Classification and Logical Structure of Basic-level Statives in Afaan Oromoo

Eba Teresa Garoma[1] and Baye Yimam[2]

Abstract

This study describes the classification and logical structure of basic-level stative situations in Afaan Oromoo within Role and Reference Grammar (RRG). Afaan Oromoo is one of the Lowland East Cushitic Languages under Afroasiatic phylum. The method employed in the study is qualitative, in which several library works, data gathering short trips and elicitation (content analysis) of written texts (written web corpora developed by the HaBit project in 2016 and grades 9-12 Afaan Oromoo textbooks) have been made. For elicitation, Western (Maccaa) variety has been considered using purposive sampling technique. Accordingly, verbs in Afaan Oromoo are semantically classified into five fundamental categories according to their dynamicity vs. stativity, telicity vs. atelicity, and durativity vs. instantaneous: statives, activities, semelfactives, achievements, and accomplishments. Statives, which have static, atelic and durative temporal features, are categorized on the basis of the semantic roles of the arguments: identificational, locative, attributive, possession, cognitive, emotive, and perceptive statives. The general logical structure of these stative types is identified as [Pred' (x, y) or Pred' (x)], where Pred' is verbal, copular or adjectival, 'x' stands for the first and 'y' is for the second argument. On the basis of the findings, Afaan Oromoo lacks morphological markers for all types of stative; however, only the semantic roles of the arguments distinguish one from the other. Lastly, it is apparent that this study may provide the foundation for further studies regarding the interface of syntax and semantics in Afaan Oromoo to establish comprehensive knowledge about the language.

*Keywords***:** /Afaan Oromoo/Eventuality/Logical structure/Situation aspect/Statives/

1. Introduction

Statives (often called states) are cumulative, non-dynamic, and totally homogeneous eventuality. They are stable situations which hold for a moment or an interval, and have the temporal features, namely static, durative, and atelic. We cannot identify stages in the development of stative eventuality because there is no change of state. In English, for example, stative eventuality does not generally occur in the progressive, and

---

[1] Corresponding and first author: Department of English Language and Literature, Jimma University, Ethiopia.
   Email: ebateresa@gmail.com
[2] Department of Linguistics, Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia

their simple present tense has a non-frequentive, non-habitual reading, which is impossible with any other verb class, as in *John knows the answer/*John is knowing the answer*[3]. Structurally, they do not occur as complements of predicates like *force/persuade*, as in **John forced her to know the answer,* neither do they generally occur in imperative forms, as in **Love Sara* (Smith, 1997, p.32; Rothstein, 2004, p.45).

As statives are durative, they can hold for as much time as possible, even the most temporal that consists of an undifferentiated period without internal structure. When they hold for a certain period of time, the whole schema is true every moment. For example, if *John owns a car* for a day, there is no single moment throughout the day when John does not own the car. Due to their non-dynamic nature, statives do not require external agency for change. They also include the ascription of concrete and abstract properties of all kinds, possession, location, belief, and other mental states and habits (Smith, 1997, p.34; Rothstein, 2004, p.46).

Regarding the speakers of the language, the Oromoo people are Cushitic-speaking people inhabiting the Horn of Africa. They are the largest ethnic group in Ethiopia. They constitute about 27.2 million people according to the 2007 Census (CSA, 2008, p.64) with a 2.9% growth rate projected to be 37.5 million in 2022 which is about 34.8% of the total population of Ethiopia (CSA, 2013, p.160). They have existed in the country for a long period of time side by side with Semitic, Omotic, and Nilosaharan speaking neighbors (Gemetchu, 1993, p.27; Griefenow-Mewis, 2001, p.9; Tadesse, 2004, p.14). They call their homeland Oromia (*ʔoromijaa*[4]), which is the largest Regional State in the country and their language Afaan Oromoo[5] (*ʔafaan ʔoromoo*), which literally means "language of the Oromoo". The speakers reside in East and Horn of Africa, such as Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, and Sudan. Afaan Oromoo uses a Latin-based (or Roman-based) writing system called Qubee (*k'ubee*), in which gemination and vowel length are indicated by doubling consonants and vowels, respectively. With few exceptions, the writing system is the same as phonemic transcription (Kebede, 2009, p.1; Debela, 2010, p.3).

There are significant studies on the phonology, morphology, syntax, and descriptive grammar of Afaan Oromoo. For example, Debela and Meyer (2003, 2006), Feda (2015), Griefenow-Mewis (2001), Kebede (2005, 2007, 2009), Wakweya (2014), and Zelalem (2014) are among the existing works. On the other hand, there are a few works on the semantics of adpositions and the constructions of motion eventuality (Samuel, 2007; Debela & Meyer, 2008; Debela, 2006, 2007, 2010), and aspect and tense (Shimelis, 2016).

Recently, Eba and Baye (2020) conducted a study on the typology and structure of basic-level activities in Afaan Oromoo. This work is very relevant to the present study in that it deals with one semantic type of verbs (activities) in the language. However, activities are among the five semantic verb classes: statives, activities, achievements, accomplishments, and semelfactives. Contrarily, the current study focuses on the other semantic type of verbs. Apart from their huge contributions, all of the above studies, except Eba and Baye (2020), have left gaps in the semantic classification of verbs, the logical and conceptual structures of eventuality/situation aspect, and other areas of semantics in the language. This study is, thus, an attempt to fill in such gaps by providing descriptions about the typology and logical structure of statives in Afaan Oromoo.

The main objective of this study is investigating the classification of basic-level statives encoded in Afaan Oromoo and determining its logical structure. Accordingly, seven types of statives— identificational, locative, attributive, possession, cognitive, emotive and perceptive— are described in the study. In addition, the logical structures of these stative types are formulated. It adds value to the existing knowledge about the

---

[3] The symbol * indicates ill-grammatical structure
[4] Words/expressions italicized in brackets are phonemic transcriptions.
[5] The name *Afaan Oromoo* will be used throughout this study as it is preferred by the speakers.

Semantics and Syntax of the language. The data can also serve as secondary sources for further linguistic studies. Furthermore, the study may motivate future researchers on the semantics of Afaan Oromoo as well as other Ethiopian languages.

2. Theoretical Framework

2.1. Eventuality: Overview

In everyday communication, language is mainly concerned with the description of processes, occurrences, states and happenings, which are understood as eventuality in linguistics and philosophy. They are recognized as what happen in the real world, what people do, understand, anticipate, and remember. Much of human's behavior is guided by understanding such experiences (Radvansky & Zacks, 2014, p.50). Humans perceive and conceptualize the unfolding world around them, simulate them, and participate in them as modes of their salient conscious experience. Eventuality is mostly generic, and may be controlled or uncontrolled based on animacy, intention or volition of agent/force (Van Voorst, 1988, p.19; Davidson, 1996, p.287; Alvarez and Hyman, 1998, p.219).

Eventuality types play significant roles in the organization of grammars as languages categorize state-of-affairs into their subcategories. Eventuality is semantically represented by verbs, verb phrases, and clauses (Jackendoff, 1991, p.13). Within eventuality, linguists usually appreciate the relationship between viewpoint and situation aspects. A number of scholars have made taxonomy of eventuality which depends on the syntax and semantics of expressions, such as verbs and their collocations with other subordinates. Hence, the taxonomies are highly dependent on the context (i.e., co-text) of the expression. Recently, however, a deeper understanding has begun to emerge (Binnick, 1991, p.559; Guéron & Lecarme, 2008, p.4).

Situation aspects/types are one of the two major components of eventuality (the other is viewpoint aspect) which relate to temporal properties of expressions in particular languages (Smith, 1997, p.39; Binnick, 2006, p.107). Concerning the classification of situational expressions, recent literature refers to the taxonomy of Vendler (1967, p.46) with some modifications, such as addition of semelfactives (Smith, 1997, p.58; Binnick, 1991, p.559; 200l, p.261). The Vendlerian distinctions of activities, accomplishments, achievements, and statives are classified mainly on three temporal diagnostic tests (features): durativity, dynamicity, and telicity (Rothstein, 2004, p.13). Durativity distinguishes instantaneous and durative while dynamicity identifies static from dynamic situations. On the other hand, telicity describes whether or not a situation has inherent endpoints (Boutin, 1994, p.133; Smith, 1997, p.107; Rothstein, 2004, p.72).

