International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences
p-ISSN: 1694-2620
e-ISSN: 1694-2639
Vol. 9, No. 4, 2017, pp. 16-30, ©IJHSS

Motion Event Constructions in Oromo: Semantic and Morpho-Syntactic Properties*

Wakweya Olani† and Elizabet Minase
PhD Candidates of Descriptive and Theoretical Linguistics at Addis Ababa University
Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

Abstract
Framing of motion events involves realization of the component schema encoded in verb roots or in other elements out of the verb root which identifies a certain language into its category of the motion event pattern. The present paper tries to outline major points about motion event systems in Oromo in terms of semantic and morpho-syntactic characteristics in which some syntactic and pragmatic patterns are also slightly treated. The semantic core schemas are mainly considered, and the component elements of the framing verb —figure, motion, path, ground and co-events (manner and cause) are distinctly addressed as they are realized in Oromo. Three forms of lexicalizing core schemas have been identified as figure conflating, path conflating and co-event conflating types in the language. The ground in motion events is marked by using case patterns, and the verb argument mainly occurs in monovalent structure though few motion verbs seem to be bivalent by assigning accusative case to their direct objects.

Key words: motion, encoding, framing, event.

Introduction

Background

The mode of encoding motion events is a language specific preference in terms of semantic component elements in an event. Oromo, a member of the lowland East branch of Cushitic family in the Afro-Asiatic phylum, is named as *Afaan Oromo* in the language community, which literally means 'language of Oromo. In Oromo, motion events are systematized semantically and morpho-syntactically; the cognitively conceptualized metaphoric expressions as in Samuel's, (2007) and some pragmatic constraints are also important in motion systems of the language. The aim of the present paper is to revisit the description of occurrence patterns of motion events in Oromo mainly in terms of their conflation systems along with some morpho-syntactic properties. It focuses on semantic values with some innovations as additional points to what has already been described so far in few relevant studies.

* We are grateful to Dr. Meyer, Ronny and Dr. Endalew Asefa for their constructive comments in the preparation of this paper. There's much to say about their generous support in directing and advising us towards quality of our work.
† Corresponding Author, E-mail: wakwoyaolani@yahoo.com

In the typological sense as Talmy, (2000) states, an event mainly conflates motion with semantic elements like figure, path and manner in which motion is the basic component that yields the other information pieces in appropriate morpho-syntactic and semantic fashion. Motion event which represents any movement encoded by verb is systematized in its semantic components, and hence the verb is considered as macro-event, in Talmy's terms, for the analyzable elements in it. The semantic components of motion events are considered as the core schemas based on which typological categorizing of languages may happen because motion events encode notions of figure, path and co-events in different systems either in the verb root, or in separate elements out of the verb. Talmy, (2000) identifies a two way distinction of verbs in the languages' typological system of encoding motion as verb-framed and satellite-framed types; the earlier one represents the conflation of motion with the semantic element, path in the verb root whereas the latter one refers to using of separate patterns (satellites) for expressing path.

In addition to Talmy's typological two-way verb forms of motion in languages, other scholars like Ameka and Essegbey, (2013) suggest the third type as equipollently-framed languages involving both features of verb-framed and satellite-framed motion event patterns in almost equal realizations related with path encoding. Languages may normally exert both verb-framed and satellite-framed patterns of encoding motion events, mostly not in equal status, so that one is dominant over the other; for example, English is basically a satellite-framed language that involves few verb-framed patterns as in the verbs *enter* and *exit* —motion+ path conflation. It is pretty rare to find languages that equally employ both features so that we just consider the dominant one for determining motion event system typology of a certain language. Verkerk, (2014: 308) states that languages are labeled as verb-framed or satellite-framed on the basis of frequency of the unmarked system to encode path because languages usually employ both framing types not in equal status.

Some studies treated motion events in Cushitic languages few of which are parts of the Grammar related studies or under other broader topics. Occurrence pattern of motion events in Cushitic languages may behave the same in some ways especially for the genetic relation; Hence, Kambaata —Tries (2007) and Sidaama —Kawachi (2007) are taken into account as additional references especially for some comparative sense in case the explanatory context demands some relational point. Oromo motion systems are revisited in this paper based on Talmy's typological theory and the most relevant studies conducted so far. The purpose is to substantiate what is already done through additional data explanations, and to fill some overlooked issues in Oromo motion events. The specific objectives to be met are as follows:

- Identifying and classifying encoding of the motion.
- Characterizing the occurrence patterns of motion events in terms of semantic and morpho-syntactic properties.

Methods

After identifying the related studies on the concept of motion events and data systems, semantic and morpho-syntactic properties of Oromo motion events are treated based on the research outputs and empirical evidences, but the semantic aspect is given due attention as the meaning-wise component elements of motion events are important issues in such studies. The paper work follows appropriate procedure of surveying the relevant studies and reviewing them thoroughly with involvement of some data presentations where necessary; primary and secondary data items were employed. For the new data items, the tool is introspection since one of the investigators is native of Oromo. Relevant points of the previous studies and the new data were systematically organized based on the language specific motion encoding patterns; these points were presented in light with Leonard Talmy's typological theories of languages in their motion event systems. Using the compiled research outputs and data presentations, some inferred discussions in the Oromo motion systems were provided with appropriate conclusions afterwards.

