Revisiting the Internal Structure of Konsoid Subgroup

Wondwosen Tesfaye[1]

Abstract

Earlier studies on the internal structure of the Konsoid subgroup have made three different suggestions. The first suggestion is that the Konsoid subgroup consists of Konso, Diraytata and Mosittacha languages. The second suggestion is that the Konsoid subgroup consists of a single linguistic cline in the process of splitting into distinct languages. The third suggestion is that Konsoid subgroup consists of two independent languages: Konso, and Diraytata and Mosittacha. The question of the internal structure of the Konsoid subgroup is not adequately answered. The present study is, therefore, meant to address this question by making a lexicostatistical, morphological, and syntactic contrast of the three members of the Konsoid group. The data for this study was obtained from native speakers through elicitation. The findings of the study show that Konsoid subgroup is divided up into Konso and Diraytoid. Diraytoid is a linguistic cline in the process of splitting into Diraytata and Mosittacha.

Keywords: [Diraytoid, Konsoid, Lexicostatistical contrast, Morphological contrast, Syntactic contrast]

1. Introduction

Konsoid is a subgroup consisting of three members: Konso, Diraytata and Mosittacha. The three members are spoken in Konso Zone and in Diraashe district within the Southern Nation Nationalities and People's Regional State. Konso is spoken by the people calling themselves χonsitta. According to the 2007 Population and Housing Census of Ethiopia, the population of Konso is 250,000 (CSA 2007). Konso[2] has four dialects: *Faaʃe*, *Karatte*, *Tuuro* and *χolme* (cf. Black 1973a). Diraytata is spoken by the people calling themselves Diraasha. According to the 2007 census report, the population of Diraasha is 69,354 (CSA 2007). Diraytata has three dialects: *West Gidole*, *East Gidole*

[1] Associate Professor of Linguistics in the Academy of Ethiopian Languages and Cultures, Addis Ababa University.

[2] In this study Konso refers to both the people and the language.

and *South Gidole* (cf, Black 1973a). Mosittacha is spoken by the people calling themselves Mosiye. According to the 2007 census report, the Mosiye population is 19,628 (CSA 2007). Mosittacha has two dialects: *North Bussa* and *West Bussa* (Wondwosen 2000).

Konsoid subgroup was first established by Bender (1971). Before Bender the three members were grouped together with other poorly known Cushitic languages (cf. Tucker and Bayan 1956:130-1). Bender (1971) makes a lexicostatistical percentage analysis of the three members based on 98 vocabulary items collected from each member. Then, he calculated the shared cognates. According to his calculation, the percentage of basic vocabulary shared between the three members ranges between 51% and 65%. The low values of their lexicostatistical parentage imply that the three members are mutually unintelligible.

In the study voiced stops and some vowels are inadequately expressed (Bender 1971: 247-248). The members of Konsoid sub-group do not have voiced stops (cf. Black 1974: 67) but in the data transcription of the three members the author uses voiced stops as the following few examples illustrate:

Konso: *bis*^{a}'water', *naba* 'ear', *dig* 'blood', *daga* 'stone', *gogit* 'dry (adj.)', *huguk* 'egg' and others. However, the transcription of the words are: *piisa* 'water', *napahta* 'ear', *ɗîika* 'blood', *ɗakaa* 'stone', *kokit* 'dry (adj.)' and *ukukka* 'egg' respectively.

Gidole: *hambira* 'bird', *rob*^{a}'rain', *-day* 'give', *daka* 'stone', *dagay* 'hear', *di:ga* 'blood' and others. But, the transcription of the words are: *hampiritt* 'bird', *roop* 'rain', *ɗaajj-* 'give', *ɗaka* 'ston', *ɗakaj-* 'hear', and *ɗîik* 'blood' respectively.

Bussa: *kobɛro* 'ear', *kılba* 'knee', *dakay* 'hear', *mədiyɔ* 'what', *diga* 'blood', *gɔ:dja* 'neck' and others. But, the transcription of the words are: *koporo* 'ear', *kilpa* 'knee', *ɗakaj-* 'hear', *mojɗîjo* 'what', *ɗîika* 'blood', and *k'oʔitʃa* 'neck' respectively.

Similarly, the author uses the vowels (ɪ, ɛ, ɨ, ɔ) in his transcription as the following examples illustrate: Konso: *tɛrr*^{a} 'ashes', *ɨgutɪ* 'big', *ɛːgta* ' tail' and others. The transcriptions of the words are: *tarra* 'ashes', *kutt-* 'big' and *ekta* 'tail' respectively.

Gidole: *tɛrdat* 'ashes', *ɪkkut* 'big', *ɨpor* 'black', *k'ɔl*^{a} 'skin' and others. The transcriptions of the words are: *tarɗ*'ashes', *kaan* 'big' and *poor* 'black', *uww* 'skin' respectively.

Bussa: *k'ɔʔe* 'bark (tree)', *mɛk'ɛte* 'bone', *ɪlca* 'eye' and others. The transcriptions of the words are: *k'oohitta* 'bark (tree)', *mek'ete* 'bone' and *iltʃa* 'eye' respectively.

The vowels (ɪ, ɛ, ɨ, ɔ) do not existent in the Cushitic vowel system in general and in Konsoid subgroup in particular. This is because, in all the three members, there are five short (i,e,a,o,u) and five long vowels (ii, ee, aa, oo, uu) which is a typical feature of the Cushitic vowel system (cf. Mous 2012). Thus, I believe that, the low value of the lexicostatistical percentage between the three members is due to inadequate data transcription.

Black (1973a) presents a newly calculated lexicostatistical percentages of four varieties of Konso (Karatti, Fasha, Kolme and Ayayte), three varieties of Gidole (West Gidole, East Gidole and South Gidole), and two of Bussa (North Bussa and South Bussa). The percentage are based on a nonstandard 141 items. He then concludes that Konsoid is a dialect chain.

Black's (1973b) study which is an expanded version of his (1973a) work. In this study he considers Konsoid as a linguistic cline in the process of split. This makes it difficult classifying the subgroup in terms of simplistic tree model of linguistic classification. Thus, Black (1973b) considers lexicostatistical percentage analysis as inappropriate to show the relationship among varieties of a single language such as Konsoid. He rather applied Multidimensional Scaling to show the relationships among varieties of a single language (Black 1973b:2). He finally concludes that Konsoid is a linguistic cline (cf. Black 1973b:4).

Still another resourceful work on Konsoid is Black's (1974). In this work Black presents Lowland East Cushitic membership and sub-grouping based on both lexicostatistical evidence of the degree of relationships among the languages and of similarities in their phonological and morphological alternations.

Regarding the lexicostatistical percentile result of Konso, Gidole and Mashile: the 76% shared by Konso and Mashile, and by Gidole and Mashile and the 65% shared by Konso and Gidole. In this study, the phonology of Konso and Gidole are treated. The study shows that, the phonology of Konsoid dialects vary particularly with regard to obstruents and nasals. Vowels are tense when double or in word initial positions, and lax elsewhere. The phonology of Turo, Gato, and Mashile are like that of Konso, whereas the phonology of Bussa is like that of Gidole.

Regarding morphophonemic alternations, the epenthetic vowel *i* is inserted after a cluster as in Konso and Gidole *kirp-* 'dance' followed by *-te* is realized as *kirpite* 'she danced'. The alveolar nasal *n* in Konso becomes both *n* and *ŋ* in Gidole as the first person prevocalic clitic *in-* in Konso becomes *heŋ-* in Gidole. Besides, Konso and Gidole *t* is realized as *n* before *n* as in Konso and Gidole *waat-* 'roast' and *–ne* realized as *waanne* 'we roasted it'. The conclusion drawn about the membership of Konsoid is similar to those which had previously been proposed. That is, this study also considers Konsoid as a dialect chain.

The more recent work on the Konsoid subgroup was Wondwosen's (2020a). In this work, Wondwosen compares the phonemic inventory, gemination, phonotactics and syllable structures of the three members in order to determine their phonological similarities and differences. The findings of the study show that Konsoid subgroup seems currently split into two independent languages. That is, Konso on the one hand, and Diraytata and Mosittacha on the other hand. However, these findings perhaps need to be further substantiated by lexical, morphological and syntactic contrasts.

In the literature review above the gaps in the internal classification of the Konsoid group are enormous. That is, Bender's (1971) study show that the

three members share a low value of lexicostatistical percentage ranging from 51% and 62% out of 98% items. However, Black's (1973a) work considers the three members as a dialect chain. Contrary to this, Wondwosen's (2020a) work suggests that the Konsoid subgroup split into two: Konso language, and Diraytata and Mosittacha dialect chain. The question about the internal structure of the Konsoid subgroup is not adequately answered.

The present study is, therefore, meant to address this question by making a lexicostatistical, morphological and syntactic contrast of the three members. The lexicostatistical contrasts will be made by using the 100-Word List (Swadesh 1955). The morphological contrast subsumes nouns, pronouns and verbs together with their inflections and derivations. The syntactic contrasts include word order, relative clauses and focus systems.

The data for the present study were collected in two fieldtrips to Konso zone and Diraashe district. The first trip was for one month from January 2022 and the second trip was for one month from April 2022. The Konso data were collected from *Kabino Sangogo* (age 68), *Shakkayto Orkayya* (age 58), and *Birke Gersimo* (age 40). The Diraytata data were collected from *Terefe Yohannes* (age 58), *Temare Dagne* (age 55), and *Tenagne Dagu* (age 45). The Mosittacha data were collected from *Gezachew Desalegne* (age 66), *Zewde Chiro* (age 62) and *Yiftu Kuyisa* (age 44). In the data transcription IPA is used. Vowel length is represented by doubling a vowel and consonant gemination is represented by doubling a consonant.

