

TWO RELATIVIZATION STRATEGIES IN KOOZIME DISCOURSE

Keith H. Beavon

Summer Institute of Linguistics, Yaoundé, Cameroon

Two strategies exist in Koozime for the relativization of nominals. One strategy, called the finite relative clause strategy results in clause structures with finite verbs. The other strategy, called the nominalized relative clause strategy, results in noun phrase structures with nominal verbs. These constructions are discussed in relation to the grammatical relations borne by their heads.

RC's are used to modify nouns referring to thematic participants and props in narrative discourse, especially in the PEAK episode.

En Koozime il y a deux stratégies pour former une construction relative. D'un côté il y a la stratégie appelée proposition relative verbale, c'est à dire une proposition relative contenant un procès. L'autre stratégie, appelée proposition nominale, est un syntagme contenant un verbe nominalisé. Ces constructions sont expliquées en tenant compte de leur fonction comme déterminant d'un substantif tête, et de la fonction grammaticale de ce substantif dans la proposition relative.

Quant à leur fonction dans le discours, les propositions relatives actualisent des substantifs dont le référent est un participant ou un figurant thématique dans une narrative. Elles sont surtout utilisées dans le point culminant (le climax).

0. INTRODUCTION

This paper describes relativization as it is observed in Koozime,¹ a Bantu language of Cameroon. This theme is discussed using terms developed within the relational grammar ("RG") model, as it is found in Frantz (1981). It also refers to the Accessibility Hierarchy which is proposed by Keenan and Comrie (1977). The analysis of the function of relative clauses in narrative discourses² is dependent on the terminology of the discourse model of language, such as is found in Longacre (1976).

1. TWO STRATEGIES FOR RELATIVIZATION

Keenan and Comrie opened up many new avenues for thinking about relativization in 1977. One interesting contribution was their effort to place relativization in a semantic context. They define relative clauses (RC's") as follows:

We consider any syntactic object to be an RC if it specifies a set of objects (perhaps a one-member set) in two steps: a larger set is specified, called the domain of relativization, and

then restricted to some subset of which a certain sentence, the restricting sentence, is true. The domain of relativization is expressed in surface structure by the head NP, and the restricting sentence by the restricting clause, which may look more or less like a surface sentence depending on the language. (pp. 63-64)

This definition of RC increases the types of constructions which usually enter into the scope of a study of relativization. These include not only sentence-like constructions with finite verbs, but also phrase-like constructions with nominal verbs. As is seen in (1), German also has the possibility of relativizing in these two manners. (This data is cited from Keenan and Comrie, p.64)

- (1) a. der Mann, der in seinem Büro arbeitet
 the man who in his study works
 'the man who is working in his study'
- b. der in seinem Büro arbeitende Mann
 the in his study working man
 'the man who is working in his study'

Note that the verb in (1a) is finite, while that of (1b) is nominal, being a participle. The second construction would not normally be considered a relative clause, yet it is so treated by Keenan and Comrie. To account for alternative constructions such as these, they propose the existence of multiple relative clause-forming strategies.

Using this semantic definition of relativization, one discovers two distinct RC strategies in Koozime.³ These are the finite relative clause strategy (abbr. "F-RC strategy"), which is described in section 2, and the nominalized relative clause strategy (abbr. :NOM-RC strategy"), which is described in section 3.

2. FINITE RELATIVE CLAUSE STRATEGY

The F-RC strategy produces an embedded RC with a tense-marked, finite verb. RC's resemble main clauses in this respect, but differ from them in others. RC's of the finite verb variety are introduced by a subordinating high replacive tone, which is discussed in 2.1. A nominal modified by an F-RC may be followed by a determiner which is peculiar to such constructions. The conditions for using the two determiners are described in 2.2. There are constraints on clause constituents which are peculiar to F-RC's, as will be shown in 2.3. It will be claimed in 2.4 that there are no relative pronouns in F-RC's. Finally, in 2.5, it will be shown that not all nominals are accessible to relativization according to the F-RC strategy. Nominals bearing the object of comparison relation and certain "oblique" relations are inaccessible to relativization.

2.1 THE SUBORDINATOR

The first element of an F-RC is a subordinator which consists of a high replacive tonal morpheme (represented by "/+"). This tone, glossed "SUB", causes an immediately following low tone to become high. It has no effect on high tones. It immediately follows the head noun, as is seen in (2).

- (2) m-ud ['+ me á bee] n-á
 c.1-person SUB 1st:c.1 PST see c.1-this:RC
 --->/mud mé á bee ná/
 'the person that I saw'

This fact lends further support to the attraction principle as stated by Givón (1972), which predicts that a subordinating particle will be attracted to the head noun and thus constitute "the perceptual clue by which the boundary between a head noun (in point of fact, head NP) and its modifying clause is signalled" (p.197).

2.2.0 Determiners of relativized nominals⁴

Relativized nominals which are intended to refer to something in a "particular universe of discourse" (Givón, 1978:293) are called "referential". Referential relativized nominals are accompanied by one of two determiners which occur following an F-RC. If the referent of the relativized nominal is the same as one in the preceding context, then one uses the anaphoric referential determiner, 'that', mentioned in 2.2.1. If there is no antecedent for the relativized nominal, then one uses the non-anaphoric referential determiner, 'this', mentioned in 2.2.2. If one is not referring to a specific thing by means of a relativized nominal, the non-anaphoric determiner is optional. Its absence is more strongly preferred in those cases where it is intended to deny that a referent matches the specification of the relativized nominal. These cases will be discussed in section 2.2.3.

There are cases in which referential relativized nominals are not accompanied by determiners. These cases will be discussed in 2.2.4. Finally, in 2.2.5, it will be shown that the demonstratives 'this' and 'that' may occur in addition to the determiners 'this' and 'that'.

2.2.1 Referential and anaphoric relativized nominals

When the speaker intends to refer to something existing in the universe of discourse for a second time, identifying it as the same entity which has been previously made definite, then the referential and anaphoric determiner, here glossed 'that', is used.

The anaphoric determiner is affixed when it modifies a nonrelativized nominal, as is seen in (3). Note that it may occur either following the nominal (3a) or before the nominal (3b).

- (3)a. e-tɔda e-^hnɔ > /etɔda é^hnɔ/
 c.5-banana c.5-that
 'that banana'
 b. l-^hnɔ e-tɔda > /l^hnɔ étɔda/
 c.5-that c.5-banana
 'that banana'

When 'that' is used as a determiner following a relativized nominal, however, it is not affixed and does not agree in class with the head noun, as is seen in (4b).

- (4)a. Me á si jâm n`-e me-de
I PST PFTV cook c.1-3rd c.6-food
'I cooked him some food.'
- b. Me-de [/' + n`-e á de] 'nǎ, m'-e á be í mbáa
c.6-food SUB c.1 -3rd PST ate that, c.6-3rd PST was at good
'That food he ate was good.'

Note that the anaphoric determiner is used in (4b), due to the presence in the preceding linguistic context of a definite reference to the same referent as that of the relativized nominal.

2.2.2 Referential (nonanaphoric) relativized nominals

When a relativized nominal is not coreferential with a preceding NP, one uses the nonanaphoric referential determiner, here glossed as 'this'.

The morphology of the demonstrative 'this' is as follows: First the prefix is selected according to the class of the head noun. Then a stem variant is selected, either -ǎ (following prefixes of classes 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, or 11) or -â (following prefixes of classes 1, 2, or 6). The determiner has the same structure except that the tone(s) of the stem is High (or High-High?) rather than High-Low. The final shape of the demonstrative and the determiner 'this' are shown in (5). Note that there is word-medial fusion of /y/ and /ǎ/ (level [2], front, unrounded), producing /í/ (level [1], front, unrounded).

