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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adj</td>
<td>adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adv</td>
<td>adverb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Constituent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.B.S</td>
<td>Central Bureau of Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig</td>
<td>Figure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Homonym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M₁</td>
<td>First meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M₂</td>
<td>Second meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M₃</td>
<td>Third meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M₄</td>
<td>Forth meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Polyseme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Sentence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Verb</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF TERMS

Dialect: One of the subordinate forms or varieties of a language arising from local peculiarities of vocabulary, idiom and pronunciations.

Intermediaries: Words whose meanings are both homonymous and polysemous.

Lexicology: The study of vocabulary items (lexemes) of a language including their meanings and relations as well as changes in their form and meaning through time.

Lexeme (lexical item): Refers to the smallest unit in the meaning system of a language that can be distinguished from other similar units. It is an abstract unit which can occur in different forms in actual spoken or written sentences and is regarded as the same lexeme even when inflected. In this study, *lexeme* is used to refer to a word.

Lexical semantics: The investigation of meanings stored in the mental lexicon.

Sense: The sense of a lexeme or an expression is its indispensable hardcore of meaning.
ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine the distinction between homonymy and polysemy in Kimasaku within the Sense Relations approach. On the background of the study, we explored the history of the Kamba people and their language. This was followed by the research objectives whereby the study sought to identify words with multiple meanings and determine which of the multiple meanings are related and that which were not. The third objective was to determine the extent to which Sense Relations Theory is useful in the distinction between homonymy and polysemy. By looking at the rationale of the study, we explained the importance of the study to various groups like the Ministry of Education, book writers, bible translators and linguists.

In literature review and theoretical framework, we discussed in indepth perspective homonyms and polysemes, their distinction and also looked at discussion by other scholars. We also explained why we sought to use the Sense Relations Theory and not any other theory like the Semantic theory or Componential Analysis. On methodology, we chose the descriptive method of the qualitative research design. The area of study was Kangundo District in three locations: Kawethei, Mbiuni and Matungulu. A Kikamba dictionary by Mwau was the source of words with multiple meanings. Respondents and a Kikamba – English by Mutisya were also used to provide more meanings. Sampling procedures included purposive complemented by systematic random sampling and snowball. Data collection involved getting words from a dictionary in form of nouns and verbs, meanings got from the two dictionaries as well as from the respondents. Instruments used were an interview schedule and a pilot survey. Later, interpretation of the data and discussion was done followed by summary of findings. Recommendations and suggestions for further research were given by the researcher.
CHAPTER ONE

1.0 Introduction

This section focuses on the following areas: background to the study, statement of the problem, research objectives, research question and research assumptions, rationale for the study and the scope and limitations of the study.

1.1 Background of the Study

The Akamba of today occupy the traditional counties of Kitui, Machakos and Makueni in the lower part of Eastern Province (Ukambani). The Akamba also live in Mbeere, Kirinyaga, Kwale and Taita Taveta counties with a sizeable Kamba diaspora community in Tanzania, the Democratic Republic of Congo and other parts of the world. They are also the leading integrationists with communities such as the Mbeere, Embu, Taveta and Tharaka being largely Kamba by blood (Joshua, 2011). Today, the Kamba community has intermingled with other communities within and outside Ukambani such as those in Mwea region in Embu, Shimba Hills in Kwale District, parts of Taita Taveta and Mombasa region due to social economic and political factors (Maundu, 1980; Mathooko, 2004).

History has it that the Kamba migrated into Kenya in the 14th Century and settled in the Taveta area before migrating northwards to the Nzau Hills in the present day Makueni county. A dispersal of the community occurred in the 17th Century, with some moving to Mbooni and others to Kitui, Mwingi and the fringes of Central province. The Mbooni group later moved to present day Machakos and Kangundo counties (CBS, 2009).

The Akamba people have made significant contributions to the historical development of modern Kenya (Joshua, 2011): the country draws its name from the Kamba compound word Kinyaa
(referring Kamba name for a place with Ostriches), the Kamba were an integral part of the Mau Mau struggle for freedom contributing human and other resources including the oath (Kithitu) that was administered by the Mau Mau fighters.

The area occupied by the Kamba community is approximately 17,396 square miles and in terms of the geographical location, it lies between 4 minutes and 3 degrees south of Equator and 37 degrees and 39 degrees East of Greenwich Meridian (Ndeti, 1972). The two larger districts, Kitui and Machakos, were named by the white settlers. German missionaries in East Ukamba named Kitui after the place of their settlement while Masaku was named after Chief Masaku but later was anglicized to Machakos (Kimilu, 1962: 22).

Traditionally, the Akamba of Kitui were known as Athaisu. They were distinguished from the Akamba of Masaku, popularly known as Malela, by Kyathi - sharpening the upper two teeth into spatulate form (Ndeti, 1972: 32).

The total population of the Akamba was approximately 3.89 million people which is 11% of the total population in Kenya according to 2009 Population and Housing Census (CBS, 2009).

Kikamba is a Bantu language belonging to the Central Kenyan Bantu cluster (Mberia, 1993 and Guthrie, 1964). All Kenyan Bantu languages are classified under five groups: Coastal, Taita, Central Kenya, South Nyanza and Luhya with the Gikuyu - Kamba group falling under code E50. Specifically, Kikamba is given code E55 (Guthrie, 1964). The Akamba are the fourth largest ethnic community in Kenya (CBS, 2009) whose ethnic code is NAB57e (Joshua, 2011).

According to Greenberg’s classification, Kikamba is grouped among the Niger-Congo family as cited in (Whiteley, 1974:13).
According to Maundu (1989) and Whiteley and Muli (1962), Kikamba has several dialects which include Ki-kilungu, Kitui North variety, Central Kitui dialect and the Kimasaku dialect spoken in Central Machakos, Kathiani, Mbooni, Mwala, Yatta and Kangundo. This study mainly focuses on Kimasaku. Kimasaku is considered as the standard Kikamba used in the media. Also, most of the important written works like the Kikamba dictionaries, the Kikamba Bible, Kikamba instructional materials in schools for lower classes, and storybooks such as Ngotho (1963, 1989) and Mwikali and Coughlin (1990) among others are written in it.

Indigenous languages are not irrelevant to today’s world. Indeed, their advancement impacts heavily on African cultural heritage. The African agenda will always remain incomplete without them. Momanyi (2007) asserts that language is the key instrument of communication and is the principal means of bringing about development. This calls upon the initiators of technology to take into consideration the indigenous knowledge structures. This, she says, will incorporate African languages in the mainstream development agenda of the African continent. She also calls for the creation of avenues that can be used to preserve African linguistic heritage. This study will serve as a documentation of the distinction between polysemous and homonymous words in Kimasaku. If well kept, it will serve as reference for future scholars with interest on Kikamba language.

Koenraad and Scott (1996) observe that a semantic concept that might be quite fundamental to one language might be much less important in another as is evidenced by English and Warlpiri (an Australian language) where the word ‘big’ in Warlpiri language is a noun while English speakers would consider it to be an adjective although in both languages the word ‘big’ denotes the size of a thing. This suggests that the semantics of each language is worth studying as there is a great variety of the ways in which languages can accomplish the task of talking about peoples’
environment. Therefore, studying homonymous and polysemous words in Kimasaku might reveal interesting details.

Leech (1974: 97, 102) notes that the convergence of historical and synchronic approaches to a lexical study leads to a problem which has been a long-standing matter of concern for students of semantics. The question here is: how does one draw the line between homonymy and polysemy?

The answer to this, according to Lobner (2002), is that one can recognize a case of polysemy if the senses concerned are related while homonymy has unrelated senses. But when one asks what ‘related’ means, there are two answers: one historical and the other psychological, which do not necessarily coincide. Therefore, the distinction criteria for differentiating homonymy and polysemy fall into two categories: Etymology (the historical source of words) and the relatedness of meaning (Lyons, 1995). Two meanings are historically related if they can be traced back to the same source or if one meaning can be derived from the other. Using Kimasaku, this study seeks to establish the distinction between homonymy and polysemy using the Sense Relations approach.
1.2 Statement of the Problem

Semantic studies on Kikamba, and in particular Kimasaku dialect, are not as elaborate as those on syntax, morphology and phonology. Studies on semantics are crucial if people are to understand their rich cultural heritage and assert their identity as a people. Momanyi (2007) notes that our languages are the cornerstones of our economic and technological development. For this to become a reality, we need to be semantically competent in these languages and this entails knowing how words are related in terms of sense relations such as synonymy, antonymy, hyponymy, homonymy and polysemy.

It has been observed that in practice, it is impossible to draw a clear line between homonymy and polysemy (Lyons, 1995; Hurford and Hearsley, 1983; Greenbaum, 1996). These studies are based on European languages and therefore this study seeks to establish whether the same case applies to Kimasaku dialect.

There are assertions that in some languages, homonymy is a rare case to find and usually happens as an accidental phenomenon while polysemy is abundant (Lobner, 2002). As such, this study seeks to establish whether or not this claim is true in relation to Kimasaku.

Also Lobner (2002: 209) asserts that if one consults a more comprehensive monolingual dictionary, one will hardly find a word with just one meaning given. This calls for a close investigation, something that this study takes up.

The information gathered in this study is also useful in contributing to the debate highlighted by scholars like Lyons (1995), Hurford and Hearsely (1983), Greenbaum (1996) in regarding the controversial distinction between homonyms and polysenes.
1.3 Research Objectives

This study sought to achieve the following objectives:

1. To identify words with multiple meanings in Kimasaku.

2. To determine which of the meanings are homonymous and which are polysemous based on the intuitions of the speakers.

3. To determine the extent to which the Sense Relations Theory is useful in distinguishing between homonymy and polysemy.

