

Insubordinated conditionals in Kupsapiny (Kupsapiiny, Kupsabiny)

KAWACHI, Kazuhiro

National Defense Academy of Japan

The present study describes two types of insubordinated conditionals in Kupsapiny, the Southern Nilotic language of Eastern Uganda: one starting with the conditional marker *yèè/yòò* or *ńte/ńto* and the other starting with the combination *ńto yèè*. It shows that different senses of these constructions can be distinguished on the basis of what types of responses to them are possible or impossible. It also shows that the two types of constructions differ from each other in a few respects (e.g., the recoverability of a main clause, the difference from the full conditional construction); this suggests that one developed later historically than the other.

Keywords: insubordination, conditional, Kupsapiny, Kupsapiiny, Kupsabiny, Nilotic, Uganda

1. Introduction
2. Literature review
3. Background information on Kupsapiny
4. Insubordinated conditionals in Kupsapiny
5. Analysis and discussion
6. Conclusion

1. Introduction

This paper describes two types of constructions that can be regarded as insubordinated conditionals in Kupsapiny (ISO 639-3: *kpz*, also spelled Kupsapiiny or Kupsabiny), the Southern Nilotic language of Uganda. It has two goals: one is to show that the senses of either type of insubordinated conditional construction can be distinguished on the basis of what types of responses to them are possible or impossible, and the other goal is to speculate on the historical development of these insubordinated conditional constructions.

Section 2 briefly reviews previous studies on insubordination across languages. Section 3 provides background information on Kupsapiny including patterns of clause linkage and the formation of conditionals. Section 4 describes different types of situations where the Kupsapiny insubordinated conditional constructions are used by examining how the addressee responds to them. Section 5 analyzes the data presented in section 4 and

speculates on the historical development of the constructions. Section 6 concludes the paper.

2. Literature review

Evans (2007) shows that insubordination, “the conventionalized main clause use of what, on prima facie grounds, appear to be formally subordinate clauses” (p.367), is widespread across languages (see also Evans 1993). Examples of insubordinated constructions include free-standing conditional clauses in English (e.g., *If you could come this way, please.* or *If you (dare) touch my car!*), free-standing ‘whether’-clauses with verb-final word order in German, and the infinitive used as a command in Italian (Evans 2007).

Evans hypothesizes that insubordination follows four stages of diachronic development, as in (1).

- (1) a. Subordinate construction
- b. Ellipsis of main clause
- c. Conventionalized ellipsis
- d. Reanalysis as main clause structure

At stage (a), the construction consists of a main clause and a subordinate clause. At stage (b), the main clause is elided, and the subordinate clause stands alone. At this stage, the main clause is easily recoverable. At stage (c), the ellipsis is conventionalized, and the main clause is difficult to recover. At stage (d), what was previously a subordinate clause is conventionally used as a main clause, and it is impossible to recover the original main clause.

Insubordination has attracted attention especially because insubordinated clauses, which serve as main clauses but whose verbs are non-finite, provide a counterexample to the assumption that verbs in main clauses are finite, and also because insubordination, whereby a subordinate clause comes to be used as a main clause, is a counterexample to the purported unidirectionality of grammaticalization (e.g., Heine & Reh 1984: 74-76, Heine, Claudi & Hünnemeyer 1991), according to which a main clause comes to be used as a subordinate clause.

Another observation that Evans makes of examples of insubordination in various languages is that the unit of the message can go beyond the level of a single clause, because no sharp distinction can be drawn between syntactic relations and discourse relations.

The specific research questions that the present study addresses are: (i) Does Kupsapiny exhibit any insubordinated constructions? (ii) How can one collect data on the use of such constructions in an understudied language like Kupsapiny, for which corpora do not exist? (iii) What can one assert with confidence about the historical development of insubordinated constructions in such a language, assuming a scenario like (1)?

3. Background information on Kupsapiny

3.1. Overview of grammatical properties of Kupsapiny

Kupsapiny is spoken by the Sebei or Sabin/Sapiny people, who live in the Sebei region on the northern and western slopes of Mt. Elgon in Eastern Uganda, which is crossed by the Uganda-Kenya border running northeast to southwest. According to the national census by the Uganda Bureau of Statistics in 2002, the population of the Sebei is approximately 181,000, and almost all of them speak Kupsapiny. Kupsapiny belongs to the Kalenjin branch of the Southern Nilotic group of the Nilotic language family. Sabaot, which is spoken by about 280,000 people on the Kenyan side of Mt. Elgon, is another intelligible dialect of this language.

In this language, the consonant phonemes are *p, t, c, k, f, s, š, m, n, ɲ, ŋ, r, l, w,* and *y*, and the vowel phonemes are *i, e, a, o, u, ɨ, ə, a, ii, ee, aa, oo,* and *uu*.¹ Kupsapiny also makes a five-way tonal distinction, high (´), mid (no diacritic), low (`), rising (ˇ), and falling (ˆ).

Kupsapiny is an agglutinating language with some fusion, where nouns and verbs both use prefixes and suffixes, but some morphemes are portmanteaux. It shows head-marking properties. The case marking system of this language is marked-nominative (Dixon 1994: 63-67, König 2006, 2008: 138-203) — that is, the case for the object (the absolute case) is functionally unmarked (in that the absolute case forms of nouns are the same as their citation forms, and are used in various types of situations), whereas the case for the subject (nominative case) is functionally marked. Although it is not clear whether the absolute case or the nominative case is morphologically unmarked, absolute case forms of most nouns with the case distinction show a flat tone pattern or a rising tone pattern (starting from a low or mid tone and rising toward the end), whereas their nominative case forms usually have a falling tone pattern (starting from a high tone and falling toward the end). Examples are shown in Table 1.

¹ Nilotic languages are conventionally considered to have the advanced tongue root distinction in their vowels (e.g., Ladefoged, Glick, & Criper 1968: 37-38, Larsen 1991: 144). However, I am not sure whether Kupsapiny does in fact have this distinction, in other words, whether any pair of the vowels listed here should be regarded as exhibiting this distinction, or whether the vowels have any further distinction. This issue needs closer investigation.

Table 1: Absolute and nominative case forms of nouns

Absolute case	Nominative case	Gloss
<i>Cìtò</i>	<i>cító</i>	‘person’
<i>Lèkwèt</i>	<i>lékwet</i>	‘child’
<i>Tàrtet</i>	<i>tártet</i>	‘bird’
<i>Tariya</i>	<i>táriya</i>	‘white ant’

Absolute case is used not only for the direct object (both the direct object of a transitive verb and the theme of a ditransitive verb), but also for the citation form and the subject of a copula construction. In addition to general subjects, the nominative case is used for the indirect object (and for the direct object of a transitive verb immediately after a word ending in a high tone and for the predicate of a copula construction).

However, not all nouns make this case distinction; some nouns do not exactly match the above uses of absolute and nominative cases. Moreover, there are a relatively large number of nouns that do not carry any morphological marking of case at all and are invariant in form (e.g., *kó* ‘house’, *àmpùreerèt* ‘umbrella’, *màwùwaan* ‘flowers’).

Instances of distinctive tone seem to be sporadically found in other places in the grammar of this language.² For example, on some nouns, the future suffix for the first person and the negative suffix for the first person are identical in form (*mà-*), but only the low tone of the negative suffix affects the tone of the first syllable of the following verb.³

The basic word order of Kupsapiny is VSO, but other orders are also possible in some discourse contexts. VOS is used when the subject is a full noun and the object is a pronoun or when the subject is in the third person and the object is in the first or second person. Moreover, VOS is often preferred over VSO when the subject is non-human and the object is human.

Kupsapiny uses prepositions (*am/om* ‘at, from’, *kucaké* ‘from, since’, *akay/akoy* ‘up to, until’, *paka* ‘up to, until’, *kupa* ‘for’), and in this language, nouns precede noun modifiers (e.g., adjectives, numerals, relative clauses, genitive nouns). Finally, this language has no grammatical gender. In some of the examples in the present paper, *s/he* or *him/her* is used

² Although tone seems to be relevant mainly to nouns in Kupsapiny, the present study attempted to record as many tone markings on words belonging to other grammatical categories as possible.

³ A pair of examples is shown in (i) and (ii).

- (i) *mà-yiku* *àni* *ɲarakat.*
 FUT.S:1-become 1SG.NOM happy
 ‘I will become/be happy.’
- (ii) *mà-yiku* *àni* *ɲarakat.*
 NEG.S:1-become 1SG.NOM happy
 ‘I am not happy.’

as an English translation of the Kupsapiny third person singular pronoun *neetó*, which is gender-neutral.

3.2. Finite and non-finite verb forms and patterns of clause linkage in Kupsapiny

Kupsapiny verbs have finite (tensed) forms and non-finite (participle) forms, which emerge as different sets of prefixes on verbs. They inflect for person and number; for example, *kà-ram* in (2) and *kèè-kally-à* in (3) are finite verb forms, while *a-ràm* in (3) is non-finite.⁴

(2) *kà-ram* *neetó* *pééko*.
 T.PST.3-collect 3SG.NOM water.PL.ABSL
 ‘S/he collected water.’

(3) *kèè-kally-à* *neetó* (*kulè*) *a-ràm* *peekò*.
 T.PST.3-help-O:1SG 3SG.NOM CMPL PTCP.1SG-collect water.PL.ABSL
 ‘S/he helped me collect water.’

In finite forms, tense is indicated with a prefix, which inflects for person and number. A set of examples are given in Table 2, which shows different tense forms of *ràm* ‘collect’ for the third-person subject. There are three past tense categories: distant past, recent past, and today past. The present forms of some verbs require the imperfective suffix *-e*.

