



10.2478/topling-2022-0006

## The focus system in Hadiyya

Dereje Adane Menore\*  
Shimelis Mazengia Beyene  
Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia

---

### Abstract

This study identifies, analyses and describes the devices and functions of focus in information structuring in Hadiyya, a Highland East Cushitic language. Data, which were collected from native speakers, were dealt with based on the theory of Functional Grammar (Dik 1997). For focalization, the language uses morphological, lexical and syntactic means. The latter involves word-order change and cleft construction (including pseudo-cleft). Comparatively, the morphological mechanism is the most dynamic and frequent in use while the lexical means is limited both in the number of items employed and in frequency of occurrence.

### Key words

Hadiyya, Cushitic, focus, focus devices, information structure

### 1. Introduction

In speech, utterances are organized in various ways based on the kind of message intended to be transmitted in a given discursive context. The organization of sentences into various types of information units is referred to as “information structure” (Féry and Ishihara, 2016, p. 1). Chafe (1976) provided the alternative term “information packaging”. Information structure embraces such key notions as topic, givenness and focus (Krifka, 2008). The terms are complemented with comment, newness and background, respectively. The topic-comment structure is alternatively referred to as theme-rheme. While the former is the subject of a sentence the latter is what is said about it (Féry and Ishihara, 2016, p. 3). Of the preceding notions of information structure, this article focuses on “focus”. As defined by Krifka (2008, p. 247), focus is an indicator of important choices for interpreting utterances. In other words, it is a part of an utterance that is given prominence and to which attention is drawn. Givenness and background are associated with shared information or what is commonly known by interlocutors. On the contrary, newness and focus are associated with new information that is imparted by the speaker.

The present study deals with the mechanisms and functions of focus in Hadiyya, which is spoken in the Hadiyya zone in the Southern Nations, Nationalities, and Peoples Regional State (SNNPR) of Ethiopia. The zonal capital, Hosa'ina, is located 232 kilometres southwest of Addis Ababa, Ethiopia's capital. The language is classified under the Highland East Cushitic (HEC) group of the Cushitic family. The languages which belong to the HEC group are Hadiyya, Burji, Gedeo, Kambaata and Sidaama (Fallon, 2015, p. 71). There are also dialects associated with the aforementioned languages. Hudson (1976, p. 529) says that Libido is a variety of Hadiyya, while T'ambaaro, K'abeena and Alaaba are the dialects of Kambaata. Hadiyya is in contact with the Semitic languages Gurage and Silt'e as well as the Cushitic Kambaata and Alaaba.

---

\* Address for correspondence: Dereje Adane, Addis Ababa University, College of Humanities, Language Studies, Journalism and Communication, Department of Linguistics and Philology, Sidist Kilo, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. derejeadane@gmail.com

As regards the grouping of the Cushitic languages, there are different views. However, Fallon (2015, p. 71) presents them in a tree diagram based on sources such as Hayward (2000), Tosco (2000), and Mous (2012). This classification organizes the Cushitic languages into four major groups: Northern, Central, Eastern and Southern. Hadiyya belongs to the Eastern group.

The Hadiyya population is 1,243,776 (Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia Population Census Commission, 2008). In the distant past, the Hadiyya were followers of *Fandaannano*, a traditional religion. At some point, they adopted Islam. Currently, the majority of them are Protestant Christians, and only small sections of the population are followers of the Catholic and Ethiopian Orthodox churches as well as Islam.

Before moving on to the specific topic of the paper, just for a quick look at what the literature offers concerning focus marking in Hadiyya and the other Cushitic languages, let us look at the following brief outline. In HEC languages, copula and covert copula (functionally present but formally absent) have a focus function (cf. Crass, 2007; Treis, 2007). Treis (2007, p. 91) promotes Appleyard's (1989) generalization that cleft sentences are commonly used as focus-marking devices in the Ethiopian language area.