1.4 Research Questions

The study sought to answer the following questions:

1. Which are some of the words that have multiple meanings in Kimasaku?

2. Which of the meanings are homonymous and which are polysemous according to the speakers’ intuitions?

3. To what extent is the Sense Relations Theory useful in distinguishing between homonymy and polysemy?

1.5 Research Assumptions

The study assumed the following:

1. There are many words with multiple meanings in Kimasaku.

2. Speakers can distinguish between multiple meanings of words as either homonymous or polysemous on the basis of intuition.

3. The Sense Relations Theory is to some extent useful in distinguishing between homonymy and polysemy.
1.6 Rationale for the Study

This study will be useful to the curriculum developers in the Ministry of Education as polysemes and homonyms form puns, which are useful in teaching learners how to relate pronunciation and meaning. Puns are made possible because words are polysemes or homonyms. For example, 'Mwanzia ethiile nthia nthiani na osa ila nthia anthia kuthauka nasyo'. (Mwanzia found feathers on the path, took them and started playing with them). The pun here is in the fact that feathers (nthia) and path (nthia) have similar spellings and the same pronunciation hence there is confusion in meaning. Anthia which means started would appear to be formed from either nthia (feathers) or nthia (path) but has a different meaning not related to either of the two.

Another group that could benefit from this study includes the textbook writers of Kikamba since Kimasaku is the standard form used in writing formal literary materials like the Kikamba Bible and institutional books. Editors of texts written in Kikamba shall benefit from this study as their work requires knowledge of homonymy and polysemy.

Further, the Kikamba translators of the Bible and government documents like Vision 2030 and the constitution will find this study useful, as the knowledge of polysemes and homonyms is necessary in the translation process.

The study will also be useful to the upcoming media houses who have shown much interest in the preservation and use of local languages. These stations include Musyi FM, Mbaitu FM and Syokimau FM which broadcast live in Kikamba.

Gonzolo (2004) outlines the great contribution that the sense relations of polysemy and homonymy accord the improvement of WordNet in respect to information retrieval and computer applications. All these indicate how important sense relations are, hence need for studies on them based on local dialects. The findings of this study will add more information to the already existing body of
knowledge on Bantu languages and form a source of reference for future researchers. Moreover, the study hopes to open a door so that other scholars will see the need to research and publish relevant literature in other Kikamba dialects alongside Kimasaku.

1.7 Scope and Limitation of the Study.

The study was done on Kimasaku although there are other Kikamba dialects such as Ki-Kilungu, Kitui North variety, and Central Kitui dialect (Maundu, 1980; Whiteley and Muli, 1962; Mathooko, 2004). Kimasaku was selected since it is the one used in the textbooks that were sampled for the study.

Although there are other lexical sense relations like synonymy, hyponymy and antonymy, the research limited itself to only homonymy and polysemy because these two have been the source of controversy for many scholars of semantics over the issue of their distinction (Stokoe, 2005). The study also limited itself to analysis based on commonality of different possible meanings of words using the Sense Relations approach. It did not consider differentiation based on the etymology of words. Greenbaum (1996) says that it is possible to have homonyms and polysemes in various word classes. Our study restricted itself to nouns and verbs since they are the most numerous and the most important (Burton, 1982: 129-134).

In this section, we have discussed the following areas: background of the study where the history of the Kamba people and their language with some of its dialects was discussed, statement of the problem which attracts the need to know how words are related in terms of lexical sense relations like synonymy, antonymy, hyponymy, homonymy and polysemy. Also research objectives based on distinction between homonymy and polysemy, research questions, and research assumptions, rationale of the study and the scope and limitation of the study. In the following section, we are going to look at the literature review and theoretical framework.
CHAPTER TWO

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This section presents the literature related to this research and theoretical framework within which
the research is based.

2.2.0 Literature Review

Literature review of this research is divided into four sub-sections: homonymy and polysemy,
methods used in distinguishing between homonyms and polysemes, sense relations and other
related works.

2.2.1 Homonymy and polysemy

Two meanings are psychologically related if the present-day users of the language feel intuitively
that they are related and therefore tend to assume that they are different uses of the same word
(Greenbaum, 1996; 428). He also notes that there are cases where historically related meanings are
not always psychologically related; likewise, there are cases where historically unrelated forms are
felt to be related psychologically (Leech,1974). Examples include ear (organ of hearing) and ear
(of corn) and weeds (wild, useless plants) and weeds (mourning garments worn by a widow). In
both these cases, Leech (1974: 228) says that the etymologies of the two meanings are quite
different as shown below:

a) ear (organ of hearing) Old Eng. eare (compare Latin anris, ear)
   ear (head of corn) Old Eng. ear (Compare Latin acus, aceris = hook)

b) Weed (wild useless plant) Old Eng weed (weed)
   weeds (Mourning garment) Old Eng wæd garment worn by widow)
Nevertheless, people often see a metaphorical connection between them and adjust their understanding of the words accordingly. Thus, what from a historical point of view is a homonymy resulting from an accidental convergence of forms, becomes reinterpreted in the context of present-day English as a case of polysemy (Leech, 1974: 229-230).

Greenbaum (1996) discusses homonyms as distinct cords that happen to have the same form as in the case of ‘bank’ where the words are pronounced the same, spelled the same and belong to the same word class. He also cites cases where homonyms like duck belong to different word classes, those of noun and of verb. This means it is possible to have homonyms in various word classes. Homonyms are, on one hand, contrasted with homophones and on the other with homographs. Homophones as is the case with “cell” and “sell”. However, homographs are spelled the same but pronounced differently as in the case of “lead” (/led/ and /liːd/). Finally, homomorphs are words with the same form that are related in meaning but are distinct grammatically. These are related by means of conversion. Examples include “laugh” which is both a verb and a noun and “calm” which is both a verb and an adjective (Leech, 1974). This study was only interested in homonyms in this case.

A lexical conception of polysemy was developed by Atkins (1991) (Wikipedia Encyclopaedia March, 2011) in the form of lexical implication rules. These are rules that describe how words, in one lexical context, can then be used, in a different form, in a related context. A crude example of such a rule is the pastoral idea of “verbizing one’s nouns”: that certain nouns, used in certain contexts, can be converted into a verb, conveying a related meaning as illustrated by the following sentences: That cow produces a lot of milk. Mwende has gone to milk that cow. The first milk
refers to substance and it is a noun while the second milk refers to the act of getting the substance from a cow's teats and is a verb.

A polyseme by definition according to Wikipedia, free encyclopaedia, refers to a word or phrase with multiple, related meanings. A word is judged to be polysemous if it has two or more related senses. Examples of polysemes include: first ‘chimney’ (pipe or funnel-like structure on a building for smoke to escape through) and second ‘chimney’ (narrow vertical space between rocks up which a climber can wriggle by pressing against the sides). Both senses contain the concept of a narrow vertical shaft in some solid material. A ‘Cup’ with a sense of (drinking vessel), and a ‘cup’ with a sense of (brassiere cup) are two senses that have the concept of container with particular round shape. A ‘Ceiling’ (top inner surface of a room) and a ‘ceiling’ (upper limit) have a related sense of a maximum upper boundary. ‘Drive’ (as in drive a nail) and ‘drive’ (as in drive a car) are two senses that show the concept of causing something to move in a particular direction (Lyons, 1977; Hurford and Hearsley, 1983; 120). A ‘Book’ (a bound collection of pages), and a ‘book’ (a text produced and distributed) shows that someone who has read the same text on a computer has read the same book as someone who had the actual paper volume.

2.2.2 Distinction between homonyms and polysemes

Several scholars have identified the distinction criteria for differentiating homonyms and polysemes. Among them is Lyons (1995; 34) who cites two aspects: etymology and relatedness of meaning. Other tests for differentiating the two sense relations found in Wikipedia, free encyclopaedia, 2011 include definitions, dictionary presentations, zeugma, speaker’s intuitions, linguistic function, word class and derivations.
a) Definitions

By definition of the terms, differences between homonyms and polysemes become clear. According to Lyons (1977) and Hurford and Hearsley (1983), a polyseme is a word or a phrase with multiple related meanings or senses. A word is judged to be polysemous if it has two or more senses whose meanings are related. For example, ‘guard’ (sentinel; a person who guards) and ‘guard’ (solid protective shield); both contain the concept of protection against danger.

On the other hand, a homonym is a word whose different meanings or senses are far apart from each other and not obviously related to each other in any way. For example ‘left’ (opposite of right) and ‘left’ (past tense of leave) (Lyons, 1977; 65). Also ‘bank’ which is a homonym (Greenbaum, 1996; 103) indicates that a river bank has nothing to do with a financial institution.

Also, according to Wikipedia, free encyclopaedia 2011, polysemes are words with the same spelling but related meanings while a homonym is one of a group of words that share the spelling and the pronunciation but have different meanings.

b) Dictionary presentation

Lexicographers define polysemes within a single dictionary entry, numbering different meanings such as 1, 2, 3…while homonyms are treated in separate entries (Hurford and Hearsley, 1983; 56). In this case, polysemes are treated as a single word with different meanings, which are numbered while homonyms are treated as different words with different meanings.

c) Etymology

Etymology is the study of the history of words and how their form and meaning have changed over time. According to Lyons (1995; 98), Polysemes have related meanings, which show that these may be as a result of sharing similar etymologies or historical backgrounds while in homonyms, there is one form of many lexemes with separate etymologies. A distinction may be made between
polysemes which have shared origin such as ‘mouth’ (of a river) and ‘mouth’ (of an animal) (Hurford and Hearsley, 1983; 58); the two senses are clearly related by the concept of an opening from the interior of some solid mass to the outside and of a place of issue at the end of some long narrow channel; and homonyms which are unrelated in origin such as ‘skate’ (glide on ice) and ‘skate’ (the fish). Another example is ‘fluke’ which has the following meanings:

- A fish and a flatworm.
- The end parts of an anchor.
- The fins on a Whale’s tail.
- A stroke of luck.

