Competing Scripts in multilingual Ethiopia: An Option for a Common Script Use

Fekede Menuta

Abstract

This article aims to describe the sociolinguistics of scripts used in multilingual Ethiopia with a focus in Southern Ethiopia including the Southern Nations, Nationalities and Peoples Regional State (SNNPRS), and Sidaama. It attempts to describe the challenges of competitively and divisively used scripts, Ethiopic and Latin, thereby showing, with linguistic-based pieces of evidence, that Ethiopic can be used for all languages in Southern Ethiopia in particular and Ethiopia in general. The methodology used is qualitative, but numbers are also used to count graphemes and lines in the paragraphs, thereby showing an economy of graphemes and words. Five languages: Amharic, Gurage, Konta, Sidaama, and Aari were chosen using purposive sampling. To compare an economy of graphemes and words, Amharic and Guragetexts were compared to one another. For Konta, Sidaama, and Aaritexts written in Ethiopic and Latin-based scripts were compared for each language. It was found that the Ethiopic script is more economic than the Latin-based script. The study also showed that Ethiopic script can very well represent gemination and length. It is suggested that a phonemic inventory of Ethiopian languages should be made and that Ethiopic phonetic alphabet (EPA) needs to be prepared for consistent use of graphemes across Ethiopian languages.

KeyWords:/Ethiopic/Latin/Multilingualism/Othography/Script/

1. Introduction

1.1 Background to the Study

Ethiopia is a multilingual country with more than 73 languages (Hudson 2004, p. 168) or about 80 languages (Salawu & Asemahagn, 2015, p. 72; Fekede, 2019, p. 29) belonging to the Afro-Asiatic and Nilo-Saharan phylum are spoken. Of the languages across Ethiopia 56 of them have a writing system. Since 2019, 29 of the 56 languages are in Southern Ethiopia (Fekede, 2019, p. 34). The languages that are written are used in different domains such as education, media, and administration. The writing systems used include Ethiopic, Arabic, and Latin. Ethiopic is also called Sabian and Geez-script (Piper and Ginkel, 2016; 1, Pasch, 2008, p. 7) by different authors. In this article, I shall use Ethiopic than the other possible labels. The Ethiopic writing system is alphasyllabary; Arabic is alphabetic, and Latin is phonetic

(Piper&Ginkel, 2016, p. 4). Arabic was used to write some Ethiopian languages such as Afan Oromo (Wondimu, 2016, p. 10) and is still used for teaching Islamic education and Quran. Ethiopic is mostly used by Ethiosemitic languages, and the Latin-based script is used by Cushitic and Omotic languages (cf. Fekede, 2019, p. 35 for SNNPRS).

The fact that Ethiopia uses three scripts implies that the country is multilingual and a multi-script user. It is also important to mention that there is an instance of polygraphia, the use of different graphemes for the same language. For instance, Ethiopic is used in Bible, in reporting administrative issues to the Federal State of Ethiopia, and in advertisings whereas Latin-based script is used in education and local administration as in Aari, Konta, and Sidaama. Multi-script use has been a point of discussion and researches as to whether different script use may affect, for instance, learning to read (Piper&Ginkel, 2016), and 'script and identity' (Brandta &Sohonib, 2018, p. 1).

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Since 1994, following the grant of linguistic rights to all ethnolinguistic groups of Ethiopia to use their language in all walks of life, script use diversification has become reality. Though it is known that any script can represent the sounds of any language, the reasons for the introduction of multi-script in Ethiopia are not well known. Some scholars who are the pro introduction of Latin based scripts to write Ethiopian languages reason out that Ethiopic could not represent gemination and length (Gedaa Melbaa,1988, p. 16); Latin script is easily adaptable to several world languages and computer technology (Wodimu, 2016, p. 13). There are also other socio-political reasons for the use of bi- (tri)-scripts in the writing system of Ethiopia. Previous studies did not empirically address if gemination and length can be handled economically with Ethiopic, the advantage gained and the challenges felt when using Latin-based script. In this study, the researcher will attempt to fill these gaps by investigating the different causes for the multi-script use, comparing the advantages and disadvantages of using Ethiopic and Latin-based scripts, and showing if Ethiopic can be used for all Ethiopian languages.

1.3 Objectives

The primary objective of this research is to uncover the challenges, benefits, and drawbacks of using Ethiopic and Latin-based scripts from a linguistic standpoint and to propose options for a common script use for Ethiopian languages. It specifically aims to:

o   Find out why the majority of Omotic and Cushitic language speakers in Southern Ethiopia and Sidaama tend to choose a Latin-based script while Semitic language speakers tend to stick to Ethiopic use.

o   Uncover if there were challenges, advantages, and disadvantages in using Latin-based scripts since 1994compared to Ethiopic scripts in the study cites.

o   Show whether Ethiopic or Latin-based scripts are preferable in terms of economy of graphemes and words, patterning in writing, and consistency.

o   Propose solutions for some of the deficiencies that were ascribed to the Ethiopic writing system.

---

2. Related Literature Review

The term 'script' has several meanings such as a play, a file in a computer containing a list of commands, a particular orthography, or writing. According to Unseth (2005, p. 20) script "refers to a certain style of letter shapes built on a common basic form … or sets of symbols, such as Roman, Arabic, Cyrillic, Hangul (Korean), Ethiopic, Devanagari (India), Hiragana (Japanese), etc." The style of letter shapes is what computer specialists call them fonts, hence, the concern of this article is the one referring to the set of symbols used by different languages of the world.

Writing itself in English has several meanings. Coulmas (2003, p. 1) distinguishes six meanings of writing: '(1) a system of recording language using visible or tactile marks, (2) the activity of putting such a system to use, (3) the result of such activity, a text, (4) the particular form of such a result, a script style such as block letter writing, (5) artistic composition, [and] (6) a professional occupation'.

According to Coulmas (2003, p. 35), the writing system is used in two different contexts of meaning. 'It refers to the writing system of an individual language and an abstract type of writing system. In the first sense, there are as many writing systems as there are written languages, but in the second sense the number is limited to a few types, such as logographic or word writing systems, syllabic writing systems, phonetic writing systems, or variant forms thereof'. The researcher shall discuss the second sense when describing types of writing systems.

A further terminological specification is that script refers to the graphic form of the units of a writing system, such as Fidel in Amharic and Qube in Afan Oromo. A similar term associated with writing system and the script is 'orthography, which refers to the standardized variety of a given, language-specific writing system' (Coulmas, 2003, p. 35).

Types of writing as the abstract system of writing are classified into logographic or ideographic, syllabary, and alphabetic. In a logographic writing system, the word is the basic functional unit. The Chinese characters and the Sumerian cuneiforms of Mesopotamia are the best examples of logographic writing systems. In the syllabary writing system, the unit of the grapheme is a speech syllable. The Japanese Kana, Cherokee, and Akkadian are examples. In an alphabetic writing system, a segment is a unit of the grapheme. Speech sounds are grouped into two, consonant, such as /p/, /t/, and /k/, and vowel such as /i/, /u/ and /a/. The Latin alphabet used in many European languages and currently in some of the Ethiopian languages, such as Sidaama is an example of an alphabetic writing system. In alphabetic writing, it is ideally assumed that there should be 'one-to-one correspondence between phonemes and their written representation' (DeFrancis, 1989, p. 185). However, this principle 'does not apply to any particular orthography' (Coulmas, 2003, p. 93).

Some languages combine syllables and segments as their unit; hence, they are neither syllabary nor alphabetic. Such languages have been called by different terms by different authors, such as neo-syllabary (Février, 1948), semi-syllabary (Diringer, 1968; Ullman, 1989;), syllabic alphabet(Coulmasp. 1989), and alpha-syllabary (Bright, 1999). The researcher will use Bright's term alpha-syllabary as it is the blend of alphabets and syllabaries. Amharic is the best example of alphasyllabary as can be demonstrated in the terms, such as *ləb-bə-sə*ለበሰ 'he dressed' and *libs*ልብስ   'clothes'. In *ləb-bə-sə,* the Amharic Fidel has a closed syllable in the IPA version which is ignored in the Ethiopic version as each Fidel represented an open syllable. In *libs,* we have consonantal segments without vowels, and the central high vowel in the IPA form is epenthetically used to break three consonant clusters. This vowel is completely invisible in the Fidel form of words.

Based on the classifications of the types of writing systems, Ethiopia currently uses *an alphabetic writing system* for the majority of Cushitic, Omotic, and a few Nilo-Saharan languages and an *alphasyllabary* writing system for nearly all the Ethiosemitic languages. It is important to uncover whether these choices were based on the knowledge of the advantages and disadvantages of each type of

the writing system chosen or not and whether there were non-linguistic motives for such script choices. It is also relevant to evaluate the strengths and drawbacks witnessed in the two writing systems used in Ethiopia in the last two decades.

Pasch (2008, pp. 2-3) writes that historically there were script competitions that replaced several African writing systems with the Roman script:

> With regard to a number of languages in West, North-East, and East Africa, the introduction of the Roman script under colonialism by the missionaries caused the replacement of the earlier scripts. Geez and Amharic, Tigrinya, and Oromo were written in the Ethiopic script, and in Ethiopia, there was a tradition of written literature for fifteen centuries…. Berber dialects were written in Tifinagh and in Arabic. Swahili, Somali, Hausa, Kanuri, Manding, Susu, Wolof, and Fulfulde were written in adapted forms of the Arabic script, Ajami. For some of these languages, there is a competitive coexistence of the old and the new script with alternating 'winners'.

When it comes to Ethiopia, Ethiopic was used for all Ethiopian languages until 1994. Ethiopia was not colonized and the colonial imposition was not there, but as was the case in other African countries, missionaries and other Europeans who were interested to support education developed writing systems for several Ethiopian languages often with Roman script in the last four decades. Now, there are two main competing scripts: Latin-based Roman script and Ethiopic. Arabic also has a significant role, particularly in Muslim communities of Ethiopia as they use it for religious purposes, and there is huge Arabic literature with modified graphemes to fit Ethiopian languages (Wetter,2007, pp. 1-6).

