Relative Clauses in Kikamba

David Rowbory • 20 June 2008

Nairobi Evangelical Graduate School of Theology: Advanced Morphology & Syntax

Introduction

Kikamba is classified by Guthrie (1948) as Bantu language E55, related quite closely to Kikuyu. See Rowbory (2008) for more detail. Here we study morphological operations used in Kikamba to relativise nominals so as to produce a multi-clause (multi-predicate) sentence. The study has been somewhat hindered by many writers (whether casual writers, or in books such as Mbiti 1966) neglecting to use the full orthographic means to distinguish tone and some vowels. So, what should be written *ĩ* representing IPA [e] is often not distinguished from *i* (IPA [i]), though there is a definite phonological difference. The situation is similar with *u / ũ* (IPA [o]).[1] The standard word order is SVO.

We began this study not with elicitation but by examining some texts from transcribed speech and translated stories and it became clear that Kikamba makes frequent use of restrictive relative clauses. However we found no unambiguous evidence of non-restrictive relatives, which merely comment on a noun phrase rather than delineating its reference. So for this paper we narrow our focus to treat only restrictive relative clauses, following Andrews (2006:207) who considers non-restrictive relatives to behave somewhat differently to relative clauses. Although Andrews considers questions and adverbial clauses to fall outside the scope of a typology of relative clauses, we touch on these briefly here since they seem to be related to relative clauses in Kikamba.

We explore the most common and obvious relativising strategy, the situations in which it may be used, and other relativisation strategies. We examine the grammatical categories (subject, direct

---

[1] Note that orthographic *e, o* represent IPA [ɛ], [ɔ]

object, oblique, indirect object etc) which may be relativised, and briefly mention the use of relative clauses in questions and the related use of headless relative clauses.

Natural texts were sourced from Mbiti (1966) and an interview with an elderly man recorded and conducted by a fellow student Michael Mwaka. Subsequent clarification, translation and elicitation was carried out with the help of Michael and our house help.

The Most Common Strategy: -la

The most common strategy for relativising noun phrases in Kikamba is to use the relativiser *la* with a noun class prefix corresponding to the relativised noun phrase:

(1)

Kuya	*kitwii*	*mundu*	**ula**	**wambie**	**utangiiwa**	**mbee**	**ni**	**chief.**
kuya	*kitwii*	*mu-ndu*	**u-la**	**w-amb-i-e**	**u-tangiiwa**	**n-vee**	*ni*	*chief.*
In	Kitwii	1-person	**1-REL**	**1-become-PERF-FV**	**14-saved**	**9-first**	was	chief.
		(NP$_{MAT}$)	(NP$_{REL}$)					

"In kitwii, the man who got saved first was a chief."

(2)

Twineena	*iulu*	*wa*	*musimamo*	*wa*	*ikanisa*	*iulu*	*wa*	*iveti*	*ili*	*na*	*mathina*
tu-i-neen-a	*i-ulu*	*wa*	*mu-simamo*	*wa*	*i-kanisa*	*i-ulu*	*wa*	*i-veti*	*i-li*	*na*	*ma-thina*
1p-talk-FV	8-matter	of	3-position	of	5-church	8-matter	of	8-wives	8-two	and	6-problems
											(NP$_{MAT}$)

"We are now talking about the position of the church on two wives and the problems…"

ala	**mookie**	**nundu**	**wa**	**musimamo**	**usu**	**wa**	**ikanisa**
a-la	**ma-ok-i-e**	**nundu**	**wa**	**mu-simamo**	**usu**	**wa**	**i-kanisa**
6-REL	**6-arise-PERF-PAST2**	because	of	3-position	that (demonst)	of	5-church
(NP$_{REL}$)							

"…which arose because of that position of the church."

In the first example (1) above, the subject "man" of the matrix clause "In Kitwii the man… was a chief." is class 1 (see class list in the appendix). It is relativised with *ula* in the relative clause *ula wambie utangiiwa mbee* "who got saved first" where the relativised noun phrase (NP_{REL}) is also the subject of the verb *wambie.* The relativiser *la* takes a prefix *u-* corresponding to class 1 (human, singular). This combination could be considered a relative pronoun, though it never inflects for anything except the class of the relativised noun phrase. So it behaves quite differently from English relative pronouns which inflect for the grammatical category of the NP_{REL}. In further examples below we see that the same form can be used even when the NP_{REL} is the direct object, indirect object, oblique etc. in the relative clause.