(Leech, 1974: 106)

All the four are separate lexemes with separate etymologies, but share the one form, ‘fluke’

e) Speaker’s intuitions

Intuition is the apparent ability to acquire knowledge without inference or the use of reason. The reliability of one’s intuition depends greatly on past knowledge and occurrences in a specific area. Intuition is a knowing, a sensing that is beyond the conscious understanding (Wikipedia, free encyclopaedia). The distinction between homonyms and polysemes can be based on intuitive semantic judgements. The speaker is only supposed to be subjected to a linguistic item and asked to pass judgement on it. The judgements may be based on polysemy and homonymy.

Intuitions about meaning can, if properly chosen, be clear and reliable. For example, the verb ‘to get’ can mean ‘take’ (I’ll get the drinks), ‘become’ (She got scared), ‘Have’ (I’ve got three dollars), ‘understand’ (I get it) (Cruse, 1986: 8-14).
f) Word class and derivations

One group of polysemes are those in which a word meaning an activity, perhaps derived from a verb, acquires the meanings of those engaged in the activity or perhaps the results of the activity for example the word playing which could be a verb as in (they are playing football) or a noun as in (playing football is enjoyable); or the time or place in which the activity occurs or has occurred. Sometimes only one of those meanings is intended, depending on context and sometimes multiple meanings are intended at the same. Other types are derivations from one of the other meanings that lead to a verb or activity. For example, ‘milk’ where the verb ‘milk’ (He’s milking it for all he can get) derives from the process of obtaining milk. (Wikipedia, free encyclopaedia, 2011)

g) Linguistic function

The linguistic function of words in language can also be used as criterion for distinguishing between the two sense relations of polysemy and homonymy. Homonyms may recur in a given text hence bringing a sense of monotony for example a fluke with a fluke got injured by a fluke while still in deep waters of the sea (the first fluke referring to a type of fish, second fluke refer to fins and the third referring to the end parts of an anchor) (Wikipedia, 2011).

2.2.3 Other related works.

Gonzolo (2004), Miller and Teibel (1991) outline the great contribution that the sense relations of polysemy and homonymy accord the improvement of Wordnet. The researchers were able to realize a full potential of Wordnet as a standard way for lexical resources in computational analysis. This has a bearing on our study as it explains the usefulness of the two sense relations.

Murianki (2007) looks at the structural semantics study of kinship terms in Gichuka and Ki-igungbe dialects of Kimeru. His study is useful to us as it discusses part of the lexical sense relations and uses Sense Relations Theory, which is also useful to our study.
2.3.0 Theoretical Framework

2.3.1 Introduction

This study draws from the Sense Relations Theory (Cruse, 1986; Kempson, 1977; Hurford and Hearsley, 1983).

We could have used Semantic Theory but this proved to be wide and general as it asserts that semantics must rise to the Chomskyan challenge of generativeness - the ideal that is fully explicit and literally applicable description. Weinreich (1972) observes that if a semantic theory is to furnish a procedure for evaluating alternative descriptive statements, it must assure the comparability of such statements by specifying the exact form in which they are made. This is true for Sense Relations Theory which is a theory within semantics and which narrows itself to sense relations hence suitable for our study.

Our study could not use Componential Analysis approach which confines itself to a number of basic semantic components or features of a lexeme. This method of semantic description has been applied successfully to kinship terms. Our study was not interested in looking at semantic features hence this method was of little use to us.

Sense Relations Theory was felt to be more relevant as it adequately explained the distinction between senses of words, which was our main concern.

2.3.2 The Sense Relations Theory

Lexical sense relations include synonymy, hyponymy, antonymy, homonymy and polysemy. This research limited itself to only homonymy and polysemy because these two have been the source of controversy for many scholars of semantics over the issue of their distinction (Stokoe, 2005).

The basic tenet of the Sense Relations Theory is that the sense of an expression has its place in a system of semantic relationships with other expressions of language (Kempson, 1977). The theory
seeks to use lexemes (family of lexical units) in place of words in explaining meaning and sees a lexical unit as the unit of a lexical form that carries a single sense meaning (Cruse, 1986).

This study draws from the following paradigmatic sense relations: Polysemy – the relation in which one term names others closely related in meaning and homonymy - the relation where a term may mean two different things (Hurford and Hearsley, 1983; Kempson, 1977; Palmer, 1981; Cruse, 1986).

The Sense Relations Theory informs the study in that, for instance, we can explain the terms nzou (elephant) and nzou (placenta) (Kimilu, 1962:12) as a homonymous case as these have unrelated meaning.

A case of homonymy can be summarized as:

A constituent (C) with meanings M1, M2, M3, M4 .......where M1, M2, M3, M4....... are unrelated. (Katz, 1972: 34-60).

A case of polysemy can be summarized as:

A constituent (C) with meanings M1, M2, M3, M4 .......... where M1, M2, M3, M4 .......... are closely related. (Katz, 1972: 34-60).

In this chapter two, our concern has been the review of the related literature where we have looked at homonyms and polysemes, tests for distinction between homonyms and polysemes, and other related works. We have also looked at theoretical framework where we have discussed the Sense Relations Theory and its tenets. Next, we are going to look at the methodology.
CHAPTER THREE

3.0 METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This section describes the research design, area of study, sample size and sampling procedure, data collection procedures, data analysis and presentation.

3.2 Research Design

The study utilized the qualitative research design in handling the data collected. Specifically, it used the descriptive method. Studies of this kind require analysing information in a systematic way in order to come to some useful conclusions and recommendations as opposed to scientific researches that call for quantification of data for purposes of analysis (Mugenda, 1999).

The technique employed generally yielded the descriptive details on the sense of the lexemes and their categorization as either homonymous or polysemous words.

3.3 The Area of Study

Field research was conducted in Kangundo District in three locations. These were Kawethei, Mbiuni and Matungulu. These were assumed to be representative of the entire region where Kimasaku is spoken.

3.4 Sample Size

The sample for our study took two forms namely, words and respondents. Firstly, a total of 30 words (15 nouns and 15 verbs) were sampled from a Kikamba dictionary (Mwau, 2006). Secondly, the respondents' population for the research study was sampled from 3 locations in Kangundo District. The sample size was 30 respondents sampled as 10 from Kawethei, 10 from Mbiuni and 10 from Matungulu.
3.5 Sampling Procedures

We used two sampling procedures, one for the lexemes required by the study and the other for the respondents.

3.5.1 Purposive Sampling
Lexemes with more than one meaning were selected from a Kikamba Dictionary (Mwau, 2006) using the purposive sampling method. In this kind of sampling, the researcher uses his judgement and prior knowledge to choose subjects which would best serve the purpose of the study (Kothari, 1990) and decides the purpose he/she wants them to serve. The number of words in the Kikamba Dictionary was 8128. Out of these 6816 words had a single meaning each. Those with two or more meanings were 1312. We were only concerned with words with multiple meanings since Lobner (2002) says that one can only recognize a case of polysemy or homonymy if the senses concerned are related or unrelated. The percentage of multiple meaning words was 1312/8128 x 100 = 16%.

Still on the basis of purposive sampling, we sampled nouns and verbs. Out of 1312 words, 746 were nouns and 566 verbs. Using the systematic random sampling method of picking the Kth item (Wambua, 2000) which provides fixed and consistent intervals of lexeme sampling, 15 nouns were sampled from 746 nouns and 15 verbs sampled from 566 verbs. This gave a total of 30 lexical items; the 30 lexemes were taken to respondents in order to be assigned meanings. For each of the 30 lexemes, the respondent was asked to supply as many meanings as their inituitions could allow.

Later the researcher compiled all the meanings of one lexeme provided by all the 30 respondents. The researcher then used two dictionaries to verify the meanings and/or supplement the ones provided by respondents. If the meaning provided by the respondents was not found in the two dictionaries, the researcher denoted it as new and if a meaning of a lexeme in the dictionaries was
not supplied by respondents, the researcher added it to the corpus. The reason for this was to gather as many meanings of one lexeme as possible. The two dictionaries used here were *Kikamba Dictionary* by Mwau (2006) and *Kikamba- English Dictionary* by Mutisya and Nduna (2003). These were the only recent Kikamba dictionaries. The Mwau (2006) dictionary was chosen on the basis that it is the only purely Kikamba while Mutisya and Nduna (2003) dictionary is said to have benefited from the earlier *Kikamba – English Dictionary* of 1939. The three sources of data proved to adequate, if not comprehensive.

3.5.2 **Snowball Sampling**

To identify appropriate respondents in the field research, we used the snowball-sampling method. In this method, a researcher locates one or more key informant(s) and asks them to name others who would be likely candidates for the research (Denscombe, 2002). In a relatively small population, snowballing is an effective way to build an exhaustive sampling frame. In our research, we were interested in old people aged 60 years and above since they were assumed to be highly proficient in Kikamba. Our research only required 30 respondents. 10 respondents were identified from each of the three locations: Kawethei, Mbiuni and Matungulu. In each location, 5 men and 5 women were picked for gender balance. Apart from being helped by the village elders, we used a ‘friend of a friend’ approach developed by Milroy (1980: 44) to identify the respondents.

3.6 **Data Collection Procedures**

In step one, data in the form of nouns and verbs was collected from the *Akamba Dictionary* (Mwau, 2006). In step two, another set of data, this time in the form of the meanings of nouns and verbs obtained in step one, was collected from three sources: respondents, Kikamba dictionary (Mwau, 2006) and Kikamba – English dictionary (Mutisya and Nduna, 2003).
The relatedness or otherwise of the meanings obtained in step two was provided by the respondents. Different respondents were visited and appointments booked since all the interviews could not be conducted on the same day. Each respondent was visited at least four times – twice for the meanings of the sampled words and twice for the relatedness or otherwise of the multiple meaning.

Each respondent answered questions from an interview schedule containing 30 sampled lexemes. The researcher tried to create rapport with the respondents and explained the purpose of the study and how to respond to the questions.

Additional meanings were got from the two dictionaries. All the meanings from the three sources were compiled by the researcher and taken to respondents so that they could determine the relatedness or otherwise of the multiple meanings of the sampled words.

