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CHAPTER ONE

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Topic and Research Questions
This study explores the meaning and interpretation of Luganda li-(5), ki-/bi-(7/8), lu-(11), ka-/bu-(12/14), tu-(13) and gu-/ga-(20/22), when these prefixes are used with nouns from other noun classes than the ones they are usually associated with. Luganda is a language in which noun classes play a huge role in grammar. Each noun belongs to a noun class, and each noun stem takes a prefix which signals the same class. While the noun stem and the prefix usually belong to one and the same noun class, there are also cases where they do not.¹

In this thesis, I aim at answering the following 3 questions:

- What is the encoded meaning of li-(5), ki-/bi-(7/8), lu-(11), ka-/bu-(12/14), tu-(13) and gu-/ga-(20/22) when these prefixes are used with nouns from other noun classes than the ones they are usually associated with?
- What are the possible pragmatic effects of li-(5), ki-/bi-(7/8), lu-(11), ka-/bu-(12/14), tu-(13) and gu-/ga-(20/22) when these prefixes are used with nouns from other noun classes than the ones they are usually associated with?
- What is the ranking for li-(5), ki-/bi-(7/8), lu-(11), ka-/bu-(12/14), tu-(13) and gu-/ga-(20/22) in contexts where they are used with a derogatory intention? That is, which ones are most or least derogatory?

1.2 The Luganda Language
Luganda is the major language of Uganda. The exact number of speakers is a bit uncertain and changes constantly, but according to recent web pages, it is spoken by over sixteen million Baganda (people from the Buganda region).² According to Ssekiryango (2006:66-67), Luganda belongs to the Bantu language subgroup of the Benue-Congo of the Niger-Congo language family.

¹ Some scholars refer to the language investigated as Ganda whereas others refer to it as Luganda. Those who prefer the former find it right to drop the noun class prefix lu-, hence maintaining only the stem Ganda. However, judging from my competence in the language, dropping the noun class prefix leaves the stem with no clear meaning. It is on this ground that I chose to refer to the language investigated as Luganda, not Ganda.

Typologically, it is a highly agglutinating language with subject–verb–object word order and nominative–accusative morphosyntactic alignment. Luganda is the second most widely spoken language in Uganda, following English but preceding Swahili. The language is used in some primary schools in Buganda as pupils begin to learn English, the primary official language of Uganda. In 1900, the British government signed an agreement with the Kingdom of Buganda, granting special and preserved status to Baganda (the people from Buganda region) cultural practices. In addition, the British government interacted with the people of Uganda almost exclusively via the Baganda tribe (Ladefoged, et al. 1972:22). It’s these special treatments of the Baganda tribe that allowed Luganda to remain strong and flourish. Additionally, when Uganda gained independence in 1962, the Baganda tribe was given administrative power, so Luganda maintained a high status compared to other languages.

Cole (1967) describes Luganda as the “unofficial official language” of Uganda because of its prevalence throughout the country. He notes that despite English being the official language of the country (although not the native language for any significant piece of the population), Luganda stays strong among the people. Cole adds that Luganda is used as one of the primary languages for culture, and that Luganda speakers often attend church services given in Luganda. He states that there is a good deal of pop music sung in Luganda, and also mentions that Luganda is used in written texts with an orthography based on English characters. Cole mentions the bible (translated from English) and dictionaries as part of literature available in Luganda among others. Although Cole (1967) is not a recent source, the information given above is still valid, at least according to my personal experience.

1.3 Method

The method employed in this thesis has been to collect authentic examples of the prefixes under investigation and then to consult native Luganda speakers on how they interpret them. These data were in turn used as a basis for my analysis of the semantics and pragmatics associated with each prefix. The consultation with informants was done partly by questionnaires and partly by interviews.
Data collection yielded a total of 108 text excerpts which were annotated (glossed and translated) in TypeCraft, a multi-lingual online database consisting of linguistically-annotated natural language texts.\(^3\) Data collection started with gathering 70 text excerpts containing the phenomenon under investigation, which later formed the basis for my interview guide. The text excerpts were extracted from 5 sources, i.e. (1) 44 excerpts from newspapers and comments relative to their news, (2) 15 excerpts from YouTube songs and comments relative to them, (3) 8 excerpts from television news broadcasts and comments relative to them, (4) 2 excerpts from films, and (5) 1 excerpt from radio news broadcast. However, the 70 text excerpts (which appear as number 1-70 in appendix 2), did not include any occurrences of the prefixes *lu-* and *tu-* . This motivated me to create a questionnaire involving all the prefixes, including *lu-* and *tu-* . This is explained in more detail in § 4 and 5.\(^4\) Throughout the entire process of data collection, informants/consultants were asked questions about their interpretation of utterances with the prefixes under investigation. In addition to the excerpts with the given affixes that were used for consultations with my informants, I also gathered 11 utterances from a play. These appear as number 71-80 and number 108 in appendix 2.\(^5\) Therefore, the total number of text excerpts used for this study is 108.

1.4 Important Linguistic Notions
The thesis discusses the encoded meaning(s) attached to the selected prefixes, together with the various pragmatic meanings they may achieve in context. When determining which part of meaning attributed to a prefix should be seen as grammatically (semantically) encoded, and which ones should be seen as pragmatically inferred, I have relied on the definition of these categories as proposed by Ariel (2008:1-24). According to Ariel, semantic meaning is the stable and conventional association between forms and meanings, whereas pragmatic meaning is meaning which is inferred in context.

---

\(^3\) For the annotated text excerpts, see appendix 2

\(^4\) See the questionnaire in appendix 3.

\(^5\) These utterances were collected at a time when the interview guide had already been drafted and the interviewing process had been concluded. Hence, they are not part of the utterances that the interviewees commented on. I still found it necessary to include them as part of the collected data, owing to the fact that they are available videos and furthermore contain the required context to establish the meaning and interpretation of the prefixes under investigation.
The collected data showed that some of the prefixes are diminutives (lu-, ka-/bu-, tu-) whereas others are augmentatives (li-, ki-/bi-, gu-/ga-). Therefore diminution and augmentation have been given considerable attention in my discussion of the meaning and interpretation of the prefixes under investigation. Some important works that have played a role in my study are; Appah & Amfo (2007), Xydopoulos & Christopoulou (2011), Jurafsky (1996), Dressler & Merlini Barbaresi (1994), Fortune (1970), Chao (1947), and many others.

Unfortunately, little has been written on diminutives and augmentatives with specific reference to Luganda, Katamba (2003), Cole (1967) and Ashton et al. (1954) being some of the few exceptions that I have found. For that reason, I have mostly based my study on literature on diminutives and augmentatives in general in this thesis.

1.5 Value of the Study
As already mentioned, I have not been able to find much published work on diminutive and augmentative uses of the Luganda prefixes that I am studying. Two of the works that I have found, i.e. Cole (1967) and Ashton et al. (1954) are quite old. And none of the works, including Katamba (2003), include a thorough empirical investigation of Luganda speakers’ interpretations of the prefixes. Therefore, an up-to-date empirical investigation of how the given prefixes are used today will be of value. One possible source of information about the topic is the Luganda dictionary written by Kibuuka Kiingi (see Kiingi, 2009). However, the prefixes investigated in this study are not defined as independent morphological units in the dictionary. The dictionary defines some Luganda words composed of the investigated prefixes and other affixes, hence giving a general meaning to the word including the prefix. However, the special meanings that arise when the given prefixes are used with nouns from different noun classes than the ones they normally co-occur with are not discussed in Kiingi (2009). The present study may therefore contribute to the existing Luganda literature on diminution and augmentation.
1.6 Outline of the Thesis

The rest of this thesis is structured as follows: Chapter Two gives a general presentation of Bantu languages and Luganda, focusing on the noun class system, whereas Chapter Three reviews the general literature on diminutives and augmentatives as well as specific literature on Luganda diminutives and augmentatives. In Chapter Four I present details on how the entire process of data collection was conducted while Chapter Five is the gist of the thesis. This chapter gives an analysis of the collected data, presented and discussed under the two main topics *diminutives* and *augmentatives*. In this chapter I propose a scale which represents a ranking of the prefixes with respect to degree of derogatory intention. Chapter Six is the last chapter of the thesis. It summarizes the whole thesis, gives concluding remarks and finally suggests how further research may be conducted.
CHAPTER TWO

2.0 BANTU LANGUAGES AND LUGANDA: THEIR NOUN CLASS SYSTEMS

2.1 Introduction

This chapter gives a general overview of Bantu languages, their origin and their noun class systems. It also presents the Luganda language more specifically, focusing on its noun class system.

2.2 Origin of the Bantu Languages

The Bantu language group consists of approximately 450-650 languages (Marten 2006), the majority of which have not been sufficiently described yet. Most scholars claim that the first people speaking proto-Bantu emerged south of the rain forest in the Congo River area, probably not too long before the beginning of the Christian era and they spread out from there (Collins et al. 1993:57-113 and Guthrie 1969-71, 1970).

However, some authors (Blench 1993, Flight 1980, 1988 and Vansina 1979, 1980) claim that the origin of the Bantu languages has its roots in West Africa. These authors consider the Cameroon Highlands to be the ‘cradle’ of the Bantu.

2.3 Bantu Noun Class System

Noun classification is a common phenomenon in Bantu languages and has attracted the attention of many authors, e.g., Amidu (2007), Denny & Creider (1986), Heine (1982), Hurskainen (1999), Maho (1999) and many others. Alexandre (1972:39) had earlier noted that the system of noun classes, characteristic of a large proportion of African languages, reaches its maximum development in the Bantu languages.

According to Katamba (2003), Bantu nouns are categorized into noun classes on the basis of the prefixes that they take and it is the system of noun class prefixes that is the hallmark of Bantu nominal morphology. Katamba perceives a noun class to be signaled by; (1) a pre-prefix and a prefix attached to the nominal stem for both singular and plural cases, (2) grammatical agreement elements including subject pronouns, object pronouns, possessive pronouns, adjective prefixes, and other sentence elements.
Aikhenvald (2006:463) maintains Katamba’s opinion that indeed noun classes are signaled by agreement. Aikhenvald adds that: (1) there is a limited, countable number of classes, (2) each noun in the language belongs to one (or sometimes more than one) class, (3) there is always some semantic basis to the grouping of nouns into gender classes, but languages vary in how much semantic basis there is. This usually includes animacy, humanness and sex, and sometimes also shape and size.  

Trauth & Kazzazi (1996:332) report that languages with up to twenty noun classes are often grouped in singular/plural pairs, and the classification is often more or less semantically motivated, with the distinction between animate and inanimate playing a major role. This was earlier noted by Hendrikse & Poulos (1990) and is also applicable to Luganda, as will be shown in the next section of this chapter.

It is common for Bantu languages to have special classes for human beings, animals, trees, and so on. As outlined in e.g. Myachina (1981:2), Sanusi (2003:5) and Welmers (1973:162), it is also observable that in many Bantu languages, noun class markers participate in patterns of agreement or concord with nouns and other constituents with which the noun class markers co-occur in a given construction. Hendrikse & Poulos (1990:199-201) propose a generalization with respect to the possible semantic contents attributed to Bantu noun classes.  

This is presented in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noun Classes</th>
<th>Semantic Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Human beings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>Proper names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kinship terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Regular plural of class 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>Regular plural of class 1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Natural phenomena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Body parts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

6 The cross-linguistic properties of noun classes as presented by Katamba (2003) and Aikhenvald (2006) apply to Luganda, as will be illustrated later in this chapter.

7 The semantics of the Bantu noun class system had earlier before Hendrikse & Poulos (1990) been discussed by a number of authors (see Richardson 1967 and Welmers 1973).
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 8 | Plants  
|   | Animals  
| 4 | Regular plural of class 3  
| 5 | Natural phenomena  
|   | Animals  
|   | Body parts  
|   | Collective nouns  
|   | Undesirable people  
|   | Augmentatives  
|   | Derogatives  
| 6 | Regular plural of class 5  
|   | Mass terms and liquids  
|   | Time reference  
|   | Mannerisms  
|   | Modes of action  
| 7 | Body parts  
|   | Tools, instruments and utensils  
|   | Animals and insects  
|   | Languages  
|   | Diseases  
|   | Outstanding people  
|   | Ameliorative  
|   | Derogatives  
|   | Diminutives  
|   | Augmentatives  
|   | Curtatives (shortness and stockiness)  
|   | Mannerisms  
| 8 | Regular plural of class 7  
| 9 | Animals  
|   | People  
|   | Body parts  
|   | Tools, instruments and household effects  
|   | Natural phenomena  
| 10 | Regular plural of class 9  
| 11 | Long, thin entities  
|   | Languages  
|   | Body parts  
|   | Natural phenomena  
|   | Implement, utensils and other artifacts  
|   | Augmentatives  
|   | Derogatives  
| 12 | Diminutives  
|   | Ameliorative  
|   | Derogatives  
| 13 | Regular plural of class 12  

8
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Abstracts</th>
<th>Collectives</th>
<th>Location terms</th>
<th>Infinitives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Infinitives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Location terms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Location terms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Location terms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Diminutives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Derogatives</td>
<td>Augmentatives</td>
<td>Diminutives</td>
<td>Mannerisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Augmentatives</td>
<td>Derogatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Plural of class 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Location terms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hendrikse & Poulos (1990:201) notice the heterogeneity of semantic contents in table 1. They however state that despite this noticeable heterogeneity, there are classes that appear to have a common underlying denominator, i.e., a denominator that results from the semantic details of each class. These are presented below:

**Classes** | **General Significance**
---|---
1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 & 10 | Concreteness
11, 12, 13, 19, 20, 21 & 22 | Attributes
16, 17, 18 and 23 | Locatives and spatial orientation
14 and 15 | Abstractness

The semantic categories ‘concreteness’, ‘attribution’, ‘spatial orientation’ and ‘abstractness’ appearing in the above overview are argued by Hendrikse & Poulos (1990:201) to constitute a continuum, as illustrated below:

Concreteness  Attribution  Spatial orientation  Abstractness
In order to complete the continuum, Mohlala (2003:10) claims that the objects under each parameter have to be sorted and categorized. Hendrikse & Poulos (1990:204) note that the objects are sorted according to their perceptual properties, and according to their selective qualitative attributes. Other objects are perceived in relation to some fixed points, both in space and time, thus the spatial orientation. On the other hand, nominalization brings in abstract entities such as qualities.

As earlier noted, the prefixes investigated inherently belong to certain Luganda noun classes (5, 7/8, 11, 12/14, 13, 20/22). The general meanings associated with these classes in table 1 will be partly relied on in the discussion of the semantics and pragmatics of the Luganda diminutives and augmentatives in chapter 5.

2.4 A brief Description of the Luganda Language
According to Ssekiryango (2006:66-67), Luganda belongs to the Bantu language subgroup of the Benue-Congo of the Niger-Congo language family. The unmarked word order is SVO with an option of having the object topicalized by fronting. Like other Bantu languages characterized by agglutination, Luganda has both prefixes and suffixes functional in nominal and verbal morphology. A very elaborate noun class system involves singular and plural agreement marking. The verb comprises a verb root to which verb extensions are added to form the verb stem. These verb extensions affect the argument structure by determining the number of expressible nominal arguments that the stem can support. Prefixes that are added to the verb stem express syntactic information pertaining to agreement with the subject and optionally with the object. The noun phrase internal agreement marking claimed by Ssekiryango (2006:66-67) to be present in Luganda is exemplified in the following phrase:

**Omukyala omulungi omugagga “The beautiful rich lady”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Omukyala</th>
<th>omulungi</th>
<th>omugagga</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o mu kyala</td>
<td>o mu lungi</td>
<td>o mu gagga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV CL1.AGR</td>
<td>IV CL1.AGR</td>
<td>IV CL1.AGR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lady</td>
<td>beautiful</td>
<td>rich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>ADJ</td>
<td>ADJ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generated in TypeCraft.
In the previous phrase, the two adjectives *omulungi* and *omugagga* (*beautiful* and *rich* respectively) both agree with the noun *omukyala* (*lady*) with respect to noun class. This is illustrated by the class 1 marker *mu-* appearing in the prefix position of all the three words.

### 2.5 The Luganda Noun Class System

Just as in other Bantu languages, every Luganda noun belongs to a noun class and every noun class has distinctive set of concord expressions which separate it from other noun classes. Luganda has a noun class system that involves singular and plural patterns as well as agreement marking triggered by the noun classes. The agreement markers are manifested on syntactic constituents like adjectives, numerals, verbs and others, as illustrated in the previous example.

Demuth (2000) mentions that Bantu noun class systems participate in a pervasive agreement system, where nominal modifiers, pronouns, and the verb all agree with the head noun in terms of its noun class features. Demuth further discusses the Sesotho noun class system and proposes a table with the different grammatical agreement elements associated with the various Sesotho noun classes. Borrowing Demuth’s idea, I propose the same for Luganda as presented below:

**TABLE 2: LUGANDA NOUN CLASSES AND THEIR AGREEMENT ELEMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOUN CLASS</th>
<th>PROX</th>
<th>DIST</th>
<th>DIST 2</th>
<th>POSS (1P)</th>
<th>POSS (2P)</th>
<th>POSS (3P)</th>
<th>SBJ PRE</th>
<th>DIR OBJ</th>
<th>SAMPLE WORDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <em>mu</em></td>
<td>ono</td>
<td>oyo</td>
<td>oli</td>
<td>(o)wange</td>
<td>(o)wuwo</td>
<td>(o)wuwe</td>
<td>n-</td>
<td>-n-,</td>
<td>-n-,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(this)</td>
<td>(that;</td>
<td>(that;</td>
<td>(mine)</td>
<td>(yours)</td>
<td>(his/hers)</td>
<td>-o-,</td>
<td>-ku-,</td>
<td>-mu-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>remote)</td>
<td>far)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(o)waffe</td>
<td>(o)wammwe</td>
<td>(o)waabwe</td>
<td>tu-,</td>
<td>-tu-,</td>
<td>(a)mubbi (thief)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(ours)</td>
<td>(yours)</td>
<td>(theirs)</td>
<td>mu-,</td>
<td>-ba-,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-ba-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>gu-</td>
<td></td>
<td>(o)musota (snake),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(o)muri (tree),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>gu-</td>
<td></td>
<td>(o)mumwa (mouth/lip),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(o)muyembe, (mango),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(o)munya (lizard)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <em>ba</em></td>
<td>bano</td>
<td>abo</td>
<td>bali</td>
<td>(a)bange</td>
<td>(a)babo</td>
<td>(a)babe</td>
<td>-tu-,</td>
<td>-tu-,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(these)</td>
<td>(those;</td>
<td>(those;</td>
<td>(mine)</td>
<td>(yours)</td>
<td>(his/hers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>remote)</td>
<td>far)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(a)bafe</td>
<td>(a)bammwe</td>
<td>(a)baabwe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(ours)</td>
<td>(yours)</td>
<td>(theirs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <em>mu</em></td>
<td>guno</td>
<td>ogwo</td>
<td>guli</td>
<td>(o)gwanje</td>
<td>(o)guwo</td>
<td>(o)guwe</td>
<td>gu-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(this)</td>
<td>(that;</td>
<td>(that;</td>
<td>(mine)</td>
<td>(yours)</td>
<td>(his/hers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>remote)</td>
<td>far)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(o)waffe</td>
<td>(o)gammwe</td>
<td>(o)gabwe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(ours)</td>
<td>(yours)</td>
<td>(theirs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>gu-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column 1</th>
<th>Column 2</th>
<th>Column 3</th>
<th>Column 4</th>
<th>Column 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. mi gino (these) egyo (those; remote) giri (those; far)</td>
<td>(e)gyange (mine) (e)gigyo (yours) (e)gigye (his/hers)</td>
<td>(e)gyaffe (ours) (e)gyammwe (yours) (e)gyabwe (theirs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. li lino (this) eryo (that; remote) liri (that; far)</td>
<td>(e)ryange (mine) (e)ryiro (yours) (e)ryiye (his/hers)</td>
<td>(e)ryaffe (ours) (e)ryammwe (yours) (e)ryabwe (theirs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. ma gano (these) ago (those; remote) gali (those; far)</td>
<td>(a)gage (mine) (a)gago (yours) (a)gagye (his/hers)</td>
<td>(a)gaffe (ours) (a)gammwe (yours) (a)gaabwe (theirs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. ki kino (this) ekyo (that; remote) kiri (that; far)</td>
<td>(e)kyange (mine) (e)kikyo (yours) (e)kikye (his/hers)</td>
<td>(e)kyaffe (ours) (e)kyammwe (yours) (e)kyabwe (theirs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. bi bino (these) ebyo (those; remote) biri (those; far)</td>
<td>(e)byange (mine) (e)bibyo (yours) (e)bibye (his/hers)</td>
<td>(e)byaffe (ours) (e)byammwe (yours) (e)byabwe (theirs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. n</td>
<td>eno (this)</td>
<td>eyo (that; remote)</td>
<td>eri (that; far)</td>
<td>(e)yange (mine)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(e)yaffe (ours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. n</td>
<td>zino (these)</td>
<td>ezo (those; remote)</td>
<td>ziri (those; far)</td>
<td>(e)zange (mine)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(e)zaffe (ours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. lu</td>
<td>luno (this)</td>
<td>olwo (that; remote)</td>
<td>luli (that; far)</td>
<td>(o)lwange (mine)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(o)lwaffe (ours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. ka</td>
<td>kano (this)</td>
<td>ako (that; remote)</td>
<td>kali (that; far)</td>
<td>(a)kange (mine)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(a)kaffe (ours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. tu</td>
<td>tuno (this/these)</td>
<td>otwo (that/those; remote)</td>
<td>tuli (that/those; far)</td>
<td>(o)twange (mine)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(o)twaffe (ours)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- (e)koko (hen), (e)mbuzi (goat), (e)nte (cow),
  (e)mbwa (dog), (e)nkumbi (hoe)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14. bu</th>
<th>buno (these)</th>
<th>obwo (those; remote)</th>
<th>buli (those; far)</th>
<th>(o)bwange (mine)</th>
<th>(o)bubwo (yours)</th>
<th>(o)bubwe (his/hers)</th>
<th>bu-</th>
<th>bu-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(o)bwaffe (ours)</td>
<td>(o)bwammwe (yours)</td>
<td>(o)bwabwe (theirs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. ku</td>
<td>kuno (this)</td>
<td>okwo (that; remote)</td>
<td>kuli (that; far)</td>
<td>(o)kwange (mine)</td>
<td>(o)kukwo (yours)</td>
<td>(o)kukwe (his/hers)</td>
<td>ku-</td>
<td>ku-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(o)kwaffe (ours)</td>
<td>(o)kwammwe (yours)</td>
<td>(o)kwabwe (theirs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. wa</td>
<td>wano (here)</td>
<td>awo (there; remote)</td>
<td>wali (there; far)</td>
<td>(e)wange (mine)</td>
<td>(e)wuwo (yours)</td>
<td>(e)wuwe (his/hers)</td>
<td>wa-</td>
<td>wa-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(e)waffe (ours)</td>
<td>(e)wammwe (yours)</td>
<td>(e)wabwe (theirs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. ku</td>
<td>kuno (here)</td>
<td>okwo (there; remote)</td>
<td>kuli (there; far)</td>
<td>(o)kwange (mine)</td>
<td>(o)kukwo (yours)</td>
<td>(o)kukwe (his/hers)</td>
<td>ku-</td>
<td>ku-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(o)kwaffe (ours)</td>
<td>(o)kwammwe (yours)</td>
<td>(o)kwabwe (theirs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. mu</td>
<td>muno (here)</td>
<td>omwo (there; remote)</td>
<td>muli (there; far)</td>
<td>(o)mwange (mine)</td>
<td>(o)mumwo (yours)</td>
<td>(o)mumwe (his/hers)</td>
<td>mu-</td>
<td>mu-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(o)mwaffe (ours)</td>
<td>(o)mwammwe (yours)</td>
<td>(o)mwabwe (theirs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. gu</td>
<td>guno (this)</td>
<td>ogwo (that; remote)</td>
<td>guli (that; far)</td>
<td>(o)gwange (mine)</td>
<td>(o)gugwo (yours)</td>
<td>(o)gugwe (his/hers)</td>
<td>gu-</td>
<td>gu-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(o)gwaffe (ours)</td>
<td>(o)gwammwe (yours)</td>
<td>(o)gwabwe (theirs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 is relevant not only to demonstrate the Luganda noun classes and their agreement elements, but also to build a background for the two phenomena which are most central to this thesis, namely diminution and augmentation. Diminution and augmentation are expressed in the very last column entitled ‘sample words’. These two phenomena occur with prefixes from class 5, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 20 and 22. So, with the exception of class 20 and 22, the sample words given in the rightmost column in table 2 are grouped into two: The first group (above the double line) consists of nouns which inherently belong to that particular noun class. The second group (below the double line) consists of nouns which inherently belong to other noun classes, but the prefix of that noun class has been appended to their stems, a fact that renders them to be used with a secondary sense, thus carrying an extra meaning and/or interpretation. The scope of this thesis is such that it strictly focuses on this latter use of the prefixes.

