

This is the accepted version of a paper to appear in *Studies in Language*. Please refer to the published version for citation purposes.

Morphosyntactic retention and innovation in Sheng: an urban youth language of Kenya

Hannah Gibson, Chege Githiora, Fridah Kanana Erastus and Lutz Marten

Abstract

This paper examines the morphosyntax of the East African Swahili-based urban youth language Sheng. Research on urban youth languages has often focused on these varieties as sites of change, characterised by linguistic creativity and rapid change. However, we show that many of the structural features which appear to make Sheng stand out when compared to (Standard) Swahili are widespread across East African Bantu. We examine nominal and verbal domains, as well as clausal syntax and highlight areas in which Sheng exhibits features in common with its contact languages, as well as features which appear to reflect instances of independent innovation. The study shows that Sheng is not a ‘simplified’ version of Swahili which deviates from the grammar of Swahili in a range of ad hoc ways. Rather the language exhibits features of retention and contact-induced borrowing, as well as systematic changes which are reflective of variation across the Bantu languages.

Keywords: language contact, language change, youth languages, Bantu languages, morphosyntax, Sheng

1. Introduction

Since the early twentieth century, the existence of slang phenomena has been reported from various urban centres across Africa (Mazrui and Mazrui 1995, Kießling and Mous 2004, Hurst 2009). This has been followed by the appearance of urban youth languages, which deviate more from the base language than slang, but which nonetheless have their origins in another language (or languages) spoken in the city. Urban youth languages can broadly be thought of as those languages which are developed by young speakers in urban areas in order to set themselves apart from older speakers (Kießling and Mous 2004). Urban youth varieties are known for their innovation, particularly in the domain of the lexicon, with semantic change and borrowing, as well as extensive use of code-switching which are often considered to be defining features of these registers. As such, urban youth varieties are often thought of as sites – and drivers of – innovation, characterised by linguistic creativity, rapid changes and ephemeral vocabulary (e.g. Beck 2012).

The study of young people’s speech in Africa, often subsumed under the label of ‘youth language’, began in the late 1980s (Dumestre 1985, Spyropoulos 1987, Sesep 1990). Some of the early works treated youth languages repeatedly as pidginised or ‘hybrid’ forms of language (Goyvaerts 1988 on Indoubill in Bukavu, DR Congo; Ferrari 2004 and Bosire 2006 on the Sheng of Nairobi). The notions of pidginisation or hybridity in these studies is often used to refer to changes in the concordance systems, a simplification of tense-aspect systems, and a multiplicity of linguistic manipulations. Other early studies examined youth language primarily from a contact perspective, focusing on codemixing or codeswitching as guiding concepts (see, among others, Mazrui 1995, Abdulaziz and Osinde 1997, Slabbert and Myers-Scotton 1997).

Kießling and Mous’ (2004) seminal paper constitutes the first overview paper, which brought increased attention to the youth language in Africa. Subsequently, distinctive ‘youth languages’ were described in various parts of the continent, often following Kießling and Mous (2004) in their identification of a) linguistic manipulations (predominantly on a phonological, morphological and lexical level) and b) in their application of sociolinguistic theory, including a focus on anti-language (Halliday 1963) and resistance identity. Numerous more recent studies build on this popular model of analysis (Reuster-Jahn and Kießling 2006, Hurst 2008, Hurst and Mesthrie 2013, Namyalo 2015, Barasa and Mous (2017) amongst others). A number of

This is the accepted version of a paper to appear in *Studies in Language*. Please refer to the published version for citation purposes.

ethnographically oriented studies have also been carried out (e.g. Samper 2002, Wairungu 2014, Wilson 2012).

However, less attention has been paid to the morphosyntactic aspects of urban youth languages. Exceptions to this include Shinagawa (2007), Gunnink (2014), Beck (2015), and more recently Nassenstein and Bose (2020). This is also true of Sheng for which, despite the presence of a number of descriptive linguistic works on the topic, (Githiora 2002, Mbaabu and Nzuka 2003, Ferrari 2004, Ogechi 2005, Bosire 2006, 2008, Shinagawa 2006, 2007, Beck 2015, Nassenstein and Hollington 2015) the area of morphosyntax remains under-examined (although see Githiora 2018: Chapter 4).

This paper aims to address this gap with a discussion of morphosyntactic features of Sheng, an urban youth variety spoken in Kenya. The goal of this paper is three-fold: firstly, to provide a more detailed account of the morphosyntax of Sheng, complementing the previous studies which have focused primarily on other aspects of the variety. Secondly, to examine features of Sheng morphosyntax against the comparative backdrop of Bantu languages and the variation found in the language family. Thirdly, the paper draws on examples from Sheng to examine processes of language contact and change more broadly.

Sheng data are from published sources while Swahili data are based on the authors' own knowledge unless otherwise indicated. It should also be noted that Sheng is only one of a number of Swahili-based youth languages, which are found across East Africa. These include also Lughya ya Mitaani (Dar es Salaam, Tanzania), Yabacrâne (Goma in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC)) and Kindubile (Lubumbashi, DRC). Here we focus on Sheng due to its strong descriptive foundation, and the data available that pertain to the domain of morphosyntax. However, comparable studies drawing from either one of the other Swahili-based youth languages or drawing comparisons across the languages would also be welcome avenues for future research.

We examine case studies from the verbal domain, nominal domain and clausal syntax, and show that, despite innovation in a number of areas, Sheng morphosyntax tends to retain the complex structures of its Bantu source languages. We claim that many of the structural features which appear to make Sheng stand out when compared to so-called Standard Swahili, are features which are widespread across other Bantu languages, including those of East Africa (cf. Marten et al. 2020).

The paper is structured as follows: Section 2 explores contact and convergence in Bantu languages, introducing the notions of centrifugal and centripetal convergence developed by Marten (2013). Section 3 presents an overview of Sheng, providing the relevant sociolinguistic background necessary to understand the subsequent discussion. Section 4 focuses on the nominal domain, Section 5 examines the verbal domain, while Section 6 examines syntax. Section 7 constitutes a concise conclusion, highlighting the findings of the paper, as well as avenues for future research.

2. Contact and convergence in Bantu

Many classic models of language relationship assume that languages change and become more different over time. This employs the notion of (linguistic) divergence and assumes that over time and space languages become less similar to each other as they become increasingly removed from their locus of origin and, by extension, from one and other. This is the model of language change commonly reflected in language family trees. However, the assumption that languages become more different over time is only partially borne out and depends to a large extent on the sociolinguistic and historical conditions under which this process – or processes – takes place. In many ways, the idea that languages (only) become more different over time assumes that the speakers of different varieties no longer communicate with each other. However, languages may also become more similar to each other over time due to language

This is the accepted version of a paper to appear in *Studies in Language*. Please refer to the published version for citation purposes.

contact, particularly in bi- and multi-lingual contexts. Speakers may continue to be in sustained contact with each other – or may in fact reflect portions of the same speech community. In such contexts, processes of language change can instead also represent processes of linguistic convergence, as features of the language are maintained, reinforced or reintroduced, especially in instances in which the languages are quite similar as a result of close genetic relatedness.

Language contact and convergence can therefore have contrasting effects depending on the languages involved. Marten (2013) notes that contact between related languages may lead to increased structural similarity – i.e. centripetal convergence – while contact between unrelated languages may lead to decreased structural similarity between languages involved in the contact situation and those which are not – i.e. ‘centrifugal convergence’.

(1) **Centrifugal convergence**

Structural convergence effects which lead to increased similarity of the languages involved in the contact situation, but to decreased similarity with related languages outside of the contact situation

(2) **Centripetal convergence**

Structural convergence effects which lead to increased similarity of the languages involved in the contact situation, and also to increased similarity with related languages outside of the contact situation

Marten (2013) employs the notions of ‘centripetal’ and ‘centrifugal’ convergence to capture the nature of the effects of contact between Bantu languages with other Bantu languages and contact between Bantu and non-Bantu languages. The Bantu languages are a group of some 450-600 languages spoken across much of Central, Eastern and South Africa (Van de Velde and Bostoen 2019). Many of the areas in which Bantu languages are spoken are characterised by widespread multilingualism, with speakers often employing more than one Bantu language. The prevalence of these multilingual ecologies, with Bantu languages often in contact with other Bantu languages (as well as in some instances with non-Bantu languages) is proposed to have an impact on the nature of contact-induced change and structural transfer.

Contact between Bantu and non-Bantu languages may lead the Bantu language in question to exhibit decreased structural similarity with other Bantu languages (centrifugal convergence). Centrifugal convergence will therefore lead to what are also described as periphery effects. Those Bantu languages which are in contact with non-Bantu languages potentially show more divergent features in all linguistic domains. This is indeed what has been noted at some of the ‘peripheries’ of the Bantu zone, including in northern Tanzania where Bantu languages are in contact with Cushitic and Nilotic languages, as well as the isolates Hadza and Sandawe. In this region, signs of centrifugal convergence have been observed. The Bantu language Rangi for example has been in sustained contact with non-Bantu languages in the area, including representatives from the Cushitic and Nilotic language families, as well as the language isolate Hadza and Sandawe. It has been shown that certain features of Rangi morphosyntax are the result of contact with non-Bantu languages found in the areas (Gibson and Marten 2019). Other regions in which Bantu languages come into contact with non-Bantu languages are those at the edges of the Bantu area where the languages are in contact with Nilo-Saharan and Nilotic languages in the north of the Bantu area, or with so-called ‘Khoisan’ languages (e.g. in Southern Africa), as well as the contact zones in the north-west of the Bantu region (around Cameroon and Nigeria).

In contrast, contact between Bantu languages may lead to increased structural similarity with other Bantu languages (centripetal convergence), particularly at the centre of the Bantu

This is the accepted version of a paper to appear in *Studies in Language*. Please refer to the published version for citation purposes.

language region (cf. Guthrie 1962, Möhlig 1981). For example, in so-called ‘Mainland Colloquial Swahili’ (Kihore et al. 2001), the habitual suffix *-aga* and diminutive prefixes *ka-/ta-* have been attributed to second-language Swahili-speakers who have similar features in their first language (King’ei 2000, Rugemalira 2007, Marten 2013). These are features which are not found in Standard Swahili and which are not regularly associated with Swahili-speaking coastal populations. However, their presence in Mainland Colloquial Swahili appears to reflect the structural effects of language contact between Swahili and other Bantu languages which have these markers as part of their grammars. This will also be seen to be the case for Sheng in the current paper.

Applying the notions of centrifugal and centripetal convergence to the case of Sheng, the question is therefore: How are processes of morphosyntactic innovation in Sheng situated within the wider context of contact, change and convergence, particularly in relation to Bantu languages? The discussion of features of the morphosyntax of Sheng across the nominal, verbal and clausal domain examined in the following sections will seek to answer this question.

3. Sheng: a background

Sheng is most commonly described as an urban youth language. Opinions vary in relation to its genesis. Some describe the origins of Sheng as dating back to as early as the 1930s (Mazrui 1995, Abdulaziz and Osinde 1997), while other accounts suggest Sheng emerged in the 1950s (Spyropoulos 1987: 30). The label Sheng certainly appeared in early studies of the subject including those of Spyropoulos (1987) and Mazrui (1995) although, as noted by Beck (2015: 52), some of the observations of Myers-Scotton (1993) exhibited features of what would today also be described as Sheng or ‘Sheng talk’. There is general agreement that Sheng originated in the Eastlands estates of Nairobi (Githiora 2018: 31) and that it can be considered as a distinct way of speaking Swahili which is indexical of a particular set of speaker identities. As a low-income residential area of Nairobi, Eastlands was – and continues to be – a multilingual, multi-ethnic part of the city and is reflective of its inhabitants’ complex and often fluid identities.