### 3.7 Data Collection Instruments

#### 3.7.1 An Interview Schedule

An interview schedule which comprised a set of items or questions was filled in by the researcher as answers were supplied by the respondents in a face-to-face interaction. Essentially, a schedule is a questionnaire that is read to the respondents (Marete, 2004: 52). This is useful in a case where information is to be obtained from respondents who are illiterate or old, and also where the respondents do not understand the questions and need some assistance from the interviewer in a personal interview.

The interview schedule was used to obtain the information which could not be obtained from the dictionaries like additional meanings to the words which we denoted as new and meaning relatedness or otherwise of the sampled words. The technique was appropriate since it enabled the researcher to tap the knowledge held by speakers of Kimasaku regarding the multiple meanings of
the words presented to them by the researcher. They were also able to determine whether the senses of the meanings provided to words were related or not. All the interview sessions were tape-recorded.

3.7.2 A Pilot Survey

A pilot survey was done before the actual comprehensive data collection. This was conducted to 5 respondents. Each respondent was subjected to an interview schedule to answer the set questions based on the first 10 words of the total 30 words. Since the respondents were aged people, the researcher read the questions to them. This helped in identifying any potential problems with the interview schedule hence avoiding a waste of time, money and effort that results from a defective survey (Mulwa, 2009). The results of the study provided an encouraging feedback necessary for ensuring feasibility of the study. It showed that the respondents were willing to sacrifice their time to answer the asked questions.

3.8 Ethical Considerations

Permission to conduct the research was obtained from the Office of the President through the chief. A letter from Kenyatta University introducing the researcher to relevant people proved useful. The village elders were used to introduce the researcher to the respondents.

3.9 Data Analysis

The researcher compiled all the meanings of one lexeme provided by the 30 respondents and the additional ones from *Kikamba dictionary* (Mwau, 2006) and a *Kikamba-English Dictionary* (Mutisya and Ndunda, 2003).

Meanings provided by the but which were absent for the two dictionaries were denoted as (new) by the researcher. Also (n) was used for nouns and (v) for verbs.
Finally, tables indicating relatedness of meanings or otherwise according to the intuitions of the respondents. Patton (1990), points out that massive qualitative data collected from research instruments such as interview schedule needs to be organized with significant patterns to reveal the essence of the data. Responses were analysed and reported qualitatively.

In this chapter, we have looked at the qualitative research design used in the description of data collected, area of study which was Kangundo District, sampling procedures for both words and respondents which were the purposive and snowball methods, data collection procedures, the instruments used, ethical considerations and data analysis. In the next chapter, we are going to look at data analysis, interpretation and discussion of the data collected.
CHAPTER FOUR

4.0 DATA ANALYSIS, INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION.

4.1 Introduction

This section presents and analyses the data and presents the findings of the study through the use of tables, percentages, graphs and pie charts. In addition, the researcher applied description as an analysis technique because of the nature of the data handled. Analysis was based on the set objectives.

The researcher categorized all the lexemes below as polysems, homonyms or H-P (homonymy-polysemy) intermediaries using the Sense Relations Theory. Its basic tenets are that a constituent $C$ with meanings $M_1, M_2, M_3, M_4$ where $M_1, M_2, M_3, M_4$ are unrelated is a case of homonymy and case where $M_1, M_2, M_3, M_4$ are all related, the constituent $C$ is a polysemy (Katz, 1972;35).

Since we failed to get an established term to refer to the category where a word had meanings in both categories of polysemy and homonymy, we called it H-P intermediaries.

As explained in the methodology chapter, the respondents were asked to provide the meanings of the sampled lexemes and also to say whether the meanings are related or not. Below we present their responses, lexeme by lexeme, on the relatedness or otherwise of these words.

4.2.0 Responses on the Meanings of the Sampled Words

In this analysis, most meanings were got from the respondents, others from Mwau (2006) Kikamba dictionary and a few from Mutisya and Ndunda (2003) Kikamba – English dictionary whose initial purpose was for verification of meanings originating from the respondents. Below, (v) is used to denote verbal meanings while (n) is used to denote noun. After every meaning, the source is indicated. The meanings provided by the respondents and are not in the two dictionaries are indicated as (new).
Responses on Akila

1. (v) Ikya kanywa (to put into the mouth) – This is found in Mwau (2006) and Mutisya (2003)
2. (v) Neeny’a/ kandia (to argue with/ bargain) – This meaning is available in Mwau (2006)
3. (v) Kusungila ndeto na ukumu /kunena nai (to answer arrogantly/ no agreement – addition from respondents (new)
4. (v) Kutavya mundu ni ake mwako vandu (to tell somebody to erect a building in a certain place) e.g akila vaa (construct it here) – addition from respondents (new)

From the above information, we see that respondents were able to generate new meanings of the word *akila* (M3 and M4). Dictionary writers may add these two meanings in their future editions.

**TABLE 4.1 Determining the relatedness of the meaning of Akila**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>NO. OF RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1-M4 syiusiana na kutumia kanywa (involve use of mouth)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn’t know</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failed to answer</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the respondents had varied opinions concerning relatedness or unrelatedness of meanings as indicated above, the researcher, on invoking the Sense Relations Theory, concurred with the 21 who said that all meanings M1-M4 are related in that they all involve use of mouth organ. M1 involves to put into the mouth especially to eat or chew or swallow; M2- one argues using the mouth; M3- one answers any question using his or her mouth and M4- one instructs verbally. Therefore the four meanings involve use of the mouth to initiate an activity. This means that *Akila* is a case of polysemy.

Respondents here provided 2 new meanings in addition to what was found in the two dictionaries consulted for meaning verification.
4.3.2 Responses on Ananga

2. (v) Tumia nai (waste/ misuse e.g time, money etc) - also found in Mwau (2006)
3. (v) Asya (to spoil) e.g tuma mundu ungi asya kielelo kana mwikalile (influence someone’s behavior/ conduct negatively) - also found in Mwau (2006)
4. (v) kuoa (to bewitch) – addition from respondents (new)
5. (v) Taanya/ kuthuany’a andu (to sow discord in people/ cause to separate). – addition from respondents (new)
6. (v) Kutuma kindu kyasya maana (to make something/ someone lose meaning or value or reputation/ to malign someone’s character) – addition from respondents (new)
7. (v) thokoa (distort what had been put in place) e.g thokoa mivango (distort plans or statement) – addition from respondents (new)

TABLE 4.2 Determining the relatedness of the meaning of Ananga

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>NO. OF RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maana Syonthe syi muonza M1-M7 -itenye nundu syonania wasyo/ wanangiko (all the seven meanings are related because they denote something negative in terms of loss, lack of respect, insufficiency, regret and misunderstanding)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All meanings are unrelated</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn’t know</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table shows that the majority of the respondents (21 out of 30) considered all the seven meanings related. Only a few (3) felt that all the meanings are unrelated. Five respondents said that
they did not know whether the meanings were related or not. Only one respondent failed to answer.

The researcher felt that after consideration of all the meanings provided by the respondents, the seven meanings were related because they denoted something negative in terms of loss, lack of respect, insufficiency, regret and misunderstanding which may bring about hatred. The study therefore establishes that this is a case of polysemy.

4.3.3 Responses on Andika

1. (v) Kwatanya ndeto (to write)- found in Mwau (2006) and Mutisya and Ndunda (2003)
2. (v) Onanya (to display)- found in Mutisya and Ndunda (2003)
3. (v) Nenga wia (employ/ engage someone for some job)- also found in Mwau (2006) and Mutisya and Ndunda (2003)

Table 4.3 Determining the relatedness of the meaning of Andika

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>NO. OF RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1- M3 syet e kumanyika (lead to one being popular) na vaita (and benefits)</td>
<td>21-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1- M3 are unrelated.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not know</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failed to answer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above table, the majority of the respondents (21) observed that all the three meanings were related. Seven respondents said that they did not know whether the meanings were related or not while only one respondent failed to answer.

The researcher observed that M1-M3 are related in that employment (M3) is associated with a written record on terms of service and terms and conditions of the job and also something written
Mlbecomes visible just as something displayed is. Therefore, by use of the Sense Relations Theory, the word *Andika* is a case of polysemy.

### 4.3.4 Responses on *Inda*

1. (v) ikalya kindu kiwuni (to soak, submerge) - found in Mwau (2006) and Mutisya and Ndunda (2003)
2. (v) ususya iima (to fill a hole) - found in Mutisya and Ndunda (2003)
3. (v) kengana (to cheat/lie/hide the truth) – addition from respondents (new)
4. (v) vingia seli (to lock someone in cells) – addition from respondents (new)
5. (v) kuvwikania kindu kiw’e e.g kuinda maiyu (to cover something like a fruit to ripen e.g cover bananas to ripen.- also found in Mwau (2006).
6. (v) kwiaanny’a mwana ute muviku (to incubate a premature child especially done in hospitals.= this is metaphorically used. – addition from respondents (new)
7. (v) vulanya na mauuta/ iia/ kiwu (mix something e.g flour, cement, soil, with oil, milk or water)

#### TABLE 4.4 Determining the relatedness of the meaning of *Inda*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>NO. OF RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1, M2, and M3 itianye nundu kielelo ni kuvwika na kiw’u kana uvungu (the intention is to fill with soil or submerge in water or blindfold using lies)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M7 nditienye na ingi ( M7 is not related to others as it involves kuvulanya/kwongelanya/ koloka (mixing with a liquid and so is M2 as it involves filling )</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4, M5 and M6 syina utianyo nundu syonanasya ualyuku wa kindu (M4,M5 and M6 are related as they touch on a change in state of something e.g unripe to ripe, rehabilitation, lead to maturity.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1,M2, M3 are neither related to M4, M5 and M6 nor to M7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not know</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failed to answer</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The above table shows the presence of different sets (M1, M3, M5), (M4, M5, M6) and (M7). Members of a similar set are related hence polysemous while they differ from members of the other sets thus exhibiting instances of homonymy. The researcher agreed with the respondents’ views and concluded that the word *inda* is a case of H-P intermediary.

