

## Effects of Relativization on the Morpho-syntactic Structure of the Runyambo Verb

*Nelius Rwebangira Neckemiah\**

### **Abstract**

*This article intends to move a step beyond brief description of subject and object relativization provided in the grammar of Runyambo (cf. Rugemalira, 2005: 101-103). It aims at describing the formation of relative clauses in Runyambo and it specifically analyses the effects of relativization of different grammatical functions (GFs) of the morpho-syntactic structure of the Runyambo verb. Descriptive research design was used in conjunction with a qualitative approach in data collection and analysis of findings. Ten (10) respondents were purposively selected to inform the study. The findings included (i) the relativization of the subject NP nominalises the verb; (ii) the relativization process alters the position of tense markers within the relative verbs for the present continuous, and the immediate future tenses; and (iii) the relativization of different GFs changes the present continuous and immediate future tense marker 'ni' 'is/are', and the remote past tense marker 'ka' (P3) into 'ri-ku' 'is/are' and á (P1)...íre (P2), respectively.*

**Key words:** *Accessibility Hierarchy, grammatical functions, relative clauses, Runyambo*

### **Introduction**

This article sets out to analyse the effects of relativization in Runyambo, a Bantu language spoken in Kagera Region in Tanzania, and classified as JE21 in Guthrie's (1948) classification. Some studies have established possible relativizable grammatical functions (GFs) and relativization strategies in Bantu (Barret-Keach, 1985; Walusimbi, 1996; Zeller, 2004; Cheng & Kula, 2006; Simango, 2006; Kombe, 2010; Mtenje, 2011). However, studies have paid attention to the effects triggered by the relativization of an object NP position on syntactic patterns of the clause. For instance, Demuth and Harford (1999), Nkonyani (2001), and Simango (2006) contend that the relativization of the object NP position triggers subject-verb inversion in Shona, Swahili, and ciNsenga languages, respectively. This shows unequivocally that the effects of relativization of different GFs on the morpho-syntactic structure of the verb still need attention, not only in the already

---

\*Assistant Lecturer, Department of Languages and Literature, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, P. o. Box 2329, Email: nneckemiah@gmail.com

mentioned studies in Bantu languages, but also in many others. Thus, this article seeks to investigate the effects of relativization on the morpho-syntactic structure of the verb in Runyambo.

It has also been found that relativization of different grammatical functions in Bantu languages applies varied relativization strategies. For example, relative clauses in Haya, a Bantu language also classified as JE22 in Guthrie's (ibid.) classification, are realized by verbal relative markers, relative pronouns, and resumptive pronouns (Riedel, 2010). The three aforementioned relativization strategies result in subject relative clauses, object relative clauses, and prepositional relative clauses, respectively. This paper also seeks to show whether or not similar relativization strategies are applicable in Runyambo. However, unlike Riedel's (ibid.) study, the present analysis does not limit itself to possible relativizeable GFs and their relativization strategies. It rather goes a step further as to show the effects of relativization of different GFs on the morpho-syntactic structure of the verb.

### **Review of Literature**

The consulted literature indicates that languages differ significantly in the way they form relative clauses. Payne (1997), for example, argues that the structural variation manifested by relative clauses (RCs) across languages can be explained by typological parameters. The typological parameters along which relative clauses vary both internally and cross-linguistically include, among others, the position of the head in relation to the relative clause, the relativization strategies, and the NP positions that are accessible to relativization (Comrie, 1989; Payne, 1997; Kroeger, 2004). Of the three-just-mentioned typological parameters, the current article describes the last two parameters which seem to be the most relevant.

### **Relativization Strategies**

Typological studies (e.g. Keenan and Comrie, 1977; Comrie, 1989, Payne, 1997, De Vries, 2002) indicate that languages vary in their ways of marking relative clauses. Comrie (1989), Kroeger (2004), and Andrews (2007) identify four ways through which RCs are marked across-languages. However, it has been further indicated that some languages mark RCs by using only one relativization strategy whereas others use more than one strategy to relativize different NP positions (Kroeger, *op cit.*). The commonly used relativization strategies are presented hereunder.

- *Non-reduction strategy*: In this strategy, the relativized NP position remains expressed within the relative clause in its full form. This is attested in languages such as Japanese.