(5) Morphology of 'this' (demonstrative and determiner)

Class of <u>Head noun</u>	'this' <u>(determiner)</u>	'this' <u>(demonstrative)</u>
1, 1a	n-á, /nǎ/	n-â, /nâ/
2, 2a	b-á, /bǎ/	b-â, /bâ/
3, 11	w-ǎ, /wǎ/	w-â, /wâ/
4	ny-ǎ, /nǎ/	ny-â, /nâ/
5	l-ǎ, /lǎ/	l-â, /lâ/
6	m-á, /mǎ/	m-â, /mâ/
7	y-ǎ, /yǎ/	y-â, /yâ/
8	by-ǎ, /bǎ/	by-â, /bâ/
9	n-ǎ, /nǎ/	n-â, /nâ/

One can see in examples (2) and (6) that the prefix of 'this' (determiner) changes in agreement with the class of the head noun.

- (6) b-ud [/' + me á bee] b-á
c.2-people SUB 1st:c.1 PST see c.2-this:RC
'the people (whom) I saw'

2.2.3 Nonreferential relativized nominals

If there is nothing in the universe of discourse which corresponds to the relativized nominal, it is usually unaccompanied by a determiner. These conditions exist when the existence of the nominal is excluded, as in the case in (7) through (9).

- (7) Mé a-be e mumá [/'+ jám'+ me me-de]
 I:NEG not-be with c.1-woman SUB cook me c.6-food
 ((n-á) /*'nǎ))
 c.1-this:RC / that
 --->/Mé abe e muma jám mé mede (ná) /
 'I have no wife to cook me food.'
- (8) B'-e á bé a-bee'+ `sâ [/'+ b'-e dèk]
 c.2-3rd PST be not-see c.7-thing SUB c.2-3rd eat:HORT
 ((y-ǎ) /*'nǎ) --->/Bé á bé abee 'sá bé dèk (yǎ)/
 c.7-this:RC / that
 'They didn't find anything to eat.'
- (9) kâd `sûm [/'+ b'-e dèk me-díbé]
 not:even c.7-place SUB c.2-3rd.eat:HORT c.6-water
 ((y-ǎ) /*'nǎ) --->/kâd `sûm bé dèk medíbé (yǎ)/
 c.7-this:RC/that
 'not even a place where they might drink some water'

Another kind of nonreferential noun is one whose referents are generic. The speaker who employs a generic reference "does not commit him/herself to the existence of any specific individual member of that genus" (Givón, 1978:294). Although the determiner is generally present in such cases, it has also been omitted, as is seen in (10).

- (10) ne l'ǎ e-kpɛl'+ e-de'+ me-de nímèś
 he at c.5-like c.5-eating c.6-food c.6-any/all/every
 [/'+ dí ǎ `mběd] (m-á)
 SUB stay:PRES in house c.6-this:RC
 --->/ne lǎ ekpɛl éde méde nímèś dí ǎ `mběd (má)
 'He would like to eat any kind of food that's in the house.'

2.2.4 The nonoccurrence of determiners following referential relativized nominals

There are at least three contexts in which the determiners 'this' and 'that' are appropriate but in which they may fail to occur. (They are "appropriate" because their heads are referential and are relativized.) The first environment in which it is permitted to omit a determiner is before the focus marker in general statement equational sentences.⁵ These sentences have the structure "X ó Y", meaning 'X equals Y'.

- (11) Me-de m'-ám ó m-á.
 c.6-food c.6-my FOC c.6-this
 'This is my food.'
- (12) Me-de m'-ám ó 'nǎ
 c.6-food c.6-my FOC that
 'That is my food.'

If the nominal in the first part of this equational sentence is relativized, the referential determiner 'this' would precede the focus marker. It is permitted to occur in that context, as is seen in (13), but there is clear statistical evidence that K zime speakers prefer to omit it there.

- (13)a. **m-ud** [ʹ+ **á jâm**] (**p-á**) **ó** **p-â**.
 c.1-person SUB PST cook c.1-this:RC FOC c.1-this
 'This is the person who cooked (the food).'
- b. **me-de** [ʹ+ **p-e á jâm**] (**m-á**) **ó** **m-â**.
 c.6-food SUB c.1-3rd PST cook c.6-this:RC FOC c.6-this
 'This is the food he cooked.'

In two other environments, however, it seems ungrammatical to use a determiner. One is that in which the immediately following word would be a conditional marker, as in (14a). The other is that in which the immediately following word would be another determiner for a relativized head, as in (14b). (In the latter case, one RC is being embedded in another RC.) In these cases, determiners are apparently not permitted.

- (14)a. **Gó** **ó** **de'**+ **me-de** [ʹ+ **me á jâm**](***má**) **nó**,
 you:COND will eat c.6-food SUB I PST cook c.6-this:RC if
 'If you eat the food I prepared,...'
- b. **-kɔk** [ʹ+ **me á bee m-ud** [ʹ+ **á byêl**]
 c.7-time SUB I PST see c.1-person SUB PST be:born
 (***p-á**] **y-í**
 c.1-this:RC c.7-this:RC
 'When I saw the person who was born,...'

2.2.5 The modifying of relativized nominals by demonstratives

It is possible to use 'this' or 'that' twice in a noun phrase, once as a demonstrative and once as a determiner. In such cases, the demonstrative must precede the head noun, as is seen in (15). Note that a tone change (low --> high) occurs in a noun which is preceded by its modifier.

- (15)a. **p-â(k)**'+ **m-ud** [ʹ+ **á tô**] **p-á**
 c.1-this c.1-person SUB PST go c.1-this:RC
 'this person who went'
- b. **p-íní**'+ **m-ud** [ʹ+ **á tô**] **'nǎ**
 c.1-that c.1-person SUB PST go that
 'that person who went'

2.3 Further characteristics of RC's

In addition to the above-mentioned characteristics of RC's, the following ones can be added.

The perfective aspect marker (**si** for general past time, **si** for recent past time) is ungrammatical in a RC, whereas it must occur in a main clause, as is shown in (16a) and (17a).

- (16)a. ***me-de** /+ **me á si jwe m-wân m-á**
 c.6-food SUB I PST PFTV gave c.1-child c.6-this:RC
 ('the food I gave the child')
- b. **me-de** /+ **me á jwe m-wân m-á**
 c.6-food SUB I PST gave c.1-child c.6-food
 'The food I gave the child'
- (17)a. **Me á si jwe m-wân me-de.**
 I PST PFTV gave c.1-child c.6-food
 'I gave the child some food.'

- b. *Me á jwe m-wân me-de.
 I PST gave c.1-child c.6-food
 ('I gave the child some food.')

It is also ungrammatical in RC's to mark a nominal with the focus marker, 6. A nominal in a main clause may be placed in focus, as is seen in (18b).

- (18)a. *me-de /+ me á jwe 6 m-wân m-á
 c.6-food SUB I PST gave FOCUS c.1-child c.6-this:RC
 ('the food I gave the child')
 b. Me á jwe 6 m-wân
 I PST gave FOCUS c.1-child
 'I gave (it) to the child.'

2.4 NO RELATIVE PRONOUNS

There is no need to employ the term "relative pronoun" in speaking of Koozime RC's, since there is no difference between the pronouns used to replace nominals in main clauses and those used in RC's.

2.5 ACCESSABILITY TO RELATIVIZATION (RC-STRATEGY)

Keenan and Comrie (1977) claimed that nominals bearing different relations to the verb will not be equally subject to becoming the heads of RC's by a given strategy. The relations are in a hierarchy according to their relative accessibility to relativization. The hierarchy they proposed is seen in (19). Note that the hierarchy does not include reference to DO's which are demoted due to the advancement to DO of an IO or other grammatical relation. Demoted DO's in such cases are referred to in relational grammar as "DO-chômeurs" ("DO-CHO's") (see Perlmutter and Postal, to appear).

(19) Accessibility hierarchy ("AH")

S > DO > IO > OBL > GEN > OCOMP

Where:

S-	'subject'	DO-	'direct object'
IO-	'indirect object'	OBL-	'oblique'
GEN-	'genitive'	OCOMP-	'object of comparison'
>	'is more accessible than'		

2.5.1 Subject RC's (F-RC strategy)

All final subjects are accessible to relativization. Nominals are replaced if two conditions exist:

- 1) The time of the verb is general past, referring to the events of the preceding day or earlier, and
- 2) the lexical tone of the subject concord is High.

