

Relativization strategies as evidenced in Chindali spoken in Ileje, Songwe region, Tanzania

Imani Alinanuswe Mwang'eka¹
Chrispina Alphonse²

¹imanimwangeka@gmail.com

²chrisalphi333@gmail.com

¹Tanzania Institute of Accountancy, ²The University of Dodoma, ^{1,2}Tanzania

<https://doi.org/10.51867/ajernet.7.2.6>

ABSTRACT

This paper investigates the strategies employed in the formation of relative clauses (RCs) in Chindali as spoken in the Ileje district of the Songwe region in the southern highlands of Tanzania. The study employed a qualitative approach with a descriptive research design. Data were gathered through text collection and introspection. The population of this study consisted of Chindali native speakers found in Ileje District. The population also included texts written in Chindali. To inform the study, 10 informants were sampled using the purposive and snowball sampling techniques. The collection and analysis of the data were guided by promotion theory and the interpretivism philosophical paradigm. The collected data were analyzed by inductive and deductive thematic analysis. The study revealed that Chindali employs relative pronoun, gapping, and pronoun retention strategies to form its RCs. The article concludes that relativization strategies differ depending on the language. The study supplements the little existing literature in Chindali. The study has contributed to the development of the theory through empirical data from Chindali that show the importance of the agreement and dependency structure to accomplish the relativization process. It is suggested that policymakers place more attention on ethnic community languages in order to promote them. The study recommends further research on the structure of Chindali RCs to identify the position of RCs in relation to the head noun.

Keywords: Bantu, Chindali, Relative Clauses, Relativization Strategies, Resumptive Pronoun, Songwe Region, Tanzania

I. INTRODUCTION

This paper examines strategies for the formation of relative clauses (RCs) in Chindali. It provides an overview of the strategies employed in Chindali RCs formation. Different studies have described the Syntax of RCs in various languages (de Vries, 2002, 2004; Alphonse, 2018; Comrie & Kuteva 2005; Comrie & Kuteva, 2013) which exposed relativisation aspects that differ from one language to another. This deviation becomes the motive of this study. The article will focus on relativisation strategies, which are subsets of the broader relativisation aspects. It answered the following questions: what are the RCs? What does the term 'relative clause formation strategies' mean? How do Chindali RCs come about? Do Chindali relativisation strategies correspond to other reviewed relativisation strategies across languages, particularly Bantu languages? This paper explores the answers to the aforementioned questions through a syntactic analysis of Chindali sentences containing RCs.

Kuteva and Comrie (2005) outline four major strategies of relative clause formation across languages, namely the relative pronoun strategy, non-reduction strategy, pronoun retention strategy, and the gap (gapping) strategy. Maxwell (1979) concurs with Kuteva and Comrie (2005) except in the gap strategy for which the term word-order strategy (Wo-s) has been used but with the same concept (a relative clause with a missing shared nominal).

A relative pronoun strategy is a case marked relative pronoun that indicates both syntactic and semantic role (Comrie & Kuteva, 2005). It is marked by relative pronouns. This strategy is employed in most of the Indo-European languages like English. The relativised NP is represented by the relative pronouns which stand for nouns or substitute nouns. They include *who*, *that*, *which*, *whose*, and *whom* (Master, 1996). The strategy is also common in Germanic languages (Gärtner, 2001; Salzmann, 2017) and Russian (Comrie, 1998).

Non-reduction refers to as a full NP strategy. In this strategy, the relativised NP remains as a full NP within the relative clause (Andrews, 2007). Non-reduction strategy is characterized by correlative, head internal and paratactic clauses (Comrie & Kuteva, 2005). In correlative, a relative clause in a left-adjoined position is separated from its correlate in matrix clause by its correlate which can be a pronoun or demonstrative. However, in the head internal, a pivot is spelled out inside the relative clause (de Vries, 2002). A pivot is a constituent that is semantically shared by the matrix clause and the relative clause; and syntactically, it is subordinated and connected to the outside surrounding material of relative in which it is independent. In paratactic relative clause, a relative clause looks like a declarative sentence with the fledged head. Subsequently, non-reduction strategies, i.e. correlative and head internal strategies, are employed in Hindi and Japanese languages (de Vries, 2002), while paratactic strategy is employed in English (Herrera

& Sykorova, 2013), Amele (Tras-New Guinea; Papua New Guinea), and Piraha spoken in Brazil (Comrie & Kuteva, 2013).

Conversely, gapping strategy which de Vries (2002) refers to as free relatives meaning a relative clause without an overt nominal head. In gapping strategy, there is no overt reference to the case of the head noun (de Vries, 2002; Comrie & Kuteva, 2005). Gapping is employed in English and Korean in which the empty space in the relative clause would be filled by the relativised noun (Comrie, 1989). Likewise, the gapping strategy is employed in Malagasy, Tagalog (de Vries, 2002), Ethiopian languages (Wu, 2012), and Indonesian languages, namely Bahasa, Indonesia, and Austronesian (de Melo, 2007). Pronoun retention strategy is the one containing a resumptive pronoun. According to Ermisch (2013), resumptive pronoun applies only if the pronoun is ungrammatical or optional in an independent clause. de Melo (2007) explains that in English, resumptive pronoun is well tested, but it is not the main relativisation strategy; while in some languages like Babungo, Arabic, and Syriac, the strategy is the main relativisation strategy.

A resumptive pronoun is a pronoun that refers back to a previously realized item within the same syntactic structure. In principle, the resumptive pronoun is active where a pronoun representing the head noun is used within a relative clause to show the relativised noun as in Arabic or Syriac (Andrews, 2007). This strategy is common in Ethiopian languages like Amharic, Kambaata, Silt'e, Afar, Sidano, Harar Oromo, Tigrigna, and Alaba-K'abeena (Wu, 2012). The pronoun retention strategy is used in Iraqw, a Southern Cushitic language spoken in Tanzania (Alphonse, 2018). It is also employed in Babungo, a Bantu language spoken in Cameroon (Schaub, 1985) and Kiswahili, a Bantu language (Ngonyani, 2006).

