Article

An analysis of linguistic choices in Kalenjin narratives relating to protection of animals

Prisca C. Simotwo
Moi University, Kenya
E-mail: psimotwo2@gmail.com

Abstract

This paper investigates Kalenjin discourses to find out how language is used to promote the protection of animals among community members. Accordingly, a sampled Kalenjin folk narrative is analysed to examine how verbs, active voice constructions and rhetorical questions are used with the aim of protecting animals, within Stibbe's framework of ecological philosophy (ecosophy) and Fairclough's approach to critical discourse analysis (CDA). Purposive sampling was used to identify the story which is popular among the community members and has indications about animal discourse. Findings indicate that verbs and embedded material processes, active voice constructions and agency, as well as rhetorical questions and mental processes are used by oral folk story composers as community educators to convey their environmental values and beliefs which discourage anthropocentrism. The study concludes that language forms in Kalenjin narratives aid in the protection of animals.

Keywords: Kalenjin narratives, linguistic forms, protection, animals, ecosophy, CDA.

1. Introduction

A major concern for ecolinguists in the anthropocene era (Brown, 2017), noted especially in the twenty-first century, is the effect of negative human actions that reduce the quality of the environment. The development of the field of ecolinguistics has provided several theoretical and analytical tools useful in understanding the ways language is involved in the destruction of the environment (Fill, 2001; Mühlhäusler, 2003; Stibbe, 2012, 2015; Harré *et al.,* 1999). Specifically, samples of studies on the effects of language on non-human species include Stibbe (2012), Brown (2017), and Fusari (2018), among others. The broad aspect

is that our lexical and grammatical choices shape the world, including the ecological reality, in which we live; or as Halliday (2001: 185) claims, "language does not correspond; it construes". According to Shapiro (1995, as cited in Brown, 2017), there are various ways by which humans construe non-human animals. Humans are distanced from animals by semantically excluding humans from the condition of being animals. For Stibbe (2001), another way humans distance themselves from non-human animals is through lexical distinctions that treat humans and non-human animals as belonging to different categories even though the underlying reality is the same; dead human bodies, for example, are referred to as 'corpses' while dead non-human bodies are referred to as 'carcasses'.

1.1. Background studies on how language constructs the human-animal relationship

Numerous studies that aid in revealing the many ways in which language constructs a human relationship with animals have been carried out by ecolinguists in the last few years. Stibbe (2012) analyses the use of language across a variety of discourses to establish how language forms patterns of thought that distance human beings from non-human animals. The data include the language used by animal product industries, animal rights movements, ecological reports, newspapers, textbooks, haiku poetry, and contemporary children's animated films. The findings indicate that hidden ideologies embedded in these discourses construct animals as objects, machines, resources for human exploitation, or passive victims. Further results suggest that, in addition to the growing rate of inequality, the effects of climate change, loss of biodiversity, people's alienation from nature and loss of community life are bringing into question the fundamental stories that industrial societies are based on (Stibbe, 2012). Furthermore, he notes that animal species are disappearing, vanishing, dying out, not just in the physical sense of becoming extinct, but in the sense of being erased from our consciousness. Stibbe (*op cit*) concludes by considering the ecological implications of the erasure of animals, arguing that it is necessary to reconnect with the reality of animals if we are to build human systems which work in tandem with, rather than against, nature.

Brown (2017) investigates monolingual English learner's dictionaries, firstly to find out if the use of the relative pronoun 'who' with animal antecedents in reference materials for English as an Additional Language (EAL) is treated as acceptable. Secondly, he attempts to establish whether such a construction appears in EAL reading materials, and particularly EAL graded readers; and thirdly to find out what implications the findings may have for EAL pedagogy and ecolinguistic awareness in EAL contexts. The paper mainly focuses on functional lexico-grammatical choices which shape or construe the representation of non-human animals in EAL materials, regardless of a text's theme or content. The findings indicate that the English learner's dictionaries did not allow the use of the relative pronoun 'who' with animal antecedents; however, it was noted in the graded readers. Also, in the context of teaching and learning EAL, many course books and other materials now contain content or themes that are explicitly focused on ecological issues, even though attention to the way seemingly mundane EAL topics affect, and are affected by, ecology has been

lacking.

Fusari (2018) presents a diachronic study of the discursive representation of animals. The paper uses the CDA approach and aims at tracking the main changes noted in Canadian English expressions that have affected the use of the word 'animal' during the period 1921-2011. Data are composed of a corpus of Canadian English, the Strathy Corpus. The corpus is used as a source of examples to investigate changing patterns of word context and usage. In this analysis, the author mainly concentrates on dichotomies (e.g., 'animals' vs. 'humans' vs. 'plants') and other phraseologies that emerge consistently from corpus data. The study employs corpus-assisted discourse analysis to identify meaningful patterns of lexis and grammar, which are not easily seen through simple reading and critical discourse analysis (Fairclough, 1995), to interpret the relevance of the identified linguistic patterns to social change. Results indicate the presence of 'human/animal' dichotomies, metaphors which indicate that some animals are consistently represented as symbols of Canada as a nation, and secondly, that new patterns in discourse about animals have been noted recently in response to climate change.

In conclusion, all the above studies indicate that language choice aids in the destruction of the environment. However, in the current study, the analysed data show otherwise. Verbs, the active voice, and questions are used by the Kalenjin to aid in the protection of the physical and biological environment. This paper is specifically interested in how the protection of animals is conveyed by the Kalenjin discourses.

1.2. Kalenjin folk narratives

Kalenjin folk narratives are the community's discourses about events that relate to aspects of social life. The Kalenjin are highland Nilotes and are made up of eight ethnic groups that are culturally and linguistically related. They include Nandi, Keiyo, Kipsigis, Tugen, Marakwet, Sabaot, Pokot, and Terik. Storytelling sessions were a common phenomenon that the Kalenjin employed for several purposes, among which was the protection of animals. According to Kipkorir (1985: 37), children frequently told each other stories, especially at night. Besides, children acquired traditional ecological knowledge (TEK), as portrayed by Holis (1909) who has written extensively on the community. These teachings were conveyed orally from generation to generation through the communities' folk stories, which served several purposes and functions. According to Kipkorir (1985), one of the main tasks of folk narratives was to pass the oral traditions of the community to the next generation. Since, according to Chesaina (1991), the oral narratives result from the community's day-to-day experiences and reflect the world view of that particular community, a study of the community's stories can inform us of the nature of the natural environment in which the population lived. This therefore means that the values and beliefs of the Kalenjin stories can be identified alongside the use of language forms, to aid in exposing the relationship between language, discourse participants, and protection of animals.

2. Theoretical framework

Two theories were used to guide the current study. The first was Stibbe's (2015) framework of ecological philosophy (ecosophy). According to Stibbe (2015: 11), "all critical language analysts have an ethical framework that they use for evaluating the language they are analysing, whether or not it is made explicit". The ecosophy adopted for the study by the researcher and which guided the identification of what accounted as data is 'protection'. The theoretical frame consists of values of protection, care, concern, empathy, consideration, valuing animals and allowing them to thrive by not encroaching on their typical habitats, allowing them to look for food and water without human interference, and allowing young animals to thrive and to grow to maturity in their natural habitat for their well-being and benefit.

