

INTRODUCTION

I. *Classification and Nomenclature*

Scholarship to-day is beginning to accord to Bantu languages a proper recognition of their value in grammatical structure. For many years—ever since these languages were first thrown open to investigation by pioneers in Africa—Bantu grammar has been treated as of very little moment; and, judging from the slight material presented in "Handbooks," "Collections" and "Outlines," which have been published in increasing numbers, it is evident that the writers themselves, in the main, have little realized the remarkable philological mine which any one of these Bantu languages possesses. Most grammars did little more than present the obvious material visible upon the surface, the mere outcrop a knowledge of which would make possible communication with the people. Fortunately, however, not every investigator has been so superficial, and there are some great names, especially among the missionaries, who have laboriously delved into the hidden things, and striven to bring to light the real gold of construction and idiom, without which a full understanding of the people's mind and processes of thought cannot be attained. But others again, in their effort and enthusiasm to "think black," have overstepped their balance and introduced into the language they portray thoughts and processes foreign to its genius, or have weighted it with the shackles of preconceived notions of origin and import.

The time is more than ripe for a calm, serious and careful study of the situation, and for the establishment of a sound and sure foundation upon which to set the wonderful structure of Bantu grammar. Before discussing this subject in detail, I would emphasize one or two things. To begin with, *any, every, Bantu Language*

possesses a *phonetical, grammatical and syntactical structure deserving of the most careful and exact investigation and recording*. None should be despised. It is only the ignorant who have the temerity to despise a Bantu tongue. On the other hand, each investigator must beware of that folly, not confined to youth—a folly of which I myself was at one time guilty—of considering “his” Bantu language as “the best,” “the purest,” “the most expressive,” “the most euphonious” of all. It is generally ignorance of any other Bantu language which engenders this vanity. One language may have a much greater variety of verb tenses than another, but that other may excel in the diversity of its verbal derivatives, or in the multitude of compound verb forms it may use. One may excel in its suffixal inflexions of the nouns, while another will multiply its facets by the manifold action of the prefixes. Each has some real contribution to make to philological study.

Further, *Bantu grammatical structure is Bantu, and must not be expected to conform to European or Classical standards in every respect*. The great majority of writers on Bantu grammar have unhesitatingly accepted their own mother tongue or Latin as the basis for everything grammatical—classification, treatment, terminology. Serious investigation must be made to determine in how far a Bantu language tallies with accepted standards, and wherein it diverges therefrom. Where there is divergence we must be prepared to blaze a new trail, use new terminology where necessary, prepare a fresh type of classification, or follow a fresh method.

Do we realize how much our accepted grammatical standards are dependent upon historical heritage? There is no real historical heritage for us in Bantu grammar to-day. We are therefore not bound down in any way to the past, and Bantu languages can be examined, recorded and classified according to their merits, untrammelled by what has gone before. This does not mean that we are to ignore what philology and grammar

have through the centuries contributed. We find a remarkable underlying similarity in all grammatical systems, a uniformity of method in language expression and structure through all human speech; and what has been done in other languages—if done with care and precision—is of inestimable value in assisting us in real work upon Bantu.

I would further venture to say that owing to the very recent introduction of writing among the Bantu,¹ and the absolute lack of historical commitments in grammar, *the Bantu languages, when grammatically classified according to their own genius, are singularly lacking in that bug-bear of grammar, exceptions*. Such exceptions as do occur are found, in the main, to be susceptible of explanation, and become less and less in number as our knowledge of the language and of the laws governing it, increases. In Bantu the appearance of exceptions is often the warning signal that we have laid down a wrong or incomplete law of formation, inflexion or mutation. At times, too, the solution and explanation of constructions may baffle us for many a long day; that, however, is no excuse for taking what we may consider to be an easier short cut, and ignoring difficulties which we cannot understand.² Even that most baffling of studies, the inflexion of tones in Bantu languages, will one day definitely yield to painstaking enquiry, and surrender the key which the Native speaker uses quite uncon-

¹ Swahili is the only Bantu language, which has been seriously influenced by writing for any length of time. Mbundu, Kongo and Nyungwe, though recorded for upwards of 300 years, cannot be said to have been influenced by such recording. Apart from the case of Swahili, I don't know of any Native Bantu writers earlier than 1850.

² H. A. Junod came to a wrong decision regarding the “initial vowel of the prefix” when he wrote: “As this initial vowel tends to disappear in the spoken language, as its regular introduction into written language would be fraught with many difficulties, owing to the frequent elisions to which it gives rise;—as it is different in the various clans,—as its suppression is not resented by the natives,—we have dropped it in our books in most instances, keeping it only where its presence seems more imperative.” (*Elementary Grammar of the Thonga-Shangaan Language*, § 68.)

sciously and naturally, but which seems so elusive and invisible to the scientific seeker to-day.

The original basis of grammatical classification was the word. Historical changes in some languages have caused words to split up, or on the other hand to amalgamate or lose their separable function. The fact that identical grammatical nomenclature may at times have been retained, despite such changes in function, is the cause of certain looseness in classification, and the use of terminology to-day, which could well stand overhauling. In preparing a classification and a terminology for Bantu languages it is, then, necessary to accept once again the word as our basis for the parts of speech. It is one of the things most difficult to understand about the majority of Bantu grammarians that the question of the Bantu word seems never to have entered their thoughts; even such a deep investigator as Meinhof gives no time to a discussion of the composition of the word in Bantu. I am convinced that, until the composition of the word is decided upon in Bantu, we dare not seriously discuss a grammatical classification, or deal with the question of nomenclature.

* * * * *

The whole question of classification and nomenclature is becoming urgent to-day. In several areas isolated attempts are being made to provide individual languages with suitable terms for recording and teaching grammar in the vernacular. In practically all these cases some Bantu grammar written in a European language is taken, and terms translated or transliterated (according to individual preference) therefrom, without any real enquiry into the basic meaning or function of the terms, or the correctness of the use of those terms. It is therefore my aim here to examine critically the terms which have been, and are being, used in Bantu grammars, to try, to the best of my ability, to bring some order out of a present chaos, and to suggest what terms are rightly or preferably applicable to Bantu languages, and how it

may be well to convey such terms in a Bantu language when recording or teaching grammar. I claim no prerogative of knowledge upon this subject. There are many who will differ from me in details. There are some who will deny the very fundamental principles upon which I build. But it is my hope that interest and seriousness will be stimulated, and some degree of uniformity aimed at as a result of this essay.

The body of this present work will comprise the critical dictionary of linguistic terms; but it is necessary at this stage to deal in some detail with three matters: The Bantu word, Bantu grammatical and syntactical classification, and the rendering in a Bantu language of linguistic terminology.

II. *The Bantu Word*

In 1929 the Department of Native Development, Southern Rhodesia, published a paper prepared by me entitled "The Problem of Word-Division in Bantu, with special reference to the Languages of Mashonaland." The preparation of this paper was necessitated by the state of the orthographies used in the different dialects of the Shona cluster then being investigated with a view to unification. Examples from publications in Karanga, Zezuru, Manyika and Ndaou were cited, and shown to employ no less than five different degrees of disjunctive and semi-conjunctive writing. In fact one word alone was found to be divided up in no less than three ways: *kwaari*, *kwa ari*, and *kwa a ri*. For purposes of unification something had to be done about this. And in the wider question of deciding upon grammatical classification and correct terminology, with which we are now concerned, it is of equally vital importance that we should come to a uniform decision, *and a correct decision at that*, concerning the composition of a word in any language of the Bantu family.

The real importance of method in word-division will be borne out if we examine parallel passages in a few Bantu languages using divergent methods. For this purpose I have chosen a short New Testament passage (Mark x, 46-49) from the published scriptures in Sotho, Lamba, Kongo, Ganda, Nyanja and Swahili. These six examples are fairly representative of the various types of written Bantu. After each text I have appended certain comments, indicating the ways in which certain elements are treated grammatically.

(a) Sotho¹

Ba fihla Jeriko. Jesu ha a e-tsoa Jeriko le barutuo a ba hae, a e-na le bongata bo boholo, Bartimea, mor'a Timea, oa sefofu, o na a lutse pel'a tsela, a kōpa. Ha a utloa hoba ke Jesu oa Nazaretha, a qala ho hoa le ho re: Oho, mor'a Davida, Jesu, nkutloele bohloko! Ba bangata ba mo khalemela, ba re, a khutse; a mpa a eketsa a hoa, a re: Mor'a Davida, nkutloele bohloko! Jesu a ema, a re, a bitsoe.

This is a typical example of the disjunctive method of writing,² in which the verb is broken up, separating the "subjective" and "objective connective pronouns" from the verb stem. The "conjunction of co-ordination," *le*, and the "possessive particles," *ba*, *oa*, etc., are written separately, the latter even from the pronominal stems, e.g. *ba hae*; so also is the "invariable copulative particle," *ke*, and the "nominal prefix" *ho*, indicating the infinitive (though this is joined to the verb stem when "regarded" as a noun of the seventh Sotho class). Naturally such disjunctive method treats as separate words the "auxiliary particles," and classes as "prepositions" the "locative prepositions" *ho*, *ha* and *ka*, as well as the "possessive particles."

¹ This is Southern Sotho as spoken in Basutoland.

² The terminology quoted here is that used by Jacottet in his *Grammar of the Sesuto Language*.

(b) Lamba

Popele apo wa li fikile ku Jélíko; popéle, ili a lu ku fuma mu Jélíko pamo ne wasambile wakwe ne wumba ilikulu, lombá Batimayo, umwana wakwe Timayo, impofu iya ku lombá-lombá, ya lu kwikala ku mbali ya nsila. Popele ná yo, pa kumfwa ati ni Yesu uwa ku Nasaleti, ya li tatikile uku wílikisya, ne ku lawíla ati: Yesu, Mwe Wana wakwe Dáfidi, nga mu ncitilé nkumbu newó! Popele awantu awenji wa li i kenye ati: Ko ikele celele! Sombi ná yo ya li wílikisye ukwa ku cila ati: Mwe Wana wakwe Dáfidi, nga mu ncitilé nkumbu newó! Popele Yesu wa li imakene, ne ku lawíla ati: I iteni!

This is an example of ultra-disjunctive word-division.¹ The verb is split up, e.g. *wa li fikile*, in which *wa* is called the "pronominal verbal particle,"² and *li* a "verbal auxiliary"; similarly with *a lu ku fuma*, *a* is the "pronominal verbal particle," and *lu ku* the "continuous auxiliary," split into two words. At the time of this translation no consideration was given to the division of words as to their status as parts of speech. The "object particle," for instance, was written separately, as in *i iteni*.