The literature shows that, in Bantu languages, relativisation strategies are classified into three categories identified by manner of agreement, namely agreeing with the subject and relativised NP, agreeing with the subject only, and agreeing with relativised NP only (Henderson, 2007). Mohamed (2001) labeled these three tense strategies in Kiswahili as tensed relative strategy, tenseless relative strategy, and *amba*-relative strategy. This feature of embedded restrictive clauses is found also in other Bantu languages like Kivunjo, Ikalanga, and Cuwabo. Relativisation strategies are not a universal phenomenon but vary across languages. Again, a language may use one or more strategies of relativisation where one may be more favoured than others. These kinds of literature on Bantu languages show the embedded restrictive clause and not the case marked relative pronouns as the strategies discussed earlier. However, this conclusion was reached after reviewing the available studies; hence, it lacks sufficient evidence to generalize the relativisation strategies in all languages. This motivated the current researcher to scrutinize the strategies employed in the Chindali relativisation to find out if the embedded morphological feature is universal in all Bantu languages.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

Since 1964 when Smith conducted an investigation that resulted in a paradigm known as the D-Complement hypothesis, the syntactic analysis of relative clauses (RCs) has become the focus of research in the field of linguistics (de Vries, 2002). D-Complement hypothesis states that a relative clause is a complement of the determiner (D). Linguists investigated different aspects of relativisation across languages and Bantu languages in particular (de Vries, 2004; Zeller, 2004; Szczegielniak, 2005; Thomas, 2011; Ermisch, 2013; Zeller, 2015; de Reuse & Zamponi, 2015; Deveci & Nuun, 2018). These studies focused on the concept of relativisation, relative markers (relativisers), position of relative clauses in relation to the head noun, relativisation strategies, and grammatical relations that can be relativised under NPAH. These studies reveal variation in various aspects of relative clauses across languages even within genetically related languages. These variations necessitate the analysis of relativization aspects in which this study build upon. This study focuses on relativisation strategies, which are subsets of the broader relativisation aspects specifically taking Chindali languages spoken in southern Tanzania as a case. On other hand little has been made to analyse the relativisation strategies in Chindali, hence the study will address the issue by analysing the relativisation strategies in Chindali.

1.2 Research Objective

To scrutinize the strategies employed in the formation of relative clauses in Chindali

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Theoretical Review

The study was guided by the Promotion theory advocated by Schachter (1973) and Vergnaud (1974). Then, the theory was modernized by Kayne in the anti-symmetry of Kayne (1994). The promotion theory considers the complementation of RCs to the outer determiner in the D-Complement hypothesis and the raise of the head noun from within an RC to the matrix clause in raising analysis. The theory has shown its rationality by allowing the raise of the head noun from the RC to the matrix clause. In the case of the complementation of RCs to its outer determiner, the theory was not applicable because Chindali has not revealed the outer determiner. In this study, the author used this theory to examine the relationship between the antecedent and the gap in the Chindali relative constructions to reveal if the language employs the gapping strategy. Similarly, raising the head noun in the structure of RCs in Chindali helped



to determine the head noun and the relative markers in which different patterns and themes in sentences with RCs were revealed. In this mechanism, the researcher examined strategies of Chindali relative clause formation i.e. relative pronoun and pronoun retention strategies.

The study was guided by the interpretivism philosophical paradigm which involves the interpretation of elements of the study. The interpretivist assumes that access to reality is socially constructed such as language, consciousness, shared meaning and instruments (Myers, 2008; Collins, 2010). The interpretivism philosophical paradigm was used during data analysis by interpreting and understanding the meaning of different subjects and language patterns under investigation to reveal relativization strategies in Chindali. The researcher selected the paradigm purposely because the current study intended to analyze and interpret texts collected from natural settings.

2.2 Empirical Review

Scholars identify four major strategies of RC formation across languages, namely relative pronoun (RP) strategy, non-reduction strategy, pronoun retention strategy and gapping strategy (Comrie & Kuteva, 2005). Likewise, de Melo (2007) concurs with Kuteva and Comrie (2005) in outlining common strategies used across languages except that de Melo (Op. Cit.) lacks a non-reduction strategy.

The majority of studies on Bantu relativisation investigate relative construction in general on various languages without providing detailed descriptions of syntactic aspects of relative clause construction, resulting in a theoretical gap. Karels (2014) investigated the syntax, semantics, and activation status of information in Chinyiha in his study on relative construction. According to the study, RCs in Chinyiha are marked by free-standing relative pronouns. Kula's (2009) research on the prosody of Bemba RCs concludes that tone shapes Chibhembamba RCs. Similarly, Kombe (2010) concludes that tone distinguishes Kivunjo RCs. A study by Guérois and Creissels (2020) concludes that Cuwabo RCs are participles with full contextual orientation, Mohamed (2001) concludes that Kiswahili employs tensed, tenseless, and amba-relatives, Letsholo (2009) concludes that Ikalanga relatives are marked by embedded particles, and Kaoneka (2018) concludes that Shambala RCs are marked by relative strategies embedded within a morphology of a verb which is highly constrained by tense systems. These studies addressed the general overview of RCs without specifying the syntactical aspects of RCs, as adopted by Comrie and Kuteva (2005), Henderson (2007), de Melo (2007), de Vries (2002, 2004, 2018), and Alphonse (2018). The current study intended to focus on relative clause formation strategies in Chindali.

Literature shows that some languages employ the RP strategy as the main strategy of relativization. The RP strategy is case-marked with the RP that indicates both syntactic and semantic roles of the head noun within the RC (Comrie & Kuteva, 2005; de Melo, 2007). This occurs in most Indo-European languages like English (Keenan & Comrie, 1977). These sentences illustrate this aspect.

Please handle this over the man who is wearing a red jacket.

The chest in which John put the money.

Source: de Vries (2004)

In the former sentence, 'who' is an RP referring to an antecedent 'the man', whereas in the latter sentence, 'which' is an RP referring to an antecedent 'the chest'. The RC is introduced by RP like 'who', 'that', 'which', 'whose', and 'whom' which stand for nouns or their substitutes (Master, 1996). The strategy is also common in Germanic languages (Gärtner, 2001), Russian (Weeda, 1980; Comrie, 1998) and Hebrew (Weeda, 1980). The sentence in Table 1. illustrates Hebrew relativization in which *she* is an RP referring to an antecedent *ha-isha*.

Table 1

Hebrew Relativization

<i>ha</i>	<i>isha</i>	<i>he</i>	<i>Yon</i>	<i>natan</i>	<i>la</i>	<i>et</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>-sefer</i>
<i>The</i>	-woman	hat	John	gave	to-her	DO ¹	he	-book

'The woman *that* John gave the book to'

Languages may employ a non-reduction strategy that includes correlative, head internal and paratactic. Correlative and head internal strategies are employed in Hindi, Japanese, and Persian languages (de Vries, 2002); while the paratactic strategy is employed in English (Herrera & Sykorova, 2013); Amele (Tras-New Guinea and Papua New Guinea); Piraha spoken in Brazil (Comrie & Kuteva, 2013) and Lule spoken in Argentina (de Reuse & Zamponi, 2015) Non-reduction strategy is referred to as a full NP. The relativized NP remains as a full NP within the RC (Andrews, 2007). Regarding the correlative strategy, a relative in a left-adjoined position is separated from its correlate in the matrix clause as in Table 2. The correlative strategy is characterized by a full NP within the RC and at least one

¹DO-Direct Object



pronominal form in the matrix clause which contains a personal or demonstrative pronoun that is not nominalized (Comrie & Kuteva, 2005).

