

Re-review: Noun derivation in Kinga Language

The issues that I have highlighted regarding a previous submission of this paper have not been addressed in this resubmission. As I had pointed out previously, this study makes only a very modest contribution to our knowledge on the Bantu languages, in providing an additional example of well-known processes of word formation. This is not a problem if it fits the goals of the journal, but only if the presentation and analyses are clear, correct and systematic and if an effort has been made to identify the more versus less usual characteristics of the language in the domain of word formation. Unfortunately, this paper falls short on all these criteria. However basic the description may be, it is still inaccurate (or plain wrong) in many respects. In what follows, I will list some of the problems in order of appearance.

Abstract: 1st line “is intends”: this version has not been proofread before submission. Very many issues of wording and layout remain. I will not provide a list of them.

p1, bottom: “this article does not attempt to describe the tone system” The tone system of Kinga already has been described (at least partially), see the reference to Schadeberg (1973). In a scientific publication on tone languages, examples should be provided with tone marking, at least on the primary data gathered by the authors. However, since one of the authors appears to be a native speaker, it should be possible to add tone marking on examples from secondary sources as well. Even if the authors do not feel confident to analyse tone, tone marking on examples should give readers the opportunity to figure out whether derivational processes involve any tone changes. This strikes me as especially relevant for the topic of independently used adjectives.

p2, third paragraph. Compounding is not normally analysed as a type of derivation, but rather as a word-formation procedure separate from derivation. That being said, compounds can contain derived elements (see below).

p3, third paragraph “The pre-prefix vowel ... due to gliding” This statement is inaccurate. The vowel quality of the augment should be properly described. Gliding does not seem to be relevant in the examples. Explain why there is a difference in aperture between the vowels of the augment and the class prefix in example (3b) ‘children with bad manners’, but not in (2b) ‘bad husband’. In example (35) the augment of class 14 is

given as *u-* underlyingly, whereas elsewhere it is said to be *ʊ-*. Similar issues exist for the vowel of the noun class prefixes, e.g. the examples for class 14 and 15 in Table 1, where the underlying vowel is said to be *u-*, whereas on the surface it comes out as *ʊ-*, to name only these examples.

p4, Table 1: The prefix of class 9 and 10 is a nasal consonant, with a zero allomorph preceding stems with an initial voiceless stop (with some morphophonological complications). The *i-* is the augment in these classes. This is shown in example (6), where *i-m-* commutes with *ʊ-gʊ-*.

p5, 2nd paragraph: the class pairing 5/4 for augmentatives is unusual in the Bantu languages. Nyakyusa has it too, as the authors rightly point out. This is a place where this paper could have made a more meaningful contribution, if it had explored this topic a bit more from a comparative perspective: which other languages in the region have it, how could it have come about?

p5, example 3: the augment is missing in the underlying representation of *avaana* ‘children’.

Similar inaccuracies occur elsewhere too. Please proofread carefully.

p6, example (4) versus (7): there is variation in the length of the stem vowel of ‘person’, suggesting that the segmental transcription is unreliable.

Please provide an underlying representation and glossing for longer examples (e.g. (7), (8), (9), and the examples following (10)).

Please also provide some more descriptive guidance for your readers. In example (7), for instance, the absence of an augment on the noun is probably due to the demonstrative that precedes the noun.

p8, last paragraph: Specify that ‘beans’ is a noun of class 5/6 in Kinga (I assume). Without this information the description will be hard to follow for most readers.

p10 Why are examples (19) to (22) given without the augment? According to the example in Table 1, infinitives do have one.

p11, please provide generalisations for the subsection “derivation by suffixation” instead of giving a list of examples and leaving it to your readers to try and figure out to what extent the choice of derivational suffix and target noun class are predictable.

“assimilation of some sounds in some words” This is so vague as to be meaningless.

Please say which sound assimilate to what in what in which contexts. If “assimilation”

is really lexically determined, as suggested here, it cannot be a purely phonological rule.

“assimilation to alveolar nasal n” The examples happen to have an alveolar initial stem consonant. Surely, there is assimilation in place of articulation, which happens to be alveolar in the chosen examples.

The underlying representations of examples (26) and (28) are wrong. Both have a derivational suffix –i (as stated in the preceding text), not –*si* or –*tsi*. The changes in the final root consonant appear to be due to a process that is commonly called “spirantisation” in Bantu linguistics.

Is there a reason why the verb is provided with a Final –*a* in (30), but not in the other examples?

p12, Please translate example (34) and provide proper glossing for its clarification.

Example (35). Elsewhere, the underlying consonant of the prefix of class 14 is given as β , but here as *v*. In examples where it is given as β , the following prefix vowel is *u*. All this shows a lack of basic phonological analysis, and a mixing up of different levels of representation (phonetic versus phonological).

p13 Examples (36) and (37) should both have an augment according to the description, but both are presented without one.

The examples of compounding are impossible to interpret without their underlying representation and its glossing.

Examples (41)-(42): please say how you know / why you think that these examples are borrowings from Swahili. It may be interesting to note that the first element in both of them is a noun derived from a verb.

p14. The characterisation of adjective-to-noun derivation in the conclusion does not seem to be compatible with the description of this phenomenon given earlier in the paper. No mention of a “conditional” or “state” prefix has been made earlier. Instead, the independent use of adjectives was said to simply involve the omission of the head noun. In fact, tonal data might show a formal difference between adnominal and independent adjectives.