From among the Cushitic languages of Ethiopia, Oromo is relatively well studied with regard to information structure. Aynalem (2020) is a full-fledged doctoral dissertation on the information structure of the language. In addition, there are studies on the various aspects of focus in the language including Baye (1988), Taaha (1990) as well as Dabala and Meyer (2003).

In an attempt to fill the gap concerning information about the focus system in Hadiyya, this study attempts to deal with the focus mechanisms employed in the language and their functions. For the purpose, the necessary data were gathered from a district called Sooro which is found west of Hosa'ina, the capital of the Hadiyya Zone. To attain the objective of the qualitative study, a descriptive approach was framed on the theory of Functional Grammar (Dik, 1997). Since focus is a component of information structure and the function of the latter takes context into account, the data which bear foci were extracted from recorded free speech and stories. The data were then organized into a mini corpus. Free speech in our context means a continuous conversation conducted between two or more target subjects without any interruptive guidance.

The necessary data, including focus elements and structures, were obtained from the mini corpus. However, in rare cases when we could not find the appropriate structure, we resorted to the introspection of the author and got verified by native speaker informants.

To facilitate readers' understanding of the pragmatic descriptions in the study, the next section presents some features of the grammar of Hadiyya.

## **2. Salient morphological and syntactic features of Hadiyya**

Based essentially on Tadesse (2015)<sup>1</sup> and consulting Hudson (1976), the characterizing features of the morphology and syntax of the language are outlined. In Hadiyya, nouns end in a vowel. Of the five vowels of the language (i, u, e, o, a) with contrastive long ones, nouns terminate in *-a*, *-e* or *-o*. None of the high (closed) vowels, *-i* and *-u*, appears as a terminal vowel of a noun. The fact that nouns end in a vowel is a characteristic of most HEC languages (Tadesse, 2015, p. 42). In Hadiyya, it is the uninflected citation form of nouns that is used as an object in a sentence. In this function, the terminal vowel of the noun is retained but phonetically weakened. Such is the form of nouns in the absolute case in the language (Tadesse, 2015, p. 56).

In Hadiyya, verb roots convey meaning with inflectional suffixes. They are monosyllabic, disyllabic and trisyllabic. The widely occurring root is monosyllabic (Tadesse, 2015, p. 98). Personal pronouns of the first and second persons are common gender (no distinction in gender). Only the singular third person exhibits gender distinction. The second and third persons have corresponding honorific forms which are used in reference to elderly and respected persons.

The verb stem in Hadiyya is a root plus inflectional morphemes (subject, aspect and additional subject markers). The roots and the inflectional suffixes manifest the pattern in (1). A corresponding example of the pattern is given in (2).

---

<sup>1</sup> Tadesse (2015) is a doctoral dissertation on the grammar of Hadiyya.

- (1) *Verb root – Agreement – Aspect – Additional Subject Marker (ASM)*
- (2) *waar-am-u-kko*  
 come-3PL-PFV-ASM  
 ‘They came.’

In Hadiyya, true adjectives are non-existent. They are formed by derivation (Tadesse, 2015, p. 137). The major grammatical strategy for using derivative adjectives is affixation. Such adjectives are generated from nominal and verbal roots.

The canonical word order of a transitive sentence in HEC languages, to which Hadiyya conforms, is Subject-Object-Verb (SOV) (Hudson, 1976, p. 275). For an intransitive sentence, the order is SV.

Section 3, below, is the core of the paper. It deals with the identification and description of the formal and functional aspects of the focus devices employed in Hadiyya.

### 3. Focus devices and types

The first part of the section identifies and describes the devices that are employed for focalization in Hadiyya. Based on the formal categories as well as the actual focus elements and the structures the language employs, the second part identifies and describes the types of focus functions.

#### 3.1 Focus devices

Languages express focalization using different devices. Dik (1997, p. 327) points out that cross-linguistically focus is shown via one or more of the following coding mechanisms. These are: prosodic prominence, particles, constituent order change, and cleft construction. In Hadiyya, focus is marked via morphological means, lexical words, constituent order change, and cleft construction. The prosodic means does not seem to have a significant role for the purpose.

