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ABSTRACT

Discovering different senses which a single word may convey has been at the top of my thoughts during my ten-years of translation of the New Testament into Luwo. The semantic lectures on polysemy, synonymy, hyponymy, and meronymy have deepened my thought and made me ask about what possibilities there are to express different senses of words in Luwo. Lectures on Morphosyntax aroused my thought on the language forms. This made me to ask about the morphological or analytical devices that help in expressing different senses of a word in Luwo.

This is the first attempt to study semantic and pragmatic features of the Luwo language. Chapter one is overview on the demography of the Luwo, language classification, geography and environment, word order typology, phonology, and orthography. In chapter two, different terminologies, which have been used in the study, are defined. In chapter three, declaratives are discussed. The discussion focuses on declarative and performative verbs, indirect speech acts and echoic speech acts. Chapter four examines interrogatives, specifically the yes/no questions, the word-question words, indirect and echoic interrogatives. Chapter five examines imperatives.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1. DEMOGRAPHY

The real name of the Luwo people, according to how they called themselves, is Jɛ-Luo (pl), yad-Luo (sg), where Jɛ means ‘people’ and yad means ‘person’, while the language of the Luwo people is Dhe-Luo. However, the word “Luwo” has become the predominant term used in contemporary writings about the Luo. Therefore we will be using “Luwo” throughout our research. The Luwo people are, locally, called Jur, being a Dinka nickname for “foreigners”. But to differentiate the Luwo people from other foreigners, the Dinkas have added another term ‘Chol’ to refer to the Luwo people as “Jur Chol”, probably meaning ‘a black foreigner’ or ‘a timely foreigner’.

Luwo is spoken by an estimated 80,000 people in southern Sudan (Grimes 2000, 224). Santandrea (1977, 558) says that the Luwo “represent in all likelihood the oldest remnants of the original Luo stock, whose land lies in Atwot country, just southwest of actual Jurland”. Santandrea (558) adds that the Luwo people have not been mentioned much because more concern has been paid to larger tribal groups in southern Sudan such as Dinka and Azande:

But, in my opinion, the main reason of the unfair oblivion to which the Jur have been condemned is the world-wide fame enjoyed by their “bigger” neighbours as mentioned above. It is the sad destiny of the “small”, even if qualitatively, they often are much worth, and even more than, the “big”.

The close neighbours of the Luwo include: the Dinka, Ndogo, Bongo and Belanda Mviri people group. However, the Luwo have an especially close affinity
with the Dinka from the cultural and linguistic point of view. The Luwo have borrowed many words from the Dinka, but there is no specific data on the percentage of those words. The majority of names of the deities in Luwo are from Dinka i.e. Machardiit which means Black god, Magoog which means Monkey god etc.

1.2 LINGUISTIC CLASIFICATION

The Luwo belongs to the Nilo Saharan, Eastern Sudanic, Nilotic group. The direct group under which the Luwo belongs is Northern Luwo (see table 1 below). This group includes Anuak, Belanda Bor, Shilluk, Thuri, Maban or (Burun), Jumjum and Lokoro or (Pari). The Luwo people are also related to the Western and Northern and Northern Sudanic group, but they are different from Luɔ of Uganda and Luɔ of Kenya and Tanzania though they are closely related. There are three major Luwo dialects spoken: the abad in the east from Tonj town to Wau town (the capital city); the Kwac dialect spoken in the northwest from Aweil to Wau town; and the Thuri spoken in the West around Abulo area. This research is based on the Abad dialect.

1.3 GEOGRAPHY AND ENVIRONMENT

The borders of Luwo land extend from Tonj town in the East of Bahr el-Ghazal region to Abulo in the West and from Tumba in the South to Aweil town in the North. The main river in the area is the Jur River, named after the nickname of the Luwo people (Jur). The other important rivers are the Pongo River, Bussere River and Mbili River. The last two are branches of the Jur River. Generally, the land in the Luwo area is flat and there are no high mountains as such, but there are some high hills. The famous hills include Mbili Hill, Pala Hill, and Mapel Hill.
The Luwo live in residences separated by distances varying from a few hundred yards to over a mile. It is an inherited characteristic that the Luwo set their residence sufficiently far away from neighbours to give enough space for cultivation.

### TABLE 1. LINGUISTIC CLASSIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nilo-Saharan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Western and Northern Sudanic Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Nilotic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Nilotic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Nilotic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Sudanic Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Luo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Luo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maasai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kakwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acholi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotuyo-Teso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acholi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Othuho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dongo tuna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lango</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lopit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lokoyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toposa, Turkana</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on Grimes 2000, 690
The land of the Luwo is very fertile for agriculture. The Luwo people are agriculturists who usually practice traditional agricultural activities to produce subsistence crops for consumption. The system of agriculture is seasonal, based on the rainfall which starts in April and lasts until November. The main crops the Luwo people cultivate include sorghum, sesame, millet, groundnuts, maize, and cassava. They also maintain domesticated animals such as goats and cows at limited levels.

1.4 PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this paper is to describe the way speech acts operate in the Luwo language with a particular concentration on non-declarative speech acts. Luwo has a complicated word order and tone system. In such a language, it is a challenge to discover the function of speech acts beyond the declarative, imperative, and interrogative moods. This study aims at exploring non-declarative speech acts within a relevance theoretic framework. Hence, our focus is to discover which linguistic devices are used to guide the addressee to the right interpretation of the speech act within a given context.

This study will contribute in providing a literature database about the Luwo language that may help other researchers in the linguistic area, as well as set a foundation for further analysis of the Luwo language. Luwo is among many languages in southern Sudan that have not been studied at all, as can be seen in a review of the previous work. Thus, this study represents a contribution to the linguistic study of the Luwo language.

1.5 METHODOLOGY

In this study, I am using both elicited and natural text data. The text data is used as the basis for analysis. However, elicited data is also used as a significant
supplement for the text data. The data was collected and transcribed in consultation with language informants. The collected corpus includes narrative, procedural, informative, and stories. The text, included as appendices, is glossed and given a free translation.

The data have been collected directly from some Luwo speakers who are fluent in the language, as well as from the author of this research who is a native speaker of the Luwo. Other data have been taken from a list or from short stories booklets in Luwo.

The data in this paper will be presented in the following manner. Each explanation is illustrated by a Luwo sentence, with a morpheme-by-morpheme and free translation. Morphemes or affixes are separated from the noun and/or verb stems by hyphens and translated accordingly. Luwo words are italicized, and inverted commas are used when quoting single English terms, words of the authors and/or sentences that do not exceed three lines. Quotations that exceed more than three lines are written in separate paragraph with single line spacing and indented.

1.6 WORD ORDER TYPOLOGY

Luwo can be described as typically SOV with respect to basic word order typology (or APV when there is a full Noun Phrase in the case of nominative\accusative position).

(1) Transitive:

\[ Aleu \ kuzn \ a- \ cam \ -e \ SOV \]
\[ Aleu \ food \ perf\ eat \ he \]
‘Aleu ate food’

(2) Intransitive:

\[ Aleu \ a- \ twaany \ SV \]
\[ Aleu \ perf\ sick. \]
‘Aleu has become sick’
(3) Negative transitive:
\[ \text{Aleu} \ ku\text{\`a}n \ ku \ a\text{-}cam \ -e \ \text{SOV} \]
\[ \text{Aleu} \ \text{food neg perf eat he}. \]
‘Aleu has not eaten food’.

(4) Negative intransitive:
\[ \text{Aleu} \ ku \ a\text{-}twaany \ \text{SV} \]
\[ \text{Aleu neg perf sick}. \]
‘Aleu has not become sick’

The morpheme ‘e’, which occurs directly after the verb stem in the transitive case, refers back to the actor. This morpheme can come in the form of singular e ‘he’ or plural ge ‘they’, depending on the number of the actor(s). However, the constituent order typology may shift from SOV to OVS when the focus is on the Object or Patient. In this case, the morpheme will come directly after the Actor (Subject or Agent). This latter constituent order is not possible with the intransitive verbs which lack typical Object.

(5) Assertive transitive:
\[ \text{Ku\`a}n \ enaa \ a\text{-}cam \ Aleu \ -e. \ \text{OVS}. \]
\[ \text{Food that perf eat Aleu he}. \]
‘It is the food that Aleu ate’

1.7 PHONOLOGY

The Luwo language has nineteen consonants and twenty-two vowels distributed symmetrically over the phoneme inventory chart as follows.
**TABLE 2. LUWO CONSONANTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bilabial</th>
<th>Dental</th>
<th>Alveolar</th>
<th>Palatal</th>
<th>Velar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plosives</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>k</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiceless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiced</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laterals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasals</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>η</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glides</td>
<td>w</td>
<td></td>
<td>j</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 3. LUWO VOWELS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Front/unrounded</th>
<th>Back/rounded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Un-breathy</td>
<td>Breathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>short long</td>
<td>Short long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close</td>
<td>i i:</td>
<td>i: i:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close-mid</td>
<td>e e:</td>
<td>o o:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-mid</td>
<td>e e:</td>
<td>e e:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td>a a:</td>
<td>g g:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this symmetrical distribution, we see that /u/ occurs as short breathy and long breathy. The breathiness or softness can be of different degrees, but it has been difficult to distinguish between un-breathy and breathy /u/. Moreover, the chart indicates that Luwo has no fricatives. The following contrasts support the phonemic presentation in table (2) and table (3).
## Consonant Contrasts

### a. Labial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sound</th>
<th>Pronunciation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[b]</td>
<td>[bɔɔɡo]</td>
<td>‘leave’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[m]</td>
<td>[mɔɔɡo]</td>
<td>‘another thing’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[hɔt]</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘arm’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[mat]</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘disappear’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[p]</td>
<td>[pɪnɔ]</td>
<td>‘ground’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[b]</td>
<td>[bɪnɔ]</td>
<td>‘weave’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[pʊj]</td>
<td>[lʊj]</td>
<td>‘bad smell’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[m]</td>
<td>[ɡaŋ]</td>
<td>‘hold’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[n]</td>
<td>[ɡaŋ]</td>
<td>‘delay’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[cam]</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘bad’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[can]</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘longing’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### b. Dental

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sound</th>
<th>Pronunciation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[t]</td>
<td>[tɔb]</td>
<td>‘start’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[c]</td>
<td>[kɔb]</td>
<td>‘spear’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[tɛj]</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘wet’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[cej]</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘look for’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[d]</td>
<td>[dɑɔc]</td>
<td>‘adding’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[t]</td>
<td>[tac]</td>
<td>‘remove the bark’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[dɑɑr]</td>
<td>[tɑɑr]</td>
<td>‘give up’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[n]</td>
<td>[nɔq]</td>
<td>‘suck’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[n]</td>
<td>[niid]</td>
<td>‘make tiny’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘press strongly;’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### c. Alveolar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sound</th>
<th>Pronunciation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[d]</td>
<td>[dɪj]</td>
<td>‘tightly’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[t]</td>
<td>[tɪj]</td>
<td>‘carry’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[dɔk]</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘reconcile’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[tɔk]</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘remove groundnut’s cover’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[l]</td>
<td>[lɔn]</td>
<td>‘release’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[r]</td>
<td>[rɔn]</td>
<td>‘dive’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[kαl]</td>
<td>[cɛr]</td>
<td>‘misinterpret’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[n]</td>
<td>[nɔm]</td>
<td>‘take some’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[n]</td>
<td>[nɔm]</td>
<td>‘chew’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[d]</td>
<td>[dɔɔk]</td>
<td>‘return’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[n]</td>
<td>[nɔɔk]</td>
<td>‘tooth’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[d]</td>
<td>[dɑqɑk]</td>
<td>‘remove’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[n]</td>
<td>[nɑqɑk]</td>
<td>‘kill’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### d. Palatal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sound</th>
<th>Pronunciation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[j]</td>
<td>[jaac]</td>
<td>‘cultivating tool’s wood’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[c]</td>
<td>[caac]</td>
<td>‘silence’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[jɡɑyo]</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘denying something’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[cɡɑyo]</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘looking for’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
e. Velar

[k] [g]  [kəl] ‘remove thorn from foot’  [gəl] ‘start to cultivate’
[kal] ‘to bring’  [gəl] ‘to prevent’
[ŋ] [n]  [lɔŋ] ‘torture’  [lɔŋ] ‘release’
[maŋo] ‘keep’  [maŋo] ‘see’

Vowel Contrasts

[a] [a]  [kəc] ‘bite’  [kəc] ‘hunger’
[a:] [a:]  [ka:r] ‘thorny tree’  [kə:r] ‘clothes’ rack’
[ɔ] [ɔ]  [dɔ:r] ‘malnourished’  [dɔ:r] ‘peace’
[i] [i]  [ci:m] ‘kiss’  [cɪ:m] ‘comfort’
[i] [e]  [bi:] ‘simple’  [be] ‘sharp’
[a] [o]  [lak] ‘teeth’  [lo] ‘axe’
[a:] [o:]  [ka:r] ‘thorny tree’  [kə:r] ‘rats’ path’
[ə] [ə]  [ma:lo] ‘warming’  [mə:lo] ‘sunrise’
[u] [u:]  [bul] ‘roast’  [bu:l] ‘drum’

Tone Contrast

[beː:r] ‘swamp area’  [beː:r] ‘good’
[bâːy] ‘stubborn’  [bâːy] ‘slave’
[bâːr] ‘an empty place without trees’  [bâr] ‘taking along’
[mɔːk] ‘putting grass on the house’  [mɔːk] ‘bee’s attack’

Some tone patterns in Luwo include the following:

Monosyllabic words

H  [bâr] ‘taking along’
L  [bâr] ‘pole’
M  [bâr] ‘an empty place without trees’
**Disyllabic words**

L L  \([p̥adʰò]\)  ‘fall’
H H  \([rɪŋo]\)  ‘meat’
L M  \([tʊdò]\)  ‘fear’
M H  \([tɔŋo]\)  ‘egg’
M M  \([tɔbɔ]\)  ‘rotten’

**Trisyllabic words**

L H H  \([dɪcɑŋo]\)  ‘day time’
L L M  \([bɪkJɪdǝ]\)  ‘never, not’
M H L  \([kɛʁɑːɪ]\)  ‘indeed’

The common syllable patterns in Luwo are the following:

V  \([á]\)  ‘I’

[é]  ‘he’

VC  \([ãn]\)  ‘me’

[úm]  ‘nose’

CV  \([ʃɔː]\)  ‘die’

[pɔː]  ‘water’

CVC  \([cãm]\)  ‘food’

\([pãr]\)  ‘think’

**Word patterns**

VCVC  \([atɔp]\)  ‘rotten’

VCCVC  \([agwãk]\)  ‘old’

### 1.8 ORTHOGRAPHY

Literacy activities in vernacular languages in southern Sudan started in 1928.