The relativiser appears directly after the noun phrase in the matrix clause which is being relativised (NP_{MAT}), that is, the noun phrase which is coreferential with the NP_{REL}. The relativiser (REL) marks the start of the NP_{REL} but no morphology indicates the end of the NP_{REL}; that must be deduced from context. In both examples above the relative clause is indicated in bold. We note in (1) that the relative clause is embedded within the matrix clause, but the relative clause in example (2) is postposed to the main clause, since the NP_{MAT} is an object (which comes normally at the end of the main clause). However in example (2) the NP_{REL} functions as the subject in the relative clause.

One surprising observation of the relativiser's concord marking is that when the NP_{MAT} is class 6 (prefix *ma-* for nominals and verb subject marking) the REL takes the prefix *a-* rather than *ma-*. However, given in class 2 the prefixes *a-* and *ma-* both occur in verb subject marking, this may just be a variant class marker which Kioko (2005:22,49) has not included. In the section on multiple-embedding below, examples (12) and (13) show that the class of the NP_{MAT} governs the relativiser's prefix, but other evidence suggests that the relativiser may take slightly different prefixes:

(3)

Ngombe	ila	yina	mukwato	ni	yiva?
Ø-ngombe	i-la	yi-na-Ø	mukwato	ni	yi-va
9-cow	9-REL	9-PRES-be	on.heat	QMARK	9-which.of

"Which cow is on heat?"

(4)

Ngombe	ila	syina	mukwato	ni	syiva?
Ø-ngombe	i-la	syi-na-Ø	mukwato	ni	syi-va
10-cow	10-REL	10-PRES-be	on.heat	QMARK	10-which.of

"Which cows are on heat?" (a plural number expected)

This is not very surprising, since nominals and verb subjects use slightly different sets of prefixes. Class 9 nominals often have a null prefix, but just like a verb, the relativiser requires a non-null prefix. The question words *yiva* and *syiva* takes the same class prefix as the verb, but in each case the prefix for the relativiser is *i-*. (However in this class the nominals share the same null prefix for singular and plural, and it is not so surprising that the relativiser prefix reflects this invariance.)

Non-Subject Grammatical Roles

This *–la* relativising process is very productive and can apply to noun phrases throughout the continuum of grammatical roles from subject to genitive. That is, the NP$_{MAT}$ (noun phrase co-referential with the NP$_{REL}$ in the matrix noun phrase) may exhibit any grammatical function in the matrix clause and the corresponding NP$_{REL}$ may fit into any grammatical role.

When the NP$_{REL}$ is a direct object in the relative clause, the main clause and relative clause behave similarly to when the NP$_{REL}$ is subject:

(5)

Nininaiye	liu	ula	kiveti	kyakwa	kinauie
Ni-ni-Ø-nai-i-e	Ø-liu	u-la	ki-veti	ky-akwa	ki-Ø-nau-i-Ø-e
FOC-1S-PAST2-eat-PERF-FV	3-food	**3-REL**	**7-wife**	**7-1s.POSS**	**7-PAST2-cook-PERF-DO-FV**

"I ate the food which my wife cooked."

(6)

Ninaiye	*kila*	*kiveti*	*kyakwa*	*kinauite*
Ni-ni-Ø-nai-i-e	*ki-la*	*ki-veti*	*ky-akwa*	*ki-Ø-nau-i-t-e*
FOC-1S-PAST2-eat-PERF-FV	**7-REL**	**7-wife**	**7-1s.POSS**	**7-PAST2-cook-PERF-DO-FV**

"I ate what my wife cooked."

