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## Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>!</td>
<td>downstep of tone level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2, 3</td>
<td>first, second, third person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>accusative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>anticausative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adj.</td>
<td>adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adv.</td>
<td>adverb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMB</td>
<td>ambulative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>antipassive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APL</td>
<td>applicative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASS</td>
<td>associative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aux.</td>
<td>auxiliary verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLL</td>
<td>collective plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM</td>
<td>comitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPL</td>
<td>complementizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONJ</td>
<td>conjunction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONT</td>
<td>continuous aspect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D, dem.</td>
<td>demonstrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DI</td>
<td>distal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM, dm.</td>
<td>discourse marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVI.SE</td>
<td>visual evidential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVI.HE</td>
<td>acoustic evidential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCL, excl.</td>
<td>exclamation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fem.</td>
<td>feminine gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSE, fse.</td>
<td>formula of social exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE</td>
<td>hearer-proximal, close to hearer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYP</td>
<td>hypothetical mood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>imperfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEO, ideo.</td>
<td>ideophone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>imperative suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMV</td>
<td>imperfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INC</td>
<td>inceptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCH</td>
<td>inchoative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF</td>
<td>infinitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS</td>
<td>instrumental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT</td>
<td>intensifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTJ, intj.</td>
<td>interjection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Maasai loanword</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>middle past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>nominative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.</td>
<td>noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAR</td>
<td>narrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>negation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>nominalizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>near past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>num.</td>
<td>numeral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>obligation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>perfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAS</td>
<td>passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERF</td>
<td>perfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL, pl.</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSS, poss.</td>
<td>possessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pr.</td>
<td>pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>proximal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTC, ptc.</td>
<td>particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PURP</td>
<td>purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFL, refl.</td>
<td>reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>relative clause marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RP</td>
<td>remote past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>subjunctive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG, sg.</td>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STA</td>
<td>stative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB</td>
<td>subordinate marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAM</td>
<td>tense, aspect, modality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi.</td>
<td>intransitive verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vt.</td>
<td>transitive verb</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 Introduction

1.1 General
When embarking on field research in Gitu and Kibirashi of north-central Tanzania on the documentation of the endangered language Akie in January, 2013, our Akie informants would point out implicitly that they were not entirely satisfied with the way we approached the study of their language. We were primarily aiming at finding regularities underlying language use and the compositionality of language structure, but they wanted us to focus on what they thought was more at the core of speech, namely on how language serves as a tool of social and cultural exchange. To this end they tried to introduce us to frequently used patterns of linguistic interaction, ritualized forms of social exchange such as greetings, interjective expressions, etc., indirectly making it clear to us in a gentle way that asking for grammatical paradigms and syntactic relations was something that would fall out naturally once we had familiarized ourselves appropriately with what language use was about.

Note that the Akie were not arguing from linguistic ignorance, most of them had considerable experience with second language acquisition, having acquired a near-native speaker competence of three, or even four different languages (see Heine et al. 2014).

This was not the first time that we made such an observation. Time and again when doing linguistic in Africa we were confronted by our language consultants with the question of why we did not study their language in its socio-cultural setting rather than focusing on phonological distinctions, morphological paradigms, syntactic rules, and the like. It would seem that there is in fact reason to ask this question when looking at how language is used in social interaction: there is at least some justification to follow Schrempp (1992: vii) when maintaining that “language appears to begin where analytical grammar leaves off” (see also Pawley 2009).

The present work is an attempt to take such concerns seriously. To this end, we will present two contrasting perspectives on what linguistic discourse is about, applying the theoretical framework of Discourse Grammar (Kaltenböck et al. 2011; Heine et al. 2013) to the study of the Akie language. This framework distinguishes between two domains of linguistic analysis, referred to respectively as Sentence Grammar, which is the subject of Section 3, and Thetical Grammar, to be discussed in Section 4.

The grammatical sketch provided in Section 3 is not meant to be a reference grammar; rather, it is restricted to a survey of the grammatical material and its compositional potential that Akie speakers dispose of and that was traced in recorded speech. The sketch constitutes a small part of the data collected during our field research in Kilindi District of Tanga Region, as well as earlier in Kibaya and Simanjiro Districts of Manyara Region, Tanzania. This data collection includes, on the one hand, a sociolinguistic survey, a grammatical and a lexical corpus and, on the other hand, for the time being an edited
version of 21 spoken and transcribed text recordings of roughly 10,000 words. To keep
the level of accountability as high as possible (cf. Mosel 2012), exemplification in the
chapters to follow is taken as much as possible from this text collection. Nevertheless, we
also had to draw on elicited grammatical and lexical data, especially when dealing with
grammatical structures that do not surface in the texts.

Research leading to this study was carried out from January 21 to March 20, 2013 and
from January 15 to March 15, 2014. Our main informants were Bahati Nkuyaki and
Nkoseyoo Kalisya, two men who each had four primary languages, namely Akie, Maasai,
Nguu and Swahili. In their daily interaction with family members and neighbors their
main means of communication was Akie. Bahati Nkuyaki, (ca. 30 years of age) had seven
years of primary school education whereas Nkoseyoo Kalisya (ca. 55 years) had no formal
education. In addition, some 30 Akie consultants of both sexes assisted in the fieldwork
for specific purposes, mostly for sociolinguistic and cultural interviewing. All interviews
were conducted in Swahili, the national language of Tanzania.

Work was carried out mostly in Gitu Juu, a small settlement area consisting of five
homesteads (in 2013) and three homesteads (in 2014), all inhabited exclusively by Akie
people. Gitu Juu is located in the hilly country some two kilometres northwest of the
village of Gitu.

Informant work took place under a tree next to our tent some 50 meters away from the
homestead of the Nkuyaki family. When there were rains we had to give up this camp
temporarily and work in the trading center Kibirashi, some 15 kilometers south of Gitu
Juu. Linguistic fieldwork was accompanied by the video-recording of all aspects of
traditional Akie culture.

---

2 Suffice it to note that, in addition, there is a bulk of audio and video recordings which is still in the
process of transcription, analysis and editing.

3 In addition to relying on text analysis, elicitation was also needed in a language documentation
project of this nature where no adequate linguistic description facilitated our understanding of the
virtually unknown language. In the references at the end of text examples, the number and the line
of the text concerned are provided. For example, “(3/15)” stands for text 3, line 15 of the texts in
König et al. (2014a).
1.2 The Akie language

The Akie call themselves *akie* (sg. *akiántee*) and their language *kuuti táá akie* (‘mouth of the Akie people’).\(^4\) The language is endangered (Heine et al. 2014), and in some places critically endangered. The number of speakers is presumably less than two hundred, although the number of people classified as Akie is estimated to be between 2000 and 5000 (Schöperle 2011: 6).\(^5\)

Our guess of less than 200 hundred Akie speakers is fairly vague, for the following reason: Quite a number of them live far away from the settled areas deep in the forest and savannah areas of the Maasai Steppe of north-central Tanzania, inaccessible even to other Akie. We were able to get some second-hand information at least on some of them from fellow Akie but were assured by the latter that there were more Akie people in the forests than they could tell.\(^6\)

The Akie inhabit the Kilindi District of Tanga Region and the Kiteto and Simanjiro Districts of Manyara Region of north-central Tanzania. Most of their homesteads are located in the mountaneous regions at the periphery of villages (Swahili *vijiji*), and they are claimed to have been living in this general area before all their neighbors arrived, such as the Maasai and the Nguu (Ngulu) (Kaare 1996; Bakken 2004: 38ff.; Schöperle 2011). The main villages where Akie and/or Akie speakers can be found are listed below in alphabetical order (see MAP; cf. Legère 2012):

Amei Chini – Ranchi, which is a place close to Kijungu in Kiteto District, next to the Kibaya – Handeni road (coordinates: S 05° 18.676’, E 037° 07.583’, altitude 1230 m), three Akie speakers were recently (August 2014) traced.

Balang’a or Mkombora, near Jungu (Kwediboma Ward) (coordinates S 05° 18.425ˈ, E 037° 34.649ˈ, altitude 975 m). In February 2013 we found no Akie people in this village, but about a kilometer north of Balang’a there is a homestead consisting of two houses where ten Akie live (5 males, 5 females), six beyond the age of 40. Of the ten Akie, only four had a knowledge of the language.

---

\(^4\) According to Rottland (1982: 305; p.c.), their autonym is *ákičk* (with unreleased final k). Kaare (1996: 142) claims that “[t]he ethnic name Akie (of the land) derives from the term *kie* meaning land.” In a similar fashion, Schöperle (2011: 6, fn. 2) maintains that “Akie” means literally translated ‘people of the land’. Whether such folk etymologies are diachronically correct must remain doubtful.

\(^5\) Sommer (1992: 305) mentioned a figure of less than 1000, and Brenzinger (2007: 199) of 50 speakers, both classifying it as a seriously endangered language.

\(^6\) Somewhat surprisingly, our counting of the numbers of Akie speakers in the areas where they were expected to be found resulted in a total of around 200 speakers (see below). We suspect, however, that this figure contains a number of persons who were counted twice, or even three times. Traditionally a largely nomadic society, the Akie have retained much of their earlier mobility, being constantly on the move — either temporarily, to visit relatives or friends, or for an extended periods of time to look for better living conditions. Wherever we went we found Akie people whom we had seen already in other places.
In mid-December 2013 five Akie-speaking persons were met nearby (coordinates S 05° 18.408', E 037° 34.999', altitude 938 m) Chang’ombe or Mafisa Chang’ombe (coordinates S 05° 18.135', E 37° 37.662', altitude 1310 m). We found 13 Akie people there, but none had an active command of the language. However, in May 2013 some 10 Akie speakers were identified in the area. Engeju in Kiteto District (coordinates S 05° 29.585', E 036° 37.562', altitude 1393 m) records some 120 Akie, 8 of them claiming to be good Akie speakers as well as 12 others who have kept a limited command of the language. Gitu (Loosikito) (coordinates S 05° 16.893', E 37° 23.201', altitude 1319 m). This appears to be the most important residential area of the Akie, it is claimed by some to be the original and/or cultural home area of the Akie. 47 Akie people are said to live in the Gitu area, approximately 40 people have a good command of the language. Jungu (Kisankasa Ward) (coordinates S 05° 18.147', E 037° 37.681', altitude 931 m). Most people there are Akie (Kisankare group) who live mainly in Seuta in Jungu area. A few of them have a good command of the Akie language, some a more limited knowledge, while the majority (approx. 20 persons) do not speak Akie. Kijungu (coordinates S 05° 23.476', E 037° 09.493', altitude 1332 m, formerly known as Talamai; Maguire 1948). A number of Akie are said to live there. This, however, was not confirmed during a trip to the area made in August, 2014. Kinkhwembe (Kwekinkwembe, coordinates S 05° 19.556', E 037° 55.427', altitude 778 m, Kilindi District). There are both Akie and Kisankare” (six speakers among 40 people). Kitwai A (coordinates S 04° 48.470', E 37° 08.570', altitude 1000 m) in Simanjiro District (Manyara) is situated approx. 47 km from Orkesumet. We found 19 speakers there in March 2010, of whom eleven were females and eight males. 

(Kwa) Mang’ule (Hondohondo; Mang’ule is said to be a kind of tree in Nguu; coordinates S 05° 22.503', E 037° 35.476', altitude 912 m). Four Akie speaking adults were identified. Kwenkele (Kilindi District, coordinates: S 05° 33.026', E 037° 14.393', altitude 1451 m). Three Kisankare people there speak Akie/Kisankare. Lalasa, near Kibirashi (coordinates S 05° 16.695', E 38° 01.260'). In February 2013 one family consisting of two Akie adults plus six children was found there. Only a 40-years old man spoke Akie, the primary languages of the Akie being Nguu, Swahili, and Maasai. It was said that there used to be many Akie but most died, having been bewitched by Nguu people. But in May 2014, four competent Akie speakers and three children speaking some Akie were found.

---

7 Concerning Kisankare, see below.
8 The Akie are in fact afraid that they may be poisoned by the Nguu. Thus, Bakken (2004: 144) notes: “When it comes to Akie stereotypes of their cultivating ‘Swahili’ Guu and Zigua neighbors there is the strong belief that they may be dangerous witches that can be able to kill Akie by witchcraft referred to as sumu - ‘poison’, a belief that also applies to the agro-pastoral Gogo in the area. I was often told that I had to take great care when
Lolera Milula (or Lolera Juu), a quarter (kitongoji) of Kijungu. Schöperle (2011: 33) found about 20 people in Lolera engaged in foraging, but he does not provide any information on language knowledge. However, when we visited Lolera in November 2009, 11 female Akie speakers were found, while in August 2010 only one was present. Makau (Kimali Ward, Miatu District, Simiyu Region). In October 2014, seven Akie speakers (out of 10 Akie) were traced far away from the other places in Tanga and Manyara Regions listed here.

Mbogo (Kilindi District, coordinates S 05° 14.800’, E 037° 47.692’, altitude 791 m). In May 2014 we were told that many people there speak Akie. However, the community was not prepared to reveal details because of their frustration with four earlier researchers who had promised to inform them about their research results but have not done so.

Mkindi (coordinates S 05° 19.732’, E 037° 51.180’, altitude 823 m). Akie people are mixed with Kisankare. In February 2010 there were five Akie-speaking persons.

Mkombora, see Balang’a.

Munimuni (which is part of Kwekinkhwembe, coordinates S 05° 17.746’, E 037° 56.007’, altitude 807 m). There are 36 Akie (18 males, 9 females, 9 children). A knowledge of Akie was found with 7 men and 4 women.

Nanj (close to Kibaya, Kiteto District, coordinates S 05° 32.005’, E 036° 35.467’, Altitude 1455 m). In August 2014 we found there 43 Akie, of which seven were Akie speakers, and 11 semi-speakers.

Napilukunya (Napilo Konya; coordinates S 05° 14.974’, E 036° 47.520’, altitude 1120 m). Schöperle (2011: 32) observes about this area: “According to the village census of 17 June 2010, the settlement hosted 102 self-described Akie adults and about 50 children.” During our trip in August 2014, 135 Akie were found. Competent Akie speakers numbered 16, 10 had some command of Akie.

Ngababa (Ngapapa; coordinates S 05° 24.371’, E 037° 02.630’, altitude 1390 m). According to the village chairman Ngoisolo, there are 87 traditional foragers in Ngababa. The village census of July, 2010 lists 307 adults, of whom 86 claim to be Akie (Schöperle 2011: 34, 78). In 2009 we met ten competent Akie speakers including Akie elders who are considered to be guardians of the language. This information was confirmed in August 2014.

Ng’abolo (coordinates S05°07.069’, E 0 36° 07.435’, approx. 8 km from Ndudu-Kibaya road, from there 28 km to Kibaya). In November 2009 there were six Akie-speaking persons (3 male, 3 female). According to our informants there were mostly Kinyalang’ate but no Akie. In 2014 all of them had obviously left the village.

visiting them. A brother of one of my field assistants claimed to have been ‘poisoned’ by a ‘Swahili’ he had worked with in a safari company. He found himself recurrently confused and sick, and was convinced that he had been bewitched.”

Concerning the Kinyang’alate, see below.
Ngilimbahi (coordinates S 05° 15.451', E 037° 23.178', altitude 1309 m, a settlement close to Gitu). Out of seven people (including four children), two were good Akie speakers, and one being a moderate speaker.

Nkama (coordinates S 05° 30.971', E 037° 15.327', altitude 1377 m, see Balang’wa/Mtambalo).

Olmoti or Kitwai B (Kata ya Kitwai B), some 30 kilometres north of Kibirashi. There is a substantial community of Akie speakers, 20 among them were very good speakers, seven were average speakers.

Olping’wa, village of Kwediswati (coordinates S 05° 17.198', E 037° 30.427', altitude 1082 m), 25 kilometers north of Kibirashi. There are 18 Akie-speaking people, of whom 14 are adults (10 males, 4 females) and four children (1 male, 3 females). The mother tongue of the children is either Nguu or Maasai.

Palahala (also Mphalahala, Kwediboma Ward, coordinates S 05° 24.483', E 037° 34.110', altitude 947 m), there are about ten Akie people.

Sisimita (near Munimuni, Handeni District, coordinates S 05° 11.192', E 037° 59.142', altitude 733 m). In May 2014 we found some 50 Akie/Kisankare people. Six of them claimed to know the Akie language, 14 were said to be semi-speakers.

The neighbors of the Akie are the Maasai (or Maa) to the north, west, and south, speaking an Eastern Nilotic language. To the east, their neighbors are the Nguu (or Ngulu), speaking a language belonging the Zigula-Zaramo group of Bantu languages (Nurse and Philippson 2003). Furthermore, their neighbors also include the Kisankare (kisaŋkäre) and Kinyalang’ate (kinaŋlåate), who, like the Akie, are classified as “(N)dorobo”, that is, traditional hunter-gatherer communities (see König et al. 2014a, Section 1).

Akie is a member of the Kalenjin language cluster, which belongs to the Southern Nilotic branch of the Nilotic family. The latter has been classified as belonging to the Eastern Sudanic branch of the Nilo-Saharan phylum, a genetic unit which was proposed by Greenberg (1963) but is not entirely uncontroversial.

While Akie qualifies as a separate language, its genetic relationship to Kalenjin is close. When we played tape-recorded Kalenjin conversations to our Akie informants they were able to understand at least part of the topics and content of these conversations.

Akie is a fairly homogeneous language; there do not appear to be any dialect or other noticeable linguistic cleavages, even if phonetic variation among speakers is quite pronounced. The language is not used in writing.

---

10 Following Heine (1980), the Maasai are sometimes referred to as Maa since they are part of the Maa society, which in addition to the Maasai also includes other ethnic groups such as Parakuyu, Arusha, Samburu and Chamus, the latter two living in north-central Kenya.

11 The language is fairly closely related to the Kalenjin languages of Kenya. For example, one of our Akie consultants checked a piece of an Okiek text extracted from Kraatz (2010: 368) and he was able to understand most of the text.
Earlier information about Akie falls under the rubric of research on “Dorobo”, or “Ndorobo” (Maguire 1948; Maghimbi 2005; Legère 1992; 2002; 2006; 2012). The “Mósiro Dorobo” described by Maguire (1948) in the 1920s presumably also include what is now known as Akie (see Sommer 1992: 305). Maguire used Mósiro as a collective term for groups calling themselves Mósiro, Médiak, or Kisankasa, and he concluded: “The language of the Mósiro is dying, as any language except Masai tends to do in the Masai country” (Maguire 1948: 10). The significance of “Mósiro” is not entirely clear; some of our consultants suggested that it was a clan name; according to Kaare (1996: 22), “Mósiro” is the name used by the Maa-speaking Parakuyu (see below) for the Akie.

In the course of the last decades there have been substantial activities by social and cultural anthropologists to describe and understand Akie society, resulting most of all in three monographic dissertations (Kaare 1996; Bakken 2004; Schöperle 2011). While this work has improved our knowledge of the life and culture of the people and, most of all, of how the Akie conceptualize their identity and cope with the rapidly changing demographic, social, economic, and ecological conditions they are faced with, this works has contributed little to our knowledge of the language, even if there are a few interesting sociolinguistic details.

The only readily available linguistic material on Akie stems from Rottland (1982), providing some phonetic, grammatical and lexical information. What Rottland’s work demonstrates beyond reasonable doubt is that Akie is a language closely related to the cluster of Kalenjin dialects spoken in Kenya, Northern Tanzania, and Southeastern Uganda, including the Kenyan traditional hunter-gatherer communities commonly referred to as Okiek. The Akie are, however, unaware of this relationship; there are no contacts of any kind with their linguistic relatives in Kenya and Uganda, or in Tanzania.12

While there are various estimates of the number of Akie people (see Schöperle 2011), those who refer to themselves as Akie is likely to range between 2000 and 5000. The Akie are widely known in Tanzania as (Wa-)Ndorobo or Ndorobo. This xenonym originates from Maasai ol-tóorróbóni or en-tóorróbónì (sg.), il-tórrobo (pl.) ‘a person without cattle, a poor person or people’ -- a term that is clearly derogatory. In contact with members of other ethnic groups, e.g. the Maasai, Akie people in fact refer to themselves as Ndorobo.13

Earlier work carried out by Karsten Legère had established that there is a considerable difference between ethnic self-identification and competence of the Akie language.

No claim is made here that the Akie form an “ethnic group” or “nationality”, considering that these terms are theory-dependent and are discussed controversially in the anthropological literature (cf. Schöperle 2011: 28-31). The main features used by the people themselves to identify Akie people are (i) common descent, (ii) knowledge of the

---

12 However, this situation appears to have changed. Recent visitors tell us that what we told our Akie consultants about the historical connection between their language and other Kalenjin languages has become part of the oral traditions of the people concerned.

13 The name is homophonous with the Maasai word for ‘tsetse fly’. For a folk etymology volunteered by Maasai people, see Maguire (1948: 3).
Akie language, (iii) honey collection, and (iv) hunting, but which of these features are highlighted in a given case differs from one person to another. There are many cases reported, especially from Kiteto District (Schöperle 2011), where people identified themselves as Akie, or were identified by others as Akie, even though only one or two of these four features applied.

Note, however, that our consultants tended to distinguish at least two different concepts of *akie*, namely, (a) Akie in a narrow sense and (b) Akie in an extended sense. (a) consists of those speaking or believed to have spoken the Akie language until recently, we will refer to them as the “Akie proper”, and the present study is restricted to them. (b) includes in addition other traditional hunter-gatherer groups of the Maasai Steppe with whom the “Akie proper” claim to share the same origin and traditional culture, most of all the Kisankare, Kinyalang’ate, and Aramani (see below).

That the Akie are the earliest inhabitants of the country in which they live appears to be generally acknowledged by the surrounding peoples (see Kaare 1996), and both their Maasai and Bantu neighbors rely on Akie fertility charms. The Akie, or at least many of them, classify their human environment into the following groups:

(a) *akie* (sg. *akiántee*): These are the Akie proper on the one hand. On the other hand, they include fellow hunter-gatherers, in particular the Kisankare, Kinyang’alate, and the Aramani.

(b) *puuní* (sg. *puúniante*), the Maasai, renowned for wearing clothes imported from Mozambique and to be extravagant also in other ways.

(c) *ɪ́kwááp* (sg. *ɪ́kwáapɪ́ntee*), being similar in language to the Maasai but speaking a dialect not easy to understand for the Akie. Many of them, commonly found around Kibirashi, wear “Islamic clothes”. All evidence available suggests that these are the Parakuyu (Il-Paraguyo, Baraguyo; Paraguyo), the southern-most Maasai offshoot, referred to in the older literature as the “L-Oikop”, “Kwavi” (or “Kwafi”), or “Lumbwa”.

(d) *mɛɛ́yɛ* (sg. *méywantee*), commonly referred to as the “Swahili”. They are farmers, wear European clothes and belong mostly to the Bantu-speaking peoples of Northeastern Tanzania (Nguu, Kagulu, Zigua, Chaga, etc.), but also the Sandawe to the west, speaking a click language. While government officials are also said to belong to this category (Kaare 1969: 56), not all Bantu-speaking peoples are subsumed under the label *mɛɛ́yɛ* (see below).16

---

14 Note that Akie membership can be acquired via marriage (Schöperle 2011).
15 The term *mɛɛ́yɛ* is possibly etymologically related to the term *ilmeek* that the Maasai use for agriculturalist peoples (Kaare 1996: 159); note that an earlier word-final velar stop *k* was frequently lost in Akie.
16 According to Kaare (1996: 56), with the term *mɛɛ́yɛ* (*meeyee* in his writing) the Akie “refer first and foremost to a type of dress and adornment which is unlike those of the Maasai and Il-Parakuyo but similar to those of the Bantu Zigua and Nguu.”
(e) *isánke* (sg. *isankáintee*). This group is difficult to isolate, it includes in particular the Bantu-speaking Gogo of the Dodoma area and Pare of the Pare mountains.

(f) *púrunkeisyê* (sg. *púrunkést*), described as the “Burunge” people, living to the west, although the locational or ethnic description is not really very precise. Presumably, these are or include the Burunge, speaking a Southern Cushitic language. The Akie claim that they share with them the same origin and that they are linked to them by a joking relationship (Swahili *utani*).

According to Kaare (1996: 26), the Akie refer to their non-Maasai neighbors, as well as to any other non-Maasai outsiders by the term *meeyee*. We were not able to substantiate this form of generalization.

The exact nature of the above taxonomy is not entirely clear. One parameter, frequently mentioned, is skin color. The Akie (*akie*) describe themselves as *pírīr-e* (red-PL), ‘the red ones’, cf. (1), and the Maasai (*puuni*) as ‘the black ones’, as in (2). Accordingly, if they meet a “red” Maasai they assume that s/he is of Akie descent. Like the Akie, the akin “Burunge” (*púrunkeisyê*) are considered to be red, cf. (3), while the Swahili are described with the Swahili term *mchuzi wa kunde* (‘(color of) the gravy of *kunde* beans’), or as in (4).

(1) ko akie chaa pírīr- e.
    COP Akie REL.PL red- PL
    ‘The Akie are red.’

(2) tuuwes púuni.
    black.PL Maasai.N
    ‘The Maasai are black.’

(3) pírīr- e púrunkeisyê.
    red- PL Burunge
    ‘The Burunge are red.’

(4) mɛɛye nté chaa pírīr- e- n ay tuuwês.
    Swahili be.at REL.PL red- PL- N and black.PL
    ‘The Swahili are red and black.’

According to Kaaye (1996: 56-7) there is yet another category distinguished by the Akie, namely *Ngereza* (cf. Swahili *Waingereza* ‘white people’), which refers, on the one hand, to white persons who contact them as researchers, as professional hunters who employ them as game trackers, or as travelers. On the other hand, *Ngereza* also refers to the colonial period when outsiders had little interest in altering the Akie way of life.
2 Notes on phonology

The phonological structure of Akie is complex, more complex than that of any other Kalenjin language (cf. Rottland 1982). The following notes are restricted to an inventory of the phonological and tonological units of the language.

2.1 Consonants

The consonant system of Akie is much richer than that of most other related languages (see Rottland 1982) much richer inventory of consonant phonemes.

The following consonant phonemes are distinguished:

\[
p \quad t \quad \text{ch} \quad [\text{c}] \quad k \\
tt \quad \text{cch} \quad [\text{cc}] \quad \text{kk} \\
b \quad d \quad j \quad g \\
s \quad \text{sh} \quad [\text{j}] \\
m \quad n \quad \text{ny} \quad [\text{n}] \quad \text{ng'} \quad [\text{ŋ}] \\
mm \quad nn \\
r \quad [\text{r}] \\
rr \quad [\text{r}] \\
l \\
ll \\
w \quad y \quad yy \quad [\text{y}] \\
\]

In addition to the consonants listed a labiodental fricative [f] has been found in a few loanwords, such as íífi ‘brother-in-law’ (presumably borrowed from Nguu) or iltafunáa, a Maasai borrowing for the youngest age-set of the Akie.

The voiceless stops \(p, t, \text{ch}, \text{and} k\) are usually pronounced as weak fortis consonants; intervocally and following nasals they tend to be voiced (but cf. Hieda 2000 on other Kalenjin languages), e.g.,

\[\text{amtì} \quad [\text{'àmdì}] \quad \text{‘food’}\]

The voiced stops \(b, d, j, \text{and} g\) are implosives ([ɓ, ɗ, ɟ, ɠ]).

The geminated consonants \(\text{cch, tt, kk, mm, nn,} \text{and kk}\) are not distinguished by all speakers, e.g.,

\[\text{àsítà} \quad \text{or} \quad \text{àsítà} \quad \text{‘sun’}\]
\[\text{ikkuu} \quad \text{or} \quad \text{ikuu} \quad \text{‘miss a target’}\]
But even those speakers who do not distinguish gemination regularly are aware of its existence.

Note that instead of a geminated consonant there may be a long vowel. It is mostly elderly people who consistently distinguish these geminated consonants, others do so in some cases but not in others. Since our data were taken from a range of different people, gemination is not systematically marked here. That it has a distinguishing quality is suggested by word pairs such as the following:

| mákattà | ‘honey container’ | vs. | makatɛɛ | ‘skin of small animals’ |
| kátteɛ | ‘needle’ | vs. | kaátɛɛ | ‘arrow’ |
| pöttɛɛ | ‘climb up!’ | vs. | pötɛɛɛɛ | ‘take (him) by force!’ |
| a puttɛɛ | ‘I climb’ | vs. | a pute | ‘I harvest (honey)’ |
| punne | ‘he passes’ | vs. | puuní | ‘Maasai’ |
| a lluɛɛ | ‘I beat (him)’ | vs. | a lulɛɛɛɛ | ‘I seize (it)’ |

Gemination can result from consonant combinations at morpheme boundaries, where the following processes have been observed:

- \( c + k \rightarrow ik \)
- \( c + l \rightarrow il \)
- \( k + ch \rightarrow cch \)
- \( t + ch \rightarrow tt \)

Consider the examples in (a) and (b) (see Section 3.2.3.1.2.5), although even here, speakers may ignore the changes, e.g., saying (c) instead of (b):

(a) *táák-chini-aan čhééka
    > táčch-ini-aan čhééka
    see- DAT-1.SG.O milk.A
    ‘He sees me with milk.’

(b) a ret-chiini > a rett-inii ‘I help him’
(c) a ret-chiini > a ret-inii

\( p \) has three variants. Very frequently, and by some speakers consistently, it is pronounced as a voiceless bilabial fricative [f]. Intervocally, it tends to become a voiced bilabial fricative [β]. However, in all contexts it may have its basic value as a voiceless bilabial stop [p].
Rottland (1982: 72) observes that the voiceless plosives $t$ and $k$ are frequently unreleased in word-final position. We have found no evidence for this in the variety of Akie that we studied: All final consonants are released.

The voiceless alveo-palatal fricative $sh$ ([ʃ]) occurs in two varieties. On the one hand it is a free variant of the combination $sy$, cf. (a); on the other hand it occurs in loanwords of Maasai, cf. (b).

(a) kalísyà [kàˈlíː:ʃà] or [kàˈlìːʃà] ‘Kalisya (name of an Akie elder)’
(b) náápishana [ˈnáːpʃá:nà] ‘seven’ (≺ Maasai náápishana ‘seven’)
óloishó [ʔólòʃó] ‘country’ (≺ Maasai oloshó ‘country’)

$ti$ immediately followed by vowel other vowel other than $i$ is phonetically [t′] or [t̚], e.g.,

tiépkwááki [t̚iˈkwáági] ‘White-Bellied Go-Away Bird’

The palatal stop [c] and nasal [ɲ] are written here $ch$ and $ny$, and the velar nasal [ŋ] $ng$ because this convention is in accordance with the preferences of the speech community and is also the one used in the standard orthography of the national language Swahili.

The units $h$, $rr$, and $z$ are more marginal phonemes, found in particular in words of traditional culture and grammar.

The glottal fricative $h$ has been observed on the one hand in a number of lexical terms, e.g.,

hawówe pánye! ‘Let’s get meat!’ (ritual exclamation used to invoke the ancestors)
húúmpi ‘traditional guitar’ (no longer manufactured)
imáhói ‘medicine mixed from different substances’
lòllòhò ‘dirt, trash’

On the other hand it is found in the suffix $-ahi$, which serves as a nominal plural marker, e.g., (a), or in the imperfective of the andative suffix $-tááhi$ (first and second person only), cf. (b):

(a) tòsshnyásw-áhí ‘ostriches’
(b) a-tór-tááhí ‘I push (it)’

The voiceless retroflex flap $rr$ ([r̚]) occurs in a limited set of lexical items:

kururrta ‘peace, well-being’
losókorrí ‘name of a specific baobab tree in the north of Akie country’
rrínkwá proper noun (name of an 18-years old Akie youth)
r is pronounced as a flap [ɾ] by some, but as an alveolar liquid [r] by others. Word-final r is devoiced and lengthened, e.g.,

\[\text{ar- ko- nyôr tianchû.} \quad \text{[nôr:\]}\]

P- 3.P meet dangerous.animal.PL

‘And he met dangerous animals.’

Devoicing can also be observed when r immediately precedes voiceless consonants.

The voiced alveolar fricative z [z] has been found only in a few lexical items, all relating to traditional Akie culture, e.g.,

\[\text{ntézi} \quad \text{‘mouse sp.’}\]

Word-initial r is pronounced by some informants in certain words as [d]:

\[\text{rííríantɛɛ} \quad \text{[dííríàntɛ̀:]} \quad \text{‘bird sp.’}\]

Further notes on consonants

Word-initial vowels are preceded a glottal stop [ʔ]. Since the stop is predictable there it remains unmarked. Note, however, that there are a few thetics (see Chapter 4, Table 4), in particular interjection-like forms, where the glottal stop also occurs word-internally:

\[\text{á'à} \quad [ʔáʔà] \quad \text{‘no!’}\]

The nasal n is replaced by ñ preceding velar consonants, e.g.,

\[\text{a'keenke} \quad [ʔàkê:ŋkê] \quad \text{‘one’}\]

\[\text{a nkûn} \quad [ʔà'ŋkûn] \quad \text{‘I know’}\]

The consonant sequence c + k is replaced by ik:

\[\text{mac-áá par} \quad \text{‘I’ll kill him’}\]

\[\text{but: mai-kó par} \quad \text{‘he’ll kill him’}\]

The sequence rk tends to have an epenthetic vowel [ɪ] in between:

\[\text{17 Note that according to Osamu Hieda (p.c.), Southern Nilotic languages have a distinctive glottal stop, to be found, e.g., in interjections in utterance-initual position.}\]
kárka [ˈkárkà] ‘woman’

The stop c is omitted if immediately preceded by t:

\*ki mít- chmi tíúka kó ee pee.
> ki mít- mí tíúka kó ee pee.

‘We water the cattle.’

n is velarized [ŋ] preceding velar consonants (k, g) and tends to be omitted if immediately followed by s, e.g.,

till- e pánye neɛ(n) sílele.
cut- I meat.A at knife.A
‘He cut the meat with a knife.’

The phonemes ng’ [ŋ] and ny [ɲ] are usually, though not always, replaced by n word-finally and before t:

ayéng’-uun ‘two (N)’ vs. ayén ‘two (A)’
kuyang’-i ‘this bow’ vs. kúyánta ‘bow’

Comments. The system of consonants is clearly richer than that of other Kalenjin languages: Whereas other languages of the cluster have between 12 and 16 consonant phonemes (including semi-vowels; see Rottland 1982: 69-73), Akie has 26.

That the language has been exposed to strong influence from Maasai is certainly one reason for this fact, it could be responsible for the fact that there are two complete distinct sets of plosives, namely voiceless and voiced ones. But this is not the only reason: Akie has also a number of consonants that appear to belong to the old stock of the language but have no equivalents in the other languages of the cluster. More research is needed on this issue.

2.2 Vowels

There are two sets of vowel phonemes distinguished by means of the relative position of the tongue root, referred to respectively as [+ATR] vowels and [-ATR] vowels (where ATR stands for “advanced tongue root”):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[ + ATR ] vowels</th>
<th>[-ATR] vowels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i u</td>
<td>i u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e o</td>
<td>e o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments. The system of consonants is clearly richer than that of other Kalenjin languages: Whereas other languages of the cluster have between 12 and 16 consonant phonemes (including semi-vowels; see Rottland 1982: 69-73), Akie has 26.

That the language has been exposed to strong influence from Maasai is certainly one reason for this fact, it could be responsible for the fact that there are two complete distinct sets of plosives, namely voiceless and voiced ones. But this is not the only reason: Akie has also a number of consonants that appear to belong to the old stock of the language but have no equivalents in the other languages of the cluster. More research is needed on this issue.
The low vowel $a$ does not normally show this tongue root distinction, even if in specific contexts the distinction is clearly marked but is contextually predictable. The number of (short) vowels therefore is nine.