The literature: Overview

Oromo is basically an SOV language whose case system is nominative marked; the accusative case is morphologically unmarked while subject of transitive and intransitive verbs are marked for nominative case (Debela and Meyer, 2008; Konig, 2008). Besides the semantic phenomenon of expressing motion events, morpho-syntactic and syntactic constraints also play significant roles in determining the typological category of a language so that involvement of morphology and syntax happens according to the language's preference (Walchli and Solling, 2013:87). The communicative value of motion verbs may sometimes depend on even pragmatic sense; a certain syntactically acceptable motion expression can be semantically senseless due to using of less appropriate patterning with the involvement of shared knowledge (Meyer, 2007). Oromo is identified as a verb-framed language in Talmy's typology in which the core schema (path) is mapped into the verb with rich path conflation in motion events (Debela, 2007; Samuel, 2007). The verb-framed system of encoding motion is hypothetically considered to be the basic feature of the general African languages (Schaefer and Graines, 1997: 197), and Oromo probably confirms this tendency. However, some features of satellite-framed languages like manner conflation in verb root are also observed in the language since there is no language with rigid boundary referring to one typological framing of core schema in motion verbs.

Previous studies on motion event constructions in Oromo (Debela, 2006 & 2007; Samuel, 2007; Debela and Meyer, 2008) and Highland East Cushitic languages like Sidaama (Kawachi, 2007), and Kambaata (Tries, 2007) can be cited as the related ones. However, the studies on Oromo are obviously the most relevant descriptive works with considerable points taken into account in the present paper. Debela, (2006) classifies motion events in Oromo according to their integrated semantic components according to Talmy's typological elements in motion verbs —motion, path, co-event, figure, and ground. Debela, (2007) treats path conflating motion verbs re-considering the sub-categories within path-oriented motion verbs stated in his broader work about one year back; both papers focus on semantic phenomenon of the motion events in Oromo with slight consideration of the syntactic and/or morpho-syntactic properties of motion verbs, but Debela and Meyer, (2008) focuses on marking of grounds as syntactic phenomenon of motion events with some morpho-syntactic patterns in the language. The basically motion verb *baʔuu* 'to go out' in Oromo as described by Samuel, (2007) focuses on semantic representational variations and schematic analysis with a detailed explanations. On the way of describing semantic properties of the verb, it treats the motion related features in the language indicating that motion verbs on one hand may convey semantic elements like path in the root and on the other hand such semantic features are expressed by separate words (like adpositions or nouns), not in the verb root. For example, the verb *sussukuu* 'to trot' which conflates motion with manner and *seenuu* 'to enter' which conflates motion with path dominantly convey semantic elements (path and manner) in semantics of their root so does the motion verb *baʔuu* 'to go out' in Samuel's paper which conflates path.

Tries (2007) describes Kambaata as verb-framed motion encoding system; it demonstrates the occurrence of path, manner, figure and ground of motion in terms of morpho-syntactic and semantic characteristics along with case systems on ground NP's for encoding path. Considering Sidaama as a verb-framed language, Kawachi (2007) describes the motion event with specific semantic category, manner as conflated notion; it examines manner verbs in connection with boundary crossing and ground positioning (goal and source NP's). The paper focuses on morpho-syntactic phenomenon with some semantic considerations in manner verb constructions of the language.

Results and Discussion

Oromo motion event systems

The core semantic components of motion events figure, motion itself, path, ground and co-event (manner/cause) from which path is the predominantly lexicalized entity in the verb root are systematized in Oromo. The conflation types are motion with figure, motion with path, and motion with co-event (manner/cause) though Debela, (2006) adds the fourth conflation motion with neutral semantic category, motion only. Even though encoding these semantic elements in the verb root is mainly observed, path and manner can also be expressed by preverbs or other forms out of the motion verb; these happens through separate markers in satellite forms through different systems. The co-events, manner and cause happen in locomotive and non-locomotive motion events respectively. The ground NP is structured either in unmarked form or through case marking that grammaticalizes other functions like object or adjunct in motion event construction of the language. The core schemas of framing verbs in Oromo are as follows:

Figure

A certain kind of figure (the moving entity) is inevitably involved in motion events, and the motion verbs that relatively specify the figure are considered as figure conflating verbs. As one type of motion events, such verbs as in Debela, (2006: 62) are described figure-oriented because they convey figure specification within the verb root. This might be conceptually similar with Kersten's (2003: 919) point of the figure's involvement in motion encoding; it states that the information of motion is not only conveyed by verbs but also by nouns in some appropriate contexts whereby the noun is considered to play a determining share of a motion type. The two approaches towards motion and figure integration seems to be conversely proportional that the earlier one focuses on the motion verb identifying the figure type whereas the latter prefers the figure type to be determining factor for the motion type; however, the general point is that figure and motion are semantically intertwisted in some verbs like *ɗangalaʔuu* 'to be spilt', *jaaʔuu* 'flow', *ʧ'op'uu* 'drop', *bubbisuu* 'blow', *lolaʔuu* 'to flood' in Oromo.

