

THE SEMANTIC AND MORPHOLOGICAL CHARACTERIZATION OF KWA IN KISWAHILI

David P.B. Massamba

1.0 INTRODUCTION

In Kiswahili the form KWA has often been associated with a range of rather unclear semantic notions by scholars who have worked on this language. Different scholars have tended to differ with regard to its semantic characterization. The problem seems to have been that previous scholars have tended to assign meanings to a form which by itself, as we will later argue, has no semantic meaning.

The disagreement becomes even more pronounced when we come to think of the basis of its morphological configuration. Some scholars think that the form is basically locative while others are of the opinion that there are two different KWAs - an adverbial KWA and a locative KWA. What is interesting, however, is the fact that almost all scholars agree that the form KWA is a result of a prefix KU- joined to a final vowel A.

In order to come to grips with the arguments brought forward by these scholars we will try to examine what each scholar has to say about this form. We can then reconcile the views of these scholars and propose an analysis that, in our view, captures certain important generalizations which seem to have been missed by these previous scholars.

2.0 PREVIOUS VIEWS

One of the most eminent scholars of the Kiswahili language is undoubtedly E. Ashton (1944). We will begin our discussion by examining what Ashton has to say about the form KWA in Kiswahili.

Ashton begins her discussion by saying that as a preposition KWA is used to introduce adverbial phrases.¹ According to Ashton the adverbial phrases introduced by this form are "very commonly used to express cause, reason and to a lesser extent manner or state." We see from this statement that Ashton, like many others, characterizes the meaning of KWA on a functional basis. According to her there seem to be only three interpretations of this form; and of these the last one (i.e. 'manner or state') does not, in Ashton's view seem to carry as much weight as the first two. If this is a correct interpretation of Ashton's view then we must say that the view is clearly objectionable. It is objectionable on two grounds. First, there does not seem to be any clearly defined criteria on which such an argument could be based; at least Ashton herself does not provide one. Secondly, there is an awful lot of examples in this language that clearly show that the function of KWA as an expression of 'manner' or 'state', to use her own words, is just as common, given appropriate context, as the other two. Ashton's own examples of the contexts in which KWA occurs no doubt disproves her claim. Of the sixteen examples she gives (on page 172 of her book) at least three clearly refer to 'manner' or 'state' (cf. 2 (iii) - (v) below).

Ashton also argues that the adverbial phrases introduced by this preposition indicate: (i) means of, (ii) reason of and (iii) in respect to. Here it seems Ashton is not very clear about what she means by 'cause' and 'means of'. Reading between the lines one would say she tends to treat the two as one and the same thing, functionally at least. We say this because at first she presents the function of KWA as (i) expressing 'cause', (ii) expressing 'reason' and (iii) expressing 'manner' or 'state'; then she assigns the same form the function of expressing (i) means of, (ii) reason of and (iii) in respect to. If we are interpreting her correctly then it would seem that according to her 'cause' and 'means of' are synonymous. But strictly speaking the two are not exactly the same. Perhaps it would best suit our discussion if we cite examples given by Ashton herself. We can then use these examples to show why we think there are problems involved in her analysis.

- | | | | |
|----|------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1. | (i) | alikhwenda <u>kwa</u> miguu | he went <u>on</u>
foot |
| | (ii) | alikhwenda <u>kwa</u> gari | he went <u>by</u>
train |

(iii)	aliku <u>fa</u> <u>kwa</u> njaa	he died <u>of</u> hunger
(iv)	aliku <u>chonga</u> <u>kwa</u> tezo	he shaped it <u>with</u> an adze
(v)	alim <u>tambua</u> <u>kwa</u> sauti yake	he recognized him <u>by</u> his voice
(vi)	aliku <u>sa</u> <u>kwa</u> ujinga wake	he failed <u>through</u> his ignorance
(vii)	aliku <u>staa</u> jabu <u>kwa</u> uzuri wake	he was astonished <u>at</u> its beauty
2.	(i) <u>Kwa</u> ajili hii siendi tena	<u>for</u> this reason I am not going again.
	(ii) nguo hizi hazim <u>fai</u> <u>kwa</u> kazi	these clothes are no use to him <u>for</u> work
	(iii) aliku <u>wenda</u> zake <u>kwa</u> furaha	he went away <u>with</u> joy (in a state of joy)
	(iv) fanya kazi yako <u>kwa</u> bidii	do you work <u>with</u> zest.
	(v) alion <u>doka</u> <u>kwa</u> haraka	he left <u>with</u> haste (in a hurry)
	(vi) <u>kwa</u> nini huk <u>wenda</u> ?	<u>why</u> did you not go?
	(vii) <u>kwa</u> sababu gani hukun <u>iita</u> ?	<u>for</u> what reason did you not call me?

