

# Editing Rangi Narratives

## *A Pilot Study in Literature Production*

Oliver Stegen

*oliver@ling.ed.ac.uk*

### ABSTRACT

The research described in this paper is embedded in the Rangi language development project in Tanzania, and specifically in Rangi literature production. From a literature review, the areas of text and sentence length, clausal organization, vocabulary elaboration, and participant reference are identified as worthwhile to be investigated concerning the difference between oral and written style. Two traditional Rangi stories, recorded both in an oral and a written version and then edited into a joined story, are then analysed. For length and participant reference, the previous findings are confirmed. With regard to clausal organization and vocabulary elaboration, the Rangi written texts do not yet exhibit specifically written stylistic features as Rangi literacy is only recently emerging. In editing both versions into a publishable form, the editors have employed both written and oral stylistic features, thus enriching the simple original writing, which had been influenced by L2 writing in Swahili. Further investigation is suggested in the areas of audience feedback and identification of genre-specific stylistic features in Rangi.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The research described in this paper is embedded in the Rangi language development project in Tanzania, run by SIL International since 1996, and specifically in the aspect of Rangi literature production. A brief history of the Rangi project can be found in Stegen (2003), and a particular recommendation was to “[c]onduct an in-depth discourse analysis to discover Rangi specific styles, with a view to inform prospective Rangi authors in creative writing seminars” (Stegen 2003:5). The present study is hoped to be a first step in that direction.

Given the facts that a Rangi orthography is only existent since 1998, that only a handful of Rangi writers actually use it, and that only a very small number of written Rangi materials were published so far, we cannot claim that a conventionalized writing style<sup>1</sup> has already developed in the Rangi language. Consequently, we are looking at emerging literature where the negotiation between oral and written styles is still in flux. For the production of literacy material, we have followed an approach similar to the one described by Eckert (1981):

One of our bilingual school teachers [...] became better aware of appropriate ‘book language’ through the following process: We had her first ‘orally’ translate to a live audience of children and we taped it. At a later date, she worked on a written translation of the same story. Meanwhile, I transcribed the oral version. Afterwards, she sat and studied the two drafts, creating out of both sets of alternatives a final

---

<sup>1</sup> The terms ‘writing style’ and ‘written style’ are used interchangeably throughout this paper.

version she felt best for the book. Her final product was not simply a choosing between two alternatives, but often the creation of something better stimulated by that choice.  
(Eckert 1981)<sup>2</sup>

In particular, we will look at two stories, for both of which an oral and a written version were produced relatively independently of each other and then edited into a joint whole.

Before presenting the Rangi data and its analysis, however, it should be in order to put this study into the perspective of previous research, not least for delineating the areas in which analysis of the Rangi narratives may be particularly relevant.

## 2. PREVIOUS RESEARCH

As one of the foremost organizations active in vernacular literacy, SIL International through its members has produced a considerable body of research into literacy development. Out of this, we will start with looking at the development of writing style. Concerning differences between oral and written style, we can take additional recourse to wider research beyond SIL. The section will conclude with relating a preliminary study into editing processes (Adams 1972).

### 2.1 Development of writing style

When it comes to the introduction of writing in an up-to-then exclusively oral vernacular, even though the corresponding community may be familiar with writing in a regional or national language, there are several issues which have been discussed in the literature. Most of these are relevant to Rangi language development, and we will look at them in turn.

First, a concern has been expressed that writing ability does not follow naturally from speaking ability alone, and consequently, without “practice, stamina, confidence, and usually some helpful friends as well who can read over one’s work in progress”, a natural vernacular style in writing will be difficult to acquire, especially as no authority is available on good vernacular writing style for previously unwritten languages but vernacular writers have to rely on equally inexperienced peers (Jacobs 1977). However, most vernacular literacy researchers connected with SIL International found that, once writing is introduced to a society, a written style develops almost automatically (cf. Gudschinsky 1974; Collins 1979), and the speakers “seem to have an intuitive sense of what elements should make up their written style, even before any body of literature has been produced” (Poulter 1991). This “intuitive sense” seems to be contingent, however, on the amount and regularity of exposure which the language community has to vernacular writing. Kerr (1980) also remarks that this development of written style comes more easily in familiar than in unfamiliar texts.

Second, most SIL members involved in literacy projects demand that vernacular writing style develop independently of other languages’ writing styles (cf. Gudschinsky 1974; Kerr 1980; Bolli 1983). Collins (1979) emphasizes that “literature [should] be viewed as belonging to a culture - distinctly theirs - as opposed to being thrust upon them from the outside”. While the uniqueness of each language certainly makes such a stance desirable, it may be very difficult, if not impossible, to completely avoid stylistic influences from regional and/or national languages with which the vernacular community may be familiar. For our purposes, we will restrict ourselves to a descriptive, rather than prescriptive, approach. If vernacular

---

<sup>2</sup> No page numbers can be given for articles accessed via *LinguaLinks* and *Translator’s Workplace*, as they are not paginated on the CD-ROMs.

writers should be free to develop their own style, they should be equally free to adopt stylistic principles from other languages.

Third, Jacobs (1977) lists the components of acquiring a good written style as “to get the prose to sound natural, to select words that are really on target in the sense that they convey exactly the nuance that the writer intends, to use sentence embedding to good effect, and, in fact, learn to use all of the stylistic options that the language has to offer”. While the fourth component, “stylistic options”, is rather broad and would need to be elaborated in more detail, the three components of naturalness, lexical accuracy, and clausal organization seem to be a good starting point for evaluating writing style.

Fourth, no written style can develop without relationship to the oral style of the respective language, as this precedes it in time. However, the newly developed written style will only “reflect to some degree what is considered good oral style of that language” (Bolli 1983). Furthermore, it has been observed that written style diverges from oral style in significant aspects (Poulter 1991), as it has to, due to being a rather distinct medium. The relationship between oral and written style definitely warrants a closer look.

## 2.2 Differences between oral and written style<sup>3</sup>

As has been noted earlier (cf. Jacobs 1977), there is a general difference between speech and writing, not necessarily directly related to style, yet nevertheless relevant to our considerations. This difference of mode of communication has been attributed to the intrinsic difference of the short-term memory constraints of speaking over against the non-immediate interaction of writing (Barton 2004:63, discussing Chafe’s research). Table 1 lists those opposite features which Chafe (1994:41ff) discusses as intrinsic to the respective activities of speaking and writing.

**Table 1: Differences between the Activities of Speaking and Writing (Chafe 1994)**

Speaking	Writing
Evanescence	Permanence and transportability
Higher tempo	Slower tempo
Spontaneity	Deliberate “working over”
Prosodically rich	Prosodically “impoverished”
Natural to humans	Has to be taught
Situated (co-presence of communicators)	Desituated (lack of immediate interchange)

Some of these intrinsic differences, e.g. prosodic features of speech like intonation, speech tempo and voice quality, have been discussed with regard to the need to compensate for them in writing (cf. Duff 1973; Johnston 1976). Such compensation accounts for some of the divergence of oral versus written style.

When it comes to an analysis of structural and stylistic differences, the literature is almost too vast to be presented in a short paper like this. A good starting point may be Nida (1967:156) who suggests differences between oral and written style as displayed in Table 2.

<sup>3</sup> For researching the differences between oral and written style, two annotated bibliographies were especially helpful: Leutkemeyer et al (1983), and Frank (1983). The former was consulted on Drieman (1962), Nida (1967), Poole & Field (1976), Chafe (1979), Hurd (1979), and Tannen (1982), and the latter on Duff (1973), Deibler (1976), and Johnston (1976).

**Table 2: Differences between Oral and Written Style (Nida 1967)**

<b>Oral style</b>	<b>Written style</b>
Parallel structure of kernels	Greater inbedding [sic] and subordination
Psychological atmosphere provided mainly by intonation	Psychological atmosphere provided by the selection of terms having fitting connotations
Numerous onomatopoeic expressions and frequent use of sound symbolism	Much less sound symbolism except in poetic utterance
Relatively frequent syntactic abnormalities	Greater syntactic consistency
Less careful sequencing	Studied sequencing
Limited vocabulary	Richer vocabulary
More words in proportion to the number of ideas	Fewer words in proportion to the number of ideas
Frequent changes resulting from feedback from receptors	Not subject to sudden shifts as result of feedback

These differences can be categorized into broader areas like length (relating to the word-idea proportion), overall organization (subsuming differences of structure like embedding and sequencing), and elaboration of vocabulary (subsuming differences of sound symbolism, connotations, and richness of vocabulary). This then harks back to Jacobs' (1977) stylistic components of naturalness, clausal organization, and lexical accuracy. Another similar categorization can be found in Poole & Field's (1976) structural complexity, language elaboration, and verb complexity, adding the aspect of personal reference.

With regard to length, it has been found that sentences in written texts are significantly longer than in oral texts (Carl 1986; Barton 2004:62). By contrast, when comparing oral with written versions of the same basic content, the written text is significantly shorter than the oral one (Drieman 1962; Eckert 1981).

With regard to structural organization, written texts tend to have higher numbers of combined clauses and embedding than oral ones (Carl 1986; Barton 2004). This manifests itself in the pronounced use of clausal connectives in writing (Wise 1991). Also, written texts exhibit a closer adherence to chronological and logical order over against the more experiential involvement of oral texts which include more flashbacks (Eckert 1981; Wise 1991). This corresponds to the fact that in written texts, a lot of background information is given in the introduction, as well as to the increased use of opening and closing devices (Carl 1986; Wise 1991).

With regard to vocabulary elaboration, oral texts are found to be wordier, while written texts tend to be more concise (Hurd 1979). This can be demonstrated by the higher use of emotives and similar colourful language in oral texts (Deibler 1976; Chafe 1979; Eckert 1981) over against the higher use of attributives and more varied vocabulary in written texts (Drieman 1962).

With regard to pronominal or participant reference, the greater distance of writing from the situation communicated about necessitates a greater explicitness, e.g. "the addition of a specific free pronoun, the substitution of a specific noun or noun phrase for pronouns" (Eckert 1981). The omission of references which can be inferred in oral texts through gestures and tone of voice, in written texts might lead to unintelligibility (Jacobs 1977). Hence Wendell's list of questions concerning pronominal reference whether written versions of oral texts are explicit enough:

Are these references as clear in written style as in oral? Are there places where the characters should be specifically identified in a written account as to whether they are subject or object? Will another speaker-reader of the language understand the references without having to ask questions of the author?

(Wendell 1982)

Finally, it has to be borne in mind that this juxtaposition of oral versus written texts and their styles is not an absolute one. How oral and written texts can influence each other is demonstrated in the summary of Tannen (1982) by Leutkemeyer et al (1983):

Tannen's analysis of the spoken and written versions of the same narrative yields two main findings: (1) features that have been associated with oral discourse are found in written discourse, and (2) the written version of the narrative combines syntactic complexity expected in writing with features that create involvement expected in speaking. Since both literary language and ordinary spontaneous conversation focus on subjective knowledge and interpersonal involvement, they share some devices previously considered to be purely literary.

(Leutkemeyer et al 1983)

In a similar way, Ong (1982), as referred to by Leander & Prior (2004), distinguishes between primary orality, i.e. the oral literature of a society uninfluenced by writing, and secondary orality, i.e. the oral literature of literate cultures which is "quite different because forms of language and thought developed in writing come to saturate the forms and content of oral language" (Leander & Prior 2004:203).<sup>4</sup> And Barton (2004:63-64) reports research by Biber (1988) which found that text types are not characterized by a single difference but by sets of co-occurring features; for example, the functional category 'narrative', cutting across both oral and written, exhibits a high frequency of simple past tense, third person pronouns, perfect-aspect verbs, and verbs that report communicative acts. As a result, it should be borne in mind that stylistic features are not exclusively belonging to the oral or written medium, and that "oral and written language [are] on a structural-functional continuum, with different structures conventionally associated with different functions in context" (Barton 2004:64).

