SCHOOL GRAMMARS WITH EVERYDAY VOCABULARY: SUGGESTION FOR A CULTURE SPECIFIC APPROACH, WITH SIDAAMU AFOO AS AN EXAMPLE

KJELL MAGNE YRI

ABSTRACT

This contribution deals with the problematic area of specialised nomenclature in school material for languages that are comparatively new as languages of instruction. It concerns grammar, although in principle the same problems arise for those who write school materials for mathematics, chemistry, physics or any other subject taught in school. The nature of this contribution, however, is not the description of a research project in the normal sense, so it is not built up around a well formulated research question. Nonetheless, a working hypothesis can be seen to underlie the discussion. It is a reasonable assumption that if a grammatical terminology is created hastily and with quick ad hoc solutions based on English or a dominant language, it may impede transparency and learning in both the short and longer term. Consequently the hypothesis is that one finds the best solutions by starting from the local culture and everyday words, discussing and evaluating their merits as grammatical terms, and only resorting to loans or foreign influence if that approach fails. The suggestions that form this hypothesis are found in (1).

[1] INTRODUCTION

Languages are spoken for a long time before they are written, read, and analysed. Since these three abilities are advanced cultural developments, and secondary to the basic culture of life sustenance, it is no surprise that all languages lack the vocabulary to talk about language. This picture changes when a language begins to be used as a medium of instruction, or when writers start to write about language itself. Starting from only around 2500 years ago, we have the first descriptions of phenomena in language, and we have them from Indian, Greek and other philosophers. We have inherited their thinking and linguistic vocabulary from such works as Panini's Sanskrit grammar and Plato's *Cratylus*. The first linguistic terms are metaphors, extensions of meaning from

some everyday domain to the domain of speech and writing. The verb Γράφειν, “to scratch” in Greek, was extended to the activity of writing; *legere* “to pick up” in Latin was extended to the idea of reading. Grammarians of Latin and Greek between them developed a vocabulary, which to a great extent became commonly used as loanwords in European languages. Verb, noun, adjective, inflection, and conjugations, to mention but a few, are pure Latin words. Phrase, syntax, and morph are likewise Greek words. They were everyday terms for everyday concepts before they became specialised grammatical terms and spread around the world as loanwords. Hovdhaugen (1982) gives a fascinating insight into the long process that resulted in the now generally accepted grammatical terminology in “Western linguistics”.

The dominating linguistic metalanguage now being English, the Latin and Greek loanwords find their way through English into school grammars of languages around the world, again often as loanwords, but also as translation loans.

[2] PROBLEM AREA

In this study I investigate some aspects of the efforts in Sidaama to create linguistic terminology, and report on a project which is contributing towards that effort. Sidaama is a Highland East Cushitic language spoken in south central Ethiopia by people calling themselves Sidaama and numbering around 2.9 million according to the 2007 Ethiopian population census (Central Statistical Authority 2010:200). It is the 5th largest language in Ethiopia after Oromiffa, Amharic, Tigrinya, and Somali. The self-described name of the language is *Sidaamu Afoo* (lit. Sidaama-of mouth), literally “language of the Sidaama”.

Even though the history of written Sidaama is short, there are nonetheless some established terminology metaphors and loans which have become settled. Among them are *?afo*¹ “mouth” for language (metaphor), *k’aale* for “word” (loan from Amharic *k’al* “word”), and *su?ma* “name” for noun (metaphor). There is no way of doing away with the terms for either writing or reading; the former is a metaphor in the spirit of Greek, viz. *borreessa* “to engrave”, while the latter is a phonologically adapted loan from Amharic, viz. *nabbaba* “to read”, adapted from Amharic *anäbbäbä*.

When it comes to the more sophisticated terms, my view is that the formation of the vocabulary should not be undertaken prematurely, because the

[1] In this article, Sidaama examples are given in phonemic notation following IPA, except that a digraph indicates a long vowel or consonant, according to the Sidaama tradition for indicating length. The phonemic rendering of Sidaama applied here is sometimes different from the one used by other investigators, as it is based on my longstanding phonological analysis, published in Yri (1990, 2004) and in numerous later publications.

analysis of the language needs to have reached a well advanced stage. And on the basis of the Sidaama situation, which I know fairly well, I propose that it is also preferable to delay the process of terminology creation in other less analysed languages, while awaiting good descriptions of the language. However, I see no problem in undertaking the creative process of terminology coinage for those areas of the languages which are well analysed and where researchers have no great disagreement.