The first problem which we encounter here is that as far as characterization is concerned Ashton does not say which one of the given examples belongs to what. She

probably assumes that we can infer from the glosses she provides. But glosses can sometimes be very misleading. Let us go back to the examples she gives to show what we mean.

Going through the examples given in 1 and 2 above we can make the following subgroupings:

- a) Sentences (i), (ii), (iv) in 1 and sentence (ii) in 2
- b) Sentences (iii), (v), (vi) (vii) in 1
- c) Sentences (i), (vi) (vii) in 2
- d) Sentences (iii), (iv), (v) in 2

Of course there are some slight differences in terms of the messages conveyed but these are essentially the major subgroupings. The sentences in (a) could fall under what Ashton calls 'means' or 'aid'; those in (b) under what she calls 'cause', those in (c) under what she calls 'reason' and those in (d) under what she calls 'manner'. One might argue that sentence 1 (iv) could equally be considered under (a) and not necessarily under (b). This cannot, however, be true if we critically examine the sentences in (a). Observe the following examples;

3. (i) alikwenda kwa miguu 'he went on foot'

(ii) alikwenda kwa gari 'he went by train

as opposed to:

(iii) alikufa kwa njaa 'he died of hunger'

(v) alimtambua kwa sauti 'he recognized him by
yake his voice'

In sentence 3 (i) the 'going' and the 'legs' (i.e. the feet) are part and parcel or the action simultaneously. That is, the going did not precede the movement of the legs and vice versa. Again in 3 (ii) the going did not precede the movement of the train. However, in 3 (iii) hunger preceded death; he first felt hungry the consequence of which was his death. In 3 (v) too the voice preceded the recognition; he first heard the voice and then interpreted it as being his/hers. Therefore there is a clear distinction between the sentences in (a) and those in (b). Given these

considerations we can say that to treat 'cause' and 'means' undifferentiated, as Ashton tends to do, is rather unwarranted.

The second problem concerns the morphological status of the form KWA. With regard to this Ashton makes a claim which is rather curious. She claims that the form KWA is derived from the prefix 'KU' - and the 'A of relationship' and adds that this prefix (i.e. KU-) must be distinguished from the 'KU-' of place. What makes the whole claim curious is the fact that she does not attempt to give any explanation as to why this prefix should be distinguished from the 'KU-' of place; neither does she say what kind of prefix 'KU-' this one is.

In any case, from her discussion it would seem that Ashton distinguishes two kinds of KWAs.² Besides the one we have been considering above Ashton believes there is a 'KWA' of place. She says: "when built upon the 'KU-' of place KWA has a directional significance". At this point we will not attempt to say whether or not this kind of stand is justifiable; we will come back to it in the last part of our discussion. What is important to note here, however, is that Ashton realizes the fact that KWA can also be used to refer to place. But according to her the KWA of place is different from the KWA we have been discussing above.

Another scholar who has also made great contribution to the study of Kiswahili grammar is Loogman (1965). At first sight Loogman seems to differ radically from Ashton on the issue. However, some of the things he says are in agreement with what Ashton says as we will very soon see.

At the very beginning of his discussion³ Loogman makes a very bold claim. He says that as far as the morphology of the form KWA is concerned it consists of the locative prefix 'KU' joined to the connective '-A' He adds by saying "the force of this form (which he calls mwao) is basically locative" This is a statement the validity of which we must critically examine.

By saying that the prefix 'KU-' is joined to the connective -A (or -A of relationship as some people, including Ashton, call it) Loogman is in agreement with Ashton. But by saying that the 'KU-' that is involved here is the locative 'KU-' Loogman differs radically

from Ashton. While Ashton thinks that the KWA of direction (or place) differs from the KWA of say 'manner' or 'cause', Loogman tends to think that it is just the same KWA. There seems to be something more serious with Loogman's claim that KWA is basically locative. This is because according to him KWA must somehow show reference to location. This, however, is not quite true as we will see.