The paper has five sections. Section two, provides the lexicostatistical contrast and section three presents the morphological contrast. Section four, considers syntactic contrast, and under section five the major findings of the study will be summarized.

2. Lexicostatistical Contrast

The lexicostatistical percentage is computed using Bender's (1971:169) word list. This word list is a modified version of "the Swadesh 100-word list" which is customized in accordance with the experience in the Ethiopian field. The similarity among the members is determined by the number of cognates. The judgment on actual cognates was made on regular phonological

correspondence. Moreover, words in the lexicostatistical list that have CVC correspondence are also taken as probable cognates (for the details see Bender 1969). Thus, the result of the value of the lexicostatistical percentage shared between its three members show that out of the 100-word list, Konso and Diraytata share 63%, Konso and Mosittacha share 55%, Diraytata and Mosittacha share 77% cognates. The range is between 55% and 77% out of 100 items. This percentage relationship shows that Diraytata and Mosittacha are more closely related to each other (at 77%) than either is to Konso. On the contrary, Konso and Mosittacha are less closely related to each other (at 55%) than either is to Diraytata. The higher percentage between Diraytata and Mosittacha tends to indicate greater lexical similarity. The percentage result above 70% is generally indicative of mutual intelligibility (Black 1973a:7), (for the full presentation of the data cf. appendixes A-C).

3. Morphological Contrast

In this part, nouns, pronouns and verbs of the three members will be contrasted.

3.1 Noun inflections

3.1.1 Case

In Konso, nominative case is marked by the suffix -ʔ. This marker attaches to proper names in a subject position as shown in example (1). However, common nouns do not distinguish nominative and accusative cases (for the details cf. Ongaye 2013).

1 *shakko-ʔ* *χarʃa* *i-ɗam-aj*
kappolo-NOM beans FOC- eat- PRF.3M
'Kappolo ATE[3] beans.'

In Diraytata, the subject case has two forms: focused subject or non-focused subject. In the former case, the noun in the subject position occurs in its citation form such as *pillaw* 'knife', *maaka* 'snake' and *ʔinant* 'girl' whereas in the latter case, the noun in the subject position attaches the suffixes: *-at* to a masculine noun that ends in a consonant or *–ot* to a masculine noun that ends in a vowel and *-i* to all feminine nouns as the examples in (2) illustrate.

[3] The gloss of a constituent that is focused is written in capital letters.

2	a	*pillaw-at*	
		knife.M-NFS	'knife'
	b	*maak-ot*	
		snake.M-NFS	'snake'
	c	*ʔinant-i*	
		girl.F-NFS	'girl'

In Mosittacha, the subject has two forms: focused subject or non-focused subject. In the former case, the noun in a subject position occurs in its citation form as *pillawa* 'knife', *ʔinantʃa* 'girl', *ɗatikko* 'Datikko' and *ɗatto* 'Datto' whereas in the latter case, it attaches either the suffix *–ntʃì* or *-tʃa* regardless of the gender of a noun. The suffix *–ntʃì* attaches to a proper noun whereas the suffix *-tʃa* attaches to a common noun as shown in example (3).

3	a	*pillawa-tʃa*	
		knife.M-NFS	'lion (m)'
	b	*ʔinentʃe –tʃa*	
		girl.F –NFS	'girl'
	c	*ɗatikko-ntʃì*	
		'datikko.M-NFS	'Datikko (m)'
	d	*ɗatto-ntʃì*	
		datto.F-NFS	'Datto (f)'

Regarding the accusative case marking, all the three members do not morphologically mark accusative case. The citation form of a noun is used as the accusative form.

Dative case in Konso is marked by the morpheme *-ʔ*, in Diraytata it is marked by *-(a)s* and in Mosittacha it is marked by the morpheme *–hhi* as the following examples illustrate.

4	a	*kappooli-ʔ*	*piʃaa*	*apittu-ʔ*	*i-ɗaaʃ-aj*
		kappoole-NOM	water	apittu-DAT	3-give-PRF
		'Kappoole gave water to Apittu.'			

b	*kussijj-at*	*hak'*	*kuttinnajjo-s*	*he-ɗaaj-i*
	kussijja-NFS	water	kuttinnajju-DAT	FOC-give-PRF

'Kussiyya gave water to Kittonnayyu.'

c	*ɗatikko-ntʃi*	*piʃe*	*ɗatto-hhi*	*he-ɗaaj-e*
	datikko-NFS	water	datto-DAT	FOC-give-PRF

'Datikko gave water to Datto.'

Instrumental case in Konso is marked by the suffix *–n*, in Diraytata it is marked by the morpheme *–an* and in Mositтacha it is marked by the morpheme *–nne*. Consider the following examples:

5	a	*kappooli-ʔ*	*faasita-n*	*ɠojra*	*i-mur-aj*
		kappole-NOM	axe-INST	tree	3-cut- PRF

'Kappole cut a tree with an axe.'

	b	*kussijj-at*	*k'ottot-an*	*k'ojr*	*he-mur-i*
		kussijja-NFS	axe-INST	tree	FOC-cut-PRF

'Kussijja cut (a) tree with an axe.'

	c	*ɗatikko-ntʃi*	*k'ottota-nne*	*k'ojra*	*he-mur-e*
		datikko-NFS	axe-INST	tree	FOC-cut-PRF

'Datikko cut (a) tree with an axe.'

The following similarities have been observed between the members. All the members do not morphologically mark accusative case. The citation form of a noun occurs in the object position. Regarding their differences, Konso has a nominative suffix *-ʔ* for proper names and pronouns whereas common nouns are not marked for nominative case. In both Diraytata and Mositтacha, a subject noun is marked for case only when a non-subject constituent is focused. However, a focused subject occurs in its citation form without a case marker. In Diraytata, a masculine non-focused subject noun attaches the morpheme *–at* or *–ot* and a feminine noun attaches *–i* whereas Mositтacha attaches the morpheme *-ntʃi* for proper names regardless of the gender of a proper noun, and *-tʃa* for non-focused subject common nouns. But, when the subject is focused it occurs in its citation form without case. Moreover, all the members use different marking for dative case. For example, Konso marks by the suffix *-ʔ*, Diraytata marks by the suffix *-(a)s* and Mositтacha

marks by the suffix *–hhi*. Similarly, instrumental case in the three members is marked differently. For example, Konso marks by the suffix *-n*, Diraytata marks by the suffix *-an* and Mosittacha marks by the suffix *-nne*.

3.1.2 Number

Konso uses two strategies in marking number: by attaching a plural suffix to a singular noun or by geminating the final consonant of a singular noun. Consider the following examples:

6		Base	Plural marker	Plural form	Gloss
	a	*maakaa*	*-ɗɗaa*	*maakaaɗɗaa*	'snakes'
	b	*muukuta*	*-wwaa*	*muukutawwaa*	'frogs'
	c	*farta*	*-ɗaa*	*fartaɗaa*	'horses'
	d	*okkatta*	*-ajaa*	*okkajaa*	'cows'
	e	*ilkitta*	*-ijja*	*ilkijja*	'teeth'
	f	*ɗikla*	*-alla*	*ɗiklallaa*	'elbows'
	g	*tika*	*-kk*	*tikka*	'houses'

The examples in (6a-f) show plural nouns formed by attaching plural suffixes. The suffixes are *-ɗɗaa*, *-wwaa*, *-ɗaa*, *-ajaa*, *-ijjaa* and *-alla*. Example (6g) illustrates plural formed by geminating the final consonant of the base.

In Diraytata, plural noun is formed by attaching plural suffixes to a singular noun or by geminating of base final consonant of a singular noun as the following examples illustrate:

7		Base	Plural marker	Plural form	Gloss
	a	*alwt*	*-aɗa*	*alwtaɗa*	'sisters'
	b	*koʔannet*	*-awwa*	*koʔannawwa*	'frogs'
	c	*ikkiret*	*-a*	*ikkira*	'louses'
	d	*k'ililajt*	*-(j)ja*	*kililajja*	'monkeys'
	e	*silf*	*-alla*	*silfalla*	'irons'
	f	*mura*	*-rr*	*murra*	'forests'

Plural noun is formed in Diraytata by attaching the plural morphemes *-aɗa*, *-awwa*, *-a*, *-(j)ja* and *-alla* as shown in (7a-e). Moreover, plural can also be formed by geminating base final consonant as in (7f).

In Mosittacha, plural noun is formed by attaching the plural morphemes -*adɗa*, -*wwe*, and -*jja*to a singular noun as in (8a-c) or by geminating base final consonant of a singular noun as in (8d).

8		Base	Plural marker	Plural form	Gloss
	a	*pillawa*	*-adɗa*	*pillawadɗa*	'knifes'
	b	*luuha*	*-awwa*	*luuhawwe*	'anklets'
	c	*kupalitʃa*	*-jja*	*kupalijja*	'fingers'
	d	*sura*	*-rr*	*surra*	'ropes'

When we contrast number marking among the members, all the members form plural by geminating base final consonant or by attaching the plural suffixes: *-(a)wwa* and *-(ij)ja*. Regarding the difference, Konso and Mosittacha use the suffix *-adɗa* but Diraytata does not. Similarly, Konso and Diraytata use the plural morphemes: *-(a)dɗa(a)* and *-alla* but Mosittacha does not. Konso has a plural morpheme *-ajaa* but Diraytata and Mosittacha do not. Finally, Diraytata has a plural morpheme *-a*, but Konso and Mosittacha do not.