### 2.3 A Preliminary Study of Editing

While quite a number of publications in vernacular literacy are geared towards the training of editors (e.g. Dawson 1985; Kondo & Walter 1990), there seem to be hardly any on particular changes which are introduced by editors of vernacular texts. An exception is Adams (1972) which "compares the oral version of a Wolaamo fable as told by a local storyteller with the same fable as edited by a more educated Wolaamo" (Adams 1972:24). Most of that article actually contains the oral versus the edited version of the fable, and the comments on editing are relatively minor. However, Adams does distinguish three different types of editing: corrections of the storyteller's obvious mistakes, deletions of redundancy and stylistic changes, and changes in the story's content. These changes result in a more concise form of the fable. At the end of his article, Adams presents a list of questions for further research some of which are considered worthwhile in the Rangi context, too:

When the edited story is read back to Wolaamo listeners, will they prefer the edited concise form? And will Wolaamo readers prefer reading the more concise form? [...] Will the Wolaamo listener/reader miss the linking repetitions that were deleted from the original form? Or will he prefer the edited, more concise form? [...] Why did the editor make these partial deletions? Did his schooling in Amharic in grades one to six, and in

---

<sup>4</sup> For a note of caution against Ong's presuppositions and conclusions, cf. Clark 1984.

English in grades seven to twelve “program” his editing? Would a different kind of written Wolaamo style develop if newly-literate, uneducated Wolaamos did the editing?  
(Adams 1972)

### 3. RANGI DATA

As we see a beginning of emerging literature in the Rangi language development project, we had a small pool of Rangi stories to choose from. Due to comparability of content as well as similarities of production, the choice fell on the story of the stone in the ‘ugali’<sup>5</sup> and the story of Dinu. These were among four stories which Peter Patrick, a 30-year old Rangi mother tongue speaker<sup>6</sup>, employed as part-time office assistant in the Rangi language development project, had written in September 2003. They were subsequently adapted to the revised Rangi orthography (SIL 2003), entered into the computer and interlinearized. On December 19, 2003, three stories were recorded from Peter Patrick’s mother in her Kondoia home in the presence of Peter, his eldest brother and the author; again, our two chosen stories were among them. However, Peter’s mother had not seen his written versions prior to telling the stories. These oral versions were then transcribed, again using the revised Rangi orthography, entered into the computer and interlinearized. Finally, in June 2004, printouts of both versions were given to Peter Patrick and Andrew Lujuo, a 44-year old Rangi mother tongue speaker and doctoral student at the Catholic University of East Africa in Nairobi, Kenya,<sup>7</sup> to edit and produce out of the oral and written versions a single version for each story which they both agreed to be publishable. The fully interlinearized stories in all three versions, oral, written, and edited, are given in the Appendix.

#### 3.1 Comparison between oral and written versions

In the following, the oral and written versions of both stories will first be compared with regard to their content, and then, in a second step, concerning the categories and features established and reported in §2.2, especially length, clause combination, vocabulary elaboration, and participant reference.

The story of the stone in the ‘ugali’ has the following basic content: During a time of famine, a man frequently goes to his brother to beg for food. When the brother tires of constantly giving, he gives him an ‘ugali’-covered stone as food to share with his children. When discovering the stone, the man stops his children from eating. After the famine is over, the man gives a feast during which he shows the ‘ugali’-covered stone to the guests. A rope is brought, and he and his brother hold each end. Then the rope is cut as a sign of their severed relationship.

Over against this basic story-line which is common to both original versions, the written version adds some speech and explanations about the exchange of the food containing the stone (1.A.5-9)<sup>8</sup>, that they survived the famine by begging elsewhere (1.A.13), and that this was the beginning of two Viisi-subclans (1.A.18). By contrast, the oral version states that they

---

<sup>5</sup> ‘Ugali’ is the staple food of Tanzania, a very stiff mush made from maize meal.

<sup>6</sup> While Peter Patrick has never finished primary school, his command and knowledge of the Rangi language, his mother tongue, is exceptional, and he came highly recommended for employment in Rangi language work.

<sup>7</sup> Andrew Lujuo has considerable experience in both composition and editing, mainly in Swahili and English.

<sup>8</sup> References to the story versions are given in accordance with numbering in the appendix, i.e. 1.A.5-9 stands for story number 1, version A (originally written), and sentences 5-9.

survived by planting millet (1.B.9), adds more details about the feast like who is invited and what they eat (1.B.11-14), and an explanation about the meaning of cutting a rope (1.B.22-23). The written and oral versions further differ content-wise in that the oral version starts off with the fact that those brothers cut a rope (and then, the story follows like an explanation of that fact), whereas the written version emphasizes the famine and only mentions the cutting of the rope at the end of the story. Also, the conversation between the offended brother and his guests is rather different, with a short exchange in the written version (1.A.14d-16) over against a longer one in the oral (1.B.16-20).

The basic components of the story of Dinu are as follows: A Rangi girl named Dinu is abducted by cattle-raiding Maasai and married by one of them. After having born children, she is warned by an old Maasai woman of her husband's plot to kill her. She consequently flees and returns home.

The written version adds explanations about Dinu's family situation (2.A.2-3), a lengthy and highly repetitive explanation about the Maasai habit of cattle-raiding (2.A.4-6b), and a comment on the situation of Dinu's mother after Dinu had been abducted (2.A.7). By contrast, the oral version fills in many more details, e.g. that Dinu was guarding a field when abducted (2.B.2a), reported speech by Dinu's Maasai husband (2.B.2c,4), the song by Dinu's mother (2.B.6-7),<sup>9</sup> the food and magic she's given for the way (2.B.9-10), that she slept in trees on the journey, and that it lasted three days (2.B.11b-13a), and the encounter with the old man who brought her home (2.B.13b-20). Further differences between written and oral version are that the written version introduces Dinu first whereas the oral starts with the Maasai, and the warning of the old Maasai woman which is given as indirect speech in the written (2.A.9) but as a slightly longer stretch of direct speech in the oral (2.B.8).

When turning to distinctive features, emerging differences between the written and the oral versions of both stories show in all aspects established in §2.2. With regard to text and sentence length of text, table 3 gives an overview of both versions of both stories.

**Table 3: Text and sentence length of written versus oral versions**

	1.A (written)	2.a (written)	1.B (oral)	2.B (oral)
No. of words	171	116	182	223 <sup>10</sup>
No. of sentences	18	10	26 <sup>11</sup>	20
Words / sentence ratio	9.5	11.6	7.0	11.15
Most words / sentence	20,19,16	19,19,14	15,13,11	32,23,21

While the first story is of almost equal length in both versions, the written version has comparatively longer sentences. By contrast, the second story is almost twice as long orally, yet both versions seem to have comparable sentence lengths. Taking these results at face value is not unproblematic. Whereas sentence breaks in the written versions can be determined by punctuation, they are not as obvious in the oral versions. In order to have comparable sentence breaks, the punctuation in Peter Patrick's transcription of the oral versions has been taken as a guide to determine sentence breaks. This, however, leads to one-word sentences consisting of higher-level discourse markers like 'baasi' denoting the closing of a section, and 'haya' introducing a new development. Even more distorting for the word-per-sentence ratio is

<sup>9</sup> However, this song was only inserted at a slightly later point in the story than it would have belonged because the narrator was prompted by the audience to do so.

<sup>10</sup> Interaction from the audience like 2.B.0 and sentences interrupted by the audience and repeated later like 2.B.5 have not been entered into the total word count.

<sup>11</sup> Whereas in the appendix, 24 sentences only are numbered, sentences 10 and 11 comprise two sentences each.

reported speech, which is subordinate to the verb of locution even when consisting of several sentences. Consequently, 2.B.6 is counted as a single sentence consisting of 32 words, even though the reported speech part of it consists of four sentences, averaging seven words per sentence only. If readjusting the sentence count by joining higher-level discourse markers with preceding or following sentences, and splitting reported speech into component sentences, a picture emerges as given in table 4, which comes closer to the reported longer sentences in written texts<sup>12</sup>.

**Table 4: Revised sentence length of written versus oral versions**

	1.A (written)	2.a (written)	1.B (oral)	2.B (oral)
No. of words	171	116	182	223
No. of sentences	24	10	39	37
Words / sentence ratio	7.13	11.6	4.67	6.03
Most words / sentence	18,16,14	19,19,14	11,11,10	11,11,11

Concerning clausal organization, the most frequent method of clausal combination is through the conjunction *maa* ‘and then’<sup>13</sup> and the consecutive tense marked by *-ka-*. When it comes to subordination, the difference does not seem to be one of frequency of embedding, as all four versions exhibit between 11 and 13 subordinate clauses, but rather of the type used. Most conspicuous is the use of conjunctions for clausal combination: Whereas there is only one instance in the oral versions, employing *kooni*<sup>14</sup> (2.B.15c), the written versions make more frequent use of conjunctions like *kooni* (1.A.6d), *sa* (2.A.4b etc), *mpaka* (1.A.13, 2.A.8b), and *kwa hiyo* (1.A.16b), the latter two of which are borrowings from Swahili. In the oral versions, *sa* (e.g. 2.B.10) and *mpaka* (e.g. 2.B.20) are used as prepositions and not as conjunctions. In general, Rangi subordination seems to make use of verb forms rather than conjunctions. This is especially pronounced in the oral versions, e.g. the use of perfective aspect as temporal subordinate clause meaning ‘when X had ...’ is restricted to the oral versions only (1.B.4,5,7a,9,11,14a; 2.B.2b,7,14a). Other embedding strategies are more equally distributed, e.g. relative clauses three times in written (1.A.16a; 2.A.1,3) versus four times in oral versions (1.B.15,17b,18b; 2.B.18), or infinitival clauses eight times in written (1.A.4c,10,10,16b,18a; 2.A.5b,6b,10b) versus four times in oral versions (1.B.17a; 2.B.9,10,14b). A possible explanation for this quantitatively similar yet qualitatively different frequency of clausal combination could be that Peter Patrick as inexperienced writer has not yet learned to employ the full range of stylistic devices in writing.

With regard to vocabulary, the oral versions seem to have the broader variety, contrary to claims reported above (cf. §2.2). Examples are where *iwye* is varied with *nkamaangwii* (1.B.3b), *-umbirira* with *-hakwa* (1.B.17b), *-ulaa* with *-tema* (2.B.2b), *-sumulwa* with *-kwaatwa* (2.B.7), or *-inuka* with *-tamanya* (2.B.8b) and *-doma* (2.B.17d). Other examples of employing a more elaborate vocabulary are *-dumuka* (1.B.11), *isaamba* (1.B.12b,23), or *-tanukula* (1.B.16), the latter of which Peter Patrick didn’t even recognize. It is quite conceivable that the fact that all Rangi writers first learn to write in L2, i.e. Swahili, has a narrowing effect on their Rangi writing vocabulary. That conjunctions in Rangi have been borrowed from Swahili has already been mentioned above. Additional examples of Swahili borrowings in the written versions are *-endelea* (1.A.13), *kabisa* (1.A.16a), *mwáanzo* (1.A.18a), *tabiya* (2.A.5a), or *hali* (2.A.7b). Kinship terms are another point of divergence:

<sup>12</sup> Note that the numbers for story 2.A remain unchanged due to the absence of reported speech in it.

<sup>13</sup> This is used interchangeably with *naa*, which is probably an influence from Swahili *na* ‘and’.

<sup>14</sup> The orthographic conventions of Rangi as followed in this paper are briefly summarized at the beginning of the appendix.