In that year, a Rejaf Language Conference was held and nine languages were chosen to be used for educational purposes in southern Sudan. The Luwo language was not among those nine languages. However, during the Addis Ababa Accord of 1972, the
southern region was granted its right to develop local languages. As a result, in 1976
the Regional Ministry of Education requested the Summer Institute of Linguistics
(SIL) to help implement the policy of developing orthographies for local languages in
southern Sudan. It was that year in which the SIL assigned Randall Buth to analyze
and come up with an orthography for the Luwo language. Buth stayed among the
Luwo people in Mbili in the eastern side of Wau town and he (together with Luwo
helpers) was able to develop a orthography for Luwo. The Luwo Literacy
Organization approved that orthography and it has been used since then. We can see
features of the Luwo orthography from the following chart:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phonemes</th>
<th>Graphemes</th>
<th>Phonemes</th>
<th>Graphemes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/a/</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>/p/</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/aː/</td>
<td>aa</td>
<td>/b/</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ɑː/</td>
<td>ah</td>
<td>/tʃ/</td>
<td>th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/æː/</td>
<td>aah</td>
<td>/dʒ/</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/o/</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>/t/</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/oː/</td>
<td>oo</td>
<td>/d/</td>
<td>dh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ɔː/</td>
<td>oh</td>
<td>/c/</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ʊ:/</td>
<td>ooh</td>
<td>/ʃ/</td>
<td>j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/oː/</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>/k/</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/oː/</td>
<td>oa</td>
<td>/g/</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/u:/</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>/r/</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/uː/</td>
<td>uu</td>
<td>/l/</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/iː/</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>/m/</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/iː/</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>/ŋ/</td>
<td>nh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ɪː/</td>
<td>ih</td>
<td>/n/</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ʃː/</td>
<td>iih</td>
<td>/ŋ/</td>
<td>ny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/e:/</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>/ŋ/</td>
<td>ng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/eː/</td>
<td>ea</td>
<td>/w/</td>
<td>w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ɛː/</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>/j/</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ɛː/</td>
<td>ee</td>
<td>/ŋ/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ɡː/</td>
<td>eh</td>
<td>/ŋ/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ɡːː/</td>
<td>eeh</td>
<td>/ŋ/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.9 PREVIOUS WORKS ON LUWO

Luwo is one of the languages in southern Sudan that have continued to lack proper study in all domains. The first few attempts to write Luwo were made by some missionaries who visited Luwo land early in the 19th century. Among them were Petherick and Antinori. In the early 1870s, Schweinfurth visited Luwo land and made a number of drawings of Luwo people, their animals, huts and tools. Later on in 1924, Boutros Ghawi, an Egyptian official, wrote about the Luwo. Recent publications include a small volume by Santandrea (1977,72). He published some articles under titles: The Luo of the Bahr el Ghazal, Praise-Songs for “Killers” in Jur-Luo, and Jur-Luo Texts and Comments: The Family. Another study was made by Dr. Randall Buth in 1980 on the Vowel System in Luwo.
CHAPTER TWO

THEORETICAL APPROACHES OF SPEECH ACTS

2.1 INTRODUCTION

Chapter two focuses on various approaches to describing speech acts. A number of speech acts theorists have given various definitions according to their own views about speech acts. This chapter, therefore, tries to present different approaches provided by speech act theorists. The model of choice for this prominent speech act is Relevance Theory. In this chapter, a number of terms frequently used by speech act theorists are also defined.

2.2 DEFINITION OF SPEECH ACTS WITHIN RELEVANCE THEORY

Speech Act Theory was first discussed by Searle and Austin in the 1960s. This theory claims that utterances involve some acts by which the speaker does something referred to as a ‘performative act’. Utterances are, therefore, not only meant to convey the content of the conceptual meaning, but also to perform specific speech acts with certain peculiar properties (Austin 1962, 102).

Sperber and Wilson (1986, 243) argue that “speech act theory grew out of a reaction to what was seen as an excessive narrow concentration on the informative use of language”. According to them, “language can be used to perform actions, such as creating and discharging obligations to influence the thoughts and actions of others or to create new states of affairs and new social relationships (243)”. They claim that an utterance is relevant in a context if and only if it has some ‘contextual effects’ in that context. They claim that the ‘contextual effect’ of an assumption in a given
context are the effects brought about by mental processes and processing efforts to be relevant to a context. They claim that relevance is the key to human cognition. They have formulated a ‘Cognitive Principle of Relevance’ which is referred to as the ‘First Principle of Relevance’ (Sperber and Wilson 1986, 260). This cognitive principle of relevance maintains that “human cognition tends to be geared to the maximization of relevance” to achieve maximal cognitive effect.

Moreover, Sperber and Wilson (1986, 155-163) have formulated a ‘Communicative Principle of Relevance’, which they refer to as the ‘Second Principle of Relevance’. According to this principle, “every act of ostensive communication communicates a presumption of its own optimal relevance” (158). Cognitive effects are achieved when information gained from perception or in communication enters into deductive processing.

Blass (1990) quoting Sperber and Wilson discusses how information can be relevant to a hearer. She says:

Sperber and Wilson claim that information is relevant to somebody if it interacts in a certain way with his existing assumptions about the world: as they put it, if it has contextual effects in some context that he has accessible. They claim that contextual effects are of three types: contextual implication; strengthening an existing assumption; and contradicting and eliminating an existing assumption (44).

(6) below illustrates the cognitive effect of contextual implication, (7) the effect of strengthening, and (8) the effect of eliminating an existing assumption.

(6) ụwu ịwị ụnwụ ụnwụ ụnwụ. Lion is in road that.
‘Lion is in that road’.

The immediate contextual implication a hearer may formulate from (6) is to avoid that road. The hearer will implicate that lion is a dangerous animal that kills people. Therefore since there is a lion in that road then one cannot go in that road.
In (7), the assumption is given that there is a lion in the road has been strengthened by another utterance, *ya-i ri-i* ‘be careful’. The utterance in (6) has some implication, but not strong as the utterance in (7). So, the existing assumption has been strengthened in (7).

In (8), the immediate implicated assumption that the hearer might have formed has been eliminated. The hearer had an assumption that he/she would not go in that road since there is lion. But by saying that the lion has no teeth, it is now possible for the hearer to go in that road. The marker for such elimination in Luwo is *abee*, which is almost translated as ‘but’ in English or ‘αλλα’ in Greek. *Abee* ‘but’ gives contradicting information that eliminates the effect of feeling the danger the hearer might have because of the lion.

Let’s consider a further example of this type made by two Luwo gentlemen, referred to as X and Y.

In (9), X is making a proposal to Y to accompany him to a drumming ceremony. *Cidh-o* ‘let’s go’ reveals that this utterance is a proposal. However, (10) constitutes a rejection. But this rejection does not lie in the meaning of the utterance. The utterance of Y is just a statement saying that he his tired. From encyclopedic knowledge of the Luwo community, going to a drumming ceremony takes a long time.
and involves certain activities that need strength. At the same time, being tired is not a single event that may last for a moment, but it also takes a long time and cannot go together with an activity that needs strength. Therefore, a person cannot be tired and go to a drumming ceremony at the same time. As a result, the utterance of Y constitutes a rejection to the proposal of X. Such a counterproposal can be reinforced by a certain marker in Luwo. Let’s consider examples (11) and (12).

(11) X: Cidh -o yi buul tiin.
   Go 1st pl in drum today.
   ‘Let’s go to drum today’.

(12) Y: Kuرسم -a a-thyaai wa.
   Body 1st sg perf tired wa
   ‘I am tired wa’.

In (12), Y is reinforcing what he has said in (10). This is a confirmation of statement according to Relevance Theory. Y is making a confirmation that it is not possible at all for him to go to the drum ceremony since he is very tired. The particle wa reinforces this confirmation. The function of this particle is to assert focus on thyaai ‘tired’ to strengthen it more. But supposing Y made the following answer to X instead of (12):

(13) Kuرسم -a a-thyaai tudi.
   Body 1st sg perf tired tudi.
   ‘My body is tired tudi’.

This would have implied that Y is not totally rejecting the proposal, but he is saying that there is a possibility of going to drum despite his being tired. The non-literal meaning is that ‘I am tired tudi’, but we can go. The particle tudi gives a counter sense against what is expected from the encyclopedia knowledge that being tired cannot go together with going to the drumming ceremony. Let’s consider example (14).
(14)  
\[ A \text{ dqd} \ gwir \ n' \text{-a} \ wa. \]  
I want prepare self 1st sg wa.  
'I want to prepare myself wa'.

An example such as (14) is a confirmation to the proposal of X, but it is associated with a request for a little time. Particle wa implies that the speaker is asserting that he has to prepare himself first, so they cannot go to the drumming ceremony immediately.

### 2.3 Definition of Reformative Speech Acts

Crystal (1992, 362) defines speech act as:

A communicative activity defined with reference to the intentions of a speaker while speaking and the effects achieved on a listener. In this context, the act itself is called a locutionary act; the intentional aspect is the act’s illocutionary force; and the impact on the listener is the act’s perlocutionary effect.

In this definition, three new terms are presented: ‘locutionary act’, ‘illocutionary force’ and ‘perlocutionary effect’. The ‘locutionary act’ was first defined by Austin (1962, 61) as: “The utterance of certain noises... certain words in a certain construction, and the utterance of them with a certain sense and a certain reference”. According to this definition, the ‘locutionary act’ involves producing certain noise or utterances, composing sentences and contextualization of sentences. The ‘locutionary act’, therefore, has no consequence of fulfillment of the act, but it is the act itself. However, resemblance can be inferred in the context as Sperber and Wilson (1986, 148) say, “The propositional form of an indicative is entertained as a true description of the actual world”.

Crysttal (181) defines ‘illocutionary force’ in terms of the ‘illocutionary act’. He defines the illocutionary act as, “a speech act which is performed by a speaker by virtue of the utterance having been made”. For example, the verb of promise in
English can lead to fulfillment of the speech act as soon as a person says it. It has the intentional aspect from the side of the speaker.

An example of an illocutionary act in Luwo is presented in (15).

(15) A ceg ru₄dh -e piny kee lug u_uol -e.
    Past promise chief e down 3rd sg judgment fut cut he.
    'The chief has promised that he would finalize (cut down) the judgment'.

By making this utterance, the 'illlocutionary act' has already been fulfilled regardless of whether the chief will really finalize the judgment or not. The force of fulfilling the act lies in uttering the utterance, rather than performing the action itself. This force is the consequence or the function that results from the 'illlocutionary act'.

Crystal (181) points out that the 'perlocutionary effect' is the effect that the 'perlocutionary act' has on the hearer. An utterance which is intended to state a fact can cause a 'perlocutionary' effect on the hearer. For example, the Luwo utterance (16) can have an effect on the hearer.

(16) Tie₃n nuu a-yood -a yi yoo ti₃n.
    Foot lion past find 1st sg in road today.
    'I found the foot (print) of lion in the road today'.

This can be a normal utterance with intention of informing somebody that the footprint of a lion was found on the road. However, the effect on the listener may be different. He/she may be afraid that there is lion in the area. Such effect is what Crystal (1992, 181) refers to as the 'perlocutionary effect'.

