# Complex Motion Events and Clause Combining in Saamia

HIEDA, Osamu
Tokyo University of Foreign Studies

Contrary to Talmy (2000: 222), who regards Bantu languages as verb-framed languages, Saamia (E34) is not a verb-framed language. However, it is not a satellite-framed language, either. This language expresses many types of complex events with a construction where a finite clause is followed by a non-finite clause without any linking morpheme. For example, when it is used for the domain of motion, the first clause expresses manner or cause, while the second one expresses motion including path. The present paper also points out that this construction may originate from a cross-linguistically common adverbial clause of consequence. This construction may develop on the basis of semantic function of the adverbial clause of consequence where the second clause expresses the consequence of the event described by the preceding clause. There is an iconic relationship between the order of events or states and that of clauses in the construction; the event or state described by the first clause has to happen before the event or state described by the second clause occurs.

Keywords: Saamia, Bantu, complex event, motion, clause combining

# 1. Introduction[1]

All linguists might agree that discovering arbitrariness marked an epoch in modern linguistics. Nevertheless, some linguistic elements such as onomatopoeia show non-arbitrary relation between expression and meaning because of their physical properties. In this paper, I will demonstrate that Saamia, a dialect of the Luyia language, has a particular construction consisting of clauses combined in a non-arbitrary manner of meaning upon expression. In this particular construction, clauses are always arranged in the order whereby the events described by them occur.

One might regard Saamia as one of the satellite-framed languages according to the typological classification of meaning-expression relation developed by Talmy, Slobin, and their colleagues, with the reservation that a clause subordinated to a main one can be the satellite (Talmy 2000, Croft, Barddal, Hollman, Sotirova, and Taoka 2002). This typology is based on how an event complex is integrated into one clause on the assumption that languages have stereotyped expression patterns for expressing meanings that speakers categorize through their cognitive system. An example in Talmy's works is the typology with regard to the ways that languages integrate an event complex into a clause (Talmy 2000). The following sentence illustrates how English expresses a complex motion event (Talmy 2000. Vol. Ⅱ: 30). Sentence (1) expresses at once both the framing event of motion and the manner: [I WENT down the stairs] and [I run].

(1)  I ran down the stairs. = [I WENT down the stairs] WITH-THE-MANNER-OF [I run]

According to Talmy's framework, a sentence such as (1) integrates two events (cognitive contents): the motion of the subject's moving down the stairs and the manner of the subject's running. In these events, motion is the framing event, which plays a primary role in an event complex. Manner or cause is a co-event, which holds a particular supplementary relation to a framing event. Languages are classified into two major types: satellite-framed and verb-framed. The verb-framed languages are those in which the core schema in a motion event, namely the path of motion, is encoded by a verb. The satellite-framed languages are those in which the core schema in a motion is expressed by a satellite element affiliated with a verb, such as clitics or adverbs.

Some researchers have tried to classify African languages into the these major types by adopting Talmy, Slobin, and their colleagues' approach. However, they sometimes do not understand the framework that Talmy, Slobin, and their colleagues have used to attain their goal. When the researchers discuss motion events, for example, they do not distinguish between a transitional and a "self-contained" motion. For example, Heyking and Storch regard that Boor, a western Nilotic language, is a satellite-framed language by taking the following sentence as an example (Heyking and Storch 2007: 98).

(2)  utem       na      wɔt      ki       rɪ         bat̪kɔt       (Boor).
     spider     COP     walk     PART     PREP:on    roof         (ceiling)
     'the spider is walking on the ceiling.'

As Heyking and Storch point out, the preposition *rɪ* 'on' is a locative preposition. They mention that most of the prepositions can be used to define path, though they do not make

clear that Sentence (2) expresses a "self-contained" motion.[2] Without being clear whether it expresses a complex event or not, this type of sentence cannot be used to test whether a particular language is satellite-framed or verb-framed.

We will discuss here the typological classification of Saamia making sure that each example sentence expresses a complex motion event.

Saamia is spoken in eastern parts of Uganda, Busia, Bugiri, Butaleja, Kamuli, and Tororo District. It is a dialect of the Luyia language, a Bantu language spoken in Kenya and Uganda (cf. *Uganda Districts Information Handbook, Expanded Edition 2007-2008*). The number of Saamia speakers is listed as 50,000 in Ethonologue 2005 (Gordon 2005).

Saamia is an under-studied language. To my knowledge, there is only a morphological sketch of the tense system of the language (Botne 2006). We do not have sufficient information about its grammar, nor a reliable dictionary. However, it is not necessary for readers who have knowledge on Bantu languages to be given explanation about the Saamia phonological and morphological system, because the language has a typical Bantu phonological and morphological system. In order for other readers to understand the points of this paper, I will supply minimal information of the morphological system.[3]

## 1.1. Saamia morphology

Saamia has no morphological device for expressing case. It has SVO as its basic word order. In the verbal morphology, a verbal complex consists of a subject prefix, a tense marker, an object prefix, a verb stem, and a final vowel. In (3), for example, the verb stem *heng-es-a* 'make (someone) cut' is preceded by the third person singular subject prefix fused with the simple past tense marker, *yáá-* '3SG:PAST,' and is preceded by the object suffix *yi-* 'OS' that refers to the antecedent *émotoka* 'a car.' A verb stem may be extended by a derivational suffix. The verb stem *heng-es-a* 'make (someone) cut' is a causative verb stem extended by the derivational suffix *-es* 'CAUS.' A verbal complex has the final vowel *-a* 'FV' in the final position.[4]

(3) Yáá-sindih-a           émotoka,       yáá-yi-heng-es-a                engíra.[5]
    3SG:PAST-push-FV        car            3SG:PAST-OS-cut-CAUS-FV        road
    'S/he pushed a car, S/he made it cut a road (=S/he pushed a car across a road).'

