Chapter 28

VOICE and ROLE: SiSwati & Hua

1. Introduction

In this chapter, we will examine two languages that give the appearance of having three PROPOSITIONAL ROLES. Once the languages are presented, we will conclude with a brief discussion of the limits to the number of PROPOSITIONAL ROLES that are possible in one PROPOSITION, and hence, the limits to the complexity that VOICE may impose on propositional organization.

2. SiSwati

The following three sources expand upon the statement that SiSwati is a Bantu language:

The siSwati language (sometimes called Swazi, from the Zulu form of the name) is a Bantu language of the Nguni group, closely related to Zulu. It is the national language of Swaziland (or kaNgwane) and is widely spoken also in the Eastern Transvsi province of the Republic of South Africa.

Since 1968 when Swaziland became an independent sovereign State, siSwati has steadily been replacing Zulu in education, administration and public life and its use as a written medium has grown rapidly. (Rycroft 1981.vii)

The Swati who are better known as the Swazi, i.e. the zunda form, area people of Bantu stock speaking a Bantu language ... According to the latest cencus [sic] statistics 498 000 Swati live in the Republic [of South Africa] and 419 000 in Swaziland ...The devergences [sic] in speech within the whole Swati realm (inside and outside Swaziland) are quite pronounced. (Ziervogel & Mabuza 1976.v-vi)

SiSwati is understood by all the Nguni speaking people (approximately ten to twelve million people) in Southern Africa, although only about one million in Swaziland, KaNgwane and South-Eastern Transvaal speak it. SiSwati belongs to the Bantu Language Family ... [whose] languages are grouped into geographical zones, which in their turn are divided into groups, sub-groups, dialect clusters (languages) and dialects ... SiSwati belongs to the South-Eastern Zone which also includes the four major language groups found in South Africa, viz. Nguni, Sotho, Tsonga and Venda ... The Nguni group is divided into two sub-groups, viz. the Zunda and the Tekela sub-groups ... The Tekela sub-group comprises a number of dialects ... Of these dialects, siSwati is the only one that has attained recognition as a language in its own right. SiSwati has also acquired written status and it is
used as the medium of instruction in schools in Swaziland and KaNgwane. (Taljaard, Khumalo & Bosch 1991.1)

SiSwati is a language spoken by people who call themselves EmaSwati who are found in the Kingdom of Swaziland and in the Republic of South Africa. The exact number of speakers of SiSwati is not known since no study of this has ever been performed, but it is estimated that there are about 1.7 million speakers, the majority of whom live in the Republic of South Africa. (Thwala 1996.1)


In determining the SiSwati configuration of a NUCLEUS and the PROPOSITIONAL ROLES that occur in it, we shall need first to identify the EVENT-PROPOSITIONAL ROLES. Having done that, we can perhaps identify the boundary between the occurring EVENT-PARTICIPANT ROLES and the non-EVENT-PARTICIPANT ROLE RELATIONS. We will begin with some preliminary

---

1 There is an earlier version of Ziervogel & Mabuza 1976 (Ziervogel, Dirk. 1952. *A Grammar of Swazi*. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.). I have not consulted it. Ziervogel & Mabuza (1976.1) describe the relation between the two editions in this way:

This (Ziervogel & Mabuza 1976) is a completely revised version of *A Grammar of Swazi* published by WUP in 1952. The arrangement of the grammatical materials is completely new, but the examples quoted are to a large extent those found in the 1952 work.

remarks on the morphosyntax of the SiSwati sentence.

2.1 Morphosyntactic Preliminaries

On basic word order, we have this assessment:

“SiSwati is an SVO type of language and the order IO before DO is observed to an inviolable degree” (deGuzman 1987.311)

... the basic order is S>V>IO>DO in double object constructions and S>V>DO in two place verbs ... In double object constructions, the indirect object must precede the direct object when neither object triggers verb agreement. So the word order is S>V>IO>DO ... The object which fails to trigger verb agreement must occur immediately after the verb ... All other occurrences are ungrammatical ... (Thwala 1996.131, 213, 214)

Klein (2007.128) adds this further restriction: “... in basic clauses the complement NPs and the verb form a verb phrase which cannot be separated by adverbs”. The Noun functioning as the S in SVO occasions an agreement prefix on the following Verb:

In SiSwati there always exists a definitive relationship between the subject and the verb of a sentence. This relationship is manifested by the subject concord which is prefixed to verb stem .... (Taljaard, Khumalo & Bosch 1991.26)

In Klein’s (2007.131) formulation:

The class-prefix of the verb is obligatory ... In monotransitive and ditransitive basic clauses the verbal class prefix must have the same class as a particular NP of the clause ... The particular NP on which the first class-prefix depends will be referred to as the privileged NP.

The “class-prefix” referred to by Klein identifies a general grammatical characteristic of Bantu languages, in which Nouns are assigned to one of a number of classes formally recognized by the prefix accompanying the Noun. Thwala (1996.13) and Klein (2007.127) provide a succinct display of the SiSwati Noun classes and their identifying affixes (Thwala 1996.16-17):

---

2 We will discuss “object agreement” below.

3 The final choice of the shape of the Subject Agreement prefix is a bit more complex than represented in Figure 1. Cf. Thwala 1996.74 for more detail.

Subject Agreement “is marked twice in some environments ... [e.g.,] the remote past” (Thwala 1996.108). Cf. also Thwala 1996.137.
2.2 PROPOSITIONAL ROLES

The following examples illustrate the three PROPOSITIONAL ROLES expressed in the S+V+IO+DO SiSwati order (Ziervogel & Mabuza 1976.138, de Guzman 1987.311):

(1) Make\textsubscript{1} u\textsubscript{1}-phek-e ku-dla
    [mother CL\textsc{1a}.SG\textasciicircum4-cook-IP CL\textsc{8}.SG-food]
    ‘Mother has cooked food’ (Ziervogel & Mabuza 1976.138)

(2) Babe\textsubscript{1} u\textsubscript{1}-shay-e ba-ntf\textsc{1}\textsubscript{a}wana itolo
    [father CL\textsc{1a}.SG-beat-IP CL\textsc{1}\textsc{pl}.children yesterday]

Not everyone agrees on the constitution of SiSwati Noun classes. Apparently, a frequent way to compose the Noun classes (cf. Givón 1969 & Welmers 1973. For SiSwati, cf. Taljaard, Khumalo & Bosch 1991.3-4) is to count the plurals as a separate class. By their tally, Taljaard, Khumalo & Bosch end with seventeen SiSwati Noun classes. Ziervogel & Mabuza (1976.9-28) follow still a third principle and end with eighteen classes. Rycroft (1981.xvi) has still another classification that produces either twelve or seventeen classes depending on how one counts. Klein’s classification, which is based on Thwala 1995, is the simplest of the classifications, and I have adopted it in the discussion. The affixes will have grammatical glosses identifying them by Noun Class number and by whether the affix is singular or plural.

There are some minor differences between Thwala and Klein. Where Klein has um- in Classes 1 & 2, Thwala has umu-. Where Klein has tim- in Class 6, Thwala has tiN-. N is an archiphoneme of variant positions of articulation.

The Pronouns and pronominal agreement prefixes are as follows (Thwala 1996.50):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th>Subject Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st.sg</td>
<td>mine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st.pl</td>
<td>tsine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd.sg</td>
<td>wena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd.pl</td>
<td>nine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Pronouns may occur as Subjects or Objects (Thwala 1996.51):

(i) Mine u-bon-e Jabulani
    [I 1ST.SG-see-IP Jabulani]
    ‘I saw John’

(ii) Jabulani u-bon-e mine
    [Jabulani CL\textsc{1}.SG-see-IP me]
    ‘John saw me’

The agreement prefixes of third Person Pronouns are those of the class of the Noun to which the Pronoun refers. The Pronoun may be Ø-, as in (5) below or it may have an overt shape keyed to the class and number of the Noun which it represents.

4 The singular prefix of Class 1\textsc{a} that is listed as Ø- in Figure 1, has a variant u-. 
‘Father beat the children yesterday’

(Thwala 1996.6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noun Class</th>
<th>Prefix</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>um-fana</td>
<td>boy</td>
<td>mu-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ba-fana</td>
<td>boys</td>
<td>ba-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a.</td>
<td>babe</td>
<td>father</td>
<td>mu-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bo-babe</td>
<td>the fathers</td>
<td>ba-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>um-fula</td>
<td>river</td>
<td>wu-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>imi-fula</td>
<td>rivers</td>
<td>yi-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>li-hhashi</td>
<td>horse</td>
<td>li-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ema-hhashi</td>
<td>horses</td>
<td>wa-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>si-nkhwa</td>
<td>bread</td>
<td>si-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tiN-nkhwa</td>
<td>breads</td>
<td>ti-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>iN-khomo</td>
<td>cow</td>
<td>yi-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tiN-khomo</td>
<td>cows</td>
<td>ti-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>lu-phondvo</td>
<td>horn</td>
<td>lu-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tim-phondvo</td>
<td>horns</td>
<td>ti-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>bu-hle</td>
<td>beauty</td>
<td>bu-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>ku-dla</td>
<td>food</td>
<td>ku-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: SiSwati Noun Classes.
These three examples express an **AGENT** in the preverbal position, a **PATIENT** in the POSTVERBAL position of (1), (2), and (3) and in the second postverbal position of (4). The first postverbal position in (4) expresses a **RECIPIENT**. The preverbal **PARTICIPANT** may be omitted, leaving the verbal prefix to identify its class (Klein 2007.132): 5

(5)  
Si-nats-e  ema-nti  itolo  
[CL4.GN-drink-IP  CL3.PL-water  yesterday]  
‘He (e.g. si-lima ‘the fool’) drank water yesterday’

Trying to omit **PARTICIPANTS** in the IO or the O position, on the model of (5) in which nominal expression the S is omitted, produces unacceptable SiSwati utterances (Klein 2007.133): 6

(6)  
*Si-lima  si-nik-e  Ø  ku-dla  itolo  
‘The fool gave (them) food yesterday’

(7)  
*Si-lima  si-nik-e  ba-fana  Ø  itolo  
‘The fool gave the boys (it) yesterday’

---

5 The complement Nouns in the IO and O positions in specific contexts, i.e., when Object agreement is present. Cf. below.

6 The 1st and 2nd Pronouns can appear as affixes, and they provide examples of the grammatical absence of an Object (Thwala 1996.74)

(i)  
I-tshe  li-to-ku-limat-a  
[CL3.SG-stone  CL3.sg-FUT-2ND.PRS-hurt-FV]  
‘The stone will hurt you’
But if a verbal prefix marks the Object, then that Object is deleted (de

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noun Class Prefix</th>
<th>Object Agreement</th>
<th>Prefix</th>
<th>Object Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. um-fana</td>
<td>boy</td>
<td>mu-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ba-fana</td>
<td>boys</td>
<td>ba-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a. babe</td>
<td>father</td>
<td>mu-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bo-babe</td>
<td>the fathers</td>
<td>ba-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. um-fala</td>
<td>river</td>
<td>wu-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imi-fala</td>
<td>rivers</td>
<td>yi-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. li-hhashi</td>
<td>horse</td>
<td>li-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ema-hhashi</td>
<td>horses</td>
<td>wa-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. si-nkhwa</td>
<td>bread</td>
<td>si-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tiN-nkhwa</td>
<td>breads</td>
<td>ti-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. iN-khomo</td>
<td>cow</td>
<td>yi-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tiN-khomo</td>
<td>cows</td>
<td>ti-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. lu-phondvo</td>
<td>horn</td>
<td>lu-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tim-phondvo</td>
<td>horns</td>
<td>ti-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. bu-hle</td>
<td>beauty</td>
<td>bu-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. ku-dla</td>
<td>food</td>
<td>ku-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2:** *SiSwati Noun Classes.*
Guzman, 1987.312) and the sense is that of a Pronoun:

(8) (a) Jón1 ú1-ńík-è sínínì bânànà  
       [John CL1.SG-give-IP friend banana]  
       ‘John gave a/the friend a banana’

(b) Jón ú-wù-ńík-è sínínì Ø  
       [John CL1.SG-CL2.SG-give-IP friend it]  
       ‘John gave it to a/the friend’

(c) Jón ú-sí-ńík-è Ø bânànà  
       [John CL1.SG-CL4.SG-give-IP him banana]  
       ‘John gave him a banana’

The prefixes that occur to mark Objects reflect the SiSwati distribution of Nouns into classes in the same way that the Subjects do. The Object prefixes are listed in Figure 2 (Thwala 1996.16-17).

The following sentences illustrate the unacceptability of ordering AGENTS, PATIENT, and RECIPIENTS in ways that do not follow the prescribed S+V+IO+DO. In (7), the DO precedes the IO (Klein 2007.132):

(9) *Si-líma ba-ńík-e ku-dla ba-fana  
      itolo yesterday]

In (9), the S intercedes between the Verb and the DO (Klein 2007.132):

(10) *Si-nats-e si-líma ema-nti  
     ‘The fool drank water’

In (11), the S separates the IO from position immediately following the Verb (Klein 2007.132):

---

7 The Object prefixes for the 1st and 2nd persons are the same as the Subject prefixes, with the sole difference that the 2nd Person Plural is -ku-, not -u- (Thwala 1996.50).
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(11) *Si-nik-e  
     si-lima  
     ba-fana  
     ku-dla  
     ‘The fool gave the boys food’

In (12) and (13), the IO is separated from the DO, first by an S and then by an Adverb (Klein 2007:132):

(12) *Si-nik-e  
     ba-fana  
     si-lima  
     ku-dla  
     ‘The fool gave the boys food’

(13) *Si-lima  
     si-nats-e  
     itolo  
     ema-nti  
     ‘The fool drank water yesterday’

These three fixed syntax positions — preverbal (__)$_0$V, first post-verbal (V__$_1$), and second post-verbal (V__$_2$) — are cleanly established as the syntactic marks of the three PROPOSITIONAL ROLES of SiSwati. First, the three are initially recognizable by the precision of their morphosyntax in (1) - (13). Second, __$_0$V, V__$_1$, and V__$_2$ are recognizable as the positional marks of PROPOSITIONAL ROLES by the variety of EVENT-PARTICIPANT ROLES that may be manifest in them. Lastly, the EVENT-PARTICIPANT ROLES that appear in these PROPOSITIONAL ROLES can have expressions in other ways, ways that separate them from the semantics of VOICE, and hence, ROLE.

2.3 EVENT-PARTICIPANT ROLES V__$_1$

We will begin by identifying the EVENT-PARTICIPANT ROLES that occur in each of the three PROPOSITIONAL ROLES. We look first at the immediately postverbal position: V__$_1$. If there is no affix attached to the Verb to identify a contrasting EVENT-PARTICIPANT ROLE, the PARTICIPANT in V__$_1$ will appear to be a RECIPIENT as in (4) above. Verbal suffixes identify additional EVENT-PARTICIPANT ROLES.

2.3.1 RECIPIENT

The RECIPIENT exemplified in (4) is typical. Unlike the remaining EVENT-

---

8 Immediate postverbal position can have some imprecision in SiSwati. Sometimes it is V__$_1$ and sometimes it is V__$_2$. It is most clearly V__$_1$ when a second participant follows or when it is additionally marked by a verbal suffix. We will discuss this vagueness in the grammar below.
PARTICIPANT ROLES of the PROPOSITIONAL ROLE $V_{\_1}$, the morphologically unmarked. RECIPIENT appears to be grammatically distinct from the PATIENT EVENT-PARTICIPANT ROLE, which also can follow immediately after the Verb — cf. (1) above, by the fact that the RECIPIENT must itself be followed in turn by a PATIENT.

But SiSwati RECIPIENTS may be more complex. First, consider examples such as (14) and (15), which contain EVENTS expressing verbal performances:

(14) Le-si-lima si-hlek-e Jabulani]
[DET-CL4.SG-fool CL4.SG-laugh-IP Jabulani]
‘The fool laughed at Jabulani’ (Thwala 1996.147)

(15) Ti-nja ti-khonkhots-e babe
[CL5.PL CL5.PL-bark-IP father]
‘Dogs barked at father’ (Thwala 1996.135)

One might think that the PATIENTS Jabulani and babe are so little directly manipulated and touched by their EVENTS, that they are in fact RECIPIENTS of ‘laughing’ and ‘barking’, not PATIENTS. But if that were so, we might also expect alternative expressions of (14) and (15) along the lines of (16b) (Thwala 1996.214):

(16) (a) Um-hloli u-nik-e $ba$-tfwana
[CL1.SG-inspector CL1.SG.give-IP CL1.PL-child
um-khomelo la-babili
CL2.SG-prize DET-two]
‘An inspector gave a prize to two children’

(b) Um-hloli u-nik-e um-khomelo
[CL1.SG-inspector CL1.SG.give-IP CL2.SG-prize
ku-ba-tfwana la-babili
P-CL1.PL-child DET-two]
‘An inspector gave a prize to two children’

(c) *Um-hloli u-nik-e $ku$-ba-tfwana
[CL1.SG-inspector CL1.SG.give-IP P-CL1.PL-child
um-khomelo la-babili
CL2.SG-prize DET-two]
‘An inspector gave a prize to two children’

The RECIPIENT of (16a) is, in (16b), expressed differently by means of a Preposition ku. Thwala (1996.214) comments on (16c): “In double object constructions where the IO is realized as a PP, it must occur after the second complement.” Placed against the earlier description of the grammar of RECIPIENTS, which requires that they stand immediately after the Verb, (16b) and (16c) indicate that ku-ba-tfwana is not representing a PROPOSITIONAL ROLE and that ku-ba-tfwana is not a RECIPIENT EVENT-PARTICIPANT ROLE. It stands outside the semantics of PROPOSITIONAL ROLES and is an EVENT-PARTICIPANT RELATION, but not ROLE. (Cf. Chapter 25).

At least one ditransitive Verb of verbal performance permits similar alternate expressions of what appears to a RECIPIENT:9

(17) (a) “Loku umu-ntfu aka-chutshis-w-a
[as CL1.SG-person NEG-PASS-FV
njeng-en-khomo, a-bu-bik-w-e,
like-CL5.SG-beast CL3.PL-report-PASS-IP
a-bik-el-w-e la-ba-phansi”
CL3.PL-report-APPL-PASS-SBJ DET-CL1.PL-below]
“While a person is not done away with like a beast, let it be reported to the ancestral spirits”’ (Appendix I, 2b)

(b) “Yebo, aku-vele a-bik-w-e
[yes -indeed CL1.SG-report-PASS-IP
e-ndzabukw-eni, ...
LOC-spirits-LOC ...
]’
‘Yes, she should indeed be reported to the spirits ...’
(Appendix I, 2d)

In both (17a) and (17b), the PATIENT is the passive Subject. The RECIPIENT in (17a) follows the Verb as expected, but in (17b) the RECIPIENT is cast in a Locative mode as was ku-ba-tfwana in (16b). Although the choice of Locative expression differs from (16b), as in (16b), e-ndzabukw-eni is representing an EVENT-PARTICIPANT RELATION, but not a EVENT-PARTICIPANT ROLE.

