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This thesis has two aims. The first is to provide a description of constituent ordering in Silozi syntactic structures. It also describes the language's morphological structure. The other is to ascertain, in an empirical way, the extent to which Dik's categorial complexity hypothesis (or LIPOC) affects the ordering of constituents in Silozi syntactic structures. It is claimed that the internal structure of a constituent can have a direct effect on its placement, since the composition of syntactic units in terms of length and structural complexity is a further factor influencing their linear ordering.

Using a database of spoken and written Silozi texts, the thesis employs both qualitative and quantitative methods to investigate the distribution of constituents in their functional profiles. The methodology used involves counting and studying the distribution of all the constituents (elements) of the clause and sentence. The constructions studied are SVX, XSVX and special focusing constructions. In short, the study considers parameters of constituent order variation in discourse.

The study concludes that there is a strong correlation between the internal structure of constituents and the position in which they occur in a clause or sentence. This is so especially in constructions that place the subject in the initial position (SVX) which constitute the bulk of the data. There is also evidence for this hypothesis in some focusing constructions. The study has also found that in constructions which place constituents other than the subject in the initial position, the ordering significantly contradicts the predictions of this hypothesis. The bulk of these are those which place adverbial constituents in the initial position. Left dislocations and fronting or topicalizations also contradict the predictions of the hypothesis. Although evidence for the effect has been found in both spoken and written discourse, the study takes the view that the two mediums of Silozi display different syntactic patterns of use. This is primarily because the two types of language have different syntactic patterns of use, which are attributable to the circumstances under which they are produced.

This study is significant in several ways. First it introduces Silozi to the linguistic world as a separate Southern African Bantu language. Second it contributes to constituent ordering studies, which are highly Euro-centric and parametrically biased. It does so by bringing data from a little known language. Further, it shows that focusing on the central constituents of the clause, which is the main stay of most studies is not adequate in explaining constituent order facts. One issue that the study raises is that the use of authentic data is vital in the formulation of linguistic theories and explanation of language phenomena. The thesis espouses the view that constituent ordering explanations should take into account the formal and discourse-pragmatic characteristics of language.
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Chapter One

Introduction

In this chapter I discuss ethnolinguistic and general background information. I also review the previous studies done on Silozi and offer a critique. The chapter also briefly introduces the data and some methodological information.

1.1. The language

Silozi, which is also known as “Lozi”¹ in most writings, is mainly spoken in the Western and Southern provinces of Zambia. It is also spoken in neighbouring Zimbabwe, Namibia (Caprivi strip) and Botswana. In this study, the Silozi that we are dealing with is what has been termed “Silozi tota”. This means “real Silozi”. It is the Silozi which is spoken and written in the Western province of Zambia (see map for the location)². It is one of the recognised seven official languages in Zambia. It is taught in primary and secondary schools in the Western Province. Silozi is also broadcast on both television and radio sponsored by the Zambia National Broadcasting Co-operation. It is categorized as a member of the Bantu family of languages along with other Zambian languages. Presently, it is the mother tongue of about 250,000 people and the lingua franca of about 480,000 more.

We do not intend to go into the historical details of the language. Much of this has been covered by historians, missionaries, anthropologists and ethnologists some of whom have written some grammars on it. However, a few pertinent comments on its background may be useful. There are varying historical and classificatory records of Silozi. The general view is that the Kololo, a group of warriors, ran away from Shaka Zulu’s imperialist wars in South Africa between 1823 and 1827. They settled among the Aluyi (Luyi) in the area of the flood plains of the Zambezi river in Barotse (land of the Malozi people). The Aluyi spoke Siluyana and are thought to have come from Zaire’s (now republic of Congo) Luba - Lunda Empire during the great Bantu dispersals and settled in the Barotse flood plains. The mixture of Kololo and Siluyana bred the language which is now called Silozi. The historical link between Silozi and Siluyana is noticed by Givon (1970: 1) in his claim that “the

¹ The term “Lozi” was introduced by early missionaries and colonial administrators removed the prefix “Si-”. Native Speakers of the language call it Silozi which refers to the language. A speaker of the language is called “Mulozi” (Lozi) whose plural is “Malozi” (Lozis).
² The Linguistic map of Zambia is outdated. Silozi is recorded as “LOZI”.

understanding of Siluyana could also prove vital for resolving some highly intriguing questions concerning present day Silozi." Gowlett (1989: 127) claims: “However, it is a particular feature of the Lozi language that it is a child of two parents, Sotho and Luyana (also known as Luyi)”. He further claims that it owes its inheritance to the Kololo, a Sotho group under the leadership of Sebitwane whose warriors left Lesotho, ultimately to conquer the Luyi in the area of the flood plains of the Zambezi river. He believes Silozi belongs with the Sotho group arguing that however much it may differ with respect to certain classificatory criteria from the other Sotho languages, it is to a large extent mutually intelligible with them. O’Sullivan (1993) asserts that the Lozi people, or Malozi, in the Western Province of Zambia, trace their origins to two distinct sources, viz, the Aluyi from the North and the Kololo from the South. In this study, we adopt the synchronic approach to the study of language. Accordingly, it is assumed that Silozi is originally a product of Siluyana and Sikololo. As a language which is rapidly developing, it now contains some features of other languages such as Luvale, Nkoya, Lunda and Mbunda. Some grammatical elements of English and Afrikaans are also part of Silozi.

1.1.2. Classification

There is considerable disagreement in the existing classification of Silozi. Doke (1945) classifies it as a member of the Sotho group of the South Eastern Zone. In this group are Luyi, Subiya and Leya. Guthrie (1971) puts it in its own group called Zone K 20. In his revised classification of the languages of Western Province, Fortune (1970) puts it in Group 1:“Lozi a Sotho language spoken as the first language by people in the central Barotse plain and along the Zambezi as far as Livingstone and as a lingua franca all over the province”. According to Bright’s (1992) classification Silozi belongs to Narrow Bantu ‘S’ which designates a subgroup of Bantu languages spoken in South Eastern, South Western and Central Africa. In the face of all these conflicting classifications, our view is that Silozi belongs to the Sotho-Tswana Group, since however much it may differ with respect to classificatory criteria from the other Sotho languages, it is mutually intelligible with them.

It is interesting to note that some scholars have claimed that Silozi differs from other Zambian Bantu languages (see for instance Kashoki and Mann 1978). Givon (above) hints to these claims as “intriguing questions concerning present day Silozi”. O’Sullivan (1993: viii) observes that “Silozi is quite different from other Zambian languages which generally share a substantial convergence in vocabulary as well as
in grammatical structure”. This is mainly because it combines features of Siluyana genetic inheritance and Sikololo genetic inheritance. Most of the other Zambian Bantu languages have a single origin. This has made it somewhat difficult for non-Silozi native speakers to speak Silozi with a good measure of fluency. Silozi native speakers also find it difficult to speak the other languages fluently. Their speakers mainly came from the Lunda-Luba empire in the north and settled in present Zambia and therefore are genetically remotely related to Silozi. As far as I know, these characteristics do not make Silozi significantly different from other Zambian Bantu languages with respect to the coding of morphological and syntactic phenomena. As in many languages, it has its own characteristic phonological and lexical inventories, which distinguish it from other Zambian Bantu languages.

1.2. Some information on the orthography

For practical purposes, it is necessary to provide information about orthography in a language that is as heavily understudied and under-described as Silozi. Up until 1975, there had not been a commonly accepted convention of spelling in any of the seven Zambian languages approved for teaching in Zambia. The absence of a spelling convention for the languages has reflected itself not only in the way the same word is written differently by two different authors but also in the way the same word is written in several different ways by the same author in the same book. With respect to Silozi, there are two systems that have been used. This has had a significant influence on the presentation of its grammatical categories and possibly of other Bantu languages. One of these systems is known as the “disjunctive”. In this system certain elements that may belong to one and the same word category are written separately. The other is the “conjunctive” which presents parts of words as joined together. Silozi, like many other Bantu languages, is characterised by the use of affixes to mark especially agreement or concord. We shall discuss this phenomenon in the section dealing with morphology and word formation. Interestingly, the two varying systems have been used by the authors in the present written texts. This means that affixes are presented either as separated to stems or conjoined to them in the texts. In Silozi, the disjunctive system is a legacy of early missionaries and former government authorities. The colonial government authorities had ruled that Silozi should be written disjunctively, basing it on the concepts and principles applied by the Paris Evangelical missionaries who first committed the language to writing.
The inconsistency is manifested particularly in the verbal part of the clause. By way of illustration, let us consider the presentation of the highlighted items in the examples provided in 1 where the sentences are used by Mukuni (1981) in Sandaula Uhola Mendulu.

1. a. Bazamai kaufela ne ba mu tonda.
   Travellers all PAST SM OM miss
   All travellers missed him.

   b. Bashemi bahae ha-pepwa nebaitumba ka yena.
   Parents his when-he born PAST+SM+boast of him
   His parents were boasting about him when he was born.

In 1.a. the tense marker (ne) subject / agreement marker (ba) are not joined to the verb stem (tonda). In .b. They are joined to the stem (itumba). In 2. I illustrate a disparity exhibited by the three different authors (see 7.1.1.) in the presentation of verbal groups:

2. a. Mukolozwani ne una ni pilaelo
   Lizard PAST SM have complaint
   Lizard had a complaint.

   b. Sandaula na-toile kutina malukwe.
   Sandaula SM+PAST-hate to wear trousers.
   Sandaula hated wearing trousers.

   c. Mitangana babang’wi ne ba se ba mu toya
   Young men other PAST SM already SM OM hate
   The other young men had already hated him.

As can be seen in the examples, the highlighted items, which mark the subject, object number, agreement and tense are written differently by the authors. In 2.a. the tense marker is separated from the stem (nani). The subject marker is joined to it. Curiously, one central part of the stem, the terminative (ni) is written separately. In 2.b. the affixes are joined to the verb stem. In 2.c., all the affixes including the object marker (OM) are separated from the stem. This lack of consistency is not good for any systematic analysis and description of the language. A related problem has been noted by the Zambian education minister³: “This is clearly undesirable if good and

³This is a quotation from the minister’s foreword to the Zambian Languages Orthography published in 1975. He hails the book as something which presents a rationalisation of what
acceptable literature in Zambian languages is to be produced for educational purposes. To rectify this, my ministry deems it imperative to standardise the orthography of each of the Zambian languages taught in our education system". The disjunctive system has long been considered inappropriate for writing Bantu languages including Silozi. For example, Gluckman (1942) cites a Mr. J. Ritchie, principal of the Barotse National School, Mongu, as one person who advised him about the inappropriateness of writing Silozi disjunctively. According to the current standard system, the affixes should be conjoined because they do not represent independent words or separate syntactic units. They all make up one word category, which is a verb. With these observations in mind, the items above should be represented as below:

3. a. *Bazamai kaufela ne-ba-mu-tonda.*
   b. Bashemi bahae hapepwa *ne-ba-i-tumba* ka yena.

   b. Sandaula *na-toile* ku tina malukwe.
   c. Mitangana babang'wi *ne-ba-se-ba-mu-toya.*

To avoid the inconsistency manifested in the writing systems used by the authors, I have employed an extension of the conjunctive system of writing in both the transcription of the spoken data and representation of the written data. Specifically, I have used hyphenation in my examples as in 3 and 4 above. This system of presentation is believed to meet the demands of those favouring disjunction and those favouring conjunction as argued by Gluckman (ibid). The choice of this system has been determined by two considerations. The first is that it is the one that has been recommended for writing the seven Zambian official vernacular languages by the local ministry of education in the *Zambian languages Orthography* (1975). The second is that it has been used in the description and analysis of Southern Bantu languages. It has long been argued that it handles Bantu grammatical features better than the other system (see for example Doke 1935, 1954, Guthrie 1948, Cole 1975). It has had an impact on many modern Bantuists. Many scholars who have come up with studies on the structure of Bantu languages have almost invariably used it in the representation of the categories (see Givon 1969, Maw 1969, Fivaz 1970, Siewierska 1998 citing Demuth & Johnson 1989). It is in current use and has gained wide acceptance as an attempt to bring into line several conflicting practices of spelling the same word.
empirical recognition. We see this system employed by Bresnan & Kanerva (1989) as in the Chichewa example⁴:

5. **Ku-mu-dzi** kuli **chi-sime**
   17-3-village 17SB-be 7-well
   ‘In a village is a well’.

More recently, the system has been used in the presentation of an example from Bemba, a Zambian Bantu language by Givon (1995: 133):

6. **a-a-ebele** Peta **ukuti a-y-e**
   s/he-REM-tell Peter SUB he-go-SBJUN
   ‘s/he told Peter that he **should** go’.

In view of the foregoing, the orthography used in the present study differs from that used by previous scholars. It should be stated that although I employ a morpheme to morpheme approach in the glosses, there are situations when this is not possible. This is because certain single units which have semantic significance in Silozi can only be glossed using more than one morpheme in English.

1.3. Previous studies of the language

In this section, I discuss the previous studies that have been carried out on Silozi so far. I also offer some critique to the work. For convenience, the studies carried out on Silozi may be divided into types, viz, non-linguistic and linguistic.

1.3.1. Non-linguistic work

This consists of work done by non-linguists such as missionaries, social anthropologists and colonial administrators. Their aims and methods are limited to pedagogical considerations.

---

⁴This glossing follows from transcription conventions of Bresnan and Mchombo (1987). In the conventions, the eighteen noun classes are denoted by Arabic numerals. Roman numerals are used for first, second, and third person. I do not use these conventions in my glosses. This example has been used in order to illustrate the presentation of word division in Bantu languages.
1.3.1.1. Coyler

As far as I know, the first work on Silozi grammar is by Coyler (1915). This work presents some basic facts about the grammar of the language. It aims at providing some operational grammar and contains vocabulary for colonial administrators and other people who were going to work with the Malozi in Barotseland.

1.3.1.2. Jalla

Jalla is probably the greatest contributor in this category of writers. He was a missionary of the Paris Missionary Society. He has written two grammars. One is undated but is thought to have been published in 1930. It contains some graded exercises. The other, which is a revised version of the former was written in 1937. Both the grammars are, to use his word, “elementary”. Both the grammars are divided into two parts. The first deals with phonology, stating the actual ways words are pronounced in Silozi (intonation and accent). The second part is dedicated to “Words”. It presents a brief description of the traditional parts of speech. It also includes some aspects of “politeness” in speaking and writing.

1.3.1.3. Gluckman

Gluckman (1942) has written a short paper on prefix concordance in Silozi. He was a member of staff of the Rhodes-Livingstone Institute in Barotseland. The aims of his paper are summarised as follows:

“I hope that this analysis of prefix concordance in Lozi (Kololo), the lingua franca of Barotseland and one of the four official Bantu languages in Northern Rhodesia will be of some help to students of Bantu linguistics. My analysis may at any rate help the many Europeans who have to learn Lozi in working with Africans. I myself worked out the rules described in this paper to ease my own task in learning Lozi while doing my sociological work in Barotseland” (Gluckman 1942: 105).

1.3.1.4. Gorman

His book is a simple grammar of Silozi published in 1950. Like Gluckman’s work, the grammar targets beginners of Silozi who are most presumably Europeans going
to work in Barotseland. It mainly describes the parts of speech of the language. His work has been criticised by Mwisiya (see below) for adopting the disjunctive model in the description of Silozi grammar.

1.3.1.5. Mwisiya (1977)

Unlike the other grammars written by non-linguists, this is the first grammar by a Silozi native speaker. He is a lawyer. The work presents a basic introduction to the grammar of the language. It has some exercises for the intended readers. It is designed for teaching in the Zambian schools and, ultimately, for “examination purposes.” It has carefully graded exercises, some of which involve translations from English to Silozi and vice versa. Mwisiya aims at correcting the mistakes made by previous grammarians of Silozi and other Bantu languages. He notes that “most old grammarians tried to apply classical terminologies to Bantu languages. It is a pity that Mr. W. A. R. Gorman used classical nomenclatures with the result that the book may not be useful for examination purposes” (Mwisiya 1977: 11). From this statement it is clear that he intends his grammar to be more useful for examination purposes.

To close this subsection, I would like to point out that these studies are essentially basic outlines of the phonological and morphological aspects of the language. They are chiefly prescriptive.

1.3.2. Linguistic work

In what follows I consider work by what I would consider to be linguists. Unlike the scholars discussed above, these are a group of people whose main aim is to investigate and describe particular aspects of the grammar of the language. Their work focuses on some well-defined aspect of the language which is analysed fairly rigorously.

1.3.2.1. Gowlett

From the available sources, it seems that the person who has done the most extensive work on Silozi is Gowlett who is based in South Africa. He has written two dissertations on the language. The first is a Bachelor of Arts dissertation (1964) which focuses on the morphology of the substantive in Silozi. This basically presents
an investigation of the structure of the noun and noun phrase. It outlines and describes the noun class system and prefixes in the language. It also provides the meaning of each concordial prefix. The other (1967) is an M. A. dissertation which is a description of the structure of verb and verb phrase in Silozi. It is a reasonably detailed outline of the various conjugations of the verb and verbal extensions. He wrote another paper in 1989, which discusses the "parentage of Silozi". The paper addresses the issue of parentage of the language by focusing on phonology, morphology and lexicon. This is done in order to determine the sources of the features that are exist in present Silozi. He has isolated structures that are from Sisotho and those from Siluyana.

1.3.2.2. Kashoki & Mann

In a joint paper (1978), the two scholars have done some brief grammatical sketches of the seven official Zambian languages, namely: Silozi, Chibemba, Chitonga Chinyanja, Luvalo, Lunda and Kaonde. Kashoki has also done a paper, which documents the process of word-formation and innovation in four Zambian languages including Silozi. In another study, Kashoki considers lexical borrowing that has affected Zambian indigenous languages due to the influence of extra linguistic factors such as migration (urbanisation), education and assimilation to another culture and language. Both these papers are short and therefore not detailed.

1.3.2.3. Yukawa

Yukawa is a Japanese linguist who went to Zambia to undertake some research on the local languages including Silozi. He has published (1978) a book that contains a chapter which presents a study of Silozi verbs from a tonological point of view. His study begins with a brief outline of the Silozi noun class system, emphasising the relationship between the noun prefixes and other grammatical categories. It then moves on to the conjugation of the verb. The bulk of the study focuses on the tonological aspects of the language with a touch of morphology.

5 Kashoki is the first Zambian professor of Bantu linguistics. He is probably the greatest authority on Zambian Bantu languages. He is a Chibemba native speaker and most of his work is based on this language.
1.3.3. Conclusion

It should be stated that apart from these works, there is a substantial number of literary works by Silozi authors which have been published by the Zambia Educational Publishing House. There is also a Silozi version of the Bible which was translated into Silozi by the Paris Evangelical Missionary Society. In recent years, it has been re-translated and published by an ecumenical team working under the auspices of the Bible Society of Zambia. There are about six Silozi-English, English-Silozi dictionaries, most of which have been written by non-Silozi native speakers. These non-native speakers are also not linguists. The overall picture is that there are very few linguistic studies that have been done on Silozi.

This completes the account of the previous studies on Silozi. In the next section, I offer a critique of these studies, focusing on the most important points for present purposes.

1.3.4. Some observations

All the above studies share some inadequacies that merit discussion. I will examine the studies from the methodological and theoretical point of view.

1.3.4.1. Methodological considerations

The first methodological problem is that most of the studies do not explicitly state the sources of data they use. They also do not state how the data have been collected. Gowlett (1967) provides a list of Silozi native speakers who he calls "informants" but does not say how he dealt with them to get the information. Yukawa (ibid) mentions three informants who are native speakers. It is thus difficult to establish whether the data (if any) were from written or spoken sources. Ultimately, all there is are published grammar textbooks, short papers, monographs and dissertations. This poses the problem of reliability and validity of the data used. In short, without adequate knowledge about the methods employed in the collection of data, it is almost impossible to determine their reliability and validity. One is only left to speculate that they were based on solicited responses if obtained from native speakers. And if this is the case, then it is methodologically inadequate. This inadequacy is noted by Foley and Van Valin (1984: 13):
"With respect to methodological issues, it is obvious (or at least it should be) that the native speaker’s competence cannot be fully uncovered by eliciting judgements about grammaticality and synonymy by presenting speakers with context-free individual sentences".

Ultimately, it is difficult to assess exactly how the nature of the database on which these grammars have been developed has affected their basic principles and structure. This problem is compounded by the fact that all of them but one have been done by a non-native speaker. This then constitutes the second problem. Native speaker intuition, although not absolutely necessary, is lacking in the grammars. I subscribe to the view that the native speaker’s knowledge of the language is direct as opposed to the indirect knowledge of the non-native speaker. The desirability of the native speaker as a source of linguistic data and as a metalinguistic authority has long been recognised. In their discussion of data sources, Mallinson & Blake (1981) stress the importance of availability and reliability of primary sources and recommend the use of live informants. Further, familiarity with the language is an imperative in the production of reliable grammars. A similar view is expressed by Croft (1990: 25) who observes that primary grammatical sources, written by native speakers or field workers, are superior to the use of secondary sources, in which data from primary sources is gathered together. Accordingly, secondary sources must always be confirmed by the primary sources they cite. In general, the better expedient remains the native speaker linguist, especially when dealing with fine-tuned syntactic and analysis of discourse-pragmatic data. This is a person who has practical and theoretical knowledge of the language in question.

1.3.4.2. Theoretical considerations

From the theoretical point of view, the first problem concerns the fact that the studies are predominantly formal as they just deal with the structures of isolated language units (which are, in this case, parts of speech). They adopt a formal approach that studies grammar in isolation from discourse and context. They thus overlook the significance of the role of the context and “actual use” in the organisation and structure of the language. By the same token, the communicative functions of language are not revealed. This approach to language study, which is similar to the American structuralism and the Chomskyan approach (formalism) has received heavy criticism in linguistic theory. This criticism can be illustrated in the following quotation from Givon’s (1979: xiii) preface which is about sentences:
“First, isolated sentences and their syntax are often at great variance with the syntax of sentences or clauses in natural, unsolicited speech, so much so that serious doubts may be cast over their legitimacy and ultimate reality except as curious artefacts of a particular method of elicitation. Furthermore, the study of syntax, when limited to sentence-clause level and deprived of its communicative-functional context, tends to bypass and even to obscure the immense role that communicative considerations affecting the structure of discourse play in determining so-called syntactic rules. The dogma of autonomous syntax also precludes asking the most interesting questions about the grammar of human language, namely, why it is the way it is; how it got to be that way; what function it serves, and how it relates to the use of human language as an instrument of information processing, storage, retrieval, and above-all-communication”.

It should be stated that although these claims are about sentences, I strongly believe they apply to other categories and can be extended to their analysis as well. My own position is that there is a fundamental relationship between the structure of language and discourse. In a similar spirit, Andersen (1983: 189) argues that any analysis of word order restricted to syntax and excluding discourse and possibly other areas of grammar will therefore be incomplete.

The second characteristic of the studies is that none of them addresses the syntax of the language in a systematic and detailed way. They are mostly concerned with phonological and morphological aspects of the language, focusing mainly on the noun class system and the concomitant concordial markers, and the conjugation of the verb. It follows from this that important linguistic issues such as word order, constituent order and syntactic variation have never been systematically investigated. Ultimately, there is no study which has focused on the application of syntactic theory. It is interesting to note that one of the reasons offered for not having done any systematic work on syntax in Zambian Bantu languages is presented by Kashoki and Mann (ibid: 80):

“The information available to the writers is not adequate to make any extensive remarks on the combination of words into phrases, clauses and sentences in the Zambian languages”.
This explanation for not doing work on syntax does not hold because the syntactic structure of the languages, and indeed of all languages, is as old as the languages themselves. Needless to say, every language has structures which are larger than the word or phoneme at any stage of its existence. It is firmly established in linguistics that when human beings communicate with each other linguistically, they do not do so in isolated sentences. Rather, discourse is constituted by complex expressions made up of a number of expressions linked together in various ways (Foley & Van Valin: ibid). There can never, therefore, be a time when information is inadequate for any writer to make extensive remarks about Zambian languages.

The exclusion of syntax from grammatical description is not restricted to Silozi. It has been observed by various scholars who have studied other Bantu languages. For instance, Givon (1969) notes that studies in Bantu languages have confined themselves to the morphological aspects of “parts of speech” particularly nominal systems and concordial affixes. Fivaz (1970: xi) asserts that “in the context of South African Bantu linguistics, we have, for example to justify the common implicit assumption that a “part of speech” analysis is in some sense the “core” of grammatical description.” Myers (1975) observes that although the linguistic unity of the Bantu language group is an accepted fact in linguistics, the majority of the evidence establishing the unity of the Bantu languages falls within the realms of morphology and phonology. He asserts (ibid: 184): “On the syntactic level however, the work has barely begun. Although Bantuists recognise some syntactic patterns as ‘typical’ of Bantu, intensive investigations into the extent to which syntactic phenomena in various Bantu languages parallel or differ from each other are rare. Yet it is precisely this type of investigation which is crucial to our understanding of Bantu Syntax.”

More recently, Mbom (1990) in her work on tense and aspect (temporal structure) in Basaa, a Cameroonian Bantu language, has also noted this trend. She reports that all the linguistic studies she has reviewed on the language revolve around phonology and morphology. She comments: “It clearly emerges from the foregoing survey that Basaa syntax and semantics have fared rather poorly. To date, there has been no study in the language devoted to either these two important linguistic dimensions”. With this information, it is not unreasonable to conclude that the study of syntax has been neglected in Silozi This seems to be a legacy of Bantu linguistics, especially in the southern sub-region. The question may thus be asked “Where is the syntax and
discourse of Silozi?"

1.3.4.3. Other considerations

Another point which is related to the general approach adopted in the bulk of the studies is that they are chiefly based on what is known in Southern African Bantu linguistics as the Doke model. This model has influenced most, if not all, the Southern African Bantuists. I do not dwell much on the details of this model since most of what it deals with does not concern us. However, because of its impact on the description of Bantu languages, a few background remarks may be useful. The thrust of the Doke model is the development of radical approaches and terminology to the analysis of Bantu languages, particularly those in Southern Africa. Doke believed that describing Bantu languages by applying terminology developed in the mould of classical grammar for Indo-European languages is "harmful". The crux of the Doke model was the question of word division—whether certain morphemes (syllables in the Doke Model) should be written conjunctively or disjunctively. The model is, in essence, a guideline for the representation of Bantu words and word groups. It is outlined in his publication titled Bantu Linguistic Terminology (1934).

The influence of the Doke Model has been received with mixed feelings among the people who are concerned with analysing, describing and teaching Bantu languages. Some scholars are critical of it. For example, Westphal (1970: 383) observes that despite the presence of what appeared to be very complete grammars of several Bantu languages, Bantu language description was at a very low ebb in the post-war years. "It seemed as if the pattern had been set by C.M. Doke for all Bantu languages and that there was nothing more to do than to record every remaining bit of language according to this pattern." Westphal goes on to state that "notional" and "formal" trends have been characteristic features of Bantu linguistics and that a sort of combined morphology and syntax—of C. M. Doke—had served the Bantu languages well. In this model, a statement of Bantu morphology was in some

---

6 Fivaz has defended the Doke model by stating that the Doke model was developed in the sphere of anthropological linguistics and, as such, it is probably as significant a model as has been produced for any group of languages anywhere. He further argues that criticisms which arise from theoretical concerns do not minimise its importance and value as an anthropological taxonomic model. Doke's significance as a Bantuist is seen to be all the greater when it is remembered that he was not primarily a linguistic theoretician, nor had he worked in an environment of theoretical concern with the nature of language and of linguistic descriptions. He produced his model in the late 1920s, apparently practically alone and without outside theoretical stimulus.
measure a statement of syntax. Another critical view is expressed by Fivaz ((1970: xviii) who argues that if the Doke model is considered as the first stage in an overall syntactic analysis the approach embodied in it has certain serious deficiencies, which may be summarised as follows:

1. The grammatical primes recognised are “parts of speech” or words rather than sentences.
2. The words which are the subject of classification are phonological rather than grammatical segments, and several of these (such as adverb, possessive, copulative, relative and verb) straddle clear constituent boundaries.
3. Syntax, while not ignored, is clearly not seen as the major part of linguistic description.

As far as I know, these criticisms are applicable to most of the Silozi grammars. However, some scholars are supportive of this model and have applied it almost in toto to the description of Bantu languages. Cole is one such scholar.

“The adoption of conjunctive word division obviously demands a reorientation in the approach to the grammatical analysis, and with this in view, Professor C. M. Doke has been primarily responsible for developing, over a period of years the system of Bantu grammar for Bantu languages” which is now generally accepted in South Africa.” (Cole 1975: xxxv).

Three writers of the work I have reviewed on Silozi, namely Gluckman, Gowlett and Mwisiya acknowledge the usefulness and applicability of the Doke model to Silozi. Mwisiya notes the comparative appropriateness of this model over those used in other studies.
“Most of the old grammarians tried to apply the classical terminologies to Bantu languages and thus caused much harm to the study of these languages. It is a pity that Mr. W. A. R. Gorman used classical nomenclatures with the result that the book may not be useful for examination purposes. In this book the system developed by Prof. C.M. Doke of the University of Witwatersrand will be followed.” (Mwisiya ibid: 11).

This model, significant as it may be, is not without criticism. The salient one is that by deliberately using terminology and methodology specifically designed for Bantu languages, this model isolates their study from developments, theories and terminology in mainstream linguistics. This raises the question of whether a separate field of linguistics with its own set of metalanguage and principles must be developed in order to analyse and describe Southern Bantu languages. When looked at closely, there are two sets of terminology and approaches that have been applied to the description of Silozi. The first is based on what Mwisiya calls “classical terminologies” used by the so-called “old grammarians”.

It may be useful to point out that there is a very strong relationship between the two writing systems mentioned in 2.1. on the one hand, and the development of grammatical descriptions of Silozi. The relationship is manifested in the existence of at least two conflicting presentations of grammatical structures and related terminology. Those who have used the so-called classical terminology have one system. This system presents grammatical units disjunctively. Since the great rule underlying disjunctivism is that, with the exception of certain affixes, every element that has a meaning must be written separately, this has meant that certain affixes have been written as independent words in some descriptions. In such descriptions about eight word classes are recognised: noun, verb, adjective, adverb, pronoun, preposition conjunction and interjection. On the other hand those who have adopted the Doke model have produced descriptions which are based on conjunctivism. In this system so called “six basic parts of speech” are recognised. It should be pointed out that although the grammars that have been written on Silozi claim to be based on the two different writing systems discussed, there seems to be some disagreement among the proponents of the conjunctivist system. Jalla (ibid) and Mwisiya (ibid) both claim to be conjunctivists. For example, while the former recognises the existence of prepositions in Silozi the latter does not. After presenting the “parts of speech as known by scholars today,” Mwisiya goes on to argue:
“As will be noted from the foregoing, there is no preposition in Silozi. What Rev. A. Jalla and Mr. A Gorman regarded as prepositions are part of the adverb. Languages which write conjunctively appreciate this phenomenon (Mwisiya ibid: 12).

It should be noted that at some other juncture, Mwisiya (ibid: 11) acknowledges that “Rev A. Jalla does not have respect for the disjunctive method of writing”. This makes it reasonable to conclude that Silozi has been described in a manner that is different from what is usual in most linguistic descriptions. It might be argued that this is expected in an understudied language, and in a field that is open-ended and ongoing. Lyons (1977: 25) has noted the importance of terminological consensus in grammatical descriptions:

“Terminological agreement would not, of itself, resolve the theoretical disputes that have been taking place in linguistics between data and theory; but it would clarify the issues and perhaps eliminate a certain amount of misunderstanding”.

The crucial consequence of this is that the terminology and methodology developed exclusively for Southern Bantu languages are inconsistent. They have also been found to be significantly different from what obtains in mainstream linguistic descriptions. Further, the terminology, in particular, has been deemed redundant and unnecessary (Gregerssen 1967). Overall, the current state of Silozi grammatical descriptions, significant as it may be, is undesirable. More importantly, the linguistic significance of the orthographic arguments used in the explanations of the linguistic categories remains questionable.

In summary, it is clear from the foregoing survey that Silozi is an understudied and under-documented language. The few studies that have been done are not consistent with the general principles of late twentieth century linguistic science. This is underscored by the fact that the structures described ignore the communicative and functional aspects of language. They also overlook the role of the interface of the various aspects and levels of grammar. Further, as the current studies stand they are based on two conflicting currents of grammatical description and terminology. These are those which are based on the so-called classical grammar and nomenclature and those based on the Doke Model (dubbed “Bantu system of grammatical analysis”).
However, these inadequacies may be understandable when one considers the fact that the aims, methods, methodology, terminology, concepts and theoretical motivations could only be limited to the circumstances obtaining at the time. The limitations have also been defended on the grounds that there is a lack of general theoretical stimulus in Southern Bantu linguistic theoretical studies (Fivaz: ibid). This notwithstanding, the studies have left crucial linguistic issues that need to be addressed.

1.3.5. Silozi and constituent order typology

One of the issues that have not been addressed so far is the place of Silozi in language typology. Linguistic typology aims to determine the principles which govern all human language - in Edward Sapir’s phrase, “their great underlying ground-plan” (Lehmann: 1978). It has been used to classify the languages according to certain types and investigation and determination of certain typical mechanisms of language (Andersen 1983). Typology focuses on the central component of language, syntax. Constituents are ordered according to certain rules in the larger systems in which they occur: how morphemes are organised into words, words into phrases and phrases into clauses and clauses into sentences. It has been argued that one of the central questions of linguistic theory is ‘How are languages different and how do they differ?’ (Perlmutter 1980, among many others). One of the ways in which this can be shown is to examine how their constituents are ordered.

In particular, one needs to determine how grammatical relations - subject and object - are ordered relative to the verb. It has been argued that the order in which the elements of the clause occur varies considerably from one language to another, and even within the same language. Payne (1997: 71) remarks that “descriptive linguists have long observed that individual languages structure their clauses in characteristic ways; some languages tend to place the verb at the end of the clause, others at the beginning, still others place it somewhere in the middle. Finally, many languages seem to place the verb just about anywhere.” Unfortunately, previous scholarship on Silozi has not addressed constituent order phenomena in a straightforward way. The direct consequence of this is lack of information on the syntactic patterns of the language. A similar situation applies to the other type of typology, morphological typology. As noted above, there has been more work on morphology (and phonology) than on syntax. Despite this, the studies do not expressly and explicitly state what sort of language it is in terms of its morphology. Ultimately, both morphological typology and syntactic typology have not been systematically
addressed in Silozi. The language has not been adequately located in typological studies and universal grammar.

The functional and (morpho-syntactic) typological approaches to language study which have dominated linguistic debate for some time now have not been applied to the study of the language. There is thus no direct systematic and empirical information about the linguistic type of the language. What is known about its basic order has been derived from comparative Bantu studies which have almost invariably claimed that Bantu languages have the basic order in which the subject is followed by the verb which is, in turn, followed by the object, i.e. SVO. So far, no study has ever been undertaken to place Silozi in the realm of linguistic typology. Without any empirical studies and evidence, the information remains questionable. It is clear, therefore, that Silozi, like many other Bantu languages, has not been adequately studied at the syntactic level in a satisfactory manner.

1.4. Goals and scope of the study.

The main aim of this study is to provide a more systematic and comprehensive description of Silozi constituent order than what has been done before. In linguistics it is claimed that sentence constituents are ordered in terms of their categorial complexity. The intuition underlying this claim is that there is a tendency for simpler and lighter constituents to precede more complex and heavier ones. This linearization phenomenon has been variously referred to as “short before long” (Behagel 1932), “order of increasing complexity (Dik 1978, 1980, 1989, 1997), “Heaviness to the right” (Hawkins 1994). These weight principles have collectively come to be called the theory of end-weight (Quirk et al 1985, Greenbaum 1996). In Dik’s (ibid) Functional Grammar, this has been termed the “language independent preferred order of constituents” (LIPOC). This tendency is claimed to be universal and applies to both the (term) phrase and clause levels. Although this principle has been applied to the study of other languages, it has never been applied to the description of the order of constituents in Silozi.

The other aim of this study is to investigate the extent to which LIPOC which concerns the theory of end weight affects the ordering of constituents in the phrase, clause and sentence. The major question addressed is whether there is a correlation between the internal structure of a constituent and the position it occupies in a larger construction of which it forms apart. The analysis and description is meant to focus
on Silozi syntax, which has received scanty formal attention in grammatical descriptions. As we have shown above, the Silozi clause and sentence have not been properly delineated. While the major focus of the description is the clause or sentence, the study includes the word categories and phrasal categories. There are two reasons for including these categories which are lower than the clause in the study. The first is to provide a more detailed and comprehensive background to the grammatical structure of the language; given the fact that it is highly under-described. The second is to reconsider these units from a different approach, which applies principles and insights that have been developed since they were last studied. In this way I hope to come up with some standardised and updated metalanguage that may be deemed to be appropriate for the description and analysis of Silozi grammar structure in the context of later twentieth century linguistic theories. The phrase structure (or term level in FG) is particularly considered because Siewierska (1988: 43-47) and Dik (1997: 430) argue that weight principles in general and LIPOC in particular, are relevant to the term phrase (noun phrase). They justify this by arguing that RCs (Relative clauses) not only prefer the Postfield, but also preferably occupy the final slot and in the term phrase. Alternatively, they may even get "extraposed" (displaced) out of the term phrase altogether into some later position in the clause.

I summarise the aims of the study as follows, with the emphasis on an explanation which can address some major issues in contemporary descriptive linguistics:

7. a. to describe and analyse Silozi morphological and syntactic structure with emphasis on the ordering of constituents in clauses and sentences
   c. to investigate the applicability of the theory of end weight and LIPOC in Silozi constituent order.

1.4.1. Motivation for the study

Apart from achieving these aims, there are other compelling reasons for undertaking this study which have been brought to my attention by some observations made by other scholars to which I subscribe. Grimes (1992) reports that about 6,000 languages are spoken on earth. About 2,000 have received close attention by linguistic researchers. The other 4,000 (roughly speaking) have only been sporadically been described by linguists. Krauss (1992) estimates that 3,000 of the 6,000 or so languages spoken today may become extinct in the next century. Along similar lines, Payne (1997) points out that it is not surprising that the 3,000 languages
facing extinction come overwhelmingly from the 4,000 or so that have not been consistently described. To avert what he refers to as "the human and intellectual tragedy of language extinction" he has endorsed the role of primary descriptive linguistic undertakings:

"Though linguistic description alone will not solve the problems of language and culture extinction, it is an important part of the solution. The mere existence of a good dictionary and grammatical description confers a certain status on a language that may have previously been described as having "no grammar" or being just a dialect or even primitive... Furthermore, when a language becomes extinct as in many cases, the linguistic description and other materials remain as a central part of the cultural heritage of descendants of the language's speakers, as well as all humanity. Without this documentation the language along with the cultural traditions and wisdom embodied in it is lost forever."

(Payne 1997: 2)

Given the information above, there is no doubt that Silozi belongs to this category of languages. Crucially, two factors threaten the viability of Silozi. The first is lack of thorough and close attention by linguists as noted in 1.3. Silozi has been left behind in recent and current linguistic descriptions. The second is the influence of other languages, particularly English. O’Sullivan (1993 b: viii) observes: "The viability of the Lozi language is under threat. The increasing use of English as the country's official language, as the international language, as the language of science and technology, and as the almost sole language of Zambian television, have called into doubt the future of Lozi and indeed of other Zambian languages as well. Ideally, Zambians would be bi-lingual, as indeed very many are at present, speaking both English and their own language."

I believe that this should be the opportunity to save Silozi from extinction. Much work has been devoted to African languages in general and Bantu languages in particular. This scholarly work has been much to the exclusion of Silozi. Although the language is recognised for educational, and to some extent, administrative purposes in Zambia, it still remains a largely under-described Bantu language, little known in current linguistic debate and theories. This is underscored by the fact that no application of linguistic theories and concepts (both old and current) is reflected in the previous studies. There is also no methodological rigour in these studies.
Another reason for carrying out this study is that no native speaker has undertaken the task of studying the rules and structures of the language from a linguistic point of view.

Another compelling reason for undertaking this study is to address some aspects of the language that have not been covered in the previous scholarship. Primary among these is discourse. As observed above, this has been totally ignored. Discourse is of paramount importance in the description of the structure of any language. Longacre (1996:175) points out that “a systematic account of the grammar of a language treats of the units and relations that hold within its grammar...Discourse (or text) is the most inclusive unit and reflects the realities of oral and written communication. It is of almost universal relevance in Grammar”. In order to observe how the language exploits its structures in particular discourse contexts, I have used data from spoken and written discourse texts. This, inevitably, entails investigating the constituent orders that are permitted in discourse.

Superficially, this study seems to be based on work that has a long standing in linguistic history, i.e. constituent order or positional syntax. However, its overall orientation is distinctive enough to make it a piece of new work in that I have recast the insights of its predecessor to the study of Silozi. The evidence and data offered in this thesis are new. What makes it more unique is the fact that it considers spoken and written data. In addition, it is reasonable to acknowledge the fact that a study of Silozi could also contribute to further linguistic research and knowledge in a section of Zambian Bantu languages, which have been described only scantily from a linguistic point of view. It is hoped that the general syntactic features of Silozi (the ways in which words combine into structures of phrases, clauses and sentences) will be brought to light in the course of achieving the main goals of this thesis. A contribution to syntactic typological research is made in this way.

1.5. Approach and methodology.

In order to achieve the goals of the study and to address the inadequacies of the previous studies pointed out above, a different approach to the analysis and description of the language is needed. We assume that this study is mainly concerned with positional syntax and linearization. The description of the linguistic structures is done using the functional approach. I have not restricted myself to any grammatical framework. However, I have drawn from various frameworks of grammatical
description which appeal to constituent order and primary syntactic relations. References will be made to theory specific treatments of several constituent structure phenomena but preference is given to approaches that embrace functional and formal orientations in accounting for language structure and linearization rules. These include syntactic typology and discourse pragmatic oriented frame works. The discussion is couched within what Siewierska (1993: 826) refers to as “the context of a body of largely traditional assumptions about linguistic categories and clausal and sentential structure as reflected in the host of so-called linearisation hierarchies that have featured in the word order literature of the last decade or so.”

The present study recognises the interface between the various levels of grammar. The thrust of this approach is that explanations of constituent order may be made in terms of syntactic, discourse-pragmatic and cognitive domains. It is founded on the view that order is determined by various (factors or principles), which are not autonomous from each other. With respect to this approach Payne (1992: 12) asserts:

“In understanding order variation, it is unhelpfully reductionist to seek an explanation in terms of only one domain. In all languages, each domain makes some contribution to determining the surface order of sentence elements (though the relative contribution of each domain may vary from one language to another). One might think of this as a “modular” approach to the question of word order variation, though it is from at least a diachronic perspective (if not from a synchronic one as well) surely a fiction to suppose that such modules are autonomous from each other”.

Although I wish to remain as theory-neutral as possible, I have found it helpful to draw on some insights from the FG approach to linearization and positional syntax (Dik 1978, 1980, 1989, 1993, 1996, 1997). The specific aspects of this model which have been applied in the description of the ordering principles in Silozi are provided in Chapter Two. I have chosen to use the FG approach for various reasons. Principally, it is because it is the only framework that explicitly provides certain categorial information at clause and sentence level in comparison to other grammatical models that seek to account for constituent order principles (see also Siewierska 1988, 1991, 1993). Because of this it is the framework that has introduced and espouses the language independent preferred order of constituents
(LIPOC) in linguistic theory. As Connolly (1991) points out, Dik's functional Grammar has gone further than other scholars in singling out LIPOC as a key cross-linguistic principle. Needless to say, this is one of the constituent ordering principles that is investigated in this study. Another reason for having recourse to FG is that it deals with tendencies, preferences favoured and disfavoured solutions which may be seen as simpler, more effective or more efficient in relation to functional prerequisites. These are: a) the aims and purpose for which natural language expressions are used; b) the means by which natural languages are implemented; c) the circumstances in which natural languages are used (Dik 1986: 9-10). This is what distinguishes FG from the formal approaches with respect to the construction of linguistic explanations and more appropriate for describing the structures that occur in our type of data. In addition to FG, I have also drawn on Hawkins' work on performance and processing in the ordering of constituents. This is because it seeks to explain constituent ordering in terms of the complexity metric although this is seen to be motivated by performance and processing principles which in turn constitute the principle of Early immediate Constituents (EIC). The approach I adopted also draws on Foley & Van Valin's Role and Reference Grammar. Other frameworks that I have found useful will be mentioned in the course of the discussion.

The specific details of the methods used in the data collection are discussed in the appropriate chapters. I will just discuss some general methodological issues here. Since the study adopts the functional approach, the crucial data come from analysis of actual language use in social interaction - spoken and written texts. As in any natural occurring discourse, there are various types of linguistic units or constructions in the data. These include incomplete utterances which may be interpretable as sentences in spoken contexts. These are however necessary in the overall structure of discourse. To facilitate a systematic description of the structures and exposition, I have found it necessary to make a distinction between observed and observable utterances, and the set of grammatical clauses or sentences that may be postulated. Accordingly, the first step in the analysis has been to separate what may be considered "grammatical" constructions from "ungrammatical" ones.

To do this I have used my native speaker intuition. I have also been guided by Lyons' (1977: 29) proposal which makes a distinction between "text-sentence" and "system-sentence". According to this proposal a text-sentence refers to something that can be uttered i.e. as the product of a bit of language behaviour. Text-sentences
can be identified as tokens of the same type: for they are either utterances (whether written or spoken) or parts of utterances. They may be complete or incomplete. On the other hand, a system sentence is seen as an abstract, theoretical entity in the linguist’s model of the language system. “System-sentences are sequences of words in a one-to-one order-preserving correspondence with what would be judged, intuitively by native speakers to be grammatically complete text-sentences” (Lyons ibid). He has further suggested that representations of system sentences may be used in metalinguistic discussions of the structure and functions of language and it is such representations that are customarily cited in grammatical descriptions of particular languages. Based on this view, our description and analysis of constituent ordering focuses on system sentences. Text sentences will be cited in some examples. Along these guidelines, spoken clauses have been transcribed into graphological or orthographic units using the orthographic system outlined here.

The next stage in the analysis involved dividing each clause into individual constituent clauses. This means that compound clauses were broken into their individual constituent clauses. Each clause must consist of at least a subject and verb. The clause must have the bipartite structure in which the constituents can reasonably be termed subject and predicate. Having delimited the clauses, an extension of the traditional “parsing” system has been employed to determine the constituents of the clause. The constituents were identified and described using the traditional functional labels: subject, object (direct and indirect), complement and adverbial. A count of the number of constituent type was then made for each functional slot. The length and structural complexity of each constituent were measured with respect to their distribution in the clause. This was done to determine whether their internal structure determined their distribution (or functional slot) across the clause.

Having identified the structural and functional characteristics of the constituents, an extension of FG’s linearisation mechanism was applied. According to this mechanism, the appropriate ordering of constituents is accomplished by means of comparatively late rules, known as placement rules which allocate the constituents to

---

7 Lyons (1977) has proposed that the terms ‘language behaviour’ and ‘utterance’ belong to the ‘pretheoretical’ or ‘observational’ vocabulary of the linguists metalanguage: they are terms which he can use to talk about his data prior to and independently of its description within a particular theoretical frame work. Pretheoretical or observational terms contrast with theoretical terms whose definition and interpretation is fixed within a particular linguistic theory.
specific positions within pattern schemata that define the overall ordering possibilities but are distinct from the rules themselves. Once a constituent has been placed in a given position, it cannot then be moved. We examine the placement rules and pattern positions (or schemata) that are permissible in the data and, thereby explaining their preferred and favoured ordering patterns.

We assume that the surface form is determined by the interaction of syntactic and discourse-pragmatic factors. A full description of the surface structures should therefore involve these components. However, for practical (methodological) considerations, it is crucial and helpful to tease them apart. It follows from this that two types of constructions may be postulated in terms of these domains. These are:

8. a. clauses or sentences which are motivated by purely syntactic factors
   b. clauses or sentences that are driven by discourse-pragmatic factors.

This entails investigating matters of clause-internal morpho-syntax, clause linkage and cross-clause reference-tracking mechanisms.

The study seeks to be as objective as possible by providing both qualitative and quantitative evidence for the distribution of constituents in the Silozi clause or sentence. The patterns are not merely explained and described. We have gone a step further by employing a statistical test (chi-square) to determine whether the permissible orders represent significant tendencies.

1.6. The data

I will discuss the specific details of the data in the relevant chapters. For the moment let me just state that the present study is based on 803 clauses extracted from spoken and written discourse. There are 600 clauses from written discourse and 203 from spoken discourse. Almost all the examples that are cited are from the data. When a particular structure is not attested in the data I have had to rely on my intuition as a native speaker. The choice of the texts as the objects of study was motivated by various factors: spoken and written data have never been used in the grammatical descriptions of Silozi. Secondly, the choice was motivated by a strong desire to test the two putative constituent ordering principles with a sample of data from a Bantu language since such an exercise has never been done in this field. In the next
subsection, I would like to discuss some general interesting characteristics, which are common to both the text types.

1.6.1. Some language features

One interesting feature of the texts is that they are not delivered exclusively in Silozi. They are not spoken or written exclusively in Silozi because the speakers mingle English and Silozi in the course of the discourse. As a result, there are numerous instances of code-switching and mixing mainly involving the two languages. We shall examine this phenomenon briefly. From some studies carried out on language use, there is evidence that this phenomenon is not an idiosyncrasy of the text or the participants. It is a characteristic of bilingual or multi-lingual users of language. For instance, it has been claimed by some scholars that there is a brand of English which should be called “Zambian English” (Simukoko 1977, Moody 1985, Kashina 1994). This is an interlanguage, which consists of a mixture of English linguistic structures and those of one or more Zambian languages. Generally speaking, code switching and shifting, which are closely related to borrowing, are devices used to fill lexical and other linguistic gaps in the host language in order to enhance effective communication.

The phenomena of code-switching and code shifting have been identified as characteristics of bi-lingual and multi-lingual speakers of many languages of the world. English is spoken by most educated people in the former British colonies of which Zambia is one. These are inevitably bilinguals or multilinguals because they have to use English in addition to their mother tongue and (an) other Zambian indigenous language(s). An average Zambian speaks at least three languages. At the personal and interpersonal level, English is used primarily for communication between Zambians. Zambia has a multiplicity of indigenous languages and people who communicate with each other outside their first language groups often choose to do so through English. Commenting on the same phenomenon, Kashoki and Mann (1978: 72a) observe that:

“This is generally what is meant by such statements as ‘he speaks English with a Lozi or, Tonga, or Nyanja accent’. What is involved in this case is that sound patterns in the mother tongue are transferred to sound patterns in English”.
Bokamba (1988) has observed the same phenomenon for bilingual and multi-lingual speakers of Swahili, Lingala and languages of former colonisers. It has also been observed in the speech of bilingual Spanish-English speakers residing in America (Sankoff and Poplack 1980, Poplack 1982). The grammar of these speakers, by and large, consists of code-mixed and code-shifted syntactic and morphological structures. Because of this mingling, our corpus exhibits some patterns mainly from Silozi, English and, to a lesser extent, Chitonga. Expressions such as “minisita” for minister, “peshini” for pension, “misita” for mister (Mr.) are indiscriminately used even when a Silozi form is readily available. We can see this in one of the titles of the novels under study where the word “mendulu” is used. This is the English “medal”. Some of the features have to do with orthography, which I look at in section 1.2 above.

1.7. Organisation of the study

The remainder of the thesis is organised into two parts in order to reflect the two inter-related facets of language, namely communicative function (discourse) and morpho-syntax (grammar). Part One is subdivided into three chapters. Chapter 2 deals with the core theoretical and terminological issues that are crucial to the study. Chapter 3 deals with word classes and morphological typology. In Chapter 4, I discuss Silozi phrases. The clause and sentence are discussed in chapter 5. Part Two has two chapters. Chapter 6 discusses presents a background to constituent ordering which is predominantly determined by discourse-pragmatic factors in Silozi. Data from Silozi written texts are analysed in Chapter 7. Chapter 8 is concerned with spoken data from spoken discourse. This chapter also briefly points out the differences between written Silozi and its spontaneous spoken form. The functions of preposed adverbials in the discourse are discussed in Chapter 9. Chapter 10 outlines the outcome of the study.
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Chapter Two

Some terminological and theoretical considerations

2.1. Introduction

Since the last publication on Silozi in 1977, there have been enormous advances in the techniques of linguistic analysis and description. In view of what has been observed in the overview of the studies of Silozi hitherto, I believe there is need to analyse and describe its structures by using a different approach. This involves explaining Silozi constituent ordering by applying principles that are consistent with the developments in mainstream linguistic theory and language description. There are some terms, concepts and theoretical issues that need elucidation in order to situate the discussion of Silozi facts in the context of current and recent linguistic theory. Most of them may be widely known and familiar. However, certain definitions and interpretations are inappropriate to the structures that occur in the present data. These may need to be revised. Yet others may be unfamiliar because they have been introduced in the literature by a relatively recent version of Functional Grammar which has been inspired and led by Simon Dik since 1978. In this chapter, I explicate them and indicate how they are to be used in this thesis. I will start with theoretical preliminaries and then focus attention on some matters of terminology.

2.1.1. The Functional Grammar model

As pointed out in the preceding chapter, the version of functional grammar I am concerned with in this study is that developed by Dik and built upon by his associates. FG is well documented. Since 1978 and 1997 the grammar has been built upon by publications by Dik (see for instance 1980, 1983, 1993, 1997) and his associates. Some of these include Hannay and Vester (1990), Connolly (1983, 1991), and Siewierska (1991). The developments in the grammar have been consolidated and published in two parts. *The Theory of Functional Grammar, Part I: The structure of the clause* in 1989 (revised in 1997), sets out the basic principles. *The Theory of Functional Grammar, Part II: The structure of utterance* in 1993 and 1997, discusses the principles and methods of the grammar.

---

8 Mackenzie (1996) and Hengeveld (1997) provide an update of the model’s recent developments and opportunities for collaboration with other branches of functional linguistics. The two authors have prepared the manuscripts of Dik’s work after his death in 1995.
underlying the theory of FG. *Functional Grammar, Part II: Complex and Derived Constructions, a sequel to Part I,* was published in 1997. Clearly, FG has received considerable attention in the linguistic literature. I will thus refrain from giving it a detailed exposition. I will instead concentrate on the points that are most essential to the description of Silozi constituent ordering. It should be stated that no attempt is made to produce a formalised FG or indeed any other model since the discussion is limited to the generalisations FG proposes or assumes about constituent ordering.

I would also like to point out that FG has undergone extensive refinements, modifications and applications since its inception. Although I acknowledge the role of these recent refinements, I have preferred to restrict myself to the mainstream FG as introduced and laid down in Dik (1978, 1980, 1989, 1997). I have also made some modifications to FG linearisation mechanism in order to handle some of the structures that occur in the present data.