3.1.3 Gender

Konso has three gender systems: masculine is designated by the suffix *-aj*, feminine by suffix *–t*, and plural gender by the suffix *-n* (Mulugeta et al 2013, Mous 2008 and Ongaye 2013). Consider the following illustrative examples:

9	a	*iʃa - ʔ*	*i-ɗej-aj*
		he-NOM	3-come- PRF
		'He came.'	
	b	*iʃeena-ʔ*	*i-ɗej-t-i*
		she-NOM	3-come-3F-PRF
		'She came.'	
	c	*karma-adɗaa-siniʔ*	*i-toj̲-i-n*
		lion-PL-DEF.P	3-die-PPF-PL
		'The lions died.'	

Diraytata distinguish three gender systems: masculine is designated by a zero morpheme and feminine by the suffix *–t* and plural by the suffix -n (cf. Hayward 1981). Consider the following examples.

10	a	*ijj-at*	*he-ɗeʔ-i*
		he-NFS	FOC-come-PRF
		'He came.'	
	b	*it*	*he-ɗeʔ–t-i*
		she	FOC-come-3F-PRF
		'She came.'	
	c	karm-aɗ-an	he-toj-i-n
		'lion-PL-DEF-P	FOC-die-PRF-P
		'The lions died.'	

Contrary to Konso and Diraytata, Mosittacha distinguish two gender systems: masculine is designated by zero morpheme and feminine by the suffix *-tʃ* (cf. Wondwosen 2020b). This is illustrated in (11).

11	a	*ijjo-tʃa*	*he-ɗeʔ-e*
		he-NFS	FOC-come-PRF
		'He came'	
		itʃa	*he-ɗeʔ-tʃ-e*
		she	FOC-come-3F-PRF
		'She came.'	

Konso and Diraytata have three genders: masculine, feminine and plural, whereas Mosittacha has two genders: masculine and feminine. Konso and Diraytata have plural gender which is not found in Mosittacha. Moreover, Konso has the masculine gender suffix *-aj* but in both Diraytata and Mosittacha masculine gender is marked by a zero morpheme. Feminine gender is marked by the suffix -t in Konso and Diraytata, but it is marked by the suffix *-tʃ* in Mosittacha.

3.1.4 Definiteness

In Konso there is no indefinite marker. Hence, the citation form of a noun is used as indefinite. However, there are two definite marker morphemes: *-siʔ* and *-siniʔ*. The former is suffixed to either plural or singular masculine and feminine nouns whereas the latter is suffixed to a noun with plural gender as the following examples illustrate:

12	a	*karma-siʔ*	*i-toʔ-aj*
		lion-DEF.M/F	3-die-PRF[3M]
		'The lion died.'	
	b	*karmaɗaa-siniʔ*	*i-toʔ-i-n*
		lions-DEF.P	3-die-PRF-P
		'The lions died.'	

In (12) the definite marker morpheme for both masculine and feminine gender is *-siʔ* and for plural gender is *-siniʔ*.

In Diraytata, there is no indefinite marker. The citation form of a noun is used as indefinite form. However, definite nouns are morphologically marked by the suffixes: *-in(ett)*, *-se(t)*, *-an* and *-anet* as illustrated in (13) below:

13	a	*karm-ot-in(ett)*	*he-toj-i*
		lion-NFS-DEF	FOC-die-PRF.M
		'The lion DIED.'	
	b	*karm-se(t)*	*toj*
		lion.ABS-DEF	die.PRF
		'THE LION died.'	
	c	*karm-aɗ-an*	*he-toj-en-i*
		lion-PL-DEF	FOC-die-PL-PRF
		'The lions DIED.'	
	d	*karm-aɗ-anet*	*toj*
		lion-PL-DEF	die.PRF
		'THE LIONS died.'	

In (13a), the definite morpheme *–in(ett)* is suffixed to a singular non-focalized subject *karmot* 'lion', in (13b), the suffix *–se(t)* is attached to a singular focused subject *karm* 'lion'. Similarly, in (13c), the morpheme *–an,* is suffixed to a plural non-focalized subject *karmaɗa* 'lions', in (13d), the morpheme *–anet* is suffixed to a plural focalized subject *karmaɗa.*

In Mosittacha, there is no indefinite marker. The citation form of a noun is used as an indefinite form. There are two definite morphemes: *-ni* and *-itʃtʃi*. The former is suffixed to a noun with a non-focalized subject case and the latter is attached to a noun with a focalized subject case as illustrated in (14).

14	a	*karma-tʃi-ni*	*he-toj-e*
		lion-NFS-DEF	FOC-die-PRF
		'The lion DIED'	
	b	*karm-awwe-tʃi-ni*	*he-toj-en-e*
		lion-PL-NFS-DEF	FOC-die-PL-PRF
		'The lions DIED.'	
	c	*karmaj-itʃtʃi̱*	*toj-e*
		lion.ABS-DEF	die-PRF
		'THE LION died.'	
	d	*karma-awwej-itʃtʃi*	*toj-e*
		lion.ABS-PL-DEF	die-PRF
		'THE LION died.'	

In contrasting the definite system among the members, the following similarity has been observed. All the three members do not have indefinite marker morphemes. Regarding the differences, Konso has the definite suffixes *-si?* for both masculine and feminine genders and *-sini?* for plural gender. However, Mosittacha and Diraytata distinguish definite marker that can attach to non-focused subject and focused subject. In Mosittacha, a focused subject attaches the suffix *-ni* and a non-focused subject attaches the suffix *-tʃtʃi* regardless of whether a noun is singular or plural. Thus, Diraytata seems similar to Mosittacha in identifying definite suffix attached to focused and non-focused subjects. However, Diraytata further distinguish the definite marker suffixed to a non-focused singular subject from and a non-focused plural subject, and similarly between a focused singular subject and a focused plural subject.

Regarding definite marking, Diraytata seems closer to Mosittacha than Konso, in that both of them do not have definite marker for plural gender and also both of them distinguish definite forms that can be attached to non-focalized subject and focalized subject.

3.2 Noun Derivations

In this subpart, nouns derived from nouns, nouns derived from adjectives and deverbal nominalizations will be contrasted.

3.2 .1 Nouns Derived from Nouns

In Konso, nouns can be derived from nouns by suffixing *-uma* as in (15).

15		Noun (base)	Suffix	Derived noun	Gloss
	a	*nama*	*-um*	*namuma*	'manhood'
	b	*aappaa*	*-um*	*aappuma*	'fatherhood'
	c	*aajjaa*	*-um*	*aajjuma*	'motherhood'
	d	*inanta*	*-um*	*inantuma*	'girlhood'

In Diraytata, nouns are derived from nouns by suffixing *-uma* as in (16).

16		Noun (base)	Suffix	Derived noun	Gloss
	a	*nam*	*-uma*	*namuma*	'manhood'
	b	*appa*	*-uma*	*appuma*	'fatherhood'
	c	*inkot*	*-uma*	*inkotuma*	'matherhood'
	d	*inant*	*-uma*	*inantuma*	'girlhood'

In Mosittacha, noun is derived from nouns by suffixing *-umaa* as in (17).

17		Noun (base)	Suffix	Derived noun	Gloss
	a	*nama*	*-umaa*	*namumaa*	'manhood'
	b	*lemme*	*-umaa*	*lemmumaa*	'fatherhood'
	c	*inkotʃa*	*-umaa*	*inkotʃumaa*	'motherhood'
	d	*inantʃa*	*-umaa*	*inantʃumaa*	'girlhood'

The examples in (15, 16, 17) show that the nominalizer morphemes in Konso, Diraytata and Mosittacha are: *-uma*, *uma* and *umaa* respectively. The three members seem to have similar nominalizer morphemes.

3.2.2 Nouns Derived from Adjectives

In Konso, noun can be formed from adjectival root by attaching the morpheme *-uma* as shown in the examples (18).

18		Adjective (base)	Suffix	Derived noun	Gloss
	a	*tiim-*	*-uma*	*tiimuma*	'redness'
	b	*kokkook-*	*-uma*	*kokkookuma*	'strength'
	c	*ɗer-*	*-uma*	*ɗeruma*	'tallness'

In Diraytata, nouns can be derived from adjectives by attaching the nominalizer morpheme *-uma* as the following examples show.

19		Adjective (base)	Suffix	Derived noun	Gloss
	a	*room*	*-uma*	*roomuma*	'redness'
	b	*ɗer*	*-uma*	*ɗeruma*	'tallness'
	c	*k'im*	*-uma*	*k'imuma*	'strength'

In Mosittacha, nouns can be derived from adjectival base by attaching the suffix *-umtʃa*. Consider the examples in (20).

20		Adjective (base)	Suffix	Derived noun	Gloss
	a	*rooma*	*-umtʃa*	roomumtʃa	'redness'
	b	*ɗeera*	*-umtʃa*	ɗeerumtʃa	'tallness'
	c	*k'ime*	*-umtʃa*	k'imumtʃa	'strength'

When we contrast the morphemes –uma (both in Konso and Diraytata) with *-umtʃa*, in Mosittacha, it seems that the nominalizer morpheme in Konso and Diraytata have identical morpheme which is different from Mosittacha.

3.2.3 Deverbal Nominalizations

In Konso, agent noun is formed form an active verbs by suffixing the morpheme *-ampajta* as shown in (21).

