Noun Structure and Classification in Chagga-Mochi
By

[1] Gambela, Anna, A
St Augustine University of Tanzania

[2] Moses James Olenyo Malande
Kabarak University, Kenya

[3] Kulikoyela Kahigi
University of Dares Salaam, Tanzania
4
Nestroy Ligembe
St Augustine University of Tanzania

Abstract
The paper analyses Chagga-Mochi (language) with a special focus on its Noun structure classification and derivation. This study is anchored on Generative Morphological Theory (GMM). GMM posits a system of explicit rules, which generated an indefinite number of words that obtain in Chagga-Mochi Noun structure and classification. An elaborate descriptive design and Qualitative approach are used to collect adequate data from both primary and secondary sources. The data obtained is presented and analysed using morphological parsing. The study establishes a basic structure of noun, a noun class system under which the noun classes in Chagga-Mochi have been analyzed. The study finds that Chagga-Mochi has 15 noun classes.

Key words: Noun structure, Noun Classification, derivation, Chagga-Mochi and Generative Morphological Theory (GMM)

Noun Structure and Classification in Chagga-Mochi

By

Gambela, Anna, A; Moses James Olenyo Malande, Kulikoyela Kahigi, Nestroy Ligembe

Introduction

Crystal (2008) describes a Noun as a term used in the grammatical classification of words, traditionally defined as the 'name of a person, place or thing', but the vagueness associated with the notions of 'name' and 'thing' (e.g., is beauty a thing?) has led linguistic descriptions to analyse this class in terms of the formal and functional criteria of syntax and morphology. In linguistic terms, then, nouns are items which display certain types of inflection (e.g., of case or number), have a specific distribution (e.g. they may follow prepositions but not, say, modals), and perform a specific syntactic function (e.g. as subject or object of a sentence). Nouns are generally sub classified into common and proper types, and analysed in terms of number, gender, case and count ability. The constructions into which nouns most commonly enter, and of which they are the head word, are generally called noun phrases (NP) or nominal groups. The structure of a noun phrase consists minimally of the noun (or noun substitute, such as a pronoun); the constructions preceding and following the noun.

Noun exhibits a definite syntactic distribution. Nouns often appear after determiners such as the, those, these, (e.g., these peanuts) and can appear after adjectives (the big peanut). Nouns can also follow prepositions (in school). All of these conditions can happen together: in the big gymnasium). Nouns can appear as the subject of the sentence.

Noun Independence, which is an element of nouns, can be created from noun phrases using a number of ways. According to Mtallo (2015), there are three ways through which these elements can be made independent. Among these ways includes affixation. Mtallo (2015), argue that morphological properties such as syntactic behavior, affixation and semantic features are used in creating noun independence (in Noun phrases).

According to Joseph (2017), the main source of morphology is material that is already in existence in the language through the of processes of resegmentation and reinterpretation applied in a multiplicity of ways as well as by other processes of alteration such as sound changes that lead to grammaticalisation. In addition, morphology may move into a language through various forms of language contact (Oz, 2004). Thus, it is possible to find changes in the system taken by various types of inflectional morphology, such as marking for person, number, gender, agreement, case and the like, as well as the addition or loss or other alteration of such categories and the forms that express them; in the derivational processes by which stems are formed and modified, and in the degree of productivity shown by these processes; in the morphological rank (compound member, clitic, affix, etc.) of particular elements; in the overt or covert associations among morphological elements, and more generally, in the number and nature of the entries for morphemes and words in the lexicon (Rugemarila, 2005).

According to Robinson (2016), the noun morphology of most Bantu languages is composed of similar processes which are used to form nouns. Robinson argues that in Nyakyusa language, nouns are formed through the normal morphological processes which are used to form nouns in other word classes. These processes include affixation, compounding, etc.

Malande (2006, 2011, 2018, 2020a) in his studies on Luloogoli (a bantu language), Saho (a Cushitic language) and KPP Mixed code political names observes that Generative morphological processes form a noun (read name) on which semantics confers meaning thus realizing an interplay between morphology and semantics in noun ((read name) formation. Malande (2006, 2018, 2010) strongly argues that you can't divorce semantics from morphology when analysing the Bantu affix. Malande finds Luloogoli (Bantu) name-noun formation is hugely morphosemantic. (Malande 2006) observes that Personal names are proper nouns thus inviting Generative morphology in the analysis of Luloogoli Nouns (Malande (2006, 2010). Malande identifies prefixes, suffixes and multiple affixes arguing that most of the luloogoli personal names are derived from verbs, nouns and adjectives. Quite a number also have non- derivative origins. These derived personal names-nouns, signal an interplay between Morphology and semantics, as possible co- determinants of meaning of Luloogoli personal names. Whereas the current paper doesn't dwell on the semantic component, we did appreciate Malande's application of Generative morphology and analysis of word formation on name-noun analysis.

Morphological processes which are used to form nouns in most Bantu languages are similar. Muhirwe (2007) made an analysis of the noun morphology of Kinyarwanda language. He found that the rule of noun formation in Kinyarwanda like in any other languages, are dependent. He argues that rules of Kinyarwanda language are not applicable on other Bantu languages despite the fact that it is a Bantu language. This means that every Bantu language has got its own noun formation rules.