Blakemore (2003, 101) uses a relevance theoretic approach and defines speech acts in terms of three types of utterances based on pragmatic function, 'saying that', 'telling to', and 'asking whether'. According to Blakemore, 'saying that' is the most general form of assertive acts, 'telling to' is the most general form of a request for action, and 'asking whether' is the most general form of a request for information.
This definition has unfortunately excluded other important types of non-declarative speech acts.

Blass discusses the theoretical foundation of relevance theory. She points out that Sperber and Wilson have claimed that humans attend to certain phenomena rather than others.

Humans tend to pay attention to what is relevant to them; they form the most relevant possible representations of these phenomena, and process them in a context that maximizes their relevance (1990, 43).

Corresponding to this definition, Sperber and Wilson believe that relevance, and the maximization of relevance is the key to human cognition.

2.4 PROTOTYPICAL TYPES OF SPEECH ACTS

Section (2.4) outlines the key arguments that play a significant role in describing the process of performing speech acts to give a clear picture on the process.

Givon (288) claims that it is not “absolute” to set a traditional dichotomy between declarative and non-declarative speech acts on one hand, and between various non-declarative speech acts on the other. He acknowledges that there are three major speech act prototypes “distinctly and most consistently grammaticalized in most human languages” (Givon 2001, 288). The main three prototypes are:

- Declarative.
- Interrogative.
  * yes/no-question
  * wh-question
- Imperative.

These main three prototypes are what Blakemore refers to as three types of utterances. According to Blakemore, ‘declarative’ is ‘saying that’, imperative is ‘telling to’, and interrogative is ‘asking whether’. Let examine the following chart to make the point of comparison clear:
TABLE 5. COMPARISON OF GIVON’S AND BLAKEMORE’S APPROACHES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Givon’s approach</th>
<th>Blakemore’s approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Declarative</td>
<td>Saying that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogative</td>
<td>Asking whether</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>Telling to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the declarative, interrogative and imperative model, Givon (2001, 288) has divided his topic into small chunks and analysed each chunk according to its functional and syntactic typological domains. For example:

17) **Declarative**

\[ Ku\mathcal{n} \ a-\ cam \ bor-e. \]
Food perf eat cat it
‘the cat ate food’

18) **Yes/no-question**

\[ Ku\mathcal{n} \ a-\ cam \ bor-e \ ne? \]
Food perf eat cat it QM
‘Did the cat eat food’

19) **Wh-question**

\[ yaa \ e \ naa a-\ cam \ ku\mathcal{n}? \]
Who is that perf eat food
‘Who ate food’

20) **Imperative**

\[ Cam \ ku\mathcal{n}. \ ‘eat food’ \]
Eat food.

21) **Negative**

\[ Gay, \ yi \ awqaj. \]
No, you wrong.
‘No, you are wrong’.

However, Payne (1997, 294) has outlined a clear distinction between declarative and non-declarative speech acts. According to him, the interrogative and imperative acts are non-declarative. Payne has also distinguished between modal operations; realis and irrealis. A prototypical realis mode strongly asserts that a
specific event or state of affairs has actually happened, while a prototypical irrealis mode makes no such assertion. According to this distinction, declarative speech acts are realised and non-declarative speech acts are irrealis.

2.5 SUMMARY OF CHAPTER TWO

Chapter two has dealt primarily with definitions. In section 2.2 speech acts were defined according to Relevance Theory, and in section 2.3 performative speech acts were defined. In section 2.4 prototypical types of speech acts were discussed.
CHAPTER THREE

DECLARATIVE SPEECH ACTS

3.1 INTRODUCTION

Chapter three discusses declarative speech acts in 3.2. The discussion centers on declarative verbs 3.2.1 and performative verbs 3.2.2. Discussion of these verbs is necessary to outline a clear view about the declarative speech acts. In 3.3, discussion will continue focusing on indirect declarative speech acts, and in section 3.4, echoic declaratives are discussed.

3.2 DECLARATIVE SPEECH ACTS

Crystal (1992, 95) defines the declarative speech acts as, “The description of a verb form or a type of sentence or a clause which is typically used in expression of a statement, that is, a ‘declaration’ that something is or is not the case”. Declarative clauses are usually the normal unmarked clause type. The declarative form is frequently used in many cases such as everyday informal conversation and narrative stories. A sentence in declarative form can have different effects on the hearer, such as believing the speaker that P, where P stands for truth value of what the speakers says. (22) and (23) present an intransitive declarative speech act, while (24) presents a transitive declarative speech act. The intransitive declarative speech act does not take an object, while the transitive declarative speech act takes an object.

(22) Ru¿dh ne thar yaadh.
Chief is under tree.
‘Chief is under the tree’

(22) is an example of relating information. As Givon (2001, 287) states, the speaker’s main communicative goal in the declarative form is to give information. The copula particle ne ‘is’ gives the mood and aspect of the statement, grounding or asserting it in time and context.
(23) Ruqdh beed thar yaadth
Chief is under tree
‘Chief is under the tree’

(23) is also an intransitive statement. The verb beed 'stay' expresses a progressive tense like example (22), but they differ in that the verb ne in (22) can be ‘static’, while the verb beed (23) is not ‘static’. Both (22) and (23) are not marked by any other grammatical devices, except the prefix a for the past in (23).

(24) Ruqdh u- cam kujn
Chief fut eats food
‘Chief will eat food’

(24) is another example of relating information, i.e. someone is informing another person that the chief will be eating food. Such utterance as (24) may be simply taken as focus, meaning that the chief will be eating food, in contrast to eating meat or drinking wine.

The declarative speech act is a ‘constative’, or in other words, “It is the ‘basic’ sentence form, which is regarded as the neutral form, from which all other forms are derived” (Cruse 2000, 337). The declarative form has a wide range of applicability and can be used grammatically and semantically in a way that other forms cannot because of its basic quality (i.e. the declarative form can have nominalization whereas interrogative or/and imperative forms cannot). At the same time, it has a restricted, non-extended range of interpretations. In its prototypical manifestation, it commits the speaker to the truth of the expressed proposition.

3.3 SPEECH ACT VERBS

3.3.1 Declarative verbs

Venderveken (1990,198) gives a list of 85 declarative verbs in English. He groups them under specific categories according to their semantic senses. Venderveken has also classified other verbs, such as ‘assertives’, ‘commissives’,
directives and 'expressives'. Luwo does not have all of these distinct types. Classification of the verbs into declarative, 'assertives', 'commissives', 'directives' and 'expressive' may be a problem in many languages. In his explanation about declarative verbs, Venderveken (1990, 198) says:

Most declarative illocutionary verbs name declarations that require a position of authority of the speaker in an extra-linguistic institution. In general, the mode of achievement of such declarations consists in invoking that institutional position and it determines the preparatory condition that the speaker occupies effectively such a position. Thus, for example, for speaker to be entitled to make an adjudication, there must be institutions and forms of life like auctions and special roles enabling certain persons, like appraisers, to attribute goods for sale by declaration to the one who makes the highest bid.

Declarative speech acts are characterized by giving direct information without involving any extended interpretation. The information the declarative speech acts give has varying degrees from reporting a certain event (25) to reporting an uncertain event (26) or making a commitment (27). But (25) is the most prototypical example of the declarative speech act being discussed in this section.

(25) Wur -a a- beeno ne wâgro.  
Father 1st sg Past come at yesterday.  
'My father came yesterday'.

However, the various degrees of certainty and uncertainty are much more related to 'epistemic' and 'deontic' features, rather than declarative speech acts. According to Collins Dictionary of the English Language, 'epistemic' is relating to knowledge, as well as denoting the branch of modal logic that deals with the formalization of certain concepts, such as knowledge, certainty and ignorance, while deontic is relating to such concepts as obligation and permissibility.

Payne (1997, 246) states that 'deontic' comes from the same root as the English word debt, and expresses the subject's duty or obligation to perform the irrealis act
expressed by the verb, while ‘epistemic’ has to do with the speaker’s degree of commitment to the truth of the proposition.

Structurally (26) is a form of declarative speech act, but semantically, it is not a prototypical declarative speech act because it involves probability. Hence, the structural form qualifies (26) to be declarative, but the semantic function qualifies it to be epistemic mood. The semantic function is expressed in Luwo by the *nee par* ‘probably’ which shows that the speaker is not sure whether they are on the road or not. But according to this statement, the probability of their being on the road is high.

(26) *Nee par e ge ne yi ygo.*

If think then They hab in road.

‘Probably they are on the road’

(27) expresses a high degree of commitment or obligation. It is a declarative speech act according to its structural form, but semantically it is in deontic mood. The speaker uses *dhiil* ‘must’ to commit him/herself to the obligation of going to the river. This truth is reinforced by *awqani* ‘now’. *Dhiil* ‘must’ expresses both the ‘deontic’ and ‘epistemic’ attitude of the speaker.

(27) *A dhiil ci naam awqani*

1st sg must go river now

‘I must go to the river now’

Givon (2001, 290) points out three main epistemic modes of ‘presupposition’, ‘realis-assertion’ and ‘irrealis-assertion’. These three modes are asserted in terms of binary distinctions that the information is either taken for granted (presupposed); or the information is either asserted strongly (realis) or weakly (irrealis).

The conventions that govern declarative speech acts from the epistemic and deontic point of view according to Givon (2001, 291) include:

a. The speaker assumes that the various presuppositions associated with the utterance are sufficiently acceptable to the hearer and will prompt no challenge.
b. The speaker has relatively high certainty in the asserted portion of the information.
c. The speaker assumes the hearer's ignorance of the asserted portion of the utterance.
d. The speaker's communicative intent is to supply information to the hearer.

The speaker assumes that the hearer will welcome, or at least won't object to, being informed. For example, the Luwo utterance (28) can have no reason why the hearer may object to it.

(28) Kuɔn a- cam Joon -e.
    Porridge perf eat Joon it.
    'John ate porridge'

Since the speaker is informing the hearer that Joon has eaten the porridge, then there is no point for the hearer not to welcome the message in such a typical appropriate context. Although he/she may not believe that Joon has eaten the porridge, he/she may admit that the utterance has been said.

(29)-(31) illustrate the morphological process of declarative speech acts. Investigation focuses on suffix -e to find its morphological function.

(29) A ignty Ɂuɔdơ -e piny kee lug u- ɣol -e.
    Perf vow Chief suf down that judgment fut cut he.
    'The chief vowed that he would finalize the court'

Besides ignty ruɔdhe piny 'the chief vowed', the relative pronoun kee 'asserts' functions in Luwo like a verb (e.g. the chief has vowed, affirming that he would finalize the judgment). ignty 'vow' cannot stand alone without piny 'down'. Syntactically, the subject, Ɂuɔdơ 'chief', occurs between the verb ignty 'vow' and the modifier piny 'down'. The suffix -e that follows Ɂuɔdơ 'chief' is a marker of presentational articulation, where the focus is on the whole sentence of what the chief has said. Meanwhile the suffix -e that follows ɣol 'will finalize' refers to the chief himself. (30) tells more about this argument.
(30) A ceg ge ruødəh -e piny kob-gene lug u-ŋo-lgene.
   Perf promise they chief suf down 3rd pl judgment fut cut they.
   'The chiefs have promised that they would finalize (cut down) the judgment'.

By changing from chief (singular) to chiefs (plural), we see that the suffix -e
which follows ruødəh 'chief' has not changed, but the suffix -e that follows
uŋo1 'will finalize' has changed, which indicates that the former suffix does not refer
to ruødəh 'chief', while the latter suffix refers to ruødəh 'chief'. Again, to make it
clearer, we can see example (31).

(31) A- ceg ruødəh -e piny kee luwe u-ŋo-1-e.
   Perf promise chief suf down 3rd sg judgments fut cut he.
   'The chief has promised that he would finalize (cut down) the judgments'.

The suffix -e which follows ruødəh 'chief' has not changed in all the three
examples, which supports the argument that the suffix -e, that follows ruødəh, does
not refer to chief but it refers to what the chief has said.

3.3.2 Performative verbs

In English, certain verbs are used for performative acts, such as ‘promise’,
‘warn’, ‘beg’ and ‘thank’ (see section 2.3 for definition of performative acts).
Goddard (1998, 136) says, “If these verbs are used in the first person ‘present tense’
then they can constitute or carry out the speech act”. These verbs are called
‘performative verbs’ because they “lack descriptive meaning, or in other words, they
do not contribute to a proposition with truth conditions” according to Austin (1962,
70). These verbs are characterized by occurring normally with ‘hereby’, and their use
is grammatically restricted in English because ‘hereby’ goes only with some specific
verbs.
Example (32) in Luwo illustrates a performative verb of naming with the subsequent result of bringing into being a state of affairs, ‘the calling of that person with that name’, as from the day his name is declared.

(32) Yi a- cag -a ne Ukelo, nying kuo -a.
You perf name 1st sg as Ukelo, name grandfather my.
‘I name you Ukelo, the name of my grandfather’.