- *Resumptive pronoun*: In this strategy, when the relativized NP is moved out of its underlying position, it leaves behind a trace which is filled by the pronominal copy of the moved constituent within the RC.
- *Relative pronoun*: In this strategy, relativization is realized by a relative pronoun. This strategy is said to be commonly used in languages such as English, and French.
- *Gapping strategy*: The formation of RCs by this strategy provides no overt indication of the relativized function within the relative clause. The gap left behind after the removal of the relativized element in the RC is interpreted as being filled by the head noun in the NP. For example, in the sentence *I admire the prize the boy won*, the relative clause *the boy won* that modifies the head noun *the prize* has a gap since we know that the verb *won* is a transitive verb and it licences the object argument (cf. Kröeger, 2004; Kuteva and Comrie, 2005).

Besides, the above-mentioned cross-linguistic RC forming strategies, literature indicates that some languages form RCs by means of prosodic features such as tone (Kuteva and Comrie, 2005). Typical languages include Kinyarwanda (Kimenyi, 1978), Ikalanga (Letsholo, 2009), Kivunjo (Kombe, 2010) and Chichewa (Mtenje, 2011), just to mention a few. This suggests the complexity of the phenomenon under investigation. For example, it has been further indicated that some languages mark RCs by using only one relativization strategy whereas others use more than one strategy in different NP positions (Kroeger, *ibid*).

### Relativization and Accessibility Hierarchy

Keenan and Comrie (1977) found that languages vary with respect to the NP positions that they can relativize, and that the variation is not haphazard, but rather it is in accordance with certain principles. Keenan and Comrie's hypothesis of Accessibility Hierarchy (AH) states that any given relative clause forming strategy must apply to a continuous segment of the AH as illustrated below.

#### (1) *Accessibility Hierarchy (AH)*

SU > DO > IO > OBL > GEN > OCOMP

**Source:** Keenan and Comrie (1977:66)

From the scale above, the symbol ">" entails 'more accessible than'; SU stands for 'subject', DO for 'direct object', IO for 'indirect object', OBL for 'major oblique case NP (those NPs which express arguments of main predicate', GEN for genitive, and OCOMP for 'object of comparison.'

The AH above signifies that, if a language has relative clauses, it should allow relativization on subjects, the topmost end of the AH. Additionally, if a language permits relativization on only two positions of the AH, these will necessarily be the subject and the direct object NP positions in that order. The AH indicates, further, that if a given language permits a relative clause to be formed on a grammatical function associated with a low position in the hierarchy, then it will allow relativization of all grammatical functions representing higher positions above it. Thus, the whole idea of AH hinges on the assumption that the relativizability hierarchy (with a primary strategy) decreases as one descends the ladder of the relativizability hierarchy, and in that manner, the more one goes down the accessibility hierarchy, the harder it is to relativize.

Drawing from Keenan and Comrie's (ibid.) AH, linguists have conducted research on relative clause formation in Bantu languages (e.g. Walusimbi, 1996; Demuth and Harford, 1999; Ngonyani, 2001; Zeller, 2004; Kroeger, 2004; Simango, 2006; Kombe, 2010; Mtenje, 2011). The reviewed literature reveals that most languages are highly constrained such that they do not permit relativization on grammatical functions other than the subject (cf. Kroeger, 2004; Walusimbi, 1996). However, despite the restriction, Walusimbi (ibid), Nakamura (1997), and Mkude (2005) have shown that languages have mechanisms through which unrelativizeable NP positions can be promoted to higher positions on the AH where they can be easily extracted. These mechanisms include movement, passivization, verbal extension (applicative, causative, etc.) just to mention a few.

It has been evident in the literature that the subject has not been exhaustively investigated with regard to relativization. There are also many issues that are yet to be addressed including the possible relativizeable grammatical functions and the effects triggered by the relativization of different NP positions on the AH. Thus, this article aims at bridging this gap by investigating the effects of relativization on the morpho-syntactic structure of the Runyambo verb.

### **Methodology**

This article adopts a descriptive research design as it enables a thorough and detailed inquiry of relative clause formation in natural setting (cf. Creswell, 2013). Data were collected in Kagera Region, particularly in Karagwe District, in Ndama and Kibondo wards, and in Nyabwegira and Nyakaiga villages, respectively. Some 10 respondents were purposively involved whereby, 4 respondents worked on the questionnaire and acceptability judgement tasks, 3 respondents were involved in narratives and free conversations, and the remaining 3

respondents were selected specifically to judge the acceptability or unacceptability of different relative clause constructions provided by other respondents.