Kamau (2011) made an analysis of Gikuyu noun morphology establishing that Gikuyu nouns are grouped into two main categories. The first category of the Gikuyu nouns are those derived nouns and the second category is that of underived nouns. Gikuyu underived nouns consist of named entities whereas derived nouns are formed through affixation as well as nominalization of verbs.

Linguistic Profile of the Chaga Mochi

Chagga-Mochi also known as Kimochi is a Bantu language spoken by Chagga people of Kilimanjaro region in Tanzania. Chagga people are also called Wachagga, Jagga, Dschaga, and Waschaga (Lema 2003). This language is categorized into Bantu language families, as an indigenous African language spoken by the third largest ethnic group in Tanzania. Chagga people are traditionally living in the southern and eastern slopes of Mount Kilimanjaro, Mount Meru and near Moshi. Chagga people descended from various Bantu groups who migrated from the east of Africa into the foothills of Kilimanjaro. Chagga-Mochi is classified in zone E group 62(a) (Maho, 1999). It is classified in the same group with Kahe E64, Gweno E65, Arusha-chini E63, Mbokomu E62B and Kivunjo which is classified in E60 and include the following languages; Kirua, Kilema, Mamba, Marangu and Mwika.

Justification of the Study

A number of researches exist on noun structure and classification in several Bantu languages. The data shows that there exists a NCP + ROOT+ (SUFFIX) basic noun structure in Bantu languages such as Kiswahili as shown by Mdee (2014), Kiuru by Mtallo (2015) and Mashami by Rugemalira (2014). On the other hand, we have an AUG+ NCP+ STEM + (SUFFIX) Bantu noun structure in Kisukuma by Luhende (2018), Kinyakyusa by Lusekelo (2009), Runyambo by Rugemalira (2005) and Kinyarwanda by Muhirwe (2007). Researchers have

argued that Bantu languages have a 15 to 21 noun class distinctions and 'a prefix, a set of class specific agreement markers and a particular semantic content of a given class distinguishes Bantu noun classes. However not all Bantu languages have been exhaustively analyzed. For instance, there is no notable noun structure and classification research on Chagga-Mochi. The absence of relevant literatures on Chagga-Mochi nouns pauses a challenge in understanding its noun structure and its classification. Therefore, this chapter seeks to address this anomaly researcher by presenting a study on Chagga-mochi noun structure and classification.

Generative Morphological Theory
Generative morphology is a chomskyian theory. In 1957, Chomsky used morphophonemic rules to describe formation of the past tense of verbs. The assumptions of generative morphology theory are as follows;

First, generative morphology is the theory of competence. Chomsky distinguishes between competence and performance. Competence is the native speaker's knowledge, while performance is the real language use by the native speakers in real situations. Competence covers following abilities:

a) The ability to generate and understand the infinite number of sentences.

b) The ability to determine whether an utterance or expression belongs to the language concerned.

c) The ability to give meanings to utterances or expressions belonging to a certain language.

d) The ability to determine the level of derivation from those utterances

e) The ability to determine the different kinds of derivation

f) The ability to determine the identities of the expression concerning their membership in one utterance.

g) The ability to give judgments concerning the formal similarities among various utterances

h) The ability to determine the similarities of meaning of those utterances

i) The ability to determine the variability of meaning of an utterances

Second, Language has creative innovative characteristic. The creativity of language is meant the ability of the native speaker to generative new sentence, that is, sentences that have no similarities with usual sentences. The native speaker has the capability of generating and understanding new sentence or he has the capability of making judgments on their grammaticality.

Third, Human language in all levels is governed by rules. Every language that we know has systematic rules governing pronunciation, word formation, and grammatical constructions. Furthermore, the way of associating meanings with phrases of a language is marked by regular rules. Finally, the use of language for communication is governed by important generalization which we can express with rules.

Fourth, various human languages form unified phenomena. The linguists assume that it is possible to study human languages in general and certain languages to express universal language features. Generative morphology also makes use of the principles and techniques of morpheme identification used by structural morphology. These rules capture generalizations whereby one rule accounts for all alternatives. Given a set of rules one may predict other forms in which the rule may apply unless otherwise specified. Pluralization in English illustrates this. In regular nouns, there is the rule of, 'add '-s' for plural';

Book- books

Cat- cats
Film—films

These rules bring about morphological processes that include inflection, compounding, and derivation.

All identified morphemes are classified into two main groups, namely, free morphemes and bound morphemes. Free morphemes are morphemes that can stand alone as words, while bound are morphemes that cannot stand alone as words. Free morphemes consist of class or content words, like nouns (N), verbs (V), adjective (Adj) and adverbs (Adv), and function words, like determiners (primary auxiliaries and modal auxiliaries), intensifiers, and question words. Bound morphemes consist of affixes which can be further divided into prefixes that are added after the base.