Table 2: Different tense forms of *ràm* ‘collect’ for the third-person subject

distant past (more than a week ago)	<i>kii-rám</i> [D.PST.S:3-collect]
recent past (yesterday–a week ago)	<i>kù-ram</i> [R.PST.S:3-collect]
today past	<i>kà-ram</i> [T.PST.S:3-collect]
present	<i>Ø-ràm-e</i> [PRS.S:3-collect-IMPFV]
future	<i>mà-kù-ram</i> [FUT-PTCP.S:3-collect]

⁴ Kupsapiny uses participle constructions for (a)–(g) in (i) where a finite verb is followed by a participle (Kawachi 2014).

- (i) Participle constructions (V1: finite verb – V2: participle)
- (a) Temporal sequence of two events: Event 1 (V1), and then Event 2 (V2)
 - (a’) Subconstruction of (a): Means of causation (V1) – path of motion/state change (V2)
 - (b) Event 2 (V2) is the purpose of Event 1 (V1)
 - (c) Subject-control construction
 - (d) Object-control construction
 - (e) Perception verb (V1) – perceived event (V2)
 - (f) Motion event: Path of motion (V1) – manner of motion/concomitance (V2)
 - (g) Motion event: Manner of motion/concomitance (V1) – path of motion (V2)

The participle verb forms of *ràm* ‘collect’ are shown in Table 3.⁵

Table 3: Participle forms of *ràm* ‘collect’

1SG	<i>a-ràm</i>	(<i>ànito/àni</i>)	[PTCP.S:1SG-collect	(1SG.NOM/1SG.NOM)]
2SG	<i>Ø-ràm</i>	(<i>niìto/ni</i>)	[PTCP.S:2SG-collect	(2SG.NOM/2SG.NOM)]
3SG	<i>kù-ram</i>	(<i>neetó/ne</i>)	[PTCP.S:3-collect	(3SG.NOM/3SG.NOM)]
1PL	<i>cee-ràm</i>	(<i>acékto/acék</i>)	[PTCP.S:1PL-collect	(1PL.NOM/1PL.NOM)]
2PL	<i>a-ràm</i>	(<i>akwékto/akwék</i>)	[PTCP.S:2PL-collect	(2PL.NOM/2PL.NOM)]
3PL	<i>kù-ram</i>	(<i>cèkto/cék</i>)	[PTCP.S:3-collect	(3PL.NOM/3PL.NOM)]

Most subordinate clauses in Kupsapiny cannot stand by themselves without the main clause. However, this cannot serve as a definition of subordinate clauses in this language. A conditional clause can be insubordinated to serve as an independent utterance in various situations, as discussed in the bulk of the present paper.

Subordinate clauses cannot be distinguished from main clauses in terms of the non-finiteness of the verb, either. In a complex sentence, a main clause can contain a non-finite verb (a participle) rather than a finite verb (a tensed verb) (as will be discussed shortly; see (D) and (F) in (4)). Nevertheless, whether the verb is finite or non-finite can be a factor in characterizing the different types of Kupsapiny subordinate constructions to some extent.

There are six combinations of clause order and verb finiteness, shown in (4), that Kupsapiny subordinate constructions can follow. Different constructions can use different sets of combinations. Overall, (A), (C), and (D) are the most commonly used; however, note that ‘Main: non-finite, Subordinate: finite’ and ‘Main: non-finite, Subordinate: non-finite’ are impossible patterns.

- (4) (A) Main: finite – Subordinate: finite
 (B) Main: finite – Subordinate: non-finite
 (C) Subordinate: finite – Main: finite

⁵ These verb forms do not stand by themselves when used as the participle. However, because they exhibit syncretism with forms for other grammatical categories, they can stand alone in other uses. First, the participle forms of verbs for any of the person-number combinations are identical with their optative forms (e.g., *a-sit* [PTCP.S:1SG/2PL-wash] or [OPT.S:1SG/2PL-wash]). Second, the participle forms of verbs for the second person singular and plural are the same as their imperative forms (e.g., *a-sit* [PTCP.S:2PL-wash] or [IMP.S:2PL-wash]). Third, the participle forms of some verbs for the third person are the same as their recent past forms (e.g., *ku-sit* [PTCP.S:3-wash] or [R.PST.S:3-wash]). Fourth, the first person singular and the second person plural participle forms of verbs whose present forms do not require the imperfective suffix are the same as their present forms (e.g., *a-nket* [PTCP.S:1SG/2PL-know] or [PRS.S:1SG/2PL-know]).

The forms in the parentheses in Table 3 are full pronouns, long and short forms, which can be omitted.

- (D) Subordinate: finite – Main: non-finite
 (E) Subordinate: non-finite – Main: finite
 (F) Subordinate: non-finite – Main: non-finite

Thus, in Kupsapiny, although the finiteness of a verb is not necessarily associated with whether its clause is main or subordinate, there are specific possible and impossible combinations of clause order and verb finiteness.

3.3. Conditional constructions in Kupsapiny

Kupsapiny has two types of conditional constructions. The first uses either of the two conditional markers *yèè/yòò* and *ńte/ńto*, and the other uses the combination of *ńto* and *yèè* (sometimes, *ńte* and *yèè*) as its conditional marker.⁶ (Note that *yèè* and *yòò* and *ńte* and *ńto* are each in free variation with each other in most cases, though there are cases where only one in each pair can be used, and the other cannot, as shown later.)

3.3.1. The *yèè/yòò* construction and the *ńte/ńto* construction

Out of the six combinations of clause order and verb finiteness in (4), the *yèè/yòò* construction can follow (A), (C), or (D), whereas the *ńte/ńto* construction can follow only (C) or (D), not (A).⁷ Thus, in both constructions, the verb of a conditional clause is in a finite form. Examples of the *yèè/yòò* and *ńte/ńto* constructions are shown in (5)–(10) and (8)–(10), respectively.

(i) *yèè/yòò* construction

(A) Main: finite, Subordinate: finite

- (5) *ma-a-mńáán* *yèè* *ka-a-yaam* *ámii-cà.*
 FUT-S:1SG-become.sick if T.PST-S:1SG-eat food.ABSL-that
 ‘I will become sick if I eat that food.’

⁶ The word *ńto* (but not *ńte*) can also mean ‘or’.

- (i) *masa-á-kooon-ńj* *cukooompét* *ńto* *kasáánit.*
 FUT-S:1SG-give-O:2SG cup or plate
 ‘I will give you a cup or a plate.’

⁷ Although the use of combination (D) for either type of conditional construction is not common, it is perfectly grammatical.

(C) Subordinate: finite, Main: finite

- (6) *yèè ka-a-yaam àmii-cà (kulè), ma-a-mpáán.*
 if T.PST-S:1SG-eat food.ABSL-that top FUT-S:1SG-become.sick
 ‘If I eat that food, I will become sick.’

(D) Subordinate: finite, Main: non-finite

- (7) *yèè ka-a-yaam àmii-cà (kulè), a-mpáán.*
 if T.PST-S:1SG-eat food.ABSL-that top PTCP.S:1SG-become.sick
 ‘If I eat that food, I will become sick.’

(ii) *n̄te/n̄to* construction

(C) Subordinate: finite, Main: finite

- (8) *n̄te ka-a-yaam àmii-cà*
 if T.PST-S:1SG-eat food.ABSL-that
 ((a) *paantáñi*/(b) *kòrròn*) (*kulè*), *n̄te ka-a-mpáán.*
 now/this.morning TOP then T.PST-S:1SG-become.sick
 (a) ‘If I ate this food (now), then I would become sick.’
 (b) ‘If I had eaten this food (this morning), then I would have become sick.’

- (9) *n̄te kya-a-yaam àmii-cà yooto (kulè),*
 if D.PST-S:1SG-eat food.ABSL-that that.time TOP
n̄te kya-a-mpáán.
 then D.PST-S:1SG-become.sick
 ‘If I had eaten this food at that time, then I would have become sick.’

(D) Subordinate: finite, Main: non-finite

- (10) *n̄te ka-a-yaam àmii-cà (paantáñi) (kulè),*
 if T.PST-S:1SG-eat food.ABSL-that now TOP
n̄te a-mpáán.
 then PTCP.S:1SG-become.sick
 ‘If I ate this food (now), then I would become sick.’

As is clear from these examples, the *yèè/yòò* and *n̄te/n̄to* constructions differ from each other in a few other respects. First, the *yèè/yòò* construction is used for realizable or

possible conditions, whereas the *ñte/ñto* construction is used for counterfactual, unrealizable, or unlikely conditions. Second, *yèè/yòò* occurs only at the beginning of a conditional clause; on the other hand, *ñte/ñto* also occurs at the beginning of a conditional clause, but *ñte* (but not *ñto*) normally occurs additionally at the beginning of a main clause to form *ñte/ñto ... , ñte ...* ‘If ... , then ...’, where *ñte/ñto* and *ñte* mean ‘if’ and ‘then’, respectively.⁸

3.3.2. The *ñto yèè (ñte yèè)* construction

This construction begins usually with *ñto yèè* and sometimes with *ñte yèè*, the main clause always contains *múúc* ‘can’, and has to be in the interrogative to form a polar question, where the last word ending in a consonant takes the polar question enclitic *=í* or the last word ending in a vowel lengthens that vowel.⁹ The question is a rhetorical question: using a positive question ‘Can X do Y?’ (e.g., (11)), the speaker makes a negative assertion ‘I am sure that X cannot do Y’, and using a negative question ‘Can’t X do Y?’ (e.g., (12)), the speaker makes a positive assertion ‘I am sure that X can do Y’.