Although initially associated with youth populations living in the Kenyan urban centre of Nairobi, recent years have seen the spread of Sheng into other cities in Kenya as well as rural areas. Sheng is also increasingly used by a wider range of speakers from different age groups and socioeconomic backgrounds (Githiora 2018, Nassenstein and Bose 2020). Recent years have also seen an increase in the visibility of Sheng, including in advertising and the media. Since 2013, for example *The Nairobiian* has been publishing a weekly column in Sheng (Githiora 2018: 128) and there are Sheng activist groups such as GoSheng and a radio station Ghetto FM which brands itself as ‘The official Sheng station’ and ‘Voice of the Youth’. There is also a growth in interest in the study of Sheng (see e.g. Bosire 2006, Beck 2015, Githiora 2018, Kanana Erastus and Kebeya 2018, Kanana Erastus and Nyong’a 2019, Kanana Erastus and Hurst-Harosh 2019, Nassenstein and Bose 2020, amongst others).

In structural terms, some authors have described Sheng as close to Swahili, with a morphosyntax based on Swahili. Others view it more akin to a practice of code-switching involving Swahili-English (Mazrui 1995), where Swahili is the matrix language (Bosire 2015). Others have described it as a pidgin (Chimerah 1998), an approach which the current account does not adopt. Githiora (2018) describes the grammar of Sheng as ‘straightforwardly that of Swahili’ a point which we will return to over the course of the paper. The linguistic context of Kenya contributes to the structural and lexical properties of Sheng, which draws on influences from other languages found in the region, including for example Gikuyu, Dholuo, English, and Gujarati. Another relevant observation is that the linguistic landscape in Kenya involves what may appropriately be considered a continuum of

This is the accepted version of a paper to appear in *Studies in Language*. Please refer to the published version for citation purposes.

speech codes. There exists a Kenyan Swahili, which is characterised by specific morphosyntactic and lexical features and which differs from, for example, so called Standard Swahili, with Sheng exhibiting yet different features again from both of these varieties. Sheng therefore exists somewhere along this continuum and the way in which speakers use it reflects both this continuum and speakers' broader linguistic repertoire. The majority of Kenyan Swahili-speakers use at least one other language in addition to their 'first language'. This means that many people use Swahili, another Kenyan language and English on a regular basis in a broad range of domains in a fluid manner, often without clear boundaries between discrete codes in ways that have been described more widely as translanguaging (Williams 1994, Caragarajah 2011, García and Wei 2014).

Another concept which will be shown to be central to the current discussion is that of 'stylect' – a term coined by Hurst (2008) for Tsotsitaal, an urban language of South Africa. Here we follow the approach taken by Hurst (2008) and consider Sheng to be a 'stylect' of Swahili. This means that it is a variety that is heavily linked to a performative practice that allows for a 'range of identity alignments which are reflected in the linguistic range' (Hurst 2008: 2). Githiora (2018: 31) notes that 'Sheng talk' is a helpful term to describe the 'distinctive ways of speaking Swahili, which is indexed to social identity and language ideologies of Kenya'. Githiora (2018) also argues that this identity-based approach is crucial to the study of Sheng which he describes as closely indexed to 'style' and therefore encourages us to move away from employing both the terms 'youth' and 'urban' in our descriptions of Sheng, whilst still acknowledging the role of both of these concepts in the dynamics of the emergence of Sheng within the broader ecology of Swahili.

A couple of brief terminological points are in order here. We use the term Sheng to describe the Swahili-based broad linguistic practice or 'stylect' which has traditionally been associated with urban youth populations, whilst recognising also its broader contemporary use. We use the term 'Standard Swahili' to refer to a codified form of Swahili which was historically based on the southern urban dialect of Zanzibar known as Kiunguja. Standardisation efforts were heavily influenced by the adoption of Swahili as the language of administration by German and British colonial administrations in Tanzania and Kenya, as well as subsequent and in many ways ongoing codification and standardisation activities which are reinforced by its use in education across the region. We use terms such as 'Colloquial (Mainland) Swahili' to refer to varieties of spoken Swahili which are found across the region which are distinct from the Standard. We further use terms such as 'Kenya Swahili' or 'Lubumbashi Swahili' to describe regiolectal or city-specific varieties. We are conscious however that in many ways youth languages and youth language practices are social phenomena which often cannot be demarcated or indicated on maps (or ascribed to cities) in purely geographic terms. We are also aware that the use of such labels is not without broader problems in terms of essentialisation or reification of such languages (see, e.g. Lüpke and Storch 2013 for further discussion). Where these considerations impact on the structures and analysis under development this will be discussed. However, for the broader purposes of this paper, these are helpful labels which do play a role in being able to refer to the specific varieties under examination.

4. Features of Sheng morphosyntax: the nominal domain

4.1 Noun class assignment and semantics

Bantu languages are characterised by systems of noun classes. Nouns are assigned to noun classes, which are often analysed as grammatical genders. These noun classes are commonly associated with nominal prefixes and trigger agreement across a range of dependent elements such as adjectival, numeral and other modifiers. Agreement with the appropriate noun class is also seen through subject and object marking, with subject and object markers cross-

This is the accepted version of a paper to appear in *Studies in Language*. Please refer to the published version for citation purposes.

referencing arguments of the verb.

Noun classes can also be exploited for semantic effects across Bantu. For example, many Bantu languages employ specific noun classes to encode diminutive and augmentative meanings (Gibson et al. 2017), as well as (sometimes by extension) pejorative or ameliorative senses. Diminutives in Bantu are thought to have been historically expressed as part of the noun class system, and several noun classes have been reconstructed as including diminutive meanings (Maho 1999). The reconstructed class 12 Proto-Bantu prefix **ka* is widely associated with diminutives, and a corresponding diminutive plural in class 13, with the prefix **tu*, has also been proposed (Bleek 1862/9, Meinhof 1910[1899], Meeussen 1967, Maho 1999). Classes 19/20 represented by **pi* and **yù* respectively, and 7/8 **ki* and **βi* respectively, have also been reconstructed as diminutive classes in Bantu, although with a more restricted distribution (Maho 1999, Gibson et al. 2017).

The use of class 12 for encoding diminutives can be seen in the examples from the Tanzanian Bantu languages Nyamwezi and Chindamba below. In Nyamwezi, the diminutive prefix *ka-* appears instead of the class 1 prefix *ngwa-*, yielding the form *kaaná* ‘small child’ in contrast to *ngwaaná* ‘child’. Similarly, in Chindamba, the class 12 prefix *ka-* yields the form *kapiki* ‘small tree’ in contrast to *lipiki* ‘tree’.

(3) Nyamwezi (Maganga and Schadeberg 1992: 63)

- a. **ngwa**-aná ‘child’ (class 1)
- b. **ka**-aná ‘small child’ (class 12)

(4) Chindamba (Edelsten and Lijongwa 2010: 36-38)

- a. **li**-piki ‘tree’ (class 5)
- b. **ka**-piki ‘small tree’ (class 12)

Swahili also makes use of noun classes to encode diminutive meanings. However, the language has lost the historical diminutive classes 12 and 13 which synchronically have been replaced by the class 7/8 prefixes *ki-* and *vi-* (Kihore et al. 2001, King’ei 2000: 85/86). This can be seen in the examples in (5) below where the class 7 and 8 prefixes *ki-* and *vi-* are used to form singular and plural diminutive forms respectively.

(5) Standard Swahili (Kihore et al. 2001)

- a. m-toto ‘child’ (class 1)
- b. wa-toto ‘children’ (class 2)
- c. **ki**-toto ‘small child’ (class 7)
- d. **vi**-toto ‘small children’ (class 8)

In contrast to the situation in Standard Swahili, in Sheng we see the use of class 12/13 to encode diminutive meanings. This can be seen in the presence of the class 12 prefix *ka-* on the nominal *kamanoo* ‘little man’, as well as in the class 12 form of the demonstrative *hako* in (6) below. As can also be seen particularly on examination of (7), the diminutive meaning in Sheng is commonly associated with pejorative meanings. The class 12 form is found on the noun, as a verbal prefix (8), and as an object marker (9). The nominal form *kakitu* ‘little thing’ in example marker (9) also shows that the *ka-* prefix can appear in addition to the inherent class prefix of the noun (in this case the class 7 prefix *ki-*).

(6) Ha-**ko ka**-manoo ka-na-katisi-ang-a

DEM-12 12-man 12-CONT-annoy-HAB-FV

‘That little man is (always) so annoying’ (Bosire 2015)

This is the accepted version of a paper to appear in *Studies in Language*. Please refer to the published version for citation purposes.

- (7) ... uzuri ni-li-kuwa na ka-simu ke-ngine.
11.good SM1sg-PAST-be CONN 12-phone 12-other
' Luckily I had a little (cheap) phone...' (Sheng, Githiora 2018: 87)
- (8) Ka-li-kuwa ka-toto ka-dogo
12-PAST-ba 12-child 12-small
'It was a (mere) little child' (Sheng, Githiora 2018: 87)
- (9) Sasa u-na-ka-on-a ka-ki-tu ka-dogo huku
now SM2sg-PRES-OM12-see-FV 12-7-thing 12-small here
'Now you see it, a small thing here' (Sheng, Rudd 2008:140 in Nassenstein and Bose 2020: 4)

Since the *ka-* diminutive prefix is not found in Swahili, its presence in Sheng represents reintroduction of morphosyntactic marking. The proposal here is that the marker is assumed to have existed at some point in the historical development of Swahili but to have been lost (with *ki-* used in present day Swahili rather than *ka-*) before being 'reintroduced' into Sheng. In this case, Sheng is drawing on the noun class system of neighbouring Bantu languages (Gikuyu, Meru and Luhya are Kenyan Bantu languages all of which employ the *ka-* diminutive prefix) with which it is in contact and draws on for lexical and morphological material.

It also seems that the 'reintroduction' of the historical class 12/13 diminutive marking system in Sheng is mirrored in the Swahili-based youth languages Lugha ya Mitaani, Kindubile and Yabacrâne (Nassenstein and Bose 2020), as well as in Colloquial Mainland Swahili. This is an interesting recurring pattern in which Swahili spoken in areas which have a high proportion of speakers of other Bantu languages with this diminutive strategy in their linguistic repertoire have made use of comparable strategies that are available.¹

Also in the domain of noun class semantics and class assignment, Sheng employs the prefix *ki-* to express augmentative meaning. The use of *ki-* in Sheng is in contrast to Standard Swahili where *ki-* is the diminutive prefix and augmentatives are formed using the prefix *ji-*. Githiora (2018: 86) observes that Sheng, and Kenyan Swahili more broadly, "overwhelmingly prefers the prefix *ka* (plural: *tu-*) only, to express diminutive or affectionate meanings, and *ki-* alone for augmentatives." Examples of the use of *ki-* for augmentatives in Sheng include *kijua* 'lots of hot burning sunshine' or *kimtu* 'a big (bad, ugly, unpleasant) person' (in contrast to *kamtu* 'a small person'), as in (10) below.