Example (5) shows a simple matrix clause where the direct object *liu* has been relativised. Somewhat surprisingly the relativiser takes the prefix u-, though this cannot be class 1 since that class is for humans, so we deduce it is class 3 like *liu* which apparently has a null class marker. Food is generally class 3, together with 'tree' since so much food comes from trees. Example (6) demonstrates a headless relative clause which we discuss below. Aside from the presence of *liu ula* the NP_{MAT} and NP_{REL}, the other difference between these two examples of a direct object NP_{REL} is a resumptive pronoun suffix –t on the relative clause verb in (6) which does not appear in (5). So either it may be that where a headless relative is used a resumptive pronoun is required. However since *liu* has a null class prefix, it seems reasonable that whether headless or not, a direct object NP_{REL} requires a resumptive pronoun before the final vowel.

Obliques (such as locative, temporal) and indirect objects are sometimes hard to distinguish in Kikamba and can be relativised with *–la* too:

(7)

Ikanisa	*ila*	*mathina*	*maumilile*	*yaii*	*kitwii*
i-kanisa	*i-la*	*ma-thina*	*ma-u-m-i-il-il-e*	*ya-i-i*	*kitwii*
5-church	**5-REL**	**2-problem**	**2-?-2.REFL-PAST4-arise-ITER-FV**	9-PAST4-be	kitwii

"The church in which the problems arose was in kitwii."

(8)

Nyumba	*ila*	*mundu*	*usu*	*wekalaa*	*yaii*	*nini*
Ø-nyumba	*i-la*	*mu-ndu*	*usu*	*w-e-kala-a*	*ya-i-i*	*Ø-nini*
9-house	**9-REL**	**1-person**	**that**	1-PAST4-live-FV	9-PAST4-be	9-small

"The house where that man had lived was small."
(Note: The sense of 'in' seems to disappear or be absorbed into the 'relative pronoun'.)

(9)

mundu	*usu*	*wekalaa*	*nyumbani*	*nini*
mu-ndu	*usu*	*w-e-kala-a*	*Ø-nyumba-ni*	*Ø-nini*
1-person	that	1-PAST4-live-FV	9-house-in	9-small

"That person lived in a small house."

(10)

Nyumba	***ila***	***mundu***	***usu***	***wekalaa***	*niyavalukie*
Ø-nyumba	***i-la***	***mu-ndu***	***usu***	***w-e-kala-a***	*ni-ya-Ø-valuk-i-e*
9-house	**9-REL**	**1-person**	**that**	**1-PAST4-live-FV**	FOC-9-PAST2-collapse-PERF-FV

"The house where that man had lived collapsed."

These four examples demonstrate various ways in which a a subject nominal from the matrix clause can be relativised as a locative indirect object or oblique. Example (9) contrasts with (8) revealing that the expected location suffix *–ni* is lost in the relative clause. It may be implied by the class 9 prefix to the relativiser *ila* which is associated with a place. There is nothing distinctive about the final vowels or any other feature of the verb in the relative clause. Unsurprisingly for a restrictive relative, the time of the relative clauses is either simultaneous with the matrix verb time or precedes it in these examples. (Past 1 to 4 move back from recent to distant time.) The analysis of the somewhat complex verb in (7) may be insufficient, but does not seem to contradict this relationship of temporal grounding of the verbs.

Not only can NP_MAT subjects be relativised in this way, but objects (and likely all other roles) can be relativised as locative obliques or indirect objects:

(11)

Ninyie	*naakie*	*nyumba*	***ila***	***mundu***	***usu***	***wekalaa***
ni-Ø-ny-i-e	*n-Ø-aak-i-e*	*Ø-nyumba*	***i-la***	***mu-ndu***	***usu***	***w-e-kala-a***
1S-PAST2-build	1S-PAST2-build	9-house	**9-REL**	**1-person**	**that**	**1-PAST4-live-FV**
-PERF-FV	-PERF-FV					

"I built the house where that person lived."

Here, assuming the tense analysis of the verb pair *Ninyie naakie* is correct, it does seem surprising that *wekalaa* 'live' is grounded in an earlier time.

In all of these examples the NP~MAT~ is identified unambiguously regardless of grammatical role since the relativiser immediately follows it, and takes a matching prefix.

