_____

NOUN MODIFICATION IN SHINYIHA

Devet Goodness

Abstract

This paper, which is guided by markedness theory, focuses on noun modification by forms other than pure adjectives that appear within the scope of the noun phrase in Shinyiha. The paper presents the markedness of these forms in their secondary function of modification. The data used in this study were obtained from written sources and through elicitation technique conducted to 10 Shinyiha informants. Purposive and snowball sampling techniques were used to obtain the sample of the study. The study reveals that noun modification is a productive process in Shinyiha and it is performed by different forms ranging from pure adjectives to derived adjectives, verbs, participials, passives and locatives. The findings indicate that in order to perfom the function of modification nouns and verbs involve the following changes: juxtapositioning and structural coding respectively. The study concludes that although an adjective is an important category in Shinyiha, there are other various ways through which Shinyiha speakers use to express property concepts which are expressed by pure adjectives in Indo-European languages.

Keywords: adjective, modification, markedness, associative phrases, modifier, property concepts

1. Introduction

Noun modification is a process that takes place within the noun phrase. There exist several studies on the noun phrase (cf. Drier 2000; Ndomba 2006; Rugemalira 2007; Lusekelo 2009; Rijkhoff 2012; Van velde 2013, 2019) or DP structure (Carsens 1997) for those are in favour of DP Hypothesis in both Bantu and non-Bantu languages. Most studies on the Bantu noun phrase have focused on elements that appear with the head noun (Ndomba 2006; Rugemalira 2007; Lusekelo 2009). These studies have specifically attempted to answer the following questions: What kinds of elements appear in the noun phrase? What is the order of their co-occurrence? What restrictions are there in their co-occurrence? One issue of concern with the different forms that appear within the scope of the noun phrase is concerned with what label these forms should be given. As a neutral term most authors call them 'elements' (Ndomba 2006;

Rugemalira 2007; Lusekelo 2009). Whether or not all elements that co-occur with a head noun should be regarded as modifiers is open to debate. This debate is beyond the scope of this paper. The current paper focuses on elements that in one way or another add meaning to the head noun. That is, any form that occurs with the head noun to describe it will be regarded as a modifier. I will focus on other marked forms and the way they perfom the process of modification and the various meanings they add to the head noun. In this context, modification is the process of adding meaning to the head noun. Modification is an optional and a macrofunction which covers a wide range of semantic notions. Carnie (2013) proposes informal and formal principles of modification. According to him, informally, modifiers are always attached within the phrase they modify and formally, using X bar theory, If an XP (that is, a phrase with some category X) modifies some head Y, then XP must be a sister to Y (i.e a daughter of YP. Stowel (1981) posits that every modifier must be a maximal projection (to use the minimalism concept) of phrasal category.

Rubin (1994) proposes a model where modifiers are headed by a functional category contrary to what used to be the case in the earlier Chomsky's Generative models where only lexical categories (nouns, verbs, adjectives) were heading the phrases. Traditionally, based on Structuralism there are two types of modifiers: premodifiers and postmodifiers. Premodifiers appear before the head noun while postmodifiers appear after the head noun. In English, for instance, the word 'tall' in a *tall* boy is a premodififier and the phrase *under the table* in the phrase 'the boy *under the table'* is a postmodifier. Modification is the defining function of adjectives (Croft 1991, 2001). However, it is important to note that there are other forms that when marked they perfom the function of modification.

Nouns and adjectives in Bantu languages share certain properties based on their morphology and syntactic distribution. Radford (2004) following Chomsky's approach uses plus and minus signs to distinguish between nouns, adjectives, verbs and prepositions as follows: Adjective = [+N, +V], Noun= [+N, -V], Verb= [+V, -N], prepositions are [–N, -V]. Langacker (2009) developed a linguistic structure based on cognitive approach and distinguished two types of prominence: profiling and trajectory/landmark organisation. According to him, each is strongly motivated in purely semantic terms, and subsequently proves essential for describing grammar. Langacker (2009) argues that an expression can profile a thing or a relationship. He distinguishes between adjective, verb and noun in terms of predicate structure. He identifies two types of predicates; a nominal predicate which designates a thing and a relational predicate which designates either an atemporal relation or a process. Langacker (2009) shows that atemporal relations correspond to categories such as

adjectives, adverbs, prepositions, infinitives and participles. According to him nouns are also atemporal because they do not designate processes but a thing. The word 'thing' in Langacker's words is not limited to physical objects but it also includes abstract nouns. Langacker (2009) offers a definition of a thing as a product of grouping and reification. He notes that the trajectory of an adjective is a thing (noun) which it describes as having a certain property.

The concept of 'thing' is also used by Halliday (1994) in his model showing the arrangement of the following elements in a noun phrase: *Deictic, Numerative, Epithet, Classifier, Thing, Quantifiers*. According to Halliday 'thing' is the function realised by the head noun of the noun phrase. Payne (2010) differentiates between modifiers and complements. He shows that both complementation and modification are very syntactic functions that may occur within any phrasal category. Payne shows that complements are licenced by their heads while modifiers are not. A head which is defined in purely syntactic terms expresses the meaning incompletely in itself and, therefore, requires (i.e licences) another element to complete it. This is different from a head which is defined in purely semantic terms. Payne (2010) argues that complements complete the meaning of a phrase and modifiers, and on the other hand, they may add important information but they are not licenced by their heads. According to Payne (2010) modifiers are not necessarily the expression of a complete idea. By implication here modifiers include not only pure adjectives but also other forms which in this article are included as modifiers.