In addition, the data were collected through elicitation method by employing different instruments of data collection such as questionnaire, acceptability judgement tasks, narratives and free conversations. The data from spoken texts (i.e. oral stories and narrations) were collected by means of a voice recorder that was kept running throughout the narration and conversations. The use of varied data collection instruments aiming at ensuring accuracy and trustworthiness of the data, to give what is technically referred to as data triangulation (Bryman, 2011). The data were coded and thematically analysed based on the specific objectives formulated. The Creswell's (2014: 249) hand coding approach was adopted in the establishment of the themes. The process of data collection, and analysis observed all codes of conduct of a research work. That is, the purpose of the study and all its details were clearly explained to respondents, and their consent to participate willingly in the research was sought.

## **Findings**

This section presents and discusses the findings in relation to relative clause forming strategies, possible relativizeable grammatical functions and the morpho-syntactic effects triggered by the relativization of different GFs.

### **Relative Clause Forming Strategies and Accessibility Hierarchy (AH) in Runyambo**

This section presents the relativization strategies in line with possible relativizeable grammatical functions in the Runyambo language. In particular, the section determines the NP positions of the AH that are accessible to relativization, and the relativization strategies that are involved for each relativizeable grammatical function. The findings revealed that relativization strategies tend to vary in relation to the type of a grammatical function involved. In Runyambo, for instance, the relative clauses appear to be marked by two different relativization strategies, namely, the relative pronoun strategy, and the resumptive pronoun strategy.

As pointed out earlier, the distribution of the aforementioned relativization strategies is determined by the type of the NP position of the AH involved in the construction of a relative clause. The possible relativizeable grammatical functions and their respective relativization strategies in Runyambo are presented and discussed below.

Based on Keenan and Comrie's (1977:63) observation that any language that has RCs must relativize on a subject NP position, Runyambo permits RCs to be formed on the subject NP position as illustrated in (2) and (3) below.

- (2) E- *n-koko eyá- bur- a ni ya Yohana*  
 AUG -9-chicken REL.pst-lose -FV Cop of Yohana  
 'The chicken that has got lost belongs to John'
- (3) *A-ba-seija abe-ib- ír- e a-ma-hera ga-we ba-*  
*torok- ír- e*  
 AUG-2-man 2REL-steal-P3-AF AUG-6-money 6-POSS 2SP-  
 disappear-P1-AF  
 'The men who had stolen your money disappeared'

In (2), the relativized nominal constituent *enkoko* 'chicken' assumes the role of a subject within the relative clause. Likewise, in (3), the relativized nominal constituent *abaseija* 'men' plays the role of a subject within the relative clause. Regarding the relativization strategy employed in the formation of the RCs in (2) and (3) above, the data indicate that the RCs in both sentences have been marked by means of a relative pronoun. In this relativization strategy, the relativized nominal constituent is realized by a relative pronoun that takes the head of a RC as its antecedent (cf. Comrie, 1989). In this respect, the elements *eya* 'that/which' and *abe* 'who' in (2) and (3) above function as relative operators, respectively.

Besides subject relativization, Runyambo permits relative clauses to be formed on non-subject grammatical functions, namely the object, the oblique and the possessives. The Runyambo object relative clauses are presented and discussed in (4) and (5) below.

- (4) E-*bya-kurya ebí a- ba-kazi ba- a- teek-ir- e bi-*  
*ka-nura*  
 AUG- 8-food REL AUG-2-woman SP2-P1-cook-P2-FV  
 8-P3-be delicious  
 'The food which the women cooked was delicious'
- (5) *O-mw-ana owí o- mu-kazi ya- siig- a a- ma-juta ya-*  
*nagira*  
 AUG-1-child REL AUG-1-woman 1SM.pst-smear-FV AUG-6- oil  
 SM1.pst-sleep  
 'The child on whom the woman smeared oil has slept'

The Runyambo data presented in (4) and (5) above indicate that the relativized nominal constituents *ebyakurya* 'the food' and *omwana* 'the child', respectively, function as objects within their respective relative clauses. This is evident in (4) where the verb *teeka* 'cook' in the RC *ebi abakazi baateekire* 'which the women cooked' lacks an object that it

ought to bear by virtue of being a transitive verb. However, based on Radford's (1997) idea of trace theory, the moved element is assumed to bind and determine the grammatical properties of its trace. In this respect, the trace left behind within the RC in (4) is assumed to be filled by the relative pronoun *ebi* 'which' that has been moved to pre-clause position. As for the relativization strategy, the data in (4) and (5) above demonstrate that the relativized object NP positions in both cases have been marked by the relative markers *ebí* 'which' and *owí* 'who' which play a role comparable to that of the English *wh*-pronoun.