The second theory adopted was Fairclough's (1989, 1995, 2003) Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) approach. Fairclough's theory of CDA based on the three stages of description, interpretation, and explanation (1989: 91) was used; dimensions which are indispensable for discourse analysis (Fairclough, 1992: 72). A description is a "detailed linguistic analysis to reveal patterns in the way that language is used within and across the texts" (Stibbe, 2015: 34). Fairclough (1989: 22) postulates that what one sees in a text, what one regards as worth describing, and what one chooses to emphasise in the description, are all dependent on how one interprets a text. Therefore, to identify the language forms, the theory requires reading of the discourses repeatedly and in detail against the background of this analytic perspective (Wood & Kroger, 2000). Since the study sought to find out how language is used to aid in the protection or destruction of the environment, what was settled on are grammatical choices which have experiential, relational, and expressive value. To get them, we were guided by the questions provided by Fairclough (1989: 92-93) which targeted processes and agency, both essential aspects of this study as the process of protection or destruction has to do with material processes and agency. Experiential value is a trace of the producer's experience of the natural and social world and has to do with contents and knowledge, in addition to beliefs (Fairclough, *op cit*). The last levels involve the processes of interpretation and explanation. Fairclough (1989) recommends that interpretation should be complemented with an explanation. Interpretation focuses on "linguistic features which combine together to tell stories about the world" (Stibbe, 2015: 34), while explanation involves explaining what is being done in the discourse and how the discourse is structured or organised in such a way that it performs various functions and achieves various effects or consequences (Wood & Kroger, 2000: 95). Interpretation and explanation are, therefore, seen as the two procedures of uncovering and exposing the hidden stories; the analyst is in the position of offering interpretations of complex and invincible relationships (Fairclough, 1989: 22).

3. Methodology

The data for the study was a Kalenjin community's popular folk narrative titled *Anyiny kopo*

tiony kong'wan kopo chii (An act is painless when directed at animals but painful when directed at humans), also titled by some of the narrators as *Tandoos kopo moso ko ng'wan kopo chii* (An act is sweet like music when directed at a baboon but painful when directed at humans) (See Appendix 1). The story has it that a long time ago a man who was out in the forest to perform his usual errands stumbled upon a baby baboon that had been left by its mother under a tree by the riverside, while she went up the tree to pluck fruits for it. We are further told that on seeing the baby baboon, the man got very excited and immediately picked it up to take it to his home for his child to play with it. On arriving home, the story has it that the man handed over the baby baboon to his child who then played with it as his father had wanted. The playing involved throwing, tossing, pulling and dragging the baby baboon along the ground until it eventually died.

The narrative was purposively sampled. According to Leedy and Ormrod (2001: 219), purposive sampling involves choosing a unit for a particular purpose. The purpose was to identify the community concerns about the protection of animals, to determine the language forms employed in the narrative, and to establish how the language forms are used to aid in the protection of animals. The qualitative approach was opted for, since descriptive design studies, according to Mugenda (2008), are commonly used when examining social issues that exist in any given community. The current research is concerned with a social problem – the destruction of animal life. The narrative was transcribed and translated into English. It adopted the broad approach to transcription as opposed to a narrow one; a broad transcription is a less detailed one, while a narrow one is detailed (Wray & Bloomer, 2006: 180). For example, it was not found necessary to include the phonetic details like diacritics to indicate the exact articulatory position or ways of making a sound as they would have led to more information not essential for the study. The words were written as they were heard, ensuring that they were accurate.

In preparation for data analysis, the identified story was first read carefully to identify the parts containing embedded discourses on animals properly. Any words that mentioned anything about the human-animal relationship were highlighted. These were the "Greenspeak" parts (Harré *et al.*, 1999) that contained the expected lexical and grammatical items as well as structures that were to be used in the analysis. They were gathered and categorised, then numbered for ease of reference. The parameters used to decide which parts to consider ecological and which sections not to were guided by Stibbe's (2015) ecological philosophy (ecosophy).

4. Discussion

The narrative under analysis is an example of stories which use grammatical forms that aid in criticising actions that lead to the wanton harm to animals. In the section that follows, the grammatical structures that refer to the human-animal relationship are identified and discussed. These include verbs, the active voice, and questions. After that, we discuss how the identified language forms aid in the protection of animals.

4.1. Verbs

Verbs denoting human's actions directed at animals are noted in the narrative *Anyiny kopo tiony kong'wan kopo chii* (An act is painless when directed at animals but painful when directed at humans). The verbs are highlighted in bold as exemplified in Extract 1 below:

Extract 1

(1) ***Kiip*** *as kaa iman chichoo*   The man actually **took** home
(2) *lakwet ap moset*   the baby baboon
(3) *Ko***supi** *kamet let...*   while its mother **followed** behind...
(4) *Ip***kokooito** *lakwap moset chichikai.*   He **gave out** the baby baboon.

In line (1), the verb *kiip* (took) tells the listener about the action of *chichoo* (the man) noted in line (1), who was involved in the act of taking *lakwet ap moset* (the baby baboon) indicated in line (2) to his home and giving it to *lakwenyi* (his child). This man takes *lakwet ap moset* (the baby baboon) to his home from the forest which is its usual, conducive and natural habitat and gives it to his child. Forcefully removing the baby baboon from its habitat is a harmful practice that poses a risk to the young animal as it is delinked from the animal family and is introduced to a human one. As a result, it is denied a sense of belonging. Another destructive act is noted in line (4) through the phrase *ipkokooito lakwap moset* (he gave out the baby baboon). Here, the baby baboon is treated as a commodity owned by an individual who handles it as he wishes, as further supported by the choice of the verb *kiip* in line (1).

Opting to use the verb *kiip* (took) instead of the alternative *kiimut* indicates the speaker's desire to further represent the man as a destructive person with a bad attitude towards animals. The verb *kiip* (take along) is used in reference to the taking along of an object, for example *kiip lolet kaa* (s/he took the bag home); while *kiimut* (take along) is used in reference to the taking along the child of a domestic animal and also wild animals when they are sick or weak due to injury. For example, the young one of an elephant is *lakwet ap peliot*, that of a lion is *lakwet ap ng'etundo*, that of a cow *moita*, while that of a goat and sheep is *warwet*. If for one reason or another, any of these young animals were to be carried by a human being to be taken to a certain place for whatever reason, the verb to use would be *kiimut* and not *kiip* animal, for example. The Kalenjin are nomads and it was common to see them assisting the calves when they were unable to walk for long distances in search of pasture. If a lion was killed for threatening the lives of the herders, its young one was not left to die but was carried to a place where it was deemed likely to survive. If the animal was walking on its own and was being herded to a particular place, one would say *kikweri*, and not *kiip*. Therefore, the narrator's use of the verb *kiip* in reference to the baboon is to represent the man as seeing the baboon as a being without much value. Such an attitude towards the baboon is further described through the verbs in the following extract:

Extract 2

(5)	*Ko**kooch** lakwenyi ko**urerenee***	he gave it to his child **to play with**
(6)	***Kiurerenee** as nikapochito*	the human child then **played with**
(7)	*nikapomoset*	the baby baboon
(8)	*ko**par**.*	and **killed** it.