In nutshell, statives need recognized duration to happen. However, they do not require force/energy as they are non-dynamic in nature. These eventuality types include the ascription of concrete and abstract properties of all kinds, possession, location, belief and other mental states and habits (Smith, 1997, p.123; Rothstein, 2004, p.75). In this study, therefore, the different types and logical structures of basic-level statives in Afaan Oromoo are described.

2.2. Role and Reference Grammar (RRG)

The development of Role and Reference Grammar (RRG) by William Foley and Robert Van Valin, Jr. in the 1980s was a response to Extreme Formalist and Radical Functionalist theories (Foley & Van Valin 1984, p.203). Chomsky's Extreme Formalist theory claims that meanings of linguistic expressions are thoroughly determined by structural descriptions of grammar (Chomsky, 1981, p.4). Contrary to this, Radical Functionalists disregard the value of grammar, and consider it as only a group of fixed phrases (Hopper, 1987,

p.141). RRG emerged to mediate these two extremes. In RRG, language is a system of communication, so it should be approached in terms of communicative functions of grammatical structures. So, RRG considers grammar as a system which is only understood and described with reference to its semantic roles. Thus, it is structural-functionalist theory of grammar (Van Valin, 1993, pp.1-5).

In RRG model, clauses/sentences are described in terms of logical structure to reveal communicative functions and grammatical features, such as semantic roles, predicates, etc. available in a language. Dowty (1991, p.583) proposed lexical decompositions of predicate structures to describe clauses/sentences. RRG analyzes clause structures by using Layered Structure of Clause (LSC) model as a general framework which is originally proposed by Foley and Van Valin (1986, p.229). LSC is composed of three elements (constituents): Nucleus, Core, and Periphery. Nucleus has predicate (prototypically verb, but there are nominal, adjectival, and adpositional elements in statives), and core is a larger unit that consists of nucleus and argument/s of the predicate. The last is periphery, which has non-arguments (adjuncts) like temporal and locative modifiers of the core.

Generally, RRG is an eclectic model since it falls between Extreme Formal and Extreme Radical Functionalist theories. It considers structures and functions of languages in its analysis. The principal focus of analysis in RRG is the clause because it consists of nucleus, core, and periphery. In the description of clause structure, the theory uses LSC model to show the syntax-semantics interface. Accordingly, grammatical relations, semantic roles, and logical structures are highly relevant concepts in RRG. These are presented in results and discussion section.

3. Materials and Methods

As far as the methods and procedures are concerned, this study is based on corpus-driven data as one of its sources. Afaan Oromoo written web corpus has been crawled and developed by The HaBit Project and Ethiopian Language Technology Group in 2016, and displayed on the Internet[6]. In addition, Afaan Oromoo textbooks of grades 9-12 were the other data sources. The four textbooks were prepared by the Ministry of Education (MOE) and Oromia Education Bureau in 2013. Regarding the varieties are concerned, only Western (Maccaa) dialect was taken and its speakers were requested to participate in judging and crosschecking the data which were collected from the corpus and the textbooks. Theoretically, the study employed Role and Reference Grammar (RRG) in which semantic roles, types, and logical structures of situation aspects are explained. Other domains, such as case, voice and focus systems, grammatical relations, nominal and adjectival aspects, conceptual metaphors and metonyms, are not dealt with in this study. References are made to them for particular purposes only.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1. Basic-level Statives in Afaan Oromoo[7]

Stative situations are defined as having static, atelic, and durative temporal features. The static feature refers to stability which does not change in the state-of-affairs. The atelic feature distinguishes predicates without intrinsic temporal boundary. Durative is a span of time in duration. The situations are temporally unbounded and non-dynamic, and can be the results of changes in state-of-affairs. Nonetheless, they do not

---

[6] The address for the written web corpora is: http://tekstlab.uio.no/ethiopia/
[7] The term 'basic-level' refers to statives which are not derived through morphosyntactic processes.

undergo any changes in their existence, such as physical, spatial, mental, etc. states (Lin, 2004, p.166). They constitute the simplest logical structure in semantic description, such as Pred' (x) or Pred' (x, y). Hence, they have less complex structures than activities, accomplishments, achievements, and semelfactives. They contain only single thematic relation, namely experiencer, theme or locative (Rothmayr, 2009, p.27). The following Layered Structure of Clauses (LSCs) show statives:

1(a) *maartaa-n*   *gammad-tuu-ɗa* [*gammadduuɗa*][8]
       Marta-NOM   happy-FS-COP
       'Marta is happy.'
 (b) *nam-ni*   *duʔa*   *sod-(a)at-a*
       person-NOM   death   fear-INC-IMPF
       'Human being fears death.'
 (c) *gurb-iʧʧ-i*   *daɗab-aa-ɗa*
       boy-SG.DEF-NOM   tired-MS-COP
       'The boy is tired.'

As indicated above, the happiness of *maartaa* 'Marta' in (1a) and death-fearing of *nama* 'human' in (1b) are emotional states where the experiencers found themselves. Similarly, in (1c), the situation of *gurbaa* 'boy' is physical state of existence. These statives are in time interval in which they occur. In this, we mean that if statives are true at an interval, they are also true at every moment comprising the interval.

In the language, stative situations are verbal, adjectival, or nominal with or without a copula. Predicates along with their core arguments denote property, relation, position, emotion, and existence of situations as shown below.

2(a) *ʔani*   *waak'a-tti*   *nan-ʔaman-a*
       I   God-LOC   FOC-believe-IMPF
       'I believe in God.'
 (b) *ʔinni*   *muka-rra*   *ʤir-a*
       he   tree-LOC   exist-IMPF
       'He is in a tree.' Lit. 'He is on a tree.'
 (c) *ʧ'aalaa-n*   *loon*   *baajʔee*   *k'ab-a*
       Chala-NOM   cattle   many   catch-IMPF
       'Chala has much cattle.' Lit. 'Chala holds much cattle.'
 (d) *hintal-ni* [*hintalli*]   *ɗeer-tuu-ɗa*
       girl-NOM   tall-FS-COP
       'The girl is tall.'
 (e) *tolaa-n*   *ʔasteer*   *ni-ʤaalat-a*
       Tola-NOM   Aster   FOC-love-IMPF
       'Tola loves Aster.'

The examples in (2) have different stative predicates in their LSCs. The first, (2a), expresses cognitive stative (*ʔaman-* 'believe') of the argument *ʔani* 'I' while the second, (2b), existential *ʤir-* 'exist' with the locative noun *mukarra* 'on tree'. Example (2c) describes relation of possession, and the fourth, (2d), indicates property of the core argument. The last LSC, (2e), denotes the emotion of Tola (*tolaa*). Despite the existence of different nucleus and core arguments, the above LSCs are categorized as stative situations. However, they fall into different categories.

---

[8] *-duu* is the allomorph of *-tuu* as a result of assimilation in morpheme boundary, so *t* changes to *d* in *gammad-tuu* due to the effect of *d*; hence, *gammadduu*.

On the basis of the types and natures of nucleus and core arguments of LSCs, we identify seven types of statives in Afaan Oromoo, namely identificational, locative, attributive, possession, cognitive, emotive, and perceptive. These are consecutively described below.

Identificational statives. Identificational (often called Equational) statives have two nouns (or NPs) in their LSCs. The first takes the position of the syntactic subject, and the second appears preceding the verb in predicate structures. The second noun always identifies the particular status of the first (Van Valin, 2004, p.69; 2005, p.181). The following are examples.

3(a)   *dʒiraa-n*   *barsiis-aa-ɗa*
       Jira-NOM   teach-MS-COP
       'Jira is a teacher.'

(b)   *k'ullubbii_ʔadii-n*⁹   *ɗibee*   *hed-tuu-f*¹⁰   *k'oriʧʧa-ɗa [ø]*¹¹
       garlic-NOM   illness   much-FS-DAT   medicine-COP
       'Garlic is a cure for many illnesses.'

(c)   *biʃaan*   *lubbuu-ɗa*
       water.NOM   life-COP
       'Water is life.'