- (11) *ñto yèè kée-rú paantápi,*
 if if T.PST.S:2SG-sleep now
múúc-i Ø-ɲet lákkwar=í ?
 can-IMPFV PTCP.S:2SG-get.up quickly=Q
 ‘If you sleep now (during the daytime), can you get up quickly?’
 (Implied: ‘If you sleep now (during the daytime), you (will not feel like sleeping until late tonight and) will not be able to get up quickly tomorrow morning.’)

- (12) *ñto yèè kà-co né yu,*
 if if T.PST.S:3-come 3SG.NOM here
ma-múúc-e ce-ɲalaal=í ?
 NEG-can-IMPFV PTCP.S:1PL-talk=Q
 ‘If s/he comes here, can’t we talk?’
 (Implied: ‘If s/he comes here, we should be able to talk.’)

⁸ Another difference is that *yèè/yòò* can carry past-tense prefixes for the third person subject (distant past: *ki-yèè/ki-yòò*, recent past: *ku-yèè/ku-yòò*, today past: *ka-yèè/ka-yòò*), unlike *ñte/ñto*.

⁹ This construction does not seem to be able to use a main clause lacking *múúc* ‘can’, as in (i).

- (i) *?ñto yèè kà-co né yu, ñte ká-tapón.*
 if if T.PST.S:3-come 3SG.NOM here then T.PST.S:3-good
 to mean, ‘If s/he comes here, it will be good.’

4. Insubordinated conditionals in Kupsapiny

The conditional clauses in either type of Kupsapiny conditional construction presented in section 3.3, which have to be finite, can stand alone as a sentence (this section assumes that they both serve as insubordinated clauses, but this point is returned to in section 5.2). Either type of conditional marker, *yèè/yòò* or *ńte/ńto*, or the combination *ńto yèè* can occupy the beginning of an insubordinated clause.¹⁰

Sections 4.1 and 4.2 deal with insubordinated conditionals with *yèè/yòò* or *ńte/ńto* and those with *ńto yèè*, respectively. Each section first describes the types of situations where the relevant insubordinated conditional is used, and then presents examples of its use and possible responses to it in each type of situation.

4.1. The insubordinated conditional construction with *yèè/yòò* or *ńte/ńto*

4.1.1. Types of situations where the insubordinated conditional with *yèè/yòò* or *ńte/ńto* is used and the recovery of a main clause

The insubordinated conditional with *yèè/yòò* or *ńte/ńto* can be used in various types of situations, most of which concern the positive or negative evaluation of an event by the speaker. Thus, this construction expresses any of the meanings in Table 4 (referred to by number in the text below).

Table 4: Relations between the meaning of an insubordinated conditional clause with *yèè/yòò* or *ńte/ńto* and a set of factors

	Meaning	Speaker's evaluation: positive/negative for whom	Person of subject	<i>yèè/yòò</i> or <i>ńte/ńto</i>	Tense of verb
[1]	Request for action	positive for speaker(s) (if the conditional event occurs)	2	y/n	PRS, T.PST
[2]	Advice/suggestion	positive for addressee(s) (if the conditional event occurs)	2	y/*n	PRS
[3]	Asking for permission	positive for speaker(s) (if the conditional event occurs)	any person	y/n	PRS, T.PST
[4]	Making an offer	positive for addressee(s) (if the conditional event occurs)	any person	y/n	PRS, T.PST
[5]	Hope/wish	positive for speaker(s) (if the conditional event occurs)	any person	y/n	PRS, T.PST
[6]	Obligation/need	negative for speaker(s) (if the conditional event does not occur)	1	y/n	y: PRS, n: T.PST
[7]	Warning/threat	negative for addressee(s) (if the conditional event does not occur)	2	y/n	y: PRS, n: T.PST
[8]	Hypothetical bad event	negative for any person (if the event of the conditional had not occurred)	any person	*y/n	T.PST, R.PST, D.PST
[9]	Self-addressed polar question	Neutral	any person	<i>ńto</i> only (*y/*ńte)	PRS, T.PST

¹⁰ These are the only insubordinated constructions that I found in Kupsapiny. It is not clear whether this language has any other insubordinated construction.

Examples of insubordinated conditionals with *yèè/yòò* or *ńte/ńto* used for [1] (request for action) are given in (13) and (14).

- (13) *yèè/yòò* *múúc-e* (*ni*) *Ø-sut-twò*
 if/if can-IMPV 2SG.NOM PTCP.S:2SG-bring-O:1SG
pééko.
 water.PL.DEF.ABSL

‘Please bring me water.’ (*lit.* ‘If you (SG) can bring me water.’)

- (14) *ńte/ńto* *kee-múúc-e* (*ni*)
 if/if T.PST.S:2-can-IMPV 2SG.NOM
Ø-sut-twò *pééko*.
 PTCP.S:2SG-bring-O:1SG water.PL.DEF.ABSL

‘Please bring me water.’ (*lit.* ‘If you (SG) could bring me water.’)

Note that the conditional markers *yèè/yòò* and *ńte/ńto* each cannot be used for all the types of situations in Table 4, but are used for different sets of situations (in the rightmost column of this table, ‘y’ and ‘n’ respectively indicate that *yèè/yòò* and *ńte/ńto* can be used, and the asterisk indicates that that conditional marker cannot be used). The exact meaning depends on context and may be ambiguous in some cases. (For example, the same insubordinated conditional may be interpreted as either the speaker’s [1] request that something be done or [5] hope/wish, or as either the speaker’s [3] request for permission or [5] hope/wish; or the same insubordinated conditional may also be interpreted as either an [2] advice/suggestion or a [5] hope/wish.)

When the insubordinated conditional with *yèè/yòò* or *ńte/ńto* involves the speaker’s positive or negative evaluation of the event, as in [1]–[8], a main clause could be provided to form the full conditional construction. According to my consultants, recovered main clauses are usually expected to contain either the word *tàpon* ‘good’, as in the case of [1]–[5], or *miyáát* ‘bad’, as in the case of [6]–[8].¹¹ (15) and (16) are examples of full-construction counterparts of (13) and (14), respectively.

¹¹ A main clause that expresses a specific emotion or fact related to the speaker’s positive or negative evaluation of the event could also be added to the insubordinated conditional with *yèè/yòò* or *ńte/ńto*. For example, instead of *ńte ka-tápon* [then TODAY.PST.S:3-good] in (16), (i)–(iii) could be added to (14) to form a full conditional sentence.

- (i) *ńte ka-a-ɲarac* [then TODAY.PST-S:1SG-be.happy] ‘then I would be happy’
 (ii) *ńte ka-a-kast-ij* [then TODAY.PST-S:1SG-thank-O:2SG] ‘then I would thank you (SG)’
 (iii) *ńte ka-a-sop* [then TODAY.PST-S:1SG-be.saved/alive] ‘then I would be saved/alive’

Nevertheless, my consultants think that the main clause omitted from an insubordinated conditional with *yèè/yòò* or *ńte/ńto* involving the speaker’s evaluation of the event should be one expressing the notion of ‘good’ or ‘bad’ (e.g., (15)

- (15) *yèè/yòò* *múú-c-e* (*ni*) \emptyset -*sut-twò*
 if/if can-IMPV 2SG.NOM PTCP.S:2SG-bring-O:1SG
pééko (*kulè*), *tàpon*.
 water.PL.DEF.ABSL TOP good
 ‘If you (SG) can bring me water, then it is good.’
- (16) *ñte/ñto* *kee-múú-c-e* (*ni*) \emptyset -*sut-twò*
 if/if T.PST.S:2-can-IMPV 2SG.NOM PTCP.S:2SG-bring-O:1SG
pééko (*kulè*), *ñte* *ka-tápon*.
 water.PL.DEF.ABSL TOP then T.PST.S:3-good
 ‘If you (SG) could bring me water, then it would be good.’

Thus, as long as it is used for any of meanings [1]–[8], the insubordinated conditional with *yèè/yòò* or *ñte/ñto* could be regarded as an omission from the main clause. That is, one could understand that in (13), *tàpon* ‘good’ is omitted from (15), while in (14), *ñte ka-tápon* [then T.PST.S:3-good] is omitted from (16), though (13) and (14) are nevertheless still complete as utterances. Note that the topic marker *kulè*, which can occur optionally at the end of the conditional clause in a full conditional construction, cannot be used in an insubordinated conditional.

In contrast, when used for meaning [9] (e.g., (106)), an insubordinated conditional with *yèè/yòò* or *ñte/ñto* does not involve a positive or negative evaluation of the event by the speaker but is instead used as a polar question that the speaker asks himself/herself. In this case, no main clause can be retrieved, and thus the insubordinated conditional used this way does not involve the omission of a main clause.

4.1.2. Examples of the insubordinated conditional with *yèè/yòò* or *ñte/ñto* and possible responses to it

This section presents data on the uses of the insubordinated conditional with *yèè/yòò* or *ñte/ñto* and possible responses to it for each use.¹² Note that in the following descriptions, the person who produces the insubordinated conditional is called the speaker and the person who hears and responds to it is called the addressee even when the latter is being considered in the role of the speaker of the response.

and (16)), rather than clauses such as (i)–(iii).

¹² When the verb in this insubordinated conditional construction can be used in either the today past or the present, the use in the today past is generally more polite than that in the present. For example, the verb in the present can be used only when a request is made to someone of equal or lower status compared to the speaker, whereas the verb in the today past can be used regardless of the relationship between the speaker and the addressee. When either the conditional marker *ñte/ñto* or *yèè/yòò* can be used in this insubordinated conditional construction, *ñte/ñto* is generally considered more polite than *yèè/yòò*.

