Full Length Research Paper

Lexical Loss in Afaan Oromoo, the Case of Central Dialect of North Shawa Zone, Oromia

Bekele Buko Heyu (PhD c) *

College of Humanities, Language Studies and Communication,
Department of Linguistics, Addis Ababa University (Ethiopia)

Email: bukobekele@gmail.com)

Abstract

The article attempts to identify some dying out lexical items within the framework of socio-historical and cognitive model in three (plant, animal and traditional materials) semantic domains. Qualitative research method was used. To investigate lexical loss, different lexical items were gathered through interview and elicitation from elderly native Afan Oromoo speakers of Central dialect. Sixty informants were selected by purposive and snow ball sampling techniques to identify lexical items that have been less used or lost. Then endangered lexical items have been identified. Thus, technological developments led to the replacement of most traditional materials with modern ones. In doing so, cultural loss and other social developments are resulting into the present day society. Finally, the study recommends that these words have been potentially used for classroom lessons and parents should build a habit of using them as a way to reserve its originality and teach the meaning of words to the current generation so as they can become familiar with the meaning and concept of words. Moreover, further studies should have been carried out in Afan Oromoo lexical change.

Keywords: Central dialect, endangerment, lexical loss, North Shawa, Tulama Oromoo

----

----
* Corresponding author.

Axareeraa

Qorannoo kun jechoota xabboo Afaan Oromoo badaa jiran tuuta hiika jechootaa (semantic domain) sadi keessa jiran maloota hawaaseenaafi sammuutiin (socio-historical and cognitive model)tiin adda baaseera. Qorataan kun qorannoo akkamtaatti dhimma ba'eera. Jechoota dagataman xiinxaluuf, tooftaa funaansa ragaa afgaaffiifi Afaanii baasuutti fayyadamuun maanguddoota jaatamni (60) tooftaa kaayyefataafi darbii darbootiin iddattoof filatamaniiru. Haaluma kanaan jechoonni xabboo dagatamuun dhalootaa gara dhalootaatti akka darbaa hin jirre qorannoo kanaan adda ba'eera. Kanaafis guddinni tekinoloojii, irra caalaan meeshaaleen aadaa akka meeshaalee ammayyaatiin bakka bu'an taasiseera.Kun immoo dagatamuu aadaafi afanii fiduun hawaasni akka techinoloojii ammayyaatiin jiraatan taasiseera. Dhumarratti, jechootni xabboo kunneen akka hin badneefi akka hin dagatamneef, akka dubbattootni Afaan kanaa dandeettiifi fedhii jechoota xabbootti fayyadamuu horatan akkasumas dhaloota haaraa akka barsiisan akkasumas kutaa barnootaa keessatti akka itti fayadamuu akka yaada furmaataatti ka'eera. Dhumairrattis, qorattoonni biraa dagatamuu jechootaa Looga Giddugaleessaa tuutaa hiikaa jechootaa (semantic domain) biroo irratti akka qorannoo adeemsisan akka yaada furmaataatti kaa'eera.

Jechoota Ijoo: Afan Oromo, Dagatamuu Jechootaa, Looga Giddugaleessaa, Shawaa Kaabaa

----

1.   Introduction

Afaan Oromoo is a Cushitic language spoken in most parts of Ethiopian empire and northern Kenya. It is considered one of the five most widely spoken languages in Africa (Gragg, 1982). Afaan Oromoo is rich in vocabulary and it is the third most widely spoken language in Africa surpassed only by Arabic and Hausa (Gadaa, 1988; Kebede, 2009). This language is grouped under the Afro-asiatic language family. So, Afaan Oromoo is grouped along with Afar, Somali, Saho and other East Cushitic languages.

Afaan Oromoo is spoken as a native language in one of the nine administrative regional states in Ethiopia called Oromia National Regional State. This regional state has 20 administrative zones. North Shawa is one of them. Several varieties of Afaan Oromoo are spoken in Ethiopia, Kenya and some parts of Somalia. But, few linguists have suggested the classification of Afaan Oromoo dialects in detail. For instance, Kebede (2009) conducted extensive research on Afaan Oromoo dialects and divided them into ten genetic groups. These are Western, Eastern, Central, South-east-north, Wata, Northeast, East, North, Wollo and Raya. The recent work on the classification of Afaan Oromoo dialects is (Feda, 2015). He divided Afaan Oromoo in to six dialects: West, central, Northern, Southern, Southeast and Eastern dialects (Feda, 2015:6). Thus, this study agrees with him for he clearly puts Central dialect as a distinct dialect.