In line (5), the verb *kokooch lakwenyi* (gave) and *kourerenee* (play with) further indicate the man's insensitive treatment of the baby baboon. The man treats the baby baboon as an object which he hands over to *lakwenyi* (his child) to use as a play item. He plays with it as we see through the verb *kiurerenee* (he played with it) which confirms that the child used it as a play item. The effect of these actions on the baby baboon is its death seen through the verb *kopar* (killed) in line (8) (to avoid repetition we discuss this verb further below after line (12) of Extract 3 where the same verb is noted). More verbs that mark human's harmful actions towards animals are seen in the following excerpt:

Extract 3

(9)	*Ki**wiir-toi**, Ke**taltooli** lakwet ap*	It is **thrown** and **tossed** about by
(10)	*chito lakwani ka pomoset, ko**chuut***	the man's child. He **pulled** and
(11)	*kotokchi kok, ko**ng'irir**tot eng' yoo.*	**dragged** it all over the compound.

In these examples, we note that the playing mentioned in Extract 2 is in fact the child's rough actions towards the baboon, demonstrated through the verbs *kiwiirtoi* (thrown about) and *ketaltooli* (tossed about) in line (9), *kochuut* (pull) in line (10), and *kong'irirtot* (drag along) in line (11). These verbs suggest rough treatment of the baby baboon and mark the destructive nature of the man's child that results in the suffering and death of the baboon, which as we mentioned earlier is seen in line (8), and also line (12) below:

Extract 4

(12) *Kiki**par** lakwana po moset…*	The baby baboon was **kill**ed…

In example (12) the verb in bold *kikipar* (it was killed), also seen in example (8) *kopar* (and killed it), indicates the death of the baby baboon as a result of the child's rough actions represented by the verbs in Extract 3 above which imply the use of the baboon as an object. This use is the wanton killing of animals, which is destructive, undesirable, and must be discouraged by all means. Since baboons are harmless beings, they are supposed to be allowed to thrive; as stated earlier, they must not be treated as non-living things that do not have value. Besides, for the Kalenjin community, the baboon (*Moset*) is the totem of one of the community's clans: the Kibiegen clan (Holis, 1909: 5) and it is thus considered an abomination to kill it. The killing of young animals is not only destructive to life but has further negative consequences for other animals as seen through the verbs in Extract 5

below:

Extract 5

    (13) **kokeree** *kityo kamet.*   as its mother **watched** helplessly
    (14) *Kwo moset ko***rirooti**   the baboon **went away crying**

In line (13), the phrase *kokeree kityo kamet* (while the mother watched helplessly) constructs the baboon as a helpless being that is incapable of acting to save her child. However, it also suggests the mother baboon's distress, anguish, suffering, self-pity and misery, all emotions which are unnecessary as her baby's death which was facilitated by the man was wanton and could have been avoided. In line (14), we see another effect of the killing of the baby baboon on its mother through the phrase *kwo moset korirooti* (the baboon went away crying). This verb indicates the unhappiness, pain, hopelesness, and trauma that the mother baboon experiences. All these are emotions that prove that animals, just like human beings, feel intense despair when their offsprings are killed. This idea is supported by Stibbe (2012) who states that animals have intelligence, feelings, and mental lives and act in the world pursuing their purposes for their individual needs. They must, therefore, be allowed to remain in their habitats to fend for themselves.

    In this section, we have seen that verbs are used to represent people's actions towards animals to facilitate criticising them and in this way, use the narrative to teach the importance of caring for animals. The verbs serve to indicate the events in the fabula and the story. According to Fairclough (2003: 83), "the fabula is the 'material or content that is worked into a story', a 'series of logically and chronologically related events'", while "the story is a fabula that is presented in a certain manner" – this involves the arrangement of events in a sequence providing the social agents of actual events with 'distinct traits' which transform them into 'characters' and focalises the story in terms of a particular 'point of view'. According to him, the fabula is summed up in terms of their actual chronological order which can be deduced from the story: a man who was in the forest on his errands takes a baby baboon to his home from the forest, he gives it to his child to play with it, the child kills it, the mother baboon takes the human child from his home, takes it up the tree, she plays with it (playing here is pinching) and throws it down the tree, and it dies. The story places events in a chronological sequence. In the folk narrative *Anyiny kopo tiony kong'wan kopo chii* (An act is painless when directed at animals but painful when directed at humans), the representation of the activities of the man and his son precede those of the treatment of the human child by the baboon. The sequence is thus the man's and his son's bad treatment of the baboon, which leads to its death and, as a result, the baboon treats the human child in a similar manner and the human child dies. These sequential features focalise the story in terms of the treatment of humans who kill animals for no reason and as a result, we can conclude that it is the moral lesson that the story desires to pass across to the listener. The narrative text is spoken.

4.2. Material processes

The verbs used in the narrative under analysis represent the actions of the man and his son as material processes. According to Machin and Mayr (2012: 106), material processes describe processes of doing, and they are usually concrete actions that have a material result or consequence. We saw earlier that the man removes the baby baboon from the forest, takes it to his home to his son who plays with it and kills it. The actions of the man and his son are concrete actions as they have a material result; the death of the baby baboon which further results in its mother's suffering due to the loss of her child. Such material results can be criticised because they construct the baby baboon and its mother as resources to be used for the pleasure of humans. As Schultz (2001) points out, "when something is labelled as a resource, it is implicit that it should or will be used or exploited in some way" (Schultz, 2001: 110, as cited in Stibbe, 2015: 53). Animals must not be used as resources to serve human's purposes but should be treated as living beings that exist for their own sake. Stibbe further supports this when he states:

> The framing of nature as a resource is so widespread that NATURE IS A RESOURCE could be described as a pervasive story-we-live-by. Resisting this framing and opening up paths towards more beneficial framing is a huge task, but one to which ecolinguistics could contribute through systematic analysis of frames and their detailed workings. (2015: 54)

We further note that the transitive material processes are active; there is an Actor + Process + Affected. The Actors are social actors who are represented as nouns; *chichoo* and *lakwenyi* meaning that the social actor is personalised. The Processes are: taking of the baby baboon from the forest, giving it to the child to play with and killing it. *Lakwet ap moset* is the Affected or Beneficiary; it is the one affected by the action of *chichoo*. Concerning the grammatical role, the social actors are realised as Participants in the clause. Agency is thus attributed to them as demonstrated in the discussion in the following section.

