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Abstract

This study was aimed at analyzing the Lunyala 'K' simple sentence using a Role and Reference Grammar theoretical framework, purposely to ascertain how the RRG’s layered structure of the clause can account for the simple sentences in this Language. The syntactic, semantic and focus structures of the Lunyala ‘K’ simple sentence were investigated within the Role and Reference Grammar framework. The Objectives of the study included: Establishing whether Focus structure determines the arrangement of elements in a simple Lunyala ‘K’ sentence; finding out if Constituent projection determines the Focus domain in a simple Lunyala ‘K’ sentence: determining whether the Operator and Focus projections are related in a simple Lunyala ‘K’ sentence and representing the Lunyala ‘K’ simple clause using the Role and Reference Grammar (RRG). The study revealed that various elements of the Lunyala ‘K’ clause can be accounted for using the RRG’s Layered Structure of the Clause (LSC). The constituent projection of the clause in which case we identified the non universal properties of the clause in Lunyala, such as the left detached position (LDP), right detached position (RDP), pre-core slot (PrCS) and post-core slot (PoCS) elements was analyzed. The study revealed that the ‘who’ and ‘what’ Wh- words in Lunyala ‘K’ can occur both in the Pre-core slot and the post-core slot. The study also discussed the Lunyala ‘K’ Noun Phrase, showing how the modifying elements portray the concordial agreement from the head noun. It showed that the NP can consist of the head and its modifiers, which follow a strict order of co-occurrence. It was also evident that in nearly all cases, the modifiers occur to the right, that is, the noun precedes its modifiers. It also demonstrated that the RRG’s layered structure of the Noun Phrase (LSNP) can account for the various operators in the Noun Phrase. It also revealed that the verb, depending on its classification, is so important in determining the macrorole element in a Lunyala ‘K’ sentence. The study also revealed the interrelatedness of the constituent projection, operator projection and the focus projection. Focus structure was seen to determine the arrangement of elements while the focus domain is determined by the constituent projection. On the other hand, given that the Potential Focus Domain falls within the Illocutionary Force operator, it became evident that the operator and focus projections are related.
### List of abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3sg</td>
<td>3rd person singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3pl</td>
<td>3rd person plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM</td>
<td>Tense marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>Layered Structure of the Clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDP</td>
<td>Left detached position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDP</td>
<td>Right detached position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSNP</td>
<td>Layered Structure of the Noun Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB</td>
<td>Government and Binding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXT</td>
<td>Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>Minimalist Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>Singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OM</td>
<td>Object marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Subject marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASP</td>
<td>Aspect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FV</td>
<td>Final vowel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMA</td>
<td>Tense marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF</td>
<td>Illocutionary Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
<td>Direct Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEIC</td>
<td>Deictic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASP</td>
<td>Nominal Aspect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QNT</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADJ</td>
<td>Adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO</td>
<td>Indirect object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADV</td>
<td>Adverb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REF</td>
<td>Reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSA</td>
<td>Privileged Argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFD</td>
<td>Actual Focus Domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFD</td>
<td>Potential Focus Domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUH</td>
<td>Actor – Undergoer Hierarchy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td>Logical Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>Noun phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARG</td>
<td>Argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVP</td>
<td>Adverb phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPIP</td>
<td>Noun Phrase Initial Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PrCS</td>
<td>Pre Core Slot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PoCS</td>
<td>Post Core Slot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRED</td>
<td>Predicate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRG</td>
<td>Role and Reference Grammar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUC</td>
<td>Nuclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UND</td>
<td>Undergoer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBJ</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>Actor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGT</td>
<td>Agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM</td>
<td>Focus Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL</td>
<td>Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘K’</td>
<td>Kakalewa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRCE</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRCE</td>
<td>Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASS</td>
<td>Passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INST</td>
<td>Instrument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXP</td>
<td>Experiencer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pstpft</td>
<td>Past perfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PST</td>
<td>Past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Focused element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>Future</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1.1 Background to the study

Lunyala ‘K’, the language under study is a dialect of the Luyia language. It is an African language of the Bantu subgroup. According to Ng’ang’a (2006), there are three sub-groups which claim to be Abanyala. These are the Bakabarases, the Kakalewa and the Abanyala ba Baongo. They have more than thirty clans, the major ones being the Abamulembo, Abanyakera, the Abasinyama and the Abakhoone.

The name “Abanyala” is claimed to have originated from the fact that certain people drove away the Abakhoone and for that reason, they boasted saying khubanyalire (‘we have served them right’), and therefore the name of Abanyala became applicable to all the clans of the Abanyala. Osogo, (cited in Ng’ang’a 2006:42) asserts, “It is possible that the Banyala ba Baongo have earlier connections with the people who live in an area called Bunyala in present day Buganda. If this were true, it would not disprove anything said about the latter meaning given to the name Abanyala by the clans which conquered the Abakhoone.” It is also possible that the Banyala originated from a person called Munyala, or they have connections with the people who live in Bunyala area in Uganda.
The Kakalewa (therein referred to as Lunyala ‘K’) are the central Banyala to whom this study is aimed. Presently, Lunyala‘K’, is spoken by the Abanyala of Navakholo constituency, Kakamega County, Western region of Kenya. Lunyala (K) is also spoken by native speakers who have migrated to other parts of Kenya.

According to Fedders and Salvadori (1980), variations found in Luyia dialects are phonological, morphological, syntactic and semantic and as such warrant dialects specific studies.

Bantu languages are known to have highly agglutinative morphology especially the verb complex. This agglutinative morphology of Bantu languages conceals other morphosyntactically unusual complex features of African languages and therefore, given that Lunyala (K) is a Bantu language and so highly agglutinative, there is need for a morphosyntactic approach in its description. Lunyala portrays Bantu agglutinative characteristics in that the nominal element can function like a complete sentence. e.g

\[
Mbe \quad \text{‘give me.’}
\]

The tense form of Lunyala ‘K’ also allows us to point to four different periods of past time as well as the future using the same verb stem and affixes, totally without any ‘time’ word. e.g.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Kecha} & \quad \text{‘s/he is coming’} \\
\text{Kechire} & \quad \text{‘s/he came’} \\
\text{Kechanga} & \quad \text{‘s/he comes’} \\
\text{Aneche} & \quad \text{‘s/he will come’} \\
\end{align*}
\]
Therefore morphosyntax in language description is of interest because it is by describing it that linguistics will be able to explain the discourse semantic-pragmatic functions of those elements that make up the clauses, a description that the RRG functional approach offers. (Kihara, 2010:2)

1.2 Statement of the Problem

This study aimed at describing the morphosyntax of Lunyala ‘K’ simple sentence using the RRG’s layered structure of the clause and in particular, to investigate how the various linguistic levels like semantics, syntax and pragmatics would interact on a single clause and be represented on the layered structure of the clause as postulated in RRG.

Language is a complex phenomenon and in heavily agglutinative languages like Lunyala, morphology and syntax interact in an interesting way and quite obviously, knowledge of one supplements the other. There is evidence of syntactic categories that are manifested as morphemes. Therefore, with this knowledge, this study aims at providing an analysis of the Lunyala ‘K’ simple sentence basically via morphology.

As such, there is a vacuum in Lunyala (K) in the availability of documented data in Morpho-syntactic, phonetic, phonological and semantic studies, especially using a functional approach. This study therefore, will help in filling the existing gap in Lunyala ‘K’ through the analysis of its Morphosyntax using the Role and Reference Grammar.

1.3 Objectives

1. To establish whether Focus structure determines the arrangement of elements in a simple Lunyala ‘K’ sentence

2. To find out if Constituent projection determines the Focus domain in a simple Lunyala ‘K’ sentence

3. To determine whether the Operator and Focus projections are related in a simple Lunyala ‘K’ sentence

4. To represent the Lunyala ‘K’ simple clause using the Role and Reference Grammar (RRG)

1.4 Research questions

1. Does Focus structure determine the arrangement of elements in a simple Lunyala ‘K’ sentence?

2. Does the constituent projection determine the Focus domain in a simple Lunyala ‘K’ sentence?

3. Are the operator and focus projections related in a simple Lunyala ‘K’ sentence?

4. Can the Lunyala ‘K’ simple clause be represented using the Role and Reference Grammar (RRG)
1.5 Hypotheses

1. Focus structure determines the arrangement of elements in a simple Lunyala ‘K’ sentence

2. Constituent projection determines the Focus domain in a simple Lunyala ‘K’ sentence

3. Operator and Focus projections are related in a simple Lunyala ‘K’ sentence

4. Lunyala ‘K’ simple clause can be represented using the Role and Reference Grammar (RRG)

1.6 Justification of the Research

Lunyala ‘K’ is one of the minor dialects of the larger Luyia community and it is marginally underrepresented in terms of scholarly documentation of its grammar. There is no documentation of any study done on the morphosyntax of Lunyala ‘K’ using the RRG’s theory, hence the motivation of this study. Literature on Luyia is biased towards the major Luyia dialects like Lubukusu, Lulogooli, Lutachoni, Lunyore and so, the more need to research on this minor dialect.

The agglutinative nature of Lunyala ‘K’ makes it worthwhile to consider the morphological factor together with syntax because syntax and morphology are perceived to be strongly intertwined hence, the need to show the two components’ relatedness and the influence they have on each other.
Relevant studies to this have been undertaken in various languages. These include the works of Kihara (2010) who analyses the Gikuyu simple sentence using RRG approach, Kaviti (2004) investigates the principles and parameters in KikambaMorphosyntax within the Minimalist perspective, Gachomo (2004) investigates tense, aspect and mood-morphosyntactic verb inflections in Gikuyu using the MP, Susan (2011) investigates the morphosyntactic verbal inflections for tense and aspect of Lunyore, using the minimalist program and Odhiambo (2012) analyses the interface between syntax and pragmatics in Dholuo using RRG.

Therefore, the novelty of the research comes from the fact that no known study, at least at this point in time, and known to the researcher, has been done on the morphosyntax of Lunyala ‘K’ simple sentence using the Role and Reference Grammar.