---

[2] The English translation reveals sentence (2) to be an expression of a "self-contained" motion. Sentence (2) might express what action the spider is doing on the ceiling. Thus, sentence (2) might not express a complex event.
[3] I use the conventional orthography of Swahili writing system to describe Saamia. For example, the palatal plosive /c/ and the palatal nasal /ɲ/ are written ch and ny, and the velar nasal /ŋ/ ng'. Saamia has prenasalized plosive consonants, mb, nd, nj, and ng.
[4] A verbal complex always ends with the final vowel *-a* 'FV' in indicative mood.
[5] The vowel of the third person singular subject prefix *yá-* '3SG' and the simple past tense marker *a-* 'PAST' are coalesced into *yáá-* here. An acute accent marker on vowels marks high tone, though the tonal description in this paper is tentative.

Saamia nouns are classified into noun classes like other Bantu languages. Locative nouns form a class in the noun class system. For example, the locative noun *mú-nyumba* 'inside a house' expresses location in a sentence such as (4).

(4) Yáá-kend-a          mú-nyumba.
    3SG:PAST-walk-FV     LOC-house
    'S/he walked in a house (inside a house).'

## 2. Is Saamia a satellite-framed language?

It is controversial whether Saamia is a satellite-framed language with regard to the typological classification of meaning-to-expression relationship.

Saamia locative prefixes as a classifier on the noun do not express motion, but express location in a "self-contained" motion or ground in a transitional motion. For example, the locative prefix *mú-* 'inside' does not express the motion, but the location of the "self-contained" motion expressed by the verb *-kenda* 'walk' in (4). Thus, this sentence is interpreted to mean that the subject was walking inside the house.

Saamia also has the applicative verbal extension that many Bantu languages commonly have in their verbal morphology, but the Saamia applicative suffix *-ir/-er* 'for, with' has semantic function to express only benefactive or instrumental meaning, as shown in (5).[6] Saamia applicative extension does not express "motion toward" unlike applicative extension in other Bantu languages.[7]

(5) Yáá-m-sindih-ir-a          ómwana        émotoka.
    3SG:PAST-3SG-push-for-FV     child         car
    'S/he pushed a car for a child.'

Saamia has only one motion verb that seemingly conflates the meanings of a motion and a co-event. The verb *-iruha 'run'* expresses at once the motion as a framing event and the manner as a co-event in (6). As the English translation shows, however, the meaning of the verb *-iruha* 'run' is ambiguous. It may sometimes express a "self-contained"

---

[6] The vowel of the applicative suffix is subjected to vowel harmony with the preceding vowels.

[7] For example, in Swahili, a Bantu language, motion verbs with the applicative extension express "motion toward," but they do not express a transitional motion. Sentence (1) is interpreted to mean that the subject was on his way to a house. The motion verb with the applicative extension does not express a transitional motion event as a macro-event.

(1) A-li-tenbe-le-a          nyumba.        (Swahili)
    3SG-PAST-walk-toward-FV     house
    'He walked toward a house.'

motion event, depending on the construction where it is used: S/he was running inside a house. It may sometimes express at once both of motion as a framing event and manner as a co-event: S/he ran into a house, or ran out of a house, provided that the verb -*iruha* 'run' is used regardless of the path. Motion and manner are seemingly conflated within the Saamia verb -*iruha* 'run.' However, Saamia is not regarded as one of languages that has a series of verbs conflating motion and manner, because peculiar verbs such as the verb -*iruha* 'run' are isolated in the lexicon and do not constitute a core part in event integration.[8]

(6)  Yéeruha                          mú-nymba.[9]
     3SG:PAST:run in/into/out of      LOC-house
     'S/he ran in/into/out of a house.'

In Saamia, a complex motion event is expressed by neither locative prefixes nor verbal extension. It is expressed by a construction consisting of two clauses combined without any linking morpheme, where the subordinate clause is always preceded by the main clause. In a complex motion event, the manner is expressed by the main clause, but the motion including path or ground is expressed by the subordinate clause, as shown in (7).[10] The main clause *yéeruha* 's/he ran' expresses manner, while the subordinate clause *yéengira mú-nymba* 's/he entered a house' expresses the motion including path.

---

[8]  There are a few transitive verbs such as -*chuha* 'pour into' that seemingly conflate motion, and cause or manner.

(i)  Chuha          ámaachi      mu-chúpa.
     IMP:pour into   water        LOC-bottle
     'Pour water into the bottle.'