Table 2

Hindi Relativization

<i>jo</i>	<i>laRke</i>	<i>KhaRe</i>	<i>hai</i>	<i>ve</i>	<i>lambe</i>	<i>haiN</i>
Wh	boys	standing	are	those	tall	Are

‘The boys who are standing are tall’

The sentence in Table 2. is introduced by *jo* in Hindi, which is similar to ‘that’ in English. The relativizer *jo* appears in the left-adjoined position separated by its correlate *laRke*. In the head internal strategy, a pivot is spelt out inside the RC (de Vries, 2002). The head internal strategy is characterized by a full NP within an RC-no representation thereof in the matrix clause. Yaowapat and Prasithratsint (2006) explain that in an internally headed strategy, the head noun occurs inside the RC and there is no repetition of it in the main clause. This explanation implies that the head noun appears within the RC and does not raise again to the matrix clause. In paratactic RCs, an RC looks like a declarative sentence with a full-fledged head as in English, as illustrated in the sentence below:

That woman just passed by us, and helped me activate the card.

Source: de Vries (2002)

a sentence is introduced by an RP ‘that’ in English, which is a complementizer. These sentences are loosely joined to the RC; hence, a relative clause sounds like a declarative clause or sentence. A paratactic clause has several characteristics. The RC contains the full-fledged head and is the same as unmarked simple clauses which are only very loosely joined together. The RC does not differ from an ordinary declarative clause, loosely connected to the main clause (Comrie & Kuteva, 2013)

Afroasiatic languages such as Arabic, Ethiopian languages and Iraqw employ both pronoun retention and gapping strategies. Literature shows that gapping strategy is also common in Indo-European languages such as English. The pronoun retention strategy is a resumptive pronoun within the RC, which is a pronoun that refers back to a previously realized item within the same syntactic structure. However, the resumptive pronoun becomes a pronominal element which is obligatorily bound and which appears in the position in which a gap would appear (McCloskey, 2006)as in forthcoming sentence.

Here is the man to whom he has talked.

Source: de Vries (2002)

In the sentence, ‘whom’ is a resumptive pronoun that refers back to the antecedent ‘man’. If a resumptive pronoun is bound by null operators in the specifiers of CP, then the heads which host such binding operators in their specifiers bear a distinctive morpho-syntactic feature in the complementizer system (McCloskey, 2006). In some languages, a resumptive pronoun applies only when these pronouns are ungrammatical or optional in an independent clause; while in others, it is an independent strategy of relativization. According to Skaf (2009), a resumptive pronoun used in a clause does not prevent the presence of the primary strategy. This implies that the language employed RP and resumptive strategy. In English, pronoun retention is sub-literary but well-tested; while in some languages, this is the main relativization strategy (de Melo, 2007). Some languages attested to the use of pronoun retention as the main relativization strategy are Iraqw (Alphonse, 2018); Arabic (Skaf, 2009); and Ethiopian pronominal languages like Sidamo, Harar Oromo, Amharic, Kambaata, Silt’e, and Afar (Wu, 2012).

In the gapping strategy, there is no overt reference to the case of the head noun. According to Yaowapat and Prasithratsint (2006), the gapping strategy is commonly used in a language that expresses grammatical relations through the position of basic nominals in a clause. The gap strategy includes a covert gap with zero relativization markers and a gap with one relativization marker. The gap with one relativization marker consists of conjunction. It may also involve a person, gender, and number agreement. The gap means the head is not expressed at all (de Melo, 2007). There is no overt reference to the case of the head noun (de Vries, 2002; Comrie & Kuteva, 2005). The relativized noun that fills the empty element/gap is known as a gap-filler (Sag, 2009). These gap-filler dependencies do highlight restrictions on what syntactic or semantic categories can appear as part of different constructions, as illustrated in these two sentences.

**Treated can make you sick (ungrammatical).*

Treated wood can really make you sick (grammatical).

Source: Sag (2009)

In the former, a sentence is ungrammatical because it lacks a gap-filler; and in the latter, the sentence is grammatical because it is filled with a gap-filler ‘wood’, which is a noun. The former sentence can be relativized as in the sentence.

A wood that is treated can really make you sick.

Also, the gapping strategy is well demonstrated in the sentence below:



The mouse that I caught ...yesterday was hungry

Source: de Vries (2004)

The gap in the RC representing ‘*the mouse*’ is both semantically and syntactically independent of its roles in the main clause. Some languages restrict this property (Keenan & Comrie, 1977). Subsequently, the study of de Reuse and Zamponi (2015) shows that the strategy for RC construction in the Lule language spoken in Argentina is classified as the gap strategy, normally with a nominalizer at the end of the clause, as in Table 3&4.

Table 3

Lule Gapping Strategy with Nominalizer

<i>Pele</i>	<i>inle</i>	<i>wotikeyu</i>	<i>-ton</i>	<i>Wetsi</i>	<i>-p</i>
Man	-yesterday	Work	NMLZ ²	Die	-3s SBJ ³

‘The man who worked yesterday is dead’

Table 4

Lule Gapping Strategy without Nominalizer

<i>Tala</i>	<i>kistse</i>	<i>-i</i>	<i>ni</i>	<i>-tse</i>	<i>mima</i>	<i>pal? a -p</i>
Dress-1sPROG ⁴	Give	-THEM	P.REC.VIS	-Z2s	SBJ.ANA. ⁵ DST ⁶	-be new.3sSBJ

‘The dress you gave me that one is a new one.’

Source : de Reuse and Zamponi (2015)

Examples in Table 3&4. show the gapping strategy which is employed in Lule. Moreover, in Indonesian languages (Bahasa, Indonesia, Austronesian), the head noun of the subject is gapped. Its function must be that of the subject or genitive attribute of the subject, as demonstrated in Table 5.

Table 5

Indonesian Gapping Strategy

<i>Dia</i>	<i>menulis</i>	<i>buku</i>	<i>Yang</i>	<i>tebal</i>	<i>Itu</i>
He	ACT ⁷ - Write	book	REL ⁸	thick	DEF ⁹

‘He is writing a book that is thick.’

