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1. Introduction

The goal of the present paper is to describe and analyse the system of verbal extensions in Changana1. Previous studies on this issue have been made by missionaries such as Junod (1967), Ouwehand (1965) and Ribeiro (1965), as well as scholars such as Baumbach (1988), Sitoe (1996), and others. I intend to compare the Changana verbal extensions as they have been described and analyzed by Doke (1954), Ribeiro (1965) and Baumbach (1988), in order to arrive at a consistent and more coherent presentation of Changana verbal extensions, as there is some disagreement about this issue in the previous literature.

Below, there is first a comparative survey of the various verbal extensions that have been claimed for Changana, which then leads me to present my own analyse and proposal for a re-statement on this matter.

2. Verbal extensions in Changana

The notion of Bantu verbal extensions has been defined differently by different authors. While most authors seem to agree in considering the verbal extensions as a morphological process (Jensen 1990; Payne 1994; Katamba 1993; Nurse and Philippson 2003, and others), they diverge in whether or not to consider them as derivational or inflexional affixes. For instance, Mutaka and Tamanji (2000:176) define verbal extensions as “verbal suffixes which are added to the root resulting in a new verb stem”. Matsinhe (1994:163) considers that a verbal extension “may be seen as a bound morpheme hosted by a verbal root”. According to Mutaka and Tamanji (2000) verbal extensions are derivational. Matsinhe (1994) sees them

---

1 Doke (1954) and Ribeiro (1965) use the designation Tsonga to refer the language (here called Changana) as well as a group of languages (which includes Changana, Rhonga, and Xitshwa). Here, I will use the terminology adopted by Centro de Investigação das Línguas Moçambicanas (NELIMO) in which Tsonga is used to refer to the larger grouping only, while Changana refers exclusively to a language.
also as inflexional. In the verbal structure, the verbal extensions occur immediately after the root and before the final vowel.

Table 1 comprises a comparison of the verbal extensions that have been suggested for Changana, together with their assumed Proto-Bantu origins, where such exist. The Proto-Bantu forms derive from Meeussen (1967:92) and Schadeberg (2003), unless otherwise noted.

Table 1: verbal extensions in Changana

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*-il- applicable</td>
<td>-el- applicative</td>
<td>-el- applicative</td>
<td>-el- applicative</td>
<td>-el- applicative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(ic)i- causative</td>
<td>-is- causative</td>
<td>-is- causative</td>
<td>-is- causative</td>
<td>-is- causative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*-ikj- intensive2</td>
<td>-isis- intensive</td>
<td>-isis- intensive</td>
<td>-isis- intensive</td>
<td>-isis - causative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*-ik- neuter</td>
<td>-ek- neuter</td>
<td>-ek-qualificative</td>
<td>-ek-neutro-passive</td>
<td>-ek- pseudo-passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*-(ib)u- passive</td>
<td>-iw- passive</td>
<td>-iw- passive</td>
<td>-iw- passive</td>
<td>-iw- passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*-idid- persistive3</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-elel- intensive applied</td>
<td>-elel- persistive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*-an- reciprocal</td>
<td>-an- reciprocal</td>
<td>-an- reciprocal</td>
<td>-an- reciprocal</td>
<td>-an -reciprocal/Attributive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*-ud- reversive</td>
<td>-ul- reversive</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-ul- reversive</td>
<td>-ul- reversive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*-at- contactive +</td>
<td>-etel- kind of intensive</td>
<td>-etel- iterative</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-etel- iterative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*-il- applicative</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-et- contactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*-am- positional</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-am- positional</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-rh-/-ndz-</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-rh-/-rhel-</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 shows how the various analyses of Changana verbal extension differ from one authors to another. This will be used as a starting point for the rest of the discussion. Below, I will discuss and analyse each of these extension in turn.

---

2 This extension derives from Guthrie (1967/71) and is listed as CS2192.
3 This is listed by Guthrie (1967/71) as CS2189.
2.1. Applicative -el-

The applicative extension is sometimes called benefactive or dative, and “it indicates that the state or the action described is for the benefice of somebody else” (Mataka and Tamanji 2000:179). However, Matsinhe (1994:165-166) argues that this verbal extension can also be regarded as a maleficiary, in which case it can introduce an object associated with a locative.