In this paper, I describe different ways by which the Shinyiha noun can be modified to express various meanings, herein referred to as property concepts, which may be expressed by a single adjective in other languages. I present patterns of noun modification by other forms to express what Dixon (1977, 1982, 2004) calls property concepts. In order to narrow the focus of this paper, the closed system elements such as demonstratives, possessives and interrogatives, are not dealt with in this paper. Forms other than adjectives that perfom the function of adjectives will be referred to as adjectivals. These forms which have their primary functions but perfom functions expected to be perfomed by adjetives are marked in their functions, thus calling for markedness theory.

2. Materials and Methods

Data for this study were obtained from 10 Shinyiha speakers found in Ileje, Ntembo village. In a linguistic study like the current one, 10 respondents were considered to be enough to provide reliable data as the use of many respondents might bring

_____

variations between the respondents which would confuse the researcher. Therefore, 10 respondents helped to minimize individual variations. The speakers were selected by purposive and snowball sampling techniques. The researcher purposely used informants believed to be competent in Shinyiha. The sample comprised informants of different ages, ranging from 30 years and above. To minimize bias on the part of the researcher, snowball sampling technique was used. Therefore, five participants were known to the researcher and the other five participants were new to the researcher. Data were obtained from two main scources: oral sources and written sources.

Oral sources involved elicitation, a method commonly used by linguists. The researcher elicited data on noun phrases, to find out the different kinds of modifiers that co-occur with the noun and any structural coding involved when the process of noun modification occurs. The researcher used a checklist which contained Kiswahili data consisting of noun phrases with various modifiers. The respondents were asked to find their equivalents in Shinyiha. The participants were also asked to narrate any stories or events that took place in the village. The researcher noted down various structures of interest from the stories narrated. Written sources were obtained from Shinyiha story books. The different noun phrase structures were examined and thereafter analysed. The researcher used 150 tokens containing noun phrases.

3. Theoretical Approaches

As noted earlier this study is guided by Markedness theory. The concept of 'markedness' was first used by the Prague scholars, Nikolai Trubetzkoy and Roman Jakobson and it was applied in phonology. Later on, the concept received considerable attention by several other scholars and its use spread to other fields. Markedness theory holds that certain linguistic elements in the world languages are more basic, natural and more frequent (unmarked) than others which are less natural and less frequent (marked). Givon (2001) provides the following criteria for determining markedness: *Frequency distribution:* The marked category tends to be less frequent than the unmarked one; *cognitive complexity*: This involves the extent to which the form is structured and processed in the mind/brain. A complex form tends to use more mental effort than the simple one. *Structural complexity;* a marked form has a complex   structure as it may require structural coding.

The criteria above imply that the unmarked category is the one that has a wider distribution and the marked one is the one that has a less distribution. Cognitively, the unmarked form tends to be simple to articulate as opposed to marked one. Structural

complexity seems to be the least controversial criterion compared to other markedness criteria. Structural complexity which is based on morphology received support from Greenberg (1966) who argued that markedness in morphological sense may be used to determine which of two related categories is more basic or more expected. Croft (2003) provides examples of mophologial markedness hierarchies as follows:
Number: (nouns, pronouns, adjective, verb), trial > dual >plural >singular
Gender: (noun, adjective) oblique > nominative person (ver): 2 >1 > 3 or 1 >2 > 3 etc.

According to Levinson (2000:137), marked forms are more morphologically complex and less lexicalized, more prolix or periphrastic. Cognitive complexity seems to be the most complex and problematic criterion. Since no one can access the mind, it is difficult to say which forms are cognitively complex and which ones are not. Similar to the concept of markedness, based on meaning, when referring to semantics, scholars differentiate different parts of speech in terms of prototypicality, a central term in prototype theory (Hopper and Thompson 1984). Scholars who are guided by prototype theory argue that certain forms are prototypical and others are peripheral. Drawing examples from animals, Taylor (1991) shows that although there are many living creatures that can be grouped under the category of birds, there are those which are more typical than others. For instance, a parrot is a better example of a bird than an ostritch. In other words, a parrot is a prototypical bird. If we apply markedness theory a parrot is unmarked while an ostritch is marked.

With regards to lexical categories, there are typical nouns, typical adjectives, typical adverbs, etc. For example, traditionally, a typical noun is the one which is inflected for number (singular and plural). More recently, syntactic approaches have dealt with distributional variability in terms of markedness. That is, they tend to define parts of speech in terms of unmarkedness or typical syntactic distribution. Based on the markedness theory, a verb is a lexical item that can be used as an actant of a specific predicate only. According to Greenberg (1966), verbs, nouns, adjectives and adverbs can be placed in a continuum to explain their markedness as follows: Verb> Noun> Adjective >Adverb. According to this scale, elements to the right end of the scale are more marked than elements to their left and marked distinctions are expected to be more readily neutralized than the ummarked ones. In this sense, adjectives are more marked than verbs. Croft (1991) argues that in many ways adjectives are an intermediate class between verbs and nouns. I will refer to Dixon's (2004) semantic classes to examine the meanings expressed by the different modifiers. In this paper, the following criteria will be used to determine a marked form: *frequency of occurrence*: forms which seem to occur infrequently. *Complex forms*: Forms that undergo morphological modification such as structural coding, compounding,

addition of other forms, derived forms and *complex meanings:* Forms that convey extra meanings not expressed by pure adjectives.

This paper shows the markedness of nouns and verbs in their role of expressing property concepts. In the following section, I begin with modification by adjectives which is its typical defining function of adjectives.