Source: de Melo (2007)

Xu (2014) states that although both Chinese and English have the SVO¹⁰ order, they differ in the use of gap strategies. English uses relative pronouns and gapping strategies, while Chinese is more gapped. African languages use three types of relativization strategies: correlative, pronoun retention, and gapping. Other relativization strategies include the use of nominalization in Ndebele (Bantu), relative tense in Hausa (Afroasiatic), and optional particle marking in Ngas (Afroasiatic) (Comrie & Kuteva, 2005). Based on this evidence, it is possible to conclude that languages differ in their strategies for RC formation even if they are of the same language family. Iraqw, Hausa, and Ngas, for example, are all members of the Afroasiatic family, but their strategies for RC formation differ. Kiswahili employs relative markers embedded in the morphological sequence of a verb (Ermisch, 2013), which are used in three different relativization strategies (Ngonyani, 2006a). Mohamed (2001) labelled them as tensed relative, tenseless relative, and *amba*-relative. The agreement between the subject marker and the relative marker shapes these relativization strategies. Surprisingly, Chinyiha, which is related to Kiswahili, employs a relative pronoun strategy (Karels, 2014) similar to that found in Indo-European languages. Relativization in African languages can also take the form of verbal tones rather than lexical relative pronouns as in Kivunjo. The process involves three major operations, namely pro nominalization, focus deletion, and insertion of high tone (Kombe, 2010). It also includes fronting and postposing of RCs (Kombe, Ibid.). Also, there is evidence that Kivunjo relativization has embedded restrictive clauses, which is a common feature in African languages marked by *o* and *lya*. As illustrated in Table 6&7, Kivunjo relativization has a straightforward feature whereby the head of an NP is followed by a relative marker (Dalgish, 1979).

² NMLZ-Nominalizer

³ SBJ-Subject

⁴ PROG-Progressive

⁵ ANA-Anaphoric

⁶ DST-Distributive

⁷ ACT-Active

⁸ REL-Relative Clause

⁹ DEF-Definite

¹⁰ SVO-Subject, Verb, Object

Table 6*Kivunjo Restrictive Relative Clauses*

<i>Wa</i>	<i>soro</i>	<i>w</i>	<i>o-</i>	<i>wai-</i>	<i>cha</i>	<i>wa</i>	<i>le-</i>	<i>kora</i>	<i>ky</i>	<i>-elya</i>
CM ¹¹ ₂ SG ¹² -	man	CM ₂	REL	SMC ₂	T	come-	SMC	T ¹³ cook	CM ₇	- food

'The men who are coming cooked food'.

Table 7*Kivunjo Restrictive Relative Clauses*

<i>Ngi-</i>	<i>e-</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>i-</i>	<i>e-</i>	<i>i-</i>	<i>ya-</i>	<i>Ndesamburo</i>	<i>a-</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>apa</i>
SM 1sg	T	ee	M ₇	og	M ₇	EL	N ¹⁴	SM3SG	T	eat

'I saw the dog which Ndesamburo beat'.

Source: Dalgish (1979)

According to Kula (2009), Bemba, a Bantu language spoken in Zambia, is a tonal language that employs a high tone as a relativization strategy in restrictive relatives. In this language, a head noun of the RCs can be distinguished by tonal marking. Therefore, according to Kula (Ibid.), one can identify restrictive and non-restrictive clauses by examining their tonal marking, as in Table 8&9.

Table 8*Bemba Restrictive Relative Clauses*

<i>abá</i>	<i>ntú</i>	<i>bá-</i>	<i>ka-</i>	<i>s-</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>á-</i>	<i>a-</i>	<i>fúm-</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>u-</i>	<i>Lusaka</i>
2	people	REL	SM2-FUT ¹⁵	Come	FV ¹⁶	M2	FUT	from	FV	17	Lusaka

'The people who will come will come from Lusaka.' (restrictive)

Table 9*Bemba Non-Restrictive Relative Clauses*

<i>abá-</i>	<i>ntu</i>	<i>Ábá</i>	<i>-ka</i>	<i>ís-</i>	<i>- a</i>	<i>bhá</i>	<i>ka-</i>	<i>fúm-</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>u-</i>	<i>Lusaka</i>
2	people	REL	SM2.FUT	come	FV	M2	UT	from	FV	17	Lusaka

'The people who will come will come from Lusaka. (non-restrictive)

In Table 8 and 9, the sentences are distinguished by their tone marking of a head noun abantu 'people'. In Table 8, a head noun of the RC has a word-final ntú 'person' with a high tone. The RC sounds like the restrictive RC. Similarly, in Table 9, the head noun has a word-final ntu 'person' with a low tone which sounds like a non-restrictive/appositive RC. Therefore, it was concluded that Bemba restrictive and appositive RCs are differentiated by the tone marking of the head noun. Therefore, Bemba employs tone marking as one of the strategies in restrictive RC formation.

According to a review of literature on relativization strategies, some languages use relative pronoun strategies such as English, German, Chinyiha, and Hebrew; non-reduction strategies such as Hindi, Japanese, Persian, Amele, Piraha, and Lule; and pronoun retention strategies such as Arabic, Sidamo, Harar, Oromo, Amharic, Kaambata, and Afar. The gapping strategy is also used in English, Bahasa Indonesia, Austronesian, and Chinese. The literature demonstrates that Bantu relativization strategies differ from those considered commonly used in linguistics.

Non-reduction, pronoun retention, and gapping relativization strategies were discovered by Comrie and Kuteva (2005) to be common in African languages, but they do not conform to Henderson's (2007) classification of Bantu relativization strategies which are classified into three categories, namely those agreeing with the subject and relativized NP; those agreeing with the subject only; and those agreeing with the relativized NP only. Correspondingly, further literatures surveyed are not consistent with the aforementioned strategies. For example, Kiswahili, a Bantu language, employs three relativization strategies, namely tensed relative, tenseless relative, and *amba*-relative (Mohammed, 2001). Likewise, Kivunjo employs a verbal tone strategy of relativization (Kombe, 2010). Although Kiswahili, Kivunjo, Bemba and Chinyiha are genetically related, still relativization strategies do differ. These variations and deviations of Bantu relativization strategies in particular motivated the researcher to analyze strategies of Chindali relative clause formation which have received little attention.

¹¹ CM- Class Marker

¹² SG- Singular

¹³ T-Tense Marker

¹⁴ N- Noun

¹⁵ FUT-Future

¹⁶ FV-Final vowel

III. METHODOLOGY

The study employed a qualitative approach with a descriptive research design. The qualitative research approach was useful in analyzing the structure of Chindali sentences with RCs in which different patterns and themes were identified. These themes helped the researcher to identify Chindali relative markers and then analyze strategies of Chindali RC formation. The researcher collected data through text collection (written and spoken texts) and introspection techniques. Data were obtained from 10 Chindali native speakers found in Ileje District, Kalembo village and 3 Chindali written texts: *Tutumoshange Utwajha Twitu* written by Konga (2019); *Ukalata ughwa Tupango twa Chindali* written by Chibona et al (2015); and *Ukalata ghwa Luuti* written by Cooper et al (2011). Text collection was essential to collect authentic and natural Chindali sentences with RCs. 10 informants and 3 Chindali written texts saturated the information and were enough to provide reliable data. 10 informants also minimized individual variations and enabled the collection of natural speeches without manipulation. The researcher asked the informants to tell oral narrations and life stories about social and cultural issues that happen in village. These oral narrations and life stories were recorded with the consent of the informants.