### 4.3.5 Responses on **Itema**

1. (n) Nyama ya nda (a liver) - found in Mwau (2006) and Mutisya (2003)
2. (n) Kitheka kite me (a newly cleared land) - also found in Mwau (2006).
3. (n) Wenge (a cleared strip in the forest) - also found in Mwau (2006) and Mutisya (2003).
4. (n) Uwau (a disease/ a liver disease) – addition from respondents (new)

### TABLE 4.5 Determining the relatedness of the meaning of **Itema**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>NO. OF RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M2 and M3 itienye nundu syonany’a vandu vathesye (M2 and M3 are related as they show a cleared piece of land which may be turned into a shamba or garden)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1 and M4 itenye nundu syonany’a kilingu kya mwii (itema) ( M1 and M4 are related as they involve a body organ known as liver)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No relation</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn’t know</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above shows that the majority of the respondents (23) felt that all the four meanings were unrelated. A few, on the other hand, said some meanings were related e.g (M2, M3) or (M1, M4). This means that (M2, M3) are not related to members of the set with (M1, M4). The researcher did not concur with this group of respondents forming the majority but observed that M2 and M3 are related in that they involve clearing of a vast land while M1 and M4 involve a body organ - the liver. The first set (M2, M3) is not related to (M1, M4). Therefore, this is a case of H-P intermediary.
4.3.6 Responses on *Itumo*

1. (n) Muthemba wa ikita (a type of spear)- found in Mwau (2006) and Mutisya and Ndunda (2003)
2. (n) Uvya wa Mbusya (a rhino horn)- also found in Mwau (2006)
3. (n) Muti muasuvye wa uthauka na syana sya sukulu (javelin) – addition from respondents (new)

**TABLE 4.6 Determining the relatedness of the meaning of *Itumo***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>NO. OF RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maana Syonthe (M1-M3) itienye nundu syonany’a syindu syina muthya (all</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the three meanings are related in that they refer to things with sharp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pointed ends and can be used for protection, security or competitions as</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in games)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn’t know</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Considering the responses captured in the table above, the majority of the respondents (22 out of 30) felt that all the three meanings are related. The researcher agreed with them and the reason they gave and concluded that *Itumo* is a case of polysemy.

4.3.7 Responses on *Ivu*

1. (n) Muvuko wa liu mwiini.(stomach/belly/abdomen) - found in Mwau (2006) and Mutisya and Ndunda (2003)
2. (n) Kuitava kwa mundu muka (pregnancy)- also found in Mwau (2006) and Mutisya and Ndunda (2003)
3. (n) Itomo/Kuthuunika (greed)-metaphorical. – addition from respondents (new)
4. (n) Mundu munou muno ethiwaa ena ivu inene (a fat person) – addition from respondents (new)
5. (n) Mundu utavunaa mituki aya liu (a person is not easily satisfied after eating food) – addition from respondents (new)
6. (n) Ungu wa …(the under belly of…) Mwau (2006).

TABLE 4.7 Determining the relatedness of the meaning of *Ivu*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>NO. OF RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1-M6 itieny’e nundu syonania mavu ni ilungu sya mwii wa mundu kana nyamu monthe methiawa itheo wa kithui (M1 – M6 are related as they are in reference to body part of human beings or animals found below the chest).</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not related</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn’t know</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the meanings are related in the sense that they refer to the part of human body below the chest. There is also a metaphorical relationship for a greedy person is said to have a big stomach (this means that he or she eats too much).

The researcher agreed with the respondents hence accepted *ivu* as a case of polysemy.

4.3.8 Responses on *Iwoya*

1. (n) Ivuuta ya nguku/Isoni (a small chicken feather)- found in Mwau (2006) and Mutisya and Ndunda (2003).
2. (n) Vandu vonyunga nai (a place with a foul smell)- found in Mutisya and Ndunda (2003)
3. (n) Mwambile wa Ng’ombe (bellowing/moowing of a cow) – addition from respondents (new)
TABLE 4.8 Determining the relatedness of the meaning of *Iwoya*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>NO. OF RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1, M2 and M3 vai undu syiitenye (all the three meanings are not related)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn’t know</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failed to answer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above responses, the majority of the respondents said that the three meanings were unrelated. The researcher concurred with them and after invoking the sense Relations Theory declared *iwoya* a case of homonymy.

4.3.9 Responses on Kasukali

1. (n) Uwau uetawe nikwithiwa na sukali mwingi mwiini (diabetes) - found in Mwau (2006) and Mutisya and Ndunda (2003).
2. (n) Muthemba wa maiu meithiawa na sukali mwingi (a variety of bananas which is small in size and very sweet) - found in Mutisya and Ndunda (2003)
3. (n) Sukali wa kiasi kinini (a little amount of sugar) - also found in Mwau (2006).
4. (n) Musamo wa liu ula wi muyo/ liu wi muyo wiwaa wi kasukali (a delicious or tasty food) = metaphorical – addition from respondents (new)
The Majority of the responses show that the respondents felt that all the meanings were related. The researcher concurred with them, although he observed that M1 is associated with the presence of excess sugar in the body hence sickness. Therefore, this a case of polysemy.

4.3.10 Responses on *Kisasi*

1. (n) Maemanw’a (conflict, feud, animosity, vendetta)- found in Mutisya and Ndunda (2003)
2. (n) Muio wa kau (a bullet, gun cartridge)- found in Mwau (2006) and Mutisya and Ndunda (2003)
3. (n) Kimena (hatred, differences) - found in Mutisya and Ndunda (2003)
4. (n) Uthu (enemity)- found in Mutisya and Ndunda (2003)
### Table 4.10: Determining the Relatedness of the Meaning of *Kisasi*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>NO. OF RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1-M4 synthe itieny’e nundu no syete kivuvu na kwithiwa mundu ate mwianie, kimena na kumisya (all the four meanings are related as they involve some feelings of tension and discomfort which results from hatred, an indication that there could be squabbles e.g. presence of bullets (fight).</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not related</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn’t know</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher agreed with those respondents who said that the meanings are related and also with the reasons they gave since all the meanings have a notion of tension and discomfort e.g. a bullet may be used in situations of conflict. *Kisasi* is therefore a case of polysemy.

#### 4.3.11 Responses on *Kithana*

1. (n) Muthemba wa ngamu yuma mitini ta minyua na miseme (a glutinous substance that comes out of trees like the acacia species (sap).- found in Mwau (2006) and Mutisya and Ndunda (2003)
2. (n) Iia ya mbee kuma nondoni itina wa nyamu kana mundu kusyaa (colostrum).- also found in Mwau (2006) and Mutisya and Ndunda (2003)
3. (n) Iia yikwatanu (cuddled milk).- also found in Mwau (2006) and Mutisya and Ndunda (2003)
From the above responses, the majority of the respondents felt that the meanings were related. The researcher agreed with them since in all the meanings, there is secretion of a thick substance. He therefore concluded that this is a case of polysemy.

4.3.12 Responses on Kithu

1. (n) Kitala kya nyamu ta ngiti (a paw of a dog)- found in Mwau (2006) and Mutisya and Ndunda (2003)
2. (n) Ikinya yumanite na kithu (a print of a paw) - also found in Mwau (2006)
3. (n) Kw’oko kutilitwe syaa (a hand without fingers)- also found in Mwau (2006) and Mutisya and Ndunda (2003)
4. (n) Mundu utalumwa ni nthi/wangangaa okila saa (a person who keeps on loitering)= metaphorical– addition from respondents (new).
5. (n) Isyitwa ya mundu muume ula usyaitwe mundu/umae utaii na maau kana moko kana utalumawa ni nthi (name of a person named after someone who had deformed legs(without toes) or hands(without fingers) or one who used to loiter) – addition from respondents (new)
6. (n) Unyaii (a foot) mostly used informally to create humour. It could also be derogatory. You can tell someone off by using the term. – addition from respondents (new)
TABLE 4.12 Determining the relatedness of the meaning of *Kithu*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>NO. OF RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1-M6 syusiana na ilungu sya mwii sya nyamu kana andu (all the six meanings are related in that they indicate to parts of animals or human body)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1, M2, M4 and M5 not related to M3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn’t know</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above table, most of the respondents said that all the meanings were related. Only a few felt that one meaning (M3), was not related to the other five meanings. The researcher concurred with those who said that the all meanings were related in that they all involve the presence of a paw. On M3, he felt that it was related with others as a hand without fingers resembles a paw hence many people will refer to it as a *kithu*. This is therefore a case of polysemy.

4.3.13 Responses on *Kivwau*

1. (n) Kindu kya kwonany’a (a sign board)- found in Mutisya and Ndunda (2003)
2. (n) Kilinga (a spool of thread)- found in Mwau (2006) and Mutisya and Ndunda (2003)
3. (n) Mundu wa kwikwatw’a kana wa kwatiiwa (someone who is reliable and may be used as a positive role model = metaphorical– addition from respondents (new).
TABLE 4.13 Determining the relatedness of the meaning of *Kivwau*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>NO. OF RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1 and M3 nisyonanasya nthia kana ngaliko ya kwendela kana mwelekeo</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(M1 and M3 are related as both indicate a direction or the way to use/go. They guide on direction to follow)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No relation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn’t know</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failed to answer</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table shows the majority felt that M1 and M3 are related but unrelated to M2.

The researcher agreed with the reasons they advanced. This therefore shows that kivwau exemplifies both polysemy and homonymy hence a case of H-P intermediary.

4.3.14 Responses on *Kunyaeka*

1. (v) *Kutanisya* (to spread)- found in Mwau (2006)
2. *(v)* *Kuvalaana* (to be far apart/ stay away from others) – addition from respondents (new)
3. (v) *Kutambalalya* (to stretch legs/ open legs) – addition from respondents (new)
4. (v) *Kwingiva* (to be many in numbers/ perceived so due to being widespread)= metaphorical- addition from respondents (new).