1.7 Scope and limitations

The investigation only covered the morphosyntax of the Lunyala (K) simple sentences, which will be analyzed within the RRG framework. The study, in order to analyze the research questions concentrated on investigating the following projections: constituent projection, operator projection, semantic representation and focus projection. The study did not concern itself with complex sentences because of the fact that these simple clauses add up to form the larger units and more still, RRG proposes a slightly different theory of analyzing complex sentences.
1.8 Literature Review

The study takes a comparative view of other Bantu languages because they are structurally related in terms of their grammars and vocabulary as well. Related works to the present study include: Mugune (1998) in *Gikuyu NP Morpho-Syntax*, deals with morphological marking, lexical specifications and prosody, which shades much light on the Bantu NP structure.

Marete’s (1981) thesis on *A Study of Grammatical Agreement in Ki-Meru Syntax* brings out the concordial agreement features of Bantu languages.

Appleby (1947) in *A First Luyia Grammar*, concentrates on pronunciations parts of speech and tense. Using Luwanga, Appleby (1961) gives the basic structure of Luyia language, basically she discusses tense and aspect, as well as parts of speech. This gives relevant basic information about the language under study, particularly the basics of sentence structure.

Kanyoro (1983) in his book, *Unity in Diversity*, classifies Luyia dialects and, although she focuses on Luloogoli and Lubukusu, she gives relevant information about tense, negation, mood and aspect that is relevant in the analysis of Lunyala simple sentence.

Wasike (1992) in the *Analysis of Lubukusu Simple Sentence using GB*, provides information on verbal inflections and sentence structure, which is relevant to the present study.
Malanda (2005) describes the Morphophonology of Lunyore and Lutachoni consonantal system by using the Generative Phonology Theoretical Framework. His work is relevant to the present study in that it will help provide data on Luyia Morphology. Kihara’s (2010) analysis of Gikuyu simple sentence using RRG is quite handy to the present study, which is also basing its analysis on RRG.

1.8.1 Theoretical Framework

1.8.1.1 Role and Reference Grammar

Role and Reference Grammar (RRG) (Van Valin 1993b, Van Valin & Lappolla 1997), may be termed a structural-functionalist theory of grammar. This places it on a range of theoretical perspectives from extreme formalist at one end to radical functionalist at the other. RRG falls between these two extremes, differing markedly from each. In contrast to the extreme formalist view, RRG views language as a system of communicative social action, and hence, the need to analyze the communicative functions of morphosyntactic structures plays a vital role in grammatical description of languages in this theory. Language is a system and so is grammar in the traditional structuralist sense; what differentiates the RRG conception of grammar from the standard formalist one, especially the Chomskyan theories, is the view that grammatical structure can only be understood and explained with reference to its semantic and communicative functions. Syntax is not autonomous, as it is in Generative theory, rather it is viewed as relatively motivated by semantic and pragmatic factors.
RRG deals not only with relations of co-occurrence and combination in strictly formal terms but also with semantic and pragmatic co-occurrence and combinatory relations. Hence, RRG may be properly designated as a structural–functionalist theory rather than purely formalist or purely functionalist since it is interested in both structure and function of language. RRG is said to be a rigorous, typologically semantic grammatical theory that highly regards semantics and syntax –Kihara (2010).

On issues of cognition, RRG adopts Dik’s criteria of typological and psychological adequacy which states that a theory should be compatible with the results of psycholinguistic research on the acquisition, processing, production, interpretation and memorization of linguistic expressions (Dik, 1991:248). It also agrees with Kaplan & Bresnan’s (1982) criterion that a syntactic theory should be relatable to testable theories of language production and comprehension.

1.8.1.2 Historical development of role and reference grammar

According to VVLP (1997), RRG grew out of an attempt to answer two basic questions:
1. What would linguistic theory look like if it were based on the analysis of Lakhota, Tagalog and Dyirbal, rather than on the analysis of English?
2. How can the interaction of syntax, semantics and pragmatics in different grammatical systems be best captured and explained?
RRG looks at language in totality and not as an abstract entity. Therefore, the analysis of the syntax, semantics and pragmatics and how they are interlinked is paramount. Language in RRG is seen as a tool of communication, and not an abstract entity.

RRG is a monostratal theory, positing only one level of syntactic representation which is the actual utterance itself without any feature-checking as found in the Minimalist programs or the D- or S-structures found in GB. The single syntactic level corresponds to the actual utterance without resorting to movements. The organization of the grammar is given here:

![Diagram of RRG Organization](image)

*Figure 1: Organization of Role and Reference Grammar (from Van Valin 1993 (b))*
The Figure posits a single level of syntactic representation for a sentence which is mapped directly into the semantic representation of the sentence and vice versa hence the double headed arrow (VVLP 1997). There are no abstract levels mediating between overt syntactic representations of sentence and its semantic representation as found in GB and PP (Principles and Parameters) and earlier versions of Transformational Grammar nor movements as in the Minimalist program. RRG posits the minimal number of representations so as to capture the relationship between form and meaning in language.

### 1.8.1.3 Central Concepts of RRG

#### Clause Structure

According to Van Valin (1993b), RRG rejects the standard formats of representing clause structure (grammatical relations, X-bar syntax) because they are not universal and hence unnecessarily impose aspects of structure on at least some languages where it is not appropriate. The RRG conception of clause structure was originally proposed in Foley & Van Valin (1984) and subsequently improved in Van Valin (1993b), Van Valin & Lapolla (1997). RRG has a clause structure called the *layered structure of the clause* (LSC), which is made up of:

- a. The nucleus, which contains the predicate(s)
- b. The core, which contains the nucleus and the arguments of the predicates
- c. The periphery, which contains adjunct temporal and locative modifiers of the core.

These aspects of the LSC are universal.
According to Van Valin & Lapolla (1997), some languages have a ‘Pre-core slot’ (PrCS), which is the position of WH-words in languages like English and Icelandic. Some verb final languages like Japanese have a post core slot (PoCS), while others have a Right-Detached position (RDP), which is a position of the post-clausal element in a right-detached dislocation, and a Left-Detached position (LDP), which is the position of the pre-clausal element in a left-detached dislocation construction. Each of the major layers (nucleus, core and clause) is modified by one or more operators, which include grammatical categories such as tense, aspect, modality and evidentiality. The LSC applies equally to fixed word-order and free word-order languages, to head-marking and dependent-marking languages, to languages with and without grammatical relations. In the formal representation of the LSC, operators are represented in a distinct projection of the clause from the predicates and arguments (the constituent projection). This is presented in fig. below;
Figure 2: The layered structure of the clause
RRG does not allow phonologically null elements in the syntactic representation, e.g., traces, and null pronominals. The representation may be abstract with respect to phonology or morphophonology, e.g. the output could be in terms of abstract morphophonological units rather than concrete phonetic ones. The three central components of the LSC also turn out to be the three fundamental building blocks of complex sentences in human language.

1.8.1.1.4 The layered structure of the Noun Phrase

RRG also has the Layered Structure of the Noun Phrase (LSNP) that is similar but not identical to the LSC. It has both the constituent and operator projections, as shown below:
Some languages have the NP initial position in their NP structures. This is the position before the head where the possessive pronouns occur. NP operators are determiners (which include articles, demonstratives deictics), quantifiers, adjectival and nominal modifiers, negation and nominal aspect.

The quality operators specify the particular qualities of the referring expression, while the nominal aspect shows the individuation to the mass/count distinction.

Negation is expressed through a special negation marker e.g. Ta(we) in Lunyala ‘K’ as in

\[ \text{Sikechata}(\text{we}) \]

‘s/he is not coming.’

Adjectival and nominal modifiers are nuclear operators together with the nominal aspect. The quantity operators modify the \( \text{CORE}_N \) of the NP and these are concerned with quantification and negation. The locality operators modify the NP as a whole and they are meant to express the location of position of the referent with respect to a reference point, usually the interlocutors (deictics) and with indicating the speaker’s assumption about the identifiability of the hearer (definiteness).

### 1.8.1.5 Semantic Structure

The heart of the RRG approach to lexical representation is a system of lexical decomposition based on Vendler’s (1967) Aktionsart classification of verbs into states, activities, achievements and accomplishments.

### 1.8.1.6 Semantic Roles

RRG posits two types of semantic roles. The first are specific thematic relations, the traditional notions of agent, theme, patient, experience, etc. The second are generalized semantic roles called ‘semantic macroroles’. Following the ideas of Gruber (1965) and Jackendoff (1976), RRG defines thematic relations in terms of argument positions in
Logical Structures (LS). All thematic relations are defined in terms of argument positions in state and activity. The thematic relations posited by RRG can be summed up in five relevant distinctions, which correspond to the five possible argument positions in LSs, as shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arg of</th>
<th>1st arg of</th>
<th>1st arg of</th>
<th>2nd arg of</th>
<th>Arg of state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
<td>do’ (x, …)</td>
<td>pred’ (x,y)</td>
<td>pred’ (x,y)</td>
<td>pred’ (x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGENT</td>
<td>EFFECTOR</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>THEME</td>
<td>PATIENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOVER</td>
<td>PERCEIVER</td>
<td>STIMULUS</td>
<td>ENTITY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST-MOVER</td>
<td>COGNIZER</td>
<td>CONTENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-EMITTER</td>
<td>WANTER</td>
<td>DESIRE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-EMITTER</td>
<td>JUDGER</td>
<td>JUDGEMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERFORMER</td>
<td>POSSESSOR</td>
<td>POSSESSED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSUMER</td>
<td>EXPERIENCER</td>
<td>SENSATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CREATOR</td>
<td>EMOTER</td>
<td>TARGET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPEAKER</td>
<td>ATTRIBUTANT</td>
<td>ATTRIBUTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBSERVER</td>
<td>IDENTIFIED</td>
<td>IDENTITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USER</td>
<td>VARIABLE</td>
<td>PERFORMANCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 4: Thematic relations continuum in terms of LS argument positions*

*Source: Van Valin & Wilkins (1996)*
Agents are willful, controlling, instigating participants in states of affairs, while patients are strongly affected participants. The DO of lexicalized agency always co-occurs with \textit{do'}(x,…) which defines effector and its subtypes, and therefore the first two columns are closely related to each other; both of them express participants which do something. At the other end of the continuum are patient and theme. The single argument of the state \textit{predicate'} (x) includes those participants which are crushed, killed, smashed, shattered, broken, destroyed, etc while the second argument of \textit{predicate'} (x,y), includes those participants which are placed, moved, thrown, given, possessed, transferred, seen, heard, loved etc. Into the middle of the continuum falls the first argument of \textit{predicate'} (x,y).

