



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

A grammar of Lumun : a Kordofanian language of Sudan

Smits, H.J.; Smits H.J.

Citation

Smits, H. J. (2017, September 21). *A grammar of Lumun : a Kordofanian language of Sudan*. LOT, Utrecht. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/57165>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/57165>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/57165> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation

Author: Smits, H.J.

Title: A grammar of Lumun : a Kordofanian language of Sudan

Issue Date: 2017-09-21

1. Introduction

Lumun is spoken in the Nuba Mountains in the Republic of the Sudan by the Lumun people and is classified as Niger-Congo/Kordofanian/Talodi group. This chapter introduces the Lumun and their language. It also provides information about the research for this book.

1.1. The Lumun people

The Lumun number an estimated 20,000 people, of which ca. 15,000 speak the language (Lewis et al. 2016). An earlier figure is provided by Stevenson (1984, p. 28), who mentions an estimated number of 5,000 Lumun speakers around 1960.¹ The Lumun live on and near Mount Lumun (in Arabic *Jebel Lumun*), which is located in the southern part of the Nuba Mountains in the Republic of Sudan, approximately between 10° 91' 00" to 10° 84' 00" latitude and 30° 23' 00" to 30° 32' 00" longitude. Mount Lumun forms the northern part of a mountainous range called the Limon Hills. Mount Lumun is not actually one mountain, but a constellation of hills, valleys and plateaus. The Limon Hills, together with the Moro Hills to their west, are surrounded by vast and flat lowland area.

Part of the Lumun community resides nowadays in the greater Khartoum area, where people took refuge after the second Sudanese civil war (1983-2005) reached the Nuba Mountains and the Lumun area. After a short interval of peace, the Nuba Mountains came under attack again in June 2011; military actions against the area continue up to today. Many Lumun, and particularly young men, have since crossed the border to South Sudan.

In their own language, the Lumun refer to themselves as **arrô**, singular **parrô**, and to their home area as **tarrô**, literally 'Up at the Lumun people'. As mentioned in Smits (2007a), **arrô** is not, in origin, a proper name, but probably means something like 'our people'. A

¹ The number of Lumun speakers is mentioned under 'Mesakin', 'Settlements in Lumun' (p. 28). As sources for his information about the size of Nuba peoples, Stevenson used the 1955/56 Sudan Census and some reports published no later than 1963.

cognate term **arra** refers to **darra**-speaking people, in the literature referred to as Masakin Tuwal (Vanderelst 2016, p. 4). **parra/arra** is also mentioned in Tucker & Bryan (1966, p. 286): **arra kaji** ‘we are Masakin’. The origin of the (non-indigenous) name ‘Lumun’ is not clear.

1.2. Lumun and Tira Lumun

The eastern part of the Lumun home area has a mixed population of Lumun speakers and speakers of Tira, a language of the Heiban group of Kordofanian. The speakers of Tira in the Lumun area are referred to in the literature as Tira Lumun², and form part of the Lumun community³. Several Tira Lumun, however, and particularly of the younger generations, do not speak Lumun, or only very little⁴. Some settlements in the Lumun area are predominantly Tira Lumun, in particular Kərəkkər, which is located on the plains at the north-east side of the Limon Hills. The Tira people themselves live in an area north east of the Lumun area. In the literature, the Lumun speakers are sometimes referred to as Kuku Lumun⁵, as opposed to the Tira Lumun. In this study, I use Lumun for both the language and the speakers of the Lumun language.

1.3. Settlements on and around Mount Lumun, and neighbouring peoples

The Lumun heartland and the place where the Lumun people consider themselves to originate from is Təṛəmaṭṭṛn, in the western part of Mount Lumun. Oral history tells that, from there, people moved south-west to (inner) Ṭaṛu (also called Cangaro) after finding a large water place there. This wet area is still there, allowing, amongst others, the cultivation of lime trees and banana plants.