Most of the "figure-oriented" motion verbs are derived from nouns whose meanings are related with the noun (i.e. figure) they are derived from. These verbs include: *lolaʔuu* 'to flood', *bubbisuu* 'to blow', *roobuu* 'to rain', and their bases (noun forms) are *lolaa* 'flood', *bubbee* 'sandstorm', *rooba* 'rain' respectively. Hence, the semantic connections between the motion of the verb and nature of the figure are intuitive because they are basically from the same notional roots. However, there are motion and figure combinations in verbs that are not derivational like *ɗangalaʔuu* 'to be spilt'. Consider the examples in 1 below:

1	(a)	*aannan*	*ɗangalaʔ-e*		(b)	*muʧ'aa-n*	*kurkur-t-e*
		milk:Nom	spill-3sm:Pfv			child-Nom	toddle-3sf-Pfv
	'The milk spilt'				'The child toddled'		
	(c)	*lolaa-n*	*lolaʔ-e*		(d)	*bubbee-n*	*bubbis-e*
		Flood-Nom	flood-3sm:Pfv			sandstorm-Nom	blow-3sm:Pfv
	'The flood flooded'				'The sandstorm blew'		

The motion verbs in (a) and (b) above identify that the subjects are liquid and child respectively as their semantic content; these verbs are semantically figure-oriented. The verb *ɗangalaʔe* 'spilt' takes as liquid subject, and the verb *kurkurte* 'toddled' refers to a child subject with the diminutive marker *-t-* as in the verb. Unlike the first two sentences in example 1 above, the latter two (c) and (d) contain verbalized forms of the nouns (their subjects) so that they are inherently

related because their verbal sense emanates from the nominal sense itself, but semantics as conflation of motion and figure is involved in all framing verbs above.

Since, the figure-oriented motion verbs seem to be embraced under the co-event, manner, they can be considered as sub-categories of manner conflating verbs. Such verbs lexicalize figure besides the co-event but a large number of other verbs happen as manner-oriented ones without encoding figure in the verb root. This may make us categorize manner verbs as *motion* + *manner* + *figure* and *motion* + *manner* types in their sub-division in Oromo. In such analysis, we find a two way distinction of motion encoding in Oromo regarding conflation of semantic components in the motion event as path-oriented and manner-oriented which can ultimately be considered as Ameka and Essegbey's (2013) motion typology, equipollently-framed language. However, this hypothetical tendency needs to be confirmed by other research with more empirical evidences in motion related features of the language. Such complexity of verb components in languages is a token for high integration of events as typological theories indicate. According to Wakasa (2016: 146), the semantic components motion and manner conveyed in one clause makes it complex event in the integration pattern; taking event other semantic component like figure, as in Oromo, would make it more complex event.

Motion

The major and typical semantic component, motion is considered for determining the verb type in event description, and the event involves some kind of movement. Basically, motion event can be neutral or without conflating of other semantic schemas like path and figure in the verb root as a categorical possibility in languages Talmy, (2007: 101). However, occurrence of a sole motion conflation in Oromo can be controversial.

According to Debela, (2006), the Oromo verb *deemuu* 'to go' is considered to convey motion only without specifying the figure, path, manner, etc of its own. The unmarked NP seeming the verb object happens in adjunctive function though it appears in the same form in paradigmatic position and morphological similarity with the syntactic object. The movement (translocation) conveyed in the verb *deemuu* 'to go' is not known what the figure takes for the motion; maybe by car or on horseback or on foot etc. Neither does it show what course of motion the figure follows for moving from one location to the other as claimed in Debela's paper, so that the verb *deemuu* 'to go' is considered as just motion-oriented.

However, it seems empirically pretty ungrounded to determine the verb *deemuu* 'to go' neutrally motion-oriented because it can have a notion of path when it is used alone in a sentence (without a verb external path encoding element) in Oromo (Debela and Meyer 2008). Separate path encoding preverbs may actually change path of the motion by changing the deictic center.

2	(a)	*mutʃ'-itʃiʃ-I*	*deem-e*		(b)	*mutʃ'-itʃiʃ-i*	*as- deem-e*
		boy-Def-Nom	go-3sm:Pfv			boy-Def-Nom	Path-go-3sm:Pfv
	'The boy went away'				The boy walked towards here'		

The route taken is away from a deictic center that *deeme* 'went away' seems to conflate motion and path behaving like the verb *sokke* 'went away' in (a) above. Actually, varied path can be expressed with this verb, when it is used with path encoding preverbs like *as-* 'here', *atʃiʃi* 'there' as opposite direction. The preverb *as-* 'here', in (b), is an adverbial proclitic which indicates the path of the motion by specifying the way to be taken by the figure.

Path

Indicating the granular nature of events in motion construction, Antunano, (2008: 409) states that path is the core semantic element in motion events whose elaboration and way of encoding

may differ in languages. Path (the way taken) can either be lexicalized in verb root or expressed in separate elements using adpositions or some relevant case markings especially for source indicating NP's and destination indicating NP's; these markers refer to ground marking in order to encode path element. This supports, Tries' (2007: 199) and Kawachi's (2007:5) point that path can be conveyed through case marking on ground nouns and lexicalizing motion with path in verb root as well, but it is pervasively lexicalized in the framing verb.

The path-oriented verbs make an important type of motion verbs because there are many verbs of this kind in Oromo; they happen conflating motion and path together. Examples of these motion verbs are *ɗufuu* 'to come', *galuu* 'go home', *k'ak'k'abuu* 'reach', *lit'uu* 'to enter', *ɗak'uu* 'to go', *baʔuu* 'to exit', *deebiʔuu* 'to return', etc that are classified into other sub-categories whereby the path element is common feature to all of them. The verbs are sub-categorized on the criteria of deictic space and base object that are somehow involved in the motion event of path. The motion may happen towards or from the deictic center; or it may be towards, away, across, beside or around the base. Debela's, (2006) is a relatively broader description of motion verbs in terms of semantic properties in Oromo besides which he treats again a more specific part of motion verbs in the language focusing on path-conflating verbs. Hence, Debela (2007) explains that path can either be lexicalized in the verb root or encoded by separate elements (adpositions or preverbs) in Oromo. The motion event also considers deictic position, reference point and ground in systematizing path in motion events of the language.

