Asking in Freedom;

Questioning and requesting in [‡]Ākhoe Haillom

by

Gertie Hoymann

A Doctoral Thesis

Submitted to the University of Hamburg, Faculty of Humanities, in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the award of the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Hamburg, 2024

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Roland Kieβling Evaluator: Prof. Dr. Henning Schreiber

Date of defense:

01.11.2024

Declaration on oath

I do hereby declare on oath that this thesis is my own original work and has not been submitted before for any degree award in any other university and that the sources which have been used in this thesis have been acknowledged accordingly.

Contents

AI	BBREVIATIONS	Ι
	Abbreviations used in interlinear glossing	Ι
	Conversational transcript conventions	II
1	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	Goals	1
1.2	2 Introduction to ‡Ākhoe Haillom and its speakers	3
	1.2.1 Genetic affiliation	3
	1.2.2 Project, area and field site	6
	1.2.3 Attitudes towards ‡Ākhoe Haillom	8
	1.2.4 Multilingual context	9
	1.2.5 Previous work on <i>\U00e4</i> Ākhoe Haillom	9
1.3	3 Culture and society	10
	1.3.1 Egalitarianism	10
	1.3.2 Possessions, sharing and the <i>llgâus</i>	11
	1.3.3 A preference for non-coerciveness	13
1.4	Language and interaction	14
	1.4.1 Human interaction	15
	1.4.2 The interaction between language and culture	16
	1.4.3 Speech acts and actions	19
	1.4.3.1 Questions and their functions	21
	1.4.3.2 Requests, politeness and contingency	22
	1.4.3.3 Sequence and action organization	25
	1.4.3.3.1 Question response sequences	26
	1.4.3.3.2 Request sequences	29
1.5	5 Data and methods	31
1.6	5 Summary	33
2	GRAMMATICAL SKETCH	34
2.1	Phonology	34
	2.1.1 Vowels	35
	2.1.2 Consonants	35
	2.1.3 The Syllable	37
	2.1.4 Root and word structure	38

2.1.5 Tone and Stress	39
2.1.6 Orthography	39
2.1.7 Phonemes, sounds, graphemes	39
2.2 Word classes	41
2.2.1 Prior work on word classes	42
2.2.1.1 Dempwolff and Günther on Nama-Damara	43
2.2.1.2 Haacke on Nama-Damara	43
2.2.1.3 Summary	44
2.2.2 Nouns	44
2.2.2.1 Nominal morphology	46
2.2.2.1.1 Nominal derivation	46
2.2.2.1.2 Nominal inflection	48
2.2.2.1.3 Final marking	48
2.2.2.1.4 Noun compounding	52
2.2.2.1.5 Nominal agreement markers	52
2.2.3 Verbs	54
2.2.3.1 Verbal morphology	54
2.2.3.1.1 Verbal derivation	54
2.2.3.1.2 Reduplication	56
2.2.3.1.3 Compound Verbs	57
2.2.4 Auxiliaries	57
2.2.5 Adjectives	59
2.2.6 Demonstratives	61
2.2.7 Personal pronouns vs. definite articles	63
2.2.8 Possessives	64
2.2.9 Numerals and quantifiers	66
2.2.10 Adverbs	67
2.2.11 Conjunctions	68
2.2.12 Postpositions	70
2.2.13 Interjections	70
2.3 Tenses, aspects and moods	71
2.3.1 Tense	71
2.3.2 Aspect	72
2.3.3 Mood	73
2.3.3.1 Imperative	74
2.3.3.2 Hortative	75
2.3.3.3 The particle re	76
2.3.4 Negation	77
2.4 The clause	79
2.4.1 Constituent order	79
2.4.2 Major sentence types	79
2.4.3 Simple clauses	80
2.4.4 Interrogatives	82
2.4.4.1 Content interrogatives	83
2.4.4.1.1 Person	84
2.4.4.1.2 Thing	84

	2.4.4.1.3	Selection (thing)	85
	2.4.4.1.4	Place	85
	2.4.4.1.5	Manner	86
	2.4.4.1.6	Quantity	86
	2.4.4.1.7	Time	86
	2.4.4.1.8	Direction	87
	2.4.4.1.9	Reason	87
	2.4.4.1.10) "What kind of"	87
	2.4.4.2 Pola	ar interrogatives	88
	2.4.4.2.1	Sentence final interrogative marking	88
	2.4.4.2.2	Interrogative particles kha and o	88
	2.4.4.2.3	Other sentence final interrogative markers	89
	2.4.4.3 Alte	ernative interrogatives	90
	2.4.4.4 Inte	progative intonation	91
	2.4.5 Topic and	l focus marking	96
	2.4.6 Nominalis	sed clauses	97
3	QUESTIC	ONS AND RESPONSES	99
3.1	The data		100
3.2	Frequency of	of interrogative types in ‡Ākhoe Haillom	101
3.3	An overview	w of question functions	103
	3.3.1 Information	on Requests	104
	3.3.2 Repair ini	itiations	105
	3.3.2.1 Ope	en-class repair initiations	106
	3.3.3 Requests	for confirmation	109
	3.3.4 Assessme	ents	109
	3.3.5 Challenge	2S	110
	3.3.6 Understar	nding checks	111
	3.3.7 Complain	ts	112
	3.3.8 Broadcast	ts and out-louds	114
	3.3.9 Rhetorica	l questions	117
	3.3.10 Pre-seque	ences	119
3.4	Distribution	of question functions	121
3.5	Responses		122
	3.5.1 Pursuits		124
	3.5.2 Visible re	esponses	128
	3.5.3 Interjectio	on and repeat answers	129
	3.5.3.1 Con	firming answers	132
	3.5.3.2 Dise	confirming answers	133
	3.5.3.3 Rep	beat answers	134

3.6 Hunter-gatherer interactional styles

136

137

3.5.3.4 Interjection answers

4		REQUESTS AND OTHER WAYS OF GETTING WHAT ONE WANTS	142	
	4.1.1 4.1.2	Language predictions based on culture Domain of inquiry	143 144	
4.2		The data	145	
4.3		Requests in ‡Ākhoe Haillom	145	
	4.3.1	Sequence organization in ‡Ākhoe Haillom	148	
4.4		An overview of request practices	151	
4	4.4.1	Taking: non-communicative	152	
	4.4.2	Imperatives	155	
	4.4.3	Gestures: non-verbal direct requests	156	
	4.4.4	Hortatives	160	
	4.4.5	Interrogatives (indirect requests)	162	
	4.4.6	Declaratives (indirect requests)	163	
	4.4.7	A sequence of request strategies (pursuits and upgrading)	165	
4.5		Responses	169	
4.6		Selection of request practice	173	
	4.6.1	Proximity	174	
	4.6.2	The joint activity of the in-group	178	
	4.6.3	Social identity	180	
	4.6.4	Choice of practice dependent on object being requested	184	
4.7		+Ākhoe requests in numbers	189	
4.8		Conclusions	194	
5		# GONA, A CULTURE SPECIFIC ACTION	196	
5.1		Ethnographic definitions of #gona	197	
5.2		+Gona in interaction	199	
	5.2.1	Examples of [‡] gona	200	
	5.2.2	Upgrading [‡] gona	210	
:	5.2.3	Responses	212	
5.3		Culture and #gona	215	
5.4		Conclusions	216	
6		SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	218	
6.1		Possible directions for further research	221	
APPENDIX A			223	
AP	APPENDIX B 22			

APPENDIX C	236
REFERENCES	239
ABSTRACT	251
ZUSAMMENFASSUNG	252

Abbreviations

Abbreviations used in interlinear glossing

1	first person	IMP	imperative
2	second person	INSTR	instrumentation suffix
3	third person	LOC	locative
А	final case marker	М	masculine
ABS	suffix that produces an abstract noun	NEG	negative
ADDR	addressee	OBJ	object agreement marker
AGENT	agentization suffix	PL	plural
APPL	applicative	PASS	passive
ASS	association suffix	PASSSUF	passivisation suffix
AUG	augmentative	PP	postposition
AUX	auxiliary	PST	past
BEC	become, stative in other tenses	PRF	perfective
С	common or neuter	POSS	possessive
COLL	collectivisation suffix	PRIV	privation suffix
COND	conditional	PROG	progressive
CONJ	conjunction	Q	question word or particle
DECL	declarative	RE	re-marker
DEM	demonstrative	RECP	reciprocal
DIM	diminutive	RECPST	recent past
DISC	discussed	SG	singular
DU	dual	STAT	stative
EMPH	emphatic	UNK	unknown
EXL	exclamation	VEN	venitive
F	feminine	VOC	vocative
FUT	future		
HAB	habitual		

I

Conversational transcript conventions

((laughs))	Double round brackets used for non-verbal behaviour.		
[]	Square brackets signify overlapping talk.		
()	Single round brackets signify unclear items of speech.		
=	Equal signs connect a single, continuous utterance.		
	The period sign indicates a final falling intonation.		
,	The comma indicates a final slightly rising intonation.		
?	The question mark indicates a final marked rising intonation.		
1	The upward pointing arrow indicates a rising pitch on whatever follows it.		
LOUD	Capital letters signify a raised or loud voice.		
°soft°	Degree signs mark soft or whispered speech.		
ac <u>cent</u>	Underlining indicates stress or emphasis in a word.		
(.)	A period in brackets indicates a micro pause.		
(0.2)	Numbers in brackets indicate the length of silence in seconds.		
cu-	A hyphen indicates cut off speech.		

1 Introduction

1.1 Goals

The central claim in this thesis is that speakers of $\frac{1}{4}$ khoe Haillom, a Namibian Khoisan language, have a preference for language usage that is non-coercive and non-restrictive of their interactional partners. The evidence for this is visible in the conversational structure discernible in natural interaction between speakers, in the speakers' selection of utterances, in the building blocks speakers make use of to build their utterances, and in the communicative actions themselves that speakers perform.

Interactional conversational data will be used to investigate the influence of the speakers' culture and social organisation on their language use and conversational structure. This thesis will attempt to provide some answers to the questions of whether and how the cultural preference for non-coerciveness and non-restrictiveness of the speakers are reflected in their language use. To answer these questions for $+\bar{A}$ khoe Haillom, this thesis will start with a grammar sketch of the language in chapter 2 and then look specifically at question-answer and requestresponse sequences in naturally occurring conversations in chapters 3 and 4. Questions are one of the most highly researched topics in linguistics and the philosophy of language. The syntax of interrogatives has been crucial to the arguments of generative grammar over many decades, while the corresponding semantics has been explored extensively in formal semantics. This thesis focusses however, on the speech acts of questioning and requesting, that is the usage of interrogatives and other linguistic forms that perform the action of requesting information, products and actions or behaviour from an addressee. Despite a number of complexities that will be addressed in the coming sections, question-answer and request-response sequences have much to offer for the analysis of interaction as they are amongst the more easily identifiable actions often (but not always) recognizable by their interrogative or imperative form, and the specifics of those forms provide important information about language use. Furthermore, these communicative actions predictably bring about recognizable turn transitions and thus they provide important insights into the investigation of conversational structure. The structures of conversation and language use occur in their most unmarked form in natural conversations and are therefore most fruitfully investigated using natural multi-party conversational data. In addition to questions and requests, in chapter 5, a culture specific communicative act called #gona will be investigated with the purpose of shedding light on the question of possible culture specific conversational structures, as this action includes nonverbal communicative elements of a physical and gestural nature.

In chapters 3 and 4 $\pm \bar{A}$ khoe Haillom is approached using an etic viewpoint, examining the language and behaviour from outside the cultural and language system (Pike, 1967) The concepts of questions and requests are

taken to be universal and are used to examine the language. In chapter 5 on the other hand, an emic approach is taken, examining the language and behaviour from inside the cultural system by studying a behavioural concept that speakers themselves define.

This thesis will be particularly relevant for the disciplines of African linguistics, pragmatics and ethnology. In the field of African linguistics, the focus has often been on descriptive grammar writing and historical linguistics in an effort to get the numerous languages of that vast continent described and sorted. Studies have often used traditional elicitation methods and have missed the incomparable richness that natural conversational data can add to a grammatical description. This thesis will show that including conversational data is crucial in order to achieve an adequate description of a language: a description that is not restricted to the possible grammatical constructions of a language but also has something to say about the actual use of these constructions, their frequency, the situations in which they are and are not used, etc. In addition, this research shows that the diversity of the cultures and societies in Africa contribute greatly to the quest for universals that is underway in the field of interaction and conversation research.

Researchers in the field of pragmatics will find this thesis to be relevant in the area of speech act theory. Chapters 3 and 4 highlight some of the difficulties concerning the definitions of specific speech acts (questions and requests). In chapter 3, the concern is with the linguistic form of questions, and the actions that speakers perform with them are examined. Chapter 4 takes an inverse approach with the starting point the speech act of requesting. All the different linguistic forms with which speakers perform this speech act are looked at. This approach highlights some of the problems with the speech act definitions, and the use of the notion of action is suggested instead. In addition, when studying pragmatics, or in other words the content related meaning of language or the meaning that is determined by usage, what better way to do this than with natural conversational data? Natural conversational data, by its very nature, forces one to take all the non-verbal aspects of conversations into account. These aspects of language are claimed to be studied.

This thesis will also be of interest to researchers working in the field of ethnology, especially those concerned with hunter-gatherer populations. In this field, reciprocity and the sharing of goods is a much-researched subject. In this thesis, in chapter 4 and 5, numerous instances of the exchange of goods are analysed by looking at interaction and language. Looking at the manner in which speakers utilize the grammar they have at their disposal gives information concerning their culture and social organisation. More so, studying the interactional practices in minute detail, by reviewing the captured video data repeatedly, lead to the noticing of a pattern in non-verbal behaviour, that speakers intend to be communicative and that would have been missed using normal elicitation techniques. This culture specific action will be discussed in chapter 5.

1.2 Introduction to **‡**Ākhoe Haillom and its speakers

The current section of this chapter will provide more in depth information on the language \bar{A} khoe Haillom, the language situation, the field site and the data and methods used in this thesis.

[‡]Ākhoe Haillom is a language of the Khoekhoe variety spoken in northern Namibia. It belongs to the Central Khoisan language family (Greenberg, 1963) or the Khoe or Khoe-Kwadi language grouping (Güldemann & Vossen, 2000). [‡]Ākhoe has 49 phonemes of which 20 are clicks. The language has free word order, but the dominant word order is SOV. In keeping with the typological profile of SOV languages, adjectives, demonstratives and numerals generally precede nouns, and the language has postpositions. Person-gendernumber markers mark nouns. Adjectives, demonstratives, interrogatives and numerals can all carry agreement markers referring to the main noun. Tense, aspect and mood are marked by particles instead of by bound morphemes.

#Ākhoe Haillom is spoken by a semi-nomadic hunting-gathering people living to the north and east of the town Tsumeb in northern Namibia. In current times, the #Ākhoe Haillom do still gather their food, but they do not hunt much any longer because there is not much wildlife left to hunt. Amongst people living in the urban areas, #Ākhoe Haillom is also known as "the Haillom of the elders" or "deep Haillom".

1.2.1 Genetic affiliation

There are a number of differing opinions on what the Haillom and the $\pm \bar{A}$ khoe languages are and what the relation to each other and to the neighbouring languages is. In addition, many of these differing opinions overlap somewhat making the overall picture rather muddied. The following is an attempt to explain it as clearly as possible.



Figure 1-1: Greenberg's classification of Khoisan.

The Ethnologue (Lewis, Simons, & Fennig, 2013) mentions the language Haillom but not $\pm \overline{A}$ khoe. It gives an estimated number of 18,400 speakers in 2006 in Namibia. The Haillom speakers live in the north of Namibia in an area encompassing, in the west Mangetti Dune, in the south Omatako, Grootfontein in the north, and Maroelaboom on the border of former Bushmanland in the east. The Ethnologue's linguistic classification taken from Greenberg's (1963) is shown in Figure 1-1.

However, the classification given by Güldemann (2014) is structured somewhat differently. It is not represented in a tree because it does not presuppose a genealogical relation between all of the branches. This is shown in Figure 1-2.

Khoisan			
1. Hadza			
2. Sandawe			
3. Khoe-Kwadi	A. Kwadi		
	B. Khoe	Kalahari Khoe	
		East	Shua
			Tshwa
		West	Kxoe
			Gllana
			Naro
		Khoekhoe	Nama-Damara
			Haillom
			<u>‡Ākhoe</u>
			!Ora (extinct)
			Cape Khoekhoe varieties (extinct)
4. Kx'a	A. Ju		
	B. ‡'Amkhoe		
5. Tuu	A. Taa-Lower N	lossob	
	B. !Ui		

Figure 1-2: Güldemann's classification of Khoisan. Adapted from Güldemann (2014).

Haacke et al. (1997) claim that there is a Khoekhoe dialect continuum. In their view, it consists of a number of dialects, amongst them Nama/Damara (one of the official languages in Namibia), Haillom and ‡Ākhoe Haillom. According to Haacke, Haillom and ‡Ākhoe Haillom are two separate dialects on the same par as Nama and Damara. Historically, the ‡Ākhoe were Khoekhoe speakers who lived in the north of Namibia, in Eastern Owamboland, but were forced to move further south because of lack of water and population pressure, due to the Angolan Bush War between South Africa and Angola that was waged in the Namibia Angola border area from 1966 to 1989. This group of ‡Ākhoe speakers is now dispersed among the farms in the Mangetti area and around the village of Tsintsabis, both north of Tsumeb.

Rapold (Rapold & Widlok, 2008), after re-analysing the Khoekhoe lexical survey data of Haacke, Eiseb and Namaseb (1997), found that $\bar{+}Akhoe$ and Haillom together deviate the most from all the languages of the Khoekhoe cluster confirming claims by Haacke that Haillom is the most archaic form within the Khoekhoe branch. It is plausible that $\bar{+}Akhoe$ and Haillom were the first languages to split away from Khoekhoe or are the ancestral Khoekhoe. Figure 1-3 shows the results of the re-analysis.



Figure 1-3: Rapold's classification of Central Khoisan represented in a phylogenetic tree.

Widlok (1997) also argues that there is a dialect continuum. However, he considers $\bar{+}Akhoe$ to be a subgroup of the Haillom dialect continuum. He sees the language situation as a very fluid one in which speakers can switch between dialects or sociolects as it suits them. Whether speakers classify themselves $\bar{+}Akhoe$, Haillom or Khoekhoe is often politically and economically motivated.

1.2.2 Project, area and field site

This dissertation project was made feasible under the larger umbrella of the $\pm \bar{A}$ khoe Haillom language documentation project within the DoBeS program funded by the Volkswagen Foundation. My colleagues in this project were Thomas Widlok and Christian Rapold. More information concerning this project can be found at <u>www.mpi.nl/dobes</u>. Much of the analysis was conducted within the Interaction Project at the Max-Planck-Institute for Psycholinguistics under the leadership of Tanya Stivers and Steven Levinson.

The people whose language is the concern of this study call themselves both Haillom as well as $\pm \bar{A}$ khoe. They live in an area in the North of Namibia which they call |Gomais. This means "place of mangetti" after the Mangetti trees that grow in this area and provide the nuts that make up the staple diet of the people. The area of Gomais is located in between Owamboland, a communal farming area inhabited by Oshiwambo speaking Bantu people, in the north and the commercial farms, which are mostly run by Afrikaans speaking people, to the south (see Figure 1-4). |Gomais is in an area also known as Mangetti West. This land is leased to the Namibian Development Corporation (NDC) by the Namibian government, and it is exploited as a cattle farm. The $\neq\bar{A}$ khoe speakers, with whom this thesis is concerned, live on this cattle farm and on a number of other private farms in the surrounding area. The main and most permanent settlement is located on Farm 6, part of NDC. The Farm 6 settlement is concentrated in the vicinity of the main farm buildings where the white farm manager, his wife and the Owambo foreman live. At most, there are about 300 +Ākhoe living in the area surrounding the main farm buildings. They live in huts made of grass, wooden poles, corrugated iron, army blankets and other such materials. There is a reliable source of water available because there are several taps dispersed through the settlement that are connected to the main dam and are maintained by the farm manager. There is a small farm shop where the farm manager sells basic supplies such as rice, maize meal, sugar, oil, tobacco, etc. Since 2003, there is a small lower primary school. The community was asked to come up with a name for the school. They chose to name it /Khomxa Khoeda 'we, the pitiful people' Junior Primary School.

Farm 6 is "at the end of the line" from a transport point of view, it is not "en route" to anywhere else. There is no regular traffic passing the farm, there is no public transport, there are thus not many opportunities to get lifts. People travel on foot if they need to get anywhere and they cannot get a lift from the farm manager or a researcher. The nearest village with a medical clinic, Tsintsabis, is 40 km to the south, a seven to eight hour walk. The nearest place with a police station, hospital and government offices is the small town of Tsumeb, 100 km to the south.



Figure 1-4: Map showing field site and approximate language area.

Despite the lack of transport, the +Akhoe Haillom are very mobile, having a semi-nomadic culture. They frequently walk from one cattle post (places on a farm that provide water for the cattle) to another and between farms, visiting relatives and friends. This mobility greatly depends on and is due to the availability of food. The +Ākhoe Haillom were traditionally hunter-gatherers and largely remain so to this day. Currently, there is not enough wildlife in the area to hunt, since hunting domesticated animals is considered poaching. Therefore, the +Ākhoe now live mostly off food gathered in the bush, which is supplemented by shop-bought food when there is money and by the occasional cow or goat slaughtered at the farms and the very sporadic drought relief food they receive from the government. Since the arrival of the school though, the mobility has lessened somewhat during school terms and is concentrated in the school holidays. During school holidays, the settlement at Farm 6 is virtually empty as all the families take this chance to move away to places with more abundant food to stock up. It is usually the women and children who gather food. What sporadic hunting does occur is the work of the men. Only a few members of the community have a monthly income. These are a handful of men who earn an income working as farm labourers on Farm 6, as well as some elderly, widowed and disabled people who receive a government pension. At the time of my visits to Namibia, these incomes were between N\$250 -N\$400 per month, the equivalent of around ϵ 20 - ϵ 40 per month. When the money is spent, people revert to gathering as their main source of food. There is not much farming to speak of in the community. This is partly due to a lack of fencing which enables animals to destroy or eat the crops. For more detailed information on the hunter-gatherer, nomadic and egalitarian lifestyle, see section 1.3.

In the years during which I have been going to |Gomais, there have been small changes. In 2008 a telecommunications mast was put up in the village of Tsintsabis, 40km away. Through this mast, it is now possible to get cell phone reception under one specific tree in |Gomais. A few of the younger people have now

acquired cell phones and can phone researchers to let them know that they need a ride! Previously, no telephone communication was possible for the community. The only phone around was the farm phone which could only be used for farm business. The nearest public phone was 40km away. Some of the younger women, who learnt about human reproductive health in the school and in many of the clinics and other programs that came to the community, now go more or less regularly to the clinic for a monthly family planning shot. Previously, there had been sporadic dissemination of condoms and femidoms by the outreach clinic, but birth control was not something that was considered positively. The school has grown over the years. It started with three grades and three teachers; it now has six grades and four teachers. The latest addition is a kindergarten which is financed privately and which employs one of the community's own school leavers to teach the children. This is the first school leaver who obtained a job due to her education. Two more school leavers are currently continuing their upper primary schooling at the school in Tsintsabis. In addition, the Namibian NGO WIMSA (The Working Group on Indigenous Minorities in Southern Africa) is now aware of this community and has started sending their paralegal advisors to the farm regularly to teach, encourage and empower the people.

1.2.3 Attitudes towards **#**Ākhoe Haillom

The $\pm \bar{A}$ khoe Haillom language and culture are considered endangered. There are a number of factors that are frequently mentioned when language endangerment is considered. Among these are the number of speakers, the domains in which the language is used, the transmission of the language (are the children learning it), migration, globalization, intermarriage, the attitude of the speakers towards their language and the status of the language in comparison to other languages. The status of a language is influenced by social conditions. Not all of these factors are needed to categorize a language as being endangered (Brenzinger, 2007).

In comparison to some other endangered languages, there is a relatively high number of Haillom and $\frac{1}{4}$ Akhoe Haillom speakers: about 7500 (Widlok, 2000). Despite this, these languages are endangered because social conditions do not favour the maintenance of the language (Batibo, 1998; Florey, 2005; Grenoble & Whaley, 1998; Terrill, 2002). Languages are more likely to be maintained in places where there is a strong sense of ethnic identity with language being a marker of this, and where the language is not stigmatized. These conditions can be found for example in the Solomon Islands or on Vanuatu, but the situation in Namibia is different. There is a sense of ethnic identity amongst the Haillom and $\frac{1}{4}$ Akhoe Haillom, but they do not have much pride in their identity because they are a despised minority. They are economically and politically marginalized and suffer greatly from discrimination and oppression. A particularly poignant example of this occurred when very hungry people took meat from an already putrid cow that had died of natural causes and had been left to rot. A farm manager subsequently charged these people with livestock theft. Luckily, there are also other types of farm managers who slaughter livestock for the benefit of the $\frac{1}{4}$ Akhoe, assist in banking matters and ferry ill people to and from the hospital. Since the reputation of the culture and language is low, language shift to the languages of the majority groups in the area (Nama-Damara,¹ Oshiwambo, Afrikaans, and English) is attractive, in particular to Nama-Damara, since it is so closely related to $\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe that these languages are mutually intelligible. An additional problem from the perspective of language endangerment is that $\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe Haillom is used only in the home or within the settlement. Though children do learn $\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe Haillom at home, as mentioned previously, schooling is in Nama-Damara as are radio broadcasts. The government officials, nurses and doctors that $\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe speakers come into contact with are more likely to speak Oshiwambo, English or Afrikaans than Nama-Damara, and definitely not ($\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe) Haillom. All these factors point towards an environment that is not conducive for the maintenance of the language.

1.2.4 Multilingual context

At the Farm 6 settlement, there are two "political groups" vying for control. The split is a geographical one. One group consists of \bar{A} khoe Haillom who originally came from further north, from Owamboland, and the other group consist of \bar{A} khoe Haillom who have always lived in the lGomais area. This is borne out by a slight difference in speech as well which is clearest amongst the older people. This means that the people at lGomais do not all speak the same dialect. The situation is made more complicated because of the mobility of the people that brings them into contact with many other slightly differing dialects. In addition, the Damara teachers at the school teach in Nama-Damara and the radio broadcasts widely listened to are in Nama-Damara too. The immediate neighbours of the \bar{A} khoe Haillom are speakers of Haillom, Damara, Afrikaans, Oshiwambo and English and in some places !Xũ. Most of the workers on the farm are Owambo, and there are many mixed marriages too. All this contributes to a very fluid language situation. People speaking slightly differing dialects are in contact, communicate with each other, and very probably influence each other's speech.

1.2.5 Previous work on *\Previous* Akhoe Haillom

The most extensive work on \bar{A} khoe Haillom is in the area of anthropology. The anthropologist Thomas Widlok has published much work on a large variety of topics including the social structure of the community (Widlok, 1994), the culture (Widlok, 1999a), the conceptualization of space (Widlok, 1999b, 2009), trance dances (Widlok, 2007), sharing (Widlok, 2004, 2010b) and morality issues (Widlok, 2010a). Terttu Heikkinen, a Finnish missionary who worked in Namibia in the 1960s and 1970s, provided some of the earliest descriptive work on the \bar{A} khoe Haillom language. Aside from locally publishing a few readers, she wrote the first grammar sketch and a wordlist for the language (Heikkinen, n.d.-a). Based on Heikkinen's grammar sketch, Widlok also wrote a grammar sketch (Widlok, 2013). Aside from his anthropological work, Widlok has also published on the irrealis (Widlok, 1995), space (Neumann & Widlok, 1996; Widlok, 1999b) and some sociolinguistic issues

¹ Nama-Damara is a dialect cluster, often also called Khoekhoegowab and Khoekhoe. In this thesis, the term Khoekhoe is used as the name for the language family of which Nama-Damara is a part.

(Widlok, 1997). Christian Rapold also worked on space (Haun, Rapold, Janzen, & Levinson, 2011), as well as on tone and historical linguistic comparisons (Rapold & Widlok, 2008) and on the encoding of "putting" and "taking" events (Rapold, 2012).

In the area of linguistics, much more extensive work has been done on Nama-Damara of which Haillom and +Ākhoe are often considered dialects. The most prolific author is Wilfrid Haacke on phonology (Haacke, 1999), syntax (Haacke, 1976, 1978, 1992, 1995, 2006), tone (Haacke, 1999; 2008), and dialectology (Haacke, 1986; 1997), amongst other things. Rapold has also published some work on the reciprocal in Nama-Damara (Rapold, 2011). There are also a number of studies in the area of syntax and focus (Den Besten, 2002, 2005; Hahn, 2013; Huybregts, 2003; Washburn, 2001; Witzlack-Makarevich, 2006) and one on tone and prosody (Brugman, 2009).

1.3 Culture and society

This section will present some of the pertinent aspects of hunter-gatherer and $\frac{1}{4}$ Akhoe Haillom culture² and society. This information will be essential in the construction of the proposition that $\frac{1}{4}$ Akhoe Haillom speakers have a preference for non-coercive forms of interaction. The egalitarian nature of hunter-gatherer communities will first be discussed. This will be followed by a section on the $\frac{1}{2}$ Akhoe Haillom perspective on possessions and sharing as well as the settlement notion of the *llgâus*. Finally, an overview will be given of the evidence for the preference for non-coerciveness in hunter-gatherer societies found in other studies.

1.3.1 Egalitarianism

 $\pm\bar{A}$ khoe Haillom speakers have an egalitarian society (Widlok, 1999a). The term egalitarian in this work is used to refer to societies that have no institutionalised social or political hierarchy, where individuals have equal access to resources and exchange functions along the lines of generalized reciprocity. The term is used to mean that the $\pm\bar{A}$ khoe Haillom society is less hierarchical and stratified than most pastoralist or agricultural societies are (there are no chiefs, nobility or people with controlling power, etc.). Whether this is due to the culture or because the living communities are mostly small and family based is not clear at this point. For the aim of the current work it is not relevant why the society is egalitarian, it is only relevant that it is so. The egalitarian nature of the $\pm\bar{A}$ khoe Haillom society will be of particular interest in the study of requests. In a less stratified and formalized society one would expect the requesting behaviour to be less restricted by issues of politeness than in, for example, Javanese society where politeness issues play a very important role (Geertz, 1960). In situations where everyone is an equal there is no need for indirectness as a way to show sensitivity to social hierarchy. It could also be the case that the social closeness of the community makes the need to show politeness and deference less. This type of a society would thus predict an absence of indirect requests and pre-requests, there

 $^{^{2}}$ The concept of culture has a problematic history (Fox & King, 2002). Nevertheless, in this work, this concept shall be used. The concept of culture used here roughly signifies the common social practices of an ethnic group that constitutes knowledge required to conduct oneself in a native-like manner in the sense proposed by Goodenough (1965).

being no need to politely beat around the bush or to test the water in order to get what you want. Based on the egalitarian nature of the $\pm \bar{A}$ khoe Haillom society, it is predicted that hierarchy based politeness issues will not be visible in the requesting behaviour of the speakers.

1.3.2 Possessions, sharing and the *llgâus*

The $\pm \bar{A}$ khoe Haillom have a hunting-gathering lifestyle which they complement with pastoral and agricultural activities (Widlok, 1994, 1999a). This means that they derive their main subsistence from the wild by gathering edible plants and hunting animals as well as keeping some livestock and engaging in sporadic and not always successful planting and harvesting. This lifestyle involves a certain amount of mobility and the mobility of the $\pm \bar{A}$ khoe has an effect on their possessions. The people move around between several fixed living places. The movement is usually based on food procurement: hunting, but mostly gathering. If the food runs out in one place, the people move somewhere else. Currently, many people have started coordinating their movements with the school holidays of their children. Generally, people who are nomadic or even semi-nomadic have fewer possessions than sedentary people do (Gowdy, 2005; Lee & DeVore, 1969; Marshall, 1965). In these societies, personal possession is not very convenient. $\pm \bar{A}$ khoe people do not have many possessions, due either to their mobility or to their poverty, and what possessions they do have, for example clothing and cooking utensils, are generally shared. One could expect that in such societies requesting objects might be less face threatening than it would be in other societies.

Related to this are the notions of giving and sharing in the $\pm\bar{A}$ khoe Haillom lifestyle. The important aspect of many exchange systems is not only the giving and receiving but crucially also the reciprocity of the system (Mauss, 1966). In foraging societies, sharing, which is in essence reciprocal, is very important. It is a method in which people regulate access to resources such as food and goods (Kelly, 1995; Widlok, 2019) since storing a surplus is not an option in a nomadic society. This, once again, is a feature of the lifestyle of which one can expect that it will have an influence on the requesting behaviour of the people. If sharing is the default, does one need to request a product in the first place? There are several forms of sharing: reciprocity, demand sharing, tolerated theft, etc. The $\pm\bar{A}$ khoe have a demand-share culture with obligatory sharing aspects (Peterson, 1993; Widlok, 1999a). Demand-sharing entails that sharing is prompted by demands rather than by offers or "unsolicited giving" as Peterson (1993) calls it. This means that, if a person wants something, they can make a direct verbal or non-verbal demand for it. This might imply that doing a request in the form of a direct demand is, contrary to English for example, the normal manner, or the unmarked manner, of requesting.

Sharing is the moral prerequisite, the prescribed norm, for the people who live in the same settlement or *//gâus*, a residential unit, hearth group or band, in the $\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe society (Widlok, 1994, 1999a). Within the *//gâus*, sharing is obligatory. Widlok (1999a) gives a detailed definition of the *//gâus*. "the range of people who visibly recognize, foster, and manage their relations as potential co-residents by using a range of socially defined modes of interaction". This means that not only people who are actually living together but also people who are willing to live together and who show this, by frequently visiting for example, are members of the *//gâus*. Amongst these

members, goods are obligatorily shared. Thus, if a member of the *//gâus* has a shareable product, they are expected to share it with the people present. However, this does not mean that one is "entitled" to "one's" share. The evidence for this is that people hang around waiting for "a share" instead of just taking it. Additionally, people will avoid having to share if they can. Often, when a community member was given consumables by the researchers, they would also request a bag or some paper to put it in, in order to make the consumable less obvious, and thus reduce the chance of anybody demanding a share.

Another aspect of the culture that needs to be taken into account here is that in $\pm \bar{A}$ khoe culture, asking for something can entail incurring a burden of reciprocity (Mauss, 1966; Widlok, 1999a). Once an interactant has asked for something and gotten it, they may be asked for something in return (Schegloff, 2007). Therefore, if an interactant can avoid actually having to ask, this is beneficial because they do not acquire a debt. On the other hand, in $\pm \bar{A}$ khoe society, sharing is not something that the person who initiates the sharing boasts about. Sharing is not a behaviour that is flaunted in order to make oneself look good (Widlok, 1999a). In the same manner, accepting an offer can imply gratitude from the recipient and would also result in indebtedness which interactants try to avoid. All exchange of goods is performed in an as unmarked manner as possible. Often people do not even look at each other when they are handing things over. This means that if an offer is initiated, it is done so very inconspicuously. Consequently, in this culture two opposing things are at play. On the one hand, interactants prefer not to ask for things since this would incur a burden of debt, and on the other hand, unsolicited offers are not often initiated. This begs the question whether these preferences are visible in the request sequences in interactions between speakers.

A final issue concerning consumables that needs to be introduced at this point is the concept of free goods (Brown & Levinson, 1978a; Lemert & Branaman, 1997). Goffman (1967) makes a distinction between 'free' goods and 'non-free' goods. Free goods are those goods that are freely available to the participants, things anyone may ask from another without causing a debt. Which goods are considered free is dependent on the situation and the culture. Whether the product requested is a free good or not will presumably have an effect on the degree of politeness used in the request. Free goods will not necessitate the same level of politeness as non-free goods. In the ‡Ākhoe Haillom community residing at Farm 6, water, for example, is a free good. There are taps spread throughout the community that were put there by the farm manager. Everyone in the community freely uses these taps. There are no monetary or other costs entailed in the use of the water from those taps.

Summarizing the above, in \bar{A} khoe Haillom society, making requests and offers potentially entails incurring a debt for one of the parties. Simultaneously, there is a general culture of demand-sharing as well as obligatory sharing being the norm with certain members of the society implying that requests are ordinarily direct if they are needed at all. These aspects, when taken together seem somewhat contradictory. Nevertheless, it will be shown that all of the above aspects have their own specific influence on the system of requests in \bar{A} khoe Haillom and that they are all geared towards respecting the autonomy of individuals.

1.3.3 A preference for non-coerciveness

A number of studies in the field of hunter-gatherer research have found deviances in hunter-gatherer interaction when compared to the turn-taking system for interaction as presented by Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974). The most commonly cited deviances found in hunter-gatherer interaction are longer silences and more frequent occurrences of overlaps (Eades, 1991, 1994; Gardner & Mushin, 2007; Kimura, 2001; Kitamura, 1990; Liberman, 1985; Mushin & Gardner, 2009; Philips, 1976, 2005; Sugawara, 1996, 1998, 2012; Walsh, 1991, 1995). In this thesis, it will be argued that these deviances show a culturally and socially motivated preference for non-coerciveness in interaction. Speakers are driven by their cultural and societal norms when constructing their turns. This cultural and social colouring of turns is what provides the interaction in $\frac{1}{4}$ khoe Haillom with less coerciveness and thus enables interactional partners to interrupt more or not take up turns at all, etc., whereby the interaction may give the impression of not adhering to the turn-taking system.

Claims concerning the deviation from the turn-taking system for San speaking hunter-gatherers come from the anthropologists Sugawara and Kitamura who study natural interaction of the |Gui and ||Gana people in the Central Kalahari (Kitamura, 1990; Sugawara, 1996, 1998, 2012). In southern Africa, hunter-gatherer societies are officially grouped together under the name San and the ‡Ākhoe Haillom belong to this group. Sugawara and Kitamura observed more overlap and less uptake of turns than would be expected given comparisons with evidence from American English interaction. They both claim that San languages show that the turn-taking system, as presented by Schegloff amongst others as being universal (Levinson, 2006b; Schegloff, 2006; Stivers et al., 2009), is not universal. For San languages, the rules governing the taking of turns are argued not to apply: people speak simultaneously, i.e. in overlap, more than they "should". Turns are claimed not to be taken up by the interlocutors when one would expect them to be, according to the current turn-taking rules, which leads to prolonged sequences by one speaker. Sugawara and Kitamura claim that the most important factor that seems to shape San interaction is the speakers' seeming indifference or lack of concern with the attention of their conversational partners but which is actually a mutual concern for individual independence. This concern results in frequent and often lengthy periods of overlap of speech, as well as long extended turns consisting of several transitional units with just one speaker talking. Sugawara proposes that the form of speaking is "deeply rooted in the form of life specific to hunting-gathering societies" (Sugawara, 1998: 238).

Kimura (2001) has similar claims for the Baka pygmies. He looked at the overlaps and long silences in Baka conversations. The principle of turn-taking is based on the commonly observed rule that only one person speaks at a time. Thus, overlap is considered to be something to be avoided. If two speakers happen to speak at the same time, one or both of the speakers will stop. Similarly, silence is considered to be something to be avoided. Kimura shows that in Baka conversations both utterance overlap and long silences are more frequent than in Bakwele (neighbouring pastoralist) and Japanese conversations. In his opinion, the structure of the Baka conversations is formed by other tendencies observable in the rest of their lifestyles such as synchronization (also observable in their polyphonic singing and dancing). Unfortunately, Kimura gives no examples of his data.

In addition, the manner in which the data was collected (sampling conversations every 10 min for number of active speakers) leaves one open to including schisms in the count of overlapping speakers.

Walsh (1991, 1995), Eades (1991, 1994) and Liberman (1985) report on the style of interaction amongst the Aborigines of Australia. Walsh mentions the greater control of listeners in interaction to take up talk or not which results in relatively long periods of silence, for example talk is "broadcast" with no listener explicitly addressed. Walsh points to two main factors in the Aboriginal way of life that lead to this, namely conversations being typically multiparty and continuous. This comes forth out of the public nature of speakers' lives. Liberman and Eades report on the indirectness that is characteristic of Aboriginal interaction and which Eades summarises as a manner of "giving other people interactional privacy [...] where there is frequently little physical privacy" (Eades, 1991: 238). Some of the few studies that do systematically look at the reported length of silence, the tolerance for longer silences and overlapping speech, are by Mushin and Gardner (2007; 2009). They confirm that silences in Garrwa talk-in-interaction can indeed be longer without being problematic. In addition, they find a type of post-start-up overlap, which may well be what gives the impression of inattentiveness of speakers for each other and may be contributing to the idea of "broadcast" speech.

Philips (1976; 2005) reports on the interactional style amongst the Indians of the Warm Springs Reservation in Oregon, North America. Their conversations have fewer interruptions and a slower pace than English conversations, and there are longer silences. Speakers are said to have a greater tolerance for silence giving the respondent a greater choice whether to respond or not. Additionally, as in Aboriginal conversation, talk is often not explicitly addressed to anyone.

Overall, the main claim that the above-mentioned researchers make is that culture influences conversation styles. The conversational styles of these societies contain more overlap (except for the American Indians) and longer periods of silence between turns. These styles of conversation are in no way marked, they are not arguments or heated discussions (Sugawara, 1996, 1998). This brings some researchers to take this argument further and claim that the turn-taking system as it is presented by Sacks et al. (1974) is thus shown not to be adequate. In contrast to this claim, this thesis will endeavour to show that the similar differences found in the $+\bar{A}$ khoe Haillom conversational style come forth from a cultural and social preference to avoid restricting the conversational partner.

1.4 Language and interaction

The following sections will provide an overview of the literature and background of interactional and speech act theories that are necessary to follow the line of argumentation that will be offered in this thesis to support the claim for a preference for non-coerciveness in \bar{A} khoe Haillom interaction. First, the interaction model within which this thesis is set will be presented in section 1.4.1. This will be followed by a look at the influence that

culture and society has on interaction and vice versa in section 1.4.2. In section 1.4.3, a closer look will be taken at the notion that utterances are (communicative) actions.

1.4.1 Human interaction

The work in this thesis is set within the context of the Interaction Engine model of human communication (Levinson, 2006b) using as its base interactional data. This model emphasizes the interactional foundations of language, which appear to be more universal in organization than the very varied typology of languages. This interactional base may then make the acquisition and cultural elaboration of languages possible without invoking specific universals of grammar.

The traditional method of undertaking linguistic research has generally involved pen and paper. You took your pen and paper out into the world, found a speaker and elicited their language. In a time preceding (digital) recording equipment, this was indeed the only way to record language. With only pen and paper, it was not possible to record language as it was actually used in the wild, namely language in interaction. As a linguistic researcher, it was impossible to remember every single little detail of a conversation that one was watching. Details inevitably remain uncaptured, such as the grammatical constructions and the precise words used, their placement and their pronunciation, who said what when, and in which sequence, the grammaticality, the presence of any repairs, hesitations or pauses and their placement in the utterance, as well as what the speakers were doing with their bodies and facial expressions and how these things coincide with the verbal utterances, etc. Language is too fast to record on paper in real time. Currently, with the easy availability of digital cameras, laptop computers and computer programmes that work with audio and video data, it is possible to include the actual language use (of often more than one speaker), which is enchronic in nature (Enfield 2022), in one's linguistic work.

There were synergies between the old ways of working and the theories of generative grammar. Generative grammar emphasized the psychological nature of linguistic competence, and a universal core (Universal Grammar) that children brought to the task of learning languages (Chomsky, 1965). Elicitations of metalinguistic judgements were considered useful in order to capture some of this psychological knowledge and lay bare the universal structure of language. However, since then there has been a great deal of criticism of the generative programme. This criticism has been based partly on the grounds that the distinction between competence and performance cuts the subject off from the primary evidence, partly on the grounds that there is much more information in the learning environment creating less need for prior innate knowledge, and partly on the basis that the universals proposed have been hard to verify. Thus, Evans and Levinson (2009) argue against most of the universals claimed to have been found. Instead, Levinson suggests that the stronger universals might actually be found in the structure of social interaction, the Interaction Engine hypothesis (Levinson, 2006b).

The starting point for the Interaction Engine hypothesis (Levinson, 2006a, 2006b) is the question: "Why can humans interact and communicate?" The Interaction Engine hypothesis is similar to the Universal Grammar

hypothesis in that it suggests that there are properties in the human mind that enable language and communication. The idea on which the Interaction Engine hypothesis is based is that humans evolved a unique mode of social interaction and this mode of interaction enabled language just as it recurrently enables children to learn the languages around them. The Interaction Engine hypothesis perceives interaction as the whole amalgam of verbal and non-verbal acts of communication that is turn-based instead of sentence-based. The Interaction Engine is seen as a set of interconnected principles that is adaptable to "local" principles: culture and social organisation. This means that interaction is culturally adaptable: that even though all humans have the innate characteristics that enable interaction, the various local cultural and social rules shape the interaction.

Other interactional theories that inform this thesis are conversation analysis and interactional linguistics. Conversation Analysis is the study of the structure of human conversation with specific attention being paid to the systematicity of the turn-taking of speakers and the structure of the sequences of talk by speakers. The turn-taking of speakers is argued to be systematic and subject to rules such as avoidance of overlap and avoidance of silence (Sacks et al., 1974). The organisation of a sequence of talk is taken to be built of adjacent pairs of turns (Schegloff, 2007). This systematicity of conversational interaction is considered to be universal (Schegloff, 2006; Kendrick et al., 2020). This thesis also takes its inspiration from the field of interactional linguistics. This field studies the structure of human conversation, as does conversation analysis, but approaches this interaction from a perspective motivated by linguistic structures (Couper-Kuhlen & Selting, 2001; Ford, Fox, & Thompson, 2002; Fox, Thompson, Ford, & Couper-Kuhlen, 2013). The view is held that linguistic forms are shaped by their use in interaction.

1.4.2 The interaction between language and culture

This thesis is concerned with the idea entailed in the Interaction Engine hypothesis and Interactional Linguistics that cultural preferences and social organization can influence the shape of interaction, language and grammar. If, as this thesis argues, the culture and society of \bar{A} hoe Haillom speakers leads speakers to be less coercive in interaction, then it must first be shown that culture and society influence language and interaction.

Boas (1911) emphasized that studying the mental habits and social life of any society requires linguistic investigation. Following Boas, Sapir and Whorf (Sapir, 1933, 1974; Whorf, 2012) considered that grammars of a language lead speakers to think and behave according to specific patterns and thus grammar gives insight into how humans structure the world. Wide-ranging studies, for example in the fields of sociolinguistics, ethnography of communication, and others, have shown that communicative activities and linguistic structures are linked to cultural systems of meaning and are socially organized (Bauman & Sherzer, 1974; Carbaugh, 2005; Enfield, 2002; Evans-Pritchard, 1940; Evans, 2003; Gumperz & Hymes, 1972; Hanks, 1990; Holmes, Marra, & Vine, 2011; Hymes, 1976; Ochs, 1984; Sapir, 1949; Schieffelin, 1990; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986; Sherzer, 1983; Whorf, 2012). For example, Schieffelin and Ochs in the field of language socialization show that the culture and society in which small children live and grow up systematically relates to the conversational activities of these children. The language acquired during these conversational activities is the source from which children learn

the worldview of the society in which they live (Ochs, 1988; Ochs & Schieffelin, 1984; Schieffelin, 1990; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986). This means that the study of language and the manner in which language is used can lead to a better understanding of a culture or society of speakers since language is the means through which cultural and social knowledge is transmitted.

Equally, grammar is 'vulnerable to social interaction' (Schegloff, Ochs, & Thompson, 1996) in that interaction (or culture and society) organizes language. This is shown for example in two further studies by Schieffelin (Schieffelin, 1996, 2008). In the earlier study, Schieffelin showcases an alteration in the evidential system (i.e. in the grammar of the language) in the Bosavi society that came about due to modernisation through literacy and education. In the Bosavi society, the evidence for facts and the source of truths is of concern, as evidenced by the evidential system with which these issues are formulated. With the advent of modernity (i.e. a change in the society) through missionaries, government, schooling, and especially printed words and photographs, different kinds of facts, truths and evidence for these entered the conversational arena and the evidentiality system was adapted to accommodate them. This shows that social changes had linguistic consequences. In the later study, Schieffelin shows that certain linguistic practices exhibited by Kaluli speakers of the Bosavi society, such as indirection and other metaphoric and figurative uses of language, are motivated by "a preference for the avoidance of verbally speculating about the intentions, motives, and internal states of others". Thus, it is the grammar of the language that is influenced by the cultural aspects of the society. The linguistic practices that speakers use enable them to avoid reproach should they involuntarily verbalize someone's intentions thereby violating the cultural norm. In short, one can say that the dispreference of the speakers to speculate about other speakers' internal states, which is part of the speakers' culture or society, forms the grammatical shape of their utterances.

A notable study on questions within this domain by Goody (1978) examines the interplay between the social status of speakers and the use of certain question types by those speakers in Gonja society. In Gonja society, there are two additional performative modes of questioning aside from the general information questions. These are control questions and deference questions. Roughly speaking, control questions are demands in the form of a question, and deference questions are suggestions in the form of a question. The interpretation of an interrogative utterance as an information question, control question or deference question depends on the higher or lower social status of the questioner. This means that speakers select the syntactical characteristics of their intended speech act based on their own status in relation to that of their conversational partner.

From the above it will have become clear that cultural traits, language, language use and possibly interaction influence each other. This thesis seeks to establish that culture influences the shape of interaction and that different cultures influence interaction differently. Most work in CA presumes a universal structural basis for interaction (Schegloff, 2006; Levinson, 2006), consisting of turn-taking rules, sequence types, repair strategies, and so forth. Reconciling these lines of work requires explorations into the degrees of freedom still made possible by a universal interaction system. Focussing on question-answer sequences may provide potential insights, as this is an area in which a number of factors are already well established. For example, we know that interrogative forms vary across languages, that close turn-timing varies subtly across cultures (Stivers et al.,

2009) and that the use of gaze in such sequences is culturally conditioned (Rossano, Brown, & Levinson, 2009). One line of thought, convincingly addressed by Goody (1978), is that questions are socially sensitive – on the one hand they can be used to express power in the role of the interrogator, while on the other hand they can also be used to express the subordinate character of the student or servant. This socially sensitive nature seems to be exploited in interaction (Stivers & Rossano, 2010) where questions make an answer conditionally relevant, and where ways of resisting the terms of a question have also been extensively explored (e.g. Atkinson & Drew (1979), Heritage & Raymond (2012)). There have also been claims of more fundamental shaping of interaction, e.g. the very nature of turn-taking (Kimura, 2001; Kitamura, 1990; Sugawara, 1998b), which were discussed in section 1.3.3.

If culture influences the shape of interaction, then one might assume that different cultures influence interaction differently. Most research on interaction has been done on (American) English interaction, specifically in the field of Conversation Analysis. Also, despite the extensive cross-linguistic work on questions, in this field too most work comes from societies that are modern, industrialised, large scale, sedentary and hierarchical, or part of the WEIRD cultures (western, educated, industrialized, rich, democratic) (Henrich, Heine, & Norenzayan, 2010) as they have become known. Due to these issues, it would be beneficial to look at interaction in a culture that is as different as possible to those cultures to which speakers of (American) English belong. The speakers of $\frac{1}{4}$ Akhoe Haillom have such a culture. $\frac{1}{4}$ Akhoe Haillom is spoken by a minority group of San or Bushmen³ in the north of Namibia, Africa. Whereas most native speakers of (American) English live in industrialized, large-scale settlements, have a sedentary, hierarchical and agricultural subsistence system, the speakers of $\frac{1}{4}$ Akhoe Haillom live in small-scale settlements and are semi nomadic. They are largely egalitarian but not individualistic, and they live a hunter-gatherer lifestyle, complemented with sporadic pastoralist and agricultural activities.

[‡]Ākhoe Haillom culture differs in a number of areas from that of the WEIRD cultures, for example, in the areas of egalitarianism, the small-scaled nature and the hunter-gatherer nature of the society, or the reciprocity associated with foraging cultures, etc. A few studies have looked specifically at the grammar of hunter-gatherer languages from a cross-linguistic viewpoint. The work of Bowern and her colleagues at the Dynamics of hunter-gatherer language change project have looked at loanwords (Bowern et al., 2011) and numerals (Epps, Bowern, Hansen, Hill, & Zentz, 2012). Brown investigated biological taxonomies utilized by hunter-gathering people vs. small scale agriculturalists (Brown, 1985). Comrie and Cysouw (2013) reviewed structural features of hunter-gatherer and non-hunter gatherer languages (e.g. constituent order, phonology, lexicon) and propose a tentative list of possible correlates between them. The outcome of these studies was somewhat contradictory. Some of the studies showed that the phenomena that were looked at were shared amongst hunter-gatherers. Yet, a comparison of numeral terms for example (Epps et al., 2012) found that the correlation between low-limit numeral systems and hunter-gatherer groups, which are often associated, is weak and that the phenomenon under investigation was not a commonality due to mode of subsistence, but rather due to linguistic and cultural areas crossing languages and ethnic boundaries. Similarly, Bowern (Bowern et al., 2011) showed that the levels of

³ For discussions concerning the use of the terms San, Bushmen, Khoisan and Khoesan, etc. see amongst others Gordon (1992), Hitchcock, Ikeya, Biesele, & Lee (2006), Vossen (2013) and Güldemann (2014).

lexical borrowing is no higher for hunter-gatherer languages, something that has often been assumed to be the case, than it is for large-scale pastoralist communities. This implies that there is no commonality between hunter-gather languages as a group, which would have made them distinct from pastoralist groups. No study as yet has tried to identify certain influential traits on the level of interaction, as this thesis proposes.

In order to provide arguments for the proposition that some of the basic cultural and social traits of $\ddagger \bar{A}$ khoe Haillom influence the interaction of its speakers, the intention in this thesis is to examine human culture and social organization at an everyday level. The focus is on every day, informal interactions between speakers since it is the general rules governing behaviour in interaction that are of interest here and not the genre-specific interaction in specialized speech events. Furthermore, as the intention is to argue for a non-coercive nature in interaction, the most ideally suited interactions between speakers are felt to be those in which an interactant is trying to obtain a goal, which involves eliciting the help of another person to achieve that goal, thus triggering interaction with someone and making it necessary to get that someone to interact with you. The most well suited communicative actions to work with in this respect are questioning (requests for information) and requesting, specifically the requesting of objects. Both these actions involve interacting with another human in order to obtain one's goal. In this thesis, natural conversational data will be analysed in the tradition of Conversation Analysis and Interactional Linguistics in order to lay bare some of the cultural and social traits of speakers that influence their language use and may or may not influence the structure of their interaction.

1.4.3 Speech acts and actions

In order to lay a foundation upon which the chapters concerning questioning and requesting will rest, this section will provide some background on the features of sentence types, speech acts and communicative actions. Questioning and requesting are two of the building blocks of interactions which will be analysed and of which it will be argued that they are built up in a non-coercive interactional manner steered by the cultural and social characteristics of the speakers.

Aside from having several sentence types, every language also has several speech acts. Whereas the classification of sentence types is based on grammatical features, the classification of speech acts is based on the type of communicative function that is intended with an utterance (Austin, 1962). Three basic speech acts are statements, questions and commands (Searle, 1975). These may seem to be the equivalent of the basic sentence types declaratives, interrogatives and imperatives, but speech acts (the functions) and sentence types (the forms) do not have a one-to-one mapping (Hymes, 1971). It is not the case that when an utterance is in a certain grammatical form that it thus always fulfils the same function or speech act; the forms are multi-functional.

The theoretical point of departure, in chapter 3 of this thesis as well as in the later chapters, is that utterances are, or perform, actions with the aim of obtaining responses. Utterances, or actions, are a form of behaviour, not just a representation of facts with a negative or positive truth-value (Austin, 1962; Levinson, 2013; Searle, 1975; Tomasello, 2008). The proverbial "It's cold here," could just be a statement of a fact with no more than just its

propositional content and no intention of eliciting a response. On the other hand, the utterance could be a complaint, if the speaker were a person who does not like being cold. It could also be a request, as long as the recipient⁴ of the utterance knows that the speaker does not like being cold and if for example a window in the room were open. In that case, the utterance could be a request to close the window.

Tomasello (2008) argues that human communication arose through a need for cooperation which resulted in (non-verbal) communicative actions (e.g. requests) which eventually became verbalized. In its most primitive, or its earliest form, communication was probably achieved through gestures, namely pointing, which indicates the desired object (Rossano & Liebal 2014). Austin considers speech itself as a form of action which he calls performative utterances and speech acts (Austin, 1962). To distinguish the multiple kinds of actions within a speech act, Austin introduced the notions of locution, illocution and perlocution. A locutionary act being the act of saying something, an illocutionary act being a locutionary act performed with a certain force, i.e. uttering a question with the intention of receiving an answer, and a perlocutionary act finally is an illocutionary act that receives the intended response. Searle further classified the illocutionary acts into declarations, assertions, directives, commissives and expressives (Searle, 1975). Grice introduced, amongst other things, the concept of implicature which is also related to the idea that speech is an action (1989). Levinson, as Austin, Searle and Grice before him, addresses the issue of utterance understanding. How is it that we interpret so much into so little?

Levinson claims that "there must be powerful heuristics that give us preferred interpretations without too much calculation of such matters as speakers' intentions, encyclopaedic knowledge of the domain being talked about, or calculations of others' mental processes" (Levinson, 2000: 4). Utterances are underspecified in part because we can comprehend utterances faster than we can produce utterances, motivating the use of short expressions amplified by inferences that can use the metalinguistic properties of the utterance as well. Levinson is of the opinion that we can understand utterances (which are basically underspecified) because we can utilize heuristics like his Q heuristic (what isn't said to be the case is not the case), the I heuristic (what is said in an unmarked manner represents a stereotypical situation) and M heuristic (what is said in a marked manner represents an abnormal situation) to give us a preferred interpretation. Levinson states that the heuristics are fundamentally culture independent and are the prerequisites for the communicative system to work (Levinson, 2000: xiv)

An fMRI study by Van Ackeren et.al. has shown the difference in people's comprehension of underspecified utterances based on the extra-linguistic knowledge available (van Ackeren, Casasanto, Bekkering, Hagoort, & Rueschemeyer, 2012), and an EEG study by Gísladóttir (Gísladóttir, Chwilla, & Levinson, 2015) shows this resolution of underspecified illocutionary force to be very fast indeed.

In the preceding section an effort was made to explain that utterances such as questions and requests are actions, they have a function, and recipients understand this to be the case. Recipients are able to interpret the form of

⁴ In this thesis the term "recipient" will be used to refer to the addressee of an utterance. In

Conversation Analysis utterances are considered actions and in this sense the addressee is the recipient of the action.

the utterances as well as the functions or actions these utterances are performing. The functions of questions and requests as well as aspects of their sequential conversational nature will be addressed in the next sections in this chapter.

1.4.3.1 Questions and their functions

As the preceding section made clear, questions are clearly not only about form, but they also have interactional functions, and these functions shape the responses to the questions by making different sorts of answers relevant. Some of the major interactional functions, or "actions" as they are called in conversation analysis, that will be addressed in this thesis are "pure" information requests, repair initiators, requests for confirmation, assessments as well as suggestions, offers and requests.

Information requests are often considered "real" questions. Their primary goal is to obtain information. Questions in the form of repair initiators on the other hand aim to clarify a misunderstanding (Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977) in cases where there is a problem of hearing or understanding of the previous utterance. In such cases, a speaker can ask a question showing that there is such a problem and that they are in need of clarification (Schegloff et al., 1977). This action is called initiating a repair. An example in English is shown below:

- (1) (adapted from Schegloff et al. (1977)
 - A: Well I'm working through the Amfat Corporation.
 - B: The who?
 - A: Amfat Corporation. It's a holding company.

The line by speaker B is the question that is used to initiate a repair. It shows that B had a problem with the first utterance by A. A's response to B's question is the repair itself.

A special subcategory of repair initiating questions is the category of open-class other-initiation of repair. These are repair initiations in which the question in the repair initiation does not target a specific item contained in the prior utterance (hence "open-class") but it targets the prior utterance as a whole (Drew, 1997). In the above example, speaker B's "The who?" specifically targets "the Amfat Corporation" in the previous utterance as a problem source. Had speaker B said "Huh?" or "What?" instead of "The who?", such a repair initiation would not have specified which part of the previous utterance needed to be repaired and thus such a repair initiator would have targeted the whole of the previous utterance as a possible problem source. There are two common types of open-class repair initiations: the "huh" type of initiators that use an interjection to initiate the repair, and the "what" type of initiators that use an interrogative word, usually "what", to initiate the repair (Enfield et al., 2013). The intended effect of both types of open-class repair initiations is that the utterance is either repeated in its entirety or rephrased by the initial speaker.

Questions are also used to request confirmation. These requests for confirmation do not aim to obtain confirmation to something that was misheard or misunderstood but rather seek confirmation to previously held assumptions. This is the case when a speaker thinks they know something but are not completely sure and they assert a proposition in order to get it confirmed. For example, a presenter at a conference might ask "I have 20 minutes for my presentation, right?" just before starting in order to get confirmation for the assumption based on which they had prepared their talk. Related to requests for confirmation are understanding checks. These are questions that can be used by a speaker in order to check whether their co-participant has understood them.

Speakers can also make assessments or challenge co-speakers using questions. Assessments posed as information requests seek agreement (Heritage & Raymond, 2005; Pomerantz, 1984a), for example, the question "That was a great presentation, wasn't it?" gives a positive evaluation, or assessment, of the presentation and also seeks agreement from the addressee. Questions can be used to deliver complaints as well. Heinemann and Traverso define complaints as expressions of "feelings of discontent about some state of affairs, for which responsibility can be attributed to "someone" (to some person, organization or the like)" (Heinemann & Traverso, 2009). Questions can be used to challenge a co-speaker by disputing or denying the truth or validity of the statement or claim made. They can also implicitly ask for proof or a justification.

Questions can be used rhetorically. This is the case when, even though a question is asked, receiving an answer is not the intention of the person who posed the question, although some may seek a response. An English example of this is the question "Are you crazy?" The person posing this question does not intend you to answer it but is using the question to show that they think you are indeed crazy.

A number of questions can be grouped by their sequential position in interaction. In this case, it is the position of the question that makes the action the question is doing clear. Questions of this type occur in what are called pre-sequences or pre-insert expansions (Schegloff, 2007; Stivers, 2013). Roughly speaking, pre-sequences are short sequences of talk that occur before the base sequence. In a sense, they lead up to the main business of the talk, or the main objective of the talk. Questions in this position can be used for several actions. They are used for example by speakers to notify the co-participants of the action they are intending to perform. The telling of a story can be introduced by a speaker saying, "Did you hear what happened the other day?" In a similar manner, if a speaker wants to initiate an invitation, they can lead up to that main objective with a pre-question to test the water "Are you doing anything tonight?" as a manner of finding out what the likelihood of an acceptance would be before proceeding to the invitation itself. Often these questions in pre-sequences come in the guise of simple information questions. Section 1.4.3.3.1 will give more information on the sequence organization of questions in English.

1.4.3.2 Requests, politeness and contingency

The speech act and action that is of concern in chapter 4 is requesting. Trosborg gives a clear definition of this speech act: "a request is an illocutionary act whereby a speaker conveys to a hearer that he/she wants the requestee to perform an act which is for the benefit of the speaker. The act may be a request for non-verbal

goods and services, i.e. a request for an object, an action or some kind of service, etc., or it can be a request for verbal goods and services, i.e. a request for information" (Trosborg, 1994).

There is a difference between the analytic category of actions and the vernacular category of actions. This is specifically pertinent in the case of the speech-act of requests. In English, the category of requests is a natural category that speakers have and not solely an abstract theoretical category. In Dutch, this is the case too with the category of verzoeken, which is equivalent to requests. However, in German, on the other hand, there is not just one category of requests. There are two separate categories that together form what in English and Dutch is put into one category of requests. The two categories in German are bitten 'to beg or entreat' and auffordern which encompasses the meanings 'to ask', 'to invite', and 'to summon'. It is possible that "request" was considered by Searle (1976) amongst others to be a speech act and has subsequently been taken to be an analytical category, because it is a vernacular category in their native English tongue. Since it was added to the speech acts, it has become a much-studied analytic category. Nevertheless, it is questionable whether the category of requests is a universally applicable speech-act category. Recently, the category of recruitments, which incorporates requests, has also been found to be a useful category to delineate a set of conversational actions with the same goal: to get someone to do something for you (Floyd, Rossi & Enfield 2020). However, in chapters 4, the category of requests will be used as a starting point with an emphasis on the idea entailed in requests that the requester's aim is to obtain something. In chapter 5, it will become clear that the "simple" category of requests is not enough to accommodate all the intricacies that speakers of \overline{Akhoe} Haillom accomplish with their communicative actions.

In chapter 4, the specific object of attention will be the interplay of politeness (Brown & Levinson, 1978b), contingency (Curl & Drew, 2008) and society type with actions, specifically requests. Studies have focused on how the form of a request or directive is related to politeness on the one hand or entitlement and contingency on the other. As the speakers of $\bar{*Akhoe}$ Haillom have an egalitarian society, it is assumed that social hierarchy based politeness will not play a role in request formation whilst contingency- and entitlement-based politeness may have a larger role to play.

The most well-known study on politeness in social interaction is by Brown and Levinson (1978b). According to Brown and Levinson, requesting is a potentially face-threatening act. Speakers have the choice of more or less direct ways of making a request, and they base their choice of strategy on how serious they judge the imposition entailed in their request to be. The seriousness of the imposition depends on three factors: the power relationship between the speakers, the social relationship (or distance) between the speakers, and the level or ranking of the particular imposition under discussion in the social context relevant at the time of the discussion. It is in these three factors that cultural differences come into play. Many researchers have been at pains to show that the linguistic form of the politeness strategies differs from one culture to the next (Byon, 2006; Hong, 1998; Rue & Zhang, 2008; Tsuzuki, 1999). Brown and Levinson stress that the fact that all these cultures have politeness strategies is important, and the real interest lies in finding the reason for this commonality.

Examining the different politeness practices first, it can be said that the two most commonly described forms for posing a request are questions and directives. Different languages seem to prefer either the one form or the other. Each form has its own manner of marking politeness. English has numerous ways of making requests. In

terms of politeness and entitlement, there is a preference to formulate requests using questions instead of imperatives: contrast "Close the door," with "I wonder if you could close the door please." For examples of work on English requests see Ervin-Tripp (1981) and Kendrick (2020) on recruitments. English requests often question the addressee's ability or willingness to perform the request e.g. "Could you close the door?" In Spanish (Le Pair, 1996) speakers have a similar preference for the use of "conventional indirect strategies" of questioning in order to pose requests, specifically for the types of "query preparatory" questions, questions that make reference to the feasibility or the hearer's ability or willingness to perform the request. On the other hand, in other languages such as Zulu (De Kadt, 1992), German (Hofstede, 1984; House, 2005) and Polish (Huszcza, 2005; Wierzbicka, 1985, Zinken 2020 (on recruitments)) for example, requests in the form of directives are preferred. In Polish, politeness is shown through specific honorific markers which are added to the imperative. Chinese speakers usually pose their requests in the form of a directive too, (Gao, 1999; Song, 1994) as do Korean speakers in natural conversations (Rue & Zhang, 2008). Even though, as in English, social hierarchies are very important in these languages, unlike in English, politeness is shown through the use of utterance internal modifications, which are added to the imperative instead of through the choice of question type. Korean speakers mostly use specific honorific markers, while Chinese speakers prefer other modifications such as understaters, downtoners and appealers (e.g. please!) (Rue & Zhang, 2008).

In the work discussed above, the focus is on the use of politeness strategies due to the social relationships between speakers. Another angle is that of imposition (Brown & Levinson, 1978b; Curl & Drew, 2008). Curl and Drew specifically argue that the form in which a request in English is made is not so much concerned with the sociolinguistic settings, i.e. social hierarchies between speakers, but with the possible contingencies connected with the request, i.e. the degree of imposition placed on the recipient of the request, and the perceived entitlement of the requester. A further point of view brought forth in a number of studies on African languages is that this type of "politeness due to social settings or contingency and entitlement" can only be an issue if requests are seen within the culture as face-threatening acts that thus necessitate politeness. Obeng (1999) claims that in Akan, requests for services are not viewed as face-threatening acts. The Akan culture has a collective nature with a high degree of interdependence amongst its people, and therefore requests for services are not seen as an imposition. Nwoye (1992) reports the same for the Igbo community. He suggests a differentiation of face into 'individual face' and 'group face': individual face being concerned with the individual's needs and desires and group face being concerned with the individual's desire to conform to the culturally expected norms. It is this form of group face that leads to requests not being considered face-threatening acts if they fit in with the cultural norms of the Igbo egalitarian society. The idea of a group face is not uncommon in Africa and has been reported on by a number of other researchers (Adegbija, 1989; De Kadt, 1998; Kasanga, 2006; Kasanga & Lwanga-Lumu, 2007; Mekamgoum, 2013; Sommer & Vierke, 2011).

One last point that needs to be made here concerns the use of the terms "direct" and "indirect" with regard to requests. Gordon and Lakoff (1971) first introduced the term indirect speech-acts. From this was born the varying uses of the terms direct and indirect requests, often used in the field of politeness studies. It is a distinction that is commonly made in the linguistics literature, yet, these terms are not always used to mean the same things (Trosborg, 1994; Wierzbicka, 1991). In this thesis, when dealing with $\pm \bar{A}$ khoe data, the term direct

request will be used to mean any utterance in which the requester's wishes are explicitly stated, be they in the grammatical form of imperatives ("Give me a cigarette!") or hortatives ("Let's have a cigarette"). Imperatives and hortatives are usually very bald statements of intentions. The term indirect request will be used to refer to utterances in which the requester's wishes are not explicitly stated but may be inferred. Indirect requests are utterances intended to be requests but that can be interpreted as other actions, usually due to their linguistic form. For example, questions and statements concerning the presence or absence of desired objects ("Are there any cigarettes?" or "There are no cigarettes,") will be called indirect requests in those instances where it is clear from the situation that they are intended as requests. Questions and statements can be interpreted as something other than a request. For example, "Are there any cigarettes?" could be interpreted as merely being a query concerned with the possible presence of cigarettes which could then be responded to with a yes or no but not necessitating the handing over of any cigarettes. Similarly, the declarative "There are no cigarettes," could be interpreted as purely a noticing that is devoid of any intention of motivating anyone to bring some cigarettes. These types of utterances are often pre-requests: a type of utterance that is performed to "test the water" before doing an actual (direct) request or even to avoid having to make an actual request (Sacks, 1992b). Questions of the type "Can I have a cigarette?" or "Will you give me a cigarette?" which question the other interactant's willingness or ability to perform an action and which are very commonly used in English for requests do not occur in the *‡*Ākhoe data.

Summarising the above, languages may show a preference for using a specific speech act to formulate requests (questions vs. imperatives for example). Within this preference, languages use all sorts of grammatical means to show politeness in requests (for example the use of honorifics vs. the use of query preparatory questions). Most research has focused on how the form of the actions "request" or "directive" is related to politeness in connection to the speakers' relationship to each other. Another approach focuses on how the form of the action is related to entitlement and contingency. Both approaches are valid: the form of a request or directive can be based on the relationship between the speaker and the addressee as well as on the speaker's perception of the entitlement or contingency of their request. This makes requests an interesting area to look at with respect to the $$\bar{A}$ khoe Haillom language as $$\bar{A}$ khoe Haillom society is said not to be hierarchical but egalitarian. This would suggest that there should not be a big variety in the forms requests take in this language because when everyone is equal, there is no need to be especially polite to superiors for example. Alternatively, if there is variety in the forms of request, this variety must be doing something other than catering to politeness issues.

1.4.3.3 Sequence and action organization

The current section will explain how the sequences of turns in conversations (when speaker A says something, and speaker B responds to it) are built up in general and for questions and requests in particular. It will also show how knowledge of the regularities of these sequences is helpful in the analysis of requests.

The sequences within conversations are generally built up of turns between speakers. Ordinarily, one speaker's turn will make a following turn by the other speaker relevant. This can be seen most clearly in actions such as greetings, questions and such like. If speaker A, for example, greets someone with *"Matisa?"* 'How are you?'

this makes a response relevant from the person that was greeted. Something along the lines of "!*Gâi i ge a*," 'It is fine.' Turns often come in these types of adjacency pairings. The first turn is generally called the First Pair Part (FPP), and the second turn, the response, is called the Second Pair Part (SPP) (Schegloff, 1968, 2007). A sequence itself is a succession of turns at talk in which the turns have a meaningful relationship to each other, in that they have a coherent and orderly organization in which a previous turn constrains the possibilities for the next turn (who can speak and what they can speak about), and that together implement a course of action (Liddicoat, 2007; Schegloff, 2007).

1.4.3.3.1 Question response sequences

The action of questioning is counted as an FPP. A question, being the FPP of an adjacency pair, makes a responsive turn relevant. This responsive turn is generally counted as the SPP. See the example below:

The turn by VIV is ostensibly an information question, the FPP, and the response by NAN is an answer to the question and forms the SPP.