Na, and even *ne* (influenced by a succeeding vowel), were considered as "conjunctions," and written separately.

Though the "locatives" were treated among the noun classes, *ku*, *mu* and *pa* were also called "locative prepositions"; but the preposition was recognized as "almost non-existent in Lamba."

In *ya nsila*, *ya* was considered a "possessive particle" and written separately, though joined in the case of pronominal stems, e.g. *wakwe*. The plural vocative *mwe* was written alone, and called a "vocative pronoun."

¹ Conjunctive writing has since been adopted for Lamba.

² The terminology quoted here is that used in my *Grammar of the Lamba Language*.

(c) Kongo

Balueke muna Yeriko : una se kevaika muna Yeriko y'alongoki andi ye ndong'ayingi, o mwan'a Timai, wa Batimai, o mvingi ampofo, ofongelenge muna nteto a nzila. Vava kawa vo i Yesu wa Nazarete, obantikidi o kaza, oku vo, E Yesu, e Mwan'a Davidi, umfw'e nkenda. Engi bambadidi, kabutama : vo i yandi, e kazu kinungunukini kikilu, oku vo, E Mwan'a Davidi, umfw'e nkenda. O Yesu otelamene, ovovele vo, Numbokela.

In this orthography, as used in the latest revision of the Kongo Bible, the verbs are written conjunctively, including subjectival and objectival concords with them. Locatives are treated as "prepositions"¹ and separated, e.g. *muna* ; so is *se*, an auxiliary indicating the exclusive implication, called by Bentley a "particle." *Ya* is described as the "preposition 'and,' 'with,'" and shows coalescence, e.g. *y'alongoki, ye ndong'ayingi*. This is exactly parallel to the use of *na-* in other Bantu areas, and, as evidenced by its coalescing, should be joined up with the following word.

O is described as an "article" and written separately. *A* (the possessive concord) is called a "preposition," and is written separately, e.g. *nteto a nzira, Yesu wa Nazarete*, except when used with pronominal stems, e.g. *andi*. The copulative formative *i* is termed a "verbal particle" equivalent to the verb "to be," e.g. *i Yesu*. Similarly *e* "the sign of the vocative" is written separately, e.g. *E Yesu*. Further, certain compounds which should be written together, or at least hyphenated, are separated, e.g. *mwan'a Timai*, instead of *mwana-Timai*, as this is a contracted form.

(d) Ganda

Awo nebatũka Eyeriko : bweyava mu Yeriko nabaigiri-zwabe, nekibina kinene, omwãna wa Timayo, Batimayo,

¹ Quoted terminology is according to Bentley's *Dictionary and Grammar of the Kongo Language*.

omusabi omuzibe wamaso, yali atu'de ku ma'bali ge'kubo. Awo bweyawulira nga Isa Omunazalesi ye wũyo, nãtanula okwogerera wa'gulu nokugamba nti Omwãna wa Daudi, Isa, onsãsire. Bangi nebamubogolera okusirika : naye neyeyongera nyo okwogerera wa'gulu nti Omwãna wa Daudi, onsãsire. Awo Isa nãmirira nãgamba nti Mumuite.

This is a case of almost fully conjunctive writing. Exception is made in the case of locatives, e.g. *ku ma'bali*; though many common words, such as *wansi* (on the ground), *munda* (inside), *wagulu* (in the sky), etc., are written together in Ganda as "adverbs." This is clearly inconsistent as *egulu* (sky) is as much a noun as *meza* (table) in *ku meza*, where *ku* is called by Crabtree¹ an "independent part of speech."

Another exception is made in the case of possessive concords before proper names, e.g. *wa Daudi*. Crabtree calls this the "genitive particle." In other cases the possessives are joined up, e.g. *wamaso*.

From other evidence in Ganda we note that the conjunctive formative *na-* "and," "with," is separated from nouns, but joined to pronouns.

(e) Nyanja

Ndipo iwo anafika ku Yeriko ; ndipo m'mene Iye anali kuturuka m'Yeriko, ndi ophunzira ache, ndi khamu lalikuru la anthu, mwana wa Timeyu, Bartimeyu, wopempha wakhungu, analikukhala pansu m'mbali mwanjira. Ndipo pamene anamva kuti ndi Yesu wa ku Nazarete, anayamba kupfuula, ndi kunena, Yesu, Inu Mwana wa Davide, mundichitire ine chifundo. Ndipo ambiri anamuyamula kuti atonthole : koma makamaka anapfuulitsa kuti, Inu Mwana wa Davide, mundichitire chifundo. Ndipo Yesu anaima, nati, Mwitaneni.

The verb here is fully conjunctive, but locatives and possessive concords with nouns are kept separate, e.g.

¹ In his *Manual of Luganda*, § 81.

wa ku Nazarete, mwa njira, ku Yeriko. These are called by Hetherwick "relative particles used to express the possessive case." Possessives with pronominal stem are joined up, e.g. *ache*. Similarly *ndi*, whether used as "conjunctive" or "copula," is written as a separate word from nouns, but joined up to pronominal stems.

(f) *Swahili*¹

Wakafika Yeriko: hatta akishika njia kutoka Yeriko, pamoja na wanafunzi wake na makutano makubwa, mwana wa Timayo, yule kipofu, jina lake Bartimayo amekaa kitako kando ya njia, akiomba sadaka. Hatta aliposikia ya kwamba ni Yesu Mnazareti, akaanza kupaza sauti, na kunena, Mwana wa Daudi, Yesu nirehemu. Watu wengi wakamkaripia, anyamaze: yeye akazidi sana kupaza sauti, Ee Mwana ya Daudi, unirehemu. Yesu akasimama, akasema aitwe.

This is conjunctive, except in the following cases: (a) of possessive concords with nouns, e.g. *kando ya njia, mwana wa Timayo*, where *ya, wa*, etc. are called "prepositions,"² in contrast to *wanafunzi wake*, where *wake* is called a "possessive pronoun"; (b) of *na*, which is treated separately as a "conjunction"; and (c) of *ni* (and *si*), which is treated separately as a "copula."

* * * * *

From the foregoing it is seen that the method of word-division is of vital importance to the grammatical classification and the terminology used therein.

It must at once be conceded that the definition adopted for the "word" may be arbitrary. Some³ consider—and they have a perfect right to do so—that each entity conveying a complete concept is entitled to be

considered a word. Such a definition may prove suitable to certain languages—it would be to isolating languages; but it is impossible to apply it to inflexional or even agglutinating languages. *Each type of language is entitled to its own detailed connotation of what comprises a "word."* The fundamental unity of structure of all Bantu languages demands a unity in method of word-division suitable to the inflexional type of languages they represent.

The present diversity in method of word-division in Bantu languages is due to the diversity and individual peculiarities of the European investigators who have been responsible for reducing them to writing. Because in English "we are loving" consists of three words, therefore the English-speaking missionaries wrote *si ya tanda* in Zulu and *ti no da* in Shona. Because in French "nous aimons" consists of two words, therefore the French-speaking missionaries wrote *ha randa* in Ronga and *rea rata* in Sotho—despite the fact that *si-ya-tanda* contains precisely the same elements as *re-a-rata*. It is quite unnecessary here to go into the detail¹ of explaining that *si-ya-tanda* is not the real equivalent of *we-are-loving*, the type of predicate formation in the two languages being quite distinct, for *-ya-* does not equal "are," nor is *si-* the same as "we," though it represents *thina*, the equivalent of that pronoun.

On investigation we find that the various verbal formatives in Bantu have definite fixed positions in relation to the verb stem. The subject-indicator must always precede the verb stem, and the object-indicator always *immediately* precede that stem, while each auxiliary formative has its definite position. In English and French, however, such fixed positions do not exist. For instance, "we are walking" may become "are we walking?" or "walking are we?" or "walking we are," while "we are" or "are we?" may be used alone. Similarly "je suis" may be inverted for the question to

¹ See *The Problem of Word Division in Bantu*, p. 10.¹ Zanzibar dialect as taken from the 1913 edition of *Agano Jipya*.² See Steere's *Handbook of the Swahili Language*.³ As for instance Marconnés; see his *Grammar of Central Karanga*,

"suis je?" No such inversion of the elements constituting the verb is possible in Bantu languages. The very immutability of the Bantu positions indicates adhesion. The force of this adhesion is illustrated in the English infinitive. It is considered wrong to "split infinitives," because "to go," "to see," etc. are really in each case single words (phon. *təgdu, tasi*), though there is a growing tendency to give the "to" a separable value to-day.

Apart from this, the distinct individuality of the words in the English sentence is further emphasized by two facts. Firstly, most of the words are capable of receiving emphatic stress, and secondly, they may take final or isolated positions in a sentence. Neither of these phenomena is possible with the components of the Bantu verb. Take, for instance, the stress possibilities with the English sentence "We are going": "We are going" (and not anyone else), "We *are* going" (natural emphasis of statement), and "We are *going*" (not coming). In Bantu, in order to express emphasis, an alteration of the sentence is necessary. Take the equivalent in Lamba, hyphenated so as not to confuse the issue, *tu-lu-ku-ya*:—

We are going, *Ni-fweŵo* (*efwe*) *tu-lu-ku-ya* (lit. It is we who are going).

We are going, *Tu-lu-ku-ya icine* (lit. We are going indeed).

We are going, *Ukuya tu-lu-ku-ya* (lit. Going, we are going).

In each case the immutability of particle-order is clearly seen in *tu-lu-ku-ya*. Similar instances could be given in other Bantu languages.

Regarding the isolating quality of the English words, the answer to the question "Are you going?" is "We are!" or to the question "Who are going?" the answer might be "We!" or "We are!" But the equivalent answers in Lamba are, to the first, *Tu-lu-ku-ya*, and to the second, *Ni-fweŵo* (It is we), or *Ni-fweŵo tu-lu-ku-ya* (It is we who are going).

From the verb, consideration may be diverted in similar way to the possessive construction. The Bantu equivalent to the English preposition "of" is based upon the formative *-a-*, but its position is immutable, always preceding the word indicating the possessor. In English, when "of" is used in that way, it weakens to become 'v, e.g. "hearts 'v oak," "the strength 'v Samson." "Of," however, has its strong form when ultimate, e.g. "an unheard-of thing," "it is not to be thought of," etc. Similar inversions of the prepositions "to," "at," "in," "on," etc., are possible in English, but quite out of the question with the Central Bantu locative equivalents, *pa-*, *ku-*, *mu-*, which always immediately precede and adhere to the word they inflect.