4. Modification by Adjectives

I will present adjectives in passing as they deserve a study of their own. A brief discussion is important here so as to paint a picture of how this class of words behave in Shinyiha. Then much attention will be paid to other modifiers which in this paper are considered as marked. Precisely speaking, adjectives are words which describe the noun to give it various interpretations. There exist several studies on adjectives (Bhat 1994; Mpofu 2009, Nyanda 2010). Like other nouns in the world languages, Shinyiha nouns can be modified to give the noun different interpretations. A Shinyiha adjective is best described in the context of morphosyntax since adjectives do not occur by themselves; they must co-occur with their *trajectory*, to use Langacker's (1987; 2008; 2009) term. Simply put, they occur with a variable prefix. They adopt the form of the head noun. Observe the following examples of the adjective stem **-refu** in Kiswahili (Examples from my intuitive knowledge):

(1) **mtu mrefu**   'a tall person'
    watu warefu   'tall people'
    kitu kirefu   'a tall/long thing'

The examples above illustrate the different forms of the adjective *–refu* which changes according to the form of the head noun. As is the case with other Bantu languages, adjectives in Shinyiha may be classified into two classes: underived and derived adjectives.

Underived Adjectives

Underived adjectives refer to adjectives whose roots cannot be traced from other word categories such as nouns, verbs, adverbs etc. When an adjective modifies a noun, it expresses meanings which Dixon (2004) classifies into what he calls adjective semantic types/classes. I borrow his idea here with a view to examining how these several meanings are expressed by Shinyiha adjectives. I present a semantic classification of Shinyiha adjectives hereunder:

Dimension: *-piti* 'big'/fat' *-nsi* 'small'/young, *-nyela* 'thin', *-tali* ' tall, long *-inu* 'fat', *-babazu* 'broad; *-baba* 'wide'.
Value: '*-inza* 'good'; *-βiβi* 'bad'; *-kaali* 'old', *-shindamu* 'honourable

Age: *songo*'elderly'; *-pwa* 'new'; *-gosi* 'old'(for people/ animals
Colour: *ilu* 'black' *-zelu* 'white' *-chemamu*'red'; *-βogwa*'green'
Behaviour: *hata* 'lazy' ; *-luvu* 'selfish' ; *-tonsu* 'polite' ; *-βesi* 'loiterer' ;*-hali* 'ruthless'
Physical condition: *-βinu* 'sick'; *-gomu*'hard'
Taste : *hali* 'sour/bitter' ; *-sulu* 'fresh' ; *-nonu* 'sweet
Weight : pupusu 'light', mwaamu 'heavy'
Quantity : -nji 'many/much
State of mind : kaleza 'dull' ; pena 'mad'
Physical appearance: *-sanza* 'clean'; *-nyali* 'dirty'for things'; *-popo* 'dirty' (for
                          people-*βulunje* 'round'; *-papa* 'flat'
(Goodness 2014)

This classification slightly differs from what Dixon (1982, 2004) terms universal semantic types associated with adjectives. The following semantic types are not found in Dixon's (1982, 2004) list: *state of mind, physical appearance, taste* and *behaviour.* The findings indicate that it is difficult to classify meanings into discrete classes since meanings cannot be categorised into observable units like morphemes. In my view, certain meanings included under Dixon's classification need to be assigned to separate classes. For example, Dixon's physical condition includes various meanings such as taste, state of mind, physical appearance, etc. that cannot be classified together.

The classifications displayed above implies that the meaning of an adjective depends on the meaning of its *trajectory*, to use Langacker's (1987) term. In this sense, several interpretations may be assigned to a single phrase. The adjective **-piti**, in Shinyiha, for instance, can co-occur with many other nouns to denote various meanings. Consider the meanings of the adjective **–piti** when it co-occurs with different nouns.

(2) **a. *Umuntu umupiti***   'a famous person' or a big person
    b. ***Umulungu umupiti***   'a powerful God', the mighty God
    c. ***Ibhungaana ipiti***   'a huge crowd'
    d. ***Insibho impiti***   lit.'strong ideas'

Example (2) above clearly indicates that adjectives adopt their meanings from their trajectories. For example, the word *mupiti* in *umuntu mupiti* acquires its meaning from the noun *umuntu* 'person'. When the same adjective co-occurs with a different noun, for example, *ibhungana* 'crowd' the modified noun extends its meaning. However, one can argue that these different meanings are related to the core meaning 'big.' This is the case for meaning expansion. Examples in (2) indicate that when a noun is

_____

modified by an adjective, it results into various meanings which cannot be strictly divided into discrete classes. Examples in (2) above imply that one cannot ignore context in the interpretation of meaning of the modifier.

4.1 Derived Adjectives

Derived adjectives are those whose stems can be traced in other word categories. In Shinyiha most adjectives are derived from verbs. Shinyiha has a good number of derived adjectives.   Examine the following list of derived adjectives.

Table 1: Derived Adjectives

Stem	Gloss	Verb Stem	Gloss
-βinu	sick	*<βina>*	become sick
-βomvi	hardworking	*<βomba>*	Work
-βulunje	Round	*<βulunga>*	Mould
-imi	Selfish	*<ima>*	refuse to give
-jenzi	loiterer	*<jenda>*	Walk
-lozi	witch	*<loga>*	bewitch
-lumu	dry	*<luma>*	to dry
-manyi	educated	*<manyisya>*	teach
-nyali	dirty	*<nyazya>*	make dirty
-pezi	lit. creator	*<pela>*	Create
-pinyu	pregnant (animals)	*<pinya>*	become pregnant
-pumaje	quiet	*<puma>*	become quiet
-pwe	Hot	*<pwa>*	become cooked
-sankanu	talkative	*<sankana>*	Talk
-sansamsu	charming	*<sansamuha>*	be charming
-tamwe	troublesome	*<tamwa>*	be troublesome
-yanzi	talkative	*<yanga>*	Talk

I have collected 17 derived adjectives. The derived roots either have a derivational suffix *-e, -i for example, -im-i* 'selfish' *-yanz-i* 'talkative',*-jenz-i* lit.'loiterer'', or *-u* and the verb stem such as *-βin-u* 'sick', *-nyaz-u* 'dirty', A few derived adjectives end with suffix *-e* like *–βulunj-e* 'round' and *-tamwe* 'troublesome'. When a noun is modified by a derived adjective, it results in various meaning types, for example, behaviour *–tamwe* 'troublesome', *-yanzi* talkative', physical appearance '*-nyazu* 'dirty', shape 'round', etc. Generally, speaking derived adjectives modify the meaning of the head noun and this meaning is related to the meaning of the word class from

which it was derived. What puts this derived adjective in the class of adjectives is the form it adopts, the meaning of the derived stem and its syntactic distribution.