Where the written version uses the Swahili-based *maámwaaavo* ‘their mother’ (2.A.2), the oral version has the original Rangi *íwaaavo* (2.B.6a,7). The oral version also uses *taáta* ‘father’ (2.B.8d) where more and more Rangi have switched to the Swahili *baba*, and *baaba* ‘grandfather’ (2.B.17a) where the Swahili *babu* is increasingly used. Finally, contractions are found in the oral versions, e.g. *maree* (2.B.13a) from *maa reerũ* ‘and then finally’, or *hiyahere* (2.B.6b) which purportedly comes from an old saying *iyaaka haaha reerũ*, meaning ‘I don’t know how it will be’.<sup>15</sup> Such uses of archaic language in songs have been reported by Reuster-Jahn (2002:156) for another Tanzanian Bantu language.

When finally looking at participant reference, it can be observed that it is not always unambiguous in the oral versions. At times, a change in agent occurs without this being marked explicitly, as in 1.B.4 ‘he said ... and he took’, or 2.B.16 ‘3sg came out, and 3sg said’.<sup>16</sup> Such ambiguity is not necessarily confined to pronominal reference, however. For example, the two consecutive occurrences of *mwaanaavo* (1.B.2,3) refer first to the one, and then to the other brother. By contrast, in the written version, change of agent is denoted by remote demonstrative pronoun *ũra* (1.A.4a,4b,8a,9b etc), or by full explicit reference, e.g. *ũwo Dina* (2.A.6c,8a,9b,10a). Similarly, reported speech is always identified in the written version by a verb of locution, whereas in the oral version, such a verb is sometimes missing (1.B.17b).

In summary, some of the differences between oral and written texts as reported in the literature have been found in Rangi also. Where this was not the case (cf. sentence complexity and variety of vocabulary), this could be explained by the inexperience of the writer and the influence of Swahili. It is now time to turn our attention to how these different features have been integrated in the edited versions.

#### 4. DISCUSSION OF EDITING

When discussing the editorial changes which Peter Patrick and Andrew Lujuo introduced in the joining of the two versions, the self-perception of the two editors is an important parameter.<sup>17</sup> Consequently, both were interviewed after the editing process how they understood their role and task as editors. In order not to predispose them to certain editorial processes, they had not been given any further instructions or guidelines beyond the task to produce out of the two versions a story which they considered publishable. It was seen as a particular advantage that one of the editors was highly educated and well-versed in editing while the other had little formal education but an above-average intuition about Rangi naturalness and accuracy. In the interview, they both agreed that they saw their task as leaving the original versions intact where possible, only expanding and filling in gaps where parts had been forgotten, and changing “weak expressions” where they deemed necessary.

First, it can be observed that the edited versions exhibit a layout<sup>18</sup> where the written versions had been handwritten in a continuous script. During editing, both stories received titles. The title of the first one, *Njala Isũula Nduũ* ‘Hunger despises family relationships’, is actually a traditional Rangi proverb, capturing the message of the story succinctly. Andrew Lujuo mentioned that they copied this idea from Swahili where it is quite common to set a

<sup>15</sup> How to derive this translation is rather cryptic as *haaha* means ‘now’ and *reerũ* means ‘finally’, whereas the meaning of *iyaaka* is unknown these days.

<sup>16</sup> In Rangi, gender isn’t marked.

<sup>17</sup> I am indebted to Hugh Trappes-Lomax for pointing this out to me.

<sup>18</sup> These layout features are not apparent in the appendix.

proverb as title of a story. Also, the edited version of the first story has a paragraph break at the end of the famine (1.C.13), and in both stories, the closing formula is set apart from the main body of text (1.C.26; 2.C.25).

**Table 5: The Story of the Stone in the ‘Ugali’**

edited version	written version	oral version
1 (Title)	-/-	-/-
2a	= <b>1a-b</b> (-kĩntũ)	1a
2b	-/-	1b
3	2	-/-
4a-b	4a-b	-/-
4c	(4c)	(2)
5a-b	(5)	-/-
5c	-/-	(3a)
6a	(6a)	-/-
6b-7	= <b>6b-7</b>	-/-
8a	(8a)	-/-
8b	(8b/9a)	3b
9a-c	-/- (9b)	4
10	-/-	= <b>5</b>
11a <sup>1</sup>	(10)	-/-
11a <sup>2</sup>	-/-	= <b>6<sup>1</sup></b>
11b	= <b>11a<sup>1</sup></b>	= <b>6<sup>2</sup></b>
11c	= <b>11b</b>	(7a <sup>2</sup> -b)
12a-b	12	(8)
12c	13	-/-
13a <sup>1</sup>	-/-	11 <sup>1</sup>
13a <sup>2</sup>	-/-	= <b>10/11<sup>2</sup></b>
13b	(14a)	12a-b
14	-/-	= <b>13</b> (karya → kanya)
15a-b	-/- (14b <sup>1</sup> )	14a-b <sup>1</sup>
16a	-/- (14d <sup>1</sup> )	14b/16
16b-17	14d <sup>2</sup> -15	-/-
18	-/-	(17a-b)
19a	(16a)	= <b>18a</b>
19b-20	-/-	18b-19
21-22a	-/-	= <b>20-21a</b>
22b	-/-	21b
23a	(17)	= <b>22a</b>
23b-c	-/-	22b-c
24	-/-	= <b>23</b>
25a	= <b>18a</b>	-/-
25b	18b	-/-
26	-/-	= <b>24</b>

With regard to integration of written and oral version, tables 5 and 6 give overviews which parts of the edited version correspond to the original versions. Lack of correspondence is marked by ‘-/-’. Verbatim equivalents are marked with the sentence number preceded by ‘=’ and put in bold, with minor deviations mentioned in brackets. Equivalent parts which have

undergone editing are marked in neutral font, whereas parts which only relate to each other in content but without equivalence in lexis and grammar are shown in brackets. If a subpart of a line numbered a, b, c etc needs to be referred to, superscript numbers are used.

For this first story, almost all elements of both original versions have been used in editing. Both written and oral version have been used verbatim extensively, albeit it the latter more often. Parts which have been omitted altogether are 1.A.3,14b,16b and 1.B.9,15; in most cases, the editors considered these to be redundant repetitions (as explicitly stated for 1.A.3). In the second half of the story, the edited version relied more heavily on the oral version as that is much more explicit there. Apart from the title, the edited version did not add any information which is not present in the original versions.

**Table 6: The Story of Dinu**

<b>edited version</b>	<b>written version</b>	<b>oral version</b>
1 (Title)	-/-	-/-
2a	-/-	= <b>1a</b>
2b	(4-6b)	1b
3	= <b>1<sup>2</sup></b>	-/-
4a-b	3	-/-
5a-b <sup>1</sup>	-/-	2a
5b <sup>2</sup> -c	-/-	-/-
6a-b	(6c)	2b <sup>2</sup> -c
7a-c <sup>1</sup>	-/-	(7/6a)
7c <sup>2</sup> -f	-/-	6b-g
8a-b	8a-b	3
9a-b <sup>1</sup>	-/-	4a
9b <sup>2</sup> -d	-/-	= <b>4b-d</b>
10a	9a-b	= <b>8a</b> (-maa)
10b	(9c)	= <b>8b</b>
10c-12	-/-	= <b>8c-10</b>
13-14	(10a-b)	= <b>11a-b</b> (laala→looka)
15a-b	-/-	= <b>12a-b</b> (-Haya)
16-18a	-/-	= <b>13-14a</b>
18b	-/-	14b
19-20b	-/-	= <b>15a-c</b> (na→maa)
21a-b	-/-	16
22a	-/-	= <b>17a</b> (naaja→niija)
22b	-/-	= <b>17b</b> (da→baa)
22c-24	-/-	17c-20
25	-/-	-/-

In the second story, the editors again stuck closely to the components of the original versions. However, apart from the title, they also added the logical information that the Maasai meet Dinu at the hut in the field (2.C.5c), as well as the formulaic closing (2.C.25), copied from the first story. They relied much more heavily on the oral version, and the only verbatim quote from the written version is 2.A.1, the introduction of Dinu, which is missing from the oral version as the narrator and her audience had agreed beforehand that she would tell the story of Dinu. Parts of the original versions omitted completely are only from the written version (2.A.2,7a-c). Both editors agreed that the written version was not a good starting point, and not even a well-written story. In their opinion, it dwelt too excessively on

the cattle raiding of the Maasai, which is not a main feature of the story, and then did not provide nearly enough detail on the rest of the story.

As a result of this close integration, the edited versions are the longest of all, with 251 and 265 words respectively, thus resembling more the oral versions. However, the edited versions kept some of the longer sentences with 16, 16 and 15 words (1.C.5,12,4) and 17 and 14 words (2.C.5,10b-d). Nevertheless, it can be said that the edited versions are still more concise than the oral ones, due to editing out of redundant repetitions like *kũntũ* (1.A.1b) or redundant parts mentioned above. On the other hand, information left implicit in the original versions had to be added for better understanding, e.g. that the brother continued begging *elsewhere* in 1.C.12c (cf. 1.A.13), or that Dinu guarded the field *against birds* in 2.C.5b (cf. 2.B.2a).

With regard to clausal organization, the edited versions exhibit more embedding, with 19 and 16 occurrences respectively. The majority of clause combinations still uses *maa* and consecutive *-ka-* both of which can be considered main features of narratives. However, the editors saw the need of editing out a number of *maa* occurrences, e.g. in 1.C.8a (cf. 1.A.8a). With regard to subordination, the editors reduced the use of conjunctions, restricting it to Rangi conjunctions like *ũntũ* (1.C.5a-b) and *koonĩ* (2.C.20b), while *sa* is used as a preposition only (e.g. 1.C.2b). The only Swahili conjunction remaining is a single occurrence of *mpaka* (1.C.12c). Remarkably, the edited versions kept the use of perfective aspect as temporal subordinate from the oral versions (1.C.9a,10,13a,15a; 2.C.7a,18a,21a). Also, some uses of the higher-level discourse markers *baasi* and *haaya* were kept (1.C.14,24; 2.C.13,15a,18a,21a). The frequency of relative and infinitival clauses, with eight and six occurrences respectively in both stories together, remained largely unchanged.

Concerning language elaboration, only some of the varied vocabulary from the oral versions has been kept, e.g. *isaamba* (1.C.13b,24), or *-tamanya* (2.C.10b). The editors considered some words too colloquial, e.g. *-dumũka*, and others too unfamiliar, e.g. *-tũnũkũla*. On the other hand, they also added a few idiomatic expressions, e.g. *-kanya* ‘slaughter’ (literally ‘cause to fall’) in 1.C.14. The elimination of Swahili conjunctions has been mentioned above. Yet, also other loanwords from Swahili were edited out; the only ones remaining are *mwiisho* (1.C.5c), *-endelea* (1.C.12c), *mwáanzo* (1.C.25a), and *wakati* (2.C.7a). Whereas colloquial contractions have been resolved, e.g. *maa ree* (2.C.16) from *maree* (2.B.13a), or *ũntũ yootahĩrwa* (1.C.5a) from *ntũyootahĩrwa* (1.B.2), other colloquialisms have been kept when occurring in reported speech, e.g. *daa* instead of *baa* (1.C.6b), or *nũũ* instead of *ũhũ* (1.C.9b). In Dinu’s mother’s song, the original *hiyahere* is even further contracted to *hiyeeree* (2.C.7c,e). Here, it becomes evident that editing draws on both written and oral forms.