It is manifestly unwise to base arguments for Bantu grammar upon supposed European parallels. *But disjunctive writing in Bantu is based upon a preconceived grammatical classification.* The words are divided according as their European equivalents are divided, and these resultant "words" form the basis for the classification of the parts of speech. Is this likely to give a satisfactory result?

The fully-disjunctive writer divides the subjectival concord from the verb stem, calling it a pronoun, and he divides the possessive concord from the noun (though usually not from a pronominal stem), calling it a preposition. To carry his method of division to its logical conclusion, he should divide the possessive concord from its pronominal stem also,¹ and ultimately the adjectival concord from its stem and the noun prefix from the noun stem.² If disjunctive writing is not carried to its logical conclusion, rules innumerable, replete with exceptions, burden the person who endeavours to write consistently.

¹ This is done in Sotho.

² As is done by Marconnès in his *Karanga Grammar*, with a result such as the following: *Mu nhu wa ngu mu kuru wa ka ndi ona*; instead of: *Munhu wangu mukuru wakandiona*.

It has already been stated that in Bantu we have no historical heritage to guide our division of words—nor have we that heritage to trammel the spelling. Even the very earliest blundering attempts at reducing a Bantu language to writing were made on the basis of spelling the words as they were pronounced—the nearest to phonetic principles of which those attempting were capable. To-day, throughout Africa, mainly due to the exertions of the International Institute of African Languages and Cultures, phonetic principles are being applied to the revision and improvement of orthographies in many areas. The same principles, based on the pronunciation, must be applied in the settlement of word-division. Full conjunctive word-division follows this method. It records what the Native says—not what the European believes he should have as concepts in his mind. *There is an inherent word-division in all Bantu speech, and Natives are able to divide accurately without fail, as soon as they understand what the investigator is seeking.*

During my investigations in Southern Rhodesia, to quote from my paper on this problem, "I carried out experiments with a boy at St. Augustine's Mission, Penhalonga. He could read well, and was acquainted with the slightly disjunctive method of word-division employed in writing Manyika. I got him to read the whole of the first paragraph of the *Masoko e Testamente ye kare* twice. Then I asked him to read again to the first full-stop; then again to the first comma. Then I suddenly said, 'What is the first word?' Without the least hesitation he answered, '*Pakutanga*,' despite the fact that in the book it is given as *Pa kutanga*. Thereafter he divided the words systematically as follows:—

Pakutanga Mwari wakasika denga nepasi, nezwirowezwe zwiwimo, akagumisira ngesika munhu mumufanamidzo wake, akamuyita atonge zwirowezwe izwo akange asika.

The last two words he gave alternately with elision as one, viz., *akangasika*.

"At Morgenster and Chibi Missions I attempted the same ruse, but failed to get the Natives to fall into the trap unconsciously. Their education had instilled into them that the divided portions as printed were *mashoko*, words. So I had to resort to direct explanation of what was intended. After explanation, they, too, consistently divided the words according to the conjunctive method. In a few instances they joined more words than one together, but in no instance did they divide any complete words—and this within fifteen minutes of the matter being first discussed with them. At Chibi one of the teachers ventured the remark: 'This is how we speak, but not how we write!'

"With a Zezuru at Salisbury results were not at first so consistent. The man concerned could read slightly, but his mind was not trained to discriminate, as is that of a Native teacher who has passed Standard IV. His conception of *mazgwi* was very vague, when the term was applied in the sense of 'words.' For investigations of this type the Native subject must be either unsophisticated and unable to read, or else he must have sufficient education to be able to do a certain amount of self-analysis. After a few days of training, however, this Zezuru divided the words conjunctively, counting them on his fingers without a single mistake."

Writing with a word-division foreign to that made by them in speech has the result of confusing in the Native mind the syllable and the word. Many Natives using disjunctive writing think that the division is syllabic. They cannot understand why it is syllabic in some cases and not in others, for they have not the background of European grammar, which we have, to explain why divisions are made.

A missionary once told me that 80 per cent. of the dictation mistakes made by the boys in his classes are due to incorrect division of the words. This was in an

area where disjunctive writing was taught in the schools.

* * * * *

As far back as 1905 the Rev. A. T. Bryant, in the Introduction to his *Zulu-English Dictionary*,¹ recognized the existence of an underlying phonetic principle in word-division. Writing on this question, he stated: "Accentuation then is the only guide by which we know whether particles of speech are to be regarded as independent or as forming part of a compound word." And when dealing with the compounding of certain elements due to elision, he wrote: "*Leyo'ndhlu* is a compound word and must be united in writing, since both the particles of speech are united under a common penultimate." In this reference to the "common penultimate," Bryant touched the main point of this whole question.

There are three subjects which come under the main heading of phonetics, which have as yet been insufficiently studied in relation to Bantu languages. These are the subjects of "length of vowels," "tone" and "stress." In many Bantu languages a change of length in a vowel may alter the significance or meaning of a word,² e.g. in Lamba, *lela* (nurse) and *lêla* (fade), *amala* (intestines) and *amāla* (nails); in Zulu *bahamba* (they travel) and *bāhamba* (they travelled). Similarly in many Bantu languages a change of tone or musical pitch upon a syllable may alter the significance or meaning of a word. In Sotho, for instance, *oa tseba* (with a low tone on *o*) means "thou knowest," while *ôa tseba* (with a high tone on *o*) means "he knows." In Zulu a change of the tone on *inyanga* changes the meaning from "doctor" to "moon." Similar significance of tone in the meanings of words is found in almost every Bantu language.

Length and Tone each has its significant work in Bantu. What of Stress?

¹ Page 86.

² The long vowel is indicated by a bar.

In French, length of vowels may be significant, e.g. *tousse* and *tous*, *tette* and *tête*; tone, on the other hand, gives but "character" to the language, or conveys emotion, while stress on words is almost non-existent.

In English, length of vowels is only a significant feature if accompanied by change of vowel quality, e.g. *peat*, *pit*; tone but conveys emotions; but stress, on the other hand, is most important: it is used to give prominence, emphasis, to particular words. More than that, it is used to distinguish one word from another. An illustration of this is in the contrast between the following pairs of words: *désert* and *desért*, *cóntent* and *contént*, *cónduct* and *conduct*, etc.

Now, in Bantu, stress never has the significant work of emphasizing words, or of differentiating one word from another, but nevertheless its work is of extreme importance. *Stress is the word-builder in Bantu.* Upon a rule of stress is the natural word-division of Bantu founded. Investigation has revealed the following law: *In each word or word-group in Bantu there is one, and only one, main stress.* This main stress falls usually upon the penultimate¹ syllable, and other secondary stresses, lighter and less significant, may be found upon other syllables in polysyllabic words; but a Bantu word is capable of having only one main stress. With the general rule in Bantu that this stress falls on the penultimate syllable of each word, it is natural to expect that Bantu words will usually be composed of two or more syllables. Nevertheless quite a number of monosyllabic words is found, particularly among the ideophones. In Karanga, one of the principal dialects of Shona, even monosyllabic nouns occur, e.g. *mbga* (dog), *she* (headman), *nda* (louse); though most Bantu languages avoid such. That the monosyllabic word is not a feature in Bantu may be gauged from the behaviour of the verbs. In all Bantu languages there is a number of monosyllabic

¹ This is not invariable in all Bantu languages, but is the general rule.

verb stems, but (with rare exceptions¹) these are not used as words in their monosyllabic form. In Shona, for instance, the imperative of ordinary regular disyllabic verbs is the simple stem, e.g. *gara!* (sit), *baia!* (catch hold); but the imperative of *-da* (love) is *ida*, inflected by the prefixing of "penultimate *i-*," essential to take the penultimate stress. The same thing takes place in Zulu, where such a monosyllabic verb stem as *-dla* (eat) is used normally throughout its conjugation, except in the case of the imperative where an extra syllable has to be added, to make *yidla* or *dlana*, in order to form a word capable of taking the normal stress. Such verb stems, then, as *-da* or *-dla* themselves have no stress, and in these cases cannot comprise a word alone.

When suffixes are added to verbs to form derivatives, it is the general rule that the stress moves forward to rest each time on the penultimate syllable, e.g. in Zulu, *ukuhamba*, *ukuhambisa*, *ukuhambisisa*, *ukuhambisisana*.

Apparently an exception to this stress shifting is to be found in Ganda, where the stress in many cases is maintained on the root syllable, and does not always move forward with the derivative suffixes.²

According to the rule of "one main stress one word" the Native speaks, whether slowly or deliberately or in quick narration. With but a few minutes' tuition he is able to divide his words correctly. If Bantu languages have thus a natural word-division, why should we go out of the way to devise intricate rules for dividing Bantu words according to our own traditional grammar, imposing the foreign upon the languages and forcing square pegs into round holes?

* * * * *

In the foregoing paragraphs the English and French

¹ Monosyllabic verbs sometimes occur unchanged in the imperative in Lamba, e.g. *lya!* or *lya-ko!* eat.

² See Crabtree, *A Manual of Luganda*. But the author has so evidently confused "tone" and "stress" that his conclusions are not reliable. I have no first-hand experience of Ganda.

languages have been cited from time to time to give contrasts and to emphasize the unique position of Bantu as a language family. Arguing from other languages, when discussing the field of Bantu, is generally to be deprecated, and this is especially the case when the languages are of such diverse type. Relative word-position seems to be the strongest similarity between English and Bantu, but the word-composition and word-inflexion are entirely distinct.

There is another type of language, however, which, while acting in a reverse way, shows a much closer parallel to Bantu, and may serve the purpose of illustrating the conjunctive inflexion so characteristic of Bantu. This language is Latin.

Bantu is a prefix-forming language family. Latin is suffix-forming. But the principles governing these formations are very much alike. Compare, for instance:

(Latin)	(Sotho)
<i>am-o</i>	<i>ke-a-rata</i>
<i>am-as</i>	<i>u-a-rata</i>
<i>am-at</i>	<i>o-a-rata</i>

In the Sotho *-a-* is a tense auxiliary. In Latin *-o-*, *-as*, and *-at* are not pronouns, but they refer to the pronouns *ego*, *tu* and *is*. Similarly *ke-*, *u-* and *o-* are not pronouns; they are subjectival concords used in building the Sotho verb tense, and refer to the pronouns *'na*, *uena* and *eena*. In the Latin *am-ab-o* and the Sotho *ke-tla-rata* the parallel is more complete, each having a tense auxiliary in addition to a subject indicator.