2.1.1.1 The F.G. Approach to constituent order.

In what follows, I discuss the specific aspects of FG employed in the account of constituent ordering in Silozi in chapters, 4, 5, 6, and 7. In FG, each clause must be described in terms of an abstract underlying clause structure, which is mapped onto actual form of the corresponding linguistic expression by a system of expression rules, which determine the form, the order and the prosodic contour of the underlying clause structure, given their status within the underlying structure:

```
Underlying Clause Structure
  Expression Rules
    Linguistic Expressions
```

Dik further states that the underlying structure is a complex abstract structure in which several “layers” of formal and semantic organisation can be distinguished (Dik 1997: 50-51). This study is mainly confined to the expression component of the linearization mechanism of FG. It thus focuses on actual linguistic expressions. My application of FG to the description of Silozi constituent order precludes the stipulation of the varied rules in underlying clause structures. My major assumption here follows from Dik (1996, updated by Mackenzie) who states that constituent
ordering is not a 'deep' property of natural languages, but rather one of the means through which underlying structures are mapped onto linguistic expressions. Following Valin and La Pola (1997: 20-21) the position assumed in this study is that multiple levels of syntactic representation are not necessary.

Two reasons, to which I subscribe, are offered to support this position: (1). There is no empirical fact in any human language that absolutely requires that a theory of syntax posit multiple levels of syntactic representation. Rather, the motivation for positing an abstract underlying syntactic level is theory-internal, (2) multilevel syntactic analyses are unnecessarily complex and inelegant or entail a loss of significant generalizations. The ethos of the two authors' position is that although there is equally no empirical fact to disprove the existence of the multiple levels of syntactic representation, it can be shown that certain phenomena which have been asserted to require recourse to multiple levels can be handled equally well or better by a different analysis with a single level of syntactic representation. To add more weight to their argument they further argue that the idea of abstract underlying syntactic representations is highly controversial and most contemporary theories do not posit them.

We do not present any arguments against analyses assuming multiple levels in this study. In accordance with the aims of this study we shall focus mainly on positing the minimal number of representations possible in order to capture the relationship between form and function in Silozi natural discourse. We believe that the single morpho-syntactic representation given to the structures that are attested in the data should be concrete, not abstract in the sense that it should represent the actual form of the sentence, including the linear sequence of its constituent elements and their morphological properties.

The expression component consists of several discrete rules or subcomponents. The rules within the subcomponents and the subcomponents themselves are ordered. The various subcomponents (currently modified by Connolly 1991) deal with the following phenomena:

```
1  a  The basic form of the constituents
    b  The assignment of syntactic functional categorisations
```
The order of constituents
Adjustments to the form of constituents
Prosody.

In this study, I do not deal with aspects of tone and stress or morphophonological representations in detail. I will only refer to them with respect to sentence functions. In addition to the aspects of the expression component in 1, I have made use of the following. These have been seen to be the characteristics that make FG different from other approaches to constituent ordering:

(a) **Placement rules are expression rules.**
Placement rules are regarded as part of the expression component of a functional grammar: constituent order serves as one of the means through which relations and functions of underlying clause structure can be formally expressed.

(b) **Placement rules are not movement rules**
Placement rules are not rules which move constituents from one specified position to another. Rather, they assign a position to a constituent which has no position yet, and in this sense “add” the feature of ordering to underlying unordered structures. Placement rules thus map underlying networks onto surface sequences.

(c) **Constituent ordering is not a deep property of languages.**
This approach implies that constituent ordering is a superficial expressive device which, to a greater or lesser extent, can be used to code underlying relations into surface sequences.

(d) **There are no free word order languages.**
This approach claims that no true free word order language exists. This follows from the fact that a true free word order language would be one in which, for a given set of constituents, all possible permutations of these constituents would not only be grammatical, but also communicatively equivalent to each other. Further, there are no languages which do not exclude at least certain sequences of constituents at some level. Even where different sequences exist side by side, there will usually be some significant difference between them (for example, a difference in the pragmatic functions of the constituents). FG also proposes that even in so-called free word order languages we need placement rules in order to account for these facts.

---

9 A detailed comparison of the treatment of constituent ordering in F.G. and some theories is in Siewierska (1988, 1993). For detailed information on the specific details of these characteristics see Dik (1997:392-394)
I have also drawn on the intuition that constituent ordering in natural languages should be described and explained in terms of a number of interacting and possibly competing principles and preferences. On the basis of this, a “multifunctional” theory of constituent ordering has been proposed:10 (Dik 1979: 396) has proposed eight assumptions upon which a multifunctional theory of constituent ordering is based.

(A1) The actual constituent ordering patterns found in a language are the resultant of a number of interacting principles.

(A2) Each of these principles is in itself functionally motivated: it is a natural principle with respect to some parameters of “naturalness”.

(A3) But two such principles do not necessarily define the same ordering preference. One principle may, for good reasons, prefer the order AB while another may, for good reasons, prefer BA.

(A4) Therefore, no language can conform to all the ordering principles at the same time and to the same degree.

(A5) The actual “solution” for constituent ordering in a given language will thus contain an element of compromise, and will to that extent be characterised by a certain amount of “tension”.

(A6) Shifts in the relative force of the different principles may lead to (sometimes radical) changes in constituent ordering.

(A7) Where such changes relieve tension with respect to one principle, they may create new tension with respect to another.

(A8) There is consequently no optimal, stable solution to the constituent ordering problem.

The multifunctional approach has also been described in terms of “competing motivations” (see Croft 1990). I would like to point out that it is the multifunctional theory that has persuaded me not to formalise any framework or principle. In addition to the multifunctional theory of constituent ordering, I will have recourse to the following generalizations. These state that actual constituent orderings of languages are outcomes of three main tendencies, which may partially counteract each other. These are:

3a The preference for giving designated positions to constituents with specified syntactic functions.

10 A similar approach has been adopted by Steele (1975), Keenan (1979), Hawkins (1983).
b The tendency to give “special” positions to certain specific categories of constituents and to constituents with specified pragmatic functions.

c The preference for linearizing constituents in order of increasing internal complexity (this is referred to as (GP9) below).

2.1.1.1. Constituent ordering principles in FG.

These are divided into general principles (GPs) and specific principles. They together should approximate as closely as possible the actual ordering patterns found in individual languages. The idea is that the general principles are reflected in the specific principles, and the specific principles in the actual constituent ordering patterns of individual languages. I do not go into the details of these principles here. (cf. Dik 1989, 1997: 398-416). However, reference to them with examples of how they operate will be made in the relevant portions of the discussion.

For the moment, I would like to call attention to one general principle (GP9) and one specific constituent ordering principle (SP7) which are of most relevance for our purposes (Dik ibid). The latter is a more specific formulation of the former. (GP9) is The principle of increasing complexity. This principle states that there is a preference for ordering constituents in order of increasing complexity. It can be illustrated in figure 4:

4 a Preferred: [ - ] [ --- ] [ ------- ] [ ----------- ] [ ------------- ]

b Non-preferred: [-------------- ] [----------- ] [----- ] [------ ] [ - ]

Figure 4 - Possible ordering principles

(GP9) is an instantiation of (GP2). This is The principle of linear order which claims that constituents conform to it when their linear order is fixed, no matter which position they take relative to the head. Because of the significance of (SP7) to our study, I devote a separate subsection to its discussion (see section 2.2).

2.1.1.1.1. Prefield and Post field

One feature that is relevant to the multifunctional theory of constituent ordering in FG is the Prefield and Postfield character of language. FG divides languages into Prefield and Postfield. Different domains of constituent ordering are distinguished. The most important domains are (i) clause (main or subordinate) as a whole, (ii) the term phrase, (iii) the adjectival phrase. The constituents to be ordered in these
domains are heads and dependents. The head is the central constituent in the domain and acts as the point of orientation for other constituents in the domain. The head of a clause is the main predicate (typically V) and the head of the term phrase is the first restrictor (typically N). The head of the adjectival phrase is the adjective. In each domain the area in front of the head is called the “Prefield” and the area after the head is called the “Postfield” (Dik 1997: 386-7):

\[
\text{Prefield}[\text{head}] \quad \text{Postfield}
\]

The dependents in any given domain are all the lexical constituents of that domain other than the head. In short, a language that places modifiers before the head is called a Prefield language. On the other hand, a language that places its modifiers after the head is called a Postfield language. The terms Prefield and Postfield are the correlates of Hawkins’ division of languages into “postpositional” and “prepositional” languages. As we demonstrate in chapters 3, 4 and 5, Silozi is predominantly a Postfield language.

2.2. (SP7) The Language Independent Preferred Order Of Constituents

As stated in Chapter One, LIPOC is one of the principles of constituent ordering we seek to find evidence for in our data. It dates back to 1978 and is said to distinguish FG from other grammatical models, such as Word Grammar, Lexical Functional Grammar, Relational Grammar, which seek to account for constituent order principles. Unlike the other models, it explicitly provides certain categorial information at sentence and clause levels. As Connolly (1991) observes, Dik’s functional grammar has gone further than other scholars in singling it out as a key cross-linguistic principle. Siewierska (1991) suggests that LIPOC is the most important of the more specific principles of order posited in FG because it concerns matters of length and internal syntactic complexity. Since 1978 the principle has been revised in both the two parts of FG. Its most recent formulation (Dik 1997: 411-412) is as follows:
5 (SP7) Other things being equal, constituents prefer being placed in order of increasing complexity which is defined as follows:

i) clitic < pronoun < noun phrase < adpositional phrase < subordinate clause.

ii) for any category $X$: $X < X \text{ co} X$

iii) For any categories $X$ and $Y$: $X < X \text{ [sub Y]}$

(co = co-ordinating element, sub = subordinating element).

In essence, the above formulation states that there is a tendency for structurally complex constituents to be placed later than structurally simpler constituents. In other words, pronouns are expected to be placed relatively earlier, especially if they are clitic. Other noun phrases tend to occur later. Adpositional phrases tend to occur later still. The most complex of the elements on the scale, subordinate clauses, tend to be placed towards the end of the superordinate structure. In addition to (5), LIPOC includes the following tenets: (a) Adding a preposition or postposition to a constituent will make it more likely to occur later than it would otherwise have. (b) Conjoining two constituents will make them likely to appear later than either singly; and (c) A constituent, $X$, will be likely to occur later if it contains an embedded constituent, $Y$, than it would otherwise have. Effectively, it deals with matters of structural complexity, expressing a preference for placing shorter and less complex material before longer and more structurally elaborate material. It is strongly argued in FG that “Due to the influence of LIPOC, then, we may expect subordinate clauses to occur in positions later than their pattern positions, and preferably at the very end of the construction in which they occur. And this is what we do indeed find in an overwhelming number of languages, including English” (Dik 1997: 127). In sum, LIPOC is about the ordering of constituents across the clause or sentence in terms of categorial complexity. This may be presented in the schema.

\[
\text{\langle-----[-],[-],[---],[----],[-----]------\rangle}
\]

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
\text{LEFT} & \text{RIGHT}
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\text{Figure 5 - The preferred structure of the clause according to LIPOC}

2.2.1 LIPOC in linguistic studies

LIPOC has been postulated as a putative universal preference for the ordering of the elements of a sentence within Dik’s FG (Trask 1993). There is evidence that LIPOC has received some empirical support in the study of some languages. Mackenzie and Hannay (1982: 46) observe that the non-occurrence of headless relative subjects in
the first position (P1) of English focus constructions is “subject to LIPOC, the language-independent preferred order of constituents, which *ceteris paribus* places embedded clauses as far right as possible.” Using data from Old English to determine the preferred position of clausal elements, Connolly (ibid) asserts that they tend to be placed towards the end of the sentence in accordance with LIPOC. Another scholar who has tested the principle is Siewierska. She studied constituent orderings in an array of languages from different areal and genetic families. She reports: “Our investigation of word order preferences incorporated in LIPOC has shown that though word order patterns in conflict with the schema can be found, on the whole, languages do display an evident tendency to linearize constituents according to increasing categorial complexity” (Siewierska 1991: 212-213). She has claimed that there is ample evidence for LIPOC, citing a few cases in point:11

6  a the tendency for clitics to occur in second position in the utterance, known as Wackernagel’s law;
   b the earlier placement of pronominal as compared to nominal subjects or objects in languages such as Bimoba, Cairene Arabic, German, Grebo, Ila, Karen, Twi or Uzbek;
   c the preference for final placement of sentential NPs observed in, for example, Blackfoot, Tuscarora, Kinyarwanda, Malagasy, Sherpa (see (Dryer 1980 for comprehensive discussion of the phenomenon);
   d The phenomenon of heavy NP shift and extraposition from NP (see e.g. Mallinson and Blake 1983: 324)

Hawkins (1994) has also acknowledged the relevance of LIPOC although he claims that it is a principle that supports his general weight principle of performance. Although LIPOC is said to be a universal tendency, there has been no empirical evidence to show that this applies to the ordering of constituents in Silozi and possibly many other Bantu languages. A further limitation of LIPOC and of FG in general is that it is based on isolated sentences (Siewierska 1991). This is contrary to its claim that it seeks to describe linguistic expressions in terms of the conditions under which, and the purposes for which, it is put to use. In this study I apply the principles of constituent ordering to data from spoken and written discourse-language in actual use.

---

11 Examples to illustrate these cases from some languages are provided by Siewierska (1991).
2.3. LIPOC and the Theory of End-Weight/End Weight Principle

LIPOC is a formulation of the theory of end weight, which is based on the insight that weight or length is relevant for the ordering of elements. Various concepts such as "heaviness", "syntactic weight", "short before long", "heaviness to the right" have been applied in the literature to refer basically to this phenomenon. The factor of "complexity" or "weight" may be traced to Behagel's "Gesetz der wachsenden Glieder" (law of increasing parts). The major claim he makes is that "von zwei Gliedern, soweit möglich, das kürzere vorausgeht, das längere nachsteht", i.e. of two elements, as far as possible, the shorter precedes and the longer follows.\(^5\) Although these principles were formulated for German, Behagel pointed out that they apply to other languages also. They suggest that simpler, lighter and shorter elements precede complex, heavier and longer ones. These principles are thus principles of increasing weight in the ordering of constituents. Generally speaking, they are appropriate for those structures where there is a preference for short-before-long constituent orders. In other words, elements that are morphologically and syntactically simpler tend to be placed before heavier ones.

2.3.1. Weight principles in linguistic studies.

Since Behagel, some studies have been carried out to investigate the efficacy of weight principles in the ordering of constituents. In this section I discuss some previous studies and proposals regarding weight principles. I also wish to advance reasons for studying them in this thesis. Throughout this study, I assume that weight principles, which constitute the theory of end weight, subsume LIPOC. Weight principles have been proposed, among other factors such as discourse-pragmatics, as determinants of constituent order. It has recently been suggested that, in fact, they are the dominant factor underlying linearisation of elements (Dik 1993, Siewierska 1993, Hawkins 1994). More recently, Hawkins (1997) has claimed that LIPOC is subsumed in his EIC principle that is founded on ease of processing (see below).

In particular, some linguists have carried out some research not only to categorise NP types but to investigate their distribution in English clause and sentence structure. Using data from a corpus which forms part of the files of English Usage at the University College, London, Aarts (1971) reports that there is overwhelming

\(^{12}\) The German words and translations are due to Andersen (1983) and Hawkins (1994).
evidence to justify the conclusion that noun phrase types are not randomly distributed over the English clause. He claims that there is a marked association between their structural make up and their functional role. Further, he claims that lighter and shorter noun phrases tend to occur in the subject position while heavier and longer ones tend to occur in the object and complement positions. In a similar study based on the same data from the survey of English usage Quirk et al (1972: 933) report an investigation of a sample of some 17,000 noun phrases in the survey of English usage. The investigation yielded striking results one of which revealed that ‘the majority of simple noun phrases and the overwhelming majority of names and pronouns are subjects of clauses or sentences, but only rather less than a quarter of complex noun phrases are subjects”. They further state that in fact it is a dominant tendency of syntactic structure that the greatest amount of subordination or embedding is reached in the final part of the sentence.

Kuno (1974) has done a study which is directed at explaining a number of typological facts. One of these, which is of relevance to Silozi, is that SVO languages have extraposition rules that move sentential subjects to the end of sentences. The effect of this rule is that sentential subjects will have a greater tendency to occur in clause final position rather than clause-initial position. He further observes that his arguments predict that sentential NPs with initial complementizers in SOV languages should also display a tendency to occur in clause-final position rather than clause initial or clause internal position. It should be noted that Kuno’s explanations are in terms of movement rules. I would like to submit that it can be extrapolated to talk in terms of positional tendencies.

Grosu and Thompson (1977) discuss the nature of constraints on internal sentential NPs. They also survey the empirical inadequacies of earlier proposals regarding the position of sentential NPs. Their work is based on the tendencies of NPs with initial subordinator (complementizer). Although their work is mainly based on English, they cite examples of sentences from other languages, containing clause internal sentential NPs without initial subordinators. Their facts are summarised in a principle that states that a clause containing a sentential NP (A) is marked if A is clause-initial but even more marked if A is clause-internal. This principle implies that a clause containing a sentential NP is unmarked if the sentential NP occurs in clause-final position. Their proposals are made in terms of “established facts of language processing”.

Dryer (1980) has demonstrated this tendency in his study of the location of sentential subjects and objects in universal grammar. His study seeks to provide support for the **Sentential Noun Phrase Position Hierarchy** and the three hypotheses it comprises, namely: **Final-Over-Internal-Position Hypothesis, Initial-Over-Internal Position Hierarchy, Final – Over-Initial-Position-Hierarchy**. His conclusion is that they tend to occur clause finally in some languages that have been described as verb final. This is summarised in the following hypothesis called **FINAL - OVER - INITIAL HYPOTHESIS**: 

"Whenever sentential NPs and simple NPs of the same grammatical relation differ in their relative tendencies to occur in clause-final position as opposed to clause-internal position, the difference will be that sentential NPs will exhibit a greater tendency than simple NPs to occur in clause - final position rather than clause - initial position".

It is important to note that Dryer’s explanations are in terms of syntactic processing. Nevertheless, they represent linearisation tendencies. He has done more quantitative work on word order universals using presumably the largest sample compared to the others in this area. Another work that supports the theory of end weight is Kashina’s (1988). The work is based on the distribution of NPs and is based on a corpus of thirty essays written (in English) by first year University of Zambia students. The study concludes that there is a correlation between subject exponents and structural “lightness” on the one hand and a very strong tendency for non-subject exponents to be realised by structurally “heavy” noun phrase types on the other hand.

Another scholar who has argued for the significance of weight principles in the ordering of constituents is Hawkins (1980, 1983,1990, 1991). To endorse the heuristic power of the principles, Hawkins (1994: 111) asserts: “I believe that the major determinant of word order and indeed of all word order, is syntactic weight, while information notions play only a subsidiary role.” He (1983) has extensively studied the ordering of constituents in the phrasal category. Extending Greenberg’s (1963) raw data, Hawkins investigated the order of Dem, Num Gen and Rel with respect to the head noun. His data are based on a division into “postpositional” and “prepositional” languages. Starting with the theoretical assumption that all determiners and modifiers might be expected to occur on either side of the head, Hawkins found two deviations from this theoretically expected pattern. The deviations are captured in the Principle of Cross-Category Harmony (PCCH).
principle states that languages display a quantified preference to generalize the order obtaining in one head/dependent category to other categories. Two explananda are proposed:

**Head ordering:** The statistical tendency for languages to have a consistent positioning of heads relative to the non-heads across the phrasal categories in the competence grammar.

**Left-right asymmetries:** Short constituents such as pronouns tend to appear to the left of heavy constituents such as relative clauses in competence grammars as well as in performance.

This work has been further built upon (Hawkins 1990, 1992, 1994, 1998) and has been variably called parsing theory and performance theory. He argues that weight is a far more fundamental determinant of order than is currently appreciated. As in the previous work, the subsequent work examines the choice of word orders in performance both within so-called fixed word order constructions and in free word order constructions. It also examines the distribution of basic word orders in “free order” constructions. The central idea behind the parsing theory of word order and the performance theory is that performance can actually explain the rules (and grammar) of word order universals. This means that orderings that are easiest to parse are the ones that have generally been grammaticalised, and rearrangements from these are constrained in a way that will optimize efficiency for that subset of inputs whose basic orders are not already optimal. He argues that in both types of word order languages, grammars fix constituent orders and permitted rearrangements in accordance with the same principles. His EIC principle builds on the insight that syntactic weight or length is relevant for the ordering of elements. Clearly, Hawkins’ principles are essentially principles of weight, which are explained in terms of performance and processing. He conceives of his proposed principles as follows:
"Performance principles are principles that explain how language is used in real time. Foremost among them are the principles of language processing as developed within the field of psycholinguistics and comprising the subtheories of comprehension and production. Also relevant are the semantic and pragmatic theories developed by linguists involving communicative efficiency, viewed as a relationship between the linguistic form of an utterance, its meaning and the discourse context" (Hawkins & Siewierska 1991: ii).

Primus (1991, 1993) has challenged the common opinion that pragmatics is the primary determinant of word order variation (see for instance Gundel 1988, Givon 1988). By examining ‘topic positions’ and ‘focus positions’ in Rumanian, Finnish and English among other languages, she concludes that “Rather, the preferred position of sentence topics and that of focused constituents is dependent upon their average weight and thus, straightforwardly explained by performance principles based on syntactic principles based on syntactic weight (most explicitly formulated in Hawkins 1990)”. Although Primus emphasises the performance principles formulated by Hawkins, it is clear that what she is referring to are weight principles. Perhaps the greatest empirical contribution to the study of weight principles is expressed in EUROTYP Working Papers 2: Performance Principles of Word Order (Hawkins and Siewierska 1991). This publication presents work that has been done by various scholars on the relevance of performance principles of word order, on the one hand and pragmatic information status on the other, in determining the relative positioning of constituents. Quantitative data were used from genetically different languages to test the efficacy of Hawkins’ EIC. The papers of this volume provide relevant contributions to the following three questions: first, to what extent do grammars respond to performance principles? Second, what are the performance principles exactly? and third, how do they interact? Although there is no consensus to the interpretation of the role of performance principles as determinants of order, the majority of the authors almost invariably produce evidence to show that syntactic weight or length are more relevant than pragmatic information status principles (see also Givon 1983, 1988, Firbas 1966). They also acknowledge the fact that considerations of syntactic weight and of pragmatic information status are not necessarily at odds with each other. Finally, Greenbaum (1996) argues that the extraposed postmodifier is a postmodifier in a noun phrase that is postposed to a later position in the sentence in accordance with the principle of end weight.
2.3.1.1. Critique

An examination of work in this research field shows that there are some interesting inadequacies which are of relevance for our purposes. The first is that the work is biased towards data from Indo-European languages, making it grossly Euro-centric. This is corroborated by Hawkins (1994: 117) as follows: “I believe that discussions of weight hitherto have been too Euro-centric in the languages and structures that have been examined and in the inferences that have been drawn in its effects”. Further, the studies have a parametric bias. From the evidence available, studies on these principles are predominantly focused on phrasal categories. They are confined to syntactic categories of extreme length in low level grammatical units such as phrases. This has been done principally with regard to pre-head modification and post-head modification in the phrase. One is compelled to argue that the effect of weight principles have been biased to word order rather than constituent order (c.f. the distinction I make below). Some notable examples include Ross’s (1967) Complex NP Constraint; Hawkins’ (1983) Heaviness Hierarchy (HH) and Heaviness Serialization Principle (HSP); and Keenan and Comrie’s (1977) NP Accessibility Hierarchy. The other studies are also restricted to the distribution of NP types.

In summary, I believe that the previous studies seem to be inadequate in some respects since they fail to capture the fact that the tendencies may apply to other constituents of the clause or sentence types such as dislocations. Given the above information, there are good reasons for investigating weight principles in this study. First, the study adds an impetus to this line of research by considering all the constituents (in all their ramifications) that may make up the structure of the clause or sentence. It also does so by considering data from a non-Indo-European language. For these two reasons, I believe this study may provide some information in addressing the relative inadequacies cited above. Judging from what has been covered in these studies, LIPOC seems to be a more appropriate principle to investigate than weight principles. This is because it concerns the influence on linearization of matters of length and matters of syntactic complexity in a more general and broader sense than the other principles or generalizations. It is not restricted to any constituent type.

In the description of the constituents I assume, along with other scholars, that syntactic weight is related to the all the other explanations which emanate from other
principles of grammar and pragmatics (see Arnold et al 2000). This ends the discussion of theoretical matters. I will now turn to explicating terminological issues.

2.4. Heaviness

Having discussed the notions of LIPOC and weight principles, I would now like to address the related notion of ‘heaviness’ or ‘weight’. The crucial question is: what makes a constituent heavy, long or complex? Similarly, what would make one constituent lighter than the other? There seems to be virtual unanimity in the studies that have addressed the phenomenon of end weight that relative “length” is a determinant of complexity and heaviness. This is evident in Behagel’s (ibid) original formulation of the principle of increasing weight. It is also evident in Dik’s (ibid) LIPOC, which as it should be clear now, is a preference for constituents to be ordered in terms of categorial complexity. Allan’s (1987) formal and complexity hierarchy makes reference to a “short and long” distinction. Further evidence for internal complexity comes from Mallinson and Blake (1981: 151 who refer to heavy material as “internally complex material” and justify this by stating that

“a noun phrase that consists of two co-ordinated noun phrases (the boy
and the girl) is heavier than a simple noun phrase (the children). A noun
phrase with a phrasal complement (the girl on the magazine cover) or a
clausal complement (the girl who was featured in the centerfold of the
Financial Review) is heavier than a simple noun phrase (the girl).

A more eloquent and intuitive formulation is probably Hawkins (1983: 91) who proposes what he calls the Heaviness Heirarchy:

7. **HEAVINESS HIERARCHY (HH)**

\[
\text{Rel} \geq \text{Gen} \geq \text{Adj} \geq \{\text{Dem}\}
\]

\[
\{\text{Num}\}
\]

where “ $\geq$ ” means “greater than, or equal to in heaviness”. Further, relative heaviness is a composite notion defined in terms of (at least) the following four factors: Length and quantity of morphemes, quantity of words, syntactic depth of branching trees and inclusion of dominated nodes. In all these studies, the notion of “short before long” is invoked.
The answer to the question above then is that length and internal complexity determine the “heaviness” of an item. For one constituent to be “heavier” than another, one or more of the factors listed above must be capable of imposing an ordering between them (Hawkins ibid: 90). Note, however, that Hawkins’ proposals are primarily focused on NP modification. I believe that they can be transposed and neatly applied to clauses and sentences. For the purposes of this study, complexity or heaviness is used to refer to the internal structure or “size” of a constituent or category. This description is based on Dik’s categorial complexity hypothesis as expounded in LIPOC (see especially 5 (i) above). In other words, a pronominal category or clitic is lighter than a word which is, in turn lighter than a phrase. The clause is the most complex category. The ethos of this hypothesis is that the internal structure of a constituent determines the position it occupies in a larger unit in which it occurs.

2.5. Constituent order and word order

The concept of order is central in the discussion of any language’s structure. It has been found to be the most important among the various means of syntax or processes. Lehmann (1978: 10) has noted this: “The device known as arrangement or order is the most important process of language. ... Arrangement owes its significance to the linear structure of language. Its linearity requires that entities must be arranged in order.” Unfortunately, in the current and recent research literature this term is collocated with the terms “constituent” and “word”. The collocations have been used interchangeably. This use has been extended to the collocations basic word order and basic constituent order. For the sake of precision, I will use the term constituent order to refer to the ordering of all the constituents or elements of a clause or sentence. In this case constituent is used as a general term to cover clauses, phrases, words and morphemes which may form functional parts of a larger structural whole. On the other hand, basic order will be used to refer specifically to the order of the order of the three major constituents in a transitive clause: subject, object and verb. In many discussions the term basic word order has been used to refer to the pioneering work of Greenberg (1963, 1966). Comrie (1981: 80) presents supporting views for the use of the term ‘constituent’ rather than ‘word’ in such collocations by arguing that it is more correct to speak of constituent order typology with reference to Greenberg’s term ‘the order of meaningful elements’.
2.5.1. Some Observations

There are some limitations of “word” order studies that have crucial implications for a language like Silozi. In the context of Bantu linguistics, the studies are biased towards a few languages that are frequently featured in linguistic studies such as Swahili, Lingala, Kinyarwanda, Shona and Zulu. Second, the work is biased towards a few selected principles and parameters since Greenberg (1963, 1966). Two parameters, in particular, have dominated discussions in linearization phenomena. The first is the placement of the grammatical relations (S and O) relative to the verb (see for example, Steele 1978, Dik 1978, 1989, Hawkins 1983, Tomlin 1986, Myhill 1992). The other is the parametric bias mentioned with respect to weight principles mentioned above. That is, the studies are mainly focused on the order of constituents in the NP. This has eclipsed the role of other principles and parameters that may be equally crucial in the ordering of constituents. Although Myhill (ibid) has recently done work which focuses on these parameters, he has some criticism against the trend which I find attractive. He argues that there have been no quantitative studies at all of the word order position of constituents other than subjects, verbs, and objects, and it is necessary that we understand the principle governing the placement of, for example prepositional phrases and adverbs in order to be able to develop a general theory of word order.

It is clear from the foregoing that there has been more work on some phenomena (parameters) and languages than others. Although Siewierska (1991, 1993) and Hawkins (1994, 1998) claim that that the interaction of weight principles and constituent ordering is well documented, the bias is still in existence. For these reasons, I feel discussions of factors and principles that affect constituent ordering should be viewed from a different perspective, which involves other languages and parameters. Silozi is one language that has not contributed to studies of typology. Indeed, Bantu languages in general have been little studied by typologists.

2.6. Factors that determine CO

In this section, I discuss a set of terms that are associated with the factors that affect constituent order. Let me first set the background to CO. It has been claimed in the literature that the ordering of constituents is determined by an array of factors. Connolly (1991) classifies them into stylistic and non-stylistic factors. According to him non-stylistic factors can be further subdivided into purely syntactic, primarily
syntactic and primarily semantic. Stylistic factors, on the other hand can be subdivided into organisational and aesthetic factors. Organisational factors, which are more relevant to our study than aesthetic ones, include: **Topic comment structure, Distribution of information, Emphasis, Empathy, Composition of constituents, Cohesiveness and connectivity.** Allan (1987) has classified the factors in terms of linearization hierarchies (see also Siewierska 1988). These hierarchies are divided into three groups. The first group consists of what are referred to as formal hierarchies. These deal with matters of length and internal syntactic complexity which we have examined in 2.2 and 2.3. The second group consists of dominance hierarchies which deal with factors connected with perceptions of natural salience as reflected in the way humans experience the world. In the third group are familiarity hierarchies, which deal with the speaker’s interests as manifested in discourse via parameters such as topicality, givenness, definiteness.

In a more recent publication, Siewierska (1993: 826) asserts that broadly speaking word order is seen to be dependent on the following range of factors:

7. a grouping relations (e.g. dependence and/ or constituency relations),
   b grammatical relations (e.g. subject, object, indirect object, etc),
   c thematic roles (e.g. topic, focus, theme, etc),
   d semantic features (e.g. agent, patient, recipient, etc),
   e syntactic feature (e.g. categorial status, internal categorial structure, tense, aspect, modality, mood, finiteness, etc.),
   f semantic features (e.g. animacy, humanness, definiteness, referentiality, etc),
   g pragmatic factors (e.g. perceptions of salience or dominance, familiarity, iconicity, relative identifiability, etc).

Generally speaking, three factors have been recognised in the literature: syntactic, pragmatic and cognitive (Mithun 1992). However, the factors can be divided into syntactic (formal) and discourse-pragmatic factors (Payne 1992, Hawkins 1990, 1991, 1994). Payne et al (1992) argued that any language is sensitive to one type of principle or the other, or may display a more balanced mixture of the two. On the basis of this hypothesis, the languages of the world have been divided into two, viz, languages whose word order is determined by syntactic factors and those in which it is determined by pragmatic factors. This division corresponds to the distinction between rigid/ fixed word order languages and those with free/ flexible word order.
In essence, factors affecting word order and linearization phenomena are fundamentally interconnected with syntactic, cognitive/processing, functional, discourse-pragmatic aspects. It is possibly along these lines that van Dijk (1977:233) has identified four principles for presenting facts or events in a certain discourse order. These are: natural ordering, cognitive ordering, thematic ordering and pragmatic ordering.

From the information given in this short survey, the factors that affect constituent order may be divided into three: discourse pragmatic, cognitive and syntactic. Since the purpose of this study is to investigate the role of the theory of end eight (weight principles) and LIPOC, attention will mainly be focused on syntactic (formal) aspects and the principles underlying them. Although the other factors are crucial to the ordering of constituents, the surface structures that result from such orderings are determined by the grammatical rules of the language. Grammar and syntax (structure) are crucial to the ordering of constituents. We assume, therefore, in this study that it is the grammar and syntax that code discourse pragmatic functions. This discussion is therefore confined to the investigation of syntactic factors, which are the concern of the formal hierarchies. The schema below presents what they entail (where, other things being equal, items to the left of > are understood as showing a preference to precede those on the right of >).

8. The Formal Hierarchies\(^{13}\):

Structurally simpler > structurally complex
Short > long.

2.7. Markedness/Unmarkedness

“Markedness” has been used in several different (though not totally unrelated ways) senses (Gundel et al 1988, Anderson 1989, Tomic 1989, Croft 1990). This concept and its converse “unmarkedness” are of paramount importance to our discussion since most of the structures to be dealt with are context sensitive. In this section I would like to make explicit how the concept markedness will be used with respect to Silozi constituent ordering. The statements I make will be justified and further developed in chapters 5, 6 and 7. We are concerned here with syntactic and pragmatic markedness (Givon 1979, Andersen 1983). The major assumption we

\(^{13}\) The term structure is used here to refer to the internal composition of a constituent.
make is that the pragmatically unmarked constituent order for sentences with full lexical arguments is Subject - Verb - Object. Pronominal arguments obey rather different syntactic constraints (Lambrecht 1994: 15).

We are using the terms to refer to the arrangement of constituents in the clause. Givon (1995: 28) has proposed three main criteria which can be used to distinguish the marked from the unmarked category in a binary grammatical contrast: **structural complexity, frequency distribution** and **cognitive complexity**. I assume that these provide a useful summary of the characteristics and types of marking proposed in the literature. Firm data on the cognitive complexity of morphemes and syntactic constructions in context are not usually available so that other more substantive considerations must be taken into account (Givon: ibid). Dryer (1995) has also observed that it is less clear how we can talk about the cognitive complexity of a given construction. Marked and unmarked orders can be characterised statistically or non-statistically (Givon's frequency distribution above). Our conception of "marking" in this study is not determined by statistical considerations. The structures are characterised using formal considerations. The preference of non-statistical to statistical consideration is based on the intuition that the unmarked order is not necessarily the most frequent. According to the non-statistical view, an unmarked sequence is a default ordering, which is used unless there is some particular reason (such as emphasis) to depart from it, in which case the marked sequence is used instead (Connolly 1991). Dryer (ibid: 19) argues that the unmarked order is not necessarily the most frequent one. Rather, it is the default; "elsewhere" order used in situations which fail to satisfy the concisely characterisable conditions for the use of alternative (marked) word orders. Lambrecht (1994: 17) proposes the following general rule for the pragmatic markedness status of grammatical structure: given a pair of allo-sentences, one member is pragmatically unmarked if it serves two discourse functions while the other member serves only one of them. While the function of the marked order is positively specified for some pragmatic feature, the unmarked member is neutral with respect to this feature.

Since our focus is on the ordering of constituents in the clause, we are concerned with marked and unmarked clauses. Unmarked clauses are considered to be basic, neutral and declarative clauses. Keenan (1976:309) has proposed some characteristic properties for identifying basic sentences. His conclusion is that "the basic sentences are roughly the "simplest" sentences syntactically". The basic order is by default prototypically neutral, declarative and unmarked. Since Greenberg (ibid) the basic
clause structure is taken to be the one in which the subject is followed by the verb which is in turn followed by the object (i.e. SVO) in subject first languages like English and Bantu which we are concerned with. There is abundant evidence in the research literature to support this view. Gundel et al (1988: 294) have argued that clause orderings where the subject precedes the verb or other predicate constituent are unmarked relative to orderings where the predicate precedes the subject, since all languages which have predicate before subject (for example, German and Tagalog) also have subject before predicate, while there are some languages (for example Japanese) which have clauses with subject before predicate but none with predicate before subject. These views are echoed by Givon (1995: 32) who refers to markedness as a context dependent phenomenon par excellence and points out that the main, declarative, affirmative clause has been tacitly assumed, in grammatical description ever since the Greeks, to be the privileged, unmarked type. Siewierska (1996: 374) has also noted that “since the vast majority of the world’s languages display basic orders in which the subject precedes the object, such ordering is seen to be typologically unmarked, while the converse object –before –subject order is labelled as marked”. It is important to be mindful of the fact that because of its high dependence on the context, the very same structure may be marked in one context and unmarked in another (Givon ibid). This deviation is possible in natural occurring discourse. Such instances illustrate certain contexts in which there are no extremely syntactic tendencies favouring a particular order of clausal elements (SVO) but rather that the choice of one or the other is determined by discourse factors. As Myhill (1992) points out probably every language has some word order variation based upon discourse factors.

To sum up, we use the concept of markedness to refer to “marked” and “unmarked” construction types. Our use of the term includes structural and distributional considerations. In this case a construction type is more marked to the extent that it is less expectable, and therefore commands more attention when it occurs. In general, the less frequent, the more rare a linguistic item is, the higher its markedness value. Following Dik (1997:43) it is not only the existence of alternatives but also the frequency with which these are chosen that are essential for determining the markedness value, and hence the degree of “expressiveness” of these alternatives

---

14 The bias towards frequency distribution, where typically the marked category is less frequent while the unmarked is more frequent has been succinctly demonstrated by Greenberg (1976) over a wide range of phonological, semantic and grammatical categories.
2.7.1. Markedness and the Silozi clause

Based on the position of the subject and the object relative to the verb as proposed in Greenbergian typological studies (1963), there should not be a problem determining the basic order in Silozi. Consequently, there should also be no problem in making a distinction between marked and unmarked constructions. This is because its basic clause structure inherently exhibits characteristics of what is considered to be the typical unmarked order. The subject precedes the verb and object follows it. Based on the assumption we make above and without taking into account statistical frequency Silozi may be described as having the basic word order SVO\(^{15}\).

Given the above information, I propose that the unmarked usual constructions in Silozi display the SVX structure. The marked structure should take the form XSV structure (where X may be any other constituent, i.e. O,C,A). Put simply, in the unmarked clause structure the initial functional position is the subject. In the marked construction, the initial element is not a subject and this is typically an adverbial or a fronted NP. We will also use the term “marked” to refer to the other types of constructions that are marked for focus, voice and polarity. These are covered in part two of the study.

2.8. Grammatical relations

In section 2.7. above, we noted that pronominal arguments obey rather different syntactic constraints. In this section I want to discuss the coding of the grammatical relations in Silozi. The clause has been described in terms of the predicating element (verb) and its terms or arguments, i.e., subject and object. As such the clause is the domain of the verb and of the nouns that are associated with it (Longacre 1996). Van Valin and LaPolla (1997) have observed that these notions also seem important for many non-Indo-European languages, because subjects and indirect objects appear to be elements in their grammar. Descriptive linguists have long observed that individual languages structure their clauses in characteristic ways. The order in which the verb and related nouns occur in clauses varies considerably from language to language, and even within the same language. This is true in Silozi and many other languages (especially Bantu languages). Word order variation, which is motivated by discourse-pragmatic factors, involves the rearrangement of the positions of the

\(^{15}\) Siewierska (1988: 8-14) argues that the “basic” order as defined by Greenberg need not be the “dominant” one in terms of text frequency.
arguments associated with the verb within the simple (main) clause. It also involves a change in their syntactic status. With respect to the word order typology proposed by Payne (1985), Mithun (1992), inter alia, Silozi belongs to two language types. In purely syntactic contexts, it belongs to languages which order their main-clause elements in terms of subject verb and object. In these contexts these categories are easily identifiable. However, in discourse contexts, the two elements do not occur as subject and object as described in standard definitions of the terms. They are not full or lexical categories. This phenomenon has been observed by Siewierska (1988:10): “Transitive clauses with full nominal participants are also uncommon in numerous other languages in which the subject and object are either optionally or obligatorily represented in the verb or by clitics elsewhere in the clause”. This means that we may need different terms to refer to these two apparently different argument types.

The methodology used in this study builds upon the view that a full description of constituent ordering should take into consideration the influence of both syntactic and discourse-pragmatic factors. The study also subscribes to the view that the description of syntax cannot be carried out without paying serious attention to morphology. In recognition of the interaction of the various factors that effect constituent ordering, two types of surface structures need to be accounted for. For convenience, I will divide the clause construction types that occur in the data into two main types. The first type consists of clauses which may be considered to be motivated by purely syntactic factors. These are basically transitive and intransitive clauses which have full independent nominal arguments in the subject and object positions as in 9.

9 a. Mitangana ba-posaka mang’omo.
   Youngmen(S) SM+PAST-throw stones(O)
   The young men threw stones.
b. Kamuyongole na-lata Katekwe.
   Kamuyongole (S) SM+PAST-love Katekwe (O).
   Kamuyongole loved Katekwe.

The nominal arguments may also be realised as full, emphatic pronouns. Consider the example:
In such constructions, the arguments associated with the verb will be referred to using the standard functional terms, namely subject and object. In Southern African Bantu linguistics, they are termed “substantival subject” and “substantival object” (Cole 1975).

On the other hand, the other type of clauses are those which are motivated by discourse-pragmatic factors. They are constrained by properties of the surrounding discourse. Consequently, the nominal arguments in these clause types mark co-reference across clauses. The terminology used in the identification of such arguments has been the locus of much debate in the literature (Mchombo 1993, Croft 1996). This is primarily because of the terminology that has been used to refer to them in the different studies that have been devoted to these categories. The crux of the matter is whether the arguments that occur in such constructions should be referred to as subject and object. It has been also been debated as to whether they should be treated as full nominal elements.

The studies that have focused attention on these categories fall into three categories. The first consists of what may be termed the pioneering studies of Silozi and other Southern African Bantu languages. In these studies classical terminology associated with Indo-European languages has been used in the description and representation of these categories and indeed other linguistic phenomena (e.g. Jalla, Gorman in the literature review). In such studies the elements are treated as pronouns.16 The second category of studies is by the proponents of the Doke model (c.f. Gluckman Gowlett, Mwisiya above) who denounce the terminology used by their predecessors. In these studies they are referred to as affixes, formatives or concords. Precisely, they are called subject concord (SC) and object concord (OC). For example, in his description of Tswana, a language which is genetically related to Silozi, Cole (1975: xxxi) argues:

16 Kashoki and Mann (1978) use the term "pronoun" to refer to them as subject and object pronouns.
“Except in the case of certain copulative forms, the predicative contains a subjectival concord agreeing in person, number and class with its subject, whether this is expressed or not. Tswana has also objectival concords, which have been termed ‘pronouns’. The substantival object, be it a noun or pronoun, follows the verb in both Tswana and English. But when the objectival concord is used in Tswana, it is placed before the verb stem, thus *Monna wadibona* (The man sees them). The element ‘di’ therefore does not behave like a pronoun. Though it may convey something of the significance of the English pronoun ‘them’, it is definitely not equivalent in function. It is not a separate word form, a pronoun, but a formative element, an integral part of the verb.”

As observed in chapter 1, the terminology used in the representation of these elements in the studies hitherto is based on orthographic and structural considerations. Their linguistic validity remains empirically suspect.

Another category of studies derives its terminology from more recent theoretical and descriptive traditions which are characterised by a rejection of the syntactocentric approach. They consider the structural and functional characteristics of these elements. They also recognise functional overlap of the various facets of grammar. Unfortunately, none of these studies cites data from Silozi. Among these studies is the work of Wald (1979: 504-505) who observes that a proper analysis of the Bantu object marker should take into consideration both the syntactic and discourse constraints that affect its availability. His view is that for many syntactic features of any language, the syntactic availability of the OM serves discourse requirements (see also Allan 1983). Bresnan and Mchombo (1987) have proposed that there is a distinction between grammatical agreement and anaphoric agreement. They assert:
In grammatical agreement a NP bears an argument relation to the verb, while the verbal affix expresses redundantly the person, number, and gender class of the NP. In anaphoric agreement, the verbal affix is an incorporated pronominal argument of the verb, and the coreferential NP has a non-argument function—either as an adjunct of the pronominal argument or as a topic or focus of the clause or discourse structure” (Bresnan & Mchombo 1987: 741).17

In the context of Bresnan and Mchombo’s theory of argument and discourse functions, there seem to be fundamental differences between syntactic structures organised by grammatical agreement on the one hand, and those organised by coreferential agreement with discourse functions on the other. Van Valin & LaPolla (1997) have observed this trait and point out that it is a characteristic of the so-called “pro-drop languages”. In such languages the independent NP counts as the core marker if present, but if it is absent, the bound marker on the verb functions as the argument. They further assert that the noun class system uses affixes for discourse reference in Bantu languages. The approach taken in the third category of studies differs from the approach taken by the other two categories of studies. I find the third category of studies more useful in the analysis and description of my data. It is important to note that there is an implicit agreement in the studies that the pronominal elements change their syntactic status, positions and functions.

In our view, they are incorporated pronouns or pronominals and will be referred to as subject marker (SM) and object marker (OM) in this study. They perform both discourse pronominal and grammatical functions regardless of which writing system is used in their presentation. We illustrate their occurrence in the following example:

10 Sakunopa *u*-sa-pila kono *ki* sihole sa noka.
Sakunopa SM-still-alive but SM+PRES-be cripple of hip
Sakunopa is still alive but he is crippled in the hip.

The SM coded by ‘*u*’ in the first clause is an agreement marker. On the other hand, the SM coded by ‘*ki*’ in the second part of the clause marks both grammatical agreement and discourse functions. In this case it is in a cataphoric reference with the

17 The explanations proposed by Bresnan and Mchombo are made within Lexical Functional Grammar. These predictions are made by their theory of the properties of subject and topic functions.
NP Sakunopa. What emerges from these examples is that the elements do not only mark grammatical agreement but perform pronominal functions as well. This leads to the prevalence of the morpho-syntactic structures which we refer to as single word clauses (SWCs) throughout this study (see 5.2.1)

With respect to the incorporated pronominal which marks the OM consider the following text extract. Note that L refers to the line number in the text.

11. L1 Bo-Ndate Mboma ba-buluke-zi mulamu mwana bona
   HON-Father [of] SM+PAST-keep-PERF stick son his
   Mboma’s father has kept his son a stick. “Has kept a stick for his son”.
   L2 Ba-ta-mu-fa ona ha-ta-kuta.
   SM-FUT-OM-give it when-FUT-return
   He will give it him when he returns.

In L2 SM ‘ba’ is in coreferential relationship with the NP ‘Bo-Ndate Mboma’ in L1. Similarly, the OM ‘mu’ in L2 refers back to ‘mwana bona’. ‘ona’ in L2 functions as a pronominal element which is related to ‘mulamu’ in L1. What sentences 10 and 11 show about the agreement prefix is that when there is a full NP, the verbal affix is an agreement marker. However, when it is absent the agreement marker functions as the ‘subject’. In other words, the independent noun phrase counts as the core marker, if present, but if it is absent, the bound marker on the verb functions as the argument. Noun prefixes therefore, do not have the sole function of marking agreement or concord. We shall therefore assume that the elements coded as SM and OM are the arguments of the clauses they occur in. Consequently, the structures in which these elements occur will be considered to have the status of clauses (see also Jelinek 1984, Van Valin 1985, Mithun 1986, Gillian 1987, Lambrecht 1994). By contrast, the elements coded as CM refer to the concordial or class markers which signal a head-modifier relationship. These elements are restricted to phrases.

To sum up this section, grammatical relations are coded in two different ways. When the arguments associated with the clause are full nominal elements they will be referred to as subject and object. When they are not they will be referred to as incorporated pronouns which are coded as subject marker (SM) and object marker (OM). These elements are linked to overt NPs with which they agree. There is considerable empirical support for the use of this terminology in the literature. The support comes from studies carried out by scholars of varying theoretical persuasions.
(see e.g. Baker 1988, Demuth and Johnson 1989, Hyman & Duranti 1982, among many others). This concludes our discussion of the theoretical and terminological issues.
Chapter Three

Word Classes

3.1. Introduction

In this chapter, the first in the grammatical sketch, I provide a brief description of Silozi word classes. This will involve looking at how the language’s large inventory of words is grouped into a relatively small group of word classes depending on their semantic, morphological and syntactic properties. The motivation for this is to provide a grammatical ground plan for a little known language like Silozi. Matthews (1974: 8) has aptly argued:

“The analysis of words (under whatever heading we put it) is an important task facing the investigator of most little known languages. It is only in favoured cases, where morphology is simple or is thoroughly explored that a beginner can plunge straight into syntax. How does one plunge into syntax when one cannot identify or categorize the elements whose role and distribution is in question?”

Further an understanding of Silozi morphology is necessary for the analysis of the syntactic structures that we describe in the forthcoming chapters. As we shall demonstrate, Silozi uses a lot of morphology to represent grammatical information in the structure of clauses, sentences and even discourse. Accordingly, the major question with which this chapter is concerned is the forms of the word classes and the grammatical categories with which they are associated. That is, their morphosyntactic categories. The method of presentation is as follows. Since a description of Silozi word forms is presented in this chapter, it is imperative to define the conception of “word” as it is applied in the present study. This is addressed in the rest of section 1. This is followed by a survey of the description of Silozi parts of speech carried out in previous studies in section 2. In section 3, an account of the word classes is provided. Finally, in section 4, a summary of the grammatical categories associated with Silozi word classes is provided together with a morphological classification of the language. This chapter is not an exhaustive account of Silozi morphology. Some issues such as allomorphy, grammatical
function changing morphology, phonology, derivation have not been addressed in
detail. Sometimes, they are just hinted at.

3.1.1. The word

An important concept in morphological studies is the “word”. It is, however, difficult
to state what a word is and how one is to be recognized. This problem is more acute
in Silozi, which has a lot of morphologically complex structures, particularly single
word clauses (SWCs), which we shall repeatedly be making reference to in this
study. For the purposes of this chapter, a word is conceived as a lexical item. In this
sense it is regarded as single item belonging to a lexical category, having an
identifiable meaning or grammatical function and a fairly consistent phonological
and morphological shape, though possibly exhibiting a certain amount of inflectional
variation reflecting its grammatical environment in particular sentences (Trask ibid).
On this basis, such forms as “ca” (eat), “canga” (eats), “cile” (eaten) are all forms of
a single item “ca” (eat). While on this point, there is a possible basis for the notion of
“word” which is strictly morphological in heavily inflectional languages. Anderson
(1985) argues that where formally expressed grammatical categories are associated
with particular word classes they provide a potential approach to the definition of the
word. In Silozi, which is such a language, some words belonging to different word
classes obligatorily include the expression of different categories. As we shall see,
Silozi nouns obligatorily express the categories of class (gender) and number, while
verbs obligatorily indicate tense, mood voice, and the person and number of their
subjects. This definition of word is essential to distinguish “words” from SWCs,
which exhibit word-like characteristics. These transcend lexical boundaries.
Accordingly, for a language like Silozi we need to make a distinction between words
as lexical categories and word-like elements, which have the status of main clauses.
The present chapter focuses on the former while the latter will feature in later
chapters.

3.1.2. Description of Silozi parts of speech

The description of Silozi parts of speech has, to the present day, been based on
Doke's (1935) model of grammatical classification of Southern Bantu parts of speech
(see references in the review of studies). This system recognises six “fundamental
parts of speech” outlined as follows: the substantive, the qualificative, the
predicative, the descriptive, the conjunctive and the interjective. These are further
split up into twelve subdivisions. On the basis of this method, Silozi has twelve parts of speech, which are nouns and pronouns (substantives); adjectives, relatives, enumeratives and possessives (qualificatives); verbs and the copulative (predicatives); adverbs and ideophones (descriptives); conjunctives and interjectives.

This description, though widely used by scholars working with Southern Bantu languages, is not without faults. Some scholars elsewhere have taken issue with some aspects of the system. For example, Gregersen (1967a) asserts that Doke's category of the "Qualificative" which consists of what Doke calls adjectives, relatives, enumeratives, and possessives must be rejected (or at least modified). Although Gregersen does not provide good reasons for his contention, there is no doubt that the system is inconsistent with regard to terminology. As an example, the so called relatives are actually adjectival and noun stems both morphologically and semantically. Some words or stems which are cited as relatives are as follows:

1. -nde  
   -maswe  
   -busula  
   -butuku  
   good  
   bad  
   tastelessness, staleness  
   pain, illness

In fact, qualificatives turn out to be modifiers of the noun in a noun phrase. And when they do so, a concordial or agreement marker (formative) must be attached to them. Further, the term relative is commonly used to include relative clauses in Silozi and other Southern Bantu languages (see for example Cole 1975 for Tswana and Poulos 1990 for Venda). Parts of speech are words. The inclusion of the clause in this category is, therefore, inappropriate. There are other weaknesses with the Doke model. Although this model represents a significant development in Southern Bantu grammatical analysis, I do not utilise it and its terminology much in this

------------------
18 Gregersen (1967) cites a Jordan (1965) who he claims has demonstrated that relatives are actually verbs. The correctness of this claim is, however, questionable because it is very unlikely to have relative constructions which are verbs. The use of the term "prepositional phrase" and the denial of the existence of a preposition as a word class manifest another terminological confusion. This is an apparent anomaly given the standard view that phrases are formed out of the main lexical words, i.e. they are projections of these.

19 Fivaz has a detailed critique of Doke's model, particularly his terminology. However, he is cautious of the fact that the Doke model was developed in the sphere of anthropological linguistics and that Doke himself was not primarily a linguistic theoretician. (see also Chapter One)
description. I have digressed somewhat from some earlier approaches regarding the classification and analysis of certain parts of speech or word classes.

**3.1.3. Criteria for the description of the word classes**

In the present description we use morphological and grammatical criteria as the basis for classifying Silozi word classes. These are complemented by notional criteria in certain cases. The grammatical properties of a word to be considered in the classification include its distribution, the range of its syntactic functions, and the morphological or syntactic categories for which it is specifiable. Word classes are also described on the basis of the distinction made between open and closed classes. In Dixon (1982a: 12) it is remarked “that major parts of speech vary from language to language- all languages appear to have Noun and Verb but some lack a major class Adjective.” Silozi seems to have only two word classes in the open class. These are nouns and verbs. Adjectives, adverbs, prepositions, pronouns, interjections and ideophone are limited and relatively closed classes. This is because their membership is relatively fixed or limited. It is debatable as to whether idiophones belong to the open or closed classes as people tend to be very creative in their use. In addition to this, the present chapter recognises two basic types of words, namely major words or content words and function words (c.f. Sasse 1993, Gleason 1961 and elsewhere in structural linguistics). In terms of its morphosyntactic characteristics, Silozi, like other Bantu languages, has three basic word classes (Gregersen 1967): words with inherent gender or class; words with “derived” or concordial gender (adjectives, and, in some analyses, also verbs); words with neither inherent nor derived gender (Ideophones, interjections, and various invariable items). The former are a group of words, which must carry a concordial marker that is triggered by the grammatical relationship they have with an NP that they enter into. The latter do not.