- (10) Ki-mtu ki-li-kuja hapa jana
7.AUG-1.person SM7-PAST-come-FV here yesterday
'A big [bad, ugly, unpleasant] person came here yesterday' (Githiora 2018: 86)

The use of class 12/13 diminutive strategies in Sheng can therefore be seen to represent an instance of language contact. Whilst the use of class 12/13 for diminutive purposes represents a deviation from Standard Swahili, this is a pattern seen widely across the Bantu languages and so reflects an increased similarity between Sheng and other Bantu languages as a result of contact.

¹ Evaluative morphology therefore seems to be particularly interesting in this regard: Swahili-speaking youth from DR Congo reveal very diverse diminutive patterns (noun class pairings 12/13, 12/14, 12/19 and a lack of morphological strategies).

This is the accepted version of a paper to appear in *Studies in Language*. Please refer to the published version for citation purposes.

4.2 Nominal agreement

In previous accounts, Sheng has been noted to exhibit reduced systems of agreement in comparison to Standard Swahili (see e.g. Myers-Scotton 1979, Ferrari 2004, Shinagawa 2007, Bosire 2008, Nassenstein and Bose 2020).² This was observed as early as Myers-Scotton (1979) who noted reduced agreement in adjectival forms such as *baridi mingi* ‘lots of cold’, *maji mingi* ‘lots of water’ and *watu mingi*³ ‘lots of people’ all of which exhibit the same concord of *-ingi* despite the nominals belonging to different noun classes (class 9, class 6 and class 2 respectively). This agreement pattern can also be seen on examination of the examples in (11) below which show the noun *kitu* ‘thing’ which would be a class 7/8 noun in Standard Swahili triggering agreement with what would be analysed as class 9 (11a-c) and class 10 (11d) (data from Beck 2015: 67).

- (11) a. hi-i ki-tu i-le
 DEM-9 7-thing 9- DEM
 ‘the thing’
 b. ki-tu hi-yo
 7-thing 9-DEM.REF
 ‘the thing mentioned’
 c. hi-i ki-tu
 DEM-9 7-thing
 ‘this thing, the thing’
 d. zi-le vi-tu
 10-DEM 8-thing
 ‘those things’

In example (12) the noun *vitu* ‘things’ is prefixed with the class 6 marker *ma-*, representing another deviation from Standard Swahili agreement patterns. In (13) despite the presence of the plural class 8 form *vitu*, the agreement triggered on the verb is *zi-* which is associated with class 10. This is also reflected in the adjectival agreement in example (14) with the form *mbaya* ‘bad’ (with the Swahili class 1 or class 9 prefix *m-*).

- (12) ma-vi-tu
 6-8-thing
 ‘things’ (Beck 2015:67)
- (13) vi-tu ha-zi-kam
 8-thing NEG-10.PROG-occur
 ‘the things don’t occur’ (Beck 2015: 67)
- (14) ki-tu first m-baya
 7-thing first 1-bad
 ‘the first bad thing’ (Beck 2015: 67)

Githiora (2018: 89) also notes that Kenyan Swahili deviates substantially from Standard Swahili in terms of agreement and concord. He notes that a common feature of Kenyan Swahili

² Reduced agreement in the verbal domain (specially in relation to subject-verb agreement) has also been described for contact varieties of Swahili. See De Rooji (1995:187) for Shaba Swahili and Nassenstein (2015:79-80) for Kisangani Swahili.

³ In the present-day, we note that while *baridi mingi* and *maji mingi* are widespread, the form *watu mingi* is not a form the authors have heard before.

This is the accepted version of a paper to appear in *Studies in Language*. Please refer to the published version for citation purposes.

is the invariable use of class 9/10 agreement markers, representing a ‘drastic simplification of the elaborate noun classification of Standard Swahili’ (Githiora 2018: 89). Under such an approach, despite the presence of the prefixes *ki-* and *vi-* on the nominal forms (which in Standard Swahili would be analysed as class 7/8 markers) these nouns all find their agreement with the Swahili classes 9/10 in Sheng.

Nassenstein and Bose (2020: 6) also note the use of non-agreeing forms in Sheng which would in Swahili otherwise show agreement with the head noun. For example *-ngine* ‘other’ appears to have developed into a non-agreeing form in Sheng which always appears as *ingine* regardless of the noun class of the nominal it modifies. This contrasts with the case in (Standard) Swahili more broadly where the *ingine* form would be considered to show class 9 agreement and if it modifies a class 7 noun such as *kitu* ‘thing’ for example, would exhibit class 7 agreement in (16).

(15) Sheng (Beck 2015: 67)

ki-tu i-ngine
7-thing 9-other
‘another thing’

(16) Swahili

Ki-tu ki-ngine
7-thing 7-other
‘another thing’

Class 6 concord also plays a significant role in the nominal system of Sheng and a range of Swahili-based youth languages. Nassenstein and Bose (2020: 5) suggest that *ma-* may be developing into a ‘general plural marker’ where it is used extensively in the formation of plurals with loanwords. However, there is variation in Sheng (and indeed between Kenyan Swahili and Tanzanian Swahili) in this regard. Alongside the use of the class plural prefix *ma-*, we also see concord with the ‘underlying’ class of the noun. Consider example (17) below where the class 9 noun *nyumba* hosts the plural class 6 prefix but the agreement on the possessive takes the form of the class 10 marker *z-* reflecting class 10 (plural of class 9) agreement with the class 9/10 noun.

(17) Tu-me-build ma-nyumba z-etu
SM1pl-PRF-build 6-9.house 10-POSS.1PL
‘We have built our houses’

This apparent reduced system could easily be analysed as a simplification in Sheng in which nominals take agreement in a reduced number of classes (see also Jerro (2018) who explores notions of simplification and complexification in Swahili). This is the case, for example, in Lingala, a contact language that emerged from a pidginised form of Bobangi in the Congo Basin towards the end of the 19th century which shows a simplified agreement system.

4.3 Demonstratives

The main area of variation in demonstratives in Sheng relates to their position within the noun phrase. There is variation amongst Bantu languages in terms of the position of the demonstrative relative to the noun. Some languages permit only Noun-Dem order in pragmatically unmarked contexts, other languages show a preference for Dem-Noun while some allow both Noun-Dem and Dem-Noun. Other languages employ so-called circum-

This is the accepted version of a paper to appear in *Studies in Language*. Please refer to the published version for citation purposes.

demonstratives in which a demonstrative form appears either side of the noun (see Taji 2021 on Yao, van der Wal 2009 for Makhuwa).

In Swahili demonstratives typically appear after the noun they modify, yielding Noun-Dem order (18). However, Swahili also allows both Dem-Noun ordering with this variation that appears to relate to specificity or definiteness (Ashton 1947: 59, Van de Velde 2005).

(18) Swahili (Van de Velde 2005: 436)

- a. Ki-tabu kile
7-book DEM
'That book' (far from us)
- b. Kile ki-tabu
DEM 7-book
'The book' (known to both of us)

In Sheng there are also examples in which the demonstrative appears pre-nominally (19) - (21).

(19) Sheng (Beck 2015)

- u-u dem m-supu
DEM-1 9.girl 1-super
'the good-looking girl'

(20) ha-wa ma-chali

- DEM-2 6-boy/lover
'the lovers' (Beck 2015)

(21) hi-i picha

- DEM-9 9.picture
'the picture' (Beck 2015)

However, there are examples of post-nominal numerals (22) and pronominal modifiers (23).⁴

(22) Sheng (Beck 2015)

- ma-chali wa-sita
6-boy 2-six
'six boys' 'six lovers'

(23) hu-o chali

- DEM-1REF 5.boy
'this lover, this guy' (Sheng, Beck 2015)

Rather than concluding that demonstratives in Sheng have grammaticalised to appear consistently in the pre-nominal position, it appears that there is a degree of flexibility in Sheng in terms of the placement of modifiers within the noun phrase. It also appears that this general flexibility of ordering within the noun phrase is greater in Sheng than it is in Swahili and the distinction between Noun-Dem and Dem-Noun ordering does not convey the same pragmatic

⁴ An alternative, and more common, demonstrative form used in expressions such as (23) would be the proximal demonstrative *huyu* (i.e. *huyu chali*). The form in *huo* given in (23) appears to be a class 3 anaphoric demonstrative. Further investigation would be needed on this point.

This is the accepted version of a paper to appear in *Studies in Language*. Please refer to the published version for citation purposes.

or information structural properties as are found in Swahili. For Sheng, this perhaps reflects influence from English (where Dem-Noun dominates), influence from other Bantu languages in which there is variation in noun-modifier order and/or an awareness of the pragmatic effect of changes in word order in Swahili and other Bantu languages. It is therefore difficult to conclude whether this feature represents either a case of contact-induced change or is an independent innovation, albeit one that reflects the variation found across Bantu more broadly.

4.4 Locative nouns

Bantu languages are known for their widespread use of locative noun classes. These are often indicated through the use of nominal prefixes and verbal agreement. In Swahili, locatives are also indicated through the use of the locative suffix *-ni* (see Samsom and Schadeberg 1994 for the historical origins of the suffix and its reconstruction). In Swahili there are a number of rules governing where the suffix can and cannot appear. The suffix can be used widely with nominal forms – such as *nyumbani* ‘home’ and *mezani* ‘on the table’. However, proper nouns appear without the locative suffix (24a, 25a) and the attempt at using the suffix with a city or country name results in unacceptability (24b, 25b).

(24) Swahili

a. Niko Mombasa
SM1sg.LOC.COP Mombasa
‘I’m in Mombasa’

b. *Niko Mombasa-ni
SM1sg.LOC.COP Mombasa-LOC
Intd. ‘I’m in Mombasa’

(25) Swahili

a. Tu-na-som-a shule-ni
SM1pl-PROG-read-FV school-LOC
‘We study at school’

b. *Tu-na-som-a Dar es Salaam-ni
SM1pl-PROG-read-FV Dar es Salaam-LOC
Intd. ‘We study in Dar es Salaam’

In Sheng however, there are examples of the locative suffix *-ni* appearing on proper nouns such as the place name Mombasa as can be seen in example (26) below.

(26) Sheng (Githiora 2018: 86)

Mambo vipi huko Mombasa-ni?
6.things how DEM.17 Mombasa-LOC
‘How are things over there in Mombasa?’

One possible analysis here is that this form represents transfer from locative classes which, in Bantu languages other than Swahili often combine with place names. Beyond East Africa we find *kuLusaka* ‘to/in Lusaka’ in Bemba, for example. However, it is not clear how common this is in East African Bantu languages and the languages we are aware of and familiar with do not employ this strategy. An alternative analysis therefore would be that that this represents an extension/overgeneralisation in the Standard Swahili locative suffixation system. This would

This is the accepted version of a paper to appear in *Studies in Language*. Please refer to the published version for citation purposes.

mean simply that the Sheng speakers are aware of *-ni* as a locative suffix and generalise this use to all forms, meaning that the prohibition of adding *-ni* to place names is not operative.

