THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES & SOCIAL STUDIES

Individual and Co-occurrence of Ekegusii Verbal Extensions

Sylvia Magoma Luka
Student, Department of Literature, Linguistics and Foreign Languages,
Kenyatta University, Kenya
Dr. Gerry Ayieko
Lecturer, Department of Literature, Linguistics and Foreign Languages,
Kenyatta University, Kenya

Abstract:
The article looks at the co-occurrence of five Ekegusii verbal extensions namely: passive, applicative, reversive, reciprocal and causative. The researcher used minimalist approach to explain the order and co-occurrence of verbal extensions. The derivational affixes marked on the base are each affiliated to a syntactic operation. The affix order is determined by the semantic function and scope of each affix; the affixes having greater relevance to the action of the verb root appear closer to it. The morphological view postulates a template where affixes were inserted in specific slots which was not directly motivated by either syntactic or semantic considerations. Affix ordering was determined by the morphology where languages impose specific morphotactic constraints for which there is no synchronic extra-morphological explanation. The Ekegusii verbal extensions followed a Pan-Bantu default template; CARP (causative, applicative, reciprocal and passive). The findings are explained by use of different structures in Ekegusii.

Keywords: Verbal extensions, occurrence, MP

1. Introduction

Ekegusii, a Bantu language is spoken in the South Western Kenya by about 1,872,436 Abagusii speakers, as per the Census Report of 2019. They are spread over two counties; Nyamira and Kisii. Maho (2009) labels the language Gusii and classifies it as JE42, following the classification system of Guthrie (1967).

The Ekegusii language has two dialects. The *Rogoro* (northern) dialect which is the standard form used in books or many other written materials and it is the one taught in lower primary and the *Maate* (southern) dialect, which is the non-standard form that is mainly spoken by a majority of Ekegusii speakers in Southern part of Kisii Sub-Counties.

The Bantu verbal morphology has been given varied definitions by different scholars. While most writers concur that verbal, extensions are formed via a morphological process, (Jensen 1990; Payne 1994; Katamba 1993; Nurse and Philipson, 2003) they differ on whether or not to consider them as either derivational or inflectional affixes. For example, Mutaka et al. (2000) define verbal extensions as verbal suffixes which are added to the root to form new verb stems. Matsinhe (1994) looks at it as a bound morpheme that attaches to the verbal root. Also, Bantu verbal morphology is defined as 'agglutinative' (Hayman, 2003) and highly productive (Good, 2005).

Ekegusii is an example of an agglutinating language, agglutinating meaning 'glued together'. Isolating languages have their morphemes occurring as words in isolation; for instance, English is an isolating language. The sentence, she will go home has four morphemes occurring separately. In Ekegusii, the same sentence occurs as two words. The first word combines several morphemes: the focus marker, person, tense and root verb, for instance, na-che-a-gende inka. From the Ekegusii words, we see several morphemes glued together thus making the language rich morphologically.

Finally, qualitative research design was used to achieve the following objectives; the types of verbal extensions in Ekegusii verb phrase morphology within the MP, the morpho-syntactic features of Ekegusii verb phrase morphology within the Minimalist Program and the co-occurrence restrictions in Ekegusii verb morphology within the Minimalist Program. The researcher adopted the Minimalist Program henceforth referred to as MP (Chomsky, 1995) as the theoretical framework to analyse the Ekegusii affixes under study. The Minimalist Program is a Generative Grammar theory which integrates morphology and syntax. Morphology is key in the theory since the process of structure-building depends on how rich the language is. The Minimalist Program is the first Generative Grammar theory to give morphology serious attention. However, just like all the other Generative Grammar theories, the MP is built more around English and other isolating languages.

2. Individual Occurrence of Ekegusii Verbal Extensions

The meaning of verbs is enriched by the addition of a morpheme which has a specific function in a language. Ekegusii language verbs like in many languages can also be enriched by the morpheme addition. Many linguists have done

research on verbal extensions and have come up with different types and all of which have different uses. The study was limited to five VEs which are reviewed herein.

2.1. Applicative

According to Carochi (1983) the term applicative was initially coined by the missionary grammars of Uto-Aztecan languages during the 17th century as 'verbos applicativos' which refers to a verbal form indicating that the verb or the action denoted is intended towards another person. In the studies that followed, the terms 'applicative' or 'applied' were used in the study of Bantu languages to refer to a special verbal inflection adding an extra, 'affected' object to the argument structure of the verb (Marantz, 1993). Payne (1997) refers to the new object as an applied object. It is a participant that is peripheral; however, it is given prominence by marking it as a direct object. Other scholars have simply defined applicatives as verbal affixes or specific grammatical elements that increase valence (Shibatani, 1996). He notes applicatives cannot be explained using rule-like derivations because a given verb is not always consistent when it comes to allowing an applicative in seemingly identical semantic role contexts.