In (32), the performative verb acaga ‘I name’ has a power of a performative because it brings into being a state of affairs. The child, as from that time will be called Ukelo due to the effect of the performative verb of naming. The verbs which bring the state of affairs into being are called performative verbs.

Verbs expressing the present state of affairs in Luwo are usually unmarked as mentioned above. Sometimes, they are reduplicated as in: cuon-a cuono ‘call-I call’, ‘I am calling’, or ‘I call’. However, performative verbs do not take such forms of the normal verbs. The performative verbs look like past tense forms of the normal verbs because they take the perfective device a-, but they express the present state of affairs.

In English, a large number of declarative performative verbs are related to juridical practices and institutions, such as ‘exonerate’, ‘condemn’ and ‘acquit’. However, other declarative verbs, like the definitions and appellations, only require linguistic competence. Juridical practices are very uncommon in Luwo, and institutions such as: “I name this child ‘Elizabeth’”, are not practices widely used in Luwo. Thus we expect Luwo to have a limited number of such verbs.

3.4 INDIRECT DECLARATIVE SPEECH ACTS

Crystal (1992, 185) has defined an indirect speech act as, “an utterance whose linguistic form doesn’t directly reflect its communicative purpose”.
(33) below is a declarative statement according to its linguistic form, but the communicative purpose may differ. If the speaker was in a room with another person who is close to the window, and if the window was open, the communicative purpose of such an utterance may be a suggestion to the person near the window to close the window. In this case, there is no specific marker in the linguistic form to mark the communicative intention of the speaker, but the communicative intention is understood from the context.

(33) K#:yow a- dhal.
Cold perf serious.
‘It is very cold’.

Searle (1989,57) defines an indirect speech act as an utterance “in which one ‘illocutionary’ act is performed indirectly by way of performing another”. Based on this definition, speech act theory can be used to explain sentences with one ‘illocutionary force’ in order to perform an act with different ‘illocutionary force’. (See section 2.3 for the definition of these terms). According to Searle, “Each type of ‘illocutionary’ act has a set of conditions that are necessary for the successful and felicitous performance of the act”. (See Searle 1989, 57). These are felicity conditions.

Crystal (1992, 133) defines ‘felicity condition’ as, “the criteria which must be satisfied if a speech act is to achieve its purpose”. For example, it is not enough for any normal person to say, ‘I pronounce you husband and wife’. For the speech act of marrying to be properly used, the speaker must have the authority to fulfill the criteria of carrying out the activity.

Cole and Morgan (1975, 71) outline certain conditions as important for the successful performance of a speech act. The felicitous conditions include those having to do with felicity conditions on the performance of a directive illocutionary act, those
having to do with reasons for doing the act, and those embedding one act inside another one. In (table 6 below), S is used for speaker, H for hearer and A for act.

### TABLE 6. FELICITIOUS CONDITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Directive (Request)</th>
<th>Commissive (Promise)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparatory condition</td>
<td>H is able to perform A.</td>
<td>S is able to perform A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H wants S to perform A.</td>
<td>S intends to do A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincerity condition</td>
<td>S wants H to do A</td>
<td>S intends to do A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propositional content</td>
<td>S predicates a future act</td>
<td>S predicates a future act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential condition</td>
<td>Counts as an attempt by S</td>
<td>Counts as the undertaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to get H to do A</td>
<td>by S of an obligation to do A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table (6) the ‘felicity condition’ in the preparatory condition stage is that the hearer is able to perform an act, or the speaker is able to perform an act, or the hearer wants the speaker to perform an act or the speaker himself intends to perform an act. In (34) below, the speaker is able to perform the act.

Though the speech act is an interrogative, in (34) the speaker is actually making a promise in a question form to the hearer that he can be of assistance to the hearer if the hearer wants. This relates to the preparatory stage in that S is able to perform A for H. (The linguistic form in this utterance is polar interrogative (see 4.2).

(34)  \( Ka\ll \quad -a \quad pii \quad yir \quad -i \quad ne? \)

\[ \text{Bring 1\textsuperscript{st} sg water to 2\textsuperscript{nd} sg QM} \]

\[ \text{‘May I bring water to you?’} \]

In the sincerity stage, the speaker wants the hearer to perform an act or the speaker intends to perform an act. In example (35), the speaker intends to perform an act. The speaker is expressing sincerity to help the hearer in making a basket.

(35)  \( A\quad tag\quad -a\quad diido\quad cw\aa g\quad -a\quad cw\aa fo\quad yir\quad -i. \)

\[ \text{Perf think 1\textsuperscript{st} sg basket make 1\textsuperscript{st} sg make For 2\textsuperscript{nd} sg.} \]

\[ \text{‘I have decided to make a basket for you’}. \]
(36) is an utterance of the propositional content condition, where the speaker predicates the future of an act. This utterance is another type of promise because the speaker is assuring the hearer that he will help him in cultivating the farm.

(36) Yi u- kony -a ke puur puodho
    You hab help 1st sg with cultivate farm
    ‘I will help you with cultivating the farm’.

(37) can be interpreted as information, i.e. somebody is giving information that a dog is in the house. At the same time, it can be interpreted as in a given context, a warning, i.e. “Be careful because a dog is in the house”. This means that there is a dangerous dog which is a threat to people, so they are warned to be careful when going to that house.

(37) Guż̄ ng ne paajo.
    Dog at home.
    ‘Dog is in the house’.

(38) is a statement. In the Luwo area there are many seasonal rivers and streams. A person who makes such an utterance might have come across one of the streams where water has increased beyond normal consideration that day. By this utterance, the literal meaning is to inform that the river has more water today. Nepek ‘extremely’ is a Luwo ideophone that gives a strong meaning beyond normal description. The literal meaning for this utterance is to provide information that the river is extremely full. However, there may also be a indirect speech act, in an appropriate context, which may be to warn that the river is extremely full today, so it is very risky to cross.

(38) Naam a- pay tin nepek.
    River perf full today extremely.
    ‘The river is extremely full today’.

This proposal of two speech act types, or indirect literal speech acts, was developed by Searle (1975,70). He says there are two speech acts available to the
hearer, where the literal act is secondary and the non-literal act is primary. “When one of these statements is uttered with the primary illocutionary point of a directive, the literal illocutionary act is also performed” (Searle 1975, 70).

Sperber and Wilson (1995, 244) have refuted the claim of two speech acts. They claim that an utterance like (38) may be analysed like a normal utterance by accessing assumptions in order of accessibility and drawing conclusions according to the context. The claim made by Sperber and Wilson would not be appropriate in the Luwo context. The use of the indirect speech act is clear in the Luwo culture as we noted earlier. So, such utterances as (37) and (38) will communicate two acts in Luwo, the direct and indirect.

3.5 ECHOIC DECLARATIVES

3.5.1 Interpretive use of state of affairs

Interpretive use of a declarative speech act may be embedded within ‘high level explicatures’. Blakemore (2003, 91) describes these as “utterance in which the proposition expressed describes a state of affairs”. For example (39) in Luwo describes a state of affairs where there is a buffalo in the grass.

(39) J2¿bo ne yi lum keca.
Buffalo is in grass there.
‘Buffalo is there in the grass’.

Though this utterance is a description of the state of affairs, the recovery of its proposition is not simple as such. The speaker of (39) could be guessing that there is buffalo in the grass, or he could be warning, claiming, and expressing his surprise that there is buffalo in the grass. Based on this, we can argue that a language is not used just to describe the world, but there are high level explicatures involved in utterances which describe the state of affairs.

‘Resemblance’ has also been cited by Blakemore (2003, 102-110) as important for the interpretation of declaratives. According to this view, a declarative utterance
can resemble a state of affairs instead of just describing it. The resemblance may take
different forms such as lexical or grammatical forms. Resemblance involves utterance
such as (40) where someone told a friend that ‘Dimo is the grandfather of the Luwo
people’. Assuming that the utterance was made by Buok, hearers of this utterance can
infer the assumptions in (40) and (41).

(40) A ted Buok -e kee Dimo -e naa kuw jo Luwo.
   Perf say Buok he that Dimo is that grandfather people Luwo
   ‘Buok said that Dimo is the grandfather of the Luwo people’.

(41) A yi Buok -e kee Dimo -e naa kuw jo Luwo
   Perf believe Buok he that Dimo is that grandfather people Luwo
   ‘Buok believes that Dimo is the grandfather of the Luwo people’.

The high level explicature is marked by kee. In both cases, it refers to the
situation such as the speaker says or the speaker believes. (We have assumed that the
speaker is Buok to avoid the consequence of using long sentences in the Luwo
context. There is no way to explain the speaker with one word. The speaker can only
be explained by a phrase, such as nua rubo ‘the one speaking’). In the following
examples, we will address different levels of resemblance, the echoic resemblance
which includes the resemblance of thought.

(42) The Utterance

Buok: Kadd -a- panych kë melô.
   Broth perf full with salt.
   ‘Broth is full of salt’.

In (43), Amel has echoes the utterance of Buok in (42), agreeing that the broth
was really full of salt. This approval is shown by the particle, mon, in Luwo. There is
no change of tone in the echoed utterance.

(43) Echoic use of approval

Amel: Kadd -a- panych kë melô mon.
   Broth perf full with salt mon.
   ‘Broth is full of salt mon’.
(44) is a case of wondering. There are two changes, one in tone and the other by
the particle e. In the main utterance (42), the tone is mid on the final word melo ‘salt’,
but the tone has become low in the echoed utterance (44). Also there is a particle e
with low tone.

(44) Echoic use of wondering
Amel:  Kādō  a- pāŋ  kē  mēlō  -ē.
    Broth  perf  full  with  salt  -e.
    ‘Broth is full of salt e’.

Echoic disapproval is made by only one change; that is, the high tone on the final
word (45). In Luwo when a person echoes something with a high tone, it means that
he/she is in disagreement with the speaker.

(45) Echoic use of disapproval
Amel:  Kādō  a- pāŋ  kē  mēlō.
    Broth  perf  full  with  salt.
    ‘Broth is full of salt’.

(46) and (47) are cases of expression of attitudes. (46) expresses something
about the attitude of the speaker. There are two particles in Luwo that show that the
speaker is not accepting that the addressee is brave. These two particles are ce and wa.
Ce may be translated by a phrase like ‘I don’t believe’, and wa may be translated
English particle ‘yeah’. However, such translations are not identical to the sense in
Luwo. (46) is a surprise but at the same time the speaker does not believe that P. The
speaker believes that the person he is referring to is brave because he might have done
something great.

(46) Cē, yī  kēː ē  jī  wā!.
    Ce, you          brave     wa!
    ‘Ce, you are  brave   wa’.
3.5.2 Metarepresentation of thought

The Luwo usually set traps to catch animals. When they go hunting their attitudes can show whether there is expectation of an animal getting into a trap. Supposing that Buok took a number of spears and started to move quickly without speaking to anyone, then Ukelo saw him and said (47). In this case the utterance is a metarepresentation of thought. The speaker is repeating what is in the mind of Buok.

(47) Ukelo: Laci ne yi booi awaaani.
Animal is in trap now.
'Animal is in trap now'

3.6 SUMMARY OF CHAPTER THREE

Discussion in chapter three has centered on declarative speech acts. In section (3.2) declarative speech acts were discussed, while speech acts verbs were discussed in section (3.3) with focus on declarative verbs (3.3.1), and performative verbs (3.3.2). Declarative indirect speech acts were discussed in (3.4), and echoic declarative uses were discussed in section (3.5) with focus on interpretive use of state of affairs (3.5.1) and metarepresentation of thought (3.5.2).
CHAPTER FOUR

INTERROGATIVE SPEECH ACTS

4.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter examines interrogative speech acts. (4.2) defines interrogative speech acts, (4.3)-(4.6) describe different types of interrogatives, such as yes/no questions (4.3), question-word questions (4.4), indirect interrogatives (4.5) and other types of questions (4.6). The line taken in the course of discussion includes investigation of the functions and syntactic structure of the interrogatives.

4.2 DEFINITION OF INTERROGATIVE SPEECH ACTS

Crystal (1992, 192) defines an interrogative:

Descriptive of a grammatical category found in verb forms or sentence and clause types, used in the expression of questions; contrasts with declarative. Words which mark interrogative constructions are interrogative words, often sub-classified as interrogative adjectives (e.g. which), adverbs (e.g. why) and pronouns (e.g. who).

Languages have different morphosyntactic devices that mark what kind of speech act is being performed. Interrogative words, particles, word order, and intonation are a combination of the devices that languages use to ask questions or demand the hearers to respond according to the desirability of the speakers.

Payne (1997, 294) says all languages have grammaticalized devices that show whether a clause is an assertion (declarative), a request (interrogative), or a command (imperative). Interrogatives have traditionally been analyzed as a request for information.
Two subtypes of interrogatives are distinguished. One subtype, typically
called 'yes/no questions' is the interrogative in which the speaker expects the hearer
to answer with yes or no. This is a request for simple information in confirmation or
negation.