(d)   *ʔasteer*   *dubartii*   *ʧ'im-tuu-ɗa*
       Aster.NOM   woman   strong-FS-COP
       'Aster is a strong woman.'

As shown in the (3), the nouns (or NPs) in the predicate structures, namely *barsiisaa* 'teacher', *k'oriʧʧa* 'medicine', *lubbuu* 'life' and *dubartii ʧ'imtuu* 'strong woman' identify those in the syntactic subject positions. In (3a), *barsiisaa* 'teacher' is equated to *dʒiraa* 'Jira' by the copula *-ɗa* 'be' while in (3b), the medicinal value of *k'oriʧʧa* is equated to *k'ullubbii ʔadii* 'garlic' so that both nouns refer to the same entity. The LSC in (3c) has *biʃaan* 'water' in its syntactic subject position. It is associated with *lubbuu* 'life' which exists in the world mainly by having water. The last example, (3d), describes the social status of *ʔasteer* 'Aster' by describing her as *dubartii ʧ'imtuu* 'strong woman'.

In each example, the noun in the predicate and the one in the syntactic subject position refer to the same entity. The association between the two nouns is indicated by the copula *-ɗa* 'be'. Formally, identificational statives have two-place predicates, the first in syntactic subject position and the second in complement position. To assign thematic relations to each argument, we employ Role and Reference Grammar (RRG) principle (Van Valin, 1990, p.40). Hence, syntactic subjects are locatives, and those in complement positions are themes. We argue that themes express locatives in terms of status or attribution, so locatives have the attributes expressed by the themes. Arguments, such as *dʒiraa* 'Jira', *k'ullubbii ʔadii* 'garlic', *biʃaan* 'water' and *ʔasteer* 'Aster' play locative thematic roles while *barsiisaa* 'teacher', *k'oriʧʧa* 'medicine', *lubbuu* 'life', and *dubartii ʧ'imtuu* 'strong woman' assume themes in identificational statives.

Despite the presence of two arguments, there is only one state-of-affair expressed in identificational statives. The second argument occurs with the copula in predicate structures. This argument attributes the existence of the syntactic subject which is linked to it. The statives, thus, are represented by LSCs which have two thematic relations, but only one semantic macrorole. This semantic macrorole is the undergoer, which is

---

⁹ *k'ullubbii_ʔadii* 'garlic' is compound noun; underscore (_) distinguishes the boundary of the component lexemes of the word. Similar pattern is consistently used throughout this study.

¹⁰ The surface form of *hed-tuu* is [*hedduu*].

¹¹ The copula *-ɗa* often disappears when a nominal predicate ends with short vowel.

assigned to the locatives in the Actor-Undergoer Hierarchy. Generally, identificational statives in Afaan Oromoo have copular predicates which have single macroroles.

Locative statives. The fundamental feature of stative situations is that they are attributive of relatively permanent quality of an entity (Van Valin, 2004, p.190). Locative statives in Afaan Oromoo are represented by LSCs which have existential verbs in their predicates. Such statives show the locations or positions of entities. The predicates have locative or positional adverbials in addition to existential verbs.

4(a) *Ɂiʃee-n*   *mana*   *keessa*   *ʤir-t-i*
      she-NOM   house   in   exist-3FS-IMPF
      'She is at home.' Lit. 'She exists in a house.'

(b) *Ɂabbaa-n*   *koo*   *siree-rra*   *ʧ'iis-a*
      father-NOM   my   bed-LOC   lie-IMPF
      'My father sleeps in a bed.' Lit. 'My father lies on a bed.'

(c) *barat(t)-oota*   *t'ik'k'oo-tu*   *daree*   *keessa*   *ʤir-a*
      student-PL   few-FOC   room   in   exit-IMPF
      'There are few students in the classroom.'

(d) *ʤaldeess-i*   *tulluu*   *gubbaa*   *ʤir-(a)at-a*
      baboon-NOM   mountain   top   exist-MID-IMPF
      'Baboon lives on top of a mountain.'

(e) *k'arʃ-iʧʧ-i*   *saanduk'a*   *keessa*   *ʤir-a*
      money-SG.DEF-NOM   box   in   exist-IMPF
      'The money is in the box.' Lit. 'The money exists in the box.'

In (4), locative statives have predicates with two arguments: the located entity and its location. Verbs, such as *ʤir-* 'exist' (4c-e) and *ʧ'iis-* 'lie' (4b), are necessarily M-intransitive. The located entities are *Ɂiʃee* 'she', *Ɂabbaa koo* 'my father', *barattoota* 'students', *ʤaldeessa* 'baboon' and *k'arʃii* 'money'. All cores of the LSCs are modified by their locations/positions in the predicate structures: *mana* 'house', *siree* 'bed', *daree* 'room', *tulluu* 'mountain' and *saanduk'a* 'box'.

Following RRG theory, the structure of locative statives is predictable as the situations require two thematic relations parallel to the two arguments. The argument in subject position is theme, whereas the one in predicate position has locative role. With respect to semantic macrorole assignment, the undergoer is the only macrorole assigned to theme since the verbs are intransitive (called M-intransitive).

In general, locative statives express situations which exist in a particular location or position. They have themes and locatives as thematic relations. The theme is geared to undergoer in Actor-Undergoer Hierarchy of Van Valin (2004, p.195).

Attributive statives. Afaan Oromoo has lexical categories which describe entities in terms of dimensions, physical or mental properties, qualities, values, ages, colors, and propensities. The existence of such lexical elements triggers situations to be statives. The lexical elements co-occur with the copular predicates which are unspecified as to whether there was a preceding situation to give rise to the current statives. From lexical semantic point-of-view, words naming attributive (also called condition) statives are adjectivals, like those in (5) below.

5(a) *ʤiraa-n*   *ɗeer-aa-ɗa*
      Jira-NOM   tall-MS-COP
      'Jira is tall.'

 (b) *hintal-ni* [*hintalli*]   *bareed-tuu-ɗa* [*bareedduuɗa*]
      girl-NOM   beautiful-FS-COP
      'The girl is beautiful.'

 (c) *ɗok'k'ee-n*   *kun*   *diim-aa-ɗa*
      mud-NOM   this   red-MS-COP
      'This mud is red.'

 (d) *taliilee-n*   *barnoota-ʃee-tiin*   *daran*   *ʧ'im-tuu-ɗa*
      Talile-NOM   education-her-INST   very   strong-FS-COP
      'Talile is very clever in her education.'

 (e) *ʔiʃee-n*   *gammad-tuu-ɗa*   [*gammadduuɗa*]
      she-NOM   happy-FS-COP
      ''She is happy.'

The statives in the above LSCs are dimension (*ɗeeraa* 'tall'), value (*bareedduu* 'beautiful'), color (*diimaa* 'red'), mental property (*ʧ'imtuu* 'strong'), and propensity (*gammadduu* 'happy') of the arguments in (5a-e), respectively. All of these attributives are predicates of the copula *-ɗa* 'be' as they denote properties of entities. They refer to the arguments *ʤiraa* 'Jira', *hintala* 'girl', *ɗok'k'ee* 'mud', *taliilee* 'Talile', and *ʔiʃee* 'she' in that order.

Attributive statives are different from identificational and locative statives in that they have only one argument in their LSCs. The argument is assigned theme. In Actor-Undergoer Hierarchy, if a verb has one argument, it has either actor or undergoer semantic macrorole. In view of this, the above attributive statives assign undergoer, and not actor role.

To sum up, attributive statives describe qualities to entities. They do not show any kind of motion since they have no actor, but undergoer who is in the condition stated by the predicates.

Possession statives. Possession is a relationship of two entities, such that one possesses the other. The relation is irreversible. This semantic concept is marked in various ways on the basis of language particulars: simple juxtaposition of nouns (NPs), case marking, adpositions, possessive pronouns, particles and clause (McGregor, 2009, p.7). In Afaan Oromoo, possession is described by possessive pronouns, genitive particle, NPs, and clauses. However, as the focus of this study is clause level situation aspect, only possession statives of LSCs are presented hereunder.