5. Modification by Participials and Passives

Participials and passives deserve a special attention as it seems they are not common in most Bantu languages and different from other derived adjectives they partly consist of the morphology of the verb extension and partly that of an adjective. A participial is a verbal form that typically ends in a verb affix. As noted before, any other form apart from an adjective that perfoms the function of modification is regarded as marked. Participials and passives have been classified separately from derived adjectives since their morphology differs from that of derived adjectives to some extent. They end in *-ile* suffix or a passive suffix *-w* which are typical verb markers. These forms are marked when they modify nouns. I have collected a few examples as shown below:

Table 2: Participials and Passives

Stem	Gloss	Verb Stem	Gloss
-lem-aye	'be disabled'	*<lemala>*	'be disable'
-finj-ile	'holy'	*<finga>*	'make holy'
-kund-w-a	'be loved'	*<kunda>*	'love'
-fw-il-ilwe	'be bereaved'	*<fwa>*	'die'

When participials and passives are used adjectively, they behave like relative clauses.as in *umwana unkundwa* (lit. a child who is loved) 'a beloved child', *umuntu umufwililwe* (lit. a person who has been bereaved) 'a bereaved person" etc. Like derived adjectives, parcipials and passives derive their meanings from the verb. They are used as a different way of forming adjectives in Shinyiha. Like pure adjectives, they express property concepts such as behaviour, for example, *finjile* 'holy', physical condition, for example, *lemaye* 'be disabled' etc. They have a restricted range of property concepts unlike pure and derived adjectives.

6. Modification by Nouns and Verbs

It is observed by various Bantuists (cf. Dixon 1982, 2004; Rugemalira 2008) among others) that properties that are not covered by adjectives in Bantu languages are covered by nouns, or verbs or both. Nouns and verbs can perfom the modification function to express property concepts. I reiterate Croft's (2001, 2003) view that

_____

lexical categories perfom their primary functions when they are unmarked and secondary functions when they are marked. In this section, I examine the secondary function of nouns and verbs in modifying nouns.

6.1 Modification by Nouns

Following cognitive linguistics approach, what differentiates an adjective from a noun is that an adjective designates different atemporal relations while a noun designates a thing (Langacker 1987). When a noun functions as a modifier to express property concepts, its valence is reduced to one, a characteristic of adjectives. Similarly, when a noun perfoms a function of modification, it becomes atypical as this function is expected to be perfomed by adjectives. In Shinyiha, in order for nouns to function as modifiers, one of the following operations has to be perfomed: structural coding or juxtaposition of nouns. The two operations are discussed here under.

6.1.1 Structural Coding
As pointed out earlier, following Croft (2003), the marked value of a grammatical category will be expressed by at least as many morphemes as the unmarked value of that category. As one indicator of moprhological markedness, Shinyiha uses overt coding in certain pharses to modify a noun.

6.1.2 The Use of the Genitive Marker -a
Different labels have been given to what I call here a genitive marker: associatives, connectives, connexives (Van de Velde 2013). A genitive marker is a nominal possessor. Expression of linguistc possession is one of their interpretations (Van de Velde 2013). An agenitive marker *-a* can be attached to a noun, to indicate a sense of 'of something'. Observe the following examples:

(3) *u-wa maluli* lit. of naughtiness 'the naughty one'

 u-wa lwisi lit. of rudeness 'the rude one'

 u-wa maha lit. of strength 'the strong one'

Examples in (3) above show the structure of association phrases which consist of genitive marker *–a* and a noun which is its complement. The genitive marker when attached to a noun to form an associative phrase can be used with a noun to modify it as shown below.

(4) a. *u -mw -ana u-wa -maluli*

---

	aug	-1	-child aug-GEN1	-naughtness

lit. a child of naughtiness 'a naughty child'

b.   *u*   *-mu*   *-ntu*   *u-wa*   *-lwisi*

     aug   -1   -person   aug-GEN1   -rudeness

     lit. a person of rudeness 'a rude person'

c.   *u*   *-mu*   *-ntu*   *u- wa*   *maha*

     aug   -1   -person   GEN1   strength

     lit. a person of strength 'a strong person'

The above bolded constructions are not adjectives as claimed by some linguists (cf. Salaün 1969). They are similar to adjectives since they perfom the function of modification to express property concepts. Such nouns answer the question 'What kind of a person? The expected answer should describe the attributes/traits of a person, which is a crucial role of an adjective. Morphologically and syntactically, these constructions differ from adjectives. Syntactically, genitive markers show concord with the noun they refer to and the whole construction may appear recursively in a noun phrase. For example,

(5)   a.   *u-mu*   *-ntu*   *u- wa*   *maha*   *na*   *lw-isi*

          aug-1   -person   aug-GEN1   strength   and   rudeness

          lit. 'a person of strength of rudeness' 'a strong rude person'

     b.   *u-mu*   *-ntu*   *u- wa*   *lwisi*   *wa*   *maha*

          aug-1   -person   aug-GEN1   rudeness   GEN1   strength

          lit. 'a person of rudeness of strength' 'a rude strong person'

In the above examples, one head noun *umuntu* occurs with two genitive constructions which means genitives are adjective-like as adjectives can co-occur.