The other subtype, typically called 'wh-questions' is the interrogative in which
the speaker expects a more elaborate response than simply confirmation or negation.
This subtype is also called 'question-word questions', 'content questions',
'information questions' and/or 'constituent questions'. The term 'wh-questions' is
English-biased. Luwo is a question- word questions language, hence both terms 'wh-
questions' and question-word questions can work well. But for consistency we will
use the term 'question-word questions' throughout this chapter, especially in (4.4)
where they are discussed at length.

Givon (2001, 300) states that question-word questions are used when the
speakers presuppose that the hearers share with them knowledge of a state/event, but
the speakers still miss one element of that state/event. The focus element of question-
word questions can be the subject, object, verb, predicate, adverb, indirect object, or
time, place, manner, reason adverbials, among others. The main epistemic and deontic
features of an interrogative, according to Givon (2001, 291) are:

a. The speaker assumes that the various presuppositions associated
with the utterance are sufficiently acceptable to the hearer and will
prompt no challenge.
b. The speaker has relatively low certainty in, or may be altogether
ignorant of the queried portion of the utterance.
c. The speaker assumes that the hearer knows the queried information.
d. The speaker’s communicative intent is to request and receive
information from the hearer.
e. The speaker assumes that the hearer is willing to part with the
information.

The Luwo examples in this chapter follow the same line taken in chapter two.
Although the main focus is on the interrogative, declarative utterances are used to
give a clear view about comparison of the speech act prototypes. The discussion focuses on two main topics, yes/no questions (4.3) and question-word questions (4.4). In this chapter, we aim at describing the structural devices which the Luwo language employs to form yes/no question, such as intonation, word order, particles and tag questions. Moreover, our aim is to discover the Luwo words which are used in the question-word questions, and the in situ system of question in Luwo, or the system where the question word comes at the end of the sentence.

4.3 YES/NO QUESTIONS

4.3.1 Functional dimension

The traditional definition of a yes/no question as an interrogative is as follows (Givon 2001, 292): “Given proposition P, tell me whether it is true or false”. However, Sadock and Zwicky (1985, 179) give a more flexible definition for a yes/no question saying that it is one that seeks to comment on the degree of truth of the questioned proposition.

According to this position, both questions (48) and (49) below presuppose that the affirmative declarative (50) or its corresponding negative (51) is true.

(48) *Buok a- cì pāājó nè?*
   *Buok perf go home QP*
   ‘Did Buok go home?’

(49) *Buok kū a- cì pāājó nè?*
   *Buok not perf go home QP*
   ‘Didn’t Buok go home?’

(50) *Buok a- cì pāājó.*
   *Buok perf go home.*
   ‘Buok went home’.

(51) *Buok kū a- cì pāājó.*
   *Buok didn’t perf go home.*
   ‘Buok didn’t go home’.

In English, yes/no questions are not just open alternative questions, but involve a systematic bias toward a certain response. For example, the affirmative
yes/no question such as (48) is neutral, while negative yes/no questions, such as (49) involves a systematic bias toward the affirmative response (50). This bias toward a certain answer also prevails in the Luwo language, almost along the same lines as in English. Structurally, there are two markers in (48)-(51), one for negation and the other for interrogative. Ne as a question particle is the marker for the interrogative in the case of yes/no questions. Ne usually occurs at the end of the sentence and it has no specific propositional meaning, but only is used to confirm whether a question is true or false. The other marker is ku (49)-(51). This marker mainly functions as negation (did not), used in both question and affirmative sentences. Ku as a marker does not occur at the end of the sentence, but occurs immediately after the subject or the agent.

Unlike American English, the intonation pattern employed in yes/no questions in Luwo is a falling intonation. It is possible in Luwo to omit the yes/no interrogative particle and maintain the falling intonation on the final word to indicate that it is still a question, such as in example (52), where the falling tone on the final word shows that it is a yes/no question.

(52) Buok a-ci pääjə?
    Buok perf go home?
    ‘Did Buok go home?’

According to constituent typology order, Luwo is OV as we noted in chapter one. There is no distinctive constituent order marking Luwo yes/no questions.

Payne (1997, 297) defines tag question as: “a yes/no question consisting of a declarative clause plus a ‘tag’ that requests confirmation or disconfirmation of the declarative clause”.

4.3.2 Tag questions

Tag questions are the types of questions which have strongest bias toward negative or positive response. A tag question is not a main device, but secondary for a
language like Luwo which employs another particle for yes/no question. The particle *ne* in (48) and (49) must always be present in the yes/no question, or at least its tone must be present, whereas it is not important for the tag particles to be always present.

Let’s consider (53) and (54) for the tag questions in Luwo.

(53) *Buok a- cī pāājó, karè?*
    
    Buok perf go home, true?
    ‘Buok went home, right?’

(54) *Buok kū a- cī pāājó, tɔ̃da-à?*
    
    Buok didn’t perf go home, lie-my?
    ‘Buok didn’t go home, am I not right?’

The tag question in (53) with *kare* ‘true’ is more strongly biased toward a positive response, while the tag question in (54) with *tɔ̃da* is more strongly biased toward a negative response or a response by no. In both cases, the bias toward the positive or negative response is stronger than in the simple yes/no questions, such as (50)-(51).

4.3.3 *Echoic questions*

Echoic use in declarative speech acts was discussed in section 3.5. Now, this section examines echoic questions. Echoic questions are not concerned with expressing desirability of the hearer to answer, but they express the interpretive use of the language. (55) is an interpretive use of thought.

(55) *Naa yɛ̃ də̈d pə̃r dom?*
    
    Is it that 2nd sg want rebel forest?
    ‘Is it that you want to rebel by running into the forest’?

In (55), the attitude of the speaker is skeptical and disapproving. First of all, the particle *nnaa* shows that the speaker does not believe that a person like the addressee can rebel. Secondly, the speaker is expressing his/her attitude towards the dangers the addressee may meet by rebelling. Although the speaker was not told that the addressee wants to rebel, he might have interpreted it from the addressee’s
thought. Consider Amel’s utterance in (56) after seeing Buok taking his spear and
going towards the river road:

\[(56) \text{Yi caa naam bo.} \]
\[2^{\text{nd}} \text{ sg going river bo.} \]
You are going to the river bo’.

Besides (55), (56) is another way of expressing metarepresentation of thought
in Luwo. Amel was thinking that Buok’s thought was to go to the river. So, she drew
from the thought of Buok the idea of going to the river, and she asked him whether he
was going to the river. The use of particle bo in Luwo is for affirmation of thought.
Interpretation of thought in some cases is a matter of degree. In (57) the thought
seems explicit that something was abnormal with Buok.

Amel, seeing Buok coming tiredly, says:

\[(57) \text{Wa yi u- caadho wa gin nu!} \]
\[2^{\text{nd}} \text{ sg pres walk like that nu!} \]
‘You are walking like that!’

(57) is an echoic question of thought. Amel has echoed the thought of Buok of
thinking that something was abnormal. This type of echoing of thought is an
interpretive question because Amel interpreted that the walking of Buok was not
normal, therefore something might be wrong. If Amel wanted to ask Buok directly
she could have said: Gin e caadhi wa gin nu? ‘Why do you walk like that?’ That
would also have indicated that Amel wanted an answer from Buok.

The two particles, ‘nu’ in (57) and ‘bo’ in (56) are similar but there is a slight
difference between them. Nu expresses a situation that has already occurred or is
underway at the time of speaking and a person is amazed by that situation, while bo
expresses a situation which seems not to be believable.
4.3.4 Alternative questions

In alternative questions where the expected response is yes or no, both the affirmative and negative are expressed in a form of alternative request.

(58) Buok nē pāājō nē, wale nē yī pu₂dhō?  
Buok is home QM, or is in farm?  
‘Is Buok at home or is he on the farm?’

(59) Buok nē pāājo nē, wale nē yī pu₂dho wale a- cī naam?  
Buok is home QM or is in farm or perf go river  
‘Is Buok at home, or is he on the farm or has he gone to the river?’

The structural form of alternative yes/no questions in Luwo differs slightly from the simple yes/no questions. In the simple yes/no questions, the question marker ne occurs at the end of the sentence, as in (48)-(49). In alternative questions, the question particle occurs immediately after first alternative question. At the same time, the question marker still maintains the falling tone. (There are three ne(s) in (59), one with falling tone and two with mid tone. They are not the same because each has different function. Ne with the falling tone is the question particle, while ne(s) with mid tone are auxiliary verbs).

(60) Buok ne pāājo nē, *wale yī pu₂dho* nē *wale a- cī naam* nē  
Buok is home QM *or in farm* QM *or perf go River* QM  
‘Is Buok at home, or he is on the farm or he has gone to the river’.

(60) shows that the question particle is not repeated in the alternative yes/no questions. When there are more than two alternatives in the same sentence, the question mark particle occurs only in the first question, and will never occur in the other alternatives.

4.3.5 Focused yes/no questions

Focused yes/no questions are the type of questions used when all the specific elements of the state or event are well known, but the epistemic of the state of event is still in doubt.
In (61), the focus is on meat. The speaker is aware about all the elements, such as the availability of meat and the presence of Buok. He is also aware that Buok has roasted something, but the question is whether that thing is meat or yam. Hence, the focus is on what Buok has roasted. There is no particular marker for the focus apart from the high tone on Riŋó 'meat' which is the point of focus. Also the constituent order shows that Riŋó 'meat' is the focus because it is at the beginning of the sentence. If Buok was the focus, then Buok would be at the beginning of the sentence.

(61) Riŋó e naa a-bul Buok -e ne? PVA
Meat is that Perf roast Buok he QM
'Is it meat that Buok roasted?'

In focused yes/no questions, the question particle also appears once even if there are alternative questions. The structural form is the same as that of the alternative questions. In (62) there is another focus marker naa which gives more weight to the first word Riŋó 'meat' than the last word lum 'grass'.

(62) Riŋó e naa a-bul Buok -e nè wale a-cwiny lum? PAV/
Meat it focus perf roast Buok he QM or perf burn grass?
'Has Buok roasted meat or has he burned grass?'

In (63), Buok is the focus since he occurs at the beginning of the sentence. In (62), the subject occurs immediately after the verb and the object is fronted in the sentence, while in (63) the object occurs after the verb and the focused subject is in the beginning of the sentence.

(63) Buok e naa a-bul riŋó nè wale yaa moogo PVA/A
Buok he marker perf roast meat QM or person another
'Has Buok roasted meat or has somebody else roasted it'.

4.4 QUESTION-WORD QUESTIONS

Payne (1997, 299) defines question-word questions as the types of questions in which a more elaborate response is expected than simply an affirmation or
disaffirmation. These types of questions are called content questions or information questions because they seek from the hearer some missing information. In Luwo, the question words have high tone while a falling intonation occurs on the final word of the question phrase. The question word ɣaâ ‘who’ is only used for humans, and the question word gin ‘what’ is used for non-human. Generally, question words are used in interrogative cases, while relative pronouns are used in declarative cases. Structurally, table 7 shows that there is no great difference between subject and object relative pronouns except that in the human object and the generic relative pronouns, there is a consonant ‘n’ in the end of the word, while it is not there in the human subject pronoun.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question word</th>
<th>Relative pronoun</th>
<th>Meaning in English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ɣaâ</td>
<td>ɣaâ</td>
<td>human, subject or object ‘who’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gin</td>
<td>gin</td>
<td>non-human ‘which’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>keé</td>
<td>kaa/ke</td>
<td>location. ‘where’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>baŋgin</td>
<td>baŋ</td>
<td>reason. ‘why’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nadjí</td>
<td>kaa</td>
<td>manner ‘how’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wγénè</td>
<td>naa/ne</td>
<td>time ‘when’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mawγénè</td>
<td>maa</td>
<td>generic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.1 Functional dimension

In question-word questions, there is an element of focus which can be subject, object, verb, predicate, adverbs, indirect object, time, place, manner, and reason among others. (64) presents the basic declarative sentence with focus on the child.

(64) Declarative

Nyethiin a̱ lor Buok -e newaaro paar ruodh. OVS
Child Perf receive Buok he yesterday. house chief.

‘Buok received the child yesterday in the house of the chief.’
In the subject case, the question-word occurs at the beginning of the sentence as in (65), and in the declarative form the name *Buok* occurs at the beginning of the sentence (66). This indicates that there is no difference between interrogative form and declarative form in terms of word order.

(65) **Subject question-word**

\[ yaa \ e \ naa \ a-\lor \ nyethiin? \quad \text{SVO} \]

Who is that perf receive child?
‘Who is the one that received the child?’

In (66), the name *Buok* occurs at the beginning of the sentence, occupying the same position where the question-word has been. As the question *yaa* ‘who’ has been the focus in (65), hence *Buok* is the focus in (66). He takes the same position of the question word.

(66) **Buok e naa a- lor nyethiin.** SVO

Buok is that perf receive child.
‘Buok is the one that received the child.’

(67) adds more emphasis to the focus. The relative pronoun *yaa* strengthens the already emphasized phrase *e naa* ‘is the one’.

(67) **Buok e naa yaa a- lor nyethiin.**

Buok is that who perf receive child.
‘Buok is the one who received the child.’