Note that a subject replacer is present in (20a), where the two conditions are met. The replacer is ungrammatical in (20b), because the time of the verb is not general past. It is also ungrammatical in (20c), in which the tone of the subject concord is low.

- (20)a. b-ud [ʎ+ b'-e á tô] b-á
 c.2-people SUB c.2-3rd PST go c.2-this:RC
 'the people who went'
- b. *b-ud [ʎ+ b'e ngá tô] b-á
 c.2-people SUB c.2-3rd FUT go c.2-this:RC
 ('the people who are going to go')
- c. *m-ud [ʎ+ m'-e á tô] m-á
 c.1-person SUB c.1-3rd PST go c.1-this:RC
 ('the person who went')⁶

The S in (20a) was subject in both the initial stratum and the final stratum. It can be described as an initial/final S. Other final S's bear different initial relations.

In (21) the final S is an initial DO. The verb is passive, indicating that a DO has advanced because the initial S is unspecified.⁷ Note that a replacer is left only in the (final) S position, not the initial DO position.

- (21) b-ud [ʎ+ b'-e á m̂ed-ɔ̄ ɩ̄ d-ɔm] b-á
 c.2-people SUB c.2-3rd PST seized:PASS in c.5-war c.2-this:RC
 'the people who were seized in war'

In (22) the final S bears an initial Comitative ("COM") relation.

- (22) b-ur b-ʎs l'e o-nɔ̄ɔ̄ [ʎ+ b'-e á tô] b-á
 c.22-people c.2-we(excl.)with c.2-4th SUB c.2-3rd PST go c.2-
 á
 those:RC

'those people with whom we went'

In the S-RC's which have been considered above, one observes that a single replacer is used, one which replaces the nominal in the RC with reference to its final relation. In the following two S-RC's, however, there are two replacers in the RC. The first example is that of an initial Instrument-RC, in which the initial Instrument has advanced to final S. This advancement is nonerasing, since a replacer, lé, flagged by e, 'with', is final Instrument (Frantz, 1981:47).

- (23) e-bák [ʎ+ l'-e á cík-ɔ̄ tíd e l'-e] l-ɩ̄
 c.5-knife SUB c.5-3rd PST cut:PASS meat with c.5-3rd c.5-this:RC
 'the knife which was used to cut meat with'

Another instance of a replacer in an RC involves possessor ascension. Looking first at possessor ascension in an independent clause, one observes (as in (24)) that the possessor ascends as an IO and then advances to DO. The possessor relation may be erased. (Possessor ascension can have either a malefactive or a benefactive reading.)

- (24) Me á si jú b'-e ʎ-tab (y-ɔ̄ɔ̄).
 I PST PFTV kill c.2-3rd c.7-goat c.7-their
 'I killed them the(ir) goat.'

But if the ascended possessor is the shared nominal of an RC, it advances to S and the POSS relation is not erasable. Consequently, one replacer is final S, while another replacer, from the

possessive pronoun series, is final POSS, modifying 'goat' in (25).

- (25) b-ud [/+ b'-e á jú -ᵛᵛ -tab y-ᵛᵛ] b-á
 c.2-people SUB c.2-3rd PST kill:PASS c.7-goat c.7-their c.2-this
 'the people who (were hurt by having) their goat killed' :RC

2.5.2 Direct object RC's (F-RC) strategy

Final DO's are never replaced when relativized.⁸

- (26) me-de [/+ b-ud b'-e á de (*m'-e)] m-á
 c.6-food SUB c.2-people c.2-3rd PST eat c.6-3rd c.6-this:RC
 'the food the people ate'

2.5.3 Indirect object RC's (F-RC strategy)

IO-RC's are indistinguishable from DO-RC's since the indirect object always advances to direct object. This is observed in the main clause (27) and in the relative clause (28).

- (27) Me á si jwe m-wân me-de
 I PST PFTV gave c.1-child c.6-food
 'I gave the child some food.'
- (28) m-wân [/+ me á jwe me-de] j-á
 c.1-child SUB I PST gave c.6-food c.1-this:RC
 'the child to whom I gave some food'

Note that it is ungrammatical to replace the IO in the RC.

- (29) * m-wân [/+ me á jwe j-e me-de] j-á
 c.1-child SUB I PST gave c.1-3rd c.6-food c.1-this:RC
 ('The child to whom I gave some food')

2.5.4 Oblique-RC's (F-RC strategy)

A variety of non-term relations are usually specified for different languages. These are grouped under the heading "oblique relations" within the RG model. Certain OBL's are accessible to relativization in Kozzime. These are of two types: those OBL's which are replaced and those which are not replaced.

Among the OBL's which are replaced is the Benefactive relation ("BEN"). This relation is flagged in independent clauses by the noun phrase 'to the profit of', as is shown in (30a). If a BEN is the shared nominal of an RC (F-RC strategy), it is replaced by a possessive pronoun, as is seen in (30b).

- (30)a. Me á si jú -tab l'í e-sû é
 c.1-I PST PFTV kill c.7-goat at c.5-profit AM(c.5)
 b-ud b-á
 c.2-people c.2-the:said
 'I killed a goat for those people.'
- b. b-ud [/+ me á jú -tab l'í e-sû
 c.2-people SUB I PST kill c.7-goat at c.5-profit
 l-ᵛᵛ] b-á
 c.5-their c.2-these:RC
 'the people for whom I killed a goat'

Nominals with human referents may bear the relations Source, Path, or Goal. When these are relativized, they are replaced in the RC. Source and Goal relations are both expressed by the use of the noun *kwá*, which is in class 1.⁹ This is observed in main clauses in (31).

- (31)a. *Me á si nua me-de kwá mé'+ m-ud w-aá.*
 I PST PFTV took c.6-food from AM c.1-person c.1-that
 'I got some food from that person.'
- b. *Me á si cyen me-de kwá mé'+ m-ud w-aá.*
 I PST PFTV sent c.6-food to AM c.1-person c.1-that
 'I sent some food to that person.'

The nominals bearing the relations Source and Goal are replaced in the RC by possessive pronouns, as is seen in (32).

- (32)a. *m-ud [/+ me á nua me-de kwá w-é] n-á*
 c.1-person SUB I PST took c.6-food c.1-from c.1-his c.1-
 this:RC
 'the person from whom I got some food'
- b. *m-ud [/+ me á cyen me-de kwá w-é] n-á*
 c.1-person SUB I PST sent c.6-food c.1.to c.1-his c.1-
 this:RC
 'the person to who I sent some food'

The expression most clearly expressing the relation Path involves the verb *cií*, 'pass by way of', and the locative preposition *í*, followed by the nominal bearing the relation Path. This is seen in (33).

- (33) *Me á si jwe n-e me-de, cií í m-ud w-aá*
 I PST PFTV gave c.1-him c.6-food, pass by c.1-person c.1-that
 'I gave him some food by means of that person.'

One replaces the nominal bearing the relation Path with a pronoun. Odd to say, the flag of the replacer is not the locative preposition, but the preposition *e*, 'with' as is seen in (34).

- (34) *m-ud [/+ me á jwe (n-e) me-de e n-e]*
 c.1-person SUB I PST gave (c.1-him) c.6-food with c.1-him
n-á
 c.1-this:RC
 'the person by whom I gave (him) some food'

The preposition *e* 'with', is also used as the flag for the relation Instrument, as is seen in (35).

- (35) *Me á si cíke ø-tíd l'e e-bák l-aá.*
 I PST PFTV cut c.1-meat with c.5-knife c.5-that
 'I cut the meat with that knife.'

It is observed that a nominal bearing the relation Instrument is replaced in the RC and is flagged by 'with', as in (36).

- (36) e-bák [/+ me á cíke ø-tíd e l'-e] l-í
 c.5-knife SUB I PST cut c.1-meat with c.5-3rd c.5-this:RC
 'the knife with which I cut the meat'

This nominal may alternatively be replaced by the locative replacer, **tík**, 'there', as is seen in (37)

- (37) e-bák [/+ me á cíke ø-tíd e tík] l-í
 c.5-knife SUB I PST cut c.1-meat with there c.5-this:RC
 'the knife with which I cut the meat'

Nominals preceded by e, 'with', may also bear the relation Association, as is seen in (38).