- á-jít* *wùloo* *ke-mmwo-ttyó-wo* *ni*.
PTCP.S:1SG-fulfill where T.PST.S:2SG-say-to-O:1SG 2SG.NOM
'I am sorry I cannot fulfill what you (SG) said to me (*lit.* where you said to me).'
- (19) *múúc-e* *á-jít* *wùloo* *ke-mmwo-ttyó-wo* *ni*.
can-IMPV PTCP.S:1SG-fulfill where T.PST.S:2SG-say-to-O:1SG 2SG.NOM
'I can fulfill what you (SG) said to me (*lit.* where you said to me).'
- (20) *èè*, *a-múúc-e* (*â-sut-uŋ*) *peeko*.
yes S:1SG-can-IMPV PTCP.S:1SG-bring-O:2SG water.PL.DEF.ABSL
'Yes, I can (bring you (SG) water).'
- (21) *pùriyo*, *ma-a-múúc-e* (*â-sut-uŋ*) *peeko*.
no NEG-S:1SG-can-IMPV PTCP.S:1SG-bring-O:2SG water.PL.DEF.ABSL
'No, I cannot (bring you (SG) water).'
- (22) *pùriyo* *wúyin*.
no problem.SG.INDEF
'No problem.'
- (23) *ma-a-sut-uŋ* *aní*.
FUT-S:1SG-bring-O:2SG 1SG.NOM
I will bring it to you (SG).
- (24) *pùriyo*, *mà-cee-tíŋe* *acék* *péy*.
no NEG-PRS.S:1PL-have 1PL.NOM water.PL.INDEF.ABSL
'No, we do not have any water.'
- (25) *ma-a-pónt-e* *sááwa*. *Ø-wèè-num-ùŋit*
NEG-PRS.S:1SG-have-IMPV time IMP.S:2SG-go-get-yourself
peeko.
water.PL.DEF.ABSL
'I do not have time. Go and get water for yourself.'
- (26) *à-yiku* *cálat* *kulè* *ma-a-múúc-e*
S:1SG-COP(*lit.* become) sorry CMPL NEG-S:1SG-can-IMPV
(*â-sut-uŋ*) *peeko*.
PTCP.S:1SG-bring-O:2SG water.PL.DEF.ABSL

‘I am sorry I cannot (bring you (SG) water).’

- (27) *Ø-kaŋ-a* (aŋi).
 IMP.S:2SG-wait-O:1SG 1SG.ABSL
 ‘Wait for me.’

- (28) *Ø-kaŋ* *tàkkaanuk* *tukúsiic*.
 IMP.S:2SG-wait minutes.PL.DEF a.few
ma-wáá-kas *àni*.
 FUT.S:1-go-check 1SG.NOM
 ‘Wait a few minutes. I will go and check.’

[2] Advice/suggestion

The insubordinated conditional can also be used to express the speaker’s advice or suggestion that the addressee perform some action, as in (29).

- (29) *yèè* *múúc-e* (ní) *Ø-ŋét* *korrón*.
 if can-IMPV 2SG.NOM PTCP.S:2SG-get.up early
 ‘I advise/suggest that you (SG) get up early.’ (*lit.* ‘If you (SG) can wake up early.’)

Other examples are ‘I advise/suggest that you eat vegetables’ (*lit.* ‘If you can eat vegetables’) and ‘I advise/suggest that you come tomorrow’ (*lit.* ‘If you can come tomorrow’).

In this use of the insubordinated conditional with *yèè/yòò* or *ñte/ñto*, which my consultants state is possible irrespective of the social relation between the speaker and the addressee, the subject is the second person, the conditional marker is *yèè/yòò* (not *ñte/ñto*), and the verb is accompanied by *múúc* ‘can’.

The addressee interprets the speaker’s utterance as advice or a suggestion that the addressee perform an action, as is clear from the addressee’s responses in (30)–(36). The addressee may accept the advice or suggestion, as in (30a), (31), (32), and (33), may thank the speaker for it, as in (31), or reject it, as in (30b), (34), (35), and (36).

- (30) (a) *a-cem-cíintoos* / (b) *a-ta-cíintos* (àni)
 PRS.S:1SG-agree-together/PRS.S:1SG-disagree-together 1SG.NOM
akóó *ŋi*.
 with 2SG.ABSL

‘I (a) agree/(b) disagree with you (SG).’

- (31) *kèy* *tàpon,*
 MEANINGLESS(?) good
 (a) *kee-rwókk-wo* / (b) *kè-mmwow-o* *ni.*
 T.PST.S:2SG-advise-O:1SG/T.PST.S:2SG-tell-O:1SG 2SG.NOM
 ‘Thank you (SG) (a) for advising me/(b) for telling me (about that).’
- (32) *tapon.*
 good
 ‘It is good.’
- (33) (*mantéé-sot,*) *mà-à-šëm* *àni.*
 NEG.IMP.S:2SG-worry FUT-S:1SG-try 1SG.NOM
 ‘(Do not worry,) I will try.’
- (34) *manté-rwókkw = aní.*
 NEG.IMP.S:2SG-advise=O:1SG
 ‘Do not advise me.’
- (35) *mee-ní* *ne* *Ø-yeme* *ne*
 NEG-2SG.NOM REL.SG PRS.S:2SG-be.supposed.to REL.SG
Ø-rwókkw = aní.
 PRS.S:2SG-advise=O:1SG
 ‘You (SG) are not the one who is supposed to advise me.’
- (36) *mà-nam-ijní* (*cú/cí.*)
 NEG-matter-2SG.POSS this.NOM/that.NOM
 ‘(This/That is) none of your (SG) business (*lit.* not your (SG) matter).’ (*impolite*)

[3] Asking for permission

Using the insubordinated conditional with *yèè/yòò* or *ńte/ńto*, the speaker may ask the addressee for permission to perform an action, as in (37).

- (37) *yèè* *ka-múúc-e* *aní*
 if T.PST.1SG-can-IMPV 1SG.NOM

a-yáát *tiriisét.*
 PTCP.S:1SG-open window.SG.DEF.ABSL
 ‘May I open the window?’ (*lit.* ‘If I could open the window.’)

Other examples of this use of the insubordinated conditional include ‘May I use your phone?’ (*lit.* ‘If I can/could use your phone’) and ‘May my child play with your child?’ (*lit.* ‘If my child can/could play with your child’).

In this use, the subject can be any person; when the subject is the first or third person, the verb is normally accompanied by *múúć* ‘can’, in either the present or the today past. Any conditional marker can occur, but *yèè/yòò* and *ñto* are more polite than *ñte*.

A construction used to ask for permission often takes the form of a question, but the insubordinated conditional with *yèè/yòò* or *ñte/ñto* is formally not in the interrogative (for a polar question).¹³

Examples of addressee’s responses to (37) are shown in (38)–(54). Similar to [1], the addressee interprets the speaker’s utterance as a question, as seen the use of the verb of asking in (38)–(40). It may be formally ambiguous whether the speaker is asking the addressee to perform the action or is asking the addressee for permission to perform the action himself/herself, but in this use, the speaker’s intention is the latter — it is the speaker’s possible action, not the addressee’s, that is relevant. This is clear from the fact that, as a response, the addressee may or may not let the speaker perform the action or not, as in (41)–(54). In addition, the addressee may endorse the speaker’s performance of the action, as in (41)–(45), order the speaker to perform the action, as in (46), or reject the speaker’s performance of the action, as in (47)–(54). When the addressee rejects it, s/he may explain the reason, as in (53)–(54).

(38) *Ø-teep-éé-n = aaní* *ni* *àkookáy.*
 PRS.S:2SG-ask-IMPV-EP=O:1SG 2SG.NOM always
 ‘You (SG) are always asking me (for permission).’

(39) *mantée-teep-ééna.*
 NEG.IMP.S:2SG-ask-O:1SG
 ‘Do not ask me.’

¹³ Another Kupsapiny construction for asking for permission, using the present tense, takes the form of a polar question, as in (i).

(i) *a-yáát* (*aní*) *tiriseet = í ?*
 PRS.S:1sg-open 1SG.NOM window=Q
 ‘May I open the window?’ (*lit.* ‘Do I open the window?’)

- (40) *mee-tep-é-n = aaní* *ni.*
 NEG-ask-IMPV-EP=O:1SG 2SG.NOM
 ‘You (SG) do not have to ask me.’
- (41) *èè, tapon.*
 yes good
 ‘Yes, good.’
- (42) *èè, kee-sót(-wo) (ni) tapon.*
 yes T.PST.S:2SG-think(-O:1SG) 2SG.NOM well
 ‘Yes, it is a good idea (*lit.* you (SG) thought (about me) well).’
- (43) *èè, múúc-e ní.*
 yes can-IMPV 2SG.NOM
 ‘Yes, you (SG) can.’
- (44) *èè, wo (ni) tây.*
 yes go 2SG.NOM front
 ‘Go ahead.’
- (45) *mantéé-sot ní. Ø-wo tây.*
 NEG.IMP.S:2SG-worry 2SG.NOM IMP.S:2SG-go front
 ‘Do not worry (You (SG) do not have to ask me). Go ahead.’
- (46) *Ø-yaat ní tiríset.*
 IMP.S:2SG-open 2SG.NOM window.ABSL
 ‘Open the window.’
- (47) *pùriyo, mà-tapon.*
 no NEG-good
 ‘No, it is not good.’
- (48) *mà-paantáni.*
 NEG-now
 ‘Not now (but maybe later).’
- (49) *pùriyo, (ampé) katít kot.*
 no because cold very

‘No, (because) it is very cold.’