6(a) *saaraa-n*   *ɗiibbaa*   *diigaa*   *k'ab-t-i*   [*k'abdi*]

      Sara-NOM   pressure   blood   hold-3FS-IMPF
      'Sara has blood pressure.' Lit. 'Sara holds blood pressure.'

 (b) *Nu-ti*   *lamaa-n*   *keeɲɲa*   *muut'annoo*   *bidiruu*   *ʔoofuu*   *k'ab-n-a*
      we   two-NOM   our   experience   ship   driving   hold-1PL-IMPF
      'Both of us have experience in sailing ship.'

 (c) *nagaa-n*   *gatii*   *guddaa*   *k'ab-a*
      peace-NOM   price   big   hold-IMPF
      'Peace has a big price.' Lit. 'Peace holds a big price.'

 (d) *ʔinni*   *k'arʃii*   *gahaa*   *hin-k'ab-u*
      he   money   enough   NEG-hold-IMPF
      'He has no enough money.' Lit. 'He does not hold enough money.'

As shown in (6a-d), the verb stem which expresses possession is *k'ab-* 'hold' with different inflectional affixes. Each clause has two core arguments. The first is the possessor that occurs in syntactic subject position while the other in predicate position is the possessed. In addition to the above LSCs, possession can also be expressed in Afaan Oromoo by using the copula in existential predicates, as shown below.

7(a) *kitaab-ni   kun   kan   taliilee-ti*
      book-NOM   this   of   Talile-COP
      'This book is Talile's.' Lit. 'This book is of Talile.'

(b) *man-ni   sun   kan   koo-ti*
      house-NOM   that   of   my-COP
      'That house is mine.'

(c) *bijj-ittii-n   dargagg-oota   harka   dʒir-t-i*
      country-SG.DEF-NOM   adolescent-PL   hand   exist-3FS-IMPF
      'The country is possessed by adolescents.'

Unlike the statives illustrated in (6), those in (7) show possession relationship where the possessed occurs in the syntactic subject position. The possessed entities in (7a-c) are *kitaaba* 'book', *mana* 'house', and *bijja* 'country', respectively. The possessors are the proper noun *taliilee* 'Talile' in (7a), the possessive pronoun *koo* 'my' in (7b), and the common noun *dargaggoota* 'adolescents' in (7c). They appear in predicative position in the LSCs.

With respect to thematic relations, the statives have the possessors as locatives and the possessed entities as themes. In the thematic relations, the undergoer is assigned as the only macrorole to the locatives. Possession statives are structurally similar to identificational and locative statives because they all involve two-place predicates that require two nominals. However, possession statives explicitly deal with possessor-possessed relationship, whereas identificational statives focus on two nominals referring to one argument. Locative statives express the locations, positions or places of arguments called locatives, and themes that refer to the located entities.

Cognitive statives. Cognitive statives are situations which describe mental, intellectual, internal or non-volitional states of mind. Their predicates describe subjectively verified states of mind to represent conceptual dimension construed by the cognizer. Speakers externalize their own mental state to influence the world, negotiate their interlocutor's stance, or attribute an evidential position to others (Van Valin, 1993, p.126). In Afaan Oromoo, there are cognitive statives which express the mental states of speakers. The following are examples.

8(a) *taliilee-n   hangaf-oota-ʃee   ni-kabadʒ-t-i* [*nikabadʒdʒi*]
      Talile-NOM   elder-PL-her   FOC-respect-3FS-IMPF
      'Talile respects her elders.'

(b) *haadʼ-ni* [*haati*][12]   *boontuu*   *waaʔee-ʃee*   *daran*   *jaad-t-i* [*jaaddi*]
      mother-NOM   Bontu   about-her   much   think-3FS-IMPF
      'Bontu's mother is concerned very much about her.'

(c) *ʔorom-oot-ni   waak'a-tti   ni-ʔaman-u*
      Oromoo-PL-NOM   God-LOC   FOC-believe-IMPF
      'The Oromoo people believe in God.'

(d) *kamaal   ʔarabiffa   beek-a*
      Kemal.NOM   Arabic   know-IMPF
      'Kemal knows Arabic.'

---

[12] [*haati*] is the surface nominative case for *haadʼ-ni*, possibly due to assimilation (*haadʼ-ti*), and then deletion (*haaØ-ti*).=> [*haadʼ-ni > haadʼ-ti > haat-ti >haati*].

In the four examples above, (8), the syntactic subjects are cognizers who experience the states indicated by the nucleus in the predicate structures. In (8a), *taliilee* 'Talile' is the one who *kabadʒ-* 'respect' *hangafoota* 'elders' while in (8b), the state of *jaad-* 'worry' is experienced by *haaɗa* 'mother'. In addition, (8c-d) express *ʔaman-* 'believe' and *beek-* 'know' to be cognized by Oromoos and Kemal, respectively.

Cognitive statives have two core arguments; the syntactic subject is experiencer, and the object is theme. The experiencer is assigned the semantic macrorole of the undergoer since there is no activity predicate in the situations. Thus, they do not refer to any kind of dynamic, but static situations. There are some other verbs which fill in the nucleus position in the above LSCs: *hubat-* 'understand', *filat-* 'prefer', *waliigal-* 'agree' and *ʃakk-* 'doubt'. As a result, the core arguments in the subject positions (experiencers), such as *taliilee* 'Talile', *haaɗa* 'mother', *ʔoromoota* 'Oromoos' and *kamaal* 'Kemal in (8a-d) always assume animate feature, but those in the predicate structures are either animate, such as *hangafoota* 'elders' and *-ʃee* 'her' in (8a-b) or supernatural *waak'a* 'God' in (8c) and inanimate *ʔarabiffa* 'Arabic' in (8d).

Emotive statives. Emotive statives are expressions having two core arguments in their LSCs. They describe the feeling, attitude and volition of the emoters (Quirk et al., 1985, pp.202-203). In Afaan Oromoo, such statives express the feelings of emoters about or towards the arguments in predicate structures as shown below.

9(a)   *ʔaannanee-n   siifan   daran   dʒibb-(i)t-i*
      Anane-NOM   Sifan   much   hate-3FS-IMPF
      'Anane hates Sifan very much.'

(b)   *dargagg-oot-ni   hed-tuu   bareedina-ʃee   ni-dʒadʒ-u*
      adolescent-PL-NOM   much-FS   beauty-her   FOC-admire-IMPF
      'Many adolescents admire her beauty.'

(c)   *ʔinni   kubbaa   tap'atʧuu   dʒaal-at-a*
      he   ball   playing   intimate-INC-IMPF
      'He likes playing ball.'

As shown above, (9a-c), the LSCs have predicates with emotive verbs, such as *dʒibb-* 'hate', *dʒadʒ-* 'admire', and *dʒaalat-* 'like' with emoted entities *siifan* 'Sifan', *bareedinaʃee* 'her beauty' and *kubbaa tap'atʧuu* 'playing ball', respectively. The emoters are *ʔaannanee* 'Anane', *dargaggoota* 'adolescents' and *ʔinni* 'he' in that order. As the LSCs have two-place predicates, the two arguments have experiencer for emoters and theme (stimulus) for emoted entities. In Actor-Undergoer Hierarchy, the undergoer is assigned as the only macrorole for experiencers as in other stative situations.

The structure in emotive statives is similar to locative, identificational, possession, and cognitive statives as all of them have two arguments in their LSCs. However, the semantic nature of the verbs and the thematic relations of the arguments are quite different among the types of statives. There are some other verbs which take the position of predicates in emotive statives: *ʔabdat-* 'hope', *haww-* 'wish', *gaabb-* 'regret', *jaaddaʔ-* 'worry' and *fed-* 'want'.

Perceptive statives. Perception expresses the ability of perceivers (most notably humans) to interact with the physical world through sensory information. This ability includes detecting, organizing, identifying, and interpreting information to understand our environment. To deal with syntax-semantics interface of perceptive statives, we identify two types of perception, namely active and perceptive (often called cognitive perception) (Rothmayr, 2009, p.100).