- (38) Me á be ó, e mede
 I PST be FOCUS with food

A nominal bearing the relation Association may be replaced either by the regular pronoun or by 'there', as is seen in (39).

- (39) me-de [/+ me á be e (m'-e / tík)] m-á
 c.6-food SUB I PST be with c.6-3rd there c.6-this:RC
 'the food I had'

Nominals bearing the relation Location ("LOC") are flagged by **í**, 'in, at', as is seen in (40a). When relativized, they are replaced by **tík**, 'there' (40b). This replacer may not be flagged, as is seen in (40c).

- (40)a. Me á si já i ~-mběd
 I PST PFTV sleep in c.3-house
 'I slept in a house.'
- b. ~-mběd [/+ me á já tík] w-í
 c.3-house SUB I PST sleep there c.3-this:RC
 'the house I slept in'
- c. *~-mběd [/+ me á já í tík] w-í
 c.3-house SUB I PST sleep in there c.3-this:RC
 ('the house I slept in there')

There is a very small class of nouns which, presumably because place or location is part of their meaning, are not replaced in F-RC's, as is seen in (41a). All other nominals bearing the relation LOC must be replaced by 'there', as is seen in (41b), in which 'house' is not replaced in the RC.

- (41)a. ~-súm [/+ me á já (*tík)] y-í.
 c.7-place SUB I PST sleep there c.7-this:RC
 'where I slept'
- b. *~-mběd [/+ me á já] w-í
 c.3-house SUB I PST sleep c.3-this:RC
 ('the house I slept in')

Nominals indicating [-human], Source or Goal are never replaced, as is seen in (42) and (43), respectively.

- (42) Y'-e ó `-mběd [/'+ me á duso (*tík)] w-í
 c.7-3rd FOC c.3-house SUB I PST come:from there c.3-this:RC
 'It's the house I came from (or 'out of').'
- (43) Y'-e ó `-mběd [/'+ me á tō (*tík)] w-í.
 c.7-3rd FOC c.3-house SUB I PST go there c.3-this:RC
 'It is the house I went to.'

A nominal bearing the relation Time may be relativized. Its flag in independent clauses is í, as in (44a). Time-RC's are not replaced in the RC, as is seen in (44b).

- (44)a. N'-e á si pyál í `-mbû w-í
 c.1-3rd PST PFTV arrive in c.3-year c.3-this
 'He arrived this year.'
- b. `-mbû [/'+ N'-e á pyál] w-í
 c.3-year SUB c.1-3rd PST arrive c.3-this:RC
 'the year he arrived'

Nominals bearing the relation Manner may also be relativized. Such RC's do not involve replacers, however, as is seen in (45b).

- (45)a. N'-e á si sâ í `-mbi w-í
 c.1-3rd PST PFTV do in c.3-manner c.3-this
 'He did (it) this way.'
- b. `-mbi [/'+ N'-e á sâ] w-í
 c.3-manner SUB c.1-3rd PST do c.3-this:RC
 'the way he did (it)'

2.5.5 Possessor (or "genitive") RC's (F-RC strategy)

The [human] possessor of a nominal is accessible to relativization, as in (46b), related to the sentence (46a).

- (46)a. Me á si bâ m-wân mé N-úú ' + m-ud.
 I PST PFTV marry c.1-child AM c.1-certain c.1-person
 'I married the child of a certain person.'
- b. m-ud [/'+ me á bâ m-wân w-é] N-á
 c.-person SUB I PST marry c.1-child c.1-his c.1-this:RC
 'the person whose child I married'

2.5.6 Object of comparison-RC's (F-RC strategy)

The OCOMP in an independent sentence is the nominal following the noun 'likeness', `mpu, (c.7). An example of this is seen in (47).

- (47) Me á si sâ `-mpu [/'+ b-ud b'-í-b-ês
 I PST PFTV do c.7-likeness SUB c.2-people c.2-all at
 (l'í e-sâ)] y-í
 c.5-to:do c.7-this:RC
 'I did (it) as everyone (does (it)).'

It is not possible to relativize on the OCOMP, 'people', as is seen in (48).

- (48)a. *b-ud [/+ me á sâ ~-mpũ b'-e] b-á
 c.2-people SUB I PST do c.7-likeness c.2-3rd c.2-this:RC
 'the people like whom I did (it)'
 b. *~-mpũ b-ud [/+ me á sâ] b-á
 c.7-likeness AM(c.7) c.2-people SUB I PST do c.2-this:RC
 'the people like whom I did (it)'

2.5.7 Circumstance RC's (F-RC strategy)

CIRC-RC's are slightly uncharacteristic of other RC's and must be treated separately. The verb of CIRC-RC's may be marked with perfective aspect (cf.(49a)) and the subject of CIRC-RC's may be focus-marked (cf(49b)). There is no replacer for final Circumstance.

- (49)a. ~-mpũ [/+ me á (s) tō] y-ǀ
 c.7-likeness SUB I PST PFTV go c.7-thisRC
 'since I had gone'
 b. ~-mpũ [/+ me ó b' á tō] y-ǀ¹⁰
 c.7-likeness SUB I FOCUS PST go c.7-this:RC
 'since it was I who had gone'
 c. *~-mpũ [/+ me á de ó me-de] y-ǀ
 c.7-likeness SUB I PST eat FOCUS c.6-food c.7-this:RC
 'since it was food I had eaten'

2.6 CONCLUSIONS

As is summarized in 50, it has been shown that all relations are accessible to relativization except the Object of Comparison ("OCOMP"), which is identified by Keenan and Comrie as the relation least accessible to relativization. The evidence from Koozime supports their predictions, therefore.

(50)

Relations accessible to relativization

<u>S</u>	<u>DO</u>	<u>IO</u>	<u>OBL</u>	<u>POSS</u>	<u>OCOMP</u>
x	x	x	x	x	

3. NOMINALIZED RELATIVE CLAUSE STRATEGY ("NOM-RC STRATEGY")

Keenan and Comrie's semantic definition of RC's (cf.section 1.0) identifies as RC's any construction which constitutes a two-step specification of objects. The first step is that which specifies a (usually) larger set of objects, and the second step is that which specifies more restrictively the object(s). The first part is the head, with the second part being the restricting sentence.

The implications behind a semantic definition of relativization are, as Keenan and Comrie say, that there will be constructions of clearly different types which have the same (relativizing) function. Not all will look like embedded clauses. Their example of a German finite verb RC (1a) was clearly different from a German participial RC (1b), which looked like a constituent of a prepositional or noun phrase.

The RC's which have been discussed in the preceding section clearly resemble clauses. They constitute the second part of the two-step specification process, with the first part consisting of

the shared nominal. The RC's which are the subject of this section do not resemble clauses. These relativized nominals may be analyzed, however, as consisting of a two-step specification process. Since this is the criterion employed by Keenan and Comrie in identifying RC's, they will be so treated.

The RC's of this second strategy have nominalized verbs rather than finite verbs. The term which will be applied to constructions arising from this strategy is therefore "nominalized RC's" (or "NOM-RC's"). Two types of NOM-RC's will be posited: subject and non-subject NOM-RC's. The point of difference is that, in subject NOM-RC's, the nominalized verb is noun phrase initial, while in non-subject NOM-RC's the nominalized verb is in the second position of an associative construction, and it is in class 5 (the infinitive class). These subtypes of NOM-RC's will be discussed in sections 3.1 and 3.2 respectively.

3.1 SUBJECT RC'S (NOM-RC STRATEGY)

The Subject NOM-RC contains a nominalizing prefix, in either class 1 (for singular human subjects), class 2 (for plural human subjects), class 3 (for singular nonhuman subjects) or class 4 (for plural nonhuman subjects). These prefixes affix the verb, which may additionally have a suffix. Human agents are identified by a suffix -l on vowel-final verbs. Human patients are identified by a suffix -(n), which is the passive verbal suffix. Nonhuman patients are identified as such by a suffix -a. These affixes combine to identify the referent as being either [+ human, + patient], [+ human, - patient], or [- human, + patient].

This can be observed in the data in (51).