[3] PRINCIPLES FOR THE CREATION OF GRAMMATICAL TERMS

In the following I set out to propose four principles for successful grammatical terminology. To a great extent, they are explicit statements of what appears to have been the actual principles from the beginning, but I do not want to imply that the Latin and Greek tradition is perfect in this respect. On the contrary, I advocate the need for a certain liberation from that tradition, if not from its principles, at least with regard to the conceptual background of the actual terms which are chosen or coined. For example, in searching for good terms for inflection or conjugation, there is no need for, or universal rationale behind, resorting to the concepts of “bending” which is the everyday concept behind inflection, or “tying together by means of a yoke”, which is the agricultural concept behind conjugation.

Suggested principles for the coinage of grammatical terms

- (i) The term should be a metaphor based on the local culture, rather than a loan.
- (ii) It should be defensible from a linguistic point of view, i.e. based on analysis.
- (iii) It should be to some extent intuitively self-explanatory.
- (iv) It should be simple to remember.

[4] DISCUSSION OF SOME EXISTING EXAMPLES

Indriyas (1993 E.C.) is an attempt at a generative syntactic analysis of a sample sentence in Sidaama. It makes reference to a work which is called “Sidaamu Afii Jirte” (The Laws of the Sidaama Language), prepared in 1991 (E.C.). In the title, “the laws of the language” is apparently intended to be the translational equivalent of “grammar”. As indicated above, mouth in Sidaama also is a metaphor for language. This term for grammar conforms to the points in 1, 3, and 4 in the

principles being proposed. To evaluate its merits under point 2, the crucial word is *jirte*, “law, regulation, rule, norm, custom” (the equivalents as given in three dictionaries: Yri (1982), Gasparini (1983), and Shimelis (2007)). Is grammar a set of such phenomena, or is there a better Sidaama term to describe the regularities and patterns of the language? Such are the considerations that would necessarily be undertaken, and no opinion with the respect to this is indicated here.

The above-mentioned contribution of Indriyas (1993 E.C.) is printed in *Woganke* “Our Culture”, a magazine published annually by the Office for Culture and Tourism at Zone level in Hawassa on the occasion of the annual Sidaama Language and Culture Symposium. It is important because it is the only available sophisticated explanation of the syntax of Sidaama, which is written in the language itself. Shimelis (1998) contains fragments of phonological explanation, especially with reference to the writing system. And in the readers of elementary schools, one can find scattered grammatical terminology. Otherwise, the more complete grammars of Sidaama are written in English (Maccani 1990, Anbessa 2000 (PhD thesis) and 2014, Yri 2006, Kawachi 2007) and consequently do not suggest grammatical terminology in Sidaama.

Giving more examples of recently coined terms, I present the solution currently in effect for consonants and vowels. They are both based on the verb for talking, *c’o-id-a* “to speak” (morpheme breaks shown by a hyphen). “Vowel” is expressed with the causative active of this root, “cause to speak, address”, nominalised as an instrument or a nomen agentis, viz. *c’oi-fiif-aan-co* “something which causes/helps one to speak/pronounce”. Both Gasparini (1982) and Shimelis (2007) list “read” among the meanings of this causative verb, witnessing that the concept of “talking” is, or at one time was, the basis for the metaphorical extension “reading”. “Consonant” is expressed as *c’oi-fiif-am-aan-co*, the only difference being that the latter form contains the passive morpheme –*am*, hence “something which is caused to be spoken/read, something pronounced”. The translations are my attempts to convey the literal meanings of the words.

Obviously the terms are new coinages that purport to explain linguistic facts about the differences between vowels and consonants in Sidaama. However, in my opinion, they are not based on linguistic analysis; that is, if my understanding of the verb used is somewhat near the correct one. I cannot see what phonetic knowledge they describe, in particular how the difference between vowels and consonants is adequately captured in the difference between causative active on one hand and causative passive on the other. Besides, being so similar to each other, they cannot be easy to keep apart in memory, either for pupils in