Questions, unless they are "true" information questions, often do not merely perform the action of questioning but are used for their recognizable grammatical shape as a vehicle to perform other actions. For more on this, see section 1.4.3.1.

Responses to questions consist of answers, non-answers and transformative answers (Stivers & Hayashi, 2010). Example (2) above showed a question that receives an answer. Non-answer responses are responses that orient to the fact that a question has been asked but do not actually give an answer to the question. Examples of non-answer responses would be laughter or "I don't know" for instance, as MIC's response in the example below shows.

(3) (adapted from Chicken Dinner)

NAN: Soo w'time sh'd they c'm over t'morruh.

(1.5)

MIC: I don'know wuh ti-:me

A transformative answer is an answer that is in essence disaffiliative. The answerer has an issue with a certain aspect of the question and uses the answer to adjust the question. An example is shown in (4) in which the answerer, Maureen, has an issue with the passive portrayal of herself as "coming with" in Jake's question while
she will be the one driving the car. In a sense, she adjusts the question by answering, "I'm taking you," overtly putting herself in the much more active role of driver.

(4) (adapted from Stivers and Hayashi (2010))

Jake: °()° Are>you gonn come,< Oh you're gonna come with us yeah:? (0.2) Maur: I:'m taking you

A speaker can select a person to respond to her or his turn. This next speaker can be selected by a number of means. For example, by the use of eye gaze, address terms or by addressing the recipient's domain of epistemic authority. With the latter, questions that concern the addressee's domain of expertise are meant. A next speaker can also be selected with a combination of these options. Example (5) shows the use of an address term in the form of the personal name 'Nance' used to select a next speaker.

(5)	(adapted	(adapted from Chicken Dinner)				
	VIV:	You w <u>a</u> nt s[m m <u>or</u> e Nance ?]				
	NAN:		[ˈh <u>i</u> hh °(]uh(h)hn)°		
		(0.3)				
	NAN:	hh <u>i</u> h (.) No I <u>ha</u> ve my o <u>w</u> :n.				

Initial questions are rarely designed in such a manner that they use multiple features to pressure for a response (e.g. use of an address term combined with speaker gaze). When questions do involve multiple features, this still does not guarantee a response. One manner in which speakers can push for a response is by pursuing the question (Pomerantz, 1984b). This is usually done with a follow up or second question that does involve the use of multiple features to pressure for a response. This type of question is called a pursuit. A pursuit can be performed by various methods. For example, by repeating the utterance, redoing the utterance or by not averting one's gaze from the intended next speaker until a response is given (Stivers & Rossano, 2010). One can also pursue a response if no response is given or if the response that was given to the initial question was not satisfactory. An example of a pursuit is shown in the transcript of an alarm call in (6).

	4		answer my questions please? What iz thuh problem?		
	3	CT:	[Si:r: I- eh would you		
	2	C:	I don't kno:w. if I knew I wouldn't be needin' [y-		
	1	CT:	And what is thuh problem there?		
(6)	([Dallas FD/B I] in Zimmerman (1992))				

In line 1, the operator poses the first question. The response to the question in line 2 does not deliver any useful information and so in line 3 the operator pursues the initial question. The pursuit is preceded by a reference term 'sir', then there is an added request to the caller to answer the question and this is followed by a repeat of the

initial question which has added emphasis on the question word 'what'. All these extra elements contribute to raising the pressure for the caller to answer the question.

In the domain of polar questions, a few extra things need to be made explicit. Polar questions can receive a confirming or disconfirming answer. A speaker's stance is generally displayed in the polar question they pose. The question "Would you like some tea now?" displays that the speaker assumes the addressee will want some tea whereas the question "You don't want any tea, do you?" displays that the speaker assumes the addressee will not want tea. A confirming answer confirms the stance displayed in the question, while a disconfirming answer disconfirms this stance (Bolinger, 1987). It has been shown that it is more common for speakers to confirm polar questions than to disconfirm them (Stivers et al., 2009). A disconfirmation would be a disaffiliative action which is dispreferred in conversation (Heritage, 1984; Pomerantz, 1984a). Polar questions can be answered with an interjection (yes or no) and also with a (partial) repeat of the question, also referred to as echo responses (Jones, 1999). In the case of interjection answers, the positive or negative phrasing of a polar question can potentially lead to confusion. Polar questions can be positively or negatively phrased "Will you come?" versus "Will you not come?" Confirming or disconfirming a negatively phrased question with only a 'yes' or 'no' answer can lead to confusion. For example, when the English negatively phrased question "Will you not come?" is answered with 'yes', it is not always clear whether the interjection 'yes' is confirming the stance of the questioner entailed in the negatively phrased question thus meaning "Indeed, I will not come," or whether it is a positive answer to the question itself, saying "Yes: (contrary to your stance) I WILL come." Some languages, such as German, French and Danish (Heinemann, 2005) for example, have a separate word which can be used to confirm negatively phrased questions. In German, the standard word for 'yes' is 'ja', but the word used to confirm negatively phrased questions is 'doch'. Answering a question such as "Will you not come?" with 'doch' can only mean "Yes I WILL come." For more information on these truth-based and polarity-based answering systems see Jones (1999).

Repetitions can be used as a response to polar questions. For example, answering, "I'm coming" in response to the question "Are you coming?" Repetition answers generally confirm the question although they are by no means an unmarked type of response in all languages (Hayano, 2013; Jones, 1999; Keevallik, 2010; Sorjonen, 2001). In addition to confirming a question, a repeat answer can also be used, for example, to upgrade the speaker's authority on the matter being discussed. During conversations, speakers routinely deal with issues of epistemicity, i.e. who has the right to say what (Heritage, 2013). One of the ways in which a speaker can claim authority over something that has just been said is by upgrading a turn, in a sense by making the claim "bigger". In the case of questions, a repeat answer not only confirms or disconfirms a question but it can also be used to upgrade the turn and/or claim authority over the subject matter (Heritage & Raymond, 2005).

Verbal responses can be accompanied by, usually simultaneous, visible components; head nods and shakes, deictic pointing gestures or iconic gestures for example (Lee, 2012; Stivers et al., 2009). A response can also consist of only a visible component, for example, in the case of polar questions, a confirming or disconfirming head nod or shake can be enough to answer a question adequately.

1.4.3.3.2 Request sequences

As for the action of requesting, it is also generally analysable as a FPP (Schegloff, 2007), as a question is. A request always makes a response relevant, specifically a response that makes it clear whether the request will be granted or denied. Hence, the request is always the first part of a pair of turns, and the response is the second part of the pair. The following shows this. It is an example of a request for an action followed by an acknowledgement that the request will be granted.

(7) (Stew Dinner in Schegloff (2007: 94))
FPP Dad: An' may I have thuh -butter please.
SPP Mom: Yes. = hh

Once the request has been made, a response is relevant. This response can either come in the form of a granting or in the form of a denial or rejection of the request. The design of grantings and rejections are the same as the design for the acceptance and rejections of offers and proposals. Requests are granted simply and without delay as the previous example showed. When requests are rejected, speakers make use of delays, prefaces (e.g. 'uh' and 'well'), accounts and declinations (Davidson, 1984; Heritage, 1984: 266-267). The rejection of a request is shown in example (8). In this example, the rejection is preceded by a delay of the response.

 (8) (US in Schegloff (2007: 129))
 Carol: C'mmere fer a minnit. (0.7)
 Vic: Y'come [he:re.

Request sequences have often been analysed as dispreferred actions when compared to offer sequences (Levinson, 1983; Schegloff, 2007) although the clear cut nature of this distinction has been challenged (Kendrick & Drew, 2014). The reason for the perceived threatening nature of requests is that they can pose a threat to a person's face (Brown & Levinson, 1978b). Speakers perceive that a request can possibly be taken as a threat by the listener, and one manner in which speakers orient to this is by making use of accounts in their requests. The frequent use of accounts in requests is an attempt to show that the request is reasonable (Goodwin & Heritage, 1990; Lindström, 2005; Schegloff, 2007). This is shown in example (9) where the account is included in the FPP occurring before the actual request. Speaker Ann asks speaker Marty if she can have a match after she has accounted for not having any matches with "she took my matches."

(9) (Post-Party in Schegloff (2007: 83))

Ann: Marty she took my ma:tches kin I have a match,

Mar: Su:re, hmhh

Another way in which people orient to the face-threatening nature of requests is by not making an overt request at all or by disguising the request as another action. Schegloff (2007: Ch. 5) argues that offers are preferred to

requests, and therefore the making of a request is delayed in the hope that an offer may be forthcoming. He shows this with the example that is repeated below in a shortened form. Speakers Abb and Bet are talking about a book.

(10)	SBL 2	hegloff, 2007))	
	1	Abb:	I say do you have it?
	2	Bet:	Yes.
	3	Abb:	Uh huh,
	4	Bet:	And I'll be glad to (.) let you have it (a week'r two).
	5	Abb:	Yes I'd like to.

In line 1, speaker Abb asks Bet whether she has a certain book, she does not ask if she can have the book. Bet responds with a strong, emphatic confirmation, but, in line 3, Abb accepts this confirmation with a continuer implying that she does not consider Bet's turn to be complete. Bet then indeed does continue and issues an offer in line 4, which is accepted by Abb. Abb could have requested the book right after Bet's confirmation that she has it. Abb does not do this, instead she holds out for an offer, which is eventually forthcoming.

Sacks (1992b) shows that requests can be "sprung" on a conversational partner in a first pair part. To avoid springing a possibly unwanted request on one's conversational partner, a speaker can give a pre-signal, called a pre, before doing the actual request in order to "test the water". The reaction to the pre will determine whether the speaker will then perform the actual request. Compare the following two examples Sacks gives.

- (11) (from (Sacks, 1992a))
 - A: What are those, cigars?
 - B: Yeah. You want one?
 - A: Sure.
- (12) (from (Sacks, 1992a))
 - A: What is what are those, cigars?
 - B: Yeah, me and Al are gonna smoke cigars.
 - A: Oh. Lemme have a cigar.

In the first example the pre "What are those, cigars?" leads to an offer "You want one?" In the second example the pre "What are those, cigars?" does not lead to an offer, but it has topicalized the cigars in such a manner that the request for a cigar in B's next turn does not come completely out of the blue.

Another example that is often used to show the usefulness of pre's is the "asking someone on a date" example. Compare the two following fictitious examples:

(13)	A:	So what are you doing tonight?
------	----	--------------------------------

B:	Dave is	taking me	out for	dinner.
----	---------	-----------	---------	---------

(14) A	.: So	what are	you doing	g tonight?
--------	-------	----------	-----------	------------

- B: I have a date with my microwave.
- A: How about having dinner with me instead?

Asking someone on a date is a situation where the face-threatening aspects of a request become clear. Being asked out is problematic for the addressee in those cases where they cannot or do not want to accept the request. Asking someone out is also potentially problematic for the requester in the case that s/he is turned down. In these types of instances, doing a pre (asking a preparatory question) in the form of the question "What are you doing tonight?" reduces the risks somewhat for both sides (Schegloff, 1988). From the requester's point of view, it checks whether the addressee is actually available to potentially fulfil the request before posing it. From the point of view of the addressee, the pre gives the addressee the option of claiming not to be available and thus softening the act of turning the requester down.

A request sequence is closed either after the SPP, which shows whether the request will be granted or denied, or after the SPP in a third turn which is commonly called a third position receipt. The requester uses this third position to acknowledge the granting or the denial of the request.

(15) (Stew Dinner in Schegloff (2007: 94))
Dad: An' may I have thuh -b<u>utter please</u>.
Mom: Yes. = hh
Dad: Thanks

This section has summarized some of the links between language, culture and human interaction and it has given a basic description of the structure of question answer sequences and request sequences in English. This thesis will explore these links within the $\frac{1}{4}$ khoe Haillom language and culture and, using the structure of question answer sequences and request sequences, attempt to show the concern for an individual speaker's freedom that exist in this society.

1.5 Data and methods

The field site where the data used in this thesis was collected is the settlement at Farm 6. I visited the settlement on eight occasions for periods of six weeks up to four months between 2004 and 2007. Most of the data gathered during those stays consists of video recordings that were collected for the DoBeS language corpus. The DoBeS language corpus is an online corpus that consists of (video) recordings of endangered speech communities. It was funded by the Volkswagen Foundation and is accessible at www.mpi.nl/DOBES.

Using video recordings as the basic data has the advantage that it not only allows one to capture speech in the form of natural conversation, but one can also capture the non-verbal components: gestures, facial expressions, eye gaze, posture, bodily movements and spatial orientation, that together with speech make up a conversation. The choice to work mainly with natural conversation was made because it permits one to give a more accurate representation of the manner in which language is actually used. The use of only traditional elicitation methods is likely to result in a representation of how the informants think the language should be used. Most video recordings of natural interaction were made by setting up the camera, after having been given permission by the speakers, inserting a one-hour video tape and then leaving. Upon returning an hour later, if the ongoing interaction was deemed to be of continuing interest, the tape would be switched, and the recording would be continued. On occasion, an interactant who joined in later would sometimes assume that the camera was switched off if the researcher was absent, and they would be surprised to find later that the camera was actually recording. Nevertheless, they invariably consented to the use of the data. In general, interactants were very comfortable being recorded. This was the case to the extent that, if interactants decided to relocate to a shadier spot during an ongoing recording, they would take the camera and microphone with them, set it all up and continue with their conversation.

The natural conversational data was supplemented with data that consisted of participants performing specific tasks. The aim was to elicit interrogatives (Chapter 3) and requests (Chapter 4), and the tasks were chosen with this in mind. Elicitation techniques such as the picture book The Frog Story (Mayer, 1994), video clips (the MPI "staged events" task clips (van Staden, Senft, Enfield, & Bohnemeyer, 2001)) and a Lego blocks building task were used. For the picture book task and the staged events task, informants were paired up, and they were asked to talk about what they were seeing and to ask each other questions about what they were seeing. For the Lego blocks building task, informants were once again paired up. This time one informant was given the visual instructions for building a small car, and the other informant was given some Lego blocks. The informants were then asked to build the car together, but they were only allowed to collaborate verbally, i.e. only one was allowed to see the instructions and the other allowed to handle the Lego blocks. The Lego blocks given to the informant for the task were more than were needed, and one piece that was needed was not available. This task was intended to elicit questions as well as requests. The majority of the tasks can also be found on the Max-Planck-Institute for Psycholinguistics' field manual website: http://fieldmanuals.mpi.nl. For these interactions, the participants were often asked to come to the local primary school so that the recordings could be made indoors without an audience. In all these settings, the speakers were free to talk as they wished. The verbal interaction in these tasks was constrained only by the demands of the task, and thus it provides useful data for a study of verbal interaction in the community.

The video recordings were transcribed and translated locally by Linda IUises and Mariane Kheimses after which they were reviewed with speakers. IUises and Kheimses were teachers at the Farm 6 school, native speakers of Nama-Damara, fluent in English and Afrikaans and with extensive experience with $\frac{1}{4}$ khoe Haillom due to their teaching activities. They were coached to transcribe the interactions as they occurred, without "correcting" them, i.e. making them grammatically correct, leaving in all the repairs, hesitations, etc.

1.6 Summary

The object of this thesis is to show the non-coercive characteristics of \bar{A} khoe Haillom interactional practices and to examine whether universal interactional principles are shaped by cultural factors. The microsociology of questioning and requesting interaction, as well as a culture specific speech act, will be explored as they occur in everyday, informal conversations of \bar{A} khoe Haillom speakers with the aim of identifying cultural and social traits that influence language use and the structure of conversation leading to this non-coercive nature.

2 Grammatical sketch

This grammar sketch of $\bar{+}Akhoe$ Haillom is included in this thesis firstly in order to enable the reader to have a better understanding of the examples that will be given in the later chapters, and secondly because $\bar{+}Akhoe$ is an underdescribed and endangered language that deserves primary description in its own right. To arrive at this sketch of the grammar, I have exhaustively compiled prior sketches, citing them as relevant, and supplemented these materials with observations and elicitations of my own (unattributed descriptions are thus my own). The corpus collected for the DOBES project in which I was involved provided invaluable material for this sketch.

This sketch is based largely on Heikkinen's unpublished sketch (Heikkinen, n.d.-a). The standard Nama-Damara orthography is used, and phonetic transcriptions are not included unless otherwise stated. In the standard Nama-Damara orthography, a horizontal line above the vowel (\vec{u}) indicates long vowels, and a circumflex (\hat{u}) indicates nasalized vowels. If a diphthong is nasalized, only the first vowel is marked with a circumflex (\hat{oa}). Furthermore, although voice is not a distinctive feature in Nama-Damara or in $\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe Haillom, the voice distinction is reflected in the stops in the standard orthography. This distinction is used to show a difference in tone. The voiced stops b, d and g precede a low tone melody, and the voiceless stops p, t and k precede a high tone melody. This is based on a historical change in tone and voicing. Proto-Khoe is presumed to have had a voicing distinction. The voiced consonants functioned as depressor consonants lowering the tone on the following vowel enabling a tonal split. Once this difference in tone was established, the consonants lost their voicing distinction (Beach, 1938; Haacke, 2008; Honken, 2008).

2.1 Phonology

The phonological patterns that are found in $\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe Haillom today are largely still the same as they were in Proto-Khoe. Historically, the Khoekhoe languages had only short vowels and no long vowels or diphthongs. The long vowels and diphthongs that currently exist in $\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe came about due to the elision of the consonants in between the short vowels: $*C_1VC_2V > C_1VV$ (Haacke, 2001). In the cases where C_2 was a nasal, the elision resulted in a nasalized vowel. The distribution of the vowels and consonants in words in $\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe Haillom also still follows this strict historical pattern: $C(C)_1-V_1-C_2-V_2$ (Güldemann & Vossen, 2000).

2.1.1 Vowels

 \bar{A} khoe Haillom has five short vowels and five long vowels. Of all the vowels, only the long vowels \bar{i} , \bar{u} and \bar{a} can be nasalized.

	Front	Central	Back
High	i/ī/î		$u/\bar{u}/\hat{u}$
Mid	e/ē		o/ō
Low		a/ā/â	

Figure 2-1: Vowels

Vowel length is distinctive, as is nasalization. For example, the term of address for one's mother *ma* has a short vowel, whereas the verb for 'to give' $m\bar{a}$ has a long vowel. If the long vowel is nasalized, the word is $m\hat{a}$, which is the question word 'which'. Similarly, the verb *oa* 'to return' is not nasalized but the verb *ôa* 'to search' is.

 $\frac{1}{4}$ Åkhoe Haillom oral and nasal diphthongs are phonologically analysable as strings of V+V. Some minimal contrasts to illustrate the distinctions in the diphthongs are for example the nouns *tsau-b* 'well' and *tsâu-b* 'bull calf'. These illustrate again the distinction between nasalized and non-nasalized vowels. In addition, the verbs *toe* 'to move place' and *toa* 'to be finished', as well as *tai* 'to suckle' and *tau* 'to be on fire' show the distinctions in the diphthongs.

oral:	ael ail aol au	nasal:	âi∥âu
	oal oe		ôa
	ui		ûi
			îa

2.1.2 Consonants

[‡]Ākhoe Haillom has a total of 36 consonants of which 20 are clicks. Amongst Khoisan languages, this is a rather small collection of consonants. They are all shown in Figure 2-2. The phonetic transcriptions are given where necessary in square brackets. The consonants given in round brackets occur only in loanwords or in the speech of older speaker who originally come from further north.

There are only three stops, which are represented with *b*, *d* and *g* (p, t, k are used in the practical orthography to mark a distinction in tone). In \bar{A} hoe Haillom, voice is not a distinctive feature. The glottal stop is not represented in the standard orthography. To exemplify this contrast, compare [20] used for conjunctions with *bo* 'or', $d\bar{o}$ 'to bead' and the recent past marker *go*. \bar{A} hoe furthermore has fricatives: *s*, *x*, *h*, as in the words *sam-i* 'breast', *xam-ba* 'lion and *hame* 'who'. There are nasals: *m* and *n*, and an alveolar flap: *r*, as in the words

xamani-sa 'animal', *xana-sa* 'marijuana' and *xara-sa* 'scratch'. There are also affricatives *kh*, and *ts* as in the words *khama* 'to be like' and *tsama* 'type of melon'.

In the northern variant of $\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe, the nasals *m* and *n* are prenasalised stops *mb* and *nd*, as in for example the demonstratives: 'this' is $n\bar{e}sa$ in the southern variant but $nd\bar{e}sa$ in the northern variant. This is probably an influence from the Owambo languages. The northern $\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe speakers live surrounded by Owambo speakers, and nasalised stops are a common feature of the Owambo languages (Baucom, 1974). The voiceless fricative *f* occurs only in loanwords. For example, the word for 'table' *tafel-sa* is a loanword from the Afrikaans word 'tafel'. In addition, the verb *flex* 'to braid' is a loanword from the Afrikaans word 'vleg'. Likewise, the word for 'Friday'' *fraita-tsē* is a loanword from either German 'Freitag' or Afrikaans 'Vrydag'. Consonant clusters also occur in only loanwords, as can be seen in the above examples *flex* and *fraita-tse*. In some loanwords, though, the clusters can be split into a succession of CV syllables. This can be seen in the loanword *brukhoe-sa*.

	Labial	Dental	Alveolar		Palatal	Velar	Glottal
Stops	b	d				g	[?]
Nasals	m	n					
	(mb)	(nd)					
Flaps			r [r]				
Fricatives		(f)	S			х	h
Affricates			ts [t∫]			kh	
Approximants	w						
Liquids			(1)				
Clicks Glottalized		I	!	II	ŧ		
		[?]	[!?]	[?]	[‡?]		
Voiceless		lg	!g	llg	‡g		
		[]	[!]	[]	[‡]		
Aspirated		lh	!h	llh	‡h		
Affricated		kh	!kh	llkh	‡kh		
		$[\mathbf{x}^h]$	$[!x^h]$	$[\mathbf{x}^h]$	$[\ddagger x^h]$		
Nasalized		ln	!n	lln	≠n		

Figure 2-2: Consonants

The clicks are ingressive consonants and are built up of a primary articulation and a secondary articulation. These are called influxes and effluxes respectively. The influxes are the effect of the manner of articulation (suction) at the primary articulation points. There are four of these: dental (|), alveolar (!), palatal (\ddagger) and lateral (||). There are four effluxes or releases of the suction that are distinct through manner of articulation: glottal stop (|), aspiration (|h), nasalization (|n) and affrication (|kh). When a click is not accompanied by an efflux, it is orthographically realized with the letter g following the click: (|g). The influxes and effluxes are combined to make up the 20 different clicks. For a Khoisan language, $\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe does not have very many clicks. Naro, for

example, has 28 clicks (Visser, 1998), and ||Ani has 41 (Vossen, 2000). In all languages, the same influxes occur, but Naro and ||Ani have more efflux options. They have more voiced and voiceless distinctions as well as ejective clicks. For $\pm \bar{A}$ khoe, compare the verbs $\pm \hat{u}$ 'to eat' and $\pm n\hat{u}$ 'to sit'. They show the difference between a click with a glottal stop and a click with nasalization. A three way minimal contrast is illustrated in the following verbs: *//ore* 'to be naughty' with glottalization, *//gore* 'to attack' without an efflux and *//khore* 'to long for' with affrication.

As mentioned at the start of this chapter, the distribution of the vowels and consonants in words in $\pm\bar{A}$ khoe Haillom follows a strict pattern: C(C)₁-V₁-C₂-V₂. The first slot can only be filled by a strong consonant, or a consonant cluster, represented by the brackets. All consonants are considered strong except for the bilabials *b* and *w* and the flap *r*. The C₂ slot can only be filled with the nasals *m* and *n*, or with the oral consonants *b*, *w* and *r* that cannot occur in C₁. For example, the noun *tsara.b* 'dust' is built up as follows: C-V-C-V. The C₁ slot is filled with the affricate *ts* and the C₂ slot with the oral consonant *r*. The word *xawe* 'but' is built up as follows: C-V-C-V, where the C₁ slot is filled with the strong consonant *x* and the C₂ slot with the oral consonant *w*. Loanwords can deviate from these rules. For example, the bilabial stop *b* occurs only in word initial position in loanwords such as in the word *brex-sa* 'bridge' that comes from the Afrikaans word *brug*. Also, strong consonants can occur in the C₂ slot only in loanwords as in the example *kete-ba* 'chain', which comes from the German *Kette*.

If the vowels, V_1 and V_2 , in a word are identical and the second consonant, C_2 , is a nasal, only the vowels *i*, *a* and *u* occur in V_1 and V_2 . For example, in the word *‡gama* 'brown', the vowels are identical: *a*, and C_2 is the nasal *m*. In the noun *‡khini-b* 'sheet of paper', the vowels are identical: *i*, and the consonant in the C_2 slot is the nasal *n*. In the cases where the vowels V_1 and V_2 , are identical but C_2 is an oral consonant, any vowel can take the V slots. For example the verb *liri* 'to spray' has the oral consonant *r* in the C_2 slot and the same vowel *i* in the vowel slots. The word *‡here* 'shallow' also has the oral consonant *r* in the C_2 slot, but the vowel *a* in the vowel slots, and finally, the noun *‡horo-b* 'neck' has the oral consonant *r* in the C_2 slot and the vowel *o* in the vowel slots.

Long vowels and diphthongs were formed when C_2 was lost due to an increase in sonority. This means that long vowels and diphthongs only occur in monosyllabic CV-roots. For example, the verb *xoa* 'to write', with its diphthong, came from the bisyllabic verb *xora* 'to scratch' when the r was lost. Similarly, the Nama-Damara word *#haa* 'flat/shallow' is related to the $\frac{1}{4}$ khoe word *#haba* 'wide'.

2.1.3 The Syllable

The syllable forms CV, CVV and CVN are possible in $\pm \bar{A}$ khoe. All consonants occur in the syllable initial C slot, including the glottal stop. In the cases where orthographically a syllable appears to start with a vowel, there

is actually a glottal stop in the C slot. In the case of loan words, the syllable initial C can also consist of a consonant cluster, e.g. *skoli* 'school'. The CV syllable does not occur on its own as a root form.

CV.CV	kha.ra	'different'
CVV	lkhai	'to be absent'
CVN	/khan	'to split'
	?am	'to roast'

2.1.4 Root and word structure

The root and word structure of $\frac{1}{4}$ khoe Haillom today still largely follows the historical patterns of the strict bisyllabic distribution of vowels and consonants in proto Khoekhoe roots that have been mentioned before. The roots were built up as follows:

 $C(C)_1 V_1 C_2 V_2$ (Güldemann & Vossen, 2000)

The CVV syllable came about due to the lenition of C_2 , and the CVN syllable arose due to the lenition of V_2 where C_2 was a sonorant.

khana > *khan* 'to split' (Haacke, 1992)

In ‡Ākhoe, most words are of the CVV structure. In the lexicon compiled for this thesis (based on Heikkinen's unpublished word list and supplemented with data collected for Dobes) of about 2000 words (not roots), about 540 are CVV (where VV can be a long vowel as well as a diphthong), 450 are CVCV and 100 are CVN.

Roots can have up to four syllables:

CV	<i>?o</i> 'and then'
	<i>bo</i> 'or'
CVV	<i>?ôa</i> 'child'
	$d\bar{o}$ 'to bead'
	doa 'to tear'
CVN	!om 'hand'
CVCV	to.ro 'war'
CVCVCV	hu.ku.ri 'chicken'
CVCVCVCV	?a.bu.xa.re 'butterfly'

The most common form though is a bisyllabic root. Most of the longer words are derived words, compounds or loanwords. For example, the verb *//khā.//khā.sen* 'to learn' or 'to teach oneself' is built up of three syllables: a reduplication of *//khā*, which as a verb means 'to be able to' but once reduplicated means 'to teach'. This

reduplication is then followed with the reflexive suffix -*sen*. The noun $/g\hat{a}.!gae.ba$ 'beehive' also consists of three syllables, it is built up of the noun $/g\hat{a}$ 'grass' and the verb !gae 'to tie' and, because it is a noun, is then followed with a Person Gender Number marker *ba*. An example of a loan word that is multi-syllabic is the word *ku.nu.be.sa* 'button'. It consists of four syllables, the first three of which are a loan from the Afrikaans word for button *knop*, which was assimilated to the $\frac{1}{4}$ khoe CV syllable structure.

2.1.5 Tone and Stress

Tone is distinctive in \bar{A} khoe Haillom. Heikkinen (n.d.-a) identifies seven tonal units: these seem to be tonal melodies that cover a whole word. She distinguishes between rising, high, mid, low, falling, rising falling and falling rising melodies.

For Nama-Damara, which is mutually intelligible with \bar{A} khoe Haillom, Haacke (1976) identified four surface tonemes, or register tones: double low, low, high and double high. These combine in pairs to form six tonal profiles, or melodies, on roots. The tone bearing units are the vowels. In the cases where the vowel following a sonorant has been elided the sonorant is the tone-bearing unit.

A study of the complete tonal system of \bar{A} khoe Haillom was considered to be beyond the scope of this thesis. Therefore, for the work presented here, the tonal information collected by Heikkinen and Rapold was relied upon. At the time of the publication of this thesis, the work on tone was not complete.

2.1.6 Orthography

In this thesis, the standard orthography set up for Nama-Damara (Curriculum-Committee-for-Khoekhoegowab, 2003) will be adhered to. In the standard Nama-Damara orthography vowel length is indicated with a macron, a horizontal line, above the vowel (\vec{a}), and nasalization is marked with circumflex (\hat{a}). Although voicing is not a distinctive feature in Nama-Damara or in $\pm\bar{A}$ khoe Haillom, the stops are written as voiced or voiceless stops in the official orthography depending on the tones of the following vowels. The stops are written as voiceless *p*, *t* and *k* to indicate a higher tone, and they are written as voiced *b*, *d* and *g* to indicate a lower tone. Thus, only two tones are represented. As the tonal system of $\pm\bar{A}$ khoe Haillom was not fully identified, as mentioned above, the transcriptions as the local transcribers Mrs. M. Kheimses and Mrs. L. lUises gave them, will be followed.

2.1.7 Phonemes, sounds, graphemes

/b/	[b]	b, p
	[ß]	b, p
	[v]	b, p
	[p]/_C	b, p
	[mb]	b, p
/d/	[d]	d, t
/g/	[g]	g, k
/m/	[m]	m
/n/	[n]	n
	[nd]	n
/ r /	[1]	r
	[d]/N_	r
/s/	[s]	S
/tʃ/	[tʃ]	ts
/x/	[x]	X
/h/	[ĥ]	h
/kh/	[kh]	kh
/?/	[?]	is not represented in the orthography
/ ?/	[?]	I
/\/	[]	g
/ h /	[h]	h
/ x /	[x]	lkh
/ n /	[n]	In
/!?/	[!?]	!
/!/	[!]	!g
/!h/	[!h]	!h
/!x/	[!x]	!kh
/!n/	[n!]	!n
/‡?/	[‡?]	ŧ
/‡/	[‡]	‡g
/ŧh/	[‡h]	[‡] h
/‡x/	[‡x]	‡kh
/‡n/	[n‡]	†n
/ ?/	[?]	II
/11/	[]	llg
/ h/	[h]	llh
/ x/	[x]	llkh

/ n/	[n]	lln
/i/	[i]	i
/e/	[ɛ]	e
/a/	[a]	a
/0/	[ɔ]	0
/u/	[u]	u
/i:/	[i:]	ī
/e:/	[ε:]	ē
/a:/	[a:]	ā
/o:/	[ɔ:]	ō
/u:/	[u:]	ū
/ĩ:/	[ĩ:]	î
/ã:/	[ã:]	â
/ũ:/	[ũ:]	û
/ae/	[aɛ]	ae
/ai/	[ai]	ai
/ao/	[aɔ]	ao
/au/	[au]	au
/oa/	[ɔa]	oa
/oe/	[36]	oe
	[we]	oe
/ua/	[ua]	ua
	[wa]	ua
/ui/	[ui]	ui
/ãĩ/	[ãĩ]	âi
/ãũ/	[ãũ]	âu
/õã/	[õã]	ôa
/ũĩ/	[ũĩ]	ûi
/ĩã/	[ĩã]	îa

2.2 Word classes

Looking at the morpho-syntactic marking on words in ‡Ākhoe Haillom, it is possible to distinguish two word classes. On the one hand, words that have a compulsory Person Gender Number marker (henceforth PGN marker) and on the other hand, words that do not. PGN markers are suffixes that mark a root for its gender, number and person (see Section 2.2.2). Nouns have compulsory PGN markers but all other word classes do not. In example (16) below, the two nouns 'dice' and 'person' have PGN markers but the verb 'throw' does not.

(16) Daes-de ra +noa khoe-s ge.
dice-3PL.F.A PROG throw person-3SG.F DECL
'The woman is throwing dice.' (Collect_nuts:Man)

Verbs do not have PGN markers but they can occur with other word classes, for example, with adjectives, demonstratives, quantifiers, etc. On verbs, these PGN markers are not obligatory.

There are a number of roots that can occur in more than one word class. Take for example the root $\neq \hat{u}$. In example (17), it has no PGN marker and is semantically a verb meaning 'to eat'. In example (18), it does take morphological marking, namely the PGN suffix -e, and semantically it is a noun meaning 'food'.

- (17) #Û ra /gôa-n ge.
 eat PROG child-3PL.C DECL
 'The children are eating.' (Ga_beads_2:Ga)
- (18) #Û-e nabo ra oa n-a.
 food-3SG.C.A forage PROG return 3PL.C-A
 'They collect food and are going back.' (State_hospital:Ga)

Similarly, the root *ama* occurs in example (19) as a noun meaning 'truth' with a PGN marker, and in example (20), it occurs as an adverb meaning 'truly' without a PGN marker.

- (19) Ama-e sa mî i ge hana auma.
 true-3SG.C.A 2SG say 3SG.C DECL actually grandmother
 'Actually, you tell the truth grandmother.' (Gas_yardA:Ap)
- (20) Ari-i ge ama khoe-e ra o.
 dog-3SG.C DECL truly person-3SG.C.A PROG eat.meat
 'The dog is truly eating a person.' (Gas_yardA:Ga)

2.2.1 Prior work on word classes

There has been no prior work on word classes in $\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe Haillom. Therefore, this section will briefly review the debate on word classes in the Nama-Damara literature, which will shed some light on what may be going on in $\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe Haillom due to the languages' close proximity. The debate on word classes focuses on the distinctions, if any, between verbs, nouns and adjectives. The three researchers who concerned themselves with this issue were Dempwolff (1934), Günther (1969) and Haacke (1976, 1978).

2.2.1.1 Dempwolff and Günther on Nama-Damara

Dempwolff (1934: 66), who used as his main source bible texts and a volume of transcribed texts spoken by mother tongue speakers in 1907, writes that Nama-Damara roots give the impression of being "polyvalent", i.e. that they cannot be sorted into grammatical categories and only have semantic content. He states that, within the semantic domain, the language does consciously differentiate the three categories of nouns, verbs and adjectives even though this is not recognisable from the roots themselves. Dempwolff gives examples of nominalization and derivation, which he calls transformation. 'Verbs' and 'adjectives' can be nominalised when used as subject or predicate respectively, and they can be "transformed" into other words in a different word class through the addition of specific suffixes. Dempwolff claims that once Nama-Damara roots have been transformed to actual words, for example through various derivations, they clearly belong to specific word classes.

The second author who concerns himself with Nama-Damara word classes is Günther (1969). In his view, the boundary between nouns and verbs in Nama-Damara is fluid because the PGN markers can attach to nouns as well as verbs. Unfortunately, the examples he uses to show this are problematic and not grammatically acceptable to all speakers (Haacke, 1976: 146). $\pm \bar{A}$ khoe Haillom speakers agree to some extent, although these speakers also evince a clear dislike for giving grammaticality judgments.

2.2.1.2 Haacke on Nama-Damara

Haacke (1976:10) argues that the previous authors were not able to find the underlying structures of Nama-Damara because they were approaching the language from the word level. In his view, one needs to approach this language from the syntactic level. He considers Dempwolff's analysis that roots are divided into word classes to be correct (1976:52). Haacke considers the "polyvalent" or fluid roots standpoint to be too strong although he does concede that there is considerable overlap of the various word class categories (1978:9). The $+\bar{A}$ khoe Haillom examples (17)-(20) give an idea of this overlap.

Haacke (1976:62) demonstrates that even though there is considerable overlap between the word classes, the distribution of the roots across the word classes is constrained by auxiliaries. Noun, verb and adjective stems can be identified by their distributional patterns and not just by their semantic content. For example, nouns only occur in the present unmarked state or with the perfective aspect marker *a*. Verbs only occur with the habitual aspect marker $h\hat{a}$ or the progressive aspect marker *ra*. Adjectives however can occur with all four aspect markers. Haacke (1976) gives many examples and shows that this pattern is found in several different types of phrases. From this, he concludes that even though there can be some overlap, the Nama-Damara roots can be categorised into noun, verb and adjective classes based not only on their lexical meaning but also on their distributional patterns. Haacke (1976) claims that this feature of adjective stems is probably responsible for the appearance that stems are "polyvalent".

2.2.1.3 Summary

Elicited data collected by myself for this thesis shows partial support in $\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe Haillom for Haacke's claim regarding Nama-Damara: that all the word classes are syntactically based. $\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe shows the same distribution of aspect markers with noun stems and verb stems as Nama-Damara does: noun stems occur with the present unmarked state and the perfective aspect marker, while verb stems occur with the progressive and the habitual aspect markers. However, concerning the adjectives in $\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe Haillom, which occur in all four situations in Nama-Damara, the picture is less clear because not all informants agreed. For some informants the distribution of the adjective stems patterned with that of the nouns while for others it was identical to the Nama-Damara distribution.

The following description and analysis of the $\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe Haillom language will be based on the premise that $\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe Haillom has distinct verb, noun and adjective classes. The distinction between noun and non-noun classes is morphologically and syntactically based while the distinctions amongst the non-noun classes themselves is semantically and functionally based.

2.2.2 Nouns

The noun in $\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe Haillom consists of a stem and a nominal designant (a suffix) or the Person Gender Number marker (PGN marker). The PGN marker marks the noun for person: first, second or third, gender: masculine, feminine or common, and number: singular, dual or plural. This is shown in the examples below. The paradigm for the first set for person is borrowed from Haacke's description of Khoekhoe (2001), but elicited by myself in $\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe Haillom.

Person

	1 st person	khoe-ta	'I, the person.'
	2 nd person	khoe-ts	'You, the person.'
	3 rd person	khoe-b	'He, the person.'
Gender			
	feminine	khoe-s	'the woman'
	masculine	khoe-b	'the man'
	common	khoe-i	'the person'
Number			
	singular	khoe-s	'the woman'
	dual	khoe-m	'the two women'
	plural	khoe-se	'the women'

All person gender number markers are shown in the following table:

	Masculi	ne		Feminin	ie		Common		
Person	Ι	II	III	Ι	II	III	Ι	II	III
Singular	-ta	- <i>ts</i>	- <i>b</i>	-ta	-S	-S	-	-	- <i>i</i>
Dual	-tsum	-	-	- <i>m</i>	-	-	m/tsum	-	-
Plural	-ge	-go	-gu	-se	-50	-di	-da	-du	-11

Figure 2-3: PGN markers (subject markers)

The PGN markers are also used to mark agreement on nouns. This is dealt with in section 2.2.2.1.5. The following example shows an instance of first person marking, 'I, the person', taken from a natural conversation:

(21) Telefon dara-b-a ge ūhâ i khoe-ta ge etsē.
telephone wire-3SG.M-A PST have BEC person-1SG DECL EXL
'Me, I had telephone wire, ETSĒ.'⁵ (Handcraft_3:YB)

The gender of animate nouns is initially based on the biological gender of the referent: *khoe-i* 'person', *khoe-sa* 'woman' and *khoe-ba* 'man'. Inanimate nouns can take any gender although they are sometimes more strongly associated with one specific gender. *Audo* 'car', for example, is most commonly female: *audo-s*.

(22) Nēti mû tama-s go hâ //î audo-s-a.
DEM see NEG-2SG.F RECPST PRF DISC car-3SG.F-A
'There hadn't you seen that car?' (Ga_beads_2:Ma)

Although a lorry is male:

(23) !Khapo loa-n go-ro i ge //nā lori-b ai.
UNK bec.full-3PL.C RECPST-PROG 3SG.C DECL DEM lorry-3SG.M on
'They were becoming full on that lorry.' (meaning there were many people on the lorry) (Collect_nuts:Ga)

As the above two examples show, a change in gender can also reflect a change in size. Where feminine *llho-s* refers to a pocket, the masculine *llho-b* refers to a bag.

⁵ In the examples taken from naturally occurring conversations, a number of exclamations occur. Their approximate meanings cover comparable English emotive terms such as "gosh", "jeez", "damn", etc. Free translations without explicit research into their meaning would not do them justice, and so they remain untranslated in the examples.

A noun in \bar{A} hoe Haillom is built up of the nominal stem followed by an optional derivational suffix followed by the compulsory PGN-marker and, finally, a case marker. Example (24) shows this standard build-up of a noun.

(24) //gôa-ro-s-a 'small female frog'

The nominal stem is //goa frog', the derivational suffix (for more on this see the following section) is the diminutive -ro, the PGN-marker (see 2.2.2) is the feminine singular marker -s, and the case marker, or final marker (see 2.2.2.1.3), is -a.

2.2.2.1.1 Nominal derivation

There are a number of suffixes through which new nouns can be derived from nominal stems. These are the augmentative -kara/gara, the diminutive -ro, the localizing -ai and the agentizing -ao, the abstraction suffix -si, instrumentation -ube, collectivization -xa, association -sa, passivisation -sabe and the privation suffix -o. The suffixes follow the stem and precede the PGN marker.

The augmentative suffix -kara or -gara is a very productive suffix that is added freely to nouns, as speakers require it. It can also be used to derive verbs from stems although this is not very frequent (see 2.2.3.1). Example (25) shows the noun *l/harogara-gu* 'big shoes' which is derived from the noun *l/haro-b* 'shoe'.

(25)	llharo-b	haro- gara -gu
	shoe-3sg.m	shoe-AUG-3PL.M
	'shoe'	'big shoes' (FS_Sa_Ei:Sa)

The diminutive suffix *-ro* is also a highly productive suffix. Similar to the augmentative suffix it can also be used to derive verbs (see 2.2.3.1) although this is again much less frequent. Example (26) shows the noun *!gupurosa* 'a little round one' which is derived from the adjective stem *!gupu* 'round'.

(26)	!gupu	!gupu- ro -s-a
	round	round-DIM-3SG.F-A
	round	'a little round one' (Ga_beads_2:child)

The localization suffix -ai, which signifies 'place', is also a productive suffix.

(27)	lgom-e	lGom- ai -s
	mangetti-3SG.C	mangetti-LOC-3SG.F
	mangetti	'place of mangetti (nuts)'

The suffix *-ao* is generally considered the agentization suffix. It signifies the people associated with the stem to which it is suffixed. This is another productive suffix.

(28)	toro-b	toro- ao -b
	war-3SG.M	war-AGENT-3SG.M
	war	'soldier' (Heikkinen, n.db)

The association suffix -*sa* is used to denote an association between the speaker and the noun. It occurs mostly with kinship terms, and it is used productively even with loanwords, as example (29) illustrates. The word *ome* 'uncle' is borrowed from Afrikaans *oom* 'uncle'.

(29)	ome-b	ome- sa -b
	uncle-3sg.M	uncle-ASS-3SG.M
	uncle	'my uncle' (Ga_beads_2:Th)

The suffix *-sabe* is used to denote someone who undergoes an event or action. It has previously been called the causation suffix (Widlok, 2013) but because it is not about the one who causes an action but the one who is affected by or undergoes an action, in this work it will be referred to as the passivisation suffix.

(30)	//khā//khā	//khā//khā- sabe -n
	teach	teach-PASSSUF-3PL.C
	'to teach'	'students (the ones who undergo the teaching) (Heikkinen (n.db))

The suffix -xa denotes collectivization. When this suffix is added to a noun stem, this noun stem, which initially named a single thing, now signifies a larger collective whole.

(31)	//gû-b	//gû- xa -n
	parent-3SG.M	parent-COLL-3PL.C
	father	'forbearers' (Tsumeb0701p.40)

The suffix -o, called the privation suffix, signifies that something is "lacking". This suffix is added to both nouns and verbs.

(32)	lommi	/om- o
	breath.3sg.c	breath-priv
	breath	'without breath' or 'dead' (Tsumeb0701p.41)

The suffix -si produces abstract nouns. Heikkinen (n.d.-a) mentions this suffix as being used extensively by politicians and missionaries. In the corpus of natural conversation used for this thesis, it occurs very

infrequently. This suffix is more productive with adjectives and verbs than it is with nouns. In example (33), the suffix is attached to an adjective to produce an abstract noun.

(33)	!gāsa	!gāsa- si -b
	clear	clear-ABS-3SG.M
	clear	'clarity' (Handcraft_3:RS)

The instrumentation suffix -ube, mentioned by Heikkinen (n.d.-a), does not occur in the conversational data. It signifies an object that is used for a certain action.

(34)	<i>‡nau</i>	+nau- ube -s-a
	beat	beat-INSTR-3SG.F-A
	'to beat'	'a thing to strike or play with' (Heikkinen, n.db)

2.2.2.1.2 Nominal inflection

[‡]Ākhoe Haillom nouns are inflected for person, gender, number and what is often called case. The noun stem is clearly marked by a nominal suffix, the PGN marker (see 2.2.2 and Figure 2-3) marking the noun for person, gender and number. The final marker that occurs on nouns will be called 'final marking' in this thesis and it is most commonly presumed to mark case.

2.2.2.1.3 Final marking

Following the PGN marker, nouns (or more specifically noun phrases as will become clear at the end of this section) take a final marker. In the Khoekhoe languages, there is not much agreement amongst linguists concerning the function of final markers found on nouns. In \bar{A} khoe Haillom the final markers on nouns are -Ø, -a, and -e. The subsequent section will describe the markers and their occurrence.

There are two situations in which nouns are marked with zero marking. Examples (35) and (36) show instances of zero marking. Firstly, nouns are not marked when they are in the topic position of an utterance. The topic position is before the declarative marker *ge* as is shown in example (35).

(35) //Haro-gara-gu-Ø ge.
shoe-AUG-3PL.M-Ø DECL
'They are big shoes.' (FS_Sa_Ei:Ei)

Secondly, nouns that occur before postpositions, as in (36), are not marked either.

(36) O-b ge nau audo-s-Ø lkha mûn go //goa !khoe ū-he?
CONJ-3SG.M DECL DEM car-3SG.F-Ø with must RECPST descend run take-PASS
'So he must have been brought with the other car?' (Collect_nuts:Ga)

The only exception to the "zero-marking before postpositions" rule occurs with the postposition xu 'from'. See example (37). Nouns preceding xu get the -a marker.

(37) Dana-s-a xu-ts kom nēti ra tsoatsoa.
head-3SG.F-A from-2SG EMPH like.this PROG start
'Surely you start from the head like this.' (Handcraft_3:YB)

In all other situations, nouns are marked with a final -a. Example (38) shows both zero marking and -a marking. The $-\emptyset$ marks the demonstrative which occurs in the topic position before the declarative marker *ge*. The -a marker occurs with the noun following the declarative marker.

(38) Nē-gu-Ø ge //haro-gu-a.
DEM-3PL.M-Ø DECL shoe-3PL.M-A
'These are shoes.' (FS_Sa_Ei:Sa)

The marker -e marks the vocative. It is used when addressing someone or something. In these cases, the noun is marked with -e. One of the most commonly heard examples of the vocative is shown in example (39). It is the expletive 'my God!'

(39) *Ti Elo-ts-e*! POSS.1SG God-2SG.M-VOC 'My God!' (Ga_beads_2:Su)

Example (40) shows the vocative used when addressing someone.

(40) *AI* sa-ts-**e** *‡gae-e* $\bar{u}h\hat{a}$. name ADDR-3SG.M-VOC smoke-3SG.C.A have 'You have a smoke AI.'⁶ (LEGO_Fr_NO:man1)

The personal pronoun *sats*- has the vocative -e marker. The noun 'smoke' *‡gae*- also has a suffix -e that in this case is the PGN marker -i for third person singular neutral, which is assimilated to an -e due to the addition of the final -a marker.

⁶ In the examples taken from natural conversational data, the names of the participants have been made anonymous by using two random letters. Following anthropological traditions, if the first letter is capitalized the name is that of a woman, if both letters are capitalized it is that of a man.

These final markers exist in $\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe as well as in Nama-Damara. For both languages it is not completely clear what these markers mean, and there are a number of different analyses (Haacke, 1976; Hagman, 1977). There is consensus on the form of the marking, but there is less agreement on the function. The possible endings in Nama-Damara for nouns are $-\emptyset$, -a, -i, -e and di. Zero marking is alternatively called the nominative form (Haacke, 1976; Rust, 1965) or, for $\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe, the non-final case (Heikkinen, n.d.-a). The -a marker is called the accusative case (Rust, 1965), oblique marking (Haacke, 1976), the subordinative (Hagman, 1977) or, for $\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe, the final case (Heikkinen, n.d.-a). The marker -i is called the agentive (Hagman, 1977) or the ablative (Haacke, 1976), -di is called the genitive case and -e the vocative case (Haacke, 1976).

	Nama-Damara			ŧĀkhoe Haillom
Marking	Haacke	Rust	Hagman	Heikkinen
-Ø	nominative	nominative	unmarked	non-final case
-2	oblique	accusative	subordinative	final case
- <i>i</i>	ablative		agentive	
-е	vocative			
di	genitive			

Figure 2-4: The different names used for the final marking on nouns.

I do not consider -di or -i to be final markers in $\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe. The $\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe conversational data did not supply any examples of nouns with -i endings. Those nouns that do end in -i in $\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe are either nouns with an object agreement PGN suffix, which in a few cases end in -i (see Figure 2-5), or nouns in which the final vowel of the PGN suffix is contracted with the postposition ai 'on' as is shown in examples (42) and (43). Example (42) shows the use of ai 'on' when it is not contracted, and example (43) shows a contracted version.

(41) Nâ bi-b ge go.
bite 3SG.M.OBJ-3SG.M DECL RECPST
'He bit him.' (FS_Sa_Ei:Ei)

(42) O khoe-s-a tae ai-s #nôa?
CONJ person-3SG.F-A Q on-3SG.F sit
'And what is the woman sitting on?' (SE_AN_FE:AN)

(43) Haibi ≠nôa. hai-b-Ø ai ≠nôa tree-3sG.M-Ø on sit
'Sitting on a tree stump.' (SE_AN_FE:AN)

The marker di, which is considered a noun final marker in Nama-Damara, also occurs in $\pm \bar{A}khoe$, but it should preferably be analysed as a possessive construction instead of as a noun final marker as it occurs only in possessive constructions. The difference between di and the final markers is that di occurs between two nouns linking them in a possessive construction, and the final markers only occur at the end of one single noun or noun phrase. Compare examples (35) [//haro-gara-gu-O] ge 'They are big shoes' and (38) [$n\bar{e}$ -gu-O] ge [//haro-gu-a] 'These are shoes', where the square brackets represent the NPs, with the examples (44) and (45) shown below. The possessive constructions *khoeb di tsoas* 'the man's butt' and //*îs di khoeba* 'her man' in the two examples below are the noun phrases that as a whole get the noun final markers. These noun phrases have the same final marking as the examples (35) and (38) above. In the case of example (44), this is the zero marker for the NP in topic position just before the declarative marker ge. In the case of example (45), it is the –a marker.

- (44) [*Khoe-b* **di** tsoa-s-**Ø**] ge. person-3SG.M GEN butt-3SG.F-Ø DECL 'It's the man's butt.' (LEGO_NO_XX:woman1)
- (45) $[//\hat{l}$ -s **di** khoe-b-**a**]. DISC-3SG.F GEN person-3SG.M-A 'Her man.' (Gas_yardA:Ga)

To strengthen the argument further that -di is not a final marker, consider the examples below containing other noun phrases. Compare the above examples of phrases with possessive constructions (44) and (45), with the following examples of phrases containing noun phrases (46) and (47). As in the possessive constructions, it is only the head noun of the NP that is marked. The modifiers (//i) are not marked. In the two cases below, the modifiers also do not have a PGN marker because they are not nouns. In example (46) the noun phrase is marked with the zero marker, and in example (47), the noun phrase is marked with the -a marker.

- (46) [//Î ao-b-Ø] ge nē-b-a.
 DISC man-3SG.M-Ø DECL DEM-3SG.M-A
 'This is that (same) man.' (SE_WL_TV:TV)
- (47) [//Î ao-b-a] !khō-he †gae†gui-he.
 DISC man-3SG.M-A catch-PASS pull.out-PASS
 'That man is caught and pulled out.' (SE_WL_TV:WL)

To summarise, in possessive constructions the two nouns can be connected by the particle di, and it is the final noun in the construction, the modified noun, that is marked with the final marking ($-\emptyset$, -a or -e). In general, it is only the NP as a whole that is marked with a final marker.

Lastly, when the final marker -a is suffixed to a PGN-marker ending in a vowel, assimilation may occur. The rules for the assimilation are as follows: a PGN-marker ending in *a* followed by the final -a remains as -a. A PGN-marker ending in a front vowel (either *e* or *i*) followed by the final -a becomes an -e. Finally, a PGN-marker ending in a back vowel (either *o* or *u*) followed by the final -a becomes an -o. The following two

examples illustrate this. Example (48) shows the PGN-marker -di with a front vowel assimilating to an *e*, and example (49) shows the PGN-marker -du with a back vowel assimilating to an *o*.

- (48) *Ti* hū-de mâ te go etsē!
 ti hū-di-a mâ te go etsē
 POSS.1SG thing-3PL.F-A give 1SG.OBJ GO EXL
 'Give me my things ETSĒ.' (Handcraft_3:YB)
- (49) /Gôa-s-a kē ra khoe-do.
 /gôa-s-a kē ra khoe-du-a
 child-3SG.F-A look PROG person-2PL.C-A
 'Look at the girl, people.' (LEGO_Fr_NO:woman1)

There is one exception to the assimilation rule. The PGN marker for third person plural masculine -gu behaves differently. -gu followed by the final -a becomes -gua.

(50) \hat{I} krag-i di !uri dara-gu-a \bar{u} . yes electricity-3sG.C POSS white wire-3PL.M-A take 'Yes, take the white electricity wires.' (Handcraft_3:RS)

2.2.2.1.4 Noun compounding

New nouns can be made by compounding two noun stems. The first noun of the compound is the modifier. The final noun is the head noun and determines the meaning of the new noun. In example (51), the nouns *kuni-s* 'cart' and *dao-b* 'path' are compounded and give a type of path, namely a road. Examples (52) and (53) follow the same pattern.

(51) kuni-dao-b 'road' from 'cart' + 'path' (Heikkinen, n.d.-b)

- (52) dao-am-s 'door' from 'path' + 'mouth' (Gas_yardA:Ga)
- (53) aore-/gôa-b 'boy' from 'male' + 'child' (Ga_beads_2:Ga)

2.2.2.1.5 Nominal agreement markers

‡Ākhoe Haillom has nominal agreement markers. These markers come in the shape of subject and object markers. They are not obligatory but occur very frequently. They mostly take the same shape as the PGN

markers. The agreement markers occur on adjectives, demonstratives, numerals, interrogatives and postpositions. Example (54) shows an instance of agreement marking on the adjective 'all'.

(54) Xū-di hoa-de ra khâi i ge.
thing-3PL.F all-3PL.F.A PROG go.up 3SG.C DECL
'All the things are rising up.' (FS_Sa_Ei:Ei)

Example (55) shows agreement marking on a demonstrative.

(55) /Āsa-b ge nē-b-a.
new-3SG.M DECL dem-3SG.M-A
'This one is new.' (Ga_beads_2:AR)

Example (56) shows agreement marking on an interrogative.

(56) O xū-s-a nēsa mâ-s-a ī e?
CONJ thing-3SG.F-A now Q-3SG.F-A go UNK
'And where does the thing go now?' (FS_Sa_Pu:Sa)

The subject agreement markers have the same form as the PGN markers. These were previously shown in Figure 2-3. The object agreement markers mostly have the same form as the PGN markers too. The differences occur in the markers for the feminine and masculine singular markers, and these are shown in the following table (Figure 2-5).

	Masculine			Feminine		
Person	Ι	II	III	Ι	II	III
Singular	-te	-tsi	-bi	-te	-si	-si

Figure 2-5: Object agreement markers

The following example sentence shows an instance of both a first person singular subject agreement marker and a first person singular object agreement marker used pronominally (for more information on pronominal markers see section 2.2.7).

(57) Ap sē-e so au te re i ta //ā-sen.
name soap-3SG.C.A 2PL.F let.so.share 1SG.OBJ RE CONJ 1SG wash-RECP
'Ap give me soap so that I can wash myself.' (Gas_yardA:Ma)

2.2.3 Verbs

‡Ākhoe Haillom has two different kinds of verbs: 1) stative or non-event verbs and 2) event verbs (Heikkinen, n.d.-a). Most verbs fall into the category of event verbs. The non-event verbs correspond to what Haacke (1976: 87; 1988: 28) defines as a stative verb category for Nama-Damara and what Rust (1965) calls "Verben der a-Konjugation" (verbs of the a-conjugation). Henceforth, Haacke's term stative verbs will be used to refer to the category of non-event verbs. The difference between these two verb types is based mostly on a difference in syntactic behaviour exhibited by the verbs. There is also a semantic distinction between these two categories of verbs: event verbs represent events and actions, and the stative verbs signify a state of affairs.

The distribution of the stative verbs is similar to that of adjectives. In addition they are obligatorily accompanied by the auxiliary verb $h\hat{a}$ or aspect marker -a. This is not the case for the event verbs. Examples (58) and (59) show a contrast of an event verb and a stative verb. In (58) the event verb \bar{u} , which represents the action 'to take', is contrasted with the stative verb $\neq an$ in (59) representing the state of 'knowing'. In (59) the stative verb is accompanied by the auxiliary a.

Event verb:

(58) Nē-ro-di tsū-de ta ra ū i ge.
DEM-DIM-3PL.F only-3PL.F.A 1SG PROG take 3SG.C DECL
'I am just taking these little ones.'(Ga beads 2:Ma)

Stative verb:

(59) #An ta a i ge.
know 1SG STAT 3SG.C DECL
'I know.' (Handcraft_3:KO)

2.2.3.1 Verbal morphology

There is not a lot of morphology concerned with the verbs in $\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe. Verbs are not inflected. Tense is not marked on the verb, and neither is mood nor aspect. Instead, particles are used to indicate tense and aspect. Verbs also do not carry any agreement markers. There is verbal derivation though.

2.2.3.1.1 Verbal derivation

The only marking $\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe Haillom allows on verbs is in the area of verbal derivation. Verbs can take suffixes to indicate the applicative (*-ba*), reciprocity (*-gu*), the passive (*-he*), reflexive (*-sen*), diminutive (*-ro*) and the venitive (*-xa*).

The applicative is marked using the suffix -ba. Example (60) shows a sentence containing a subject ta 'I' and an object tsama-e 'melon' and the verb $s\hat{a}i$ 'to cook' without the applicative. Example (61) shows the verb $s\hat{a}i$ 'to cook' with the applicative in a sentence containing a subject mamas 'mother', an object $\pm \hat{u}-e$ 'food' and an indirect object $|g\hat{o}asa$ 'child'.

- (60) Tsama-e ta ra sâi i ge.
 melon-3SG.C.A 1SG PROG cook 3SG.C DECL
 'I am cooking melon.' (Gas_yardA:Ga)
- (61) Mama-s ge /gôa-s-a +û-e ra sâi-ba.
 mother-3SG.F DECL child-3SG.F-A food-3SG.C.A PROG cook-APPL
 'Mother is cooking food for the child' (Tsumeb0702p.7)

Example (62) shows an instance of the reciprocal, which is marked using the suffix -gu.

(62) Axa-n ge ra //gore-gu.
child-3PL.C DECL PROG attack-RECP
'The children are attacking each other.' (Tsumeb0701p.15)

The passive is marked with the suffix -he as can be seen in example (63).

(63) Sâi-he ra |gau-s ge ||nā-s-a.
cook-PASS prog custom-3SG.F decl DEM-3SG.F-A
'It's the way it is cooked, that.' (State_hospital:Mt)

The passive suffix -he can also be contracted to -e as in example (64).

(64) Nē-b ge-re nâ-e +gui-si nē-b-a.
DEM-3SG.M PST-PROG bite-PASS nose-3SG.F.on DEM-3SG.M-A
'This one was being bitten on the nose, this one.' (FS_Sa_Pu:Sa)

The reflexive is marked with the suffix *-sen*. In the first example, example (65), the verb $l\bar{a}$ 'to wash' is not marked with the reflexive. In this example, the verb is followed by the object PGN *-si* that refers to the daughter's fingers that are being washed.

(65) /Khunu-s-a ta ra //ā-si i ge ti ôa-s-a.
finger-3SG.F-A 1SG PROG wash-3SG.F.OBJ 3SG.C DECL POSS.1SG child-3SG.F-A
'I am washing my daughter's finger.' (Gas_yardA:Ap)

In example (66), the verb l/\bar{a} 'to wash' is marked with the reflexive suffix *-sen* resulting in the meaning that the person is washing herself.

(66) Ega-s-a //ā-sen i ge.
later-3SG.F-A wash-REFL 3SG.C DECL
'She washes herself later.' (Ga_beads_2:Su)

The diminutive is marked with the suffix -ro. This suffix, which is shown in example (67), is the same suffix that is also used to diminutize nouns (see 2.2.2.1.1). It is not as common on verbs as it is on nouns.

(67) Î sa-go go //khobam-ro re.
yes ADDR-2PL.M 2PL.M open-DIM RE
'Yes you, open (it) a little.' (Handcraft_3:RS)

The venitive is marked with the suffix -xa. This suffix signifies a movement towards the speaker. Compare examples (68) and (69). In example (68), someone is told to walk towards 'me', the speaker. This meaning is achieved by marking the verb with the venitive -xa. However, in example (69), the addressee is told to go to 'the old woman' (and not to 'me' the speaker), and here the verb is not marked with the venitive.

- (68) !Gû-xa re taukhoe!
 walk-VEN RE EXL
 'Walk to me, my god!' (SmallTalkOmboto:XXX79)
- (69) !Gû re sī khaukhoe-s-a mû.
 walk RE AUX.LOC2 old.person-3SG.F-A see
 'Go see the old woman.' (Ga_beads_2:Ap)

The agentization suffix, *-ao*, which was also mentioned in 2.2.2.1.1, can also be attached to verbs as shown in example (70). In these cases, the verb is nominalised by the suffix.

(70) ā-ao-s-a
drink-AGENT-3SG.F-A
'a drinker' (Gas_YardA:Ga)

2.2.3.1.2 Reduplication

Verbs can be reduplicated in \bar{z} has an added causative meaning. In example (71) the verb $g\bar{u}$ means 'to be near', but when it is reduplicated: $g\bar{u}/g\bar{u}$, as in example (72), it means 'to cause to be near' or 'to bring near'.

- (71) Dana-s-a î khao-b-a |gū.
 head-3SG.F-A CONJ back-3SG.M-A be.near
 'The head and back are near.' (Handcraft_3:RS)
- (72) /Gū/gū re dara-b-a.
 bring.near RE wire-3SG.M-A
 'Bring the wire near.' (Handcraft_3:RS)

Adjectives can also be reduplicated to form verbs. The adjective *//gai* 'bad' shown in example (73), can be reduplicated to form the verb *//gai//gai* with the meaning 'to cause to be bad' as shown in example (74).

- (73) *IIGai !ā-s ge.*bad place-3SG.F DECL
 'It's a bad place.' (Ga_beads_2:AR)
- (74) *Ti* dara-b-a go *llgaillgai* /gôa-gu ge.
 POSS.1SG wire-3SG.M-A RECPST make.bad child-3PL.M DECL
 'My wire was made bad by the boys.' (Handcraft_3:SS)

2.2.3.1.3 Compound Verbs

Verb stems can combine with other stems to form new verbs. Example (75) shows this for the combination of the two verbs $d\bar{a}$ 'to step' and *khâi* 'to rise', which together form a verb meaning 'climb' $d\bar{a}kh\hat{a}i$.

(75) Kē re /gae-si ba dākhâi.
look RE gemsbok-3SG.F.on 3SG.M climb
'Look he climbs on the gemsbok.' (FS_Sa_Pu:Sa)

2.2.4 Auxiliaries

Some word stems occur as auxiliaries as well as verbs. Auxiliaries are verbal elements that stand somewhere between fully lexical verbs and bound grammatical affixes (Anderson, 2011). In their function as auxiliaries, these stems give extra meaning to the main verb. This meaning is usually concerned with tense and aspect features of the clause. The stems concerned are the following:

The auxiliary a 'be' conveys a meaning of completion or a stative state in the present tense. Example (76) shows an instance of its usage.

(76) Ao-b ge $\neq n\hat{u}$ **a**. man-3SG.M DECL sit STAT 'The man sits.' (Tsumeb0701p.15)

The auxiliary i 'become' conveys a completive or stative state in the past, future and negative tenses but not in the present tense. An example is shown in (77).

(77) #Nû//nâsen i go stul-s-i.
sit.back BEC RECPST chair-3SG.F-A.on
'(He) sat back in the chair.' (SE_AN_FE:AN)

The perfective state is conveyed by the auxiliary $h\hat{a}$ 'be' and is shown in example (78).

(78) Tarare /gôa-s-a //ora hâ khoe-ta.
female child-3SG.F-A give.birth PRF person-1SG
'Me, I have given birth to a baby girl.' (Collect_nuts:Ce)

Example (79) shows in instance of the use of the auxiliary $h\hat{i}$ 'do', which conveys a sense of future.

(79) Labi-g-a ta nî !naba g-a ta hî-a ge.
cloth-3PL.M-A 1SG FUT mend 3PL.M-A 1SG AUX.FUT-UNK DECL
'I will mend the cloth.' (Ga_beads_2:Ga)

Example (80) shows the use of the auxiliary $m\hat{a}$ 'stand', which conveys a repetitive sense.

(80) *//Ae-tsē* ta ra do mâ i ge.
yesterday-day 1SG PROG bead AUX.REP 3SG.C DECL
'Yesterday I was beading (and beading).' (Ga_beads_2:Ga)

The auxiliary hâna denotes the habitual, and it is shown in example (81).

(81) #Hana hâna ra /gôa-s ge /lî ti-a.
crawl HAB PROG child-3SG.F DECL DISC thus-UNK
'This child is always crawling like that.' (LEGO_Fr_NO:woman1)

An example of the auxiliary ôa 'want' or 'look' is shown in (82). It conveys a sense of intentionality.

(82) //Ama ôa-s-a ta ge nî.
buy AUX.DES-3SG.F-A 1SG DECL FUT
'I want to buy it.' (State_hospital:SN)

The auxiliary $h\bar{a}$ 'come' denotes a change in locality or time. An instance of this auxiliary is shown in the utterance in (83) which was said in connection with a video clip showing a man walking with a washing bowl filled with hot water.

(83) //Ā-bi hā ra i ge.
wash-3sg.M.OBJ AUX.LOC1 PROG 3sg.C DECL
'He is going to wash.' (SE_AN_FE:AN)

Finally, the auxiliary sī 'come' denotes a change in locality or time and is shown in example (84).

(84) #Nû-b go si.
sit-3SG.M RECPST AUX.LOC2
'He went to sit.' (SE_AN_FE:AN)

Some of the auxiliaries occur in constructions similar to serial verb constructions, for example, utterance (83). In these constructions, the verb and the auxiliary share the same subject, they share the subject marking, while tense, mood and negation is only marked once. These aspects are shared with serial verb constructions. Yet, there are also differences. In the $\pm\bar{A}$ khoe Haillom conversational data, strings of no more than two verbs were found. Additionally, it was found that many things can intervene between the two verbs. Subject marking, objects, tense marking, adverbs, postpositions and even locatives occur in between the two verbs. Example (85) shows an instance of an adverb occurring in between the verb *lari* 'to rub out' and the auxiliary *hî* 'do'.

(85) Tā /arî-s /guisa hî re.
NEG rub.out-3SG.F just AUX.FUT RE
'Don't just rub it out.' (Handcraft_3:man3)

Haacke (2014) argues that these constructions are serial verb constructions but uses less stringent criteria than are generally applied. Due to the discrepancies in definitions and pending more research in this area, these stems will continue to be considered auxiliaries in this work.

2.2.5 Adjectives

Stems occur as adjectives, modifying nouns and noun phrases. They can occur as complements in the predicate, i.e. as predicative expressions, as shown in example (86).

(86) Om-s ge a kai.
house-3SG.F DECL STAT big
'The house is big.' (Tsumeb0701p44)

Adjectives also occur in the nominal phrase where they usually precede the nominal head, i.e. as attributive expressions, as shown in example (87).

(87) Ese tsū /gôa-b ge.
EXL bad child-3SG.M DECL
'ĒSE, it's a bad boy.' (Ga_beads_2:Th)

Adjectives can be derived from verbs and nouns by adding one of several possible suffixes. The following examples show some of these suffixes. The suffix -xa can be used to denote abundance. In examples (88) and (89), the verb */khom* 'to pity' thus becomes an adjective */khomxa* 'pitiful'.

- (88) /Khom te re.
 pity 1SG.OBJ RE
 'Pity me.' (Heikkinen, n.d.-b)
- (89) /Khom-xa khoe-da.
 pitiful person-1PL.C
 'We pitiful people.' (name of local Primary School)

The suffix -sa is used to derive adjectives from verbs with the meaning "possessing that quality". Thus a verb such as *goba* 'to argue' in (90) becomes an adjective *gobasa* 'argumentative' in (91).

- (90) *Tita ge goba e.*1SG DECL argue UNK
 'I argue.' (Ga_beads_2:Su)
- (91) //Nā goba-sa /gôa-se.
 DEM argumentative child-3sG.F.OBJ
 'That argumentative girl.' (Ga_beads_2:Th)

The suffix -sa is sometimes preceded by the passive suffix -he thus creating "passive adjectives" as in the example (93) where the adjective $!g\hat{u}hesa$ 'walkable' is derived from the verb $!g\hat{u}$ 'to walk'.

- (92) !Gû ta ra i ge.
 walk 1sG PROG 3SG.C DECL
 'I am walking.' (Ga_beads_2:Ga)
- (93) !Gû-he-sa xū-i ge ra mî-he.
 walkable thing-3sG.C DECL PROG say-PASS
 '(It's) a walkable thing, it is being said.'⁷ (Ga_beads_2:AR)

The remaining suffixes used to derive adjectives have a more restricted usage, and their exact meaning is less clear than that of the previous suffixes. For example, the suffix *-ai* used in example (94), is used to derive the adjective $g\bar{a}$ -ai 'clever' from the verb $g\bar{a}$ 'to trick'.

(94) *Gā-ai bi-a go.* clever 3SG.M-A RECPST 'He was clever.' (FS_Sa_Ei:Ei)

The suffix *-ra* is used to derive the adjective *//khoara* 'tasty' from the verb *//khoa* 'to taste'. This suffix denotes a permanent state, and an example is shown in (95).

(95) //Khoa-ra hū-de a-nî ta koma +û-di.
tasty thing-3PL.F.A HORT-FUT 1SG supposedly eat-3PL.F
'They are tasty things if I could eat them.' (FS_Sa_Ei:Sa)

2.2.6 Demonstratives

There are three demonstratives: $n\bar{e}$, nau and $//n\bar{a}$. Generally speaking, $n\bar{e}$ is used to indicate closeness to the speaker, $//n\bar{a}$ indicates distance from the speaker, and nau indicates distance from both the speaker and the listener. It is likely that the distinctions are somewhat more subtle than this, and a closer look at for example conversational data would shed more light on the distinctions. Either the demonstratives occur with the noun they refer to, or they take the place of the noun and are marked by PGN-markers.

nē xu-b-a	nau xu-de	ll nā audo-s-a
DEM thing-3SG.M-A	DEM thing-3PL.F.A	DEM car-3SG.F-A
'this thing'	'those things'	'that car' (Handcraft_3)
(Proximal to S)	(Distal to S)	(Distal to S & A)

⁷ The conversation in the case of this example revolved around walking to a club in the village of Tsintsabis. The example given in (93)

(93) !Gû-he-sa xū-i ge ra mî-he.

is an instance of speaker AR reporting that other people had claimed that the distance was feasible on foot.

In the following two examples the demonstrative $n\bar{e}$ 'this' refers to the subject of a sentence, example (96), and the object of a sentence, example (97).