(51)	Domain of <u>Relativization</u>	Restricting <u>Sentence</u>	
a.	n- c.1 ([human])	[j ^h ám]	'one who cooks'
		cook:AGENT	
b.	o- c.2 ([human])	[j ^h ám]	'those who cook'
		cook:AGENT	
c.	n- c.1 ([human])	[jám-ɔ]	'one (person) who was cooked'
		cook:PASS	
d.	o- c.2 ([human])	[jám-ɔ]	'those who were cooked'
		cook:PASS	
e.	ñ- c.3 ([-human])	[jé ^h ám]	'a thing which is cooked'
		cook:PASS ([-human])	
f.	ni-n- c.4-c.3 ([-human])	[jé ^h ám]	'things which were cooked'
		cook:PASS ([-human])	

A word of explanation is required to support the claim, implicit in (51), that class membership suggests whether something is [(+)human]. It should be admitted from the outset that there is no perfect correlation here between class and semantics. Some nouns in classes 3 and 4(-3) which are derived from verb stems are [human], which would contradict the statements made above. Among these are ñ-j^hám, 'old person/thing' and ñ-bé^hl, 'sick person'. These

exceptions only appear with respect to classes 3 and 4, however. There seem to be no [-human] nouns formed from verbs in classes 1 and 2. This should not be interpreted as saying that all nouns in those classes are [human]. There are many nouns in those classes which are [-human], whether [animate] or [-animate], but these are not derived from verb stems. Nor are they affixed by the segmental prefix *n-*, which serves to nominalize verbs which begin with voiced stops.

RC's formed by the nominalization strategy have no indication of tense. The voice of the verb is indicated, however, and this suggests tense. The agentive voice suggests present habitual, present extensive, or present intensive tenses. The passive voice suggests past time. These points can be supported by the glosses in (51).

A subject-RC (NOM-RC Strategy) may include the specification of a DO, as is seen in (52).¹¹

- (52) *n-já-l* [*ˈ* *baɪ*]
 c.1-kill:AGENT AM(c.1) people
 'a killer of people' or 'a murderer'

Note that the nominalized verb and the DO are linked by the associative marker (AM) or 'connective'.¹²

3.2 NON-SUBJECT RC'S (NOM-RC STRATEGY)

If the nominal to be relativized bears a relation other than final subject, it will be relativized in a different manner than that shown in 3.1. In such cases one makes the shared nominal the head of an associative construction.

The AM agrees in class with the head noun, and the verb is nominalized by being placed in class five (prefix *e-*). This is seen in the DO-RC (NOM-RC Strategy) as in (53).

- (53) *ne-díbé* [*né'* + *e-de*]
 c.6-water AM(c.6)c.5-drinking
 'water for one to drink' or 'drinking water'

Note that in (53) that the first suggested gloss employs the present habitual tense. This seems to be the preferred reading given to non-subject RC's formed by the NOM-RC Strategy.

In (51) it was shown that the subject of an S-RC (NOM-RC Strategy) can be specified by the noun class prefix as [(+)singular] and [(+)human]. The subject of a non-Subject RC must, it seems, be [+human], but it may be additionally specified as [(+)plural]. The plural subject suffix, *-(ŋ)ɔ*, is identical in form to the passive verbal extension, seen in (51c) and (51d). The plural subject suffix is distinct in use, however.¹³ As is shown in (54), the suffix *-(ŋ)ɔ* has an active voice reading, specifying third person plural [human] subjects when used in an RC (NOM-RC Strategy).

- (54) **me-díbé** [mé' + e-de-ŋɔ]
 c.6-water AM(c.6) c.5-drinking:Pl.
 'water that many drink' or 'drinking water'

Nominals bearing the initial relations DO, IO, INSTR and LOC are accessible to relativization according to this strategy, as is seen in the following sections.

3.2.1 DO-RC's (NOM-RC Strategy)

All final DO's may be relativized by means of the NOM-RC strategy, regardless of their initial states. The noun **mumá**, 'woman', is an initial-final DO in (55a). In (55b) it has become the head of a nominalized RC.

- (55) a. **Me ó-bâ** ' + **mumá** **ŋ-â**.
 I FUT-marry c.1:woman c.1-this
 'I'm going to marry this woman.'
 b. **mumá** [' e-bâ]
 c.1:woman AM(c.1) c.5-marrying
 'a woman to marry'

The noun **mumá** is an initial IO-final DO in (56a). Note that it is relativized in the same manner as was seen in (55b).

- (56) a. **Me ó-jwe** ' + **mumá** **ŋ-â** **-mɔ́n**.
 I FUT-give c.1:woman c.1-this c.7-money
 'I'm going to give this woman some money.'
 b. **mumá** [' e-jwe ' + **-mɔ́n**]
 c.1:woman AM(c.1) c.5-giving c.7-money
 'a woman to give money to'
 'a woman to whom money should be given'

Note in (55b) and (56b) that the DO is never replaced.

3.2.2 Instrument-RC's (NOM-RC Strategy)

Instruments are accessible to relativization according to the NOM-RC strategy. The shared nominal is optionally replaced in the relative clause with either the pronoun or the nonagreeing replacer **tɛ́k**, 'there'. The replacer, when used, is flagged by **e**, 'with, to'. Examples of instrument-RC's are shown in (57).

- (57) a. **e-bák** [lé e-ba ' + **gbak** (e tɛ́k)]
 c.5-knife AM(c.5) c.5-cutting:up chimpanzee with there
 'a knife for cutting up a chimpanzee (with it)'
 b. **me-díbé** [mé e-jwi ' + **me-bô** (e m ' -e)]
 c.6-water AM(c.6) c.5-washing c.6-hands with c.6-3rd
 'hand-washing water'

3.2.3 Locative-RC's (NOM-RC Strategy)

Locatives are also accessible to relativization. The replacer **tɛ́k**, 'there', is optional, as is seen in (58).

- (58) a. $\text{`-mbéd } [\text{ / } \text{ e-komo } \text{ / } + \text{ bi-sók } \text{ (tík)}]$
 c.3-house AM(c.3) c.5-storing c.8-things there
 'a house for storing things (there)' or 'a storeroom'
- b. $\text{`-súm } [\text{ / } \text{ e-ba } \text{ / } + \text{ o-tíd } \text{ (tík)}]$
 c.7-place AM(c.7) c.5-cutting:up c.2-animals there
 'a place for cutting up animals (there)'

It is possible that other RC-types exist using this strategy, but none others have been observed or found in the texts present to the author at the time of this study.

3.3 CONCLUSIONS

By means of the NOM-RC strategy one may relativize on initial S, DO, IO, INSTR, and LOC. This confirms the second hierarchy constraint (Keenan and Comrie, 1977), which predicts that a continuous segment of the accessibility will be accessible to relativization.

(59) Relations Accessible to Relativization.

S DO IO OBL POSS OCOMP

x x x x

4. SOME CONSTRAINTS ON MODIFYING NOMINALS WITH RC'S

Two kinds of constraints seem to be operating in Koozime narrative discourse on the modification of nominals by RC's (F-RC strategy). These are of a grammatical and a pragmatic (or discourse-motivated) nature, as will be seen.

4.1 GRAMMATICAL CONSTRAINTS ON MODIFYING NOMINALS WITH RC'S

The second noun of an associative construction may be modified by an RC (finite RC strategy), but not the first noun, as is seen in (60c). Note that the first noun must be left-dislocated (being replaced by the definite determiner mentioned in note 4), if it is modified by an RC. This is illustrated in (60d).

- (60) a. $\text{`-súá } \text{ e-bák}$
 c.3-handle AM(c.3) c.5-knife
 'the handle of the knife'
- b. $\text{`-súá } \text{ e-bák } [\text{ / } + \text{ me á bee }] \text{ 1-í}$
 c.3-handle AM(c.3) c.5-knife SUB I PST see c.5-this:RC
 'the handle of the knife I saw'
- c. * $\text{`-súá } [\text{ / } - \text{ me á bee }] \text{ wí } \text{ / } \text{ e-bák}$
 c.3-handle SUB I PST see this:RC(c.3) AM(c.3) c.5-knife
 'the handle I saw of the knife'
- d. $\text{`-súá } [\text{ / } + \text{ me á bee }] \text{ w-í, } \text{ w-aá}$
 c.3-handle SUB I PST see c.3-this:RC, c.3-the:said
 e-bák
 AM (c.3) c.5-knife
 'the handle I saw, the one of a knife'

Just as the first noun of an associative construction must be left-dislocated when modified by an RC, so also may the subject be left-dislocated. The subject of the main clause in (61), 'person',

may be replaced by a subject pronoun. This is optional, however, as is seen in (61b).