schools, or for adults. They are obviously coined in the same mould as the Amharic *annababi* (“vowel”) and *tānababi* (“consonant”) that at first glance also exploit the concept of reading (not talking) in the active and passive voices as the home domain of the two classes of sounds. The Amharic choice of terms, however, is inherited from Gə’əz and is related to the “fidel” system of writing, where a symbol represents a syllable. Further, the basic stem *nababa* in Gə’əz has “utter a sound, give voice to” among its sense descriptors, which explains the causative/adjutative active derivation of the term for vowel: “something which helps to give voice to (viz. to the consonant in the fidel grapheme)”, while the consonant is “that which is (only) pronounced (by means of the vowel in the fidel grapheme)”. That explains the passive voice in the term for consonant. As of 1992, Sidaama did not employ the fidel system, so the choice of terms can at best be defended by reference to the time when fidels were used for writing Sidaama, and even so by reference to the history of Amharic and Gə’əz. (The factual information towards the end of this paragraph is provided by Prof. Baye Yimam and Lutz Edzard in personal communication. It is reformulated by me, so that any resulting misrepresentation of facts is solely my responsibility.)

A superficial knowledge of the phonology of a language on the part of the decision makers is not only unfortunate for the phonological terminology, but also for the creation of the orthography. Graphemes of a language can be seen as grammatical terms in a wider sense, and should be subject to the same caution as other terms. In Shimelis (1998:xxii) some glottal stops are called *lik’insu k’oonk’o* “throat sounds”, which is probably an adequate term. But the glottal stop is not listed among the consonants, and in some occurrences the symbol is not described as standing for a “throat sound”, but as a device “separating identical vowels from each other”. The present Sidaama orthography bears witness to the disadvantage of prematurely presenting linguistic results in the form of a new writing norm. For example, the glottal stop is sometimes written <'> (in clusters with liquids, and also as geminated between vowels of any quality), sometimes <'> (ungeminated between identical vowels), and sometimes omitted altogether (word initially and ungeminated between vowels of different quality). For a systematic evaluation of the Sidaama orthography see Yri (2004).

[5] ONE POSSIBLE THEORETICAL ORIENTATION – CONSTRUCTION GRAMMAR (CG)

Rather than using Latin and Greek through the mediation of English or another dominant language as a mould or straightjacket, translating grammatical terms

from them, I suggest another way. It may result in a temporary solution, or in a lasting solution, but its main idea is not to hurry. My suggestion is to take seriously the principles outlined above in (1), without committing oneself to choices to be adhered to forever. Let me first outline one possible theoretical foundation for such a suggestion, using the treatment of lexical categories, or parts of speech, in the so called construction grammar framework as an example.

It must be emphasised that the suggestion in (1) does not depend on those principles or any other particular theory of grammar. And although CG is an attractive framework because of its flexibility, only a fragment of the theory is presented here, viz. the skeleton of how to think about lexical categories. It is attractive because it treats each language on its own merits, claiming that the categories are not universal, but language specific.

	REFERENCE		MODIFICATION		PREDICATION	
OBJECTS	object reference	—	object modifier	—	object predication	— identity predication
PROPERTIES	property reference	—	property modifier	—	property predication	— location predication
ACTIONS	action reference	—	action modifier	—	action predication	

FIGURE 1: Conceptual space for the parts of speech (Croft 2001:92).

In Croft’s framework, this is a table that summarises the purposes for which the languages of the world use words and phrases. The upper case labels along the left hand margin are not terms for lexical categories like noun and adjective, to avoid thinking of any language in particular, but more abstract labels referring to uncontroversial semantic groupings. Figure 1 shows a semantic map of the concepts involved in the description of the functions or the meanings of constructions in any language.

Reference, modification and predication (along the top line) are some of the pragmatic functions of language, defining propositional acts. Objects, properties, and actions (along the left margin) represent major semantic classes. At the crossing points of the horizontal and the vertical lines we get an abstract characterisation of what in specific languages are different kinds of words or phrases, the prototypical categories of nouns, adjectives, and verbs (indicated by boldface letters in the chart). Along the top horizontal line, there might have been more propositional acts, like classification and quantification, and along the left margin there might have been more semantic classes, not just the three central ones.

In the following, capitalised labels are language specific (Noun), while lower case labels are universal prototypes, defined from their position in the semantic map (noun).

In traditional (school) grammars of a particular language, words belonging at these boldfaced crossing points are labelled Nouns, Verbs, Adjectives, Prepositions etc., following the Latin tradition, rather than receiving indigenous names that allude to their function. Once a label is coined, a category is established for the words that belong under this label, for example Nouns, and the words are listed as belonging to that category. That is exactly what I want to avoid before the language is thoroughly analysed, and I will show how it can be done in such a way that it helps both the child learners and those who undertake the standardisation efforts which are bound to follow at some point.