² Also Tira Luman, Tira Limon.

³ Stevenson (1984, p. 27) provides a number of 12,661 Tira Lumun, mentioned as ‘Lumun’ under ‘Koalib-Moro peoples’.

⁴ Information by John Shakir.

⁵ Several variants are used: Kuku Lumun, Kuku-Luman, Koko-Luman (Stevenson 1956); Koko Limon (Roden 1972).

The northern boundary of Mount Lumun is marked by a rather steep descent onto the flat plains. The valley of Ṭṛṛî forms the southern boundary of Mount Lumun; beyond Ṭṛṛî to the southern edge of the Limon Hills is Tocho territory. In the west, the Lumun border on the Acheron community, who live in the north-western part of the Moro Hills. The Torona people were the (south-)eastern neighbours of the Lumun in the Limon Hills. Some time after end of 1930-beginning of 1931, during which period language data were collected among Torona people by Donald and Phoebe MacDiarmid (MacDiarmid & MacDiarmid 1931), the Torona have ceased to exist as a community dispersing and integrating into other communities (Norton & Kuku Alaki 2015, p. 65), particularly into the Tira Lumun community. According to Lumun oral history this was due to a conflict with the Lumun over the cutting of ṭupú, a kind of bamboo⁶.

Lumun people are also living in the surroundings of Mount Lumun. The market town of Saraf Jamous (lit. ‘drinking of the buffalo’, from Sudanese Arabic *sharaab* ‘drinking’ and *jaamuus* ‘buffalo’) lies south-west of Mount Lumun and is the main entry point to the Limon Hills from the south. Here, Lumun live together with (mainly) Moro, Tocho and Acheron. Coming from Umm Dorein, cars don’t usually go beyond Saraf Jamous, though it is possible for a car to reach up to the beginning of the valley of Ṭṛṛî.

Lumun have further settled on the plains north of Mount Lumun, mixing there (mainly) with Moro and Acheron. In southern direction, away from Mount Lumun, they can be found in Ramla and on Jebel Ṭabuli (north-eastern part). Settlement outside of Mount Lumun seems to be of fairly recent date. Roden (1972, p. 80) reports that, in the early seventies, the Lumun, unlike many other Nuba groups, were still exclusively living and cultivating on their mountain.

Administratively the Lumun area is divided into Ṭṛṛəmaṭṣṇ and Ṭṛṛṣ. Ṭṛṛəmaṭṣṇ and Ṭṛṛṣ both have an area chief, who is the highest administrative authority. Ṭṛṛəmaṭṣṇ is entirely Lumun-speaking and

⁶ Oral history as told by Osman Alope (born around 1940), recorded in September 2012 in Omdurman and summarized by John Shakir.

diet, as may sometimes birds and rodents, trapped in the wild, and, in the wet season, fish. The staple food is a stiff sorghum porridge called **ḡurû**, translated in this book with the term ‘asida’, from Sudanese Arabic *‘aṣiida*. Relatively few food items come from outside, most importantly salt (though in times of need there is an indigenous replacement), sugar and tea. Some foodstuffs are produced in surplus of private use and sold in the local markets, such as onions; some other products are collected in the wild especially for selling (such as tamarind fruits).

Towards the end of the dry season (March, April) water tends to become scarce in several places and women may have to walk far to get water. In general, the rhythm of life on Mount Lumun is based on the agricultural cycle. Descriptions of the agricultural year in other communities in the Nuba Mountains can, a.o., be found in Meerpohl (2012, about Tima) and Ille (2013, about Miri, Krongo, Moro, Tira and Abol); no studies, however, exist of (aspects of) Lumun society, whether relating to the agricultural cycle and livelihoods, social organization, religious beliefs, cultural practices, material culture, or any other subject. In Nadel’s study of Nuba peoples (1947) the Lumun are not mentioned.