- (61) a. **M-ud** [/' me á bee] **p-á**, **p`-e** á si de.
 c.1-person SUB I PST saw c.1-this:RC c.1-3rd PST PFTV eat.
 'The person I saw ate.'
- b. **M-ud** [/' me á bee] **p-á** á si de.
 c.1-person SUB I PST saw c.1-this:RC PST PFTV eat.
 'The person I saw ate.'

One may left-dislocate an initial IO prior to modifying it with an RC, or one may modify it in its post-verbal (final DO) position, as is shown in (62a) and (62b).

- (62) a. **M-wân** [/' me á bee] **p-á**, **me á** si **jwe]**
 c.1-child SUB I PST saw c.1-this:RC, I PST PFTV gave
p`-e **me-de**.
 c.1-3rd c.6-food.
 'As for the child I saw, I gave him some food.'
- b. **Me á** si **jwe** **m-wân** [/' me á bee] **p-á** **me-de**
 IPST PFTV gave c.1-child SUB I PST saw c.1-this:RCc1-food
 'I gave the child I saw some food.'

4.2 PRAGMATIC CONSTRAINTS ON THE MODIFICATION OF NOMINALS BY RC'S

A description of a speech component, such as a relative clause, should not be oriented solely to structural matters, for to do so would never guide a non-speaker of the language to use these structures appropriately or to interpret the significance of their use in the speech of another. Instead, it is to be hoped that linguists will seek to account for the use of a given construction in terms of discourse-forming strategies.¹⁴ Learning how to form low-level constructions which pass the test of grammaticality, the linguist ought to proceed to use these in discourses which pass the tests which are appropriate to that level of the grammatical hierarchy.¹⁵ Discourses may, in a given language, fail tests of grammaticality if a grammatical construction is not permitted at a given point in the discourse. More often, however, one judges discourses as being more or less felicitous in conveying messages so that the discourse 'abstract'¹⁶ is understood by the hearer. He should gain an understanding of the discourse which approximates that of the speaker, and be able, if asked, to identify the prominent participants and developments in the plot-line. This is the ultimate proof that the discourse was successful or felicitous in its execution.

An analysis of the plot structure of twelve narrative texts in Koozime shows conclusively that one of the means employed by storytellers to raise a participant or prop to prominence is the RC. This is clearest in the case of those RC's which have an appositive relation to the shared nominal. These RC's are identical in form to the RC's used to restrict reference. The only difference between the appositive or nonrestrictive RC's and the restrictive RC's is that the shared nominals of restrictive RC's do not, of themselves, specify the individual referent. The shared nominals of nonrestrictive RC's, on the other hand, identify the referent

clearly. Thus the RC's which accompany them are superfluous from the standpoint of restricting reference to the intended, unique referent. Since the noun is referential apart from the RC, it seemed likely that they had a function governed by the discourse abstract. This hypothesis was supported by the texts at hand.

One example of a restrictive RC is (63). There being many children in God's family, it is necessary to use an RC to restrict reference to the specific child named 'Dyɛl'.

- (63) Dyɛl á be ó m-wán [/' + `Nsyɛm á be ɛ bɔ̃
 " PST be FOC c.1-child SUB God PST be asp. much
 kpɛl] n-á.
 love c.1-this:RC
 'Dyɛl was the child whom God loved the most.'

An example of the nonrestrictive use of an RC is found in (64). Since the demonstrative 'this' clearly restricts the reference of 'woman', the RC does not further restrict reference. It is, instead, saying something additional about an already-specific referent.

- (64) mómá n-ák, m-umá [/' + dí wá ñ-díndí]]
 c.1:woman c.1-this c.1-woman SUB remain:PRES here c.3-seated
 n-á, ... n-e ó jwe+/' + me mi-címe
 c.1-this:RC c.1-3rd FOCUS P₁ give-P₁ me c.4-cooked, pounded
 e-kúma.
 AM(c.4) c.5-cassava.
 'This woman, the woman who is here sitting down, it was she who gave me the (poisoned) pounded cassava (today).'

Nonrestrictive RC's, such as (64), are used in Kɔ̀zime to refer to the thematic participant of a discourse. In certain cases, two participants will be highlighted in this way, one being the protagonist and the other being the antagonist. An example of this is found in the story 'Panther and Father Monkey'. Both the thematic participants are referred to by nonrestrictive RC's, as is seen in (65) and (66).

- (65) Nkœ œ, ø-tíd [/' + dí e-jú /' + o-tíd ɛ
 leopard c.1-animal SUB stay:PRES c.5-killing c.2-animals in
 -dwík] n-á, n-e á be ó, ...
 c.7-forest c.1-this:RC c.1-3rd PST be FOC, ...
 'Leopard, the animal that is always killing animals in the forest, he was ...'
- (66) Nó ó ø-són ` ø-céme [/' + dí
 thus FOC c.1-father AM(c.1) c.1-monkey SUB stay:PRES
 -jân] n-á, -jân n-e ...
 c.7-monkey species c.1-this:RC, c.7-monkey sp. c.1-3rd ...
 '(It was) thus that the father (or 'chief') monkey who was of the species jan, jan, he ...'

Subsequent references to the chief monkey include non-restrictive RC's. In (67) one observes this in the reported speech of Leopard.

- (67) θ -s⁵ŋ ʔ-jân [ʔ+ me á léɛ me
 c.1-father AM(c.1) c.7-monkey sp. SUB I PST said I
 ó jû] p-á, me ó jû ʔ+ p-e ómén.
 will kill c.1-this:RC, I will kill c.1-3rd tomorrow.
 '(As for) the chief jan monkey which I said I would kill,
 I am going to kill him tomorrow.'

In (68) one observes that another monkey refers to the chief monkey by using a nonrestrictive RC.

- (68) Mpá m-ud pák léɛ ó p-e bána jû
 not:true c.1-person this says FOC c.1-3rd would:even kill
 ó θ -s⁵ŋ ʔ-jân, [ʔ+ dí
 FOC c.1-father AM(c.1) c.7-jan, SUB stay:PRES
 θ -s⁵ŋ w-ís] p-á ?!
 c.1-father c.1-our(excl.) c.1-this:RC
 'What?! This person says he would kill even Father Monkey,
 who is our father?!'

There seems to be a second purpose for using RC's nonrestrictively: the marking of Peak, which corresponds to the climax of the story, or the "Inciting Moment" (Longacre, 1976) which corresponds to the first episode of the story. This can be expressed in the form of a general statement: if the thematic participant is referred to only once by means of a nonrestrictive RC, that RC will be found in either the Peak or the Inciting Moment. To support this, it can be seen in one story that its sole nonrestrictive RC (shown in (64)) referred to the thematic participant, and that it occurred in the Peak of the story, the point at which she is being accused of murder. An RC used nonrestrictively is found in the Inciting Moment of another story. It identifies the referent, her prospective husband, as being thematic. The RC in (69) ("whom I will marry") is nonrestrictive due to the fact that the referent of its head nominal ("my prospective husband") is already clear.

- (69) Mám me wák ó, ʔ-mbû [ʔ+ me ó tó l'í e-bâ
 I:EMPH I here FOC c.3-year SUB I will go at c.5-marriage
 w-í, me ó léɛ ʔ+ go d-íe é w-ám
 c.3-this:RC I will tell you c.5-name AM(c.5) c.1-my
 n-jám [ʔ+ me ngá bâ] p-á.
 c.1-husband SUB I will marry c.1-this:RC
 'I, as for me, (insist) that when I am to go and get married,
 that I tell you the name of my husband whom I will marry.'