The second type of semantic role plays a crucial role in the theory. These are called macroroles which act as the primary interface between the LS and syntactic representations. There are only two macroroles, these are, actor and undergoer, corresponding to the two primary arguments in a prototypical transitive relation. They are called macroroles because each subsumes a number of specific thematic relations.

There is a range of, sometimes overlapping thematic relations that can serve as subject and direct object; the subject can be an agent (effector), instrument, perceiver or recipient, while the direct object can be a patient, theme, stimulus, recipient, source or perceiver.

The relationship between the macroroles and the argument positions in LSs is captured in the actor-undergoer hierarchy, shown below:
Figure 5: Actor – Undergoer Hierarchy

1.8.1.7 The Lexicon

The lexicon plays a very important role in RRG. The lexical entries for the verbs are built around LSs. RRG states that lexical entries for verbs should contain only idiosyncratic information, basically derived from general lexical principles or rules. No syntactic subcategorization information is included in lexical entries; all of the relevant information is derivable from the LS of the verb plus information about its transitivity. Thus these principles have the effect of predicting the syntactic subcategorization of a verb from its semantic representation. RRG distinguishes lexical from syntactic phenomena in terms of the linking scheme. Basically, any process which affects LSs or the arguments therein or the mapping between LSs and macroroles is considered to be lexical. Syntactic phenomena involves the mapping between macroroles and the syntactic representation, e.g. some types of passivization and antipassivization, WH-question formation in languages like English and Icelandic, and raising constructions. (Van Valin 2005).
1.8.1.8 The focus structure

Focus structure is the grammatical system which serves to indicate the scope of the assertion in an utterance in contrast to the pragmatic presupposition, and it is vital to the RRG analysis of many grammatical phenomena. (Kihara 2010). The focus structure of an utterance is represented in a projection of the clause which is distinct from the operator and constituent projection.

This is shown in figure 1.5 below;
Figure 6: The LSC with Constituent, operator and Focus Projections

Each language has some grammatical system for marking the type of information within an utterance, (i.e., statement, question, command). According to Van Valin (1997:201), some languages use intonation, morphological marking or word order.
RRG distinguishes between the ‘potential focus domain’ (PFD), i.e., the syntactic domain in the sentence where focus may fall, and the ‘actual focus domain’ (AFD), the part that is focused in a particular utterance. Languages vary so much in terms of how PFD is restricted, both in simple and complex sentences. In addition, RRG recognizes in situ focus and existence of specific focus positions in languages. (Van Valin & Lapolla 1997).

RRG recognizes three types of focus: sentence, predicate and narrow focus. These foci types play an important role in communication since they help in identifying a referent, commenting on a topic and reporting an event or presenting new discourse referent. Being pragmatic in nature, the focus structure is relevant to this study that is aimed at establishing the interface between syntax and pragmatics in Lunyala ‘K’ simple sentence.

1.8.2 Why RRG?

RRG holds that syntax cannot be understood separately from semantics and pragmatics, since to a very large extent, it is semantically and/or pragmatically motivated. Lunyala ‘K’, being an African Bantu language is so agglutinative that, according to Childs (2003:105), most of its components are realized as affixes which have both syntactic as well as functional roles. Therefore, a morphosyntactic language description of this nature requires identifying the semantic as well as the pragmatic functions of those elements that make up the clause, a description that RRG approach offers.
1.8.3 Conceptual Framework

**Figure 7: Conceptual Framework**

The independent variables are syntax, semantics and pragmatics. They interact with each other on the Lunyala ‘K’ simple sentence thus conforming to the RRG layered structure which is the dependent variable.

1.9 Research Methodology

1.9.1 Research Design

This study adopted a descriptive survey design. Surveys are mainly conducted in case of descriptive research studies. The design is efficient in collecting large amounts of information within a short time. The intention of survey research was to gather data at a particular point in time and use it to describe the nature of existing conditions. The design
was suitable for this study because it seeks to describe the morphosyntax of Lunyala ‘K’ simple sentence using the RRG’s layered structure of the clause by investigating how the various linguistic levels like semantics, syntax and pragmatics interact on a single clause and be represented on the layered structure of the clause as postulated in RRG.

1.9.2 Target Population

The study targeted the Abanyala of Navakholo constituency, Kakamega County, Western region of Kenya whose population is 137,165 (National Census 2009). However, only 3 out of the 5 wards in the constituency speak Lunyala ‘K”, that is Bunyala East, Bunyala West and Bunyala Central. Therefore the target population was the 3 wards.

1.9.3 Sampling Procedures and Sample Size

Simple random sampling was used to select the respondents from each of the 3 wards in Navakholo constituency as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Target population</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Bunyala West</td>
<td>38,407</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bunyala East</td>
<td>22,122</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Bunyala Central</td>
<td>29,193</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>89,722</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1: The population of Navakholo Constituency*

Source: Census 2009
1.9.4 Data collection Methods

The data for this study was collected using an interview schedule and a questionnaire. These data collection instruments used to elicit information from the respondents who are the native speakers of Lunyala ‘K’ to obtain information on the relationship between the syntactic, semantic and pragmatic relationship in the Lunyala ‘K’ simple sentence.

1.9.5 Pilot Study

A pilot study is a small-scale trial intended to assess the adequacy of the instruments to be used for data collection. It reflects what the actual study would be. Piloting was done on 10 native Lunyala ‘K’ speakers selected at random from Kakamega District. The findings derived from the pilot study supported by the available literature provided useful answers to the stipulated research questions. The pilot study findings were used to improve the appropriateness of the methods for data collection and data analysis in the main study.

1.9.6 Data Analysis

The study adopted both qualitative and quantitative approaches to analyze the categories of data drawn with the instruments preceded in the preceding sections.

1.9.7 Qualitative Analysis

Qualitative analysis provides in-depth explanations about a phenomenon. The researcher used it to analyze information in a systematic way in order to arrive to some useful
conclusions and recommendations. The researcher obtained detailed information about the phenomenon being studied that is, the relationship between the syntactic, semantic and pragmatic relationship in the Lunyala ‘K’ simple sentence. Since data in qualitative analysis are in the form of words rather than numbers, the words were grouped in categories and general statements were made on how these are related.

1.9.8 Quantitative Analysis

In quantitative analysis, the responses in the questionnaire were assigned numerical values from which statistical descriptions are made. Data was described using descriptive statistics to enable the researcher to meaningfully describe a distribution of scores using a few statistics. In this study the descriptive and numerical data was generated from the analysis of scores obtained from the respondents in the questionnaires and interview schedules and predictive correlation studies based on the findings were then used to determine the relationship between the syntactic, semantic and pragmatic relationship in the Lunyala ‘K’ simple sentence. The results of the analyzed data then were presented and discussed.

1.10 Data Presentation, Analysis and Interpretation

1.10.1 Questionnaire return rate

A total of 178 questionnaires were administered to Key informants who included 76 from Bunyala East, 44 from Bunyala Central and 58 from Bunyala West. The completion rate of the questionnaires was 100%. 
1.10.2 The basic syntactic patterns of the Lunyala ‘K’ simple sentence.

Table 4.3: Percentage of respondents showing the correctly structured sentences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Li-o-u-suma</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yi-cha wangu</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yi-cha wa-ngu Nawire</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-mu-losi ke-cha</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nawire ka-nyimi-re echemwa</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasio ke-chir-e mungolobe</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-mw-ana a-chor-ire-nge mu-weru na-manda</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lia-o-u-suma Nawire ni-u-cha-nyich-a</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-u-suma lia mayi kho-khu-chi-e</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siauli nyinga, Nawire ke-ch-anga e-wefwe sibuyi</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si-mwana ka-mu-ka-bir-e o-mu-kunda</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nawire ke-uye</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ese-nchia mu-mw-alo</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-mu-losi ke-ch-a</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ncha-nu o-li-mu-nchu?</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sio-si(na) e-si-khu-lu-mir-e?</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we-chir-e li-na?</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-li o-chi-e</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o-ch-i-ye-nge ena?</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Correctness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wao!</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yi-cha!</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-nyoy-e!</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ke-chir-e!</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ka-yich-a</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ke-rukh-a nesifulia</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-li-mulay-i</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-fukir-e</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaka ke-ch-a</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ka-wa-ye Nekesa e-si-tau Mungolobe</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ba-i-ri-ye Liaka a-ma-tumwa no-mutoka.</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-mu-khana Ola,na-mu-wen-e mu-mw-alo mungolobe</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-si-chay-e ena?</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-mu-sacha ola, a-bebi ba-mu-khupa ba-ba o—</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>khumw-icha</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-se u-sa khu-lwa-ngi, ke-nye-kha-na ba-mu-wo-wei</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na-ka-si-ma sa-na a-ma-be-re ma-wo-wu</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ba-chi-a e-wa-wei o-mw-ana o-la</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ncha-nu o-li-ye e-chemwa li-a-ngi?</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-khu-khu-pir-e ncha-nu?</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-mwa-na o-la ke-chi-re mu-ngo-lo-be.</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-ba-na ba-la be-chi-re mu-ngo-lo-be</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-kha-na kha-la khe-chi-re mu-ngo-lo-be</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
O-chwa-na chu-la chew-chi-re mu-ngo-lo-be. | 176 | 99%
---|---|---
O-kwa-na ku-la kwe-chi-re mu-ngo-lo-be | 176 | 99%
E-mia-na ki-ra ki-e-chi-re mu-ngo-lo-be | 176 | 99%
Nekesa alimunchu | 175 | 98%
Nawire alima | 178 | 99%
Epwoni likumukhire | 176 | 100%
Enguo yomire | 176 | 99%
Nawire aliye enchuku | 176 | 99%
Omulosi amusindusise | 178 | 99%
Omwana kachire eningiro | 176 | 100%
Liaka akumuye epwoni | 176 | 99%
Nawire asiubire omukoye | 175 | 98%

**Table 2: The Morpho-Syntactic Structure of the Lunyala ‘K’ Sentence**

95% to 100% of the respondents said that all the given constructions were the correct sentence structure in Lunyala ‘K’.