In a learner's elementary school grammar, these pragmatic functions and semantic classes may well be expressed by means of everyday language, without technical terms which will sometimes be difficult to penetrate. The appendix is an excerpt from a grammar project in progress, still in its initial stage, but following the principles outlined in (1). Applying the constructionist approach that categories are flexible, I do not commit myself or the student to a rigid categorisation. Rather, the function of words and phrases are explained in everyday words.

[6] THE LAYOUT OF THE GRAMMAR AND THE LESSONS

It is imagined that my suggestion might work e.g. for the fifth grade in an elementary school.

First, there is a lengthy explanation of letters and sounds (not included in the appendix), focusing on the difference between them, and using the metaphor that letters are mirror images of sounds. The latter can only be spoken and heard, the former can be written, seen, and read. Normally, 5th grade pupils are able to read and write fluently, so the grammar only helps them to get a deeper understanding, and to become conscious of some of the peculiarities of the orthography. The orthography, being inconsistent and self-contradictory from a phonological point of view, is bound to be difficult to learn, and thus presents pedagogical challenges.

The larger part of the grammar, at its present stage, deals with the Sidaama equivalents of Sentences, Nouns, Pronouns, Adjectives, Verbs, Copula, Demonstratives, and Tense/Aspect. Every lesson introduces one concept, or at most a very few related concepts. Then the body of the lesson is made up of a few short statements explaining this concept. Then follows a text for the pupils to

read carefully and search for instances of that concept in the text.² The excerpt of the grammar that is presented here contains only enough to give an idea of its structure.

The grammar in the appendix contains the part that deals with sentences and, extremely abbreviated, the part that deals with word function, illustrated with some functions of a noun, that in Sidaama easily overlap with those of an adjective. To put it in CG terms, “the same word may refer or modify according to the construction in which it occurs”. The accompanying English translation is for the benefit of the non Sidaama reader. A sentence is defined as a message, which sometimes consists only of one word, sometimes of more words. The word I use for message is *sokka*, that may mean “something sent, message, letter”. The commonly used word for sentence, e.g. in Indriyas (1993) and all the Sidaama readers of the elementary schools, is *c’oi fooliffjo*, a translation loan from the Amharic *aräftä nägär*, “the pause/break/rest of a matter/something spoken”. I use both of these terms, although the translation loan is not a very intuitive choice. As for the term “word”, I assume that the loanword *k’aale* is so entrenched that there is neither the need nor any easy means to replace it with an indigenous everyday word.

After the two topics that are treated in the excerpt, I go on to the more complex fields of the chart given in figure (1), viz. nouns functioning as predication (e.g. ‘my brother **is a patient**’), as modifier (e.g. ‘a **widow** woman’), and a great many others. Those are not included in this presentation.

It is not necessary at this point to draw any conclusion about the most recommended choices of specific grammatical terms. But from the treatment of topic 2, “The word”, it would appear reasonable that *su’ma* “name” is a viable choice for a Sidaama grammatical concept noun, which is in fact the solution actually in effect in school material. It happens to be in line with the “Western” tradition.

The grammar goes on with examples and explanations that are attempts to overcome the Sidaama problem of classification of nouns (read: “referring expressions” and adjectives (read: “modifying expressions”). No such term as “adjective” is introduced, but by means of examples it is demonstrated that e.g. the

[2] The reading texts in the grammar are taken from Kachara (2002 and 2003), used with permission from the leader of the literacy project of the Mekane Yesus Church that published the books, Mr. Peter Lanting. They are authored by Kachara Bansa and contain stories from the rural culture of Sidaama. The grammatical explanations both in Sidaama and English are written by the author of this article, who also translated the Sidaama texts into English. (Yaicob Wayu helped with the translation of *deesallo* in Text 1.) The translation of the texts is a general one, not necessarily in perfect English, but sufficient to convey the semantic contents of the sentences. Morphological glossing is not provided because the aim of the paper is not linguistic analysis.

word *gunnitte* “widow” in some contexts “points to a thing (which includes persons and animals)”, and that is its work in that context. Semantically we would have said that the word refers. With Latin as metalanguage we would have called it a *Nomen*, a Noun. But in other contexts, e.g. *gunnitte manco*, “widow woman” the same word “tells how a person/thing is”, and that is its function in that context. Semantically, we would have said that it modifies, and in a rigid metalanguage we might have called it an Adjective. So the question arises: is it an Adjective or is it a Noun, or is it both? This problem is not trivial in Sidaama (see Yri (2007)).