TABLE 4.14 Determining the relatedness of the meaning of *Kunyaeka*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>NO. OF RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1-M4 itieny’e nundu syonania syindu syithiawa syitevamwe ( all the four meanings are related as they reflect the case of things that are spread randomly, e not in one place. Things are far apart)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No relation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn’t know</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to the table above, four respondents said that the four meanings had no relation at all. The researcher concurred with the 17 respondents who said that all meanings were related in that all the meanings bring the idea of something spreading out to cover a wide area such that individual units are far apart. Therefore, *kunyaeka* is a case of polysemy.

### 4.3.15 Responses on *Kututa*

1. (v) Kuthesya vandu ta nyumba (to sweep e.g a house)- found in Mwau (2006)
2. (v) Kueka/ kuveta maundu mathuku (to do away with vices) – addition from respondents (new)
3. (v) Kwithiwa ngya nundu wa kumina mali vyu /kuthoosya mali vyu (to clear stock or ones savings/wealth and be left poor). – addition from respondents (new)

#### TABLE 4.15 Determining the relatedness of the meaning of *Kututa*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>NO. OF RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1-M3 itieny’e nundu syonania kuveta kiko kana mali (M1-M3 are related because they involve doing away with something like dirt or possessions)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not related</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn’t know</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failed to answer</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As this table shows, only a few respondents thought that the three meanings were not related but the majority felt the were all related. The researcher agreed with the majority as well as the reasons they advanced to support their assertion though he observed that M1 and M2 are positive while M3 is negative. He felt that all the meanings have something to do with clearing something that exists, hence a case of polysemy.
4.3.16 Responses on *Lekya*

1. (v) Eka ukwata (to release/ let go)- found in Mwau (2006)
2. (v) Syaa matumbi (to lay eggs)- also found in Mwau (2006)
3. (v) Ekana na muunda (to fallow a piece of land)- also found in Mwau (2006) and Mutisya and Ndunda (2003)
4. (v) Kunengane/ kwithiwa wi mulau (to give out/ being generous)- also found in Mwau (2006)
5. (v) Kuthasya mundu kuma kolokoloni (to release an inmate from the cells/to acquit -also found in Mwau (2006) and Mutisya and Ndunda (2003)
6. (v) Eka unenga mundu utethyo kana usuvio/ukwata mbau (withdraw support/ care from somebody/ leave someone alone. – addition from respondents (new)

**TABLE 4.16 Determining the relatedness of the meaning of *Lekya***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>NO. OF RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maana syonthe syi thanthatu itieny’e nundu syonanya kwathukia (ta nguku isyaa mathai), kueka undu/ kindu kana kutia mundu emanthie syindu mwene atena utethyo waku (All the six meanings are related as they involve the act of releasing (hen laying eggs) or leaving someone alone as a result of withdrawing support / this also involves generosity )</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not related</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the respondents felt that M1-M6 were related. The researcher agreed with them but observed that M1-M5 were positive as they involved releasing what with a good intention while M6 may result to someone suffering. This word is therefore a polysemous.

4.3.17 Responses on *Lolonga*

1. (v) Seuvya laini (to queue)- found in Mwau (2006)
2. (v) Lilinga/sembany’a (to chase after)- found in Mutisya and Ndunda (2003)
3. (v) Asavya kinene (to prolong a talk)- also found in Mwau (2006) and Mutisya and Ndunda (2003)

4. (v) Kukulilya undu (enquire on something persistently) – addition from respondents (new)

5. (v) Kwithiwa andu me aingi (presence of many people especially in need of something)= metaphorical– addition from respondents (new).

6. (v) Kwatany’a ve muvango (to join some things with consistency) – addition from respondents (new)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 4.17 Determining the relatedness of the meaning of Lolonga</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RESPONSES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1-M6 itieny’e nundu syonania kwithiwa syindu ivangitwe syatianite musitalini umwe (all meanings M1-M6 are related as they involve being in a single file like being in a queue or doing something in succession)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failed to answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above responses, the majority of the respondents said that all the meanings were unrelated and only three felt that the six meanings were related. The researcher agreed with the latter as he felt that all the meanings involve arrangement of things in a single file as if in succession. He observed that: M1 shows things being in a queue which reflects a succession such that from one you go to next; M2 involves a case of things moving in the same direction following one another; M3 is that a prolonged talk has words following each other in succession; M4 involves persistent enquiry with questions following each other in succession; M5 shows that many things are arranged in a systematic manner and M6 refers to joining things one after the other. The researcher therefore concluded that lolonga is a case of polysemny.
4.3.18 Responses on Maau

1. (n) Ilungu sya mwii ila itetheasya kungama na kutambuka kwa syumbe ta andu kana nyamu (legs of people or animals)- found in Mwau (2006) and Mutisya and Ndunda (2003)

2. (n) Ilungu sya kindu ta kitaa kana uii (legs of a piece of furniture like bed/table) – addition from respondents (new)

3. (n) Utonyi wa kui kana kusemba (ability to move at a speed) = metaphorical- addition from respondents (new)

4. (n) Ituvi (a reward) = metaphorical- addition from respondents (new)

5. (n) Itwiki (supporters/ pillars) – addition from respondents (new)

**TABLE 4.18 Determining the relatedness of the meaning of Maau**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>NO. OF RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1-M5 itieny’e nundu syonthe syonania syindu sya utetheesya kuungama</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(M1-M5 are related as they involve the idea of support which may lead to something standing upright or move without losing a balance or feel motivated in doing something like in the case of having been given a reward).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not related</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn’t know</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of respondents that all the meanings are related. The researcher concurred with their reasoning although he observed that M4 could be taken as an idea of support to someone who appreciates the reward given and feels backed up by those who provide the reward hence involves a feeling of motivation and the zeal to go on with what he was being rewarded for. Meanings M1-M5, except M4, clearly indicates a case of pivoting. Although there are those respondents who felt that all the meanings were unrelated, we can conclude that the word maau is a case of polysemy.
4.3.19 Responses on *Mbio*

1. (n) Kilungu kya mwii kila kithambasya nthakame (a kidney)- found in Mwau (2006) and Mutisya and Ndunda (2003)
2. (n) Muae, kiko kyumanaa na syuki (a soot)- also found in Mwau (2006) and Mutisya and Ndunda (2003)
3. (n) Liu/ nyama (food/ meat) – addition from respondents (new)
4. (n) langi mwiu (black colour) – addition from respondents (new).

**TABLE 4.19 Determining the relatedness of the meaning of *Mbio***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>NO. OF RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1 and M3 itieny’e nundu kilungu kya mwii no kitumike ta nyama ya kuya kwa kuvivwa kana kuua (M1 and M3 are related in that the part of body – kidney may be used as meat after roasting, frying or boiling)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maana M2 and M4 itieny’e nundu wa langi mwiu (M2 and M4 are related because they involve a black colour)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(M1,M3) are not related to (M2,M4)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn’t know</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results on the above table show that a considerable number of respondents felt that M1 and M3 are related while others said that M2 and M4 are related. There are those who said that M1 and M3 are not related to M2 and M4. The researcher agreed with both groups and the reasons they gave. He agreed that members of the same set are related while the two sets are not related. Therefore, the researcher concluded that the word *mbio* involves a case of H-P intermediary.

4.3.20 Responses on *Ndeto*

1. (n) Nthoo ngwatany’e (a word)- found in Mutisya and Ndunda (2003)
2. (n) Uneeni (a talk)- found in Mwau (2006)
3. (n) Uvoo Museo ta wa witikilo (Good news/ Glad tidings)- also found in Mwau (2006)
4. (n) Iteta ( a quarrel = metaphorical)- also found in Mwau (2006) and Mutisya and Ndunda (2003)
5. (n) Ngewa ( stories) – addition from respondents (new)
6. (n) Makwatanio (agreement) – addition from respondents (new)
7. (n) Isyitwa ya mundu usyaitwe mutavanya wa uvoo museo wa mbivilia ( a name of a person named after someone who was a preacher of Good news) – addition from respondents (new)
8. (n) Utavye wa kutethya mundu mithenya yukite (a piece of advice given to someone to help them in future) – addition from respondents (new)

TABLE 4.20 Determining the relatedness of the meaning of Ndeto

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>NO. OF RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1-M8 itieny’e nundu syonania maundu ma uneeni kwa kutumia kanywa kana kwa kuandika (all the eight meanings are related as they involve communication whether verbal or written which is a human activity and may lead to acquisition of ideas, help, knowledge agreement, or disagreement)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not related</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn’t know</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above table, the majority said that all the meanings were related. The researcher concurred with this observation as well as with the reasons given. The researcher went ahead to observe that all the meanings, except M4, are positive in that communication is made with good intentions. M4- (a quarrel) may lead to disagreement hence a negative communication. It was therefore concluded that this is a case of polysemy.
4.3.21 Responses on Ngovia

1. (n) Kindu kya uvwika mutwe (a hat, cap, helmet) - found in Mwau (2006) and Mutisya and Ndunda (2003)
2. (n) Kindu kya kuita nyumba (a roof ridge) - found in Mutisya and Ndunda (2003)
3. (n) usumbi / unene (royal highness) - addition from respondents (new)

TABLE 4.21 Determining the relatedness of the meaning of Ngovia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>NO. OF RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maana Syonthe syonania kindu kwithiwa yiulu wa kingi (all the three meanings (M1-M3) involve something being on the top most part hence related) on top of another)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All meanings not related</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not know</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the table 4.21 shows, the majority of the respondents said that all the meanings were related and that they involved something being in the top most section. Those who said that the meanings were unrelated were seven. Those who did not know about relatedness were five. The researcher agreed with those who said that all the meanings were related. He accepted the idea of being in the top most part since a hat (M1) is worn on someone’s head which is the top most part of the body, a ridge (M2) which is placed at the apex of house’s or building and the royal highness refers to highest rank in authority in any regime. Therefore, it is worth to conclude that ngovia is a case of polysemy.