The inclusion of an objectival concord as well as a subjectival concord is unique in Bantu, e.g. *ke-a-mo-rata*. None the less, but one single word is the result, and no breaking of the verb on this account is possible.

Take again the Bantu concord system as used with the adjective. It is prefixal, and it refers to "class genders," e.g. *emo-holo*, *ama-holo*, *tse-kholo* (where nasal influence has changed *h* to *kh*). In Latin the change is

suffixal, and refers to "sex genders" and declensions in place of classes, e.g. *magn-us, magn-a, magn-um*. Similar prefixal-suffixal parallels in genitive-possessive formation may be noted.

One does not want to force further comparisons, for Latin and Bantu belong to two entirely distinct language families and must be treated entirely separately. Traditional spelling and grammar have established the conjunctive writing of Latin, and there is no difficulty in getting accustomed to it. I have introduced the Latin parallel to dissipate the fears of those who believe difficulty will be experienced in detecting the verb stem in conjunctive Bantu. There may be certain initial difficulty, but when the strangeness in any change in orthography is once surmounted, it will be found far easier to detect it in the conjunctive writing than in the disjunctive, where formative particles have equal prominence with stems.

* * * * *

One of the most potent criticisms of conjunctive writing is that against the length of words which it is possible to make by this method. In some cases words of considerable length are possible in Bantu written conjunctively, but one does not need to go to Welsh or to German or Afrikaans compounds to find long words in European languages. In Bantu it is possible to have a derivative verb of considerable length preceded by subjectival and objectival concords, and maybe some auxiliaries, but the combining of several auxiliaries in addition to a lengthy derivative suffix is of extremely rare occurrence. The possibility of such an occurrence occasionally should not prevent the adoption of correct word-division.

Careful investigation will reveal the fact that certain so-called "auxiliaries" used with the verb have actually the potentiality of words. These are not mere "verbal auxiliaries," but are "deficient verbs," and serve to break up the predicate into two or more parts. One

prominent example of this is the deficient verb *-nga* in Shona. This is used to indicate a continuous action, and it is noticeable that it has its own subjectival concord, as well as that used with the succeeding verb, e.g. *ndanga ndicivuya, ndakanga ndakavuya* (I was coming), *ndanga ndisingavuyi* (I was not coming), etc. Another example of this kind from Shona is found in the compound *handizati ndavuya*. Lengthy tenses are not nearly so common as many people think.

The conjunctive writer, like any other, runs the risk of carrying the application of his principle of word-division too far. He may become ultra-conjunctivist, and his writing may become totally unwieldy and out of proportion. In ordinary speech the Native often employs elisions and coalescences, running several words together. Is this practice to be followed in writing?

Elision and coalescence of vowels are common phenomena in Bantu languages which employ the initial vowel with the noun prefixes, such languages as, for instance, Zulu and Lamba, where every noun¹ commences in a vowel, e.g. Zulu: *umuntu, into, inkomo, amanzi*; Lamba: *umuntu, icintu, inombe, amenda*.

In Zulu, when coalescence takes place, it is compulsory. There is no alternative; and the resultant must be one word. This takes place in possessive formation, with the conjunctive formative *na-*, and with certain adverbial formatives such as *nga-*. For instance, the possessive concord *wa-* appears in *womuntu, wemithi* and *wamakhosi*. Similarly other formatives show coalescence in *nenkosi, nomame, ngabafana, ngomntwana*.

Elision of a vowel in Zulu, on the other hand, is generally² the result of quick speech, and therefore

¹ Except in Lamba those of Class Ia, and those with preprefixes, e.g. *tata, kamuntu*, etc.

² See the cases of compulsory elision in Zulu, in my *Text Book of Zulu Grammar*, pp. 22, 23.

optional. Examples: *ngifuna imali* (I want some money) becomes *ngifunimali*; *asifuni ukubona inkabi* (we do not want to see an ox) becomes *asifunukuboninkabi*. As this is optional, the interests of orthography are best served by writing each word separate and complete, and leaving the elisions to be carried out by the quick reader.

In Lamba, on the other hand, when elision takes place, it is compulsory. In possessive formation, with *wa-* for instance, we have *wamuntu*, *wamiti*, *wamafuta*. Further, whenever an initial vowel succeeds *na-*, it is elided and *na-* becomes *ne-*; thus *nemfumu*, *nemuti*. This latter process we term substitution.

Coalescence, in Lamba, takes place between the final vowel of one word and the initial vowel of another. To a certain extent this is optional, but even in slow speech it is customary. It is best therefore to carry this out and to use a device such as the hyphen to distinguish the two or more parts. Thus: *ndukufwaya umuntu* (I want someone) is almost invariably *ndukufwayo-muntu*; *tulacindika imfumu* (we honour the chief) is *tulacindikemfumu*. Another device, sometimes used, is the apostrophe, though this is less applicable in these cases of coalescence than it would be with Zulu elisions. Such use of the hyphen, when compounding of the words is advisable, indicates where the separate words have been joined, and eases the reading.

* * * * *

In concluding this survey of the subject of Bantu word-division, the implications of the phonetic word will perhaps be made still clearer, if the passages previously quoted in their current forms, are now given according to their pronounced divisions.

(a) Sotho

Bafihla Jeriko. Jesu ha aetsoa Jeriko le barutuoa

bahae, aena le¹ bongata boboholo, Bartimea, moraTimea, oasejofu, ona alutse pel'atsela, akōpa. Ha aulloa hoba keJesu oaNazaretha, aqala hohoa le hore: Oho, moraDavida, Jesu, nkutloele bohloko! Babangata bamokhalemela, bare, akhutse; ampa aeketsa ahoa, are: MoraDavida, nkutloele bohloko! Jesu aema, are, abitsoe.

(b) Lamba

Popele apo walifikile kuJeliko; popele, ili alukufuma muJeliko pamo newasambile wakwe newumba ilikulu, lomba Batimayo, umwana wakwe Timayo, impofo iyakulomba-lomba, yalukwikala kumbali yansila. Popele nayo, pakumfwa ati niYesu uwakuNasaleti, yalitatikile ukuwilikisya, nekulawila ati: Yesu MweWana wakwe Dafidi, ngamuncitile-ηkumbu newo! Popele awantu awenji waliikenye ati: Koikele celele! Sombi nayo yaliwilikisye ukwakucila ati: MweWana wakwe Dafidi, ngamuncitile-ηkumbu newo! Popele Yesu waliimakene, nekulawila ati: Iiteni!

(c) Kongo

Balueke muna² Yeriko: una sekevaika muna Yeriko yalongoki andi yendonga ayingi, omwanaTimai, waBatimai, omvingi ampofo, ofongelenge muna nteto anzila. Vava kawa vo iYesu waNazarete, obantikidi okaza, oku vo, EYesu, eMwanaDavidi, umfwe-nkenda Engi bambadidi, kabutama: vo iyandi, ekazu kinungunukini kikilu, oku vo, EMwanaDavidi, umfwe-nkenda. OYesu otelamene, ovovele vo, Numbokela.

(d) Ganda

Awo nebatūka eYeriko: bweyava muYeriko nabaigiri-zwabe, nekibina kinene, omwana waTimayo, Batimayo,

¹ In Sotho *le* is a conjunction, whereas Bantu *na-* has lost its individual power and is to-day a formative.

² Probably this comprises a separate word as do *muna*, *kuna*, etc., in Shona, and *muli*, *kuli*, in Lamba.

omusabi omuzibe wamaso, yali atu'de kuma'bali ge'kubo. Awo bweyawulira nga Isa Omunazalesi yewūyo, nātanula okwogerera wa'gulu nokugamba nti Omwāna waDaudi, Isa, onsāsire. Bangi nebamubogolera okusirika: naye neyeyongera nyo okwogerera wa'gulu nti Omwāna waDaudi, onsāsire. Awo Isa nāimirira nāgamba nti Mumuite.

(e) Nyanja

Ndipo iwo anafika kuYeriko; ndipo m'mene Iye anali kuturuka m'Yeriko, ndiophunzira ache, ndikhamu lalikuru laanthu, mwana waTimeyu, Bartimeyu, wope-mpha wakhungu, analikukhala pansu m'mbali mwanjira. Ndipo pamene anamva kuti ndiYesu wakuNazarete, anayamba kupfuula, ndikunena, Yesu, Inu Mwana waDavide, mundichitire ine chifundo. Ndipo ambiri anamuyamula kuti atonhole: koma makamaka anapfuulitsa kuti, Inu Mwana waDavide, mundichitire chifundo. Ndipo Yesu anaima, nati. Mwitaneni.

(f) Swahili

Wakafika Yeriko: hatta akishika njia kutoka Yeriko, pamoja nawanafunzi wake namakutano makubwa, mwana waTimayo, yule kipofu, jina lake Bartimayo amekaa kitako kando yanjia, akiomba sadaka. Hatta aliposikia yakwamba niYesu Mnazareti, akaanza kupaza sauti, nakunena, Mwana waDaudi, Yesu nirehemu. Watu wengi wakamkaripia, anyamaze: yeye akazidi sana kupaza sauti, Ee Mwana waDaudi, unirehemu. Yesu akasimama, akasema aitwe.

III. Bantu Grammatical and Syntactical Classification

Taking the word as the basis of Bantu grammatical classification, each complete word constitutes some "part of speech" according to its syntactical force,

that is, according to the work which it does in the sentence. There will thus be found six fundamental parts of speech, the very same fundamental parts of speech found in other inflexional languages. These are: the *Substantive*, which may act as subject or object of the sentence, the *Qualificative*, which "qualifies" the substantive, the *Predicative*, which composes the "predicate," the very heart of the sentence, the *Descriptive*, which "describes" either a qualificative or a predicative, the *Conjunction*, which acts as a link, and the *Interjection*, which stands apart from the ordinary structure of the sentence.

The fact that these fundamental parts of speech are the same in all inflexional languages need not be surprising: they serve to emphasise the basic unity of the structure of human inter-communication by speech. All languages, even those of isolating type, share most of these as well—though not necessarily all. Some have attempted, with very questionable success, to explain Bantu grammar from a hypothetical basis of two original parts of speech—substantive and predicate; but it is not my object here to enquire into what might have been; my aim is to set out a workable classification for what is to-day found in the living Bantu languages.