Moreover, an applicative construction can also be referred to as benefactive, prepositional, instrumental and indirective depending on the type (Jeong, 2006). This study settles for the term applicative limited to the meanings of benefactive or instrumental.

Jeong (2006) further adds that applicative is usually understood as a verb construction that bears a specific morpheme which allows an oblique or non-core argument that would not otherwise be considered as part of that verb's argument structure. It is a productive process that is heavily used in everyday language and it adds another participant to a verb's event or action. The two most common uses applied to most verbs are locational and benefactive.

Pylkkanen (2002) identifies two types of applicative heads namely: high applicatives which denote a relation between an individual and an event and low applicatives which indicate a relation between two individuals. Heads denote the applicative affix in a specific language. For instance, in Ekegusii which is the language under study the derivational affix marks the applicative.

For example,

*go (*to*)-kor* (do*)-a* (final vowel)

gokora (to do)

go (to*)-kor* (do)-*er* (applicative*)-a* (final vowel)

gokorera(to do for /at).

The Ekegusii applicative is marked by the following morphological construction: '*Root - er –FV (Final Vowel)*

2.2. Reciprocal

The reciprocal form indicates that the action is reciprocated, done to one another. There are two forms of reciprocals; the one denoting reciprocity between two bodies and the other denoting reciprocity among or between several bodies. A lot of attention by many researchers has been given to reciprocals within the past decades, both in syntax and semantics. The reciprocal is a de-transitivizing morpheme which derives intransitive verbs from transitive verbs. For this reason, it is said to be a valence or argument reducing operator.

Payne (1997) states that the reciprocal indicates, the noun phrases subject is both the patient and agent in terms of meaning. This is because the action or activity denoted by verb is done mutually between the participants who act on each other. Mchombo and Nguga (1994) note that in a reciprocal construction's effect is that of ascribing the members of a group the property that they are involved in an activity where each member is performing an action on the other. Mchombo and Nguga further add that this is very common and clear when the group comprises of two participants. Although a reciprocal construction is syntactically intransitive, it is semantically transitive in that the two participants are doing some action on each other. The two participants in the construction are both subjects (agents) and objects at the same time.

Kimenyi (1980) identifies Subjectivization as another feature associated with reciprocal constructions and it is closely related to the loss of an argument. The direct object which is the entity intimately affected by the action of the verb is promoted to the position of subject in the reciprocal construction. The reciprocal construction is a low productive affix only realized by transitive verbs whose arguments are animate or the few inanimate which are capable of motion. The reciprocal is not hosted by the argumentless and intransitive verbs because they do not have two participants that can mutually act on each other. For example,

go(to*)-kor* (do)-*er* (for)-*a* (final vowel)

go-kor -er -a (to do for)

go(to*)-kor* (do)-*er* (for)-*an* (reciprocal)-*a* (final vowel)

go-kor-er-an-a (to do for each other)

The Ekegusii reciprocal is marked by the following morphological construction:

Root - er - an – FV

2.3. Passive

A prototypical passive construction is characterised both morpho-syntactically and in terms of its discourse function (Comrie, 1989). According to Payne (1997) morpho-syntactically a passive is semantically transitive and it has two arguments or participants who hold the following properties. First, the agent or most agents like participant is either demoted to oblique case or omitted entirely. Second, the other core participant has all the properties of subject relevant

for all the languages as a whole. Third, the verb possesses any and all language specific formal properties of intransitive verbs.

Keenan (1985) sees the formation of a passive as a fore-grounding process. The active sentence's object is raised to the position of subject as the subject gets demoted to an oblique position. According to Marten and Kula (2007) the two main functions of the passive are to change the argument structure and encode agency. There are two major classifications of passive constructions, namely: personal and impersonal passives. In personal passives constructions, some specific agent is implied, either it is not expressed or it is expressed in an oblique role. Additionally, personal passives can be morphological, periphrastic or lexical. Lexical passives are not common since they are verbs that are inherently passive. A lexical passive is a verb that obligatorily expresses a scene that includes the presence of a causing agent, but the patient is the grammatical subject. Morphological passives are the most common. They involve the attaching of a passive affix to a transitive verb root as is evident in many Bantu languages. Periphrastic passives require an auxiliary verb as is the case with passives in the English language.