The question-word (68) in the case object is questioned differs from the case where subject is questioned of the subject/object order. The systematic order in (65) is SVO, while it is (OVS) in (68).

(68) **Object question-word**

\[ yaa \ e \ naa \ a-\lor \ Buok-e? \quad \text{OVS} \]

Whom is that perf receive Buok he?
‘Whom did Buok receive?’
The answer (69) to the interrogative (68) in the case of object question-word is similar to that of the subject question-word (66). Both the subject and object nouns occur in the beginning of the sentence. However, when the noun occurring at the beginning is subject, then there is no suffix ‘e’ after the object noun at the end of the sentence (66), but if the noun occurring at the beginning is object, then there is suffix ‘e’ after the subject noun at the end of the sentence (69). An answer to (68) can also be with a relative pronoun yaan as in (70).

(69) Nyethiin e naa a- lor Buok-e.
    Child is that perf receive Buok he
    ‘It is the child that Buok received.’

Note that the relative clause in (70) is yaan. This is because child is the object, therefore the object relative clause is used.

(70) Nyethiin e naa yaan a- lor Buok-e.
    Child is that who perf receive Buok he
    ‘The child is the one that Buok received’

(71) Predicate question-word

In the predicate case, the focus is on what Buok did to the child. From (65) & (68), it is shown that the question-words of the focus occur at the beginning of the sentence. In the case of a predicate question-word, the order of the question is the same as that of declarative. In (72) the verb lor ‘receiving’ occurs at the beginning of the sentence because it is the focused element. (71) shows the interrogative gin focusing on the predicate. This means that in the answer to interrogative questions the noun of focus always replaces the question-words in Luwo.

(71) Gin e naa a- yug Buok -e yihr nyethiin?
    What is that perf did Buok he to child?
    ‘What did Buok do to the child?’
(72) L̄or e naa a- yug Buok-e yir nyethiin.
Receiver is that perf do Buok it for child.
‘Receiving is what Buok did for the child.’

The auxiliaries e and naa, are playing an important role in the question because of their nature of indefiniteness. There is only one question word for ‘who’, ‘whom’ and ‘whose’. This word is yaa.

(73) Indirect object question-word

yaa e naa a- yug Buok -e lor yire?
Whom is that perf do Buok he receiving for?
‘For whom did Buok do receiving?’

We have realized that in case of real objects, the question words occur in the beginning of the sentence. However, this is not the case with the manner, time and place question words. They occur at the end of the sentence. There is also absence of the auxiliaries e and naa because the question is not about a person or a thing.

(74) Manner question-word

Nyethiin a- lor Buok -e nadji?
Child perf receive Buok he how?
‘How did Buok receive the child?’

In answer to the question of manner (75), the question-word nadji is being replaced with the relative pronoun kaa, then the relative pronoun is followed by the manner stating how the child was received. The first suffix -e that occurs after the subject Buok refers to the subject himself, while the second suffix -e that occurs at the end of the sentence refers to the child. (76) gives more clarification about this.

(75) Nyethiin a- lor Buok -e kaa dheyoon lagd bay -e.
Child perf receive Buok he by Way fast to him.
‘Buok received the child by the way of going fast to him’
When *nyethiih* 'child' was changed from singular in (75) to plural in (76), the suffix -e at the end of the sentence changed from -e (singular) to *gen* (plural) which indicates that these affixes refer to the children.

(76) *Nyethen a- lor Buok -e kaa dheyoo laqd bay gen*  
Children perf receive Buok he by way fast to them  
'Buok received the children by the way of going to fast to them'

The question about time is almost like the question about manner. The question word occurs at the end of the sentence and the constituent order of the answer is the same.

(77) **Time question-word**

*Nyethiih a- lor Buok -e wëgene? OVS*  
Child perf receive Buok he when?  
'When did Buok receive the child?'

In answer to the question about time (78), the question-word *wëgene* is replaced by the preposition *ne* and the time during which *Buok* received the child is stated.

(78) *Nyethiih a- lor Buok -e ne wagro. OVS*  
Child perf receive Buok he at yesterday.  
'Buok received the child yesterday'.

Place question is also like the time and manner question in that the question word is at the end of the sentence.

(79) **Place question-word**

*Nyethiih a- lor Buok -e kee? OVS*  
Child perf receive Buok he where?  
'Where did Buok receive the child?'

Answer to a place question is similar to that of a time question (80). The question word *kee* is replaced by the preposition *ke* and the place where *Buok* received the child is mentioned.
(80) **Nyethin a- lør Buok -e ke paajo.**
Child perf receive Buok he at Home.
‘Buok received the child at home’

Again, the reason question is structurally formed like the manner, time and place questions. In (81), reason is the focus, but it occurs at the end of the sentence.

(81) **Reason question-word**

**Nyethin a- lør Buok -e bagin?**
Child perf receive Buok he why?
‘Why did Buok receive the child?’

In answer to the reason question (82), the question word *bagin* is replaced by the pronoun *bay* and the reason why Buok received the child is mentioned. Hence, the answer to the questions of time, place, manner and reason follow a regular system in Luwo. The structural form of answers to questions in Luwo is made by replacing the question word by a corresponding relative pronoun and stating the time, place, manner, and reason.

(82) **Nyethin a- lør Buok -e bay yug qin me beer.**
Child perf receive Buok he because doing thing that good.
‘Buok received the child because of doing something good’.

4.4.2 Cleft and pseudo-cleft questions

Question-word questions often share many of the syntactic characteristics of cleft or pseudo-cleft constructions. As noted in section (4.3.1) above, the question word is the focus of requested information. It is therefore, natural to consider the question words as cleft or pseudo-cleft. Utterances (83-87) below provide further examples of this.

(83) **Neutral declarative**

**Amel a- niid Buok -e.**
Amel perf see Buok he.
‘Buok saw Amel’.


(84) Subject cleft question

\[ B\underline{\text{ee}}da \ yaa \ e \ n\underline{aa} \ a- \ niid \ Amel? \]

\[ \text{SVO} \]

Is WHO is that Perf see Amel?

'WHO is it that saw Amel?'

(85) Object cleft question

\[ B\underline{\text{ee}}da \ yaa \ e \ n\underline{aa} \ a- \ niid \ Buok \ -e? \]

\[ \text{OVS} \]

Is WHO one that perf see Buok he?

'WHOM was it that Buok saw?'

(86) Subject pseudo-cleft question

\[ yaa \ a- \ niid \ Amel \ b\underline{ee}da \ yaa? \]

\[ \text{SVO} \]

The one perf see Amel is WHO?

'The one that saw Amel is WHOM?'

(87) Object pseudo-cleft question

\[ yaa \ a- \ niid \ Buok \ -e \ b\underline{ee}da \ yaa? \]

\[ \text{OVS} \]

The one perf see Buok he is WHO?

'The one that Buok saw is WHO?'

Outlining the connection between the word questions and cleft construction in such interrogatives is important for understanding the prefixing and suffixing of pronouns.

In (84), the interrogative is not about the one who was seen, because she is already known 'Amel'. However, the one who saw her is not known, so the question focuses on that person. In (85), it is known that Buok has seen somebody, but the question is about that person. Who is he/she? Luwo does not differentiate between masculine and feminine. No separate question words or pronouns for each.

In the subject cleft question in (84) and object cleft question (85) there are differences concerning the systematic word-order. The systematic order in (84) is SVO, while it is OVS in (85). There is no specific particle in the case of object focus. It is also the same in the case of pseudo-cleft questions.
4.5 INDIRECT INTERROGATIVES

Syntactically, indirect interrogatives look like yes/no questions in that the expected answer can be yes or no. However, the intention of the speaker behind the question may be deeper than that. The real intention is reached through interpretive use.

(88) is syntactically a question. By saying this, two illocutionary acts are being performed. The primary illocutionary act is the act of asking the person who is near the spear to assure whether he/she is able to reach the spear. This is called the ‘primary or non-literal act’. However, there is another illocutionary act which can be formed by this utterance, it is called ‘secondary or literal illocutionary act’. The person who has made this utterance might have been making a request. Such cases are many in the Luwo culture, particularly when a person doesn’t want to send the one near the spear for one reason or another.

(88) ăngg gîn-nu rôm-i kaa dëdëdo ne?
Spear that near able you to catch QM
‘Can you catch/hold that spear?’

(89) is also a real question where the expected answer is yes or no. But the speaker has another intention behind the question. It may be the house has some defect, for example a crack, and the speaker has seen that crack. At the same time, the hearer knows that there is a crack in the wall of the house he is building. In this situation, the question is a warning to the hearer that it is a risk to build a house with crack on it. There no specific particle to show the intention of the speaker, but the context shows that such a question has an intention of warning.

(89) ągi dâdd bar maalo ke ęgër wod -nu ne?
You want go up with build house that QM
‘Do you want to continue building that house?’
(90) is also a question that expects an answer with yes or no. Such questions are common between young boys and their fathers in the Luwo community. The main activity is farming, and if a son wants to go to the farm he can take permission from his father by uttering such question. The question expresses the will of the listener and not the speaker. So the real intention is whether the listener is willing that the hearer goes to the farm or not. This shows a high degree of respect from the son’s side.

(90) Cidh-a yi puqdho ne?
    Go-1st sg to farm QM
'Should I go to the farm?'

4.6 OTHER TYPES OF QUESTIONS

4.6.1 Rhetorical questions

Rhetorical questions are types of question where no answer is expected. Both the speaker and the hearer may know the answer, but the speaker is basically trying to communicate a statement for reminding the hearer about the situation.

A man promises his wife that he will not go out during evening hours. But one day in late evening he took his spear and started to walk out and his wife says (91).

(91) Gin e naa a- rob i necayi?
    What had That perf say you last?
'What did you say last time?'

This type of question does not need any answer. Of course the wife knew what the husband had said, so she is not requesting any information from the husband. This is a rhetorical question and it functions as a reminder to a situation that known already by both the speaker and the hearer. It does not need any response.
4.6.2 Guess questions

In guess questions the speaker always knows the answer, so the question cannot be a request for information. At the same time the hearer does not know the answer. The answer he/she gives can only be a guess.

Such questions in the Luwo community are used as entertainment or games between little children and youth. A person may hold something in one of his hands and asks another person to guess the hand that has something. Syntactically, guess questions have an imperative form in Luwo, and the word *caar* 'guess' is usually used.

(92) *Caar ciɣ nee yee.*
    Guess hand In it.
    'Guess the hand in which it is'.

4.6.3 Surprise questions

Surprise questions are the type of question arising out of surprise because of an event that a person has not expected. No answer is expected for such questions. Surprise questions are widely used by the Luwo. Usually they occur when information is given (93) and the addressee is moved by surprise to hear that information.

(93) *Buok: wod a- waay.*
    Buok: house Perf burnt
    'The house has burnt'

In (94) although Amel has properly heard what Buok has said, she expresses her attitude by a surprise question. This question does not mean that Buok is required to repeat what he has said. But usually an affirmation is made by ‘yes’ to confirm the second part of the surprise. The difference between (94) and the yes/no question is
that in the yes/no question the speaker doesn’t know the answer, while in (94) the speaker knows the answer.

(94) Amel: yi rob gìn? Wod a- waay ne!
Amel 2nd sg Say what? House perf burn QM
‘What do you say! The house has burned?’

4.6.4 Expository question

In expository questions, the writer or the speaker asks questions to arouse the audience’s interest in an answer that he/she plans to give. They are types of questions for paving the way to give more attention to the matter.

Some people among the Luwo are fond of using expository questions. For example, in the course of discussion a young man is trying to persuade a lady for marriage, and the discussion gets heated, so the young man says (95).

(95) A u- rob gìn yi r -i aw ànî?
1st sg fut say what to 2nd sg now?
‘What will I tell you now?’

In question (95), the question does not mean that the young man doesn’t know what to say. It is just a way of introducing a new argument. The young man will continue after that question by a statement like ‘well you know...’ which is an answer to his expository question.

4.6.5. Self addressed questions

Self-addressed questions are wondering or crying out questions, mostly addressed to an audienceless situation.

These types of questions are also widely used by the Luwo people. A person who is in a certain dilemma always directs questions to him/herself.

(96) A u- tii gìn aw ànî?
1st sg fut do what now?
‘What will I do now?’
It does not mean that a person knows what he/she will do, but yet a person may continue to ask such questions.

4.7 SUMMARY OF CHAPTER FOUR

In section 4.3 yes/no questions were examined with the functional dimension of the yes/no questions discussed in 4.3.1, tag questions in 4.3.2, echoic questions in 4.3.3, alternative questions in section 4.3.4, and focused questions in 4.3.5. Question-word questions were discussed in 4.4, with the functional dimension of the question-word question reviewed in 4.4.1, and cleft and pseudo-cleft questions were reviewed in 4.4.2. Indirect interrogatives were discussed in 4.5, and other types of questions were discussed in 4.6.
CHAPTER FIVE

IMPERATIVE SPEECH ACTS

5.1 INTRODUCTION

Chapter five examines imperative speech acts. Imperatives are discussed under two main sections. Section 5.2 defines imperative speech acts, and section 5.3 presents the relevance theoretic approach to speech acts. The discussion centers on reviewing structural forms of imperatives in Luwo, how imperatives are marked, and what semantic senses do the imperatives communicate in different contexts.