21		Verb (base)	Suffix	Derived noun	Gloss
	a	*ukt-*	*-ampajta*	*uktampajta*	'drinker'
	b	*ɗam-*	*-ampajta*	*ɗamampajta*	'eater'
	c	*iʃʃ-*	*-ampajta*	*iʃʃampajta*	'killer'

In Diraytata, agent noun is derived from an active verb by suffixing the morpheme *-ampajt* as in (22).

22		Verb (base)	Suffix	Derived noun	Gloss
	a	*uk-*	*-ampajt*	*ukampajt*	'drinker'
	b	*ɗam-*	*-ampajt*	*ɗamampajt*	'eater'
	c	*ikajj-*	*-ampajt*	*ikajjampajt*	'killer'

In Mosittacha, agent noun is formed by attaching the suffix *-anpajtʃa* to an active verb as in (23).

23		Verb (base)	Suffix	Derived noun	Gloss
	a	*uhotʃa*	*-ampajtʃa*	*uhampajtʃa*	‘drinker’
	b	*ɗametʃa*	*-ampajtʃa*	*ɗamempajtʃa*	‘eater’
	c	*ikasotʃa*	*-ampajtʃa*	*ikasampajtʃa*	‘killer’

By the same token, in Konso, action noun is formed by attaching the suffix *-anta* to masculine and *-antaa* to feminine nouns as in (24).

24		Verb (base)	Suffix	Derived noun	Gloss
	a	*keer-*	*-anta*	*keeranta*	‘running’
	b	*piʔ-*	*-anta*	*piʔanta*	‘falling down’
	c	*tooj-*	*-anta*	*toojanta*	‘seeing’

In Diraytata, action noun is formed by attaching the suffix *-ant*. Consider the examples in (25).

25		Verb (base)	Suffix	Derived noun	Gloss
	a	*feel-*	*-ant*	*feelant*	‘running’
	b	*sunk-*	*-ant*	*sunkant*	‘falling down’
	c	*tooj-*	*-ant*	*toojant*	‘seeing’

In Mosittacha, action noun is derived by attaching the morpheme *-tʃa*. This is shown in (26) below.

26		Verb (base)	Suffix	Derived noun	Gloss
	a	*feele*	*-tʃa*	*feeletʃa*	‘running’
	b	*sunke*	*-tʃa*	*sunketʃa*	‘falling down’
	c	*tʃooje*	*-tʃa*	*tʃoojetʃa*	‘seeing’

When we contrast deverbal derivation in the three members, the agent noun in Konso is derived by attaching the suffix *-ampajta*, in Diraytata by attaching *-ampajt* (the final vowel *a* is deleted) and in Mosittacha by attaching *-ampajtʃa* (the final consonant t is changed in to *tʃ*). But, in deriving action nominal all the three members have different forms: Konso *-anta(a)*, Diraytata *-ant* and Mosittacha *-tʃa*.

3.3 Pronouns

In this sub-part, personal pronouns, possessives, reflexives and reciprocal pronouns in the three members will be contrasted.

3.3.1 Personal Pronouns

The personal pronouns of Konso are given in the table below:

Person	Subject pronouns	Object pronouns
1sg.	*anti*	*ana*
2sg.	*atti*	*ke*
3msg.	*iʃa*	
3fsg.	*iʃeena*	
1pl.	*inu*	
2pl.	*iʃìna*	
3pl.	*iʃoonna*	

Table 1. Personal Pronouns of Konso

In Konso, first person and second person singular pronouns distinguish subject and object forms. However, all the other pronouns do not distinguish subject and object forms and hence they are used both in the subject and object position interchangeably.

Regarding the personal pronouns in Diraytata consider the following table.

	Subject pronouns		Object pronouns
	NFS	FS	
1sg.	*antot/antu*	*ana*	*ana*
2sg.	*attit*	*he(ɗ)*	*he(ɗ)*
3msg.	*ijjat*	*ijj*	*ijj*
3fsg.	*it*	*it*	*it*
1pl.	*innot*	*innu*	*innu*
2pl	*innat*	*inn*	*inn*
3pl	*ijjaa*	*ijjaa*	*ijjaa*

Table 2. Personal pronouns of Diraytata

In Diraytata, subject personal pronouns appear in two case forms: non-focalized subject (NFS) and focalized subject (FS) forms. When the subject pronoun is not focused it occurs in its non-focalized subject pronoun form. But, when the subject pronoun is focused it occurs in a focalized subject (FS) pronoun form and the form is identical to its citation form (for the details cf. Wondwosen 2006:57-58). However, the third person feminine *it* 'she' and

the third person plural pronoun *ijjaa* 'they' are invariable whether the subject is focused or not.

The pronoun system of Mosittacha is presented in the table below.

	Subject pronouns		Object pronouns
	NFS	FS	
1sg.	*antʃo*	*ana*	*ana*
2sg.	*atʃtʃi*	*heʔe*	*heʔe*
3msg.	*ijjatʃa*	*ijja*	*ijja*
3fsg.	*itʃa*	*itʃa*	*itʃa*
1pl.	*innotʃa*	*inno*	*inno*
2pl	*innatʃa*	*inna*	*inna*
3pl	*ijjotʃa*	*ijjo*	*ijjo*

Table 3. Personal pronouns of Mosittacha

In Mosittacha, subject personal pronouns occur in two case forms: non-focalized subject pronoun and focalized subject pronoun forms. That is, when the subject pronoun is not focused it occurs in a non-focalized subject form and when the subject pronoun is focused it occurs in a focalized subject pronoun form. This form is identical to the citation form of a pronoun.

When we contrast the pronoun systems among the members we can observe the following similarity. The first person singular object pronoun *ana* 'I' is identical in form in the three members. However, the three members differ in the form of their focused and non-focused subject pronoun forms. For example, Konso does not distinguish between focused and non-focused subject pronouns. However, Diraytata and Mosittacha use different forms for focused and non-focused subject pronouns. Thus, Diraytata and Mosittacha seem to have similar personal pronoun forms compared to Konso.

3.3.2 Possessive Pronouns

Possession in Konso is expressed by independent and dependent pronouns. The independent possessive pronouns are given in table (4).

Person	Possessive pronouns	Gloss
1sg	χajju	'mine'
2sg	χaajti	'your (sg)'
3msg	χaadɨ	'his'
3fsg	χaadi	'her'
1pl	χannu	'ours'
2pl	χaajʃin	'yours (pl)'
3pl	χaajʃu	'theirs'

Table 4. Independent possessive pronouns of Konso (Ongaye 2013:133)

The dependent possessive forms are given in table (5).

Possessor	Possessed (m/f)	Possessed (p)
1sg	*-awu*	*-jju*
2sg	*-ajti*	*-tti*
3msg	*-adɨ̂*	*-adɨ̂*
3fsg	*-adɨ̂*	*-adɨ̂*
1pl	*-ajnu*	*-nnu*
2pl	*-ajʃin*	*-ssin*
3pl	*-ajʃuʔ*	*-ssuʔ*

Table 5. Dependent possessive pronouns of Konso (Ongaye 2013: 131)

Under table (4), independent possessive pronouns do not distinguish gender, whereas the dependent possessive pronouns distinguish the gender of the possessed as the examples in table (5).

Diraytata has both independent and dependent possessive pronouns. The independent possessive pronouns distinguish masculine and feminine gender only as shown in table (6).

Possessor	Possessed (m)	Possessed (f)
1sg	*hekaw*	*heketaw*
2sg	*hekajy*	*heketajt*
3msg	*hekajj*	*heketajj*
3fsg	*hekadɗ*	*heketadu*
1pl	*hekajnu*	*heketajnu*

2pl	*hekajn*	*heketajn*
3pl	*hekaɗɗu*	*heketaɗɗu*

Table 6. Independent possessive pronouns of Diraytata

Under table (6), the independent possessive pronouns distinguish gender of the possessed noun. Now let us consider the dependent possessive pronouns.

Possessor	Possessed
1sg	-aw
2sg	-ajt
3msg	-ajj
3fsg	-aɗɗ
1pl	-ajnu
2pl	-ajn
3pl	-aɗɗu

Table 7. Dependent possessive pronouns of Diraytata

In table (7), the dependent possessive pronouns do not distinguish gender of the possessed noun.

In Mosittacha, there are two types of possessive pronouns: independent and dependent possessive pronouns. The independent possessive pronouns distinguish the gender of the possessed noun as in table (8).

Possessor	Possessed (m)	Possessed (f)
1sg	*hekaho*	*heʃaho*
2sg	*hekajtʃi*	*heʃajtʃi*
3msg	*hekajji*	*heʃajji*
3fsg	*hekaɗɗi*	*heʃaɗɗi*
1pl	*hekajno*	*heʃajno*
2pl	*hekajna*	*heʃajna*
3pl	*hekaɗɗo*	*heʃaɗɗo*

Table 8. Independent possessive pronoun of Mosittacha

The dependent possessive pronouns do not distinguish gender of the possessed noun as shown intable (9).

Possessor	Possessed
1sg	*-ho*
2sg	*-jtʃi*

3msg	*-jji*
3fsg	*-ddî*
1pl	*-jno*
2pl	*-jna*
3pl	*-ddo*

Table 9. Dependent possessive pronouns

When we contrast the possessive pronouns among the three members, we can observe the following similarities: (1) All the members have two types of possessive pronouns, the independent and dependent forms, although the forms may not be identical. (2) The dependent possessive pronoun forms seem similar in all the members. Regarding the differences: (1) Konso has one form of independent possessive pronoun whereas Diraytata and Mosittacha have two forms of independent possessive pronouns. (2) Konso has two forms of dependent possessive pronouns whereas Diraytata and Mosittacha have one form of dependent possessive pronoun. The dependent pronouns in both Diraytata and Mosittacha seem similar.