**3.2. The essence of word classes**

The criteria for analysing word classes presented in the foregoing section have been language specific, that is, based on the structures of Silozi. Specifically, we have shown that the analysis of word in Silozi classes or indeed any other language must take into consideration the formal and distributional properties. In addition to this approach, the present study subscribes to the universal hypothesis that takes into consideration the interaction of syntax, semantics and discourse pragmatics. The explanation of the existence of word classes at a universal level must proceed from
general functional considerations as an answer as to why it should be useful to have such things as word classes (Sasse ibid). Some scholars have proposed an approach which combines prototype theory with the insight that syntactic relations are nothing more but formal manifestations of combined semantic and pragmatic ‘content’ (Croft 1984, Hopper & Thompson 1984, 1985, Foley and Van Valin 1984). Croft (1984), who characterizes a linguistic prototype as a ‘morphosyntactically unmarked, natural correlation’ proposed a chart for prototypical combinations of semantic and discourse –pragmatic features for nouns, adjectives and verbs:

Word classes can be defined on this basis as a preclassification of the lexical items of a language with regard to their most ‘normal’ discourse functions. Category-changing morphology (which we are not concerned with in this chapter) indicates the extent to which a member of a class deviates from the prototype. Precisely, “derivational morphology and special syntactic constructions such as English be + N, A for predication [...] exist in order to signal the markedness of ‘unnatural’ correlations” (Croft 1984: 57). Sasse (1993: 651) has proposed an alternative but complementary hypothesis which takes a sentence as a valid linguistic unit, arguing that pragmatics and semantics manifest themselves in syntax. The three linguistic operations which are of relevance here can be PREDICATION, REFERENCE and ATTRIBUTION (see also Dubois 1980, Givon 1984)

With this information, we can now proceed to the description of Silozi word classes.

3.2.1. The noun and noun classes

Before engaging in a full discussion of Silozi nouns, we consider the system of noun classes. Dixon (1982b: 159) states that “the category of noun classes is (1) a grouping of all the nouns of a language into a smallish number of classes (2) so that there is some overt indication of the class of a noun within any sentence in which it occurs (3) and this indication is not entirely within the noun word.” In Silozi as in Bantu languages, nouns are divided into classes according to their prefixes. The
system of noun classes, which sometimes codes gender, is elaborate. Most of the prefixes function as members of singular-plural pairs to which a particular group of stems is common. Some of the nouns do not have prefixes. Noun classes are a conflation of number and class. There is no unanimity on the number of noun classes in Silozi among the people who have worked with the language. The following facts illustrate this claim. Jalla (1937) claims that Silozi nouns are divided into nine principal classes. Gowlett (1964) asserts that there are eight noun classes in Silozi, with an additional three vestigial ones. Kashoki and Mann claim that all the seven Zambian Bantu official languages (which include Silozi) have 15 noun classes. Yukawa (1987) provides a list of only eight noun classes. O’Sullivan (1993) says there are ten.

There are three main characteristics of Silozi and most Bantu noun class systems noted by Bantuists (see for example Welmers (1970, 1973a). The first is that there is some, but only a partial, correlation between noun classes and semantic features. In relation to this, Givon (1970) claims that the various semantic types of nouns are dispersed all over the noun class system seemingly at random (see also Wald 1987). Secondly, identical prefixes are in some cases assigned to different classes. Thirdly, the membership of the noun classes includes items which are not “real” or prototypical nouns. Classes 16, 17 and 19 which contain locatives “kwa Mongu” (at/ to Mongu), “mwa Zambia” (in Zambia) are some examples of members of this peripheral class. There is also a class which consists of infinitives such as “ku ca” (to eat) and “ku mata” (to run).

The main reason advanced for the inclusion of the two constructions (locatives and infinitives) in the noun class system is that they may function like nouns. For instance, they can function as subjects or objects of sentences. However, De Miguel (1996) argues that the infinitive is not nominal and verbal at the same time. She further states that there are two kinds of infinitive structures (two homophonous affixes) with different categorial status. They have a dual character, which makes them either nominals or verbals. They share grammatical characteristics with nouns but they do not behave absolutely like nouns. The persistent inclusion of these forms in the noun system of any language defies the principles of word class systems (or parts of speech) as defined above. These forms can only assume the characteristics of nouns through nominalisation. Infinitives are non-finite verb forms. Locatives are basically structures which express locational meaning and can be noun phrases or
prepositional phrases. As Corbett (1987: 1991) has argued, there are difficulties with the traditional approach to noun classes and this is true for Silozi.

3.2.1.1. The Silozi noun class system

With the above in mind, I propose a revised system of Silozi noun classes. I find the inclusion of infinitives and locatives in the noun class system inappropriate for the reasons stated. To underscore the grammatical identity of nouns as a word class; I have not included locatives and infinitives in this proposed system. These are considered in sections 3.2.6. and 3.2.2.1. respectively. I present the system below with some modifications to the traditional comparative Bantuist enumeration and that used by previous Silozi grammarians, in particular. The proposed classification is based on a synthesis of all the classification systems presented by previous scholars on Silozi grammar and Gowlett’s proposal (personal communication). In this system the same number (which is represented by the column class) is given to two prefixes, one singular and one plural. In this sense, our use of the term class is used to mean a pair of prefixes that make the singular and plural for a group of words. Table 1 shows the different noun classes in Silozi. There are few nouns in Silozi which do not have any of these prefixes: for instance “kuku” (grandparent), “malume” (uncle). However, these require the same sort of agreements as the other nouns, so they are treated as belonging to a “subsidiary” class 1a. Their plural is formed with a special prefix “bo-”

---

20 An example of infinitives in subject position is provided in section 7.3. (ex.1.f).
21 The noun prefixes of the Silozi noun classes and most Bantu languages and their numbering is according to the system established by Meinhof (1932) et al for the comparative study of Bantu languages. In this system two different numbers are given to the singular and plural. Further the vestigial noun classes are given three different numbers 15, 16, 17 18 (see also Bresnan and Kanerva 1989, Mwisiya 1977).
### Table 1: Silozi noun classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
<th>Example words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>mu-</td>
<td>ba-</td>
<td>mushimani/bashimani (boy/boys)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>la</td>
<td>zero</td>
<td>bo-</td>
<td>bondate/fodate (father/fathers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>mu-</td>
<td>mi-</td>
<td>muluti/miluti (shade/shades)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>li-</td>
<td>ma-</td>
<td>lihalimu/mahalimu (sky/skies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>si-</td>
<td>li-</td>
<td>sikolo likolo (school/schools)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>li-</td>
<td>komu/likomu (cattle/cattle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>lu-</td>
<td>ma-</td>
<td>luswana/maswana (spoon/spoons)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>ka-</td>
<td>tu-</td>
<td>katwa/tutwa (trap/traps)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>bu-</td>
<td>ma-</td>
<td>butuku/matuku (illness/illnesses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>si-</td>
<td>bi-</td>
<td>sishimani/bishimani</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before closing the discussion on noun classes, I want to comment on the designation of classes. The typical conclusion reached by many Bantuists about semantic contents of noun classes is summarised by Denny and Creider (1986: 217) as follows: “While all or most members of certain natural classes of entity may be placed in the same class (familiar examples are the placement of trees in class 3/4 and fruits in 5/6), the classes themselves have no overall intrinsic semantic content (with the frequent exception of class 1/2 for humans)”. Although this conclusion is correct, it is possible to find some sub-regularities in the distribution of nouns. Based on the system proposed above, the semantic membership of Silozi noun classes looks like this:

**Class 1**

**Humans:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>musali</td>
<td>basali (woman-women)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mutu</td>
<td>batu (human being-human beings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mubusisi</td>
<td>babusisi (governor-governors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>musizana</td>
<td>basizana (girl-girls)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Class 1a**

This is a class whose nouns (singular) do not have prefixes which we have referred to above. However, these nouns require the same concords as those in class 1. They are
thus regarded as a subsidiary of class 1. Their plural is formed with a special prefix “bo-”. This element is generally employed as the “polite plural” or “people’s plural”. The following main types of nouns are included here:

Names of people, Nouns expressing kinship, Nouns referring to personified objects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>plural prefix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kamuyongole</td>
<td>bo Kamuyongole (name of person)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nalishebo</td>
<td>bo Nalishebo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ndate</td>
<td>bo ndate (father- my father)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>malume</td>
<td>bo malume (uncle- my uncle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kezeli</td>
<td>bo kezeli (sister- my sister or brother- my brother)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Class 2

Names of parts of the body, plants and deverbal nouns:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mulala</td>
<td>milala (neck- necks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mutahali</td>
<td>mitahali (jaw- jaws)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>muzamaelo</td>
<td>mizamaelo (styles of walking)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>muñolo</td>
<td>miñolo (handwritings)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Class 3

Parts of the body, peculiar people, deverbal nouns and names of plants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lihutu</td>
<td>mahutu (leg-legs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lizoho</td>
<td>mazoho (hand-hands)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lihata</td>
<td>mahata (liar- liars)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lisholi</td>
<td>masholi (thief- thieves)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Class 4

Nouns designating languages, the disabled, certain parts of the body, instruments and places where things are made:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Silozi (Silozi language)</td>
<td>no plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikuwa (English)</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simumu</td>
<td>limumu (dumb person- dumb people)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sihole</td>
<td>lihole (lame person- lame people)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>silupi</td>
<td>lilupi (thigh- thighs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sishengiso</td>
<td>lishengiso (sharpener-sharpeners)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Class 5

Names of animals, certain parts of the body, deverbal nouns:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nja</td>
<td>linja (dog- dogs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ngwe</td>
<td>lingwe (leopard- leopards)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mba</td>
<td>limba(stomach- stomachs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mpo</td>
<td>limpo (gift- gifts)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Class 6

Names of instruments, augmentatives and some names of animals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>luswana</td>
<td>maswana (spoon-spoons)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lufiyelo</td>
<td>mafiyelo (broom-brooms)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lushimani</td>
<td>bishimani (tall, lean boy- tall, lean boys)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lusizana</td>
<td>bisizana (tall, lean girl- tall lean girls)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>luwawa</td>
<td>mawawa (fox-foxes).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The nouns of this class often convey a pejorative, negative or biased attitude.
Class 7

Nouns which designate small or short people and other things:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>katwa</td>
<td>tutwa (trap-traps)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kalilo</td>
<td>tulilo (small fires)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kashimani</td>
<td>tushimani (small boy/s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaana</td>
<td>tuuna (small man-small men)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kakomoki</td>
<td>tukomoki (small cup-small cups)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Class 8

This class is a “mixed-bag” of semi-concrete nouns:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>buhobe</td>
<td>mahobe (thick porridge-thick porridges)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bucwala</td>
<td>macwala (beer-beers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>butuku</td>
<td>matuku (illness-illnesses)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Class 9

Nouns which express the augmentative:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sishimani</td>
<td>bishimani (huge, ugly or awkward boy-big, ugly or awkward boys)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sisali</td>
<td>bisali women (huge, ugly or awkward woman, huge, ugly or awkward women).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I mentioned above that the inclusion of this locatives and infinitives in noun class system is appropriate. These are a group of vestigial elements, which according to Gowllett (in a personal communication) are “not true nouns”. Givon (1969) argues that the treatment of “prepositional agreement genders” as noun classes much like other agreement genders is curious since as genders they have no inherent genders. Krifka (1993) endorses this view in relation to Swahili by asserting that locative classes are special insofar as there are no nouns which belong to them per se. Unlike prototypical nouns, they do not inflect for number. These are locatives, and
infinitives. Examples of these are "ku ina" (to sit); "ku loya" (to bewitch), "mwa munzi" (in the village), "kwa Mungu" (to Mongu). I will therefore adopt the position that these elements are part of the class system but not part of the noun-class as argued by previous scholars. I do recognise the fact that they share distributional and functional characteristics with nouns.

To sum up this section, the noun prefixes under the column “class” in table 1 are those used when the noun is at the head of a phrase. These prefixes play an important role in syntax and discourse. Specifically, they are used to code cross-referencing and agreement. As we show in Part II of this study and elsewhere, they sometimes constitute the core grammatical arguments of SWCs. In Silozi discourse, full NPs are rare and are instead instantiated as cliticized pronouns which are coded as SM and OM for subject marker and object marker respectively. I should also call attention to the existence of the relationship prefixes “ndate-” (male parent of) and “ma/mahe-” (female parent of). Unlike other prefixes in the other classes, these should not be joined to the proper noun about which they are expressing a relationship. They do not inflect for plural but may occur with the respect prefix “bo-” for class 1a.. For illustration consider the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2</th>
<th>word</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(bo) ndate Ngenda</td>
<td>father of Ngenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(bo) ma Mpule</td>
<td>mother of Mpule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(bo) mahe kwibisa</td>
<td>mother of Kwibisa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.1.2. Other characteristics of Silozi nouns

The description of nouns given above mainly provides morphological information. From the data, it is reasonable to conclude that the class system is not systematic in several respects. It is thus not sufficient to enable us to establish the characteristic properties of Silozi nouns. Given this state, there is need to present Silozi nouns in a more consistent and systematic manner. To achieve this, I consider below the subclasses and syntactic properties of nouns.

3.2.1.2.1. Subclasses of nouns

The tag ‘noun’ is cross-linguistically assigned to the class of words which include names of persons, places, and things. However, nouns exhibit different semantic,
morphological and grammatical behaviour. I present below a classification of Silozi nouns that reflects these facts. I begin with semantic classifications. Givon (1984) proposes some general semantic characteristics of nouns such as concreteness, animacy, artifactness, countability, generality and reference. The terms used in the semantic classification of nouns are the ones which are commonly employed in linguistic theory. These are widely known and do not need defining. I will thus concern myself only with the provision of some examples from Silozi data.

a. Common and Proper nouns: nouns can be either common or proper.

proper nouns: Mungu (name of a place), Lusaka (name of a place), Kamuyongole (name of a person), Munukayumbwa (name of person).
common nouns: kota (tree), lihutu (leg), nja (dog), namani (calf), musizana (girl).

b. Count (mass) and non-count nouns: Silozi nouns can be distinguished in terms of countability.

count nouns: sikolo (school), ndu (house) munzi (house), muuna (a man), sisapo (bone), mwanana (child).
non-count nouns: mezi (water), mali (blood), moya (air), lilato (love).

c. Concrete and abstract: common and proper nouns can further be subclassified into concrete and abstract nouns.

concrete nouns: licwe (stone), mukolo (canoe), batu (people), mulaka (kraal), sipatela (hospital).
abstract nouns: lilato (love), mihupulo (thoughts), sifateho (appearance), Silozi, Sikuwa.

d. Animate and inanimate: concrete nouns may be further divided in terms of animacy.

animate nouns: namani (calf), mutu (human being), musali (woman), linja (dogs).
inanimate nouns: kota (tree), simu (farming land), mulamu (stick), mataka (reeds).

3.2.1.2.2. Syntactic characteristics

In the classification that follows syntactic characteristics mean syntactic positions that nouns can occupy in the clause or in the phrase, and their grammatical role in the clause. The typical roles that a noun plays in a clause (which also entail placing the noun in typical syntactic positions) are:

3 a Subject, Object:

Kabisa anata linja
Kabisa(S) hit(V) dog(O)

Kabisa hit the dog.

b Subject, indirect object:

Katekwe afa Kamuyongole mulamu wahae.
Katekwe(S) gave(V) Kamuyongole(IO) walking stick his(DO)
Katekwe gave Kamuyongole his walking stick.

c as the oblique object in the passive construction:

Headteacher Sunduma na-tolokel-wanga ki Bobby Kaluwe
Headteacher Sunduma(S) SM-interprate-APPLIC by Bobby Kaluwe(OBL).

Headteacher Sunduma was being interpreted for by Bobby Kaluwe

“Bobby Kaluwe was interpreting for Headteacher Sunduma.”

d as the headword in the noun phrase:

Basali babande
Women (H) beautiful (M)

“Beautiful women”

3.1.2.3. Morphological characteristics

22 These functions can also be performed by locatives and infinitives which are also capable of inducing some form of concord.

23 In other analyses of Bantu languages, the recipient is treated as the primary object (and can be represented by OM). The gift is secondary object and cannot be represented by an OM.
As observed above, the morphological characteristics of the nouns have been covered somewhat in the discussion of the noun class system. The noun class system cannot be the sole basis for determining the morphological characteristics of a word class. Assignment of nouns to classes involves other aspects of nouns. Specifically, the noun class system deals with morphosyntactic and semantic facts. It has been noted there that most nouns are made up of a prefix and a stem as in 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>plural</th>
<th>meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mutu</td>
<td>batu</td>
<td>person/people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lisapo</td>
<td>masapo</td>
<td>bone/bones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sikolo</td>
<td>likolo</td>
<td>school/schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in (4) provide us with information about number in Silozi. As observed in preceding discussions, the prefixes determine concords in other parts related to the head noun in the phrase or sentence. Even those stems without prefixes (cf. 2 above) govern concord prefixes. We return to the functions of noun prefixes chapter 4.

3.2.2. The verb

The tag ‘verb’ cross-linguistically codes the word class in which occur most of the words that express actions, processes, states. A verb in Silozi consists of a number of morphemes that are put together to form a single word category. These may be a stem and affixes which code number, concord, tense, mood, derivation, etc. This section deals with the study of the base form which may be considered to be the part that carries the central meaning of the verb complex.

3.2.2.1. Characteristics of Silozi verbs

There are three verbs forms which may be recognized in Silozi, namely:

5 a the basic stem:
  ca eat
  mata run
  zwa get out
3.2.2.1.1. Subclasses of verbs

Silozi verbs may be classified into a number of subclasses which share certain properties. A characteristic feature of Silozi morphology that we shall observe throughout this chapter and elsewhere in this study is that it is a synthetic language with agglutinating and incorporating characteristics. Consequently, a full verb consists of a stem and an array of grammatical morphemes. It is thus not possible to discuss the subclasses of verbs without referring to the morphemes that cluster around them. There is an immense variety in the structure of the verb in this language. I will confine myself to those with the minimum number of morphemes in the discussion of verbal subclasses that follows.

3.2.2.1.1. Transitive and intransitive.

The verbs in Silozi can be subclassified as transitive or intransitive on the basis of whether or not they occur with objects. Transitivity entails grammatically motivated morphological changes in the Silozi verb. Examples of transitive verbs with their objects are in 6.

6 a Kabisa a-nata yeng’wi ya linja.
   Kabisa SM+PAST-hit one of dogs.
   Kabisa hit one of the dogs.

b Kabisa a-i-nata.
   Kabisa SM+PAST-OM-hit
   Kabisa hit it.

c Mitangana ba-posa mañomo.
   Youngmen SM+PAST-throw stones
   The young men threw stones.
The facts in (6)a show that if the object is a noun or noun phrase it is put after the verb. When it is a cliticized pronoun (OM), it is put between the subject concord (SM) and the verb stem as in (6)b. This is the case in discourse as we shall see in part II of this study. The verb in these examples is “nata”. In (6)c the verb is “posa”. Other transitive verbs are “ca” (eat), “laha” (kick), “loba” (break).

Some examples of intransitive verbs are provided in (7).

7. a Tucikwi twa-fuf-a.
   Goslings SM+PRES-fly-PROG
   Goslings are flying.

b Kamuyongole ni Katekwe ba-ina fafasi.
   Kamuyongole and Katekwe SM+PAST-sit down
   Kamuyongole and Katekwe sat down.

3.2.2.1.1.2. Active and stative

Another subclassification of Silozi verbs involves the distinction between active and stative verbs. Active or dynamic verbs express actions and processes and occur in the progressive. Stative or static verbs refer to states and do not occur in the progressive form. The progressive verb in Silozi is marked by the suffix “-nga or -a”. The examples in (8) illustrate some dynamic verbs in Silozi.

8 a Sandaula na-silisa-nga batu mahala
   Sandaula SM+PAST-help cross (river)-PROG people freely
   Sandaula was helping people cross the river freely.

b Mubusisi wa tuto na-potel-a likolo.
   Inspector of education SM+PAST-visit-PROG schools
   The education inspector was visiting schools.

c. Banana ne-ba-opela busihu kaufela
   Children SM+PAST-sing-PROG night all
   The children were singing all night.

24 Demuth and Johnson (1989) have found that Setawana, a language which is closely related to Silozi, exhibits what is commonly called “pro-drop” phenomena for both subject and object argument NPs as shown in example (6)b. They suggest that the SM and OM are obligatorily incorporated pronominal elements.

In Silozi the stative is mainly formed by using the suffix “-eha”. Other suffixes are “-hala”, “-la”. Examples of stative verbs are: “lobala” (sleep), “hupula” (think), “zwafa” (lose courage), “nahana” (consider). As illustrations for stative verb and the constructions in which they occur, the following examples may be considered:

9 a Ndate Ngenda na-ziba ku zamaisa munzi.
   Ndate Ngenda SM+PAST-know to lead village
   Ndate Ngenda knew how to head a village
   i.e. “Ndate Ngenda was a good village headman”.

b Batu ba munzi wo ba-fumile likomu.
   People of village this SM+PRES-own cattle
   The people of this village own cattle

c. Sandaula u-lata hahu hu ku fuluha.
   Sandaula SM+PRES-like much to paddle
   Sandaula likes paddling a lot.

3.2.2.2. Morphological and grammatical characteristics

Most of the aspects of Silozi grammatical morphology will be dealt with in the next chapter. For present purposes, some of the categories the Silozi verb may be specified for are tense, aspect, number, mood and polarity. Since this study is generally not intended to provide a full description of Silozi grammatical structure, I do not include all the details pertaining to the conjugation of the verb such as those called verb adjuncts (Schachter 1985: 40-46). The account that follows just highlights the basic facts and provides illustrative examples of these. It should be born in mind that the conjugation of Silozi verbs, like its morphology, is very complex. This being the case, many different allomorphs corresponding to equally many different verbs are extant. Furthermore, certain morphemes share the same structural characteristics. In such cases, the interpretation of tense is contextually and intuitively determined.
3.2.2.2.1. Tense

Various tenses have been described in Silozi (see the works reviewed in chapter 1, especially Gowlett 1967 and Mwisiya 1977). In this discussion, we shall confine ourselves to the traditional classification of tense into present, past and future. The other subdivisions will be mentioned at relevant points of the discussion. The following tenses are found in Silozi:

3.2.2.2.1.1. The present

The present simple is of the structure stem+ -a. The following examples illustrate

10a Kamuyongole u-lat-a Jesika.
   Kamuyongole SM-like-PRES Jesika
   Kamuyongole likes Jesica.

b Mutangana u-nw-a hahulu.
   Young man SM-drink-PRES much
   The young man drinks a lot.

c Muleta u-pil-a hande.
   Muleta SM-live-PRES well
   Muleta lives well.

3.2.2.2.1.2. The Past

Three types of past are recognized in Silozi. The examples that I provide below are from (Mwisiya 1977):

(i) immediate past indefinite

11a Ni-cile buhobe.
   SM-eat +PAST porridge
   I ate porridge.

25 All these studies are dedicated to the study of morphology, albeit from a traditional grammatical point of view. They provide a comprehensive description of the conjugations.
b Batu ba-bulaile tau.

People SM-kill+PAST lion
People killed a lion

c Likomu li-bulail-we ki tau.

Cattle SM-kill+PAST-PASS by lion
The cattle were killed by a lion.

(ii) immediate past continuous

12 a Kamuyongole na-zamaya-nga anosi
Kamuyongole SM+PAST-walk-PROG alone
Kamuyongole was walking alone

b Sandaula na-bala-nga mitende.
Sandaula SM+PAST-read-PROG newspapers
Sandaula was reading newspapers.

c Sicaba ne-si-kopana-nga fa hala munzi
People PAST-SM-gather-PROG on centre village
The people were gathering on the centre of the village.

In (12)a-b the tense and agreement are marked by the subject marker while the progressive (continuous) is marked by the suffix “-nga” which is also part of tense-marking. In (12) c. however, the tense is marked by the affix “-si-”.

(iii) immediate past perfective

a. Mitangana ne-ba-kate-zi.
Young men PAST-SM-tired-PERF
The young men were tired.

b. Ne-ni-lobe-zi
SM-PAST-sleep-PERF
I was asleep.

c. Likomu ne-li-kate-zi.
Cows PAST-SM-tired-PERF
The cows were tired.

Although these distinctions are made, they do not seem to have distinct formal elements that mark them.
3.2.2.1.3. Future

The future is marked by "-ka" or its variant "-ta". This variation is dialectical.

14a. Ni-ka-lata mwanana yale.
   SM-FUT-like child that
   I will like that child
b. Mubusisi wa tuto u-ta-lindula maticele kaufela.
   Governor of education SM-FUT-sack teachers all
   The governor of education will sack all the teachers.

3.2.2.2 Aspect

Silozi verbs show distinctions of aspect to indicate the following:

15.a. **simple actions**
   Kamuyongole u-lata Katekwe
   Kamuyongole SM+PRES-love Katekwe
   Kamuyongole loves Katekwe.

b. **progressive**
   Kamuyongole wa-zamaya
   Kamuyongole SM+PRES+PROG-walk
   Kamuyongole is walking.

c. **perfective**
   Muluti Libombolwa u-sebeli-ze mwa likolo zeñata.
   Teacher Libombolwa SM+PRES-work-PERF in schools many
   The teacher Libombolwa has worked in many schools.

d. **habitual**
   Kamuyongole na-tona hahulu ni mulamwa-hae.
   Kamuyongole SM+PAST-chat much with in law-his
   Kamuyongole chatted her sister inlaw much (in the night).
3.2.2.2.3. Number

As noted above, the noun prefix in Silozi imposes concords on the verb in a sentence. Included among these concords is number. In the sentences below, the verb agrees in number with the subject noun prefix. This can be seen in (16)a (singular “mu-”/ “a-”) and (16)b (plural “ba-”/ “ba-”).

16a  **Mu-shimani a-lila**  
Boy SM+PAST-cry  
The/a boy cried.

b. **Ba-shimani ba-lila**  
Boys SM+PAST-cry  
The boys cried.

3.2.2.2.4. Mood

The following are the moods that are found in Silozi. The mood is mainly encoded through the context of the situation.

17a  **Indicative**  
Batu ba-luile likomu.  
People SM-PRES+own cattle  
The people own cattle.

b  **Imperative**  
zamaya fa (go)  
Utwa (listen)

c.  **optative**  
Mulimu a-lu-tus-e  
God SM-OM-help-OPT  
God help us

d.  **Subjunctive**  
Ne-ku-taba hande haiba Kamuyongole a-nyala.  
SM+PAST-FUT-be good if Kamuyongole SM+PAST-marry.  
It would be good if Kamuyongole got married.
3.2.2.2.5. Polarity

Silozi verbs are distinguished for the affirmative and negative. The standard marker of the negative in Silozi is “ha-”. It occurs with some allomorph variations in discourse. These will be indicated in appropriate contexts.

18a Ndate Ngenda ki mutu yalukile.
    Ndate Ngenda SM+PRES-be person peaceful
    Ndate Ngenda is a peaceful man.

b Ndate Ngenda ha-ki mutu ya-lukile.
    Ndate Ngenda SM+NEG-be person peaceful
    Ndate Ngenda is not a peaceful man.

c. Mutangana na-sika-sinya nako.
   Young man SM+PAST-NEG-waste time
   The young man did not waste time.

As can be seen in (18) b, it is common for an element to combine the functions of negative and agreement marker. In this case the functions are conflated. In (18)c, we see a variety of the negative, which is coded by “-sika-”.

3.2.2.3. Syntactic functions

As in many languages of the world, the verb is the obligatory nucleus of clauses and sentences. That is, the characteristic function of verbs is as predicates. They occur after the subject in the basic or canonical sentence. A detailed discussion of these functions is reserved in chapter 4. For the moment, we just illustrate this typical function as in:

    Kulu SM+PAST-make salute
    Kulu made a salute.

b. Bazamai ba-mu-fuyola.
   Travellers SM+PAST-OM-bless
   Travellers blessed him.

What is of interest from this description of the morphology of Silozi verbs is that they allow both prefixation and suffixation.
3.2.3. The Adverb

Another class of full words which is distinguished in Silozi is the class of adverbs. As in other languages, the label adverb is often applied to several different sets of words. Silozi adverbs are heterogeneous in their semantics, syntax and morphology unlike, say, the subclasses of nouns or verbs. Given this heterogeneity, the term adverb is used to refer to items that modify constituents other than the noun, in the sense of Schachter (1985). This definition is used as an extension of the usual functional definition of adverbs as modifiers of verbs, adjectives or other adverbs to include adverbs that modify entire sentences and verb phrases.

3.2.3.1. Morphological characteristics.

Adverbs in Silozi are morphologically classified into two types. The first type consists of adverbs which are primitives or underived morphemes. As we shall show below most adjuncts of time, manner and place are morphologically nouns. Some examples of one-word adverbs are:

20. bushu night
    mabani yesterday
    kale long ago
    cwale now

The other type of adverbs are derived from other parts of speech. One observation that may be made is that manner adverbs are derivable from adjectives. These adverbs mainly consist of the prefix "ka-" or "ha-" and a stem. The data in (21) provide some examples.

21. ka-bubebe quickly
    ka-bunya slowly
    ha-butuku painfully
    ha-hulu extremely

3.2.3.2. Subclasses of adverbs.

The classification given below is primarily semantic. Silozi adverbs are divided into
manner, place and time. As pointed out above, most Silozi adverbs are derivative and most of them are morphologically nouns. Consequently, examples of simple, primitive (underived) adverbs are rare not only in the data but in the language as a whole.

3.2.3.2.1. Adverbs of manner

Some examples of Silozi manner adverbs are: "Kabubebe" (hurriedly); "hande" (well); "hang’ata" (often); "katata" (strongly); "mutumbi" (completely, entirely); "maswe" (badly). The data in (22) illustrate contexts in which they can be used.

22a. Sandaula a-tina malukwe ka-bunolo
     Sandaula SM+PAST-wear trousers easily.
     Sandaula was able to wear trousers easily.

b Kwalukiswa ka-pili kuli ku-fundukiwe habusa.
     SM+PAST-be-arrange quickly COMP to leave following day
     It was quickly arranged that they leave the following day.

3.2.3.2.2. Adverbs of time

Some examples are: "busihu" (at night); "katwelufu" (at 12 ); "mabani" (yesterday); "kacenu" (today); "kapili" (soon); "kapili-pili" (very soon) are some adverbs of time found in Silozi. We present examples in (23) to illustrate their use in sentences.

23a Kamuyongole na-sa-kona ku-zamaya busihu alinosi
     Kamuyongole SM-PAST-be able to-walk at-night alone
     Kamuyongole was able to walk alone at night.

b A-bulelela mutaliwa wahae kuli u-ta-mu-bona kamuso.
     SM+PAST-tell lover his that SM+PAST-FUT-OM-see tomorrow
     He told his lover that he would see her the following day.

3.2.3.2.3 Adverbs of place

There are few single words which belong to this sub-class. Some examples are "fa", "kwanu, mo" (here); "fani, mwani, kwani, fo" (there). To illustrate their use in context let us consider (24).
24a Kamuyongole na-sa-kona ku ya kwani.
Kamuyongole SM-PAST-be able to go there
Kamuyongole was able to go everywhere.

b Tucikwi ne-tuinzi fani.
Goslings SM+PAST-sit there
The goslings sat there.

Adverbs of place are mainly “locative phrases” and the nouns at the core of such constructions tend to be semantically nouns of location (Givon, 1984). Relevant examples of adverbs of place are “kwa lapa la Ndate Ngenda” (at Ndate Ngenda’s yard); “mwa tasa kota” (under the tree); “fa kaufi” (near); “mwa libala” (in the plains); “kwa tuko a simu ya bo Ndate Mboma” (near the garden of Mboma’s father). We do not treat these as adverbs but as adverbials and their discussion is deferred until the section dealing with prepositional phrases. This is so because they are structurally prepositional phrases.

3.2.3.2.4. Sentence adverbs

In Silozi, as in other languages, these commonly express the speaker’s attitude towards the event being spoken of or various aspects of the speech situation. They are also known as speaker’s comment adverbs. Examples of adverbs that occur in this subgroup are “Kabumai bobutuna” (very unfortunately; “kabutali” (cleverly); “kabunyemi hape” (angrily again); “kubulela niti” (to say the truth). To illustrate their use in sentences, consider (25).

25a Kabumai bobutuna, muhulwana hae na-si-ka-pila
Unfortunately very, elder-brother his SM+PAST-NEG-live
nako yetelele.
time long
Very unfortunately, his elder brother did not live long.

b Kabunyemi hape, Kulu a-nata ng’indi fafasi.
Angrily again, tortoise SM+PAST-hit fist ground
Angrily again, tortoise hit the ground with a fist.
With respect to the structure of (derived) adverbs, they consist of prefixes such as "ha-" and "ka-" and stems.

3.2.3.3. Syntactic and distributional characteristics

A typical syntactic function of adverbs is that of modifier of verbs as observed in their subclassification above (see also chapter 9). Silozi adverbs are, in general, optional constituents of sentences. The following examples illustrate and to indicate their optionality, the adverbs are bracketed.

26a Kamuyongole ni Katekwe ba-zamaya (singanya).
   Kamuyongole and Katekwe SM+PAST-walk (hand in hand).
   Kamuyongole and Katekwe walked hand in hand (romantically).

b Linja za-lumaka (maswe) namani.
   Dogs SM+PAST-bite badly calf
   The dogs bit the calf badly.

c Namani ya-bokolola (habutuku).
   Calf SM+PAST-squeal painfully
   The calf squealed painfully.

Their syntactic position varies enormously as they often have the option of occurring in several positions. We illustrate these characteristics below. (26)a. above can be written as (27)b and (26)c as (27)b These facts show that the adverbs "singanya" and "habutuku" can occur in various positions.

27a Singanya Kamuyongole ni Katekwe ba-zamaya.
   Hand in hand Kamuyongole and Katekwe SM+PAST-walk
   Hand in hand (romantically), Kamuyongole and Katekwe walked.

b. Habutuku namani ya-bokolola.
   Painfully calf SM+PAST-squeal
   Painfully the calf squealed.

In (28), we illustrate the distributional behaviour of sentence adverbs. We notice here that these expressions are mobile.
28a Kalishwau, Kupalelwa a-lumbukela kwande ni ku ya. Rudely, Kupalelwa SM+PAST-walk outside and to go kwa lapa lahae. to house his. Rudely, Kupalelwa walked out and went to his house. 
b Kupalelwa a-lumbukela kwande kalishwau ni ku ya Kupalelwa SM+PAST-walk outside rudely and to go kwa lapa lahae. to house his Kupalelwa walked out rudely and went to his house. 
c. Kupalelwa a-lumbukela kwande ni ku ya kwa lapa lahae. Kupalelwa SM+PAST-leave outside and to go to house his kalishwau. rudely Kupalelwa walked out and went to his house rudely.

3.2.4. The adjective.

Adjectives are identified as the class of words expressing permanent or temporary qualities and attributes. That is, their main prototypical function is to attribute properties of some of the head noun or the phrase. In Silozi, adjectives constitute a closed class. There are very few lexical items that can be identified as adjectives.

3.2.4.1. Subclasses of adjectives

Based on the range of meanings that they can express, there are basically two subclasses of adjectives. Following Givon (1984) and Dixon (1982c) we distinguish between prototypical adjectives which code inherent, concrete, relatively stable qualities of entries; and those that are relatively less prototypical and thus code more temporary, less concrete states.26

26 Dixon (1982) has proposed seven semantic types which make up the word class adjective. These are dimension, physical property, colour, human propensity, age, value, speed.
29. **Prototypical adjectives**
   
   tuna  big  
   sisani  small/ thin  
   hulu  old  
   kima  huge/ thick

30. **Less prototypical adjectives**
   
   nde  good  
   nca  new  
   maswe  bad/ ugly  
   kale  old

In addition to the subclasses in (29) and (30), there is another subclass of adjectives in Silozi. It consists of quantifying modifiers, numerals and ordinals. These are illustrated in (31) with the relevant prefixes and noun heads they modify.

31  
   likozi  ze-ng'ata many accidents (quantifier)  
   batu  ba-ba-nyinyani few people (quantifier)  
   mutu  wa-pili first person (ordinal)  
   lizazi  la-bubeli second day (ordinal)  
   mutu  a-li-mung'wi one person (numeral)  
   batu  bababeli two people (numeral)

Before closing the semantic classification of adjectives, it is important to state that adjectival senses are expressed through verbs. The expression of adjectival meaning typically involves relativization to express the equivalent of a modifying adjective (Schachter ibid). The following examples are representative.

32a  Sandaula ki mutu  yamusa.  
    Sandaula is person  who-is-kind  
    Sandaula is a kind person.

b  Munukayumbwa  ki musizana  yabuheha  
   Munukayumbwa is girl  who-is-admirable.  
   Munukayumbwa is an admirable girl.

---

27 Fortune (1970) calls adjective stems 'relative inflected stems'.
3.2.4.1.1 Morphological and syntactic characteristics

Adjectives are virtually always used either as noun modifiers or predicates as we show in the examples below. In addition to this, Silozi has a fairly complex agglutinating morphology. Adjectives often take the concordial prefix of the noun they modify. In (33) the noun prefix and the adjective prefix (CM) are similar. Unlike many Bantu languages, say Swahili, there are two types of adjectival agreement markers in Silozi, namely simple adjectival markers and compound adjectival markers. Simple adjectival markers take the prefix of the nouns that they modify. On the other hand, compound markers are a combination of what is called the “first place demonstrative pronoun” and the noun prefix. The latter is the most widely used in Silozi while the former is very limited. The facts in (33) and (34) illustrate simple and compound agreement markers respectively. They also provide information about the function of the adjective as a modifier. It follows the noun it modifies.

33. | Head noun | Adjective modifier | Gloss |
---|---|---|
| a. musali | muhulu | old woman |
| b. basali | bahulu | old women |
| c. muuna | muhulu | old man |
| d. baana | bahulu | old men |

34. | Head noun | Adjective modifier | Gloss |
---|---|---|
| a. musizana | yomunde | beautiful girl |
| b. basizana | babande | beautiful girls. |
| c. bashimani | babatiile babalulu | three strong boys |
| d. kakomoki | kakanyinyani | small cup |

In (33) all the adjective stems have single prefixes which agree with the noun they modify. In (34) all the adjective stems (which include numerals) have nominal prefixes by which they agree with the head noun. In the examples, the first prefix (CM) represents the demonstrative pronoun and the second represents the noun prefix. For example, “yo-” in (34)a, represents the first place demonstrative while “mu-” represents the noun prefix.

In addition to functioning as modifiers of nouns, Silozi adjectives are used as
predicates in (copular) sentences. As a rule, they contain a concordial marker which is closely related to the prefix of the noun class they modify. The data in (34) can be re-written as below to illustrate the predicative function of the Silozi adjectives in sentences.

35a Musizana ki yomunde. The girl is beautiful
   b Basizana ki babande. The girls are beautiful.
   c Bashimani babalalu ki babathile. The three boys are strong.
   d Kakomoki ki kakanyinyani. The cup is small.

From these examples, it can be concluded that adjectives in Silozi are morphologically marked by a noun prefix of the noun which they modify. It would have been desirable to provide a table of adjectival prefixes. This is not possible for reasons of space. Syntactically, they follow the head noun that they modify, giving us the structure H + Mod.

Because of the relative scarcity of adjectives in Silozi, use is often made of verb forms. Hence the claim that adjectival meaning in Bantu languages typically involves relativization to express the equivalent of a modifying (Dixon 1977, Shachter 1985, Thompson 1988, O’Sullivan 1993). For example, “mwanana yanani boi”, or, literally a child who has fear. The plural is “banana babanani boi” (literally, Children who have fear). The equivalent of a predicate adjective, on the other hand, is expressed by a non-relativized verb as in example (35).

3.2.5. The pronoun

The pronoun is traditionally described as an item that stands in place of a noun or noun phrase. There are two main types of pronouns in Silozi. These are personal and demonstrative pronouns. These are the only types of pronouns which are independent words in Silozi. The other types of pronouns that are attested in other languages such as the reflexive, reciprocal and relative cannot stand on their own in Silozi. They are bound morphemes in the structure of the verb. We shall show this in the discussion of the verb phrase.

---

28 Almost all the grammars written on Silozi provide tables of agreement markers for all the categories that are in a grammatical relationship with the noun phrase.
3.2.5.1. Personal pronouns

Followers of Doke call these absolute pronouns because they have an independent status and emphatic significance (Fortune 1959, Cole 1975). Silozi personal pronouns are listed below. It should be noted that the pronouns agree in number and the class of the noun.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>na (I)</td>
<td>luna (us)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>wena (You)</td>
<td>mina (You)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>yena (him)</td>
<td>bona (them)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>yena (him)</td>
<td>bona (them)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>lona (it)</td>
<td>ona (them)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>sona (it)</td>
<td>zona (them)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>yona (it)</td>
<td>zona (them)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>lona (it)</td>
<td>ona (them)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>kona (it)</td>
<td>tona (them)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>bona (it)</td>
<td>ona (them)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>sona (him)</td>
<td>byona (them)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The glosses used for the pronouns above are provisional. They vary according to the noun used. The equivalents of “him” and “it” are not distinguished for sex in Silozi and they represent both female and male in this context.

3.2.5.1.1. Syntactic characteristics.

Silozi personal pronouns perform the function of subject and object. They therefore occur in essentially the same sentence positions as other nominal expressions. I illustrate these functions and grammatical positions below. In the data on the right are examples with nouns that could possibly be used in the slots.
Subject

a Yena waziba. Kamuyongole waziba.  
S knows. S knows  
She/he knows. Kamuyongole knows.

b Yona yabokolola. Namani yabokolola.  
S squeals. S squeals  
It squealed. The calf squeals.

Object

a Sicaba silata bona. Sicaba silata Mitangana  
People like O People like O  
People like them. People like youngmen.

b Munukayumbwa anata zona. Munukayumbwa anata linja.  
Munukayumbwa hit O Munukayumbwa hit O  
Munukayumbwa hit them. Munukayumbwa hit the dogs.

In addition to the grammatical roles mentioned above, Silozi personal pronouns are used for emphasis and contrast in a sentence. This is achieved through apposition to a noun or noun phrase to add emphasis. This sometimes involves change of word order as in (38) c.

Apposition

a Batu bamunzi, bona, ki bayambiba litapi.  
People of village, them, are trappers of fish  
As for the people of the village, they are fishermen.

b Tucikwi, tona, twa-fufa kabubebe.  
Goslings them SM+PAST-fly fast  
As for the goslings, they flew fast.

c Basali bona, mutangana na-balata.  
Women them, youngman SM+PAST-OM-like  
The women, the youngman loved them.

Before closing this section, it should be borne in mind that in actual discourse, pronouns are more rarely employed than full NPs. In the forthcoming chapters, we
shall show that most grammatical arguments occur as cliticized or "incorporated" pronominals.29

3.2.5.2. Demonstrative pronouns

In Silozi, demonstrative pronouns are divided into three groups according to distance from the speaker and number. There are three distinct positional distances and a fourth one which is a dialectal alternant of the third (see also Mwisiya ibid). Morphologically, Silozi demonstratives are characterised by terminatives -o; -oo, -ni and-le (this, that, yonder and these, those and those yonder). These are for the first, second, third and fourth positions respectively. Krifka (1995: 1398) suggests that these demonstratives actually represent a far deictic "licwe lale" (that stone), and two near deictics. Traditionally, the latter ones are described as near deictic "licwe le"(this stone) and the text-deictic "licwe le"(the aforementioned stone). The pronouns are presented in the table below according to the noun class:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>4th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>yo ba</td>
<td>yoo bao</td>
<td>yani bani</td>
<td>yale bale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>o ye</td>
<td>oo yeo</td>
<td>wani yani</td>
<td>wale yale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>le a</td>
<td>leo ao</td>
<td>lani lani</td>
<td>lale ale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>se ze</td>
<td>seo zeo</td>
<td>sani zani</td>
<td>sale zale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ye ze</td>
<td>yeo zeo</td>
<td>yani zani</td>
<td>yale zale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>lo a</td>
<td>leo ao</td>
<td>ani ani</td>
<td>lale ale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>ka to</td>
<td>kao too</td>
<td>kani twani</td>
<td>kale twale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>bo a</td>
<td>boo ao</td>
<td>bwani ani</td>
<td>bwale ale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>se bye</td>
<td>seo byeo</td>
<td>sani byani</td>
<td>sale byale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29 This is because there is an intricate relation between agreement and grammatical argument assignment in Silozi discourse.
3.2.5.2.1. Syntactic characteristics

There are four syntactic characteristics of demonstrative pronouns in Silozi. They play the role of subject and object.

39. **Subject**
      S SM+PRES-come-PROG
      Those are coming.
   b. *Bo* bwa-bulaya.
      S SM+PRES-kill
      This (one) kills.

40. **Object**
   a. Lu-ziba *yo*.
      SM+PRES-know this one.
      We know this one.
   b. Banana *ba-nata-ka* [twani].
      Children SM+PRES-beat-PROG those yonder
      The children are beating those ones.

41. **As modifier in a Noun Phrase**
   a. Mushimani *yani*
      Boy that
      That boy (over there)
   b. Likulu *ze*.
      Chickens these
      These chickens.

It should be pointed that demonstrative pronouns play the role of articles in Silozi. As modifiers they follow the noun head that they modify.
3.2.6. The Preposition

There is controversy over the treatment of adpositions in Silozi and Southern Bantu linguistics in general. Doke (1954: 48) asserts that “there is no preposition, properly so called, in the Bantu languages. What many writers have called prepositions are not separable words, but morphological elements forming adverbs. Disjunctive orthography is largely responsible for these elements often having been regarded as prepositions.” From this premise, Mwisiya (1977: 11) has argued that there are no prepositions in Silozi. He further claims that the absence of prepositions is a characteristic of languages which use the conjunctivist system of writing. The thrust of these claims is that prepositions do not exist in Silozi (and Bantu languages) because they are not separable words. This argument does not seem to be applicable to Silozi because the elements in question are not “morphological elements forming adverbs” as Doke claims. Even if they were not to be treated as prepositions, they are not used to form adverbs. They are used to form locatives that function as adverbs, that is, adverbials. Because of this, there are no strong arguments for treating them either as mere prefixes or independent words.

There seems to be a strong case for claiming that they are words because they can separately be stressed. I will therefore assume that these (Silozi) elements are, in fact, function or grammatical words equivalent to the English “to”, “at”, “in”, etc, which play an important role in grammatical relationships. In the Zambian Language Orthography (1975: 114), it is stated that “locative prefixes kwa, mwa, ku, fa should be separated from common and proper nouns, but joined to adverbs.” This rule enables us to identify the elements in question as separate words. It fits the generally accepted definition of the preposition as a word that typically precedes a noun to form a single constituent of structure- a prepositional phrase often used as an adverbial (Greenberg 1966, Crystal 1992, Greenbaum 1996). It is, therefore, reasonable to conclude that Silozi uses actual locative particles. In an analysis of Bantu locative constructions, Gregersen (1967: 67) observes: “...we shall have approached the earlier conception of the locative particles as prepositions rather than as prefixes in the ordinary sense”. Assuming that the elements are not prefixes in the ordinary sense as proposed, we now turn to the description of prepositions in Silozi.
3.2.6.1. Morphological and syntactic characteristics of prepositions.

Some examples of prepositions (so-called locative formatives) in Silozi are: "kwa" (to, from); "mwa" (in); "fa" (on) and "ku" (to, from), "ni" (with), "ka" (by), etc. Syntactically, they precede the noun or noun phrase. In these positions, they serve the function of expressing a relationship between entities and state of affairs they are involved in. In other words, they express adverbial and/ or complemental relationships. As illustrations, consider:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prep</th>
<th>Prep. Comp</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a ku</td>
<td>Ndate Ngenda</td>
<td>to Ndate Ngenda (name of person)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b kwa</td>
<td>Mongu</td>
<td>at/to Mongu (name of place)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c mwa</td>
<td>libala labulozi</td>
<td>in the plains of the Malozi land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d fa</td>
<td>munanga wanuka</td>
<td>on the banks of the river</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

They (with the exception of ku) are also used as prefixes in the formation of adverbs of place. In this case they are used as adverb forming prefixes which cannot be written separately. This makes them different from their role as prepositions above. Some illustrations are provided below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adverb</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a fafas</td>
<td>on earth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b mwahali</td>
<td>inside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c kwatasi</td>
<td>underneath</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be noted, the adverb stems "-fasi", "-hali" and "-tasi" must be attached to the prefixes in order to form single words.

3.2.7. The Conjunction

There are three types of conjunctions in Silozi which we describe below. Most Silozi conjunctions are written as single words even when composed of more than one element. The distinction between simple and complex conjunctions does not apply much in Silozi. However, a distinction that can be made is one between co-ordinating and subordinating conjunctions.
3.2.7.1. Coordinating conjunctions

Silozi coordinators are “ni” (and) and “kono” (but). As in many other languages of the world, they are used to join linguistic items which are equivalent or of the same rank. The examples below illustrate this.

44 a. Kamuyongole ni Katekwe ba-lata-na
   Kamuyongole and Katekwe SM+PRES-love-REF.
   Kamuyongole and Katekwe love each other.

b Muhulwa hae a-mu-eleza Kono Kamuyongole a-tokwa ku utwa.
   Brother his SM-OM-advised but Kamuyongole SM+PAST-NEG to listen
   His elder brother advised him but Kamuyongole would not listen.

3.2.7.2. Subordinating conjunctions

Some examples of subordinating conjunctions (SCs) in Silozi are: “nihakulicwalo” (nevertheless), “kabakateo” (for this or that reason), “hakulicwalo” (if it is so), “hakusicwalo” (if it is not so), “haiba” (if), “muta” (when), “kambe” (if).
Syntactically, they have a connective function. They appear as independent words. A detailed discussion of their uses, morpho-syntactic and distributional characteristics will be provided in the chapter 9. For the present, I will provide some examples.

45 a Kamuyongole u-ta-nata Mboma muta a-fita
   Kamuyongole SM+PAST-will-hit Mboma SC SM+PAST-arrive
   Kamuyongole would hit Mboma when he arrived.

b Sicaba ha-sina-kutusa haiba Punga a-tahi
   People SM+NEG+NEG-help SC Punga SM+PRES+NEG-come
   The people will not help if Punga does not come.

c Ha-yo-fita kwa lisima mutangana a-bona basali bao.
   SC-SM+PAST-arrive well young man SM+PAST-see women those
   When he arrived at the well, the young man saw those women.

3.2.8. The interjective

In Silozi, interjections are exclamatory and emotive in character. Some examples of the principal ones are “au!” (is that so!); “acuu!” (expressing pain); “awa” (no),
“uhu” (surprise), “mawe” (sorrow), “ashe” (contempt), “luli!”, “faa!”, “kauke!” (approval, affirmation). A notable characteristic of Silozi interjectives, as in other languages, is their ability to act as whole utterances. They do not enter into syntactic relationships with other word classes.

3.2.9. Ideophones

There is apparently no agreement among scholars on the definition of the term ideophone for African languages in general. However, there is no doubt that there is a set of words that tend to have certain phonological properties that distinguish them from other word classes. This phenomenon, according to Schachter (1985b: 21) has received special attention in African linguistics. Quoting Doke (1935: 119), Schachter asserts that the term ideophone has gained currency as the label for “a word, often onomatopoeic, which describes a predicate, qualificative, or adverb in respect to manner, colour, sound, smell, action, state or intensity”. Welmers (1973) who questions Doke’s definition asserts that the label “ideophone”, though not as yet formally defined for African languages in general, seems entirely appropriate. He further argues that with possible occasional exceptions, ideophones in any language are, like other forms, part of the community-accepted lexicon entry of arbitrary associations between sound and meaning. They are rigidly conventional in form as other words, though they may sometimes exhibit exceptional phonological characteristics as asserted by Trask (1993).

Judging from the literature on ideophones and from my own intuition, I am of the position that Silozi has a grammatical class of words called ideophones. I deal with some characteristics of Silozi ideophones in the following section. It should be stated that it is difficult, almost impossible, to find English equivalents of Silozi ideophones. I have therefore retained the Silozi forms in the gloss of such elements. In certain cases, I have adopted Doke’s system in which the ideophones are glossed by a paraphrase commencing with “of”, i.e. “pertaining to”.

3.2.9.1. Classification of ideophones

In the classification of Silozi ideophone, I will use morphological and semantic criteria. On the basis of morphology, three types of ideophones are found in Silozi which I present below with their semantic characteristics. These are:
3.2.9.1.1. Simple underived Ideophones

46  **ideophone**  | **gloss** (semantic import)  
   a  twaa-       | completely white, clear (colour, vision)  
   b  suu-       | completely black or dark (colour, vision)  
   c  ka         | of beating by fist or stick (action)  
   d  poo        | of being very cold (feeling)  
   e  tuu        | of being very silent (sound)  

3.2.9.1.2. Complex Ideophones

Most of these are reduplicatives as illustrated below.

47  **Ideophone**  | **Gloss** (semantic import)  
   a  tulya tulya  | of walking hurriedly (manner of action)  
   b  welu weluu   | of laughing loudly (manner of action)  
   c  pii pii      | of a bad smell (sound)  
   d  ti ti ti     | of running or walking (sound)  
   e  ndombya ndombya  | of walking slowly (action)  

The functions of ideophones seem to differ in the two text types that we are dealing with. In the written texts, all the ideophones used are adverbials (see ex 49 in the next section). In this sense they are related to adverbs (Samarin 1965). On the other hand, in the spoken text they function as complements (see example in 8.6 ex. 26). In both functions, their position is restricted to the end of the clause or sentence.

3.2.9.1.3. Verb derived ideophones

These are ideophones derived from verbs. Examples are in (49) below.

48  **Verb**  | **Gloss**  | **Ideo**  | **Gloss**  
    tulyaela   | walk hurriedly | tulya tulya | of walking slowly  
    temuna    | look behind    | temu temu   | of looking here and there  
    pumwaela  | swim with noise| pumwaa      | of plunging into water  
    pwakama   | fall badly     | pwaka       | of falling down(down!)
I will now illustrate the examples of sentences in which ideophones occur:

49 a Meto ahae afubezi telee.  
    Eyes his are-red IDEO. (of the appearance of eyes).  
    His eyes are bloodshot.

b Fande kuli tuu  
    Outside it is IDEO (of silence)  
    It is very quiet outside.

c Mwandu yahae kuli wii  
    House her it-is IDEO (expressing intense darkness)  
    It is completely dark in her house.

3.3 Grammatical categories and morphological classification of Silozi

In this section, I briefly summarize the grammatical categories associated with Silozi word classes. I also consider the morphological classification of the language. This is done in order to situate Silozi in the domain of typology. It might be helpful to recapitulate the functions of noun prefixes. There is no doubt that noun prefixes are very important in the grammatical structure of Silozi. They perform at least three functions. The first is that of classifying nouns. That is, they are used to distinguish different classes of nouns as illustrated in Table 1. Second, they are used to indicate number and person. Finally, they are used to apply concords of various sorts even on the other parts of a sentence or phrase. In the phrase, or sentence, all items relating to a head noun assume a prefixal element that is in agreement with that noun. The prefix is also similar in form with the head prefix. Crucially, the affixes also assign grammatical categories.

From the description of the internal structure of Silozi word classes, it is clear that not all the words are assigned grammatical categories. It is only nouns, verbs, adjectives (including numerals) and pronouns. These take agreement prefixes of various forms.
Table 4: Grammatical categories for Silozi word classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word class</th>
<th>Grammatical categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noun</td>
<td>number, class (gender)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>subject and object agreement, tense, predication, tense, aspect, mood, voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjective</td>
<td>agreement characterizable as morphological copying that copies the noun on to the variable adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronouns</td>
<td>number, person.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Let us now consider the morphological classification. From the descriptions of the words provided in the preceding sections, it should be clear that Silozi words use both prefixes and suffixes. However, it is also clear that inflection is predominantly done through prefixes and rarely through suffixes. In fact, it is only verbs that use suffixes and even then they have to be used in combination with prefixes. Based on these facts, Silozi is an inflectional language. Given all the morphological characteristics that have been presented above, Silozi can be characterised as all of synthetic, agglutinating, fusional and polysynthetic (incorporating language). One might accept the intuition that has been articulated by many scholars that no language is pure in terms of morphological typology (see Comrie 1981, Bauer 1988, Spencer 1991).