The reasons for the current multi-script use in Ethiopia are not well known despite the existing arguments for the choices by some scholars. Some of the arguments are based on linguistic factors while others are social and political. The history of the writing system informs us that script choice is affected by linguistic and non-linguistic factors (Unseth, 2008, pp. 1-3) The linguistic factors are often conscious choices made by linguists, pedagogues, and historians. It may or may not include the strict involvement of political bodies. A few of the linguistic and non-linguistic factors are outlined as follows.

i. Linguistic factors

Several linguistic factors have been considered in script choice. According to Berry (1968, p. 738), for example, an acceptable orthography should have the following qualities: (1)*linguistically*, the alphabets have to be economic, consistent, and unambiguous; (2) pedagogically, the alphabet should help to achieve the utilitarian aim of the economy of time and labor in learning to read and write; (3) psychologically, the alphabet should respect the psychological and physiological process involved in the reading and writing acts, and (4)typologically, the alphabet should suit to the needs of modern techniques of graphic representation.

The linguistic principles of economy, consistency, and non-ambiguity are achieved by various means. For instance, economy assumes a one-to-one correspondence between phoneme and grapheme, and an abstract level of phonemic representation rather than phonetic reality. This may also be associated with script type choice of syllabary, alphabetic, or alphasyllabary that may maximize or minimize graphemes. Consistency has to do with the patterning of graphemes for shaping and memorizing them. Non-ambiguity is more concerned with avoiding over-differentiation and under-representation of graphemes (Fekede, 2016), and graphemes that have similar shapes; hence, it is difficult to easily distinguish them.

_____

ii. Non-linguistic factors

The non-linguistic factors for script choice include the history and prestige of the writing system, the existing and anticipated intergroup relationship of the script users, the levels of accommodation and types of affiliations of the script users, the expected harmonization among languages such as transfer to other languages in the school and the speech community of a given area, language and script attitude (Fekede, 2019, p. 35), the instrumentality of the script such as readily available keyboard and ease of access to the application, and identity (national, regional or religious) of script users (Fekede, 2016, p. 6).

When it comes to the script choice situation in Ethiopia, linguistic and non-linguistic factors are involved. Among linguistic factors mentioned include, the historic and longtime used the writing system, Ethiopic, which does not represent some unique sounds of languages of Ethiopia. Ethiopic is blamed for not representing length and gemination as in Afan Oromo (Wondimu, 2016, p. 13), and the trend was followed by Cushitic and Omotic languages most of which have contrastive length and gemination. The non-linguistic factors include language and script attitude; Ethiopic was associated with the languages of the politically dominant group, the Amhara. Instrumentality, a Latin-based writing system was found easy and compatible with the English keyboard (Wondimu, 2016, p. 13).

3. **Methodology**

The study was conducted between 2020-2021 in Jinka, Ameya, Wolkite, and Hawassa towns which are administrative towns of the South Omo zone, Konta Zone, Gurage Zone, and Sidama regional state, respectively. The towns are located at 658km, 455km, 150km, and 282km from Addis Ababa, the capital city of Ethiopia, respectively.

The methodology used is a qualitative description of the sociolinguistics of script use. The researcher conducted key informant interviews using Amharic with 15 participants to uncover linguistic and non-linguistic causes for multi-script use and a particular script preference. Though the script use situation is similar across Ethiopia, the area sampled for the study is limited to Southern Ethiopia (the SNNPRS and Sidaama regions). The participants for the interview were master's students from Hawassa University, curriculum developers from Aari, Konta, Sidama, and orthography developing team members in Gurage. The researcher compared and analyzed the orthographies already in use for each language sampled. The researcher chose two short stories which were written in Ethiopicand then translated into each of the sampled languages by native speakers of the languages. The researcher had five translators, one for each language. The translated texts were verified by two other native speakers of each language. The texts, then, were used to compare the economy of words and graphemes in writing with Ethiopic and Latin-based scripts. Five Ethiopian languages, two from Semitic (Amharic and Gurage), one from Cushitic (Sidaama), and two from Omotic (Aari and Konta) were chosen. Amharic and Gurage use Ethiopic script while all the other sampled languages use Latin-based script. The sampling method was purposive and convenient. It was purposive as it was planned to represent all language families of Ethiopia except the Nilo-Saharan languages which were not included due to less access to literature and key informants. It was convenience sampling because I chose languages for which access to key informants and written literature were easily available.

The analysis is made descriptively by comparing the graphemes for patterns, economy, and consistencies in writing. The economy of words and graphemes, however, were calculated by counting the number of words, graphemes, and lines with the Microsoft 'word count' tool. The responses from key informant interviews are thematically and textually presented. We kept the anonymity of the key informants, translators, and editors of texts from the local languages under investigation.

4. Presentation of Results

4.1 Orthographyofthe Languages

The researcher first discussAmharic and Gurage languages that use Ethiopic script and then Latin script using Omotic languages, Aari and Konta. Finally, the researcher describes the orthography of Sidaama, a representative sample forCushitic languages.

Amharic

Amharic is a South Ethiosemitic language spoken by 19,870,651 native speakers. This makes it the second-largest language in the country, the first being Afan Oromo with 25,489,024 native speakers(CSA,2007). Amharic being a lingua Franca of Ethiopia (Baye, 2016, p.9) is spoken as a second language by several millions of people. The language had been the national official language during Haile Selassie (1931-1974) and became the language of wider communication during the Dergue (1974-1991), EPDRF (1991-2019), and the Prosperity Party (December 2019 to present). The language is used in education as a medium in Amhara Region and the zones such as Gurage and is taught as a subject nearly in all regions at different grade levels. It is used in the media of the Federal Government and the SNNPRS. It is a language of administration in Addis Ababa, The Zones in SNNRPS whose languages are not designated for such a role as in Gurage. It is one of the well-described languages of Ethiopian Semitic (Appleyard, 2003,p. 233). Amharic has been described by several linguistic studies such as Baye (2000), Bender (1968), Girmay (1992), Leslau (1995), Getahun (1997), Mullen (1968), Mulugeta (2001), and Hirut (1999), in addition to many sociolinguistic studies such as Fekede (2016), Daniel (1998E.C.), and Zelealem (2003).

Amharic uses an Ethiopic script which is alpha-syllabary. Abraham states that the Amharic writing system, which was adopted from Geez, was 'derived from the cursive version of the South Semitic alphabet' (Abraham, 1981). It was Geez that introduced vocalization of consonants to the Ethiopic that originally lacked. According to Fekede (2016), there were different script reform efforts by different individuals and groups. Most of the reform efforts were not successful, but the addition of some deficient sounds, such as the palatals ቸ፣ጀ፣ዣ (/ʧ/, /ʤ/, /ʒ/), the fricative ቨ /v/, and the vowel ኧ /ə/, which was required due to the merger of the first and fourth-order /ə/ and /a/ into only /a/.

Amharic orthography, Fidel, consists of 34 basic graphemes of which only 28, shown below, are phonemic sounds:

Fidel	ሀ	ለ	ሐ	መ	ሠ	ረ	ሰ	ሸ	ቀ	በ	ተ	ቸ	ነ	ነ	ኘ	አ	ከ	ኸ	ወ	ዐ
IPA	h	l	h	m	s	r	s	ʃ	k'	b	t	ʧ	H	n	ɲ	a	k	h	w	ʔ

Fidel	ዘ	ዠ	የ	ደ	ጀ	ገ	ጠ	ጨ	ጰ	ጸ	ፀ	ፈ	ፐ	ቨ
IPA	z	ʒ	j	d	ʤ	g	t'	ʧ	p'	s'	s'	f	P	v

Each of the graphemes has six other shapes when combined with the vowels: /u/, /i/, /a/, /e/, /ɨ/, and /o/. The graphemes represented above are read with the vowel /ə/ except a few, such as ሀ, ሐ, ገ, አ and ዐ which are read with /a/. Some of the graphemes are homophones as can be observed from the IPA counterparts. There are four hə (ሀ, ሐ, ገ, ኸ) graphemes; historically the first two have velar, the third glottal, and the fourth pharyngeal qualities. Some of them had sociolinguistic significance as they were associated with different meanings. Some words were peculiarly spelled with one variant of these four h's. The grapheme ገ was associated with power (exampleገ of ገይለሥሳሴ [Haile Selassie 'power of the trinity']); the grapheme ሀ was associated with wealth (example ሀ of ሀብታሙ [habtamu 'the wealthy']); the

grapheme ሐ was related to beauty (example ሐ of ሐብል [habɨl 'necklace']). The grapheme ኽwas introduced because of the mergers of the first orders (ሀ, ሐ, ኀ,)and their corresponding fourth-order forms (ሃ, ሓ, and ኃ). The fourth-order of ኸ 'hə'which is ኻ'ha' also overlaps with the /ha/ types above.

There are also two graphemes of /s/; namely, ሠ and ስ which are described as the nɨgusu /s/ 'the king s' and the ɨsatu s 'the fire s', respectively. These attributive names presuppose that the graphemes are used to write certain nouns specifically as inንጉሥ (nɨgus) 'king' but not *ንጉስ (nɨgus), and እሳት (ɨsat)'fire' but not *እሣት (ɨsat). The other homophones are the ኣ and ዐ which historically represented the vowel /a/ and the glottal stop /ʔ/, respectively. These graphemes were also associated with certain categories of meaning. The ዐ was called ዐይኑ(ʔajnu) ዐ (ʔ) 'the eye a' and was used to write words such as ዓለም(ʔaləm)'world' and ዐይን(ʔajn) 'eye'. The ኣ, which has wider use, has no special attributive name as the former was associated with and distinguished from the latter. The other homophonous graphemes are ጸ and ፀ often distinguished by the attribute ጸበሉ (s'əbəlu)'ጸ'(s') 'the holy water s'' and ፀሐዩ (s'əhaju)'ፀ' (s') 'the sun s''. The graphemes ዐ and ፀ look iconic; the former is typically associated with the 'eye' and the latter with 'the sun'.