3.3.3 Reflexive Pronouns

In Konso, reflexive reference is marked by the independent morpheme *isi* 'self'. It has an object function and invariable in form as shown in the following examples:

27	a	*anti-ʔ*	*isi*	*in-akk-aj*
		I-NOM	self	1- see-PRF
		'I saw myself.'		
	b	*iʃa-ʔ*	*isi*	*i-mur-aj*
		he-NOM	self	3-cut-PRF
		'He cut himself.'		

Diraytata has a reflexive pronoun with the form *iss*. This pronoun has object function and invariable in form. Consider the following examples.

28	a	*ant-ot*	*iss*	*he-n-akk-i*
		I-NFS	self	FOC-1-see-PRF
		'I saw myself.'		

	b	*ijj-at*	*iss*	*he-mur-i*
		he-NFS	self	FOC-cut-PRF
		'He cut himself.'		

In Mosittacha, the reflexive pronoun is designated by the morpheme *ihha*. This morpheme occurs in the object position and invariable in form as shown in (29).

29	a	*an-tʃo*	*ihha*	*he-n-akk-e*
		I-NFS	self	FOC-1-see-PRF
		'I saw myself.'		
		ijj-tʃa	*ihha*	*he-mur-e*
		he-NFS	self	FOC-cut-PRF
		'He cut himself.'		

When we contrast the reflexive pronouns in the three members we realize that Konso and Diraytata have similar reflexive pronoun forms: *isi* and *iss* respectively but Mosittacha has *ihha*.

3.3.4 Reciprocal Pronouns

In Konso, reciprocity is expressed by the morpheme *oli* 'each other'. This form is invariable. Consider the following examples.

30	a	*iʃoona-ʔ*	*oli*	*lejʃ-i-n*
		they-NOM	RECP	kill.PL-PRF-P
		'They killed each other.'		
	b	*iʃoona-ʔ*	*oli*	*gʔid-i-n*
		they-NOM	RECP	hit.PL-PRF-P
		'They hit each other.'		

In Diraytata, reciprocity is expressed by the morpheme *orr* 'each other'. The morpheme is invariable in form. The following are examples.

31	a	*ijjaa*	*orr*	*he-ʔikaj-en-i*
		they	RECP	FOC-kill-PL-PRF
		'They killed each other.'		
	b	*ijjaa*	*orr*	*he-ɗaj-en-i*
		they	RECP	FOC-hit-PL-PRF
		'They hit each other.'		

In Mosittacha, reciprocal pronoun is designated by the morpheme *orha* 'each other'. The morpheme is invariable. The following are examples.

32 a *ijjo-tʃa* *orha* *he-ʔikaj-en-e*
they-NFS each other FOC-kill-PL-PF
'They killed each other.'

b *ijjo-tʃa* *orha* *he-ɗaj-en-e*
they-NFS each other FOC-hit-PL-PF
'They hit each other.'

The reciprocal morphemes of Konso, Diraytata and Mosittacha are *oli*, *orr* and *orha* respectively.

3.4 Verb Inflections

3.4.1 Imperfective Aspect

In Konso, the imperfective aspect is designated by the suffix *-ni*. This is shown in table (10) using the verb *ɗam-* 'eat'.

Person	Imperfective aspect	Gloss
1sg	*ɗam-ni*	'I (will) eat.'
2sg	*ɗam-ni*	'You (sg) (will) eat.'
3msg	*ɗam-ni*	'He eats/ will eat.'
3fsg	*ɗam-ni*	'She eats/ will eat.'
1pl	*ɗam-ni-nna*	'We (will) eat.'
2pl	*ɗam-ni-ttan*	'You (pl) (will) eat.'
3pl	*ɗam-ni*	'They (will) eat.'

Table 10. Imperfective aspect paradigm in Konso

In the imperfective paradigm, person markers occur in first person and second person plural forms. For all the remaining other persons there is no person marker on the verb.

In Diraytata imperfective aspect is expressed by the suffix *–in* as shown in table (11).

Person	Imperfective aspect	Gloss
1sg	*ɗam-h-in*	'I (will) eat.'
2sg	*ɗam-h-in-t*	'You (sg) (will) eat.'

3msg	*ɗam-in*	'He eats/ will eat.'
3fsg	*ɗam-in-t*	'She eats/ will eat.'
1pl	*ɗam-h-in-n*	'We (will) eat.'
2pl	*ɗam-h-in-t-an*	'You (pl) (will) eat.'
3pl	*ɗam-in-an*	'They (will) eat.'

Table 11. Imperfective aspect in Diraytata

The imperfective morpheme *-in* occurs in predicate final position in first person singular and third person masculine singular. It occurs preceding person markers in second person singular and plural forms. Moreover, it occurs preceding the number marker morpheme *-an* in first person and third person plural forms. It also occurs preceding gender marker in third person feminine singular.

In Mosittacha, imperfective aspect is designated by the morpheme *-ina* as the following table illustrate.

Person	Imperfective aspect	Gloss
1sg	*ɗam-h-ina*	'I (will) eat.'
2sg	*ɗam-h-in-ʧ-a*	'You (sg) (will) eat.'
3msg	*ɗam-ina*	'He eats/will eat.'
3fsg	*ɗam-in-ʧ-a*	'She eats/will eat.'
1pl	*ɗam-h-in-na*	'We (will) eat.'
2pl	*ɗam-h-in-ʧ-ani*	'You (pl) (will) eat
3pl	*ɗam-in-ani*	'They (will) eat.'

Table 12. Imperfective aspect in Mosittacha

The imperfective aspect morpheme *-in(a)* occurs in verb final position in first person and third person masculine singular. It occurs preceding person marker in second person singular and also it occurs preceding gender marker in third person feminine singular. By the same token, it occurs preceding number marker in first person, second person and third person plural forms.

The imperfective marker in Konso is *-ni*, in Diraytata it is *-in* and in Mosittacha it is *-ina*. Thus, the imperfective markers among the three members seem similar. In Konso, except for first person and second person plural forms, in all the other forms there is no person marking on the verb.

But in Diraytata and Mosittacha person markers occur in first person, second person singular and plural forms. Moreover, in Diraytata and Mosittacha the imperfective aspect occurs in verb final position in first person and third person singular. It also occurs preceding the first person and third person plural number markers in both Diraytata and Mosittacha. Thus, in the imperfective paradigm Diraytata and Mosittacha are closer to each other than Konso.

3.4.2 Perfective Aspect

The perfective aspect morpheme for first person singular and third person masculine singular is *-aj* and for all the other pronouns is *-e* (Black 1973a:39) as shown in table (13).

Person	Perfective aspect	Gloss
1sg	*in- ɗam-aj*	'I ate.'
2sg	*iɗ-ɗam-t-e*	'You (sg) ate.'
3msg	*i-ɗam-aj*	'He ate.'
3fsg	*i-ɗam-t-e*	'She ate.'
1pl	*in-ɗam-n-e*	'We ate.'
2pl	*iɗ-ɗam-t-en-e*	'You (pl) ate.'
3pl	*i-ɗam-en-e*	'They ate.'

Table 13. Perfective aspect paradigm of Konso

The perfective aspect morpheme *-e* occurs in verb final position following person marker in second person singular, and gender marker in third person feminine singular. Moreover, the perfective aspect marker *-aj* occurs in verb final position in first person and third person masculine singular forms. First person marker is prefixed on a verb whereas second person marker is a discontinuous morpheme. In all persons, the perfective aspect marker occurs in verb final position. Moreover, Konso has a preverbal clitic *i-* that occurs in perfective verb forms.

In Diraytata, the perfective aspect is marked by the morpheme *-i* and this morpheme occurs in verb final position in all persons as shown in table (14).

Person	Perfective aspect	Gloss
1sg	*he-n-ɗam-i*	'I ate.'
2sg	*he-ɗ-ɗam-t-i*	'You (sg) ate.'
3msg	*he-ɗam-i*	'He ate.'
3fsg	*he-ɗam-t-i*	'She ate.'
1pl	*he-n-ɗam-n-i*	'We ate.'
2pl	*he-ɗ-ɗam-t-en-i*	'You (pl) ate.'
3pl	*he-ɗam-en-i*	'They ate.'

Table 14. Perfective aspect paradigm of Diraytata

First person marker occurs preceding the verb root and second person marker is a discontinuous morpheme that curcumfix the verb. Besides, the perfective paradigms in Diraytata begin with the preverbal clitic *he-* that occurs in perfective verb forms.

In Mosittacha, the perfective aspect is marked by the morpheme *-e* as shown in table (15).

Person	Imperfective aspect	Gloss
1sg	*he-n-ɗam-e*	'I ate.'
2sg	*he-ɗan-ʧ-e*	'You (sg) ate.'
3msg	*he-ɗam-e*	'He ate.'
3fsg	*he-ɗan-ʧ-e*	'She ate.'
1pl	*he-n-ɗam-in-e*	'We ate.'
2pl	*he-ɗan-ʧ-in-e*	'You (pl) ate.'
3pl	*he-ɗam-in-e*	'They ate.'