Regardless of some political, economic and cultural factors, there are some natural conditions in which a language or some aspects of it may be endangered. There may be occasions when words no longer have any use due to absence of objects, among the many possible reasons, at least in every day's use. This may result in the extinction of the word. Samuel and Wolde (2015:75) suggested that lexical items can be lost due to globalization and modernization. To this end, human knowledge toward lexical items becomes dying out with the language elements. As a result, the speech community may encounter identity problems, lack of effectively understanding of their environment to search solution to the social and natural problems.

In the same analogy, Central Dialect has gone through such encounters, where some endangered aspects of the words are being observed. Native Central Dialect words have been lost and lots of its elements became out of use in the current discourse. Furthermore some indigenous knowledge dies away with some words in their speech community. Just to cite some examples from elderly, the knowledge that people had to make /k'ank'al:o:/ a 'traditional suck made of goat hide' used for carrying grain, /itil:e:/ 'cattle skin used to sleep on' and /k'andʒili:/ traditional material used to keep water cold' and materials are getting endangered in some aspects.

On the other side, as far as researcher knowledge goes no study has been done on lexical loss in Central Dialect of North Shawa before this work. Considering this gap, the present research focuses on the lexical loss of Central Dialect lexical items from historical point of view. Therefore, this article is believed to be a good beginning for the application of identifying the dying out of Central Dialect lexical items that have occurred over North Shawa Zone of three districts.

The study is valuable for lexicographers who are engaged in the preparation of Afaan Oromoo dictionaries. Again it will contribute to our general knowledge as a source material for future research on the language.

The researcher preferred to limit his study area to Central dialect and focused on lexical loss descriptions in three semantic domains (plant, animals, and traditional objects). The scope of the study can be seen from spoken corpora of three age groups informants. Spoken corpora include narratives, short stories and fables. Furthermore, the researcher limited to discuss lexical loss in nouns word categories.

2. Review of Related Literature
2.1. Language Endangerment
A language is said to be endangered when its speakers cease to use it or use it in an increasingly reduced number of communicative domains; it is also likely no longer transmitted from one generation to the next, and actively spoken by a steadily decreasing

number of speakers (UNESCO, 2003:3) or as Wurm (2003:16) puts, language endangerment leads to the ultimate extinction and disappearance of languages, constitutes the gradual shortfall of the speakers of a language, usually beginning with children, continuing with young adults, middle-aged speakers, aged speakers, until only a few very old speakers are left, with whose death the language becomes extinct.

According to Brenzinger and Graaf (2006) and UNESCO (2003) language endangerment, may be caused primarily by external forces such as military, economic, religious, cultural, or educational subjugation; or internal forces such as a community's negative attitude towards its own language or by a general decline of group identity. These scholarly woks indicate that a substantial number of the languages in the world still spoken today are threatened by extinction. They suggest that creating lasting multipurpose documentation is seen as one major linguistic response to the challenge of the dramatically increased level of language endangerment observable in our times.

In 2003 the UNESCO's Intangible Cultural Heritage Unit's ad hoc committee of linguists also proposed a core set of nine factors to assess the linguistic vitality and degree of language endangerment in a given community. These are intergenerational transmission, absolute number of speakers, proportion of speakers within the total population, loss of existing language domains, response to new domains and media, materials for language education and literacy, governmental and institutional language attitudes and policies, including official status and use, community members' attitudes toward their own language and amount and quality of documentation. These nine factors are a key in assessing language endangerment.

Based on the above factors, linguists classify languages according to their levels of endangerment. A common sense classification made by Crystal (2000:20) recognizes three levels of language endangerment: safe, endangered and extinct. Whereas Grenoble and Whaley (2006: 18) present a six-way classification which captures different levels of endangerment: safe, at risk, disappearing, moribund, nearly extinct and extinct.