---

8 Wherever a noun or word has its initial vowel put in brackets, it means that the usage of the bracketed vowel is contextually dependent.

9 Luganda words and statements presented in this study have not been marked in terms of tone. This is not to oppose the undisputed fact that Luganda is a tonal language. The reason why I allow myself to not represent the tones is that for those linguistic items that I study, differences in tone do not affect meaning. However, in cases where works of other authors are quoted, the marked tone is maintained if it was present in the original work of the author(s).
My aim is to explain the semantics and pragmatics which underlies the choice of prefixes in cases where there is a mismatch between the noun class associated with a certain noun and the particular prefix preposed to this noun. For example, according to table 2, the common noun o-mu-wala (girl) inherently belongs to class 1. However, the stem for o-mu-wala, which is –wala, combines with the prefixes of class 5, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 20 and 22 to appear as e-ri-wala, e-ki-wala, e-bi-wala, o-lu-wala, a-ka-wala, o-tu-wala, o-bu-wala, o-gu-wala and a-ga-wala in table 2. Thus, relating to the given example, this study explores the semantic and pragmatic meaning contributed by the substitution of mu- in omuwala with li-, ki-, bi-, lu-, ka-, bu-, tu-, gu- and ga-.

Lastly, it is essential to note that class 20 and 22 don’t have primary nouns. Therefore, all the nouns presented in class 20 and 22 inherently belong to other classes. This explains why they only have one group of nouns, nouns that are always used with a secondary function.
CHAPTER THREE

3.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

3.1 Introduction
This is the chapter which summarizes, discusses, and analyzes the current literature on diminutives and augmentatives. So this part of the thesis is intended to familiarize the readers with essential background on the topic with respect to what has been written before, demonstrate that the study undertaken is original, and show that the study contributes in a relevant way to the existing body of knowledge.

3.1.1 Diminutives
The survey considers two kinds of literature related to diminutives, i.e. general literature with cross-linguistic focus and literature specifically on Luganda diminutives. Hence, this sub-section is divided into two parts.

3.1.1.1 General Literature on Diminutives
Appah & Amfo (2007:86) assert that, the diminutive has been an object of study for quite a long time, dating back to the nineteenth century, and that this tradition of study has continued well up until now. In spite of this rich history of research, they claim that there has been comparatively little research done on diminutives in African languages and particularly languages belonging to the Kwa sub-group of the Niger-Congo language phylum. Appah & Amfo further state that most research on diminutives in African languages focuses on Bantu languages and mainly Swahili. This implies that a survey on diminutives in any Bantu language other than Swahili, including Luganda, is relevant to fill the missing gaps.

Al-Azzaawi (2006) links the term diminutive to morphology and defines it as an affix with the general meaning of small, little, or a particular form of a noun indicating that the person or thing referred to is small in size. Al-Azzaawi argues that diminutive affixes perform the function of meaning modification and usually add a semantic feature of quantitative and/or qualitative nature.

10 See Schneider (2003) and Dressler & Merlini Barberesi (1994) for further reports.
11 Heine et al. (1991) is an exception; it provides, among other things, an analysis of the Ewe (Niger-Congo, Kwa) diminutive –vi in the context of grammaticalization.
By stating that the entity in the scope of a diminutive is a small sized person or thing, Al-Azzaawi’s statement opens gates to an investigation intended to discover whether the smallness implied by all diminutive affixes is only associated with size, not status or anything else. Al-Azzaawi also talks of ‘diminutive affixes’, and this calls for a deeper language specific research to discover whether the affixes are morphologically realized as prefixes, infixes, or suffixes.

The idea of associating diminutives with small entities is not only claimed by Al-Azzaawi (2006). Different authors have cross-linguistically associated diminutives with the basic meaning small (see Schneider 2003, Jurafsky 1996, Booij 2007, Dressler & Merini Barbaresi 1994, and Bybee 1985). For instance, Jurafsky (1996:534) defines the diminutive as any morphological device which means at least small. Schneider (2003:10) considers diminutives to prototypically express smallness. Dressler & Merini Barbaresi (1994:85) in apparent recognition of the fundamental significance of the meaning small of the diminutive refers to smallness as its ‘morphosyntactic denotation’ in contrast to other features such as endearment which they consider as its connotation.

With the goal of characterizing a wide range of meanings of the diminutive, Chao (1947:35) represents the ‘abstractionist approach.’ The approach relies on single abstract concepts such as small or child in characterizing the diminutive. However, Chao’s view seems only to concentrate on the semantics part of the diminutive, thereby neglecting its pragmatics. It is this weakness that lays a foundation for some authors to disregard the abstractionist approach. For example, Jurafsky (1996:537) talks of the most problematic aspect of the abstractionist approach as its failure to cover any of the more pragmatic senses of the diminutive, such as the common affectionate or pejorative uses. Schneider (2003:1) also identifies this lack of attention to the pragmatics of the diminutive as one of the main problems found with the analyses of diminutives, noting that diminutives have not, as a rule, been studied from a pragmatic perspective.

Therefore, there is a doubt as to whether there can ever be any fully comprehensive approach to diminutives which ignores their pragmatic senses. Jurafsky (1996:538) appreciates some components of the abstractionist approach, i.e. the intuition that the concepts child and small are fundamental but not enough to help account for the wide range of functions of the diminutive.
Jurafsky builds his critique on the argument that, without metaphorical, inferential, or abstractive extensions, small cannot model the individuating or exactness sense, nor the use of the diminutive to mark ‘imitation’ of a natural object.

Appah & Amfo (2007:95) write about another possible approach to define the diminutive, the ‘homonymy approach’. It characterizes the multi-functionality of the diminutive, rather than building a single generalized abstract meaning for all senses of a diminutive morpheme, and it models each sense as a separate lexeme. That is, the small sense of the diminutive is a separate lexeme from the child sense. According to this approach, the fact that synchronically each lexeme is composed out of the same phonological material is “coincidental”. The homonymy approach has the advantage of avoiding vague and insupportable generalizations. However, as pointed out by Jurafsky (1996), from a diachronic perspective, it is simply the wrong model to account for the semantics of the diminutive, in the face of abundant evidence of the extension of the meaning of the diminutive over time.

Jurafsky (1996:538) argues that, if the different senses of the diminutive were unrelated, there would be no reason to expect similar groupings of senses in different languages. Aside from its failure to account for the diachronic facts, the homonymy approach also fails to model the complex overlapping between senses that often occur. For example, Jurafsky (1996:538-9) claims that, the affectionate, contemptuous, and child-related senses of the diminutive are often present in words with the approximative, small, or individuating/partitive meanings. The homonymy approach seems not to give an explanation to this occurrence. This is supported by Appah & Amfo (2007:95) who claim that, in Akan (a Kwa language spoken in Ghana), ‘feminine’ and ‘small’ or ‘feminine’ and ‘contempt’ sometimes overlap in a single diminutive form. Jurafsky (1996:539) argues that both the strict abstractionist and the strict homonymy positions lack the theoretical machinery for defining a polysemmous semantic category, since they are forced to stake out some arbitrary position between abstraction and homonymy, pointing out some generalizations and avoiding others.

To resolve the shortcomings associated with the abstractionist and homonymy approaches to defining the diminutive, Jurafsky (1996:533) proposes to model the synchronic and diachronic semantics of the diminutive category with a ‘radial category’.
The radial category is a type of structured polysemy that explicitly models the different senses of the diminutive and the metaphorical and inferential relations which relate them. Synchronically, this model explains the varied and contradictory senses of the diminutive. Diachronically, the radial category acts as a kind of archaeology of meaning, expressing the generalizations of the classic mechanisms of semantic change (metaphor, abstraction and inference). The model also predicts that the origins of the diminutive cross-linguistically lie in words semantically or pragmatically linked to children. Thus, the radial category approach combines tenets of the two research paradigms, i.e. the abstractionist and homonymy approach, thereby accounting for the varying semantics of the diminutive beyond the putative basic meaning of small, and the development of the various related senses.

According to Jurafsky (1996:543), the radial category approach agrees with the observed unidirectionality of semantic change proposed by Heine et al. (1991), showing that the meanings of the diminutive in a particular language will develop diachronically from central senses towards senses on the edge of the category. The radial category approach has child and small as the central senses with various senses appearing at its edge, i.e. contempt, affection, intimacy, sympathy, among others. This approach is also in accordance with the works of Wierzbicka (1984), which predicts that the central meaning of the diminutive, child, is historically prior to the other senses of diminutives, and metaphorically and inferentially motivates these.

### 3.1.1.2 Luganda Diminutives

Cole (1967:44) describes Luganda ka- as a prefix belonging to class 12, and as a prefix used to indicate the smallness of an object (see also Katamba 2003). Cole illustrates this by giving kêêyó and kalenzi as Luganda nouns which translate to ‘small broom’ and ‘little boy’ respectively. Cole’s remarks will be vital in explaining the semantics of Luganda ka- in § 5, especially since he illustrates his argument by giving possible Luganda examples.

However, Cole’s work tends not to cater for the interests of readers whose intentions are to go beyond the semantics of ka-. He seems to concentrate exclusively on the semantic part and leaves other aspects of meaning unattended to. There is a need to consider also pragmatic aspects of meaning associated with Luganda ka- and other Luganda diminutives. As mentioned in § 1, this is a matter to be resolved in this thesis.
Cole (1967:47) goes further to discuss Luganda *tu-*CLAIM, claiming that it has a diminutive significance denoting small quantities of liquid and granular substances. Cole supports his claim by giving two Luganda nouns, *tûnnyó* and *tûzzí*, which translate to ‘a pinch of salt’ and ‘a drop/small quantity of water’, respectively. Cole’s analysis of Luganda *tu-* suggests that it can only be used with liquids and granular substances. It would therefore be interesting to test whether it is ungrammatical for *tu-* to be used with nouns that don’t denote liquids and granular substances, i.e. people. This will be done in chapter 5.

3.1.2 Augmentatives

Compared to diminutives, there is relatively little literature about augmentatives. This can be explained by the work of Dressler & Merlini Barbaresi (1994:430), who argue that augmentatives represent a marked category compared to diminutives. Their claim is supported by the fact that augmentatives are cross-linguistically less common than diminutives.

This situation can be explained by an implicational correlation which is supposed to be universal: if a language has augmentatives, then it has diminutives too. The reverse is not true. The cross-linguistic survey conducted by Grandi (2002) on augmentatives in the Mediterranean area also reports that augmentatives are significantly less widespread than diminutives.

3.1.2.1 General Literature on Augmentatives

There are some authors who have attempted to give a definition of augmentatives. Lombard et al. (1993:83) consider the term ‘augmentative’ to refer to the enlargement or increasing of an object. The question as to whether the augmentative can ever be used without presenting the entity in its scope as large is not a point of concern here. This can’t be used as the basis to reject the given definition, but rather as a way of testing its authenticity on a cross-linguistic level.

Xydopoulos & Christopoulou (2011:11) also made some brief remarks on augmentatives. Their views suggest that augmentation has the following four properties: (i) denotes high degree of a property or characteristics of the base, (ii) attributes intensiveness to the meaning without yielding an augmentative, (iii) indicates large size, high intensity, long duration, and large area of the referent of the base word, (iv) expresses admiration and surprise. These are not necessarily properties that one and the same augmentative marker possesses, they are rather alternative properties.
The definitions presented so far seem to treat the referent of the augmentative as having a large size. Since this is a cross-linguistic tendency, investigating its application to a particular language, i.e. Luganda, may be of great value.

Xydopoulos & Christopoulou (2011:27) consider diminutives to have a less offensive force than augmentatives. This generalization only applies to the comparison between augmentatives and diminutives. There could also be a need to make a more fine-grained division among various augmentatives or among various diminutives, with respect to their offensive power. In chapter 5, I will do this, by establishing which diminutives or augmentatives carry a more offensive force. I will thus compare the diminutives *lu-*, *ka-/bu-* and *tu-*, and then compare this group to the augmentative prefixes *li-*, *ki-/bi-* and *gu-/ga-*.

Prieto (2005:134) writes about the Spanish evaluative morphology. He compares augmentatives with diminutives, thereby proposing a cross-linguistic generalization which says that both categories have the same major pragmatic categories, namely intensification, attenuation, derogation, and affection. Prieto notes, however, that the difference between augmentatives and diminutives lies in the predominance of some of these categories over the others. For diminutives, attenuation and affection are the primary ones, whereas for augmentatives, it is the intensification function that is predominant.

Additionally, Prieto argues that there are other subtle differences that have to do with the connection between a function and the quality of the function itself. He claims that the attenuation function in the diminutives comes from the ‘littleness’ sense, whereas the attenuation function in augmentatives may come from the ‘brevity’ sense of some augmentatives. Prieto further argues that the intensification function in diminutives mostly affects appreciated qualities whereas the intensification of augmentatives affects any quality. In more clear terms, Prieto seems to imply that appreciated qualities such as endearment or amelioration are more enforced with diminutives than augmentatives. If pleasant qualities are not as likely with the augmentatives as for with the diminutives, the conclusion can be that augmentatives are more associated with pejorative aspects of meaning than the diminutives. This is equivalent to stating that augmentatives carry a more disparaging force than diminutives, which tend to judge the entity positively.
Hence, Prieto’s observation concurs with the earlier mentioned claim by Xydopoulos & Christopoulou (2011:27) which says that augmentatives are more offensive than diminutives.

### 3.1.2.2 Luganda Augmentatives

According to table 2 in chapter 2, Luganda augmentation is linguistically expressed through several prefixes, including prefixes from noun class 5, 7, 8, 20 and 22 when these are used with nouns inherent to other noun classes. The prefixes are *li-*-, *ki-*-, *bi-*-, *gu-* and *ga-* respectively. As mentioned earlier, class 5, 7 and 8 have inherent nouns whereas class 20 and 22 don’t. This implies that the prefixes of the latter classes, i.e. *gu-* and *ga-* are always used with an augmentative sense.

Cole (1967) treats *gu-* and *ga-* as Luganda augmentatives that indicate the huge size of an object. Ashton et al. (1954:363) also writes about *gu-*(20) and *ga-*(22) as Luganda augmentative prefixes that denote abnormality in size and quality and usually carry a derogatory implication. There is however a need to compare *gu-/ga-* with its fellow augmentatives and determine which ones have a more derogatory force. Cole and Ashton paid less attention to the rest of the augmentatives and focused on discussing the meaning of *gu-/ga-*.

This thesis is meant to exhaustively discuss all the Luganda augmentatives as well as diminutives.
CHAPTER FOUR

4.0 DATA COLLECTION

4.1 Introduction
In this chapter, I present how the entire process of data collection was conducted, up to the stage of annotating (glossing and translating) the data. The chapter also includes profiles of the respondents who were interviewed (recordings) and those who answered the questionnaires.

Data collection started with gathering several utterances containing the prefixes under investigation, which later formed the interview guide. 70 utterances were collected from 5 sources. The sources and the number of items collected from each source, is represented below:

1. Newspapers and comments relative to their news: 44
2. YouTube songs and comments relative to them: 15
3. Television news broadcasts and comments relative to them: 8
4. Films: 2
5. Radio news broadcast: 1

It is the interviewees’ response to the 70 utterances that has first of all formed the basis for establishing the meaning and interpretation of li-(5), ki-/bi-(7/8), ka-/bu-(12/14) and gu-/ga-(20/22). It is, however, worth noting that the 70 utterances which appear as number 1-70 in appendix 2 were not rich enough to account for two of the prefixes under investigation, namely lu-(11) and tu-(13). This was the reason why I created a questionnaire involving all the prefixes, most importantly lu-(11) and tu-(13).

4.2 Interviewing and Recording
The 70 utterances were organized on sheets of papers as a point of departure for the interview guide. It was thus these utterances that I presented to the informants throughout the interview session. During the interview, I asked the interviewee/respondent to tell me the context in which the utterance could be applied.

12 There was slight editing in some utterances which were not meeting the standard grammar of Luganda as far as spelling is concerned. This was the case with comments over newspaper news, television news and YouTube songs, where the information never passed through editorial process before being posted.
Additionally, I asked whether or not the word containing the prefix under investigation was used endearingly, derogatorily, or in any other specific way according to the informant. I also kept on asking why the initial speaker of the utterance preferred a certain prefix to others, say *ka-* to *gu-* in a word like *kawala* (small girl). I would also request the interviewee to provide any other relevant information. Some interviews were conducted and recorded in my residence while others were conducted in the interviewees’ homes, depending on our agreement prior the recording.

I interviewed 7 respondents, 4 males and 3 females. I realized that some of the prefixes are used also in other Bantu languages. This inspired me to conduct two more recordings from other Bantu languages; Kinyarwanda and Lusoga, which yielded a total of 9 recordings. However, the procedure followed in the two extra recordings from the Kinyarwanda and Lusoga speakers was quite different. Since these respondents were Luganda speakers as well, I would simply create a Luganda sentence with a word that bears one of the prefixes under investigation, then request the respondent to translate that very sentence to his/her mother tongue. I would then ask for a context in which the sentence would be applicable. I would also ask for any additional meanings of the ‘target word’ being communicated by the added prefix, say *ki-*, such that a deletion or substitution of the prefix with another prefix would change the meaning of the word or the interpretation of the entire sentence.

The table below illustrates the profiles for the interviewees:

**TABLE 3: THE PROFILES FOR VIDEO RESPONDENTS (VR)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(VR)</th>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>ACADEMIC LEVEL</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>AGE BRACKET</th>
<th>FIRST LANGUAGE</th>
<th>OTHER LANGUAGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VR1</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>Luganda</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VR2</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>Luganda</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VR3</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>Luganda</td>
<td>English, Swahili, Lusoga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VR4</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>Luganda</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VR5</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>Luganda</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VR6</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>Kinyarwanda</td>
<td>Luganda, English, Runyankole, Rukiga, Rutooro, Runyoro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VR7</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>Samia</td>
<td>Luganda, English, Runyankole, Rukiga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VR8</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>Kinyarwanda</td>
<td>Luganda, English, Runyankole, Rukiga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VR9</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>Lusoga</td>
<td>Luganda, English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AVERAGE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>31.9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Essential to note, is that some interviewees were responding at a low pace, hence I recorded them twice. The first recording in these cases bearing an A label and the second bearing a B. This was true with Video Respondent 3 (VR3) and Video Respondent 7 (VR7). In such cases, I chose not to amalgamate the videos since it is very clear according to the naming that they belong to the same respondent. It is this state of affairs that made me come up with 11 recordings, in reality the interviewees were 9.

I contacted all the interviewees asking for their permission to upload the videos on YouTube, as this would play a significant role in my documentation. None of the respondents turned down the request, though one of them requested that I treat the video as being private. This meant that if a third party wants to view the video, it is only possible with my authorization and possibly the informant’s. Of all the videos this is the only one that can’t be accessed even if the third party accesses the link. This video is appearing as ‘VR9 Anthony – 29’ in appendix 4, VR9 being the unique number of the video which differentiates it from all others, Anthony being the respondent’s first name, 29 being his age. This is the same naming criterion as the one that applies to all the other videos.

For purposes of privacy, I did not include the informants’ middle or second names and I included the videos in the category ‘unlisted.’ This means that the videos are not included in for instance Google searches, but still one can access them through their links. I finally uploaded all the videos, whose links are available in appendix 4.
I made sure to send the links to the owners of the videos (the informants), so that they could watch them before any other person and suggest possible changes if any. There were no changes suggested.

4.3 Questionnaires
As stated before, the interview guide didn’t have any single utterances containing *lu-* and *tu-*, implying that I had to devise to get information about these prefixes. It is on this ground that I came up with the questionnaire appearing as ‘appendix 3.’ The questionnaire includes all the prefixes, but the main intention was to get data from the respondents regarding the two mentioned prefixes that were missing in the interview guide. I drafted and distributed 50 questionnaires to different respondents, but due to the fact that some of them were returned incomplete, I decided to consider the 30 which were fully filled. The 30 questionnaires also consist of a few which I filled on behalf of the respondents who couldn’t read and write, and others that were a bit busy to do the writing themselves. The 30 respondents included 23 females and 7 males, with an average age of 23.5. The following table reports on this in detail:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(QR)</th>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>ACADEMIC LEVEL</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>AGE BRACKET</th>
<th>FIRST LANGUAGE</th>
<th>OTHER LANGUAGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QR₁</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>Luganda</td>
<td>English, French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR₂</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>Luganda</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR₃</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>Luganda</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR₄</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>Luganda</td>
<td>English, Lusoga, Runyankole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR₅</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>Luganda</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR₆</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>Lusoga</td>
<td>English, Lusoga, Runyankole, Swahili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR₇</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>Rukiga</td>
<td>Luganda, English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR₈</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>Rutooro</td>
<td>Luganda, Runyankole, English, Swahili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR₉</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>Luganda</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR₁₀</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>Luganda</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR₁₁</td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>Kinyarwanda</td>
<td>Luganda, Rutooro,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I was also working on the assumption that diminution and augmentation can give rise to pragmatic meanings which, among others, could be pejorative or offensive. For cases where the prefixes are used pejoratively, I was interested in knowing their relative offensiveness, starting with the most pejorative prefix and ending with the least pejorative one. This question was addressed by the questionnaire (see number 1 of appendix 3).
Each respondent provided an arranged list of how the prefixes should be ranked, starting with the most pejorative and ending with the least pejorative. I assigned numbers to the listed prefixes in a descending order, using numbers 6 to 1. This meant that the first prefix listed was assigned number 6, the second one number 5, and the order continues to the last prefix which takes number 1. The implication of this is that the prefix with the least total is the one that most respondents agreed to be the least pejorative one. On the other hand, the prefix with the highest total is the one that most respondents ranked high, i.e. as the most pejorative one. This is elaborated on in the next chapter.

In an attempt to investigate the meaning and interpretation of lu- through the questionnaire, a dialogue was created. One of the utterances in the dialogue appearing as number 81 in appendix 2, has the word luwala (slender girl). The role of the respondents was to state the context in which the word and the utterance was used, stating the possible appearance of the referent relative to luwala and giving any other relevant information.13

To explore the meaning and interpretation of tu-, I also came up with a dialogue where one of the words in the utterance appearing as number 83 in appendix 2 had tu- as its prefix. The respondents were directed to respond and the instructions were similar to the ones used when testing for the meaning and interpretation of lu-. Additionally, I provided my respondents with one of the Luganda equivalents for ‘small mouth,’ appearing as otumwa in number 4 of appendix 3. The respondents were instructed to create a sentence out of otumwa, then propose a context in which the sentence could be applied, on top of giving the possible appearance for the mouth being talked about, not forgetting any other relevant information.

What the informants gave as their response is what I have generally considered when establishing the meaning and interpretation of tu-. To see this, consider the utterances appearing as number 82 and 84-107 in appendix 2.14

13 It is mainly the response of the respondents towards this dialogue that I have based the meaning and interpretation of lu-.
14 There was slight editing in some responses which were not meeting the standard grammar of Luganda as far as spelling is concerned.
4.4 Plays
One of the sources for my investigation is the online play entitled ‘Katemba mu Kkooti’, literally meaning *Drama in Court*. From this play I gathered 11 utterances appearing as number 71-80 and number 108 in appendix 2. These utterances were collected at a time when the interview guide had already been drafted and the interview process was ended, hence these are not part of the utterances that the interviewees commented on. I however found it necessary to include them as part of the collected data, owing to the fact that they contain sufficient context to suggest the meaning and interpretation of the intended prefix in the given utterance.

This is so because the referent of the nominal with the given prefix can be identified in the video, revealing properties such as size and height (or other features). The context in the play also provides a convincing atmosphere regarding nonverbal communication, e.g. the facial expression of the characters.