The speaker or the addressee is the deictic center for the path conflating motion events in some verbs like *ɗufuu* 'to come', *koott-u/-aa* 'come-sg/-pl' (suppletive imperative form of the verb *ɗufuu* 'to come') and *sokkuu* 'to go' in which the meaning is based on where the speaker or the addressee is in the given discourse. Have a look at examples 3 below:

3	(a)	*inni*	*ɗuf-e*		(b)	(*ati*)	*koott-u*
		he:Nom	come-3sm:Pfv			(you:Nom)	come-2s:Imp
	'He came'				'(you) come'		

These sentences are conceptualized in relation to the deictic position of the speaker or the addressee; for instance, sentence (a) may have two meanings in terms of the speaker and the addressee related deictic centers although it is basically related with the speaker's deictic center. The motion verb *koott-* 'come' is just referring to the speaker related deictic center which the figure moves as in (b) without an overt goal NP because the discourse connected deictic location is not necessarily stated. A motion event can have relevant goal NP (the addressee related deictic center) as in example 4 below whereby the destination needs stated overtly as the goal NP because the word *ɗufuu* 'to come' is mainly considered as the speaker related deictic center.

4		*inni*	*gara-koo/kee*	*ɗuf-e*
		he:Nom	vicinity-Poss:1s/2s	come-3sm:Pfv
	'He came to where I am/where you are'			

The speaker/addressee related deictic center is distinguished by the given goal NP in the sentences above, and the word *gara* can be categorized as a noun class in such genitive construction [noun + genitive] combination in 4 confirming Debela and Meyers's (2008) claim that *gara* basically means 'vicinity' being, and it is a noun. The Oromo verb *sokkuu* 'to go' which conflates motion and path can happen in speaker or addressee based deictic center when the overt source of motion is not stated. Especially, in interrogative construction the deictic center from which the figure moves is addressee related.

5	(a)	*inni*	*harʔa*	*sokk-e*
		he:Nom	today	leave-3sm:Pfv
	‘He left today’			
	(b)	*inni*	*yoom*	*sokk-e*
		he:Nom	when	leave-3sm:Pfv
	‘When did he leave?’			

The source information intuitive to both the speaker and the addressee is the speaker related deictic location in sentence 5 (a) because the path conflating motion verb *sokkuu* ‘to go’ represents that the figure departing from some defined location away in the discourse. In the second example, sentence (b), the source information is sought from the addressee which implies that the figure departs from the addressee related deictic center away. Therefore, the verb *sokkuu* ‘to go’ is understood for its source in the discourse though the path is already there.

Other groups of Oromo verbs that conflate motion and path can also be described in relation with static or moving base so that the motion happens towards, across, through or away from the base in the language. These information pieces may happen to be conveyed in the motion verb along with the component element path. Particular verbs of this kind in Oromo include: *ɗak’uu* ‘to go’, *gaʔuu* ‘to reach’, *k’ak’k’abuu* ‘to arrive’, *galuu* ‘to go home’, *lit’uu* ‘to enter’, *deebiʔuu* ‘to return’, *fatʃ’aʔuu* ‘to disperse’, *naannaʔuu* ‘to circle’, *tʃ’eʔuu* ‘to cross’, and so on. Here are some examples of path conflating motion verbs with base related information:

6	(a)	*inni*	*bijja-tti*	*gal-e.*		(b)	*mutʃ’aa-n*	*na*	*k’ak’k’ab-e.*
		he:Nom	country-to	go-3sm:Pfv			child-Nom	me	reach-3sm:Pfv
	‘He went back to his country.’					‘The child catches up with me.’			
	(c)	*mutʃ’aa-n*	*muka*	*jaab-e*		(d)	*nam-ich-i*	*darb-e.*	
		child-Nom	tree	climb-3sm:Pfv			man-Def-Nom	pass-3sm:Pfv	
	‘The child climbed a tree.’					‘The man passed by.’			

Debela, (2006)

The verb *gale* ‘went home (country)’ in 6 (a) encodes the information that the figure just went to his homeland (towards a base), and the destination marked by *-tti* probably adds some meaning of staying there for long time as place of residence. The opposite expression, the figure goes somewhere for short time is conveyed by the verb *ɗak’e* ‘went’ which indicates that someone moved away from a certain base with the intention of getting back after some time. The sentence in (b) contains the verb *k’ak’k’abe* ‘arrived’ which means got closer to the moving base *(a)na* ‘me’ so that the motion is considered in terms of the non-static base unlike the verb *gale* ‘went home (land)’ of sentence (a) whose destination is the static base ‘home country’. The unmarked goal NP’s in (b) and (c) seem to be syntactically and semantically direct objects because they are somehow affected by action of the verb; the goal NP’s especially the animate bases are assigned for accusative case in Oromo motion event as bivalent structure. The verb *jaabe* ‘climbed’ in (c) is

a movement upward from the earth, and the opposite is *buʔe* 'climb down' which is a motion to the reverse whereby the point of departure is somewhere in the upper position of maybe a tree or a mountain or a building. The motion verb *darbe* 'passed by' in (d) is better considered as basically bivalent verb, and it expresses that a side of something (i.e. base) is taken for the motion to happen; the verb can also be used along with adpositions like *keessa* 'through', *irra* 'above' or *ʤala* 'under' as preverbs for further specified path (Debela, 2006: 61).