4.3. Agency

In the narrative, the animator uses "specifically agentive language in speaking of the actions of social actors" (O'Connor, 1995). Agency for the destruction of the baboon's life is foregrounded in the narrative under analysis. According to Fairclough (2003: 145), the foregrounding of agency aims at including the actor responsible for the named action. In the narrative, the transitive material processes are active; they have active agents; *chichoo* (the man) in Extract 1 and *lakwet ap chiito* in Extract 2. Actions are represented in ways which specify the agency of actors and indicate what the social significance of this textual choice is (Fairclough, 2003). It means that *chichoo* (the man) is the actor who engages in the act of removing the baby baboon from the forest, taking it to his home and giving it to his son who plays with it and finally kills it. The man and his son are the agents responsible

for destructive deeds that lead to the death of the baby baboon. Agency for the destructive actions is thus attributed to them. Their agency for environmentally harmful actions that lead to animal death is foregrounded to criticise them and instead promote practices that lead to the protection of animals. According to Wood and Kroger (2000: 101), "if a person is constructed or positioned as an agent, he or she can be assigned responsibility, blame, or credit for his or her actions". In the folk narrative, since the agents of destruction are identified as the man and his child, they are blamed, and so the action is taken against them; they are punished as seen in the following extract of the narrative:

Extract 6

(15) *Yatukul ko**komoti** lakwet.*	Meanwhile, she **pinched** the child
(16) *Kakelwoo. Nka**urerenee** akine!*	Lucky me! Let me also **play with** it
(17) *Ko**komoot**. Nkuu **riire** kamet?*	She **pinched** him. Is the mother **crying**?
(18) *Koketyi ko**palda** siiyet*	She **deepened the nails**
...	...
(19) *Ko**wiir** moset lakwet koek pany*	The baboon **threw** the man's child
(20) *eng' ng'ony.*	down the tree and it got **smashed**.

In this extract, we have an Actor + Process + Affected. The Actor represented as a social actor is *moset* (the baboon) which is represented as a noun in line (19) and as a pronoun *ko* (she) in lines (15), (17) and (18). The Process is pinching, playing with and smashing to a pulp of *lakwet* (the human child) which is the Affected. In the narrative, the baboon is constructed as an Actor, an agent capable of taking action due to what it has suffered. Roles have been reversed; the baboon that was the Patient earlier when the man and his child were Actors is now an Actor, and the man and his child are the Affected. In line (16), the verb *Nkaurerenee* (let me play with it) is the equivalent of the playing that the human child played with the baby baboon. In line (17), just as the mother baboon cried when her child was taken away, the mother of the human baby is said to cry: *nkuu riire kamet* (is the mother crying?); a fact which motivates the baboon to pinch the human child more: *Koketyi kopalda siiyet* (she deepened the nails). In line (19), the verb *Kowiir* (threw) marks the action of *moset* (the baboon); she threw the human baby down the tree and it got smashed to death. The baboon is thus constructed as an active being and not one that is only acted upon.

Besides, the baboon is constructed as an agent in order for it to punish both the man and his son, who were earlier represented as agents of killing the baby baboon. The speaker casts both as determined to act in numerous destructive ways that harm the animals; the man's removal of the baby baboon from the forest, taking it to his son, and the son killing it. By attributing agency to the baboon for purposes of punishing the two for their destructive actions, acknowledgement on the part of the narrator that the actions are harmful is shown. According to Machin and Mayr (2012), agency in texts is about how actions are represented in ways which specify or conversely elide the agency of actors, and what the social and political significance of this textual choice might be. The constructed

agency of the baboon has social implications for the protection of animals. The baboon's killing of the human child is a reminder to the listener that it is necessary for us human beings to avoid destructive deeds towards animals in order to reconnect with the reality of animals if we are to build human systems that work with, rather than against, nature (Stibbe, 2012). Animals, just like humans, are living beings that must be treated considerately. Besides, Stibbe (*op cit*) postulates that animals have intelligence, feelings, and mental lives and act in the world pursuing their purposes for their own needs. They must, therefore, be allowed to live freely.

On the social front, this way of representing actors and their actions results in emotive as well as cognitive coercion. According to Hart (2010: 64), "emotive coercion involves producing 'emotive effects' in text consumers". As seen in the narrative, when the baboon kills the man's child as a revenging act, the understanding is that when one kills the child of an animal, their child will be killed in return. This revenge creates fear in the listener, which results in coercive effects. Coercion is defined by Hart (2010) as an intention aimed at affecting a person's beliefs, emotions, and behaviour in such a way that suits the interests of a given speaker. The listener's fear of losing their child to death encourages them to avoid killing animals, an act which is further useful to the protection of the biological environment. Citing Dawkins (1999: 2), Hart (*op cit*) postulates that the emotive effects are manipulative:

> Emotive coercion works in much the same way as in advertising; the advertiser uses his knowledge of human psychology, of the hopes, fears and secret motives of his targets, and he designs an advertisement which is effective in manipulating their behaviour.

We have thus seen how an emphasis on agency foregrounds how situated agents produce events and actions in narratives in potentially creative and innovative ways (Fairclough, 2003). The speaker's way of representing Participants, Processes and the Affected is a means of affecting the listener in such a way that they are motivated to desist from acting in the same way as the agents of destructive practice so that they can avoid suffering. It also indicates the community's position on the killing of a baboon through how the man and his son are subsequently treated. This position is deemed as punishment that reveals the moral of the story: humans must not kill animals or else they will be punished in the same way through the killing of their young ones. However, from an ecological point of view, this is interpreted as punishment for the destruction of animal life. It may also, in turn, be regarded as the community's position against wanton killing of animals and hence its strong position on the need to protect animal life. The ideology of this community on animal treatment is therefore seen to be one of conservation, care, and protection.

In this section we have seen that, in terms of representational meanings and grammatical and lexical realisation, clauses in the narrative have Processes, Participants, and Beneficiaries. Regarding the representation of social events, we have noted that clauses have social events which are concretely represented, and the one which is emphasised is

the mistreatment and wanton killing of animals by humans. The representation of social actors or Participants is done through several ways; activation as opposed to passivisation, classified as opposed to named, and inclusion as opposed to exclusion. The decision to pick any of these choices is important in the representation of agency of actors. We saw that the animator of the story uses agentive language in speaking of the destructive actions of humans. We noted that agency of Participants is foregrounded and, as a result, the man and his son suffer the consequences of their actions; the human child is killed, and the man and the whole village become miserable like the baboon did when her child was killed. In the following section, we discuss how the active voice determines events and actions in the narrative to facilitate foregrounding of agency.

4.4. Active voice

The narrative being examined employs the active voice as exemplified in lines (1) and (2) *Kiip kaa chichoo lakwet ap moset* (the man took home the baby baboon); the verb is *kiip* (took) a subject (*chichoo*) and an object *lakwet ap moset*. In terms of ideational meaning, the clause in lines (1) and (2) is transitive as it signifies a process of a certain individual, the Actor, acting physically, *ipkokooito* (he gave out), upon a certain being, *lakwet ap moset*. Below is the linguistic structure:

[Action] + [Thing doing action] + [thing receiving action]
Verb   +   Subject   +   Object

In this structure, the active voice marks the capacity of the Participant as an agent. Use of the active voice in the folk narrative under analysis is motivated by the speaker's desire to foreground responsibility for mistreatment and killing of animals. According to Fowler (1991: 78), the active voice is chosen when the focus is to be on the agent of the action, implying clear responsibility. In the folk narrative, the speaker's aim is to foreground agency for human's destructive actions that lead to animal death in order to criticise them. This results in responsibility for killing of the baby baboon being attributed to the man and his child.