4.5 Annotating the Data
Relating back to which data was collected from which source, I have to emphasize that, the films, radio news broadcast, television news broadcasts and comments relative to them, YouTube songs and comments relative to them, and newspapers and comments relative to their news, are the sources which contributed to the 70 utterances that made up the interview guide, hence contributing 64.8% of the annotated data. The 27 sentences from the questionnaires contributed 25% of the annotated data and the 11 utterances from the play contributed 10.2%.

Therefore, as stated before, the total number of collected texts that have been referred to when explaining the meaning and interpretation of the prefixes, is 108. It’s these very texts that were annotated (glossed and translated) in the online natural language database Type Craft. The texts are appearing in appendix 2, each with a footnote showing its source and where necessary the date when it was accessed.
CHAPTER FIVE

5.0 DATA ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION

5.1 Introduction
As stated earlier in § 1, the collected data was analyzed and discovered to be strongly linked to diminution and augmentation (see also the annotated text excerpts together with their morphological break-ups in appendix 2). To state it concisely and precisely, each prefix was found to be either a diminutive or an augmentative. This chapter gives an analysis of the collected data, presented and discussed under the two main topics diminutives and augmentatives. This chapter also provides a scale, i.e. a ranking of the prefixes with respect to degrees of derogatory meaning.

5.2 Diminutives
According to the collected data and the previous presentation on diminution, 3 prefixes were discovered to be diminutives. These include lu-(11), ka-/bu-(12/14), and tu-(13). They are presented and discussed independently in this section.

5.2.1 The Diminutive lu-(11)
It was noted earlier in the previous chapter that the interview guide didn’t have any single utterance containing this particular prefix. Therefore, data from the questionnaire appearing as ‘appendix 3’ have been largely relied on when establishing the meaning and interpretation for lu-. The fact that lu- did not feature on the interview guide suggests that it is perhaps not a commonly used diminutive compared to ka-/bu-. Remember that the interview guide was composed of utterances from 5 sources; films, radio news broadcast, television news broadcasts and comments relative to them, YouTube songs and comments relative to them, newspapers and comments relative to their news.

Considering the discussion in § 2, lu- inherently belongs to class 11 (for Luganda). The information given by Hendrikse & Poulos (1990:199-201) in table 1 suggests that class 11 (for Bantu) is composed of long, thin entities (see also Richardson 1967 and Welmers 1973). Contrary with this study, Hendrikse & Poulos (1990:199-201) consider class 11 for Bantu to be for augmentatives. The definitions for diminutives and augmentatives presented in § 3 tend not to consider height (tall/long or short) as determining whether an entity should be classified as a diminutive or an augmentative. It is instead the size of the entity (big or small) that matters.
Therefore the fact that Luganda *lu-* carries with it the quality *long/tall* in terms of height doesn’t make it an augmentative, because it at the same time bears the quality *small*. Based on this I claim that a combination of the attributes *tall/long* and *small* results in diminutive not augmentative.

However, Prieto (2005:134) mentions *intensification* as one of the pragmatic categories for both diminutives and augmentatives. Prieto claims that the intensification function is most predominant among the augmentatives. It is therefore possible that for Hendrikse & Poulos (1990:199-201) to consider class 11 entities (for Bantu) as augmentatives, they have in mind an intensification of the quality *long/tall*. The noticeable increase in the height of class 11 entities is possibly what motivated Hendrikse & Poulos to classify them as augmentatives.

In the quest to determine the meaning and interpretation for *lu-* a dialogue was created in the questionnaire where one of the utterances had the common noun *lu-wala* (slender girl). The role of the respondents was to state the context in which the noun and the utterance was used, stating the probable appearance of the referent relative to *lu-wala*, and giving any other relevant information. The key utterance which was considered to determine the meaning and interpretation of *lu-* appears below:

1) **Olwo lwala lwa Joseph.**

   “That is Joseph’s daughter.”

   olwo lwala lwa
   o lw o lu wala lw a
   IV CL11.AGR DIST DIM.CL11.AGR girl REL.CL11 GEN
   DEM CN PREP

Joseph

*name-of-a-person*

Np

The above utterance is extracted from a dialogue between two interlocutors, Julie and Joan. See the dialogue on the following page.

---

15 From dialogue 4, page 6 of the questionnaire (see appendix 3).
Julie: Oli ani agenda? (Who is the other person going over there?)

Joan: Olwo lu-wala lwa Joseph. (That is Joseph’s daughter)

As explained already, here the role for the respondents was to state the context in which the noun lu-wala together with the entire utterance was used, stating the probable appearance of the referent relative to lu-wala, and giving any other relevant information.

Note that, the prefix lu- in the noun lu-wala can be replaced with any of the prefixes investigated in this study, to come up with other possible Luganda equivalents of the English girl. Implicitly, the respondents had a task of explaining the semantics and pragmatics surrounding Joan’s choice to refer to the girl with lu-, and not gu- as in gu-wala, or any of the other 4 prefixes.

When describing the entity referred to by lu-wala, all the 30 respondents agreed that, Joan was referring to a small/tiny/slim/thin and tall girl (slender girl). This proves the observation by Hendrikse & Poulos (1990:199-201) that class 11 (for Bantu in general) is for long, thin entities. Poulos (1990:53) made a similar study on Venda.¹⁶ Poulos’ observation was that, lu-, a Venda prefix linked to class 11 (just like the Luganda prefix lu-), brings about the significance of length and narrowness. Poulos gives an example of the Venda noun lu-kutana which translates to ‘tall, thin boy.’

General comments by the respondents on the noun lu-wala featuring in Juan’s utterance are summarized in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(QR)</th>
<th>SIZE AND HEIGHT</th>
<th>NORMAL</th>
<th>OFFENSIVE</th>
<th>ADDITIONAL INFORMATION (if any)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QR₁</td>
<td>tiny and tall</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>speaker is in a good mood, word is kind of praiseful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR₂</td>
<td>slim and tall</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>speaker hates the referent; communicates with odium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR₃</td>
<td>slim and tall</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>speaker dislikes the referent; the referent is unhealthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR₄</td>
<td>tiny and tall</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹⁶ Venda is the language spoken mainly in an area that is bordered on the North by Limpopo River, found in Guthrie’s zone S.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QR</th>
<th>Shape and tall</th>
<th>Referent</th>
<th>Speech contextualization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QR5</td>
<td>thin and tall</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>speaker minimizes the referent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR6</td>
<td>small and tall</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>speaker communicates with a negative mind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR7</td>
<td>small and tall</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>referent is bad behaved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR8</td>
<td>small and tall</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>referent is stubborn, the speaker has a negative mind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR9</td>
<td>small and tall</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>speaker’s mood is normal; referent might be beautiful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR10</td>
<td>tiny and tall</td>
<td></td>
<td>not clear whether normal or offensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR11</td>
<td>small and tall</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>word is used derogatorily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR12</td>
<td>small and tall</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>speaker is in a good mood, referent is nice looking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR13</td>
<td>small and tall</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>speaker’s mood is a bad one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR14</td>
<td>small and tall</td>
<td></td>
<td>word can be used in both normal and offensive contexts; can be used to diminish and to praise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR15</td>
<td>tiny and tall</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>referent is bad behaved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR16</td>
<td>small and tall</td>
<td></td>
<td>not clear whether normal or offensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR17</td>
<td>tiny and tall</td>
<td></td>
<td>not clear whether normal or offensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR18</td>
<td>tiny and tall</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>the referent is weak, stubborn and likes insulting others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR19</td>
<td>small and tall</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>it’s a primitive way of describing people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR20</td>
<td>tiny and tall</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>referent is badly behaved and indecently dressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR21</td>
<td>small and tall</td>
<td></td>
<td>not clear whether normal or offensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR22</td>
<td>small and tall</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>kind of abusive; referent is disliked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR23</td>
<td>tiny and tall</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>speaker was annoyed, the word sounds offensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR24</td>
<td>small and tall</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>speaker expresses dislike towards the referent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR25</td>
<td>small and tall</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>speaker was annoyed and the referent is disliked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR26</td>
<td>small and tall</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>kind of abusive; referent is disliked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR27</td>
<td>tiny and tall</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>speaker was annoyed, the word sounds offensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR28</td>
<td>small and tall</td>
<td></td>
<td>not clear whether normal or offensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR29</td>
<td>tiny and tall</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>kind of abusive; referent is disliked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR30</td>
<td>slim and tall</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 clearly shows that although the respondents did not concur regarding whether or not the word *lu-wala* was used offensively, the clear tendency is that the entity is regarded as small/tiny/slim/thin and tall (slender). Ariel (2008:18) states that the most important differences between codes and inferences are that the former are explicit, truth-conditionally relevant, and uncancelable, while the latter are implicit, truth conditionally irrelevant, and cancelable. I base on Ariel’s view to claim that small/tiny/slim/thin and tall/long (slender) are the attributes of *lu-* which qualify to be codes, since they were discovered to be explicit and uncancelable.

Four of the respondents considered the word *lu-wala* to have been used in a normal way without any defamatory intentions towards the referent. In fact, 3 of these 4 respondents (QR1, QR9 and QR12) claimed that *lu-wala* was not only used normally but also with endearing intentions and some sort of intimacy and warm feelings. They perceived the entity within the scope of *lu* to be nice looking. This is in accordance with Laalo (2001) who states that besides smallness, diminutives often express intimacy and warm feelings.

Out of the 30 respondents, 20 confirmed that Joan used the word *lu-wala* with a derogatory intention and that her attitude was mostly negative towards the entity in the scope of *lu-*, so she intended to minimize/diminish, abuse, or offend the referent. This is very similar to the observation by Haas (1972:148) who argues that the diminutive also carries with it a number of affective connotations among which include derogation and insult. This derogatory interpretation for *lu-* and the already seen intimacy or endearment is what Schneider (2003) classifies to be connotative or associative, in a sense that the diminutive form may express smallness plus an attitude. So Luganda *lu-* carries with it a semantic denotation of small/tiny/slim/thin and tall/long (slender), which sometimes moves together with some pragmatic connotations which may be attitudinal, i.e. endearing or derogatory.

Strang (1968:136) observed that there is a diachronic link between smallness and attitude, and that through a grammaticalization process, diminutives have taken on a range of meanings from affection through condescension to contempt. Note that, there are 6 respondents who refused to comment on whether *lu-* was used endearingly or offensively. This confirms that amelioration and derogation are parts of meanings relative to *lu-*, which are pragmatically inferred since they can be canceled out.
5.2.2 The Diminutive ka-/bu-(12/14)

This is the prefix that was most frequently occurring in this study. It contributed 39 text excerpts out of the 70 which made up the interview guide (55.71%), 5 out of the 11 text excerpts gotten from the play (45.45%), and 44 out of the 108 annotated text excerpts appearing in appendix 2 (40.74%). These quantifications provide a convincing ground for one to claim that ka-/bu- is the mostly used Luganda diminutive. According to the information appearing in § 2, nouns with ka-/bu- belong to class 12 and 14 respectively.

Many researchers have suggested that small is the basic meaning of diminutives in various languages. A case in point is Schneider (2003:10) who indicates that, prototypically, diminutives express smallness. Dressler & Merlini Barbaresi (1994:85) also refer to smallness as the morphosyntactic denotation of diminutives in contrast to other features such as endearment which they consider as its connotation (see also Jurafsky 1996:534 and Booij 2007).

Cole (1967:44) mentions that ka- in Luganda is used to indicate the smallness of an object. Cole illustrates this by giving kèèyó and kalenzi as Luganda examples which translate to ‘small broom’ and ‘little boy’ respectively.17 Cole’s view is that in both examples ka- has a diminutive denotation (see also Denny 1976 and Aikhenvald 2000:281-3 for a similar discussion on class 12 for ChiBemba).18

When commenting on the 44 text excerpts which involved ka-/bu-, all the 7 respondents agreed that the entity in the scope of ka-/bu- was small/little. This confirms that the semantics of ka-/bu- is built on the grammatical sense of small/little. The Pragmatic senses of ka-/bu- as given by the 7 respondents, ranged from positive to negative evaluative connotations, i.e. amelioration and derogation, to other contextual senses such as young, mature, short, tall, weak, energetic, light, and narrow. See table 6 on the next page for a summary of the informants’ responses concerning the meaning and interpretation of ka-/bu-.

---

17 Disregard the fact that due to some phonological processes, ka- is realized as k- in kèèyó.

18 ChiBemba is a Bantu language spoken in Zambia.
TABLE 6: VIDEO RESPONDENTS’ INTERPRETATION OF “ka-/bu-(12/14)”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UT</th>
<th>VR1</th>
<th>VR2</th>
<th>VR3</th>
<th>VR4</th>
<th>VR5</th>
<th>VR6</th>
<th>VR7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>tiny, derogatory</td>
<td>tiny, offensive</td>
<td>tiny, diminishing</td>
<td>tiny, diminishing</td>
<td>tiny, offensive,</td>
<td>tiny, short,</td>
<td>tiny, short,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>diminishing</td>
<td>diminishing</td>
<td>diminishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>tiny, endearing</td>
<td>tiny, endearing</td>
<td>tiny, tall</td>
<td>tiny, attractive</td>
<td>tiny, attractive</td>
<td>tiny, short, ugly</td>
<td>tiny, ugly,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>diminishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>tiny, derogatory</td>
<td>tiny, derogatory</td>
<td>tiny, tall</td>
<td>tiny, abusive</td>
<td>tiny, abusive</td>
<td>tiny, unpleasant</td>
<td>tiny, abusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>tiny, young, tall</td>
<td>tiny, young, attractive</td>
<td>tiny, short</td>
<td>tiny, nice, young</td>
<td>tiny, young</td>
<td>tiny, young, short</td>
<td>tiny, bad behaved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>tiny, endearing</td>
<td>tiny, young</td>
<td>tiny, young,</td>
<td>tiny, young,</td>
<td>tiny, young,</td>
<td>tiny, young, short</td>
<td>tiny, youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>attractive</td>
<td>pleasant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>tiny, mature, diminishing</td>
<td>tiny, short</td>
<td>tiny</td>
<td>tiny, short,</td>
<td>tiny, nice</td>
<td>tiny</td>
<td>tiny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>young,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>tiny, endearing</td>
<td>tiny, young,</td>
<td>tiny, young,</td>
<td>tiny, tall</td>
<td>tiny, young</td>
<td>tiny, young, nice</td>
<td>tiny, nice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>attractive</td>
<td></td>
<td>young</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>tiny, tall</td>
<td>tiny, weak, youth</td>
<td>tiny, nice</td>
<td>tiny, derogatory</td>
<td>tiny, derogatory</td>
<td>tiny, young,</td>
<td>tiny, young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>derogatory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>tiny, short,</td>
<td>tiny, weak,</td>
<td>tiny</td>
<td>tiny, short</td>
<td>tiny, weak</td>
<td>tiny, weak</td>
<td>tiny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>diminishing</td>
<td>diminishing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>tiny, short,</td>
<td>tiny, strong</td>
<td>tiny, short,</td>
<td>tiny, short,</td>
<td>tiny, youth,</td>
<td>tiny</td>
<td>tiny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mature</td>
<td>strong</td>
<td></td>
<td>strong</td>
<td>weak,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>tiny, young</td>
<td>tiny, young,</td>
<td>tiny, young,</td>
<td>tiny, young</td>
<td>tiny, young</td>
<td>tiny, young</td>
<td>tiny, young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>attractive</td>
<td>attractive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>little</td>
<td>little</td>
<td>little</td>
<td>little</td>
<td>little</td>
<td>little</td>
<td>little, diminishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>small, light</td>
<td>small, light</td>
<td>small, light</td>
<td>small, light</td>
<td>small, light,</td>
<td>small, light,</td>
<td>small, light,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>weak</td>
<td>weak</td>
<td>weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>tiny, energetic</td>
<td>tiny, mature,</td>
<td>tiny, short,</td>
<td>tiny, short,</td>
<td>tiny, energetic</td>
<td>tiny, energetic</td>
<td>tiny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>energetic</td>
<td>attractive, energetic</td>
<td>energetic</td>
<td>energetic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>small, diminishing</td>
<td>small, nice</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>small, diminishing</td>
<td>small, attractive</td>
<td>small, unpleasant</td>
<td>small, nice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that the first column of the table entitled ‘UT’ has numbers which appear not to be in a proper ascending order. This is so because the numbers appearing in the column correspond with the text excerpts appearing in appendix 2. This implies that the numbers missing in the column represent utterances which consist of other prefixes than ka-/bu-. So for the annotated (glossed and translated) text excerpts relative to any number appearing in the first column, see appendix 2 and look out for that very number. This interpretation also applies to other tables of the same sort.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>tiny, short</th>
<th>tiny, short</th>
<th>tiny</th>
<th>tiny, short, young</th>
<th>tiny, defamatory</th>
<th>tiny, short</th>
<th>tiny</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>tiny, mature, tall, derogatory</td>
<td>tiny, short, mature</td>
<td>tiny, short, nice</td>
<td>tiny, defamatory</td>
<td>tiny, offensive</td>
<td>tiny, tall, insulting</td>
<td>tiny, lower status, diminishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>tiny, endearing</td>
<td>tiny, nice</td>
<td>tiny, pleasant</td>
<td>tiny, pleasant</td>
<td>tiny, pleasant</td>
<td>tiny, pleasant</td>
<td>tiny, pleasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>tiny, derogatory</td>
<td>tiny, weak, derogatory</td>
<td>small, weak</td>
<td>small, unpleasant</td>
<td>small, short, unpleasant</td>
<td>small, unpleasant</td>
<td>small, unpleasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>tiny, endearing</td>
<td>tiny, nice, young</td>
<td>tiny, tall, nice</td>
<td>tiny, short, derogatory</td>
<td>tiny</td>
<td>tiny, short</td>
<td>tiny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>little</td>
<td>little</td>
<td>little</td>
<td>little</td>
<td>little</td>
<td>little</td>
<td>little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>tiny, young, tall</td>
<td>tiny, nice, young</td>
<td>tiny, tall, nice, young</td>
<td>tiny, short, derogatory</td>
<td>tiny</td>
<td>tiny, short</td>
<td>tiny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>small, attractive</td>
<td>small, attractive</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>tiny, unpleasant</td>
<td>small, unpleasant</td>
<td>small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>small, endearing</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>small, attractive</td>
<td>small, nice</td>
<td>small, nice</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>tiny, endearing</td>
<td>tiny, endearing</td>
<td>tiny, endearing</td>
<td>small, attractive</td>
<td>small, nice</td>
<td>small, nice</td>
<td>small, unpleasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>small, endearing</td>
<td>small, nice</td>
<td>small, diminishing</td>
<td>small, unpleasant</td>
<td>small, unpleasant</td>
<td>small, diminishing</td>
<td>small, diminishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>small, nice</td>
<td>small, nice</td>
<td>small, nice</td>
<td>small, nice</td>
<td>small, nice</td>
<td>small, nice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>small, endearing</td>
<td>small, pleasant</td>
<td>small, pleasant</td>
<td>small, nice</td>
<td>small, nice</td>
<td>small, nice</td>
<td>small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>small, endearing</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>small, nice</td>
<td>small, diminishing</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>small, nice</td>
<td>small, unpleasant</td>
<td>small, attractive</td>
<td>small, unpleasant</td>
<td>small, unpleasant</td>
<td>small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>small, derogatory</td>
<td>small, derogatory</td>
<td>small, unpleasant</td>
<td>small, unpleasant</td>
<td>small, unpleasant</td>
<td>small, unpleasant</td>
<td>small, unpleasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>small, diminishing</td>
<td>small, unpleasant</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>small, nice</td>
<td>small, unpleasant</td>
<td>small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>small, nice</td>
<td>small, unpleasant</td>
<td>small, attractive</td>
<td>small, nice</td>
<td>small, nice</td>
<td>small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>small, nice</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>small, nice</td>
<td>small, nice</td>
<td>small, nice</td>
<td>small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>small, endearing</td>
<td>small, pleasant</td>
<td>small, pleasant</td>
<td>small, nice</td>
<td>small, nice</td>
<td>small, nice</td>
<td>small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>small, endearing</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>small, unpleasant</td>
<td>small, attractive</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>small, derogatory</td>
<td>small, derogatory</td>
<td>small, unpleasant</td>
<td>small, unpleasant</td>
<td>small, unpleasant</td>
<td>small, unpleasant</td>
<td>small, unpleasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>small, diminishing</td>
<td>small, unpleasant</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>small, nice</td>
<td>small, unpleasant</td>
<td>small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>small, nice</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>small, nice</td>
<td>small, nice</td>
<td>small, nice</td>
<td>small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>tiny, short, narrow/tight</td>
<td>tiny, short, narrow/tight</td>
<td>tiny, short, narrow/tight</td>
<td>tiny, short, offensive</td>
<td>tiny, short, diminishing</td>
<td>tiny, short, abusive</td>
<td>tiny, ugly, abusive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6 rests on the grammatical sense of small/little which combines with several pragmatic senses to come up with the meaning and interpretation of ka-/bu-. The smallness embedded in ka-/bu- is linked to size, see example (2) below:

2) **Naye kawala ggwe lwaki olimba?**

```
Naye kawala ggwe lwaki Olimba?
```

```
naye    kawala    ggwe    lwaki    Olimba?
```

```
bu    DIM.CL12.AGR    girl    you.2SG    why.Q    2SG    lie.Vstem    FV
```

```
PRT    CN    PN    ADV    V
```

The above statement was uttered in a courtroom by the accused in her attempt to question the plaintiff for giving false information about her. The accused was being charged for mistreatment of her servant (the plaintiff), by denying her food and forcing her to do hard labor. Judging from the images in the video, it is clearly evident that the referent of *ka-wala*, who is the plaintiff in the case, is unquestionably a thin girl. The use of *ka-* in example (2) suggests that *ka-* is a diminutive.

Appah & Amfo (2007:89) claim that the range of meanings expressed by the diminutive in each particular language is not confined to *smallness*. This means that *smallness* sometimes moves hand in hand with some pragmatic inferences. Indeed if the atmosphere surrounding the courtroom by the time of uttering example (2) is to be considered, one would come up with pragmatic conclusions that the speaker exposed a negative attitude towards the referent, and that the statement was diminishing and/or derogatory. This can be viewed from the speaker’s raised tone accompanied with an exceedingly sad face, together with the repeated act of pointing at the referent in a disrespectful manner typical of a quarrel. In fact, there was so much disrespectful behavior in this situation that at a certain time the judge had to intervene and prevent the speaker from making further utterances, thereby calling for silence in the courtroom.

---

20 It is appearing as number 72 in appendix 2.
The judge’s choice of cautioning the accused and stopping her from making further statements raises the possibility that the accused was making statements that have some components of derogation. This usage of the diminutive in a contemptuous way was also noted by Schneider (2003:96-102) when discussing the English diminutive morpheme –let which appears in such words as, kinglet, princelet, dukelet, lordlet, bosslet, godlet, to mention a few.

Schneider indicated that when these diminutive forms are used in reference to the substantive holders of these titles, they are usually depreciatives, expressing a negative assessment of the referent and conveying contempt, thereby presenting the referents as incompetent, unimportant and petty. This then means that on top of the semantic denotation of smallness/littleness, ka-/bu- carries with it a connotation of derogation. However, the smallness attributed to ka-/bu-may not necessarily be of size, see example (3) below:

3) **KaNsambu tekasobola kuyitamu.**

   ka
   DIM.CL12.AGR

   Nsambu
   name of a person

   te
   NEG

   ka
   DIM.CL12.AGR

   sobol
   can

   a
   FV

   kuyitamu
   kuyita
   INF

   mu
   pass

   V

All the 7 respondents when interviewed regarding utterance (3) agreed that Nsambu (the referent of ka-) is a small sized male. They also gave several possible contextual connotations relative to Nsambu; mature, young, tall, short, nice looking, derogation.

The inconsistency demonstrated by the respondents when describing Nsambu with reference to age, height, physical appearance, and amelioration vs. derogation, is an indicator that these are not part of the denotations to base on when establishing the semantics of ka-/bu-, they are rather purely contextual, hence pragmatic.

---

21 It is appearing as number 36 in appendix 2.
However, although VR7A\textsuperscript{22} did comment that Nsambu is a slim male, he eventually declined accepting that the smallness must always be in terms of size. See the conversation below between the interviewer and the interviewee (VR7A) in response to utterance (3):

**Interviewer:** How exactly can you describe Nsambu?

**Interviewee:** He is a slim and poor man.

**Interviewer:** Do you think one would as well have referred to Nsambu as $kaNsambu$ if he wasn’t slim?

**Interviewee:** Yes, it is very possible to refer to a big man with $ka$-, but it implies that the referent is poor, or of any lower status, say financially as compared to the speaker.