The Informants were obtained by purposive and snowball sampling techniques. The researcher purposively consulted the known informants believed to be insightful and conversant in Chindali. After the session, the researcher asked the informants for another person who was conversant with the Chindali language and culture. This chain from the known informants helped the researcher to get other nine informants. The technique was natural and convenient in collecting natural and authentic information from insightful native speakers.

Because the researcher is native to Chindali, the introspection technique enabled him to use his intuition in self-examining the sentences with RCs and assessing the correctness and grammatical errors. The introspection technique was opted for because the study was qualitative and was thus characterized by subjectivity in the process of interpreting data. The collected data were analysed by inductive and deductive thematic analysis. Inductively, coding and themes were developed from raw data; while deductively, themes were drawn from an existing theoretical frameworks that guided the researcher to investigate the strategies of Chindali RCs. The researcher used 29 sentences containing RCs.

IV. FINDINGS & DISCUSSION

4.1 Relative Pronoun Strategy

The relative pronoun strategy is mostly employed in comparison with gapping and pronoun retention. Regarding relative pronoun strategy, Chindali RCs are case-marked with relative pronouns which indicates the syntactic and semantic role in a sentence. RCs in Chindali are introduced by relative pronouns that have both syntactic and semantic roles in a sentence, as in Table 10.

Table 10

Relative Pronoun Strategy in Chindali

<i>i-</i>	<i>ndumi</i>	<i>shii-</i>	<i>sho</i>	<i>u-</i>	<i>bhaghi-</i>	<i>le</i>	<i>u</i>	<i>ku-</i>
aug ¹⁷	information	AGR ¹⁸	REL ₁₀	3P ¹⁹	can-	NT ²⁰	aug-	PRES ²¹ -
<i>shi-</i>	<i>bhombel-</i>	<i>a</i>						
3CL ₁₀ .SM-	work-	FV						

In Table 10, the RC *shisho tubhaghile* 'which we can' modifies the NP *indumi* 'information'. This subordinating RC is introduced by the relative marker *shisho* 'which' which is a relative pronoun. This relative pronoun plays both syntactic and semantic roles in the sentence. The relativized NP *indumi* 'information' is raised to the prefix *shi* in the matrix clause *ukushibhombela* 'we can work on' which justifies the use of promotion theory. The relative pronoun *shisho* 'which' introduces the relative clause, indicating the syntactic and semantic role in a sentence. There is a strong relationship in Chindali between relative pronoun strategy and other relativisation strategies, such as pronoun retention and gapping. In the gapping strategy, for example, the relativised head noun takes the place of the gap. Because the relative pronoun represents a noun phrase, it fills the gap in the sentence by modifying the noun phrase, as in Table 11.

¹⁷ Aug-Augment

¹⁸ AGR-Class Agreement Marker

¹⁹ PL-Plural

²⁰ ANT-Anterior Suffix

²¹ PRES-Present

Table 11*Gapping Strategy in Chindali*

<i>i-</i>	<i>Ndima</i>	<i>shi-</i>	<i>ake</i>	∅	<i>isha-</i>	<i>mu-</i>	<i>fisabhi</i>
aug-	Beans	3CL ₁₀ ²² .	POSS ²³	gap	Prep ²⁴ -LOC ²⁵	3CL ₁₈ -	terrace
<i>shi-</i>	<i>ta-</i>	<i>nyiisa</i>					
3CL ₁₀ .	PRES.NEG ²⁶ -	good					

'The beans which s/he has planted on the terraces are not good'.

In Table 11, the sentence is gapped. The symbol ∅ shows the gap which is filled by the relative marker (gap-filler) *shisho* 'which' which is a pronoun and it takes the place where the NP *indima* 'beans' should stand when the sentence is relativised. The relative pronoun strategy in Chindali is characterized by the high tone in the class agreement marker, a common feature of Bantu languages. As in Table 12. the tone appears in the relative marker *jhújho* 'which' is identified in vowel *ú* <*uu*>. The language uses a tone at the beginning of RC because RCs are introduced by relative pronouns. Different from other languages reviewed such as Kivunjo (Kombe, 2010) and Chibhamba (Kula, 2009) which the RCs are marked by the relative tone, Chindali RCs is marked by relative pronoun which is characterized by a high tone. The RC can be easily identified by the use of pitch in a clause which is found in the class agreement marker of the relative pronoun as in Table 12.

Table 12*Relative Pronoun Marked by High Tone in Chindali*

<i>ghweshi</i>	<i>u-</i>	<i>mu-</i>	<i>ndu</i>	<i>jhúj^H</i>	<i>jho</i>	<i>a-</i>	<i>fuumbi-</i>	<i>itwe</i>
Det ²⁷	aug-	CL ₁ -	person	AGR ₁	REL ₁	3CL ₁ ²⁸ .SG.SM	need-	ANT
<i>kooshikala</i>	<i>ká^H</i>	<i>ko</i>	<i>a-</i>	<i>ta-</i>	<i>li</i>	<i>nak</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>i-</i>
pro ²⁹ .	AGR ₁₂	REL ₁₂	3CL ₁ .SG	RES.	NEG-	has	FV	3CL.SG
<i>sagh-</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>ku-</i>	<i>kwangu</i>	<i>ku-</i>	<i>wegh-</i>	<i>a</i>		
come	FV	to.inf.	me	to.inf.	take	FV		

'Anyone who requires anything that he or she does not have is welcome to come and take it from me.'

In Table 12, the RCs *jhújho afuumbitwe kooshi* 'who needs everything' has a higher tone than the rest of the sentence. This is caused by the stress of the initial syllable (subject concord prefix/class agreement marker) of the relative pronoun attached to the initial/beginning part of the clause. The RC can be identified through the tone of the relative word. The high tone is caused by the long vowel in the class agreement marker which distinguishes the relative word and copula. It was revealed that the high tone of the relative word is not a relativization strategy but a characteristic of relative markers in Chindali. This salient feature is motivated by the stress of the class agreement marker of the relative pronoun. Therefore, the class agreement marker is stressed or becomes strong and the relative marker is unstressed; hence, it becomes weak. In spoken texts, an agreement of the relativized grammatical role and the stressed class agreement marker necessitates the deletion of that prefix and its role is played by the subject. This deletion process makes the relative marker stand without the class agreement marker. The mechanism of deletion is revealed in spoken texts where the RCs are introduced by the relative marker without the class agreement marker. For example, the deletion of *jhújho* to *jho* 'who' is illustrated in Table 13 and 14.