Loogman seems to contradict himself when he claims that the form KWA is basically locative while at the same time saying, "in addition to its use in these locative constructions the 'mwao' KWA has several other important uses in Swahili." Here it may not be clear why this seems a contradiction. But let us examine some of the examples he gives:

4. (i) J. aliandika barua hii kwa kalamu mpya 'J. wrote this letter with a new pen'.
 (ii) Simba aliuawa kwa sumu 'the lion was killed with poison'.
 (iii) Mzungu akapigwa kwa 'the white man was struck with a stone'.

In these sentences Loogman says that the KWA is used to support the names of instruments. One really wonders what it means to say that KWA is used to "support" the name of an instrument. Loogman is probably assuming the instrumental role which is essentially the same as the one that we saw in (a) sentences above (cf. 1 and 2).⁴ If not then his claim is rather unmotivated.

5. (i) Walimjia Sultani kwa 'they went to see the Sultan for the purpose of getting the case judged'.
 shauri ya kuamuliwa.

Here Loogman says the KWA is used to express 'purpose' or 'aim'. This function of KWA may seem rather 'new' at first sight but it is not in any strict sense different from such sentences as we saw in group (c) above (cf. 1 and 2).

6. (i) Tukaja kwa gari la 'We came by train up to Kilindini and then
 moshi mpaka Kilindini
 halafu tukaja kwa miguu. we came on foot'

In this sentence Loogman says that KWA is used to indicate 'manner' or 'mode of action'. It is clear here that Loogman looks at the function of KWA from the view point of the way the action is done while Ashton looks at it in the same context from the view point of the means of doing that particular action. These are two different approaches and none of them is, we believe, better than the other.

What seems interesting here though, is the fact that even when Loogman sees clearly that the examples given in 4-6 do not involve anything like location in terms of the function of KWA he still claims that this KWA is basically locative. Notice that here too Loogman, like Ashton, falls into the problem of making claims without justifying them. Why must we think that the KWA in examples 4-6 above is derived from KU- of place and the -A of relationship (or connective -A, to use his terminology)? In other words is there any reason for not treating the KWA realized in such examples as 4-6 above as different from the KWA of location as Ashton does? This problem, Loogman too does not address himself to.

Brain (1969)⁵ and Wilson (1972)⁶ also mention just in passing the function of the form KWA. Seriously speaking they say nothing about the semantic characterization of this form other than giving a few examples of contexts in which the form can occur. As to the morphological analysis of the word they also say nothing worth mentioning.

Polome (1967)⁷ discusses this form briefly. He outlines what he calls the four functions of KWA in the following way.

7. (i) to mark location

e.g. mtalala <u>kwa</u> Shabani	you will sleep at Shabani's place
---------------------------------	---

(ii) to express associative concepts

e.g. (a) sipendi wali <u>kwa</u> samaki	'I do not like (eating) rice <u>with fish</u> '.
--	--

(b) Wazee <u>kwa</u> watoto	' <u>(both)</u> oldmen <u>and</u> children'
-----------------------------	--

form. First is the prefix used on "-A of relationship" in "concord" with an infinitive verb, as in 'Kuimba KWA watoto' (the singing of the children); second is the locative KU- which may or may not be in 'concord' with a noun + NI as in 'nyumba + NI kwa Bw. Ali (at Mr. Ali's place); the third is an unidentified KU- Prefix used with '-A of relationship' to express such messages as cause, instrument, manner and the like.

Morava tends to think that the first two KWAs are one and the same. She argues that the first KU- (which she calls the KU- of infinitive) is the temporal analogue of the spatial KU-. She argues further that even the third KU- also falls under the first two KUs. The reason, according to her, being that 'wherever KWA is used there appears to be at least a spatio-temporal co-existence of two entities or occurrences such that it is nearly always translatable as English "by" or "with".