- (50) *pùriyo, ma-a-mac-é/ma-a-cem-ùŋ*
 no NEG-S:1SG-want-IMPV/NEG-S:1SG-allow-O:2SG
aní kulè Ø-yaat ni tiríset.
 1SG.NOM CMPL PTCP.S:2SG-open 2SG.NOM window.ABSL
 ‘No, I don’t want you (SG) to open/I don’t let you (SG) open the window.’

- (51) *ki-múna-mwóow-uŋ aní kulè*
 D.PST.S:1SG-NEG-tell-O:2SG 1SG.NOM CMPL
ma-a-macé céé-yaat tiriiseet = í ?
 NEG-PTCP.S:1SG-want PTCP.S:1PL-open window.ABSL=Q
 ‘Didn’t I tell you (SG) that I don’t want the window to be opened (*lit.* I don’t want us to open the window)?’

- (52) *kyaa-mwóow-uŋ aní kulè*
 D.PST.S:1SG-tell-O:2SG 1SG.NOM CMPL
ma-a-macé céé-yaat tiriiseet.
 NEG-PTCP.S:1SG-want PTCP.S:1PL-open window.ABSL
 ‘I told you (SG) that I don’t want the window to be opened (*lit.* I don’t want us to open the window).’

- (53) *mee-múuc-e ni amjé wǎy kot cé-yaat.*
 NEG.S:2SG-can-IMPV 2SG.NOM because hard very S:IMPERS-open
 ‘You (SG) can’t because it is too hard to open.’

- (54) *pùriyo, wo palatét kot.*
 no big noise.NOM very
 ‘No, it is too noisy.’ (*lit.* ‘The noise is very big.’)

[4] Making an offer

The use of the insubordinated conditional to express an offer on the part of the speaker to perform an action for the addressee is exemplified in (55).¹⁴

¹⁴ Another Kupsapiny construction for making an offer, which uses *múuc* ‘can’, takes the form of a polar question, as in (i).

- (i) *múuc-e à-yoot-uŋ aní tiriiseet = í ?*
 can-IMPV S:1SG-open-O:2SG 1SG.NOM window=Q
 ‘Shall I open the window for you?’ (*lit.* ‘Can I open the window for you?’)

- (55) *yèè ka-múúc-e à-sut-uy pééko.*
 if T.PST.S:1SG-can-IMPV PTCP.S:1SG-bring-O:2SG water.PL.DEF.ABSL
 ‘I will bring you (SG) water.’ (*lit.* ‘If I could/can bring you water.’)

Other examples include ‘I will lend you this umbrella’ (*lit.* ‘If I lend you this umbrella’), ‘I will cook *matooke* (a kind of starchy banana) for you’ (*lit.* ‘If I cook *matooke* for you’), and ‘I will bring you water’ (*lit.* ‘If you (can) let me bring you water’).

In this use, which is polite, the speaker is lower in status than the addressee. The subject is often the first person (though the speaker could make an offer on behalf of someone else: e.g., ‘S/he will bring you water’). When the conditional marker is *ète*, the verb *múúc* ‘can’ is usually (though not obligatorily) present, whereas its appearance is obligatory when the conditional marker is *yèè/yòò* or *nto*. The subject can also be the second person, and in this case, the verb is *cem* ‘let’, which may or may not be accompanied by *múúc*. The tense is either the present or the today past.

Possible responses to (55) are shown in (56)–(65). First, the addressee can interpret the speaker’s utterance as an offer to help the addressee by performing the action, as is clear from the use of the verb of helping in (56). The addressee may accept the offer, as in (57)–(59), and may also thank the speaker, as in (56) and (60). Finally, the addressee may say that s/he does not need the help, as in (61)–(65).

- (56) *kèy tàpon, kee-kállya aní (ni).*
 MEANINGLESS(?) good T.PST.S:2SG-help 1SG.ABSL 2SG.NOM
 ‘Thank you (SG) for helping me.’

- (57) *èè, múúc-e (ni).*
 yes can-IMPV 2SG.NOM
 ‘Yes, please./Yes, go ahead./Yes, you (SG) can.’

- (58) *èè, Ø-wo (ni) táy.*
 yes IMP.S:2SG-go 2SG.NOM front
 ‘Yes, go ahead.’ (*impolite*)

- (59) *èè, kee-sót(-wo) (ni) tapón.*
 yes T.PST.S:2SG-think(-O:1SG) 2SG.NOM well
 ‘Yes, it is a good idea.’ (*lit.* ‘you (SG) thought (about me) well.’)

- (60) *èè, (kèy tàpon).*
 yes MEANINGLESS(?) good

‘Yes, thank you.’

(61) *pùriyo.*

no

‘No.’

(62) *mà-tàpon.*

NEG-good

‘Not good.’

(63) *mùne-yi (ni) tapón.*

NEG-do 2SG.NOM well

‘That is not a good offer.’ (*lit.* ‘You (SG) do not do well.’) (*impolite*)

(64) *mantéé-sot (ni) (a-mííte àni tàpon.)*

NEG.IMP.S:2SG-worry 2SG.NOM PRS.S:1SG-exist 1SG.NOM well

‘Do not bother.’ (*lit.* Do not worry.) (I am OK.)’

(65) *a-mííte (àni) (ne) tàpon.*

PRS.S:1SG-exist 1SG.NOM REL.SG well/good

‘I am OK.’ (*lit.* ‘I exist well/in a good way.’)

[5] Hope/wish

The insubordinated conditional can also express the speaker’s hope or wish for an event. Whether it is a hope or wish that is expressed depends on how likely or unlikely the event is to occur. As long as the event is one that might happen in the future or at present, which is expressed with the present tense or the today past, one’s hope for the occurrence of the event and his/her wish for the occurrence of the event form a semantic continuum, and there is no formal difference between these interpretations. However, the construction expresses a wish for a past event that could have occurred but did not occur or a past event that might not have occurred but did occur, expressed with the today past, recent past, or distant past. An example where the insubordinated conditional seems to express the speaker’s hope(/wish) is given in (66).

(66) *yèè kà-roopən tun.*

if T.PST.S:3-rain tomorrow

‘I hope that it rains tomorrow.’ (*lit.* ‘If it rained tomorrow.’)

Other examples include ‘I hope that s/he comes’ (*lit.* ‘If s/he comes’) and ‘I hope that I can swim’ (*lit.* ‘If I can/could swim’).

In this use, the subject can be any person, and the conditional marker can be either *yèè/yòò* or *ête/êto*. The verb is in the today past when not accompanied by *múúc* ‘can’; when *múúc* is used, either the today past or the present can be used.

The addressee interprets the speaker’s utterance as expressing his/her hope that the event mentioned happens; thus, the addressee can respond with ‘I also hope’, as in (67) and (68).¹⁵ The addressee may add a main clause describing an event that may happen as a consequence of the event that the speaker hopes happens, as in (69) (with *ête*); this can form a full conditional sentence with (66). (The response could also be *kà-tapon* [T.PST.S:3-good] or *tàpon* [good] ‘It is good.’) The addressee may also express his/her opinion about the event, as in (70) and (71), or about its likelihood, as in (72).

(67) *pàra àni ñpo kulè kù-roopən tun.*
 hope 1SG.NOM also CMPL PTCP.S:3-rain tomorrow
 ‘I also hope that it rains tomorrow.’

(68) *pàra àni ñpo.*
 hope 1SG.NOM also
 ‘I also hope so.’

(69) *(ête) kà-tapon.*
 then T.PST.S:3-good
 ‘(Then) it will be good.’

(70) *pùriyo wuyìn (yèè kà-roopən tun).*
 no problem if T.PST.S:3-rain tomorrow
 ‘(There will be) no problem ((even) if it rains tomorrow).’
 (*lit.* ‘No problem if it rained tomorrow.’)

(71) *ma-a-macé àni rópta tun.*
 NEG-S:1SG-need 1SG.NOM rain.DEF.ABSL tomorrow
 ‘I don’t need rain.’¹⁶

¹⁵ Hope for an event that may or may not happen is expressed with *pàra*, and a wish for an event that is unlikely to happen or cannot happen is expressed with *peré*.

¹⁶ In (71), *ma-a-macé àni* is normally pronounced as *maamacaaní*, and in (72), *a-sóót-i àni* is normally pronounced as *asóttináání*.

- (72) *a-sóót-i* *àni* *kulè* *kù-roopøn* *tun.*
 PRS.S:1SG-think-IMPV 1SG.NOM CMPL PTCP.S:3SG-rain tomorrow
 ‘I think that it will rain tomorrow.’

Next, (73) shows an example where what the insubordinated conditional with *yèè/yòò* or *ñte/ñto* expresses seems to be the speaker’s wish.

- (73) *ñto* *ka-mííte* *neetó* *yu* *(paantàni).*
 if T.PST.S:3-exist 3SG.NOM here now
 ‘I wish that s/he were here.’ (*lit.* ‘If s/he were here.’)

The addressee interprets the speaker’s utterance as expressing his/her wish that the event would happen now or in the future or would have happened in the past, as shown by the fact that the addressee can respond with ‘I also wish’, as in (74). The addressee may also add a main clause describing an event that might happen as a consequence of the event that the speaker wishes to happen (e.g., (69): (*ñte*) *ká-tapon* [(then) T.PST.S:3-good] ‘(Then) it would be good.’).

- (74) *peré* *ìpo* *àni* *(kulè* *ka-mííte* *neetó* *yu).*
 wish also 1SG.NOM CMPL T.PST.S:3-exist 3SG.NOM here
 ‘I also wish (that s/he were here).’