If we merge the homographs discussed above to represent the corresponding single phonemes, we are left with 28 graphemes. All the 33consonantal graphemes have seven orders representing CV where the V represents the vowels of the language: አ (ə) ፡ኡ (u), ኢ (i), ኣ (a), ኤ (e), እ (ɨ), and ኦ (o). The phoneme /b/, for example, will have the graphemes:

በ   ቡ   ቢ   ባ   ቤ   ብ   ቦ

bə   bu   bi   ba   be   bɨ   bo

Amharic has geminated and non-geminated consonants, such as *gəna* 'yet' and *gənna* 'Christmas'; *alə* 'someone said' and *allə* 'there is. Many of its verbs have geminated forms as in səbbər-ə (break-3SGM 'he broke') and 'nək'k'əl-ə (uproot-3SGM 'he uprooted'). In orthographic writing, Amharic does not show gemination; geminates and non-geminates are distinguished by context. Thus, both *gəna* and *gənna* are represented as ገና, and *alə* and *allə* are አለ.

Amharic writing traditions have not been considered a problem though some linguists argue that it is a challenge for beginners (Fekede, 2016). Most of the Cushitic and Omotic languages speaking groups often reason out that the absence of gemination marking and vowel length marking in Ethiopic script tradition is the main cause for them to shift into the Latin-based script (Wondimu, 2016), in addition to other sociolinguistic factors. Gemination is contrastive in Amharic and has a grammatical function though it is not marked in the orthography; the syntax disambiguates the different readings of the geminated and not geminated forms of words (Fabri et al, 2014, pp. 6-7). Some writers believe that if marking gemination is required, it can be shown with diacritics or by doubling Ethiopic script following the same Latin-based script traditions (cf. Mulugeta, 2016). Hadis Alemayehu tried to put a dot on the geminated consonants to mark gemination in his novel, *fɨk'ɨr ɨskə mək'abɨr* 'love unto the grave'.

Gurage

Gurage is a South Ethiopian Semitic language natively spoken by 1,867,377 people (CSA, 2007)in the Gurage Zone of the SNNPRS. It has thirteen dialects; namely, Chaha, Gura, Gumer, Ezha, Muhir, Geto, Inor, Ennar, Endegegn, Welene, Dobbi, Meskan, and Kistane. Two other Gurage languages spoken outside the Gurage zone are Silte, which is now claimed to be Silte, not a Gurage language, and Zay spoken in Zway island of the Oromiya region (Fekede, 2015). Gurage language is not used so far in

education, media, and court. There is limited use in religion, mainly in protestant and marginally in orthodox churches. According to Fekede (2015), the communication among the speakers of Gurage dialects varies from mutual intelligibility to irreversible intelligibly and unintelligibility.

Gurage is one of the well-described languages of Ethiopia. Each Gurage variety has a grammatical description despite the huge similarities among the dialects. Many of them are unpublished Ph.D. theses and are not enumerated here. Gurage orthography was developed by individuals beginning from the 1960s as in Leslau's (1966) book written in Chaha Gurage variety. The other document produced in the Ethiopic script in Gurage is the Bible: Gədər Gurda Bəguragina 'A New Testament in Guragina' (1982). The other works written with Ethiopic script are *jəʧ'amut ʃika* 'the trap of Chamut' and *Agəki: təketnət adʒinət* 'Ageki: from a maid to an honored wife' by Gebreyesus (1981). Tenkir (1999) also provides a relatively well patterned Gurage script while describing the proverbs of Gurage in three Gurage language varieties.

Fekede (2015, p. 275) provides the revised version of the preexisting Gurage scripts. He also offers a complete patterned description of the Gurage orthography written in Guragina (Fekede, 2018, pp. 24-32). The revised orthography was officially recognized by the Gurage Zone Council in 2018. There are two fonts; namely, *Yetenbi* and *Zebidar* that are based on the newly developed Gurage script. The phonemic inventory and the graphemes of Gurage are the following:

Phoneme: b, b^w, p, p^w, f, f^w, m, m^w, d, t, t', s, z, l, r, n, ʒ, ʃ, ʧ, ʧ', ʤ, j, g, g^j, g^w, k, k^j, k^w, k', $k^{'j}$, $k^{'w}$, h, h^j, h^w, ʔ

Ethiopic: በ ፡ ቡ ፡ ፐ ፡ ፑ ፡ ፈ ፡ ፉ ፡ መ ፡ ሙ ፡ ደ ፡ ተ ፡ ጠ ፡ ሰ ፡ ዘ ፡ ለ ፡ ረ ፡ ነ ፡ ዦ ፡ ሸ ፡ ቸ ፡ ጨ ፡ ጀ ፡ የ ፡ ገ ፡ ኟ ፡ ጐ ፡ ከ ፡ ኸ ፡ ኩ ፡ ቀ ፡
ቿ ፡ ቄ ፡ ሐ ፡ ኻ ፡ ሐ ፡ 0

Gurage has a writing system similar to that of Amharic except that it avoids the over-differentiated phonemes of Amharic. Additional graphemes Gurage has are the palatal g^j, k^j, $k^{'j}$, and h^j represented by ኟ, ኸ, ቿ and ኻ, respectively, and the labialized consonants b^w, p^w, f^w, m^w, g^w, k^w, $k^{'w}$, and h^w represented by ቡ,ፑ, ፉ,ሙ, ጐ, ኩ, ቄ and ሐ, respectively. The vowels of Gurage are i, e, ɨ, ə, u, o, and a.

Like in Amharic, Gurage has seven orders, based on the vowels that combine with consonants. The pattern for each grapheme is shown with only one of the consonant /b/ as follow:

	ə	u	i	a	e	ɨ	o
b	በ	ቡ	ቢ	ባ	ቤ	ብ	ቦ

The labialized consonants are defectively lacking the second and the seventh orders that overlap with their plain or not labialized forms of the respective phonemes. Thus, they assume the pattern shown below:

	ə	i	a	e	ɨ
b^w	ቡ	ቡ	ቢ	ቤ	ቡ

Regarding gemination and vowel length, there is variation among the Gurage dialects. Many of the Gurage dialects have lexical geminates and vowel length.

Aari

Aari is one of the Aroid languages of South Omotic, the others being Hamer-Benna, Beshada, Karo, and Dime, of the East Omotic branch of the Omotic family. It is spoken by 290,453 people CSA (2007) in the South Omo Zone of the SNNPRS. According to Fekede (2011, pp. 5-12), the language has nine dialects, namely Bakka, Shengama, Laydo, Sido, Seyki, Mura, Ubamer, Zeddo, and Gayl. The

_____

difference among the dialects is not much-affecting intelligibility. Relatively high variation is observed between Southern dialects and the Northern dialect Gayl.

The language is relatively less studied. The main linguistic works available include Ayyalew (1995), Daniel (1993), Ford (1985), Hyward(1990), and Tsuge (2004).

i) Consonants

The phonemic inventory of Aari (across the dialects), the corresponding orthographic forms, and the Ethiopic version proposed in this study are the following:

Phoneme: p, p' b, ɓ, f, m, w, t, d, ɗ, s, z, ts, ts', n, l, r, ʧ, ʧ', ʃ, ʒ, j, k, g, ŋ, q' χ, ʔ, h
Grapheme: p, p', b, ph, m, w, t, d, dh, s, z, ts, ts', n, l, r, ch, c', sh, zh, y, k, g, q', h', h
Ethiopic: ፐ፣ጰ፣በ፣ፈ፣መ፣ወ፣ተ፣ደ፣ዼ፣ሰ፣ዘ፣ዠ፣ጸ፣ነ፣ለ፣ረ፣ቸ፣ጨ፣ሽ፣ዣ፣የ፣ከ፣ገ፣ቀ፣ኸ፣ሀ

The orthography developing committee made some changes including, the addition of /dz/ which was considered a cluster in previous studies. The consonant /ʤ/, which was considered phonetic by Fekede (2011, pp. 15-16) is included in the orthography and is represented with /j/. The implosive /ɓ/ is avoided and a velar implosive /ʄ/ is introduced which is represented by /g'/ in the orthographic form rather than by **gh** in an analogy with **dh** for /ɗ/. The velar nasal /ŋ/ is missing, probably merged with alveolar nasal /n/. The glottal stop /ʔ/ is merged with the vowel /a/. The already established graphemes dz, ʤ, and ʄ are here represented with Ethiopic graphemes **ፀ, ዸ** and **ኘ,** respectively.

In Aari, consonant gemination is phonemic and nearly all the consonants can be geminated. A patterning problem is observed as /h/, which is both phoneme and diacritic, and it is used to show implosives and affricates when used as a diacritic. It is not also clear as to why /f/ is represented by the **ph**. Another pattern problem is that /ʧ/ which is represented by **ch** but /ʧ'/ by **c'**. It was possible to represent the former with /c/ and the latter with /c'/ for simplicity and patterning.

ii) Vowels:

Aari has five vowels which can be short or long. Vowel length is phonemic in the language. The orthography also contains additional two diphthongs; namely, *ie*, and *ea* which were not attested in Fekede (2011) and Ayyalew (1995).

<div align="center">

i, ii   u, uu

e, ee   o, oo

a, aa

</div>

Fekede (2011, p. 17) also has a front, low and lax vowel /ɛ/ which appears in words as in *bɛk* 'to plant a seed' contrasting with *buk* 'trim' and *bak* 'arrange hearth'; *gini* 'butter' and *gɛni* 'soothe'. However, a contrast between /e/ and /ɛ/ was not found, though the two vowels are clearly distinguished by the native speakers of Aari. In the new orthography, the two are merged into one, /e/.