Now, consider the following possibility. What if the two Verbs of (14) and (15) permitted alternative expressions of their post-verbal PARTICIPANTS by

9 These two examples come from Appendix I.
means of some Preposition, for example (These are not attested):

(18) Le-si-lima si-hlek-e ku-Jabulani

[DET-CL4.SG-fool CL4.SG-laugh-IP P-Jabulani]

‘The fool laughed at Jabulani’

(19) Ti-nja ti-khonkhots-e ku-babe

[CL5.PL CL5.PL-bark-IP P-father]

‘Dogs barked at father’

Hlek ‘laugh’ and khonkhots ‘bark’ would stand in contrast with phek ‘cook’ and Shay ‘beat’ in (1) and (2), which seem clearly (from the literature I have examined) not to have (nor to suggest) alternatives such as (18) and (19). That would then further suggest that the PROPOSITIONAL ROLES and the EVENT-PARTICIPANT ROLES of (14) and (15) are distinct from those in (1) and (2). That is, the grammatical sequence of V____N does not by itself fix the PROPOSITIONAL ROLE of the following Noun. The semantics of the EVENT/Verb itself is required in order to know whether the Noun is a RECIPIENT or PATIENT, i.e., a PROPOSITIONAL ROLE of V____1 or V____2.

To explore the possibility in SiSwati, I examined a selection of verbal performance EVENTS seeking to determine their range of permitted syntactic expressions.10 The Verbs were:

(20) (a) tsi ‘say’
(b) but ‘ask’
(c) cel ‘ask’
(d) khulum ‘speak, talk, consult’
(e) tshel ‘tell’
(f) bit ‘call’
(g) tjel ‘tell’
(h) tfuk ‘swear’
(i) konkhots ‘bark’
(j) sho ‘speak’

Of the ten Verbs in (20), I have found only one attested in the literature in a

---

manner that suggests the pattern proposed in the preceding paragraph may in fact exist:

(21) (a) Wa-but-a *ku-nina* ...  
[CL1.SG-ask-FV LOC-mother ...]  
‘She asked her mother ...’  
(Ziervogel & Mabuza 1976.148)

(b) ... *na-ngi-m*-but-ako  
[... when-1ST.PRS.SG-CL1.SG-ask-when]  
‘... when I asked him’  
(Ziervogel & Mabuza 1976.158)

The morphosyntax of (21a) matches the morphosyntax of *tsi* in (22):

(22) No-be ba-nga-hlala-nje lapha e-ndl-ini a-ksi  
[perhaps CL1.PL-MOD-sit-only where LOC-hut-LOC CL1.SG-say  
*ku-lomunye* no-be ngu-malukatana:  
LOC-someone perhaps COP-daughter.in.law  
‘Perhaps while they are seated in the hut she says to some one, perhaps the daughter-in-law:’  
(Appendix I, 5i)

The syntax of (21b) matches that of *bit* in (23):11

(23) Seba-ya-*m*-bit-a *nabo-Lomavila* ....  
[now-CL.PL-CL1.SG-call-FV mother.of-Lomavila ...]  
‘Now they call the mother of Lomavila ....’  
(Ziervogel 1957.26)

The EVENT/Verb *but* ‘ask’ is one that allows a RECIPIENT EVENT-PARTICIPANT ROLE in the PROPOSITIONAL ROLE of V___1 (i.e., [21b]) and also a RECIPIENT EVENT-PARTICIPANT RELATION which is not a ROLE (i.e., [21a]).12

2.3.2 MOTIVATION: *-el-*  
When the V___1 EVENT-PARTICIPANT ROLE is something other than

---

11 The presence of a RECIPIENT in (21b) and in (23) is recognized by the presence of a second agreement prefix on the Verb, here *-m*-. While the prefix that marks the S is obligatory, the prefix that marks the Object is occurs only when the Object is a Pronoun and expressed by *Ø* in V___1 or V___2. The simultaneous occurrence of a nominal with an Object agreement prefix is discussed below.

12 Cf. also (29) and (34) below.
RECIPIENT, it will be identified by a verbal suffix. One of these is the suffix -el-, commonly called the “Applicative” (Thwala 1996.10, 105, 117 et passim, Klein 2007.144-148, Taljaard, Khumalo & Bosch 1991.67-68, and Ziervogel & Mabuza 1976.188-189). It appears in the following (Klein 2007.144, 153-54):

(24) Jabulani u-gez-el-e make i-moto
    [Jabulani CL1.SG-wash-APPL-IP CL1.SG.mother CL5.SG-car
     itolo
     yesterday]  
    ‘Jabulani washed the car yesterday for mother (or on behalf of
    mother, or to the detriment of mother)’

Klein (2007.146) comments on the semantics of (24) as follows:

As shown by the translation of sentence ... [(24)], the argument introduced by the applicative suffix can have various semantic roles. In other words, the applicative suffix itself does not encode the specific semantic role which is assigned to the argument it licenses.

Klein bases his negative conclusion about the meaning -el- on the observation that make ‘mother’ may be ‘malefactive’ or ‘benefactive’ and the conviction that ‘bene/malefactive’ is a “semantic role” in SiSwati; but the variety in the EPROLE of -el- is even broader than that found in (24). Consider the following:

(25) Jabulani u-ti-gez-el-e i-mali
    [Jabulani CL1.SG-CL5.PL-wash-APPL-IP CL5.SG-money
     (ti-mphala)
     CL5.PL-clothes]
    ‘Jabulani washed the clothes for money’ (Klein 2007.154)

(26) Um-ntfana le-nga-ti-tsats-el-a ku-dla
    [CL1.SG-baby DET-1ST.PRS.SG-self-take-APPL-FV CL8.SG-food
     kwa-khe u-ya-khal-el-a
     -POSS CL1.SG-YA-cry-APPL-FV]

13 Thwala (1996) does not discuss -el- directly but includes “Applicative” among his abbreviations. Klein (2007) devotes a section to -el-, but his examples are limited to four roots: gez ‘wash’ (27), sik ‘cut’ (1), fundz ‘study’ (8), dlal ‘play’ (1), and shay ‘beat’ (1). Since everyone uses “Applicative,” I will use the grammatical gloss APPL for -el-.
‘The baby whose food I have taken for myself is crying for it’
(Taljaard, Khumalo & Bosch 1991.164)

(27) Nhlanhla u-to-dlal-el-a *kutsi um-dlalo
[ Nhlanhla CL1.SG-FUT-play-APPL-FV that CL1.SG-game
  u-phel-e nge draw
  CL1.SG-end-SUBJ PREP draw]
‘Nhlanhla will play for the game to end in a draw’ (Klein 2007.148)

(28) Jabulani wa-a-jabul-el-a *ba-tfwana
‘Jabulani became happy for the children’ (Thwala 1996.104)

Clearly, neither ‘benefaction’ nor ‘malefaction’ extends to these. A possible
unifying thread for (24) and (25) - (28) may be ‘motivation’, i.e., What it is
that is impelling the activity. The fact that *wh* questions with *-el* express the
sense of ‘Why?’ adds support to this interpretation (Ziervogel & Mabuza

(29) U-hamb-el-e-ni?
[ CL1.SG-go-APPL-IP-QUESTION]
‘Why has he gone?’ (Ziervogel & Mabuza 1976.189)

(30) Ba-m-bit-el-a-ni?
[ CL1.PL-CL1.SG-call-APPL-FV-QUESTION]
‘What are they calling her for?’ (Ziervogel & Mabuza 1976.189)

(31) Ba-ngi-fun-el-a-ni?
[ CL1.PL-1PRS.SG-look-APPL-FV-QUESTION]
‘Why are they looking for me?’ (Taljaard, Khumalo & Bosch
1991.67)

(32) (a) Ba-m-tfwal-is-a-ni?
[ CL1.PL-CL1.SG-carry-CAUS-FV-QUESTION]
‘What do they help her carry?’

(b) Ba-m-tfwal-is-el-a-ni um-tfwalo?
‘Why do they help him carry a load?’
If we interpret (29) strictly, then -el- has rendered the Intransitive Verb hamb ‘go’, Transitive; -ni questions the added Transitive Object, which is the ‘reason’.\(^{14}\) Note also that if hamb is Transitive in (29), and if -el- is the mark of an EVENT-PARTICIPANT ROLE of MOTIVATION, and lastly if that EVENT-PARTICIPANT ROLE is realising the PROPOSITIONAL ROLE of V\(_{1}\), then (29) joins (21b) and is additional evidence for the existence of the PROPOSITIONAL ROLE V\(_{1}\) without the presence of V\(_{2}\). In (30) and (31), -el- adds a grammatical ROLE in V\(_{1}\) in addition to the PATIENT ROLE of V\(_{2}\), i.e., -m- ‘her’ and -ngi- ‘me’, and that added EROLE is MOTIVATION. In (32), there is a minimal contrast in the verb forms. In (32a), -ni functions as the grammatical DO.\(^{15}\) In (32b), the DO is expressed by um-tfwalo ‘load’, so that -ni must be a fourth PARTICIPANT in the PROPOSITION in addition to ‘they’, ‘him’ and ‘load’.\(^{16}\) As in (29) - (31), that PARTICIPANT -el- ... ni is filling the EROLE of MOTIVATION. The sense of ‘motivation’ extends to (24) by interpreting the EVENT-PARTICIPANT ROLE with reference to the AGENT Jabulani. Make ‘mother’ is the motivation for his washing the car, and that comes through in the gloss as ‘for the sake of’ or ‘to the detriment of’. Notice that since ‘motivation’ is neutral with respect to ‘bene-’ or ‘male-’ ‘factive’, and hence it permits both interpretations. In (33),

(33) Jabulani u-to-ngi-b-el-a

[Jabulani CL1.SG-FUT-1PRS.SG-COP-APPL-FV
ne-m-ona uma e-va kutsi
with\(^{17}\)CL1.SG-jealousy if -hear that
ngi-phas-ile
1PRS.SG-pass-PRF]

‘Jabulani will be jealous of me when he hears that I have passed’

(Thwala 1996.104)

---

\(^{14}\) Ziervogel & Mabuza (1976.88) note, “-ni? ‘what?’ is an interrogative suffix which behaves like an object.”

\(^{15}\) Rycroft (1981.98) lists tfwalo as a “v.t.”.

\(^{16}\) We will return below to discuss the simultaneous presence of -is- and -el- and the possibility of four cooccurring PROPOSITIONAL ROLES.

\(^{17}\) Ziervogel & Mabuza (1976.5) identify ne as a variant of na ‘with’ “before nouns.”
MOTIVATION works as follows. Jabulani is jealous, and the reason/motivation for his jealousy is me. ‘I’ am the ‘why’. Notice that (33) seems also to provide still another example of the PROPOSITIONAL ROLE V₁ without the presence of the pROLE of V₂.\(^{18}\) Ziervogel & Mabuza (1976.189) further provide this minimal pair:

\[(34)\]

(a) \(\text{U-ya-}\text{ngi-}\text{sebent-}\text{el-a}\)  
\[\text{CL.1.SG-1PRS.SG-work-APPL-FV}\]  
‘He works on my behalf’

(b) \(\text{U-ya-}\text{ngi-}\text{sebent-a}\)  
\[\text{CL.1.SG-1PRS.SG-work-FV}\]  
‘He works for me’

Their only explanation is contained in the accompanying glosses. The gloss of sentence (34a) suggests the ‘motivation’ from above, while in (34b), there is no sense of ‘motivation’ present, and ‘he’ is just an employee. Notice that -ngi- ‘me’ (34b) indicates that sebenta ‘work’ is Transitive, and the -el- in (34a) suggests that the PROPOSITIONAL ROLES in both (34a) and (34b) are V₁, not V₂: yet another example of V₁ without V₂.\(^{19}\) Another of Ziervogel & Mabuza’s examples (1976.188):

\[(35)\]

(a) \(\text{Wa-}\text{ngi-}\text{tfum-}\text{el-a}\)  
\[\text{he-1PRS.SG-send-APPL-FV CL5.SG-letter}\]  
‘He sent me a letter’

which implies a-not-provided:

(b) \(\text{Wa-}\text{ngi-}\text{tfum-a}\)  
\[\text{he-1PRS.SG-send-FV CL5.SG-letter}\]  
‘He sent me a letter’

is described as an action “carried out on behalf of someone” (Ziervogel & Mabuza 1976.188) even though ‘on behalf of’ does not come through in the

---

\(^{18}\) If -el- is enabling the presence of -ngi- ‘me’, the it appears to have created a curious instance of a grammatically Transitive Copula.

\(^{19}\) Rycroft (1981.86) lists sebenta as a ‘v.’. In contrast with his ‘v.t.’ and ‘v.i.’, this suggests that sebenta is both Transitive and Intransitive, and we find that Rycroft provides two such glosses: a Transitive ‘work at, work for’ and an Intransitive ‘work, labour’.
gloss of (35a), which could equally well apply to (35b).

Finally, Ziervogel & Mabuza (1976.189) include this example:

(36) Hlal-*el*-a nga-lapha
    [sit-APPL-FV like-DEM]
    ‘Sit this way’

and they helpfully add some context — “you are obscuring the view (for them)” — which provides the otherwise missing ‘motivation’, the ‘why’ for the request. Notice that *hlal-el-a* gives no grammatical indication of being Transitive. From above, we know that SiSwati will not permit the omission of a grammatical Object unless there is a verbal prefix present to index it. In this example, *-el-* appears not to make the Verb Transitive, yet it implies ‘motivation’, which lies unmentioned, in the context. A last example of *-el-* without evidence of a transitivising Object is to be found in (37) (Taljaard, Khumalo & Bosch 1991.67):

(37) Ngi-to-ti-hamb-*el*-a ngobe aw-su-funi
    [1ST.PRS.SG-FUT-self-go-APPL-FV because NEG-2ND.PRS.SG-want
     ku-hamba
     CL8-go]
    ‘I will go alone because you don’t want to go’

As in (36), the MOTIVATION lies outside the main clause, and is identified in the clause following.20

---

20 This does not exhaust the uses of *-el-*. But the remainder are difficult to interpret given the present literature on SiSwati. Consider, for example the following:

(i) Ngi-sebent-a   e-New York
    [1ST.PRS.SG-work-FV LOC-NewYork]
    ‘I work in New York’
    (Thwala 199611.205)

(ii) Kwe-ba-fana ku-ya e-sitolo
    [DIM.CL.1.PL-boy CL8-go LOC-store]
    ‘Little boys are going to the store’
    (Thwala 1996.66)

The prefix *e-* denotes a kind of Locative, sometimes with a following suffix *-eni/-ini*. In this context, Klein (2007.147) has these two examples with *-el-:

(iii) (a) Jabulani u-fundz-*el*-a e-hlats-ini
    [Jabulani CL1.SG-study-APPL-FV LOC-forest-LOC]
    ‘Jabulani studies in the forest'
2.3.3 CAUSATION: -is-

What appears to be a CAUSED-AGENT also occurs in V__1, and it is distinguished from RECIPIENT and MOTIVATION by the suffix -is-:

(38) Jabulani wa-a-jabul-is-a ba-tfwana
   ‘Jabulani made the children happy’ (Thwala 1996.104)

(39) Le-ti-boshwa ti-tsemb-is-e Jabulani
    kutsi ti-to-ti-nakekel-a]
   that CL4.PL-FUT-RF-take.care-FV]

Because li-hlatsi does not occur in sentence (iiib) without the Locative e-, it seems that li-hlatsi is not a PARTICIPANT in the EVENT fundz. It fills no ROLE, and as in (i) and (ii), it is just a Locative. The unattested, but probable, (iiic) would be a minimal contrast with (iiia). That leaves us an unanswered question. Just what is the contrast between (iiia) and (iiic)? Although fundz-el give no evidence of transitivity in these examples, Rycroft (1991.27) cites fundza as ‘v.t.’. Klein does not address the issue. Taljaard, Khumalo & Bosch (1991.67) remark, “When a locative appears after the applicative, the meaning of the basic verb stem will determine the meaning of the applicative.” They give four examples, one of which is:

(iv) Sipho u-to-buy-el-a e-khaya
    [Sipho CL1.SG-FUT-return-APPL-FV LOC-home]
    ‘Sipho will return home’

The probable alternative with utobuya is not provided, and there is no further discussion.

There is one last example that is unexplained (Thwala 1996.104):

(v) Le-si-keti si-to-m-b-el-a si-khulu lapha
     e-lu-khalw-eni make LOC-CL6.SG-waist-LOC CL1.SG.mother]
    ‘The skirt will be large for mother along the waist’

No context is provided for this utterance.

