**Reflexive/reciprocal marking in Markweeta**

In the Kalenjin languages (Southern Nilotic, Kenya/Tanzania) one and the same lexical item, *kɛ:(j)*, expresses both reflexive (1) and reciprocal (2) meanings (Rottland, 1982). This item has hardly been systematically studied in any of the Kalenjin languages (but see Bii, 2014 for Kipsigis). This paper partially fills that gap by describing the behavior of *keey* in Markweeta (ISO 639-3 enb, Mietzner (2016) for the Cherang'any variety). It does this on the basis of the largest corpus available, the translation of the New Testament in the Endo variety (Bible Translation and Literacy, 2008), with *keey* occurring 1816 times.

*Keey* is commonly viewed (see Jerono, 2018 for a recent and typical example) as **(i)** a (derivational) verbal suffix, **(ii)** giving the verb a reflexive or reciprocal meaning, and **(iii)** reducing its valency. However, the data from the corpus (illustrated in the original orthography) point in a different direction.

**(i)** *Keey* is not a verbal suffix but a separate word. No other suffix ever follows it and it is opaque to the Advanced Tongue Root vowel harmony that affects all of the morphemes in a word (2)/(3) (also Mietzner, 2016, p. 145). Moreover, it can be separated from the verb by adverbs (1) and pronouns (4) and it can be the object in a nominal construction (5). (The orthography does not show it, but all the morphemes in *ā-uu-chin-ii* in (2) are +ATR and in (3) only the left-edge conjunctive morpheme *ak-* escapes vowel harmony, suggesting it is not a real affix either.)

**(ii)** In addition to the reflexive and reciprocal meanings, *keey* also has anticausative (3) and intensifying (4) uses, covering a larger area on the middle/reflexive map (Haspelmath, 2003) than usually thought (Heine, 2000).

**(iii)** *Keey* typically fills an object position, but clearly not in its intensifying use (4), in which the third person singular pronoun *inyeentee* already fills the object position derived applicative-like by the dative suffix *-chi* (Creider, 2002). Hence, not all uses of *keey* operate on the argument structure of the verb (also Mietzner, 2016, p. 76,164).

If the Markweeta data are representative for the Kalenjin cluster, then Kalenjin seems similar in this respect to languages that use a 'body' lexeme for intensive/middle/reflexive/reciprocal meanings (Heine & Kuteva, 2002). Although there is no evidence for such an etymology for *kɛ:(j)*, its Proto-Southern Nilotic reconstruction does suggest some number inflection (Rottland, 1982, p. 247) and hence a nominal status. Kalenjin reflexive/reciprocal marking is then also reminiscent of the 'transitive reciprocal constructions' discussed for Niger-Congo languages in Safir and Selvanathan (2016), which are characterized by a general type of anaphor in the object position.

**Examples**

(1)  *kaa-kee-syaak  nyuun    keey*
     RP-1P-judge    then     KEEY
     'we then judged ourselves' (1Cor11:31)

(2)  *ā-uun-chin-ii      keey  kēēl-yēn*
     2P-wash-DAT-IPF   KEEY  foot-PL
     'wash each other's feet' (John13:14)

(3)  *ak-u-wiir-u          keey  :kookeel*
     AND-3-throw-VENT    KEEY  NOM.stars
     'and the stars fell (lit. threw themselves)' (Rev6:13)

(4)  *ak-ii-pāy-iisyēē-chi   inyeentee   keey*
     AND-2S-do-INTR-DAT   3         KEEY
     'and work for him only' (Matt4:10)

(5)  *las-at-aa        keey*
     praise-NOM-ASS  KEEY
     'pride (lit. praise-ing-of self)' (2Cor10:5)

**Bibliography**

Bible Translation and Literacy. (2008). *Marakwet Bible: Ārāruut nyoo Rēēl*.
http://live.bible.is/bible/ENBBTL

Bii, J. K. (2014). Reciprocals in Kipsigis. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, *19*(10),
15–21.

Creider, C. A. (2002). The semantics of participant types in derived verbs in Nandi. *Revue
québécoise de linguistique*, *31*(2), 171–190. https://doi.org/10.7202/009316ar

Haspelmath, M. (2003). The geometry of grammatical meaning: Semantic maps and cross-
linguistic comparison. In M. Tomasello (Ed.), *The new psychology of language* (Vol. 2, pp.
211–242). Lawrence Erlbaum.

Heine, B. (2000). Polysemy involving reflexive and reciprocal markers in African languages. In Z.
Frajzyngier & T. S. Curl (Eds.), *Reciprocals: Forms and functions* (pp. 1–29). John
Benjamins.

Heine, B., & Kuteva, T. (2002). *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. Cambridge University Press.

Jerono, P. (2018). Passive and antipassive in Tugen. *International Journal of Language and
Linguistics*, *5*(3), 189–197.

Mietzner, A. (2016). *Cherang'any: A Kalenjin Language of Kenya*. Rüdiger Köppe.

Rottland, F. (1982). *Die Südnilotischen Sprachen: Beschreibung, Vergleichung und Rekonstruktion*.
Reimer.

Safir, K., & Selvanathan, N. (2016). Niger-Congo transitive reciprocal constructions and polysemy
with reflexives. In D. L. Payne, S. Pacchiarotti, & M. Bosire (Eds.), *Diversity in African
languages: Selected papers from the 46th Annual Conference on African Linguistics* (pp.
495–512). Language Science Press. http://langsci-press.org/catalog/view/121/496/577-
2