 Konta

Konta (also called Kontatsuwa) is one of the central Ometo languages of the North Omotic branch of Omotic languages. It is spoken in the Konta special district of the SNNPRS by 91, 743 people (CSA,2007). It is used in education in lower primary (1-4), court, and local media transmitted from Waka. Zeleke (2011, p. 29) reports that Konta is mutually intelligible with Wolayta, Gamo, Gofa, and Dawro. It is recalled that these languages were blended as WoGaGoDa for use in education across the Ometo language clusters, but failed functioning mainly due to linguistic politics.

The main linguistic studies on the language are Kontatsuwa Grammar by Fekede (2015) and Documentation and Description of Konta Phonology and Morphologyby Lemma (2018). Konta uses a

Latin-based script to represent the sounds of the language. The phonemes of the language as presented inFekede (2015, pp. 33-35), the orthographic forms used by the orthography developing committee, and the suggestions made to represent the graphemes in Ethiopic by Fekede (2015, p. 42-44) are given as follows:

Phonemes: p, b, f, m, w, t, d, ɗ s, z, ts, ts', n, l, r, ʃ, ʒ, ʤ, ʧ, ʧ', [ɲ], j, k, g, k', ʔ, h

Grapheme:p, b, f, m, w, t, d, dh, s, z, th, ts', n, l, r, sh, zh, j, ch, c, nh,y, k, g, q, 7, h

Ethiopic:ፐ፣ ደ፣ ፈ፣ መ፣ ወ፣ ተ፣ ደ፣ ዸ፣ ሰ፣ ዘ፣ θ፣ ጸ፣ ነ፣ ለ፣ ረ፣ ሽ፣ ዠ፣ ጀ፣ ቸ፣ ጨ፣ ኘ፣ የ፣ ከ፣ ገ፣ ቀ፣ 0፣ ሀ

The vowel phonemes of Konta are /e/, / i/, /e/, /u/, /o/and /a/ which are represented in Ethiopic with ኤ፣ ኢ፣ ኡ፣ ኦ፣ and ኦ, respectively. All the vowels have long counterparts, and length is phonemic.

Gemination is phonemic in Konta and is represented in writing by doubling the orthographic forms as in *shsh* for geminate /ʃ/. Vowel length is also shown by doubling the vowels as in /aa/ for a long /a/.

Sidaama

Sidaama is a Highland East Cushitic (HEC) language of Ethiopia spoken by 2,966,474 people (CSA,2007), in the Sidaama Zone of the SNNPRS (and independent regional state since June 18, 2020). A distinction is made between Sidaama, the people who speak the language, and Sidaamu afo 'the language spoken by the people'. Sidaamu afo is used as a medium of instruction in the Sidaama region in lower primary schools (1-4) and taught as a subject in upper primary schools (5-8) and high schools (9-12). There is also a bachelor's degree program in 'Sidaama Language and Literature' at Hawassa University. The language is used in court, media, and administration.

The major linguistic works on the language include Anbessa (2000)'A Grammar of Sidaama', Kawachi (2007)'A Grammar of Sidaama', Girum (2013)'Idiophones in Sidaama'and Dukamo (2014)'Documentation of the Form and Function of Sidaama Demonstratives'. All the works have provided the phonemic inventory of the language as an introduction and means of a description of their study. Sidaama phonology which evaluates the strength and problems of Sidaama orthography is more relevant for the present study(Yri,2011).

The phonemic inventory, the orthographic forms and the Ethiopic representation of the Latin-based scripts of Sidaama are as follows:

Phoneme: b, p', f, m, w, t, t', d, ɗ, s, n, l, r, ʧ, ʧ', ʤ, ʃ, ɲ, j, ʔ, h

Grapheme: b, ph, f, m, w, t, x, d, dh, s, n, l, r, ch, c, j, sh, ny, y, ʾ, h

Ethiopic: በ፣ ጰ፣ ፈ፣ መ፣ ወ፣ ተ፣ ጠ፣ ደ፣ ዸ፣ ሰ፣ ነ፣ ለ፣ ረ፣ ቸ፣ ጨ፣ ጀ፣ ሽ፣ ኘ፣ የ፣ 0፣ ሀ

All the consonants except /h/ have phonemic geminated counterparts. Gemination in orthography is shown by doubling the graphemes. According to Yri (2011, p. 158) /b/ alternates with /w/, and /ɗ/ with pre-glottalized /r/, hence, represented as /'r/. These alternates are not represented in other studies as in Dukamo (2014, p. 22).

The vowel phonemes of Sidaama are five with short and long phonemic contrasts shown below:

<div align="center">

i, ii,   u, uu

e, ee   o, oo

a, aa

</div>

The vowels /i/, /e/, /u/, /o/, and /a/ are represented in Ethiopic with ኢ፣ ኤ፣ ኡ፣ ኦ፣ and ኦ respectively. Length is automatically shown by doubling the vowels.

_____

4.2 Result from Interview

This section reports the finding from key informant interviews. The responses from the participants are summarized thematically rather than quoting verbatim. The first question which was asked to the participants was 'do you think it is good to continue using more than one script in Ethiopia'. The responses obtained are diverse:

o   As the scripts were chosen to fit the languages, it is fine to continue this way.

o   Amharic was dominating other Ethiopian languages, and the Amharic script does not fit most of the Cushitic and Omotic languages.

o   Amharic Fidel cannot represent any sounds, such as /ɓ/, /ɗ/, and /ɠ/. We easily used bh, dh, and gh for them in Latin-based scripts.

o   Amharic Fidel could not provide a solution for vowel length and consonant gemination which are very important to Cushitic and Omotic languages.

o   The Latin-based script enables easy use of the English keyboard.

o   It is not problematic to use Ethiopic for all languages if there is an agreement. We are already using Amharic Fidel concomitantly in the Bible, magazines, and pamphlets; it is a matter of public decision and agreement.

o   I feel it is the same divide and rule policies that also made divisions of scripts in Ethiopia, Amharic Fidel can be used, as it was used before 1994. It is a matter of consensus.

The majority of the participants reported that Amharic Fidel is deficient in handling length, gemination, and it lacks graphemes for some sounds of Cushitic and Omotic languages. Thus, they prefer the Latin-based script use trend to continue. Linguistic hegemony is also associated with script choice by a respondent. Two participants think that Ethiopic can be used for all Ethiopian languages as it was used before 1994, and as it is already used as a side dish these days.

The second question asked 'how linguistic groups chose scripts'. As some of the participants were teachers and curriculum developers, they knew the procedures. Here are their responses:

o   In Aari, linguists from Addis Ababa University helped us to develop orthography. They prepared for us Ethiopic and Latin-based scripts, but the curriculum committee chose the latter.

o   Konta at the beginning was using the Latin-based script prepared for WeGaGoDa. When the groups that were using the common script disintegrated, we developed the Konta script which almost looks like the earlier one. Subsequent researches on Konta suggested some amendments. We do not, however, intend to go for Ethiopic script.

o   In Sidaama, we had teachers and a linguist from the Ethiopian Language Academy. I think the script was developed in the model of Afan Oromo.

o   Gurage is using Amharic Fidel with some modified graphemes for sounds that are not available in Amharic. Now, it has an Ethiopic-based script tuned to Gurage and some graphemes simplified.

o   Amharic orthography is well established as it was the national official language. We heard several dialogues on the media regarding the homographs, but the dialogues did not bring any changes in the orthography.

o   I think Fidel is a mix of Geez and Amharic sounds.

The responses on how the script choices were made show that there is no national or regional organized system that guides script choice and use. It is a matter of the ethnic group's or individuals' preference that determined the choice.

The participants were also asked if there is any advantage in using only one script for all Ethiopian languages. The following are the responses:

o A common script can unify ethnolinguistic groups as linguistic and script differences are politicized and associated with ethnic differences.

o It will help second language learners because they will learn only the different sounds and graphemes that are not available in their language.

o A common script can help to use one keyboard and font application than several.

The fourth question asked to participants was stated 'Do you think there were challenges in using Latin-based scripts since 1994?' Here are the major themes from the question:

o Some letters confuse students because they have different readings in our languages and English which is taught as a subject from grade one. For instance, the English /x/ which is pronounced as [ks] or [z] as in the initial and final of the word Xerox, respectively is pronounced as [t'] an alveolar voiceless ejective consonant in some Cushitic and Omotic languages. The English consonant /c/ which is pronounced as [k] as in cat or /s/ as in the city is pronounced as /ʧ'/ an alveo-palatal voiceless ejective consonant again in the Latin-based script using Ethiopian languages.

o Geminated consonants make the words too long when they are written. This is particularly a problem for affricates such as sh, zh, zd, ts which become four letters when geminated.

o There is an interference of concepts in writing; some students from Sidaama for instance used MD instead of G.C. (Gregorian calendar) when writing paragraphs/ essays in English. This is a negative transfer.

o Some people, particularly elders cannot read the Latin-based script though they can read and write Amharic and English. It seems the Latin-based script created some sort of generation gap.

o There are no major challenges but some problems that you can expect from any writing system.

In summary, the participants' responses show that there is confusion due to the shapes and pronunciations of letters; there is a negative transfer to English language learning, geminated graphemes cause an uneconomical representation, and there is a generation gap in reading texts written with the Latin-based scripts.

The last question the participants were asked was if they think a common script use is an achievable goal. The main points they provided are the following:

o In principle, it is possible as it was possible during the Haile Selassie and the Dergue regimes. However, the language policy and the constitution should state it.

o It is impossible at least shortly because many Ethiopian languages have already developed huge literature in their different scripts.

o It depends on government policy; if the central government ordered it, it may be possible.

The participants think the achievability depends on policies. The new Ethiopian language policy (2020, p.18) has no clear statement of whether one or more scripts should be used. It, however, states that languages that already have a writing system will be improved in terms of orthography status and standardization. The participants' view that using a common script will not be possible shortly seems more plausible.