4.3.22 Responses on Salukya

1. (v) Tumua metho (to open one’s eyes) - found in Mwau (2006) and Mutisya and Ndunda (2003)
2. (v) Manya (realize/ understand) = metaphorical - also found in Mwau (2006) and Mutisya and Ndunda (2003)
3. (v) Ona (to see) - also found in Mwau (2006)
4. (v) Vinduka (to wake up for a while) = metaphorical - also found in Mwau (2006)
5. (v) Vindiisya (to think or meditate about something) = metaphorical – addition from respondents (new)

TABLE 4.22 Determining the relatedness of the meaning of Salukya

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>NO. OF RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1-M5 itieny’e nundu syonania kuvingua metho ni kana uelewe (M1-M5 are related in that they involve opening of one’s eyes which may lead into a new dawn, new understanding, or awareness)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not related</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn’t know</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By looking at the results of the table above, the majority of the respondents (26) considered all the five meanings to be related. The researcher agreed with them and their reasons. It is true that all the meanings show that there is a new realization or awakening. It was only a few respondents who said that the meanings were unrelated (2). Here, we concluded that salukya is a case of polysemy.

4.3.23 Responses on Tamba

1. (v) tambaa, nyaiika, songa (to creep e.g a plant) - found in Mwau (2006) and Mutisya and Ndunda (2003)
2. (v) Ongeleka (to increase in number) - also found in Mwau (2006)
3. (v) Kuneneva/Kusyaana/Kuingiva (to multiply) – addition from respondents (new)
4. (v) Kutunga muvea/kwathimika (to be blessed, to prosper) – addition from respondents (new)
5. (v) Kuendeea (to continue) – addition from respondents (new)
TABLE 4.23 Determining the relatedness of the meaning of *Tamba*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>NO. OF RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1-M5 itieny’e nundu syonania ve kwingiva, kuneneva kana kwiana (M1-M5 are related in that they denote a case of an increment of something like size, growth, or development e.g there is increase in numbers)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn’t know</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failed to answer</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the study as per the table above is that most of the respondents said that M1-M5 were related. The researcher was in agreement with them and the reason they advanced - that there is growth, multiplication or development. With an increase of something, a case of spreading to cover a wide area is noted. The conclusion here is that there is growth or prosperity as a result of one’s blessings. Therefore, this is a case of polysemy.

4.3.24 Responses on *Tandika*

1. (v) Kuna (whip, cane, flog) - found in Mutisya and Ndunda (2003)
2. (v) Nyaaikya unyaasye (spread to dry) – addition from respondents (new)
3. (v) Kwalany’a (to spread e.g a bed) – addition from respondents (new)
4. (v) Umaalya nza wonany’e (to display)- found in Mutisya and Ndunda (2003)
5. (v) Kuvua (to thresh like millet or maize) – addition from respondents (new)
6. (v) Thauka(kithembe/Ngoma/kithalu/mwase (to play an instrument such as a drum) – addition from respondents (new)
7. (v) Kuseuvya (to rectify) = metaphorical – addition from respondents (new)
TABLE 4.24 Determining the relatedness of the meaning of Tandika

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>NO. OF RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1, M5, M6 and M7 itieny’e nundu syusiana na kutumia vinya kukuna kana kuvua ni kana voneke useo, kwonthe ni kuseuvya (M1, M5, M6 and M7 are related as they involve human action involving use of some force which may lead to likeable results)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2, M3, M4 itieny’e nundu syina kunyaekya kindu kyoneke (M2, M3, M4 are related in that they involve the act of spreading or displaying something)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(M1, M5, M6, M7) are not related to (M2, M3, M4)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn’t know</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failed to answer</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above shows that according to the respondents, some meanings are related while others are not while a few did not know or failed to answer. The researcher agreed with those respondents and their reasons. Due to the presence of related meanings in one group which are not related to those of the other, we concluded that tandika is a case of H-P intermediary.

4.3.25 Responses on Thinga

1. (v) aka na ndaka (to build with mud) - found in Mutisya and Ndunda (2003)
2. (v) vaka/mala/kwatangya (to smear with dirt) - found in Mutisya and Ndunda (2003)
3. (v) nengane vate umu (to give out generously) - found in Mutisya and Ndunda (2003)
4. (v) (Kuthinga) ithiwa na kithito na wendi wa kuthukuma (be energetic, industrious, diligent) - found in Mwau (2006).
5. (v) kuthinga mwatu/vaka kithingo/ muvua mwatuni (to rub a mixture of honey and beeswax into a hive to attract bees) – also found in Mwau (2006)
TABLE 4.25 Determining the relatedness of the meaning of *Thinga*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>NO. OF RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1, M2, and M5 iti ene nundu syonania kuvaka kindu kitweku ukwenda useo</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(M1, M2, and M5 are related as they involve smearing with a liquid form in anticipation for good results)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3, and M4 syonanasya wi museo anduni (M3, and M4 are related in that they reflect the case of desire to do good like being a generous person)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1, M2, and M5 are not related to M3, and M4.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn’t know</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the table above indicates, we see that quite a number of respondents had different observations. The researcher accepted their views after invoking the Sense Relations Theory. The results here were that there emerged two sets of separately related meanings i.e (M1, M2, M5) and (M3, M4). The two sets are not related. By consensus with the respondents, the researcher concluded that thinga is a case of H-P intermediary.

4.3.26 Responses on *Venia*

1. (v) kusalukya na kulalya na mituki (to blink) - found in Mwau (2006)
2. (v) kena (flash- momentary blockage or emission of light e.g cars, torches’ flash) - also found in Mwau (2006)
3. (v) onekana (to be seen) – addition from respondents (new)
TABLE 4.26 Determining the relatedness of the meaning of *Venia*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>NO. OF RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1, M2 and M3 itieny’e nundu syusianaa na undu wa mituki- ivenia na isalukkyya na kwonthe kumanaa na kutumia metho kwona (M1, M2 and M3 are related as they involve high speed, haste or frequency and the sense of sight).</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not related</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn’t know</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failed to answer</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12 out of the 30 respondents, as shown in the table above, said that M1-M3 are related. Nine respondents also said that the meanings were not related. After keen introspection, the researcher concurred with those who said the meanings were related. He also accepted the reason that they gave. It can therefore be concluded that *venia* is a case of polysemy.

4.3.27 Responses on *Vika*

1. (v) Thengeeya (come closer) – addition from respondents (new)
2. (v) Uma, Imika (to reach maturity) - found in Mutisya and Ndunda (2003)
3. (v) Mina savali (to complete a journey/ reach destination) - found in Mutisya and Ndunda (2003)
4. (v) Kwianiisya kiwango (to hit the target) – addition from respondents (new)
5. (v) Kwithiwa vo (avail oneself) – addition from respondents (new)
6. (v) kuuma kwa mongu (to harden e.g a gourd) – addition from respondents (new)
TABLE 4.27 Determining the relatedness of the meaning of *Vika*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>NO. OF RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1-M6 itieny'e nundu syonthe syonania kwithiila vala ukwendaa/ kuvika vala ukwendaa/mwisho (M1-M6 are related as they express the case of being where you prefer/ getting where you wanted to be/end/ attaining the target)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All the meanings not related</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn’t know</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failed to answer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Looking at the above table, half of the respondents said that all the meanings were unrelated. After looking at the meanings closely, the researcher did not concur with these respondents. Although only 8 respondents said that all the meanings were related, the researcher felt convinced and agreed with the reasons they had advanced. By appealing to the Sense Relations Theory, we concluded that this was a case of polysemy.

4.3.28 Responses on *Vitany’á*

1. (v) Kosa (to make a mistake, err, get it wrong) - found in Mutisya and Ndunda (2003)
2. (v) Ika nai (to sin) – addition from respondents (new)
3. (v) tula mwiao kana watho (commit a crime or break a promise) – addition from respondents (new)
4. (v) isilya kindu vakuvi na kingi (cross an object over another) - found in Mutisya and Ndunda (2003)
5. (v) kulea kueleanwa/ kukosana (to differ/ get into a conflict) – addition from respondents (new)
6. (v) Kumenana (to hate one another) – addition from respondents (new)
TABLE 4.28 Determining the relatedness of the meaning of Vitany’a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>NO. OF RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maana Syonthe ateo M4 itieny’e nundu syonania kwika nai kana ikosa (All meanings except M4 are related in that involves committing a mistake, a sin or a crime. This may also involve breaking a promise leading to a conflict or hatred).</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All the meanings are not related</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn’t know</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failed to answer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From this table, most of the respondents said that all the meanings were unrelated. Others said that all the meanings, except M4, are related. Those who said that they did not know were very few and only one respondent declined to answer. After a close examination, the researcher concurred with those who said that all the meanings were related except M4 and agreed with the reasons they gave. This shows that all other meanings are polysemous while M4 is homonymous to these. Therefore, vitany’a is a case of H-P intermediary.

4.3.29 Responses on Wimbu

1. (n) Uvuviiu wa mwii (a swelling) - found in Mwau (2006) and Mutisya and Ndunda (2003)
2. (n) Uthatu (a rage/anger) – addition from respondents (new)
3. (n) Unene wa kindu/waamu (breadth/width)- found in Mutisya and Ndunda (2003)
4. (n) Uwau (a disease resulting from swelling) – addition from respondents (new)
5. (n) Imba mutwe/ kwimba mutwe/ ithiwa muemu (a rude person)= metaphorical.- found in Mwau (2006)
TABLE 4.29 Determining the relatedness of the meaning of *Wimbu*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>NO. OF RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1-M5 itieny’e nundu Syonthe syonania kuneneva (M1-M5 are related</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as they involve increase in size, being swollen or expansion)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not related</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn’t know</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failed to answer</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above table, the majority of the respondents said that M1-M5 are related. Only a few said that all the meanings were not related. The researcher concurred with the respondents who said that all meanings were related and agreed with the reason that they gave - that all the meanings involve increased size. For instance M2 when someone is angry or in a rage, there is a possibility of swelling with emotions (the idiomatic expression huffing and buffing with anger). The conclusion is that *wimbu* is a case of polysemy.