4.5 Summary of Sheng features in the nominal domain

To summarise, in the nominal domain we examined noun class assignment and associated noun class semantics where we saw variation in regard to noun classes agreement between Sheng and Swahili. For both the reduced nominal agreement and the relative flexibility of the ordering of elements in the nominal domain (where Sheng allows both Dem-N and N-Dem order) we analysed these as an independent innovation which is likely to be the result of language contact. In the case of reduced agreement this mirrors processes of ‘simplification’ observed with contact varieties of Bantu languages (such as Lingala) as well as cross-linguistic patterns of reduced agreement in contact languages. In this case, it may also reflect the high number of second language speakers of Swahili. For the variability of word order this is the result of contact with speakers of languages which have either Dem-N or both Dem-N and N-Dem order in their grammars. Finally, the option of proper nouns hosting the locative suffix in Sheng (prohibited in Swahili) is proposed to be the result of contact with other Bantu languages or indeed English which has resulted in an over-generalisation of the locative marking system in Sheng when compared to Standard Swahili for example. This is summarised in Table 1 below.

Domain	Feature	Change type
Noun classes	Noun class assignment and semantics	Contact
Agreement	Nominal agreement: Reduced or default agreement system	Contact
Nominals	Nominal modification: Dem-N and N-Dem order	Independent innovation/contact
Locative nouns	Locative nouns: Locative suffix <i>-ni</i> on proper nouns	Contact

Table 1: Summary of nominal features analysed

5. The verbal domain

Bantu languages commonly employ a range of simple and complex verbal forms to encode a range of tense-aspect-mood distinctions. Simple verb forms consist of a single verbal form which is inflected for tense or aspect information, and polarity distinctions along with other affixes which may cross-reference the arguments of the verb – such as subject and object arguments. Complex verb forms comprising an auxiliary and a main verb form are also widespread throughout Bantu and typically enable the encoding of a broader range of tense-aspect distinctions than may otherwise be available with single word forms. This section explores instances of innovation and structural retention in Sheng in the verbal domain.

5.1 Tense-aspect-mood distinctions

5.1.1 The habitual *-ag*

Many Bantu languages employ some variation of the form **-ag* to encode imperative, repetitive or habitual meanings (e.g. Meeussen 1967: 110, Sebasoni 1967, Nurse 2008). This can be seen in the examples below from Kagulu (27) and Ciruri (28) below.

- (27) Kagulu (Petzell 2008: 118)
 Ha-ka-ij-**ag**-a ka-mwendu kwa wiki
 PAST-SM1.PAST-come-IPFV-FV NUM-one per week

This is the accepted version of a paper to appear in *Studies in Language*. Please refer to the published version for citation purposes.

‘S/he came once per week’

- (28) Ciruri (Massamba 2000: 122)
 E-ni-gur-**ag**-a
 PRES-SM1sg-buy-HAB-FV
 ‘I buy (regularly)’

However, in Standard Swahili, the historic Proto-Bantu suffix **-ag* has been lost and has instead been replaced by a new habitual formative *hu-* (Schadeberg 1992: 25; Nurse and Hinnebusch 1993: 405, 414/5), which is shown in (29).

- (29) Standard Swahili
 a. Wewe hu-l-a wapi?
 you HAB-eat-FV where
 ‘Where do you (usually) eat?’
 b. Mimi hu-end-a shule-ni kwa mi-guu
 I HAB-go-FV 9.school-LOC PREP 4-foot
 ‘I (usually) go to school by foot’

Significantly for our purposes, the habitual suffix *-ag* is found in Congo varieties of Swahili (Nassenstein and Bose 2020), as well as being reported to be widespread in colloquial use across the Swahili-speaking area (Abe 2009). This introduction is significant enough to have led to the following observation and commentary: “Standard Swahili may be reclaiming productive inflection *-ag-* and its wide occurrence in colloquial Swahili seems to be unstoppable” (Rugemalira 2010: 232)

- (30) Colloquial Swahili
 a. U-na-ku-l-**ag**-a wapi?
 SM2sg-PRS-STM-eat-HAB-FV where
 ‘Where do you (usually) eat?’ (Rugemalira 2010:232)
 b. Kosa la ku-ni-omb-a m-samaha, ha-kun-**ag**-a
 5.mistake 5-of INF-OM1sg-ask-FV 3-forgiveness SM1NEG-be-HAB-FV
 ‘You don’t ask me for forgiveness, [but] it doesn’t matter [lit. ‘There is nothing’]
 (Suma Lee, *Hakunaga*)

A similar situation seems to have arisen in Sheng, presumably also as a result of influence from contact with Bantu languages in which the suffix *-ag* is present. Indeed, this is the proposal put forward by Bosire (2008:113–116) who accounts for the presence of *-ag* in Sheng as the result of borrowing from other Kenyan Bantu languages such as Gikuyu and Lubukusu. As can be seen on examination of examples (31) - (34) below, in Sheng the habitual suffix *-ag* ~ *-ang* can be added to verb forms and conveys a habitual reading.

- (31) Siku moja ni-li-kuwa na-end-**ag**-a na ha-po hi-vo Dandoo ...
 day one SM1sg-PAST-be SM1sg-go-HAB-FV CONNDEM-16 DEM- Dandoo
 ‘One day I was going about there in Dandora ...’ (Sheng, Githiora 2018: 114)
 (32) a-na-fany-**ang**-a kazi tu kwa ofisi y-a gavaa
 SM1-PROG-do-HAB-FV work just PREP 9.office 9-of 1.governor

This is the accepted version of a paper to appear in *Studies in Language*. Please refer to the published version for citation purposes.

‘He just works in a government office’ (Sheng, Githiora 2015: pp)

Interestingly, in examples (33) and (34) below the Standard Swahili habitual prefix *hu-* co-occurs with the innovative habitual suffix *-ang*, perhaps reflecting an ongoing process of change where the *hu-* prefix is becoming semantically bleached of its meaning therefore leading to the addition of the *-a(n)ga* suffix.

(33) yee **hu-kuj-ang-a** hapa kila siku
 s/he HAB-come-HAB-FV DEM-16 every day
 ‘He comes here every day’ (Sheng, Githiora 2015: pp)

(34) Ni venye hawa makarao **hu-mada-nga** majamaa huku
 COP how DEM.2 cops HAB-murder-HAB-FV 2-guys DEM.17
 ‘It’s how these cops kill guys around here’ (Sheng, Githiora 2018: 114)

Such a process would in some ways be reminiscent of the Jespersen’s Cycle in which material is added to ‘reinforce’ negation before losing its emphatic weight and the construction as a whole becoming a regular part of the negation strategy. The idea here would be that *hu-* and *-anga* combine, with speakers reinforcing the habitual aspect of the event. Alternatively, one of the affixes could be considered as bleached of its habitual semantics (perhaps instead reanalysed as part of the verb stem) and therefore the ‘additional’ habitual suffix is needed to encode habituality. A similar process can be observed in the grammaticalization of the new Swahili perfect marker *-sha-* (from *-isha* ‘finish’) in the context of the older marker *-me-* in forms like *-mekwisha-* and *-mesha-* (see Marten 1998, and the discussion below).

A note can also be made here in terms of the difference in form between the suffix *-ag* and *-ang*. Example (31) shows the presence of the marker *-ag* while (33) and (34) employ the marker *-a(n)ga*. From a synchronic perspective, there is variation within Bantu in terms of which form of the marker is exhibited. As shown above, Kagulu and Ciruri above both exhibit the form *-ag*. It is perhaps unsurprising then that the variation across Bantu languages is also reflected within Sheng. This can be assumed to result from different influences operative on Sheng: speakers may well be familiar with this variation if they speak a language (or languages) which has the marker *-ag* and have heard speakers of other languages using *-ang*. Similarly, there may be awareness that both forms are accepted in Sheng, with no difference in meaning conveyed through the distinction between *-ag* and *-ang*. It appears that the *-anga* form is also used by those speakers of languages in which vowels before a stop are prenasalised. However, a systematic study of this would need to be conducted to see the patterns of variation between *-aga* ~ *anga*.

The habitual verb form in Standard Swahili differs from other tense-aspect-mood markers in that it appears as a prefix and cannot be used alongside subject information. The standard habitual prefix occurs as *hu-* in all contexts and due to the lack of subject marking requires an overt subject to disambiguate between possible referents. This differs from other TAM forms where the TAM marker is typically preceded by the subject marker pertaining to noun class and/or person and number. Another characteristic of the habitual in Standard Swahili is that it is not available for negation, with the corresponding negative form in the TAM paradigm usually assumed to be the present negative. However, in contrast, the habitual/imperfective suffix *a(n)g* in Sheng allows for negation. This is facilitated by the appearance of the negative post-final suffix *-i* (used in Standard Swahili for present tense negation), meaning that it can appear after the habitual form *-a(n)g-* yielding the negative habitual form *-angi*.

(35) Mi ata **si-ju-ang-i** game y-ake

This is the accepted version of a paper to appear in *Studies in Language*. Please refer to the published version for citation purposes.

I even SM1.NEG-know-HAB-NEG 9.game 9-POSS1sg
'I don't know what's his game' (Sheng, Githiora 2018: 115)

If we consider Swahili to be the language from which Sheng has drawn most heavily in structural terms, the case of the *-ag ~ -ang* suffix can therefore be seen as an instance of the 're-introduction' of morphosyntactic marking into Sheng. This is most likely the result of its presence in other Bantu languages found in ecologies in which Sheng is present, including those used by Sheng-speakers. This would mean that whilst the morphological *-ag* is not present in Standard Swahili, the use of *-ag ~ -ang* in Sheng means that the variety is more similar to other Bantu languages in this regard, reflecting a case of contact-induced change.

5.1.2 New tense-aspect-mood markers and distinctions

We also see the introduction of new tense-aspect-mood markers (and distinctions) in a number of instances. In Sheng, an innovation in the form *-wes-* from the lexical verb *-weza* 'be able' appears to have assumed a role in the encoding of TAM. In example (36) *-wes-* appears alongside the verb *mek* from English 'make', meaning that *-wes-* appears in the typical tense-aspect-mood slot and is conveying an ability/capacity modality and is used to convey 'we can make it'.

(36) Tu-na-wes-mek
SM1pl-PROG-able-make
'We can make it' (Sheng, Githiora 2015)

The new *li-* plus *sha-* combination can be seen in (37) where the past tense marker *li-* appears alongside the marker *sha-*

(37) A-li-sha-enda
SM1-PAST-PERF-go-FV
'S/he has already gone' (Sheng, Bosire 2015)

The use of *-sha-*, historically related the verb *-kwisha* 'finish' through grammaticalization into a perfect or completive marker, is in Standard Swahili mainly found in combination with the older perfect marker *-me-* or with the situational TAM marker *-ki-*, resulting in the 'unexpected perfect' marker *-mesh-* (Schadeberg 1990) and completive situative marker *-kisha-* (see Marten 1998). The use of *-sha-* with *-li-* can thus be seen as innovative extension of the use of the new form.

Another feature reflected in Sheng which is also quite widespread in Kenyan Swahili is the use of what in Standard Swahili is the future tense marker *-ta-* to encode conditional meanings. This can be seen in (38) where the translation provides either the future tense ('How will you feel?') or conditional ('How would you feel?').