6.1.3 Semantic Characteristics of Genitive Constructions

Semantically, genitive constructions display characteristics of gradability, which is a typical characteristic of adjectives: Gradability is expressed by the use of an intensifier like *nkani* as exemplified below:

(6)   a.   *Unahaonga amile mwana wa maluli nkani*

             Lit.'Nahaonga was a child of absolute naughtness'

_____

'Nahaonga was a very naughty child'.
> b.   *Umwampashi amile muntu wa maha nkani*
>   lit. 'Mwampashi was a person of absolute strength'
>   'Mwampashi was a very strong person'.

Genitive constructions allow comparison. Like pure adjectives, they are not inflected for comparison rather they use periphrastic constructions as shown in (7) below:

(7) a. *Unahaonga amile mwana wa maluli kulusya Umwampashi*
       Lit. Unahaonga was a child of naughtiness to defeat Mwampashi'
       'Nahaonga was a naughtier child than Mwampashi'.
    b. *Umusongole amile muntu wa maha kulusya Usikaponda*
       Lit. 'Musongole was stronger than Sikaponda.'
       'Musongole was a person who is stronger than Sikaponda'.

In the above examples, the genitive constructions behave like simple adjectives in that they may be intensified or compared.

6.2 Juxtaposition of Nouns

Two nouns, derived or underived can be juxtaposed so that one   becomes the modifier of the other. This is also marked in terms of order. Nouns that can be juxtaposed in this way are mainly those referring to human beings. These nouns, as well, answer the question whose answer is expected to be provided by an adjective (another case of markedness), 'What kind of a person?' Most nouns of this kind denote behaviour or physical condition. Examples are *–βinu* 'the sick one', *-nunu* 'dumb', *-lozi* 'witch' etc. Consider the following examples.

	Example				*Semantic class*
(8) a.	*u-mu*	*-ntu*	*u-mu*	*-βin*	*-u*	physical condition
	aug-1	-person	aug -1	-get sick	F	
	'a sick person'					
b.	*u-mu-ntu*		*u-mu-pin-a*			unclassified
	aug-1-person		aug-1-become poor- FV			
	'a poor person'					
c.	*u-mu-ntu*		*u-shi-nunu*			state of mind
	aug-1-person		aug-7—dumb			
	'a dumb person'					
d.	*u-mu-ntu*		*u-mw-iβ-a*			behaviour

aug-1-person   aug-1-steal-nom.suf
'a person who steals' 'a thief'

The examples above are not compounds since compounds form a composite syntactic and semantic unit that does not permit any word to be inserted between them. Like other phrases, they permit insertion of another word between them. For example:

(9)   a.   *u-mu-ntu   u-mu -tali   u-mu -βin-u*
            aug-1-person aug-1 -tall   aug-1 -get sick-der.suf.
            'a tall sick person'

       b.   *u-mu-ntu   u-mu-inza   u -mu -pin   -a*
            aug -1-person aug-1-good   aug -1 -become poor –FS
            'a good poor person'

       c.   *u-mu-ntu   u-mu-nyela   u-mw -iβ   -a*
            aug-1-person aug-1-thin   aug-1   steal   -der.suf.
            'a thin person who steals'

       d.   *u-mu-ntu   u-mu-fupi   u-mu-loz   -i*
            aug-1-person aug-1-short   aug-1-bewitch -der.surf.
            'a short person who is witch'

The words; *umuβinu, umulozi* and *umwiβa* can occur without a typical noun as in the following example *umuβinu afiha* 'A sick person has arrived.' When translating to English, these words carry a definite article as in *umuβinu,* 'the sick'. In other words, these words   are atypical nouns. They display behaviours of both nouns and adjectives. As nouns, they can occur alone as subjects and designate a thing. For example,

(10)   a*. Umwiβa aβinile*   'A thief is sick'

       b*. Umupina aβinile*   'The poor is sick.'

The nouns above refer to human attributes and can occur as subjects in a sentence. The noun occurring with them can be overt or covert. When these nouns occur without other nouns, the assumption is that the nouns are known. When these words occur with other nouns, they also refer to attributes/properties. These words answer the question, 'What kind of a person?' Since these *words* can occur attributively and modify nouns, on the one hand, they are adjective-like. Since they are restricted in class range and can function as subjects or objects, on the other hand, they are noun-

_____

like. They are somewhat different from typical nouns such as the noun *umuntu* 'person', which is not restricted in class range and cannot be used to modify another noun. For example, the noun *umuntu* refers to a human being who is adult who may be male or female and the word *mupina* 'poor' refers to a human being who is poor or an orphan. Here a human being refers to an object; a characteristic of a noun but poor refers to an attribute, which is a characteristic of an adjective. Therefore, one may argue that *mupina* is an atypical noun. By 'atypical' it means 'not representative of a type, class or group, not normal, irregular etc. but grammatical. Typical nouns cannot be modifiers. Therefore, **umuntu umwana* lit. 'person child' is unacceptable because none of the two can be a modifier of the other. It is appropriate to classify these words (*mupina, mwiβa, muβinu*) as both atypical nouns and atypical adjectives.

6.2.1 Semantic Characteristics of Juxtaposed Nouns

Some juxtaposed nouns are gradable. Therefore, they can be intensified as shown below.

(11)   a.   ***Uhaonga muβinu nkani***
            'Haonga is very sick'

        b.   ***Umuntu βula mupina nkani***
            'That person is very poor'

They allow comparison as shown in the following examples:

(12)   a.   ***Uyangi umupina kulusya Umwampashi***
            'Yangi is poorer than Mwampashi'

        b.   ***Unasibhale muβinu kulusya Usikaponda***
            'Nasibhale is more sick than Sikaponda'

Examples in (12) are possible in Shinyiha but very unnatural and therefore uncommon in other Bantu languages like Kiswahili. One cannot compare sick people in Kiswahili.