Furthermore, active voice constructions are used in the folk narrative to foreground agency of animals in order to promote their protection as seen in lines (19) and (20) *Kowiir moset lakwet koek pany* (the baboon threw the man's child down the tree and it got smashed). Here we have a verb *kowiir* (threw), a subject *moset* (baboon) and an object *lakwet* (child). The baboon is constructed as an agent that is actively engaged in defending herself against the destructive actions of humans. This way of constructing the baboon is environmentally constructive discourse as it represents animals as agents that are capable of action and not Patients to be acted upon by humans. Stibbe (2012) states that animals play an important role in human society and therefore there are many discourses that influence how these animals are socially constructed. When the baboon is constructed as an agent, the listener perceives it as an important being which is capable of engaging in activities that benefit it

and must not be killed or mistreated for whatever unjustified reasons. In this way, they allow it to thrive thus protecting it from destruction.

However, had the sentence in lines (1) and (2) been in the passive voice, it would have been *kikiip lakwet ap moset* (The baby baboon was taken). In this sentence, the subject has been left out, and we have only the verb and the object. The linguistic structure of this passive voice would be as follows:

[Action] + [thing receiving action]
Verb   +   Object

In the passive *kikiip lakwet ap moset* (the baby baboon was taken), the doer of the action would be hidden. If the passive had been used in the folk narrative in the place of the active voice, it would have made it impossible to take action on the man and his child who are the culprits of animal destruction because their identity would have been hidden. The active voice is used to tell us the truth, the reality as it is as opposed to the passive voice which deceives us (Berger, 1992: 167, as cited in Mühlhäusler, 2003: 94). As a result, use of the passive would have informed the listener that when social actors kill animals, they suffer no consequences as it is not possible to punish a person who is not known. Punishment inflicts pain, and if an individual suffers none, the listener is motivated to engage in the destructive practice. This is harmful to the biological environment as many animals get killed, and the act potentially results in animal depletion.

Besides, the clause in lines (1) and (2) are declarative and not interrogative or imperative. Declaratives in Kalenjin are marked by a Verb (V) followed by a Subject (S) and an Object (O). The Kalenjin structure is thus VSO. Concerning relational value, this means that there is a speaker who acts on somebody; the speaker in the folk narrative under examination is the narrator who gives some information to the listener. The speaker-listener relationship, in this case, is one between somebody telling of events as have been the case and another being told; these are the two subject positions set up in the clause. In its context, the narrator of the folk narrative is acting on behalf of the principal and author which is the Kalenjin community (Fairclough, 2003: 12). He is telling the listener to avoid mistreating and killing animals. This is the literal or surface meaning of the story aimed at emphasising the necessity of human's protection of animals. In this interpretation, the baboon is taken for what it actually is: an animal. The narrative targets the need for a good relationship between animals and human beings; humans are discouraged from engaging in actions that lead to the misplacement, mishandling, mistreatment, and eventual death of animals. This literal meaning is taken from the understanding and realisation that folk narratives arise from social activities and processes that have actually taken place in the community. As stated earlier in Section 1.2 above, Chesaina (1991) points out the fact that Kalenjin oral narratives are a result of the community's everyday experiences, and therefore, the narrative *Anyiny kopo tiony kong'wan kopo chii* (An act is painless when directed at animals but painful when directed at humans) reflects the nature of treatment some of the members of the Kalenjin accord animals. We can thus infer that in this community, there are people who

mistreat and kill animals but are cautioned against the bad practice by being punished. Therefore, analysis of the narrative from this perspective plays a vital role in demonstrating how language use contributes to efforts to protect animals.

However, the community metaphorically used the narrative in a second interpretation. In this case, the speaker is communicating to the listener about the moral of considerate treatment of other people; treat others the way you want them to treat you. In this deeper meaning of the folk narrative, the baboon is personified. According to Chesaina (1991: 9), it is easier to manipulate animal characters than human ones as doing so serves to "help present events and absurd situations as vividly as possible without making too much demand of the audience's emotions". In narrating the story to young children for example, too much demand of their emotions would be made if in the narrative it was said that the child of man A was killed by man B because man A killed the child of man B. However, saying that the child of man A killed the baboon's child because the baboon killed its child is emotionally lighter for the children. Besides, Chesaina (1991: 10) states that the use of animal characters in the Kalenjin narratives "enables the narrator to satirise society without identifying particular individuals in a community". However, the way of presenting the baboon can be criticised as the children may grow up believing that animal life is of less value and that killing of animals is not a problem.

We have noted in this section that knowledge of the actor is facilitated by the use of the active voice; as it exposes those who engage in harmful practices, while the passive hides them. It is essential to know who is responsible for actions that lead to the destruction of animal life for them to be cautioned against the harmful practice or for them to be punished as happens in the folk narrative.

4.5. Grammatical questions

Questions are used in the Kalenjin narrative under analysis to make listeners critically think about the need to protect the biological environment. This is seen in the following example:

Extract 7

(21) *Kile nee mukuleldap kamet iman?*   What did the mother feel?

The question in example (21) is directed at the listener and seeks information from them. However, because it is rhetorical, the listener is not supposed to respond to it verbally. The targeted mental response aims at involving the listener in critically interrogating the man's treatment of the baby baboon and reflecting on its mother's feelings towards the terrible treatment by humans. It is meant to make the listener put themself in the situation of the mother baboon and imagine how she felt as a result of the ill-treatment. The words *muguleldap kamet* (the heart of the mother) signify the emotions and feelings of the mother baboon. Van Leeuwen (2008: 56, as cited in Machin & Mayr, 2012) points out that social roles, as reinforced in texts, prescribe not only actions and identities, but also feelings. The

listener is therefore made to question their actions, and those of other people not in the audience, that negatively affect animals to correct the harmful practice. The desired response of the question is that the mother baboon just like a human mother felt hurt when her child was killed. Humans need to be empathetic and treat animals with respect as they are living beings.

Besides, the question is also meant to allow listeners to have an internal view of the speaker. According to Machin and Mayr (2012), through thinking, we are given access to how the speaker feels. The speaker does not condone the mistreatment and killing of the baboon, and so the question arouses his feeling of empathy for the baboon meaning that he aligns himself with the baboon; he feels sorry that its child is killed. This feeling of empathy is the emotion that the speaker would like the listener to emulate. Furthermore, it summarises the message of the narrative; animals just like human beings need to be treated well as they too have feelings and are hurt when they are badly treated.

In the question, value assumption is also triggered by the lexical choice *iman*, which means actually/really/truly. This is explicit evaluation. Fairclough (1992: 57) states that "most evaluation in texts is assumed". Value assumptions are triggered by the lexical choice *iman*, which reflects the speaker's surprise and disbelief at the harmful practice of killing of the baboon, which is undesirable. However, even without a trigger word, according to Fairclough (1992: 57), for the killing to be unwanted, one can interpret it as such basing oneself on one's knowledge and recognition of the value system which underlies the text. The narrative shows that the Kalenjin community considers the killing of the baboon undesirable. The baboon is the totem of the Kalenjin Toiyoi clan and it is deemed taboo to kill totems (Holis, 1909). Besides, the community only allowed the killing of animals when they posed a threat to people's property and for the provision of food. Since the baboon is not a source of food and it did not pose any threat to the man and his child, killing it is undesirable. Besides, life is believed to be given by God, and it is only Him who can take it away. This view is further supported by question (22) below:

Extract 8

(22) *Nda kineng'ung nda kiikastoi ano we chichi?* If the child was yours, how would you have felt?