**Interviewer:** There is this fat Ugandan politician called Ssebaggala. Can you really refer to him as $kaSsebaggala$ even though he is not small?

**Interviewee:** Yes, if he is say a poor man, I can refer to him as $kaSsebaggala$, but the $ka$- would in most cases also demonstrate the speaker’s negative attitude, it diminishes the referent and has much to do with communicating that he is of a lower status especially compared to the speaker.

Considering the above dialogue, it becomes convincing to argue that the smallness embedded in $ka$-/bu- and perhaps the other two investigated diminutives ($lu$- and $tu$-) may sometimes not necessarily imply small size, but rather small status. This implies that when a big sized referent is diminutivized, then s/he has to be of a lower status, especially compared to the speaker.

I am of the view that, if statuses are to be classified into two groups, big and small, then higher statuses would belong in the first classification and the lower statuses in the latter. I then presuppose that small (lower status) is to diminutives, as big (higher status) is to augmentatives. The discussion following the collected data on augmentatives proves this opinion, as will be seen later in this chapter. Considering the collected data for this research, this usage of the diminutive that ranks the referent low on the scale of statuses seems uncommon compared to the one that calls for the size of the referent to be small.

\textsuperscript{22} Details regarding the video can be accessed in appendix 4.
Laalo (2001:72) writes about Finnish diminutives in child language and child-directed speech. From a pragmatic point of view, Laalo states that Finnish diminutives express endearment, intimacy and warm feelings. The situation isn’t different with Luganda *ka/-bu-*, but this time around not necessarily in child-directed and child speech as it is with Finnish. See example (4) below:

4) **Ako akayumba ka mulembe nnyo.** “That house is very modern.”

Ako akayumba ka ako a ka yumba ka
\textit{that.CL12.AGR.DIST IV DIM.CL12.AGR house for.GEN.CL12.AGR}
DEM CN PREP
mulembe nnyo
mu lembe nnyo
\textit{CL3.AGR generation very.DEG}
CN PRT

In response to utterance (4), all the respondents maintained the earlier discussed core sense of *ka-* which is built on the denotation small. The respondents’ view was that the referent in the scope of *ka-*(the house), must be small. On top of this, all the respondents argued that the house in the scope of *ka-* is indisputably pleasant and nice looking. This raises the likelihood that the speaker’s utterance rests on amelioration factors catalyzed by a positive attitude with endearing intentions mixed with warm feelings towards the house. It can therefore be argued that the amelioration meaning associated with *ka/-bu-* is perhaps a prominent discourse pattern. Taylor (1990:148) was right to conclude that diminutivization thus becomes an important means whereby a language can extend its lexicon.

According to Grandi (2011:21), Sub-Saharan Africa has diminutives with a semantic archetype young/child. Wierzbicka (1984) also suggests that ‘child-centered’ is the core sense of the diminutives.\(^{25}\)

\(^{23}\) It is appearing as number 37 in appendix 2.

\(^{24}\) Ariel (2008) states that a prominent discourse pattern may after time develop into a properly encoded meaning.

\(^{25}\) For purposes of this thesis, child-centered has been used not only to refer to child-related conversations, but also to presuppose (in some cases) that the referent be young in terms of age.
Although some of the data collected for this research supports Grandi and Wierzbicka, there are some respondents who refused to link the referent of *ka-lbu- to young/child*, and instead claimed that the referent was either *mature/adult* or not clear whether young or adult. Still, if child-centered is interpreted to mean that the conversation engaged in is childish (not necessarily suggesting that the referent is young), this wasn’t always the case. There are several instances when the communicating environment proved not to give enough evidence to claim that the interlocutors were engaging in a child-related talk. This agrees with Dressler & Merlini Barbaresi (2001) who in their opinion don’t agree with the idea of considering ‘child-centered’ as the core sense of diminutives. See example (5) below:

5) **Munsonyiwe akasajja kannemeye okugaaya.**

   Munsonyiwe akasajja
   
   mu n sonyiw e a ka sajja
   2PL 1SG *forgive.Vstem* IND IV DIM.CL12.AGR *man*
   V CN

   kannemeye okugaaya
   ka n nemy e o ku gaay a
   DIM.CL12.AGR 1SG *fail.Vstem* IND IV INF *crush/chew.Vstem* FV
   V V

Utterance (5) was made by Golola Moses, a Uganda kick boxer. It was an apology to his fans, as a way to seek for forgiveness after losing to the Hungarian Mate Zsamboki. Quoting the newspaper which is the source for the text excerpt, Mate Zsamboki is a relatively slim man aged 23 and in the given utterance he is the referent for *ka-* in the common noun *a-ka-sajja.* Of the 7 respondents, 1 commented that Mate Zsamboki is a slim male adult. All the remaining 6 respondents interpreted Mate Zsamboki to be a slim male, but not clear whether young or adult.

Furthermore, none of the respondents interpreted the talk to be childish since Golola Moses was making a serious and formal statement to his fans that were not happy with his loss. This implies that treating child-based as a central sense of the diminutive in Luganda remains questionable.

---

26 It is appearing as number 30 in appendix 2.
27 Note that in the quest to achieve a neutral response, the context on which every text excerpt was built was not provided to any respondent. This was meant to provide the respondents with a fertile ground conducive enough to yield uncorrupted and unbiased judgment towards the referent of any prefix.
I would rather agree with Jurafsky (1993:425) on his claim that the sense child is the historically and semantically prior sense of the diminutive, but that most of the extensions of the category follow the early extension to the sense small. Croft & Suzanne (1987) and Pederson (1991) studied the directionality of change in the reflexive construction. They noted that as a category decays, the most central sense is often lost first, and a new construction arises to take over this sense. I presuppose that, in Luganda diminutives, the category child has with time decayed and been replaced with the category small.

Jurafsky (1993:427) notes that the diminutive represents weakness in the physical world. According to the comments from the respondents, Jurafsky’s remark can be taken to be true, only to a larger extent but not always. For example in utterance (5), the referent of ka- (Mate Zsamboki) emerged the winner of the fight, thus, he is possibly an energetic fighter. It is therefore not by coincidence that, 6 of the 7 respondents claimed that the referent of ka- in utterance (5) was unquestionably energetic, not leaving any chance to attribute weakness to the referent. The only respondent that refused to associate the referent with energetic was just undecided, since he as well refuted claims that the referent was weak.

However, it is practically possible for a weak fighter to win a fight, i.e. by applying more tactics than power, although this may generally be surprising and unanticipated. Relating back to Jurafsky’s claim that the diminutive represents weakness in the physical world, I believe this is factual to a bigger extent but not always. Precisely, weakness is just part of the many meanings associated with ka-/bu- and probably other Luganda diminutives, taken for pragmatics not semantics.

As briefly stated earlier, the respondents were not consistent when attributing height to the referent of ka-/bu- (short or tall/long). Hence, most utterances were left uncommented on. Nevertheless, one interesting observation is the fact that the few that were commented on had the quality short with the highest percentage (76.74%) compared to tall/long (23.26%). Although the semantics of ka-/bu- is such that it doesn’t consider the feature height, the tendency by most respondents to attribute the quality short to ka-/bu- can’t just be taken for granted.

28 Note that not all referents could qualify grammatically to be defined in terms of height, short or tall/long. So the explanation is intended to refer to those referents that can be measured in terms of height. Therefore utterances like 39 and 43 in appendix 2 with nouns as money are an exemption.
It appears that there are limited chances for the referent of \textit{ka-/bu-} to be tall/long.\footnote{It appears that whenever the referent has attributes \textit{small} and \textit{tall/long}, the speaker prefers the diminutive prefix \textit{lu-} to \textit{ka-/bu-}. So \textit{tall/long} is more associated with \textit{lu-} than \textit{ka-/bu-}.} For that reason, it becomes convincing to argue that, if we imagine a scale of properties associated with the referents of expressions with \textit{ka-/bu-}, ranging from the properties most expected for these referents, to those that are the least expected, the quality \textit{short} is indeed expected, hence highly ranked. In other words, on top of the denotation \textit{small/little}, there are more chances for the referent of \textit{ka-/bu-} to be young, short, weak, and light.

\textbf{5.2.1 The Diminutive \textit{tu-}(13)}

Just as \textit{lu-}, data from the questionnaire appearing in appendix 3 has been largely relied on when establishing the meaning and interpretation of \textit{tu-}. This is because \textit{tu-} did not appear on the interview guide, hence not a commonly used diminutive compared to \textit{ka-/bu-}.\footnote{The interview guide composed of utterances from 5 sources; films, radio news broadcast, television news broadcasts and comments relative to them, YouTube songs and comments relative to them, newspapers and comments relative to their news. Had it been that \textit{tu-} was such a common diminutive, it would definitely have featured in at least one of the 70 text excerpts gathered from the 5 sources.}

Based on the information appearing in § 2, \textit{tu-} is a class 13 prefix. Cole (1967:47) mentioned that the Luganda \textit{tu-} has a diminutive significance denoting small quantities of liquid and granular substances. Cole supports his argument by giving two Luganda nouns, \textit{tûnnyó} and \textit{tûzzí}, which translate to ‘a pinch of salt’ and ‘a drop/small quantity of water’ respectively. On the same note, there are some informants who kept on citing \textit{tûzzí} and \textit{tussukaali} as the Luganda equivalents for the English ‘little water’ and ‘little sugar’ respectively, a fact that supports Cole’s argument.

A relatively similar study was conducted on the Shona prefix \textit{tu-}, also linked to class 13 (for Shona not Luganda). Judging from the results of the study, Fortune (1955:54, 95) reports that the prefix \textit{tu-} is used to refer to small things. To strengthen his claim, Fortune presents \textit{tukova}, \textit{tuvanhu}, and \textit{tufodya} as Shona equivalents of the English ‘small rivers’, ‘small people’, and ‘a little tobacco’ respectively. Although this may not be enough evidence to claim that the diminutive aspect of \textit{tu-} cuts across to all Bantu languages, the Shona comparison raises suspicion that there is a possibility of \textit{tu-} to behave similarly in other Bantu languages. See the table on the next page for the summarized meaning and interpretation of \textit{tu-}. 
The discussion by Cole (1967:47) suggests that Luganda *tu-* is used with uncountable entities. However, the collected data for this study indicates that the referent of *tu-* is not always an uncountable entity. See example 6 on the next page.
6) **Otwo tuwala twa Joseph.** “Those are Joseph's daughters.”

In the above utterance, *tuwala* is used to literally mean ‘girls’. It is obvious that ‘girls’ belong to the category ‘countable nouns.’ Thus, it is claimed with evidence that the entity in the scope of *tu-* doesn’t necessarily have to be an uncountable entity.

The question as to whether or not *tu-* evaluates the referent positively attracted the attention of the respondents, but important to note is the fact that the opinions appeared to take 3 parallel directions. For example, when commenting on the above utterance, 5 respondents agreed that *tuwala* was used to demean the referents, 2 respondents did not specify whether or not the speaker used *tuwala* with derogatory intentions, and 23 did not notice any single derogatory intention in the utterance, but rather positive evaluation, i.e. in terms of beauty.

Although the figures indicate that most respondents evaluated the referents positively, the 7 who never agreed with this are a reason to argue that the idea of using *tu-* with intentions of positively evaluating the referent is not an issue to be taken for semantics, but rather pragmatics. The tendency of using *tu-* with intentions of judging the referent negatively, i.e. insignificant, is also contextual, hence pragmatically inferred. This is supported by Booij (2007) who considers insignificance to be one of the pragmatic or evaluative interpretations associated with the diminutive.

---

31 From dialogue 6, page 7 of the questionnaire. It is appearing as number 83 in appendix 2.
Bybee (1985) claims that a diminutive form must of necessity include the semantic feature *small*. This is not different with *tu*- at all. At least all the 30 respondents did state that the girls in example (6) could not in any circumstance be *big/fat*. This implies that *tu*- is semantically associated with *small/little*, and that the denotation *small/little* sometimes goes hand in hand with several pragmatic inferences which can range from *endearment* to *derogation* as already discussed.

In comparison, although *lu-, ka-/bu-* and *tu-* all qualify to be diminutives, *tu-* has an extra quality that distinguishes it from the rest. Considering the data, *lu-* and *ka-/bu-* are mostly used with countable entities, the former with slender entities and the latter with small entities. The diminutive *tu-* behaves in a somewhat different way in the sense that the entity in its scope is mostly an uncountable entity. Additionally, all the informants seemed more confident to associate *tu-* with plural entities. It appeared ungrammatical to the informants, whenever I could make an attempt to trick and convince them that I have used *tu-* to refer to a singular entity. Therefore, much as all the 3 diminutives investigated shared the denotation *small*, there are extra qualities that make each of them to behave differently.

### 5.3 Augmentatives
In comparison with diminutives, there is relatively little literature about augmentatives (see Haas 1972, Dressler & Merlina Barbaresi 1994, and Grandi 2002). Out of the 6 prefixes investigated, 3 have been found to be augmentatives. These include *li-*(5), *ki-/bi-*(7/8), and *gu-/ga-*(20/22). These augmentative prefixes are presented and discussed independently in this chapter.

#### 5.3.1 The Augmentative *li-*(5)
This prefix was the least occurring in this study. It occurred in 6 text excerpts out of the 70 which made up the interview guide (8.57%), 1 out of the 11 text excerpts taken from the play (9.09%), and 7 out of the 108 annotated text excerpts appearing in appendix 2 (6.48%). Therefore *li-* is not only a rarely used Luganda augmentative but also the least used Luganda augmentative.

---

32 Although *tu-* is mostly used with uncountable entities, most of the examples appearing in this research, for *tu-* are countable entities. This is so because I wanted to test whether *tu-* can really be used with countable entities. Remember that Cole (1967:47) suggests that *tu-* is only used with uncountable entities. Although the informants kept on emphasizing that *tu-* is mostly associated with uncountable entities, none of them concluded that the countable nouns used with *tu-* in this research are not grammatical Luganda words. This raises a question as to whether or not Cole’s claim should be modified to read that “*tu-* is mostly (not always) used with uncountable entities”.
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According to the information appearing in § 2, li- is a class 5 marker for Luganda. Hendrikse & Poulos (1990:199-201) give a continuum interpretation of the Bantu noun class system which treats class 5 (this is represented by li- in Luganda) as having augmentatives, undesirable people, derogatives, among others. Hendrikse & Poulos (1990:206) further state that the prefixes of class 5 are used in a secondary sense to reflect the deviations in size and shape. In a relatively similar discussion, Cole (1967:50-51) notes that, in Luganda, anything with features that are bigger than normal, is disapproved of, and also invites criticism, hence such features may lead to the referent being perceived as sinister.

The meaning expressed by Luganda li- is not different from the one presented in the above discussion. At least all the 7 video respondents, when commenting on the 6 text excerpts which involved li- agreed that the entity in the scope of li- was always big. This suggests that the semantics of li- corresponds to the grammatical sense of big. Note that big is realized as the basic meaning but may have an interpretation of fat when describing human beings or animals in general.

The Pragmatic senses of li- as given by the 7 respondents range from positive to negative evaluative meanings, i.e. amelioration and derogation, to other contextual senses such as ugly, energetic, abusive, obscene, old, beautiful, rich, wide, and tall. See table 8 below for the summarized meaning and interpretation of li-.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UT</th>
<th>VR1</th>
<th>VR2</th>
<th>VR3</th>
<th>VR4</th>
<th>VR5</th>
<th>VR6</th>
<th>VR7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>fat, ugly</td>
<td>fat, ugly</td>
<td>fat, ugly</td>
<td>fat, ugly</td>
<td>fat, ugly</td>
<td>fat, ugly</td>
<td>fat, badly behaved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>big, obscene, offensive</td>
<td>big, obscene, abusive</td>
<td>big, obscene, abusive</td>
<td>big, obscene, abusive</td>
<td>big, obscene, offensive</td>
<td>big, obscene, offensive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>big, ugly, old</td>
<td>big, ugly</td>
<td>big, ugly</td>
<td>big, ugly</td>
<td>big, ugly</td>
<td>big, ugly</td>
<td>big, offensive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The example below illustrates the core sense of *li* - (big) noted on the previous page and also summarized in table 8:

7) **Erikazi eryo lyekaza.**³⁴ “That woman is pretending.”

Erikazi e  r i  k a z i  e r y o  l y e k a z a
IV AUG.CL5.AGR woman IV CL5.AGR DIST REL.SBJ pretend.Vstem FV
CN DEM V

Utterance (7) was made in a courtroom by a witness who was testifying in favor of the servant; the plaintiff in the case. The accused was being charged for mistreatment of her servant (the plaintiff), by denying her food and forcing her to do hard labor. Considering the images in the video, it is obvious that the referent of *e-ri-kazi*, who is the accused in the case, is a fat lady.

Venda (also a Bantu language) has a similar prefix *li-* , which according to Poulos (1990:31) is used in a secondary sense to convey the idea of bigness or greatness. Poulos gives possible examples as *li-ṋona* and *li-ḍu* which translate to 'big clod of earth' and 'huge hut' respectively.

Shona, another Bantu language spoken in Zimbabwe, also has the prefix *ri-* which according to Fortune (1955:77) has a secondary function of signifying bigness, largeness or hugeness. Fortune supports his claim by citing *ri-buka* a Shona equivalent of the English ‘large beast.’

³⁴ It is appearing as number 78 in appendix 2.
Lusoga also has the prefix *li*-. In a dialogue with one of the respondents, who was a Lusoga speaker\(^{35}\), it was revealed that the Lusoga *li*- behaves just the same way as the Luganda *li*-. The respondent gave *e-ri-kazi* as an example to demonstrate this, which he strongly believed to translate to *fat woman*, with higher possibilities of the referent being negatively evaluated.

A combination of the above discussion and the one on the previous page serves not only to strengthen the fact that Luganda *li*- has the semantic meaning *big*, but also to argue that this kind of meaning is anticipated to be maintained in quite a number of other Bantu languages. From a pragmatic point of view, most respondents maintained the opinion that the entity in the scope of *li*- is negatively evaluated, hence regarding *li*- to be a carrier of derogation, in such a way that belittles the referent.\(^{36}\) This is illustrated by example (8) below:

8) **Ssajjabb**i.\(^{37}\) “*Ugly man.*”

Ssajjabb
s
sajja
bi
AUG.CL5.AGR
man
CL5.AGR
ugly/bad
CN

In respect to the above utterance, the 7 respondents wholly agreed that the *li*- in **ssajjabb**i suggests that the man in question is not only fat, but also ugly or badly behaved. The original source of the text excerpt is also such that the referent of **ssajjabi** in the song is an extremely disliked man with wild behaviors, who mistreats his wife in an uncalled for and malicious manner. However, a judgment can’t be reached based on just one utterance. Therefore, to come up with the conclusion that the contemptuous sense attributed to Luganda *li* - is a matter of pragmatics not semantics really called for the feedback from respondents regarding several utterances. Indeed, upon making the tests on numerous utterances, it was clearly revealed that the referent of *li*- is not always negatively evaluated. This is true with example (9) on the next page.

---

\(^{35}\) See VR9 Anthony- 29 in appendix 4.

\(^{36}\) In Setswana, a Bantu language with a large set of noun classes, it is now considered politically incorrect to refer to ethnic minorities, such as the Chinese or the Bushmen, using noun class 5 (which includes substances, such as dirt or clay, and abstract nouns); all humans have to be referred to with the ‘human’ class 1/2 (Aikhenvald 2006:469).

\(^{37}\) It is appearing as number 9 in appendix 2. Also note that *li*- undergoes intricate phonological changes of assimilation to turn to *s* in **ssajja**.
9) **Ninayo li-sugar-mummy.**³⁸ “I have a sugar-mummy.”³⁹

Concerning the above utterance, none of the respondents refuted the fact that the referent of *lisugar-mummy* was fat. Lack of uniformity was only noted in the question as to whether or not the sugar-mummy was being undervalued and demeaned by being referred to as *lisugar-mummy*.

Out of the 7 respondents, 2 were not sure whether or not the referent of *lisugar-mummy* was negatively evaluated, 2 noticed derogatory intentions in the utterance thereby judging the referent to be ugly, and 3 held an opinion that the referent was positively evaluated; beautiful or rich. Therefore the context within which *li-* occurs plays a pivotal role in expressing amelioration and/or derogation. This sums up to a conclusion that the idea of treating the entity in the scope of *li-* to be linked to derogatory and/or ameliorative interpretations of beauty, wealth, age, behavior, height or length, width, among others, are pragmatic aspects of meaning, arising as a result of the semantic meaning of *li-* (big) in combination with contextual assumptions.

Relating back to the diminutive prefixes already discussed, it can be recalled that in terms of strength, they are more linked to the attribute *weak* than *energetic*. This is the opposite with *li-* and perhaps also the other two augmentative prefixes as will be argued later. This is exemplified in utterance (10) on the next page.

---

³⁸ It is appearing as number 22 in appendix 2.

³⁹ In the Ugandan perspective, a sugar-mummy is a relatively aged woman that engages in a love affair with a relatively young man. In any case a sugar-mummy is expected and perceived to be rich, and the man (who should in most cases be poor compared to the sugar-mummy) is among other factors interested in the wealth.
“A typical thief has even bought a vehicle out of his/her friend’s money.”

Example (10) was a comment relative to a Ugandan city socialite, Shanita Namuyimbwa, a.k.a Bad Black, who was accused of embezzling funds from her lover, David Greenhalgh. After embezzling the funds, Shanita embarked to living a luxurious life alongside purchasing several posh and expensive cars. So Shanita is the thief being talked of in utterance (10). 2 of the 7 respondents perceived the referent of e-ri-bbi not to be merely a thief, but an energetic one. The remaining 5 respondents didn’t specify whether the thief in question was weak or energetic. Even utterance (8) had the feature energetic attributed to the referent of li- at least once. On a general note, the feature weak was nowhere mentioned to be an attribute of the entity in the scope of li-. This shows that even though the referent of li- may not necessarily be energetic, there are limited chances for weak to be attributed to the base.

Utterance (10) can also be taken to suggest that li- doesn’t denote big in the size sense, but a more general category. Thus a big thief is not necessarily a large thief, but a thief that steals a lot.

---

40 It is appearing as number 45 in appendix 2.
5.3.2 The Augmentative *ki-/bi-* (7/8)
The collected data placed this particular prefix in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} position regarding the commonly used Luganda augmentatives. Although it appeared nowhere in the play, *ki-/bi-* contributed 11 text excerpts out of the 70 which made up the interview guide (15.71\%), thereby contributing 11 out of the 108 annotated text excerpts appearing in appendix 2 (10.19\%). The total number of text excerpts consisting of the augmentative prefixes was 31. The fact that *ki-/bi-* contributed 11 out of the 31 gives it a percentage of 35.48, thus lying in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} position after *gu-/ga-* and before the already discussed and least used *li-*.

The information appearing in § 2 suggests that *ki-/bi-* is the Luganda noun class marker for class 7/8. As already noted with *li-*, *ki-/bi-* also expresses something as above normal size or quality. The continuum interpretation of the Bantu noun class system presented by Hendrikse & Poulos (1990:199-201) suggests that class 7 (this is represented by *ki-* in Luganda) is constituted by diminutives, augmentatives, amelioratives, and derogatives, among others. Hendrikse & Poulos (1990:206) further note that the prefixes of class 7/8 are used in a secondary sense to reflect the deviations in size and shape.

Luganda *ki-/bi-* is realized as *ci-/zi-* in Shona (also a Bantu language). According to Fortune (1955:82), *ci-/zi-* is used in a secondary sense to indicate short and stout things. Fortune gives examples as ‘ci-kadzi’ and ‘zi-kadzi’ which translate to ‘short and fat woman’ and ‘short and fat women’ respectively.