Finally, the disambiguating strategies of participant reference in the written versions have been preserved where necessary, e.g. the use of *ũra* to denote change of agent (1.A.5c,6a,7,8a). In other places, explicit reference has been added for clarity, e.g. *ũra moosi* (2.C.21b) to denote change of agent from Dinu to the old man. Where the narrator had used the near locative *kũũũ* (1.B.21b) for dramatic effect, i.e. implying that she had been there when it happened, this was changed to the distant locative *kũra* (1.C.22a-b).

## 5. CONCLUSION

First, it should be emphasized how helpful Eckert’s (1981) suggestion of integrating oral and written versions for vernacular literature production is. The Rangi editors would not have

employed a variety of stylistic features had they started only from one version, either written or oral. This corroborates Jacobs' (1977) concern that writing does not follow naturally from speaking but that young vernacular writers have to learn the full array of stylistic options available for the written medium. In this study, we have gone one step further than Adams (1972) in that we have been asking the editors about their self-perception and about the reasons for some of the changes which they made to the original versions. However, we have not yet investigated the reaction of the audience, which remains an important task in determining stylistic features acceptable for writing.

Concerning differences between written and oral style, the Rangi stories confirmed previous findings with regard to length and participant reference. Where the differences did not correspond to what is reported in the literature, especially in clausal organization and vocabulary elaboration, this is at least partly due to the relative newness of writing Rangi. Stylistic conventions have not been established yet, and Rangi writers, who were trained in writing Swahili only up to now, have not yet become accustomed to the wider range of stylistic options available to them when writing in their mother tongue. As the editors were quick to realize, it is not only legitimate but also actually beneficial in editing narratives to merge both written and oral features, keeping some, rejecting others. This is in accordance with Tannen's (1982) conclusions. Finally, some stylistic features have been identified as being universal narrative features applicable across the written-oral divide. This is in line with Biber's (1988) study, and further in-depth analyses should be undertaken to identify more of Rangi's stylistic features, both for narratives and other genres.

Overall, this pilot study has been an encouraging step in the direction of Rangi literature production, not only for the author but also for the two Rangi editors. As more and more Rangi texts become available, both in oral and in written form, it is hoped that they will speed along both Rangi literacy and stylistic research.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, my deepest thanks go to Peter Patrick and his mother, and to Andrew Lujoo for allowing me to use the fruits of their labour in my research. My involvement with the Rangi project has been made possible under residence permit no. C 21903 with support from the Anglican Dioceses of Central Tanganyika and of Kondo, to both of whom I am most grateful. Financial support from SIL International and Wycliff e.V. Germany is gratefully acknowledged. Last, but not least, I express my thanks to Cathy Davison, Marg Hartung, Tegan Kroening, Bob Ladd, Miriam Meyerhoff, Uta Reuster-Jahn, Dorothea Stegen, and Hugh Trappes-Lomax for support of various kinds.

## References

- Adams, Bruce. 1972. "A Wolaamo fable: The editing of oral literature". *Notes on Literacy* 13:24–29. *LinguaLinks* Version 5. [CD-ROM]. Dallas: SIL International, 2002. Available: Literacy Bookshelf/ Reference Materials/ Articles/ Notes on Literacy.
- Barton, Ellen. 2004. "Linguistic Discourse Analysis: How the Language in Texts Works". In: Bazerman & Prior (eds.). 57-82.
- Bazerman, Charles, and Paul Prior (eds.). 2004. *What Writing Does and How It Does It: An Introduction to Analyzing Texts and Textual Practices*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Biber, Douglas. 1988. *Variation across speech and writing*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Bolli, Margrit. 1983. "The Victor Hugo in Dan country: Developing a mother tongue body of literature in a neoliterate society". *Notes on Sociolinguistics* 5:3–14. Dallas: SIL. *LinguaLinks* Version 5. [CD-ROM]. Dallas: SIL International, 2002. Available: Sociolinguistics Bookshelf/ Notes on Sociolinguistics.
- Carl, Richard. 1986. "Oral and written styles". *READ* 21.1:5–8. Ukarumpa, Papua New Guinea: SIL.
- Chafe, Wallace. 1979. "Integration and involvement in spoken and written language". Proceedings of the Second World Congress of the International Association for Semiotic Studies, Vienna, July 1979.
- . 1994. *Discourse, consciousness, and time: the flow and displacement of conscious experience in speaking and writing*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Clark, Sherri. 1984. "Speech versus writing". *Notes on Literacy* 43:1–11. *LinguaLinks* Version 5. [CD-ROM]. Dallas: SIL International, 2002. Available: Literacy Bookshelf/ Reference Materials/ Articles/ Notes on Literacy.
- Collins, Wesley M. 1979. "Some interrelationships between literacy and discourse study". *Notes on Literacy* 28:18–29. *LinguaLinks* Version 5. [CD-ROM]. Dallas: SIL International, 2002. Available: Literacy Bookshelf/ Reference Materials/ Articles/ Notes on Literacy.
- Dawson, Barbara. 1985. "Training writers: Evaluation and self-editing". *Notes on Literacy* 47:2–3. *LinguaLinks* Version 5. [CD-ROM]. Dallas: SIL International, 2002. Available: Literacy Bookshelf/ Reference Materials/ Articles/ Notes on Literacy.
- Deibler, Ellis. 1976. "Differences between written and oral styles in languages near Goroka". *READ* 11:77–79. Ukarumpa, Papua New Guinea: SIL.
- Drieman, G.H.J. 1962. "Differences between written and spoken language". *Acta Psychologica* 20:36-58, 79-100.
- Duff, Martha. 1973. "Contrastive features of written and oral texts in Amuesha". *Notes on Translation* 50:2–13. *Translator's Workplace* Version 4. [CD-ROM]. Dallas: SIL International and United Bible Societies, 2002. Available: Library Menu/ Other Translation Resources/ Journals and Articles.
- Eckert, Ann. 1981. "Analysis of written style—an imperative for readable translations?". *Notes on Translation* 85:27-32. *Translator's Workplace* Version 4. [CD-ROM]. Dallas: SIL International and United Bible Societies, 2002. Available: Library Menu/ Other Translation Resources/ Journals and Articles.
- Frank, Lynn. 1983. "Characteristic features of oral and written modes of language: Annotated bibliography". *Notes on Linguistics* 25:34-. *LinguaLinks* Version 5. [CD-ROM]. Dallas: SIL International, 2002. Available: Linguistics Bookshelf/ Notes on Linguistics.
- Gudschinsky, Sarah C. 1974. "Summer Institute of Linguistics' literacy policy and its practical outworking". *Notes on Literacy* 17:22–28. *LinguaLinks* Version 5. [CD-ROM]. Dallas: SIL International, 2002. Available: Literacy Bookshelf/ Reference Materials/ Articles/ Notes on Literacy.
- Hurd, Conrad. 1979. "A study of oral versus written Nasioi discourse". *READ* 14:84–86. Ukarumpa, Papua New Guinea: SIL.
- Jacobs, Suzanne. 1977. "Vernacular writing for Micronesians: Notes on a bilingual training

- project at the University of Hawaii". *Notes on Literacy* 22:1–19. *LinguaLinks* Version 5. [CD-ROM]. Dallas: SIL International, 2002. Available: Literacy Bookshelf/ Reference Materials/ Articles/ Notes on Literacy.
- Johnston, Ray. 1976. "Devising a written style in an unwritten language". *READ* 11:66–70. Ukarumpa, Papua New Guinea: SIL.
- Kerr, Isabel. 1980. "How literacy work began among the Cuiva". *Notes on Literacy* 32:10–12. *LinguaLinks* Version 5. [CD-ROM]. Dallas: SIL International, 2002. Available: Literacy Bookshelf/ Reference Materials/ Articles/ Notes on Literacy.
- Kondo, Riena and Leah Walter. 1990. "Training indigenous editors". *Notes on Literacy* 61:1–43. *LinguaLinks* Version 5. [CD-ROM]. Dallas: SIL International, 2002. Available: Literacy Bookshelf/ Reference Materials/ Articles/ Notes on Literacy.
- Leander, Kevin, and Paul Prior. 2004. "Speaking and Writing: How Talk and Text Interact in Situated Practices". In: Bazerman & Prior (eds.). 201-237.
- Leutkemeyer, Jean, Caroline Van Antwerp, and Gloria Kindell. 1983. "Bibliography of spoken and written languages". *Notes on Linguistics* 25.25–34. Summer Institute of Linguistics. *LinguaLinks* Version 5. [CD-ROM]. Dallas: SIL International, 2002. Available: Linguistics Bookshelf/ Notes on Linguistics.
- Nida, Eugene. 1967. "Linguistic dimensions of literacy and literature". In: Shacklock, Floyd (ed.). *World literacy manual*. New York: Committee on World Literacy and Christian Literature. 142–161.
- Ong, Walter. 1982. *Orality and literacy: The technologizing of the word*. London: Methuen.
- Poole, Millicent, and T.W. Field. 1976. "A comparison of oral and written code elaboration". *Language and Speech* 19:305–311.
- Poulter, Todd. 1991. "Development of a written style among newly literate people". *Notes on Literacy* 17(2):43–47. *LinguaLinks* Version 5. [CD-ROM]. Dallas: SIL International, 2002. Available: Literacy Bookshelf/ Reference Materials/ Articles/ Notes on Literacy.
- Reuster-Jahn, Uta. 2002. *Erzählte Kultur und Erzählkultur bei den Mwera in Südost-Tansania*. Köln: Rüdiger Köppe.
- SIL 2003. 'Herufi za Kirangi'. Leaflet distributed to teach how to write the Rangi language. Dodoma: SIL.
- Stegen, Oliver. 2003. 'If You've Got a Mother Tongue, Please Use It!'. Paper presented at TAAL Postgraduate Conference, May 26-28, 2003. University of Edinburgh. Online: [http://www.ling.ed.ac.uk/~pgc/archive/2003/proc03/Oliver\\_Stegen03.pdf](http://www.ling.ed.ac.uk/~pgc/archive/2003/proc03/Oliver_Stegen03.pdf)
- Tannen, Deborah. 1982. "Oral and literate strategies in spoken and written narratives". *Language* 58:1–21.
- Wendell, Margaret. 1982. *Bootstrap literature: Preliterate societies do it themselves*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association. *LinguaLinks* Version 5. [CD-ROM]. Dallas: SIL International, 2002. Available: Literacy Bookshelf/ Reference Materials/Books.
- Wise, Mary Ruth. 1991. "The old and the new in written indigenous literature of Peru". *Notes on Literacy* 17(4):21–29. *LinguaLinks* Version 5. [CD-ROM]. Dallas: SIL International, 2002. Available: Literacy Bookshelf/ Reference Materials/ Articles/ Notes on Literacy.

## Appendix

All Rangi text below follows the orthographic conventions as described in SIL (2003). In brief summary, Rangi consonant letters are the same as Swahili consonant letters which are pronounced like English, with the exception of <ng'> which stands for the velar nasal [ŋ]. The apostrophe <'> is also used in some instances of vowel elision. Rangi features seven vowels, so in addition to <a, e, i, o, u>, the second degree height vowels [ɪ, ʊ] are written with barred i and u respectively, <ɪ̄, ʊ̄>. Long vowels are written with double vowel letters. High tone is marked with acute accent <'> but only written when occurring on non-final nominal stem syllables, on the locative suffix –í, and in a few cases of grammatical tone on verbs.