- (96) Boko [nē dara-b] ge xū-n-a ra /gom/gom.
 EXL DEM wire-3SG.M DECL thing-3PL.C-A PROG complicate
 'BOKO, this wire is complicating things.' (Handcraft_3:man1)
- (97) [Nē /ae-e] ta ra mā-bi i ge.
 DEM wood-3SG.C 1SG PROG give-3SG.M.OBJ 3SG.C DECL
 'I am giving him this wood.' (Ga_beads_2:AR)

The demonstrative precedes the noun it refers to, and it also precedes the adjectives that modify that noun, see example (98).

(98) Nē kai khoe-s-a.
dem old person-3sG.F-A
'This old woman.' (Gas_yardA:Th)

Example (99) shows an instance of a phrase in which the noun the demonstrative refers to is not present so that the demonstrative takes the PGN marker.

(99) *Nē-b* ge. DEM-3SG.M DECL 'This one.' (FS_Sa_Pu:Pu)

As well as PGN markers, demonstratives can also take derivational suffixes, as for example the diminutive, as shown in (100).

(100) *Nē-ro-gu-a.* DEM-DIM-3PL.M-A 'These little ones.' (Ga_beads_2:AR)

The demonstratives are also used to express the spatial and adverbial meanings 'here' and 'there'. In this form they usually occur with the suffix -ba.

(101) Nē-ba #gā re.
DEM-SUF put.in RE
'Put (it) in here.' (Handcraft_3:RS)
- (102) //Î-n nau-ba?
 3disc-3PL DEM-SUF
 'Them there?' (Gas_yardA:Ga)
- (103) //Nā-ba ≠gā re
 DEM-SUF put.in RE
 'Put (it) in there.' (Gas_yardA:Ga)

Additionally the demonstrative $n\bar{e}$ is used to express time: 'now'. When expressing time, this demonstrative often occurs with the suffixes -ao or -sa.

- (104) O **nē-sa** tae-s-a nē-s-a? CONJ DEM-SUF Q-3SG.F-A DEM-3SG.F-A 'And now what is this?' (FS_Sa_Ei:Sa)
- (105) $//\hat{l}$ -b-a-s-a gabe i ge **nē-ao**. DISC-3SG.M-A-3SG.F-A look.for 3SG.C DECL DEM-SUF 'She looks for him now.' (FS_Sa_Ei:Ei)

2.2.7 Personal pronouns vs. definite articles

The paradigm of the full personal pronouns of \bar{A} khoe Haillom, as given by Heikkinen (n.d.-a), is given below with the corresponding reduced pronouns following the full pronouns in brackets. The personal pronouns in this paradigm are almost identical to those in Nama-Damara.

	Masculine			Feminine	eminine			Common		
	Ι	Π	III	Ι	II	III	Ι	II	III	
Singular	ti(-ta)	sa(-ts)	//î(-b)	ti(-ta)	sa(-s)	//î(-s)	-	sa(-m)	//î(-da)	
Dual	sa(-tsum)	-	-	sa(-m)/			sa(-m)∕	sa(-ro)	//î(-ra)∕	
				si-(m)			si-(m)		//î(-du)	
Plural	sa(-ge)	sa(-go)	//î(-gu)	sa(-se)	sa(-so)	//î(-di)	sa(-da)∕	sa(-du)	//î(-n)	
							si-(d)a			

Figure 2-6: Pronouns, adapted from Heikkinen (n.d.-a).

The full personal pronoun consists of a stem and an inflexional suffix, separated by a hyphen in the table. The stem on its own forms the reduced personal pronoun of which there are only 4: ti, si, sa and $//\hat{i}$.

The opinions on what constitutes a personal pronoun in Nama-Damara are divided. There are arguments for the existence of an extensive set of full personal pronouns all of which have a reduced form as well (Güldemann &

Vossen, 2000). Also, there are arguments for the sole existence of determiners and articles, which can be used pronominally, instead of personal pronouns (Haacke, 1977). For Nama-Damara, Haacke (1988:51) puts forward the view that the reduced pronouns *ti*, *si*, *sa* and *l*/*î* are definite articles and not pronoun stems. He states that the difference in the articles is speaker and addressee related: *ti* signifying a singular speaker, *si* dual or plural speakers (exclusive), *sa* the addressee, and *l*/*î* signifies the person that is discussed.

Haacl	xe (2001)	others
ti	singular speaker	1sg
si	dual/plural speakers, exclusive	1pl
sa	addressee	-
//î	discussed	3rd person

The $\pm \bar{A}$ khoe Haillom data shows that not only do the reduced pronouns follow the PGN markers, the object PGN markers are also used pronominally (see section 2.2.2.1.5 for an example). This suggests an analysis more along the lines of Haacke's proposal. There would appear to be two systems. On the one hand, there are the PGN markers that can be suffixed to other stems (nouns, adjectives, etc.) as well as being able to occur on their own in a pronominal function. On the other hand, there are the four "short pronouns", or determiners, or definite articles, shown in the table above that have a pronominal kind of function and can also take PGN suffixes. The only two examples ((106) and (107) below) found in the conversational data suggest that the "short pronouns" also seem to be able to join with the PGN suffixes.

(106) Aibe hū khâi ra-s hoa-s ge lî-bi tsū ra ī.
first all go.up PROG-3SG.F every-3SG.F DECL DISC-3SG.M.OBJ only PROG pass.by
'First all of them going up are only passing by him.' (FS_Sa_Pu:Sa)

(107) *O* ta ge tita sa-si //nā stori-b-a nî gaxu gaxu, CONJ 1SG DECL 1SG ADDR-2SG.F.OBJ DEM story-3SG.M-A long long FUT *mî tama* hâ. ti 1SG say NEG PRF 'And I did not tell you to make that story longer. (Ga beads:Su)

2.2.8 Possessives

To indicate possessive relations, \bar{A} khoe Haillom uses either the possessive marker *di* or a personal pronoun is used adjacent to the referential noun. The personal pronouns *ti*, which is used for the first person singular, and *sa*, which is used for the second person singular, used in possessive relations are shown in examples (108) and (109).

(108) **Ti** elo-ts-e! POSS.1SG God-2SG.M-VOC 'My god!' (Ga_beads_2:Ga)

(109) Nē-b ge [sa ôa-b-a].
DEM-3SG.M DECL POSS.2SG child-3SG.M-A
'This is your son.' (Gas_yardA:AT)

The possessive marker di occurs in between the possessor and the possessed. This possessive construction is always head-initial. The possessor always precedes the possessed as is shown in example (110) where the possessor, the child, comes first, followed by the possessive marker di, which is then followed by the possessed: the nappy.

(110) [*/Gôa-s* **di** *//nabe-b*] ge. child-3SG.F POSS nappy-3SG.M DECL 'It's the baby's nappy.' (Collect_nuts:Fr)

When the possessed is brought to the front of the phrase, the PGN marker remains in-situ and is added to the possessive marker. This is shown in example (111) where the possessed, the beads, are sentence initial, and the PGN marker for third person singular common -e which implies 'the beads' is suffixed to the associative marker *di*.

(111) Nē kara-e ti [â-gu di-e] ta go-ro !khō e.
DEM bead-3SG.C POSS.1SG child-3PL.M POSS-3SG.C 1SG RECPST-PROG catch UNK
'These beads, my children's one's, I was taking.' (Ga_beads_2:Ga)

Example (111) is a little confusing because there are two possessive constructions in it. The possessive construction which is of interest in this example is not the one between the speaker and her children *ti âgu* 'my children' but the one between the children and their beads $\hat{a}gu \, di \, kara-e$ 'the children's beads'.

In the case of inalienable possessions, the possessive marker *di* may be dispensed with, and the possessor can simply precede the possessed as shown in example (112).

(112) *ari-b dana-s* dog-3SG.M head-3SG.F 'the dog's head' (Tsumeb0702p.43)

Heikkinen (n.d.-a) also mentions the alternative form *ki* for the possessive marker *di*. This form does not occur in the data collected for this thesis.

(113) //*î-b* **k***i* ai-s DISC-3SG.M POSS face-3SG.F 'his face' (Heikkinen, n.d.-b)

2.2.9 Numerals and quantifiers

For their cardinal numbers, speakers of \bar{A} khoe Haillom use two numeral systems (Heikkinen, n.d.-a: 24). One is the Nama-Damara system, which is a decimal system.

lgui	'one'	!nani	'six'
/gam	'two'	hû	'seven'
!nona	'three'	//khaesa	'eight'
haka	'four'	khoese	'nine'
koro	'five'	disi	'ten'
		(disi) gui a	'eleven'
		lgamdisi	'twenty'
		kaidisi	'hundred'
		honnor	'hundred' from Afrikaans
		loadisi	'thousand'
		daisen	'thousand' from Afrikaans

The other numeral system is a quinary one, having five as its numeral base.

/gui	'one'	gui‡ondo	'six' (one finger)
lgam	'two'	lgam≠ondo	'seven' (two fingers)
!nona	'three	!nona‡ondo	'eight' (three fingers)
haka	'four'	llgamsa	'nine'
lgui!om	'five' (one fist)	disi	'ten'

In the quinary numeral system, the words for six, seven and eight include the word *tondo* 'finger'. There is also a slightly different variant in which the word for finger *tondo* alternates with *tonobwa* 'finger': */guitonobwa* 'six'. None of the young speakers (up to 30 years of age) in the lGomais community knew the quinary counting system, and they claimed to have never heard of it before. It would seem that this is a prime example of a part of the language that is dying out.

The ordinal numbers are formed by suffixing l/i, the short pronoun for the third person discussed, to the cardinal numbers. Only the first ordinal number and the word 'last' are not formed in this manner.

 #guro
 'first'

 /gam/lî
 'second'

 !nona/lî
 'third'

 /uni
 'last'

A few quantifiers are the following:

hoa	'all/every'
hoaraga	'all/whole
‡gui	'many'
loro	'few'
!nāsa	'more'
nox	'more' a loanword Afrikaans 'nog' or German 'noch'
<i>‡âusa</i>	'enough'
!khom	'bunch/load'

The numerals and quantifiers function as adjectives. When qualifying a noun, they do not take PGN markers, as in example (114), but when they stand on their own, they do, as in example (115).

- (114) *IGui IIgôa-ro-s-a* ūhâ.
 one frog-DIM-3SG.F-A have
 '(They) have one small frog.' (FS_Sa_Ei:Sa)
- (115) *Nē-b* ge /gui-b-a //goe. DEM-3SG.M DECL one-3SG.M-A lie 'Here one lies.' (Handcraft_3:RS)

2.2.10 Adverbs

In $\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe, there are only a few underived adverbs. Following is a list of underived adverbs that occurs in the data: *hana* 'indeed', *kanube* 'yet', *koma* 'supposedly', *lkhā* 'again', *lnai* 'already' and *llari* 'one day from now'. *Koma* is the most frequent as it marks evidentiality, although there is not a full evidential system in $\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe. *Koma* is used to show that the information one is giving is not from one's own direct experience. This is shown in example (116), where speaker Ga is sharing information on something she heard about but did not personally witness.

 (116)
 JE-b
 tsū-b
 go
 koma
 tabaka-ro-e
 ra

 name-3SG.M
 only-3SG.M
 RECPST
 supposedly tobacco-DIM-3SG.C
 PROG

 mā-he
 i
 ge.
 give-PASS
 3SG.C
 DECL

 'Only JE was supposedly being given a little tobacco.' (Collect_nuts:Ga)
 Give-Pass
 Give-Pass

Koma can also be used in questions.

(117)Xo-s-akoma/ae-sen-shâ?name-3SG.F-Asupposedlysick-RECP-3SG.FPRF'Has Xo supposedly been sick?'(Collect_nuts:Ga)

There are a few adverbs that have been loaned (and then adapted) from Afrikaans. These are for example *rexte* 'real' from *regte*, *toxoba* 'please' from *asseblief tog*, *noxoba* 'still' from *nog*, and *amar* 'almost' from *amper*. However, most adverbs in $\ddagger\bar{A}khoe$ are derived using certain prefixes. For example, the adverbs meaning 'here' $n\bar{e}$ -ba, 'like this' $n\bar{e}$ -ti, 'today' $n\bar{e}$ -ts \bar{e} and 'now' $n\bar{e}$ -si are all derived from the demonstrative $n\bar{e}$ 'this' using suffixes to indicate place: -ba, manner: -ti, time: $-ts\bar{e}$ and a suffix of unclear meaning: -si. Examples of other productive suffixes are -se to indicate manner forming *hoaragase* 'completely' from the adjective *hoaraga* 'whole', and -ga to indicate time and place forming *hūga* 'long ago' from *hū* 'all'.

Adverbs are most commonly situated just preceding the verb as can be seen in the previous example (117). In this formation, the subject of the sentence can also be interposed between the adverb and the verb and its tense markers, as shown in example (116). Adverbs can take PGN markers. This is shown in example (118).

 (118)
 //Nā komitē-s-a
 //lati-s-a
 \$\no\$ oa i
 \$ge.

 DEM committee-3SG.F-A tomorrow-3SG.F-A go.out
 3SG.C
 DECL

 'That committee will be out tomorrow.' (Collect_nuts:Ga)

2.2.11 Conjunctions

Conjunctions connect words or clauses together. Some examples of conjunctions in $\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe follow below. The conjunction *tsî* 'and', for example, is used to connect words (see example (119)) as well as phrases (example (120)).

(119) *Sē-i* **tsî** vaslin-i /kha. soap-3SG.C CONJ vaseline-3SG.C with 'With soap and vaseline.' (Ga_beads_2:Su) (120) *Ō-s* ge /nisi //nāpa hā tsî hā go-ro kē te.
CONJ-3SG.F PST maybe DEM come CONJ come RECPST-PROG see 1SG.OBJ
'Then maybe she came there and was coming to see me.' (State_hospital:womanB)

The conjunction can be placed in between the two entities it is connecting (as in example (120)) or after them (as in example (121)).

(121) !Gûna-b go-ro dākhâi tsî i ge, mû re.
walk-3SG.M RECPST-PROG climb.up CONJ 3SG.C DECL look RE
'He was walking and climbing up, see.' (FS_Sa_Ei:Sa)

This conjunction can also be used to list things, as in example (122). In these cases, a final $ts\hat{i}$ is placed after the last item in the list, and this $ts\hat{i}$ is marked with the PGN marker -n for third person plural common.

(122) Engels ≠nū-khoe Afrikaans tsî-n !nâ tsî tsî goba-b English CONJ Afrikaans CONJ black-person language-3SG.M CONJ-3PL.C in mâ-e !gâi? а Q-3SG.C.A STAT good 'English and Afrikaans and Nama-Damara, which one is good?' (Si_WP:KO)

The conjunction $ts\hat{i}$ also connects constituents in an utterance to those in previous utterances. In these instances, in English it is more accurately glossed as 'also'. In such cases, (see example (123)), it is marked with the PGN marker and it can also be marked for case (see example (124)).

(123) Ce: Touris-i ge.
tourist-3SG.C DECL
'He is a tourist.'
(Three turns omitted.)
Pt: //Î-n nē-n tsî-n ge touris-i-a ra.
DISC-3PL.C DEM-3PL.C CONJ-3PL.C DECL tourist-3SG.C-A PROG
'Them there, they are also tourists.' (Collect_nuts)

```
(124) Ei: Nâ bi-b ge go.
bite 3SG.M.OBJ-3SG.M DECL RECPST
'He bit him.'
(One turn omitted.)
Sa: Dâni-di tsî-n-a ge ra nâ-bi.
bee-3PL.F CONJ-3PL.C-A DECL PROG bite-3SG.M.OBJ
'The bees are also biting him.' (FS_Sa_Ei)
```

The conjunction $ts\hat{i}$ is the most common conjunction in conversation. Other frequent conjunctions in $\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe Haillom are \hat{i} 'and' and o 'and' (phrase initial). Less frequently occurring conjunctions are o 'when' or 'if' (phrase final), *xawe* 'but', *bo* and *of* 'or', *xuige* 'so that/because', *hîa/îa* 'while', *ise* 'if', *ani* 'in order to' and *amaga* 'because'.

2.2.12 Postpositions

Postpositions generally occur at the end of the noun or noun phrase they modify, as shown in example (125) and (126).

- (125) $[N\bar{e} x\bar{u}]$ -b **ai**-b go mâ. DEM thing-3SG.M on-3SG.M RECPST stand 'He stood on this thing.' (Collect_nuts:Fr)
- (126) [Nē !ā-s]-i-s ge [ari-i] xa tsū ts-a nâ !gam-he e amase.
 DEM place-3SG.F-in-3SG.F DECL dog-3SG.C by just 2SG.M-C bite kill-PASS UNK truly 'Truly, in this place, by dogs only will you be bitten and killed.' (Gas_yardA:Ma)

Following is a list of postpositions that occur in the data collection.

ai 'on/at', *ama* 'at/with/near', *khama* 'like', *khaosa* 'below', *kose* 'up to', *toari* 'behind', *tsū* 'only/just', *xa* 'by', *xō* /*kha* 'next to', *xu* 'from/since', /*hoa* 'with', /*kha* 'with/beside', /*nisi* 'perhaps', *!aka* 'down', *!aroma* 'because', *!oa* 'to', *!auka* 'outside', *!gao* 'under', *!nâ* 'in', *!naka* 'in the middle'.

2.2.13 Interjections

There are numerous interjections in $\pm \bar{A}$ khoe Haillom, ranging from fillers to swear words, and there are a number of loanwords amongst them. Aside from the fillers, these interjections often convey a state of mind or attitude towards a situation, for example, surprise, anger, empathy, etc. The interjections regularly occur phrase initially and phrase finally as well as on their own. *Boko*, for example, is an exclamation of negative surprise or disagreement that usually occurs on its own or phrase initially, as is shown in example (127).

(127) Boko //nā-s ge sa /ui-s ge īse ī-s-a.
EXL DEM-3SG.F DECL POSS.2SG in.law-3SG.F DECL actually appear-3SG.F-A
'BOKO that one could be your in-law.' (Ga beads 2:Ma)

Etsē, on the other hand, occurs phrase initially as well as phrase finally, which is shown in examples (128) and (129). Its use seems to add some emphasis to the stance the speaker is portraying, be it positive or negative.

- (128) Hî-î hî toma ta ge etsē.
 no do NEG 1SG DECL EXL
 'No, I will not do it ETSĒ.' (Handcraft_3:RS)
- (129) Etsē îxa kara-e.
 EXL beautiful bead-3SG.C
 'ETSĒ beautiful beads.' (Ga_beads_2:Child)

Other commonly used primary interjections (Ameka, 1992) in $\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe are *ae, aita, at* or *ātatata* (expressions of surprise, the last being a loan from Nama-Damara), *ēdo, ēse, ox* (from Afrikaans), *ja* (also from Afrikaans), *okua* or *okha* (possibly *o kha* 'and why') and *fok* (again from Afrikaans). Some examples of secondary interjections are *aukhoe, taukhoe, abo, !Khutse* and *Elotse* all meaning 'forefather' or 'God'. The secondary interjections can be inflected, for example with PGN markers, postpositions and possessives.

- (130) *abo-b ao* forefather-3sG.M before 'before God'
- (131) *ti elo-ts-e* POSS God-2SG-VOC '(you!) my God'

A much greater amount of work will need to be performed in the area of $\pm \bar{A}$ khoe interjections before any clear definitions can be given concerning their meaning and use. In the remainder of this thesis, any interjections occurring in the examples will not be translated, as their interpretation would be premature.

2.3 Tenses, aspects and moods

The tenses and aspects in $\neq \bar{A}$ khoe Haillom are all expressed by particles (see sections 2.3.1 and 2.3.2). The diverse modalities are expressed in a number of different moods. These are shown in section 2.3.3.

2.3.1 Tense

The tenses that are expressed in $\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe Haillom are the present, past, recent past and future tenses and they occur most generally just prior to the verb. The present tense is unmarked. In the case of stative verbs (see section 2.2.3 for information on stative verbs vs. event verbs), as shown in example (132), the unmarked present tense usually implies a stative aspect.

(132) Axa-b ge ≠nôa.
child-3SG.M DECL sit
'The boy is seated.' (Farm6_0701p.6)

In the case of event verbs, the progressive aspect marker ra is often present. This can be seen in example (133).

(133) Axa-b ge ra ≠nû.
child-3SG.M DECL PROG sit
'The boy is sitting down.' (Farm6_0701p.6)

The past is expressed with the particle ge as is shown in example (134). The recent past is expressed with the particle go, as shown in example (135). Both of these examples include the progressive aspect marker ra, the vowel of which is assimilated to the vowel of the preceding tense marker. In combination with the past marker ge, the progressive maker has become re and in combination with the recent past marker go it has become ro.

- (134) Aetsē ta ge tita ge-re mā si s-a.
 two.days.from.now 1SG DECL 1SG PST-PROG give 2SG.F.OBJ 3SG-A
 'The day before yesterday I was giving it to you.' (Gas_yardA:Ma)
- (135) Boko, *llari* ta go-ro hau xala-b-a.
 EXL one.day.from.now 1SG RECPST-PROG bring glas-3SG.M-A
 'BOKO, I was bringing a glass yesterday.' (Ga_beads2:Ga)

The future tense is marked with nî. Example (136) shows an instance of its use.

(136) /Nîsî-b nētsē nî hā.
maybe-3SG.M today FUT come
'Maybe he will come today.' (Collect_nuts:Ga)

2.3.2 Aspect

Four distinct aspects are marked in $\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe Haillom: *a* or *i*, *ra*, *hâ* and *hâna*. The aspect markers *a*, *i*, *hâ* and *hâna* are also discussed in section 2.2.4 on auxiliary verbs. *A* marks the stative in the present tense. In Heikkinen's work it is called the completive (Heikkinen, n.d.-a). *I* is its counterpart for the past and future tenses. The present tense stative marker *a* is shown in example (137), while the stative marker *i*, used in the past and future tense, is shown in example (138).

- (137) Hoaraga duur a xū-b ge.
 total expensive STAT thing-3SG.M DECL
 'The thing is totally expensive.' (Handcraft_3:SS)
- (138) Telefon dara-b-a ge ūhâ i khoe-ta ge.
 telephone wire-3SG.M-A PST have BEC person-1SG DECL
 'Me, I had telephone wire.' (Handcraft_3:YB)

Ra, which was often referred to in the previous section on tense (2.3.1), marks the progressive. Heikkinen (n.d.-a) refers to it as the incompletive and Haacke (1976) as the inchoative. An example was also shown in the previous section, example (133). In addition, the preceding examples (134) and (135) showed the assimilation of the vowel of the aspect marker *ra* to the preceding vowel.

The auxiliary verb hâ marks the perfective aspect. This is shown in example (139).

(139) *IIO* hâ-n ge.
die PRF-3PL.C DECL
'They have died.' (State_hospital:SN)

Finally, the aspect marker hâna, shown in example (140), marks the habitual.

(140) #Gai du ta ra hâna.
call 2PL 1SG PROG HAB
'I am (habitually) calling you.' (Gas_yardA:Ga)

In the table below, all the tense and aspect markers are shown. For the perfective aspect in the related language Richtersveld Nama, Witzlak (2006) reports the "i" as part of the aspect marker. In $\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe, the "i" is optional.

	Past	Recent past	Present	Future
Stative verbs	ge (i)	go (i)	-/a	nî
Active verbs	ge	go	-	nî
Progressive	ge re	go ro	ra	nî ra
Perfective	ge hâ (i)	go hâ (i)	hâ	nî hâ (i)

Figure 2-7: Tense and aspect marking on stative and active verbs.

2.3.3 Mood

[‡]Ākhoe Haillom also grammatically expresses a number of moods. The moods that are marked are the conditional, an emphatic declarative, the imperative, hortative and jussive. The conditional mood is expressed

using the particle *ga*. An example of this is shown in (141). As can be seen in this example, the moods can combine with tense and aspect markers, in this case the past and the perfective.

(141) 'Etsē sao-ai-bi-ts ge ga hâ etsē.
EXL follow-3SG.M.OBJ-2SG PST COND PRF EXL
'ETSĒ you should have followed him ETSĒ. (Handcraft_3:Man1)

Another mood that is expressed grammatically in $\frac{1}{4}$ Åkhoe Haillom is the emphatic declarative, which Heikkinen calls the expressive sentence (n.d.-a). This mood is marked with *kom*(*o*), usually phrase finally, and is shown in example (142).

(142) *Boko ‡û-b* **komo**-b go. EXL eat-3SG.M EMPH-3SG.M RECPST 'BOKO he really ate.' (Ga_beads_2:Ma)

Heikkinen's assertion that a sentence final -o is added when the sentence continues after the marker (Heikkinen, n.d.-a) is not corroborated by the conversational data.

The standard mood, most frequently called the indicative modality, is not marked. Heikkinen also mentions the modality of necessity which is expressed using the future tense marker $n\hat{i}$ (Heikkinen, n.d.-a). It is arguable that the modality of necessity is more likely expressed indirectly (through the illocutionary force of the utterance) in the future tense in a similar manner in which it is possible to do this in English. An example of this is "Young man, you will go to bed this instant!" which conveys the sense of "you must go to bed" without there being a dedicated grammatical marker to convey this sense of necessity.

In the following sections, the imperative, hortative and jussive moods will be treated separately and more comprehensively as they will play a larger role in the remainder of the thesis. For the same reason, the interrogative moods will be treated separately in Chapter 3.

2.3.3.1 Imperative

The standard imperative is formed with only the verb stem, as the following example shows.

(143) **#Gai** /Gâ-b-a. call name-3SG.M-A 'Call |Gâ.' (Gas_yardA:AU)

The PGN suffixes for the addressee can be included, and they follow the verb stem. These are the second person singular feminine and masculine sV and tsV, second person plural feminine and masculine so and go and second person plural common du. Example (144) shows an imperative that includes the second personal pronoun

common for the addressee. At times, a plural PGN suffix will be included in an imperative addressed to a single person in order to show politeness.

(144) *†Gai du /Gâ.* call 2PL.C name 'You (pl) call |Gâ.' (Gas_yardA:AU)

If the complete object is explicitly mentioned, it usually precedes the verb stem as in examples (145) and (146).

- (145) [Dara-b-a] mâ etsē.
 wire-3SG.M-A give EXL
 'Give the wire ETSĒ.' (Handcraft_3:SS)
- (146) *[Krag-i di !uri dara-gu-a] ū.* electricity-3SG.C POSS white wire-3PL.M-A take 'Take the white electricity wires.' (Handcraft_3:YB)

However, if the object is referred to using only the PGN marker, the PGN marker follows the verb stem as in example (147).

(147) *Kuru* **s-a.** fix 3SG.F-A 'Fix it.' (Handcraft_3:Man1)

My findings contrast somewhat with those of Heikkinen (n.d.-a: 51) who writes that imperatives are marked with the particle *re* and only those imperative sentences that follow another imperative occur without *re*. She calls these imperatives without *re* 'imperative equivalents'. In the data used here, there are numerous occurrences of imperatives formed with the verb stem only, i.e. without *re*, even though they do not follow another imperative. A number of these are shown in the examples above. There are imperatives that do take the marker *re*, and this type of utterance is actually more frequent than the unmarked imperatives in the conversational data. Yet, despite this, *re* may not be an imperative marker simply because imperatives can be formed without using it. Also, and equally importantly, the particle *re* occurs in sentences that are not imperatives. For examples of this see section 2.3.3.3 that covers the particle *re*.

2.3.3.2 Hortative

A hortative is introduced with the auxiliary $h\bar{a}$ which is sometimes shortened to *a*. Furthermore, the verb stem is used, and there are no tense markers. The subject of the sentence is obligatorily present. Example (148) shows a hortative with the first person singular (I) as subject, and example (149) shows a hortative with the first person

plural (we) as subject. The second example also shows that the hortatives can include the *re* marker that also occurs with imperatives. Example (150) shows the second person plural (you) as subject.

- (148) Hā ta +nau tsi.
 HORT 1SG beat 2SG.M.OBJ
 'Let me beat you.' (Gas_yardA:Th)
- (149) A ge //nā !khare-se ī ū-si re tenminste.
 HORT 1PL.M DEM half-3SG.F.A come take-3SG.F.OBJ RE at.least
 'Let us come and take that half at least.' (Handcraft_3:RS)
- (150)Hāgotādeur-s-a//khōbamre.HORT2PL.MNEGdoor-3SG.F-AopenRE'You (pl.) should not open the door.' (Handcraft_3:SS)

Finally, example (151) shows a hortative with the third person singular (he/she) as subject (for more on third person hortatives see Auwera, Dobrushina, & Goussev (2013)).

(151) A tsa Tsînstabis !gû ū te.
HORT 3SG name.of.town go take 1SG.OBJ
'Let him take me to Tsintsabis.' (Gas_yardA:Ga)

2.3.3.3 The particle re

There is a particle *re* that can occur after a verb in the imperative and hortative. Heikkinen, working on $\pm \bar{A}$ khoe Haillom, calls the particle an imperative marker (Heikkinen, n.d.-a: 52). As previously argued in section 2.3.3.1, it is probably not an imperative marker as utterances can be imperatives without *re*, and *re* also occurs in utterances that are not imperatives, e.g. in hortatives.

The particle re always occurs phrase finally. An imperative with re in its most basic form is shown in example (152) below.

(152) #Gai re.
call RE
'Call.' (addressee is asked to call someone) (Gas_yardA:Th)

The particle mostly occurs in imperatives with second person singular and plural as subjects. In these instances subject marking is optional. Two examples are given below. In examples (153) and (154), the *re* particle occurs with the second person singular and second person plural as subject respectively.

- (153) Ap sē-e so au te re i ta //ā-sen.
 NAME soap-3SG.C 3PL.F.A let.so.share 1SG.OBJ RE CONJ 1SG wash-REFL
 'Ap, give me soap so that I can wash myself.' (Gas_yardA:Ma)
- (154) //Om du re i da sē.
 sleep 2PL.C RE CONJ 1PL.C collect
 'Sleep so that we can collect.'
 (said to a crying child by a parent who wants to collect nuts) (Collect_nuts:Fr)

There are a few incidents in the conversational data where the particle *re* occurs in imperatives with the first and third person singular as subject. This may seem unusual at a first glance, but conversational data often adheres less rigidly to what are generally perceived to be the standard grammatical rules. In the imperatives in the first and third person that are marked with *re*, the subject has to be marked. Example (155) shows the *re* marker used in an imperative with the first person singular as subject.

(155) Fraitaxtsē ti Haka//îtsē ī. tā тî kom ge re ra Friday 1SG NEG say RE Thursday EMPH DECL PROG go 'I mustn't say Friday (because) we'll really go on Thursday.' (Handcraft_3:YB)

Example (156) shows an imperative marked with re with the third person singular.

(156)Nēkhoe-b-a-bkhoe-e!gâisemî-bare.DEMperson-3SG.M-A-3SG.Mperson-3SG.Cwellsay-APPLRE'This man must tell a person correctly.' (LEGO_Fr_NO:Fr)

Researchers working on the neighbouring dialect Nama-Damara (Böhm, 1985: 228; Haacke, 1988: 86; Planert, 1905: 19; Rust, 1965: 60) suggest that *re* is a particle used in imperatives to "soften" the command, that it is best glossed as 'please' and that it is used for politeness.

2.3.4 Negation

There are several forms of negation in $\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe Haillom: $t\bar{a}$, tama, tide and ti.⁸ $T\bar{a}$ and tama are used for negation in all tenses and aspects except the future tense. The conversational data shows that while both $t\bar{a}$ and tama are used in the present tense, $t\bar{a}$ is used more frequently in the imperative and in the present progressive tense occurring before the verb and the tense markers. Tama is used more frequently in the perfective present and past

⁸ The findings reported here may seem to differ markedly to those reported by Heikkinen (n.d.-a) and Widlok (2013). This is not the case. The seeming difference is due to a probable oversight in the header of the depicted negative paradigm tables in both earlier works that actually depict the negative *future* tense.

tenses occurring after the verb and the tense markers but before the aspect markers. Example (157) shows a negation in the imperative using $t\bar{a}$, while example (158) shows a negation in the present progressive tense also using $t\bar{a}$.

- (157) Tā axu re.
 NEG throw.away RE
 'Don't throw (it) away.' (Handcraft_3:YB)
- (158) *Tita ge tā ra hî.*1SG DECL NEG PROG do
 'I am not doing it.' (Gas_yardA:Ma)

The following examples show the use of *tama*, which in the conversational data is also frequently realized as *toma*. Example (159) shows a negation in the present tense, and example (160) shows a negation in the past perfective tense.

- (159) Khoe-e-s *†nau* toma.
 person-3SG.C.A-3SG.F beat NEG
 'She doesn't beat anyone.' (State_hospital:Ga)
- (160) Sa-b ge //nāti go ī toma hâ.
 POSS.2SG-3SG.M DECL like.that RECPST be NEG PRF
 'Yours wasn't like this.' (State_hospital:Ga)

The future tense is negated with *ti* and *tide*. *Ti* occurs only in conjunction with the future tense marker $n\hat{i}$ or the progressive marker *ra*, while *tide* occurs phrase finally in future tense utterances in which $n\hat{i}$ is not present. Example (161) shows a case of a negation in the future tense using *ti* and (162) shows a negation in future tense using *tide*.

- Naotenîti-sge.chase1SG.OBJFUTNEG-2SG.FDECL'You won't chaseme.' (Ga_beads_2:Xo)
- (162) Hâ-â ā ta tide okua.
 no drink 1SG NEG EXL
 'No, I will not drink OKUA.' (Ga_beads_2:Su)

The field of negation would benefit greatly from more detailed research. So far, the work in this area has been solely descriptive.

2.4 The clause

2.4.1 Constituent order

The basic constituent order of simple sentences in $\frac{1}{4}$ Åkhoe Haillom is SOV. This is the order found when eliciting simple sentences: sentences with an object, a subject and an active verb. Example (163) shows an elicited sentence that has the basic SOV constituent order.

(163) Goma-s ge $/g\hat{a}$ -n-a ra $\neq \hat{u}$. cow-3SG.F DECL grass-3PL.C-A PROG eat S O V 'The cow is eating the grass.' (Tsumeb0701p.3)

In line with the related Khoekhoe language, which is generally held to be an SOV language (Den Besten, 2002; Hahn, 2013; Witzlack-Makarevich, 2006), although with possible underlyingly SVO (Haacke, 2006), it is generally agreed that, notwithstanding several constraints, the languages have a fairly unrestricted constituent order (Haacke 1976, Rust 1965). One of the constraints is that the topic of the sentence occurs in sentence initial position (Haacke 1976:139) and another is that grammatical formatives, such as PGN markers and TAM markers, cannot occur in sentence initial position (Haacke, 2013).

2.4.2 Major sentence types

A distinction between the three basic sentence types declarative, imperative and interrogative⁹ is made in most languages (Sadock & Zwicky, 1985). These distinctions should be based on formal (syntactic) properties, i.e. one should be able to tell from the syntax of a sentence or clause to which sentence type it belongs. Ideally, these distinctions should also be mutually exclusive (König & Siemund, 2007), i.e. if a sentence or clause shows a certain formal marker it cannot belong to either of the other types which each have their own specific markers.

 \pm Ākhoe Haillom has the three basic sentence types, and these types are marked by particles. The declarative and imperative can be marked by a mood particle whereas the interrogative is signalled by the absence of these particles. The declarative is marked by the declarative marker *ge* and the imperative can be marked by the marker *re* or remains unmarked. Marking an utterance as an interrogative by leaving out the declarative marker is very unusual. Dryer (2008) in WALS (the World Atlas of Language Structures) mentions only four languages

⁹ I will be using the term 'interrogative' to refer to formal questions (i.e. clauses that are syntactically or grammatically questions) and the term 'question' to refer to functional questions (i.e. clauses that are semantically or functionally questions). In Huddleston's words "Interrogative contrasts with declaratives, imperatives, etc., in the system of clause type [...]; a question defines a set of answers" (Huddleston, 1994).

of a sample of 842 languages that form interrogatives in this manner. In addition to these four, Omotic languages also have an unmarked sentence type as the interrogative (Azeb Amha, personal communication).

The example sentences below show one instance of each sentence type in \bar{A} khoe Haillom. Example (164) shows a declarative sentence which is marked with the declarative marker *ge*.

(164) Vanesa-s ge ra tai.
Vanesa-3SG.F DECL PROG suckle
'Vanesa is suckling.' (Farm60701p.3)

Example (165) shows an imperative with the re marker.

(165) *Oa* **re** om-s kha. return RE home-3SG.F to 'Go home.' (Tsumeb0702p.20)

The interrogative in example (166) is 'marked' by the absence of both the declarative marker ge and the re marker.

(166) Mā-s-a oa ī? mother-3SG.F-A return pass.by 'Has mom returned?' (Gas_yardA:Ma)

The distinction "declarative with ge" "interrogative without ge" is not quite as clear-cut as it is presented here. The declarative marker does not mark all declaratives, especially in conversational data. It only marks "non-embedded declaratives" (Heikkinen, n.d.-a). It does not mark subordinate clauses. *Ge* also does not occur in interrogatives (Haacke, 1976).¹⁰ Similarly the marker *re* also does not occur in interrogatives. *Ge* probably entails some form of focus marking too (Güldemann, T; Siegmund, S. 2009), however a complete analysis of *ge* goes beyond the scope of this grammar sketch.

2.4.3 Simple clauses

Heikkinen identifies a number of clause structures for $\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe Haillom. A basic structure for all clauses that she identifies occurs in narratives. Here, clauses generally start with a conjunction and end with a verb final -e or a sentence final topic/focus construction *i ge* (Heikkinen, n.d.-a). While this framework is indeed applicable to clauses found in narratives, it does not apply entirely to utterances occurring in natural conversation on which

¹⁰ This may seem to be contradicted by an utterance found in the conversational data used for this thesis, but this seeming exception is explained in section 2.4.4.2.3.

the work in this thesis is based. In natural conversation, utterances can but do not generally start with a conjunction, and they can but do not generally end in a verb final -e. The sentence final topic/focus construction *i ge* on the other hand does occur in declarative utterances in natural conversation but not in all. It will be discussed later on in this section.

Heikkinen furthermore makes a two-way distinction in the simple clauses between event sentences and stative sentences. This distinction continues through all three sentence types: declaratives, imperatives and interrogatives. Heikkinen divides sentences into several fields in the following manner: the simple declarative sentences are formed by the optional pre-sentence followed by the subject, the predicate and finally by the optional post-sentence. The pre-sentence can consist of a conjunction, adverb or of the object followed by a PGN suffix which refers to the subject or topic of the sentence. The post-sentence can consist of verbal or nominal modifiers. In event sentences, the predicate is made up of an adverb and/or the object and a verb. This is shown in examples (167), (168) and (169) which also show the different sentential fields.

Event sentences:

(167)	[]	[<i>Tita</i>	ge]	[ti	soro-b-a]		[<i>ra</i>	xoa].		[]
			1sg	DECL	POSS.1SG	skin-3sg.1	M-A	PROG	scrat	ch		
			Subjec	t	Object			Verb				
	Pre-sentence		Subjec	t	[Predicate]		Post-sentence	;
	'I am scratch	nin	ig my sl	kin.' (Гsumeb070	1p.18)						
(168)	[<i>O</i> - <i>s</i>]	[auma-s	- <i>a</i>]	[<i>no</i> 2	xoba] [ra	ŧ	khā].				
	CONJ-3SG.F	g	randmo	other-3	SG.F-A agai	n PROC	3 re	fuse				
		S	Subject		Adv	verb Verb)					
	Pre-sentence	S	ubject		[Pre	dicate]				
	'And grandm	na	is still	refusir	ıg.' (Ga_bea	ds_2:Su)						
(169)	[NU-bia]	[[nētse]	[///	nā khoe-b	- <i>a</i>]	[g0	ūhe	hâ	<i>i</i>]	[/gau-s-a]	
	name-3sg.M.A	\ t	oday	DE	M person-	-3sg.m-a	REC	PST have	PRF	3sg	manner-3sg.I	F-A
	Subject	1	Adverb	Ob	oject		Ver	0				
	Subject	[Predica	ate]	Post-sentence	e
	'NU was today holding the other man like this.' (Ga_beads_2:Ma)											

In stative sentences, the predicate is made up of a copula and a complement. The copula is either a stative 'to be', i stative 'to become' or ge i the past tense. This is shown in example (170). In stative sentences, the order of the predicate and the complement may be reversed. In cases where there is no copula, the sentence is considered a non-verbal stative sentence. This is shown in example (171).

Stative sentence:

(170)	[Tafel-s	ge]	[<i>a</i>]	[<i>‡ha-b-a</i>].				
	table-3SG.F	DECL	STAT	flat-3SG.M-A				
	Subject		Copula	Complement				
	'The table is flat.' (Tsumeb0701p.16)							

Non-verbal stative sentence:

 (171)
 [Nē-b
 ge]
 [/asa-b-a].

 DEM-3SG.M
 DECL
 new-3SG.M-A

 Subject
 Complement

 'This one is new.' (Collect_nuts:Ce)

Heikkinen further identified some modifications of these basic clause types. These are the focus sentence and the expressive sentence. In the focus sentence, both the event sentence (pre-sentence – subject – predicate – post-sentence) and the stative sentence (pre-sentence – subject – predicate) are modified by preposing that part of the predicate that is intended to be the focus. This focused part of the predicate is placed between the pre-sentence and the subject. Example (172) shows an event sentence in which the object has been brought to the focus position in the front of the sentence.

(172) [//Gôa-s-a]-b ge ra kabe.
frog-3SG.F-A-3SG.M DECL PROG look.for
[Object]-Subject Verb
'He is looking for the frog.' (FS_Sa_Ei:Ei)

Heikkinen's expressive sentence is not found in the conversational data. Heikkinen identifies this sentence as being a stative non-verbal sentence (predicate - topic marker - (subject)) that is marked by the expressive marker kom(o) and a sentence final -o. Kom(o) was identified earlier on in this chapter as an emphatic declarative mood particle, see section 2.3.3.

Heikkinen continues further with derived sentences. These are the interrogative and the imperative. These sentences types will be treated in more detail as they will be relevant in the chapters on question-answer sequences and request sequences.

2.4.4 Interrogatives

The following sections will give a description of interrogatives (formal questions) in $\pm \bar{A}$ khoe Haillom. Interrogatives can be posed in the form of content interrogatives, polar interrogatives or alternative interrogatives are the rarest type of interrogative used in conversation.

2.4.4.1 Content interrogatives

The main strategy to form content interrogatives in $\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe Haillom is the use of an interrogative word in conjunction with the dropping of the declarative marker *ge*. Additionally, in content interrogatives, the case marker *-a* marks subjects in phrase initial position. In declaratives, subjects in the phrase initial position are not marked by this case marker. Interrogative words usually occur in the first position in the phrase. The first position can be a focus position (Witzlack-Makarevich, 2006). If another element in the phrase is in this position, the interrogative word comes directly after it. Compare elicited example (173) with example (174) which comes from the conversational data. In (173) the interrogative word *tae* 'what' comes in first position and in example (174) the interrogative word comes after the NP 'this walking thing', which is in the focus position, i.e. the first position.

- (173) **Tae** e nē e? what 3SG.C.A DEM 3SG.C.A 'What is this?' (Tsumeb0701p.34)
- (174) Nē-s-a !gû-xū-s-a tae-s-a?
 DEM-3SG.F-A walk-thing-3SG.F-A what-3SG.F-A
 'What is this walking thing?' (H001108) (FS_Sa_Ei:Ei)

The interrogative words that occur in ‡Ākhoe Haillom are: *tae* (*tare*) 'what', *tae kōse* 'why', *tai* (*tari*) 'who', *mâ* 'which', *mâba* 'where', *mâti* 'how', *mâtiko* 'how many', *ham* 'who' and *hana* 'when'. Cysouw's (2004a) typological classification of interrogative words will be used to categorise the interrogative words in ‡Ākhoe Haillom. Cysouw's main categories are Person 'who', Thing 'what', Place 'where', Selection 'which', Quantity 'how much', Manner 'how' and Time 'when'.

Category	Interrogative word	Translation
Person	tai (tari)	'who',
	ham	'who'
Thing	tae (tare)	'what'
Reason	tae kōse	'why'
Selection	mâ	'which'
Place	mâba	'where'
Manner	mâti	'how'
Quantity	mâtiko	'how many'
Time	mâ llae	'what time'
Time	hâna	'when'

Figure 2-8: Most common interrogative words.

‡Ākhoe Haillom has interrogative words for the main categories Person, Thing and Selection. The interrogative words for the categories Quantity, Time and Manner are derived using the interrogative word for Selection. The most common interrogative words used in ‡Ākhoe Haillom are shown in Figure 2-8.

2.4.4.1.1 Person

There are two interrogative words for Person: *tai* and *ham. Tai* is a contraction of *tari*. Vossen (1997) reconstructed the interrogative word for 'who' in Proto-Khoekhoe to **da*. In $\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe that is the *ta*- part of *tari* 'who' and *tare* 'what'. Vossen suspects that the *-re* and *-ri* suffixes are manifestations of the same particle as the interrogative particle in the non-Khoekhoe languages, for example Kxoe (Köhler, 1981), which is added at the end of an interrogative. In the following elicited example, the uncontracted interrogative word *tari* is used, and it carries a PGN marker for third person female and occurs in phrase initial position.

(175) Tari-s-a //nā †nôa-sa?
who-3SG.F-A DEM sit-3SG.F
'Who (female) sits over there?' (Tsumeb0701p.10)

The next example shows the less frequent interrogative word *ham*, which is also used for 'who'. In example (176), the interrogative word is in clause initial position and has a PGN marker for third person common.

(176) Ham i go hau kara-e? Q 3SG.C RECPST bring bead-3SG.C.A 'Who brought the beads?' (H002412) (Ga_beads2:EN)

Further research is needed to explore the difference between the interrogative words ta(r)i and ham.

2.4.4.1.2 Thing

The interrogative word for the category Thing, *tare*, can be contracted to *tae*. The interrogative word usually occurs clause initially. The elicited examples shown below are of a declarative (177) followed by the interrogative (178) with the interrogative word in clause initial position.

(177) *Nē-b ge ari-b-a.* DEM-3SG.M DECL dog-3SG.M-A 'This is a dog.' (178) *Tae e nē*?
what 3SG.C.A DEM
'What is this?' (Tsumeb0701p.10)

The interrogative word *tae*, usually used to ask about objects and events, can also be used to ask for reasons despite there being a designated interrogative word for 'why': *tae kose*. Example (179) shows the use of *tae* used to ask for a reason.

(179) O //nā-b-a xū tae-si +gae tama hâ?
CONJ DEM-3SG.M-A from Q-2SG.F.OBJ smoke NEG PRF
'And why don't you smoke from there?' (H002227) (Ga_beads2:AR)

2.4.4.1.3 Selection (which)

The interrogative word for Selection (which) is $m\hat{a}$. As with the previous interrogative words, it generally occurs in clause initial position as is shown with these examples. Example (181) is the question form of (180).

- (180) Nau khau-khoe-si a se-e go mû s-a.
 DEM big-person-3SG.F.OBJ UNK 1PL-UNK RECPST see 3SG.F-A
 'That grown-up woman we saw.' (Tsumeb0701p.35)
- (181) Mâ khau-khoe-s-a?

Q big-person-3SG.F-A

'Which grown-up woman?' (Tsumeb0701p.35)

The interrogative word *mâ* is used to ask about people, things and places.

In the following, the specific interrogative words for Place, Manner, Quantity, Time and Direction are derived from the interrogative word $m\hat{a}$ for Selection.

2.4.4.1.4 Place

The interrogative word for Place is mâba, which can be glossed as either 'which place' or 'where'.

(182) Ari-b ge dao-b !nâ ra !gû.
dog-3SG.M DECL road-3SG.M in PROG walk
'The dog is walking in the road.' (Tsumeb0702p.8)

(183) Mâba ra !gû ari-b-a?
Q PROG walk dog-3SG.M-A
'Where is the dog walking?' (Tsumeb0702p.8)

2.4.4.1.5 Manner

The interrogative word for Manner, glossed as 'how', is mâti.

- (184) Ari-b ge !aise ra !gû.
 dog-3SG.M DECL fast PROG walk
 'The dog is walking fast.' (Tsumeb0702p.9)
- (185) Mâti ra !gû ari-b-a?
 how PROG walk dog-3SG.M-A
 'How is the dog walking?' (Tsumeb0702p.9)

2.4.4.1.6 Quantity

The interrogative word for Quantity, 'how many', is mâtiko.

(186) Mâtiko-de ta !gae †nôa?
how.many-3PL.F.A 1SG tie sit
'How many do I sit and tie?'
(uttered by a woman sitting on the ground beading) (Ga_beads_2:Ap)

2.4.4.1.7 Time

The interrogative word for Time, 'what time' or 'when', is *mâ l*/*aeb*. Literally, it is 'which time'; *mâ* being the interrogative word for Selection and *l*/*aeb* meaning 'time'.

(187) Ari-b ge nētse ra uri.
dog-3SG.M DECL today PROG jump
'The dog is jumping today.' (Tsumeb0702p.9)

(188) Mâ llae-b-a uri ari-b-a?
Q time-3SG.M-A jump dog-3SG.M-A
'When does the dog jump?' (Tsumeb0702p.9)

Another manner of asking about time is using the construction mâ llaeb ai 'at what time'.

Mâl/ae-bai-smama-s-a#û-e/gôa-s-anîQtime-3SG.M to/at-3SG.Fmother-3SG.F-Afood-3SG.C.Achild-3SG.F-AFUTsâi-ba?cook-APPL'When will mother cook food for the child?' (Tsumeb0702p.9)item base of the child?' (Tsumeb0702p.9)

2.4.4.1.8 Direction

The selection interrogative word for Direction, 'which direction', is $m\hat{a}/\hat{a}$. It is built up of the selection interrogative word $m\hat{a}$ and the adverb $/\hat{a}$ 'to' or 'towards'.

- (190) *Mâlî du ra !gû e?* Q 2PL.C PROG go UNK
 - '(In) which direction are you going?' (Ga_beads_2:Ga)

2.4.4.1.9 Reason

There are two manners in which Reason interrogatives can be asked. Hagman (1977) gives the interrogative word *tare!aroma* 'why' or 'because of what'. In the conversational data the construction *tae kose* 'why' is used.

(191) Tae kose gâre /gôa-b-a //nāba?
Q stupid child-3sG.M-C DEM
'Why is the boy stupid like that?' (FS_Sa_Ei:Sa)

2.4.4.1.10 "What kind of"

Finally, there is the interrogative word *ta(r)ebe* which asks 'what kind or what type of thing'.

(192) Tarebe koma-n?
what.kind.of cow-3PL.C
'What kind of cattle?' (Hagman 1977)

(193) **Taebe** khā-de i de?

Q bow-3pl.f.c bec 3pl.f.c

What kinds of bows are they (Ga_beads_2:Ga)

To sum up, \bar{A} khoe Haillom has a reasonably large number of interrogative words that usually occur in clause initial position. The most commonly used interrogative words in conversation in the present corpus are ta(r)e 'what', ta(r)i 'who' and $m\hat{a}$ 'which'.

2.4.4.2 Polar interrogatives

Whereas content interrogatives are signalled by the absence of the declarative marker, the case marker -a on subjects in clause initial position, as well as by the presence of an interrogative word, polar interrogatives can be signalled by the absence of the declarative marker and the presence of the case marker -a on subjects in clause initial position alone, although, as detailed in 2.4.4.2.1, there are also sentence final polar interrogative markers that are used. Compare the elicited example sentences (194), a declarative, and (195), an interrogative.

- (194) /Hao-ū bi ta ge go.
 meet.with 3SG.M.OBJ 1SG DECL RECPST
 'I met with him.' (Tsumeb0701p.48)
- (195) /Hao-ū bi i-s?
 meet.with 3SG.M.OBJ BEC-2SG.F
 'Did you meet with him?' (Tsumeb0701p.48)

Aside from the important difference being the presence (in 194) versus the absence (in 195) of the declarative marker *ge*, there is a difference in the pronouns: first person singular *ta* in sentence (194) and second person singular feminine marker -s in (195). Also the past tense particle *go*, which is present in (194), is absent in (195) where the stative particle *i* reflects the tense.

2.4.4.2.1 Sentence final interrogative marking

Polar interrogatives can have a sentence final interrogative particle or word although this is not frequent in conversation. \bar{A} hoe Haillom has two sentence final interrogative markers: *kha* and *o*, and a number of words that can function as sentence final interrogative markers: *bo* 'or' and the loan from Afrikaans *of* 'or', *ama-e* 'true' or 'truth' and *hina* 'right'. The last two are very rare.

2.4.4.2.2 Interrogative particles kha and o

The interrogative particles kha and o occur at the end of a noun phrase that in itself forms the complete interrogative clause. Compare the examples (196) and (197).

- (196) [Khau-khoe-s-a] kha? big-person-3SG.F-A Q 'Is this the woman?' (Tsumeb0702p.13)
- (197) [O //nā goaro-b som-s-a] kha?
 CONJ DEM marula-3SG.M shade-3SG.F-A Q
 'And what about that marula's (tree species) shade?' (Handcraft_3:YB)

Kha cannot occur at the end of a complete clause.

(198) *Khau-khoe-s-a ge ra uri kha?
big-person-3SG.F-A DECL PROG jump Q
'Is the woman jumping?' (Tsumeb0702p.13)

O occurs in the same places as kha, namely after a noun phrase.

(199) Khoe-s-a o?
person-3SG.F-A Q
'The woman?' 'Where is the woman?' 'What woman?' etc. (Farm608p.4)

Kha additionally occurs in content interrogatives after the interrogative word itself, as long as the interrogative word is marked with a PGN marker. *O* cannot occur in this position.

(200) *Tai-s-a* **kha**? who-3SG.F-A q 'Who is she?' (H002207) (Ga_beads2:Ga)

The examples of this type of interrogative particle that occur in conversational data look very much like interrogative particles that have elsewhere been called topic-only interrogative markers (Ameka, 1998; Comrie, 1984). These interrogative particles mark the topic about which the speaker wants information, and they occur in interrogatives that do not contain a verb.

2.4.4.2.3 Other sentence final interrogative markers

The other sentence final interrogative markers are words that, aside from their normal function (for example as conjunctions), can also be used to form polar interrogatives. The words *bo* 'or' and *of* 'or' can be used as sentence final markers in polar interrogatives. They are distinct from *kha* because they can occur at the end of all noun phrases as well as after complete clauses. Compare example (201) where *bo* occurs after a noun phrase with the example (202) where *bo* occurs after a complete clause.

(201) *Kiba-b-a* **bo**?
goalkeeper-3sG.M-A or
'Is he the goalkeeper or?' (SE_WI_TV:WI)

(202) Sîsen !gû-b go-ro **bo**? work go-3SG.M RECPST-PROG or 'Was he going to work or?' (Ga_beads2:Ga)

The word *of* also means 'or', and it is a loanword from Afrikaans. It is used as an interrogative particle in polar interrogatives in the same way *bo* is used. In the natural conversational data, it is only used by young speakers suggesting that it is being adopted into the language and may become more prevalent.

Note the lack of the declarative marker ge in both examples (201) and (202) above. This is expected, since ge does not occur in questions. If (201) had for example been a statement with an added disjunctive marker 'He is the goalkeeper or?' it would have been *kibab ge bo?* Through the lack of the declarative marker ge and the addition of the case marker -a on the subject, the utterance is a question: 'Is he the goalkeeper or?' Yet, the words *bo* 'or', *of* 'or', *ama-e* 'true' and *hina* 'right' can also be used as sentence final interrogative markers at the end of declarative sentences to form polar tag interrogatives. These interrogatives are the only ones that do have a declarative marker ge. They consist of a declarative followed by a sentence final interrogative marker. In this manner, they function as the English tag interrogative does.

- (203) Nē hū-de hūga nēti di ge mâ-e bo?
 DEM thing-3PL.F.A long like.this 3PL.F PST stand-3SG.C.A or
 'These things stood long like this, or?' (LEGO_Fr_NO:Fr)
- (204) O-b ge a xū-ru gara ama-e?
 CONJ-3SG.M DECL STAT thing-UNK big true-3SG.C.A
 'And he is a big thing, true?' (Gas_yardA:Ga)

One could argue that these clauses are declarative statements that, because of a lack of uptake from the conversational partners, are then extended with a tag and that thus only the tag is the interrogative. However, these utterances are through-produced; they are produced as one utterance, there is no pause in between the declarative and the tag. This is the reason the complete utterances are regarded as interrogatives.

2.4.4.3 Alternative interrogatives

Alternative interrogatives can be formed using the phrase *tama(s) ga/ka io* or by using *bo* 'or' or *of*, the Afrikaans loanword for 'or'. *Tama(s) ga/ka io* is a conjunction which literally means '(it) possibly not being so', *tama(s)* being the negative, *ga/ka* being the potential, *o* being 'if' or 'when' and *i* being a stative. The following three elicited examples show the three possible methods of forming alternative interrogatives.

- (205) Uri ra ari-b-a tama-s ga i-o !gû ra ari-b-a?
 jump PROG dog-3SG.M-A NEG-3SG.F COND BEC-if walk PROG dog-3SG.M-A
 'Is the dog jumping or is the dog walking?' (Tsumeb0702p.10)
- (206) !Gû ra ari-b-a bo uri ra ari-b-a?
 walk PROG dog-3SG.M-A or jump PROG dog-3SG.M-A
 'Is the dog walking or is the dog jumping?' (Tsumeb0702p.11)
- (207) Ari-b of katsi-s-a ra !gû?
 dog-3SG.M or cat-3SG.F-A PROG walk
 'Is the dog or the cat walking?' (Farm60801p.9)

While the phrase tama(s) ga/ka io tends to be the first one that informants provide when asked to translate alternative interrogatives it is not at all frequent in natural conversation. In many hours of recorded conversational data, there was not a single example to be found where this phrase was used in an interrogative. On the other hand, examples for *bo* being used to form alternative interrogatives were more common.

2.4.4.4 Interrogative intonation

Intonation can be used to convey many different things, for example the syntactic, semantic and discourse information in an utterance. Intonation can be used to mark the sentence type (declarative, imperative, and interrogative), the speech act (statement, command, and question) and also speaker attitude (see Hirschberg (2004) for an overview). Sentence types and speech acts do not completely overlap. An utterance can be in the form of a declarative while performing the act of a question. Witzlack-Makarevich (2006) has shown that in Richtersveld Nama, a variety of Nama-Damara that is mutually intelligible with +Ākhoe Haillom, intonation is used to mark focus. Selting (1992) claims that intonation is an autonomous system and that intonation patterns are not linked to the syntactic form of an interrogative. Instead, intonation is used to mark specific conversational interrogative types and requires specific types of answers. All these factors point to intonation being a rather complex area of research, especially when the data is natural conversation in which many of the above factors play interlocking roles. The quality of the recordings used for this thesis is not suited for detailed phonological analysis along the lines of calculating speaker means, initial and/or final pitch, etc. Also, as the language is a tone language but not enough is known about the tonal system so far, one cannot be sure that it is not lexical tone that is driving the initial and final pitch. Furthermore, phonological research by Rialland (2007; 2009) has shown that in many African languages it is not just intonation that is used to mark questions but that a number of other prosodic features are used, for example vowel length and breathiness. Nevertheless, in this section, a first few steps will be taken towards describing the function of intonation in interrogatives in $\pm \bar{A}$ khoe Haillom.

To begin with, a Praat¹¹ analysis of a recording of two folk tales¹² told by just one speaker, i.e. monologues, shows a consistently falling intonation throughout all the clauses in the whole narration. The lowest pitch in a single clause occurs at the end of that clause when the utterance is syntactically complete. Interrogatives that occur in the folk tales are content interrogatives given in reported speech. These interrogatives also have an overall falling intonation, but the initial pitch is higher than the pitch of the declaratives, and the interrogative words are accented. This is in line with findings by Merrigi (1931) and Von Essen (1966) whose work with elicited data shows a rise in intonation at the beginning of questions in Nama-Damara. From this, it can be proposed that interrogative intonation in content interrogatives might have falling intonation with a relatively higher starting pitch, although this may also be due to the interrogatives being in reported speech. In addition to that, the accent is on the interrogative words.

In the case of conversational data, as was previously mentioned, intonation can be used to communicate very many different things. For this reason, in this section, only utterances where the communicative intent, or action, is clear will be considered. Also, initially, only the shortest utterances will be considered. The shortest utterances, utterances consisting of only one syllable, with the clearest communicative intent are agreement markers and continuers: hm, hn, \hat{i} , etc, and repair initiators $h\bar{e}$ and hm. Open class repair initiators of the 'huh?' kind were coded as content interrogatives in this study. Of 64 repair initiators in the data sample, 12 are open class repair initiators. Comparing these repair initiators, which have the function of statements, should show a difference in intonation if there is interrogative intonation in $\pm\bar{A}$ khoe Haillom.

In the repair initiator $h\bar{e}$, i.e. 'huh' or 'what did you say?', the pitch rises followed by a slight lowering right at the end. This is shown in Figure 2-9.



¹¹ http://www.fon.hum.uva.nl/praat/

¹² Haiseb_tale_2 and Haiseb_tale_3 told by ST.

All other turns that consist of similar utterances to $h\bar{e}$, for example agreement markers, continuers and different version of yes: *hm*, *hn*, *î*, *ā*, etc. have a falling intonation when used as statements. This pattern is shown in Figure 2-10.



Figure 2-10: Handcraft_3:RS

There are two interrogative particles in $\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe Haillom, namely *bo* and *kha*. When the word *bo* is used as a phrase final interrogative tag to form polar interrogatives, it has a rising intonation. This is shown in Figure 2-11. In contrast, the phrase final interrogative particle *kha* does not have rising intonation in any of the cases found in the data sample. The intonation remains level as can been seen in the example in Figure 2-12.



Figure 2-11: H002_c



In Nama-Damara, *kha* has a low tone, and one could assume that this is the same in $\pm\bar{A}$ khoe Haillom. Hypothetically, a low tone on *kha* would lead to the expectation of a drop off at the end of an utterance ending with *kha*. However, the rising intonation of an interrogative would counteract the low tone, and therefore the intonation would remain level in interrogatives with a final *kha*. More information on the tonal system of $\pm\bar{A}$ khoe Haillom would be needed to prove or disprove this hypothesis.

Interrogative words consisting of two syllables (usually the interrogative part followed by a PGN marker) that form a complete utterance on their own, and that are thus longer than the repair initiators, have the higher pitch on the second syllable. This can be seen well in the next two examples shown in Figure 2-13 and Figure 2-14. The examples show a statement *llnāba xu* 'From there,' and a question *mâba xu*? 'From where?' Figure 2-13 shows the statement in which the first word *llnāba* 'there' is a near minimal pair with the interrogative word for place *mâba* which is shown in Figure 2-14. The two examples show a difference in pitch between the statement *llnāba xu* 'From there,' and the question *mâba xu* 'From where?' In the question, the pitch rises much higher, and the rise starts earlier.



Figure 2-13: H002_a statement



Figure 2-14: H002_b interrogative

The difference in overall pitch between these two utterances is visible more clearly when they are viewed in their sequential context. The two utterances occur in a conversation between two women: Ap and Gu. Ap has just asked Gu to move from where she is sitting as she is blocking the view of the camera. Gu misunderstands her. The excerpt starts with Gu's request for clarification of what she thinks Ap told her.

(208)

1	Gu:	Mâ	ta	ra	kē	si	e?
		Q	1sg	PROG	see	3sg.f	UNK
		ʻWhe	ere d	o I see ł	ner?'		
2	Ap:	//Nāl	ba	хи			
		DEM		from			
		'Fro	m the	ere.'			
3	Gu:	//Nu	a <u>1</u>	<u>'e</u> ?			
		leave	e R	RЕ			
		'Lea	ve?'				
4	Ap:	((no	ds))				
5	Gu:	Mâ <u>b</u>	<u>a</u> x	xu?			
		Q	f	rom			
		'From	m wl	here?'	(Ga_bea	ds2)

Speaker Gu asks the question "Mâ ta ra $k\bar{e}$ si e?" 'Where do I see her?' Speaker Ap answers with the statement "//Nāba xu," 'From there.' Things are still not completely clear to speaker Gu who responds with another question "//Nau re?" 'Leave?' (i.e. 'Must I leave?'). In the following pause, speaker Ap nods to which Gu responds with yet another question "Mâba xu?" 'From where?' The pitch on both final questions by speaker Gu is clearly distinct from that of speaker Ap's statement, the questions having a much wider pitch range than the statement.



Figure 2-15: H002_a and H002_b

In a corpus study of pitch in 10 languages, including \bar{A} khoe Haillom, the initial pitch in the questions and statements was measured (Sicoli, Stivers, Enfield, & Levinson, 2014). The pitch was measured at the peak of intensity of the vowel nucleus of the first prominent syllable. The results showed that the height of the initial pitch in comparison to the speaker's median correlated with the action the question performed, e.g. evaluative questions vs. information questions. In \bar{A} khoe, this difference was small, on average only 7 Hertz, but it was nevertheless an audible difference. Sicoli argues that this difference shows that this feature of intonation is not a grammatical interrogative marker but a device that is used to mark action.

Summing up the preliminary findings of a look into the possibility of interrogative intonation in \bar{A} khoe Haillom show that repair initiators have a rising pitch, interrogative tags have a rising pitch, and the pitch of interrogatives is higher than that of declaratives as well as the pitch range being wider.

2.4.5 Topic and focus marking

The topic of the clause is shown by Heikkinen to be marked by the declarative marker *ge* which occurs mainly in declarative main clauses (Heikkinen, n.d.-a: 40). All arguments can be marked as the topic. This is shown in the elicited example sentences (209), (210) and (211) below. The marker *ge* generally comes after the PGN suffix that marks the stem of the topic.

(209) Mama-s ge \$\overline{u}\$-e \$\overline{g}\overline{a}\$-n-a ra s\overline{a}\$i-ba.
mother-3SG.F DECL food-3SG.C.A child-3PL.C-A PROG cook-APPL
'Mother is cooking food for the children.' (Tsumeb0702p27)

- (210) #Û-i ge mama-s-a /gôa-n-a ra sâi-ba e.
 food-3SG.C DECL mother-3SG.F-A child-3PL.C-A PROG cook-APPL UNK
 'It is food that mother is cooking for the children.' (Tsumeb0702p27)
- (211) *IGôa-n ge mama-s-a xa \neq \hat{u}-e ra sâi-ba-he.* child-3PL.C DECL mother-3SG.F-A by food-3SG.C.A PROG cook-APPL-PASS '**The children** are being cooked food for by mother.' (Tsumeb0702p27)

Concerning focus, it was explained in the previous section on Heikkinen's focus sentences that the focus position in a $\frac{1}{4}$ khoe clause is between the pre-sentence and the subject of the clause. Haacke argues for the focus position in a clause in Nama-Damara being the initial slot of the sentence. This slot coincides with what Heikkinen argues for in $\frac{1}{4}$ khoe Haillom. Other studies on Khoekhoe have also mentioned focus. Dempwolff (1927) argues for the sentence initial position as the place where stressed elements are put; Cysouw (2004b) argues for the P1 position being the focus position, and Huybrechts (2003) claims that focus is marked in the 'left edge of the clause'. But none have studied this issue in as much detail as Witzlack-Makarevich (2006). She uses the German topological fields approach (Drach, 1937) to divide the clause into a linear structure of fields, slightly different from Heikkinen's structure of pre-sentence, subject, predicate and post sentence. This structure is shown in example (212) below, using the same clause as in example (163).

(212)	Goma	-S	ge	lgâ-n-a	ra	≠û.	
	cow	3sg.f	DECL	grass-3PL.C-A	PROG	eat	
	Prefield	Clause second		Middle field		Verb	Post verbal position
	'The cow is eating the grass.' (Tsumeb0701p.3)						•

Summarized here very roughly, Witzlack-Makarevich shows that, amongst other alternative strategies used to mark focus and topic, the prefield and the clause second position in Richtersveld Nama, a dialect of Khoekhoe, are positions that are used to mark various types of focus and topic (e.g. broad, narrow, contrastive). This coincides with Heikkinen's statements that focused elements in \pm Ākhoe are placed in the beginning of the clause after the pre-sentence if any, and that the topic is marked by the *ge* marker. Since *ge* generally occurs in the clause second position, whatever is "marked" by it, in Heikkinen's sense, precedes *ge* and would therefore be in the prefield or clause second position. The areas of topic and focus are undoubtedly areas that need more extensive study, but for now, it is possible to say that the prefield and clause second positions are important fields in the \pm Ākhoe clause.

2.4.6 Nominalised clauses

In \bar{A} khoe Haillom, it is possible to nominalise entire clauses. The utterances are nominalised using the third person common PGN marker -i followed with the declarative marker *ge*. The utterances given below show examples of this pattern, starting with simple noun phrases and expanding to more lengthy phrases that are

nominalised using the same construction. The first example, (213), merely shows a standard noun phrase with a noun carrying the common third person singular PGN marker -i with the declarative marker phrase finally.

(213) Ama-i ge. truth-3SG.C DECL '(It is) true.' (FS_Sa_Ei:Ei)

The PGN marker -i together with the declarative marker *ge* make up the nominalising construction *i ge*. The following example, example (214), shows a phrase that is nominalised using this construction.

(214) [*Sari ta go hâ*] *i ge.* visit 1sG RECPST PRF 3sG.C DECL '(It is that) I have visited.' (Ga_beads_2:Su)

And the last example, example (215), shows an event sentence that is nominalised.

(215) [Audo-s #gao tsû-b-a go-ro mā te] i ge.
car-3SG.F heart pain-3SG.M-A RECPST-PROG give 1SG.OBJ 3SG.C DECL
'(It is that) the car was giving me heart pain.' (Ga_beads_2:Ga)

This construction occurs extremely frequently in the natural conversational data.

This concludes the final section of this grammar sketch. This chapter has provided a sketch of the basic grammar of the language. Much further research is required to round out the picture, particularly on the tone system, the complex syntax and information structure. Nevertheless, the information that has been provided should both provide a foundation for future research and adequately ground the rest of this thesis.
3 Questions and Responses

"In Zoo City, it's impolite to ask." (The South African author Lauren Beukes. 2010. Zoo City)

This chapter aims to describe the question and response system in $\frac{1}{4}$ Akhoe Haillom. This enables the investigation of the preference for non-coerciveness in the interaction of $\frac{1}{4}$ Akhoe Haillom speakers. Despite questions being seen by some as ultimately clear and by others as terribly complex (as illustrated in De Ruiter (2012)), the communicative acts of questions and responses are amongst the most basic utterances and the more easily identifiable speech acts or actions for speakers and researchers alike. When performing these actions, speakers make use of predictable linguistic forms (interrogatives), and their choice of form provides information at the level of language use. Importantly, these communicative actions predictably bring about recognized turn transitions, which is advantageous for the investigation of conversational structure. This chapter will show the extent to which the cultural preference for non-coerciveness of the speakers influences their language use and conversation structure with respect to the system of questions and responses. The structures of conversation and language use are most effectively investigated using natural, multi-party, conversational data as that is the environment in which these structures occur in their most unmarked form.

The evidence that will be presented in this chapter to argue for a preference for non-coerciveness is (1) the higher frequency of open questions or question-word questions when compared to closed questions or polar questions, (2) the overall low number of requests for confirmation, (3) the lower levels of next speaker selection and linked with that the lower levels of responses to questions as well as (4) the general hunter-gatherer interaction patterns that $\frac{1}{A}$ hoe Haillom fits within.

Since this work follows the assumption that culture influences the shape of interaction and that different cultures influence interaction differently (Levinson, 2005) (see section 1.4.2), in this chapter, the $\bar{+}A$ khoe Haillom question response system will be compared with that of several other languages. Incidentally, there are several languages in Africa, e.g. Swahili, Kera in Chad, and Gciriku in Namibia where posing questions is considered impolite and, certain question types, such as polar questions, are dispreferred. In Kavango Kxoe, spoken in Namibia, a special phrase can be added after a question if you really want someone to answer it (personal communication M. Mous, M. Pearce and W. Möhlig 26 August 2008). For Ju/'hoansi, a Khoisan language spoken in Botswana and Namibia, it is reported that asking questions implicates suspicion and a lack of trust (Marshall Thomas, 2006). This has not, however, been systematically researched in natural conversation in these languages.

Most research on interaction has been done on English interaction, specifically in the field of Conversation Analysis. Using the techniques of Conversation Analysis (CA), natural conversations have been shown to be systematic in their structure (Sacks et al., 1974). Conversations are based on sequences of turns by the speakers. The speakers' turn-taking is systematic, it is based on norms, it is predictable, and speakers themselves are aware of this. They can tell each other off if the rules are violated, e.g. "Why don't you answer my question?" Additionally, this systematicity is claimed to be universal (Levinson, 2006b; Schegloff, 2006; Stivers et al., 2009). Yet, the English interactions used have generally come from societies that are modern, industrialised, large scale, sedentary and hierarchical, part of the WEIRD cultures (western, educated, industrialized, rich, democratic) (Henrich et al., 2010). If one wants to find an influence of culture, it would therefore be advantageous to look at a language whose speakers have a culture that is as far removed from that of the 'average standard Indo-European' as possible. It is in this context that this dissertation explores the use of questions among the speakers of $\pm \bar{A}$ khoe Haillom, a language spoken by a minority group of San people in the north of Namibia, Africa, as explained in Chapter 1, with a still largely foraging lifestyle.