Concerning Afaan Oromoo language, as far as number of speakers it has, it is difficult to say that it is endangered. Yet opinions from different informants indicate that it has been losing lots of its lexical items as a result of different factors. In this lexical study the loss of native lexical items is the focus which intends to create awareness to concerned organs as well as individuals so that such endangered lexical items could be reserved before they totally die out.

2.2. Lexical Loss
All human languages are productive in the sense that their speakers are able to produce new words and phrases to fulfill the demand of communication. According to Pole (1999) a language produces new lexical items to fill lexical gaps and others get total or partial lost.

Besides, Varshney (1995:283) classified lexical change into three categories, namely: loss of lexical items, change of meaning and creation of new words. According to him lexical loss is a phenomenon in which a particular use of words disappears or replaced by another word due to internal and external causes.

Just as new words and loan words may be added to a language, words can also be lost from a language due to being old form or their less frequent use. Koopman (1994) states that, lexical loss occurs if a new object which stimulated the acceptance of that lexical item disappears and its substitute also fades out. Likewise, Mahdad (2012:22) suggested that teenagers, tend to avoid some words and replace them by other alternatives. Because many words go out of use and they are substituted by new words that match best the demands of the new generation. As a result, the native words tend to disappear and become therefore lost. Therefore, in this study lexical loss is used to refer to the state where a lexical items become out of use.

Concerning Central dialect the less used of lexical items related animals, plants and traditional material are noticeable in some younger group living in Wachale, Warra Jarso and Girar Jarso districts. When asked to give Afaan Oromoo counterparts for different lists of words in Central Dialect, many youngsters were hardly speaks the native lexical items of the three semantic domains.

2.3. Approaches to the Study of Lexical Loss

Several approaches of language change in terms of sociolinguistics and historical linguistics have been proposed to explain lexical change. Among these, socio-historical and cognitive approaches have been dominant in the study of lexical change. The Socio-historical approach was developed by Vygotsky in 19th century. According to Traugott (1985:158) the primary focus of Socio-historical approach is investigating lexical changes which arose from particular situations as lexical loss, lexical borrowing, semantic change, and new creation and so on. From this point of view lexical loss seems very natural under this approach.

According to Traugott (1985:159) the emphasis of cognitive approach is the conceptual structure and the mental life of the language user as reflected in causation, time, understanding, and so forth. Again cognitive approach is found to be effective in resolving or neutralizing the processes observed in the socio-historical approach. Thus, it can be said that the two models, socio-historical and cognitive can complement each other.

The researcher was therefore employing a combination of the two approaches in analyzing and interpreting lexical loss in Central Dialect. Therefore, in account of all the issues raised in favor of this framework, it was a guide for the researcher to undertake an exploration of lexical loss in Central Dialect.

3. Research Methodology

In this study qualitative method was employed to obtain natural data, because qualitative method allows the researcher to gain access to the motives, actions and reactions of people in the context of their daily life. In order to ensure the originality of data and to provide lexical items to represent the entire targeted population that suited the focus of the study 24 youth (18-28), 21 adult (46-62) and 15 elderly (63+) totally 60 respondents were selected from the three districts of urban and rural area. As far as my knowledge goes 60 is an appropriate to manage data. If it is more than this, it is difficult to manage. If it is less than this, it may not appropriately represent the study population.

Age demarcation is not arbitrary. It depends on the last three consecutive Ethiopia governments. The elderly of (63 and above) were used to cross check whether the collected native words were used in the past or not. Adult or mid age group of (46 – 62) were consulted on assumption that they have the balance of the past and the present while young were consulted in regards of science and technological advancement they encounter with.

In order to get data that stands for the specific objectives, the researcher used elicitation and interview to collect lexical data. Since the required information for the study was identifying the endangered lexical items, the respondents were purposively selected because the study covered different people from different place of birth (urban or rural) and different people that some of them are literate and others are illiterate.

In the open interview, the interviewees were asked to list the endangered lexical items they could recall. The interview method was more preferable than the questionnaire for this study because the informants are mostly illiterate and elderly. The elicitation fits this research as it helps the informants to understand the required lexicons in the contexts of linguistic practices. Moreover, data collection focuses on language performance on endangered words of Central Dialect. The entire response of the language consultants was audio recorded. The recorded words were then categorized, transcribed analyzed and translated into English by researcher.