A motion verb with a physically realized basic meaning can have several metaphorical meanings on the basis of sociolinguistic —language use and morpho-syntactic properties in which goal and source alternation makes semantic distinction along with morphological patterns. A case in point, the meaning of the word *galuu* 'to enter' happens to encode different meanings in varieties of structures as in 7 below:

7	(a)	*inni*	*mana-tti*	*ol-gal-e*			(b)	*inni*	*mana-tti*	*gal-e*	
		he:Nom	house-to	up-enter-3sm:Pfv				he:Nom	house-to	go-3sm:Pfv	
		'He entered into the house'						'He went to home'			
	(c)	*inni*	*waadaa*	*naaf*	*gal-e*		(d)	*aariin*	*isa*	*irra-a*	*gal-e*
		he:Nom	promise	me:Appl enter-3sm:Pfv	he:Nom			anger:Nom	him	Loc:Abl	go-3sm:Pfv
		'He gave me his word' (Lit: He entered into a promise for me)						'He settled his anger' (Sorrow went away from him)			

The pre-verb *ol-* 'up' in (a) adds a sense of immediacy to meaning of the verb *gale* 'entered', and the encoded meaning with the pre-verb is to enter into a house which is the basic meaning of the word itself. The pre-verb *ol-* 'up' and the goal NP marker *-tti* both are obligatory for conveying such meaning provided that the goal NP exists because the verb *gale* in (b) without the pre-verb mostly expresses different meaning that it just indicates the figure went home; no information about arriving at the destination or entering his house. Pre-verbs like *ol-* 'up', *gad-* 'down', *gargar-* 'apart' can be integrated with path conflating motion verbs as adverbial functions (Debela, 2007: 80). The goal NP's in both (a) and (b) can be left out based on the awareness of the speaker and the addressee about the destination of the figure in such motion. The meanings of the verb *gale* in (c) and (d) are both metaphorically different. The action in (c) is not physical motion; it is rather cognitive that the verb *gale* represents action in communication. The applicative object like addressee *(a)naaf* 'for me' is an optional participant that grammaticality of the sentence can be okay without it, but its presence specifies the benefactive object. The verb *gale* with source NP marked by vowel *-a* as in (d) encodes disappearance of some condition; it's a non-agentive form which metaphorically conveys stative meaning rather than physical motion.
In addition to preverbs, path can be encoded by adpositions and case markings in Oromo which are structural forms apart from the conflation system. Even the considerably path-oriented verbs can take the adpositions and/or case marker for more specifying the goal or source NP of the motion event. Debela and Meyer, (2008) demonstrates that adpositions like *gara* 'vicinity', *bira* 'near', and *irra* 'top' are common nouns functioning as locational notions; case markers *-ii* and *da+vowel length* on source NP (ablative case), and *-tti* on the goal NP are with similar functions in motion construction; they encode path.

According to Debela and Meyer (2008), adpositions and case markings may happen to change meaning of the motion event; their occurrence may add some new information whereby their

absence makes a grammatical structure. Example 8 below provides slight difference between the sentences with postposition *keessa* 'inside' and without:

8	(a)	*Tolaa-n*	*mana*	*lit'-e*		Debela and Meyer, (2008: 36, 40)
		Tola-Nom	house:Acc	enter-3sm:Pfv		
	'Tola entered (his) house.'					
	(b)	*Tolaa-n*	*mana*	*keessa*	*lit'-e*	
		Tola-Nom	house:Acc	inside:Acc	enter-3sm:Pfv	
	'Tola entered into (his) house.'					

The postposition *keessa* 'inside' in (b) above adds emphasis only; no other significant meaning change happens because its occurrence. Basically, the two sentences (a) and (b) are similar with the unmarked object like goal NP in Oromo motion verb structure. The goal NP, *mana* 'house' seems to be a direct object immediately following the verb in syntactic structure, but its semantic aspect categorizes the goal NP as an adjunct for locational meaning.

Meaning change may, actually, happen for using adpositions in many situations of the language; for instance, when the prepositional notion *gara* 'vicinity' is used, the goal NP functions as the location around which the motion is supposed to end whereas absence of the preposition makes the goal NP the exact destination of the move (in the motion).

9	(a)	*inni*	*Adaamaa*	*deem-e*	
		he:Nom	Adama:Acc	go-3sm:Pfv	
	'He went to Adama'				
	(b)	*inni*	*gara*	*Adaamaa*	*deem-e*
		he:Nom	vicinity:Acc	Adama:Gen	go-3sm:Pfv
	'He went towards Adama' (Lit: He went to the vicinity around Adama)				

Absence of the preposition *gara* 'vicinity' in 9 (a) indicates the exact destination of the motion unlike the sentence (b) which conveys the notion of nearby the destination, not the exact destination. This meaning difference lies in using of adpositions along with the goal or source NP's as syntactic phenomenon; it works with several adpositions like *bira* 'near' and *irra* 'top' in respective meanings. Occurrence of some adpositions and morphological markers in ground NP's (goal and source) is mostly for adding emphasis to the ground.