3.4. Conclusion

The main aim of this chapter has been to provide a description of the internal structure of Silozi word classes. The focus has been on their morphosyntactic or grammatical categories. The word classes have thus been distinguished by their morphology, their syntax and their patterns of distribution. It has been argued that Silozi has nine word classes instead of twelve as claimed in previous studies. These are the noun, verb, adverb, adjective, preposition, pronoun, conjunction, interjection and ideophone. We have also discussed the Silozi noun class system and proposed a revised version. I have also argued for the existence of a class of prepositions in Silozi which have been lumped together with adverb forming morphemes. There are subtypes of particles (function words) which may be distinguished according to their functional and distributional peculiarities such as verbal extensions. These could not be covered within the scope of this chapter. In the next chapter we shall see how these combine to form phrases and other aspects of syntax and discourse in later chapters.
Chapter four

The phrase

4.1. Introduction

In chapter 3, we examined the forms of Silozi words and established their classes. We also examined the grammatical categories that attach to specific word classes. As we established in chapter 1, previous studies in Silozi grammar have mainly focused on the parts of speech and morphological analyses as the “core” of grammatical description. In recent years, as the scope of linguistic theory has widened, there has been an upsurge in studies focusing on grammatical structures of the languages of the world. The methodology that has proven most productive in the production of linguistic theory has been to examine closely selected sentences and phrases that native speakers of a language judge to be possible, impossible, and marginal (Hawkins 1994, Givon 1995). Central to linguistic analysis has been the description of structural properties that should be ascribed to syntactic structures: linear order, constituency, grammatical morphology and headhood. Unfortunately, the phrase in Silozi has never been described.

As we shall demonstrate, some Silozi word classes can act as heads of phrases. The aim of this chapter is to provide a structural description of Silozi phrases. From the descriptive point of view, the chapter has two main aims. The first is to establish whether Silozi provides evidence for syntactic constituents bearing the characteristics of phrasal categories as found in standard definitions of the phrase. The second, which is the main thrust of the chapter, is to describe the syntactic structure of Silozi phrases, clarifying how they are internally structured. From a more theoretical point of view, on the other hand, the chapter contributes to investigating notions of command and government and the theories of word order adequate to meet the empirical challenges emerging from the study of phrases. In line with the main aims of this study, the chapter explores constituent structure and ordering principles to determine whether there is evidence for LIPOC or End Weight in general. Several scholars have argued that categorial complexity or LIPOC may be relevant to the ordering of constituents in the noun phrase (Siewierska 1988, 1993, 1998, Hawkins 1983, 1994, 1998). We would like to determine whether this hypothesis could be extended to the ordering of heads and their modifiers in other phrases. Effectively,
the question that is addressed is whether phrasal constituents are ordered in terms of categorial complexity. The scope of the present chapter is essentially illustrative rather than exhaustive.

The chapter is organised as follows. I start by providing the basic assumptions and methodological foundations underlying the discussion in the section that immediately follows in section 2. In section 3, a general description of the defining characteristics of Silozi phrases is provided. A more specific and detailed account of the properties characteristic of Silozi phrases from the point of view of their internal structure is also presented. I will concurrently explore the role of categorial complexity in the ordering of constituents in the individual Silozi phrases. In section 4.5, I synthesize all the findings concerning constituent order (linear order) in the various phrasal constructions. This is done in order to assess the putative universality of the theory of end-weight as a determinant of constituent order in Silozi phrases in general.30

4. 2. Some preliminary considerations

This study draws from the Autonomous Systems view (Jackendoff 1977, 1983). Each component of the grammar has its own primitives, rules of combination, and well-formed conditions. The basic assumption made about phrase structure is that every phrase has a head. The characteristics of the phrase as identified in syntactic theory are captured by Culicover (1997:19) as follows: “It is crucial in this theory that all categories have maximal projections associated with them. This includes the familiar “lexical categories”, such as N(oun), V(erb), A(djective) and Preposition, but also “functional categories”, such as complementizer (a word like that), tense and other inflectional elements, and so on.” Thus every lexical category used in an utterance HEADS a phrase and the syntactic type of a constituent is determined by the category of the head of that constituent (Napoli 1996). In many accounts of syntax, the phrase has been emphasised as an intermediate unit between the word and the clause which lacks the subject-predicate structure usually found in a clause (c.f. Halliday 1961, Croft 1990 on grammatical hierarchy).

30 It is generally held that end-weight does not apply to phrases since the order of constituents is fixed. However, as Connolly (1991: 101) argues the rules and template approach to constituent ordering is applicable to the placement of items within phrases much in the same way as to the positioning of elements within the clauses. He has demonstrated this in relation to all the different types of phrase types of English. It is in this spirit that we extend the principles to the ordering of elements in Silozi phrases. We merely want to establish whether categorial complexity is relevant in the ordering of constituents in the other phrases.
To explicate what Silozi phrases are, I adopt the standard practice of naming phrases after their heads. This approach has been employed in most analyses. Its putative universal nature is called into question by the structure of the Silozi "verb phrase. It does not handle Silozi data adequately, particularly verbs and their dependents. We shall consider it important, therefore, to adopt this approach with some adjustments to handle the Silozi data since it provides a basis for explaining the constituent structures and grammatical relations we want to present. As Chomsky (1981) has aptly noted the idiosyncratic properties of particular languages, which must be learned as language is acquired, set the limit that linguistic theory aims to approach.

I do not treat tense and other inflectional items as lexical categories and therefore as putative heads of phrases (see Culicover ibid). More precisely, our conception of the head follows from Anderson's (1993: 15) strong and natural position: a head as well as being obligatory to a construction type, is also syntactically atomic, it is a lexical category and the construction is headed. Thus the head of any syntactic category must be a word, the word being the minimal unit of the syntax\textsuperscript{31}. By extension, a word is also called a phrase when it plays the roles of the syntagm it heads on its own. I, therefore, assume that some phrases consist of single words. Following from this, a major assumption made in this chapter is that the presence of a head word is the minimal requirement for a phrase. That is, the phrase may additionally contain some (optional or obligatory) dependents. In most cases, the head has the same distribution (and function) as the entire phrase. It follows from this that the word classes which we discussed in the previous chapter and their functional and grammatical categories are the same as those of the phrases they head. However, it should be pointed out that not all phrases have identifiable overt heads and heads do not always have the same distributions as their projected heads (see 4.3.1.1). This chapter does not, therefore, discuss the functions of phrases. Rather, it is restricted to their formal characteristics, focusing on the placement of modifiers with respect to their heads.

\textsuperscript{31} Following Anderson, J. M. (1992: 20), this position is motivated by the distinct character of the principles governing the principles of supra-word structure vs. morphological structure. According to this position, an element such as tense of "Infl" (e.g. Chomsky 1981) which is not a syntactic unit but a property of syntactic units, of words, is not eligible for head-hood in the syntax, or indeed for any status therein independent of the word with which it is associated.
4.3. Silozi phrases

Unlike "nonconfigurational languages" like Walpiri (cf Hale 1983, 1992), Silozi words are capable of being heads of well-formed configurations. They undoubtedly determine the category of whole phrases. As an example noun and adjective can be modified in a manner illustrated below.

1. a Kamuyongole wazamaya.  
   Kamuyongole moves/walks  

   b Kamuyongole uzamaya hahulu.  
   Kamuyongole moves/walks badly

2. a musizana yomunde  
   girl beautiful  
   a beautiful girl  

   b musizana yomunde hahulu  
   girl beautiful very  
   a very beautiful girl.

We can distinguish between unmodified items (1)a and (2)a and modified items (1)b and (2)b. In (1)b, the adverb "hahulu" modifies the verb "zamaya". In (2)b, the intensifier "hahulu" modifies the adjective "yomunde".32 The order of the constituents is fixed. The modifiers "maswe" and "yomunde" cannot be moved to another position as they form constituent parts of the phrases in which they occur. Given the working assumptions and the two examples, there is evidence for the existence of the phrasal category in Silozi. There is a highly motivated structural (semantic) relation in which the dependent modifies, or qualifies, or intensifies, or adds some attribute to the sense of the controller as articulated in Matthews (1993).

Let us now consider the characteristics of Silozi phrases within the grammar and syntax of the language. Following Pullum (1977), another important assumption made in this study is the uncontroversial one that grammars of natural languages have to make explicit the order of constituents (in sentences), and, further, that the theory of grammar should seek to place constraints on the set of such principles that can be made consistent with observed facts about attested languages. Of significant relevance to our description of Silozi phrases are morpho-syntactic aspects, particularly the distribution of affixes. Accordingly, the structure of phrases in Silozi, as in other Bantu languages, is influenced by a system of inflections and concordial agreements triggered by the noun class system. Most elements which are independent in other languages lose their independence to function as constituent parts of other words in Silozi. There is a default concordial marker (bound prefix) on

---

32 The allomorphy coded by "u-" and "wa-" is triggered by the addition of the adverb "maswe".
most lexical heads. For example verbs and adjectives must carry a concordial marker. We referred to these as words with “derived” or concordial gender in the previous chapter. Nouns have inherent gender. Prepositions are exceptions to this requirement and do not require an affix at all. It is, therefore, the case that phrases headed by words with derived gender have to carry a prefix attached to the head word. Given these facts, the following rule for phrasal structures in Silozi may be posited.

3.a. Phr ---> (Pref.) H ( Mod.)

These structures are necessary for the representation of words with inherent gender and those without any gender on the one hand, and those with derived gender respectively. To facilitate our description, the phrases will be presented according to their behaviour within the system of Silozi grammatical agreement. The phrasal category as presented by Culicover (ibid) must be modified to illustrate its instantiations in the grammar of Silozi. The phrase in Silozi is a varied and pervasive unit. The categories to be considered phrases are: noun phrases, adverb phrases, adjective phrases, adverbs and prepositional phrases. For reasons which will be provided below, the term “verb phrase” is considered to be inappropriate for a language like Silozi. Concordial markers (prefixes) and detailed lists of words used in the various phrases are obviously relevant, but since the facts were discussed in the sections dealing with word classes and their morphology, I will not repeat the examples here. We start the description with the noun phrase whose head incorporates an element that determines the structure of other constructions that enter into a grammatical relationship with it. Givon (1990) contends that such morphological features are ways of “binding” multi-element noun phrases together.

4.3.1. The Silozi noun phrase

4.3.1.1. The simple NP

The Silozi NP, in what we can call its simplest form consists of a single emphatic pronoun, a noun, a nominal adjective or numeral. The examples in (4) illustrate structures in which the NP consists of pronouns (henceforth Pron). NPs which consist of one noun (N) are illustrated in (5). Examples of sentences to demonstrate how they could be positioned are provided on the right.
4. a. yo Yo wa-lila. this(one) This one is crying.
   b. yale Mundia u-natile yale. that (one) Mundia has beaten that one.

5. a. Kamuyongole Kamuyongole ki muuna. Kamuyongole Kamuyongole is a man
   b. nja Nja ya-kula. dog The dog is unwell
   c. li-nja Li-nja zakula dogs The dogs are unwell.

Nominal adjectives can serve as the head of a noun phrase in Silozi. They are always preceded by an affix which expresses agreement in terms of number with the noun they supersede. I will use the term subject marker (SM) to refer to prefixes that are related to the subject and the verb. Concordial marker (CM) is used to refer to prefixes that attach to adjectives. With this information, the underlying structure is CM+Adj. We illustrate the structure and use of nominal adjectives below:

6. a. ba-ba-hulu Babahulu ba-taha. CM-Adj Adj SM-coming The elderly are coming
   b. yo-mu-nca Yomunca wa-opela. CM Adj Adj SM-singing The youth is singing

Other items that can occur as heads are numerals. Silozi numerals must be preceded by an affix that agrees in number with the noun it modifies. Its structure is therefore CM+Num. (the numeral may be either a cardinal or an ordinal). Illustrative examples are provided below:

7. a. wa-pili Wa-pili u-fitile. CM-Num. The first has arrived
   b. ze-peli Ze-peli li-kwanile. CM-Num. Two are enough.
4.3.1.2. The complex Silozi NP

More typically, the Silozi NP consists of a head and other elements of modification. Silozi noun phrases must occur with prefixes that mark gender, class and number. Givon (1979, 1990) argues that these are typical categorial features that are specified for nouns, either morphologically or syntactically. They tend to be more often grammaticalized. That is, they tend to appear as grammatical/inflectional morphology and have a higher probability of becoming noun affixes. In addition to these affixes, the nouns occur with modifiers, which are in essence the optional items that serve to add semantic information provided by the head of the category in which they are contained. They include determiners of definiteness, reference, deixis (discourse-pragmatic devices) and adjectives, quantifiers, relative clauses, relational nouns (meaning restricting elements) as articulated by Givon.

Before engaging in the description, it should be stated that in Silozi there are no articles (the equivalent of the English definite article “the” and the indefinite “a/n”). This claim confirms Langacker’s (1972: 175) observation that “the semantic distinction between definite and indefinite nominals is probably valid for all languages though the distinction is not always marked overtly in any obvious way, as it is in English by the contrasting articles “a” and “the”. Indeed many languages lack articles entirely”. This characteristic has also been noted by Anderson (1985). To these languages, we add Silozi. A more pertinent source of support for this characteristic probably comes from Barret-Keach’s (1985: 20) comments on Swahili, a language that belongs to the same family as Silozi. The comments are made with respect to Givon’s (1969) use of the term “definite” to describe the kind of NP likely to co-occur with an agreement affix. “Whatever definite may mean in Givon’s study, it cannot mean the sort of thing as the term ‘definite’ in English.” I want to illustrate this by comparing Silozi NPs with English ones:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Silozi</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. a. muuna</td>
<td>a/the man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. nja yale, ye</td>
<td>a/the dog, lit.: “that dog”, “this dog”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. basali ba, bale</td>
<td>the women, lit.: “these women”, “those women”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. kokwani</td>
<td>an/the insect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What should emerge from these examples is that while the English NPs employ articles to indicate definiteness, the Silozi NPs do not. Indefiniteness is expressed through the use of a single noun as in (8)a. Examples (8)b and (8)c show that
definiteness, particularly in isolated sentences, is done through the use of deictic determiners. They occur as distal demonstratives and they must follow the head noun. This order militates against the assumption that modifiers precede the head. In other cases, discourse factors permit a definite interpretation of a bare noun.

4.3.1.2.1. Modification by Adj: H +Adj.

The complexity of the considerations that govern the relative order of adjective in the languages has been noted by a number of scholars (see for example Dixon 1982, Sabbagh 1992, Greenbaum 1996). In most general terms, the order seems to be based on the proximity principle by which “elements that belong together more, semantically or functionally, tend to be put in closer proximity at the code level”. From the structural point of view, modification using the Adj involves two processes. As an indisputable rule, both the processes require the placement of a particle which signals a concord between the head and the modifier. The concord to be used depends on the category of the noun the adjective describes and the number. The morphological and syntactic characteristics of adjectives were discussed in section 3.4. I will repeat them here together with the examples.

The first structure involves what is termed the compound adjectival concord. As we saw in chapter 3, this is a combination of the first place demonstrative pronoun and the simple adjectival concord. The latter is (generally, not always) identical in form with the noun prefix. Although one of the concords is clearly derived from the first place demonstrative, it has lost its demonstrative force and individuality. Thus “yo”- and “ka-” function together with “mu-”, and “ka-” purely as concords as in the data below:

9. a. muuna yo-mu-nde
   man CM-good
   a good man
b. kasizana ka-ka-nde
   girl CM-beautiful
   A/the beautiful girl

The second structure involves the single adjectival concord. This involves the elision of the concordial particle so that there is only a single item of concord. We illustrate this type of modification below:
10 a baana bahulu or baana ba-ba-hulu (old men)
b. muuna muhulu or muuna yo-mu-hulu (old man)
c. basali bahulu or basali ba-ba-hulu (old woman)

4.3.1.2.2. Modification by Relative clause: H+Relc

It has been observed that in Silozi the expression of adjectival meanings typically involves relativization to express the equivalent of a modifying adjectival effect. Comrie (1981) supports this observation by asserting that related to Adjective-noun order (Noun-adjective in Silozi), at least conceptually, is the order of head noun and relative clause (Relc) in the relative clause contraction. He has further observed that adjectives and relative clauses are indeed hard to separate from each other. The preceding section has been dedicated to the description of N+Adj. To distinguish this structure from that of H + Rel, we briefly point out the characteristics of the latter in what immediately follows. The relative construction in Silozi, as in other members of the Bantu family, has a predicative basis. This position is based on the fact that essentially, the structure of the Relc is closely linked to that of verbals. They are formed from main verbs and copulars. Cole (1975: 171) observes that “All relatives have a predicative basis i.e. they are fundamentally copulative or verbal forms which are used attributively and therefore as qualificatives”. Sandilands (1953: 101) has observed that, in Tswana “some verbs while still very obviously verbs are very nearly adjectives, and in the relative construction correspond to adjectives in English”. Our basic classification and description is based on Keenan’s (1985a) and the essentially semantic definition of restrictive relative clauses given by Keenan and Comrie (1977 : 1):

“Any syntactic object [is] a relative clause if it specifies a set of objects (possibly a one-member set) in two steps: A larger set is specified, called the domain of relativization, and then restricted to some subset of which a certain sentence, the restricting sentence, is true. The domain of relativization is expressed in surface by the head NP, and the restricting sentence by the restricting clause, which may look more or less like a surface sentence depending on the language...”

33 Our use of the term Relc departs from that of Keenan in that it is not restricted to restrictive clauses. We use it to refer to the general relationship between a noun head and any relative clause modifier in the noun phrase. It seems that Silozi does not have any formal
The structure **H+CM+Rel stem** is similar to **H+CM+Adj stem** in that they both have composite concords which consist of a first place demonstrative and a subjectival concord. There is very little formal evidence to justify the difference between the two. One notable difference is that (direct) relative concords have forms for the first and second persons while adjectival concords do not. Another difference is that the stems used in relative constructions have a verbal basis as noted in the description that follows (see (11)). They may not be used as attributive adjectives.

Returning to the structure of **H+CM+Relc**, the head noun which Keenan (1985b) refers to as the domain noun is always followed by the relative clause, making this type of modification postnominal. In addition to providing additional information about the head, the relative clause agrees in features of number, concord, etc with it. Silozi relative clauses can be distinguished in terms of verbal clauses and copular clauses.

A further distinction which we make is based on the relation between the head and the relative verb stem. This classification gives us what are called the **direct relative** (Dr) and the **indirect relative** (Ir). In the Dr the head occurs as the subject of the relative verb. In other words, the antecedent is also the subject of the relative predicate. Further, the Relc refers directly to the antecedent and agrees with it in class, etc. The appropriate noun is directly modified by the $S_{rel}$. We illustrate the basic structure of **H+Relc** which involves Dr below:

### 11 Verbal clauses (H+CM+Rel)

a bashemi ba-ba-zamaile  
parents REL-CM-travelled  
Parents who have travelled.

b Sandaula ya-na-sweli mazoho mwa lipokoto.  
Sandaula REL-CM-put hands in pockets  
Sandaula who had put his hands in pockets.

---

means to code the distinction between restrictive and non-restrictive clauses.  
Following Keenan (1985) $S_{rel}$ is used to refer to the (restrictive or non restrictive) relative clause. The structure has in general the syntactic properties of a sentence.
12 Copular clauses (H+CM+Rel)

a mwanana ya-kula
child REL-unwell
A/the child who is unwell.

b tunyunywani to-tu-buheha
small birds REL-beautiful
small birds which are beautiful.

Modification using Relc that involves the Ir has the following characteristics. The nominal element is the antecedent but not the subject. The subject of the relative predicate is different from the antecedent. The antecedent is the object in the underlying clause which is relativized. This necessitates a double representation in the relative clause modification which is done firstly through the S_rel and secondly through (among other structures it co-occurs with) a CM. As illustrations, consider (13) below. Note that the double representation of the antecedent is coded by “ze-lu-”, and “ze-ba-”. These are referred to as pre-prefixes by (Wald 1987, 1990). The subjects are “lu-” (we) and “ba-” (they).

13a Likomu ze-lu-lekile
   Cattle REL-CM-bought
   The cattle which we have bought

b. Lika ze-ba-sa-latì
   Things REL-CM-NEG-like
   Things which they do not like

To sum up, the relevant general observations about the H+Rel in Silozi are the following. First, there are morphemes between the head noun and the verb. That is, there is an item analysable as WH-word or complementizer\(^ {35} \). Second, the head noun always precedes the relative clause. Before closing this section, I want to state that in terms of Keenan and Comries’ proposed ACCESSIBILITY HIERARCHY, it is

\(^ {35} \) This position is consolidated by a set of facts noticed by Keenan and Comrie. Specifically, they have pointed out that a number of languages permit a pronoun to be retained in the position relativized on. I want to suggest that the concordial marker which is effectively an incorporated nominal, is the equivalent of the permitted pronoun retained in the position relativized on. This is consistent with Keenan’s conservation of logical structure (CLS). The pronoun (in our case CM) identifies the semantically appropriate position of the NP within the relative clause that is co-referential to the head and, and so makes the relative clause and head more semantically transparent.
possible to relativize subjects and objects of the relative verb. It is also possible to relativize possessors (See ex 21). However, from our data, it seems that it is not easy to relativize the oblique.

4.3.1.2.3. Modification by the possessive: H+Poss

In this structure the relationship that exists between the H and M as the term indicates is one of possession. Although the possessive construction is primarily related to nominals, it can be extended to other structures particularly the Adv. Because of this, the construction does not indicate a simple relationship of “ownership” but includes a number of semantically distinct relationships. This characteristic of the possessive is attested in other languages. Givon (1970: 11) has claimed that “as in other languages, the term ‘possessive’ is possibly a misnomer, as the range of semantic relations between the two nouns thus associated is much wider than mere “possession”.

In an effort to give a description of the structure H+Poss, Kashoki and Mann (1978: 76) assert that in “all Zambian languages, an extra possessive prefix can be added to a noun...” This statement begs modification. However, we use it as a starting point in the description of the structure in question since some of what it entails is of relevance to what follows. The authors recognise the fact that there is a morphological process used to code this structure. Following from this, we state that the possessive is made up of two parts which must follow the head. The first part is the concordial element which brings about agreement between the possessive and the noun to which it refers. The second part may be regarded as the possessive stem or base. The structure H+Poss has an underlying structure which we postulate in this schema: H+CM-a+ NP (where CM represents a particle and “-a” which can be interpreted as "pertaining to" and NP is a full noun or other nominal). This structure, which has the pattern H+CM-a+ NP is illustrated in the following examples:

14a lunaka lwa-puli
   horn CM-goat (a goat’s horn)

b toho ya-hao
   head CM-his (his head)

c mulala wa-hae
   neck CM-his (his neck)
Having considered these facts, we now go back to the various semantic relationships that attach to the structure H+Poss referred to above. Two main types of Poss are distinguished by Bantuists from the semantic point of view. This distinction is determined by the relationship that exists between the associated nominals in a particular construction. The types are the “direct possessive” and the “descriptive possessive” (hence forth Di.Poss and Des.Poss respectively). We describe these next.

4.3.1.2.3.1. The Direct Possessive (Di.Poss)

This structure denotes a relationship of ownership, belonging or possession which may be alienable or inalienable. The possessive concord agrees with the entity possessed. In other words, there is a direct relationship between the possessee and the possessor. For example, when we say “ndu ya-Ndate Ngenda” (house of Ndate Ngenda) the relationship between “ndu” and “Ndate Ngenda” is that of ownership. Thus Ndate Ngenda has/ owns/ possesses a house. Direct possessives are usually based on nouns or pronouns but they may be based on other stems. We illustrate these structures below.

15  Di.Poss with noun stems
   a. sapalo sa Lubasi (se-si-fubelu)
      shirt of Lubasi (N) Rel be red.
      Lubasi’s shirt (which is red)
   b. sikwalo sa Mushimbei (se-si-nani musima)
      door of Mushimbei Rel-SM-has hole.
      Mushimbei’s door (which has a hole).

16.  Di.Poss with pronouns
   a. sapalo sa hae
      shirt of his
      his shirt
   b. sikwalo sa ka
      door of mine
      my door
17. Di.Poss with the demonstrative
   a namani \textit{ya} \textit{yale} \\
   calf \textit{PM} that one \\
   that one’s calf \\
   b naha \textit{ya} \textit{bani} \\
   land \textit{PM} those

We note that in (17) the modifier consists of a PM which are represented by “\textit{ya}” and a demonstrative “\textit{yale}” and “\textit{bani}”\textsuperscript{36}

4.3.1.2.3.2. Des.Poss

Unlike the Di.Poss, this structure denotes some quality, function, feature, purpose pertaining to the antecedent other than ownership or belonging. The CM can take on various stems to denote equally various semantic relationships. In the examples below, we illustrate some of these constructions with their concomitant semantic relationships. The stems we use are the infinitive, adverb, and nouns.

18. CM+Vinf to express purpose:
   a litipa \textit{za} \textit{kupumisa} \\
   knives \textit{PM inf.} cut i.e.”knives to cut with” \\
   b liapalo \textit{za} \textit{ku-apala} \\
   clothes \textit{PM inf.} wear i.e. “clothes to wear”

In both (18)a. and (18)b. the items are used for a particular purpose, that is, "cutting" and "wearing".

19. CM+Adv to express time and place
   a. batu \textit{ba} kacenu \\
   people CM Adv \\
   people of today

\textsuperscript{36}Welmer’s (1973) study of African and Bantu languages reveals that languages with noun class systems and concord add a new dimension to demonstratives. This is because class concord is required, as a rule to co-occur with the demonstrative.
b. pula ya mwa libala
rain CM in plains
the rain of the plains, i.e. the rain which took place in the plains

20. **CM+N** to indicate “sex gender” or “name of a particular thing”:
- a. nja *ya muuna*
dog of male = “male dog”
- b. komu *ya sitole*
cow of female “cow”
- c. mushitu *wa Kalamba*
forest of Kalamba “Kalamba forest”

I mentioned above that it is possible to relativise possessors in Silozi. To justify this claim, I provide some examples below:

21 a Munna yo likomu zahae ne-li-uzw-izwe
Man REL cattle his SM-PAST-steal-PASS
The man whose animals were stolen
b Mutanga yo linja zahae ne-li-lumak-ile namani
Young man REL dogs his PAST-SM-bite-PERF calf
The young man whose dogs had bitten the calf

To close this subsection, we observe that modification of the noun by the possessive or genitive differs from that of English. In English, the preferred order is that the possessor precedes the possessed while the preferred order in Silozi is that the possessed is followed by the possessor as sketched below.

22 **Preferred order**
(unmarked > marked)
- a. **English Possessor > possessed:**
  Ndate Ngenda's village
- b. **Silozi Possessed > possessor:**
  munzi wa Ndate Ngenda
  village of Ndate Ngenda

**Less preferred order**
(mark > unmarked)
- a. village of Ndate Ngenda
- b. *wa Ndate Ngenda munzi*
  of Ndate Ngenda village
4.3.1.3. Modification by determiners: H+Det

The term determiner is used here in the sense of Crystal (1992: 98-99) who defines it as “a grammatical element whose main role is to occur with nouns to express such semantic notions as quantity, number...” The formation of this structure consists of a concordial marker and a determiner which we schematise as follows: CM+Det. Items that occur in the slot of Det include possessive pronouns, numerals and demonstratives as below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>23.</th>
<th>Head</th>
<th>Modifier</th>
<th>Type of Modifier</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>likota</td>
<td>za-ka</td>
<td>possessive pronoun</td>
<td>my trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>muuna</td>
<td>wa-hae</td>
<td>possessive pronoun</td>
<td>her husband</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>mwanana</td>
<td>yo</td>
<td>demonstrative</td>
<td>this child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>bashimani</td>
<td>bale</td>
<td>demonstrative</td>
<td>those boys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>poto</td>
<td>i-ing’wi</td>
<td>adjective</td>
<td>one pot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>litapi</td>
<td>ze-ne</td>
<td>adjective</td>
<td>four fish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>mutu</td>
<td>wa-bune</td>
<td>adjective</td>
<td>fourth person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td>mwana</td>
<td>wa-bulalu</td>
<td>adjective</td>
<td>third child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>batu</td>
<td>ba-bang’ata</td>
<td>quantifier</td>
<td>many people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j.</td>
<td>lipula</td>
<td>ze-nyinyani</td>
<td>quantifier</td>
<td>few chairs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The account above should suffice to illustrate the various categories that modify the NP in Silozi. We now turn to the ordering principles that govern this construction.

4.3.1.4. Order of constituents in Silozi NPs

Ordering of various constituents in a particular syntactic unit is determined by various factors (Siewierska 1991, 1993). There are some linearization hierarchies which specify a series of precedence preferences between pairs of items bearing particular features. Among these are formal hierarchies which encompass matters of length and internal syntactic complexity (Allan 1987: 51). In this section, we briefly address multiple modification in the Silozi NP with respect to formal hierarchies. When there is a sequence of modifiers, certain types take precedence over others in word order. Shorter, less complex modifiers occur closer to the head than longer, more complex ones. Thus adjectives are more likely to occur earlier than relative clauses. This sort of interaction is illustrated below. It should be noted that (24)b is odd because it violates the ordering rules.
24. a. Musizana yo-mu-hulu ya-opelanga u-timezi
   Girl(H) CM-old(Adj) CM-sings (Rel) has-died
   The old girl who sings has died
*b. Musizana ya-opelanga yo-mu-hulu u-timezi
   Girl(H) CM-sings(Rel) CM-old(Adj) has died
   The old girl who sings has died.

Turning to specific modifiers, the usual order is 1 quantifiers or numerals, 2 possessives, 3 adjectives and 4 relatives. As an illustration of a construction in which all modifiers interact, consider the following:

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
   & H & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\
\hline
   mwana & wapili & wa Ndate Ngenda & wamuna & ya-pilamwa Lusaka \\
   child & first & of & male & who lives in Lusaka \\
   & first & male & child of Ndate Ngenda who lives in Lusaka \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

Items that occur in 3 and 4 frequently occur together in sequence but those in 3 tend to be given precedence. The two are usually interchangeable in word order. Other interactions of modifiers are presented below:

26. a. nja yaka yensu
   dog mine black = my black dog
b. mandu amalalu amatuna
   houses three big = three big houses.
c. mandu amatuna amalalu ale.
   houses big three those = those three big houses.

It is interesting to note that (26)c somewhat contradicts Greenberg's predictions about basic word order and the ordering of elements internal to the NP. Greenberg

\[\text{Although this is indeed the case, there is a preference for heavier elements to be placed to the end of the construction. Hawkins has proposed a principle which specifies that heaviness overrides mobility when the heavy modifier is a relative clause. This position has been consolidated by Dik (1997) in his proposed specific principle (SP12): Relative constructions prefer the Postfield. He further argues that this rather strong tendency for placing relative constructions in the Postfield could be interpreted as due to the impact of LIPOC (SP7) at the term phrase.}\]
(1963) has observed that when any or all of the items - demonstrative, numeral, and descriptive adjective - precede the noun, they are always in that order. If they follow, the order is either the same or its exact opposite. In Silozi and many Zambian Bantu languages like Chitonga and the order of these elements is flexible. It is perfectly correct to say “ale mandu amalalu amatuna” or “mandu ale amatuna amalalu”.

Given these facts, we can state the characteristics of the unmarked NP in Silozi. The first is that modification is postnominal. That is, all elements of modification occur after the head. The other fact is that most of the items that modify the head nouns must be preceded by an affix which functions as a concordial marker. There must be an affix between the head and its modifier. Elements like “kaufela” (all) in (27)a do not require an affix. The order of constituents is relatively fixed as illustrated in the template posited in (25) above. In so far as modification occurs after the head, recursion and multiple modification occur postnominally in Silozi NPs. Increased complexity occurs further away from the head. This pattern places heavier constituents later in the NP construction than lighter ones. The heaviness principle seems to be an intrinsic characteristic of the NPs in Silozi and is consistent with Hawkins’ (1983) Noun Modifier Hierarchy which underlines the principle of placing lighter constituents before heavier ones. Siewierska (1996: 838) argues that the postposing of a modifier after a noun in postpositional languages tends to comply with the word order preferences incorporated in the formal hierarchies. There is therefore prima-facie evidence for the heaviness principle in Silozi constituents. More examples of “lighter” constituents before “heavier” ones in Silozi noun phrases are provided in:
27. a. Sandaula ki mwana wa-bulalu wamushimani wa-Ndate Mpule
    Sandaula be child GM-third male GM-Ndate Mpule

    Mundia ni Ma Mpule Mundia Liholos ya-hulile
    Mundia and Ma Mpule Mundia Liholosi Rel-grown

    ni sishemo kwa batu kaufela.
    with generosity to people all

    Sandaula is the third born son of Ndate Mpule and Ma Mpule Mundia
    Liholosi who grew up with generosity to all people.

    b. Muhulwana hae neli muuna muhulu ya-napila ka lituso
    Brother.elder his was man old Rel-lived by help

    zana-fumana kumunyana hae yana-beleka kwa Mungu.
    Rel-get from young.brother his Rel- working in Mungu
    His elder brother was an elderly man who lived by getting help from his
    brother who was working in Mungu.

To complete the discussion of the noun phrase, the following must be stated. The
order of constituents within the phrase is usually relatively fixed, and there is little
room for pragmatically significant alternatives. There are exceptions to this,
however. As we have seen in all the examples, all nominal dependents occur in the
post head position. Emphatics, quantifiers, demonstratives and possessors may be
placed in prenominal position. This can be seen in the following examples:

28 a. babang'ata batu.
    Many people

    b. yale mutu
    that person

    c. zaluna likomu
    our cattle

Such a situation could well be described by means of a pattern of the form (Dik
1997: 430):

29  P1 N X
where PI is the first position in the phrase, used for special pragmatic purposes, in this case for focus. Categorial complexity is manifest in the fact that relative clauses prefer to be placed in the final position while the simpler modifiers are closer to the head. There is another reason for claiming that LIPOC is relevant to the Silozi noun phrase. This is that relative clauses not only prefer the Postfield, but also preferably occupy the final slot in the phrase (as in example (25) and (26) above). Alternatively, they may even get “extraposed” (displaced) out of the noun phrase altogether into some later position in the clause (see also Blackmore and Malinson 1981, Siewierska 1988).

30.a. Sandaula a-yofumana musizamaisi kwa musebezi, ya-nani tuso hahulu.
Sandaula SM+PAST-find leader at work REL-had help very
Sandaula found at work a boss who was very helpful.
b. Muuna u-til-e yo-no-bata ku bona.
Man SM+PAST-come-PERF REL-SM+PAST-want to see
The man has come who you wanted to see.

To sum up, this section has examined the defining characteristics the NP in Silozi. We have seen that the construction, though not fully described, displays variability in terms of internal composition. With the exception of names and pronouns, the Silozi NP is made out of a head noun and some modifiers which themselves can be modified. These are the Adj, the Poss and the Det and the Relc. The modifiers consist of two parts. The first is the concord, which shows agreement in features of person, number and class with the head. The second part is the stem, which actually modifies the reference and meaning of the head. Each modifier has its own sets of concordial markers but may have varying stems. In general, modifiers follow the head noun. We would like to note that this observation is consonant with Lehman's (1978: 19) principle that nominal modifiers precede nouns in OV languages and follow them in VO languages, granted that Silozi has the basic structure VO. It only remains to state that the coverage of the NP in this section could only have limited usefulness and the degree of detail is restricted to the presentation of the basic, canonical and underlying kinds of regularities of the construction. In the section that follows, we turn to the verb and its constituents.

4.4. The Verb Phrase

The constituency of the category VP is controversial in the literature. Matthews
(1993) argues that what exactly is a verb phrase will depend on the grammarian. While it is claimed that all languages possess the VP constituent, there have been nearly as many different proposals concerning its status as there have been linguists who espouse it (Chomsky 1970, Bresnan 1982, Gazdar et al 1983, Hoekstra 1984). It is therefore important to make it clear that I do not use the term VP in the wider sense and as described in many linguistic studies. I will use the term “verbal group” to refer to a single word constituent whose stem is a verb.” Before describing the structure of the verbal group in Silozi, let me discuss the concept of auxiliary and establish whether Silozi has auxiliary verbs.

4.4.1. Tense, aspect and mood (TAM) in linguistic theory

Although this section is not about the structure of VP per se, it is instructive to briefly look at some discussions on certain categories that have a bearing on the structure under investigation. Specifically, I want to call attention to the locus of items that express tense, aspect and mood and how they interact with the verb stem in Silozi. I also want to explain why I consider it inappropriate to refer to the verb and its constituents as “verb phrase”.

The status of auxiliaries as presented in the literature has interesting implications for the analysis of the verb and its constituents in Silozi and (possibly) other Bantu languages. The term auxiliary has been applied by a number of people working in different frameworks, and it has found a variety of divergent uses. Its status is controversial and confusing. Mbom (1990) has observed that in studies of tense and aspect, for instance, one constant source of confusion is the complex interrelations between the grammatical and the lexical systems of a language. Most discussions on the status of auxiliaries have centred on the controversy between the autonomy and the main verb hypotheses. One position, the autonomy hypothesis, claims that auxiliaries or labels subsumed under the label "AUX" constitute a distinct category, different from verbs and other categories (Jackendoff 1972, Lightfoot 1979, Akmajian et al 1979, Steele et al 1981). Proponents of this hypothesis claim that auxiliaries constitute a universal category even if there are of course differences in the realisation of this category in different languages" (Puglielli 1987: 346). The other hypothesis is the main-verb hypothesis which states that auxiliaries are underlying verbs or verbs exhibiting deviant behaviour. Proponents of this hypothesis argue that there is neither syntactic nor any other evidence for defining a category "AUX" for any language (see Langacker 1975, Pullum & Wilson 1977).
Significantly, “there does not appear to be any typologically meaningful way of delimiting the range of conceptual, morphosyntactic or other properties that an auxiliary, or a "canonical auxiliary" for that matter should exhibit” (Heine 1993: 5).

My own position is that although there are elements that code tense, aspect and mood in Silozi, most of them do not constitute a separate and distinct category. They also do not have characteristics of main verbs. In this study, I do not deny the relevance of some linguistic items that take care of grammatical functions commonly expressed by auxiliaries (tense, aspect and mood). They constitute an obligatory category without which sentences (simple and complex) could not be produced.

To validate my claims, I will firstly argue that the instantiation tense, aspect and mood in Silozi may not have cross-linguistic equivalence as argued in the most generative grammars. The various verb structures that are attested in the language prove this. These are characterized by morphosyntactic and semantic properties, and more specifically by the typical contexts in which they are manifested morphologically and syntactically. The elements subsumed under the label “auxiliary” may not form a distinct constituent within a clause.

4.4.2. The Silozi verbal group

I have pointed out above that the term “verb phrase” is not appropriate for the Silozi verb and its constituents. In this section, I want to briefly justify this position. The main reason for not using the term verb phrase is that most of the elements that occur with the verb are affixes which are bounded to the verb stem. The last chapter and the examples cited immediately above should have given us an idea of what Silozi verbs look like. In Silozi, the main verb is coded as a verb stem or radical and the other “verbs” are affixes. Most of the elements that are used to code tense, aspect, modality and negation are not independent words. Morphologically, Silozi, like many Bantu languages has a rich system of verbal affixes, which may appear as subject markers and also as tense and aspect markers. The abundance of these affixes and the complexity of verbal system make it somewhat difficult to account for all the elements that are used to express tense, aspect and mood. Consequently, this study does not cover all the aspects of the Silozi verbal group. In line with the conjunctive system of writing which we have adopted, the verb and its constituents will be treated as a single word.
There are two types of modifiers of the verb to be accounted for in Silozi. I will call the first type core modifiers. These have the characteristics of being bounded and incorporated in the core structure of the verb form. The second type, peripheral modifiers, are not central to the structure of the verb. These are typically adverbial constructions. I start with the core modifiers.

As illustrations, consider the following examples:

31.a Likomu *ne-li-fulile* mwa libala.
   The cattle PAST-SM-graze in plains
   The cattle grazed in the plains.

b. Linjanana *li-nw-ile* mabisi.
   Puppies SM-drink-PERF milk
   The puppies have drunk (the) milk.

Empirically speaking, the constituents of the verbal group in Silozi consist of the following:

32. Likely constituents of the Silozi verbal group:
   a. verb-stem (obligatory)
   b. SM
   c. TM
   e. optional obliques or adverbs

In what follows, I illustrate examples of Silozi Vgps with constituents that may follow it:\footnote{These examples illustrate the verb with its complements and adjuncts, a category which in most analyses, typically functions as a predicate.}
In all the data presented above and elsewhere, there is striking evidence to show that verbal inflections may not constitute a separate category. The facts of the language are that as in many other Bantu languages, Silozi is an agglutinating language with verb stem plus numerous affixes. The V node is the locus of a number of linguistic processes ranging from phonological, morphological, syntactic as well as semantic. These differences have implications for the constituency of the category verb and its constituents. There is no convincing reason not to treat the verbal affixes of tense and aspect in Silozi as independent lexical units. These, as a rule, are constituent parts of the verb structure. There is an agglutinating morphological process between the aspect markers and main verb. Obviously, the status of tense and aspect markers in Silozi is different from what is suggested by scholars working in the general frame of Generative grammar and GB in particular. It is also different from what previous writers on Silozi have suggested. This position is supported by Heine (1993) in his assumption that all languages have Verb-to-TAM chains, even though there is an enormous range of variation these chains exhibit both between different languages and within a given language. The facts provided above seem to suggest that the grammar of Silozi treats the categories that constitute tense and aspect markers as part of the morphology of the verb rather than as reorganised constituents. It should be clear from the foregoing why it is not appropriate to use the term verb phrase. In the next two sections, I consider and illustrate other aspects of the Silozi verbal group.
4.4.2.1. Modification by aspect markers in Silozi

As we have already seen in Chapter 3 and above, the equivalent of aspect markers in Silozi occur as affixes. In this sense, if we define a phrase as a syntactic unit which typically consists of more than one word, and is intermediate between word and clause level in sentences, we will probably find that verb phrases may not exist in Silozi. This is because its constituent parts are not independent words as such. It is thus not amenable to the tests of substitutability and movement (Fabb 1994). Since we have already covered these, I will concentrate, albeit briefly, on some properties of the verb that were not covered in the previous chapter.

4.4.2.2. Modification using special aspectual markers and the metrical tense.

The elements that I discuss here have similarities with adverbs, which we discussed in the preceding chapter. They are different because they are incorporated ("infixed") within the structure of the verb group. I will refer to them as "aspectual markers". As they do not have independent lexical status, they are best discussed with respect to the so-called metric tense. This tense is associated with grammatical categories that are used to mark underlying dimensions known as "remoteness distinctions". Mann (1976), for example, has observed that there are often four divisions of past time, and three or four divisions of future time in Zambian Bantu languages. ChiBemba has four metrical tenses that are nearly symmetrical in past and future (Givon 1972). This has also been observed in Zulu (Mkhatshwa 1991: 130). In principle, remoteness is relevant to the Silozi TAM system. According to the data the metrical tense is not particularly well developed. Combinations of tense markers and adverbial expressions are by and large employed to code this. Remoteness categories thus play a marginal role since they are not systematically coded by formal morphological markers (special affixes). There are four metrical tenses that are nearly asymmetrical in past and future. The constructions and terminology we use in the account that follows have been largely based on Mwisiya's grammar. In this grammar the concept of "remoteness" does not seem to be applicable to the past tense. This may suggest its structural and semantic insignificance. It may be noted that no precise time measures can be given. This can be explained by the fact that tense distinctions are inherently weakly metrical in the sense that they provide an approximate and subjective measure of the interval between the frame and the tense locus (Chung & Timberlake 1985). This is compounded by the fact that metrical
tense distinctions can in principle be further cross-classified by aspectual distinctions. In addition, Silozi has a tendency to use tense affixes also for categories which are in other languages more often expressed by adverbs. There are forms called “still tenses” and “already tenses” as illustrated in (33). “sa” or its allomorph may be an adverb, but it is generally considered as an auxiliary verb. It modifies the sense of the verb, giving it the sense of “still”. The auxiliary “se” adds to the verb it precedes the meaning of “already” in past tenses.

34.a. Linyunywani ne-li-sa-opela.
   Birds SM-PAST-PROG-sing
   The birds were still singing.

b. Punga ne-se-a-fitile.
   Punga PAST-PERF-SM-arrive.
   Punga had already arrived.

In these examples, it is clear that the so-called auxiliaries are actually prefixes. As stated above, the structure of the verb in Silozi is quite complex. There are other aspects of it which have not been covered here. These include “the Consecutive or Historical perfect” (Jalla 1937); the Past present, the Past future, the Future present (Gowlett 1967); the narrative past (Yukawa 1987). The major concern of the account has been to provide the facts about the internal structure of the Silozi Vgrp modified by verbal affixes. On the basis of this structural description, I conclude that the verb group in Silozi is mainly modified by affixes.

4.4.3. Relative order of modifiers in the Silozi verbal group

From the discussion in chapter 3, it should be clear that two types of modifiers, namely tense and aspect markers and adverbs may be recognised in Silozi. In the discussion, we have also indirectly presented the orders in which the elements of modification occur. This being the case, a detailed and full exposition of its positional syntax need not concern us here. I will simply present a synopsis of the main principles and facts surrounding this construction. We start with the positioning of tense, aspect and mood markers. As pointed above, most of these appear as affixes prefixed to the verbal radical thereby creating a multi-morphemic verbal unit. When they occur in sequence the leftmost bears the tense. Taking into account grammatical function assignment and the concomitant agreement, the relevant morphotactics of the Silozi verbal word itself may be summarized as follows:
where SM stands for subject agreement morpheme, ASM stands for aspectual marker which is by and large optional, T for tense-aspect-modal morpheme, "OM" for anaphoric object pronoun, VDS* for verb derivational suffix (with the asterisk indicating possible recursion), and "-a" for the "neutral" verb suffix, which may be supplanted by either a negative, subjunctive or modified base suffix.

It should be added that the Silozi verb may be decomposed into a verb root and suffixes, which indicate argument-changing processes like the passive. It also has about eight suffixes which are generally referred to as verbal extensions such as applicatives, causatives, and reciprocal. O'Sullivan (1993:xv) observes that "Silozi has a highly flexible system. Once the root is known, a great variety of forms can be developed from it to provide a large number of different usages..."39

To conclude this section, the type of “verb group” that we have been concerned with is that which is modified by affixes and, to some extent, the adverb. The description of the Silozi verbal group provided shares in the conviction that the correct way to handle order and constituent phenomena is not by devising sets of transformations that can derive it from distinct underlying orders of a desired type. We have established that Silozi has a well formed, rule-governed verbal group whose modifiers are mainly affixes and adverbs. The Silozi verbal group undergoes multiple valency changes which are related to grammatical function changing rules. As has been demonstrated, the verbal group handles a number of morpho-syntactic functions.

4.5. The Adverb phrase(AdvP)

Under the theoretical approach adopted in this description, an adverb phrase is a phrase that is headed by an adverb. In its simplest form, it consists of a single adverb. All the examples cited above illustrate this type of construction. The adverb may be

---

39 The forms of verbs that are referred to here are the so-called extensions in Bantu linguistics (Doke 1935, Cole 1975, Dembetembe 1987). These are affixes which are added to the verb radical to extend its basic meaning in various ways. Examples of these are the applied (-ela), stative (-sa) and the causative (-isa).
modified by various items. The basic structure of the Silozi adverb phrase can be presented in the following schema:

36  $\text{AdvP} \rightarrow \text{H} + \text{Mod}^*$

The contexts in which this structure occurs are provided in the examples cited below. These examples illustrate the simple adverb phrase.

37.a. Komu ishwire mabani.
   The cow died yesterday
b. Mango iciwa matabula
   Mango is eaten in winter.

4.5.1. Modification by an adverb: Adv + Adv

The typical modifier of the adverb is another adverb which semantically functions as an intensifier as in:

38.a. Kamuyongole na-sa-kona ku zamaya busihu hahulu.
   Kamuyongole SM-PAST-be able to move night very
   Kamuyongole was able to move very late at night.
b. Mwanana u-ca maswe hahulu.
   Child SM+PRES-eat too much.
   The child eats too much.

4.5.2. Modification by an intensifier:

This can be done through repetition of the adverb. In other words, one of the adverbs plays the role of an intensifier. Another way is through the use of “hahulu”. Adverb intensifiers are derived from adverbs of manner and adjectives. It should be pointed out that intensifiers are very few in Silozi. Consequently, the same types of items will be used in the examples that we provide with respect to this function. Some examples of modification of an AdvP modified by an intensifier are provided below:
   People SM+PAST-gather quickly-quickly.
   The people gathered very quickly.
b. Batu kaufela ba-tabela likezo za Sandaula hahulu-hulu
   People all SM+PAST-appreciate actions of Sandaula much-much.
   All the people greatly appreciated Sandaula's actions.
c. Katekwe ni Kamuyongole ba-utwa-na hahulu
   Katekwe and Kamuyongole SM+PRES-understand-REF well-very
   Katekwe and Kamuyongole understand each other very well.

4.5.3. Order of constituents and end-weight in the Silozi AdvP

In the adverb phrase, the modifier follows the head. That is, modification is post head. As can be seen in the type of items that modify adverbs, it is not easy to discuss the order of constituents in Silozi in terms of heaviness. This is more so with respect to phrases which are headed by primitive adverbs. This type of modification may involve words of the same syntactic weight. An example would be an adverb that modifies another adverb. There is no "short" before "long" or "light" before "heavy" ordering of constituents in such a case. However, when the modifier is itself modified and recursion occurs, it is reasonable to conclude that weight is a determinant of linear ordering in the structure of the AdvP in Silozi. In so far as this kind of syntactic relationship can occur, constituent order is affected in one way or the other by the principles of end weight. As an example, consider

40. Baenyi ba-fitile mabani busihu hahulu-maswe.
   Visitors SM+PAST-arrive yesterday night very-very
   The visitors arrived very late at night yesterday.

In this example the lighter item “mabani” which is the head precedes the “heavier” modifier. However, both the orders of adverbs are possible. So much for the Adverb phrase.

4.6. The Adjective phrase (AdjP).

Keeping in the spirit of the standard description of phrases, an adjective phrase is a group of words headed by an adjective. As we saw in the previous chapter, the adjective in Silozi takes the concordial prefix of the noun it modifies. As Bokamba
(1985) has noted, adjectival agreement is characterizable as a morphological copying phenomenon that copies the prefix of the modified noun onto the variable adjective. With these observations in mind, the structure of the Silozi adjective phrase can be formulated thus (where CM is the concordial marker an AS is the variable adjective stem, Mod* is for modifier with possible recursion):

41. AdjP---&gt; CM + AS + Mod*

In the grammar of Silozi, it is difficult to discuss adjectives and adjective phrases in isolation. Jalla (1937) has argued that adjectives in Silozi cannot stand on their own. To illustrate the structural and functional roles of the adjective phrase in a more comprehensive manner, it is therefore necessary to discuss it within the structure of a noun phrase. The following are the facts about the Silozi AdjP.

4.6.1. The simple Adjective phrase

In its simplest form, the Silozi AdjP consists only of a single adjective which, as a rule must be a stem. Examples of simple AdjPs in Silozi are provided below.

42. NP AdjP Gloss
   a. Litapi ze-tuna big fish
   b. Siapalo se-si-fubelu red shirt
   c. Mutangana yo-mu-kuswani short young man

Examples of these in sentences are provided in (43):

43.a Kamuyongole ki mwan’a bashemi ba-ba-lukile.
   Kamuyongole is child of parents good
   Kamuyongole is a child of good parents.

b. Kaze yaka ye-nsu i-latehile.
   Cat mine black is missing
   My black cat has is missing.

4.6.2. The complex Adjective Phrase.

Talking about the complex AdjP is, by and large, talking about modification. A
distinct group of adverbs are used to modify the adjective. These are mainly derived adverbs of manner which act as intensifiers. According to the data, there seems to be only two items that function as intensifiers in Silozi unmarked constructions. These are “hahulu” and “maswe” which carry the meaning “very”. As illustrations, consider the following:

44.a. Mushimbei ki musizana yo-munde hahulu.
Mushimbei is girl beautiful very
Mushimbei is a very beautiful girl.
b. Ki nzila ye-nde hahulu.
It-is path good very
It is a very good path.
c. Mwa munzi waNangayula kwa- zuha taba ye-tata maswe.
In village of Nagayula there irrupted case complicated very
In the village of Nangayula there irrupted a very complicated case.
d. Mboma ki muuna ya-kolile maswe.
Mboma is man strong very
Mboma is a very strong man.

4.6.3. Constituent order and end weight in the Silozi AdjP

In the structure of the Silozi AP, the head is followed by its modifiers. This is illustrated by all the examples cited above. The next question to be addressed concerns the effect of the heaviness principle on the ordering of constituents in this construction. The structure places prefixed concordial affixes before the stem which is the head. Other modifiers which are themselves (potentially) heavier than the head follow it. Without any further information, we can see that the prefixes are lighter than the head and the head is in its turn lighter than the words and phrases that modify it especially when recursion occurs. The conclusion to be drawn from this ordering pattern is that lighter items occur before heavier ones. If the elements were reordered, placing heavier ones before lighter ones the resulting construction would either be unacceptable or marked if not rare. We can assert that LIPOC, then does play a role in the ordering of constituents in Silozi AdjPs. However, as stated earlier, there is very little room for pragmatically significant alternatives because the order within the phrase is rather limited.
4.7. The prepositional phrase (PP)

As in other languages, the prepositional phrase consists of a preposition and its complement (PPC) in Silozi. In the description of prepositions as word classes, it was established that Silozi has very few items that can be identified as prepositions. These include “kwa” (to, from); “mwa” (in); “fa” (on) and “ku” (to, from). There are various types of items that occur with the preposition as complements to give it an extended structure and scope. The structure of the Silozi PP can be formulated as follows:

45 .PP—>H + PrepC

According to this formulation, the preposition which functions syntactically as the head of the prepositional phrase is followed by the prepositional complement. As can be seen from the examples in (47), prepositional complements are varied but they are generally made around nouns. They may be nouns or noun phrases:

46. **Head** | **Complement** | **Gloss**
---|---|---
a. mwa | ndu | in the house
b. kwa | sikolo | at school
c. fa | sooli sa Mbeta | on the island of Mbeta.
d. mwa | munzi wa Nangayula | in the village of Nangayula
e. ku | mung’a bupilo | to the almighty god

Examples are given in (47) in which the PrepC is highlighted.

47.a. Bashimani ne-ba-lwan-a *mwa libala*
Boys PAST-SM-fight-PROG in plains
The boys were fighting in the plains.

b. Ndatahe Mutangana a-liba *kwa siliba* ku yoka mezi.
Father-of young man SM+PAST-go to well to fetch water
The young man’s father went to the well to fetch water.

c. Litapi ne-li zeñata *mwa lisa la Nangayula.*
Fish SM+PAST-be many in lake of Nangayula
Fish was plentiful in the lake of Nangayula.
The prepositional phrase may be modified by other items. Some examples are provided below.

