

DECLARATION

**THE SYNTACTIC PATTERNS OF CODE-SWITCHING  
IN EKEGUSII-ENGLISH**

own original work submitted for a degree at any university.

Bitutu  
TERESA BITUTU

BY

**TERESA BITUTU**

This thesis has been submitted for examination with my supervisor, the university supervisor.


**A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT FOR  
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS IN ENGLISH  
IN KENYATTA UNIVERSITY.**

ANDREW THOMAS

20th July 1991  
DATE

1991

Bitutu, Teresa  
*The syntactic  
patterns of*



1992/201085

DECLARATIONS

I declare that this thesis is my own original work and has not been submitted for a degree in any other university.

I am very appreciative with Kenyatta University for offering me the scholarship. I would also like to thank Dr. Andrew Thomas, my supervisor and Dr. Bitutu English Department, Kenyatta University for their continued guidance in

Bitutu  
TERESA BITUIU

and Mrs. Orjala, Carol and 2nd July 1991 and encouragement they accorded me during this study. Last but not least, I would not forget all those who made this work possible especially Mr. Njaguna and Mr. Kibiki of the English Department, Kenyatta University.

This thesis has been submitted for examination with my approval as the university supervisor

DR. ANDREW THOMAS

2nd July 1991  
DATE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I register my appreciation with Kenyatta University for offering me the scholarship. I would also like to thank Dr. Andrew Thomas, my supervisor, and Dr. Joseph Muthiani, Chairman, English Department, Kenyatta University, for their continued guidance in this study. Special thanks go to Mr. and Mrs. Ochola, Carol and Maureen for the support and encouragement they accorded me during this study. Last but not least, I would not forget all those who made this work possible especially Mr. Njuguna and Mr. Kitivi of the English Resources Centre, Kenyatta University.

TABLE OF CONTENTS		Page
<u>Content</u>		<u>Page</u>
Title.....		i
Declaration.....		ii
Acknowledgement.....		iii
Table of contents.....		iv
List of symbols and abbreviations.....		vii
Abstract.....		ix
<b>CHAPTER 1</b>		
1.0 Introduction.....		1
1.1 Background of the study.....		1
1.2 Statement of the problem.....		2
1.3 Rationale of the study.....		3
1.4 Scope and Limitation of the study.....		5
1.5 Objectives of the study.....		8
1.6 Hypotheses.....		9
1.7 Methodology.....		9
1.7.1 Data collection.....		9
1.7.2 Data analysis.....		13
1.7.3 Results presentation.....		17
<b>CHAPTER 2</b>		
2.0 Theoretical Framework and Literature Review.....		18
2.1 Theoretical Framework.....		18

<u>content</u>	<u>page</u>
2.2 Literature Review.....	22
2.2.1 Spanish-English code-switching.....	24
2.2.2 Russian-French code-switching.....	30
2.2.3 Hebrew-Spanish code-switching.....	30
2.2.4 Yoruba-English code-switching.....	31
2.2.5 Bokamba on 'general' constraints.....	33
 <b>CHAPTER 3</b>	
3.0 The syntactic structures of Ekegusii and English : Similarities and Differences.....	35
3.1 Syntactic Typology.....	35
3.2 Similarities.....	36
3.2.1 Noun Phrase.....	36
3.2.2 Verb Phrase.....	37
3.2.3 Conjunctions.....	39
3.3 Differences.....	39
3.3.1 Noun Phrase.....	39
3.3.2 Verb Phrase.....	45
3.3.3 Other general differences.....	51
 <b>CHAPTER 4</b>	
4.0 Data Analysis and Results Presenation.....	53
4.1 Introducion.....	53
4.2 Code-switch Patterns.....	54
4.2.1 EK->ENG Patterns.....	54
4.2.2 ENG->EK Patterns.....	61

<u>content</u>	<u>page</u>
4.3 Code-switch Constraints.....	66
4.3.1 EK->ENG Constraints.....	68
4.3.2 ENG->EK Constraints.....	77
4.3.3 Comparison of EK->ENG and ENG->EK Constraints.....	83
4.4 Comparison of Ekegusii <-> English constraints with other code-switch constraints.....	85
4.4.1 Spanish-English vs Ekegusii <-> English..	86
4.4.2 Ekegusii-English vs Russian-French.....	90
4.4.3 Ekegusi-English vs Spanish-Hebrew.....	91
4.4.4 'Universal' constraints vs Ekegusii <-> English.....	91
<b>CHAPTER 5</b>	
5.0 Summary and Conclusion.....	97
5.1 Summary of findings.....	97
5.2 Conclusions.....	98
Bibliography.....	104
Appendices.....	107-110

## A LIST OF SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS

Ekegusii <-> English	- switching from Ekegusii to English and vice versa
EK->ENG	- switching from Ekegusii to English
ENG->EK	- switching from English to Ekegusii
Adj	- Adjective
Adv	- Adverb
Advl	- Adverbial
Ass	- Assertive
Aux	- Auxiliary
Conj	- Conjunction
Det	- Determiner
GL	- Gloss
L <sub>1</sub>	- First Language
L <sub>2</sub>	- Second Language
Mod	- Modal (verb)
N	- Noun
NP	- Noun Phrase
Num	- Number
Obj	- Object
P	- Preposition
Perf	- Perfect(ive)

PP	-	Prepositional Phrase
Pres	-	Present
Pro	-	Pronoun
Prog	-	Progressive
S	-	Sentence
Sg	-	Singular
V	-	Verb
VP	-	Verb Phrase

- \* - exception structure
- \*\* - odd structure
- \*\*\* - unacceptable structure
- + - items on either side

The of this sign are morphologically bound switching. The findings were grouped into two, that is, covers-switch patterns and code-switch constraints. These were further grouped according to the sequence of the code, i.e. Ekegusi->English and English->Ekegusi. In the Ekegusi->English sequence, a total of 21 (twenty one) patterns were identified while the constraint is numbered 18 (eighteen). English->Ekegusi had 20 (twenty) patterns with 18 (eighteen) constraints.

The Ekegusi->English constraints were compared with those of other code-switches. Ekegusi->English had seven constraints in common with Spanish-English,

## ABSTRACT

This research was carried out to identify the syntactic patterns of code-switching in Ekegusii <-> English and any syntactic constraint on the code-switch that there may be. What is meant by constraint here is that two elements in a sentence cannot collocate if they are in two different codes because the construction would be ungrammatical.

Data (code-switch utterances) was collected from a total of 43 (forty three) Ekegusii <-> English speakers and it was supplemented by the researcher's intuitive code-switch constructions. The results revealed that there exist certain syntactic constraints on code-switching. The findings were grouped into two, that is, code-switch patterns and code-switch constraints. These were further grouped according to the sequence of the codes, i.e Ekegusii -> English and English -> Ekegusii. In the Ekegusii-> English sequence, a total of 21 (twenty one) patterns were identified while the constraints numbered 16 (sixteen). English-Ekegusii had 20 (twenty) patterns with 10 (ten) constraint structures.

The Ekegusii <-> English constraints were compared with those of other code-switches. Ekegusii <-> English had seven constraints in common with Spanish-English,

three with Russian-French, one with Yoruba-English and five out of the seven claimed to be universal with a few exceptions in some of the constraints.

The thesis is divided into five chapters. Chapter 1 comprises the introduction and research methodology. Chapter 2 contains the Theoretical Framework and Literature Review. Chapter 3 briefly discusses some syntactic similarities and differences in the two codes. The discussion is mainly based on the internal structures of the Noun Phrase and the Verb Phrase. The findings of the research are presented and discussed in chapter 4. A summary of the findings and the conclusion are contained in chapter 5.

## CHAPTER ONE

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

#### 1.1 Background of the study

Code-switching is a common phenomenon in many bi- and multilingual informal settings. The term 'code' refers to a system or sub-system of linguistic communication and, as such can refer to a dialect, a style of speaking, or a distinct language like English, Ekegusii, Kiswahili, French etc... As used here, code refers to a distinct language and code-switching is therefore the alternation in speech between two languages.

The research under discussion was done on Ekegusii-English code-switching. Although the title reads Ekegusii-English, data analysis was not restricted to those sentences starting in Ekegusii and switching to English. Those switches from English to Ekegusii were also analysed because it was realised that there is a lot of back and forth switching between the two codes. The analysis of switches from English to Ekegusii, henceforth ENG->EK (as opposed to EK->ENG), also helped to clarify whether the switching from EK->ENG differed from that of ENG->EK and which one was the predominant sequence, EK->ENG or ENG->EK.

The research particularly focussed attention on the syntactic structure of the code-switch speech to find out what syntactic patterns there are, what syntactic constraints, if any, exist in the code-switch, what rules govern these constraints and on which codes these rules are based.

Syntax, from which the word 'syntactic' is derived is the study of the rules governing the way words are combined to form sentences in a language, (Crystal, 1985).

What is meant by syntactic constraint is that certain syntactic elements cannot collocate in the code-switch because the construction would be ungrammatical.

Ekegusii is the language spoken by the Gusii, a Bantu group that comes from Nyanza province of Kenya. In many written records, the language is also known as Gusii and in a few as Kisii. English being the official language in Kenya is spoken by a large number of people hence the code-switching among Ekegusii-English speakers.

## 1.2 Statement of the Problem

Some of the researches done on code-switching claim that there are language - pair specific syntactic constraints if not general ones. Some of the alleged

general or universal constraints have been counter-exemplified by among others, Bokamba (1986) and Berk-Seligson (1986). The aim of this study was therefore to analyse the syntactic structure of Code-switched sentences in Ekegusii <-> English and to establish whether there are regular syntactic patterns, syntactic constraints on code-switching, what rules govern these constraints if they exist and, on what codes they are based.

### 1.3 Rationale of the Study

Research on code-switching has not been as wide and as thorough as research on several other areas of language. As will be evident in the literature review, most work on code-switching started in the 1970s and is far from being exhausted. No research is known to have been done on Ekegusii - English.

The linguistic structure of code-switching has in recent years given rise to questions such as:

1. Are there syntactic constraints on code-mixing?<sup>1</sup> (Bokamba 1986).
2. Are there universals on code-switching?
3. What linguistic knowledge do speakers need to have in order to distinguish meaningful

---

1 In this study, code-switching is synonymous with code-mixing. See further clarification under Literature Review.

juxtaposition from mere random alternations?

4. Are there hybrid rules created in code-switching? (Woolford, 1983).

It is questions such as these that provoked this study.

There has been some controversy over the existence of general linguistic constraints on code-switching. While some authorities like Gumperz (1982), Timm (1975, 1978), Pfaff (1979), Poplack (1980), among others, would have it that there are general constraints on code-switching, i.e constraints that are common in all code-switches, others such as Bokamba (1986), Berk-Seligson (1986) and El-Noory, as cited in Bokamba (1986), argue that there are no general syntactic constraints on code-switching. These conflicting views and the questions already raised made it necessary for further research on the subject, especially on the Ekegusii <-> English code-switching which has not been researched on.

The research findings will provide more data on code-switching and also contribute towards solving the conflict already mentioned. Poplack (1980) has been working towards a typology of code-switching and this requires as much information on code-switching as possible. It was the intention of this research to

contribute towards the advancement of the study on code-switching.

#### 1.4 Scope and Limitation of the Study

##### 1.4.1 Scope of the study

The study was addressed to the analysis of intrasentential switching and not intersentential. Linguistically, intersentential analysis will not yield findings regarding syntactic patterns of code-switching because, as we have seen in sub-section 1.1, syntax deals with the structure of the sentence and syntactic patterns are therefore an intrasentential phenomenon.

As has already been indicated, the research was not restricted to Ekegusii-English but also included English-Ekegusii for reasons already explained.

The research focussed its attention on the surface structure of the code-switched sentences and NOT on the deep structure. The deep structure of a sentence is represented in an abstract way displaying all the factors that govern how its meaning is to be understood.. Surface structure on the other hand is a more concrete representation giving the string of morphemes that closely correspond to what we would hear if the sentence were spoken. A morpheme is


the minimal distinct unit of grammar.

The following examples illustrate the notions of deep and surface structures.

Surface structure:

The girl ate the food.

Deep structure:



S = Sentence

NP = Noun Phrase

VP = Verb Phrase

V = Verb

Aux = Auxiliary

N = Noun

det = determiner

num = number (Singular/Plural)

Sg = Singular

#### 1.4.2 Limitations of the Study

The study faced some limitations. The most suitable data required was spontaneous utterances

in code-switch and the most suitable instrument for this kind of data elicitation was tape-recording. This, however, faced some problems in that it was realized that most people tend to be self-conscious when they realise that their speech is being recorded and are therefore not as natural in their speech as we would like them to be. This meant that the recording had to be done as discreetly as possible through anonymous observation, (Milroy 1987). This discreet recording meant that some chances for data collection were ignored simply because the circumstances would not allow recording without the speakers being aware of it. To minimize the above limitation, the researcher and her assistants tried to collect data from people known to them because first, they would be freer with each other than with strangers, and this would facilitate code-switching. Secondly, it would enable them to record the speech more easily than if they were to deal with strangers.

Due to the short time available for this research, it was found necessary to limit the number of respondents as well as the data. The respondents were limited to forty - three in the actual exercise.

With the limitations discussed above, it was found necessary for the researcher to use her intuition to construct some possible sentences in code-switch

which were then tested through informant - testing (see data analysis). This intuitive data supplemented the actual utterances.

Since no unacceptable code-switch sentences were collected, sentences collected had to be manipulated to see if there are any syntactic constraints on code-switching, (Gumperz 1982). (Also see data analysis).

## 1.5 Objectives of the Study

### General Objective

The general objective of the study was to analyse the syntactic patterns of Ekegusii - English code-switching and their syntactic constraints which, as will be seen later, were found to exist.