The two types of perception have significant differences. First, in active perception, the perceiver does the act of perceiving volitionally, intentionally, purposefully, and responsibly while in perceptive, the perceiver

is in non-volitional, unintentional, and arbitrary state. Second, active perception is semantically dynamic, but perceptive (cognitive) is static. Third, verbs in active perception express agentive (M-transitive) situations, but verbs of perceptive describe non-agentive (M-intransitive) situations. Though there are such semantic differences between active perception and perceptive, there are no lexical differences, for example, in languages, such as English, to distinguish each except for the verbs *see* and *look (at)* and for *hear* and *listen (to)*. Rothmayr (2009, p.101) shows the two types of perception in terms of agentivity as follows.

(10) **Non-agentive (Stative)**	**Agentive (Eventive)**
see	*look (at)*
hear	*listen (to)*
smell	*smell*
taste	*taste*

From the two groups in (10), the agentive (eventive) verbs occur in progressive constructions to express intentional and on-going activities, but non-agentives occur only in stative forms.

11(a) *beekaa-n*   *mana*   *keessa-tti*   *sagalee*   *simbira-a*   *dagah-a*
    Beka-NOM   house   in-LOC   sound   bird-POSS   hear-IMPF
    'Being at home, Beka hears sounds of birds.'

(b) *waak'oo-n*   *galgala*   *dandaʔ-ee*   *hin-ʔilaal-u*[13]
    Wako-NOM   night   able-CVB   NEG-see-IMPF
    'Wako cannot see during night time.'

(C) *nama*   *hund-umaa-tu*   *ʔisa*   *dura-a*   *dandam-a*
    person   all-FOC-FOC   him   front-POSS   taste-IMPF
    'All of them taste before him.' Lit. 'All persons taste before him.'

(d) *tolaʃii-n*   *foolii*   *daaʔim(m)-an-ʃee*   *fuunfat-t-i*
    Tolashi-NOM   scent   child-PL-her   smell-3FS-IMPF
    'Tolashi smells scent of her children.'

The LSCs in (11) express the functions of perceptions by the sense organs. In (11a), *beekaa* 'Beka' is the perceiver who is in a state of *dagah-* 'hear' *sagalee simbiraa* 'sound of birds'. This does not need any kind of intention or volition as the sound comes from nearby. Likewise, the ability not to see (*ʔilaal-*) during the night is something that is out of the control of perceivers as in (11b). Similar states are attested in (11c-d), where humans naturally want to taste the flavor of things, and mothers smell the odors of their children with no intention. As there are no morphological markings to distinguish these states from active perceptions, there is only one way of detecting their stativity. Perceptive statives occur only in non-progressive structures. However, active perceptions occur in progressive structures to refer to derived-level activity situations.

The two arguments in the LSCs of perceptive statives are the perceiver and the percept in syntactic subject and object positions, respectively. The perceiver experiences the perception, so experiencer is assigned as its thematic relation. Percept is the target of perception, hence it is theme. On Actor-Undergoer Hierarchy, the undergoer is the only macrorole for experiencer of perceptives. In a nutshell, perceptive includes senses of listening, seeing, smelling, and tasting. It is the way in which we deal with information obtained from our

---

[13] This is uncommon expression, but acceptable.

environment through the senses. Consequently, we categorize them as the subtypes of stative situations in Afaan Oromoo.

4.2. Logical Structure of Statives in Afaan Oromoo

Statives are homogenous and stable state-of-affairs in their temporal space. They have very simple Logical Structures (LSs) which are basic in the analysis of the other situation aspects (Smith, 1997, p.53). In Afaan Oromoo, they have nonverbal and verbal predicates. The adjectival predicate occurs in attributive, and the copula appears in identificational statives. The verbal predicate appears in locative, possession, cognitive, emotive, and perceptive statives. Below, we illustrate the structures of these stative types.

The LSCs of identificational statives have two arguments (nominals) which represent the same entity or concept and the copula *-ɗa/-ti* 'be' in clause-final position, where *-ti* occurs in possessive statives. The second argument (nominal) always identifies the first to have the same feature, as in (12) below.

12(a)	*ʤiraa-n*	*barsiis-aa-ɗa*
	Jira-NOM	teach-MS-COP
	'Jira is a teacher.'	
(b)	*girmaa-n*	*ʔeessuma* *koo-ti*
	Girma-NOM	uncle my-COP
	'Girma is my uncle.'	

The first LSC, (12a), contains the copula *-ɗa* 'be' which assigns *ʤiraa* 'Jira' and *barsiisaa* 'teacher' as its arguments, and the second, (12b), has *-ti* 'be' which links *girmaa* 'Girma' and *ʔeessuma koo* 'my uncle'. The LSs for these statives are shown below.

13(a)	General LS for Identificational Stative:	***-ɗa/-ti* 'be' (x, y)**	
		x=Locative, y=Theme	
(b)	Clause-specific LS for (12a):	*-ɗa* 'be' (*ʤiraa* 'Jira', *barsiisaa* 'teacher')	
	i. Thematic relations:	*ʤiraa* 'Jira' ◄——————— Locative	
		barsiisaa 'teacher' ◄—— Theme	
	ii. Semantic macroroles:	Undergoer ◄— Locative	1 Macrorole
(c)	Clause-specific LS for (12b):	*-ti* 'be' (*girmaa* 'Girma', *ʔeessuma koo* 'my uncle')	
	i. Thematic relations:	*girmaa* 'Girma' ◄——————— Locative	
		ʔeessuma koo 'my uncle' ◄—— Theme	
	ii. Semantic macroroles:	Undergoer ◄—Locative	1 Macrorole

In (13), the general LS refers to identificational stative with two arguments represented by 'x' and 'y'. In such stative, the second argument ('y') claims the attribution of the first ('x'), but it is not considered the syntactic argument since there is only one entity in the LSC of identificational stative. In the structures, the predicate is represented by *-ɗa* and *-ti* to identify the two arguments in the LSC as one or the same. In addition, these forms are combined with the theme to constitute predicate. In sum, the LS of identificational stative constitutes locative in 'x' and theme in 'y' positions, to refer to the properties attributed in the LSC. The general LS in (13a) applies to all identificational statives in the language.

The first clause-specific LS, (13b), has [*-ɗa* 'be' (*ʤiraa* 'Jira', *barsiisaa* 'teacher')], where the predicate is represented by *-ɗa* 'be', the locative is *ʤiraa* 'Jira' and the theme is *barsiisaa* 'teacher'. The reason for the assignment of locative to *ʤiraa* 'Jira' is that the status or attribution expressed by the second argument (the

theme, *barsiisaa* 'teacher') is located or found in *ʤiraa* 'Jira'. Similarly, (13c) has the same LS, except that the copula is *-ti* 'be', which is cliticized to possessive nominals ending in long vowels. The assignment of thematic roles and macroroles is within the framework of RRG model. Despite the presence of the two arguments in the LSs, there is only one macrorole for the state-of-affair. Thus, the locative is given the undergoer macrorole.

The second subclass of stative is locative. In Afaan Oromoo, it shows state-of-affair which is principally described using existential verb *ʤir-* 'exist' or posture verbs and adpositional phrase in the predicate structure. The LSCs of locative stative reveal the location or position of entities. In (14) below, we get LSCs of locative.

14(a)   *ʔiʃee-n*   *mana*   *keessa*   *ʤir-t-i*
         she-NOM   house   in   exist-3FS-IMPF
         'She is in the house.' Lit. 'She exists in a house.'
   (b)   *daaʔim-ni*   *siree-rra*   *raf-a*
         baby-NOM   bed-LOC   sleep-IMPF
         'The baby sleeps in the bed.' Lit. 'The baby sleeps on the bed.'

The predicate structure of locative has two arguments in terms of thematic roles, where the first is theme and the second is locative. The general and clause-specific LSs for the above LSCs are shown in (15).