By taking this approach, pupils are made more aware of the functions of words in certain constructions, rather than being forced to learn categories of words that are not even adequate labels, and which may have to be revised when the language is better analysed. While the intuitively attractive option of choosing *su'ma* “name” as the term for Noun probably will remain the lasting solution, one will have to struggle more with the category containing modifiers, which in Sidaama overlaps with Nouns. Focusing on the two pragmatic functions of referring and modifying might be easier to deal with, both theoretically and pedagogically. By the way, one suggestion for Adjective in Sidaama actually in use is *su'mi ledo*: “the companion of a Noun”. One of its disadvantages is that it alludes to a purely formal, not functional characteristic of its meaning. One may object that a lot of different grammatical phenomena can appear “accompanying a name/Noun”, without saying anything about “how the thing is”.

In the drafted grammar, predication is described as “adding new knowledge”. It is not included in the excerpt that is the appendix to this article. Words which “add new knowledge”, are however, are not simply the Verbs of Sidaama, albeit including them. Predicates may also be all kinds of nominal and sentential constructions, with a Copula as the wizardly function determiner.

[7] CONCLUSION

This is just a small introduction to a work in progress, along with the considerations that triggered it. The approach does not reduce the importance of the creation of a well-reflected set of grammatical terms. But those who create it should be native speakers (so that concerning Sidaama, the present author is disqualified from the outset, but hopefully entitled to have an opinion), and have enough linguistic insight not to form misleading terms, which may be the case if the task is undertaken too early in the standardisation process. A grammar composed along the lines suggested here may even help those who set about coining the conclusive metalanguage.

It is claimed here that the propositional acts of reference, modification, and predication, as well as the semantic classes of objects, properties and actions, can be made simple without technical terms. It is also assumed that the approach is feasible and would be profitable for any topic of grammar. The present suggested grammar does not distinguish between morphology and syntax. They are interwoven within each other. That, however, is a matter of organisation and not crucial to the main objective of this contribution: to create an awareness of the power of everyday words to describe grammatical phenomena in an intuitive and simple way.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Professor Baye Yimam and Professor Lutz Edzard provided details about the background of terms for vowels and consonants in Amharic and Gĩ'iz. I should also like to thank the NORHED project 'Linguistic Capacity Building – Tools for the Inclusive Development of Ethiopia' financially supported by NORAD.

REFERENCES

- Anbessa Teferra. 2000. *A Grammar of Sidaama* (unpublished PhD thesis). Revised and published as Anbessa (2014).
- Anbessa Teferra. 2014. *Sidaama (Sidaamu Afoo)*. Lincom Europa.
- Central Statistical Authority. 2010. *The 2007 Population and Housing Census of Ethiopia. Statistical Report for Southern Nations, Nationalities, and Peoples' Region*. Addis Ababa.
- Croft, William. 2001. *Radical Construction Grammar. Syntactic Theory in Typological Perspective*. Oxford.
- Gasparini, Armido. 1983. *Sidamo – English Dictionary*. Bologna (Italy).
- Hovdhaugen, Even. 1982. *The Foundations of Western Linguistics*. Oslo.
- Indriyas Xa'miso Dooqe. 1993 E.C. *Sidaamu Afii Xiinxallo guma (The advantages (lit. fruit) of studying Sidaama) in Woganke 1:2*. Hawaasa.
- Kachara Bansa. 2002. Sidaamu Afii Rosu Xinti Hanafote Dhagge, Roso 1-20, *The Sidama Literacy Project*, Awasa.
- Kachara Bansa. 2003. Sidaamu Afii Rosu Xinti Hanafote Dhagge, Roso 21-40, *The Sidama Literacy Project*, Awasa.