[9]  The vowel /i/ of the verb -*iruha* 'run' is coalesced into /ée/ with the vowels of the third person singular subject prefix and the simple past tense marker.
[10]  A verb of the second clause has to be inflected in the simple past when it is preceded by the first clause consisting of a verb inflected in one of the past tenses: namely the simple past, the today past, or the yesterday past. It has to be inflected in the subjunctive mood when it is preceded by the first clause consisting of a verb inflected in one of the non-past tenses: namely the present, the near future, or the remote future. Because the tense of the second clause depends on that of the first one, the second clause could be regarded as subordinated.

(i)  Nderúhíré,      ndéngira         mú-nyumba.
     1SG:TPAST:ran   1SG:PAST:enter   LOC-house
     'I ran into the house today.'

(ii)  Nj-íruha,       ny-ingire       mú-nyumba.
      1SG:PRES:run    1SG-enter:SUB   LOC-house
      'I run into a house.'

Although a verb in the second clause is in the simple past tense, this tense can be regarded functionally as a non-finite tense because a verb in the second clause cannot be not in any other tense than the simple past. The tense in the first clauses controls the tense of the whole sentence including the second clauses in the construction. Thus, two clauses combined without a linking morpheme are regarded as constructing a sentence consisting of two clauses in subordination.

(7) Yéeruha,     yéengira     mú-nymba.
    3SG:PAST:run    3SG:PAST:enter    LOC-house
    'He ran into a house.'

Thus, Saamia has a particular construction for expressing a complex event where two clauses are combined without a linking morpheme. When this construction expresses at once both of motion and manner, the first clause expresses manner or cause and the second clause expresses a core schema of motion including path or ground. I will propose that a clause can be a satellite in a complex motion event.[11] In the following section, we will discuss the syntactic and semantic characteristics of this construction as used for expressing complex motion events.

## 3. Complex event and clause combining

Complex motion events are expressed by a construction consisting of two clauses combined without a linking morpheme, where the main clause expresses manner or cause and the subordinate clause expresses motion. We will refer to the construction as "no-linker construction" hereafter. The following sentences exemplify that the motion including path "INTO" is expressed by the subordinate clauses consisting of the verb *-ingira* 'enter,' while modes of manner or cause are expressed by various verbs in the main clauses.

(8) Yáá-kend-a,     yéengir-a     mú-nyumba.
    3SG:PAST:walk-FV    3SG:PAST:enter-FV    LOC-house
    'S/he walked into the house.'

(9) Ómupííra     kwéesiringis-a,     kwéengir-a     mú-nyumba.
    ball     SP:PAST:roll-FV     SP:PAST:enter-FV     LOC-house
    'The ball rolled into the house.'

(10) Yáá-let-a     esíkónó,     yáá-yi-ingis-a     mú-nyumba.
    3SG:PAST-bring-FV    basket    3SG:PAST-OP-enter:CAUS-FV    LOC-house
    'S/he brought the basket into the house.'

In (8) and (9), the main clauses consist of an intransitive verb expressing manner. In (10) the main clause consists of a transitive verb expressing cause. In (8) and (9) a non-agentive motion is expressed by the verb *-ingira* 'enter,' while an agentive motion is

---

[11] Matsumoto (2003) pointed out that a verb can also be a satellite.

expressed by the causative verb -*ingisa* 'cause (someone) to enter' morphologically derived from the verb -*ingira* 'enter' in (10).

## 3.1. Motion events in a complex event

Because verbs in main clauses express modes of manner or cause, verbs expressing manner or cause, such as running, rushing, walking, flying, crawling, floating, jumping, throwing, pulling, pushing, or kicking, are not limited to the figures. The following sentences illustrate some verbs expressing modes of manner or cause in main clauses of the "no-linker construction," followed by the subordinate clause expressing the motion including path [INTO].

(11) Yáá-laal-a,             yéengir-a              mú-nyumba.
     3SG:PAST:rush-FV     3SG:PAST:enter-FV     LOC-house
     'S/he rushed into the house.'

(12) Eyoni     lyá-buruh-a,         lyéengir-a          mu-kúlú.
     bird      SP:PAST:fly-FV       SP:PAST:enter-FV    LOC-cloud
     'The bird flew into the cloud.'

(13) Yáá-siegér-a,           yéengir-a              mú-nyumba.
     3SG:PAST:limp-FV     3SG:PAST:enter-FV      LOC-house
     'S/he limped into the house.'

(14) Yáá-ful-a,             yéengir-a             mú-nyumba.
     3SG:PAST:crawl-FV    3SG:PAST:enter-FV     LOC-house
     'S/he crawled into the house.'

(15) Ecúpa     yá-beng-a,           yéengir-a              mú-lina.
     bottle    SP:PAST:float-FV     SP:PAST:enter-FV       LOC-hole (cave)
     'The bottle floated into the cave.'

(16) Yáá-tum-a,             yáá-kw-a            mú-maachi.
     3SG:PAST:jump-FV     3SG:PAST:fall-FV     LOC-water
     'S/he jumped into water.'[12]

(17) Yáá-tach-a            ómupíira,      kwéengir-a           mú-nyumba.
     3SG:PAST:kick-FV     ball           SP:PAST:enter-FV     LOC-house

---

[12] The verb -*kwa* 'fall' is used for expressing motion including path [INTO] here.