Since vowel length is distinctive (see below), there is a second set of nine vowel phonemes, namely:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[ + ATR] vowels</th>
<th>[-ATR] vowels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ii</td>
<td>ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uu</td>
<td>oo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ee</td>
<td>ee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oo</td>
<td>oo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ATR-feature is distinctive in a number of ways, e.g., in the marking of number in some nouns, cf. (a), of verbal aspect (b), or in lexical distinctions (c):

(a) kwééye (SG) kwééye (PL) ‘shoe, sandal’
(b) ikormoot (I) ikormoot (P) ‘chew something hard’
(c) oorâ ‘boy’ oore ‘way, path’

Like other languages of the Kalenjin cluster, Akie has a system of cross-height vowel harmony based on tongue root position. This means in principle that all vowels of a (phonological) word have the same [ATR] quality across morpheme boundaries. Thus, in the following forms for ‘tree’, the singular form has all [ + ATR] vowels and the plural form all [-ATR] vowels:

keeti ‘tree’
kééti ‘trees’

Lexical items and a number of non-lexical forms have an inherent ATR-feature and assimilate other morphemes of the same word or syllable group to that feature.

pééli-antee, pl. pééle ‘elephant’
sékéémi-antee pl. sékéémi ‘bee sp.’

Each vowel may be short (e.g., $i$) or long (e.g., $ii$):

kaatii ‘arrows’
vs. kááti ‘neck’

Word-initial vowels are preceded by a glottal stop, for example:
The glottal stop is generally omitted in this study because it is predictable. In fluent speech, the glottal stop tends to be omitted.

Word-initial /i/-/t/ in lexical items is optionally deleted if followed by a sequence [nasal + stop] or liquid. Alternatively one could also argue that this initial sequence takes an optional high front vowel, e.g.,

inká ng’aa? or nká ng’aa? ‘Whose (is it)?’

### 2.3 Tones

The following tones are distinguished as phonemic units:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Marking</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>accute accent</td>
<td>káé ‘Look there!’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>unmarked</td>
<td>kaau ‘homestead’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-falling</td>
<td>HF</td>
<td>circumflex</td>
<td>yâ ‘bad’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-falling</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>(e.g., å)</td>
<td>kɛ̃n ‘oneself’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition there is a high-rising tone ("), restricted to polar questions (see Section 3.7.3.1).

For economy reasons, low tones are not marked -- in other words, syllables having no tone symbol are low-toned. But there are two exceptions. Low tones are consistently marked in phonetic transcriptions and in non-lexical morphemes having their own inherent tones.

The high-falling tone has been observed to occur in all environments but is most commonly found on the final syllable nominative case forms, as in the following examples:

tóroreita ‘God (accusative)’

vs.

tóroreitâ ‘God (nominative)’

túlwê ‘hill (accusative)’

vs.

tólwê ‘hill (nominative)’

The low-falling tone has so far only been found in word-final syllables, e.g.,
kē̱n̫n̫ reflexive (and reciprocal) pronoun
mákattà ‘honey container made from tree trunk’

Nevertheless, it may be distinctive, e.g., in case marking. Thus, case of the quantifier ‘all’ below is distinguished only by whether there is a final low (a) or low-falling tone (b):

(a) tukul ‘all (accusative)’
(b) tukūl ‘all (nominative)’

Tone is a feature mainly associated with vowels, and long vowels are interpreted as carrying two tone units. For example, the long vowel ɛɛ in (a) consists of a sequence of two low tones whereas the long vowel aa in (b) and (c) is interpreted, respectively, as consisting of a sequence of low and high tone (b) or of high and low tone (c).

(a) ankɛɛ [ʔɑŋkɛː] ‘clothes’
(b) waárɛ [wàˈárɛː] ‘children (accusative)’
(c) wáarɛɛ [wáɔˈárɛː] ‘children (nominative)’

Word-initial nasal consonants may also be tone-bearing units. Thus, in the following example, the high tone on the nasal marks the nominative case:

ntɔɔlɛɛ ‘lower firestick’ (accusative)
vs. ñtɔɔlɛɛ ‘lower firestick’ (nominative)

Words and many affixes have their inherent tone. But tone values may, and frequently do change due to certain grammatical functions or due to their tonological environment. Context-sensitive variation in tone is a complex phenomenon and cannot be treated here. There are most of all two reasons for such variation, namely grammatical functions and tone combination.

**Grammatical functions**

(a) Case of “nominals” (nouns, adjectives, numerals, pronouns, possessives, demonstratives, or question words), that is, the distinction between accusative (A) and nominative case (N), e.g.,

nè (A), née (N) ‘what?’
ng’àà (A), ng’áá (N) ‘who?’

(b) number of nouns
keeti ‘tree’
kééti ‘trees’
(c) verbal tense, aspect, or modality

a táák- u ‘I am visible’ (imperfective)

vs.

á taak- ü ‘I should be visible’ (subjunctive) (4.3.2.10)

Tone combination

Tone is highly sensible to its contextual environment; thus, a high tone easily changes to low, and vice versa. There are a few recurrent changes when tones combine with certain other tones, in particular the following (H = high tone, L = low tone, F = falling tone):

(a) HF > H | _ L
A high-falling tone (HF) changes to high tone (H) when followed by a low tone (L):

*ma- ω mach- e akwë pee.
> mɔ- ω mach- é akwé pee.
NEG- 2.PL want- I 2.PL.N water.A
‘You (pl.) don’t want water.’

(b) L > H | #. L
A low tone (L) changes to high (H) in fluent speech if followed by a low tone in the next word:

keelie ‘feet’

vs.

keelié cu ‘these feet’

Finally, there is a tonal downstep (marked with a preceding exclamation mark), whereby a word or part of a word is pronounced at a lower tone level than the preceding part.

Stress, or pitch accent, clearly exists but does not appear to phonologically distinctive.
3 Sentence Grammar

Much of what happens in speech falls within the domain of Sentence Grammar: Akie speakers tend to construct their discourse contributions in a propositional format, building constituents, clauses, and sentences, etc. But they will also design structures that are built on a different principle -- one that is elusive to a propositional format and to sentence constructions. Consider the following text piece, taken from the Blessing the Hunting Weapons ceremony, one of the most central events in the Akie cultural calendar:

```
ichaide kuúmi akó inkone hún leeláá kolo ...
DM beer.A COLL.A Inkone.A DM folks
‘The beer, people of Inkone, folks, ...’ (1/66)
```

Neither this text piece nor any of its parts is really compatible with an analysis of grammar in terms of clause structure or meaning presented in a propositional format; none of the information units used in this utterance is part of some syntactic hierarchy.¹⁸

In the framework adopted in this work, this is the domain of Thetical Grammar, where the above text piece would be analyzed as consisting of a sequence of a conceptual thetical (kuúmi ‘beer’), that is, a theme, two discourse markers (ichaide and hún; DM), and two vocatives (akó inkone ‘associates of Inkone!’ and leeláá kolo ‘folks!’).

In accordance with the framework of Discourse Grammar (Kaltenböck et al. 2011; Heine et al. 2013), we will treat the two domains separately, dealing with Sentence Grammar in the present chapter and reserve Chapter 4 for Thetical Grammar. It goes without saying that the two are not neatly separated but interfere with one another in multiple ways (see Heine et al. 2013). This is an issue that cannot be tackled in the present work and needs a treatment of its own.

3.1 The clause

The basic order of the constituents of a clause is fairly consistently verb-initial, that is, the verb precedes all other constituents of a clause. The default order of constituents, that is, the one used most frequently, is the following:

```
Verb - Subject - Adverb - Indirect object - Direct object
```

¹⁸ “Information unit” is a cover term for any pairing of form-meaning segments that can be separated from the remainder of an utterance by means of semantic, syntactic, and/or prosodic criteria -- ideally by all three of them. An information unit can be a word, but it can consist as well of a complex collocation of words, including an utterance (Heine et al. 2013). The term “information unit” thus is similar to, but is not the same as that of a discourse act in the tradition of Discourse Functional Grammar, defined as “the smallest identifiable unit of communicative behaviour” (Hengeveld and Mackenzie 2008: 308).
There is however a remarkable freedom in placement, in that a range of alternative orderings are allowed. In the following text example, the predicate á-ánté occurs in the canonical initial position, but in its repeated form it is placed finally:

á ánte lúbooto nká loosíkitô á ánte.
1.SG exist edge.ACC GEN.SG Gitu 1.SG exist

‘I am at the edge, (at that) of Gitu I am.’ (1/22)

Word order alternation appears to be facilitated to some extent by the system of tonal case marking. But case does not offer an entirely satisfactory explanation for the remarkable freedom of placement, as can be seen in the ordering of participants of ditransitive constructions. Recipients (typically “indirect objects”) normally precede patients (“direct objects”), cf. (a), but their order can be reversed, cf. (b). Both the recipient and the patient are encoded in the accusative case, so there is no safe way of distinguishing the two morphologically. What matters in this, as well in many other examples, is pragmatic plausibility, that is, whether case functions can be identified on the basis of contextual information.

(a) ar-áá kaa- chî kuoka kuúmi.
P- 1.SG give- DAT grandfather.A beer.A
‘I’ve given grandfather beer.’

(b) ar-á kaa- chî kuúmi kuoka.
P- 1.SG give- DAT beer.A grandfather.A
‘I’ve given beer to grandfather.’

3.2 The verbal group
The verbal group forms the core of clause structure. Many utterances are restricted to it, and it is also the main information unit of discourse structure as a whole. It is therefore dealt with in greater detail than other parts of Sentence Grammar.

3.2.1 Verbs
Verbs do not have inherent lexical tones.\(^9\) Their tones are determined by the elements with which they combine within the verbal group. This group consists of the following basic elements (obligatory elements are marked in bold):

- negation - tense - aspect - subject proclitic - verb - derivation - object suffix

\(^{19}\) Hence they are not tone-marked in the Akie wordlist of König et al. (2014b).
Thus, in the following example the tense marker (kíí - remote past; RP) precedes the aspect marker (ar- perfective; P), which again precedes the subject proclitic (kéé ‘we’), and the verb stem (sik ‘get’) is followed by the derivational suffix (the ambulative morpheme -aat-).

\[ \text{kíí } r- \text{ kéé sik- aat- è.} \]
\[ \text{RP- P- 1.PL get.P- AMB- APL} \]
\[ \text{‘We used to get (it) long ago.’} \]

As we will see in the paragraphs to follow, there are a few factors complicating this basic structure. One main complicating factor consists in the structure of aspect marking (3.2.3), another one has to do more generally with the inflectional format of verb forms.

### 3.2.1.1 Valency

Depending on the number of arguments they take, verbs are classified into intransitive verbs, transitive verbs, and ditransitive verbs.

**Intransitive verbs.** They are either unaccusative (a) or unergative (b), taking only one argument, which is coded in the nominative case. Thus, in the following example (a), the verb nya/nyi ‘become full’ takes sóttée ‘calabash’ as its only argument, coded in the nominative case. And in (b), the only argument is múreenée ‘warriors’:

(a) ká nya sóttée.
\[ \text{PERF become.full.P calabash.N} \]
\[ \text{‘The calabash is full.’} \]

(b) ar- kó pwá múreenée ayéng’- uun.
\[ \text{P- 3.P come.P.PL warriors.N two- N} \]
\[ \text{‘Two warriors have come.’} \]

Intransitive verbs can be transitivized either by the dative or the applicative derivation (3.2.3.2).

**Transitive verbs.** The clearly predominant transitive construction has an agent as its subject coded in the nominative case and a theme (or patient) as its object, coded in the accusative:

\[ \text{ká íngil amóo- n ng’álle.} \]
\[ \text{NP repeat.I mother- N words.A} \]

---

20 The verb stem for ‘get’ is si, but sik preceding some derivational suffixes (see Section 3.2.3).
‘Mother repeated the news.’

When the object of a transitive verb is a third person referent it need not be, and frequently is not formally expressed,

A number of transitive verbs take either nominal arguments, cf. (a), or clausal arguments, cf. (b):

(a) ká íngil amóo- n ng’álleɛ.
NP repeat.I mother- N words.A
‘Mother repeated the news.’

(b) ká íngil amóo- n ko riech kuúmi.
NP repeat.I mother- N 3.P brew beer.A
‘Mother repeated that she would brew beer.’

We will return to this issue in Section 3.8.2.

_Ditransitive verbs_. The paradigm construction involving ditransitive verbs is one where there is an agent argument, being the subject coded in the nominative, an undergoer as the direct object and a recipient as the indirect object. Both objects take the accusative case:

ká kii nyím- chi láákwɛɛ meséɛree kwáan.
‘Father has shown the child the baobab (long ago).’

Considering the highly flexible word order of the language (see Section 3.1), the arrangement of participants shown in the above example can be changed in almost any conceivable way. The only structural peculiarity to be noted is that a subject argument placed in front of the verb loses its nominative case in favor of the accusative case -- a peculiarity that applies not only to Akie but to African marked-nominative languages in general (König 2008):

kwaan ká kii nyím- chi láákwɛɛ meséɛree.
father.A PERF RP show- DAT.P child.A baobab.A
‘Father has shown the child the baobab (long ago).’

Ditransitive verbs are restricted in number; the following are common examples:

intaam  ‘feed’
inyim-chini  ‘show’
mwaa-chini ‘tell, explain somebody’
pay ‘feed’
up-chini ‘bring to, take to’

3.2.1.2 Copulas
The following are the main copular devices taking nominal complements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Main functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ŋtè (íntè)</td>
<td>location, existence (‘exist, be at’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kò (or kɔ̀)</td>
<td>classification, identification (‘it is’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yekuu/ye</td>
<td>inchoative events (‘become’)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ŋtè location, existence
The copular verb ŋtè, frequently pronounced íntè, expresses location when used with two arguments, cf. (a), but existence when used with one argument only, cf. (b). The latter argument may be implied rather than formally expressed, as in (c). The complement of ŋtè takes the nominative case.

(a) i ínte inyee iyũ. ‘You are here.’
   2.SG be.at 2.SG.N here

(b) ma ínte róópta. ‘There is no rain.’
   [máíntè] NEG be.at rain.N

(c) ma ínte. ‘There is nothing’ or ‘S/he is not here’.
   [máíntè] here

The copular verb may not be used in the perfective aspect but occurs freely in all tenses, cf. (d), and in the subjunctive (S), cf. (e).

(d) kíí ínte ápa tíántaakômë í naá kíí nyô
   RP exist long.ago monster.N DM REL.SG RP come

   kɔ̀ cheng’ waárẽ.
   P.3 search.for children.A
‘Long ago there was a monster who came to search for children.’ (3/1)

(e) mach- e kò ínte pée.
   want- I 3.S be.at water.N
‘There should be water.’
The initial vowel of ŋtè (ńtè) tends to assimilate to the preceding vowel of the personal proclitic a ‘I’:

á ántè lúbòtò ìnká lòòsíkitò á ántè.
1.SG exist edge.A GEN.SG Gitu 1.SG exist
‘I am at the edge, (at that) of Gitu I am.’ (1/22)

kò (or kɔ) classification, identification
Predicative classification (a) and identification (b) are commonly expressed by means of the particle kò (kɔ when the following word has [-ATR] vowels; see Section 2.2):

(a) kira chìchɛ ko akie? aá, ko akie.
DM 3.PL.A COP Akie.PL.A yes COP Akie.PL.A
‘Are they Akie?’
‘Yes, they are Akie.’

(b) ko waàrɛɛ chaa a taak- e.
COP children.A REL.PL 1.SG see- I
[á]
‘It is children that I see.’

The noun phrase following kò must take the accusative case. For classificatory equations, however, no copula is needed, e.g.,

anɛɛ (má) a aki- ántee.
1.SG.A (NEG) 1.SG Akie- SG.A
‘I am (not) Akie.’

The copula kò also serves diverse discourse functions, including that of a focus marker (3.6.2).
Negation is generally expressed by the negation marker mà:

ntán, chìchɛ má akie.
DM 3.PL.A NEG Akie.PL.A
‘You should know, they are not Akie.’

yekuu/ye ‘become’
This copular verb introduces inchoative events (‘become’) when taking nominal complements, the latter being coded in the accusative case, e.g.,

ar- ìí yekúú aki- ántee.
P- 2.SG become.P Akie- SG.A
‘You (really) have become an Akie.’
ar- kó yê  akie.
P- 3.P become.P  Akie.PL.A
‘They have become Akie.’

koto pwa ko ééch- it(u)
until go.PL  NAR  big- INC

ar- kó yê  muréénee.
P- 3  become  warriors.A
‘until (they) grew up and became warriors.’ (4/26)

The copula has the following conjugational paradigms;

Imperfective  

Sg 1  a yékku 'kuoka  ‘I become grandfather’
2  i yékku 'kuoka
3  yekú 'kuoka

Pl 1  ki yékku 'kuuká-ísye  ‘we become grandfathers’
2  o yékku 'kuuká-ísye
3  yekú 'kuuká-ísye

Perfective  Subjunctive

Sg 1  ar-áá ye(kú) 'kuoka  áá ye  'kuoka
2  ar-íí yekú 'kuoka  íí ye  'kuoka
3  ar- kó yé  'kuoka  kóó ye  'kuoka

Pl 1  ar- kée ye(kú) 'kuuká-ísye  kée ye  'kuuká-ísye
2  ar- óó ye(kú) 'kuuká-ísye  óó ye  'kuuká-ísye
3  ar- kó yé  'kuuká-ísye  kóó ye  'kuuká-ísye

3.2.1.3 Basic verbs vs. i-verbs
Verbs are divided into two morphophonological classes depending on whether they begin with a vowel i (or ì). We will call the latter i-verbs and all others basic verbs. The following paradigms demonstrate the differences between these two classes.

Basic verb: ɛẹy (pee) ‘drink (water)’
Imperative: ɛẹy, pl. 5 ɛ(ey) ‘drink!’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Imperfective</th>
<th>Perfective</th>
<th>Subjunctive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sg 1</td>
<td>a ɛẹy- ɛ</td>
<td>ar-áá ɛẹy</td>
<td>á ɛ(ey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>i ɛẹy- ɛ</td>
<td>ar-íí ɛẹy</td>
<td>í ɛ(ey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ɛẹy- ê</td>
<td>ar- kó ɛ</td>
<td>kó ɛ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I-verb: iruuki ‘agree’

Imperative fuku, pl. oo ruuki-n ‘agree!’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Imperfective</th>
<th>Perfective</th>
<th>Subjunctive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sg 1</td>
<td>aa rúuki-i</td>
<td>ar-áá ruk</td>
<td>áá ruk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ii rúuki-i</td>
<td>ar-ii ruk</td>
<td>ii ruk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>iruuki</td>
<td>ar-kóó ruk</td>
<td>kóó ruk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl 1</td>
<td>kii rúuki-i</td>
<td>ar-kíí ruk</td>
<td>kíí ruk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>oo rúuki-i</td>
<td>ar-óó ruk</td>
<td>óó ruk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>iruuki</td>
<td>ar-kóó ruk</td>
<td>kóó ruk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In i-verbs, the vowel i (or î) turns up in the imperative singular and the third person imperfective forms and in the vowel quality of the perfective and subjunctive first person plural forms. But its effect can be seen in vowel lengthening, where the following rules apply:

- a + i > aa
- e + i > ii
- i + i > ii
- o + i > oo

These are the forms of [+ATR] vowels; verbs taking [-ATR] vowels use the corresponding [-ATR] vowels (see Section 2.2).

The following are examples of i-verbs (as elsewhere, both imperfective and perfective forms are given if they differ in their forms):

- iken-i/iken ‘wait’
- mut-i/mut ‘take’
- iruuk-i/iruk ‘agree’
- iiten-i/iiten ‘wait’
- iyooy/iyoy ‘cook’

As the above paradigms show, the third person singular and plural forms are identical. We will see, however, that there are a number of suppletive verbs having different forms in the singular and plural and we therefore consistently list the two number paradigms separately (see Section 3.2.3.4).
3.2.1.4 Combining verbs
While sequences of verbs form a paradigm pattern of discourse organization, Akie is not a verb serializing language (cf. Aikhenvald and Dixon 2006), but it is a highly verb-centered. It differs in particular from other Kalenjin languages in that there is no infinitive nor any construction to form non-finite verbs corresponding to an infinitive. Rather, the verb and its verbal complement are simply juxtaposed, agreeing in person-number marking, e.g.,

```
ar- áá raak áá eey pee.
P- 1.SG finish 1.SG drink.S water.A
'I've finished drinking water.'
```

```
ko pa ko riek- iis.
3.P go.S 3.P brew- AP.S
'Let them go to brew (beer).'
```

This construction of combining finite verbs is not restricted to verbal complementation. It is also found for verb combinations that are not in any semantic dependency relation to one another but simply express sequences of events, e.g.,

```
ng’ëet tóónoon.
wake.up.P stand.up.P
'Wake up and stand!'
```

Typically, the second verb appears in the subjunctive, as in the following example:

```
a lul- e á am.
1.SG seize- I 1.SG eat.S
'I take it and eat it.'
```

Verbs are also commonly used to express directed motion (cf. Section 3.8.4):

```
wéntin kóto wa kaau.
go.SG.I up.to go.S home
'He’ll go home.'
```

```
kóto nyo ko nyó loosíkitô.
and come.P 3.P come.P Gitu.A
'And she came to Gitu.'
```
Finally, consider also the following example which illustrates the verb-centered profile of the language:

ko pwâ pí kóto pwa ko pwá loosīkitô.


‘And the people came and they arrived in Gitu.’

### 3.2.2 Person markers

Distinctions in personal deixis within the verbal group are expressed either in the form of personal pronouns (3.2.2.1), by subject proclitics (3.2.2.2), object suffixes (3.2.2.3), or by verbal TAM suffixes (3.2.2.4). Concerning personal deixis within the noun phrase, see Section 3.3.2.4.2.

Akie is a “pro-drop” language, that is, personal pronouns need not and most of the time are not used except for specific marking processes such as topicalization or disambiguation. Subject proclitics and object suffixes, as well as verbal TAM suffixes, by contrast, are an obligatory part of the verbal word, they must not be omitted.

#### 3.2.2.1 Personal pronouns

Since both subject and object participants are as a rule indexed in the verbal word by means of subject proclitics and/or object suffixes, the use of personal pronouns is optional in pragmatically unmarked situations.

Like nouns, pronouns are case sensitive, marked by tonal distinctions. The following sentence combines all three singular pronouns, where andWhere ‘I’ and inyèè ‘you’ are in the accusative and ninyèè ‘he, she, it’ in the nominative case. Notice that this is an elicited sentence; while being fully grammatical, speakers would not normally use such a sequence of pronouns for economy reasons. Nevertheless, the sentence is perfectly acceptable.

ká ínyim-ch- íín anee inyee nnyée.

PERF show- DAT- 2.SG.O 1.SG.A 2.SG.A 3.SG.N

‘He introduced me to you.’

The basic forms of personal pronouns are as follows (we have added the forms preceded by ák ‘and’, which are reduced in the third person):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accusative</th>
<th>Nominative</th>
<th>Preceded by ák</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG 1</td>
<td>ânèè</td>
<td>ânèè</td>
<td>ák ânèè</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inyèè</td>
<td>inyèè</td>
<td>ák inyèè</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ninyèè</td>
<td>ninyèè</td>
<td>ák-inyèè</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

21 Clitic boundaries are treated like word boundaries in this work.
The third person pronouns are not restricted to human or animate referents, they may have inanimate ones as well, as in the following examples:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{péénta kɔ nnyɛɛ ni.} & \quad \text{‘The meat (sg.) is this.’} \\
\text{pányee kɔ chichɛɛ chu.} & \quad \text{‘The (pieces of) meat (pl.) are these.’}
\end{align*}
\]

Like with nominal arguments, the order is subject - indirect object - direct object, cf. (a), but the order can be reversed for pragmatic marking, cf. (b), the argument function being frequently, though not always, determined by tonal case marking (see above).

(a) \text{ki taak-é achɛɛ inye.}  \\
\text{1.PL see-I 1.PL.N 2.SG.A}  \\
\text{or}  \\
(b) \text{ki taak-é inyeɛ achɛɛ.}  \\
\text{1.PL see-I 2.SG.A 1.PL.N}  \\
\text{‘We (will) see you.’}

### 3.2.2.2 Subject proclitics

Akie differs from other Kalenjin languages in using subject proclitics rather than prefixes. That these are in fact clitics rather than affixes is suggested, first, by the fact that they are separated by the following verb by a phonetic boundary: If a verb begins with a vowel then there is a glottal stop between the clitic and the verb stem (even if the stop may be omitted in fluent speech); note that words beginning with a vowel are obligatorily preceded by a glottal stop. In the following example, the verb \textit{am} ‘eat’ starts with a vowel, hence it has a glottal stop before the subject proclitics:

\[
\begin{align*}
kɔ nɛɛ \text{ ka-1 ?ám?} \\
\text{COP what.A P-2.SG eat}
\end{align*}
\]

‘What have you eaten?’

Since the glottal stop is a predictable part of word-initial vowels (see Section 2.2) it is not marked in this study.\(^{22}\)

Second, adverbs can be, and not uncommonly are, inserted between subject proclitics and the verb, e.g.,

\[^{22}\text{We have added the word-initial glottal stop here for demonstration only.}\]
ki- r- kó ápa irii këët̄i.
RP- P- 3.P long.ago break.P sticks
‘He has broken sticks long ago.’

And third, the proclitics are not restricted to the verbal group but may also precede adjectives or nouns, e.g.,

kií ng’ëëta ‘we, the men’
1.PL men

kí siing’ow- e ák achëë.
1.PL good- I with 1.PL.A
‘We’re fine (with ourselves).’

This analysis of the verbal subject markers as clitics rather than affixes is also not challenged by the fact that their use is obligatory even in the presence of a full personal pronoun, as in the following example of the topicalization of a personal pronoun:

anëë a láákwee taapaay.
1.SG.A 1.SG child.A marriageable
‘I am a girl ready to be married.’

As in the topicalization construction of many other languages, a left-dislocated topic constituent requires the topicalized constituent to be pronominally resumed in the following clause.

The proclitics are sensitive to tonal inflection and vowel harmony; we are listing here only the basic, tonally unmarked [+ATR] forms. The segment “(i)” signals that it is here where the verb stem has an initial i-vowel (see Section 3.2.1.4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Imperfective</th>
<th></th>
<th>Perfective</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Basic verb</td>
<td>i-verb</td>
<td>Basic verb</td>
<td>i-verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG 1</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>aa</td>
<td>aa</td>
<td>aa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(i)</td>
<td>ko</td>
<td>koo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL 1</td>
<td>ki</td>
<td>kii</td>
<td>kee</td>
<td>kee, kii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>oo</td>
<td>oo</td>
<td>oo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(i)</td>
<td>ko</td>
<td>koo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2.2.3 Object suffixes
Unlike Maasai, Akie and other Kalenjin varieties do not distinguish unpredictable subject-object affixes on verbs (cf. e.g. Creider and Tapusubei Creider 1989: 97-9).

Object suffixes are used only for speech participants, that is, first and second person referents, but third person referents are unmarked. This means that transitive verbs having no object suffix have an implicit third person referent (‘him’, ‘her’, ‘it’, ‘them’). Thus, in the following example, any possible third person object can be implied; if none were implied then the antipassive would be used (3.2.3.2).

\[
\text{ma- aa nyíti.} \\
\text{NEG- 1.SG know} \\
\text{‘I don’t know (him, her, it, or them).’}
\]

The object suffixes are the last part of a verb, that is, they follow all verbal derivational morphemes. The suffixes are sensitive to tonal inflection and vowel harmony. We are listing here only the tonally unmarked [+ATR] forms; the corresponding [-ATR] forms are illustrated in the examples below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SG 1</th>
<th>-aan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-iin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL 1</td>
<td>-eech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-aak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Examples**

- taak- aan ‘he sees me’
- i taak- aan ‘you see me’
- taak- iin ‘he sees you’
- a taak- iin ‘I see you’
- a taak- e ‘I see him, her, it, them’
  \(-e \text{ is an imperfective marker}\)
- taak- ééch ‘he sees us’
- i taak- ééch ‘you see us’
- taak- aak ‘he sees you (pl.)’

\[
\text{ko lén- chi laakwa ni kóón- aan dé kamáy- antée.} \\
\text{NAR say- DAT girl.A PR.SG give.IMP- 1.SG.O DM fried.meat- SG} \\
\text{‘And (the crow) said to the girl: “Give me (a bit) of the fried meat!”’ (5/20)}
\]
3.2.2.4 Verbal TAM suffixes and tone patterns
In addition to the dedicated subject proclitics and object suffixes, distinctions in personal deixis are also expressed by tone patterns and TAM suffixes. As we will see in the paradigms of Section 3.2.3, there is a wide range of suffixes and tone patterns. Suffice it here to list a few generalizations applying to most of the paradigms:

(a) The distinction between speech participants (first and second person referents) and non-participants (third person referents) is paramount; there are generally morphophonological differences between the two in the paradigms.
(b) Compared to the distinction mentioned in (a), that of number is fairly insignificant. Most paradigms do not distinguish morphologically or tonally between singular and plural referents (except for the subject proclitics and suppletive paradigms).
(c) In accordance with (b), third person forms do not as a rule distinguish number. We nevertheless list them separately in the paradigms below, for the following reasons: First, there is a range of suppletive distinctions between singular and plural forms and, second, there are a few “irregularities” in the paradigms that affect the number of referents.

3.2.3 Tense, aspect and modality (TAM)
The verbal system is centrally determined by the distinction between two aspects, namely imperfective (I) and perfective (P). All other categories of tense, aspect and modality are based on either of these two aspects. This also applies in particular to the perfect (3.2.3.1.1) and the subjunctive (3.2.3.1.3), which are both based on the perfective. The various tense categories, on the other hand, occur in both the imperfective and the perfective. As we will see in Section 3.2.3.3, there are a number of auxiliary constructions to express additional aspectual functions.

Finally, we observed in Section 3.2.1.4 that verbs are divided on morphophonological grounds into basic and i-verbs; for more details, see there.

3.2.3.1 Categories
3.2.3.1.1 Aspect
As we will see below, the distinction imperfective vs. perfective has a number of morphophonological and morphological implications.

Many verbs have an imperfective stem that differs from the corresponding perfective one. For example, the verb nereech/nereech ‘be angry’ has [+ATR] vowels in the imperfective (nereech) but [-ATR] vowels (nereech) in the perfective aspect. In addition to or instead of vowel quality there may be a difference in the length of the stem, in that the perfective stem may have a reduced form vis-a-vis the imperfective.

But there are also a number of verbs that are suppletive, having different stems in the imperfective than in the perfective aspect (see Section 3.2.3.4).
In the present section we are restricted to fully grammaticalized aspect categories. As we will see in Section 3.2.3.3, there are a number of additional aspects in the language coded by means of periphrastic constructions. The whole range of aspect categories distinguished in the language thus includes the following in alphabetical order:

- a Already-perfect (3.2.3.3)
- b Imperfective
- c Inchoative (3.2.3.3)
- d Perfect
- e Perfective
- f Proximative (3.2.3.3)
- g Still-perfect (3.2.3.3)

**Imperfective vs. perfective meaning**

In most general terms, the imperfective (I) expresses an unbounded and the perfective (P) a bounded event.

State verbs, such as *ting* ‘have, own’ and *nkun* ‘know’, are restricted to the imperfective. In order to form a perfective aspect, a different (“suppletive”) verb stem must be used (see Section 3.2.3.4), e.g.,

- a *ting’- e sekee.*
  1.SG have- I money.N
  ‘I have money.’

- *ar- áá ting’ sekee.*
  P- 1.SG have money.N

- ar- áá si sekee.
  P- 1.SG have.P money.N
  ‘I’ve had money, I’ve got money.’

With accomplishment verbs, such as *nyi/nyi* ‘become/be full’, the imperfective denotes a change-of-state event (a) while the perfective denotes a completed event (b):

- (a) *nyi- e míllé.*
  be.full- I honey.bag.N
  ‘The honey bag is becoming full.’

- (b) *ar- kó nyt.P míllé.*
  P- 3.P be.full honey.bag.N
  ‘The honey bag is (now) full.’
3.2.3.1.1 Imperfective

This aspect has normally present or future reference, but it may also denote events or actions in the past.

With some verbs, the imperfective has no future reference. The verb ting’ ‘have’ in (a) can only refer to the present. If future reference is intended, the subjunctive equivalent sich/si ‘get’ of ting’ must be used, and constructed in the future tense (3.2.3.1.2.4), which is not acceptable with the imperfective verb ting’, cf. (b).

(a) a ting’- e sekee.
    [é]
    1.SG have- I money.A
    ‘I have money.’

(b) *mach- a ting’- e sekee.
    mach- a si- I sekee.
    [á]
    FUT- 1.SG have.S money.A
    ‘I will have money.’

The following are the basic person-number proclitics of imperfective verbs (see Section 3.2.2.2 for more details):

SG 1 à  
2 i  
3 -

PL 1 ki  
2 ø  
3 -

3.2.3.1.2 Perfective

The canonical perfective construction is one that we will refer to as the ar-perfective. It commonly occurs in all kinds of narrative and other discourse forms. The following are basic person-number forms for basic verbs (with [+ATR] verbs; see also 3.2.2.2):

SG 1 àr- áá  + perfective verb stem (low tone)
2 àr- íí
3 àr- kóó

PL 1 àr- kée
2 àr- óó
3 àr- kóó
The perfective marker \textit{ar}- and the subject proclitics form one proclitical unit before the verb, and this marker thus has the same kind of clitical features as the subject proclitics (see Section 3.2.2.2).

The \textit{ar}-perfective must not occur with actions or events in the future:

\begin{verbatim}
*ar- áá si sekeə mechóon.
P- 1.SG have.P money.A tomorrow
(‘I’ll have money tomorrow.’)
\end{verbatim}

The verb \textit{ting} ‘have’ occurs only in the imperfective (see Section 3.2.3.4); in the perfective (or subjunctive), the suppletive form \textit{si} must be used (derived from the verb \textit{sic}h (I), \textit{si} (P) ‘get’:

\begin{verbatim}
a ting’- é waárée somok.
1.SG have.I- I children.A three.A
‘I have three children’
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
*ar- áá ting’ waárée somok.
P- 1.SG have.O- children.A three.A

ar- áá si waárée somok.
P- 1.SG have.P children.A three.A
‘I have (got) three children.’
\end{verbatim}

\textbf{3.2.3.1.3 Perfect}

The following is the basic conjugational paradigm of the perfect aspect, which expresses current relevance of a situation relating to the past. Its form is similar to that of the near past, but whereas the former may be constructed in the imperfective or the perfective, the latter is always constructed in the perfective aspect (3.2.3.1.2), as can be seen in the following pair:

\begin{verbatim}
ká ru ‘he has slept’ Perfect
PERF sleep.P

vs.

ká ru- e ‘he was sleeping’ Near past
NP sleep- I
\end{verbatim}

The perfect is compatible with adverbs marking speech time:

\begin{verbatim}
ká am koron. ‘He has eaten now.’
PERF eat.P now
\end{verbatim}
?ká am-e kɔrɔ. ?'He was eating now.'

The following are the basic personal markers of the perfect (cf. 3.2.2.2):

SG 1 ka-à + perfective verb stem
2 ka-i
3 ká
PL 1 ká-kì
2 k- ò
3 ká

Example
ka-  a til- ú keélie ikáa chii.
PERF- 1.SG find- VEN feet.A GEN.PL person
'I've spotted human footprints.'