No matter whether it is the speaker’s hope or the speaker’s wish that the speaker intends the insubordinated conditional with *yèè/yòò* or *ñte/ñto* to express, the addressee might deny the desirability of this event, as in (75). Thus, unlike (69) with *ñte*, ‘Then it will/would be good’, which can be added to (66) or (73) to form a full conditional sentence that expresses that the speaker and the addressee feel the same way, (75) with *ñte* has the opposite meaning to the full conditional sentence formed with it and (66) or (73), and reflects only the addressee’s feelings (specifically, the addressee’s hope/wish for the non-occurrence of the event), not the speaker’s.

- (75) *(ñte)* *ká-miyáát.*
 then T.PST.S:3-bad
 ‘(Then) it would be bad.’

[6] Obligation/need

Below, (76) is an example of the use of the insubordinated conditional to express the speaker's obligation or need to perform the action expressed by the clause (minus the negative prefix).

- (76) *yèè múná-a-sárcí.*
 if NEG-S:1SG-hurry
 'I have to hurry.' (*lit.* 'If I do not hurry.')

Other examples are 'I have to wake up early' (*lit.* 'If I do/did not wake up early') and 'I have to study hard' (*lit.* 'If I do/did not study hard').

In this use, the subject is the first person, and the verb is in the negative. Either of the two types of conditional markers, *yèè/yòò* and *ńte/ńto*, can occur; with *yèè/yòò*, the verb is in the present (1SG: *múná-a-VERB* [NEG-S:1SG-VERB]), whereas with *ńte/ńto*, the verb is in the today past (1SG: *ka-múná-a-VERB* [T.PST-NEG-S:1SG-VERB]). The speaker feels that s/he is in a situation where s/he has to perform the action indicated with the verb form (minus the negative prefix). This use of the insubordinated conditional with *yèè/yòò* or *ńte/ńto* may be employed as internal speech.

Examples of potential responses to (76) are shown in (77)–(88). The addressee may agree with the speaker by saying, for example, (77)–(79), or motivate the speaker to perform the action in question by giving him/her a reason to do it, as in (80). On the other hand, the addressee may assert that the speaker should not or does not have to perform the action, as in (81)–(83), or give a reason that the speaker does not have to do so, as in (84)–(86). The addressee may also propose a possible solution to the speaker's problem, as in (87) and (88).

- (77) *mánta.*
 truly
 'Truly.'
- (78) *Ø-sárcí ní.*
 IMP.S:2SG-hurry 2SG.NOM
 'Hurry!'
- (79) *yème ní Ø-sárcí.*
 have.to 2SG.NOM PTCP.S:2SG-hurry
 'You (SG) have to hurry.'

- (80) *ma-ku-wicikéy mááta.*
 FUT-S:3SG-go.away power
 ‘The power will go out.’
 (For example, the speaker of (76) is working on a computer.)
- (81) *pùriyo, menté (ni) (kulè) a-sarcí.*
 no NEG.IMP.S:2SG 2SG.NOM CMPL PTCP.S:1SG-hurry
 ‘No, do not hurry.’
- (82) *pùriyo, ma-yemé ji Ø-sarcí.*
 no NEG-have.to 2SG.NOM PTCP.S:2SG-hurry
 ‘You (SG) do not have to hurry.’
- (83) *Ø-sut jee réysi.*
 IMP.S:2SG-take REL.SG easy
 ‘Take it easy.’
- (84) *mantée-sot. Ø-pónte ji saawét je yemé/wó.*
 IMP.NEG.S:2SG-think PTCP.S:2SG-have 2SG time REL.SG enough/large
 ‘Do not worry. You (SG) have enough time/a lot of time.’
- (85) *kee-liilenkéy kot.*
 T.PST.S:2SG-become.late much
 ‘You (SG) are too late.’
- (86) *kaa-wúcikéy páásit kej.*
 T.PST.S:3SG-go.away bus already
 ‘The bus is already gone.’
- (87) *àm ne mee-nám/mee-láp pùppukiit?*
 at what NEG.S:2SG-catch/NEG.S:2SG-climb motorcycle.DEF.ABSL
 ‘Why don’t you (SG) take a *booda* (motorcycle taxi)?’
- (88) *ma-a-kwar-ééniŋ àni matáke-mmwaaní pàka*
 FUT-S:1SG-take-O:2SG 1SG.NOM car-1SG.POSS up.to
òfisii-ŋùŋ.
 office.ABSL-2SG.POSS
 ‘I will take you (SG) in my car to your office.’

[7] Warning/threat

The insubordinated conditional can be used by the speaker to express a threat or warning toward the addressee, as in (89).

- (89) *yèè muna-a-yóónte akwék peletét.*
 if NEG.S:2PL-S:2PL-stop 2PL.NOM noise.ABSL
 ‘Stop the noise!’ (*lit.* ‘If you (PL) do not stop the noise.’)

Other examples include ‘Study!’ (*lit.* ‘If you do/did not study’) and ‘Wake up early!’ (*lit.* ‘If you do/did not wake up early’).

In this use, the subject is the second person, and the verb is in the negative (marked with a verb prefix). Either *yèè/yòò* or *nte/nto* can be used here: with *yèè/yòò*, the verb will be in the present (2SG: *mune-VERB* [NEG.S:2SG-VERB]), while with *nte/nto*, it will be in the today past (2SG: *kee-mune-VERB* [T.PST.S:2SG-NEG.S:2SG-VERB]). The speaker warns the addressee to perform the action indicated by the verb form minus the negative prefix.

Possible responses to (89) are in (90)–(97). First, the addressee may interpret the speaker’s utterance as a threat, as is clear from (the use of the verb of threatening in) (90). The addressee may yield to the speaker, as in (91) and (92), apologize to the speaker for not having performed the action earlier, as in (93), or thank the speaker for telling him/her to perform the action, as in (94). On the other hand, the addressee may refuse to accept (or may actively reject) what the speaker said, as in (95)–(97).

- (90) *muna-cee-múyye acék amɲè kee-múyy-ekiyék.*
 NEG.S:1PL-fear 1PL.NOM because T.PST.S:2SG-threaten-O:1PL
 ‘We are not afraid of your (SG) threat.’
 (*lit.* ‘We do not fear because you (SG) threatened us.’)

- (91) *mà-cii-yóónt-e acék pelètèt.*
 FUT-PTCP.S:1PL-stop-IMPV 1PL.NOM noise.ABSL
 ‘We will stop the noise.’

- (92) (*mantéé-sot,*) *ma-ce-šem àcek.*
 NEG.IMP.S:2SG-worry FUT-S:1PL-try 1PL.NOM
 ‘(Do not worry.) We will try.’

- (93) *cì-ku cálat.*
 PRS.S:1PL-COP(*lit.* become) sorry

‘We are sorry.’

- (94) *kèy* *tàpon* *ke-mmwoow-éc* *ni*.
 MEANINGLESS(?) good T.PST.S:2SG-tell-O:1PL 2SG.NOM
 ‘Thank you (SG) for telling us (about that).’

- (95) *mà-cee-céme* *ce* *ke-mmwóww-ec* *ni*.
 NEG-S:1PL-accept REL.PL T.PST.S:2SG-tell-us 2SG.NOM
 ‘We will not accept what you (SG) said.’

- (96) *mà-cì-yooŋt-òy* *acék* *peletét*.
 NEG-S:1PL-stop-REFL 1PL.NOM noise.ABSL
 ‘We will not stop the noise.’

- (97) *mà-nam-ijjí* *(cú/cí)*.
 NEG-matter-2SG.POSS this/that.NOM
 ‘(This/That is) none of your (SG) business (*lit.* not your (SG) matter).’

[8] Hypothetical bad event

Below, (98) is an example of the use of the insubordinated conditional to describe a hypothetical bad event that might have occurred in the past. The speaker feels glad or relieved that the event did not occur (as in (99), without *m̄po* ‘also’).

- (98) *ńto* *ka-múna-ku-laláŋ*.
 if T.PST.S:3SG-NEG.S:3SG-PTCP.S:3SG-stop.raining
 ‘If it had not stopped raining, it would have been bad.’
 (*lit.* ‘If it did not stop raining.’)

Other examples are ‘If it had been sunny every day last week, it would have been bad.’ (*lit.* ‘If it had stopped raining every day last week.’) and ‘If I had not brought the clothes in, it would have been bad (for example, they might have gotten wet in the rain).’ (*lit.* ‘If I had not brought the clothes in.’)

When the insubordinated conditional is used this way, the subject can be any person, but the conditional marker is *ńte/ńto*, not *yèè/yòò*, and the verb is in the today, recent, or distant past, depending on the time of the event. The verb is in the negative if the event actually occurred in the past, and in the affirmative if the event did not occur.

From the conditional clause, the addressee infers a consequence that could have been expressed by a main clause like ‘it would have been bad’. In other words, what this

conditional conveys is that the real situation in the past was good because the hypothetical bad event did not happen.

(98) may be responded to in ways including those given in (99)–(105). That is, the addressee may agree with the speaker, as in (99) and (100), or agree with the speaker with a proviso, as in (101). The addressee may also provide a main clause for a possible specific consequence of the event that might have happened, as in (102)–(105). Note that such a main clause would only optionally contain *ñte* ‘then’, which normally occurs at the beginning of the main clause of the full conditional construction that follows the conditional–main clause order; thus, in order for (102)–(105) to form a full conditional sentence with (98), *ñte* ‘then’ is necessary.