Therefore, generative morphology is regarded as the key unit of morphological analysis of the noun classification and derivation. Therefore, this theory is very important for the analysis of Chagga-Mochi noun classification and derivation.

Noun Structure and Classification In Chagga-Mochi Language

The study found that, noun in Chagga-Mochi language is realised as a noun class prefix, a root and a suffix. For the underived noun, as in m-mdu 'a person' where 'm' is a noun class prefix and '-ndu' is the root.

(9)
(a)   maheho ('teeth')   ma-heho   (tooth) cl.6-

(b)   ikidi (stick)   i-kidi (sticks)   cl.5-

In Chagga-Mochi the derived noun comprises of the class prefix, the stem, and the derivational suffix.

(10) Derived Noun	Gloss	Source Verb	Gloss
m-rund-i	a worker	rund-a	work
m-dem-i	a farmer	dem-a	cultivate
ki-terew-o	prayer	terew-a	pray

The basic structure of Chagga- Mochi

The basic structure of Chagga- Mochi noun is;
NCP + ROOT + (SUFFIX)
This study established that Chagga-Mochi has the following elements in her noun structure.
Noun Class Prefix (NCP)
This morpheme indicates the noun class in which a noun belongs. It is the first element that makes up a noun of chagga-Mochi. This research reveals that Chagga-Mochi noun is made up of NCP. NCP does also indicate the semantic group and polarity that is the differences in number (singular and plural) of noun.

(11)   ikumbi lyadeka
          i-kumbi
          cl.5-hoe
          'hoe'
(12)   mdemi ('a farmer') cl.1-

m-demi ('a farmer')
(13)   shitara (bed)   cl.8
Shi-tara (beds)

ROOT
A root is the main part of a noun. It is the nucleus. In morphology, root is a morphologically simple unit which can be left bare or to which a prefix or a suffix can attach. The data collected from the field indicate that nouns can be formed from roots. This is the second element that is found in a noun structure. In Chagga-Mochi, a single root is capable of forming more than one noun. This is possible because prefixes and suffixes are attached to the root so as to form words (nouns). Hence different NCP can be attached to the same root and get nouns of the different number.

(14)   (a) -ndu
bha-ndu 'people' cl.2-person
(b)   mndu   person   cl.1
m-ndu   'person'

To the root –ndu the NCP 'bha' and 'm' can be attached to the root and form nouns of the different number (singular and plural)

(15)   -ndo
From the root–ndo we can get nouns such as:
Kindo   'a thing'   cl.7
ki-ndo   'a thing'
(16)   shindo   'things'
shi-ndo   things   cl.8

SUFFIX
Suffixes are affixes placed after the stem of a word. A suffix can be a vowel, a syllable as well as a consonant. Suffixes can be affixed on a word to form a derivative. The data shows that derived nouns in Chagga-Mochi contain suffixes. The suffix of a chagga-Mochi is a vowel.

(17)   mrundi   worker   cl.1
m-rund-i   'a worker'
(18)   ikumbi cl.5-hoe
i-kumb-i   'a hoe'

The basic structure of a chagga-Mochi noun is similar to some Bantu languages such as Kiswahili (Mdee 2014), Kiuru (Mtallo 2015) and Mashami (Rugemalira 2014). The three languages noun structure are made up of NCP + ROOT+ (SUFFIX).

On the other hand, the noun structure of Chagga-Mochi is different from some other Bantu languages including Kisukuma (Luhende 2018), Kinyakyusa (Lusekelo 2009), Runyambo (Rugemalira 2005) and Kinyarwanda (Muhirwe 2007). This is because the structure of the noun in the stated languages contain an AUG hence AUG+ NCP+ STEM + (SUFFIX).

Chagga-Mochi Noun Class system
we group nouns in their classes. The odd numerals make up four classes which mark singular while the even numerals mark plural. In Chagga-Mochi, noun classes occur as a pair. Class 1

and class 2, class 3 and class 4, class 5 and class 6. However, there are exceptions in classes
9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16 and 17.

      A typical Bantu language has15-21 noun classes (see Nurse 2003). Essentially,
literature on noun stems in Bantu languages reviewed under this study often have the CV
structure. In fact, noun class systems of Chagga-Mochi correspond with the proposition of
Nurse (2003) who argued that Bantu languages have between 15 to 21 noun class
distinctions. Prefixes, sets of class specific agreement markers and particular semantic
content of a given class distinguish Bantu noun classes (Maho, 1999). Below is the list and
examples of the Chagga-Mochi noun classes:

Table 1: Chagga-Mochi Noun Class System

Class	Prefixes	Noun (example)	Gloss	Semantic Field
1	m	Mndu	Man	Human beings
2	bha/ wa	bhandu/ wandu	People	Human beings
3	m	Mdi	tree, medicine	Plant, object
4	mi	Miri	trees, medicines	Plants,objects
5	i	Iheho	Tooth	Naturalphenomenon, animal, body partand collective noun.
6	ma	Maheho	Teeth	Maturalphenomena, animals, bodypartsandcollective nouns.
7	ki	Kilo	Frog	Tool, instrument and utensil
8	shi	Shilo	Frogs	Tools,utensilsand instruments
9	N	Mburu	Goat	Thing and animal
10	N	Mburu	Goats	Things and animals
11	U	Urusu	Thread	Long thing object
14	U	Ukundi	Love	Abstract nouns
15	I	Ifuha	to cry	Verbal infinitive
16	ha	Handu	Place	Locatives
17	ku	Kundu	Place	Locatives