21 Remote Past.
‘The prisoners promised Jabulani that they will take care of themselves’ (Thwala 1996.223)

(40) (a) Jabulani u-to-dabul-a tin-yamatane kusasa
[Jabulani CL1.SG-FUT-shoot-FV CL5.PL-game tomorrow]
‘Jabulani will shoot game tomorrow’ (Thwala 1996.104)

(b) Jabulani u-to-dabul-el-a Gogo
[Jabulani CL1.SG-FUT-shoot-APPL-FV CL1.SG.granny
tin-yamatane kusasa CL5.PL-game tomorrow]
‘Jabulani will shoot game for granny tomorrow’

(b) Jabulani u-to-dabul-is-a Gogo
[Jabulani CL1.SG-FUT-shoot-CAUS-FV CL1.SG.granny
tin-yamatane kusasa CL5.PL-game tomorrow]
‘Jabulani will make granny shoot game tomorrow’

The occurrence of the CAUSED-AGENT gogo in (40c) in the V__1 position, paralleling the MOTIVATION gogo in (40b) suggests that the EVENT-PARTICIPANT ROLE of CAUSED-AGENT is a V__1 PROPOSITIONAL ROLE. The inability of a CAUSED-AGENT to follow a PATIENT in V__2, confirms that impression:

(41) (a) Nhlanhla u-gez-is-e ba-fana i-moto
tolo yesterday]
‘Nhlanhla made the boys wash the car yesterday’ (Klein 2007.149)

(b) *Nhlanhla u-gez-is-e i-moto ba-fana
tolo yesterday]
‘Nhlanhla made the boys wash the car yesterday’

(Klein 2007.149)
Ziervogel & Mabusa (1976.189) point out that -is- is more broad semantically than ‘cause’. With the appropriate EVENTS, it can have ‘permissive’ as well as ‘assistive’ senses, sometimes with the same Verb “depending on the context”:

(42) Ngi-m-akh-is-a in-dlu
[1ST.PRS.SG-CL1.SG-build-CAUS-FV CL5.SG-house]
‘I let him build a house’
‘I helped him build a house’
‘I made him build a house’

The CAUSED-AGENT interacts with the Animacy of its PARTICIPANT (Klein 2007.151):

(43) (a) ?Nhlanhla u-lum-is-e in-ja um-fana
‘The man made the dog bite the child’

(b) Nhlanhla u-lum-is-e um-fana nge in-ja
‘The man made the dog bite the child’

“If the causee is animate but not human, then there is a preference for expressing the causee by means of a prepositional phrase” (Klein 2007.151). If the causee is inanimate, then the preference becomes more absolute and (44a) is therefore not acceptable (Klein 2007.151):

(44) (a) *U-moya u-limat-is-e si-valo Jabulani
‘The wind caused the door to hurt Jabulani’

(b) U-moya u-limat-is-e Jabulani nge
‘The wind caused the door to hurt Jabulani’
By the criteria used in SiSwati for the recognition of PROPOSITIONAL ROLES, both nge inja and nge sivolo fail. They are both marked by Prepositions and they do not occur immediately following the Verb. Yet the presence of -is-signals the presence of a CAUSED-AGENT. There is either a contradiction here, or there exists a middle ground between ROLE and non-ROLE. ROLES do not necessarily exist in discrete opposition to non-ROLES (cf. Chapter 30), and the implication for VOICE is that it, too, is graded. Figure 3 displays the degrees in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSITIONAL ROLE</th>
<th>PROPOSITIONAL non-ROLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... u-gez-is-e ba-fana ...</td>
<td>... u-lum-is-e in-ja ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>... u-lumat-is-e ... nge si-valo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3: Degrees of PROPOSITIONAL ROLES.

the SiSwati CAUSED-AGENT EVENT-PARTICIPANT ROLE. The example in I is from (41a). The example in II is the questionable one in (43a). The examples in III are (43b) and (44b). The example in IV is ‘I will chase you with the help of dogs’ (Thwala 1996.121), where nge tinja ‘with the help of dogs’ represents the weakest degree of ‘agency’.22 Nge tinja probably ascends to some degree of ‘agency’ because of the Animacy of tinja ‘dogs’. Compare (Klein 2007.161):

(45) Nhlanhla u-dlal-e nge ba-fana
    [Nhlanhla CL1.SG-play-IP with CL1.PL.-boy]
    ‘Nhlanhla played with the boys’

in contrast with (Klein 2007.147):

(46) Ngi-sik-e si-nkhwa nge mu-khwa
    [1ST.PRS.SG-sut-IP CL4.SG-bread with CL2.SG.-knife]
    ‘I cut the bread with the knife’

Of (46), Klein writes, “Unlike other bantu languages, Siswati does not license

22 The arrangement in Figure 3 remains schematic. Understanding the semantic contrast between (43a) and (43b) would be of help.
the interpretation of an ‘applicative’ NP as an instrument... Instead Siswati uses prepositional phrases to encode the semantic role instrument, as shown in [46].” With the loss of Animacy in *tinja* ‘dogs’ and *bafana* ‘boys’, *nge mukhwa* ‘with the knife’ seems to move even further to the right in the scale of Figure 3. We have progressed from the CAUSED-AGENT EVENT-PARTICIPANT *ROLE* through (perhaps) three degrees to arrive at the INSTRUMENT EVENT-PARTICIPANT *RELATION*.

2.4 *Revision of PROPOSITIONAL ROLES*

In this section, we continue our consideration of the EVENT-PARTICIPANT ROLES and the PROPOSITIONAL ROLES from above and propose an alternative description. The PROPOSITIONAL ROLE schema of (47):

\[
\begin{align*}
V_{-0} & \quad V_{-1} \quad V_{-2}
\end{align*}
\]

was prompted by examples such as

(1) **Make₁** u-phek-e *ku-dla*  
[mother CL1a.SG-cook-IP CL8.SG-food]  
‘Mother has cooked food’  
(Ziervogel & Mabuza 1976.138)

(4) **Jāhn₁** ú₁-nǐk-è *sìníni* bānānā  
[John CL1a.SG-give-IP friend banana]  
‘John gave a/the friend a banana’  
(de Guzman 1987.311)

(24) **Jabulani** u-gez-él-e *make* i-moto  
[Jabulani CL1.SG-wash-APPL-IP CL1.SG.mother CL5.SG-car itolo  
yesterday]

---

23 This could not work in SiSwati if the Applicative *-el*- in fact is MOTIVATION as suggested above. The semantics are wrong for ‘instrument’.

24 There is another Preposition that contrasts with *nge* in these contexts (Thwala 1996.205):

(i) **Ngi-sebent-a** na-Jabulani  
[PRS.SG-work-FV p-Jabulani]  
‘I work with Jabulani’

If one wonders how (i) contrasts with (45) [No one speaks of it.], it may be that the activities in (i) are more separate, but parallel (We are at separate desks, but Jubilani & I are not otherwise involved.), while in (45), Nhlanhla and the boys are interacting, i.e., the ‘agency’ contributed to the playing by the boys that *nge* marks.
‘Jabulani washed the car yesterday for mother (or on behalf of mother, or to the detriment of mother)’ (Klein 2007.145)

(40) (c) Jabulani u-to-dabul-ís-a Gogo
    [Jabulani CL1.SG-FUT-shoot-CAUS-FV CL1.SG.granny
     tin-yamatane kusasa
     CL5.PL-game tomorrow]
  ‘Jabulani will make granny shoot game tomorrow’
  (Thwala 1996.104)

Looking at just those examples, we have the impression that there are just two post-verbal PROPOSITIONAL ROLES, and the RECIPIENT, MOTIVATION, and CAUSE-AGENT manifest the first, while the PATIENT manifests the second post-verbal PROPOSITIONAL ROLE. We know when V₁ is present because it is followed by a PARTICIPANT in V₂, and we recognize V₂ because it is always final.

But then things begin to look strange. First, we find that any post-verbal EVENT-PARTICIPANT ROLE may occur by itself with no following ROLE. In addition to (1),

(1) Make₁ u-phek-e ku-dla PATIENT
    [mother CL1a.SG-cook-IP CL8.SG-food]
  ‘Mother has cooked food’  (Ziervogel & Mabuza 1976.138)

there is:

(21) (b) ... na-ngi-m-but-ako RECIPIENT
    [… when-1ST.PRS.SG-CL1.SG.ask-when]
  ‘… when I asked him’  (Ziervogel & Mabuza 1976.158)

(34) (a) U-ya-ngi-sebent-el-a MOTIVATION
    [CL1.SG-1PRS.SG-work-APPL-FV]
  ‘He works on my behalf’  (Ziervogel & Mabuza 1976.189)

(38) Jabulani wa-a-jabul-ís-a ba-tfwana CAUSED-AGENT

25 Remote Past.
'Jabulani made the children happy'  
(Thwala 1996.104)

Now, all EVENT-PARTICIPANT ROLES (recognized to this point) occur by themselves immediately postverbally. What sense does it make to force two PROPOSITIONAL ROLES onto (1), (21b), (34a), and (38) when there appears to be only one?

Second, there are examples in which what were described as two EVENT-PARTICIPANT ROLES attributed to V__1 cooccur:

(48) Tsine si-to-ku-dlal-is-el-a
[1ST.PRS.PL 1ST.PRS.PL-FUT-2ND.PRS.PL-play-CAUS-APPL-FV
 la-ba-ntfwana ...]  
DET-CL1.PL-children ...

‘We will make the children play on your behalf ...’26  
(Thwala 1996.106)

(49) Bhuti u-to-ngi-tseng-is-el-a
[CL1.SG.brother CL1.SG-FUT-1ST.PRS.SG-buy-CAUS-APPL-FV
 le-ti-khono kusasa
DET-CL4.SG-cow tomorrow]

‘Brother will sell the cows on my behalf tomorrow.’27  
(Thwala 1996.106)

Both (48) and (49) contain a CAUSED-AGENT and a MOTIVATION. Sentence (49) is curious in that there seems to be no overt presence of the CAUSED-AGENT. Bhuti is the AGENT, letikhono is the PATIENT, -ngi- is the MOTIVATION, but where is the CAUSED-AGENT? Such examples as (48) indicate that the two EVENT-PARTICIPANT ROLES of CAUSED-AGENT and MOTIVATION must now manifest distinct PROPOSITIONAL ROLES ... but which? Sentence (48) suggests that an utterance may contain four post-verbal EVENT-PARTICIPANT ROLES, not the three of (47).28 Thwala’s (1996.106)

---

26 There is a Passive version of this in Thwala 1996.126.

27 Although Thwala glosses tseng as ‘sell’ in this one example, elsewhere in his dissertation it is ‘buy’. Rycroft (1981.103) glosses tseng as ‘buy’. The gloss for the utterance given by Thwala is more literally ‘Brother will cause cows [to be] purchased/bought on my behalf tomorrow’.

28 For example,

(i) BrotherAGENT will cause JabulaniCAUSED-AGENT to give NhlanhlaRECIPIENT foodPATIENT for motherMOTIVE.
remark describes a much more limited SiSwati syntax:

The causative must precede the applicative. The order APPLICATIVE-CAUSATIVE is ungrammatical. Note that the occurrence of two extensions is not accompanied by the occurrence of two extra arguments as we would expect given that normally they each license different types of arguments... That is, the two extensions do not each introduce an argument. Only the applicative licenses a complement.29 (Thwala 1996.106)

and implies that there is a mismatch between the post-verbal PROPOSITIONAL ROLES — which are limited to two — and the EVENT-PARTICIPANT ROLES, which may exceed two.

It seems clear that the PROPOSITIONAL ROLES have no unique association with the EVENT-PARTICIPANT ROLES and that they are characterized by degrees of VOICE as in Yogad. But how are the two kinds of ROLES — PROPOSITIONAL and EVENT-PARTICIPANT — related? The SiSwati examples attested to this point suggest this alternative description. First, there are a number of PROPOSITIONAL ROLES ordered postverbally, probably two. Sentences like (4) and (49) indicate at least two. Second, both PROPOSITIONAL ROLES and EVENT-PARTICIPANT ROLES are scaled by degrees of VOICE. In the depiction of Figure 4, the greater degree is to the left,

\[
\text{PROPOSITIONAL ROLES} \\
V_{-1} > V_{-2}
\]

\[
\text{EVENT-PARTICIPANT ROLES} \\
\text{AGENT} > \text{CAUSED-AGENT} > \text{MOTIVATION} > \text{RECIPIENT} > \text{PATIENT}
\]

Figure 4: SiSwati PROPOSITIONAL ROLES & EVENT-PARTICIPANT ROLES.

and the lesser is to the right.30 Third, SiSwati morphosyntax now works as

---

29 If “license a complement” means that the overt PARTICIPANT following the Verb names the MOTIVE (‘beneficiary’), then that is not accurate. The overt post-verbal PARTICIPANT in (48) is the CAUSED-AGENT, and in (49), it is the PATIENT.

30 Notice that the configuration of PARTICIPANT-EVENT ROLES scaled by VOICE in Figure 4 appear to recapitulate the course of the EVENT. The most intense EVENT-PARTICIPANT ROLE is the AGENT, followed by the slightly “diluted” CAUSED-AGENT. Yet one more degree removed from the original intensity of the EVENT is the MOTIVATION, which precedes the normally animate and sensible, but inactive, RECIPIENT. And last on the scale is the PATIENT, the most totally passive and uninvolved PARTICIPANT, the most completely removed from the sense of
follows. The VOICE of PROPOSITIONAL ROLES and EVENT-PARTICIPANT ROLES aligns the two per Behagel’s First Law (Chapter 9, section 4). The greater VOICE of the EVENT-PARTICIPANT ROLES associates with the greater VOICE of the PROPOSITIONAL ROLES. Whatever selection of EVENT-PARTICIPANT ROLES is present (possible with a given EVENT) will be expressed so the the one(s) with the greater degree of VOICE is/are expressed by the PROPOSITIONAL ROLE with the greater degree of VOICE. Like goes with like. The PROPOSITIONAL ROLE of V__1 is now composed by a degree of VOICE recognized relatively by the “>” of EVENT-PARTICIPANT ROLES in Figure 4. It is the greater degree of VOICE in V__1 that is distributed across the EVENT-PARTICIPANT ROLES from AGENT to PATIENT. In contrast with V__1, V__2 is then the lesser degree of VOICE.

Two additional observations about SiSwati morphosyntax support the interpretation given in Figure 4 as well as explaining the presence of AGENT among the post-verbal PARTICIPANTS. There exists in SiSwati an expression that is called the “impersonal construction” (Klein 2007.158-160 and Thwala 1996):

(50) Ku-to-fik-a ti-mvu e-pulas-ini
[IMPR-FUT-arrive-FV CL5.PL-sheep LOC-farm-LOC]
‘There will arrive sheep at a/the farm’ (Thwala 1996.208)

(51) Ku-a-nats-a Jabulani i-wayini
[IMPR-REM.PST-drink-FV Jabulani CL5.SG-wine]
Jabulani drank wine’ (Thwala 1996.209)

The AGENTS in these constructions appear “immediately after the Verb.” (Klein 2007.159) in the V__1 position of Figure 4. They displace the PATIENT if the EVENT is Transitive.

Thwala (1996.211) notes some limitations on the use of this ku-;³¹

EVENTNESS.

The SiSwati VOICE scale of EVENT-PARTICIPANT ROLES recalls that of Yogad (Chapter 27) and of other Philippine languages (Shibatani 2006).

³¹ SiSwati ku is probably cognate with Kinyarwanda ha (Chapter 3):

Subjects alone allow dummy insertion [i.e., the use of ha-]. The only dummy that is inserted in such a case is ha-, which causes the subject to follow the verb, and the sentence then acquires a cleft meaning. (Kimenyi 1980.56)

Kimenyi (1980.188) has:
The occurrence of the non-agreeing post-verbal subjects is not possible with some transitive verbs ... The class of verbs which permit non-agreeing post-verbal subjects differ from the ones which do not in that they are optionally transitive. That is, they can occur as intransitives. On the other hand, the verbs which do not allow the post-verbal subject cannot occur without a complement. So, they are obligatorily transitive.

Thus, because (52a) exists, (52b) can also (Klein 2007.160-161):

(52) (a) Jabulani u-ya-bhem-a  
[Jabulani CL1.SG-PROG-smoke-FV]  
‘Jabulani smokes’

(b) Ku-to-bhem-a Jabulani in-sangu  
[IMPR-FUT-smoke-FV Jabulani CL5.SG.pot]  
‘Jabulani will smoke pot’

but (53) cannot (Thwala 1996.211):

(53) *Ku-to-shay-a ba-fana tin-ja nga-si-swebbu  
‘Boys will beat dogs with a whip’

Because nik ‘give’ necessarily appears with a RECIPIENT and a PATIENT as in (54a) (cf. [6] & [7]) above), the Impersonal of (54d) is not possible (Thwala 1996.211-212):

(i) (a) Umukwoobwa a-ra-som-a igitabo  
[girl she-PRES-read-ASP book]  
‘The girl is reading the book’

(b) Ha-ra-som-a umukoobwa  
[it-PRES-read-ASP girl]  
‘It’s the girl who is reading’

(c) *Ha-ra-som-a umukoobwa igitabo  
[it-PRES-read-ASP girl book]  
‘It’s the girl who is reading the book’

which seem to show an even greater restriction. If ‘read’ is both Transitive and Intransitive, then (ic) would be acceptable in SiSwati in the way (52b) is.
(54) (a) Babe u-nik-e ba-ntfwana i-mali
   ‘Father gave children money’

(b) *Si-lima si-nik-e Ø ku-dla itolo
   ‘The fool gave (them) food yesterday’
   (=[6])

(c) *Si-lima si-nik-e ba-fana Ø itolo
   ‘The fool gave the boys (it) yesterday’
   (=[7])

(d) *Ku-nik-e babe ba-ntfwana i-mali
   [IMPR-give-IP CL1.SG-father CL1.PL-child CL5.SG.-money]

Because there are only two post-verbal PROPOSITIONAL ROLES, (54d) has no possible syntactic expression.32

The second observation that supports Figure 4 is this. Recall from Chapter 8, sections 3 & 4, that there is a type of language that uses a “crossover” syntax to express FOCUS.

There is a kind of language which uses word order to signal FOCUS, but which requires two positions to signal it exhaustively. Languages in this group are similar to Telugu in that they seem rely on the contrast between the semantics of the position and the semantics of of the content occupying that position. They use the opposite of Béhal’s First Law. In place of positioning like-with-like, they put like-with-unlike. The startling of the juxtaposition achieves the effect that is FOCUS, i.e. “Look here first!”

The Chadic languages Kanakuru (Chapter 8, section 3) and Pero (Chapter 8, section 4) illustrated the type. SiSwati now resorts to the same strategy to effect what the researchers on SiSwati call “emphasis” or “contrastive” (Thwala 1996.237), but what is probably also FOCUS.33

32 It is not clear to me why (53) shoud fail.

33 Thwala (1996.207) has examples comparable to (58c) but with no mention of “emphasis”:

(i) Ku-to-fik-a e-pulaz-ini tim-vu
    [IMPR-FUT-arrive-fv LOC-farm-LOC CL5.PL.-sheep]
    ‘There will arrive sheep at a/the farm’
(55) (a) Babe u-to-tseng-a in-sangu
\[\text{CL1.SG.father CL1.SG-FUT-buy-FV CL5.SG.-pot kamalula kusasa easily tomorrow}\]
‘Father will buy pot easily tomorrow’ \(\text{(Thwala 1996.237)}\)

(b) ?*Babe u-to-tseng-a kamalula
\[\text{CL1.SG.father CL1.SG-FUT-buy-FV easily in-sangu kamalula CL5.SG.-pot tomorrow}\]
‘Father will buy pot easily tomorrow’ \(\text{(Thwala 1996.237)}\)

(56) (a) Si-lima si-nik-e ba-fana ku-dla
\[\text{CL4.SG-fool CL4.SG-give-IP CL1.PL-boy CL8-food}\]
‘The fool gave the boys the food’

(b) Si-lima si-nik-e ku-dla \textit{ba-fana}
\[\text{CL4.SG-fool CL4.SG-give-IP CL8-food CL1.PL-boy}\]
‘The fool gave \textit{THE BOYS} the food’ \(\text{(Klein 2007.132)}\)

(c) *Si-lima si-nik-e ku-dla \textit{ba-fana}
\[\text{CL4.SG-fool CL4.SG-give-IP CL8-food CL1.PL-boy itolo yesterday}\]
‘The fool gave \textit{THE BOYS} the food yesterday’ \(\text{(Klein 2007.132)}\)

(57) (a) Jabulani u-gez-el-e make im-oto
\[\text{Jabulani CL1.SG-wash-APPL-IP CL1.SG.mother CL5.SG-car}\]

(ii) Ku-to-lala eceleni kw-a-mi RipVanWinckle
\[\text{IMPR-FUT-sleep next PREP-POSS-1PRS.SG RipVanWinckle’}\]
‘Rip Van Winkle will sleep next to me’
(b) Jabulani u-gez-el-e im-oto make
[Jabulani CL1.SG-wash-APPL-IP CL5.SG-car CL1.SG.mother
‘John washed the car for MOTHER’ (Klein 2007.145)

(58) (a) Nhlanhla u-gez-is-e ba-fana im-oto
[Nhlanhla CL1.SG-wash-CAUS-IP CL1.SG-boy CL5.SG-car
itolo yesterday]
‘John made the boys wash the car yesterday’ (Klein 2007.149)

(b) Nhlanhla u-gez-is-e im-oto
[Nhlanhla CL1.SG-wash-CAUS-IP CL5.SG-car
ba-fana
CL1.SG-boy]
‘Nhlanhla made THE BOYS wash a car’ (Klein 2007.149)

c) *Nhlanhla u-gez-is-e im-oto
[Nhlanhla CL1.SG-wash-CAUS-IP CL5.SG-car
ba-fana itolo
CL1.SG-boy yesterday]
‘Nhlanhla made THE BOYS wash a car’ (Klein 2007.149)

(59) (a) Jabulani u-fik-e e-kus-eni
[Jabulani CL1.SG-arrive-IP LOC-morning-LOC]
‘Jabulani arrived in the morning’

(b) Ku-fik-e Jabulani e-kus-eni
[IMPR-arrive-IP Jabulani LOC-morning-LOC]
‘Jabulani arrived in the morning’ (Klein 2007.159)

c) Ku-fik-e e-kus-eni Jabulani
[IMPR-arrive-IP LOC-morning-LOC Jabulani]
‘JABULANI arrived in the morning’ (Klein 2007.159)

The essential in (55) - (59) appears in getting the EVENT-PARTICIPANT ROLE
that is in the immediate post-verbal $V_{\_1}$ position out of that PROPOSITIONAL ROLE. Disturbing the mating of the greatest VOICE of the EVENT-PARTICIPANT ROLE with the greatest VOICE of the PROPOSITIONAL ROLE produces the effect of FOCUS. Sentences (55b) and (59c) show that it is not a swap between two EVENT-PARTICIPANT ROLES, but simply a disturbance in the matching of EPROLE with the greatest degree of VOICE with PROLE with the corresponding greatest degree.\footnote{Which may not be precisely a “crossover” FOCUS, but it is one that depends upon matching an EVENT-PARTICIPANT role in a principled way with a PROPOSITIONAL ROLE, a matching that can be contradicted to effect.}

Which in turn leaves some further unanswered questions. How would one say:

(i) Jabulani beat THE DOGS.