The interview schedule and Focus Group Discussion showed that Focus in the falling sentences fell on the following elements:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause</th>
<th>Focus domain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachi owene embusi</td>
<td>Embusi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nche Embwa yi mbwene</td>
<td>Embwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nche Nawire oliye echemwa</td>
<td>Nawire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nche Wawire okhupire Liaka.</td>
<td>Wawire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okhulenge khwange Khusimbere</td>
<td>Khusimbere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omwibi kecha.</td>
<td>Clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echemwa ncherindiye.</td>
<td>Echemwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esi Nawire aliye nche echemwa</td>
<td>Esi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nchanu owirukhire?</td>
<td>Nchanu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siosi(na) esikhulumire</td>
<td>Siosi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echemwa lili?</td>
<td>Echemwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nawire aliye</td>
<td>Nawire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER TWO

THE CONSTITUENT PROJECTION OF LUNYALA ‘K’

2.1 Introduction

In this chapter a summary of the findings of the study are related to other study findings. The Constituent Projection of Lunyala ‘K’ as an independent variable is discussed in detail in relation to studies carried elsewhere as reflected in review of literature.

2.2 The Syntactic Structure of Lunyala ‘K’

2.2.1 Functions of Lunyala ‘K’ simple sentences

The different simple sentences in Lunyala ‘K’ can be assigned different functions depending on their illocutionary force. Functionally, the sentences can be classified as declaratives, interrogatives, imperatives and exclamatives. This classification is based on the purpose of the sentence rather than on sentence structure. Thus:

2.2.1.1 Declarative:

A declarative is a sentence construction that makes statements, whose structural arrangement of constituents is:

Noun / Pronoun + Verb + (Adverb) e.g.

\( O\text{-}mu\text{-}losi\text{ ke-ch-a} \) ‘The witch is coming.’

Pre prefix-prefix-S-SM-TM-V-FV

\( Ese\text{-}nchia\text{ mu-mw-alo} \) ‘I am going to the river.’

1sg-SM-TM-V-S LOC

\( Nawire\text{ ke-uye} \) ‘Nawire has given birth.’

S-SM-TM-ASP-V
2.2.1.2  Interrogative

According to Maloba (2012), the interrogative is defined as a sentence which is uttered by somebody seeking to elicit information from another person, or simply from themselves. Lunyala ‘K’ interrogatives are of two types corresponding to the English Yes/No and WH-questions, depending on the answer the question demands. e.g.

Yes/No.  

*Nawire ke-chir-e?*  ‘has Nawire come?’

S-SM-TM-V-ASP-FV

*Wu-ndech-e-ye o-u-sie?*  ‘have you brought me flour?’

2sg-TM-V-FV-DO

*Wi-yokir-e?*  ‘Have you showered? (taken a bath?)’

2sg-SM-TM-V-FV

*O-chiy-e mu-mw-alo?*  ‘did you go to the river?’

Did-2sg-TM-V-FV-S LOC

The Wh-questions are introduced by the use of:

Nchanu  _ ‘who’

Siosi(na) – ‘what’

Ena – ‘where’

Lina – ‘when’

-chie – ‘how’

e.g.

*ncha-nu o-li-mu-nchu?*  *(o-li-mu-nchu ncha-nu?)*  ‘who is in the house?’

Who-SM-TM-V-S LOC
Sio-si(na) e-si-khu-lu-mir-e? (e-si-khu-lu-mir-e sio-si(na)?) ‘what has bitten you?’
what-SM-TM-V-2sg-FV

we-chir-e li-na? ‘when did you come?’
2sg-did-SM-V-FV-when

O-lio-chi-e ‘how are you?’
SM-V-SM-how

o-ch-i-ye-ngae ena? ‘where had you gone to?’
SM-TM-V-ASP-FV-where

From the above examples, it is clear that in Lunyala ‘K’ “who” and “what” questions can
occupy both the in-situ and ex-situ positions, that is, the Pre-core slot and the Post-core
slot on the Layered Structure of the Clause.

2.2.1.3 Imperative sentence

An imperative is a command or order, mainly characterized by lack of a subject. The
subject is non-overt, assumed to be known beforehand from the context. An imperative
can be said to be a declarative sentence with a deleted subject, hence we claim that all
other functional sentence types can be derived from the basic declarative sentence, at
least in Lunyala.

e.g. Wao! “Go home!”
2sg-TM-V

Yi-cha! Come!
2sg-TM-V
2.2.1.4 Exclamative

This sentence is used to show surprise or disgust.

\[ \text{e.g. } \quad \text{Ke-chir-e!} \quad \text{‘He/she has come!’} \]

2sg-SM-TM-V-FV

\[ \text{E-nyoy-e!} \quad \text{‘I have got it!’} \]

1sg-SM-TM-V-FV

Prosodically, the same sentence can be used declaratively or interrogatively. As in:

Declarative: \quad \text{Nawire ke-chir-e.} \quad \text{“Nawire has come.”}

S-SM-TM-V-FV

Interrogative: \quad \text{Nawire ke-chir-e?} \quad \text{“Has Nawire come?”}

S-SM-TM-V-FV

2.2.2 The Layered Structure of the Clause

RRG proposes a clause structure that is aimed at accounting for both universal and non-universal features of the clause. The Layered structure of the clause proposed in VVLP (1997:31) contains the CORE, which comprises of the nucleus and the arguments of the predicate in the nucleus, the NUCLEUS, which contains the predicate(s) and the Periphery that comprises of the adjunct temporal and locative modifiers of the Core. This is shown in the following diagram:
2.2.2.2  Constituent Projection of Lunyala ‘K’ Simple Sentence.

2.2.2.3  Transitive sentences

Simple transitive sentences have the Actor and Undergoer, pre theoretically referred to as subject and object, e.g.

\textit{Ka-yich-a} – ‘she killed it’  \hspace{1cm} \textit{Ke-rukh-a nesifulia} ‘she ran with a sufuria’
2.3.1.2 Intransitive sentences

The Lunyala intransitive sentence is made up a syntactic argument and a predicate, e.g.

a) Liaka ke-ch-a  ‘Liaka is coming.’
   S-SM-TM-V=FV

b) A-fukir-e   ‘He/she has cooked (ugali).’
   3sg-SM-TM-V-FV

c) O-li-mulay-i  ‘You are good.’
   2sg-SM-TM-V-Adv-FV
The pronominal ‘Liaka’ is taken as a core argument and the only argument in the core, hence an intransitive sentence. (b) and (c) are copular sentences because they comprise only of a verbal complex. The copular sentences justify the lack of a VP in the LSC because the predicating element is not always a verb. It could be a noun, an adjective or a PP.

![Figure 10: Lunyala ‘K’ Intransitive Sentences](image)

**2.3.1.2 Ditransitive sentences**

According to Van Valin (2005), ditransitive sentences have three arguments, only that the third argument is a non–macrorole direct core argument. “They are three argument constructions with an actor, a theme and a proto-recipient” (Van Valin 2008). A proto-recipient is an argument that is similar to a recipient and occurs in a three-place construction. Proto-recipients include the following roles:

Recipient possessor (with ‘give’, ‘hand’, ‘donate’)

Goal possessor (with ‘bring’, ‘send’.)

Addressee-listener (with ‘tell’, ‘explain’)
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Addressee-viewer (with ‘show’).

Examples of ditransitive simple sentences in Lunyala are:

a) Ka-wa-ye Nekesa e-si-tau Mungolobe. ‘He/she gave Nekesa a book yesterday.’

   SM-TM-V-FV-IO-DO-TA.

   SENTENCE
   CLAUSE
   CORE
   ARG NUC ARG ARG
   PRED NP NP ADV
   Pro V
   Ka wa-ye Nekesa E-si-tau Mungolobe

b) Ba-i-ri-ye Liaka a-ma-tumwa no-mutoka. ‘They took for Liaka maize by vehicle.’

   3Pl-SM-TM-V-FV-S-DO-PreP.
2.4 RRG’s extra clausal elements

According to the RRG framework, there are languages with extra clausal elements that is, the Left Detached Position (LDP) and Right Detached Position (RDP), as well as the Pre-core Slot (PrCS) and the Post-core Slot (POCS). Van Valin (1993a, b) argues that these elements are not obligatory. An LDP is the location for sentence initial elements, set off from the main clause by a pause or an intonational break. An RDP on the other hand appears in sentence –final position. Both PrCS and the PoCS are clause internal elements.

2.4.1 Sample Lunyala ‘K’ clause with a PrCS:

O-mu-khana Ola, na-mu-wen-e mu-mw-alo mungolobe
Girl that ISM –OM-See-ASP-at river yesterday
That girl, I saw her in the river yesterday.’

Figure 12: Lunyala ‘K’ sentence with a PrCS

5.5.2 Sample simple Lunyala ‘K’ clause with a PoCS:
O-si-chay-e ena?
3sg TNS it put where
‘Where did you put it?’

Figure 13: Lunyala ‘K’ simple sentence with a PoCS

2.4.2 Lunyala ‘K’ LSC with an LDP and the PrCS:
O-mu-sacha ola, a-bebi ba-mu-khupa ba-ba o—khumw-icha
‘Thieves beat that man almost to death.’

Figure 14: Lunyala ‘K’ Sentence with both the LDP and PrCS
In this example, the LDP is realized as an NP with a pause. This NP is also marked on the verb because it is a semantic argument.

(a) E-se u-sa khu-lwa-nge, ke-nye-kha na ba-mu-wo-we
   1sg-on-mine-3sg- deserve-TM-jail.
   ‘I, in my own view, he should be jailed.’

Figure 15: A Lunyala ‘K’ Clause with an LDP
Here in fig.5.11, the LDP is realized by an intonation set off from the main clause. The RDP is like the LDP, only that it appears in the right dislocation position of the LSC. This means, it must be pronominally marked on the verb if it is a semantic argument of the main clauses, and it should be set off by a pause, realized by a comma in sentences.

The following figures (5.12 – 5.13) represent an LSC of a Lunyala ‘K’ clause, with an RDP:

a) Na-ka-si-ma sa-na a-ma-be-re ma-wo-wu

1sg-TM- Love (degree)-milk -sour

“I love it so much, sour milk.”

b) Ba-chi-a e-wa-we o-mw-ana o-la

3Sg-TNS-go –to their home-child-that

‘They are going to that child’s home.’
In these examples, the right-detached phrasal elements are marked on the verbs, i.e. ‘ka’ in (a) referring to amabere mawowu’ and ‘awe’ as a verbal extension referring to ‘omwana ola. This shows that they are motivated by discourse needs such as emphasis or clarification.