1.5. Language situation

Among Lumun on Mount Lumun monolingualism is not at all uncommon, and especially not in the area of inner *Tɔɾəmaɾɔn*. In other places on Mount Lumun, especially men may have some competence in a neighbouring language such as Tocho and/or Moro, due to their greater mobility as compared to women. Arabic seems to play little role in the Lumun community on Mount Lumun, though particularly men may have (some) competence in it. Knowledge of English is rare among Lumun residing in the home area, but not entirely absent.

In the lowland areas surrounding Mount Lumun, people often have competence in one or more neighbouring languages; they may also have (some) competence in Arabic. In the Arab-dominated and otherwise mixed-language environment of greater Khartoum,

language loss in favour of Arabic proceeds rapidly. Generations born in or near the capital often have little competence in Lumun. Regular visits to people in the home area and vice versa, which used to give important boosts to the language competence of those living outside, have since 2011 again come to a halt.

1.6. Sources on Lumun

The earliest published Lumun data are eighteen words collected by Brenda Seligman during an ethnographical expedition in South Kordofan in 1910. The expedition did not venture into the Limon Hills, but Seligman found speakers of Lumun in Talodi, a town to the south-east of the Limon Hills (Seligman 1910/1911).

The next language data come from a missionary couple from New Zealand, Phoebe and Donald MacDiarmid, who went on a three-months linguistic survey expedition in the Nuba Mountains in 1930-1931. They did not include their Lumun data in the article that appeared in 1931, but the data were made available to missionary and linguist Roland C. Stevenson who mentions them as his main source for Lumun and incidentally provides some examples (Stevenson 1956, p. 142, 145).

In the mid-nineties, after a Lumun refugee community had taken root in greater Khartoum, community members engaged in designing an alphabet, the development of literacy materials and Bible translation. Unpublished notes on phonology were drafted by, amongst others, Jacob (1996) and Kutsch Lojenga (2004); on morphology, amongst others, by Spronk (2000), Yip (2003), Kutsch Lojenga (2004), Smits (2007a and 2007b), Goff (2010), and Lalu Balati, Tager Arkatha, Kabjan Kapija & Shakir Kilia (2015). Unpublished wordlists were compiled by, amongst others, Kuku, Shakir, Kamsur & Tager (2006), unpublished notes on orthography by the Lumun Language Team (2010). Published work on Lumun includes Spronk (2004) on orthography as part of a description of Talodi orthographies, Smits (2011, 2012 and 2013) on morphology, and Stirtz (2012) on narrative discourse. Norton & Kuku Alaki (2015) include Lumun data in their comparative-historical analysis of Talodi languages.

1.7. Classification

In 1981 Schadeberg published three studies on three of the five groups of Kordofanian, a language family originally posited in 1950 by Joseph Greenberg as part of his Niger-Kordofanian phylum (later renamed Niger-Congo) and presented more elaborately in Greenberg's 'Languages of Africa' (1963). Schadeberg's surveys of the Heiban group and Talodi groups (1981a and 1981b), based on data collected during his field trip from October 1974 to January 1975, established these groups as coordinated clusters within the Kordofanian family; his article on the Kadugli (Kadu) group (called Tumtum in Greenberg's work) proposed the —widely accepted— exclusion of these languages from Kordofanian (Schadeberg 1981c). Since 1981 the Kordofanian family has generally been regarded as consisting of the four remaining groups: Heiban, Talodi, Rashad and Katla: '[the] one level of classification within Kordofanian that is unambiguous and non-controversial' (Schadeberg 1989). However, with more data on different languages having become available in recent years, new questions have arisen. Both Dimmendaal and Blench consider Katla (or Katloid) and Rashad a genetic unit within Niger-Congo, but not together with Talodi and Heiban (Dimmendaal 2009a, 2015 (a.o.), Blench 2013). According to Dimmendaal, Katloid-Rashad is more closely related to Benue-Congo than to Talodi and Heiban (2015, p. 59). The issue of whether Lafofa is indeed part of Talodi (supported in Schadeberg 1981b) is also still not settled (Blench 2013, p. 580; Dimmendaal 2015, p. 29), not in the least because sufficient language data are still lacking. A different type of critique on the Kordofanian grouping is Hammerström (2013).