(ii) Jabulani gave Nhlanhla THE FOOD.

(iii) Jabulani washed THE CAR for mother.

(iv) Jabulani made Granny shoot GAME.

(v) Boys beat dogs WITH A WHIP.

I.e., besides (i), all those PARTICIPANTS that are not expressed in $V_{\_1}$?

Taljaard, Khumalo & Bosch (1991.138) have a different interpretation of “emphasis”. The morphosyntax of these utterances singles out preverbal position:

(vi) Make \textit{u-ya-kuphek-a} ku-dla
$([\text{CL.1.mother \ CL.1.SG-YA-cook-FV} \ \text{CL.8-food}])$

‘Mother is cooking \textit{the} food’

(vii) \textit{Ku-dla} make \textit{u-ya-kuphek-a}
$([\text{CL.8-food \ CL.1.mother \ CL.1.SG-YA-cook-FV}])$

‘Mother is cooking the food’

(viii) \textit{Make}, \textit{ku-dla} \textit{u-ya-kuphek-a}
$([\text{CL.1.mother \ CL.8-food \ CL.1.SG-YA-cook-FV}])$

‘Mother is cooking the food’

(ix) \textit{U-ya-kuphek-a} ku-dla make
$([\text{CL.1.SG-YA-cook-FV \ CL.8-food \ CL.1.mother}])$

‘Mother is cooking food’

(x) \textit{Ku-dla}, \textit{u-ya-kuphek-a} make
$([\text{CL.8-food \ CL.1.SG-YA-cook-FV \ CL.1.mother}])$

‘Mother is cooking food’

The transposition of subject and object results in subtle changes of emphasis. In sentence ... [(vi)] the object is expressed more definitely, i.e. “mother is cooking the food”; in ... [(vii)] the object is singled out, thereby emphasizing that \textit{food} is
2.5 \(_0V\) and \(TOPIC\)

In attempting to understand the last PROPOSITIONAL ROLE and its EVENT-PARTICIPANT ROLES, we shall first turn to a text. As in previous chapters, the interest will be in whether we can detect any morphosyntax that may be attributed to \(TOPIC\). Then we shall relate \(_0V\) to that grammar (if it is found).

2.5.1 A SiSwati Text

The text is presented in Appendix 1. As formatted there, there are forty utterances. As presented here, there are seventy-one entities. The difference is created by recognizing that some sentences appear to consist of more than one clause and recording that finer segmentation. The verbs that support those clauses are identified in the text by italics. The information that interests us is abstracted in the schema of Figure 5.

I have marked the ROLE PARTICIPANTS by \(S(=subject), \) \(P(=patient), \) \(R(=recipient), \) and \(C(=caused\ Agent)\). Where the PARTICIPANTS are elided, I have used Ø with the functional marks subscripted. Coreference is coded as follows. Where a PARTICIPANT is not coreferential with the \(S\) of the preceding clause, it will be noted by bold italics. Where the PARTICIPANT is coreferential with the \(S\) it will be in regular font.

There are eleven utterances containing words of the characters of the

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>IMPRS</td>
<td>(S)</td>
<td>(OldWoman)</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>(S)</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>OW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>(S)</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>OW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>(S)</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>OW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>(S)</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>OW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

cooked, not anything else; in ... [(viii)] the subject is singled out, i.e. it’s mother cooking and not someone else; in ... [(ix)] the predicate is stressed, i.e. the food is cooked and not left to rot, whereas ... [(x)] indicates that food is cooked.

It is not clear how “that food is cooked, not anything else” in (vii) differs from “that food is cooked” in (x). In any case, sentence initial position appears to be associated with “emphasis” by Taljaard, Khumalo & Bosch. In contrast, Klein (2007.142) says of (xi):

\(Ku-dla\) si-lima si-ba-nik-ile

[CL.8-food CL.4.SG-fool CL.4.SG-CL.1.PL-give-PRF]

‘The food, the fool has given (it) them (the boys)’

that the “complement NP kudla (class 8) can occur topicalised’. Sentences (vii) and (xi) are nearly minimal morphosyntactic pairs. Both are OSV, the one clear difference being that (vii) lacks agreement with the \(PATIENT\), whereas (xi) has that agreement.

The semantics and syntax of FOCUS in SiSwati is a general unknown. No one has remarked upon it except obliquely in passing. The language could benefit from one or two well-directed dissertations.
narrative. Those quoted utterances are set aside and do not figure in the discussion. We are finally left with sixty clauses to consider.

If this text were all we knew of SiSwati, no one would think that the language is SVO/SV. The contents of the list above are further distilled in

Figure 5: Schematic of a SiSwati text.
Figure 6. Of the sixty clauses under consideration, only one is SV, and forty-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elided S</th>
<th>Expressed S</th>
<th>No S</th>
<th>Elided P</th>
<th>Expressed P</th>
<th>Elided C-A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6: PARTICIPANT functions in a SiSwati text.

eight have no expressed S. It is either elided (43) or entirely absent (5).³⁵

Of the 43 clauses where the verb has an agreement marker for the S, yet
there is no separate S expressed, i.e., the elided S’s, 34 (79.1%) are
coreferential with the S (expressed or not) of the immediately preceding
sentence.³⁶ Of the 12 clauses that have an S present, none are coreferential

³⁵ The “No S” clauses are exemplified by (6a1):

(6a1) Ku-ya-khal-w-a, [IMPRS-PROG-weep-FV]
     ‘There was weeping ...’

Klein (2007.159) has a similar utterance:

(i) Ku-fik-w-e e-kuseni [IMPRS-arrive-PASS-IP LOC-morning]
    ‘It was arrived in the morning’

Klein’s gloss suggests that there is no S present. It is not a matter of an S being elided. Of
(ii),

(ii) Ku-nakhata [imprs-cold]
    ‘It is cold’

Klein (2007.160) says, ‘... this construction can also be used to express predicates which do
not have an obvious semantic role ....’ Cf. the discussion of the remaining “No S” clauses
below.

³⁶ In saying “immediately”, I have removed the QUOTATIONS since a a coreferential Ø_S
ignores their presence.

This number includes one example in (5k) in which the Ø_S refers back to the Imperative
Subject of the preceding utterance:

     ‘Cover me with a blanket!’

(k) A-m-embes-e. [CL1.SG-CL1.SG-cover-SBJ]
    ‘Then she covers her’
with the S of the preceding clause, nor are they coreferential with any other content of the preceding clause(s). This pattern of coreference appears to be (part of) SiSwati TOPIC, and S appears to be strongly associated with it. The Ø’s are distributed regularly through the text.

(60) (1a) through (1f) 7 ØS index the old woman  
(2a) through (3a) 5 ØS index the family  
(3b) through (3h) 5 ØS index the head of the kraal  
(4a) through (5h) 14 ØS index the old woman  
(5i1) through (5i2) 2 ØS index the family  
(5i3) through (5i1) 3 ØS index the daughter-in-law  
(5i3) 1 ØS indexes the old woman  
(5m1) through (6b2) 6 ØS index the family

In Figure 4, the initials at the right margin identify the reference of the ØS. Notice that the first appearances of ØS as the old woman, the family, and the kraal are each preceding by a clause with an overt S that, in each case, overtly names the following elided S. The fourth character to appear as TOPIC, the daughter-in-law, is not so prepared. A different strategy identifies her before she is named as ØS:

(5i2) ... a-tsi ku-lomunyei  
[... CL1.SG say PREP-someone  
‘... she says to someone, ...’

(5i3) nobe Øi ngu-malukatana;  
perhaps it COP-daughter.in.law]  
‘perhaps the daughter-in-law:’

(5j) QUOTATION

(5k) Øi a-m-embes-e.  
[she CL1.SG-CL1.SG-cover-SUBJ]  
‘Then she covers her’

Each of the characters to function as TOPIC in the narrative (identified by

\( \emptyset_S \) is named and introduced immediately before they assume the \( \emptyset_S \) marking. In the remainder of the narrative, if a character returns as \( \text{TOPIC} \), it is without benefit of such introduction. That is, once a \( \text{TOPIC} \) in the narrative, always a \( \text{TOPIC} \). This produces the nine examples of \( \emptyset_S \) that are not referencing the \( S \) of the immediately preceding clause: (4b2), (5i1), (5i2), (5i3), (5i3), (5m1), (6a2), (6a6), and (6b2). As expected, these nine are necessarily less systematic than a continuing \( \text{TOPIC} \), but the \( \emptyset_S \) in each instance identifies a \( \text{PARTICIPANT} \) in close proximity, and there is no occasion for losing track of who the \( \emptyset_S \) is referring to. Two — (6a2) & (6b2) — refer back to a preceding \( S \), but in doing so, they must ignore \( \text{IMPERSONAL} \) clause, (6b2), or through an \( \text{IMPERSONAL} \) clause and a \( \text{QUOTATION} \), (6a2). \( \text{QUOTATIONS} \) are known elsewhere to stand aside from the chain of \( \text{TOPIC} \), and the \( \text{IMPERSONAL} \) clauses of SiSwati seem to stand aside as well in that they do not contain \( \text{TOPICS} \) that must then be worked around by the current \( \text{TOPIC} \) (cf. the discussion of \( \text{IMPERSONALS} \)) below.

Clauses (4b2) and (5i3) contain \( \emptyset_S \)'s whose reference passes backwards through one or more \( \text{IMPERSONALS} \) but continues an \( \emptyset_P \) in each case. For example in (5i3):

\[
\begin{align*}
(5i1) \quad & A-m-\text{embes}-i \quad \emptyset_i \\
& [\text{CL1.SG-CL1.SG-cover-PRF her}] \quad \text{‘having covered her,} \\
(5i2) \quad & \text{kutaw-ku-\text{tsi nya,}} \\
& [\text{-IMPRS-say silence}] \quad \text{‘all is quiet,’} \\
(5i3) \quad & \text{ne-ku-\text{tamatama} \emptyset_i a-\text{nga-\text{tamitam}-i.}} \\
& [\text{-INFINITIVE-stir she CL1.SG-NEG-stir-}] \quad \text{‘and she does not even stir’} \\
& [\text{Mote literally: ‘She covered, all is quiet, she does not even stir’}]
\end{align*}
\]

Clause (5i3) seems similar to these two, but there is no intervening \( \text{IMPERSONAL} \):

\[
\begin{align*}
(5i2) \quad & \text{... a-\text{tsi ku-lomunye}_i} \\
& [... CL1.SG say PREP-someone] \quad \text{‘...she says to some one,’}
\end{align*}
\]
(5i3) nobe $\emptyset_i$ ngu-malukatana:
[perhaps it COP-daughter.in.law]
‘perhaps [it is] the daughter-in-law:’

Two more — (5i2) & (6a6) — simply ignore the preceding clause, which is neither a QUOTATION, nor an IMPERSONAL, and continue the S from the preceding clause but one:

(5h) Ne-ku-tamatama $\emptyset_i$ a-ka-tamatam-i.
[ -PROG-stir\(^\text{38}\) she CL1.SG-NEG-stir- ]
‘She does not even stir’

(5i1) Nobe ba-nga-hlala-nje lapha e-ndl-ini ...
[perhaps CL1.PL-MOD-sit-only where LOC-hut-LOC
‘Perhaps while they are seated in the hut ...’

(5i2) ... $\emptyset_i$ a-\(\text{-tsi}\) ku-lomunye ...
[... she CL1.SG say PREP-someone ...]
‘she says to someone’

and

(6a4) ... $\emptyset_i$ ba-hal-e ba-caphe\(\text{-}l-e\)
[... they CL1.PL-live-SBJ CL1.PL-pay.attention-SBJ
tin-dlel-eni ...
CL5.PL-road-LOC ...]
‘... they watch all the roads ...’

(6a5) ... ngoba ba-ntfu ba-ta ku-ta
[... because PL.1-person CL1.PL-come INFINITIVE-come
ba-khala, ...
CL1.PL-cry ...]
‘because when people come along crying ...’

(6a6) ... $\emptyset_i$ ba-ba-bindz-is-e
[... they CL1.PL-CL1.PL-be.quiet-CAUS-SBJ]

\(^{38}\)”(ku)tamátama v.i. quake, rock, tremble, shake, vibrate” (Rycroft 1981.95).
The last two examples are found in (5i1) and (5m1). Both these are alike in that they index then the background audience. At this point in the text, the narrative is describing the death of the old woman. The family council from (2a1) is in the hut to shepherd her to the next life.39 Clauses (5i1) and (5m1) reach into the extralinguistic treating the people as if they, as much as the old woman, is an ongoing presence, a TOPIC.40

The “No S” clauses in Figure 4 are (4a1), (4a3), (4a4), (4a5), and (6a1):

(6a1) Ku-ya-khal-w-a,
[IMPRS-PROG-weep-FV]
‘There was weeping ...’

Klein (2007.159) has a similar utterance:

(60) Ku-fik-w-e e-kuseni
[IMPRS-arrive-PASS-IP LOC-morning]
‘It was arrived in the morning’

Klein’s gloss suggests that there is no S present. It is not a matter of an S being elided. Of (ii),

(61) Ku-nakhata
[IMPRS-cold]
‘It is cold’

Klein (2007.160) says, “… this construction can also be used to express predicates which do not have an obvious semantic role, like for example weather predicates.” Three of the remaining four have, like (61), ambient S’s:41

39 “Thereafter they slept in the hut by the old woman’ (3e).

40 Twenty-two of the 43 Ø’s refer to the old woman. Thirteen index the family (ba-). Five refer to the head of the cattle kraal; three, to the daughter-in-law.

41 The odd one is (4a3), but there may still be “ambiency” there. Note that even without an S, that cala ‘attack’ is still somehow Transitive, i.e., the PATIENT agreement -m-.
(4a1) Ku-ya-sa-ke ... [IMPR-PROG-dawn-ENCL ...]
   ‘It dawns ...’

(4a3) ... ku-nga-m-cala-nje
   [... IMPR-MOD-CL1.SG-attack-only
   ‘... it may afflict her ...’

(4a4) ... ku-se-bu-suku
   [... IMPR-PROG-CL7-night ]
   ‘... it is night ...’

(4a5) ... ku-se-mini.
   [... IMPR-PROG-in.the.daytime]
   ‘... it is day’

In contrast with the Ø S’s that are an indication of a continuing TOPIC, the no-S utterances are an indication of the absence of TOPIC, witness the ambient contexts. Five of the twelve NS are S of Impersonal Verbs: (1e), (1f), (4b1), (512), and (6b1).

(1e) ... ku-ya-bonakala kutsi lomu-ntfu
   [... IMPR-PROG-appear that CL1.SG-person
   lom-dzala so-wu-luphele.
   CL1.SG-old now-CL1.SG-get/be.old]
   ‘... it was evident that ...’

(1f) U-ta kw-ent-iw-a njani?
   [CL1.SG-come IMPR-do-PASS-FV how]
   ‘What could be done to her?’

(4b1) So-ku-cala-ke ku-gula, ...
   [now-IMPR-attack-ENCL INFINITIVE-be.ill ...]
   ‘Illness attacks ...’

(512) ... kutaw-ku-tsi nya, ...
   [... -IMPR-say silence ...]
   ‘... all is quiet ...’
None of the $N_S$ participates as $\emptyset_S$ TOPIC. In this context, it seems that the IMPERSONAL clause is one that has no TOPIC.\textsuperscript{42}

One must ask whether the $\emptyset_S$ that is S is further associated with a syntactic position. If there is no motivation in Figure 4 to assert that SiSwati is SV, then the elision might simply be in some sense “global”, i.e., the S is not absent from $\_\_0V$ but from the clause as a whole. A couple of reasons direct us to attribute the elision to $\_\_0V$. First, post-verbal positions are clearly semantically knit together in a morphosyntactic pattern of PROPOSITIONAL ROLES, and S is not part of it. If $\emptyset_S$ is to be associated with a position, then it must be preverbal. The SV and SVO SiSwati utterances missing from the narrative text are certainly not missing from SiSwati. Examples of such abound in the literature.\textsuperscript{43} It seems that those articulations simply do not have a common place in narratives (at least this one). If the preverbal $\emptyset_S$ is an indication of a continuing TOPIC, then $N_S$ in $\_\_0V$ may indicate a TOPIC that is not continuous.\textsuperscript{44}

2.5.2 Other TOPICS.

The preverbal position is not confined to Subjects:

\textsuperscript{42} In that sense, SiSwati IMPERSONALS are homologous with the OBLIATIVE in Kutenai. Both have the function of asserting the absence of TOPIC.

\textsuperscript{43} And they have been cited extensively above.