_____

4.3 Economy in Writing

In this section, the researcher has discussed the economy of graphemes in writing. To analyze these, he had two texts translated into all the five sample languages. The texts are labeled Language-n: Text-1 and Text-2, where *n* is the names of the sampled languages. Then, he made word count and character with and without space count. The number of lines the texts have is also calculated. He used the Microsoft Office Word count tool for those counting. As Amharic and Gurage languages use Ethiopic script, he has compared the two languages for the relative economy of words and graphemes. On the other hand, languages using the Latin-based script are compared against Ethiopic versions of the same stories for each sample language. The results are presented as follows:

Amharic and Gurage

Table-1 presents the count results of both Text-1 and Text-2 of Amharic and Guragelanguages. The texts counted for Amharic and Gurage are attached in the appendix-(i) and (ii), respectively.

	Amharic		Gurage		Differences	
	Text-1	Text-2	Text-1	Text-2	Text-1	Text-2
Words	77	59	78	61	1	2
Characters without space	306	237	275	202	31	35
Characters with spaces	382	295	356	261	26	34
No of Lines	7	5	6	5	1	0

Table-1: Amharic and Gurage textscomparison

The two languages have nearly the same number of words. Amharic seems slightly more economical in terms of words, Gurage used 1 and 2 extra words to explain the concept in text 1 (cf. 77 and 78) and text 2 (cf. 59 and 61), respectively. This, however, depends on the language user's vocabulary choice and diction as well as whether the language used a lexical item or a phrase to explain a particular concept expressed by the word or phrase. When we compare characters (graphemes) *with* and *without space* Amharic and Gurage differed by 31 and 26 in Text-1 and 35 and 34 in Text-2, respectively. In both cases, Amharic used more graphemes than the Gurage. This has resulted in differences in the number of lines used by the two languages in Text-1 where Amharic had one more line than Gurage though the number of lines in Text-2 is the same. The Ethiopic script used in these two languages showed a relatively similar economic representation of concepts with graphemes despite the small variations in the spaces the graphemes occupied.

Aari

Table-2compares the number of words and graphemes with and without space while using Latin-based and Ethiopic-based scripts. The computed texts are attached in Appendix (iii).

	Latin-based		Ethiopic		Differences	
	Text-1	Text-2	Text-1	Text-2	Text-1	Text-2
Words	82	63	81	63	1	0
Characters without space	514	447	314	271	200	176
Characters with spaces	595	508	394	333	201	175
No of Lines	7	7	6	7	1	0

Table-2: Latin based and Ethiopic scripts text comparison of Aari

In terms of the number of words, there is no significant difference between the Latin-based and Ethiopic-based texts of Aari. In text-1, there is only one extra word used in the Latin-based script version, but there is no difference in Text-2, which was a relatively shorter text than Text-1. The difference, however, is high in the number of characters used in the two script types. The Latin-based script used 176 more characters without space, and 175 more graphemes with a space. The increase in the number of graphemes in Latin-based script increased in one more line in Text-1, though the number of lines is similar inText-2. Undoubtedly, the longer the texts, the higher the differences in both the number of graphemes and the lines used.

Konta

Table-3 presents the Konta word and grapheme count, based on the texts 1 and 2attached in the appendix (iv)

	Latin-based		Ethiopic		Differences	
	Text-1	Text-2	Text-1	Text-2	Text-1	Text-2
Words	78	58	78	58	0	0
Characters without space	551	456	331	276	220	180
Characters with spaces	629	517	409	335	220	182
No of Lines	7	7	6	6	1	1

Table-3: Latin based and Ethiopic scripts text comparison of Konta

The number of words in Latin-based and Ethiopic scripts is the same in Text-1 and Text-2(cf. appendix-iv). The big difference comes when we compare the graphemes. In both graphemes with and without space, Latin-based texts have 220 more graphemes than the Ethiopic-based ones in Text-1. In Text-2, the Latin-based grapheme without space and with space is higher than the Ethiopicones by 180 and 182, respectively. What is more, the number of lines for Latin-based script texts is higher by one line in both Text-1 and Text-2, implying that the Ethiopic script is more economical in terms of space and number of graphemes representing words.

Sidaama

Table-4 presents the comparison of Latin-based script and Ethiopic script (cf. appendix v) for Sidaama

	Latin-based		Ethiopic		Differences	
	Text-1	Text-2	Text-1	Text-2	Text-1	Text-2
Words	91	57	91	57	0	0
Characters without space	711	461	428	271	283	190
Characters with spaces	801	517	517	327	284	190
No of Lines	10	6	8	6	2	0

Table-4: Latin based and Ethiopic scripts text comparison of Sidaama

Table-4 shows that there is no difference in the number of words in Text-1,91 each, and Text-2, 57 each in both Latin-based and Ethiopic-based scripts. As was the case for Aari and Konta, there is a high difference in the number of graphemes. The Latin-based graphemes are higher by 283 and 284 in graphemes without space and with space, respectively in Text-1 than the graphemes in Ethiopic script. The Latin-based graphemes without and with character are higher each by 190 graphemes compared to the Ethiopic-based graphemes. The number of lines is higher by 2 lines in the Latin-based text than the Ethiopic-based text in Text-1, but it is the same in Text-2.

In conclusion, the number of words is relatively stable and similar in all cases, whether we used Latin-based or Ethiopic-based scripts. When we compare the number of graphemes between languages that use Ethiopic script, there is insignificant variation ranging from 2-35 for Amharic and Gurage. The difference in the number of graphemes is higher for Latin script-based texts compared to texts in Ethiopic script in all the three languages: Aari, Konta, and Sidaama. This leads us to the conclusion that the Ethiopic script is more economical than the Latin-based script. This can be theoretically supported in that languages using syllabic writing systems represent two graphemes, a consonant and a vowel with a grapheme, unlike the alphabetic languages that have to spell out both a consonant and a vowel of the syllable when it has CV (consonant and vowel) structure.

5. Discussion

Despite the visual complexity of symbols in Ethiopic (Piper & Ginkel, 2016, p.6), the present study showed that Ethiopic script is more economical than the Latin-based scripts used for Ethiopian languages. Palatalized consonants and implosives which used double characters such as *sh* for /ʃ/ and *dh* for /ɗ/ inflated the grapheme number particularly when they are used in geminated forms: (cf. **maccii*shsh*antannonsa** in Sidaama Text-1, line-6, and the Ethiopic version, line-15 ማጪ:ኢሻ:ንታኖ: 20 graphemes in the Latin-based against 7 graphemes and 3 colons marking gemination in Ethiopic-based). Vowel length similarly inflated the grapheme numbers, for instance in Aari on Text-2 line-6 **yimashsh*aa*g'*aa*ket** has twice written /aa/ hence four /a/s in the word. The Ethiopic version on line-12 is ዪማሻ:ኣኃኣኪት in which long vowels are represented with only two /a/s.

Geminate and length representation, which were the main linguistic factors to prefer Latin-based script for Ethiopian languages (Wondimu, 2016), can easily and economically be represented by Ethiopic script. In this research, gemination is represented with a colon (:) whereas vowel length by adding a single vowel appropriate to the consonant in alphabet order. For instance, in Konta Text-1 line-4, we have the word: **simmoosona**, with geminated /m/ and lengthened /o/. The two are represented as ሲ.ም:ኦሶና where /ም:/ followed by a colon marking gemination and the vowel /ኣ/ that exactly matches the consonant /ም:/ marks length. Similarly, in Sidaama Text-1, line-2 *Seenne*is represented byሰኤኔ: where ሰ 'se' is the fifth order in Fidel and a similar fifth-order vowelኤ 'e' is added to show length. The last syllable of *seenne* has a colon to mark gemination.

Mulugeta (2016, p. 15) has a similar representation of vowel length for Maale, an Omotic language, but with a different approach for consonant gemination representation. He uses the six-order consonants, which are considered either non-syllabic or have a weak vowel /ɨ/. Any geminated consonant is preceded by an appropriate sixth-order consonant that matches the consonant undergoing gemination. Here are a few examples of length and gemination for Maale:

	Ethiopic	IPA	Gloss
1)	ቢስሲ	bissi	'placenta'
2)	ዳችቺ	datʃtʃi	'to churn'
3)	ሻችቺ	ʃatʃtʃi	'ice'
4)	ሶኦፕፔ	sooppe	'fontanel'
5)	ጌኤሲ	geesi	'subject'

Examples 1-4 show gemination represented; example four has gemination & length, and example five demonstrates length. Whether we use a colon or the sixth order consonants, we can handle gemination in Ethiopic. Similarly, length can easily and economically be shown by adding a vowel.

The key informant interview responses confirmed that gemination and length in Latin-based orthography use made the writing uneconomical though it is important to make it more transparent by representing each phoneme. The interview response also showed that there is no national or regional organized system that guides script choice and use. The recently published Ethiopian language policy (2020) does not provide clear direction on whether a common script may be used in Ethiopia; rather it indicates the improvement and standardization support on scripts will be made possible. The key informant response showed that a common script choice for Ethiopia is an advantage to unify Ethiopia and to make language learning transfer easier. A person with knowledge of Ethiopic script will find it easier to learn Sidaama or Aari with Ethiopic than the Latin-based graphemes because he will learn only new graphemes required to represent unique sounds in the particular languages. Though the key informants' response suggests a common script use is an asset and that the study on the economy of representation of sounds and words show Ethiopic is more economical as well as can fairly well represent gemination and vowel length, a common script choice seems remote but not impossible.

6. Recommendation

The finding showed that Ethiopic is more economical than the Latin-based scripts used for Ethiopian languages. Gemination and length are better and economically represented with Ethiopic. As reported by some interviewees, using a common script can help to unify the country on one hand, and can allow easy transfer of language learning among different language users. Based on the findings, the following suggestions are forwarded:

1) There should be a language policy that encourages a common script use across Ethiopia.

2) There should be a country-level language planning, development, and monitoring unit that regulates orthography and provides technical assistance to ethnolinguistic groups.