- Kawachi, Kazuhiro. 2007. *A grammar of Sidaama (Sidamo), a Cushitic Language of Ethiopia*. PhD dissertation. Buffalo, NY: University at Buffalo.
- Maccani, B. 1990. *Small Grammar of the Sidamo Language*. Catholic Mission, Miqe.
- Shimelis Gizaw. 1998. *Sidaamu Afii maammashsha (Proverbs in Sidaama)*. Addis Ababa University.
- Shimelis Gizaw (ed.) 2007. Indrias Xa'miso, Sileshi Workineh, Yohannis Latamo, Desalegn Garsamo (compilers): *Sidama – Amharic – English Dictionary*. Sidama Information and Culture Department. Master Printing Press. Addis Ababa.
- Yri, Kjell Magne. 2004. *Orthography and Phonology in Sidaamu Afoo*. JES xxxvii,1.
- Yri, Kjell Magne. 2006. *A Grammar of Sidaamu ʔafó*, preliminary version. Unipub. Oslo.
- Yri, Kjell Magne. 2007. Nouns and Adjectives in Sidaamu ʔafó. : *Omotic and Cushitic Language Studies. Papers from the Fourth Cushitic Omotic Conference, Leiden 10-12 April 2003*. Köln: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.
- Yri, Kjell Magne. 1982. *English – Sidamo Wordlist* (mimeographed, unpublished).

APPENDIX: SELECTED TOPICS OF GRAMMAR AND HOW THEY COULD BE PRESENTED IN SIMPLE WORDS

TOPIC 1 (FIRST PART): SOKKA - THE SENTENCE

Coyi'nannire³ wole doogonni sokka yinara dandiinanni.

What we say (speak about) in another way can be called a message.

Coyi'nanni woyite, yinanniha sayisiinsara sae sae seeda yanna hasiissanno, sae sae harancho yanna hasiissanno.

It may take a long time or a short time to say what you wanted to say.

Harancho sokka ikkituro, miteege mittu qaali calla hasiissanno. Lawishshu gedde:

If the message is short, we sometimes only need one word. For example:

No. "He is here" "She is here" "He is alive" etc.

Dino. "She is not at home" "He is not here" etc.

Ofolli! "Please, sit down"

Danchaho. "It is good"

Maati? "What is it?"

Mineho. "It is a house"

Dee'ni! "No, not at all"

Fulino? "Has he gone out?"

Ee! "Yes, (he has gone out)"

Aliidi borreessinoonniti mitte mitte sokka mitto mitto qaale callaati.

Each single message written above consists only of one word.

Togoo sokkano wole doogonni 'coyi foolishsho'⁴ yinanni.

Such messages are also called 'sentences'.

Borreessineemmo woyite, sokka borreessine gundummoro, mitto malaate lendeemmo.

When writing, having finished writing the message, we add a sign at the end.

Malaatta tennete:

[3] The explanations and the examples adhere to the standard orthography as a matter of course.

[4] Both Amharic (through Ga'az) and traditional Sidaama structure the conventional concept of 'sentence' as 'the resting point of the speech/matter'. In other words, the pause between sentences is metonymically extended to represent the material that precedes the pause. In Sidaama this is a translation loan from Amharic.

The signs are these:

. ? !

Tenne sase malaatta su'ma egennootto (egennootta).

You know the names of these three signs.

Tenne sase malaatta giddonni mitto laittoro (laittaro), mitte sokka gooffinota afatto (afatta).

If you see one of these three signs, you know that one message has ended.

Sokkate giddo wole malaattano heedhara dandiitanno:

Inside sentences there may be other marks:

; , : - wkl (etc.)

(Here will be inserted the names and uses of all the marks which are deemed necessary)

NIWAAWE – TEXT (LITERALLY “READING”): SAA – THE COW

Aadde Amalora mitte saa noosi. Ise su'mino Boontuuti. Hatte saa ado deesal-lote.⁵

Mr Amalo has a cow. Her name is Boontu. That cow provides enough milk.

Aadde Amalo saa lowo geeshsha asse baxannose. Hakkonnira hatte saa mininni gobbara fultara dibaxanno.

Mr. Amalo is very fond of the cow. Therefore he does not like it to go outside.

Isi ilaala fule hayisso mide abbe itisannose. Saano Aadde Amalo lowo geeshsha baxxannosi.

He goes up on the mountain and cuts grass which he brings for her to eat. The cow is also very fond of Mr. Amalo.

Isi ilaala fule hayisso mide abbara ha'riro, saa woddanni qarrissanno.

When he climbs the mountain to cut grass to bring to her, the cow bellows and causes trouble.

[5] Kachara's (2002) original was deensallo, which Yaicob Wayu in personal communication corrected to deesallo. None of the available dictionaries contains the word in any form.