(38) U-ta-feel-aje?
SM2sg-TA-feel-how
'How will/would you feel?' (Sheng, Githiora 2018: 129)

5.1.3 The verbal stem *ku-*

Bosire (2006: 189) notes that in Sheng the verbal stem *ku-* can be found in all tenses, aspects and moods both in the negative and the affirmative. However, this contrasts with the TAM system in Swahili where the use of *ku-* is more restricted and appears with certain affirmative/negative tense-aspect-combinations. For example, while in (39) the stem *ku-* is

This is the accepted version of a paper to appear in *Studies in Language*. Please refer to the published version for citation purposes.

used alongside the negative perfect marker *ja-* in Sheng, in Swahili, the *ku-* stem would be omitted in constructions involving *ja-*.

- (39) Ha-ja-ku-w-a VCT.
1.NEG-CXP15-be-FV VCT
'She hasn't been to the VCT [Voluntary Testing and Counselling] yet.' (ref)

Similarly, in (40) the subjunctive form includes the *ku-* stem which is omitted in Swahili (41).

- (40) A-ku-l-e mboga.
SM1-15-eat-SBJV 9.vegetable
'She should eat vegetables.' (Sheng, (ref))
- (41) Ni-li-mw-amb-i-a a-l-e mboga
SM1sg-PAST-OM1-tell-APPL-FV SM1-eat-SBJV vegetables
'I told him/her to eat vegetables' (Swahili)

Beck (2015: 60) proposes that the rules prescribing that *ku-* must precede all verbs containing just a single syllable have likely been 'copied' from neighbouring Bantu contact languages. However, we know that this rule does not hold for Gikuyu for example. It also seems equally plausible that what can be seen in Sheng is simply an erosion of the rule relating to the presence/absence of the stem which has been generalised to appear across all tense-aspect-mood and polarity distinctions as part of an independent process of language change. This would therefore contrast with the situation in Swahili where the presence is TAM-specific, but would be in keeping with a contact-induced change in the language resulting in a simplification (i.e. generalisation) of this aspect of the syntax.

5.2 Co-occurrence of object markers

In addition to subject agreement, Bantu languages also exhibit object agreement which appears as a series of object markers within the verb which serve to cross-reference the arguments of the verb. Bantu languages vary with respect to the number and kind of object markers they permit (e.g. Marten and Kula 2012, Marlo 2015). Standard Swahili, in common with many other Bantu languages, only allows a maximum of one object marker per verb (42).⁵

- (42) Swahili
- a. ni-li-**m**-p-a
SM1sg-PAST-OM1-give-FV
'I gave him (it)'
 - b. *ni-li-i-m-p-a
SM1sg-PAST-OM9-OM1-give-FV
Intd. 'I gave him (it)'
 - c. *ni-li-m-i-p-a
SM1sg-PAST-OM1-OM 9-give-FV
Intd. 'I gave him (it)'

Despite this restriction in Swahili, Sheng permits multiple object markers. This can be seen in example (43) which shows the presence of both the first person singular marker *ni-* and the

⁵ Although see also the work of Gibson et al. (2020) who note that there are reasons to think that the situation, even in Standard Swahili, is more complex than this.

This is the accepted version of a paper to appear in *Studies in Language*. Please refer to the published version for citation purposes.

class 1 marker *m(w)-* before the verb stem. Similarly, example (44) shows the co-occurrence of the first person plural object marker *tu-* and the class 7 object marker *ki-*.

(43) si u-**ni-mw**-it-i-e?
NEG SM2sg-OM1sg-OM1-call-APPL-SBJV
'Why didn't you call him/her for me?' (Sheng, Githiora 2018: 91)

(44) u-ta-**tu-ki**-let-e-a?
SM2SG-FUT-OM1PL-OM7-bring-APPL-FV
'will you bring it for us?' (Sheng, Githiora 2018)

While the system of multiple object markers in Sheng deviates from that found in Swahili, numerous other Bantu languages do allow the co-occurrence of object markers (as described extensively in Marlo (2015)). This is the case in Chaga (spoken in Tanzania) for example where multiple object markers can appear within a single verb form (45).

(45) Chaga (Moshi 1998)
a. Mangí n-á-lé-zrúm-a máná nyámá kilíri-nyí
chief FOC-SM1-PAST-send-FV child meat room-in
'The chief sent the child for (to get) the meat in the room'
b. Mangí n-á-lé-í-kú-ń-zrúm-a
chief FOC-SM1-PAST-OM9-OM16-OM1-send-FV
'The chief sent him there with it.'

However, more relevant for our purposes here perhaps, there are other Bantu languages which are a more common part of the linguistic ecologies in which Sheng has developed. In Gikuyu for example, which has had an influence on Sheng, multiple object markers are also possible. This can be seen in the Gikuyu example in (46) which hosts both the class 1 object marker *mũ* and the first person singular object marker *nj*.

(46) Mũ-nj-ĩĩ-r-e
OM1-OM1^{sg}-call-APPL-FV
'Call him/her for me' (Gikuyu, Githiora 2018: 91)

Although multiple object markers are not possible in Standard Swahili, the presence of multiple object markers in the broader contact languages for Sheng leads us to analyse this feature as the result of language contact. Bantu languages vary in relation to the possibility of allowing multiple object markers to co-occur or for object marking to be limited to only a single marker. If we take Sheng to be a Swahili-based variety, then this feature can be considered as the result of contact with Bantu languages which allow multiple object markers. The result is an increased morphosyntactic similarity between Sheng and other Bantu languages of the region, in contrast to Swahili.

5.3 Summary of features of Sheng in the verbal domain

In this section we have examined a number of features in the verbal domain. We considered the presence of the habitual suffix *-a(ng)a* to constitute a clear case language contact, with the presence in Sheng whilst in Standard Swahili it is not found, reflective of contact with Bantu languages in the area which have this marker. In this respect then, Sheng is more similar to other Bantu languages in exhibiting this form which has also been reconstructed for Proto-

This is the accepted version of a paper to appear in *Studies in Language*. Please refer to the published version for citation purposes.

Bantu but which has been lost in Swahili. The presence of the stem *ku-* in the verb form in Sheng in instances where it would not be found in Swahili is also analysed as the result of language contact with the syntactic conditioning triggering the presences/absence of the marker *ku-* eroded in this variety. This can be considered either to be the result of transfer from other Bantu languages in which the stem *ku-* is consistently present or the influence of second language speakers of Swahili who generalise over such patterns of ‘variation’ and irregularity in the target language.

The presence of multiple object markers in a single verb form (possible in Sheng but prohibited in Swahili) is also taken to be reflective of language contact with many Bantu languages of East African allowing multiple object markers.

Domain	Feature	Change type
TAM	New TAM distinctions	Independent innovation
TAM	Presence of the habitual suffix <i>-a(ng)a</i>	Contact
Verbal template	Presence of <i>ku-</i> stem throughout	Contact
Co-occurrence of multiple object markers	Co-occurrence of multiple object markers	Contact

Table 2: Account of Sheng features in the verbal domain

6. Further features of Sheng

A number of studies have noted that despite variation in some areas, the structure (and syntax) of many urban youth languages is predominantly that of the main language on which they are based. This has been observed for urban youth varieties such as Sepitori in South Africa of which Distsele and Mann (2014:160) say ‘Consistent with being a mixed language, Sepitori’s syntax is the same as that of Setswana and Sepedi’. Similarly, Githiora (2002:174, 2018) notes that the grammatical structure of Sheng is ‘really that of mainstream Swahili’. Similarly, while there are claims that Sheng may represent a reduction or simplification of sorts (ref), this does not seem to be the case. Githiora (2002: 173) notes:

“One may expect a reduced, pidginized variety to adhere less to canonical forms of its substrate but Sheng samples do not reveal any such reduction of grammatical form. In fact, many of them are as complex and used in the same ways as in Standard Swahili.”

Despite drawing heavily on the grammar of Swahili as its source language, there are features of the clausal syntax of Sheng which certainly differ from standard varieties of Swahili. In the current section we examine a number of additional features, namely negation, plural address marking, relative clause formation, copula constructions and post-verbal locative clitics.

6.1 Negation

In the domain of negation, the strategies for negation employed are those found more widely in Swahili. In example (47), the negative marker *si-* appears after the class 1 subject marker *a-* as is standard for a negative subjunctive construction (Ashton 1947). Similarly, in example (48), the negative non-inflecting copula *si* is the strategy used for negative predication in Swahili. What makes these examples of negation from Sheng stand out therefore is the use of

This is the accepted version of a paper to appear in *Studies in Language*. Please refer to the published version for citation purposes.

English words (the verb ‘contract’ and the noun ‘genius’ in the examples). However, the strategy employs entirely Swahili negative morphology, with the influence from English representing only a borrowing of lexical material.

(47) A-si-contract.
1-NEG-contract-(FVØ)
‘So that she doesn’t contract [HIV].’ (Sheng, Beck 2015: 59)

(48) Mie si genius.
1SG.PRON.POSS NEG.ID.COP 9.genius
‘I am no genius.’ (Sheng, Beck 2015: 59)

The negation strategies shown here therefore show that in some regards Sheng morphosyntax is the same as that of Standard Swahili, albeit drawing on lexical sources from other languages – in this case English.

6.2 Plural addressee marking

In Swahili the suffix *-ni* is used in the formation of plural imperatives. The use of a specific morphological marker to indicate a plural subjunctive form is relatively widespread across Bantu languages (Devos and Van Olmen 2013). In Sheng however, this plural suffix is also used to convey plural addresses in non-imperative contexts. This can be seen in its use with the greetings *hambjamboni?* ‘How are you (pl)?’ (49) which contrasts with the Swahili form *hamjambo?*.⁶ The addition of the plural addressee suffix *-ni* onto the English expression ‘How are you’ also results in the form *hawayuni?*.

(49) Ha-m-jambo-ni?
NEG-2PL-matter-PL.ADDRS
‘How are you (pl.)?, Are you well?’ (Sheng, Githiora 2018: 86)

6.3 Relative clauses

Relative clause constructions are an area in which innovation can be observed in Sheng. While Standard Swahili has been described as having three structural types of relative clauses (Schadeberg 1989), work on Sheng by Shinagawa (2019) notes the existence of five strategies for the formation of relative clauses: null marking, Relative Marker-Verb, Verb-Relative Marker, demonstrative and the use of *-enye* as a relative pronoun. While the two relative marker strategies (RM-Verb and Verb-RM) are present in both Standard Swahili and Sheng, the other three strategies are not present in Standard Swahili.

The use of a zero marked relative clause and the demonstrative strategy have also both been described for Kenyan Colloquial Swahili (Myers-Scotton 1979, Shinagawa 2019). In example (50) there is no overt relative clause marker (contrast the KCS example in (50a) with the Standard Swahili example in (50b).

(50) a. Ha-m-ku-i-pata na ni-li-ku-elez-a mahali
 NEG-SM2PL-PST-OM9-get-FV and SM1SG-PST-OM2SG-explain-FV place
 m-ta-ipata

⁶ This is also similar to the construction found in the South African language Zulu where the Colloquial Zulu greeting *Sanibonani* ‘Hello, good day...’ is used with plural addressees.

This is the accepted version of a paper to appear in *Studies in Language*. Please refer to the published version for citation purposes.

SM2pl-FUT-OM9-get-FV

- b. Ha-m-ku-i-pata na ni-li-ku-elez-a mahali
 NEG-SM2PL-PST-OM9-get-FV and SM1SG-PST-OM2SG-explain-FV place
 mtakipoweza ku-i-pat-a
 SM2pl-FUT.REL-16OM-able-FV INF-OM9-get-FV
 ‘You didn’t get it and I told you the place where you will get it’ (Swahili, Myers-
 Scotton 1979: 120)

Example (51) shows the use of a demonstrative for the formation of a relative clause. The use of a demonstrative in the formation of a relative clause is a widespread mechanism across Bantu but again, is not found in Standard Swahili.