Sim (1989, p. 186) and Tadesse (2015, p. 217) are of the stance that Hadiyya does not mark focus morphologically. As far as the present study is concerned, the language uses such morphological elements as *-naʔe*, *-tte*, *-mii*, *-du*, and *-m* for focusing. For each of these morphemes a respective example is given in (3) below.

- (3) a. *saajj-i k’ar-ø-u-kko-naʔe*  
 cow-NOM give.birth-3SG.M-PFV-ASM-FOC  
 ‘The cow GAVE BIRTH.’
- b. *ʔawwaad-ø-oo latfiʔa siid-ø-u-mmo-tte*  
 help-3SG.M-IPFV knowledge.ABS find-1SG-PFV-ASM-FOC  
 ‘I FOUND helpful knowledge.’
- c. *ʔani ʔamb-inaa-mii meer-ina ʔih-ø-oo-mmo-jjo*  
 1sg.NOM village-DAT-FOC market-DAT be-1SG-IPFV-ASM-NEG  
 ‘I am good for guarding a VILLAGE, not for going to the market.’
- d. *ʔi sogitano sab-t-aa-tto [sabbaatto] haww-du*  
 1SG.GEN advice.ABS refuse-2SG-PF-ASM disturb-FOC  
 ‘You refused my advice, keep on BEING DISTURBED.’
- e. *ʔani maara ʔit-ø-aa-mmo ʔado-m ʔag-ø-aa-mmo*  
 1SG.NOM meat.ABS eat-1SG-PF-ASM milk.ABS-FOC drink-1SG-PF-ASM  
 ‘I have eaten meat; I have also DRUNK MILK.’

The above morphemes can be used interchangeably for nominal, adverbial and verbal focusing, except *-tte* which functions only as a verbal focus.



- c. *meera*            *mar-ø-u-kko-k-i*            *buufeeb-o-tte*  
 market.ABS    go-3SG.M-PFV-ASM-REL-NOM    bufebo-COP  
 ‘Who went to the market IS BUFEBO.’

In a cleft construction, the focused constituent is placed in the initial position of the sentence, whereas in a pseudo-cleft construction, it is placed in the final position. In other words, the former has a focus-background pattern whereas the latter has a background-focus pattern.

### 3.2 Focus types

This section presents focus types from a functional perspective; that is, examining the various meanings they impart in pragmatic situations. In broad terms, focus in functional terms could be divided into informational focus and identificational focus (Gundel and Fretheim, 2004, p. 181; Kiss, 1998, p. 245; Stoyanova, 2008, p. 11). As regards informational focus, the information that a speaker intends to draw attention to is emphasized, whereas with respect to identificational focus, the speaker provides information as opposed to the information that the addressee has (Gundel and Fretheim, 2004, p. 181). The preceding classification is related to Dik’s (1997, p. 331) classification: (i) information gap and (ii) contrast. Information gap focus is a type which could be viewed from two perspectives. The first perspective is that a speaker who lacks information concerning something presumes that an addressee has it and thus asks a question. In such a case, the question itself has a focus value in what it specifically demands and it is termed questioning focus. The second perspective is that a speaker has a piece of information about something which s/he presumes that the addressee has a gap and thus fills the gap. The latter is thus termed completive focus.

Contrast focus (counterpart of information gap focus) is the type which involves providing information which counters the information the addressee has.