In the interlinearization, morpheme breaks have not been indicated in the Rangi text; in the interlinearization line, '-' denotes a morpheme break whereas ':' denotes two fused morphemes. Higher-level discourse markers have been glossed in italics, like baasi '*surprise*'. Numbers 1-17 refer to nominal classes which, like in most Bantu languages, determine agreement throughout their domains. Note that noun classes 1 and 2 are equivalent to third person singular and plural respectively. A free translation line is given for each full sentence only, i.e. sentences broken over more than one line have their free translation at the end, e.g. for 1.A.4a-c, the free translation comes after 1.A.4c. Abbreviations of grammatical categories used in the interlinearization line are as follows:

APPL	applicative verb extension
CAUS	causative verb extension
CONS	consecutive tense
CONT	continuous aspect
COP	copula
DEM	demonstrative (without distinction between the three types)
DIR	directional verb marker (without distinction between the directions)
EMPH	emphatic (both for imperative particle, and demonstrative suffix)
FUT	future tense (without distinction between immediate and distant future)
HAB	habitual aspect
IMP	imperative (without distinction between different forms)
ITER	iterative aspect
LOC	locative suffix
NEG	negative
NOM	nominalizer
PASS	passive voice
PAST	past tense (without distinction between recent and distant past)
PFV	perfective aspect
POSS	possessive
RECIP	reciprocal
REF	referential marker
REL	relative
SUB	subordinate verb suffix

## 1. The Story of the Stone in the Ugali

### A. original written version (by Peter Patrick)

1a) Aho	kaɬ	kwaaja	kwatɪte
16:DEM	old-times	17-PAST-be	17-have

1b) mɛɛntu	ɛmwɪ	kɛntɪ	na	mwaanaavo.
1-person	1-one	7-thing	and	1-child-POSS:3pl
1. Once upon a time, there was a man and his brother.				

2) Na	mwaáka	ɛwo	kɛkava	na	njala.
and	3-year	3:DEM	17-CONS-be	and	9-hunger
2. And that year, there was a famine.					

3) Maa	kukaari	na	njala.
then	17-be:yet	and	9-hunger
3. And there still was a famine.			

4a) Na	ɛra	ɛmwɪ	aaja	atɪte	chákurya
and	1:DEM	1-one	1-PAST-be	1-have	7-food

4b) maa	ɛra	mweene	aaja	asiina	chákurya
then	1:DEM	1-self	1-PAST-be	1-NEG:have	7-food

4c) naa	akadoma	noo	kɛnja.
and	1-CONS-go	and:REF	15-beg:for:food
4. And one had food, but the other didn't have food, and he went and begged.			

5) Lwa	kwaanza	akaheewa,	lwa	kaviri	akaheewa.
11-of	first	1-CONS-give-PASS	11-of	12-two	1-CONS-give-PASS
5. The first time, he was given [food]; the second time, he was given [food].					

6a) Akadome	lwa	katatɪ	ɛra	mwaanaavo	akamusea,
1-CONS-go-SUB	11-of	12-three	1:DEM	1-child-POSS:3pl	1-CONS-1-say

6b) “Haaha	da	nɛnɛ	nsiina
now	even	I	1sg-NEG:have

6c) chákurya	choo	toosha	tuku.
7-food	7-of:REF	be:enough	NEG

6d) Reka	nikuheere	wari	koonɪ	naruire.”
IMP:leave	1sg-2sg-give-SUB	14-ugali	when	1sg-cook-PFV
6. When he went for the third time, his brother told him, “Now even I don't have enough food. Let me give you some ugali when I have cooked [it].”				

7) Ɔra	mwaanaavo	naa	akaruma.
1:DEM	1-child-POSS:3pl	and	1-CONS-agree
7. And his brother agreed.			

8a) Maa	ɛra	akarua	maa	akamutemera	ɛra	wari,
then	1:DEM	1-CONS-cook	then	1-CONS-1-break-APPL	14:DEM	14-ugali

8b) kɛmba	hara	ɪsɪ	ya	wari	avɛkɛre	iwe.
surprise	16:DEM	9-below	9-of	14-ugali	1-put-APPL:PFV	5-stone

8. Then the other cooked and broke off some ugali for him, but there, underneath the ugali, he had put a stone.

9a) Maa	akũũmbĩrĩra	na	warĩ,
then	1-CONS-form-APPL	and	14-ugali

9b) na	ũra	naa	akasũmũla	ũra	warĩ.
and	1:DEM	and	1-CONS-take	14:DEM	14-ugali

9. Then he formed ugali [all around the stone], and the other took that ugali.

10) Maa	vakaanda	kũrya	na	vaana	kũrijarija.
then	2-CONS-begin	15-eat	and	2-child	15-taste-taste

10. Then they began to eat with [his] children to taste a little.

11a) Maa	akashaana	iwye	ĩsĩ	ya	warĩ,
then	1-CONS-meet	5-stone	9-below	9-of	14-ugali

11b) naa	akasea	vaana	vaachwe,	“Reki	kũrya!”
and	1-CONS-say	2-child	2-POSS:3sg	IMP:leave-pl	15-eat

11. Then he found the stone inside the ugali and told his children, “Quit eating!”

12) Maa	akatoola	ũra	warĩ	maa	akavũka.
then	1-CONS-bring	14:DEM	14-ugali	then	1-CONS-put

12. Then he took that ugali and put [it away].

13) Maa	akeendelea	kũtoonoookũnja	mpaka	njala	ĩkasira.
then	1-CONS-continue	15-DIR-and:REF-15-beg:for:food	until	9-hunger	9-CONS-stop

13. Then he continued to go begging until the famine was over.

14a) Maa	akakemera	vaantũ	maa	akatereka	chákũrya
then	1-CONS-call	2-person	then	1-CONS-cook	7-food

14b) maa	vakũrya	naa	akafũmya
then	2-CONS-eat	and	1-CONS-come:out-CAUS

14c) ũra	warĩ	na	rĩra	iwye
14:DEM	14-ugali	and	5:DEM	5-stone

14d) maa	akavasea	vaantũ,	“Koonaa	mwiise?”
then	1-CONS-2-say	2-person	15-see	2pl-FUT:be

14. Then he invited people, cooked food, then they ate, and he brought forth that ugali with that stone, and he asked the people, “Do you see?”

15) Vaantũ	vakamũsea,	“Hĩ,	koonaa	twiise.”
2-person	2-CONS-1-say	yes	15-see	1pl-FUT:be

15. The people told him, “Yes, we see.”

16a) Akasea,	“Ũhũ	nĩ	mwaaniitũ	kabisa	abooya	jei,
1-CONS-say	1:DEM	COP	1-child-POSS:1pl	totally	1-REL:do	thus

16b) kwa hiyo	nĩnĩ	navaaniĩrĩre	nĩ	lũkóva	tookwiikera.”
therefore	I	1sg-2-cry-APPL:PFV	COP	11-rope	DIR-15-RECIP-cut

16. And he said, “It’s my very brother who did this, therefore I have called you to cut each other a rope.

17) Kweeri	maa	vakiikera	lũkova.
Truly	then	2-CONS-RECIP-cut	11-rope

17. Truly, they then cut each other a rope.
---

18a) Noo	mwáanzo	woo	fumira
COP:REF	3-beginning	3-of:REF	come:out-APPL

18b) Viisi	va	kwiikome	na	Viisi	va	idáhwí.
2-clan:name	2-of	17-subclan	and	2-clan:name	2-of	5-subclan

18. This is the beginning of how the Viisi subclan of Kwikome and the Viisi subclan of Idahwii came to be.
--

### B. original narrated version (by Peter Patrick's mother)

1a) Aho	kali	múuntá	na	mwaanaavo
16:DEM	old:times	1-person	and	1-child-POSS:3pl

1b) viikera	lukóva	sababu	ya	njala.
2-RECIP-cut	11-rope	9-reason	9-of	9-hunger

1. Once upon a time, there was a man and his brother who cut each other a rope because of famine.
---

2) Үһү	mwaanaavo	yootookwñnja	kweene	ntiyootahirwa.
1:DEM	1-child-POSS:3pl	1-CONT-DIR-15-beg	17-self	DIR-1-CONT-share-APPL-PASS

2. This brother always goes begging where he would be given.
--

3a) Maa	mwaanaavo	akatire
then	1-child-POSS:3pl	1-be:tired-PFV

3b) maa	akuumbirira	iwe	na	wari	nkamaangwii.
then	1-CONS-form-APPL	5-stone	and	14-ugali	9-stone-LOC

3. Then the brother has tired and forms a stone and ugali [around] the stone.
---

4) Үһүмбирне	akasea,	“Kaheere	vaana,”	naa	akasumula.
1-form-APPL:PFV	1-CONS-say	CONS-give-IMP	2-child	and	1-CONS-take

4. When he had formed, he said, “Give [it] to [your] children,” and he took [it].
---

5) Аһүмбирне	maa	akakemera	vasinga,	“Yeendi	murye!”
1-take-PFV	then	1-CONS-call	2-child	IMP:go-pl	2pl-eat-SUB

5. When he had taken [it], he called the children, “Go and eat!”
--

6) Na	aandira	abendule	jei	maa	akashaana	iwe.
and	1-PAST-begin-APPL	1-break:off-SUB	thus	then	1-CONS-meet	5-stone

6. And he started breaking off [pieces of ugali] like this, then he encountered the stone.
--

7a) Haaha	ashihne	iwe	maa	akasea,
now	1-meet-PFV	5-stone	then	1-CONS-say

7b) “Vasinga,	reki!	Kurya	tuku!”	Baasi.
2-child	IMP:leave-pl	15-eat	NEG	closing

7. As soon as he had met the stone, he said, “Children, stop! Don't eat!” That was it.
--

8) Naa	akarivka	rira	iwe.
and	1-CONS-5-put	5:DEM	5-stone

8. And he put that stone [away].
----------------------------------

9) Аһүнкire	vakarima	vakahumula,	viryo	vikahumula.
1-5-put-PFV	2-CONS-hoe	2-CONS-finish	8-millet	8-CONS-finish

9. When he had put it [away], they hoed and they finished, and the millet finished [ripening].
--

10) Baasi.	Maa	vakakoloa	irusu.	[audience: vatomw̄re]
<i>closing</i>	then	2-CONS-brew	5-beer	[2-get:firstfruits-PFV]
10. That was it. Then they brewed beer. [audience: When they had got the firstfruits]				

11) Vatomw̄re	njala	yadumukire.	Maa	vakakoloa	irusu.
2-get:firstfruits-PFV	9-hunger	9-burst-PFV	then	2-CONS-brew	5-beer
11. When they had got the firstfruits, the famine was over. Then they brewed beer.					

12a) Maa	akakemera	vaantũ	vandũũ	vaavo
then	1-CONS-call	2-person	2-relative	2-POSS:3pl

12b) na	vaa-...	isaamba	ra	vaantũ.
and	2-...	5-group	5-of	2-person
12. Then he called his relatives and the ... a group of friends.				

13) Haya,	haaha	maa	vakarya	ng'oombe.
<i>forward move</i>	now	then	2-CONS-eat	9-cow
13. Well then, they ate a cow.				

14a) Variire	iyó	ng'oombe	maa	akakemera,	akakemera
2-eat-PFV	9:DEM	9-cow	then	1-CONS-call	1-CONS-call

14b) m̄ndũũ	na	m̄untu	wa	vaantũ,	“Hoonĩ	laangi.”
1-relative	and	1-person	1-of	2-person	EMPH	IMP:watch-pl
14. When they had eaten this cow, then he called, he called a relative and a friend, “Watch [this]!”						

15) Aha	jei	av̄nkire	r̄ra	iwye	r̄rĩ	na	warĩ.
16:DEM	thus	1-put-PFV	5:DEM	5-stone	5-be	and	14-ugali
15. And here like this he has put that stone which is with ugali.							

16) Haya,	akasea,	“Hoonĩ	tũnkuli	laangi.”
<i>forward move</i>	1-CONS-say	EMPH	IMP:take:apart-pl	IMP:watch-pl
16. Well, he said, “Take [the ugali] apart and watch!”				