- (51) Lete ni-on-e i-le ki-tabu u-li-sem-a
 bring-IMP SM1sg-see-SBJV 9-DEM 7-book SM2sg-PST-FV
 ‘Bring the book you talked about, so that I can see (it)’ (Swahili, Myers-Scotton 1979: 120)

These forms already show that there is variation in different forms of Swahili in terms of relative clause structures.

Sheng exhibits a relative clause construction which employs the form *-enye*. The form *-enye* is found in Standard Swahili, where it functions as an adnominal possessive stem and conveys the meaning ‘having’. This can be seen in the example in (52) where it is used to convey the meaning of having a higher age. Similarly, the lexical items provided in (53) show the use of *-enye* as part of a nominal compound.

- (52) Swahili
 M-tu **mw-enye** umri mkubwa
 1-person 1-having 9.age 9.big
 ‘The/a person having a large age’

- (53) a. mw-enye-ki-ti
 1-having-7-chair
 ‘chairperson’

- b. mw-enye-duka
 1-having-5.shop
 ‘shop-owner’

Whilst *-enye* has its origins in Swahili, it is used in Sheng in the formation of a relative clause, as shown in (52). This not only differs from its use in Swahili (cf. (52) and (53) above) but also reflects a deviation from the more typical relative clause found in Swahili. In Swahili, relative clauses are constructed through either use of an infix relative marker showing concord with the relevant noun class (54a), the agreeing relative clause marker *amba-* (54b) or with the relative marker appearing as an enclitic on the verb form (54c).

- (54) Swahili
 a. M-tu a-li-ye-kuj-a jana
 1.person SM1-PAST-REL1-come-FV yesterday
 ‘The person who came yesterday...’

This is the accepted version of a paper to appear in *Studies in Language*. Please refer to the published version for citation purposes.

- b. Mtu amba-ye a-li-kuj-a jana
 1.person REL-REL1 SM1-PAST- come-FV yesterday
 ‘The person who came yesterday...’
- c. Mtu a-kuja-ye jana
 1.person SM1-come-REL1 yesterday
 ‘The person who came yesterday...’

However, in Sheng an inflected form of *-enye* can be used in the formation of the relative clause as can be seen in the examples below where *-enye* introduces the relative clause. In the data we have showing this construction type *-enye* is marked either with the class 1 prefix *m-*, the class 2 prefix *wa-* or the class 8 prefix *v-* which is also widely used in Swahili to convey manner. However, there is no reason to think that agreement is only limited to these classes and further data would be needed to examine the frequency of the different classes.

- (55) Mtu **mw-enye** a-li-kuj-a jana
 1.person 1-REL SM1-PAST-come-FV yesterday
 ‘The person who came yesterday’ (Sheng, Githiora 2015)
- (56) **W-enye** wa-na-ku-hand-a
 2-REL SM2-PROG-OM2ndsg-rob-FV
 ‘Those who rob you’ (Sheng, Githiora 2018: 122)
- (57) Ni **v-enye** hawa ma-karao hu-mad-anga ma-jamaa huku
 COP 8-REL 2.DEM 6-cops HAB-murder-HAB 6-guy 17.DEM
 ‘It’s how these cops kill guys around here’ (Sheng, Githiora 2018: 114)
- (58) Lakini **w-enye** wa-na-ku-hand-a si w-a hapo...
 But 2-REL SM2-PROG-OM2SG-rob-FV NEG 2-of 16.DEM
 ‘But the ones who rob you are not from here’ (Sheng, Githiora 2018: 120)
- (59) Lipa **ch-enye** u-na-like pekee
 Pay 7-REL SM2SG-PROG-like only
 ‘Just pay for what you like’

The use of *enye* as a relative marker in Sheng therefore represents innovation in morphosyntactic marking, albeit drawing on the lexical material already available in Swahili.

In terms of clausal syntax, we also see other features which cause Sheng to differ from Swahili but which are found in other East African Bantu languages. In example (60) below the verb *-endelea* ‘continue’ appears with the infinitival prefix *ku-* in standard Swahili (60a), while in Sheng it is used without (60b). Variation in the use and marking of infinitival complements often occur in the context of grammaticalization of modal and auxiliary verbs and is also a relatively widespread feature across Bantu (cf. Gibson 2012, Botne 2004).

- (60) a. ...wa-toto w-etu hawa-wezi **ku-endelea** bila wa-limu
 2-children 2-our NEG.SM2-able-FV INF-continue-FV without 2-teachers
- b. ...watoto we-tu hawa-wezi ende-le-a bila wa-limu
 2-children 2-our NEG.SM2-able-FV continue-FV without 2-teachers

This is the accepted version of a paper to appear in *Studies in Language*. Please refer to the published version for citation purposes.

‘...our children cannot continue without teachers’ (Sheng, Githiora 2018: 128)⁷

6.4 Copula constructions

The copula ending with *-ko* as found in the examples below represents an independent development in Sheng.

(61) U-u dem a-ko na ma-chali wa-sita.
DEM1-1 girl SM1-LOC.COP CONN 6-boy/lover 2-six
‘The girl has six lovers.’ (Sheng, Beck 2015: 61)

(62) A-ko wera
SM1-LOC work
‘She is at work’ (Sheng, Githiora 2018: 95)

(63) Yu-ko kazi-ni
SM1-LOC work-LOC
‘She is at work’ (Swahili)

These examples show the locative copula *-ko* hosting the 3rd person singular subject concord *a-* in (59) and (60). This is a different pattern from that found in Standard Swahili, where the pronominal concord is *yu-*, resulting in *yuko* (63). The form *ako* is shown in (61) and (62) where in (61) *ako* combines with the conjunction *na* to encode ‘have’, while in (62) *ako* is used to encode a location.

Shinagawa (2007: 160) interprets the existence of forms such as *ako* as an indicator of the simplification of concords. The suggestion is that the noun class distinctions are neutralised and the agreement *a-* is used with nouns from a range of different noun classes. This contrasts with the situation in Standard Swahili, where speech act participants have different agreement for first and second person and varying according to singular or plural nouns. However, examples (64) and (61) seem to suggest that there is also variation in Sheng with both the *ako* and *yuko* forms accepted.

(64) a. A-ko kolee.
SM1-LOC.COP 9.college
‘She is at college’
b. Yu-ko kolee.
3SG-LOC.COP 9.college
‘She is at college.’ (Sheng Beck 2015: 61)

This is perhaps to be expected given what can be presumed to be differing levels of interaction and interference from Swahili and also the availability of different (comprehensible forms) amongst speakers.

⁷ Original text is from *The Nairobiian* 5-11 July 2013.

This is the accepted version of a paper to appear in *Studies in Language*. Please refer to the published version for citation purposes.

6.5 Post-verbal locative enclitics

A feature which is present in Swahili but seems to show variation in function and meaning in Sheng is the use of the post-verbal locative enclitic *-ko*, already seen in the formation of the locative copula in the preceding section. While the locative classes 16, 17 and 18 can be encoded through an enclitic on the verb in Swahili, the widespread use of this strategy for locative marking in Sheng does seem to represent variation in this regard. Consider the construction shown in (65) below, where the locative enclitic is added to the verb *-kwenda*.

- (65) Tu-na-kwenda-ko hóm
SM1pl-PROG-go-LOC home
'We are going home' (Sheng, Githiora 2018: 92)

A possible analysis of this example is that a locative noun such as 'home' (*nyumbani* in Swahili) would host the locative suffix *-ni* in the comparable structure in Standard Swahili yielding *tunakwenda nyumbani* 'We are going home'. Since the locative noun in this example is *hóm*, a borrowing from English, this noun is not available for locative marking and so the locative enclitic *-ko* is added to the verb instead. Thus, although the structure found in (65) does not deviate from what is found in Swahili, in the Sheng construction the use of this locative enclitic is the only way to indicate (or emphasise) the locative noun since the borrowed nominal is not available for locative marking.

Similarly in example (66), the Sheng example employs the locative enclitic *-ko*. While Standard Swahili does employ locative enclitics the interpretation here suggests that this is functioning as 'substitutive applicative' (cf. Marten and Kula 2014 for Bemba). In such constructions, the applicative is used alongside a locative enclitic to encode a meaning along the lines of 'instead of, in your place'. Therefore, on interpretation of the utterance in (66) would be that the hearer gives the speaker twenty shillings to look after their car 'instead of them'.

- (66) Si u-ni-p-e twenty bob ni-ku-angali-li-e-ko
Neg SM2sg-OM1sg-give-SBJV twenty bob SM1sg-OM2sg-look-APPL-SBJV-LOC
hiyo gari
DEM.9 9.car
'Why don't you give me twenty shillings I look after that car?' (Sheng, Githiora 2018: 92)

These structures appear to function in much the same way as in Standard Swahili, but results in a function not found in there. One difference worth noting here however is the presence of the locative suffix *-ko* at the end of the verb form. It is also noteworthy here that many speakers would associate the constructions presented in (65) and (66) with Luyha-speakers. While we have not been able to check this systematically, even this as a perception is instructive for our purposes as it shows awareness of internal variation in Sheng and moreover, variation in terms of the speaker's first language further supporting our analysis of this construction as the result of language contact.

6.6 Summary of further features of Sheng morphosyntax

In this section, we examined a range of further features of Sheng morphosyntax. In terms of negation and the distribution of verbal extensions, the structures in Sheng examined here closely mirror those found in Swahili. However, we consider it useful to include here since it is informative to see areas in which Sheng and Swahili are similar, as well as those in which

This is the accepted version of a paper to appear in *Studies in Language*. Please refer to the published version for citation purposes.

they differ. We consider the use of the plural suffix *-(e)ni* an example either of an independent innovation or the result of language contact since the use of a plural address marker in non-imperative contexts is found in other Bantu languages, although the example we present here is from Zulu which is not a contact language for Sheng. We examined the use of *-enye* to form a relative clause which we analysed as an independent innovation. Similarly, the use of the class 1 subject agreement *a-* on the inflecting copula form *-ko* (which in Standard Swahili appears as *yu-* rather than *a-*) is also considered to represent an instance of independent innovation. However, this might also be reflective of language contact with additional language speakers of Swahili perhaps extending the class 1 subject agreement also to the copula clause context rather than maintain a distinct paradigm for the inflecting copula. The use of the locative enclitic *-ko* is seen as the result of contact with other Bantu languages which employ the post-verbal locative enclitic.