3.1 The data

The question response sequences collected for this project come from seven conversations collected for the $\pm \bar{A}$ khoe Haillom DoBeS language corpus. The seven conversations comprise 94 minutes of video-recorded conversation containing 408 questions. Three of these conversations (comprising 28 minutes and containing 133 questions) were task-based in that the participants, who knew each other, were given the picture book *The frog story* (Mayer, 1994) or shown video clips (the MPI "staged events" task clips (van Staden et al., 2001)) together and were asked to talk about that. For the frequency analyses, this task-based data was excluded because the nature of the task influenced the kind of questions being asked. Most questions in these task-based recordings were content questions of the "What is s/he doing?" and "What is that?" kind. In addition, in these conversations many more questions were asked than in the non-task based conversations presumably because the subjects were confronted with something unknown. The task-based data was drawn on for the grammatical description of question formation in $\pm \bar{A}$ khoe Haillom and when dealing with structural issues in conversation. The non-task based data used comes from four natural, multiparty conversations comprising 66 minutes of video recording. They include 29 participants, 15 women and 14 men ranging from 6 to over 60 years in age.

The 408 question response sequences were coded for features such as the lexical, morphological and syntactic marking, question type, negative marking, communicative action, next speaker selection, the type of response, etc. These features were chosen because prior research in the field of social interaction has shown them to be important in natural conversations. For a more comprehensive overview, see Stivers et al. (2010). Some comparisons will be made to other languages in this section. The data, numbers, charts, etc. pertaining to these languages can also be found in a special issue of the Journal of Pragmatics in which the studies of the question response sequences in these languages were published (Journal of Pragmatics, volume 42, issue 10).

3.2 Frequency of interrogative types in **‡**Ākhoe Haillom

In this section, the first aspect of the argument that speakers of \bar{A} khoe Haillom are concerned with not being coercive in their interaction will be presented. It concerns the frequency of the different interrogative types in \bar{A} khoe Haillom conversation.

Interrogatives can be posed in the form of content interrogatives, polar interrogatives or alternative interrogatives. Just fewer than 60% of all interrogatives that occur in data sample of natural conversation in \bar{A} khoe Haillom are content interrogatives, and just less than 40% are polar interrogatives. Alternative interrogatives are the rarest type of interrogative used in conversation.

	%	n
Polar	41%	95
Content	58%	134
Alternative	1%	2
Total	100%	231

Figure 3-1: Distribution of interrogatives in ‡Ākhoe Haillom by interrogative type.

There are four alternative interrogatives in the data sample and two of those are through-produced interrogatives. Through-produced interrogatives are two interrogatives that are produced as one utterance without a pause between them and that are produced as one prosodic unit. The other two alternative interrogatives occur in the experimental data and therefore do not figure in the table above that shows the distribution of interrogatives in conversational data.

The fact that content interrogatives form the majority of questions in $\pm \overline{A}$ khoe Haillom is interesting as a number of other languages for which the distribution of interrogative types has been studied (see the special issue of Journal of Pragmatics, volume 42, issue 10) show an inverse distribution¹³. In these languages, polar interrogatives form the majority of questions asked as shown in Figure 3-2.

It was proposed that in $\frac{1}{4}$ Akhoe Haillom speakers tend to pose questions in a manner that is less coercive and less restrictive of the answerer than speakers of these other languages do. This is reflected in $\frac{1}{4}$ Akhoe speakers' frequent reliance on open questions rather than on closed questions. Open questions, i.e. content questions, provide the answerer with greater freedom in choosing a type of answer than a closed question, i.e. polar questions, would provide. Closed questions generally constrain the recipient to providing either a yes or no answer.

¹³ To make the sample of languages more representative from the perspective of $\pm \bar{A}$ khoe and less weighted in favour of European languages and cultures, the European languages Danish, Dutch, English and Italian were combined into one "Indo-European" language to represent them all.



Figure 3-2: Distribution of interrogative types.

Even more striking is that, as can be seen in Figure 3-3, $\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe speakers make virtually no requests for confirmation, while in the other languages requests for confirmation make up between 20% and 50% of all questions. Requests for confirmation are an even more restrictive type of polar question as these questions generally have a preference for an affiliative answer in the form of a confirmation. Whereas polar questions give a choice between two answers: yes or no, requests for confirmation entail a strong preference for only a yes answer.



Figure 3-3: The percentage of questions requesting confirmation.

In order to take a more detailed look at this argument and enhance it, the next section will first focus on describing the functions questions can have in conversation in $\pm \bar{A}$ khoe Haillom before looking at the distribution of these functions. This will give information pertaining to the actions that speakers perform with their talk, which in turn will give more insights into the preference for non-coerciveness of the speakers. The distribution

of question types is interesting as it has been found that the grammatical structure of an utterance is often linked to the interactional function of the utterance (Curl & Drew, 2008; Schegloff, 2006). This suggests that the grammatical structure of a question is also related to the communicative action which that question is used to perform. The idea is that if $\pm \bar{A}$ khoe speakers do different actions with their questions, or perform certain actions more or less frequently than speakers of the other languages do, this will affect the distribution of the question types.

3.3 An overview of question functions

This section will describe the major interactional functions that questions can be used to perform in $\pm\bar{A}$ khoe Haillom. At the end of this section, we will return to the implications of the question functions for the argument that $\pm\bar{A}$ khoe Haillom speakers are concerned with the non-coerciveness of their utterances. In the following sections, the term 'question' will be used as the emphasis is usually on the questioning function of utterances and their responses more than on the interrogative grammatical aspects. The five major interactional functions, or actions, that the $\pm\bar{A}$ khoe Haillom data sample was coded for are "pure" information requests, repair initiators, requests for confirmation, assessments and suggestions, offers and requests (see Stivers and Enfield (2010), for a description of the coding). These actions in general were previously described in section 1.4.3.1.

The major action types for polar and content questions are information requests and repair initiators. Sixty-two percent of the polar questions in the conversational data are used to do information requests, and 24% are repair initiators. Content questions are used marginally more for repair initiators: 38%. Information requests are 56%. For the total distribution of the action types for polar and content questions, see Figure 3-4. The only alternative question in the data sample occurs in the experimental data and is used to perform an out-loud (Levinson, 1988).

	Polar Question	15	Content Questions		
Actions:	%	n	%	n	
information requests	62	51	56	58	
repair initiator	24	20	38	39	
confirm question	2	2	-	-	
assessment	7	6	3	3	
suggestion/offer/request	4	3	4	4	
Total	100	82	100	104	

Figure 3-4: Distribution of actions by interrogative type.

3.3.1 Information Requests

As mentioned, information requests are used – at least in principle - with the sole intention of acquiring information. In the following sequence, there are three examples of information requests. The sequence is taken from a session in which two young girls, Sa and Ei, are looking at a picture book together, The Frog Story picture book (Mayer, 1994), for the first time. They were instructed to ask each other questions about the pictures. Because of this instruction, most questions cannot be analysed for action; due to the instruction, the motivation for the questions is always the same. Yet in this sequence, both girls are looking at a picture of an antelope and ask each other what creature it is. After a long silence, in which they both stare intently at the picture, Sa turns to her friends who are looking in through a window to where Sa and Ei are sitting, and Sa asks them what the creature in the picture is. This shows that she is not just following the instructions at this moment but that she really is intent on finding out what the creature is to the extent that she enlists the help of people who are not supposed to be participating in the task. She wants the information.

(216)

1	Sa:	Nē g[aru hū-s-a tae-se.]
		DEM pass.by thing-3SG.F-A Q-3SG.F.UNK
		'This thing p[assing by, what is it?'
2	Ei:	[Nē:: nau hū]-ge.
		DEM DEM thing-unk
		['Thi::::s is the other thi]ng.'
3		(2.7)
4		Ama-e ta go mî
		truth-3sg.c.a 1sg recpst say
		'I said the truth.'
5	Sa:	Khoe-n-a mî hū-s ge dai-s
		person-3PL.C-A say thing-3SG.F DECL Q-3SG.F
		'What do people say about the thing?'
6	Ei:	Dai-s nē [ene ge nē-s-a:.]
		Q-3SG.F DEM UNK DECL DEM-3SG.F-A
		'What is thi:s?'
7	Sa:	[°Nē-s-a tae] hū-s-a°
		DEM-3SG.F-A Q thing-3SG.F-A
		'[What is this] thing?' (FS_Sa_Ei)

In line 1, Sa is possibly still following the task instructions and asks the questions "*Nē garu hūsa tease?*" 'This thing passing by, what is it?' In overlap with this question, Ei says "*Nē nau hūge*," 'This is the other thing.' This is followed by 2.7 seconds of silence in which both girls look intently at the picture (see Figure 3-5 line 3) after which Ei comes to the conclusion in line 4 that she was right "*Ama-e ta go mî*," 'I said the truth.' In line 5, Sa

rephrases her previous question and asks *"Khoena mî hūs ge dais?*" 'What do people say about the thing?' Since Ei does not know what the thing is in the first place, never mind what people say about it, in line 6 she looks at the picture, points to it and asks *"Dais nē ene ge nēsa,"* 'What is this?' While Ei is still asking for more information, in line 7 Sa turns towards the window and whispers the information request *"Nēsa tae hūsa?"* 'What is this thing?' to the children outside while performing a gesture to show the horns of the animal (see Figure 3-5 line 7). All she wants is an answer to the question what animal they are looking at, she performs no other actions with this question.



Figure 3-5: Lines 3 and 7.

The sequence above shows an example of an information request. This is the most frequent type of questioning action in the collection.

3.3.2 Repair initiations

Questions are often used to initiate repair when there is a problem of hearing or understanding of the previous utterance. The following sequence shows an example of a repair initiation in a $\pm \overline{A}$ khoe conversation. The conversation, at this point, concerns three women who have come out to a cattle post about 5 km away from their home in order to gather the staple food Mangetti nuts. They are sitting around, waiting for the men to finish raking the Mangetti kernels out of the goat kraal. Goats are given the Mangetti fruit to eat. After they digest the fruit, they defecate the kernels. The Mangetti nuts are inside these kernels, which are gathered from the goat kraals. Just prior to this sequence, the women were discussing a European tourist who had come with them to the cattle post in order to witness and participate in food gathering.

(217)							
1	Ce:	//Nâu tama-s go	hâ nētse-si-b		ge	koma	nau-b-a
		DEM NEG-3SG.F RE	ECPST PRF today-3SG.F	F.OBJ-38G.M	DECL	apparently	DEM-3SG.M-A
2		ra hā ti-n	go-ro	mî o,			
		PROG come thus	-3pl.c recpst-prog	say UNK			
		'Didn't you hear wh	nen they said that the o	ther one is c	oming	today?'	
3	Ga:	Mâ-b ge?					
		q-3sg.m decl					
		'Which one?'					
4		(1.2)					
5	Ce:	Aita					
		EXL					
		'Oh my.'					
6		(1.0)					
7		Nē ge-re	<i>‡nā-</i> [<i>b-a</i>]				
		DEM PST-PROG	dance-3SG.M-A				
		'This one who was	da[ncing.'				
8	Fr:		[<i>DH</i>] <i>-b-a?</i>				
			NAME-3SG.M-A				
			'[DH?]'				
9	Ce:	Î					
		'Yes.'	(Collect nuts)				

In this sequence, there is an understanding problem with the reference term *nauba* 'the other one' in the first line in the question "//*Nâu tamas go hâ nētsesib ge koma nauba ra hā tin goro mî o?*" 'Didn't you hear when they said that the other one is coming today?' uttered by speaker Ce. Ce is referring to a researcher who sometimes works in the community and who, like the tourist they had been discussing, is a tall, slim, young, white man. Since this is the first reference to this researcher in this conversation, we can assume that speaker Ce expected this to be recognized by her addressee Ga (Stivers, Enfield, & Levinson, 2007). Ga however does not recognize the reference term. Speaker Ga calls attention to her problem by uttering the content question "*Mâb ge?*" 'Which one?' in line 3. In this case, Ga uses the content question as a repair initiator. She uses it to let speaker Ce know that Ce needs to repair her previous utterance for Ga to understand it. Speaker Ce supplies this repair of her original turn, with her turn in line 7, by giving a more extensive description of the person she was referring to "*Nē gere ‡nāba*,"'This one who was dancing.'

3.3.2.1 Open-class repair initiations

The repair initiation subcategory of open-class other-initiation of repair, which is also used in the case of problems of hearing or understanding with the previous utterance, encompass "huh" or interjection type initiators as well as interrogative word type initiators. The data sample used here contains 13 open class repair

initiations. Eleven of these are of the interjection type and two of the interrogative word type. In $\pm \bar{A}$ khoe, the interjections used for the interjection type of repair initiations come in the following forms: *he*, *he*, *ye*, in all of which the vowel can be lengthened, and one instance of *hm*.

Example (218) and (219) below show instances of the interjection type open-class repair initiator. In example (218), speaker AR asks Su whether he should give the leftover food he has just been handed by her to the dog. However, speaker AR contracts the words $m\hat{a}$ 'give' and *ariba* 'dog' in his utterance to *mariba*. After a pause, Su utters the open-class repair initiator "Ye?" 'Huh?' after which AR repairs his initial utterance by repeating it and articulating it more carefully: $m\hat{a}$ ariba.

(218)

1

2 3

4

AR:	Marib	a?
	'Gidog	3?'
	(0.5)	
Su:	Ye?	
	'Huh?	,
AR:	Mâ	arib-a.
	give	dog.3sg.m-a
	'Give	(it to) the dog.' (Ga_beads_2) (H002215)

In example (219), the trouble source is in the first turn by speaker KO in which he remarks "//Nā aorogua ge koma //gaise ra /huru," 'Those men are apparently playing badly.' The first part of his utterance is in overlap with the laughter of another man. Again after a pause, another speaker initiates a repair with the open-class repair initiator "He?" 'Huh'. Speaker KO repairs his utterance by partially repeating it and substituting the object 'those men' with the personal pronoun 'you' and adding an exclamation "Sago ge koma //gaise koma ra //huru etsē, "'You are apparently playing badly ETSĒ.'

(219)

1	man1:	[((laug	hter))]					
2	KO:	[//Nā	aoro-gu	-a	ge]	koma	llgai-se	ra	/huru.	
		DEM	male-3P	L.M-A	DECL	apparently	bad-MANNER	PROG	play	
		'[Thos	e men] a	re app	arently	playing badly	.'			
3		(0.5)								
4	man2:	He?								
		'Huh?'								
5	KO:	Sago	ge	koma		llgai-se	koma	ra	/huru	etsē.
		2pl.m	DECL	appar	ently	bad-MANNER	apparently	PROG	play	EXL
		'(It is)	apparent	ly you	ı (who)	are apparentl	y playing badl	y etsē.'		
		(Hando	craft_3) (1	H0070	44)					

The other commonly used repair initiation strategy is the use of an interrogative word. In $\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe Haillom, the interrogative word used to initiate open-class repair is the manner interrogative word *mâti* 'how'. In the data sample used, there is one example of this form of repair initiation in $\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe Haillom. It is shown in example (220). In the example, the first utterance by Ma *"\#Gona tsîsi nî ā //î tē-e, "*'She will beg for and drink it, the tea.' is in partial overlap with a previous utterance, and it is not understood by the recipient Ap. Ap initiates an open-class repair by asking the question *"Mâti?"* 'How?' in line 2. Speaker Ma reformulates her utterance in line 4, saying *"Nē lgôade hā tsū tē-e †gōna,"* 'These children come just to beg for tea.'

1	3	2	n	1
l	7	7	υ	"

1	Ma:	[‡Gō]na	a tsî-s-i	n	nî i	ā	//î	tē-e.	
		beg	CONJ-3SG.F	-OBJ F	UT (drink	DISC	tea-3sg.c.a	
		'She wi	ll [beg] for an	nd drink	it, the	e tea.'			
2	Ap:	Mâti,							
		'How?'							
3		(1.0)							
4	Ma:	Nē ļ	gôa-de	hā	tsū	tē-e		‡gōna.	
		DEM C	hild-3pl.f.A	come	only	tea-3	SG.C.A	beg	
		'These	children come	e just to	beg fo	or tea.'	(Ga_be	eads_2) (H002257, H002258	3)

It is yet unclear whether the interrogative word for 'what' *tae* can be used to initiate open-class repair too. The data contains one example of this interrogative used to initiate repair, but it is not clear whether this is an openclass repair initiation. It is shown in example (221). In this example, speaker AR asks his mother Ga if she has Vaseline "*Vaslin ū tamasia hâ?*" 'Don't you have Vaseline?' After a pause, Ga responds by asking "*Tae?*" 'What?' This example is problematic because it is unclear whether the focus of the interrogative word 'what', used in the repair that is initiated by Ga, covers the whole prior utterance and thus means "What did you say?" or whether it is restricted to only the object of the prior utterance thereby meaning "What don't I have?" Speaker AR interprets it as requesting a repair of the object in his initial turn and responds by only repeating that object: Vaseline.

(221)

1	AR:	Vaslin	ū	tama-s-i-a	hâ
		Vaseline	take	NEG-2SG.F-OBJ-A	PRF
		'Don't ye	ou ha	ve Vaseline?'	
2		(1.7)			
3	Ga:	Tae			
		Q			
		'What?'			
4		(1.6)			

5 AR: Vaslin.

'Vaseline.' Ga_beads_2 (H002401)

The literal equivalent of "What did you say?" in $\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe Haillom is *mâti tsa mî* or *mâti sa mî*. While this formulation occurs in the conversation data, in all instances it is used to ask someone's opinion, not to initiate a repair.

3.3.3 Requests for confirmation

Questions are also used to request confirmation. As previously mentioned, these types of question actions are very infrequent in the $\frac{1}{4}$ khoe conversational data sample and one of only two instances is shown in the following example. In this example, speaker Ms performs a request for confirmation in the first line. The people concerned in the conversation are making wire cars using wire brought by researchers. Speaker KO who answers the question is not the person to whom the wire was brought.

(222)

1	Ms:	//Ari		go	SĨ		ra	ū-he	dara-n
		one.day.fror	n.now	RECPST	AU	x.loc2	PROG	take-PASS	wire-3PL.C
2		ge hîna	?						
		DECL TAG							
		'The wire w	as being	taken av	vay y	vesterda	y, right?	,	
3	KO:	Ti-b	go-ro		mî	i	ge		
		thus-3SG.M	RECPST	-PROG	say	3sg.c	DECL		
		'He was say	ing so.'	(H00701	3) (H	Iandcraf	t_3)		

Speaker Ms is inquiring about some wire that was intended for the use of making wire cars. She asks her question using a declarative with an added question tag saying *"//Ari go sī ra ū-he daran ge hîna?"* "The wire was being taken away yesterday, right?" This is the request for confirmation. In the case of this sequence, the request for confirmation is more or less confirmed by speaker KO who says that someone else said that this was the case.

3.3.4 Assessments

The following sequence contains an example of a question being used to make an assessment. The sequence concerns several women talking together while beading. The speakers in this sequence are the younger women Ap, Ma and Su. They have been discussing another woman who went somewhere in a car that they consider to have been too full. The sequence ends with Ap's assessment in line 7 which is delivered in the form of a question.

(223)		
1	Ma:	. //Nāti-s mûsae ra ī i go
		like.that-3SG.F apparently PROG pass 3SG.C RECPST
		'She was apparently going past like that.'
2		(1.1)
3		() ‡nan tama, ‡nan tama ().
		look.around NEG look.around NEG
		() (she's) not careful, not careful ().'
4		(0.3)
5		Nēti mû tama-s go hâ //î audo-s-a
		like.this see NEG-3SG.F RECPST PRF DISC car-3SG.F-A
		'Here didn't you see that car?'
6	Su:	Mû-s-a ta go-ro i ge
		see-3sg.f-c 1sg recpst-prog 3sg.c decl
		'I saw it.'
7	Ap:	Mâ-si koma ra !gû gau-s-a
		Q-3SG.F.OBJ apparently PROG go manner-3SG.F-C
		'Where is she apparently going like that?'
8		(0.7)
9	Ma:	MĀ-BI HĀ RE
		give-3SG.M.OBJ come RE
		'Come and give him!' (Ga_beads_2) (H002390)

The example starts with turns by Ma in which she shows her stance to be somewhat disapproving which is made apparent by the use of the demonstrative $//n\bar{a}ti$ 'like that' and the insistence that "she is not careful". Not getting any uptake (in lines 2 and 3), she eventually upgrades to an actual question in line 5 which makes a response relevant from one of the other interactants. After Su has answered Ma's question, Ap shows her stance in line 7 by giving the assessment in the grammatical form of a question "*Mâsi koma ra !gû |gausa?*" 'Where is she apparently going like that?' The question receives no response, and it is arguably not intended to do so as it is in effect an assessment, and it forms the end of the sequence. After 0.7 seconds of silence, Ma shouts an order at someone off screen.

3.3.5 Challenges

Questions can be used to challenge a co-speaker. In the following sequence, speaker Su uses a question in line 2 to challenge speaker Ma who wants Su to give her some beads.

1 *Ma: |Gui-ro-de-si mā te go,* one-DIM-3PL.F.A-2SG.F.OBJ give 1SG.OBJ GO 'You give me some of them.'

2	Su:	Ani-si			ma	âti	hî?=				
		in.orde	r.to-2	SG.F.OB	aj Q		do				
		'In ord	er for	you to	do wl	hat? =	= '				
3		$=!\hat{A}u$	re	aibe	î	ta	dō	!hābe	î	mā-si	nâi
		wait	RE	first	CONJ	1sg	bead	UNK	CONJ	give-2sg.f.obj	then
		ʻ=Wai	it first	so that	t I can	do t	he bead	ing and	then gi	ve you.' (Ga_be	eads_2)

In this sequence, some women are busy stringing beads, amongst them Ma and Su. In line 1, Ma uses an imperative form to tell Su to give her some more beads "/*Guirode si mā te go*," 'You give me some of them.' As Ma finishes speaking, she leans over and reaches for Su's beads. In line 2, Su responds to the imperative with the question "*Anisi mâti hî?*" 'In order for you to do what?' This question challenges Ma's imperative. There is only one thing Ma could realistically want to do with the beads. Additionally, Ma has been stringing beads in plain view of Su for the past hour. So speaker Su knows what Ma wants to do with the beads. However, by asking the question nonetheless, Su implies that she considers what Ma has been doing not to be beading. But, after the challenge in line 2, Su cannot wait for a response because Ma is already reaching over and taking her beads so she continues with "!Âu re aibe î ta dō !hābe î māsi //nâi," 'Wait first so that I can do the beading and then give you.' in line 3.

3.3.6 Understanding checks

Questions can be used by a speaker to check whether their co-participant has understood them. An example of such an understanding check is shown in the following sequence at the end of the turn in line 8. In this sequence, the woman Ga, who is busy stringing beads, is talking about her daughter Na.

(225)

1	Ga:	Nē k	ara-i	/kha	Ná	l-si		().
		dem b	ead-3sg.	c with	nai	me-3sg	.F.OBJ		
		'With th	ese beads	s Na ().'			
2		(0.8)							
3		Na-s-a	ĺ		(.)	aore	∣gôa-b-	a	i
		name-38	G.F-A C	CONJ		male	child-3	SG.M-a	UNK
		'Na and	(.) the m	ale chi	ld.'				
4		(1.4)							

(224)

5	Ly:	Na-s-a	i	i g	0	mā-l	he,					
		name-3s	G.F-A I	BEC R	ECPST	give	-PASS					
		'Was Na	a given?'									
6		(0.7)										
7	Ga:	//Î-s	hoa	-5	ge	// <i>î</i> -	-S	kara-e	ūhâ	nē	gôa-s=	
		DISC-3SC	G.F eve	ry-3sg.i	F DEC	L DI	sc-3sg.f	bead-3sg.c	.A have	DEM	child-3SG.F	
8		=go	sē:-i	Ê	70	gô::	a-si	ana-he	hâ	е	mû-s-a	
		RECPST	soap-3s	SG.C R	ECPST	child	1-3sg.f.ol	BJ wear-PA	SS PRF	UNK	see-2SG.F-A	
		'She has	all her l	beads, it	t was th	nis chi	ld, it was	the soa:p, t	the chi:ld	has be	een wearing i	it
		do you s	ee?'									
9		(1.3)										
10		Laeron	kara-i	g	e a	1	s-a	mâi-ba-he				
		nylon	bead-3s	G.C DI	ECL S	TAT	3sg.f-a	put.down-	APPL-PAS	s		
		'Nylon l	beads we	ere put c	lown fo	or her.	,					
11		!Nona	!gom-c	le.								
		three	heavy-	3pl.f.a								
		'Three l	oads.'					(Ga_be	ads_2)			

Just prior to this sequence, speaker Ga has been talking about for whom she is making the necklaces, anklets and/or bracelets. She continues with this in lines 1 and 3 where she is talking about her daughter Na saying " $N\bar{e}$ kara-i |kha Na-si (), "'With these beads Na (),' and "Na-sa î, aore /gôaba I," 'Na and, a male child.' After this, in line 5, speaker Ly asks whether the daughter Na was herself given any beads "Na-sa i go māhe?" 'Was Na given?' Speaker Ga's response comes in lines 7 and 8 where she states that her daughter Na was indeed given beads. However, she adds that they were for her child who is currently wearing them "// shoas ge //îs kara-e ūhâ, nē /gôas go, sē-i go, /gôasi anahe hâ e, "'She has all her beads, it was this child, it was the soa:p, the child is wearing it.' Why she refers to soap is not clear. At the end of line 8, speaker Ga delivers the understanding check "Mûsa?" 'Do you see?' With this question, Ga is asking whether her listener Ly has understood her explanation. The expression Mûsa? 'Do you see?' is frequently used for understanding checks. In this example the utterance mûsa 'do you see' does not refer to whether Ly can see that the child is wearing the beads because neither the child in question, nor her mother, are present. Speaker Ly does not answer to the question, she merely continues looking at speaker Ga. Ga interprets this as meaning Ly has understood, and in line 10 and 11, she continues talking about the beads that were given to her daughter.

3.3.7 Complaints

Questions can also be used to deliver complaints. Complaints are delicate and have the potential to be problematic. This is evident in the example shown in the sequence below, in that the question that is used to "do" complaining is received as a joke and elicits laughter. The speaker is a woman who is known for "being difficult", and in this example she is playing this role, possibly for the benefit of the camera and the researchers

who are present. The researchers have just set up the camera in order to record several women talking around a hearth fire and who have given their permission for the recording. The example is taken from a stretch of talk at the start of the recording in which the women cannot resist a moment of joking and laughing at the weirdness of the researchers who would want to record such a banal setting as women sitting around a hearth fire.

(226)

1	Ma:	<i>‡Gae</i>	tsū-s	<i>≠nôa</i>	ra	е	((uhi)			
		smoke	only-3sg.F	sit	PROG	UNK				
		'Are you ju	ist sitting sn	noking?	((laught	ter))'				
2	Ga:	Tita ge	‡gae	ta	≠nôa	ra	<i>e</i> =			
		1SG DEC	L smoke	1sg	sit	PROG	UNK			
		'I am sittin	g and smoki	ing.'=						
3		=tae-e-n	khod	- -e	ra	m	ai-ai	!ū	hâ	ba.
		Q-3SG.C.A-3	BPL.C pers	on-3sg.	C.A PRC)G pi	it-on	forehead	PRF	APPL
		= 'Why are	e they pointi	ing the c	camera a	it a pers	son (i.e.	me)?'		
4	Ma:	((laughter))) (Gas yard	lA)						

Preceding the lines shown in the example, the women were already engaged in joking and laughing. In line 1, speaker Ma asks speaker Ga " $\#Gae ts\bar{u}s \#n\delta a ra e$?" 'Are you just sitting and smoking?' This turn is delivered with laughter and is apparently still intended to be non-serious. Speaker Ga responds affirmingly in line 2 "*Tita ge \#gae ta \#n\delta a ra e*," 'I am sitting and smoking.' She follows this up with a question of her own in line 3 "*Tae-en khoe-e ra mâi-ai !ū hâ ba*?" 'Why are they pointing the camera at me?' Ga's turn is followed by laughter from the other participants who seem to interpret it as part of the joking. Yet speaker Ga already knows why the researchers are recording them; it was explained at the start of the session. By claiming in line 2 that she is doing nothing out of the ordinary and then asking why she is being recorded even though she already knows why, she is voicing dissatisfaction with the situation. This is further made clear by the tone of her voice, which is markedly louder in line 3 than in her previous utterances, and than that of her conversational partners. Incidentally, in some cultures there may be taboos on smoking, or specifically on the combination of women and smoking, which might prompt women not to be too happy about being recorded while smoking, but this is not the case here. In this culture, everybody smokes, and there are less and possibly even no negative connotations with smoking.

The example above shows that questions can be used to do a complaint, but more so, it also shows that actions can be somewhat ambiguous. The action in the above example is somewhat ambiguous between a complaint and a joke. The following sections on rhetorical questions and pre-sequences will also show this. Actions can be ambiguous, they can be delivered in the guise of another action or certain actions can serve as a vehicle for other actions (Schegloff, 2007).

3.3.8 Broadcasts and out-louds

In the natural conversational data, seven questions are coded as broadcasts (Walsh, 1991, Kendrik et al., 2020) or out-louds (Levinson, 1988). Out-louds are utterances seemingly "said to oneself" and not intended to receive a response. These utterances are comparable to utterances that in Australian Aboriginal studies are called broadcast talk (Walsh, 1991), and there are similarities with aspects of what Sugawara has called prolonged talk in lGui (Sugawara, 2012). Even when in the form of questions, these utterances do not seem to be specifically designed to pressure anyone for an answer, i.e. no next speaker is selected, and often they indeed do not receive a response. Only two of the seven cases in this collection are answered, and four receive no response at all. The following example of a broadcast utterance in the form of a question, shown in line 4 of example (227), occurs in the session Ga_beads_2. The elderly woman Ga is sitting on the ground beading. Two of her relatives, the young woman Su and her partner AR are sitting with her eating. In the interaction just preceding the excerpt shown in the example below, the man AR makes a joke about eating, and the example starts in line 1 with Ga's laughter in response to his joke. The turn in line 2 is uttered by a woman sitting at the hearth, further away from Ga, Su and AR, where the food has just been cooked. In line 2 and 7, this woman picks up and continues an earlier conversation.

(227)

1	Ga:	<u>ha ha</u> ha ha h::::: (.) uhe u <u>he e</u> ::::::
		((laughter))
2	Ma:	(Ovaherisan) ta //nâu (!ā)
		(Christians) 1SG hear UNK
		(Christians) I hear ()
3		(1.0)
4	Ga:	!Khu-ts-ē (.) tae gara hau-b-a te ari-s-a,
		God-2SG.M-VOC Q big bring-3SG.M-A 1SG.A dog-3SG.F-A
		'!KHUTSĒ! (.) What big (thing) did the dog bring me?'
5		(0.5)
6		Moerskon?
		curse
		'MOERSKON.' (loan from Afrikaans)
7	Ma:	Amar ta go si !gam-he a ō i ge.
		almost 1SG RECPST UNK kill-PASS COMP die 3SG.C DECL
		'I was almost killed and died.' (Ga_beads_2)

The broadcast or out-loud question occurs in line 4. Speaker Ga is about to thread a needle in order to continue stringing beads when she utters the curse in the beginning of line 4 and looks over her shoulder at the ground behind her. Then she asks the question *"Tae gara hauba te arisa?"* What big (thing) did the dog bring me? By the end of the question, her gaze is back on her beads, and when she utters the second curse in line 6, she is

once again actively stringing beads. The question in line 4 is not directed at anyone in particular. No next speaker is addressed with gaze or an address term. This question is considered a broadcast. It was a thought the speaker had, and she "broadcast" it without there being any compulsion on anybody to pick it up or respond to the turn.

There are clearer examples of this type of broadcast talk in the data sample. In the following, an example of broadcast talk will be shown in support of the argument above that certain utterances in $\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe Haillom do not necessarily make a next turn relevant. These turns are not in the form of questions though. The example again concerns the elderly woman Ga who, with a number of other female members of her family, is sitting on the ground around a hearth. The sequence starts with Th and Ga talking in overlap. Th is talking to the baby on her lap, and Ga adjusts her talk so as not to be talking in overlap. Following this, in lines 7 to 12, Ga continues to speak, but none of her turns elicits any response. Her voice is low, and her gaze is not directed at any particular person. This is the broadcast speech. Ga executes a number of turns that do not receive a response from the other people present even though the turns in lines 2 and 4 make it clear that Ga is making sure that her turns are audible and not produced in overlap. In the turn represented in lines 15, 16 and 17, Ga stops broadcasting and instead speaks directly to a present researcher, raising her voice, and using gaze and an address term to select this person as next speaker. Speaker Ap in line 18 is off screen and involved in a different conversation all together.

(228)

1	Th:	/Ū-si	а	g[ôa-b	g]e	//nā	//nā-b-	а	(.)	=
		not.know-2sg.F	STAT	child-3sG.	M DECL	. DEM	1 DEM-3	SG.M-A		
		'You don't know	w that b[oy], that or	ne there. ((.)'=				
2	Ga:			[Tsama-	-e,]					
				melon-3	SG.C.A					
				['The m	elon,']					
3	Th:	= //Nā [gara-	-b-a]							
		DEM big-38	SG.M-C							
		= ['That [big o	ne].							
4	Ga:	[Tsan	na]-e	tama	е	ra	[sâi]			
		melor	n-3sg.c.A	NEG	3sg.c.a	PROG	cook			
		['The	melo]n i	is not [cook	cing].'					
5	Th:						[//Nā]	gôa	gara	n-b-a
							DEM	child	big-	3SG.M-A
							[That] big	g boy.'		
6		(1.1)								

7	Ga:	Ani nesia dom !nâ
		CONJ now swallow in
		'In order to eat now.'
8		(1.4)
9		Tsama-e ta ra sâi i ge=
		melon-3SG.C.A 1SG PROG cook 3SG.C DECL
		'I am going to cook melon =
10		= a ta nau (.) om-di hā ī suguri-e ôa ga
		CONJ 1SG DEM house-3PL.F go pass sugar-3SG.C.A search SUF
		= and from those other (.) houses go and find sugar.'
11		Nau aibe om-s ge.
		DEM first house-3SG.F DECL
		'That one first, the house.'
12		[Ae gam-s] di khama i de.
		Windhoek-3sg.f poss like BEC 3PL.F.C
		'Like the ones of [Windhoek].'
13	Th:	[‡An re ti:]
		know RE do
		['Be careful!']
14		(1.4)
15	Ga:	O nēdo audo-s-a =
		CONJ UNK car-3SG.F-A
		'And this car ='
16		[!nari si du a xū-i xa //nāti tsū du ra m]â
		drive 3SG.F.OBJ 2PL.C STAT leave-3SG.C with like.that just 2PL.C PROG stand
17		om-de?
		house-3PL.F-A
		'[will you be driving it, leaving with the thing standing just like that,] the houses?'
18	Ap:	[Elo-b di /nū-ga a-ts khoe-ts-a ra mâ gu-a]
		God-3SG.M POSS leg-3PL.M.A STAT-2SG.M person-3SG.M-A PROG stand 3PL.M-A
		['It is God's legs I am standing with.']
19		(1.6)
20	TW:	Sten om-de?
		stone house-3PL.F.A
	'Brick houses?'	

21 Ga: Î sten om-de yes stone house-3PL.F.A 'Yes brick houses.' (Gas_yardA)

In the turns of broadcast speech, lines 4-12, Ga does not select a next speaker. She does look around in different directions while speaking, she points and uses gestures, but she does not gaze directly at any particular person. Nor does she use any terms of address. She does not pursue any responses, and she keeps her voice low and soft. Towards the end of line 12, she focuses her gaze on one of the researchers who is present but off screen. During her silence through lines 13 and 14, she keeps her gaze on the researcher. Then in line 15, Ga addresses her next utterance to him, using her gaze, audibly raising the level of her voice, directly addressing him as a member of the group of researchers with a personal pronoun marked for plural and asks him a question concerning the roof top tents on the researchers' car. Ga keeps her gaze focused on the researcher for most of the turn, only looking away twice while pointing and making a gesture. At the end of the turn, her gaze is fixed on the researcher and remains there until he has finished the repair initiation in line 20. The turn started in line 15 is, in contrast to the broadcast turns, thus clearly designed to obtain a response (Stivers & Rossano, 2010), which it does, starting with the repair initiation shown in line 20. The above example, together with the occurrence of out-louds in the shape of questions, give an indication that while some turns are clearly designed to get a response, not all turns in $\frac{1}{4}$ khoe Haillom make a response relevant.

3.3.9 Rhetorical questions

Related to the above, questions can also be used rhetorically. Rhetorical questions are not always used with the intention of seeking an answer. An example of a rhetorical question in $+\bar{A}$ khoe is shown in the following sequence in line 10. In the sequence, a number of people, mostly women, converse while stringing beads. This excerpt involves speakers Ga, an elderly woman, her son AR and her daughter-in-law Su. Su has a chain of beads around her ankle, and AR wants to remove it from her ankle. He has attempted it once previously but was told off by Su. At the start of the example, he tries again.

(229)

- 1
 AR: [Nēba //gôa koma i ge

 DEM
 come.off

 supposedly
 3SG.C

 DEM
 time

 it
 ge
- 2 AR: [((reaches for anklet again))

3 (0.4)

4 Ga: °Aitsama ta ra ≠gae !gao i ge° oneself 1sg pROG pull cut 3sg.c DECL '°Myself I will pull it to break.°'

5		<i>‡Gao</i> [<i>!gao</i> .]
		pull cut
		'Pull to [break.]'
6	AR:	[Ae] KARA-DE #GUI-S-A !GOM !GOM HE TI-S-A
		EXL bead-3PL.F.A many-3SG.F.A heavy heavy PASS POSS.1SG-3SG.F-A
		'[AE] a lot of beads, difficult, mine is difficult.'
7	Ga:	//Î ama::::ga ta ra mî i ge o du ga ‡gae!gao=
		DISC CONJ 1SG PROG say 3SG.C DECL CONJ 2PL.C COND pull.to.break
		'That's why:::: I say you should pull it to break loose' =
8		= i ta xao-!gao tita ge ra mî ‡gae-se.
		CONJ 1SG cut.through 1SG DECL PROG say pull-3SG.F.OBJ.A
		= 'and I will cut it through, I say pull.'
9		(1.2)
10		llNâu ti ra † gae-s-a,
		hear NEG PROG ear-3SG.F-A
		'Does that ear not hear?'
11		(6.5)
12		Tsū ŧhôase se tsū ŧhôa go.
		lie 2sg.f.unk lie RECPST
		'Lie, you lied.'
13		(0.5)
14		Apa kara-e go ↑ gôa-s-a laeron-i ai ra =
		red bead-3SG.C.A RECPST child-3SG.F-A nylon-3SG.C on PROG
15		$= d\bar{o}$ -ba s-a.
		bead-APPL 3SG.F-C
		'She beaded red beads for the <i>child</i> onto the nylon.'
16		(0.8)
17		≠Nū laeron-i si /gôa-s-a [dō-ba go]
		black nylon-3sg.c 3sg.f.on child-3sg.f-A bead-APPL RECPST
		'She [beaded] on black nylon for the child.'
18	Ap:	[<i>Ti</i>] <i>lgôarose lnam lgôa =</i>
19		= aita khoerosa nam gôa ae ti gôarose. ((sings))
		'[My] little child loved child, oh little thing loved one, oh my little child.' ((sings))
		(Ga_beads_2)

In line 1, AR states "*Nēba //gôa koma i ge*," 'Here it supposedly comes off,' while again reaching for the anklet. Presumably, he has found the knot that ties the ends of the anklet together. After a short pause, his mother Ga, states how she would go about removing the anklet "*Aitsama ta ra ‡gae !gao i ge, ‡gao !gao,*" 'I will pull to break it by myself, pull to break.' Following that in line 6, AR complains that it is difficult because there are many beads "Ae, karade #guisa, !gom !gomhe tisa," 'Oh, a lot of beads, difficult, mine is difficult.' It is likely that he means it is difficult to get a hold of the thread or knot in between the beads because it has been so densely beaded. Ga responds to this complaint in the following line saying "// amaga ta ra mî i ge o du ga *+gae!gao i tā xao-!gao, tita ge ra mî +gaese,"* 'That's why I say you should pull it to break loose and I will cut it through, I say pull.' Basically, she is repeating the advice she gave earlier in lines 4 and 5, but in this turn her voice is louder and there is a clear accent through lengthening of the second vowel of amaga 'why'. After a short pause, she follows up on this turn with the rhetorical question in line 10 "//Nâu ti ra +gaesa?" 'Does that ear not hear?' Ga does not expect this question to be answered. She is using the question to criticise her son for not listening to her and thereby making her repeat herself. She has shown her irritation at having to repeat her advice by raising her voice and giving a marked accent on why in 'that is why:....' The question in line 10 is therefore a rhetorical question, and indeed, she receives no answer to it. After her question, there is 6.5 seconds of silence in which Ga continues beading without looking up, and AR continues fiddling with the anklet. In lines 14-17, Ga starts speaking again. It is not entirely clear what her intentions are with her uttered turns, but they are delivered in the "broadcasting" style of speech. This is a style of speech that does not seem to be directed at anyone in particular, not does is seem to require a response (see section 3.3.8). Ga's turns in lines 14-17 are not referring back to her son or the anklet nor are they pursuing a response to her question in line 10. At the end of her turn in line 17, her broadcasting turn is moreover overlapped by Ap who starts singing a song.

This sequence shows an example of a rhetorical question. As with questions in general, and as the section on complaints showed, rhetorical questions too can be used to perform different actions. For example joking, assessing or criticizing, as the question in the example above.

3.3.10 Pre-sequences

This section shows an example of a question that is used in a pre-sequence. It is used to lead up to the main business of the talk. The example involves the women Ga, Ce and Fr who have been driven to a cattle post for the purpose of collecting mangetti nuts. There was an incident during the trip to the cattle post of a little boy clinging to the back of the car in order to get a lift. In the example below, Ga starts telling the resident of the cattle post, Pu, about this incident. Her telling is prompted by the turn in line 1 by Fr who comments on the apparent death wish of the child GE, whose approach they are all watching. The first turn by Ga in line 3 and the responses to it by Ce and Fr are the pre-insert expansion that precedes the actual telling that starts in line 7.

(230)		
1	Fr:	m GE-b-a //ō ga i /goa-b ge nēba nedu e hîna
		name-3SG.M-A die CONDBEC child-3SG.M DECL DEM UNK UNK TAG
		'm GE will become dead this child here () isn't it.'
2		(0.7)
3	Ga:	Edo tita go netsē go-ro goba goba ai he =
		EXL 1SG RECPST today RECPST-PROG talk talk on PASS
4		= //nâu ga tama du hâ
		hear 2PL NEG 2PL.C PRF
		'EDO, (the thing) I was talk talking about today didn't you hear?'
5	Ce:	A:bo
		EXL
		'(Holy) Father.'
6	Fr:	Hm m-hm
		'Oh no (or "tsk tsk").'
7	Ga:	Edo /gôa-b go-ro m- mâ i ge audo lamberi ai
		EXL child-3SG.M RECPST-PROG stand 3SG.C DECL car back on
		'EDO, the boy was standing on the back of the car.'
8		(0.5)
9		Mâ kai so re /hû-s-a anisi-,
		stop cause 2PL.F RE white.person-3SG.F-A in.order.to
		'Make it stop white lady (I said) so that-,'
10	Fr:	∱Nē xu-b ai-b go mâ,
		DEM thing-3SG.M on-3SG.M RECPST stand
		'He stood on this thing.' (Collect_nuts)

The question in line 4 by speaker Ga *"//Nâu ga tama du hâ?"* 'Didn't you hear?' is the pre-telling. It is an information question that simultaneously announces that a telling will be forthcoming. The turns in lines 5 and 6 by Ce and Fr, who both witnessed the event that Ga wants to talk about, show their stance towards this event, which is one of slight outrage or exasperation. In line 7, Ga commences with the telling which becomes a joint telling when Fr in line 10 and later Ce too participate.

Questions in the sequential position of pre-insert expansions often perform actions of introducing tellings, statements, invitations, offers or requests. In chapter 4, the issue of pre-requests will be treated in more detail in section 4.3.

The previous sections in this chapter have given a description of the various actions that can be performed using utterances that are in the grammatical form of a question in \bar{A} khoe Haillom. These actions include information requests, repair initiations, requests for confirmation, assessments, challenges, complaints, rhetorical questions, understanding checks and broadcasts or out-louds. Two further actions that can be performed in this manner but

(220)

that are not dealt with here are requests and an action called $\neq gona$. These will be discussed separately in chapters 4 and 5. The linguistic form 'question' is a very versatile vehicle, which speakers engaged in natural interaction use to perform various communicative actions.

3.4 Distribution of question functions

As was discussed in section 3.2, $\pm \overline{A}$ khoe speakers show a preference for open questions over closed questions. It was argued that this preference is due to the general preference for non-coerciveness of the speakers that makes open questions more attractive because these questions offer a conversational partner more freedom in their response than closed questions do. Additionally, the marked dearth of requests for confirmation was pointed out. Requests for confirmation typically restrict next speakers to a confirmatory response and are thus even more coercive than an average polar question would be.

In this section, the additional argument offered to show the preference for non-coerciveness concerns the actions that questions perform. The communicative actions of questions were discussed in section 3.3. As was previously shown, $\pm \bar{A}$ khoe has 58% content questions and 42% polar questions and this is the opposite distribution to that of other languages that have been studied thus far. As the grammatical structure of an utterance is often linked to the interactional function of the utterance (Curl & Drew, 2008; Schegloff, 2006), the grammatical structure of a question is thus also related to the communicative action which that question is used to perform. If $\pm \bar{A}$ khoe speakers perform different actions with their questions, or perform certain actions more or less frequently than speakers of the other languages do, this will affect the distribution of the question types.



Figure 3-6: The percentage of questions acting as repair initiators.

This different distribution can be explained by looking at the actions that the questions are used to perform. The actions that explain the different distribution are the requests for confirmation, which have already been mentioned in section 3.2, and repair initiators. It is in these actions that $\pm \bar{A}$ khoe speakers' behaviour differs from that of speakers of the other languages. As shown in Figure 3-6, $\pm \bar{A}$ khoe speakers ask more repair initiating questions than speakers of most of the other languages, except Korean, do. Additionally most of the repair initiating is done using content questions. This boosts the overall number of content questions for $\pm \bar{A}$ khoe.

In section 3.2, the scarce occurrence of requests for confirmation in $\pm \bar{A}$ khoe conversation was already pointed out. While $\pm \bar{A}$ khoe speakers make virtually no requests for confirmation, in other languages requests for confirmation constitute 20% and 50% of all questions posed in conversations. Since requests for confirmation are always posed using polar questions, not performing any requests for confirmation, as is the case in $\pm \bar{A}$ khoe, dramatically reduces the overall number of polar questions.

From the results described above, it can be concluded that there is a link between action and question type and that the type of action being performed by the speakers influences the distribution of the question types. More repair initiators in the form of content questions lead to more content questions, while fewer requests for confirmation lead to less polar questions. In this thesis, it is argued that the reason that speakers of \bar{A} khoe Haillom perform more repair questions in the form of content questions and fewer confirmation requests is the orientation to their co-conversationalist's sense of restrictedness. Section 3.6 will return to this argument in more detail.

3.5 Responses

This section will take a closer look at responses (or the lack thereof) to questions in $\pm \overline{A}$ khoe Haillom. The overall number of responses to questions in $\pm \overline{A}$ khoe is lower than that of other languages that have been studied for this (Journal of Pragmatics, volume 42, issue 10). The amount of pursuits for answers when an answer is not forthcoming is also low in $\pm \overline{A}$ khoe. Both of these situations are argued to be a reflection of speakers' concern to be non-coercive in their questioning. Furthermore, the answers to polar questions show an interesting deviation to some other languages and they will be described in more detail in section 3.5.3. For a general overview of responses in interaction, please refer to section 1.4.3.3.1 in the Introduction.

Questions can have different functions, and dependent on their function they may or may not require a response.¹⁴ Rhetorical questions for example do not require a response. The current section only makes use of questions implementing actions that make a response relevant. Responses to questions consist of answers and non-answers. Non-answer responses are responses that do not actually give an answer to the question but do orient to the fact that a question has been asked. Overall 77% of all questions in the $\pm\bar{A}$ khoe Haillom corpus are responded to, but only 60% of questions are actually answered.

¹⁴ Not all questions that make a response relevant request information. Questions can have other functions and for a discussion of these see 1.4.3.1.

response type		%	11
response	answer	60%	193
	non-answer	16.8%	54
no response		23.2%	75
total		100%	32215

Figure 3-7: Distribution of response types in ‡Ākhoe Haillom data.

Just over 23% of questions receive no response what so ever. The number of questions that receive no response is slightly high in $\pm\bar{A}$ khoe compared to other languages studied for this as is shown in Figure 3-8.



Figure 3-8: Responses to questions.

Most of those languages have less than 20% of questions receiving no response, ranging from 16% in Italian to 4% in Dutch (Englert, 2010; Rossano, 2010). In the figure, these languages fall in the collapsed group of Indo-European. Yet, $\pm \bar{A}$ khoe Haillom is not extreme in the level of response. Lao, for instance, has an even higher number of questions not receiving a response: 25% (Enfield, 2010; Enfield et al., 2010). Similarly, Gardner's (2010) results of a study of question-answer sequences in the Australian aboriginal language Garrwa showed overall longer response times (longer than Danish, see Figure 3-13) as well as a high rate of non-answers and non-responses comparable to Lao.

The slightly elevated amount of questions that remain unanswered in $\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe may be related to the fact that speakers select a next speaker less often too. When a question is asked it is possible to select the person you want to answer it by, for example, using an address term or looking at the person you want to give the answer (Lerner, 2003; Sacks et al., 1974). Looking only at the multi-party data, where the presence or absence of next speaker selection can be assessed, of 229 questions 56% (n=128) select a next speaker, and 18% (n=41) do not

¹⁵ This is the total amount of questions, including experimental data, for which the response could be assessed.

select a next speaker. In 26% of the cases (n=60), it could not be assessed whether eye gaze was or was not used to select a next speaker. ¹⁶ If in all these cases a next speaker were selected, that would bring the total of next speaker selection to 81%. That would still put $\frac{1}{4}$ khoe at the lowest end of the scale of next speaker selection for all the languages studied, lower even than Lao with its 84%. The highest amount of next speaker selection occurs in Japanese, where 99% of questions select a next speaker (Enfield, 2010; Hayashi, 2010). Selecting a next speaker can be effective in securing a response in $\frac{1}{4}$ khoe. A question is slightly more likely to receive a response if a next speaker is selected. Sixty-two percent (n=26) of questions that do not select a next speaker receive a response, while 79% (n=100) of questions that do select a next speaker receive a response. The comparatively low level of next speaker selection in $\frac{1}{4}$ khoe Haillom may explain the comparatively high level of questions that remain without a response.

Eye gaze is used most often to select a next speaker. In the 84 question-answer sequences that selected a next speaker and where the direction of eye gaze could be assessed clearly, 63% (n=53) of the questioners selected the next speaker using gaze. For address terms and domain of authority, there were a total of 126 question-answer sequences in which a next speaker was clearly selected. Amongst these, address terms were used in 18% (n=23) of the cases, and 15% (n=19) of the cases relied on speaker selection through the addressees domain of authority. There are only very few cases in which more than one manner of selecting a next speaker was used (n=13). The numbers for these cases are too small to say anything concerning the effectiveness of using multiple means of selecting a next speaker in order to obtain a response.

In sum, $\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe speakers select a next speaker to answer their questions markedly less frequently than speakers in other languages do. Possibly linked to this is the slightly elevated number of questions that receive no response. In relation to a preference of speakers for non-coerciveness, this points towards a preference not to pressure a co-interactant for a response. A way to raise the likelihood of obtaining a response to a question is for example by clearly selecting a next speaker (Stivers & Rossano, 2010). Speakers of $\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe do this less than speakers of other languages do, and in this manner, they provide more freedom to their co-interactants even though this may result in less responses overall.

3.5.1 Pursuits

When questions remain unanswered or even unresponded too, as they do in $\pm\bar{A}$ khoe Haillom with a higher frequency than in other languages, speakers can decide to pursue the question in order to obtain a response. In this section, a number of pursuits in $\pm\bar{A}$ khoe Haillom interaction will be discussed, but only those pursuits that were implemented in cases where there was no response at all to the initial question will be considered.

¹⁶ Due to typical seating patterns of speakers (e.g. very far apart, in groups with some backs to the camera) and only one camera, a number of cases cannot be assessed for next speaker selection.

An example of a pursuit in $\frac{1}{4}$ khoe Haillom is given in the following sequence. In this sequence, three women are sitting on the ground stringing beads when a fourth woman, Ap, comes on to the scene and asks about the beads that she sees the other women using. Her question in the first line of the sequence, which is built up of the noun *karasa* 'bead' followed by the interrogative particle *kha*, implies something along the lines of "What about the beads?" (see section 2.4.4.2.2 on the question particle *kha*).

(231)

1	Ap:	Kara-s-a kha	\rightarrow	Question
		bead-3SG.F-A Q		
		'Beads?'		
2	KO:	//Hā hai-b di /oa-de,		
		chop wood-38G.M POSS knot-3PL.F.C		
		'Chop the wood's knots off.'	>	Lack of response
3	Ga:	Hōxōxō[ru doa]		
		([])	J	
4	Ap:	[Kara-s-a kha]	\rightarrow	Pursuit
		bead-3sg.F-A Q		
		'[Beads?]'		
5	Ma:	[Ēti kara-s-a] na-i	\rightarrow	Response
		EXL bead-3SG.F-A 3PL.C-3SG.C		
		'[ETI it's the beads.]'		
6	Ga:	([]) (Ga_beads_2)		

Speaker Ap comes and stands next to the other women who are sitting on the ground and are beading. Ap bends forward and, with her hand on her knee, looks at the beads and utters the question in line 1 *"Karasa kha?"* 'Beads?' While she waits for a response, a different conversation between KO and Ga that was going on simultaneously continues in lines 2 and 3. In total, Ap waits 2.3 seconds while looking around at the women and the beads before pursuing her first question with a repeat of the same question in line 4 *"Karasa kha?"* 'Beads?' However, this time around, both the pitch and the intensity of the question are higher. Figure 3-9 shows the pitch on both the first and the second question. The first *"Karasa kha?"* 'Beads?' is represented with a thick solid line and the second *"Karasa kha?"* 'Beads?' is represented with a thin dotted line. As can be seen in the figure, the overall pitch of the second question is higher than the first question. In addition, there is a prominent pitch peak on the second syllable of the word *karasa* 'bead'.



Figure 3-9: Pitch on both question and pursuit 'karasa kha'

In Figure 3-10, the first question is again represented by a solid line and the second question by a dotted line. This figure shows the intensity of each utterance. As can be seen, in the utterance that is repeated, the intensity is higher.



Figure 3-10: Intensity of both question and pursuit 'karasa kha'

Returning to the conversation, speaker Ap poses her question "*Karasa kha?*" 'Beads?' the first time in line 1. Getting no response, she redoes her question in pursuit of a response in line 4 by repeating it with a higher pitch, a more marked pitch pattern, and a higher intensity. This time she does get a response. In line 5, speaker Ma responds with a raised voice, i.e. a higher intensity, possibly showing irritation "*Eti karasa na-i*," 'ETI it's the beads.' This suggests that speakers rely on both pitch and intensity for soliciting responses.

The previous sequence shows a pursuit performed in the form of a repeat of the original question. The following sequence shows a pursuit performed in the form of a re-doing or reformulation of the original question. In this sequence, the young man AR is speaking to his mother Ga. When, after two insert expansions in lines 3 and 7, she still does not provide an answer to his question, he reformulates the question in line 11 in order to pursue his aim to obtain an answer.

(232)

1	AR:	Mî-ba:-he-s	g0-10.	\rightarrow	Question
		say-APPL-PASS-2SG.F	RECPST-PROG		
		'Were you told?'			
2		(0.7)			
3	Ga:	Iye?)	
		'Huh?'			
4		(0.7)			Repair sequence
5	AR:	Mî-ba:-he-s	g0-r0.	$\left\langle \right\rangle$	insert expansion
		say-APPL-PASS-2SG.F	RECPST-PROG		
		'Were you told?'			
6		(0.9)			
7	Ga:	Tai bîa		~	
		who 3sg.m.by			
		'By whom?'			
8		(0.6)		ļ	Information request
9	AR:	RT-ai-a,			insert expansion
		name-by-A			
		'By RT.'			
10		(6.2)		→	No response
11		Mî-ba-he tama-	si hâ	→	Pursuit
		say-APPL-PASS NEG-2	2SG.F PRF		
		'Were you not told?'			
12		(1.5)			
13	Ga:	(Î) tā ta ge.		\rightarrow	Answer
		yes never 1SG PST			
		'(Yes) I was not (told).' (Ga_beads_2)		

In line 1, AR ask his mother Ga "*Mîbahes goro?*" 'Were you told?' After a pause, his mother responds with a repair initiation in line 3 "*Iye?*" 'Huh?' AR then repairs his previous utterance by repeating the question completely in line 5 "*Mîbahes goro?*" 'Were you told?' After another pause in line 6, his mother requests more information asking "*Tai bîa?*" 'By whom?' AR provides the information in line 9, giving the name of the person "*RTaia*," 'By RT.' In the following six seconds of silence it becomes clear the Ga will not answer his initial question. In line 11, AR reformulates his question by reversing the polarity from positive to negative. He asks "*Mîbahe tamasi hâ?*" 'Were you not told?' In line 1, the question 'Were you told?' is biased towards a confirmation of the positive state of affairs. In line 11, the pursuit is in the form of a negatively biased question 'Were you not told?' such that a confirmation would now confirm the negative state of affairs. After another pause, this question is answered in line 13 "*(Î) tā ta ge,*" '(Yes), I was not (told).' There is generally a preference in conversation for speakers to affiliate with each other (Heritage, 1984; Pomerantz, 1984a). In the domain of polar questions specifically, there is a preference for addressees to affiliate with the bias entailed in

the speaker's question. A positively formulated question, as the question in line 1, is built for a positive answer, and interactants generally try to fulfil these expectations. Speaker Ga shows a reluctance or inability to answer the positively formulated question in line 1, demonstrated in the repeated silences and the two insert expansions she initiates. This may be because she cannot respond with a confirming answer which would be the affiliative thing to do (Stivers & Robinson, 2006). Speaker AR pursues an answer by changing the bias of his question from positive to negative, treating the problem of Ga's not answering as possibly or likely rooted in a problem of question design. By reformulating his question as a negative polar question, speaker Ga can now affiliate to it by giving a negative answer, which she does.

The two previous sequences show that in \bar{A} khoe Haillom speakers do pursue a response if one is not forthcoming. Yet, this is not done frequently. As was noted at the beginning of section 3.5, in the conversational \bar{A} khoe data, there are a relatively high number of questions that receive no response. Despite this, there are very few pursuits. There are a total of 78 questions that receive no response. Of these, only seven are pursued with a verbal pursuit. In the case of the questions that have a delayed response, none of the responses was eventually obtained using a non-verbal pursuit, i.e. gaze or a gesture. This again suggests that speakers of \bar{A} khoe Haillom have a concern for not being coercive. While the structures to pursue a response are there in the language, as the examples in this section show, speakers rarely seem to use them, especially when the higher number of unanswered questions is taken into account that would warrant such a pursuit.

3.5.2 Visible responses

Responses can consist of only a visible component or of a combination of verbal and visible components. In the case of $\frac{1}{4}$ khoe Haillom, fifty-two responses are accompanied by visible components. Half of these, 50% (n=26), are deictic gestures: mostly manual points and one head point.



Figure 3-11: a deictic pointing gesture.

Figure 3-12: an iconic gesture.

Twelve responses, 23%, are accompanied by iconic gestures: in this case gestures that illustrate the activity about which the speaker is talking. For example, in response to the question *"Taeba hî e?"* 'What is he doing?',

the response *"Khoebi baikisi nētisi !khōhē ti e,"* 'The man's jacket is held like this,' is accompanied by a gesture illustrating holding on to something. This is shown in Figure 3-12. Seven responses, 13%, are accompanied by confirming and disconfirming head nods and head shakes.

There are also responses that consist solely of a visible component without an accompanying verbal utterance. In the data collection, there are six of these instances. Four, the majority, are answers in the form of deictic gestures: three manual points and one lip point (Hewes, 1981; Wilkins, 2003). Another of the six is an answer in the form of a confirming head nod accompanied by an eyebrow flash. The last is a non-answer response: a gesture in which the responder puts her hand in front of her mouth showing surprise. The questions that receive an answer consisting of only a visible response are either polar questions or content questions that ask about a place/direction or a person for example "Who did that?" and "Where is it?" type questions. In all cases, the responses were accepted as a satisfactory answer in the sense that they were not challenged and there was no pursuit.

3.5.3 Interjection and repeat answers

Polar questions can be answered in $\pm \bar{A}$ khoe Haillom by interjections: 'yes' or 'no', as well as by repetitions of a part or of the whole question. The bare interjections (yes and no) as answers occur in longer and shorter forms. The "full" yes is $\hat{i} h\hat{i}$, and the shorter forms range from $\hat{i}h$ and \hat{i} : to just a nasal *m*. There is also the *ah* version of yes. The "full" form of the no answer is $h\hat{a} \hat{a}$ or $h\hat{i} \hat{i}$. In this data collection, there is also a nasal no: /hm?m/ and there is the interjection *ai ye* (/aye/ or /eye/) which is a marked no. There are not enough negative propositions in the data sample to be able to tell whether there is a connection between the form of the interjections and the valency of the propositions. The repetition answers usually do not include either 'yes' or 'no'. This can be seen in the following example (233) in which the polar question uttered by speaker Pt is answered simultaneously by two different speakers, one answering with a repeat answer lacking an interjection, the other with a 'yes' answer. The speaker of the question possibly selects Fr as a next speaker using eye gaze but speaker Ga is looking away and does not see this. The information Pt asks for is in the epistemic domain of both women answering.

(233)

1	Pt:	Komponi-si-s	ge-re	doe	ra	е,
		compound-3sg.f.OBJ-3sg.f	PST-PROG	move	PROC	G UNK
		'Was she moving to the comp	oound?'			
2	Fr:	[Kom]poni-si-(.)s	ge-re	doe	i	ge.
		compound-3sg.f.OBJ-3sg.f	PST-PROG	move	3sg.c	DECL
		'She was moving to the [com]pound.'			
3	Ga:	[Î]				

'[Yes.]' (H005044) (Collect_nuts)

Speaker Pt asks the polar question *"Komponisis gere doe ra e?"* 'Was she moving to the compound?' She is asking about a researcher who recently moved from living in a tent under a tree to live with some local teachers in the brick and cement housing meant for farm workers, locally known as "the compound". Both Fr and Ga provide an answer to her question, starting simultaneously. Fr responds with a repeat answer *"Komponisi(.)s gere doe i ge,"* 'She was moving to the compound.' Ga responds with the 'yes' interjection *î*. This example shows that in principal both types of answers, repeats and interjections, are acceptable.

Interjection and repeat answers are equally frequent. In the data sample, of the 70 functional polar questions that are answered, 41.4% (n=29) have interjection answers; 41.4% (n=29) have repetition answers and less than 3% (n=2) have both: an interjection and a repetition. In the remaining 14.2% (n=10), questions are mostly answered differently, for example by disconfirming the question through correcting the question's underlying assumption. This is shown in example (234) in which the speakers have been talking about a person who took some beads. Speaker Ma does not seem to be completely sure who is being talked about and offers a candidate understanding in the form of a question: *"llAbelsia?*" 'By llAbel?' Speaker AR answers by giving another name: *"Thomabia,*" 'By Thomas.' Thereby he names the person they were actually talking about who happens not to be the person speaker Ma thought it was. By answering in this way, speaker AR is disconfirming what speaker Ma thought without overtly saying 'no', akin to transformative answers described by Stivers and Hayashi (Stivers & Hayashi, 2010).

(234)

1 Ma: *//Abel-si-a?* name-3sg.f.OBJ-A 'By //Abel?'

2 AR: *Thoma-bi-a.* name-3SG.M.OBJ-A 'By Thomas' (H002235a) (Ga_beads2)

Some of the other answers to questions that do not get a repeat or a 'yes/no' answer, are questions that have the form of a polar question but are actually asking for more than just a 'yes' or 'no'. This is the case with the questions that have the topic-only question marker (see section 2.4.4.2.2) and the question can be interpreted as "And what about X?" This is the case in example (235).

(235)

1	Ga:	0 //gû-,	O llgû-s-a		kha?				
		CONJ parer	nt-3sg.f-A	Q					
		'And (what a	about) her i	nother?'					
2	Pt:	Hā-s	ge nē	≠nôa	i	ge			
		come-3sg.F	PST DEM	1 sit	3sg.c	DECL			
		'She came, s	e.' (H	[005028]) (Collect_nuts)				

Speaker Ga asks, " $O \parallel g\hat{u}sa \ kha?$ " 'And (what about) her mother?' Giving a 'yes' or 'no' answer to this question in this instance would not be considered adequate. And indeed, speaker Pt responds not with a 'yes' or 'no', but by giving information on what is going on with the mother in question saying, "Hās ge nē $\pm n\hat{o}a \ i \ ge$," 'She came, there (she) sits.'

A number of responses also answer the question without explicitly giving a 'yes' or 'no' but by implying it, as in example (236), again akin to transformative answers.

(236)

1	Ms:	//Ari		go	SĨ		ra	ū-he	dara-n
		one.day.from	n.now	RECPST	AUX	K.LOC2	PROG	take-PASS	wire-3PL.C
2		ge hîna?							
		DECL TAG							
		'The wire w	as being	g taken aw	vay y	esterday	, right	?'	
3	KO:	Ti-b	go-ro		mî	i	ge		
		thus-3SG.M	RECPST	ſ-PROG	say	3sg.c	DECL		
		'He was saying so.'				(H007013) (Handcraft 3)			

Speaker Ms is inquiring about some wire that was intended for the use of making wire cars. She asks, "//Ari go $s\bar{i} ra \bar{u}$ -he daran ge hîna?" 'The wire was being taken away yesterday, right?' Speaker KO answers saying, "Tib goro mî i ge, "He was saying so.' With this answer, KO does not give an explicit 'yes' but instead gives a possible version of the answer by stating who he himself got the confirming information from, thus shifting the accountability away from himself.

Both interjection answers and repeats can be used to confirm or disconfirm a polar question. Eighty percent (n=57) of the functional polar questions receive a confirming answer, and only 17% (n=12) receive a disconfirming answer. This is in line with the general finding that speakers more commonly confirm polar questions (Stivers et al., 2009) and that disaffiliative actions are dispreferred in conversation (Heritage, 1984; Pomerantz, 1984a).

In the subsequent sections, I will show examples of all the different confirming and disconfirming answers to negatively phrased question that occur in the data sample and that can lead to confusion. \bar{A} khoe Haillom, in this respect, does not have a special word for confirming negatively phrased questions, as German, French and Danish for example do (Heinemann, 2005), and so, to avoid misunderstandings, all negatively phrased questions in the data sample are answered with more than just a simple 'yes' or 'no'.

3.5.3.1 Confirming answers

Example (237) shows a 'yes' answer that confirms a positively phrased question. Speaker AR asks his mother, speaker Ga, whether she had come with any vaseline "Vaslin-i /khās goro hā sasa?" Speaker Ga gives an affirmative answer to this " \hat{A} " 'yes', meaning that she indeed had come with vaseline.

(237)

 AR: Vaslin-i /khā-s go-ro hā sasa? petroleum.jelly-3SG.C with-3SG.F RECPST-PROG come 2SG 'Were you coming with vaseline, you?'
 Ga: Â 'Yes.' (H002403) (Ga_beads_2)

Example (238) is another example of a 'yes' confirming response, but in this case, it comes as a response to a negatively phrased question and is thus expanded.

(238)

 AR: Mî-ba-he tama-si hâ? say-APPL-PASS NEG-2SG.F PRF 'Were you not told?'
 Ga: (Î) tā ta ge yes NEG 1SG PST

'(Yes) I was not. (H002420) (Ga_beads_2)

Speaker AR asks the negatively phrased question "*Mîbahe tamasi hâ?*" 'Were you NOT told?' The form in which this question is asked implies that speaker AR thinks that the addressee was not told. Speaker Ga confirms this bias with her answer " (\hat{I}) tā ta ge," '(Yes) I was not.' The interjection 'yes' in the answer in this case confirms that the bias in AR's question was indeed correct. It does not contradict the negatively phrased question. A bare interjection 'yes' could potentially have been interpreted as meaning 'yes I was told', and to avoid this, the interjection is followed with the expansion 'I was not,' which again confirms the bias entailed in the question that the addressee was not told. The two examples above show that a positively phrased polar question is answered simply with a bare interjection, while a negatively phrased polar question is answered with more than simply an interjection. The added expansion avoids potential confusion.

The following example, (239), shows a negatively phrased polar question that receives the interjection 'no' as well as a partial repetition which in this case confirms the question. There is no example in the data collection of a question that receives only a 'no' confirming answer.

(239)
1 Pt: Hā tama-bi noxoba hâ? come NEG-3SG.M.OBJ yet PRF 'Hasn't he come yet?'
2 Ga: Hâ-â tā-b ge ra hā

no NEG-3SG.M DECL PROG come 'No, he isn't coming.' (Collect_nuts)

In this question-answer sequence, speaker Pt asks the question " $H\bar{a}$ tanabi noxoba hâ?" 'Hasn't he come yet?' This question is negatively phrased, in other words it is biased towards a negative answer. The questioner expects that it is indeed the case that "he" has not come yet. Speaker Ga, who responds, confirms this with a 'no' answer followed by a repetition of part of the question "Hâ-â tāb ge ra hā," 'No, he isn't coming.'

The following example shows an instance of a repetition without an interjection used to confirm a positively phrased question.

(240)

1	Sa:	!Khā-gu	sia	hā	ra	i	ge	mû-s-a	hū-e?
		poke-3PL.M	3sg.f.unk	AUX.LOC1	PROG	3sg.c	DECL	see-3SG.F-A	thing-3SG.C.A
	'She is going to poke them, do you see it?'								
2	Ei:	!Khā-gu	sia	hā	ra	i	ge		
		poke-3PL.M	3sg.f.unk	AUX.LOC1	PROG	3sg.c	DECI	-	
'She is going to poke them.' (H001102) (FS_Sa_Ei)									

In example (240), speaker Sa asks, *"!Khāgu sia hā ra i ge, mûsa hū-e?"* 'She is going to poke them, do you see it?' Speaker Ei confirms that she does see this, not by using the interjection 'yes' but by repeating part of the question and thereby confirming that she indeed sees it *"!Khāgu sia hā ra i ge,*" 'She is going to poke them.'

The examples shown in this section demonstrate that polar questions can be confirmed by using both positive and negative interjections as well as with repetitions of part of the question. In the specific case of negatively phrased questions, the examples show that \bar{A} khoe Haillom does not fall into either the truth-based or polarity-based answering systems. In order to avoid ambiguity, more than a bare positive or negative interjection is used.

3.5.3.2 Disconfirming answers

In this section, I will describe the practices through which speakers of $\bar{+}A\bar{k}hoe$ Haillom provide disconfirming answers to polar questions. The following examples show two different types of answers to polar questions that are disconfirming: an interjection answer and a repeat answer. Disconfirming answers are less frequent than confirming answers, as was previously noted, and the data collection does not contain any examples of a 'yes' response used to disconfirm.

133

Example (241) shows one of the disconfirming answers to a polar question. In this case, it is an interjection 'no' that disconfirms the question. Speaker Ma is speaking about the video camera that is recording the conversation. Speaker Ma joined the conversation after the camera had been set up. She asks, *"‡Ganamhe-i hâ i?"* 'Has been it closed?' meaning 'Has it (the camera) been switched off?' Speaker AR answers with a marked form of the interjection 'no' *"Ai ye!"* 'No!' disconfirming her question.

(241)

1	Ma:	<i>‡Ganam-he-i</i>	hâ	i?
		be.closed-PASS-3SG.C	PRF	BEC
		'Has it been closed?'		
2	AR:	Ai ye		

'No!' (H002266) (Ga_beads_2)

The following example shows a disconfirming transformative answer to a polar question that does not use an interjection but instead repeats a minimal part of the question, repeating only the verb, and adding a negation.

(242)

1	Sa:	Sasa	m	û sa	e?			
		2sg	see	e 2sg	UNK			
		'Do g	you s	see?'				
2	Pu:	Tā	ta	ge	ra	mû	ga	!gâise
		NEG	1sg	DECL	PROG	see	UNK	well
		'I an	n not	seeing	very v	well.' (I	10040	02) (FS_Sa_Pu)

Sa and Pu are looking at a picture book together and discussing the story unfolding in it. Speaker Sa asks the positively phrased question "Sasa mû sa e?" 'Do you see?' The implication here is 'Do you understand?' This is answered by Pu, who disconfirms this without using a 'yes' or 'no', saying, "Tā ta ge ra mû ga !gâise," 'I am not seeing very well.' Speaker Pu qualifies her answer by taking issue with the stark polarity of the question: seeing or not seeing. Instead, she concedes that she does see a little, just not well enough to be able to answer with a yes.