Purposive and snow ball sampling techniques were adopted. These techniques were preferred because the researcher believed that only few informants of age 63+ can list the endangered words. This is because these people have good exposure towards these lexical items since their childhood days and thus can probably identify words which underwent lexical endangerment.

The analysis of lexical loss in Central Dialect was primarily based on words gathered through the tools that were mentioned above. Here, the words were classified according to their relative semantic domains; plants, animals and traditional objects. The classifications, analysis and discussion of their disappearance were done qualitatively based on contents and research objectives.

4. Results and Discussion

In this section, the findings in relation to lexical loss among lexical items in Central Dialect of North Shawa were presented. Words were identified as total loss and partial loss.

4.1. Lexical loss in Central Dialect

The lists of endangered lexical items of traditional object, plant and animal semantic domains with their transcription are presented below.

A. Lexical Loss in Traditional Objects

According to the information collected from informants, there are traditional materials which are out of function or less used by youth and some elderly used them in their communication. The majority of the lexical items have no roles in the current social, political as well as economic activities.

The results of the study show that traditional materials such as: farm tools, cooking materials, domestic apparatuses and shelters are not available at almost all young generation. Even though, these lexical items have been lost, few of them were used by adult and elderly age group in some cases.

Lexical items that were used in expressing household materials were forgotten day to day and new and modern objects have been replaced.

	Native Lexical Items	Gloss
(1)		
a.	/k'ank'al:o:/	'traditional sack made of goat skin'
b.	/itil:e:/	'cattle skin used to sleep on'
c.	/k'andʒili:/	'material used to fetch water'

The items in (1a-c) less used by younger generation, especially, urban dwellers because it has been replaced by modern plastic bags, mattress and cup respectively. Elderly respondents used the lexical items in their communication.

Words referring to traditional farm tools,

	Native Words	Gloss
(2)		
a.	/la:dana:/	'made of grass, contains about 50 kg. of grain'
b.	/wagala/	'farm tool (metal staple for fastening plow)'

According to elderly informants of rural of the study area dwellers the words referring to traditional farm tools in example (2a&b) are there but the materials are changed as well as

no more roles in younger generation of 18-28 age groups, especially urban dwellers. But few of rural young generation of this age group and many adults and aged people both in towns and countryside have used the lexical items in their communication.

The traditional household materials made of clay.

(3)	Native Afaan Oromoo Lexical Items	Gloss
a.	/gug:uʃi:/	'small store made of soil and stone used to store grain'
b.	/gumbi:/	'made of soil used to store grain'.
c.	/sak'ala:/	'a big store used store grain'
d.	/wac'i:ti:/	' made of clay in which we eat porridge'

The above materials under the pottery technologyhave been not longer used by many young generation of urban area but very few rural young informants have used them in some cases. They have been replaced with modern objects. We can say such kind of lexical change is partial loss or less used.

The traditional household materials made of gourd[a].

(4)	Afaan Oromoo Native Lexical items	Gloss
a	/arad:o:/	'Material used to drink local beer'.
b	/butʃuma/	'milk store'
c	/k'a:nʤili:/	' used to fetch water'
d	/wara:b:i:/	'usedto fetch water which is bigger than /k'a:nʤili:/'

From the table above, 4(a-d) Afaan Oromoo words relating traditional household materials have been lost together with their names in the current time. According to the elderly informants these traditional materials and the terms were used together at the stage of their age. The name of these traditional materials was gradually replaced with modern materials. As a result the name and the materials have been forgotten less used in the current time. The situation shows that material loss may lead to lexical loss.

---

[a]Gourd is a type of large fruit which is often dried and used as a container.

The household materials that were made of horn of cattle,

(5)	Native lexical items	Gloss
a	/wa:nc'a:/	'a cup made of horn'
b	/bu:da/	'big cup made of horn'

From the example, (5a&b) above Afaan Oromoo words relating household materials made of horn have been replaced by modern materials. In case many young generation do not used both the concept and the object of some household materials made of horn. But few adult informants explained us as they hear the words sometimes while elderly were using them in their communication. As a result these lexical items had been endangered or less used in the current times.