3.2.3.1.2 Tense
Whereas aspect is an obligatory feature of verb forms, tense need not and frequently is not marked. Nevertheless, there are five verbal categories distinguishing deictic time by means of pre-verbal particles, of which three are past tenses. These categories are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Canonical marker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a Present</td>
<td>zero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b Near past (NP)</td>
<td>kà-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c Middle past (MP)</td>
<td>kóí-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d Remote past (RP)</td>
<td>kíí-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e Future (FUT)</td>
<td>màch-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The present is the morphologically unmarked default tense, typically expressing actions or events at the time of speaking, both in the imperfective and perfective aspects. Its basic person-number exponents are (for [+ATR] vowels):

SG 1 a
2 i
3 -

PL 1 ki
2 o
3 -
**Near past**
The kà near past tense (NP) refers mostly to events or actions that took place earlier today, even if it may more marginally refer to those of yesterday. Like the other two past tenses, the near past occurs both in the imperfective and the perfective aspects.

**Middle past**
The kóí middle past (MP) refers to events or actions that took place early today or yesterday (thus overlapping with the near past) but more likely a few days ago. The paradigm of person-number markers of the middle past marker (MP) kóí in the imperfective is as follows (for [+ATR] vowels):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Marker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG 1</td>
<td>kóí- à</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>kóí- i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>kóó</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL 1</td>
<td>kóí- ki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>kóí- ò</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>kóó</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Like the near past, it combines with both imperfective (a) and perfective verb forms (b):

(a) kóí- a mach- e áain pee.  
MP-1.SG want- I recently water.A  
‘I wanted water recently.’

(b) kóí- a sí amút sekee.  
MP-1.SG have.P yesterday money.A  
‘I got money yesterday.’

**Remote past**
The remote past (RP) kíí refers mostly to events or actions of the distant past, extending from a few weeks or months to generations ago. The paradigm of person-number markers of the remote past marker kíí in the imperfective is as follows (for [+ATR] vowels) (cf. 3.2.2.2):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Marker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG 1</td>
<td>kíí- à</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>kíí- i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>kíí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL 1</td>
<td>kíí- ki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>kíí- ò</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>kíí</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The remote past collocates frequently with the adverb ápa ‘long ago’, a Maasai borrowing, like in the following text piece:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{kíí nte ápa tiántaakomḗ í naá kíí nyô} \\
\text{RP exist long.ago monster.NOM DM REL.SG RP come}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
kó̂ cheng’ waářɛɛ. \\
P.3- search.for children.A
\end{align*}
\]

‘Long ago there was a monster who came to search for children.’ (3/1)

**Future**

The future tense is formed with the prefix mach-, which is presumably a grammaticalized form of the verb mach ‘want’ (cf. English will; see Heine and Kuteva 2002). The (main) verb is constructed by means of the subjunctive (perfective) verb stem, e.g.,

\[
\begin{align*}
mach- á nyor- ú waářɛɛ. \\
\text{FUT- 1.SG meet-S children.A}
\end{align*}
\]

‘I’ll meet the children.’

The following is the conjugational paradigm of the suppletive verb meɛy (sg.), peek (pl.) ‘die’ (see Section 3.2.3.4). Note that the consonant ch of mach-changes to a high front vowel preceding k (> mar-).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>mach- áá me- i</th>
<th>‘I’ll die’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG 1</td>
<td>mach- íí me- i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL 1</td>
<td>mar- këé pek- u</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>mach- óó pek- u</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>mar- kó pek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But we also found an alternative conjugation, where ch and k co-occur. Here as well, the verb is constructed in the perfective aspect:

---

23 As the tone pattern (high tone on the subject proclitic and low tone on the verb stem) suggests, the future tense goes back to an earlier subjunctive construction; note that the subjunctive also uses the perfective aspect form (see Section 3.2.3.1.3).
Concerning two other grammaticalized forms of the verb *mach* ‘want’, see under proximative aspect (3.2.3.3) and negative past (3.2.4). The future and the negative past are formally similar but clearly different in essential phonological features, as the following examples may illustrate:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{SG 1 mecc-} & \quad \text{áá we nén pee} & \text{‘I’ll go to the water’} \\
\text{2 mecc-} & \quad \text{í we nén pee} \\
\text{3 mech-} & \quad \text{kóó wa nén pee} \\
\text{PL 1 mecc-} & \quad \text{kéé pe nén pee} \\
\text{2 mecc-} & \quad \text{é pe nén pee} \\
\text{3 mech-} & \quad \text{kóó pa nén pee}
\end{align*}
\]

The paradigm grammatical category of modality is the subjunctive (S). The subjunctive morphology is basically that of the perfective aspect although there are both suprasegmental and segmental differences:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{SG 1 á} & \quad + \text{perfective verb stem (low tone)} \\
\text{2 í} \\
\text{3 kó} \\
\text{PL 1 ké} \\
\text{2 ó} \\
\text{3 kó}
\end{align*}
\]

\textbf{Example}

\[
\begin{align*}
a \quad \text{mach-é á al amtn.} \\
1.SG \quad \text{want- I} & \quad 1.SG \quad \text{buy.S food.A} \\
\text{‘I want to buy food.’}
\end{align*}
\]

The subjunctive is a frequently used category, occurring not only in main clauses and subordinate clauses but also in main verbs of auxiliary constructions (see Section 3.2.3.3). It is also widely used as a substitute for the imperative; note that the suffix *-en* in the first and second person plural is presumably derived from the imperative suffix (see Section 3.2.5). Note further that the subjunctive is widely used to introduce verbal complements, corresponding to infinitives in many other languages (see Section 3.2.1.4).
Hypothetical mood
The preverbal particle tòòs (HYP) denotes actions or events that might take place but have not (yet) taken place. The particle combines both with the imperfective (a) and the perfective aspect (b):

(a) toos ki ápiit- e këën.
   HYP 1.PL listen.to- I REFL
   ‘We might listen to each other.’

(b) toos kéé al amtu.
   HYP 1.PL buy.P food.A
   ‘We might buy food.’

The particle precedes all other elements of the verbal group and may be separated from the latter by means of adverbs, like ra ‘today’ in the following example:

toos ra ká roopan.
   HYP today PERF rain
   ‘It might have rained today.’

On evidentiality
Evidentially is not a relevant grammatical domain of the language, neither in Sentence Grammar nor in Thetical Grammar (see Chapter 4). But there are two weakly grammaticalized forms of evidentiality, namely the following:

tááku ‘I have visible evidence to the effect that’ (EVI.SE)
kásö ‘I have audible evidence to the effect that’ (EVI.HE)

They are placed before the verb form, which takes the usual TAM inflections.

Examples
tááku kó am- líyve.
   EVI.SE NAR eat.3.I- AP
   ‘They are eating (I can see them).’

kasu kó péntin.
   EVI.HE NAR go.3.PL.I
   ‘They are leaving (I hear them).’

The two evidential markers are transparently derived, respectively, from the verbs taak ‘see’ and kas ‘hear’, having been grammaticalized in their venitive form.
3.2.3.1.4 The “narrative”
There is a range of different constructions to signal subsequent events in discourse. Most of them concern discourse markers and, hence, will be discussed in Thetical Grammar (Section 4.4). But some are part of Sentence Grammar.

One form commonly found in the texts is kótò, presumably related etymologically to the homonymous preposition (3.4.1) and the conjunction (3.8.2.3). As a marker of consecutive events, best translated as ‘and (then)’, kótò merges with the following subject proclitic, giving rise to the following paradigm:

SG 1 kót- àà
   2 kót- îì
   3 kótò
PL 1 kót- kèè
   2 kót- òò
   3 kóto

Example
ko nyó nnyée kóto nyo ko ít loosíkitò.
‘She came and arrived in Gitu.’

What we loosely refer to here as a “narrative” has a different form. The verbal proclitic kò (kò) is presumably a grammaticalized form of the copula kò (kò) (3.2.1), and in a number of its uses it can still be translated as a copular element. Furthermore, it serves as a third person subject proclitic in the perfective (see Section 3.2.2.2). In addition it is also used as what we tentatively gloss here “NAR” (narrative), even if many of its uses are not narrative in a paradigm sense of the term.

One main function is in fact to introduce a sequence of events in a narrative event flow. In this capacity it occurs sentence-initially, e.g.:

ko úp- chi keechiriée ko nyō
NAR take- DAT.P sheep.A NAR come

kó am pányee.
NAR eat meat.A
‘And he took the sheep and ate the meat.’ (5/11)

3.2.3.1.5 “Subordinate n-”
There is a construction of the verbal predicate taking the prefix n- and the perfective proclitics. The exact function of this construction is not entirely clear, it appears to form dependent predicates and we tentatively refer to it as “subordinate n-.” In doing so, we
are aware of the fact that it also occurs without a main clause – as a matter of fact, two of its uses listed below are of the latter kind. While the verb may appear in either aspect, subordinate n- takes the form of a subjunctive construction; note that the subjunctive is coded in the perfective aspect. “Subordinate n-” has the following uses in particular:

(a) Expressing obligation, e.g.,

\[
\text{n- kó tíén.} \\
\text{SUB- 3.P play.P} \\
\text{‘S/he or they should play.’}
\]

(b) When preceded by the negation marker mà- it expresses negative past in the imperfective (i) and negative obligation in the perfective aspect (ii), e.g.,

(i) \[
\text{ma- n- íí ting’- é sekee.} \\
\text{NEG SUB- 2.SG have- I money.A} \\
\text{‘You had no money.’}
\]

(ii) \[
\text{ma- n- íí chéng’- aán.} \\
\text{NEG SUB- 2.SG.P search.P- 1.SG.O} \\
\text{‘You shouldn’t search for me.’}
\]

(c) It forms simultaneous temporal clauses (‘while’-clauses) when preceded by the preposition \text{ka}, and the verb can appear both in the imperfective and the perfective aspect. Cf. the following perfective paradigm:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SG 1</th>
<th>ka</th>
<th>n-</th>
<th>áá</th>
<th>we</th>
<th>‘while I had gone’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ka</td>
<td>n-</td>
<td>íí</td>
<td>we</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ka</td>
<td>n-</td>
<td>kó</td>
<td>wa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PL 1</th>
<th>ka</th>
<th>n-</th>
<th>kéé</th>
<th>pe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ka</td>
<td>n-</td>
<td>sś</td>
<td>pe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ka</td>
<td>n-</td>
<td>kó</td>
<td>pa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\text{Examples}

\[
\text{kóó tuluch amót ka n- kó am- e panyee.} \\
\text{‘He fell down while he was eating meat yesterday.’}
\]

\[
\text{ar- kó am- íís ka n- kó eëch.} \\
\text{P- 3.P eat- AP ka SUB- 3.P dawn.P} \\
\text{‘He has been eating while it dawned.’}
\]
### 3.2.3.2 Derivation

Akie dispose of a wide range of derivational extensions which, with few exceptions, are expressed by means of suffixes. Many of them are not fully productive, that is, they can be applied to some verbs but not to others. Akie thus differs from the neighboring Bantu languages, where verbal derivation is a fairly productive process. The following is a sketch of the extensions that we were able to identify.

The morphophonology of the extensions to be discussed below is complex and cannot be discussed here. One morphophonological feature concerns the verb root. When a derivational suffix is added, a number of verbs take a final consonant \(k\), as the following examples may show:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Default form of the verb</th>
<th>Before some derivational suffixes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>si</td>
<td>sik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>riech</td>
<td>riek</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Example**

- ariech-e: 'I brew (beer)'
- 1.SG brew- I
- kéé riek-fís: 'we should brew'
- 1.PL brew.S- AP

The ten extensions distinguished are:

- a Ambulative
- b Andative
- c Antipassive
- d Applicative
- e Associative
- f Causative
- g Dative
- h Passive
- i Stative
- j Venitive

They are now discussed in alphabetical order.

#### 3.2.3.2.1 Ambulative

Following Creider and Tapsuei Creider (1989: 89) we use the term “ambulative” (AMB) for the verbal extension \(-aat\), which serves a conglomeration of the following three
meaning: (a) ‘to do here and there and/or this and that’, (b) ‘to do carefully’, and (c) ‘to do habitually’.

(a) a táák- aatéy k'éétkú.
1.SG see- AMB.I trees.A
'I see many trees here and there.'

(b) went- áátc.
go- AMB
'He goes carefully but moves on.'

(c) ey- áátc.
drink- AMB
'He drinks little by little, or fairly regularly.'

The following ambulative paradigms are those of the verb pun ‘pass’.

Stem: pun-aat ‘pass carefully, or here and there, or regularly’

Imperative: pun-áát-en pl. o pun-áát-en ‘pass carefully’!, or ‘pass here and there!'

Imperfective Perfective Subjunctive
SG 1 a pun- aat-ey ar-áa pun- aat- ē a pun- aat- ey
2 i pun- aat-ey ar-íí pun- aat- ē i pun- aat- ey
3 pun- áát-e ar- kó pun- áát- a ko pun- aat- a
PL 1 ki pun- aat-ey ar- kée pun- aat- ē ki pun- aat- ey
2 o pun- aat-ey ar- óó pun- aat- ē o pun- aat- ey
3 pun- áát-e ar- kó pun- áát- a ko pun- aat- a

3.2.3.2.2 Andative
The andative (‘motion away from speaker or deictic center’, also called itive; AND) suffix -ta is not a productive verbal extension. It is commonly found as an obligatory or optional suffix on verbs implying motion away from the speaker, such as lu-ta ‘push off accidentally’ and tii-td ‘take along’.

A typical example is provided by the verb tór-ta ‘push (away)’, for which the following paradigms have been recorded:

Stem: tór-ta ‘push (away)’

Imperative: tór-t-én, pl. o tór-t-én ‘push (away)!’

Imperfective Perfective Subjunctive
SG 1 a tór- ́tááhi ar-á tór- te á tór- te
2 i tór- ́tááhi ar-í tór- te í tór- te
3 tór- tái ar-ko tór- ta ko tór- ta
3.2.3.2.3 Antipassive
The antipassive (AP) suffix -iisye (or -eesyee) (I), -ns (P) serves to delete the undergoer (direct object) of a transitive verb, e.g.,

\[ \text{kí al- e amti.} \]

'We buy food.'

vs.

\[ \text{kí ál- iisye- y (*amti).} \]

'We buy, we do shopping.'

To the extent that transitive verbs are involved, the suffix is fully productive. The following are the conjugational antipassive paradigms of the verb *am* 'eat'.

Stem: am-iisye ‘eat (intr.)’
Imperative: kéé am-iisye-n ‘let us eat!’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Imperfective</th>
<th>Perfective</th>
<th>Subjunctive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG 1</td>
<td>a ám- iisye-y</td>
<td>ar-áá am- ns(yê)</td>
<td>á am- ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 i</td>
<td>ám- iisye-y</td>
<td>ar-íí am- ns(yê)</td>
<td>í am- ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>am- iisye</td>
<td>ar-kó am- ns</td>
<td>kó am- ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL 1</td>
<td>ki ám- iisye-y</td>
<td>ar-kéé am- ns(yê)</td>
<td>ké am- nsy-en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 o</td>
<td>ám- iisye-y</td>
<td>ar-óó am- ns(yê)</td>
<td>ó am- nsy-en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>am- iisye</td>
<td>ar-kó am- ns</td>
<td>kó am- ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.3.2.4 Applicative
The applicative suffix (APL) adds a typically inanimate participant to the valency of the verb. It is largely, though not entirely productive. The participant added is mostly either a locative (a) or an instrumental one (b). In a number of cases, the preposition *nen* can be used instead of the applicative. Thus, instead of (b), (c) may be used.

(a) \[ \text{ar-áá taak- en láákwêê paráí taa kopuruêê.} \]

P 1.SG see- APL child.A top GEN hill.A

'I've seen the child on top of the hill.'

(b) \[ \text{i llúú- eyen rúńkuu láákwêê.} \]

2.SG beat- APL club.A child.A
‘You are hitting the child with the club.’

(c) i lluu- e nen rünk uu láákw ee.
2.SG beat- I LOC club.A child.A
‘You are hitting the child with the club.’

The following is the basic paradigm of the applicative:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Imperfective</th>
<th>Perfective</th>
<th>Subjunctive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG 1</td>
<td>-èyyèn</td>
<td>-èèn</td>
<td>-èèn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-èyyèn</td>
<td>-èèn</td>
<td>-èèn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-èyyà</td>
<td>-èè</td>
<td>-èèn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL 1</td>
<td>-èèyyèn</td>
<td>-èèn</td>
<td>-èèn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-èèyyèn</td>
<td>-èèn</td>
<td>-èèn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-èyyà</td>
<td>-èñèèn</td>
<td>-èèn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whereas the dative adds a typically animate participant (3.2.3.2.7), the applicative takes as a rule inanimate ones. Note that the two suffixes can be combined (see Section 3.2.3.2.11).

3.2.3.2.5 Associative
What Creider and Tapsuebe Creider (1989: 94) describe in Kalenjin as an associative derivation (‘more than one actor participating in an activity’; ASS) also exists in Akie. The main function of the suffix -itoos (I)/ -ia (P) is to denote ‘do something jointly, together’.

The following example illustrates this extension:

oo rú- ie- n nen íyu kosi kée am ímahoi.
2.PL sleep- ASS- IMP LOC here PURP PAS eat.S medicine.A
‘You (pl.) sleep here together so that the medicine (can) be taken.’ (4/33)

This derivational suffix is restricted to the plural while in the singular the underived verb form is used. Some verbs, such as sitt- ‘be silent’ and rui ‘sleep’ commonly occur only in the associative as their default form. The verb rui ‘sleep’ illustrates the paradigms of this derivation:

Stem: rui ‘sleep’
Imperative: ru ‘Sleep!’, pl. oo-rú-ie-n ‘Ye sleep!’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Imperfective</th>
<th>Perfective</th>
<th>Subjunctive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG 1</td>
<td>a ru-e</td>
<td>ar- áá ru</td>
<td>á ru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>i ru-e</td>
<td>ar- í í ru</td>
<td>í ru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ru-e</td>
<td>ar-kó ru</td>
<td>kó ru</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other verbs showing this conjugation are i-syep-i ‘stay’ and sap-i ‘recover, get healed’.

### 3.2.3.2.6 Causative

The causative extension (CAUS), basically expressed by the verbal prefix i-, is no longer productive, occurring only as a lexicalized element of verbs, such as raraa(k) ‘put down’ or isaap ‘heal’. Thus, these causative verbs are morphophonologically i-verbs (see Section 3.2.1.4).

That the causative is associated with a distinct meaning can be seen from pairings such as the following, where (a) shows the underived and (b) the derived, causative function:

(a) raráák-ʊ láákweč.
   descend- VEN child.N
   ‘The child is coming down.’

(b) iraráák-ʊ-ʊ láákweč.
   put.down- VEN- IMP child.A
   ‘Put the child down!’

The following are the three basic paradigms of causative verbs, illustrated with the verb isaap ‘to heal’. Note that the prefix i- surfaces only in the third person of the imperfective (I); otherwise, it manifests itself generally in the lengthening of the preceding vowel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stem: isaap ‘heal’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imperative: saap-en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG 1 aa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 isáap-e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL 1 kii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 oo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 isáap-e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Causative meanings are more commonly expressed lexically by means of periphrastic constructions, as we will see in Section 3.2.3.3.
3.2.3.2.7 Dative

The dative suffix (DAT) is -chin (imperfective) and -chi (perfective). It is a fully productive verbal derivation, typically adding a recipient or benefactive participant to the syntactic frame of the verb, e.g.,

ki- rá ál- chi láákwɛɛ amti.
1.PL- P buy- DAT.P child.A food.A
‘We have bought food for the child.’

The following are the morphological paradigms associated with this extension, using the verb kaa- ‘give’ as an example.

Stem: ikaa-chin ‘give’

Imperative: kóón-aan ‘give me!’, pl. ó kóón-eech ‘you (pl.) give us!’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Imperfective</th>
<th>Perfective</th>
<th>Subjunctive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG 1</td>
<td>a káá- chin- i ar- áá kaa- chi áá kaa- chî</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>i káá- chin- i ar- íí kaa- chi íí kaa- chî</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ikáá- chin   ar- kóó kaa- chi kóó kaa- chi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL 1</td>
<td>ki káá- chin- i ar- kée kaa- chi kée káá- chi- n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>o káá- chin- i ar- óó kaa- chi óó káá- chi- n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ikáá- chin   ar- kóó kaa- chi kóó kaa- chi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The dative suffix -chin/-chi loses its initial consonant (>) -in if immediately preceded by t (see Section 2.1). Thus, (a) is obligatorily replaced by (b):

(a) *a ng’út- chini ng’ólleɛ.
(b) a ng’út- ini ng’ólleɛ.
1.SG spit- DAT saliva.A
‘I spit (at him, for blessing).’

3.2.3.2.8 Passive

A passive-like construction (PAS) is formed by using the verb with the frozen, that is, grammaticalized first person plural proclitic (PAS) while the undergoer (patient) is encoded as an object participant in the accusative case (using the pronominal object suffixes; 3.2.2.3), and the verb is constructed in the third person (rather than the first person plural). Take the following examples. In the first one, the i-verb ikeni ‘wait’ in (a)

---

24 While "dative" is mostly found in uses as a nominal case marker, we are extending its use here to verbal derivation because its functions significantly overlap with those of a nominal case marker in marking most of all recipients of actions.
takes the first/second person agreement suffix -$i$ in the active form while the passive in (b) has the zero marker of third person subject reference:

(a) $\text{kíí kéni-} i$ ‘we wait’
   1.PL  wait-  1/2

(b) $\text{kíí kéni}$ ‘(he) is expected’
   PAS  wait  (lit. ‘(he) is waited for’)

**Example**

\begin{quote}
\text{paakach} ‘abandon’:
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\text{ar- kéé paakach- áan}
\P-  PAS  abandon-  1.SG.O
\end{quote}

‘I have been left alone.’

In the following example there is also a difference in the subject proclitic:

(a) \begin{quote}
\text{ar- kéé yɔ- y}.
\P- 1.PL  cook.CAUS.P-  1/2
\end{quote}

‘We’ve cooked (it).’

(b) \begin{quote}
\text{ar- kíí yɔ.}
\P- 1.PL  cook.CAUS.P
\end{quote}

‘(It) has been cooked.’

While the passive normally occurs without an agent, it is possible to add one, coded in the nominative case, which appears to be a kind of afterthought:

\begin{quote}
\text{ar- kéé pir waárɛe amóø- n.}
\P-  PAS  beat  children.A  mother- N
\end{quote}

‘The children have been beaten by mother.’

\begin{quote}
\text{weɛrrii kí uny- e kááruusyê.}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\text{boys.A  PAS  hide- I  women.N}
\end{quote}

‘The boys (to be taken to the initiation ceremony) are hidden by the women (i.e., their mothers).’

The passive is quite commonly used in narrative discourse, as in the following example:
ar- kó taa kéé am- aan.
P- 3.P do.again PAS eat- 1.SG.O

‘[...] I was again about to be killed (‘eaten’) (by the buffalo).’ (Bahati’s buffalo story)

The following are the conjugational paradigms of the passive using the suppletive verb *taak* (I), *sowa* (P) ‘see’. Note that the perfective stem *sowa* is restricted to the third person of the perfective and subjunctive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stem: taak ‘see’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imperfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG 1 ki táák- áán ‘I am seen’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ki táák- íín</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 ki taák- ê</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL 1 ki táák- ééech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ki táák- áák</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 ki taák- ê</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.2.3.2.9 Stative

The verbal suffix *-ak* is of limited productivity to form agent-deleting stative verb forms (STA), e.g.,

nyšy- e kárka amt.
cook- I woman.N food.A

‘The woman is cooking food.’

vs.

ká nyšy- ak ámt.
NP cook- STA food.N

‘The food was cooked.’

mai- kó am- ák ámt.
FUT- 3.P eat- STA food.N

‘The food will be eaten.’

But a more productive means of deleting an agent is provided by the the venitive extension *-u* (3.2.3.2.10).

### 3.2.3.2.10 Venitive

The venitive suffix (also referred to as “ventive”; VEN) *-u* (or *-un*) expresses ‘motion towards the speaker or deictic center’. Preceding other derivational suffixes the form is *-un* (or *-un*), e.g.,
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nyoon-ún-eyya kəskólmyee.
come-VEN-APL evening.time
‘He will come here in the evening.’

It is no longer a fully productive derivational extension. Nevertheless, the suffix occurs in semi-lexicalized forms, as in the following pairs:

ar-áá kuur ‘I’ve called him’
ar-áá kuur-u ‘I’ve called him here’

a-mút-i ‘I take something or somebody somewhere’
a-mút-u ‘I bring something or somebody here’

Like the stative (3.2.3.2.9), the venitive extension -u is also used to delete a patient, cf. the following example:

a- kas-e. ‘I hear (it).’

vs.

a- kás-u. ‘I can be heard.’

The patient in this intransitivizing construction is coded in the nominative case (a). As the above paradigm shows, the suffix -u disappears in the perfective (b):

(a) ka táak-ʊ kááruusyê ayéng'-uun.
NP see-VEN women.N two-N
‘The two women are visible.’

(b) ka táak kááruusyê ayéng'-uun.
PERF see.P.VEN women.N two-N
‘The two women have been visible.’

Furthermore, the venitive appears to survive in the form -(it)u in various paradigms of verbs, namely

(a) as a stative (intransitivizing) suffix (cf. 3.2.3.2.9), and
(b) as a de-adjectival inceptive verbalizer (3.5.2).

3.2.3.2.11 Combinations
In the preceding paragraphs we have already seen a few examples showing that verbal extensions can be combined within a single verbal word. The following combinations of derivational suffixes have been found:
A thorough study of such combinations is urgently needed, and this concerns in the same way their morphophonology and their semantics. We are restricted here to two examples. It would seem that in such combinations, the first extension occurs in a fixed form, unaffected by TAM inflections, while the second shows a suffixal distinction between speech participants (first and second person) and non-participants (third person).

The following are examples of these combinations:

```
1. SG eat- AND- AP- APL spoon.A
'I eat with a spoon.'

1. SG spit- DAT- APL saliva.A boys.A beer.A
'I spit beer at the boys (for blessing them).'
```

```
1. SG tear- STA- AP
'I am split, torn.'

1. PL harvest- AP- APL sun.A
'We harvest (honey while fully exposed to) the sun.'

1. PL harvest-VEN- APL honey.A sun.A
'We harvest honey in the full sun.'

1. PL talk- DAT- ASS
'We talk to each other about something.'

1. PL eat- AP- AMB- ASS
'We eat together here and there while traveling.'
Neither the meanings nor the forms of combinations are always predictable from those of non-combined derivational suffixes.

3.2.3.3 Periphrastic constructions
The language disposes of a range of auxiliary-like verbs that express concepts of (a) verbal aspect or (b) derivation.

(a) Verbal aspect
In addition to the aspects distinguished in Section 3.2.3.1.1 there are a number of periphrastic aspects, to be discussed below.

Proximative
The verb *mach* ‘want’, which appears to have been grammaticalized to a future tense in its perfective form (3.2.3.1.2), is used in its imperfective form as an auxiliary for a proximative aspect (‘be on the verge of, be about to’):

```
mach- e a ting'- e sekee.
[maˈće ðiˈniˈšeke:]
want- I 1.SG have.I- I money.A
‘I am about to have money.’
```

Note that the auxiliary *mach* is apparently grammaticalized to the extent that it no longer takes personal subject proclitics. Note further that the main verb is also constructed in the imperfective aspect.

Change of state
By means of the perfective form of the verb *si* ‘have (got)’ (see Section 3.2.3.4) an change-of-state aspect (‘get into a state of doing’) can be formed, where the main verb is in a subjunctive form (constructed in the perfective aspect):

```
ar- áá si á nyit.
P- 1.SG got 1SG know
‘I’ve come to know (him, her).’
```

Already-perfect
An ‘earlier-than-expected’, already-aspect is formed by means of the auxiliary *rààk* ‘be ready, have already done’, a grammaticalized form of the verb *raak* ‘finish’. As usually, the verbs are combined, where the second verb, i.e., the main verb, appears in the subjunctive mood. The two verbs agree in person and number, *rààk* appears in the perfective (in the following example, *am* ‘eat’ is used with the antipassive extension; 3.2.3.2.3):
ar- áá raak á am- ñsyê.
P- 1.SG done.already 1.SG eat.S AP
‘I’ve already eaten.’

The following illustrates this aspect with the perfective stem si ‘have’:

SG 1 ar- áá raak á si ‘I have already got (it)’
2 ar- íí raak í si (Lit. ‘I’ve finished I’ve got’)  
3 ar- kó raak kó si
PL 1 ar- kén raak ké si
2 ar- só raak ó si
3 ar- kól raak kó si

Still-perfect
The auxiliary (or adverb) tàà, taking no subject proclitics, serves to express the aspectual notion ‘longer than expected’ (i.e., ‘still be doing’ (i) or, when negated, ‘have not yet done’ (ii). The auxiliary is compatible with both the imperfective and the perfective aspects.

(i) taa á am- ñsyê.
STILL 1.SG eat- AP.I
‘I am still eating.’

(ii) taa kó toomá a am- ñsyê.
STILL 3 not.yet 1.SG eat- AP.I
‘I have not yet eaten.’

(b) Derivation
Rather than using the derivational causative construction mentioned in 3.2.3.2.6, the main grammatical means for expressing causative concepts is via periphrasis, whereby either of the verbs mut ‘make’ or kaa ‘give’, actually the main verbs, serves as auxiliaries and the main verb is encoded in the subjunctive mood. Note that the auxiliaries take the dative extension:

kí míft- chini tūúka kó ëe pee.
[mištini]
‘We water the cattle.’

a káá- chini kó am amtí wáárëe.
‘I feed the children.’
3.2.3.4 Suppletive verbs
A number of verb forms exhibit suppletism, which is based on distinctions in aspect (imperfective vs. perfective), number (singular vs. plural), and/or modality (declarative vs. imperative). Table 1 provides a list of suppletive stems, restricted to frequently used verbs.

Table 1. Forms of suppletism in verbs (basic forms only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Imperfective</th>
<th>Perfective</th>
<th>Imperative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>Singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'come'</td>
<td>nyoon-u</td>
<td>pwaan</td>
<td>nyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'die'</td>
<td>meey-e</td>
<td>peek-u</td>
<td>me-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'give'</td>
<td>kaa-chin-i</td>
<td>kaa-chin-i</td>
<td>kaa-chi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'go'</td>
<td>wenti</td>
<td>penti</td>
<td>wa, we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'have'</td>
<td>ting'-e</td>
<td>ting'-e</td>
<td>si</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'know'</td>
<td>nkun</td>
<td>nkun</td>
<td>nyit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'see'</td>
<td>taak-e</td>
<td>taak-e</td>
<td>suwa, suwe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'be silent'</td>
<td>sitt-aahi</td>
<td>sitt-ai</td>
<td>sitt-e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We may illustrate the nature of suppletism by providing the conjugational paradigms for one of the suppletive verbs, namely meey (SG), peek (PL) ‘die’ (for a more comprehensive treatment of suppletism, see König et al. 2014b):

Stem: meey (SG), peek (PL) ‘die’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Imperfective</th>
<th>Perfective</th>
<th>Subjunctive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG 1</td>
<td>a meey- e</td>
<td>ar-á me- 1</td>
<td>á me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 i meey- e</td>
<td>ar-í me- 1</td>
<td>í me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 meey- ê</td>
<td>ar-kö me</td>
<td>kö me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL 1</td>
<td>ki péék- u</td>
<td>ar-kéé pek- u</td>
<td>kéé pek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 o péék- u</td>
<td>ar-óó pek- u</td>
<td>óó pek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 peek- u</td>
<td>ar-ko pëk</td>
<td>kó pek</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.4 Negation
Negative verb forms are expressed by means of the negation particle mà, which is prefixed to the person marker:

am mà- kí wèch dé këēn pesyo
because NEG- 1.PL dislike DM REFL day.A
hǹg ke ley ɛláá
DM 1.PL say folks

o pua-n dé o pua- n dé.
‘Because we don’t dislike each other, not a single day, we say, Folks, come, just come!’
(1/60)

Except for a few peculiarities, prefixing the negation particle does not affect the tone
pattern of the verbal predicate, e.g.,

ínte íyù. ‘It is here.’
be.at here.N

ma ínte íyù. ‘It is not here.’
NEG be.at here.N

The particle may function as a predicate:

ma achɛɛ. ‘It is not us.’
[má:acɛː]
NEG 1.PL.A

má ou- inta dé ting’- e chaa yáide ichaadé kuúmi.
NEG big- NOM DM have-I D.PL DM DM beer.A
‘It is not very much [it is not bigness that it has], this beer here!’ (1/68)

Negative questions require an affirmative answer in order to be negated:

ceɛɛ má akie? aá, má akie.
3.PL.A NEG Akie.PL yes NEG Akie.PL
‘Are they not Akie?’ ‘No, they are not Akie.’

In the negative past, má- is not used. Instead, it is the verb mach ‘want, need’, with the
main verb constructed in the perfective aspect:

SG 1 mách-a me-i ‘I have not (yet) died’
2 mách-i me-i
3 toomá ko me
PL 1 mái- ki pek-ú
2 mách- o pek-ú
3 mái- ko pek
A second negative construction, let us call it the “not-yet-perfect”, is formed with the clause-initial particle tòòmâ ‘not yet’:

\[
\begin{aligned}
\text{ar-kò nyó?} & \quad \text{toomâ.} \\
\text{P- 3.P come.SG.Q} & \quad \text{not.yet}
\end{aligned}
\]

‘Has he come?’ ‘Not yet.’

 tôòmâ requires the verb to be in the perfective aspect (the high-falling tone on tôòmâ changes to high before a low tone; see Section 2.3) and, in fact, this constitutes the perfective equivalent of verbal negation.

Once again, negative questions require an affirmative answer in order to be negated:

\[
\begin{aligned}
\text{toomâ ko nyo nnyéé?} & \quad \text{aa, toomâ ko nyo.} \\
\text{not.yet 3.P come.SG.P 3.SG.N} & \quad \text{yes not.yet 3.P come.SG.P}
\end{aligned}
\]

‘He hasn’t come yet?’ ‘No, he hasn’t come yet.’

A third negative tense employs the negative particle mi- followed by the “subordinate n-” form of the verb (3.2.3.1.5). Unlike the other two constructions it expresses a past continuous event. Consider the following paradigm of the verb rui ‘sleep’, which takes the associative derivation (3.2.3.2.5):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Sg 1} & \quad \text{mi n- áá ru-e} & \quad \text{‘I was not sleeping’} \\
\text{2} & \quad \text{mi n- íí ru-e} \\
\text{3} & \quad \text{mi n- kó ru-e} \\
\text{Pl 1} & \quad \text{mi n- kéé ru-itoos- ëy} \\
\text{2} & \quad \text{mi n- óó ru-itoos- ëy} \\
\text{3} & \quad \text{mi n- kó ru-itoos}
\end{align*}
\]

### 3.2.5 Imperative and deontic modality

Being an important category of discourse management, imperatives will be discussed in more detail in our discussion of Thetical Grammar (Section 4.2.4). Here, we are restricted to a few morphosyntactic features characterizing this category.

The regular pattern of forming imperatives is by using the perfective form and adding the imperative suffix -en (-en), which is reduced to -n after a vowel. The following are a few examples, others can be found in the verbal paradigms presented above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ëé-sye-n</td>
<td>o ëé-sye-n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Drink (AP)!’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(&lt; ëé-fïsyen)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drink-AP-IMP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>Plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ám</td>
<td>ó am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bîk</td>
<td>o bîk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ɛí</td>
<td>ó ɛí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kóón-aan</td>
<td>ó kóón-aan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nyóón</td>
<td>ó pwaan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>úúï</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Example**