### Specific Objectives

1. To collect empirical data on code-switch utterances.
2. To analyse the syntactic patterns of the code-switch sentences.
3. To analyse the syntactic constraints on Ekegusii <-> English code-switching.
4. To identify the rules that govern these constraints and the codes on which these constraints are based.
5. To make a comparison between EK->ENG and

ENG->EK code-switch patterns and constraints.

6. To compare identified constraints with those of other code-switches and especially those claimed to be universal.

## 1.6 Hypotheses

1. Code-switch sentences have a systematic syntactic structure and are not random.
2. Rules governing the syntactic structure of the code-switch may be either common to both codes or from either of the codes involved.
3. A speaker who code-switches has competence in both codes as well as the code-switch.

## 1.7 Methodology

### 1.7.1 Data Collection

#### 1.7.1.1 Place of data collection

This research was carried out in Kisii district and in Nairobi. More emphasis was placed in Kisii in view of the fact that the population there being predominantly Gusii, there would be more chances of getting Ekegusii-English code-switching than anywhere else.

Although it had initially been thought that more data would be collected from the urban areas of

Kisii, it was later realized that it was even more important to select appropriate settings for data elicitation irrespective of the place, whether urban or rural. It was much easier to elicit data from respondents the researcher was familiar with than from strangers. To illustrate the importance of appropriate setting for data elicitation, out of the twelve conversations taped in Kisii, only four were in the urban area, one was in a bus and the rest were in the rural area.

#### 1.7.1.2 Sample

It had initially been planned that the sample should comprise a minimum of forty (40) Ekegusii-English speakers but the number rose to forty-three during the actual exercise.

It was obviously not possible to get an even number of sentences from each speaker as conversations varied in length. A total of 374 spontaneous code-switch sentences were transcribed and these were supplemented by the researcher's forty-six (46) intuition sentences. In all 420 sentences were analysed.

### 1.7.1.3 Method of Sampling

Both random sampling (Phillips 1985), and purposive sampling were used. Random sampling was used in collecting code-switch utterances that were heard by chance i.e. not elicited or prior arrangements made to get them.

Most of the data was got from the purposive sample. This method of sampling involves selection of a sample based on the researcher's knowledge and judgement. The respondents in this sample were picked depending on the researcher and her assistants' knowledge of their linguistic competence in the two codes. This method was also opted for because it enabled data elicitation from as natural a setting as possible because the elicitors had some familiarity with the respondents and they could converse freely. This familiarity between the elicitor and the respondents also made it possible for the elicitors to sometimes initiate a conversation on a topic in which code-switching was likely to take place. (For method of recording see 1.7.1.5).

### 1.7.1.4 Assistants

Two university undergraduates assisted in data collection. The two, who have a good command of Ekegusii and English, were instructed by the

researcher on how to record code-switch utterances. They were further instructed to target Ekegusii-English bilingual respondents and, especially those whom they are familiar with for easy recording. They were told to use the tape-recorders discreetly and record in writing the details of each data elicitation situation, i.e the participants and the place where the conversation took place.

#### 1.7.1.5. Data Elicitation

The general research method that was employed was the survey method in which both participatory and non-participatory observation was used. (Milroy, 1987). The researcher also used her intuition to construct possible code-switch sentences whose acceptability was checked through informant testing i.e the intuition sentences whose acceptability was in question were checked with other Ekegusii-English speakers.

In the participatory observation, through which most of the data was collected, the researcher and her assistants took part in conversations and where possible initiated conversations on topics they felt the participants were likely to code-switch.

Code-switch utterances were mainly discreetly

tape-recorded especially those that were collected through participatory observation. Most of the data collected through non-participatory observation was recorded in writing because most of these utterances were encountered in places such as shops, buses, bus-stops, hotels etc... and were quite short. It was also not possible to stay around where strangers were conversing and record long stretches of conversation without causing suspicion. There were instances of writing as little as one sentence from a pair of people conversing. (See appendix 1 for data elicitation situations).

#### 1.7.2. Data Analysis

The data analysis was done in three major steps, two of which also had sub-steps. First, the tape-record utterances were written out in exactly the way they were spoken. The syntactic patterns of the code-switches, viz. EK->ENG and ENG->EK, were analysed and grouped according to the above sequences. The patterns were written in abbreviation with the major constituent (S, NP and VP) within which the switch or constraint occurs, i.e sentences (S), Noun Phrase (NP) and the Verb Phrase (VP) indicated to the left and the exact element comprising the switch or the constraint to the right. For example, S: Conj./PP, where S is the major

constituent and the switch is from a Conjunction to Prepositional Phrase. In some cases, there is more than one alternative element that constitute the pattern and this is indicated by the use of curl brackets. Optional items are put in ordinary brackets. A slash is used to indicate the boundary between one code and the other. The words forming the switch point, or point of constraint, are underlined.

It should be emphasized here that only those words forming the switch point are underlined and not everything. This means that the last word of the code to the left and first (onset) of the words in the code to the right are the only ones underlined, although more may be involved. The translation for the Ekegusii parts is given directly below them. The analysis is illustrated in the following sentence:

On that occasion, ookonywa esoda for one  
 ..... you+take a soda .....  
 hour.

The pattern of the switch is:

VP: obj. NP/Advl

The above pattern indicates that the switch took place within the VP and the exact point of the switch is between an object NP and an adverbial.

The same transcribed sentences were manipulated to check for code-switching constraints. This was done by

expanding the code and thereby changing the code-switch point to either direction but one at a time until a point was reached that yielded a constraint, i.e. it was not possible to code-switch at the indicated point. For example, in the sentence:

Tatebeti kende concerning either of us.  
s/he did not say anything concerning .....

G1: S/he did not say anything .....

if the code expansion is made so that concerning is in Ekegusii, we would have the following construction:

Tatebeti kende igoro\_ya\_either of us.

The above structure is acceptable too. If the expansion was extended up to either the following would be realised:

Tatebeti kende igoro ya onde\_of us.

The above structure is unacceptable and is therefore a syntactic constraint on code-switching. The constraint pattern for this would be:

NP:Pro/PP

Although here the translation of the shifted part has been given, in the actual data analysis no translation has been given but the constraint has been explained because as will be evident later some words have no direct translation.

Another example:

She came from sobo.  
 .....her/his/their home

The switch is from English to Ekegusii and it is between from and sobo. The code expansion can only be extended to the left, i.e to the English side, because there is only one Ekegusii word and it ends the sentence. The first expansion would give us the following:

She came koru Sobo

This means that came would still be in English but from would be in Ekegusii and the sentence would still be acceptable. The expansion of the ENG code cannot go further so that we have the switch between she and came because the verb came cannot stand alone in Ekegusii; it has to have the personal pronoun she prefixed to it. Ekegusii requires that personal pronouns be prefixed to the verbs or auxiliaries they go with. It should also be noted here that the verb in Ekegusii always has the subject morpheme encoded in it, unless there is an auxiliary, in which case, the morpheme is encoded in the auxiliary. (see further details in 3.3.2).

The above constraint falls in the constraint pattern: S: Pro/V (ENG->EK).

Once a constraint point has been reached the code of expansion stops there and does not go beyond it. In some sentences a constraint would be realised in

each direction.

### 1.7.3 Results Presentation

The findings of the research are presented in five groups, namely: EK->ENG and ENG->EK code-switch patterns, EK->ENG and ENG->EK constraints, and finally, a comparison of Ekegusii <-> English constraints with those of Spanish-English (SP-E), Russian-French (R-F), Hebrew-Spanish and, the alleged universal constraints. Each constraint is also illustrated, the number of occurrences in the corpus indicated and thereafter followed by a discussion of the constraint. (Samples of the spontaneous utterances are given in appendix 2).

There are a few code-switch constraints that are exceptions rather than the rule. These are marked by a single asterisk. There are also a few patterns that just sound odd and are neither correct nor wrong. They have been grouped under constraints and are marked by a double asterisk.

## CHAPTER TWO

### 2.0 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND LITERATURE REVIEW.

#### 2.1 Theoretical Framework.

This research was based mainly on Noam Chomsky's theory of competence and performance (Chomsky, 1965). The research also utilised a component of the generative grammar theory i.e syntax; there are two branches of generative linguistics viz. syntax and phonology.

According to Chomsky's theory of competence and performance, a speaker is able to speak a given language fluently because she/he has competence in that language. Competence is the underlying knowledge which is applied to produce the actual utterance, which is perceived as performance. In order to make the notion of competence and performance more explicit, Chomsky developed a technical apparatus, i.e a system of rules and symbols that provide a formal representation of the underlying syntactic, semantic and phonological structures of sentences. For example, the syntactic structure which we are interested in in this study is expressed in the following way:

S -> NP + VP

VP -> V (NP)

NP -> (Det) (Adj) N(PP) (RC)

N -> [man, ball, teacher.....]

V -> [hit, bought, come.....]

N.B Items in ordinary brackets are optional while those in box brackets can be substituted for each other.

S = Sentence

NP = Noun phrase

N = Noun

Det = Determiner

Adj = Adjective

PP = Prepositional Phrase

RC = Relative Clause

VP = Verb Phrase

V = Verb

This is what is called Phrase structure rules.

Although it was not the aim of this study to show how competent speakers of Ekegusii - English are in either code, it is necessary to argue that it is their competence in both codes that enables them to produce grammatically acceptable sentences in the code switch. Chomsky argues that the grammar of any language or linguistic system is actually a model of the speaker's competence, (Chomsky, 1980). There are therefore acceptable and unacceptable sentences and a speaker who knows a given language will distinguish them. This is

supported by Matthews when he says:

"There are rules for every aspect of language; for syntax, for phonetic representation, for meaning of individual words, for meanings of combinations of words etc ....." (Matthews 1979: 88)

Chomsky, who in later years referred to the notion of competence and performance as grammatical competence and pragmatic competence sums up the notion of competence as:

"... grammatical competence means the cognitive state that encompasses all those aspects of form and meaning and their relation including underlying structures which are properly assigned to specific sub-systems of the human mind that relates representations of form and meaning." (Chomsky, 1980: 59).



Crystal (1987: 135) defined a generative grammar, which is actually founded on the theory of competence and performance, as a set of rules which project a finite set of sentences upon a potentially infinite set of sentences that constitute the language as a whole, and it does this in an explicit manner, assigning to each a set of structural descriptions.

According to Matthews (1979), a generative grammar concerns itself with syntactic relations within sentences. In other words, a generative grammar must account for the relations between the elements in the

sentence and, it is this relation that gives the sentence a given structure. This applies to the code-switch sentences as well in that they have defined structures designed on a set of syntactic rules.

From the phrase structure rules given above, we can get a large number of sentences, and as Chomsky (1965:15) says, a generative grammar must be a system of rules that can iterate to generate an indefinitely large number of structures.

From these rules, we can have English sentences such as:



Ekegusii and English have the same structures as far as the major sentence constituents are concerned, viz. NP and VP. Both languages have a general order of the NP being followed by the VP. However, there are

differences in the internal structures of these major constituents.

Since a generative grammar identifies sets of rules that would produce grammatical sentences, a competent speaker is expected to produce acceptable sentences, be they in one code or in a code-switch such as Ekegusii-English.

## 2.2 Literature Review

The phenomenon of code-switching exists wherever there is bi- or multilingualism. Although no known research (apart from the current one) has been done on Ekegusii-English code-switching, several have been carried out on other code-switches with individual researchers concentrating on different aspects. Some, like Bentahila (1983), Scotton and Ury (1977), Scotton (1983), among others, have concentrated on the social function of code-switching. Others, such as Bokamba (1986), Timm (1975; 1978), Poplack (1980), Gumperz (1982) and Pfaff (1979) have studied the linguistic, and to be more specific, the syntactic structure of code-switching.

\* There has arisen a problem in terminology viz. the distinction between code-switching and code-mixing. Some researchers have recognized the distinction while others have not. Bokamba (1986: 2) distinguishes the

two and defines code-mixing as:

"...the embedding of various linguistic units such as affixes and clauses from two distinct (sub-) systems within the same sentences and speech event. that is, code-mixing is intrasentential."

He defines code-switching as:

"...the mixing of words, phrases and sentences from two distinct (sub-) systems across sentence boundaries within the same speech event. In other words, code-switching is intersentential."

Bokamba, however, uses the term code-switching as a cover term for the two meanings distinguished above.

Pfaff (1979) uses the term 'mixing' to cover the two senses while others, such as Gumperz (1982), Timm (1975), Goke-Pariola (1983) and Bentahila (1983) do not make the distinction. For example, Gumperz (1982: 59-60) defines code switching as:

"...the juxtaposition within the same speech exchange of passages of speech belonging to two different grammatical sub-systems. Most frequently the alteration takes the form of two subsequent sentences ... often, code-switching also takes place within a single sentence."

As can be seen from the fore-going sections the term code-switching has been adapted, and this is because not only is it the more common of the two, but also because it has certain basic principles which can apply to the two senses distinguished by Bokamba (1986).

### 2.2.1 Spanish-English Codeswitching

Gumperz (1982) did a research on code-switching among the Spanish-English speakers. The research was on the syntactic structures of code switching. He argues that if code-switching is meaningful, it must be subject to some form of linguistic regularity and, it should therefore be possible to isolate instances of switching which will not be linguistically meaningful. He cites nine patterns of Spanish-English code-switch and arrives at unacceptable forms of code-switch by shifting the switch point. This was the method adapted for getting the syntactic constraint in code-switching in the present study. Gumperz claims that the following patterns cannot be shifted because of syntactic constraints: Noun - complement, subject (pronoun) - predicate, object - embedded relative clause, verb - verb complement, conjoined phrases, verb of propositional attitude, two verbs of propositional attitude, and idiomatic expressions. A few of these constraints are illustrated below. (N.B. The underlined parts are in English and, Gumparz himself has done the translation).