Lexical items that have been lost in current generation,

(6)	Native lexical items	Gloss
a.	/korodʒo:/	'wallet; leather bag'
b.	/ da:be:/	'hair style which is plaited in ringlets'
c.	/gasa:/	'traditional rain coat'
d.	/ilil:a:n/	'small bead'
e.	/hank'alba:/	'material used carry baby on back'
f.	/ bilil:e:/	'bottle used to drink local beer
g.	/burungudi:/	'stool with short leg'
h.	/ga:j:a:/	'smoking in a pipe'
i.	/gonga:/	'' materials used to watering cows'
j.	/k'olomʃa:ʃi:/	'traditional tool for decoration'
k.	/le:m:ati:/	' made of grass used to placing food '
l.	/muta:/	'awl'

The objects in example (6a-b) have been lost or changed in form in young generation. But some elderly and adults use the concept at some degree with their age mate. Moreover, traditional household materials (6c-l) have been less used at younger generation both in concept and object. According to elderly informant's justification and researcher's investigation the young generation has hardly used these lexical items in their daily communication. So, these lexical items have been lost in form and less used in concept.

B. Lexical loss in plant Domain

Considering the field data presented, lexical loss in the plant domain covers much of the plant varieties such as trees, vegetables and crops lexical items. These lexical items have been not or less used in ordinary conversation. To clear the doubt, the researcher made an interview involving 6 elderly based on their experiences to mention the plants lexical items that were hardly used or they have totally been lost. To investigate the result in detail, the semantic field was categorized in specific domains: trees, vegetables and grains domains. The following are lexical loss refers to trees sub semantic domain.

(7)	Native lexical items	Gloss
a.	/botoro:/	'a kind of tree (of low land)'
b.	/c'e:ka:/	'a kind of a tree'
c.	/dod:ti:/	'a kind of acacia tree'
d.	/go:su:/	'kind of tree with edible fruit'
e.	/haɗe:s:a/	'a kind of a tree used a stick'
f.	/k'amat';e:/	'plants with thorns prickle'
g.	/hat':e:/	' tree with sharp leaves'
h.	/huɗa:/	'an edible yellow fruit'
i.	/insila:le:/	'tree of a good smell '
j.	/koʃom:i:/	'a kind of tree or its fruits'
k.	/lo:ko:/	'dessert straight tree'
l.	/k'adi:da:/	'greenish bush like tree'
m.	/ruk:es:a/	'tree with broad leaves'
n.	/t'unʤi:ti:/	' tree with full of thorn'

The field data (7a-n) lexical items of plants domain have been lost. Lost in a sense, young generation do not used the lexical items in their conversation in both form and concept level. So, the above words have been less used both in concept and object in young generation. Nowadays youth, understand less the meaning of these native words referring to plants in general and trees in particular.

When we come to lexical loss referring to crops the following words in (8a-f) have been lost.

(8)	Native words	Gloss
a.	/ta:m:ɲe:/	'Kind of barley'
b.	/but:uʤ:i:/	'Kind of wheat'
c.	/sal:t:o:/	'kind of wheat'
d.	/k'at':e:/	'kind of wheat'
e.	/ʃaf:a:n:e:/	'Kind of sorghum'
f.	/ʃokofe:/	'Kind of barley'

The field data (9a-f) varieties that are referring to crops have been lost. As a result new crop varieties came into existence.

Lexical loss referring to grass and other plants are shown in (10a-i).

(10)	Lost Lexical items	Gloss
a.	/ando:de:/	'plant used for washing '
b.	/k'oritʃ:alaga:/	'thick grass grown by water side'
c.	/sa:m:a:/	'stinging'
d.	/hid:i:/	'solanaceous fruit or plant'
e.	/sari:ti:/	' long grass'
f.	/adasi:/	'a kind of fragrant bush'
g.	/do:b:i:/	'nettle'
h.	/k'un:i:/	'tall grass that grown by river side'

As shown in example (10a-h) grasses and other plants lexical items have been used by elderly and adult for different purposes. But, these lexical items have been replaced with new names in the current generation. In case the native plants and their concepts have been lost. So the finding of the study revealed that the existences of new lexical items lead to the loss of native lexical items.