Multiple-embedding

The main clause may include more than one relative clause as appropriate. Often a question (see below) might involve a relative clause, but as in the examples below, another part of the question might include a relative clause. As the two following examples show, it is perfectly reasonable to embed multiple relative clauses in one matrix clause, with the relativisers taking the appropriate (different) class-concord prefixes:

(12)

Andu	**ala**	maii	iveti	ili,	maundu	**ala**	mataiimeka	ikanisani	ni	mau?
a-ndu	***a-la***	*ma-ii*	*i-veti*	*i-li*	*ma-undu*	***a-la***	*ma-t-aii-m-ek-a*	*i-kanisa-ni*	*ni*	*mau?*
2-person	2-REL	2-PAST4	8-wives	8-two	6-thing	6-REL	2-NEG-PERMIT -2.REFL-do-FV	5-church-in	QMARK	what?

"Those people who had two wives, what things could they not do in the church?"

(13)

Mundu	**ula**	maii	iveti	ili,	maundu	**ala**	utaiieka	ikanisani	ni	mau?
mu-ndu	***u-la***	*wa-i-i*	*i-veti*	*i-li*	*ma-undu*	***a-la***	*u-t-aii-Ø-ek-a*	*i-kanisa-ni*	*ni*	*mau?*
1-person	1-REL	1-PAST4 -have	8-wives	8-two	2-thing	2-REL	1-NEG-PERMIT -1.REFL-do-FV	5-church-in	QMARK	what?

"This person who had two wives, what things could they not do in the church?"[2]

---

[2] Notes on the interpretation of the interlinear text:

The permissive sense here may be difficult. It seems the person being permitted is embedded as a reflexive indirect object. Other forms of the verb shedding light on the permissive 'mood' are here:

> They could do: *m[a]-aii-m-ek[a]-a* **He** could not do: *u-t-aii-Ø-ek[a]-a*
> They **did** not do: *ma-t-eka-a*

Although the forms of the relativiser are identical in the first example, in the second the change of matrix clause subject (which is also relativised) brings a change in the prefix for the first relativiser. The second relativiser operates on 'things' *maundu* so is unaffected whether the matrix subject is plural or singular because it is relativising the complement of an implied 'be' verb, possibly incorporated in the question word *mau.*

Other Strategies in brief

Three other relativising strategies are evident: omitting the relativiser, using a copular with nominalised verb and using a demonstrative. It seems that certain strategies are preferred by particular verbs or combinations of grammatical role in the NP_{MAT} and NP_{REL}.

Null Relativiser

When the NP_{MAT} follows the verb (for example as a direct object) the relativiser is frequently omitted:

(14)

Ninisi	*mundu*		*wai*	*na*	*nzwii*	*nene*	*muno*
Ni-ni-s-i	*mu-ndu*	Ø	*wa-i-Ø*	*na*	*n-zwii*	*n-ene*	*muno*
1s-PRES-know-PERF	1-person	REL	**1-PAST4-be**	**with**	**9-hair**	**9-long**	**very**

"I know a man who has very long hair."

(15)

Kamundu	*kai*		*na*	*nzwii*	*nene*	*muno*
Ka-mu-ndu	*ka-i-Ø*		*na*	*n-zwii*	*n-ene*	*muno*
12-1-person	12-PAST4-be		with	9-hair	9-long	very

"A small man had very long hair."
(Class 12 is a diminuitive when prefixed to an existing
class 1 noun with prefix.)

(16)

Tene	*muno*	*nduani*	*imwe*	*vai*	*kamundu*	*kai*	*na*	*nzwii*	*nene*	*muno.*
tene	*muno*	*n-dua-ni*	*Ø-imwe*	*va-i-Ø*	*ka-mundu*	*ka-i-Ø*	*na*	*n-zwii*	*n-ene*	*muno*
past.time	very	9-village-in	9-one	16-PAST4-be	12-man	12-past4-be	with	9-hair	9-long	very

"A very long time ago, in one of the villages there lived (was) a small man

who had very long hair."