In example (22), the speaker intends to put the listener further in the place of the baboon for them to perceive how they would have felt if their child was killed. The aim is to involve them in thinking about the destructive deeds of the man that negatively impact on animals and as a result reflect keenly on the need to avoid engaging in the act.

Besides, the pronoun *neng'ung* (yours) in *Nta kineng'ung* (If it was yours) is used exclusively. It separates the speaker from the audience as he constructs himself as belonging to the category of people that feel hurt when animals are mistreated, unlike the listener who is discriminative of animals and not personally responsible in ensuring animals are protected. Fairclough (2001: 106) states that "pronouns have a relational value of

different sorts". Its use is relationally of importance in that it represents the listener and the speaker as belonging to different classes of people with different opinions concerning actions towards animals. This is what O'Connor (1995) calls indexicality; the use of pronouns as a discourse feature to represent actions. The speaker is distancing himself from the act of killing the baby baboon and invites the listener who is constructed as belonging to the group of people who mistreat animals to empathise with the baboon. The words *we chichi* (you person) are meant to make the listener interrogate their thoughts about what they feel about animals and their relationship to people. What the speaker is emphasising is that just like human beings, animals have feelings which humans must take into consideration all the time in their dealings with them. He is thus speaking of the community, himself and all good-hearted people who might mistreat or kill animals. In example (23) below, we note the same pronoun:

Extract 9

    (23) *Kaa ng'wan* **neng'ung** *ii?*   So losing your child is painful?
    (24) **Nikinyu** *kokimakong'wan i?*   Losing mine was not painful?

In these questions, the use of pronouns is to allow the speaker to interrogate the insensitive actions of humans that result in animal death. In question (24), the pronoun *nikinyu* (that one of mine) is used inclusively. In this example, the pronoun refers to the speaker and some other person not in the audience but who promotes protection of animals. It indicates that the speaker is acting for some other being; the baboon and other animals. In this way, animals are constructed as beings that have similar feelings and needs as those of humans. The speaker, in example (23), is pointing out the fact that people need to treat animals well just as they take care of their young ones.

    In addition, the modality is objective in example (24) *nikinyu ko kimakong' wan-i?* (was losing mine not painful?). Whereas there is no tag in this question as Fairclough (1992) suggests there should be, the question asked is in the negative, and the answer anticipated is ideally supposed to be positive *king' wan* (It was painful). Concerning the affirmative answer, Fairclough (1992: 160) citing Hodge and Kress (1988: 123) states that the answer:

> ... presupposes that high affinity with the presupposition is shared between speaker and listener and (given that the latter's answers are known in advance) such questions are asked to demonstrate the affinity and solidarity rather than to get information. So expressing high affinity may have little to do with one's commitment to a proposition, but a lot to do with desire to show solidarity.

Besides, the question is meant to express solidarity with those who care for animals in order to point out the reality that all animals need to be treated fairly. This is further seen in the following extract:

Extract 10

> (25) *Kipo tiony ile "Ng'wan kopo tiony i?"*   When an act is directed at an animal, you ask "is it painful when it involves an animal?"

The question asked by the narrator in example (25) targets the listener's feelings about the harmful acts that are directed at animals by humans. Unlike the previous two questions which were rhetorical, this question has an answer; *Achicha. Ng'wan kopo chii koanyiny kopo moso* (No. It is painful when it is directed at humans but not when directed at animals). The answer, which is the title of the narrative, indicates what some destructive people feel about animals; they perceive them as insensitive beings that feel no pain when they are mistreated. This is not true and is an anthropocentric attitude which is criticised by the narrator, and he desires that humans should avoid it. Animals feel pain and are hurt when badly treated.

Besides, the grammatical question in example (25) has relational modality. Fairclough (2001: 107) states that modality is not only about modal auxiliaries. In relational modality, the authority of one participant over another is noted. The speaker asks the question, and in the next sentence immediately gives the answer indicating the existence of subjective modality of the speaker. In subjective modality, Fairclough (1992: 159) states that "the subjective basis for the selected degree of affinity with a proposition may be made explicit". When the speaker responds to his own question in (25), what the speaker is saying is "I believe that you believe that when a bad act is directed at animals, it is fine, but when the same act is directed at humans it is wrong". This is what he perceives as an individual is the feeling of the listener and others who do not value the animals' feelings, and this is what for him would be their answer if allowed to respond. His degree of affinity to the proposition is being expressed; he is critical of the negative attitude and actions of humans towards animals. However, as discussed in the following paragraph, this also marks objective modality as, according to Fairclough (1992: 159), "it is common for modality to be realised in multiple features of a single utterance or sentence".

We also note objective modality. According to Fairclough (1992), in objective modality it may not be clear whose perspective the speaker was representing; whether they are projecting their own perspective or a universal one, or whether they act as a vehicle for the perspective of some other individual or group. However, in the narrative, the speaker is acting on behalf of the community, and so he is a vehicle for its perspective on the need to avoid wanton killing of animals. Since the story is being reproduced and is not composed by the speaker, he is the animator (Fairclough, 2003: 12) acting on behalf of the community which is the author and principal (Fairclough, *op cit*). Therefore, in reciting the narrative, the animator is understood by the listener as an authoritative person who must be listened to keenly since he has more power over them. According to Fairclough (1992: 159), the use of objective modality often implies some form of control. In example (25), the animator is the more powerful individual as compared to the listener who is supposed to be silent and let the speaker provide the answer to the question on their behalf. This has an

ideological interest as the aim of the narrative is to teach the importance of care for animals. This is supported by Fairclough (2001: 107) who states, "the prevalence of categorical modalities supports a view of the world as transparent – as if it signalled its meaning to any observer, without the need of interpretation". The authority of the animator in answering the question suggests that the opposite is true; animals just like humans feel hurt when they are mistreated and killed. This is the view that the listener is supposed to get even without the speaker's intervention.

In addition, we note that the questions are mental processes. Mental processes are processes of thinking, and they are expressed through the verb 'to think' and its many synonyms (Machin & Mayr, 2012: 106). In this study, questions generally cover what the Kalenjin are made to think about and fall within the mental processes. They are used in Kalenjin narrative interactions to make people think about the need to protect the biological environment. Through the questions, listeners are encouraged to think about animals and to empathise with them. According to Machin and Mayr (2012), it is often the case that participants who are made the subjects of mental processes are constructed as the 'focalisers' or 'reflectors' of action. This means that in thinking about their actions, listeners are allowed an internal view of themselves and so they think about their activities regarding the treatment of animals, and as a result, they are likely to stop destroying animal life. According to Stibbe (2015: 1), "how we think has an influence on how we act, so language can inspire us to destroy or protect the ecosystems that life depends on". Through the listener's thinking that is provoked by the questions asked in the narrative, the listeners are inspired to protect and not destroy animal life. According to Stibbe (2012: 23), animals play an essential role in human society, and therefore, narratives are among the many discourses that influence how these animals are socially constructed. Animals are crucial and must be allowed to live for their own sake.