Class 1/2
The data from the questionnaire revealed that noun classes 1 and 2 are marked by prefixes 'm', 'bha' and 'wa' respectively. These classes comprised of nouns referring to human beings. Class 1 has singular nouns while class 2 has plural nouns. For example'

(19) Class 1   class 2
(a)   m-ndumii   'man'   bha-ndumii   'people'
(b)   m-pora   'bride'   wa-pora   'brides'
(c)   m-soro   'man'   wa-soro   'men'
(d)   m-meku   'old man'   wa-meku   'old men'
(e)   m-mii   'husband'   wa-mii   'husbands'
(f)   m-sacha   'brother'   wa-sacha   'brothers'
     NCP-Cl.1-person   NCP-Cl.2-people

The study establishes that noun class 1 mark Augmentative (pejorative) (on individuals). In Chagga-Mochi Prefix 'm' is used to mark for augmentative and pejorative. Hence in Chagga-Mochi all people regardless of the behavior, physical size etc are found in class 1 as in example

(20)
      (a)   Mbicho   'a bad person'
      (b)   Muili   'a very clean person'
      (c)   Msise   'a very thin person'
      (d)   Mleshe   'a very tall person'
      (e)   mfui   'a very short person'

The above data depicts a difference between Chagga-Mochi and other Bantu Languages like Runyambo by Mpobela (2018) in which pejoratives are found in a distinct noun class

Class 3/4
Class 3 and 4 are marked by the prefix 'm/n' and 'mi' respectively. Class 3 marks for singular nouns, whereas class 4 mark for plural nouns. These classes include nouns for natural and cultural phenomena, body parts, plants (trees) and animals. As indicated below

             Class 3   class 4
(21) Natural and cultural phenomena
      i-fumu   'mountain'   mi-fumu   'mountains'
      m-ra   'flood'   mi-ra   'flood'   '
23)   Trees (plants)
      (a) m-di   'tree/ medicine'   mi-di   'trees/medicines'
(b) m-furuhanje   'kind of a tree'   mi-furuhanje   'kind of trees'
 (c) m-turuanda   'type of a tree'   mi-turuanda   'type of trees'
(d) m-nanambo   'a type of banana'   mi-nanambo   'type of banana'
(e) m-lali   'a type of banana'   mi-lali   'types of bananas'

From the data collected, classes 3 and 4 are similar to that of Kiswahili language (Carstern 2008).
Furthermore, according to the data, class 3 is different from some Bantu languages including Kisukuma language by Luhende (2018), Mashami by Rugemalira (2014) and Kiuru by Mtallo (2015). The different is that, in Chagga Mochi language the prefix for class 3 are i- and m- whereas in kisukuma language is n-
Class 5/6

The findings reveal that classes 5 and 6 have broad semantic range of groups, expanses miscellaneous objects, body parts, insects, animals, human beings and collective nouns. Loan words and borrowed words are also found in this class. Kiswahili is a borrowing language therefore, necessitating a change on the syllable structure. Class 5 are marked by the prefix 'i' which is singular form whereas class 6 are marked by prefix 'ma' for the plural nouns.

Objects

(24)

Class 5		class 6	
i-sumu	'hole'	ma-sumu	'holes'
i-ra	'leaf'	ma-ra	'leaves'
i-ho	'stone'	ma-ho	'stones'
i-rinda	'dress'	marinda	'dresses'

Borrowed words

(25)

i-kari	'car'	ma-kari	'cars'
i-tofali	'brick'	ma-tofali	'bricks'
i-ndasi	'burn'	ma-ndasi	'burns'
i-tirisha	'a window'	ma-tirisha	'windows'

Body parts

(26)

i-kudu	'ear'	ma-kudu	'ears'
i-riso	'eye'	ma-so	'eyes'
i-dumbu	'mouth'	ma-dumbu	'mouths'

Insects

(27)

inje	'fly'	mainje	'flies'

Animals

(28)

irumu	'leopard'	marumu	'leopards'
ichondi	'sheep'	machondi	'sheep'
ihache	'calf'	mahache	'calves'

(29)

itondo	'idiot'	Matondo	'idiots'

The study discovered that classes 5 and 6 refer to humans representing a queer character or behavior by people. This makes Chagga-Mochi unique compared to some other Bantu Languages including Kiswahili shown (Mdee 2014), Runyambo (Rugemalira 2005, Mpobela 2018) and Kisukuma (Luhende 2018).

The study reveals that, Class 6 also represents mass nouns. They are marked by prefix 'ma'.