15(a)	General LS for Locative Stative:	**Pred' (x, y)**
		x=Theme, y=Locative
(b)	Clause-specific LS for (14a):	*ʤir-* 'exist' (*ʔiʃee* 'she', *mana* 'house')
	i. Thematic relations:	*ʔiʃee* 'she' ⟵———— Theme
		mana 'house' ⟵———— Locative
	ii. Semantic macroroles:	Undergoer ⟵——— Theme	1 Macrorole
(c)	Clause-specific LS for (14b):	*raf-* 'sleep' (*daaʔima* 'baby', *siree* 'bed')
	i. Thematic relations:	*daaʔima* 'baby' ⟵———Theme
		siree 'bed' ⟵———— Locative
	ii. Semantic macroroles:	Undergoer ⟵———Theme	1 Macrorole

As shown in (15a), the general LS of locative stative is [Pred' (x, y)], where the Pred' is either the existential verb *ʤir-* 'exist' or any posture verb, 'x' represents the theme, and 'y' is the locative. In the clause-specific LSs, the first arguments, *ʔiʃee* 'she' in (15b) and *daaʔima* 'baby' in (15c), assume the position of 'x'; hence, the theme, but the second respective arguments, *mana* 'house' and *siree* 'bed', fill the place of 'y'; hence, the locative. The predicates are *ʤir-* 'exist' and *raf-* 'sleep' for (15b-c), respectively.

In RRG model, the above and any other LSs have no representation for grammatical features, such as case, gender, viewpoint aspect, etc.; only arguments and predicates fill the slots of the structure. So, RRG can be criticized along this line. As a model which considers language as a system of communication and as a structural functionalist approach, it was supposed to have a slot for grammatical features like gender, case, etc. If we follow this model, it would be filling in the already given slots. In a nutshell, locative statives have existential and posture verbs to appear in predicate structure. They are two-place predicates because they assign two arguments: the theme and the locative. On the basis of Actor-Undergoer Hierarchy, the theme is the unmarked form of undergoer as it is the rightmost location of the hierarchy.

Attributive statives are the third kind of stative. They have the simplest LS because they have only single argument whose predicate structure is formed from adjectival only. Functionally, they describe the qualities or attributions of the entities (core arguments or themes) (Koontz-Garboden, 2007, p.173). In Afaan

Oromoo, one of the unique features of attributive statives is that the predicate appears to be adjectival, with the copula as tense marker. The LSCs in (16) below illustrate attributive statives.

16(a) *ɗiraa-n*   *ɗeer-aa-ɗa*
       Jira-NOM   tall-MS-COP
       'Jira is tall.'
  (b) *hintal-ni* [*hintalli*]   *bareed-tuu-ɗa* [*bareedduuɗa*]
       girl-NOM   beautiful-FS-COP
       'The girl is beautiful.'

The LSCs in (16) have one-place predicates, *ɗeer-* 'tall' and *bareed-* 'beautiful', which are primarily nonverbal, i.e., adjectival. In (17) below, we indicate the general and clause-specific LSs for these statives.

17(a)	General LS for Attributive Stative:	**Pred' (x)**	
		x=Theme	
(b)	Clause-specific LS for (16a):	*ɗeer-* 'tall' (*ɗiraa* 'Jira')	
	i. Thematic relations:	*ɗiraa* 'Jira' ◄——— Theme	
	ii. Semantic macroroles:	Undergoer ◄——Theme	1 Macrorole
(c)	Clause-specific LS for (16b):	*bareed-* 'beautiful' (*hintala* 'girl')	
	i. Thematic relations:	*hintala* 'girl' ◄——Theme	
	ii. Semantic macroroles:	Undergoer ◄——Theme	1 Macrorole

The general LS [Pred' (x)] of attributive stative has only one thematic role, the theme, parallel to the single core argument. In this sense, the attribution/adjective (*ɗeer-* 'tall') reveals the property possessed by the argument as the attribution/adjective cannot be considered an argument. The predicate slot is occupied by adjectival along with present tense marking copula *-ɗa/-ti* 'be'. The property of the core argument is described by the adjectival, so the function of the copula is to show tense of the LSC. In addition, the single macrorole, undergoer, is assigned to the theme.

In clause-specific LSs, (17a) has *ɗeer-* 'tall' as its predicate and *ɗiraa* 'Jira' as the only argument, which is the theme. Likewise, the predicate slot in (17b) is filled with *bareed-* 'beautiful', and the argument position is taken by *hintala* 'girl'. As long as Afaan Oromoo is concerned, the LS of the clause structure for all attributive statives is equivalent to the general LS identified in (17a). In short, attributive stative is described by a one-place predicate whose argument is the theme.

Possession stative is another subclass of stative situation. It has LSCs which describe possessing or owing something. The LSCs in (18) below illustrate possession stative.

18. *saaraa-n*   *k'arʃii*   *k'ab-t-i* [*k'abdi*]

     Sara-NOM   money   hold-3FS-IMPF
     'Sara has money.'

In (18), the LSC has the predicate *k'ab-* 'hold' which expresses the possessor-possessed relationship between *saaraa* 'Sara' and *k'arʃii* 'money'. The general LS for possession stative is shown in (19a), and the clause-specific is in (19b).

19(a)	General LS for Possession Stative:	***k'ab-* 'hold' (x, y)**
		x=Locative, y=Theme
(b)	Clause-specific LS for (18):	*k'ab-* 'hold' (*saaraa* 'Sara', *k'arʃii* 'money')
	i. Thematic relations:	*saaraa* 'Sara' ⟵——— Locative
		k'arʃii 'money' ⟵——— Theme
	ii. Semantic macroroles:	Undergoer ⟵——— Locative | 1 Macrorole

The general LS for possession stative presented in (19a) is straightforward in that the position of the possessor is represented by 'x' and the possessed is taken by 'y'. Despite structurally similarity with identificational stative, possession stative has two different arguments as opposed to the identification, which has only argument. The predicate which links the arguments is replaced by *k'ab-* 'hold'. Accordingly, in (19b), *saaraa* 'Sara' is the locative (or possessor) and *k'arʃii* 'money' is the theme (or possessed). There is undergoer as the only semantic macrorole since the two arguments are labeled in the middle tier of the Actor-Undergoer Hierarchy. To recapitulate, possession stative has the LS [*k'ab-* 'hold' (x, y)] to represent the clause structures which describe possessor-possessed relationship.

In cognitive stative, we express mental and (non)-volitional processes of human mind. The LSCs of such stative require cognizer and cognized entities as their arguments (Van Valin, 2005). The following are examples from Afaan Oromoo.

20(a) *taliilee-n*   *barsiisaa*   *ni-kabaʤ-t-i* [*nikabaʤʤi*]
      Talile-NOM   teacher   FOC-respect-3FS-IMPF
      'Talile respects teacher.'
  (b) *kamaal*   *ʔarabiffa*   *beek-a*
      Kemal.NOM   Arabic   know-IMPF
      'Kemal knows Arabic.'

The LSs for (20) are shown in (21) below. The first argument, 'x', is the experiencer, whereas the second, 'y', is the theme.

21(a)	General LS for Cognitive Stative:	**Pred' (x, y)**
		x=Experiencer, y=Theme
(b)	Clause-specific LS for (20a):	*kabaʤ-* 'respect' (*taliilee* 'Talile', *barsiisaa* 'teacher')
	i. Thematic relations:	*taliilee* 'Talile' ⟵——— Experiencer
		barsiisaa 'teacher' ⟵——— Theme
	ii. Semantic macroroles:	Undergoer ⟵——— Experiencer | 1 Macrorole
(c)	Clause-specific LS for (20b):	*beek-* 'know' (*kamaal* 'Kemal', *ʔarabiffa* 'Arabic')
	i. Thematic relations:	*kamaal* 'Kemal' ⟵——— Experiencer
		ʔarabiffa 'Arabic' ⟵——— Theme
	ii. Semantic macroroles:	Undergoer ⟵—Experiencer | 1 Macrorole

As shown in (21a), the general LS for cognitive stative assigns two core arguments. The experiencer, i.e., the cognizer, assumes the position of the first argument ('x'), and the theme (or the cognized) holds the place of the second ('y'). In the LS, the predicate is formed by the cognitive verb as the nucleus of the LSC.

In (21b-c), the predicates are *kabadʒ-* 'respect' and *beek-* 'know', whereas the experiencers are *taliilee* 'Talile' and *kamaal* 'Kemal'. In RRG, the cognizers are animates who experience what they do regardless of the effect on the cognized arguments. The themes are *barsiisaa* 'teacher' and *ʔarabiffa* 'Arabic'. Contrary to the two thematic roles in the LS, there is only one macrorole, undergoer. While experiencer is central in cognitive stative, it becomes undergoer in its macrorole, but the other (theme) is relatively peripheral.