\textsuperscript{44} For example, the one example of SV in the narrative is $ba-ntfu$ in

(6a4) \hspace{1cm} ... $ba-ntfu$ \hspace{1cm} ba-ta \hspace{1cm} ku-ta \hspace{1cm} ba-khala, ...  
[... CL1.PL-person CL1.PL-come INFINITIVE-come CL1.PL-cry ...]  
‘... people come along crying ...

is in the $\_\_0V$ TOPIC position, but it is discontinuous with the preceding text, and it is not continued with what follows. I take $ba-ta ku-ta ba-khala$ to be a complex verb similar to $si$-phindz-a $si$-nats-e (Klein 2007.140):

(i) \hspace{1cm} $Si$-lima \hspace{1cm} $si$-phindz-a \hspace{1cm} $si$-nats-e  
‘The fool drinks again’
Le-li-tiya  babe  u-to-li-nats-a  
masinyane  quickly]
‘The tea, father will drink it quickly’                    (Thwala 1996.215)

Babe  le-li-tiya  u-to-li-nats-a  
masinyane  quickly]
‘Father, the tea, he will drink it quickly’                (Thwala 1996.215)

Ba-fana  si-lima  si-ba-nik-e  ku-dla  
itolo  yesterday]
‘The boys, the fool gave (them) food yesterday’            (Klein 2007.137)

Manje  babe  u-to-tseg-a  in-sagu  
[now  CL1.father  CL1.SG-FUT-buy-FV  CL5.SG-pot  
kamalula  easily]
‘Now, father will buy pot easily’                           (Thwala 1996.233)

E-hlats-ini  ku-sel-e  ema-bhuhesi  
[LOC-forest-LOC  IMPRS-left-IP  CL3.PL-lion]  
‘In the forest have remained lions’                        (Thwala 1996.249)

The non-S preverbal PARTICIPANTS must occur with a verbal agreement (Thwala 1996.215)\(^{45}\), and only one such PARTICIPANT may occur.\(^{46}\) The

\(^{45}\) “The object which fails to trigger verb agreement must occur immediately after the verb” (Thwala 1996.214). Klein (2007.142) notes “the only exception to the generalisation that the presence/absence of a complement NP in/from the verb phrase correlates with the absence/presence of a class-prefix” in examples like this:

(i)       Ku-dla  si-lima  si-ba-nik-ile  
‘The food, the fool has given (it) them (boys)’

Given examples like (ii) (Klein 2007.142):
definiteness imparted by the prefix of Object agreement and the fact that only one PARTICIPANT may precede the Verb both suggest the semantics of TOPIC.

2.5.3 Variety of SiSwati TOPICS

SiSwati TOPIC is a complex phenomenon, both semantically and morphosyntactically. The most basic TOPIC, the one that most obviously from an adjacent portion of text, is carried by the elided S. If a TOPIC is introduced for the first time, it is—at least in this narrative—marked by an S that follows the Verb. Placing an overt S before the Verb, i.e., an SV or SVO utterance, seems—on the basis of the one occurrence in this text—to name an entity that does not continue as TOPIC. The examples in (61) - (66), by this reasoning, name a one-time TOPIC, and we would not expect to find, for example, le-li-tiya as the elided S of any utterance that follows.47 This

(ii) Si-lima si-ba-nik-ile itolo ba-fana ku-dla
‘The fool has given them, the boys, yesterday food’

(Given Thwala’s statement that “The object which fails to trigger verb agreement must occur immediately after the verb” why is [ii] possible? Why is it not Si-lima si-ba-nik-ile ku-dla itolo ba-fana?) it is not clear whether the unattested (iii) is also possible:

(iii) Ku-dla si-lima si-ba-nik-ile itolo ba-fana
‘The food, the fool has given (it) them (boys) yesterday’

The coincidence of Object agreement with the overt presence with participant the agreement indexes requires that it not appear in the postverbal position of its propositional role. “An object that triggers verb agreement ... cannot immediately follow the verb” (Thwala 1996.215), and if not separated from the Verb by some form such as itolo in (ii), then by a pause (Klein 2007.141):

(iv) La-ba-fana ba-yi-gez-ile # i-moto
‘The boys have washed it, the car’

These patterns suggest that such PARTICIPANTS share somehow in the semantics of TOPIC. Such forms have figured prominently in the literature on SiSwati (e.g., Thwala 1996.206-217, Klein 2007.138-148, and de Guzman 1987) but without resolution.

46 “In SiSwati, the verb can only agree with one argument at a time” (Thwala 1996.215). Cf. also Klein 2007.142:

(i) *Si-lima si-ba-ku-nik-ile itolo
[CL.4.SG-fool CL.4.SG-CL.1.PL-give-PRF yesterday]
‘The fool has given it (food) to them (boys) yesterday’

Intuitively, this seems right. One would not expect contents such as manje ‘now’, e-hlats
morphosyntax provides SiSwati a way to introduce TOPICS, a way to maintain them throughout a text (changing and non-changing), and a way to have a one-time, non-continuing TOPIC. While consistent with the little textual material we have examined, this description remains very tenuous.

The implementation of the “basic” SiSwati TOPIC is complemented by the use of Object agreement co-occurring with the PARTICIPANT with which it agrees. If this is a part of the SiSwati TOPIC, it is even more unknown than the TOPIC of the previous paragraph.\footnote{As noted above, our understanding of SiSwati could benefit from a couple of good dissertations.}

\section*{2.6 Conclusion}

SiSwati, finally, seems to be a language with three PROPOSITIONAL ROLES

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
Languages that & Languages that Do Not \\
Associate TOPIC with & Associate TOPIC with \\
the PROPOSITIONAL & the PROPOSITIONAL \\
ROLE & ROLE \\
Having the Maximum VOICE & Having the Maximum VOICE \\
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

Languages with One PROPOSITIONAL ROLE \hfill Kutenai

Languages with Two PROPOSITIONAL ROLES \hfill Bella Coola \hfill Yogad

Languages with Three PROPOSITIONAL ROLES \hfill SiSwati

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure7.png}
\caption{A beginning typology of VOICE, ROLE & TOPIC.}
\end{figure}

\footnote{The same PROPOSITIONAL ROLE then — per Behagel’s First Law — also bonds with the}
TOPIC, VOICE, and PROPOSITIONAL ROLE. Cf. Figure 7.

The five EVENT-PARTICIPANT ROLES of Figure 4 are graded by the degree of TOPIC as are the PROPOSITIONAL ROLES. Like the EVENT-PARTICIPANT ROLES of Kutenai and Yogad, SiSwati EVENT-PARTICIPANT ROLES draw from the “evolution” of the EVENT (as proposed by Shibatani 2006). Note that the “evolution” is about the only thing that the EVENT-PARTICIPANT ROLES of Kutenai, Yogad, and SiSwati share. They draw from a common source, but the execution is unique from language to language.

Looking back at Figure 7, we must wonder about the blanks. Is there a language with one PROPOSITIONAL ROLE in which TOPIC is separately constituted? I don’t know of one, but I suspect they do not exist. Is there a language with three PROPOSITIONAL ROLES in which TOPIC is distinct?

3. **Hua**

Hua is Papuan language spoken in the Eastern Highlands of Papua New Guinea. Haiman (1980 vii, xxix) describes it thus:

Over one thousand languages are spoken in New Guinea: approximately a fifth of the languages of the world. Most of them (the so-called Papuan languages) seem to be unrelated to any others spoken anywhere. Hua (Huva) is a Papuan language spoken by about 3000 people residing in a dozen villages in the immediate vicinity of Lufa District Office in the Eastern Highlands Province of Papua New Guinea. It is the westernmost, and most aberrant, of a group of dialects whose 20,000 speakers are known to linguists and to the northern neighbors, (but not to themselves), as Yagaria. The Yagaria language is a member of the East-Central Highlands family, which includes Gimi and Siane as well as Fore, Benabena, and Gahuku. All the members of the East-Central family are spoken within a fairly tight radius of Goroka, the provincial capital.

The *International Encyclopedia of Linguistics* (New York: Oxford University Press) says of these languages (Vol. 3, p. 87):

The Papuan languages ... number about 750, and constitute close to sixty distinct language families — each, at this stage of our knowledge, equivalent in status to the Austronesian family. In a sense, ‘Papuan’ is not a particularly satisfactory designation for these languages; they are not a genetic unit, but simply comprise those languages of the New Guinea area which are not Austronesian.

EVENT-PARTICIPANT ROLE with the greatest degree of VOICE, i.e., the AGENT. Cf. Figure 4.

50 Nootkan or Algonkian may provide an example.

3.1 *Hua Syntax*

Haiman (1980.335-336) assesses Hua word order in the following way:

The basic structure of a Hua clause is given by the phrase structure rule (1):

\[
S \supset (NP) \ (NP) \ (NP) \ (NP) \ VP
\]

where VP is, like the Verb Complex, a single word, the verb. The canonical order of constituents is then SOV. However, the statement “Hua is an SOV language” could be more accurately replaced by two statements (2a) and (2b), of which the second admits of fewer exceptions than the first:

2. a) Most clauses are subject-initial.
   b) Most clauses are verb-final.

Most clauses are indeed subject-initial; however, almost any relative ordering of the subject, object and indirect object is possible, while other nominal complements (henceforth adverbs) generally come either at the very beginning of a clause or just before the verb.

Sentence (1) is an example (Haiman 1980.336):

(67) Kenaga-mo etvagi-mi-mo fu-mo a’-di’
[long.ago-PTS our.fathers-ERG-PTS pork-PTS women’s
p-Za’-viti’ a’-da-e
their-hands-ELAT NEG-eat-FIN.A]
‘In the old days, our fathers did not eat pork from women’s hands’

The sentence-final -e “has the widest distribution” of the personal verbal desinences. “It generally forms assertive sentences” (Haiman 1980.154). The suffix -mo is a “potential topic suffix,” an “apparently ubiquitous and

---

51 About the use of \( \supset \), Haiman elsewhere (1977.54) warns

The symbol \( \supset \) is used advisedly, as [(1)] should not be understood as a phrase-structure rule ....

52 The grammatical gloss “final A” is Haiman’s (1980.153), chosen, because in a list of seven “more or less indicative desinences” (a) - (g), -e is the first.
meaningless particle” (Haiman 1980.246), that “cooccurs with, and thus marks, nouns which are acting as nouns” (Haiman 1980.247).53 The suffix -mu is the “dual and plural ergative ending” (Haiman 1980.228).54 It occurs with Nouns that are the subjects of (Di)transitive Verbs, and it contrasts with “the nominative or absolutive case [which] is the case in which nouns occur that are subjects of intransitive verbs, direct or indirect objects of (di)transitive verbs ... It is invariably the unmarked case ...” (Haiman 1980.228). The Ergative, however, is “apparently the one optional case affix in Hua” (Haiman 1980.361). Thus, we have (Haiman 1980.361):

(68)  (a)  Buro-bamu  Ø-bkai-e
      [Buro-ERG 3RD.SG-swallow-FIN.A]
      ‘Buro swallowed it’

      (b)  Buro'-Ø  Ø-bkai-e
      [Buro-NOM 3RD.SG-swallow-FIN.A]
      ‘Buro swallowed it’

(69)  (a)  Buro'-Ø  fu-mo  k-e
      [Buro-NOM pig-ERG see-FIN.A]
      ‘The pig saw Buro’

      (b)  Buro'-Ø  fu-Ø  k-e
      [Buro-NOM pig-NOM see-FIN.A]
      ‘Buro saw the pig’
      ‘The pig saw Buro’

While (69b) remains Transitive, the Subject and the Object are indeterminate because though not common, OSV is possible (“Most clauses are subject-initial.”). Sentence (68b), however, has an Intransitive gloss, in which Ø-, the

53 In Haiman 1977, mo is a “connective particle”:

It occurs, in the words of my best informant, ‘to join words’ in connected speech, never being found on words which are cited in isolation. For this reason, I have chosen to call it the connective particle.

It would be interesting — were the data available — to compare Hua mo with Palauan a (Chapter 6, sections 5 & 6), which, like mo, occurred with Nouns and which seemed to have the semantics of ESTABLISHED.

54 The singular shape is -mu.
3rd.SG prefix is absent:

(70) \begin{align*}
\text{Buro}'-\emptyset & \text{bkai-e} \\
\text{[Buro-NOM drown-FIN.A]} & \\
\end{align*}

‘Buro drowned’

The vagueness of \textit{Buro' bkai-e} exists because the Verb \textit{bkai} is one of a “number” (Haiman 1980.360) that are Transitive-Intransitive. Verbs “with no internal structure that are transitive [i.e., they are Intransitive] ... do not occur with the ergative” (Haiman 1980.361-362):

(71) \begin{align*}
\text{(a)} & \text{ *Fu-mu' ai'-e} \\
\text{[pig-ERG come.up-FIN.A]} & \\
\text{‘The pig came up’} \\
\text{(b)} & \text{ Fu-\emptyset ai'-e} \\
\text{[pig-NOM come.up-FIN.A]} & \\
\text{‘The pig came up’} \\
\end{align*}

Haiman (1980.361) concludes that the Ergative in Hua is reduced to “virtual insignificance”.55

The remaining discussion of Hua grammar starts with a description of Medial Verbs and Verb Chaining (section 3.2), then moves on to a specific Verb that operates in the grammatical context of Verb Chaining (section 3.3), and finally to the role this Verb plays in what Haiman calls the “NP ecology constraint” (section 3.4). The constraint is operative in identifying the boundary between the semantic NUCLEUS of a Hua PROPOSITION and the PERIPHERY. This in turn identifies the PROPOSITIONAL ROLES within the NUCLEUS of which there is a maximum of three.

3.2 \textit{Medial Verbs}

Hua (Haiman 1980.vii) morphosyntax is characterized by its Medial Verbs:

The chief typological peculiarity of Hua ... is the existence of a “medial verb” construction, which, in the absence of all clausal conjunctions, is used to conjoin

---

55 There is no discussion of a semantic contrast between utterances like (68a) & (68b) and (69a) & (69b).
clauses in compound and complex sentences. Medial verbs not only mark their own clause as non-final, the indicate as well whether their subject is coreferential with that of the following clause.

This grammar is commonly called “Verb chaining” meaning that clauses may be strung together with the last clause being a Final, and the preceding one(s), Medial. Myhill & Hibiya (1988.363) offer a general characterization of the clause chaining construction:

Clause-chaining will here be defined as the use of non-finite forms not headed by a conjunction with temporal or circumstantial meaning. Clauses headed by dependent or independent forms meaning, e.g. before, after, if, when, because, etc., are therefore considered not to constitute clause-chaining. Clause chaining may occur in English, although it generally has a bookish ring to it as in (i):

(i) Sitting down, taking out a pencil, he began to write.

Haiman (1982.179) describes the relation in Hua in this way:

Medial clauses, like subordinate clauses in the more familiar languages, are thus unable to stand as complete utterances. Final clauses, like principal clauses, are identical with complete utterances.

All Medial Verbs in Hua contain a suffix that cross-references the subject of the following clause. And if the subject of the Medial is different from that of the following clause, there will be an additional suffix on the Medial Verb which cross-references the subject of the medial clause (Haiman 1982.179):

Where the subject of the medial verb is identical with that of the following verb, the medial verb will occur in one form, the “like-subject medial,” or LSM. Otherwise, the medial verb will occur in another form, the “changed-subject medial,” or CSM.

All medial verbs, whether, LSM or CSM, will have as their final morpheme a personal desinence (actually a pronoun), which agrees in person and number with the subject of the following verb. This desinence, the “anticipatory ending,” will be denoted by the letter A.

The Hua anticipatory desinences are are given in Figure 8 (Haiman 1991.xxxviii). These affixes simply alert the listener to the person and number of the Subject of the following clause. They do not, in themselves, mark whether that individual is the same as or different from the Subject in the clause in which the anticipatory desinences actually occur. That additional
information is provided by an affix that agrees with the Subject of the present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1s</th>
<th>da</th>
<th>1d</th>
<th>ta’a</th>
<th>1p</th>
<th>ta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2s</td>
<td>ka</td>
<td>2d</td>
<td>ta’a</td>
<td>tina’a</td>
<td>2p</td>
<td>ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3s</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>3d</td>
<td>ta’a</td>
<td>tina’a</td>
<td>3p</td>
<td>ta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8. *Hua anticipatory desinences.*

clause. The absence of such a desinence marks the two Subjects as ‘same’. The presence of the desinence marks the Subjects as distinct.

Agreement with the object of the clause is recorded by the presence of a prefix on the Verb in which clause the Object appears. Clause chains are further tied together by the fact that the Medial Verb(s) “must agree in tense with the following verb” (Haiman 1982.179). Figure 9 provides a schematic view of clause chaining in Hua.56

Figure 9. *Grammatical configuration of a Hua clause chain.*

3.3 *The Verb to-*

The form *to-* appears as an independent Verb with the glosses ‘leave’, ‘place’, and ‘put’ (Haiman 1982.177), but it also appears as a Final Verb in a clause chain with other senses that appear to manipulate VOICE. For example, in (72b), the use of *to-* produces a Causative effect (Haiman 1982.180):57

---

56 ‘M’ = ‘medial ending’ for a subject in the same clause when different from the subject of the following clause; ‘A’ = ‘anticipatory ending’ for the subject in the following clause (Haiman 1982.179).

57 Haiman (1982.180) views the Medial Verb, e.g. vo ‘sleep’ in (72) as the ‘main Verb’, although it “is an L[ike]S[ubject]M[edial] which occurs with only one affix, the anticipatory desinence”. It has the glosses ‘lie down’ and hence ‘to sleep’. It is one of the Intransitive Verbs of motion discussed in 3.3.1.
VOICE and ROLE: SiSwati & Hua

(72)  
(a) \text{vo-e}  
\text{[sleep-FIN.A]}  
‘I lay down/I slept’

(b) \text{vo-da} \ \text{Ø-to-e}  
\text{[sleep-1SG 3sg-TO-FIN.A]}  
‘I will put him to sleep’

The appearance of \text{to-} need not be absolutely final in the chain; it may follow a Medial Verb, yet itself be followed by (an)other Verb(s) (Haiman 1982.181):

(73) \text{vo-da} \ \text{Ø  ₂\text{to-}e} \ \text{k-te-su-ga-ka}  
\text{[sleep-1sg.A 2sg.Obj-TO-Fut-1sg.M-2sg.A]}  
‘I will put you to sleep and you will ...’

In the following five sections, we will introduce \text{to-} as it is used with Intransitive Verbs (3.3.1), Middle and White Magic Verbs (3.3.2), Intransitive/Transitive Middle Verbs (3.3.3), Intransitive/Transitive non-Middle Verbs (3.3.4), and Transitive Verbs (3.3.5).

3.3.1 \textit{The use of to- with Intransitive Verbs}

When combined with an Intransitive Verb, \text{to-} reconfigures the semantics so that the EVENT occurs with two EVENT-PARTICIPANT ROLES, not one (Haiman 1980.351):

The function of \text{to-} support is ... to transitivize almost any (basically intransitive) verb and indicate that this verb has a human object \textit{distinct from the subject}.

If the Intransitive Verb is one of motion, the second PARTICIPANT is a caused-Agent when the Verb is followed by \text{to-}. See (72b) and these (Haiman 1982.184, 1980.354):

(74)  
(a) \text{havi-e}  
\text{[go.up-FIN.A]}  
‘He went up’
(b) hau-na Ø-te-e
[go.up-3SG.A 3SG.OBJ-TO-FIN.A]
‘He made him go up’

(75) (a) Krukrufu-e
[run-FIN.A]
‘I ran’

(b) Krukfufu-da k-to-e
[run-1SG.A 2 SG.OBJ-TO-FIN.A]
‘I made you run’

3.3.2 Use of to- with Transitive/Intransitive (middle) verbs

Haiman (1982.185) calls those Verbs in which the “objects are typically identical with their subjects ... introverted”. Compare the English Verbs wash and kick:

(76) (a) I washed myself.
   (b) I washed.