In Runyambo, oblique arguments are among non-subject grammatical functions of the AH that are relativizeable. The Runyambo oblique relative clauses are presented in (6) and (7) below.

- (6) *A-ba-ntu abí ye-ija na-bo ni a- ba-ganda*  
 AUG-2-people REL SM1-come with-them are AUG-2-Ugandan  
 'The people with whom s/he has come are Ugandans'
- (7) *I- ø-chumu erí o- mu-hiigi a- re- ij- a na-ryo ri-remeire*  
 AUG-5-spear REL AUG-1-hunter1SP- FUT-come-FV with-it  
 it-be crooked  
 'The spear which the hunter will come with is crooked'

As shown in (6) and (7) above, the italicized sentences are Runyambo oblique relative clauses. The relativized nominal constituents *abantu* 'the people' and *ichumu* 'the spear' function as objects of the complement preposition of companionship *na* 'with'. Regarding the relativization strategy involved, the data in (6) and (7) above indicate that the RCs have in both cases been marked by a resumptive pronoun. In this relativization strategy, the relativized nominal constituent, when moved to the pre-clause position, leaves behind a trace that is filled by its pronominal copy. This is apparent in (6) and (7) above where the movement of the nominal constituents *abantu* 'the people', and *ichumu* 'the spear' to pre-clause positions has left traces that are filled by the pronominal clitics *-bo* 'them', and *-ryo* 'it', respectively.

Besides the relativization of oblique arguments, possessives are another non-subject position of the AH that are also relativizeable. The Runyambo possessive relative clauses are presented in (8) and (9) below.

- (8) *E-chi-tabo echí o-ru-papuro rwacho ru-tagukíre ni change*  
 AUG-7- book REL AUG-11-page of it it-be torn is mine  
 'The book whose page is torn is mine'
- (9) *A-ba-higi abí e-m-bwa zabo zi-is-ir-e e-chi-nyameiswa ba-á semererwa*

AUG-2-hunter 2REL AUG-10-dog 10SP-kill-Perf-FV AUG-7-  
animal 2SP-P1-be happy. ‘  
‘The hunters whose dogs killed an animal are happy’

As indicated in (8) and (9) above, the clauses *echí orupapuro rwacho rutagukíre* ‘whose page is torn’ and *abi embwa zabo ziisire echinyameiswa* ‘whose dogs killed an animal’, respectively, are possessive relative clauses. The possessive relative clauses, similar to objects of the complement preposition of companionship in (6) and (7) above, are marked by the resumptive pronoun strategy. For instance, in (8) above, the relativized nominal constituent *echitabo* ‘the book’ has been moved to pre-clause position where it is realised as a relative pronoun *echi* ‘which’, while remaining expressed within the relative clause in the form of a resumptive pronoun *-cho* ‘it’. Similarly, in (9), the relativized nominal constituent *abahigi* ‘the hunters’ has been moved to the pre-clause position thereby leaving a trace which is filled by the resumptive pronoun *-bo* ‘it’.

This study also sought to analyse the effects of relativization of different grammatical functions on the morpho-syntactic structure of the verb in Runyambo. A variety of ways in which the relativization of different GFs affects the morpho-syntactic structure of the verb in the Runyambo language is presented and discussed in the subsequent sections.

### **Effects of Relativization on Morpho-syntactic Structure of the Verb in Runyambo**

This section offers various ways in which the relativization of different GFs affects the morpho-syntactic structure of the verb in Runyambo. The data depicting various ways in which the morpho-syntactic structure of the verb is affected by the relativization of different GFs are presented and discussed hereunder.

#### **Verbal Nominalization**

The nominalization of the verb is among the apparent effects of relativization on the morphological structure of the verb in Runyambo. The verbal nominalisation holds when the relative clause is formed on the subject NP position of the AH. The attachment of the pre-prefix on the third person verb form appears to be the most visible indicator. This is illustrated in (10) and (11) below.