Apart from the case of Lafofa, the internal consistence of the Talodi group has not been contested. Internal subclassification, however, is 'a less clear matter' (Schadeberg 1981b, p. 92); this includes the position of Lumun within the group. In MacDiarmids' (1931) survey Lumun (Luman) had been grouped together with Tocho (Tacho), Acheron (Achron) and Torona; Stevenson (1956-1957) has the same grouping, calling it "Moro Hills dialect cluster". Schadeberg, who did not have access to the unpublished notes of the MacDiarmids, only to Seligman's eighteen words, confines himself to confirming that

Lumun belongs to the Talodi group (p. 12). Recently Norton and Kuku Alaki (2015) have proposed an internal classification of Narrow-Talodi (that is, the Talodi languages except Lafofa) that deviates from Schadeberg's structuring of the Narrow-Talodi languages included in his survey. Schadeberg proposed a cluster of Ngile and Dengebu in coordination with Tocho, Jomang and Nding; Norton and Kuku Alaki, identifying nine Talodi language varieties, posit an initial split between Lumun-Torona and the other seven: Nding, Tasomi-Tata (Jomang), Dagik (Dengebu), Tuwal, Daloka-Aheimar (Ngile), Acheron and Tocho.

The data of Lumun, Tocho, Acheron and Dagik in the table below illustrate the close genetic relations between these languages. The table lists the first ten items of the Leipzig-Jakarta list of basic vocabulary (Haspelmath & Tadmor 2009).

Table 1 Basic vocabulary

		<i>Lumun</i>	<i>Tocho</i> ⁷	<i>Acheron</i> ⁸	<i>Dagik</i> ⁹
1	fire	ṭik/lík	ṭik	ḍik/rik	ḍi [F]
2	nose	kɪnce/ɪnce		gɔnze/nɔnze	
3	to go	ɛḏ ; IMP: ŋkɔ	IMP: ŋgɔ		taw ; IMP: agɔ
4	water	ŋəɾi/ɲəɾi	ŋí	ŋɪr; ŋɪrɛk	ŋer [FF] ¹⁰
5	mouth	ṭɔn/lɔn	ṭɔŋ/lɔŋ	ḍɔŋ	ḍɔgəɾɔ/ɾɔgəɾɔ [LLL]
6	tongue	ṭɔɾe/lɔɾe	ṭóɾóŋe/ lóɾóŋe	ḍɔɾɔŋe/ ɾɔɾɔŋe	ḍɔlɔŋe/ɾɔlɔŋe [LLL]
7	blood	ŋɔccɔk/ ɲɔccɔk; ŋiccɔk/	ŋíccɔk	ŋissok	ŋeru [HH]

⁷ Data from Schadeberg (1981b).

⁸ Data from Norton (2000). Tone is not written on these data.

⁹ Data from Vanderelst (2015). The tone class is mentioned between brackets. The tonal realization of the isolated noun may be different (p. 41).

¹⁰ There is a deleted underlying sequence [əkʰ], hence the two tones (Vanderelst 2016, p. 24-25).