Like its counterpart (information gap focus), the contrast focus is further divided into counter-presuppositional focus and parallel focus. Counter-presuppositional focus demonstrates contrast between one focus constituent against another – that is, a piece of information against another one. On the other hand, parallel focus exhibits focalization of corresponding constituents in parallel constructions; that is, a focused constituent would have a focused counterpart in the same construction (e.g., DERJE is TALL but LAMBEBO is SHORT). Of the two classes of contrast focus, counter-presuppositional focus is relatively multifarious. Accordingly, it is divided into: (a) Restricting focus, (b) Expanding focus, (c) Rejecting focus, (d) Replacing focus, and (e) Selecting focus. In the sections that follow, we shall discuss how the above-identified focus classes and subclasses are formally and functionally manifested in Hadiyya

#### 3.2.1 Information gap focus

As pointed out above, information gap focus concerns providing a piece of information that a speaker considers missing in what the addressee knows. It is done through questioning. The information obtained in such a manner would be new and not presupposed.

##### 3.2.1.1 Questioning focus

As indicated earlier, the questioning focus is a means by which a speaker solicits a piece of information to fill the gap s/he has with the assumption that the addressee has the information. The speaker may ask a question using question words (What...? Who...? etc.) or Yes/No questions depending on the kind of information required. The speaker may ask question to obtain new information, clarification, or confirmation. In all cases, the purpose is to fill a gap in her/his knowledge. Let us look at the examples below. In (9), the speaker uses a question word whereas in (10) a Yes/No question.

- (9) S: *summor-i*            *hanno*            *mar-ø-u-kko?*  
 sumore-NOM    where            go-3SG.M-PFV-ASM  
 ‘WHERE did Sumore go?’

- A: *hosa?ina*  
 hosa’ina  
 ‘HOSA’INA.’

- (10) S: *gotitf-i t'or-ø-u-kko-nnih?*  
hyena-NOM escape-3SG.M-PFV-ASM-Q  
'Did the hyena ESCAPE?'

A: *ʔeejja*  
yes  
'YES.'

The responses to the questions provide new information to fill the gap that the questioner has. Therefore, both questions and answers have a significant role as focalization means in information structuring.

### 3.2.1.2 Completive focus

It is a type of focus which is based on a situation where a speaker has a piece of information which s/he assumes that a speaker lacks (information gap) and thus s/he (the speaker) is in a position to fill that gap.

In Hadiyya, the completive focus is shown by focus morphemes and cleft as well as pseudo-cleft constructions. Of the focus-marking morphemes in the inventory of the language, *-tte* and *-naʔe* are the ones which are mostly used for marking the completive focus. In the utterance in (11), the coming of the subject is focused with *-tte*. The context is that the speaker presupposes the addressee was not aware of the coming of the subject and, therefore, fills the gap by providing the information (which is new).

- (11) *Summor-i waar-ø-u-kko-tte*  
sumore-NOM come-3SG.M-PFV-ASM-FOC  
'Sumore CAME.'

In (12 a-c) below, the speaker provides the emphasized parts as focused information that the addressee is presumed to have missed. The focusing in (12a) is morphological while in (12b-c) syntactic; that is, cleft and pseudo-cleft constructions. The speakers of the utterances presuppose that their addressees have information gaps, and therefore, they provide new information, which fill in the gap. In each case, the information fills a gap and, therefore, it has a completive function.

- (12) a. *got-i-tf-i dimbaan-tf-o-ø-naʔe ʔit-ø-u-kkó*  
hyena.PL-EP-SGV-NOM drunkard.PL-SGV-ABS-COP-FOC eat-3SG.M-PFV-ASM.REL  
'A hyena attacked (ate) A DRUNKARD.'
- b. *dimbaan-tf-ó-ø got-i-tf-i ʔit-ø-u-kko-k-i*  
drunkard.PL-SGV-ABS-COP hyena.PL-EP-SGV-NOM eat-3SG.M-PFV-ASM-REL-NOM  
'IT IS A DRUNKARD that the hyena attacked (ate).'
- c. *got-i-tf-i ʔit-ø-u-kko-k-i dimbaan-tf-o-ø*  
hyena.PL-EP-SGV-NOM eat-3SG.M-PFV-ASM-REL-NOM drunkard.PL-SGV-ABS-COP  
'What the hyena attacked (ate) is A DRUNKARD.'