We pointed out above that both Morava and Loogman agree that KWA is basically a locative form. The difference between the two scholars, however, lies in the fact that while Loogman fails to substantiate his arguments Morava provides evidence to support her claim. Morava's arguments are based on the localist hypothesis which believes, among other things, that temporal expressions in many unrelated languages are derived from locative expressions; that almost all prepositions and or particles which are locative are also temporal; and that what is true of prepositions and particles is also true of many verbs, adverbs, adjectives and conjunctions (cf. Anderson 1973; Lyons 1977: 718- 19). Localists argue further that even 'process' verbs have a locative kind of inclination. The logic behind this argument is that although processes take certain spans of time it is possible to locate a point within the duration of a process. A conclusion of this sort is based, according to localists, on the following premise: that events happen at certain points of time; that a point is contained within a line; and that the duration of a process represents its line; hence the argument that a point can be located within a duration of a process. Since a point can be located within a duration of a process it is logical to conclude that 'process' verbs are underlyingly locative, so they argue.

It is from the standpoint spelled out in the preceding paragraph that Morava (op. cit) argues that all KWAs in Kiswahili are basically locative. While Morava's analysis

of KWA seems plausible we think that it is unnecessarily abstract. It is rather difficult to convince any native speaker that the verb 'Kutembea' (walking) is locative. Note that most contemporary linguists are of the opinion that an analysis that is too abstract is less valued than one that is less abstract. We do not think that there is much to be gained by buying this localist approach. Hence our rejection of Morava's analysis.

Myachina (1981) also mentions in passing that KWA is formed from the possessive particle -A modulated in the locative class. Myachina gives no further explanations. She therefore faces the same problem as her predecessors.

3.0 THE MORPHOLOGY OF KWA

Having surveyed the different views about the form KWA as propounded by different Kiswahili scholars we may now try to give a critical evaluation of these views and suggest what seems to be a more appropriate way of viewing the concepts associated with this form. Since there seems to be more disagreement on the issue of the morphological set up of this form rather than on the semantic notions associated with it we will begin by looking at its morphology.

All the scholars we have considered so far seem to agree that the morphology of KWA is a prefix KU- and the -A of relationship. The disagreement crops up when we come to think what the prefix really is. Ashton thinks that there are two types of KWAs; that both these forms are formed from two different prefixes, both of which have the forms KU- and -A of relationship. Ashton claims that one of the two KU- prefixes is locative while the other is not. But as we saw earlier she does not tell us what this other prefix is; for surely since one of the two prefixes is interpretable (i.e. as 'locative') the other too should be.

Others like Loogman and Morava claim that this KWA is derived from the locative prefix KU- joined to the -A of relationship. Others like Polome, Brain Wilson and Steere for example do not attempt to explain this form but judging from their explanations with regard to its uses it is clear that they too take Loogman's view. If we look at Loogman's claim in a more critical sense we find that it is not without problems. We will now delve into it more closely.

Loogman argues that the prefix KU- in the form KWA is basically locative. However, as we pointed out earlier, Loogman himself admits that the form has several other important uses in Kiswahili. He gives examples (cf. 4-6) which do not overtly show that there is anything like location involved in them. One, therefore, wonders why Loogman claims that this form is basically locative. It cannot be imagined that in a sentence like "Juma aliandika barua kwa kalamu" (cf. 4 (i)) any native speaker of Kiswahili would really feel that KWA here implies that some 'locativeness' is involved in it.

It appears therefore that Loogman's claim has no justification whatsoever. On the basis of this the claim that the prefix KU- is necessarily locative must be rejected. Given this trend of thinking one would be inclined to conclude that Ashton is actually correct in claiming that there are two different KU- prefixes. However as we will soon see this is not entirely true.

The analysis we present here is based on the hypothesis that morphologically there is only one KU- prefix. Our analysis claims that whatever the semantic implications of this form are the prefix is basically one of agreement (or concord). We will now elaborate on this.

We agree with Loogman, Morava, Ashton and others that in a sentence like: "mtalala kwa Shabani" (you will sleep at Shabani's place) the prefix KU- in KWA implies location. However, what they don't point out is the fact that this prefix KU- is an agreement marker indicating location, an indefinite location to be precise.¹⁰ Notice that one could also say:

8. Mtalala mwa Shabani "You will sleep in Shabani's house/place"

We think that this information about agreement is not only crucial but central too; it cannot in any way be ignored if we are to come to grips with the basis of this prefix. It is within the sense of agreement that the scholars have come to conclude that this prefix is a locative form.