(1) a. xitombhana xisveka nyama
   7-girl 7-PRES-cook-FV 9-meat
   ‘the girl cooks the meat’

   b. xitombhana xisvekela mamani nyama
   7-girl 7-PRES-cook-APPL-FV 1-mother 9-meat
   ‘the girl cooks the meat for the mother’

(2) xitombhana xijela mamani nyama
   7-girl 7-PRES-eat-APPL-FV 1-mother 9-meat
   ‘the girl eats the meat for the mother’ (i.e. ‘the girl eats the mother’s meat’)

In (1a), the verb -svek- ‘to cook’ occurs in the present tense with no verbal extension. In (1b), the applicative verbal extension -el- has been suffixed to the verbal root resulting in a new verb stem -svekela- ‘to cook for the benefice of’ (in this case the mother). However, in (2), the action is not in favour of the mother (the object). Instead, the girl is eating something that was meant to be eaten by the mother, thus being not a benefactive, but rather a malefactive (cf. Matsinhe 1994).

2.2. Causative -is-

The causative has the meaning “to cause or to make somebody do something” or “to cause something to become something different” (Mataka and Tamanji 2000:177). They add that
“generally, the causative has the effect of changing monovalent verbs to bivalent verbs” (Mataka and Tamanji 2000:117) as it is shown in the following examples:

(3) a. xitombhana xija $[^{NP}_{nyama}]$
7-girl 7-PRES-eat-FV 9.meat
‘the girl eats the meat’

b. xitombhana xijis $[^{NP}_{mamani}]$ $[^{NP}_{nyama}]$
7-girl 7-PRES-eat-CAUS.FV 1-mother 9.meat
‘the girl causes the mother eats the meat’

In (3a), the verb kuja ‘to eat’ has no verbal extension attached, while in (3b) the causative extension -is- has been added. According to Schadeberg (2003:73), “the causative extension may be added to transitive as well as to intransitive verbs. In both cases a new argument is added to the syntactic frame of the simple verb”, as can be seen in (3a) and (3b).

2.3. Intensive -isis-

The intensive verbal extension is also referred to as intensive-causative, and it “indicates that an action is performed with intensity/thoroughness/quickness, or sometimes with extensiveness” (Baumbach 1988:210). I consider it causative-intensive because it adds the intensive meaning over the causative. Considers the following examples:

(4) a. mamani ajis $[^{NP}_{pawa}]$ $[^{NP}_{n’wana}]$
1-mother 1-PRES-eat-CAUS-FV 5-bread 1-child
‘the mother causes the child eats the bread’

b. mamani ajisisa $[^{NP}_{pawa}]$ $[^{NP}_{n’wana}]$
1.mother 1-PRES-eat-INT-FV 5-bread 1-child
‘the mother intensively feeds the child with the bread (eating a lot)’
In (4a), the verb *kuja* ‘to eat’ is shown with the causative extension. In (4b), the same extended verb has been suffixed with the intensive verbal extension. Morphologically, the intensive extension seems like the reduplication of a causative extension. However, it always gives the causativized verb a new meaning, the intensive meaning.

2.4. Pseudo-passive -ek-

The pseudo-passive extension has been described in different ways in the literature. For instance, for Guthrie (1967/71) it is neuter/potential, while Doke (1954) and Mischke (1993) see it as a neuter extension. Ribeiro (1964) considers it a qualificative extension, Baumbach (1988) sees it as neutro-passive, and Matsinhe (1994) as a neutro-stative. I do not intend to discuss the theoretical designation of this verbal extension. However, I will refer to it as a pseudo-passive (cf. Ngunga 1999, Ngunga 2000) because it, as the passive verb extension (see 2.5 below), also decreases the verb valency, by promoting the object of the phase to the subject position. The difference between these two extensions is that in a passive construction, the grammatical object is optional, while in a pseudo-passive construction the occurrence of a grammatical object is ungrammatical, as the examples show:

(5)  

a.  

\[ n’wana_{npi} \quad acina \quad musakazi_{npi} \]  
\[ 1\text{-child} \quad 1\text{-PRES-dances-FV} \quad 3\text{-type of music} \]  
‘the child dances the musakazi’

b.  

\[ musakazi_{npi} \quad wa \quad cineka \]  
\[ 3\text{-type of music} \quad 3\text{-GEN} \quad 15\text{-INF-dance-PPAS-FV} \]  
‘the musakazi is danceable’

c.  