4.3.30 Responses on *Woo*

1. (n) Kyalya (pain) - found in Mwau (2006) and Mutisya and Ndunda (2003)
2. (n) Uthilik/kyua (callousness/inhumanity) - also found in Mwau (2006)
3. (n) Kimeto/kyeva (suffering) - also found in Mwau (2006) and Mutisya and Ndunda (2003)
4. (n) Thina (a problem) – addition from respondents (new)
5. (n) Kyeva (sorrow) - found in Mutisya and Ndunda (2003)
6. (n) nthika/uthatu (rage/anger) – addition from respondents (new)
TABLE 4.30 Determining the relatedness of the meaning of *Woo*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>NO. OF RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1-M6 itien’ye nundu Syonthe syonania kwiv’a nai (M1-M6 are all related as they all lead to a bad feeling like that of pain, suffering, sorrow, grief, anger or may lead to indifference in someone due to problems faced)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not related</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn’t know</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table shows that the majority of the respondents were in agreement that all the meanings are related. Only two respondents said that none of the meanings were related. The researcher’s opinion is that the meanings are related as they reflect discomfort and an unpleasant state or situation. Consequently, this is a case of polysemy.

Having looked at the meanings of the sampled words and whether the meanings are related or not, we now show how polysemes, homonyms and H-p intermediaries are distributed.

TABLE 4.31 A Summary of the Classification of Noun Meanings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEXICAL SENSE</th>
<th>NO. OF WORDS</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Polysemes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homonyms</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-P intermediaries</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the table above, the occurrence of polysemes is the highest at 73.3% followed by that of H-P intermediaries at 20% while homonyms are the lowest at 6.7%.

This shows that most nouns are polysemous.
TABLE 4.32 A Summary of the Classification of Verb Meanings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEXICAL SENSE</th>
<th>NO. OF WORDS</th>
<th>PERCENTAGES %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Polysemes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homonyms</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-P intermediaries</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table shows that polysemes are 11 forming the highest percentage of 73.3% followed by H-P intermediaries which are 4 in number and form 26.7%. There are no homonyms.

This study shows that there are no purely homonyms among the verbs category.

TABLE 4.33 Overall Distributions of Polysemes, Homonyms and H-P Intermediaries in All the 30 Lexemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEXICAL SENSE</th>
<th>NO. OF WORDS</th>
<th>PERCENTAGES %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Polysemes</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homonyms</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-P intermediaries</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results here show that the overall distribution of polysemes is the highest at 22, forming a percentage of 73.3%. H-P intermediaries follow at 23.3% while homonyms form the least percentage of only 3.4%.
5.0 SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This section summarises the findings of the study and presents conclusions and recommendations emanating from an investigation of homonymous and polysemous relations in Kimasaku, a dialect of Kikamba. Also included in this section are suggestions for further research.

5.2 Summary of findings

The aim of this study was to investigate the distinction between homonymy and polysemy in Kimasaku within the Sense Relations approach. A number of objectives were set to guide the collection of the required information.

The first objective involved identifying words with multiple meanings in Kimasaku. This was done using a Kikamba dictionary (Mwau, 2006). From this dictionary, 1312 words were identified as having multiple meanings out of a total of 8128 words. During this process, 6816 words were found to have only a single meaning. 15 nouns and 15 verbs were selected and presented to respondents who were required to supply the meaning of these words. In agreement with the dictionary, they confirmed that the selected words had multiple meanings. They even supplied additional meanings. Mutisya and Ndunda (2003) dictionary was used to verify meanings provided by both the respondents and Mwau (2006). It also provided more meanings which were recorded by the researcher.

The research established that respondents supplied more meanings of words than there were in the two dictionaries. In the listing of the meanings, those which were provided by the respondents and were not in the dictionaries were indicated as new by the researcher.

The second objective sought to determine which of the meanings are homonymous and which are polysemous based on intuitions of the speakers. Through the use of respondents, meaning relatedness or otherwise of the sampled words was established. Majority of the respondents were able to say when the meanings were related and when not. This did not mean that all the
respondents were in agreement, for some were saying that they did not know about any relatedness or otherwise of the meanings of the sampled words while a few were declining to give us answers. Out of the 30 words, 73.3% were found to be polysemous, 3.4% homonymous and 23.3% H-P intermediaries.

Regarding word classes, out of 15 nouns, polysemes form 73.3%, homonyms 6.7% and H-P intermediaries 20%. Thus, most nouns turned out to be polysemous. Homonyms were very few. Among verbs, 73.3% were polysemous, 0% homonymous and 26.7% H-P intermediaries. This shows that verbs just like nouns, have far more polysemous meanings than homonymous ones.

As claimed by Lyon (1995), Hurford and Hearsley (1983) and Greenbaum (1996), we found that although there are some clear cases where one can easily establish instances of homonymy and polysemy, sometimes it is difficult to determine whether a word is homonymous or polysemous. This was contrary to our expectation that multiple meanings clearly fall under homonymy or polysemy.

In our statement of the problem, we observed that there are assertions that in some languages homonymy is a rare case to find and usually happens as an accidental phenomenon while polysemy is abundant (Lobner, 2002). In this connection, our study sought to establish whether this was the case in Kimasaku. The study did ascertain that polysemous words were more abundant than homonyms in the corpus of the words with multiple meanings. Homonyms formed a paltry percentage.

The third objective was to determine the extent to which the Sense Relations Theory is useful in distinguishing between homonyms and polysemes. Using the theory we found that some words had meanings whose senses were not related at all. These were homonyms. Other words had all the meanings related according to the views of the respondents and the researcher. These were polysemes. This coincided with our assumptions. Most interesting was a situation where some sets of meanings seemed to be related while differing with other sets in the same word or respondents felt that some meanings were more closely related than others. Using this theory, we found it difficult to declare these words either as homonyms or polysemes. This was seen as a limitation in the theory. For our convenience, we referred to these words as H-P intermediaries. We felt that the sets of meanings which were related were polysemous sets while those unrelated were homonymous sets though within the same word. The study therefore found the Sense Relations
Theory suitable only to some extent in testing whether a lexeme was a homonym or a polyseme based on meaning relatedness.

We found it important to observe that although comparison of Mwau (2006) and Mutisya and Ndunda (2003) dictionaries was not one of our objectives, we saw that Mwau (2006) had more meanings to words than Mutisya and Ndunda (2003).

5.3 Conclusion

Based on the findings of the study, we conclude that, firstly, there are many words with multiple meanings in Kimasaku. Secondly, most of the multiple meanings of words are polysemous with a few being homonymous. Also there are those that are H-P intermediaries and thirdly that the Sense Relations Theory is to some extent useful in distinguishing between cases of homonymy and polysemy in Kimasaku.

5.4 Recommendations

In the light of the findings and conclusions, the study makes the following recommendations. Lexicographers using Kimasaku dialect should conduct a thorough research amongst old people in order to obtain more meanings of words when developing their work since our study found them very resourceful. Meanings provided by the respondents in this study which are not there in the dictionaries should be added by the lexicographers to those dictionaries in future revised editions.

5.5 Suggestions for Further Research

In the light of our study, the following are suggested as areas for further research:

i. Our study dwelled on homonyms and polysemes in noun and verb classes. Other studies could be conducted based on other word classes like adjectives, and adverbs.

ii. Distinction between homonymy and polysemy using etymology of words in Kimasaku.

iii. Researches based on semantics especially on other lexical sense relations like synonymy, hyponymy and antonymy should be carried out in Kikamba dialects.


Kenyatta University.


APPENDIX 1
AN INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

(A) INFORMATION ABOUT THE RESPONDENT

1. Age of the respondent ..............................

2. Physical location of the respondent:
   A. Location.................................

(B) OBJECTIVES

1. To identify words with multiple meanings in Kimasaku.

2. To determine which of the meanings are homonymous and which are polysemous based on the intuitions of the speakers.

3. To determine the extent to which the Sense Relations Theory is useful in distinguishing between homonymy and polysemy.

(C) QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED ORALLY BY THE RESPONDENTS:

i) Elesya maana syonthe ila wisi yiulu wa ndeto ii syi vaa itheo (supply meanings to words provided below)

ii) Maana isu itienye ata? (how are the meanings related?)
APPENDIX 2
LIST OF HOMONYMOUS, POLYSEMOUS WORDS AND H-P INTERMEDIARIES

**Homonyms**
Iwoya

**Polysemes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Akila</th>
<th>Kithu</th>
<th>Salukya</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ananga</td>
<td>Kunyaeka</td>
<td>Tamba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andika</td>
<td>Kututa</td>
<td>Venia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itumo</td>
<td>Lekya</td>
<td>Vika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivu</td>
<td>Lolonga</td>
<td>wimbu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasukali</td>
<td>Maau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kisasi</td>
<td>Ndeto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kithana</td>
<td>Govia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**H-P intermediaries**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inda</th>
<th>Itema</th>
<th>Kivwau</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mbio</td>
<td>Tandika</td>
<td>Thinga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitanya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOUNS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Itema</th>
<th>Akila</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Itumo</td>
<td>Ananga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivu</td>
<td>Andika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iwoya</td>
<td>Inda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasukali</td>
<td>Kunyaeka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kisasi</td>
<td>Kututa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kithana</td>
<td>Lekya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kithu</td>
<td>Lolonga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kivwau</td>
<td>Salukya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maau</td>
<td>Tamba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mbio</td>
<td>Tandika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ndeto</td>
<td>Thinga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngova</td>
<td>Venia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wimbu</td>
<td>Vika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>Vitany’a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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