The first part of the cleft construction (12b) is spoken in a relatively higher pitch and is accompanied by morphosyntactic changes, that is, insertion of a covert copula and a relativizer (*-k*) in the verb.

Unlike (12), a completive focus could be provided without any focus-marking device. The discourse context of example (13) is as follows. It might be in a situation where the interlocutors are, say, in Europe and the one who visited Ethiopia tells a friend about the country. In the course of the narration, the speaker might presuppose that the addressee does not know the name of the capital city of Ethiopia and may utter the statement given below.

- (13) *ʔitop'p'eʔ-i won-i beeroʔ-i ʔaddis ʔabab-a-ø*  
itop'p'eʔ-GEN first-NOM city-NOM addis abab-ABS-COP  
'The capital city of Ethiopia is ADDIS ABABA.'

### 3.2.2 Contrast focus

As defined above, in this focus type, the speaker provides information that is in opposition with the information that the addressee has. The subclasses of contrast focus, which have been identified above as: restricting focus, expanding focus, rejecting focus, replacing focus and selecting focus are described below.

#### 3.2.2.1 Expanding focus

This is a case of focusing where a speaker assumes that the addressee knows a piece of information but another relevant piece of information is missing which is important for the addressee to know (cf. Dik, 1997, p. 333). In Hadiyya, expanding focus is marked morphologically by affixation. Accordingly, the expanding focus morpheme *-m* is suffixed to the constituent which has to be within what should be focalized. The following is an example of expanding focus.

- (14) *kukkuss-i-tfif-o*                      *bagad-i-nne*                      *k'as-ø-u-mmo*                      ***mug-i-nne-m***  
 antelope.PL-EP-SGV-ABS      spear-NOM-INS      stab-1SG-PFV-ASM                      stick-NOM-INS-FOC  
*ʔap'p'is-ø-u-mmo*  
 hit-1SG-PFV-ASM  
 'I stabbed an antelope with a spear; I hit it WITH A STICK too.'

#### 3.2.2.2 Restricting focus

In this focus type, the speaker considers only the relevant information and disregards the information which s/he assumes that the addressee wrongly possessed additionally. All the world languages may have the focus-sensitive word, "only" (Skopeteas et.al., 2006, p. 237). This word is sometimes used to express restrictive focus. In Hadiyya, *t'aleʔe* 'only' could be used to restrict information. Below, in (15a), the speaker's utterance involves two individuals. But in (15b), the addressee makes a correction by restricting the participant in the verbal action to one.

- (15) a. *land-i-tfif-o-o*                      *beet-i-i*                      *waar-am-u-kko*  
 girl.PL-EP-SGV-NOM-CONJ      boy-NOM-CONJ                      come-3PL-PFV-ASM  
 'The girl and the boy came.'
- b. *t'aleʔ-i*                      ***land-i-tfif-o-tte***                      *waar-t-o-ʔo-k-i [waattoʔoki]*  
 only-NOM      girl.PL-EP-SGV-COP                      come-3SG.F-PFV-ASM-REL-NOM  
 'Only THE GIRL came.'

Observe that the restricting focus word *t'aleʔi* 'only' appears just before the focused constituent giving the interpretation that it was not the girl and the boy who came, but only the girl. The focus word may also appear after the focused constituent.

#### 3.2.2.3 Rejecting focus

In this focus type, a speaker presumes that an addressee possesses a piece of information that should not be considered correct and must be rejected. In such a case, a rejecting focus may be employed.

- (16) a. *dambal-e*                      *faana*                      *kaas-t-o-ʔo [kaassoʔo]*  
 dambale-F.NOM      cabbage.ABS                      plant-3SG.F-PFV-ASM  
 'Dambale planted cabbage.'
- b. *ʔããʔe*                      *dambal-e*                      *faana*                      ***kaas-t-o-ʔo-jjo [kaassoʔojjo]***  
 No      dambale-F.NOM      cabbage.ABS                      plant-3SG.F-PFV-ASM-NEG  
 'No, Dambale DID NOT PLANT CABBAGE.'