Contrary with the Luganda *ki-/bi-* and the Shona *ci-/zi* which are augmentative prefixes, Venda (another Bantu language) has class 7/8 prefixes as *tshi-/zwi-* which according to Poulos (1990:38) convey a diminutive significance when used in a secondary sense. Poulos cites some Venda examples, ‘tshi- vhudu,’ ‘zwi- vhudu,’ ‘tshi-kedzi,’ and ‘zwi-kedzi,’ which translate to ‘small hill,’ ‘small hills,’ ‘small sack,’ and ‘small sacks’ respectively. This usage of the class 7/8 prefixes to convey a diminutive significance when used in a secondary sense wasn’t noticed with the Luganda *ki-/bi-* in this study. Instead, the Luganda *ki-/bi-* suggests that the entity in the scope of the prefix should be big. See table 9 on the next page for the summarized meaning and interpretation of *ki-/bi*.
**TABLE 9: VIDEO RESPONDENTS’ INTERPRETATION OF “ki-/bi-(7/8)”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UT</th>
<th>VR1</th>
<th>VR2</th>
<th>VR3</th>
<th>VR4</th>
<th>VR5</th>
<th>VR6</th>
<th>VR7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>fat, old</td>
<td>fat, old</td>
<td>fat, old</td>
<td>fat, old</td>
<td>fat, offensive</td>
<td>fat, mature, offensive</td>
<td>fat, offensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>defamatory</td>
<td>defamatory</td>
<td>defamatory</td>
<td>diminishing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>fat</td>
<td>fat</td>
<td>fat, short</td>
<td>fat, short</td>
<td>fat, offensive</td>
<td>fat, derogatory</td>
<td>fat, offensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>derogatory</td>
<td></td>
<td>derogatory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>fat, abusive</td>
<td>fat, abusive</td>
<td>fat, insulting</td>
<td>fat, insulting</td>
<td>fat, abusive</td>
<td>fat, offensive</td>
<td>fat, derogatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>high, offensive</td>
<td>high, offensive</td>
<td>high, endearing</td>
<td>high, endearing</td>
<td>high, diminishing</td>
<td>high, insulting</td>
<td>high, offensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>fat, tall, insulting</td>
<td>fat, dirty, insulting</td>
<td>fat, mature, defamatory</td>
<td>fat, mature, defamatory</td>
<td>fat, dirty, diminishing</td>
<td>fat, unpleasant</td>
<td>fat, unpleasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>fat, mature, offensive</td>
<td>fat, mature, offensive</td>
<td>fat, short, offensive</td>
<td>fat, tall, unpleasant</td>
<td>fat, abusive</td>
<td>fat, dirty, abusive</td>
<td>fat, dull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>fat, tall</td>
<td>fat, mature</td>
<td>fat, mature, rich</td>
<td>fat, unpleasant, tall, mature</td>
<td>fat, energetic, unpleasant</td>
<td>fat, mature, unpleasant</td>
<td>fat, tall, mature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>big, offensive</td>
<td>big, offensive</td>
<td>big, defamatory</td>
<td>big, defamatory</td>
<td>big, abusive</td>
<td>big, derogatory</td>
<td>big, derogatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>big, wide, abusive</td>
<td>big, wide, abusive</td>
<td>big, insulting</td>
<td>big, wide, insulting</td>
<td>big, insulting</td>
<td>big, abusive</td>
<td>big, unpleasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>fat, mature, insulting</td>
<td>fat, insulting</td>
<td>fat, tall, unpleasant</td>
<td>fat, tall, unpleasant</td>
<td>fat, mature, insulting</td>
<td>fat, mature, insulting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>fat, mature, tall insulting</td>
<td>fat, mature, tall insulting</td>
<td>fat, mature, tall insulting</td>
<td>fat, mature, tall insulting</td>
<td>fat, mature, tall insult</td>
<td>fat, mature, tall insult</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 illustrates that the referent of *ki-/bi-* is always big. This confirms that *ki-/bi-* is indeed an augmentative prefix whose grammatical sense requires the entity in its scope never to be small. See example (11) on the next page for more clarification on this.
11) **Wabula Walukagga weebale kuvuma kikazi ekyo.**41 "But Walukagga thank you for insulting that woman."

```
Wabula Wabula Walukagga weebale kuvuma
wabula wabula walukagga we ebale ku vum a
but you thank. Vstem INF insult. Vstem FV
PRT Np V V

kikazi ekyo
ki kazi e ky o
AUG.CL7.AGR woman IV CL7.AGR DIST
CN DEM
```

The above was a comment relative to a Luganda song appearing on YouTube. Walukagga is the artist for the song, so the writer was thanking him for insulting the woman in question, referred to with the expression *kikazi* in (11). The woman (a widow) had an HIV virus, hence capable of spreading AIDS. However, with all this state of affairs, the woman still went on with engaging different men in love, which according to Walukagga (the artist of the song) was an intended case of malice to knowingly spread the deadly virus. So the entire song is abusive with the artist attacking the heartless woman by using several Luganda insulting words.

In response to the utterance, all the 7 respondents unanimously agreed that the woman, a referent for *ki-kazi*, is a big/fat woman, which indeed is true, judging from the female character in the video. This was also maintained in all the referents of *ki-/bi-* in the other 10 text excerpts investigated, especially where the entity could be described in terms of size, big or small. So there is no doubt that *ki-/bi-* denotes *bigness*, hence an augmentative.42 Still in response to utterance (11), all the 7 respondents evaluated the referent of *ki-/bi-* negatively, claiming that the writer used the word *ki-kazi* as an insult, to demean the referent, or to bring out the fact that the woman in question was either dirty or unpleasant. However, this derogatory sense attributed to *ki-/bi-* wasn’t always maintained. See utterance (12) on the next page.

---

41 It is appearing as number 21 in appendix 2.

42 As demonstrated already, the tendency of associating class 7/8 with large size seems to cut across other Bantu languages. Aikhenvald (2006:464) notes that in ChiBemba, class 7/8 is associated with large size and carries pejorative overtones.
The above utterance was made in reference to a male Ugandan city socialite, Meddie Ssentongo. Meddie had gotten in touch with Shanita Namuyimbwa, another Ugandan city socialite already described in the discussion following utterance (10), who was in love with a white man from the United Kingdom. So the two city socialites connived to con the white man over 11 billion Ugandan Shillings (UGX 11b). The speaker, a friend to Meddie, was testifying in the court that indeed the two socialites are guilty and that Meddie once contacted him (the speaker) and said that he (Meddie) had gotten in touch with a girl (Shanita) who had a white lover whom they wanted to con. So the white man is the referent of *ekisajja ekizungu*.

When responding to utterance (12), all the 7 respondents maintained the earlier discussed core sense of *ki/-bi-*., claiming that the white man must be *big*. When discussing the pragmatic sense of *ki-* in relation to derogation, 3 respondents argued that the white man was an unpleasant guy, so the speaker wanted to belittle him by referring to him as *e-ki-zungu* instead of using the normal Luganda equivalent of white man which is *o-mu-zungu*. 3 of the respondents perceived the white man to either be tall, mature, or both, but not clear whether the statement was in any way derogatory or not.

---

43 It is appearing as number 40 in appendix 2.
The remaining 1 respondent refuted any claim that the white man was in any way demeaned or degraded by being referred to with the expression *e-ki-zungu*. For this matter, the respondent instead linked the *ki-* to amelioration and also added that the entity in its scope was preferably a rich person. The newspaper which is the source for this text excerpt indeed supports this respondent’s idea of linking the white man to richness, as it is stated clearly that the man was rich. In fact, that’s the sole reason why the two Ugandan city socialites allegedly conned him UGX 11b. Otherwise in a Ugandan context, it’s impossible for a poor person to own such a huge amount of money.

Judging from the fact that 4 of the 7 respondents didn’t confirm that utterance (12), in particular *ekisajja ekizungu*, was derogatory, verifies the opinion that derogation is among the several meanings of *ki-/bi* which are contextual, hence taken as pragmatics. On a general note, most respondents did associate *ki-/bi-* with derogation, for example indicating that the word containing *ki-/bi-* was defamatory, diminishing, offensive, insulting, to mention but a few. However, the few exceptions suggest that it would not be correct to treat derogation as a semantic sense of *ki-/bi-*.

As demonstrated in table 9, *ki-/bi-* was mostly but not always found to pragmatically be associated with mature entities (age), tall (height), energetic (strength), wide (width), and heavy (weight). As presented before, the same qualities were noticed to be associated with *li*- *. Now that *li-* and *ki-/bi-* have proved to have similar denotations and pragmatic inferences, the challenging task is to account for their differences, i.e. present contexts where one is used in preference to the other. This is a topic that can probably be of attraction to future researchers focusing on the same prefixes.

The 2 extra recordings for Kinyarwanda and Lusoga also sum up to one uniform conclusion concerning the pragmatics of *ki-/bi-* (in Kinyarwanda and Lusoga), i.e. that when used in a secondary sense, *ki-/bi-* mostly but not always evokes negativity. The 2 recordings also semantically evaluated *ki-/bi-* as an augmentative prefix denoting *big*.

---

This is a clear indication that the denotation big attributed to Luganda ki-/bi-, together with the derogatory pragmatic sense already discussed, are meanings and interpretations of ki-/bi- that perhaps cut across other Bantu languages. As noted already, this is fueled by Fortune (1955:82) whose work indicates that the Shona ci-/zi- (equivalents of Luganda ki-/bi-) are used in a secondary sense to refer to stout entities.

5.3.3 The Augmentative gu-/ga-(20/22)
Based on the collected data, gu-/ga- is the mostly used Luganda augmentative. It featured in 5 utterances out of the 11 gathered from the play (45.5%), thus in this regard sharing the same percentage with the mostly used diminutive discussed already; ka-/bu-(12/14). It appeared in 14 text excerpts out of the 70 which made up the interview guide (20%), thereby contributing 19 out of the 108 annotated text excerpts appearing in appendix 2 (17.6%). With the exception of only one source, i.e. the radio news broadcast, gu-/ga- dominated in the rest of the sources that produced the utterances which made up the interview guide. (Comparison is made in reference to fellow augmentative prefixes not the diminutives).

Chapter 2 of this thesis indicates that gu-/ga- appears with nouns linked to class 20/22. When discussing li-(5) and ki-/bi-(7/8), it was noted that these particular prefixes only function as augmentatives in contexts where they are used in a secondary sense, otherwise there are instances when they are combined with primary stems which inherently belong to class 5 and 7/8 respectively. In the latter instance, li-(5) and ki-/bi-(7/8) can never function as augmentatives. However, gu-/ga- behaves in a somewhat different manner. It belongs to classes (20/22) which don’t have inherent nouns. This implies that gu-/ga- is always used in a secondary sense, hence qualifies to be an augmentative in whichever way it is used. Ashton et al. (1954:363) noted that the two classes 20 and 22 (for gu- and ga- respectively) denote abnormality in size and quality, and usually carry a derogatory implication.

When writing about derived gender, Mould (1971:27) briefly discusses Luganda gu-. Mould claims that Luganda gu- expresses abnormality and sometimes pejoration. To justify this, Mould mentions that o-mu-ntu o-mu-nene is a person who is big, but probably within normal limits, whereas o-gu-ntu is a person who is abnormally and sometimes pejoratively big. Mould adds that, o-gu-som-es-a ‘a huge teacher’ is, then, by definition abnormal in size and so is not a normal musajja ‘man’.
However, although the collected data reports that some respondents associated \textit{gu}/\textit{ga}- with abnormal entities, the most important point is that the entity in the scope of \textit{gu}/\textit{ga}- was always big but not necessarily abnormal.

Cole (1967:50-51) also maintains the idea that Luganda \textit{gu}/\textit{ga}- indicates the hugeness of an object, thereby translating to augmentative(s). In this regard, Cole mentions Luganda \textit{gu-ntu}, \textit{gw-áná}, \textit{gúù-só}, and \textit{gáà-só}, which translate to ‘huge thing’, ‘big, fat child’, ‘enormous eye’ and ‘enormous eyes’ respectively. On the same note, Cole states that in Luganda, anything with features that are bigger than normal, is disapproved of, and also invites criticism. Such features may lead to the referent being perceived as sinister. According to Cole, this kind of perception can lead to the degrading of the nature of the referent due to its unacceptable features. Furthermore, Cole indicates that the prefix \textit{gu}- in Luganda may have a pejorative implication of sinisterness when used in the context of disapproval and/or criticism.

The continuum interpretation of the Bantu noun class system presented by Hendrikse & Poulos (1990:199-201) indicates that classes 20 and 22 (these are represented by \textit{gu}/\textit{ga}- in Luganda) are constituted by diminutives, augmentatives, derogatives, and mannerisms. With exception of the diminutive sense, the rest of the attributes that Hendrikse & Poulos generally believe to apply to class 20 and 22 of Bantu languages were also found to apply to Luganda \textit{gu}/\textit{ga}-.

The above discussion and the one on the previous page indeed reveal the meaning and interpretation of Luganda \textit{gu}/\textit{ga}-. There was overwhelming evidence to link the semantics of \textit{gu}/\textit{ga}- to big entities that could sometimes be abnormal. However, in rare cases, the respondents didn’t mention big as a denotation of \textit{gu}/\textit{ga}-. Interestingly, in these rare cases, big/fat was substituted with heavy. Practically, it seems right to argue that heavy entities are expected to be big. This implies that the denotation big could not in any way be cancelled out, thus considered as a semantic feature for \textit{gu}/\textit{ga}-.

From a pragmatic perspective, \textit{gu}/\textit{ga}- is registered with more derogatory connotations than endearment. This means that \textit{gu}/\textit{ga}- has a greater force of evoking criticism than praise, hence the entity in its scope is likely to be negatively evaluated.
As noted with li- and ki-/bi-, gu-/ga- was also in most cases found to pragmatically have strong connections with mature entities (age), tall (height), energetic (strength), and wide (width). See table 10 below for the summarized meaning and interpretation of gu-/ga-.

**TABLE 10: VIDEO RESPONDENTS' INTERPRETATION OF “gu-/ga-(20/22)”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UT</th>
<th>VR1</th>
<th>VR2</th>
<th>VR3</th>
<th>VR4</th>
<th>VR5</th>
<th>VR6</th>
<th>VR7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>fat</td>
<td>fat, energetic</td>
<td>fat</td>
<td>fat, mature</td>
<td>fat</td>
<td>fat, energetic</td>
<td>fat, extreme, energetic, offensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>heavy, energetic</td>
<td>heavy, energetic</td>
<td>big, energetic</td>
<td>heavy, energetic</td>
<td>heavy, energetic</td>
<td>big, energetic</td>
<td>heavy, energetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>fat, energetic, defamatory</td>
<td>fat, energetic, offensive</td>
<td>fat, energetic, offensive</td>
<td>fat, offensive</td>
<td>fat, offensive</td>
<td>fat, tall, derogatory</td>
<td>fat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>fat, defamatory</td>
<td>fat, energetic, derogatory</td>
<td>fat, derogatory</td>
<td>fat, extreme</td>
<td>fat</td>
<td>fat, energetic, tall, derogatory</td>
<td>fat, derogatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>fat, tall, mature</td>
<td>fat, tall, energetic</td>
<td>fat, tall, derogatory</td>
<td>fat, tall, energetic</td>
<td>fat</td>
<td>fat, tall, mature</td>
<td>fat, tall, energetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>big, energetic</td>
<td>big, energetic</td>
<td>heavy, energetic</td>
<td>heavy, energetic</td>
<td>heavy, energetic</td>
<td>heavy, energetic</td>
<td>heavy, energetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>fat, tall, energetic</td>
<td>fat, energetic</td>
<td>fat, energetic</td>
<td>fat, tall</td>
<td>fat</td>
<td>fat, diminishing</td>
<td>fat, tall, diminishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>heavy, defamatory</td>
<td>heavy, derogatory</td>
<td>heavy, derogatory</td>
<td>heavy, derogatory</td>
<td>heavy</td>
<td>heavy, extreme</td>
<td>heavy, extreme, inhuman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>fat, energetic, derogatory</td>
<td>fat, energetic</td>
<td>fat, energetic, endearing</td>
<td>fat, tall, diminishing</td>
<td>fat</td>
<td>fat, tall, rich</td>
<td>fat, endearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>fat, mature</td>
<td>fat, energetic</td>
<td>fat, tall, derogatory</td>
<td>fat, tall</td>
<td>fat</td>
<td>fat, derogatory</td>
<td>fat, extreme, diminishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>big, abusive</td>
<td>big, abusive</td>
<td>big, abusive</td>
<td>big, abusive</td>
<td>big, abusive</td>
<td>big, abusive</td>
<td>big, extremely abusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>big, wide, abusive</td>
<td>big, offensive</td>
<td>big, sharp, insulting</td>
<td>big, wide, insulting</td>
<td>big, ugly, insulting</td>
<td>big, ugly, offensive</td>
<td>big, offensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>big</td>
<td>big</td>
<td>heavy</td>
<td>heavy</td>
<td>big</td>
<td>heavy, big</td>
<td>big</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The tendency for gu-/ga- to always suggest that the referent should at least not be small was also well supported by the additional text excerpts extracted from the online play. Here it is even very clear that the entity in the scope of gu-/ga- is always big. Consider the following example on this matter:

13) **Ogukazi ogwo tegusiima.**

"That woman doesn’t appreciate."

Ogukazi ogwo
o gu kazi o gu o
IV AUG.CL20.AGR woman IV CL20.AGR DIST
CN DEM
tegusiima
tegu siim a
NEG REL.SBJ appreciate.Vstem FV V

The above utterance shares a somewhat similar communicating environment with utterance (7), presented when discussing the meaning and interpretation of li-(5). But, this time it is the plaintiff (also the servant), testifying before the judge in a courtroom, in order to prove that the accused (also the boss) is indeed guilty in a mistreatment case.

The servant was allegedly denied food and forced to do hard labor. The accused and the referent of o-gu-kazi, appears in the video to be a quite abnormally big woman. Intuitively, if the accused was not such a big woman, the plaintiff would have referred to her as o-mu-kazi, the normal Luganda equivalent of English ‘woman’, without any additional meaning and interpretation brought about by the size of the referent. Therefore, the idea to associate o-gu-kazi with ‘not merely a woman’ but ‘a big woman’ rotates on gu-.

---

45 It is appearing as number 76 in appendix 2.
This tendency of linking *gu/-ga*- to big and sometimes abnormal entities, as argued before, is purely for semantics reasons not pragmatics, thus **big** is the core sense for *gu/-ga*-

Earlier on, it was noted that Ashton et al. (1954:363) claim that Luganda *gu/-ga*- denote abnormality in size and quality, and usually carry a derogatory implication. This study suggests that abnormality is a possible interpretation of *gu/-ga*- but not necessarily its denotation. This study also reveals that indeed *gu/-ga*- may carry a derogatory implication.

Still in the same video, it is noticed that, slightly before making utterance (13), the speaker (the plaintiff) began referring to the accused as *o-mu-kazi*, the normal way of addressing a normal woman. However, it reached a time when the speaker resorted to crying, raised her tone, and developed all signs typical of an irritated person. It is at this point that the speaker found it necessary to stop addressing the accused as *o-mu-kazi*, and replaced it with *o-gu-kazi*. The speaker’s decision to resort to *o-gu-kazi* seemed to have been fueled by strong desires to demean and insult the accused as a way of retaliating. All this transpired immediately after the plaintiff had just given a testimony on how the accused used to mistreat her. Presumably, it is this flashback that raised her anger, hence a need to express it by addressing the accused in a somehow insulting manner. This usage of *gu/-ga*- with a pejorative implication can also be viewed in utterance (14) below, which unlike utterance (13), was on the interview guide (has comments from the interviewees):

14) **Kalina ogumwa.**46 “S/he has a mouth.”

Kalina          ogumwa  
ka              lina     o gu    mwa  
DIM.CL12.AGR   has.Vstem IV AUG.CL20.AGR mouth/lip  
V               CN

On one side, utterance (14) contributed a lot concerning the semantic sense of *gu/-ga*-. All the 5 interviewees emphasized that the mouth in question is big. On the other side, the utterance served to demonstrate the already mentioned derogatory sense attributed to *gu/-ga*-, but from a purely pragmatic perspective, as will be elaborated more.

46 It is appearing as number 49 in appendix 2.
All the 5 interviewees were of the view that the referent of *gu-* in utterance (14), was either abused, insulted, or offended. These are all demeaning signs, which sum up to a uniform conclusion that *gu-* indeed carries with it a pejorative or derogatory implication.

The interviewees’ decision to unanimously link *gu-* to derogation in utterance (14) creates a suspicion that perhaps this derogatory implication is a matter to be handled on semantic grounds. Although utterance (14) seems to qualify this, interviewees’ comments relative to most referents of *gu/-ga-* in examples other than utterance (14), tend to paint a picture that the idea of evaluating the entity in the scope of *gu/-ga-* in a somewhat negative manner, has much to do with context. This doesn’t refute the fact that *gu/-ga-* has a derogatory interpretation, but rather serves as an indicator that this kind of meaning is contextual, therefore pragmatically inferred. There are several recorded instances when the interviewees refused commenting whether or not the referent of *gu/-ga-* was being demeaned by the speaker. A case in point is utterance (15) below:

15) **Agakonde g'omuzungu gatutte Golola ku kitanda.**[^47] “The punches taken from the European have made Golola to be admitted to the hospital.”

Utterance (15) was a newspaper headline reporting what transpired after the kick boxing fight held in Uganda on 29/06/2012 between Golola Moses, the Ugandan, and Mate Zsamboki, the Hungarian. It is alleged that the Hungarian Mate Zsamboki displayed a nice performance, which did not only make the Ugandan opponent (Golola Moses) to lose the fight, but also to be admitted to the hospital shortly after the fight.

[^47]: It is appearing as number 29 in appendix 2.
It is Mate’s punches which are the referents of agakonde in utterance (15). While commenting on utterance (15), none of the 7 respondents did state that the referent of agakonde was negatively evaluated nor demeaned or insulted in any way. Instead, all the respondents attached big/heavy and energetic to the base, the former for semantics and the latter for pragmatics. Most probably, the pragmatic inference energetic evaluates the referent positively. Remember that all the respondents considered the referent of ogumwa in utterance (14) to have been negatively evaluated: this is the opposite with the results for utterance (15). Preferably, this kind of inconsistency can only be rectified by considering the tendency of linking derogation and/or amelioration to the referent of gu-/ga- as a matter of pragmatics not semantics.

Utterance (15) also strengthens the already discussed energetic pragmatic sense embedded in gu-/ga- which was also discovered to be true with li- and ki-/bi-. It is important however to stress the fact that this kind of meaning is more pronounced with gu-/ga- than with li- and ki-/bi-. Thus, there are relatively limited chances for the entity in the scope of gu-/ga- not to be energetic, compared to li- and ki-/bi-.

5.4 The ranking for li-(5), ki-/bi-(7/8), lu-(11), ka-/bu-(12/14), tu-(13), and gu-/ga-(20/22) in contexts where they are used with a derogatory intention

This is the section that answers research question 3 of this thesis, i.e. what is the ranking for li-(5), ki-/bi-(7/8), lu-(11), ka-/bu-(12/14), tu-(13), and gu-/ga-(20/22) in contexts where they are used with a derogatory intention? For example, which ones are most or least derogatory? Among the many assumptions I had before conducting this research, was that the usage of the investigated prefixes brings about several pragmatic effects, one of them being derogation. Indeed the previous sections on both diminutives and augmentatives have confirmed that the usage of both the former and the latter may bring about a pragmatic inference of derogation. This is not a purely new discovery, since it had earlier been noted by some authors, e.g. Ashton et al. (1954), Cole (1967), and possibly others. However, although these authors agree that Luganda diminutives and augmentatives may bring about a pejorative implication, none of them attempts to give a ranking for the prefixes, ranging from the least derogatory up to the most derogatory ones. It is this gap that this section is intended to fill. Hence, this section will be unique in the sense that it presents the results of a question that has so far not been raised.
Therefore, as indicated in § 4, for cases where the prefixes are used pejoratively, I was interested in knowing their degree of offensiveness/derogation, starting with the least pejorative prefix up to the most pejorative one. This role was played by the questionnaire (see number 1 of appendix 3). Each respondent gave an arranged list of how the prefixes should be ranked, starting with the most pejorative and ending with the least pejorative. I assigned numbers to the listed prefixes, in a descending order, using numbers 6 to 1. This means that the first prefix to be listed was assigned number 6, the second one was assigned number 5, and the order continues up to the last prefix which was assigned number 1. The implication of this is that the prefix with the lowest total is the one that most respondents considered to be the least pejorative one, and on the other hand the prefix with the highest total is the one that most respondents ranked high, i.e. more pejorative. See table 11 below for a summarized overview.