Impersonal passives, unlike personal ones can be formed from both intransitive and transitive verbs. Personal passives are formed from transitive verbs. Impersonal passives downplay the importance of an agent. Comrie (1977) notes that there is no rising of the object as the agent/subject get relegated. Payne (1997) observes that no language employs specific morphology just for impersonal passives and one for personal passives. Below is an example:

O (Person marker)-*ko* (to)-*rok* (name)-*a* (final vowel)

okoroka(to name)

  O (person marker)-*ko*(to)-*rok* (name)-*w* (passive)-*a* (final vowel)

okorokwa(to be named)

The Ekegusii Passive construction is realized by the addition of -w- to a verb immediately before the final vowel if the verb root ends in a consonant.

2.4. Causative

The causative is a morphological category that exists in many languages. It indicates the meaning of causation by adding a causer which is a new agent argument to the valence pattern. The causative form is the most common valence-changing morphological category (Bybee, 1985). It also increases the verb valence by adding an argument. In addition, in the causative construction, the causer and the causee are core arguments. The causee is defined as the agent or the doer of the caused event, sometimes referred to as the coerced endpoint while the causer is the agent of the predicate of the cause also called agent of cause.

Lexical, morphological and periphrastic are the three types of causatives (Pyne, 1997).

2.4.1. Lexical Causative

The lexical causative focuses on the lexical meaning of the verb itself.

2.4.2. Morphological Causative

The morphological causative is formed when you attach a causative affix to a base or bare form of the verb yielding a causative construction.

2.4.3. Periphrastic Causatives

These are referred to as analytical because they involve a separate causative verb. Therefore, the notion of causation is contained in the predicate of cause while the predicate of effect is used to express the effect of the causative situation. For example,

ko (to)-*om* (make)-*i* (causative)-*a* (final vowel)

koomia(to make dry)

Ekegusii morphological causative is marked by single */i-/* morpheme which essentially mean 'to cause' or 'to make'.

2.4.4. Reversive

According to Kemmerer and Wright (2002), in their English analysis they show that verbs that host the reversive share the designate events property where an agent or doer causes something to enter a constricted potentially spatial configuration. For instance, the semantic constraints of the English verb 'cross' are revealed; one can cross his /her arms and then uncross; however, if one crosses a street and then decides to walk back, it cannot be said that one has uncrossed the street. This is because there is no constricted spatial configuration involved.

Research shows that there are very few studies on the reversive as compared to the other affixes. A reversive verb denotes an entire reversal of an action or activity (Lodhi, 2002). At times it is also referred to as the converse or reversative. Quirk et al. (1985) refers to it as the privative. However, for consistency it will be referred to as the reversive in this study. The affix is restrictive in that it licenses some verbs but not others. The reversive does not affect the valence of the verb for it neither increases nor decreases the arguments, therefore, it is a neutral affix. Therefore, verbs that host the reversive designate events and this is a shared property in which an agent causes something to enter a constricted and potentially reversible spatial configuration (Kemmerer & Wright, 2002). For example,

rog (bewitch)-*a* (final vowel)

roga (bewitch)

rog(bewitch)-*or* (reversive)-*a* (final vowel)

rogora(unbewitch).
The Ekegusii reversive construction is marked by –or- affix.

3. Co-occurrences of Ekegusii Verbal Extensions
The study focused on five verbal extensions. This part introduces the discussion of the determinants of the order of affixes. The order and co-occurrence of verbal extensions can be explained by three broad perspectives: syntactic, semantic, and morphological. The derivational affixes marked on the base are each affiliated to a syntactic operation. Baker (1985) states that the order of the derivational affixes reflects the corresponding order of the syntactic derivational steps which are not strictly fixed.

According to Bybee (1985) and Rice (2000), the order of affix is determined by the scope of each affix and the semantic function; the affixes that have greater relevance to the action denoted by the verb root will appear closer to it. Bybee's classification was on the inflectional affixes. Rice's view of the semantic scope is broad and seeks to explain the cases in which affixes are not rigidly ordered, and where alternative order is possible.

On the other hand, the morphological view postulates a template where affixes are inserted to specific slots which are not directly motivated by either syntactic or semantic considerations. Affix ordering is determined by the morphology where languages impose specific morphotactic constraints devoid of any synchronic extra-morphological explanation. The morphotactic constraints can represent a relation between pairs of specific morphs or they might define a template by which multiple affixes are automatically ordered (Hyman, 2002).