3) Inventory of sounds phone of Ethiopian language, to which graphemes are assigned, should be made.

4) To avoid different representations of the same sound with different graphemes, as is the case now in Latin-based orthographies where **t'** alternates with **X,** and **d'** alternates with dh, there should be

an Ethiopian phonetic alphabet (EPA) from which different languages can develop their specific orthography.

5) This study could not address the writing system of the Nilo-Saharan language, which is a limitation. It is important to compare a sample Nalo-Saharan language with a similar methodology.

Author details:

[1]AssociateProfessor, Department of English Language and Literature, HawasaUniversity, Ethiopia E-mail: mnutafekede2012@gmail.com

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

Fekede Menuta

Publisher's Note: Jimma University is neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published material and affiliations.

_____

References

Abraham Demoz. (1981). Amharic script reform efforts. *In Ethiopian Studies: Dedicated to Wolf Leslau on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday, Nov.14.*Wiesbaden*:* Otto Harrassowitz.

Anbessa Teferra. (2000).*A grammar of Sidaama*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Jerusalem: Hebrew University.

Appleyard, David. (2003). Amharic. In Uhlig, Siegbert (ed). *Encyclopedia Aethiopica. Vol.* 1, (233-234). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.

Ayyalew Mitiku.(1995)*The phonology of Aari*.MA thesis, Addis Ababa University, School of Graduate Studies.

Baye Yimam. (2000)*Yamaringa sewasew.* Addis Ababa: E.M.P.D.A.

Baye Yimam. (2016). Phonological features of the Amharic variety of south wəllo. *Oslo Studies in Language8*(1), 2016.9–30.

Bender, M. Lionel. (1968). *Amharic verb morphology: A generative approach*. Ph.D. Dissertation, the University of Texas at Austin.

Berry, Jack. (1968) 'The making of alphabet', in *Reading in the Sociology of Language*, edited by Fishman Joshua. The Hague: Mouton.

Brandta, Carmen and Sohonib, Pushkar .(2018). Script and identity – the politics of writing in South Asia: an introduction. *South Asian History and Culture*. Routledge: Tayler and Francis Group.

Bright, William. (1999). A matter of typology: alphasyllabaries and abugidas. *Written Language and Literacy*2.1 (1999): 45-55.

Central Statistics Authority. (2007). *Summary and statistical report of 2007 population and housing census*: *population size by age and sex*. Addis Ababa: UNFPA.

Coulmas, Floria. (1989).*The writing system of the world*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Coulmas, Florian. (2003). *Writing systems: an introduction to their linguistic analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Daniel Abera. (1993).*The verb complement in Ari*.MA thesis, Addis Ababa University, School of Graduate Studies.

Daniel Abera (1998). Yamariɲa tərətna misalewoʧ.https://www.researchgate.net/publication/267512470_Amharic_Proverbs_in_Amharic, Accessed, 3 January 2021.

DeFrancis, John. (1989). *Visible speech: the diverse oneness of writing system*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Diringer, David. (1968[1948]).*The alphabet: A key to the history of mankind*. 3edn, 2 vols, completely revised with the collaboration of Rheingold Regensburger. London: Hutchinson. New York: Philosophical Library.

Dukamo Duguna. (2014). *Documentation of the form and function of Sidaama demonstratives.*MA thesis, Addis Ababa University, Department of Linguistics.

Ethiopian Bible Association. (1982[1974].*Gədər gurda bəguragina*. Addis Ababa: NP.

Fabri, Ray; Gasser, Michael, Habash, Nizar, Kiraz, George, and Wintner, Shuly. (2014). Linguistic introduction: the orthography, morphology and syntax of Semitic languages In Zitouni (ed.), *Natural language processing of Semitic languages, theory and applications of natural language processing*. Berlin Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag.

Fekede Menuta. (2019). Language use in multilingual Ethiopia: The case of southern nations nationalities and people's regional state. In Cohrane (ed*.), Ethiopia: social and political issues*. Pp. 27-51. New York: Nova Science Publishers, Inc.

Fekede Menuta. (2018). *Our voice: Guragina grammar*. Addis Ababa: AAU printing press.

Fekede Menuta. (2016) 'Over-differentiation in Amharic orthography and attitude towards reform'.*Ethiop.j.soc.lang.stud. 3*(1), 3-32.

_____

Fekede Menuta. (2015a).*Kontatsuwa grammar*. Hawassa: Council of Nationalities of the SNNPRS.

Fekede Menuta. (2015b).*Intergroup Communication among Gurage: A study on intelligibility, inter-lingual comprehension and accommodation*. Saarbrucken: Lambert academic publishing.

Fekede Menuta. (2011). *Aari language: a comparative grammar*. Addis Ababa: Bole printing Press.

Février, James G. (1948). *Histoire de l'écriture*. Paris: Payot.

Ford, M. Carolyn. (1985).*Reports on Aari Linguistic Survey*. Addis Ababa, NP.

Gadaa Melbaa. (1988). Oromiya: An introduction to the Oromo People. Minneapolis: Kirk House Publishers.

Gebreyesus, Hailemariam.(1983 E.C).*Teketnet-aginet: ageki*. Addis Ababa: Birhanina Selam Printing Press.

Gebreyesus, Hailemariam.(1981 E.C). *Yechamut shika*. Addis Ababa: Birhanina Selam Printing Press.

Getahun Amare.(1997).*Yamaringa sewasew bek'elal ak'erarb*. Addis Ababa: Commercial Printing Press.

Girmay Berhane. (1992).'Word Formation in Amharic'.*Journal of Ethiopian Languages and Literature 2, 50-74.*

Girum Tesfaye. (2013).*Idiophones in Sidaama*.MA Thesis, Addis Ababa University, Department of Linguistics.

Hirut Woldemariam. (1999) 'An autosegmental approach to the Geez-based Amharic plurals.'*Journal of Ethiopian languages and literature* 8, 69-92.

Hayward, Richard. (1990). 'Notes on the Aari languages: In Hayward (ed.), *Omotic language studies*, London: SOAS, pp. 425-493.

Hudson Grover. (2004).Languages of Ethiopia and Languages of the 1994 Ethiopian Census. *Aethiopica* 7, 160-172.

Kawachi, Kazuhiro. (2007). *A grammar of Sidaama, a Cushitic language of Ethiopia*. US: ProQuest Information and Learning Company.

Lemma Demissie. (2018). *Documentation and description of Konta phonology and morphology*.Ph.D.Thesis, Addis Ababa University, Department of Linguistics & Philology.

Leslau, Wolf. (1966). *Ethiopians speak: studies in cultural backgrounds, Chaha-II*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, California: California University Press. London: Cambridge University Press.

Leslau, Wolf. (1995). *Reference grammar of Amharic*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Ministry of Culture & Tourism. (2020). *Language policy of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia*. Addis Ababa.

Mullen, Dana. (1986). *Issues in the morphology and phonology of Amharic: The lexical generation of pronominal clitics*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Ottawa.

Mulugeta Seyoum. (2001)*The syllable structure of Amharic. A moraic approach based on autosegmental phonology*. MPhil Thesis, Norwegian University of Science and Technology.

Mulugeta Seyoum. (2016). 'The Maale orthography in Ethiopic script'.*Zena-Lissan: Journal of Academy of Ethiopian Languages and Cultures*, 25 (1), 74-99.

Pasch, Helma. (2008). Competing scripts: The introduction of the Roman alphabet in Africa. *International Journal of the sociology of Language*, 191, 65-109.

Piper, Benjamin & Ginkel, Agatha J. van .(2016). Reading the script: How the scripts and writing systems of Ethiopian languages relate to letter and word identification, *Writing Systems Research* Routledge: Taylor and Francis Group.

Salawu, Abiodun & Asemahagn Aseres .(2015). Language policy, ideologies, power and the Ethiopian media, Communication: *South African Journal for Communication Theory and Research*, 41(1), 71-89.

Tenkir Tereda. (1999 [1991E.C]).*Temsayt, wemaka, wekmachot: yebete Gurage misaleyawi nigigiroch*. Addis Ababa: Commercial printing press.

_____

Tsuge Yoichi (2005). 'Notes on some modal and aspectual morphemes of Aari'. In Tsuge (ed.),*Cushitic-Omotic Studies 2004,* 133-150. Kanazawa: Japan.

Tsuge Yoichi. (2006). 'On the Galila dialect of the Aari language.'In Hideyuki (ed.),*Cushitic-Omotic Studies*,93-112.Yamaguchi: Japan.

Ullman, Berthold. (1989). *Ancient writing and its influence*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Unseth, Peter (2005). Sociolinguistic parallels between choosing scripts and languages. *Written Language & Literacy* 8 (1), 9–42.

Unseth, Peter (2008). The sociolinguistics of script choice: an introduction. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 192, 1–4.

Wetter, Andreas. (2007). Arabic in Ethiopia.*Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics*, Vol. 2.

Wondimu Tegegne. (2016). The development of written Afan Oromo and the appropriateness of qubee, Latin script, for Afan Oromo writing. *Historical Research Letter*, 28.

Yri, Magne Kjell. (2011) 'The phonology of 'Sidaamu Afii jirte': Implications for the orthography of Sidaama'. *Journal of Ethiopian Studies*, 45, 149-161.

Zelealem Leyew. (2003). Amharic personal nomenclature: A grammar and sociolinguistic insight.*Journal of African Cultural Studies*16 (2),181-211.

Zeleke Belayneh.(2011).*Council of nationalities and promotion of manja in Konta special woreda*.Saarbrucken: Lambert Academic publishing.