5.2 DEFINITION OF IMPERATIVE SPEECH ACTS

Crystal (1992, 182) defines the imperative as “a grammatical mood recognized in language where the verb is inflected, used in the expression of commands”.

Hence, the imperative is a grammatical category, typically expressed by verb inflection, used to indicate what a speaker is doing with a proposition in a particular discourse situation. There are three aspects to the imperative, namely i) the speaker who utters P intends that P is a desirable state of affairs, ii) the desired state of affairs may be desirable to the speaker, the hearer, or someone else, and iii) the speaker believes that P is desirable.

In imperatives, mood normally identifies the status of an utterance. For example, an utterance may be indicative (the usual form), imperative (a command), hortative (an exhortation), or subjunctive (a subordination). Mood is also referred to as a modality or mode, especially when inflectional forms are not involved. In Luwo
as in any other language, modal auxiliaries are verb-like which typically express speaker’s attitudes toward the factual content of an utterance.

(97) is an imperative speech act. An element of prototypical use is involved, whose main intention is to get someone do something. The hearer is told to go home, and the language used is very strong. This is prototypically a command form made according to desirability of the speaker. At no point is there expectation that the addressee will not go home, or otherwise the intention of the speech act is a failure.

(97) Buok, cidh -i paajo.
Buok, go 2nd sg home.
‘Buok, go home’.

(97) shows that an imperative in Luwo employs an explicit pronoun in reference to the addressee (you). Instead of ‘go home!’ as the case in English, the Luwo has the structure of ‘go (you) home’. It is not always the case that such a pronoun is made explicit. Sometimes imperative forms can be uninflected as in (98).

(98) Buok, hgen kan.
Buok, come here.
‘Buok, come here’.

The imperative form in this case is uninflected. There is no any explicit pronoun employed unlike the case in (97). The imperative intention still give the same force as that in (97). Sometimes employing an explicit pronoun as in (97) or leaving it out as in (98) is a matter of emphasis. A person who wants to stress the imperative may add an explicit pronoun. Such strong commands as in (97) and (98) cannot be uttered by a child or a young person to an elder person. Age is greatly respected in Luwo culture. Strong commands like that must have an authoritative element from the side of the speaker. (97) and (98) indicate that a person who is speaking to Buok must be of his age-mate or older then him.
The above outlined analysis is a type of analysis of the imperative that relevance theory cannot accept without some modification. Relevance theory looks at such utterances from the perspective of different degrees ranging from an order or command, which is a stronger type of directive compared, to a request. Relevance theory looks at utterances like (97) and (98) as an attempt to get the hearer do something. The question in this argument is whether the Luwo express request cases in the same way they do with commands and orders. Supposing that Amel was a wife of Buok and she wanted him to come in she would say (99).

(99) *Yi rom *been wod ne?
    2nd sg can come house QM
    ‘Is it possible that you can come in?’

Usually it is the structure that shows whether an utterance is an order or request. A request usually takes the form of interrogative in order to show a sign of respect. The interrogative is exactly the same as that provided in section 4.4, but the meaning is imperative. It is the context that provides an assumption to interpret the meaning as imperative. Hence, it is not possible in Luwo to interpret utterances such as (97) and (98) as request. In (99), although it is the desirability of the speaker for the addressee to enter, yet she is asking whether the addressee is willing to enter.

Palmer (1986, 29-30) maintains that the strong directive force used in a military command, is not a property of the imperative as such, but arises from the recognized authority of the speaker. Palmer adds that when a person says, ‘Come in!’ in reply to a knock at the door it is not strongly a directive, but it gives permission. According to Palmer, the basic meaning of the imperative is the expression of the favorable attitude to the action indicated.
5.3 RELEVANCE THEORETIC APPROACH TO IMPERATIVE SPEECH ACTS

Sperber and Wilson (1995, 79) argue that mood cannot be satisfactorily analyzed as a conventional indicator of force, although they say “it is possible to assign the moods some intrinsic semantic content that would lay a satisfactory account of force”. They add (79) that mood is simply understood by “knowing the range of speech acts it is conventionally or standardly, used to perform”. This means that mood signs classify sentences according to the speech acts to which they are assigned by the convention which gives meaning to those signs. Sperber and Wilson refute the claim that imperative utterances are exclusively used to get the hearer to perform the action described by the proposition expressed. There can be cases of advice, permission, threats and dares, good wishes and audienceless cases where the speaker may not care whether the addressee performs the action or not. These all are processed relative to formal marks of the imperative speech act.

A passerby asking for the road is directed in a certain way as in (100). In (100), the passerby is advised to take a specific road. If the passerby changes his/her mind and does not take that road, it will not bother the speaker. This shows that it is not an attempt by the speaker to get the addressee to carry out the action, but it is relevant for the hearer’s point of view.

(100) Advice

\[ Cidh \; -i \; ke \; y\text{\textipa{gg}}n \; -nu. \]

Go 2\textsuperscript{nd} sg with road that.

'Take that road straight'

In (101), a child asks his mother indirectly if he can go out to play, and the mother replies to the child as in (102) with an imperative form. Such an imperative form is permission. The mother was not instructing the child to go
out, but the mother is giving permission for the child to go out. The mother would not care whether the child performs the act or not. The permission is reinforced by *arumo* 'then'. *Arumo* adds the force that the child might have asked the mother frequently and at last he has been given permission.

(101) Permission

A *daad* ci *wogo* ne *tuo*.  
1st sg want go out to play

‘I want to go out to play.’

(102) *Cidh* -*i* *wogo* *arumo*.  
Go 2nd sg out then

‘Go out then’

(103) is not to make an attempt for somebody to try something. In fact, it is the opposite. Such utterances are common between two people who confront each other. The speaker is threatening the hearer that if he/she tries it he/she will bear the consequence. The structure of threat is different from the structure of making an attempt for a person to do the action.

(103) Threats

*Tu* *yo* do.  
Try it Then.

‘Try to do it’

In the case of an attempt for a person to do the action (104), there is no particle *do* as in the case of threat. This marks the different between the two. *Do* is no an ideophone because all the cases of Luwo ideophones are preceded by the preposition *ne*.

(104) *Tji* *yo*.  
Do it

‘Do it’
The entire Luwo land has a lengthy rainy season. Sometimes the rains may continue from morning to evening, or even two days. People usually get tired of such rain and they utter something like (105). They address rain as mother. Although being audienceless, they plead for rain to stop. The particle naa `oh' gives the strength of the plea.

**(105) Audienceless cases**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Cumu} & \quad -i \quad \text{këgo} \quad \text{naa} \quad \text{mii} \quad -a. \\
\text{Stop} & \quad 2^\text{nd} \text{ sg} & \quad \text{oh} & \quad \text{mother} & \quad \text{my}.
\end{align*}
\]

`Stop then oh mother'

(106) is a case of hatred. Somebody who is sitting at home and sees a person he/she hates coming; he/she utters (106). The coming of that person is already taking place. ‘Come with those feet of yours’ has an element of insult, probably ‘such bad feet which come to my place’. The speaker hates the one who is coming, but no action is expected. The situation is not under control of the speaker, while in (103) the situation is under control of the speaker. If the hearer tries to come, then he/she will bear the consequence, likely from the speaker.

**(106) Predetermined cases**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Bëgo} & \quad \text{ke} \quad \text{tien} & \quad -i \quad \text{nëono}.
\end{align*}
\]

`Come with those feet of yours'.

### 5.4 INDIRECT IMPERATIVE SPEECH ACTS

Sperber and Wilson (1986, 88) argue that interpretive resemblance is a matter of degree. It can be possible that two objects do not bear any interpretive resemblance to each other, that they do not share any analytical or contextual implication. In other instances there can be full identity of analytical and contextual implication. For
example, utterance $p$ is a literal interpretation of $q$ if and only if $p$ and $q$ share all their implications. Utterances are used to represent the thought of the speakers.

However, Wilson and Sperber argue that the expectation crucial to communication is not that of truthfulness but that of optimal relevance, where an utterance communicates enough contextual implications to be worth the hearer’s attention. They say loose talk and metaphor may satisfy the expectation of optimal relevance in some imperative utterances.

(107) \[ \text{Paag} \quad \text{to} \quad -i \quad \text{beer.} \]
\[ \text{Sharpen spear 2nd sg Carefully.} \]

‘Sharpen your spear carefully’

In processing the metaphor in (107) regarding encyclopedic knowledge of a Luwo man about hunting, the hearer may get a number of implications, such as “you should not stay idle but you must go hunting”, “you should have meat at home”, “do not look on others to provide you with meat” etc. Sharpening the spear may also mean “be a skilled fighter”. But according to relevance theory, there should be one interpretation consistent with the assumption that the speaker aims at optimal relevance. The relevant interpretation should be the one easily recovered from the utterance. In this case, the Luwo speaker is mostly associated with hunting. The Luwo rarely use spears in fighting. The common tool for fighting for a Luwo man is a thick stick.

The literal meaning of (107) can be advice, instruction or a request to a person to sharpen his spear. But the Luwo will not always take such utterance with its literal meaning. This is because the utterance has shifted from its literal meaning and has become metaphorically used. Examples such as (107) are desirable to the addressee. The speaker would not care if the addressee acts or not, but it would be for the benefit of the addressee to act.
(108) is another type of interpretive imperative. (Jaaj is a blade of certain type of cultivating tool that is slightly different from a hoe. This tool has been translated here as ‘hoe’ because both have the same function). The immediate meaning processed from this utterance according to the context implication is that the addressee should work hard in on his farm. He should cultivate and produce plenty.

(108) Mag jaaj teeg mee.
    Hold hoe firm mee.
    ‘Hold the hoe firmly indeed’

However, there are other contextual implications involved in the process of interpretation. Always such an utterance is linked to a particular cause. Two causes are prominent in processing this utterance:

i. Sometimes some people eat a lot while still young and they are reluctant to work hard in the field. In such circumstances, a person who eats a lot and is lazy at the same time would be told to hold the hoe firmly. It is like saying that a person should not eat a lot when he doesn’t know how to cultivate properly.

ii. Sometimes a man marries a wife who is extravagant. The wife does not know how to store things properly and she gives out randomly. In that case, the husband would be told to hold the hoe firmly so that he may have plenty. If he has plenty, his things would not run out even if the wife is extravagant.

Structural forms of (107) and (108) are imperative in form but both have interpretive extension of meaning.

Besides declarative sentences, other types such as imperatives can express an indirect speech act. Let’s consider example (109).

(109) Cup riyo piny necud ubar guwq yo.
    Put meat ground simply seize dog it.
    ‘Put the meat down carelessly and the dog would pick it’
Structurally, (109) is an order. It looks as if a person is being ordered to put down the meat so that the dog may pick it up to eat. This is the direct meaning that may be understood from this utterance. However, there is an indirect meaning. In Luwo, such an utterance can be a threat, particularly from parents to their children. According to Relevance Theory, when a mother says this utterance to a child, the child will immediately understand that he is being threatened that if he leaves the meat down carelessly for a dog to eat, he will be beaten. The extended meaning is processed from both the context and the encyclopedic knowledge about the relation between dogs and meat.

In structural form, (109) is similar to (103). Both examples also express an indirect meaning, usually warning. But in the Luwo context, (103) is used as a threat for children with another extended meaning of teaching. However, (109) is not necessarily for children and it has no other indirect meaning besides warning.

(110) *Bar maalo ke tuuo yi kɔdh -nu.*
Go up with play in rain that.

‘Continue to play in that rain’

The literal meaning obtained from (110) is an order or command. Luwo children are fond of playing while it is raining. The parents are usually worried with such a situation. So a father or mother seeing a child playing in the rain can utter (110). The intention of the father or mother is not to tell the child to continue playing in the rain, but it is the opposite. It is a warning that the child should immediately stop playing in the rain.

From all these examples, one can conclude that Luwo language is lexically rich and capable of expressing various circumstances using a certain linguistic form such as imperative to communicate other interpretive meanings.
5.5 SUMMARY OF CHAPTER FIVE

Besides giving definitions and examining the structural forms of imperatives in Luwo, the relevance theoretic approach to imperative speech acts was examined in section 5.3, where different imperatives such as advice, permission, threats, audienceless and predetermined cases were reviewed. Indirect imperative speech acts were examined in section 5.4.
CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSION

Interpretation of non-declarative speech acts, (i.e. the interrogative and imperative), is of great interest to pragmatics in general and to this study in particular. Apart from this focus on non-declarative speech acts, different forms of declarative speech acts have also been discussed. Generally, both declarative and non-declarative speech acts have been discussed, relative to their prototypical function, indirect use, and extended interpretative (echoic) uses.