The speaker of utterance (16b) rejects that cabbage has been planted because s/he was certain that cabbage was not planted.

### 3.2.2.4 Replacing focus

The replacement of one item in an utterance by another in a second utterance may involve a replacement of focus. That may happen in a situation where a speaker presumes that an addressee possesses an incorrect piece of information. Contrary to the addressee, the speaker may have the correct information. As a result, the speaker may replace the correct piece of information in place of the incorrect one which was wrongly possessed.

In (17), the addressee possesses incorrect information about the performed activity. In this example, the addressee possesses incorrect information about the activity of *murimma* ‘cutting’. To correct the incorrect information, the speaker applies the replacement focus using the cleft construction as shown in (17).

- (17) A: *dilaam-i hak'k'a mur-ø-u-kko*  
 dilamo-NOM trees.ABS cut-3SG.M-PFV-ASM  
 ‘Dilamo cut trees.’
- S: *ʔããʔe dilaam-i hit'e mur-ø-u-kko*  
 No dilamo-NOM grass.ABS cut-3SG.M-PFV-ASM  
 ‘No, Dilamo cut GRASS.’

Sometimes replacing focus is marked morphologically and lexically. The morpheme *-mii* in (18a) and the lexical word *bagaan* ‘rather’ in (18b) show replacing focus. At the same time the latter construction has a cleft interpretation as the result of the high pitch on the object noun and the verb.

- (18) a. *dilaam-i hit'ee-ø-mii mur-ø-u-kkó*  
 dilamo-NOM grass.ABS-COP-FOC cut-3SG.M-PFV-ASM.REL  
 ‘Dilamo cut GRASS.’
- b. *dilaam-i hit'é-ø bagaan mur-ø-u-kkó*  
 dilamo-NOM grass.ABS-COP FOC cut-3SG-M-PFV-ASM.REL  
 ‘IT IS GRASS that Dilamo cut.’

Rejecting focus and replacing focus could occur together, as in (19).

- (19) A: *dilaam-i hit'e mur-ø-u-kko*  
 dilamo-NOM grass.ABS cut-3SG.M-PFV-ASM  
 ‘Dilamo cut grass.’
- S: *ʔããʔe dilaam-i hit'e mur-ø-u-kko-jjo hak'k'a mur-ø-u-kko*  
 No dilamo-NOM grass.ABS cut-3SG.M-PFV-ASM-NEG trees.ABS cut-3SG.M-PFV-ASM  
 ‘No, Dilamo didn’t cut GRASS, he cut TREES.’

In general, the replacing focus can be marked via morphological, lexical and syntactic devices.

### 3.2.2.5 Selecting focus

When a speaker selects one item from a presupposed set of information, a selecting focus may be involved. An addressee may presuppose that one or the other item is correct, but not sure which one would be preferred. The presupposition could be specified by a disjunctive question, and the response could be simply by choosing the item preferred.

- (20) A: *fellakk-i-tʃifo-nnih gereebb-i-tʃifo [gereetʃifo] bites-t-ø-oo [biteessoo]*  
 goat.PL-EP-SGV.ABS-Q sheep.PL-EP-SGV.ABS sell-2SG-IPFV  
 ‘Would you sell goat or sheep?’

S: *fellakk-i-tfif*  
 goat.PL-EP-SGV  
 'GOAT.'

Optionally, the selecting focus could be expressed through a cleft construction seen below.

- (21) a. *hit'e*            *mur-t-i-tto-nnih*            *hak'k'a*            *ʔan-t-i-tto*  
 grass.ABS      cut-2SG-EP-ASM-Q      trees.ABS      cleave-2SG-EP-ASM  
 'Did you cut grass or trees?'  
 b. *ʔani*            ***hit'é-ø***            *mur-ø-u-mmó*  
 1SG.NOM      grass.ABS-COP      cut-1SG-PFV-ASM.REL  
 'IT IS GRASS that I cut.'