- (99) *à-yikú* *àni* *(m̀po)* *ɲarakát*
 PRS.S:1SG-COP(*lit.* become) 1SG.NOM also glad
kulè *káá-lalóŋ*.
 CMPL T.PST.S:3SG-stop.raining
 ‘I’m (also) glad that it stopped raining.’
- (100) *cee-pónt-e* *kùpeyok*.
 PRS.S:1PL-have-IMPFV luck
 ‘We are lucky.’
- (101) *èè,* *ñteené* *roptà* *kulè,* *tapón* *àm* *kaapatíšiyèt*.
 yes but rain.ABSL TOP good for farming
 ‘Yes, but the rain is good for farming.’
- (102) *(ñte)* *mùna-woo* *ká*.
 then NEG.S:1SG-go home
 ‘(Then) I would not have gone home.’
- (103) *(ñte)* *múna* *ci-pè* *wo-coom-ííše*.
 then NEG PL-go go-eat-INTR
 ‘(Then) we would not have been able to go to eat.’
- (104) *(ñte)* *kà-ci-púúr-e* *ká*.
 then T.PST-S:1PL-stay-IMPFV home
 ‘(Then) we would have stayed home.’

- (108) *ma-a-múú-c-e*.
 NEG-S:1SG-may-IMPV
 ‘I may not be.’ (*lit.* ‘I cannot be.’)
- (109) *a-sóót-i* *àni* *kulè*
 PRS.S:1SG-think-IMPV 1SG.NOM CMPL
à-yikú/m-à-yikú *solwò*.
 PRS.S:1SG-COP(*lit.* become)/NEG-PRS.S:1SG-COP(*lit.* become) fool
 ‘I think that I am/am not a fool.’
- (110) *ma-a-sóót-i* *àni* *kulè*
 NEG-PRS.S:1SG-think-IMPV 1SG.NOM CMPL
à-yikú *solwò*.
 PRS.S:1SG-COP(*lit.* become) fool
 ‘I do not think that I am a fool.’

4.2. The insubordinated conditional construction with *nto yèè*

4.2.1. Types of situations where the insubordinated conditional with *nto yèè* is used

There are four types of situations where the insubordinated conditional with *nto yèè* is used, as shown in Table 5.

Table 5: Relations between the meaning of the insubordinated conditional clause with *nto yèè* and a set of factors

	Meaning	Speaker’s evaluation: positive/negative for whom	Person of subject	Tense of verb
[1]	‘What if ...?’	neutral	any person	T.PST
[2]	Advice/suggestion	positive for addressee(s)	2	T.PST
[3]	Suggestion to 1PL (inclusive of addressee)	positive for 1PL (inclusive of addressee)	1PL (inclusive of addressee)	T.PST
[4]	Making an offer	positive for speaker(s)	1	T.PST

Examples of the insubordinated conditional with *nto yèè* as used for [1] (‘What if ...?’) and for [2] (advice/suggestion) are shown in (111) and (112), respectively.

- (111) *nto* *yéé* *kà-co* *né* *yu ?*
 if if T.PST.S:3-come 3SG.NOM here
 ‘What if s/he comes here?’ (*lit.* ‘If if s/he came here.’)

- (112) *̀̀to* *yèè* *kéé-rú* *paantápi ?*
 if if T.PST.S:2SG-sleep now
 ‘What if you (SG) sleep now?’ (*lit.* ‘If if you (SG) sleep now?’)

As mentioned in section 3.3.2, the full *̀̀to yèè* construction is limited to use as a rhetorical question with *múú* ‘can’, and the main clause cannot be elided from it to form an insubordinated clause. Conversely, because the insubordinated conditional with *̀̀to yèè* is not used as a rhetorical question, it is impossible to add a main clause to it to form a full conditional sentence, regardless of the sense in which it is used. For example, (113), (114), and (115) are all ungrammatical:

- (113) **ma-ku-tok* *ne* *̀̀to* *yee* *kà-co*
 FUT-PTCP.S:3-happen what if if T.PST.S:3-come
né *yu ?*
 3SG.NOM here
to mean, ‘What will happen if s/he comes here?’ (*lit.* ‘If if s/he came here.’)¹⁷

- (114) **̀̀to* *yèè* *kéé-rú* *paantápi,* *tápon.*
 if if T.PST.S:2SG-sleep now good
to mean, ‘If you (SG) sleep now, it will be good.’ (*lit.* ‘If if you (SG) sleep now, it will be good.’)

- (115) **̀̀to* *yèè* *kéé-rú* *paantápi,* *tápoon-i.*
 if if T.PST.S:2SG-sleep now good-Q
to mean, ‘If you (SG) sleep now, will it be good?’ (*lit.* ‘If if you (SG) sleep now, will it be good?’)

Thus, this insubordinated conditional does not constitute an omission of a main clause, regardless of its use.

4.2.2. Examples of the insubordinated conditional with *̀̀to yèè* and possible responses to it

This section presents data on the uses of the insubordinated conditional with *̀̀to yèè* and possible responses to it in each use.

¹⁷ In order to express the intended meaning here, either *yèè/yòò* or *̀̀te/̀̀to*, instead of *̀̀to yèè*, has to be used.

When the *nto yèè* construction is used for any of [2]–[4] in Table 5, the response can be *èè* ‘yes’ or *pùriyo* ‘no’; in contrast, when this construction is used for [1] (‘What if ...?’), the response cannot be either of these.

[1] ‘What if ...?’

An example where the *nto yèè* construction is used to convey the meaning ‘What if ...?’ is given in (111). Other examples include ‘What if I sleep now?’ (*lit.* ‘If if I slept now’), ‘What if I fall down?’ (*lit.* ‘If if I fell down’), and ‘What if s/he becomes sick?’ (*lit.* ‘If if s/he became sick’).

In this use, the subject can be any person, and the verb is in the today past. The *nto yèè* construction in this use expresses ‘what if ...?’ That is, the speaker asks the addressee what will happen if the event expressed by the construction minus *nto yèè* occurs in the future. (However, the *nto yèè* construction used this way may also have another interpretation matching one of the other uses.)

The *nto yèè* construction, when used this way, constitutes a WH-question. Thus, it cannot be answered with either *èè* ‘yes’ or *pùriyo* ‘no’, as mentioned above. The addressee is expected to give some other kind of answer, though simple *tapon* ‘good’ or *miyáát* ‘bad’ remain possible answers. Examples are shown in (116) and (117). In these examples, it may seem as if the addressee were continuing or completing the speaker’s unfinished conditional by providing what appears to be a main clause. Similar to the responses to the insubordinated conditional with *yèè/yòò* or *nte/nto* shown above (e.g., (69), (75), and (102) – (105)), here, *nte* ‘then’, which normally occurs at the beginning of the main clause of a full conditional construction following subordinate–main clause order, is optionally used in the addressee’s response. However, unlike the responses to the insubordinated conditional with *yèè/yòò* or *nte/nto*, (116) and (117) cannot form full conditional sentences with (111), because the *nto yèè* construction, which is restricted in use as described in section 3.3.2 above, does not take *nte* ‘then’ at the beginning of its main clause.

(116) (*nte*) *ká-tapón/ká-miyaát.*
 then T.PST.S:3SG-good/T.PST.S:3SG-bad
 ‘(Then) it would be good/bad.’

(117) (*nte*) *ma-a-ηarec* *àni.*
 then FUT-S:1SG-be.happy 1SG.NOM
 ‘(Then) I will be happy.’

- (120) (*èè*) *cì-pe* (*sáŋ*).
 yes OPT.S:1PL-go.PL outside
 ‘(Yes,) let us go (outside).’
- (121) *ka-a-càm* *àni*.
 T.PST-S:1SG-agree/like 1SG.NOM
 ‘I agree.’
- (122) *mà-à-càme* *àni*.
 NEG-PRS.S:1SG-agree/like 1SG.NOM
 ‘I do not agree.’
- (123) *mà-à-càme/à-teyé* *àni* *ce*
 NEG-PRS.S:1SG-agree/PRS.S:1SG-dislike 1SG.NOM REL.PL
ke-mmwóów-o *ni*.
 T.PST.S:2SG-say-O:1SG 2SG.NOM
 ‘I do not agree with/I dislike what you (SG) said to me.’
- (124) (a) *a-cem-cíntoos* / (b) *a-ta-cíntos* (*àni*)
 PRS.S:1SG-agree-together/PRS.S:1SG-disagree-together 1SG.NOM
akóó *ni*.
 with 2SG.ABSL
 ‘I (a) agree/(b) disagree with you (SG).’
- (125) (*èè*) *kee-sót* (*ni*) *tapón*.
 yes T.PST.S:2SG-think 2SG.NOM well
 ‘(Yes,) it is a good idea (*lit.* you (SG) thought well).’
- (126) *mà-para* *àni* *á-wo* *sáŋ*.
 NEG-hope 1SG.NOM PTCP.S:1SG-go outside
 ‘I don’t feel like going outside.’

[4] Making an offer

Similar to the insubordinated conditional with *yèè/yòò* or *nte/nto*, the *nto yèè* insubordinated conditional construction can also be used by the speaker to offer to perform an action for the addressee, as in (127).

obtain full data on what set of responses are possible and impossible to a particular use of an insubordinated conditional.

There are two types of responses to an insubordinated conditional that can help us understand its meaning in a particular situation. First, the addressee may describe what behavior the speaker has engaged in or what emotion the speaker has expressed with the utterance containing the insubordinated conditional. For example, the addressee might say such things as in (128).