48. PP MOD GLOSS
    a. ku Nawa kabuhali (Adv.) to Nawa angrily.
    b. fa halimu hahulu (Adv. Intes.) very high up.

4.7.1. Order of constituents and the weight principle Silozi PP

It is obvious from the structure of the prepositional phrase that structurally simpler elements occur before the more complex, heavier ones as predicted in LIPOC. The preposition is inherently simpler than its complement, which is a lexical word or a phrase. If it precedes its complement then it conforms to the heaviness principle in that it prefers to precede an element that structurally outweighs it. We can therefore conclude that weight, as a determinant of constituent order in the Silozi prepositional phrase is a deep-seated inherent characteristic.

Based on the data at our disposal, it is reasonable to conclude that Silozi has a phrasal category that is headed by a preposition contrary to the claims of the previous scholars working within the Doke mode who have dismissed the existence of the preposition in Silozi and Bantu in general. If their position was to be accepted, then they would be no prepositional phrases in Silozi and Bantu in general. However, the legitimacy and validity of their claims is quite doubtful. It is not the purpose of this study to provide a detailed argument against this view. We need only to state that Silozi is different from most Central and Southern Bantu languages in terms of parentage and (Gowlett 1989, Kashoki 1990). Prepositions do exist in Silozi although they may not be attested in other languages which belong to the Bantu family. It follows, therefore, that there are prepositional phrases in Silozi whose structure we have described in this section.

4.8. Constituent order in the Silozi phrase and the categorial complexity hypothesis

Having explored the various phrase structures that are attested in Silozi, the question to be addressed is whether the constituents in them are ordered in terms of increasing categorial complexity. It has been noted that grammatical agreement plays a significant role in the morpho-syntactic structures of Silozi and probably Bantu in
general. The consequence of this is the appearance of bound prefixes on lexical items, particularly verbs and adjectives. Thus there are two main types of agreement in Silozi, namely, verbal agreement and adjective agreement. The adverb does not need any concordial markers. However, due to the fact that most adverbs in Silozi are derived with concomitant prefixes, the resulting elements obligatorily carry morphological dependents (prefixes).

One general descriptive observation that can be made is that in the noun phrase, prepositional phrase, adjective phrase and adverb phrase there is post-head modification. That is, modifiers occur after their head. The following formulation represents their structure.

49. Phr-->\(\text{Pref} + \text{H} + \text{Mod}^*\)

(Pref= prefix which is presented as an optional element because prepositions and some adverbs, particularly so called primitive adverbs, do not co-occur with prefixes; H = head and Mod = modifier). As noted at various points in the preceding discussion, the placement of bound prefixes before lexical items or stems is of necessity the placement of structurally lighter elements before heavier ones. In the verb phrase there is what is called "mixed typologies in Verb Phrase syntax": VO and OV. Affixation and cliticization show a preference for lighter items to occur in the pre-head position. The items that occur in the slot of Pref sketched above are subject and object agreement markers, tense, aspect and modal markers. These are either affixes or clitics. In the modification that involves adverbs, the modifiers occur after the head. This situation is problematic vis-a-vis the heaviness principle because it may involve elements which are structurally equal. If, however, we allow for modifiers that are themselves modified or have undergone recursion, there is a strong possibility that the head will be structurally simpler than its modifiers which would then have extended structures. In this case the order of constituents would conform to the principles of end-weight. We summarise the constituent structure of Silozi phrases in the following table:
Table 5: Summary of modification in Silozi phrases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHRASE TYPE</th>
<th>MODIFIERS</th>
<th>MODIFICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>Adj, Relc, Poss, Det</td>
<td>Post-head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP</td>
<td>TAM, Adv</td>
<td>Pre-head/post-head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AdvP</td>
<td>Int., Adv</td>
<td>Post-head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AdjP</td>
<td>Adv. Int.</td>
<td>Post-head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>N, NP, Adv</td>
<td>Post-head</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.9. Summary and Conclusion

The aim of this chapter has been to provide a description of phrases in Silozi. The chapter has also demonstrated that Silozi does have a grammatical category identifiable as a phrase which is intermediate between the word and the clause. Four types of phrases corresponding to their word classes have been described, namely the noun phrase, adverb phrase, adjective phrase and prepositional phrase. The relationship between the verb and its dependents do not represent a structure which can be called a phrase in a clear way. We have pointed out that the structure of phrases is subject to the Silozi concordial grammatical system which maps prefixes on other parts of speech and elements that enter a relationship with a particular noun. Most heads of phrases are, therefore, stems. It is sometimes difficult to distinguish between a word, a phrase and a sentence, particularly with respect to verbal structures.

With respect to the order of constituents (linear order) in the phrases, the investigation has shown that there seems to be a tendency for placing lighter constituents (affixes) before heavier ones in most of the phrases. The processes of grammatical agreement, pronominal incorporation and cliticization which are inextricably attached to the Silozi grammatical system seem to have the morphosyntactic consequences of ordering phrasal constituents in terms of complexity. The Silozi (and Bantu) grammatical agreement system significantly place affixes and clitics before lexical items (words) and phrases. It is unquestionable that the affixes and clitics, as presented in our data, are structurally lighter than the elements they precede which are stems. Although these ordering patterns may not be directly the concern of LIPOC and EW, they do mirror some characteristics expounded in these hypotheses. It follows from this that they exhibit a tendency of occurring before
heavier elements. The chapter has also illuminated some of the limitations of some universals expounded in typological studies, particularly the constituency of the verb phrase. We close this chapter by stating that there are some aspects of Silozi phrases that have not been covered in the discussion. This account should provide a picture of the structure of Silozi phrases and the extent to which the theory of categorial complexity (LIPOC) affects constituent order therein. It should be emphasized that the chapter does not argue that the categorial complexity hypothesis operates in the same way as it does in the clause or sentence. It only suggests that there are some striking similarities. In the next chapter, we consider how phrases combine to form clauses.
Chapter 5

Silozi Clause and Sentence

5.1 Introduction

Chapters 3 and 4 described the structures of words and phrases. The present chapter continues the grammatical sketch of Silozi by focusing on the syntactic structure of the clause and sentence. The emphasis is on exploring constituent order in these categories by examining their distribution in relation to their internal structure. In accordance with the main aims of this study, the chapter also examines the effect of the theory of end weight and LIPOC on the order of constituents. It is hoped that at the end of the chapter, the facts about constituent order and the range of syntactic functional categories of clausal and sentential structure in Silozi will have been adequately and comprehensively explained. The discussion is limited to the complete, grammatical constructions, which have been referred to as “system sentences” (Lyons: ibid). These constructions are ‘unmarked’ clauses. According to the operational definitions proposed in section 2.6.1., these are structures which place the subject in the initial position. For the purposes of this discussion, these constructions belong to the pattern SVX. I will consider the more complex and marked structures in Chapters 7, 8 and 9.

The chapter is divided into two major parts. Part 1 focuses on the structure of the (simple) main clause while Part 2 deals with the sentence. The first part is organised as follows. In the first section, I provide a description of the declarative clause in Silozi. The second section discusses constituent order and the effect of end-weight in the clause. The organisation of part 2 is as follows: the first section will discuss the structure of the Silozi declarative sentence. The second section explores the order of constituents and the extent to which end-weight affects the order of constituents in this category. In section 6, we bring together all the findings about the structure of the two units with the conclusion that end-weight and LIPOC are determinants of the ordering of constituents therein.
5.1.1 The clause and the sentence

In the presentation, two strategies will be followed to describe the properties of the units. I will describe the clause in terms of the verb and its dependants. Since this chapter is concerned with the structure of main clauses and sentences, the verbs that are discussed are finite ones. I will also discuss valency operations since the notion of valency is closely aligned with the traditional idea of transitivity (Payne 1977, Van Valin & LaPola 1997). The term “clause” is used to refer to a grammatical unit intermediate between phrase and sentence. The distinctive feature of the clause is that it has a subject-predicate structure. The sentence on the other hand, is used to refer to a unit that contains more than one clause. In this case, “sentence” refers to the phenomenon of clause combination. For the purposes of this study, clauses like sentences, are made of constituents (elements), namely subject, predicator (or verb), object, complement and adverbial or (adjunct). These are the elements whose ordering we are investigating. As stated earlier, in order to investigate the ordering of these constituents, we shall have recourse to some principles of Functional Grammar constituent ordering. The specific aspects of FG that were mentioned in section 2.1.1. My main aim is to expand on them and show how they may be applied to constituent ordering in the Silozi clause. Although these specific aspects of the FG expression component have been outlined, I repeat them here for convenience: (a) the basic form of constituents, (b) the assignment of syntactic functional categories, (c) the order of constituents, (d) adjustments to the form of constituents, (e) prosody.

Matters of prosody (the prosodic contour which is to be assigned to the linguistic expression) are not extensively discussed in this study. It is also important to remember that in explaining the constituent ordering patterns of the Silozi clause, the focus is on the concrete rather than the abstract underlying structures. Dik (1997: 70) has observed:

"With respect to constituent order it should be remembered that the underlying clause structure is not linearly ordered, at least not in the sense of specifying the actual order of constituents in the surface structure of the linguistic expression. The ordering rules thus assign a linear position to constituents which do not yet have such a position. Therefore, these linearization rules are called placement rules."
From this statement it can be deduced that while the hierarchical surface structure of the clause is a result of a complex application of form-determining expression rules at various levels, the actual order of constituents is determined by placement rules. Recall that these rules define the position(s) the constituents may or must take in an ordering template relevant to the language in question. Placement rules work in conjunction with functional patterns (Connolly 1991b: 26). Accordingly, the description of the clause presented here is restricted to explaining the placement rules and the positions that are relevant to the ordering of constituents in the templates relevant to Silozi.

There are some claims made in FG that I have found appealing and useful in accomplishing the present task. In the first place FG proposes that its approach to constituent ordering is fully compatible with the co-existence of different patterns or templates, to be used in different conditions and for different purposes. Further, it is claimed that FG wishes to be generally applicable to natural languages. It should thus formulate rules, structures, and principles of language in a way which generalizes across languages of any type and is unbiased in relation to specific types. Arguably, this is what makes it claim to be typologically adequate.40 In other words, placement rules can take care of the different ordering patterns. It follows from this that the basic principles proposed in the expression component of FG may be extended and adapted to the description of constituent ordering patterns of any natural language. As stated previously, the examples provided in this discussion are limited to the specification of the possible placement rules and ordering templates (functional patterns) in Silozi. The formal nature of placement rules can be symbolised as follows (Dik ibid: 70-71):

---

40 Dik (1996: 84) asserts that for typological adequacy to be achieved in an interesting way, grammatical analysis should be couched in terms which are sufficiently abstract to be generally valid for natural languages. But in order to actually say something empirically relevant the analysis should be as concrete as possible. This seeming paradox, Dik claims, must be solved by seeking, in grammatical analysis, the level of optimal generalization across languages.
1 underlying structure: \{a, b, c, d\}
ordering template: 1 2 3 4
placement rules:
\begin{align*}
a &:= 4 \\
b &:= 2 \\
c &:= 1 \\
d &:= 3
\end{align*}
output sequence: c b d a

In this schema the description starts with an unordered set in underlying structure. Then, we have an ordering template consisting of positions, which are numbered or otherwise characterised. The placement rules tell us which constituents go to which positions under which conditions. The result is an ordered sequence of constituents. The operation of these rules has been applied to the following example:

2 underlying structure:
\{had [Vf], cook-ed [Vi], JohnSubj, the potatoesObj\}
ordering template: 1 2 3 4
placement rules:
\begin{align*}
Vf &:= 2 \\
Vi &:= 3 \\
Subj &:= 1 \\
Obj &:= 4
\end{align*}
output sequence: John had cooked the potatoes.

The main principles of the FG treatment of constituent ordering are followed here but are adapted in this respect to Silozi. For present purposes, it is not necessary to develop predicate formation rules for Silozi. Such rules are omitted from the account. The approach adopted here is that constituent order belongs to the surface structure. We are mainly concerned with describing the formal means of expressing discourse - pragmatic and semantic categories. This approach is endorsed by Andersen (1983: 57) who points out that a comprehensive analysis of language which subscribes to the 'placement principle' should take into account the linear order of constituents and the placement of elements. Accordingly, in the examples, I will only present the surface ordering templates for the constructions illustrated. In other words, we shall take it for granted that the constituents are placed in their respective positions by placement rules.
5.2. The simple clause

This section concentrates on intransitive clauses. Following the “subject predicate analysis” in which the sentence is divided into two parts (Palmer 1994), the simplest Silozi clause consists of a subject and verb (predicate). As may be known by now, arguments of the verb are not always coded as full NPs in Silozi. The examples provided in (3) illustrate the structure of Silozi intransitive clauses:

3  a  Mutangana a-nahana.
    Young man SM+PAST-deliberate
    The young man deliberated.

b  Kulu a-lila.
    Tortoise SM+PAST-cry
    Tortoise cried.

c  Bana ba Sikolo ba-yema.
    Children of school SM+PAST-stand
    The school children stood (up).

What the constructions in (3) show is that the subject precedes the verb in Silozi simple clauses; giving rise to the pattern SV. Note that once a constituent has been assigned a position in the linear sequence, that constituent can no longer move to any other position (see also Mallinson and Blake’s 1981:15 three principles). In terms of syntactic valency, the verbs in these examples have only one core argument.

5.2.1. Transitive clauses

Transitivity in the traditional view necessarily involves at least two participants and an action, which is typically effective. The transitive clause in this case is one in which the verb takes an object complement in addition to its subject (Givon 1984, Tomlin 1986). In relation to the valency Dik (1997: 8) observes that the quantitative valency of a predicate, i.e. the number of arguments with which it combines, can be affected in two ways by predicate formation: (i) valency extension, and (ii) valency reduction. With respect to valency extension, which is of relevance to our purposes, he states that “the quantitative valency of a predicate is extended when, for example, an intransitive predicate is turned into a transitive one.” We illustrate transitive constructions with the following examples:
4. a. Kamuyongole u-lata Katekwe.
   Kamuyongole SM+PRES-love Katekwe
   Kamuyongole loves Katekwe.

   b Muunamuhulu a-kwaula sikiso sahae.
   Man elderly SM+PAST-grab container his
   The elderly man grabbed his container.

   c. Muzumi yani na-bulaile Silukombwe.
   Hunter that SM+PAST-kill coke
   That hunter killed the cock.

This construction is referred to as the ‘clause proper’ in Dik’s FG. The surface structure of transitive clauses with full lexical arguments may be capture in the following template:

5 **surface structure**:  S  V₁, O

In this description, the subject is placed in position 1, the verb in 2 and the object in 3. Put in other words, the subject occupies the initial position and it is followed by the verb which in its turn is followed by the object. However, as we indicated in section 2.8., grammatical arguments are not always coded as full lexical elements. Silozi, like Setawana a dialect of Setswana (Demuth and Johnson) exhibits what is called “pro-drop” for both subject and arguments. These arguments perform grammatical and discourse functions such as reference. As we show later in this and subsequent chapters, the bulk of grammatical subjects and objects are coded as incorporated pronominal arguments in Silozi (natural) discourse. In order to account for clauses which consist of these types of arguments, we introduce the term single word clauses (SWCs), so called because they appear to be words which have the status of a clause. These will be elaborated on in Part 2 where they will be treated as alternative constructions to the canonical SVO. As illustrations consider the following:

   SM-OM-catch
   They have caught him.

   b Ba-ba-tamile.
   SM-OM-arrested
   They have arrested them.
c. U-latehile.  
SM+PRES-loss  
He is lost.

The verb may also take three core arguments in which case it is ditransitive. Some examples of such constructions are presented in (7):

7. a. Muzumi a-fa **mukuli wahae mulyani.**  
Hunter SM+PAST-give patient his medicine  
The hunter gave his patient medicine.

b. Baituti ba-ta-lumelela **Sandaula mendulu.**  
Educated SM-FUT-send Sandaula medal  
The educated will send Sandaula a medal.

c. Mboma u-ng’ole-zi **Kamuyongole ling’olo.**  
Mboma SM-write-PERF Kamuyongole letter  
Mboma has written Kamuyongole a letter.

The objects in (7)a are **mukuli wahae** and **mulyani.** In (7)b, the objects **Sandaula** and **mendulu** while in (7)c, it is **Kamuyongole** and **ling’olo.** The surface structure for such clauses is as follows:

7  **surface structure:** S V, O O

There is another valency increasing process in which the verb is marked with an “applicative” affix or “the applicative species” in Southern African Bantu linguistics tradition. This has been termed the “applicative construction” in the literature (Kimenyi 1980, Baker 1988, Hyman & Duranti 1982). They are also referred to as “double object constructions” (Bresnan and Moshi 1990). It is a construction in which the verb is ditransitive. The two objects in these clauses usually correspond to the “indirect” and “direct” object of English grammar. However, these terms have been found to be unsuitable in Silozi grammar and possibly other Bantu languages. Because of their structural and functional characteristics they are referred to as “primary” and “secondary” or “subsidiary” objects (Doke). Cole (ibid) asserts that the use of the applied form (affix) of the verb corresponds to that of various prepositions in English. This is because the applicative affixes give the sense of the preposition ‘for’ which marks the recipient in the English (cf example 8). The presence of the applied suffix marks the emminence of an “applied” or
“prepositional” object in Bantu. Hyman & Duranti (1982: 218) have observed that
the grammatical relations subject, (direct) object and oblique can be established
without controversy. They add:

“The major difficulty arises as soon as the notion of an ‘indirect’ object
is considered. In each Bantu language there exist a small number of
simplex verbs which in addition to the subject, can take two nominal
complements without marking either one with a preposition. Among the
verbs frequently used are ‘to give’, ‘to hide’, ‘to ask’, ‘to teach’.”

These construction types are rare in the data as simple clauses. The following
examples illustrate such constructions.41

8 a Musizana u-ñole-zi liñolo bo-ma-he.
    Girl SM+PAST+PERF-write-APPLIC letter RM-mother-PM
    The girl has written a letter for her mother.
b Mutangana u-lise-za ndatahe likomu.
    Youngman SM+PRES-herd-APPLIC father-his cattle
    The youngman herds cattle for his father.
c Bobby Kaluwe na-tolok-elanga bo-Headteacher Libombolwa
    Bobby Kaluwe SM+PAST-interpret+APPLIC RM-headteacher Libombolwa
    Bobby Kaluwe translated for Head teacher Libombolwa.

The ordering template and placement rules yields the following surface structures:

9. surface structure: S V, O O

---
41 According to the definitions proposed in Southern Bantu grammar the primary object is
that of the recipient/beneficiary, and is always expressed or represented by its objectival
concord (OM in our definition), whereas the subsidiary or secondary object is the goal/target.
(Cole 1975: 201) suggests that the applied form of the verb may have two objects, either or
both of which may be expressed as nouns or pronouns, or represented by their objectival
conords. The principal object is that of the applied idea of the verb, and is always expressed
or represented by by its objectival concord, whereas the the subsidiary or secondary object is
that of the original simple form of the verb and may be merely implied. When both objects
are expressed or represented by their objectival concords, the word or concord indicating the
principal object has precedence of order and is placed nearest the verb. The object
asymmetries and other grammatical relations in Bantu have been extensively discussed in
Mchombo (1993) where other theoretical aspects of Bantu grammar are addressed.
What the placement rules tell us is that the subject occupies the first position. The verb immediately follows it in the second position. The “primary” object then follows in the third position and the “secondary” is placed in the final position.

5.2.2. Word order typology

Having described and identified the ordering of the core arguments of the clause, I present the basic order of Silozi in this section. I follow the seminal work of Greenberg (1966) in which the basic order is determined in terms of the ordering of core nominal arguments subject and object relative to the predicate (verb). This approach presupposes that the grammatical relations are identifiable. It has been argued in the literature that identifying such elements especially subjects is problematic (cf Keenan 1976). From the examples provided in sections 4 and 5, it should be clear that establishing the core grammatical relations in Silozi is not problematic with respect to the simple, declarative clause with full lexical arguments. In these clauses the subject consistently occupies the preverbal position. We also observe that the objects consistently follow the verb. Going by the Greenbergian typology of word order, the three major constituents S O and V are identifiable. Therefore, we can say that subjects can be distinguished from objects by having a fixed position for each NP in the ordinary, basic constituent order. Lehmann (1978: 170) characterises SVO languages as those in which “simple, unmarked clauses agree with the SVO pattern, and require representations for the three constituents: Subject, Verb and Object. Neither the subject, nor the verb of a transitive verb may be omitted.” Based on this information and the predictions of the transitive verb, it is reasonable to conclude that Silozi belongs to one of the statistically dominant orders, which is SVO. Silozi is an SVO language.

5.2.2.1 Complex transitive verbs

The basic structure of the clause can also be extended when there is a complex transitive verb, i.e. a verb that takes a direct object and an object complement (see

---

42 See also Lehmann’s (1973) Structural Principle, Venneman’s (1974) Natural Serialization Principle, Hawkins’ (1980) Cross Category Harmony. Despite the modifications and negative conclusions about Greenberg’s basic concept in subsequent research, the contribution of his original insights to language typology cannot be denied (Hewitt (1996), (Dryer 1991). Payne (1997) endorses this view by asserting that despite all the problems with the Greenberg typology, it is still helpful to a reader of a grammar sketch to have some sense of the basic constituent order type the language represents. In the same spirit Payne (1987) refers to it as “the standard typological tradition”.

---
also section 5.3. below). Such clauses are illustrated below:

10 a Mitangana ba university *ba-mu-biza* professor wa litaba
Youngmen of university SM+PAST-OM-name professor of affairs

za naha ni za lifasi.
of countries and of world
The youngmen of the university named him professor of general
knowledge and public affairs.

b Bana bahae ba-*pendile* sipupe sabona bunsu.
Children his SM+PERF-paint poppy their black
His children have painted their poppy black.

To sum up, in so far as the distribution of the core arguments of the verb and its core arguments is concerned, Silozi does not show any spectacular differences from English and the Bantu languages that have been extensively studied and described. The only difference that has been noted is the clauses that have double objects. As noted in example 8, in Silozi two noun objects can follow the verb in succession without being preceded by a preposition. These are called applicative constructions. The constructions that we have described may be summarised in their normal order of appearance as follows:

11 a. *S + V*
b. *S + V + O*
c. *S + V + O + O*
d. *S + V + C*
e. *S + V + O + C*

So far I have only provided examples of applicatives. I will provide examples of constructions which involve an object and the oblique in the sections that follow.

5.3. Complementation.

In this section I further discuss the process of complementation in Silozi. This is determined by the nature of the verb. In addition to transitive verbs, there are predicates in Silozi (as in other languages) which are referred to as "complement-taking predicates" (CTPS) (Noonan 1985). Lehmann (1978) states that whatever the
devices used for complementation, it is simply a process of expanding the nuclear sentence. In this section, I would like to discuss their morphosyntax and their placement in the structure of the simple clause. We are concerned here with elements that typically act as complements of copular verbs. This contrasts with the older, more traditional treatment of a complement as any phrase that follows the verb be (or any other copular verb). Following from this, an object is distinguished from a complement in that it occurs with transitive verbs. A complement, on the other hand, only occurs with copular verbs ("linking verbs"). The simple clause in this case is extended because the verb takes on a complement.

The most common copula verb in Silozi is ki. Mwisiya (ibid: 14), referring to it as a 'copulative formative' states that "ki" is the most commonly known in Silozi. It is used to form copulatives e.g. ki mutu (it is a person). This is the equivalent of the English verb be. Copular verbs in Silozi include bonahala (seem, appear), ba (become), fetuha (become).

In addition to the above, Silozi complements exhibit two characteristics. First, a complement does not become the subject through a passive transformation. Second if there is both an object and complement in the clause or sentence, the complement comes after the object in typical active constructions which have corresponding passive constructions. In this case a necessary property of "passive" is that they have an alternative construction which can be expressed in the active. Since our focus is on the simple sentence in this part of the chapter, the complements that we are dealing with are its immediate constituents, which are words and phrases. As we saw in chapter 3, the typical words that function as complements are adjectives or nouns and phrases which are headed by these words. Some more examples to illustrate their occurrence are presented in (12)- (16). All the complements are in bold.

5.3.1. Adjectives:

12 a Basali bao ne-li ba-bandé  
Women those SM+PAST-be beautiful  
Those women were beautiful.

b. Punga na swabile.  
Punga SM+PAST-be sad  
Punga was sad.
c. Balikani bahae ne-ba-mu-bona *bukuba.*
Friends his SM-PAST-OM-consider foolish
His friends considered him foolish.

5.3.2. Nouns:

13 a Balisana babona ki *masholi.*
Herdsmen theirs PRES-be thieves
Their cowherders are thieves.
b Musizana yomung’wi yana lakaza Kamuyongole ki *Katewe.*
Girl particular who loved Kamuyongle is Katekwe
One particular girl who Kamuyongole admired is Katekwe.
c Bupilo ki *masunda.*
Life PRES-be struggle
Life is a struggle.

5.3.3. Adjective phrases:

14 a Batu ba munzi wo ne-li-baba *ñata-ñata.*
People of village this SM-PAST-be many many
The people of this village were many.
b Balikani bahae ba-ikutwa *bumaswe hahulu*
Friends his SM+PAST-feel bad very
His friends felt very bad (guilty).
c Basali bao neli *babande hahulu.*
Women those SM+PAST-be beautiful very
Those women were very beautiful.
5.3.4. Noun phrases:

15a Ndate Ngenda ki muzamaisi yomunde.
   Ndate Ngenda PRES-be leader good
   Ndate Ngenda is a good leader.

b Katekwe ki musala’a Mboma.
   Katekwe PRES-be wifeof Mboma
   Katekwe is Mboma’s wife

c Sandaula ki libizo la musebezi.
   Sandaula PRES-be name of profession
   Sandaula is a name of a profession, i.e. “Sandaula is a profession.”

5.3.5. Prepositional phrases:

The prepositional phrases presented in the examples below are necessary for the completion of the clauses. They are locative complements.

16 a Punga u-ile kwa Mungu.
   Punga SM-PERF-go to Mungu
   Punga has gone to Mungu.

e Mitangana ba-cezi mwa libala.
   Boys SM-PAST-be-burn in plains
   The boys were burnt in the plains.

f Kamuyongole na-pepezwi mwa sikiliti sa Mongu.
   Kamuyongole PAST-be-born in district of Mongu
   Kamuyongole was born in Mongu district.

In all the above examples, the surface structure for the constructions is of the pattern S V₁ C.

5.4. The ordering of other constituents in the Silozi clause

So far, all the examples presented to illustrate constituent ordering in Silozi have been limited to relatively short and simple sentences. The largest constituent of these clauses is the phrase. The descriptions of the syntax of the clause have been aimed mainly at the placement of clause-rank elements (i.e. direct and major constituents of the clause S V O and C). We have only presented information about the ordering of
the core building blocks within the predication. Satellites or clause margins (adverbials, coordinators and subordinators) have not been considered. If our grammar has to explain the facts of Silozi constituent order, it must account for the order of other constituents. In this subsection, I provide an account of these structural and functional aspects of Silozi CO. Two issues are addressed: clause internal and clause external modification extension. Specifically, I discuss the use of coordination, iteration and adverbs to expand the structure of the simple clause. Since most of the basic structures and their attendant orders have already been presented, we do not discuss them here. As before, we are concerned with unmarked declarative clauses.

5.4.1. Clause internal extension

The extension of the clause is done through the processes that affect the major constituents of the clause. The extension involves only the internal constituents. Instead of having simple structures in each grammatical category, we have complex ones. For example, instead of having a single word in the S position we would have a modified one. An account of the syntax of phrases and their ramifications is provided in chapter 4. For the present, I will only demonstrate how these structures are coded in the Silozi main clause. The devices used to extend grammatical categories within their designated positions are coordination, apposition and recursion. I will illustrate these in turn by using the central constituents (as functionally labelled) as points of reference. Since the placement rules and ordering templates for these structures have been presented above, I do not discuss them here.

5.4.1.1. Coordination

In Silozi, coordination may involve various types of categories in equally various grammatical positions. It is done through the coordinating conjunctions 'ni'(and), 'kapa' (or). These can be used to coordinate categories at the same level. In this section we are confining ourselves to phrases which are, in essence, compound subjects and compound objects. Here are some examples to illustrate some instances of coordination in our data.

I will start with coordination that involves the exponents of Subject. These are illustrated below:
17. a Basali ni baana kaufela ki bayambiba litapi babatuna.
Women and men all PRES-be trappers of fish great
Women and men are great fishermen.
b Muuna muhulu kapa mwana hae u-ta-yoka mezi.
Man old or son his SM-FUT-fetch water
The old man or his son will fetch water.
c Kamuyongole ni Katekwe ne-ba-puma-ni kuli ba-ta-nyalan'a.
Kamuyongole and Katekwe PAST-SM-promise-REC that SM-FUT-marry
Kamuyongole and Katekwe had promised each other that they would marry.

Coordinated objects can be seen in the following examples:

18 a Sandaula u-file muhulwana hae siapalo ni makatulo amansu.
Sandaula SM+PERF-give brother his shirt and shoes black
Sandaula has given his brother a shirt and black shoes.
b Litau li-bula-ile manamani amane ni mapulu aketalizoho.
Lions SM-kill-PERF calves four and oxen five
Lions have killed four calves and five oxen.
c Mutangana yo u-ni-fanga ma-tepu ni maCds amang'ata.
Young man this SM+PRES-OM-give tapes and CDs many
This youngman gives me many tapes and CDs.

The following examples illustrate coordinated Verbs or predicates.

19 a Kamuyongole na-ca ni ku nwa.
Kamuyongole SM-PAST-eat and to drink
Kamuyongole was drinking and eating.
b Basizana ba-tomile ni kulukisa lionda isali bona.
Ladies SM-PERF-fix and arrange dowries they themselves
The ladies have fixed and arranged the dowries themselves.
c Basizana ni bashimani ne-baopela ni ku bina
Boys and girls SM+PAST-sing and INF dance
Boys and girls sang and danced.

The coordinated verbs in 19(a) are ca and nwa. In Silozi the rule is that when the conjunction ni is used to coordinate verbs, the second verb becomes non-finite.
Precisely, it becomes an infinitive as can be seen in (19)a-c (see also (33) below). We now turn to examples that illustrate the placement of extended complements:

20 a Mutangana ki yo-munde ni butelele.
The young man SM-PRES-be handsome and tall
The young man is tall and handsome.
b Taba ne-ili yetata hahulu ni butelele.
Case SM-PAST-be complicated very and long
The case was lengthy and complicated.

Clause extension involving apposition is illustrated by the following examples:

21 a Muhulwana hae Spider Mpule Liholosi, yena mweli na-pilil-e
Elder brother his, Spider Mpule Liholosi, him first SM-live-PERF
nako yeninyani hahulu.
time short very
His elder brother, Spider Mpule Liholosi, the first born child had lived for a very short time.

b Muhulwana hae yomung’wi, ili yena ya-muamuha mazwele
Brother his another DET REL+PRES-OM-grab breasts
ki Wankie Sakunopa Liholosi, mutu ya-na-swana hahulu ni
is Wankie Sakunopa Liholisi person REL-PAST-look a lot with

Sandaula kuli inge bana bamabile.
Sanadaulalike like children wins
His other brother, the immediate one, is Wankie Sakunopa Liholosi who looked so much like Sandaula as if they were twins.
Headteacher, Peter Sunduma Likochokile  
neili muuna yomunde
Headteacher, Peter Sunduma Likochokile was man good

ya-na-lukile,  ya-na-sebelize  nako yetelele mwa likolo-
REL+PAST-be righteous  REL+PAST-be-work time long in schools

za Sabata pili asika cincezwa ku za muso.
of Sabbath before being transfer to of government
Headteacher, Peter Sunduma was a good, righteous man who had worked for a long time in the schools run by the Sabbath before transferring to government run ones.

5.4.1. 2. Iteration and recursion

In Silozi, as in many languages, there are many constructions whose generation requires recursion. Recursion is, in fact, thought to be so pervasive in natural languages, that, in general, there is no definite limit to the number of instances of recursion (Crystal 1992). The term recursion has been used to refer to two different patterns or phenomena. It may be applied to phrases, clauses and sentences. In this case, it is restricted to constructions in which one construction is embedded in another construction of the same category. That is, a constituent may contain constituents of the same category as itself. Thus Trask (1993) defines recursion as:

“The phenomenon by which a constituent of a sentence dominates another instance of the same category; equivalently, the phenomenon by which the rules of a formal grammar permit a category to have an instance of the same category as a descendant.”

In another, more general sense, it refers to the application of a rule almost indefinitely. For instance, Lyons (1968: 221) states that rules that may be applied an indefinite number of times are called recursive. He cites the coordination of nouns, clauses and the modification of nouns with adjectives as examples of constructions the generation of which requires recursive rules. Crystal (ibid) referring to recursive rules as ‘iterative’ states that the rule for inserting adjectives before a noun applies recursively. Given this information, we can argue that recursion involves both multiple coordination and embedding of categories. Needless to say, words can only admit coordination. This section is mainly concerned with the description of
recursive constructions involving the immediate constituents of the simple sentence: words and phrases, i.e. clausal recursion. Sentential recursion is dealt with in Part Two.

The description that follows assumes that recursion involves coordination or subordination of constituents. We use it in a rather general sense to refer to the generative feature of language that makes it possible for some structures to be repeated endlessly. For instance, there is no theoretical limit to the length of an adjective string, prepositional phrases that can follow each other, or even relative clauses. In this case, we are extending its use to refer any rule that can be applied repeatedly without any limit. This will help us to explain constructions which involve multiple coordination. With this information in mind, the following are some examples of categories that recur in my data:

22 a Batu ba munzi wo ba-fumile likomu, mikolo, mataka, People of village this SM+PRES-posses cattle, canoes, reeds, lifolofolo, linyunywani, tunyandi miwayo mane niona mezi. animals, birds, nets, spears even and water. The people of this village possess cattle, canoes, reeds, animals, birds, fishing nets, spears and even the water itself.

b Kamuyongole na-pepezwi mwa sikiliti sa Mongu ili Kamuyongole SM+PAST-be-bear in district of Mongu which-is mwa silalo sa Mukuku. in area of Makuku Kamuyongole was born in Mongu district in the area of Makuku.

c. Musalahae niyena a-ituta bupilo bwa muuna hae Wife his she.too SM+PAST-learn life of husband her bwa kutabela batu. of liking people His wife also learnt the life of her husband of liking people.
5.4.2. Clause external modification

By clause external modification we mean the extension of the structure of the clause which involves external categories. These are variously referred to as margins, satellites and adjuncts. They are, in effect, adverbials which are usually unessential to the grammatical structure but are important informationally. As we established in section 3.2.3, and as established in linguistic theory, the class of adverbs (and adverbials) are the most heterogeneous category in terms of morphology, syntax and semantics. Consequently, rules governing this area of syntax are very difficult to formulate with precision. With the present state of knowledge, a complete generative description of the placement rules of adverbials is unattainable. The placement and classification of adverbials has mainly been done by considering their semantic functions (Dik 1970, Thompson & Longacre 1985). The notional range of adverbs varies with the type of constituent modified. Since the description of clauses presented in this chapter has been associated with the verb, it is reasonable to focus our attention on adverbs that modify verbs and verb phrases to demonstrate this phenomenon in Silozi. Schachter (1985) has noted that modifiers of verbs or verb phrases commonly express time, place, direction, manner, etc. In this section, I discuss the placement of simple adverbials in Silozi. The discussion is confined to single words or phrases, which are the immediate constituents of the clause. Let us consider words first. The most common external modifiers of the clause are adverbs, which we discussed in section 3.2.3. The following examples illustrate clause modification involving an adverb:

23 a Banana ba-ta-pota kamuso
Children SM-FUT-visit tomorrow
The children will visit tomorrow.

b Katekwe na-bulela ka-lilato.
Katekwe SM+PAST-speak romantically.
Katekwe spoke romantically.

c Mala a-na-bila ka bunyemi a-bata pooo
Intestines REL-PAST-be-boil with anger SM+PAST-cool IDEO

ka-sabo yetuna.
with-fear great
The intestines which were boiling with anger calmed down with great fear.
The clause in (23)c is extended by an ideophone which indicates the intensity of the coldness felt in the intestines. The surface structure of this construction is shown below:

24 surface order: S V, X

In this schema position the adverb immediately follows the verb. The ordering template has been extended in order to accommodate the position X which is occupied by extra material, which in this case is an adverb. There are however surface structures in which there is a transitive verb and an adverbial in (25).

25 a Mihupulo yeo ya-kataza Kamuyongole hahulu.
    Thoughts those SM+PAST-haunt Kamuyongole much
    Those thoughts haunted Kamuyongole a lot.

b Punga a-lemuha takazo ya-munyana hae mwa mikiti.
    Punga SM+PAST-notice interest of-brother his in parties
    Punga noticed his brother's (strong) desire in parties.

c Ngunga a-talima mulikana hae kabunyemi.
    Ngunga SM+PAST-look friend his angrily
    Ngunga looked at his friend angrily.

d Basali ba-swala litapi ka lizuma.
    Women SM+PRES-catch fish with baskets
    Women catch fish with baskets.

e Muzumi na-bulaile folofolo ka lisho.
    Hunter SM+PAST-kill animal with spear
    The hunter killed the animal with a spear.

(25)d and (25)e have been included to illustrate examples of clauses which contain an object and an oblique. They show that it is possible in Silozi to have a construction in which the verb is a ditransitive verb, one in which there is a transitive verb and one in which there is a transitive verb whose object is followed by the oblique. We may posit the following surface structure for these constructions:

26 surface structure: S V, O A

Before closing the discussion of clausal extension through obligatory and optional (but informationally crucial) elements, I would like to demonstrate that the adverb
may occur between the verb and object. Obviously, this is because of their characteristic considerable constituent order flexibility and enormous variability according to their semantic type. These positions are illustrated in the example:

27 a Kamuyongole u-lakaza hahulu mikiti.
    Kamuyongole SM-PRES-like much parties
    Kamuyongole likes parties a lot.

  b Manzwi ao a-taba hahulu Kamuyongole kwa pilu.
    Words those SM+PRES-hurt a lot Kamuyongole in heart
    Those words hurt Kamuyongole.

The surface structure for these constructions is as follows:

28 **surface structure**: S V A O

In what follows I provide some examples of clause extension that involve iterated or coordinated adverbials:

29 a **SVA**

  Banana ba-ta-yota kamuso ni sunda yetaha.
  Children SM-FUT-visit tomorrow and week next
  The children are coming to visit tomorrow and next week.

  b **SVOA**

  Muunamuhulu na-boni basali kwa lisima ni kwa masimu.
  Man old SM-PAST-see women at well and at fields
  The old man saw the women at the well and at the fields.

  c **SVOOA**

  Nalishebo-u-ta-fa malumahe miwayo mwa lapa lahae kamuso.
  Nalishebo SM-FUT-give uncle-his spears in yard his tomorrow
  Nalishebo will give his uncle spears in his yard tomorrow
d SVOCA
Batu ba Nangayula ba-bizaka-nga mung’a bona mabizo amaswe
People of Nangayula SM+ PRES-call-PROG leader their names bad

nako kaufela.
time all
The people of Nangayula call their leader bad names all the time.

It is also possible to have the basic structures extended using adverbials repeatedly. We demonstrate this below:

30 Mpule Liholosi na-shwile lifu la ku-swalwa ki kwena mwa sileze
Mpule Liholosi SM+ PAST-die death of to-be-caught by crocodile in mud

fa likamba la Moombo bukaufi ni lilundu la Mwanambinyi ka
on bank of Moombo near to hill of Mwanambinyi at

nako ya musihali.
time of day.
Mpule Liholosi was killed by a crocodile in the mud on the banks of Moombo near Mwanambinyi hill during day time.

Given the wide functional, formal and notional range of adverbs, it is not possible to provide a full account of their instantiations in the present work. The above examples illustrate their ability to undergo extension through coordination and recursion. Positionally, the adverbials tend to be placed towards the end of the clause. The observation made by Hawkins (1994) that when AdvPs contain right branching daughter complements such as PP will occur only post verbally supports this pattern. In terms of the predictions of LIPOC and weight principles, this is because the addition of a PP creates a longer or more complex constituent. A single adverb is shorter than a combination of an adverb and PP. We return to this issue later. In what follows I consider the structure of the Silozi sentence.
5.5. Part 2: The sentence: clause combinations

The main aim of this second part of the chapter is to discuss the ways in which simple clauses combine to form complex sentences. The discussion focuses on declarative, unmarked clauses. Silozi provides numerous ways in which two or more clauses can be united. As in many other languages, these range from simple joining of two sentences with a conjunction to various constructions in which one sentence is “embedded” in and “subordinated” to another. Complex sentences are divided into grammatically co-ordinated and subordinated clauses. In what follows, I present an account of co-ordination and subordination with respect to compound and complex sentences in turn. The presentation is a simplification that does not take account of various patterns of coordination and subordination.

5.5.1. The compound sentence

Silozi uses several conjunctions to link clauses of equal syntactic status. The coordinating conjunctions in Silozi are “ni”, “mi” (and), “kapa” (or) and “kono” (but). Before presenting the actual constructions, it is important to recognise the fact that Silozi clausal coordination is coded in quite a different way from English. While the subjects of both the coordinated clauses are full nominals or NPs in English this is not the case in Silozi, especially in discourse. The subject of the initiating clause is always a full NP while that of the subsequent clauses one is generally not if they have the same referent. Below are examples to illustrate coordinated clauses (where cc = coordinating conjunction):

31 a Sakunopa u-sa-pila kono ki sihole. U-kile-awa
Sakunopa SM-PRES-alive c.c. SM+PRES-be cripple SM-PERF-PAST-fall
fa pelesa asali mwanana mia-sikuka noka ni ling’wele.
from ox SC young cc SM+PAST-twist hip and knee
Sakunopa is alive but he is a cripple. He had fallen off the back of an ox when he was young and (he) twisted his hip and knee.
162

b. Muuna wa batu, yena ndatahe mucaha a-kwaula
Man of people, him father of young man SM+PRES-get

sikiso sahae ni kuliba kwa lisima.
container his cc to go to well

The man, the young man’s father himself, got his container and (he) went to the well.

The surface structures for the ordering of clauses in sentences can be symbolised as follows (where cc is a coordinating conjunction):

32 surface structure: Cl1 cc Cl2

The placement rules tell us that the first clause goes to the first position. The coordinating conjunction goes to the second position. The second clause goes to the third position. Having posited the placement rules and the ordering template for the constituents of the compound sentence, we may now answer the question: how does Silozi’s coordination mechanism differ from that of English or similar languages which have been more extensively described? I will answer this question by referring to the examples in (31). What we observe in these examples is that the subject position of the first clause is occupied by a full NP which is Sakunopa. On the other hand, the subject of the second clause ki is not a full NP. It combines the functions of predicate, pronominal, agreement marker and subject which refer to the “Sakunopa”.43 It is defined in Jalla’s (1982: 113) dictionary as a verb particle which is used when the predicate is a noun, a pronoun or an adverb. It is important to note that this definition does not say anything about the inter-clausal (discourse) functions of this element. I would like to submit that it does have discourse and grammatical functions. Coming back to the more relevant issue, what we see in the examples is that the English glosses of these coordinated clauses show the presence of full NPs. This means that coordination in some other languages at this level involves the use of full nominals (nouns or pronouns). Silozi does not (c.f. section 2.7. for the coding of grammatical relations where the roles of these units are treated in detail).

Another difference between Silozi clausal coordination and that of English manifests itself when the conjunction “ni” (and) is used.

43 Recall that elsewhere “Ki” is used as the typical copular verb (the equivalent of the English be).
33 a Bazamai kaufela ba-mu-tonda ni ku-mu-lila.
Travellers all SM+PAST-OM-miss c.c INFT-OM-cry
All the travellers missed him and cried for his services.

b Kulu a-itumela ni ku sepisa kuli u-ta-latelelela
Tortoise SM+PRES-be.thankful cc to promise COMP SM-FUT-follow
ze ne-bulezwi hande cwalo.
what PAST+be-say well so
Tortoise was thankful and promised that he would follow what said so well.

In (33)a, the two clauses bazamai kaufela ba mutonda and kumulila are joined by the conjunction ni. In (33)b, the two clauses are Kulu aitumela which is is joined to ku sepisa kuli utalatelela ze nebulezwi hande cwalo by ni. In each one of these sentences the subject of clause 2 is omitted or “deleted. As we have seen in (19), the verb phrase of the clause 2 is also reduced to a non-finite infinitive verb form and its complement when the conjunction ni is used. In other words, the subject and predicate of the second coordinate clause need not have the same and equal syntactic status as the first one. Superficially, and when interpreted in English, the sentences have the surface structures of complex clauses. It should be emphasised that they are compound sentences which involve coordinated clauses according to the syntactic rules of Silozi. The alternative reading of the sentences that include full nominals would be as in (34). Although the glosses have been provided in (33), I repeat them here for convenience. Note the change in the syntactic status of the subject of the second coordinate:

34 a Bazamai kaufela ba-mu-tonda mi ba-mu-lila.
Travellers all SM+PAST-OM-miss cc SM+PAST-OM-cried
All the travellers missed him and they bemoaned (his services).

b. Kulu a-itumela mia-sepisa kuli u-ta-latelelela
Tortoise SM+PAST-thanks cc SM+PAST-promise that SM-FUT-follow
ze-bulezwi hande cwalo.
what+BE-PAST-say well so
Tortoise expressed his gratitude and he promised that he would follow what was said so well.
What is evident in the above examples is that the most common means of indicating conjunction is by the use of a coordinating conjunction. This normally occurs between the two conjoined clauses. As further illustration of these, consider the following example:

35. Balikani bahae ne-ba-mu-bona bukuba, mi ba-kala
   Friends his SM-PAST-OM-consider foolish, c.c SM+PAST-start
   ku mu-seha ni ku mu-sheununa mane ba-mu-beya libizola
   to him-laugh c.c. to him-mock c.c SM+PAST-him-give name of
   Sandaula kono ba-palelwa ku-mu-tepeleza mane ba-ikutwa
   Sandaula c.c SM+PAST-fail to-OC-past-discourage c.c. SM+past-feel
   bumaswe mwa lipilu.
   badness in hearts
   His friends considered him foolish and started laughing at him and mocked him and even nick-named him Sandaula but they failed to discourage him and they felt very guilty.

The data show some instances of clause coordination without using overt conjunctions. This asyndetic coordination is illustrated below (where* marks the position of asyndetic coordination):
36. a. Tuchikwi tu-fundukile * kale,* bashemi batona ba-sa-i-tukisa
Goslings SM+PERF-leave already, parents their SM-still-REF-prepare
kaza musipili wa kamuso.
for trip of tomorrow
The goslings have already left, their parents are still preparing themselves for tomorrow's trip.
b. Mubusisi wa tuto a-nyema, * a-tenuka,
Governor of education SM+PAST-fume, SM+PAST-shout,
a-yukauka, * a-bonisa lilo.
SM+PAST-scream SM+PAST-display anger
The education governor fumed, shouted, screamed displayed extreme anger.

In these sentences the missing coordinating conjunctions could be supplied. The missing conjunctions are "mi" or "kono" for these slots. When included, the sentences would read as follows:

37. a. Tuchikwi tu-fundukile kale kono/mi bashemi
Goslings SM+PAST-leave-PERF already c.c parents
babotona ba-sa-i-tukisa.
their SM+still-REF-prepare
The goslings have already left and/ but their parents are still preparing themselves.
b. Mubusisi wa tuto a-nyema mi a-tenuka mi
Governor of education SM+PAST-fume c.c SM+PAST-shout cc
a-yukauka mi a-bonisa lilo.
SM+PAST-scream c.c SM+PAST-display anger
The education governor fumed and shouted and screamed and displayed extreme anger.
5.5.2. The complex sentence

The complex clause reflects a relationship in which one clause is subordinated to the other. The embedded unit is a nonfinite clause. Subordination is done through the use of an array of conjunctions in Silozi. Some examples of such conjunctions are “kuli” (that, in order that, so that), “ha” (when), “kabakala” (because, because of), “niha” (although). In what follows, I discuss their morphosyntactic behaviour and the placement of the constituents. The surface structure of the complex sentence can be symbolized as follows:

38. MCI + SCI

In these sentences, one of the clauses (the main clause) is modified by one or more subordinate clauses, which is grammatically dependent upon it. As a rule, the subordinate clause must be introduced by a conjunction. This presentation is concerned with subordinate clauses that function as complements and adverbials. Relative clauses and how they function were the subject of the NP structure and will not be dealt with here.

5.5.2.1. Complementation

Silozi complement clauses are associated with complementizers. Three types of complementizers are generally used in Silozi. As stated above, complements occur after the verb. In a transitive clause they follow the object. The common complementizers are: “kuli” (that), “ku” (the infinitive) and some non-finite verb forms. These, together with the complements, are illustrated below:
39. a Mubusisi watuto a-bulelela maticele kuli
Inspector of education SM+PAST-tell teachers COMP

u-ta-ba-lundula haiba a-fumana kashwau kaka:
SM+PAST-OM-dismiss if SM+PAST-find indiscipline that

cwalo mwa sikolo hape.
kind in school again
The inspector of education told the teachers that he would dismiss them if
he found that kind of indiscipline in the school.

b Mutangana na-bata ku nyala basali bao.
Young man SM+PAST-want COMP marry women those
The young man wanted to marry those women.

c. Sicaba sa-bulelela Kupalelwa kuli a-inyaze ka
People SM+PAST-ask Kupalelwa COMP SM+PRES-apologise for

lishwau la hae
rudeness of his
The people asked Kupalelwa to apologize for his rudeness.

Although the main focus of this section is on nominals that function as objects, this is
not the only function they serve in the clause. Complement clauses can also function
as subjects. The following examples show constructions in which subordinate clauses
function as subject complements:

40. a. Sa-ezize Kulu ki ku apula mulomo kuli a-bulelele sicaba
What-did Tortoise is to open mouth comp SM+PRES-tell people

se-ne-sitezi fa fasi kuli ha-bana-ku-fumana mai hape.
REL-PAST-gather on ground COMPNEG-SM-to-find eggs again
What tortoise did was to open his mouth in order to tell the people
gathered on the ground that they would never get eggs again.
b. Ku-siya Ngoma inge ilila ku yolobala ki ku salata
To leave drum while it is sounding to sleep is to dislike
ngoma yeo.
drum that
To leave a drum while it is still sounding is to dislike that drum.
Lit. “Leaving a party while it is still going on is to dislike that party.”
c. Mutu ku tatula simu ki ku ziba kuli u-ta-kutula
Person to start garden is to know COMP SM+FUT-harvest
For a person to start a garden he must expect that he will harvest
(something).

Before leaving this section, it is useful to remember that this position is rather
unusual for clauses. We shall return to this in section 5.6.2. where the distribution of
subordinate clauses is discussed.

5.5.2.2. Adverbial Clauses

The complex sentence may be modified by an adverbial clause. As with
complements, adverbial subordinate clauses are marked by a subordinating element,
which always precedes the subordinate clause. They differ from complements in that
they are optional constituents. They stand in an adverbial relationship with the matrix
clause. As illustrations for these clauses, consider the following:

41a Sandaula u-lata kutina malukwe kabakalakuli
SM+PRES-SM+PAST-like to wear trousers SC

        u-bata kupata busisani bwa mahutu a hae.
SM+PRES-want to hide thinness of legs of his
Sandaula likes wearing trousers because he wanted to hide the thinness of
his legs.
b Kamuyongole na-bata ku-nyala Katekwe nihaixe
Kamuyongole SM+PAST-want INF-marry Katekwe SC

na-nyezwi ku Mboma.
SM+PAST-marry to Mboma.
Kamuyongole wanted to marry Mboma although she was married to Mboma.

c Bo Silukombwe ba-kutela kwa mukopano kasamulahoa
The cocks SM+PAST-return to meeting SC

ku palelwa ku kena mwa sinkwana-tuna seo.
INF fail INF fail into pot-big that
The cocks returned to the meeting after failing to enter that big (water) pot.

5.5.2.3. Compound-complex sentence

This type of sentence contains at least two coordinated clauses and at least one subordinate clause, thereby making it compound and complex. Consider the following examples:

42 a Mubusisi wa tuto Robin Deville a-nyemela Muluti
Governor of education Robin Deville SM+PAST-accost teacher

Libombolwa mi a-nyaza maticlekaufela ka-kusa luta
Libombolwa cc SM+PAST-blame teachers all SC-not teach

bana basikolo likute ni ku saba makuwa.
children school manners and to fear whites
The school governor accosted teacher Libombolwa and criticised all the teachers for not teaching the school children good manners and fearing white people.
The teacher Libombolwa seemed to be embarrassed and (he) froze because of the stupidity of his school children.

In (42)a, the two main clauses are joined by the conjunction *mi* (and) and the subordinate clause is introduced by the subordinating conjunction *ka kusa* (for not). This is followed by another quasi clause which is introduced by the conjunction *ni* (and). In (42)b, the main clauses are joined by the conjunction *mi* and the subordinate clause is introduced by the conjunction *bakeng'isa*. Both the surface structure of the complex-compound sentences as illustrated in (43) may be symbolised as follows (where *x* marks any possible recursion):

43  **surface structure:**  C11 cc C12 SCC1x

### 5.5.2.4. Silozi multiple sentences and typology

In this section I briefly discuss the implications of the ordering of Silozi clauses in multiple sentences for typology. In particular, I want to firmly establish its type. Let us consider compound sentences first. From the above examples, it can be observed that syntactically, coordinating conjunctions in Silozi consistently occur between the elements they conjoin. These central coordinators do not allow preceding conjunctions or conjuncts (which we deal with in the next section). They are also restricted to the first position of the second clause. According to Schachter’s classification, coordinating conjunctions which exhibit such characteristics are prepositional, since they form structural units with the conjuncts they precede, while unlike in languages like Japanese, they can be characterised as postpositional, since they form structural units with the conjuncts they follow. “It appears that the prepositional or postpositional character of coordinating conjunctions that occur in a language are quite systematically associated with the language’s general word-order characteristics. Specifically, non-verb-final languages have the prepositional type of conjunction, verb-final languages the postpositional type” (Schachter 1985: 46). From our observations about the general basic order of Silozi, it is an SVO language. This makes it prepositional coordinating language from the typological point of view.
Let us now establish its type with respect to complex typology. To do this we need to refer to its basic word order again. We have established above that Silozi is an SVO language. All we have to do is to adduce information to ascertain whether it exhibits the characteristics of SVO languages. The characteristics of such language types have been proposed by Lehmann (1978: 195) who argues that while coordination, or parataxis, is general in sentences of SVO languages, it is far more characteristic of OV languages, which tend to have many nonfinite forms for linking clauses paratactically. He further claims that SVO languages on the other hand are more widely characterised by subordination or hypotaxis. The other characteristics which are relevant to our purposes are: (i) clause relationships are introduced by means of specific conjunctions; (ii) the subordinate clause may precede or follow the main clause; (iii) conjunctions may be omitted.