Hyman (2002) proposes a Pan-Bantu default template which is, CARP (Causative, Applicative, Reciprocal and Passive) for the Bantu suffixes. As for Hyman, the morpheme order; CAUSE-APPL was part of the Proto-Bantu verbal template, and as a result of this, it is still the 'default' order of morphemes in most Bantu languages. He acknowledges that the different perspectives can be a source of potential conflict in the explanation of affix ordering in Bantu. He notes that the potential conflicts between these principles are resolved differently across the Bantu languages.

It is evident that the three approaches give some explanations on the distribution of Bantu derivational affixes though not conclusive. The three perspectives deal with a few selected affixes; for instance, Hyman's proposed template is based on the analysis of four affixes. The three approaches guided the descriptive part of the Ekegusii verbal extensions.

Thereare possible combinations of co-occurrences of Ekegusii verbal extensions. These combinations are in three broad categories, namely co-occurrences of two extensions, of three extensions, and of four extensions as illustrated:

3.1. Co-occurrences of Two Extensions

3.1.1. The Causative and the Applicative
1.*Zuri natereria Magoma ogotera.*
Zuri (Spec) na (Foc)-ter (V)-er (App)-i (Caus)-a (FV) Magoma (Spec) ogotera (Spec)
(Zuri has sung a song for Magoma)
ii) The Applicative and the Passive
2. *Getate narikerwa rirube (na Mokeira)*
Getate (Spec) na (Foc) - rik (V) – er (App) – w (Pas)-a (FV) rirube (Spec) (na Mokeira)
(A letter has been written for/to/on behalf of Getate (by Mokeira)

3.1.2. The Applicative and the Reversive
3. *Nyambane nasiborera ise eng'ombe.*
Nyambane (Spec) na (Foc) sib (V) or (Rev) er (APP) a (FV) ise (Spec) eng'ombe (Spec)
(Nyambane has untied the calf for his father).

3.1.3. The Applicative and the Reciprocal
4.*Omongina na omogaka mbatengerana.*
Omongina na omogaka (Spec)mba - (Foc)- teng(V) - er (APP)- an (Rec)- a(FV).
(The man and woman have danced for each other).

3.1.4. The Causative and the Passive
5.*Mokeira narugigwa obokima (na Bochere).*
Mokeira (Spec) na (Foc) rug(V) i(Caus) gw (Pas) a(FV) obokima (Spec) (na Bochere).
(Mokeira has been made/ forced to cook ugali (by Bochere).

3.1.5. The Causative and the Reversive
6.*Omogambi nasiekia omworokia esukuru.*
Omogambi (Spec) na (Foc) siek(V) i(Caus) a(FV) omworokia (Spec) esukuru (Spec).
(The chief has caused the teacher to close the school).

3.1.6. The Causative and the Reciprocal
7.*Bitengo naumerania Sifu na Maya*.
Bitengo(Spec) na(Foc)umer(V)an(Rec)i(Caus)a(FV) Sifu na Maya(Spec).

(Bitengo has caused Sifu and Maya to meet).

3.1.7. The Reversive and Reciprocal
8.*Bwari na Boke mbarogorana.*
Bwari na Boke (Spec) mba (Foc) rog (V) or (Rec) an(Rev) a(FV).
(Bwari na Boke have unbewitched each other)

3.2. Co-occurrence of Three Verbal Extensions

3.2.1. The Causative, the Applicative, and the Passive
9*. Nyambane nagoreriwa ekeki yomwana (na Getate)*
Nyambane(Spec)na(Foc)gor(V)er(App)i(Caus)w(Pas)a(FV)ekeki(Spec) y(Foc)omwana(Spec) (na Getate)
(Nyambane has been made to buy a cake for the baby (by Getate))
ii) The Causative, the Applicative and the Reciprocal.
10.*Omorandi naancherania Mose na Kemunto inka.*
Omorandi(Spec)na(Foc)anch(v)er(App)an(Rec)i(Caus)a(FV)Mose na Kemunto(Spec) inka(Loc).
(Pastor has caused Mose and Kemunto to love each other at home)

3.2.2. The Causative, the Reversive, and the Applicative
11.*Omonsansiroti narogoreria omorogi omwana.*
Omonsansiroti(Spec) na(Foc)rog(V)or(Rev)er(App)i(Caus)a(FV) omorogi (Spec) omwana
(Spec).
(The priest has caused the witch to unbewitch the baby)

3.2.3. The Causative, the Reversive, and the Passive
12*. Juma naseretoriwa enyomba (na Ogero)*
Juma(Spec) na(Foc)seret(v)or(Rev)i (Caus)w(Pas)a(FV) enyomba(Spec) (na Ogero)
(Juma has been made to unroof the house (by Ogero)).