Table 13*Deletion Process in Chindali Relativization*

<i>u-</i>	<i>ku-</i>	<i>shel-</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>i-</i>	<i>filombe</i>	<i>i-</i>	<i>fiteta</i>	<i>pa-</i>	<i>lwala</i>
PL-	PRES	il-	FV	aug-	maize	aug-	fresh	Loc.3cl. ₁₆	grinding stone
<i>luu-</i>	<i>lwo</i>	<i>lu-</i>	<i>ta-</i>	<i>ku-</i>	<i>menyuk-</i>	<i>a</i>	(Written text)		
AGR ₁₁ -	REL ₁₁	cl ₁₁ -	PRES.NEG	cl ₁₅ -	break	FV			

'We mill fresh maize at the grinding stone which is not broken'.

²² Pref-Prefix

²³ POSS-Possessive

²⁴ Prep-Preposition

²⁵ LOC-Locative

²⁶ NEG-Negative

²⁷ Det-Determiner

²⁸ CL-Class

²⁹ Pro-Pronoun



Table 14

Deletion Process in Chindali Relativization

<i>tu-</i>	<i>ku-</i>	<i>shel-</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>i-</i>	<i>filombe</i>	<i>i-</i>	<i>fiteta</i>	
IPL-	PRES-	mil-	FV	aug-	OM-maize	aug-	fresh	
<i>pa-</i>	<i>lwala</i>	<i>lwo</i>	<i>lu</i>	<i>ta-</i>	<i>ku-</i>	<i>Menyuk-</i>	<i>a</i>	(spoken text)
Loc.cl. ₁₆	grinding stone	REL ₁₁	3cl ₁₁	PRES	3cl ₁₅	break	-FV	

‘We mill fresh maize at the grinding stone which is not broken’.

In Table 13, the relative pronoun *lulwo* ‘which/that’ in written texts is reduced to *lwo* ‘which/that’ in the spoken texts in Table 14. Sentences Table 13 and Table 14. are differentiated by the form of RCs. The RC in Table 13 is introduced by the relative pronoun *lulwo* ‘which/that’ with the class agreement marker; hence, the tone appears in the class agreement marker. In contrast, the RC in Table 14 is introduced by the relative pronoun *lwo* ‘which/that’ without the class agreement marker resulting from the deletion process. Hence, the tone appears in the initial prefix *lu* in the verb *lutakumenyuka* ‘is not broken’. It is at this juncture that the researcher argues that the tone in Chindali should be treated as a characteristic of RCs and not a relativization strategy.

The RC to be marked by unstressed syllables in Chindali is supported by Kula (2009) who investigated the effect of phonological phrasing on syntactic structure in Bemba. The investigation made by Kula (Ibid.) revealed that in Bemba, there is the use of grammatical tone in RCs in which a low tone can be used in place of the relative marker. The researcher argues that the low tone relative morpheme in the language functions in combination with phrase boundary tone indicated on the head noun and which indicates both restrictive and non-restrictive interpretation of the relatives. The findings of the study revealed that the deletion or reduction process in Chindali relativization conforms to the common feature in spoken texts. Kuligowska et al. (2018) state that, “a spontaneous speech is characterized by pronunciation variations such as reduction and elision”. Master (1996) termed the deletion as RC reduction. Master (ibid.) explains RC reduction as the deletion of certain elements of an RC, the results of which do not change the meaning of a clause.

The study revealed that Chindali employs a relative pronoun strategy as in Indo-European languages like English (Master, 1996) and Chinyiha, a Bantu language spoken in the same zone as Chindali (Karels, 2014). Chindali RCs are marked by free-standing relative markers/linkers which are relative pronouns. These relative pronouns are morphologically formed with or without the class agreement marker (class subject concord prefix) agreeing with the head noun (the relative markers are not the focus of this study). RCs in Chindali are introduced by a relative pronoun that plays both syntactic and semantic roles in a sentence as proclaimed by Kuteva and Comrie (2005) and their follower de Melo (2007) who explains the relative pronoun strategy as a case-marked relative pronoun that indicates both syntactic and semantic roles.

4.2 Gapping Strategy

In some cases, Chindali uses a gapping strategy. In the gapping strategy, Chindali relativization employs the reference to the case of the head noun which is not overt. Therefore, the reference becomes overt when the sentence is relativised and the gap is filled by the gap filler which is a relative marker. This observation is supported by Weeda (1980) and his followers, de Vries (2002) and Comrie and Kuteva (2005), who define gapping (gap) strategy as the strategy in which the RC has covert reference to the case of the head noun. According to Alphonse (2018), the gapping strategy occurs in the position where the relativized NP could occur in the formation of RCs in Iraqw language. In Chindali language, when the gapping strategy is employed, the sentence becomes simple, as in Table 15. but when relativised is subordinated as in Table 16.

Table 15

Gapping Strategy in Chindali

<i>u-</i>	<i>Cha-</i>	<i>la</i>	<i>a-</i>	<i>ka-</i>	<i>bha-</i>	<i>afw-</i>	<i>a</i>
aug-	3cl ₁ .	God	3SG.SM-	PST	3PL.cl ₂	help	FV
<i>u</i>	<i>kupapa</i>	<i>u-</i>	<i>mwa-</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>jhumujhwene</i>	\emptyset	<i>u-</i>
aug-	birth/get	aug-	3cl ₁	child	Quant.one	gap	aug-
<i>mu-</i>	<i>lindu</i>						
3cl ₁₈	girl						

‘God helped them to get only one child who was a girl’.

In Table 15, the sentence is gapped. The gap \emptyset takes the place of the raised NP *umwana jhumujhwene* ‘one child’ after the relativization process. The NP *umwana jhumujhwene* ‘one child’ is equivalent to the relative pronoun that is raised as in Table 16. Then, the promoted NP to RC *jhújho akabhamulindu* ‘who was a girl’ is raised again to fill



the space Ø. The relativized NP that fills the gap is promoted to the matrix clause where it is represented by the person case *a*, which is in the singular form as illustrated in Table 16.

Table 16

Relativized NP in Chindali

<i>u-</i>	<i>Cha-</i>	<i>la</i>	<i>a -</i>	<i>ka-</i>	<i>bha-</i>	<i>afw-</i>	<i>a</i>
aug-	3cl ₁	God	3SG.SM-	PST	3PL.cl ₂	help	FV
<i>u-</i>	<i>ku-</i>	<i>papa</i>	<i>u-</i>	<i>mwa-</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>jhumujhwene</i>	<i>jhuu</i>
aug-	Ger ³⁰ -	birth/get	aug-	-3cl ₁	-child	Quant.one	AGR ₁ -
<i>jho</i>	<i>a-</i>	<i>kabha</i>	<i>mu</i>	<i>lindu</i>			
REL ₁	3SG-	form to be	3SG-	girl			

‘God helped them to get only one child who was a girl’.