(30)

(a) mafuda		'oil'
(b) Marua		'milk'
(c) Madifi		'stool'

Class 7/8
Noun Classes 7 and 8 are used for **tools, instruments and utensils, animals, birds** and
diminutives are marked by these classes. Classes 7 and 8 are marked by the prefix 'ki' and
'*shi'* respectively. Class 7 use prefix '*ki'* for showing singular nouns, whereas class 8 use
prefix '*shi'* for showing plural nouns as indicated below

(31)

	Class 7		class 8	
a)	Ki-tapu	'book'	shi-tapu	'books'
b)	Ki-kombe	'cup'	shi-kombe	'cups'
c)	Ki-tima	'chair'	shi-tima	'chairs'
d)	Ki-howo	'rope'	shi-howo	'ropes'
e)	k-itara	'bed'	shi-tara	'beds'
f)	ki-waro	'flower'	shi-waro	'flowers'

Class 7 is also dominated by **diminutive**. In Chagga-Mochi diminutives are marked by the
prefix 'ki' in singular and the prefix 'shi' in plural.

(32)

	Class 7		class 8	
g)	Ki-mri	small tree'	shi-mri	'small trees
h)	Ki-meku	'old man'	shi-meku'	old men'
i)	Ki-soro	small boy'	shi-soro	'small boys'
j)	Ki-mana	'small child'	shi-wana	'small children'
k)	Ki-daina	'small goat'	shi-daina	'small goats'
l)	Ki-hache	'small cow'	shi-hache	'small cows'

The study finds that Chagga-Mochi dimunitives are found in classes 7 and 8 unlike
Runyambo (Mpobela 2018) where they are in classes 12 and 13.

Animals
(33)

Ki-te	'dog'	shi-te	'dogs'

Bird
(34)

Ki-lehe	'bird'	shi-lehe	'dogs'

Class 9/10
Classes 9 and 10 are normally for animals, birds and parts of the body. They are marked by a
nasal prefix. These nasal prefixes include [m, n and η]. Nasal prefixes are marked both
singular and plural. Classes 9 and 10 share the same noun class prefix, thus their singular and
plural distinction is determined largely syntactically rather than semantically.

Class 9	class 10

(35)

Nguku	'hen'	nguku	'hens'
Nguwe	'pig'	nguwe	'pigs'
Mburu	'goat'	mburu	'goats'
Mbari	'rib'	mbari	'ribs'

From the examples above, it can be argued that it is difficult to differentiate nouns in class 9 and 10 because the two noun classes share the same noun class prefix, that is 'N'.
Class 9 and 10 are similar to some Bantu languages such as Kiswahili (Carsten 2008), kinyakyusa (Lusekelo 2009), Kisukuma (Luhende 2018) and Mashami (Rugemalira 2014).

Class 11
Class 11 is a class dedicated to nouns denoting long things and abstract objects. The study revealed that class 11 is marked by the prefix 'u' and they take their plural in class 10.

(36)

uchaa	'nail'
urusu	'thread'
ulimi	'tongue'

Class 14
Class 14 is characterized by abstract entities. The noun class prefix for class 14 is 'u'. Noun Class 14 do not have plurals.
(38)

u-nyamari	'destruction'
u-kundi	'love'
u-fofo	'weakness'
u-lang'a	'harshness'
u-rango	'silly'
u-tondo	'stupidity'

Class 14 is similar to some Bantu languages such as Kiswahili (Mdee, 2014), Mashami (Rugemalira, 2014), and Kisukuma (Batibo, 1985 and Luhende, 2018).

Class 15
Class15 refers to verbal infinitives which in Chagga-Mochi are nouns depicting character. The noun class prefix for class 15 is 'i'
It can be argued that the noun class prefix for class 15 is the infinitive morpheme 'i '. The infinitive class 15 are characterized as a norminal with an internal clausal structure, a view which is similar to some Bantu Languages such as Mashami and Kiuru Bantu languages have this class with the same prefix marker 'i' Rugemalira (2014) and Mtallo (2015) respectively.

Class 16 and 17
Class 16 and class 17 are the locative classes in Chagga-Mochi. The researcher observed that, in Chagga-Mochi the locative expressions are marked by prefixes 'ha' and 'ku'. They mark location. Class 16 is marked by prefix 'ha' whereas class 17 is marked by the prefix 'ku'.

Verbal infinitives

Infinitives	Gloss
idema	' to dig'
ifihira	'to cry'
ikora	'to cook'
Ikapa	'to beat'
iseka	'to laugh'
Iwesa	'to ask'
Irikira	'to greet'
Iwaya	'to plant'
Isambuo	'to harvest'
Isoma	'to read'
Ilosha	'to teach'
Itema	'to play'
Iruma	'to insult'
Ishikia	'to close'
Ifinka	'to open'
Irehia	'to write'
Itala	'to count'
idicha	'to run'
Ichumia	'to walk'
ialika	'to marry'
irunduka	'to fly'
Imanya	to cut'
ideda	'to talk'
Iterewa	'to pray'
Isamba	'to bath'
Ifagia	'to sweep'
Irunda	'to work'
Ilaa	'to sleep'

(39)
  (a) handu halya   'at that place'

 Ku
(40)   (a)   kundu   'in the house'

In Chagga-Mochi the locative nouns are marked by suffixes rather than prefixes. The general suffix is -nyi.