**TABLE 11: THE SCALE OF OFFENSIVENESS FOR THE PREFIXES ACCORDING TO QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONDENTS (QR)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(QR)</th>
<th>ka-/bu-</th>
<th>tu-</th>
<th>lu-</th>
<th>ki-/bi-</th>
<th>gu-/ga-</th>
<th>li-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QR₁</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR₂</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR₃</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR₄</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR₅</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR₆</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR₇</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR₈</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR₉</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR₁₀</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR₁₁</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR₁₂</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR₁₃</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR₁₄</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR₁₅</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR₁₆</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR₁₇</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR₁₈</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR₁₉</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR₂₀</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR₂₁</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR₂₂</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>QR23</td>
<td>QR24</td>
<td>QR25</td>
<td>QR26</td>
<td>QR27</td>
<td>QR28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL SCORE AND POSITION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lower numbers signal lower degree of derogation; higher numbers signal higher degree of derogation.

The information in table 11 can as well be presented in a more concise and precise way as given in the following figure:

**FIGURE 1: THE SCALE OF OFFENSIVENESS FOR THE PREFIXES**

More Derogatory

6. *li-*
5. *gu-/ga-*
4. *ki-/bi-*
3. *lu-*
2. *tu-*
1. *ka-/bu-*

Less Derogatory

Augmentatives

Diminutives
Figure 1 appears in such a way that, the more one goes up, the more one is likely to be making a derogatory statement. This is the opposite in case one chooses to go down. If figure 1 is to be described on the basis of amelioration, not derogation, then the interpretation would be that, the more one goes higher up on the scale, the less one is expected to be ameliorative. On the same note, the more one goes further down on the scale, the more one is expected to be ameliorating the entity in the scope of the used prefix.

It was earlier noted that Xydopoulos & Christopoulou (2011:27) generally consider diminutives to be less offensive than the augmentatives. Considering figure 1, Xydopoulos & Christopoulou’s remark is true for Luganda diminutives and augmentatives. At least the first 3 prefixes occupying the positions at the top of the scale are augmentatives. On the other hand, the first 3 prefixes lying at the bottom are all diminutives.

However, it has to be noted with reference to table 11, that, although the totals gathered by each particular prefix are different from the other, the numbers for the augmentatives are quite close to each other. For example, the most offensive augmentative prefix li- has the sum 151, gu-/ga- has 145, and the least offensive augmentative prefix ki-/bi- has 144. The difference among these prefixes is probably not statistically significant. Presumably, if more informants were to be involved, there is a possibility that this could not only change the outcome in terms of the total scored, but also changing the positions, hence the ranking.

The above argument implies that, perhaps, there is no single Luganda augmentative prefix that is always more derogatory than the other. It may be that the degree of offensiveness is rather dependent on factors such as the context and possibly the way each speaker perceives the prefix. In fact, this suspicion was raised by the inconsistency that the informants displayed when ranking the prefixes. Some of the informants had untidy work in the sense that they kept on erasing prefixes to substitute them with others thus changing the ranking. All this was common with the augmentatives, and specifically under the part that required for a scale of offensiveness.

The questionnaire was drafted in such a way that, informants were availed with possible Luganda equivalents of the English word head (the word is neutral and could be used with any of the investigated prefixes). Each of the prefixes investigated was represented in one of the words listed.
In order to test for the degree of offensiveness for each prefix, informants were requested to: (i) Tick on the words which they think are not derogatory. (ii) Tick on the words which they think are derogatory. (iii) Write down the non derogatory words ticked, starting with the ones that could be more endearing than the others. (iv) Write down the derogatory words ticked, starting with the most offensive words and ending with the least offensive words.

For the questionnaires that I filled in on behalf of the informants, it was even more evident that native speakers don’t have a clear scale of offensiveness to be followed in contexts where the Luganda augmentatives are used with a derogatory implication. I noticed this by asking the informants to avail me with the scale they provided before. I had to pretend as if I never recorded down the initially communicated scale. To my surprise, most of them could not give the same scale as given before. It is this kind of inconsistency, together with my knowledge on Luganda as the mother tongue and first language, that I conclude that there does not exist a proper scale of offensiveness for Luganda augmentatives.

However, as presented in the table 11, although all this confusion brought about by the inconsistency in ranking the prefixes occurred, at least one point to be noted is that the informants most of the times maintained such a ranking that put the augmentatives up and the diminutives down, as shown in figure 1. Therefore, the conclusion is that Luganda augmentatives carry a greater derogatory sense as compared to the Luganda diminutives. However, this aspect of meaning is pragmatically inferred, as already discussed in the earlier sections of this chapter.
CHAPTER SIX

6.0 SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Summary

For purposes of brevity, the findings discussed in the previous chapter are presented in this section in a somewhat concise and precise manner. It is paramount to recall that the entire research involved 6 Luganda prefixes: 3 of these are diminutives [lu-(11), ka-/bu-(12/14), tu-(13)], and the other 3 are augmentatives [li-(5), ki-/bi-(7/8), gu-/ga-(20/22)].

6.1.1 Diminutives

The 3 diminutives investigated have been found to have semantics that requires the entity in their scope to be small. However, although these Luganda diminutives share the semantic sense of small, it so appears that each has a unique attribute(s) that differentiates it from its counterparts. For example, lu- and ka-/bu- are mostly used with countable entities, the former for slender entities and the latter for small entities. The diminutive tu- behaves in a rather different way in the sense that the entity in its scope is most of the times an uncountable entity. Additionally, all the informants seemed more confident to associate tu- with plural entities than with singular entities. Therefore, although the 3 diminutives investigated share the denotation small, there are extra qualities that make each of them behave in a different way.

The 3 Luganda diminutives investigated all proved to have such pragmatics that entails amelioration and derogation, both senses being aspects of meaning associated with these diminutives. The diminutives were also mostly, but not always, found to pragmatically be associated with entities that are young (age), weak (strength), narrow (width) and light (weight).

Relating back to the derogatory sense of the Luganda diminutives, it’s important to stress that all the 3 diminutives can represent meanings that are deeply disparaging and are used when the speaker deliberately wishes to cause great offense. However, their degree of offensiveness varies, with lu- having a greater offensive force, followed by tu-, then ka-/bu- occupying the last position.

Note that, with the commonly used diminutive ka-/bu-, the smallness implied may not necessarily be of size. Therefore, it is possible for the referent of ka-/bu- to be big in size but of a lower status, hence small in rank.
The order changes the other way around when the diminutives are used with purposes of ameliorating the entity in their scope, i.e. ka-/bu- occupies the first position, followed by tu-, then lu- being the least ameliorative.

I earlier presented three different approaches to defining the diminutive in § 3. This includes the abstractionist approach by Chao (1947:35) which relies on single concepts such as ‘small’ or ‘child’ in characterizing the diminutive. This is highly criticized by Jurafsky (1996:537) and Schneider (2003:1) for ignoring the pragmatic senses of the diminutive. There is the homonymy approach presented in the work of Appah & Amfo (2007:95) which models each sense as a separate lexeme, the ‘small’ sense of the diminutive is a separate lexeme from the ‘child’ sense. Lastly, there is the radial category by Jurafsky (1996:539). This approach involves a type of structured polysemy that explicitly models the different senses of the diminutive and the metaphorical and influential relations which combine them. The radial category approach also has child and small as the central senses with various senses appearing at its edge, i.e. contempt, affection, intimacy and sympathy, among others.

Relating to the above, the radial category is the preferred approach to define the Luganda diminutives. The first two approaches, i.e. the abstractionist and the homonymy approaches only focus on the child and small senses. They discuss the semantics and ignore the pragmatics of the diminutive. The results of this study somewhat agree with the homonymy approach on grounds that the small sense of the diminutive in Luganda is a separate lexeme from the child sense. At least, for the text excerpts relied on when discussing the diminutives, it has been clear that the child and small senses don’t always have to co-exist. Still, among the three approaches, the radial category is the best to define the Luganda diminutives, although it also has its own shortcoming, i.e. it has child and small as the central senses taken for semantics. Even though there has been overwhelming evidence to qualify small as the putative basic meaning of Luganda diminutives in this study, this has not been the case with the child sense. In fact, the child sense has in some contexts been missing. Therefore, for Luganda diminutives, the child sense is a matter of pragmatics not semantics.
The preference for the radial category as the best approach to define the Luganda diminutives owes to the fact that it goes beyond the semantics and discusses the different aspects of meaning associated with the diminutive, i.e. the contemptuous and affection senses. Indeed, these two senses have been linked to the pragmatics of the Luganda diminutives in the previous chapter. The radial category approach also talks about small as a possible basic meaning of the diminutive. The data presented qualifies this to be true with Luganda diminutives.

6.1.2 Augmentatives

The 3 investigated Luganda augmentatives, i.e. li-(5), ki-/bi-(7/8) and gu-/ga-(20/22) semantically demand their referents to be at least big. In rare cases, the bigness embedded in these augmentatives may not necessarily be of size. Thus, although uncommon, it’s possible for a small sized rich person to be an entity in the scope of these Luganda augmentatives. This suggests that, metaphorically speaking, on the scale representing the financial status of people, the rich are ranked high, hence big in status.

The pragmatics of the Luganda augmentatives is similar. Each augmentative has a force to induce amelioration and derogation as an aspect of its meaning. The huge resemblance among the Luganda augmentatives can also be explained with the fact that they are all mostly associated with entities that are mature (age), energetic (strength), wide (width), tall (height) and heavy (weight).

The slight difference among the Luganda augmentatives is mostly noted with the commonly used gu-/ga-. It has some characteristics that make it a bit different from li- and ki-/bi-. It appears that whenever the entity is bigger than normal, there are high chances for the speaker to opt for gu-/ga-. This seems not to be a rule, but it qualifies to be true most of the times. Furthermore, the attribute energetic is frequently associated with gu-/ga-, at least considerably more frequently than with li- and ki-/bi-. Therefore, on a scale representing the energetic level of a person, gu-/ga- indicates that the level is high, i.e. big. This means that out of the three investigated augmentatives, gu-/ga- is the one that is most likely to signal that the referent is energetic.
Regarding derogation, all the 3 Luganda augmentatives can pragmatically be used to impose contemptuous meanings which are belittling, hence used by the speaker to deliberately demean and/or offend the referent. Different from the diminutives, the Luganda augmentatives appear to have almost the same degree of offensiveness.

Table 11 and figure 1 regard li- to be the most offensive, followed by gu-/ga-, then ki-/bi- being the least offending. However, the difference in the total score by each augmentative prefix is small. This may suggest that, perhaps, if more informants were to be interviewed, the results could possibly change, and so the positions and the ranking. Therefore the difference suggested by table 11 and figure 1 may not be statistically significant; it could be that Luganda augmentatives have a relatively equal offensive power.

6.1.3 Concluding Remarks

Both the Luganda diminutives [lu-(11), ka-/bu-(12/14), tu-(13)] and augmentatives [li-(5), ki-/bi-(7/8), gu-/ga-(20/22)] have their pragmatics linked to forces capable of inducing amelioration and derogation. However, this study shows that amelioration is more associated with diminutives than augmentatives. On the other hand, derogation is more associated with augmentatives than it is with the diminutives. Hence, the order for the general ranking starting with the least derogatory prefix up to the most derogatory one is: ka-/bu-, tu-, lu-, ki-/bi-, gu-/ga-, li-.49

The semantics for the prefixes investigated is such that the entity in their scope is either small (for the diminutives) or big (for the augmentatives). It is however noteworthy to emphasize that, although in rare cases, the small and big denotations mentioned here may not necessarily be of size. For example, in some contexts, the small and big modifies the status of the referent, not the size, with the former associated with lower status and the latter associated with higher status.

49 Note that the difference between the augmentative prefixes: ki-/bi-, gu-/ga-, li-, may not be statistically significant. Hence, there is likelihood for these three prefixes to exchange the positions depending on the degree of offensiveness that a particular speaker may associate with any of them.
6.1.4 Recommendations

Remember that the semantics and pragmatics of li-(5) and ki-/bi-(7/8) is very similar. Each of them has a strong tie with the denotation big, has a force that induces amelioration and derogation as an aspect of their meaning, and is associated with entities that are mature (age), energetic (strength), wide (width), tall (height), and heavy (weight). Since their semantics and pragmatics has proven to be so similar, there is an urgent need to make further research intended to discover the various circumstances that govern the speaker’s choice to use one of these augmentative prefixes instead of the other.

The prefixes investigated in this study have been studied on a synchronic level. It could be pleasing if further research is conducted also on a diachronic level in order to establish how the meaning and interpretation of Luganda diminutives and augmentatives has changed over time. This way, it would be easy, for example, to tell whether the child sense claimed by some authors to be the central sense of the diminutives did exist in Luganda, and has now perhaps decayed and evolved into the small sense.

Lastly, it can be of great value if the data collected for this study can be presented using some syntactic frameworks, e.g., lexical functional grammar (LFG). This can perhaps be another possible approach to explain the meaning and interpretation of Luganda diminutives and augmentatives in a more illustrative way.

50 Remember that gu-/ga- behaves a bit different from li- and ki-/bi-. It was indicated earlier that, whenever the entity is bigger than normal, there are high chances for the speaker to opt for gu-/ga-. This seems not to be the rule, but rather qualifies to be true most of the times. Furthermore, the attribute energetic was frequently associated with gu-/ga-, at least much more times than it was with li- and ki-/bi-.
### APPENDIX 1: Gloss Tags

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Glossing tag</th>
<th>Tag description</th>
<th>Gloss class</th>
<th>GOLD Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1st person</td>
<td>Person Number</td>
<td>First Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL</td>
<td>1st person plural</td>
<td>Person Number</td>
<td>no match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>1st person singular</td>
<td>Person Number</td>
<td>no match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2nd person</td>
<td>Person Number</td>
<td>Second Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>2nd person plural</td>
<td>Person Number</td>
<td>no match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>2nd person singular</td>
<td>Person Number</td>
<td>no match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3rd person</td>
<td>Person Number</td>
<td>Third Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>3rd person plural</td>
<td>Person Number</td>
<td>no match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>3rd person singular</td>
<td>Person Number</td>
<td>no match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABB</td>
<td>abbreviation</td>
<td></td>
<td>no match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADD</td>
<td>additive (also)</td>
<td>Aspect</td>
<td>no match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADJ&gt;ADV</td>
<td>deadjectival adverb</td>
<td>Derivation</td>
<td>no match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADJ&gt;N</td>
<td>noun derived from an adjective</td>
<td>Derivation</td>
<td>no match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADJ&gt;V</td>
<td>deadjectival verb</td>
<td>Derivation</td>
<td>no match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGR</td>
<td>agreement</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>no match</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

51 Available at typecraft.org/tc2wiki/Special:TypeCraft/GlossTags/ and accessed on 28.10.2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Match</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APPL</td>
<td>applicative</td>
<td>Diathesis</td>
<td>Applicative Voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPROX</td>
<td>approximate</td>
<td>Deixis</td>
<td>no match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUG</td>
<td>augmentative</td>
<td>Derivation</td>
<td>no match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUS</td>
<td>causative</td>
<td>Diathesis</td>
<td>Causative Voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>noun class marker</td>
<td>Noun Class</td>
<td>no match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL1</td>
<td>noun class 1</td>
<td>Noun Class</td>
<td>no match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL10</td>
<td>noun class 10</td>
<td>Noun Class</td>
<td>no match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL11</td>
<td>noun class 11</td>
<td>Noun Class</td>
<td>no match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL12</td>
<td>noun class 12</td>
<td>Noun Class</td>
<td>no match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL13</td>
<td>noun class 13</td>
<td>Noun Class</td>
<td>no match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL14</td>
<td>noun class 14</td>
<td>Noun Class</td>
<td>no match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL15</td>
<td>noun class 15</td>
<td>Noun Class</td>
<td>no match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL16</td>
<td>noun class 16</td>
<td>Noun Class</td>
<td>no match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL17</td>
<td>noun class 17</td>
<td>Noun Class</td>
<td>no match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL18</td>
<td>noun class 18</td>
<td>Noun Class</td>
<td>no match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL2</td>
<td>noun class 2</td>
<td>Noun Class</td>
<td>no match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL20</td>
<td>noun class 20</td>
<td>Noun Class</td>
<td>no match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL21</td>
<td>noun class 21</td>
<td>Noun Class</td>
<td>no match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL22</td>
<td>noun class 22</td>
<td>Noun Class</td>
<td>no match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL23</td>
<td>noun class 23</td>
<td>Noun Class</td>
<td>no match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL3</td>
<td>noun class 3</td>
<td>Noun Class</td>
<td>no match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL4</td>
<td>noun class 4</td>
<td>Noun Class</td>
<td>no match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL5</td>
<td>noun class 5</td>
<td>Noun Class</td>
<td>no match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL6</td>
<td>noun class 6</td>
<td>Noun Class</td>
<td>no match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL7</td>
<td>noun class 7</td>
<td>Noun Class</td>
<td>no match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL8</td>
<td>noun class 8</td>
<td>Noun Class</td>
<td>no match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL9</td>
<td>noun class 9</td>
<td>Noun Class</td>
<td>no match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COND</td>
<td>conditional 'if' or 'would'</td>
<td>Mood</td>
<td>Conditional Modality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONJ</td>
<td>conjunctive=subjunctive</td>
<td>Mood</td>
<td>Subjunctive Mood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP</td>
<td>copular</td>
<td></td>
<td>Copula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEG</td>
<td>degree</td>
<td></td>
<td>no match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIM</td>
<td>diminutive</td>
<td>Derivation</td>
<td>no match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIST</td>
<td>distal 'remote'</td>
<td>Deixis</td>
<td>no match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIST2</td>
<td>far distal</td>
<td>Deixis</td>
<td>no match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPH</td>
<td>emphatic</td>
<td></td>
<td>no match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREQ</td>
<td>frequentive</td>
<td>Aspect</td>
<td>Frequentive Aspect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>future</td>
<td>Tense</td>
<td>Future Tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUTnear</td>
<td>near future</td>
<td>Tense</td>
<td>Near Future Tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUTrm</td>
<td>remote future</td>
<td>Tense</td>
<td>Remote Future Tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FV</td>
<td>verb-final vowel (Bantu)</td>
<td>Bantu</td>
<td>no match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>genitive</td>
<td>Case</td>
<td>Genitive Case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>imperative</td>
<td>Force</td>
<td>Imperative Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IND</td>
<td>indicative</td>
<td>Force</td>
<td>no match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF</td>
<td>infinitive</td>
<td>Verb Form</td>
<td>no match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTR</td>
<td>interrogative</td>
<td>Force</td>
<td>Interrogative Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>initial vowel (Bantu)</td>
<td>Bantu</td>
<td>no match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>locative</td>
<td>Space</td>
<td>Locative Case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N&gt;A</td>
<td>noun-to-adjective</td>
<td>Derivation</td>
<td>no match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N&gt;ADJ</td>
<td>derives an adjective from a noun</td>
<td>Derivation</td>
<td>no match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N&gt;V</td>
<td>derives a verb from a noun</td>
<td>Derivation</td>
<td>Verbalizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>negation</td>
<td></td>
<td>no match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMLZ</td>
<td>nominalizer</td>
<td>Derivation</td>
<td>Nominalizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBJ</td>
<td>object</td>
<td>Grammatical Function</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Grammatical Function</td>
<td>Match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBJ2</td>
<td>second object</td>
<td>no match</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OM</td>
<td>object marker</td>
<td>no match</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART</td>
<td>part-of</td>
<td>no match</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASS</td>
<td>passive</td>
<td>Diathesis</td>
<td>Passive Voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAST</td>
<td>past perceived as a whole</td>
<td>Tense</td>
<td>Past Tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASThst</td>
<td>hesternal past: yesterday or earlier but not remote</td>
<td>Tense</td>
<td>no match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASTim</td>
<td>very recent, in the last minute or so</td>
<td>Tense</td>
<td>no match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASTrm</td>
<td>remote past</td>
<td>Tense</td>
<td>no match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFV</td>
<td>perfective</td>
<td>Aspect</td>
<td>Perfective Aspect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>plural</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Plural Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSS</td>
<td>possessive</td>
<td>Case</td>
<td>Possessed Case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROX</td>
<td>proximal</td>
<td>Deixis</td>
<td>no match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>question</td>
<td>Force</td>
<td>no match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECP</td>
<td>reciprocal</td>
<td>Reciprocal Middle Voice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REDP</td>
<td>reduplication</td>
<td>no match</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFL</td>
<td>reflexive</td>
<td>no match</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>Grammatical Function</td>
<td>Note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>relative</td>
<td></td>
<td>no match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBJ</td>
<td>subject</td>
<td></td>
<td>subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBJV</td>
<td>subjunctive</td>
<td>Mood</td>
<td>Subjunctive Mood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>singular</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Singular Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td>subject marker</td>
<td>Grammatical Function</td>
<td>no match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAT</td>
<td>stative</td>
<td>Aspect</td>
<td>Non Progressive Aspect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTL</td>
<td>title (Mr., Dr.)</td>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>no match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V&gt;ADJ</td>
<td>deverbal adjective</td>
<td>Derivation</td>
<td>no match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V&gt;ADV</td>
<td>verb-to-adverb</td>
<td>Derivation</td>
<td>no match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V&gt;N</td>
<td>deverbal noun</td>
<td>Derivation</td>
<td>no match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vbl</td>
<td>verbal</td>
<td>Derivation</td>
<td>Verbalizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vstem</td>
<td>verbal stem</td>
<td>Verb Form</td>
<td>no match</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2: ANNOTATED TEXT EXCERPTS

1. Bakumanyiira, bwonna tebulina bwe buli kyokka ne kakumanyiira.52 “They despise you, all of them are not in good conditions but s/he despises you.”

2. Kale n’okitunuulira, ye mukadde, ye mubi.53 “So you look at him/her, s/he is old and at the same time ugly.”

---


3. Kati is this news? Omunyankole okubba munyankole munne? Gonna gabbi.54 “Now is this news? A Munyankole to still from a fellow Munyankole? They are all thieves.”

Kati is this news? Omunyankole
kati is this news? o mu nyankole
now IV CL1.AGR member-of-a-certain-tribe
ADVtemp CN
okubba munyankole
o ku bb a mu nyankole
IV INF steal.Vstem FV CL1.AGR member-of-a-certain-tribe
V CN
munne? Gonna gabbi
mu nne? go nna ga bbi
CL1.AGR REL.3SG AUG.CL22.AGR all AUG.CL22.AGR thief
PROposs QUANT CN

4. Olaba ne kitabani kya gundi kyansomera luli.55 “You see even the other guy’s son talked bad about me the other time.”

Olaba ne kitabani kya gundi
o lab a ne ki tabani ky a gundi
2SG see.Vstem FV even AUG.CL7.AGR son CL7.AGR GEN someone
V PRT CN PREP PN
kyansomera luli
ky a n som er a lu li
CL7.AGR PAST 1SG read.Vstem APPL FV CL11.AGR last-time
V ADVtemp


5. **Ako ka Lucia kawala ka kinyoozi**.56 “That is Lucia barber’s daughter.”

Ako ka Lucia kawala
ako ka lucia ka wala
that.CL12.AGR.DIST DIM.CL12.AGR Ruth DIM.CL12.AGR girl
DEM PRT Np CN
ka kinyoozi
for.GEN.CL12.AGR barber
PRT CN

6. **Ggyawo akagulu, gasiya**.57 “Remove the leg, silly.”

Ggyawo akagulu
gy a wo a ka gulu
remove.IMP.Vstem FV LOC.REL.CL16 IV DIM.CL12.AGR leg
V CN
gasiya
silly/foolish
ADJ

7. **Twakoowa ebisiru ebirina obwongo obwakwata ice**.58 “We got fed up of fools who have the brain that formed ice.”

Twakoowa ebisiru ebirina obwongo obwakwata ice
tw a koow a e bi siru
1PL PAST get-tired.Vstem FV IV AUG.CL8.AGR fool
V CN
ebirina obwongo
e bi rina o bw ongo
IV CL8.AGR have.Vstem IV CL14.AGR brain
V CN

---


8. **Abazungu beggunze agakonde lwa zzaabu.**[^59] **“Europeans exchanged blows because of gold.”**

Abazungu beggunze
a ba zungu e ggung e
IV CL2.AGR european CL2.AGR REFL beat.Vstem IND
CN V
agakonde lwa zzaabu
a ga konde lwa zzaabu
IV AUG.CL22.AGR fist for gold
CN PREP CN

9. **Ssajjabbi.**[^60] **“Ugly man.”**

Ssajjabbi
s sajja bi
AUG.CL5.AGR man CL5.AGR ugly/bad
CN

10. **N’ekirobooz kyange kino.**[^61] **“With this voice of mine.”**

N’ekirobooz kyange kino
n’ e ki robooz ky a nge ki no
with IV AUG.CL7.AGR voice/sound CL7.AGR GEN me CL7.SG PROX
CN PRTposs DEM


11. **Ago agazungu gantu gabì nnyo nnyo nnyo.**

“Those Europeans are very bad people.”