Ground

The stationary reference point of motion is semantically connected with motion event as the locational object encoded by morpho-syntactic pattern. Languages do not conflate motion and ground in verbs; they rather use case marking to express the ground of motion. Talmy (2007: 99) states that motion and ground are not considered together in conflation that the typological theory recognizes the two entities as separate elements separately indicated in motion event construction in languages. In Oromo motion verbs, three forms of conflation are observed: path,

figure and co-event are lexicalized in verb roots (cf. section 2.1), but ground NP's are marked by case systems especially ablative for source NP and locative for goal NP (Debela 2006, 2007; Debela and Meyer 2008). This common ground marking system seems to be for most Cushitic languages as Kambaata and Sidaama behave similarly as described by Treis (2007) and Kawachi (2007) respectively.

Many goal NP's are in the unmarked (citation) forms whereas some others can be marked in Oromo motion construction; the marked goals may happen to be emphasized in the discourse with a meaning diverted towards locative concept. Debela and Meyer, (2008) explains that the locative marker *-tti* happens on the goal NP with a bit different meaning indicating the location at which some action happened rather than a goal notion depending on the verb type that the marked goal NP is used with.

10	(a)	*mana-a*	*ala*	*baʔ-e*		(b)	*Fufaa-n*	*mana-tti*	*deem-e*
		he:Nom	country-to	go-3sm:Pfv			house-Nom	house-Loc	fall-3sm:Pfv
	'He went out of house'					'Fufa went inside house'			
	(c)	*mana*	*lit'-e*			(d)	*mana-tti*	*interneetii*	*lit'-e*
		house:ACC	enter-3sm:Pfv				house-Loc	internet:Acc	enter-3sm:Pfv
	'He entered into house'					'He entered into house'			

Debela and Meyer, (2008: 8)

The morpheme *-tti* on the goal NP's of example 10 (b) and (d) indicate the locational notion of the motion (where the action happened) with a sense of emphasis in the discourse whereas the ground NP's in (a) and (c) mark source and goal respectively though the goal NP in (c) happen in the base (citation) form. The source NP's are usually marked by the ablative morpheme *-a* in Oromo, but the source NP in (c) is understood from the motion verb *lit'uu* 'enter' which conveys that the exterior part of a certain bounded area would be the source; the goal NP is relatively more necessary for the completeness of the sentence.

Some path verbs are structured involving shared knowledge of the speakers and the addressee in discourse about the ground; thus, the failure to recognize the shared knowledge makes the motion to be conveyed in different verb choice. For example, topography of the destination (place), if known or not, determines the verb type to be used in conflation related variation (Meyer 2007: 6). In Oromo the words *bu'uu* 'to descend' and *ba'uu* 'to ascend' need such shared knowledge so that the communication system goes well in pragmatic sense as in 11 below:

11	(a)	*inni*	*Wallaga*	*buʔ-e*		(b)	*inni*	*Finfinnee*	*baʔ-e*
		he:Nom	Wallaga	descend-3sm:Pfv			he:Nom	Finfinne:Acc	ascend-3sm:pfv
	'He went (down) to Wallaga'					'He went (up) to Finfinne'			

These syntactically acceptable sentences in (a) and (b) happen to be pragmatically senseless if the topographic knowledge of the destinations is a gap —not commonly known by the speaker and the addressee. The verb in (a) indicates the slope goes downwards as one moves from the source center to Wallaga, and (b) conveys the reverse meaning.

Co-events: manner and cause

The semantic component elements of motion verbs include co-events (mainly manner and cause) in framing events besides figure, motion, path and ground. These co-events can occur within the motion events as complex motion construction. The semantic component elements manner, cause, concomitance* and purpose are described as co-events in motion verb structuring of which manner and cause are the most commonly lexicalized ones in the framing verb as the literature indicates (Talmy, 2000: 220). Co-events can be expressed in different ways on the basis of the typological identity of the language in event integration. They are expressed by elements other than the motion verb especially in the verb-framed languages; they are lexicalized into the verb roots so that the co-events are considered in conflation with motion especially as features of satellite-framed languages. The other way to convey co-events is using subordination in the complex sentence constructions which happens in most cases regardless of the language's motion system typology (Ameka and Essegbey (2013: 23).

In Oromo motion events, manner is a co-event that can either be lexicalized in the verb root in which motion and co-event (manner) are conflated or it can be expressed by elements other than the motion verb especially as complex predication in converbal system, the predicate containing gerundive form as manner encoding word in Debela (2007: 84) seems untenable as the gerundive form is basically a nominal domain that is not analyzed as event expression, and the verbs with final vowel length like *fiigaa* 'running' are progressive event describers whose vowel lengths are probably converb markers in progressive action. Manner is the common co-event in the motion events in Oromo, and the other co-event, cause is mainly encoded by the morphological and subordinating systems. The other co-events like concomitance and purpose, even cause are yet to be treated in the language's motion event construction (seeking further study).

Manner conflating motion verbs are enormous in Oromo; manner is considered as the main semantic element, but not necessarily exclusive of other semantic components like path, figure and ground that may co-occur with in motion verbs. Verbs of such type include: *fiigu* 'to run', *tiratʃʃuu* 'to trudge', *ʃekkeluu* 'to move with one leg', *lowuu* 'to creep', *tarkaanfatʃʃuu* 'to stride', *gangalatʃʃuu* 'to roll', *sigigaatʃʃuu* 'to slither', so and so forth. These verbs mainly encode manner along with motion though some involve path too; for instance, the verb *sigigaatʃʃuu* 'to slither' conveys the meaning that the figure slithers downward on a certain slope course as the natural gravity behaves this way. Look at the examples in 12 below:

12	(a)	*nam-itʃʃ-i*	*tarkaanfat-e*
		man-Def-Nom	stride-3sm:Pfv
	'The man strode'		
	(b)	*dʒag-itʃʃ-i*	*sigigaat-e*
		stone-Def-Nom	slither-3sm:Pfv
	'The stone slithered down'		

Debela, (2006: 54f)

* Represents events occurring at the same time because they are somehow related or maybe one causes the other in a language. Such feature is probably encoded by the morpheme *–(i)s* as a suffix appended to the co-event subject in Oromo.