		ᵛᵛccôk			
7	bone	cumian/ mumiam	ćᵛᵛᵛᵛᵛᵛ/ mᵛᵛᵛᵛᵛᵛ	z3maᵛᵛᵛᵛᵛᵛ/ ᵛ3maᵛᵛᵛᵛᵛᵛ; z3mbᵛᵛᵛᵛᵛᵛ/ m3mbᵛᵛᵛᵛᵛᵛ	səme/məme [LL]
9	2SG	ᵛᵛᵛᵛ	ᵛᵛᵛᵛᵛᵛ		aᵛᵛᵛ [FF]
9	root	ᵛᵛka/ləka	ᵛᵛᵛᵛᵛᵛᵛ/ ləᵛᵛᵛᵛᵛᵛ	ᵛᵛᵛᵛᵛᵛᵛ/ ruᵛᵛᵛᵛᵛᵛ	ᵛᵛᵛᵛᵛᵛᵛᵛᵛ [LL]

1.8. Published sources on other Talodi languages

MacDiarmid & MacDiarmid (1931) and Stevenson (1956-1957) are early sources on Talodi languages. Schadeberg (1981b) provides word lists of six Talodi languages: Ngile (Daloka), Dengebu (Masakin Tuwal), Tocho, Jomang (Talodi), Nding (Eliri) and Tegem (Lafofa), and presents reconstructions of Proto-Talodi nouns and noun classes. Norton (2000) is a study on Acheron nouns; Spronk's overview of Talodi orthographies (2004) was already mentioned above. Vanderelst (2013) is a study on Dagik personal pronouns, Kuku Alaki & Norton (2013) is about Tocho phonology and orthography, and Norton (2013) deals with the Acheron vowel system. Norton & Kuku Alaki (2015) offers a historical-comparative analysis of Talodi languages, including amongst others, Torona data. The authors obtained these data from a last known speaker in her eighties, who was interviewed in Khartoum in 2012, and who passed away in 2014 (Norton & Kuku Alaki 2015, p. 62). Vanderelst's 'A grammar of Dagik' (2016) is the first published grammar of a Talodi language. Vanderelst's book has been available to me while writing this introduction; the manuscript of the main text, however, had already been finished.

1.9. Some sources on Heiban, Rashad and Katla languages

Some studies have recently appeared on languages of the Heiban, Rashad and Katla groups as well. The following is not an exhaustive listing. A phonology of Koalib (Heiban) was published by Quint (2006), as well as some articles, a.o. on benefactive and malefactive verbs (Quint 2010) and loans (Quint 2013). There were articles on

various issues of phonology and tone in Moro (Heiban); recent publications include Rose & Piccinini (2016), Jenks & Rose (2015) and Ritchart & Rose (2015). Articles on other topics deal, a.o., with noun classes and noun phrases, verbal morphology and wh-questions (a.o. Gibbard et al. (2009), Rose (2013), Jenks (2013), Ackerman & Moore (2013), Rose et al. (2014)). Abdalla Kuku published on vowel harmony and on locatives in Laru (Heiban) (2012, 2015) and articles appeared on participant reference in verbs and on comparative constructions in Ebang (Heiban) (Schadeberg & Kossmann 2010; Schadeberg 2013). The manuscripts were published of Stevenson's grammars of two languages of the Heiban group, Tira and Otoro (Schadeberg 2009). On Tima, a language of the Katla group, there were several studies on various topics of phonology and grammar, a.o. on vowels and on morpho-phonology (Bashir 2013, 2015), on nouns (Schneider-Blum 2011, 2012; Dimmendaal 2014), on nominal and verbal morphology and on adjectives (Alamin 2012, 2013), on participant marking and on ditransitive constructions (Dimmendaal 2009b, 2010). There was an article on sociolinguistics (Mugaddam & Abdelhay 2013), and Schneider-Blum produced an illustrated dictionary (2013). Hellwig published on Katla (2013). A survey article of Rashad research data was published (Schadeberg 2013) as well as an article on the pronominal system of Tagoi (Rashad) (Alamin 2015). Lafofa remained the most understudied group, no new language data became available.

An overview of older linguistic and anthropological research in the Nuba Mountains can be found in Schadeberg & Blench (2013); a bibliography of Nuba Mountains research is Dabitz (1985).