- (10) a. *O-mu-suma ye- ib- a e- n- koko*  
AUG-1-thief SP1-steal-FV AUG-9-chick  
‘The thief who stole the chicken ran away’  
b. *O- mu-suma eye- ib- a e- n-koko ye- iruk- a*  
AUG-1-thief REL-steal-FV AUG-9-chick SP1-run- FV  
‘The thief who stole the chick ran away’



- (11) a. *A- ba- ana ni- ba- som- a e- bi- tabo*  
 AUG-2-child FOC-2SM-read-FV AUG-8-book  
 ‘Children are reading books’
- b. *a- ba- ana aba- ri- ku- som- a e- bi- tabo ni a- ba- somali*  
 AUG-2-child 2REL-be-INF-read-FV AUG-8-book are  
 AUG-2-somalian  
 ‘Children who are reading books are Somalians’

As indicated in (10) and (11) above, the sentences in (10a) and (11a) are non-relative clauses whereas their counterparts in (10b) and (11b) are relative clauses. The relative clauses differ from the non-relative clauses in that, the verb structures in the former bear the pre-prefixes *e* and *a*, respectively, which is not the case in the latter. In this respect, the verb in the relative clauses behaves in the manner similar to that of common nouns in Bantu languages. Illustrating examples of Runyambo, common nouns are provided in (12) below.

- (12) a. *a-ba-ntu* b. *e-chi-tabo*  
 AUG-2-people AUG-7-book  
 ‘People’ ‘a book’

In (12a-b) above, each of the nouns consists of a pre-prefix in addition to its noun class prefix. Likewise, the relative verbs in (10b) and (11b) above are prefixed with the relative marker which is a combination of both the pre-prefix and the subject prefix. In this regard, the claim that the relativization of the subject NP nominalises the verb in the relative clause is justified.

### Order of Elements in the Verb Structure

This section aims at examining the way in which the order of elements within the main clause verb is affected by the relativization of different grammatical functions in Runyambo. The findings reveal that the relativization of different GFs modifies the order of elements within the verb structure in various ways. This is exemplified in (13) and (14) below.

- (13) a. *Ni-ba-handik-a e- bi-tabo*  
 Co-2-write-FV AUG-8-book  
 ‘They are writing books’
- b. *E- bi-tabo ebi ba- ri- ku- handik- a ni bi-rungi*  
 AUG-8-book REL 1SP-be-INF- write- FV are 8- good  
 ‘The books which they are writing are good’
- (14) a. *Ni-ba-ja ku-handik-a e- bi-tabo*  
 Co-2-go INF-write- FV AUG-8-book  
 ‘They are going to write books’

b. *E- bi-tabo ebi ba- ri- ku- ja ku- handik-a ni bi-rungi*

AUG-8-book REL 2SP-be-INF-go INF-write- FV are 8-good  
 ‘The books that they are going to write are good’

In (13) and (14) above, the sentences in (a) are non-relative clauses whereas their counterparts in (b) are relative clauses. The order of elements within the verb structures of the non-relative clauses differ from that of the elements within the verb structures of the relative clauses in terms of the position occupied by tense markers. That is, the tense marker *ni* ‘is/are’ for the present continuous, and the immediate future tenses precedes the subject prefix within the non-relative verb, whereas the tense marker *ri-ku* ‘are’ for similar tenses, follows the subject prefix within the relative clauses.

### Effects of Relativization on Tense Markers

This subsection presents and discusses different ways in which tense markers are affected by the relativization of different grammatical functions in the Runyambo language. The findings show that the relativization of different GFs affects tense markers in various ways as illustrated in (15) below.

- (15) a. *O- mw- ana ni- a- som-a e- barua*  
 AUG-1- child Co-1SP- read-FV AUG-letter  
 ‘A child is reading a letter’  
 b. *O-mw-ana a- ri-ku- som- a e- ø-barua ni o- w-ange*  
 AUG-1-child REL.1SP-be-INF- read-FV AUG- 9-letter  
 is AUG-of-mine  
 ‘The child who is reading a letter is mine.’

The sentence in (15a) is a non-relative clause whereas its counterpart in (15b) is a relative clause. The tense markers within the verb structures of the two clauses differ in that; the present continuous for the non-relative clause is marked by *ni* ‘is’, whereas the same tense is marked by *ri-ku* ‘is’ for the relative clause. The tense marker for the relative clause appears to be the replica of the tense marker within the negative non-relative clause verb form as shown in (16) below.