In Lunyala ‘K’ the ‘who’ and ‘what’ wh-words are both ex-situ and in-situ. That is, the question words can either occupy the PrCS or the PoCS depending on their linear occurrence in the sentence.

For example:

a) Ncha-nu o-li-ye e-chemwa li-a-nge?

who-2sg-eat-TM ASP –FV-banana-mine

‘Who has eaten my banana?’
Figure 18: Lunyala ‘K’ Clause with a PrCS WH-word

b) O-khu-khu-pir-e ncha-nu?

ISM-beat-TM-FV-who

‘Who has beaten you?’

Figure 19: Lunyala ‘K’ Clause with a PoCS WH-word

The following is an LSC constituent projection of the Lunyala ‘K’ simple sentence:

E-se Sa-mwe-ne na-mu-wen-e mu-siro no-mu-kha-si u-ndi

I myself-/SM-TNS-Saw-IOM-night-woman-another
‘I myself saw him at night with another woman.’

Figure 20: Constituent Projection of Lunyala ‘K’ Simple Sentence

5.5 Operator Projection in Lunyala ‘K’ simple sentence

The operator projection comprises of such elements as aspects, tense and modality. These modify the clause, the core and the nucleus. There are about eight operator projections in RRG (VVLIP 1997).

2.4.3 Tense

According to VVLIP (1997:40), tense indicates the temporal relationship between time of the event and the time of the utterance describing the event. It is a function of the verb and it refers only to the time of action.
In Lunyala ‘K’ tense is distributed into the past and the future in three degrees. These are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Near past</th>
<th>Intermediate past</th>
<th>Far past</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘eat’</td>
<td>a-li-ye</td>
<td>ka-li-ye</td>
<td>ka-lia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘He/she has eaten.’</td>
<td>‘he/she ate.’</td>
<td>‘he/she ate.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Near future</th>
<th>Intermediate future</th>
<th>Remote future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-li-khu-li-a</td>
<td>a-na-li-e</td>
<td>a-li-li-a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘He/she will eat.’</td>
<td>‘he/she will eat.’</td>
<td>‘he/she will eat.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.4.5 Aspect

Aspect, like tense, is a grammatical category that is a function of the verb. Lunyala ‘K’ portrays four major aspectual functions: the habitual, progressive, perfective and the iterative. The habitual aspect indicates that an action takes place repeatedly or always.

The habitual marker in Lunyala ‘K’ is –ang-. This morpheme marks the present daily, the past and the future habitual. e.g.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present</th>
<th>past</th>
<th>future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ke-cha</td>
<td>ke-ch-ang-a</td>
<td>ke-ch-a‘ng-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s/he comes’</td>
<td>‘He/she comes.’</td>
<td>‘He/she was coming.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.4.6 Modality

RRG defines modality in terms of possibility, permission, ability, obligation, etc. According to VVLP (1997:41), modality is the relationship between the subject NP and
the action in reference to ability, permission and obligation. Lunyala’K’ exhibits mood via morphemes inflected on the verb which express uncertainty, wishes, desires, possibilities and conditions.

2.4.7 Negation

A negative clause is one which asserts that some event, situation or state of affairs does not hold. It is derived from the declarative sentence by adding a basic negating morpheme at the end of the verb phrase. According to Kanyoro (1983), da(be) is the basic negative morpheme in Luyia, though Lunyala ‘K’ uses ‘ta(we).’

a) Simple negatives:

*A-on-a*  ‘He/she sees’
3sg-SM-V-FV

*Si-a-on-a ta (we)*  ‘He/she does not see’
NEG-3sg-SM-TM-V-NEG

*Ke-bir-e*  ‘he/she has stolen’
3sg-SM-TM-V-FV

*Sikebire ta(we)*  ‘he/she has not stolen’
NEG-SM-TM-V-FV-NEG
The Lunyala ‘K’ negation syntactically works like discontinuous negation in French, though in Lunyala ‘K’, the second element is verbal final, while in French, it can never follow the complement:

**French:**                \[ \text{je ne vais pas au cinema} \] ‘I am not going to the cinema.’
                           \[ \text{NEG- V- NEG- to Movies} \]

**Lunyala’K:**         \[ \text{si-nchi-a mu-senema ta (we)} \] ‘I am not going to the cinema.’
                           \[ \text{NEG-1sg-TM-V- to movies-NEG} \]

a) To negate a simple indicative statement:
   \[ \text{Si-a-wona ta(we)} \] ‘s/he does not see’
   \[ \text{NEG-3sg-TM-V-NEG} \]

b) To negate the near past:
   \[ \text{Si-ba-mwich-ir-e ta(we)} \] ‘they have not killed him.’
   \[ \text{NEG-3sg-TM-V-FV-NEG} \]

c) To negate the far future tense:
   \[ \text{Si-a-li-won-a ta(we)} \] ‘s/he will not see’
   \[ \text{NEG-3sg-TM-V-FV-NEG} \]

2.4.8 **Illocutionary force**

According to VVLP (1997), illocutionary force and negation are the only universal operators. Illocutionary forces like interrogative, imperative, declarative are brought out
in a sentence if it indicates a question, command, wish or assertion. It is a universal operator that enable all human languages to make statements, ask questions, give orders and show surprise or disgust.

2.4.9 Operator projection in the LSC in Lunyala ‘K’

Operators in RRG are meant to modify the clause, the core and the nucleus and therefore, the following figure shows the linear arrangement of operator elements within the LSC.

\[
\begin{align*}
V \\
\text{NUCLEUS} & \quad \text{Aspect} \\
\text{NUCLEUS} & \quad \text{Negation} \\
\text{NUCLEUS/CORE} & \quad \text{Directionals} \\
\text{CORE} & \quad \text{Modality} \\
\text{CORE} & \quad \text{Negation (Internal)} \\
\text{CLAUSE} & \quad \text{Status} \\
\text{CLAUSE} & \quad \text{Tense} \\
\text{CLAUSE} & \quad \text{Evidential} \\
\text{CLAUSE} & \quad \text{Illocutionary force}
\end{align*}
\]

\textbf{Figure 21: Operator projection in LSC}

(Source: VVLP (1997:47))
2.5 The Lunyala ‘K’ Noun Phrase

Mathews (1997, cited in Maloba 2012) defines a noun as a class of words which characteristically denote concrete entities e.g. name of a person, a place, etc. It also refers to words which though do not denote concrete entities, have the same similar roles in syntax as the former. He argues that nouns form part of the principal parts of speech.
Kanyoro (1983:91-92), basing on the criteria introduced by Bleek (1969), classifies nominals by means of their concord prefixes, assigning a number to each class constituted. The Proto-Bantu is said to have twenty-three noun classes according to this classification. Table one below shows some of the Lunyala ‘K’ noun classes, partly adapted from Maloba (2012:98).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Pre-prefix</th>
<th>Prefix</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>o-</td>
<td>mu-</td>
<td>omwana</td>
<td>child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>a-</td>
<td>ba-</td>
<td>abana</td>
<td>children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>o-</td>
<td>mu-</td>
<td>omukoye</td>
<td>rope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>e-</td>
<td>mi-</td>
<td>emikoye</td>
<td>ropes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>e-</td>
<td>si</td>
<td>chwi</td>
<td>ear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>a-</td>
<td>ma-</td>
<td>chwi</td>
<td>ears</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>e-</td>
<td>si</td>
<td>esimwer</td>
<td>basket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>e-</td>
<td>bi-</td>
<td>ebimwer</td>
<td>baskets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>N-</td>
<td>N-</td>
<td>embwa</td>
<td>dog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>e-</td>
<td>mi-</td>
<td>emiwa</td>
<td>dogs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>o-</td>
<td>u-</td>
<td>olukhw</td>
<td>a piece of firewood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>a-</td>
<td>kha-</td>
<td>akhasier</td>
<td>Small old woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>o-</td>
<td>chu-</td>
<td>ochusier</td>
<td>Small old women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0-</td>
<td>wu-</td>
<td>owunyasi</td>
<td>grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>o-</td>
<td>khu</td>
<td>okhulasa</td>
<td>To throw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>a-</td>
<td>si</td>
<td>asi</td>
<td>down</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>17</th>
<th>khu-</th>
<th>mu-</th>
<th>khumukulu</th>
<th>On top</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>mu-</td>
<td>mukachi</td>
<td>Inside/in the middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>o-</td>
<td>ku</td>
<td>okusacha</td>
<td>Big/huge man</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4: Noun Classes**

*(partly adapted from Maloba 2012).*

Since Bleek base the classification on concord prefixes, Guthrie (1970:41) asserts that a prefix has the restricted sense of the concord element of an independent nominal. Here is an example of concordial agreement of elements in Lunyala ‘K’:

a) O-mwa-na o-la ke-chi-re mu-ngo-lo-be.

1sg 1AGR self 1AGR TM come yesterday

‘that child come yesterday.’

b) A-ba-na ba-la be-chi-re mu-ngo-lo-be

1Pl 2AGR self 2AGR TM(pst Pft) come yesterday.

‘Those children came yesterday.’

c) A-kha-na kha-la khe-chi-re mu-ngo-lo-be

C12-C1person 12AGR that 12AGR TM(pst pft) come yesterday.

‘That small (derog/dimin) child came yesterday.’

d) O-chwa-na chu-la chew-chi-re mu-ngo-lo-be.

C13-C1person 13AGR those 13AGR TM(pstpft) come yesterday.
‘Those small (derog/dimin) children came yesterday.’

e) O-kwa-na ku-la kwe-chi-re mu-ngo-lo-be
   C5-C1person 5AGR that 5AGR TM (pst pft) come yesterday.
   ‘That huge (derog/aug) child came yesterday.’

f) E-mia-na ki-ra ki-e-chi-re mu-ngo-lo-be.
   C6-C1person 6AGR those 6AGR TM (pst pft) come yesterday.
   ‘Those huge (derog/aug) children came yesterday.’

The above data shows that in Lunyala ‘K’, the lexical categories share various morphological properties in terms of agreement prefixes attached to the noun stem, verb stem and adjectival stem. Furthermore, it is clear that noun prefixes in Lunyala ‘K’ can function both inflectionally (to indicate singularity and plurality), as well as derivationally, to form words with new meanings. Hence we argue that there is an inherent relationship between the noun class and the grammatical agreement pattern it imposes on all the other elements within the sentence in Lunyala ‘K’.