C. Lexical loss in Animals Semantic Domain

The researcher interviewed 6 elderly and adults based on their experiences to mention the animals lexical items that are hardly used or they have totally been lost. To analyze the result in detail the semantics field was categorized in specific domains like: wild animals, domestic animals, birds and insects.

Having the data analysis as a core source of conclusion, it was found out that lexical loss of wild animals domain yielded an important pattern of change; total loss and partial loss. Total loss occurred due to the absence of the animals and concepts where as partial loss occurred due to the absence of the animals among the language users of different age groups. These items are discussed in their specific categories as follows:

Lexical items refer to wild animals,

(11)	Lost Lexical items	Gloss
a.	/le:nc'a/	'Lion'
b.	/arba/	'Elephant'

c.	/bo: j: e:/	'Pig'
d.	/wara:bes:a/	'Hyena'
e.	/sardi:da/	'Fox'
f.	/k'amale:/	'ape'
g.	/k'e:'ransa/	'Tiger'
h.	/kurup'e:/	'gray duiker'
i.	/bosonu:/	'big gray duiker'
j.	/sa:tawa:/	'giraffe'
k.	/a: nko:/	'Young ape'
l.	/ɗaɗ:e:/	'Porcupine'
m.	/hama: go: ta: /	'badger'
n.	/aw:ldi:ges:a/	'genet'
o.	/bo:rte:/	'gray duiker'
p.	/borofa/	'bush buck'
q.	/osole:/	'chipmunk squirrel'
r.	/karkar:o:/	'wild boar'
s.	/gafarsa/	'buffalo'
t.	/hil:e:nsa/	'hare'
u.	/je:j:i:/	'wolf'

From the above examples (11a-u) words were very much used in the dialect. But, in the current time many of them not used or less used due to different factors. The physical absence of the animals results in partial[b] loss in many current generation of the study area of urban and rural area. In most cases the youth informants do not know these animals physically but they heard the name of these animals through education or their parents at a concept level.

On the contrary, as of the physical distance even the youth generations are far apart from knowing the animal physically. On the contrary, this doesn't work for few urban dwellers that visited zoo and watched national geography knew better the wild animals physically. More or less the above wild animals have been partially lost in young generation of rural dwellers in general and young generation of urban dwellers in particular.

Lexical loss referring to birds;

(12)	Lost Lexical items	Gloss
a.	/c'ir:i:/	'red beaked bird that eats ticks'
b.	/c'uk'uli:sa/	'bird with dark blue color (a kind of bird)'
c.	/gogor:i:/	'partridge'

---

[b] the absence of either in objects or concepts

d.	/ʤaʤ :u:/	'owl'
e.	/mako:di:/	'pigeon'
f.	/k'ura:/	'crow'
g.	/ʤo:bira/	'vulture'
h.	/simbirahalkani:/	'bat'
i.	/sololija:/	'guinea fowl'

By using semi-structured interview and questionnaire, the researcher collected lexical items related to lexical loss in birds' specific domain. The respondents were asked to tell the researcher what they know and what they don't know. As a result, lexical items in examples (12a-i) words are very much alive in the dialect. But, the physical absences of the animals were observed. This results in partial loss in many current generation of the study area of urban and rural area. So, the above kinds of birds have been lost in current generation.

Next, the researcher collected lexical items related reptiles domain. The respondents were asked to give the lexical items that they consider to have completely disappeared from the study area as shown in (13).

	(13)	Lost Lexical items	Gloss
	a.	/bu:ti:/	'a kind of snake'
	b.	/ab:a: c'onga:r:e:/	'a kind of warm'
	c.	/ɗala:nɗula /	'leech'
	d.	/ga:nfol:e:/	'snail'
	e.	/ga:rar:a:/	'chameleon'
	f.	/bu:ʤale:/	'bigger'
	g.	/ʤaw:e:/	'python'
	h.	/na:tʃ:a/	'crocodile'
	i.	/ma:ga:/	'hookworm'
	j.	/k'oc'a:/	'tortoise