The unity of inflexional language structure is especially exemplified in an examination of sentence analysis. All Bantu sentences may be contained in the long-tested frame of "connective, subject, enlargement of subject, predicate, object, enlargement of object and extension of predicate." Allowing for the interjection to stand apart from the sentence, the subject and object comprise substantives, the enlargements of subject and object qualificatives, the predicate predicatives, the extension of the predicate descriptives, and the connective conjunctions.

Naturally the six fundamental parts of speech may be further subdivided according to the form which the words assume, and according to their more detailed

significance. For instance substantives comprise *nouns* and *pronouns*.¹ Nouns are again subdivided into classes, in the composition of which one Bantu language may vary slightly from another; while pronouns, too, are of several kinds—absolute, demonstrative, enumerative, qualificative. Many Bantu languages will be found to have no formal distinction to indicate the last-named type of pronoun, while others definitely have; nevertheless the syntactical distinction will always be there. The lack of formal distinction, for instance, between *vakuru* in such a Shona sentence as *takavavona vana vakuru* (we saw the big children), where it is an adjective qualifying *vana*, and in *vakuru vakasika* (the elders—big ones—arrived), where it is a qualificative pronoun, has led Marconnès to the conclusion that there is no real adjective in Shona—only the noun.² Syntactical significance is therefore all important.

The tendency to follow the analogy of other language classifications has led to many a grievous error in Bantu grammar. In almost all Zulu grammars, for instance, *ubani* (who?) is called an "interrogative pronoun," when a little careful thought would have shown that *ubani* (pl. *obani*) is in form the same part of speech as *ubaba* (my father; pl. *obaba*), and is used syntactically in the same way. Its counterpart in many another Bantu language is also a noun of "Class Ia," and thus Bantu presents us with the "unusual" phenomenon of an "interrogative noun." But why unusual? Merely because we approach Bantu grammar with the background of European and Classical grammar. We are used to talking of "interrogative pronouns," when

¹ For purposes of analysis substantival clauses or phrases may be added as a third division, this last being made up of several words each of which also has its work as a separate part of speech.

² But he overlooks the fact that the locative prefixes, which with nouns are prefixed to the whole noun (i.e. complete with its own prefix), e.g. *pabanga, kumusha* (not *papanga, kusha*), may be prefixed to the plain stem of all adjectives, e.g. *pakuru, murefu*, etc. He also overlooks the evidence of other Bantu languages.

formally there are no such things in Bantu, which has the "interrogative noun," "interrogative adjective," "interrogative numeral," "interrogative adverb," etc. Certainly some of the interrogatives of qualificative type may be used syntactically as pronouns (qualificative pronouns) without formal distinction.

In the great majority of Bantu grammars quite a wrong approach is made. Why should our Bantu grammars be burdened with such headings as: "Substitutes for English Adjectives," "Substitutes for the Comparative and the Superlative," "Indefinite Pronouns," "Les Verbes être et avoir," etc.? These things do have a certain value for the European learner, but they do not reflect the true grammatical structure of the Bantu language treated.

In the same way, a wrong attitude is adopted towards the phonetics of many Bantu languages. The clicks in Nguni are often described as "difficult sounds." But difficult for whom? For the European! Of necessity this approach has had to be made in the past. For many years it has been only the Europeans who have made any study of the grammar, and a presentation of the grammar for the Bantu people themselves has hardly been contemplated.¹ Now, however, that there is clamant need in many areas for the provision of vernacular Bantu grammars, it is essential that the foreign approach and ill-fitting clothes be dispensed with, and the applicable Bantu classification and nomenclature used.

I now give here an outline classification, which is the result of investigations in a number of Bantu languages. In its broader aspects this classification will suit all Bantu languages; in some of its details adjustment, simplification or extension will prove necessary with some languages, in order to meet individual

¹ There are, of course, some notable exceptions, Kempe's *Igrama Lesizulu*, Jacottet's *Grammar e nyenyane ea Sesotho*, Schweltnus's *Grammar ea Sesotho*, and Broomfield's *Sarufi ya kiswahili*, among others.

peculiarities. I do not intend to discuss this classification in detail, as each term used will be dealt with in the main body of this work.

- I. Substantive : (1) Noun (divided according to classes)
 (2) Pronoun (a) Absolute
 (b) Demonstrative (4 positions)
 (c) Enumerative
 (d) Qualificative
- II. Qualificative : (1) Adjective
 (2) Relative
 (3) Numeral
 (4) Possessive
- III. Predicative : (1) Verb (a) Regular dissyllabic
 (b) Monosyllabic
 (c) Vowel verb
 (d) Derivative
 (2) Copulative
- IV. Descriptive : (1) Adverb
 (2) Ideophone
- V. Conjunction
- VI. Interjection (including vocatives and imperatives).

A further classification of word-formatives is, however, necessary as the result of the process of *parsing*. This must be kept clearly distinct from the classification of the parts of speech, as outlined above, resultant upon sentence analysis. The formatives, discoverable by parsing the words, consist of affixes of all kinds, prefixes, suffixes, infixal inflexions, concords, auxiliaries, stems, roots and even tonal inflexions. The great difference between the disjunctive treatment of a Bantu language and that advocated herein lies in the elevation by disjunctivists to the status of "word" of many of these

formatives, and hence the introduction into the grammar of "prepositions" and "articles" causing a vital distinction in treatment.

IV. *The Rendering of Linguistic Terminology in Bantu*

Having discussed the grammatical classification and terminology to be used in a European language (such as English), there now remains this question: How are the Bantu to record these principles of classification in any vernacular of their own? This must be the ultimate educational value of our present task. As with so many questions there are the two sides to this one; and the 100% exponents of each side have already appeared.

First there are those who maintain that the Bantu languages have no provision for the rendering of such abstruse ideas by means of their vocabulary, and therefore advocate the use of Latin-English terms as far as possible. It is only necessary to quote a passage from the *Igrama Lesizulu*¹ to see the unwieldiness of this method: "*Ipasti futuri li patwa eindikativi kupela; lenziwa ngokubeka ipasti li ka ba pambi kweverbi elikulu, lisemudi lerelativi efuturi.*" Anyone who is in a position to understand such a statement as that could understand far more easily a grammar written in English.

Then there are those who maintain that Bantu equivalents should be found or formed for every grammatical term used. I have before me lists of words used² or proposed³ for Northern Sotho and Tswana respectively, these two groups belonging to the Sotho cluster. In these "noun" is rendered *leselō* (thing-name) in Tswana, and *leina-n̄su* (name-word, from the Afrikaans *naamwoord*) in Northern Sotho; "pronoun" is *leēmēla* and *lešala*, each meaning "substituting"; "verb" is *ledira* (doing) and *lentšutirō* (work-word);

¹ By Kempe and Leisegang, page 97.

² By Schweltnus in his *Grammar ea Sesotho*.

³ By Wenhold for Tswana in a Memorandum entitled, *Setsoana Grammatical Terminology*.

"preposition" is *labaeamalebanya* (relation) and *leléma-ina* (binding noun); "adjective" is *lelhaola* (limiting) or *lefarologanya* (distinguishing) and *lelhaoli* (describing); while "adverb" is *lelhalosa* (describing) or *lephutholla* (unfolding) and *lehlatha-tiró* (amplifying action). The translators have immediately come up against insuperable difficulties. A word chosen for a certain context is often found ill-fitting in a somewhat different context, and the words are often too unwieldy to handle in a sentence. In some cases a paraphrase of words is the only way in which the idea can be conveyed, and paraphrases are not usable in a grammatical work. In some cases, however, very suggestive words are used in these lists; for instance a "syllable" is called *noko*, which indicates a section of a reed or bamboo, "derivation" is termed *thlaxó* (origin), "brackets" are *lesákana* (little kraal), while "prefix" and "suffix" are indicated by "little head" and "little tail" respectively. Yet this very directness of description is in itself often misleading. It is palpably wrong to call "tense" *sebaka* or *lebaka* (time)—it means far more; or "active voice" *xo dira* (doing)—it may indicate state; or "masculine" and "feminine" by the terms for "male" and "female"—they are used in a different context.

Again, too much literalness in translation must be avoided. The *Igrama Lesizulu* renders "first person," "second person" and "third person" by a direct translation, viz. "*umuntu wokuqala*," "*umuntu wesibili*," and "*umuntu wesitatu*," just as one might say, "the first lesson," "the second lesson," etc., instead of using some such form as *okukhulumayo* (the speaker), *okukhulunywa kukho* (the spoken to), and *okukhulunywa ngakho* (the spoken about). On the other hand the investigator into nomenclature for Tswana, stumped when searching for terms for the cases, was reduced to calling "nominative case" *maémó a ntlha* (the first standing), "possessive case" *maémó a bobedi* (the second standing), "objective case" *maémó a boraro* (the third

standing) and "locative case" *maémó a bone* (the fourth standing). Fortunately cases are not required in Bantu.

A most suggestive list of over eighty terms prepared by Mr. W. G. Bennie for Xhosa is to be found on page 158 of *The Native Primary School: Suggestions for the Consideration of Teachers*, 1929. This list follows obsolete grammatical methods, including terms for "case," "voice," "preposition," the old classifications of pronouns, tenses, etc. Nevertheless there are many most useful terms included in this list, which will doubtless ultimately become a portion of Xhosa linguistic nomenclature. For "tense" the word *ixesfa* is used; this means "time." I would suggest that in such a case it would be better to manufacture a new word by a mere change of prefix, e.g. *isixesfa*, or *ubuxesfa*. Several most useful compound words are suggested.

In the *Regulations and Syllabuses for Native Training Colleges* of the Natal Education Dept., issued in January 1934, are a few Zulu terms based on an up-to-date grammatical division. That suitable terms in Bantu are to be found is amply evidenced from these suggestions.

Now a comparison of the grammatical terms used in English, French and German reveals a large percentage of common or international forms. This is noticed more particularly between French and English where the Latin has so strong an influence. There is a decided advantage in this. German, on the other hand, has a great number of German terms synonymously used with international terms, such as the following *Hauptwort* and *Nomen*, *Fürwort* and *Pronomen*, *Eigenschaftswort* and *Adjektiv*. The latter terms in each case, of Latin origin, have their decided advantage for students; the similarity of *Pronoun*, *Pronom* and *Pronomen*, or of *Adjective*, *Adjectif* and *Adjektiv*, effects a useful economy in study. For this reason it is likely that the Latin terms will gain increasing popularity in German nomenclature, especially when dealing with languages foreign to German.

The same arguments may be applied to Bantu. A great advantage will result if at least the main parts of speech have similar terms in various Bantu languages.