Additionally, through the provoking questions, the listener is made to empathise with the baboon for the death of her baby brought about through mistreatment by the man. The listeners are therefore likely not to align themselves with the man's actions, and as a result, they will desist from killing animals. This, as a result, contributes to good practices that result in care and protection of animal life. In this way, the questions promote the value of careful treatment of animals and an attitude which perpetuates human's inclusion of the non-human animals. Besides, through the mental processes, we see the community's ideology regarding the conservation of animals. Ideology is defined by Haig (2001) as "a whole set of beliefs, ideas, and values that make up a person's or a society's world-view". The belief is that when animals are killed for no reason, punishment is inevitable as we saw earlier through the killing of *lakwetab chito* (the man's child) who suffered as a result of his killing of the baby baboon.

5. Conclusion

This paper set out to find out how language forms embedded in Kalenjin folk narratives aid in the protection of the biological environment. From the narrative under analysis,

findings indicate that Kalenjin folk narratives serve more than one purpose depending on whether the surface or literal meaning is considered. We noted that the sampled folk narrative embeds environmental discourse which constructs human's ecologically destructive relationship with the biological environment, to correct people's harmful actions and anthropocentric attitude. Through this, the community's values of care, protection, conservation of animals, and caution against disobedience of the community's teachings and social beliefs that contribute to animal protection are revealed. This was seen to promote a biocentric view of the biological environment.

Secondly, concerning language forms, it was found that verbs, the active voice, and questions are the grammatical forms used in the sampled Kalenjin narrative. Verbs opted for by the narrator mark people's destructive actions. However, their being represented as material processes is what contributes to encouraging the listener to embrace actions that lead to the protection of animal life, consequently protecting them. As for the active voice, its role in foregrounding the agency of actors and, as a result, exposing the culprits responsible for destructive actions contributes to protection in that the destructive actors are punished. We noted that if the passive voice were used instead of the active voice, the agency would be obfuscated, and this means that the culprits would not be known and therefore no action would be taken against them resulting in the continued killing of animals. This killing is harmful to animals, as many would be killed. Due to the punishment, we further noted that emotive and cognitive coercion which result in fear and cognitive representations respectively contribute to animal protection as the listeners link the punishment to the killing of animals and as a result desist from killing them. Besides, we observed that questions are used to involve the listeners in critically thinking about the mistreatment of animals by humans and to allow the listener to have an internal view of the narrator who is critical of human's negative actions towards animals that lead to their suffering and death. Besides, the sarcastic tone employed in the questions and the objective and subjective modality are meant to remind the listener that all animals are feeling beings and must be treated well. The questions were also noted to be mental processes which aid in exposing the community's ideology to protect animals as they are equally important.

Finally, the gap filled in this study consists of studying an oral folk Kalenjin narrative in the dimension of language forms and their role in promoting animal protection and welfare. Previous studies on Kalenjin have not studied the relationship between the linguistic aspects identified and protection of animals. We however note that the results of this study present a general overview of the Kalenjin community's representation of one aspect of the environment: animals and their protection. As a result, further research needs to be done on more Kalenjin narratives and other discourses like proverbs, songs, riddles, and personal stories to give more insight into this interesting topic of environmental discourse and embedded language forms and their role in environmental protection. Comparison of such Kalenjin environmental discourses with other languages can also be made.

References

Brown, M. H. (2017). Non-human animals and the relative pronoun 'who' in English learner's dictionaries and graded readers. *Language & Ecology*. Available at http://ecolinguistics-association.org/journal

Chesaina, C. (1991). *Oral literature of the Kalenjin*. Nairobi: Heinemann Kenya Limited.

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman Inc.

Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. New York and London: Routledge.

Fill, A. (2001). Ecolinguistics: State of the art 1998. In Alwin Fill and Peter Mühlhäusler (eds), *The ecolinguistics reader: Language, ecology and environment*. London and New York: Continuum.

Fill, A. & Mühlhäusler, P. (2001). *The ecolinguistics reader: Language, ecology and environment*. London and New York: Continuum.

Fowler, R. (1991). *Language in the news: Discourse and ideology in the press*. London: Routledge.

Fusari, S. (2018). Changing representations of animals in Canadian English (1920s – 2010s). *Language & Ecology*. Available at http://ecolinguistics-association.org/journal

Haig, E. (2001). A study of the application of critical discourse analysis to ecolinguistics and the teaching of eco-literacy. *Studies in Language and Culture (Nagoya University, Faculty of Language and Culture), 22*(2), 205-226.

Halliday, M. A. K. (2001). *An introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.

Harré, R., Brockmeier, J., & Mühlhäusler, P. (1999). *Greenspeak: A study of environmental discourse*. London: Sage.

Hart, C. (2010). *Critical discourse analysis and cognitive science: New perspectives on immigration discourse*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan

Holis, A. C. (1909). *The Nandi: Their language and folklore*. London: Oxford Clarendon Press.

Kipkorir, B. (1985). *People of the Rift Valley: The Kalenjin*. Nairobi: Evans Brothers Kenya Limited.

Leedy, P. D. & Ormrod, J. E. (2001). *Practical research: Planning and design* (7th Ed). New Jersey: Merrill Prentice Hall.

Machin, D. & Mayr, A. (2012). *How to do critical discourse analysis: A multimodal introduction*. London: Sage Publications.

Mugenda, A. G. (2008). *Social science research: Theory and principles*. Nairobi: Applied Research and Training Services.

Mühlhäusler, P. (2001). Talking about environmental issues. In Alwin Fill and Peter Mühlhäusler (eds), *The ecolinguistics reader: Language, ecology and environment*. London and New York: Continuum, pp. 31-42.

Mühlhäusler, P. (2003). *Language of environment, environment of language: A course in ecolinguistics*. Hampshire: Battlebridge Publications.

O'Connor, P. (1995). Speaking of crime: 'I don't know what made me do it'. *Discourse &*

Society, 6(3), 429-456.

Schultz, B. (2001). Language and environmental problems. In Alwin Fill and Peter Mühlhäusler (eds), *The ecolinguistics reader: Language, ecology and environment.* London and New York: Continuum, pp. 109-114.

Stibbe, A. (2001). Language, power and the social construction of animals. *Society & Animals, 9*(2), 145-161.

Stibbe, A. (2012). *Animals erased: Discourse, ecology and reconnection with the natural world.* Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.

Stibbe, A. (2015). *Ecolinguistics: Language, ecology, and the stories we live by.* London and New York: Routledge.

Wood, L. A. & Kroger, R. O. (2000). *Doing discourse analysis: Methods for studying action in talk and text.* London: Sage Publications.

Wray, A. & Bloomer, A. (2006). *Projects in linguistics: A practical guide to researching language.* London: Hodder Arnold.