(77) (a) I kicked myself.
   (b) I kicked.

The Verb wash is introverted as seen by (76b) in which the Intransitive form implies that the target of the washing is the performer, an identity which is lacking in the extroverted Verb kick. Formally, Hua ‘introverted’ Verbs contrast with ‘extroverted’ ones, in that when the action is directed upon a Patient which is identical with the Agent, the extroverted ones remain Transitive and take a reflexive form of the Patient pronoun. The introverted Verbs turn Intransitive as in (79a), and there is no reflexive (Haiman 1982.186). Sentence (78) contains the extroverted Verb dgai ‘see’ and (79), the introverted Verb ehi ‘stand up’:

(78) (a) dgai=di=mo d-go-e
[me=self=me 1SG.OBJ-see-1SG.IND]
‘I saw myself’
(b) (dgaimo) d-ga-ne
[me 1SG.OBJ-see-2SG.IND]
‘You saw me’

(79) (a) ehi-e
[stand.up-3SG.IND]
‘He stood up’

(b) ehi-na Ø-te-e
[stand.up-3SG.A 3SG.OBJ-TO-3SG.IND]
‘He stood her up’

Compare the gloss of (79b) with that of (74b). In (79b), the Patient performs no activity, while in (74b), the Patient is stimulated by the Agent and who then executes the activity on its own.

Verbs of the introverted (Middle) type include auva zo- ‘wash body’, ható ‘scratch’, mnagetagefu- ‘look for lice’, meso kki- ‘shave beard’, frava fro- ‘smear grease’, ku’ vaai- ‘put on clothes’, rgino- ‘turn around’, etc. With these Middle Verbs, to- ‘is available to mark transitive Verbs only when the Objects of these Verbs are distinct from their Subjects (Haiman 1982.186).

3.3.3 The use with a small set of verbs

There are only three Verbs in this class: kigi ‘laugh’, kakorana ‘initiation’, and rusa ‘white magic’ They occur with hu ‘do’ to make Transitive Verbs. (Haiman 1982.188):

(80) (a) kakorana hi-e
[initiation do-FIN.A]
‘He performed the initiation’

(b) kakorana hu-na p-te-e
[initiation do-3SG.A 3SG.OBJ-TO-FIN.A]
‘He initiated them’

They are “neither transitive with nonhuman objects, nor middle (with objects understood to be identical with their subjects). They are Transitive verbs whose object must be human, but whose object need not be specified. Where the object is unspecified, they are ‘undirected transitives’ [as in (80a)] and morphologically indistinguishable from intransitive verbs” (Haiman
1982.188). When their Object is specified, they must occur with to-. And the Object must be human as in (80b).

3.3.4 The use of to- with Transitive/Intransitive verbs


(81) (a) Ø-frufi-e
   [3SG.OBJ-remove-FIN.A]
   ‘He came out’
   ‘He removed it’

(b) frufu-na Ø-te-e
   [remove-3SG.A 3SG.OBJ-TO-FIN.A]
   ‘He removed her’

“There are truly an enormous number of verbs like English break, which can be interpreted as either transitive or intransitive depending on the way in which they are used” (Haiman 1982.183). These Verbs when used transitively without to-, must have a nonhuman Object, while with to-, the Object is human. Since the 3SG.OBJ marker is Ø-, (81a) is ambiguously Transitive (Ø-frufi-e ‘He removed it’) and Intransitive (frufi-e ‘He came out’).

3.3.5 The use of to- with Transitive Verbs

“Verbs in Hua are not generally marked for transitivity” (Haiman 1982.183). The use of to- with unambiguously Transitive (Haiman 1982.183-84) Verbs such as ‘squat’, ‘put down’, and ‘leave s.t./s.o.’ is illustrated in (82):

(82) (a) Ø-iro-e
   [3SG.OBJ-leave-FIN.A]
   ‘I left it’

(b) iro-da Ø-to-e
   [leave-1SG.A 3SG.OBJ-TO-FIN.A]
   ‘I left him’
With these consistently Transitive Verbs, as in (82a), the Object may be either human or non-human, but with to-, as in (82b), the Object must be human.\(^{58}\) This parallels the use of to- with the Transitive/Intransitive non-Middle Verbs.

Transitive Verbs offer one additional possibility with to-. If the Verb occurs with a Non-Human Patient, then to- supports the expression of an additional PARTICIPANT, a Beneficiary (Haiman 1980.352-353):\(^{59}\)

\[(83)\]

(a) \[\text{Zu ki-e} \]
\[[\text{house build-FIN.A}]\]
\[\text{‘He built a house’}\]

(b) \[\text{Dgai-si’ zu ki-e} \]
\[[1\text{ST.SG-BEN house build-FIN.A}]\]
\[\text{‘He built a house for me’}\]

(c) \[\text{Zu ki-na d-t-e} \]
\[[\text{house build-3SG.A 1SG.OBJ-TO-FIN.A}]\]
\[\text{‘He built me a house’}\]

‘He built a house’ in (83a) occurs with the Beneficiary si’ in (83b). Finally in (83c), the Verb ki ‘build’ has three PARTICIPANTS. The third one is a Beneficiary as in (83b).\(^{60}\)

“The main verb iro- is unambiguously transitive [in (84)]. In ... [(84a)], where no nonhuman direct object is specified, the human object of to- is interpreted as the direct object of iro-. In ... [(84b)], where the nonhuman direct object bzamo ‘sweet potatoes’ is spelled out, the only possible interpretation of the human object is that of beneficiary” (Haiman 1982.192):

\(^{58}\) “to- support is not required merely when a verb has an object. It \textit{is} required, however, when the object is human” (Haiman 1982.183).

\(^{59}\) As seen above, with the Transitive/Intransitive Verb in (70), when there is not already a NonHuman Patient present, the result of combining a Transitive Verb with to- is to force a Human Patient. Cf. also the Transitive/Intransitive iro ‘leave’ in (74).

\(^{60}\) Except for the contrasting English glosses, there is no comment on the semantic difference between the two, although Haiman (1982.190) does offer this somewhat cryptic explanation:

... the circumstances under which a sentence like ... [(83b)] may be transformed into one like ... [(83c)] are so limited that the semantic category of “benefactiveness” is at best of merely incidental relevance.
The texts in Haiman 1980 have only one example of *to-* and it has a Transitive Verb (Haiman 1980.500):61

There is no entry *ko* ‘look for’ in Haiman 1991, but Haiman (1982.183) places it among Transitive Verbs “which have no intranegative congers”. It is grammatically unlike hâko ‘seek’ that takes a Benefactive Object (Haiman 1991.54).

3.3.6 *The effect of to-*

Figure 10 illustrates the possibilities for the Patient function when the auxiliary *to-* is not used. The effects are systematically associated with classes of Verbs. As we move from top to bottom in Figure 10, each EVENT becomes more intense. Intransitive Motion EVENTS (a) have no Patient; Transitive/Intransitive Middle EVENTS (b) may have a Patient non-distinct from the Agent; Middle & White Magic EVENTS (c) have Patients distinct from the Agent, but they are nonspecified; the Transitive/Intransitive non-Middle EVENTS (d) may take Distinct, but NonHuman Patients. The absolutely Transitive EVENTS (e) allow both Human and NonHuman Patients. In Figure 10, the PARTICIPANTS from top to bottom represent an increase in VOICE: None < Nondistinct Patient < Nonspecific Patient < NonHuman Patient < NonHuman/Human Patient. Paired with the VOICE quality of their patients, the second, third, fourth, and fifth kinds of EVENTS each, then, repre-

---

61 There are four texts, containing, respectively, 21, 10, 10, and 81 numbered utterances. Because Hua is a Verb Chaining language, each utterance commonly contains multiple clauses, and texts are longer than the numbers suggest. I may have missed other uses of *to-* in the texts.
Figure 10: *Hua* verb class behavior without to-.

resents a parallel increase in VOICE over the preceding one(s). As the VOICE increases in the EVENT so does VOICE in the PARTICIPANT increase. As goes one member of the pair, so goes the other. There is a parallel and direct relation between the VOICE of the EVENT and the VOICE of its non-Agent PARTICIPANT. It is useful to compare this direct relation of VOICE in Figure 10 with a similar one in Farsi (Chapter 25, section 2.2). The Farsi pattern is summarized and repeated in Figure 11. It was the parallelism between the VOICE of the EVENT and the VOICE of the Agent in Figure 11 that explained how the Inchoative graded into the Passive.

Figure 11: Direct relation of VOICE in EVENTS & PARTICIPANTS in Farsi.
The effect of to- on the pattern of Hua VOICE is dramatic. The specific pattern of to- emerges when, having added to-, we pair — as we did for Figure 10 — the range of the effects on the Patient with the semantics of the EVENTS which accept those effects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSITIONAL ROLE 1</th>
<th>PROPOSITIONAL ROLE 3</th>
<th>PROPOSITIONAL ROLE 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intransitive Motion</td>
<td>[Agent]</td>
<td>Causee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitive/Intransitive (Middle)</td>
<td>[Agent]</td>
<td>Distinct Patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle &amp; White Magic</td>
<td>[Agent]</td>
<td>Directed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitive/Intransitive (non-Middle)</td>
<td>[Agent]</td>
<td>Human Patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitive</td>
<td>[Agent]</td>
<td>Human Patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitive</td>
<td>[Agent] Beneficiary</td>
<td>NonHuman Patient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 12: Hua verb class behavior with to-.

When to- is present, the increasing degrees of VOICE (the left side of Figures 10 & 12) are paired with decreasing degrees of VOICE in the PARTICIPANT (The right side of Figure 12). The effect of adding to-: Causee > Distinct

---

62 Following the practice of Hopper & Thompson 1980, Haiman (1982.193) calls this “high transitivity”.

Haiman (1982.178) describes the “meaning” of to- as follows:

My contention is that the to- auxiliary is employed under the following conditions, which define its meaning: ...

(a) The main verb involves at least two particulars
(b) The object of the verb is human
(c) The object is distinct from the subject
(d) The main verb without the to- auxiliary is either intransitive or, if transitive, occurs with nonhuman objects.
Patient > Specified (already distinct) Patient > Human (already present) Patient > .... The VOICE required to add a Causee in (a) is greater than is the VOICE necessary to distinguish a Patient (whose presence is already implied) from an Agent (b). And rendering an already distinct Patient specifically directed (c) is less highly VOICED than (b) and in turn more highly VOICED than it is to require an already present specific Patient to be semantically Human (d). (b) adds a second PARTICIPANT; (c) specifies a second; and (d) only adds a property to an already present PARTICIPANT.63

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVENT</th>
<th>PROPOSITIONAL ROLE 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intransitive Motion</td>
<td>Causee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitive/Intransitive (Middle)</td>
<td>Distinct Patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle &amp; White Magic</td>
<td>Directed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitive/Intransitive (non-Middle)</td>
<td>Human Patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitive</td>
<td>Human Patient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Increase VOICE

Figure 13: *Inverse relation of VOICE in EVENTS & PARTICIPANTS in Hua.*

3.4 ‘NP ecology constraint’ & the maximum extent of the NUCLEUS

The effect of using an EVENT with to- is to create a sort of ‘conservation of VOICE’ between an EVENT and its PARTICIPANTS. An increase in the VOICE of one is offset by the loss of VOICE in the other, and this relation of conservation only exists within the semantic frame of the NUCLEUS of the PROPOSITION. This is the pattern that Haiman (1982.192) calls the “NP ecology constraint”, which finally reveals the maximum number of ROLE components in the NUCLEUS. In this series of examples, the Verb types are Intransitive, Transitive, and Ditransitive.

There is a ‘benefactive’ postposition *si’ in Hua (Haiman 1982.189-190), and “Any action, whether transitive or intransitive, may be performed for a beneficiary.” The sentences of (86) contain a Verb of motion (*ai’o ‘come up’), a Transitive Verb (*ebgu ‘kill’) and a Ditransitive Verb (*mu ‘give’). In each,

63 (e) and (f) are discussed in the following section.
the Benefactive can be expressed by a phrase built upon si’:64

(86)   (a)   kgai-si’ ai’o-e  
        [you-BEN come.up-FIN.A]  
        ‘I came up for you’

   (b)   kgai-si’ fu Ø-ebgu-e  
        [you-BEN pig 3SG.OBJ-kill-FIN.A]  
        ‘I killed the pig for you’

   (c)   kgai-si’ fu bzamo Ø-mu-e  
        [you-BEN pig sweet.potato 3SG.OBJ-give-FIN.A]  
        ‘I gave the pig sweet potatoes for you’

If we omit the Benefactive but retain the PARTICIPANTS of each of (86a), (86b), and (86c), while using these three Verbs with to-, we produce the following:65

64 There are also “a number of verbs in Hua which take benefactive government. Among them are kigihu- ‘laugh at’, korihu- ‘run away from, fear’, the impersonal Transitive hau- ‘like’, whose experiencer occurs in the absolutive as the direct object prefix, while the ‘likee’ occurs in the benefactive, and a number of others” (Haiman 1982.189):

(i) Kgai-si’ korihu-e  
    [you-BEN run.away-FIN.A]  
    ‘I ran away from you: I fear you’

(ii) Kgai-si’ háko-e  
    [you-BEN look-FIN.A]  
    ‘I looked for you’

65 The suffix -si’ “means not only ‘on behalf of’ but also ‘about’” and “some verbs ... happen to take objects in the benefactive case” (Himan 1980.353):

(i) Kgai-si’ hu-e  
    [you-BEN talk-FIN.A]  
    ‘I talked about you’

(ii) Kgai-si’ háko-e  
    [you-BEN look-FIN.A]  
    ‘I looked for you’

“In neither of these cases does the external Benefactive NP have an internal prefixed pronominal counterpart”, i.e., there is no expression with to-:

(iii) *Hu-da k-to-e  
     [talk-1SG.A 2SG.OBJ-TO-FIN.A]  
     ‘I talked about you’

(iv) *Háko-da k-to-e
With the Intransitive Verb of motion, *ai’o ‘come up, the addition of *to-yields the Causative (as seen above in [74] and again in [87a]). There is no Benefactive sense when these EVENTS occur with *to-.

Transitive Verbs respond in two ways in the company of *to-. If they remain simple Transitives, then the Patients must be Human as in (82b) and (84a). But if the Patient of the Transitive Verb is non-Human, e.g., *sweet potato in (84b) and *pig in (87b), then the Human that *to- specifies is a Beneficiary. With Transitive Verbs, the Human Patient with *to- and the Human Beneficiary with *to- must be, in some sense, equivalents in terms of VOICE.66 Equally, there is no Causative sense when *to- is used with Transitive Verbs, (87b).

The Ditransitive Verb *mu ‘give’ does not occur at all with *to-. See (87c). Figure 14 depicts this relation.

66 Since Hua Transitive Verbs accept either Human or non-Human Patients, there will be a contrast of a Human Patient occurring with a Transitive Verb with *to- and a Transitive Verb without *to-. Unfortunately, the semantics of the contrast is not discussed.
Figure 14: Maximum interaction of the auxiliary -to- with the NUCLEUS.

But why can (83c) not have a benefactive meaning? Haiman (1982.192) proposes an “NP ecology constraint”, in which “A clause may have only one object pronoun expressed as a verbal prefix”. This is true of Hua, but it is certainly not true of languages in general. The Bantu languages frequently permit three prefixes tracking PARTICIPANTS in the EVENT.

3.5 Conclusion to Hua

What may be happening in Hua is this. The language organizes its PRO-
The proposition structure of Hua is represented in Figure 15:

\[
\text{[PrepPhrase] \ [Propositional Role 1] \ [Propositional Role 2] \ [Propositional Role 3] \ Nucleus \ PROPOSITION}
\]

**Figure 15: NUCLEUS and PERIPHERY in Hua.**

US reaches its maximum extent in sentences such as (84b), i.e., three PROPOSITIONAL ROLES, with one AGENT (I), one PATIENT (sweet potatoes), and one BENEFICIARY (you). The same maximum is achieved with sentences such as (88) (Haiman 1980.371):

(88) Vede-mo fu-mo p-mu-e

\[
\text{[man-PTS \ pig-PTS \ 3SG.OBJ-give-FIN.A]}
\]

‘I gave the men pork’

with one AGENT (I), one PATIENT (pork), and one RECIPIENT (men). The conclusion is that the Hua NUCLEUS maximally permits only two non-AGENT PROPOSITIONAL ROLES. PROPOSITIONAL ROLE 2 is limited to the EVENT-PARTICIPANT ROLES of PATIENT or CAUSEE, and PROPOSITIONAL ROLE 3 is limited to the EVENT-PARTICIPANT ROLES of RECIPIENT or BENEFICIARY.

The organization of PROPOSITIONAL ROLES in the NUCLEUS now allows us to understand some of the asymmetries of Hua morphosyntax. **First**, the absence of ‘I made you kill the pig’ as a gloss for (87b) follows from the fact that the CAUSEE ‘you’ and the PATIENT ‘pig’ both manifest PROPOSITIONAL ROLE 2, but the NUCLEUS has only one such ROLE. ‘I killed the pig for you’ has the PATIENT ‘pig’ as PROPOSITIONAL ROLE 2, and the BENEFICIARY ‘you’ as PROPOSITIONAL ROLE 3. No contradiction exists. **Second**, (87a) can have only the gloss ‘I made you come up’ and not ‘I came up for you’ because ‘you’ occupies the expresses PROPOSITIONAL ROLE 2, and the BENEFICIARY must be PROPOSITIONAL ROLE 3, which is absent from (87a). The contradiction prevents the gloss. **Third**, in (87c), the gloss ‘I gave the pig sweet potatoes for you’ fails because both the RECIPIENT ‘pig’ and the

---

67 The PROPOSITIONAL ROLES are ordered as they are in Figure 14 — 1 3 2 — to reflect their actual order in (88).

68 Unlike SiSwati (section 2.3.1 above), Hua gives no indication that PROPOSITIONAL ROLE 3 occurs without PROPOSITIONAL ROLE 2, in the way a SiSwati V\_2 seemed to occur without a V\_1 (using the arbitrary notation of that section). That is, in Hua, there is no semantics of EVENT & RECIPIENT without a PATIENT or an EVENT & BENEFICIARY without PATIENT.
BENEFICIARY ‘you’ are PROPOSITIONAL ROLE 3. Since there is a single PROPOSITIONAL ROLE 3 in (87c), there is one too few PROPOSITIONAL ROLES to host them. **Fourth,** ‘I made you give sweet potatoes to the pig’ fails for the complement reason. The PATIENT ‘sweet potatoes’ and the CAUSEE ‘you’ are both PROPOSITIONAL ROLE 1, but again, there is a single PROPOSITIONAL ROLE 1 for two competing EVENT-PARTICIPANT ROLES. The gloss is not possible. **Fifth,** the VOICE character of to- — namely that the force of its VOICE decreases as the VOICE of the EVENT which it qualifies grows (Figure 13) — explains the use of to- in expressing the BENEFICIARY. If the RECIPIENT is more imbued with the EVENT’s VOICE than is the BENEFICIARY, then to- is the appropriate means in Hua to signal that decline in (87b).