Greenberg (1963, 1966), Lehmann (1973, 1978), Venneman (1973, 1974) and Hawkins (1980, 1983) inter alia, have carried out studies to establish some typologies. In a similar spirit, Dryer (1992) presents evidence from a large and diverse sample of languages to provide evidence for THE BRANCHING DIRECTION THEORY (BDT). This theory predicts that languages tend towards one of two ideals: right branching languages, in which phrasal categories follow non-phrasal categories, and left-branching languages in which phrasal categories precede non-phrasal categories. The categories which are relevant to our purposes from his study are the correlation between the placement of adverbial subordinators, adverbs (and adverbials in general), complementizers and the order of verb and object. His conclusion is that, with some exceptions, (S)VO languages tend to be prepositional. He also claims that adverbs precede the verb more often among OV languages than among VO languages. The most common position of manner adverbs is after the verb. There is some evidence from Dryer’s study, which we can use to extend this characteristic of adverbs to adverbials in general. He asserts:
"Thus one account of the correlation between the order of verb and manner adverb and that of verb and object is to view it as an instance of a more general correlation between the order of verb and adverbial and the order of verb and object. On this view, manner adverbs belong to the general category ‘adverbial’, which is a phrasal category, since it includes adpositional phrases. It is questionable, however, whether ‘adverbial’ constitutes a grammatical category in the conventional sense of this term. Rather, it seems to be a functional category that includes a number of different categories that serve the same function” (Dryer 1992: 123)

It is clear from this quotation that Dryer acknowledges that the “adverbial” is a functional category that includes a number of different categories that serve the same function. The categories that he puts in this function are limited to phrases (adpositional phrases). Hence he refers to some instances of relative clauses as belonging to the “phrasal category”. The standard view of “adverbial” in the literature is that it may be a word, phrase, or clause. The existence of these categories has led to the existence of the categories adverb phrase, prepositional phrase and adverb clause. With this information, it is legitimate to include clauses in the category adverbial since it serves the same functions as those of adverbs and adverbial phrases. Further, the range of meaning conveyed by adverbs (manner, location, time, etc.), which Dryer and others treat as correlates of the verb and object is shared by adverbial clauses. A further prediction confirmed by Dryer’s BDT and Hawkins (1990: 225) is that complementizers in VO seem invariably to be initial, adding that final complementizers may be more common in OV languages than they are in VO languages. Finally, VO correlates with the copular and predicate pattern, i.e. VO& CopPred.

The question may be asked: Does Silozi exhibit most if not all of these characteristics? Based on the characteristics of SVO languages presented above, the answer to this question is that it does. On the basis of the constituent orders it permits, we can identify the type to which it belongs. The available facts from the examples provide strong evidence for this. I will briefly summarise them here. The first is that conjunctions are used to effect hypotaxis or subordination. Second, subordination is found whether or not the two related clauses have the same subject. We also observe that adverbials exhibit a strong tendency to occur on the same side of the verb as the object. Silozi also exhibits a correlation between VO and CopPred
in that the copular verb is followed by its predicates at all levels. The other characteristic which Silozi shows is that the main clause cannot have a complementizer, but embedded clauses may. In fact, embedded clauses must be introduced by complementizers or subordinating conjunctions. From the point of view of the standard typological tradition, Silozi possesses a whole range of properties characteristic of (S)VO languages. The ordering of the verb and object and their correlations exhibit traits that typically co-occur with VO languages that have thus far been studied. It is therefore a familiar (S)VO language. The SVO pattern is also reflected in the embedded or subordinate clause as illustrated in the following examples:

44 a Sandaula ki libizola musebezi *sina onacwalo minister haetelezi*

Sandaula is name of job just as minister SM+PRE-head ministry.

Sandaula is a name of a profession just as a minister heads a ministry.

b Mutangana a-bulelela Katekwe *kuli u-ta-lindula Mboma*

Young man SM+PAST-tell katekwe SC SM-FUT-hit Mboma zazi la-fita.
day SM+PAST-arrive
The young man told Katekwe that he would hit Mboma on the day he arrived.

c Punga ni munyana hae ba-fumana *kuli sicaba*

Punga cc brother his SM+PAST-discover COMP people

ne-si-ba-tabela bashemi babona hane ba-sa-pila.
SM-PAST-OM-like parents their SC SM+PRES-still-alive
Punga and his brother discovered that people liked them when their parents were still alive.

In these examples, the Subject-Predicate object pattern is present in both the main and subordinate clause. This is indicated by the presence of a subject marker in both the matrix and the subordinate clause. Before closing the discussion, I provide some
examples of long sentences in SVX type of constructions. The subordinating and
coordinating conjunctions are in bold:

45 a Bashemi bahaebubeli bwa bona hakuna ya-na-keni sikolo
Parents his both of them none REL-PERF-PAST-enter school

kono nekuli cwalo ndatahe Manyando na-tabela kuli but despite this father-his Manyando SM+PRES-want COMP

mwanahae akenesikolo, kakuli likomu li-ta-liswa ki Punga
son his enter school SC cattle SM-FUT-herd by Punga

muhulwana Kamuyongole.
brother.of Kamuyongole
None of his parents was educated but despite this Kamuyongole's father wanted him to go to school because the cattle would be herded by Punga, Kamuyongole's brother.

b. Punga a-lemuha takazo ya munyanaa hae mwa mikiti mi
Punga SM+PAST-notice desire of younger-brother his in parties CC

a-mu-eleza kuli anyale kakuziba lika ze-telanga
SM-PAST-OM-advice SC marry knowing things REL-happen

ba ba-tabela mikiti of babanca.
those REL-like parties for young
Punga advised his brother that he should get married knowing that bad things happen to people who frequent parties for young people.
The purpose of splitting the hippo so quickly was to extract the liver and rush it to his wife at home if she had already returned from where she had already gone and to ask the people of the village to help him skin the hippo.

We have established that Silozi has morphosyntactic means of linking two or more clauses through coordination and subordination. In general, recursive rules can be applied to add independent and subordinate clauses. This effectively leads to syntactic complexity. Givon (1990: 687) observes that embedding one clause within another is, by definition, an increase in the syntactic complexity of the ‘host’ clause and that languages may possess the formal grammatical apparatus for creating such embedded structures and for recreating them recursively in more complex yet multiple embeddings. However, it is important to remember that the occurrence of such complexity in actual—especially oral communication— is strongly constrained by cognitive (perceptual and productive) factors as we show in chapter 8. To sum up, I would like to state that Silozi employs numerous complex ways linking its clauses into sentences. There are many subordinating conjunctions in the language and we cannot cover all of them within the scope of this study. It is sufficient for our purposes to have shown how they work to link clauses.

5.6. LIPOC and TOEW: implications for the distributions and tendencies

So far we have only described the ordering of constituents in the units under investigation. I would now like to focus attention on one of the other main aims of this study, which is to ascertain the efficacy of weight principles and in particular the predictions of LIPOC. The basic tenets of these principles have been outlined in chapter 2. I will briefly recapitulate them here and discuss their implications for the
distribution of constituents in our data. The ethos of the principles is that shorter elements precede longer weightier elements (Andersen 1983).

There seems to be general agreement in the literature that this principle is relevant to constituent ordering. However, the explanations and the structures cited for these are different. For convenience, the studies on weight principles can be divided into two broad types. The first consists of studies which focus on word order and correlations. The structures are also limited to certain categories, particularly the ordering of the verb and subject and ordering of heads and dependents which Dryer refers to as the ordering of phrasal and non phrasal elements (see the review in section 2.3.1). Further, these studies explain order by using parsing and performance principles. Dryer’s (ibid) extensive work which espouses the BRANCHING DIRECTION THEORY is formulated in purely syntactic terms. However, she proposes that the word order correlations ultimately reflect the nature of the human parser. Primus (1993) observes that although word order is determined by an interaction between pragmatic principles and weight based principles, the former is not the primary determinant of word order variation. By using data from various languages, she concludes that the preferred position of syntactic nodes marked with a pragmatic feature is not straightforwardly explicable by intrinsic pragmatic property of these nodes. “Rather, the preferred position of sentence topics and that of focused constituents is dependent upon their average weight and thus, straightforwardly explained by performance principles based on syntactic weight (most explicitly formulated in Hawkins (1990)).”

More recent work by Hawkins (1994) seeks to provide an alternative approach to performance: the Early Immediate Constituents (EIC). The structures on which the predictions are tested are mainly heads and their dependants, i.e. NPs, VPs and PPs.

These studies, although empirical, detailed and statistically reliable, leave some constituent order facts unexplained. This is because they are limited to either the phrasal category or the central arguments of the clause. The effect of weight and, by extension, of LIPOC has not been applied to all the constituents of the clause or sentence. Discourse tends to be expressed in clauses or sentences, which are the linguistic expression of a proposition. Payne (1997: 71) argues that communication tends to be multipropositional, consisting of groups of “conceptual chunks”, each contributing some bit of information to the message to be communicated. This shows that restricting the study of constituent ordering to the phrase or the central arguments of the clause (S V and O) is not useful. What we need is an alternative
approach which accounts for all the elements that constitute the structure of the clause or sentence.

The most appropriate proposals for explaining constituent ordering at the clause and sentence level are probably Dik’s (ibid). The insights I use from Dik are mainly based on his revised Part 1 Theory of Functional Grammar: The Structure of the Clause and Part 2 of his volumes of his theory of Functional Grammar. Unlike the proposals cited above, Dik’s proposals deal with matters of complexity and internal structure of constituents at the sentence and clause level. He proposes placement rules, which assign positions to the constituents of the underlying structure in the linear sequences in which they actually appear. The placement rules obey certain principles which constrain the possible sequences of constituents, and the possible combinations of such sequences in different domains both within and across languages. The important domains are clause, term phrase and adjectival phrase (see section 2.1.1.1.1). A further proposal is the formulation of constituent ordering principles, which together approximate as closely as possible the different arrays of ordering patterns found in natural languages. These were discussed in chapter 2. To facilitate exposition, I will repeat them here. These are the general principles (GP2) and (GP 9), and the specific principles (SP1) and (SP7). The idea behind formulating two types of rules is that the general principles are reflected in the specific rules, and the specific rules in the actual ordering pattern of individual languages. The rules are:

46 (GP2) The Principle of Linear Ordering
Constituents conform to (GP2) when linear order is fixed, no matter which position they take relative to the head.

(GP9) The Principle of Increasing Complexity
There is a tendency for ordering constituents in an order of increasing complexity.

(SP1) A language makes a basic choice between Prefield and Postfield ordering of dependents with respect to their heads.

(SP6) The Prefield is universally less hospitable to complex material than the Postfield; Prefield languages may thus be expected to possess strategies for relieving the Prefield of excessive complexity.

(SP7) Other things being equal, constituents prefer to be placed in an order of increasing complexity (see section 2.1.1.1. for the precise tenets of LIPOC)
(SP7) is intended to account for the fact that in most languages there are situations in which we find constituents either earlier or later in the sequence than would be expected on the basis of their functional profiles (Dik 1997: 412). Dik argues that, to a considerable extent, such deviations from expected ordering may be understood in terms of the following tendencies: (i) constituents which are relatively less complex than other constituents of similar function tend to occur earlier in the linear sequence; (ii) constituents which are relatively more complex than other constituents of similar function tend to occur later in the linear sequence. In essence, LIPOC predicts that pronominals precede nouns, which in turn precede phrases. Phrases precede clauses.

Although these studies propose different explanations for different types of constructions, they all demonstrate that weight principles are relevant to constituent ordering. However, as stated earlier on in chapter 2, it is Dik’s version of weight principles (LIPOC) that I will specifically apply to the description of constituent ordering of Siolozi. We are therefore going to demonstrate whether constituent ordering in the unmarked Siolozi clause and sentence conforms to these two related putative principles of weight. We will do so for all the constituents S V O C and A to find out if there is a correlation between their internal structure and the position they occur in the clause or sentence.

In order to explain the relationship between constituent ordering and heaviness, we need to further explore the notion “type” which we have glossed over above. In other words, are there any particular characteristics that are associated with specific types of word orders? Studies in positional syntax, syntactic typology and universals reveal that there is a correlation between basic order type and the order of constituents in languages of the world. For example, SVO languages are said to exhibit certain syntactic characteristics which would distinguish them from, say, SOV languages. It is generally agreed that facts about constituent order must specify, *inter alia*, the type or nature of constituents and how they are positioned (ordering rules). These are the so-called left to right asymmetries. In terms of the Greenbergian word order typology, we have established that Siolozi is generally classified as SVO as evidenced by the numerous examples cited above. End-weight is therefore discussed with respect to a language with SVO characteristics. We will, however, have to determine whether the observed patterns represent a significant effect.

As we have already seen, Dik’s proposed typology divides languages into Postfield and Prefield, the equivalent of the better known Posthead and Prehead positions.
According to the predictions made by the general and specific constituent ordering principles outlined in this proposal, the placement of constituents is determined by the internal structure (internal complexity) of a constituent and the Prefield or Postfield nature of the language. This corresponds to SVX in our description. In other words, the Prefield is occupied by the subject position and the Postfield by any other constituent(s) that follow the verb. On the basis of these principles and the description of the basic structure of the clause, we should expect relatively less complex constituents to occur in Prefield which is the left of the clause. According to the placement rules and ordering templates posited for such surface structures this is position 1, which is occupied by the subject. On the other hand, relatively more complex constituents should exhibit a tendency to occur later in the linear sequence than other constituents of similar function. This is Postfield (X in our analysis) which is occupied by the object, complement and adverbial. If Silozi is organised on the Prefield basis, the subordinate clause will prefer to occur in the prefiel (before the matrix clause). If it is organised on the Postfield basis, the subordinate clause occurs in the Postfield position (after the matrix clause). On account of their categorial complexity, embedded clauses should show a tendency to occur towards the end of the linear sequence. With respect to the placement of clauses Dik observes:

"On the basis of principle (SP7), then, we shall expect a tendency to place embedded constructions further to the end of the complex construction preferably to the very end of that construction. And this is indeed what we find in an overwhelming number of languages" (Dik 1997: 127)

5.6.1. The distribution of constituents

This section reports the results of the investigation of the distribution of constituents. This is done in order determine whether these principles are relevant to the ordering of constituents in SVX constructions as defined and illustrated throughout this chapter. In order to do this, the constituent types were subjected to a count with respect to their distribution in the clause. The count does not only involve independent and full constituents of the clause or sentence but incorporated arguments (the so-called zero subjects) too. The latter are the elements which are coded as SM and OM.
The constituents have been identified as pronominal arguments, words, phrases and clauses. And they correspond to simple, complex and more complex on the internal complexity scale. These would in principle, correspond to their preferred positions in the clause or sentence from left to right as predicted by LIPOC. The categories that constitute the category of word are pronouns, nouns, adverbs, ideophones and adjectives. Phrases are of two types: nominal phrases and non-nominal phrases. Nominal phrases are those categories whose head word is a noun and are further subdivided into Head + modifier and Head + Rel. In other words a distinction has been made between clausal modifiers (relative clauses) and other modifiers (number, adjective, genitive, etc). Non nominal phrases are those whose head word is an adjective, adverb or preposition. Accordingly, they are adjective phrases, adverb phrases and prepositional phrases. This category also includes coordinated nouns. Clauses are also of two types, namely complement clauses and adverbial clauses. Relative clauses are treated as modifiers of heads in the noun phrase. Based on this classification the simplest and shortest constituent is the cliticized subject (pro) and the longest and most complex is the clause. According to FG’s predictions subjects should occur in the prefeld. The constituents which go to this position are typically nominals: pronouns, nouns, noun phrases and noun clauses. Moving on to the postfield, there are four positions, namely, object (direct and indirect), complement and adverbial. The categories that go to the object position are the same as those that go to the subject position. The categories that go to the complement position may be either nominals or non-nominals depending on their relationship to the predicate. As nominals, they share the same characteristics as those that go to the subject and object position. As non-nominals, they may be adverbs, prepositional phrases, complement clauses or adverb clauses. Finally, as adverbials they may be adverbs, adverbial phrases (including PP) or adverbial clauses.

The following symbols are used in the all the tables in this study: Pro = Zero subject or cliticized pronominal argument, Pron = Emphatic Pronoun, N = simple noun, NP = a noun phrase without a clausal modifier, Nrel = Noun phrase with a relative clause modifier, CI = clause, CI* = multiple clausal subordination or coordination, Adj = adjective, ADJP = adjective phrase, ADV = adverb, ADVP = adverb phrase, PP = prepositional phrase (which for our concerns are non-nominal complements), Zero (0) indicates that the constituents does not occur in the position. The dash (-) indicates there is no possibility for a constituent to occur in a particular position. The column “TYPE” represents the categories or constituents while “POSITION”
represents the functional profiles in which the constituents are placed from left to right.

The method we use for dealing with the distributions is to compare the distribution and frequency of constituents that share the same structural and functional characteristics. I will also comment on the relevance of the principles on the distributions and typology as I explain the distributions. Thereafter, a statistical test (the chi-square) is used to determine whether these frequencies are significant. Table 6 summarizes the results for the text counts on which our conclusions are based.

### Table 6: Distribution of constituents in SVX constructions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>DO</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRO</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRON</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NREL</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLX</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADJ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADJP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADV</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ido</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data cited here do not include indirect objects because they are very rare. These distributions show us that the subject position is dominated by the least complex (pronominal arguments or zero subjects). 45.7% of the constituents in this position are zero subjects. The second most frequent are NPs (22.7%). Next are nouns (19.1%) which are followed by pronouns (5.7%). The least frequent constituents are clauses (1.9%). In the object position the most frequent constituent are, once again, the incorporated pronouns (37.4%). The second most frequent are nouns (32.5%),
which are followed by NPs (24.4%). Next are noun phrases involving relative clause modification (4.87%). The least occurring constituent is the pronoun (.81%). Interestingly, no clauses occur in this position.

Moving on to the complement position, we shall report on nominal constituents first and then move on to non-nominals. The dominant constituents in this position are clauses (41%). The second most frequent constituents are NRELS (16.2%), which are followed by NPs (10.1%). Next are nouns (6.5%) and the least frequent are pronouns (1.1%). Crucially, no incorporated pronouns occur in this position. With respect to non-nominal constituents, the data show that the most frequent constituents are PPs, which constitute 12.2% of all the complements. These are followed by adjectives (8.3%). The least occurring constituents are adverbs and ideophones (.4%), which are very rare in this position, any way.

In the adverbial position, the dominant constituents are clauses (40%), which are followed by adverb phrases (32.4%). Next are adverbs (18%) which are followed by conjoined subordinate clauses (7.7%). The least occurring constituents in this position are ideophones (1.1%).

5.6.2. Correlation of distributional patterns with the unmarked structure: evidence for LIPOC and EW

So far we have just presented the distribution of structures in the positions as percentages of their total populations. The principal aim of this section is to determine and posit an analogy between the distribution of constituent types and the ordering of constituents (elements of structure-SVCOA) within the unmarked of the clause. We also wish to ascertain this with a measure of empiricism and objectivity the effect of the two principles under study. In doing so, I am guided by Givon’s proposed methodological perspective, which he outlines as follows:

“The distributional study of grammar in text can also be viewed from a methodological perspective, that of linguistics as a would-be empirical science. From this perspective, any pairing between a particular structure and a communicative function is only a hypothesis to be tested inductively.” (Givon 1995: 312)
To achieve this we adopt Popper’s (1959) standard procedure of falsificatory testing. The most relevant aspect of this procedure states that after having observed correlations apply statistical tests to the observed distributions to see whether the correlations are not simply due to random fluctuation of sampling. To accomplish this, we shall present the results of the statistical chi-square test. Since the primary aim of this section is to ascertain the effect of the two principles under study, my comments are confined to the most relevant constituents. These are the simplest and the most complex constituents on the scale.

Starting with the subject, the data show the dominant constituents in this position are incorporated pronominal arguments or zero subjects. This finding is supported by other studies. Givon (1995) for instance observes:

“The most prototypical subjects in natural discourse are coded as either zero or anaphoric pronoun. This is true not only of the subjects of active-direct clauses, but also of the subjects/topics of passive and inverse clauses. The prototypical natural propensity of subjects is referential continuity, thus also attentional continuity.” (Givon 1995: 334)

As for the frequency of clauses in this position, there are good reasons to conclude that the predictions of the two principles are correct. Syntactically, this position is typically preferred by nominal constituents. This view is widely recognised in linguistic theory. Givon (1984: 94-96) observes that most languages prefer to have nominal rather than sentential surface syntactic subjects. These are typically incorporated pronominal arguments (in our sample), pronouns, nouns and noun phrases. Dik (1997: 123) also notes that although clauses (embedded constructions in his terminology) may serve as subject arguments, the constructions they occur in are “rather unnatural”. He also observes that most languages would use nominals rather than sentential complements in the subject position. As we demonstrate in chapters 6, 7 and 8, most constructions that would otherwise have a sentential subject are rendered through an extraposed structure with a “dummy” subject. Since clauses or sentential complements, which are semantically propositions are not the “natural” exponents of this position they can only function in the role of subject through the process of nominalisation. They are therefore nominalised arguments. The other reason for the relatively low frequency of clauses in this position can be expressed in terms of categorial complexity. LIPOC and TOEW predict that the internal structural complexity co-determines the ordering of constituents. Because they are the most
complex on the scale, they should not be expected to occur in this position with great preference. So in so far as the placement of clauses, which are the most complex constituents, is concerned, the predictions are correct. This is because they are significantly less frequent than incorporated pronouns in this position. The justification for their occurrence in this position is summarized in what Dik proposes a further consequence of LIPOC which is as follows:

"Languages which are organized according to the Prefield pattern may nevertheless place their subordinate clauses in the Postfield; but Postfield languages will never systematically place their subordinate clauses in the Prefield."

He further argues:

"The actual situation is again a little bit more complicated, since all languages allow some subordinate clauses to appear in the Prefield in certain conditions...The point is thus that the basic, unmarked position for subordinate clauses may be in the Postfield in Prefield languages, but not in the Prefield in Postfield languages." (Dik 1997:128)

The distributions presented in the table seem to provide evidence for the correctness of this prediction. The distributions are consistent with the prediction that the Prefield is less hospitable to heavier, complex constituents. So much about the Prefield position. Let us now move on to the Postfield.

According to the structures described above, the Postfield is occupied by the object (direct and indirect), the complement and adverbial. The first constituent in this field is the indirect object. It is clear from the table that there are no clauses in this position, confirmation that this is not their preferred position. Noun phrases which are modified by relative clauses are also very few. On the contrary the dominant constituents in this position are simple elements, which by the definition employed in this study, are incorporated pronouns. In this position, the distribution of the constituents seems to be compatible with the principle which states that constituents which are relatively less complex than other constituents of similar function tend to

44 The examples that I use to illustrate the indirect object are based on my native speaker knowledge of the language. Others are from some of the Silozi grammars, particularly Jalla. I have also made some reference to some other grammars on Southern African Bantu languages which are closely related to Silozi.
occur earlier in their linear sequence. This is because pronouns and phrases involving relative clause modification are rare while clauses do not turn up. Pronouns are rare because most of them occur as incorporated arguments. This may explain the relative dominance of PROs.

Let us look at the distribution of the constituents that go to the position of complement. There are two types of constituents that function as complements. As stated earlier, one of the functions of NPs is that of complement in addition to subject and object. So one type of constituents that function as complements are NPs. These may be nouns, noun phrases and noun clauses. FG makes specific predictions about the position of embedded clauses in the matrix domain in their functions as either arguments or satellites. Again, the concept of “type” is used in ascertaining the efficacy of LIPOC. Specifically, it is proposed that the Prefield or Postfield character of the language is certainly one factor which determines the positioning of embedded constructions. In Postfield languages we do indeed usually find embedded constructions in the Postfield and in Prefield languages we tend to find them in the Prefield. It also proposes that other factors of a quite different nature co-determine the positioning of embedded constructions. These factors are: (i) the categorial complexity of embedded constructions which we have made brief reference to above, (ii) their pragmatic functions with the main predication, (iii) their semantic function within the main predicate. We shall restrict our discussion to categorial complexity in this study.

According to the formulation of (SP7) Noun Phrases and Adpositional Phrases count as “less complex” for the purposes of LIPOC than subordinate clauses. From this the following prediction has been derived:

“When embedded constructions are expressed in the form of an NP or an Adpositional Phrase, there will be less pressure for them to seek the final position in the construction.”

By extension, NPs whose modification involves non-clausal categories are “less complex” than those which are modified by relative clauses. There is some evidence in our data for the correctness of this prediction. There are fewer NPs occurring in this position than there are NRELs. This table shows that the further we move towards the rightmost position in the clause the lower the frequency of occurrence of less complex constituents. In fact, this position is not very hospitable to simple
constituents as evidenced by the lack of pronominal arguments and the paucity of pronouns. However, the constituents get progressively more complex as we move towards the end of the sequence. This is because the frequency of the constituents increases with their categorial complexity. The least frequent are pronouns which are also the least complex among these constituents. On the other hand, the most frequent are clauses. According to the predictions of the principles of weight, the Postfield is more hospitable to heavy than lighter ones. In this case, Dryer’s (ibid) FINAL-OVER-INITIAL-HYPOTHESIS with regard to the placement of sentential NPs is also correct in predicting that sentential NPs tend to occur in clause final.

Let us consider the distribution of the other non-nominal complements. They take the structural forms of adverbs (especially locatives), adjectives, adjective phrases and prepositional phrases. The distributions show that the dominant constituents in this position are (locative) prepositional phrases. The least frequent are adverbs and ideophones. The interesting observation is that adjectives are more frequent than adverbs in this position when they actually have the same weight, i.e. they are both words. This is contrary to our expectations. The explanation for this can be sought from the syntactic characteristics of these classes with respect to the clause. Adjectives inherently function as predicatives. Adverbs, on the other hand, are typically external modifiers. Obviously, adjectives are more integrated into the structure of the clause than adverbs. They are therefore more likely to occur in the clause structure than adverbs. It is therefore plausible that this may explain their predominance. As to whether the two weight principles have an effect on the ordering of the constituents, the facts show that relatively more complex constituents (phrases) are more frequent than all the less complex ones (words) put together. We have seen in table 1 that the most frequent constituents in this position are clauses. There seem to be evidence to conclude that this arrangement is consistent with the predictions of LIPOC and EW.

Moving on to the adverbial position, which is the final position, the constituents that occur in this position are ideophones, adverbs, adverb phrases, prepositional phrases and adverb clauses. The predictions made by LIPOC with respect to the position of embedded constructions in the matrix clauses have been summarised above. The distributions show that the least frequently distributed element is the ideophone, which is followed by the adverb. Clearly, there is a difference between the distribution of constituents, which have the same categorial characteristics. There are more adverbs occurring in this position than ideophones. The explanation for this is that the use of ideophones is not as widespread as that of adverbs in the type of
discourse we are studying. These expressions are more common in narrative discourse, especially fairy tales. Coming back to the distribution of adverbial types, the data show that there are more clauses than phrases in this position. In fact, adverbial clauses are the most frequent occurring constituents in the Postfield compared to complement clauses. This is because adverbial clauses admit of multiple repetition. With these facts, the most preferred position for subordinate clauses is the Postfield. Specifically, this is the rightmost position of the linear sequence. With respect to this position Dik (ibid: 127) specifically observes that due to the influence of LIPOC, then, we may expect subordinate clauses to occur in positions later than their pattern position, and preferably at the very end of the construction in which they occur. LIPOC further predicts that these will be no material after a subordinate clause, unless that material is of the same or greater complexity than that subordinate clause. Given the fact that Silozi is a Postfield language, this is the preferred position for the heaviest and most complex material. Quirk et al (1985) claim that most of subordination occurs towards the end of the clause. In so far as most of the most complex clauses occur in the final position, there is evidence that the placement is in accordance with LIPOC.

To sum up this section, it only remains to state that although constituents of varying complexity occur in positions in which they are not expected, they nevertheless show a predilection to occur in terms of their categorial status in the clause or sentence. The frequency of distribution reflects a tendency in which short and relatively less complex constituents prefer the earlier position in the linear sequence. More complex and heavier constituents exhibit a tendency to occur earlier in the sequence and preferably the last. The preferences may be presented in the following hierarchies (where < means precedes).

47. **Pro< Pron< N < NP < NREL < CI**

This hierarchy presents the preferred of ordering of nominal constituents in our data. As for our proposed complexity hierarchy, the following schema summarises the preferred ordering of constituents in the data.

48. **Pro < Word < CI < CI cc CI**

The results of the chi-square test show us that there is a strong correlation between the internal structure of a constituent and the position it takes in SVX construction
types. This means that short and less complex constituents prefer to be placed earlier in the clause than heavier ones. The chi-square test results for Table 6 for the distribution in table 6 shows that LIPOC has a highly significant on the ordering of constituents: \( p < .0001 \). This is not to say that heavier items do not occur earlier in the clause. Neither does it mean that lighter items do not occur later in the clause. They do but not with significant frequency.

5.7. Summary

This chapter has been dedicated to the description of the structure of Silozi in what we have termed SVX constructions. These are basically simple and complex sentences. With respect to the basic order Silozi is SVO language in constructions with lexical arguments. Consequently, it exhibits characteristics of SVO languages in clause combination devices. Notable among these is that co-ordinating and subordinating conjunctions precede the clauses they introduce. Some clauses may be linked without their explicit use. An idiosyncrasy has been noted with respect to co-ordination of clauses. The process involved in the linking of clauses departs from the conventional system in which sentence structures are divided into two main types called "co-ranking" structures and "chaining" structures. Our description shows that Silozi is neither chaining nor co-ranking in the sense of Longacre’s (1985) typology. It is a counter example to the predictions incorporated therein. Thus the division may need to be modified to account for the structures exhibited in Silozi (and possibly other similar languages). The chapter has also shown that pronominal arguments obey rather different morpho-syntactic constraints.

With respect to the effect of the two principles, particularly LIPOC, there is evidence that suggests that in SVX constructions simpler constituents are placed in the earlier position and more complex constituents tend to be placed towards the end of the construction. Given the fact that Silozi is an SVO language, the order of the constituents is expected to take a rightward skewing. In other words, most linearization processes would involve right branching. This was ascertained in our discussion of the morpho-syntax of phrases. We concluded that Silozi seems to have a default mechanism of placing heavier items after lighter ones, thereby possessing the structure: light before heavy. A salient example cited was the position of the relative in the NP. The modifier relative clause (which is heavier) follows the head noun (which is lighter). The order of constituents that is affected by LIPOC can be represented in the following schema (the arrow indicates increasing categorial
complexity.):

```
<---L--------------------R----->
(S)                         (O, C, A)
“Light items”               “Heavy”
```

Figure 7 - Distribution of constituents in the SVX construction types

Numerous factors relating to the nature of the constituents are involved in a particular pattern such as semantic role, definiteness, referentiality, etc., all of which bear on perceptions of markedness (Siewierska 1988). Needless to say, we have not been able to illustrate all possible structures in the language. The description has been limited by the fact that it focuses on structures that are determined predominantly by syntactic factors. Naturally, other factors, which may have an equally important role in determining the distribution and order of constituents at the clausal and sentential level have been overlooked. One issue that has not been addressed concerns the variations in the order of certain constituents of the clause and sentence. We shall pick up these and other related issues in the next chapters where we feature discourse-pragmatic driven constituent ordering in written and spoken texts.
Chapter 6

Discourse- Pragmatic Determined Structures

6.1. Introduction

The aim of this chapter is mainly to serve as a preamble to part 2. It describes and illustrates the constructions that are attested in both the written and spoken data. The unifying theme of the forthcoming three chapters is the intuition that human language is a means of communication sensitive to discourse and pragmatic factors. Accordingly, this chapter focuses on describing and analysing the structural and functional characteristics of these constructions. Part One was devoted to the morphological and syntactic description of Silozi. From the syntactic point of view, we have focused on the simple, compound and complex structures, which are neutral, declarative and unmarked. The description and the attendant typological classification of Silozi word order provided therein have offered only a restricted amount of information about the constituent order patterns that exist in the language. We established then that determining the surface structure word order phenomena using purely formal and syntactic considerations is not very helpful (c.f. Siewierska 1988, Givon 1988, Payne 1992). This strategy, as beneficial as it may be in providing syntactic facts about language, does not reflect constituent structure as it is used in actual texts and discourse.

To provide a description of Silozi constituent ordering that can be considered to be more comprehensive and representative than what was presented in Part One, we need to take into consideration discourse-pragmatic factors. The aim of Part Two is to describe Silozi constituent ordering which is mainly governed by discourse-pragmatic factors. It shows that constituent ordering in Silozi is not necessarily fixed. There is some level of constituent order flexibility which is used to code certain properties, which are not accessible to sentence level analysis. Moreover, certain parameters of constituent ordering lead to a distinction between marked and

45 The thesis has taken the clause as its point of departure. There is a fundamental and intricate interconnection between morphology and syntax in Silozi. It is therefore felt that an understanding of the morphological structure is necessary in the presentation of syntactic and discoursal structure of the language. A relationship between C O typology and morphological patterning has been noted in linguistic theory since Greenberg (1966) (see also Nichols 1986, Dryer 1990, Connolly 1991, inter alia).
unmarked order which we introduced in Chapter 2. An adequate investigation of these will entail an analysis of word order not only in isolation but also in context (Andersen 1983). Although the study does not devote a lot of space to contextual factors, it recognises their important role in motivating the choice of constructions.

Part Two also seeks to ascertain whether LIPOC and EW are determinants of CO in the alternative constructions. While this discussion focuses mainly on discourse-pragmatic motivated constructions, the explanations and illustrations are made in syntactic terms. Recent studies have shown that constituent ordering is best described in syntactic terms (see for instance Van Valin and LaPolla 1997). One of the reasons offered is that order is not primarily sensitive to statuses of given/new, definite/indefinite, topic comment, etc. The other is that order may be primarily correlated with pragmatic status of information encoding so much so that even in languages where order is primarily determined by pragmatic principles, there may yet be minority constructions in which order is more strictly based on syntactic factors. Third, some languages may evidence a greater balance of pragmatic and syntactic factors. In Mandarin Chinese (Sun & Givon 1985) and Spanish (Bentivoglio 1983) the order of subject is said to be largely determined by pragmatic factors, but the object more consistently comes after the verb, and may be syntactically determined. Cowan (1995) observes that when closely examined, the pragmatic principles that have been proposed to account for word order variation in discourse have been predominantly formulated from the perspective of information structuring. Referring to principles such as “information predictability” (Givon 1988), “first things first” (Gundel 1988), “the newsworthiness” principle (Mithun (1988) and “discourse iconicity”. Cowan comments:

“Unfortunately, the desire to achieve maximum generality through broad definitions has directed interest away from studying other discourse variables which may interact with these principles to produce word order variation. Moreover, there are attested cases of syntactic structures whose occurrence is definitely determined by discoursal factors that do not fall within the bounds of currently proposed pragmatic principles” (Cowan 1995: 25).

As observed earlier, Hawkins (1990, 1994, 1997) has strongly criticised discourse theories and pragmatic principles. In his proposed performance theory of order and constituents, he repeatedly casts doubt on the role of information structure
and pragmatic principles as determinants of word order and word order variation. The thrust of his claim is that the two major research traditions, that is, that of the Prague school and that of Givon (1983, 1988) and his associates, do not provide satisfactory explanations for constituent order. This position, which is based on formal considerations, has been reinforced by Primus (1991, 1993)\textsuperscript{46}. In fact, end weight is a structural principle by which longer units of information tend to come at the end of a sentence. This follows from the intuition that ‘new’ information may need more detailed explanation than ‘given’ information and naturally makes the ‘weighty’ information to come naturally at the end. Givon (1995) has also observed that the surface manifestations of syntactic structure cannot be denied because natural communication can be observed and recorded. He further argues that these observations constitute the traditional surface grammatical structure in both clausal and text contexts. The observable reality of grammar in natural communication consists of: (a) linear order, (b) nested hierarchic structure, (c) grammatical morphology, and (d) rhythmics: intonation and pauses.

As in Part One, I will use the syntactic and grammatical terms, which have been used in the traditional study of surface grammatical structure in both clausal and textual contexts, to describe and illustrate the constructions. The reasons for not using discourse pragmatic terminology have been put forward by some authors cited above. In addition, there is a general problem of establishing a satisfying terminology in the field of discourse, semantics and pragmatics. Terms like “old” or “given information”, “new information”, “topic” and “comment” and so on have been especially subjected to misinterpretation, and have been used in a variety of confusing ways. For instance, Chafe (1971) notes that the term emphasis is the worst offender, since it can serve to designate topic, focus, and contrastive topic or focus. Based on the above observations, the discussion that follows assumes a syntactic (form-function) perspective in accordance with the main aims of the study. The role of discourse-pragmatic and cognitive factors as determinants of constituent ordering

\textsuperscript{46} Primus claims that she has attempted to give support to the formal approach by accommodating data that, according to common opinion, were thought to be exclusively determined by pragmatics. Her study is based on an examination of languages with grammaticalized topic and focus positions, i.e. “with discourse configurational” nodes in their syntactic representations in addition to syntactic nodes such as NP, VP, etc. She discusses some proposed pragmatic explanations for the positioning. She argues that discourse constituents in a grammar are positioned according to the same principles that position syntactic constituents. She further argues that inherent information status is not relevant to their ordering and that proposed pragmatic principles in this area either correlate with or are overridden by syntactic weight.
are well recognised. However, it is not within the scope of this study to provide a detailed account of the discourse and pragmatic dimensions of these constructions. Because of their importance in the shaping of grammatical structures, they are pointed out at relevant points throughout the discussion for purely illustrative purposes.

Part 2 is organised into three main chapters. In the rest of this chapter, I describe and illustrate the constructions. Chapter 7 deals with written discourse. In Chapter 8, I consider spoken discourse. The role functions of preposed adverbials in the discourse are discussed in Chapter 9.

6.2. The constructions and operational definitions

Payne (1997) suggests that an important step in determining what constituent orders are used to express pragmatic statuses is to decide whether the language has a basic order based on grammatical relations. He further suggests that if constituent order is based on grammatical relations, then unusual orders of nominals with respect to the verb can be very powerful signals of marked pragmatic status. It should be evident from Part 1 that Silozi is a relatively strong SVO language. There are conditions under which it employs alternative constructions which deviate from this unmarked order.

The constructions we are describing may be divided into three main types: marked, unmarked and clearly marked constructions. Unmarked constructions are those which have the pattern SVX. These have been described in Part 1. Marked constructions are those which have the surface structure XSVX. These are constructions in which other constituents than the subject are placed in the initial position. Other construction types are those, which involve some intricate changes to the ‘normal’, ordering of constituents. The most common of these are passives, clefts and extrapositions. To be considered here are:

a. SWCs
b. Passive constructions
c. Left dislocations
d. Right dislocations
e. Existential-presentative constructions
f. Clefts
g. Interrogatives
h. Negatives
i. Miscellaneous constructions.

The markedness of these constructions may be determined by structural and
distributional characteristics. In the rest of this section, I describe the formal and
syntactic characteristics of these constructions. I also provide some examples to
illustrate their instantiations in the text. This will involve positing their placement
rules and ordering templates for these surface structures. Thereafter, I will consider
their distributional (textual frequencies) characteristics. This section merely provides
a description and illustrations of these constructions by way of introduction. A more
detailed discussion of their distributional characteristics is dealt with in the specific
chapters.

6.2.1. SWC constructions

The aim of this section is to further describe and illustrate the different constructions
whose grammatical roles are not coded by full NPs, which we introduced in sections
2.7 and 2.8. It is important to discuss these constructions because although they do
not contain autonomous syntactic constituents, they are necessary for the flow of
discourse. As pointed out earlier, the major principle of constituent order in these
constructions involves incorporated verbal arguments which express person-and-
number (cross-referencing), and sometimes, tense and mood. Their constituent
elements thus serve the major functions of noun phrases: semantic, pragmatic and
grammatical.

The characteristics of these constructions, particularly the coding of grammatical
roles, were discussed in section 2.8. and briefly illustrated in section 5.21. Although
they exhibit different structural characteristics, the majority of them are declarative,
affirmative clauses in which the subject exponent occupies the initial position (SVX).
Our discussion will therefore mainly focus on them, bearing in mind the fact that
they are primarily driven by discourse-pragmatic factors. To some extent, we might
refer to them as “alternative” clauses. The prime evidence for their “alternativeness”
is exhibited by the coding of grammatical roles. Their structure deviates from the
basic, canonical order in various ways. The first is that the exponents of S and O are
not manifested as full NPs. Further, these “NPs” do not occur in the positions they
would otherwise occur in the strictly syntactically motivated sentences. In other words, the grammatical functions of subject and object are not carried, respectively, by preverbal and postverbal position. As we have already seen, both the exponents of S and O are preverbal incorporated pronominal arguments in polysynthetic verb forms which constitute the alternative type of clause we have referred to as SWCs above. Thus the verb carries markers not only for subject agreement but for object agreement as well.

I now want to elaborate on the morpho-syntactic constraints that relate to pronominal arguments mentioned in sections 2.7. and 2.8. The typical clause that is constrained by properties of the surrounding discourse does not have an overt SV(O) pattern. The position of O is variable while that of S is not. Direct object pronouns are wedged between tense/aspect markers and the verb stem and are frozen in that position (see also Givon 1971). All in all, Silozi has different word orders for direct and indirect object exponents. In these constructions, it does not seem to make sense to try to describe the ordering possibilities of grammatical roles in terms of independent constituents. Given the above facts, I summarize the properties of the Silozi SWCs in (1). As stated earlier, the description takes into account the fact that the constituents of SWCs are incorporated pronominal arguments (cf Bresnan and Mchombo 1987):

1. The Single word clause:

When the arguments of the verb are not full NPs they are frozen into the verbal structure as pronominal arguments. The resulting order is not SVO. The element that codes the subject precedes the verb stem. The element that codes the object follows the subject and precedes the stem. It sometimes occurs between T-A-M and the verb stem.

We can argue that SWCs exhibit variant constituent orders because they rearrange grammatical relations which are not overtly coded. We shall only illustrate complex sentences in which a single word clause is accompanied by some other constituents. These accompanying constituents serve the functions of complement and adverbial. The following examples in (2) illustrate complex constructions in which the subject and object are not a full NP. In each of these constructions the incorporated pronominals (SM) and (OM) refer to an NP that is mentioned in a previous clause. The context of this text extract is that Sandaula’s peers are jealous of him because of
his kindness. He helps travellers to cross the river in his canoe for free. They are trying to discourage him by giving him the derogative name “Sandaula”.

2 L1: Ba-palelwa ku-mu-tepeleza
   SM+PAST-fail to-OM+PAST-discourage

L2: mane ba-ikutwa maswe hahulu mwa lipilu ha-ba-bona
   and SM+PAST-feel bad very in hearts SC+SM+PAST-see

L3: kuli yena ka sibili na-li-lata hahulu mane
   COMP PRON by himself SM+PAST-OM-like much and

L4: a-kala ku-i-piza “Alexander Liholosi Sandaula”
   SM+PAST-start to-OM+REF-call “Alexander Liholosi Sandaula”

They failed to discourage him and they even felt bad when they discovered that he liked it so much that he started calling himself “Alexander Liholosi Sandaula”.

In line 1, “ba-” refers to Sandaula’s nasty peers and “-mu-” to Sandaula himself. “- Ba-” has the same discourse functions in L2. “Na-” in L3 refers to Sandaula. The pronoun in L3 is used for emphasis. In line 4 “a-” and the reflexive “i-” refer to Sandaula.

It is clear from these examples that these elements are very crucial to the flow of discourse despite their structural dependency. As we shall show in the forthcoming chapters, their text frequency is quite spectacular. They are termed “pro” in all the tables that summarize the frequencies of constituents. Before closing this section, I would like to emphasize that there are other constructions in which the grammatical relations are not coded as full NPs. These will be illustrated in the course of the discussion. For the present our aim has been mainly to illustrate the occurrence of these elements in discourse.

6. 2.2. The passive construction

In Silozi passivization causes some major rearrangements of clause structure in response to discourse-pragmatic factors.
6.2.2.1. Syntactic characteristics

Silozi has a fully productive stock of simple passives from which the various passive clauses may be formed. Following Dik (ibid) the major diagnostic for subject assignment in Silozi is the active/passive opposition. A verb is active only if it has a corresponding passive. The subject is the central element of passive constructions and there is always a covert (semantic) passive actor (see also Perlmutter and Postal 1977; Keenan 1985; Siewierska 1984, Shibatani 1988). Myhill (1992) observes that voice alternations consist of two or more different ways of representing the same verb with the same arguments. Actives and passives differ only in regard to subject assignment; the quantitative (number of arguments) valency, as well as the qualitative (nature of the arguments) valency, are the same. This is rationalised by the fact that the valency of the predicate in the passive must be the same as in the active. However, not all passives have two arguments as we show below.

Various forms of passives have been recognised in the literature (Keenan 1985, Givon 1988). The passive construction prototypically involves a change in grammatical roles in which the object (patient) is assigned the subject position. Another characteristic of the Silozi passive clause is the agent phrase which consists of a particle “ki” (English “by”). The agent phrase is optional depending upon the discourse function and context. It is not required by the syntax of the language since its omission is perfectly acceptable. In addition to the presence of the subject, a distinctive feature of passive constructions is their verb phrase. More specifically, a passive VP will consist of a strict morphological modification of a transitive verb (VT) together with, in some languages, an auxiliary verb specific to the passive construction (Keenan 1985).

With respect to morphology, the passive is formed by the insertion of the suffix “-iwa” or its variant “-wa” to a verb radical in Silozi. These suffixes have variants which are occasioned by grammatical factors such as tense. Two scholars have attempted to describe the passive in Silozi. Mwisiya (1977: 110) describes the passive as a construction in “which the action of the verb is upon the subject... The subject suffers the action of the verb as in English.” Gowlett (1967: 43) states that “the passive in Lozi indicates that the subject is acted upon or affected by some action brought about by some agent. An agent, even if not specifically expressed is always implied.” Gowlett, however does not provide examples of passive clauses. He only lists the verb “radicals” and the associated “extensions”. Here is an example for
the morphology of what he calls “Extension 2 (Passive)”: /-w- ~ -iw-/ and its allomorph /-iw-/.

3. With C radicals except for /-l- -t-/ (say).

- ciw-a (be eaten) <-ca- (eat)
- fiw-a (be given) <-f-a (give)
- kiw-a (be drawn) <-k-a (draw water).

The prototypical type of subject type of active-passive alternation in Silozi is represented in the following syntactic alteration:

4. a. Banana ba-natile nja.
   Children SM+PAST-beat dog
   The children beat the dog.

b. Nja i-natil-we ki banana.
   Dog SM+PAST-beat-PASS by children
   The dog was beaten by the children.

Observe that the termination of the verb “-e” is “-we” as claimed above. This is occasioned by the conjugation of the verb to reflect the past tense. The structure just described above represents the fullest form of the passive. I have made some modifications to the examples in order to illustrate the instantiation of the agent phrase. This is how it would be represented in accordance with grammatical rules incorporated in written texts. Consider the following examples:

5. a. Mungomba na-bulail-we ki muzumi.
   Mungomba SM-kill-PASS by hunter
   Mungomba was killed by the hunter.

b. Njolo na-lindu-zwi ki Kamuyongole fa mukokoto.
   Njolo SM-hit-PASS by kamuyonole on back
   Njolo was hit by Kamuyongole on the back
   “Njolo was hit on the back by Kamuyongole.

In the examples below, I illustrate passive constructions which do not have the agent phrase.
6. a. History ya Kaunda i-ng'oz-wi.
   History of Kaunda SM+PAST-write-PASS
   Kaunda’s history is written.

b. Nja ne-i-bulail-we.
   Dog PAST-SM-kill-PASS
   The dog was killed.

c. Ne-i-cil-we.
   PAST-SM-eat-PASS
   It was eaten.

The Silozi construction is marked relative to the active construction for two reasons, namely, morphological marking/structural complexity and text frequency. The example in (6)c shows a passive construction in which the constituents are all incorporated into a single unit which we refer to as a single word clause.

Given the above description, the Silozi passive construction involves adjusting the relationship between semantic roles and grammatical relations in the clause. In these constructions, the patient is placed in the subject position and the agent the oblique. The passive construction in Silozi takes two main forms, namely, the basic passive and the derived one. The basic passive consists of only the verb and an argument (SV). The expanded passive consists of the verb and its arguments and an oblique. The surface structure of the passive is of the form:

7. NP V (PP)

6.2.2.2. Discourse and pragmatic features

Passivization is considered to be a topicalising process (Creider 1979, Keenan ibid, Primus 1993). The examples presented above clearly show that passivization involves placing an NP constituent to the left of the clause in some constructions. From a pragmatic point of view, this is a case of bringing an NP with the grammatical function of object into the topic position. Comrie (1989) has noted that the similarity between the agent and the subject is topicality. It is patient arguments in subject position that tend to be topical and therefore represent old information. This means that the object argument (patient) is brought into the centre of attention and the agent is not topical. Passivization is, therefore, a foregrounding process.
6.2.2.3. Effects of LIPOC and EW

The passive in Silozi exhibits several structural characteristics in discourse. It may consist of single word clause, a mono-valent clause, a monovalent clause with the oblique (agent phrase). From the surface structure, we can only infer that these two principles of increasing weight are relevant only when there is an adverb phrase or adposition phrase involved. This follows from the fact that the agent phrase of a passive is an adpositional phrase, and therefore LIPOC predicts a tendency for later position than simple NPs. The fact that agentive NPs/PPs in passives (when they occur) occur on the right and the fact that agentive NPs in actives (which have no adposition) occur on the left is evidence for LIPOC and EW. Passives that do not have adpositional phrases belong to the type of constructions called “basic passives”. A characteristic feature of such clauses is their lack of agent phrases. This feature has been observed by Givon (1990), Langacker and Munro (1975) among others who have almost invariably recognized the following syntactic properties of passives: (a) verb stativization, (b) unspecified active-subject and (c) object topicalization. With regard to markedness, Givon (1995: 44) observes that in passive clauses which are marked by verbal morphology or an auxiliary, one could argue that more structure is there relative to the active clause. The case for higher structural complexity of the passive is thus stronger in passive types that retain the agent in an oblique case.

6.2.3. Dislocation

This device involves the placing of clause elements outside the syntactic boundaries of the clause. The dislocated elements may be placed to the left or right of the clause. Silozi employs special particles in dislocation constructions. In the passive construction, the subject generally occupies the sentence-initial position. However, there are other constructions which place an NP other than subject in sentence initial position. These are known as topicalizations or left dislocations. We make a distinction between left dislocations and topicalizations. The difference is that in left-dislocations but not in topicalizations there is a pronoun which refers to the clause-initial NP. This non-subject clause-initial NP is termed the external topic (Foley and Van Valin 1985: 300). In some uses, the left dislocated constituents are said to be “fronted” or “preposed”. We will prefer to use the terms “fronting” or “preposing” to topicalization. Other constructions place NPs to the right of (or after) the clause. A similar distinction made for the placement of external NPs in the initial non-subject position is applicable to those in these constructions which we discuss later. This
term is used to refer strictly to constructions where a pronoun in the clause refers to a clause-final NP. Constructions where there are no coreferential NPs are considered under the term postposing. Both fronting/preposing and postposing constructions are discussed under the heading “miscellaneous constructions”. We start our account with dislocations.

6.2.3.1. Left dislocations

As noted above, the markedness of left dislocations is indicated by the positioning of some elements in the position which is typically reserved for the subject.

6.2.3.1.1. Syntactic characteristics.

A range of constituents can be placed in this position. They share the characteristic of being external or peripheral constituents obviously, because they are not the arguments of the predicates. Peripheral constituents are those filled by circumstantial arguments such as instruments and locative arguments. Further, peripheral constituents are generally marked by prepositions, whereas core constituents are more likely to be unmarked in Silozi. This distinction between core and peripheral is recognised by other writers in other languages, for example Dixon (1977:402-4) and Andrews (1985) who terms them core and oblique. Since these constructions involve inter-clausal relationships (discourse), a substantial number of the NPs are coded as incorporated pronominals. In this section, we are concerned with constructions which place an NP in the initial position or to the left and an extra pronoun is added to the clause. In other words, there is an extra NP in addition to the subject. Below are some examples to illustrate them.

   Women them SM+PRES-OM-love much
   The women, he loved them a lot.

   b. Neba na, ni-lata hahulu muziki.
   Also me SM+PRES-like much music
   I also like music a lot.
c. Munko wabona, ha-bu-lati.
   Smell its SM+NEG-OM-like
   Its smell, he doesn’t like it.
   “He can’t stand its smell”.

Due to discourse-pragmatic factors, the dislocated noun phrase is a full nominal while the subject NP is an incorporated pronominal argument. In (8)a, it is “na” and “ni” in (8)b In (8)c it is “ha” which also acts as a negative marker. Having said this, we may illustrate the requisite surface structure for this construction in (9). The schema shows that position 1, which is normally reserved for the subject is taken by some other constituent (X). In this case it is the dislocated constituent. The comma separates the syntactic boundaries of the clause.

9. X, S V (O)

6.2.3.1.2. Discourse-Pragmatic characteristics

LD belongs to a group of processes in which a new constituent is created. The dislocated element which precedes the subject assumes the status of topic. Keenan-Ochs and Schieffelin (1976), treating LD as a construction that has a format of ‘Referent + Proposition’, suggest that the function of this construction is to bring a referent into the foreground of the listener’s consciousness, a referent that is usually not currently a ‘center of attention’. They argue that such a global function of LD is used by the speaker to introduce discourse-new referents or to re-introduce into the discourse a referent which has temporarily elapsed into the background of the interlocutor’s mind (Keenan-Ochs and Schieffelin 1976: 243). Other functional dimensions of LD have been described by Givon (1990: 757):

“Left dislocation is typically a device to mark topics - most commonly definite- that have been out of the focus of attention for a while, and are being brought back. That the L-dislocated referent must be anaphorically topical is attested by the fact that it may be either definite or generic, but never REF-indefinite. In other words, L-dislocation is not used for introducing topics.”

In Dik’s FG these are topical elements which are singled out for special treatment in the expression of the clause. These constituents bear the thematic relation of theme
and focus. By “special treatment” is meant one or more of the following features, when these refer to the topical or focal status of the constituents concerned (Dik 1997: 313):

(i) the constituent gets a special position;
(ii) it gets a special marker signalling its pragmatic status;
(iii) it gets a special position in the linear order of the clause;
(iv) it gets a special prosodic contour;
(v) it otherwise leads to the selection of a special construction type.

Left dislocated constructions in Silozi are a special type of constituents which have pragmatic functions. In FG, these constructions are called “Theme+Clause” constructions. We conclude this section by emphasizing that left dislocations are foregrounding constructions which ‘draw attention to’ an element. In this case, it is the dislocated NP which is foregrounded. These are “Basali bona”, “Na” and “Munko wa bona” in examples (8)a through to (8)c47.

6.2.3.1.3. Effects of LIPOC and EW

Silozi is an SVO language. Languages with this basic order are said to have addressee-oriented communicative strategies (Gundel 1988, Greenbaum 1996). From the morphosyntactic, discourse-pragmatic and even cognitive point of view, the placement of heavier constituents before shorter ones inhibits successful communication. It is therefore surprising that left dislocated elements (especially complex ones) are placed in the initial position. Since left dislocation places constituents to the left, we would expect a preference for lighter constituents to be placed there due to the influence of LIPOC as the next chapters will show.

6.2.3. 2. Right dislocation

We consider right dislocation to be the syntactic and discourse analogue of left dislocation. I will discuss both the syntactic and discourse characteristics of these constructions together.

47 “Bona” in (8) is a pragmatic marker which marks either contrast or change of foreground background information.
6.2.3.2.1. Syntactic and Discourse-pragmatic characteristics

Unlike left dislocations, right dislocations are constructions in which some constituent occurs at the end of the sentence and, its canonical position being occupied by a proform. In FG right dislocations are referred to as Clause+Tail constructions.