In relation to cognitive, emotive stative describes feelings or emotional states of mind. They involve two arguments: the emoter and the emoted entities (Van Valin, 2005, p.237). In (22) below, we get LSCs with M-transitive verbs in expressing emotive stative.

> 22(a) *ʔaannanee-n   siifan   dʒibb-(i)t-i*
>   Anane-NOM   Sifan   hate-3FS-IMPF
>   'Anane hates Sifan.'
> (b) *dargagg-oot-ni   ʔiʃee   dʒadʒ-u*
>   adolescent-PL-NOM   her   admire-IMPF
>   'Adolescents admire her.'

In (22 a & b), the subjects *ʔaannanee* 'Anane' and *dargaggoota* 'adolescents' are emoters with volition and intention. The LS of these statives is similar to that of possession and cognitive statives. However, emotives have emotion verbs, whereas possession and cognitive statives have possessive and cognitive verbs in their predicate slots. LS of emotive is shown in (23) below.

23(a)	General LS for Emotive Stative:	**Pred' (x, y)**	
		x=Experiencer, y=Theme	
(b)	Clause-specific LS for (22a):	*dʒibb-* 'hate' (*ʔaannanee* 'Anane', *siifan* 'Sifan')	
	i. Thematic relations:	*ʔaannanee* 'Anane' ⟵ Experiencer *siifan* 'Sifan' ⟵———— Theme	
	ii. Semantic macroroles:	Undergoer ⟵Experiencer	1 Macrorole
(c)	Clause-specific LS for (22b):	*dʒadʒ-* 'admire' (*dargaggoota* 'adolescents', *ʔiʃee* 'her')	
	i. Thematic relations:	*dargaggoota* 'adolescents' ⟵Experiencer *ʔiʃee* 'her' ⟵———— Theme	
	ii. Semantic macroroles:	Undergoer ⟵Experiencer	1 Macrorole

The general LS of emotive stative, (23a), the predicate (Pred') slot is occupied by emotive verbs. In the clause-specific LSs, the emoters take the place of the first argument ('x') as in (b and c). On the other hand, the emoted entities fill the position of 'y' in the structure; *siifan* 'Sifan' in (23b) and *ʔiʃee* 'her' in (23c). The predicates for the two LSCs are *dʒibb-* 'hate' and *dʒadʒ-* 'admire', respectively. Like cognitive stative, the semantic macrorole of emotive stative is one, undergoer. In short, emotive statives have the general LS [Pred' (x, y)], where 'x' is the experiencer (emoter) and 'y' is the theme (emoted). The experiencer has undergoer macrorole.

Lastly, perceptive stative deals with interaction of the perceiver and the immediate environment through sense organs (Rothmayr, 2009, p.316). It is the last type of stative in Afaan Oromoo. In clause structure, this stative indicates non-volitional state-of-affair. The perceiver experiences the act of perception without attention and recognition by his/her mind. The following are examples.

24(a)   *beekaa-n*   *waʧ'a*   *dagah-e*
        Beka-NOM   noise   hear-PFV
        'Beka heard noise.'

(b)   *waak'oo-n*   *dukkana*   *keessa*   *ni-ʔilaal-a*
        Wako-NOM   dark   in   FOC-see-IMPF
        'Wako sees in the dark.'

One typical feature of perceptive stative is that the percept does not necessarily appear in the LSC. In (24) above, the emphasis is on the perceivers *beekaa* 'Beka' and *waak'oo* 'Wako', so the percepts (or themes) are optional in the predicate structures, as in (24b). In (25) below, we show the general and clause-specific LSs of perceptive stative.

25(a)	General LS for Perceptive Stative:	**Pred' (x, y)**	
		x=Experiencer, y=Theme	
(b)	Clause-specific LS for (24a):	*dagah-* 'hear' (*beekaa* 'Beka', *waʧ'a* 'noise')	
	i. Thematic relations:	*beekaa* 'Beka' ←——— Experiencer	
		waʧ'a 'noise' ←——— Theme	
	ii. Semantic macroroles:	Undergoer ←—Experiencer	1 Macrorole
(c)	Clause-specific LS for (24b):	*ʔilaal-* 'see' (*waak'oo* 'Wako', Ø)	
	i. Thematic relations:	*waak'oo* 'Wako' ←——— Experiencer	
	ii. Semantic macroroles:	Undergoer ←—Experiencer	1 Macrorole

The general LS for perceptive stative in (25a) is [Pred' (x, y)], where Pred' represents perceptive verbs, such as *fuunfat-* 'smell', *dagah-* 'hear', *ʔilaal-* 'see', *dandam-* 'taste', etc. The first argument position, i.e., 'x', is held by perceiver as the experiencer, and 'y' is taken by stimulus as the theme (or it is left empty). The experiencer is assigned undergoer semantic macrorole. In clause-specific LS, (25b), the perceptive verb is *dagah-* 'hear' to assign *beekaa* 'Beka' as the experiencer and *waʧ'a* 'noise' as the theme or stimulus. Similarly, (25c) has the perceptive verb *ʔilaal-* 'see' which assigns *waak'oo* 'Wako' as the sole argument (the experiencer). In both clause-specific LSs, the experiencer has undergoer macrorole.

5. Conclusion

In this study, we have classified basic-level stative situations in Afaan Oromoo into seven types. The bases of the classification are the semantics of the verbs (nucleus) and the semantic roles of the arguments in the LSCs. The seven types are identificational, locative, attributive, possession, cognitive, emotive, and perceptive. With very slight overlapping, these statives have arguments with different thematic relations. One common feature among these is that they have single semantic macrorole: undergoer.

Secondly, we have described the LSs of different stative types in Afaan Oromoo. These are identificational, locative, attributive, possession, cognitive, emotive, and perceptive. They have the general LS [Pred' (x, y) or Pred' (x)], where Pred' is verbal, copular or adjectival, 'x' stands for the first argument, and 'y' is for the second. Another common feature for stative is the existence of single macrorole, called undergoer. In the following table, we give summary of the LS of each subclass.

Table: LS Summary of Statives in Afaan Oromoo

Type of stative	LS	Thematic relation	Semantic macrorole	Predicate
Identificational	*-ɗa*/*-ti* 'be' (x, y)	x=Locative, y=Theme	Undergoer= Locative	Copula
Locative	Pred' (x, y)	x=Theme, y=Locative	Undergoer= Theme	Verbal
Attributive	Pred' (x)	x=Theme	Undergoer= Theme	Adjectival
Possession	*k'ab-* 'hold' (x, y)	x=Locative, y=Theme	Undergoer= Locative	Verbal
Cognitive, Emotive, Perceptive	Pred' (x, y)	x=Experiencer, y=Theme	Undergoer= Experiencer	Verbal

Despite having slightly similar general LS, the seven subclasses of stative have variations in clause-specific LSs, thematic relations/roles and the types of predicates, as indicated in the above table. If the LS has two arguments, the first argument is locative as in identificational and possession, theme as in locative and attributive, or experiencer as in cognitive, emotive and perceptive. In the same token, the second argument can be theme as in identificational, possession, cognitive, emotive and perceptive, or locative as in locative stative. In predicate structure, we get copula in identificational, respective verbal elements in locative, possession, cognitive, emotive and perceptive, and adjectival in attributive statives. Syntactic pivots (subjects) or the first arguments ('x') are assigned undergoer as the only semantic macrorole. By and large, LS of stative does not show any syntactic complexity since the state-of-affair does not involve dynamicity. The general LS is more or less similar across all subclasses of stative as revealed in the discussion as well as in the table above.