3.5.3.3 Repeat answers

The following two sections focus in on the difference of answering a polar question with a repetition and answering it with an interjection. In \bar{A} khoe Haillom, polar questions are often answered with a repeat when answering the question with only a 'yes' or 'no' would lead to confusion. This is the case for two types of polar questions: negatively phrased polar questions (3.5.3.1 and 3.5.3.2) and polar questions using the question tag *bo* 'or'. As mentioned previously, confirming negatively phrased polar questions with an interjection answer can lead to confusion. In such cases, it can be unclear whether the answer is confirming the negatively phrased assumption of the questioner or whether it is disconfirming the question itself. In these cases, it is wise to
formulate the answer in such a manner that it is clear what one is confirming. Examples of this can be seen in (238) and (239). Polar questions that use the word *bo* 'or' as a tag (see section 2.4.4.2.1) can lead to a lack of clarity because of the use of the tag itself, probably due to the implication of 'or not' entailed in the 'or'. Example (243) shows the use of *bo* as a tag in a polar question used by speaker Ga to ask about the availability of tobacco. The answer to this polar question is not an interjection but a repetition of part of the question, thus giving a disambiguous answer.

(243)

Repeat answers with an added negation can be used to disconfirm polar questions. This was shown in example (242) in which speaker Pu is asked whether "she sees". She disconfirms this, saying that she does not see "very well".

In addition to confirming a question, a repeat answer can also be used to upgrade the speaker's authority on the matter being discussed (Heritage, 2013; Heritage & Raymond, 2005). This is what happens in the following example in which speaker Ga, the mother of Su, asks Su whether Su's baby is vomiting. Su could have answered merely with a confirming 'yes' or even with the repetition 'he is vomiting', but instead she upgrades her answer and replies that her baby is not merely vomiting, he is vomiting a lot.

(244)

1	Ga:	Hûi	i	b-a?					
		vomit	BEC	3SG.M-A					
		'Is he v	omitir	ng?'					
2	Su:	Hûi	gara	b-a	i	ge			
		vomit	big	3SG.M-A	3sg.c	DECL			
		'He is v	vomiti	ng a lot'	(H003054) (Gas_yardA)				

This upgrading answer is consistent with speaker Su, as mother, being more likely to know about her own child than Ga, the grandmother, would and claiming that authority.

3.5.3.4 Interjection answers

'Yes' and 'no' answers are commonly used to answer repair initiations that come in the form of polar questions. The data sample used for this thesis has no instances of repeats being used in these cases. Example (245) shows an instance of a repair initiation.

(245)

1	Su:	Frytax	tsē-s-i	piri	а	tita	ra	xapa	[()]	
		Friday	day-3SG.F-on	goat	UNK	1sg	PROG	receive				
		'On Fri	day I am receiv	ing a g	oat [()]	.'					
2	AR:								[Go,]			
									[Go, (pers	onal name))]
3	Ga:	Piri-e?										
		goat-3se	G.C									
		'A goat	?'									
4	Su:	Î										

'Yes.' (H002219) (Ga_beads_2)

The repair initiation in this example is in the form of a candidate understanding being answered with 'yes'. Speaker Su and her mother Ga are beading and talking to each other. In the first line, Su states something that sounds like 'On Friday I am receiving () a goat,' *"Frytax tsēsi piri a tita ra xapa ()."* The last part of Su's statement is in overlap with speaker AR shouting the name Go, in order to get that child's attention. Possibly, due to the overlapping speech, Ga initiates a repair in line 3 in the form of an echo question, asking, *"Piri-e?"* 'A goat?' Su confirms that she was indeed talking about a goat in line 4 by responding with a 'yes' answer *"Îr"*

The previous sections have shown that polar questions in \bar{A} khoe Haillom are answered with interjection answers as well as repetition answers. Answers to negatively framed polar questions are more extensive in order to avoid confusion.

In this section on responses, the answers to polar questions were discussed which show an interesting deviation to some other languages. In \bar{A} khoe Haillom, polar questions can be confirmed by using both positive and negative interjections as well as repetitions of part of the question. In the specific case of negatively phrased questions, \bar{A} khoe Haillom speakers do not use either truth-based or polarity-based answering systems. Rather, they answer with more than merely a bare positive or negative interjection and avoid ambiguity in this manner. Additionally, in this section, the following arguments in favour of \bar{A} khoe Haillom speakers' preference for noncoerciveness were brought forward. The overall number of responses to questions in \bar{A} khoe is lower than that of other languages, the pursuits for answers when an answer is not forthcoming is also low, and the frequency with which speakers select a next speaker is lower than in other languages. All of these characteristics of \bar{A} khoe interaction are argued to be a reflection of speakers' concern to be non-coercive in their questioning. By not using all the tools at their disposal, like clear next speaker selection or pursuing a response, speakers leave their interactional partners more freedom to respond resulting in a lower number of responses to questions.

In the coming section, a number of other reported aspects of hunter-gatherer interaction will be discussed and compared to $\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe Haillom.

3.6 Hunter-gatherer interactional styles

In the preceding sections, an argument was made for an interactional style of questioning in \bar{A} khoe Haillom that is less coercive and less restrictive of the answerer than questioning in other languages is. The arguments put forward include a preference for open questions over closed questions, a dispreference for requests for confirmation, and a dispreference to either press for an answer or pursue an answer. These characteristics taken together provide the answerer with greater freedom in choosing whether to answer and in choosing a type of answer.

In this section, I suggest that these preferences are shaped by the culture of ‡Ākhoe speakers. This is supported by claims from hunter-gatherer studies. It is claimed for certain societies that lead an egalitarian, hunter-gatherer lifestyle that the conversational style differs from pastoralist societies due to the different social culture (Eades, 1991, 1994; Gardner & Mushin, 2007; Kimura, 2001; Kitamura, 1990; Liberman, 1985; Mushin & Gardner, 2009; Philips, 1976, 2005; Sugawara, 1996, 1998, 2012; Walsh, 1991, 1995). In section 1.3, these claims were first discussed and I will now briefly summarize them here.

For San speaking hunter-gatherers it has been observed that there is more overlap and less uptake of turns than would be expected given comparisons with evidence from American English interaction (Kitamura, 1990; Sugawara, 1996, 1998, 2012). It is claimed that the most important factor that shapes San interaction is a mutual concern for individual independence. This results in frequent and lengthy periods of overlap as well as extended turns with just one speaker talking. Kimura (2001) shows that in the interaction of Baka pygmies (huntergatherers) both utterance overlap and long silences are more frequent than in Bakwele (neighbouring pastoralist) and Japanese conversations. For the Aborigines of Australia there are also reports of longer periods of silence and overlap in conversation (Gardner & Mushin, 2007; Mushin & Gardner, 2009; Walsh, 1991, 1995) as well as a style of interaction that is concerned with giving people "interactional privacy" (Eades, 1991: 238). The interactional style of the Indians of the Warm Springs Reservation in Oregon, North America, is reported to have fewer interruptions, a slower pace than English conversation, and again longer silences (Philips, 1976, 2005). As in +Akhoe Haillom and in Aboriginal conversation, talk is often not explicitly addressed to anyone. Moreover, the greater tolerance for silence is explained as giving the co-speaker a greater choice whether to respond or not. Overall, the conversational styles of these hunter-gatherer societies contain more overlap (except for the American Indians), longer periods of silence between turns and there seems to be a general concern for "individual independence"/"interactional privacy" or a speakers choice to respond or not.

 $\pm \bar{A}$ khoe Haillom would seem to fit into this general picture. As has been argued in this chapter, there is a concern for non-coerciveness similar to the reported concerns for individual independence or interactional privacy and the speakers' choice (or freedom) to respond. As for the longer silences, these were similarly found in $\pm \bar{A}$ khoe Haillom. The response times to questions were measured in $\pm \bar{A}$ khoe and a number of other languages. The response time is the time that elapses from the moment the questioner finishes speaking to the moment the responder starts speaking or communicating. This may be in overlap, in the cases where the response times that were measured per language. The bars show the response times, and the numbers represent the mean response time per language. Japanese speakers were the fastest responders in the language sample, and $\pm \bar{A}$ khoe speakers along with the Danish speakers were the slowest responders.



Figure 3-13: Response time to questions per language in milliseconds (Stivers et al., 2009).

Even though $\pm\bar{A}$ khoe speakers respond more slowly, this does not have any effect on the structure of the turntaking of the speakers. The length of time that counts as a meaningful silence differs between the languages. Yet, the factors that predict how fast a speaker responds, relative to what in the speaker's language is a meaningful silence, are the same across all the languages. Preferred answers, for example confirmations, are still produced faster than dispreferred answers, for example disconfirmations and non-answers (Stivers et al., 2009). In $\pm\bar{A}$ khoe conversation, there may be longer silences, but these are not necessarily meaningful silences.

As for the more frequent overlap, it was not encountered in the $\frac{1}{4}$ khoe Haillom question response sequences. This may be because schisms were not considered overlap. Figure 3-14 shows the frequency of response offsets (y-axis) at a given time (x-axis) in $\frac{1}{4}$ khoe. The dashed line marks the point in time at which the questioner finishes speaking. The data points to the left of the dashed line show overlapped speech, while the further to the right of the dashed line the data points are, the longer the time is between turns. As can be seen, almost none of the responses in $\frac{1}{4}$ khoe come in overlap.



Figure 3-14: Frequency of response offset in #Ākhoe.

This is especially clear when $\pm\bar{A}$ khoe is compared to Japanese, which has a relatively large amount of overlap, see Figure 3-15.



Figure 3-15: Frequency of response offset in Japanese (Stivers et al., 2009).

Once again, the speed of these responses, even though the speed differs between languages, does not have an influence on the fundamental structure of the taking of turns (Stivers et al., 2009).

One of the results of this work that fits well with the above mentioned anthropological evidence concerns the number of responses to questions, as was already mentioned in section 3.5. The anthropological evidence suggests that speakers show a greater concern for other speakers' independence, or a more general listeners control over uptake, resulting in a lack of turn uptake. The $\frac{1}{4}$ khoe data shows a high number of questions that are not responded to, that receive no uptake. Looking only at the raw data, 23% of all questions never get a response in $\frac{1}{4}$ khoe. Together with Lao, that puts $\frac{1}{4}$ khoe at the highest end of the "no response" scale (see Figure 3-8). In addition, even though there are relatively many questions that do not receive a response, only very infrequently do the questioners pursue a response (section 3.5.1). This again fits with the anthropologists' claims for a concern for the conversational partner's independence.

One claim that is brought forward in some of the linguistic anthropological studies discussed that has not been dealt with yet, is the claim that the San languages show that the turn-taking system, as presented by Schegloff amongst others as being universal (Levinson, 2006b; Schegloff, 2006; Stivers et al., 2009), is not universal (Kitamura, 1990; Sugawara, 1996, 1998, 2012). However, in the question response data that was studied for this thesis there is no evidence to support a ‡Ākhoe Haillom mode of communication that is radically unlike other cultural groups. For question-answer sequences, the ‡Ākhoe Haillom do not show a markedly different behaviour where overlaps and silences are concerned. The response times do vary across the languages, but this does not influence the fundamental structure of the taking of turns. As Stivers et al. (2009) show, the timing of questions and answers in all languages studied for this, including $\frac{1}{4}$ khoe Haillom, support the turn-taking system. There is no evidence for a larger amount of overlap or more meaningful, longer silences. What is considered a "normal" length for a pause is language dependent. #Ākhoe Haillom shows overall longer pauses between turns in comparison to a "fast" language such as Japanese for example. However, a silence does not become meaningful (for example showing that a disaffiliative response will be forthcoming) until it exceeds a certain length. Even though in $\neq \bar{A}$ khoe pauses were longer, it was still the case that pauses preceding disaffiliative answers were longer than pauses preceding affiliative answers. With respect to the seeming lack of responses in $+\bar{A}$ khoe, as well as the low number of pursuits of unanswered questions, these can be explained by a cultural difference between speakers of $\neq \bar{A}$ khoe Haillom and others. $\neq \bar{A}$ khoe speakers' preference not to put conversational partners under pressure causes speakers to not select a next speaker, which would have exerted pressure for an answer. This behaviour might well be due to speakers' concerns for an individual's independence, as put forward by Sugawara and Kitamura. For all that, it is not the fact that the speakers are hunter-gatherers, or have an egalitarian lifestyle, that directly causes questions to remain unanswered. It is the manner in which these speakers pose the questions that makes it possible not to answer questions. In order to formulate a question, speakers have an array of grammatical and interactional features at their disposal, for example: the use of question words, question tags, intonation, inversion and the option of selecting a next speaker by the use of address terms or gaze. Speakers of \$Akhoe use the feature next-speaker selection less than speakers of other languages do. This shows that culture does have an influence at the level of utterance structure, but it does not influence the structure of the sequence. The fact that a question does not select a next speaker does not change the fact that a question makes an answer relevant or that affiliative answers are delivered faster than disaffiliative answers, for example. Finally, the distribution of question types is similarly shaped by culture. A reluctance to pose direct questions, or questions that pressure more strongly for an answer, leads to a larger amount of content questions or open questions and almost no requests for confirmation, which are the most restrictive type of polar questions. Thus, for questions, the difference between "hunter-gatherer" and "nonhunter-gatherer" conversation is not on the level of the sequence of utterances but on the level of the structure of the utterances. Speakers have a number of different question types at their disposal, and, in $\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe, speakers have a preference for open questions. The fact that they use them more frequently than the other question types does not change the fundamental structure of a sequence: questions continue to make answers relevant for example, nor does it affect the turn-taking system: e.g., answers should still come "on time". Therefore, the results are not a contradiction to the universality of sequence structure or turn-taking.

[‡]Ākhoe Haillom is the only African language in which the question response system has been studied in this manner. The claims that have previously been made for the distinct conversational styles driven by culture have often been made based on holistic observations rather than on close detailed observation of turn by turn conversation as was done for this thesis. Future work should investigate these distinctions to see whether they are upheld in other African languages or other languages that fall into the hunter-gatherer group once more detailed observation of natural turn-by-turn conversation is done.

The claim made in this thesis is that the culture of the ‡Ākhoe Haillom leads speakers to pose questions in ways that are less coercive and less restrictive of the answerer than speakers of other languages do. The arguments presented in this chapter that support this claim are once again as follows: the data sample of #Ākhoe Haillom question response sequences shows that speakers make more use of open questions than closed questions. This is in contrast to other languages studied for this in which speakers use more closed questions than open questions. It was argued in this chapter that this distinct distribution in +Ākhoe is caused by a preference of the speakers for open questions as these types of questions provide the interactional co-participant with greater freedom in responding. The argument for a speaker preference for open questions was supported by the second argument: the marked dearth of use of requests for confirmation, which are the most restrictive type of closed questions. A third argument in favour of a preference for non-coerciveness presented in this chapter concerns the low levels of responses to questions. In \$Akhoe Haillom a lower amount of responses were found than in most other languages. Since it is always the case that a question makes a response relevant (with certain exceptions such as rhetorical questions) then, in cases where there are less responses, this could mean that there is less pressure on the interactants to respond. Indeed, in #Ākhoe Haillom, a concurring lower level of next speaker selection was found as well as a low number of pursuits of questions. Finally, the fourth argument presented concerns the shared characteristics with other hunter-gatherer languages, namely a lack of uptake, longer silences, and a general concern with speaker freedom.

In the next chapter, request sequences will be discussed from the perspective of politeness and culture, looking specifically at the influence of certain politeness issues and cultural preferences that shape the formation of requesting actions.

4 Requests and other ways of getting what one wants

Bum: "Hey man, can I get a smoke?" Holder: "Hell no, buy your own!" Bum: "Dude, poor cigaretiquette." (Chrisag05. 2008. Urban Dictionary)

The previous chapter (3), dealt with a specific linguistic form: questions, and their functions. The grammatical description: i.e. the different forms in which it is possible to linguistically or grammatically compose a question, was given in section 2.4.4. The different types of actions or speech acts that grammatical interrogatives can be used for were described in section 3.3. In addition, a cultural explanation was given concerning the different distribution of questions in \bar{A} khoe Haillom compared to other languages. In the current chapter, the language will be approached from another perspective. The point of departure will be the speech act or action of requesting. The different linguistic, and in this case also kinetic, forms in which this action can be performed will be illustrated. For a definition of the action as well as a review of request sequences in general, please refer back to section 1.4.3.3.2 in the introduction. The sociological and cultural background that will be referred to in this chapter was introduced in section 1.3 and will only be briefly summarized here.

Request strategies are generally agreed to be influenced by a cultures' politeness dynamics. The two most commonly described practices for posing requests are the use of questions and directives. Some languages commonly use "conventional indirect strategies" of questioning that question the addressee's ability or willingness to perform the request in order to show politeness (Ervin-Tripp, 1981; Le Pair, 1996). Other languages use the imperative to make unmarked requests, showing politeness through the use of utterance internal modifications which are added to the imperative (De Kadt, 1992; Gao, 1999; Hofstede, 1984; House, 2005; Huszcza, 2005; Rue & Zhang, 2008; Song, 1994; Wierzbicka, 1985). Many request studies focus mainly on politeness that is motivated by a difference in the social status of the speakers (see amongst others Blum-Kulka, House, & Kasper (1989); Blum-Kulka & Olshtain (1984); Byon (2006); De Kadt (1992); Félix-Brasdefer (2009); Kasanga (2006); Le Pair (1996); Lee (2005); Ogiermann (2009); Rue & Zhang (2008); Sukarsono, Soebroto, & Nurkamto (2013); Upadhyay (2003)). However, the form of a request or directive can be based on the relationship between the speaker and the addressee as well as on the speaker's perception of the entitlement or contingency of their request (Curl & Drew, 2008). Yet, politeness due to social settings or contingency and entitlement can only be an issue if requests are seen within the culture as face-threatening acts (Nwoye, 1992; Obeng, 1999). As the speakers of $\frac{1}{A}$ hove Haillom have an egalitarian society, it is expected that concerns for

this type of social hierarchy based politeness will not be reflected in $\pm \bar{A}$ khoe request practices, since in situations where everyone is equal there should be no need to be especially polite to anyone. Alternatively, if there is variety in the forms of requests, this variety must be doing something other than catering to social hierarchy based politeness issues. Furthermore, in $\pm \bar{A}$ khoe Haillom society, making requests and offers potentially entails incurring a debt for one of the parties. At the same time, there is a culture of demand-sharing in general as well as obligatory sharing between specific members of the society. This would imply that requests are ordinarily direct if they are needed at all. These aspects, when taken together seem somewhat contradictory. Nevertheless, it will be shown that it is indeed the case that the egalitarian cultural setting of the speakers leads to very specific request practices in which politeness issues are based on concerns other than social hierarchy based politeness.

The aim in this chapter is once again to highlight the effect of the cultural and sociological preferences of +Ākhoe Haillom speakers on their language use. This influence will be shown to be visibly present but not directly influencing the interactional structure of the speakers. The preference for non-coerciveness will be shown to be present in requests too, although harder to detect in the first instance due to the direct nature of unmarked requests. The specific object of attention will be the interplay of politeness, contingency and society type with requests. In the case of requests, interactants have many ways of securing objects and services in the course of an ongoing interaction. These ways vary from simply taking an object, to telling or asking another person to provide the object or service, to using non-verbal communication, for example gestures, to obtain the provision of an object or service from another person. This chapter will be concerned with the more standard notion of requesting. The term direct request will be used to mean any utterance in which the requester's wishes are explicitly stated. The term indirect request will be used to refer to utterances in which the requester's wishes are not explicitly stated but may be inferred. The next chapter, Chapter 5, will discuss the $\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe specific action type called *‡gona*, which is related to requesting but often involves the interactants' physical positioning as a method of communicating. Although aspects of the action of requesting have been examined in particular languages, it remains undescribed in $\bar{+}Akhoe Haillom and undescribed as a larger class of action encompassing$ non-verbal communication.

4.1.1 Language predictions based on culture

The speech act of requests, asking someone to give something or do something for one, is another area (similar to questions) in which, in \bar{A} khoe Haillom, one can expect the culture of the speakers to influence the form of the language. As was explained in section 1.3, \bar{A} khoe Haillom speakers have an egalitarian, semi-nomadic, hunting-gathering, demand-share society (Widlok, 1994, 1999a). Thus, their society has little to no hierarchy that would lead one to expect that requesting sequences would not be restricted by issues of social politeness, and that there would thus not be much need for indirectness in requests. Nevertheless, as wil be shown in section 4.3, pre-requests do occur. Their use will be explained in section 4.6.4. The \bar{A} khoe Haillom have a semi-nomadic, hunting-gathering lifestyle (Widlok, 1994, 1999a). They do not have many possessions and what possessions they do have are generally shared. One would predict that in such a society requesting objects would

not be as face threatening as requests would be in societies with more individually owned possessions. The $\pm\bar{A}$ khoe also have a demand-share culture (Peterson, 1993; Widlok, 1999a). This might imply that doing a request in the form of a direct demand is the unmarked way of requesting. Furthermore, sharing is the moral prerequisite for those people who live in the same settlement (Widlok, 1994, 1999a). This in turn would imply that a request should not even be necessary were it not for the fact that community members do try to avoid having to share if they can get away with it. A further aspect important in $\pm\bar{A}$ khoe Haillom society is the concept of free goods. In section 1.3 it was explained that free goods are those goods which are available freely to everyone, things anyone may ask for without causing a debt (Goffman, 1967). Free goods will not necessitate the same level of politeness as non-free goods. Which goods are considered free is dependent on the situation and the culture.

The important question at this point is how all these cultural characteristics influence the practice of requesting in natural conversation. As was shown in section 4.3, there is a possibility that requests are a face-threatening action so one would expect to see speakers orient to this in some manner. The egalitarianism would predict less need for politeness in order to save face with respect to social hierarchies. The mobility with its influence on possession, or a lack thereof, as well as the demand-sharing nature of the culture would predict that requests for goods would not be as face threatening as they might be in other cultures. One would predict that requests for free goods would be the most unproblematic request types, whereas requests for actions would in all likelihood be the most face threatening.

4.1.2 Domain of inquiry

As has become clear from the preceding sections, interactants rely on many interrelated issues and actions when performing requests in order to secure goods and services. Issues concerning the society and culture of the speakers as well as the actions speakers use: taking, requesting and directing are among them. In this chapter, these actions (taking, requesting, directing, etc.) will be viewed as not wholly separable because 1) an individual will sometimes shift from one action to another in the pursuit of the goods or services s/he seeks, and 2) these actions are reasonably viewed as alternatives to one another. 3) The third reason concerns the demarcation of the domain of these actions. This may simply be an artefact of English, which separates these actions as specific speech-acts. Although some languages have a categorization that distinguishes between requesting and asking for example, another language may not.

Overall, this chapter will look at how interactants secure the goods and services they want. This "category" will include requests, directives and non-verbal communicative behaviour. The data will illustrate that certain forms of communicative behaviour should be categorized together because they are all geared towards achieving the same thing: the procurement of goods and services. Requests are a form of behaviour with which crucially the interactants try to enlist someone else to help them achieve what they want. In the forms of behaviour that will be studied, it is irrelevant whether the interactants achieve their goals by themselves or through someone else. It is the procurement itself that is the main issue. Arguably, the easiest manner in which an interactant obtains

what they want is achieved without communication at all by just taking what they want. But in the cases where this is not possible for whatever reason (the interactants are physically not able to take or reach the object they want, or are not entitled to take it, or they lack information on its location etc.), then the interactants need to enter into communication with others, verbally or non-verbally. This communication can be in the form of the speech-act of request, directives or in the form of gestures and other non-verbal communication.

4.2 The data

The data used in this chapter to investigate the verbal requests is over all the same data that was used in chapter 3 on questions. Two of the task-based conversations were not included as the task-based conversations hardly yielded any request sequences. A total number of 106 requests were identified. The non-verbal requests investigated in this chapter were much more infrequent, only 10 occurred in the data sample used. In order to augment the collection of non-verbal requests, more were collected from video recordings throughout the $+\bar{A}$ khoe Haillom corpus that contained spontaneous, natural conversation. Requests for information are not included in this chapter; they were dealt with in the previous chapter. As almost any statement could be a veiled request for information, only requests for goods and actions are included here.

4.3 Requests in *\Frac{\Frac{1}{4}}{A}khoe Haillom*

In section 1.4.3.3.2, some of the issues of the sequential organisation of request sequences in general were discussed. This will be very briefly recapitulated here. The action of requesting is generally analysable as a First Pair Part (FPP) of a pair of turns (Schegloff, 2007). A request always makes a response relevant, the SPP. It specifically makes a response relevant that clarifies whether the request will be granted or denied. This response can either come in the form of a granting or in the form of a denial or rejection of the request. Requests are granted simply and without delay. Requests that are rejected typically include prefaces (e.g. 'uh' and 'well'), accounts and declinations (Davidson, 1984; Heritage, 1984: 266-267). The frequent use of accounts in requests is an attempt by the speaker to show that the request is reasonable (Goodwin & Heritage, 1990; Lindström, 2005; Schegloff, 2007). Requests can pose a threat to a person's face (Brown & Levinson, 1978b) and this is one of the reasons request sequences have often been analysed as dispreferred actions when compared to offer sequences (Levinson, 1983; Schegloff, 2007) although, for an alternative account, see Kendrick and Drew (2014). Requests can be delayed in the hope that an offer will be made instead (Schegloff, 2007). Moreover, speakers can give a "pre-signal", a pre, before performing the actual request in order to avoid potential face loss to either party (Sacks, 1992b).

One of the recurring themes in the sequential organisation of requests is the potentially face-threatening nature of requests and speakers' orientation to that. Please note that in this chapter, the point of interest lies not with whether requests are dispreferred when compared to offers, but that requests can be dispreferred actions or can be perceived as face threatening regardless of the position of offers. The current section and the following section in this chapter will elucidate request sequences in $\frac{1}{4}$ khoe Haillom. The discussion regarding the issue of

the face-threatening nature of requests makes it necessary to ascertain how requests in $\pm \bar{A}$ khoe are seen by their recipients. Are they regarded as being face threatening or not?

To start, it was reported that the existence of accounts, pre-requests and the preference for offers all point towards requests not being a preferred sequence type. The presence of these practices would be evidence for the argument that requests are face-threatening actions. Example (246) shows a request that includes an account in $\pm \bar{A}$ khoe Haillom.

(246)

1	Ma:	Ap	sē-e	5	0	au	te	re	i	ta	//ā-sen.
		name	soap-3	sg.c 1	PL.F	let.so.share	1sg.obj	RE	CONJ	1sg	wash-RECP
		'Ap, giv	e me so	ap so t	that I	can wash my	self.'				
2	Ap:	Tita ge	hîna	ū	tam	na hâ =					
		1SG DE	CL UNK	take	NEC	G PRF					
3		= hā-s		ge	ti-s-	-a	ūhâ				
		HORT-	2SG.F	DECL	POS	s.1sg-3sg.f-a	have				
		'I have	not take	n, you	shou	ld have mine.	' (Hreq00	3006) (Gas_	yard	A)

Speaker Ma asks Ap to give her the soap "*Ap sē-e so au te re,*" 'Ap, give me soap,' and follows this up with an account for wanting the soap "*i ta llāsen,*" 'so that I can wash myself.' In this case, the request is not successful.

Pre-requests are also present in the $\pm\bar{A}$ khoe data, although they do not occur as frequently as the accounts do. The following is an example of a failed pre-request.

(247)

1	Ap:	Kara-s-a kha,
		bead-3sg.f-A Q
		'And what about the beads?'
2	Ma:	Ēti kara-s-a nai,
		EXL bead-3SG.F-A UNK
		'ĒTI it's beads.'
3	Ap:	((steps forward and [holds out her hand]))
4	Su:	[((looks up, looks down))]
5	Su:	((passes a string of beads to Ap)) (Hreq002212) (Ga_beads_2)

Speaker Ap has just come to the hearth place where a number of women are sitting together beading necklaces. Ap asks *"Karasa kha?"* which roughly translates as 'And what about the beads?' (see section 2.4.4.2.2 on sentence final question particle *kha*) This is a pre-request that eventually fails. In response to Ap's utterance, speaker Ma does not initiate an offer but replies, *"Ēti karasa nai!"* 'Ēti it's beads!' This response by Ma looks as if it is treating Ap utterance as merely a noticing. Yet after this, as her pre-request has not resulted in an offer,

Ap steps forward and holds out her hand to make her request for beads more clearly. In response to this, one of the women beading passes over a string of beads to Ap. When this sequence is compared to the pre-requests shown in examples (11) and (12) in section 1.4.3.3.2, the similarities should become obvious. In all three cases, a noticing is used to signal that a request might be imminent: "What are those, cigars?" and "What about those beads?" In the first example (11), the noticing is responded to with the offer "You want one?" making an overt request unnecessary. But in the case of examples (12) and (247), the noticing is treated merely as a noticing by the recipient, which then brings about the overt request in the next turn: "Lemme have a cigar," and 'holding out her hand'.

The last factor that can point towards a dispreference for requests is a preference for offers. However, in the $\pm\bar{A}$ khoe data, offers are very rare. Offers do occur as physical offers of objects. Verbal offers of behaviour or action are rare, and about half of those that do occur should be considered requests in disguise. The following example illustrates this.

(248)

1	Xo:	Nētiko		sū-s-	а	pā-i			ха	/oa,	
		this.mu	ch	pot-3	SG.F-A	porr	idge-3sG	i.C	with	n full	
2		= hâsa	1	habu	si		i	tsi		nî?	
		ADDI	r e	at.up	2sg	.F.OBJ	3sg.c	280	G.C	FUT	
		'This p	ot so	full	with po	orridge,	, you, wi	ll ye	ou ea	t it all	up?
3		(2.0)									
4		Hā	ta	≠û	hui	tsi					
		HORT	1sg	eat	help	2sg.c					
		'Let me	e help	o you	eat.' (Hreq00	02324) (0	Ga_t	beads	_2:Xo)

These sentences were uttered by a young girl, Xo, about seven years of age, while she was staring down at a pot filled with porridge. Her first utterance is in the shape of a question but is interpretable as an indirect request. All children in this community are severely undernourished and continuously hungry. The girl's aim is to eat the porridge. By asking the first question, which can be considered an indirect request as well as a pre-request, she opens up the possibility of receiving an offer. However, as she does not get a response from anyone, she follows it up with her own, not very altruistic, offer "Let me help you eat." Even though this utterance resembles an offer, it is still geared towards achieving her own goals: obtaining permission to eat the porridge.

About half of the offers that occur in the data function in a similar manner: they resemble offers but are actually used to attempt to achieve the speaker's goals. They are not used to pre-empt a conversational partner from having to make a request. Thus, these types of offers cannot be said to show that requests are dispreferred. In addition, they do not occur frequently enough to be considered an unmarked form of indirect requests.

Despite a lack of offers in $\frac{1}{4}$ khoe, accounts and pre-requests do occur. The mere occurrence of accounts with requests and the occurrence of pre-requests show that (some) requests are perceived as potentially problematic

by speakers. A society in which requests were not a threat to one's face would make these actions superfluous. The reason for the existence of these accounts, the indirectness and the disguising of requests will be discussed in section 4.6 and these practices will be argued to be linked to the social and cultural preference and the preference for non-coerciveness of the $\pm\bar{A}$ khoe Haillom society.

4.3.1 Sequence organization in *\Frac{\Frac{1}{4}}{A}khoe* Haillom

In this section, the previously described sequence organization of requests in general (see section 1.4.3.3.2) will be compared with the sequence organization of requests in $\pm\bar{A}$ khoe Haillom in particular.

As in the general description, in $\#\bar{A}$ khoe requests are also FPPs that require a response, the SPPs. However, what is different in the $\#\bar{A}$ khoe data is that the response, the SPP, is usually not verbal. The response is usually the request recipient's compliance to the request, or the non-compliance. In other words, the response is the actual performance of the requested action. If a speaker requests a cup of water, the response is the actual bringing of the cup of water by the recipient of the request. The vast majority of requests in the $\#\bar{A}$ khoe data collection are concerned with the here and now. These types of requests are called immediate requests or immediate-action requests (Schegloff, 2007: 94). In $\#\bar{A}$ khoe, the response to these requests is usually the direct performance of the request for an action to be performed in the future and thus require a verbal response to make clear whether the request will be granted or denied. These types of requests are called remote or deferred requests or deferred-action requests (Houtkoop-Steenstra, 1987; Lindström, 1997; Schegloff, 2007: 94).

The first example below, example (249), shows an instance of an immediate request.

(249)

 Ga: Mā te ta aibe ‡gae ti /hō give 1sG.OBJ 1sG first smoke POSS.1sG friend 'Give me so that I first smoke my friend.'
 Ly: ((holds out pipe to Ga)) (Hreq002207) (Ga_beads_2)

Speaker Ga asks speaker Ly, who has just lit a pipe, to give her the pipe to smoke. Speaker Ly's response, i.e. her SPP, is to pass the pipe to Ga. The response is not delayed. It is shown in the pictures below. Speaker Ga is the woman in the back on the left, and speaker Ly is the woman partially hidden in the back on the right. In the first still Ga utters her request, and in the second still Ly holds out the pipe to Ga.



Figure 4-1: An immediate request and response.

The next example, example (250), shows an example of a deferred request.

(250)	Ga:	Sa	!gâ-s		ga)	lae	hâ	nape	ga =
		POSS.2SG	younger.si	oling-3s	G.F RE	ECPST	sick	PRF	greet	COND
		= te	hūga	ta go)	mû	lasa	!khai-	si	
		1sg.obj	long.ago	1sg ri	ECPST	see	new	place-	3SG.F.A	in
		'Your siste	er has been	sick, yo	u should	d greet	her fo	or me, I	saw he	er new place long ago.
		(Hreq0030	19) (Gas_ya	rdA)						

In this example, speaker Ga requests that her conversational partner greet his sister for her. The sister is not present at the time so if the request is complied with, this will be at a later point in time. Ordinarily, one would expect this type of a request to receive a response that makes it clear whether or not the request will be complied with in the future, but the three examples in the data collection of this type of request in $\frac{1}{4}$ Akhoe do not receive any response. In this manner, they are treated the same way by the recipients as the immediate requests are, as these also hardly ever receive a verbal response.

The FPP that is a request can include an account, as was shown previously in section 4.3. Below is another example of a request that includes an account.

(251) \bar{U} re lgôa-b-a aibe lkham aihe re ta ra ge child-3SG.M-A first urinate take RE RE 1SG first prog 3sg.c DECL 'Take the child, I am going to the toilet first.' (Hreq003008) (Gas_yardA:Ap)

In this example, one woman requests another woman to hold the child she has been holding " \overline{U} re /gôaba," 'take the child.' She follows this up with "aibe /kham re ta aibe ra i ge," 'I am going to the toilet first.' This addition, the account, is not strictly necessary for the request. However, it does explain to the recipient of the request why she is being asked to hold the child, and it also communicates that the recipient probably will not be left holding the child interminably but that the requester will in all likelihood take the child back after finishing with her toilet visit. In this manner, this account should make a granting of the request more likely.

In $\pm \bar{A}$ khoe, if a request is complied with, this is done simply and straight away, without any delay, as is shown in example (252).

(252)

- 1 SS: !Khō hā re //nāpa etsē hold come RE DEM EXL 'Come and hold there ETSĒ.'
- 2 *YB: ((takes hold of the wire)) (Handcraft_3)*

Speaker SS utters the request that speaker YB should come and hold the wire "!*Khō hā re ||nāpa etsē*." YB complies with the request straight away, without any delay, taking hold of the wire.

If the recipient of the request does not wish to comply with the request, the rejection is delivered with delays, prefaces (e.g. 'uh' and 'well'), accounts and declinations. This is of course only the case for the requests that receive a verbal response. For $\frac{1}{4}$ khoe, this is shown in example (253) in which speaker SN requests tobacco but the recipient Es is unwilling to comply with his request.

(253)

1	SN:	Tabaka-e	si	hau	nēba	tī-e,	
		tobacco-3SG.C.A	come	bring	DEM	do-u	JNK
		'Bring the tobacc	o here.'				
2		(0.5)					
3	Es:	Mapa.					
		Q					
		'Where?'					
4	SN:	//Nā (.) nē (.)	pakkie-s	s (.) //h	ō gar	a-b-a.	
		DEM DEM	packet-3	SG.F ba	g big	-3sg.1	M-A
		'That (.) there (.)	a packe	t (.) a bi	g bag f	`ull.'	
5	Es:	Ētse sa	ôa-n-a		SÎ	re	0
		EXL POSS.2SG	child-3	PL.C-A	send	RE	EXL
		'ETSE, send your	children	, oh'	(St	tate h	ospital)

In this example, speaker SN, an elderly man, asks speaker Es, a young woman, to bring him the tobacco "*Tabaka-e si hau nēba tī-e*," 'Bring the tobacco here.' He is performing a request. Following his request is a short insert expansion from lines 2 to 4, in which speaker Es initiates a repair with her question for clarification "*Mapa?*" 'Where?' Before Es is prepared to grant or reject SN's request, she wants to know where the tobacco is. Before speaker Es initiates the repair, there is a pause of 0.5 seconds; this can be interpreted as the first

indication that her response will not be the preferred type of response, i.e. a granting of the request. In line 4, speaker SN delivers the required information by giving the repair "// $N\bar{a}$ (.) $n\bar{e}$ (.) pakkies (.) // $h\bar{o}$ garaba, " 'That (.) there (.) a packet (.) a big bag full.' Now, in line 5, Es denies the request by issuing a counter request. She starts her utterance with the exclamation *ētse*, this is an example of the preface that can be used when declining requests. Es follows this with the counter request "sa ôana sî re," 'send your children'. One of SN's own sons is present during this conversation, and with this counter request, Es is showing that in her opinion SN should have directed the request at his own son and not at her. This example shows some of the characteristics that can be used to reject a request: delays, prefaces and counter requests.

4.4 An overview of request practices

In this section, the different types of requests interactants rely on will be discussed. Each of the different practices used to secure objects and services will be described in turn. The interactants in the \bar{A} khoe Haillom video data exhibit many different ways of getting what they want. These many strategies range from verbal strategies such as direct and indirect requests, to non-verbal strategies such as "give me" gestures. These strategies are all communicative: the wanter communicates to the possessor what they want or just THAT they want. In addition to this, there is also a non-communicative strategy for interactants to get what they want, namely just taking whatever they want.

The strategies are structured according to their level of perceived entitlement. With perceived entitlement, the extent to which the wanter thinks they have the right to obtain what they want is meant. If you have the right to something, you can just take it without there being any reprimands to your action. In other words, if you have the right to something, there is no need to ask for it. On the other hand, those things to which you do not have a right, to which you are not entitled; these things one cannot just take without asking. Besides taking, there are many other practices that speakers can make use of in order to obtain what they want. Besides taking, all the other practices are communicative whether they are verbal or non-verbal. The non-verbal strategies involve gestures. The discussion of the various strategies used by interactants to procure the objects they want will be started with the most direct strategies, used when an interactant is entitled to something. These are the imperatives and the non-verbal gestures. Following on from most direct strategies will be those strategies that are more indirect and that are used as an interactant's entitlement becomes progressively less. These practices include hortatives, questions and declaratives.

At the end of this section, we will return to the implications of the request functions for the argument that \bar{A} khoe Haillom speakers are concerned with the non-coerciveness of their utterances.

4.4.1 Taking: non-communicative

If you want a concrete object, you could just take it, even without asking. If you are entitled to the thing you take without asking, it is unlikely that any repercussions will follow. If, on the other hand you are not entitled to what you are taking, or if other people present perceive you not to be entitled to it, they will probably reprimand you for taking the thing without asking. In $\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe society, it is of course also possible to take without asking. There are numerous examples of this in the data. People take food, women take pots away to be washed, people take cups to get something to drink, etc. When the person is entitled to the thing they are taking, these instances are so unremarkable (possibly due to their non-communicative nature) that they usually pass unnoticed.

To illustrate, consider the video session in which four young men are involved in the building of model cars using wire and a pair of pliers. About 10 minutes into the video, RS is using the pliers. When he finishes with them, he puts them down on the ground in between him and SS, see Figure 4-2. Less than a minute later SS takes up the pliers and uses them. SS does not ask for permission, and his action is not commented upon at all.



Figure 4-2: Taking the pliers.

In the next example, two women, Ga and Su, are beading when a third woman Ma comes to join them, see Figure 4-3. She sits down on the ground next to a tobacco tin, takes it, and shakes it to check if it contains anything. Then she opens it and proceeds to use the tobacco to fill a pipe. The conversation that is going on while she performs these physical actions concerns a completely different topic; it concerns a fight that has occurred in the past. Only much later, when Ma has left the group of beading women and has gone to sit by the

cooking fire in order to light the pipe, does anyone refer to the pipe at all. Su tells Ma to "Smoke, and bring the pipe, woman."



Figure 4-3: Taking tobacco.

If the taker is not entitled to what she or he is taking, the instances become more noticeable because the taker is often told off. The next case is a non-verbal example of this. It is a typical situation in which a baby wants something it is not allowed to have. This case involves an experiment with two participants and some Lego blocks. The baby sitting next to participant Fr (see Figure 4-4) wants the Lego blocks and tries to reach for them, but Fr, the baby's mother, holds him back with her hand.



Figure 4-4: Taking Lego.

These kinds of cases, in which taking is not successful, are very rare in adult interaction implying that adults know very well when they are entitled to take and when they aren't. In cases in which they may not be entitled to take a thing, people will often pre-empt problems by verbalizing something. An example of this will be given in section 4.6.2. This final example in this section shows the only case in the data in which an adult attempting to take something was not successful. The taker is told off verbally because he is perceived not to be entitled to take. This case comes from the session in which women are beading. In this example (Figure 4-5), the man AR wants to remove (take) an anklet off Su, his partner's ankle. Without saying anything, he reaches over and touches the anklet. As soon as he touches it, Su says, "Hâ-â man tā hî re!" "No man don't do that!'





Figure 4-5: Taking an anklet.

Instances of taking become much more noticeable as soon as they involve some form of communication. This communication usually comes about when there is an issue concerning the takers entitlement to the object, as the above example Figure 4-5 shows.

To summarise, interactants constantly take things. This usually involves no communication, unless there is an issue with entitlement. In these last cases, interactants can be told off after they have taken or attempted to take. Taking is a completely non-communicative way for people to obtain the object they want. If they encounter or anticipate a problem, for example they lack information on the whereabouts of the object, they cannot reach the object, it is not theirs to take, etc., they may need to use a different strategy to get it, and this strategy will need to involve some form of communication. Also, if what an interactant wants is not a concrete object but for example a change of state (less noisy children), or an action or behaviour by someone else (a ride to town), they will need to communicate in order to achieve this. The following sections will discuss just these types of communicative practices interactants use to procure the goods and services they want.

4.4.2 Imperatives

The most common practice interactants use to verbally procure the objects or services they want is through the use of direct requests in the form of imperatives. For grammatical information on imperatives, see 2.3.3.1. The majority of requests, 76% (n=81) in the data sample, are performed using this grammatical form. All forms of imperatives can be used, but the forms using the *re* marker (see 2.3.3.3) are in the majority: 78% (n=64). Six percent (n=5) of the imperatives use an additional politeness marker by way of using the plural PGN marker *go* (see 2.3.3.1), and 16% (n=13) of the imperatives are not additionally marked. The additional marking on the imperatives is related to politeness issues. The imperative is the most direct manner to perform a request.

Example (254) is one of the 15 direct requests without the *re* marker, and example (255) is one of the imperative requests that includes the *re* marker.

(254) I //gam-e au te hā.
CONJ water-3SG.C.A let.so.share 1SG.OBJ come
'And come and bring me water.' (Hreq002203) (Ga_beads:Su)

(255) //Gam-e mā te hā re.
water-3SG.C.A give 1SG.OBJ come RE
'Come and give me water.' (Hreq002204) (Ga_beads:Su)

The imperatives that include the plural personal pronoun PGN marker *go* are also used to perform requests. Example (256) is an example of this.

(256) Eso sē-ro-e so nēba au te go.
EXL soap-DIM-3SG.C 2PL.F DEM let.so.share 1SG.OBJ GO
'ESO, you give me a little soap here.' (Hreq003022) (Gas_yardA:Th)

The most direct manner to perform a request is by using an imperative. Requests in the form of imperatives make up the majority, 76%, of all requests in the data sample. Some are additionally marked for politeness. Sections 4.6 and on will provide more information concerning the reasons for the use of politeness. In the next section, another almost equally direct manner of performing requests will be discussed: the use of gestures to perform non-verbal requests.

4.4.3 Gestures: non-verbal direct requests

Direct requests are often performed with an imperative, but they can also be performed without a verbal component, for example with only a gesture. Given that these requests can be non-verbal, the analysis of the data in this chapter will deviate somewhat from standard conversation analysis practices because non-verbal communication will be taken to be part of the turn-taking system. For the remainder of this work, physical communicative behaviour such as gestures, body stance, nodding, etc. will be taken to be able to constitute turns. For example, instead of saying, "Give it to me," an interactant can merely hold out his or her hand without speaking and that will be analysed as a turn, namely a first pair part request. Traditionally, these physical behaviours have not always been analysed as such in CA because the field started out analysing audio recordings of phone conversations in which physical behaviour was not available. The theory of turn-taking that was thus developed was developed for speech only. Nevertheless, the position taken in this work is that physical communicative behaviour, when it occurs without speech, does not pose a problem for the turn-taking theory as it was developed. This and the following chapter will show repeated examples of this.

The gestures used in requesting that are not accompanied by speech are not iconic or representational gestures. They are nonetheless often ritualized gestures that are signals (Halina, Rossano, & Tomasello, 2013). There is not a single gesture that means "give me what you've got" or "give me X". The gestures that interactants use when requesting are physical initiations of the action that is needed to get them what they want. Physical behaviour used in communication can be analysed as consisting of pair parts in the same way talk can. Interactant A performs a turn which requires a responding turn from interactant B. This can be seen nicely in the following example in which some young men are making wire cars. Speaker RS wants the pliers lying at SS's feet and which SS is holding. RS chooses not to take the pliers by himself even though he could reach them if he lent forward on his knees. Instead, RS decides to communicate his intentions to SS, who is closer to the pliers, using a gesture, see Figure 4-6.



Figure 4-6: A gestural request for pliers.

RS stretches out his arm and holds out his hand in the direction of SS and the pliers (still 2 in Figure 4-6). This turn by RS requires a turn in response from SS, who does indeed respond and does so by handing the pliers to RS.

Another example is shown in Figure 4-7. Here, the woman Ga wants the pipe that El is smoking.



Figure 4-7: A gestural request for a pipe.

Speaker Ga positions her hand up in front of her chest with her hand shaped so that it is optimized for receiving a pipe which needs to be held in a certain fashion to prevent the tobacco from falling out. This is not an iconic gesture denoting a pipe. Ga holds her hand there for one second before dropping the gesture. Nineteen seconds later, she repeats the gesture, this time holding the gesture for seven seconds. El takes a last pull at the pipe and then responds to Ga's 'second'-like receiving gesture, here functioning as a request, by putting the pipe in Ga's hand.

The last example, shown in Figure 4-8, concerns a woman requesting beads from other women who are busy beading.





Figure 4-8: A gestural request for beads.

In this example, the woman Ap has repeatedly asked about the beads that the other women are using. Receiving no response to her questions, she stretches out her arm and holds out her hand towards the woman Su. Su then hands her a string of beads. This is a case where a verbal request is superfluous because everyone present knows that Ap has been talking about the beads and that they are thus logically the things she wants to be handed. At no point in any of the examples that have been presented here is there any verbal reference to the object being requested during the making of the gesture.

These gestures are oriented to as requests by the co-interactants, and as such, they can be pursued. The gestures function as direct requests. Direct requests are not easily ignored. They rely on being easily recognized as requests, and they make the recipient accountable for a response. Indirect requests, for example, can be more easily ignored if they can be taken to be a different kind of action, for example a noticing. The indirect request "It is cold in here," can be interpreted as a noticing and can be responded to as such, ignoring the request. A direct request such as "Close the window," cannot be interpreted as any action other than a request. It also makes the recipient accountable for a response. Imperatives, which were discussed in the previous section, are prime examples of direct requests. Gestures are also direct requests can be. You could pretend more easily not to have seen something because you happened to be looking elsewhere, than not to have heard something. This is shown in the example depicted in Figure 4-9. In this interaction, interactant PS is cutting up meat while smoking a cigarette (in stills 1 and 2, PS has the cigarette in his mouth). He is approached from the left by interactant BP who wants the cigarette.



Figure 4-9: A gestural cigarette request.

BP signals that he wants the cigarette by holding out his hand towards PS. BP holds this posture for 48 seconds. Yet PS passes the cigarette on to the man on his left side instead. BP does not reprimand PS directly for ignoring his request. When PS stands up after having passed on the cigarette, BP loudly and possibly somewhat querulously tells him off for standing up when he should be sitting down for the camera thereby arguably showing his anger indirectly.

Once a requesting gesture has been seen, it is difficult to interpret it as anything other than a request. Reaching out one's hand towards an object in a receiving gesture (all fingers lax as opposed to one finger stretched out in a pointing gesture) is not interpreted by the recipients as a noticing. Note in all the examples above that the hand of the requesters is never shaped in anything that resembles a point that might be used for a noticing. In this sense, these gestures are considered direct requests.

4.4.4 Hortatives

Requests only rarely come in the form of hortatives, a sentence type that is less forceful and direct than an imperative. A hortative is used to try to persuade or encourage someone to do something. For information on hortatives in \bar{A} khoe Haillom, see section 2.3.3.2. Only 4% (n=4) of all the requests in the data sample are hortatives, see 4.7.

The first example of a request in the form of a hortative shows several young men making wire cars when one young man (YB) starts to fiddle with the LCD screen of the camera, drawing the attention of the men being recorded who comment on what he is doing.

(257)											
1	SS:	/Nē	hā	re?	(.)	llnāpa	mû-ts	[<i>ta.</i>]			
		aim	come	RE		DEM	see-2SG.M	1sg			
		'Com	ie and a	im (th	e can	nera) (.)	Do you see	[me]	there?'		
2	KO:							[/]Nē	hā	re	
								aim	come	RE	
								'Com	e and ai	im.'	
3		(0.6)									
4	SS:	((laug	ghs))								
5	SS:	Hā	go	tā	deu	ur-s-a	//khōba	m re			
		HORT	2pl.m	NEG	doc	r-3sg.f-	A open	RE	1		
		'You	(pl) sho	ould n	ot op	en the do	oor.' (door	= LC	D scree	n)	
6		(0.3)									
7	YB:	Etsē	nē d	leur-s	-a	nē	deur-s	hā	-m-a-ts		ge
		EXL	DEM C	loor-3	SG.F-	A DEM	door-3sg.	F HO	RT-2PL.	C-A-2SG.M	DECL
8		nî	tsek								
		FUT	check								
		'ETSĒ	this do	or, yo	u mu	st check	out this do	or.' (H	007014) (Handcraf	t_3)

Lines 1 and 2 contain the comments of some of the young men directed at YB who is fiddling with the video camera during the entire sequence. The young men are telling him to aim the camera well. In lines 3 and 4, the young men are looking towards the camera, watching YB who is still handling the camera. Then, in line 5, SS says, "Hā go tā deursa //khōbam re," 'You (pl) should not open the door.' This is a request in the form of a hortative. With deursa 'door' SS means the foldout LCD screen of the video camera. The request in the hortative form by speaker SS shows a certain level of uncertainty. The camera brings about the uncertainty here. In a sense, the camera is a new thing in the community, and the entitlement issues concerning it have not yet been clarified. It belongs to the researchers. It is generally only handled by the researchers, but none of the researchers are present at the moment. The absence of the researchers is probably the reason why YB takes this moment to have a good look at the camera. In addition, SS is not sure of his entitlement to make this request, evident because he does not use the normal imperative form for his request. SS and his friend RS are the people whom the researchers had asked if they would let themselves be recorded, while YB just happened to walk by later on. So SS may feel responsible for the camera because he is the reason it is there in the first place, but it is not his. Consequently, the presence of the camera and the absence of its owners cause some uncertainty in this case. In this specific incident, SS's request is ignored as can be seen in line 7 of the example. Speaker YB, who has been handling the camera, does the exact opposite of the request. Instead of desisting from fiddling with the LCD monitor he demonstrates a heightened interest in it exclaiming, "*Etsē nē deursa, nē deurs hāmats ge nî tsek,*" 'Etsē, this door, you must check out this door.'

In the next example, (258), the hortative request is delivered as a joke. It is not intended to be taken seriously by the recipients. The speaker EN is a man who comes across a group of women beading and requests to join in the beading.

(258)

1	EN:	A	ta	koma	kara	kara-e		lō	hui	
		HORT	1sg	supposedl	y bead	d-3sg.c.	A b	ead	help	
		'Let m	ie supj	posedly hel	lp with	the bead	ling.'			
2		(1.4)								
3	Ga:	Dō	hui	te	du	hā	re	ani		!khō-he
		bead	help	1sg.obj	2pl.c	come	RE	in.o	rder.to	catch-PASS
		'Come	and h	elp me bea	id and b	e caugh	t (on	film).' (Hrec	1002320) (Ga_beads)

From a distance, EN shouts the request "A ta koma kara-e $d\bar{o}$ hui," 'Let me supposedly help with the beading.' The request is in the form of a hortative, and it contains the word koma 'supposedly', which functions as an evidentiality marker, marking uncertainty about the information one is conveying. In this case, the request is intended as a joke since $\pm\bar{A}$ khoe men do not bead. The use of the hortative and the word koma make it clear that the utterance is not intended as a serious request.

There is one case of the hortative for the third person being used in a request while the third person in question was present. This instance will be treated later together with the indirect requests (see section 4.4.6). If the third person in question is present, these types of utterances should be considered indirect requests.

4.4.5 Interrogatives (indirect requests)

Interrogatives in the shape of content questions as well as polar questions, can be used to perform requests. In $\pm \bar{A}$ khoe, they are always used for indirect requests. There are no examples of alternative questions being used as a request in the data sample, although that may be because alternative question are very rare in natural conversation. Example (259) is a content question that is used as an indirect request.

(259) Mā ge hâ dara-e etsē?
Q DECL exist wire-3SG.C EXL
'Where is the wire ETSĒ?' (Handcraft_3:RS)

This question can be considered a request because it occurs in a sequence in which two men try to get a third man to fetch some wire. The sequence starts with very indirect requests along the lines of "There must be soft

wire," and "There is no soft wire,"¹⁷ which become more direct ("Find and bring the soft one") as the sequence progresses. The addressee is very uncooperative, and after a switch in topic, the request in example (259) is the final attempt to get him to deliver some wire, which is not responded to and thus fails. See an extended version of the sequence in section 4.4.7 or the full sequence in Appendix B.

Example (260) is an example of a polar question that is used to perform a request.

(260)

1	Fr:	Spel-sa	ū	tama-s	hâ?
		pin-3SG.F.A	have	NEG-2SG.F	PRF
		'Don't you l	have the	pin?'	
2	Ce:	Ha-a.			
		'No.' (C	ollect nu	its)	

This in turn can be considered a request because the woman asking the question is busy tying up a child's nappy for which she needs the nappy pin.

4.4.6 Declaratives (indirect requests)

Following are two examples of declaratives used as requests. The first, (261), also occurs in the sequence of conversation in which two young men are trying to get a third to fetch some wire, see section 4.4.7 and the sequence in Appendix B. In this example, it is the explicit stating of an absence that makes this hearable as a request. The addressee is uncooperative throughout, and thus the request remains without a response.

(261) O
 i ge safies dara-e h
 toma CONJ 3SG.C DECL soft wire-3SG.C exist NEG 'And there's no soft wire.' (Handcraft 3:RS)

In the declarative in the first line in (262), the speaker makes a request by way of stating her intentions.

¹⁷ By commenting on the absence of something, one can imply that one wishes for its presence.

(262)1 Nē /hapi-e natsare-s ūhâ ta ai !gû ga = DEM wound-3SG.C.A 1sg hospital-3sg.F have COND to go 2 = ta go mî hâ i ge 1SG RECPST say PRF 3sg.c DECL 'I had said I should take this rash to the hospital.' 3 (0.5)4 A-tsa Tsînstabis !gû ū пē lhapi-i te i-ta HOR-3SG name.of.town go take 1SG.OBJ CONJ-1SG DEM wound-3sG.C 5 di so/ôa he ga ūhâ е POSS medicine UNK COND have UNK 'He should take me to Tsintsabis so that I can get medicine for this rash.' (Gas_yardA:Ga)

The relevant common ground knowledge needed to be able to interpret this as a request is that the hospital is very far away: a day's walk, and that the person being (indirectly) addressed owned a car and was thus someone with the power to make this enterprise much easier. The speaker follows the statement uttered in the first line with a statement using a hortative in the third person. This request is direct in that it is in the form of a hortative but indirect in that it does not address the person who should be fulfilling the request directly even though that person is present. The speaker in example (262) follows up on this hortative with several detailed accounts, lasting approximately a minute, concerning her inability to have gotten to town during the previous days. The recipient of the request remains unresponsive throughout.

There are a few requests using the hortative that are in the third person as shown in the previous example. The following example (263) is another of these cases. It is uttered by the same woman who was the speaker in the previous example. The current example occurs slightly earlier on in the conversation. At the time this utterance is produced, there is only one person present who could conceivably be in the possession of such a luxury item as the one being requested.

(263) *A bi //nāpa /hō-dō-de ba au da hâ* HORT 3SG.M.OBJ DEM sausage-tin-3PL.F.A UNK let.so.share 1PL.C PRF 'Let him share with us those tins of sausage.' (Gas_yardA:Ga)

While producing the utterance, the speaker is not looking at the possessor of the sausages. She is looking at a young man crouching next to her who has just arrived looking for tobacco. The young man responds verbally although his utterance is not intelligible. After his response, the conversation switches to the topic of who beat up who in a fight at the football pitch.

If one frames a request in the form of a third person hortative, e.g. "He should give me cake," while that third person is present, the request is indirect in the sense that the request could have been made directly "You should give me cake." These types of requests are thus more indirect than a hortative request in the second person are.

The indirect strategies used to perform requests that have so far been described; using both interrogatives and declaratives, are verbal.

4.4.7 A sequence of request strategies (pursuits and upgrading)

The previous chapters have described the various forms in which requests occur in \bar{A} khoe Haillom. Requests can be performed using imperatives, hortatives, gestures, interrogatives and declaratives. Requests can be made in a direct and indirect manner, and there is a cline on which imperatives are the most direct type of requests, as well as the most frequent, and declaratives and gestures are the most indirect form a request can take. The following section will describe what happens when the different types of requests are combined.

Speakers often employ a sequence of practices to acquire what they desire. These sequences are built up starting with less direct requests which are made progressively more direct when the desired response is not forthcoming. The following example shows just such a building up of verbal requests and involves the young men making wire cars. A number of requests that occur in this example have already been discussed in the previous sections on interrogative requests and declarative requests. They show the different linguistic forms the same request can take. In the sequence shown in the example below, two of the participants, RS and SS, try to get the third participant, KO, to get some more wire. The wire was provided for them by the language documentation group with the aim of documenting the making of wire cars. Participant KO is known to be the main informant of the documentation team which is probably the reason that the requests are directed at him. The requests start very indirectly, in the form of declaratives stating the lack of wire, and gradually they become more direct as the interactants pursue a response that remains lacking.

(264)

1	KC	D: Hm	î bateri	-s-a	[toa i	i-si	J	/=				
			yes batter	y-3sg.f	-A fi	inish t	JNK-38	SG.F.C)BJ				
		'Hm	, yes, the bat	tery [is	finish	ning,]'	=						
2	RS	5:			[Safies	dara	a-e]					
					S	oft	wire	e-3sg	.C				
					['Soft v	vire.']						
3	KO:	=/asa	bateri-s-a	1	bi		ūhá	ìi	ź	ge.			
		new	battery-3	SG.F-A	3sg	.M.OBJ	hav	e 3s	G.C I	DECL			
		= 'he ł	nas a new ba	ttery.'									
4	(0.4)												
5	SS:	Safies	dara-i	ge	nî	hâ	ti	ta	ge	tita	ra	mî	$ets\bar{e} =$
		soft	wire-3sg.c	DECL	FUT	exist	thus	1sg	DECL	1sg	PROG	say	EXL
		'There	must be a so	ft wire,	I am	saying	g etsē	; =					
6		= nē	[dara-i	ge	!gâi	i-n-a	l	tama]			
		DEM	wire-3sg.c	DECL	goo	d-3pl.	C-A N	NEG					
		= 'this	s [wire is not	good.]	,								

7	RS:	$[\overline{O} I GE SAFIES DARA-E H\hat{A}] TOMA =$
		CONJ 3SG.C DECL soft wire-3SG.C.A exist NEG
		['And there's no soft wire]' =
8		$=E[TS\bar{E}].$
		= 'E[TSĒ]'
9	SS:	[Saf]iri-si etsē i nî kē //nā dara-b-[a] KO,
		soft-3SG.F.OBJ EXL CONJ FUT look DEM wire-3SG.M-A name
		'The [so]ft one ETSE and look for that wi[re] KO.'
10	RS:	[Hē?]
		['Yes?/Right?']
11	KO:	°Hē?°
		'Huh?'
12	SS:	[Saufiri-si]
		soft-3SG.F.OBJ
		['The soft one.']
13	RS:	[Saufiri-s-a] mâpi ī-
		soft-3SG.F-A where be
		['The soft one,] where is it-'
14	RS:	((points))
15	RS:	[Nē-b ge /gui-b-a //goe]
		DEM-3SG.M DECL one-3SG.M-A lie
		['Here one lies.']
16	SS:	[Nē-gu gui dara-ga] hantsa !uri-ga nē ‡hûi-ami =
		DEM-3PL.M similar wire-3PL.M.A UNK white-3PL.M DEM bird.plum.tree-near
		['Here are similar wires,] white ones, near this bird plum tree' =
17		= ai hâ-gu-a nā-gu-a-ts ge nî kē, =
		on exist-3PL.M-A DEM-3PL.MA-2SG.M DECL FUT look
		= 'they are, you must look for it,' =
18		= ani tsi //nā sor dara-e nî hō.
		in.order.to 2SG.M.OBJ DEM type wire-3SG.C.A FUT find
		= 'so that you find that type of wire.'
19		(0.4)
20		Ani //nā dara-b-a ‡gan
		in.order.to DEM wire-3SG.M-A ask.for
		'In order to ask for that wire.'
21	KO:	Hâ mâpa i e?
		yes where 3sg.c unk
		'Yes, where is it?' (Handcraft_3)

In line 2, RS says, "Soft wire," while in overlap with KO utterance in line 1 and while looking directly at KO. During KO's continued utterance in line 3 and the silence in line 4, RS keeps his gaze focused on KO. In lines 5 and 6, SS picks up RS's turn and states that there should be soft wire, and that the wire they have is no good. While uttering this statement, SS gazes at RS, then he gazes away at the ground and at the end of his turn, he is focused on RS again. This turn by SS is a request, albeit a very indirect one. SS, by explicitly stating that something should be present, "There must be soft wire," is calling attention to a problem. This makes a remedying of the problem relevant: namely providing soft wire. It is possible to argue that SS selects RS as a recipient for his request using his gaze, yet RS himself is continuously gazing at KO throughout the whole of SS's turn (see stills 1-2 in Figure 4-10). In line 7, RS takes up SS's utterance stating in overlap with SS that there is no soft wire. Again, RS's utterance is a request; he is also drawing attention to a problem which makes a solving of the problem relevant. RS clearly selects KO as a next speaker by looking directly at KO throughout the whole turn while raising his voice. KO does not respond, and in line 9, SS also focuses his gaze on KO and now upgrades his indirect request to a direct one using an imperative "Look for that wire," and adds an address term in the form of the recipient's name (still 3) in order to pursue a response from KO.



Figure 4-10: An indirect wire request.

In line 11, KO gives a minimal acknowledgement that he realizes that a response is expected from him, but simultaneously, he displays a lack of understanding by giving his response in the form of the repair initiator 'Huh?' A speaker can initiate a repair as a manner of displaying disagreement (Schegloff, 2007), so it is left unclear as to whether KO really does not understand or is merely displaying a lack of understanding as a manner to show his disinclination to comply with the request. At this point RS and SS launch into their repairs (lines 12-

13). Although they do repeat and modify the trouble source and thus make a response to the original request relevant, the required response by KO is still not forthcoming. In lines 15-18, RS and SS then give an explanation about the kind of wire they have been talking about and its whereabouts. These turns again ought to occasion a response from KO but it again remains absent. This interaction eventually culminates in a series of direct requests by SS in lines 17-20 that basically describe to the recipient the actions required of him: 'there you must look [...] so that you can find [...] so that you can ask [...]'.

To summarize, this example shows a pursuit for a response by an upgrading of the requests. The sequence starts with a very indirect request in lines 5 and 6, which merely states the absence of something which should be present. The next request in line 7 is still an indirect request once again stating the absence of a thing, but in this case, the manner in which it is produced makes a response more relevant because it uses persistent eye gaze and a raising of the voice (Stivers & Rossano, 2010). This is followed by a direct request in line 9 in a command form and using gaze and an address term to select the recipient.

The majority of requests in ‡Ākhoe are performed using imperatives. That means they are very direct, and it seems that a direct request is the "normal" way of doing things in $\pm \bar{A}$ khoe (see section 4.7). The example shown above is markedly different because it starts so indirectly. The explanation for this is that the request for soft wire entails an enormous imposition. Of all the requests in the data sample, this request has the most farreaching consequences. A study by Curl and Drew (2008) showed that speakers orient to different levels of imposition when forming requests, and this is the case in this example too. The wire that the young men are working with was given to them by the researchers. If the addressee of the request were to accept the request, he would have to approach the researchers in order to obtain the specific wire. The addressee happens to be a shy man and at the time of the recording, was still very reticent in his interactions with the researchers. In this specific instance, the researcher who needed to be asked for the wire had gone off to look for a battery at the farm manager's house ("He is going to the Boer's house," see line 30 in Appendix B). The recipient of the request is told he must follow the researcher and ask for the wire (lines 34 and 44 in Appendix B). This adds another set of problems to the initial request because the addressee would now have to go to the farm manager's house, and it was generally known that the farm manager did not appreciate being bothered at his home, i.e. he was liable to become angry with the petitioner. In addition to this, the farm manager's house was guarded by a whole battalion of potentially aggressive dogs that one would somehow have to get past. The men uttering the request for wire doubtlessly knew the implications their request entailed, and this is precisely the reason they started so carefully and indirectly. All the other requests in the data sample are requests concerned with things much more easily accomplished: "Bring me water," "Hold this for me," "Fix it," etc. Usually the requests only involve the requester and requestee. They do not necessitate the requestee having to go off and involving someone else in order to fulfil the request. The requests in the soft wire example are the only requests in this data sample that have such a high level of imposition.

The unusually high level of imposition that is entailed in the request for a softer wire accounts for the speaker's indirect manner in posing the request despite the norm of the culture being one for directness in requesting. The

subsequent portrayal of incomprehension by the recipient is the reason that the initially very indirect request is upgraded to more direct manners of requests.

4.5 Responses

This section will discuss the responses to the different types of requests, i.e. imperative requests, gestural requests, hortative, interrogative and declarative requests.

Once a request has been made, it makes a response relevant. In the previous chapter on questions, it was shown that not all questions require a response, for example, rhetorical questions do not. Requests on the other hand generally do require a response. Yet 36% of the requests in the data sample do not receive a response.¹⁸ The data sample contains a total of 107 requests. For 38 of these requests it is not clear whether they are responded to or not because the addressee is not visible on the video. In this section, these requests for which the response is unclear will be excluded. The number of requests not responded to, namely 36%, is even higher than the relatively high number of questions more generally that did not receive a response, 24%, as was shown in section 3.6. Sixty-four percent of the requests do receive a response. Just over a half of these are granted, the others do receive a response but are nevertheless not granted.



Figure 4-11: Percentage of requests that are granted, receive a non-granting response and receive no response.

The form of the response, when there is one, is often related to the form of the request itself. Therefore, in the following, each form will be discussed in turn.

¹⁸ Eleven requests that pursue a response after earlier requests failed were included because these requests still make a response relevant. Arguably, these pursuits make a response even more relevant than an initial request. Thus, the fact that a response in these instances was still not forthcoming is even more marked and should not be omitted.

Forty-nine of the requests in the data sample occur in the imperative form, the most direct form. Of these requests, 31 (63%) are responded to, and 18 (37%) requests are not responded to. If a request receives a response, this does not necessarily entail that the request is also granted. Almost half of the requests (n=22, 46%) are granted, while 9 requests do receive a response but are nevertheless not granted. Most of the responses are non-verbal; only 9 responses (19%) include a verbal component. Most of the requests are granted simply by the addressee performing the request that was made. An example of this was shown in section 4.3.1, and it will be repeated here. The example concerns speakers Ga and Ly. Ly has just lit a pipe which Ga requests.

(265)

1	Ga: M	lā i	te	ta	aibe	≠gae	ti	∣hō
	gi	ive	l SG.OBJ	1sg	first	smoke	POSS.1SG	friend
	'Give me so that I first smoke my friend.'							
2	Ly: ((holds	out pipe	to Ga)) (Hre	q00220	7) (Ga_bead	(s_2)

Speaker Ly responds by passing the pipe to Ga, as is shown in the pictures below. In the first still, Ga utters her request and, in the second still, Ly holds out the pipe to Ga.



Figure 4-12: A non-verbal response to a request.

Responses to requests come in the form of grantings or insert sequences that request more information or initiate a repair concerning the request. There are no responses in the form of denials or rejections. Requests are not rejected outright. Instead, if addressees do not want to grant a request, they ignore the requests. None of the imperative requests in this collection is rejected outright.

Three of the four hortative requests in the data receive a verbal response. For one of the hortative requests it was not possible to see whether there was a response. Of the three requests that receive a verbal response, only one request is clearly granted. For the other two it is not clear whether the verbal response also leads to a granting of the request.

Fourteen of the requests in the data sample are in the form of interrogatives. Ten of these receive a verbal response, while four of the interrogative requests are not responded to at all. Only one of the requests is actually
granted. This may be linked to the less direct nature of requests in interrogative form. The verbal responses to the interrogatives not only take the form of repair initiators and requests for more information, but they are also used to answer the question without granting the request. These are cases such as asking someone "Can you pass the salt?" and receiving the answer, "Yes," but not receiving the salt. The following example from the data sample concerns speaker Ga asking for a cigarette in a somewhat indirect manner and receiving a similar response as in the hypothetical "Yes, there is salt" example.

(266)

In the example above, speaker Ga's indirect request in the form of an interrogative for a cigarette *"*/*Ana he bo?"* 'Is there smoke or?' receives an answer to the question: *"*/*Ana he i ra i ge,"* 'There is smoke,' but her request is not granted. She does not actually get a cigarette.

One of the six declarative requests in the data sample receives a response although the request is not granted. One request receives no response, and for four of the six declarative requests it was not possible to determine the presence or absence of a response.

Non-verbal requests are responded to with physical actions only. The gestural requests in the data sample always occur while an interaction that has nothing to do with the request is going on. Therefore, the gestural requests are in all likelihood a manner for the requester to obtain their goal without too overtly verbally interrupting what is going on. The addressees always reciprocate in kind with a non-verbal response. In the data sample, there are 16 non-verbal requests. Nine of these receive a response, six of which grant the request non-verbally. Seven requests do not receive a response.

An example of a non-verbal request that receives a non-verbal response is shown in the following collection of stills. A large number of people (varyingly 10 to 15 throughout the sequence) are gathered in a yard. The middle-aged and elderly men and women are sitting on the ground around the hearth fire drinking tea and/or chatting. One man, BC, who is present but has not been participating in the conversation, gets up and fetches a cup. He returns and stands next to a man drinking tea who has been participating in the conversation: GH. BC places his hand on GH's shoulder to get his attention and holds his empty cup out for GH to see. GH pours some of the tea from his own cup into BC's cup. While he does this, he continues talking to the other people who were participating in the conversation. He does not address BC.



In the example above the whole request sequence is performed without speech. If BC had verbalized his request to GH, this would have had interrupted GH's ongoing conversation. By performing his request gesturally, the conversation partners were free to continue conversing while GH simultaneously fulfilled the request nonverbally.

As will have become clear from the above information on responses to requests, many requests do not receive a response. Despite this seemingly large number, most requesters accept the lack of a response; only few redo the request they made or pursue a response to it. These cases were discussed in section 4.4.7. Imperative requests are most effective in terms of getting one's request granted. In the cases where the requests are responded to, the

form the response takes often depends on the form of the request itself: non-verbal requests receive non-verbal responses, imperative requests usually receive an action as a response, and interrogatives and declaratives generally receive verbal responses.