Table 15. Perfective aspect paradigm of Mosittacha

The perfective paradigm in Mosittacha begins with a preverbal clitic *he-* that occurs in all perfective verb forms. First person marker occurs preceding a verb root and second person marker is a discontinuous morpheme that curcumfix the verb. The perfective aspect marker occurs in verb final position in all persons.

When we compare the perfective paradigm in the three members, we can observe that Konso has two perfective forms: *-aj* and *-e*. The former occurs

with first person and third person masculine singular forms and the latter occurs with all other persons. However, in Diraytata the perfective marker is the suffix *-i* and in Mosittacha, it is the suffix *-e*. Moreover, Konso has the preverbal clitic *i-* and both Diraytata and Mosittacha have the preverbal clitic *he-* . Thus, in contrasting the perfective paradigm among the three members Diraytata and Mosittacha seem different from Konso.

3.5 Verb Derivations

In this part, we shall consider causative and passive derivations in the three members.

3.5.1 Causatives

In Konso, direct causation is marked by the morpheme *-ʃ* and indirect causation by the morpheme *–atʃtʃiis*. The direct causative has only two participants. The subject who causes the action can be either agentive or non-agentive and the object is a patient that can be affected by the action of the subject. Consider the following examples (taken from Ongaye 2013:139).

33	*nama-siʔ*	*ɠojra*	*i-ɠep-ʃ-aj*
	man-DEF.M/F	tree	3-break-CAUS-PRF[3M]
	'The man broke a tree.'		

In (33), the agent subject *namasiʔ* 'the man' directly acted upon the patient object *ɠojra* 'tree' and the affected object is broken as a result of the action of the subject.

Whereas in the indirect causative there are three participants: the causer, the causee and the patient or the affected entity. The following is example with such form.

34	*apittu-ʔ*	*hellaa-siniʔ*	*ɠojra*	*i-mur-atʃtʃiis-aj*
	apitto-NOM	children-DEF.P	tree	3-cut-caus-PRF[3M]
	'Apitto made the children cut a tree.'			

In (34), we have the causer *apittuʔ* 'Apitto', the causee *hellaasiniʔ* 'children' and the patient object *ɠojra* 'tree' and the causative verb *imuratʃtʃiisaj*.

In Diraytata, there are two types of causative affixes *-i* and *–osi* (for the details see Wondwosen 2006:121). The former attaches to intransitive verbs and the latter attach to both intransitive and transitive verbs as shown in (35).

35 a *kussijj-at* *kittonnajju* *he-kaal-ij-i*
kussijj-NFS kittonnajju FOC-enter-CASU-PRF
'Kussijja took Kittonnajju inside the house'

b *kittampo-t* *kussijja* *he-ʔell-osij-i*
kittampo-NFS kussijja FOC-stand-CAUS-PRF
'Kittampo MADE Kussijja stand.'

c *kittonnajju-t* *kussijja* *k'ojr* *he-k'uur-osi-t-i*
kittonnajju-NFS kussijja tree FOC-cut-CAUS-3F-PRF
'Kittonnajju made Kussijja cut (a) tree.'

The verb *kaal-* 'enter' is intransitive as it subcategorizes one argument, the subject. But in (35a), the causative *-i* attaches to *kaal-* to derive the causative form which is transitive. In this example there are two arguments *Kussijja* and *Kittonnajju* with the grammatical relations subject and object respectively. In (35b), *ʔell-* 'stand' is an intransitive verb that subcategorizes one argument, the subject. When the causative morpheme *–osi* is attached to this verb it becomes transitive verb. As a result, there are two arguments in (35b) *Kittampo* and *Kussijja* the causer subject and the causee object respectively. In (35c), the morpheme *–osi* is attached to a two place predicate resulting with a three place predicate. In this example, *Kittonnnajju* is the grammatical subject of the verb, *Kussijja* is the causee and *k'ojr* 'tree' is a patient object.

In Mosittacha, causative is formed by attaching the morpheme *-ajtʃis* on a verb. The following are examples.

36 a *kittampo-ntʃi* *kussijja* *he-feel-ajtʃis-ij-e*
kittampo-NFS kussijja FOC-ran—CAUS-3M-PRF
'Kittampo caused Kussijja to ran.'

b	*kussijj-ntʃi*	*kittampo*	*k'ojra*	*he-mur-ajtʃis-ijj-e*
	kussijj-NFS	kittampo	tree	FOC-cut-CAUS-3M-PRF

'Kussiyya caused Kittampo cut (a) tree.'

In (36), the intransitive verb *feel-* 'run' and the transitive verb *mur-* 'cut' take the morpheme *–ajtʃis*. This shows that the morpheme *-ajtʃis*, in Mosittacha, is used for both intransitive and transitive verbs.

When we contrast the causative morphemes in the three members, we can observe that Konso has two: *-ʃ* and *-atʃtʃiis*, Diraytata has two: *-i* and *–osi,* whereas Mosittacha has one: *-ajtʃis*. From the foregoing discussion on causative forms, we can conclude that the causative morphemes *-ajtʃis* in Mosittacha seems similar to the indirect causative morpheme *-atʃtʃiis* in Konso. But the causative morphemes of Diraytata are different from the causative morphemes of Konso and Mosittacha.

3.5.2 Passives

In Konso, passive is formed from a transitive verb by attaching the morpheme *–am* as shown in (37).

37	a	*ɠojra-siʔ*	*i-mur-am-aj*
		tree-DEF.M/F	3-cut-PASS-PRF
		'The tree was cut.'	
	b	*iʃa-ʔ*	*i-iʃʃ-am-aj*
		he-NOM	3-kill-PASS-PRF
		'He was killed.'	

The examples in (37) are passive sentences as they attach the passive suffix *-am* to the transitive verb *mur-* 'cut' and *iʃʃ-* 'kill'.

In Diraytata, passive is formed from a transitive verb by attaching the morpheme *-am* as illustrated in (38).

38	a	*k'ojr-at*	*he-k'uur-am-i*
		tree-NFS	FOC-cut-PASS-PRF
		'The tree was cut.'	

	b	*ijj-at*	*he-ikaws-am-i*
		he-NFS	FOC-kill-PASS-PRF
		'He was killed.'	

In (38), the verb *k'uur*- 'cut' and *ikaj*- 'kill' suffix the morpheme -*am* and they became *k'uuram*- 'be cut' and *ikawsam*- 'be killed'.

In Mosittacha, passive is formed from a transitive base by suffixing the morpheme *–am*. This is shown in (39).

39	a	*k'ojra-tʃa*	*he-mur-am-e*
		tree-NFS	FOC-cut-PASS-PRF
		'The tree was cut.'	
	b	*ijja-tʃa*	*he-ikaj-am-e*
		he-NFS	FOC-kill-PASS-PRF
		'He was killed.'	

In (39), the passivizer morpheme *–am* is attached to transitive verbs *mur*- 'cut' and *ikaj*- 'kill'.

4. Syntactic Contrast

In this part, word order, relative clause and focus structure will be considered

4.1 Word Order

4.1.1 Word Order in a Noun Phrase

The following examples illustrate constituents of a noun phrase in Konso.

40	a	*χorma*	
		ox-NOM	
		'an ox'	
	b	*inanta-siʔ*	
		girl-DEF	
		'the girl'	
	c	*nama-siʔ*	*sedìʔ*
		man-DEF	this
		'this man'	
	d	*χorma-awu*	
		Ox-1SG.POSS	
		'my ox'	

e	*nama-siʔ*	*kapp-a*
	man-DEF	fat-M
	'the fat man'	
f	*farta-ɗaa*	*lakki*
	horse-PL	two
	'two horses'	

A noun phrase in Konso may consists of: bare noun *χorma* 'an ox' as in (40a), head noun with definitive suffix *inanta-siʔ* 'the girl' as in (40b), head noun with demonstrative suffix *nama-siʔ sedìʔ* 'this man' as in (40c), head noun with possessive suffix *χorma-awu* 'my ox' as in (40d), head noun followed by a modifying adjective *nama-siʔ kappa* 'the fat man', and head noun followed by quantifiers *fartaɗaa lakki* 'two horses' as in (40f).

Constituents of a noun phrase in Diraytata are given in examples (41) below.

41	a	*horm-at*	
		ox-NFS	
		'an ox'	
	b	*inant-i-n*	
		girl-NFS-DEF	
		'the girl'	
	c	*mam-at-in*	*hin*
		man-NFS-DEF	this
		'this man'	
	d	*horm-aw*	
		ox-1SG.POSS	
		'my ox'	
	e	*nam-at-in*	*i-merɗ*
		man-NFS-DEF	ATT- fat
		'the fat man'	
	f	*fart-aɗa*	*lakki*
		horse-PL	two
		'two horses'	

A noun phrase consists of a bare noun *horm* 'an ox', in (41b), the noun phrase contains a head noun with definite suffix inantin 'the girl', in (41c), the head noun is followed by demonstrative *mamatin hin* 'this man', in (41d), the head

noun with possessive suffix *hormaw* 'my ox', in (41e), the head noun is followed by the modifying adjective *namatin imerɗ* 'the fat man' and in (41f) the head noun is followed by quantifier *fartaɗa lakki* 'two horses'.

Constituents of a noun phrase in Mosittacha are given in examples (42).