3.2.4. The Causative, the Reciprocal, and the Passive
13*. Kemunto na Boyani mbaitaniwa (na Omondi)*
Kemunto na Boyani (Spec)mba(Foc)itan (v)i(Caus)w(Pas)a(FV) (na Omondi)
(Kemunto and Boyani have been caused to beat each other by Omondi).

3.2.5. The Causative, the Reversive, and the Reciprocal
14.*Okello nasiborania Monyenye na Magoma*
Okello(Spec) na(Foc)sib(V)or(Rev)an(Rec)i(Caus)a(FV) Monyenye na Magoma
(Okello has caused Monyenye and Magoma to untie each other).

3.2.6. The Applicative, the Reversive, and the Passive
15.*Maria nagitorerwa orobago (na Kerubo)*
Maria(Spec) na(Foc)git(V)or(Rev)er(App)w(Pas)a(FV) orobago(Spec) (na Kerubo)
(A fence has been unfenced for Maria (by Kerubo).

3.3. Co-occurrence of Four Verbal Extensions
Ekegusii verbal extensions can also co-occur in four possible combinations. These are: caus-app-rec-pas and caus-rev-app-pas. They are discussed below in detail.

3.3.1. The Causative, the Applicative, the Reciprocal, and the Passive
16.*Monyenye na Magoma mbaanchaniwa inka (na Kemunto)*
Monyenye na Magoma(Spec)mba (Foc)anch(V)an(Rec)er(App)i(Caus)w(Pas)a(FV) inka(Loc) (na Kemunto).
Monyenye and Magoma have been caused to love each other at home (by Kemunto)

3.3.2. Causative, Reversive, Applicative, and Passive
17.*Abana mbaseretoriwa enyomba (na Juma)*
Abana (Spec) mba (Foc)seret(V)or (Rev)i(Caus)w(Pas)a(FV) enyomba (Spec) (na Juma)
(The children have been made to unroof the house (by Juma).

4. The Minimalist Program Analysis of Ekegusii Verbal Extensions
The Minimalist Program is the Transformational Generative Grammar's current framework. It is a simple framework that one can easily understand. According to Chomsky (1995), the minimalist program simplifies syntax. Its main aim is to describe grammars of languages in a minimal way, since it is driven by economy principles adopted to replace some other principles in the Government and Binding theory. The principles include the economy of

representation and economy of derivation. According to the economy principle of derivation, movements are only sanctioned if they are feature driven. This means that the feature composition determines the items that will be involved in a transformation. These features are referred to as morphosyntactic features and they mark tense, number, gender and case. Meaning a transformation may occur where we have a feature that is un-interpretable in a lexical item, thereby it may require a merger with another item where this feature is interpretable and can be fully understood. Hence, any syntactic transformations are solely depended on interpretable and un-interpretable features.

The principle of economy of representation states that grammatical structures must exist for a reason and that a sentence be simple and complex than what is required to satisfy some constraints grammatically (Chomsky, 1995).

Also, Chomsky (1995) observes that within the MP, are a result of syntactic operations informed by morphosyntactic features which are addressed by our objective two. The operations include: first, the operation select which is a derivation of a clause which begins by selecting an array or unordered list of lexical items from the lexicon. Second, operations agree which dictates that two lexical items that have related features are matched together in agreement. Independently, these lexical items contain morphosyntactic features which form the basis of syntactic transformations in the MP. They are also called formal features. Other operations include: operation copy which means that a copy of any item that is moved is created. The newly created copy is moved while the original copy is retained or remains unmoved. For instance, in an interrogative: *Are you eating?* The initial form of this construction is; *you are eating*. Operations move here, moves the copied modal to the sentence initial position. We also have the operation merger which simply means the merging of two syntactic objects. The operations delete comes into force to ensure redundant or unwanted elements of derivation are done away with. Finally, the spell-out whereby the derivation continues through operation agree, copy, move and merge until the formation is ready, then it is sent to the phonological system.

The minimalist program was appropriate to our study because it is not a rigid framework. Secondly, it explains the relationship between morphology and syntax thus integrating morphology into syntax whereby syntax relies heavily on morphology. Morphology is essential within the MP because operations in the computational systems are driven by morphological necessity (Chomsky, 1993). Lastly, Ekegusii has a very rich morphology thus the theory was appropriate to the study.