In the selection process, cleft and pseudo-cleft constructions are employed. In the following example, the speaker of (22b) selects a possible response. This selective focus is shown by the pseudo-cleft construction.

- (22) a. *lar-i*            *hobb-i-tfif-iinse-e*            *kabeer-tf-iinse-e [kabeetf/iinsee]*  
 cattle-NOM      lion.PL-EP-SGV-ABL-CONJ      tiger.PL-SGV-ABL-CONJ  
*hink-a*            *badd-ø-oo?*  
 which-ABS      fear-3SG.M-IPFV  
 'From a lion and a tiger, which one is it that cattle are scared of?'  
 b. *lar-i*            *badd-ø-oo-kko-k-i*            ***hobb-i-tfif-o-ø***  
 cattle-NOM      fear-3SG.M-IPFV-ASM-REL-NOM      lion.PL-EP-SGV-ABS-COP  
 'What the cattle are afraid of is A LION.'

In the discussion above, contrast focus is expressed through restrictive focus, expansion/additive focus, rejecting focus, replacing focus and selective focus types. It is marked via morphological, lexical and syntactic mechanisms.

#### 4. Conclusion

The study investigates a sentence-level focus system, at times, with backward and forward contextual references for descriptive necessity. It attempts to identify the mechanisms and functions of focus in information structuring in Hadiyya. It has been found that the language employs morphological, lexical and syntactic mechanisms for focalization. In the latter case, constituent order change and cleft structuring, including pseudo-cleft, are in use.

In broad terms, the focus system in Hadiyya falls under two major classes: information gap focus and contrast focus each of which has subclasses. Information gap focus conveys non-presupposed information which could be expressed through questioning and responding to a gap using morphological or syntactic means. On the other hand, contrast focus is made operational via the following subclasses: expanding focus, restricting focus, rejecting focus, replacing focus and selecting focus. The rejecting focus does not use any of the focus devices, but the speaker simply employs the normal negation construction. Cleft and pseudo-cleft constructions are significant, especially in the selecting focus.

## Abbreviations

∅	Zero morpheme	IMP	Imperative
*	Ungrammatical	INS	Instrumental
-	Morpheme boundary	IPFV	Imperfective
.	Portmanteau morphemes	JUS	Jussive
1	First person	LOC	Locative
2	Second person	M	Masculine
3	Third person	NEG	Negation
A	Addressee	NMLZ	Nominalizer
ABL	Ablative	NOM	Nominative
ABS	Absolutive	NP	Noun phrase
ASM	Additional subject marker	OBJ	Object
CONJ	Conjunction	PF	Perfect
CAUS	Causative	PL	Plural
CONV	Converb	PFV	Perfective
COP	Copula	PROG	Progressive
DAT	Dative	Q	Question particle
DET	Determiner	REL	Relativizer
EP	Epenthesis	S	Speaker
F	Feminine	SG	Singular
FOC	Focus	SGV	Singulative
GEN	Genitive	SIM	Simulative
HEC	Highland East Cushitic		

## Acknowledgements

Our informants, who are many in number, play a great role in this study; they are the source of the empirical data and helped us by responding to our questions whenever we wanted to cross-check the data.