Base noun	gloss	locative noun	gloss
kiriha	'house'	kirihenyi	'at the house'
mnde	'farm'	Mndenyi	'at the farm'
kiloshio	'school'	Kiloshionyi	'at school'
ichi	'river'	Ichinyi	'at the river'
riko	'kitchen'	Rikonyi	'in the kitchen'
modo	'fire'	Modonyi	'in the fire'
mring	'water'	mringenyi	'in the water'
mbu	'norse'	mbuonyi	'in the norse'
dumbu	'mouth'	dumbunyi	'in the mouth'
riso	'eye'	risonyi	'in the eye'
meda	'forest'	medenyi	'in the forest'
kitara	'bed'	kitarenyi	'on the bed'
itirisha	'window'	itirishenyi	'on the window'

From the data above, two noun classes are for locatives Class 16 and class 17. This is similar to Kiuru (Mtallo 2015).
Generally, Chagga-Mochi has 16 noun classes.
In fact, noun class systems of Chagga-Mochi agree with the proposition of Nurse (2003) who argued that Bantu languages have between 15 to 21 noun class distinctions.

Conclusion
The study found that Chagga-Mochi nouns are manifest a NCP + ROOT + (SUFFIX) structure. Chagga-Mochi has a total of 16 noun classes covering names of persons, palaces, animals, objects as well as cultural and natural phenomenon.
On the other hand, Agreement in Chagga-Mochi language displays a relationship with other different parts of the sentence.
The basic structure of chagga-Mochi noun is similar to some of the Bantu languages such as Kiswahili as shown by Mdee (2014), Kiuru by Mtallo (2015) and Mashami by Rugemalira (2014). These languages noun structures is a NCP + ROOT+ (SUFFIX).
On the other hand, the structure of noun in Chagga-Mochi is different from some of the Bantu languages including Kisukuma, Kinyakyusa, Runyambo and Kinyarwanda.

Recommendations

The study on Chagga-Mochi Noun structure and classification establishes a relationship between Chagga-Mochi Noun morphology and morphology of other word categories in such as verbs, adverbs and adjectives. With regard to these findings, the researcher calls for further studies on morphological processes of other Chagga-Mochi word classes such verbs, adverbs and adjectives.

There are a number of reasons as to why the researcher is calling for the study on the morphological processes of other word classes of Chagga-Mochi. The first and most compelling reason is that nouns morphology in Chagga-Mochi is closely related to the morphology of other words classes.

This study presented findings on the derivation processes. It has essentially been found that there are a number of nouns in Chagga-Mochi which are derived from other word categories including verbs, adverbs and adjectives. This being the case, there is need for the study on morphology of these word categories aside from nouns.

The second reason as to why the researchers call for the study to be done on the morphological processes of other Chagga-Mochi word categories is that there is no known study that has been done on the same.

References

Abubakar, A. (2000). An introductory Hausa morphology, Maiduguri: Department of Languages and Linguistics. Faculty of Arts, University of Maiduguri Desktop Publishing. NJ: Prentice Hall.

Alice, V. (2002). Classifier System and Nouns Categorization Devices in Burmese: The Annual Proceedings of the Twenty Eighth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistic Societies. A Special Session on Tebeto Burnan and South East Asian Linguistics.

Allen,M.(1978). Morphological investigations. PhD. Dissertation, University of Connecticut.

Anderson, S. (2005). Aspects of the Theory of Clitics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Aronoff, M and Fudeman K (2011). What is Morphology? Second Edition. UK: Blackwell Publishing.

Aronoff, M. (1976). What is Noun Morphology? Fundamentals of Linguistics. Malden, Mass: Wiley Backwell.

Aronoff, M. (1994). Morphology by itself: Stem and inflection classes. Linguistic Inquiry Monograph Series 22. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Babbie, E. (2003). The practice of social research. 6th edition. New York: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Batibo, H. M (1985). Le kesukuma Bantue de Tanzanie: Phonologie Morphologie.Paris: Editions Recherche Sur Les Civilisations.

Bauer, L. (1983). English Word-formation. London, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Bauer, L. (2004). The function of Word Formation and Inflection-derivation Distinction.In H. Aertsen, et al. Words in their Places: A festschrift for J. Lachlan Mackenzie (283-292). Amsterdam: Vrije universiteit.

Beard, R (2001). Derivation. In Spencer, A and Zwicky, A.M. (eds). The Handbook of Morphology. Hoboken, New Jersey: John Willey & Sons

Berelson (1952). Content Analysis in Communication Research. Michugan: Free Press. In

Bickel, B and Nichols, J (2006). Inflectional morphology. Timothy Shopen (ed.) Language Ty-pology and Syntactic Description. Vol. 3: Grammatical Categories and the Lexicon. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 169-240.

Booij, G (2005). The Grammar of Words. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Candrasari, R. (2018). Morphological Process of Devayan: An analysis of Morphological Typology. Proceedings of MICoMS. (Emerald Reach Proceedings Series, Vol. 1). Emerald Publishing Limited, Bingley.