```
nyóón ru nen iyû.
come.IMP sleep.IMP at here
‘Come, sleep here!’ (3/14)
```

For the verb ng’alaan ‘say, call’, an imperative form ng’óloon has been noted (cf. the unusual verb-end placement in the following example):

```
kámbenia ng’óloon!
Kambenia say
‘Say Kambenia (= may I enter?)!’ (3/6)
```
3.3 The noun phrase

3.3.1 Nouns

Nouns are sensitive to number (3.3.1.1), usually indicated by suffixes or stem change, case (3.3.1.2), distinguished by tone, but not to (in)definiteness or gender; there is no grammaticalized category of semantically based gender or noun classification.

3.3.1.1 Number

There is a fairly rigid number distinction, involving either a singular vs. plural or singulative vs. unmarked contrast. The way nouns are morphologically marked for number is largely, though not entirely, predictable. The following is a rough survey of the main patterns to be observed.

First, there are a few nouns that distinguish number largely or entirely on the basis of [ATR] vowel quality (see Section 2.2), e.g.,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
<th>‘tree, wood, medicine’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>keeti</td>
<td>kēëti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kwééye</td>
<td>kwééye</td>
<td>‘shoe, sandal’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Second, a number of other nouns use suppletism to distinguish number, such as the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
<th>‘child’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>láákwee</td>
<td>waáre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oorâ</td>
<td>weéeri</td>
<td>‘uncircumcised boy’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pénta</td>
<td>pányee</td>
<td>‘meat’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pesye</td>
<td>ékɔɔsyɛ</td>
<td>‘day’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tɛɛta</td>
<td>túsya</td>
<td>‘cow’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yũake</td>
<td>kááruusye</td>
<td>‘woman, mother’ (cf. kárka ‘woman’)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And third, there is a range of number-specific segmental units. In spite of the largely unpredictable way of nominal number marking, a few recurrent ways of expressing nominal number distinctions can be observed. We propose below to distinguish between three main kinds of patterns.

The first includes a pattern where the singular has no suffix while the plural is expressed by some specific suffix.

Pl. -syɛ

This represents by far the most pattern of number marking in Akie. The following are but a few examples:
The second group contains nouns using a singulative suffix corresponding to a zero form in the plural, where the latter appears to be conceived as a collective entity:

**Sg. -antee**
This group includes but is not restricted to the nouns denoting ethnic groups or nationalities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aki-antee</td>
<td>akie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>móri-antee</td>
<td>móre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pááí-antee</td>
<td>pááí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pééli-antee</td>
<td>pééle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>puüní-antee</td>
<td>puüní</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sek-antee</td>
<td>seké</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sékéémí-antee</td>
<td>sékéémí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>súúswá-antee</td>
<td>súúswé</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sg. -ta**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ng’etúún-ta</td>
<td>ng’etúúnyi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kóí-ta</td>
<td>kóí</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third group of number marking contains nouns that have an overt singular form corresponding to an overt plural form:
Sg. -ntà, pl. -Vng’(w)è (where V = preceding vowel)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kutúnta (kútuntà)</td>
<td>kútúúng’we (kútuuung’wè)</td>
<td>‘knee’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kóyánta (kóyantà)</td>
<td>kuyááng’è (kóyaang’è)</td>
<td>‘bow’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ñnta</td>
<td>óóng’we</td>
<td>‘ditch’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tutúnta (tútuntà)</td>
<td>tútúúng’we (tútuuung’wè)</td>
<td>‘ankle’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sg. -ʊɛ, pl. -óóno

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cháár-ʊɛ</td>
<td>chaar-óóno</td>
<td>‘friend’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tááy-ʊɛ</td>
<td>tááy-óóno</td>
<td>‘Yellow-Necked Spurfowl’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tól-ʊɛ</td>
<td>tul-óóno</td>
<td>‘hill’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is also a collective plural suffix -syan, added to the plural form of nouns. Like the ambulative suffix of verbal derivation (3.2.3.2.1), it has a locative component, denoting ‘many kinds of X, typically found in different locations’. It can be used with many, though not all, nouns; nouns such as pééle ‘elephants’ or pii ‘people’, for instance, do not allow it. The following are a few examples of it.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kááruusye ‘women’</td>
<td>kaarú-syanì ‘many women in different places’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kééti ‘trees’</td>
<td>kééti-syanì ‘many trees here and there’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kóóyì ‘stones’</td>
<td>kóó-syaáni ‘stones here and there’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pááí ‘elders’</td>
<td>paáí-syanì ‘elders in many different places’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weéríí ‘boys’</td>
<td>weéríí-syanì ‘boys everywhere’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Examples**

- loosikutò kámwakèèn péé- syaaníi.  
  ‘In Gitu (there is) lots of (rain) water.’

- ko-r- áá we amút kìe táá kóó-syaáni.  
  MP-P-1.SG go.P yesterday country GEN stones-PL  
  ‘Yesterday I went to a stony country.’

**Agreement**

The number feature of a noun can typically be inferred from its morphological shape. But it can also be inferred by its agreement behavior. For example, that the nouns pii ‘people’ and sekeè ‘money’ are morphologically plural can be seen in the use of the plural relative marker chàà (instead of the singular marker nàà) in the following examples:
Collective and mass nouns are typically plural nouns, as can be derived from their number agreement behavior.

3.3.1.2 Case
Akie is a rigid case language, more precisely a marked nominative language (König 2008). A wide range of word classes (nouns, adjectives, numerals, pronouns, possessives, demonstratives, or question words) are inherently marked for case.

There are only two cases, namely accusative and nominative. Like in the many other African marked nominative languages, the accusative is the unmarked and underived case, occurring in most contexts, even if its core function is one corresponding to accusative cases in other case languages (including Latin).25 The nominative, by contrast, is the marked and derived one, largely restricted to arguments having the function of a clausal subject.

On the surface it looks as if the two cases have contrasting tone patterns where a low tone of the accusative corresponds to a high tone in the nominative and vice versa. This is suggested by the many examples showing such a pattern, e.g.,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accusative</th>
<th>Nominative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>poróówee</td>
<td>póroowée</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>puuní</td>
<td>púúní</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>puutútú(i)</td>
<td>púútutúi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Such a correspondence, however, appears to be coincidental. The nominative is derived from the accusative by means of suprasegmental (i.e. tonal) change. But to a minor extent, segmental material can be involved as well. Such segmental material, used to derive the nominative from the accusative, concerns the following elements:

---

25 Creider and Tapsubei Creider (1989) use the term “absolute” instead of accusative for a case corresponding in form and function to the accusative case in Akie. In addition to the fact that “absolute” does not reflect the actual core function of this case, this term has been used in some form or other also for a number of cases in African and other languages, and some of these cases have functions that are quite different from the Akie accusative case (see König 2008 for more detailed discussion).
(a) The nominative suffix -n on the numeral for ‘one’ (3.3.2.2.1) and some adjectives (3.3.2.3).
(b) The suffix -uun on the numerals for ‘two’ through ‘five’ (3.3.2.2.1).

Not all nominals, however, do distinguish tonal case; some have the same form in the accusative and nominative. The following are a few examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accusative</th>
<th>Nominative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kwëntæ ɛ́</td>
<td>kwëntæ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>láákwæ ɛ</td>
<td>láákwæ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>páyyán</td>
<td>páyyán</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>óu</td>
<td>óu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A paradigm distinction concerns the following pattern: Whereas the accusative may have any tonal pattern, the nominative usually has high tone (H) on the first and high-falling (HF) on the last syllable while all other syllables, if there are, are low (L). The more syllables a word has the more likely it is to conform to this pattern.

The derivation of a nominative from an accusative category is to a large extent but not entirely regular. We are restricted here to larger classes of what looks like regular derivation. More generally, however, tonal case is not predictable but must be specified in the lexicon.

### 3.3.2 Modifiers
#### 3.3.2.1 Demonstratives

Demonstratives (D) exhibit a range of alternative expressions. What we propose to call the basic demonstratives are post-nominal words, added to the noun and being sensitive to the number of the noun. Three categories are distinguished, namely proximal (i.e., near to speaker), hearer-proximal (near to hearer), and distal (far away from speaker and hearer):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accusative</th>
<th>Nominative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>Plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximal (D.PR)</td>
<td>ní (nì)</td>
<td>chú (chù, chò)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearer-proximal (D.HE)</td>
<td>nàà</td>
<td>chàà</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distal (D.DI)</td>
<td>nìn (nììn)</td>
<td>chúùn (chòùn)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The hearer-proximal form is frequently also used to refer to pieces of preceding discourse (‘that already mentioned’), for example:
(a) ‘It is the millipede near you.’
(b) ‘It is the millipede mentioned earlier.’

In addition to these independent forms there are the following suffixal forms, restricted to the singular:

- **Proximal (PR)** - `î`
- **Hearer-proximal (HE)** - `àà`
- **Distal (DI)** - `îîn`

These forms appear to be eroded forms of the full demonstratives listed above, lacking the initial nasal consonant. They are fairly commonly used, but are *unproductive*, that is, they may be used only with specific nouns, and not all three deictic categories may combine with a given noun (for use of the suffixal forms in relativization, see Section 3.3.2.5).

**Examples**

- `kéétî` ‘tree’  
  `kèèt-î` ‘this tree’
- `kéét-a` ‘that tree (near you)’
- `kéét-iîn` ‘that tree (far away)’  
- `ng’állêê` ‘news’  
  `ng’állêê-î` ‘these news’
- `kie` ‘country’  
  `kia-î` ‘this country’

Demonstratives used as pronouns are similar to their counterparts used as nominal modifiers, but generally take low tones (ignoring other factors of tonal inflection) and change their vowel quality to [ + ATR ]:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Singular</strong></th>
<th><strong>Plural</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proximal (PR)</strong></td>
<td><code>nî</code></td>
<td><code>chù</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hearer-proximal (HE)</strong></td>
<td><code>nàà</code></td>
<td><code>chàà</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distal (DI)</strong></td>
<td><code>niîn</code></td>
<td><code>chùûn</code></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Demonstrative pronouns can be used to form nominal predicates, for which see Section 3.3.4.

In addition to these basic demonstratives, Akie discourse makes use of a range of other deictic elements, some of which are formed spontaneously for specific purposes of text organization. There are in particular two sets of what we loosely call *secondary* demonstratives, which also serve as demonstrative pronouns and which differ from the basic ones in that they are *preposed* rather than postposed. They are similar in meaning to the basic demonstratives, differences being due to discourse pragmatic factors that we
were so far not able to study in detail. The respective forms that we could to identify are
the following:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ínk-ì} & \quad \text{‘this’, ‘that’} \\
\text{ík-ì} & \quad \text{‘these’, ‘those’} \\
\text{íńch-ì (PR)} & \quad \text{íńch-ìà (HE)} \quad \text{íńch-ììn (DI)} \quad \text{‘this’, ‘that’} \\
\text{ích-ì (PR)} & \quad \text{ích-ìà (HE)} \quad \text{ích-ììn (DI)} \quad \text{‘these’, ‘those’}
\end{align*}
\]

Examples

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{íńch-ììn láákwa} & \quad \text{‘that girl (at some distance; DI)’} \\
[\text{ínc’ìín ’láákwà}] & \quad \text{‘those girls (at some distance; DI)’} \\
\text{ích-ììn láákoo} & \quad \text{‘those footprints, the ones of those buffaloes’ (Bahati’s buffalo story)}
\end{align*}
\]

3.3.2.2 Numerals and quantifiers

Numerals and quantifiers are postnominal modifiers that are immediately placed after the
noun, and both are case-marked. In this respect they differ from adjectives, which cannot
be immediately attached to nouns (3.3.2.3).

3.3.2.2.1 Numerals

Cardinal numerals follow their head noun and take the case form of the latter, e.g.,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a} & \quad \text{am- e máämpé- ísyé ayén.} \\
& \quad 1.SG \text{ eat- I mango- PL.A two.A} \\
& \quad ‘I eat two mangoes.’
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{kà} & \quad \text{ìt píf taman.} \\
& \quad \text{PERF arrive.P people.N ten} \\
& \quad ‘Ten people have arrived.’
\end{align*}
\]

The numerals ‘1’ to ‘5’ and ‘10’ are inherited forms, while all other numerals have been
borrowed from Maasai. In addition to distinguishing tonal case, the forms for ‘1’ to ‘5’
have a segmental nominative form, consisting of the suffix -n after vowels (i.e., with the
numeral ‘1’) and -ùùn elsewhere (that is, with the numerals ‘2’ to ‘5’):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accusative</th>
<th>Nominative</th>
<th>Maasai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>akeɛneke</td>
<td>akɛɛne-n</td>
<td>‘one’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ayaŋ</td>
<td>ayɛŋ-ung</td>
<td>‘two’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somok</td>
<td>somók-ung</td>
<td>‘three’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ang’wán</td>
<td>ang’wán-ung</td>
<td>‘four’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mót</td>
<td>móót-ung</td>
<td>‘five’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fɛ</td>
<td>fɛɛ</td>
<td>‘six’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>náápishana</td>
<td>‘seven’</td>
<td>naápishana (fem.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>isiɛt</td>
<td>‘eight’</td>
<td>isiɛt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>náúdo</td>
<td>‘nine’</td>
<td>naáudo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taman</td>
<td>‘ten’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Decadic numerals above ‘10’ are all borrowed from Maasai, otherwise numerals are genetically inherited Akie terms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Akie</th>
<th>Maasai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>taman áí akeɛneke</td>
<td>‘eleven’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taman áí ayaŋ</td>
<td>‘twelve’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tikítam</td>
<td>‘twenty’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tikítam áí akeɛneke</td>
<td>‘twenty-one’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ɔsɔm</td>
<td>‘thirty’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ártam</td>
<td>‘forty’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ɔnɔm</td>
<td>‘fifty’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ntomoni fɛ</td>
<td>‘sixty’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ntomoni náápishana</td>
<td>‘seventy’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ntomoni isiɛt</td>
<td>‘eighty’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ntomoni náúdo</td>
<td>‘ninety’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enkeɛne</td>
<td>‘hundred’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kwɛntɛ (‘firewood’), pl. kɛɛnt (‘trees’)</td>
<td>‘thousand’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ordinal numerals are derived from cardinal ones by means of the genitive marker taa:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Akie</th>
<th>Maasai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>láákwɛɛ</td>
<td>täätáita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>láákwɛɛ</td>
<td>tääayen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>láákwɛɛ</td>
<td>tääsomok</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

etc.

Instead of táá, the alternative genitive marker nká, pl. iká can be used (3.3.2.4.1), e.g.,

---

26 Data from Maasai are taken from our field notes on Maasai as spoken in the Kajiado District of Kenya and in the Kilindi District of Tanzania.
láákwee inká somok  ‘the third child’

3.3.2.2.2 Quantifiers
The most frequently found quantifying modifiers are:

- aké(n) (aké(n)),  pl. òllôk (òllôk)  ‘some, another’
- akenken  ‘some’
- chaachàng’ (chááchang’)  ‘many’
- kâmukuol (kâmukôöl-en)  ‘all’
- tûkûl (tûkûl, tûkûl)  ‘all’

Example
- chiì aké(n)  ‘another person’
- pii òllôk  ‘some people’

Quantifiers resemble adjectives but are, like numerals, added immediately after the noun, that is, without a relative marker:

- waáree  tukuul  ‘all children’
- children  all.A

3.3.2.3 Preposed “semi-nominals”
There are a few semi-nominals that are preposed to nouns to express specific generic concepts. These decategorialized nominals, which can take neither affixes nor modifiers, behave like heads of noun phrases:

- ákò  ‘relatives, associates of’
- áárà  ‘children, descendants of’
- bwértàà,  pl. bwérikàà  ‘a huge, giant kind of’
- wèériì  ‘lots of’

The first two, ákò and áárà, are restricted essentially to human nouns and have a collective function. The third form, bwértàà, pl. bwérikàà, like the derogative diminutive to be discussed in the next section, relates to the size of the referent expressed by the following noun.

ákò ‘relatives of, associates of’
The form ákò is preposed to proper nouns as a collective plural (COLL) to denote ‘associates of, relatives of, friends of’, e.g.,
nkayáyo ‘idiot, fool’
ákọ nkayáyo ‘associates of a fool, a bunch of idiots’
ákọ sárís hm ákọ kísíko
‘the associates of Saris (the first leader of the Akie), the associates of Kisiko ...’ (1/47)

For a number of human nouns which do not have a conventionalized plural this constitutes the only form for marking the plural, e.g.,

amóó (amóó-n), pl. ákọ amóó ‘mother’
kayáyo, pl. ako nkayáyo ‘fool, idiot’

áárà ‘children, descendants of’
Another collective plural (COLL) is formed by the “semi-nominal” áárà:

ko ñiú íte hm kaaí ra de í pa
[ñiú] [DM DM]
COP here exist DM town today DM LOC.GEN

áára kipiko hm nkúyakí.
COLL Kipiko.A DM Nkuyaki.A
‘It is here in this country today, that of the people of Kipiko and Nkuyaki.’ (1/57)

bwértàà, pl. bwérikàà ‘a huge, giant kind of’
This is an augmentative formative, sometimes used with ridiculing overtones, e.g.,

bwértaa kaa, pl. bwérikaa kaárii ‘the (funny) giant house’

wèérii ‘lots of’
This constitutes the third case of a “semi-nominal”, apparently derived from the plural noun wèérii ‘(uncircumcized) boys’. It also serves to form collective plurals, roughly translatable as ‘a bunch of’:

wèérii rettanáttçé ‘a bunch of heavy drinkers or drunkards’
[wèérií]
boys drunkard

3.3.2.4 The derogative diminutive
Another kind of “semi-nominal” is provided by the preposed morpheme kíí (nominative kíi), pl. chúchùùú (nominative chúchùùú). While this morpheme is case-sensitive, the
following noun, which is semantically the head of the construction, is not, but the noun occurs in a tone pattern that differs from both the accusative and the nominative. We propose to refer to the morpheme as the “derogative diminutive” because its functions are to denote small and derogative referents, and in the plural also a small quantity of referents. The meaning of the morpheme can thus be conveyed roughly as ‘the tiny funny X’ and in the plural as ‘the (small) funny lot of tiny X’s’. Consider the following examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic form of noun</th>
<th>Derogative diminutive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>láákwee ‘child’</td>
<td>kií láákwa ‘a funny little child’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pee ‘water’</td>
<td>chuchú́ pe ‘a ridiculously tiny quantity of water’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>súúswee ‘grass’</td>
<td>chuchú́ suúswa ‘a small bunch of weak grass’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What makes this morpheme to be of particular morphophonological interest is, first, that it is of essentially unlimited productivity -- unlike many other constructions of the language. And second, it presents the following noun in a form that contrasts with that generally found elsewhere in nouns. More generally, this form can be characterized as being somehow reductive, but this is not always the case and formal reduction differs from one noun to another.

The following table lists a catalog of the features that distinguish the derogative diminutive from the basic form of nouns. Note that many of them involve more than one feature. To simplify the presentation we focus on one feature, and we also ignore tone changes in Table 2.

Table 2. The main features distinguishing the derogative diminutive from basic nouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of difference</th>
<th>Derogative diminutive</th>
<th>Basic noun</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a No change</td>
<td>kemeu</td>
<td>kemeu</td>
<td>‘hunger’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b Adding –n</td>
<td>kari-n</td>
<td>karii</td>
<td>‘things’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kuumi-n</td>
<td>kuúmi</td>
<td>‘beer’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mɔɔri-n</td>
<td>mɔɔrii</td>
<td>‘fingers’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>weeri-n</td>
<td>weérii</td>
<td>‘boys’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c Final vowel reduction</td>
<td>ka</td>
<td>kaa</td>
<td>‘house’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e Final vowel loss</td>
<td>keechey</td>
<td>keechey</td>
<td>‘honeyguides’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d Internal vowel reduction</td>
<td>keechir</td>
<td>keechíríie</td>
<td>‘sheep (pl.)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pany</td>
<td>pányee</td>
<td>‘meat (pl.)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>peel</td>
<td>péélee</td>
<td>‘elephants’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3.2.3 Adjectives

It would be possible to argue that adjectives as a word class do not exist, rather, that what has the appearance of “adjectives” may more profitably be classified as a subclass of verbs, like other more “marginal” groups of verbs such as the copula ńtè ‘be at, exist’, which also exhibits a reduced set of verbal properties.

Verbal properties of adjectives are in particular the following:

(a) They may function as predicates, placed sentence-initially:

\[
\text{ééch} \quad \text{‘big (pl.)’}
\]

*Example*

èèch \quad kárchù.
big.PL \quad house.PL.N
‘The houses are big.’

(b) They can be conjugated:

\[
\text{ki-á} \quad \text{mng’in} \quad \text{anée}.
\]

*RP- 1.SG small 1.SG.N*
‘I used to be small.’

(c) They may take some verbal derivational affixes:
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ar-í tuu(i)- ītū.
P- 2.SG black- INC
‘You have become black.’

(d) Like verbs, they are relativized when modifying nouns, e.g.,

káári cháá kaa- ēn
house.PL REL.PL tall- PL
‘tall houses’

There are a few exceptions to (d) though, such as taapaay ‘marriageable’:

anɛɛ a láákwee taapaay.
1.SG.A 1.SG child.A marriageable
‘I am a girl ready to be married.’

Nevertheless, we will tentatively treat “adjectives” as a distinct class, thereby following a tradition of work on Kalenjin linguistics, noting that this convention must be taken with care. Adjectival properties are in particular the following:

(a) They express paradigm adjectival concepts of size, color, or moral values.
(b) They are perhaps most frequently found as nominal modifiers rather than as predicates.
(c) They take the abstract noun suffix -inta which has not been found on verbs (see Section 3.5.2).
(d) Many of them mark the plural by means of the suffix -ēn, which is also not found on verbs.

The following are common adjectives of Akie (nominative forms in parentheses):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kàáay (kàåy)</td>
<td>kàà-ēn (kàá-ēn)</td>
<td>‘tall’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kàytít (kàýtít)</td>
<td>kàytít-ēn kàytít-ēn</td>
<td>‘cold’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leél (lëél)</td>
<td>leélách (lëélách)</td>
<td>‘white’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mìng’in (mìng’in)</td>
<td>mènkèc (mènkhèc-n)</td>
<td>‘small’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nyàlìfi (nyàlìffi)</td>
<td>nyàlìfi-ēn (nyàlìffi-ēn)</td>
<td>‘green’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ng’wààn (ng’waan)</td>
<td>ng’waanìünìeen (ng’waanìünìeen)</td>
<td>‘bitter’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>òùù (òùù)</td>
<td>ééch (ééech)</td>
<td>‘big’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pìrììr (pìrììr)</td>
<td>pìrììr-è (pìrììr-ēn)</td>
<td>‘red’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>siìng’òw (siìng’òw)</td>
<td>siìng’òw-ēn (siìng’òw-ēn)</td>
<td>‘good’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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sùrtût (súrtùt)  súrtût-è (súrtùtè-èn)  ‘heavy’
tùū (túū)  tùūwès (túūwès)  ‘black’
ûyûy (úyûy)  úyûy-èn (úyûy-èn)  ‘strong’
yâ (yà)  yâch (yâch)  ‘bad’

Note that some of the adjectives have a nominative suffix -n in their plural forms.

When used as nominal modifiers, adjectives follow the noun, being introduced like relative clauses, that is, by means of the relative clause markers nà (sg.) and cà (pl.) (see Section 3.3.2.5), e.g.,

ká taak-  aan  láákwee  naa  míng’in.
NP  see.I-  1.SG.O  child.N  REL.SG  small.N
‘The small child saw me.’

[è]
ting’-  e  maaè  naa  óuu.
have.I-  I  belly.A  REL.SG  big.SG
‘She has a big belly (i.e., she’s pregnant).’

Adjectives may occur without their head noun but, in any case, the relative clause marker is needed:

ma-  a  mach  anée  naa  ng’wáan.
NEG-  1.SG  want  1.SG.N  REL.SG  bitter
‘I don’t like the bitter one.’

While adjectives generally follow their nominal head, the items kíípa (pl. chuchupa) and kidáápa (pl. chucháápa), both meaning ‘tiny’, both precede the noun:

kíípa láákwa  ‘a tiny girl’
kiáápa keechtííree  ‘a tiny sheep’
chucháápa pee  ‘extremely small quantity of water’

Cf. the related derogative diminutive kìí pl. chùchùú (3.4.2.2.4).

The tone changes to L (low) when adjectives are used as predicatives with third person subjects, e.g.:

óùù  ‘big’
dòùù  káai  ‘the house is big’
big  house.N
mukul nìnyéɛ kakɛ uyuy.
short 3.SG.N but strong
‘He’s short but (he’s) strong.’

As predicates, adjectives behave like verbs in the imperfective aspect, there is no corresponding perfective use.

Concerning the use of the de-adjectival suffix -intə to form abstract nouns, see Section 3.5.2.

3.3.2.4 Attributive possession
3.3.2.4.1 Nominal
Nominal possessive modifiers (possessor NPs) follow their head noun phrase (the possessee), commonly linked with the “genitive” marker (GEN), which can be any of the following: kaa, ikaa, ikaa, nkaa (or inkaa), pa and taa, e.g.:

kuutī tāā akie
mouth.A GEN Akie.PL
‘the Akie language’

The case behavior of the various genitive markers is complex, being sensitive to both the number and the case of the possessee and/or the possessor. Tables 3 and 4 summarize the various distinctions made. As these tables suggest, taa and pa are case-sensitive but not number-sensitive, whereas nkaa is used only with singular possessees. When there is a plural possessee, ikaa is used with singular possessors and ikaa with plural possessors. In all these cases, however, taa can appear instead.

Table 3. The case and number forms of the genitive markers kaa, nkaa, pa and taa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possessee</th>
<th>Accusative</th>
<th>Nominative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG, PL</td>
<td>tāā</td>
<td>tāà</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG, PL</td>
<td>pā</td>
<td>pā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>nkāā</td>
<td>nkāà</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>kāā</td>
<td>kāà</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. The case and number forms of the genitive markers ikaa (SG) and ikaa (PL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possessee</th>
<th>Accusative</th>
<th>Nominative</th>
<th>Possessor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>ikāā</td>
<td>ikāà</td>
<td>SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>ikāā</td>
<td>ikāà</td>
<td>PL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are differences in the contexts associated with these markers. But with the exception of pa (see below), we have not found any significant semantic differences
between them, that is, they can be used interchangeably in accordance with the generalizations made in the two tables, e.g.,

a nkûn kuuti táá akie.
1.SG know.P mouth.A GEN Akie.PL.A

or

a nkûn kuuti nkáá akie.
1.SG know.P mouth.A GEN.SG Akie.PL.A

‘I know the Akie language.’

But there is one important exception: When the modifier (possessee) has a locative significance, the particles *taa, nká, Ŭká*, etc. are replaced by the particle *pa* (which is also a locative preposition; see Section 3.4.1):

íkí keélie chu pa sáaen chu
[keélie]
these foot.PL D.DI.PL GEN.LOC buffalo.PL.O D.DI.PL
‘these footprints of those buffaloes’ (i.e., ‘at the place where the buffaloes were’)

As all these examples show, inalienable concepts are treated the same way as alienable ones.

No linking element is used with the nouns *kwámpa* ‘father’ and *kaapa* ‘mother’:

kwámpa bahatî
[kwàmpábàhàtîː]
‘Bahati’s father’

kaapa bahatî
[kààpàbáhàtîː]
‘Bahati’s mother’

The head NP (possessee) may be deleted in appropriate contexts:

nkáá ng’aa?
GEN.SG who.A

‘Whose (is it)?’

The marker *nká/iká* also occurs as a benefactive preposition (‘for, of’; see Section 3.4.1).

Concerning predicative possession, see Section 3.7.1.

3.3.2.4.2 Pronominal

Pronominal possessive modifiers follow the noun they modify. They distinguish number in accordance with the number of their head (possessee):
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural (of possessee)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG 1</td>
<td>(i)nyoun</td>
<td>chou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(i)ng’oung’</td>
<td>kou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>nyin</td>
<td>chi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL 1</td>
<td>nyaan</td>
<td>chaa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ng’waang’</td>
<td>kwaa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>nyrwaan</td>
<td>chrwaach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Example**

amóó  ng’oung’  ‘your mother’
[ŋóʊŋ]

Akie makes sparing use of possessive modifiers. But if the context does not make it clear who the possessor is, then one will use the possessive modifier, e.g.,

túpche  táá  ng’aa?  núpche  nyoun.
sibling  GEN  who.A  sibling  1.SG.POSS
‘Whose sibling?’  ‘My sibling.’

In addition, possessive suffixes can be used with nouns. The following paradigm is that of the plural noun pìi ‘people’. There does not appear to be a corresponding paradigm with singular possessee nouns.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG 1</td>
<td>pìi-</td>
<td>chóù</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>pìi-</td>
<td>kúù</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>pìi-</td>
<td>chí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL 1</td>
<td>pìi-</td>
<td>chàá</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>pìi-</td>
<td>kwáá</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>pìi-</td>
<td>chíwàay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pronominal possessive pronouns are derived from the modifiers by means of the “genitive” particle ímká, pl. íká (see Section 3.3.2.4), which are number sensitive to the possessee, while the pronouns are sensitive in number to the possessor:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG 1</td>
<td>ímka (i)nyoun</td>
<td>‘mine’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ímka (i)ng’óong’</td>
<td>íka kóó</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ímka nyin</td>
<td>íka chí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL 1</td>
<td>ímka nyáan</td>
<td>íka cháá</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ímka ng’waang’</td>
<td>íka kwáá</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ímka nyíwaan</td>
<td>íka chíwaach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Example**

pa ng’aa ng’ó twee chu?
LOC.POSS who spear.PL.A D.PR.PL
‘Whose spears are these?’

ika nyín.
GEN.PL 3.POSS.SG
‘His.’

3.3.2.5 Relative clauses
These are also nominal modifiers but we will discuss them on account of their internal syntax under clause subordination (3.8.2.1).

3.3.3 Reflexives and reciprocals
Reflexive and reciprocal actions or events are generally expressed lexically only by means of the particle kēen (REFL) postposed to the verb phrase. kēen is polysemous, being reflexive with singular subject referents and either reflexive or reciprocal with plural subject referents.

**Example**

am má- kí wɛch dé kēen pesyo
because NEG- 1.PL dislike DM REFL day.A

hm ke le í eeláá o pwa- n dé.
hm 1.PL say DM folks 2.PL come.S- IMP DM
‘Because we don’t dislike each other, not a single day, we say, Folks, come!’ (1/60)

To exclude ambiguity, intensifiers (INT) tend to be used (see below), cf. (a) vs. (b):

(a) ki par- e kēen.
[č]
1.PL kill- I REFL
‘We’ll kill ourselves or each other.’

(b) ki par- e kēen pîpáánin.
1.PL kill- I REFL INT
‘We’ll kill ourselves.’

The intensifier forms (‘emphatic reflexive’; INT) are for all persons kitìò ‘oneself’ in the singular and pîpáánin ‘themselves’ in the plural for both the accusative and the nominative cases:
SG 1  àné  kitò  ‘myself’
2  ínyé  kitiò  ‘yourself’
3  ninyé  kitiò  ‘him-/herself’

PL 1  àché  pípááñín  ‘ourselves’
2  àkwé  pípááñín  ‘yourselves’
3  chiché  pípááñín  ‘themselves’

The intensifiers are frequently added to personal pronouns (see Section 3.2.2.1):

kò  ané  kítiò  náá  ouu  aí  kópóróéé  ínká  loosíkitò.
COP 1.SG.A  INT  REL.SG  big  and  mountain.A  GEN.SG  Loosikito
‘It is I myself who is big like the mountain of Losikito (Gitu).’ (1/25)

3.3.4 Nominal predicates

Nouns or noun phrases can be turned into predicates, either by using the copula kò (kɔ) plus postposed demonstrative pronoun (3.2.1.1), or by means of the subject proclitics (3.2.2.2). In both cases, the nominal used as a predicate is constructed in the accusative case (A).

By means of the subject proclitics, noun phrases can be conjugated like verbs in the perfective aspect, e.g.,

a  kuukaa.
1.SG  grandfather.A
‘I am a grandfather.’

Usually, though not obligatorily, they are preceded by topicalized personal pronouns in the accusative case:

anéé  a  aki- ántee.
[á]
1.SG.A  1.SG  Akie- SG.A
‘I am Akie.’

Furthermore, nouns can be negated with the particle má like verbs (3.2.4), cf. (a), and they can be turned into change-of-state predications by means of the copula verb ye(kuü) ‘become’ (see Section 3.2.1.2), cf. (b):

(a)  achéé  má  kí  akie.
1.PL.A  NEG  1.PL  Akie.A
‘We are not Akie.’
3.4 The adverbial phrase
Adverbial phrases mostly do not need a case marking device to be introduced; they typically have the appearance of noun phrases. Thus, in the following text example, the phrase *pesyó itáá akênken* ‘one day’ is added at the end of the sentence and has the form of a noun phrase without there being any marking of its status as an adverbial adjunct:

> a ko ééna íyaakíí ékɔsye tukul koto nyô
> and DM herd day.PL.A all.A NAR come

> dé ko nyôr tinantáákɔme pesyó itáá akênken.
> DM NAR meet monster.A day.A GEN some- N
> ‘And when she was herding all the time she came to meet the monster one day.’ (5/4)

3.4.1 Prepositions
Akie makes fairly limited use of prepositional phrases. For example, nominal temporal phrases are simply juxtaposed to the verb (a), and only when there is a need for distinctions is there a preposition, cf. (b).

(a) a taak- e ékɔsye ayen.
> 1.SG see- I days two.A
> ‘I see him for two days.’

(b) a taak- e nén pesye nkáá ayen.
> 1.SG see- I at day GEN.SG two.A
> ‘I see him in two days.’

Prepositions govern the accusative case. The following ones are found in our data base:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preposition</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ai</td>
<td>‘with’</td>
<td>(comitative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kóyù</td>
<td>‘like’</td>
<td>(similative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nèn</td>
<td>‘at, in, like’</td>
<td>(locative, multi-purpose preposition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nká</td>
<td>‘for’</td>
<td>(benefactive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pa</td>
<td>‘at, in’</td>
<td>(locative)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ai ‘with, and’**
This is both a conjunction linking noun phrases (‘and’; 3.8.1), cf. (a), and a preposition, serving comitative (b) and instrumental functions (c). Note that in (b) a plural subject referent is required.
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(a) Nkúyakiái anée ki ey- é kuúmi.
Nkuyaki with 1.SG.A 1.PL drink-I beer.A
‘Nkuyaki and I drink beer.’

(b) ki âm- nỳey ai Nkúyaki.
1.PL eat- AP with Nkuyaki
‘I eat (together) with Nkuyaki.’

(c) a kee ng’èéd- tai kɔ̀kɔ ai ng’otwee a
DM RP come.out- AND DM with spears DM
kée par- rai pi chò kiinyé.
RP kill- AND people D.PR.PL ?
‘And they (=the monster and his son) then came out with spears and killed the people.’ (4/40)

kóyù ‘like’
lezláá kóyu amòt kokèn aashé nkai!
people! like yesterday again thank.you God!
‘Folks, [it rains] like yesterday again! Thank you God!’ (1/30)

ar-kéé yaam-é kóyu ñkéeda- isye.
P- 1.PL suffer-I like small.wild.animal- PL.A
‘We suffered like small wild animals.’ (1/32)

nèn ‘in, at’
This is presumably the preposition most commonly used. Frequently it functions like a
default linker between verb and noun phrase, its basic meaning appears to be locative
(LOC).

nen kia- i
[nèn]
at country- D.PR
‘in this country’

nen anée
[nèn]
at I
‘at me, like me’

It is used, among others, to present instrumental participants:
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till- e pányee nen sílélee.

[nen]
cut- I meat.PL.A at knife.A
‘He cut the meat with a knife.’

And it also serves to present the standard of comparison in comparative constructions of inequality (‘than’) (a) or abstract concepts for giving a reason (b):

(a) amú- í ko chìchìè dé kokèn kořo cháá eech nen anɛɛ

[because DM COP 3.PL.A DM again now REL.PL be.big.PL at 1.SG.A
‘because it is they again now who are bigger than I’ (1/26)

(b) amú ar-kéé peku- u nen kɛmeu

[because 1.PL die- VEN LOC hunger.A
‘because we died of hunger’ (1/31)

nká (inká) ‘for, of’ (benefactive)
ó koon eech kurùrrta náá siing’ōw nká ọloishó.
2.PL give- 1.PL peace REL.SG be.good for country
‘You (pl.) should give us peace which is good for the country.’ (1/23)

pa ‘at, in’
The use of this locative particle is restricted to specific nouns, that is, it is not freely combinable.

Examples
pa láras-íísye ‘at the ribs’
pa óséréő ‘in the wilderness’

ó ee- sye- n dé ásiiswê iká

kía- í pa mókiri.
country.A PR.SG LOC.GEN Mokiri27
‘You, ancestors of this land of Mokiri, you should drink!’ (1/61)

27Each ancestor has his own land. Borders are set by baobabs (Adansonia digitata). One side of the baobab (including its beeholes) belongs to one ancestor, like Mokiri in the present case, whereas the other side (together with its beeholes) belongs to another ancestor.
In addition, there are a number of complex prepositions that are diachronically composed of (defective) locative nouns plus the genitive marker taa:

(nen) ari táá (< `ari taa `the inside of`) `in, inside of`, e.g.,

\[
\text{ká Chung' ari táá kaa ko (w)a kó yyei matagí.}
\]


`He entered the home and broke the egg.'

pàráí tâá (< `pa rai taa `at top of`) `on top of`, e.g.,

\[
p̥t-ɛn pàráí taa keeti!
\]

climb- IMP on.top.of tree.A

`Climb on the tree!'

### 3.4.2 Adverbs

The basic position of adverbs is immediately after the verb (a), but also after verbal complements (b), or they may appear between the subject proclitic and the verb (c). And finally, it is always possible to place them in the topical position sentence-initially (d).

(a) ka- a sı̊ amôt sekee.

NP-1.SG get.P yesterday money.A

`I received money yesterday.'

(b) ka- a sı̊ sekee amôt.

NP-1.SG get.P money.A yesterday

`I received money yesterday.'

(c) ko- r- kó amôt irii kę́tši.

MP-3.P yesterday break.P sticks

`He has broken the sticks yesterday.'

(d) amôt ka- a sı̊ sekee.

yesterday PERF-1.SG get.P money.A

`Yesterday I’ve received money.'

Adverbs are typically adjuncts, but they may have participant status as well. Thus, in the following example, the adverb kask̂šmyee `in the evening’ triggers the use of the applicative extension, which adds another argument to the valency of a verb (see Section 3.2.3.2.4):
The following is a catalog of common adverbs. Locative adverbs include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adverb</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>íyù or íyò</td>
<td>‘here’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kiáási</td>
<td>‘everywhere’ (lit. ‘countries’)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Example**

\[
\text{akiye (i)ká mókiri ñte dé íyù.} \\
\text{Akiye GEN Mokiri exist DM here} \\
\text{‘There are still Akie of Mokiri here.’ (1/61)}
\]

When used as adjuncts, locative adverbs take the locative preposition nèn (3.4.1), e.g.,

\[
\text{leláá kọ̀l ka- ki ꎥm- ĕ nèn íyu.} \\
\text{folks NP- 1.PL meet- I LOC here} \\
\text{‘Folks, we met here.’ (1/24)}
\]

There is a wide range of expressions for spatial notions. Mention should be made of the combinations having the locative relative stem oll- plus the suffixal demonstratives as their base, frequently introduced by the preposition nèn (3.4.1):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adverb</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(nen) oll-ĩ</td>
<td>‘here’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(nen) óll-iin</td>
<td>‘there (far away)’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Common temporal adverbs are:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adverb</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>áde</td>
<td>‘later’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>áain</td>
<td>‘day after tomorrow’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amút</td>
<td>‘yesterday, tomorrow’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ápa</td>
<td>‘long ago’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kɔribɔ</td>