- (16) *O- mwa-ana ta- ri-ku- som- a barua*  
 AUG-1- child NEG.1SP-be-INF- read- FV letter  
 ‘A child is not reading a letter’

As indicated in (16) above, the tense marker for the negative verb form within the non-relative clause is similar to that of the verb structure within the relative clause in (14b) above. The similar case of

relativization effect is also observable in relative clauses whose verb is in the immediate future tense. The immediate future tense in the Runyambo language is realized by the continuous progressive of the auxiliary verb plus the infinitive form of the main verb as exemplified in (17) below.

- (17) a. *Abaana ni-ba-já kusoma e- bi-tabo*  
 Children Co-SM2-go to read AUG-8-book  
 ‘The children are going to/will read books’  
 b. *Ebitabo ebí a-ba-ana ba- rí-ku-ja kusoma ni bi-rungi*  
 AUG-8-book REL8 children SP2-Co-go to read is 8-  
 good  
 ‘The books which the children are going to read are good’

In (17) above, the sentence in (17a) is a non-relative clause whereas its counterpart in (17b) is a relative clause. With respect to the tense marker in the two clauses, the present continuous tense for the non-relative clause is marked by *ni* ‘are’ which is prefixed to the auxiliary verb *ja* ‘go’, whereas the similar tense for the relative clause is marked by tense marker *ri-ku* ‘are’. The tense marker for the present continuous tense within the relative clause is comparable to that of the negative verb form within the non-relative clause as exemplified in (18) below.

- (18) *Abaana ti- ba-ri-ku- já kusoma bi-tabo*  
 Children NEG-2- SM2- go to read 8-book  
 ‘The children are not going to/will not read books’

Besides affecting the present continuous and the immediate future tense markers, the relativization of different grammatical functions also affects the remote past tense marker in the Runyambo language. Illustrating examples of the relative clauses whose verbs are in the remote past tense are provided in (19) below.

- (19) a. *A-ba-higi ba-ka-chumit-a e- m-bogo*  
 AUG-2-hunter 2SP-P3-spear-FV AUG-9-buffalo  
 ‘Hunters speared a buffalo’  
 b. *E- m-bogo eyi a- ba-hígi ba- á- chumis-ir-e ya- fw-a*  
 AUG-9-buffalo REL AUG-2-hunter 2SP-P1-spear- P2-FV  
 9.PAST-die-FV  
 ‘The buffalo that the hunters speared died’

In (19) above, (19a) is a non-relative clause, but (19b) is a relative clause. With regard to the tense marker, the remote past tense within the non-relative clause is marked by *ka* (P3), whereas the similar tense is marked by the combination of the marker for the immediate past (P1

(*á*) and the recent past marker (P2 (-*ire*)) within the relative clause in (19b).

A close examination of Runyambo relative clauses reveals that, despite a few observed effects of relativization on the present continuous, immediate future, and the remote past tense markers, the tense markers for the relative clauses formed on the rest of the tenses seem to remain unaffected. The tense/aspect system in the Runyambo relative verb is provided in Table 1 below.