APPENDIX

i. Amharic Texts

Text-1: እንስሳትናሚስትግጫት

በብዙ ብሔረሰብ ሽማግሌዎች ሚስት ለልጆቻቸው ለማጫት ሲሔዱ የሚገጥማቸውን እንሰሳ እንደመልካም ወይም መጥፎ እድል አመላካች አድርገው ይቆጥሩታል:: ለምሳሌ ጦጣ ወይም ዝንጀሮ ከሽማግሌዎች ፌትለፌት አቋርጦ ካለፈ ገደቢስነት ነውና ሽማግሌች ወደቤታቸው ይመለሳሉ:: ቀበሮም እንደዚሐ ገደቢስ እንስሳ እንደሆነ ይታመናል:: በሌላ በኩል አንዳንድ የወፍ ዘሮች ሽማግሌዎቹ መንገድ እያለፉ ሳለ የሚያሰሙት ድምጽ እንደበጎ እድል ይታያል:: ከእንስሳት ሌላ ሴት ባዶ እንስራ ይዛ ሽማግሌዎቹን ካቋረጠች መጥፎ ነው:: በተቃራኒው ውሃ ሙሉ እንስራ ያዘለች ሴት ካጋጠማቸው እንደበጎ አጋጣሚ ይወሰዳል::

Text-2: የመገበያ ያመንገዶች

የሐገራችን ሕዝብ የተለያየ የመገበያያ መንገዶች ይጠቀም እንደነበረ አዋቂሰዎች ይናገራሉ:: እንደዛሬ ገንዘብ መገበያያ ከመሆኑ በፊት ሰዎች እቃን በእቃ ይለዋወጡ ነበር:: ለምሳሌ ጨውን ለመግዛት ገብስ ወይም ስንዴን መስጠት ማለትነው:: ግብርም የሚከፈለው በእይነት ነበር:: ለምሳሌም ማር፣ ወርቅ፣የበግ ሙክትና እሕል ባመረቱት መጠን ይከፈል ነበር:: ቆስ በቆስ ገንዘብ ከብረት፣ከብር እንዲሁም ከወርቅ መሰራትጀመረ:: ቀጥሎም የወረቀት ገንዘብ መጣ::

ii.   GurageTexts

Text-1:አዊ ተምሽት ፍዶት

በብዘ ቤረሰብ ባሪቅ የዴንጃሑና ምሽት ይፈዶይ ቲያሮ ያትጋጥምኖ አዊ ዮሔዌም ምጥጥ ሽሕ ያትየሽ ባሮም ያምሪ:: የምሳሌ ያሕር ዛንሽረ ዌም ወንኽ ተባሪቅ ሕኖ ይፍት አንጠኖም ባለፈ አግረ-ጠረቅ የሐሬ ባሪቅሕኖ ቤተሑና ይትዠፐፐር:: ቀወረም ቢሐረ አያና ሙጥጥ አዊው ቢረም ያምሪ:: ብንጉድ ወሐት አታታ ያምኙፍ ዘርም ባሪቅ ይፈዶይ ቲያሮ ያትሰመዊ ድምጥ ወሔ አያም ነረን ባሮም ያምሮ:: ታዊም እንጉድ ገረድ ጉፍራ ወሸር አሰረችም ባሪቅ አንጠችኖም ባለፈች ምጥጡ:: ብንጉድ ወሐት ወሸር ምራ እሐ አሰረችም ባሪቅ አንጠችም ባለፈች ወሔ አያሙ ይውሪ::

Text-2:የቄጥ ኤማ

የገነንዳ ሐልቅ ብዘ ኤነት የቄጥ ይትሻከርወ ዋጋ የረቡረን ሐማ ሐሪ ሰብ ዮዶ:: የኳ ሐማ ፍራንክ የቄጥ ቴወር ሰብ ግብር ተግብር ይትሽጋከሮ ባነ:: የምሳሌ አሕር ባሶ አሕር ዌም ስናይ ሰሮት በሮቱ:: ግብርም ይኹሺ የረፐራ በግብር ባነ:: የምሳሌ አሕር ውየ፣ወርቅ፣የጤ ምቅወነ ዌም አሕር ባሙረተን አሕር ይከስ ባነ:: ቲኮሺ ፍራንክ ተብረት፣ተብር ቶርቅ ሰክቦት ጌነሺም:: አከሰም ዮረቀት ዋጋች ነም::

iii. Aari Texts

Text-1:Deq'ol keenni kup'si

Bedmi worshent galtena yints'i yinteen maa eg'msikan ke kaydink kera mashimdinda deg'ol wannensh way dag'limsh aydda dhawudinda massto phaydekee.Kamsikan g'aara way gaay galtenta bira kattso g'aaltink aydda dakkindee galtena eyer yint maatdekee.wuksaakere konn aydda dakkinda g'ots'adeg'ol ko maatdimsh buuda izerdee.

_____

Abindetk wollag' wollag' aphtit susa galtena googi gaalo kedak uphsi ke esmsdaak lag'minda aydd emsh shederdee. Deg'ol dank abind maa guri tiila teyo galtenam ko katts'ink dag'liyee. Walgechek noga tiilek tsootsi ko koie tag'o kera ko mashimshink lag'mind mashmimsh teyerdee.

ቤድሚ ዎርሸንት ጋልቴና ዩንጺ ዩንቴኤን ማአ ኤሻምሲካን ኬ ካይዲንክ ኬራ ማሼምዲንዳ ዴሻል ዎኑንሽ ዎይ ዳሻሊምሽ አይዳ፡ ዳዉዲንዳ ማስ፡ቶ ፋይዴኬኤ፡፡ ካምሲካን ኃአራ ዎይ ጋአይ ጋልቴንታ ቢራ ካትሦ ኃአልቲንክ አይዳ፡ ዳኪ፡ንዴኤ ጋልቴና ኤዮር ይንት ማአትዴኬኤ፡፡ ዊክሳአኬራ ኮን፡ አይዳ፡ ዳኪ፡ንዳ ኃጸዴሻል ኮ ማአትዲምሽ ቡኡዳ ኢዘርዴኤ፡፡

አቢንዴትክ ዎላ፡ኃ ዎላ፡ኃ አፊቲት ሱሳ ጋልቴና ጎአጊ ጋአሎ ኬዳክ ኡፕሲ ኬ ኤስምስዳአክ ላኃሚንዳ አይድ፡ ኤምሽ ሼዴርዴኤ፡፡ ዴሻል ዳንክ አቢንድ ማአ ጉሪ ቲኢላ ቴዮ ጋልቴናም ኮ ካጺ፡ንክ ዳሻሊዮኤ፡፡ ዎልጌቼክ ኖጋ ቲኢሌክ ሦኦጺ ኮ ኮኢኤ ታኃ ኬራ ኮ ማሼምሼንክ ላኃሚንድ ማሽሚምሽ ቴዮርዴኤ፡፡

Text-2: Shenmet googina

phec'a wontetta worshena gala galenda shenmintit googam meymaaro ke haag'imsh estta eedina keezdekee. Taakimsh solli shenmita ko maatkaaket bira zen eedina ziigam ziigek ookimda shaashekee. Kamsikan soog'am senintikan gosi way zergam imintiy gayintyee.

Giirere kasherdaak kamintekshaashee. Kamsikan: kuri, gayi g'olita agnakee. Isin yimashshaag'aaket g'eetik kashdasha ashekee.Izze izze gaaro solli sibil dank koynere gaydank /worg'idank/ phiksh yedersee. Zenankere pilts'ts'et solli h'aadee.

ሼንሜትጎአጊና

ፌጫዎንቴታ፡ ዎርሼናጋላጋሌንዳሼንሚንቲትጎአጋምሜይማሮኬሃአጊምሽኤስታ፡ ኤኤዲናኬኤዝዴኬኤ፡፡ ታአኪምሽሶሊ፡
ሼንሚታኮማአትካአኬትቢራዘንኤኤዲናዚዚኢጋምዚኢጌክኦኪምዳሻአሼኬኤ፡፡ካምሲካንሶኦጃምሴኒንቲካንጎሲዋይዘርጋም ኢሚንቲይጋኝንትዮኤ፡፡

ጊኢሬሬካሼርዳአክካሚንቴክሻአሼኤ፡፡ ካምሲካን፡ ኩሪ፣ ጋዩ፣ ኃሊታአግናኬኤ፡፡.
ኢሲንዩማሻ፡አኃአኬትጌኤቲክካሽዳሻአሼኬኤ፡፡ኢዘ፡ ኢዘ፡ ጋአሮሶሊ፡ ሲቢልዳንክኮይኔሪጋይዳንክ (ዎርጊዳንክ) ፊክሽዮዴርሴኤ፡፡ ዜናንኬሬፒልጼ፡ትሶሊ፡ ኃአዴኤ፡፡

iv. Konta Texts

Text-1: du'anne machiya oysha

Cora yara asatan cimati machchiw bana'aasi oychiqachchanaw beewode antatara gahettee medossaa lo''o woy iita qaadaa besseega udidi paydoosona.Leemisuwasi qaarey woy geleshshoy cimatappe sintsara kantsi aad'd'ikko deemuwa d'ayuwa d'ayuwa gido gishaw cimati bagollokko simmoosona.Workanaykka hegaadan deemo baynna wora medossa gideegi ammanettees.Hara baggara issi issi kafo yarati cimati ogiya aad'd'ee wode sissee kooshey lo''o qaadaadan ts'eelettees.Medossaappe haraa mac'c'aara mela otuwa oyqada cimata kantsikkokka iita. Dumma baggara haatsa kumetsa otuwa ba''ade mac'c'aara antatara gahettikko lo''o hanotaadan ekettees.