According to the conjoined phrases constraint, both coordinate and subordinate conjoined sentences can freely be switched but the conjunction always goes

with the second switched phrase.

1. I was reading a book and she was working.

\*\*\* I was reading a book and she was working.

According to the verb of propositional attitude constraint, when a message is preceded by a phrase like 'I think', 'I believe', etc... the switch can only occur after what Gumperz calls the 'performative' verb. For example:

2. I think that my father is the oldest.

\*\*\* I think that my father is the oldest.

The subject - embedded relative clause constraint requires that when a relative clause is embedded in a subject phrase, this phrase cannot stand alone, it must be followed by a personal pronoun in Spanish. For example:

3. The man who was here yesterday he didn't come today.

\*\*\* The man who was here yesterday didn't come today.

Timm (1975) also carried out a research on Spanish-English syntactic constraints and observed that although code-switching may appear to be random, certain patterns begin to emerge when she examines whole texts of conversation, (Timm 1975). She identifies the following patterns of syntactic constraints on Spanish-English code-switching:

Pronominal subject/object - finite verb, verb - infinitive complement, VPs containing auxiliary and main verb, negation element - main verb, and finally, switching within some NPs especially those containing Det+Adj+N or Det+N+Adj. The following are examples of constructions which she notes are unacceptable in the patterns she has identified above, (1975:477-480).

(a) Pronominal Subject/Object - Finite Verb:

PRON.				
SUBJ.	VERB			
S	E	* Yo went;	* Ellos gave	
E	S	* I fui;	*He quiere;	They daban
		PRON.		
VERB	OBJ.	E WORD ORDER	S WORD ORDER	
S	E	* Mira him	* Him mira	
		* Dijo to them	* To them dijo	
E	S	* She sees lo	* Lo she sees	
		* Said les	* Les said	

(b) Finite Verb - Infinitive Complement:

VERB	PREP.	INF.	
E	S	S	* (they) want a venir;
			* (I'm) going a decidir
S	E	E	* quieren to come;
			* voy to decide

(c) Auxiliary - Main Verb

AUX.	VERB	
E	S	* (I) must esperar; *(he) has visto
		* (I) was caminando
S	E	* debo wait; *ha seen; * estaba walking

(d) Negation Element - Verb

NEG.	VERB	
S	E	* (I) no want
E	S	* (I) not quiero

(e) NPs containing Det.+Adj.+N/Det.+N+Adj.

Word Order: Det Adj N  
 E S E \* his favorito spot  
 S E S \* su favorite lugar

S Word Order: Det Adj N  
 E S E \* his lugar favorite  
 S E S \* su spot favorito

She, however, points out that some of these constraints are motivated by non-linguistic factors which she does not identify.

Timm also analysed the constraints on both sequences of the code-switch i.e Spanish-English and English-Spanish as has been done in this study.

Another Spanish-English research was done by Woolford (1983) and she has even attempted to develop a generative model of bilingual code-switching.

Woolford's model aims at solving such questions as:-

" How can two separate grammars team up to generate a hybrid phrase structure tree, insert lexical items into its terminal nodes, and perform all other syntactic and semantic tasks that sentences require?"  
 (Woolford 1983:522).

According to Woolford, the intersecting portions of the two phrase structure components represent those phrase structure rules that are common to both languages. (Also see Poplack 1980:581). The model here predicts that there should be points of constraint. She concludes:

" The ability of grammars to co-operate in this fashion to produce structurally and lexically mixed sentences strongly indicates that the category labels of different grammars have cross-linguistic identity." (Woolford 1983:534).

Poplack (1980) did yet another research on Spanish-English and drew her own conclusions. She identified some syntactic constraints, some of which she claims are general and therefore not peculiar to Spanish-English, a proposition that has raised some opposition, (Milroy 1987:195, Berk-Seligson 1986:313 and Bokamba 1986:1). As will be seen later, Ekegusii-English constraints were compared with some of these 'general' or 'universal' constraints.

One of Poplack's general constraint is the equivalence constraint which claims that code-switching tends to occur at points in discourse where juxtaposition of L<sub>1</sub> and L<sub>2</sub> elements does not violate a surface syntactic rule of either language, i.e points in the surface structure where the two languages map onto each other. This claim has however been disputed. For example in Adanme (of Ghana) and English, the following code-switch is possible:

e wo green dress ko  
s/he(past-tone) wear green dress (article)

G1: S/he wore a green dress/garment. (Bokamba 1986:7-8).

The word order between the adjective green and its

head, dress, obey the internal structure of the adjectival phrase in English but violates that of Adanme. The position of the article also violates the order of the adjectival phrase in English but is consistent with that of Adanme, (Ibid).

Another example in EK->ENG will illustrate this further.

Ogorire egari yellow  
s/he+has bought vehicle yellow

G1: S/he has bought a yellow vehicle.

The above structure violates the English adjectival phrase order that requires the adjective yellow to precede the noun (egari) while obeying that of Ekegusii. It should, however, be pointed out that in Ekegusii <-> English, the above structure is an exception and this is probably why Poplack considers it a general constraint.

Pfaff (1979), yet on Spanish-English, raises the question of whether a separate grammar of mixing is required to account for the mixed varieties (switches), or whether the syntax of mixing follows entirely from universals (Ibid:293). In her conclusion of the findings, she says that speakers who code-switch are competent in the syntactic rules of the two languages involved, and dismisses the existence of a third grammar to account for utterances in the code-

switch, (Ibid:314).

On structural constraints, Pfaff concludes that surface structures common to both languages are favoured for switches. Adjective switches, in contrast, are restricted when they take the form of predicate adjectives, but are limited within the NP. Post-nominal attributive adjectives do not in general occur in NPs with switched adjectives or nouns; prenominal, adjective switching is restricted to typical limiting type of adjectives, which often precede the noun in English, (Ibid).

### 2.2.2 Russian-French code-switching

Timm (1978) did a research on Russian-French basing it on Leo Tolstoy's novel War and Peace. She tries to compare her findings on Russian-French with those of Spanish-English and draws the conclusion that there are similarities and differences. The similar constraint are:- Pronominal subject/object-finite verb auxiliary-main verb, and, negating element-main verb. These similar constraints were compared with those of Ekegusii <-> English at a later stage.

### 2.2.3 Hebrew-Spanish code-switching

Berk-Seligson (1986) is one of the researchers on

code-switching who have disputed the existence of universal syntactic constraints on code-switching. She did her research on Hebrew-Spanish and has counter-exemplified some of the constraints claimed to be universal, such as, the equivalence constraint, the Free Morpheme constraint, and the size-of-constituent constraint which derives from Poplack's constraint, that requires that code-switches should occur primarily at phrase structure boundaries.

Berk-Seligson has shown in her analysis of Hebrew-Spanish that switches consisted of large constituents, such as, independent clauses, PPs, Adverbial Phrases, and smaller constituents, such as, determiner, Noun, Adjective, Adverb, conjunction, preposition, interrogative words, interjection, idioms, tags, negation particle, and affirmative particle, (Ibid:324).

She considered any element in a two-code sentence to be a switch so long as it was not phonologically, morphologically or syntactically integrated into the base language(code). Also excluded were proper nouns.

#### 2.2.4 Yoruba-English code-switching

Goke-Pariola carried out a research on Yoruba-English. Yoruba is a language spoken in Nigeria. In his research, he sought to answer four specific questions:

1. How frequent is code-switching in the discourse of Yoruba-English bilinguals, and can we predict where in their discourse the switches from one language to another will take place?
2. Which word classes are most susceptible to being rendered in the second language?
3. Does one language consistently serve as the matrix language?
4. Do we actually observe language-mixing or a case of linguistic borrowing? (Ibid:40).

His findings revealed that 51% of the total discourse carried out among four graduate students for forty-five minutes, was Yoruba-English while the complete Yoruba sentences made up 28.03% and complete English 20.04% of the total sentences.

Goke-Pariola also found that switching from Yoruba to English and from English to Yoruba is random. He also found that Yoruba, the mother tongue of the speakers, was almost invariably the matrix language. There was a lot of integration of the English elements into Yoruba and in the light of this, he would rather talk of borrowing than mixing. However, the study was very limited as he admits and the results cannot be generalised to apply to a cross-section of Yoruba-English speakers.

Switching took place in adjuncts, nominal groups,

verbal groups, adverbials such as to me, anyway, so that etc. Very few adjectives were found in the corpus.

The study also revealed that there is a constraint on splitting the verb from the auxiliary. He concluded that there are rules of what is acceptable and what is not. (Ibid:45).

#### 2.2.5 Bokamba on 'general' syntactic constraints

Bokamba (1986) has strongly disputed the existence of general constraints and has used sentences from different code-switches to counter-exemplify each of the claimed general constraints. He has used Lingala-French, Nairobi Swahili-English, and Arabi-English. Following are the constraints he cites as being regarded as general, and given in brackets are names of those he says claim that the cited constraint is general.

1. The size of the constituent (Timm 1975, Schaffer 1978 and Poplack 1980).
2. Conjunction and/or complementizer (Gumperz 1982, Kachru 1978, 1982a, Singh 1981).
3. Adjective - Noun Phrase (Pfaff 1979).
4. Clitic Pronoun (Pfaff 1979).
5. Free Morpheme (Poplack 1980).
6. Equivalence Constraint (Poplack 1980).
7. Dual Structure Principle (Sridhar 1980).

Some of the techniques used by researchers on code-switching such as discreet tape-recording (Goke-Pariola 1983), manipulation of raw data to get constraints (Gumperz 1982), categorization of constraints (Pfaff 1979), and informant testing (Milroy 1987), were also used in this research. Ekegusii <-> English constraints were compared with most of the constraints of the code-switches discussed in this section. The Ekegusii <-> English constraints were also compared with the constraints that are claimed to be general and the results are given in chapter four.

English is a Germanic language while Ekegusii is a Bantu language but according to syntactic typology, they both belong to the SVO (subject-verb-object) group.

The languages in this group have their sentence elements occurring in the order indicated in the brackets. However, the object does not have to be present in every sentence. The following sentences in Ekegusii and English illustrate the SVO structure.

EN:	Jane	beat	the child
	S	V	O
EE:	Jane	agalla	omwaga
	S	V	O

There are, however, differences in the internal

## CHAPTER THREE

### 3.0 THE SYNTACTIC STRUCTURE OF EKEGUSII AND ENGLISH: SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES

#### 3.1 Syntactic Typology

This chapter briefly discusses similarities and differences between the syntactic structures of Ekegusii and English. Its purpose is to enable the reader to understand the constraints discussed in chapter four and the conclusions arrived at in chapter five.

English is a Germanic language while Ekegusii is a Bantu language but according to syntactic typology, they both belong to the SVO (subject-verb-object) group.

The languages in this group have their sentence elements occurring in the order indicated in the brackets. However, the object does not have to be present in every sentence. The following sentences in Ekegusii and English illustrate the SVO structure.

ENG: Jane beat the child  
      S      V                  O

EK: Jane agaita omwana  
      S      V          O


There are, however, differences in the internal

structures of these elements in the two languages that are significant as far as code-switching is concerned. These shall be discussed in section 3.3.

Another difference that should be taken note of is that, in Ekegusii, when the subject and/or object is a pronoun, the order of occurrence changes so that we have SOV, but they are all morphologically bound, so it is not a word order change. For example:

ENG: She broke it

EK:



The discussion will mainly be based on the major sentence constituents, viz. Noun Phrase and Verb Phrase. The conjunction will be given a special mention for reasons to be explained later.

## 3.2 Similarities

### 3.2.1 Noun Phrase

Both languages have noun substitutes (pronouns), and noun modifiers such as adjectives, which may in turn be modified by adverbs. Determiners are also a common element in the two languages. The order of these elements in the NP is the only difference between the two languages. Consider:

ENG: a big red bag  
 1 2 3 4

EK: omobuko omonene omobariri  
 4 2 3 1  $\emptyset^1$

The two languages, like other SVO languages, have post-modifying relative clauses. For example:

ENG: He has people who help him

EK: Nabwate abanto bakomokonya

The two codes have the following constituents of the NP: Determiner, Adjective/Adjectival Phrase, Noun, Prepositional Phrase, and Relative Clause.

### 3.2.2 Verb Phrase

As in the NP, the two languages also share some similarities in the VP. In both languages, the Verb Group, which is different from the Verb Phrase (VP), carries certain features, such as, tense/time, voice, aspect, and mood. There however, may be some minor differences in the way these aspects are realised in the two languages. The following sentences illustrate the realisation of the above features in the Ekegusii and English verb group.

ENG: John is coming (non-past + progressive)

EK: John ngocha are

ENG: John has come (non-past + perfective)

---

1 Ekegusii does not have the article.

- EK: John ochire
- ENG: John came (past)
- EK: John nachete
- ENG: John will come (non-past = future)
- EK: John nachache
- ENG: John has beaten Tom (active voice)
- EK: John oitire Tom
- ENG: John has been beaten (passive)
- EK: John oitirwe
- ENG: John is here (indicative mood)
- EK: Jonh noare aiga
- ENG: John must go (subjunctive)
- EK: John goika agende<sup>2</sup>
- ENG: Come here! (imperative)
- EK: Inchwo aa!

The verb in both languages may be modified by an adverb, and its normal position is after the verb, although in English the adverb may precede the verb.

ENG: She walked slowly.

EK: Akagenda ng'ooro.

ENG: She slowly walked home.

The VPs in both languages are also made up of similar constituents. For example:

---

<sup>2</sup> The alternative structure is: Goika John agende.