We would also like to argue that what Ashton calls a second prefix KU-, i.e. one which is used in such sentences as: "Mzungu akapigwa kwa jiwe" (cf. 4 (iii)) and "alikuwenda kwa gari" (cf. 1 (ii)) is also a case of agree-

ment. In which case morphologically this prefix does not differ from the one that we just saw. However, this is not a straightforward case and needs some explanation.

In order to come to grips with the issue at hand let us re-examine the following examples:

1. (ii) alikwenda kwa gari
- (iii) alikufa kwa njaa
4. (i) aliandika barua kwa kalamu mpya
- (ii) simba aliuawa kwa sumu

What we would like to claim here is that the kind of agreement which is realized in the above sentences is triggered by the more basic or underlying and neutral forms of these sentences. The neutral forms are:-

1. (ii) kuenda kua gari
- (iii) kufa kua njaa
4. (i) kuandika kua kalamu
- (ii) kuuawa kua sumu

Clearly here we see that the prefix KU- agrees with the prefix of the infinitive form (i.e. it agrees with KU-). It must be stressed here that the agreement in these forms can only be realized if we look at the underlying structure of both the infinitive and the form KWA. And as we will see when we examine its semantic function this form (i.e. KWA) plays an important role in giving us more information about the action involved.

In some sentences the opacity of the nature of agreement is even greater such that it becomes even more difficult to realize the fact that the prefix KU- is triggered by the agreement force. Observe the following sentences.

7. (ii) (a) Sipendi wali kwa samaki
- (iv) Kwinini yafaa kwa dawa

Note that in these sentences there is no indication of an infinitive form. One might, therefore, wonder how it

could be claimed that the prefix KU- in KWA is an agreement marker. A close examination of sentence 7. (ii), however, tends to show that this sentence is derived from the sentence: "Mimi sipendi kula wali kwa samaki" ('I don't like eating rice with fish'). The form KWA again here refers to the action - "kula" (to eat). Given this the claim that the prefix KU- in the form KWA is an agreement marker becomes rather obvious. Hence /Ku-la wali Ku-a samaki/. The same thing applies to 7. (iv) Kwinini yafaa KWA dawa. This sentence is derived from: "Kwinini yafaa kutumiwa kwa dawa". In which case the prefix Ku- in KWA agrees with the prefix Ku- in 'kutumiwa'.

This same process is also evidenced in interrogative construction like:

2. (vi) Kwa nini hukwenda?
 (vii) Kwa sababu gani hukuniita

Assuming that these interrogative constructions are derived from affirmative constructions such as:

- | | | | | |
|---------|-------------|-----|--------------------|---|
| 2. (vi) | (hukwenda) | kwa | { kuwa
sababu } | X |
| (vii) | (hukuniita) | kwa | { kuwa
sababu } | Y |

we can also say that the prefix KU- in KWA agrees with the prefix KU- in 'kuenda', in the case of the former sentence and in 'kuniita' in the case of the latter.

The examples given above clearly demonstrate that the prefix Ku- in kwa is one that marks agreement more than anything else. In fact looking at this prefix in the way we did explains why the following constructions are ambiguous:

7. (i) kulala kwa Shabani
 (ii) kwenda kwa Juma

The above sentences are ambiguous in that (i) can be interpreted in the following two ways:

- (i) (a) to sleep at Shabani's place
 the sleeping of Shabani

Sentence 7 (ii) can also be interpreted in the following two ways:

7. (ii) (a) to go at Juma's place
(b) the going of Juma

In other words if the prefix Ku- is taken as an agreement marker which refers to place then the interpretation will be that of (a). On the other hand if the prefix is regarded as an agreement marker for the gerundive form the interpretation will be that of (b).

4.0 THE SEMANTIC CHARACTERIZATION OF KWA

Having discussed in detail the morphological set up of the form KWA we may now turn to the issue of the concepts associated with it. According to the views of the scholars we have seen above the form KWA seems to be associated with the following concepts:

- (a) expressing means or aid in doing something, e.g.

9. Juma alisafiri kwa basi 'Juma travelled by bus i.e. the bus was the means of going.

- (b) to express cause, e.g.

10. Mzee yule alikufa kwa njaa "That old man died of hunger' i.e. hunger was the cause of his death.

- (c) to express reason, e.g.