'S/he kicked the ball into a house.'[13]

(18) Yáá-hwes-a          émsusi,      yáá-yi-ingis-a[14]              mú-nyumba.
3SG:PAST-pull-FV       goat        3SG:PAST-OP-enter:CAUS-FV    LOC-house
'S/he pulled the goat into a house.'

The main verbs are intransitive verbs in (11) to (16), expressing various modes of manner in a complex motion event. The main clause and subordinate clauses have to share the same subject.

The main verbs are transitive in (17) and (18). In (17), once the ball leaves the subject's foot, the ball moves into the house by itself. The object in the main clause would be the subject of the intransitive verb in the subordinate clause. The goat has to be pushed by the subject of the main clause when it enters the house, as shown in (18). The subject in the main clause would be the subject of the extended causative verb in the subordinate clause.

Motion including path, such as into, to, out of, through, across, or down, are limited to the figures. Consequently, a limited number of verbs are used in subordinate clauses of the "no-linker construction" when they express motion in event integration, because verbs in the subordinate clauses express the motion including path. The following sentences illustrate the verbs that express motion including path in this construction: INTO, TO, OUT OF, THROUGH, ACROSS and DOWN.

(19) Yéeruh-a,          *yéengir-a*        mú-nyumba.
3SG:PAST:run-FV     3SG:PAST:enter-FV   LOC-house
'S/he ran into a house.'

(20) Yéeruh-a,          *yáá-ch-a*         mú-sokóni.
3SG:PAST:run-FV     3SG:PAST-come-FV   LOC-market
'S/he ran hither to the market.'[15]

---

[13] The subject kicked the ball once. When the subject continues kicking the ball into a house, an adverbial clause should be used, such as *Yáá-tach-a ómupíira, ni-kwéengir-a mú-nyumba.* 'S/he kicked the ball while it entered a house'.

[14] The causative extension *-is* 'CAUS' is coalesced with the verb stem *-ingir-* 'enter' into *-ingis-* 'make someone enter.'

[15] The notion of "TOWARD" is expressed by the verb *-cha* 'come' in an adverbial clause preceded by the conjunctive prefix *ni-* 'while/when'.

(i)  Yéeruh-a,          náá-ch-a                      mú-nyumba.
3SG:PAST:run-FV     while/when:3SG:PAST-come-FV   LOC-house
'S/he ran toward the house.'

The above sentence is interpreted to express a simultaneous event that the subject was running when s/he entered the house.

(21) Yéeruh-a,           *yáá-tul-a*              mú-nyumba.
     3SG:PAST:run-FV      3SG:PAST:come from-FV    LOC-house
     'S/he ran hither out of a house.'

(22) Yáá-hin-a,          *yáá-bit-a*              mú-lwiki.
     3SG:PAST:dance-FV    3SG:PAST:pass-FV         LOC-door
     'S/he danced through the door.'

(23) Yéeruh-a,           *yáá-heng-a*             mú-ngíra.
     3SG:PAST:run-FV      3SG:PAST:cut-FV          LOC-road
     'S/he ran across the road.'

(24) Ómuwaná     yáá-sukuna        ómupíra,     *kwésingis-a*.
     child       3SG:PAST-throw    ball          SP:PAST:fall-FV
     'A child threw a ball down.'

In summary, a complex event of motion is expressed by the "no-linker construction," where the main clause expresses manner or cause, and the subordinate one expresses motion including path.

## 3.2. Syntactic and semantic charactersitics of the "no-linker construction"

I demonstrated that a complex motion event is expressed by a particular clause combining referred to as the "no-linker construction" in Saamia in the preceding section. In order for the "no-linker construction" to be involved within clause combining, the latter has to be defined as follows; clause combining does not necessarily include embedding as an adjunct, though it never includes relativization or complementation. According to this definition, clause combining makes a construction in which clauses are linked in coordination or subordination, with a linking morpheme or without a linking morpheme. Even if it has no linking morpheme, a construction consisting of two clauses represents phonologically an independent sentence bearing the correspondence intonation pattern. No distinctive pause between a main and a subordinate clause in this construction represents a sentence boundary, though a comma separates them in this paper to clarify independent clauses conveniently.

As we have already observed, when two clauses in the "no-linker construction" express a complex event, the first clause syntactically controls the second clause. For example, the tense in the whole sentence is determined by the tense of the first clause.[16] In addition, we will discuss how this construction is integrated semantically.

---

[16] See note 10.

Two clauses in the "no-linker construction" are so closely integrated semantically that meaning of the whole construction does not differ depending on whether an adverb is located in the main or subordinate clause. For example, (25a) is semantically equivalent to (25b). In (25a), although the time adverb *ekúlo* 'yesterday' is located in the main clause, the whole sentence is interpreted to mean that the subject entered a house yesterday.

(25)  a.  Yéeruuh-é            ekúlo,          yéengir-a            mú-nyumba.
          3SG:YPAST:run-FV     yesterday       3SG:PAST:enter-FV    LOC-house
      b.  Yéeruuh-é,           yéengir-a            mú-nyumba        ekúlo.
          3SG:YPAST:run-FV     3SG:PAST:enter-FV    LOC-house        yesterday
          'S/he ran into a house yesterday.'