VP -> V : (Mark) go.  
genda

VP -> V NP : (Mark) bring the books.  
inta ebitabu

VP -> V NP NP : (Mark) threw Mary the ball.  
akarutera.....omopira

VP -> V AP : (Mark) is intelligent.  
n'omong'aini

### 3.2.3 Conjunctions

A special mention needs to be made about conjunctions because, in some instances, they function as immediate constituents of the sentence and are not lesser than either the VP or the NP and therefore do not fall under either of them. This of course excludes those conjunctions that are used within the NP or VP to, for example, produce compound subjects such as: Mary and Jane. The conjunctions in Ekegusii and English are used in much the same way, with a few exceptions, such as and being absent in some Ekegusii structures.

## 3.3 Differences

In this section, as in 3.2, the discussion will mainly be based on the VP and NP.

### 3.3.1 Noun Phrase

The NP in both languages comprises various constituents of which the noun (head) is obligatory.

The noun can have more than one determiner and several modifiers as shown below.

ENG: half (of) the very beautiful college girls  
 1 2 3 4 5 6  
who passed the examination  
 7

EK: enusu ya abaiseke bekorechi bare ekieni mono  
 1 6 5 4 3  
baetete amatemwa  
 7

The order of the determiners and modifiers in the NPs of the two languages is the main difference. Moreover, Ekegusii does not have the article. Below, is a comparison of order of the items illustrated above:

ENG: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

EK: 1 Ø 6 5 4 3 7 ,

The differences in each of the NP constituents in the two languages are discussed in the following sections.

### 3.3.1.1 The determiner

According to Quirk et al (1985), the English determiners are divided into three categories, namely: predeterminers, central determiners, and post-determiners. Examples of predeterminers are: half, all, both, two etc... Central determiners include: articles (a, an, the), demonstratives (e.g this, that, those etc...), WH-determiners (e.g whichever, whoever, whatever etc...), relative determiners (e.g whose, which), interrogatives (e.g what, which), assertive

(e.g some), non-assertive (any), and negative determiner, no.

The post-determiners include cardinal numbers, and general ordinals such as next, past, a great deal etc..

The determiners have been categorised according to the position they occupy in relation to the noun they co-occur with. They do not have to appear all at the same time, but should they, then the predeterminer comes first, followed by the central determiner and finally the post-determiner.

In English, the determiner is the first item in the NP as indicated by the illustration already given. It never follows the noun and if there is an adjective in the NP, then the determiners have to precede it.

The position of the determiner in Ekegusii NP differs from that of English. Its normal position is after the noun as illustrated below:

ENG:    those girls            all those books  
          1            2                    1        2        3

EK:    abaiseke baria    ebitebu biria bionsi  
          2            1            3            2            1

The only determiner that precedes the noun in Ekegusii is the partitive. For example:

ENG:    half of the school

EK:    enusu y'esukuru

ENG: part of the paper

EK: ensemo ye risakara

### 3.3.1.2 Adjectives

Like the determiner, the attributive adjective, which is a constituent of the NP, precedes the NP head, while in Ekegusii it follows it. The predicative adjectives behave differently as we shall see in the VP discussion. Compare:

ENG: a good girl  
1 2 3

an old chair  
1 2 3

EK: omoiseke omuya  
3 2

ekerogo ekegotu  
3 2

### 3.3.1.3 Adjective modifiers

Adjectives can also be modified by adverbs, and their position in the adjectival phrase in English is before the adjective while in Ekegusii it is after the adjective. The adverb itself can further be modified by another adverb and the modifier always precedes the modified. Compare:

ENG: a very good book  
1 2 3 4

EK: egetabu ekiya mono  
4 3 2

ENG: an exceptionally well organised meeting  
1 2 3 4 5

EK: omosangererekano obangire buya mono  
5 4 3 2

As it is clear from the order of the adjective, its modifier and the noun, the Ekegusii order is the reverse of the English one. Whereas we have the deictic - numeral - epithet - classifier - head(thing) sequence in English, in Ekegusii it is: head(thing) - deictic - numeral - classifier - epithet, (Halliday 1985: 159).

#### 3.3.1.4 Prepositional phrase (PP)

In English, all prepositions precede the prepositional complement. In Ekegusii, the prepositions behave much in the same way as English with the exceptions of the post-positions, which express sense of position. As the name suggests, these come after the NP they co-occur with instead of preceding it like the prepositions. Compare:

ENG: on the table

EK: emesa igoro  
table on

ENG: beside the wall

EK: enyasi ensemo  
wall beside

#### Prepositions:

ENG: towards the shop

EK: gochia etuka  
towards shop

ENG: until morning

EK: goika mambia  
until morning

In some situations, the postposition is omitted when the position intended is obvious but it may be used for emphasis. For example:

EK: nyebeke egekombe  
it+put cup

ENG: Put it in the cup.

EK: kebeke emesa  
it+put table

ENG: Put it on the table.

Compare:

EK: Nyebeke egekombe ime  
it+put cup inside

ENG: Put it inside the cup.

EK: Kebeke emesa nyaro  
it+put table under

ENG: Put it under the table.

There are other constructions where the preposition is not used at all whereas they are used in English. For example:

ENG: We went to Kericho

EK: Tokagenda Kericho  
we+went.....

ENG: She came to the market

EK: Agacha echiro  
she+came market

ENG: He left on Saturday

EK: Akagenda Enyongesa  
he+left Saturday

ENG: Come here for a minute.

EK: Inchwo aiga etageka eyemo.  
 come here minute one

ENG: He went home over the weekend.

EK: Achiete ka omoerio bw'omokubio.  
 he+went home end of+week

One implication of such differences is that if there has to be code-switching, then a preposition has to be either dropped or inserted (depending on the code) or else the switch would create a constraint.

### 3.3.2 Verb Phrase

Certain elements in the Ekegusii sentence are morphologically bound. The subject pronoun, the verb, and the object pronoun (if it is present) are always morphologically bound. For example:

Ek: Ochire.  
 s/he+come+perfective

ENG: S/he has come.

EK: Ong'itire.  
 s/he+me+beat+perfective

ENG: S/he has beaten me.

As seen earlier, the positions of the object and the verb also change when the object is a pronoun, but this is morphological rather than a word order phenomenon.

The subject, be it a pronoun or a noun is always reflected by a morpheme that is prefixed either to the main verb or the auxiliary. For example:

EK: Jane orikire.  
 .....she+write+perfective

G1: Jane has written.

EK: Jane nkorika are.  
 .....ass+write she+be+progressive

There are other elements that are morphologically realised in Ekegusii but are syntactically realised in English. These will be discussed in the following subsections.

### 3.3.2.1 Auxiliary

Although the two languages utilise the auxiliary verbs, these do not behave in exactly the same way in the two languages. The auxiliary in English always precedes the verb it is helping which is not always the case in Ekegusii auxiliary. The regular position for the Ekegusii auxiliary is after the verb but there are instances, as will be seen, when the auxiliary precedes the main verb.

In Ekegusii positive sentences, the auxiliary be always comes after the the verb and is morphologically bound with the pronoun subject morpheme. If the sentence is negative however, the auxiliary precedes the verb and if it carries the tense, then it is bound to the main verb otherwise it is only bound to the subject morpheme. For example:

ENG: She is writing.

EK: Nkorika are.  
ass+write she+be+progressive

ENG: She was writing.

EK: Nkorika arenge.  
ass+write she+be+past+progressive

Negative:

ENG: She is not writing.

EK: Tarikorika.  
she+not+be+present+write

ENG: She was not writing.

EK: Tarenge korika.  
she+not+be+past+prog write

In English, the perfective aspect is expressed both in the main verb and in the auxiliary have, whereas in Ekegusii it is expressed by a morpheme suffixed to the main verb. For example:

ENG: She has written.

EK: Orikiire.  
she+write+perfective

English always requires the presence of an auxiliary for negation although it does not have to be bound to it. In Ekegusii this is not the case. Compare:

Positive:

ENG: Write

EK: Rika

Negative:

ENG: Do not write

EK: Takorika  
you+not+write

However, if the auxiliary is already present in the positive sentence, it is used for negation.

The modal auxiliary must, that always belongs to the verb group in English, may be separated from the main verb by the subject in Ekegusii. For example:

ENG: Sam must go now.

EK: Goika Sam agende bono.  
must .....he+go now

or

Sam goika agende bono.

Meanings expressed by other modals such as can, might, may etc. are encoded in the main verb but the verb has to be preceded by an assertive. For example:

ENG: Jane might come.

EK: Jane nabo arache.  
.....as she+possibility+come

ENG: Jane can come.

EK: Jane nabo agocha.  
.....ass she+ability+come

This means that switching will be constrained at some point in a two-code sentence.

### 3.3.2.2 Verb modifiers

In both languages, the verb may be modified by the adverb but the order in which these elements follow each other in the sentences differs to some extent. In

Ekegusii, the adverb must always come after the verb while in English it occupies either position.

ENG: They (slowly) packed them (slowly).

EK: Bakabibanga ng'oorā  
       they+past+them+packed       slowly

The adverb itself could be modified by an intensifier, but the positions still differ in the two languages. Compare:

ENG: They packed them very slowly.

EK: Bakabibanga ng'ora mono.  
       .....very

If the verb is modified by a clause, then this clause occupies the same position in the two languages.

For example:

ENG: They walked like old men.

EK: Bagatara buna abagaka.

'like old men' (buna abagaka) modifies the verb walked.

### 3.3.2.3 Predicate Adjective

The predicate adjective is the head of the adjectival phrase which is a constituent of the verb phrase. The predicate adjectives occupy the same positions in the two languages except when the verb involved is the copular verb be in Ekegusii. Be, whether functioning as a main verb or as an auxiliary has the adjective preceding it, if it is in a positive

sentence, or the adjective following the verb, if it is a negative sentence.

Positive:

ENG: She is intelligent.

EK: N'omong'aini are.  
 ass+intelligent she+be+pres

Negative:

ENG: She is not intelligent.

EK: Tari mong'aini.  
 she+not+is intelligent

Other linking verbs have two optional positions, i.e before or after the adjective, as illustrated below:

ENG: She appeared intelligent.

EK: Nigo arorekanete omong'aini.  
 or  
 Nomong'aini arorekanite.

ENG: He felt bad.

EK: Akaigwa bobē.  
 or  
 Mbobe aigwete.

#### 3.3.2.4 The conjunction

The conjunction and is being given a special mention here, because there are significant differences in the two languages in the use of this conjunction, whether conjoining elements within the VP, the NP or clauses. The conjunction and is not used in some Ekegusii structures although it is used in their English counterparts. For example:

ENG: Go and bring me a book.

EK: Genda ondetere egetabu  
go you+me+bring book

ENG: They cooked and ate.

EK: Bakaruga bakaria.  
they+cooked they+ate

ENG: They called the pupils and they came back.

EK: Bakarangeria abana bakairana.  
they+called pupils they+came back

The conjunction and cannot however be omitted in compound nouns, adjectives and adverbs. For example:

ENG: the teacher and the pupils

EK: omwarimu n'abana

ENG: slowly and well

EK: ng'ora naende buya

ENG: short and easy

EK: -eng'e naende -ororo<sup>3</sup>

### 3.3.3 Other general differences

Ekegusii has an overt marker for assertion, which English does not have. In English, assertion is expressed through positive declarative sentences. The assertion markers are :- nabo, nigo and the morphemes {n-} and {mb-}. Roughly translated, the assertives

---

3 The adjective in Ekegusii has to have a prefix morpheme that shows concord between it and the noun it is modifying.

nigo and nabo would mean 'it is'. For example:

Nabo agocha  
ass s/he+can come

Nkorika are  
ass+write s/he+be+progressive

Nigo airanete  
ass s/he+came back

### 3.3.3.2 Equivalence of words

Another difference between the two languages arises from the lack of a one- to- one equivalence of words. What this means is that, what may be expressed in several words in English may be expressed in one or fewer words in Ekegusii. The several words expressing one meaning cannot therefore be split so that one part of the expression is in one code while the other is in another. For example:

ENG: apart from

EK: gotatiga

ENG: whereas

EK: abwo ase

ENG: why?

EK: ase ki?

The differences that have been discussed here account for some of the syntactic constraints on code-switching in Ekegusii <-> English discussed in chapter four and five.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### 4.0 DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS PRESENTATION

#### 4.1 Introduction

It has already been explained in the fore-going chapters that the research findings discussed herein are on Ekegusii <-> English code-switching.

As discussed in chapter one, a two-stage analysis was done on both code-switch patterns and code-switch constraints patterns manipulated out of the raw data. First, the major constituents (S, NP, or VP) of the switch or constraint were identified, and then the constituents or elements comprising the switch were identified. Example 1 illustrates the method of analysing the code-switch patterns while example 2 illustrates the analysis of code-switch constraints.

1. He has become a person otatakiri  
.....who is not wanted

The constituent of the switch is in the NP and the switch is between the noun and its post-modifying relative clause. This gives us the pattern: NP: N/Post-modifier (relative clause).

2. Egento eke is very special.  
thing this.....

In 2 above, the constraint is also in the NP between the noun and its determiner. We thus get the pattern: NP: N/det

The method of arriving at such a constraint has already been discussed in chapter one.

Ekegusii is highly agglutinative, i.e it has many sentence elements morphologically bound, which would otherwise be syntactically realised in a non- or less agglutinative language like English.

There are some structures that are made up of a pronoun and a verb and yet they are considered to be in the VP. This is so because, as was explained in chapter three, the subject pronoun is encoded in the verb in Ekegusii. Such a pronoun is purely for concordial purposes. For example:

The boys mbachete ka.  
 .....they+came home

If however there is only a subject pronoun bound to the verb with no subject noun or pronoun to which it bears reference, then the whole structure is considered to be under the S(sentence) constituent and not in the VP. For example:

4. Mbachiete  
 they+went

## 4.2 Code-switch Patterns

### 4.2.1 EK->ENG Patterns

A total of twenty-one patterns were identified out of the total corpus. Each pattern is illustrated by two

examples and the frequency of its occurrence in the corpus is indicated against it. The switch point is underlined, because there could be more than one switch within the same sentence, and they have to be dealt with separately. The gloss (Gl) for the sentence is given when necessary. .ls1

1. S: VP/clause (41)

- a. Ekwarengé kogenda you inquire first.  
 you+were to go .....
- b. Tigabaraika they report the matter.  
 let+them+arrive.....