Carstens.V (2008). Dp in Bantu and Romance. Colombia. University of Missouri

Crystal, D. (2008). A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics 6th ed. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Dantata, U. A. (2008). Semantic Constraints on Hausa Morphological Operations. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Department of Nigerian Languages, Faculty of Arts, Bayero University, Kano.

Demuth, K. 2000. Bantu noun class systems: Loan word and acquisition evidence of semantic productivity. In G. Senft (ed.), Classification Systems. Cambridge University Press.

Dixon, R. M. W (2010) Basic Linguistic Theory: United States: Oxford University Press

Fabri, R. (2008). Models of Inflection. In Sonderndruckaus LA 388. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

Finegan, E. (2012). Language: Its structure and Use. Sixth edition, international edition. Wadsworth, Cengage learning.

Giraudo, H (2007). Selected Proceedings of the 5th Décembrettes: Morphology in Toulouse, ed. Fabio Montermini, Gilles Boyé, and Nabil Hathout, 108-114. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Hamans, C. (2017). Language Change and Morphological processes. Year Book of the Poznan Linguistic Meeting, January, 2017.

Hinnebusch, T. 1992. Swahili. In Bright (ed.), International encyclopedia of linguistics, Vol. 4. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 99–106

Jackendoff, R. (1977). X syntax: a study of phrase structure. (Linguistic Inquiry Monograph Two). Cambridge (Mass): The MIT Press.

Jackson, H. E (2001), Words Meaning and Vocabulary: An introduction to Modern English Lexicology. London and New York

Joseph, B. (2017). Handbook of comparative and Historical Indo-European. Linguistics Vol. 2 (HSK 42.2), Berlin/Boston.

Joseph, B. D. (1996a). 'Where can Grammatical Morphemes Come From? Greek Evidence Concerning the Nature of Grammaticalization', paper read at 7th Meeting of the Formal Linguistic Society of the Midwest, The Ohio State University, May 1996.

Joseph, B. D. (1996b). 'Textual Authenticity: Evidence from Medieval Greek'. To appear in Susan Herring, Pieter van Reenen, & LeneSchoesler, eds., Textual Parameters in Ancient Languages. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Kahigi, K. (2008). Derivational in Sisumbwa. In Occasional Papers in Linguistics 3: 53-81

Kamau, C. (2011). Morphological Analysis of Gikuyu Using a Finite State Machine. Research Paper. University of Nairobi.

Katamba, F. & Stonham, J. (2006). Morphology. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Katamba, F. (2003). Bantu Nominal Morphology. In Nurse, D and G. Phillipson (Eds.).The Bantu Languages. pp. 103–120. London: Routledge.

Keiffer, M. & Lesaux, N. K. (2008). The role of Derivational Morphology in reading Comprehensions of Spanish Speaking English Learners: Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal.

Khanyisile, E. (1992). The Noun Class System of Isizulu. Master's Degree Dissertation. Rand Afrrikaans University, Johannesburg.

Kiparsky, P. (2003). Word-formation and the lexicon. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the 1982 Mid-America Linguistics Conference.

Kombo, D. K. & Tromp, L. A. (2006). Proposal and Thesis Writing: An Introduction. Nairobi: Pauline's Publication of Africa.

Kothari, C. (2004). Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques.New age.

Mradi wa Lugha za Tanzania. (2009). Atlasi ya Lugha za Tanzania. Dar es Salaam: Chuo Kikuu cha Dar-es-saalam.

Kroeger, P. R (2005) Analyzing Grammar: An Introduction: UK: Cambridge University Press

Lema, A. A. (2003). The Impact of the Leipzig Lutheran Mission on the People of Kilimanjaro: Dar es Salaam: University of Dar es Salaam.

Libben, G. (2017). Morphological parsing and Morphological Structure.Accessed from www. researchgate.net. On 1st October, 2020

Luhende, J. P (2018) Lexical-Semantic and Morpho-Syntactic properties of English Loanwords in sukuma. Stellenbosch University.

Lukeselo, A. (2009). 'The Structure of the Nyakyusa Noun Phrase'. Nordic Journal of African Studies.Dar es Salaam University College of Education, Tanzania

Lyons, J. (2007). Semantics. Cambridge University Press, New York

Maganga, C. and Schadeberg T, C (1992) Kinyamwezi Grammar, Text Vocabulary. Rudger Koppe Verlag. Koln

Maho, J (1999). A comparative study of Bantu noun classes, Goteborg: Acta Universities, Gothoburgensis.

Malande M. J. O and Omer R. Omer (2020). Towards the Saho Anthroponymy and Making Meaning from Naming Trends: A study of the Semantics and Cultural Aspects of Saho Personal Names. In Strategic Governance and Sustainable Development in Africa. Edited by Maurice N. Amutabi and Magdalene Ndeto. Nairobi: Cedred Publications. Pp.298-311

Malande, M. J. O, Vikiru, L. I & Kebeya, H.U. (2020). Linguistic Manipulation in Design and Deployment of Abbreviations: Focusing on the Kenya Political Party Names Abbreviations (KPPNA). Journal of Popular Education in Africa. 4(10), 114 – 132.