7. Modification by Locatives

We set a separate section for locatives since they behave like nouns and to some extent like adverbs. There are two kinds of locatives. There are those that are basic. Basic locatives include *pansi* 'below/under', *panzi* 'outside', *papipi* 'near' *patali* 'far'; *mukasi* 'inside', *pakasi* 'at the centre', *pamwanya* 'above' *paluβazu* 'on the side';

_____

There are also nouns that refer to location. These are nouns from classes 16 *pa*, 17 *ku* and 18 *mu*. For example, *panyumba* 'at the house', *munyumba* 'in the house', *kunyumba* 'to the house. These locatives can be juxtaposed. For example,

(13)   a.   *pa   -shi   -tengo pa   -nsi*
            16   -7   -chair 16   -under
            'under the chair'
       b.   *mu-nyumba   mu-kasi*
            18-9-house   18-inside
            'inside a house'
       c.   *ku-haya   ku-tali*
            17-home   17-far
            'home which is far'

The locatives *pansi, mukasi, kutali, papipi* modify other locative nouns which suggests that these locatives are adjective-like.

7.1 Semantic characteristics of Locatives

Locatives in Shinyiha can be used adnominally or pronominally. In their adnominal use, they occur as noun modifiers. They have spatial use to designate the location of an entity and relate to that of the speaker and focus the hearer's attention to the specific location of these entities. Semantically, locatives express meanings such as near, below, far, above, under, etc. Their meanings do not fall under what Dixon (1977, 1982 and 2004) terms semantic types. When these locatives are used with nouns, they modify them. Therefore, to some extent, they function as adjectives. Their co-occurence with nouns indicates location or position. Like adjectives, locatives denote a single property. For example, the locative *kutali* 'far' denotes only distance. Its meaning refers to the meaning of its trajectory. Semantically, locatives display the property of gradability. For example, they use the same constructions used for comparison by adjectives as shown below:

(14)   *Kuhaya kukwitu kutali kulusya kukwinyu*
       'Our home is farther than your home'

Like adjectives, some locatives can be reduplicated as in the following examples.

_____

	Locative	Gloss	Reduplication	Gloss
(15)	*pansi*	below	*pansipansi*	'slightly below'
	papipi	nearby	*papipipipi*	'slightly near'
	patali	far	*patalitali*	'slightly far'
	pantanzi	in front	*pantanzitanzi*	'slightly in front'

The effect of reduplication on these words is that they are construed according to the quantitative aspect of SCALE schema denoting degrees of 'more' or 'less'.

8. Modification by Cardinals

Location can be expressed by cardinal directions. In Shinyiha, cardinal direction can be expressed in two ways. First, by using terms referring to the four main points of the compass. These terms are concerned with the rising and setting of the sun. That is,

(16) a   *kuβuswelo*   'where the sun sets' 'West'

     kuβutukulo   'where the sun rises' 'East'

The language has no terms referring to other cardinal directions. Cardinal directions can be used with locative nouns to indicate direction as in the following examples:

(17)   a.   ***Ku-haya ku-βu-swelo***   *βu-izuβa*
           17-home 17-15-west   of-sun
           lit. 'Home is in the West where there is sun'
       b.   ***Ku-haya***   ***ku-βutukulo*** *βuizuβa*
           17-home   17-east   of-sun
           lit. 'Home is in the East where there is sun'

The above examples indicate that cardinals can co-occur with nouns to express direction. These cardinals agree with their relevant heads.

8.1 *Semantic Characteristics of Cardinals*

_____

Words indicating cardinal directions denote a single property. Therefore, they refer to the nouns with which they co-occur. These words are not like other modifiers as they do not describe the head noun. They only show direction.

9. Modification by locative nouns

Location can as well be expressed by using personal names when directing someone as exemplified below.

Names of places:

(18)   a. *Kubundali*   'to Bundali land

      b. *Kuisongole*   'to Isongole land'

      c. *Kubulambwe*   'to Bulambia land'

Names of people

(19)   a. *Kwamwampashi*   'to Mwampashi's place' (One Mwampashi)

      b. *Kuβamwampashi*   'to Mwampashi clan place'

      c. *Kwahaonga*   'to Haonga's place'

      d. *Kuβahaonga*   'to Haonga clan's place'

Locativised names of people may occur with locative nouns as in the following example:

(20)   a. *Kuhaya kwa Haonga*   'to Haonga's home'

      b. *Kumugunda wa Haonga* 'to Haonga's farm'

These names of people may occur with the locative prefix 'pa' to mean at a place as in the following examples:

(21) a. *Pahaonga* 'at Haonga place'

    b. *PaMasebo* 'at Masebo place'

10. Modification by Verbs

According to Langacker (2008: 123), the kinds of elements that can modify nouns are those that profile non-processual relationships. As a result, verbs have to be atemporalized in order for them to function as modifiers. In Shinyiha, two operations have to take place for this atemporalization to take place i.e., relativization and infinitization. The two operations are discussed hereunder:

10.1 Relativization

This section focuses on relativised verbs and pays no attention to relative clauses as noun modifiers in general. That would deserve a separate study. The section focuses on the form of the verb which is affected. Other periphrastic constructions involved in relativisation are beyond the scope of this paper. In order to function as modifiers, a relative marker has to be attached to a verb (overt structural coding) as shown below:

	Example	**Gloss**
(22)	a. *aβana βeβainile*	'children who have become fat'
	b. *aβana βeβanyazile*	'children who have become dirty'
	c. *muntu weahondeye*	'a person who looks smart'
	d. *ing'ombe yeyinile*	'a cow that has become fat'

Syntactically, the relative markers *β, ye* and *we* in examples (22) above agree with their head nouns.