When the "no-linker construction" is used to express a complex motion event, it makes an assertion about the motion, not about the manner. For example, Sentence (26a) and Sentence (26b) make an assertion about the subject's entering a house, not about the subject's running. Running is an action with long duration, while entering a house is an event in an instant. Adverbs expressing long duration such as *ésawa chibili* 'for two hours' cannot be located in the main clause nor in the subordinate clause in Sentence (26a) and Sentnece (26b), because these sentences make an assertion about the subject's entering a house. Sentence (26b) is completely unacceptable. When the adverb is located in the main clause, although it can modify the preceding verb *-iruha* 'run,' the sentence (26a) is normally rejected by Saamia speakers. We can conclude that the scope of adverbs extends to whole sentences when they express a complex event.[17]

---

[17] Sentence (26a) is reluctantly accepted by Saamia speakers, when it is interrupted to mean that the subject ran for two hours and then entered to the house. In general, the scope of adverbs is limited within the clauses. The following sentences are semantically equivalent. However, when speakers intend to emphasize the speed of running, they prefer to the sentence (i a).

(i)   a.  Yéeruh-a            mangú,       yéengir-a            mú-nyumba.
          3SG:PAST:run-FV     quickly      3SG:PAST:enter-FV    LOC-house
      b.  Yéeruh-a,           yéengir-a            mú-nyumba        mangú.
          3SG:PAST:run-FV     3SG:PAST:enter-FV    LOC-house        quickly
          'S/he ran into the house quickly.'

The sentence (ii a) is semantically accepted on the condition that the manner adverb *múno* 'hard' modifies the preceding verb *-iruha* 'run', but the sentence (ii b) is rejected because the manner adverb *múno* 'hard' may not modify the verbal prase *-ingira mú-nyumba* 'enter the house.'

(ii)  a.  Yéeruh-a            múno,        yéengir-a            mú-nyumba.
          3SG:PAST:run-FV     hard         3SG:PAST:enter-FV    LOC-house
      b.* Yéeruh-a,           yéengir-a            mú-nyumba        múno.
          3SG:PAST:run-FV     3SG:PAST:enter-FV    LOC-house        hard
          'S/he ran into the house hard.'

(26) a.*/?Yéeruha     ésawa    chibili,     yéengira       mú-nyumba.
         3SG:PAST:run     hours    two       3SG:PAST:enter       LOC-house
     b.*Yéeruha,         yéengira         mú-nyumba    ésawa    chibili.
         3SG:PAST:run     3SG:PAST:enter       LOC-house        hours    two
         '*S/he ran into a house for two hours.'

Saamia has another construction where two clauses are connected by the conjunctive prefix *ni-* 'while/when'. The conjunctive *ni-* is followed by an adverbial clause in a sentence such as (27b). This construction will be referred to as "*ni-* construction" hereafter. When the main verb *-iruha 'run'* is followed by the adverbial clause specifying the point of time, *náá-bita mú-lwiki* 'while/when s/he passed the door,' Sentence (27b) sounds odd because the main verb *-iruha 'run'* expresses the action with duration. Passing a door is an event in an instant. The action described by the main clause is semantically incompatible to that described by the adverbial one. A main and an adverbial clause are interpreted independently in "*ni-* construction" such as in (27b), while a main and a subordinate clause are interpreted to express a complex event as a whole in "no-linker construction" such as in (27a). Thus, events described by the main and adverbial clause are semantically separate, not integrated in the "*ni-* construction". Main and subordinate clauses in "*ni-* construction" are interchangeable in the order because they are semantically independent. In addition, in the "*ni-* construction," the main clause makes an assertion about an event that happens at the point of time specified by the adverbial clause.

(27) a. Yéeruh-a,         yáá-bit-a         mú-lwiki.
         3SG:PAST:run-FV      3SG:PAST-pass-FV      LOC-door
         'S/he ran through the door.'
     b.?Yéeruh-a,        náá-bit-a                mú-lwiki.[18]
         3SG:PAST:run-FV      while/when:3SG:PAST-pass-FV      LOC-door
         'S/he ran while/when s/he passed the door.'

---

[18] The vowel of the conjunction *ni-* 'while/when' is coalesced with the following vowel.

We will discuss the difference between the "no-linker construction" and the "*ni-*construction" with regard to expressions of state changes briefly.

In Sentence (28a), the "no-linker construction" expresses a change of state. It is interpreted to mean that the man died because the subject hit him. Sentence (28b) with the "*ni-* construction" is judged as odd by Saamia speakers, though it could be interpreted to mean that the subject hit the dying man.

(28) a Ndá-hub-a          ómusaacha,     yáá-f-a.
        1SG:PAST-hit-FV      man             3SG:PAST-die-FV
        'I hit the man to the death.'
     b? Ndá-hub-a          ómusaacha,     náá-f-a.
        1SG:PAST-hit-FV      man             while/when:3SG:PAST-die-FV
        'I hit the man while he died.'