17a) Vara	vaantũ	k̄toolaanga	jei,	vakashaana,
2:DEM	2-person	15-DIR-watch	thus	1-CONS-meet

17b) “Amũ	nĩ	iwye	rahakwa	ũwarĩ.”
why	COP	5-stone	5-REL-smear-PASS	14-ugali
17. Those people watching there like this, they encountered [it], “Why! It’s a stone smeared with ugali.”				

18a) Akasea,	“Naheewa	nĩ	mwaaniitũ
1-CONS-say	1-PAST-give-PASS	COP	1-child-POSS:1pl

18b) r̄rĩ	iwye	r̄ũmbir̄rwa	nũ’warĩ.”
5:DEM	5-stone	5-REL-form-APPL-PASS	and:14-ugali
18. He said, “I was given this stone that is covered with ugali by my brother.”			

19) “Haaha,	joolĩ	t̄rĩ	booya?”,	vara	vaantũ	voom̄usea.
now	how	1pl-be	do	2:DEM	2-person	2-CONT-1-say
19. “Now, what are we to do?”, those people are asking him.						

20) Akasea,	“Toolĩ	lukova!	Haaha,	nĩ	akwaate	k̄ra.”
1-CONS-say	IMP:bring-pl	11-rope	now	COP	1-hold-SUB	17:DEM
20. He said, “Bring a rope! Now, he should hold [it] there.”						

21a) Na	ura	mwaanaavo	naa	akakwaata	kura,
and	1:DEM	1-child-POSS:3pl	and	1-CONS-hold	17:DEM

21b) naaye	akakwaata	kunu	maa	vakakera.
and:he	1-CONS-hold	17:DEM	then	2-CONS-cut
21. And that brother held [it] there, and he held [it] here, and they cut [it].				

22a) Akasea,	“Baasi	haaha	tiikerire	lukova.
1-CONS-say	<i>closing</i>	now	1pl-RECIP-cut-PFV	11-rope

22b) Weewe,	si	uri	wiitu	tuku,
you	COP:NEG	2sg-be	1-POSS:1pl	NEG

22c) naani	si	ndiri	waanyu	tuku.”
and:I	COP:NEG	1sg-be	1-POSS:2pl	NEG
22. He said, “That’s it! Now, we have cut each other a rope. You, you are not ours, and I, I am not yours.”				

23) Baasi,	vavhre	isaamba	ra	vaantu.
<i>closing</i>	2-be-PFV	5-group	5-of	2-person
23. That was it, they had become [like] unrelated people.				

24) Noo	kalusimo	ja	aka,	mundoosimira	vajukulu	vaanyu.
COP:REF	12-11-story	like	12:DEM	2pl-ITER-tell-APPL	2-grandchild	2-POSS:2pl
24. It’s a little story like this, and you tell [it] again to your grandchildren.						

**C. edited version (by Andrew Lujuo and Peter Patrick)**

1) NJALA	ISUULA	NDUU
9-hunger	9-hate	relative
1. Hunger despises relationship.		

2a) Aho	kali	kwaaja	kwathte	muntutu	umwiri	na	mwaanaavo,
16:DEM	old-times	17-PAST-be	17-have	1-person	1-one	and	1-child-POSS:3pl

2b) vajaa	viikera	lukova	sa	njala.
2-PAST-be	2-RECIP-cut	11-rope	for	9-hunger
2. Once upon a time, there was a man and his brother, they had cut each other a rope because of famine.				

3) Mwaaka	hwo	kukava	na	njala.
3-year	3:DEM	17-CONS-be	and	9-hunger
3. That year, there was a famine.				

4a) Ura	umwiri	iijaa	athte	chakurya,
1:DEM	1-one	1-PAST-be	1-have	7-food

4b) uhu	mwiiwachwe	ajaa	asiina	chakurya	tuku,
1:DEM	1-fellow:POSS:3sg	1-PAST-be	1-NEG:have	7-food	NEG

4c) maa	ndootooknja	kwa	mwaanaavo.
then	1-ITER-DIR-15-beg	17-of	1-child-POSS:3pl
4. And the one had food, and his fellow had no food, but he went begging again and again from his brother.			

5a) Akh̄ta	k̄h̄nja	h̄ntu	yootah̄rwa,
1-CONS-go	15-beg	because	1-CONT-share-APPL-PASS

5b) akh̄ta	k̄h̄nja	h̄ntu	yootah̄rwa	(n̄i	mwaanaavo),
1-CONS-go	15-beg	because	1-CONT-share-APPL-PASS	COP	1-child-POSS:3pl

5c) maa	mwiisho	ura	mwaanaavo	akakatala	k̄taha.
then	3-end	1:DEM	1-child-POSS:3pl	1-CONS-be:tired	15-share
5. And he went begging because he was shared with, and he went begging because he was shared with by his brother, but in the end, that brother was tired of sharing.					

6a) Maa	akamusea	ura	m̄w̄nji,
then	1-CONS-1-say	1:DEM	1-beg-NOM

6b) “Haaha	daa	n̄h̄n̄i	siina	ch̄ak̄rya	choo	toosha	t̄ku,
now	even	I	1sg-NEG:have	7-food	7-of:REF	be:enough	NEG

6c) reka	n̄ikuheere	wari	koon̄i	naruire.”
IMP:leave	1sg-2sg-give-SUB	14-ugali	when	1sg-cook-PFV
6. Then he told that beggar, “Now, even I don’t have enough food; let me give you some ugali when I have cooked [it].”				

7) Ura	mwaanaavo	naa	akaruma.
1:DEM	1-child-POSS:3pl	and	1-CONS-agree
7. And his brother agreed.			

8a) Ura	aruire	ura	wari,
1:DEM	1-cook-PFV	14:DEM	14-ugali

8b) maa	ak̄umb̄ira	iwe	ɪsi	ya	wari.
then	1-CONS-form-APPL	5-stone	9-below-LOC	9-of	14-ugali
8. He had cooked that ugali, but he put a stone down inside the ugali.					

9a) Ūmb̄ir̄e	maa	akamusea	mwaanaavo,
1-form-APPL:PFV	then	1-CONS-1-say	1-child-POSS:3pl

9b) “S̄um̄la	kaa	wari	n̄u,
IMP:take	<i>informal</i>	14-ugali	14:DEM

9c) mwaaniit̄,	ukaheere	vaana.”	Naa	akas̄um̄la.
1-child-POSS:1pl	2sg-CONS-give-SUB	2-child	and	1-CONS-tak
9. When he had formed [it], he told his brother, “Take this ugali, my brother, and give it to [your] children.” And he took [it].				

10) As̄um̄w̄re	maa	akakemera	vasinga,	“Yeendi	m̄rye.”
1-take:PFV	then	1-CONS-call	2-child	IMP:go-pl	2pl-eat-SUB
10. When he had taken [it], he called the children, “Go and eat!”					

11a) Maa	yeeye	akaanda,	na	aand̄ra	abendule	jei,
then	he	1-CONS-begin	and	1-PAST-begin-APPL	1-break:off-SUB	thus

11b) maa	akashaana	iwe,
then	1-CONS-meet	5-stone

11c) maa	akasea	vaana	vaachwe,	“Reki	k̄rya!”
then	1-CONS-say	2-child	2-POSS:3sg	IMP:leave-pl	15-eat

11. Then he began, and he began breaking [it] off like this, but he encountered the stone, then he said to his children, “Quit eating!”

12a) Maa	akatoola	rɪra	iwe
then	1-CONS-bring	5:DEM	5-stone

12b) rʉmbɪrɪrwa	na	wari,	maa	akarɪvɪka,
5:REL-form-APPL-PASS	and	14-ugali	then	1-CONS-5-put

12c) maa	akeendelea	kɪnja	kwɪngɪ	mpaka	njala	ɪkasira.
then	1-CONS-continue	15-beg	17-other	until	9-hunger	9-CONS-stop

12. Then he took that stone which was covered with ugali and put it [away], then he continued to beg elsewhere until the famine was over.

13a) Vatomwɪre	njala	yasirire	maa	vakakoloa	irʉsʉ,
2-get:frstfruits-PFV	9-hunger	9-stop-PFV	then	2-CONS-brew	5-beer

13b) maa	vakakemera	vandʉ	na	isaamba	ra	vaantʉ.
then	2-CONS-call	2-relative	and	5-group	5-of	2-person

13. When they had got the firstfruits, the famine was over, then they brewed beer, and they invited relatives and friends.

14) Haaya,	haaha	maa	vakakanya	ng’oombe.
<i>forward move</i>	now	then	2-CONS-fall-CAUS	9-cow

14. Well then, they slaughtered a cow.

15a) Variire	ɪra	ng’oombe	maa	akakemera
2-eat-PFV	9:DEM	9-cow	then	1-CONS-call

15b) mandʉ	na	mʉantʉ	wa	vaantʉ.
1-relative	and	1-person	1-of	2-person

15. When they had eaten that cow, he called a relative and a friend.

16a) Maa	akavasea,	“Hoonɪ	laangi	aha	jei,
then	1-CONS-2-say	EMPH	IMP:watch-pl	16:DEM	thus

16b) kooana	mwiise	ʉʉ?”
15-see	2pl-FUT:be	Q

16. Then he told them, “Watch [this] here like this, do you see [it]?”

17) Maa	vakasea,	“Kooana	twiise.”
then	2-CONS-say	15-see	1pl-FUT:be

17. Then they said, “We see [it].”

18) Vɪne	rɪra	iwe	rʉmbɪrɪrwa	na	wari.
2-see:PFV	5:DEM	5-stone	5-REL-form-APPL-PASS	and	14-ugali

18. They had seen that stone which was covered with ugali.

19a) Akavasea,	“Naheewa	nɪ	mwaaniitʉ
1-CONS-2-say	1-PAST-give-PASS	COP	1-child-POSS:1pl

19b) ɪrɪ	iwe	rʉmbɪrɪrwa	warfi.”
5:DEM	5-stone	5-REL-form-APPL-PASS	14-ugali-LOC

19. Then he told them, “I was given this stone covered in ugali by my brother.”

20) Vara	vakamusea,	“Haaha	joolɪ	tʉrɪ	booya?”
2:DEM	2-CONS-1-say	now	how	1pl-be	do

20. And those said to him, “What are we to do now?”

21) Akavasea,	“Toolī	lūkova!	Haaha	nī	akwaate	kūra.”
1-CONS-2-say	IMP:bring-pl	11-rope	now	COP	1-hold-SUB	17:DEM

21. He told them, “Bring a rope! Now, he should hold [it] there.”

22a) Naa	ura	mwaanaavo	naa	akakwaata	kūra,
and	1:DEM	1-child-POSS:3pl	and	1-CONS-hold	17:DEM

22b) na	yeye	maa	akakwaata	kūra,	maa	vakakera.
and	he	then	1-CONS-hold	17:DEM	then	2-CONS-cut

22. And that brother, he held [it] there, and he then held [it] there, then they cut [it].

23a) Akasea,	“Haaha	baasi,	twiikerire	lūkova,
1-CONS-say	now	<i>closing</i>	1-RECIP-cut-PFV	11-rope

23b) weewe	sī	mwaaniitū	tūkū,
you	NEG:COP	1-child-POSS:1pl	NEG

23c) naanī	sī	ndīrī	mwaanaanyu	tūkū.”
and:I	NEG:COP	1sg-be	1-child-POSS:2pl	NEG

23. He said, “Now this is it, we have cut each other a rope; you are not my brother, and I, I am not your brother.”

24) Baasi,	vavh̄re	isaamba	ra	vaantū.
<i>closing</i>	2-be-PFV	5-group	5-of	2-person