10.1.1 Semantic Characteristics of Relativized Verbs

Relativised verbs as well describe a noun. For example, examples (22a) answer the question, 'What kind of children?' Its typical answer should be provided by a pure adjective. With regard to semantic structure, relativised verbs can be intensified as follows:

(23) a. *a-βa-na*   *βe-βa-in-ile*   *nkani*
          aug-2-child   rel. 2-get-fat-T/A   very
          'children who have become very fat'

      b. *u-mu-ntu*   *we -a-nyaz-ile*   *nkani*
          aug 1-person rel.1-become dirty T/A very
          'a person who has become very dirty'

      c. *i-ng'ombe*   *ye-yi-yin-ile*   *nkani*
          aug 9-cow   rel.9-become fat-T/A   very
          'a cow that has become very fat'

Examples (23) clearly show that relativized verbs are gradable at least in Shinyiha. However, it is not common among the speakers to use intensifiers with the relativized verbs although the use of an intensifier does not render the sentence ungrammatical. This suggests that these verbs are adjective-like.

10.1.2 Infinitization

In Shinyiha, an infinitive is formed by adding an infinitive marker ***ku-*** to the verb stem. However, it should be noted that ***ku*** can appear as a progressive marker. In order for an infinitive verb to function as a modifier, it has to be preceded by a genitive marker ***a-*** to show linguistic possession or create a sense of 'of something'. For example,

(24)   a.   ***umuntu we a kusiβa***
               lit. 'a person of thinking'
               'a thoughtful person'
         b.   ***umuntu we akuβoβosya***
               lit. 'a person of making funny
               'a funny person'

10.2 Semantic Characteristics

Like adjectives, these infinitives as well answer the question, what kind of X? The expected answer is a descriptive one. Examples (22) express the semantic type of human behaviour. Semantically, infinitives can be intensified. For example,

(25)   a.   ***umuntu we akusiβa nkani***
               'a person of very much thinking'
         b.   ***umuntu we akuβoβosya***
               'a person of making much funny'

The use of an intensifier ***nkani*** 'very' is typical with adjectives and adverbs. However, since infinitives display the characteristics of adjectives, they are adjectivals.

11. Discussion

_____

The results of this study have indicated that there are various ways by which a noun in Shinyiha can be modified. However, attention has been paid to few elements which have received little attention in the literature. The study has shown that there are various ways by which these modifiers resemble an adjective. The study has presented in summary the various meanings that can be expressed by adjectives in Shinyiha. Based on Dixon's (1982, 2004) notion of semantic classes the following meaning can be expressed by Shinyiha adjectives: dimension/size, value, age, colour, behaviour, physical condition, physical appearance, taste, weight, quantity, state of mind. Some of these meaning types were not presented by Dixon's (1982, 2004) semantic types.. Attention has been paid to other forms which are different from pure adjectives. These other forms that appear in the scope of the noun phrase include: derived adjectives, nouns, verbs, participials and passives, infinitives and locatives. Other forms like possessives, demonstratives, intrerrogatives, etc. lack semantic characteristics of pure adjectives and, therefore, they are not included in this discussion.

As with the adjectives, the study has revealed meaning types expressed by atypical nouns (i.e nouns that partake the nature of both nouns and adjectives). These are value, physical properties, position and behaviour. Similarly, semantic types expressed by verbs are physical properties and behaviour and those expressed by adjectives are dimension, physical property, behaviour, age, value, size, colour, difficulty and quantity. Table (4) below summarizes the three categories, adjectives, nouns and verbs and the semantic types they express.

Table 3: Semantic Types and the Word Categories

	Word category associated with each semantic type and its percentage					
Semantic Type	Adjective	%	Noun	%	Verb	%
Dimension	٧	100%	X	0%	X	0%
Physical condition	٧	90%	٧	10%	V	50%
Behaviour	٧	50%	٧	40%	V	50%
Age	٧	100%	X	0%	X	0%
Value	٧	100%	X	0%	X	0%
Position	X	0%	٧	100%	X	0
Speed	X	0%	X	%	X	%
Colour	٧	80%	X	20%	X	0%
Similarity	X	0%	X	0%	X	0%
Quantification	٧	100%	X	0%	x	0%

Examining Table (3) above, one realizes that in Shinyiha the following semantic types are strictly associated with the adjective class: dimension, age, value, physical condition and quantification. Some semantic types are shared between adjectives and nouns, for example, physical condition and behaviour. Other semantic types are shared between adjectives and verbs. These are physical appearance and behaviour.

The paper has indicated the markedness of other forms in expressing property concepts. The paper has revealed that Shinyiha is rich in modifiers ranging from pure adjectives, derived adjectives, participials and passives, nouns, locatives and verbs. The study has shown that underived adjectives express property concepts as reported in other studies (Dixon 1982, 2004; Rugemalira 2008; Mpofu 2009).

Derived adjectives as well express property concepts. However, as in most other Bantu languages, most roots of derived adjectives are derived from verbs. Their meanings can be obtained from the meaning of the verb. These have almost all characteristics of pure adjectives. Distributionally, they occur postnominally but morphologically they share the properties of both nouns and verbs. The study has also shown that modifiers which appear within the scope of the noun phrase either retain their forms in the sense that they do not involve structural coding or require structural coding. The use of genitive markers and infinitives for structural coding is also reported in Mpofu (2009) for the Shona language. Forms that do not require structural coding are adjectives both underived and derived, participials, conjoined nouns and locatives. Forms that require structural coding are nouns and verbs.