Mini ama Baabba Sooreette saa “Boontu’ya ballo, sammi yii! Woddootina! xaanni hasi’roottare abbannohena” yite awissuse.

The housewife Mrs. Sooreette tried to calm the cow; “Please Boontu, keep quiet; he will bring your food to you right now”, she said soothing the cow.

Saa woddanni heedheenna, Aadde Amalo ilaalunni hayisso mide umoho duqqe kae dayi.

While the cow was bellowing, Mr. Amalo had cut grass on the mountain, and was carrying it on his head to her.

Iseno iso affe suunte, hayisso luqqisse adhitara golo shashshaffu.

When she saw him she quieted down, but in order to snatch at the grass she shook the wall.

Aadde Amalono saasi Boontura hanqe, hayisso uulla tuge, “Hawusa iti atina!” yee

Mr. Amalo became angry at his cow Boontu, threw the grass on the floor and said, “You disagreeable creature, eat!”

haqqichcho haa’re gane bararraassi. Iseno xooqqe hedheenna, hayisso al-baseenni wori.

He hit her with a stick and frightened her. While she fled, he put the grass in front of her.

Isi ofolle fooliishshi’rita saano higge hayisso ittu. Baabba Sooreette saa xuurte ado shaffanno.

As he sat down to rest, the cow also returned and ate the grass. Mrs. Sooreette milks the cow and processes the milk.

Saate ado shaffe, buuronna ado badde, gama mine horoonsidhu gedensaanni
Processing the milk she separates the butter from it. First she uses part of it in the house,

gattinota dikko fushshite hirte, lowo womaashsha abbitanno.

then she takes the rest to the market and sells it. That way she earns a lot of money.

LOOSO – HOMEWORK (TASKS):

Tenne niwaawe giddo meu coyi foolishshi no?

How many sentences are there in this story?

Heedhanno malaatta maanna maa ayinateeti?

What kinds of signs exist?

TOPIC 1 (SECOND PART): COYI FOOLISHSHO (2) - THE SENTENCE (2)

Sokka sase danna afidhino:

There are three kinds of sentences:

1. Ubbino. “*She has fallen down*”

Togoo sokka woy coyi foolishsho “duduwo” yinanni.

*Such a message or sentence is called a “**piece of news**” (statement).*

Konne malaate (.) laittoro (laittaro), coyi foolishshi duduwo ikkinota afootto (afootta).

If you see this sign (.), you know that the sentence is a statement (piece of news).

2. Hadhino? “*Did they/she go away?*”

Togoo sokka woy coyi foolishsho “xa’mo” yinanni.

*This kind of message or sentence is called a **question**.*

Konne malaate (?) laittoro (laittaro), coyi foolishshi xa’mo ikkitinota afootto (afootta).

If you see this sign (?), you know that the sentence is a question.

3. Amme! “*Both (all) of you; come here!*”

Togoo sokka woy coyi foolishsho “hajajo” yinanni.

*This kind of message or sentence is called a **command**.*

Konne malaate (!) laittoro, coyi foolishshi hajajo ikkitinota afootto.

If you see this sign (!), you know that the sentence is a command.

Coyi foolishshi dancha ikkiro, wo’ma sokka kulanno.

If a sentence is good, it tells a complete message.

Aleenni nabbawoottori (nabbawoottari) sasunku coyi foolishshi danchaho.

All the three sentences you read above are proper sentences.

Kunni woroonni noo qaalla, “Saa” yinanni niwaawe giddoonni fushshinoonnite:

The words below are taken from the story called “The cow”.

1. xaanni hasi’roottare “now that which you want”
2. iseno xooqqe hedheenna “while she ran away”
3. hirte, lowo womaashsha “after selling, much money”

Sasunku lawishshi wo’ma sokka dikulanno.

None of the three examples tells a complete message.

Hakkunni daafira danca coyi foolishsho di”ikkanno.

Therefore they are not good sentences.

Mimmitu ledi coyi’rama dandiinannihu, danchu coyi foolishshi widoonni callaati.

Conversation is only possible by means of proper sentences.

Tenne coyi foolishshuwa galagalte lai:

Look at these sentences again:

1. Ubbino. “She fell down.”
2. Ha’rino? “Did he go away?”
3. Amme! “Both (all) of you; come here!”

Sasunku coyi foolishshi giddo mitto mitto qaale calla noona, haranchoho.

All three sentences consist only of one word, so they are short.