## References

- Ansah, A., 2014. Information packaging – focus marking and focus constructions in Leteh (Larteh). *Nordic Journal of African Studies*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 162–179.
- Appleyard, D., 1989. The relative verb in focus constructions. An Ethiopian areal feature. *Journal of Semitic Studies*, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 291-305.
- Aynalem, G., 2020. *Information structure in Oromo*. Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University. PhD Dissertation.
- Baye, Y., 1988. Focus in Oromo. *Studies in African Linguistics*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 356-384.
- Carr, P., 2008. *A glossary of phonology*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Chafe, W., 1976. Givenness, contrastiveness, definiteness, subjects and topics. In: C. N. Li, ed. *Subject and topic*. New York: Academic Press, pp. 27–55.
- Cheng, S., 2012. A short analysis of information structures of English sentences. *Academy Publisher*, vol. 2, no. 3 pp. 492-497.
- Crass, J., 2007. Copula constructions in K'abeena and Libido. In: J. Crass and R. Meyer, eds. *Deictics, copula and focus in the Ethiopian convergence area*. Köln: Rüdiger Köppe, pp. 71-97.
- Dabala, G. and Meyer, R., 2003. Focus phenomena in Wellega Oromo. *Afrika und Uebersee*, Band 86, pp. 161-171.
- Dik, C. S., 1997. *The theory of functional grammar: The structure of the clause. Part I: The structure of the clause*. 2<sup>nd</sup> revised edition. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Fallon, P., 2015. Coronal Ejectives and Ethio-Semitic Borrowing in Proto-Agaw. In: R. Kramer, E.C. Zsiga and O.T. Boyer, eds. *Selected proceedings of the 44th annual conference on African linguistics*. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project, pp. 71-83
- 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: United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA).

- Féry, C. and Ishihara, S., eds. 2016. *The Oxford handbook of information structure*. Oxford: OUP.
- Greenbaum, S. and Quirk, R., 1990. *A student's grammar of the English Language*. Harlow: Longman.
- Gundel, J. and Fretheim, T., 2004. Topic and focus. In: L. Horn and G. Ward, eds. *Handbook of pragmatics*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 175–96.
- Halliday, M., 1967. Notes on transitivity and theme in English: Part 2. *Journal of Linguistics*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 199–244.
- Hayward, R., 2000. Afroasiatic. In: B. Heine and D. Nurse, eds. *African languages: An introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.74-98.
- Hudson, G., 1976. Highland East Cushitic. In: M. L. Bender, ed. *The non-Semitic languages of Ethiopia*. East Lansing, MI: African Studies Center, Michigan State University, pp. 232-278.
- Hudson, G., 1989. *Highland East Cushitic Dictionary (Kuschitische Sprachstudien 7)*. Hamburg: Buske.
- Kiss, K., 1998. Identificational focus versus information focus. *Language*, vol. 74, no. 2, pp. 245-273.
- Krifka, M., 2008. Basic notions of information structure. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica*, vol. 55, no. 3-4, pp. 243-276.
- Mous, M., 2012. Cushitic. In: Z. Frajzyngier and E. Shay, eds. *The Afroasiatic languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 342-422.
- Roach, P., 2002. *A little encyclopedia of phonetics*. [Accessed 8 May 2019] Available at: <http://www.personal.reading.ac.uk/~llsroach/peter/>.
- Sim, R., 1989. *Predicate conjoining in Hadiyya: A head-driven phrase structure grammar*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University. PhD Dissertation.
- Skopeteas, S. et al. 2006. *Questionnaire on information structure (QUIS): Reference manual*. Potsdam: Universitätsverlag Potsdam.
- Stoyanova, M., 2008. *Unique focus*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Tadesse, S., 2015. *Documentation and description of Hadiyya*. Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University. PhD Dissertation.
- Taha, Y., 1990. *The focus system in Oromo: A functional grammar approach*. Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University. M.A. Thesis.
- Tosco, M., 2000. Cushitic overview. *Journal of Ethiopian Studies*, vol. 33, no. 2, pp. 87-121.
- Treis, Y., 2007. Copulas in Kambaata. In: J. Crass and R. Meyer, eds. *Deictics, copula and focus in the Ethiopian convergence area*. Köln: Rüdiger Köppe, pp. 71-97.
- Treis, Y., 2008. *A grammar of Kambaata, part I: Phonology, nominal morphology, and non-verbal predication (Cushitic Language Studies 26)*. Cologne: Rüdiger Köppe.