Domain	Feature	Type of change
Negation	Morphological negation marker <i>si</i>	No apparent change
Plural addressee marking	Plural suffix <i>-(e)ni</i> used in non-imperative contexts	Independent innovation/contact
Relative clauses	The use of <i>-enye</i> to form a relative clause	Independent innovation
Copula constructions	Inflecting copular <i>-ko</i> 3 rd person singular inflected copula form <i>ako</i>	Independent innovation/contact
Post-verbal locative clitics	Prevalence of the locative enclitic <i>-ko</i>	Contact

Table 3: Features of Sheng clausal syntax

7. Summary and conclusions

The aim of this paper has been to examine features of the morphosyntax of Sheng with a view to better understanding the structural properties underlying this variety. We have also adopted the notions of centripetal and centrifugal convergence to better understand the features found in Sheng and the processes of change that may have given rise to these features. While Sheng, and urban youth languages in general, is generally thought to exhibit radically different structures and forms than its main source language Swahili, in this paper we have shown that in fact Sheng is more conservative than is perhaps usually thought to be the case. While urban youth languages are often thought of as drivers of change and innovation, we have argued here that while this might be true of lexical material, in terms of morphosyntax Sheng is a ‘well-behaved’ Bantu language – or stylect of Swahili – which either follows the broader morphosyntax of Swahili or presents instances of innovation well attested from a comparative Bantu perspective. In many of the instances in which Sheng can be seen to deviate from the structures or forms found in Swahili, it has in fact moved ‘closer to’ the syntax of other Bantu languages with which Sheng is in contact, reflecting its speakers’ multilingual repertoires and the multilingual realities of the broader speech communities who use Sheng.

This study has further supported the observation by Githiora (2018) that Sheng is not that of some ‘pidginised’ or ‘simplified’ version of Swahili which simply varies (and ‘deviates’) from the grammar of the Standard language in an ad hoc way. Rather the changes in terms of grammar are systematic changes reflective of broader variation across Bantu and more specifically the Bantu languages with which its speakers are in contact. The examples explored here therefore represent consistent examples of centrifugal convergence where, in instances in

This is the accepted version of a paper to appear in *Studies in Language*. Please refer to the published version for citation purposes.

which Sheng varies from Swahili, it converges towards other Bantu languages. A good example of this is that multiple object markers are not permitted in Swahili but are acceptable in Sheng, as they are in numerous other Bantu languages, albeit with a range of different restrictions and variation attested (see e.g., Kula and Marten 2012, Marlo 2015). In other instances, the changes we see in Sheng which cannot be identified in neighbouring or contact languages are still reflective of and only in line with universal constraints and tendencies as are observed in relation to language change. That is not to say however that there is no innovation in Sheng. There are some innovations found in the language, as would be expected and as is in line with the observations about African urban youth languages more widely. However, in the domain of syntax and morphosyntax more broadly, this innovation seems to be less great than is often assumed.

In terms of directions for future research, in this this paper we focused primarily on ways in which the variation between Sheng and Swahili can be attributed to contact and prevalence of other languages in the area. However, given the multilingual language ecology and the presence of non-Bantu language in the area. Another avenue to explore would be to look at the impact that non-Bantu languages have had on the grammar of Sheng. It would also be interesting to better understand the ways in which Sheng-speakers report on these features and to what extent different features are considered indexical (or not) of Sheng. Similarly, it would be good to get a better understanding of these features in light of the broader linguistic continuum of Kenyan Swahili, Sheng and Standard Swahili. While here we have in most instances compared features of Sheng to Standard Swahili, another important reference point for Sheng would be Kenyan Swahili. Again, these would be avenues to explore further in future research, alongside a comparable examination of Lugha ya Mtaani – the Tanzanian ‘counterpart’ to Sheng which could then also be compared with Standard Swahili which is more widespread and prevalent in Tanzania.

However, given these limitations and the caveats outlined at the start, the present study has provided insights into an often-underexplored element of the (morpho)syntax of a key African urban youth language, as well as processes of contact-induced change more broadly.

Abbreviations

Abbreviations follow the Leipzig Glossing Rules with the following additions: 1, 2, 3 = noun classes, CXP = counterexpectational, FV = final vowel, OM = object marker, SM = subject marker.

Acknowledgements

Earlier versions of this paper were presented at the Conference on African Urban Youth Languages held at Kenyatta University (Kenya) in 2015, Baraza Swahili studies conference held at SOAS University of London (UK) in 2016, the African Studies Association UK meeting at the University of Birmingham (UK) in 2018 and the British Association of Applied Linguistics conference hosted by Northumbria University as part of a session organised by the BAAL Africa Special Interest Group in 2021. We are grateful to the audiences and organisers of these various forums for their comments, questions and feedback. Parts of the research reported on here were supported by a Leverhulme Research Project Grant for the project ‘Morphosyntactic variation in Bantu: contact and change’ (RPG-2014-208) and ‘Grammatical variation in Swahili: contact, change and identity’ (RPG-2021-248). We are grateful to the funders for their generous support. We are also grateful to the anonymous reviewers and the editor of *Studies in Language* for their comments and input on

Commented [A1]: Feel free to add any other acknowledgements needed.

This is the accepted version of a paper to appear in *Studies in Language*. Please refer to the published version for citation purposes.

the paper which have served to make it stronger overall. Any errors naturally remain our own.

References

- Abe, Yuko. 2009. The use of -ag- in colloquial Swahili in Tanzania: Report of a preliminary survey conducted in 2008. In Yuji Kawaguchi, Makoto Minegishi and Jacques Durand (eds.), *Corpus analysis and variation in linguistics*, 299–313. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Abdulaziz, Mohamed H. and Ken Osinde. 1997. 'Sheng and Engsh: development of mixed codes among the urban youth in Kenya'. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*. 125. 43–63.
- Ashton, Ethel Ormerod. 1944. *Swahili Grammar (Including Intonation)*, London: Longmans.
- Barasa and Mous 2017. 'Engsh, a Kenyan middle class youth language parallel to Sheng'. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 32(1) 48–74.
- Beck, Rose Marie. 2015. 'Sheng: an urban variety of Swahili in Kenya'. In: *Youth Language Practices in Africa and Beyond*. Editors: Nassenstein, Nico and Andrea Hollington, De Gruyter Mouton. 51-79.
- Beck, Rose Marie. 2010. Urban Languages in Africa. *Africa Spectrum* 45(3): 11–41.
- Bembe MP, Beukes A-M. 2007. The use of slang by black youth in Gauteng. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies* 25(4): 463–472.
- Bleek, Wilhelm Heinrich Immanuel. 1862/9. *A comparative grammar of South African languages: Part I: Phonology*. London: Trübner.
- Bosire, Mokaya. 2006. Hybrid languages: the case of Sheng. In: Selected Proceedings of the 36th Annual Conference on African Linguistics. Editors: Arasanyin, Olaoba F. and Pemberton, Michael A., Cascadilla Proceedings Project, 185-193.
- Bosire, B. Mokaya. 2008. Sheng: The phonology, morphology and social profile of an urban vernacular. New York: University at Albany/State University of New York dissertation.
- Bosire, Mokaya. 2015. 'Sheng – what youth languages tell us about language change' Paper presented at African Urban Youth Languages conference, Kenyatta University, Nairobi Kenya 11-13 Decmeber 2015.
- Botne, Robert. 2004. 'Specificity in Lusaamia infinitives.' *Studies in Language*. 28(1): 137–164.
- Caragarajah, Suresh. 2011. Translanguaging in the classroom: Emerging issues for research and pedagogy. *Applied Linguistics Review* 2: 1–28.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110239331.1>
- Childs, G. T. 1997. The status of Iscamtho, an Nguni-based urban variety of Soweto. In: Spears A. K. and Winford D. (eds.), *The structure and status of pidgins and creoles*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. pp 341–367.
- Chimerah, Rocha 1998. *Kiswahili: past, present and future horizons*. Nairobi: Nairobi University Press.
- De Rooij, Vincent. 1995. *Shaba Swahili*. In: Arends, Jacques, Pieter Muysken and Norval Smith (eds.) *Pidgins and Creoles: An Introduction*. 179–190. Amsterdam, John Benjamins.
- Devos, Maud and Daniël Van Olmen. 'Describing and explaining the variation in Bantu imperatives and prohibitives'. *Studies in Lanugage* 37 (1). 1–57. DOI 10.1075/sl.37.1.01dev
- Dumestre, Gérard. 1985. L'argot Bambara: une première approche. *Mandenkan*. 10. 49-61.
- Edelsten, Peter and Chiku Lijongwa. 2010. *A grammatical sketch of Chindamba, a Bantu language (G52) of Tanzania*. Rüdiger Köppe.
- Ferrari, Aurélia. 2004. Le sheng: expansion et vernacularisation d'une variété urbaine hybride à Nairobi. In Akinlabi, A. M. and O. Adesola (eds.), *Proceedings of the 4th World*

This is the accepted version of a paper to appear in *Studies in Language*. Please refer to the published version for citation purposes.

- Congress of African Linguistics, New Brunswick 2003, 479-495. Cologne: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.
- Ferrari, Aurélia. 2009. *Emergence de langues urbaines en Afrique: Le cas du Sheng, langue mixte parlée à Nairobi*. Paris: INALCO dissertation.
- García, Ofelia and Li Wei. 2014. *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gibson, Hannah. 2012. *Auxiliary placement in Rangi: A Dynamic Syntax perspective*. PhD dissertation. SOAS University of London.
- Gibson, Hannah, Gastor Mapunda, Lutz Marten, Sheena Shah and Julius Taji. 2020. 'Variation in double object marking in Swahili' In: Nico Nassenstein and Daisuke Shinagawa (eds.) *Swahili Forum*. Special Issue on Variation in Swahili. 142–165
- Gibson, Hannah, Guérois, Rozenn. and Marten, Lutz. 2017. 'Patterns and developments in the marking of diminutives in Bantu'. *Nordic Journal of African Studies*. 26 (4), 344–383.
- Gibson, Hannah and Lutz Marten. 2018. 'Morphosyntactic retention and change: Insights from African urban youth languages'. Talk presented at the African Studies Association of the UK Biennial Meeting, University of Birmingham, 11-14 September 2018.
- Gibson, H. and Marten, L. 2019. Probing the interaction of language contact and internal innovation: four case studies of morphosyntactic change in Rangi. *Studies In African Linguistics* 48: 63-92
- Githiora, Chege. 2018. *Sheng: Rise of a Kenyan Swahili Vernacular*. London: James Currey.
- Githiora, Chege. 2002. 'Sheng: Peer language, Swahili dialect or emerging creole?' *Journal of African Cultural Studies* 15(2): 159-181.
- Githinji, Peter. 2006. 'Bazes and Their Shibboleths: Lexical Variation and Sheng speakers' Identity in Nairobi', *Nordic Journal of African Studies* 15, 4: 443-472.
- Goyvaerts, Didier L. 1988. Indoubil: A Swahili hybrid in Bukavu (with comments on Indu Bill by K. Kabongo-Mianda). *Language in Society*. 17 (2). 231-242.
- Gunnink, Hilde. 2014. 'The grammatical structure of Sowetan tsotsitaal'. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*. 32 (2). 161–171.
- Guthrie, Malcolm. 1962. Bantu origins: A tentative new hypothesis. *Journal of African Languages* 1: 9-21
- Halliday, M. A. K. 1976. 'Anti-Languages'. *American Anthropologist* 79: 570–584.
- Hurst, Ellen. 2008. *Style, Structure and Function in Cape Town Tsotsitaal*. PhD, University of Cape Town.
- Hurst Ellen and Rajend Mesthrie. 2013. 'When you hang out with the guys they keep you in style': The case for considering style in descriptions of South African tsotsitaals. *Language Matters: Studies in the languages of Africa* 44(1): 3–20.
- Hurst Ellen. 2009. Tsotsitaal, global culture and local style: identity and recontextualisation in twenty-first century South African townships. *Social Dynamics* 35(2): 244–257.
- Hurst-Harosh, Ellen. 2019. Tsotsitaal and decoloniality. *African Studies* 78(1): 112-125.
- Hurst-Harosh, Ellen. 2020. *Tsotsitaal in South Africa. Style and Metaphor in Youth Language Practices*. Rüdiger Köppe.
- Jerro, Kyle. 2018. Linguistic complexity: A case study from Swahili. *The Selected Proceedings of the 45th Annual Conference on African Linguistics: African Linguistics on the Prairie*. Jason Kandybowicz, Travis Major, and Harold Torrence (eds). Berlin: Language Science Press. 3-20.
- Kanana Erastus, Fridah and H. Kebeya. 2018. Functions of Urban and Youth Language in the New Media: The Case of Sheng in Kenya. In Ellen Hurst-Harosh and Fridah Kanana Erastus (eds.). *African Youth Languages: New Media, Performing Arts and Sociolinguistic Development* Palgrave Macmillan: UK.PP 15-52.
- Kanana, Erastus, Fridah. and A. C. Nyong'a, A. (2019). Lexical restructuring processes in

This is the accepted version of a paper to appear in *Studies in Language*. Please refer to the published version for citation purposes.