<td>‘now, right away’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kɔrînchi</td>
<td>‘now, right away’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kɔskólnyee</td>
<td>‘in the evening’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mechɔn</td>
<td>‘tomorrow, in the morning time’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nááye</td>
<td>‘this morning’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pééntinta</td>
<td>‘in the daytime’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i)ra</td>
<td>‘today’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>túun</td>
<td>‘soon, later, in the future’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Common manner adverbs are:

- ká’tükul: ‘extremely, very’
- kokên: ‘again’
- kolléen: ‘in vain’
- sííng’owinta: ‘well’
- tí: ‘just, only’

**Examples**

- ng’álaan kokên: ‘Say it again.’
- say again
- ming’in ká’tükul: ‘He’s the smallest.’
- small extremely

### 3.5 Derivation

We have treated verbal derivations already in Section 3.2.3.2. Here we are restricted to derivation as far as it concerns nouns (3.5.1) and adjectives (3.5.2).

#### 3.5.1 Nouns

From verbs, agent nouns can be derived by means of the [+ATR] suffix -óóti- àntè, pl. -óóti. In this case, the verb is used in the antipassive form (AP; 3.2.3.2.3) and the resulting noun denotes a person who performs the action concerned habitually or regularly (nominative forms added in parentheses):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Agent noun</th>
<th>Plural</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>al ‘buy’</td>
<td>al- iisy-óóti-antee</td>
<td>al- iisy-óóti</td>
<td>‘a regular buyer’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>am ‘eat’</td>
<td>am-eesy-óóti-antee</td>
<td>am-eesy-óóti</td>
<td>‘a regular eater, a glutton’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ee ‘drink’</td>
<td>ee-sy-óóti-antee</td>
<td>ee-sy-óóti</td>
<td>‘a drinker’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taitai ‘watch’</td>
<td>taitai-sy-óóti-antee (taitai-sy-óóti)</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘an observer’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.5.2 Adjectives

To form abstract nouns from adjectives, the de-adjectival suffix -intà (NOM), sensitive to vowel harmony, is used. Derivation is fully productive and takes the singular stem as a base:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjective</th>
<th>Abstract noun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kàày</td>
<td>‘tall’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ming’in</td>
<td>‘small’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>óùù</td>
<td>‘tall’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>úyúy</td>
<td>‘strong’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sîng’ow</td>
<td>‘good’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yà</td>
<td>‘bad’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

káá-ínta ‘tallness’  
míng’ín-ínta ‘smallness’  
óù-ínta, ou-ínta ‘bigness, size’  
uyuy-ínta ‘strength’  
sîng’ow-ínta ‘goodness, well-being’  
yá-ínta ‘badness, evil’

Example

má ou- ínta dé ting’- e chaa yáide ichaadé kuúmi
NEG big- NOM DM have-I D.HE.PL DM DM beer.A

‘It is not big what they have, this beer here!’ (1/68)

3.6 Pragmatic functions

3.6.1 Topic

The most immediately available strategy for highlighting participants as topics, both as referentially and as relationally new (Gundel 2003), is by placing the participant concerned in the sentence-initial position. Any participant can be topicalized, in which case that participant is syntactically detached, constructed in the accusative case. Such detached topics are not restricted to nominal expressions, they can also be personal pronouns, as in the following example. Note that the personal pronoun is in the accusative (anɛɛ) rather than the nominative case (anɛɛ).28

anɛɛ a láákwɛɛ taapaay.
1.SG.A 1.SG child.A marriageable
‘I am a girl ready to be married.’

Basic:

ki míít- mî túúka kó ɛɛ pee.
‘We water the cattle.’

Topicalized:

túúka ki míít- mî kó ɛɛ pee.
‘The cattle, we water them.’

Quite commonly, personal pronouns are topicalized, coreferenced by the following subject proclitics, with a following nominal predicate:

28 Like in other African marked-nominative languages, there is no case distinction before the verb (König 2008).
You (pl.) are Kinyalang’ate people.’

3.6.2 Focus

The paradigm means of focalizing a constituent, presenting it as relationally new (Gundel 2003), is by placing it sentence-initially in the accusative case, introducing it by the copula kɔ̀ (kɔ), which has the function of a focus marker (see Section 3.2.1.2):

ko waárɛε chaa a taak- e.
[Cá]
COP children.A REL.PL 1.SG see- I
‘It is children that I see.’

While almost invariably placed initially, this is not the only position that a focused constituent may employ:

péélee ko anó 'áte?
elephants.N COP where be.at
‘Where are the elephants?’

As the following examples show, any phrasal or clausal constituent can be focalized. Thus, we have a subject participant in (a), an object participant in (b), an adverb in (c), nominal adverbials in (d) and (e), and a subordinate clause in (f).

(a) káɛ ko mkwanhempo naa ɨsaap-ɛɛch
  but COP Mkwanhemo.A REL.SG heal- 1.PL.O
  ‘But it is (Peter) Mkwanhemo who heals us (that is, brings us beer for the blessing ceremony).’ (1/8)

(b) ko waárɛε chaa a taak- e.
  [Cá]
  COP children.A REL.PL 1.SG see- I
  ‘It is children that I see.’

(c) ko ra ka púá wáarɛɛ.
  COP today PERF come.PL.P children.N
  ‘It is today that the children have come.’

(d) ko chusɛ ká pír- aan.
  COP stick.A NP hit.I- 1.SG.O
‘It is with a stick that they hit me.’

(e) ko tímta kíf- ki pe.
COP forest.A RP- 1.PL go.PL.P
‘It is in the forest that we went.’

(f) ko kííám ko sekeè si ka- a wé tímta.
COP because COP money.A PURP PERF- 1.SG go.SG.P forest.A
‘It is because of money that I went into the forest.’

If the constituent in focus is the subject of the clause, the verb of the focalized clause must be presented as a relative clause, using the relative markers nàà, pl. càà. Consider the following pairs of sentences: In the (i)-sentences, the focalized constituent is the object, hence no relativizer is needed, while in the (ii)-sentences there must be a relativizer with the subject being focalized:

(i) ko sááe a taak- e.
COP buffalo.A 1.SG see- I
‘It is a buffalo that I see.’

But:

(ii) ko sááe naa táák- aan.
COP buffalo.A REL.SG see- 1.SG.O
‘It is a buffalo that sees me.’

(i) ko ng’aa ká suwa kárka
COP who.A PERF see.3.P woman.N
‘Whom has the woman seen? ’

But:

(ii) ko ng’aa naa ká suwa kárka?
[ŋáá] COP who.A REL.SG PERF see.3.P woman.A
‘Who has seen the woman?’

Note that the noun kárka has the same tone in the accusative and the nominative case. Note further that the high tone on ng’dá is not case-determined but phonologically conditioned: Low tone changes to high when the next word begins with a low tone (see Section 2.3).

Instead of kò (kò), the focalized constituent can be introduced by other elements, such as the phrase ichiyaíde ‘it is this’ in the following example, which in other uses is a discourse marker (see Section 4.4).
iciyaide kuúmi kúrrúrrta yaide kí saam-ɛ tórroó̱.

it.is.this beer.A peace.A DM 1.PL beg- I Gods.A

‘It is beer and peace that we ask the Gods for.’ (1/9)

Finally, a focus function can be expressed by *intáanō* 'it is there', as in the following example, where *intáanō* laang’unáte ‘it is in the east’ and *intáanō* raraítye ‘it is in the west’ present the new, salient information:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{amu} & \quad \text{intáanno} \quad \text{laang’unte} \quad \text{ánte} \quad \text{intáanno} \\
& \text{because} \text{it.is.there} \quad \text{east.A} \quad \text{1.SG be.at} \text{it.is.there} \\
& \text{raraítye} \quad \text{ánte} \text{lúbooto ínkaa tórreita}. \\
& \text{west.A} \quad \text{1.SG exist} \text{edge.A GEN.PL God.A} \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘Because I was in the east, I was in the west, at the edge of God’s world.’ (1/21)

### 3.7 Other domains

#### 3.7.1 Predicative possession

We have dealt with nominal possession in Section 3.3.2.4. The paradigm means for expressing predicative ‘have’-possession is provided by the action schema (Heine 1997b), using the verb *ting’* (I), *si* (P) ‘have’, e.g.,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{íting’- e} & \quad \text{se”kee}^{29} \\
\text{2.SG have- I} & \quad \text{money.Q} \\
\text{aa, a ting’- e.} & \quad \text{‘Yes, I do.’} \\
\text{yes 1.SG have- I} \\
\end{align*}
\]

Concerning the suppletive paradigms of this verb, see Section 3.2.3.4.

#### 3.7.2 Comparison

A comparative of inequality is formed, like in many African languages, by introducing the standard of comparison by means of a location schema (Heine 1997a), that is, a locative construction formed in Akie by means of the locative preposition *nen* ‘at’ (see Section 3.4.1), e.g.,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ma-} & \quad \text{a nkkú̱n nko uyuy sháni nen ínkauli}. \\
\text{NEG-} & \quad \text{1.SG know if strong Shani at Inkauli}. \\
\end{align*}
\]

---

29 The diacritic on the noun *se”kee* ‘money’ (lit. ‘leaves’) stands for a high-rising tone marking polar questions (see 3.7.3.1).
‘I don’t know if Shani is stronger than Inkauli.’

3.7.3 Questions

3.7.3.1 Polar questions

Polar questions do not affect the normal word ordering in a sentence. They are marked either by a high-rising tone (ʺ) on the last high-toned syllable or the last word of the sentence. Accordingly, in the following examples the declarative (b)-sentences change into the interrogative sentences in (a):

(a) i nkûn?  
2.SG know.I  
‘Do you know (it)?’

(b) àà, a nkûn.  
yes 1.SG know.I  
‘Yes, I do.’

(a) i par-e këén?  
2.SG kill- I REFL  
‘Will you kill yourself?’

(b) i par-e këén.  
[pàˈrékëén]  
2.SG kill- I REFL  
‘You will kill yourself!’

(a) kó ting- e seke amût?  
[é]  
MP have- I money.A yesterday.Q  
‘Did he have money yesterday?’

(b) kó ting- e seke amût.  
MP have- I money.A yesterday  
‘He had money yesterday.’

In other Kalenjin languages there is a final morpheme -í to mark polar questions (Creider and Tapsuebi Creider 1989: 141). This morpheme, which is restricted to sentences ending in a consonant, does not appear to exist in Akie. Conceivably, it is etymologically related to the Akie discourse marker í (see Section 4.4). Another possible reflex of it can be seen in the final element -í of the greeting formula kirâdéë́ ‘how is it?’ (4.2).
3.7.3.2 Word questions

The following are the question words that we found in Akie:

ànò ‘how?’
ànò, ntán(ó) ‘where?’
atâ ‘how many?’
áyyò ‘when?’
kâlfàn sikó ‘why?’
ko án(o) ‘which?’
nèè (A), néè (N) ‘what?’
ntán(ó) ‘where?’
gaà (A), ng’áá (N) ‘who?’
yûû ‘why?’

Question words are commonly placed in situ, that is, they occupy the position they would do in corresponding declarative sentences. But perhaps more frequently they appear in the focal initial position, typically though not necessarily introduced by the copula kò (kɔ).

ànò ‘how?’

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{k- o ru- aat-e ano?} \\
\text{NP- 2.PL sleep- AMB-I how} \\
\text{‘How did you sleep?’ (Greeting; note that there is no subject person marking; cf. 4.2.2)}
\end{align*}
\]

ànò, ntán(ó) ‘where?’

\[
\begin{align*}
k- o ru- yèn ano? \\
NP- 2.PL sleep- APL where \\
\text{‘Where have you (pl.) slept?’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ko ánó ńtè wàarèe kuo?} \\
\text{COP where be.at children.N 2.SG.POSS} \\
\text{‘Where are your children?’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
pééle ko ánó ńte? \\
elephants.N COP where be.at \\
\text{‘Where are the elephants?’}
\end{align*}
\]
The word ànò is replaced by ntán(ò) ‘where?’ when the question consists of a nominal predicate. ntán(ò) is composed of the locative copula ñtè ‘exist, be somewhere’ (3.2.1.2) and the interrogative ànò. Being verbal in origin, it occupies the clause-initial position:

\[
\text{ke ley ntán de mëye chaa ko kwaí hōn.} \\
1.\text{PL say exist DM Swahili.A REL.PL 3.P ? hōn} \\
\text{‘We say: Where do these Swahili people come from?’ (1/52)}
\]

atá ‘how many?’

\[
\text{ko pìi atá chaa nte loosíkitō?} \\
[ʔáˈtacá:] \\
\text{COP people.A how.many REL.PL be.at Gitu} \\
\text{‘How many people live in Gitu?’}
\]

This question word can also be preposed to its head noun in the focus construction (3.6.2); thus, both (a) and (b) are possible:

(a) \[
\text{ko atá sekee chaa kí siich- e?} \\
\text{COP how.many money.A REL.PL 1.PL get- I} \\
\text{‘How much is the money that we get?’}
\]

(b) \[
\text{ki siich- e sekee atá?} \\
[ˈkísiːˈcesekː ?átá] \\
1.\text{PL get- I money.A how.many} \\
\text{‘We get how much money?’}
\]

áyyò ‘when?’

\[
\text{ki ám- ìsyei áyyo?} \\
1.\text{PL eat- AP.I when} \\
\text{‘When will we eat?’} \\
\text{kò áyyo nyóón- u nnyéé?} \\
\text{COP when come.I- VEN 3.SG.N} \\
\text{‘When will he come?’}
\]

kálíán sikó ‘why?’

This interrogative consists of two parts. kálián (or kálíán) appears clause-initially (a) or finally (b) while sikó is placed before the clause but is preceded by kálián (if there is).

(a) \[
\text{kálíán sikó al teeta?} \\
\text{why buy.3.P cow.A} \\
\text{‘Why has he bought a cow?’}
\]
(b) sikó al tɛɛta kálían?
   why buy.3.P cow.A why
   ‘Why has he bought a cow?’

kalián sikó ka pwâ peélee 'iyû?
   why PERF come.3.PL.P elephants.N here
   ‘Why have the elephants come here?’

ko án(o) ‘which?’
This number- and case-neutral nominal modifier precedes its head noun. It consists of the copula kò (kɔ̀) plus the interrogative ânò. As elsewhere, the following relative clause requires the relative clause markers nàà, pl. chàà if the head noun has subject function in the relative clause (a) but not if it has any other function (b) (see Section 3.8.2.1). The marker án(o) appears to be a shortened form of ânò ‘where, how?’. It has its full form if there is no following head noun, cf. (c).

(a) ko án chii naa ka nyô?
   which person.N REL.SG PERF come.3.SG.P
   ‘Which person has come?’

(b) ko án láákwee i mach- e?
   which child.A 2.SG want- I
   ‘Which child do you want?’

(c) ko áno? ‘Which one?’

néè (A), néé (N) ‘what?’
   i nkûn neè?
   2.SG know what.A
   ‘What do you know?’

kɔ neè ka- i ám?
   ‘What have you eaten?’

kɔ neè nììn?
   COP what.A D.DI
   ‘What is that?’
ari táá kaai kɔ née naa ńte?
inside home COP what.N REL.SG be.at
or
kɔ née naa ńte arí táá kaai?
COP what.N REL.SG be.at inside home
‘What is inside the homestead?’

ng’àà (A), ng’áá (N) ‘who?’
ko ng’áá? ko ni.
COP who COP D.PR
‘Who is it? This one.’

pa ng’aa ng’ótwéé chu?
LOC who.A spear.PL D.PR.PL
‘Whose spears are these?’

yúú ‘why?’
We have found this interrogative only in the following text piece:

yúú nadé má ńte chíí-chí
why DM NEG-exist person.N-person
‘Why is there nobody?’ (4/44)

3.8 Clause combining
3.8.1 Coordination
The following are the most common particles used for noun phrase and clause coordination:

NP coordination Clause coordination
ai, ka, ánan nan ‘and’
ánan nkoi ‘or/and’
kekë or kakei kakë or kakei, käe, káí ‘but’

‘And’ (additive)
ká ki pa amómo-n ai paapâ.
PERF RP go.P.PL mother- N and father.A
‘Mother and father have gone long ago.’

As the last example shows, the participant following ai is coded in the accusative case. In the following text example, both ánan and ka cooccur in the same utterance:
We children, we boys and girls and us, there is nothing we can tell.’ (1/77)

In texts, we found examples without any formal linkage between the conjoined phrases, e.g.,

‘It is beer and peace that we ask the Gods for.’ (1/9)

In narrative texts, the discourse marker *hḿ* (see 11.1) is also found serving apparently as a coordinating conjunction:

‘It is here in this country today, that of the people of Kipiko and Nkuyaki.’ (1/57)

‘Or’ (alternative)

‘Do you want honey or tobacco?’

‘Do you want to sleep here or to go home?’

‘But’ (adversative)
mukul nnyée kaké uyuy.
short 3.SG.N but strong
‘He’s short but (he’s) strong.’

káe kɔ mkwanhempo naa ísaap- eech.
but COP Mkwanhembo REL.SG heal- 1.PL.O
‘But it is (Peter) Mkwanhembo who heals us (that is, brings us beer for the blessing ceremony).’ (1/8)

káí má ŋte páái cháá sas- e chaa ŋte íyû.
but NEG exist elder.PL.N REL.PL disrespect-I REL.PL exist here
‘But there are no disrespectful elders here.’ (1/26)

### 3.8.2 Subordination

#### 3.8.2.1 Relative clauses

There are two types of relative clause constructions, which we will refer to loosely as nominal (3.8.2.1.1) and locative (3.8.2.1.2) relative clauses depending on whether their head is nominal or locative in structure, respectively.

#### 3.8.2.1.1 Nominal relative clauses

Nominal relative clauses are introduced by the markers nàà with singular head nouns and cháá with plural head nouns. These markers are presumably grammaticalized forms of the hearer-proximal demonstratives (see Section 3.3.2.1).

Relative clause markers do not distinguish case; it is only their head noun that does. Thus, in the following examples, the relative clause remains the same while the head noun is either in the nominative (pée ‘water’), cf. (a), or in the accusative (pee), cf. (b):

(a) má siing’ow pée chaa ka ît.
    [pée]
    NEG good water.N REL.PL PERF arrive.3.P
    ‘The water that has come isn’t good.’

(b) a mach- e pee chaa ka ît.
    [má’cépèè]
    1.SG want- I water.A REL.PL PERF arrive.3.P
    ‘I like the water that has just come.’

Virtually any participant of a sentence can be relativized. In the following example it is the extraposed possessee noun (‘father’) of a “genitive” construction, with the relative marker nàà remaining in situ:
a nkûn laakwɛ naa ká me kuaan (nyîn).

[ŋ̀kún]
1.SG know child.A REL.SG PERF die.3.SG.P father 3.SG.POSS
‘I know the child whose father has just died.’

If the head noun of a copula clause coreferences the subject of the relative clause, the relative clause marker nàà (pl. chàà) is needed, cf. (a). Otherwise, no relative marker is required, cf. (b).

(a) ko sááe naa táák-aan.
COP buffalo.A REL.SG see- 1.SG.O
‘It is a buffalo that sees me.’

ko ng’aá naa ká suwa kárka?
COP who REL.SG PERF see.P woman.A
‘Who has seen the woman?’

(b) ko sááe a taak-e.
COP buffalo.A 1.SG see- I
‘It is a buffalo that I see.’

ko ng’aa ká suwa kárkâ?
COP who PERF see.P woman.N
‘Whom has the woman seen?’

The relatives have a wide range of applications. One use concerns adjectives, which are obligatorily introduced by means of the relative clause markers (3.3.2.3), e.g.,

ká taak-aan láákwɛ naa míng’in.
NP see.I- 1.SG.O child.N REL.SG small.N
‘The small child saw me.’

Another application concerns the focus construction, even if their use is not obligatory there (see Section 3.6.2):

ko akie chaa piriiir-e.
COP Akie.A REL.PL red- I
‘The Akie people are red (colored).’

In addition to the demonstrative-derived relative marker nàà/chàà, there are also occasional uses of the proximal demonstrative ni (ni), pl. chò:
h mâ kò nnyɛɛ dɛ nì kì nteyyak nen iyù nkûyaki.
DM COP 3.SG.A DM REL.SG 1.PL be.together at here Nkuyaki
‘It is him, Nkuyaki, we are all together with here.’ (1/63)

kò sînɛɛ nì kì am-ɛ.
There is this problem that we are facing (lit. ‘eat’). (1/7)

3.8.2.1.2 Locative relative clauses
Locative relativizer ɔll- (LOC.REL) combines with the hearer-proximal suffixal demonstrative -àà (HE) in its unmarked form, hence ɔll-àà, cf. (a). But when a nearby place is implied it is the proximal demonstrative -ï which is used, and with a more remote place, as in (b), it is replaced by the distal demonstrative -ììn (see Section 3.3.2.1). The relativizer can be omitted in contexts such as (c), and rather than being placed between the main clause and the relative clause it may follow the latter, cf. (d):

(a) ma- a nkûn ɔll- aa mëng’a.
NEG- 1.SG know.I LOC.REL D.HE live
‘I don’t know where he lives.’

(b) ma- a nkûn ɔll- iin mëng’a.
NEG- 1.SG know.P LOC.REL D.DI live
‘I don’t know where (far away) he lives.’

(c) kò loosîkîtô (ɔll- aa) mëng’-aatì akié chááchang’.
‘It is in Gitu where many Akie live.’

(d) toomá a kas si ko nyô kóó pun ɔll- ìì.
‘I haven’t heard yet where he (went and) passed by.’

3.8.2.2 Complement clauses
No complementizing marker is needed and in fact, more often than not, there is none between the main clause and the complement clause, e.g.,

30 The locative relativizer ɔll- is pronounced by many speakers as ol-, that is, without a geminated consonant (see 2.1). It is presumably historically a grammaticalized form of a locative noun; cf. Nandi ol ‘place’ (Creider and Tapsubei Creider 1989: 47).
he (the buffalo) intended me to be killed (lit. ‘eats me’).’ (9/59)

Occasionally, the clause-final discourse marker í (4.4) appears to do service as a complementizer, like in the following example:

‘You see today that my mice don’t have tails!’ (4/42, from the tale of the woman and the monster)

Nevertheless, there are some complementizers:

nánchi
nkó
sì
(n)tákile

nánchi ‘if’
We have found this conjunction to be used with subject complement clauses, like tákile (see below):

‘It would be good if Bahati drank water.’

nko ‘if’
This is essentially a conditional marker (see Section 3.8.2.3), used in alternative complement clauses:

‘I don’t know if Shani is stronger than Inkauli.’

sì ‘that’
It seems that this marker is used in conjunction with the locative relativizer oll-:
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toomá a kas si ko nyô köó pun oll- ì.
‘I haven’t heard yet where he (went and) passed by.’

(n)tákile ‘that, if’
This is the most common complementizer, used to introduce both object (a) and subject complement clauses (b):

(a) nkûn tákile ma- a ñte kaaou.
3.know COMPL NEG- 1.SG be.at.I home
‘He knows that I am not at home.’

(b) táákún tákile ká ε láákwɛɛ pee.
be.clear COMPL 3.PERF drink.P child.N water.A
‘It is clear that the child has drunk water.’

(n)tákile is used in particular with alternative complement clauses:

i (i)kûn takile ñte pee?”
2.SG know COMPL be.at.I water.N.Q
‘Do you know if there is water?’

In subject-to-object raising, the complement clause is presented in the subjunctive mood without a complementizer:

a taak- e waárɛɛ kó am- ūşye.
‘I see the children eating.’

ar- kɛɛ suwɛ kó yyei mááe taa mutúka.
P- 1.PL see.P 3.P burst.S belly.P GEN car
‘We’ve seen the tyre burst.’

The object of the matrix clause, which is also the subject of the complement clause, may precede (a) or follow the complement clause (b):

(a) a mach- e báhatí kó suwa kaa nyóon.
‘I want Bahati to see my home.’
3.8.2.3 Adverbial clauses
There is a common pattern according to which adverbial clauses are asyndetically attached to main clauses. Thus, in the following sentence, the conditional protasis clause is followed by a verbal clause in the imperfective aspect:

\[
\text{am-ísye láákwɛ́ nyʊ́n a cham-ɛ́.}
\]

\[
\text{eat-AP child.N 1.SG.POSS 1.SG like-I}
\]

‘If my child eats I’ll be happy.’

Cause and reason clauses
The following are the main conjunctions introducing cause or reason clauses:

àmù, am  ‘because’
ánkolo, amka  ‘because’
kíra  ‘because’
koinákata  ‘therefore’

Example
ko len-chi a yéyé kaaʊ am(ʊ) ka- a
[NAR say-DAT.P 1.SG return home.ACC because NP 1.SG]
paakái láákwɛ́ taa akening náá ming’m.
leave.behind child.A GEN some REL.SG small
‘She replied: “I will return to my homestead because I left a small child behind!”’ (4/4)

Concessive clauses
The conjunction for introducing concessive clauses is nkórọ  ‘although’. Concessive clauses may follow (a) or precede the main clause (b):

(a) ki pent-i nkóro roopan roopta.
   1.PL go.PL-I although rain.P rain
   ‘We’ll go even though it is raining.’

(b) nkóro roopan roopta kéé pe.
   although rain.P rain 1.PL go.PL.S
‘Although it is raining (nevertheless) let’s go.’

**Conditional clauses**

The following are the main markers of conditional protasis:

na
nánchí
nkó

No marker of conditionality is needed in the following kind of construction:

am- ñsye láákwee nyoon a cham- ñ.
[láákwee:nyoon]
eat- AP child.N 1.SG.POSS 1.SG like- I
‘If my child eats I’ll be happy.’

But if the protasis clause follows rather than precedes, then there is a conditional marker:

1.SG like- I if eat- AP child 1.SG.POSS
‘If my child eats I am happy.’

In postposed conditional clauses the protasis markers are nánchí (a) ‘if’ or nkó (b), but if the latter may appear in initial position as well (c):

(a) kó siing’ow nánchí ká ñ bahatí pee.
COP good if NP drink.S Bahati.N water.A
‘It would be good if Bahati drank water.’

(b) má ya nkó nyô.
NEG bad if come.3.P
‘It is not bad if he comes.’

(c) nko ka ée- sya ká ˈtŭkul ká rett-ak.
if PERF drink- AP.P very PERF be.drunk
‘If he has drunk too much he’s extremely drunk.’

**Purpose clauses**

No purpose clause marker (PURP) is needed if the function of the clause is obvious, cf.,

ká wa kapléɛme kó (w)a kó cheng’ kúúmíántɛe.
PERF go.3.SG forest NAR go.3.SG.S NAR search.for.S honey.A
'He went into the forest in order to look for honey.'

But as a rule, purpose clauses are introduced by the following conjunctions:

kosi, si, or si kó ‘so that, in order to’

**Examples**

ka mach-e eíta naa kí enye e í kosi

PER want-I bull.A REL.SG PAS slaughter DM PURP

kéé yuita muuitá kosi ó cing’ akwéé ari.

PAS spread.out skin.A PURP 2.PL enter.S 2.PL.N inside

‘And this medicine needs a bull, it needs a bull which is slaughtered so that its hide be spread out and you cover yourself with it (lit. ‘you enter it’).’ (4/29, from the tale *The woman and the monster*)

ké pé dedúo sí í we í lal.


‘Let’s go now so that you watch it. (2/75)

**Temporal clauses**

The following temporal conjunctions have been found in our data:

ko ‘when’

kolé, alé kole, olé, kélé ‘when’

kótò ‘until’

**ko, kolé, alé kole, olé, kélé ‘when’**

kelé kee pwa í kelé kee kúrsa í ko iten nen ari táá kaa.

when RP come DM when RP call DM NAR answer at in GEN house.A

‘When they came and called (her), (the calabash pieces) answered there from inside the house.’ (5/39, from the tale *The fat girl and the monster*)

The order of the two clauses can freely be reversed, with the temporal clause being in the initial position:

kíí mach-é kó up tukun tukul ko kaa pwâ ‘píí.


‘We wanted to take everything when people came.’
ko kaa pwâ pîi kîf mach-é kó up tukun tukul.
‘When people came we wanted to take everything.’

kótò ‘until’ (cf. 3.4.1)
ntên kót- áa wé.
wait until- 1.SG go.S
‘Wait until I go!’

Concerning a construction used for coding simultaneous temporal clauses (‘while’-clauses), see under “subordinate n-’ (3.2.3.1.4).

3.8.3 Direct and indirect speech
In direct speech, reporting clauses are usually preposed to the direct speech utterance without any linkage:

amu intááno dé ápa lenkái si kée le: lenkái.
because it.is.time DM long.ago Lenkai.A PURP PAS say Lenkai.A
‘Because long ago Lenkai (God) was called (by saying): “Lenkai!”’ (1/9)

But not uncommonly, discourse markers such as dé and í in (a), or hüm in (b), are recruited to establish cohesion between the reporting clause and the event reported (see Section 4.4):

(a) a ki ley dë í íchaa dé kuúmi chaa ká pwa
DM 1.PL say DM DM D.HE.PL DM beer.ACC REL.PL PERF- come.PL.P
kíá- í nyané.
country.A- D.PR 1.PL.POSS
‘And we say this: ‘This is beer which has come to our country.’ (1/42-3)

(b) kee ley hüm ó yum-a-yum- uu-n náá këën hüm áko kikëko.
‘We say you should gather all together, the associates of Kikeko.’
(1/64)

Indirect speech clauses are treated like complement clauses, being simply added to the main clause either without a complementizer (a) or by using (n)tákile ‘that’ (b) (3.8.2.2):
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(a) ko lé pun-e.
   3.P say.P3 pass-I
   ‘He said that he’d pass.’

(b) ka lé ntákile nyoónu mechón.
   PERF say.P that come.PL.I tomorrow
   ‘He’s said that he’d come tomorrow.’

3.8.4 Motion verbs as new event markers (NEM)
The suppletive verbs for ‘go’ and ‘come’ serve most of all, but not only, in narrative texts to highlight an event expressed by the following verb phrase or clause. Thus, in the following piece, taken from the tale *The woman and the monster*, the verb ‘go’ has no lexical meaning but rather serves exclusively to perspectivize what follows – that is, it functions as part of a fully grammaticalized new-event marking construction (NEM; Heine 2000):

   koto pwa ko ééch- it(u) ar- ko ye muréénee.
   until go.PL.P NAR big- INC P- 3.P become.P warriors
   ‘They (the twins) (went and) grew up and became warriors.’ (4/19)

In most of their uses as new event markers, however, a lexical reading in terms of physical motion is still possible. For example, the verb form *í we ‘you go’ in (a) is largely though not entirely redundant since motion is expressed already in the preceding verb. What the verb form appears to achieve is to highlight the subsequent event (‘you watch’). Note that NEMs are not restricted to main clauses; rather, they may also be presented in subordinated material, as the complement clause in (b) suggests.

(a) ‘go’
   ké pé dedúo sí í we í lal.
   ‘Let’s go now so that you (go and) watch it.’ (2/75)

(b) ‘come’
   toomá a kas si ko nyó kóó pun oll- í.
   ‘I haven’t heard yet where he’s (come and) passed by.’
4 Thetical Grammar

We observed in Section 1 that by applying the theoretical framework of Discourse Grammar (Kaltenböck et al. 2011; Heine et al. 2013) to the study of the Akie language the present work presents two contrasting perspectives of what linguistic discourse is about. According to this framework, each of these perspectives is associated with one particular domain of discourse: namely Sentence Grammar and Thetical Grammar. The relationship between the two domains is complex; it is shaped by a number of factors, but most of all by cooptation, a mechanism whereby a chunk of Sentence Grammar, such as a clause, a phrase, a word, or any other unit is deployed for use in Thetical Grammar (Kaltenböck et al. 2011: 874-5). For example, the English adverb *frankly* (as, e.g., in *He didn't speak frankly about his problems*) can be coopted as thetical, thereby being syntactically, prosodically, and semantically independent of the clause concerned, as in *Frankly, he didn't speak about his problems* (see (2) below).

4.1 Introduction

Sentence Grammar was the subject of Section 3. It is based on propositional logic and is organized in terms of constructions taking the form of sentences, clauses, phrases, words, and morphemes plus the syntactic and morphological machinery to relate constructions to one another.

But in spite of its nearly unlimited conceptual and compositional potential, some of which was summarized in Section 3, Sentence Grammar is severely limited when it comes to establishing a meta-linguistic “umbrella” for discourse, by linking grammar to the extra-linguistic world, in particular to the socio-cultural setting, the interpersonal and emotional needs of interlocutors, and the organization of texts beyond the level of a sentence. This is the domain of Thetical Grammar. Its building blocks are *theticals*, consisting on the one hand of thetical formulae and constructions and on the other hand of the ability to coopt information units of Sentence Grammar and deploy them for structuring discourse. The main categories of theticals distinguished so far are listed in (1). As we will see below, many theticals are more or less non-compositional and fixed, being used recurrently, but this need not be so (see Heine et al. 2013: 207).

---

31 Discourse, in the sense of the term used here, consists of all the linguistic resources that are available for constructing spoken or written texts.
32 “Information unit” is a cover term for any pairing of form-meaning units that can be separated from the remainder of an utterance by means of semantic, syntactic, and/or prosodic criteria -- ideally by all three of them. An information unit can be a word, but it can consist as well of a complex collocation of words (Heine et al. 2013). The term “information unit” thus is similar to, but is not the same as that of a discourse act in the tradition of Discourse Functional Grammar, defined as “the smallest identifiable unit of communicative behaviour” (Hengeveld and Mackenzie 2008: 308).
33 Throughout this chapter, theticals are printed in bold.
(1) The main categories of Thetical Grammar (Kaltenböck et al. 2011; Heine et al. 2013)
- Conceptual theticals (including discourse markers)
- Formulae of social exchange
- Vocatives
- Imperatives
- Interjections

Theticals differ in a number of ways from constituents of Sentence Grammar. Prototypical properties of theticals are listed in (2)\(^{34}\) (see also Kaltenböck et al. 2011, Section 2). As we will see below, not all theticals behave in every respect in accordance with (2).

(2) Properties of theticals (Kaltenböck et al. 2011: 853)
- They are syntactically independent.
- They are typically set off prosodically from the rest of an utterance.
- Their meaning is non-restrictive.
- They tend to be positionally mobile.
- Their internal structure is built on principles of Sentence Grammar but can be elliptic

Unlike theticals, the units of Sentence Grammar are syntactically dependent (they can, e.g., be embedded; cf. (2a)), prosodically integrated (they are as a rule part of the intonation contour of the clause; cf. (2b)), their meaning is restrictive (that is, it is grounded in the semantic structure of a sentence or its constituents; cf. (2c)), there are limits as to where they can be placed in a sentence, cf. (2d), and as to which parts of them can be “ellipsed”, cf. (2e).

“Non-restrictive” meaning (Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 1352) concerns reasoning processes grounded in the situation of discourse, whose main components are listed in (3). Rather than being neatly separated from one another, these components form a network of interlocking functions (Heine and Kaltenböck 2013) and, as we will see in the sections to follow, theticals may, and frequently do combine elements of more than one of the components.

The theticals to be discussed below can exhibit contrasting functions depending on the context in which they are used. This may mean that one and the same unit will be discussed with reference to more than one component.

(3) Components of the situation of discourse (Kaltenböck et al. 2011: 861)
- Speaker-hearer interaction
- Attitudes of the speaker
- Text organization

\(^{34}\) The term thetical must not be confused with that of "thetic" statement (see Kaltenböck et al. 2011, Fn. 6). Note that the definition in (2) is prototypical rather than being based on necessary and sufficient criteria.
We may illustrate the contribution that theticals make to the presentation of linguistic discourse with the following utterance taken from the Blessing the Hunting Weapons ceremony, where the elders address the public and the ancestors:

(4) ɛɛláá ténkesa ɛɛláá í mut- u í hḿ í mut- u dé
folks Tenkesa folks 2.SG bring.S-VEN DM DM 2.SG bring.S-VEN DM

‘People of Tenkesa, folks, you should bring (your people) here, just bring them here!’

This utterance consists entirely of theticals: There are two vocatives (ɛɛláá ténkesa ‘people of Tenkesa’ and ɛɛláá ‘folks’), three discourse markers (í, hḿ, and dé), and two imperatives (í mut-u ‘you should bring here’, twice). Most of these theticals, that is, the two vocatives and the two imperatives, serve the component of speaker-hearer interaction in (3a) by directly relating the audience (namely the Tenkesa family and other people) to the content of the utterance. The three discourse markers, by contrast, serve to achieve text cohesion, that is, they relate to the component of text organization (3c).

Discourse markers, such as the ones in (4), are the most frequently used information units in Akie, and they may illustrate the definitional criteria of theticals listed in (2):35

Discourse markers are syntactically independent, that is, they are not a part of sentence structure, they cannot be subordinated, and they tend to be set off prosodically by means of distinct intonation or other features. Their meaning is non-restrictive: It is not part of and does not contribute to the semantics of the sentence and, in fact, while they are important for structuring the text, omitting them is as a rule possible without significantly changing the semantic content of an utterance (Schiffrin 1987; Hansen 1998a; 1998b; Schourup 1999; Heine 2013). And discourse markers are also positionally mobile, that is, many of them can be placed virtually anywhere in an utterance. For example, in the text piece of (4) above we saw that the discourse marker hḿ occurs in the middle of a complex verb phrase. In the following text piece (5), by contrast, where the Akie elders recall their first meeting with two German linguists who visited them in 2013, the same discourse marker hḿ appears utterance-initial and also twice at the end of the utterance, interrupted by another discourse marker (icháide).

35 Since most discourse markers of Akie are etymologically opaque, feature (2e) is not applicable to them and will not be considered below.
(5) hḿ a kéé táá ko pa ko ng’ám
DM and RP still.be.doing NAR go.P NAR receive

akìe chaa hḿ icháide hń.
Akie.N D.PR.PL DM DM DM

‘And they (the white people) went and the Akie welcomed them, so be it.’ (1/55)

We observed above that the definition in (2) is prototypical rather than based on necessary and sufficient criteria. What this means is that a given feature of the ones listed in (2) is likely to but need not be present in a given case. This applies most of all to prosody (2b): In fluent speech, theticals may lose their prosodic distinctiveness, being integrated in the intonation contour of a larger unit of Sentence Grammar. This applies in particular to phonetically short (monosyllabic) theticals, such as the discourse marker í in (4), which is always treated as a suffix-like prosodic appendix of the preceding word, separated from the latter neither by a pause nor by intonational features.

Providing a comprehensive structure of Thetical Grammar in Akie is a task for the future; we can do here no more other than presenting an outline of it by way of illustration. To this end, we will be restricted to four of the six components listed in (3), namely speaker-hearer interaction (4.2), attitudes of the speaker (4.3), text organization (4.4), and discourse setting (4.5), which account for most of the functions of theticals. Each of these components will be treated separately, even if many theticals are notoriously “polysemous” and their meanings may simultaneously activate two or even more of these components.

Due to its anchoring in the situation of discourse, Thetical Grammar aims at understanding language use as it is embedded in the society and culture of its speakers. To this extent, it relates to the rich work written in the tradition of linguistic anthropology, anthropological linguistics, and in particular of the ethnography of speaking as established by Hymes (1962). But the perspective of Thetical Grammar is a linguistic one, that is, one that aims at an extended view of grammar, focusing on linguistic phenomena that were either described as marginal or ignored altogether in most grammatical accounts. And this also means that Thetical Grammar is restricted to the analysis of linguistic resources, that is, paralinguistic communication is not within its scope.

4.2 Speaker-hearer interaction

If two Akie people meet and one says ar-kó ēech ‘It has dawned’, then this may not be an utterly informative utterance since the information expressed by it must be obvious to the hearer.

This is different when the utterance is understood not as one belonging to the domain of Sentence Grammar but rather to that of Thetical Grammar. In this case, the utterance is in fact meaningful: It signals to the hearer that the speaker proposes to enter into social exchange – that is, it activates the world of speaker-hearer interaction, and more specifically the institutional frame of greeting (4.2.2, 4.5).
Speaker-hearer interaction concerns most of all the following kinds of activities:

- Requests for action (asking the hearer to act, to accept a proposal, to provide more information, or asking for the hearer's attention)
- Stance (agreeing with the hearer, taking a stance that contrasts with that of the hearer, or conveying one’s stance to the hearer)
- Social relations between interlocutors (negotiating the role relations between interlocutors, proposing a change in the social climate of speaker-hearer relations, negotiating turn taking, etc.).

Unlike Sentence Grammar, Thetical Grammar disposes of a wide range of function-specific categories for speaker-hearer interaction. It is most of all three of the categories listed in (1) of Section 4.1 that are used to shape interaction, namely formulae of social exchange, vocatives, and imperatives. We will now deal with each of the three in turn.

4.2.1 Formulae of social exchange

Formulae of social exchange (FSEs) serve the flow of speaker-hearer interaction in a way that is believed to be both socially acceptable and beneficial to the interlocutors concerned (Heine et al. 2013). Most commonly they are to be found in conversations, but they are not restricted to any particular discourse genre. Table 5 lists the ones most commonly found in our text collection; other formulae, used for specific functions, are discussed in Sections 4.5.

Table 5. The most common formulae of social exchange
(H = hearer, IU = information unit, S = speaker)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marker</th>
<th>Approximate English equivalent</th>
<th>Main discourse function</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>àà, àá</td>
<td>‘yes’</td>
<td>Confirmation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>áádè</td>
<td>‘yes, you are right’</td>
<td>Confirmation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>akúryee táá amóó/ paapâ</td>
<td>‘I swear!’</td>
<td>Emphasizing the truth of one's statement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aríí suwé ira</td>
<td>‘Have you seen (it)?’</td>
<td>Making sure that H has understood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aríí kas ira</td>
<td>‘You follow me?’</td>
<td>Making sure that H has understood</td>
<td>Lit. ‘Have you heard (it)?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aashê</td>
<td>‘Thank you!’</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; Maasai ashê ‘thanks!’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression</td>
<td>Interpretation</td>
<td>Functions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>à’à</td>
<td>‘No’</td>
<td>Disagreement, rejection, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hààyyà</td>
<td>‘Now, …’</td>
<td>Asking H for information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hèbú</td>
<td>Inviting H to a joint action</td>
<td>Swahili <em>hebu</em> (same function)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hēi (+ raised voice)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Giving H a warning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hũ</td>
<td>Emphasizing one’s request (e.g., to God)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kāmbènùa</td>
<td>‘May I come in?’</td>
<td>Asking for admission to someone’s home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>máleena</td>
<td>‘Isn’t it?’</td>
<td>Asking for confirmation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nayái</td>
<td>‘So be it!’</td>
<td>Accepting H’s position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nkán</td>
<td>Inviting H to act</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nténio, ntóduo</td>
<td>‘Just wait!’</td>
<td>Asking H for patience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pà ùmân</td>
<td>‘True!, ‘What I/you say is true!’</td>
<td>Emphasizing that S or H is correct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Literally: ‘at the truth’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FSEs are largely non-compositional, frozen expressions serving speaker-hearer interaction. Like other theticals, they are syntactically unattached and prosodically set off, and many form utterances of their own. When combined with other information units within an utterance their preferred position is utterance-initial.

**Functions**

Among the most frequently occurring theticals figuring in social exchange are theticals serving to signal confirmation (or non-confirmation) to what the speaker just said. The units àà (or àá) ‘yes’ and à’à ‘no’ are paradigm instances of such theticals, typically used as responses to polar questions asking the hearer for confirmation (3.7.3.1), e.g.:

```
i    ting’-    e   se”kee?   ‘Do you have money?’
2.SG have- I    money.Q
```
àà, a ting’- e. ‘Yes, I do.’
yes 1.SG have- I

or
á’à, m- a ting’- e. ‘No, I don’t.’
no NEG- 1.SG have- I

The following text piece from a conversation between Nkoiseyyo Kalisya (N) and Bahati Nkuyaki (B) shows that the FSE on its own can form an utterance:

N: í páll- iisye- i?
   2.SG cultivate-AP- 1/2
   ‘You cultivate?’

B: aá.
   yes
   ‘Yes.’

N: í wé í pall- úu ímpyeɔ.
   2.SG go.S  2.SG cultivate.S- VEN seeds.A
   ‘You go, you should cultivate the seeds!’ (13/58-60)

A pronounced form of confirmation is expressed by the marker nayái ‘So be it!’, as in the following conversation between a mother (M) and her boys:

M: o rú- ie- n nen íyu kosi kéé am ímahoi.
   2.PL sleep- ASS- IMP LOC here so.that 1.PL eat.S medicine.A
   ‘You (pl.) sleep here together (with us) so that we take the medicine (together).’

kas- é i ira í?
hear- I DM now DM
   ‘Do (you) hear?’

ko nayái.
COP so.be.it
   ‘So be it.’ (4/33-5)

To make sure that the hearer has understood what has just been said or shown, the speaker may use either aríí suwé ira (for visually accessible information) or aríí kas ira (for auditevilly accessible information), both being roughly translatable as ‘You follow me?’; we will return to these theticals in Section 4.5.4.
There are a number of other means to solicit responses from the hearer. For example, to ask the hearer for confirmation of what has been said or is going to be said by the speaker, the thetical *máleena* ‘isn’t it?’ is used, acting like a question tag:

\[
\text{roopáni róópta mécháón } \text{máleena?} \\
\text{rain.I rain.N tomorrow isn’t it} \\
\text{‘It is going to rain tomorrow, isn’t it?’}
\]

*máleena* is usually found utterance-finally but is fairly flexible in its placement. Thus, in the following constructed example it can appear finally (a) or initially (b) in the utterance:

(a) \[
\text{ko } \text{chichë } \text{pùunì, } \text{máleena?} \\
\text{COP 3.PL.A } \text{Maasai.N isn’t it?} \\
\text{‘They are Maasai, aren’t they?’}
\]

(b) \[
\text{máleena, má } (*\text{ko}) \text{ chichë } \text{pùunì?} \\
\text{isn’t it } \text{NEG } (*\text{COP} 3.\text{PL.A } \text{Maasai.N.Q} \\
\text{‘Isn’t it (true), they are Maasai?’}
\]

A pronounced form of confirmation is provided by the thetical *pá ùmàn* ‘what you say is true!’, literally ‘at the truth’, cf. the following elicited example:

\[
\text{pá umàn } \text{ng’állëe } \text{chaa } \text{ka- } \text{i } \text{mwaa- úu.} \\
\text{FSE words REL.PL NP- 2.SG tell-VEN} \\
\text{‘Absolutely true what you (just) said!’}
\]

In order to be emphatic about the truth of what s/he has claimed, e.g., when refuting counter-arguments of other interlocutors, the speaker uses either (a) or (b), depending on his or her sex:

(a) \[
\text{akúryee táá amóó!} \\
\text{underwear GEN mother} \\
\text{‘I swear!’ (Male speaker)}
\]

(b) \[
\text{akúryee táá paapâ!} \\
\text{underwear GEN father} \\
\text{‘I swear!’ (Female speaker)}
\]

These theticals form the Akie equivalents and have the strength of an oath, meaning ‘What I’ve just said is absolutely true!’ or ‘I swear!’. *akúryee* means literally ‘underwear’ but here refers to the leather vest under the main dress said to have been worn by the ancestors of the Akie. The literal meaning thus is approximately: ‘If what I say is not true then I’ll wear the *akúryee* of my mother (said by men) or my father (said by women)’.
Doing so would be one of the most disgraceful and unlikely things Akie people can conceive of.

The FSEs mentioned so far are primarily about speaker-hearer interaction concerning the content of what has been said, and hence, also relate to the component of text organization (4.4). But there are other FSEs that more centrally concern the relationship among interlocutors. Asking for permission is one of them. The expression kámbena ‘may I come in?’, for example, is used when one visits someone else and asks to be admitted to the latter’s home. For example, in the tale *The monster and the child* (Text 3), the monster (*tiantáák*
**om**e) notices that people refuse him access to their homes. So he uses a child that he had kidnapped:

ko len- chi láákwɛɛ nyɛm ɪ kámbena ng’óloon!
P.3 say- DAT child.A POSS.3.SG DM Kambena say
‘(The monster) said to his child: ‘Say Kambenia!’ (3/6)

To invite the hearer to a new activity, speakers may use a range of expressions, especially imperatives (3.2.5; 4.2.4), but also the theticals hébū and nkán:

nkán  ki pe.
FSE  1.PL go.S
‘So, let’s go!"

Inviting the hearer to volunteer new information is achieved most of all by the thetical hàáyyá:

hàáyyá, taa- u- n ng’állɛɛ!
FSE  start- VEN- IMP  words
‘Now, come out with the news!’

The thetical héi (pronounced with a raised voice), placed utterance-initially, gives the hearer a warning not to do, or be careful with doing something, e.g.,

héi, ma pár-chinií naa.
FSE  NEG  do  D.HE
‘Watch out, don’t do this!’

héi, pákaa.
‘Hey, leave it/stop it!’

Face manipulation, including face-threatening acts (Brown and Levinson 1987 [1978]; Janney and Arndt 1993) do not appear to play any unusual role in the thetical categories
of Akie. A concept that is blatantly absent in our texts, however, is that of apologizing. Furthermore, there is also no inherited thetical for thanking in the texts or in our lexicon (König et al. 2014b). To express one’s gratitude, the FSE aashê ‘thanks!’, borrowed from Maasai (ashê ‘thank you!’), can be used (see also 4.4). It is, however, hardly ever used between people, even if there seemingly would be reason to thank someone e.g. for an extraordinary gift. We have heard it in the following utterance, but such utterances using aashê are rare, and there is usually no reply to them:

aashê yááí inyêè ámu ar-íí sááp- aan.
thanks only 2.SG.N because P- 2.SG heal.P- 1.SG.O
‘Thanks for having rescued me!’

Where aashê occurs frequently is in one particular discourse setting, namely in the communication with the ancestors: Quite commonly, the ancestors or God are given thanks for their benevolence, we will return to this issue in Section 4.5.1.

4.2.2 Greetings
Unlike a number of other African societies, the Akie do not seem to rely on fixed templates of greeting or farewell taking. There is a catalog of formulae of social exchange (FSEs), to be discussed below, but none is entirely mandatory.

Presumably the most frequently used greetings, not restricted to any particular time of the day, are súpai (for male addressees) and táákwɛɛnɛya (for female addressees), the ritualized response being épa or úpa (by male addressees) and íkóó (by female addressees). These FSEs, all borrowed from Maasai, are frequently preceded by a vocative term denoting the role relation between the persons concerned, as in the following examples (where A stands for the speaker and B for the addressee):

A: amóó, táákwɛɛnɛya! ‘Mother, how are you?’
B: íkóó. ‘I am fine.’
A: kuukaa (, súpai)! ‘Grandfather (, how are you)’36
B: épa. ‘I am fine.’

Alternatively, or in addition, there is a range of other conventions. In particular, a person may simply be greeted with a term for the role relation obtaining with the addressee. Such terms include the following:

- állápa between male cousins,
- èttóò between persons of the same generation,

36 ‘Grandfather’ stands for both mother’s and father’s father. Note further, that kuukaa also refers to ‘grandchildren’, hence this greeting can also apply to the latter.
- kómpa(tuu) between cousins of different sexes,
- láákwaâni for younger female addressees,
- sántèè between in-laws of the same generation,
- túpchee between siblings,
- weérii for younger male addressees,

etc.

As a response to these greetings, presumably the prevalent FSE is wóè (or yée, or èéé), used by male addressees, and ééú, used by female addressees. Thus, a common greeting exchange between two unrelated men belonging to the same age-set may take the following form:

A: èttóò!
B: wóè!

Depending on the time of the day, a number of different FSEs can be employed. A fairly general FSE, one directly asking the addressee for information is the following:

kiràdééí (kwaani)? ‘How is it?’

When people meet in the morning, presumably the most common formula is:

A: ar- kó êéch!
    P- 3 dawn
    ‘It has dawned.’

B: ar- kó êéch!
    P- 3 dawn
    ‘It has dawned.’

Alternatively, or in addition, the following ritual may be used:

A: k- o ru- aat- e ano?
    [éânò]
    NP-2.PL sleep- AMB- I how
    ‘How did you sleep?’

B: ká- kii ru- yê sííng’owinta.
    NP 1.PL sleep- AMB well
    ‘We slept well.’

And when visiting someone, an additional or alternative exchange is the following:
In the evening, people most commonly use the following FSE, which invites the addressee to elaborate on what has happened over the day:

\[
\text{kaskólinye!}
\]
\[
evening
\]
\[
\text{‘How was your day?’}
\]

Farewell bidding does not appear to be a salient social concept. If there is an FSE used recurrently then it is perhaps the following:

\[
\text{ar-áá wenti anéé (si kéé túyyen nén pesyee táá kén)!}
\]
\[
P\- 1.SG go 1.SG.N PURP 1.PL meet at day GEN other
\]
\[
\text{‘I am leaving (so let us meet on another day)!’}
\]

Furthermore, there is a wide range of more or less formulaic expressions showing considerable variation depending on who uses them when and where. Two examples may suffice to illustrate the kind of concepts invoked in such social exchanges. Conceivably, both involve semantic replication of corresponding Swahili expressions, but more research is needed on this issue.

When people meet during day time, the speaker may ask either (a) or (b), and a possible response would be (c). It may then be that the addressee himself asks the first speaker (d) if there is one referent or (e) if there is more than one, and the first speaker may respond with (f).

(a) \[
\text{parénne ikaa péétinta?}
\]
\[
\text{? GEN.PL day.time}
\]
\[
\text{‘How is it today?’}
\]

(b) \[
\text{parénne ikaa ékɔɔsye?}
\]
\[
\text{? GEN.PL days}
\]
\[
\text{‘How has it been over the last days?’}
\]

(c) \[
\text{àááá, siing’owe.}
\]
\[
\text{INTJ good}
\]
‘Thanks, good.’

(d) m- a nkûn inyee?\(^{37}\)
    NEG- 1.SG know 2.SG.A
    ‘I don’t know how about you?’ (Lit. ‘I don’t know you?’)

(e) m- a nkûn akwεε?
    NEG- 1.SG know 2.PL.A
    ‘I don’t know how about you (pl.)?’

(f) siìng’ow.
    ‘Good (as well).’

The second example concerns either meetings early in the morning or farewell bidding late in the evening. The concept invoked in both cases is that of sleep, encoded with the verb rui ‘to sleep’ or the noun rúúinta ‘sleep’. Thus, in addition to or instead of the morning greetings mentioned above, a speaker may ask (g) early in the morning and receive either (h) or (i).\(^{38}\) And when splitting late in the evening, speaker and hearer may both say (j).

(g) ka- i ru siìng’owinta?
    NP- 2.SG sleep well
    ‘Did you sleep well?’

(h) aa, ka- a ru siìng’owinta.
    yes NP- 1.SG sleep well
    ‘Yes, I did.’

(i) toomá, a ru siìng’owinta.
    no 1.SG sleep well
    ‘No, I didn’t.’

(j) ru siìng’owinta (ki tu- ñtooey mech5on).
    sleep well 1.PL meet- ASS tomorrow
    ‘Sleep well (we shall meet tomorrow)!’

---

\(^{37}\) Cf. the corresponding Swahili response Sijui wewe? ‘I don’t know (about) you?’

\(^{38}\) Note that a negative response, such as in (i), is socially perfectly acceptable.
4.2.3 Vocatives

Vocative theticals are an important means of linking the speaker to the external world, typically to the hearer (including the ancestors; see Section 4.5.1), or of singling out one referent as against other possible referents, or of drawing attention to what is going to come next or, in some cases, to signal that one has some important concern.

Thus, in the following text example (a), the speaker wishes to lay emphasis on his request by addressing the hearer with the vocative (l)eláá ‘folks’, which is normally reserved for plural referents. In (b), by contrast, it signals regret:

(a) ɛɛláá, uui yáide duo!
   folks.A go.IMP DM DM
   ‘My friends, would you please leave now!’

(b) lɛɛláá, ka- a wê.
   folks.A PERF 1.SG go.P
   ‘Folks, (I’m sorry) I must leave now.’

As the (a)-example above illustrates, vocatives frequently combine with imperatives (4.2.4) and as a rule they precede the latter. The vocative can be either a noun or a pronoun, or even a subject proclitic, as in the following example, where the vocative is the second person singular proclitic î:

í nyoo- n ínhulu!
2.SG come.S- IMP Inchulu.A!
   ‘You come, Inchulu!’

Vocative expressions are coded in the accusative case, there is no formal marking on nouns.

With regard to word order we have not found any noteworthy restrictions on where they may be placed within an utterance: They can appear utterance-initially (a) or -finally (b), or they may form utterances of their own (c). And they can also be inserted within sentence constituents. Thus, the vocative ánanú ‘folks!’ appears between a verb and its object complement in the text piece of (d).

(a) paapâ, pányee ko anó ſíte?
   father.A meat.A COP where be.at
   ‘Father, where is the meat?’

(b) ko anó ſíte pányee, paapâ?
   COP where be.at meat.A father.A

---

Inchulu is one of the well-known Akie ancestors.
‘Where is the meat, father?’

(c) paapâ!
‘Father!’

(d) ko má pet- u- un ánanú ámti.
COP NEG miss- VEN- 2.SG.O folks food.N
‘(Even) food, you won’t miss it, folks!’ (13/197)

Clearly the most frequent use of vocatives in our text collection concerns general addresses of the speaker to the audience at large (including the ancestors). And most commonly, the expressions used are leeláá or its variants (leeláá kɔlɔ, eeláá (kɔlɔ), ánanú, and löyé, all translatable best as ‘folks’, as in the following examples:

lóyé ko ma- kí eesai.
folks,A COP NEG- 1.PL refuse
‘Folks! We don’t refuse (it).’ (1/44)

ichaíde kuúmi akó inkone hůn leeláá kɔlɔ ...
DM beer.A COLL.A Inkone.A DM folks
‘The beer, people of Inkone, folks, …’ (1/66)

The last example also illustrates another common type of vocatives, to be found in particular in ceremonial speech. This type consists of the construction [ako + proper noun], where ako is a “semi-nominal” meaning ‘relatives, associates of’ (3.3.2.2.3).

One important kind of referents in vocatives consists of the ancestors (asíswe), who are invoked in various kinds of situations, but most of all in ritual acts. Thus, in the following text piece from the Blessing the Hunting Weapons ceremony that we already saw above, the ancestor Inculu, believed to be one of the founding members of Akie society, is invited to attend:

í nyoo- n inchulu.
2.SG come.S- IMP Inculu.A
‘(Please) come, Inculu!’ (1/3)

Most commonly, vocatives are proper nouns, or general, classifying nouns. But they can also be personal pronouns, and as such they have the same positional freedom, being placed e.g. initially (a) or finally (b):

40 They are said to be Maasai borrowings, e.g. of Maasai leeláá kɔlɔ ‘these people’.
Vocative pronouns and nouns can co-occur, where one is appositional to the other, and vice versa (cf. (c)). And as observed above, such combinations enjoy all freedom of vocative placement (d), e.g.:

(c) **paapâ inyee, pányee ko anó ōte.**
father.A 2.SG.A meat.A COP where be.at
‘Father, you, where is the meat?’

inyee paapâ, pányee ko anó ōte.
2.SG.A father.A meat.A COP where be.at
‘You, father, where is the meat?’

(d) ko anó ōte pányee, **paapâ inyee.**
COP where be.at meat.A father.A 2.SG.A
‘Where is the meat, father?’

Vocatives normally have human referents but in special cases there may be inanimate addressees as well. Thus, in the following example, the noun *kaau* ‘homestead’ (here reduced to *kaa*) is conceived as standing for the people living in it:

**kaa í ó yaat- u- aan**
homestead.A DM 2.PL open- VEN- 1SG.O
‘Homestead! You open me!’ (3/9)

There is no variation of address forms used for one and the same person in accordance with distinctions of discourse setting similar to that reported from other Nilotic languages (see, e.g., Evans-Pritchard 1964 on Nuer): Akie retain the name given to them after birth and it remains the primary address form throughout their life. The following is one of the main exceptions: Many people are addressed with a Maasai name in a discourse setting involving Maasai people or culture.

4.2.4 Imperatives

Some features of imperatives have already been looked at in Section 3.2.5. Imperatives are widely considered to belong to the paradigm of speech acts or sentence types. But they
have also been claimed to differ in kind from other discourse categories. They have been characterized as being morphologically unusual (Zanuttini and Portner 2003: 42), as having “an extragrammatical, extrasyntactical form” (Watkins 1963: 44), or even as being “a law unto themselves” (Aikhenvald 2010: 7, 399). They have also been described as being “defective” or as belonging to the “sentences of some minor type” (Hockett 1958: 200-1), or as being potentially elusive to the phonotactic rules of grammar (Floricic and Molinu 2008).

In the framework of Discourse Grammar, imperatives form one of the main, open-ended categories of Thetical Grammar. Quite a number of them figure in our text collection. The few forms listed in Table 6 are found recurrently and appear to have specific functions relating to stereotypic situations of interpersonal discourse.

Table 6. The most common formulaic imperatives (H = hearer)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marker</th>
<th>Approximate English equivalent</th>
<th>Typical discourse function</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ípáipai, pl. óó paípai</td>
<td>‘Help us!’</td>
<td>Said when addressing the ancestors to ask them for help</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nítên, nítenioo, kánten</td>
<td>‘Wait!’</td>
<td>Asking H to interrupt his speaking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ng’óloon</td>
<td>‘Say (it)!’</td>
<td>Asking H for information</td>
<td>Cf. ng’alaan ‘talk, say’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pákkaai</td>
<td>‘Leave it!’</td>
<td>Asking H to stop an action</td>
<td>Cf. pakaach ‘abandon’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following text example illustrates the use of one of the formulaic imperatives listed in Table 6, namely ípáipai ‘Help us!’:

tóroorô ípáipa sékeerí i kóón- eech í pee.
Gods.A help.us Sekeeri 2.SG give.S- 1.PL DM water.A
‘God, help us! Sekeeri, give us water!’ (1/16)

As this example shows, imperatives frequently combine with vocatives, including pronominal vocative forms and subject proclitics (4.2.3).

Functions
Akie imperatives have a number of discourse functions. Generally, they constitute the paradigm means for eliciting action (Givón 2001: 31). One kind of action is to prevent the
hearer from continuing to do what he is doing by interrupting him. This is a major function of pëkäai and ñtëñiioo. The imperative ng’ölooa has different functions, typically used by the speaker to ask the hearer for more information.

4.3 Attitudes of the speaker
This component concerns the inner state of the speaker, in particular what s/he feels, believes, experiences, concludes, claims, or accepts.

There is one paradigm category in Thetical Grammar devoted to expressing the attitudes of interlocutors, namely interjections, even if not all Akie interjections are restricted to speaker attitudes (see below).

In the framework of Discourse Grammar, the category of interjections includes not only paradigm interjections but also exclamatives (e.g.,Isn’t he the cutest thing!, What a nice guy he is!; Zanuttini and Portner 2003), pause fillers and hesitation markers (uh, um; Clark and Fox Tree 2002; O’Connell and Kowal 2003; Hayashi and Yoon 2006; 2010), even if the latter two are more or less marginal members of the category: Exclamatives differ from paradigm exemplars of interjections in having some “recoverable propositional content” (Michaelis and Lambrecht 1996: 378). And pause fillers and hesitation markers do not typically index a change in the emotional state of the speaker (cf. Ameka 1992a; Norrick 2009). Perhaps somewhat surprisingly, both are absent in our texts (see Section 4.4).

Most interjections index a change in the emotional or cognitive state of the speaker and, hence, serve to express speaker attitudes. But they may also express other functions, and some of them relate more centrally to speaker-hearer interaction (4.2).

Table 7 lists a number of frequently used Akie interjections. With one exception (aashé nkai) they all belong to the category of primary interjections (Ameka 1992a; 1992b). The main function of Akie interjections is to signal emotional states of the speaker. And here it is the concept of surprise that is most frequently invoked. The speaker expresses his or her surprise in particular about something unexpected that has come up in the preceding discourse. Other attitudes conveyed by the interjections are joy, relief, and regret or disappointment. Amongst the most frequently used items listed in Table 7 there is only one (háá) that clearly expresses disagreement.

Table 7. The most common Akie primary interjections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marker</th>
<th>Approximate English equivalent</th>
<th>Typical discourse function</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ááá</td>
<td>‘I am surprised, it seems I was wrong!’</td>
<td>Surprise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>àáá</td>
<td>Joy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>àháá</td>
<td>‘I see!’</td>
<td>Surprise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

41 English examples are pst! or sht! (cf. Ameka 1992a; 1992b).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exclamatory</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aashé nkai</td>
<td>‘Thank God!’</td>
<td>Relief about something positive that happened. Maasai <em>ashê enkáí</em> ‘thanks God!’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ééé</td>
<td></td>
<td>Surprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hái</td>
<td>‘Oh no!’</td>
<td>Disappointment, complaint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>káé</td>
<td>‘Look there!’</td>
<td>Surprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kúmpe</td>
<td></td>
<td>Surprise about an unexpected observation. Swahili <em>kumbe</em> ‘Lo and behold!’ (interjection)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taan</td>
<td>‘Wow!’</td>
<td>Surprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tánde</td>
<td></td>
<td>Disbelief about some unexpected observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>úúshò</td>
<td>‘What a pity!’</td>
<td>Sadness, regret</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exclamatives tend to overlap in function with formulae of social exchange (4.2), that is, many may also be understood to serve speaker-hearer interaction. This applies in particular to the hunting calls, to be discussed in Section 4.5.3 (Table 10). For example, a call such as *hawówe pányee* ‘Let us get meat!’ can alternatively be understood to be an exclamative relating to the emotional state of the speaker (a) or to signal a communal act among hunters (b):

\[
\text{hawówe pányee} \quad \text{ich- a } \text{yáide pányee.}\]
\[
\text{let.there.be.meat D- HE DM meat.A} \quad (a) \text{‘Wow, there is meat!’}
\]
\[
\text{háì, } \text{má } \text{koleena!} \quad (b) \text{‘Let there be meat, here, meat!’} \quad (1/42)
\]

Like vocatives, interjections are preferably placed utterance-initially, as the interjections *àááá* and *háì* are in the following examples:

\[
\text{àááá, } \text{a } \text{nyór- u- iaa!} \quad \text{INTJ 1.SG find- VEN- ASS} \quad \text{‘Really, I got it!’}
\]

\[
\text{háì, } \text{má } \text{koleena!} \quad \text{INTJ NEG DM} \quad \text{‘Oh no! It wasn’t like this!’}
\]
But this is not a requirement, that is, interjections may appear in other positions of an utterance as well. Thus, in the following example, the thetical *taan* appears interpolated between two segments of an utterance:

```
ka- a wé de taan nté lettu.
PERF- 1.SG go.P DM DM be.at last
'I went and, wow!, it was behind!' (From Bahati’s buffalo story)
```

To emphasize their expressive force, many interjections can be repeated, sometimes three times or more. Note that in Sentence Grammar, reduplication is not a really productive mechanism in Akie.

We already mentioned the unit *aashé* ‘Thanks!’ in 4.2 as a thetical promoting good social relations. But when combined with *nkai* ‘God’, both terms borrowed from Maasai, it functions as an exclamative, expressing one’s relief about some state of affairs. Thus, in the following text piece, the Akie elders make use of it as an exclamative in the blessing ceremony, which is arguably the most central ritual of the Akie annual calendar. There had been a long period of drought but now, in January, 2013, there were a few rain showers and during the ceremony the elders acknowledge this by voicing their relief and joy, chanting *aashé nkai* ‘Thank you, God!’:

```
lele a köyu amôt koken aashé nkai!
people! like yesterday again thank.you God!
‘Folks, [it rains] like yesterday again! Thanks, God!’
```

**Functions**

Cross-cultural work on emotions suggests that there is a fairly small pool of elementary emotions that tend to be distinguished. For example, in the Discrete Emotion Theory of Ekman (1972) and others, the following six basic emotions are proposed: happiness (or joy), sadness, surprise, anger (or rage), disgust, and contempt. Other concepts that have been mentioned in subsequent research are interest and shame. As the overview in Table 7 suggests, only the first three of these concepts figure in the list of salient Akie interjections, that is, joy, sadness, and surprise. But in addition, there are other concepts, namely relief and disappointment (or complaint).

Clearly the majority of interjections figuring in our texts concern various manifestations of surprise about something unexpected that the speaker experiences. For example, in the following text piece the speaker uses *káé* ‘Look there!’ to voice his surprise about the fact that there can be a (white) woman video-recording men -- and that right in the (male-dominated) country of the Akie.
kilé ſte dé í kárka káé ko
DM exist DM DM woman look.there! COP

yúake- í naa nyóó ko táðminian- efch nen kía- í.
‘There is a woman, there is this female, look, who comes to record us (our voices) in this country!’ (1/13)

In a similar fashion, using the interjection kúmpe in the following text piece signals disbelief about the fact that two Akie men who had gone to the forest for honey collection are confronted with buffaloes all of a sudden:

kúmpe ntán óll- in ki penti ſte
EXCL where LOC.REL- DI 1.PL go.P exist

dé sááeni chaa ſte koken ólla.
DM buffaloes REL.PL exist again there
‘Ala! There where we went there were buffalos, (they) were (back) again!’ (2/28)

In the case of strong emotional involvement, the interjection tends to be repeated, as háì ‘oh no!’ is in the following text piece where the monster faces a situation of being burned alive by the brothers:

námpari ni ko le: hai hai hai.
monster.A D.PR NAR say hai hai hai
‘(and) the monster said: ‘Oh no, oh no, oh no (emphatic complaint)!’ (8/16-7)

4.4 Text organization
This component of the situation of discourse concerns most of all the following:

- The structure of texts (text planning, coherence between pieces of text, boundaries between text pieces)
- Content of texts (elaboration, modification, comment on the content of some text piece, repairing)
- Information structure (functions such as highlighting or backgrounding givenness or newness of some text piece, mitigation, etc.)

In terms of the magnitude of linguistic material deployed, text organization is the most important functional component in Akie linguistic discourse, and there is a wide range of theoretical expressions that Akie speakers are able to activate in order to organize or bracket their discourse contributions.
Our interest here is restricted to one type of units, namely theticals that are commonly referred to as discourse markers (DMs; see Section 4.1). Their main function is to structure linguistic discourse, that is, they constitute the paradigm means for speakers to design their texts. Beyond the features that generally define DMs as theticals (cf. (2) above; see also Heine 2013), Akie DMs exhibit in particular the following characteristics:

a  They most frequently serve to establish discourse cohesion.
b  They tend to be ignored in translations, and it is hard, if not impossible, to establish their existence in elicitation tests.
c  Many are flexible as to where they can be placed, and a few can form utterances of their own.

Discourse markers (DMs) are typically elements that establish overall cohesion within a text or parts of it. As such, they may seem to be largely redundant in that texts would lose hardly any conceptual content if the DMs were omitted. In a number of situations, however, DMs are recruited when Sentence Grammar fails to supply appropriate function-specific grammatical constructions.

For example, we observed in Section 3.8.3 that Akie does not have any grammaticalized means in expressions of direct speech for linking reporting clauses with the utterance reported. In such a situation, DMs tend to be inserted to establish cohesion between the two and, hence, within the text at large. Thus, the DM hǹ in the following text piece assists the speaker to establish a link between the reporting clause kee ley ‘we say’ and the following direct speech clause:

keee ley hǹ ó yum-a-yum- uu- n náá këën hǹ áko kìkìkìko.
‘We say, you should gather all together, the associates of Kikeko.’ (1/64)

Table 8 provides a list of Akie DMs that are particularly frequent in the texts. Note that a number of them appear to be frozen collocations that include the DM dé.

Table 8. The most common Akie discourse markers
(H = hearer; IU = information unit)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marker</th>
<th>Approximate English equivalent</th>
<th>Typical discourse function</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>à</td>
<td>‘and’</td>
<td>Introducing a new IU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anasínanu</td>
<td>‘Look!’</td>
<td>Drawing H’s attention to what follows</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ási</td>
<td>‘so, well’</td>
<td>Pausing, preparing for new IU</td>
<td>Presumably a shortened form of Swahili basí (see below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>basí</td>
<td>‘well’</td>
<td>Pausing, preparing for new IU</td>
<td>&lt; Swahili basí ‘well!, ‘that’s all!’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dé, ídé</td>
<td></td>
<td>Text continuity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dedúo</td>
<td>‘now’</td>
<td>Text continuity, signaling new event</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dúo</td>
<td>‘and (then)’</td>
<td>Introducing a new IU, text continuity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hḿ</td>
<td>‘and (then)’</td>
<td>Introducing a new IU, text continuity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>í</td>
<td>topic enclitic</td>
<td>Ending a topical IU and preparing for a new IU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ichayaíde, icháide, yáide</td>
<td>‘it is this’, ‘you should know’</td>
<td>Text continuity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ikaísha</td>
<td>‘it is over’</td>
<td>End of narrative account</td>
<td>&lt; Swahili ikaísha ‘it is finished’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>íra</td>
<td>‘now’</td>
<td>Text continuity</td>
<td>Lit. ‘today’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kitío</td>
<td>‘just’</td>
<td>Text continuity</td>
<td>Lit. ‘self’ (3.3.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>koééna</td>
<td>‘then’</td>
<td>Text continuity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>koinákata</td>
<td>‘and now’</td>
<td>Highlighting a new event</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kolééna or kokolên</td>
<td>‘this is how it is’</td>
<td>Lit. ‘it is (what) they say’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kɔrdɔ</td>
<td>‘now’</td>
<td>Text continuity</td>
<td>Lit. ‘now, presently’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hńń</td>
<td>‘I follow you and agree with you’</td>
<td>Confirmation in turn-taking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>náide</td>
<td>‘now’</td>
<td>Text continuity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nayáí</td>
<td>‘So be it!’</td>
<td>Concluding agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ntán</td>
<td>‘you should know’</td>
<td>Drawing attention to the following IU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discourse markers are a prominent feature of Akie narrative discourse. Consider the following example, already presented in Section 4.1, where there is a sequence of two DMs at the beginning and three at the end of one utterance:

\[
\text{hḿ a kée táá ko pa ko ng’ám}
\]
\[
\text{DM and RP still.be.doing NAR go.P NAR receive}
\]
\[
\text{akiê chaa hḿ icháide hḿ.}
\]
\[
\text{Akie.N D.PR.PL DM DM DM}
\]
\[
\text{‘And they (the white people) went and the Akie welcomed them, So be it.’ (1/55)}
\]

At the same time, this example may also serve to point out another feature of Akie DMs. The marker hḿ figuring in this example is restricted to a few people, we have not found it in the speech of other Akie people. Which markers and the extent to which and where they are used is in fact largely a matter of personal choice. Some speakers make extensive use of DMs whilst others do not, and some may avoid e.g. combinations of three DMs such as hーム icháide hーム in the example above.

The placement of some discourse markers, especially dé and hーム, is highly flexible. As the text piece above shows, for example, hーム appears virtually anywhere in an utterance.

DMs cannot be inserted within a word; nevertheless, they do not necessarily honor boundaries of constituents of Sentence Grammar. In the following example, the topic enclitic í separates the head noun from its relative clause:

\[
\text{kíí nte ápa tíántaakômê í naá kií nyô kó cheng’ waáree.}
\]
\[
\text{RP exist long.ago monster.N DM REL.SG RP come P.3 search.for children.A}
\]
\[
\text{‘Long ago there was a monster who came to search for children.’ (3/1)}
\]

Text planning

With regard to the linguistic material used to structure the discourse, three main types of text planning may be distinguished that we will loosely call (a) retrospective, (b) prospective, and (c) connective planning, and each type tends to be associated with a specific set of theticals serving as discourse markers (DMs). This typology is neither discrete nor exhaustive; it is simply meant to point out some salient functions associated with certain DMs. And these functions are not mutually exclusive. A given DM is rarely restricted to one of these functions but rather may imply alternative functions in addition. Table 9 provides an overview of the main categories that Akie speakers dispose of to plan
and structure their texts. Note that we are restricted here to discourse markers, which are the most important though not the only means used for text planning.

Table 9. Categories of Akie discourse markers serving text planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Sub-category</th>
<th>Main function</th>
<th>Paradigm examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retrospective DMs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Signal the end of an episode or event</td>
<td>ikaísha, mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospective DMs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Signal the beginning of an episode or event</td>
<td>dedúo, koinákata, ntán, tándeí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connective DMs</td>
<td>Conjunctive</td>
<td>Link larger pieces of a text to one another</td>
<td>à, ási, basí, í, and koééna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cohesive</td>
<td>Serve text continuity</td>
<td>dé (ídé), dúo, ichayaíde, icháide, ɪra, kitío, korú, náide, yáide</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Retrospective DMs

The main function of retrospective DMs is to signal the end of an episode or event. This can be achieved, for example, by providing a concluding comment or by drawing attention to the significance of the preceding discourse contribution.

A paradigm Akie example of a retrospective DM is provided by ikaísha ‘it is over’, which may not only terminate episodes but also entire narrative accounts, such as tales.

Another important retrospective DM characterizing turn-taking is mm. Its use can be illustrated with the following text piece taken from a conversation between Nkoiseyyo Kalisya (N) and Bahati Nkuyaki (B), two Akie men (see Section 4.5.4). With the use of the reinforcer mm, Bahati acknowledges what Nkoiseyyo had just said: “I follow you and agree with you”.

N: káé ntán nén taíta ma- n- kó yaai. but you.should.know at in.front.A NEG- SUB- 3.SG be.spoilt
   ‘But, you should know, the future is not yet spoilt.’

B: mm DM
   ‘Right.’

---

42 With the term “episode” we refer generally to a discourse unit that offers a thematically distinctive topic requiring a shift in the speaker’s or the reader’s understanding (cf. Miall 2004: 112).
N: kira iyaa ki taa- úún- e kó roopáni.
   because here PAS begin-VEN- APL 3.P rain
   ‘Because here it has started to rain.’ (13/7-9)

A retrospective DM such as mm in the preceding example may have something like ‘I
understand what you have said’ as its salient function. At the same time, it is implicitly
suggestive of a prospective function, namely ‘(therefore) you may go ahead’.

A complex retrospective marker characteristic of procedural descriptive texts where
Akie people describe their cultural institutions is the following:43

ₙₐₐ  n- oll- aa ki parchinii.
D.HE REL.SG- LOC.REL- HE 1.PL do.DAT
   ‘This is how we do it.’

(b) Prospective DMs

Prospective DMs serve to signal the beginning of an episode or event and/or to herald a
new utterance. They include for example English utterance launchers such as oh, well or
okay (Biber et al. 1999: 1054).

In Akie, the units koinákata ‘and now’, ntán ‘you should know’ and, in some of its uses,
dedúo, exemplify the functions of prospective DMs: They highlight a new topic, marking
the beginning of a new event, episode or some other larger discourse segment.

In the following turn-taking from the tale The fat girl and the monster (Text 5), the crow
asks the child for meat and is given some. Then he asks for more but is refused. Asking for
more meat in (a), the crow then decides on a new reasoning strategy, introducing his new
argument with the DM dedúo in (b):

(a) tési- an.
   increase- 1.SG.O
   ‘Give me more!’

(b) déduo, sa- a mwáu- n ng’alle cchuu …
   DM so.that- 1.SG tell- 2.SG.O words.A D.PR.PL
   ‘At this point (the crow said), Let me tell you this …’ (5/28)

The prospective DM ntán ‘you should know’ is used by the speaker to draw attention to
what s/he is going to say next. Thus, in the conversation discussed earlier, Nkoiseyyo (N)
points out that there is a piece of information that his hearer should take into account:

43 Since the entire utterance is a thetial, it is printed in bold.
N: káe ntán nén taíta ma- n- kó yaai.
   but you.should.know at in.front.A NEG- SUB- 3.P be.spoilt
   ‘But, you should know, the future is not yet spoilt.’ (13/7)

The information introduced by the prospective marker can be a longer stretch of discourse, but it may as well be a short information unit. Thus, in the following example from a procedural text the unit consists simply of a pronoun: Explaining how honey is harvested, the speaker uses the marker ntán to introduce the demonstrative pronoun chuu ‘those’, pointing at the bunch of grass (súúswee) that he is processing into a torch in order to access the bee-hole.44

ási kéé nyínyí súúswee chu í ntán chu í.
   ‘Well, we rub this grass, you should know, this one’ (14/3)

While ntán concerns speaker-hearer interaction in the example above (see Section 4.2), presumably its main function is to serve text planning, that is, to highlight a prospective discourse contribution by the speaker.

Drawing the hearer’s attention to what is going to come next is also achieved by the markers anasínanu and tándei, e.g.,

tándei pwáán- u de píí!
   look come.PL- VEN DM people.N
   ‘Look! People are coming!’ (4/7)

In a similar fashion, the DM suwe-n ‘look!’ also has a dual potential: It aims at capturing the hearer’s attention (= speaker-hearer interaction; 4.2) but it also draws attention to the information unit that the speaker is going to present next. In the following example, the speaker Nkoiseyyo (N) talks about the seasonal problems that the Akie were facing when planting maize in early 2014:

N: suwe- n náide ámu ka- kí pall- té achée hekái táá akeenké
   look.P- IMP just because PERF- 1.PL plant- AND 1.PL.N acre GEN one
   ‘Just look! Because we’ve planted the first acre ... ’ (13/17-8)

Note that suwe-n is similar in function to a thetical that we classified as an interjection, namely káé ‘Look there!’ (Table 7), both serving to draw attention to something unexpected. The difference is that the former lacks the emotional commitment that

44 Like other collective nouns, súúswee is a plural noun, hence the plural of the demonstrative.
characterizes the latter; unlike ᱴé, suw-en appears to have text planning as its primary function.

(c) Connective DMs
These are theticals whose main function it is to provide a link between two episodes or events. Connective DMs require both a preceding and a following episode or event and thus can be viewed as being the equivalent in Thetical Grammar to what is achieved in Sentence Grammar by means of sentence connectives (see Section 3.8). But unlike the latter, connective DMs do not require a preceding information unit as long as the meaning of that unit is recoverable from the situation of discourse.

We propose to distinguish the following two main kinds of connective DMs (cf. Grosz and Sidner 1986 for a related distinction between global coherence and local coherence in Centering Theory):

(i) Conjunctive connectives, which link larger pieces of a text to one another.
(ii) Cohesive connectives, which, in a loose sense, can be said to serve to maintain text continuity.

(i) Conjunctive connectives
They relate larger discourse units, such as episodes, to one another. Accordingly, they are normally placed at the junction of such units. As such, they have also a separating function in that they mark the end of one unit, on the one hand, and the beginning of a new unit, on the other. The following are examples of such units: à, ási, bast, í, and koééna (see Table 8).

The connective à is a highly frequently occurring DM, to be found in all genres of discourse. It introduces new events and relates these events to what has just been said or implied. While it is frequently found at the beginning of an utterance, it presupposes a preceding discourse content. It thus connects pieces of discourse and is best translated as ‘and’. Thus, in the following piece from the blessing text, its use presupposes a preceding text contribution while relating that contribution to the present utterance:

ko nayái.
COP so.it.be
‘So be it.’

a ko ru-ia í nen íya kée ru-ia
and NAR sleep-ASS DM LOC there RP sleep-ASS

nen íya kwáan ai weerí nyim.
at there father.N and boy.N POSS.3.SG
‘And they slept and slept there, father and his son.’ (4/35-6)
In a similar fashion, the DM ási ‘so, well’ presupposes, at least in one of its uses, a preceding flow of information while at the same time drawing attention to what happens next. In the following example, ási cooccurs with à, another connective DM just looked at:

ási a kó wa íde í ko wa dedúo nnyé
d[ásí]
well and NAR go.P DM DM go go.P DM 3.SG.N

ko wa kó mut piichúwai …
NAR go.P NAR take brother.PL.A
‘Well, and he went and went then and he went and collected his companions
(lit. brothers) …’ (5/18)

The connective marker ási in particular relates different experiences to one another in a coherent way. In the following narrative example from Text 5 (The fat girl and the monster), the first utterance (5/47) provides the hearer with background information about a common belief that concerns the past, namely that monsters (tiantáákɔɔmɔɔsyɛ) used to wear sea-shells on their heads. In the next utterance (5/48) then, introduced by ási, the speaker relates this belief to what happens in that tale:

kíí ting’- é ápa kíí pa, ma- a nkún ko,
RP have- I long.ago RP go.PL.P NEG-1.SG know when

ko ínc hu u ng’-sekéériee náá nté paraí taa meti.
NAR put.on.head sea-shell.N REL.SG exist up GEN head.A
‘Long ago it happened (lit. ‘went’), I don’t know when, (that a monster would) put a sea-shell on his head.’ (5/47)

ási kolé kole ko tup këen í koééna taak-u kíí.
DM when when NAR cover RFL DM then see- VEN thing.N
‘So, when (the monster) had covered himself (in the hole), something [that is, the sea-shell] was still visible.’ (5/48)

The DM ási is not restricted to the initial position, as the following example illustrates. Once again there is a collocation of the two connective markers ási and à:

á wentíí ási a a mut- ín kotaá káá
1.SG go.I well and 1.SG take- 2.SG.O up.to house
Íng'waang’ ámù puán- u ápiyyoo.
2.PL.POSS because come.PL. VEN enemies.N
‘I go, well, and I take you up to your house because the enemies are approaching.’
(5/34)

Another frequently occurring connective DM is provided by í. It presupposes both a preceding and a following discourse unit, irrespective of whether that unit refers to a whole episode or part of an episode. This DM cliticizes on the preceding element, which may be the final element of a clause or any other information unit. For example, the final element can be another discourse marker, as dé is in the following example:

hḿ lecláá saris i mut- u- n dē í ...
‘Folks of Saris, bring (your people) here …!’ (1/69)

In most of its uses, í is the final marker of a topic predication, followed by a comment presenting new information:

kilé níte dē í kárka kae ko yúake í
DM exist DM DM woman look.there! COP woman.A DM

naa nyóó ko táiminian- eech nen kía- í.
REL.SG come NAR record-1.PL at country.A- D.PR
‘There is a woman, there is this female, look, who comes to record us (our voices) in this country!’ (1/13)

As the use of the second í in this example shows, that new information can even be provided by a non-restrictive relative clause (naa nyóó ko táiminian- eec).

But í is not restricted to the boundary position of discourse units, it can also appear somewhere in the second discourse unit, as in the following example, where it interrupts a reason clause:

amú í kɔ chichiɛ dē kokɛn kɔrɔ cháá eech nɛn anɛɛ
[nen]
because DM COP 3.PL.A DM again now REL.PL be.big.PL at 1.SG.A
‘because it is they again now who are bigger than I.’ (1/26)

The example above illustrates another use feature of the DM í: It quite commonly co-occurs in recurrent combination with some other units, such as the Sentence Grammar connective amú ‘because’; here is another text example:
amú í εεláá ó raraak- u- n dé róópta.
because DM folks! 2.PL descend.S- VEN- IMP DM rain.A
‘Because, folks, let it rain!’ (1/75)

And í is not restricted to topic-comment structures. For example, it can also be found connecting predications where the second is a repetition of the first, as in the following example:

εεláá ténkesa εε láá í mut- u í hm í mut- u dé.
fOLKS Tenkesa folks 2.SG bring.S- VEN DM DM 2.SG bring.S- VEN DM
‘People of Tenkesa, folks, you should bring (your people) here, just bring them here!’ (1/70)

Also connecting different events, the DM koééna appears to serve a function similar to that of a continuative aspect marker. Usually translatable by ‘then’, it relates the preceding discourse to what follows. Its place is basically utterance-initially (a), and it may be preceded by the DM à (cf. (b)).

(a) koééna iyaakyí- sye ēkɔɔsyɛ tukul ...
DM HERD- AP days.A all
‘(And) she kept herding all days … (5/3)

(b) a koééna wéntin tiántaakóɔɔ- mi ko wa ko wa kó par chii.
‘And this monster continued to go, and he went and went and killed a person.’ (5/10)

(ii) Cohesive connectives
Unlike conjunctive markers, they do not link larger discourse units but rather are interpolated anywhere in an utterance. They include a large catalog of DMs, including those whose function is given in Table 8 as serving “text continuity”. The most common of these are listed in that table, namely dé (or ìdè), dedúɔ, dúɔ, ichayaìde, icháide, ɪra, kitíò, koɔɔ, náide, and yáide.

The glosses proposed in Table 8 are tentative, the exact discourse function of these cohesive connectives is subject to further research. Translators are likely to ignore them when translating Akie texts into another language. For example, the content of the following utterance from the Blessing the Hunting Weapons ceremony would hardly be affected even if the DM náide were omitted:

ko looskitò í nyoon náide ìyu.
COP Gitu.A 2.SG come.S DM here
‘It is here to Gitu that you should come!’ (1/2)
But cohesive DMs may also serve specific functions, such as highlighting an event in specific contexts. Consider the following text example where one and the same text piece *ar-ké parparú-ú maa* ‘fire has been lighted’ occurs consecutively in two utterances produced by the same interlocutor. In the first utterance, the DM *dé* is placed between verb and object, thereby highlighting the relevant event by providing new information. In the second occurrence of this text piece there is no DM: the content of the event is now part of the shared knowledge of the interlocutors.

í pakaach-e kapléemec ámu ar-ké parparú-ú dé maa
2.SG abandon-I forest.A because P-PAS kindle-VEN DM fire.A

naa isaap-e loshoo.
REL.SG heal-I country.A
‘Fire has been lighted, which heals the country.’ (1/4-5)

Expressing new information can be observed at least in some uses of a number of cohesive connectives. Thus, in the following example, the DM *ichiyaide* can be translated as ‘it is X’, introducing the front-shifted focus constituent *kuúmi kúrúrrta* ‘beer (and) peace’:

Ichiyaide kuúmi kúrúrrta yaíde kí saam- e tóororô.
it.is.this beer.A peace.A DM 1.PL beg-I Gods.A
‘It is beer and peace that we ask the Gods for.’ (1/9)

All these DMs serve to strengthen text cohesion. On the whole, a text would be intelligible even if all cohesive connectives were omitted but would not be judged by native speakers as being a well-formed Akie text.

What characterizes this type of connective DMs is in particular, first, that they are extremely frequently used, more than any other theticals. Second, they are highly flexible in their placement -- other than word-internally there is hardly any slot in an utterance where at least some of them cannot appear. Interestingly, one common slot is within verb phrases between a verb and its object, as may be illustrated below with the DMs *dé* (a) and *dedúo* (b):

(a) ma-ng’as kó ting’-e kuúmi má ting’-e
   NEG-start COP have-I beer.A NEG have-I
More than a verb and its object complement, a verb and a following reflexive (or reciprocal) marker *kthern* form a fairly tight syntactic unit. But even here, cohesive connectives commonly appear, as *dë* does in the following example:

> am má- kí wëch dë kthern pesyo hùn ke ley eeláá  
> because NEG- 1.PL dislike DM REL.PL day.A DM 1.PL say folks

> o pua- n dë o pua- n dë.  

> ‘Because we don’t dislike each other, not a single day, we say, Folks, come, just come!’ (1/60)

And finally, which cohesive connective is used and how frequently it is used are much a matter of personal style. Some speakers use them sparingly while others would not form any utterance without including at least one cohesive connective in it.

The cohesive connective *ichayaíde* occurs in a number of different forms, such as *yáide*, *ichadé*, *icháide*, *icháyaidé*, or *ichiyáide*. When repeated, as in the example below, it can have an emphasizing function: With the repetition of *yáide*, the speaker wants to make it absolutely clear what a moral value forests have for the Akie:

> kóó- cëch dedúo ng’allée í chaa kí paréyy- a maa.  
> give- 1.PL.O DM news DM REL.PL 1.PL extinguish- APL fire.A

> ‘But you know it is the Swahili people, it is they who brought us the knowledge to extinguish the fire.’ (1/27)

> má ting’- e ki par- e dë maa.  
> NEG have- I 1.PL extinguish- I DM fire.A

> ‘There is no beer. There is none, there is none for us to extinguish the fire with’ (1/28)
An interesting cohesive connective can be seen in the DM hná. It has been found to occur, for example, between noun phrases, as in the following text example:

\[\text{leelá}á\ \text{yum-ú-n} \quad \text{dé áko sáris} \quad \text{hm áko}\]

\[\text{folks 2.PL be.together- VEN- IMP DM COLL.A Saris.N DM COLL.A}\]

\[\text{kísíko icha dé kuúmi} \quad \text{hm áko pármele}\]


\[\text{hná kígégo hná}\]

\[\text{DM Kigego DM}\]

‘Folks, you should gather with the associates of Saris (the first leader of the Akie), with the associates of Kisiko, (together with) this beer (which is brought by our ancestors), (and) the associates of Parmele, and of Kigego.’ (1/48)

Like in the example above, the DM hná is commonly found in narrative texts as a listing marker with a function similar to that of a coordinating conjunction ‘and’:

\[\text{ko ýú} ánte hná kaaí ra dé í pa}\]

\[\text{COP here exist DM town today DM LOC.GEN}\]

\[\text{áára kipiko hná nkúyaki.}\]

\[\text{COLL Kipiko.A DM Nkuyaki.A}\]

‘It is here in this country today, that of the people of Kipiko and Nkuyaki.’ (1/57)

As we observed in the introduction to Section 4.4, however, use vs. non-use of hná is much a matter of personal style, that is, hná appears to be restricted to a few people.

Crosslinguistically, a fairly widespread discourse structuring device is provided by pause fillers and hesitation markers, such as English uh and um (Clark and Fox Tree 2002; O’Connell and Kowal 2003; Hayashi and Yoon 2006; 2010), which in the framework of Discourse Grammar form a marginal group of interjections (Heine et al. 2013, 4.6). We have found no evidence for the existence of such markers in Akie. Instead, people appear to rely primarily on cohesive connectives such as dé, dúo, ichayáide, korró, etc. as hesitation and filling elements.

4.5 Discourse settings and institutional frames
This component of the situation of discourse (Section 4.1; see also Kaltenböck et al. 2011: 862) relates to the human and physical environment in which linguistic discourse takes place. It concerns in particular the following factors:

- General setting (e.g., the location, time and function of the discourse event)
- Participant setting (the nature of and role relation between interlocutors and other participants in the discourse)
- Socio-cultural institution (e.g., family, restaurant, school, church, etc.)
- Medium of communication (spoken, written, or signed discourse)
- Genre (conversational style, narrative, procedural text, etc.)
- Co(n)text (the knowledge that interlocutors are assumed to have or to share on the basis of what was said or written earlier)

There is a wealth of Akie theticals whose use is restricted to specific discourse settings. Such setting can be interpreted as representing what has been described with terms such as (knowledge) schemas, frames, scripts, etc.; we will loosely refer to one sub-set of them as institutional frames or, in short, as frames (cf. Minsky 1975; Goffman 1974; Frake 1977; Tannen 1993: 14-21; see also Wierzbicka 1997; Goddard 2005: 227-237 on cultural scripts). This term relates, on the one hand, to expectations that interlocutors have based on a body of recurrent experiences associated with a given discourse setting. On the other hand, (institutional) frames also determine, at least to some extent, which linguistic options are available to interlocutors. Our use of the term “frame” is similar to that used in Frame Semantics (Fillmore and Baker 2015), which is concerned with the study of how, as a part of our knowledge of a language, we associate linguistic forms with frames, that is, cognitive structures that largely determine the process (and the result) of interpreting those forms.

A frame can be based on any of the factors or set of factors listed above. In the present section we will, by way of illustration, briefly look at five discourse settings suggestive of institutional frames that are salient in Akie culture. We are restricted to linguistic manifestations of frames, and more narrowly to thetical expressions signaling the presence of a given frame. The first (4.5.1) is about ancestor worship. The next two settings concern the two foci of traditional economy, namely honey collection (4.5.2) and hunting (4.5.3). The final two settings concern the genre of discourse. One is a procedural text (4.5.4) and the other features some characteristics of conversational discourse (4.5.5).

---

45 Nevertheless, institutional frames must not be confused with cultural scripts, which are hypotheses about culture-specific attitudes, assumptions, or norms spelt out in terms of a set of meta-linguistically defined semantic primes (cf. Goddard 2005: 230).

46 This position is in accordance with that maintained in the framework of Discourse Grammar (Kaltenböck et al. 2011; Heine et al. 2013), according to which the analysis of discourse structure simultaneously needs to take care of both an inherited knowledge structure and a manipulation of this structure, where the latter may entail a gradual modification of the former. To be sure, these two factors must be conceptually distinguished, as is in fact done in work on frames or scripts, where the former concerns what tends to be called “(knowledge) schemas” and the latter “(interactive) frames” (Tannen 1993: 59-63). Nevertheless, discourse analysis would be incomplete if reduced to only one of the two; what is needed, rather, is an understanding of the nature of interaction between the two.
Each of these discourse settings has its own frame-specific linguistic cues. Most of the theticals to be discussed in the following sections can therefore be understood as frame markers, enabling the hearer or others exposed to that part of discourse to activate the pool of shared expectations associated with the frame concerned. For example, as we saw in Section 4.2.2, uttering the thetical ettóò is likely to activate the frame of a greeting ritual between two unrelated men belonging to the same age-set, where use of ettóò triggers the response wóè and a range of features of frame-specific behavior. Accordingly, ettóò is interpreted as a frame marker of one subtype of the institutional frame of greeting rituals.

Thus, these discourse settings allow not only for predictions on discourse options but also on sociolinguistic behavior. To use another example, collecting honey and hunting are exclusively the domain of the male population. Accordingly, using frame markers such as the ones presented in Sections 4.5.2 and 4.5.3 allow one to predict with some degree of probability that the speaker belongs to one specific segment of Akie society, namely the adult male population – that is, these theticals are characteristics of men’s speech.

4.5.1 Communicating with the ancestors
One form of social exchange, one that is focal to Akie culture, concerns the communication with the asííswe, the ancestors. The asííswe (sg. asííswantee) are a constant part of Akie life. When one’s father or mother has died, s/he turns into an asííswantee, meaning that s/he is always watching you -- as far away as you may be. One cannot escape them, everything one does must be shared with the asííswe. Going to town to have a drink in a bar does not make a difference: The asííswe are already there, waiting for their share.

The Akie therefore communicate with them at all times. They have blessing ceremonies for them once a year, even if the asííswe keep complaining that this is not enough, urging the people to have a ceremony at least every five months.

The asííswe’s main complaint is that they are hungry, that is, they need kuúmi (beer). In order not to be hit by accidents or death, people practice blessing rituals at all occasions, especially when something unexpected has happened or one intends to travel. Another complaint of the asííswe is that the Akie are rapidly discarding their traditional culture in favor of a puuní (Maasai) or a mɛɛ́ɛ ("Swahli") life style.

Speakers dispose of a wide range of theticals specifically for communicating with the asííswe. The following text piece, for example, activates the frame of the Blessing the Hunting Weapons ceremony – it is unlikely to be uttered in any other discourse setting.

tóróorò ípáipai sékeeri í kóón-eech í pee.
Gods.A help.us Sekeeri DM give.S-1.PL DM water.A
‘God, help us! Sekeeri, give us water!’ (1/16)

And this piece also shows the extensive use made by theticals when communicating with the asííswe (Sekeeri is a particularly influential ancestor): The piece consists entirely of
there are two vocatives (toroorô and sekeeri), one discourse marker (í), and two imperatives.

God (tóroreita, here addressed in the plural form toroorô) is important, but more important are the asííswe. They are here represented by Sekeeri even though people are well aware that addressing just one of the ancestors could be a mistake. Rather, one should address them by mentioning all their names. Missing one name might mean that the ancestor concerned will be annoyed and send a punishment.

The above piece is frequently followed by another, fairly complex thetical consisting of the expression óyumayumúún kēēn (commonly reduced to óyumúún kēēn):

ó puaan ó yumayumúún kēēn.
2.PL come.PL.IMP 2.PL gather.VEN.IMP REFL
‘Come you all and be together with us!’

As we observed in Section 4.2, the concept of thanking is not frequently invoked in Akie narrative discourse. But this is different in the ancestor worship frame, which includes communication with God. Expressing one’s gratitude for the benevolence received appears to be a salient concept of this frame, as in the following text piece:

lééláá kóyu amôt koken aashê nkai!
folks! like yesterday again thanks God