Lowi yanna kulleemmo duduwo seedaho. Lowi yanna xa’mineemmo xa’mono seedate.

Very often the news we tell is long. Very often the questions we ask are long.

Lowi yanna hajanjeemmo hajajono seedate.

And very often the commands we give are long.

For example: (*Lawishshu gede*;)
 Sukkaare hidhitara mamoota hadhu?
 When did she go to buy sugar?

Tini xa'mo seedate.
 This question is long.

Haqqa maxxanni heedhe ubbino.
 While he was cutting branches off a tree, he fell down.

Kuni duduwi seedaho.
 This piece of news (statement) is long.

Saada fushshitine ka'ine kawa amme!
 When you have finished driving out the cattle, then come here both (all) of you!

Tini hajajo seedate.
 This command is long.

NIWAAWE – READING (TEXT): RISA – THE FALCON

(The text itself is omitted in this presentation; only the associated homework is quoted.)

“Risa” yinanni niwaawe giddu, duduwo, xa'monna hajajo ikkitino coyi fool-
ishshuwa duuchcha hasi'ri!
In the story called “The falcon”, find all the sentences which are statements, questions, or commands.

TOPIC 2: MITTU MITTU QAALI LOOSO – THE WORK OF THE WORDS

Mine wole wole looso loosa hasiissannohe.
 At home you have different kinds of work to do.

Mine loosikki maati?
 What is your work at home?

Ati labbaaha ikkittoro, annakki kaa'latto.
 If you are a boy, you help your father.

Isi lalo noosiro, saada hayikkisatto.
If your father has cattle, you lead the cattle to the water.

Meyaata ikkittaro, amakki kaa'latto.
If you are a girl, you help your mother.

Mine giira hasiissannona, meyaati dubbunni haqqe abbitanno.
Fire is necessary in a house, so girls fetch firewood from the forest.

Qaallano babbaxxanno.
In the same way words are different from each other.

Togoonnino loosinsa babbaxxanno.
Likewise their tasks are also different from each other.

COYENNA UDUUNNE - THINGS

Minu gid dono dubbu gid dono dikkoteno qaalla diafi'neemmo.
Be it in the house, in the forest, or at the market, words we do not find.

Afi'neemmohu coyenna uduunneeti.
*What we find are different **things**.*

Uullate aana coyinna uduunnu batinye no.
The world is full of things.

Mitto mitto uduunnichcho kinsara dandiinanni, woleha kinsara didandiinnan-
 ni.
Some of them we can touch, others we cannot.

Lawishshu gede, moyiccuno, mannuno, mini uduunneno, togonni ceano no.
For example: There exist animals, house equipment, people and birds.

Insa duuchcha babbaxxino coyubbaati.
They are all different things.

Coyi'nanni qaali kayinni wole garaati.
The spoken words are different from these.

Qaalu loosi maati yiniro, mittu mittu qaali hakkonne coye malaatisanno woy riqiwan-no.

*The work of some words is to **refer** (expressed by means of “pointing to” = malaatisa and/or “replace” = riqiwa) to those things.*

‘Kincho’ yinanni qaali kincho ikkino coye malaatisanno.

The word ‘kincho’ points to the thing which is a stone.

‘Ado’ yinanni qaali ado ikkino coye malaatisanno.

The word ‘ado’ points to the thing which is milk.

‘Gunnitte’ yinanni qaale minaannise reyinoose mancho malaatisanno.

The word ‘gunnitte’ points to a woman whose husband has died.

LA ‘NANNIKKI C’OYE - ABSTRACT MATTERS

Tunsichcho lainohu dino.

Nobody has seen darkness.

Ikkirono, tunsichcho maatiro anfoommo.

But we know what darkness is.

‘Tunsichcho’ yinanni qaali hakkonne la’nannikkinna kinsannikki coye malaatisanno.

The word ‘tunsichcho’ points to that thing which cannot be seen or touched.

Qaalu coye malaatisannota hiitto assine anfeemmo?

How can we know that a word points to a thing?

Qaalu coyi su’ma ikkiro, coye malaatisanno.

If the word is a name of a thing, then it is a pointing word.

(A piece of homework again is based on the previous story about the falcon:)

Tenne niwaawe giddo, malaatisanno qaale duuchcha hasi’ri!

Find all the pointing words (=all the Nouns) in this text.

CONTACT

Kjell Magne Yri
University of Oslo
kjellmy@iln.uio.no