1.10. The research for this study

My first introduction to members of the Lumun community was in 2004, when I was in Khartoum to attend the Nilo-Saharan Conference organized by prof. Amin Abu Manga of the University of Khartoum and dr. Leoma Gilley. Afterwards I took part in language workshops by dr. Constance Kutsch Lojenga of Leiden University, amongst others with the Lumun language team. My MA-thesis (2007)

resulted from this, as well as a paper on Lumun locative constructions (2007).

The research for the current study started in September 2007, in the framework of a PhD position at the Leiden University Centre for Linguistics (LUCL). In order to collect language data, I made shorter and longer trips to Sudan, respectively in 2008, 2008-2009, 2010 and 2012; these periods together added up to fifteen months. I travelled to the Lumun area four times, altogether staying there about three and a half months (in 2008, 2009 and 2010); the rest of my fieldwork time was spent in Khartoum and Omdurman. In 2015 I went back to Khartoum for a visit to the Lumun team and the Linguistics Department of the University of Khartoum.

In the initial stages of the research in Khartoum/Omdurman in 2008, my language consultant was Nimeri Alemin from Ṭōmâṛ, then ca. 30 years old, who was visiting family in Omdurman and who had been trained as a health worker during the war by Doctors Without Borders. The purpose of my first trip to the Nuba Mountains in 2008, undertaken together with John Shakir, was to be introduced to leaders and other community members in Kadugli and the Lumun area, and to explain about the research I planned to do. The stories in appendix I and II were recorded in (inner) Ṭaṛṣ during this first visit.

During my second visit to Mount Lumun I stayed with Nasra, sister of Appanco, in Icapô (Ṭaṛəmaṭṣn). She and Risala Abdullai, also from Icapô, were my main language consultants during this visit. Both were then around 20 years old. After Nimeri had returned to the Nuba Mountains, my main consultant in Khartoum became Risala's younger sister Nafisa, who was staying in the capital for some months. During my third and longest visit (two months, early 2009) I was a guest of the Abdullai family in Icapô, working with both Nafisa and Risala. The texts in the appendices II and III were recorded during this period. In 2010, I went on a short trip to the Lumun area on the occasion of a celebration in Ṭaṛṣ.

From the very beginning of my fieldwork in the capital, I had been welcome in the office of the Lumun language team in Omdurman,

consisting of Lukka Kamsur from Ṭṭoppó (Tocho area), whose family came from Ṭṭpaṛṣ (Ṭṭaṛṣ), Lotti Tager, born in Ṭṭəraŋkâŋ (Ṭṭəmaṭṭn), Markos Lalu from Ṭṭəməṣ (Ṭṭaṛṣ) and team leader John Shakir from Ṭṭṛṭ. Born between 1970 and 1977, three of these men had come to Omdurman as adolescents/young men and had been in the capital for many years. Only Markos Lalu was living in Ṭṭaṛṣ during my first fieldwork periods; he sometimes travelled to Omdurman. All team members had, for shorter or longer periods, been back to Mount Lumun since the war had ended.

Several times I sat in on working sessions and language discussions of the team, and we made recordings of Lumun words and stories. After the initial years, John Shakir became my most important language consultant. Following on the 1st Nuba Mountain Languages Conference in Leiden in September 2011 he stayed a further three weeks in Leiden and during my (one-month) visit in 2012 he was my main language consultant. The rest of the time, we mostly worked through the internet while I was in the Netherlands.

1.11. Language examples in this study

Example sentences in this book come from different sources. A first source are the recordings. Six texts by three different speakers were recorded in Ṭṭaṛṣ and Ṭṭəmaṭṭn and fully transcribed with the help of Nafisa Abdullai and John Shakir (in total 22 minutes of spoken text). Four of these texts are included in the appendices. The other two, by Nafisa Abdullai, are an instruction how to make a dish of groundnuts and vegetables called **pačikkōt** and an animal story, ‘The story of the jackal’.¹¹ Another source were written texts. These include stories and other texts written by members of the Lumun language team and by others during language workshops organized by the language team on Mount Lumun. Some of these texts were checked and revised by John Shakir together with the authors during a later visit to the area. Furthermore, Nafisa Abdullai wrote some short essays and stories when I worked with her in Khartoum, one in

¹¹ Both were recorded in Ṭṭəmaṭṭn in February 2009.

the form of a dialogue. She also wrote a letter. Of some of these written texts recordings were made.