4. **Conclusion**

To this point, the semantics of VOICE has allowed PROPOSITIONS to be ordered into a NUCLEUS with one, two, or three PROPOSITIONAL ROLES. Two questions now arise. First, are three PROPOSITIONAL ROLES indeed allowed? Second, are four or more PROPOSITIONAL ROLES possible?

The only explicit discussion of the first question — that I am aware of — occurs in VanValin’s Role and Reference Grammar (e.g., Van Valin 2004, 2005, 2007 & 2009). Van Valin makes a clear negative response to the first question. In his Role and Reference Grammar, the analog of PROPOSITIONAL ROLES are “macroroles” (2005.53, 60-61):69

> R[ole and]R[eference]G[rammar] posits two types of semantic roles: thematic relations and semantic macroroles ... The second type of semantic roles ..., the two macroroles, [are the] ‘actor’ and ‘undergoer’ ... Generally speaking, the actor is the most agent-like argument, while the undergoer is the most patient-like. They are called ‘macroroles’ because each subsumes a number of specific thematic relations. Macroroles are motivated by the fact that in grammatical constructions groups of thematic relations are treated alike. For example, themes and patients function alike for certain purposes in the grammar. It is necessary to distinguish them on semantic and other grounds. But nevertheless, the grammar, for certain purposes, treats these roles as essentially the same, e.g. they can be both the direct object in an active and the subject in a passive ... It appears that a significant generalization is being missed here, since there are long disjunctive lists of roles

---

69 Van Valin (2004.62) claims priority (Van Valin 1977) in proposing a distinction between “macroroles” and “thematic relations”, analogous to PROPOSITIONAL ROLES and EVENT-PARTICIPANT ROLES, respectively.
[treated the same] ... But in fact, it is not an accident\(^70\) that they seem to group together as they do, and the obvious generalization can be captured in terms of semantic macroroles: in an active clause, the actor is subject and the undergoer direct object, while in a passive the undergoer is subject and the actor is in a peripheral PP.

For the last century, it has been standard linguistic procedure to create a disjunctive class to contain items that behave alike. The patterns shared by the individuals can now be expressed once about the disjunctive class (“the obvious generalization”) and not many, separate times for each of its members. This is what supports the macroroles. They are “generalized semantic roles” (Van Valin 2005.60), and whatever meaning that is attributed to them (“actor” and “undergoer”) derives from the semantics of their membership. The idea of macroroles then contrasts sharply with PROPOSITIONAL ROLES, whose semantics is composed solely of VOICE and which may even continue to exist in the absence of EVENT-PARTICIPANT ROLES.\(^71\) Macroroles differ again from PROPOSITIONAL ROLES in how each works in language. Macroroles are the means for stating “significant generalizations”, while PROPOSITIONAL ROLES mate with EVENTS to create the semantic organization of a PROPOSITION into a NUCLEUS and a PERIPHERY. Lastly, because of their etiology, macroroles are limited in number to two (Van Valin 2004.78-81 & 2005.65-66):

There are strong empirical and theoretical reasons for rejecting the postulation of a third macrorole. First and foremost, it is highly unlikely that it would not be universal like actor and undergoer ... a third macrorole would be qualitatively different concept from the two semantic macroroles posited in RRG. It would not be universal, it would not receive consistent morphosyntactic treatment, and it would be relatively unimportant for the syntax.

In a context of discussion in which macroroles have been created as they have been, it probably does make sense not to add to their number. But in an alternate world where PROPOSITIONAL ROLES exist, it makes sense to acknowledge the existence of languages with three PROPOSITIONAL ROLES.

\(^70\) The first question is just how is it \textit{not} an “accident”? What, besides reiterating the fact of the pattern, explains it?

\(^71\) Cf. the discussion of Yogad in Chapter 30, section 2. It would make no sense to propose macroroles without the thematic relations that they subsume: “They are called ‘macroroles’ because each subsumes a number of specific thematic relations” (Van Valin 2009.243). Because of their contrasting semantic componency, PROPOSITIONAL ROLES may exist without EVENT-PARTICIPANT ROLES, but not the reverse (cf. Chapter 25).
when we encounter them. And we have just seen empirical demonstration of that condition in SiSwati and Hua. Further, while there would probably not exist a language with one macrorole, there do exist languages with a single propositional role (Kutenai). And finally, there seem to exist languages with no propositional roles (e.g., Lisu and Riau Indonesian. Chapter 30). Almost certainly, languages without macrorole(s) would not be permitted in Role and Reference Grammar since the existence of those languages would deny the “universal ... actor and undergoer”.72

RRG and the understanding of language presented in these chapters seem initially to be much akin, and they are (Van Valin 2009.239):

What differentiates the RRG conception of grammar from the standard formalist one is the view that grammatical structure can only be understood and explained with reference to its semantic and communicative functions. Syntax is not autonomous, rather it is viewed as relatively motivated by semantic and pragmatic factors.

This sentiment is very much that of Chapter 1. But then Van Valin continues:

In terms of paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations that define a structural system, RRG deals not only with relations of cooccurrence and combination in strictly formal terms but also with semantic and pragmatic cooccurrences and combinatory relations. Hence, RRG may be properly designated as a structural-functionalist theory, rather than purely formalist or purely functionalist.

In contrast, the description of language(s) developed here is “purely functionalist” and not “structural [formal]-functionalist”. It is probably that divergence which makes it possible to construe macroroles as motivated by avoiding structural statements that would otherwise be “less than elegant” (Van Valin 2004.66). The basis of propositional roles is entirely other. Ultimately, the difference between RRG and this view creates different

---

72 The approach pursued here has nothing to lose in that regard. It is first and always a matter of trying to understand what we find and not to declare as a matter of rule that such and such cannot exist. Indeed, as mentioned occasionally in earlier chapters, it is — after the initial irritation evaporates — a delight to find a language that works counter to expectation. Working to understand how that happened is how our grasp of language matures. (However, I still remember the bother I felt, and continue to, when I found a language like Aghem, that uses immediately post-event position to signal focus. I really did not want that to happen. It ruined a good idea. But hey, wtf.)
expectations about what we may find in language\textsuperscript{73} and finally about what language “is”.\textsuperscript{74}

\textsuperscript{73} Again: (i) the complete absence of PROPOSITIONAL ROLES (Lisu & Riau Indonesian in Chapter 30), (ii) the presence of a single PROPOSITIONAL ROLE (Kutenai), (iii) the presence of three PROPOSITIONAL ROLES (SiSwati & Hua), (iv) the presence of four PROPOSITIONAL ROLES (Kinyarwanda in Chapter 29).

\textsuperscript{74} For example (Van Valin 2009.242): “The heart of the RRG approach is the system of lexical representations [of verbs & their thematic relations] and semantic roles”. In contrast, the attitude acted out here has no real “heart”. As suggested in Chapter 1, it is the semantics of FOCUS, TOPIC, VOICE, PROPOSITIONAL ROLE, EVENT-PARTICIPANT ROLE, EVENT, PARTICIPANT, DETERMINACY, PROPOSITIONAL NUCLEUS & PROPOSITIONAL PERIPHERY that will interact and in their expression create — for the most part — what we recognize as the syntax of a language.
Appendix I

The SiSwati text in this appendix is taken from Ziervogel’s *Swazi Texts* (1957). The collection contains eighteen narratives, most of which are procedural texts or normative texts that describe cultural practice. The volume concludes with notes and a short glossary. The collection is segmented sequentially into paragraphs numbered 1 to 400. The paragraphs are in turn segmented into sentences identified by punctuation. The sentences are not numbered. There is no indication of SiSwati length, stress, or tone. Neither is there a morphological segmentation. The SiSwati texts are printed on the even pages, and an English gloss is printed on the odd pages. The content of one SiSwati paragraph is located in the same numbered English paragraph, but the two languages are not more closely matched than that.\(^{75}\)

The text reproduced below was one that came the closest to retelling a specific historical occurrence. The text is from paragraphs 76 to 81, inclusive. In presenting the text, I have kept the paragraph structure; hence, there are six numbered segments. Each sentence within a paragraph is assigned a letter designation. I have additionally segmented words in SiSwati and attempted to label the morphological components. I have relied on Rycroft 1981, Ziervogel & Mabuza 1976, Taljaard, Khamulo & Bosch 1981, Thwala 1996, and Klein 2007. More than once, I have not been able to reasonably identify morphological elements, and I have left a gap in the grammatical glosses. The third line in the text is Ziervogel’s gloss.

Finally, I have placed certain verb stems in italics. The purpose of this is explained above in section 2.5.

```
Lo-lu-phel-e Ubikwelwa Ku-laba-phansi
[DET-LU-come.to an.end-IP to-DET-BA-below\(^{76}\)]
    The Death of an Old Person
```

(1) (a) Kwa-ku-khona s-alukati

\(^{75}\) “My own share in presenting the texts has been confined to arranging them under appropriate headings and in a certain sequence” (Ziervogel 1957.8)

\(^{76}\) “labaphánsi: ancestral spirits (i.e. those below)” (Rycroft 1981.79).
**VOICE and ROLE: SiSwati & Hua**

There was an old woman who was the mother of Mlingwako, the wife of an *umntfwanenkhosi*.

(b) *Sa-hlala kakhulu sa-guga.*

‘She lived long and grew old’

(c) *Kwa-tsi se-si-gug-ile*

---

77 “remote past t. ccd. for cl.15 -17 [i.e., cl. 8, ku-]” (Rycroft 1981.54).

78 A verbal prefix of the shape *ku-* (with the variant *kwa-*) is “homophonous to the class 8 marker as well as to the bleached locative particle” (Klein 2007.157). Klein (2007.157 ff.) labels its appearance as the “impersonal construction” (as does Thwala 1996.209) because the form is independent of the class of the Noun that is the Subject which “occurs immediately after the verb” (Klein 2007.159):

(i) *Ku-fik-e Jabulani e-kuseni*  
[8-arrive-IP Jabulani LOC-morning]  
‘Jabulani arrived in the morning’

Klein glosses *ku-* as ‘8’ and Thwala (1996.209 et passim) glosses it as ‘SA’. I shall gloss it more mnemonically as IMPRS.

79 Rycroft (1981.155) has *s-álukáti*.

80 “adjectival ... qualificative” for Class 4, Sg. (Ziervogel & Mabuza 1976.4)

81 “nü- cop. pfx. for certain nouns & pr.: it is ...; by ...” (Rycroft 1981.71).

82 “nábó (+ name of child) n. formative: mother of ...” (Rycroft 1981.65)

83 “khosíkati ... 1. princess. 2. unmarried lady, miss. 3. sacred calabash at incwala. 4. heiress. 5. lightning. 6. female cat” (Rycroft 1981.50). “-kati feminine or augmentative sfx. (with noun or adj.)” (Rycroft 1981.45). Ziervogel & Mabuza (1976.51) have “-sikati ‘feminine’”.


85 “kakhulu adv. greatly, very much, extremely, especially” (Rycroft 1981.44).
It is not certain that this *kwa* is the **REMOTE PAST** of (1).

“The progressive aspect which conveys the meaning ‘still’, i.e., an ongoing process, may occur in a number of tenses and forms. It is expressed by the formative *-sa* which is inserted immediately after the subject concord” (Taljaard, Khumalo & Bosch 1991.61). “The formative ... *-sa* ... change[s] to *-se* ... before verbs with latent initial vowel ...” (Ziervogel & Mabuza 1976.96). “*se* ... implies that the action (of the main verb) has not been carried out previously, consequently, it refers to ‘now’ in the present tense and ‘already’ and ‘then’ in the past tense ...” (Ziervogel & Mabuza 1976.158).

“*-ile** perfect positive, e.g. *unatsile* ‘he has drunk’” (Ziervogel & Mabuza 1976.7). “A main verb which is suffixed with the morpheme *ile* is similar to a present tense verb prefixed with *ya*, in that it can occur pre-pausally” (Klein 2007.140):

(i) Nhlanhla u-dlal-ile

[Nhlanhla CL2.SG-play-SBJ]

‘Nhlanhla has played’

Hence, Klein’s gloss for *-ile* is **DISJ.PRF** in order to include notice of its “disjunctive” behavior.

“(kú)-hlúla v.t. conquer, defeat, overcome” (Rycroft 1981.41).

Thwala 1996.122-123.

“The suffix *-a* is the final vowel of the verb stem which also occurs with other tenses [in addition to the present tense which “is not marked morphologically’] ...” (Klein 2007.138). For example:

(i) La-ba-fana ba-nats-a tjwala

[DET-CL1.PL-boy CL1.PL-drink-FV alcohol]

‘The boys drink alcohol’

‘The boys are drinking alcohol’

(ii) Ba-fana na-to-nats-a tjwala

[CL1.PL-boy CL1.PL-future-drink-FV alcohol]

‘The boys will drink alcohol’

*Ba-* is the Plural prefix for this class of Nouns. “... the present tense verb ... cannot occur at the end of a sentence”:

(iii) (a) *Nhlanhla u-dlal-a*
ne-ku-phuma e-m-nyango.
there.is-INFINITIVE-go.out.of LOC-CL2.SG-door]
‘She grew so old that she was unable to go out by the door even’

(d) Sa-sale sa-nya e-ndl-ini,
[CL4.SG-might.as.well.do CL4.SG-defecate LOC-hut-LOC
sa-sale sa-tfundza e-ndl-ini,
CL4.SG-might.as.well.do CL4.SG-urinate LOC-hut-LOC
se-hlul-ek-a ku-dla
PROG-conquer-ABLE-FV INFINITIVE94-eat]
‘She even relieved nature in the hut. She even urinated in the hut
and was unable to eat’

(e) Kwa-se ku-ya-bonakala kutsi lomu-ntfu
[REM.PST- IMPRS-PROG95-appear96 that97 CL1.SG98-person

In order to occur at the end of a sentence, a present tense verb must be marked with the affix 
"ya":

(iii) (c) Nhlanhla u-ya-dlal-a
[Nhlanhla CL2.SG-YA-play-FV
‘Nhlanhla plays’

If a present tense verb is not marked with ya... it must conjoin with the phrase which
follows to build a prosodic unit of some kind” (Klein 2007.140). These forms are called
“conjoint” (Klein 2007.141). “If, however, the present tense verb is marked with ya, then I
shall say that it is in disjunctive [sometimes “disjoint” (141)] form” (Klein 2007.140).

Thwala (1996.134):

The vowel -a is a default ending is SiSwati (here marked FV). It occurs in finite
and non-finite clauses... [e.g.,] the infinitive clause... and the finite declarative
clause... The default vowel also occurs with negative future tense verbs....

Thwala (1996.145) concludes that “It is not enlightening to say that ya- is a present tense
marker.”

93 “ne- ... (with subj. ccd. ku-): there is/are ...” (Rycroft 1981.68)
95 Ziervogel & Mabuza (1976.6) gloss -ya- as ‘present’. Taljaard, Khumalo & Bosch
lom-dzala so-wu-luphele.
CL1.SG-old now^99-CL1.SG-get/be.old^100]
‘So it was evident that this old person was very old’

(f) U-ta kw-ent-iw-a njani?
[CL1.SG-come IMPRS-do-PASS-FV how^101]
‘What could be done to her?’

(2) (a) Se-ba-ya-hlangana lolu-sendvo
[then-CL1.PL-PROG-gather CL6.SG^102-family.council]
na-le-tin-ye ta-lukati,

(1991.29) call -ya- “The long present tense,” which “is used when the verb appears at the
end of a sentence. Because it completes a sentence, the -ya- is often referred to as the
completive morpheme ... When a verb is followed by an adverbial form indicating time or
locality, the verb may appear in the long present tense as well.” In the note to FV in (1c),
Klein employs “disjunctive” to characterize -ya- (cf. Klein 2007.138-144.). Thwala
(1996.145) writes, “It is not enlightening to say that ya- is a present tense marker in view of
its interaction with the complement structure ... For now, I will consider ya- to be the present
tense progressive aspect without argument.” I will arbitrarily gloss it as PROG.

96 (kū)-bonākala v.i. appear, be visible, be evident, seem” (Rycroft 1981 6).

97 “kūtsi conj. that; in order that” (Rycroft 1981.54). “The infinitive kutsi is used in both
direct and indirect speech to express ‘that’ (‘to wit’) ...” Ziervogel & Mabuza 1976.171).

98 lomu- is “adjectival ... qualificative” for CL1.SG.

99 so- aux.v.i[n]f[if]x. for ‘Exclusive’ implicn. (variant of -sé-, if vl. ‘u’ follows): now,
already, then” (Rycroft 1981.92). implicn. is not among the abbreviations.

100 “stat.perf[ect]” of lumphāla (Rycroft 1981.59)

101 “As adverb it follows the predicate, e.g.

Usebenta njani? ‘How does it work?’”

(Ziervogel & Mabuza 1976.224).

102 This is an “adjectival ... qualificative” prefix (Ziervogel & Mabuza 1976.4).
together with - Det 103 - CL.6.PL - other 104 CL.6.PL - old woman ba-tsi:
BA - say]

‘So the family council gathered together with other old women, and they said: ’

(b) “Loku umu-ntfu aka-chutshis-w-a
[as CL.1.SG - person NEG - PASS - FV
njeng-en-khomo, a-bu-bik-w-e,
like - CL.5.SG - beast CL.2.SG - CL.7 - report - PASS - IP
a-bik-el-w-e la-ba-phansi109”

“‘While a person is not done away with like a beast, let it be reported to the ancestral spirits’”

(c) Nemphela-ke ba-vum-el-an-e, ba-tsi
‘Indeed they agreed saying ...’

(d) “Yebo, a-ku-vele a-bik-w-e
[yes CL1.SG- -indeed111 CL1.SG-report-PASS-IP
e-n-dzabukw-eni, k-utsi-w-e
LOC112-CL5.SG-origin113-LOC IMPRS-say-PASS-IP
a-sale ba-m-londvolot-e.”
CL1.SG-can.justifiably.do CL1.PL-CL1.SG-guard-SBJ]
“‘Yes, she should indeed be reported to the spirits, and they must
be told to guard her’”

(e) Nemphe-la-ke ba-lal-e khona lapha
[indeed-ENCL CL1.PL-sleep-IP there where
ku-le-s-alukati
LOC-DET-CL4.SG-old.woman]
‘Thereafter they slept in the hut by the old woman’

(3) (a) Ku-tsi e-busuku ku-nga-kasi,
[IMPRS-say LOC-night IMPRS-MOD114-
ge-tin-khuku te-ku-cala,
by.means.of115-CL5.PL-domestic.fowl -LOC-first116
se-ba-ya e-si-bay-eni.

It is spoken with a perceptible pause between it and the preceding word. Although enclitics can follow most parts of speech they are adverbal ...
-ke used in narration ...”

111 “-vele ... ‘appear’. It is followed by the indicative including the potential, and the
subjunctive ... vele indicates that an action will happen undoubtedly or with good reason ...
(Ziervogel & Mabuza 1976.124, 160). Its glosses seem to be ‘have reason to’, ‘is
necessary to’, and ‘should in fact’.