42	a	*horma-ʧa*	
		ox-NFS	
		'an ox'	
	b	*inan-ʧi-ni*	
		girl-NFS-DEF	
		'the girl'	
	c	nama-ʧi-ni	*hiɗɗo*
		man-NFS-DEF	this
		'this man'	
	d	*horma-jjo*	
		ox-1SG.POSS	
		'my ox'	
	e	*nama*	*karma- ʧi-ni*
		man	fat-NFS-DEF
		'the fat man'	
	f	*faras-awwe*	*tammo*
		horse-PL	two
		'two horses'	

In Mosittacha, a noun phrase may contain bare noun *hormatʃa* 'ox' as in (42a), it may contain a head noun with definite suffix *inantʃini* 'the girl', the head noun followed by demonstrative *namatʃini hiɗɗo* 'this man', the head noun with possessive suffix *hormajjo* 'my ox', the head noun followed by adjective modifier *nama karmatʃini* 'the fat man' as in (42e) and the head noun followed by quantifier *farasawwe tammo* 'two horses'

When we compare the word order in noun phrases, all the members have: a bare head noun, head noun with definite affix, head noun with possessive affix, head noun with adjective modifier and head noun with quantifier. Their difference is on demonstrative modifiers. That is, in Konso the demonstrative modifier - *asiʔ* 'this' is a suffix attached to the head noun as in (40c) whereas

in both Diraytata and Mosittacha the demonstratives are independent forms *hin* 'this' as in (41c) and *hiɗɗo* 'this' as in (42), respectively.

4.1.2 Word Order in a Sentence

The structure of simple sentence with overt subject and object in Konso is as shown in (43).

43	a	*iʃeenna-ʔ*	*ɗama*	*i-ɗam-t-e*
		she-NOM	food	3-eat-F-PF
		'She ate food.'		
	b	*anti-ʔ*	*ɠojra-siʔ*	*in-mur-aj*
		I-NOM	tree-DEF	I-cut-PF
		'I cut the tree.'		

The subject NPs: *iʃeennaʔ* 'she' and *antiʔ* 'I' occur preceding the object NPs *ɗama* 'food' and *ɠojrasiʔ* 'the tree'. Moreover, the object NPs occurs preceding the verbs: *iɗamte* 'ate' and *inmuraj* 'cut'. Thus, from this pattern we can learn that the basic word order of sentences in Konso is: Subject-Object –Verb (or SOV).

In Diraytata, simple sentence with overt subject and object has the following structure.

44	a	*it-i*	*ɗama*	*he-ɗam-t-i*
		she-NFS	food	FOC-eat-3F-PRF
		'She ate food.'		
	b	*an-tot*	*k'ojr-set*	*he-n-mur-i*
		I-NFS	tree-DEF	FOC-1-cut-PRF
		'I cut the tree.'		

The basic word order of simple sentences in Diraytata is Subject- Object – Verb (SOV). This can be learned from the examples in (44a-b). In these examples, the subjects *iti* 'she' and *antot* 'I' are subject NPs, *ɗama* 'food' and *k'ojrset* 'the tree' are objects NPs and the verbs *heɗamti* 'ate' and *henmuri* 'cut' occur following the object NPs.

In Mosittacha, simple sentences with overt subject and object may have the following order as shown in (45).

45	a	*itʃa*	*ɗamotʃa*	*he-ɗam-tʃ-e*
		she	food	FOC-eat-3F-PRF
		'She ate food.'		
	b	*antʃo*	*k'ojra-jtʃi*	*he-n-mur-e*
		I.NFS	tree-DEF	FOC-1-cut-PRF
		'I cut the tree.'		

The basic word order in Mosittacha is Subject- Object- Verb (SOV). This can be learned from (45a-b). In these examples, the subjects *itʃa* 'she' and *antʃo* 'I' are subject NPs, and *ɗamotʃa* 'food' and *k'ojrajtʃi* 'the tree' are object NPs. The subject NPs precedes the Object NPs.

4.2 Relative Clauses

In Konso, a relative clause is introduced by the particle *ʔa* and a relative clause follows its head noun. Consider the following example.

46	a	*nama*	[*ʔa*	*χala*	*harreta*	*kaʃ-aj*]	*i-toj̲-aj*
		man	REL	yesterday	donkey	sell-PRF	3-die-PRF
		'The man who sold a donkey yesterday died.'					
	b	harreta	[*ʔa*	*χala*	*nama*	*kaʃ-aj*]	*i-toj̲-aj*
		donkey	REL	yesterday	man	sell-PF	3-die-PF
		The donkey that was sold yesterday died.'					

(46a) is an instance of subject relativization and (46b) is an example of object relativization. In (46a), *nama* 'man' is the subject of both the matrix clause verb *toj*- 'die' and the relative clause verb *kaʃ*- 'sell'. Similarly, in (46b), *harreta* 'donkey' is the object of both the matrix clause verb *toj*- 'die' and the relative clause verb *kaʃ*- 'sell'.

In Diraytata, a relative clause occurs following the head noun as shown in (47).

47	a	*nam-at-in*	[*hal*	*harret*	*kaʃ-i*]	*he-toj-i*
		man-NFS-DEF	yesterday	donkey	sell-PF	FOC-die-PRF
		'The man who sold a donkey yesterday died.'				

b	*harret*	[*hal*	*nam-se*	*kaʃ-i*]	*he-toj-i*
	donkey	yesterday	man-DEF	sell-PF	FOC-die-PRF
	'The donkey that the man sold yesterday died.'				

There is no relative particle that introduces a relative clause in Diraytata. From the above examples, we learn that the subject NP *namatin* 'the man' is relativized in (47a), and the object *harret* 'donkey' is relativized in (47b).

In Mosittacha, a relative clause occurs following the subject head noun and preceding the matrix verb as illustrated in (48) below.

48	a	*nama-ʃa*	[*hala*	*harreʃa*	*kaʃ-e-tʃtʃi-ni*]	*he-toj-e*
		man-NFS	yesterday	donkey	sell-PRF-REL-DEF	FOC-die-PRF
		'The man who sold a donkey yesterday died.'				
	b	*harre-tʃa*	[*hala*	*nama-tʃa-ni*	*kaʃ-e-tʃtʃi-ni*]	*he-toj-e*
		donkey-NFS	yesterday	man-NFS-DEF	sell-PRF-REL-DEF	FOC-die-PRF
		'The donkey that the man sold yesterday died.'				

The relative marker suffix *-tʃtʃi* is attached to the relative verb *kaʃ-* 'sell'. In (48) the subject *namaʃa* 'the man' is relativized whereas in (48b) the object NP *harretʃa* 'the donkey' is relativized.

When we contrast the three members, we can observe the following similarities: in all the members, relative clauses follow their head nouns and occur preceding the matrix verb. Their difference is that, Diraytata does not have a relative particle, Konso has a relative particle *ʔa* and Mosittacha has a relative suffix *-tʃtʃi*.

4.3 Focus

Regarding focus in Konso, there are three constituents to be identified. That is, subject noun phrase, verbs and constituents such as compliments or adpositional phrases of adverbial functions. Based on the focused constituents the affirmative declarative tensed verb can come into three paradigmatic sets. This can be illustrated by taking the verb *ɗam-* 'eat'.

	Form A	Form B	Form C	Gloss
	indaamaj	*ndaamaj*	*daamaj*	'I ate.'
	iddaamte	*ddaamte*	*daame*	'You (sg) ate.'
	idaamaj	*daamaj*	*daamaj*	'He ate.'
	idaamte	*daamte*	*daame*	'She ate.'
	indaamme	*ndaamme*	*daame*	'We ate.'
	iddaamteni	*ddaamteni*	*daame*	'You (pl) ate.'
	idameni	*dameni*	*daame*	'They ate.'

Table 16. Focus structure in Konso

The difference between *Form C* and *Form B* is that the former can take the inflectional marker for aspect whereas the latter can take the inflectional affixes for person and aspect. *Form A*, on the other hand, takes the focus, person and aspect marks. In table (16), when *Form A* is used the verb is focused, when *Form B* is used the object NP is focused and when *Form C* is used the subject NP is focused. This can be learned from the examples in (49)

49 a Question: *atti* *iddaamtee?*
'Did you eat?'
Answer: *anti* *indaame*
'I EAT'

b Question: *maana* *ddaamti?*
'What did you eat?'
Answer: *anti* *soha* *ndaame*
'I ate MEAT.'

c Question: *ajno* *daame?*
'WHO ate?'
Answer: *ana* *daame*
'I ate.'

In (49a), *anti* 'I' occurs in its nominative form and the verb occurs in *Form A*. In this sentence, the intension of the speaker is on the eating activity (whether he ate or not) but not on the type of food he ate. Thus, in such sentence the verb is focused. In (49b), the subject NP, *anti* 'I' is in nominative case form and the verb is in *Form B*. In such structure, the speaker focuses on the type of food than the eating activity. In this example, the object NP, *soha* 'meat' is focused. Similarly, in (49c), the subject NP, *ana* 'I' is in

general or absolutive case form and the verb is in *Form C*. In this sentence, the focus of the speaker is on the subject NP, *ana* 'I' but not on the object NP, *soha* 'meat' nor on the verb *ɗam*- 'eat'.

In Diraytata, focus is simultaneously expressed in the verb and noun. The verb occurs in three forms. I will adopt Hayward's (1980, 1981) terminology the Full, Reduced and Neutral forms of a verb. The affirmative declarative tensed verb can come into three paradigmatic sets. This can be illustrated in the following examples by taking the verb *ɗam*- 'eat'.