2.5.1 Noun Modification.

The Lunyala ‘K’ noun may be expanded into a noun phrase basically through modification. The most common modifying elements include the adjectives, the numerals, the demonstratives, the possessives and the quantifier. In this expanded form, the noun remains as the nuclear and the head word. It controls all the other elements in
the phrase morphosyntactically in that, the form of the modifier is determined by the prefix of the noun.

2.5.2 The adjective.

The adjective post modifies the noun by giving the quality or characteristic of the noun. Grammatically, it agrees with noun in number, whereas morphologically, it takes the noun prefix through concordial agreement. Examples are shown in table 2.3 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Prefix</th>
<th>Noun</th>
<th>Modification</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>mu-</td>
<td>omwana</td>
<td>omwana mukali</td>
<td>Big child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ba-</td>
<td>abana</td>
<td>abana bakali</td>
<td>Big children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>mu-</td>
<td>omokhono</td>
<td>omukhono muleyi</td>
<td>Long hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>mi-</td>
<td>emikhono</td>
<td>emikhono mireyi</td>
<td>Long hands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>efumo</td>
<td>efumo esicho</td>
<td>Heavy spear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ma-</td>
<td>amafumo</td>
<td>amafumo masicho</td>
<td>Heavy spears</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Si-</td>
<td>esimwero</td>
<td>esimwero siangu</td>
<td>A light basket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Bi-</td>
<td>ebimwero</td>
<td>ebimwero biangu</td>
<td>Light baskets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Adjectives

2.5.3 The Demonstratives

The demonstrative modifies the noun in terms of time and place. It portrays the pragmatic and semantic properties of the noun. Here, demonstratives describe proximity in reference to the speaker as well as the hearer, based on how near or how far. This
corresponds to the English *this/these* and *that/those* contrasts. In Lunyala ‘K’ however, it is possible to demonstrate both what is further from both the speaker and hearer, and what is nearer to the hearer. English uses *That/those* to refer to both. The following table gives examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noun</th>
<th>This/these</th>
<th>that/those</th>
<th>That/those</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Omunchu</td>
<td>oyu</td>
<td>ola</td>
<td>oyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abanchu</td>
<td>aba</td>
<td>bala</td>
<td>abo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omukoye</td>
<td>oku</td>
<td>kula</td>
<td>okwo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emikoye</td>
<td>eki</td>
<td>kira</td>
<td>ekio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efumo</td>
<td>eli</td>
<td>lila</td>
<td>elio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amafumo</td>
<td>aka</td>
<td>kala</td>
<td>ako</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akhana</td>
<td>akha</td>
<td>khala</td>
<td>akho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ochwana</td>
<td>ochu</td>
<td>chula</td>
<td>ochwo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 6: Demonstratives*

2.5.4 The numerals and quantifiers

The numerals describe the noun in terms of quantity or number. They are basically digits one to ten. Quantifiers on the other hand mark quantity without using numerals. Example (a) below shows noun modification using numerals, while (b) shows noun modification using quantifiers:

(a)

E-ng’o-mbe chi-cha-nu chi-a-fwi-ye. ‘Five cows died.’
Pl-cow-five-TM-die

Kakulile edahwya chibiri ‘he bought two cocks.’

3sg-TM-Buy-FV-Pl-cock-two

(b)

A-ba-nchu a-ba-ngi be-chi-re ‘so many people came.’

PL-person-many-TM-ASP-come-FV

A-ba-kha-si ba-ndi ba-lo-si ‘some women are witches.’

PL-woman-some-PL-witch

Wuli mu-nchu ke-chi-re ‘everybody has come.’

Every-body-TM-ASP-come-FV

2.5.6 The Possessives

Lunyala ‘K’ uses the morphemes -ange and -efwe to mark singular and plural possessive forms respectively, e.g.

Enguo chi-ange ‘my clothes.’

Enguo chi-efwe ‘our clothes.’

2.5.7 Order of co-occurrence of Lunyala ‘K’ NP Elements.

In the case where the noun is modified by more than one element, there is a strict order of co-occurrence of these elements in the noun phrase, dependent upon their semantic
relation with the noun they modify. The order however varies depending on the elements modifying the noun.


Example: a-ba-na ba-nge ba-bi-ri ba-la ba-bi-chi-re e-ke-ra.


‘Those my two children passed exam.’


E-nguo e-nda-yi chi-ra ncha-nu o-ku-li-le?

Clothes-beautiful-those-who-bought

‘who bought those beautiful clothes?’

5.6.3 RRG’s Layered Structure of the Noun Phrase

According to VVLP (1997:57) RRG has a Layered Structure of the Noun Phrase that has both constituent and operator projections. The following is a general schema of the LSNP, adapted from VVLP (1997:57).
Figure 23: The LSNP

In the LSNP, there is an NP Initial Position (NPIP), which occurs before the head in which possessives are placed. The NP operators include: Determiners which comprise of articles, demonstratives and deictics, quantifiers, negation, adjectival and nominal modifiers and the nominal aspect. The Nominal Aspect (NASP) refers to the individuation to the mass/count distinction. The most common formal expression of nominal aspect is through noun classifiers. Quality operators show distinctive qualities of the referring expression, while adjectival and nominal modifiers are nuclear operators together with the nominal aspect. Quantity operators basically modify the CORE of the NP, mainly concerned with quantification and negation. Negation is expressed through a
special negative marker for NPs e.g. Uma- in Lunyala ‘K’ corresponding to the English ‘No’, as in;

a) Echupa yiuma esifunikho. ‘The bottle has no lid.’

b) Ng’ina aumao ‘the mother is not there.’

The deictic (DEIC) operators show locality and they modify the NP as a whole, expressing the locality of the referent with respect to a reference point, while the definiteness (DEF) shows the identifiability of the referent by the hearer, an assumption made by the interlocutors. Therefore, we come up with the following sample Lunyala ‘K’ layered structures of the noun phrase representing the underived nouns and the derived nouns. Derived nouns are a result of prefixation and suffixation on verb roots, e.g. *Omusiuki* from the verb *siuka*, ‘weave’
Figure 24: Lunyala ‘K’ LSNP of a Proper Noun

This structure does not show operator projections because it is a proper noun thus referential. The case is however different for a derived noun like esimwero ‘basket’, as shown below:

NP
\[\text{CORE}_N\]
\[\text{NUC}_N\]
\[\text{REF}\]
\[\text{N}\]
E- si- mwero

NASP \[\rightarrow\] NUC\(_N\)
NUM \[\rightarrow\] CORE

Figure 25: Lunyala ‘K’ LSNP of a Derived Noun

The operator projection is shown where the noun is marked for Noun Aspect (NASP), because the pre-prefix e- is a class marker while the prefix si- is marked for NUM (number) to indicate singularity.

The following is a LSNP for a Lunyala ‘K’ noun phrase, showing various elements of the LSNP.

a) Emikhana kira kine kiosi simireyi ta

C6- Pl- girl- those- four- all- NEG - tall – NEG

‘All those four girls (derog) are not tall.’
Figure 26: Lunyala ‘K’ LSNP with various operators
In this structure, various projections are shown whereby, the demonstrative kira is marked DEIC (deictic), kine marked for NUM (number), Kiosi marked for QNT (quantity) and mireyi is marked for ADJ (adjective). The NASP is marked on the head word ‘Emikhana’, as well as on the adjective ‘mireyi’ because, in Lunyala ‘K’, just like in Bantu languages, the adjective get their class markings from the nouns they modify.

2.6 Lexical representation of Lunyala ‘K’ verbs and their arguments

Below are lexical representations for the basic Aktionsart classes, adapted from VVLP(1997:102).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Logical structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State:</td>
<td>Predicate’(x) or (x,y)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. Nekesa alimunchu</td>
<td>be’(Nekesa’[munchu]) ‘Nekesa is in the house.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Activity: | do’(x[predicate’(x) or (x,y)]) |
| e.g. Nawire alima | do’(Nawire[lima’(Nawire)]) ‘Nawire is digging.’ |

| Achievement: | INGRpredicate’(x) or (x,y) |
| e.g. Epwoni likumukhire | INGR kumukha’(epwoni) ‘The potato has scaled.’ |

| Accomplishment: | BECOME predicate’(x) or (x,y) |
| e.g. Enguo yomire | BECOME Oma’(enguo) ‘The cloth dried.’ |

Active accomplishment:
e.g. Nawire aliye enchuku do’(Nawire[lia’(Nawire, enchuku)])&BECOME chiliywe (enchuku).

Causatives:

Omulosi amusindusise do’(omulosi, )CAUSE[feel’(him, [sindukha])]
‘The witch scared him.’

Omwana kachire eningiro do’(omwana, )CAUSE[BECOME-acha’ (eningiro)]
‘The child has broken the pot.’

Liaka akumuye epwoni do’(Liaka ) CAUSE [INGRkumula’(epwoni)]
‘Liaka scaled a potato.’

Nawire asiubire omukoye do’Nawire,) CAUSE [do’(omukoye, [siuba (omukoye)])}
3.1 Introduction

In this chapter a summary of the findings of the study are related to other study findings. The Operator Projection of Lunyala ‘K’ as an independent variable is discussed in detail in relation to studies carried elsewhere as reflected in review of literature.

3.2 The Semantic Structure of Lunyala ‘K’

3.2.1 Thematic Relations

Following Jackedoff (1976), thematic relations can be defined in terms of the argument positions in the decomposed logical structures (LS). Only state and activity predicates have argument positions which define thematic relations; the thematic relations of other types of verbs are derived compositionally from their constituent state and activity predicates. This is because, the Aktionsart of a verb is determined by syntactic and semantic tests which do not refer either directly or indirectly to thematic relations (VVLP1997).

There are five distinctions of thematic relations that correspond to the five possible argument positions in LSs. These are: agent, effector, location, theme and patient.

Agent is a willful, purposeful instigator of an action or event. E.g.
Wawire$_{AGT}$ kaka ‘Wawire is digging.’

Experiencer: these are things that experience internal states such as think, believe, love, etc. e.g.

Liaka$_{EXP}$ kasiima omukati. ‘Liaka likes bread.’

Instrument: these are usually inanimate things that are manipulated by an agent in carrying out a task. e.g. Amukhupire$_{INST}$ nomwikho. ‘She hit him with a cooking stick.’