Gl: Let them arrive and report the matter.

2. S: clause/clause (13)

- a. Riria barora more iga they  
 When they+saw you+are like this  
 changed their minds.
- b. Nonye bantebia amarieta, they  
 although they+me+told names .....
- got out their cards.

Gl: Although they told me their names  
 .....

3. S: Conj/clause (36)

- a. Igo I have not said ng'a tekoba bo.  
 so ..... that it+not+be like that

Gl: So I have not said that it cannot be like  
 that.

- b. Gose a friend of yours cannot even say hi.  
 or.....

4. S: clause/Adv{Adv} (5)

- a. Akoigora obeka iga, after two  
s/he+opens s/he+puts like this .....  
minutes oimokia eyende.  
.....s/he+picks another one.

G1: S/he opens and puts like this, after two  
minutes s/he picks another one.

- b. Aabaseretie as soon as he saw  
s/he+them+sent away .....  
them.

G1: S/he sent them away as soon as s/he saw  
them.

5. S: Conj/Adv{Adv1} (8)

- a. Ogotumia chibese chiao chionsi ekiagera  
you+use money your all because  
omanyete ng'a soon it will be useless.  
you+know that.....

G1: You use all your money because you know  
that soon it will be useless.

- b. Enkoigwa ng'a in hospital they just cover  
I+hear that.....  
all your body in white plastic.

6. S:S Adv/Clause<sup>1</sup> (4)

- a. Naende Friday is her birthday.  
again Friday is.....  
b: Korende next week is the deadline.

---

1 S Adv. stands for sentential adverb.

7. S: Conj/PP (4)
- Ntoteme korende with such problems  
we+will+try  
it is not easy.
  - Nachete rakini without a single cent.  
s/he+came but .....
8. S: Interjection/clause (7)
- Yaya, the people who took it must be those  
No, .....  
guys.
  - Gaki help me.  
please.....
9. S: Adv/Conj (2)
- Igo you have to know onye yaikire  
so..... if it+has reached  
ang'e because baria ebagocha babe served.  
near.....those they+come they+be..
- Gl: So you have to know if it has reached near  
because those ones will come and be served.
- Nigo abegete igoro aria although he's  
ass s/he+put up there .....  
been warned.
- Gl: S/he put (it) up there although.....
10. S: clause/Conj (11)
- Takogendi bwango whether she is  
she+cannot+drive fast .....  
late or not.
  - Mbachete riria although they were late.  
they+came that time.....
11. NP: P/NP (7)

- a. Echio chia selection are the best.  
those of .....
- b. Otaaake esimi gochia some  
you+cannot+ring telephone to.....  
offices onyare.  
.....you+manage

Gl: You cannot manage to ring some offices.

12. NP: NP/post-modifier (6)

- a. Tatebeti kende concerning either of us.  
s/he+not+say anything .....

Gl: S/he did not say anything.....

- b. Tancheti abana who cry all the time.  
s/he+not like children .....

Gl: S/he does not like children who cry all the time.

13. NP: P/Adv (2)

- a. Inaki abanto ba around there bachete  
how people of.....they+came  
komanya ng'a nabwate chibese?  
to know that s/he+had money?

Gl: How did people of around there come to know that s/he had money?

- b. Anyway, mbarenge ang'e there.  
.....they+not+were near there

Gl: Anyway they were not near there.

14. VP: V/NP- (complement) (21)

- a. Abana bonsi etore one hundred and  
children all we+are .....  
something.

Gl: All the children we are one hundred.

- b. Bono tabeti an important person?

now s/he+not+become .....

Gl: Hasn't s/he become an important person?  
now?

15. VP: V/NP - object (20)

a. Tigandarika the last sentence.  
let+me+write .....

b. Goika ing'ire six units.  
must I+take .....

Gl: I must take six units.

16. VP: object NP/Advl (10)

a. On that occasion, okonywa esoda for one  
.....you+take soda .....  
hour.

b. Nkonyware amarwa, full stop.  
s/he+drinks alcohol .....

17. VP: Pro+aux/V (19)

a. Nabo oranyore nigo abeté pushed out.  
ass you+find ass s/he+was .....

Gl: You might find that s/he was pushed out.

b. Onye mbari capable, ehabwenerete koba  
if they+not+are ... they+should to  
be....

thrown out.

Gl: If they are not capable, they should be  
thrown out.

18. VP: V/Adv{Advl} (54)

a. Preps etokogenda at seven o'clock.  
.....we+go .....

Gl: We go for preps at seven o'clock.

b. Bagachaka gotara towards the shops.

they+started to walk .....

19. VP: Adv/P (2)

- a. We can't wait riooka without knowing what  
..... throughout.....

is happening.

- b. Nigo aminyogete ng'ooro until the last  
ass s/he+ran slowly .....

minute ekero aroche oisire goikerwa.  
when s/he+saw s/he+is+about to be caught

Gl: S/he ran slowly .....when s/he saw  
that s/he was about to be caught.

20. VP: V/Adj- (complement) (32)

- a. Nkarora omoiseke gete ore brown  
I+saw girl certain who is ...

okweyaka ebinto bikomekameka twenty-four  
she+smears things they+glitter....

hours.

Gl: I saw a certain girl who is brown and  
smears (on herself) things that glitter  
twenty-four hours.

- b. Tari intelligent even though people say so.  
s/he+is+not.....

21. VP: Adv/(aux,mod) V (4)

- a. Rituko ntabe aa will be 4th  
day I+not+be here.....

Gl: The day I will not be here will be 4th

- b. Ekio kiagera tagenda oo  
that it+caused s/he+not+go there..

must be something serious.

Gl: Whatever made him/her not go there

must be something serious.

#### 4.2.2 ENG-> EK Patterns

The same procedure as that used for EK-> ENG was used here and twenty code-switch patterns were identified.

##### 1. S: NP/VP (37)

- a. Terminating your life nero enchera yoka  
 ..... it+is way only  
 yogotanga the spread.  
 of+preventing.....

Gl: .....is the only way of  
 preventing the spread.

- b. The first one yachete nero twairete.  
 .....it+came it+is we+took

Gl: The first one to come is the one we  
 took.

##### 2. S: Clause/Conj (7)

- a. She cannot be perfect korende goika ateme.  
 .....but must she+try

Gl: She cannot be perfect but she must try.

- b. They know gotatiga batatageti gokonya.  
 .....except they+not+want to help

Gl: They know except they don't want to  
 help.

##### 3. S: Clause/clause (25)

- a. Before you start goika oraakana.  
 ..... must you+pay

Gl: Before .....you must pay.

b. When people mean to drink, nabo bakonywa.  
 ..... ass they+drink

Gl: When..... they can drink.

4. S: VP/obj NP (14)

a. You never know egento arwerete oo.  
 ..... thing s/he+left for there

Gl: You..... why s/he left there.

b. Poverty has threatened abanto mono.  
 ..... people very much

5. S: VP/Verb Complement (7)

a. Why would one want gokora egento buna ekio?  
 .....to do thing like that?

Gl: Why..... to do a thing like that?

b. You can't know kogendia egari out of the  
 ..... to drive vehicle.....  
 blue.

Gl: You cannot know how to drive a vehicle out  
 of the blue.

6. S: VP/Conj (14)

a. Igo I have not said nq'a tekoba bo.  
so..... that it+not+be so

Gl: So I..... that it cannot be like  
 that.

b. Go and ask omanye gocha.  
 .....you+then come

Gl: Go.....and then come.

7. S: Adv/clause (9)

a. Perhaps nabo atebete.  
 ..... ass s/he+said

Gl: Perhaps s/he said (it).

- b. Obviously nigo angete.  
 ..... ass s/he+refused

Gl: Obviously s/he refused.

8. S: Conj/Clause (6)

- a. But naki abanto bakorete bakamanya ng'a  
 .....how people they+did they+knew that  
 nabwate chibese?  
 s/he+has money?

Gl: But how did people know that s/he has money?

- b. So, eke naki oroché kiare koba?  
 .. .this how you+see it+was to be?

Gl: So, how do you think this one would have been?

9. NP: Conj/N (5)

- a. She could have told either omwarimu gose the  
 ...../.... teacher or....  
 prefect.

- b. Mbaroché either entang'ani gose the second  
 they+saw .... first one or.....

Gl: They saw either the first or the second one.

10. NP: NP/Post-modifier (6)

- a. You may talk of general issues but you  
 know there are some batari korengereria  
 they+not to think..

mpaka abwo.  
 up to there

Gl: You.....some who do not think that  
 far.

- b. He has people bakomokonya  
 .....they+her/him+help

gochionia.

to them+sell

G1: He .....who help him/her to sell  
them.

11. NP: N/det (possessive adjectives) (5)

a. Term yane teraera whether I'm sick or not.  
.... my it+not+finished.....

G1: My term is not yet over whether I'm sick or  
not.

b. Baigoire an accountancy firm yabo.  
they+have opened .....theirs

G1: They have opened/started their  
accountancy firm.

12. NP: NP/Adv{Advl} (6)

a. Omonto oria obweikaine my brother pi.  
person that he+resembles .....completely

G1: That person resembles my brother  
completely.

b. But I had told you koru riria twarenge  
..... from when we+were  
Kahawa ng'a orike erieta riane.  
.....that you+write name my

G1: But.....from when we were at  
Kahawa that you write my name.

13. NP: N/PP (7)

a. I don't know the selection ya 1990.  
..... of.....

b. We did not see that group yabo Jane.  
..... of.....

14. VP: Indirect obj/direct obj (5)

- a. We need to buy her amatunda.  
 ..... fruits
- b. The home science teacher teaches us buna  
 .....how  
 tokwerenda.  
 ...we+us+take care of

Gl: The.....how to take care of  
 ourselves.

15. VP: Adj/Conj (5)

- a. Anyway nkorengia things are not that bad buna  
 .... I+think ..... like  
 bagoteba.  
 they say

Gl: Anyway I don't think things are as bad as  
 they say.

- b. But travelling by bus is cheaper kobua  
 .....than.....  
 taking a taxi.

16. VP: Adv/Adv (2)

- a. Abanto banywa chisoda this time sana.  
 people they+take soda.....

Gl: People take soda at this time a lot.

- b. They arrived before noon igoro.  
 .....yesterday

17. VP: Adj/Infinitive Complement (7)

- a. I was too busy kori lunch.  
 .....to eat .....
- b. They found it dangerous gotara botuko.  
 .....to walk night

Gl: They .....to walk at night.

## 18. VP: V/Adv (7)

- a. Gose oranyore            ere engaged bobé.  
      or you+might+find it+is .....very much
- b. But he is the one who designed matagataga.  
      ..... carelessly

## 19. VP: Conj/Gerund (3)

- a. At least it is better than gocho rimo.  
      ..... than coming once
- b. Passing is not as easy as kogwa.  
      .....failing

## 20. VP: P/NP (8)

- a. He went towards enyomba yaye.  
      ..... house his

Gl: He went towards his house.

- b. They went without onde  
      ..... anybody

okobakoba  
 s/he+them+escort

Gl: They.....anybody to escort them.

There were six code-switch patterns that were common to both code-switches. They are:- clause/clause, conj/clause, clause/conj, obj NP/Adv, V/Adv and, P/NP. Some of these had a higher frequency of occurrence than others.

#### 4.3 Code-switch constraints

Like the code-switch patterns, the code-switch constraints have also been grouped into two according to their sequence i.e EK->ENG and ENG->EK. As

defined earlier, the term constraint is used in this study to mean that there is a restriction on having two collocating elements in two different codes. A great majority of the structures clearly unacceptable while a small minority just sound odd. This oddity was checked through informant - testing (Milroy 1987) and the informants agreed that the structures were not quite wrong and yet they were not correct either. (Also see Data Analysis). These odd structures are marked by a double asterisk.

A few exception constraint patterns were also identified and these are marked by a single asterisk. The method of arriving at the constraints has already been explained in sub-section 1.7.3. One code-switch example will be analysed here. What is on the left (of the parts that form the switch point) has to be in the code that is on the left, and what is on the right has to be in the code that is on the right. In the EK->ENG sentence:

Mboyetie those books yesterday,

the switch is being moved so that those is in Ekegusii while books still remains in English. The resulting string is Mboyetie biria books yesterday, hence the constraint. The constraint structure this yields is

NP: Det/N

If the whole NP, and not just the determiner those were in EK., the switch would be acceptable.

#### 4.3.1 EK->ENG Constraint Patterns

Sixteen code-switch syntactic constraints were identified in the EK->ENG sequence. Each pattern has been illustrated and discussed. The number of occurrences of each pattern in the corpus has also been indicated.

1. S: NP- personal pronoun/VP (12)
  - a. Nachete oo but she ignored him.  
s/he+came there .....
  - b. Nimanyete it is like a market  
I+know.....

The constraint arises due to the fact that in Ekegusii, the personal pronoun has to be morphologically bound to the verb and cannot therefore be separated from it as we are trying to do here.

2. S: NP/Pro+V (2)
  - a. Onde taiyo ore able to explain.  
nobody s/he+not+is who is.....

Gl: There is nobody who is able to explain.

  - b. Abana mbaseretigwe to go and collect  
children they+were sent away.....  
fees.

Gl: The children were sent away to go and  
collect fees.

Ekegusii requires that a subject reflecting morpheme be prefixed to the verb, which in English would be a repetition and hence a violation of the English structure. Another problem pertaining to example 2a is that the word order of the words involved in the switch is different in both codes.