ዱዓኔ፡ ማቺያ አይሻ

ጮራያራአሳታንጪማቲማቹ፡ውባና፡ሲኦዩቺቃቻ፡ናውቤኤዎዴኤናታታራጋሔቴ፡ኤሜዶሳ፡አሎዖ፡አዋይኢ፡ታቃ አዳአቤሴ፡ኤጋኡዲዲፓይዶአሶና፡፡ ሌኤሚሱዋሲቃአሬይዎይጌሌሽ፡ይጪማታቴ፡ ሲንትሳራካንትሲኣ፡ዲ፡ኮ፡ ዬኤሙዋዳዖዋዳዩዋጊዶጊሻውጪማቲባጎሎ፡ኮ፡ ሲሞ፡አሶና፡፡ .ዎርካናይክ፡ ሔጋአዳንዴኤሞባይና፡ ዎራሜዶሳ፡

ጊዬኤጊማ፡ኔቴ፡ኤስ፡፡ ሐራባጋ፡ራኢሲ፡ ኢሲ፡
ካፎያራቲጪ ማቲኦጊያአ፡ዴ፡ኤዎዴሲሴ፡ኤኮአሼይሎዖ፡አቃአዳአዳኘኤሌቴ፡ኤስ፡፡ ሜዶሳ፡አፖ፡
ሐራአማጫ፡አራሜላአቱዎአይቃዳጪ ማታካንትሲኮ፡ካ፡ኢ፡ታ ፡ ፡ ዱማ፡
ባጋ፡ራሐአትሳኩ ሜትሳአቱዎባዓ፡ዬማጫ፡አራአንታታራጋሔቲ፡ኮ፡ ሎዖ፡አሐኖታ፡ዳንኬቴ፡ኤስ፡፡

Text-2:ʒal''ettanaasi ogeta

Nu gade dalgga asay ʒal''ettanaasi dumma dumma ogeta go'ettidde gam''ideega eranch asati odoosona.Hachchiiga mala shaloy ʒal''iyassi hananaappe kase asati miishshaa miishshaara laamettoosona.Leemisuwas mats'iniya shammanaw banga woy gistiya imussaa guussa.Giiraykka cigetteegi qommuwanna.Leemisuwasi eessaa, worqaa, dorsaa mod'd'wanne murutissideega keena katsay cigettees.Leelan leelan shaloy birataappe, biraappe qasikka worqaappe med'ussay doomettiis.Kaallidikka warqata shaloy yiis.

ዝልዬ፡ታ፡ናአሲአጌታ

ኑጋዬዳልጋ፡ አሳይዝልዬ፡ታ፡ናአሲዱማ፡ ዱማ፡ አጌታጎዬቲ፡ዴ፡ ጋምጊ፡ዬኤጋፌራንችአሳቲአዶአሶና፡፡
ሐቺ፡ኢጋማላሻሎይዝልጊ፡ያሲ፡ ሐናናፖ፡ ካሴአሳቲሚኢሻ፡አሚኢሻ፡አራላአሜቶ፡አሶና፡ ፡
ሌኤሚሱዋስማጺኒያሻማ፡ናውባንጋዖይጊስቲያኢ ሙሳ፡ ጉ ኡሳ፡ ፡ ጊኢራይካ፡ ጪጌቴኤጊቆሙ፡ዎና፡፡
ሌኤሚሱዋሲኤ፡ሳ፡አ፤ ዎርቃ፤ ዶርሳአሞ ድ፡ዎኔ፡ ሙ ሩቲሲ፡ዬኤጋኬኤናትሳይጪጌቴ፡ኤስ፡ ፡
ሌኤላንሌኤላንሻሎይቢራታአፖ፤ ቢራአፖ፡ ቃሲካ፡ ዎርቃአፖ፡ ሜ ዱሳ፡ይዶአሜቲ፡ኢስ፡፡ ካአሊ፡ዲካ፡
ዎርቃታሻሎይዩ፡ኢስ፡፡

v.Sidaama Texts

Text-1:**Seenni huuccate hannani yannara xaattanno saada**

Bataye dagahu, jajjabbu manni oosonsaa seenne huuccitara hadhanna xaaddannonse saada kaayyimmatenna kaayyiweellete gade kiirtanno/haddanno.Lawishshi, doosote hadhanna qamalcho woy galashshu albansaanni tayse sairo kaayyu dielino yite wirro qaensa higganno.Hatto no saadate giddonni yeedaala kaayya busha ikkitino gade hendanni. Wole ragaanni, jajjabbu woy geerru doogo hadhanna mite mite create sirchi giddonni macciishshantanno hooronni/aiqonni danchumma macciishshantannonsa. Hattonni, saadate gobbaanni, meyaa beetto moola gambayicho muliissidhinotenni dooso xaaddoro woy jajjabbu mannira albaanni tayisse sa'uro kaayyu injiinokkita buuxxanno.Kayinnilla, gambayichisera waa wonshidhino mayateenni xaadduro danchu kaayyi xaadinonsata hegersitanno.

ሴኤኒ፡ ሐኡጫ፡ታሐና፡ኒያና፡ራጣአ፡ታ፡ኖ፡ ሳአዳ

ባታዬዳጋሐጃጃ፡ቡ፡ ማኒ፡ አኦሶንሳአሴኤኔ፡ ሐኡጫ፡ታራሐዳና፡ ጣአዳ፡ኖ፡ንሴሳአዳካአዩ፡ማ፡ቴና፡
ካአዩ፡ዌኤሌ፡ቴጋዴኪኢ ርታኖ/ሐዳ፡ኖ፡፡ ላዊሺ፡፤ ዶአሱ ቴሐዳና፡ ቃማልቾዎይጋላሹ፡ አልባንሳአኒ፡ ታይሴሳይሮካአዩ፡
ዲኤሊኖዩ፡ቴዎሮ፡ ቃኤንሳሒ፡ጋ፡ኖ፡ ፡፡ ሐቶ፡ ኖሳአዳቴጊ፡ዶ፡ኒ፡ዩኤዳላካአያ፡ ቡሻኢኪ፡ቲኖጋዴሐንዳኒ፡ ፡፡
ዎሌራጋአኒ፤ ጃጃ፡ቡ፡ ዎይኔኤሩ፡ ዶአጎሐዳና፡ ሚቴሚቴጭሬአቴሲርቺጊ፡ዶ፡ኒ፡ ማጪ፡ኢሻ፡ንታኖ፡ሐኦሮኒ/አኢ ቆኒ፡
ዳንቹ ማ፡ ማጪ፡ኢሻ፡ንታኖ፡ንሳ ፡ ሐቶ፡ኒ፤ ሳአዳ፡ቴነበ፡አኒ፤ ሜያአቤኤቶ ዎአ፡ጋምባዩ፡ቾ ሙ ሊኢሲ፡ዲኖ፡ቴኒ፡
ዶአሶጣአዶ፡ሮዖ ይጃጃ፡ቡ፡ ማኒ፡ራአልባአኒ፡ ታዩ፡ሴ፡ ሳ ኡ ሮካአዩ፡ ኢንጂኢኖኪ፡ ታቡ ኡጣ፡ኖ፡ ፡፡ካዩ፡ኒ፡ላ፤
ጋምባዩ፡ቺሴራ፡ዋአፖንሺዲኖማያቴኤኒ፡ ጣአዱ፡ሮ ዳንቹ ካአዩ፡ ጣአዲኖንሳታሐኤርሲ፡ታ፡ኖ፡፡

Text-2: Dikkirate Doogga

Gobbanke daga, babbaxxitinota dikkirate doogga horonsidhanni heedhino gode esennaammu kultanno. Xaa yanna gede woxunni dikkidhannore ikkitara albaanni, udiinnincho uduunnichunni (c)soorridhanno. Lawishshaho, mxine hidhannohu hayixe woy sinde aate gedeeti.

Gabbaro nafa gabbartannohu nafa dana danadanunkunniiti. Lawishshaho malaw unni worfetenni goodannonninna loosidhino gidi baalunku bikkinniiti.Suutu suutonni woxe siwiilunni birrunni hattonni worfetenni loosa hananfoonni.Gedensaani higeno woraqatu birri dayno.

ጎባ፡ንኬዳጋ፣ ባባ፡ጢኔ፡ቲኖታዲኪ፡ራቴዶ፡ጋ፡ ሐሮንሲዳኒ፡ ሔ፡ዲኖጎዬኤሴና፡አሙ፡ ኩልታኖ፡፡፡ጣአያና፡ ጌዾዎጡኒ፡ ዲኪ፡ዳኖ፡ሬኢኪ፡ታራአልባአኒ፣ ኡዲኢኒ፡ንቸኡዱኡኒ፡ቹኒ፡ ሶአሪ፡ዳኖ፡፡፡ላዊሻ፡ሐ፣ ምጢኔሒ፡ዳኖ፡ሑሐዩጤዎይሲ፡ንዴአቴጌዬኤቲ፡፡

ጋባ፡ሮናፋ፡ጋባ፡ርታኖ፡ሑናፋዳናዳናዳኑንኩኒ፡ኢ፡ቲ፡፡ላዊሻ፡ሐማላውኡኒ፡ ዎርፈቴኒ፡ ጎአዳኖ፡ኒ፡ና፡ ሎኦሲ፡ዲኖጊ፡ዲባአሱንኩብ፡ኪ፡ኒ፡ኢ፡ቲ፡፡ሱኡቱሱኡቶኒ፡ ዎጤሲዊኢሱኒ፡ ቢ፡ሩ፡ኒ፡ ሐቶ፡ኒ፡ ዎርፈቴኒ፡ ሎኦሳሐናንፎ፡አኒ፡ ፡፡ ጌዬንሳአኒሒጌኖዎራቃቱብ፡ሪ፡ ዳይኖ፡፡

Vi. Key Informant Interview Guide

The purpose of this interview is to find out the advantage and disadvantages of using more than one script for Ethiopian languages. I thank you for your willingness to take part in the interview.

1) Since 1994, Ethiopia is using two scripts, Latin based and Ethiopic, for Ethiopian languages. Do you think it is good to continue using more than one script in Ethiopia?

2) If you have any information regarding script choices made during orthography development, how do linguistic groups choose from the available writing systems?

3) Do you think it is possible to use just one script, such as Ethiopic, for all Ethiopian languages?

4) Do you think there were challenges in using Latin-based scripts since 1994?

5) Is there any advantage in using only one script across the country for all Ethiopian languages?