The sentences indicate manner conflating motion verbs that (a) shows the way one takes foot that is a relatively longer stepping distance walk whereas in (b) the figure gets dragged towards a lower space of a slope on the earth surface. These and the related verbs are clearly manner-oriented ones that they most importantly convey manner of the movement, how of the motion is communicated within the motion verb.

When motion verbs happen in a complex way of structuring, the core schema contained in the verb may determine the way the verbs co-occur in the sentence. The verbs put one after the other in converbal sense can have two separate forms which is semantically constrained as manner co-event system. Given that two main verbs involving motion, the one needs to precede the other so that the sentence becomes grammatical and acceptable. Belkadi (2015: 58) indicates that the main verbs precedence structure in motion systems depends on the inherent semantic value and pragmatic consideration within the respective language. The precedence basis in Oromo seems to be more prominently semantic because it, as in example 13 below, identifies the meaning whereby two path verbs exert a certain meaning and manner verb co-occurring with path verb shows another meaning.

13	(a)	*inni*	*ɗuf-e-e*	*sokk-e*
		he:Nom	come-Pfv-Cnv	go-3sm:Pfv
		'He came and then went'		
	(b)	*inni*	*fiig-e-e*	*ɗuf-e*
		he:Nom	run-3sm:Pfv-Cnv	come-3sm:Pfv
		'He came running'		

The two path conflating verbs *ɗufe* 'came' and *sokke* 'went' in 13 (a) are just sequenced events that happen one after the other, and the two verbs can structurally be exchanged with the reversed acceptable meaning. Hence, the events are separate although the first is converb and the next one is main verb in the complex predication. On the other hand, relation between the two verbs *fiige* 'ran' and *ɗufe* 'came' in (b) is semantically different from that of (a), but their syntactic structure is similarly okay. The meaning difference lies in the core schema that the sequenced verbs express as their distinctive feature that is the co-event (manner) conflating motion verb preceding the path conflating motion verb makes the manner verb an adverbial modifier instead of separate motion event, and reversing the position of these verbs brings senseless construction (Meyer, 2007: 8).

The other co-event, cause seems to happen in an action that conveys motion, and the motion in such complex predication is the embedded semantic entity whereby the matrix verb is not a trans-locational motion by itself but causes such motion. Hence, the co-event (cause) can be considered as the conflated entity because the motion is caused by other verb. Such motion expression happens as the second hidden motion event of an overt verb (Talmy 2007: 75). In Oromo, the verbs like *ɗiituu* 'to kick' and *darbaʧʧuu* 'to throw' in 14 below may happen to be of this kind because they are motion causing actions through body movement.

14	(a)	*inni*	*kubbaa*	*ol-ɗiit-e*		(b)	*inni*	*ɗakaa*	*aʧʧi-darbat-e*
		he:Nom	ball:Acc	Path-kick-3sm:Pfv			he:Nom	stone:Acc	Path-throw-3sm:Pfv
		'He kicked a ball up'					'He threw a stone away'		

Within the simple like sentence in (a), the verb *ɗiite* 'kicked' is construed to embed the motion event [cause move] of the object *kubbaa* 'ball', and the other sentence (b) contains the verb *darbate* 'threw' with the same hidden meaning [cause move] of the object *ɗakaa* 'stone'. The matrix verbs are just the causers of the motions as co-event system, and the motion is a kind of locomotive motion through non-locomotive movement because the agent causes the motion through axial body movement. If the cause event *ɗiite* 'kicked' should be structured with overt framing verb as complex clause, the cause indicating event precedes, and the sentence follows temporal structuring in separate clauses. However, such meaning is usually the understood one from the embedded meaning within the matrix verb (Kawachi, 2016: 20).

Valence of motion verbs

Most of the motion verbs are like monovalent verbs in their syntactic structure that they happen with adpositional or suffixal case of their bases which are clearly adjuncts from the surface forms in the structure as well; however, some path-oriented verbs take a syntactically direct object like NP right after the verb in the unmarked goal object in the accusative case. The unmarked forms of direct objects look like the objects of transitive verbs in their morphological surface though the functional information is an issue of argument.

The path conflating motion verbs especially that are referenced to moving or static base take a direct object like NP in the syntactic relation likewise the mono-transitive verbs (in bivalent system), and the passivisability may be okay; however, the NP that directly follows the motion verb play different semantic role as an object motion verb because it doesn't receive action of the verb unlike in non-motion verbs (Debela 2007). The object element in the motion verb functions as specifying the base with reference to which the motion happens; therefore, it can be considered as an adjunct on the basis of semantic constraint.

15	(a)	*mutʃ'aa-n*	*mana*	*lit'-e.*		(b)	*man-ni*	*lit'-am-e.*
		child-Nom	house	enter-3sm:Pfv			he:Nom	stone:Acc
		'The child entered the house.'					'The house was entered.'	