3. S: Ass/clause (14)

- a. Nabo okorina gwatoberete very difficult.  
 ass climbing it+us+became .....

G1: Climbing became difficult for us.

- b. Nigo achete before we were ready.  
 ass s/he+came.....

G1: S/he came before we were ready.

As already explained in sub-section 3.3.3.1, Ekegusii has an overt marker for assertion, which is not the case in English. Whatever immediately follows this marker in Ekegusii has to be in Ekegusii, hence the constraint.

4. S: V/Adv (of place)\* (5)

- a. Tigangende ka, otherwise inarengereretie  
 let+me+go home..... I+not+intended  
 mbogere aa.  
 pass by here

G1: Let me go home, otherwise I did not intend to pass by here.

- b. Etwatarete etaoni mpaka late in the evening.  
 we+walked town until.....

G1: We walked in town until late in the evening.

This is an exception constraint, because this pattern is commonly acceptable, except when certain intransitive verbs such as walk, go, and come are involved.

In example (a), the Ekegusii and English structures are identical but the pattern is unacceptable. In (b), English would require the insertion of the preposition in before town.

5. S: Clause/Conj\*(7)

a. Nche nabo ndoche ng'a we go and find  
myself ass I+see that.....  
out first.

G1: I think we should go and find out first.

\*\* b. Torochi ng'a it is becoming a big  
you+not+see that.....  
problem?

G1: Don't you see that it is becoming a  
big problem?

The constraint under discussion is an exception, because it only arises when the conjunctions that (ng'a) and and (rende) are used. When the preceding clause is in Ekegusii, the conjunction that must be in Ekegusii. Even when the preceding clause is in English, the construction sounds better with that and and in Ekegusii.

6. S: Conj/clause\*(5)

- a. Riria baroche pupils' work, they stopped  
when they+saw.....  
the inspection.
- b. Ekerō bamanyire ng'a you have finished,  
when they+known that .....  
they come for your work.

G1: When they have known that you have  
finished, they come for your work.

This structure is normally acceptable except with the conjunction when, which is realised in two forms in Ekegusii, i.e ekero and riria. It is not clear why the switch involving this conjunction creates a constraint and yet others do not.

7. NP: Det/{N } (16) {  
{Pro}

- a. Mboyetie those books yesterday.  
they+collected .....
- b. Agoteba ng'a I am among the few in Kenya  
s/he+says that.....  
who understand this thing.

G1: S/he says that I am among the few.....

The constraint arises here because of the differences in the internal structures of the Noun Phrases (NPs) in the two codes. In Ekegusii, the determiner (except for the partitive, see 3.3.1) is preceded by the noun whereas in English it is the determiner that precedes the noun. Also, Ekegusii does not have the article. The above pattern, be it Det/N or

Det/Pro would therefore violate the structures of both codes.

8. NP: Adj/N (8)

- a. Babe bagoteba ng'a nare a  
 they+be they+be saying that s/he+is...  
big risk.

Gl: They will be saying that s/he is a  
 big risk.

- b. Ase ki and there is clear evidence ng'a they  
 why ..... that ...  
 committed the crime?

In English, the adjective precedes the noun it modifies while, in Ekegusii we have the reverse order. Clearly then, this rule would be violated in the above structure, hence the constraint in switching at the indicated point.

9. NP: {N }/ P\* (2)  
 {Pro}/ P

- a. Echio chia selection are the best.  
those of .....
- b. Abarimu ba permanent basis are better off.  
teachers of .....

This constraint is also an exception, because there are {N}/P structures that do not create {Pro}/P constraints at all.

The preposition of has been identified to be creating a syntactic constraint on code-switching. It is also one of those unusual constraints in that no

syntactic rule has been violated in either code.

Consider:

those of selection  
chiria chia ogochorwa

kori kwa abang'ina  
 that of women

biria bia seito  
 those of our home

There, however, seems to be some phonological concord between the demonstrative and the preposition. It is the disruption of this concord that creates the constraint. The constraint does exist, only that it is not syntactic; it is phonological.

10. VP: P/Adv (5) (

a. Agoteba ng'a on Friday they came to  
 s/he+says that .....

collect eggs from moino aria.  
 ..... ..side there

G1: S/he says that on Friday they came to  
 collect eggs from that side.

In the above structure, no preposition is required before the adverb Friday, and using it would violate the Ekegusii structure. (see sub-section 3.3.1.4 for further details).

11. VP: V/P\*(4)

a. Omanyete you look at the person before  
 you+know .....

you start.

- b. Bakarora ng'a shouting to them would  
they+saw that .....

be easier.

This is yet another exception constraint in that it arises only when there is a combination of certain verbs with certain prepositions. The constraint arises due to the fact that the sense expressed by the preposition in English is already encoded in the Ekegusii verb and there is no need of repeating it in the English preposition.

The following examples illustrate that the verbs shout and look can be used with other prepositions:

gotwora (shouting) with/without/before etc..

rigereria (look) with/before/instead of etc..

12. VP: Adv/V (3)

- a. Gaki just sympathise omokonye.  
Please.....you+him/her+help

G1: Please just sympathise and help him/her.

- b. Nigo ancheranete too quickly to convince  
ass s/he+admitted .....

them.

G1: S/he admitted too quickly to convince

them.

The word order of both codes does not allow the switch between an adverb and the verb it modifies. In Ekegusii the verb precedes its intensifier

while in English it precedes the verb. Switching would therefore violate the rules of both codes.

13. VP: Adv/Adj (6)

a. Igaa ekere very expensive.  
here it+is .....

b. Enyomba eria ere quite beautiful.  
house that it+is .....

G1: That house is quite beautiful.

The word order within the adjectival phrase is quite different in both codes. Ekegusii requires that the adjective precede its modifier while English requires that the adjective be preceded by its modifier. A switch at the indicated point would therefore be disobeying the rules of both codes.

14. VP: Adv/Adv (4)

a. Tiga inyeire bono iga before I forget.  
let I+it+take now just .....

G1: Let me take it just now before I forget.

b. Nkeri gotoka very easily.  
it+not+is to be found .....

G1: It is not very easily available.

This constraint is also raised by the differences in word order. In Ekegusii the modifier is preceded by the modified which is the opposite for English.

15. VP: PP: P/NP\* (5)

a. Ebagaachete beside the road.  
they+built .....

b. Abarero nabo bagoikaransa even on  
of+nowadays ass they+can sit.....

the table.

G1: Those of nowadays can sit even on the ....

The constraint is created by the word order of the spartial preposition and its object. In Ekegusii, this preposition is actually a postposition, and therefore it is preceded by the noun. This would therefore create a constraint, should there be a switch at the indicated point. It is also an exception, because prepositions in Ekegusii occupy the same position as those in English.

16. VP: V/Infinitive Complement (6)

- a. Tiga inyerigie                    tincha  
 let I+it+look for I+not+come  
  
gogosumbua tomorrow morning.  
 to+you+disturb.....

G1: Let me look for it so that I do not come  
 to disturb you tomorrow morning.

- b. Ekwarenge kogenda you inquire first  
you+were to go .....  
 omanye kogenda.  
 you+then to go

G1: You were to go and inquire first and then you  
 go.

The above structure involves the verb and its infinitive complement which cannot be split in Ekegusii, hence the constraint.

## 4.3.2 ENG-&gt;EK Constraints

The same procedure as that used in the analysis and presentation of EK->ENG constraints is used here. Ten constraint patterns were identified in this sequence.

1. S: Conj/Clause\*(6)
  - a. They have to go onye ise ochire.  
..... if his father has come
  - b. Ekwarengé kogenda you inquire first  
you+were to go .....  
  
omanye kogenda.  
you+then to go

G1: You were to go and inquire first and then  
you go.

This is yet another example of an exception constraint involving the conjunction. It is an exception, because the code-switch constraint arises only when certain conjunctions are involved. The conjunctions are if, when, and and. In example b, the conjunction omanye has the subject pronoun prefixed to it, which means that the verb following it (kogenda) lacks it. If the conjunction were in English, then this subject morpheme would be entirely missing, which would not be acceptable in the Ekegusii structure.

2. S: NP- Personal Pronoun/VP\*(7)
  - a. It depends on circumstances chiroo.  
..... they+are+there

Gl: It depends on circumstances that are there.

- b. She came koru sobo.  
 ..... from his/her/their home

The switch cannot occur at the indicated point because of the personal pronoun as Ekegusii requires that a personal pronoun, be it a subject or an object should be bound to the verb. However, other pronouns, acting as subject only do not have to be morphologically bound to the verb. Consider the following sentences:

Those ones mbiarenge ebiya ake.  
 ..... they+were good much

Gl: Those ones were much better.

He said that gokoondokia.  
 ..... to+you+scare

Gl: He said that to scare you.

3. S: Pro+V/Advl\*(10)

- a. Last time etwachiete echiro korende  
 ..... we+went market but

tateba kende.  
 s/he+not+say anything

Gl: Last time we went to the market but s/he did not say anything.

- b. But I had told you koru riria twarenge Kahawa  
 ..... from when we+were...

orike erieta riane.  
 you+write name my

Gl: But I had told you from when we were at Kahawa that you write my name.

The above construction would create a constraint, because it violates the English structure, which requires that the noun in the adverbial be preceded by a preposition. However, if this were done, then the structure would be violating Ekegusii rules. The structure would be perfectly alright with NPs that do not require a preceding preposition.

4. NP: Conj/NP\*(2)

a. Do you want another one buna eye?  
 ..... like this one?

b. She brought buna eyaigoro.  
 ..... like of+yesterday

G1: She brought (one/some) like that of  
 yesterday.

There is some restriction on switching within an NP when certain conjunctions such as like are involved. As seen earlier, conjunctions when, and if also create a constraint on switching from conjunction to clause. The structure is otherwise acceptable with several other conjunctions.

5. NP: WH-pronoun/else (4)

a. Bono, apart from the new topic inki  
 now .....what

kende mwakorire?  
 else you+have done?

G1: Now, apart from the new topic what else  
 have you done?

- b. Who else otagete konyegora?  
 .....s/he+wants to+it+buy?

G1: Who else wants to buy it?

There cannot be a switch within an NP made up of the WH-pronoun and the adverb else, although the word order is identical in both codes. Compare 5a and 5b. There is, however, some phonological concord between the pronoun and the adverb in Ekegusii and perhaps this is what is causing the constraint.

6. NP: Det/N (16)

- a. The number mokorina gochia aroro  
 .....you+board to there?

nero                    nebire  
 it+is                 I+forget+Perf.

G1: The number of the bus you take is what I  
 have forgotten

- b. Those cassettes chia Bongoman chiachire.  
 .....of .....they+have come

G1: Those cassettes of Bongoman have come

The constraint is created by differences in the structure of the NP in the two codes. In Ekegusii, the noun precedes the determiner while in English it is the determiner that precedes the noun. A switch at the indicated point would therefore violate the syntactic rules of both codes.

7. VP: Negation/Verb (8)

- a. I don't think neire amatuko abere gose  
 .....it+take days two or  
 atato.  
 three

Gl: I don't think it can take two to three  
 days.

- b. The headmaster cannot forgive you oise  
 ..... if  
 gotoroka.  
 sneak out

Gl: The headmaster cannot forgive you if you  
 sneak out.

Ekegusii does not require an auxiliary for negation like English; the negation element is incorporated in the main verb. If however, the auxiliary affix is present, it may be used. Furthermore, Ekegusii does not have the equivalence of certain auxiliary affixes for do and have. The negation element cannot therefore be split from the main verb. 7a would further violate the Ekegusii rule, i.e binding the personal pronoun to the verb.

#### 8. VP: Mod/V (5)

- a. The next general elections goika abe  
 ..... must s/he+be  
 aroro.  
 there

Gl: S/he must be there during the next  
 general elections.

- b. I have told them goika ing'iche kobarora.

.....must I+come to+them+see

G1: I.....that I must come to see them.

In English, the modal precedes the verb and it is in turn preceded by the subject. In Ekegusii, the modal must (goika), which behaves a little differently from other modals, can occupy two alternative positions, i.e before or after the subject as illustrated below:

Jane goika ache  
Jane must she+come

Goika Jane ache  
must Jane she+come

G1: Jane must come.

Other moods of the verb are encoded in the verb.

For example:-

She can come.                      She might come.  
nabo agocha                      nabo arache

The underlined parts express the mood of the verb.

Although one of the alternative positions of the modal must is identical to that of English, there is a constraint on switching, because Ekegusii will require the subject pronoun to be bound to the verb, which would be violating the English syntactic structure.

#### 9. VP: V/Adj complement (7)

- a. May be this one nare omong'aini  
..... s/he+is intelligent  
ere.  
himself/herself

G1: May be this one is himself/herself  
intelligent.

b. That of millet is better kobua echaē.  
..... than tea

G1: That (porridge) of millet is better than  
tea.

The constraint here is created because of the  
subject being encoded in the verb in Ekegusii  
which would be a repetition in English.

10. VP: Adv/V (3)

a. I was just waiting inyigwe buna bagoteba.  
..... I+hear how they+say

G1: I ... to hear what they would say.

b. You simply pick the books ogende.  
..... ..you+go

G1: You.....and go.

This structure would violate the Ekegusii  
syntactic structure, because it requires that the verb  
modifier be preceded by the verb and not vice versa as  
is the case here.

#### 4.3.3 Comparison of EK->ENG and ENG->EK Constraints

From the analyses done on EK->ENG and ENG->EK, we  
can at a glance see that there certainly are  
constraints on switching from one code to another. The  
constraints depend on the syntactic elements involved,  
because switching from some elements to others does not

create a constraint at all. Word order within a sentence or phrase plays a key role in the acceptability or unacceptability of a given code-switch structure. Code-switch constraints are most common at points where the syntactic structures of both codes are at conflict. There are, however, some situations where there are constraints in spite of the structures of the two codes being identical as in ENG->EK 5 and EK->ENG 9.