‘Folks, [it rains] like yesterday again! Thank you God!’ (1/30)

An important part of ancestor worship consists of asking the asííswe for success in hunting; we will return to this part in Section 4.5.3. A comprehensive analysis of the frame is urgently needed for a more comprehensive understanding of Akie culture.

4.5.2 Honey collection

Up to the present, honey collection is at the core of traditional Akie economy, side by side with hunting. Honey plays a central role both in the cultural and economic life. Thus, Kaare notes:

For the Akie honey is more than their major food; it is also a symbol of their being. In their stories about their origin and the subsequent structuring of their social relations, honey features as a major transformative substance. (Kaare 1996: 126)

Although in the village of Ngababa people nowadays use bee-hives (Schöperle 2011: 80), traditionally it is exclusively wild honey that is collected.

The honey-collecting frame includes the knowledge pool that Akie people share on their expeditions, which may lead them more than 50 kilometers away from their homes. When Akie men go searching for honey they knock at the stem of a tree (other than a
baobab) suspected to house a bee gum, using the following frame marker by saying to the asíswe:

**síkóònkò!** (‘We are knocking now, would you please help us to find honey’)

Having knocked at different parts of the stem that are accessible to them, they will know whether, where, and roughly how many bees there are on the tree. Then they will make a fire for smoking out the bee-hole and, while drilling the firestick, they say with a raised voice:

**tápi** (or típi)!  (Roughly: ‘Be there many bees!’, i.e., much honey)

When the smoke produced by the fire is applied to the bee-hole, the asíswe are addressed with the following expression:

**kóòì!**  (‘Let there be pure honey!’)

Usually the following passage is added: **síkóònkò, yákwaai-tái sekémn**, roughly meaning ‘We knock for you, hoping that you will become full (from eating lots of honey)!’

Once the smoke has disappeared and the men see that there is honey, they say:

**túmura!**  (‘Cover your eyes!’),

which is a shortened version of the following expression taken from Maasai: **túmura nkong’óu olotáng’** (‘cover the eye he who is at home’), roughly meaning ‘What a pity that you back home cannot join us in this honey harvest!’

Finally, the expressions kóòì and síkóònkò are repeated while the honey is removed from the bee-hole.

The use of these theticals is not restricted to the actual process of honey harvesting but is also extended to other occasions related directly or indirectly to honey collecting. Uttering any of these four frame markers has two main effects: On the one hand, it activates the entire sequence of markers and, on the other hand, it evokes the whole script of a honey searching experience including the taste of what for Akie people is the most delicious food on earth.

### 4.5.3 Hunting

Compared to honey collection, a much richer set of formulaic theticals needs to be activated when hunters are in the wild searching for game. These expressions, let us call them hunting calls, are frame markers primarily directed at the other members of the hunting party, but secondarily also at the asíswe (ancestors).

Once a piece of game has been shot (with poisoned arrows, spears are not used) the hunter will follow the animal until he has found it being dead. Then he calls the other
members of the hunting party, who may be away at some distance, with the call appropriate for the animal concerned (for each kind of animal there is a different call). The most common calls are listed in (a) of Table 10. The other hunters will then respond with the corresponding call from the list in (b).

The meanings of (a) are etymologically opaque, but many of those in (b) are not, referring to the most desirable part of the animal. The calls in (b) mean roughly ‘May the asííswe give me X’, but they have been ritualized to the extent that they may have lost their literal significance. For example, the reply call *rorowántee* for an elephant means ‘marrow (inside the tusks)’, even if the marrow of elephant tusks is no longer highly appreciated these days.

Table 10. Akie hunting calls used when the dead animal has been found

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of dead animal</th>
<th>(a) Hunter’s call</th>
<th>(b) Response by the others of the hunting party</th>
<th>Literal meaning of (b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cháíko ‘Lesser Kudu’</td>
<td>tükúrée</td>
<td>iinaii</td>
<td>‘sinews’ (of hindlegs or back, made into bow strings; those of giraffes are considered the best)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inkáita ‘wildebeest’</td>
<td>sót</td>
<td>konta</td>
<td>‘eye’ (fat behind the eyes of hartebeests and elephants is highly appreciated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ínkuruwɛɛ ‘wild boar’</td>
<td>chişiyɔ</td>
<td>námɪ̀nɛnɛˈkɔɔyɔɔ</td>
<td>‘meat of belly and chest of boar’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>írónko ‘dikdik’</td>
<td>kusu kusuú</td>
<td>chááti túwai</td>
<td>‘the two hindlegs’ (the only delicious meat provided by dikdiks’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nyîfɛ ‘rhinoceros’</td>
<td>kopulée</td>
<td>namanantipîlî</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ng’etúúnta ‘lion’</td>
<td>túsée</td>
<td>malaa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pééliantëe ‘elephant’</td>
<td>kópchóo</td>
<td>rorowántee</td>
<td>‘marrow (of elephant tusks)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pútúyyantëe ‘warthog’</td>
<td>taále (or taláa)</td>
<td>mɔkɔyɛɛ táá maae</td>
<td>‘skin (and meat) of belly’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saraámɛ ‘Greater Kudu’</td>
<td>pûlôt</td>
<td>muuîtā</td>
<td>‘skin (of kudu, made into beds)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>terkéchantëɛ ‘guinea fowl’</td>
<td>chîlchîl</td>
<td>pûútôôni</td>
<td>‘breast meat of birds’ (birds have otherwise not much meat)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most commonly, the theticals listed in Table 10 are frame markers of hunting: Invoking one of them is likely to activate the knowledge associated with a hunting frame. But they may also appear in other discourse settings. One such setting is provided by ritual ceremonies invoking the ancestors (see Section 4.5.1), especially the Blessing the Hunting Weapons ceremony, as the following text piece shows:

ləeláá kóyu amót koken aashé nkai!
people! like yesterday again thank.you God!
‘Folks, [it rains] like yesterday again! Thanks, God!’

leeláá iraráak- ó- n dé kɔrɔ pee sí kée sap- ch- een.
folks pour.out- VEN- IMP DM now water.A PURP PAS heal- 1.PL- IMP
‘Folks! Pour out water now so that we can be healed!’

amú ar- kée peku- u nén kéeµ.
because P- 1.PL die- VEN LOC hunger.A
‘Because we die of hunger.’

ar- kée yaamë kóyu ñkɛ́a- ñye.
P- 1.PL suffer like small.wild.animal- PL.A
‘We have suffered like small wild animals.’

táálé!
‘(Give us) boar (meat)!’

mókoyee táá maae!
skin.A GEN belly.A
‘Skin of belly!’

chupiyɔ!
‘Warthog!’

námíñenkiyɔɔ!
‘Meat of belly and chest of warthog!’
König, Heine, Legère, The Akie language 153

santééé!
‘Giraffe!’

kuunóosye!
‘Pieces of meat of the upper part of giraffe’s neck!’

púlót!
‘Greater Kudu!’

muuitá!
‘Skin of Greater Kudu!’ (1/30-39)

The discourse function that the calls have in this frame is different from the one they have during the hunt: Rather than the hunters it is the elders that use these calls in the blessing frame of 4.5.1. And rather than announcing a dead piece of game or responding to the announcement, the elders producing texts such as the one above wish to convey something like ‘You, the asíswe (ancestors), help us to soon be able to say chipyɔ, santééé, etc. Furthermore, after finishing their singing and dancing, the elders may again communicate with the asíswe using such hunting calls, asking the asíswe to provide them with meat of a particular antelope or other animal.

Theticals such as these hunting calls form an important component of cultural communication within Akie society, where communicative interaction includes in much the same way the living and the dead. At the same time, they are also markers invoking the hunting frame. Thus, whenever an Akie speaker uses a thetical such as cmúuyɔ or santééé then for other members of the speech community this activates the frame of a hunting expedition, including all the rich knowledge of hunting, hunting techniques, the communication among hunters, the rituals associated with hunting, the taste of game meat, and, last but not least, the interaction of hunters with their biological environment.

4.5.4 Describing how honey is collected
Whereas the discourse settings described in the preceding sections are about activities central to Akie culture, the present section is concerned with the way Akie people describe their traditional knowledge to others lacking this knowledge – it might be called a teaching frame. The persons taught may be either children initiated to institutions of traditional culture or, as in the present example, outsiders. The following notes are based on a trip that the authors undertook with two Akie men who had agreed to take them to
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kikā, one of the well-known baobabs (Adansonia digitata) of the eastern Akie country, renowned for its rich honey resources.47

When arriving at the baobab, Bahati Nkuyaki, one of our consultants, taught us how honey high up in the tree is collected from bee gums in tree holes, producing a text with appropriate demonstration of the activities involved. In discussing features of this text, our interest here is not with the frame of honey collection, for which see Section 4.5.2, but rather with one specific discourse genre, namely that of procedural, descriptive texts accompanied by visual demonstrations. A detailed analysis of such texts is still to be done; we are restricted here to pointing out a few features that appear to be diagnostic of a procedural text.48

The present text, consisting of approximately 1700 words, contains about 200 uses of discourse markers – that is, roughly 12 per cent of all information units of the text.49 This figure is in the range of that found in various other kinds of text genres but lower than that to be observed in narrative texts. Obviously, a number of the theticals appearing in the text, such as sīkōūnkō! (‘We are knocking now, would you please help us to find honey’), tāpī! (‘Be there many bees!’), or kōōl! (‘Let there be pure honey!’), are indicative of the cultural frame of honey collection, as we saw in Section 4.5.2. But our interest here is generally with theticals that can be analyzed as markers of a procedural text frame.

One possible diagnostic marker can be seen in the prospective discourse marker ntān that we discussed already in Section 4.4. While ntān, whose meaning is glossed roughly as ‘you should know’ (see Table 8), is not restricted to any particular genre, it is distinctly more common in procedural texts. In the text discussed here it occurs eleven times, as in the following example:

kő ſte temēnīc naa ſte iyu pa kuuti
3.SG exist wax.N REL.SG exist here LOC mouth.A

fūūūú
IDEO (imitating the sound when one blows into a fire)

naa  ntān  n-  ſí  sar- te
REL.SG you.should.know SUB- 2.SG ram.in- AND

éęu  ſt  kōta  kő  purkei.ii.
arm.A DM up.to 3.P become.hot.P

‘There is wax at the entrance (of the honey-comb) – fūūūū –, which -- you should know

47 On account of their focal economic importance for honey collection, baobabs are given proper names. The present baobab kikā is located some 25 kilometers north of Gitu, the home of the two Akie men.
48 Since Discourse Grammar is restricted to linguistic resources, paralinguistic data must be ignored here.
49 This is Text 14 (Bahati and Nkoiseyyo collect honey in Kika).
-- when you stick your arm into (the bee gum), the arm will become hot.’ (14/96-8)

While the frequent occurrence of ntán suggests that the relevant text is procedural this is not necessarily so: This formula of social exchange (FSE) is also found in other kinds of texts, even if less frequently. But there are other theticals that can be taken to be diagnostics of procedural texts of the kind examined here.

Two of them were mentioned earlier, namely aríí suwé ɪra ‘Have you seen it?’ and aríí kas ɪra ‘Have you heard it?’, both being roughly translatable as ‘You follow me?’ (4.2.1, Table 5). The former is used to make sure that the hearer has seen what the speaker just demonstrated. When there is auditive information, the speaker may use aríí kas ɪra ‘Have you heard it?’ instead. When there is both visual and auditory information, speakers tend to prefer the latter, as in the following text piece, where Bahati Nkuyaki demonstrates what is to be done before honey is harvested:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{aa} & \quad \text{ko} \quad \text{kolééna} \quad \text{i} \quad \text{dé} \quad \text{ki} \quad \text{pá}r\text{-}chìn, \\
\text{yes} & \quad \text{COP} \quad \text{DM} \quad \text{DM} \quad \text{DM} \quad \text{1.PL} \quad \text{make-DAT} \\
n\text{-} \text{kéé} & \quad \text{rat\text{-}uu} \quad \text{maa.} \quad \text{ar\text{-}íí} \quad \text{kas} \quad \text{ɪra.} \\
\text{SUB-1.PL} & \quad \text{fasten-VEN} \quad \text{fire.A} \quad \text{P-2.SG} \quad \text{hear} \quad \text{now} \\
\text{‘Yes, this is how we do it when we fasten the tussock (used to make fire).} \\
\text{You follow me?’} \quad (14/1-2)
\end{align*}
\]

The FSEs aríí suwé ɪra ‘Have you seen it?’ and aríí kas ɪra ‘Have you heard it?’ are in fact a common feature of procedural discourse texts. We encountered them in particular when Akie speakers provide descriptive accounts of their traditional economic or social activities or their material culture. With these two units, the speaker aims at making sure that the hearer has understood the descriptions provided, enabling the speaker to carry on with his account. Thus, the two units also have a bracketing function: On the one hand they signal that one episode is concluded and, on the other hand, they prepare the learner for the episode to follow. Thus, in addition to speaker-hearer interaction, these two formulae of social exchange (FSEs) also concern the components of text organization discussed in Section 4.4.

That these two FSEs are diagnostic of procedural texts is suggested in particular by the following: In our collection of 21 texts there are 12 occurrences of aríí suwé ɪra and 9 of them are found in the procedural text discussed here (Text 14), and all 9 occurrences of aríí kas ɪra in the 21 texts are restricted to the present text. It is therefore possible to predict with some degree of probability that whenever either of these two theticals occurs then this is likely to be a procedural text.

The following example illustrates the FSE aríí suwé ɪra, but in addition it also illustrates another formulaic frame marker that can be taken to be diagnostic of this type of procedural texts. This is kee par-chini, best translated as ‘This is how we do it’, which
belongs to the most frequently used information units of the present text (Text 14). Like the preceding two theticals, *kee par-chini* is a retrospective discourse marker that typically concludes some preceding episode (cf. Section 4.4).

\begin{align*}
\text{ar-
\text{í} & \text{suwé} \text{ ira} \text{ kee par-
\text{chini} \text{ koléena í de} \\
P- 2.SG & \text{see.P now} \ 1.PL \ \text{make-DAT DM DM DM}
\end{align*}

‘Have you seen (it)? This is how we do it (lit. ‘we make (it like this’)).’ (14/16)

4.5.5 Conversations and the role of the reportee

As the rich literature on conversation analysis has shown, the study of conversations is a complex subject matter. This final section is restricted to a single issue of turn-taking, namely to the differential roles played by interlocutors in conversational exchanges as they can be observed in Akie texts.

For a good part of these exchanges, speaker and hearer assume shifting roles as what we propose to refer to, respectively, as the reporter (RR) and the reportee (RE). The RR provides the bulk of conceptual information, characterized by larger text pieces, whereas the RE is confined mainly to short reactions to what the RR offers, in particular to back-channeling.\textsuperscript{50}

The difference between the two kinds of contributions to conversation is reflected most clearly in the way the resources of Discourse Grammar are made use of: The RR relies overwhelmingly on Sentence Grammar, with discourse markers serving as text-organizing material. The RE, by contrast, draws primarily on Thetical Grammar. And the information units recruited by the RE are above all formulae of social exchange expressing agreement or, less commonly, disagreement with what RR says (cf. Table 5), and theticals relating to speaker attitudes, expressing the personal commitment of the RE (cf. Table 7).

We may illustrate this turn-taking structure with one example. In our video-recorded Text 13 of a conversation between two Akie men on January 21, 2014, Nkoiseyyo (N) was the reporter (RR) and Bahati (B) the reportee (RE) for most of the time. When occasionally shifting to the role of an RE, Nkoiseyyo was generally silent, using essentially no theticals, just waiting for his next turn. Bahati, by contrast, made only few and short RR contributions. His contribution as an RE was consistent and showed a clear discourse structure: When Nkoiseyyo paused after short text pieces, Bahati usually took to back-channeling cues, responding with the acknowledgement reinforcers *aa* (or *áá*, roughly translatable as ‘yes, I follow you and agree with you, and you may continue’). After a full episode, Nkoiseyyo paused with a descending intonation contour and Bahati, the RE, responded with another back-channel reinforcer, *dááde* ‘yes, you are right. I understand you’.

\textsuperscript{50} Back-channel cues are used by hearers to indicate that they do not wish to turn from reportee to reporter even when there is an opportunity to assume the role of speaker and/or the speaker is displaying turn-yielding cues (cf. Duncan 1972; Duncan and Fiske 1977).
Take the following text piece from this conversation. Nkoiseyyo was not only the more talkative but also more senior, being two age-sets ahead of Bahati,\(^{51}\) and he was the RR over most of the conversation. The piece presented below marks the end of a larger episode where Nkoiseyyo complains about the problems that he has with a Swahili trader whom he owes some money. He suggests in (a) that he could offer the trader a lamb as a compensation for his debt. When Nkoiseyyo pauses, Bahati comes in acknowledging this suggestion in (b) with the formula of social exchange (FSE) \(\text{áá} \) (see Table 5). Then Nkoiseyyo concludes the episode with a general observation in (c), and in (d) Bahati adds the concluding FSE \(\text{ááde} \) and demonstrates his loyalty to his senior counterpart by repeating the latter’s last utterance.

(a) N: \(\text{a úp anéé kiáápa waaruâ ka ng’ét.} \)
\[
1.\text{SG carry.P} \quad 1.\text{SG.N} \quad \text{tiny.SG.A} \quad \text{kid.A} \quad \text{GEN remain}
\]
‘I should carry the tiny lamb that is left.’

(b) B: \(\text{aá} \)
\[
\text{yes}
\]
‘Yes.’

(c) N: \(\text{ma pimáán- ak- iisye kényii nii.} \)
\[
\text{NEG measure- STA- AP} \quad \text{year.A} \quad \text{D.PR}
\]
‘It is not predictable, this year.’

(d) B: \(\text{ááde, ma pimáán- ak- iisye.} \)
\[
\text{yes} \quad \text{NEG measure- STA- AP}
\]
‘Yes, it is not predictable.’ (13/50-3)

With regard to the role of the RE in turn-taking in such conversations, the generalizations surfacing from this example are the following:

(a) There are noteworthy personal differences in the use vs. non-use of RE thethicals. Nkoiseyyo is virtually a no-user in this discourse setting, while Bahati presents a regular text bracketing structure: A recurrent distinction is made when turn-taking occurs between an incomplete discourse unit (marked by \(\text{aa} \) or \(\text{áá} \)) and a completed unit (\(\text{ááde} \)).

(b) In addition to the specifics of conversation structure, this example shows that there are also specifics of another factor of the component of discourse setting, namely the nature of the social setting involved (see the introduction of 4.5 above): Use vs. non-use of RE

\(^{51}\) Akie men are obligatorily assigned to one of six age-sets (\(\text{poroorie}, \text{pl. pororióósye} \)). In the case of Nkoiseyyo this is the \(\text{lmakaa} \) and in the case of Bahati the \(\text{lkoriánká} \) age-set.
theticals appears to be contingent on the kind of role relation obtaining between interlocutors. Senior RE’s make less use of them than junior ones. For example, Nkoiseyyo is distinctly more senior and hence is not obliged to respond with RE theticals after Bahati has concluded his discourse contributions as an RR. Bahati, by contrast, is somehow obliged to signal that he pays full attention to the RR, and he does so by injecting back-channel theticals expressing confirmation with the RR.

(c) With regard to functional components other than the discourse setting characterizing the situation of discourse (Section 4.1) there appears to be a division of labor of the following kind: In the speech of RRs it is primarily the units of text organization (4.4), and especially discourse markers, that are activated, while RE contributions are mainly the domain of speaker-hearer interaction (4.2) and speaker attitudes (4.3).
5 Conclusions

This study was based on the framework of Discourse Grammar (DG), as proposed by Kaltenböck et al. (2011) and Heine et al. (2013). The framework differs from many grammar-based models in claiming that the existence of grammar both presupposes and is shaped by linguistic interaction. In this sense, DG has features of an interaction-based model in assuming that linguistic discourse is an interactionally shaped phenomenon (Schegloff, Ochs and Thompson 1996; Ford, Fox and Thompson 2002).

But DG differs from paradigm interaction-based accounts in three important aspects: First, it assumes that linguistic interaction does not exist without language knowledge, more specifically with some pool of inherited linguistic conventions – in other words, some kind of pre-existing grammar (cf. Günthner 2007).

Second, these conventions consist of two kinds of grammatical resources, or domains, that are available to interlocutors for linguistic communication, namely Sentence Grammar (SG) and Thetical Grammar (TG), each with its own inventory of form-meaning units and compositional potential. These two kinds of grammatical resources provide interlocutors with alternative modes for designing linguistic discourse. And third, in addition to being able to choose between two kinds of domains, interlocutors are also able to coopt material from one domain (SG) for discourse management in another domain (TG).

To conclude, unlike some interaction-based models, DG does not assume that “grammar”, whatever exactly this term may stand for, is epiphenomenal, or “a by-product of communication” (Hopper 1998: 156); rather, linguistic interaction presupposes grammar, and the present study provided an outline of this grammar. At the same time, grammar does not form a closed, static system; rather, it constantly changes as a result of its manipulation by interlocutors, and a major source of change is provided by grammaticalization processes. This dynamic component of grammar could not be studied here and constitutes a task for future research.

In the present study we portrayed the potential that the two domains of Discourse Grammar provide for interaction, that is, for successful linguistic communication. With its virtually unlimited compositional potential, Sentence Grammar allows one to express in a structurally coherent format essentially any kind of conceptual information. An outline of this potential as it is available to Akie speakers was presented in Section 3. But Sentence Grammar is hard-pressed when it comes to relating linguistic communication to a wider space of human interaction, in particular to the “extra-linguistic” environment of linguistic discourse. This environment is commonly referred to as pragmatics; in the framework of Discourse Grammar (Kaltenböck et al. 2011; Heine et al. 2013) it is described with reference to the situation of discourse (see Section 4.1).

To be sure, Sentence Grammar is able to and in fact does access this environment, but it lacks the flexible and function-specific apparatus that Thetical Grammar provides. This apparatus consists on the one hand of an inventory of more or less formulaic theticals and
on the other hand of the ability to design new theticals by using the resources available in Sentence Grammar. It is tailored-made for relating personal and interpersonal needs of interlocutors and the overall structuring of texts to the situation of discourse, as may have become apparent in Section 4.

The grammatical sketch presented in this work could achieve hardly more other than providing a skeleton of the Discourse Grammar of Akie. In particular, some central parts of phonology in Chapter 2, most of all vowel harmony and tonology, are in need of much further analysis. And rather than describing the grammatical categories in any detail, Chapter 3 was restricted to providing an overview of general structural features. Still, this overview has made it possible to transcribe, translate, and understand the 21 Akie texts that we collected in the course of this project.

Whereas Chapter 3 could build on established templates of grammatical analysis, Chapter 4 presented a first attempt at relating language use to the situation of discourse by reducing it to the framework of Discourse Grammar. In doing so we were confined to four components, namely speaker-hearer interaction (4.2), speaker attitudes (4.3), text organization (4.4), and discourse setting (4.5). More research is now needed on how these components are interrelated, what their respective role is in discourse planning, and on how and to what extent the remaining components that could not be discussed here, namely source of information and world knowledge (see Chapter 4.1), contribute to jointly shaping meaning in linguistic discourse.
The text was video-recorded in Gitu Juu in the afternoon of January 31, 2013. Participants of the ceremony were approximately 15 Akie women and men who took part in the singing and dancing.

The Blessing the Hunting Weapons ceremony is one of the central cultural events in the annual Akie calendar. It serves to connect the living with the ancestors (asíswe) and with God (tóroreta).

1/1 nyóó- n náíde inyéé loosíkitô
come-IMP DM 2.SG.N Gitu.A52

ó puáan náíde akwéc loosíkitô.
come.IMP.PL DM 2.PL.N Gitu.A

Come to Gitu! Come (ye) to Gitu!

1/2 ko loosí kitô í nyoon náíde fyu.
COP Gitu.A 2.SG come.S DM here

It is here to Gitu that you should come’

1/3 í nyoó- n ínhulu!
2.SG come.S- IMP Inchulu!

You come, Inchulu53

1/4 í pakaac- e kapléémeé ámu ar- ké
2.SG abandon-I forest.A because P- PAS

parparú- ú dé maa.
kindle- VEN DM fire.A

Come out of the forest because fire has been lighted.

1/5 ar- ké parparú- ú maa naa isaap-e loshoo.
P- PAS kindle- VEN fire.A REL.SG heal- I country.A

Fire has been lighted, which heals the country.

52 Loosíkitô is the name of an important ancestor of the Akie and the name of the mountain where Akie people live. It is also the Akie name for the village Gitu, north of the trading center Kibirashi.
53 Inchulu is one of the well-known Akie ancestors, considered one of the founders of Akie society.
1/6 ko nyô tóroreitâ iyû kî ñte.
3.SG come.S God.N here 1.PL exist
God should come here [where] we are.

1/7 kô sînce ni kî am- e.
COP problem.A D.PR.SG 1.PL eat-I
There is a problem that we have (lit. eat).

1/8 kæ ko mkwanhempo dél naa isaap- eech.
but COP Mkwanhembo DM REL.SG heal- 1.PL.O
But it is (Peter) Mkwanhembo who heals us.\(^{54}\)

1/9 iciyaide kuûmi kûùrrta yaîde kî saam-e tórroô.
it.is.this beer.A peace.A DM 1.PL beg-I Gods.A
It is beer and peace that we ask the Gods for.

1/10 amu intááno dél ápa lenkâi
because it.is.time DM long.ago Lenkai.A

si keé le: lenkâi.
PURP PAS say Lenkai.A
Because long ago Lenkai (God) was called (by saying): “Lenkai!”

1/11 ko tóróreita dél naa í nkun duniai ni kámukûul.
COP God.A DM REL.SG DM know world D.PR.SG all
It is (only) God who knows the whole world.

1/12 kô kapléemee kítîo naa ñkun ichayaîde
COP forest.A self REL.SG know DM

ma ting'-e yaîde ya-ínta.
[ting'-é yáîdé]       NEG have-I DM badness.A
It is the forest itself which knows (that) there is no evil.

1/13 kilé ñte dél í kárka kéé ko
DM exist DM DM woman look.there! COP

\(^{54}\) Peter Mkwanhembo was one of the authors’ assistants who supplied the celebrating Akie with new beer.
There is a woman, there is this female, look, who comes to record (our voices) in this country!

1/14 kó miit- ëch źmáádaí-sye.\(^{55}\)
She makes us [look like] idiots. [Usually during such ceremonies there is plenty of beer, but this white woman brought only little beer, therefore she is said to make the Akie look like idiots.]

1/15 kœnna makíngayame weéri ñkaa kapléémee inkó kuúmi ëeláá.
So the boys of the forest (i.e., the Akie men) come and see what the beer (situation is like), folks.

1/16 tóororo ipáipai sékeeri í kóon- eech í pee.
God, help us! Sekeeri, give us water!

1/17 í kaa- cin waárë tukuul ëeláá
You should support all, folks, both the healthy people (lit. ‘children’) who are alive, and (also) the ones who are dead!

1/18 má- á ting’- e.
I don’t have any.

\(^{55}\) Maasai loanword ŋl-mádaí, pl. ŋl-máda ‘fool’ with Akie plural ending –sye.
And I am the one who tells them, let (them) die because we all will die, including ourselves.

It is this: all (our) fathers and their associates who are in the east, whichever country they may be in (lit. ‘who are in all countries’), who are in the forest, and (even those) who are in the Nadun’goro forest, I invoke their spirits here today, from all corners of God’s world, from all corners of God’s world.
1/22 á ánte lúbooto inkaá loosíkitō á ánte.  
1.SG exist corner.A GEN.SG Gitu.A 1.SG exist 
I am at the edge of Gitu, that’s where I am (now).

1/23 ó koon- eech kurúrrta náá síng’ow inkaá óloishó.56 
2.PL give- 1.PL.O peace REL.SG be.good GEN.PL land (M) 
You should give us peace which is good for the country.

1/24 leeláá kòlò ka- ki ëm- ë nen íyu. 
folks NP- 1.PL meet- I LOC here 
Folk, we met here.

1/25 kò anëe kítio náá ou ai kopuruëe inkaá loosíkitō. 
COP 1.SG.A self REL.SG be.big A and mountain.A GEN.SG Gitu.A 
It is I myself who is big like the mountain of Gitu.

1/26 kòf mà ñte dé pááí cháá sas- e chaa ñte íyu 
but NEG exist DM elder.PL.N REL.PL disrespect- I REL.PL exist here 
amú í kò chíchee dé kokèn kòrò cháá 
because DM COP 3.PL.A DM again now REL.PL 
eech nen anëe amú ar- á madak- isye. 
[nén] 
be.big.PL at 1.SG.A because P- 1.SG old- AP 
But there are no disrespectful elders here. Because they are 
senior (lit. ‘big’) like me, (and) because I have grown old.

1/27 íchayáide kae kò meëye í kò chíchee chaa 
DM but COP Swahili DM COP they.A REL.PL 
kóón- eech dedúo ng’álleë í chaa kí paréyy- a maa. 
give- 1.PL.O DM news DM REL.PL 1.PL extinguish- APL fire.A 
But you know it is the Swahili people, it is they who brought us the knowledge to 
 extinguish the fire.

56 óloishó is taken from Maasai, the corresponding Akie term is kìe ‘country’.
1/28 ma ting’- a kó ting’ kuúmi
NEG have-? NAR have beer.A

má ting’-e má ting’-e ki par- e de maa.
NEG have- I NEG have- I 1.PL extinguish- I DM fire.A
There is no beer, there is none, there is none for the fire to be extinguished.

1/29 ámú ar-kó roopan ar-kó roopan de tóroreitâ.
because P- 3.P rain P- 3.P rain DM God.N
Because it has rained, God has made it rain.

1/30 lešláá kóyu amöt kokên aashé nkai!
folks like yesterday again thank.you God!
Folks, [it rains] like yesterday again! Thanks, God!

1/31 lešláá i- raráak-ú-n dé kɔrɔ
folks CAUS- descend- VEN- IMP DM DM

pee si kée sap- ch- ɛɛn.
water.A so.that PAS heal- CAUS- 1.PL.O
Folks, bring water down so we can be healed!

1/32 amú ar-kée peku-u nén kêmɛu.
because P- 1.PL die.P- VEN LOC hunger.A
Because we’ve died of hunger.

ar- kée yaamɛ kóyu ũnkeɛda- ɛsyɛ.
P- 1.PL suffer like small.wild.animal- PL.A
We’ve suffered like small wild animals.

1/33 taále!
(Give us) boar (meat)!

1/34 mʃkɔyeɛ tάá maae!
skin.A GEN belly.A
Skin of belly!

1/35 chipiyɔ!
Warthog!

1/36 námínɛnɔyɔɔ!
Meat of belly and chest of warthog!
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1/37 santééé!
Giraffe!

1/38 kuunósye!
Pieces of meat of the upper part of giraffe’s neck!

1/39 púlót!
Greater Kudu!

1/40 muuitâ!
Skin of greater kudu!

[A blessing pronounced by the elder Inkauli Samakuya:]

1/41 ó koon- an náa a nyô
2.PL give.S 1.SG.O REL.SG 1.SG come.S

    o epiti.áhi a ma- a nkún ané a ka- a naitá- ñye.
    2.PL listen.to and NEG 1.SG know 1.SG.N PERF 1.SG bless- AP
You (pl.) should allow me to come (lit. ‘give me which I come’), you should listen
because I don’t know how to bless.

1/42 hówówe pányee\(^{57}\) ich- a yáide pányee.
let.there.be. meat DE- HE DM meat.PL.A
Let there be meat here, meat!

    a ki ley dé í.
and 1.PL say DM DM
and we say this:

1/43 ích- a dé kuúmi chaa ká pwa
DE- HE DM beer.A REL.PL PERF come.PL.P

kía- í nyaané
country- D.PR.SG 1.PL.POSS
This beer which has come to our country

---

\(^{57}\)hówówe pányee is a ritual expression, mostly used during hunting trips.
kéé ko mpesa-ísye.
3.PL give.out money-PL.
It is the white people who came to give (us) money.

Folks, we don’t refuse it!

We say (that) it is to the town of Nkuyaki that the enemies have come.

We have not refused the beer.

Folks, you should gather with the associates of Saris (the first leader of the Akie), with the associates of Kisiko, (together with) this beer (which is brought by our ancestors), (and) the associates of Parmele, and of Kigego.

Folks, here is beer, come and drink! Wait here, mother, I am a learner.
1/50 kidógo ngoja (i)chayáide kuúmi. hḿ ko o le58 hḿ.
little wait DM beer.A DM COP 2.PL say hm
Wait a bit, there is beer.59 You say:

1/51 ó pwa- n ó ee- sye- n nen íyu hḿ.
2.PL come- IMP 2.PL drink.S- AP- IMP at here hm
Come and drink here!

1/52 ke ley ntán de meéye chaa ko kwaí hḿ.
We say: Where have these Swahili people come from?

1/53 ke ley ko aneé kíí ng’as
1.PL say COP 1.SG.A RP begin
ko nyor hḿ naa- n naidé
NAR meet hm REL.SG- ? here
kíá- ín ira hḿ a kelé
country- D.DI.SG DM hm and when
We say: It is me who began to meet ? in that country. And when ...

1/54 ale a ng’ámí hḿ
when 1.SG receive hm
nen íya- í hḿ lëéláá kɔ pa
LOC here- DM DM folks 3.PL go.P.PL
When I met (them) there they left.

1/55 kó ng’ám meéye nen íya
NAR receive Swahili.N at there

58 Here is an error: The speaker should have said ke le-i ‘we say’ rather than o le-i ‘you (pl.) say’.
59 The speaker inserts the Swahili words kidogo ‘a little’ and ngoja ‘wait!’ here.
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The Swahili met (us) here and they were sent here today to this side of the mountain.

1/56 hḿ a kéé táá ko pa ko ng’am
DM and RP still.be.doing NAR go.P NAR receive

akie chaa hḿ icháide hḿ.
Akie.A D.PR.PL DM DM DM
And they (the white people) went and the Akie welcomed them, So be it.

1/57 ko iyú nte hḿ kaaí ra de í pa
COP here exist DM town now DM DM LOC.GEN

áára kipiko hḿ nkúyakí.
COLL Kipiko.A DM Nkuyaki.A
It is here in this country, that of the people of Kipiko and Nkuyaki.

1/58 ko nnyeč dé naa hḿ eéláá
COP 3.SG.A DM D.PR.SG DM folks

ká méng’a í hḿ chíí naa
NAR live DM DM person.N REL.SG

kí par- é nkóíseyyó.
PAS call- I Nkoiseyyo.A
It is him (Nkuyaki), folks (and) there lives the one who is called Nkoiseyyo.

1/59 kia- in aí túpchee [náá kí par- é] papalai

hḿ ká chúche dé kí ng’ár- chiin- toosey
hm COP 3.PL.A DM 1.PL eat.together- DAT- ASS

am- ítuaki hḿ.
food- PL.A hm
in this country, and (there is) that sibling who is called Papalai.
They eat their food together.
There are no words in the document that need to be translated.
Folks, here is the town of Kisiko, here is the town of Kisiko.

Associates of Injulu, associates of Taaye, folks, associates of Parleti, folks!

This beer here, associates of Inkone, folks, we say, you should know, this town of Mokiri.

It is not big what they have, this beer here!

Folks of Saris, bring (your people) here …!

People (of) Tenkesa, folks, you should bring (your people) here, just bring them here!
1/71 ko jule alé i mut-û
COP Jule if 2.SG bring-VEN

ko jule í í mut-u dē í.
Jule you should bring (people) here!

1/72 íńcháa dé ak- nyɛɛ dé tiyanko hm
D.PR.SG DM and- 3.SG.A DM Tiyanko.A DM

ɛɛláá áára tiyanko
[aará]
folks COLL.A Tiyanko.A

dé chichɛɛ akó amóó
DM 3.PL.A COLL.A mother.A

amu í nyoo-n dé íńkaisunkui
because 2.SG come-IMP DM Inkaisunkui.N

hm í nyoo-n í hm í nyoo-n
hm 2.SG come-IMP DM hm 2.SG come-IMP

nóóloreren hm leɛláá kɔlo hm.
Nooloreren.N DM folks DM
This, and he, Tiyanko, people of Tiyanko, his father, leave them, leave them,
mother’s people, because you should come, Inkaisunkui, you should come, (and)
you should come, Nooloreren, folks!

1/73 ichaide í nyoon nakweni hm í nyoon
DM 2.SG come.IMP Nakweni hm 2.SG come.IMP

de í nápkʊ hm
DM DM Napoku hm

icháyá hm ɛɛláá ó pwa-n náide
DM DM folks 2.PL come.S-IMP DM
Nakweni, you should come, Napoku, you should come, folks, you should come now, you should all drink here!

Você devo vir, você deve vir, gente, você deve vir agora, você deve todos beber aqui!

Put down the meat, folks, come here, come (and) drink here all!

Put down the meat, folks, come here, come (and) drink here all!
People of this mountain, because we are here, we, the children, the boys, the girls, and there is nothing (else) that we can tell.

It is here that we were sent, and we followed.

We then say: (We have killed a) zebra, (and) you respond: “Wiiiii! Chakári!” (i.e., there is a dead zebra).⁶¹

“Wiiiii! Chakári” (there is a dead zebra, a dead zebra)!
[This signals the end of a successful zebra hunt.]

---

⁶¹ The exclamative chakári is a hunting call when a zebra has been killed (cf. 4.5.3, Table 10).
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