\[ musakazi_{npi} \quad ucineka \quad (*hi n’wana)_{r} \]  
\[ 3\text{-type of music} \quad 3\text{-PRES-dance-PPAS-FV} (*\text{by the child}) \]  
‘the musakazi is danceable (*by the child)’

d.  

\[ musakazi_{npi} \quad uciniwa \quad (hi n’wana)_{r} \]  
\[ 3\text{-type of music} \quad 3\text{-PRES-dance-PAS.FV} \quad (\text{by the child}) \]
‘the musakazi is danced (by the child)’

In (5a), the verb kucina ‘to dance’ appears in present tense without any verbal extension. In (5b), the use of the pseudo-passive reduces the arguments of the verbs (by disallowing any grammatical objects). The use of a passive extension, as in (5d), allows the occurrence of the optional prepositional phrase, which is not allowed with the pseudo-passive in (5c).

2.5. Passive -iw-

In contrast to the causative extension, “[the passive] usually modifies the meaning of the verb as well as the verb valency. With regards to verb valency, “the grammatical subject which is the agent of the action becomes the syntactic object” (Mataka and Tamanji 2000: 180). In Changana, despite being an inflexional affix, the passive, is nonetheless counted among the verbal extensions because it fills the same verb slot as do the other extensions. Consider the examples in (6):

(6) a. xitombhana npi xija nyama npr
7-girl 7-PRES-eat-FV 9-meat
‘the girl eats the meat’

   b. nyama npi yijiwa (hi xitombhana) pr
9-meat 9-PRES-eat-PAS-FV (by the girl)
‘the meat is eaten (by the girl)’

In (6a), the transitive verb kuja ‘to eat’ appears in the present tense with no verbal extensions added. In (6b), the passive extension is used, and thus also the grammatical subject has become the syntactic object.

Although the passive ordinarily occurs with transitive verbs, in Changana it can occur with intransitive verbs, too. This is illustrated in (7):

(7) a. xipixi xafa
7-cat 7-PRES-HAB-die-FV
‘the cat is dying’

b. *kafiwa*  \( (hi \ xipi) \_r \)
17-PRES-HAB-die-PAS-FV (by the cat)
‘there is dying (by the cat)

The verb *kufa* ‘to die’ is an intransitive verb but has nonetheless been suffixed with a passive extension (cf. also Kipka 2002:50). In fact, it is possible to say that *kufa* ‘to die’ has an implicit object which becomes “recovered” as a class 17 subject pronominal when this verb is passivized.

### 2.6. Persistive -elel-

The persistive extension is also referred to as an intensive applied-directive extension by Westphal et al. (1974). The persistive indicates that “the action denoted by the verb persists over a longer duration than the simple action. Often, the new lexical item has a slightly idiosyncratic meaning” (Botne 2003:437). Baumbach (1987) refers to this verbal extension as intensive-applied and states that “it is the reduplication of the applicative suffix which indicates the heightening of the force of the action indicated by the verb” (Baumbach 1987:210). Examples showing the persistive are given in (7):

(7) a. *b’ava adlaya tihuku*
1-father 1-PRES-kill-FV 10-chicken
‘the father kills the chickens’

b. *b’ava adlayelela tihuku*
1-father 1-PRES-kill-PER-FV 10-chickens
‘the father kills all the chicken that they have’

(8) a. *mbzana yilandza n’winyi*
9-dog 10-PRES-follow-FV 1-owner
‘the dog follows the owner’
b. *mbzana yilandzelela n’winyi*
   9-dog 10-PRES-follow-**PER-FV** 1-owner
   ‘the dog follows the owner all the time’

In (7a) and (8a), the verbs appear with no verbal extensions. In (7b) and (8b), the addition of the persistive extension indicates that the action denoted by the verb takes place intensively, is prolonged over time, or is done more persistively.

### 2.7. Reciprocal -*an-*

In the Bantu literature, this verbal extension is most often known as a reciprocal extension (cf. Meeussen 1967, Guthrie 1967/71, Hyman 2002, Schadeberg 2003, among others). The reciprocal indicates that “the action denoted by the verb is done simultaneously one to another” (Botne 2003:437). The examples in (9) show the reciprocal use:

(9) a. *mamani axeweta xitombhana*
   1-mother 1-PRES-greet-FV 7.girl
   ‘the mother greets the girl’

b. *mamani ni xitombhani vaxewetana*
   1-mother and 7-girl 2-PRES-greet-**REC-FV**
   ‘the mother and the girls greet each other’

In (9a), the verb appears in the present tense with no verbal extension attached to it. In this example, it is only the mother does the act of greeting. In (9b), the reciprocal extension has been suffixed to the verb, which thus denotes that the act of greeting is done reciprocally, that is, they both greet each other.