	Full form	Reduced from	Neutral form	Gloss
	henɗami	*nɗami*	*ɗam*	'I ate.'
	heɗɗanti	*ɗɗamti*	*ɗam*	'You (sg) ate.'
	heɗami	*ɗami*	*ɗam*	'He ate.'
	heɗanti	*ɗamti*	*ɗam*	'She ate.'
	henɗanni	*nɗanni*	*ɗam*	'We ate.'
	heɗɗanteni	*ɗɗanteni*	*ɗam*	'You (pl) ate.'
	heɗameni	*ɗameni*	*ɗam*	'They ate.'

Table 17. Focus structure in Diraytata

The deference between the *Neutral form* and *Reduced form* is that the former can take no inflectional affixes whereas the latter can take the inflectional affixes for person and aspect markers. The Full form takes the focus, person and aspect markers. This is illustrated in (50).

50 a Question: *attit heɗɗantemmo?*
'Did you eat?'
Answer: *antu henɗami*
'I ATE.'

b Question: *maana ɗɗante?*
'What did you eat?'
Answer: *antu soha nɗami*
'I ate MEAT.'

c Question: ajno ɗam?
'WHO ate?
Answer: *an ɗam*
'I ate.'

The *Full form* of the verb is used when the verb *henɗami* 'ate' is focused as in (50a), the *Reduced form* of the verb *nɗami* 'ate' is used when the object NP, *soha* 'meat' is focused as in (50b) and the *Neutral formɗam* 'ate is used when the subject NP *an* 'I' is focused as in (50c).

Similarly, in Mosittacha, the verb occurs in three forms due to focalization. The focused constituents are a subject NP, a verb and a complement phrase (i.e. a phrase having direct or indirect object function, nominal predicate function or adverbial function). This can be illustrated in the following examples by taking the affirmative tensed verb *ɗam-* 'eat'.

	Form A	Form B	Form C	Gloss
	henɗame	*nɗame*	*ɗame*	'I ate.'
	heɗɗantʃe	*ɗɗantʃe*	*ɗame*	'You (sg) ate.'
	heɗame	*ɗame*	*ɗame*	'He ate.'
	heɗantʃe	*ɗantʃe*	*ɗame*	'She ate.'
	henɗamine	*nɗamine*	*ɗame*	'We ate.'
	heɗɗantʃine	*ɗɗantʃine*	*ɗame*	'You (pl) ate.'
	heɗamine	*ɗamine*	*ɗame*	'They ate.'

Table 18. Focus structure in Mosittacha

The difference between *Form C* and *Form B* is that the former can take inflectional affix for aspect whereas the latter can take the inflectional affixes for person and aspect. *Form A*, on the other hand, takes the focus, person and aspect markers. This is illustrated in (51).

51 a Question: *atʃtʃit* *heɗɗantʃemmo?*
'Did you eat?'
Answer: *antʃo* *henɗame*
'I ATE.'

b Question: *maana* *ɗɗantʃe?*
'What did you eat?'
Answer: *antʃo* *soʔa* *nɗame*
'I ate MEAT.'

c Question: ajno ɗam?
'WHO ate?
Answer: *ana* *ɗame*
'I ate.'

In Mosittacha, *Form A* is used when the verb *henɗame* 'ate' is focused as in (51a), *Form B* is used when a complement phrase or object NP, *soha* 'meat' is focused as in (51b), and *Form C* is used when the subject NP *ana* 'I' is focused as in (51c). When we contrast the paradigms in the three members, Diraytata and Mosittacha have a preverbal focus marker prefix *he*- whereas Konso has the preverbal prefix *i*-. Thus, regarding the focus structure Diraytata seems closer to Mosittacha than to Konso.

5. Conclusions

The lexicostatistical analysis of 100 basic vocabularies in the three members show that the percentage cognates shared between Konso and Diraytata is 63%, between Konso and Mosittacha is 55% and between Diraytata and Mosittacha is 77%. These figures show that Diraytata and Mosittacha are closer to each other than Konso.

On the other hand, the morphological contrasts show that Diraytata and Mosittacha are closer to each other than to Konso. In Diraytata and Mosittacha, masculine gender is represented by a zero morpheme. They distinguish definite markers that may attaches to a non-focused and a focused subject noun. They also distinguish between focused and non-focused subject pronouns. The focused subject pronoun forms are identical with the object pronoun forms. On the other hand, Konso is different from the two members in that, nominative case marking in Konso is not sensitive whether the subject noun is focused or not. The masculine gender is represented by the morpheme *-aj*. The definite marker *-siʔ* attaches to both masculine and feminine nouns and the plural nouns attach the morpheme *-siniʔ* in Konso. It does not distinguish between focused and non-focused subject pronoun forms.

When we come to the syntactic contrast, the three members do not have that much significant difference as such. They have the same word order both in a noun phrase and in a sentence. The relative clause follows head nouns. However, they differ in verb focus markers. That is, both Diraytata and Mosittacha have the preverbal clitic *he*- but Konso has the preverbal clitic *i*-.

From the foregoing discussion on the lexicostatistical, morphological and syntactic contrasts complemented with the phonological comparison

(Wondwosen 2020a) among the three members, I can safely conclude that Diraytata and Mosittacha are not distinct languages but rather a dialect chain (or a single linguistic cline) whereas Konso is an independent language in its own. Regarding the internal structure of the Konsoid subgroup, Bender's (1971) lexicostatistical result implies that the three members are unintelligible, whereas Black (1973a, b and 1974) works present Konsoid as dialect chain (or a linguistic cline). Contrary to the above views the present study argue that the Konsoid subgroup split in to Konso and Diraytoid[4]. Diraytoid is a dialect chain that contains Diraytata and Mosittacha which are currently in the process of dividing up into distinct languages.

Abbreviations

1	First person	M	Masculine
2	Second person	NFS	Non-focalized subject
3	Third person	PASS	Passive
ATT	Attributive	P	Plural gender
CAUS	Causative	PL	Plural number
DAT	Dative	POSS	Possessive
DEF	Definite	PRF	Perfective
DEM	Demonstrative	PECP	Reciprocal
F	Feminine	SG	Singular
FOC	Focus	REL	Relative clause
FS	Focused subject	CSA	Central Statistical Authority

Acknowledgements

My special thanks go to the Office of the Director for Research of Addis Ababa University for the generous financial support to undertake the research.

[4] For the sake of simplicity I use the name Diraytoid rather than using Diraytatoid. Diraytoid is a dialect chain consisting of Diraytata and Mosittacha.

References

Bender, M. L. 1969. Chance CVC Correspondences in Unrelated Languages. *Language* 45(3): 519-531.

Bender, M. L. 1971. The Language of Ethiopia: A new lexicostatistical classification and some problems of diffusion. *Anthropological Linguistics,* 13 (5):165-388.

Black, P. D. 1973a. Konsoid: An Example of Extreme Dialectal Differentiation. *A paper submitted to the Conference on African Linguistics* at Queens College, April 1973.

Black, P.D. 1973b. Multidimensional scaling applied to linguistic relationships. *In proceedings of the Second Conference on Lexicostatistics*, held at Universite de Montreal, 19-21 May 1973.

Black, P. D. 1974. *Lowland East Cushitic Subgrouping and Reconstruction*. Ph.D. Dissertation. New Haven: Yale University.

Central Statistical Authority. 2007. *The 2007 Population and Housing Census for Ethiopia*. Results for Southern Nation, Nationalities and People's Region. Vol. 11. Addis Ababa.

Hayward, R. J. 1980. Some Observation on Dirayta (Gidole) Pronouns. In Gideon Goldenberg (ed.), *the Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference of Ethiopian Studies*. Tel-Aviv.

Hayward, R. J. 1981. Nominal Suffixes in Dirayta (Gidole). *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 44 (1):126- 144.

Mous, M. 2008. "Number as an exponent of gender in Cushitic". In Zygmunt Frajzynger & Eric Shay (Eds.) *Interaction of Morphology and Syntax: case studies in Afroasiatic*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. Pp 137-160.

Mous, M. 2012. Cushitic. In Z. Frajzyngier & E. Shay (eds.). *The Afro-Asiatic Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 342-422.

Mulugeta Tarekegn, Maarten Mous and Niels Schiller. 2013. "Plural as a Value of Cushitic gender: Evidence from Gender Congruency Effect Experiments in Konso (Cushitc)": In Greville G. Corbett. *The Expression of Gender*: Berlin/Boston. De Gruyter: pp. 191-214.

Ongaye Oda. 2013. *A Grammar of Konso*. Ph. D. Dissertation. Leiden: Leiden University.

Swadesh, Morris .1955. Towards Greater Accuracy in Lexicostatistic Dating. *International Journal of American Linguistics*. Vol.21. 121-137.

Tucker, A. N. and M. A. Bryan. 1956. Handbook of African languages: Part III: The non-Bantu languages of northeastern Africa. Oxford.

Wondwosen Tesfaye. 2000. The Status of West and North Bussa: a Comparative Study. *Published in the Proceedings of the 14th International Conference of Ethiopian Studies*, Vol.3. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

Wondwosen Tesfaye. 2006. *Aspects of Diraytata Morphology and Syntax: A Lexical- Functional Grammar Approach.* Ph. D. Dissertation. Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU).

Wondwosen Tesfaye. 2020a. The comparative Phonology of Konsoid in *Macrolinguistics*, Vol. 8, No. 2 (serial No. 13), pp. 83-104.

Wondwosen Tesfaye. 2020b. "Number and Gender in Mosittacha" in ZENA LISSAN, Journal of Ethiopian Languages and Cultures, Vol. 29 No.2, pp. 146-172.