Broomfield, in the introduction to his *Sarufi ya Kiswahili*, discusses nomenclature from a somewhat different angle. He writes:

"In the past the attempt was made to find Swahili words which could be used as technical terms in Swahili grammar, but in the experience of a good many people they were not satisfactory. They led to confusion just because they were familiar words which in common speech did not bear the restricted meaning put upon them in grammar. For instance, the phrase 'Fungu la Maneno' was used for 'sentence.' But in ordinary usage it means no more than 'a collection of words.' We therefore had to teach that in grammar a 'Fungu la Maneno' is a particular kind of 'fungu la maneno,' and that some 'collections of words' are not 'collections of words' (sentences). And we had no reason to be surprised when our pupils found grammar confusing!

"It has therefore seemed wiser deliberately to adopt the English (Latin) terms in the cases mentioned below. . . . There is a growing feeling that, if the words are to be adopted into Swahili, they must be bantuized both in spelling and pronunciation. This is my own view, and I have attempted to bantuize them.

"I give below in the first column the Swahili terms which I think should no longer be used. In the second column I give the English, and in the third my proposed bantuization of the English (Latin) terms. . . .

Jina	Noun	Nomino
Kiarifa	Verb	Vabo
Sifa	Adjective	Ajeto
Kisifa	Adverb	Adivabo
Kijina	Pronoun	Pronomino

Kitengo	Preposition	Preposito
Kiungo	Conjunction	Kanjungo
Kilio	Interjection	Intajeto
Fungu la Maneno	Sentence	Sentenso
Ismu	Subject	Subijeto
Kikomo	Object	Objeto
Wakati	Tense	Tenso
	Predicate	Prediketo
	Definition	Definito."

There is much to be said for the argument Broomfield has brought forward, even though his bantuizations could be improved.¹ Even as English has adopted successfully foreign (Latin) terminology in a large number of cases, so it should be possible gradually to introduce in Bantu bantuized forms for many of these terms. To begin with it may be wise to use the equivalent of "name-word" for "noun," of "describing-word" for "adverb," of "distinguishing-word" for "adjective," or even of "acting-word" for "verb," and so on; but later a transliterated form will have to be added to the Bantu vocabulary.

There are, however, many subsidiary terms, such as "prefix," "suffix," "root," "personal," "diminutive," "augmentative," "past," "present," "future," "affirmative," "negative," etc., for which adequate Bantu equivalents may be found. Time and use alone will prove in how far translation will be possible, and in how far transliteration will be advisable.

It seems, then, that the rational view to take is neither that of the 100% Latinist nor that of the 100% Bantuist, but to give such latitude in terminology decisions, as will retain a high degree of uniformity between languages, while not overburdening the vocabulary with unnecessary foreign importations.

In introducing vernacular grammar into Bantu schools, a careful grading is essential. To begin with

¹ There is no such combination as *pr* in Swahili phonology.

very little formal grammar is necessary and therefore very little in the way of terminology; but such terminology as is used must be basic, and it may prove of value to commence with vernacular descriptive terms, and then gradually introduce the more technical Latin terms where necessary. In certain cases synonymous terms will be created, only the one of which will be used in higher linguistic studies.

NOTE ON THE DICTIONARY

The words in the dictionary which follows cover more than merely grammatical terms, and include a number of others which are applicable generally in literature. As this essay is based upon the English terms, French and German works on Bantu languages have not been so closely examined for terminology as have the English works; but in one or two cases French and German equivalents have been coined.

Terms, which are applicable to Bantu, and those for synonyms which it is preferable to encourage, are inserted in bold type. On the other hand, terms which have been used but should not be retained in reference to Bantu, as well as unnecessary synonyms, are inserted in ordinary type. One of the aims of this work is to eliminate, if possible, the numerous synonymous terms used in different Bantu languages to indicate the same processes, and to delete—also if possible—the plethora of new terms introduced by some writers. A new term should be used, only when there is no other that will do.

It will be noticed that illustrations and examples have been drawn heavily from Zulu, Lamba and Shona, languages with which I am the most familiar personally. In the circumstances it is unavoidable to choose from a limited number for typical illustrations, but I think workers in any Bantu language will be able to substitute their own parallels without difficulty.

If this dictionary is to be used to advantage, most of us will have to be prepared to revise our accustomed terminology and classification seriously. An intensive study of Bantu languages has caused me to abandon many a cherished idea. From being an ultra-disjunctivist in Lamba, I have come to see that conjunctive writing is correct for Bantu. In grammar I have had to abandon my old traditional use of "case,"

"declension," "preposition," etc.; and now, in terminology, I am convinced that several new terms which I introduced into Zulu grammar were unnecessary, and "dependent mood" must give way to the time-honoured "subjunctive," and other terms such as "radical" altered for surer descriptions. I do not ask of others more than I have myself been prepared, nay compelled, to do in the cause of truth with the advancement of knowledge. Only the very best is good enough for the languages and literature of the Bantu.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First and foremost I desire to acknowledge my indebtedness to Professor J. Marouzeau's scholarly *Lexique de la Terminologie Linguistique*, which has to a great extent been a guide to me in the format of my work, and has contributed much material for its composition. My task has certainly been somewhat easier than that undertaken by Professor Marouzeau, as I am dealing with the terminology applicable to a single language family; for, as Meillet observed in reviewing Professor Marouzeau's *Lexique*, Indo-European, Semitic and Finno-Ugrian, to mention but examples, really demand three distinct terminologies to meet the needs of the differences in structure of these three languages.

I have also benefited by a study of the *Report of the Joint Committee on Grammatical Terminology*,¹ the findings of which I have in the main followed. For definitions and explanations Webster's *Collegiate Dictionary* and the late H. W. Fowler's *Dictionary of Modern English Usage* have been of great value.

I wish to acknowledge with gratitude assistance given me by my colleagues, Professor L. F. Maingard, for advice upon the French terms, Professor J. D. A. Krige, for advice upon the German variants, and Dr. P. de V. Pienaar, for help in certain of the definitions of phonetic terms. Grateful acknowledgment is also made to Mr. H. Jowitt, B.A., M.Ed., late Director of Native Development, Southern Rhodesia, for gaining the ready permission of his Department for me to use my pamphlet, "The Problem of Word-division in Bantu," published under their auspices, in the Introduction to this work; and to Mr. G. H. Franz, B.A., for supplying me with translations of the terms used and proposed in Northern Sotho and Tswana.

¹ Revised in 1911 and reprinted several times (London, John Murray).

REFERENCES

- (1) All noun class references are made according to the list of classes given under "classification" (q.v.).
- (2) Round brackets () enclose French terms and square brackets [] German terms.
- (3) An asterisk after a word indicates that further information is to be had by reference to that word in the dictionary.
- (4) All Bantu language names are referred to without any prefix, thus Zulu (not Isizulu), Ganda (not Oluganda or Luganda), Sotho (not Sesotho or Sesuto).
- (5) For the most part current orthography has been followed.

DICTIONARY OF BANTU LINGUISTIC TERMINOLOGY

ABBREVIATION (*Abréviation*) [*Abkürzung*]

A graphic or symbolic reduction used to indicate some term which occurs frequently, e.g., in Swahili, Broomfield uses *W. Uliopo* for *Wakati Uliopo*, and *H. ya Kuendelea* for *Hali ya Kuendelea*. In Carnegie's "*Uguhamba gwomhambi*" (Ndebele) the characters speaking are indicated in abbreviation, e.g. *uTe. wati* for *uTemba wati*, *uMk. wati* for *uMkristo wati*. Similarly Kempe in his tabulations in the "*Igrama lesizulu*" uses *Esing.* and *Eplur.* for *Esingulari* and *Eplurali* respectively. In Bible marginal references, e.g. in Ganda, abbreviations are used, such as *I Basek.* for *I Basekabaka* (I Kings), *Zab.* for *Zabuli* (Psalms). A full stop always closes an abbreviation. Stuart in his set of Zulu readers has followed the custom of doubling for plurals of abbreviations, e.g. *k.* for *ikhasi* (page), *kk.* for *amakhasi* (pages); *h.* for *uhlu* (line), *hh.* for *izinhlu* (lines).

Abbreviations should not be used in formal sentences or connected discourse, but will be more and more used in Bantu in tabular grammatical matter, footnotes, references, etc., as linguistic study is developed.

ABLATIVE (*Ablatif*) [*Ablativ*].

The "sixth case" of Latin. Though used by certain Bantu grammarians, this term is not applicable to Bantu languages, where true "case" does not exist. Its function is covered by the Locative* formation, and by that of the Absolute* use of substantives.

ABLAUT.

A German term borrowed to indicate a type of vowel alternation. The term "gradation" is sometimes used in English for this, as in "get, got, gat." As ablaut more particularly refers to a change of radical vowel, it is not so applicable a term to Bantu vowel changes as Umlaut*.

ABNORMAL *Anormal* [*Unregelmässig*].

Deviating from the regular type; irregular in usage.
Abnormal vowels, i.e. front-rounded or back-unrounded, are not known in Bantu languages.

Abnormal Word-order: For purposes of emphasis, prominence or rhetoric, normal word-order in Bantu, such as "subject—predicate—object," or "noun—qualificative," etc., may be replaced by an abnormal word-order, such as "object—subject—predicate," "object—predicate—subject," or "qualificative—noun." Examples:

Lamba: *aḡantu imfumu ilukuwēta*, the people the chief is calling.

arḡo-wānīce twalukuwāpamo-kwakuti, fweḡantu, those youngsters we were punishing them severely, we people.

Zulu: *ihina abasibonanga*, us they did not see.

ezethu izinja, our dogs; *abakhul'abantu*, big people.

[N.B. In these two last cases the qualificative has altered its function, and become a qualificative pronoun in apposition.]

ABSOLUTE (*Absolu*) [*Absolut*].

Considered by itself; freed; unaffected by other considerations or constructions; non-indicative of anything beyond itself; opposed to relative*.

The **Absolute use of Substantives** occurs in introductory or parenthetical speech. In analysis such substantives may be described as adverbial, e.g. Zulu: *Kodwa* [*ukufa kwabantu*] *bafa ngenḡdaba yokwesaba amanzi*, But [as to the death of the people] they died through fear of the water.