If we compare (13)(14) and (15), which are elicited extracts of (16) we see in the place after

mundu where we would expect *ula* there is nothing before the verb in the relative clause. Were it

not for the longer example (16) we might suspect that the verb 'know' was merely taking a

complement or that this is two sentences. But here we see the same structure as for a main clause,

with matrix and relative clauses sharing *kamundu*. In the matrix clause it is a direct object, but in

the relative clause a subject. The unusual focus of the sentence – not making the man the subject,

but introducing a dummy 'place' subject "there was…" – may be a result of rearranging the

sentence so that *kamundu* can be in the right position to function in both the matrix and the

relative clause.

Copular and nominalised verb

Stative-type verbs such as 'marry' or 'be given in marriage' may be particularly susceptible to

nominalisation. When such verbs (which in nominalising have become like an adjective) are

combined with the copular *uu* something equivalent to a restricted relative clause.

(17)

Mataii	*na*	*undu,*	*ningi,*	***mundu***	***muka***	***uu***	***utwaitwe***	*umunthi*	*uu*	*tikau*
Ma-t-a-i-i	*na*	*Ø-undu,*	*n-ingi,*	***mu-ndu***	***mu-ka***	***uu***	***u-twait-w-e***	*u-munthi*	*uu*	*ti-kau*
2-NEG-be	with	9-problem	9-no	**1-person**	**1-female**	**COP**	**1.NOM-marry**	14-today	COP	it.is-fight
-PERF-FV							**-PASS-PAST**			

"They had no problem, **this woman who has been married**, today it's… it's a fight."[3]

---

[3] Notes on the interpretation of the interlinear text:
(*Utwaitwe* is clearly derived from a verb root *-twait-* and takes a verb-style subject
marker u- but here appears to be nominalised and used with the copular *uu*.)

(18)

Mundu	*muka*	***uu***	***nutwaitwe.***		
Mu-ndu	*mu-ka*	***uu***	**n-u-twait-w-e**		
1-person	1-female	COP	FOC-**1.NOM-marry-PASS-PAST**		

"This woman is married."

Comparing examples (17) and (18), the major difference is the prefix *n-* in (18) which may indicate focus. The nominalised verb 'marry' combines with the copular to act as a restrictive relative clause in exactly the same position as a *–la* relative clause would be expected. The copular with nominalised verb requires a verb subject marker, coreferential in these cases with 'the woman' who is also subject in the matrix clause. A transitive verb or an interansitive verb with oblique may also be used. The NP$_{REL}$ is not restated except being referred to in the relative verb subject marker:

(19)

Ninaneena	*na*	*mundu*	*muka*	***uu***	***mutwae***		
ni-na-neen-a	*na*	*mu-ndu*	*mu-ka*	***uu***	***mu-twa-e***		
1s-PAST1-talk-FV	with	1-person	1-female	COP	**1.NOM-marry-FV**		

"I talked with a woman who is married."

(20)

Ninaneena	*na*	*mundu*	*muka*	***uu***	***utwaitwe***	***ni***	***fugoyo***
ni-na-neen-a	*na*	*mu-ndu*	*mu-ka*	***uu***	***u-twait-w-e***	***ni***	***fugoyo***
1s-PAST1-talk-FV	with	1-person	1-female	COP	**1.NOM-marry-PASS-FV**	**with**	**fugoyo**

"I talked with a woman who is married to Fogoyo."

This strategy is most usually observed when the NP$_{REL}$ functions as subject in the relative clause and NP$_{MAT}$ functions as object, so that the nominals are suitably positioned.

Demonstrative

The last and somewhat rare strategy is to use a demonstrative pronoun where we might expect a relativiser. Similarly the demonstrative takes a class-concord prefix:

(21)

Kwoou	kila	mundu	niwonaa		kyeni	**kyu**	twitaa	**utisi.**
Kuwoou	kila	mu-ndu	ni-w-ona-Ø-a		ky-eni	**ky-u**	tu-ita-Ø-a	**u-tisi**
Therefore	every	1-person	FOC-1-see-CONT-FV		7-light	**7-that**	1p-call-CONT-FV	**14-lightning**

"Therefore, everyone sees the light which we call lightning."
(Mbiti 1966:227)

My informants insisted that this is not two sentences, but that the relative clause is only correct when in the context of the main clause. This example from the end of a fable could possibly be a case of a non-restrictive relative, but in its context, explaining why people see lightning the relative clause seems most likely to restrict *kyeni* 'light' rather than just supplying additional information. That is, the story is about the light called 'lightning', not light called 'sunlight'.