11. Mwalimu alimchukia kwa uvivu wake 'The teacher hated him because of his laziness'

- (d) to express manner of action, e.g.

12. Amina anafanya kazi kwa bidii 'Amina works with zeal'

In order to get a clearer picture of these concepts let us add more examples. Observe the following sentences:

13. Kwa sheria ya Kiislamu 'according to
aliyofanya ni makosa. Islamic Law what
(s)he did was wrong'

Here we get the idea that kwa is employed as a kind of measure. That is, something on the basis of which a judgement is made.

14. Kwa mfano 'for example'

In this case KWA seems to be playing a somewhat explanatory role. The association shown here is one of clarity.

15. Kwa kufanya hivyo 'by so doing you
umejiharibia unga. have spoiled your
own bread'

Here we get the idea that KWA is used to show result of the action.

16. Kwa kheri 'good luck'

KWA is used to show that the person is being wished good luck in whatever thing he/she is doing or going to do. Clearly it reflects manner.

17. Bakari amekwenda kwa Magesa 'Bakari has gone
to Magesa's house/
place'

In this case KWA seems to denote location.

Having looked at all these examples we can perhaps now try to sum up the kind of concepts involved in (or which seem to go with) the form KWA. Our examples show that functionally there seems to be two kinds of KWA. This is where we think Ashton was correct in thinking that there are two KWAs, although she did not put her facts straight. The first KWA is one that refers to nothing else but location, functionally at least. This is the kind of KWA that we find in such sentences as: 'Bakari amekwenda KWA Magesa' (Bakari has gone to Magesa's house/place). The second KWA is one that gives us more information about the verb itself. This is seen in such examples as: 'Juma alisafiri KWA basi' (cf. 9); 'mwalimu alimchukia KWA uvivu wake' (cf. 11) and 'Mzee alikufa KWA njaa' (cf. 10). In all the three examples KWA seems to be pointing out or

signalling additional information with regard to the action (i.e. the verb). We may therefore, say that functionally there are two KWAs, the LOCATIVE KWA and the ADVERBIAL KWA.

Although we have said that functionally there are two KWAs care should be taken not to confuse the functions and the semantic notions involved. If we were to go through all the examples we have seen so far we would discover that the adverbial KWA has many concepts associated with it. More specifically it has different shades of meaning.

It must be pointed out here that the different shades of meaning and the different messages conveyed when this KWA is used pretty much depend on the different contexts in which it will occur. Given this state of affairs it would not be correct to limit the number of concepts reflected in the use of this form nor would it be possible to give an exhaustive list of the kinds of concepts associated with it. This is because, as Morava (1974) correctly observes, it is not this form that really triggers the different concepts and or messages. Rather it is the amalgamation of the verb, the form KWA and the noun (or noun phrase) that immediately follows the form KWA. In other words the meanings or messages conveyed depend on the relationship of the three items.

What the above paragraph suggests is that although in previous scholarship it has been taken for granted that this form (i.e. KWA) carries a number of concepts associated with it is argued here that this is in fact not the case. According to our analysis the form KWA serves as a link between the verb (or sometimes a noun) and the following noun. Our analysis goes further to suggest that this is not just a linking particle but as a semantic item it is a semantic "Associator". It associates semantic relationships between the verb (or noun) and the noun immediately following it. Although the form, by itself, has no clearly defined meaning or concept its presence plays quite an important role in that its absence in constructions that would otherwise require it either renders the constructions unacceptable or destroys the intended meaning. The following examples illustrate what we mean here:

18. (a) Nilichonga kwa tezo 'I shaped (s'thing)
with an adze'

- (b) Nilichonga tezo 'I shaped an adze'
19. (a) alikwenda zake kwa 'he went away
furaha happily'
- (b) *alikwenda zake furaha

In 18, we see that the absence of KWA destroys the intended meaning, although it does not render the sentence unacceptable. In 19 on the other hand we find that the absence of this form renders the whole construction unacceptable (cf. 19 (b)). Of course there are a few cases where the absence of this form neither destroys the intended meaning nor renders the construction unacceptable as in 20 below.

20. (a) Mzee amekufa kwa 'the oldman has
njaa died of hunger'
- (b) Mzee amekufa njaa.

Notice, however, that this can only happen in cases of idiomatic expressions and not in any other ordinary use. 20 (b) is therefore, a case of an idiomatic expression.