The study has shown that modifiers that have been dealt with herein share most characteristics with pure adjectives. Such characteristics include expression of property concepts, gradability and intensification. However, their differences lie in their morphology. For example, participials have some characteristics of verbs such that they end in *–ile* suffix and passive suffix *-w*. These have been treated separately from derived adjectives which contain a verb root. Based on the Markedness theory, each form has its own primary function. Following Prototypical theory, which in one way or another resembles the Markedness theory, pure adjectives are prototypical followed by derived adjectives, then participials and passives, followed by conjoined nouns, locatives and verbs. If we use the markedness criteria, nouns and verbs which involve structural coding present complex structures which according to Markedness theory, they are more marked.

12. Conclusion

_____

This paper has attempted to describe some important modifiers that appear with the head noun in a noun phrase to modify it. The paper has focused on the form of these modifiers, their syntactic distribution and their semantics. The study has shonw how certain forms partake the nature of two different classes (i.e atypical). The study notes that in terms of typicality noun modifiers can be arranged in a continuum as follows underived adjectivse >derived adjectives >participials and passives > nouns > verbs > other modifiers. This implies that in terms of prototypicality underived adjectives are typical modifiers because they do not involve any modification of the stem or structural coding, they have a typical adjective stem and they denote a single property, followed by derived adjectives, followed by participials and passives whose morphology consists of the verb root and one morpheme from the verb extension making them more complex than derived verbs/ At the end of the continuum there are nouns and verbs which require juxtaposition and structural coding respectively to perfom the function of modification.

Abbreviations
Aug (augment)
GEN (Genitive)
lit. (Literally)
FV (Final vowel)

References

Bhat, D.N.S 1994. *The Adjective Category.* Amsterdam, John Benjamins.
Carnie, A. 2013. *Syntax: A Generative Introduction,* Wiley-Blackwell, Singapore Printing Ltd.
Carstens V. 1993. ''On Nominal Moprhology and DP structure''. In S. Mchombo (eds). *Theoretical Aspects of Bantu Grammar* 2 (1), pp. 151-180. Carlifonia: CSL publications.
Croft, W. 1991. *Syntactic Categories and Grammatical Relations: The Cognitive Organization of Information*: Chicago: University of Chicago.
Croft, W. 2001. *Radical Construction Grammar: Syntactic Theory in Typological Perspective*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
Croft, W. 2003. *Typology and Universals*. 2nd edition. Cambridge. Cambridge University press.
Dixon, R. M. W. 1977. ''Where have all the Adjectives Gone?'' *Studies in Language*

19- 80, Revised Version Published as pp1-63 of Dixon, 1982.

_____. 1982. *Where have all the Adjectives Gone*? Berline: Mouton.

_____. 2004. ''Adjective Classes in Typological Perspective'', in *Adjective Classes, a Cross-Linguistic Typological Study*, R.M.W Dixon & Aikhenvald, A. (eds), 1-49. Oxford, OUP.

Dryer, M.S 2000. ''Noun Phrase Structure''. In T. Shopen (eds). *Complex Constructions, Language Typology and Syntactic Description,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press (14), pp. 151-205.

Givon T. 2001. *Syntax: An Introduction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Goodness, D. 2014. *Shinyiha Adjective as a Distinct Lexical Category*, Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Dar es salaam.

Greenberg, J. 1966. *Language Universals.* The Hague, Mouton.

Halliday, M.A.K 1994. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 2nd edn. London Arnold.

Hopper, P. & Thompson, Sandra A. 1984. The Discourse Basis for Lexical Categories, Universal grammar. *Languag*e (60), pp.703-752.

Langacker, R. 1987. *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar*, *Theoretical Prerequisites,* Stanford, Stanford University Press.

_____. 2008. *Cognitive Grammar*, a Basic Introduction, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

_____. 2009. *Investigations in Cognitive Grammar*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin. New York.

Levinson, S. C. 2000. *Presumptive Meaning: The Theory of Generalized Conversational Implicature.* Cambridge: MA: MIT Press.

Lusekelo, A. 2009. ''The Structure of the Nyakyusa Noun Phrase'', *The Nordic Journal of African Studies* 18 (4):305-331.

Mpofu, N. 2009. Shona Adjective as a Prototypical Adjective, Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Oslo.

Ndomba, R. 2006. Samatengo Noun Phrase Structure. Unpubished MA Dissertation, University of Dar es Salaam.

Nyanda, D. 2010. The Adjective as a Word Category in Kisukuma, Unpublished MA (Linguistics) Dissertation.

Payne, E. 2010. Noun Complements vs Postnominal Modifiers, Understanding *English Grammar.*

Radford, A. 2004. *Minimalism Syntax,* Oxford. Oxford University Press.

Rijkhoff, J. 2012. *The Noun Phrase.* London, Oxford University press.

Rugemalira, J.M 2007. The Structure of the Bantu Noun Phrase. *SOAS Working Papers in Linguistics, vol.*15, pp. 135-148

_____

Rugemalira, J. M. 2008. Adjectives in Bantu, in *Occasional Papers in Linguistics*, LOT Publications, University of Dar es Salaam.

Rubin, E. J. 1994. Modification: A Syntactic Analysis and its Consequences, PhD Dissertation Cornewell University.

Salaŭn, N. 1969. *Cinyanja/Cicewa: Intensive Course,* Lilongwe, Likumi Press Publishing House.

Stowell, Timothy Angus 1981. Origins of Phrase Structure, PhD Dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Taylor J. R. 1991. *Linguistic Categorization, Prototypes in Linguistic Theory*, Clarendon Press, London, Oxford University Press.

Van de Velde, M. 2013. The Bantu Connective Construction. In Carlier, A & J-C Verstraete. *The Genitive*, 217-252; AMSTERDAM. John Benjamins.

Van de Velde 2019. Noun Morphology and Syntax, HAL The Bantu Languages, 2nd Edition Routledge vol. 2 pp 237-269.