### 2.8. Attributive -*an-*

In Changana, the suffix -*an-* can also be used as an attributive extension, in which case “the action denoted by the verb reflects the characteristic of the subject” (Botne 2003:436).

The example in (10) shows the attributive use of this extension:
The example in (10) contains the same constituents as those appearing in (9). The difference in meaning is derived from the internal construction of the grammatical subject. When the subject is a conjoined noun phrase (that is, it is composed of a N+and+N construction) as in (9b), the extended verb gets a reciprocal meaning, while if the subject is a single noun, as in (10), we get the attributive meaning.

2.9. Reversive -ul-

The reversive “indicates an entire reversal of the action” (Lodhi 2002:7), that is, “it indicates the reversal of the action or process indicated by the verb to which it is affixed” (Baumbach 1988:209). The reversive extension has also been referred to as a separative extension (Schadeberg 2003:77).

(11) a. muntlwa uthlave xingufu  
3-needle 3-PRES-pierce-FV  7-ball  
‘the needle pierces the ball’

b. b’ava athlavula muntlwa ka xingufu  
1-father 3-PRES-pierce-REV-FV 3-needle LOC 7-ball  
‘the father extracts the needle from the ball’

In (11a), the verb appears without any verbal extension. In (11b), it has been suffixed with the reversive extension and thus the verb now denotes the reversal of the (original) action, that is, ‘to extract’ (or, “un-pierce”) instead of ‘to pierce’.

In Changana, this verbal extension is not productive. It cannot be freely used with all verbs, but can only be used with a small number of verbs, such as kathlava ‘to pierce’ in (11).
Moreover, many of the verbs that appear with the reversive extension have lexicalized, that is, their would-be non-derived bases no longer exist in the language (cf. also Baumbach 1988, and Doke 1954):

(12) a.  
   -pakula ‘to unpack’  
   -londula ‘to come back’

b.  
   -andlula ‘to roll up’  
   -andlala ‘to spread out’  
   -pfula ‘to open’  
   -pfala ‘to close’

None of the presumed derivational bases listed in the right-most column (12) are acceptable lexical items in Changana. Thus the verb appearing with a reversive extension -ul- as well as the ones appearing with a fossilized extension -al-, with uncertain meaning (cf. Schadeberg 2003:76), in (12b).

2.10. Contactive -et-

The contactive extension, also referred to as tentative extension, “refers to the active elements of the contact” (Schadeberg 2003:77). The previous literature on Changana does not mention the contactive extension at all. Consider the following examples:

(13) a.  
   dlambu  
   rahisa  
   5-sun  
   5-PRES-hot-FV  
   ‘the sun is hot’

b.  
   mati  
   mahiseta  
   6-water  
   6-PRES-hot-CONT-FV  
   ‘the water is hot’, e.g. for taking a bath

In (13), the verb appears with no verbal extension. In (13b), the verb appears with a contactive extension, and now implies some kind of physical contact, which the agent experiences through touching, tasting, smelling, etc.
(14) a.  -nun’wha ‘to smell bad’  -nun’wheta ‘to in contact to bad smell’
    -ringa ‘to experiment’  -ringeta ‘to touch something to see what it is like’
    -tsema ‘to cut (e.g. beard)’  -tsemeta ‘to trim’

b.  -vona ‘to see’  *-voneta
    -twa ‘to hear’  *-tweta
    -nyoxa ‘to be happy’  *-nyoxeta

The contactive typically occurs only with verbs that can imply some kind of physical contact, as in (14a), while it cannot be used with verbs that semantically exclude physical contact, as in (14b).

2.11. Iterative -etel-
Most often, the contactive extension appears together with the applicative extension -el- as a combined -etel- extension, referred to as iterative by Ribeiro (1965) and “kind of intensive” by Doke (1954), cf. also Sitoe (1996).