In Table 16, the gap is filled with the gap-filler *jhújho* ‘who’ which introduces the RC *jhújho akabha mulindu* ‘who was a girl’ and the relativized NP *umwana jhumujhwene* ‘one child’ becomes an antecedent that is semantically shared by the RC and the matrix clause. The findings revealed that the gapping strategy in Chindali is normally used when the speaker mitigates redundancy in speaking, which does not change the meaning of the sentence. Therefore, semantically, in Table 15 and Table 16, the sentences are almost the same, the difference is that the former is gapped while the latter is relativised.

4.3 Pronoun Retention (Resumptive Pronoun)

The formation of Chindali RCs has also been attested to the use a pronoun retention strategy. This strategy uses the resumptive pronoun simultaneously with the relative pronoun to provide the regressive reference to the relativized word in the same syntactic structure. The resumptive pronoun in Chindali takes place where the gap should occur as in Table 17&18.

Table 17

The Resumptive Pronoun in Chindali

<i>u-</i>	<i>mu-</i>	<i>ndu</i>	<i>jhuu-</i>	<i>jho</i>	<i>a-</i>	<i>ta-</i>	<i>papi-</i>
aug.Cl ₁ -	SM-	person	AGR ₁ -	REL ₁	3SG.SM-	PRES.NEG-	born-
<i>igwe</i>	<i>mu-</i>	<i>chi-</i>	<i>kolo</i>	<i>chi-</i>	<i>tu</i>	<i>bhwo-</i>	<i>ghwi-</i>
ANT	3cl ₁₈ -	Cl ₇	clan	Cl ₇	POSS	Pro-our -Emph. Cl ₁₄	Pro-resumptive
<i>Sosi</i>							
bastard							

‘A person who is not born in a clan is a bastard’.

Table 18

The Resumptive Pronoun in Chindali

<i>u-</i>	<i>mu-</i>	<i>lumiana</i>	<i>jhuu-</i>	<i>jho</i>	<i>a-</i>	<i>kwagh-</i>	<i>a</i>
aug-	3SG-	boy	AGR ₁ -	REL ₁	3SG.SM-	found-	FV
<i>nu-</i>	<i>ku-</i>	<i>kwikat</i>	<i>-a</i>	<i>ghwe</i>	<i>jhuu-</i>	<i>jho</i>	<i>ndi-</i>
conj-	PRES-	catch-	FV	Pro.resumptive	AGR ₁ -	REL ₁	3SG-
<i>abhe</i>	<i>mu-</i>	<i>lume</i>	<i>ghwa-</i>	<i>ko</i>			
form to be	3SG.cl ₁	husband	3SG-	POSS			

‘The boy who finds and catches you is the one who will be your husband’.

In Table 17, there is a resumptive pronoun *ghwi* which refers back to the relativized NP *umundu* ‘person’, which is nominative. This resumptive pronoun occurs where the gap can appear. It completes the information of the relativized subject by making regressive reference to the subject. It gets into the structure by raising from the relative clause *jhújho atapapighwe muchikolo chitu* ‘who is not born in a clan’ where it represented by a relative marker *jhújho* ‘who’ to matrix clause, *bhwo ghwi sosi* ‘is a bastard’. Similarly, in Table 18, the resumptive pronoun *ghwe* refers back to the relativized NP *umulumiana* ‘a boy’. In the process of Chindali RC formation, the relativized NP is required to be raised to fill the gap constructed after the verb *nukumwikata* ‘and catch’. The relativised NP *umulumiana* ‘a boy’ raise and fill the gap is occupied by the resumptive pronoun *ghwe*. The omission of the resumptive pronoun *ghwe* will make the sentence read *mulumiana jhújho ndiabhe mulume ghwako* ‘is a boy who will be your husband’. Apart from making the back reference to the head noun, the resumptive pronoun stands in a place which could be occupied by a relativised head

³⁰ Ger- Gerund

noun in the matrix clause. Thus, the gap has been filled by the resumptive pronoun *ghwe* which is bound by the agreement of relative marker found in class one of the Chindali noun class system. The results show that the resumptive pronoun in Chindali is used together with a relative pronoun. These findings concur with de Vries's (2002) argument in his work on the patterns of RCs. de Vries (ibid.) argues that resumptive pronouns are usually used in combination with other relative particles.

The results of this study show three major strategies of the formation of RCs in Chindali, which are relative pronoun, gapping and, pronoun retention contrary to Comrie and Kuteva (2005) who uncover relative pronoun, non-reduction, pronoun retention, and gapping strategies. Similarly, de Melo (2007) concurs with Comrie and Kuteva with exception of non-reduction. Therefore, the findings of this study concur with de Melo (Ibid.) who outlines three major strategies for the formation of RCs. This study also is congruent with the literature that languages may employ one or more strategies of RC formation. Therefore, the strategies of forming Chindali RCs are not consistent with the argument of Comrie and Kuteva (2005) who state that the strategies of RCs found in African languages, Bantu languages included, are non-reduction, pronoun retention, and gapping. Similarly, Ermisch (2013) explains other aspects of the formation of RCs in Bantu languages like the use of relative tense, focus construction, and the use of optional particle marking at the beginning and end of an RC.

Also, the current study does not conform to the known relativization strategies of other Bantu languages reviewed like tensed, tenseless, and *amba*-relative employed in Kiswahili (Mohammed, 2001); the use of augment as a construct form marker of RC in Eton (Van de Velde, 2014); the use of participial in Cuwabo (Guërois & Creissels, 2016); and verbal tone strategy employed in Kivunjo (Kombe, 2010). The current study agrees with Comrie and Kuteva (2005) and their followers that African languages employ non-reduction, pronoun retention, gapping, use of relative tense, focus construction, use of optional particle marking at the beginning of RC, use of augment, and verbal tone strategy. However, these strategies are not the only ones for the formation of Bantu RCs. The findings of the study revealed a new idea of relativization strategies in Bantu languages. The study supplements the existing literature on the syntax of Bantu RCs and Chindali in particular.

V. CONCLUSION & RECOMMENDATION

5.1 Conclusion

The study looked into the strategies used to form RCs in Chindali. It discovered that relativization strategies differ across languages and Bantu in particular. This variation necessitates the investigation of the strategies of Chindali relative clause formation to fill the knowledge gap. The study found that relativization strategies in Chindali are relative pronoun, pronoun retention, and gapping. Based on this observation, it is worth concluding that language relativization strategies differ from one language to another; hence, there is a need to analyse the strategies of each language to reveal the detailed and broad descriptive relativization strategies of that particular language. This study adds to the scanty literature in Chindali. The study will be useful to students and academics who are interested in the syntax of Bantu RCs, particularly Chindali.