- (128) ‘You are doing X’: e.g., (17), (38)
 ‘You did X’: e.g., (90)
 ‘your doing X’: e.g., (31)
 ‘Do not do X’: e.g., (34), (39)
 ‘I also do X’: e.g., (67), (68), (74)
 ‘I also feel Y’: e.g., (99)

In such cases, it is clear that the addressee believes that with what the speaker said, the s/he engaged in behavior X or expressed feeling Y. The use of a particular verb in the addressee’s response (e.g. ‘fulfill’ in (18) and (19)) may also be a clue to the understanding of the speaker’s intended meaning.

Second, the native speaker consultant as a hypothetical addressee may also provide a response to an insubordinated conditional in a particular situation that is usually given to another construction expressing the same meaning as that insubordinated conditional. For example, (56)–(65), which can be used as a response to the speaker’s offer expressed with the insubordinated conditional with *yèè/yòò* or *ñte/ñto*, as in (55), or the insubordinated conditional with *ñto yèè*, as in (127), can also serve as a response to other constructions for offering (e.g., footnote 14). Whether the response can be *èè* ‘yes’ or *pùriyo* ‘no’ also distinguishes the ‘What if ...?’ use of the insubordinated conditional with *ñto yèè* from the other uses of this conditional and from all the uses of the insubordinated conditional with *yèè/yòò* or *ñte/ñto*.

Thus, while one can certainly ask a native speaker directly about the meaning of a construction, the (im)possible responses to it elicited from him/her can also help understand it. Furthermore, there are cases where only by eliciting responses to an insubordinated conditional by a native speaker can data be obtained — for instance, for utterances given in internal speech (the insubordinated conditional with *yèè/yòò* or *ñte/ñto* as used for an obligation or need of the speaker’s in [6] or as a self-addressed polar question in [9]), which would not otherwise be recordable.

5.2. Historical development of the insubordinated conditional constructions in Kupsapiny

The insubordinated conditional with *ñto yèè* seems to be more conventionalized than the insubordinated conditional with *yèè/yòò* or *ñte/ñto*. One could therefore hypothesize that the former is at a later stage of development than the latter. Unlike the insubordinated conditional with *yèè/yòò* or *ñte/ñto*, to which a main clause can be added to form a full conditional sentence as long as it is used for one of [1]–[8] in Table 4, the insubordinated conditional with *ñto yèè* in any of its uses can never recover a main clause to be added to it to form a full conditional sentence. Thus, the insubordinated conditional with *yèè/yòò* or *ñte/ñto* seems to be at stage (b) or (c) in (1), where it is possible to recover a main clause that expresses the very abstract notions of ‘good’ or ‘bad’, whereas the insubordinated conditional with *ñto yèè* appears to be at stage (d), where it is impossible to do so.

It must further be noted, however, that although there is a full construction with *ñto yèè* (discussed in section 3.3.2), it is not clear whether the (non-full) conditional construction with *ñto yèè*, which the present study has regarded as an insubordinated construction, is really an insubordinated construction, because it cannot recover a main clause to form a full conditional sentence — actually, there is no evidence that it was ever insubordinated from the full construction. It may even be that what appears to be an insubordinated conditional with *ñto yèè* actually developed from the insubordinated conditional with *yèè/yòò* or *ñte/ñto*, rather than from the full construction with *ñto yèè*. Instead, the full construction with *ñto yèè* (e.g., (11), (12)) is limited in use, as discussed in section 3.3.2, and could be regarded as a juxtaposition of what looks like the *ñto yèè* construction and a rhetorical question with *muuc* ‘can’. In short, the development of the (non-full) conditional construction with *ñto yèè* needs further investigation.

5.3. Mismatches between the syntactic and discourse relations of insubordinated constructions

Across various languages, Evans (2007: 367–368) shows that it is very difficult to draw a sharp line between the syntactic and discourse relations of insubordinated constructions — the unit of a message may not be a single clause or construction formed by one speaker, but instead a larger discourse. The present study also supports this insight.

In many cases, the unit of a message is a single clause or construction formed by one speaker.

First, when an insubordinated conditional that is conventionalized enough to constitute an independent message occurs without any main clause, it can serve as the unit of a message by itself, even though it seems to be syntactically dependent. Second, the

message may be formed jointly by both the speaker and the addressee. When the insubordinated conditional with *ñte/ñto* as used for a hypothetical bad event in the past (e.g., (98)) is followed by a main clause provided by the addressee (e.g., (102)–(105)) and the speaker’s and addressee’s intended meanings match, the unit of the message seems to be the full conditional sentence formed by the speaker and the addressee together.

There are cases where the sharp line between the syntactic and discourse relations is more unclear. Even when the speaker’s and the addressee’s intended meanings do match each other, the full conditional sentence may lack *ñte* ‘then’, which normally occurs in the full conditional construction with *ñte/ñto* — thus, in such a case, the full conditional sentence formed by the speaker and the addressee without *ñte* is not perfectly grammatical, and cannot be regarded as a syntactic unit.

Moreover, when the *ñto yèè* insubordinated conditional construction, whose completed counterpart requires the main clause to be a rhetorical question with *múúç* ‘can’, is used for ‘What if ... ?’ (e.g., (111)), the addressee may provide an answer to the question with a consequence clause (e.g., (116) and (117)). Such a consequence clause does not form a syntactic unit with the *ñto yèè* insubordinated conditional, because it cannot form a full conditional sentence with the *ñto yèè* insubordinated conditional, though it could form a full conditional sentence with a *yèè/yòò* or *ñte/ñto* conditional clause.

Furthermore, there are cases where the speaker’s and the addressee’s intended meanings do not match even when the addressee provides a main clause for a insubordinated conditional (e.g., (75) as an answer to (66)), with the result that a full conditional sentence is formed. In such cases, the insubordinated conditional is a single message unit that the speaker intends to convey, while the insubordinated conditional plus the main clause provided by the addressee constitutes another larger message unit.

6. Conclusion

This paper showed that Kupsapiny has two types of what seem to be insubordinated conditionals, one with either *yèè/yòò* or *ñte/ñto* and the other with *ñto yèè*, and that the meaning of either type of insubordinated conditional used in a specific kind of context can be identified by looking at what responses are possible to it. It also showed that the insubordinated conditional with *ñto yèè* seems to be more conventionalized than the insubordinated conditional with *yèè/yòò* or *ñte/ñto*.

Although the present study gave some information on the respective politeness of the uses of the insubordinated constructions in section 4, it has not been able to provide sufficient data on what Evans (1993) calls “social placedness conditions” (conditions on what does and does not constitute appropriate relations between conversation participants in contexts where a particular type of construction can be used) and “discourse placedness

conditions” (conditions involving the presuppositions of conversation participants when a particular type of construction is used). These are aspects of insubordinated constructions that need to be further investigated.

Acknowledgments

I would like to express my profound thanks to my Kupsapiny native speaker consultants, especially Chebet Francis, Mercy Chebet, and Chemitay Joyce for the data. I am also grateful to the audiences at my presentations of early versions of the present paper at the Second International Workshop on Cross-Linguistic Studies on Clause Combining on November 12, 2011 and at one of the research group meetings on Typological Studies of Information Structures and Linguistic Forms in Africa on December 17, 2011, both at the Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies. My sincere thanks also go to the anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments. The present study was supported by a Grant-in-Aid for Scientific-Research Program (B) sponsored by the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (Kaken Research Project Number: 24320073, principal investigator: Osamu Hieda).

Abbreviations

1	First person	INTR	Intransitivizer
2	Second person	NEG	Negative
3	Third person	NOM	Nominative
ABSL	Absolute	O	Object
CMPL	Complementizer	OPT	Optative
COP	Copula	PL	Plural
D.PST	Distant past	POSS	Possessive
DEF	Definite	PRS	Present
EP	Epenthesis	PTCP	Participle
FUT	Future	R.PST	Recent past
IMP	Imperative	REFL	Reflexive
IMPERS	Impersonal	REL	Relative
IMPFV	Imperfective	Q	Question marker
INDEF	Indefinite	S	Subject

SG	Singular	TOP	Topic
T.PST	Today past		

References

- Dixon, R. M. W. 1994. *Ergativity*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Evans, Nicholas. 1993. "Code, inference, placedness and ellipsis". In William A. Foley (ed.) *The Role of Theory in Linguistic Descriptions*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter. pp.243-279.
- . 2007. "Insubordination and its uses". In Irina Nikolaeva (ed.) *Finiteness: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations*. New York: Oxford University Press. pp.366-431.
- Heine, Bernd, Ulrike Claudi, and Friederike Hünemeyer. 1991. *Grammaticalization: A Conceptual Framework*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Heine, Bernd, and Mechthild Reh. 1984. *Grammaticalization and Reanalysis in African Languages*. Hamburg: Helmut Buske.
- Kawachi, Kazuhiro. 2014. "Patterns of expressing motion events in Kupsapiny". In Osamu Hieda (ed.) *Recent Advances in Nilotic Linguistics* (Studies in Nilotic Linguistics Vol. 8). Tokyo: Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies. pp.103-136.
- König, Christa. 2006. "Marked nominative in Africa". *Studies in Language* 30.4. pp.655-732.
- . 2008. *Case in Africa*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ladefoged, Peter, Ruth Glick, and Clive Criper. 1968. *Language in Uganda*. London and Nairobi: Oxford University Press.
- Larsen, Iver. 1991. "Sabaot noun classification". In Franz Rottland and Lucia N. Omondi. (eds.) *Proceedings of the Third Nilo-Saharan Linguistics Colloquium: Kisumu, Kenya, August 4-9, 1986*. Hamburg: Helmut Buske. pp.143-164.