Etymology of the Relativiser

Although relativisers (such as English 'that') often are related to demonstratives, the common Kikamba relativiser looks very different from all the demonstratives, so it seems unlikely that it has derived at all recently from a demonstrative. *Kila* in the above example my informants insisted was not *ki-la* but a simple, non-inflecting adverbial. However it bears some resemblance to the relativiser so the relationship between these words may be worth exploring.

Headless Relative Clauses and Questions

The *la* strategy is used for headless relative clauses:

(22)

Ninaiye		kila	kiveti	kyakwa	kinauite
Ni-ni-Ø-nai-i-e		ki-la	ki-veti	ky-akwa	ki-Ø-nau-i-t-e
FOC-1S-PAST2-eat-PERF-FV		7-REL	7-wife	7-1s.POSS	7-PAST2-cook-PERF-DO-FV

"I ate what my wife cooked."

The generic class 7 *ki* coincidentally has the same class as *kiveti* but there is no occurrence of the NP_{REL} in the matrix clause, so this is a headless relative clause. Otherwise it is just the same as

other –la constructions. Where the NP_{MAT} is obvious or non-referring (vague), a headless relative clause uses the clause itself to specify the omitted NP_{MAT}.

Headless relative clauses are sometimes (but not exclusively) used in questions, with additional question-marking words:

(23)

Ngombe	*ila*	*yina*	*mukwato*	*ni*	*yiva?*
Ø-ngombe	*i-la*	*yi-na-Ø*	*mukwato*	*ni*	*yi-va*
9-cow	9-REL	9-PRES-be	on.heat	QMARK	9-which.of

"Which cow is on heat?"

A question mark *ni* always appears as the penultimate word before the question word which is linked to the relativiser, but also specifies the type of question 'who', 'what', 'why', 'when' etc.

Multiple embedding

Relative clauses may also be embedded in questions so that *la* occurs twice with slightly different functions and often quite different translations of *la* into English:

(24)

Musungu	*ndaii*		*na*	*mavityo,*	*nundu*	*maandiko*	*measya*
Mu-sungu	*n-ti-a-ii*		*na*	*ma-vityo,*	*nundu*	*ma-andiko*	*me-a-sya*
1-european	1-NEG-be-PAST4		with	2-wrong	because	6-words	6-say-PAST

"The white man was not wrong because the scriptures say…"

ila	*kila*	*kianiu*	*kiuka,*	*kila*	*kitekianiu*	*kikavetwa.*
i-la	*ki-la*	*ki-aniu*	*ki-uka,*	*ki-la*	*ki-te-ki-aniu*	*ki-ka-vet-w-a.*
5-REL	7-that	7-perfect	7-come	7-that	7-NEG-7.REFL-is.perfect	7-FUT-take.away-PASS-FV

"when the thing that is perfect comes, the thing that is imperfect will pass away."[4]

---

[4] When the thing which is perfect comes, the thing which is imperfect will be removed.
(i- is used for a relative of time, so that *i-la* = "when")

12

However in terms of Kikamba grammar this multiple use of the same form is unsurprising, since unlike English the relativiser complex is not inflecting for grammatical role. The second line is simultaneously a complement of a speech verb (*measya*) and a time relative ('when') clause. Within the time clause are two headless relative clauses, using the generic class marker *ki-la* to as a non-referring restrictive relative clause.

Question markers and the relativiser

We analyse *ni mau* as a question marker followed by 'what'. However, it is possible that *ni* is more of a question form of the copular verb and it is clear that *mau* (which does not inflect) at most specifies the type of question ('what', 'when', 'why' etc) and so only in conjunction with the preceding *la* is it equivalent to the English translation 'what'. This is outside the scope of this paper.