10.a. I-ng’oz-wi, _history ya Kaunda...
SM+PAST-write-PASS history of Kaunda
It is written Kaunda’s history.

b. Ba-mu-be-ile mwa butata, _Mubita._
SM-OM-put-PERF in trouble, Mubita
They have put him in trouble, Mubita.

c. Ki muluti yomunde, _pupil teacher Bobby Kaluwe._
SM+PRES-be teacher good, Pupil teacher Bobby Kaluwe
He is a good teacher, pupil teacher Bobby Kaluwe.

As in LD, some of the pronominals are coded as incorporated pronominals. This is true for (10)b. In (10)a, an incorporated pronominal argument which agrees with the the covert subject is used. In (10)c, “ki” is used. These incorporate the functions of the copular, which is triggered by tense and agreement. In these constructions, the dislocated NP is co-referential with the NP in the clause proper. The surface structure of these constructions takes the following form:

11 _SV (O), X_

The comma indicates the clause boundary. As in left dislocation, the elements that are placed in the position X have different structural characteristics. However, they are all clause external constituents. The pragmatic function of RD is reflected in FG as a “tail term” which is the equivalent of afterthought. It is a constituent which is assigned pragmatic functions. Right dislocated elements may be referred to as “afterthought constructions” or repair devices (Hyman 1975, Byarushengo et al 1976, Tenebaum 1977, Givon 1990). In other descriptions, they are referred to as afterthought topicalization in which there is postponed identification. This view is connected to the fact that afterthoughts are placed to the right of the clause or sentence as forgotten or added information. In what follows, I would like to discuss
this concept in a bit more detail in order to explain and motivate some rightward phenomena in my data.

The term afterthought has been discussed by various scholars to refer to two different but related phenomena. According to Hyman (1975) the term “afterthought” is a cover term for a number of different though related phenomena. It sometimes coincides with right dislocation. However, he is quick to point out that it is a rightward movement for added information. Mallinson and Blake (1981) refer to afterthoughts as postposed elements which are often in apposition to pronouns or generic nouns within the preceding construction. Mithun (1988) asserts that they refer to additional information. This position is endorsed by Chafe (1988: 9) in his statement: “Quite often in spoken language a period intonation will signal the end of a sentence, but the speaker will then tack on an intonation unit that conveys a piece of supplementary information relevant to that same sentence.”

The concept of afterthought is based on the principle that languages do not require speakers to start the whole sentence over again in order to put forgotten information into the correct preverbal slot (Hetzron 1975). Instead, the afterthought material can be tacked on at the end. The grammatical elements between S and V are placed out of their pattern positions in accordance with the likelihood of their serving as afterthoughts. This placement of forgotten or added information may take place along a hierarchical scale, with such things as adverbial phrases being more subject to this effect than, say, the direct object of the verb. “Likely candidates for afterthought are adverbs and adverbial phrases, prepositional phrases, conjoined nouns, relative clauses, and oblique cases (e.g. dative, and benefactive, also agentive in languages with passive constructions” (Hyman ibid: 126). Givon (1990: 484) uses the term in a more restricted sense to refer specifically to right dislocation that involves noun phrases. Following from this, he proposes a pragmatic principle of information-sequencing which he claims underlies the motivation for the use of right dislocation:

“If the head noun is sufficiently predictable, so that a modifier is used as an anaphoric pronoun, then if one desires added insurance, put the head noun at the end as an afterthought”.

What is relevant to us in the above observations is the intuition that “afterthought” pertains to the positioning of an array of varied constituents at the end of the clause
and is coded in two different ways. We need to illustrate both the types of explanations. Examples of right dislocated constituents that occur as “afterthoughts” in the sense of Hyman are illustrated in (12).

12. a. ...Na ni-bulelela a mixture: Sibemba, Silozi, Sinyanja.
...Me, SM+PRES-speak a mixture: Sibemba, Silozi, Sinyanja
...I speak different types of languages which are Sibemba, Silozi and Sinyanja.

b. Ma-refugees bona ba-pila hande kakuli ba-tusi-wa,
Refugees them SM+PRES-live well because SM-help-PASS
The refugees live well because they are helped
inge ba-fiwa, inge ba-fiwa, inge ba-fiwa.
just SM-give-PASS, just SM-give-PASS, just SM-give-PASS
Just being given, just being given, just being given.

I will now attempt to explain the significance of the postposed material in the examples. In (12)a the material is a chain of nouns in apposition with the NP “a mixture”. The speaker has used an indefinite NP referent with an assumption that its identity is self-evident. Presumably, he has discovered that the receiver may not have been able to recover the referent of the NP, which he has rendered with a switch to a different language. He thus finds it communicatively useful and possibly compelling to explain what “a mixture” means. This turns out to be the three languages he speaks. If my explanation is correct, then afterthoughts may be considered to be “repair devices”, used by speakers to self-correct faulty texts. In this instance, it is used to clarify the identity of “a mixture”. As for (12)b the postposed material is presumably a strategy to explain what sort of help the refugees get. The speaker has probably realised that by merely stating that refugees receive help he has not given the receiver enough information. Hence the need to add more information which is presumed missing. This explanation is supported by Callow and Callow (1992) in their observations:
"It follows that if a communicator wishes to convey his message comprehensively, he has to ensure that adequate context (i.e. the essential components of the context in his own mind) is brought into the illuminated area of the mind of the addressee. Many of the supporting elements in discourse have this function: they provide needed setting, prompt the retrieval of known-but-unilluminated information, and so on" (Callow and Callow 1992: 13)

Before leaving this subsection, here are some more examples of RDs.

13 a Za Silikani sa Commonwelth of nations nizona, About friendship of Commonwealth of nations them

wa-li-ziba Sandaula.
SM+PRES-OM-know Sandaula.
Matters that concern the Commonwealth of nations, he knows them, Sandaula.

b ....Kono ba-mu-sweli, Mubita.
...But SM+PAST-PERF-OM- trap, Mubita
...But they have trapped him, Mubita.

In (13).a. the dislocated NP “Sandaula” is in cataphoric reference with the affixed pronominal “wa” in the clause. This construction is also LD. The dislocated constituent is “Za silikani sa commonwealth of nations ni zona” and it is in reference to “li”. “Mubita” is in a cataphoric reference with the pronominal argument “mu” in (13) b.

6.2.3.2.2. Effects of LIPOC and EW

Right dislocation places adjoining referents to the right of the clause. As stated above, RD subsumes many diverse categories. Indeed an observation of the attested dislocated constituents reveals a host of elements with varying internal structural characteristics. They range from pronouns to clauses. In its prototypical surface structure, however, the construction exhibits the preference to place relatively more complex constituents earlier than lighter ones (see the template in 11 above). The elements that occur in X are generally less complex than those that precede them.
For instance, in example cited in (13)a, a simple noun “Sandaula” follows a clause. There does not seem to be evidence for the effect of LIPOC and the theory of end-weight particularly in constructions in which a complex clause precedes a simple (dislocated) noun.

6.2.4. Existential

Another constituent ordering that emerges from the interaction of morphosyntactic and discourse-pragmatic principles is the existential. As in many other languages, the existential in Silozi manifests a construction indicating what does and what does not exist. It, however, emphasizes the idea of existence. According to Longacre’s (1983) proposal a noun of which existence is affirmed or denied in the existential clause should be called the existent. In Silozi, existentials often exhibit locational properties by expressing the location of referents. As will be demonstrated below, they occur with a locative or temporal complement. Lyons (1967) and Clark (1978) claim that it may well be a universal. On the basis of such considerations, we may reach the conclusion that existential constructions can be analysed as containing an unspecified locative predicate which is applied to an indefinite specific argument.

6.2.4.1. Syntactic characteristics

Two types of existentials which correspond to the functions (existence and non-existence) are attested in the text. The first type of existentials is expressed in form of a declarative, positive sentence. This is the typical existential sentence structure in Silozi. As we demonstrate below, it consists of a particle “ku” (English there) followed by a verb “nani” which is the copula (be) and any other material which is generally an NP. “Ku” acts as the grammatical subject while the NP is the notional subject. The negative existential is marked by the particle “ha”. Henceforth, we shall refer to these elements as the existential particle. The particle has come to be a grammatical marker, assisting in providing flexibility of expression in the SVO pattern (Lehmann 1978). The attested existentials in the texts have NPs which are followed by relative clauses. Based on this description, the surface structures may be presented as follows:

14. Part Cop NP (+Rel) X

As illustrations for declarative existentials, consider the following examples:
15.a. *Ku-nani* mutangana cwana...ya-ni-tisezanga muziki...
Exist-be youngman this ....REL-OM-PRES-bring music...
There is this youngman who brings me music.

b. *Ne-ku-nani* nto iling’wi ya-na-eza-nga Kamuyongole
PAST-EXIST-be thing one REL-SM-do-PROG Kamuyongole
ya-na-sa-ezangi kamita.
REL-SM+PAST-NEG-do-PROG usually
There was one thing which Kamuyongole was doing which he never usually did.

c. *Musipili* wo ni-utwe-zi ku misisi Smith...*Ku-nani*
Trip this SM-hear-PERF from miss Smith...EXIST-PRES-be
*musali* wa mukuwa ya luta kwa sikolo.
woman of white REL+PRES-teach at school
I heard about this trip from Miss Smith... There is a white woman who teaches at the school.

In (16), I illustrate negative existential constructions. Unlike the declarative existential, the particle in these constructions is marked by “*ha-*”

16.a *Ha-kuna* musizana ya-na-tabisa Kamuyongole
NEG+EXIST-PAST-be woman REL-PRES-attract Kamuyongole

kwanda Katekwe.

apart-from Katekwe

There was no woman who attracted Kamuyongole apart from Katekwe.

b. ....*Kono*...*ha-kuna* ya-hulile ya-kona kuina asina musali.
...But....NEG+EXIST-be REL-grown REL-can stay without woman

...But there is no adult who can stay without a wife.
c. Hakuna ya-ina fa bu-lelela za
NEG+EXIST-PAST-be REL+PAST-stay where SM+PRES-talk about

teni ya-ka-palelwa ku seha mane ku lila inge yatikinywa.
them REL+PAST-fail to laugh and to cry as-if tickled
There was nobody present where he talked about things that would not end up crying as if they were being tickled.

6.2.4.2. Discourse-pragmatic characteristics

The postposing of the subject has the effect of presenting it as new information. The subject “ku” is indefinite. This existential particle rearranges the sentence in which the subject is postponed thereby re-introducing it as a new referent into the discourse “Existential representative constructions” (EPCs), also known as indefinite subject constructions, are typically used to introduce new referents into the discourse (see also Givon (1990: 17). Not only do they introduce new topics, but in particular new important referents”. Clark (1978) also observes that existential constructions typically serve a presentative function, i.e. to introduce participants on to the discourse stage. Hence the nominal element (NOM in her terminology) is almost always indefinite.

6.2.4.3. Effect of LIPOC and EW

It is evident that the order of constituents in this construction is in terms of increasing structural complexity. This is demonstrated by an ordering pattern which places a particle as the left most constituent and ends with a noun phrase or a relative clause as the right most element. Structurally and in terms of status on the grammatical hierarchy, the two constituents that are preceded by the particle “ku” are heavier and more complex. This pattern can be represented as follows:

17. Particle---------> Phrase------------->(clause)

<-------------------------------->                      
Left (lighter)                                                 
Right (heavier) 

From what we have established so far and what has been proposed in the literature about the theory of end weight and the principles incorporated in LIPOC, this is the preferred permissible order. Needless to say, lighter material is placed before heavy
material with a resultant distributional skewing to the right. Further, the ordering pattern exhibits a definite tendency and preference for placing constituents in order of increasing categorial complexity. This is done progressively from the left to right. According to LIPOC the placement rules have assigned the constituents to their designated positions in the linear sequence. In so far as these predictions are concerned, this ordering pattern is by default. Dik (1993:387) notes “this principle may lead to deviations from the expected orderings such that constituents of low complexity occur earlier than expected, whereas constituents of great complexity occur later than expected.” Since LIPOC is evidenced, it follows that the theory of end weight also finds expression in this Silozi construction. To sum up, I have provided evidence to show that the ordering of constituents in Silozi existential constructions is sensitive to weight principles and LIPOC. Grosu and Thompson’s (1977) findings that long and heavy constituents in general are least acceptable clause medially, somewhat acceptable clause-initially, and most acceptable clause-finally support our findings.

6.2.5. Extraposition

Another attested construction that departs from the basic subject-verb-object structure is in Silozi is extraposition. The type of extraposition we are concerned with here precludes the transformationalist PP complement movement.

6.2.5.1. Syntactic characteristics

Extraposition in Silozi involves the postponing of the subject which is replaced by the anticipatory subject. The anticipatory subject takes the form of a particle “ki” which combines the functions of anticipatory subject and the verb. The resultant construction is a rearranged sentence in which a complex constituent (which is normally a clausal subject) is placed later in the clause and the simpler one (in this case a particle) takes its place. Greenbaum (1996) describing the same structure in English observes that postponing of the subject provides a more balanced sentence, a sentence where what precedes the verb is shorter than what follows it. This description is applicable to our situation. There are two types of constructions that involve extraposition. The first type consists of structures that have corresponding extraposed equivalents.
18.a. *Ki* kokunde *ku* bonanga *batu* ha-ba-sa-kula....

Part+is good to see people SC-SM+PRES-be-still-ill..

It is good to see people when they are still ill....

b. *Ki* hande *kuli mutu* na-shwa *mwa-mu-bona*...

....Part+is desirable comp person SC-SM+PRES-die SM+PRES-OM-see....

.....It is desirable that you are present when the person is dying.

c. *Ki* niti *kuli manzwi amande a-zwa* kwa *batu*

PART-is true COMP words good REL-come from people babahulu atusa mwa bupilo.

elderly help in life

It is true that good words which come from elderly people are helpful in life.

The surface structures of these constructions may be symbolised by the following as below.

19. PART COMP CI X

Before the process of extraposition is effected the examples in (18) would read as in (20). These are perfectly acceptable albeit unusual.


To see-HABT people SC+SM-still-ill is good

Visiting people when they are still ill is good.


COMP person SC-SM+PRES-die SM+PRES-OM-see is desirable

That you are present when the person is dying is desirable.

c. *Kuli* mazwi amande a-zwa *ku* babahulu a-tusa

COMP words good REL-come from elderly SM+PRES-help

mwa bupilo ki niti.

in life is true.

Lit. “That the blessings of elderly people are useful in life is true”
The second type involves constructions which do not have corresponding non-extraposed equivalents. Extraposition is obligatory in these cases. In his observation concerning constraints on the distribution of complements, Noonan (1985: 83) claims that in a few cases, extraposition seems to be obligatory, even though the non-extraposed sentence would not violate the ordinary constraints on the placement of complements. In such cases, extraposition predicates seem to be governed by complement taking predicates (CTP). In Silozi, the predicate “ku bonahala” (English appear, seem) have obligatory extraposition of their subjects. Consider the following examples:

   PART seems COMP Punga SM+PAST-disappoint very
   It seems that Punga was very disappointed.

b. *Ku bonahala kuli Sandaula na-si-ka-utwiswisisa
   PART seems COMP Sandaula SM+PAST-NEG-understand
   sana bulezi president.
   what said president.
   It seems that Sandaula did not understand what the president said.

c. *Ku bonahala kuli u-twa hahulu butuku.
   PART appears COMP SM+PRE-feel great pain
   It appears that he is in great pain.

To show that these predicates have obligatory extraposition the following examples are unacceptable and ungrammatical.

   COMP Punga SM+PAST-disappoint very PART seems
   That Punga was very disappointed it seems.

b. *Kuli Sandaula na-si-ka-utwisisa hande sana bulezi
   COMP Sandaula SM-NEG-PAST-understand clearly what said
   president ku bonahala.
   president PART seems
   That Sandaula did not understand what was said by the president it seems.
c. *Kuli u-twa hahulu butuku ku bonahala.
COMP SM+PRES-feel great pain PART appears
That he is in great pain it appears.

6.2.5.2. Discourse-pragmatic characteristics

For pragmatic reasons extraposition of the nominal subject is displaced on the principle of end focus. The postposing of the clausal subject has the effect of assigning it with the status of a focused constituent. That is, the placing of the subject to the last position in the clause assigns the focus function to it. It follows from this that the constituents “kubonanga batu habasakula”, “kuli nashwa mwa mubona”, “kuli manzwi amande azwa kubabahulu a tusa mwa bupilo” in the examples above are assigned the focus status. Harris-Delisle (1978) has proposed that extraposition as a reordering rule changes the linear order of constituents in an emphatic sentence and applies to old information and/ or presuppositional material only. The extraposed constituent, thus contains focal information in the sense of Siewierska (1988: 41).

6.2.5.3. Effects of LPOC and EW

Once again, the best way to determine the efficacy of the two weight principles under study is by closely examining the distributional behaviour of constituents in a particular construction. We should point out once again that the type of extraposition we are dealing with is basically restricted to the postposing of a clausal unit from the initial position of a clause to the end. As far as the two extraposed constructions attested in the text are concerned, the following distribution pattern may be postulated.

23. PART--------------->(Adj.)------------------------>Cl
                  ________________________________________
LEFT(lighter)               RIGHT(heavier)

On the scale of complexity which is based on the internal structure of constituents, a particle is lighter than a word. A word is lighter than a phrase and so on. This is the intuition that underpins Hawkins heaviness Hierarchy (HH) which we have referred to above. It is evident from this pattern that a lighter constituent (PART) precedes a
heavier constituent (an adjective when present) which, in its turn, precedes a heavier constituent (a nominal clause). Increasing complexity in these constructions is involved when the displacement can be interpreted as a means of reducing the complexity of constituents in the positions in which these occur (see also De Groót 1981). In terms of weight principles, the displacement of the nominal subject clause is on the principle of end weight. According to FG, displacement for pragmatic reasons will bring constituents to "special positions" which are typically found towards the front end of the clause, whereas displacement for complexity reasons will typically bring constituents towards the end of the clause (Dik 1997).

Studies that have addressed syntactic, discourse-pragmatic and cognitive factors in constituent ordering have almost invariably confirmed that the preferred location for sentential NPs is the last position of the matrix clause (c.f. Kuno, Grosu and Thompson, Dryer ibid). With these considerations, we should now be in a position to address the question whether LIPOC and EW are indeed determinants of constituent ordering in the Silozi extraposed constructions. From the structural description and examples presented in (20) and (21) above, it is reasonable to conclude that these two weight principles which both predict rightward skewing of heavy material are governors in the ordering of constituents in these constructions. This conclusion does not suggest that other principles are not at play in constituent ordering. The relocating of a heavier element towards the end of a sentence and replacing it with a lighter one is inherently in accordance with LIPOC and EW.

6.2.6. Clefts

Another process of deviating from the canonical and basic clause structure is clefting. Dik (1997: 170) proposes the following as some of the salient characteristics of prototypical clefts across languages:

(i). The cleft construction will conform to the rules for expressing non-verbal predications, especially with respect to (a) constituent ordering and (b) The presence or absence of copula.

(ii). The Given topic constituent in the cleft construction will have the properties of a verbal restrictor more specifically, the properties of a headless or dummy headed relative clause.
6.2.6.1. Syntactic features

Silozi has two types of cleft constructions. These are the equivalents of *cleft* and *pseudo cleft* constructions. Let us begin with the cleft. As in other languages, the cleft sentence is a construction which involves the use of the particle “*ki*” which combines the role of the dummy subject and copula. These are translated as “*it*” and “*be*” in English. The particle is followed by a noun phrase which is, in its turn, followed by a relative clause. The placement of constituents before the verb in this construction is very restricted. Only a single constituent is allowed in the preverbal position. This is the particle “*ki*”. This construction is, henceforth, referred to as the *Ki*-cleft. These constructions have the form:

24. **Ki + copula + predicate nominal + relative clause**

Examples (25).a-c illustrate this type of construction excerpted from our data:

    PART+PRES-be father of Mboma REL-SM+PAST-bring-PERF stick that
    It is Mboma’s father who brought that stick.

b. *Ki*-wona musebezi wahae fa-holela masheleng’i.
    PART+PRES-be job his REL+PRES-pay money
    It is the job that gives him money.

c. *Ki* yena anosi ya-na-ilobona mitolo.
    PART+PRES him alone REL-SM+PAST-PERF-see bad-omen
    It is him alone who had witnessed the bad omen.

d. *Ne*-ili papali ya-na-tabela ni ku kona hahulu.
    PART-PAST-be game REL+PAST-enjoy and to excel very
    It was an activity he enjoyed and was very good at.

Note that the particle in (25)d. *Ne* is a variant of *Ki*. It is the past form of the verb. As for the pseudo-clefts, this construction typically places the particle “*sa*” initially in Silozi. It is therefore called Sa-cleft in this study. These constructions have the form:

26. **Sa + clause-argument + copula + argument**

The following examples illustrate Sa-clefts from our data:
27a. **Sa-ezize** kulu ki ku apula mulomo.

PART+PAST-do tortoise is to open mouth

What tortoise did is to open his mouth.

b. **Sa-konile** feela ku bilelela Kamuyongole ki kuli

PART+PAST+be+able just to say Kamuyongole is COMP

ni-ta-ku-bona kamuso.

SM-FUT-OM-see tomorrow

What Kamuyongole was able to say is that I will see you tomorrow.

c. **Sa-ezize** Punga ki ku kopanyaba ne-ba-mu-foselize

PART+PAST-do Punga is to summon those REL+PAST-PERF-OM-offend

kasamulaho’a mulalelo.

after supper

What Punga did was to summon those who had offended him after supper.

### 6.2.6.2. Discourse-pragmatic characteristics

Clefts and pseudo-clefts belong to a group of constructions called special focus constructions in FG. These are defined as constructions which intrinsically define a specific constituent as having the “Focus function”. The salient discourse-pragmatic characteristics of clefts (Dik ibid) include the following:

“The arguments of the cleft construction will behave as a given topic constituent, and the predicate term (nominal) will behave as a focus constituent, and these constituents will thus conform to the rules for the treatment of Given topic and Focus constituents in the language concerned.”

In a recent study of the discourse functions of WH-clefts, Kim (1995) concludes that marked word order constructions like WH-clefts can be viewed as being especially adapted to particular interactional conversation in such a way that the initial topical element is added to a proposition to refer to some general concerns. They have the functional and interactional properties in the area of focus-giving and nominal reference. The difference in the discourse functions of the Sa-clefting and Ki-clefting is that while the former puts information that is very available in the organising position the latter deals with less available information (in the non-cleft portion) and
does not use the organizing position for this information.\footnote{See Prince (1978), Harold (1995), and Kim (1991, 1995) for a more detailed study of the functions of these construction types. Although the studies are based on different languages, the observations are applicable to the Silozi constructions.} In examples (25) and (27) the particles $Ki/ Sa$ behave as given topics and those that are predicated as focus constituents. These constituents conform to the rules for the treatment of Given topic and focus constituents in Silozi.

### 6.2.6.3. Evidence for LIPOC and EW

From the surface structures, it is clear that the ordering of constituents in both the $Ki$-cleft and $Sa$-clefts is in terms of categorial complexity from the left to the right. The first elements, $Ki$ and $Sa$, are particles which are obviously shorter and less complex than the NPs and the other constituents which follow them. The NPs that immediately follow the verb are also less complex than the clauses they precede. Based on these structural observations, it is reasonable to say that cleft constructions in Silozi inherently order constituents in terms of increasing complexity. Dik observes that the clause final position could be described as a position which lends a certain “neutral” relief to that constituent which happens to end up in it. Because of this, the distributions of the constituents within the special constructions are not relevant for statistical considerations. This tendency inherently lends support to the predictions of LIPOC. The patterns underlying these constructions may be presented in the following schema in (28). The particle in this case may be $Ki$ or $Sa$

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{PART} & \rightarrow \text{NP} \rightarrow \text{CI} \\
\leftarrow \text{LEFT (lighter)} & \rightarrow \text{RIGHT (heavier)}
\end{align*}
\]

There is evidence in this construction type that the two principles of weight influence the ordering of constituents.

### 6.2.7. The interrogative

Another marked construction attested in the texts is the interrogative. Data from our texts have revealed that there are three means which are used to encode the interrogative in Silozi. These are word order, morphology and intonation. The role of these devices in interrogatives is attested by Sadock and Zwicky (1985), Ultan 1978.
who have noted them in other languages. The languages that have been used to demonstrate the use of these devices are from varying genetic and areal backgrounds. They include Swahili, Tagalog, Malay, German and Modern Hebrew. They therefore represent a fairly balanced and thus reliable sample. In FG, the expression of the interrogative clause is brought about by the effect of illocutionary operators. Illocutionary operators may have a variety of effects on the expression of the clause (Dik 1997: 386). This is done in three ways: (a) they may only effect the intonation; (b) they may effect the order of constituents and the intonation; (c) they may also affect the ordering of constituents and trigger the insertion of an interrogative particle. Among these devices, intonation seems to be the most utilised and has universal applications (Givon 1970, 1990). This is corroborated by the fact that intonation plays a significant role in the formation of all types of interrogatives in the text.

Silozi typically distinguishes two general types of interrogative clauses, which translate roughly into yes-no clauses and Wh-clauses. For ease of exposition, I have labelled them interrogative 1 (Intr.1) interrogative 2 (Intr.2).

### 6.2.7.1. Syntactic characteristics

The first type of interrogative, **Intr.1** is like a declarative, affirmative utterance in terms of structure. A rising tone is used to effect the questioning. We classify it as a **Yes-No** (or **Nexus**) question (c.f. Sadock and Zwicky ibid, Givon 1990). According to our data, it is manifested in two forms. The first is coded as a SWC, which we have discussed elsewhere. Examples of such interrogatives are illustrated below:

29. a. Ba-ba-timi-le?
   
   SM+NEG-OM-give-PERF
   
   They have not given them. Lit. “Haven’t they given them?”

b. Mu-feli-ze?
   
   SM-finish-PERF
   
   You have finished?
   
   Lit. “Have you finished?”

c. Mwa-fundu-ka?
   
   SM+PRES-leave-PROG
   
   You are leaving?
   
   Lit. “Are you leaving?”
As stated above, the examples in (29) have the structure of declaratives. They are marked for the interrogative through intonation. In (29)a, the construction, as rendered, is a negative although this is not manifested in the surface structure.

Yes-no questions may also be realised as full clauses. These are illustrated in (30).

30. a. U-twile bunde bwa liyemo mo-bu-inези?
   INT+SM-hear-PERF goodness of appearance how-SM+PRES-be
   You hear how the goodness of appearances is
   “Do you understand how deceptive appearances can be?”

   b. Ku-nani ya-ka-hanye zakuli Alexander Sandaula ki yomung’wi
   INT+PRES-be-there Rel FUT-doubt COMPAlexander Sandaula is one
   wa batu bapili mwa Zambia kuba ni kutwisiso yetuna ya
   of people first in Zambia to-be with appreciation great of
   mutomo wa naha yaluna wa Humanism-butu sakata?
   motto of country our of Humanism-humanity real
   “Is there anybody who will doubt that Sandaula is among the first
   Zambians to show a full appreciation of the country’s motto of
   humanism?”

The example in (30)b is a long question which is marked by intonation. Furthermore, it exhibits structural characteristics of declarative existentials. This is a common way of asking questions in Silozi spontaneous discourse. On the whole, the interrogative particle combines the functions of subject and auxiliary in these constructions. Seen in this way, we can say that this is the equivalent of inversion as described in other grammatical descriptions. In (30) a. the first constituent of the clause is thus a particle “U-”. This is followed by a noun phrase “bunde bwa liyemo”. In the last position, we have a subordinate clause “mobuinezi”. In (30)b, it is “Ku-” which combines with “-nani” to form the equivalent of the question marker “is there”. We may generalize that these constructions are of the ordering pattern: “QM” CI. The placement rules for these surface structures may be symbolised as follow:

31. “QM” CI
It should be noted that "QM" is not overt and the interrogative force is rendered in conjunction with intonation. This pattern simply shows that the interrogative particle, which marks the question pattern, occurs in the initial position. The clause goes to the end of the sequence.

The second form of yes-no interrogative clause is the equivalent of the tag question. These constructions consist of a clause and a "tag" that requests confirmation or disconfirmation of the declarative clause. Since tags do not form an integrated part of the clause, they are considered to be "Extra Clausal Constituents" in FG. In Silozi, the tag is encoded as "nji". The tag may follow an SWC clause or a fully fledged clause. Since Silozi employs some other, more fully grammaticalized means of forming yes/no questions, tag questions are usually a secondary yes/no question device. The following examples illustrate these constructions:

32.a. Wa-utwa nji?
   SM+PRES-hear QM
   Do you understand?

32.b. Mu-chile nji?
   SM+PRES-eat QM
   Have you eaten?

Let us now consider the second type, Intr.2. This construction is a product of the application of word order and intonational principles. Syntactically (i.e. in terms of word order) we have a clause which takes the form of a normal declarative and neutral SV order as illustrated in (33). Apparently, this is the only occurring incidence of the Intr 2.

33. Bo Synkwilimba (S) + babulelala kuli baya (V)
   Mr. Synkwilimba says that he is going.

To make it a question, an interrogative particle "lili" (when) is tacked at the end. This particle is typically used for marking interrogatives. Declaratives are the most unmarked sentence type. The particles usually take a position close to the verb. In this case, the structure places the interrogative particle (QM) or interrogative adverbial in the final position with a rising tone. In this respect, we may say that this is the equivalent of the English "Wh-" interrogative clause. Silozi differs from
English in that it places the particle at the end of the clause. This structure has been observed by Lehmann (1973) in Thai and claims that the general interrogative marker occurs in the final position. The resultant structure as manifested in the text can be seen in the following extract:

34.a. Bo Synkwilimba ba-bulela kuli baya lili?
Bo Synkwilimba SM+PRES-say COMP SM+PRES-go IA
Lit. “When does Bo Synkwilimba say he is leaving?”

Note that leaving out “lili” we get the corresponding declarative (c.f. 33). Intr. I is the equivalent of what Sadock and Zwicky (ibid) call information or question-word question. Here the alternatives are specified not in an exhaustive way by listing, but in an open-ended way quantification. For example the answer to “lili” could be “kamuso” (tomorrow), “isaho” (next year), etc. In constructions where the questioned element is the subject or object, Silozi employs intonation marking. As an illustration, consider the example:

35.a. Ki ŋi yana boni?
INT+PAST-be what he see
It is what he saw = “What did he see?”

b. Ki mang’i yana ku boni?
INT+PAST-be who you to see
It is who you saw = “Who saw you?”

It should be clear from the examples that intonation marking plays a significant role in Silozi question formation. Structurally, this construction places a clause before a particle. The surface structure of this construction may be represented as follows:

36. CI QM

6.2.7.2. Discourse-pragmatic characteristics

The use of an interrogative involves the rearrangement of constituents to change the illocutionary force of an utterance. Dik (ibid: 302) argues that this pragmatic

49 Intonation seems to be the major device for question marking even in other Zambian Bantu languages. I have confirmed this with native speakers of these languages.
conversion is effected at the level of intention and interpretation in a wider, pragmatic theory of verbal interaction. As a basic illocution, the interrogative should be interpreted as a n instruction in which a speaker (S) instructs addressee (A) to provide him with information as specified in the proposition.\(^5\) Interrogative clauses are, thus grammaticalized means of specifying that a particular utterance is to be understood as a request for information rather than an assertion. Generally, the purpose of interrogatives is to request information.

The basic use of yes-no questions is to solicit information. Focused yes-no questions are used when the state or event is assumed to have occurred, but a particular element of it, say subject-object, verb, adverb- is not fully known to the speaker. The information requested for the former is a simple affirmation or disaffirmation, i.e. “yes” or “no”. Unlike Intr1 questions, Intr 2 questions require a more elaborate response such as a phrase or clause. They always present the rest of the proposition as old or presupposed information because they interrogate part of a proposition. For instance, “Bo Syankwilimba babulela kuli baya lili?” (When does Bo Syankwlimba say he is leaving?) in (34) presupposes that Bo Synkwlimba is leaving at some time. The new information is the request for the identity of the interrogated part of the sentence. The interrogated part of the sentence can thus be called the ‘focus’ of the sentence, but it is also what the sentence is about.

6.2.7.3. Effect of LIPOC and EW

From the above description, it is clear that Silozi uses an array of structures to encode the interrogative. It is therefore not easy to state the effect of these two principles of weight in a straight forward manner for these constructions. The construction types respond differently to the effects of these principles. Some constructions place the focus or question in the pattern positions while others do not. This pattern has been observed in Babungo (Schaub 1985: 9). To address this, we

---

\(^5\) Dik stresses that the term “information” is not to be restricted to cognitive knowledge, but includes any possible item which is somehow present in the mental world of individuals, including their preconceptions and prejudices. He further claims that pragmatic information can be divided into three main categories:

(i) **general information**: long-term information concerning the world, its natural and cultural feature, and other possible or imaginary worlds;

(ii) **situational information**: information derived from what the participants perceive or otherwise experience in the situation in which the interaction takes place;

(iii) **contextual information**: information derived from the linguistic expressions which are exchanged before or after any given point in the verbal interaction.
have to examine the ordering of constituents in each one of them. Most yes-no questions especially those that involve tags or interrogative markers place them postverbally. Clauses precede the particles or tags. Precisely, the elements are placed at the very end of the clause. In such constructions, it is obvious that there is no evidence for LIPOC and EW. These constructions inherently place lighter, less complex constituents at the end of the sequency (c.f. 32 and 34). However, some constructions do place particles in the initial position. The ordering of constituents i of (30) is in terms of increasing categorial complexity. The particles which are coded as *Int* (for interrogative particle) are structurally less complex than the clauses that follow them. The only conclusion to be drawn from this is that there is no evidence for the effect of these two principles of weight.

### 6.2.8. Negatives

It is commonplace in the literature that the negative construction is marked with respect to the positive. Typically, a Silozi clause is negated by adding the affix ‘*ha-*’ to the primary verb or to the first (or only) auxiliary. In discourse, it combines the functions of subject, agreement and tense marker. Because of this, it exhibits different morphological characteristics. These characteristics have also been observed by Givon (1980, 1984) for Swahili. He claims that negation markers often cliticise on the verb, mostly commonly in conjunction with the tense-aspect-modal morphology. He also observes that the negation marker may on occasion also merge with a personal pronoun/ agreement marker to form a portmanteau morpheme. As we saw in 2.3.1. above, it is also used to mark the negative existential. Silozi employs various negative particles to express sentential negation depending upon the discourse context. For the present purposes we will only confine ourselves to what may be referred to as standard negation. Below are some examples:

37 a  Mutangana  *ha*-sika-sinya   nako
   Young man  NEG+SM-PAST-do   time
   The young man did not waste time.

b  Mutu  *ha*-yumbwi.
   Person  NEG+SM+PAST-dumped
   A human being cannot be rejected.

c  *Ha*-koni   ku   doja.
   SM+NEG-can   to   dodge
   He cannot dodge.
Examples (37) c-d illustrate cases in which a negation marker is merged with a subject and agreement marker.

6.2.8.1. Discourse pragmatic characteristics

Zwicky and Sadock (1985) term negative constructions as marked negative declaratives. This is because the major function of declaratives in discourse is to convey new information. Givon (1984: 323) argues that within the declarative sentence one can always identify parts ('chunks') that carry no new information but rather are presupposed or backgrounded, and parts that are indeed asserted new information. The negative variant is used to convey new information of a very different sort than the corresponding affirmative. On this basis negative declaratives may be rightly considered a distinct speech act, that of denial of or contradiction. As an illustration I provide some part of the context in which (37)c. is transacted. The participants are talking about a corrupt politician who has enriched himself and faces a possibility of being prosecuted. One of them suggests that he might flee the country or simply get away with it because of the corrupt system.

   SM-FUT-OM-catch
   They will catch him.

L2. B: Uh...Kono wa-kona kumata.
   Uh...But SM+PRES-can run
   Uh...But he can run away.

L3. A: Uhh!...Kono Ha-koni ku doja
   Uhh!...But SM+NEG-can to dodge
   Uhh! But he cannot escape.

What can be seen in this example is that the general informational content of the proposition is already shared by the speaker and hearer—that the politician may be prosecuted. However, the negative asserted proposition in L3, shows that the speaker tells the hearer that he does not share his/ her belief in the corresponding affirmative.
In this sense, the negative does not add new information about the verb, subject, objects or other participants in the state or event.

6.2.8.2. Effect of LIPOC and EW

The ordering of constituents in the negative sentence is not homogeneous. It is therefore not easy to assess the effect of these principles without recourse to the actual contexts in which the contructions are transacted. However, it is possible to generalize that in constructions which place the negative particle in the initial position constituents are likely to be ordered in terms of categorial complexity. In these constructions, the first constituent is always a particle. Arguably, the constituents that follow it are likely to be more complex. In constructions that place constituents other than the negative marker in the initial position, more complex material precedes lighter material. In fact, negative constructions which place complex constituents (such as clauses) before the particle are very rare in our data. As illustrations, consider the following examples.

   Nowadays SM+NEG-PRES-drink alcohol even little
   Nowadays, he does not take any alcohol.

6.2.9. Miscellaneous constructions.

This section deals with two types of constructions which involve constituents whose grammatical status cannot be derived from the clause with which they occur. These are, thus, marked constructions which do not involve the central or obligatory elements of the clause or sentence. Dik (1977) refers to them as “extra-clausal constituents” (ECCs). According to him, these constituents have the following properties:

(a). They may precede, interrupt, or follow the clause proper;
(b). They are not essential to the integrity of the internal structure of the clause: when left out without, the remaining clause structure is complete and grammatical;
(c). They are typically “bracketed off” from the clause by a pause-like inflections in the intonation pattern.
In linguistic discussions, these are referred to as fronting and postposing. We will start with fronting.

6.2.9.1. Fronting.

As observed above, Silozi sentences typically begin with a subject. In these constructions other functional elements-object, complement, adverbial and even parts of a verb can be placed at the front. The ordering pattern formulated for these constructions is:

\[40\text{ PI SVO}\]

The most occurring constituents in this position are adverbials. As is well known, adverbials are usually treated as a rag-bag category in grammar. On the scale of centrality vs peripherality, they are placed at the peripheral end. Further, they have a wide range of grammatical and semantic functions as well as different structures. I will illustrate the various types of constituents that may be preposed:

41a Habusa, Kamuyongole a-yo-bona mulatiwa wahae nihaike
Following day Kamuyongole SM-to-see lover his although
na-mu-libezi kabakala Namutesuko.
SM+PAST-PERF-OM-forget because-of Namutesuko
The following day, he went to see his lover although he had forgotten
about her because of Namutesuko

b Mwatas’a Lizauli lyeo kwa-kena tuchikwi totubeli twatuna.
Under tree that SM+PAST-enter goslings two male
Under that tree there entered two male goslings,

c Ha-na-lisiyo mwa Kamuhelo ne-ba-mu-tonda.
SC-SM+PAST+NEG-present in Kamuhelo SM-PAST-OM-miss
When he was not in Kamuhelo, they missed him.

In addition to the above fronted adverbials, there are also fronted nominals. However, cases that involve fronting of nominals are rare in our data. There is only one clear case in which we have such a construction which we illustrate in (42).
Lionda, ba-tome mo ba-konela kaufela
Dowries SM-fix+OPT how SM+PRES-like all
Dowries, they should fix how they like.

6.2.9.1.1. Discourse-pragmatic characteristics

There are various reasons for placing non-subject constituents in the initial position of a clause. Apart from the significant syntactic consequences which the placement of adverbials in the first position brings about, there are also discourse and pragmatic ones. The most common function of fronting is to mark emphasis. In FG, the clause initial position is reserved for constituents having Topic or Focus function. There is a specific constituent ordering principle which is formulated for this purpose. This is (SP4) which is presented as follows:

(SP4) There is a universally relevant clause-initial position P1, used for special purposes, including the placement of constituents with Topic or Focus function.

This position is used for special purposes which include the placement of constituents which must be placed in P1 and the placement of constituents with special pragmatic significance. The ordering pattern posited in (40) above indicates that these are non-subject and non-object constituents. As is evident from the examples in (41), adverbials may serve a variety of discourse-pragmatic functions. In general these functions concern the “management” of the discourse interaction. Because of their high frequency in the initial position, I believe we have to devote a separate slot for their discussion. Accordingly, their various discourse functions are discussed in greater detail. For the present we will only suggest that they can fulfil a wide range of functions in the organisation of discourse. There are placement rules, referred to by Dik (1980: 21) as R-rules which are proposed for positioning constituents in P1. The relevant constituents for in this section are adverbials and nominals (satellites). The proposed relevant placement rule for satellites is (R-3): else place X in P1, where X = some satellite or a dummy element51. Satellites placed in P1 are typically adverbials of time, place or circumstance. That is satellites which specify features of the setting in which the described state of affairs took place.

---

51 This rule has been formulated for Dutch but it applies to the initial position of Silozi main clauses as well. P1 is a universal position, after all.
The fronting of nominals is often referred to as topicalization (Ross 1967) or Y-movement (Postal 1971). Since they are non-subject or non-object constituents, they occupy a special position. On account of the (SP4) they have special pragmatic significance. The fronted nominals present new information. The nominal in (42) is fronted for emphasis. It is used for focus purposes.

6.2.9.1.2. Effect of LIPOC and EW

Based on the examples presented above, there are two different types of constructions which may be considered for the effect of these two weight principles. The first involves the placement of less complex constituents before more complex ones. These are constructions in which words and phrases precede clauses as in (41) a-b and (42). In these cases, there is evidence for LIPOC. In fact LIPOC predicts that when NPs and adpositional phrases occur in the Prefield, there will be less pressure for them to seek the final position. By extension, when words are placed in the initial position, there will equally be less pressure for them to seek the final position. The second type of constructions involves the placement of more complex constituents in the initial position. These constituents are typically subordinate clauses as represented by (41)c. This is not consistent with the predictions of LIPOC. However, due to pragmatic pressure these constituents are capable of appearing in the initial position (P1). This follows from the formulation that subordinate clauses can get Topic or Focus function just like other types of terms. Dik observes:

“This is in apparent contradiction with LIPOC: although the favourite position for subordinate clauses according to LIPOC is at the very end of the construction, these subordinate clauses can nevertheless appear in P1 on account of their pragmatic function. We can only conclude that the tendency for Topic and Focus constituents to be placed in P1 is apparently stronger than the pressure exerted on them by LIPOC.” (Dik 1997: 131)

Dik further argues that there is, in fact, much evidence for the rule that subordinate clauses tend to be placed either at the very end of the construction through LIPOC, or in P1 position on account of their pragmatic function. He has thus posited an ordering pattern which he considers relevant for these constructions as in (40) above.
6.2. 9.2. Postposing

We use this term to refer to constructions that involve the placement of constituents to the right. To a great extent, this term subsumes afterthought.

6.2.9.2.1. Syntactic characteristics

The postposed elements are literally placed outside the clause and do not involve cross referencing (Mallinson and Blake 1981: 119). According to Connolly (1991: 35) postposed constituents occur at the right of the clause and after the complement. They are thus “extra-clausal constituents”. This is because they are not essential to the integrity of the internal structure of the clause. When they are left out, the remaining clause structure is complete and grammatical. They are loosely adjoined constituents, which as we show below, most often provide additional information pertaining to the proper interpretation of the clause as a whole. Their typical position is, thus, after the clause. Unlike right dislocations, the postposed constituent is not necessarily in a co-referential relationship with the NP of the clause proper.

We have already pointed out that the least integrated constituents in the structure of the clause are adverbials. Because of their nature, the most likely candidates for this position are adverbials (satellites). Since the placement of adverbials in final position was covered in the Chapter 5, I will not discuss much of them here. I should state here that there are very few nominals that occur in this position. Most of the items that occur in this position are restricted to the spoken discourse. We defer their discussion to Chapter 8. Below are some examples to illustrate these constructions.
43. a. Mutangana u-ka-ni-tiseza matepu kamuso
Youngman SM-FUT-OM-bring tapes tomorrow.
The youngman will bring me some tapes tomorrow.
b. Fonikile na-sabela Sandaula ki-hakile a-tandanisa
When SM+PAST-respect Sandaula is-when SM+PRES-address
bana ba sikolo bababeli ba University ya Zambia ku-ba-luta
children of school two of University of Zambia to-them-teach
za mukopano wa manaha, United Nations.
about organization of countries, United Nations
I accorded Sandaula great respect when he addressed two University of
Zambia students, preaching to them about the United Nations.
c. Yena, he doesn’t care, Mapound a.
Him, he doesn’t care, Pounds these.
He doesn’t seem to care about spending them, these pounds.

6.2.9.2.2. Discourse-pragmatic characteristics

The postposed constituents occur in position P3 in Dik’s earlier versions of FG (see also Connolly ibid). These constructions are referred to as Clause+Tail in FG. In other words, the constituents which follow the clause proper are assigned the pragmatic function Tail. They are defined in general as characterizing constituents which present information meant to clarify or modify (some constituent contained in) the unit to which they are adjoined. They thus add bits of information which may be relevant to a correct understanding of the clause (Dik 1997: 401). Although they may represent some “repairing” strategy, they do not refer to some preceding pronominal entity in the clause proper. As noted above, the concept of “afterthought” may be extended to include any form of postposition. Hence, in a more recent publication, Harold (1995: 146) has argued that postposing with an intonation break seems to be a typical case of afterthought. That is, it appears that if the speaker makes the decision to include the postposed entity after he begins the sentence. This may be due to a re-evaluation by the speaker about the predictability of the entity. Post-verbal material is either unpredictable or unimportant.

52 As expounded in standard FG, these positions represent Topic, Focus and tail respectively (see also Connolly 1991).
The non-restrictive use of afterthought is endorsed by Dik(1997) in his designation of Tail function to constituents. The constituents which serve this function include satellites. As an example, he uses an adverbial of location. His argument is based on the premise that if the location of an action or state of affairs is not specified in the clause, then the tail, which is an adverb of location, adds a specification of a location which has not yet been referred to in the clause. Similarly, in (43)a the adverbial of time adds a specification of time which has not yet been referred to in the clause. However, since any action takes place at some point in time, the added constituent may nevertheless be seen as a further specification of the content of the clause. In this context, it seems necessary to specify when the youngman is actually bringing the tapes. As for postposed nominals, it seems that they serve the function of providing the English equivalent of entities expressed in Silozi and vice versa. In short, they act as interpretations. The senders (writers or speakers) are conscious of the fact that they are addressing potential bi-/ multi-lingual audiences. They are thus considered strategies for helping the receiver to have a correct understanding of the clause. In this case the speaker is not sure whether the receiver has a good command of either English or Silozi.

6.2.9.2.3. Effect of LIPOC and EW

From the surface structures of these constructions, there is no evidence to suggest that constituents are ordered in terms of categorial complexity. This is because in most of the constructions, clauses precede simple words such as respect markers. This is, in fact, their default structure as dictated by pragmatic factors. The only conclusion to be drawn from their surface structure is that they present a clear contravention of these two weight principles.

In the next three chapters, I report the text frequency distributions of the constituent orderings discussed here. I also provide some more examples to consolidate my claims.
Chapter 7

Constituent Order in Silozi Written Discourse

7.1. Introduction

In chapter 5, we established how constituents are distributed in what we have called SVX constructions in our database. Silozi exists in both the spoken and written forms. This chapter describes constituent ordering in Silozi written discourse. It also presents the results of text frequency counts of the distribution of constituents in the constructions. The emphasis is on ascertaining whether LIPOC and EW are determinants of constituent ordering in written discourse. The empirical results reported in this chapter are based on constituent ordering in two main types of syntactic constructions which were introduced in chapter 6, namely SVX, ASVX and specially marked constructions (clefts, existentials, extrapositions etc.).

In the rest of section 1, some introductory remarks. The methods used for analysing the texts are presented relating to this chapter are discussed in section 2. In sections 3-5, I present further illustrations of the construction types. The text count results for the frequency of distribution of constituents in them. Section 4 compares the frequency distribution of the major construction types. In section 5, we conclude the chapter with the finding that there is evidence for the effect of LIPOC and EW in the ordering of constituents in Silozi written discourse.

7.1.1. The Texts

The data upon which this study is based are written texts which were encoded in a computer record. These are 600 clauses from three novels written by Zambian Silozi native speakers. The following are the titles from which the texts were extracted:

Before proceeding with the account, a brief background to the books may be useful. *Kamuyongole* is the first literary work to be written by a Silozi native speaker. Written in the pre-independence era, the work is about a young man called Kamuyongole Manyando who becomes orphaned at an early age. Both of his parents are drowned. After the death of his parents, his older brother, Punga, brings him up. As he grows up, Kamuyongole develops a great liking for late night parties and womanising. His lust for women sees him committing adultery with a series of women including Punga's wife. One other married woman he commits adultery with is Katekwe. Because of his adventurous life, he ends up being hanged for murdering the husband of one of his lovers.

*Sandaula u hola mendulu* is set in post-independence Zambia. It about the life of a man called Alexander Mungole Libolosi who grows up in the Barotse flood plain. His village is along the banks of the Zambezi river. Because he ferries people across the Zambezi river, he is nicknamed “Sandaula”. Sandaula is a title used to refer to a person who lives by ferrying travellers across the river. This name becomes so popular that it effectively becomes his real name. Sandaula proves to be a very knowledgeable and wise man. Because of his ability to discuss issues of topical nature he is nicknamed “professor of general knowledge”. Later in life, he is awarded a “medal” for his contribution to public service. Hence the title *Sandaula uhola mendulu*, which literally means Sandaula is awarded a medal”.

The third work, *Utwa Muhaesu*, is an anthology of short stories about daily life experiences. The title is some sort of request which literally means “Listen my relative”. It is satirical in nature and features both human and animal characters. It is set in post-independence Zambia.

The discourse studied was chosen because it is narrative (a language genre which is not particular to only written languages and because it was assumed that the authors’ purposes were to tell a story (produce narrative) Brown 1983: 318). All the three texts were collapsed into a single data sample. This is because we are not interested in the individual stylistic differences of the texts. Moreover, the distributional patterns are quite similar. Rather, we are concerned with the overall patterns. This is not to suggest that the study does not recognise the role of style or genre in constituent ordering.
7. 2. Methods and analysis of text samples

The description that follows assumes that both the clause and the sentence are relevant to the analysis of written language, the clause being the basic unit upon which sentences are built. As we point out in Chapters 2 and 5, two types of constructions which fit the grammatical descriptions of the clause (main, independent) and sentence (combined clauses) are manifest in the data. Two hundred clauses or sentences were extracted from each book. Relative clauses, noun clauses, infinitive clauses, and gerund clauses were all counted as part of the clauses in which they functioned. Like Brown (1983:318), sections of conversations in the books were skipped so as to avoid the added complication of trying to determine whether a conversation is a single piece of discourse participated in by two (or more) people or whether it is two pieces of intertwined discourse.

As stated in Chapter 1, due to the overwhelming influence of both African and non-African languages (particularly English), there are numerous instances of interlanguage occasioned by code switching and shifting. Because of the phenomena a lot of borrowed grammatical structures are apparent in the narratives. Some examples are “saikolonji” (psychology), “peshini” (pension) and “silutu” (salute). Because these borrowed grammatical words and expressions are contained in the texts, we will regard them as part of the language we are studying. All the clauses and sentences used may be said to be correct and complete according to the rules of the language.

The distributions of constituents in these data were analysed both qualitatively and quantitatively with a view to establishing whether there is a correlation between their internal structure and the position they occupy. In other words, evidence for the effect of LIPOC is sought from two sources of evidence. The first source is from text counts for it is my intention that the hypotheses are interpreted as referring to tendencies in actual language use. As in Dryer (1980), some evidence is expressed in terms of rules and constraints on the assumption that such constraints will have certain effects on tendencies in actual language use. A chi-square test was carried out

53 There is general agreement in the literature that the primary unit of analysis in written language is the sentence (see especially Winter 1992). For the purposes of this study, we make a distinction between a clause and sentence which is based on the scale of grammatical hierarchy of constituency. Since this part of the thesis is about constituent ordering beyond the sentence, it is only legitimate that we consider the relationships among the basic component parts of the sentence.
to determine whether there is a correlation between the internal structure of a constituent and the position it occupies. Ultimately, this should tell us whether LIPOC and the theory of end weight are determiners of constituent ordering.

The second source of evidence consists of judgements of relative markedness. My assumption is that there are constructions which provide evidence for LIPOC by default. Some constructions which have simple constituents in the initial position and heavier, more complex constituents in the final position are pragmatically marked. Notable examples of these are clefts, existentials and extrapositions. In these construction types, judgements of markedness inherently reflect the ordering pattern in which simple constituents precede complex ones. These judgements suggest that complex constituents would exhibit a tendency for longer, complex constituents to occur later in the clause than simpler ones, thereby providing evidence for LIPOC and the theory of end weight. In these cases, we do not apply any statistical test. They are marked in terms of text frequency, anyway.

The methodology relating to the parsing of the constituents is the same as that provided in the introduction and Chapter 5. That is, the clause was divided into its constituent parts in terms of Subject, Verb, Object, Complement and Adverbial. These constitute the functional profiles of the constituents. Given the basic word order of Silozi which is SVO, we should expect lighter constituents to exhibit a tendency to occur in the subject position and more complex ones to prefer the complement and adverbial positions. The information in all the tables should be interpreted as follows. The positions reflect the surface structures of the constructions. That is, SVX represents the structure S+V+(O)+(C)+(A) and ASVX represents the surface structure A+S+V+(O)+(C)+(A). The column “TYPE” represents the types of categories that make up the constituents. These are the constituents that occur in the functional positions as described. In the explanation of the data the bracketed figures represent the frequency of occurrence and the percentage.

7.3. SVX constructions

The bulk of these constructions were described and illustrated in chapter 5. What I will do in this section is to provide more examples specifically from written texts.
1a Na-lata hahulu lika za sikuwa.
SM+PAST-like much things of modern
He liked modern things a lot.
b Punga a-rika ku susueza munyana hae...
Punga SM+PAST-try to encourage brother his
Punga tried to encourage his younger brother
c. Kono mihupulo ya yo munyinyani ne-isalulmelani ni ya Punga...
But thought of younger SM+NEG-agree with of Punga
But the younger brother’s plans were at variance with Punga’s.
d. Punga ni munyana hae ba-fumana kuli sicaba
Punga and brother his SM+PAST-discover COMP people
ne-si-ba-tabela ha-ne-basa-pilelwa ki bashemi babona.
SM-PAST-OM-like SC-still-SM+PAST-alive by parents their
Punga and his brother discovered that people liked them when their
parents were still alive.
e. Musizanayomung’wiya-na-tabela hahulu Kamuyongole ki Katekwe.
Girl one REL-CM-like much Kamuyongole is Katekwe
One girl who Kamuyongole liked a lot is Katekwe.
f. Ku yema kamba kuina ki kutosaela inge simbotwe se-si
To stand or to sit is to struggle like frog REL-SM
sina za ku eza.
NEG what to do
To stand up or to walk is a struggle just like a frog which has nothing to
do.

In example (1)a, a cliticized pronominal argument “na” agrees with the covert
subject which is mentioned previously. A single noun (name) “Punga” is the subject
of (1) b. In (1)c-d, the noun phrases “Mihupulo ya yomunyinyani” and “Punga ni
munyana hae” which involve modification by a possessive are the subjects. A noun
phrase which involves relative clause is illustrated in (1)e. (1)f illustrates an infinitive
clause “ku yema kamba ku ina” in the subject position.