Force: Involuntary causal participant which cannot be manipulated. E.g. storm, floods, etc. As in:

Omukhula$_{FRCE}$ kweyire omukunda. ‘The flood swept the land.’

Patient: these are things that are in a state or condition or undergo a state or condition. E.g.

Eningiro$_{PAT}$ yatikhire. ‘The pot is broken.’

Theme: things which are located or are undergoing a change of location (motion). E.g

Eng’ombe$_{THM}$ yiri mumukunda ‘The cow is in the farm.’

Goal: This shows the destination of something. e.g.

Batimire paka mumwalo$_{GL}$ ‘They ran up to the river.’
Locative: A location for something or somebody. e.g.
Esifunikho sirikhumesaLOC. ‘The lid is on the table.’

3.2.2 Macroroles

Macroroles act as the primary interface between the LSs and the syntactic representations. They are only two, i.e. Actor and Undergoer, that correspond to the two primary arguments in a prototypical transitive relation. They are called macroroles because each subsumes a number of specific thematic relations. The positions in the Actor-Undergoer hierarchy are the same LS argument positions. Given the LS of a verb, the most agent-like argument will be the actor, while the most patient-like, the Undergoer

In the following English sentences, subject NPs and their thematic relations are in italics, while the direct object NPs and their thematic relations are in bold.

Jane killed the dog  
\textit{effector/Agent/patient}

The flood swept the land  
\textit{Force/patient}

The director received the report.  
\textit{Recipient theme}

In order to distinguish and explain both Actor and Undergoer, RRG presents macroroles as generalizations over specific thematic relations. As in:

Yicha ‘kill’ [\textit{do'}(x,O)] CAUSE [\textbf{BECOME} dead’ (y)]

Bikha ‘keep’ [\textit{do'}(x,O)] CAUSE [\textbf{BECOME} be-LOC’ (y,z)]
Eresa ‘give’ [do’(x,O)]CAUSE [BECOME have’ (y,z)]

The relationship between macroroles and the arguments of particular verbs is captured by the Actor – Undergoer Hierarchy (AUH), shown below:

\[ \text{ACTOR} \quad \text{UNDERGOER} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arg of</th>
<th>1st arg of</th>
<th>1st arg of</th>
<th>2nd arg of</th>
<th>Arg of state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOdo’(x,...)</td>
<td>Pred’(x,y)</td>
<td>Pred’(x,y)</td>
<td>Pred’(x)s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to AUH, the leftmost argument is the actor and the rightmost, the undergoer. The order of LS argument positions in the AUH is exactly the same as the order in the semantic continuum. This means that the leftmost argument in the AUH is the most agent-like and the rightmost the most patient-like.

Semantically, the actor refers to the participant to which responsibility for the state of affairs is attributed, while the undergoer refers to the participant which is most affected by the state of affairs.

In Lunyala ‘K’, there exists an interesting asymmetry in the lexicalization of responsibility and affectedness in verbs that affects macrorole selection. Verbs tend strongly to lexicalize the responsibility for the state of affairs they denote and do not permit variable assignment of responsibility. For instance, in a single event that can be characterized in different ways in terms of which participant is responsible for the event,
each possibility is realized by a distinct verb form in which, the source is responsible and the recipient is responsible. e.g. muwe ‘give’ vs ukula ‘take’ as in:

1. (a) Nanjala awaye Nekesa esieyo ‘Nanjala has given Nekesa a broom.’
   (b) Nekesa aukuye esieyo ‘Nekesa has taken the broom.’

Also, Lunyala ‘K’ permits variable attribution of primary affectedness in the state of affairs, reflected in differential undergoer selection. E.g.

1. (a) Abana bechusise amapwoni musimwero ‘children filled potatoes in the basket’
   (b) Abana bechusise esimwero namapwoni. ‘Children filled the basket with potatoes.’

   [\textbf{do’}(Abana, O)] CAUSE [BECOME be-in’ (esimwero, amapwoni)]

In the above examples, there are different choices for undergoer. Amapwoni is the unmarked choice in terms of the AUH in 2(a), while in 2(b) esimwero represents a marked choice since, esimwero is not the rightmost argument in the LS. There is also a difference in interpretation of the two sentences: in 2(a), all the potatoes are loaded in the basket regardless of whether the whole basket is filled or not, whereas in 2(b), the basket is filled to capacity, regardless of whether all of the potatoes are loaded or not. Hence in 2(a) the NP amapwoni is referring to the most affected participant, while in 2(b), the NP esimwero is so interpreted, hence the different undergoer choices.
CHAPTER FOUR

THE FOCUS PROJECTION OF LUNYALA ‘K’

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter a summary of the findings of the study are related to other study findings. The Focus Projection of Lunyala ‘K’ as an independent variable is discussed in detail in relation to studies carried elsewhere as reflected in review of literature.

4.2 The Focus Structure

This is the morphosyntactic means for expressing the discourse-pragmatic status of elements in a sentence. RRG’s approach to focus structure is based on Lambrecht (1994), who proposes that there are recurring patterns of the organization of information across languages, referred to as ‘focus types.’ According to Kihara (2010:104) focus in language can be indicated in syntax, morphology or via prosody, either in isolation or by combination of two, say prosody and syntax.

Syntactically, focus can be expressed in terms of word-order for example through dislocation or inversion. On the other hand, focus is indicated morphologically by use of particle markers.

RRG recognizes three focus types, that is, sentence focus, predicate focus and narrow focus. Each foci types play an important role in communication since they help in
identifying a referent, commenting on a topic and reporting an event or, presenting new
discourse referent.

RRG also distinguishes between the Potential Focus Domain (PFD) which is the syntactic
domain in the sentence where focus may fall, and the Actual Focus Domain (AFD), that
is the part that is focused in a particular utterance.

The focus structure of an utterance is represented in a Focus Projection which is distinct
from the operator and constituent projections, as shown in the sentence below:

Siosi si Were kawaye Liaka mungolobe?
‘What did Were give Liaka Yesterday?’
Figure 27: The Focus Structure
4.2.1 Narrow Focus

Narrow focus is when a single constituent such as an NP is focused. The focus domain can be seen to fall on the subject, object or verb. Consider example 4.6 below:

(4.2)  
A: Bachi owene embusi? (That 1-SM-see TM a goat?)
   ‘Is it true that you saw a goat?’
B: NCHE- EMBWAₘ₋ yi - mbwene. (DOG- FM -SM-TM see)
   ‘It a DOG I saw.’

The proposition in the above dialogue is that something was seen. The focus domain falls on the entire noun phrase and it is restricted to this constituent. The focus marker *nche* is placed on the noun dog, which is in focus. The following is the information structure of the above example:

Sentence:  ‘Nche EMBWA yi mbwene’
Presupposition:  ‘speaker saw x.’
Assertion:  ‘x = embwa’
Focus:  ‘embwa’
Focus domain  NP

Example of narrow focus marking on the subject and object in Lunyala ‘K’ can be shown through WH-questions, which are both pre- and post-verbal, hence allow for both marked and unmarked narrow focus. Thus from the question in (4.7), we can get the answers in (4.8) and (4.9) below:

(4.3)  Nchanu oliye echemwa?  Oliye echemwa nchanu?
‘Who ate the banana?’

‘who ate the banana?’

(4.4) Nche NAWIRE oliye echemwa
FM-NAWIRE-eat-TM- banana

‘It is NAWIRE who ate the banana.’

(4.5) Oliye echemwa nche NAWIRE
SM-eat-TM-banana- is-NAWIRE

‘It is NAWIRE who ate the banana.’

Equally in Lunyala ‘K’, narrow focus can be marked depending on whether we are interested in the actor or undergoer of an action. This means, when we want to highlight the doer of an action, we focus on the subject as in (4.10), while when our attention is on the undergoer of the action, we focus on the object as shown in (4.11):

(4.6) Nche WAWIRE okhupire Liaka.
FM-Wawire-SM-beat-TM Liaka

‘It is Wawire who beat Liaka.’

(4.7) Wawire akhupire LIAKA.
Wawire-SM-beat-TM-LIAKA

‘Wawire beat LIAKA.’
4.2.2 Predicate Focus

According to VVLP (1997:206), the predicate focus is the universally unmarked type of focus structure, in which the focus domain is on the predicate itself, or part of it. This can be explained using the example below:

(4.12) A:  *Siosi esikwiye?* ‘What happened?’

B:  *Okhulenge khwange KHUSIMBERE.* ‘My Leg is swollen.’

In this example, there is a topic, that is the speaker’s leg, and the predicate which expresses a comment about the topic (is swollen). The focus is on the predicate ‘swollen’, and the focus domain is the core. Predicate focus is often characterized by a lack of subject topic.

The above proposition therefore will have the following information structure:

- Sentence:  *okhulenge khwange KHUSIMBIRE*
- Presupposition:  speaker’s leg is available as a topic for comment x’
- Assertion:  ‘x = KHUSIMBIRE.
- Focus:  KHUSIMBIRE
- Focus domain:  verb

4.2.3 Sentence Focus

In sentence focus, the focus domain is within the entire sentence and unlike predicate focus, there is no topic. (Van Valin (1993b). The focus domain falls on the entire clause hence the assertion and focus are identical. There is no pragmatic presupposition. The following is an example:
(4.8) Sentence: Omwibi kecha. ‘A witch is coming.’

Presupposition: none
Assertion: a witch is coming.
Focus domain: clause.

4.3 Focus structure in Lunyala ‘K’

According to Schwartz (2003), the most common grammatical means by which languages mark focus is by putting the focused element in a syntactically prominent position, for instance by fronting them or through clefting, as in the Lunyala ‘K’ sentence:

(4.9) ECHEMW A ncherindiye. ‘it is the banana I ate.’

The language also uses pseudo-clefts which may have a copular predicate with a headless relative clause as the head. For example:

(4.10) Esi Nawire aliye nche ec hemwa. ‘what Nawire has eaten is the banana.’

We have also realized that focus marking in Lunyala ‘K’ is both in situ and ex situ, indicated in the Pre- and Post-Core slots on the layered structure of the clause. This involves question words such as nchanu ‘who’ and siosi(na) ‘what.’ For example:

(4.11) Nchanu owirukhire? (Owirukhire nchanu?)

Who-SM-run-TM-FV
‘who ran away?’