Conclusions

The major strategy for relativising nominals of a main clause is to use the relativiser *–la* with a concord prefix agreeing with the class of the NP_{MAT}. As in a main clause, if the NP_{REL} is subject, the verb of the relative clause requires the appropriate class-concord prefix. It appears any grammatical role within the main clause can be relativised in this way, and there is evidence that the NP_{REL} may take any grammatical role in the relative clause except a possessive/genitive. If the NP_{REL} is a direct object in the relative clause then a resumptive pronoun may be added as a suffix to the relative clause verb root. Where the NP_{REL} is an indirect object or oblique, a resumptive class-concord prefix may appear in the usual place for an indirect object within the relative clause verb. 'What', 'When' and 'Who' questions may use one of the relativising strategies – most often using *–la*. The relativiser is quite different from the common demonstrative *usu* so would not appear to be related to that. We were unable to find concrete clues as to its etymology.

Bibliography

Andrews, Avery D (2006) Relative clauses, in Shopen, Timothy (ed) *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp 206-236

Guthrie, Malcolm (1948) *Classification of the Bantu Languages,* London: Oxford University Press for the International African Institute
summarised at http://www.linguistics.berkeley.edu/CBOLD/Lgs/LgsbyGN.html

Guthrie, Malcolm (1967) *Comparative Bantu*, Farnborough: Gregg Press Ltd

Kioko, Angelina Nduku (2005) *Theoretical Issues in the Grammar of Kikamba*, München: LINCOM GmbH

Mbiti, John S. ed. (1966) *Akamba Stories,* Oxford: Clarendon Press / 1983 Nairobi: Oxford University Press

Payne, Thomas E (1997) *Describing MorphoSyntax,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Rowbory, David (2008) *Complements of Speech in Kikamba,* Unpublished paper

Appendix A — Abbreviations & Conventions

1–17	Kikamba noun class (typically used to gloss a noun class prefix) listed in Appendix B. The prefixes used for nouns and verb subjects are not always identical but are numbered identically whether on noun or verb.
3s	Third person singular etc (person and number marking) usually for personal pronouns or subject marking on the predicate
[that]	Square brackets indicate optional material where no syntactic or semantic difference is implied whether the material is included or not.
àáá̋â	tone (where marked): low, high, super-high, falling
CONT	Continuous aspect.
DO	Direct Object Marker
FOC	Focus marker
FV	Final vowel (no syntactic/semantic/pragmatic significance, but to fulfil phonological expectations)
IO	Inirect Object Marker
ITER	Iterative or habitual aspect/mood marker (reduplication).
NOM	Nominaliser (makes a verb a nominal)
$NP_{MAT} NP_{REL}$	Matrix noun phrase, Relativised noun phrase
PAST1	Immediate past. Other past tenses are 2-4 (near, distant, remote).
PERF	Perfective aspect
PERMIT	Permitive mood marker (permission or possibly ability to do something)
POS	Possession / possessive pronoun
QMARK	Question Marker
REFL	Reflexive indirect object marker (on a verb)
REL	Relativiser
SM	Subject Marker (used only when necessary to distinguish from object marker)
TNS	tense marker (where the actual tense is unimportant for the example)

Appendix B – Kikamba Noun Classes

Class	Noun Prefix	Example & meaning		Verb Subject Marker / Pronoun
1	*mo*	*mo-ndo*	person	u-, w-
2	*a*	*a-ndo*	people	a-, ma-
3	*mo*	*mo-te*	tree	u-, w-
4	*me*	*me-te*	trees	i-, y-
5	*e*	*e-to*	leaf	i-, y-
6	*ma*	*ma-to*	leaves	ma-
7	*ke*	*ke-veti*	woman	ki-, ky-
8	*i*	*i-veti*	women	i-, sy-
9	*n*	*n-omba*	house	i-, y-
10	*n*	*n-omba*	houses	i-, sy-
11	*o*	*o-lii*	thread	u-, w-
12	*ka*	*k-ana*	child	ka-
13	*to*	*to-ana*	children	tu-, tw-
14	*o*	*o-emi*	farming	u-, w-
15	*ko*	*ko-ema*	farming	ku-, kw-
16	*ɸa / va*	*ɸa-ndo*	place	va-
17	*ko*	*ko-ndo*	places	ku-, kw-

(Taken from Kioko 2005:22,49)