I further used translated Bible portions in different stages of checking and correction, in particular the gospels and the Acts of the Apostles. Publication of the New Testament in Lumun is foreseen in 2018. Parts of the Old Testament have been translated as well, or are in the process of being translated. Versions of the books of Genesis, Exodus, Ruth and Jonah have been available to me.

Several examples were taken from these various written sources. All examples were checked with a language consultant, also because tone is not part of the Lumun orthography. In the case of examples from translated Bible parts, I mention the book and verse. In the case of examples from other written texts I mention the type of text between parentheses, for example ‘fr. written story’. Apart from ‘The story of the jackal’ by Nafisa Abdullai, the story ‘A boy and a goat’ by John Shakir is explicitly mentioned whenever an example is taken from it, because this story has been published in Stirtz (2012)¹². A source has not been mentioned in case of variations on a phrase, clause or sentence from a text.

Examples were also obtained through elicitation, which was often informed and inspired by constructions found in written or recorded texts or in pieces of conversation. Examples also came about through trial of constructions produced by myself —typically variations on attested constructions— and variants and alternatives volunteered by consultants.

It must be remarked that writing (and reading) Lumun is by no means easy for most members of the Lumun community. Literacy in the community is low, and among women even extremely low. Lumun as a written language only began to be introduced in the home area after the cease-fire of 2002, when members of the team were able to travel to the Lumun area for the first time after many years, and some of them could stay there for several months. Before

¹² Tone has not been marked in Stirtz (2012).

that, as far as people had learned to read and write, this was in Arabic rather than in the Roman script used for Lumun. During the short years of peace before June 2011, Kenyan teachers came to the area introducing the Kenyan school curriculum and using the Roman script. It was typically students of this generation who picked up on reading and writing Lumun. Opportunities to practice writing and spelling, however, remained limited, also because of the scarcity of paper and the absence of electricity and/or a mobile phone network in the area.

1.12. Orthography

The orthography I use is partly the same and partly different from the orthography as used by the Lumun team. Where the Lumun orthography writes a single consonant with a digraph or a combination with a diacritic, I use IPA-symbols (**th** vs. **t̥**, **ny** vs. **ɲ**, **ng** vs. **ŋ** and **'r** vs. **ɾ**). However, I use **kw** for the labialized velar oral consonant, just as in the Lumun orthography. The ATR-contrast between vowels is signalled in the Lumun orthography by the presence or absence of two dots over the vowel (**i** vs. **ĩ** and **u** vs. **ũ**). I write **ĩ**, **u**, **ɪ**, **ʊ**, **ɛ**, **ɔ**, **a** and an eighth vowel **ə**, which is an additional vowel as compared to the Lumun alphabet. Where I use **ə**, the Lumun team either writes no vowel (this practice is of fairly recent date), uses **a**, or uses the vowel with which **ə** is coarticulated. I write **ĩ** instead of **i** because, when marked for tone, **i** is hardly distinguishable from **ɪ**.

Table 2 Orthography: consonants

Lumun orthography	p	t	th	c	k	kw	m	n	ny	ng	l	r	'r	w
This book	p	t	t̥	c	k	kw	m	n	ɲ	ŋ	l	r	ɾ	w

Table 3 Orthography: vowels

Lumun orthography	ĩ	ũ	i	u	e	o	a	
this book	ĩ	u	ɪ	ʊ	ɛ	ɔ	a	ə

I basically use phonemic spelling, but at word-internal morpheme boundaries apply ‘surface’ spelling rather than ‘deep’ spelling. That is, in case of word-internal change to a different phoneme (due to assimilation or neutralization), I write this different phoneme. For example:

pɾɪmampɾɪman paát ‘the spider has come’ (< **pɾɪman-pɾɪman paát**)

In connected speech, both (underlying) **n**’s in ‘spider’ change to **m** before **p**, which, like **n**, exists as a phoneme. I write **m** instead of **n** word-internally, but not at the word boundary.