5. Summary, Conclusion and Further Issues

Ekegusii is considered to have complex morphology like other Bantu languages as it is agglutinating in nature. This is evident more in the co-occurrences of the verbal extensions. Five verbal extensions were studied: applicative, reciprocal, passive, causative and reversive. The affixes were described and analysed individually then concatenated or linked so as to analyse their order.

The researcher found out that the five affixes cannot co-occur on the same base. Hypothetically from the possible combinations it was argued that if the five were to co-occur, the order would be rev-caus-rec-app-pas. The reversive position is adjacent to the verb is fixed just like the passives position as the last after all the affixes. To a large extent the order of the Ekegusii verbal affixes can be accounted for by CARP template. The fixed slots for the reversive, the causative and the passive attest to this. The reversive is always next to the verb stem, the causative is the next affix, the last affix, and the one furthest from the verb stem is the passive.

In conclusion, there are different types of verbal extensions in Ekegusii language, to some extent Ekegusii verbal extensions have both morphological and syntactic features and that the Ekegusii verbal extensions and their co-occurrences can be accounted for within the Minimalist Program.

6. References

i.   Adger, D. (2003). *Core syntax: A Minimalist approach*: Oxford University Press.
ii. Basweti, N. (2005). A morph syntactic analysis of agreement in Ekegusii in the Minimalist *program.* Unpublished M.A. Thesis. University of Nairobi, Nairobi, Kenya.
iii. Bokamba, E. (1981). *Aspects of Bantu syntax*. Unpublished Manuscript, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign.
iv. Bosire, (1993). A comparative study of Rogoro and Maate Dialects of Ekegusii. Unpublished M.A Thesis. The University of Nairobi, Nairobi, Kenya.
v.   Chomsky, N. (1957). *Syntactic structures*. The Hague. Mutton.
vi. Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax.* Cambridge, M.A: MIT Press.
vii. Chomsky, N. (1995). *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
viii. Chomsky, N. (1998). *Minimalist inquiries: The Framework.* MIT Occasional papers in Linguistics.
ix. Chomsky, N. (1995). *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
x.   Chomsky, N. (1993). A Minimalist Program for Linguistic Theory in Hale and Keyser (Eds) Cambridge: MIT Press.
xi. Cocchi, G. (2009). Bantu verbal extensions: A cartographic approach, in: *Studies in* Linguistics, Vol 3, 2009.
xii. Comrie, B. (1989). *Language universals and linguistic typology: Syntax and morphology.*2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
xiii. Friesen, L. (2002). Valence change & Oroko verb morphology: Mbonge Dialect.
xiv. Unpublished MA Thesis, University of North Dakota.
xv. Guthrie, M. (1967). *The Bantu languages*. London: Dowson's Pall.
xvi. Huddleston, R. (1988). *English Grammar: An outline.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

xvii.   Guthrie, M. (1971). *Comparative Bantu: An introduction to the comparative linguistics Pre-History of the Bantu languages.*Vol 2. Farnborough: Gregy Press.

xviii.   Jeong, Y. (2006). *The landscape of applicatives.* PhD Dissertation, University of Maryland, Washington.

xix.   Kenya National Bureau of Statistics (2019). 2019 *Kenya Population and Housing* Census: Population Distribution by Age, Sex, and Administrative Units (Volume 1c). Nairobi: Government Press.

xx.   Kioko, A. (1995). The Kikamba multiple applicative: A problem for the lexical functional Grammar analysis, in: *S. Afri. J. Afric. Lang.*

xxi.   Lodhi, A.Y. (2002). Verbal extensions in Bantu: The case of Swahili and Nyamwezi. Africa & Asia.

xxii.   Maburu014, T. M. (1994). A comparative study of Ekegusii and Kuria: Morph-syntactic *features.* Unpublished M.A. Thesis.Kenyatta University, Nairobi, Kenya.

xxiii.   Mchombo, S, A. & Ngunga, A. (1994). The syntax and semantics of the reciprocal construction in Ciyao, in. *Linguistic Analysis*,

xxiv.   Osinde, K. N. (1988*). A Morphophonology of Ekegusii.*Unpublished M. A. Thesis. The University of Nairobi, Nairobi, Kenya.

xxv.   Stegen, O. (2002). *Derivational processes in Rangi.* Studies in African linguistics