In summary, events described by a main and a subourdinate clause in the "no-linker construction" are integrated into a complex event, while those in the "*ni-* construction" are not integrated, but separate.

The negative marker is always located in sentence-initial position. The scope of negation extends to whole sentences in the "no-linker construction" when they express a complex event. It is not limited within the main clause. For example, in Sentence (29a), although the negative particle *si* 'NEG' has to be located in sentence-initial position, its scope extends to the whole sentence.[19] Thus, it has two interpretations: (29b) and (29c). The interpretation in (29d) is excluded, because the main clause is negated solely.

(29) a. Si       yéeruh-a,        yéengir-a          mú-nyumba.
        NEG       3SG:PAST:run-FV   3SG:PAST:enter-FV   LOC-house
        'S/he did not run into a house.'
     b. S/he neither ran nor entered a house.
     c. S/he ran but did not entered a house.
     d.*S/he did not run but entered a house.

---

[19] Because the scope of negation extends to whole sentences in the "no-linker construction", the negative particle *si* cannot occur both in the clauses.

(1)  *Si      yéeruh-a,        si       yéengir-a         mú-nyumba.
        NEG      3SG:PAST:run-FV   NEG      3SG:PAST:enter-FV   LOC-house
        'S/he did not run into the house.'

In the "*ni-* construction," when the negative particle *si* 'NEG' is located in sentence-initial position, the scope of negation does not extend to the whole sentence, but is limited within the main clause. Sentence (30a) has only one interpretation: (30d).

(30) a. Si　　　yéeruh-a,　　　ni-yáá-heng-a　　　　　　engíra.
　　　　NEG　　3SG:PAST:run-FV　while/when-3SG:PAST-cut-FV　road
　　　　'S/he did not run while s/he crossed a road.'
　　b.*S/he neither ran nor crossed a road.
　　c.*S/he ran but did not crossed a road.
　　d. S/he did not run but crossed a road.

When the "no-linker construction" expresses a complex motion event, it makes an assertion about motion rather than manner. Therefore, the negative particle located in sentence-initial position mainly negates the motion expressed by the subordinate clause. Otherwise, it negates both the motion expressed by the subordinate clause and manner expressed by the main clause. It is not possible for the negative particle *si* 'NEG' to negate only manner even if it is located in the main clause.

Illocutionary scope is usually limited within the main clause in the "no-linker construction". For example, an interrogative sentence in the construction such as (31) asks about a mode of manner expressed by the main clause. Therefore, the sentence in (32b) sounds strange as an answer to the question (31).

(31)　　Yéeruh-a,　　　　yéengir-a　　　　mú-nyumba?[20]
　　　　3SG:PAST:run-FV　3SG:PAST:enter-FV　LOC-house
　　　　'Did s/he run into a house?'

(32) a. Hába.　Si　　　yéeruh-a.
　　　　No　　NEG　　3SG:PAST:run-FV
　　　　Yá-kend-a,　　　　　yéengir-a　　　　　mú-nyumba.
　　　　3SG:PAST:walk-FV　　3SG:PAST:enter-FV　LOC-house
　　　　'No. S/he did not run. S/he walked into a house.'
　　b.?Hába.　Si　　　yéengir-a mú-nyumba.
　　　　No　　NEG　　3SG:PAST:enter-FV　LOC-house
　　　　Nayé　yéeruh-a.
　　　　but　　3SG:PAST:run-FV
　　　　'No. S/he did not enter a house. But s/he ran.'

---

[20] Interrogative sentences have a particular intonation without any change of word order. Saamia does not have a particular morpheme for interrogative sentences.

The subordinate clause is asserted in the "no-linker construction" when it expresses a complex event, as we already observed. We will research the assertion in this construction by using "Lie test". As the subordinate clause expressing the motion is asserted in this construction, my consultants accept sentences that negate the mode of manner as in (33b) but not accept sentences that negate the motion as in (33c).

(33)  a. Yohána     yáa-bol-a         ati
       John       3SG:PAST:say-FV     that
       yéeruh-a,            yéengir-a          mú-nyumba.
       3SG:PAST:run-FV     3SG:PAST:enter-FV     LOC-house
       'John said that s/he ran into a house.'

     b. Si       si-túfu.     Si       yéeruha.
       NEG     NEG-true    NEG     3SG:PAST:run
       Yá-kenda,           yéengira           mú-nyumba.
       3SG:PAST-walk      3SG:PAST:enter       LOC-house
       'That is a lie. S/he did not run. S/he walked into a house.'

     c.*Si       si-túfu.      Yéeruh-a.
       NEG     NEG-true      3SG:PAST:run-FV
       Si      yéengir-a           mú-nyumba.
       NEG     3SG:PAST:enter-FV     LOC-house
       'That is a lie. S/he ran. S/he did not entered a house.'

As for information structure, the subordinate clause in the "no-linker construction" is brought into focus when the construction expresses a complex event. A sentence with the construction such as (34a) is appropriate as an answer to the wh-question asking about what the subject did, as shown in (34). The answering sentence (34b) sounds odd because the main clause expressing the manner is brought into focus in the "*ni-* construction". On the other hand, a sentence with the "no-linker construction" such as (35a) sounds odd as an answer to the wh-question asking how the subject did, as shown in (35). The answering sentence (35b) is perfectly accepted as an answer to the wh-question because the main clause expressing the manner is brought into focus in the "*ni-* construction".