By way of summarizing the above, Figure 4-14 shows the percentages of requests that receive a response and the percentage of requests granted.



Figure 4-14: A comparison of responses and grantings to different types of requests.

The small amount of requests in the form of interrogatives and declaratives do not allow strong conclusions, more instances will need to be collected in the future.

Ignoring the hortative and declarative requests, it still seems to be the case that using an interrogative is a much more ineffective manner of performing a request than using an imperative or non-verbal strategy is. The likelihood of getting a response is rather high when using an interrogative, but the likelihood of this response granting one's request is very low. An interesting question to ask here is whether it is the linguistic form of the request that drives the response and granting outcomes, or whether speakers select the linguistic form for their request taking into account the likelihood of that request being granted. A few of the possible issues concerned with this question will be looked into in the following section.

4.6 Selection of request practice

As was argued in section 4.4.1, the easiest way to obtain what one wants is simply by taking it. When taking is restricted, when an interactant is not allowed to take or is not able to take the object they desire, they can communicate their wishes using a request. There are a number of strategies an interactant can make use of in

order to do this. These possible strategies were described in section 4.4. There are very many factors influencing which practice an interactant selects. This section will address some of these issues that influence an interactant's strategy selection.

Overall, an interactant's choice of request strategy is dependent on their perceived level of entitlement to make a request (Curl & Drew, 2008). An entitlement is a "right". It is a right that is shaped by the social and moral values of society or culture. In the case of wanting something: either an interactant has the right to it or they do not. If an interactant is totally entitled to something, they take it. If they are not entitled to it, they need to devise some other manner of getting what they want, and this will usually involve communicating some form of a request. There are several factors that feed into entitlement and that shape the level of entitlement that an interactant feels. These are things such as the interactants' social identities, their kinship ties, whether or not they are part of the in-group, the proximity of the interactants to the object that one of them desires, and even the type of product or the characteristics of the product itself that is being requested. These factors that influence whether or not, in the case of requesting, an interactant has the right to achieve their wishes, can be divided into two groups. On the one hand there are the interactant's personal characteristics that influence their level of power, for example their gender, ethnicity or kin relationship, whether they belong to the in-group or are participating in a joint activity, etc. On the other hand, there are the characteristics of the thing or object the interactant wishes to obtain that influence their level of rights to ask for it, for example, whether their desire involves an action or object, is the object a consumable, or are they going to return it, etc. Two issues of each type will be addressed in this section. The extent to which the interactants are part of the same in-group is one of the characteristics of the requester which will be addressed, as well as the requester's social identity, or the identity the requester decides to adopt while making the request. The two characteristics of the object being requested that will be discussed are the proximity of the object to the interactants and the type of object that is being requested.

4.6.1 Proximity

One of the characteristics of the desired object that influences the choice of request made by an interactant in order to obtain the object is proximity. The proximity of the object to the requestee themselves as well as the proximity of the object to other interactants is of influence. If an interactant is entitled to the object they desire and this object is close at hand, interactants will usually simply take the object. This is illustrated in the following example, which shows young men making toy cars using wire and pliers. This example was previously shown in section 4.4.1 and is repeated here. In this example, interactant SS wants the pliers that are on the ground in between him and RS, as can been seen in Figure 4-15. SS takes the pliers without communicating his intentions or wishes to any of the other interactants.



Figure 4-15: Taking pliers

Interactants usually take what they want regardless of the object's position or proximity to another interactant. If the object that an interactant wants to acquire is within someone else's private space, this could theoretically inhibit taking. However, this is not the case for $#\bar{A}$ khoe interactants as the next examples show. In the example shown in Figure 4-16, there is a roll of wire on the ground in between YB's legs. RS wants the wire, and without any communicative reference to his intentions, he reaches over and takes it. His taking is completely successful and not remarked upon at all by YB. After RS has taken the wire, YB eventually helps him unravel it.





Figure 4-16: Taking wire from between legs.

In the example shown in Figure 4-17, the pliers are on RS's lap, which would be clearly within his private space, if that were an issue, yet this is no deterrent for YB, seated next to him, to take the pliers off his lap.



Figure 4-17: Taking pliers off someone's lap.

In the final example, shown in Figure 4-18, RS takes the pliers out of YB's hands, who is busy using them. RS does not communicate his intentions or desire before or after his actions, and YB does not complain, reprimand or resist the taking of the pliers by RS.



Figure 4-18: Taking pliers from someone's hand.

These examples have shown that when the desired object is close enough to the interactant who wants it for him or her to take it, interactants do just that. The proximity of the object to other people does not inhibit taking. Even to the extent that when another person is holding the object, the person who desires it still feels free to take it without making any communicative reference to what they are doing and why they are doing this. Importantly, this is the case when interactants are participating in a joint activity, as will be shown in the next section. The proximity of the desired object to the person who wants it does have an influence when it is not close enough to "conveniently" take. If the object is more conveniently attained by getting someone to give it to you instead of having to move yourself to get it, speakers use a communicative practice to acquire the object instead of taking it by themselves. This is shown in the next case, in Figure 4-19, which is repeated from chapter 4.4.3. Interactant RS wants the pliers that are now next to SS's feet. The pliers are within reach of RS if he were to lean forward, put his knees on the ground and stretch out his arm. However, he does not do this. He uses a gesture to signal to SS that he wants the pliers, and SS then hands them to him.



Figure 4-19: Giving the pliers.

This leads to an aspect of the interactants themselves that influences the choice of request type as opposed to a characteristic of the object that is desired. The aspect in question here is one that in all likelihood also plays a role in the interactants' selection of strategy in the above examples. It is the effect of the interactants belonging to the same in-group and being part of the same activity, namely making a wire car. The effect of this will be discussed in the next section.

4.6.2 The joint activity of the in-group

All the examples in the previous section showed that when interactants are in the same group performing the same activity, they do not verbalize their desire for specific objects they simply take them. The following example will show what happens when an object is desired by someone who is not part of the group that is in possession of the desired object, and when the person who desires an object is also not involved in the activity of that group. In this case, the taking of the object does involve communication. Figure 4-20 below shows a young boy, WS, who approaches the group of men making wire cars.



Figure 4-20: Boy taking the pliers.

WS wants the pliers that these men have been using. As he bends down to take the pliers from the ground between YB's legs he says something. Most of his turn is unfortunately inaudible except for the word *tsange* 'pliers'.

What WS says while he is taking the pliers is not important for the argument being made here. The important thing is that WS uses a communicative practice instead of the uncommunicative taking. The thing that inhibits WS from simply taking the pliers without comment is the fact that he has not been involved in the making of wire cars with the other young men. He is not inhibited by the possibility that the pliers are in YB's physical domain, i.e. between his legs. WS is clearly not part of the "group" and as an outsider is not entitled to take the pliers without any communication. This shows that the extent to which an interactant is part of the group or ongoing activity has an influence on their choice of strategy with respect to obtaining the object they want. Related to this is the influence of the identity of the interactant themselves which will be discussed in the next section.

4.6.3 Social identity

A second aspect of interactants that influences the choice of request type is the social identity of the interactant. This identity influences the request strategy an interactant selects. Not only does the identity of the interactant with respect to their being part of the same activity (as described in section 4.6.2) have an influence on the requesting behaviour, their overall social identity in respect to the other interactants also has an influence. Moreover, the interactant's social identity is relational and malleable (Goodenough, 1965).

It is important to note that the social identity of the interactants does not influence the structure of a conversation (including the request sequences) directly (D'Hondt, 1998; Sacks, 1963; Schegloff, 1987). It does influence the choice of utterance that interactants make which in turn influences the structure of a conversation. Interactants can create their social identity by the manner in which they talk, what they talk about to whom and by the actual form and content of their utterances (Mehan, 1991). Speakers can bring someone closer or distance themselves, thus creating the social role they desire for that specific interaction, or action. This implies that the actual kinship relations between speakers do not necessarily have an influence on a conversation because speakers can select which role or identity they want to have or portray in an interaction. In support of this notion, consider one of the ‡Ākhoe examples given by Widlok (1999a) that describes the interactant Ilnaib referring to his in-law Dadab as his father instead of as his in-law for the reason that Dadab and his actual father are both married to women with the same name. By calling his in-law 'father', Ilnaib has changed their social roles and has also changed their social obligations towards each other to his advantage. This shows that interactants are not restricted to one relationship but can select which relationship they want to activate in each interaction, thus they form their social identity while they interact. The ‡Ākhoe Haillom data will be discussed with this in mind, ignoring the actual kinship relations of the speakers but trying to focus on the relations speakers try to create with and within their conversations.

One $\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe specific social relationship type that needs to be mention here is the avoidance relationship, since it may be supposed that this type of relationship influences interaction, merely by its very existence or possibly through the existence of an avoidance register (Haviland, 1979; Herbert, 1990; Treis, 2005). Many Khoisan cultures have avoidance relationships (Barnard, 1992), and they exist in $\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe culture as well (Widlok, 1999a) but they have not been described in any great detail yet. Avoidance relationships exist for example between men and their mothers-in-law, and as the name implies, the idea is that these people avoid contact. An avoidance relationship is unlikely to have much influence on the structure of an interaction because these relationships are reciprocal. If a man has an avoidance relationship with his mother-in-law, then she also has it with him. This means that an interaction is unlikely to be initiated between the people in this relationship. In other words, the interactants' relationships to each other may stipulate for example whether they greet each other, who greets whom first, and what form the greeting takes. However, regardless of the social relationships allow one of them to pose a request to the other, then, once the request has been made, it should receive a response. Thus, this type of relationship is unlikely to directly influence the structure of an interaction and so avoidance

relationships will not be given any more consideration than other social relationships are in the remainder of this thesis.

Interactants' social identities can influence the practices interactants select in order to obtain what they want. Interactants' identities influence whether they are able to use a certain practice or not. The example shown below to illustrate this, concerns the couple Su and AR. The start of this sequence has previously been shown as an example of unsuccessful taking in section 4.4.1. AR wants the anklet that Su is wearing, and he attempts to take it without making any communicative reference to his desire or action.



Figure 4-21: Taking an anklet.

AR, in his social role of partner of Su, seems to think he is completely entitled to remove an item from his partner's body with no need to 'warn' her of his intentions. In this instance, it turns out that AR is mistaken, and Su objects to his action. As the sequence continues to unfold, the reason for Su's objections become clear. By attempting to take the anklet without communicating about it, AR either thinks he is entitled to do so, or he is claiming that he is entitled to do so, based on his social relationship with Su. However, Su objects to this by saying, "No man, don't do it." This objection could be interpreted as objecting to AR's entitlement to take the anklet. As it turns out, this is not what Su is objecting. The sequence continues in the following way:



Figure 4-22: Taking an anklet continued.

After AR has taken hold of the anklet and SU has voiced her objection with "*Hâ-â man ta hî re!*" 'No man don't do that' (still 3), AR responds by giving an account of what he was doing, and Su again voices her objection, this time pushing AR's hand away (still 4). After a short pause, AR asks for a knife, then reaches forward and starts fiddling with the anklet again (still 5). This time Su does not object. While AR continues trying to remove the anklet, Ga gives advice and comments on how it could best be done, and Su resumes her beading (still 6). Finally (in still 7), AR successfully removes the anklet. The transcript of the sequence is shown below.

(267)

1	AR:	((leans forward, hooks fingers under anklet))	(still 2)
2	Su:	Hâ-â man TĀ hî re.	
		no EXL NEG do RE	
		'No man, don't do that.'	(still 3)
3	AR:	Nē xū-b ge nî //gôa	
		DEM thing-3SG.M DECL FUT come.off	
		'This thing must come off.'	
4		Nē-b [ge nî //gôa.]	
		DEM-3SG.M DECL FUT come.off	
		'This [must come off.']	

5	Su:	[//Nāxu-bi] re aibe //nāxu-re aibe //gôa-b ge=
		leave-3SG.M.OBJ RE first leave-RE first come.off-3SG.M DECL
		$=n\hat{i}$ i ge
		fut 3sg.c decl
		['Leave it] first, leave first it will come off.' (still 4)
6		(0.9)
7	AR:	LB au te re etse khôa-s-a.
		NAME let.so.share 1SG.OBJ RE EXL knife-3SG.F-A
		'LB, give me, ETSE the knife.'
8		(4.0)
9		[Nēba gôa koma i ge.]
		DEM come.off supposedly 3SG.C DECL
		['Here it supposedly comes off.'] (still 5)
10	AR	[((reaches for the anklet again))]
11		(0.4)
12	Ga:	°Aitsama ta ra ‡gae !gao i ge°
		oneself 1SG PROG pull cut 3SG.C DECL
		"Myself, I will pull it to break."
13		#Gao [!gao.]
		pull cut
		'Pull to [break.]' (still 6)
14	AR:	[Ae] KARA-DE #GUI-S-A !GOM !GOM HE TI-S-A
		EXL bead-3PL.F.A many-3SG.F.A heavy heavy PASS POSS.1SG-3SG.F-A
		'[AE] a lot of beads, difficult, mine is difficult.'
15	Ga:	$ \hat{l} ama::::ga ta ra m\hat{i} ge o du ga \neq gae!gao =$
		DISC CONJ 1SG PROG say 3SG.C DECL CONJ 2PL.C COND pull.to.break
		'That's why:::: I say you should pull it to break loose' =
16		= <i>i ta xao-!gao tita ge ra mî ‡gae-se.</i>
		CONJ 1SG cut.through 1SG DECL PROG say pull-3SG.F.OBJ.A
		= 'and I will cut it through, I say pull.'
17		(1.2)
18		//Nâu ti ra ‡gae-s-a,
		hear NEG PROG ear-3SG.F-A
		'Does that ear not hear?'
19		(6.5)
20		Tsū‡hôase se tsū‡hôa go.
		lying 2sg.f.unk lie 3PL.M
		'Lying, you lied.' (still 7)
21		(0.5)

 $|Apa \ kara-e$ go $\uparrow | g \hat{o} a-s-a$ $laeroni \ ai$ ra $d \bar{o} - ba$ s-a.redbead-3SG.C.A RECPST child-3SG.F.AnylononPROG bead-APPL3SG.F-A'She beaded red beads for the \uparrow child onto the nylon.'(Ga_beads_2)

In this sequence, AR attempts to take the anklet off his partner Su's ankle. Without making any communicative reference to his intentions, AR leans forward to take the anklet (still 2) and hooks his finger underneath it. From this, it can be concluded that AR perceives his relationship to Su to be one that would allow him to select this practice for achieving his aim. AR's behaviour shows that he thinks he is completely entitled to behave in this manner, in other words, his social identity as partner of Su entitles him to take Su's anklet. Nevertheless, Su protests: she sits up (still 3) and tells AR 'no man, don't do it' (line 2). This would suggest that AR miscalculated; he picked the wrong practice. AR continues trying to achieve his desire by not letting go of the anklet and, more importantly, he now proceeds to give an account of his behaviour, which is also a statement, concerning his desire in lines 3 and 4: 'this thing must come off'. However, Su continues protesting: she leans forward and physically removes his hand (still 4) while telling AR to 'leave it' (line 5). Crucially, she adds 'it will come off'. This shows that Su is not protesting against the REMOVAL of her anklet. It may yet be the case that she is protesting against AR personally removing it, but that is not how AR understands this. He interprets her protests to be directed at the manner in which he intended to remove the anklet, namely by hooking his finger underneath it and pulling. AR's understanding is shown by his utterance in line 7 where he requests a knife, presumably in order to cut the anklet off instead of pulling it off. AR's analysis of the situation is shown to have been correct by the cessation of Su's protests, even once AR starts fiddling with her anklet again (still 5). Su even stops watching AR and goes back to her beading (stills 6-8) while AR proceeds to undo some knots and then 'gently' pulls the anklet off.

This sequence sheds some light on the influence of people's relationships on their interaction. AR is not part of the group that is engaged in the ongoing action of beading, as men generally do not bead and he has only seconds earlier sat down with the women. Not being a member of the ongoing action one would expect AR to verbalize his intentions to some extent, as was previously shown in sections 4.6.1 and 4.6.2. However, he does not do so. In addition, Su's protests are directed not at the fact that it is AR who is doing the taking or at the taking itself but merely at the manner of taking. All this implies that AR and Su's relationship makes it possible for AR to undertake the somewhat intimate action of removing Su's anklet without comment.

4.6.4 Choice of practice dependent on object being requested

A second aspect of the requested objects that influences the request practice that will be discussed is the characteristics inherent in the object itself. The type of request that a $+\bar{A}$ khoe interactant performs is dependent on the type of thing the interactant wants. If an interactant wants an action performed this will be signalled differently to a request for an object. Even within the category of requests for objects there are differences between consumables and non-consumables and between free goods and non-free goods (Goffman, 1967) (also see section 1.3.2 for a definition). If someone wants the pliers (a non-consumable free good), the pliers will not

be "used up" after that person is done with them, this in contrast to tobacco (a consumable non-free good) which will be used up and will not be given back. Amongst the consumables there is once again a distinction to be made between consumables that are freely available all the time such as water (which in this community runs freely from several taps distributed throughout the settlement) and consumables that are available less often such as tobacco (which is not available all the time, and if there is some tobacco around, someone will in all likelihood have paid money to obtain it). This distinction is visible in the type of requests that interactants use to acquire free goods versus non-free goods. Interactants tend to use more direct requests (for example imperatives) to request free goods, where as non-free goods are requested using much more indirect practices (declaratives or non-verbal requests).

Water is the most frequently requested free good in the $\bar{+}A$ khoe Haillom data sample. Requests for water tend to be performed in the most direct manner. They are often performed in the form of an imperative, and they are not accompanied by "softening" devices or downtoners in the form of diminutives and accounts which can be used to make a request look "smaller" (Brown & Levinson, 1978a; Wierzbicka, 1991). The following three examples, which are all requests for water, illustrate the direct nature of requests for free goods. The first example is a request for water in the bare imperative form. It is uttered by a woman and directed at her partner.

(268) I //gam-e au te hā.
CONJ water-3SG.C.A let.so.share 1SG.OBJ come
'And come and give me water.' (Hreq002203) (Ga_beads:Su)

The second example comes from the same interaction as the previous one. It is a repeat of the previous request, performed by the same woman 40 seconds later. It is again in the form of an imperative, although it is now posed with the added politeness marker *re*.

(269) //Gam-e mā te hā re.
water-3SG.C.A give 1SG.OBJ come RE
'Come and give me water.' (Hreq002204) (Ga_beads:Su)

The third example is a water request in the imperative form with the politeness marker *go*. It is uttered by a woman who is addressing a child.

(270) Xo //gam-e si si au te go aube.
name water-3SG.C.A 2SG.F reach let.so.share 1SG.OBJ GO UNK
'Xo, go and get me some water.' (Hreq005011) (Collect_nuts:Fr)

When a non-free good is requested using an imperative, these imperative requests are usually softened with more than just a politeness marker. The following two imperative requests show such a downtoning by making use of diminutives and accounts. Example (271) is an imperative request for soap that is followed by an account. While soap is a non-free good, it tends to be used communally.

(271) Ap sē-e so au te re i ta llā-sen
name soap-3SG.C.A 2PL.F let.so.share 1SG.OBJ RE CONJ 1SG wash-REFL
'Ap, give me soap so that I can wash myself.' (Hreq003006) (Gas_yardA:Ma)

The request for soap is followed by the account "so that I can wash myself". This account makes the request seem reasonable and understandable. The interactant is not asking for the soap just for the hell of it but has an appropriate reason for wanting the soap. In the next example, example (272), soap is again requested using an imperative, but this time the request is downtoned by the use of the diminutive marker: *-ro*-.

(272)Esosē-ro-esonēbaautegoEXLsoap-DIM-3SG.C.A2PL.FDEM-3SG.M-Alet.so.share1SG.OBJGO'ESO you give me a little soap here.' (Hreq003022) (Gas_yardA:Th)

In this example, the diminutive implies that the interactant is not asking for a lot, just a little soap, and thus the request is not a big imposition.

As can be seen from the above examples of imperative requests, as predicted by Brown and Levinson (1978a), free goods are requested with a bare imperative where as non-free goods are requested with a downtoned request. Yet, in ‡Ākhoe Haillom, non-free goods are more commonly requested using more indirect forms than the imperative. The following examples show requests performed in much less direct manners for the non-free products porridge, Vaseline and wire. The first example shows a request, or pre-request, in the form of a polar question. A pot of food has been put next to the fireplace, and a young girl, Xo, walks up to it and makes her indirect request:

(273) Nētiko pā-i รนิ-ร-ล xa loa. = this.much pot-3SG.F-A porridge-3sG.C with full = hâsa habu si i tsî nî? eat.up 2SG.F 3SG.C UNK FUT ADDR 'This pot so full with porridge, you, will you eat it all up?' (Hreq002324) (Ga_beads_2:Xo)

The child directs her gaze at the pot while she utters the interrogative. The interrogative functions as a prerequest (see section 1.4.3.3.2). When she receives no response, neither to the question nor to her indirect request, she shifts her gaze to her mother and then gazes back at the pot. Two and a half seconds after her request, she upgrades from her indirect request to a very direct proposal "*Hā* ta $\neq \hat{u}$ hui tsi," 'Let me help you eat,' making it absolutely clear that it was the porridge she was after.

The next example, (274), shows a request in the shape of a polar question of the type request for confirmation, for the non-free good Vaseline.

(274) Vaslin ū tama-si-a hâ?
Vaseline take NEG-2SG.F-A PRF
'Don't you have Vaseline?' (Hreq002315) (Ga_beads_2:AR)

A young man asks his mother whether she has Vaseline. In the unfolding of the sequence, it becomes clear that he is not just asking out of idle curiosity but that he actually wants to use the Vaseline. For a transcript of the full sequence, see Appendix C.

A final example of a request used to obtain a non-free good, shows a request in the form of a declarative. It is used by a young man to request wire from a peer.

(275) O
 i ge safies dara-e h
 toma.
CONJ 3SG.C DECL soft wire-3SG.C exist NEG
'And there's no soft wire.' (Hreq007002) (Handcraft_3:RS)

At a first glance, it may not look like much of a request because it is so indirect, but by pointing out the absence of something, a speaker can make the rectification of that absence (by the addressee) relevant (Sacks, 1992b). In the ensuing sequence it becomes clear that that is indeed what the speaker intended. For a more detailed description of the whole sequence, see Appendix B.

The examples above, showing requests for free goods and request for non-free goods, illustrate that the type of product that is requested influences the type of request that a speaker uses. A request for a free good does not entail a very high level of imposition, and the request forms used are usually imperatives. However, when the requests are for non-free goods the level of imposition is higher, and the requests tend to be more indirect, either using downtoners in the imperatives or using questions and declaratives.

However, there is one group of products where the story is slightly more complicated. Tobacco and cigarettes can be requested indirectly, using questions, as well as directly, using imperatives. The following two examples illustrate indirect requests for cigarettes. Example (276) is in the form of a polar question. Two and a half minutes earlier, a member of the group of women who were beading had lit a pipe. She leaves the group however before sharing the pipe with the others. About a minute after she leaves, one of the remaining woman, Ga, utters the request below, which she addresses to her son.

(276) /*An-a he bo?* smoke-3SG.C.A PRF or 'Is there smoke (or)?' (Hreq002206) (Ga_beads_2:Ga)

Example (277) is a request for a cigarette, also in the form of a polar question. Some young men were busy building wire cars and sharing a cigarette. Half a minute after this cigarette was finished, one of the young men utters the following indirect request:

(277) Etsē saru-b-a toa i-bi?
EXL cigarette-3SG.M-A finish UNK-3SM
'ETSĒ is the cigarette finished?' (Hreq007021) (Handcraft_3:RS)

Examples (276) and (277) above are examples of indirect requests for a cigarette. Yet there are also cases where cigarettes are requested directly using imperatives. This happens in the next two examples. The first request, example (278), in the form of a bare imperative without politeness markers is posed by a woman to her friend who had previously lit a pipe and left the group taking the lit pipe with her. Upon the return of her friend who is still smoking the pipe, the woman poses her request shown below.

(278) Mā te ta aibe #gae ti /hō.
give 1SG.OBJ 1SG first smoke POSS.1SG friend
'Give me so that I first smoke my friend.' (Hreq002207) (Ga_beads_2:Ga)

The second example occurred previously, in the same video session. The friend was busy lighting the pipe at the hearth fire, when another woman calls out a request to her.

(279) #Gae na i hau sao khoe-s-a (.) !khō-s-a ti-î.
smoke UNK CONJ bring follow person-3sG.F-A pipe-3sG.F-A UNK
'Smoke, and bring it with you, woman (.) the pipe.' (Hreq002201) (Ga_beads_2:Su)

The request is once again in the form of a bare imperative without politeness markers. The difference in these two types of requests, imperatives vs. questions, for similar objects, pipes and cigarettes, is the following. The imperative requests are only used to request pipes and cigarettes that are lit. As soon as they are lit, they are treated as a free good. Cigarettes that are not lit and often still in a packet, as well as loose tobacco is requested much more indirectly, for example with questions as was shown in the examples above.

In this paragraph, the previous sections will be summarized. The summary will include some numbers, although the numbers concerned are very small and can thus only indicate tendencies. Free goods, such as water, lit pipes and cigarettes, and goods that are not used up are requested using imperatives. In the data sample, 10 requests for such goods were found, 12 if one counts redone or pursued requests. All of these are in the imperative form, even the pursued requests. Requests for non-free goods, such as beads, non-lit cigarettes, tobacco, sweets, Vaseline, sausage, soap, wire, and medicine are frequently performed through less direct forms. In the data sample, 18 requests for these types of goods were found, not counting redoings of requests. Only three of the 18 are in the imperative form, the remainder are in the form of hortatives, questions and declaratives. The majority, eight, are in the form of questions. Interestingly, there are seven additional requests that are redone or pursued after a lack of uptake. Four of these are in the form of imperatives and are thus much more direct than a request for a non-free good tends to be. In these cases, it is the lack of uptake that necessitates a more direct pursuing of the request.

As this section has shown, there are numerous elements that can influence an interactants choice of request type. A number of these elements were described: two characteristics pertaining to the interactants themselves (social identity and in-groupness or participation in a joint activity) and two characteristics of the object being requested (proximity and status of the object: free good, etc.). All of these elements influence the perceived level of entitlement and imposition that interactants have, and through this, they influence the choice of request type. The higher the perceived level of entitlement, the more direct the requests are, and the higher the perceived level of imposition, the more indirect the requests are.

4.7 ‡Ākhoe requests in numbers

This section will give an overview of some of the issues addressed in the previous sections of this chapter on requests. It will give an overview of the numbers associated with these issues, link these with the culture of the speakers and give some explanations concerning the conclusions that can be drawn.

Initially, only the verbal requests will be considered when looking at the overall distribution of the available types of requests. This is because gestural requests are very much rarer in the data sample, and this made it necessary to look outside the set data sample in order to find enough instances to be able to say anything meaningful about them. The five interactions from which all the verbal requests were taken contain a total of 106 requests. The majority of the verbal requests, 76%, have the grammatical form of an imperative. Of these 81 imperative requests, 15% are in the unmarked imperative form, 6% are marked with *go* for politeness (see 2.3.3.1), and the majority, 79%, are marked with the *re* marker (see 2.3.3.3 for the *re* marker).

requests	n	%
imperative	81	76%
hortative	4	4%
declarative	7	7%
polar question	8	7.5%
content question	6	5.5%
Total	106	100%

Figure 4-23: Number and percentage of sentence types used to perform requests.

imperative requests	n	%
unmarked	12	15%
go	5	6%
<i>re</i> marker	64	79%

Figure 4-24: Number and percentage of imperative requests and their morphological marking.

The request shown in example (280) is an example of a request in the unmarked imperative form. Example (281) shows a request in the imperative form marked with re, and example (282) shows a request in the imperative form marked with go.

(280) *Khui.* lift.up 'Lift up.' (Hreq002317)

(281) *Khui* **re**. lift.up RE 'Lift up.' (Hreq002316)

(282) Eso sē-ro-e so nēba au te go.
EXL soap-DIM-3SG.C.A 2PL.F DEM let.so.share 1SG.OBJ GO
'ESO give me a little soap here.' (Hreq003022)

Only 24% (n=25) of all the requests did not occur in the form of an imperative. They occurred in the form of hortatives (n=4) (one of which was marked with *re*), declaratives (n=7), polar questions (n=8) and content questions (n=6), see Figure 4-23. Example (283) shows a request in the hortative form.

(283) *Hā* go tā deur-s-a //khōbam re HORT 2PL.M NEG door-3SG.F-A open RE 'Let's not open the door.' (Hreq007014:SS)

Example (284) shows a request in the form of a declarative.

(284) Nē lhapi-e ta natsare-s ai !gû ūhâ ga = DEM wound-3SG.C.A 1SG hospital-3SG.F to go have COND mî hâ i = ta go ge. 1SG RECPST SAY PRF 3SG.C DECL 'I had said I should take these rashes to the hospital.' (Gas_YardA:Ga)

This statement is analysable as a request because it was uttered by an elderly woman who lives about 100 km away from the hospital and has no means of transport. It was said in the presence of a researcher in possession of a car. By making her desire known, the speaker is indirectly requesting a ride in the car. The following example, example (285), is a request in the form of a polar question. This question is asked by a woman who is tying her child's nappy and has been looking for the nappy pin.

(285) Auma spel-s-a ū tamas hâ?
grandmother pin-3SG.F-A have NEG PRF
'Grandmother, don't you have the pin?' (Hreq005007)

This question thus performs an indirect request: in the case that Grandmother does have the pin, she should give it to the speaker. Example (286) shows a request in the form of a content question. The question is asked by a

young man who is about to start building a wire car. Just preceding the question was a discussion concerning the lack of thin wire needed to build wire cars. The question in the example is then directed at a participant as an indirect request intended to get the addressee to go and fetch the thin wire.

(286) Mâ ge hâ dara-e etsē?
Q DECL exist wire-3SG.C.A EXL
'Where is the wire ETSE?' (Hreq007007)

The majority of the verbal requests are direct requests: 80%, see examples (280) to (282). Twenty percent are indirect requests of the type shown in examples (283) to (286).

Verbal Requests	п	%
direct requests	85	80%
indirect requests	21	20%
Total	106	100%

Figure 4-25: Percentage of verbal requests that are direct and indirect.

As was already stated at the beginning of the chapter, the cultural setting of the speakers leads to several predictions concerning requests. One of those mentioned was that the egalitarianism predicts the superfluousness of indirect requests. This is borne out by the data in that even though indirect requests do occur, they are in the minority. The request sequences found in the conversational data show that direct requests using the imperative are the most common form of making a request. This suggests that the imperative is the unmarked form for requesting. The directness of requests may be a reflection of the egalitarian nature of the community. Especially so, since requests for actions are more frequently direct than requests for objects are. An interactant can request an object or an action from a person. Requests for objects are more often indirect which means that it is neither the action nor, more importantly, the person that causes the indirectness. It is the object that causes an interactant to be indirect, or in other words, that causes the interactant to use a politer request. It is not the social relationship between the interactants that makes a speaker use a more indirect form of requesting. Please note though, that as long as there are no other comparable studies of requests in small-scale communities, all conclusions will be problematic. From the $\neq \bar{A}$ khoe data, it can be concluded that within the community concerns for social politeness are not reflected in request practices. Whether the language offers ways in which to express social politeness cannot be concluded with any certainty from this data, since politeness may only come into play once speakers step out of their immediate community, and the data does not cover these types of situations. Although example (284) in which a community member requests a lift to the hospital from a researcher in a very indirect manner may hint at what may happen in such situations.

Turning back to the issue of requests for actions vs. requests for objects: most requests, 65%, ask for the performance of an action by the addressee, as in example (281). Thirty-five percent of the requests ask for a product, such as in example (282).

Verbal Requests	n	%
request for action	69	65%
request for product	37	35%
Total	106	100%

Figure 4-26: Percentage of verbal requests that request actions vs. products.

Requests for a product may include some form of an action, e.g. handing over the object, bringing it or pouring the tea, etc. These actions may also be encoded in the requests: "Pour me the tea," or "Go and bring me some water." Example (287) shows an instance of a request that asks for an action as well as a product. The speaker does not just ask for a bag but asks the addressee to go and fetch a bag.

(287) Ese !gû re si //hō-b-a hau re.
EXL go RE 2SG.F bag-3SG.M-A bring RE
'ESE, you go and bring the bag.' (Hreq005008)

Requests for actions are most frequently posed directly. Ninety-four percent (n=65) are direct requests, and 6% (n=4) are indirect requests. Requests for products are posed indirectly as well as directly. Fifty-four percent (n=20) are direct requests, and 46% (n=17) are indirect requests.



Figure 4-27: Percentage of requests that request actions and products directly vs. indirectly.

Here again, the cultural setting of the speakers is at play. The prediction was that due to the hunter-gatherer, nomadic lifestyle (which entails few personal possessions and goods that are shared), and the demand-share culture, the requesting of objects would not be face threatening and that a direct demand for objects would be the unmarked manner of requesting. The idea being that when one does not have a lot, what one does have is shared. Yet, the data shows that requests for objects are not all posed directly. They are equally frequently posed indirectly. The culture of the speakers does not impose a hierarchy on the speakers themselves, but the requests for objects show that a hierarchy is imposed on objects. The data shows that, even though the interactants have a

demand-share culture, this does not mean that all objects can be "demanded" to an equal degree. Certain goods: free goods, non-consumables, shareables, etc., are more "demandable" than others.

In the request sequences, the products that were requested directly and using the imperative form were water, a pipe, wild berries, a knife and tea. Apart from the water, these products do not seem to be free goods, except possibly for the wild berries. However, if you compare them with the products that were requested indirectly, a difference does become apparent. The products that were requested indirectly using the hortative and declarative forms were sweets, beads, sausages and Vaseline. These are mostly very rare products in the community, products that could not be gathered in the bush and that once consumed would be finished, and all of them in these instances, except for the Vaseline, had been brought into the community by the researchers. This means that these products were clearly not free goods. There were two products that were requested both directly and indirectly. One of these was wire. This product was brought into the community by the researchers and was not freely available. Important here is that the initial requests for the wire were indirect. It was not until the requests for the wire were repeated multiple times, due to an apparent lack of comprehension by the addressee, that the requests became direct. See example (264) in section 4.4.7 as well as Appendix B for a more detailed description of this interaction. The other product that is requested both directly and indirectly is tobacco in the form of pipes and cigarettes. Once the pipes and cigarettes are lit, they are requested directly and thus are regarded shareable. As long as they are not lit, but present or in the form of loose tobacco, the requests remain indirect.

Very few accounts are given when interactants make requests in $\pm \overline{A}$ khoe. Only 15% of the requests are delivered with an account, for an example see (251) in section 4.3.1.

Verbal Requests	n	%
accounts	16	15%
Total	106	100%

Figure 4-28: Percentage of requests that include an account.

Of 76 requests it is possible to tell whether they are granted or not. Despite the directness of the requests in general, only 32% are granted, and 68% are not granted. Additionally, there are no acknowledgements of granted requests.

Verbal Requests	n	%
granted requests	24	32%
non-granted requests	52	68%
Total	76	100%

Figure 4-29: Percentage of requests granted vs. not granted where this is discernible in the data.

Many requests remain unresponded to in $\frac{1}{4}$ Akhoe. When there is a response, it is often non-verbal. Since most requests are concerned with the here and now, this makes it possible for the recipient of the request, by way of a response to either perform the request or not, making a verbal response unnecessary. An alternate explanation for the dearth in responses involves the results of the chapter on questions. In this chapter, it was found that questions in $\frac{1}{4}$ Akhoe are responded to less than questions in several other languages. In that chapter, it was argued that this was because the practices used to select a next speaker, and thus raise the likelihood of receiving an answer, are used less in $\frac{1}{4}$ Akhoe than in the other languages. In a similar vein, when interactants perform a request, practices such as the use of gaze or address terms, etc., are employed equally infrequently. It is possible that if these practices were employed more, requests would receive more responses. Since there is no cross-linguistic data to compare the $\frac{1}{4}$ Akhoe request with, this will remain a theoretical speculation for the moment. Furthermore, there is no thanking after a request has been acknowledged. This may be linked to the fact that sharing in the $\frac{1}{4}$ Akhoe culture is not used as a status marker (Widlok, 1999a). This means that people do not draw attention to having shared something. Sharing is not something about which one can brag. One does not publicly share in the hope that it will make oneself look good.

In addition to requests that remain unresponded to, a large number of requests remain ungranted. This could mean that not granting a request is not as dispreferred in \bar{A} khoe as it is considered to be in English, for example. Nevertheless, once again, until similar numbers are available for other languages, what looks to be "a large number" may actually be usual.

4.8 Conclusions

This chapter looked at the manners in which interactants secure goods and services using verbal requests and directives as well as non-verbal forms of communicative behaviour in \bar{A} khoe Haillom with the aim of ascertaining how the cultural characteristics of the speakers influence the practice of requesting in natural conversation. This chapter showed that it is indeed the case that the cultural and sociological preferences of \bar{A} khoe Haillom speakers lead to very specific request practices in which politeness issues are based on concerns other than social hierarchy based politeness. When speakers of \bar{A} khoe Haillom perform the action of requesting in their interactions, they are led by their culture in their choice of linguistic type. Overall, requests in this culture were found not to be as face threatening as they are generally considered to be (Brown & Levinson, 1978a; Goffman, 1955; Lerner, 1996). This is evidenced by the directness of requests, the dearth of accounts for requests, the lack of granting of requests and the overall low number of responses in general.

The linguist form of a request is in general often driven by politeness concerns but the egalitarian nature of the $+\bar{A}$ khoe Haillom society was expected to induce less need for social hierarchy based politeness. Indeed, it was found that the unmarked form of requesting is the direct imperative. Thus, the variety in request forms that was also found was expected to be a result of politeness issues based on the entitlement or contingency of the requests. On the one hand, the mobility of the community and the resulting scarcity of goods were expected to induce a greater need for politeness in the case of requests for goods and products. On the other hand, the

demand-sharing nature of the culture as well as obligatory sharing between specific members of the society would suggest that requests would ordinarily be direct if they would be needed at all. Indeed, the data showed that issues of politeness or imposition feature especially in requests for objects and much less in requests for actions showing that speakers consider requests for actions unproblematic, while requests for products do warrant the use of circumspection. Furthermore, the data showed that while free goods, like actions, are requested directly, non-free goods in contrast are requested indirectly. The mere fact that a distinction is made between free and non-free goods in this society, which is then moreover visible in the linguistic choices speakers make, shows that speakers perceive a measurable difference in imposition that requests for said goods entail. Requesting a non-free good entails a higher imposition and thus speakers use more requests that are indirect. Additionally, an indirect request is perceived as polite and non-coercive while direct requests in certain conditions are perceived as impolite. These perceptions will be enumerated in the following chapter.

With respect to the argument being made in this thesis for a preference for non-coerciveness in \bar{A} khoe Haillom, it can be said that the data in the current chapter shows that requests can be direct and the preference for non-coerciveness comes into play once the imposition of requests rises. The preference for non-coerciveness becomes visible in the indirect manner of requesting. When speakers consider the imposition entailed in a request to be low (i.e. in requests for actions and for free-goods), requests are made directly. When speakers consider the imposition entailed in a request to be high (i.e. in requests for non-free goods) requests are posed indirectly thus leaving the interactional partner with a greater opportunity to disregard the request. In the few instances when these requests are pursued, one can see the directness of the requests rising.

In this chapter, it was also shown that, as with questions, there is a strong link between language and culture that influences speakers' language use. The link is indirect in the sense that culture again, does not influence conversation structure directly. Thus, despite the influence of the culture, request-response sequences, as question-answer sequences, do not contradict the universality claims of the sequence and turn-taking systems as long as physical communicative behaviour is taken as being part of those systems.

The following chapter, chapter 5, will show more clearly and in more detail how the speakers' perceptions of politeness with respect to requests, and request-like actions, influence the preference for non-coerciveness. The chapter will make the indirect connection between the culture of the interactants and their interaction style even clearer by looking at a culture specific action: *‡gona*. In many respects, it is similar to requesting. It is an action that speakers use to obtain a culture specific type of good which will be called a shareable.

5 *#Gona*, a culture specific action

"Stare unabashedly – no one ever got anything by being coy." (Mike Hatt. 2005. Feline Philosophy: Life Lessons from your Cat.)

The preceding chapters on the speech acts of questions and requesting have endeavoured to show the noncoercive nature of $\pm \overline{A}$ khoe Haillom interactions as well as showing the influence that culture has on interaction. $\pm \overline{A}$ khoe Haillom interactants' choice of interrogative is shaped by their culture, favouring open questions over closed questions. The interactional practices that interactants use to shape their questions are also influenced by culture: using fewer techniques to select a next speaker than speakers of other cultures do. In the area of the action of requesting, it is again certain aspects of the interactants' culture that eventually lead interactants to select certain types of requests in certain situations: preferring direct imperatives for requests for actions and free goods but indirect requests for non-free goods. Both these chapters show that while the speakers' culture and preference for non-coerciveness does influence interaction, it does not influence the basic structure of the interaction. In the current chapter, a form of communicative behaviour¹⁹ that is specific to $\pm \overline{A}$ khoe Haillom culture will be described in order to see to what extent cultural influences are discernible in very culture specific types of interaction and how the speakers' perceptions of politeness as well as the society's characteristics of egalitarianism and (demand-)sharing influence the preference for non-coerciveness.

Whereas in the previous chapters, the work has been shaped by speech act categories that are claimed to be universal, by for example Austin (1962) and Searle (1969), while others argue that these categories are Anglocentric (Goddard, 2011; Wierzbicka, 1985, 2008), the current chapter will take the $\pm\bar{A}$ khoe language itself as the starting point. The results of the previous chapters show that while the speech act categories of questions and requests may be universal in the sense that both these categories exist in $\pm\bar{A}$ khoe Haillom as well, they are not universal in the sense that these categories look and function in a somewhat dissimilar manner from the same categories in other languages. The current chapter will deal with a non-universal speech act; a speech act that exists in $\pm\bar{A}$ khoe Haillom but not in English for example.

The communicative behavioural form described in this chapter is called *\neqgona*. This is a behavioural form that speakers of $\neq \bar{A}$ khoe Haillom themselves distinguish and have lexicalized. *\neqGona* is a manner in which interactants communicate that they want to obtain a specific type of good: goods that in the culture are

¹⁹ As in the previous chapter, so in this chapter, physical communicative behaviour will be analysed on a par with speech, in that verbal utterances as well as physical communicative behaviour are taken to be able to constitute turns.

considered shareables. This may involve using requests but it may not. In this sense, calling this behaviour requesting is a little problematic. If a good is a shareable, does an interactant need to request it, or is it sufficient just to make one's presence known, so that the good can be shared? In the subsequent sections, the *†*gona behaviour will first be described. The issue whether it actually is requesting will be returned to at the end of the chapter.

The type of communicative behaviour that is the subject of this chapter is known and has been commented on in other cultures too. It exists in other Khoisan groups, and it is known in Aboriginal cultures in Australia (personal communication with Joe Blyth). Pool Balam (2012) describes a comparable behaviour in her MA-thesis on Maya, where young children use this type of behaviour, and are expected to use it, in order to obtain chicken bones from the community's mothers who are making a local dish called tamales. Another area in which this type of behaviour occurs in The Netherlands is, perhaps not surprisingly, in the sphere of communal smoking of joints (source prefers to remain anonymous but is a linguist). However, it is not often that the interactants themselves have named this behaviour as in \bar{A} khoe Haillom. *‡Gona* has been translated as 'beg for something by waiting passively' (Haacke & Eiseb, 2002) or alternatively as 'go to someone's house hoping to get food' (Heikkinen, n.d.-b). These translations only cover part of what "doing" *‡gona* actually comprises.

5.1 Ethnographic definitions of *‡gona*

The practice described in this chapter was first noticed in the recorded video data but not immediately recognized as *\pmgona*. It was noticed that interactants would stand, often silently, on the periphery of ongoing interactions and subsequently be given a product by one of the participants of that interaction. In order to ascertain whether this behaviour constituted a recognizable communicative practice, the recordings of the identified sequences involving this behaviour were presented to informants along with the question "What is person X doing," person X being the one exhibiting the behaviour. Once the informant identified the behaviour as *\pmgona*, she or he was asked for more information and for their general understanding of the behaviour. A few instances of different kinds of behaviour were also included in the questionnaire in order to be able to test the precision of the informants.²⁰

The overall definition of $\frac{1}{gona}$ given by $\frac{1}{4}$ Åkhoe speakers can be summarized as follows: if one goes to a specific place where something is to be had, and one goes there with the specific aim of getting some of it, then one is doing $\frac{1}{gona}$. Anything one does at that place, be it verbal or non-verbal, or even using one's physical proximity to show one's intentions, in order to get what one wants, all of that is considered to be $\frac{1}{gona}$. Some examples of $\frac{1}{gona}$ given by an informant are as follows:

"If you want to make porridge but you have no milk, then your wife may tell you *‡gona re seven-s-ai* 'Do *‡gona* at Post Seven' (Post Seven is a station of the cattle farm where cattle are milked), and you go there to get some milk, then this is *‡gona*."

²⁰ Special thanks are due to my colleague Christian Rapold for collecting the ethnographic definitions of $\frac{1}{2}gona$ and implementing a questionnaire on my behalf after my field time had run out.

"If you know that a specific person is cooking nice food with tomatoes and you go there and sit there and wait until he has completely finished cooking so that you can eat the food with him, then this is also \neq gona."

The action that an interactant does to make it clear that they want something can be verbal and non-verbal: "You are coming for help but you don't even ask for it, you just say" (meaning the requester uses an imperative instead of an interrogative).

"Even if they (the people performing *‡gona*) don't talk to you, just look at you putting food in your mouth; that is *‡gona*."

Speakers translate *‡gona* as "asking for help". For example the sentence *tabaka-e ta ge go ‡gona* is translated as "I'm looking for help for tobacco.' Indeed, this expression is often used when speakers of ‡Ākhoe request things in English: "I'm asking for help for sugar," or "Please help me with some flour."

There are "restrictions" concerning who can do *‡gona* to whom and opinions on what are considered to be good and bad ways of doing *‡gona*. A child, for example, cannot do *‡gona* to its parent. This is for two reasons, firstly because they live in the same home, and thus the child cannot specifically go to its home to do *‡gona* because it is already there. Secondly, the parent is expected to look after the child. Thus, the child should not need to do *‡gona*. Furthermore, other family members and friends should also not need to do *‡gona*, since a certain reciprocity is considered to be present in the relationships between family members and also between friends. Nevertheless, the examples in the data show that it does occasionally happen that people in this relationship do *‡gona* to each other.

There is sometimes a fine line between asking for something and doing $\pm gona$. The most important aspect that distinguishes the two is the "going to a specific place". If the interactant were already at the place when someone came along with tobacco and if the interactant then asked for some, they would not be doing $\pm gona$. If, instead of physically going to a place to ask for something, an interactant were to phone someone at that place to ask for something, this would also not be $\pm gona$. Both these cases are considered to be simply asking for something.

[‡]Gona is not considered something to be ashamed of, in comparison to begging for example, as long as one does it well. There are good and respectful or bad and impolite ways of doing *[‡]gona*. On this topic, an informant explained that the most respectful manner to ask for something in general (not doing *[‡]gona* specifically) is by "asking in freedom". While what "asking in freedom" meant was difficult to explain, the opposite of "asking in freedom" was clear:

"When a person comes to you, does not greet you, does not sit down to talk with you but straight away says, "Give me tobacco" and when you give this person tobacco and he leaves straight away, without even saying anything, this is not respectful."

This type of behaviour is considered "fast", and it is not considered a positive way to do \neq gona or to ask a question or make a request. Taking one's time to greet a person, to sit and talk with them before asking for the

thing one came for, is a respectful and good way not only to do \pm gona but also to ask questions and make requests. This reflects on an issue that was argued for in the chapter on questions: namely, that the more frequent occurrence of content questions and the almost complete absence of confirmation questions shows the preference of $\pm \bar{A}$ khoe Haillom interactants to not restrict their conversational partners when asking questions - iin other words, to ask in freedom. Similarly, this description of speakers' perceptions of politeness reflects on their use of requests reported on in chapter 4. A direct request, as shown above, can be considered impolite. Thus, when imposition levels are high, making an indirect request would be the politer alternative. These preference for polite \pm gona, which also happens to be easily disguised as something else, also plays into the preference for non-coerciveness of the speakers and will be dealt with in more detail in section 5.3.

5.2 *+Gona* in interaction

In this section, some examples will be given of $\pm gona$ performed by $\pm \bar{A}$ khoe interactants taken from the conversational data set. This very specific type of communicative behaviour performed by the interactants in the data occurs repeatedly and can involve verbal as well as non-verbal aspects. Due to the non-verbal aspects of this communicative behaviour, calling it a speech act might pose problems, and for now, it will be referred to here as a communicative act. The field of speech acts is still somewhat understudied in African languages, but the few studies that have been undertaken show that non-verbal communication may play a larger role in these languages than in other languages on which the speech act theory has been based (Kießling, Neumann, & Schröter, 2011; Mekamgoum, 2013; Sommer & Vierke, 2011). Whether the communicative act $\pm gona$ should be regarded as an (indirect) request or not will be addressed at the end of chapter 5.

As previously stated, when doing *‡gona* there are a number of ways in which an interactant can communicate what they desire. They can do so very directly by using imperatives or they can be more circumspect, taking their time to greet the people present, join in the conversation and eventually bring up their wishes. Interactants can also communicate their desires non-verbally by, in a sense, simply standing and waiting. Typically, these interactants do not involve themselves in the ongoing interaction but remain silent and usually stand in the vicinity of the other interactants. This type of behaviour will here be referred to as conspicuous waiting. The objects that can be requested in this manner are products considered to be "shareables" in this community. These are things such as food (prepared or unprepared), tea, tobacco, a lit cigarette, etc.

However, *‡gona* can be difficult to recognize. This is due to a number of factors, some of which have been mentioned before. For a start, there is the familiar problem of recognizing intentions: the behaviour is only *‡gona* if the interactant came to the scene with the specific *intention* of getting something. In other words, if the interactant came to the scene where someone happened to be handing out tobacco and the interactant asked for some too, this is not *‡gona*. The difference between the two can be difficult to distinguish. Another problem in recognizing *‡gona* is that an interactant needs to have specifically come to the scene. However, if the video recording started only after that person had already arrived, then it is difficult to argue that that interactant's request for something is *‡gona* since their arrival has not been captured. In addition, *‡gona* can take a very long

time. As an informant mentioned, "If you know someone is going to cook something, then you go there and wait until that person is finished cooking." In this kind of a situation, recognizing the difference between interactants doing "respectable" *‡gona*, i.e. joining in the conversation for half an hour, and an interactant not doing *‡gona* but just sitting there and happening to get a share, can be very difficult. In general, an interactant doing "respectable" *‡gona*, or polite *‡gona*, is difficult to tell apart from an interactant in an ongoing conversation who is not intending to get something at all but just happens to be present when something turns up that can be shared. And this may be the point (see off-record strategies (Brown & Levinson, 1978a)). As long as the interactant has not stated that they came for a specific thing, they may have in all innocence just stood there for a second to "check out the researcher's camera" for example. *‡Gona*, in its most "indirect" form, is an action that is easily disguised as something else.

Nevertheless, there are six clear cases of *‡gona* in the data sample. A number of these will be described here. The instances of *‡gona* that occur in the data are mostly a combination of verbal and non-verbal strategies. The type of *‡gona* that is described by informants as "fast": when an interactant comes and simply makes their request using an imperative while dispensing with greetings and leaving as soon as they have what they came for, does not occur in the data. This manner of behaving is considered impolite and showing a lack of respect, and this is undoubtedly the reason for it being scarce enough not to occur. Although the examples that will be shown verge on the "fast" type: no greetings and leaving right after receiving, interactants always conspicuously wait instead of doing an imperative.

5.2.1 Examples of *+gona*

The behavioural instances described in the current section are instances of *‡gona* that are largely non-verbal. Interactants go to a place where they know something is to be had. Once there, they perform the non-verbal *‡gona* by placing themselves, either standing or sitting, close to the possessor. The interactants generally do not join in the interaction if there is one going on, and they position themselves physically just outside the range of the interaction. There they wait until the possessor gives them what they want. It is not necessary for them to have eye contact with the possessor or even to look at the possessor, or at the object, they desire. If it takes 'too long' the interactants may give up and leave or upgrade to a more direct form of *‡gona* using gestures, e.g. holding out a hand, or making verbal requests.

A standard case of physical and non-verbal *‡gona* is shown in the sequence in Figure 5-1. It is taken from the session in which young men are making wire cars. This sequence takes place early on in the session. The young men YB and SS are about to start on the cars and are sharing a cigarette when another young man, TT, joins the group. TT is the person who wants the cigarette and who exhibits the conspicuous waiting behaviour in order to achieve it.





Figure 5-1: Handcraft_3_cigarette #gona

The full sequence lasts 1 minute and 16 seconds. At the start (still 1), TT arrives and joins the men who are engaged in the building of wire cars. While YB gives the cigarette to SS (still 2), TT moves around the back of the seated group and positions himself on SS's right hand side, leaning his body forward and supporting himself with his hands on his upper thighs (still 3). TT, after having stood in this position for 17 seconds, moves a few paces to the back to let YB take his wire car (still 4). As soon as YB is out of the way, 31 seconds later, TT moves in closer to SS and takes up his previous physical position (still 5). He remains here until he gets the cigarette; 23 seconds later (still 8). During this time, there is a moment when SS, who has the cigarette, shifts his position and leans back towards TT. At this point TT swings out his right hand (still 6) presumably because he expects he will be given the cigarette now. However, this does not happen yet, and TT once again resumes his old position with both his hands on his upper thighs (still 7).

During the whole sequence, TT does not participate in the ongoing interaction. TT could have sat down next to SS, but he does not do this, not even once he has gotten the cigarette. YB, on the other hand, does sit down on the ground with the other men once he has finished fiddling with his wire car (still 9). In other words, TT physically behaves as if he is part of the group, but he does not go all the way: he remains standing, and he does not sit down. Schegloff (1998) has shown that interactants can use their body to show their commitment to what is ongoing in an interaction. In the case of this example, the interactant is using his body to show his commitment to the ongoing interaction in the following manner. He uses his body to make himself undeniably present, as if he were a part of the ongoing interaction. However, by refraining from actually joining the conversation itself, he makes it clear that he wants something but that joining the interaction is not it. Also, by not verbalizing his intentions, e.g. by not doing a verbal request, he does not interrupt the ongoing conversation.

In terms of the actions that are performed, this interaction is built up as follows: TT arrives on the scene, and his first action is conspicuous waiting (still 3). It would be incorrect to say that this action does not receive a response because it does not require a response. It would be preferable to say that this action does not elicit anything. In still five, TT is once again doing conspicuous waiting, but this time he is doing it closer to the other interactants. This again does not elicit anything. He is not asked what his business is, he is not invited to sit down, he is not offered the cigarette, and he is not addressed in any way. Then a spot of miscommunication arises (still 6). SS shifts his body, and TT responds to this by holding out his hand: he thinks he is being offered

the cigarette. This is not the case, as SS continues smoking the cigarette (still 7), and so TT resumes his previous stance and continues with conspicuous waiting. Finally, he is offered the cigarette (still 8). Arguably, this has been elicited by his conspicuous waiting.

Neither the cigarette, nor TT, nor even TT's behaviour are ever referred to in the conversation that is going on between the other young men. Yet, at the end of the sequence, TT obtains the cigarette. The communication of his desire was successful.

The next example that will be discussed is another standard form of the physical behaviour exhibited when someone wants to obtain something. In the following sequence, two women, Th and Ga, are sitting around the hearth. Th has just finished smoking and has sent the pipe to an elderly man who is sitting off screen when a third woman, Ws, comes and stands behind Ga. Ws is the person who is using her physical proximity in order to do a request.





Figure 5-2: Gas_yardA_pipe #gona

The woman Th is smoking a pipe (still 1). She gives it to her daughter who is sitting next to her and indicates that the girl should pass it to an elderly man who is off-screen (still 2). While the girl is doing this, Ws comes and stands behind Ga (still 3). Ws stands there for 43 seconds before she is handed the pipe (still 7). During this time, she does not participate in the ongoing interaction between Ga, Th and the first recipient of the pipe who is off-screen. Ws hardly even looks at the women, she only starts looking once the girl brings the pipe back (still 5). When the girl has brought back the pipe, she gives it to Th who tamps down the tobacco before handing it to Ga (still 6). Without hesitation, Ga turns around and lifts the pipe up in order to pass it on to Ws (still 7). It is clear from Th's and Ga's unhesitating behaviour that both know who is meant to get the pipe, yet they do not communicate about it at all, nor has Ws at any point verbally signalled her desire for the pipe. This must mean then that Ws's physical positioning of her body accompanied by her lack of participation in the conversation was a clear enough message for Th and Ga to understand that Ws wanted the pipe.

This and the previous example are examples of the most "fast" versions of *‡gona* that occur in the data sample. These two instances conform to the sense of being impolite given by informants in the sense that the interactants dispense with greetings and don't involve themselves with the ongoing conversation, yet they redeem themselves to some extent by not making an outright (imperative) request but instead, by making the request through conspicuous waiting.

The final example shows a more respectful version of \neq gona. The interactant performing the \neq gona does greet some of the people present using the lengthy $\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe greeting practice, and he involves himself at least minimally in the ongoing conversation. However, the important difference with the two previous examples is that in this case the physical behaviour gets some added emphasis. Whereas in the previous examples the behaviour exhibited was merely being undeniably present, in this example, the informant augments this "being present" with other physical "hints" that allude to his desires. Because the example is lengthy and involves many different sets of behaviour, it will be dealt with in parts. For the complete and glossed transcript, see Appendix A, page 215. In the interest of space and continuity, only freely translated excerpts will be shown here. The line numbering corresponds to the numbering of the complete transcript in the Appendix. In the first part of the sequence, three women are sitting around the hearth: Ga, Sf and Th. Previously, the women had been dividing tobacco between themselves, and Sf has her portion, wrapped up in a bright orange paper bag specific to a well-known tobacco brand, visibly on her lap. Her husband, AT, comes and positions himself in between Ga and Sf (still 2). The hearth they are at is not Sf and AT's home but the home of Th. AT first greets the researcher present (but off screen) (lines 9-13), and then he demands some tea, using an imperative that lacks the polite *re* marker (still 2, line 17). He receives no response to his imperative and shows his dissatisfaction with that in line 23 after which he does receive a response, namely Ga's interjection in line 25, and she subsequently shows him that the tea is finished by lifting the lid of the pot standing over the embers (still 3). AT then moves a step back and stands there for nine seconds while he and Ga go through the culture specific greeting routine (still 4, lines 31-34). In the transcript below, the simultaneous, irrelevant conversation has been left out. The line numbers correspond to the line numbers in the complete transcript in the Appendix, see p. 215.



Figure 5-3: Gas_yardA, tobacco #gona A.

9	AT:	Ah (0.5) ja:: matisa TW
		'Ah' (0.5) 'Yea::h how are you TW (a researcher)?'
10	TW:	!Gâi a
		'It's good.'
11	AT:	<i>A::</i>
		'Ye::s.'
12	TW:	Matisa?
		'How are you?'

13	AT:	!Gâi nē ge ge a	
		'We are well.'	
17	AT:	Hei //hōba te so re tē-i xa	
		Hey you pour me tea.	still 2
18		(0.4)	
19	Ga:	(unclear)	
		(0.6)	
23	AT:	MÂ ∥AEB HOABA KĀ TSU NÎ Ī	
		'What time do we all/both have to go?'	
25	Ga:	Ai je (di)ta.	
		'No I'	
26		(0.5) ((Ga lifts lid on pot))	
27	Ga:	Sa luib go daoba khoena hâ i ge:	
		'Your in-law made tea for the people.'	still 3
		Kuru ama-e	
		'Truly made.'	
		(1.5)	
31	Ga:	°(Wa lala po)° ((start of greeting sequence with AT))	still 4
		('How are you?') (loan greeting from Oshiwambo)	
32	AT:	°(unclear)°	
33	Ga:	°!Gaisi°	
		'Good.'	
34	AT:	°(unclear)°	

After finishing the greeting routine, AT moves around Sf's back and stands between Sf and Th. There, he bends down and picks up a piece of newspaper (still 5). AT straightens up, shakes a box of matches (this is audible in the recording), presumably to see if there are any matches left inside, and then he proceeds to tear pieces off the paper he picked up thus shaping it into cigarette paper size (still 7). After shaping the paper and while Ga talks to him on a different topic (his responses are minimal) (lines 63-85), he starts rolling the paper into the form of a cigarette (still 8).




Figure 5-4: Gas_yardA, tobacco *‡gona* B.

55		((AT bends to pick up paper))	still 5
		(0.8)	
58		((AT shakes box of matches))	still 6
		(2.0)	
60		((AT starts to shape cigarette paper))	still 7
		(2.0)	
63	Ga:	(unclear) ((here Ga starts addressing AT, selecting him using gaze))
		(1.0)	
66	AT:	((points?))	
		(1.8)	
68	Ga:	Nēgo om go gara xawe go hîna ti !kham !gâb ai //gan re.	
		'Even when you build you must not talk behind me.'	
60		(0.2)	
72		((AT starts to roll cigarette paper))	still 8
73	Ga:	Tita //î !khaisa du ge xusa ra /hāba i ge.	
		'Me, that thing I want.'	
77	Ga:	//Nā-e () !aromab ge () //na tsaub aib gere //ama pere-i ge aitsa	ma =
		'That () because of that () there at the well he bought bread hi	mself' =
		= //îb maris /kha	
		= 'with his own money.'	
		(0.9)	
83	AT:	$(\neq An)$ te re°	
		('Let me know.')	
85	Ga:	(unclear)	
		(2.5)	

AT's action of rolling the paper finally elicits the directive "Give my father so that he can smoke and go," from Ga (still 9, line 90). She directs this at Th, but Th does not respond. Nb. AT is not Ga's classificatory father. Ga then follows this up by pointing at Sf's packet of tobacco and telling her to "loosen it", meaning she should

open it (still 10, line 95). Twenty-eight seconds have elapsed from the moment that AT picks up the paper until Ga telling Sf to give him some tobacco. Sf responds to the directive by picking up her packet and undoing the knot. AT walks around her back to come to her right side and holds out his cupped hand (still 11). Sf puts some tobacco into it. AT continues holding out his hand, and Sf puts some more in it. Once he has the tobacco, AT leaves, stating that he is "going back" (still 12, line 118).



Figure 5-5: Gas_yardA_tobacco *‡gona* C.

90	Ga:	<i>Mā so re ti baba ani bi \am a <u>!gû::</u></i> still 9				
		'You give my father so that he can smoke and go.'				
		(2.2)				
95	Ga:	O re mā-i he hâ- (.) ∱dūsi nēsa.	still 10			
		'This thing that is given (.) loosen this.'				
97		‡Gom!gâbi hâ sa,				
		'Do you trust him?'				
		(2.0)				
102	Ga:	() (‡am a !gû.)				
		(1.7)				
104		((AT moves to receive tobacco))				
109		((AT is given tobacco))	still 11			
118	AT:	(unclear []) oa ta ra ī ge nēsa.				
		('unclear []) I am going back now.'	still 12			

119 Ga: [(!Khub ao,)] [('Before God!')]

Summarizing the whole interaction: AT first requests tea using an imperative, but there is no tea. Then AT wants tobacco but in contrast to the tea, he "requests" this non-verbally. He does so by performing several actions. He positions himself, standing, just outside the group of women. He picks up a piece of paper, which he tears into cigarette paper shape. He shakes a matchbox, and finally, he rolls the piece of paper as if preparing it to contain tobacco. He does all this in view of the women, while standing. He does not sit down to join the women. AT's last action, rolling his piece of paper, prompts the woman Ga to tell Th to give him some tobacco. When this gets no response, Ga tells AT's wife Sf to loosen her tobacco packet, and Sf proceeds to give AT some tobacco. Upon receiving the tobacco, AT leaves immediately.

AT's behaviour is somewhat different to the behaviour of the two previous interactants attempting to achieve their objectives non-verbally. On the one hand, AT interacts more with the other people present partly due to the fact that the interactant Ga repeatedly attempts to include him in the ongoing conversation (see lines 63, 68, 73 and 77) despite his responses being minimal. By not actively engaging in the interaction but merely giving minimal responses when a response is required, AT is in a sense showing that he did not come in order to interact with them, and importantly, he also does not leave. The other difference with the two previous examples is the additional hints AT gives that are related to the thing he wants: shaking a box of matches and shaping a cigarette paper. By doing this, he makes his intentions more clear than if he were just standing on the periphery of the interaction in the same manner as the interactants in the previous two examples did. Whether his actions are upgrades is somewhat difficult to tell. His actions can be argued to be a natural sequence of preparing a cigarette or the actions may be motivated by his wish to make it clear that his subsequent conspicuous waiting has nothing to do with his initial request for tea. In the next section, a clear example of upgrading performed within a *‡gona* sequence will be given.

These three examples provide evidence that interactants use their physical proximity to others to communicate that they want something. The person who requires something approaches a group and then remains, usually silently, on the outer space of the F-formation (Kendon, 1977). The F-formation, the F referring to face, is the sustained formation that people can group themselves into when they are in an interaction together, although this is by no means universal. Erving Goffman has referred to this formation as the 'eye to eye ecological huddle' (Goffman, 1963). By remaining just outside this formation and, crucially, not passing by but remaining just outside the group, a person can show the participants of the F-formation that his or her presence is meaningful (s/he wants something). If it were not meaningful, the person would not remain but pass on by. Also, by not joining in the ongoing conversation or activity, and when addressed keeping responses to a minimum, and by often remaining standing when the rest are sitting, the "requester" shows that what they want is not to join the interaction but something else. Another "benefit" of not joining the interaction, is that once the requester has received what they want, they can leave immediately.

5.2.2 Upgrading *+gona*

In the previous section, the various forms in which $\frac{4}{gona}$ occurs in $\frac{1}{4}$ Akhoe Haillom were described. $\frac{4}{Gona}$ can be performed in a direct manner, e.g. using imperatives, as well as in less direct manner, e.g. using non-verbal communicative behaviours such as gestures and body positioning. The following section will describe what happens when speakers employ a sequence of these practices to acquire what they desire. The sequence is built up starting with the less direct practices, for example the "conspicuous standing", and is made progressively more direct, using for example gestures and verbal requests, when the desired response is not forthcoming. This is shown in the following example.

The example shown in Figure 5-6 concerns four women and a researcher around a hearth fire who are busy dividing tobacco amongst themselves when interactant PS joins them in order to obtain some tobacco.





Figure 5-6: Gas_yardA_buildup sequence

The four women Ws, Ga, Sf and Th are dividing tobacco amongst themselves (still 1). PS comes on to the scene and positions himself behind Ga (still 2). He stands at the outer edge of the group of women and does not take part in the ongoing interaction. He is exhibiting the non-verbal behaviour described previously: he remains standing, just outside the circle of interactants, and does not participate in the interaction, thus signalling that he wants something other than joining in the interaction. He stands there for one minute (still 3). During this minute, the researcher TW hands the women another packet of tobacco, which they proceed to also divide amongst themselves. Th takes up the task of dividing the tobacco and collects the various tobacco tins and other containers from the other women. At this point, not having elicited a reaction, PS moves forward to stand in between Ga and Sf (still 4). This is PS's first upgrade of his non-verbal communication: he moves in closer and re-does his initial "conspicuous standing" more conspicuously. PS remains there, once again not participating in the interaction, for 38 seconds, until the point at which Th starts handing the now filled tobacco tins back to the women. This is the point where PS upgrades his "conspicuous standing" to a direct gestural and verbal request by holding out his hand and speaking (still 5). Unfortunately, PS's utterance is not clear as he is speaking in overlap with two other people. Nevertheless, his gesture alone is enough to constitute an upgrade to a more overt communicative form. Initially, PS does not stretch his arm and hand out to a point where Th can actually reach it (still 5). This is what makes it a communicative gesture and not merely a practical action. Not until Th responds to his communicative gesture by showing she is prepared to give him some tobacco, does PS lean forward and stretch his arm out all the way. Now Th can reach his hand to put tobacco in it. Th gives PS tobacco (still 6) after which PS leaves (still 7).

In this sequence of interaction, PS starts by indicating his desire in the least direct manner possible in this culture, using the non-verbal aspects of *‡gona* behaviour: standing at the edge of the F-formation. As the interaction proceeds, and as no indication is given that his desire will be met, PS upgrades his action by moving closer into the F-formation yet still using only the non-verbal behaviour. Once the tobacco has been divided over the various tobacco tins and these are in the process of being handed back, indicating that the sequence is drawing close to a possible ending, PS upgrades once more. This time he upgrades his action to a direct request that includes a gesture as well as a possible verbal request, and he receives the response he was seeking.

5.2.3 Responses

Questions and requests make a response relevant. However, does *†gona* make a response relevant? As *†gona* comes in various forms, the answer is: sometimes a response is relevant, and sometimes it is not. When an interactant performs *†gona* by conspicuously waiting, this does not make a response relevant. However, when an interactant performs *†gona* by holding out his or her hand and making a verbal request, this does require a response. *†Gona* is a behavioural form that is built up using other actions, for example requesting. A request requires a response, but waiting, however conspicuously, does not make a response necessary, although it may cause a reaction to be forthcoming, for example an offer.

As stated above, certain actions make a response relevant. But equally importantly, if the response is not given, the person who should have responded can be held accountable for it (Schegloff, 1968). The type of response made relevant by an action is not only determined by the type of action but also by the linguistic form the action takes. For example, an interrogative request such as "Could you give me a lift tomorrow?" makes a different response relevant to, for example, an imperative request of the type "Pass me the sugar." The latter type of imperative requests can be satisfied with a physical action only as a response; someone passing the sugar. In the case of requesting actions, there are cases in the data where the intended recipient of a request does not respond, and the person making the request draws the recipient's attention to this lack of a response and holds them accountable for it.

The following example shows what can happen when an addressee does not respond to an actual request. In this example several women are sitting around beading. One young woman, Ly, has a finished string of beads, and she is attempting to arrange or tie it around another woman's ankle (still 2). In order to do this, she needs the other woman, Su, to lift up her foot. After repeatedly asking Su to lift her foot and Su not complying, Ly flicks Su's arm with the string of beads and, still not getting the desired response, eventually hits Su's leg. The sound quality is unfortunately very low, and not everything that is said is audible, but the behaviour is very clear.

(2)	8	8)
· ·			,

1	Ly: (unclear) (.) khui.	(still 2 and 3)
	lift	
	'(unclear) (.) Lift.'	
2	Su: ((looks over at her foot and flexes it))	(still 4)
3	Ly: khui:::	
	lift	
	'Li:::ft'	
4	(0.7)	

5 Ly (([reaches out] and flicks Su's arm))

6 Xo: [mâ-be.] Q-3SG.M.OBJ.A ['Which one?']

8 Ly: [(unclear) //nā-te a] DEM-3PL.F.C STAT

'[(unclear) those ones.]'

9 Ly: (([hits Su's leg.])) (Ga_beads2) (still 6)

(still 5)



Figure 5-7: Ga_beads: lift foot request

In still 2, Ly is fiddling with the anklet. Still 3 shows the first instance of Ly's request in the form of a direct imperative *"Khui,"* 'Lift.' In response, Su looks in the direction of Ly, and then she looks down at her own foot

and flexes it (still 4). This is not enough for Ly who repeats her request "*Khui:::,*" 'Li:::ft' with more insistence, shown by a lengthening of the vowel and a rise in intonation of the request. There is no drop in intonation at the end of the repeated request, instead it remains level and at a higher tone overall than the initial request. (Because there is someone whistling during these requests, it is not possible to show it in Praat.) Ly gets no reaction to her repeated and more insistent request, and so, after 0.7 sec, she reaches over and flicks Su on her arm using the string ends of the string of beads she's been trying to tie to Su's foot (line 5) (line 6 is a child talking in the background). This action is a summons or an attention getter. One of the reasons Su might not have responded to Ly's request is that she did not hear it. One method with which to remedy this would be for Ly to get Su's attention and then once again repeat the request. However, Su ignores the summons too, showing a complete unwillingness to cooperate with Ly's request. Ly in a sense reprimands her, or shows her dissatisfaction with Su's lack of response and cooperation, by subsequently slapping Su on her leg.