(15) a.  mamani  anyika  pawa  n’wana
    1-mother  1-PRES-give-FV  5-bread  1-child
    ‘the mother gives the bread to the child’

b.  mamani  anyiketa  pawa  n’wana
    1-mother  1-PRES-give-CONT-FV  5-bread  1-child
    ‘the mother gives the bread to the child’ (implying physical contact)

c.  mamani  anyiketela  pawa  n’wana
    1-mother  1-PRES-give-ITER-FV  5-bread  1-child
    ‘the mother gives the bread to the child, many times’

Its frequent occurrence in this combination is also probably why most authors seem to ignore (or miss) that it can also occur alone.
2.12. Positional -am-

Baumbach (1987:208) lists a positional extension for Changana. However, the number of verbs with which it seems to occur is very low, and the derivational bases for them are not always detectable. Though it may have been a more productive extension in the past, it does not seem to be part of current Changana. Baumbach (1987:208) provides the following examples:

(16)  
- hleyama  ‘to slant sideways, be leaning’  
- alama  ‘to brood eggs’  
- ganama  ‘to lie on one’s back’  
- korhama  ‘to bend forwards’

He further says that -ganama has the derivational base -gana ‘to lie on one’s back’ and that -korhama has the base -korha ‘to bend forwards’. For current Changana’s speakers, these putative derivational bases are not acceptable.4

2.13. “Pontactive” -rh/ndz- and “contactive” -rh(el)-

Baumbach (1987) lists two verbal extensions not mentioned by any other author, the “pontactive”5 -rh/-ndz- and the “contactive”6 -rh/-rhel-. However, neither of these should be regarded as verbal extensions. Instead, they are more appropriately analysed as verbalizers, though without any particular detectable meaning (cf. Langa 2003). They are affixed to ideophones in order to derive verbs from them.

(17)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideophone</th>
<th>Verbalizer</th>
<th>Verbalized ideophone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gogo</td>
<td>-n-…-ndz-</td>
<td>-gongondza  ‘to knock on door’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gigi</td>
<td>-n-…-ndz-</td>
<td>-gingindza  ‘to hit with fists’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 Maybe Baumbach’s data applies specifically and only to South African Changana.
5 The so-called pontactive “suffixes indicate in many instances an action (which is sometimes vigorous)” (Baumbach 1988:208). He gives the following examples: -heherha ‘to winnow by jerking movements’, -pupurha ‘to chew green maize cobs’, -gongondza ‘to knock of a door’, -gingindza ‘to tap child repeatedly to warn him against mischief’.
6 Not to be confused with the contactive extension discussed above.
In fact, there are several such derivational affixes in Changana, other than the ones discussed by Baumbach (1987). The following examples are taken from Langa (2003):

(18)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideophone</th>
<th>Verbalizer</th>
<th>Verbalized ideophone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>boo</td>
<td>-lh-</td>
<td>-bolha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>khooho</td>
<td>-l-</td>
<td>-kholola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zuu</td>
<td>-k-</td>
<td>-zuka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bu</td>
<td>-ngut-</td>
<td>-bunguta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ma</td>
<td>-ny-</td>
<td>-manya</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One reason to exclude these as verbal extensions, even though they appear in the same morphosyntactic position or slot as do the other morphemes discussed above, is the fact that they change the word class belonging of their respective derivational bases, that is, ideophones become verbs, while typically verbal extensions are applied to verbs, that is, verbs remain verbs, though with changed semantics.

In the following, it is summarizes the verbal extensions in Changana

Table 2: summarizing verbal extension in Changana

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>-el-</th>
<th>productive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-is</td>
<td>productive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-isis</td>
<td>productive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ek</td>
<td>productive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-iw-</td>
<td>productive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-elel</td>
<td>productive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-an1</td>
<td>productive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-an2</td>
<td>productive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-etel</td>
<td>productive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ul-</td>
<td>productive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-am-)</td>
<td>not productive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Concluding remarks

The goal of the paper was to describe and analyse the system of verbal extensions in Changana. The comparative survey of the various verbal extensions that have been claimed to Changana, concluded that the reciprocal verbal extension is also attributive in the language. Although it has not been mentioned at all in the previous studies of the language, the data analysis showed that there is a contactive verbal extension in Changana. It showed also that the passivation can be made with the intransitive verbs if the implicit object is become “recovered” as the class 17 subject pronominal. The study rejected the positional and pontactive as verbal extensions in Changana (cf. section 2.11) and argued that this is a verbalizer and not a verbal extension. Finally, the study added two verbal extensions that has not being mentioned before in the language, the attributive (-an-) and the contactive (-et-).
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