24. That was it, they had become [like] unrelated people.

25a) Noo	mwáanzo	woo	fum̄ra
COP:REF	3-beginning	3-of:REF	come:out-APPL

25b) Viisi	vi’dáhwī	na	Viisi	va	kwiikome.
2-clan:name	2-of:5-subclan	and	2-clan:name	2-of	17-subclan

25. This is the beginning of how the Viisi subclan of Idahwii and the Viisi subclan of Kwiikome came to be.

26) Noo	kalus̄imo	ja	aka	m̄ndoosim̄ra	vajūkūlū	vaanyu.
COP:REF	12-11-story	like	12:DEM	2pl-ITER-tell-APPL	2-grandchild	2-POSS:2pl

26. It’s a little story like this, and you tell [it] again to your grandchildren.

## 2. The Story of Dinu and the Maasai

### A. original written version (by Peter Patrick)

1) Aho	kalī	kwaaja	kwat̄ite	m̄hīnja	asewáa	Dinū.
16:DEM	old:times	17-PAST-be	17-have	1-girl	1-say-PASS-HAB	‘Dinu’

1. Once upon a time, there was a girl who was called Dinu.

2) Aaja	iikala	na	maámwaavo.
1-PAST-be	1-stay	and	mother:POSS:3pl

2. She stayed with her mother.

3) Maa	kwaavo	nī	yemweene	vii	avyaalwa.
then	17-POSS:3pl	COP	3sg-self	only	1-be:born

3. And at their [home] she is the only child.

4a) Maa	haaha	siku	ɪmwɪ	Vuumba	vaajavaaja
then	now	9-day	9-one	2-Maasai	2-PAST-come-come

4b) sa	viive	ng'oombe	kwa	Valaangi.
for	2-steal-SUB	10-cow	17-of	2-Rangi

4. One day then, the Maasai were coming so that they may steal cattle from the Rangi.

5a) Na	avo	Vuumba	vaaja	vatite	tabiya
and	2:DEM	2-Maasai	2-PAST-be	2-have	9-character

5b) ya	wiivi	woo	joovundakira	noo	kwiiva	ng'oombe.
9-of	14-theft	14-of:REF	DIR-attack-APPL	COP:REF	15-steal	10-cow

5. And those Maasai had the attitude of hit-and-run theft, that is stealing cattle.

6a) Maa	haaha	siku	ijo	vaaja
then	now	10-day	10:DEM	2-PAST-come

6b) sa	viive	maa	vakadaha	kwiiva
for	2-steal-SUB	then	2-CONS-be:able	15-steal

6c) maa	vakamɔsumula	daa	na	ɥwo	Dinu
then	2-CONS-1-take	even	and	1:DEM	'Dinu'

6d) maa	vakiinuka	naaye.
then	2-CONS-get:up	and:she

6. Those days then, they came to steal, and they were able to steal, but they even took that [girl] Dinu, then they left with her.

7a) Maa	ɥra	maámwaavo
then	1:DEM	mother:POSS:3pl

7b) akachaala	na	hali	ya	makiva	saana
1-CONS-remain	and	9-situation	9-of	6-poverty	very

7c) saantɔ	aaja	asiina	mwaana	wɪngɪ.
because	1-PAST-be	1-have	1-child	1-other

7. Then her mother stayed behind in great poverty because she did not have another child.

8a) Na	ɥwo	Dinu	maa	akasumulwa
and	1:DEM	'Dinu'	then	1-CONS-take-PASS

8b) na	akiikala	ɥko	mpaka	akava	na	vaana.
and	1-CONS-stay	17:DEM	until	1-CONS-be	and	2-child

8. And Dinu was taken, and she stayed there until she had children.

9a) Na	siku	ɪmwɪ	mudala	ɥmwɪ
and	9-day	9-one	1-woman	1-one

9b) naa	akamusea	ɥwo	Dinu,
and	1-CONS-1-say	1:DEM	'Dinu'

9c) iinuke	atɪje	afyũke	na	meevo,
1-get:up-SUB	1-run-SUB	1-return-SUB	and	LOC:3pl

9d) sa	aaja	atenre	voosaka	vamũlaye.
for	1-PAST-be	1-hear-PFV	2-CONT-want	2-1-kill-SUB

9. And one day, one woman said to Dinu that she should get up, run and return to her place, for she had heard that they want to kill her.

10a) Maa	ɸwo	Dinu	maa	akiinuka	nu'chiku
then	1:DEM	'Dinu'	then	1-CONS-get:up	and:14-night

10b) maa	akatija	kuhnduka	na	meevo.
then	1-CONS-run	15-return	and	LOC:3pl

10. Then Dinu got up at night, and ran to return to her place.

**B. original narrated version (by Peter Patrick's mother)**

0) [audience:Lausika	vii,	aho	kalɩ]
IMP: speak	only	16:DEM	old:times

0. [audience: Just say 'once upon a time']

1a) Aho	kalɩ,	Vuumba	vakukaa
16:DEM	old:times	2-Maasai	2-start-HAB:PAST

1b) maa	vindosumula	ng'oombe	ja	vaantu	vindokulaa	vaantu.
then	2-ITER-take	10-cow	10-of	2-person	2-ITER-kill	2-person

1. Once upon a time, the Maasai used to start and again and again take people's cattle and kill people.

2a) Maa	haaha	ɸwo	Dinu	arindiraa	kivaandfi,
then	now	1:DEM	'Dinu'	1-guard-APPL-HAB	7-hut-LOC

2b) Vuumba	vatemire	vaantu	na	vakasea,
2-Maasai	2-cut-PFV	2-person	and	2-CONS-say

2c) "Uhu	kumusumula	ndiri,	ni	muki	waani,	avire."
1:DEM	15-1-take	1sg-be	COP	1-female	1-POSS:1sg	1-be-PFV

2. Now then, this [girl] Dinu used to guard [the field] in a hut, and the Maasai had killed [her] people and said, "This one I will take, she's my wife, she has become [it]."

3) Baasi!	Asumulwa	akntookiikala	akava	baa	na	vaana.
closing	1-take-PASS	1-CONS-DIR-stay	1-CONS-be	even	and	2-child

3. That was it. She was taken and stayed there and even had children.

4a) Haaha	ɸra	mulame	maa	akasea,
now	1:DEM	1-male	then	1-CONS-say

4b) "Uhu	muntu	muki
1:DEM	1-person	1-female

4c) Iuu	doma	ari	na	vaana	vaani.
day:after:tomorrow	go	1-be	and	2-child	2-POSS:1sg

4d) Nini	mula	ndiri."
I	1-kill	1sg-be

4. Now, that husband then said, "This woman might go [away] with my children. I will kill her."

5) Maa	haaha	... [audience:unintelligible interruption]
then	now	

5. Now then, ... [audience:unintelligible interruption]

6a) Ahaa!	ɩwaavo	noo	ɩmba	akasea,
-----------	--------	-----	------	---------

<i>comprehension</i>	mother:POSS:3pl	COP:REF	1-sing	1-CONS-say
----------------------	-----------------	---------	--------	------------

6b) “Hiya	hee,	hiya	here!
‘hiya’	‘hee’	‘hiya’	‘here’

6c) Dinu	waanı,	yeyeye	noo	vajúungu,
‘Dinu’	1-POSS:1sg	she	and:REF	2-bypasser

6d) nı	vajúungu,	kũumba	nı	valóori.
COP	2-bypasser	<i>surprise</i>	COP	2-bridegroom

6e) Hiya	hee,	hiya	here!
‘hiya’	‘hee’	‘hiya’	‘here’

6f) Dinu	waanı,	yeyeye	na	vajúungu,
‘Dinu’	1-POSS:1sg	she	and	2-bypasser

6g) nı	vajúungu,	Vuumba	nı	valóori.”
COP	2-bypasser	2-Maasai	COP	2-bridegroom

6. Oh yes! It is that her mother sings and said, “Hiya hee, hiya here! My Dinu, she and the bypassers, they are bypassers, o-o, they are bridegrooms. Hiya hee, hiya here! My Dinu, she and the bypassers, they are bypassers, the Maasai are bridegrooms.”

7) Noo	wakatı	akwaatirwe,	íwaavo	noo	yoorıra	jeyyo.
COP:REF	14-time	1-hold-PASS:PFV	mother:POSS:3pl	COP:REF	1-CONT-weep	thus:REF

7. It is when she had been taken, that her mother is weeping like this.

8a) Maa	haaha	maa	amwaarı	mũdala	maa	akasea,
then	now	then	1-be:there	1-woman	then	1-CONS-say

8b) “Mũsinga,	tamanya	na	kaáyıı	kwaanyu.
1-child	IMP:go	and	9-home-LOC	17-POSS:2pl

8c) Reka	baa	ava	vaana	vaako
IMP: leave	even	2:DEM	2-child	2-POSS:2sg

8d) viikale	na	taáta	waavo.”
2-stay-SUB	and	1-father	1-POSS:3pl

8. But then, there is a woman and she said, “Child, go to your home. Even leave these your children that they may stay with their father.”

9) Haaha	noo	aheewa	kawarı	koorya	njırfı.
now	COP:REF	1-give-PASS	12-14-ugali	15:REF-eat	9-way-LOC

9. Now it is that she is given a little ugali to eat on the way.

10) Akalaırwı	na	matı	yoo	kiivısa	sa	vikookı.
1-CONS-show-PASS	and	6-spittle	6-of:REF	15-RECIP-hide	for	8-wild:animals

10. She is protected with spittle to hide oneself from wild animals.

11a) Baasi.	Maa	haaha	akiinũka	ayeenda
<i>closing</i>	then	now	1-CONS-get:up	1-go

11b) akalaala	njıra	akaambũka	mũtfı	akalaala.
1-CONS-sleep	9-way	1-CONS-climb	3-tree-LOC	1-CONS-sleep

11. This is it. But now, she got up and goes, and she slept the way, she climbed on a tree and slept.

12a) Haya,	sikũ	ya	kavırı	akayeenda	chobu	isekıı,
------------	------	----	--------	-----------	-------	---------

<i>forward move</i>	9-day	9-of	12-two	1-CONS-go	all:day	5-wilderness-LOC
---------------------	-------	------	--------	-----------	---------	------------------

12b) akalaala	kei	m̩t̩f̩i.	Haya!
1-CONS-sleep	again	3-tree-LOC	<i>forward move</i>
12. Well, the second day, she continued all day through the wilderness, and she slept again on a tree. Well!			

13a) Sik̩	ya	katat̩	maaree	afumire	kaáy̩i,
9-day	9-of	12-three	finally	1-arrive-PFV	9-home-LOC

13b) maa	akashaana	moosi	yoor̩ma.
then	1-CONS-meet	1-old:man	1-CONT-hoe
13. The third day, she finally arrived at home, and she met an old man hoeing.			

14a) Haya,	ash̩h̩ne	moosi	yoor̩ma,
<i>forward move</i>	1-meet-PFV	1-old:man	1-CONT-hoe

14b) haaha	nt̩s̩u̩ng̩ur̩ra	akiivisa.
now	DIR-explore-APPL	1-CONS-RECIP-hide
14. Well, when she had met the old man hoeing, after now evaluating [the situation], she hid herself.		

15a) Haaha	k̩u̩mba,	ura	moosi	k̩moona	iise
now	<i>surprise</i>	1:DEM	1-old:man	15-1-see	1-FUT:be

15b) na	akam̩seáa,	“Fum̩ra	na	k̩nu,
abd	1-CONS-1-say	IMP:come:out	and	17:DEM

15c) koon̩	ur̩	m̩unt̩	m̩laangi.	Che	wookoofa?”
if	2sg-be	1-person	1-Rangi	what	2sg-CONT-fear
15. But that old man is to see her and he told her, “Come out from there if you are a Rangi. What are you afraid of?”					