The **Absolute Pronoun**: That type of pronoun which, while indicating a certain noun (or person) does nothing further than indicate it, and in no way describes or limits it; it carries the implications of a concord in a self-standing word. Examples: 1st person sing.: Zulu: *mina*; Herero: *owami*; Ganda: *nze*; Kongo: *mono*; Swahili: *mimi*; Lamba: *neḡo*. 3rd person, class 2: Zulu: *bona*; Herero: *owo*; Ganda: *bo*; Kongo: *yau*; Swahili: *wao*; Lamba: *ḡo*. This pronoun is variously termed: "substantive pronoun" (Werner), "personal pronoun" (Steere), "separable pronoun," "disjunctive pronoun," "independent pronoun," etc. Apart from Swahili, where the absolute pronouns are

found only in the 1st and 2nd persons and the first two (personal) classes of the 3rd person, the term "personal* pronoun" is not justifiable. It is therefore best everywhere to use the term "absolute."

ABSTRACT (*Abstrait*) [*Abstrakt*].

Expressing an attribute as a quality, activity or state, considered apart from its substance or that which manifests the attribute; opposed to Concrete*. The abstract class in Bantu is generally characterized by the prefix *vu-* (class 14). True abstract nouns in Bantu commonly have no formal change to indicate number.

ACCENT (*Accent*) [*Akzent*].

The term is generally used in one of three different ways:

(i) for stress [use stress* in Bantu].

(ii) for a peculiarity of speech.

(iii) as a diacritic*, to indicate tone, stress, or a differentiation of vowels. For this purpose the following terms are used: acute* accent [ˊ], circumflex* accent [ˆ] and grave* accent [ˋ]. These are called (*accents graphiques*) [*graphische Zeichen*].

Accent may be defined as the peculiarity of pronunciation which serves to distinguish one syllable from another, or one speaker from another. In the former respect it is better to use the term tone*, when the distinction is one of pitch, and the term stress*, when the distinction is one of intensity.

In Bantu, then, it is advisable to confine the term "accent" to individual or tribal peculiarity of pronunciation, e.g. "Zulu spoken with a Natal accent"; "Foreign accent"; "Nasal accent"; "He speaks Sotho with an Nguni accent."

K. E. Laman uses the term "musical accent" for intonation.*

ACCENTUATION.

It is better in Bantu to use either of the terms emphasis or stress,* instead of the non-committal term.

ACCIDENCE (*Rudiments de grammaire*) [*Wortlehre*].

"The things that befall words." That part of grammar which is concerned with inflexions, or the forms which words may assume, in contrast to syntax*.

ACCUSATIVE (*Accusatif*) [*Akkusativ*].

As "case" is not applicable to Bantu, the significance of the accusative is indicated by objective*. In Bantu for "accusative pronoun" use objectival concord.

ACOUSTIC (*Acoustique*) [*Akustisch*].

Pertaining to hearing. The **acoustic effect** is that which is interpreted by the hearer of a sound, e.g. "the acoustic effect of the flapped lateral upon the European ear varies with its position in the word and the quality of the surrounding vowels, at times being interpreted as *l* or *d* or *r*."

ACROSTIC (*Acrostiche*) [*Akrostichon*].

A composition, especially in verse, in which one or more sets of letters taken in order form words.

This artificial type of composition has at times been employed by Swahili writers; see Werner's "An Alphabetical Acrostic in a Northern Dialect of Swahili" (*Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies*, Vol. V, Part III, 1929).

ACTION (*Action*) [*Funktion*].

Operation, working or function; a term used in such phrases as the following:

To modify the **action of the verb**, To intensify the action of the verb, **Reciprocal action**, **Reflexive action**, **Reversive action**, **Intensive action**, etc.

ACTIVE (*Actif*) [*Aktiv*].

Having the power of acting or causing; opposed as a "voice" to "passive" or "middle." The term is strictly not applicable in Bantu, where it is better to use the term transitive*. Bantu, having developed an extensive system of derivatives*, of which the passive is but one, the term "active" finds no place, and is replaced sometimes by the term simple*—the simple stem—and sometimes by that of transitive.

ACUTE (*Aigu*) [*Akut*].

Indicative of sharpness or elevation of sound. The **acute accent** ['] has been used in Bantu for several purposes, among which the following are the most important:

(i) To indicate tone, as by Laman to mark "acute pitch" in Kongo.

(ii) To indicate main stress, particularly when not in normal penultimate position, e.g. in Augustiny's "Kambamärchen" (*Zeitschrift für Eingeborenen-Sprachen*, XV, 2) *mwǎnake*, *ngwá*, etc.; also in Zulu, *inxá*, *ngibulalé*, *hlúthuluzi*, etc.

(iii) To indicate a special vowel, as for instance by Casalis in his *Études sur la langue Séchuana* (1841), where *é* had the value of the equivalent in French, e.g. *robétsa*. This use is not advisable, and fortunately by no means common in Bantu.

(iv) To indicate palatal consonants, as *n*, by Meinhof and others who employ the diacritic method in orthography.

ADJECTIVAL (*Adjectival*) [*Adjektivisch*].

Pertaining to the adjective*.

The **adjectival concord** is the prefix used with adjectival stems; in some cases, e.g. in Shona, identical in form with the noun prefix, in other cases having distinctive forms.

An **adjectival pronoun**, an adjective used substantively, e.g. Zulu: *abakhulu bayeza*, the elders, the great, are coming.

An **adjectival stem** is a word-stem, which demands the adjectival concord to give it vital force. In most Bantu languages, with the possible exception of Swahili, these are very restricted in number, varying from twelve to twenty-five.

ADJECTIVE (*Adjectif*) [*Eigenschaftswort*, *Adjektiv*].

A word which qualifies a substantive, and is brought into concordial agreement therewith by the adjectival concord. This is one of the main sub-divisions of the qualificative*. The division into "attributive" and "predicative" cannot stand in Bantu, owing to there being no use of the verb "to be" in Bantu comparable to that in European languages. All adjectives are therefore attributive.

In some Bantu languages there is considerable difficulty in distinguishing adjectives from nouns (vide, Marconnés' *Karanga Grammar*), but one method of testing stems is by applying the locative prefixes (Central Bantu, *pa-*, *ku-* and *mu-*), which may be added directly to the adjectival stem, e.g. in Shona *pakuru*, but with a nominal stem the noun prefix must also be present, e.g. *pamusha* (never *pasha*). Another method of testing is by attempting to use preprefixes*, which no adjective may assume.

ADJUNCT (*Complément*) [*Attribut, Beifügung*].

A word or words added to qualify the force of other words. This is a term specially applicable to sentence analysis, in which there are two kinds of adjuncts, viz. the enlargement*, which is qualificative in force, and the extension*, which is descriptive in force.

ADVERB (*Adverbe*) [*Umstandswort, Adverbium*].

A word which describes a qualificative, predicative or other adverb with respect to manner, place or time. This is one of the sub-divisions of the Bantu descriptive*, the other being the ideophone*.

In Bantu the division between noun and adverb is at times dependent not on form but on sentence function, e.g. Lamba : *ulwibilo*, (1) speed, (2) quickly ; *ulucelo*, (1) morning, (2) in the morning, early. Zulu : *ubusuku*, (1) night, (2) by night ; *isiminya*, (1) truth, (2) really.

Locative* adverbs are generally indicative of place, but also sometimes of time.

Adverbs of manner are often formed with some special prefixal formative, e.g. *ka-* (Zulu), *zi-* (Shona), *cha-* (Ila), etc.

Adverbs of time, also, are frequently formed with some special prefixal formative, e.g. *li-* (Lamba), *ri-* (Shona), etc.

Numerous other sub-divisions of adverbs are possible in Bantu, such as instrumental, stative, agentive, etc., but most of the forms are covered by the three given above.

ADVERBIAL (*Adverbial*) [*Adverbial*].

Pertaining to the nature of the adverb.

Adverbial Formatives : Many of the so-called "prepositions," e.g. locative *ku-*, *mu-*, *pa-*, Zulu instrumental *nga-*, Shona *na-*, are in reality adverbial formatives, forming adverbs from the substantives to which they are prefixed. For "adverbial clause" see descriptive* clause. For purposes of syntax it is preferable to use the terms for the greater part-of-speech divisions, than those for the sub-divisions.

AFFIRMATION (*Affirmation*) [*Bejahung, Affirmation*].

Confirmation or assertion, the opposite to negation*.

Adverbs of affirmation are those expressing assent, as "Yes" : Zulu, *yebo* ; Swahili, *ndio* ; Nyanja, *inde* ; Kongo,

elo ; Lamba, *in̄ya* ; etc. There are usually several such adverbs of affirmation in each Bantu language, e.g. Lamba, *in̄ya*, *e*, *'a'a* ; Nyanja, *e*, *ea*, *inde*, *etu*, *nanga*.

AFFIRMATIVE (*Affirmatif*) [*Bejahend, Affirmativ*].

Expressing reality or confirmation ; a union between subject and predicate ; positive* opposed to negative.

For **affirmative conjugation** see under positive, the more commonly-used term.

AFFIX (*Affixe*) [*Affix*].

An element which is capable of being attached to or incorporated with a word, in order to modify its function, meaning, value, etc. According as it is initial, medial or final, it is termed prefix*, infix* or suffix*. **Reflexive affix** may be considered either as prefix or infix.

AFFIXAL.

Pertaining to an affix.

An **affixal formative** is a formative element which may be attached to a stem or root, and is distinguished from these latter formatives.

AFFRICATE (*Affriquée*) [*Affrikata*].

A composite sound resulting from a compounding of an explosive consonant and its homorganic fricative. The term "explosive-fricative" is sometimes used. The following are examples :

Lateral affricate : Xhosa, *tl*.

Alveolar or dental affricate : Shona, *ts*, *dz*.

Palatal affricate : Bemba, *tʃ*, *dʒ* (*j*).

Velar affricate : Tswana, *kx*.

Semi-affricate, in which the elements are not completely homorganic : Shona, *pf*, *bv*.

AGENT (*Agent*).

A being or object from which emanates an activity ; generally in Bantu the personal cause of an action in contradistinction to the instrument* or means used by the agent. The term "nomen agentis" is often used, especially in German publications.

The agent after the passive verb, in certain Bantu languages,

e.g. Zulu, is expressed by a predicative form of the substantive, in others by an adverbial form.

Nouns formed from verbs, when indicating the agent of the action, commonly end in the vowel *-i*.

AGENTIVE.

Signifying an agent.