There are a few exceptions where the two structures are not identical and yet no constraint is created, as in ENG->EK NP: N/Det:

Naigorete an accountancy firm yaye.  
s/he+opened.....his/her

Gl: S/he opened/started his/her accountancy firm.

Another exception was identified in the use of the auxiliary be in Ekegusii, which in English is realised in many forms. This auxiliary can be separated from the main verb, i.e a switch can take place between the auxiliary and the main verb but the auxiliary has to be in Ekegusii and have the subject pronoun bound to it. If, however, the verb in English were to be in Ekegusii, then the auxiliary would not be used. For example:

Nabete thrown out  
s/he+was.....

Narutetwe isiko

s/he+throw+pass out

G1: S/he was thrown out.

Four constraint structures common to both code-switch sequences were identified. These are:-

S: NP- Personal Pronoun/VP, S: Conj/Clause

NP: Det/N, and VP: Adv/V. The S: Conj/Clause structure was an exception in both sequences.

#### 4.4 Comparison between Ekegusii <-> English constraints with other code-switch constraints

The purpose of these comparisons is to see whether there are common syntactic constraints on code-switching which might lend some truth to the claims by some researchers like Pfaff (1979), Poplack (1980), Gumperz (1982) and Timm (1975, 1978), that there are universal syntactic constraints on code-switching. If there are no common syntactic constraints on code-switching, then it will, to a limited extent, support the claim by Bokamba (1986), Berk-Seligson (1986) and El-Noory, as cited in Bokamba (1986), that there are no universal syntactic constraints on code-switching. However, research on Ekegusii <-> English alone is too narrow to make a bold claim on the existence or the non-existence of universal syntactic constraints on code-switching. Such conclusions can only be arrived at by studies of a great variety of code-switches based on

as different (syntactic) structure codes as possible.

#### 4.4.1 Spanish-English vs Ekegusii <-> English.

In chapter two, the spanish-English (Sp-E) syntactic constraints were discussed. It has been realised that there are certain syntactic constraints that are common to both Spanish-English and Ekegusii <-> English, and these are the ones that will be discussed here.

##### (a) Noun - Complement.

This constraint held true for both EK->ENG and ENG-EK. It states that the simple adjective cannot be switched even if, as in Spanish, it is postposed. (Gumperz 1982:88). The accepted structure is:

- That is the book(the one) that was lost (Sp-E)
- \*\*\* That is the book lost
- Ekio nakio egetabu that is lost (EK->ENG)
- \*\*\* Ekio nakio egetabu lost  
that it+is book.....
- \*\*\* That is the book egesiru (ENG->EK)

The adjective in Ekegusii has to have a noun/pronoun reflecting morpheme prefixed to it, and this creates some concord between the adjective and the element modified.

## (b) Personal Pronoun Subject- Predicate

This constraint states that any subject noun phrase can be switched so long as it is not a personal pronoun. For example, the Sp-E construction:

'He is the oldest.'

is wrong, (Gumperz 1982:87). The constraint also holds true for EK->ENG (1) and ENG->EK (3)

## (c) Subject-embedded relative clause

In Sp-E, when a relative clause is embedded in the subject phrase, the phrase cannot stand alone; it must be followed by a personal pronoun. This is also true of ENG->EK but not EK->ENG. In fact, if the subject phrase is followed by a personal pronoun in EK->ENG, the construction would be wrong. Consider the following constructions:

Sp-E The man who was here yesterday he  
didn't come today.

\*\*\* the man who was here yesterday  
didn't come today.

ENG->EK The man who was here yesterday  
tacheti rero.  
he+did not+come today

EK->ENG Omosacha oria orange aa igoro  
man that he+was here yesterday  
didn't come today.

\*\*\* Omosacha oria orange aa igoro he

didn't come today.

(d) Verb of propositional attitude constraint

Gumperz (1982) states that when a message is preceded by a phrase like 'I think' 'I believe,' etc.. the switch can only occur immediately after what he calls the 'performative' verb. For example:

Sp-E I think he went to the field.

\*\*\* I think he went to the field.

This constraint also applies to EK->ENG and ENG->EK.

EK->ENG Nkorengia he went to the field.

? Nkorengia nigo agenda to the field.<sup>3</sup>

ENG->EK I think nigo agenda getii

\*\*\* I think he went getii.

(e) Verb - infinitive complement

This constraint was identified by Timm(1975) and it states that there cannot be a switch between a verb and its infinitive complement. This constraint also exists in Ekegusii <-> English.

Sp-E \*\*\* quiren to come.

they+want to come. (ibid:478)

---

3 In EK-ENG, this structure is only marginally acceptable.

EK->ENG \*\*\* Ebatagete to come  
they+want.....

ENG->EK \*\*\* They want gocha  
.....to come

Also compare EK->ENG constraint 16.

(f) Auxiliary - Main verb

Timm (1975), in her analysis of Sp-E, says that VPs containing the main verb and an auxiliary cannot be split, and this is also true of Ekegusii <-> English. However, as indicated in 4.3, there is an exception when the auxiliary be is in Ekegusii and the main verb in English. For example:

Nabete thrown out.  
s/he+was.....!

(g) Negation - Main verb

This constraint also holds true for both EK->ENG and ENG->EK but like (f) above, there is the exception when the auxiliary be is involved, which means that the negation element is morphologically bound to it. We can therefore have negation+be in Ekegusii and the main verb in English. For example:

tabeti thrown out  
s/he+not+was....

G1: S/he was not thrown out.

ENG->EK \*\*\* I do not korengereria neire amatuko  
abere gose atato.

G1: I do not think it can take two to  
three days.

#### (h) Modified NPs constraint

This is another Sp-E constraint identified by Timm (1975). According to her, switching within modified noun phrases and especially within those noun phrases with the Det+N+Adj or Det+Adj+N structures is unacceptable. This also applies to Ekegusii <-> English as exemplified by EK->ENG constraint 7 and 8 and ENG->EK constraint pattern 6. However, there is an exception when the determiner is a possessive pronoun as illustrated below:

Oigoire an accountancy firm yaye.  
s/he+has+opened .....his/her

G1: S/he has started his/her accountancy firm.

#### 4.4.2 Ekegusii <-> English vs Russian-French

Timm's findings (1978) on Russian-French code-switching are being used here to compare with the Ekegusii <-> English findings. Three constraints were found to be common to both Russian-French and Ekegusii <-> English namely:- verb-clitic pronoun, auxiliary-main verb and negating element-verb. Although Timm has listed the patterns, no examples have been given of the actual utterances.

#### 4.4.3 Ekegusii <-> English Vs. Hebrew-Spanish

Berk-Seligson (1986), in her analysis of Hebrew-Spanish, has shown that switches occurred between major as well as terminal constituents. This was also the case in Ekegusii <-> English. In EK->ENG, ten switch types were between major constituents, while eleven were between terminal constituents. In ENG->EK, eight switch types were between major constituents and twelve between terminal constituents.

#### 4.4.4 'Universal' syntactic constraints vs Ekegusii <-> English constraints

According to Bokamba (1986), the following seven constraints are viewed as being general or universal. Against each constraint is indicated one proponent of its universality claim.

(a) The size of constituent constraint

(Poplack 1980)

(b) Conjunction and/or complementizer

(Kachru 1978)

(c) Adjective - Noun Phrase constraint

(Pfaff 1979)

(d) Clitic Pronoun constraint (Pfaff 1979)

(e) Free Morpheme constraint (Poplack)

(f) Equivalence constraint (Poplack 1980)

## (g) Dual Structure Principle (Sridhar 1980)

## (a) The size of constituent constraint

This constraint claims that major constituents viz. NPs, VPs and Ss are more frequently switched than terminal ones such as Det, Adj, V, N etc...(Timm 1975 and Poplack 1980). This claim has been contradicted by Pfaff (1979), Berk-Seligson (1986) and Bokamba (1986). Findings on Ekegusii <-> English cannot be said to support this claim, because eleven out of twenty-one EK ->ENG code-switches take place within the noun phrases and verb phrases, while those of ENG->EK are eleven out of twenty.

## (b) Conjunction and/or complementizer constraint

The constraint disallows the occurrence of a guest language conjunction in a host language coordinate sentence, unless such a conjunction has been assimilated<sup>4</sup> (Kachru 1978, 1982a and Singh 1981 in Bokamba 1986:5). This constraint also applies to Ekegusii <-> English with the exception of but. Thus sentence (i) and (ii) below are correct while (iii) and

---

4 Host language is the matrix/base language on which elements from another(guest) are embedded.

(iv) are not.

- (i) Nachete but tatebeti kende  
s/he+came but s/he+not+say anything

G1: S/he came but s/he did not say  
anything.

- (ii) She came korende she did not say  
..... but .....  
anything.

- (iii) \*\*\* Nachete and akairana  
s/he+came and s/he+went back

- (iv) \*\*\* She came naende she went back  
..... and.....

(c) Adjective - Noun Phrase constraint

This constraint disallows any switching that would involve an adjective and a noun within the NP. Ekegusii <-> English findings support this constraint as exemplified by EK->ENG constraint 8. The switch cannot also take place in ENG->EK as illustrated below:

I saw omwana omonene  
..... child big

(d) Clitic Pronoun constraint

The constraint claims that clitic pronoun objects have to be realised in the same language as the verb to which they are cliticised and in the same position required by the syntactic rules of that language, (Bokamba 1986:6). This is generally true of Ekegusii

<-> English, with a few exceptions involving certain verbs. Sentence (i) below, for example, is acceptable and therefore defies the above rule while (ii) is unacceptable and obeys the rule.

(i) Tokomoexcuse whatsoever  
you+not+him/her+excuse....

G1: You cannot excuse him/her whatsoever.

(ii) \*\*\* Tokomotell the story  
you+not+him/her+tell.....

G1: You cannot tell him/her the story.

#### (e) Free morpheme constraint

According to Poplack (1980:585-586), codes may be switched after any constituent in discourse, so long as the constituent is not a bound morpheme. This is counter exemplified by Ekegusii <-> English. However as we saw in the Clitic Pronoun constraint, this is more of an exception than a general rule. In the following example we have the subject and object (in Ekegusii) bound to the verb (in English).

Ekio ekeragotake many years.  
that it+you+take.....

G1: That can take you many years.

It was mentioned earlier that the personal pronoun, be it a subject or object, is always morphologically bound to the verb. The switch cannot, however, take place in ENG->EK.

## (f) Equivalence constraint

This constraint asserts that code-switches tend to occur at points in discourse where juxtaposition of L<sub>1</sub> and L<sub>2</sub> elements does not violate a syntactic rule of either language, i.e at points around which the surface structures of the two languages map onto each other, (Poplack 1980). This is also generally true of Ekegusii <-> English, but there are exceptions in which the structures of the two codes are not identical and yet there is no constraint. For example:-

- (i) Ogorire                    eyanga red  
      s/he+has+bought dress red

G1: S/he has bought a red dress.

- (ii) He has started an accountancy firm yaye  
      .....his

There are also cases where the surface structures of both codes map onto each other and yet there is a constraint on switching from one code to another. This can be seen in the ENG->EK constraint 5 and EK->ENG constraint 9 involving the WH- pronoun, and else

## (g) Dual structure Principle

This principle states that the structure of the guest constituent need not conform to the constituent structure rules of the host language, so long as its placement in the host sentence obeys the rules of the host language, (Sridhar and Sridhar 1980:412 in Bokamba

1986:8). This too is true of Ekegusii <-> English with some exceptions as seen in (f) above.

#### CHAPTER FIVE

#### 5.0 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

From the fore-going analyses, we can see that most of 'universal' constraints also apply to Ekegusii <-> English, albeit with a few exceptions. The size of constituent constraint, which claims that major constituents are more frequently switched than terminal ones was clearly contradicted by the findings on Ekegusii <-> English.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### 5.0 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

#### 5.1 Summary of findings

Out of the four hundred and twenty (420) code-switch sentences that were analysed, three hundred and eight (308) patterns were EK->ENG while one hundred and eighty-five were ENG->EK; some sentences had more than one switch within them.

EK->ENG had twenty-one(21) code-switch patterns while ENG->EK had twenty(20). The two code-switch sequences had six patterns in common.

There were sixteen EK->ENG constraint patterns and ten ENG->EK ones. The two sequences had three constraints in common.

Ekegusii <-> English had some constraints in common with other code-switches. It had the following constraints in common with Spanish-English, although there were a few exceptions in some of the constraints: noun-complement, personal pronoun subject-predicate, subject-embedded relative clause, verb of propositional attitude, verb-infinitive complement, auxiliary - main verb, negation - main verb, and modified NPs. Some of the labels for the constraints in the two code-switches differ, but the meaning is essentially the same.

Ekegusii <-> English shared the following constraints with Russian-French: Pronominal subject/object - verb, auxiliary - main verb, and negating element - main verb.

Switches and switch constraints occurred both between major constituents, i.e at the sentence level and between terminal constituents, i.e at the NP or VP level. In EK->ENG, ten switches were between major constituents, while eleven were between terminal constituents. In ENG->EK, eight were between major constituents, while twelve were between terminal constituents.

There were six EK->ENG constraints that occurred between major constituents, while ten were between terminal constituents. ENG->EK had three constraints between major constituents and seven between terminal constituents.

Of the seven code-switch constraints claimed to be universal, six were supported (with a few exceptions) by the Ekegusii <-> English findings while one was contradicted.

## 5.2 Conclusions

Several conclusions can be drawn from the findings of the research. Considering the frequency of EK->ENG, (308) switches as compared with the ENG->EK (185) ones,

it is clear that Ekegusii served as the matrix language most of the time. This is not surprising, considering the fact that the informants have Ekegusii as their first language and the settings from which the data was collected were informal. In formal settings, the situation is likely to be the reverse, if at all there is any code-switching, but this is unlikely.