In chapter two, some examples of indirect declarative sentences and echoic use have been cited to illustrate more clearly the definition of certain terms. More discussion of indirect declarative sentence and echoic use was made in chapter three. Our concern at this point was on particles which mark certain attitudes relating to the speech act. Three separate particles namely mu, tudi, and wa are used to express these different attitudes. Mu is used as an assertion for a particular situation, especially in the case of warning, while tudi and wa are used to express temporary attitude of disapproval (see 2.2).

Direct declarative sentences give direct information. But in some cases they involve weak implicatures, such as indirect declarative speech acts 3.4; and echoic declaratives in 3.5. Direct declarative sentences in Luwo are grammatically unmarked by any devices. In terms of aspect, the present tense of declarative clause in Luwo is not marked by any device, while the past tense is marked by prefix α- and the future tense is marked by prefix μ-. The degree of information the direct declaratives give various from 'probably' to full commitment. Such variation is the concern of mood.
In Luwo, ‘probably’ is expressed by the particle *nee*, which nearly translates as ‘if’ in English. The commitment degree, however, is expressed by *dhiil*, close in meaning to ‘must’ in English (see section 3.3).

Performative verbs have also been discussed. They are not many in Luwo, but few of them are common. The verb for naming a child is the obvious example of a performative verb in Luwo. Performative verbs differ from the normal verbs in that they tend to take the form of the past tense, but they express a present state of affairs. They are marked by *a*- the prefix for past tense or perfective case.

Concerning the indirect declarative speech acts, the structural form does not show any difference between them and the prototypical declarative speech act. It is the context that plays a major role in processing declarative speech acts as ‘indirect’ in Luwo since contexts have almost become conventional ideals for the interpretation of the assumptions needed to interpret the speech act indirectly.

Metarepresentation relative to declarative speech acts in Luwo turns out to be very rich in expression of different attitudes with certain poetic effects. Structurally, the attitude of approval is expressed by adding an independent suffix *-mon* at the end of the sentence. This approval is marked by echoing the original sentence plus the independent suffix *-mon*. Meanwhile, echoing a sentence and adding suffix *-e* with a low tone expresses the attitude of wondering (see section 3.4). Echoing a sentence with a high tone final word, gives the attitude of disapproval. Another independent prefix particle, *ce*- is used to imply that what the speaker has said is not true.

In discussion of the interrogative cases in Luwo in section 4.3, it has been found that the predominant particle, which marks yes/no questions is *ne*. This particle is present in questions expecting the answer ‘yes’, and questions expecting the answer ‘no’. The tone on *ne* is always low; hence it possible to drop *ne* but maintain the tone
level and the question still holds. *Ne* is only used once in an interrogative expression, which may be comprised of more than one sentence. This includes the alternative questions which have multiple embedded alternatives. Word order structure does not play any role in marking yes/no questions in Luwo. The order of interrogative is the same as that of declarative. Tag questions are expressed by the use of additional tag words, such as *kare!* ‘isn’t it’ and *tooda!* ‘Am I lying’. Tag words occur at the end of the sentence.

Regarding question-word questions, it has been discovered that there are seven ‘wh-question words’ in Luwo. Each question word has a corresponding subject and object relative pronoun in the expected answer. The subject and object relative pronouns are similar to each other except that there is consonant *n* at the end of the human object relative pronoun, while it is not there in the human subject relative pronoun. (see section 4.5). There are ‘wh-question words’ for persons, with no gender differences, for things, place, time, manner, and reason. The places occupied by the wh-question words in interrogative utterances tend to be the same as those occupied by relative pronouns in case of declarative sentences.

Regarding expression of attitudes, two particles *bo* and *mu* have been shown to occur at the end of sentences (see section 4.2). In both cases, no answer is expected to the question. However, the two particles were found to be different in that one of them *bo* expresses surprise for an event that has never occurred, while *mu* expresses an attitude about an event that has already occurred or is underway.

Indirect interrogatives also exist in Luwo and may only be interpreted upon knowledge of the contexts. No specific particles are involved to help interpret such questions.
Concerning investigation of imperative speech acts in Luwo, it has been discovered that the imperative verb form can employ some explicit pronouns or not (see 4.3.3). The basic imperative form tends always to be strongest, command or order, while the explicit form (where the pronoun is stated explicitly) tends to be a ‘soft’ request or plea. No further devices are used in the imperative cases. It is the context that helps in interpretation of the extended senses of the indirect imperative clauses like that of the declarative and interrogative clauses.

All the three speech act types (declaratives, interrogatives and imperatives) employ a variety of devices that express different degrees of desirability to the speaker, the hearer or someone else. However, in contrast to non-declarative speech acts, declarative speech acts have been found to display a variety of grammatical devices that modify the basic function of the speech act, particularly in the area of metarepresentation and echoic use. Imperatives are the least marked clauses in the Luwo language.
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APPENDICES

1.1 APPENDIX ONE: NARRATIVE STORY

This is a narrative folktale story taken from a small book entitled "Learn to Read and Write Luwo: English to Luwo transition primer, trial edition, printed in Khartoum in 1993 by the Luwo Literacy Organization. The story is between two characters, each representing a group of species. The species of the small animals in Luwo is called cignye and the species of insects is called tuŋ. Abaathuuro is a reptile that belongs to the species of cignye and Urweenyo is an insect that belongs to the species of tuŋ.

No great change has been made from the original story. However, some slight changes were made for appropriateness of the discourse and spelling. Each word is glossed and free translation is provided.

_Abaathuuro and Urweenyo_

Abaathuuro and Urweenyo

_Coon Abaathuuro nyethen Urweenyo kedee kwaad tuŋ_

Long ago Abaathuuro children Urweenyo and other insects

moŋe ge na kwaaje kaa ted dhẹẹ. Ca ni, e cignye

others they used repeatedly be pick mouth. Day this, then animals

children of Urweenyo and the children of other insects. One day the small animals

kedea tuŋ dẹẹ amaad me duŋ ayug gene yugo. Yi amaadgın ni bɔŋme

and insects big meeting which big do they do. In meeting thing this law

and insects held a big meeting. In this meeting a strong

tẹŋ arobaa bekid cigny me cag tuŋ ke camo ke.done. Maa abẹẹni

strong said that never animal that again insect to eat again. Then came
decision was made that no any animal shall eat again the small insects. So
Urweenyo umin cwinye keter, ban nyethene ge anaa
Urweenyo glad liver indeed because children his they had
Urweenyo became very glad indeed, because Abaathuuro had

athum Abaathuuroe ke nyamo.
finish Abaathuuro he with eat.
Almost finished his child by eating.

Amaad wije caa ne kreedho, e Urweenyo
Meeting head came to disperse, then Urweenyo
When the meeting dispersed, then Urweenyo

apadh yee ke waadh e no ulwii o ke warka me tar
start road with walk while he whistle with song in very white
came out and started to walk in an open place while singing by whistling.

newesi. Maa abesn Abaathuuroe ugle ree oogo yidh booge kaa
extremely. Then came Abaathuuro he appear himself out in leaves where
Then Abaathuuro came out from its hiding place where he was hiding

anaa apane yea maa apesnye Urweenyo kea,
had hidden in and ask he Urweenyo saying,
and he asked asked urweenyo saying,

"Nye Urweenyo, gin e naaatupl tin ge caadhi
"You Urweenyo, what is that happen today as walk you
"Behold Urweenyo, what has happened today as you walk

ke ka metar newesi maa yi ulqwii o ke war do?"
in a very white place and you whistle with song do?"
in an open place while you are singing by whistling do?"

Maa abesr Urweenyo e kea,
Then replied Urweenyo heit saying,
Then Urweenyo replied to him saying,

"Gin me beer ree ayuge tin wa. Amaada yug
"Thing which good self happen today wa. Meeting done
"Something good has happened today wa. A meeting has been held

kedea no arob yi amaad kejea gaa ke ciemy me
and it said in meeting that never a animal that
and it has been said in that meeting that no any animal
cag wade ke nyamo keedo”. again relative to eat again.”
shall eat its relative again”.

Maa abeer Abaathuuroe no kea,
Then replied Abaathuuro he it saying,
Then Abaathuuro replied saying,

“E naa gin pari noono bo. Naa ayug amaad e
“Is that thing think you it bo. When done meeting then
“Is it what you think so bo. When the meeting was held

naa cuon ne kaj anudo yi amaad ne?”
person called as hunger present in meeing ne?”

Kaano e Urweenyo wiie pare thiin maa arube
There then Urweenyo head his think short and said he
At that instance then Urweenyo recalled back his memory and said
kea,
that,

“Anag yinkedea naa cuon kaj wu naaa tooro yi
“Was you and person called hunger you (pl) were not in
“It was you (Abaathuuro) and the one called hunger you were not present

amaad mon.”
meeting mon.”
in the meeting mon.”

Maa adog Abaathuuroe rob keedo kea,
Then more Abaathuuro he said again that,
And again Abaathuuro said that,

“Wa gin maa agwiiru tooro”. Noono ukwany
“Wa thing that arrange you (pl) not”. So pick
“Wa you have arranged nothing.” So Abaathuuro

Abaathuuroe Urweenyo ke yi dhee unyame no ne
Abaathuuro Urweenyo into mouth and eat him ne
Picked Urweenyo and threw him in his mouth and ate him ne

keruum keruum.
keruum keruum.
keruum keruum.
1.2 APPENDIX TWO: PROCEDURAL STORY

This short story is a procedural story taken from a Luwo reader entitled \textit{Luub Paajo 1} 'Sayings of the Family 1'. This small booklet was printed in Khartoum in 1995 by the Luwo Literacy Organization. Although it's a procedural story, yet it is full of imperative case, a matter which made it appropriate as one of the texts for this research. Some slight changes have been made for spelling and discourse purpose.

\textit{Kar Mag Wii Wod}
Way of Fixing the Roof

\textit{Neayi daqd wii wod ke maa Peluwo kee yug}
If you want roof house to fix land Luwo then do
If you want to fix the roof of the house in the Luwo land then do

\textit{kwaad gii:}
things following:
the following things:

\textit{Kal kaawe ukoanyipegem piny yi diger wod beere yi}
Bring bamboo and dig high place own in middle house so you
Bring bamboo (small poles) first and dig down high place called (peem) in the

\textit{yedh wii uromi miid wod ke doodo.}
climb on it able you apex house to reach.
middle of the house so that you can reach the apex of the roof.

\textit{Yi waaj ni begda yaa me nyinge Dimeo ge ke}
In story this it is person that name Dimo they with
In this story it is a person called Dimo and

\textit{Koan ge ne mag wii wod. Koanne piny kedea Dimeo}
Koan they to fix roof house. Koan is down and Dimo
Koan are the ones fixing the roof of a house. Koan is down and Dimo

\textit{ne maalo wii pegem. Koan kaawe rwaage ke yir Dimeo}
is up on high place. Koan bamboo give - to Dimo
is up on the high (peem). Koan gives bamboos to Dimo

\textit{naaacielo acielo.}
as one one.
by one

\textit{Naa aqaal Koane ke rwaag kaaw e Dimeo arubo yire}
When delay Koan to give bamboo they Dimo said to him
When Koan delayed to give bamboos then Dimo cried out to him
ke'a,
that,
saying,

"Koa'n, kal kaaw yira piow piow". Diamo abar maalo ke
"Koa'n, bring bamboo to me quick quick". Dimo went up to
"Koa'n, bring to me bamboos quickly quickly". Dimo continued to

rob tięd ke'a,
speak also saying,
speak also saying,

"Cidhi kun caadi ukali thool yira".
"Go you there there and bring ropeto me".
"Go there and bring rope to me".

Kaano e Koan adaqd yedh maalo wiį peem maa acuo Dimoe yo
At that instance Koan wanted climb up on high place and rebuked Dimo him
At that instance Koan wanted to climb up on the high place (peem) but Dimo rebuked

kea,
saying,
him saying,

"Yi kee yedh maalo. Peem utoar ke won".
"You don't climb up. High place will break with us(incl)".
"You don't climb up on. Peem will break with us (incl).

Koono e Koan adopiny ucube kaawe yir Dimo, maa akweer
At that instance Koan returned down and give bamboos to Dimo, and refused
At that instance Koan returned down and gave bamboos to Dimo, but Dimo refused

D MMO kea,
Dimo saying,
saying,

"Kaaw kee kal yira. A dqad pii"
"Bamboo don't bring to me. I want water".
"Don't bring bamboos to me. I want water".

Ge ariįį ne mag wiį uwâdhe yi łaqy caq. Ke thïŋno
They stayed to fix roof until it reached set sun. At evening
They spent long hours while fixing the roof of the house until evening. At evening

e Dīmoe abeġn piny wiį wod urube yir Koan kea,
then Dimo climbed down from roof house and said to Koan that,
then Dimo climbed down from the roof of the house and said to Koan that,
“Awāgni cay aywudho. Cidho paaajo. Abea kuoy nyepinye
"Now sun is set. Let’s go home. But first things
“Now the sun has set down. Let’s go home. But first

ke coyo cay”.
to collect all”.
collect all things”.
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