Agentive verbs, or verbs of **agentive import***, are those which need or imply an agent to complete their action. Passives* are of this type, and in some cases neuter* forms of the verb may be regarded as agentive; e.g. Zulu: *ngabonwa ngumuntu*; Shona, *ndakavonwa nomuntu*; Lamba: *nalibwenwe kumuntu* (I was seen by a person). The passive verb in each case is followed by an adverbial agent; in the case of Zulu this is a copulative used adverbially; in Shona it is an adverb of conjunctive origin; in Lamba an adverb of locative origin.

AGGLUTINATING, AGGLUTINATIVE (Agglutinant)

[*Agglutinierend*].

Agglutinating languages are those in which grammatical forms are expressed by the agglutination* of formative elements to the various roots, these formative elements always being recognizable as independent words detachable from the root, and capable of being affixed to other roots, or even to stand alone in the sentence. They are particularly distinct in this last particular from the inflexional* languages. Typical agglutinating languages are Turkish, Finnish, Mongolian, North American Indian and Dravidian in Southern India. The term has been applied by several writers to Bantu languages. It is true that in certain features Bantu shows agglutination, but the Bantu family is far more typically inflexional. If we had more evidence of the historical development of Bantu, we might have more reason to consider agglutination to have played a large part in the structure; but the evidence of the languages as they are to-day is against it.

AGGLUTINATION (Agglutination) [*Agglutination*].

The process of combining or running together primitive words into compounds, in order to express relationships of number, case, tense, etc., as is done in the so-called agglutinating* languages.

AGREEMENT (*Accord*) [*Uebereinstimmung*].

State of uniformity or correspondence.

Grammatical agreement is that by which the various grammatical parts of a sentence are brought into conformity.

For **concordial agreement**, see concord*.

ALLEGORY (*Allégorie*) [*Allegorie*].

A narrative in which the true meaning is to be derived by translating its persons and events into others which they are understood to symbolize. Good examples of allegory are to be found in Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress* (now extensively translated into Bantu languages), Mofolo's *Moeti oa Bochabela*, and Sekese's *Pitso ea Linonyane*, both the last being examples from Sotho.

ALLITERATION (*Allitération*) [*Alliteration, Stabreim*].

Repetition, whether exact or approximate, of a sound or group of sounds (usually initial) in syllables or words, the sound generally being expressed by the same letter. This occurs in the Bantu concordial system; see alliterative*.

Alliteration is also a feature in some types of Bantu literature, e.g. in the following Lamba-Lenje saying, which is repeated quickly as a test for correct repetition: *Cisici camusamba catusita, ngacitusituce*, the stump of the samba tree is in our light, let it get out of our light (where *c* stands for phonetic *tʃ*, and *si* for phonetic *ʃi*).

ALLITERATIVE (*Allitératif*) [*Alliterierend*].

Pertaining to alliteration*.

The outstanding feature of the Bantu languages is what is generally described as the **alliterative concord**. The following examples from Zulu and Lamba will illustrate the working of this concord:

Labo-bantwana ababi bobathathu bayazibamba izinyoni
zethu ezinhle.

Awo-wānice awāwīpile wōtatu walukufikata ifyuni fyēsū
ifiweme.

Those three bad children they-are-them-catching our
beautiful birds.

It is not in every case that the words are so truly alliterative to-day as the above examples show, e.g. in Shona: *ndinoda banga rangu* (I want my knife), where the *r* of the concord can be shown to have historical alliterative derivation from *banga*, which was originally *ri-banga*. Nevertheless the term alliterative concord may be considered a correct usage. For short the single term concord* is now generally used.

ALPHABET (*Alphabet*) [*Alphabet*].

(i) In general, the system of graphic symbols employed for the writing of a language, more particularly when these are phonetic representations of the sounds.

(ii) The ordered list of letters employed in the writing of a language.

ALPHABETICAL (*Alphabétique*) [*Alphabetisch*].

Pertaining to the order of the letters of the alphabet. The **alphabetical order** is the customary order of any particular alphabet, convenient especially for reference in vocabularies and dictionaries.

ALTERNATIVE (*Alternative*) [*Alternative*].

A choice between two forms; or, more loosely, a choice between several forms, each essentially the same, cf. variant*.

In Zulu, for instance, the demonstratives *lowaya* and *lowayana* are alternatives or **alternative forms**; similarly the locatives *otshanini* and *etshanini* (from *utshani*, grass), or the diminutives *itholana*, *ithodlana* and *ithoyana* (from *ithole*, calf) are alternatives.

Alternatives will become common in the process of unifying dialects. In Shona unification, for instance, the alternatives *zhira* (Karanga dialect) and *nzira* (Zezuru dialect) are recognized for "path"; similarly *bge* and *idge* (stone); *vona*, *wona* and *ona* (see), and many others.

Alternative pronunciations are also found in Bantu languages, as for instance in unified Shona, where the conventional digraphs *ty* and *dy* stand for several dialectical alternatives. Apart from their occurrence in such processes of unifying dialects, alternative pronunciations are not common in Bantu languages.

Alternatives must be distinguished from synonyms*.

ALVEOLAR (*Alvéolaire*) [*Alveolare*].

Articulated by tongue-tip against the teeth-ridge or alveolus, that part of the hard palate which presents a convex surface to the tongue. The more common **alveolar consonants** are the following: **alveolar explosives**, *t, d*; **alveolar implosive**, *d'*; **alveolar nasal**, *n*; **alveolar fricatives**, *s, z*; **alveolar labialized* fricatives**, *ʃ, ʒ*.

In Bantu languages alveolar and dental* sounds are not significantly differentiated, but in certain cases post-alveolar* consonants, when used instead of retroflex consonants, are semantically distinct from dentals.

AMPLIFICATIVE.

A term used by some writers to indicate the augmentative* form of nouns, etc.

ANALOGY (*Analogie*) [*Analogie*].

"Inference or procedure based on the presumption that things whose likeness in certain respects is known will be found or should be treated as alike also in respects about which knowledge is limited to one of them." (Fowler).

False analogy entails the application of analogy to such parts as are really different, e.g. in Zulu (Zululand dialect) the adjectival concord for class 8 is *ezim-* or *ezin-*, instead of the normal (Southern Zulu) *ezi-* (< prefix *izi-*) by false analogy with the regular form of class 10 (< prefix *izin-*, *izim-*), e.g. *izihlalo ezimbili* (instead of *ezibili*).

On this subject Meinhof (in his *Introduction to the Phonology of the Bantu Languages*, ed. by v. Warmelo, pp. 16, 17) writes: "The origin of many sounds, otherwise not to be accounted for, is explained by the psychological process called analogy. In Swahili, for instance, it is not at all uncommon to find that *l* has dropped out after *u*, e.g. in *-pindua* 'turn round.' In longer forms of the verb this *l* is preserved, as in *-pindulia* 'turn round for someone.' In some stems however, it is not *l* but *w* that has dropped out after *u*, e.g. in *-djua* 'know,' cf. Swahili §25, *mdjuvi* 'knower,' the *w* becoming *v* according to the rules of Swahili phonology, whereas *l* would have become *z*. In spite of this, the form *-djulikana* 'be known' has been formed from *-djua* as though it were an *l* that has dropped out, by analogy with formations which really contain *l*."

ANALYSE (*Analyser*) [*Analysieren*].

(i) To examine sentences in order to determine the relationship of one proposition to another, and of one word or group of words to another.

(ii) To dissect words in order to determine their formation and derivation.

ANALYSIS (*Analyse logique*) [*Analyse*].

(i) The detailed examination of sentences to determine the relationship in which propositions and also words belonging to the same proposition stand to one another. This is sometimes called **logical analysis** or **sentence analysis**. The following example from Zulu will illustrate:

A. *Angifuni ukuba amankonyane aphume esibayeni ekuseni* (I do not want the calves to leave the cattle-kraal in the early morning). Complex sentence.

Subject: (*mina*)

Predicate: *angifuni*

Object: *ukuba . . . ekuseni* (substantive clause).

a. *ukuba amankonyane aphume esibayeni ekuseni* (subordinate clause).

Connective: *ukuba*

Subject: *amankonyane*

Predicate: *aphume*

Extension of predicate: (i) *esibayeni* (place), (ii) *ekuseni* (time).

(ii) The term "etymological* analysis" is sometimes used for that portion of parsing*, which deals with the dissection of the formation and derivation of words.

ANALYTIC (*Analytique*) [*Analytisch*].

Resolving into elements or constituent parts.

An **analytic language** is one in which the grammatical elements, such as prepositions, pronouns, auxiliaries, are expressed by separate words, instead of by inflexions, affixes, etc., as is done in the case of a synthetic* language. Latin is synthetic, while French is analytic; similarly Bantu is synthetic, while Sudanic is analytic.

To divide words "analytically" is to break them up into constituent elements irrespective of their particular type of pronunciation. This is incorrectly done in numerous Bantu languages, e.g. Sotho.

ANOMALY (*Anomalie*) [*Anomalie*].

Unexpected deviation from the general rule, due to some influence, derivation or exceptional circumstance, which is not plainly obvious. For instance in Zulu the singular prefix *i-* is associated with a plural prefix *ama-*, as in *izwe* (country), *amazwe*; but *iva* (thorn) has an **anomalous plural** in *ameva*, the deviating influence being that the stem is *-iva* causing a coalescence in the plural of $a + i > e$.

Most Bantu grammatical exceptions* are found to be of this type.

ANTECEDENT (*Antécédent*) [*Antecedens*].

A substantive, substantival clause or phrase to which a pronoun or qualificative refers. The origin of the term, "going before," is generally a reference to priority in word-order.

In direct relative construction the antecedent is the substantive qualified.

ANTEPENULTIMATE (*Antépénultième*) [*Drittletzte (Sylbe)*].

The last syllable but two in a word. The contracted form **antepenult** and the term **antepenultima** are also used.

Antepenultimate stress is stress on the third last syllable; cf. Zulu ideophones such as *ckithi* (of fullness), and Ganda *njágala* (I want).

ANTONYM (*Antonyme*) [*Antonym*].

A word which is the opposite in meaning to another word in the same language; a term used in contrast to synonym*.

Examples:

Zulu salutations on parting:

The one remaining says, *Hamba kahle!*

The one going says, *Sala kahle!*

Similarly in Lamba: *ngalukafike-po!* and *ngalusyale-po!*

In Zulu *thanda* (love) and *zonda* (hate) are antonyms; in Shona *pinda* (enter) and *buda* (go out); etc.

AORIST (*Aoriste*) [*Aorist*].

A tense of the Greek verb which denotes that the action took place in the past, but is indefinite as to the exact time.

It is very questionable whether this term is applicable to Bantu languages. Appleyard used it incorrectly, in reference