This example shows that when a request is direct, as in this case in the imperative form, and it is not granted, or not responded to, the intended recipient of the request can be admonished by the requester. This makes requesting different to the non-verbal behaviour shown earlier; the conspicuous waiting, which, if it is not responded to, does not elicit a direct telling off of the intended recipient of the request. Unsurprisingly, holding a person accountable for failing to respond to one's conspicuous waiting would not seem to be possible, and indeed, it does not occur in the data. In general, people in the community do complain when they have not been given anything, when they have not been shared with, after having performed $\neq gona$. The data sample used for this dissertation does not contain an example of this, but Widlok gives an example of it in his work (Widlok, 1994: 142). In his Case situation 9, he describes an interaction taking place at a hearth where a meal is being cooked with maize meal that was obtained at a farm called Fisa. Two visitors come over and "ask for news from Fisa". This probably means that the visitors had a conversation with the hearth members, i.e. they did more than conspicuous waiting, but they did not directly ask for food. When the food is ready, it is distributed amongst the members of the hearth, but the visitors do not receive any. Widlok reports that one of the visitors "looks very dissatisfied and repeatedly says things like, "There is plenty of food at Fisa but not here." "I think I will just go back to my house and stay like this [hungry]." This example shows that interactants do show their displeasure indirectly when their indirect *‡gona* does not elicit the intended response. They do not directly reprimand their fellow interactants however, which speakers who perform direct requests would do.

Most of the instances of $\pm gona$ that are recognizable as such in the data receive a response. There are six clear cases of $\pm gona$ that include all the elements of $\pm gona$ that were mentioned in the ethnographic definitions: the cases consist of an interactant arriving at the scene, communicating what they want, and then leaving once they have received what they came for. Four of the six cases of $\pm gona$ consist only of conspicuous waiting. The other two cases start with conspicuous waiting but are upgraded to more direct or overt requests: gestures and verbal requests. In all six cases, the interactants received a response, which was not merely a response but also constituted receiving what they actually wanted, even though four of these cases consisted of no more than conspicuous waiting. In other words, the conspicuous waiting itself was sufficient to communicate that something was desired. Interestingly, instances of $\pm gona$ that consist only of conspicuous waiting can easily be argued to have been something other than $\pm gona$, i.e. just the interactant coming to have a look at the video

camera, the researchers, the beads, etc. This in the interest of saving one's face in those instances when one does not get what one wanted. This makes them what Brown and Levinson (1978b) have called off-record communicative acts. Communicative acts in which "the actor leaves himself an "out" by providing himself with a number of defensible interpretations" (Brown & Levinson, 1978b, p. 216). So despite the behaviour being easily disguised and not making a response strictly necessary, it is nevertheless usually perfectly understood by the recipients who respond by giving the thing that was desired.

5.3 Culture and *+gona*

Previously, section 1.3, discussed the cultural setting of the speakers of $\bar{+}Akhoe$ Haillom. $\bar{+}Akhoe$ Haillom culture is egalitarian with demand-sharing and obligatory sharing aspects (Peterson, 1993; Widlok, 1999a). Sharing is the prescribed norm within society in general. Within the residential unit or hearth group, called //gâus, sharing is obligatory (Widlok, 1999a). Theoretically, in this cultural setting, all that an interactant would need to do to acquire a shareable would be to be present. This coincides with the basic principle of *‡gona*: to go where there is something to be had. Yet, the fact that sharing is a cultural norm and even an obligation amongst people living in the same community does not mean that therefore everybody shares. If people can avoid sharing, they will do so. Which avenues are open for the potential recipient to make sure she or he acquires a share if a possessor does not initiate the sharing? Theoretically, interactants could just demand the goods. Yet, as was shown in chapter 4 on requests, there is a certain hierarchy of goods. While interactants are direct with some goods, and they do demand them, with other goods they are more circumspect. As has been argued throughout the thesis, there is also a preference for indirectness, and a preference for "asking in freedom". These features taken together make conspicuous waiting an obvious route to take in order to acquire a share. Not only do interactants make themselves available for sharing, but by conspicuously waiting, interactants can position themselves in such a manner as to serve as a reminder to the possessor that they should share. From this point of view, *‡gona* does not constitute a "real" request in itself. It is more a "making oneself available for sharing". The non-verbal aspect of *†gona*, the conspicuous waiting described in this chapter, is also an action that makes an offer possible. However, since this is a demand-share culture in which sharing occurs after demands, meaning that it is unlikely that an instance of unsolicited giving, i.e. an offer, will occur out of the blue, #gona is a way of making an offrecord demand in order to initiate sharing. When the conspicuous waiting is not enough to acquire the desired good, i.e. when the possessor does not initiate sharing, an interactant can upgrade the *#gona* behaviour and use more overtly communicative actions to acquire the shareables. In these types of cases the *+gona* behaviour can lead to and actual request.

Another aspect of $\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe Haillom society that was discussed in section 1.3 and that reflects on the use of \ddaggergona is the burden of reciprocity and the burden of debt that asking for something or offering something can entail (Mauss, 1966; Widlok, 1999a). Once an interactant has asked for something, they themselves may be asked for something in return (Schegloff, 2007). Therefore, if an interactant can avoid actually having to make a request, this is beneficial because they do not acquire a debt. On the other hand, sharing in $\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe society is not something that one boasts about (Widlok, 1999a). All exchange of goods is performed in an as unmarked way as

possible. Accepting an offer (to share) could result in indebtedness due to the implied gratitude from the recipient, and interactants try to avoid this (Widlok, 1999a). Consequently, if an offer is initiated, it is done so very inconspicuously. The two points just made show that the possibility of incurring a burden of debt counteracts both the option of asking for something as well as the option of making an offer. This potentially leads to a situation in which nothing can possibly happen, but the impasse is very neatly resolved with the use of *‡gona*. Performing *‡gona*, since it is not a real, on-record demand, will not result in a debt for the performer in the event that it receives a reaction. Similarly, once *‡gona* has been performed, any reaction to it would not be interpreted as an unsolicited offer and would therefore not result in an acquisition of debt either.

From an interactional point of view, the non-verbal conspicuous waiting may also be linked to whether or not an interactant is part of the ongoing interaction. When an interactant has come specifically to do *‡gona*, i.e. to get something, they are generally not part of the ongoing conversation at the place they have just come to. Interrupting an ongoing conversation in order to make a direct request would be considered impolite (fast *‡gona*), so an interactant may try not to interrupt the conversation and performs their "request" non-verbally by waiting. As was shown in chapter 4, this suggests that direct requests are the norm, but only when an interactant is part of the ongoing interaction.

5.4 Conclusions

In this chapter, the social action $\pm gona$, specific to $\pm \bar{A}$ khoe Haillom, was described in order to see to what extent cultural influences are discernible in a very culture specific type of interaction. The communicative act $\pm gona$ is inseparably connected to the culture of the speakers and is driven by the notions of goods and sharing entailed in the culture. In its indirect form, $\pm gona$ is not a request but a manner of making oneself available for sharing. In its direct forms, it is often a request.

⁺Gona as a culture specific communicative action functions according to the principles set out by the sequence organization and turn-taking systems. It does not contradict the universality claims of these theories, as long as communicative behaviour, not just verbal communication, is taken to be part of that system. A *⁺gona* sequence generally starts with the interactant conspicuously standing. This behaviour is communicative and can thus be taken to be a first turn. This turn may elicit a next turn in the form of sharing from the other interactant for example. When sharing is not initiated, the interactant performing *⁺gona* can upgrade the *⁺gona* behaviour to a more direct form in order to elicit the desired response.

With respect to the argument for non-coerciveness, this chapter on the communicative act $\frac{4}{gona}$ shows that $\frac{1}{4}$ Akhoe Haillom interactants try to obtain a share, or their share, in a more indirect manner than by using an outright and straightforward demand for a share of a product. As there are not many instances of this communicative act in the data sample, it is difficult to argue that an indirect manner of performing $\frac{4}{gona}$ is the preferred manner of performance. Yet, there are enough examples to show that within this communicative act there is an existing practice which I have termed *conspicuous waiting*. This practice is used by speakers to

communicate the desire for a product and is understood to be doing this by the co-interactants. The practice of conspicuous waiting, which is entirely non-verbal, is the epitome of indirectness and non-coerciveness. Due to its characteristics, it affords the co-interactants with the opportunity to ignore or overlook the communicative aspect of the practice. In this way, the use of this practice puts next to no pressure on interactants to respond. Furthermore, simply the existence of this practice, which is so inextricably intertwined with the society and culture of the speakers, suggests that there is a need for this non-coerciveness. The preferences of the speakers for polite $\pm gona$ also once again points to a general preference for non-coerciveness. As was described in section 5.1, polite $\pm gona$ is performed in such a manner that it is most difficult to differentiate from ordinary non-communicative "visiting". This means that the requesting essence of the communicative act should be rendered as inconspicuous as possible and thus be made non-coercive.

6 Summary and conclusions

In this thesis, the influence of culture and social organisation on language and interaction was explored. Universals of interaction, not grammar, were sought, and it was argued that there is a preference for non-coerciveness in the language use of the speakers of \bar{A} khoe Haillom. The areas of interaction that were focused on were the microsociology of question and requesting interaction occurring in everyday, informal conversations of \bar{A} khoe Haillom speakers as well as a language specific communication form called *fgona*: a type of conspicuous standing with the aim of making oneself available to be shared with. The findings were compared to what is known about (American) English interaction, and explanations were given for the commonalities and differences from a cultural perspective.

The non-coercive and non-restrictive nature of the language use encountered in the natural interaction between speakers was found to be driven by the cultural and social norms and values in the speakers' society. These norms and values, such as egalitarianism, semi-nomadism, a demand-share culture, etc., influence speakers' selection of utterance type, the choice of building blocks speakers use to construct these utterances, and also the overall communicative actions that speakers elect to perform. The "rules" of interaction, sequence structure, and turn-taking, that have been established by the field of Conversation Analysis (Sacks, Schegloff et al. 1974) and are claimed to be universal, were looked at from the point of view of a language that is spoken by people who have a culture and social organisation that is in stark contrast to that of American English speakers. The influence of the speakers' culture was found to be present and was found to influence as mentioned just above, speakers' selection of utterance type, the choice of utterance formation, and the choice of overall communicative act. This means that the culture does not exert a direct influence on the structure of conversation.

Chapter 2 gave a short sketch of the grammar of $\frac{1}{4}$ Akhoe Haillom. It encompassed aspects of phonetics, phonology, morphology and syntax, which served as a necessary background for the conversational data used in later chapters. More detailed descriptions of the specific grammatical constructions of interrogative and imperative formations were given due to the focus on these construction in the later chapters on questions and requests.

Chapter 3 explored the linguistic form of interrogatives and extended that to question-answer sequences in natural conversation in $\frac{1}{4}$ khoe Haillom. The distribution of question types and responses to questions, as well as the various different interactional functions of questions were described and discussed. The work for this chapter was completed within a larger cross-linguistic project, and therefore a number of cross-linguistic comparisons were possible. The chapter concluded that $\frac{1}{4}$ khoe speakers prefer less coercive and less restrictive question forms, using more content questions than polar questions and using hardly any requests for confirmation, which are the most restrictive type of questions. In addition, a slower response time was ascertained as well as a low

level of next speaker selection in comparison to the other languages. These findings are in keeping with other aspects of hunter-gatherer culture that arguably point towards a greater concern of the speaker for the listener's independence and the listener's choice whether or not to respond to a question.

The preference for a less restrictive question type, the slower response time and less next speaker selection found in the data sample, all affect a difference in the constructions of the turns in a conversation. They do not however have a direct effect on the structure of the sequences of a conversation. They have an indirect effect. This means for example, that when one interactant asks a question and, because of a preference for less coerciveness, this interactant does not select the next speaker directly, i.e. refrains from using gaze or an address term, the likelihood that this question will receive a response is lower than it would have been with a question that did clearly select a next speaker. Many unanswered questions in a conversation can give the impression that "bushmen never answer questions" which is a sentiment that can on occasion be heard in Namibia. However, in this chapter, it was shown that it is not the case that an interactant who is a hunter-gatherer does not adhere to the turn-taking system by not answering questions. It is simply that a question asked by a $\frac{1}{4}$ khoe Haillom interactant may be easier to ignore since it does not address one directly.

Chapter 4 studied the speech act of requests as well as request sequences in natural conversation. This chapter showed that the form requests take is related to culturally motivated notions of entitlement. The interactants' sense of entitlement is influenced by aspects pertaining to the interactants themselves as well as aspects of the goods or products that are requested.

Requests, unlike questions, in #Ākhoe Haillom are usually very direct and come in the linguistic form of imperatives. #Ākhoe culture is egalitarian, and this predicts a lack of variety in the request types which cater specifically to politeness issues. This was born out by the data, which shows mostly imperative requests. On the occasions that requests do occur in a different, more indirect, form this was shown to be occasioned not by social politeness issues (politeness in the sense of respect) but by the type of product that was requested and the level of imposition entailed in the request. The influence of culture on the perception of entitlement of the interactants was most clearly visible in the requests for objects. The sharing culture of the speakers determines the level of imposition that a request for a specific object causes. Requests for objects considered free goods entail a much lower level of imposition than request for non-free goods entail. Thus, free goods are requested directly, often using imperatives, where as non-free goods are requested using indirect request types such as questions and even declaratives. The results suggest that the characteristics of an object warrant indirectness in requests more often than the characteristics of a person of whom a request is made. In other words, there is no need to adjust one's politeness to the people one is asking something of, but when the request involves an object, then circumspection can be warranted depending on the characteristics of the object. In the chapter on questions, speakers show a clear preference for non-coercive forms of interrogatives. In requests, this preference comes to a fore as soon as a certain degree of imposition is present in a request.

What does not become clear from the data is whether the language offers (any additional) manners in which politeness due to respect can be expressed in requests in this culture at all. This is because the data contains only

conversations and interactions between people within a small community. Because the lGomais community is a very small social unit where everyone knows each other and everyone is potentially related there is not much need for the almost "excessive" form of politeness seen in for example British English. Politeness used for example when in interaction with the police, doctors, bureaucrats, etc. In a future study, it would be interesting to look at $\bar{+}Akhoe$ requests in this type of interaction, although it would be necessary to include people from outside the $\bar{+}Akhoe$ language group in order to create a situation with such a hierarchical imbalance between interactants.

Despite $\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe interactants using mostly imperatives to perform requests and interactants' sense of imposition being driven by qualities of the object that is being requested, these aspects do not influence the manner in which request sequences occur in an interaction. The request sequences in $\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe follow the turn-taking rules that have been postulated elsewhere. In addition, although the data does show that a large number of requests are not responded to, this does not necessarily indicate a deviation from the turn-taking system. First, due to a lack of comparable cross-linguistic data at this point in time, it is not possible to ascertain whether the level of response found in the $\ddagger\bar{A}$ khoe data is really lower than it would be in other languages. Secondly, if the level of response were indeed lower, the reason for this could be due to a lower level of next speaker selection as was the case in chapter 3 with the question answer sequences.

Finally, chapter 5 discussed the culture specific communicative action *‡gona*. An interactant performs *‡gona* when they intentionally go to a specific place where a shareable good is available with the aim of obtaining some of it. *‡Gona* is an action with which interactants make themselves available to be shared with. It is communicative because the interactants make themselves conspicuously present and in that manner signal to the other interactants that they are there for the purpose of sharing. Importantly, co-interactants understand that this is what is being communicated. Overall, *‡gona* as a culture specific action adheres to the turn-taking system. A sequence generally starts with the interactant conspicuously standing. This behaviour may elicit sharing from the other interactant. When sharing is not initiated, the interactant performing *‡gona* can upgrade the *‡gona* behaviour in order to elicit the desired response. Upgrades come in the form of "closer" conspicuous standing, gestures, and eventually also verbalizations and upgrades in the form of requests.

#Gona is a communicative behaviour that is culturally specific to $\#\bar{A}$ khoe, yet it fits seamlessly into the general turn-taking system. This language specific behaviour is inextricably linked with and would not exist without $\#\bar{A}$ khoe specific settlement patterns and sharing obligations. $\#\bar{A}$ khoe sharing obligations and the general sharing morals of the society stipulate with whom one should share. These obligations are linked to $\#\bar{A}$ khoe settlement patterns, specifically the concept of *lgaus*. With the members of one's *lgaus*, sharing is obligatory. This means that, theoretically, #gona is only necessary with people who are not part of the interactant's *lgaus*. When sharing is obligatory, and in those cases where sharing is the preferred moral behaviour, requesting should theoretically be unnecessary. Nevertheless, when a request is not necessary, an interactant nonetheless still needs to make her or his intentions clear, and doing #gona accomplishes this. By standing conspicuously, an interactant can communicate that they are available for sharing. This is a much more indirect manner of communicating this than using an outright and straightforward demand for a share of a product would be. Due to its inconspicuous

characteristics, which make it difficult to differentiate from ordinary non-communicative "visiting", the practice of conspicuous waiting is exceedingly indirect and non-coercive. The manner in which this most polite version of \neq gona is performed makes it possible for co-interactants to ignore or pretend to not have noticed the communicative act that is being performed.

This chapter showed that where certain aspects of a culture influence the behaviour of interactants, this can be reflected in the communicative interaction of the people. When obligatory sharing makes requesting in order to obtain an object superfluous, interactants use other actions, in this case $\pm gona$, in order to achieve their goal.

The overall conclusions of this thesis are threefold.

First, I have shown that a cultural preference for non-coerciveness in communication can drive the choice for a grammatical form of an utterance as well as the choice of action. \ddagger Åkhoe speakers have a preference for indirect questioning forms in keeping with other aspects of their culture. The form requests take is related to a culturally motivated categorisation of goods and products, and the higher the imposition which is driven by the characteristics of the requested object, the more indirect the requests are. Additionally, the language specific *‡gona* behaviour is inextricably linked and would not exist without \ddagger Åkhoe specific categorisation of goods, settlement patterns and sharing obligations. The practice of conspicuous waiting being another sign of the preference for non-coerciveness of the speakers. The second overall conclusion is that despite these clear influences of the culture and social organisation on language use, the basic structure of interaction is not directly influenced, and this structure of interaction as it was laid out by Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974) is universal, as long as one includes physical communication along with the verbal communication. Finally, this work shows that these basics of human interaction are present even in very divergent cultures. Not only are they present in large-scale, industrialized, sedentary, hierarchical cultures, but they are also present in small-scale, nomadic, egalitarian cultures.

6.1 Possible directions for further research

Amongst the numerous possible directions in which this work could be taken, there are two fields in which useful and interesting future research would be possible that will be mentioned here. These are the fields of intercultural communication, where the work can have an applied aspect to it, and the field of interaction in which a valuable expansion of the work could be made.

Most importantly, by looking at other hunter-gatherer languages, a replication of these results and a verification of the arguments made here should be possible. Additionally, by looking at the Nama-Damara variety spoken in the Tsumeb area, it should be possible to see if this language patterns with hunter-gatherer or non-hunter-gatherer languages. Nama-Damara is mutually intelligible with ‡Ākhoe Haillom, but the cultures of the speakers are at polar opposites. ‡Ākhoe speakers are, and have always been, nomadic hunter-gatherers living in small-scale communities, while Nama-Damara speakers are currently sedentary and live in large-scale industrial

communities. Since the languages are so similar but the cultures so different, this would make these two languages ideal for comparison with regard to the cultural influences on their interaction.

On the applied side of research, an interesting avenue to take based on the work presented in this thesis is the direction of intercultural communication, or miscommunication. The (subtle) differences in talk in interaction described in this thesis may have markedly large effects in conversations between $\pm \bar{A}$ khoe and non- $\pm \bar{A}$ khoe speakers, e.g. the timing differences. In a multi-cultural community like the Namibian one, where conversations take place in English or Afrikaans even though few speakers have English or Afrikaans as their mother tongue, do speakers bring their "native" conversational styles to the table? Moreover, to what extent do these differences affect those conversations (in English or Afrikaans), and do they potentially lead to miscommunication? Looking at many of the prejudices people have about people of other ethnicities in Namibia, the possibility that they do is great. For example, San people (e.g. $\pm \bar{A}$ khoe speakers) are often said not to answer one's questions. Maybe, if they were given more time to respond and if they were "asked in freedom", they would answer questions.

Appendix A

Video: Gas_yardA

Sequence: AT doing *‡gona* in order to obtain tobacco

In this sequence of interaction, three middle-aged to elderly women, Ga, Th and Sf, are sitting around a hearth fire. They have previously been given a bag of tobacco by one of the researchers and shared out the tobacco amongst themselves. At the start of this sequence, interactant AT arrives, carrying a child. AT is the husband of Sf. After AT deposits the child, he greets the researcher TW, who is present but not visible in the video. After this, AT starts to perform *‡gona* in order to obtain some of the tobacco that the women have. Initially all he does is stand, but as time goes by, his actions become more meaningful: shaking a box of matches and making a cigarette paper. While this main sequence is going on, there are a few other interactions happening simultaneously. One is between Sf and her child *‡*G, the other is between a few younger women who are plaiting their hair: Ma, Su and Ap. These women are not visible on the video but they are audible. Most of Th's utterances are directed at a baby

Personal names are abbreviated in the transcript.

1	AT:	//Khara	i	ge.	(.)	KHAMAN,	
		big	3sg.c	DECL		stand.up	
2		'It's big	g. (.) Sta	und up!'			
3		(0.3)					
4	AT:	Nē-b		ge	sa	ôa-b-a,	
		DEM-3S	G.M	DECL	POSS.2SG	child-38G.M	Í-A
		'Here is	s your s	on.'			
5		(1.1)					
6	Th:	≠G (uncl	Tlear])=
		'‡G (a na	ume) (ur	nc[lear']])=		
7	Ga:	[]	Hōra-gu		hâ-re	hā	i ge]
		e	veryone	-3pl.m	stay-UN	k aux.loc1	3SG.C DECL
		['	Everyo	ne is goi	ing to stay.]	
8	Th:	$= [/h]\bar{u}$	(.) lë	î [bu	rukhoe-b-a.]	
		EXL	W	vet trou	user-3SG.M-	A	
		= [`o]h	(.) w	et [trou	sers.']		
9	AT:	[ah]	(0.5)	[Ja.] mati-sa	TW.
				yea	h	Q-2SG.POS	ss name
				['Y	ea::h] how	are you TW?'	

10	TW:	!Gâi a
		good STAT
		'It's good.'
11	AT:	<i>A</i> ::.
		'Ye::s.'
12	TW:	Mati-sa?
		how-2sg.poss
		'How are you?'
13	AT:	!Gâi nē ge ge a.
		good DEM 1PL.M DECL STAT
		'We are well.'
14	Th:	$ \hat{A} $ [buru]khe-b-a =
		wet trouser-3SG.M-A
		'Wet [trou]sers =
15	TW:	[m]
16	Th:	$=[\neq G-s di-b-a.$
		name-3SG.F POSS-3SG.M-A
		= [helong to $\pm G$ ']
17	AT	[Hei //hōb-a te so te] tē-i xa
1,		EXI. pour-3sg M-A 1sg OBI 2PL F RE tea-3sg C PP
		['Hey you pour me] tea '
18		(0.4)
19	Ga:	(unlclear 1)
20	Th:	[+G] = [-G] + G + G + G + G + G + G + G + G + G +
		name name-3SG.F POSS-3SG.M-A
		['+G, it belongs to +G.']
21		(0.4)
22	Th:	$ N\bar{a} -be$ (<i>†gui/si</i>] !nâhe)=
		DEM-3SG.M.UNK many/3SG.F.OBJ UNK
		'That [one (has many] ways)' =
23	AT:	[MÂ AEB HOA-B-A KĀ TSU NÎ Ī]
		Q time-3SG.M all-3SG.M-A ??? ??? FUT go
		['What time do we all/both have to go?']
24	Th:	$=[si h]\hat{a} e.$
		3sg.f.obj prf verbfinal?
		=['she is h]ere.'
25	Ga:	[Ai je (di)ta.]
		EXL 1SG
		[No I]
26		(0.5)
27	Ga:	[Sa /ui-b go] dao-ba khoe-[n-a hâ i ge]
		2SG.POSS in-law-3SG.M PAST make.tea-APPL person-3PL.C-A PRF 3SG.C DECL
		['Your in-law] made tea for the pe[ople.']
28	Th:	[(unclear)] [($h\hat{i} + G-s-a$)]
		['(unclear)'] ['(No ‡G).']

29	Ga:	[Kuru ama-e]
		make true-3SG.C-A
		['Make truly.']
30	Th:	[#G-s-a] (.) #G-s-a (.) #G[-s-a]
		name-3SG.F-A name-3SG.F-A
		$[^{+}_{+}G] (.) = ^{+}G (.) = [^{+}G.']$
31	Ga:	[°(Wa lala] po)° ((start of greeting sequence with AT))
		[('How are] you?')
32	AT:	°(unclear)°
33	Ga:	°!Gaisi°
		'Good.'
34	AT:	°(unclear)°
35	Th:	$\neq G \ [\neq G \neq G \neq G ([]) =$
		'‡G, [‡G, ‡G, ‡G, ([])'=
36	Ma:	[Ese tsû ra sore-s-a [↑man]
		EXL only PROG sun-3GS.F-A EXL
		['Ese only the sun, [man!']
37	Ap:	[//Khau]-bi]=
	1	invite-3SG.M.OBJ
		['He is invited,']=
38	Th:	
39	Ap:	=[/khā-bi hâ +âi hâ]
	-	self-3SG.M.OBJ PRF think PRF
		= 'he himself thinks.'
40	Su:	[unclear]
41	Ma:	[TaibA?]
		['Who?']
42	Su:	//Nā-s-a i ge.
		dem-3sg.f-a 3sg.c decl
		'There she is.'
43	Ma:	†Tae-b-a du g[oro ī e sida] [hâ da] go ī e=
		Q-3SG.M-A 2PL.C RECPAST gO UNK 1PL.C stay 1PL.C RECPAST UNK UNK
		'Why were [you going? We,] [we stay]ed' =
44	Th:	[He:::::.]
45	Ap:	[A JE,]
		['No!']
46	Ma:	=//[î !khai-si.]
		DEM place-3SG.F.on
		= 'at th[at place.']
47	Th:	[Hū:::]
48	Th:	//Nā-s-a i [ge.]
		DEM-3SG.F-A 3SG.C DECL
		'There she [is.']
49	Ap:	[//Gau]-bi ī tama,
		show-3sg.m.obj unk neg
		'He was not [shown].'

50	Ga:	Nē du ese !khu-TSE:::::
		DEM 2PL.C EXL god-1SG.POSS
		'Here you are my GO::::D.'
51	(0.4)	
52	Ga:	ŧOa i a [xū-e (unclear)]
		out 3SG.C STAT thing-3SG.C.A
		'It's out [the thing (unclear).'
53	Th:	[Ata H-s oa]-s-a ra=
		EXL name-3SG.F child-3SG.F-A PROG
		['ATA H's girl child] =
54	Th:	=‡ûmā khoe-ta ge]
		feed person-1SG DECL
		= I am feeding.']
55	AT:	[((bends to pick up paper))]
56	(0.8)	
57	Sf:	Au[si ga] ī auhai-b ge hîna,
		elder.sister COND UNK give-3SG.M DECL TAG
		'Elder si[ster could] have given him, right?'
58	AT:	[((shakes box of matches))]
	(0.9)	
59	Th:	[^O (.) nēti-s-a e burukhē-s-a?
		EXL like.this-3SG.F-A UNK trousers-3SG.F-A
		['Oh (.) are the trousers like that?'
60	AT:	[((starts to shape cigarette paper))
61	???:	So,
		So.
62	Th:	<i>M m m m m m m m m.</i>
63	Ga:	(uncl[ear]) ((here Ga starts addressing AT selecting him using gaze))
64	Th:	[/ō bur]ukhe-s-a,
		rotten trousers-3sg.F-A
		['Stinking tro]users?'
65	(0.5)	
66	AT:	((points?))
67	Th:	Hi (.) Hibihibihi[bihibi]
68	Ga:	[Nē-go om go ga]-ra xawe=
		DEM-2PL.M build 2PL.M POT-PROG even
		'Even [when you build] =
69		=go [hîna ti !nam !gâ-b ai //gam re]
		2PL.M TAG 1SG side back-3SG.M at talk RE
		= you [must not talk behind me.']
70	Th:	[Hibihibihibihibi.]
71	(0.2)	

72	AT:	[((starts to roll cigarette paper))]
73	Ga:	[Tita //î !khai-s-a du ge xu-s-a ra /hā-b-a]=
		1SG DISC matter-3SG.F-A 2PL.C DECL thing-3SG.F-A PROG UNK-3SG.M-A
74		[=i ge.]
		3SG.C DECL
		'Me, that thing I wa[nt.']
75	Ma:	$[Ap] s\bar{e} \cdot e so au =$
		name soap-3SG.C.A 2PL.F let.so.share
		['Ap] give me soap =
76		=[te re i ta ā-sen.]
		1sg.obj re conj 1sg wash-recp
		=[so that I can wash myself.']
77	Ga:	$[//N\bar{a}-e$ ()]=
		DEM-3SG.C.A .
		['That ()']=
78		=!a[romab ge () nā tsau-b ai-b ge-re ama pere-i]
		because DECL DEM well-3SG.M on-3SG.M PST.PROG buy bread-3SG.C
		'be[cause of that () there at the well he bought bread]' =
79	Ap:	[Tita ge hîna ū tama hâ hā-s ge ti-s-a ūhâ.]
		1SG DECL UNK take NEG PRF 2SG-2SG.F DECL 1POSS-3SG.F-A have
	~	['I did not take, you have mine.']
80	Ga:	= ge aitsama //[î-b mari-s /kha.]
		DECL himself DISC-3SG.M money-3SG.F with
01	Mar	= nimseli [with nis own money. $(M\hat{a} \circ i) = h\hat{a} = h\hat{a}$
81	Ma.	$\begin{bmatrix} 1/1a-51 & 1/a & 1/1 & j-5-a \\ 0 & 2gg = 0 & ppg & ppg & 2gg = 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & ppg & ppg & 2gg = 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 &$
		Q-SSG.F.OBJ PRF DISC-SSG.F-A
82		(0.8)
83	AT	$\sqrt[n]{44n}$ [te re ^o]
05	111.	know ISG OBL RE
		('Let me know.')
84	Ap:	[Nē]ba si [‡nôa hîa ta go !gû i [ge]
	F	here 3sg.F.OBJ sit while 1sg RECPST walk 3sg.C DECL
		['He]re she [was sitting when I went.']
85	Ga:	[(unclear) []
86	Th:	$[H\bar{a}] =$
		['Ha']=
87	Th:	=ti ôa-s-a goa !ao-s mâ ra e?
		1sg child-3sg.f-a unk afraid-3sg.f q prog unk
		= 'my child, is she afraid?'
88	(0.	4)

89	Ma:	Aetse ta ge [tita ge-re mā si s-a]
		day.before.yesterday 1SG DECL 1SG PST-PROG give 2SG.F.OBJ 3SG.F-A
		'The day before yesterday I [gave it to you.']
90	Ga:	$[M\bar{a} so re]=$
		give 2pl.f re
		['You give']=
91		=ti baba ani bi /am a !gû::
		1SG.POSS father in.order.to 3SG.M.OBJ smoke CONJ go
		= 'my father so that he can smoke and go.'
92	(0.5)	
93	Ma:	[Hē:?]
		['Huh?']
94	Ap:	$[\overline{U}$ re $[g\hat{o}a-b-a]$ aibe [kham re ta aibe ra i ge.
	1	take RE child-3SG,M-A first urinate RE 1SG first PROG 3SG,C DECL
		['Take the child] for a while, I am first going to the toilet.'
95	Ga:	O re mā-i he h[â- (.) dū]si nē-s-a
		CONJ RE give-3SG.C PASS PRF loosen? DEM-3SG.F-A
		'This thing that is given- () loosen! this '
96	Ap:	[/Nîsi nî mâ.]
	- _F .	maybe FUT stand
		[Maybe it will stand]
97	Ga [.]	#Gom[/oâ-hi hâ sa]
21	0	trust-3SG M OBL PRF 2SG
		['Do you trust him?']
98	Sf	[Ata lāse] ta go-ro mā-he i ge
20	01.	FXL now 1SG RECPST-PROG give-PASS 3SG C DECL
		['Ata_now] I was given '
99	Ma:	$Ma = S\overline{E} - E = M\hat{A} I = H[\hat{A}]$
	1,100	mother scan-3sg C A O 3 sg C PRF
		'Mother where is soap?'
100	Th:	$ K\bar{e} $ re=
		look re
		['Look].=
101		= #hapi-[i ra ‡oa /gau-ls-a.
		scabs-3SG.C PROG come.out manner-3SG.F-A
		= 'the scabs [appear like th]is.'
102	Ga:	$[(unclear) \neq am a ! gû,]$
103	(1.7)	
104	AT:	((starts moving to receive tobacco))
105	Ga:	$Ts-s-a-si \qquad khoe-di \qquad (.) \ goa-n \qquad ge =$
		name-3SG F-A-3SG F OBL person-3PL F child-3PL C PST
		'The woman Ts's children =
106		=[/āse hâ i ge.]
-		now PRF 3SG.C DECL
		=[were here now.']

107	Th:	[//Ō-s go-ro !khō-si i] ge.
		['The disease caught her.']
108	(0.6)	
109	AT:	((is given tobacco by Sf))
110	Ga:	/Hû-b /kha a di go so/ôa-e mā-he ra,=
		white-person-3SG.M with UNK 3PL.F RECPST medicine-3SG.C.A give-PASS PROG
		'They went with the white man, were given medicine,' =
111		$=(([sweeps] arm horizontally [in an arc)) oa \overline{u}-[h]e e.]$
		return take-PASS UNK
		= 'and were taken back.'
112	Ap:	[Su] [Nau xu-e]=
		name DEM thing-3SG.C.A
		['Su!'] ['The other thing']=
113	Th:	[(un]clear)]
114	Ap:	$=m\hat{a}$ $[i$ $h\hat{a}]$
		Q 3SG.C exist
		= 'Where [is it?]'
115	Ga:	[A-ta go] ampar î audo-si ra dākhâi e
		CONJ-1SG RECPST almost DISC car-3SG.F.on PROG climb.up UNK
		'[And I] nearly climbed in that car.'
116	Th:	Hibihibi
117	Ma:	Boko:.
		EXL
		'BOKO!'
118	AT:	([]) oa ta ra ī ge nēsa.
		return 1sg prog pass DECL now
		'([]) I am going back now.'
119	Ga:	[(!Khub ao,)]
		God unk
		[('As true as God!')]
120	Th:	O gai-s go-ro [i ge abi-i xa?]
		CONJ bad-3SG.F RECPST-PROG 3SG.C DECL scab-3SG.C with
		'And she is worse because [of the scabies?]'
121	Ga:	[Tē-i ge kā-i] a e=
		tea-3SG.C DECL bec.lost-3SG.C STAT UNK
		['There is no tea,]=
	Ga:	= nē-i ge ā-sen gam-e sa ôa-si=
		DEM-3SG.C DECL wash-RECP water-3SG.C.A 2POSS child-3SG.F.OBJ
		= 'this is bathing water that your daughter' =
		=mâi-ai hâ e
		put.on PRF UNK
		= 'has put on (the boil).'

Appendix B

Video: Handcraft_3

Sequence: Soft wire request

In this sequence of interaction, four young men are busy making toy cars with wire. The main interactants are SS, RS, YB and KO. The men were given wire by the researchers and were asked to make wire cars for documentation purposes. SS and RS are the main wire car builders, KO is an onlooker, and YB is very knowledgeable on the techniques of building wire cars, but he does not participate in any actual building during this session. Though KO is only participating as an onlooker here, he is the researchers' main informant and contact person. In this sequence of interaction, SS and RS try to get KO to get them a softer or thinner type of wire from the researchers, which they need to tie the thicker pieces of wire together.

1	SS:	!Nam-gu	ge a		!gom	etsē.			
		side-3PL.M	DECL ST	ГАТ	heavy	EXL			
		'The sides a	re difficult	t etsē	.'				
2	RS:	((takes wire	piece from	n SS))				
3	SS:	!Nam-bu	tsū-gu	go	e nî	≠oa	man.		
		side-3PL.M	just-3PL.M	M DI	ECL FU	г go.c	out EXL		
		'The side m	ust just go	out r	nan.'				
4	SS:	((holds out]	oliers to R	S))					
5	SS:	He garo:-	bi	[nē	hū-b-	a]
		EXL bend-3	SG.M.OBJ	DEM	1 thing-	3SG.M-	A		
		'Hey, did [tl	his thing] t	pend?	,				
6	RS:			[Sac	o-gu	i	gu	ra	bo?]
				follo	w-3pl.m	UNK	3pl.m	PROG	or
				['Th	ey are fo	llowing	g each ot	her or?']
7	(0.5)								
8	KO:	Hm î	bateri-s-a		[toa i	-si]=		
		yes	battery-3sc	G.F-A	finish U	jnk-3sc	G.F.OBJ		
		'Hm, yes, th	e battery [is fin	ishing,]'	=			
9	RS:				[Safies	dara	-e]		
					soft	wire	-3sg.c		
					['Soft v	vire.']			
10	KO:	=/asa bate	ri-s-a	bi		ūhâ	i	ge.	
		new batte	ery-3sg.f-A	A 3s	G.M.OBJ	have	3sg.c	DECL	
		= 'he has a	new batter	y.'					
11	(0.4)								

12	SS:	Safies dara-i ge nî hâ ti ta ge tita ra mî ets \bar{e} =
		soft wire-3SG.C DECL FUT exist thus 1SG DECL 1SG PROG say EXL
		'There must be a soft wire, I am saying ETSE' =
13		=nē [dara-i ge !gâi-n-a tama]
		DEM wire-3SG.C DECL good-3PL.C-A NEG
		= 'this [wire is not good.]'
14	RS:	$[\bar{O} \ I \ GE \ SAFIES \ DARA-E \ H\hat{A}] \ TOMA =$
		CONJ 3SG.C DECL soft wire-3SG.C.A exist NEG
		['And there's no soft wire]' =
15		$= E[TS\bar{E}]$
		$= \frac{1}{1} \left[T S \overline{F}^{\dagger} \right]^{2}$
16	SS:	[Saf]iri-si etsē i nî kē //nā dara-b-[a] KO.
	~~.	soft-3sg f objext content look dem wire-3sg M-A KO
		'The [solft one ETSE and look for that wi[re] KO '
17	RS:	[Hē?]
17	1107	['Ves?/Right?']
18	KO·	°Hē?°
10	no.	ни. 'Huh?'
19	SS.	[Sanfiri_si]
17	00.	soft-3SG F OBL
		['The soft one ']
20	RS	[Saufiri-s-a] mâni i-
20	RD.	soft-3sg F-A where be
		['The soft one] where is it-'
21	RS	((noints))
21	RS.	[Nē-b ge /gui-b-g //goe]
22	Ro.	DEM-3SG M DECL one-3SG M-A lie
		['Here one lies ']
23	SS:	$[N\bar{e}-\sigma_{11} - \sigma_{22} - \sigma_{23}]$ hantsa luri- $\sigma_{23} = n\bar{e} + h\hat{u}i-ami = 0$
	22.	DEM-3PLM similar wire-3PLMA UNK white-3PLM DEM bird.plum.tree-near
		['Here are similar wires.] white ones, near this bird plum tree' =
24		$=ai h\hat{a}$ -gu-a //n \bar{a} -gu-a-ts ge nî $k\bar{e}$ =
		on exist-3pl.m-A DEM-3pl.mA-2SG.M DECL FUT look
		= 'they are, you must look for it.' =
25		=ani tsi //nā sor dara-e nî hō.
		in.order.to 2sg.M.OBJ DEM type wire-3sg.C.A FUT find
		= 'so that you find that type of wire.'
26	(0.4)	
27	()	Ani //nā dara-b-a ‡gan
		in.order.to DEM wire-3SG.M-A ask.for
		'In order to ask for that wire.'
28	KO:	Hâ mâpa i e?
		yes where 3sg.c UNK
		'Yes, where is it?'
29	(0.4)	
	. /	

pass 35G.M 35G.C DECL white.person-3PL.C hearth-35G.M PRF.10 'He has gone to the boe''s home.' 31 RS: <i>Hib-n</i> on-si-b-a <i>i i</i> ge. white.person-3PL.C house-35G.P.IO-35G.M-A pass 35G.C DECL 'He is going to the boer's house.' 32 SS: <i>Bateri-b-a-f.b</i> ge si ra <i>fgan f ti-b</i> ge go mit. battery-35G.M-A-35G.M DECL reach PROG ask.for thus-35G.M DECL PST say '[He is going to ask for] the battery, he said.' 33 RS: <i>[O-Is ge ni hâ (ikhini-b-a,)]</i> CONJ-25G.M DECL FUT exist book-35G.M-A ['Then you must stay with (the book).'] 34 SS: <i>[Sao-ai-bi re etsē.]</i> 55 RS: <i>[(Aha dara-ro-e) f</i> red wire-DIM-35G.C.A [['Follow him ETSĒ.'] 35 RS: <i>[(IAha dara-ro-e) f</i> red wire-DIM-35G.C.A [['K small red wire.']] 36 YB: <i>[Eisē (.) ti-b-a f mā-b[i go hâ]=</i> EXL 15G.POSS-35G.M-A Q-35G.MOBI RECPST exist '[ETSE.] where [is mine.]= 37 KO: <i>[Bi si ra óa i ge]</i> 38 SS: <i>[î. f. j</i> ['Yes.'] 39 YB: =Nē go <i>da-bi-a</i> . DEM RECPST look-35G.MOBI-C = 'This one looked for it.' 40 <i>Di-de go go hâ ti-b ge</i> ask-UNK RECPST 2PL.M PRF 15G.POSS-35G.M DECL 'You would ask mine.' 41 (0.6) 42 YB: He? ''Huh?' 43 (0.4) 44 SS: Sao-ai-bi re etsē <i>i-bi</i> = follow-35G.M.OBI RE EXL CONJ-35G.M.OBJ 'Follow him ETSĒ.ad'= 45 = sa- <i>i</i> - <i>b-a si ā, j</i> 270SS-35G.M-A AUXLOC2 Take = ''go take yours.j' 46 KO: <i>[î bi hâ t]-b [K-n om-si.</i> pass 35G.OBJ RE text cony-35G.C.A DISC-3PL.C house-35G.F.in ''He is thus at their house.'	30	SS:	Ī	ba	i	ge	∣hû-n			llgâu-b	,	hâi.		
¹ He has gone to the boer's home.' ³ I RS: <i>IIIan ansider of the set of the person-3PLC house-3SG.E.O.</i> as <i>SG.C. DECL</i> . 'He is going to the boer's house.' ³ Z SS: <i>Bateri-b-a/fb ge si ra fgan f ti-b ge go mf.</i> battery-3SG.M-A-3SG.M DECL reach PROG ask.for thus-3SG.M DECL PST say '[He is going to ask for [the battery, he said.' ³ A RS: <i>(O-Is ge nî hâ (thhîni-b-a.)) (CONI-2SG.M DECL FUT exist book-3SG.M-A ('Then you must stay with (the book).']</i> ³ A RS: <i>(Sao-ai-bi re etsē./ follow-3SG.M.OBI RE EXL ('Follow him ETSE.']</i> ³ F RS: <i>(I/Aba dara-roc) f red wire-DIM-3SG.C.A ('A small red wire.')]</i> ³ F KS: <i>(Floka dara-roc) f red wire-DIM-3SG.G.A ('A small red wire.')]</i> ³ F KC: <i>(IBi si ra ôa i ge/</i> ³ SG.M.OBJ AUXLOC2 PROG look 3SG.C. DECL <i>('(He) will go looking for it.']</i> ³ F <i>SS: (I'Aba dara-roc) f ni-b(i go ôa-bi-a. DEM RECPST look-3SG.M.OBJ-C a This one looked for it.'</i> ⁴ O <i>Di-de go go hâ ti-b ge ask-UK RECPST 2PLM PRF ISG.POSS-3SG.M DECL 'You would ask mine.'</i> ⁴ I (0.6) ⁴ YB: He? <i>'Hhh?'</i> ⁴ G (0.4) ⁴ S <i>S: Sao-ai-bi re etsē i-bi= follow-isg.M.A JUXLOC2 take a: go take yours.]'</i> ⁴ G KO: <i>(I i bi hâ tlj-e //F-n orn-si. pass 3SG.M.OBJ exist thus-3SG.C.A DISC-3PL.C house-3SG.F.in ''He is thus at their house.'</i>			pass	3sg.m	3sg.c	DECL	white.j	person-3	BPL.C	hearth	-3sg.m	PRF.to		
31 RS: <i>Hû-n</i> om-si-b-a <i>i i ge.</i> white person-3PL.C. house-3SG.F.Io-3SG.M-A pass 3SG.C. DECL. ''He is going to the bee's house.' 32 SS: Batteri-b-a- <i>lb ge. si ra. tgan J ti-b. ge. go. mi.</i> battery-3SG.M-A-3SG.M. DECL. reach PRO cask.for thus-3SG.M. DECL PST say ''[He is going to ask for] the battery, he said.' 33 <i>RS: [O-ts. ge. ni hā. (tkhīni-b-a, J)</i> CONI-2SG.M. DECL. FUT exist book-3SG.M-A ('Ho you must stay with (the book).'] SS: <i>[Sao-ai-bi re. etsē.]</i> follow-3SG.M.OBJ RE ['Tollow him ETSL.'] 1 <i>re. etsē.]</i> follow-3SG.M.OBJ RE EXL ['Tollow him ETSL.'] 35 <i>RS: [(Laba dara-ro.e)] re. etsē.]</i> 7 <i>Rot. [Bi si ra óa i ge.]</i> 35G.M.OBJ AUX.LOC2 PROG look 3SG.C. DECL ['Yes.'] 36 <i>YB: EN go ôa-bi-a. [nā-b[i go ôa-bi-a.</i> ['Yes.'] 37 <i>KD: [Bi si ra óa i ge.] [î î j</i> ['Yes.'] 38 <i>SS: [í î j [</i> 'Yes.'] 39 <i>YB: PNE go ôa-bi-a. [f î j </i>			'He h	as gone	to the bo	er's hor	ne.'							
white.person-3PLC house-3SG.FLO-3SG.M-A pass 3SG.C DECL 'He is going to the boer's house.' 32 SS: Bateri-b-a/D ge si ra \pm gan / ti-b ge go mi. battery-3SG.M-A-3SG.M DECL reach PROG ask.for thus-3SG.M DECL PST say '[He is going to ask for] the battery, he said.' 33 RS: (O-1s ge nî hâ ($\#$ hîni-b-a,)) CONJ-2SG.M DECL FUT exist book-3SG.M-A ['Then you must stay with (the book).'] 34 SS: [Sao-ai-bi re etsē.] 56 Ilow-3SG.M.OBJ RE EXL ['Follow him ETSE.'] 35 RS: (($Aba \ dara-ro-e)$] red wire-DNM-3SG.C.A [('A small red wire.')] 36 YB: ($Eise$ () ti-b-a] mâ-b(i go hâ]= EXL ISG.POSS-3SG.M-A Q-3SG.M.OBJ RECPST exist '[ETSE,] where [is mine,']= 37 KO: [Bi si ra ôa i ge] 38 SS: ['(He) will go looking for it.'] 38 SS: ['(He) will go looking for it.'] 39 YB: =Nē go ôa-bi-a. DEM RECPST look-3SG.M.OBJ-C = 'This one looked for it.' 40 Di-de go go hâ ti-b ge ask-UNK RECPST 2PL.M PRF ISG.POSS-3SG.M DECL 'You would ask mine.' 41 (0.6) 42 YB: He? 'Huh?' 43 (0.4) 44 SS: Sao-ai-bi re etsē i-bi= follow-3SG.M.OBJ RE EXL CONJ-3SG.M.OBJ 'Follow him ETSE and'= 45 = sa-[b-a si ā.] 2POSS-3SG.M-A AUX.LOC2 take = '[go take yours.]' 46 KO: [i bi hâ t]i-e //i-n orn-si. pass 3SG.M.OBJ exist thus-3SG.C.A DISC-3PL.C house-3SG.E.in 'He is thus at their house.'	31	RS:	∣Hû-n	,	C	om-si-b-	a		ī	i	ge.			
'He is going to the boer's house.' 32 SS: Bateri-b-a- Ib ge si ra $\frac{1}{2}$ gan $\int ti-b$ ge go mille battery-3-SG.M. A-3SG.M. DECL reach PROG ask.for thus-3SG.M. DECL PST say '[He is going to ask for] the battery, he said.' 33 RS: $[O-ts ge ni ha (thhini-b-a,)]$ $CONI-2SG.M. DECL FUT exist book-3SG.M-A ['Then you must stay with (the book).'] 34 SS: [Sao-ai-bi re ets\bar{e}.]follow-3SG.M.OBJ RE EXL['Follow him ETSE.']35 RS: [(I/Aba dar-ro-c)]red wire-DIM-3SG.C.A[('A small red wire.')]36 YB: [Ets\bar{e} (.) ti-b-a] m\bar{a}\cdotb[i go h\bar{a}]=EXL 1SG.POSS-3SG.M-A Q-3SG.M.OBJ RECPST exist'[ETSE,] where [is mine,']=37 KO: [Bi si ra oa i ge]38G.M.OBJ AUX.LOC2 PROG look 3SG.C DECL['(He) will go looking for it.']38 SS: [I f. J]39 YB: =N\bar{e} go aa-bi-a.DEM RECPST look-3SG.M.OBJ-C=$ 'This one looked for it.' 40 $Di-de$ go go $h\bar{a}$ $ti-b$ ge ask-UNK RECPST 2PL.M PRF 1SG.POSS-3SG.M DECL 'You wuld ask mine.' 41 (0.6) 42 YB: He? 'Huh?' 43 (0.4) 44 SS: Sao-ai-bi re etsē i-bi= follow-3SG.M.OBJ RE EXL CONJ-3SG.M.OBJ 'Follow him ETSE and'= 45 $= sa-(b-a si i]$ 2POSS-3SG.M-A AUX.LOC2 take = '[go take yours.]' 46 KO: $[i bi h \hat{a} t]/i-e //i-n orn-si. pass 3SG.O.DBJ exist thus-3SG.C.A DISC-3PL.C house-3SG.F.in 'He is thus at their house.'$			white	.person-3	BPL.C h	ouse-3s	G.F.to-3	SG.M-A	pass	3sg.0	DECL			
32 SS: Bateri-b-a-[b ge si ra fgan f.ib ge go mini-battery 33 RS: [O-ts ge ni hâ (#khin-b-a,)] CON-2SG.M DECL FEAD FROG ask.for thus-3SG.M DECL PST say 33 RS: [O-ts ge ni hâ (#khin-b-a,)] CON-2SG.M DECL FUT exist 34 SS: [Sao-ai-bi re etsë,] follow-3SG.MOBI RE EXL ['Follow time trsE.'] 35 RS: [(Aa mar-ree)] red wire-DIM-3SG.CA ['Follow time time.'] ge nâ-b[i go hâ]= 25 RS: [[Lisé], okter [is mine.'] = 37 KO: [Bi si ra óa ge] 3SG.MOBI AUXLOC2 PRO Job Alge			'He is	s going to	o the boe	er's hou	se.'							
battery-3sG.M-A-3sG.M DECL reach PROG ask.for thus-3sG.M DECL PST say '[He is going to ask for] the battery, he said.' 33 RS: [O-ts ge nî hâ (fkhîni-b-a,)] COUJ-2SG.M DECL FUT exist book-3sG.M-A ['Then you must stay with (the book).'] 34 SS: [Sao-ai-bi re etsë,] follow-3sG.M.OBJ RE EXL ['Follow him ETSÊ.'] 35 RS: [(/Aba dara-ro-e)] red wire-DIM-3SG.C.A [('A small red wire.')] 36 YB: [Etsë (.) ti-b-a] mâ-b[i go hâ]= EXL ISG.POSS-3SG.M-A Q-3SG.M.OBJ RECPST exist '[ETSÊ,] where [is mine,']= 37 KO: [Bi si ra ôa i ge] 35G.M.OBJ AUX.LOC2 PROG look 3SG.C DECL ['(He) will go looking for it.'] 38 SS: [Î] [I] ['Yes.'] 39 YB: =Në go ôa-bi-a. DEM RECPST look-3SG.M.OBJ-C = 'This one looked for it.' 40 Di-de go go hâ ti-b ge ask-UNK RECPST 2PL.M PRF ISG.POSS-3SG.M DECL 'You would ask mine.' 41 (0.6) 42 YB: He? 'Huh?' 43 (0.4) 44 SS: Sao-ai-bi re etsë i-bi= follow-3sG.M.OBJ RE EXL CONJ-3SG.M.OBJ 'FOllow him ETSĒ and'= 45 = sar[b-a sī ā.] 2POSS-3SG.M-A AUX.LOC2 take = '[go take yours.]' 46 KO: [I bi hâ t]i-e î-n om-si. pass 3SG.M.OBJ exist thus-3SG.C.A DISC-3PL.C house-3SG.F.in 'He is thus at their house.'	32	SS:	Bater	i-b-a-[b		ge	si	ra	≠gan] ti-l	5	ge	go	mî.
'[He is going to ask for] the battery, he said.' 33 RS: [O-ts ge nî hâ (#khîni-b-a,)] CON-2SG.M DECL FUT exist book-3SG.M-A ['Then you must stay with (the book).'] 34 SS: [Sao-ai-bi re etsē,] follow-3SG.MOBI RE EXL ['Follow him ETSE.'] 35 RS: [(/Aba dara-ro-c)] red wire-DIM-3SG.C.A [('A small red wire.')] 36 YB: [Etsē () ti-b-a] mâ-b[i go hâ]= EXL ISG.POSS-3SG.M-A Q-3SG.M.OBJ RECPST exist '[ETSE,] where [is mine.']= 37 KO: [Bi si ra ôa i ge] 35G.M.OBJ AUXLOC2 PROG look 3SG.C DECL ['(He) will go looking for it.'] 38 SS: [f ,] 39 YB: = $N\bar{e}$ go ôa-bi-a. DEM RECPST look-3SG.M.OBJ-C = "This one looked for it.' 40 Di-de go go hâ ti-b ge ask-UNK RECPST 2PL.M PRF ISG.POSS-3SG.M DECL 'You would ask mine.' 41 (0.6) 42 YB: He? 'Huh?' 43 (0.4) 44 SS: Sao-ai-bi re etsē i-bi= follow-3G.M.OBJ RE EXL CONJ-3SG.M.OBJ 'Follow him ETSE and'= 45 = sa-[b-a sī ā,] 2POSS-3SG.M-A AUXLOC2 take = '[go take yours.]' 46 KO: [i bi hâ t]i-e / î-n om-si. pass 3SG.M.OBJ exist thus-3SG.C.A DISC-3PL.C house-3SG.F.in 'He is thus at their house.'			batter	у-3sg.м	-A-3SG.M	DECL	reach	PROG	ask.fc	or thu	is-3sg.m	DECL	PST	say
33 RS: $[O \cdot s ge n^{2} h^{2} (\#h^{2}h^{2}h^{2}h^{2}h^{2}h^{2}h^{2}h^{2}$			'[He i	is going	to ask fo	r] the ba	attery, ł	ne said.'						
CONJ-2SG.M DECL FUT exist book-3SG.M-A ['Then you must stay with (the book).'] 34 SS: [Sao-ai-bi re etsē.] follow-3SG.M.OBJ RE EXL ['Follow him ETSĒ.'] 35 RS: [(/Aba dara-ro-e)] red wire-DIM-3SG.C.A [('A small red wire.')] 36 YB: [EISē (.) ti-b-a] mā-b/i go hā]= EXL 1SG.POSS-3SG.M-A Q-3SG.M.OBJ RECPST exist '[ETSĒ.] where [is mine,']= 37 KO: [Bi sī ra ôa i ge] 35G.M.OBJ AUX.LOC2 PROG look 3SG.C DECL ['(He) will go looking for it.'] 38 SS: [î î] 39 YB: = Nē go ôa-bi-a. DEM RECPST look-3SG.M.OBJ-C = 'This one looked for it.' 40 Di-de go go hā ti-b ge ask-UNK RECPST 2PL.M PRF 1SG.POSS-3SG.M DECL 'You would ask mine.' 41 (0.6) 42 YB: He? 'Huh?' 43 (0.4) 44 SS: Sao-ai-bi re etsē i-bi= follow-3SG.M.OBJ RE EXL CONJ-3SG.M.OBJ 'Follow him ETSĒ and'= 45 = sa-[b-a sī ū,] 2POSS-3SG.M-A AUX.LOC2 take = '[go take yours.]' 46 KO: [î bi hā t]/i-e //i-a om-si. pass 3SG.M.OBJ exe: 1	33	RS:		[O-ts	5	ge	nî h	nâ (‡k	chîni-b-	-a,)]				
['Then you must stay with (the book).'] 34 SS: $[Sao-ai-bi re ets\bar{e}.]$ follow-3sG.M.OBJ RE EXL ['Follow him ETSE.'] 35 RS: $[(Aba dara-ro-e)]$ red wire-DIM-3SG.C.A [('A small red wire.')] 36 YB: $[Ets\bar{e} (.) ti-b-a]$ $m\hat{a}-b[i go h\hat{a}]=$ EXL 1SG.POSS-3SG.M-A Q-3SG.M.OBJ RECPST exist '[ETSĒ.] where [is mine,'] = 37 KO: $[Bi s\bar{s} ra \hat{o}a i ge]$ 35G.M.OBJ AUX.LOC2 PROG look 3SG.C DECL ['(He) will go looking for it.'] 38 SS: $[\hat{I}.]$ ['Yes.'] 39 YB: $=N\bar{e} go \hat{o}a-bi-a.$ DEM RECPST look-3SG.M.OBJ-C = 'This one looked for it.' 40 Di-de go go hâ ti-b ge ask-UNK RECPST 2PL.M PRF 1SG.POSS-3SG.M DECL 'You would ask mine.' 41 (0.6) 42 YB: He? 'Huh?' 43 (0.4) 44 SS: Sao-ai-bi re ets\bar{e} i-bi = follow-3sG.M.OBJ RE EXL CONJ-3SG.M.OBJ 'Follow him ETSĒ and' = 45 $= sa-[b-a si \bar{a}]$ 2POSS-3SG.M-A AUX.LOC2 take = '[go take yours.]' 46 KO: $[I b h \hat{h} i]/ie /[i-n om-si.]$ pass 3SG.M.OBJ exist thus-3SG.C.A DISC-3PL.C house-3SG.F.in 'He is thus at their house.'				CONJ	-2sg.m	DECL	FUT e	xist bo	ok-3sg.	.M-A				
34 SS: [Sao-ai-bi re etsē.] follow-3sG.M.OBJ RE EXL ['Follow him ETSE.'] 35 RS: [(lAba dara-ro-e)] red wire-DIM-3sG.C.A [('A small red wire.']] 36 YB: [Etsē.] () ti-b-a] mâ-b[i go hâ]= EXL ISG.POSS-3SG.M-A Q-3SG.M.OBJ RECPST exist '[ETSE,] where [is mine,'] = 37 KO: [Bi sī ra ôa i ge] 3SG.M.OBJ AUX.LOC2 PROG look 3SG.C DECL ['(He) will go looking for it.'] 38 SS: [Î' î] ['Yes.'] 39 YB: = Nē go ôa-bi-a. DEM RECPST look-3SG.M.OBJ-C = 'This one looked for it.' 40 Di-de go go hâ ti-b ge ask-UNK RECPST 2PL.M PRF ISG.POSS-3SG.M DECL 'You would ask mine.' 41 (0.6) 42 YB: He? 'Huh?' 43 (0.4) 44 SS: Sao-ai-bi re etsē i-bi= follow-3sG.M.OBJ RE EXL CONJ-3sG.M.OBJ 'Follow him ETSE and'= 45 = sa-{D-a} sī ū.j 2POSS-3SG.M-A AUX.LOC2 take = '[go take yours.]' 46 KO: [I bi hâ t]i-e //i-n om-si. pass 3sG.M.OBJ exist thus-3SG.C.A DISC-3PL.C house-3SG.F.in 'He is thus at their house.'				['The	en you n	nust stay	with (t	the book	s).']					
follow-3G.M.OBJ RE EXL ['Follow him ETSE.'] 35 RS: $f(lAba \ dara-ro-e) \qquad j$ red wire-DIM-3SG.C.A [('A small red wire.')] 36 YB: $[EtSe] (.) \ ti-b-a \qquad j \ m\hat{a}-b[i \qquad go \qquad h\hat{a}]=$ EXL 1SG.POSS-3SG.M-A Q-3SG.M.OBJ RECPST exist '[ETSE] where [is mine,']= 37 KO: $[Bi \qquad si \qquad ra ôa \qquad i \qquad ge]$ 38 SS: $[\hat{l}. \ j \ ['(He) will go looking for it.'] 38 SS: [\hat{l}. \ j \ ['(He) will go looking for it.']39 YB: = N\bar{e} \ go \qquad \hat{o}a-bi-a.DEM RECPST look-3SG.M.OBJ-C= `This one looked for it.'40 Di-de \ go \ go \ h\hat{a} \ ti-b \ geask-UNK RECPST 2PL.M PRF 1SG.POSS-3SG.M DECL `You would ask mine.' 41 (0.6) 42 YB: He? `Huh?' 43 (0.4) 44 SS: Sao-ai-bi re etsē i-bi= follow-3SG.M.OBJ RE EXL CONJ-3SG.M.OBJ `Follow him ETSE and'= 45 = sa-[b-a \ si \ a.j]2POSS-3SG.M-A AUX.LOC2 take= `[go take yours.]'46 KO: [i \ bi \ h\hat{a} \ t]i-e \ li-n \ orn-si.pass 3G.M.OBJ exist thus-3SG.C.A DISC-3PL.C house-3SG.F.in`He is thus at their house.'$	34	SS:	[Sao-	ai-bi	re	etsē.]								
['Follow him ETSE.'] 35 RS: $[(/Aba dara-ro-e)]$ red wire-DIM-3SG.C.A [('A small red wire.')] 36 YB: $[Ets\bar{e} (.) ti-b-a]$] mâ-b[i go hâ]= EXL 1SG.POSS-3SG.M-A Q-3SG.M.OBJ RECPST exist '[ETSĒ,] where [is mine,']= 37 KO: $[Bi si ra ôa i ge]$ 38 SS: [f ,] ['(He) will go looking for it.'] 38 SS: [f ,] ['(He) will go looking for it.'] 39 YB: $=N\bar{e}$ go $\hat{o}a-bi-a$. DEM RECPST look-3SG.M.OBJ-C = 'This one looked for it.' 40 Di-de go go $h\hat{a}$ ti-b ge ask-UNK RECPST 2PL.M PRF 1SG.POSS-3SG.M DECL 'You would ask mine.' 41 (0.6) 42 YB: He? 'Huh?' 43 (0.4) 44 SS: Sao-ai-bi re etsē i-bi= follow-3SG.M.OBJ RE EXL CONJ-3SG.M.OBJ 'Follow him ETSĒ and'= 45 $= sa-[b-a si \bar{a}]$ 2POSS-3SG.M-A AUX.LOC2 take = '[go take yours.]' 46 KO: [i bi $h\hat{a}$ t $ji-e$ / $li-n$ orn-si. pass 3SG.M.OBJ exist thus-3SG.C.A DISC-3PL.C house-3SG.F.in 'He is thus at their house.'			follov	v-3sg.m.	OBJ RE	EXL								
35 RS: $[(lAba dara-ro-e)]$ red wire-DIM-3SG.C.A [('A small red wire.')] 36 YB: $[Ets\bar{e} (.) ti-b-a]$ $] m\hat{a}-b[i go h\hat{a}] =$ EXL 1SG.POSS-3SG.M-A Q-3SG.M.OBJ RECPST exist '[ETSE,] where [is mine,'] = 37 KO: $[Bi si ra \hat{o}a i ge]$ 35G.M.OBJ AUX.LOC2 PROG look 3SG.C DECL ['(He) will go looking for it.'] 38 SS: $[\hat{l}, \hat{l}]$ ['Yes.'] 39 YB: $=N\bar{e} go \hat{o}a-bi-a.$ DEM RECPST look-3SG.M.OBJ-C = 'This one looked for it.' 40 $Di-de go go h\hat{a} ti-b ge$ ask-UNK RECPST 2PL.M PRF 1SG.POSS-3SG.M DECL 'You would ask mine.' 41 (0.6) 42 YB: He? 'Huh?' 43 (0.4) 44 SS: Sao-ai-bi re etsē i-bi = follow-3SG.M.OBJ RE EXL CONJ-3SG.M.OBJ 'Follow him ETSĒ and' = 45 $= sa-[b-a si \bar{a}]$ 2POSS-3SG.M-A AUX.LOC2 take = '[go take yours.]' 46 KO: $[i bi h\hat{a} t]i-e /[i-n om-si.]$ pass 3SG.M.OBJ exist thus-3SG.C.A DISC-3PL.C house-3SG.F.in 'He is thus at their house.'			['Foll	ow him	etsē.']									
red wire-DIM-3SG.C.A [('A small red wire.')] 36 <i>YB</i> : [<i>Etsē</i> (.) <i>ti-b-a</i>] <i>mâ-b[i</i> go <i>hâ]</i> = EXL 1SG.POSS-3SG.M-A Q-3SG.M.OBJ RECPST exist '[ETSĒ,] where [is mine,']= 37 <i>KO</i> : [<i>Bi sī ra ôa i</i> ge] 38 <i>SS</i> : [<i>î l j</i> ['(He) will go looking for it.'] 38 <i>SS</i> : [<i>î l j</i> ['Yes.'] 39 <i>YB</i> : = $N\bar{e}$ go <i>ôa-bi-a</i> . DEM RECPST look-3SG.M.OBJ-C = 'This one looked for it.' 40 <i>Di-de</i> go go <i>hâ ti-b</i> ge ask-UNK RECPST 2PL.M PRF 1SG.POSS-3SG.M DECL 'You would ask mine.' 41 (0.6) 42 YB: He? 'Huh?' 43 (0.4) 44 <i>SS</i> : <i>Sao-ai-bi re etsē i-bi</i> = follow-3SG.M.OBJ RE EXL CONJ-3SG.M.OBJ 'Follow him ETSĒ and'= 45 = <i>sa-[b-a sī ū,]</i> 2POSS-3SG.M-A AUX.LOC2 take = '[go take yours.]' 46 <i>KO</i> : [<i>ī bi hâ t]i-e</i> // <i>i-n om-si.</i> pass 3SG.M.OBJ exist thus-3SG.C.A DISC-3PL.C house-3SG.F.in 'He is thus at heir house.'	35	RS:	- [(Ab	oa dara	a-ro-e)		1							
[('A small red wire.')] 36 $YB: [Etsē (.) ti-b-a] mâ-b[i go hâ] =$ EXL 1SG.POSS-3SG.M-A Q-3SG.M.OBJ RECPST exist '[ETSĒ,] where [is mine,'] = 37 $KO: [Bi si ra ôa i ge]$ 38 $SS: [î l] ['(He) will go looking for it.'] 38 SS: [i l] ['(He) will go looking for it.']39 YB: = Nē go ôa-bi-a.DEM RECPST look-3SG.M.OBJ-C= 'This one looked for it.'40 Di-de go go hâ ti-b geask-UNK RECPST 2PL.M PRF 1SG.POSS-3SG.M DECL'You would ask mine.'41 (0.6)42 YB: He?'Huh?'43 (0.4)44 SS: Sao-ai-bi re etsē i-bi=follow-3SG.M.OBJ RE EXL CONJ-3SG.M.OBJ'Follow him ETSĒ and' =45 = sa-[b-a si \bar{u}]2POSS-3SG.M-A AUX.LOC2 take= '[go take yours.]'46 KO: [i bi hâ t]i-e /[i-n om-si.]pass 3SG.M.OBJ exist thus-3SG.C.A DISC-3PL.C house-3SG.F.in'He is thus at their house.'$			red	wire	e-DIM-3S	G.C.A	2							
36 YB: $[Etse]()$ ti-b-a EXL 1SG.POSS-3SG.M-A [ETSE,]] where $[is mine,'] =37 KO: [Bi si ra \delta a i ge]35G.M.OBJ AUX.LOC2 PROG look 3SG.C DECL['(He)$ will go looking for it.'] 38 SS: $[\hat{l}, \hat{l}]$ 38 SS: $[\hat{l}, \hat{l}]$ 39 YB: $=N\bar{e}$ go δa -bi-a. DEM RECPST look-3SG.M.OBJ-C = 'This one looked for it.' 40 Di-de go go $h\hat{a}$ ti-b ge ask-UNK RECPST 2PL.M PRF 1SG.POSS-3SG.M DECL 'You would ask mine.' 41 (0.6) 42 YB: He? 'Huh?' 43 (0.4) 44 SS: Sao-ai-bi re etsē i-bi= follow-3SG.M.OBJ RE EXL CONJ-3SG.M.OBJ 'Follow him ETSE and'= 45 $= sa-[b-a \ si \ \overline{u},\overline{l}]$ 2POSS-3SG.M-A AUX.LOC2 take = `[go take yours.]' 46 KO: $[\bar{i} \ bi \ h\hat{a}\ t]i-e \ //i-n \ om-si.$ pass 3SG.M.OBJ exist thus-3SG.C.A DISC-3PL.C house-3SG.F.in 'He is thus at their house.'			[('A s	small rec	l wire.')									
EXL 1SG.POSS-3SG.M-A Q-3SG.M.OBJ RECPST exist '[ETSE,] where [is mine,'] = 37 KO: [Bi si ra ôa i ge] 38 SG.M.OBJ AUX.LOC2 PROG look 3SG.C DECL ['(He) will go looking for it.'] 38 SS: [î î] 39 YB: = $N\bar{e}$ go ôa-bi-a. DEM RECPST look-3SG.M.OBJ-C = 'This one looked for it.' 40 Di-de go go hâ ti-b ge ask-UNK RECPST 2PL.M PRF 1SG.POSS-3SG.M DECL 'You would ask mine.' 41 (0.6) 42 YB: He? 'Huh?' 43 (0.4) 44 SS: Sao-ai-bi re etsē i-bi= follow-3SG.M.OBJ RE EXL CONJ-3SG.M.OBJ 'Follow him ETSE and'= 45 = sa-[b-a si ū,] 2POSS-3SG.M-A AUX.LOC2 take = '[go take yours.]' 46 KO: [ī bi hâ t]i-e //i-n om-si. pass 3SG.M.OBJ exist thus-3SG.C.A DISC-3PL.C house-3SG.F.in 'He is thus at their house.'	36	YB:	[Etsē	.) ti-	-b-a]	mâ-l	b[i	go		hâ]=
'[ETSĒ,] where [is mine,'] = 37 KO: $[Bi si ra ôa i ge]$ 38 SS: $[^{i}(He)$ will go looking for it.'] 38 SS: $[^{i}(He)$ will go looking for it.'] 39 YB: $=N\overline{e}$ go $\hat{o}a-bi-a$. DEM RECPST look-3SG.M.OBJ-C = 'This one looked for it.' 40 Di-de go go $h\hat{a}$ ti-b ge ask-UNK RECPST 2PL.M PRF 1SG.POSS-3SG.M DECL 'You would ask mine.' 41 (0.6) 42 YB: He? 'Huh?' 43 (0.4) 44 SS: Sao-ai-bi re etsē i-bi = follow-3SG.M.OBJ RE EXL CONJ-3SG.M.OBJ 'Follow him ETSĒ and' = 45 $= sa-[b-a si i]$ 2POSS-3SG.M-A AUX.LOC2 take = '[go take yours.]' 46 KO: $[i bi h\hat{a} t]i-e /[i-n om-si.]$ pass 3SG.M.OBJ exist thus-3SG.C.A DISC-3PL.C house-3SG.F.in 'He is thus at their house.'			EXL	1s	G.POSS-3	SG.M-A				Q-3s	G.M.OBJ	RECP	ST 6	exist
37 KO: $[Bi$ si ra ôa i ge] 38 SS. $[î(He)$ will go looking for it.'] 38 SS: $[if]$ $[if]$ $[if]$ 39 YB: $=N\overline{e}$ go ôa-bi-a. DEM RECPST look-3SG.M.OBJ-C = 'This one looked for it.' 40 Di-de go go hâ ti-b ge ask-UNK RECPST 2PL.M PRF 1SG.POSS-3SG.M DECL 'You would ask mine.' 41 (0.6) 42 YB: He? 'Huh?' 43 (0.4) 44 SS: Sao-ai-bi re etsē i-bi= follow-3SG.M.OBJ RE EXL CONJ-3SG.M.OBJ 'Follow him ETSĒ and'= 45 $= sa-[b-a sī \bar{u}_i]$ 2POSS-3SG.M-A AUX.LOC2 take = '[go take yours.]' 46 KO: $[\overline{i}$ bi hâ t]i-e //[i-n om-si. pass 3SG.M.OBJ exist thus-3SG.C.A DISC-3PL.C house-3SG.F.in 'He is thus at their house.'			'[ETS	Ē,] where	e [is min	e,']=								
3SG.M.OBJ AUX.LOC2 PROG look 3SG.C DECL ['(He) will go looking for it.'] 38 SS: $(f\hat{L}, f)$ ['Yes.'] 39 YB: = $N\bar{e}$ go $\hat{o}a$ -bi-a. DEM RECPST look-3SG.M.OBJ-C = 'This one looked for it.' 40 Di-de go go $h\hat{a}$ ti-b ge ask-UNK RECPST 2PL.M PRF 1SG.POSS-3SG.M DECL 'You would ask mine.' 41 (0.6) 42 YB: He? 'Huh?' 43 (0.4) 44 SS: Sao-ai-bi re etsē i-bi = follow-3SG.M.OBJ RE EXL CONJ-3SG.M.OBJ 'Follow him ETSĒ and' = 45 = sa-[b-a sī ū,] 2POSS-3SG.M-A AUX.LOC2 take = '[go take yours.]' 46 KO: $[\hat{l}$ bi $h\hat{a}$ t]i-e // \hat{l} -n om-si. pass 3SG.M.OBJ exist thus-3SG.C.A DISC-3PL.C house-3SG.F.in 'He is thus at their house.'	37	KO:	- Bi	S	ī	ra	ôa	i	ge]					
['(He) will go looking for it.'] 38 SS: $[\hat{l}, \hat{l}]$ ['Yes.'] 39 YB: = $N\bar{e}$ go $\hat{o}a$ -bi-a. DEM RECPST look-3SG.M.OBJ-C = 'This one looked for it.' 40 Di -de go go $h\hat{a}$ ti-b ge ask-UNK RECPST 2PL.M PRF 1SG.POSS-3SG.M DECL 'You would ask mine.' 41 (0.6) 42 YB: He? 'Huh?' 43 (0.4) 44 SS: Sao-ai-bi re etsē i-bi = follow-3SG.M.OBJ RE EXL CONJ-3SG.M.OBJ 'Follow him ETSĒ and' = 45 = sa-[b-a sī ū,] 2POSS-3SG.M-A AUX.LOC2 take = '[go take yours.]' 46 KO: $[\hat{l}$ bi $h\hat{a}$ t]i-e //î-n om-si. pass 3SG.M.OBJ exist thus-3SG.C.A DISC-3PL.C house-3SG.F.in 'He is thus at their house.'			3SG.N	A.OBJ A	UX.LOC2	PROG	look	3sg.c	DECI	Ĺ				
38 $SS:$ [\hat{l} ,] ['Yes.'] 39 $YB: = N\bar{e} go \hat{o}a-bi-a.$ DEM RECPST look-3SG.M.OBJ-C = 'This one looked for it.' 40 $Di-de go go h\hat{a} ti-b ge$ ask-UNK RECPST 2PL.M PRF 1SG.POSS-3SG.M DECL 'You would ask mine.' 41 (0.6) 42 YB: He? 'Huh?' 43 (0.4) 44 $SS: Sao-ai-bi$ re $ets\bar{e} i-bi =$ follow-3SG.M.OBJ RE EXL CONJ-3SG.M.OBJ 'Follow him ETSĒ and' = 45 $= sa_{-}[b-a s\bar{i} \bar{u}_{.}]$ 2POSS-3SG.M-A AUX.LOC2 take = '[go take yours.]' 46 $KO: [\bar{i} bi h\hat{a} t]i-e //\hat{i}-n om-si.$ pass 3SG.M.OBJ exist thus-3SG.C.A DISC-3PL.C house-3SG.F.in 'He is thus at their house.'			['(He	e) will go	looking	for it.']								
['Yes.'] 39 $YB: = N\overline{e} \ go \hat{o}a-bi-a.$ DEM RECPST look-3SG.M.OBJ-C = 'This one looked for it.' 40 $Di-de \ go \ go \ h\hat{a} \ ti-b \ ge$ ask-UNK RECPST 2PL.M PRF 1SG.POSS-3SG.M DECL 'You would ask mine.' 41 (0.6) 42 YB: He? 'Huh?' 43 (0.4) 44 SS: Sao-ai-bi re ets i-bi= follow-3SG.M.OBJ RE EXL CONJ-3SG.M.OBJ 'Follow him ETS and'= 45 $= sa-[b-a \ s\overline{i} \ \overline{i},]$ 2POSS-3SG.M-A AUX.LOC2 take = '[go take yours.]' 46 KO: $[\overline{i} \ bi \ h\hat{a} \ t]i-e \ //\hat{i}-n \ om-si.$ pass 3SG.M.OBJ exist thus-3SG.C.A DISC-3PL.C house-3SG.F.in 'He is thus at their house.'	38	SS:									[Î.]	
39 $YB: = N\overline{e} \ go \hat{o}a-bi-a.$ DEM RECPST look-3SG.M.OBJ-C = 'This one looked for it.' 40 $Di-de \ go \ go \ h\hat{a} \ ti-b \ ge$ ask-UNK RECPST 2PL.M PRF 1SG.POSS-3SG.M DECL 'You would ask mine.' 41 (0.6) 42 YB: He? 'Huh?' 43 (0.4) 44 SS: Sao-ai-bi re etsē i-bi= follow-3SG.M.OBJ RE EXL CONJ-3SG.M.OBJ 'Follow him ETSĒ and' = 45 $= sa-[b-a \ s\bar{s} \ \bar{u}]$ 2POSS-3SG.M-A AUX.LOC2 take = '[go take yours.]' 46 KO: $[\bar{i} \ bi \ h\hat{a} \ t]i-e \ //\hat{i}-n \ om-si.$ pass 3SG.M.OBJ exist thus-3SG.C.A DISC-3PL.C house-3SG.F.in 'He is thus at their house.'											['Yes.']	_	
DEM RECPST look-3SG.M.OBJ-C = 'This one looked for it.' 40 $Di de$ go go $h\hat{a}$ $ti - b$ ge ask-UNK RECPST 2PL.M PRF 1SG.POSS-3SG.M DECL 'You would ask mine.' 41 (0.6) 42 YB: He? 'Huh?' 43 (0.4) 44 $SS:$ Sao-ai-bi re etsē $i-bi =$ follow-3SG.M.OBJ RE EXL CONJ-3SG.M.OBJ 'Follow him ETSĒ and' = 45 $= sa-[b-a si i,]$ 2POSS-3SG.M-A AUX.LOC2 take = '[go take yours.]' 46 $KO:$ $[i bi h\hat{a} \ t]i-e //i-n om-si.$ pass 3SG.M.OBJ exist thus-3SG.C.A DISC-3PL.C house-3SG.F.in 'He is thus at their house.'	39	YB:	=Nē	go	ôa-b.	i-a.								
= 'This one looked for it.' 40 $Di de go go h\hat{a} ti b ge$ ask-UNK RECPST 2PL.M PRF 1SG.POSS-3SG.M DECL 'You would ask mine.' 41 (0.6) 42 YB: He? 'Huh?' 43 (0.4) 44 SS: Sao-ai-bi re etsē i-bi = follow-3sG.M.OBJ RE EXL CONJ-3SG.M.OBJ 'Follow him ETSĒ and' = 45 $= sa-[b-a s\bar{s} \bar{u}_{,l}]$ 2POSS-3SG.M-A AUX.LOC2 take = '[go take yours.]' 46 KO: $[\bar{i} bi h\hat{a} t]i-e / \hat{i}-n om-si.$ pass 3SG.M.OBJ exist thus-3SG.C.A DISC-3PL.C house-3SG.F.in 'He is thus at their house.'			DEM	RECPS	т look-	-3sg.m.o	DBJ-C							
40 $Di - de go go hâ ti - b ge$ ask-UNK RECPST 2PL.M PRF 1SG.POSS-3SG.M DECL 'You would ask mine.' 41 (0.6) 42 YB: He? 'Huh?' 43 (0.4) 44 SS: Sao-ai-bi re etsē i-bi = follow-3sG.M.OBJ RE EXL CONJ-3SG.M.OBJ 'Follow him ETSĒ and' = 45 $= sa-[b-a sī \bar{u}_{,j}]$ 2POSS-3SG.M-A AUX.LOC2 take = '[go take yours.]' 46 KO: $[\bar{i} bi h\hat{a} t]i-e //\hat{i}-n om-si.$ pass 3SG.M.OBJ exist thus-3SG.C.A DISC-3PL.C house-3SG.F.in 'He is thus at their house.'			= 'Tł	his one lo	ooked fo	r it.'								
ask-UNK RECPST 2PL.M PRF 1SG.POSS-3SG.M DECL 'You would ask mine.' 41 (0.6) 42 YB: He? 'Huh?' 43 (0.4) 44 SS: Sao-ai-bi re etsē i-bi = follow-3SG.M.OBJ RE EXL CONJ-3SG.M.OBJ 'Follow him ETSĒ and' = 45 $= sa-[b-a si \bar{u}_{,j}]$ 2POSS-3SG.M-A AUX.LOC2 take = '[go take yours.]' 46 KO: $[\bar{i} bi h\hat{a} t]i-e //\hat{i}-n om-si.$ pass 3SG.M.OBJ exist thus-3SG.C.A DISC-3PL.C house-3SG.F.in 'He is thus at their house.'	40		Di-de	e go	go	hâ	ti-b			ge				
'You would ask mine.' 41 (0.6) 42 YB: He? 'Huh?' 43 (0.4) 44 SS: Sao-ai-bi re etsē i-bi = follow-3sG.M.OBJ RE EXL CONJ-3SG.M.OBJ 'Follow him ETSĒ and' = 45 $= sa-[b-a s\bar{i} \bar{u}, \bar{j}]$ 2POSS-3SG.M-A AUX.LOC2 take = '[go take yours.]' 46 KO: $[\bar{i} bi h\hat{a} t]i-e //\hat{i}-n om-si.$ pass 3SG.M.OBJ exist thus-3SG.C.A DISC-3PL.C house-3SG.F.in 'He is thus at their house.'			ask-U	NK REC	PST 2PI	L.M PR	F 1SG.	POSS-3S	G.M	DECL				
41 (0.6) 42 YB: He? 'Huh?' 43 (0.4) 44 SS: Sao-ai-bi re etsē i-bi = follow-3SG.M.OBJ RE EXL CONJ-3SG.M.OBJ 'Follow him ETSĒ and' = 45 $= sa-[b-a si \bar{u}, J]$ 2POSS-3SG.M-A AUX.LOC2 take = `[go take yours.]' 46 KO: $[\bar{i} bi h\hat{a} t]i-e //\hat{i}-n om-si.$ pass 3SG.M.OBJ exist thus-3SG.C.A DISC-3PL.C house-3SG.F.in 'He is thus at their house.'			'You	would a	sk mine.	,								
42 YB: He? 'Huh?' 43 (0.4) 44 SS: Sao-ai-bi re etsē i-bi = follow-3sG.M.OBJ RE EXL CONJ-3SG.M.OBJ 'Follow him ETSĒ and' = 45 $= sa-[b-a si \bar{u},]$ 2POSS-3SG.M-A AUX.LOC2 take = '[go take yours.]' 46 KO: $[\bar{i} bi h\hat{a} t]i-e //\hat{i}-n om-si.$ pass 3SG.M.OBJ exist thus-3SG.C.A DISC-3PL.C house-3SG.F.in 'He is thus at their house.'	41	(0.6)	1											
'Huh?' 43 (0.4) 44 SS: Sao-ai-bi re etsē i-bi = follow-3sG.M.OBJ RE EXL CONJ-3SG.M.OBJ 'Follow him ETSĒ and' = 45 $= sa-[b-a si \bar{u},]$ 2POSS-3SG.M-A AUX.LOC2 take = '[go take yours.]' 46 KO: $[\bar{i} bi h\hat{a} t]i-e //\hat{i}-n om-si.$ pass 3SG.M.OBJ exist thus-3SG.C.A DISC-3PL.C house-3SG.F.in 'He is thus at their house.'	42	YB:	He?											
43 (0.4) 44 SS: Sao-ai-bi re etsē i-bi = follow-3SG.M.OBJ RE EXL CONJ-3SG.M.OBJ 'Follow him ETSĒ and' = 45 $= sa-[b-a si \bar{u}, J]$ 2POSS-3SG.M-A AUX.LOC2 take = '[go take yours.]' 46 KO: $[\bar{i} bi h\hat{a} t]i-e //\hat{i}-n om-si.$ pass 3SG.M.OBJ exist thus-3SG.C.A DISC-3PL.C house-3SG.F.in 'He is thus at their house.'			'Huh'	?'										
44 SS: Sao-ai-bi re etsē i-bi = follow-3sg.M.OBJ RE EXL CONJ-3SG.M.OBJ 'Follow him ETSĒ and' = 45 $= sa-[b-a si \bar{u},]$ 2POSS-3SG.M-A AUX.LOC2 take = '[go take yours.]' 46 KO: $[\bar{i} bi h\hat{a} t]i-e //\hat{i}-n om-si.$ pass 3SG.M.OBJ exist thus-3SG.C.A DISC-3PL.C house-3SG.F.in 'He is thus at their house.'	43	(0.4)	1											
follow-3SG.M.OBJ RE EXL CONJ-3SG.M.OBJ 'Follow him ETSĒ and' = 45 $= sa-[b-a s\overline{i} \overline{u},]$ 2POSS-3SG.M-A AUX.LOC2 take = '[go take yours.]' 46 KO: $[\overline{i} bi h\hat{a} t]i-e //\hat{i}-n om-si.$ pass 3SG.M.OBJ exist thus-3SG.C.A DISC-3PL.C house-3SG.F.in 'He is thus at their house.'	44	SS:	Sao-a	ai-bi	re	etsē .	i-bi =							
'Follow him ETSĒ and' = 45 $= sa-[b-a s\overline{i} \overline{u},]$ 2POSS-3SG.M-A AUX.LOC2 take = '[go take yours.]' 46 KO: $[\overline{i} bi h\hat{a} t]i-e //\hat{i}-n om-si.$ pass 3SG.M.OBJ exist thus-3SG.C.A DISC-3PL.C house-3SG.F.in 'He is thus at their house.'			follow	w-3sg.m.	.OBJ RE	EXL (conj-3s	G.M.OBJ	ſ					
45 $= sa-[b-a s\bar{i} \bar{u}, \bar{j}]$ 2POSS-3SG.M-A AUX.LOC2 take = '[go take yours.]' 46 KO: $[\bar{i} bi h\hat{a} t]i-e //\hat{i}-n om-si.$ pass 3SG.M.OBJ exist thus-3SG.C.A DISC-3PL.C house-3SG.F.in 'He is thus at their house.'			'Follo	ow him I	ETSĒ and	'=								
2POSS-3SG.M-A AUX.LOC2 take = '[go take yours.]' 46 KO: $[\bar{i}$ bi hâ t]i-e //î-n om-si. pass 3SG.M.OBJ exist thus-3SG.C.A DISC-3PL.C house-3SG.F.in 'He is thus at their house.'	45		=sa-	[b-a	SĪ	i	ī,]							
= '[go take yours.]' 46 KO: $[\overline{i} bi h\hat{a} t]i-e \hat{i}-n om-si.$ pass 3SG.M.OBJ exist thus-3SG.C.A DISC-3PL.C house-3SG.F.in 'He is thus at their house.'			2POSS	s-3sg.m	A AUX.	LOC2 t	ake							
46 <i>KO:</i> [<i>ī</i> bi hâ t]i-e //î-n om-si. pass 3SG.M.OBJ exist thus-3SG.C.A DISC-3PL.C house-3SG.F.in 'He is thus at their house.'			='[g	o take yo	ours.]'									
pass 3SG.M.OBJ exist thus-3SG.C.A DISC-3PL.C house-3SG.F.in 'He is thus at their house.'	46	KO:		[ī	bi	hâ	t]i-e		//î-n		om-si.			
'He is thus at their house.'				pass	3sg.m.of	3J exist	thus-3	SG.C.A	DISC-3	3pl.c	house-3	BSG.F.in		
				'He is th	hus at the	eir hous	e.'							