- Sheng among the *Matatu* crew in Nakuru, Kenya. *South African Journal of Languages and Linguistics (SAJAL)*, 39(1), 42-55
- Kanana Erastus, Fridah and Hurst-Harosh, Ellen (2019). Rural and Urban Metaphors in Sheng (Kenya) and Tsotsitaal (South Africa). In Joseph Schmied and Taiwo Oloruntoba-Oju (eds.). *African Urban Youth Languages: The Rural-Urban Divide* (REAL Studies 11). Gottingen: Cuvillier Verlag. Pp 35-51
- Kiango, John G. 2013. Swahilization of the Coastal Bantu Languages: The Case of the Bondei Language. *Bantu Languages and Linguistics: Papers in Memory of Dr Rugatiri D. K. Mekacha*, ed. by Karsten Legère. Bayreuth: Bayreuth African Studies Series. pp. 199–208.
- Kießling, Roland and Maarten Mous. 2004. Urban youth languages in Africa. *Anthropological Linguistics* 46(3): 303-341.
- Kihore, Yared Magori, David Phineas Bhukanda Massamba and Y.P. Msanjila. 2001. *Sarufi Maumboya Kiswahili Sanifu (SAMAKISA). Sekondari na Vyuo* [Grammar and Morphology of Swahili. Secondary Schools and University]. Dar es Salaam: Taasisi ya Uchunguziwa Kiswahili, Chuo Kikuu cha Dar es Salaam.
- King'ei, Kitual Geoffrey. 2000. Problems of Acceptability of Standard Swahili Forms by Non-Kiunguja Native Kiswahili speakers. In: K. Kahigi, Y. Kihore and M. Mous (eds.), *Lugha za Tanzania. Languages of Tanzania*, pp. 81–88. CNWS Publications, Universiteit Leiden.
- Kula, Nancy and Lutz Marten. 2012. 'Object marking and morphosyntactic variation in Bantu'. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*. 30 (2). 237–253.
- Lüpke, Friederike and Anne Storch. 2013. *Repertoires and Choices in African Languages*. De Gruyter Mouton.
- Maganga, Clement and Thilo C. Schadeberg. 1992. 'Kinyamwezi: grammar, texts, vocabulary. *East African Languages and Dialects 1*.
- Maho Jouni. 1999. A comparative study of Bantu noun classes. Goteborg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis.
- Marlo, Michael. 2015. 'On the number of object markers in Bantu languages'. *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics*. 36 (1). 1-65.
- Marten, Lutz. 1998. Swahili *-kwisha*: sketching the path of grammaticalization. *SOAS Working Papers in Linguistics and Phonetics* 8, 141-163.
- Marten, Lutz. 2013. Linguistic variation, language contact and new comparative Bantu. Inaugural lecture SOAS University of London 18th April 2013.
- Massamba, David. (2000) Ci-Ruri verbal inflection. In Kulikoyela Kahigi, Yared Kihore and Maarten Mous (eds.), *Lugha za Tanzania – Languages of Tanzania*. Leiden: CNWS, 111-126.
- Mazrui, Alamin and Ali Al'Amin Mazrui. 1995. *Swahili the Political Economy of an African Language*. Nairobi: EAP.
- Mazrui, Alamin M. 1995. 'Slang and codeswitching: the case of Sheng in Kenya'. AAP. 42. 168-179.
- Mbaabu, I. and K. Nzuga. 2003. *Sheng-English Dictionary: Deciphering East Africa's Underworld Language*, TUKI, Dar es Salaam
- Meeussen, Achilles E. 1967. Bantu Grammatical Reconstructions. *Africana Linguistica* 3: 79–121.
- Meinhof, Carl. 1910. *Grundriss einer Lautlehre der Bantusprachen, nebst Anleitung zur Aufnahme von Bantusprachen*. Berlin: Verlag von Dietrich Reimer.
- Möhlig, W. J. G. 1981. Stratification in the history of the Bantu languages. *Sprache und Geschichte in Afrika* 3: 251-316.
- Mugane, John. 2015. *The Story of Swahili*. Ohio University Press. Athens.

This is the accepted version of a paper to appear in *Studies in Language*. Please refer to the published version for citation purposes.

- Myers-Scotton, Carol. 1979. 'The context is the message: Morphological, syntactic and semantic reduction and deletion in Nairobi and Kampala varieties of Swahili' *Readings in Creole studies*. 2. (1979).
- Myers-Scotton, Carol. 1993. *Social Motivations for Code switching: Evidence from Africa*. Oxford: Clarendon Press
- Namyalo, Saudah. 2015. Linguistic Strategies in Luyaaye: Word-Play and Conscious Language Manipulation. *Youth Language Practices in Africa and Beyond*, ed. by Nico Nassenstein and Andrea Hollington. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. pp. 313–344.
- Nassenstein, Nico. 2015. *Kisangani Swahili. Choices and Variation in a Multilingual Urban Space*. LINCOM.
- Nassenstein, Nico and Paulin Baraka Bose. 2020. Morphological features of Kiswahili youth language(s): Evidence from Dar es Salaam, Goma, Lubumbashi and Nairobi <https://doi.org/10.1515/lingvan-2019-0034>
- Nassenstein, Nico and Andrea Hollington (eds.). 2015. *Youth language practices in Africa and beyond*. Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton.
- Nurse, Derek. 2008. *Tense and aspect in Bantu*. Oxford University Press: Oxford.
- Nurse, Derek and Thomas J. Hinnebusch. 1993. *Swahili and Sabaki. A linguistic history*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London. University of California Press.
- Ogechi, Nathan Oyori. 2005. Trilingual codeswitching in Kenya – Evidence from Ekegusii, Kiswahili, English and Sheng. Hamburg: Universität Hamburg dissertation.
- Ogechi, Nathan. 2005. On lexicalization in Sheng. *Nordic Journal of African Studies* 14(3):334–355.
- Reuster-Jahn, Uta and Roland Kießling. 2006. *Lugha ya Mitaani in Tanzania. The Poetics and Sociology of a Young Urban Style of Speaking with a Dictionary Comprising 1100 Words and Phrases*. *Swahili Forum*. 13. 1–200.
- Rugemalira, Josephat. 2007. 'The structure of the Bantu noun phrase' *SOAS Working Papers in Linguistics* Vol 15 (2007): 135-148.
- Rugemalira, Josephat. 2010. 'The ag-TAM marker and the boundary between cliticization and inflection in Bantu'. *Bantu languages: Analyses, description and theory*. 229-237.
- Rudd, Philipp W. 2008. Sheng: The mixed language of Nairobi. Muncie: Ball State University dissertation.
- Samper, David. 2002. *Talking Sheng: The Role of a Hybrid Language in the Construction of Identity and Youth Culture in Nairobi, Kenya*. University of Pennsylvania PhD thesis.
- Sansom, Ridder and Schadeberg Thilo C. 1994. Kiinimacho cha mahali: Kiambishi tamati cha mahali -ni. *Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere* 37: 127-138.
- Schadeberg, Thilo C. 1989. The three relative constructions in Swahili (sanifu). In M.-F. Rombi (ed) *Le swahili et ses limites*. Paris: Editions Recherche sur les Civilisations, 33-40.
- Schadeberg, Thilo C. 1990. Schon – Noch – Nicht – Mehr: Das Unerwartete als grammatische Kategorie im KiSwahili. *Frankfurter Afrikanistische Blätter* 2: 1-15.
- Schadeberg, Thilo C., 1992, *A Sketch of Swahili Morphology*, 3rd edition, Cologne: Köppe.
- Sebasoni, Servilien. 1967. La préfinale du verbe bantou. *Africana Linguistica* 3: 122–135.
- Sesep, N'Sial Bal-Nsien. 1990. *Langage, normes et repertoire en milieu urbain africain: L'indoubill*. Centre International de Recherche en Aménagement Linguistique.
- Shinagawa, Daisuke. 2019. The syntactic distribution of relativizers and the development of -enye relative constructions in Sheng. *Swahili Forum* 26: 122-141.
- Shinagawa, Daisuke. 2007. Notes on the morphosyntactic bias of verbal constituents in Sheng texts. *HERSETEC* 1(1): 153-171.
- Shinagawa, Daisuke. 2006. Particularities of Sheng in written texts. *Sites* 4(1): 119–137.
- Slabbert, Sarah, and Carol Myers-Scotton. 1997. 'The structure of Tsotsitaal and Iscamtho:

This is the accepted version of a paper to appear in *Studies in Language*. Please refer to the published version for citation purposes.

- code switching and in-group identity in South African townships.’ *Linguistics* 35(2): 317-342.
- Spyropoulos, Mary. 1987. ‘Sheng: Some preliminary investigations into a recently emerged Nairobi street language’. *Journal of the Anthropological Society of Oxford*. 18. 125-136.
- Taji, Julius. 2021. Demonstratives in Chiyao: An analysis of their form, distribution and functions. Unpublished manuscript. University of Dar es Salaam.
- Van de Velde, Mark. 2005. The Order of Noun and Demonstrative in Bantu. *Studies in African Comparative Linguistics with special focus on Bantu and Mande*, 425–441
- Van de Velde, Mark and Koen Bostoen (eds.) 2019. *The Bantu Languages*. 2nd edition. Routledge.
- Van der Wal, Jenneke. 2009. *Word order and information structure in Makhuwa-Enahara*. Utrecht: LOT. (PhD dissertation)
- Wairungu, Michael. 2014. “*A Language of Many Hats*”: *The Rise of Sheng and Other Linguistic Styles among Urban Youth in Kenya*. University of Virginia PhD thesis.
- Williams, Cen. 1994. *Arfarniad o Ddulliau Dysgu ac Addysgu yng Nghyd-destun Addysg Uwchradd Ddwyeithog*, [An evaluation of teaching and learning methods in the context of bilingual secondary education. Doctoral thesis, University of Wales, Bangor
- Wilson, Catherina. 2015. ‘Kindoubil: Urban youth languages in Kisangani’. In: *Youth Language Practices in Africa and Beyond*. Editors: Nassenstein, Nico and Hollington, Andrea, De Gruyter Mouton. 293-312.