Debela (2007:85)

The morphologically unmarked goad NP *mana* in (a) above seems to fulfill the syntactic and morphological criteria with passivisability structure in (b); however, Debela (2007) considers the accusative markedness possibility of this goal object and realizes it as false direct object; it hence states that the verb *lit'uu* 'to enter' is a monovalent verb. The role of the object is claimed to be an adjunct appearing as a direct object of motion verbs especially with the path conflating ones so that all motion verbs are treated as monovalent verbs.

According to Debela and Meyer (2008), motion verbs in Oromo are categorized into three based on their valence in the goal marking system as morpho-syntactically marked (for verbs like *bakatʃtʃuu* 'to run away', *tʃ'eʔuu* 'to cross' and *godaanuu* 'to move'), postpositionally modified (for verbs like *ɗak'uu* 'to go', *ɗufuu* 'to come' and *buʔuu* 'to descend') and the verb-externally unmarked types (for verbs like *darbuu* 'to pass', *k'ak'k'abuu* 'to reach' and *lit'uu* 'to enter'. Interestingly, the verb-externally unmarked goals of motion verbs are considered similarly with the direct objects of bivalent (transitive) verbs in Oromo. The third type of motion verbs are just like bivalent verbs with a sense of affectedness on the direct object, and this description seems to be satisfying the criteria for the bivalent nature of some motion events.

Conclusion

As a dominantly verb-framed language, Oromo lexicalizes three core semantic entities figure, path and co-event (basically manner) in the verb root as three forms of conflation. Path and co-event (manner) are the most common semantic elements to be in the verb root; path as the most widely lexicalized element in the verb root is encoded with reference to deictic center or a base (stationary or moving). Besides, the conflation systems, these semantic entities are encoded by preverbs, case markings and adpositions too; the affixes are on the ground NP's for case markings in motion constructions. Case morphology is a considerable phenomenon in specifying relational information between the motion verb and the ground NP (or the base). Even though the overwhelming majority of path-oriented motion verbs are just considered as monovalent types regardless of some direct object like goal NP's after them, there are some path-oriented motion verbs constructed in bivalent argument system for their morpho-syntactic and semantic applicability likewise the mono-transitive verbs.

Abbreviation

1,2,3	person	Imp	imperative
Abl	ablative	Loc	locative
Acc	accusative	m	masculine
Appl	applicative	Nom	nominative
Cnv	converb	NP's	noun phrases
Def	definite article	Pl	plural
f	feminine	Pfv	perfective
Gen	possessor	s	singular

References

Antunano, I. I. (2008). Path Salience in Motion Events. J. Guo, E. Lieven, N. Budwig, S. Ervin-Tripp, K. Nakamura, S. Őzçalişkan (eds.) *Cross-linguistic Approaches to the Psychology of Language*. New York: Psychology Press, 403-414.

Belkadi, A. (2015). Associated motion with deictic directionals: A comparative eoverview. *SOAS Working Papers in Linguistics*, 17: 49-76.

Debela G. (2007). Path in Oromo motion constructions. *APAL – Annual Publications in African Linguistics* 5: 73-88.

Debela G. (2006). Manner, path and figure in Oromo verbs of motion. *Lissan* 20, 1/2: 51-66.

Debela G. and Meyer, R. (2008). Marking of grounds with path-oriented motion verbs in Oromo. Unpublished manuscript.

Kawachi, K. (2016). Introduction: An Overview of Event Integration Patterns in African Languages. *Asian and African Languages and Linguistics*, 10: 1-36.

Kawachi, K. (2007). Manner of motion verbs in Sidaama and boundary crossing. In: Elliot, M., Kirby, J., Sawada, O., Staraki, E. and Yoon, S. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 43rd Annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society,* 2: pp. 1 – 15.

Kersten, A. W. (2003). Verbs and nouns convey different types of motion in event descriptions. In *Linguistics*: 41(5), pp. 917 – 945.

König. Ch. (2008). The marked-nominative languages of eastern Africa. In: Heine, B. and Nurse, D. (eds.), *A linguistic geography of Africa*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 251-271.

Meyer, R. (2007). Self-agentive motion verbs in Muher. *APAL – Annual Publications in African Linguistics* 5: 1 – 18.

Samuel A. (2007). Moving Metaphorically: the Semantics of the Oromo Motion Verb *ba'uu* 'to go out'. Unpublished MA Thesis: Addis Ababa University.

Schaefer, R. P. and R. Gaines. (1997). Toward a typology of directional motion for African languages. *Studies in African Linguistics* 26, 2: 195-220.

Talmy, L. (2000). *Towards a Cognitive Semantics*, Vol. 2. Cambridge: The MIT Press.

Talmy, L. (2007). Lexical Typologies. In: Shopen, T. (ed.), *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, Vol. 3. *Grammatical Categories and the Lexicon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Pp. 66 – 168.

Treis, Y. (2007). Motion Events in Kambaata. *APAL–Annual Publications in African Linguistics* 5, 197 – 226.

Verkerk, A. (2014). The correlation between motion event encoding and path verb lexicon size in the Indo-European language family. *Folia Linguistica Historica,* 35: pp. 307-358

Wakasa, M. (2016). An Analysis of Complex Event Representation in Amharic Texts. *Asian and African Languages and Linguistics*, 10: 139-155.

Walchli, B. and Solling, A. (2013). The encoding of motion events: Building typology bottom-up from text data in many languages. In Goschler, J. and Stefanowitsch, A. (eds.) *Variation and Change in the Encoding of Motion Events. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.* (*77 – 114*).