**Table 1: Tense and Aspect Systems in the Runyambo Relative Clause Verb**

Tense	Main Clause Affirmative		Relative Clause		
			affirmative		negative
Hb	<i>abara</i>	s/he counts	<i>ábara</i>	one who counts	<i>atabára</i>
	<i>babara</i>	they count	<i>abábara</i>	those who count	<i>abatabára</i>
Co	<i>naabara</i>	s/he is counting	<i>aríkubara</i>	one who is counting	<i>ataríkubara</i>
	<i>nibabara</i>	they are counting	<i>abaríkubara</i>	those who are counting	<i>abataríkubara</i>
Pf1	<i>yáábazire</i>	s/he has already counted	<i>eyáábazire</i>	one who has already counted	<i>atákabazire</i>
	<i>báábazire</i>	they have already counted	<i>abáábazire</i>	those who have already counted	<i>abatákabazire</i>
P1	<i>yáábara</i>	s/he counted	<i>eyá(á)bara</i>	one who counted	<i>atáábara</i>
	<i>báábara</i>	they counted	<i>abáábara</i>	those who counted	<i>abatáábara</i>
P2	<i>abazire</i>	s/he counted	<i>ábazire</i>	one who counted	<i>atabazíre</i>
	<i>babazire</i>	they counted	<i>abábazire</i>	those who counted	<i>abatabazíre</i>
P3	<i>akabara</i>	s/he counted	<i>eyabazíre</i>	one who counted	<i>atarázeine</i>
	<i>bakabara</i>	they counted	<i>ababazíre</i>	those who counted	<i>abatarábazire</i>
Pf2	<i>arábazire</i>	s/he has counted	<i>arábazire</i>	one who has counted	<i>atákabarága</i>
	<i>barábazire</i>	they have counted	<i>abarábazire</i>	those who have counted	<i>abatákabarága</i>
F1	<i>araabara</i>	s/he will count	<i>araabara</i>	one who will count	<i>ataraabare</i>
	<i>baraabara</i>	they will count	<i>abaraabara</i>	those who will count	<i>abataraabare</i>
F2	<i>aríbara</i>	s/he will count	<i>aríbara</i>	one who will count	<i>ataríbara</i>
	<i>baríbara</i>	they will count	<i>abaríbara</i>	those who will count	<i>abataríbara</i>

**Source:** Adapted from Rugemalira (2005: 101–102)

Note that, in the underlined relative forms, the pre-prefix, and the subject prefix have merged.

### **Key**

Hb	habitual	Co	continuous
Pf1	perfective 1 (recent)	P1	past tense 1 (today)
P2	past tense 2 (yesterday)	P3	past tense 3 (remote)
Pf2	perfective 2 (remote)	F1	near future
F2	remote future		

## Discussion

With regard to the possible relativizeable grammatical functions, the findings have revealed that all NP positions of the Accessibility Hierarchy (AH) are relativizeable in Runyambo. To a large extent, Runyambo conforms to Keenan and Comrie's (1977) AH on which the NP positions are arranged based on their levels of relativizability complexities. It has also been noted that Runyambo, unlike other Bantu languages, does not distinguish the object of comparison from the normal object. In this respect, the object of comparison is missing in Runyambo's representation of Keenan and Comrie's (1977) AH as illustrated in (20) below.

(20) *Subject > Object > Indirect object > Oblique > Genitive*

As the AH in 20 above illustrates, it is easier to relativize higher positions of the AH in Runyambo than on the lower positions. In other words, relativization of non-subject NP positions gets more complex as one descends the ladder of AH.

As for the effects of relativization strategies, the findings have revealed that the formation of RCs in Runyambo involves two relativization strategies, which are the relative pronoun strategy and the resumptive pronoun strategy. The distribution between the two relativization strategies is made based on the type of the grammatical function involved. For instance, the relative pronoun strategy is reserved for the relativization of the subject and the object (direct and indirect) NP positions on the AH. On the other hand, the resumptive pronoun strategy is restricted to the formation of oblique and genitive relative clauses. This implies that the NP positions below the object NP position on the AH could otherwise be inaccessible for relativization without the pronoun retention strategy. This implies that the more the relativization strategies there are, the lower ones can go on the hierarchy for relative clause formation.

As for the effects of relativization on the morpho-syntactic structure of the verb in Runyambo, the findings indicate that the apparent relativization effects on the morpho-syntactic structure of the Runyambo verb are verbal nominalization, order of elements in the verb, and tense markers. In relation to verbal nominalization, when the relative clause is formed on the subject NP, the third person verb form bears a pre-prefix which is the characteristic feature of common nouns in most Bantu languages including Runyambo. Regarding the question of order of elements within the verb structure, the position occupied by the tense markers for the present continuous and the immediate future tenses in the main clause verb differ from the one occupied by similar

tense markers in the relative clause verb. That is, the tense markers for the aforementioned tenses precede the subject prefixes in the main clause verbs, whereas they follow the subject prefixes in the relative clause verbs.

The findings have further revealed that the relativization of different grammatical functions affects the tense markers for the present continuous tense, the immediate future, and for the remote past tense. The data in show that the tense marker *ni* 'is/are' both for the present continuous and immediate future tenses in the main clause verb changes into *ri-ku* 'is/are' when it occurs in the relative clause verb. In this respect, the tense marker for the aforementioned tenses in the relative clause verbs is comparable to that of the present continuous tense within the main clause negative verb form. As for the remote past tense marker *ka* (P3), the tense marker for the tense changes into *á...íre* when it occurs within the relative clause verb form.