Appendix 1

Ng'wan kopo chii koanyiny kopo moso

Kimi mosonik chekimenyei timdo. Kimeng'isie eng' ketik parak eng' ye kinekite aino. Ainoni kimi timi, kokimi koik cheki olopo karon kokeelu asis koyuee asis mosonik. Mi asista ne chamei mosonik mising, olopo kamach kororokto. Kichomei mosonik kopendi koichata ipkoyuee asista. Piik ak ichek yomachei kouunkei koyutok yepwoni. Ngoit nyoko waschi koita peek korok asikounekei. Kosiepee patai koi kosing'ekei. Kwo simdo, kowastaekei ak kwo ole kawendi.

Kimi as age eng' mosonichu nekitinyei chererenyi. Kocham kokanapooti kowendi koiichun ipkoyuei asis ak mosonik chun. Pesio ye kitakoyuei asis konyal lamaywet ne mi yuto po nkekutiet ap ainet. Koorur nepo iman. Kole "nkalaany keti aputchi lakwet lamaek." Ang' ye tikomi ketit parak koit chii ne kimi kosetei luk nenyi. Koro lakwap moso komi koita parak. Kokonopi. Kole "nkopo moso lakwani. Nkiri kakelwo. Kaweke kaa. Nkaipchi lakwenyu ipkourerenee lakwanep moset. Lukoni kaka atorchikei maawendi."

Kiip as kaa iman chicho lakwet ap moset,kosupi kamet let. Makany moset korikchi chito. Kiywei kole apich kopara. Kosup akoi kotap chichikai. Ipkokoito lakwap moset chichikai, kokoch lakwenyi kourerene. Kisis moset ak kokerei lakwenyi keurerenee. Lalei moet ne makimwochin chi. Kiwirtoi, ketaltoli lakwet ap chito lakwani kapo moset. Kochuut kotokchi kok. Kong'irirtot eng' yo. Nee ipak amakanyei moset kochorkei eng' ketit olin mitei. Kepar-i?

Kiurerene as nikapochito nikapomoset kopar. "Kale nkuu kiwirta korus metit koita anan kiita nee?" Kikipar lakwanapomoset kokere kityo kamet. Kwo moset koriroti. "Rat moet-aa. Kata konee. Kaa kemutchin miat lakweng'ung chichikai? Kileen nee mukuleldap kamet iman? Nda kineng'uung' nda kiikastoi ano we chichi."

Kitun pesio koruei lakwet ap chichi kinye eng' yo po sang', nikinyeta porei lakwet ap moset. Ruee lakwet ye mi urwo. Kwo kamet kong'is piut. Kwomei lokoi poiyot ap kot ak poisio che kimi tukul kook. Ngo orono mosetkinye mi keticha parak-ee. Ka cheng'oti akinee chechiik che amei. Kiingoro ng'ony kooro lakwet koruei. Kole: "nko rumindet kinye niin ruei. Ma inendet iman ni kipareno lakwenyu? Walekei ra makata ak sot? Kenu noo kilen ngopar ake kiri komaporei ake kwe. Kiwektoi chu ra anan oiyo. Kacharune ano asis inyee?"

Kichorkei moset akosopchi. Kosapta. Koit ye mi lakwet. Koryep ak koip. Kotilji ket parak. Kole "oiye kakokelwo. Kakelwo asipaurerene akine." Kokomot komutyo. Kowach lakwet. Kekuskong'. "Wokee ano? Kaip nee eng' yu karuee. Ptoo! Ankoronin mi ketik parak. Tinyei moset!" Wakaat noo. Kotul emet. Konyi piik kurkat. Ketong'ong'so aa kityo. Kiyoe nee? Kiitanee moset asikokon lakwet? Konamkei parak ak ng'ony? Kole poisiek "oiye mosoni ta meweek lakwet. Eucho we mosoni! Kikelelun iman." Yatukul kokomoti lakwet. "Kakelwo. Nkaurerenee akine!" Kokomot. "Nkuu riire kamet?" Koketchi kopalda siyeet. "Ka ng'wan neng'ung i? Ni kinyu kokimakong'wan-i? Kipo tiony ile "Ng'wan kopo tiony-i Achicha. Tanduus. Ng'wan kopo chii, tanduus kopo tiony!" Kowiir moset lakwet

koek pany eng' ng'ony ak kwo pantanyi.

"Meochi chito ake koyait akimoche keoun chekuuk komiakiitu."

An act is painless when directed at animals but painful when directed at humans

Once upon a time there were baboons which lived on trees in a forest near a rocky river. In the evenings around sunset, the baboons sat on the rocks to bask in the sunshine which they adored. People used the same stones to clean their bodies. When they arrived at the river, they first poured water on the stones then lay on their backs and scrubbed off the dirt after which they rinsed it off and went away.

One of the mother baboons usually carried her baby along as she went to bask on the rocks with the other baboons. One day as she basked, she looked up a Lamaywet tree which was close by the river. The fruits were very ripe. She said to herself: "Why don't I go up this tree to pluck the fruits for my child?" While she was still up the tree a man came by, saw the baby baboon seated on the rocks and lifted it up saying "Isn't this a baby baboon? How lucky I am! I will not continue running my errands. I will go back home right away! I will take this baby baboon to my child to play with." The man therefore took the baby baboon to his child while its mother followed him. The baboon feared to come too close to the man for fear of being killed. It followed him till he arrived home. On arrival home the man gave the baby baboon to his child to play with.

The baboon watched helplessly as the human child played with its child. It experienced great pain. The baby baboon was thrown about, tossed, pulled and dragged all over the compound. Its mother could do nothing as she feared to alight from the tree for fear of being killed. The human child played with the baby baboon and eventually killed it. "I wonder if it was thrown and its head hit a stone or something else happened to it." The baby baboon was killed as its mother watched helplessly. She went away crying. "Persevere! Nothing can be done to change the reality of the death. So the man was bringing your child to his child so that it could be killed? What did the mother actually feel? If the child was yours how would you have felt you man?"

One day the man's child was put to sleep under the tree by its mother as she went about fending for the family. The child's father was in the compound having a chat with some men who had come to visit him. The mother baboon came to look for food in the trees near where the baby was sleeping. When it saw the human baby she said "Isn't that the killer? Isn't he the one who killed my child? Today I will revenge!"

The mother baboon came down the tree and tiptoed till it reached where the human baby was. It grabbed it and climbed up a tree with it saying "how lucky I am! I can also go and play with him." She pinched him gently. The child screamed. The people turned round to look in the direction. "Where is the child crying from? What took him from where he was sleeping? Oh no! There he is on the tree! The baboon has him!" The people started screaming. The world seemed dark. People filled the compound wondering. "What shall

we do? What shall we do to the baboon so that she gives us the child?" It was a difficult time. The elders said "How we wish the baboon would return the child. We plead dear baboon, be considerate."

Meanwhile the baboon pinched the child. "How lucky I am. Let me also play with him." It pinched the child. "It seems the mother is crying?" It pinched him harder. "So when your child is affected by the bad act it is painful? Wasn't it also painful when my child was affected by the bad act?" When a bad act is directed at animals you ask "is it painful? No. It is painless. When a bad act is directed at humans it is painful but painless when directed at animals!" The baboon threw the human child down the tree and it got smashed. She then went away.

"Do not do bad things to others and expect them to do good things to you."