(34)     Answer to the question; What did s/he do?
     a. Yéeruh-a,           yéengir-a          mú-nyumba.
       3SG:PAST:run-FV     3SG:PAST:enter-FV     LOC-house
       'S/he ran into a house.'

     b.?Yéeruh-a,          ni-yéengir-a             mú-nyumba.
       3SG:PAST:run-FV     while/when-3SG:PAST:enter-FV     LOC-house

'S/he ran while/when s/he entered a house.'

(35) Answer to the question; How did s/he do?
  a.*Yéeruh-a,   yéengir-a   mú-nyumba.
   3SG:PAST:run-FV  3SG:PAST:enter-FV  LOC-house
   'S/he ran into a house.'
  b. Yéeruh-a,   ni-yéengir-a     mú-nyumba.
   3SG:PAST:run-FV  while/when-3SG:PAST:enter-FV  LOC-house
   'S/he ran while s/he entered a house.'


## 4. Concluding remarks: Semantics of clause combining

While discussing the syntactic and semantic characteristics of combining clauses without a linking morpheme with regard to motion expressions in the previous section, we have realized that the clause combining without a linking morpheme is identified as a particular construction for expressing a complex event. We will discuss semantic characteristics of the particular construction from the perspective of semantics of clause combining.

Dixon (2011: 3) defines two clauses in linkages, a Focal and a Supporting clause, as follows;

> One clause refers to the central activity or state of the biclausal linking; this is the Focal clause (FC).
> Attached to it, there will be a Supporting clause (SC).

As we have already discussed in Section 2, the second clause is always an FC and the first one is always an SC in the construction consisting of two clauses combined without a linking morpheme, namely in the "no-linker construction," when the construction expresses a complex event. The order of two clauses is not reversible, as shown in (36) and (37). On the other hand, the first clause may be an FC and the second one may be an SC in the linkage consisting of an adverbial clause preceded by a linking morpheme, for instance, in the "*ni-* construction." In this case the order of the clauses is reversible, as shown in (38) and (39).

```
        SC                    FC
(36)  Yéeruh-a,             yéengir-a              mú-nyumba.
      3SG:PAST:run-FV       3SG:PAST:enter-FV      LOC-house
      'S/he ran into a house.'
```

```
        FC                                   SC
(37)  *Yéengir-a            mú-nyumba,       yéeruh-a.
      3SG:PAST:enter-FV     LOC-house        3SG:PAST:run-FV
      'S/he ran into a house.'
```

```
        FC                    SC
(38)  Yéeruh-a,             ni-yéengir-a                mú-nyumba.
      3SG:PAST:run-FV       while/when-3SG:PAST:enter-FV   LOC-house
      'S/he ran while s/he entered a house.'
```

```
        SC                                            FC
(39)  Ni-yéengir-a                mú-nyumba,       yéeruh-a.
      while/when-3SG:PAST:enter-FV   LOC-house      3SG:PAST:run-FV
      'While s/he entered a house, s/he ran.'
```

As far as the correlation between semantic and syntactic structure is concerned, an FC and a main clause do coincide in many instances. For example, when an adverbial clause is preceded by a linking morpheme, the FC mainly coincides with the main one, whether an adverbial clause might be preceded or followed by a main clause, as shown in (38) and (39). However, when two clauses are combined without a linking morpheme, namely in the "no-linker construction," to express a complex event, the FC does not coincides with the main clause, such as in (36).

The inconsistency that the FC does not coincides with the main clause in the "no-linker construction" in Saamia is similar to the case of Consequence linking, as Dixon points out (Dixon 2011: 4). In Consequence linking, the SC is the main and the FC is the subordinate clause, or the non-main clause, as shown in (40) and (41).

```
        SC = Main clause                        FC = Non-main clause
(40)  John has been studying German for years,   thus he speaks it well.
(41)  John has been studying German for years,   in order that he should speak it well.
```

We can observe another similarity between the "no-linker construction" and Consequence linking. When the verb in the main clause is inflected with one of the

non-past tense in the "no-linker construction," the verb in subordinate clause should be inflected in the subjunctive mood in Saamia.[21] This fact leades us to recall that verbs of FC are inflected with the subjunctive mood or the equivalent inflection in Purpose linking, which is one variety of Consequence linking.[22] Events described by the first clauses will happen in anticipation of the outcomes described by the second clauses in Purpose linking, as shown in (41).

The following examples express change of state, not motion. The "no-linker construction" expresses a complex event, such as in (42a). The order of two clauses is not reversible in this construction, as shown in (42b), while the order is reversible in the "*ni-* construction." Namely, an adverbial clause can be followed by the main clause when it is preceded by a linking morpheme, as shown in (42d). Thus, the "no-linker construction" is classified into the same category of the Consequence linking in Dixon's framework.