## Conclusion

As indicated at the outset, this article has investigated the effects of relativization on the morpho-syntactic structure of the Runyambo verb. It has been found that Runyambo permits relative clauses to be formed on all positions of the Accessibility Hierarchy (AH). However, contrary to other Bantu languages, Runyambo does not distinguish between the object of comparison, and the normal object on the AH. It has been further shown that in Runyambo, as is the case in Haya (Riedel, 2010), the relativization of different grammatical functions requires different relativization strategies. Although both languages require different relativization strategies to relativize on different grammatical functions, they differ in terms of the number of the relativization strategies required. That is, while the Haya makes use of three relativization strategies *viz.* the verbal relative marker, relative pronoun and resumptive pronoun, Runyambo makes use of two of them, namely the relative pronoun and resumptive pronoun.

The present study has shed light on the effects of relativization of different grammatical functions on the morpho-syntactic structure of the Runyambo verb. The effects include the nominalization of the verb, alteration of the order of elements in the verb structure, and the reduction of the number of TAM distinctions. Thus, this study calls for research on issues pertaining to relativization among other Bantu languages for broadening the understanding of the examined issues and finally come up with informed generalizations.

## References

- Alphonc, C. (2018). A syntactic Analysis of Relative Clauses in the Southern Cushitic Language, Iraq. *Journal of Education Humanities and Sciences*, 7(2): 42–61.
- Andrews, A. D. (2007). Complex Constructions. In T. Shopen (ed). *Language Typology and Syntactic Description* (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 206–236.
- Bryman, A. (2011). *Triangulation: Encyclopaedia of Social Science Research Methods*. LOCATION? SAGE Publications.
- Cheng, L. & Kula, N. (2006). Syntactic and Phonological Phrasing in Bemba Relative Clauses. *ZAS Papers in Linguistics*, (43): 31–54.
- Comrie, B. & Kuteva, T. (2013). Relativization on Subjects. In M. S. Dryer & M. Haspelmath (eds.). *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology.
- Comrie, B. (1989). *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing among Five Approaches* (3<sup>rd</sup> Edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Demuth, K. & Harford, C. (1999). Verb Raising and Subject Inversion in Comparative Bantu. *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics*, 20 (1): 41–61.
- Guthrie, M. (1948). *The Classification of the Bantu Languages*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Kaoneka, S. (2018). *The Morphosyntax of Relative Clauses in Shambala*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Dar es Salaam.
- Keenan, E. L. & Comrie, B. (1977). Noun Phrase Accessibility Hierarchy and Universal Grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 8(1): 63–99.
- Kimenyi, A. (1978). *A Relational Grammar of Kinyarwanda*. California: University of California Press.
- Kombe, L. E. (2010). *Relative Clause Formation in Kivunjo*. Unpublished M.A. Dissertation, University of Dar es Salaam.
- Kuteva, T & Comrie, B. (2005). The Typology of Relative Clause Formation in African Languages. In E. F. K. Voeltz (ed.). *Studies in African Linguistic Typology*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins: 209–228.
- Mkude, D. J. (2005). *The Passive Construction in Swahili*. Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa (ILCAA), Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.
- Mtenje, A. (2011). On Relative Clauses and Prosodic Phrasing in Ciwandya. *ZAS Papers in Linguistics*, 55: 121–139.
- Ngonyani, D. (2001). Evidence for Head Rising in Kiswahili Relative

- Clauses. *Studies in African Linguistics*, 30(1): 59–73.
- Payne, T. E. (1997). *Describing Morphosyntax: A Guide to Field Linguists*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Riedel, K. (2010). Relative Clauses in Haya. *ZAS Papers in Linguistics*, 53: 211–225.
- Rugemalira, J. M. (2005). *A Grammar of Runyambo*. Dar es Salaam: Languages of Tanzania Project, University of Dar es Salaam.
- Simango, S. R. (2006). Verb Agreement and the Syntax of ciNsenga Relative Clauses. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 24(3): 277–290.
- Vries, M. de (2002). *The Syntax of Relativization*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of Amsterdam.
- Walusimbi, L. (1996). *Relative Clauses in Luganda*. Köln : Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.
- Zeller, J. (2004). Relative Clause Formation in the Bantu Languages of the South Africa. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 22(1–2): 75–93.