Nonrestrictive RC's are also used to raise to prominence the important props of the narrative. This can be illustrated by means of the story about Leopard and Father Monkey. The main prop was an elaborately carved pillow, made of wood. This was designed to contain a small monkey who could overhear the conversation of Leopard and his wife. It is referred to with nonrestrictive RC's, as is seen in (70).

- (73) $N\ddot{a}$ $n\ddot{a}$ ' + \emptyset -pa, $c\acute{i}ke$ ' + mi -k\ddot{o}l
 c.1-3rd:PR.PERF. took c.1-cutlass, cut c.4-ropes
 [\emptyset -nsok \acute{a} be e my' -e] m -í, ...
 c.1-elephant PST be with c.4-3rd c.4-these:RC ...
 'He (the Salamander) took the cutlass, cut the ropes which
 the elephant was (tied) with, and ...'

The nonrestrictive RC's found in the twelve texts sampled seemed to all function as determiners at the discourse level, identifying a participant or prop as being prominent. There were no exceptions to this in the texts used for this study. Further support for these conclusions has come from attempts at generating discourses (translations of the New Testament). Native speakers have responded positively to the use of nonrestrictive RC's in references to thematic participants or props, especially in Inciting Moment or Peak. On the other hand, they expressed displeasure when it was suggested that one might refer to nonthematic participants or props by means of nonrestrictive RC's. Although many linguists would refer to this constraint on RC's as a pragmatic one, I would prefer to refer to it as a grammatical constraint. The deep structure of a given discourse specifies certain participants as [(+)thematic], and any encoding of that discourse should reflect this deep structure by whatever resources exist in a given language. Misuse of these resources would be a misrepresentation of the deep structure of the discourse.

NOTES

I would like to express my gratitude to the United Republic of Cameroon, which made possible the research reflected in this report. This research was overseen and facilitated by the General Delegation for Scientific and Technical Research.

I would also like to acknowledge the help which I received from Don Frantz, who led a grammar workshop at which this paper was written. Many of the analyses and wordings are suggestions he offered. Without him, this paper would lack many elements of value. I am grateful also to Ulla Wieseemann, who helped analyse the data contained in the paper and offered guidance for how to present it.

K\ddot{o}zime (or "Njem (A-84)"(Guthrie,1970) or "Zimu"(Guthrie,1967)) is spoken by about 40,000 people in the subdistricts of Abong Mbang, Lomle, and Messamena, in the Eastern Province of Cameroon.

There are twelve vowels in K zime which I have described in "A Phonological Description of K\ddot{o}zime", scheduled to appear in *Africana Linguistica*. The correspondence between the linguistic symbol and the practical orthography is seen below:

/i/ written as "i", referring to a high front unrounded vowel
 /ɪ/ - "í": high-mid front unrounded vowel
 /e/ - "e": mid front unrounded vowel
 /ɛ/ - "É": low front unrounded vowel
 /ü/ - "wi": high front rounded vowel
 /ū/ - "ŷ": high-mid front rounded vowel
 /ö/ - "œ": mid front rounded vowel
 /u/ - "u": high back rounded vowel
 /ω/ - "œ": high-mid back rounded vowel
 /o/ - "o": mid back rounded vowel
 /ɔ/ - "ɔ": low back rounded vowel
 /a/ - "a": low central unrounded vowel

The data in this paper represents the Nzime dialect of K\ddot{o}zime, which is spoken around Lomlé.

The transcription is of underlying morphemes. When morphophonemic changes take place and it is the author's purpose to draw attention to the final phonemic utterance, then an additional phonemic transcription will be provided, enclosed in diagonal slashes (/.../). When it is needed, a third, phonetic transcription will be provided, enclosed in square braces ([...]).

Grammatical tones are present in the underlying representation of certain constructions. Some grammatical tones spread to adjacent tones, replacing them, as is seen in the following: Note that "/+" means "spreads right, replacing with a high tone any immediately adjacent low tone."

/+ d-omo --> /dómo/ .
in/at c.5-field
'in the field'

A floating high tone is the last verbal formative in certain tense-aspects. It follows the verb and causes an immediately following low tone to become high, as in the following:

e-de /+ me-de --> /ede méde/
c.5-eating c.6-food
'eating (or 'to eat') food'

This morpheme will not be glossed in the morpheme-by-morpheme translation.

²A typology of Koozime narrative, expository and procedural discourses has been done (Beavon, to appear a).

³A third relativization strategy also exists, but it appears to be used only if the relativized nominal is 'people' and if the relation of 'people' in the RC is subject. The RC formed according to this strategy seems to share features of the finite RC and of the nominalized RC. Its verb is finite, marked for tense, but there is an associative marker between 'people' and the RC, as is seen in (i) and (ii).

- (i) Bud [ó laá /+ wák báánâ] b-á,
people AM(c.2) P₁ pass:P₁ here right:now c.2-these:RC,
bé ó dík /+ miná bí-pemé.
they FOC P₁ burn:CAUS:P₁ us(incl.) c.8-fields
'The people who have just passed by here, it is they who have burned
to our detriment the (our) fields.'
- (ii) Bud [ó dí e-laa'+ -nkpâs e -nkpâs] b-á,
people AM(c.2) stay:PRES c.5-passing c.3-side and c.3-side c.2-these:RC,
tó léé gá Nsyém e myél ó, ...
go tell P1. God and wife:his FOC, ...
'People are passing alongside (the hole I'm in), go tell God and his wife that...'

The RC's in (i) and (ii) seem to indicate that the associative marker is assuming the function of a relative pronoun and acting as well as a subordinator. The data seems to show that this third strategy has not been generalized so as to permit the relativization of nominals other than 'people', since the following RC (and others like it) are ungrammatical.

- (iii) *mi-mbéd [mí dí wák] mí
c.4-houses AM(c.4) stay:PRES here c.4-these:RC
'(the houses which are here)'

⁴Nonrelativized nominals may be determined by the following determiners:

- a. -áá 'the said' (referential, definite, anaphoric)
- i. Me á sí bee n-wá /+ m-ud.
I PST PFTV see c.1-certain c.1-person
'I saw a certain person.'
Me á be +/a-gáa /+ m-ud w-áá.
I PST be not-know c.1-person c.1-the:said
'I didn't know that (or 'the said') person.'
- b. -ísá 'one (or 'the other') of the said' (referential, indefinite, anaphoric)
- ii. n-ísá dyél w-é /+ -pák, n-ísá dyél w-é /+ -pák.
c.1-one turn c.3-his c.3-side, c.1-one turn c.3-his c.3-side.
'One turned and went his own direction, and one (or 'the other') turned
and went his own direction.'
- c. -áá 'a certain', 'some', 'one', 'some other' (referential, indefinite, anaphoric)
(cf. Ex. i. above)

⁵There is another kind of equational sentence, one which includes the copula, -be. Its structure is S+(copula)+(o)+NP. The copula is optional in the present tense. If present, its form is m̂, as is seen in (i).

- (i) Me (m̂) ó m-bel.
I be FOC c.1-farmer
'I am a farmer.'
- (ii) Me á be ó m-bel.
I PST be FOC c.1-farmer
'I was a farmer.'

The focus marker *ó* is absent in negated sentences, as in (iii).

- (iii) Mé a-be /+ m-bel. --> /Mé abe mbêl/
 I:NEG not-be c.1-farmer
 'I am not a farmer.'

Perhaps general statement equational sentences should be analysed as involving headless F-RC's. The determiner 'this' is not found following the latter, perhaps due to the presence of a following demonstrative, as is seen in (iv) and (v).

- (iv) Me-de m'-ám ó [/+ di + / wák] (*m-á) m-á
 c.6-food c.6-my FOC SUB(?) stay-PRES here c.6-this:RC c.6-this
 'This which is here is my food.'
- (v) w'-ám /+ -pák ó [/+ go ` ntfs /+ me] (*w-á) /nã.
 c.3-my c.3-side FOC SUB you P₁ come:CAUS:P₁ me c.3-this:RC that
 'That which you sent me is my part.'