The fact that cases like 18(b) and 19(b) happen and the fact that the form KWA by itself has no clearly defined semantic meaning proves that messages conveyed in constructions of the sort given in 18(a), 19(a), 20(a) and the like are a result of the amalgamation of the three items pointed out above. Furthermore, the fact that the absence of KWA in constructions which would otherwise require it either destroys the intended meaning/message or renders the construction unacceptable proves that the form KWA is a semantic "Associator".

5.0 CONCLUSION

In this paper we have attempted a critical examination of both the morphological and semantic characterization of the form KWA in Kiswahili. We have surveyed previous literature on this topic and evaluated it accordingly. We have rejected the claim that the form KWA is necessarily derived from the locative KU- joined to the -A of relationship. We have shown that the misconceptions and confusions that surface in previous

literature with regard to this form have arisen due to the fact that scholars have been confusing two levels of analysis - the morphological level and the semantic level. We have argued that in order to have a clear understanding of the morphological set up of this form and its semantic function the two levels of analysis have to be kept apart.

In our analysis we have shown that from a purely morphological point of view there is only one KU- prefix in the form KWA. That is, there is only one KWA. This in a way seems to fall in line with the claim made by such people as Loogman and Morava. However, we differ from them in that while they claim that this prefix (i.e. KU-) is basically locative we tend to believe that from a purely morphological point of view this is just a case of AGREEMENT. That is the KU- in KWA is basically an agreement marker. According to our analysis at this point it does not really matter whether this agreement marker entails location and or anything else.

We have also argued that from a functional point of view there are two KWAs as Ashton in a way suggests. (Note that Ashton's claim is that there are two KU- prefixes - hence two KWAs) the LOCATIVE KWA and the ADVERBIAL KWA. It is important to note here that our analysis does not claim that there is a locative KU and an adverbial KU-. Rather we are saying that at the level of function there are two uses of KWA, a locative use and an adverbial use.

. Finally, from a purely semantic point of view we agree with Morava (1974) that the form KWA itself has no clearly defined meaning. Our analysis goes a step further to suggest that as a semantic item the form KWA is a semantic 'Associator' serving as a semantic link between the infinitive form (or noun, in cases of locatives) and the noun (or noun phrase) that immediately follows it.

FOOTNOTES

1. Ashton's discussion on this subject is given on pages 171-174 of her book: Swahili Grammar (Including Intonation): (1944).

2. Going through Ashton's book one notices that actually Ashton might be distinguishing three kinds of KWA's; besides the above two there is also KU- of agreement.
3. See Loogman, A: Swahili Grammar and Synatax (1965) p. 286
4. We realize the problems involved in using such semantic terms as 'instrumental' role. However, we are using it here in a less restricted sense.
5. See Brain, J.L. (1969) Basic Structures of Swahili (Syracuse University Program of E.A.)
6. See Wilson (1972): Simplified Swahili
7. See Polome, E. (1967): Swahili Language Handbook
8. See Steere, E. (1934): Swahili Exercises (Revised Edition) OUP pp. 23-27
9. See Broomfield (1962) Sarufi ya Kiswahili: p. 91
10. This KU- prefix is an agreement marker for the KU class - one of the three subclasses of the PA-MU-KU class of PLACE.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ashton, E.O. (1944): Swahili Grammar (Including Intonation). Longman, London.
- Block, H.P. (1948): Swahili Anthology with Notes and Glossaries Vol. I.
- Brain, J.L. (1969): Basic Structures of Swahili. Syracuse University Program of E.A. New York.
- Broomfield, G.W. (1962): Sarufi ya Kiswahili. The Sheldon Press, London.
- Loogman, A. (1965): Swahili Grammar and Syntax. Duquesne University Press. Pittsburg Pa.

Morava, E. (1974): "Semantics of the Swahili Locative System." M.A. Essay. Columbia University.

Myachina, E.N. (1981): The Swahili Language - A Descriptive Grammar. London, Boston and Henley.

Polome, E. (1967): Swahili Language Handbook. Washington, D.C.

Steere, E. (1976): Swahili Exercises (Revised Ed.) OUP.

Wilson, P.M. (1970): Simplified Swahili. E.A.L.B. Nairobi.