From the above examples (13a-j) examples reptiles and insects were very much alive in the study area. As of the physical distance even the youth generations of urban and rural dwellers are far apart from knowing them physically. On the contrary, this not work for very few of urban dwellers those that have a chance to visit zoo and watch national geography. In most case   the above reptiles and insects have been absent physically in many current generation of the study area of urban and rural area due to different reasons. The special example that refers to this issues is /bu:ʤale:/ 'jigger' an insect that mostly lived in dirty humans' leg was eliminated by personal hygiene. Generally, the above lexical items which refer to insects and reptiles have been not used by young generation

4. Conclusions and Recommendations

Lexical loss has led to the gradual disappearance of native Central Dialect words. This is possibly an indication that lexical loss is not rapid. The study results identified many Central Dialect lexical items of plant, animals and traditional objects semantic domains that have been dying out North Shawa zone. According to informants responses these lexical items have not been passed over to the next generation. Since language carries history, culture, and knowledge and values, these words have taken away with much Tulama Oromoo indigenous knowledge, history, culture and values. To this end some community's resources have been lost away and some of them are on the way without being documented and then analyzed by researchers like linguists, historians and anthropologists.

It is, therefore, important, to have certain specific actions taken to recover the situation for Central Dialect lexical loss. It is timely to begin making linguistic documentation and analysis of some representative native lexical items. Endangered Central Dialect lexical items should be revitalized so that they can be potentially used for classroom lessons and some terminologies adopted in institution and organizations. It is the conclusion of the researcher that a commitment to better exploit the technological and social media space already available presents a great opportunity towards the recovery of Central Dialect native lexical items.

Finally, the study recommends that these words have been potentially used for classroom lessons and parents build a habit of using them as a way to reserve its originality and teach the meaning of words to the current generation so as they can become familiar with the meaning and concept of words. Moreover, further studies in lexical loss of Central Dialect in different semantic domains should be taken by all concerned and stakeholders to step up awareness creation on lexical loss.

Reference

Brenzinger, M. and Dimmendaal, G. J. (2006). Social Contexts of Language Death. In M. Brenzinger (ed.), *Language Death: Factual and Theoretical Explorations with Special Reference to East Africa*, 3-5. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Crystal, D. (2000). *Language Death*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Feda N. (2015). Classification of Oromoo Dialects:. *International Journal of Computational Linguistics (IJCL) Volume (6): Issue (1).*

Gada Melba. (1988). *Oromiya: An introduction to the Oromoo People*. Minneoapolis: Krik House Publishers.

Gragg, G. (1982). *Oromoo Dictionary, Bender et al. (eds.), and East Lansing: The African Studies Center,.* Michigan : Michigan State University.

Grenoble, L. A. and Whaley, L. J. (2006). *Saving Languages: An Introduction to Language Revitalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Pres

Kebede, H. (2009). *Towards the Genetic Classification of the Afaan Oromoo Dialects: PhD Dissertation.* Norway: Department of Linguistics and Scandinavian Studies: University of Oslo.

Koopman, A. (1994). *"Linguistic Adoptives in Zulu". .* Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal: Unpublished . PhD.

Mahdad, H. (2012). *Language change and Lexical Vairation In Youth Languages: Tulemecen Speech Community.* Unpublished Thesis Summited to Tlemcen university.

Pole, S. C. (1999). *An Introduction to Linguistics Foreign Language Teaching and Research.* Macmillan : United Kingdom: Macmillan Publishers Ltd.

Samuel Leykun and Wolde Eshetu. (2015). Linguistic Analysis of Moribund Lexicons of Bale Oromoo Speech Community, Ethiopia. *Journal of Science and Sustainable Development (JSSD), 3(2),*, 73-85.

Traugott, E. (1985). On regularity in semantic change. *Journal of Literary Semantics*, 14:155-1 73.

UNESCO Ad Hoc Expert Group on Endangered Languages (2003). Language Vitality and Endangerment. *International Expert Meeting on UNESCO Programme of Safeguarding Endangered Languages*, Paris, 10-12 March 2003.

Varshney, R. L. (1995). *An Introductory Textbook of Linguistics and Phonetics.* Rampur Bagh: Student Store.

Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wurm, S. A. (2013). *Strategies for Language Maintenance and Revival. In D. Bradley and M. Bradley (eds.), Language Endangerment and Language Maintenance,* 11-23. London: Rout ledge Curzon.