12. **Kano akalenzi nako kasiru nnyo.**

“This boy is also very stupid.”

13. **BanaUganda muli gabbi nnyo.**

“Ugandans you are extreme thieves.”

---

14. **Gattako akawala ne nnyina waako ne ssenga.** “Plus the girl, her mother and the maternal aunt.”

```
Gattako akawala ne
gett a ko a ka wala ne
add.Vstem FV LOC.REL.CL17 IV DIM.CL12.AGR girl and.CONJ
V CN CN

nnyina waako ne ssenga
nnyina waa ko ne ssenga
mother for.GEN REL.SBJ and.CONJ maternal-aunt
CN PREP CONJC CN
```

15. **Eggambo eddene eryo.** “That big word.”

```
Eggambo eddene eryo
eggambo eddene eryo
IV AUG.CL5.AGR word IV CL5.AGR big IV CL5.AGR DIST
CN ADJ DEM
```

16. **Kale ngeze ntya okukuggya ku ssodde ggwe?** “So how can I differentiate you from a chimpanzee?”

```
Kale ngeze ntya
kale n gez e n tya
so 1SG try.Vstem IND 1SG how.Q
PRT V ADVm
```

---


17. **Djenda okkakuba**.68 “I am going to beat her/him.”

Djenda okkakuba
ŋ ŋend a o k ka kub a
1SG go.Vstem FV IV INF DIM.CL12.AGR beat.Vstem FV
V V

18. **This ka-girl is very gullible**.69 “This girl is very gullible”

This ka-girl is very gullible
this ka girl is very gullible
DIM.CL12.AGR
CN

19. **Kaggaayi Kano okwogera nga akataabugumizibwako kyewuunyisa**.70 “It is surprising for this guy to speak like an illiterate.”

Kaggaayi kano
ka ggaayi ka no
DIM.CL12.AGR guy DIM.CL12.AGR PROX
CN DEM

---


okwogera nga
o kw oger a nga
IV INF speak/talk.Vstem FV like.CONJ
V CONJS

akataabugumizibwako
a ka ta a bugum iz ibw a ko
IV DIM.CL12.AGR NEG PAST get-warm.Vstem CAUS PASS FV LOC
V

kyewuunyisa
ky ewuuny is a
CL7.AGR to-wonder.Vstem CAUS FV
V

20. **Mwana oli big naye beera sitede kaguy tekakuswaza.**
   “You are big comrade but be steady the guy shouldn’t ashamed you.”

Mwana oli big naye beera sitede kaguy
mw ana oli big naye beera sitede ka guy
CL1.AGR child 2SG be but be steady DIM.CL12.AGR
CN COP CONJ COP ADJ CN

tekakuswaza
te ka ku swaz a
NEG DIM.CL12.AGR REL.2SG ashamed.Vstem FV
V

21. **Wabula Walukagga weebale kuvuma kikazi ekyo.**
   “But Walukagga thank you for insulting that woman.”

Wabula Walukagga weebale kuvuma
wabula walukagga we ebale ku vuma a
but you thank.Vstem INF insult.Vstem FV
PRT Np V V

---


22. **Ninayo li-sugar-mummy.**

Ninayo lisugar mummy
1SG have.Vstem LOC.REL.CL23 AUG.CL5.AGR
V CN

23. **Kyokka bwe byatandise akasajja ne kamufuukira ekyambika ne kamukuba n’atya.**

Kyokka bwe byatandise
kyokka bwe by a tandis e
PRT PRT V
akasajja ne
a ka sajja ne
IV DIM.CL12.AGR man and.CONJ
CN CONJC
kamufuukira ekyambika
ka mu fuuk ir a e kyambika
DIM.CL12.AGR REL.3SG turn.Vstem APPL FV IV problem/threat
V CN
ne kamukuba
ne ka mu kub a
and.CONJ DIM.CL12.AGR REL.3SG beat.Vstem FV
CONJC V

---


24. GuGgolola gwagejjera bwereere tegulina maanyi, akasajja akatono kakukuba katya? “Ggolola fattened for nothing he doesn’t have power, how can a tiny man beat you?”

25. Tekirina magezi. “S/he doesn't have knowledge.”
26. Badda ku buwala okubukuluusanya ne mubasirikira.\textsuperscript{77} “They harass girls (sexually) and you hide them.”

Badda ku buwala
ba dd a ku bu wala
3PL return.Vstem FV on.LOC DIM.CL14.AGR girl
V PREP CN

okubukuluusanya ne
o ku bu kuluusany a ne
IV INF CL14.AGR mistreat.Vstem FV and.CONJ
V CONJC

mubasirikira
mu ba sirik ir a
2PL 3PL keep-silent.Vstem APPL FV
V

27. Ani abazaala mmwe embwa ze beebakako ne babakasukira obusente obutawera na ddoola emu?\textsuperscript{78} “Who gives birth to you dogs which they sleep on and they throw to you money which doesn’t even sum up to one dollar?”

Ani abazaala mmwe
a ni a ba zaal a mmwe
3SG who.Q 3SG 3PL give-birth.Vstem FV you
PROint V PN

embwa ze beebakako ne
e m bwa ze be ebak a ko ne
IV CL9.AGR dog.ANIM REL.OBJ 3PL sleep.Vstem FV LOC and.CONJ
CN PRT V CONJC

babakasukira obusente
ba ba kasuk ir a o bu sente
3PL 2PL throw.Vstem APPL FV IV DIM.CL14.AGR money
V CN


28. **Obwedda tteke n’obukonde bw’akasuka nga tebusobola kulumya mulabe**. “The kicks and punches he was throwing all along couldn’t make the opponent feel pain.”

29. **Agakonde g’omuzungu gatutte Golola ku kitanda**. “The punches taken from the European have made Golola to be admitted to the hospital.”

---


30. Munsonyiwe akasajja kannemye okugaaya.  

Munsonyiwe  akasajja  
mu n  sonyiw  e  a  ka  saija  
2PL  1SG  forgive.Vstem  IND  IV  DIM.CL12.AGR  man  
V  CN  

kannemye  okugaaya  
ka  n  nemy  e  o  ku  gaay  a  
DIM.CL12.AGR  1SG  fail.Vstem  IND  IV  INF  crush/chew.Vstem  FV  
V  

31. Embeera eno esannyalazza emirimu mu kabuga ak’e Kibibi. 

Embeera  eno  esannyalazza  
e  m  beera  e  no  e  sannyalaz  z  a  
IV  CL9.AGR  situation  IV.CL9.AGR  this  IV  tie-up.Vstem  CMPL  FV  
CN  DEM  V  

emirimu  mu  kabuga  
e  mi  rimu  mu  ka  buga  
IV  CL4.AGR  job/work  in  DIM.CL12.AGR  town/city  
CN  PREP  CN  

ak’e  Kibibi  
a  k’e  kibibi  
IV  for.CL12.AGR  at.LOC.REL.CL23  name-of-a-place  
PREP  Np  

---


32. *Kyokka ng’abalala okuli n’agavubuka g’okukyalo gasaakaanya nti "babatwale."*\(^{83}\) “But others including even village youths were shouting that "take them."”

Kyokka ng’abalala okuli
kyokka ng’ a ba lala o ku li
*but as.CONJ IV CL2.AGR other IV INF be*
PRT CN COP

n’agavubuka
n’ a ga vubuka
even.CONJ IV AUG.AGR youth
CN

g’okukyalo gasaakaanya
g’o ku kyang ga saakaany a
*for.CL22.AGR at.LOC.REL.CL17 village CL22.AGR shout.Vstem FV*
CN V

nti babatwale
nti ba ba twal e
*that.STAT 3PL 3PL take.Vstem IND*
PRT V

33. *Tekalabika ng’akato, oba katuuse?*\(^{84}\) “S/he doesn’t look to be young, could it be that s/he is ready?”

Tekalabika ng’akato
Te ka labik a ng’ a ka to
NEG DIM.CL12.AGR appear.Vstem FV like IV DIM.CL12.AGR young
V CN

oba katuuse?
oba ka tuuse?
*perhaps DIM.CL12.AGR reach.Vstem IND*
ADV V

---


34. ©Poliisi erinnye eggere mu mbaga. “Poliisi has blocked a wedding.”

35. ©Abaana bajjakukaddiwa n’agayisa agabi kuba Nsubuga tagenda kuyitamu. “The children will grow old with bad behaviours because Nsubuga isn’t going to excel.”

---


36. **KaNsambu tekasobola kuyitamu.**\(^{87}\) “Nsambu can’t excel.”

Ka

Nsambu tekasobola

ka

nsambu te ka sobol a

DIM.CL12.AGR

NEG

DIM.CL12.AGR can

FV

PRT

Np

AUX

kuyitamu

ku yita mu

INF pass in.LOC.REL.CL18

V

37. **Ako akayumba ka mulembe nnyo.**\(^{88}\) “That house is very modern.”

Ako

akayumba

ka

ako

a ka yumba ka

that.CL12.AGR.DIST

IV

DIM.CL12.AGR house

for.GEN.CL12.AGR

DEM

CN

PREP

mulembe

nnyo

mu lembe nnyo

CL3.AGR generation

very.DEG

CN

PRT

38. **Tunuulira akazimbe kaganyegenya ke bayita poliisi y’eggwanga eddamba!**\(^{89}\) “Look at the unfavourable house that they call the police for the whole country!”

Tunuulira

akazimbe

tunuul ir a a ka zimb e

look/see.Vstem

APPL

FV

IV

DIM.CL12.AGR build

NMLZ

V

CN

---


39. Ekyo kiswaliza ddala okulaba nga gavumenti tesobola nakusasula busente butono bwe butyo.90 “That is shameful indeed to see that the government can’t even pay little money like that.”

Ekoyo kiswaliza ddala
e ky o ki swal iz a ddala
dem
dIM CL7.AGR DIST CL7.AGR shame. Vstem CAUS FV really.EMPH

okulaba nga gavumenti tesobola
o ku lab a nga gavumenti te sobol a
IV INF see. Vstem FV that. CONJ government NEG can. Vstem FV

nakusasula busente butono
na ku sasul a bu sente bu tono
even INF pay. Vstem FV DIM.CL14.AGR money CL14.AGR little/small

bwe butyo
bwe bu tyo
like. REL. OBJ CL14.AGR DIST

---

40. **Afunye omuwala alina ekisajja ekizungu kye baagala okufera.**

&S/She has got a girl who has a white man whom they want to con.

Afunye omuwala alina
afun ye o mu wala a lina
3SG get.Vstem PFV IV CL1.AGR girl 3SG has.Vstem
V CN V

ekisajja ekizungu kye
e ki sajja e ki zungu kye
IV AUG.CL7.AGR man IV AUG.CL7.AGR european which.REL.OBJ
CN ADJ PRT

baagala okufera
ba agal a o ku fer a
3PL want/love.Vstem FV IV INF con/swindle.Vstem FV
V V

41. **Agasajja gaakulaakulana galina n'emirembe mu nsi yaago okusinga ffe.**

&The guys/men developed, they even have peace in their country than us.

Agasajja gaakulaakulana
a ga sajja ga a kulaakulan a
IV AUG.CL22.AGR man CL22.AGR PAST develop.Vstem FV
CN V

galina nemirembe mu
gal ina n e mi rembe mu
cL22.AGR have.Vstem even IV CL4.AGR peace in.CL18.AGR
V CN PREP

nsi yaago
n si yaa go
CL9.AGR contry/world for.GEN.CL9.AGR them.CL22.AGR
CN PRTposs

---


42. Ggwe Cissy olowoosa bwe wava mu Uganda olwo abaasigalayo ffenna ne tufuuka gabbi? “You Cissy you think when you left Uganda then all of us who remained there turned into thieves?”

Ggwe Cissy olowoosa bwe
ggwe cissy o lowooz a bwe
you.2SG name-of-a-person 2SG think.Vstem FV when.PART.CONJ
PN Np V CONJS

wava mu Uganda olwo
w a v a mu uganda olwo
2SG PAST leave.Vstem FV in.CL18.AGR name-of-a-country CONJ
V PREP Np CONJS

abaasigalayo ffenna ne
a ba a sigal a yo ffe nna ne
IV REL.CL2 PAST remain.Vstem FV LOC.REL.OBJ we all and.CONJ
V DET CONJC

tufuuka gabbi?
tu fuuk a ga bb i?
1PL turn.Vstem FV AUG.CL22.AGR steal NMLZ
V CN

---

43. **Buli kasente ke baweereza okubaako kye mubakolera kafuuka k’abo be baaleka emabega.**94 “Every money that they send for you to do something for them is taken by those whom they left back.”

Buli kasente ke baweereza
buli ka sente ke ba weereza a
every/each DIM.CL12.AGR money which.REL.SBJ 3PL send.Vstem FV
DET CN PRT V

okubaako kye mubakolera
o ku baa ko kye mu ba kol er a
INF be LOC which.REL.CL7 2PL 3PL do.Vstem APPL FV
COP PRT V

kafuuka k’abo
ka fuuk a k’abo
DIM.CL12.AGR turn.Vstem FV for.REL.CL12 those.DIST.REL.CL2
V PRTposs

be baaleka emabega
be ba a lek a e mabega
REL.3PL 3PL PAST leave.Vstem IV behind
PRT V ADVplc

44. **Kati ekigusinisa agannya nga kimaze okukola ebiswaza ensi okinoonya nga tokiraba.**95 “Now you search for what is making him/her laugh after doing things that are shameful to the country and you fail to see it.”

Kati ekigusinisa
kati e ki gu sin is a
now IV REL.CL7 AUG.REL.CL20 laugh.Vstem CAUS FV
ADVtemp V

agannya nga kimaze
a ga nnyo nga ki maz e
IV AUG.CL22.AGR tooth when.CONJ AUG.REL.CL7 finish.Vstem PFV
CN CONJS V


45. Eribbi ery’enkukunala liguze n’emmotoka mu ssente za munne. “A typical thief has even bought a vehicle out of his/her friend’s money.”

46. Ekidiini ekigaana abantu okulya ennyama, emmere enfumbe wamu n’okuweerera abaana kigguse mu Uganda. “A religion which prohibits people from eating meat, cooked food and educating children has come to Uganda.”

---

Ekidiini ekigaana
IV AUG.CL7.AGR religion IV CL7.AGR refuse.Vstem FV CN V

abantu okulya ennyama
a ba ntu o ku li a e n nyama
IV CL2.AGR person IV INF eat.Vstem FV IV CL9.AGR meat CN V CN

emmere enfumbe wamu
e m mere e n fumb e wamu
IV CL9.AGR food IV CL9.AGR cook V>ADJ together CN ADJ PRT

n’okuweerera
n’o ku weerer a
and.CONJ IV INF paying--fees-for-someone.Vstem FV V

abaana kigguse mu
a ba ana ki ggus e mu
IV CL2.AGR child CL7.AGR reach/come.Vstem PFV in.CL18.AGR CN V PREP

Uganda
name-of-a-country
Np

47. *Guno omulambo guzuukidde! Bikka ku kimwa!*⁹⁸ “This dead corpse has resurrected!
Shut up the mouth!”

Guno omulambo guzuukidde!
guno o mu lambo gu zuuki dde!
this.PROX.CL3.AGR IV CL3.AGR corpse REL.SBJ resurrect.Vstem PFV DEM CN V

---


Bikka ku kimwa!

bikk a ku ki mwa!
close/shut-up FV on.LOC.REL.CL17 AUG.CL7.AGR mouth/lip
V PREP CN

48. Waliwo akalenzi kano akasojja uncle. 99 “There’s this boy who offends uncle.”

Waliwo akalenzi
wa li wo a ka lenzi
LOC.REL.CL16 be.Vstem LOC.REL.CL16 IV DIM.CL12.AGR boy
COP CN
kano akasojja uncle
ka no a ka sojj a uncle
DIM.CL12.AGR PROX IV DIM.CL12.AGR offend.Vstem FV
DEM V CN

49. Kalina ogumwa. 100 “S/he has a mouth.”

Kalina ogumwa
ka lina o gu mwa
DIM.CL12.AGR has.Vstem IV AUG.CL20.AGR mouth/lip
V CN

50. Tosembeza gazibu waka. 101 “Don’t invite problems at home.”

Tosembeza gazibu waka
t o sembez a ga zibu waka
NEG 2SG bring-close.Vstem.IMP FV AUG.CL22.AGR problem home
V CN CN


51. Ettemu lino lyabaddewo mu ttumbi abatuuze mu Ggangu “A” okumpi n’akabuga k’e Kibiri ku lw’e Busaabala babiri: Henry Kamoga (24) ne Badru Kakande (17) bwe baabayingiridde.\textsuperscript{102} “This massacre happened at night when two residents of Ggangu “A” near Kibiri town on Busaabala road: Henry Kamoga (24) and Badru Kakande (17) were attacked.”

---

52. Omugenzi Henry Kamoga abadde alina akaduuka akakabyeko.103 “Henry Kamoga, the deceased, has been having a shop full of items.”

Omugenzi Henry Kamoga
o mu genzi kamoga
IV CL1.AGR deceased name-of-a-person name-of-a-person
CN Np Np
abadde alina akaduuka
a b a dde a lina a ka duuka
3SG be.Vstem FV PFV 3SG has.Vstem IV DIM.CL12.AGR shop
COP V CN

akakubyeko
a ka kub ye ko
IV DIM.CL12.AGR beat.Vstem PFV REL.CL17 V

53. N’akaviiri ke yagenda nako ku mutwe. 104 “She even went with her hair on the head.”

N’akaviiri ke yagenda
n’ a ka viiri ke y a gend a
even IV DIM.CL12.AGR hair GEN.REL.CL12 3SG PAST go.Vstem FV
CN PRT V
nako ku mutwe
na ko ku mu twe
with REL.SBJ.CL12 on.LOC.REL.CL17 CL3.AGR head
PRT PREP CN

54. Ekisajja ekyo nali simanyi nti kirina omutima omubi bwe gutyo. 105 “I never knew that that man has a bad heart like that.”

Ekisajja ekyo nali
e ki sajja e ky o n a li
IV AUG.CL7.AGR man IV CL7.AGR DIST ISG PAST be.Vstem
CN DEM COP
simanyi nti kirina
si many i nti ki rina
NEG know.Vstem IND that.STAT CL7.AGR have.Vstem
V PRT V
omutima omubi bwe gutyo
o mu tima o mu bi bwe gu tyo
IV CL3.AGR heart IV CL3.AGR bad like.PART.CONJ REL.CL3 DIST CN ADJ PRT DEM


55. Kino ekisajja kitemu nnyo era nakyo kyetaaga kutemula. “This man is a typical murderer and he deserves to be murdered too.”

56. Bba yakwatiddwa oluvannyuma lwa poliisi okumukukunula mu kalwaliro gye yali yeekwese. “The husband was arrested after the police got him from the hospital where he was hiding.”


57. Azze akolera Bebe Cool obubaga. \textsuperscript{108} “She has been organizing parties for Bebe Cool.”

Azze akolera Bebe
a z ze a kol er a
3SG come.Vstem PFV 3SG do.Vstem.REP APPL FV name-of-a-person
V V Np

Cool obubaga
o bu baga
name-of-a-person IV DIM.CL14.AGR party/wedding
Np CN

58. Yakolera ne Bebe Cool akabaga k’amazaalibwa ge akaali ku Cayenne n’asasula buli kyakulya n’okunywa. \textsuperscript{109} “She even organized a birthday party for Bebe Cool which was at Cayenne and she paid for each and every eat and drink.”

Yakolera ne Bebe
y a kol er a ne
3SG PAST do.Vstem APPL FV even.CONJ name-of-a-person
V CONJC Np

Cool akabaga
a ka baga
name-of-a-person IV DIM.CL12.AGR wedding/party
Np CN

k’amazaalibwa ge
k’ a ma zaal ibw a ge
for.GEN.CL12.AGR IV CL6.AGR give-birth PASS FV GEN.REL.CL6 CN PRT


akaali       ku Cayenne
a ka   a li ku
IV DIM.CL12.AGR PAST be.Vstem at name-of-a-place
COP      PREP Np
n’asasula   buli kyakulya
n’   a asul a buli ky a ku ly a
and.CONJ 3SG pay.Vstem FV every.DEF CL7.AGR GEN INF eat FV
V          DET   CN
n’okunywa
n’   o ku nyw a
and.CONJ IV INF drink FV
CN

59. **Nasanga omusajja ng’alina akabbo k’emiyembe ke yali atwala okutunda**
**ng’asubiramu omutvalo gwe sirowooza nti yagufuna.**110 “I found a man having a
basket of mangoes, expecting ten thousand from it which I don’t think he got.”

Nasanga       omusajja
n a sang a o mu sajja
1SG PAST meet.Vstem FV IV CL1.AGR man
V          CN
ng’alina       akabbo
ng’   a lina a ka bbo
when.CONJ 3SG have.Vstem IV DIM.CL12.AGR basket
V          CN
k’emiyembe     ke yali
k’   e mi yembe ke y a li
for.CL12.AGR IV CL4.AGR mango REL.OBJ 3SG PAST be.Vstem
CN          PRT   COP
atwala       okutunda
a twal a o ku tund a
3SG take.Vstem FV IV INF sell.Vstem FV
V          V

---

110It’s from online news: Kateregga, Ahmed & Ssebalamu Kigongo (2012). Ababaka ba palamenti balaze
ng’asubiramu
ng’ a suubir a mu
*when* CONJ 3SG *expect/hope* Vstem FV *in* LOC REL CL18 V

omutwalo gwe sirowooza nti
*omutwalo* OCL3.AGR *ten-thousand* REL *NEG* think Vstem FV that STAT CN CONJS V PRT

yagufuna
y a gu fun a
*3SG PAST REL* get Vstem FV V

60. **Bakole buli kalimu omuva ensimbi.**

*They should do every job that yields money.*

Bakole buli kalimu
bakole buli ka limu
3PL do Vstem IMP every DEF DIM CL12 AGR job V DET CN

omuva ensimbi
*omuva* OCL9.AGR *money* CN

---

61. **Maura ne nnyina Kankunda babadde bapangisa mu kabuga k’e Nambaale e Mityana.**

Maura ne nnyina Kankunda babadde bapangisa mu kabuga k’e Nambaale e Mityana.

62. **Agavubuka gabadde ganywerawo enjaga.**

Agavubuka gabadde ganywerawo enjaga.

---


Obulwaliro obuzindiddwa kuliko Jurem Medical & Laboratory Services. “The invaded clinics include Jurem Medical & Laboratory Services.”

Obulwaliro
o bu lwal ir o
IV DIM.CL14.AGR sicken APPL NMLZ CN

obuzindiddwa
o bu zind iddw a
IV CL14.AGR invade.Vstem PASS FV V

kuliko Jurem Medical &
kuliko be.Vstem LOC.REL.CL17 and.ABB
COP Np CN CONJ

Laboratory Services CN CN

Mu kabuga k’e Matanga baakutte akulira SAAB Medical Clinic. “In Matanga town, they arrested the head of SAAB Medical Clinic.”

Mu kabuga
mu ka buga
in.LOC.REL.CL18 DIM.CL12.AGR town/city PREP CN

k’e Matanga
k’ e matanga
GEN.CL12.AGR LOC.REL.CL23 name-of-a-place PRT Np

---


66. **Bakoza akalyango akatono okutuuka ewa Kazinda.**

“*They use the small entrance to reach Kazinda’s place.*”

Bakoza akalyango
ba koz es a a ka lyango
3PL do.Vstem CAUS FV IV DIM.CL12.AGR entrance
V CN

akatono okutuuka ewa
a ka tono o ku tuuk a e wa
IV DIM.CL12.AGR small IV INF reach.Vstem FV CL23.LOC GEN
ADJ V PRT

Kazinda
name-of-a-person
Np

67. **Ye ggwe ki ekyakwagaza akasajja bwe katyo akatunula ng’embwa?**

“But what made you to love a man like that who looks like a dog?”