Code-switch sentences have a systematic syntactic structure and are not random. This is why we get syntactic constraints whenever we try to switch at random; some rules have to be obeyed, be they from one of the codes or common to both codes.

The universality of any of the Ekegusii  $\leftrightarrow$  English constraints still, however, remains a big question as data on syntactic constraints on all possible code-switches is not available to compare with. The findings confirm what some of the researchers on code-switching concluded, i.e there are rules on code-switching, otherwise there would not be any constraints on code-switching. This is a contention supported by Pfaff (1979), Timm (1975,1978), Gumperz (1982), and Goke-Pariola (1983), to name a few.

Poplack (1980:600), in her findings on Spanish-English, concludes that since none of the code-switch constructions was idiosyncratic, or based on rules which

were not drawn from one or the other of the grammars involved, then that is evidence enough that those who code-switch without violating the grammars of the codes involved have enough competence in those codes. This is also the conclusion that has been drawn on Ekegusii <-> English, since no unacceptable code-switch constructions were identified in the corpus.

As was evident in some code-switch constructions, it is not necessary for the two codes involved to have identical structures in order to have a constraint-free construction. However, some structures are identical and yet there are syntactic constraints on code-switching. For example:

Bono, apart from the new topic ninki kende  
now,..... what else

mwakorire?  
you+have done?

The two codes have the same word order for what else and yet we cannot have one word in Ekegusii and the other in English. Perhaps this is what led Pfaff (1979) to wonder whether a third grammar of switching was required to account for code-switch structures. It is structures such as the above that might have baffled Woolford (1983) into wondering how two separate grammars can team up to generate a hybrid phrase structure tree and perform all tasks that sentences require.

The findings on Ekegusii <-> English indicate that no third grammar is required to account for the acceptability or unacceptability of code-switch constructions, as they are based on either one of the codes or a common rule. In the analysis of the constraints in chapter four, no constraint was found at any one given time that was not based on one of the codes. In the sentence involving 'what else', the constraint is raised by Ekegusii morphonological rule that requires the reduplication of the penultimate sound of the pronoun in the adverb to yield:

nink <u>i</u> kende	ar <u>a</u> i ande
(what else)	(where else)
mbirib <u>i</u> b <u>i</u> nde	nchirich <u>i</u> ch <u>i</u> nde <sup>1</sup>
(which else)	(which else)

So, whichever item is switched in this construction violates the Ekegusii rule. The above conclusion then raises the question of whether syntax was wholly responsible for all the constraints that were identified. Ekegusii, being highly agglutinative, raised some morphosyntactic constraints while a few

---

<sup>1</sup> There is phonological concord between the pronoun and its referent noun hence the two 'which' pronouns.

others were either phonologically or semantically oriented. These accounted for some of the constraints in some constructions in spite of the identical word order in the two codes.

The findings also reveal that although most of the switching took place at points where the surface structures of the two codes are identical, there were some (four) instances where the structures were not identical and yet there was no constraint on switching. Nineteen (19) out of twenty-one (21) EK->ENG patterns had identical structures in both codes while those of ENG->EK were eighteen (18) out of twenty (20).

The question that this fact raises is: which of the two grammars is obeyed where the two structures are not identical and what is the criterion for this? The results show that there are two separate constituents involved and their internal structures are not affected. For example the EK->ENG pattern

S: NP/VP :

Egento eke is becoming difficult.  
thing this.....

English prohibits the noun to precede the determiner, but the code-switch is perfectly alright, because the switch is between the NP and VP and their internal structures are not affected. Furthermore, the position of the NP and VP are identical in the two

codes. Also consider the following EK->ENG construction:

Preps etokogenda at seven o'clock.  
 .....we+go.....

G1: We go for preps at seven o'clock.

The hypotheses of the study were proved true, and most of the questions raised in the rationale have been answered. The question of universality of constraints cannot, however, be answered by findings of a single research such as this one, or a handful of researches, just as we cannot claim a given linguistic feature to be universal unless all the languages have been considered. The implication then is that all possible code-switches be analysed in order to identify those constraints that are universal. It is hoped that this research on Ekegusii <-> English has made some contribution towards that end, apart from answering some questions on the linguistic structure of code-switching.

1960. *Rules and Regeneration*  
 New York: Columbia University Press.
- Cook, W. 1971. *An Introduction to Kenyan  
 Analysis*. New York: Holt International.
- Crystal, D. 1967. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of  
 Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aarts, F. & Aarts, J. 1988, English Syntactic Structures. London, Prentice Hall International (UK) Ltd.
- Bentahila, A. 1983, 'Motivation for code-switching among Arabic-French Bilinguals' in Language and Communication. Vol. 3 No. 3
- Berk-Seligson, S. 1986, 'Linguistic Constraints on intrasentential code-switching: A study of Spanish-Hebrew Bilingualism'. Language in Society Vol. 15 No. 3. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bokamba, E. 1986, 'Are there syntactic constraints on code-mixing?' A paper presented at the University of Stanford, U.S.A.
- Chomsky, N. 1965, Aspects of the Theory of Syntax. Massachusetts: M.I.T Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 1980, Rules and Representations. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Cook, W. 1971, An Introduction to Tagmemic Analysis. New York: Holt International.
- Crystal, D. 1987, The Cambridge Encyclopedia of English Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Structure of English. California: University of California Press.

- \_\_\_\_\_, 1985, A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics. 2nd Ed. Basil Blackwell Ltd.
- Dooley, D. 1984, Social Research Methods. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc.
- Goke-Pariola, A. 1983, 'Code-mixing in Yoruba-English Bilingualism'. Anthropological Linguistics Vol.25 pp 39 - 46.
- Gumperz, J. 1982, Discourse Strategies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Halliday, M.A.K. 1985, An Introduction to Functional Grammar. London: Edward Arnold.
- Horrocks, G. 1987, Generative Grammar. New York: Longman.
- Lyons, J. 1977, Chomsky. London: The Harvester Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 1981, Language and Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Matthews, P.H. 1979, Generative Grammar and Linguistic Competence. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 1981, Syntax. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Milroy, L. 1987, Observing and Analysing Natural Language. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Perlmutter, D.M. 1979, Syntactic Argumentation and the Structure of English. California: University of California Press.

Pfaff, C. 1979, 'Constraints on Language Mixing'.

Language Vol. 55 No. 2. Baltimore: Waverly Press.

Phillips, B. 1985, Sociological Research Methods: An Introduction. The Dorsey Press.

Poplack, S. 1980, 'Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish Y termino en espanol: Towards a typology of code-switching.' Sociology of Language Vol. 13. Mouton Publishers.

Scotton, C.M. 1983, 'The negotiation in conversation: A Theory of markedness and choice'. Sociology of Language Vol.44. Mouton Publishers.

\_\_\_\_\_, 1977, 'Bilingual Strategies: The Social Function of Code-switching'. Sociology of Language Vol. 13. Mouton Publishers.

Timm, L. 1975, 'Spanish-English code-switching: El Porque Y How-not-to'. Romance Philology Vol. 28. No. 4.

\_\_\_\_\_, 1978, 'Code-switching in War and Peace' in Paradis, M. Ed., Aspects of Bilingualism. Hornbeam Press.

Whiteley, W. 1965, A Practical Introduction to Gusii. Nairobi: East African Literature Bureau.

Woolford, E. 1983, 'Bilingual code-switching and Syntactic Theory'. Linguistic Inquiry Vol.14. No. 3. Massachusetts: M.I.T. Press.

## APPENDIX 1

Interview situations:

1. Two sisters and their brother in the latter's living room.
2. Two female friends preparing a meal in the kitchen.
3. Two female university students in a university hostel.
4. Three university students outside their hostel.
5. A chief and a primary school teacher in a friend's house.
6. Two male passengers in a bus.
7. Three male secondary school leavers in one of the participants' house.
8. One female university student with two secondary school students in a house in the rural area.
9. Three male secondary school leavers at a shop.
10. A man and his nephew in the former's house.
11. A female secondary school teacher with a lady friend in the former's house.
12. Two men in an office corridor.
13. A husband and a wife in their living room.
14. A sister and a brother in their kitchen.
15. Two secondary school leavers outside a shop.
16. Two female primary school teachers in a hotel.
17. A male 'matatu' ( a passenger minibus) driver and a female passenger in a matatu.
18. Two friends (a male and a female) at a bus stop.
19. A female employer and her house-girl outside their house.

## APPENDIX 2

## SPONTANEOUS UTTERANCES

2. (a). EK <-> ENG

1. Ekwarengenge kogenda, you inquire first omanyekogenda.
2. Tigangende ka, otherwise inarengereretie mbogereaa.
3. Ee, no! naki abanto ba around there bachetekomanya ng'a nabwate chibese.
4. Nabooranyore igo abete pushed out.
5. Abanto ekabira buna eyio you deal with them with a lot of caution.
6. Eng'encho are huge nero ekongokia
7. Omanyete he is very young.
8. Abanto baria bare bothersome.
9. Akoigora, obeka iga, after two minutes oimokia eyende.
10. Chisoda irenga Evans aranyu per hour?
11. Okogora egentokera koire time.
12. Omoiseke gete ore brown okweyaka ebinto bikomekameka twenty-four hours.
13. Abanto aba ebare more advanced.
14. Igo agoteba ng'a tinkorora any urban place for the rest of this year.
15. Igo I've not said ng'a tekoba bo.
16. Nkonyware amarua, full stop.
17. Nabo arabe nabwate many spies who tell him.
18. Ngochakogendare nka over the weekend.
19. Abanto nabange bagokwana without realizing that they are mixing languages.
20. Oise kobaboria igoro ya code-switching, they are likely to tell what they think happens, tari ekigegokorekana.
21. Tokonyora banto bange bare engaged in code-switching unless they are familiar with each other.
22. Keimokie igoro a little.
23. Bono onye titomanyeti how can we just hang around.
24. Nche nabondoche ng'a we go and find out.
25. Nabo nkonyegora ekorechi and bring it in the evening.
26. Echi nchiri as expensive as chiria twaroche.
27. Ching'encho chiabo are disgusting.
28. Mbanto ki barebest to deal with?
29. Ninche inde night shift this week.
29. Onde taiyo ore able to explain.

30. Ng'ai okorusia such a colossal amount of money.
31. Batagokonyeti how do they expect ng'a obakonye.
32. Manya we are supposed to do many units.
33. Ekeru gwakorire your research then you can write up.
34. Gaki hep me.
35. Tonyiancheta so stop lying.
36. Mbagokoa without a bribe.
37. Ogorire egari yellow.
38. Oro orange form one just the other day.
39. Nabo atema to do his best.
40. Nabo agosoa any college that offers diploma courses.
41. Tinkomanya but I guess nabo atagete igo.
42. Embura ekobatwera every morning nesukuru tekonyara kobanga for transport.
43. Eng'encho bakoba pushed, you just sympathize.
44. Amatuko aya egasi yabeire so expensive.
45. Aya onsi is because of Saddam Hussein.
46. Nomanyete ng'a ebakagete that they are the world.
47. Tiga aye, let them joke barore.
48. Tindochi who can persuade the Arabs.
49. Inanyakobegena from the beginning.
50. Ebagochenchi to put other people's names.

2. (b). ENG <-> EK

1. Why don't you wait torore buna gekoba.
2. It is not easy to record without them realising eki ogokora.
3. You don't expect ng'a ngende all the way naende ing'irane gocha aiga.
4. I don't understand eki omonto araitere omwana oye in such a manner.
5. Why don't you advise abana aba baino.
6. This semester bono nario amang'ana akare.
7. Why don't you try oigwe buna agoteba.
8. Why would one want gokora egento buna ekio?
9. Of course nomanyete igo.
10. Education yabeire very expensive mwana tabwenereti gochiesa n'amosomo.
11. Umbrellas naro abeire too expensive.
12. Sometimes torigotwara chinsa chiokoboyia from school.
13. O.K., tororane in the afternoon.
14. It looks like Americans basinyerwe this one.
15. Even the U.N. Security Council basinyirwe.
16. All they can do nokorosia resolutions.
17. People have complained korende onde tarabaa

audience.

18. Anyway, nkorengia things are not as bad buna agoteba.
19. They need to buy eyabo.
20. I don't know korende nkorengia tekoba more than two hundred shillings.
21. I was just waiting inyigwe buna agoteba.
22. Just come straight ase egari.
23. You prefer konywa echae to being dropped at home.
24. Where about omenyete?
26. You are welcome, kogicha imong'aina like a kid.
27. O.K., tororane.
28. We can't wait riooka without knowing what is happening.
29. Why don't you wait togende amo.?
30. I don't need anybody to show me buna ngokora egasi yane.
31. O.K, noon nkorengia is fine.
32. You mean abanto baria ebaba released?
33. That is unfair ekero okorengereria the seriousness of the crime.
34. Don't worry kaa mbabwatwe even if it takes time.
35. With this kind of corruption ninki omonto otabwati kende arakore.
36. You just observe gwakira ekiagera there is nothing one can do.
37. We can contribute toaganche a water tank.
38. Otherwise kera omiobori is ready.
39. Twelve thousand shillings nchiri little money.
40. Well,nabo oranyore ng'a he didn't get it.
41. Why ekero obwate all the time?
42. We need to buy her amatunda.
43. Why don't we collect chibese echio tochake some other businnes
44. That is the worst thing gokorekana bono.
45. From the signs chirorekanete igo ekororekana ng'a they've won.
46. The world cannot just sit barigererie abanto bagoitwa.
47. There is nothing barakore except to pray that there will be peace.
48. The day before nechianza chia tata abegete.
49. At least it is better than gocha rimo.
50. My cousin went to check ataranyora nonye nerirube.