Malande, M. J. O. (2020). Language and Politics: An Analysis of the Semantics, Political Discourses and Sociolinguistics of Kenyan Political Party Names. Journal of African Interdisciplinary Studies, 4(9), 50 - 74.

Malande, M.J.O. (2020). Language and Politics: An Analysis of the Semantics, Political Discourse and Sociolinguistics of Kenyan Political Party Names. Journal of African Interdisciplinary Studies, 4(9), 50-74

Malande, O.M.J. (2018). A linguistics study of Kenyan political party names, symbols, colors and slogans. Unpublished, PhD. Thesis: Kenyatta University: Kenya.

Malande, M.J.O. (2012). An Introduction to Language and Linguistic Theory: with insight from African languages. Mwanza-Tanzania: Serengeti Educational Publishers (T) LTD

Malande, O.M.J. (2011). What is in a name? An analysis of the semantics of Lulogooli personal names: International Journal of Humanities and Social Science, 1 (20), 211. Retrieved from www.ijhssnet.com

Malande, O.M.J. (2006). Onomastics: An analysis of the semantics of morphologically derived Lulogoodi personal names. Unpublished, MA Dissertation: Kenyatta University.

Mallya, G. (2018). Phonological Processes in Chagga Nativized Lexemes Borrowed from Standard Swahili: ''A Chagga - English Comparative Study''. Indonesian Journal of English Language Studies, 4(1), March 2018.

Maniacky (eds.). Studies in African Comparative Linguistics with special focus on Bantu and Mande. Tervuren: Royal Museum for Central Africa

Manova, S (2002). "Between inflection and derivation: On morphotactic expression of aspect and gender in Bulgarian, Russian and Serbo-Croattan". Wiener Jahrbuch

Mathew, P. H. (1972). Inflectional Morphology. A Theoretical Study Based on Aspects of Latin Verb Conjugation. Cambridge University Press

Matthews, P. H. (2003). Morphology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mdee, J. S (2014) A comparative analysis of Kiswahili and Echijiita Noun Classes.Dar es saalam: open University of Tnzania.

Mills, R. (2008). Lexeme-morpheme Base Morphology: A General Theory of Inflection and Word Formation SUNY Series in Linguistics. New York: State University Press.

Morris, H. (1994). Some Key features of Distributed Morphology. MIT working papers in Linguistics.

Morris, H. (2009). 'Segmental phonology of Modern English', Linguistic Inquiry 16, 57-116.

Mpobela, L. (2012). Derivation and inflection in Runyambo. University of Dar es Saalam: unpublished M.A Thesis.

Mpobela, L. (2018). Word categorization in Runyambo: University of Dar es Salaam: PhD Thesis.

Mtallo, G. (2015). 'An Analysis of the Kiuru Noun Phrase''.Journal of Literature, Languages and Linguistics. An International Peer-reviewed Journal Vol.10, College of Business Education, Tanzania

Muazu, M. A. (2009). Kilba morphological processes: A descriptive analysis. California Linguistic Notes.

Muhirwe, J (2007). Computational Analysis of Kinyarwanda Morphology: Morphological Alterations. International Journal of Computing and ICT Research.

Nida, E. A. (1994). The identification of morphemes. Morphology: The Descriptive Analysis of Words. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Nurse, D. and Philipson, G. (2003). The Bantu Languages. London: Rutledge.

Philippson, G. (2018). Gweno, A little Known Bantu Language of Northern Tanzania. Institute National des Langue set Civilizations Orientales, Paris / Dynamique du Langage, Lyon

Pinker, S. (2009). Words and Rules: The Ingredients of Language. New York: Basic Books.

Quick, R, Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., Svartvik, J (1972). A Grammar of Contemporary English. New York

Robinson, N (2016). Word Formation: The Description Nyakyusa Derivation and inflection. Research Paper. Sokoine University of Agriculture (SUA)

Rufa'I, A. (2009). Principal Resources of Lexeme Formation in Hausa. Harsunan Nijeriya IX: C.S.N.L., Bayero University, Kano.

Rugemalira, J. M (2008). Adjectives in Bantu. Occasional Papers in Linguistics. Languages of Tanzania (LoT) Publications, University of Dar es Salaam.

Rugemalira, J. M. (2005). A Grammar of Runyambo: Languages of Tanzania project University of Dar es Salaam: Languages of Tanzania Project

Rugemalira, J. M. (2005b). A grammatical sketch of Runyambo. In Occasional Papers in Linguistics.No 1. pp 38- 74. Dar es Salaam: Languages of Tanzania Project (LOT) University of Dar es Salaam.

Rugemalira.J. M (2014). Noun Formation in Mashami. Journal of Linguistics and Language in Education vol 8, number 1 (2014):1-21

Silva, C. (2017). Research Design: The New Perspective of Research Methodology. British Journal of Education, Society and Behavior Science