⁶This construction is grammatical only when it is given a different reading. It is shown below with this reading:

- (i) mud [/+ p'-e á tó] p-á
 person SUB c.1-3rd PST go c.1-this:RC
 'the person₁ (to whom) he_j went'

This is a relativization of the human Goal in (ii).

- (ii) N'-e á si tó kwá (mé/ `) mud.
 c.1-3rd PST PFTV go to(c.1) AM(c.1) person
 'He went to (or chez (Fr.)) a person.'

⁷The unspecified subject may not be first or second person, but only third person (either singular or plural). It must be human, as well.

⁸Unlike some other Bantu languages, Koozime does not have a subject-postposing rule in DO-RC's, such as is described in Meeussen (1971) and Givón (1972).

⁹Kwá seems to be a reflex of the Proto-Bantu *kúá, 'chez'. *Kúá consists of the locative class 17 prefix ku- and the associative marker (or "connective") *a. This word has been reanalyzed in Koozime, being treated as a noun of class 1 (Beavon, 1983).

¹⁰The focus marker is followed by an epenthetical /b/ before the past time marker in the Nzime dialect. It is followed by an epenthetical /w/ in the Badjué dialect.

¹¹There seems to be a recognition problem when one employs a Subject-RC (NOM-RC strategy) without an accompanying nominal. This is seen in the delayed response which one observes when one says "killer" apart from the object (such as "of people"). The objects are not always the Patient of the verb, but sometimes the Range (cf. Longacre, 1976:29). The Range is often as necessary as the Patient if the hearer is to understand a reference to the agent of the action. Thus, it is hard for someone to understand 'blacksmith' apart from the word 'blacksmithery', as is seen below:

- Ø-lú1 me-lú1
 c.1-blacksmith AM(c.1) c.6-blacksmithery
 'blacksmith'

This is true of other verbs as well, such as -sá, 'make, do'.

- Ø-syá1 me-sá
 c.1-doer AM(c.1) c.6-deeds
 'a worker'

¹²The associative construction (Welmers, 1973) is also called the "genitive". It consists of two nouns joined by an associative marker (AM). The AM has different forms depending on the class of the first noun and the prefix shape of the second noun. The variants of the AM are shown below. The tone rules applying to the associative construction are shown in Beavon (to appear d).

Class of first noun	AM before Ø- or `-	AM before V-	AM before CV-
1, 1a, 9/10	Ø	Ø	Ø
2, 2a	ó	bó	ó
3, 7	í	í	í
4	mí	myí	í
5	é	lv	é
6	mé	mí	é
8	bí	byí	í
11/14	ó	wí	ó

Where: ` - = floating tonal prefix
 V- = vowel prefix
 CV- = prefix consisting of a consonant and a vowel
 bV = the consonant of the AM is /b/; the vowel is the same as the following vowel.

¹³It is possible that the passive function is a more recent development in the language, arising from the plural subject incorporation by suffixation.

The plural subject suffix is found in narrative discourse. The subject refers to the previously mentioned third plural subject. An example of this is seen in the following sentence. Note that the construction employing the plural subject suffix conveys a past time reading. The marker for past tense, á, is not allowed in constructions having the plural subject suffix.

Tó-gɔ, pyál-ɔ' + `-pemé, be-gɔ-'/ + me-npek, búl- , di- gɔ' + `-sí.
 go-pl arrive-pl c.7-field, plant-pl c.6-plants, return-pl, remain-pl c.7-ground.
 'They left, arrived at the field, planted some plants, returned, and sat down.'

A suffix with a similar meaning is present in Basaa (Lemb:40). It is called the 'simultaneous verbal extension', and is used to show that multiple agents are doing the same thing. It is also used to show that a single agent is performing a given action in relation to multiple patients.

¹⁴The author would like to express at this point his indebtedness to Robert Longacre and Ulla Wieseemann who encouraged him to seek explanations for the way in which Kozzime speakers decide when to use relative clauses and other structures.

¹⁵The idea of hierarchical structuring of language is implicit in the near-universal use of terms such as 'embedding.' The concept has been developed by text-linguists so as to account for the different ways low-level constructions (such as sentences) are formed. Some of these differences end up being identified as indices of a grammatical function in a higher-level construction, such as a paragraph or discourse. One discussion of hierarchy within the context of text-linguistics is in Longacre (1965).

¹⁶The abstract of a discourse is the deep structure which is ultimately expressed in one of many possible surface structure discourses. It is expected that discourses having the same abstract will be highly congruent in their surface forms. The notion of discourse "abstract" is developed by van Dijk (1972) and Longacre (1976).

ABBREVIATIONS

1st	- first person pronoun
2nd	- second person pronoun
3rd	- third person pronoun
4th	- fourth person pronoun
AH	- accessibility hierarchy
AM	- associative marker
ASSOC	- associative relation
BEN	- benefactive relation
C	- consonant
c.	- class
COM	- comitative relation
DO	- direct object
EMPH	- emphatic
excl.	- exclusive of addressee
FOC	- focus
F-RC	- relative clause having a finite verb
FUT	- future
GEN	- genitive relation (=possessive)
HORT	- hortative mood
IMP!	- imperative
incl.	- inclusive of addressee
INSTR	- instrument relation
IO	- indirect object
LOC	- location
NEG	- negation
neut.	- neutral with respect to number
no.	- number
NOM-RC	- relative clause having a nominalized verb
NP	- noun phrase
OBL	- oblique relation
OCOMP	- object of a comparison
PASS	- passive voice

pl.	- plural
PRES	- present tense
PST	- general past tense
RC	- relative clause
RG	- relational grammar
RP	- recent past tense
S	- subject or semivowel
sg.	- singular
SUB	- relative clause subordinator
V	- vowel
VD	- voiced

REFERENCES

- Beavon, Keith, H. To appear a. A partial typology of Kɔ̀zime discourse. Longacre, Robert E. (ed.) *Papers in textlinguistics*. Buske, Hamburg.
- _____ To appear b. A phonological description of Kɔ̀zime. Coupez, A. (ed.) *Africana Linguistica*. Musée Royale de l'Afrique Centrale, Tervuren.
- _____ 1983. Locative expressions in Kɔ̀zime. Bendor-Samuel, John (ed.) *Journal of West African Linguistics* 13.2.
- _____ To appear d. Suprasegmentals in Kɔ̀zime. *Studies in African Linguistics*. UCLA, Los Angeles.
- Frantz, Donald G. 1981. *Grammatical relations in universal grammar*. Indiana University Linguistics Club, Bloomington, Indiana.
- _____ and Keith H Beavon. To appear. Double object clauses in Kɔ̀zime.
- Givón, Talmy 1972. Pronoun attraction and subject postposing in Bantu. Peranteau, Paul M. and Judith N. Levi and Gloria Phares, eds. *The Chicago which hunt: Papers from the relative clause festival*, Chicago Linguistic Society, Chicago, Illinois. pp 190-197.
- _____ 1978. Definiteness and referentiality. Greenberg, J.H. (ed.) *Universals of human language*. Vol.4: Syntax. Stanford University Press, Stanford, California.
- Guthrie, Malcolm 1967. *The classification of the Bantu languages*. Dawson's of Pall Mall, London.
- _____ 1971. *Comparative Bantu*. Gregg International. Farnborough, Hants, England.
- Keenan and Comrie 1977. Noun phrase accessibility and universal grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8.1:63-99.
- Lemb, P and Gastines, F. 1973. *Dictionnaire Basaa-Francais*. Collège Libermann. Douala, Cameroon.
- Longacre, Robert E. 1965. Some fundamental insights of tagmemics. *Language* 41:65-76
- _____ 1976. *An anatomy of speech notions*. Pieter De Ridder, Lisse, Netherlands.
- Meeussen, A.E. 1971. Relative clauses in Bantu. *Studies in African linguistics*. Supplement 2. UCLA, Los Angeles, California. pp 3-10.
- Perlmutter, David and Paul Postal. To appear. Some proposed laws of basic clause structure. Perlmutter (ed.) *Studies in relational grammar* 1. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- van Dijk, Teun A. 1972 *Some aspects of text grammars*. Mouton, The Hague.
- Welmers, William E. 1973. *African language structures*. UCLA, Los Angeles, California.