Ye ggwe ki ekyakwagaza
ye ggwe ki e ky a kwagaz a
but.CONJ you what.Q IV REL.CL7 PAST love/like.Vstem FV
PRT PN PRTint V

akasajja bwe katyo
a ka sajja bwe ka tyo
IV DIM.CL12.AGR man like.CONJ DIM.CL12.AGR DIST
CN PRT DEM

---


68. Eby’okubba abyegaanye n’ategeezza nti akabizzi Kayondo ye yakamuguza. “He has denied stealing and asserted that the pig was sold to him by Kayondo.”

Eby’okubba abyegaanye
e by’ o ku bb a a by e gaan ye
IV REL.CL8 IV INF steal FV 3SG REL.CL8 REFL refuse. Vstem PFV
CN V
n’ategeezza nti akabizzi
n’ a tegeez a nti a ka bizzi
and.CONJ 3SG inform. Vstem FV that.STAT IV DIM.CL12.AGR pig
V PRT CN
Kayondo ye yakamuguza
kayondo ye y a ka mu guz a
REL.SBJ 3SG PAST DIM.CL12.AGR REL.3SG buy. Vstem FV
Np PRT V

69. Abavubuka b’akabinja akabadde kateega abatambuze ku nguudo ne kabanyaga bakwatiddwa. “The youths of the group that has been blocking pedestrians on the way and rob them have been arrested.”

Abavubuka b’akabinja
a ba vubuka b’ a ka binja
IV CL2.AGR youth for.GEN.REL.CL2 IV DIM.CL12.AGR group
CN CN
akabadde kateega
a ka ba dde ka teeg a
IV DIM.CL12.AGR be. Vstem PFV DIM.CL12.AGR block. Vstem FV
COP V

---


Police invaded Ssennyonjo’s rental (room) and found inside 4 phones. 

70. Police invaded Ssennyonjo’s rental (room) and found inside 4 phones.

71. Nnyabo, are you hearing all the good things I have done for this kagirl?

“Madam, are you hearing all the good things I have done for this girl?”

Nnyabo are you hearing all the good things I have done for this
nnyabo madam CN

kagirl?
ka girl?
DIM.CL12.AGR CN

72. Naye kawala ggwe lwaki olimba?

“But you girl why are you lying?”

naye kawala Ggwe lwaki Olimba?
naye ka wala ggwe lwaki o limb a?
but DIM.CL12.AGR girl you.2SG why.2SG lie.Vstem FV
PRT CN PN ADV V

73. That kagirl chose to sleep outside.

“That girl chose to sleep outside.”

That kagirl chose to sleep outside
ka girl
DIM.CL12.AGR CN

---


74. Kyokka nga gukazi gunene!^{125} “Yet she is a fat woman!”

kyokka nga gukazi gunene
yet when CONJ AUG.CL20.AGR woman AUG.CL20.AGR big
PRT CONJS CN ADJ

75. Ogukazi gubonyaabonya ogwo.^{126} “That woman tortures.”

Ogukazi gubonyaabonya
o gu kazi gu bonyaabony a
IV AUG.CL20.AGR woman REL.SBJ torture.Vstem FV
CN V

ogwo
o gu o
IV CL20.AGR DIST
DEM

76. Ogukazi ogwo tegusiima.^{127} “That woman doesn’t appreciate.”

Ogukazi ogwo
o gu kazi o gu o
IV AUG.CL20.AGR woman IV CL20.AGR DIST
CN DEM
tegusiima
te gu siim a
NEG REL.SBJ appreciate.Vstem FV
V


77. Ogukazi ogwo ne guggyayo ogupale, oguwale nga guli bwe guti…

“Then that woman got out a knicker, the knicker was like this...”

Ogukazi ogwo ne
o gu kazi o gu o ne
IV AUG.CL20.AGR woman IV CL20.AGR DIST then
CN DEM PRT
guggyayo ogupale
gu ggy a yo o gu pale
REL.SBJ remove.Vstem FV LOC IV AUG.CL20.AGR trouser
V CN
guwale nga guli bwe
o gu wale nga gu li bwe
IV AUG.CL20.AGR trouser when.CONJ CL3 be.Vstem like.CONJ
CN CONJS COP PRT
guti
gu ti
REL.SBJ REL.PROX
DEM

78. Erikazi eryo lyekaza.

“That woman is pretending.”

Erikazi eryo lyekaza
e ri kazi e ry o ly ekaz a
IV AUG.CL5.AGR woman IV CL5.AGR DIST REL.SBJ pretend.Vstem FV
CN DEM V

---

www.youtube.com/watch?v=hD30pQO1eM&list=UUwga1dPCqBddbtq5KYRi5&index=81&feature=plpp_video.

www.youtube.com/watch?v=hD30pQO1eM&list=UUwga1dPCqBddbtq5KYRi5&index=81&feature=plpp_video.
79. **Olaba omwana amwozesa ogupale gwe guli ogw’omunda.** “You see she makes the child to wash the other inside knicker of hers.”

Olaba omwana
olab o omwana
2SG see.Vstem IV CL1.AGR child
V CN
amwozesa ogupale
amwoza ogupale
3SG REL.CL1 CAUS IV AUG.CL20.AGR trouser
V CN
gwe guli ogw’omunda
gwe e gu li o gw’o munda
REL.CL20 REL.3SG REL.CL20 REL.DIST2 IV REL.CL20 GEN inside
PRTposs DEM ADJ

80. **That woman made the young kagirl to wash her small kapale.** “That woman made the young girl to wash her small knicker.”

That woman made the young kagirl
ka girl
dim.CL12.AGR
CN CN
to wash her small kapale
ka pale
dim.CL12.AGR
CN

---


81. Olwo luwala lwa Joseph.\textsuperscript{132} “That is Joseph's daughter.”

\text{olwo} \hspace{1em} \text{luwala} \hspace{1em} \text{lwa}
\text{o lw o lu wala lw a}
\text{IV CL11.AGR DIST DIM.CL11.AGR girl REL.CL11 GEN}
\text{DEM CN PREP}

Joseph
\text{name-of-a-person}
\text{Np}

82. Omwana alina otumwa otutono ng'ate tulungi.\textsuperscript{133} “The child has small lips yet they are beautiful.”

\text{omwana} \hspace{1em} \text{alina} \hspace{1em} \text{otumwa}
\text{o mw ana a lina o tu mwa}
\text{IV CL1.AGR child 3SG has.Vstem IV DIM.CL13.AGR mouth/lip}
\text{CN V CN}
\text{otutono} \hspace{1em} \text{ng'ate} \hspace{1em} \text{tulungi}
\text{o tu tono ng'ate tu lungi}
\text{IV CL13.AGR small as.CONJ yet.CONJ CL13.AGR beautiful}
\text{ADJ CONJS ADJ}

83. Otwo tuwala twa Joseph.\textsuperscript{134} “Those are Joseph's daughters.”

\text{otwo} \hspace{1em} \text{tuwala} \hspace{1em} \text{twa}
\text{o tu o tu wala tw a}
\text{IV CL13.AGR DIST DIM.CL13.AGR girl CL13.AGR GEN}
\text{DEM CN PREP}

Joseph
\text{name-of-a-person}
\text{Np}

\textsuperscript{132} From page 6, dialogue 4, of the questionnaire.
\textsuperscript{133} Constructed by respondent 1 in response to part f, page 8 of the questionnaire.
\textsuperscript{134} From page 7, dialogue 6, of the questionnaire.
84. *Abaana ba Namusoke bonne balina otumwa tulinga otw'emmesee!*135 “Namusoke's children all have lips which are like ones for a rat.”

abaana  ba  Namusoke  bonne
a  ba  ana  ba  namusoke  bo  nna
IV  CL2.AGR  child  for.GEN.REL.CL2  name-of-a-person  3PL  all
CN  PREP  Np  QUANT

balina  otumwa
ba  lina  o  tu  mwa
REL.3PL  have.Vstem  IV  DIM.CL13.AGR  mouth/lip
V  CN

tulinga  otwemmesee!
tu  linga  o  tw'  e  m  mese!
REL.CL13  like.CMPR  IV  for.GEN.REL.CL13  IV  CL9.AGR  rat
PRT  CN

85. *Omwana wange alina otumwa.*136 “My child has lips.”

omwana  wange  alina
o  mw  ana  wa  nge  a  lina
IV  CL1.AGR  child  for.GEN.CL1.AGR  me  3SG  has.Vstem
CN  PRTposs  V

otumwa
o  tu  mwa
IV  DIM.CL13.AGR  mouth/lip
CN

86. *Otumwa twange tulungi.*137 “My lips are good.”

otumwa  twange  tulungi
o  tu  mwa  tw  a  nge  tu  lingu
IV  DIM.CL13.AGR  mouth/lip  REL.CL13  GEN  me  CL13.AGR  beautiful
CN  PRTposs  ADJ

---

135 Constructed by respondent 3 in response to part f, page 8 of the questionnaire.
136 Constructed by respondent 4 in response to part f, page 8 of the questionnaire.
137 Constructed by respondent 5 in response to part f, page 8 of the questionnaire.
87. **Otumwa twabwe tutono.** “Their lips are small.”

```plaintext
otumwa  twabwe  tutono
o  tu  mwa  tw  a  bwe  tu  tono
IV  DIM.CL13.AGR  mouth/lip  REL.CL13  GEN  REL.3PL  REL.CL13  small
CN     PRTposs     ADJ
```

88. **Otumwa tw’abaana ba Sanyu twakula bulungi nnyo.** “The lips for Sanyu's children are very nice.”

```plaintext
otumwa       tw’abaana
o  tu  mwa  tw’ a  ba  ana
IV  DIM.CL13.AGR  mouth/lip  for.GEN.REL.CL13  IV  CL2.AGR  child
CN     CN

ba        Sanyu        twakula
ba        sanyu        tw  a  kul  a
for.GEN.REL.CL2  name-of-a-person  REL.CL13  PAST  grow.Vstem  FV
PREP     Np            V

bulungi  nnyo
properly  very.DEG
ADVm   PRT
```

89. **Joan aliko otumwa otutono, oyinza okugamba twa baana bato, tulungi.** “Joan has small lips, you may say they are for young children, they are beautiful.”

```plaintext
Joan         aliko
            a  li  ko
name-of-a-person  3SG  be  LOC.REL.CL17
Np          COP

otumwa       otutono       oyinza
o  tu  mwa  o  tu  tono  o  yinz  a
IV  DIM.CL13.AGR  mouth/lip  IV  CL13.AGR  small  be-able.Vstem  FV
CN           ADJ          V
```

138 Constructed by respondent 7 in response to part f, page 8 of the questionnaire.

139 Constructed by respondent 8 in response to part f, page 8 of the questionnaire.

140 Constructed by respondent 9 in response to part f, page 8 of the questionnaire.
Susan has otumwa, whenever she smiles I don't want her to stop, it's like that one of a queen. “Susan has lips, whenever she smiles I don't want her to stop, it's like that one of a queen.”

Otumwatwe
"His/her lips are small."

141 Constructed by respondent 10 in response to part f, page 8 of the questionnaire.
142 Constructed by respondent 11 in response to part f, page 8 of the questionnaire.
92. 

**Kababy kaffe kalina otumwa otulungi.** 

“Our baby has nice lips.”

Kababy kababy ka Kalina
KAFFA for.GEN.REL CL12 us REL.SBJ CL12 has.Vstem
CN PRTPoss V

otumwa otulungi
MOUTH/LIP

o tu mwa o tu lungi

93. 

**Nakanwagi alina otumwa otutono.**

“Nakanwagi has small lips.”

Nakanwagi alina otumwa
Nakanwagi a lina o tu mwa
NAME-OF-A-PERSON 3SG has.Vstem IV DIM CL13.AGR MOUTH/LIP
Np V CN

otutono

o tu tono

94. 

**Bawala ba John baliko otumwa.**

“John's daughters have lips.”

Bawala ba John
BA WALA for.GEN.REL CL2 NAME-OF-A-PERSON
CN PREP Np

baliko otumwa

ba li ko o tu mwa

3PL BE LOC CL17 IV DIM CL13.AGR MOUTH/LIP
COP CN

---

143 Constructed by respondent 12 in response to part f, page 8 of the questionnaire.
144 Constructed by respondent 13 in response to part f, page 8 of the questionnaire.
145 Constructed by respondent 14 in response to part f, page 8 of the questionnaire.
95. Babirye aliko otumwa otulungi, twonna tutono twegombesa. “Babirye has nice lips, they are all small and admirable.”

Babirye aliko babirye a li ko
name-of-a-person 3SG be LOC.REL.CL17
Np COP

otumwa otulungi o tu mwa o tu lunghi
IV DIM.CL13.AGR mouth/lip IV REL.CL13 nice/beautiful
CN ADJ

twonna tutono twegombesa tw onna tu tono tw e gomb es a
REL.CL13 all REL.CL13 small REL.OBJ REFL admire.Vstem CAUS FV
QUANT ADJ V

96. Abaana ba saalongo baliko otumwa, twonna tulinga otwa taata waabwe. “Saalongo's children have lips which are all like their father's.”

abaana ba saalongo baliko a ba ana ba saalongo ba li ko
IV CL2.AGR child to.GEN father-of-twins 3PL be LOC.REL.CL17
CN PREP CN COP

otumwa twonna tulinga o tu mwa tw onna tu linga
IV DIM.CL13.AGR mouth/lip REL.CL13 all REL.CL13 like.CMPR
CN QUANT PRT

towa taata waabwe o twa a taata waa bwe
IV REL.CL13 GEN father/daddy for.GEN.REL.CL1 REL.3PL
PRT CN PRTposs

146 Constructed by respondent 15 in response to part f, page 8 of the questionnaire.
147 Constructed by respondent 16 in response to part f, page 8 of the questionnaire.
97. Omuwala aliko otumwa otulungi.148 “The girl has nice lips.”

Omuwala aliko otumwa
omuwala aliko otumwa
o mu wala a li ko o tu mwa
IV CL1.AGR girl 3SG be LOC.REL.CL17 IV DIM.CL13.AGR mouth/lip
CN COP CN

totulungi
o tu lungi
IV REL.CL13 nice/beautiful
ADJ

98. Otumwatwe tunkuba.149 “His/her lips attract me.”

Otumwatwe
Otu mwa tw e
IV DIM.CL13.AGR mouth/lip for.GEN.REL.CL13 him/her
CN
tunkuba
tun kub a
REL.CL13 1SG beat.Vstem FV
V

99. Omuwala oyo alina otumwa otulungi.150 “That girl has nice lips.”

Omuwala oyo alina
omuwala Oyo alina
o mu wala o yo a lina
IV CL1.AGR girl IV DIST.CL1.AGR 3SG has.Vstem
CN DEM V

otumwa otulungi
o tu mwa o tu lungi
IV DIM.CL13.AGR mouth/lip IV REL.CL13 nice/beautiful
CN ADJ

148 Constructed by respondent 17 in response to part f, page 8 of the questionnaire.
149 Constructed by respondent 18 in response to part f, page 8 of the questionnaire.
150 Constructed by respondent 19 in response to part f, page 8 of the questionnaire.
100. **Akaana ka Yakobo kalina otumwa otutono otulungi.** "Jacob's child has small lips which are nice."

Akaana ka Yakobo
a ka aha ka yakobo
IV DIM.CL12.AGR child for.GEN.CL12.AGR Jacob
CN PREP Np
Kalina otumwa
ka lina o tu mwa
REL.SBJ.CL12 has.Vstem IV DIM.CL13.AGR mouth/lip
V CN
otutono otulungi
o tu tono o tu lungi
IV CL13.AGR small IV REL.CL13 nice/beautiful
ADJ

101. **Laba otumwa twa muwala wange.** "See the lips for my daughter."

Laba otumwa twa
lab a o tu mwa tw a
see.Vstem.IMP FV IV DIM.CL13.AGR mouth/lip CL13.AGR GEN
V CN PREP
muwala wange
mu wala wa nge
CL1.AGR girl for.GEN.CL1.AGR me
CN PRTposs

102. **Otumwa otulungi.** "Nice lips."

otumwa otulungi
o tu mwa o tu lungi
IV DIM.CL13.AGR mouth/lip IV REL.CL13 nice/beautiful
CN ADJ

---

151 Constructed by respondent 20 in response to part f, page 8 of the questionnaire.
152 Constructed by respondent 21 in response to part f, page 8 of the questionnaire.
153 Constructed by respondent 23 in response to part f, page 8 of the questionnaire.
103. **Otumwatwe twa kabi.**

**His/her lips are nice.**

Otumwatwe

o t u m w e t w e

IV DIM.CL13.AGR mouth/lip for.GEN.REL.CL13 him/her

CN

twa kabi
t w a k a b i

CL13.AGR GEN DIM.CL12.AGR danger

PREP ADJ

104. **Otumwa tutono.**

**The lips are small.**

otumwa
tutono

o t u m w a t u t o n o

IV DIM.CL13.AGR mouth/lip REL.CL13 small

CN ADJ

105. **Otumwa tulungi.**

**The lips are nice.**

otumwa
tulungi

o t u m w a t u l u n g i

IV DIM.CL13.AGR mouth/lip CL13.AGR beautiful/nice

CN ADJ

106. **Otumwa tw'omwana wange twalungiwa.**

**My child's lips are nice.**

otumwa
tw'omwana

o t u m w a t w ' o m w a n a

IV DIM.CL13.AGR mouth/lip for.GEN.REL.CL13 IV CL1.AGR child

CN CN

wange twalungiwa

w a n g e t w a l u n g i w a

for.GEN.CL1.AGR me REL.CL13 PAST beautiful/nice.Vstem PASS FV

PRTposs V

---

154 Constructed by respondent 24 in response to part f, page 8 of the questionnaire.

155 Constructed by respondent 26 in response to part f, page 8 of the questionnaire.

156 Constructed by respondent 27 and 29 in response to part f, page 8 of the questionnaire.

157 Constructed by respondent 28 in response to part f, page 8 of the questionnaire.
107. Wabula Ssemujju yazaala abaana! Bonna baliko otumwa otubi.158 “But Ssemujju gave birth to children! All of them have bad lips.”

Wabula Ssemujju yazaala
wabula ssemujju y a zaal a
but name-of-a-person 3SG PAST give-birth.Vstem FV
PRT Np V

abaana! Bonna baliko
a ba ana bo nna ba li ko
IV CL2.AGR child 3PL all 3PL be LOC.REL.CL17
CN QUANT COP

otumwa otubi
o tu mwa o tu bi
IV DIM.CL13.AGR mouth/lip IV REL.CL13 bad
CN ADJ

108. I was there and that kaman touched Zai’s chest.159 “I was there and that man touched Zai’s chest.”

I was there and that kaman touched Zai’s
ka man Zai’s
DIM.CL12.AGR name-of-a-person
CN Np

chest

---

158 Constructed by respondent 30 in response to part f, page 8 of the questionnaire.

APPENDIX 3: QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear Informant/Consultant,

I am glad to introduce myself to you as Namugala Samuel, a master’s student of Linguistics (2011-2013) at the Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU) in Norway. I am currently conducting linguistics related research as part of my master’s degree. The research is on my mother tongue language; Luganda. I humbly request you to participate in filling this questionnaire. I will be very grateful for your contribution.

Informant’s/Consultant’s Personal Information:

First Name: ..................................................................................................................
Surname: ......................................................................................................................
Other Names: .............................................................................................................
Email Address: .......................................................................................................... 
Mobile Number: ....................................................................................................... 
Telephone Number: .................................................................................................
Gender/Sex: ..............................................................................................................
Age: ...........................................................................................................................
Nationality: ............................................................................................................... 
Residence: ................................................................................................................
Level of Education: .................................................................................................
Profession/Occupation: ............................................................................................
Mother tongue Language: ......................................................................................
Other Languages (in order of fluency): ......................................................................

......................................................................................................................................
1. The following words are possible Luganda equivalents of the English word *head*.  
A. Tick on ones that you think are not offensive, or ones that you wouldn’t feel annoyed if someone used them to refer to your head.  
   a) Omutwe  
   b) Ettwe  
   c) Ekitwe  
   d) Olutwe  
   e) Akatwe  
   f) Otutwe  
   g) Ogutwe  

B. Tick on ones that you would feel annoyed if someone used them to refer to your head.  
   a) Omutwe  
   b) Ettwe  
   c) Ekitwe  
   d) Olutwe  
   e) Akatwe  
   f) Otutwe  
   g) Ogutwe  

C. Write down the non offensive words that you have ticked in 1.A starting with the most acceptable word and ending with the least acceptable word.  
   .................................................................................................................................  
   .................................................................................................................................  

D. Write down the offensive words that you have ticked in 1.B starting with the most diminishing word and ending with the least diminishing word.  
   .................................................................................................................................  
   .................................................................................................................................  

E. For every word listed below, create a context where you think it would be right to use the given word and if possible give a reason why you think you would use that particular word instead of others in the given list:  
   a) Omutwe: .........................................................................................................................  
   .................................................................................................................................  
   .................................................................................................................................  
   .................................................................................................................................  
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2. Read the following sentences and tick on the one(s) which you think is/are not insulting:

   a) Omwana wange yagenze mu kyalö.
   b) Eryana lyange lyagenze mu kyalö.
   c) Ekyana kyange kyagenze mu kyalö.
   d) Olwana lwange lwagenze mu kyalö.
   e) Akaana kange kaagenze mu kyalö.
   f) Otwana twange twagenze mu kyalö.
   g) Ogwana gwange gwagenze mu kyalö.
B. All of the sentences on the previous page start with different words which are all possible Luganda words used to mean child. However, each of the sentences may be used in a different context depending on the nature of the child being referred to. If you agree with this, give relevant contexts in which every particular sentence could be used. E.g you may say that; I can use sentence (a) when I am happy/annoyed, etc or when making a statement which is praising, offensive, etc. You can also go ahead to describe how the child being talked about should look like in cases where you choose to use a certain statement. For example you may say that “I can use sentence (b) to refer to a child who is stubborn, well behaved, short, tall, medium, tiny, fat, beautiful, handsome, ugly, liked, disliked, etc. Feel free to include any other relevant information if available.

a) ........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

b) ........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

c) ........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

d) ........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
3. For each of the dialogues below between Joan and Julie, possible Luganda words which mean “girl” are interchangeably used. State Joan’s mood in every dialogue. Also suggest the likely physical appearance in which the girl being referred to could be in according to you. Feel free to include any other relevant information if available.

**DIALOGUE 1:**

**Julie:** Oli ani agenda?
**Joan:** Oyo muwala wa Joseph

---
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DIALOGUE 2:

**Julie:** Oli ani agenda?

**Joan:** Eryo liwala lya Joseph.

DIALOGUE 3:

**Julie:** Oli ani agenda?

**Joan:** Ekyo kiwala kya Joseph.

DIALOGUE 4:

**Julie:** Oli ani agenda?

**Joan:** Olwo luwala lwa Joseph.

DIALOGUE 5:

**Julie:** Oli ani agenda?

**Joan:** Ako kawala ka Joseph.
DIALOGUE 6:

Julie: Oli ani agenda/B’ani bali abagenda?

Joan: Otwo tuwala twa Joseph.

DIALOGUE 7:

Julie: Oli ani agenda?

Joan: Ogwo guwala gwa Joseph.

4. Create 7 sentences using each of these words (they are different equivalents of the English word *mouth*); omumwa, erimwa, ekimwa, olumwa, akamwa, otumwa, ogumwa. At the end of each sentence, propose a possible description of how the mouth you are referring to may be looking like, plus the possible context in which that particular sentence may be used. Feel free to write additional information regarding the Luganda word in the sentence which means mouth.

a) ..........................................................................................................................

b) ..........................................................................................................................
5. Write down any additional and relevant information regarding the questions and answers appearing in the questionnaire.

………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………

Note:
For any further information before and after filling the questionnaire, feel free to contact me on +256782046081/+4745112047 (namugalasamuel@rocketmail.com)

THANK YOU!!!
APPENDIX 4: LINKS TO THE RECORDINGS

1. VR1  Lydia - 22  http://youtu.be/ipd05xhPQrg
2. VR2  Prossy - 20  http://youtu.be/PO8GBGAfJeE
3. VR3A  Christopher - 64  http://youtu.be/8EIRqfrdJh8
4. VR3B  Christopher - 64  http://youtu.be/-vo6tai2N7Q
5. VR4  Geoffery - 25  http://youtu.be/mnAWxw1E9bQ
6. VR5  Rosemary - 45  http://youtu.be/OMkJJ0YvS3s
8. VR7A  Peter - 28  http://youtu.be/gRMRU6igjTI
9. VR7B  Peter - 28  http://youtu.be/B7FPhDynrxk
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