Sudanese Arabic words are cited, where possible, from Tamis & Persson (2011), otherwise from Hillelson (1930). I give the terms only in Roman script, using the transcription as in Tamis & Persson.

1.13. Glossing

The glossing in this book is based on the Leipzig glossing rules, with some deviations. My way of glossing is as follows:

A hyphen indicates separable morphemes within a Lumun word; no distinction is made between affixes and clitics. A hyphen in a Lumun word corresponds with a hyphen in the English gloss. A tilde (~) in a Lumun word marks a separable reduplicated part that is glossed with a grammatical meaning (either PLR (plural) or INTS (intensifying)). A tilde in a Lumun word corresponds with a tilde in the gloss.¹³ In the absence of a (clear) grammatical meaning, a reduplicated part is just glossed with REDUP and a hyphen.

A dot in a Lumun word signifies a separable morpheme or a historical formative that is left unglossed. One specific use of the dot is in inflected verbs, separating its marking for tense/aspect/mood from the lexical stem. In such cases the dot relates to a colon in the gloss, but the two are not aligned (unless coincidentally). In the

¹³ Elsewhere in the text, the tilde indicates forms in free variation.

Lumun word the tense/aspect/mood marking may precede or follow the lexical stem; in the gloss the lexical meaning of the verb is always mentioned first, followed by the colon, after which the tense/aspect/mood meaning of the verb is indicated. For example:

ukol w-a.ll̩

child C-run:INCOMPL

the child will run

A dot between two lexical and/or grammatical meanings in the gloss is used in case of a portemanteau morpheme in Lumun (i.e. two morphemes that have fused in an inseparable way).

Except in a few special cases, noun class prefixes are not glossed, nor separated from the nominal stem by a dot. Verbal derivational suffixes are only glossed in chapter 14 on verbal derivation.

An underscore is used in the gloss when the English needs two words to express one meaning. Clarifying remarks in the English translations are put between parentheses.

1.14. Organization of the book and descriptive approach

This descriptive grammar of Lumun starts out with issues of phonology, turning then to parts of speech and morphology. The chapters 2 and 3 provide inventories of the distinctive consonants, vowels and tones, their distribution and realization in different environments. Some cases of morpheme-specific behaviour have been included as well. I use the notion of ‘tone pattern’, considering segments and tone as partly independent, as in auto-segmental phonology (Goldsmith 1976). The next chapters deal with morphology: parts of speech (i.e. words with certain grammatical functions) as well smaller morphological units, i.e. clitics and affixes (for example ‘concord’ (chapter 5), the ‘restrictor’ (chapter 9), verbal inflection (chapter 12) and verbal derivation (chapter 14). The chapters on morphology make use of and are informed by linguistic concepts and descriptions as found in Payne (1997) and Dixon (2010a, 2010b, 2012). Addressing a certain morpheme, I typically

first describe its form, including its tonal characteristics, then its meaning and its use in context. The latter provides an opportunity to include remarks on syntax. Issues of syntax are in particular offered in chapter 14 on derivation, including a statement on basic word order. The morphological description is guided by form units with certain meanings as present in the language. Just occasionally will I take meaning as point of departure, in particular when a specific form is common in other languages but lacking in Lumun (e.g. Lumun has no reflexive pronoun(s)). This description is synchronic, i.e. it describes what is there in the language at this point in time. On a few occasions I, nevertheless, propose what may have happened historically, with the aim to clarify the current phenomena.