(4.12) Siosi(na) esikhulumire (esikhulumire siosi(na))

What-SM-TM-bite-OM-FV

‘what has bitten you.’

The above sentences can be presented structurally on the LSC as follows:

Figure 28: LSC with focus structure projection and focus domain
Figure 29: Subject Focus

In the above structure, the whole clause is covered in a PFD and indicated as a speech act (declarative sentence) while the subject (NAWIRE) is the focal element indicated as AFD.

Predicate focus is marked by the nuclear element being in focus. For example the question in (4.14) can be answered by (4.15):

(4.14)  echemwa lili? ‘Where is the banana?’

(4.15)  Nawire ALIYE. ‘Nawire has EATEN.’

Nawire-TM-eat-FV
Sentence focus is indicated by having the whole clause in the focus domain. The clause is enclosed both within the PFD and the AFD. For example:

(4.16) What happened?

(4.17) Westgate is under siege.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

In this chapter a summary of the findings of the study were related to other study findings. The independent variables such as syntax, semantics and pragmatics were summarized in relation to studies carried elsewhere as reflected in review of literature. Conclusions were then drawn from the results of the data collected and analyzed. Finally and recommendations made pointing to the way forward on the Lunyala ‘K’ simple clause representation using the Role and Reference Grammar (RRG)

5.2 Summary of findings

This shows that clause patterns for simple Lunyala ‘K’ sentences using pre-theoretical labels like Subject(S), Verb(V) Indirect Object (I0) Direct object (DO) Adjunct (A) include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VO</th>
<th>Li-o-u-suma</th>
<th>‘eat ugali’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SM-eat-S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA</td>
<td>Yi-cha wangu</td>
<td>‘come faster’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3sg-TM-come-MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VAS</th>
<th><em>Yi-cha wa-ngu Nawire</em></th>
<th>‘Come faster Nawire’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3sg-TM-faster-S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV</td>
<td><em>O-mu-losi ke-cha</em></td>
<td>‘A witch is coming’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre prefix-prefix-1sg-SM-TM-1sg-V-FV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVO</td>
<td><em>Nawire ka-nyimi-re echemwa</em></td>
<td>‘Nawire denied me a banana’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-SM-TM-V-FV-DO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVA</td>
<td><em>Nasio ke-chir-e mungolobe</em></td>
<td>‘Nasio came yesterday’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-SM-TM-V-FV-TA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVOA</td>
<td><em>O-mw-ana a-chor-ire-nge mu-weru na-manda</em></td>
<td>“The child was drawing on the floor with charcoal”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-1sg-SM-TM-V-ASP-IO-DO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOSA</td>
<td><em>Lia-o-u-suma Nawire ni-u-cha-nyich-a</em></td>
<td>“Eat Ugali Nawire before it gets cold”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V-TM-DO-S-MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSVA</td>
<td><em>O-u-suma lia mayi kho-khu-chi-e</em></td>
<td>“Ugali eat mother before we go”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DO-V-S-TA-FV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASVOA</td>
<td><em>Siauli nyinga, Nawire ke-ch-anga e-wefwe sibuyi</em></td>
<td>“Everyday Nawire comes to our home in the morning”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TA-S-SM-V-ASP-S LOC-TA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVOO</td>
<td><em>Si-mwana ka-mu-ka-bir-e o-mu-kunda</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3 Conclusions

This study revealed that various elements of the Lunyala ‘K’ clause can be accounted for using the RRG’s Layered Structure of the Clause (LSC).

The constituent projection of the clause in which case we identified the non universal properties of the clause in Lunyala, such as the LDP, RDP, PrCS and PoCS elements was analyzed. The study revealed that the ‘who’ and ‘what’ Wh- words in Lunyala ‘K’ can occur both in the Pre-core slot and the post-core slot.

The study also discussed the Lunyala ‘K’ Noun Phrase, showing how the modifying elements portray the concordial agreement from the head noun. It showed that the NP can consist of the head and its modifiers, which follow a strict order of co-occurrence. It was also evident that in nearly all cases, the modifiers occur to the right, that is the noun precedes its modifiers.

It also demonstrated that the RRG’s LSNP can account for the various operators in the Noun Phrase.

It also revealed that the verb, depending on its classification, is so important in determining the macrorole element in a Lunyala ‘K’ sentence.

The study also revealed the interrelatedness of the constituent projection, operator projection and the focus projection. Focus structure was seen to determine the arrangement of elements while the focus domain is determined by the constituent
projection. On the other hand, given that the Potential Focus Domain falls within the Illocutionary Force operator, it became evident that the operator and focus projections are related.

5.4 Recommendations

This study has confined itself to investigating Lunyala ‘K’ simple sentence and Noun phrase. It necessary that further studies are carried out on the Lunyala ‘K’ verb, basically on tone and how it marks tense and aspect. The semantic structure requires more research in as far as the logical structure and Aktionsart classification is concerned. The study also recommends a pragmatic study of the language aimed at describing how meaning of sentences is arrived at given the linguistic as well as conversational

5.5 Suggestions for further research

This study paves way for further studies in other Luyia subtribes to investigate their representation on the RRG which have not been studied as yet.
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Appendix 1: Cover letter

CATHERINE S. OTUNGA

P.O BOX 2966 – 50100

KAKAMEGA

PHONE: 0724 846 874

Dear sir/Madam

I am undertaking a research project to determine the characteristics of Lunyala Language spoken in Navakholo Constituency of Kakamega County, specifically to find out whether its sentence structure is related to the meaning communicated.

I therefore request that you complete the following short questionnaire regarding your mastery of the language in terms of sentence structure, in relation to meaning of utterances. It should take no longer than 10 minutes of your time. Although your response is of the utmost importance to this study, your participation is entirely voluntary.

Please do not enter your name or contact details on the questionnaire. It remains anonymous. The information you provide remains confidential.

Should you have any queries or comments regarding this research, you are welcome to contact me on Tel. 0724 846 874 or email: sikuku2012@gmail.com.

Yours sincerely

Catherine Sikuku Otunga.
Appendix 2: Questionnaire

This research is meant for academic purposes only. All information given shall remain confidential.

Instructions

Please answer the following questions by crossing (X) in the relevant box.

SECTION A: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

This section of the questionnaire refers to the background or biographical information. Although we are aware of the sensitivity of the questions in this section, the information will allow us to compare groups of respondents. Once again we assure you that your response will remain anonymous. Your co-operation is appreciated.

Q1. Gender

Male □
Female □

Q2. Approximate age

0 – 20 □
21 – 35 □
36 – 45 □
46 and above □
Q3. In which ward do you reside?

- Bunyala East
- Bunyala Central
- Bunyala West

Q4. What is your highest educational qualification?

- KCPE
- KCSE
- Diploma
- Degree and above

Q5. How would you describe the area in which you are residing?

- Rural
- Urban

Q6. Do you speak Lunyala Language?

- Yes
- No

Q7. If yes, how did you acquire it?

- By birth
By marriage

By interaction

Any other (specify)

Q8. How often do you communicate in Lunyala Language?

Everyday

Frequently

Less frequently

Rarely

SECTION B:

*Put a tick the sentence which is correctly constructed.*

1. Li-o-u-suma
2. Yi-cha wangu
3. Yi-cha wa-ngu Nawire
4. O-mu-losi ke-cha
5. Nawire ka-nyimi-re echemwa
6. Nasio ke-chir-e mungolobe
7. O-mw-ana a-chor-ire-nghe mu-weru na-manda
8. Lia-o-u-suma Nawire ni-u-cha-nyich-a
10. Siauli nyinga, Nawire ke-ch-anga e-wefwe sibuyi
11. Si-mwana ka-mu-ka-bir-e o-mu-kunda
12. Nawire ke-uye
13. Ese-nchia mu-mw-alo
14. O-mu-losi ke-ch-a
15. ncha-nu o-li-mu-nchu?
16. Sio-si(na) e-si-khu-lu-mir-e?
17. we-chir-e li-na?
18. O-li o-chi-e
19. o-ch-i-ye-nge ena?
20. Wao!
21. Yi-cha!
22. E-nyoy-e!
23. Ke-chir-e!
24. Ka-yich-a
25. Ke-rukh-a nesifulia
26. O-li-mulay-i
27. A-fukir-e
28. Liaka ke-ch-a
29. Ka-wa-ye Nekesa e-si-tau Mungolobe
31. O-mu-khana Ola, na-mu-wen-e mu-mw-alo mungolobe
32. O-si-chay-e ena?
33. O-mu-sacha ola, a-bebi ba-mu-khupa ba-ba o—khumw-icha
34. E-se u-sa khu-lwa-nge, ke-nye-kha-na ba-mu-wo-we
35. Na-ka-si-ma sa-na a-ma-be-re ma-wo-wu
36. Ba-chi-a e-wa-we o-mw-ana o-la
37. Ncha-nu o-li-ye e-chemwa li-a-nge?
38. O-khu-khu-pir-e ncha-nu?
40. A-ba-na ba-la be-chi-re mu-ngo-lo-be
41. A-kha-na kha-la khe-chi-re mu-ngo-lo-be
42. O-chwa-na chu-la chew-chi-re mu-ngo-lo-be.
43. O-kwa-na ku-la kwe-chi-re mu-ngo-lo-be
44. E-mia-na ki-ra ki-e-chi-re mu-ngo-lo-be
45. Nekesa alimunchu
46. Nawire alima
47. Epwoni likumukhire
48. Enguo yomire
49. Nawire aliye enchuku
50. Omulosi amusindusise
51. Omwana kachire eningiro
52. Liaka akumuye epwoni
53. Nawire asiubire omukoye
Appendix 3: Interview schedule

*On which word does focus fall in the following sentences?*

**Narrow Focus.**

Bachi owene embusi?

Nche- Embwa- yi - mbwene

‘Nche Embwa yi mbwene’

Nchanu oliye echemwa?

Nche Nawire oliye echemwa

Oliye echemwa nche Nawire

Nche Wawire okhupire Liaka.

Wawire akhupire Liaka.

**Predicate Focus**

Okhulenge kwange Khusimbere

Omwibi kecha. ‘

**Focus structure in Lunyala ‘K’**

EchemwA ncherindiy. 

Esi Nawire aliye nche echemwa

Nchanu owirukhire?
Thank you for your co-operation in completing this questionnaire.