47	RS:	Etsē (.) [khoe-b-a ī-b-a]
		EXL person-3SG.M-A pass-3SG.M-A
		'ETSĒ (.) [Is the man going?]'
48	KO:	[(Khoe-b go-ro ī i ge)]
		person-3SG.M RECPST-PROG pass 3SG.C DECL
		[('The man went.')]
49	(0.3)	
50	KO	$(\overline{I} go [khoe-b ge,)]$
		pass RECPST person-3SG.M DECL
		('[The man] went.'])
51	RS:	[(Toa i ge)]
		finish 3sg.c decl
		[('It's finished.')]
52		[((RS hands wire back to SS))]
53	SS:	Ama i ge.
		true 3SG.C DECL
		'It is true.'
54	KO:	()
55	(1.6)	
56	SS:	Sao-ai-bi re etsē ani (.) $ gau h\hat{u}-b-a n\bar{a} =$
		follow-3SG.M.OBJ RE EXL in.order.to show white.person-3SG.M-A DEM
		'Follow him ETSĒ in order to show the boer that' =
57		=!uri gara- (.) dara- gāran di dara-gu-a.
		white wire UNK POSS wire-3PL.M-A
		= 'white wi- (.) wir- type of wire.'
58	(1.0)	
59	SS:	$N\bar{e}$ dara i ge !gae \bar{u} -he-s-a hî h \bar{o} -sen tide. =
		DEM wire 3SG.C DECL good take-PASS-3SG.F-A AUX.FUT UNK-RECP FUT.NEG
		'This wire is not good for winding/tying cars. = '
60		=[staal i ge nā-e]
		steel 3SG.C DECL DEM-3SG.C.A
		= ['This is steel.']
61	KO:	
62 62	(0.3) VD	
63	YB:	Etse sao-ai-bi-ts ge ga na etse.
		EXL IOHOW-SSG.M.OBJ-2SG PSI COND PRF EXL
64	M11.	UNE and h me in a come
04	<i>M</i> 11.	$mva aro-v \qquad ne-ao =$
		That man will now? -
65		$\frac{1}{1} \ln a \ln w \ln how = \frac{1}{1} \ln a \ln b \ln a \ln b \ln b \ln b \ln b \ln b \ln b \ln b$
05		- III a all c Uala-II I gui-II-a Oa III II all SC 1
		- 'only search for and bring that similar type of wire '
		- only search for and oring that similar type of whe.

66	SS:	Î-hî,
		'Yes.'
67	(0.6)	
68	KO:	Kē go re ļetsē!
		look 2PLM RE EXL
		'Look FTSE!'
68	(1 0)	LOOK LIGE.
60	(1.)) KO:	Rateri sa ha îg ti h go ro mî i ge
07	кo.	battery 200 E A 200 M A search for thus 200 M DECEST DECC. Sour 200 DECL
		'He said he is looking for the hettery'
70	(0,2)	The said he is looking for the battery.
70	(0.3)	Detection -
/1	<i>M2</i> :	Balen-s-a
		battery-3SG.F-A
		The battery?
72	MI:	
		('Yes.')
73	YB:	lA-s-a bateri-s-a bi koma ra ôa i ge
		new-3SG.F-A battery-3SG.F-A 3SG.M.OBJ apparently PROG search for 3SG.C DECL
		'He is apparently looking for a new battery.'
74	KO:	$(\hat{l}$)
		('Yes,)
75	(0.7)	
76	TT:	Nēs- nē toa go-ro hantsa::?
		DEM DEM finish RECPST-PROG UNK
		'This- it is finished, isn't it?'
77		Sîsun-e-ts-a sîsun-n-a gau-s-a hantsa,
		work-3SG.C.A-2SG.M-A work-3PL.C-A manner-3SG.F-A UNK
		'Are you working at your work like that?'
78	Unk:	((burp))
79	SS:	Batri-s ge mûsae a [‡khabu-s-a]
		battery-3SG.F DECL perhaps STAT exhausted-3SG.F-A
		'The battery is perhaps [weak.]'
80	RS:	[Î mâ ge h]â dara-e etsē,
		yes Q DECL exist wire-3sg.C.A EXL
		'[Yes, where is] the wire ETSE?'
81	(1.3)	((RS looks at KO during entire silence))
82	KO:	Hē,
		'Yes?/Huh?'
83	SS:	HG-b go mûsae ama-di hâ ta ra [i ge.]
		name-3SG.M RECPST perhaps buy-3PL.F PRF 1SG PROG 3SG.C DECL
		'HG perhaps bought it (I [say]).'
84	KO:	[Hnn] =
		['No.']=
85	KO:	=//î-b go hâna go-ro //ama dara i ge.
		DISC-3SG.M RECPST HAB RECPST-PROG buy wire 3SG C DECI
		= 'he always bought the wire.'

- 86 *Ms: //Ari go sī ra ū-he dara-n ge hîna?* one.day.from.now RECPST AUX.LOC2 PROG take-PASS wire-3PL.C DECL TAG 'The wire was being taken away yesterday, right?'
- 87 KO: Ti-b go-ro mî i ge thus-3SG.M RECPST-PROG say 3SG.C DECL 'He was saying so.'
- 88 (2.3)
- 89 *RS: Eh* 'Heh.'
- 90 *YB: Twintig Rand-s-ai etsē.* twenty Rand-3sG.F-on EXL 'For R20,- ETSĒ.'

Appendix C

Video: Ga_beads_2 Sequence: Vaseline request

In this sequence, a young man, AR, wants some Vaseline petroleum jelly that his elderly mother Ga has. The interaction occurs in the yard of a relative where a number of women, including Ga, have been busy beading. Other interactions occur throughout the sequence between mother and son. Vaseline in general has been referred to several times during the interaction that occurs prior to this sequence. At the time of this recording, many members of the community were suffering from scabies, and many were using Vaseline to alleviate the itching. Presumably, it is also for this reason that AR wants the Vaseline.

1	(5.7)								
2	AR:	Vaslin	ū	tama-si-a		hâ.			
		petroleum.jelly	have	NEG-2SG.F	.OBJ-A	PRF			
		'Don't you have	Vaselir	ne?'					
3	(1.7)								
4	Ga:	Tae							
		Q							
		'What?'							
5	(1.6)								
6	AR:	Vaseli:n.							
		'Vaseline.'							
7	(0.4)								
8	Ga:	Boko //ari		ta go	0-10	hau	ı Xa	ala-b-a	
		EXL one.day.f	rom.nov	w 1sg re	CPST-PR	og brir	ıg gl	ass-3SG.M-	·A
		'воко, I brought	t a glass	yesterday.	,				
9	(0.5)								
10	AR:	Hm,							
		'Huh?'							
11	Ga:	/Nai tsū-b	g	0-10	kā		е,		
		already just-3s	G.M R	ECPST-PROC	becom	ne.lost	UNK		
		'It got lost alread	iy?'						
12	AR:	Mâ-bi ha	â.						
		Q-3SG.M.OBJ ex	kist						
		'Where is it?'							
13	(0.9)								

14	Ga:	//Garu-s	!nâ.					
		bag-3SG.F	in					
		'In the bag.	,					
15	(2.0)							
16	AR:	Vaslin-i		//	khā-s	go-ro	hā	sasa.
		petroleum.	jelly-3sg.	.C W	ith-3sg.f	RECPST-PROG	come	2sg
		'Did you c	ome with	vase	line, you?'			
17	Ga:	Â						
		'Yes.'						
18	(1.7)	((AR walk	s away, p	oresun	nably to the	bag))		
19	AR:	[//Î xū-i		a	nesi-s-a]	∥ā-sen		
		DISC thing	-3sg.c	UNK	now-3SG.F	-A wash-REC	P	
		'To wash r	nyself [no	ow be	ecause of the	at thing].'		
20	Ga:	[()]			

Thirty seconds pass by, during which other people interact, before the sequence concerning Vaseline is picked up again.

21	AR:	Ma he?
		mother VOC
		'Mother!'
22	(0.5)	
23	Ga:	Hm?
		'Yes?'
24	AR:	Kai garu-be bo?
		big bag-3sg.M.A.in or
		'In the big bag or?'
25	(0.4)	
26	Ga:	Î.
		'Yes.'
27	AR:	Kai garu-b !nâ i ge xala-e khai a.
		big bag-3SG.M in 3SG.C DECL glass-3SG.C.A be.absent STAT
		'There's no glass in the big bag.'
28	(1.2)	
29	Ga:	!Nari-si di go.
		steal-3sg.f.obj 3pl.f recpst
		'They stole it.'
30	(0.6)	
31	Su:	Tae xū-b-a ra hî e
		Q thing-3SG.M-A PROG do UNK
		'What thing was done?'
32	(1.9)	'What thing was done?'

33	Ga:	Ama du ge go !nari-bi //nā xala-b-a.
		true 3PL.C DECL RECPST steal-3SG.M.OBJ DEM glass-3SG.M-A
		'They truly stole that glass.'
34	(1.5)	
35	Ga:	Nētiko vaslin-i a ta go aetse=
		this.much Vaseline-3sg.C UNK 1sg RECPST day.before.vesterday
36		=//ama hâ-b-a
		buv PRF-3SG.M-A
		'This much Vaseline that I bought vesterday '
37	An [.]	()
38	(0.6)	
39	4n	Tita mâha ta ne mû vaslin-s sa llama_i
57	<i>т</i> р .	1sc where 1sc pst see Vaseline 3sc E 2sc E huy 3sc c
		'Me where did I see you huving Vaseline?'
40	(0.5)	where and I see you ouying v aschine?
40	(0.5) A D ·	MÂRA I HÂ
41	Α Λ .	MADA I MA.
		Where is it?
40	(1,2)	where is it?
42	(4.2)	llî lloomin linê tayi ta laga sêyi kil
43	Ga.	m ngaru-s ma isu ta [ge sau-on]
		DISC 04g-35G.F III JUST ISG DECL IIIde-35G.M.OBJ
4.4	M1.	I just [md ti] in that bag.
44	MI.	[Xd.]
		name
	(1 1)	'[Xa:]::!'
45	(4.1)	
46	AR:	IGAI-I A I GE ma.
		good-3sG.C STAT 3sG.C DECL mother
	(140	It is good mother.
4/	(14.3)	
48	Ga:	?!Gâi-i a i ge ti ts-a mî o-ts ge=
		good-3SG.C STAT 3SG.C DECL thus 2SG.M-A say CONJ-2SG.M DECL
49		<i>= amase ra gâi mî-he</i> hâna.°
		truly PROG stingy say-PASS HAB
		"When you say it's good, you are truly said to be stingy."
50	(0.7)	
51	Ga:	/Gâi mî-he h[âna.]
		stingy say-PASS HAB
		'Said to be stingy.'
52	EN:	[A ta koma] kara-e dō hui.
		HORT 1SG supposedly bead-3SG.C-A bead help
		['I want] to help with the beading.'
53	(1.4)	
54	Ga:	DO HUI TE DU HA RE ANI !KHŌ-HE
		bead help 1SG-A 2PL.C come RE in.order.to catch-PASS
		'Come help me bead and be caught (on camera)!'

References

- Adegbija, E. E. (1989). A comparative study of politeness phenomena in Nigerian English, Yoruba and Ogori. Multilingua. Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication, 8 (1), 57-80.
- Ameka, F. K. (1992). Interjections: the universal yet neglected part of speech. Journal of Pragmatics, 18, 101-118.
- Ameka, F. K. (1998). Les particules énonciatives en ewe. In S. Platiel & R. Kabore (Eds.), Les langues d'Afrique subsaharienne (pp. 179-204). Paris: Ophrys.
- Anderson, G. D. S. (2011). Auxiliary verb constructions in the languages of Africa. *Studies in African Linguistics, 40*(1&2), 1-409.
- Atkinson, J. M., & Drew, P. (1979). Order in court: the organisation of verbal interaction in judicial settings: Macmillan.
- Austin, J. L. (1962). How to do things with words: Oxford University Press.
- Auwera, J. v. d., Dobrushina, N., & Goussev, V. (2013). Imperative-hortative systems. In M. S. Dryer & M. Haspelmath (Eds.), *The world atlas of language structures online* (Available online at http://wals.info/chapter/72, Accessed on 2014-05-12.) Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology.
- Barnard, A. (1992). Hunters and Herders of Southern Africa. A Comparative Ethnography of the Khoisan Peoples. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Batibo, H. M. (1998). The fate of Khoesan languages of Botswana. In M. Brenzinger (Ed.), Language Death: Factual and Theoretical Explorations with Special Reference to East Africa (pp. 267-284). Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Baucom, K. L. (1974). The Wambo languages of South West Africa and Angola. Journal of African Languages, 11(2), 45-73.
- Bauman, R., & Sherzer, J. (Eds.). (1974). Explorations in the ethnography of speaking. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Beach, D. M. (1938). The phonetics of the Hottentot language. Cambridge: Heffer.
- Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (1989). Investigating cross-cultural pragmatics: an introductory overview. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Cross-cultural pragmatics: requests and apologies* (pp. 1-36). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Blum-Kulka, S., & Olshtain, E. (1984). Requests and apologies: a cross-cultural study of speech act realization patterns (CCSARP). *Applied Linguistics*, 5(3), 196-213.
- Boas, F. (1911). Introduction. In F. Boas (Ed.), *Handbook of American Indian languages*. Washington: Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of American Ethnology.
- Böhm, G. (1985). Khoe-kowap: Einführung in die Sprache der Hottentotten, Nama-Dialekt. Wien.
- Bowern, C., Epps, P., Gray, R., Hill, J., Hunley, K., McConvell, P., Zentz, J. (2011). Does lateral transmission obscure inheritance in hunter-gatherer languages? *PLoS one*, 6(9), e25195.
- Brenzinger, M. (2007). Language diversity endangered. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Brown, C. H. (1985). Mode of subsistence and folk biological taxonomy. Current Anthropology, 26(1), 43-64.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1978a). Politeness: some universals in language usage. Cambridge University Press.

- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1978b). Universals in language usage: politeness phenomena. In E. N. Goody (Ed.), *Questions and politeness: strategies in social interaction* (pp. 56-289). Cambridge: University Press.
- Brugman, J. C. (2009). Segments, tones and distribution in Khoekhoe prosody. Cornell University.
- Byon, A. S. (2006). Korean cultural values in request behaviors. In H. Sohn (Ed.), Korean language in culture and society (pp. 174-188): University of Hawai'i Press.
- Carbaugh, D. (2005). Cultures in conversation. Mahwah N.J.: Erlbaum Associates.
- Chomsky, N. (1965). Aspects of the theory of syntax. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Comrie, B. (1984). Russian. In W. S. Chisholm (Ed.), *Interrogativity: A colloquium on the grammar, typology and pragmatics of questions in seven diverse languages* (pp. 7-46). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Comrie, B., & Cysouw, M. (2013). Some observations on typological features of hunter-gatherer languages. In B. Bickel, L. A. Grenoble, D. A. Peterson & A. Timberlake (Eds.), *Language typology and historical contingency* (pp. 383-394).
- Couper-Kuhlen, E., & Selting, M. (2001). Introducing interactional linguistics. In M. Selting & E. Couper-Kuhlen (Eds.), *Studies in interactional linguistics*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Curl, T. S., & Drew, P. (2008). Contingency and Action: A comparison of two forms of requesting. Research on language and social interaction, 41(2), 129-153.
- Curriculum-Committee-for-Khoekhoegowab. (2003). *Khoekhoegowab orthography 3*. Windhoek: Gamsberg Macmillan.
- Cysouw, M. (2004a). Interrogative words: an exercise in lexical typology. Presentation at "Bantu grammar: description and theory workshops 3" ZAS Berlin, 13 February 2004. from http://email.eva.mpg.de/~cysouw/pdf/cysouwQUESTION.pdf
- Cysouw, M. (2004b). *Khoekhoe focus marking*. Paper presented at the ZAS project presentation 'Focus in southern African languages'.
- D'Hondt, S. (1998). Institutionalized identities in in formal Kiswahili speech: analysis of a dispute between two adolescents. *Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere*, *5*(5), 115-128.
- Davidson, J. (1984). Subsequent versions of invitations, offers, requests, and proposals dealing with potential or actual rejection. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action* (pp. 102-128). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- De Kadt, E. (1992). Requests as speech acts in Zulu. South African Journal of African langauges, 12(3), 101-106.
- De Kadt, E. (1998). The concept of face and its applicability to the Zulu language. *Journal of Pragmatics, 29*, 173-191.
- De Ruiter, J. P. (2012). Introduction: questions are what they do. In J. P. De Ruiter (Ed.), *Questions: formal, functional and interactional perspectives* (pp. 1-7). Cambridge: University Press.
- Dempwolff, O. (1927). Die Hervorhebung von Satzteilen als Anlass zur Verwendung besonderer Wortformen. In F. Boas & e. al (Eds.), *Festschrift Meinhof: sprachwissenschaftliche und andere Studien* (pp. 73-79). Glückstadt Hamburg: J. J. Augustin.
- Dempwolff, O. (1934). Einführung in die Sprache der Nama-Hottentotten. Zeitschrift für Eingeborenen-Sprachen, 15(1), 30-66, 89-134, 188-229.
- Den Besten, H. (2002). Khoekhoe syntax and its implications for L2 acquisition of Dutch and Afrikaans. *Journal* of Germanic Linguistics, 14(1), 3-56.
- Den Besten, H. (2005). *Khoekhoegowab (Nama) as an Absolute P(osition)-2 language and yet with asymmetry*, Leiden University.
- Dickey, M. H., Burnett, G., Chudoba, K. M., & Kazmer, M. M. (2007). Do you read me? Perspective making and perspective taking in chat communities. *Journal of the Association for Information Systems, 8*(1), 47-70.

Drach, E. (1937). Grundgedanken der deutschen Satzlehre. Frankfurt am Main: Verl. M. Diesterweg.

- Drew, P. (1997). 'Open' class repair initiators in response to sequential sources of troubles in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics, 28*(1), 69-101.
- Dryer, M. S. (2008). Polar Questions. In M. Haspelmath, M. S. Dryer, D. Gil & B. Comrie (Eds.), *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online* (Vol. chapter 116). Munich: Max Planck Digital Library.
- Eades, D. (1991). Communicative strategies in Aboriginal English. In S. Romaine (Ed.), *Language in Australia* (pp. 85-93). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Eades, D. (1994). A case of communicative clash: Aboriginal English and the legal system. In J. Gibbons (Ed.), *Language and the Law* (pp. 234-264). London: Longman.
- Enfield, N. J. (2002). Ethnosyntax. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Enfield, N. J. (2010). Questions and responses in Lao. Journal of Pragmatics, 42(10), 2649-2665.
- Enfield, N. J. (2022). Enchrony. WIREs Cogn. Sci. 13, el597.
- Enfield, N. J., Dingemanse, M., Baranova, J., Blythe, J., Brown, P., Dirksmeyer, T., et al. (2013). Huh? What? -A first survey in 21 languages. In M. Hayashi, G. Raymond & J. Sidnell (Eds.), *Conversational repair* and human understanding (pp. 343-380). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Enfield, N. J., Stivers, T., & Levinson, S. C. (2010). Question-response sequences in conversation across ten languages. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42(10).
- Englert, C. (2010). Questions and responses in Dutch conversations. Journal of Pragmatics, 42, 2666–2684.
- Epps, P., Bowern, C., Hansen, C. A., Hill, J. H., & Zentz, J. (2012). On numeral complexity in hunter-gatherer languages. *Linguistic Typology*, 16(1), 41-109.
- Ervin-Tripp, S. M. (1981). How to make and understand a request. In H. Parret, M. Sbisa & J. Verschueren (Eds.), *Possibilities and limitations of pragmatics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Essen, O. v. (1966). Zur Intonation der Frage im Nama-Hottentottischen. In J. Lukas (Ed.), Neue Afrikanistische Studien (5 ed., pp. 79-86). Hamburg: Deutsches Institut f
 ür Afrika-Forschung.
- Evans-Pritchard, E. E. (1940). *The Nuer: A description of the modes of livelihood and political institutions of a Nilotic people.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Evans, N. (2003). Context, culture, and structuration in the languages of Australia. Annual Review of Anthropology, 32, 13-40.
- Evans, N., & Levinson, S. C. (2009). The myth of language universals: language diversity and its importance for cognitive science. *Behavioral and brain sciences*, 32, 429-492.
- Félix-Brasdefer, J. C. (2009). Pragmatic variation across Spanish(es): requesting in Mexican, Costa Rican and Dominican Spanish. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 6(4), 473-515.
- Florey, M. J. (2005). Language shift and endangerement. In K. A. Adelaar & N. Himmelmann (Eds.), The Austronesian languages of Asia and Madagascar (pp. 43-64). London: Routledge.
- Floyd, S., Rossi, G., & Enfield, N. J. (2020). *Getting others to do things: a pragmatic typology of recruitments.* Language Science Press.
- Ford, C., Fox, B., & Thompson, S. (2002). Social interaction and grammar. In M. Tomasello (Ed.), *The new psychology of language* (Vol. 2). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Assoc.
- Fox, B., Thompson, S., Ford, C., & Couper-Kuhlen, E. (2013). Conversation analysis and linguistics. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis*: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Fox, R. G., King, B. J. (2002). Anthropology beyond culture. Oxfort, New York: Berg.
- Gao, H. (1999). Features of request strategies in Chinese. Working papers, Lund University, 47, 73-86.
- Gardner, R. (2010). Question and answer sequences in Garrwa talk. *Australian Journal of Linguistics, 30*(4), 423-445.
- Gardner, R., & Mushin, I. (2007). Post-start-up overlap and disattentiveness in talk in a Garrwa community. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics, 30*(3).
- Geertz, C. (1960). The religion of Java: University of Chicago Press.

- Gísladóttir, R. S., Chwilla, D. J., & Levinson, S. C. (2015). Conversation electrified: ERP correlates of speech act recognition in underspecified utterances. *PLoS One*, *10*(3).
- Goddard, C. (2011). Semantic analysis: a practical introduction. Oxford University Press.
- Goffman, I. (1955). On face-work: an analysis of ritual elements of social interaction. *Psychiatry: Journal for the study of interpersonal processes, 18*(3), 213-231.
- Goffman, I. (1963). *Behavior in public places: notes on the social organization of gatherings.* New York: The Free Press.

Goffman, I. (1967). Interaction ritual: essays on face-to-face behavior. New York: Garden City.

- Goodenough, W. H. (1965). Rethinking 'status' and 'role'. Toward a general model of the cultural organization of social relationships. In M. Banton (Ed.), *The relevance of models for social anthropology*. London: Tavistock Publications.
- Goodwin, C., & Heritage, J. (1990). Conversation Analysis. Annual Review of Anthropology, 19, 283-307.
- Goody, E. N. (1978). Towards a theory of questions. In E. N. Goody (Ed.), *Questions and politeness* (pp. 17-43). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gordon, D., & Lakoff, G. (1971). Conversational postulates. Papers from the seventh regional meeting, Chicago Linguistic Society, 63-81.
- Gordon, R. (1992). The Bushman myth and the making of a Namibian underclass. Boulder, Oxford: Westview.
- Gowdy, J. (2005). Hunter gatherers and the mythology of the market. In R. B. Lee & R. Daly (Eds.), *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of hunters and gatherers*: Cambridge University Press.
- Greenberg, J. H. (1963). The languages of Africa. The Hague: Mouton.
- Grenoble, L. A., & Whaley, L. J. (1998). Toward a typology of language endangerement. In L. A. Grenoble & L. J. Whaley (Eds.), *Endangered languages: language loss and community response* (pp. 22-54). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grice, H. P. (1989). Studies in the way of words. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Güldemann, T. (2014) 'Khoisan' linguistic classification today. In T. Güldemann & A. Fehn (Eds.), Beyond 'Khoisan'. Historical relations in the Kalahari Basin (pp. 1-41). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Güldemann, T., & Vossen, R. (2000). Khoisan. In B. Heine & D. Nurse (Eds.), African languages an introduction (pp. 99-122). Cambridge: University Press.
- Güldemann, T., & Siegmund, S. (2009). The marker ke in N/uu declarative or not? Presentation at the 6th World Congress of African Linguistics, Cologne 17-21/08/09.
- Gumperz, J., & Hymes, D. (Eds.). (1972). *Directions in sociolinguistics: the ethnography of communication*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Günther, W. (1969). Die Pronomina im Hottentottischen. In H. J. Greschat (Ed.), *Wort und Religion, Kalima na Dini*. Stuttgart: Evangelischer Missionsverlag.
- Haacke, W. H. G. (1976). A Nama grammar: the noun-phrase. University of Cape Town, Cape Town.
- Haacke, W. H. G. (1977). The so-called "personal pronoun" in Nama. In A. Traill (Ed.), *Khoisan Linguistic Studies* (Vol. 3, pp. 43-62). Johannesburg: Witwatersrand UP.
- Haacke, W. H. G. (1978). Subject depostion in Nama. University of Essex, Essex.
- Haacke, W. H. G. (1986). Preliminary observations on a dialect of the Sesfontein Damara. In R. Vossen & K. Keuthmann (Eds.), *Contemporary studies on Khoisan* (pp. 375-396). Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag.
- Haacke, W. H. G. (1988). Nama/Damara 1: morphology and syntax: University of Namibia.
- Haacke, W. H. G. (1992). Dislocated noun phrases in Khoekhoe (Nama/Damara): further evidence for the Sentential Hypothesis. *Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere*, 29, 149-162.
- Haacke, W. H. G. (1995). Instances of Incorporation and Compounding in Khoekhoegowab (Nama/Damara). In A. Traill, R. Vossen & M. Biesele (Eds.), *The Complete Linguist. Papers in memory of Patrick J. Dickens* (pp. 339-361). Köln: Rüdiger Köppe.
- Haacke, W. H. G. (1999). Phonological Gleanings from the dialect of Khoekhoegowab (Nama/Damara): towards internal reconstruction. In R. Finlayson (Ed.), *African Mosaic: festschrift for J.A. Louw* (pp. 131-163). Pretoria: Unisa.
- Haacke, W. H. G. (1999). The tonology of Khoekhoe (Nama/Damara) (Vol. 16). Köln: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.
- Haacke, W. H. G. (2001). Nama. In J. Garry, Carl Rubino (Ed.), Facts about the world's languages: an encyclopedia of the world's major languages, past and present (pp. 498-501). New York, Dublin: New England Publishing.
- Haacke, W. H. G. (2006). Syntactic focus marking in Khoekhoe ("Nama/Damara"). ZAS Papers in Linguistics, 46, 105-127.
- Haacke, W. H. G. (2008). Tonogenesis in flagrante: tonal depression in Khoekhoegowab, Haillom, ‡Akhoe and Naro. In S. Ermisch (Ed.), *Khoisan Languages and Linguistics: Proceedings of the 2nd International Symposium January 8-12, 2006, Riezlern/Kleinwalsertal* (Vol. 22). Köln: Rüdiger Köppe.
- Haacke, W. H. G. (2013). Namibian Khoekhoe (Nama/Damara). In R. Vossen (Ed.), *The Khoesan Languages* (pp. 325-339). London: Routledge.
- Haacke, W. H. G., & Eiseb, E. (2002). *A Khoekhoegowab dictionary with an English-Khoekhoegowab index*. Windhoek: Gamsberg Macmillan Publishers.
- Haacke, W. H. G., Eiseb, E., & Namaseb, L. (1997). Internal and external relations of Khoekhoe dialects: a preliminary survey. In W. Haacke, E. D. Elderkin (Ed.), *Namibian Languages: reports and papers* (Vol. IV, pp. 125-209). Cologne: Rüdiger Köppe.

Hagman, R. S. (1977). Nama Hottentot Grammar. Bloomington: Indiana University.

- Hahn, M. (2013). Word order variation in Khoekhoe. In S. Müller (Ed.), Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar (pp. 48-68). Freie Universität Berlin: CSLI Publications.
- Halina, M., Rossano, F., & Tomasello, M. (2013). The ontogenetic ritualization of bonobo gestures. *Animal cognition*, 16, 653-666.
- Hanks, W. (1990). *Referential practice: language and lived space among the maya*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Haun, D., Rapold, C., Janzen, G., & Levinson, S. C. (2011). Plasticity of human spatial cognition: Spatial language and cognition covary across cultures. *Cognition*, 119(1), 70-80.
- Haviland, J. B. (1979). Guugu Yimidhirr brother-in-law language. Language in Society, 8, 365-393.
- Hayano, K. (2013). Territories of knowledge in Japanese conversation. Radboud University.
- Hayashi, M. (2010). An overview of the question-response system in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics, 42*(10), 2685-2702.
- Heikkinen, T. (n.d.-a). Akhoen grammatical sketch: unpublished manuscript.
- Heikkinen, T. (n.d.-b). Akhoen word list.
- Heinemann, T. (2005). Where grammar and interaction meet: the preference for matched polarity in responsive turns in Danish. In A. Hakulinen & M. Selting (Eds.), *Syntax and lexis in conversation: studies on the use of linguistic resources in talk-in-interaction* (pp. 375-402): John Benjamins.

Heinemann, T., & Traverso, V. (2009). Complaining in interaction. Journal of Pragmatics, 41(12), 2381-2384.

- Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). The weirdest people in the world? *Behavioral and brain sciences*, 33(2/3), 61-135.
- Herbert, R. K. (1990). Hlonipha and the ambiguous woman. Anthropos, 85, 455-473.
- Heritage, J. (1984). Garfinkel and Ethnomethodology. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Heritage, J. (2013). Epistemics in conversation. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), Handbook of conversation analysis (pp. 210-228). Boston: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Heritage, J., & Raymond, G. (2005). The terms of agreement: indexing epistemic authority and subordination in talk-in-interaction. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 68*(1), 15-38.

- Heritage, J., & Raymond, G. (2012). Navigating epistemic landscapes: acquiescence, agency and resistance in responses to polar questions. In J. P. De Ruiter (Ed.), *Questions: formal, functional and interactional perspectives* (pp. 179-192): Cambridge University Press.
- Hewes, G. W. (1981). Pointing and language. In T. Myers, J. Laver & J. Anderson (Eds.), *The cognitive representation of speech* (pp. 263-269). Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- Hirschberg, J. (2004). Pragmatics and Intonation. In L. R. Horn & G. Ward (Eds.), *The Handbook of Pragmatics* (pp. 515-537): Blackwell Publishing.
- Hitchcock, R. K., Ikeya, K., Biesele, M., Lee, R. B. (2006) Introduction. In R. K. Hitchcock, K. Ikeya, M.Biesele, R. B. Lee (Eds.), Updating the San, image and reality of an African people in the 21st century.Osaka: Senri Ethnological Studies.
- Hofstede, G. (1984). Culture's consequences. New York: Sage.
- Holmes, J., Marra, M., & Vine, B. (2011). *Leadership, discourse and ethnicity*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hong, W. (1998). Request patterns in Chinese and German: Lincom Europa.
- Honken, H. (2008). The split tones in Central Khoesan. In S. Ermisch (Ed.), *Khoisan Languages and Linguistics:* Proceedings of the 2nd International Symposium January 8-12, 2006, Riezlern/Kleinwalsertal (Vol. 22). Köln: Rüdiger Köppe.
- House, J. (2005). Politeness in Germany? In L. Hickey & M. Stewart (Eds.), *Politeness in Europe* (pp. 13-28). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Houtkoop-Steenstra, H. (1987). *Establishing agreement: an analysis of proposal-acceptance sequences*. Dordrecht/Providence: Foris Publications.
- Hoymann, G. (2010). Questions and responses in #Akhoe Haillom. Journal of Pragmatics 42(10), 2726-2740.
- Huddleston, R. (1994) The contrast between interrogatives and questions. Journal of Linguistics, 30, 411-439.
- Huszcza, R. (2005). Politeness in Poland: from 'titlemania' to grammaticalised honorifics. In L. Hickey & M. Stewart (Eds.), *Politeness in Europe* (pp. 218-233). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Huybregts, R. (2003). A PF-interface condition on syntactic computation. In J. Koster & H. van Riemsdijk (Eds.), *Germania et alia: A linguistic webschrift for Hans den Besten*.
- Hymes, D. (1971). On communicative competence. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Hymes, D. (1976). Models of the interaction of language and social setting. Journal of Social Issues, 23(2), 8-28.
- Jones, B. M. (1999). The Welsh answering system. Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kasanga, L. A. (2006). Requests in a South African variety of English. World Englishes, 25(1), 65-89.
- Kasanga, L. A., & Lwanga-Lumu, J. C. (2007). Cross-cultural linguistic realization of politeness: a study of apologies in English and Setswana. *Journal of Politeness Research: Language, Behaviour, Culture,* 3(1), 65-92.
- Keevallik, L. (2010). Minimal answers to yes/no questions in the service of sequence organization. *Discourse Studies, 12*(3), 283-309.
- Kelly, R. L. (1995). The Foraging Spectrum: diversity in hunter-gatherer lifeways. New York: Percheron Press.
- Kendon, A. (1977). Studies in the behavior of social interaction. Bloomington: Indiana University Publications.
- Kendrick, K., & Drew, P. (2014). The putative preference for offers over requests. In P. Drew & E. Couper-Kuhlen (Eds.), *Requesting in social interaction*: John Benjamins.
- Kendrick, K. (2020). Recruitment in English: a quantitative study. In S. Floyd, G. Rossi & N. J. Enfield (Eds.), Getting others to do things: a pragmatic typology of recruitments. Language Science Press.
- Kendrick, K., Brown, P., Dingemanse, M., Floyd, S., Gipper, S., Hayano, K., Hoymann, G., et al. (2020) Sequence organization: a universal infrastructure for social action. *Journal of Pragmatics* (Vol. 168, pp 119-138).
- Kieβling, R., Neumann, B., & Schröter, D. (2011). "O owner of the compound, those things you are saying it is the talk of vagueness!" - Requesting, complaining and apologizing in two languages of the

Cameroonian Grassfields. In G. Sommer & C. Vierke (Eds.), *Speech acts and speech events in African languages* (pp. 83-143). Köln: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.

- Kimura, D. (2001). Utterance overlap and long silence among the Baka Pygmies: comparison with Bantu farmers and Japanese university students. *African Study Monographs*, 26, 103-121.
- Kitamura, K. (1990). Interactional Synchrony: a fundamental condition for communication. In M. Moerman & M. Nomura (Eds.), *Culture Embodied* (Vol. 27, pp. 123-140). Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology.
- Köhler, O. (1981). Les langues khoïsan. In J. Perrot (Ed.), *Les langues de l'Afrique subsaharienne* (Vol. 1, pp. 455-615). Paris: CNRS.
- König, E., & Siemund, P. (2007). Speech Act Distinctions in Grammar. In T. Shopen (Ed.), Language Typology and Syntactic Description (Vol. 1). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Le Pair, R. (1996). Spanish request strategies: a cross-cultural analysis from an intercultural perspective. *Language Sciences, 18*(3/4), 651-670.
- Lee, C. (2005). A cross-linguistic study on the linguistic expressions of Cantonese and English requests. *Pragmatics*, *15*(4), 395-442.
- Lee, R. B., & DeVore, I. (1969). Problems in the study of hunters and gatherers. In R. B. Lee & I. DeVore (Eds.), *Man the hunter*. New York: Aldine Publishing Company.
- Lee, S. H. (2012). Response design in conversation. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook fo conversation analysis*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
- Lemert, C., & Branaman, A. (1997). The Goffman reader. Blackwell Publishing.
- Lerner, G. (1996). Finding "face" in the preference structures of talk-in-interaction. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *59*(4), 303-321.
- Lerner, G. (2003). Selecting next speaker: The context sensitive operation of a context free organization. *Language in Society, 32*, 177-201.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). Pragmatics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Levinson, S. C. (1988). Putting linguistics on a proper footing: explorations in Goffman's concepts of participation. In P. Drew & A. Wootton (Eds.), *Erving Goffman: exploring the interaction order* (pp. 161–227). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Levinson, S. C. (2000). *Presumptive meanings: the theory of generalized conversational implicature*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Levinson, S. C. (2005). Living with Manny's dangerous idea. Discourse Studies, 7(4-5), 431-453.
- Levinson, S. C. (2006a). Cognition at the heart of human interaction. Discourse Studies, 8(1), 85-92.
- Levinson, S. C. (2006b). On the human "interaction engine". In N. J. Enfield & S. C. Levinson (Eds.), *Roots of human sociality: culture, cognition and interaction* (pp. 39-69). Oxford: Berg.
- Levinson, S. C. (2013). Action formation and ascription. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Lewis, M. P., Simons, G. F., & Fennig, C. D. (2013). Ethnologue: Languages of the world. online version. Retrieved 15-04, 2013, from http://www.ethnologue.com
- Liberman, K. (1985). Understanding interaction in Australia: An ethnomethodological study of Australian Aboriginal people. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Liddicoat, A. J. (2007). An introduction to conversation analysis. London: Continuum.
- Lindström, A. (1997). Affiliation and disaffiliation in Swedish conversation. Unpublished PhD dissertation. University of California.
- Lindström, A. (2005). Language as social action: A study of how senior citizens request assistance with practical tasks in the Swedish home help service. In A. Hakulinen & M. Selting (Eds.), Syntax and lexis in Conversation: Studies on the use of linguistic resources in talk-in-interaction. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Marshall, L. (1965). The !Kung bushmen of the Kalahari Desert. In J. L. Gibbs (Ed.), *Peoples of Africa*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Marshall Thomas, E. (2006). The old way: A story of the first people. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Mauss, M. (1966). The Gift: Forms and functions of exchange in archaic societies. London: Cohen and West.

Mayer, M. (1994). Frog, where are you.

- Mehan, H. (1991). The school's work of sorting students. In D. Boden & D. H. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Talk and Social Structure* (pp. 71-90). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Mekamgoum, S. V. (2013). *Netsek (rebuking) in Ngemba: a study in facework across the age and social power ladders.* Unpublished MA-thesis. Université de Yaoundé 1, Yaoundé.
- Meriggi, P. (1931). Experimentelle Beiträge zur Tonlehre des Nama-Hottentottischen. Vox: Mitteilungen aus dem phonetischen Laboratorium der Universität Hamburg, 17, 39-55.
- Mushin, I., & Gardner, R. (2009). Silence is talk: conversational silence in Australian Aboriginal talk-ininteraction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 41, 2033.
- Neumann, S., & Widlok, T. (1996). Rethinking some universals of spatial language using controlled comparison. In M. Pütz & R. Dirven (Eds.), *The construal of space in language and thought* (pp. 345-372). Berlin: Gruzter.
- Nwoye, O. G. (1992). Linguistic politeness and socio-cultural variations of the notion of face. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 18, 309-328.
- Obeng, S. G. (1999). Requests in Akan discourse. Anthropological Linguistics, 41(2), 230-251.
- Ochs, E. (1984). Clarification and culture. In D. Shiffrin (Ed.), Georgetown University round table on languages and linguistics 1984. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Ochs, E. (1988). *Culture and language development: language acquisition and language socialization in a Samoan village*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. B. (1984). Language acquisition and socialization: three developmental stories and their implications. In R. Shweder & R. Levine (Eds.), *Culture theory: essays on mind, self and emotion*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ogiermann, E. (2009). Politeness and in-directness across cultures: a comparison of English, German, Polish and Russian requests. *Journal of Politeness Research*, *5*(4), 189-216.
- Peterson, N. (1993). Demand sharing: reciprocity and the pressure for generosity among foragers. *American Anthropologist, 95*(4), 860-874.
- Philips, S. U. (1976). Some sources of cultural variability in the regulation of talk. *Language in Society, 5*, 81-95.
- Philips, S. U. (2005). A comparison of Indian and Anglo communicative behavior in classroom interaction. In S. F. Kiesling & C. Bratt Paulston (Eds.), *Intercultural Discourse and Communication* (pp. 291-303): Blackwell Publishing.
- Pike, K. (1967). *Language in relation to a unified theory of the structure of human behavior*. 2nd edition. The Hague: Mouton.
- Planert, W. (1905). Handbuch der Nama-Sprache in Deutsch-Südwestafrika. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer.
- Pomerantz, A. (1984a). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Advances in group processes: group cohesion, trust and solidarity* (pp. 57-101). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pomerantz, A. (1984b). Pursuing a response. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Pool Balam, L. (2012). Requesting and taking in Yucatec Maya. Unpublished MA-thesis. Radboud University.
- Rapold, C. J. (2011). Semantics of Khoekhoe reciprocal constructions. In N. Evans, A. Gaby, S. Levinson & A. Majid (Eds.), *Reciprocals and semantic typology* (pp. 61-74). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Rapold, C. J. (2012). The encoding of placement and removal events in #Akhoe Haillom. In A. Kopecka & B. Narasimhan (Eds.), *Events of "putting" and "taking": A crosslinguistic perspective* (pp. 79-98). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Rapold, C. J., & Widlok, T. (2008). Dimensions of variability in Northern Khoekhoe language and culture. In K. Sadr (Ed.), *Southern African Humanities* (Vol. 20, pp. 133-161).
- Rialland, A. (2009). The African lax question prosody: Its realisation and geographical distribution. *Lingua, 119*, 928-949.
- Rossano, F. (2010). Questioning and responding in Italian. Journal of Pragmatics, 42, 2756–2771.
- Rossano, F., Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (2009). Gaze, questioning and culture. In J. Sidnell (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: comparative perspectives* (pp. 187-249): Cambridge University Press.
- Rossano, F., Liebal, K. (2014) "Requests" and "offers" in orangutans and human infants. In P. Drew (Eds.) *Requesting in Social Interaction* (pp. 335-364): Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins.
- Rue, Y. J., & Zhang, G. Q. (2008). Request strategies: a comparative study in Mandarin Chinese and Korean. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Rust, F. (1965). Praktische Namagrammatik. Cape Town: A. A. Balkema.
- Sacks, H. (1963). Sociological description. Berkeley Journal of Sociology, 8, 1-16.
- Sacks, H. (1992a). Lectures on Conversation Volume 1. Edited by Gail Jefferson. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sacks, H. (1992b). Lectures on Conversation Volume 2. Edited by Gail Jefferson. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). Simplest Systematics for Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation. *Language*, 50(4), 696-735.
- Sadock, J. M., & Zwicky, A. M. (1985). Speech act distinctions in syntax. In T. Shopen (Ed.), Language typology and syntactic description (Vol. 1, pp. 155-196). Cambridge: University Press.
- Sapir, E. (1933). Language. In E. R. A. Seligman & A. Johnson (Eds.), *Encyclopaedia of the social sciences* (Vol. 9, pp. 155-169). New York: Macmillan.
- Sapir, E. (1949). Culture, language, and personality: selected essays. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Sapir, E. (1974). The unconscious patterning of behavior in society. In B. Blount (Ed.), Language, culture and society: a book of readings. Cambridge: Winthrop.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1968). Sequencing in Conversational Openings. American Anthropologist, 70(6), 1075-&.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1987). Between micro and macro: contexts and other connections. In J. C. Alexander, B. Giesen, R. Münch & N. J. Smelser (Eds.), *The mirco-macro link*. Berkeley: University California Press.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1988). Presequences and indirection. Journal of Pragmatics, 12, 55-62.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1998). Body Torque. Social Research, 65(3), 535-596.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2006). Interaction: the infrastructure for social institutions, the natural ecological niche for language, and the arena in which culture is enacted. In N. J. Enfield & S. C. Levinson (Eds.), *Roots of Human Sociality*. Oxford: Berg.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: a primer in conversation analysis.* Cambridge: University Press.
- Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). Preference for Self-Correction in Organization of Repair in Conversation. *Language*, 53(2), 361-382.
- Schegloff, E. A., Ochs, E., & Thompson, S. A. (1996). Introduction. In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff & S. A. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and grammar*. Cambridge University Press.
- Schieffelin, B. B. (1990). The give and take of everyday life: language socialization of Kaluli children. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Schieffelin, B. B. (1996). Creating evidence: making sense of written words in Bosavi. In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff & S. A. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and grammar*. Cambridge University Press.

- Schieffelin, B. B. (2008). Speaking only your own mind: reflections on talk, gossip and intentionality in Bosavi (PNG). Anthropological Quarterly, 81(2), 431-441.
- Schieffelin, B. B., & Ochs, E. (Eds.). (1986). Language socialization across cultures. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, J. R. (1969). Speech acts: an essay in the philosophy of language. Cambridge: University Press.
- Searle, J. R. (1975). A taxonomy of illocutionary acts. In K. Gunderson (Ed.), *Language, mind, and knowledge*. Minneapolis.
- Searle, J. R. (1976). A classification of illocutionary acts. Language in Society, 5, 1-23.
- Selting, M. (1992). Prosody in Conversational Questions. Journal of Pragmatics, 17(4), 315-345.
- Sherzer, J. (1983). Kuna ways of speaking: an ethnographic perspective. Austin: The University of Texas Press.
- Sicoli, M., Stivers, T., Enfield, N. J., & Levinson, S. C. (2014). Marked initial pitch in questions signals marked communicative function. *Language and Speech*, published online: 1 May 2014, DOI: 2010.1177/0023830914529247.
- Sommer, G., & Vierke, C. (2011). Speech acts and speech events in African languages. In G. Sommer & C. Vierke (Eds.), Speech acts and speech events in African languages (pp. 11-40). Köln: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.
- Song, M. L. W. (1994). Imperatives in requests: direct or impolite observations from Chinese. *Pragmatics,* 4(4), 491-515.
- Sorjonen, M. L. (2001). Simple answers to polar questions. In M. Selting & E. Couper-Kuhlen (Eds.), Studies in interactional linguistics (pp. 405-432). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Stivers, T. (2013). Sequence organization. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), The handbook of conversation analysis: Blackwell Publishing.
- Stivers, T., & Enfield, N. J. (2010). A coding scheme for question-response sequences in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42(10), 2620-2648.
- Stivers, T., Enfield, N. J., Brown, P., Englert, C., Hayashi, M., Heinemann, T., et al. (2009). Universals and cultural variation in turn-taking in conversation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 106(26), 10587-10592.
- Stivers, T., Enfield, N. J., & Levinson, S. C. (2007). Person reference in interaction. In N. J. Enfield & T. Stivers (Eds.), *Person reference in interaction: Linguistic, cultural and social perspectives*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Stivers, T., & Hayashi, M. (2010). Transformative answers: one way to resist a question's constraints. *Language in Society*, 39, 1-12.
- Stivers, T., & Robinson, J. D. (2006). A preference for progressivity in interaction. *Language in Society, 35*(3), 367-392.
- Stivers, T., & Rossano, F. (2010). Mobilizing response. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 43*(1), 49-56.
- Sugawara, K. (1996). Some methodological issues for the analysis of everyday conversations among the |Gui. *African Study Monographs* (Suppl. 22), 145-164.
- Sugawara, K. (1998). The "Egalitarian" Attitude in Everyday Conversations among the IGui. In A. Bank (Ed.), *The Proceedings of the Khoisan Identities and Cultural Heritage Conference*. Cape Town: Infosource.
- Sugawara, K. (2012). Interactive significance of simultaneous discourse or overlap in everyday conversations among |Gui former foragers. *Journal of Pragmatics, 44*(5), 577-618.
- Sukarsono, S., Soebroto, E., & Nurkamto, J. (2013). Requesting behavior of Tenggerese ethnic in East Java-Indonesia. *International journal of linguistics, 5*(6).
- Terrill, A. (2002). Why make books for people who can't read? A perspective on documentation of an endagered language from Solomon Islands. *International journal of the sociology of language*, 155/156, 205-219.
 Tomasello, M. (2008). *Origins of human communication*. Cambridge: MIT.

- Treis, Y. (2005). Avoiding their names, avoiding their eyes: how Kambaata women respect their in-laws. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 47(3), 292-320.
- Trosborg, A. (1994). *Interlanguage pragmatics: requests, complaints and apologies*. Berlin New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Tsuzuki, M. (1999). Language transfer in L2 acquisition with reference to the politeness degree of request expressions. *Sophia linguistica*, 44/45, 141-162.
- Upadhyay, S. R. (2003). Nepali requestive acts: linguistic indirectness and politeness reconsidered. *Journal of Pragmatics, 35*, 1651-1677.
- van Ackeren, M., Casasanto, D., Bekkering, H., Hagoort, P., & Rueschemeyer, S. A. (2012). Pragmatics in action: indirect requests engage theory of mind areas and the cortical motor network. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 24(11), 2237-2247.
- van Staden, M., Senft, G., Enfield, N. J., & Bohnemeyer, J. (2001). Staged events. In N. J. Enfield (Ed.), Manual for the field season 2001. Nijmegen: Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics.
- Visser, H. (1998). The phonological system of Naro. In M. Schladt (Ed.), *Language, identity, and conceptualization among the Khoisan* (pp. 117-136): Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.
- Voßen, R. (1997). Die Khoe-Sprachen: ein Beitrag zur Erforschung der Sprachgeschichte Afrikas. Köln: Köppe.
- Vossen, R. (2000). Khoisan languages with a grammatical sketch of ||Ani (Khoe). In P. Zima (Ed.), *Areal and genetic factors in language classification and description: Africa south of the Sahara* (pp. 129-145): Lincom Europa.
- Vossen, R. (2013) Introduction. In R. Vossen (Ed.), The Khoesan languages. London and New York, Routledge.
- Walsh, M. (1991). Conversational styles and intercultural communication: An example from northern Australia. Australian Journal of Communication, 18(1), 1-12.
- Walsh, M. (1995). Interactional styles in the courtroom: an example from northern Australia. In J. Gibbons (Ed.), *Language and the law*. London: Longman.
- Washburn, P. (2001). A minimalist approach to Khoekhoe declaratives. In A. Bell & P. Washburn (Eds.), *Khoisan: syntax, phonetics, phonology and contact* (Vol. 18, pp. 28-56). Ithaca: Cornell University.
- Whorf, B. L. (2012). Language, thought, and reality: selected writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf (J. B. Carroll, S. C. Levinson, & P. Lee, Eds.). Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Widlok, T. (1994). The social relationships of changing Haillom hunter-gatherers in Northern Namibia, 1990-1994. London: University of London.
- Widlok, T. (1995). The 'irrealis' at work in Haillom. In A. Traill, R. Vossen & M. Biesele (Eds.), *The complete linguist* (pp. 371-382). Köln: Köppe.
- Widlok, T. (1997). Haillom language usage and social identity. In W. H. G. Haacke & E. Elderkin (Eds.), *Namibian languages* (pp. 117-124). Köln.
- Widlok, T. (1999a). Living on Mangetti 'Bushman' autonomy and Namibian independence. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Widlok, T. (1999b). A place to rest and to talk: spatial and linguistic shifts in northern Namibia. In S. Neumann (Ed.), *Comparing African spaces* (Vol. 11). Köln: Köppe.
- Widlok, T. (2000). Names that escape the state. Haillom naming practices versus domination and isolation. In P. Schweitzer, M. Biesele & R. K. Hitchcock (Eds.), *Hunters and gatherers in the modern world: conflict, resistance and self-determination* (pp. 361-379): Berghahn Books.
- Widlok, T. (2004). Sharing by default? Outline of an anthropology of virtue. Anthropological Theory, 4, 53-70.
- Widlok, T. (2007). From individual act to social agency in San trance rituals. In R. van Dijk, M. deBruin & J. Gewald (Eds.), *Strength beyond structure: social and historical trajectories of agency in africa* (pp. 163-188). Leiden: Brill.

- Widlok, T. (2009). Where settlements and the landscape merge: towards an integrated apporach to the spatial dimensions of social relations. In M. Bollig & O. Bubenzer (Eds.), *African landscapes. Interdisciplinary approaches.* New York: Springer.
- Widlok, T. (2010a). Norm and spontaneity: elicitation with moral dilemma scenarios. In M. Heintz (Ed.), *The anthropology of moralities*. Oxford: Berghahn.
- Widlok, T. (2010b). Sharing as a cultural innovation. In M. Benz (Ed.), *The principle of sharing* (pp. 91-104). Berlin: Ex oriente.
- Widlok, T. (2013). Haillom phonology, Haillom morphology, Haillom syntax, Haillom language contact. In R. Vossen (Ed.), *The Khoesan languages*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Widlok, T. (2019) Die Praxis des Teilens. Paideuma: Mitteilungen zur Kulturkunde, Vol 65, pp 157-172.
- Wierzbicka, A. (1985). Different cultures, different languages, different speech acts. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 9, 145-178.
- Wierzbicka, A. (1991). Cross-cultural pragmatics. The semantics of human interaction. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Wierzbicka, A. (2008). A conceptual basis for intercultural pragmatics and world-wide understanding. In M. Pütz & J. Neff-Van Aertselaer (Eds.), *Developing contrastive pragmatics: interlanguage and cross-cultural perspectives*: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Wilkins, D. (2003). Why pointing with the index finger is not a universal (in sociocultural and semiotic terms). In S. Kita (Ed.), *Pointing: where language, culture, and cognition meet.* Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Witzlack-Makarevich, A. (2006). Aspects of Information Structure in Richtersveld Nama. Unpublished MA Thesis, Universitaet Leipzig, Leipzig.
- Zimmerman, D. H. (1992). The interactional organization of calls for emergency assistance. In P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at work. Interaction in institutional settings*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Zinken, J. (2020) Recruiting assistance and collaboration in Polish. In S. Floyd, G. Rossi & N. J. Enfield (Eds.), *Getting others to do things: a pragmatic typology of recruitments.* Language Science Press.

Abstract

In this thesis, the influence of culture and social organisation on language and interaction was explored. The areas of interaction that were focused on are the microsociology of questioning and requesting interaction occurring in everyday, informal conversations of $\frac{1}{4}$ khoe Haillom speakers as well as a language specific communication form called *\frac{1}{2}gona*: a type of conspicuous standing with the aim of making oneself available to be shared with. The findings were compared to what is known about (American) English interaction, and explanations were given for the commonalities and differences from a cultural perspective.

The overall conclusions of this thesis are threefold. First, I have shown that culture can drive the choice for a grammatical form of an utterance (for example open questions vs. closed questions) as well as the choice of action (for example requesting vs. *\pmgona*). \pm Ākhoe speakers have a preference for indirect questioning forms in keeping with other aspects of their culture. The form requests take is related to a culturally motivated categorisation of goods and products. The higher the imposition of the request, which is related to the properties of the object requested, the more indirect the request. Moreover, the language specific *\pmgona* behaviour is inextricably linked and would not exist without \pm Ākhoe specific categorisation of goods, settlement patterns and sharing obligations. The second overall conclusion is that despite these clear influences of the culture and social organisation on language use, the basic structure of interaction is not directly influenced, and this structure of interaction as it was laid out by Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974) is universal, as long as one includes physical communication along with the verbal communication. And finally, this work shows that these basics of human interaction are present even in very divergent cultures. Not only are they present in large-scale, industrialized, sedentary, hierarchical cultures, but they are also present in small-scale, nomadic, egalitarian cultures.

Zusammenfassung

In dieser Arbeit wird der Einfluss von Kultur und sozialer Organisation auf Sprache und Interaktion untersucht. Es werden Universalien der Interaktion gesucht, und es wird argumentiert, dass es im Sprachgebrauch der Sprecher von ‡Ākhoe Haillom eine Präferenz für Nichtzwang gibt. Die Interaktionsbereiche, auf dem der Fokus liegt, sind die Mikrosoziologie der fragenden und fordernden Interaktion, die in alltäglichen, informellen Gesprächen von ‡Ākhoe Haillom Sprechern vorkommt, sowie eine sprachspezifische Kommunikationsform namens *‡Gona*: eine Art auffälliges Warten mit dem Ziel, sich für dem Teilen verfügbar zu machen. Die Ergebnisse werden mit dem, was über die Interaktion im (amerikanischen) Englisch bekannt ist, verglichen und die Gemeinsamkeiten und Unterschiede aus kultureller Sicht erläutert.

Die allgemeinen Schlussfolgerungen dieser Arbeit sind dreifach. Erstens habe ich gezeigt, dass eine kulturelle Präferenz für Nichtzwang in der Kommunikation die Wahl einer grammatikalischen Form einer Äußerung (z. B. offene Fragen gegenüber geschlossenen Fragen) sowie die Wahl einer Handlung (z. B. Bitten gegenüber #Gona) beeinflussen kann. ‡Äkhoe-Sprecher bevorzugen indirekte Frageformen im Einklang mit anderen Aspeken ihrer Kultur. Die Form der Anfragen hängt mit einer kulturell motivierten Kategorisierung von Waren und Produkten zusammen, und je höher die Auferlegung, die auf den Eigenschaften des angefragten Objekts beruht, desto indirekter sind die Anfragen. Darüber hinaus ist das sprachspezifische #Gona-Verhalten untrennbar verbunden mit ‡Ākhoe-spezifische Kategorisierung van Gütern, Siedlungsmustern und Teilenverpflichtungen und würde ohne dies nicht existieren. Die Praxis des auffälligen Wartens ist ein weiteres Zeichen für die Präferenz der Redner für Zwangslosigkeit. Die zweite allgemeine Schlussfolgerung ist, dass trotz dieser klaren Einflüsse der Kultur und der sozialen Organisation auf den Sprachgebrauch, die Grundstruktur der Interaktion nicht direkt beeinflusst wird, und zwar diese Struktur der Interation, wie sie von Sacks, Schegloff und Jefferson (1974) dargelegt wurde als universell, solange man neben der verbalen Kommunikation auch die körperliche Kommunikation einbezieht. Schlieslich zeigt diese Arbeit, dass diese Grundlagen menschlicher Interaktion auch in sehr unterschiedlichen Kulturen vorhanden sind. Sie kommen nicht nur in großen industrialisierten, sesshaften und hierarchischen Kulturen vor, sondern auch in kleinen, nomadischen, egalitären Kulturen.