112 “e- (prefixal formative) usually with suffix -ini or -eni: Locative inflection. The noun
becomes a Locative adverb in function. The implication is nonspecific: Whether ‘at’, ‘in’,
‘to’, ‘into’, ‘on’ or ‘from’ is implied depends on the particular verb” (Rycroft 1981.xx).

113 Rycroft (1981.19) has “in-dzabûko ... n. source, origin.

114 “Modality is expressed by the prefix nga- which follows the subject agreement prefix”
(Thwala 1996.115).

115 “nge- before nouns: ngekudla ‘by means of food’” (Ziervogel & Mabuza 1976.5).

116 “... (as adv. or poss. st[em].): first” (Rycroft 1981.8).
At night before dawn, at the first crowing of the cock, they go to the cattle-kraal

The kraalhead opens the gate and lifts the gate-poles and goes into the cattle-kraal

He begins to say: ...


118 Cf. the note to -a in se-hlul-ek-a in (1c).
120 Ziervogel & Mabuza 1976.7.
121 “(kũ)-sho defec.v. (final -o persitst ...): say, express, mean, think” (Rucroft 1981.89).
“You of the chief, look after this lady, take care of her and guard her and do not be unfriendly to her”

(e) “Kw-aku-vele kw-ent-iw-a njalo
[IMPRS-AKU—indeed123 IMPRS-do-PASS-IP like.that124 ne-kadzeni ku-bo-yihlomkhulu,
NE-long.ago -obligatory125 -
ni-nga-sho kutsi
2PRS.PL-MOD—say that
ku-ngu-m-hlolo loko.”
CL8.SG—awe.inspiring.occurrence126 as127]
“Even in olden times this was done to your ancestors”

(f) “Bona-ni nine, sale ni-mtsatsa.”
[understand-IMP you.PL justifiably.so 2PRS.PL—understand]
“Do not regard this as strange”

(g) “Ku-phela-ke,
[IMPRS-come.to.an.end-ENCL
ngi-ya-phela-ke ku-lelo”
1PRS.SG—PROG—come.to.an.end—then PREP—that]
“Look and take her, please”

(h) Se-wu-ya-buyela-ke e-ndl-ini,
[PROG-CL1.SG—PROG—go.back.to-ENCL LOC—hut-LOC

122 “… before verbs with latent initial vowels,” -ya- will appear as -ye- (Ziervogel & Mabuza 1976.96).

123 Cf. aku-vele in (2d).


125 Ziervogel & Mabuza 1976.5

126 “umhlolo / imí- n. awe-inspiring occurrence, mystery; surprise; evil omen” (Rycroft 1981.40).

127 “although, as, because, when” (Ziervogel & Mabuza 1976.148).
Then he returns to the hut and goes to sleep’

(4) (a) Ku-ya-sa-ke nobe li-nga-shona
[IMPRS-PROG-dawn-ENCL either CL3.SG-MOD-set
li-langa nobe ku-nga-m-cala-nje
CL3.SG-sun either IMPRS-MOD-CL1.SG-attack-only
nobe ku-se-bu-suku nokube
either IMPRS-PROG-CL7-night or
ku-se-mini.
IMPRS-PROG-in.the.daytime]
‘It may afflict her next morning or when the sun sets or even at night or during the day’

(b) So-ku-cala-ke ku-gula,
[now-IMPRS-attack-ENCL INFINITIVE-be.ill
so-wu-tsi-ke:
now-CL1.SG-say-ENCL]
‘Her illness overtakes her, and she says ...’

(c) “Awu, ngu-y-gula, Sibanani, ngu-buhlungu,
[1PRS.SG-PROG-be.ill So-and-so ISG-painful
se-ngi-ta ku-fa,
now-1PRS.SG-come CL8.SG-death
ngi-ye-va kutsi vele
1PRS.SG-PROG-perceive.with.senses that certainly
se-ngi-ya-fa”
now-1PRS.SG-PROG-die]
‘I am ill, So-and-so, I have a pain. I will now die, indeed I feel that I am about to die!’

(d) Na i-khona in-tfo le-fanel-e

128 “even if, whether ... or” (Ziervogel & Mabuza 1976.134, 150).

129 Noun class 7 bu-sůku is ‘night’ (Rycroft 1981.154). Class 3 li-sůku is ‘day’ (Rycroft 1981.129).

130 “nóba/nóbè, nókúbə/nókúbè ‘eventhough; whether or’” (Ziervogel & Mabuza 1976.134).
[if CL5.SG-exist CL5.SG-thing DET-be.suitable-IP
a-yi-khulum-e, bese
CL1.SG-CL5.SG-speak-IP CONJ131
u-ya-yi-khulum-a, a-tsi:
CL1.SG-PROG-CL5.SG-speak-FV CL1.SG-say]
‘If there is anything she wishes to speak about, she does so and
says: ...’

(e) “Sibanibani, m-ntfwana-mi, u-bo-hlalo
[So-and-so CL1.SG-child-my CL1.SG-obligatory-remain
w-ent-e kutsi, w-ent-e kutsi”
CL1.SG-do-IP that CL1.SG-do-IP that]
“‘So-and-so, my child, stay behind and do this and that”

(5) (a) Ba- tsi ba-fa njalo-ke
[CL1.PL-say CL1.PL-die like.that-ENCL
laba be-ku-nik-w-a
those.yonder.ones BE-IMPRS-give-PASS-FV
ema-dloti.
CL3.PL-ancestral.spirit]
‘They say that those given to the ancestral spirits die in that way’

(b) U- fa a-khulum-ile, a-shiy-e
[CL1.SG-die CL1.SG-speak-PRF CL1.SG-leave.behind-IP
y-onkhe in-khulum-o.
CL5.SGall CL5.SG-speak- ]
‘She dies having spoken, having uttered her wishes’

(c) Leso si-khatsi a-nga-tsi:
[that133 CL4.SG-time CL1.SG-MOD-say]
‘Then she says: ...’

131 “Bese introduces a sequence of co-ordinated clauses after an initial present tense clause
....” (Viervogel & Mabuza 1976.154).

132 This is the “Quantitative” prefix for Class 5 Singular (Ziervogel & Mabuza 1976.4).

133 “‘eso dem. pr., cl. 7: that” (Rycroft 1981.56).
(d) “Se-ngi-cedz-ile-ke, u-hlal-e w-ent-e
[then-1PRS.SG-finish-PRF-ENCL CL1.SG-stay-IP CL1.SG-do-IP
njalo ...,]
lke.that ]
“I am finished, stay and do this ...”

(e) Noba a-be-lele phansi,
[even.if134 CL1.SG-COP-be.lying.down on.the.ground135
a-be-so-wu-ya-sukuma,
CL1.SG-COP-now-CL1.SG-PROG-stand.up
so-wu-bhek-a le na
now-CL1.SG-face.towards-FV DET if
a-be-tfukutsel-e.
CL1.SG-COP-be.angry136-SUBJ]
‘she turns around and looks the other way if she is lying down or
if she was unhappy’

(f) Na a-nga-ka-tfukutsel-i
[if CL1.SG-NEG-KA-be.angry-NOM137
a-ka-fulatsel-i.
CL1.SG-NEG- NOM]
‘If she was not unhappy, she does not turn her back [on you]’

(g) A-be-se u-ya-bindz-a.
[CL1.SG-COP- CL1.SG-PROG-be.quiet-FV]
‘Then she is quiet’

(h) Ne-ku-tamatama a-ka-tamatam-i.
[ -PROG-stir138 CL1.SG-NEG-stir- ]
‘She does not even stir’


135 “underneath/on the ground” (Taljaard, Khumalo & Boscj 1991.40).

136 The stem is tfukútsela. Cp. tfuka ‘be startled’ or ‘swear’ (Rycroft 1981.97).

137 “Nominal ending ... -i as ending of personal nouns” (Ziervogel & Mabuza 1976.6).

138 “(ku)tamátama v. i. quake, rock, tremeble, shake, vibrate” (Rycroft 1981.95).
(i) Nobe ba-nga-hlala-nje lapha e-ndl-ini
[perhaps CL1.PL-MOD-sit-only where LOC-hut-LOC
a-tsi ku-lomunye nobe
CL1.SG say PREP-someone perhaps
ngu-malukatana:
COP\textsuperscript{139}\text{-daughter.in.law}]
‘Perhaps while they are seated in the hut she says to someone,
perhaps the daughter-in-law:’

(j) “A-wu-ng-embes-e!”
[A-2ND.SG-1ST.SG-cover-SBJ]
“‘Cover me with a blanket!’”

(k) A-m-\textit{embes}-e.
[CL1.SG-CL1.SG-cover-SUBJ]
‘Then she covers her’

(l) A-m-\textit{embes}-ile kutaw-ku-tsi
[CL1.SG-CL1.SG-cover-PRF -IMPRS-say
nya, ne-ku-tamatama a-nga-\textit{tamitam}-i.
silence\textsuperscript{140} -stir CL1.SG-NEG-stir-
]
‘Having covered her all is quiet, and she does not even stir’

(m) Ba-tsi ba-nga-m\textit{gwabul}-a, ba-tsi:
‘When they open [the blankets] they say: ...’

(n) “Hho! Se-wu-hamb-ile (w-endlul-ile)!”
[oh already-CL1.SG-leave-PRF CL1.SG-pass\textsuperscript{141}-PRF]
“Oh, she has gone away (she has passed on)”

(6) (a) Ku-ya-khal-w-a, kodvwa ka-ba-khal-i
[IMPRS-PROG-weep-PASS-FV but NEG-CL1.PL-weep-I
\textsuperscript{139} “\textit{n\gu-} cp.prf. for certain nouns & pr.: it is ...; by ...” (Rycroft 1981.71).
\textsuperscript{140} “ny\Ä ideophone], of emptiness or silence” (Rycroft 1981.75).
\textsuperscript{141} “(kw)-\textit{nd\lule} v.t. pass; exceed, excel, surpass” (Rycroft 1981.22).
ka-khulu, ba-hlal-e ba-caphele-
NEG-intense CL1.PL-live-SBJ CL1.PL-pay.attention-SBJ
tin-dlel-eni ngoba ba-ntfu
CL5.PL-road-LOC because ngoba
ba-ta ku-ta ba-khala,
CL1.PL-come INFINITIVE-come CL1.PL-cry
ba-ba-bindz-is-e
CL1.PL-CL1.PL-be.quiet-CAUS-SBJ

‘They mourn, but do not mourn much, and they watch at all the roads because when people come along crying they let them keep quiet’

(b) Kw-enti-w-a-nje ku-khulunyw-e
[IMPRS-do-PASS-FV-like.this INFINITIVE- -SBJ
ng-e-m-lomo, ba-nga-kw-enti
with-CL2.SG-mouth CL1.PL-NEG-INFINITIVE-do
in-hlitiyo
CL5.SG-heart]
‘The mourning is only with the mouth; they do not make it a matter of the heart’

---

142 Ziervogel & Mabuza 1976.150. “Subordinate clauses introduced by ... ngoba ... follow the main clause ... Clause of reason” (Ziervogel & Mabuza 1976.142, 146).

143 Although the verbal prefix ku- might be taken as a CL8 Subject agreement with the CL8 infinitive ku-khulunyw-e, the VS word order indicates that this is an IMPERSONAL ku-.

144 Ziervogel & Mabuza 1976.127.
Appendix II

The nine Verbs in (20) besides but pattern as follows:

_Tsi_ ‘say’

(1) Ti-tfomba tekhaya ti-tsi
   [CL5.PL-girl home CL5.PL-say
e-li-jah-eni ...]
   ‘The girls of the home say to the young man ...’
   (Ziervogel & Mabuza 1976.226)

(2) A-tsi-ke loma-kati _ku-m-fana_
   [CL1.SG-say-ENCL old-woman LOC-POSS-son
    wa-khe
    CL1.SG-CL1.POSS.PRO]
   ‘Then the old woman says to her son ...’ (Ziervogel 1957.28)

(3) Nga-tsi ti-nemang-a kodvwa
   [1ST.PRS.SG-say CL5.SG-tell.lies-FV but
    wa-landvul-a
    CL1.SG-deny-FV]
   ‘I said he told lies, but he denied it’
   (Ziervogel & Mabuza 1976.144)

_Cel_ ‘ask’

(4) Ngi-ta-wu-cel-a ku-babe bese ...
   [1ST.PRS.SG-FUT-ask-FV LOC-CL.1.father then ...]
   ‘We’ll ask father and ...’
   (Ziervogel & Mabuza 1976.143)

_Khulum_ ‘speak’

(5) Babe u-ta-wu-khulum-a na-bo ...
   [CL1.father CL1.SG-FUT-CL1.PL-speak-FV with-CL1.PL
    ‘Father will speak to them ...’ (Ziervogel & Mabuza 1976.177)
(6) **(U)bese u-ya-khulum-a**
[then CL1.SG-PROG-speak-FV]
‘Then he speaks’ (Ziervogel & Mabuza 1976.118)

(7) **Si-ya-khulum-a nje**
[1ST.PRS.PL-PROG-talk-FV just]
‘We are just talking’ (Taljaard, Khumalo & Bosch 1991.32)

(8) **Sa-khulum-a ne-tfombi le-tawubet ngu-thisela**
[1ST.PRS.PL-speak-FV CL1.SG-girl DET-become by-teacher]
‘We spoke to the girl who was to become a teacher’
(Taljaard, Khumalo & Bosch 1991.136)

(9) **Si-khulum-e na-ye**
[1ST.PRS.PL-speak-IP with-him]
‘We have spoken to him’ (Ziervogel & Mabuza 1976.179)

(10) **Si-vakash-el-e le-so s-alukati make**
[1PRS.PL-visit-IP DET-CL4.SG-old.woman CL1.mother
   ta-khulum-e na-so
   -talk-IP with-her]
‘We visited that old woman with whom mother talked’
(Taljaard, Khumalo & Bosch 1991.165)

(11) **Kantsi make u-ya-khulum-a**
[indeed CL1.mother CL1.SG-PROG-consult-FV
   na-mi ....
   with-1ST.PRS.SG ...]
‘Indeed, my mother consults me ....’ (Ziervogel 1957.24)

(12) **Bese unina wa-lo-mfati sowu-khulum-a**
[then then-say-FV
   e-n-dvodz-eni ya-khe a-tsi ...]
‘Then the mother of the woman speaks to her husband saying ...’
(Ziervogel 1957.16)

(13) **Sowu-ya-khulum-a e-n-dvodz-eni ...**
‘Then she speaks to her husband ...’  
(Ziervogel 157.116)

‘speak-

fV-

LOC-

CL5. 

SG-

man-

LOC

...’

‘We then spoke about the matter to the induna’

(Ziervogel & Mabuza 1976.154)

‘You should listen when we speak to you’

(Ziervogel & Mabuza 1976.155)

‘We usually talk often with the secretary in the office’

(Ziervogel & Mabuza 1976.215)

‘tell’

‘she tells her son ...’

(Ziervogel 1957.32)

‘call’

‘The boy calls the dog’

(Ziervogel & Mabuza 1976.192)

‘call-

fV-

ENCL 

DET-CL1.SG-child-POSS.PRO

... a-tshel-e l-o-mfana ...

‘...she tells her son ...’

(Ziervogel 1957.32)
le-s-alukati, a-tsi
DET-CL4.SG-old.woman CL1.SG-say]
‘Now the old woman calls her child, saying ...’
(Ziervogel 1957.26)

(20) Seba-ya-m-bit-a nabo-Lomavila ....
[now-CL.PL-CL1.SG-call-FV mother.of-Lomavila ...]
‘Now they call the mother of Lomavila ....’ (Ziervogel 1957.26)

(21) Sowu-ya-m-bit-a um-fana ....
[then-PROG-CL1.SG-call-FV POSS-son ....]
‘Then he calls his eldest son ....’

(22) Ngi-m-bit-a kepha a-ke-vang-a
[1ST.PRS.SG-CL1.SG-tell-FV but CL1.SG-NEG-listen-FV]
‘I told him but he didn’t listen’ (Ziervogel & Mabuza 1976.147)

(23) ... nga-bit-w-a
[... 1ST.PRS.SG-call-PASS-FV]
‘... I was called away’ (Ziervogel & Mabuza 1976.160)

(24) ... m-tjel-e kutsi si-ya-m-bit-a
[... CL1.SG-tell-SBJ that 1ST.PRS.PL-PROG-CL1.SG-call-FV]
‘... tell him that we are calling him’
(Ziervogel & Mabuza 1976.176)

Tjel ‘tell’

(25) Nga-m-tjel-a kepha ak-ev-a
[1ST.PRS.SG-CL1.SG-tell but NEG-listen-FV]
‘I told him so but he didn’t listen’
(Ziervogel & Mabuza 1976.144)

(26) ... ngi-tjel-e!
[1ST.PRS.SG-tell-IP]
‘... tell me!’ (Ziervogel & Mabuza 1976.145)

(27) ... u-ngi-tjel-e!
[... 1ST.PRS.SG-tell-IP]
‘... tell me!’ (Ziervogel & Mabuza 1976.149)
(28) ... m-tjel-e kutsi si-ya-m-bit-a
[... CL1.SG-tell-SBJ that 1ST.PRS.PL-PROG-CL1.SG-call-FV]
‘... tell him that we are calling him’
(Ziervogel & Mabuza 1976.176)

_Tfuk’ swear_

(29) Wa-hamb-a a-se-tfuk-a
[CL1.SG-all.the.time-FV CL1.SG-1ST.PRS.PL-swear-FV]
‘He was swearing at us all the time’
(Ziervogel & Mabuza 1976.156)

_Khonkots ‘bark’_

(30) Ti-nja ti-khonkhots-e _babe_
[CL5.PL CL5.PL-bark-IP CL1.father]
‘Dogs barked at father’
(Thwala 1996.135)

(31) Ti-nja temut ti-ya-khonkhots-a
[CL5.PL-dog village CL5.PL-PROG-bark-FV]
‘The village dogs are barking’
(Taljaard, Khumalo & Bosch 1991.87)
(Ziervogel & Mabuza 1976.218)

(32) Ti-nja temut-ine ti-ya-khonkhots-a
[CL.PL-dog village-LOC CL5.PL-PROG-bark-FV]
‘The dogs in the village are barking’
(Ziervogel & Mabuza 1976.218)

_Shó ‘speak’_

(33) Babe wa-sho kutsi ...
[CL1.SG.father CL1.SG-speak that ...]
‘Father said that ...’
(Ziervogel & Mabuza 1976.142)

(34) U-vele u-ya-sho
[2ND.PRS.SG-indeed 2ND.PRS.SG-PROG-speak]
‘You have reason to speak’
(Ziervogel & Mabuza 1976.124)
There are a couple of additional isolated examples of oral performance events:

(35) Le-si-lima si-to-ni-ceb-a
     e-ma-phoyis-eni
     LOC-CL3.PL-police-LOC]
    ‘The fool will report you to the police’ (Thwala 1996.134)