5.2 Recommendation

The study suggests that policymakers place more attention on ethnic community languages in order to promote them. It recommends more research into other aspects of Chindali relativization to enrich literature in Chindali and Bantu languages in general.

REFERENCES

- Alphonse, A. (2018). A syntactic analysis of relative clauses in the Southern Cushitic language Iraqw. *Journal of Education, Humanities and Sciences*, 7(2), 42–61.
- Andrews, A. (2007). Relative clauses: Complex constructions. In T. Shopen (Ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description* (Vol. 2, pp. 206–236).
- Chibona, E., Kajange, G., Lwanga, E., & Songa, E. (2015). *Ukalata ugwa tupango utwa Chindali*. SIL International.
- Collins, H. (2010). *Creative research: The theory and practice of research for the creative industries*. AVA Publications.
- Comrie, B. (1989). *Language universals and linguistic typology* (2nd ed.). Blackwell.
- Comrie, B. (1998). Rethinking the typology of relative clauses. *Language Design*, 1, 59–86.
- Comrie, B., & Kuteva, T. (2005). Relativization strategies. In M. Haspelmath, M. Dryer, D. Gill, & B. Comrie (Eds.), *The world atlas of language structures*. Oxford University Press.
- Comrie, B., & Kuteva, T. (2013). Relativization on subjects. In M. S. Dryer & M. Haspelmath (Eds.), *The world atlas of language structures online*. <http://wals.info/chapter/122>
- Dalgish. (1979). The syntax and semantics of the morpheme *ni* in Kivunjo (Chaga). *Studies in African Linguistics*, 10(1), 42–56.

- de Melo, W. (2007). Linguistic typology: Relative clauses. <http://www.wolfgang.demelo.de/typology/lecture5>
- de Reuse, W., & Zamponi, R. (2015, May 1–3). Relative clause formation in Lule (Argentine Chaco). *Diversity Linguistics: Retrospect and Prospect*. Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology.
- de Vries, M. (2002). *The syntax of relativization*. LOT.
- Deveci, T., & Nuun, R. (2018). The use of relative clauses in humanities and social sciences research articles. *Linguistics and Literature Studies*, 6(1), 17–26.
- Ermisch, S. (2013). Relative constructions in African languages. http://web.uni-frankfurt.de/fb10/zimmermann/HP_FG-RelIS/info_typ.htm
- Gärtner, H. (2001). Are there V2 relative clauses in German? *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics*, 3(2), 97–141.
- Guérois, R., & Creissels, D. (2016). *Cuwabo relativization: Accessibility hierarchy and the typology of Bantu inversion constructions*. Helsinki University.
- Henderson, B. (2007). *The syntax of agreement in Bantu relatives*. CSLI Publications.
- Herrera, R., & Sykorova, A. (2013). Relative clauses. <http://home.unileipzig.de/assmann/teaching/SS13/HK98-ch.5HerreraSykorova>
- Kaoneka, S. (2018). Tense sensitivity of the Shambala relative markers. *Journal of Education, Humanities and Sciences*, 7(2), 73–92.
- Karels, J. (2014). Relative constructions in Nyiha. SIL International.
- Kayne, R. (1994). *The antisymmetry of syntax*. MIT Press.
- Keenan, E. L., & Comrie, B. (1977). Noun phrase accessibility and universal grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 8(1), 63–99.
- Kombe, L. (2010). *The formation of relative clauses in Kivunjo* (Master's dissertation). University of Dar es Salaam.
- Konga, J. (2019). *Tunoshange utwajha twitu* (1st ed.). SIL International.
- Kula, N. C. (2009). The prosody of Bemba relative clauses. <http://www.linguistics.berkeley.edu>
- Kuligowska, K., Kisielewicz, P., & Wlodarz, A. (2018). Speech synthesis systems: Disadvantages and limitations. *International Journal of Engineering and Technology*, 7(2.28), 234–239.
- Letsholo, R. (2009). The forgotten structure of Ikalanga relatives. *Studies in African Linguistics*, 38(2), 131–154.
- Master, P. (1996). *Systems in English grammar: An introduction for language teachers*. Prentice Hall.
- Maxwell, D. (1979). Strategies of relativization and NP accessibility. *Language*, 55(2), 352–371.
- McCloskey, J. (2006). *Resumption*. Wiley.
- Mohammed, M. (2001). *Modern Swahili grammar*. East African Educational Publishers.
- Myers, M. D. (2008). *Qualitative research in business and management*. Sage.
- Ngonyani, D. (2006). Resumptive pronominal clitics in Bantu languages. In O. F. Arasanyin & M. A. Pemberton (Eds.), *Selected proceedings of the 36th Annual Conference on African Linguistics* (pp. 51–59). Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- Ngonyani, D. (2006a). Attract F and verbal morphology in Kiswahili. *The Linguistics Review*, 23, 37–68.
- Sag, I. A. (2009). English filler-gap constructions. Stanford University.
- Salzmann, M. (2017). *Reconstruction and resumption in indirect A'-dependencies*. De Gruyter Mouton.
- Schachter, P. (1973). Focus and relativization. *Language*, 49, 19–46.
- Schaub, W. (1985). *Babungo: Croom Helm descriptive grammars*. Croom Helm.
- Skaf, R. (2009). Relativization in Aramaic-Syriac. *Coyote Papers, University of Arizona*.
- Szczegielniak, A. (2005). Relativization. MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistics.
- Thomas, J. (2011). The relative marker and long-distance dependencies in L2 acquisition of Swahili relative clauses. In E. G. Mobamba et al. (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 40th Annual Conference on African Linguistics* (pp. 36–52).
- Van de Velde, M. (2014). The augment as a construct form marker in Eton relative clause constructions. De Gruyter Mouton.
- Vergnaud, J. R. (1974). *French relative clauses*. MIT.
- Weeda, D. (1980). *Strategies of relativization revised*. University of Iowa.
- Wu, T. (2012). Prenominal relative clauses in Ethiopian languages. *Studies in African Linguistics*, 41(2), 214–253.
- Xu, Y. (2014). Accessibility hierarchy in relative clauses in Chinese. *Language and Linguistics*, 15(3), 435–464.
- Yaowapat, N., & Prasithratsint, A. (2006). Typology of relative clauses in mainland Southeast Asian languages. *Mon-Khmer Studies*, 38, 1–23.
- Zeller, J. (2004). Relative clause formation in Bantu languages. *South African Journal of African Languages*, 22, 75–93.
- Zeller, J. (2015). *The syntax of African languages*. University of KwaZulu-Natal.