(42)  a. Ndá-hub-a          ómusaacha,       yáá-f-a.
         1SG:PAST-hit-FV     man              3SG:PAST-die-FV
         'I hit the man to the death.'

      b.*Yáá-f-a,            ndá-hub-a               ómusaacha.
         3SG:PAST-die-FV     1SG:PAST-hit-FV         man
         'He died and I hit the man.'

      c. Ndá-hub-a           ómusaacha,       ni-yáá-f-a.
         1SG:PAST-hit-FV     man              while/when-3SG:PAST-die
         'I hit the man while he died.'

      d. Ni-yáá-fa,                     ndá-huba         ómusaacha.
         while/when-3SG:PAST-die        1SG:PAST-hit      man
         'While he died, I hit the man.'

One might draw a conclusion that there is an iconic relationship between the order of events or states and that of clauses in the "no-linker construction"; the event or state described by the first clause has to happen before the event or state described by the second clause occurs. This could be an example of non-arbitrary relation between meaning and form.[23]

In the "no-linker construction," the event described by the second clause is the consequence of the event described by the first clause, as we have observed. The order of clauses are seemingly parallel to the order of events in this construction. However, when

---

[21]  See note 10.
[22]  Dixon (2011) categorises Purpose and Result into one semantic category of linkages.
[23]  We can observe similar construction to the "no-linker construction" in subordination of Kumam, a Nilotic language (Hieda 2013).

this construction is used for expressing a complex event, it does not represent a sequence of two events. We cannot decompose a complex event into two sequential events: for example, "RUN INTO" ≠ "RUN" and "INTO". Sentence (43) does not say whether the subject ran before coming out of a house, or started running after coming out of a house. This integration of the "no-linker construction" has been disucussed in the preceding section from perspectives of the scope of adverbs and negation, illocutionary scope, and information structure. Thus, Sentence (43) expresses a complex event: [S/he CAME OUT OF a house] WITH-THE-MANNER-OF [S/he runs].

(43)  Yéeruha,        yáá-tula              mú-nyumba.       "OUT OF"
      3SG:PAST:run    3SG:PAST:come from   LOC-house
      'S/he ran out of a house.'

Typologists observe an iconic relationship between syntax and semantics. The iconic relationship suggests that the closer linguistic elements are linked semantically, the closer they are connected syntactically (Givón 2001 and Van Valin, R. D. Jr. & R. J. LaPolla 1997). According to their observation, two clauses are semantically linked closer in the construction of two clauses combined without a linking morpheme than those in the linkages consisting of an adverbial clause preceded by a linking morpheme. Its semantic integration leads the "no-linker construction" to the particular construction for expressing a complex event in Saamia.

## Abbreviations

CAUS: causative extension              PREP: preposition
COP: copula                            PRES: present tense prefix
FC: focal clause                       SC: supporting clause
FV: final vowel                        SP: subject prefix
IMP: imperative                        SUB: subjunctive
LOC: locative prefix                   TPAST: today past tense prefix
NEG: negative particle, negative prefix   YPAST: yesterday past tense prefix
OP: object prefix                      1SG: first person singular
PART: particle                         3SG: third person singular
PAST: simple past tense prefix

# References

Botne, Robert. 2006. *A Grammatical Sketch of the Lusaamia Verb.* Cologne: Rüdiger Köppe.

Croft, William, Johanna Barddal, Willem Hollman, Violeta Sorirova and Chiaki Taoka. 2002. "Revising Talmy's typological classification of complex events". In Hans C. Boas (ed.) *Contrastive Studies in Construction Grammar.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. pp.201-235.

Dixon R. M. W. 2011. "The semantics of clause linking in typological perspective". In Dixon R. M. W. and Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald (eds.) *The Semantics of Clause Linking: A Cross-linguistic Typology.* pp.1-55.

Dixon R. M. W. and Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald (eds.) 2011. *The Semantics of Clause Linking: A Cross-linguistic Typology.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Givón, Talmy. 2001. *Syntax: An Introduction.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Gordon, Raymond G. 2005. *Ethnologue: Languages of the World, 15th edition.* Dallas: SIL.

Haiman, John and Sandra A. Thompson (eds.) 1988. *Clause Combining in Grammar and Discourse.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Heyking, Beatrix and Anne Storch. 2007. "Motion in northern Lwoo: Luwo and Boor comparative case studies". *Annual Publication in African Linguistics No.5.* pp.89-112.

Hieda, Osamu. 2013. *A Grammar of Kumam: The Interaction between Syntax and Pragmatics.* Tokyo: Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa.

Laury, Litva (ed.) 2008. *Studies of Clause Combining: The Multifunctionality of Conjunctions.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Matsumoto, Yo. 2003. "Typologies of lexicalization patterns and event integration: Clarifications and reformulations". In Shuji Chiba et al. (eds.) *Empirical and Theoretical Investigations into Language: A Festschrift for Masaru Kajita.* Tokyo: Kaitakusha. pp.403-418.

Talmy, Leonard. 2000. *Toward a Cognitive Semantics. 2 Vols.* Cambridge: MIT Press.

*Uganda Districts Information Handbook, Expanded Edition 2007-2008*. Kampala: Fountain Publishers.

Van Valin, R. D. Jr & R. J. LaPolla. 1997. *Syntax: Structure, Meaning and Function*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.