16) Baasi,	maa	akafum̩ra	akasea,	“N̩	hai	ufumire?”
<i>closing</i>	then	1-CONS-come:out	1-CONS-say	COP	where	2sg-come:out-PFV
16. This was it. She came out, and he said, “Where have you come from?”						

17a) Akasea,	“Baaba,	naaja	nas̩m̩lwa	n̩	Vuumba.
1-CONS-say	(grand-)father	1sg-PAST-be	1sg-take-PASS	COP	2-Maasai

17b) Narekire	da	vaana	vaan̩	vatat̩	k̩uko.
1sg-leave-PFV	even	2-child	2-POSS:1sg	2-three	17:DEM:EMPH

17c) M̩l̩me	waan̩	akasea	aan̩j̩lae.
1-male	1-POSS:1sg	1-CONS-say	1-1sg-kill-SUB

17d) Haaha	amwaan̩	maáma	akasea,	‘Doma!	K̩ulawa	ur̩.”
now	1-be:there	mother	1-CONS-say	IMP:go	15-kill-PASS	2sg-be
17. She said, “Father, I had been taken by Maasai. I have even left my three children there. My husband said that he would kill me. Now there is [this] mother, and she said, ‘Go! You are to be killed.’”						

18) Akasea,	“Noo	k̩rek̩re	n̩k̩n̩ka.”
1-CONS-say	COP:REF	7-leave-APPL:PFV	1sg-CONS-get:up
18. She said, “That is what caused me to get away.”			

19) Akasea,	“Heende	kaa,	nook̩t̩waala.”
1-CONS-say	1pl:go-IMP	<i>informal</i>	1sg-CONT-2sg-bring

19. He said, "Let's go, I am bringing you."
---

20) Maa	akamutwaala	mpaka	kwaavo.
then	1-CONS-1-bring	until	17-POSS:3pl
20. Then he brought her till her place.			

## C. edited version (by Andrew Lujuo and Peter Patrick)

1) LUSIMO	LWA	DINU
11-story	11-of	'Dinu'
1. The Story of Dinu		

2a) Aho	kalɩ	Vuumba	vakukáa
16:DEM	old:times	2-Maasai	2-start-HAB:PAST

2b) maa	vɛndookuɩlaa	vaantu	noo	kiiva	ng'oombe	jaavo.
then	2-ITER-kill	2-person	and:REF	15-steal	10-cow	10-of
2. Once upon a time, the Maasai used to start killing people and stealing their cattle.						

3) Kwijáa	kwatute	muhínja	asewáa	Dinu.
17-PAST:be	17-have	1-girl	1-REL:say-PASS:HAB	'Dinu'
3. There was a girl called Dinu.				

4a) Maa	haaha	ɛwo	Dinu
then	now	1:DEM	'Dinu'

4b) nɩ	yemweene	iijáa	avyaalwa	kwaavo.
COP	3sg-self	1-PAST:be	1-be:born	17-POSS:3pl
4. Now, this Dinu was the only child at theirs.				

5a) Maa	haaha	siku	ɛmwɩ	ɛwo	Dinu
then	now	9-day	9-one	1:DEM	'Dinu'

5b) arɛndiráa	ndee	kɩvaandfi,	maa	avo	Vuumba
1-guard-APPL-HAB	10-bird	7-hut-LOC	then	2:DEM	2-Maasai

5c) naa	vakamushaana	Dinu	hara	kɩvaandfi.
and	2-CONS-1-meet	'Dinu'	16:DEM	7-hut-LOC
5. One day then, Dinu guarded [the field against] birds [while sitting] in a hut, and those Maasai encountered Dinu there in the hut.				

6a) Naa	ɛmwɩ	akasea,	"Uhu	kumsumula	ndɩɩ,
and	1-one	1-CONS-say	1:DEM	15-1-take	1sg-be

6b) ave	maki	waanɩ."	Maa	akamusumula.
1-be-SUB	1-female	1-POSS:1sg	then	1-CONS-1-take
6. And one [of them] said, "I will take this one, she should be my wife." And he took her.				

7a) Maa	haaha	wakati	asumwirwe,
then	now	14-time	1-take-PASS:PFV

7b) kɛnu	nyuma	maa	íwaavo	maa	ɛndookɛmba,
17:DEM	9-behind	then	1-mother:POSS:3pl	then	1-ITER-sing

7c) maa	ɛndoorra,	"Hiiyahee	hiyeeree,	Dinu	waanɩ!
then	1-ITER-weep	'hiiyahee'	'hiyeeree'	'Dinu'	1-POSS:1sg

7d) Na	vajúungu	nɪ	vajúungu,	Vuumba	nɪ	valóori.
and	2-bypasser	COP	2-bypasser	2-Maasai	COP	2-bridegroom

7e) Hiiyahee	hiiyeeree,	Dinu	waan!
'hiiyahee'	'hiiyeeree'	'Dinu'	1-POSS:1sg

7f) Na	vajúungu	nɪ	vajúungu,	Vuumba	nɪ	valóori.”
and	2-bypasser	COP	2-bypasser	2-Maasai	COP	2-bridegroom
7. But when she had been taken, there [staying] behind, her mother again and again was singing and weeping, “Hiiyahee, hiiyeeree, my Dinu! And the bypassers are bypassers, the Maasai are bridegrooms. Hiiyahee, hiiyeeree, my Dinu! And the bypassers are bypassers, the Maasai are bridegrooms.”						

8a) Asumulwa	maa	akɪta	kiikala,
1:PAST-take-PASS	then	1-CONS-go	15-stay

8b) maa	akava	baa	na	vaana	kũuko.
then	1-CONS-be	even	and	2-child	17:DEM:EMPH
8. She was taken and went to stay and even had children there.					

9a) Ɔra	Muumba	(mulúme	wa	Dinu)
1:DEM	1-Maasai	1-male	1-of	'Dinu'

9b) maa	akasea,	“Ɔhu	mũuntũ	mũki
then	1-CONS-say	1:DEM	1-person	1-female

9c) luu	doma	arɪ	na	vaana	vaan.
day:after:tomorrow	go	1-be	and	2-child	2-POSS:1sg

9d) Nɪnɪ	mũulaa	ndɪrɪ.”
I	1-kill	1sg-be
9. That Maasai (Dinu's husband) then said, “This woman might go [away] with my children. I will kill her.”		

10a) Maa	haaha	amwaarɪ	mũdala	maa	akasea,
then	now	1-be:there	1-woman	then	1-CONS-say

10b) “Mũsinga	tamanya	na	kaáyí	kwaanyu,
1-child	IMP:go	and	9-home-LOC	17-POSS:2pl

10c) reka	baa	ava	vaana	vaako
IMP:leave	even	2:DEM	2-child	2-POSS:2sg

10d) viikale	na	taáta	waavo.”
2-stay-SUB	and	1-father	1-POSS:3pl
10. But now, there is [this] woman and she said, “[My] child, go to your home, leave even these your children to stay with their father.”			

11) Haaha	noo	heewa	kawarɪ	koorya	njɪrɪ.
now	COP:REF	give-PASS	12-14-ugali	12-REF-eat	9-way-LOC
11. Now it is that she is given a little ugali to eat on the way.					

12) Akalarwa	na	matɪ	yoo	kiivisa	sa	vikooki.
1-CONS-show-PASS	and	6-spittle	6-of:REF	15-RECIP-hide	for	8-wild:animals
12. And she was protected with spittle to hide oneself from wild animals.						

13) Baasi	maa	haaha	akamuka.
<i>closing</i>	then	now	1-CONS-get:up

13. This was it. Now, she left.

14) Ayeenda	akalooka	njira,	akaambuka	mutfi	akalaala.
1:PAST-go	1-CONS-pass	9-way	1-CONS-climb	3-tree-LOC	1-CONS-sleep

14. She went along the way, climbed a tree and slept.

15a) Haaya	siku	ya	kaviri
<i>forward move</i>	9-day	9-of	12-two

15b) akayeenda	chobu	isekfi	akalaala	kei	mutfi.
1-CONS-go	all:day	5-wilderness-LOC	1-CONS-sleep	again	3-tree-LOC

15. Well then, the second day, she went all day through the wilderness and slept again on a tree.

16) Sikū	ya	katatu	maa	ree	akafumira	kaayfi.
9-day	9-of	12-three	then	finally	1-CONS-arrive	9-home-LOC

16. The third day, she finally arrived at home.

17) Maa	akashaana	moosi	yoorima.
then	1-CONS-meet	1-old:man	1-CONT-hoe

17. Then she met an old man hoeing.

18a) Haaya	ashihne	moosi	yoorima,
<i>forward move</i>	1-meet-PFV	1-old:man	1-CONT-hoe

18b) haaha	maa	hndoosungirira	noo	kiivisa.
now	then	1-ITER-explore	and:REF	15-RECIP-hide

18. Well, when she had met the old man hoeing, she then looked intently [at him] and hid herself.

19) Haaha	kumba	ura	moosi	kumona	iise.
now	<i>surprise</i>	1:DEM	1-old:man	15-1-see	1-FUT:be

19. But now, the old man is going to see her.

20a) Maa	akamusea,	"Fumira	na	kun!
then	1-CONS-1-say	IMP:come:out	and	17:DEM

20b) Kooni	uri	Mulaangi,	che	wookoofa?"
if	2sg-be	1-Rangi	what	2sg-CONT-fear

20. Then he told her, "Come out of there! If you are a Rangi, what are you afraid of?"

21a) Baasi	maa	akafumira.	Afumire
<i>closing</i>	then	1-CONS-come:out	1-come:out-PFV

21b) maa	ura	moosi	akamusea,	"Ni	hai	afumire?"
then	1:DEM	1-old:man	1-CONS-1-say	COP	where	2sg-come:out-PFV

21. This was it, and she came out. When she had come out, that old man then asked her, "Where have you come from?"

22a) Akasea,	"Baaba,	nijja	nasumulwa	ni	Vuumba,
1-CONS-say	(grand-)father	1sg-PAST:be	1-take-PASS	COP	2-Maasai

22b) narekire	baa	vaana	vaani	vatatu	kuko.
1sg-leave-PFV	even	2-child	2-POSS:1sg	2-three	17:DEM:EMPH

22c) Mulume	waani	asaaka	aanjulae,
1-male	1-POSS:1sg	1:PAST-want	1-1sg-kill-SUB

22d) haaha	maa	amwaaɾɪ	maáma	akasea,
now	then	1-be:there	1-mother	1-CONS-say

22e) ‘Doma,	kúulawa	ɯɾɪ’	noo	kɪɾekɪɾe	nkatɨja.”
IMP:go	15-kill	2sg-be	COP:REF	7-leave-APPL:PFV	1sg-CONS-run
22. And she said, “Father, I had been taken by Maasai, I have even left my three children there. My husband wanted to kill me, but then, there is [this] mother and she said, ‘Go, you are to be killed’, that is what caused me to run [away].”					

23) Maa	ɯɾa	moosi	akasea,	“Heende	kaa,	nɪkɨtwaale.”
then	1:DEM	1-old:man	1-CONS-say	1pl:go-IMP	<i>informal</i>	1sg-2sg-bring-SUB
23. Then that old man said, “Let’s go, I should bring you.”						

24) Maa	akamɨtwaala	na	kaáyíí	kwaavo.
then	1-CONS-1-bring	and	9-home-LOC	17-POSS:3pl
24. Then he brought her to her home.				

25) Noo	kalusímo	ja	aka	mũndoosimɾa	vajukulɨ	vaanyu.
COP:REF	12-11-story	like	12:DEM	2pl-ITER-tell-APPL	2-grandchild	2-POSS:2pl
25. It’s a little story like this, and you tell [it] again to your grandchildren.						