Acknowledgements

Abbreviations

1PL	first person plural	MID	middle
3FS	third person feminine singular	M-intransitive	macrorole intransitive
COP	copula	MS	masculine singular
CVB	converb	M-transitive	macrorole transitive
DAT	dative	NEG	negation/negative
DEF	definitive	NOM	nominative
FOC	focus	NP	noun phrase
FS	feminine singular	PFV	perfective
IMPF	imperfective	PL	plural
INC	inchoative	POSS	possessive
INST	instrument	Pred'	predicate
LOC	locative	RRG	Role and Reference Grammar
LS	logical structure	SG	singulative
LSC	layered structure of clause		

Authors' contributions:
1. Eba Teresa Garoma: Collected data, developed the proposal, transcribed the interview data, interpreted the data and wrote the manuscript from his PhD dissertation.
2. Baye Yimam: is the main and solo supervisor in the PhD program.

Authors' Details
1st Eba Teresa Garoma, Email: ebateresa@gmail.com, Jimma University, College of Social Sciences and Humanities, Department of English Language and Literature
2nd Baye Yimam (Professor) , Email: bayemekonnen@gmail.com, Addis Ababa University, College of Humanities, Language Studies, Journalism and Communication, Department of Linguistics

Competing of Interest
The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.
Declarations of Corresponding author: This study is a part of the PhD dissertation, *Typology and Structure of Eventuality in Afaan Oromoo*, which was prepared under the supervision of Professor Baye Yimam and submitted to AAU. The topic of this study is quite different from any other studies published (or to be published) on any other journals, but only related to them under the umbrella of the PhD dissertation.

Consent for publication
We have agreed - to - submit to the Journal of Social Sciences and Language Studies and approved the manuscript for submission.

Corresponding author's signature:

References

Alvarez, M. & Hyman, J. (1998). Agents and their actions. *Philosophy* 73 (284), pp.219-245.

Binnick, R. (2006). Aspect and aspectuality. In Aarts, B. and McMahon, A. (Eds.), *The handbook of English linguistics*, pp.244-268. Oxford, London: Blackwell.

Binnick, R. (2001). Temporality and aspectuality. In Haspelmath, M., König, E., Oesterreicher, W. and Raible, W. (Eds.), *Language typology and language universals*, pp.557-567. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Binnick, R. (1991). *Time and the verb: A guide to tense and aspect*. Oxford, London: Oxford University Press.

Boutin, M. (1994). *Aspect in Bonggi.* Florida: University of Florida PhD Dissertation.

Central Statistical Agency (CSA). (2008). *Summary and statistical report of the 2007 population and housing census*. Addis Ababa: FDRE Population Census Commission.

Central Statistical Agency (CSA). (2013). *Population projections for Ethiopia, 2007-2037*. Addis Ababa: UNFPA.

Chomsky, N. (1981). *Lectures on government and binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Davidson, D. (1996). The individuation of events. In Casati, R. and Varzi, A. (Eds.), *Events*, pp.286-294. Aldershot: Dartmouth.

Debela, Goshu. (2010). *The semantics of Oromo frontal adpositions.* Oslo: University of Oslo PhD Dissertation.

Debela, Goshu. (2007). Path in Oromo motion construction: *APAL- Annual Publications in African Linguistics* 5, pp.73-88.

Debela Goshu. (2006). Manner, path and figure in Oromo verbs of motion. *Lissan: Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 20 (1/2), pp.51-65.

Debela, Goshu & Meyer, R. (2008). Marking of grounds with path-oriented motion verbs in Oromo. *APAL- Annual Publications in African Linguistics 6,* pp.1-46.

Debela, Goshu & Meyer, R. (2006). Conditional expressions in Oromo. *APAL- Annual Publications in African Linguistics* 4, pp.69-90.

Debela, Goshu & Meyer, R. (2003). Focus phenomena in Wellega Oromo. *Afrika und Übersee* 86, pp.161-197.

Dowty, D. (1991). Thematic proto-roles and argument selection. *Language* 67, pp.547-619.

Eba, Teresa Garoma & Baye, Yimam. (2020). Typology and structure of basic-level activities in Afaan Oromoo. *Ethiopian Journal of Education & Sciences* 15 (2). 65-89.

Feda, Negesse. (2015). Classification of Oromo dialects: A computational approach. *International Journal of Computational Linguistics* 6 (1), pp.1-10.

Foley, W. & Van Valin*,* R., Jr. (1984)*. Functional syntax and universal grammar*. Cambridge, London: Cambridge University Press.

Gemetchu, Megerssa. (1993). *Knowledge, identity and the colonizing structure: The case of the Oromo in East and Northeast Africa.* London: London School of Oriental and African Studies PhD Dissertation.

Griefenow-Mewis, C. (2001). *A grammatical sketch of written Oromo*. Cologne: Rudiger Koppe.

Guéron, J. & Lecarme, J. (Eds.). (2008). *Time and modality*. Paris: Springer.

Hopper, P. (1987). Emergent grammar. *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 13, pp.139-157.

Jackendoff, R. (1991). Parts and boundaries. *Cognition* 41, pp.9-45.

Kebede, Hordofa. (2009). *Towards the genetic classification of Afaan Oromoo dialects.* Oslo: University of Oslo PhD Dissertation.

Kebede, Hordofa. (2007). Causative verb and palatalization in Oromo: Evidence from Oromo dialects and related languages. *Journal of Oromo Studies 14* (2), pp.65-89.

Kebede, Hordofa. (2005). The varieties of Oromo. *The Working Papers of the Ethiopian Languages Research Center 1* (1), pp.134-150.

Koontz-Garboden, A. (2007). *States, changes of state, and the monotonicity hypothesis*. Stanford: Stanford University PhD Dissertation.

Lin, J. (2004). *Event structure and the encoding of arguments: The syntax of the Mandarin and English verb phrase.* Cambridge, New York: MIT PhD Dissertation.

McGregor, W. (2009). Introduction. In McGregor, W. (Ed.), *The expression of possession,* pp.1-12. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G. & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London: Longman.

Radvansky, G. & Zacksm J. (2014). *Event cognition*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.

Rothmayr, A. (2009). *The structure of stative verbs*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Rothstein, S. (2004). *Structuring events*. London: Blackwell.

Samuel, Adola. (2007). *Moving metaphorically: The semantics of the Oromo motion verb ba'uu 'to go out'.* Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University MA Thesis.

Shimelis, Mazengia. (2016). Aspect and tense in Oromo. In Meyer, R. & Edzard, L. (Eds.), *Time in languages of the horn of Africa*, pp.117-136. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Smith, C. (1997). *The parameter of aspect,* 2nd edn. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Tadesse, Jaleta. (2004). *A contextual study of Guji-Oromo proverbs: Functions in focus.* Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University MA Thesis.

Van Valin, R., Jr. (2005). *Exploring the syntax-semantics interface.* Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Van Valin, R., Jr. (2004). *An introduction to syntax*. Cambridge, London: Cambridge University Press.

Van Valin, R., Jr. (1993). A synopsis of role and reference grammar. In Van Valin, R., Jr. (Ed.), *Advances in role and reference grammar*, pp.1-164. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Van Valin, R., Jr. (1990). Semantic patterns of split-intransitivity. *Language* 66 (2), pp.221-260.

Van Voorst, J. (1988). *Event structure*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Vendler, Z. (1967). *Linguistics in philosophy.* Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.

Wakweya, Olani. (2014). *Inflectional morphology in Oromo*. Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University MA Thesis.

Zelalem, Girma. (2014). *Form and function of converbs in Oromo*. Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University MA Thesis.

Appendix: Phonemes of Afaan Oromoo

	Bilabial	Labio-dental	Alveolar	Post-alveolar	Palatal	Velar	Glottal
Plosive	p b		t d			k g	ʔ
Nasal	m		n		ɲ		
Trill			r				
Ejective	p'		t'		ʧ'		
Fricative		f	s z	ʃ			h
Affricate					ʧ ʤ		
Approximant	w				j		
Lateral Approx.			l				
Implosive			ɗ				

Table 1: Consonant Phonemes of Afaan Oromoo

- The symbols which exist in the left corner of boxes are voiceless, and the right ones represent voiced consonants.
- Gemination and vowel length are represented by doubling the consonant and vowel phonemes.

	Front	Central	Back
Close	i		u
Mid	e		o
Open		a	

Table 2: Vowel Phonemes of Afaan Oromoo

- In Afaan Oromoo, all short vowels have long phonemic counterparts.
- Vowel length is represented by doubling vowel phoneme.