The table below summarises the distribution of constituents in the clause or sentence.
The percentages are calculated on the total populations presented in each column
which represents the functional profiles of the constituents.
The comments that I make are based on the assumption that constituents share the positional properties of constituents to which they are syntactically similar (see also Dryer 1980). On this premise, I will compare nominal constituents with other nominal constituents in their functional profiles. Non-nominal constituents will be considered separately. The leftmost position (or first) position is the subject. The rightmost (or final) position is the adverbial in this construction type. Let us now establish whether the constituents are distributed in terms of categorial complexity. I will start with nominal constituents and then move on to non-nominal constituents. The comments are mainly focused on variables (distributions) which are significant.

I will start with the subject position. The first position for these constituents is the subject. The figures show that cliticised pronouns (incorporated pronominal arguments) dominate this position. There are 153 (39%) of them. The next most frequent is the NP (110/28.3%). This is followed by the N (87/22.4%) which is, in its turn, is followed by NRel (5.9%). Sentential subjects are the next least frequent occurring constituents (11/2.8%) while pronouns are the least frequent (1.28%).

### Table 7: Distribution of constituents in SVX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>POS</th>
<th>IO</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRO</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRON</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NREL</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLx</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADJ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADV</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADJP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The next position is the object position. We do not comment on indirect objects because our analysis has yielded very few of them. The relevant position is the direct object. It might be appropriate to refer to this position as medial. Not many constituents prefer to be placed in this position. Nevertheless, on the basis of these facts, the most frequent constituents are cliticized pronominals (31/35.6%). Simple nouns are the second most frequent (26/29.9%) which are followed by noun phrases (24/27.6%). There are only six incidences of head nouns that are modified by a relative clause (6/6.9%). The relative dominance of Pros in this position is understandable because they tend to occur as incorporated pronominals in discourse. As for NPs we would expect them not to exhibit a strong preference for this position, as they do not belong to the two extremes of complexities. That is, they are neither simple nor complex constituents on the scale of complexity. I would like to propose that end position (also called final position) for a single word or a phrase does not necessarily mean 'at the very end of its clause', but rather 'after the (object and) the verb' because of their relative complexity. Hence the frequencies of the two are almost equal. Overall, the distribution of nominals in this position is consistent with LIPOC since the simpler constituents (nouns and pronominals) occur much more frequently than the more complex constituents (NREL and clauses) do.

Moving towards the end of the clause, the table shows us that the position of complement is mostly preferred by clauses (80/39.8%). They occur more frequently than noun phrases, which involve modification by relative clauses. Their frequency is (32/15.9%). The next most frequent constituents are noun phrases which do not involve modification by relative clauses. There are 26 (12.9%) of them. The least frequent constituents are simple nouns (11/5.47%). In terms of LIPOC clauses are more complex than phrases and would therefore exhibit a preference to occur later in the sequence. NRELs, however, are more frequent in this position than they are in the direct object position. I do not comment on the distribution of non-nominals in this position because they do not occur in other positions.

In the final position, which is the adverbial, the figures tell us that clauses are the most frequent. They are followed by adverb phrases, which are in turn, followed by adverbs. We also observe that there is multiple subordination in the final position. A brief comment on the distribution of clausal and non-clausal constituents in these two positions might be useful. The comment is aimed at explaining the fact that there are more clauses in the adverbial position than there are in the complement position. The complement position is earlier than that of adverbial. On account of LIPOC we
should, therefore, expect clauses to be more frequent in the adverbial position than in
the complement position. This arrangement is consistent with the predictions of
LIPOC. Since Silozi is a Postfield language we should expect a tendency for
subordinate constructions to be placed further to the end of the complex construction,
preferably at the very end of that construction. LIPOC also predicts that there will
preferably be no material after a subordinate clause, unless that material is of the
same or greater complexity than that subordinate clause (Dik ibid: 127). This then
explains the multiplicity of subordinate clauses in the adverbial position. I have no
explanation to offer for the counter expectation exhibited by the distribution of
adverbs and adverbial phrases except to suggest that they do not represent a
spectacular difference.

With respect to the overall distribution the pattern reflects what we have reported for
SVX in Chapter 5. That is, there is a strong correlation between the ordering of
candidates and their internal structure as predicted by LIPOC and TOEW. The
distribution is highly significant: p < .001. With regards to the spectacular paucity of
pronouns, we have already stated in chapter 5 and elsewhere that pronouns rarely
occur as full constituents in Silozi discourse. They mainly occur as contrastive or
emphatic pronouns. In other cases, they are coded as incorporated pronominal
arguments. Givon (1979) and Lambrecht (1994), among others corroborate this
finding.

7.3.1. Other construction types related to SVX

The preceding section was concerned with what may be termed “canonical”
constructions. There are other constructions which have a similar pattern. Some of
these construction types have generally been considered to be “marked” in the
literature (c.f. Payne 1997, Dik 1997). They are said to be marked for various
reasons, say for negation, or clefting (Lambrech 1994). In other constructions, the
core arguments are not placed in their “normal” positions. There are also
constructions which involve special devices, such as extraposition and clefting.
These have an effect on the order of constituents. The use of these constructions and
the resultant emphatic ordering may be considered to be a contingent consequence of
choosing the constructions. It may also be noted that extraposition is sometimes
obligatory. In addition to these special (focus) constructions, there are passives,
negatives, existentials, negative existential. Each of these is illustrated by the
following examples from this text.
2 a **Passive**
Ling’olo le ne-litisizwe ki Katekwe luli.  
Letter this SM+PAST-bring by Katekwe herself  
The letter was brought by Katekwe herself.
b. Butata bwa-nafuna neli ku ziba saizi yahae.  
Problem Rel-SM+PAST-find SM+PAST-be to know size his  
The problem which he found was determining his size.

A-kile-a-ng’alelwa makanabas shuzi ki mulekisi ku  
SM+PAST-PERF-PASS-give canvass shoes by assistant at  
SSusuman kakuli a-a-taza masila kabakala kuitikanya  
Soothman’s SC SM-OM-make dirty SC trying  
mo ni mwale ku bata saizi yahae.  
here and there to find size his  
He had begrudgingly been given a pair of canvass shoes by a sales assistant at Soothman’s because he had made them dirty while wasting time trying them on.

3 a. **Negative**
Hakoni ku ya ni yena.  
SM+NEG-PAST-can to go with her  
He could not go with her.
b. Libizo la Sandaula la-zibahala kalona ha-ki-lona  
Name of Sandaula Rel+SM-PRES-know by SM+NEG-PRES-know  
libizo lahae la sipepo.  
name his of birth  
The name of Sandaula which he is known by is not his real name.
4 Existential
   a. Kunani nto iling'wi ya-na-ezang Ya Kamuyongole
      EXIST+PRES-be thing one REL-SM+PAST-do Kamuyongole
      ya-na-sa-ezangi hang'ata.
      REL-SM-NEG-do usually
      There was one thing which Kamuyongole did which he did not usually do.

5 Negative existential
   a. Kono ha-kuna sa-na-kona ku eza.
      But NEG+Exist+PAST-be COMP-SM+PAST-can to do
      But there was nothing that he could do.
   b. Hakuna muzamai ya-na-silezwi linzwi ku hua
      NEG+EXIST-PAST-be traveller Rel-SM+PAST-lose voice to shout
      Mungole inge aliteng'i.
      Mungole while present
      There was not traveller who lost their voice shouting for help while
      Mungole was present.

6 Clefts
   Sa-ezize kulu ki ku apula mulomo kuli aambole ni sicaba
   What+PAST-do tortoise is to open mouth SC talk to people
   se-ne-si-tezi fa fasi.
   REL-SM-PAST-gather on ground
   What Kulu did is to open his mouth in order to address the people who were
   gathered underneath.
7 Question
Ku-nani ya-ka-hanyeza kuli Alexander Sandaula ki
Int+PRES-be-there REL-FUT-doubt COMP Alexander Sandaula is
yomung’wi wa batu bapili mwa Zambia ku ba ni kutwisiso
one of people first in Zambia to have with appreciation
yetuna ya mutomo wanaha yaluna wa Humanism-butu sakata
great of motto of country our of Humanism-humanity real
Is there anybody who will doubt that Sandaula is among the first Zambians to
show great appreciation of the country’s motto of humanism-real humanity.

The construction illustrated in (7) is derived from an existential construction. It is a
long example of a question marked by intonation. It also has characteristics of
afterthought which is coded by “butu sakata”. I believe this is additional information
which is included here to explain what “Humanism” means in Silozi.

8 Extraposition
Ku tata ku ziba mwana konela Sandaula ku zamaya
PART+PRES-be difficult to know how able Sandaula to walk
inze a-futuzi makatulo.
While SM+PAST-cross shoes
It is difficult to understand how Sandaula was able to walk while his shoes
were on the wrong feet.

The relative frequencies of these constructions are summarised in table 8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PASS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXIST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG-EXIST</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleft</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quest</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrap</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When compared to SVX constructions, these constitute 16% of all the SVX constructions while the canonical ones constitute 84%. As stated above, these construction types do not contradict the predictions of LIPOC and EW. Existentials, extrapositions and clefts, in particular, place complex constituents (subordinate clauses) further to the end of the complex construction. In these constructions, the use of elements such as “dummy” or particles is assumed to be a “means of preserving the canonical pattern of the clause, in conditions in which the subject does not occur in its pattern position” (Dik 1997: 128). If we look at all the examples in (4)-(7) simple elements akin to the dummy and particles are placed in the initial position. In the next section, I consider the distribution of constituents in ASVX constructions.

7.3.2. ASVX constructions

The elements that occur in the initial position (A) exhibit different internal structural characteristics. They range from single words to multiple clauses. We have adverbs, adverb phrases and adverbial clauses. In one construction, there are two adverbial clauses that precede the subject. The types of constructions we are dealing with in this section may be illustrated by the following examples from the text.

9 a Amano kena sikolo ka 1936, Kamuyongole
   After starting school in 1936, Kamuyongole
   a-kona ku fita mwa standard II ka Silimo sa 1941.
   SM+PAST-manage to get in standard II in year of 1941
   Having started school in 1936, Kamuyongole managed to get up to standard II in 1941.

b Mi kasona silimo seo, bubeli bwa bashemi bahaeba-lwela.
   And in same year that both of parents his SM+PAST-drown
   And in that same year, both his parents were killed in floods.
c Kuzwa nako yeo ba-timela bashemibahae ka Liatamanyi, From time that SM+PAST-die parents his in March, Kamuyongole a-kesheisa sikolo. Kamuyongole SM+PAST-neglect school Since the death of his parents in March, Kamuyongole neglected school.

d. Ka zazi leling'wi fa sipelu, ba-mano-noma-na ni kunguyana; On day particular at dance, SM-after-pick-REF and to flirt Kamuyongole a-posa linzwi ku Katekwe sipelu asesi felile. Kamuyongole SM+PAST-throw word to Katekwe dance after finish On this particular day, after dancing and flirting with each other Kamuyongole asked Katekwe out after the dance.

e. Kapili-pili, kwa lukiswa kuli habusa ku fuluhelwe. Quickly, PART+PAST-be arrange COMP following-day to depart Quickly, it was arranged that they should depart the following day.

The clause “Amano kena sikolo ka 1936” is the preposed constituent in 9(a). In 9(b) the adverb phrase “ka sona silimo seo” is placed in the initial position. Another prepositional phrase, “kuzwa nako yeo batimela bashemibahae ka Liatamanyi”, is the constituent that is placed in the initial position. In (9d), there are two conjoined clauses preceding the subject in addition to the phrase “kazazi leling’wi fa sipelu”. These are “bamano nomana” and “ku nguyana”. The first of these clauses has a finite verb while the other presents a superficial infinitive non-finite verb. Recall from our discussion of coordination in section 5.5.1.1. that when the conjunction “ni” (an equivalent of the English “and”) is used to join two clauses, the last clause is always a no-finite clause. In (9)e, an adverb “kapili-pili” is placed in the initial position.

I will now present the figures of these constructions starting with the distribution of adverbials in the initial and final position in Table 9. This is not to say that adverbials do not occur in the medial position. These are discussed in Chapter 9. The percentages are calculated on the totals for each position, i.e. initial and final positions.
Table 9: distribution of constituents in adverbial position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>INITIAL</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>FINAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADV</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVP</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLX</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The comments that I make are based on the assumption that adverb phrases and clauses serve the same “adverbial” functions as adverbs. Starting with the initial position it is evident from the table that the least frequent constituents in this position are conjoined adverbial clauses. They constitute (3%) of the constituents. This is not surprising because the Prefield is not hospitable to complex constituents. We do not expect multiple subordination or coordination in the initial position. The next least occurring constituents are adverbs (43/20%) which are followed by adverb phrases (64/30%). The position is thus dominated by clauses (97/46%).

Moving on to the final position, the table shows us that the dominant constituents are clauses (50/41%). The next most occurring constituents are adverb phrases (41/34%). The least occurring constituents are multiple coordinated clauses (14/11%). These are followed by adverbs (17/14%). Disregarding sequenced clauses, the least frequent constituents in each position are adverbs.

With respect to the overall distribution of the constituents, there is significant effect: p < .001. However, this distribution presents a contravention of the predictions of LIPOC. There is no correlation between the internal structure of an adverbial constituent and the position it occurs. Obviously, this is because constituents are not ordered in terms of categorical complexity as complex constituents (clauses) are dominant in both the initial and final positions. On account of LIPOC and EW, we should expect adverbial clauses to be more frequent towards the end of the clause than earlier. The higher frequency of adverbial clauses in the initial position relative to the final position is attributable to their functions in discourse. Fronted adverbial clauses, like adverbs, have a wider discourse scope than final ones. They are of much greater importance than simply in reference to the internal structure and description of sentences themselves. In fact, fronted adverbial clauses have considerable relevance to the structure of paragraphs and discourse as compared to final adverbial...
clauses (Longacre and Thompson 1985). Thompson and Longacres' (1985) and later Ford and Thompson's (1986) work on initial purpose and conditional clauses has shown that these clauses have a strong tendency to be initial because of their discourse functions. Specifically, Thompson's work reveals that initial purpose clauses refer to purposes or goals mentioned in the previous discourse or inferable from it. Final purpose clauses are rarely inferable and tend to refer only to the immediately preceding clause. I would like to propose that although these findings are based on purpose and conditional clauses the principles appear to hold for preposed adverbials in general.

Harold (1995) has proposed that all the pragmatic and cognitive parameters that have been proposed for the initial position in the sentence or clause relate to discourse organisation. His basic proposal is that the meta-function, organisation, is responsible for both the variety of patterns in languages and the consistencies. This meta-function is mostly, but not exclusively, effected by the use of organisers which are placed in the early position of the sentence and clause. All adverbials that are placed in this position have the characteristics of organizers. This position is called P1 in Dik's FG. In Chapter 5, we noted that there is much evidence for the rule that subordinate clauses tend to be placed either at the very end of the construction through LIPOC, or in P1 position on account of their pragmatic function. It is thus reasonable to submit that this is such evidence (see also Givon 1995). These initial adverbial clauses are more needed for discourse organisation than final ones. We return to this issue in Chapter 9. However, the effect of LIPOC and EW can be seen in the tendency for adverbial clauses to prefer recurring in the final adverbial position. In our terms, this is the final position. In terms of over all frequency, we can suggest that only the distribution of adverbs is statistically consistent with LIPOC and EW.

This suggestion is supported by Chafe (1973) who suggests that the longer ago an event occurred, the more likely the time word is to be first, and the more important the event, the more likely the time word is to be the last. Although Chafe's suggestions are based on introspective studies and on time words, they can be applied to the discourse organisational functions of adverbials per se. In sum, there

---

54 Harold has proposed a particular cross-linguistic function which he refers to as "meta-function" of early position in the clause or sentence. He uses the term "meta-function" because he considers organisation to be a combination of functions; the functions themselves are universal, but different languages use them in different combinations to define their particular version of function.
are significantly more adverbials in the initial position than there are in the final position contrary to the predictions of LIPOC because the latter are better discourse organisers than the latter.

Let us now look at the distributions of nominals in the subject, direct object and complement position. The indirect object position is not occupied by full and independent nominals in these construction types. The data in the table below represent the distributions of these constituents. As in Table 7, the percentages are calculated on the total number of constituents in the individual columns (functional profiles).

Table 10: Distribution of nominals in ASVX constructions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>DO</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRO</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRON</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NREL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our comments for the distribution of these constituents exclude adverbials (c. f. Table 9 for their distribution). We also do not comment on the distribution of pronouns except to state that they occur with very low frequency. Having said this, the distribution of nominals shows that cliticized pronominal arguments are the most frequent in the subject position (118/ 56%). These are followed by nouns (59/ 28%), which are in turn followed by NPs (26/ 12%). The least frequent constituents are noun phrases which involve relative clause modification (3/ 1%) but they are fewer than pronouns (5/ 2%). The fact that they involve clausal modification makes them to disfavour this position. Interestingly, clauses do not occur in this position. The explanation for this is that since they are the most complex on the scale they do not prefer this position. In this position, the distribution of constituents is consonant with the predictions of LIPOC since the most frequent are the simplest and the most frequent are the most complex.
Moving on to the object position the figures show that the most frequent constituents are NPs (25/ 40%). The next most frequent are incorporated pronominal arguments, PROs (17/ 27%). They are followed by nouns (12) which constitute 19% of the constituents. Next are NRELs (7/ 11%). The least frequent are pronouns (1/ 2%). As in the subject clauses do not occur in this position. It is an early position. These distributions show that the most complex, NRELs are not the most frequent in this position. However, there are more NPs and PROs which reveals a distributional difference from that exhibited in the subject position. The direct object position may be considered to be medial. In terms of LIPOC, this position would be preferred by constituents which are intermediate between simple and complex on the scale of complexity. This may be taken as evidence to suggest that simpler constituents prefer the earlier position.

In the complement position, which is the final position for these constituents, the dominant constituents are clauses (52/ 64%). The next frequent constituents are NPs (13/ 16%) which are in their turn followed by NRELs (8/ 10%). Next are nouns (6/ 7%) and the least frequent are pronouns (2/ 2%). In contrast to the subject position, PROs do not occur in this position while clauses are the most frequent. On the basis of the basic word order typological characteristics of Silozi, the complement position is considered to be one that occurs towards the end of the clause.

In terms of overall frequency, these data exhibit a preference for placing more complex nominal constituents toward the end or at the end of the construction. There is a pattern in which simple constituents are skewed to the initial position while the more complex ones are skewed towards the end position. The chi-square test results for this distribution shows that it is significant: p < .001. The fact that more complex constituents prefer to be placed later in the clause than simpler ones implies that the constituents are ordered in terms of categorial complexity, i.e. short before long.

7.3.2.1. Other marked constructions in ASVX

These are clearly marked constructions in which the initial constituent is an adverbial. From this text, the marked constructions are passive, negative, existential, negative existential and extraposition. The following examples illustrate the manifestations of each of these construction types in the sample:
10 Passive
a. *Mwa mikiti mo,* Kamuyongole na-sa-tabe-lwa hahulu
   In parties, these Kamuyongole SM+PAST-admire-PASS much
   ki basizana.
   by girls.
   In these parties, Kamuyongole was admired a lot by girls.

b. *Ka nama yebutuku hape ni hape* Kulu a-bulelel-wa
   With meat pain again and again Kulu SM+PAST-tell-PASS
   za butokwa bwa ku swala pilu yahae.
   about impotence of to hold heart his
   With great pain, tortoise was reminded of the importance of restraining himself.

11 Negative
a. *Kamuyongole amano tonela zene liezahala mwa*
   Kamuyongole after seeing what SM+PAST-PROG-happen in
   mikiti, na-sina sabo ya ku bulelisa niahili
   parties, SM+NEG+PAST-PERF-have fear of to chat up even
   musal’a mutu.
   wife of person
   After noticing what was happening in the parties, Kamuyongole was able
to chat up even married women.

b. *Kabumai na-sika-ituta hande.*
   Unfortunately, SM+NEG-PAST-educate well
   Unfortunately, he was not well educated.
12 Existential

*Mi a Kamuyongole mona ne-kutezi mioko*

In eyes of Kamuyongole them SM-PAST-be.full tears

ya sabo ni lilato.
of fear and love
In Kamuyongole’s eyes, there were a lot of tears.

13 Negative existential

a. *Mi nhaiba musihali kwa na-yemela.*

And even day NEG-EXIST+be where SM+PAST-go
And even during day time, there was nowhere he went.

b. *Kalitohonolo, hakuna ya-mulwanisize, mwendi kakuli*

Fortunately, EXIST-NEG+PAST-be Ret+SM-OM-fight, perhaps because

ha-ki person mutuya-tabela ku zamaya ahela-hela feela,
SM+NEG-PRES-be person REL+PRES-like to move aimlessly just,

sihulu busihu.
especially night
Fortunately, there was no one who fought him probably because he is not a
type of person who moves about aimlessly especially at night.

14 Extraposition

a. *Hape, nei-ta-ba ku-mu-tobisa feela bashemi*

In addition, SM+PAST-FUT-be to-SM+PRES-OM-steal just parents

bahae basa zibi.
hers without approval
It would be just taking her away without the approval of her parents.
Lit. He eloped with her.
b. Kono *cwale* ne-seli mwa likelezo ni limamela
But now *PART+PAST-be* in advice and cautions
za-butokwa mwa bupilo bwa kulu zazi la musipili.
REL-SM+PAST-be-important in life of tortoise day of trip
But now it was time to discuss precautionary measures which were important for tortoise on the day of the trip.

15 **Locative existential presentative**

*MWatasa lizauli leo*, kwa kena tUCHikwi totubeli twa tuna.
Under tree that, EXIST enter goslings two of male
Under that tree, there entered two male goslings.

In Example (10)a the fronted constituent is the adverb phrase “mwa mikiti mo” and in (10)b, it is the prepositional phrase “*Kanama yebutuku hape ni hape*”. The fronted constituents of the examples in (11) a-b are the clause “Kamuyongole amano tonela zene liezahala mwa mikiti mo” and the adverb “*Kabumai*” respectively. The phrase “*Mi nihaiiba musihali*” is the fronted adverbial in (12). In (13)a the fronted constituent is the phrase “*Mwa meto a Kamuyongole mona*” while in (13)b it is the adverb “*Kalitohonolo*”. In the extrapolosed construction illustrated in (14)a and b, the adverbs “*Hape*” and “*Cwale*” are the preposed constituents. The example in (15) is fronted by the prepositional phrase “*MWatasa lizauli leo*”.

In addition to the above examples, there is a marked construction whose structure may be described as an applicative passive. The structure is very rare because it is the only one of its type that is attested in the whole sample. This is illustrated below.

---

55 In example (16) the word “*mukuwa*” refers to a “white” person who speaks English. Silozi speakers use the term “mukuwa” to refer to a “white” person and “sikuwa” to refer to the language “English”. Any white person who speaks English is a “Mukuwa”.

Mostly SC-SM-PAST-come-PROG visitors white at school

na-toloke-lwa-nga ki pupil teacher Bobby Kaluwe
SM+PAST- interpret -APPLIC-PROG by pupil teacher Bobby Kaluwe

ya-na-ilo-pasa standard VI kwa Solusi mission mwa Rhodesia.
REL-SM+PAST-PERF-pass standard VI at Solusi mission in Rhodesia.

Usually, when the school was visited by English speaking people, he was interpreted for by Pupil teacher Kaluwe who had attained standard VI education at Solusi Mission in Rhodesia.

The pronominal argument which agrees with the overt subject in this construction is coded as "na" and it refers to the "Head teacher Peter Sunduma" who is mentioned in the preceding clause. This construction is called an applicative passive because the verbal element exhibits structural characteristics of a passive and applicative. From the formal point of view, there are several characteristics which make it a passive. First, it involves a change in the grammatical relations. Second, it has morphological suffixes which are characteristic of a passive construction in Silozi. We noted in the preamble that the passive is marked by the suffix "-wa" or its variant "-iwa". This affix can be seen in the verb "tolokelwanga". Another characteristic of the passive that is evident in this construction is the agent phrase or oblique phrase "ki pupil teacher Bobby Kaluwe...". In this construction, it is the agent of the passive. The construction bares the morphological characteristics of the applicative suffix "-ela".

Mwisiya (ibid: 110) defines the applicative as a "specie which is used when the action is done on behalf of someone or something. It is also used when the action is directed towards a certain direction" (see also O'Sullivan (ibid)). Clearly this structure is thus a hybrid of the applicative and passive. We shall give it the label "other" in the table.

Despite their different surface structures, more complex constituents, words, phrases and a clause, are placed in the initial position. Further, the subjects of these constructions are predominantly cliticized pronominal arguments or particles. Obviously, this is in contradiction with these two weight principles. Table 11, summarizes the text frequency count of marked constructions.
Table 11: Distributions of marked constructions in ASVX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PASS</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exist</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg-exist</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrap</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.3.3. Clearly marked constructions.

In addition to constructions which place an adverbial in the initial position, there are constructions which place nominals in the initial position. These constructions are akin to what Foley and van Valin (1985) call syntactic devices which are used to express variations in the packaging of information. The most widely known of these constructions is the passive, which we have already seen in (2) above. In this section, we consider left dislocations and topicalisations (fronting).

7.3.3.1. Left dislocations

17 Left dislocation
   a. Munko wabona, ha-bu-lati.
      Smell its, SM+NEG-OM-PRES-like
      Its smell, he doesn’t like it.
   b. Basali, bona ne-li bande luli.
      Women, they SM+PAST-be beautiful indeed
      The women, they were beautiful indeed.
   c. Haili Kulu ni Ngunga bona, ne-kupyatwa kande ya siina.
      As for tortoise and Ngunga them, SM+PAST-discuss issues of men.
      As for tortoise and Ngunga, they were discussing male issues.

The dislocated NP in (17)a is "Munko wa bona" and it is in cataphoric reference with "bu". In (17)b it is "Basali". It is in a cataphoric relationship with "bona". The
dislocated NP in (17)c is “Kulu and Ngunga” which is in cataphoric reference with the cliticized pronoun “ne-”.

18 Left dislocation and question

Muhaesu, wa-teeleza?
Relative, INT+SM+PRES-listen
My relative, are you listening?

In example (18) we have a mixed construction which manifests characteristics of left dislocation and question. The dislocated constituent is “Muhaesu” and is correferential with “wa-“. The construction “wa-teleeza” is a yes/no interrogative. It is thus a declarative which is structurally marked by a rising intonation. The construction below illustrates the negative existential and right dislocation.

19 Ha-kuna nihaiba ulimung’wiwa-na-tumusize, Kulu.
NEG-EXIST+PAST-be even one REL+SM+PAST-reveal, Tortoise.
There was not even a single plan which tortoise revealed.

7.3.3.2. Fronting

Apparently, there seems to be only one incidence of fronting in the whole sample, which we illustrate in (20):

20 a Lionda, ba-tome mo ba-konela kaufela.
Dowries, SM+PAST-fix how SM+PRES-want all
Dowries, they should fix whatever they want.

The fronted constituent in example (20) is the noun “Lionda” (dowries). The relative frequencies of these constructions is summarized in the table 12:
Table 12: Relative frequencies of clearly marked constructions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Left dislocation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fronting</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures show that unmarked constructions far outnumber marked ones. Out of a population of 600, 593, i.e. 98% are unmarked clauses and only 7 (2%) are marked. These results demonstrate that unmarked constructions are more frequent than marked ones in discourse. Crucially, the data in Table 7 and also Table 9 show that although ASVX constructions may place a complex constituent such as an adverbial clause, pronominal subjects still outnumber the adverbials. Hence, the evidence for the earlier placement of simple constituents compared to complex constituents.

7.3.3.3. Overall distributions

Finally, we compare the distribution of construction types in this text. According to the data, SVX constructions outnumber ASVX constructions. These distributions are summarized in table 13 below.

Table 13: Distribution of construction types in written discourse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SVX</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASVX</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.4. Conclusion

My principle aims in this chapter have been to illustrate the ordering of constituents in Silozi written discourse and to establish whether there is correlation between the ordering of constituents in the clause or sentence and their internal structure. This has been done to ascertain whether the ordering of constituents in the texts is determined by weight principles, and LIPOC in particular. The ordering of constituents in the three types of constructions shows that although Silozi may be described as SVO, it
allows some departures from this order. As we have already demonstrated in Chapter 5, in the constructions which place the subject in the initial position (SVX) there is a strong tendency to place simpler constituents earlier in the construction than later. Furthermore, in the constructions which are primarily determined by discourse-pragmatic factors and are thus clearly marked, the order is inherently in terms of categorial complexity. These constructions are clefts, extrapositions, existentials, some interrogatives and some negatives. The pattern for the distribution of constituents in these constructions is the same as posited for SVX constructions in Chapter 5.

In left dislocations, fronting and ASVX constructions which place non-subject constituents in the initial position, there is a preference for placing more complex constituents before simpler ones. By placing non-subject constituents of varying structural complexity, the order of constituents in these constructions may exhibit a preference for placing longer, heavier and more complex constituents before shorter, lighter and less complex ones. Accordingly, the pattern for the ordering of constituents in these construction types may be summarized in the following schema:

\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
\text{LEFT} & \text{RIGHT} \\
\hline
\text{More complex (heavier)} & \text{Simpler (lighter)}
\end{array}
\]

Figure 8 - Distribution of constituents in ASVX constructions

The constructions which have the pattern summarized in (21) are apparent counterexamples to LIPOC and EW. Despite the fact that some non-subject complex constituents are placed in the initial position, their frequency is much lower than that of simple constituents. There is still a strong tendency for complex constituents such as sentential NPs and NPs that contain relative clauses to be placed in the final position as compared to simpler ones. On the other hand, there is overwhelming evidence for the earlier placement of pronominal subjects as compared to nominal objects and complements. In terms of overall frequency complex constituents are significantly much fewer in the earlier position. Conversely, simple constituents are significantly fewer in the final position. There is therefore a strong correlation between the internal structure of a constituent and its placement in the clause or sentence of which it forms a part.

Our conclusions are limited to constituent ordering in Silozi written discourse as reflected in our sample. While it is true that LIPOC and EW determine the placement
(and distribution) of constituents, they are not the only factors which do so. This is because there are some patterns that run counter to them. Dik (1997 ibid), among others, argue that pragmatic and semantic functions of constituents co-determine their positions in the clause. These may well be responsible for the placement of heavier items before lighter ones and vice-versa. The written data show ordering tendencies which significantly correlate with the predictions of LIPOC and EW. More precisely they are consistent with Dik’s general principle of increasing complexity (GP9) and its more specific formulation, LIPOC (SP7). These, tendencies, which are empirically supported are:

(i) constituents which are relatively less complex than other constituents of similar function tend to occur earlier in the linear sequence;
(ii) constituents which are relatively more complex than other constituents of similar function tend to occur later in the linear sequence.

Two interesting findings from the investigation are that full NPs rarely occur in the indirect object position and that these two principles may not be relevant for the placement of adverbials. A core characteristic of adverbials is that they have considerable freedom of position, a fact which is related to their loose syntactic connection to the main clause. Unlike adverbials, nominal constituents are more closely bound to the clausal core. They are obligatory constituents. In the next chapter, we consider constituent ordering in spoken language.
Chapter 8

Constituent Ordering in Spoken Discourse

8.1. Introduction

The previous chapter was concerned with constituent ordering in Silozi written discourse. The present chapter focuses on the syntactic structure of clauses in Silozi spoken discourse. The nature of spoken language, particularly its relationship with written language has been discussed extensively. Many studies have shown that written language differs from spoken language and that the nature of the text may affect constituent order (see Siewierska 1993, Chafe 1987, Miller & Weinert 1998 henceforth M & W). Certain tendencies within individual languages have been observed, including preferences for particular constituent order patterns (see for instance, Givon 1983). The aims of the chapter are two: to describe and explain the ordering of constituents in Silozi spoken discourse and to establish whether LIPOC and EW affect constituent ordering in this genre. In order to achieve these two aims, we present further examples of constructions that have been introduced in the preamble. We also present the text count results of the ordering or placement of constituents in two major construction types, namely, SVX and ASVX.

The outline of the chapter is as follows. In the rest of this section I discuss the data, the approach and method used in this chapter. I also introduce the unit of analysis. In Section 2, I illustrate and present the statistical information about the ordering frequencies of constituents in the SVX constructions. I also offer more examples and the result of the text counts of other types of constructions. Section 3 discusses the distribution of constituents in ASVX constructions. It also provides further examples

56 Siewierska (1993) argues that there has been considerable controversy on the linguistic features characteristic of these dimensions of language use and that it is unlikely that any absolute differences exist between speech and writing, particular text types or registers (see Beaman 1984 and Biber 1986 for conflict areas in English). Using a large body of data of spoken spontaneous discourse from different languages, Miller and Weinert (1998: 22-23) present a comprehensive list of five key properties of spontaneous spoken language. They argue that these properties are reflected in certain linguistic properties. Salient among these is that the syntax of spoken spontaneous language is in general fragmented and unintegrated. Akinnaso (1982) in his review of work on the difference between spoken and written language also notes that the educational and linguistic background of informants affects the nature of spoken data.
of other marked constructions in spoken discourse, reflecting their relative frequencies. The distribution frequencies of the major construction types (SVX and ASVX) are compared in section 4. Marked constructions are considered in Section 5. In Section 6, I discuss some phenomena which are typical of spoken language and contravene the principles of weight.

8.1.1. The data, approach and method.

The text that constitutes the data for this chapter are 203 clauses from a recorded casual conversation involving four Zambians (including myself) living in Edinburgh, Scotland (see appendix II for a sample). They are aged between 28 and 42. The conversation involves various topics of general nature. These range from economic, social and political topics both in Zambia and elsewhere. A substantial chunk of it focuses on the corrupt political elite in the Zambian government. One of the participants was cutting my hair while the conversation was going on. Initially, the conversation was “unnatural” because the participants were conscious that they were being recorded. Further, two of the participants had not met before. In due course, there was spontaneity. The participants are two men and two women. Three of them come from the Western province of Zambia and are native speakers of Silozi. The language presented here is what is spoken by adults who have acquired the language in childhood and have native speaker command. One of them comes from Southern Province and speaks Chitonga, which is unintelligible to Silozi speakers. Despite this, all the speakers are reasonably proficient in the three languages relevant to this situation, that is, Silozi, Chitonga and English. Three of the participants have first university degrees and one has completed secondary school education. Despite the inevitable initial “unnaturalness” occasioned by the above mentioned factors, the bulk of the conversation took place in a highly relaxed atmosphere. The relaxedness of the environment is engendered by the excitement of meeting countrymen in a foreign country, sharing nostalgic feelings and the experiences of living abroad. I am therefore sufficiently confident that the text is natural and spontaneous.

As in the written texts, the grammar of this sample is marked by numerous code-mixed syntactic and morphological structures. In fact, there seems to be more of this in the spoken sample than there is in the written sample. The participants not only use words from English and Chitonga but whole sentences as well (see also notes 48 and 49 for a possible explanation for this). This is attributable to the social, linguistic and educational backgrounds of the participants. Because of the knowledge that one
of them is not a Silozi native speaker (and possibly less proficient in it) they seem to be switching from one language to another in order to facilitate communication. A lot of English grammatical structures are exhibited in this sample. These are considered as part of the language use of the speakers because they constitute their linguistic repertoire. In fact, this language typifies the Silozi which is spoken by most "educated" Malozi. As pointed out earlier, English is the medium of instruction in all the Zambian schools. So most educated Zambians usually use it with other languages. They have a high level of multilingual competence to alternate from one language to another in the course of the conversation (see the main introduction). This sample may be criticized for being untypical of the Silozi community as a whole because of the characteristics of the informants. While I sympathise with this, it is also important to realise that it represents the typical Silozi that is spoken by most Zambians. Most Zambians would admit that it is almost impossible to deliver a conversation in their own native languages without switching to English. As we have pointed out earlier, the alternation from Silozi to English and/ or indeed another Zambian language is also characteristic of written Silozi. It is also manifest in the spoken language of the so called “uneducated” although this is highly restricted to the lexicon (see Moody 1985). These are illustrated by the following examples:

1  a Intermarriage ye-za-confuse banana mwa Zambia.
   Intermarriage SM-PRES-confuse children in Zambia
   Intermarriage confuses children in Zambia.

57 Kashina (1989, 1994) has done some work on the dilemma of “Standard English” in Zambia. The problem it faces is that most speakers use it freely with other languages, leading to a proliferation of many varieties of the so-called “Zambian English”. In this study we deliberately avoid the controversial distinction between code switching, shifting and borrowing. As Gxilishe (1992) observes, although the distinction between the terms is an important one, there has been little agreement as to how the distinction is to be made. I had no resources to go back to Zambia to find “illiterate” native Silozi speakers. I have had to rely on the informants available within Edinburgh. Nevertheless, native speakers who are capable of producing “pure” Silozi are rare.

58 Miller and Weinert (ibid: 1) recognise the effect of formal education, especially higher education on spoken language. They cite Brown, Currie, and Kenworthy’ (1980: 15n) whose study excluded members of the academic staff and postgraduate students at Edinburgh University because “it is possible that the speech of those who spend a large proportion of their time immersed in written language may be quite untypical of the speech community as a whole”.


language, is also excluded. The only phonological units we shall need are intonation in interrogative constructions.

8.1.2. Unit of analysis

Due to the fragmented nature of spontaneous spoken language, characterizing and defining the unit of analysis in natural occurring language can be problematic. Different terms have been proposed by different scholars to refer to the structures that occur in spontaneous spoken language (see for instance Labov 1975, Zwicky & Sadock 1985, Chafe & Danielewicz 1987). Discourse analysts have recognized the non-applicability of the notion “sentence” to the analysis of natural conversational data. Alternative terms include move, tone group, utterance (Labov 1975, Pike and Pike 1982), “information unit” (Halliday 1973), “utterance chunks” (Gumperz 1977) and “idea units” (Kroll 1977). Chafe (1988: 95) has proposed that two units, the “intonation unit” and the “clause” occur in spoken language. The distinction he makes between these units is that intonation units express the flow of ideas while clauses manifest the flow of language (Chafe 1979). The majority (about 70%) of intonation units are complete single clauses and many others are clause fragments. Because of this, there is good reason to think that the clause is the typical way of verbalising an idea. Clause linkage is the predominant type of intonation unit linkage. We shall therefore use the clause as the unit of analysis in speech (see also Halliday 1989, Payne 1997) for the use of the sentence in the analysis of spoken language. The most succinct and recent objection to the use of the sentence in the analysis of spoken language is Miller and Weinert (ibid) who offer practical evidence for the appropriateness of the clause as a unit of analysis for spontaneous spoken language.

While some analysts claim that the clause is the appropriate unit of analysis for spontaneous spoken language, there are some constructions in our data which exhibit characteristics of sentences. That is, combinations of clauses. This might be because of the circumstances of the participants. Most of them have been exposed to formal education. To this effect, we shall take the sentence as a unit which is relevant for this type of spoken language. Chafe (1984) argues that two clauses can be included under a single intonation contour with no pause between them. By this he means that it is possible for an intonation unit to include both a main clause and a subordinate clause. More recently M & W (ibid) have supported this view in their epilogue when they comment: “The sentence may indeed be a relevant unit for speakers with a large exposure to and mastery of written language...”
In order to provide a comprehensive account of the use of language in the spoken text, it is necessary to use clauses, sentences and sentence fragments (intonation units) in the examples. The account presented below takes into consideration the fact that it is not useful to describe and analyse syntactic structure in spontaneous spoken language as if it were written language. The two types of language have different systems of morphology, syntax, vocabulary and the organization of texts. That this is so is confirmed by M and W’s (ibid) work. Their investigation shows that a number of constructions occur in spontaneous spoken language but not in written language, and vice-versa. Evidence for this comes from the fact that the syntactic structure of phrases and clauses in spontaneous spoken language is very different from the structure of phrases and clauses in written language. Further, the organisation of spontaneous discourse is also very different from written discourse.

The present study recognises the fact that it would be desirable to provide examples in their actual contextual environments. However, this may not be possible for all the examples purely for reasons of space. Some examples presented here are culled out of their contexts.

8.2. The constructions

8.2.1. SVX constructions

As we have shown in Chapters 6 and 7, there are two main different types of unmarked construction that occur in this text, depending upon whether they have overt full surface nominal participants. It is important to be mindful of the fact that full lexical NPs are very rare in spontaneous discourse and so is complex syntax per se. Accordingly, our description operates with the assumption that grammatical arguments are present in all clauses whether expressed or not, as stated earlier. This effectively implies that the elements glossed as SM or OM are, by and large, considered as subjects and objects respectively.

Since clauses which have full NPs and no overt NPs (including single word clauses) have been discussed, I will not discuss them here. I instead focus on their distributional characteristics. Table 14 shows the results of the count of the distribution frequency of constituents in constructions that place subject in the initial position.
Table 14: Distribution of constituents in SVX constructions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRO</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRON</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NREL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADV</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADJ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADJP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As in the previous tables, the functional slots represent the pattern positions in which constituents are distributed from left to right. S represents the initial position while A represents the final or end position. The positions therefore represent the linear structure of the clause from left to right. The first number in each column indicates the occurrences of the category in the sample. The second relates to the percentage in the population of the occurring categories. 0 indicates that the category does not occur in the position. The dash (-) indicates that there is no possibility of the category to occur in the position. In other words, they are not expected to occur in the position because they do not have the functional characteristics relating to it.

We start by commenting on the frequency of nominals in the subject, object and complement positions. Generally, the distributions mirror the patterns observed in previous tables for SVX constructions. The explanations are also similar. Since this is the case, my comments will not be as detailed. According to the figures, the subject position is dominated by incorporated pronominal arguments which we have coded as subject markers (SM). Allowing ourselves to extend the term "clitic" to these categories, we find that this is actually the first unit on the scale of complexity with respect to LIPOC as expounded by Dik. As we move towards the right, the
frequency of occurrence of these elements decreases from the object position to the complement position. There are more incorporated pronominal arguments in the object position than in the complement position. That these elements are the least frequent is not surprising with respect to the weight principles. This is not their preferred position. Hence their dominance in the subject position. Interestingly, there are no clauses occurring in this position. Similarly, there are no incorporated pronominal arguments in the complement position.

Pronouns are the second most frequent. They display similar distributional characteristics with incorporated pronouns across the clause. The comments made about PROs and nouns applies to the distributions of NPs without relative clause modification. That this is so is borne out by the fact that they all exhibit a tendency to occur more frequently in the initial position than in the final position. Moreover, all their frequencies systematically decrease as we move from the initial position (S) to the final position (C). However, NREL categories do not occur in the object position. The reasons for this are not clear and straightforward. Nevertheless, we can suggest that because they incorporate a clausal element in their structure, we would expect them to exhibit a tendency to occur towards the end of the construction, preferably at the very end. This distributional observation can be taken to support the hypothesis that relatively more complex constituents tend to avoid clause internal position. Since nominals do not typically function as adverbials, the complement position is the final position for these categories (see also Jacenick and Dryer 1992). The dominance of simple categories in this position is confirmed by the hypothesis that the most prototypical subjects and objects in natural discourse are coded as zero or anaphoric pronouns. As we have already pointed out, Silozi, like many Bantu languages, exhibits what is commonly called “pro-drop” for both subject and object arguments as shown in SWCs. The cliticized pronominal arguments perform grammatical and discourse functions such as reference. With respect to the paucity of pronouns, we can propose the reasons stated earlier, that pronouns rarely occur in the object position.

One important point relating to the pro-drop phenomenon must be mentioned with respect to the occurrence of noun phrases. Silozi typically employs bound pronominal affixes for identifying arguments. An entity is first introduced with a full noun phrase and established as a topic (topical). Thereafter pronominal reference is sufficient to identify it. When an additional entity is involved only this new one need be identified by a full noun phrase (see also Mithun 1988). Most importantly, as
Lambrecht (1984a, 1987 and 1988) argues for French, “canonical” clauses containing lexical NPs in both subject and object position hardly occur in Silozi spoken discourse. The nature and circumstances of spoken discourse further justify the dominance of pronominal categories, which are essentially deictics. In spoken discourse, there is an immediate presence of the speaker and audience. This means that they share the situational context (i.e., time and place of communication). These are considered as pronouns in other languages. Because of the grammatical nature of Silozi and Bantu languages, these are written and glossed as affixed pronominal arguments. Examples of these are “u-” (second and third person singular: you, he, she); “ba-” (third person plural: they, them); “ni-” (first person singular: I).

We do not comment on the frequencies of non-nominals (Adv, Ideo, Adj, AdvP, AdjP and PP) because they cannot occur in more than one of the positions we are concerned with. This makes them inappropriate for quantitative analysis and statistical testing. Nevertheless, we may explain that adjectives are the most frequent among simple constituents that occur in this position. They are only second to complement clauses, which are the most complex on the scale for nominal constituents. This is because they prototypically function as complements.

Finally, we comment on the frequencies of clauses which record some relatively high figures. There are no clauses in the subject position and object position. They concentrate in the complement and adverbial positions. The figures show that the clauses in the complement position outnumber those in the adverbial position. This is, in some respects, a contradiction with respect to LIPOC and EW. We would expect embedded clauses to be prefer the final position, i.e., at the very end. Once again, this counter expectation may plausibly be explained in two ways. First, they perform different functions in the construction. Nominal clauses function as arguments while adverbials function as adjuncts. Second, and closely related to the first, they can be explained in terms of peripherality (optionality) and centrality (obligatoriness). Complement clauses are obligatory, and, consequently, more necessary to the structure of the clause while adverbials are only peripheral and less necessary. We can hypothesize that the more central (or obligatory) a constituent is the more likely it is to be more frequent in the text. On the basis of this, we may infer that complements would be more frequent than adverbials in a given construction on account of their syntactic roles. This is intricately connected to their obligatoriness and optionality. It is not clear whether pragmatic and discourse factors account for these frequencies. Nevertheless, it might be reasonable to the argue that due to the
nature and circumstances under which spontaneous spoken language is delivered we would not expect a greater use of optional complex constituents than obligatory ones. This can be taken as evidence for Chafe’s (1988) proposal that clauses basically consist of a subject and a predicate.

To sum up, the figures in Table 14 show that there is a significant correlation between the weight of nominal constituents and the positions in which they occur: \( p < .001 \). The principle that shorter elements prefer to be placed earlier in a sequence than heavier ones is thus supported.

8.2.1.1 Other Construction Types in SVX

In this section, I illustrate other (marked) construction types in SVX. I also document the text count results of their relative distribution frequencies in the data. This information is presented in Table 3. The figures show that there are significantly fewer clearly marked constructions than marked constructions.

8.2.1.1.1 The passive

All of the passive constructions that occur in the spoken data belong to the type of construction called “basic passives”. By way of illustration consider the following examples. This extract follows from a portion in which the participants are talking about refugees and the expensive life styles that they lead because of the support they get from host countries. In this example and the ones that follow, the arrow (\( \rightarrow \)) will be used to indicate the relevant construction.

2 A1: Marefugees ba ba-pila hande.  
   Refugees these SM+PRES-live well  
   The refugees live well.  
B: Ku-bonahala...Ku-bonahala cwalo.  
   It-seems ... It-seems so  
\( \rightarrow \) A2: Bona ba-tusi-wa.  
   Them SM+PAST-help-PASS  
   Them, They are helped.

A characteristic feature of such clauses is their lack of agent phrases. In A2 we have a mixed construction of passive and left dislocation. There is left dislocation
indicated by the emphatic pronoun “Bona” (Them/they). It is co-referential with the incorporated pronominal argument “ba-” which is glossed as (SM) and interpreted as “they” in the main clause. The main clause is an example of what we have called a single word clause which is a passive construction. More examples can be seen in (3)

3  a ...Ba-ka-tamaki-wa kaufela.
    ..... ...SM-FUT-arrest-PASS all
    They will all be arrested.
   b....Ba-fi-wa.
    ..... ...SM-PRES-give-PASS
    They are helped.

A few comments may be useful about the structures of these passives. They are mostly short, agentless, single word clauses. This type of passive has been regarded as the most frequent in naturally occurring speech in many languages. Myhill (1992: 103), among others, argues that, in fact, in the great majority of naturally occurring passive constructions, there is no overt agent and the identity of the agent is not even known or important, which can be seen as the most extreme type of detopicalization.

8.2.1.1.2. Existentials

There are two types of existentials in the spoken data. These correspond to the declarative existential and negative existential. Declarative existentials are illustrated by the following examples:

4  a. Ku-nani mutangana cwana ya-ni-tiseza-nga muziki.
   Exist-be youngman this REL-OM-bring-PROG music
   There is this young man who brings me music.
   b. Musipili wo ni-utwezi ku misisi Smith...Ku-nani
   Trip this SM+PERF-hear from miss Smith EXIST-PRES-be
   musali wamukuwa ya-luta kwa sikolo.
   woman white REL+PRES-teach at school
   I heard about this trip from Ms Smith... There is a white woman who teaches at the school.
Example (4)a is a response to a question about the source of the music which is in the living room. The speaker is talking about the young man who buys music from high street shops. In (4)b. The speaker is telling the audience that he has already heard about the trip which someone is about to make to Zambia. This is from one Miss Smith who teaches at the same school that he teaches back in Zambia. The entities whose existence is asserted are “mutangana cwana” in (4)a and “Musali wamukuwa yaluta kwa sikolo”. Let me now consider negative existentials.

8.2.1.1.3. Negative Existentials

The following examples illustrate the negative existentials in the text. As noted earlier, they are distinguished from positive declarative existential by the negative marker “ha-”.

5  

a  Ha-kuna yomuhulu ya-kona kuba president mwa Zambia.  
   NEG+PRES-be old REL+PRES-can be president in Zambia  
There is no elderly person who can contest the presidency in Zambia.

b. Ha-kuna ko ba-kona ku fumana mashelleng’i.  
   NEG+EXIST+PRES-be place SM+PRES-can to find money  
There is no place where they can get money.

c  Ha-kuna kwa kona ku matela.  
   NEG+EXIST+PAST-be where+SM can to run to  
There is no place for him to run to

Some comments on the contexts of these constructions might be useful. (5)a is uttered in connection with a controversial article in the Zambian constitution which states that only people whose parents were born in Zambia before independence in 1964 are eligible to stand as presidential candidates. The construction denies the existence of such people because the country was Northern Rhodesia before then. So it is not possible for any mature adult to contest the elections based on this article. The example in (5)b is in connection with the economic embargo imposed on Zambia due to bad governance and corruption. The speaker is expressing the non-existence of another source of funding in the absence of donor aid. In (5)c the speaker expresses the non-existence of a hiding place for the corrupt leaders.
8.2.1.1.4. Extrapositions

The majority of these constructions are marked by "ki-". However, extrapositions can also be marked by "kwa-". The following examples illustrate constructions that involve extrapositions.

6 a Ki kokunde ku bona bashemi habasa kula.
   It is good to see parents while unwell
   It is good to visit parents while they are unwell

b Ki Zaire ona cwalo feela.
   It+PRES-be Zaire like that just
   It is going to be just like Zaire

c Kwa-zibahala kuli Kaunda bondata-he ba-zwa
   SM+PRES-be known COMP Kaunda father-his SM+PRES-come
   kwa Malawi.
   from Malawi
   It is known that Kaunda’s father comes from Malawi.

In examples (6)a-b “ki” is a zero subject which agrees with the covert subject. The extraposed constituents are “ku bona bashemi habasa kula” and “Zaire ona cwalo”. In (6)c, the dummy subject is coded by “kwa” and the extraposed constituent is “kuli Kaunda bo ndatahe ba zwa kwa Malawi.” The elements “ki” and “kwa” conflate the functions of subjects and verbs. The have characteristics of impersonal verbs.

8.2.1.1.5. Cleft constructions

The first example of clefts we deal with is a mixed construction, combining the characteristics of what we have called Ki-clefts and afterthought.

7 Ki yena ya-ni-tiseza-nga matepu a kaufela, Bo Franco,
   It+be him REL-OM-bring-HABIT tapes these, all Franco

   Bo-Madilu kaufela
   Madilu all
   It is him who brings me all these tapes, Franco, Madilu and all (etc).
The cleft construction starts with “ki” (It is). The relative clause is “yanitisezanga matepu a kaufela.” “Bo Franco, Madilu kaufela”59 constitute the afterthought. This is a complex noun phrase consisting of asyndetically coordinated nouns. The noun (phrases) provide supplementary information about the music referred to in the preceding clause. Here are some more, if slightly different, examples of clefts.

8 A: A-sa eza feela reisgn ba-mu-tama.
SC-SM do just resign SM+PRES-OM-arrest
Once he resigns, they arrest him.

--- B: Ki zona za saba.
It+PRES-be REL SM+PRES-be afraid of
It is what is scaring him.

Example (8) follows a discussion in which the speakers are wondering whether a politician is going to resign in the light of some serious sleaze allegations made against him. Speaker A says that if he resigns he might be arrested. Speaker B comments that he might not. These comments are apparently based on some strange behaviour exhibited by the politician under discussion. “Ki zona” (It is them) then refers to the possible arrest of the politician should he resign. The relative clause in this example is “za saba”, which modifies “zona”. In other words, he is scared of being arrested. Further examples of cleft constructions are illustrated in (9):

9 a Ki yena ya-ng’o-zi kuli batu bao ba-taha.
It+be her REL-write-PERF COMP people those SM-come-PROG
[I have heard about that trip from Ms. Scott]. It is she who has written that these people are coming.

b. Ki yena ya-ni-tiseza-nga matepu a kaufela.
It+be him REL-OM-bring-HABIT tapes these all
It is him who brings me all these tapes.

As in (7) and (8), both the cleft construction in (9)a-b are marked by the particle “ki” which is followed by a relative clause which is introduced by “ya”. Another construction that is attested in this text is one which is akin to reversed clefts, which we illustrate below:

59 Franco and Madilu are two Zairean musicians whose Rhumba music is very popular in many parts of sub-Saharan Africa.
In (10) we have a noun phrase (Boma bona) instead of the particle “ki” in the initial position. The noun phrase is then followed by another noun phrase “bona” which is, in its turn, followed by the relative clause “babakula”. This clause is uttered in the course of a discussion that is concerned with one Zambian who is due to travel to Zambia. The participants ponder on various reasons for this sudden trip. The speaker here points to the fact that it is “Boma bona” (her mother) who is unwell.

8.2.1.1.6. Interrogative constructions

These are illustrated in the following text extract in which the participants are discussing the disappointment experienced by the Zambian ministry of education over their failure to get money from international donors.

11 A: Mashelleng’i a ministry of Health hasi-ka-taha.
Money of ministry of health neg-it-come
Money for the ministry of health has not come.

---› B: Ha! Ba-ba-timi-le?
Ha! SM+NEG-OM-give-PERF
Ha! Have they not given them?

Now consider further the following examples which have been culled out of their contexts:
12. a. Mu-feli-ze?
    SM-finish-PERF
    You have finished i.e. “Have you finished?”

b. Lu-kamune ku isa kwa pata?
    SM-PRES-comb to take to front
    We should comb to the front i.e. “Should we stretch it to the front?”

c. Sekizenge ha-si-kata-ha?
    Sekizenge NEG+SM-PRES-come-PERF
    Sekizenge has not come i.e. “Has Sekizenge not come?”

d. Esi ki sibi feela sani?
    Yes it+PRES-be malice just that?
    That is just malice i.e. “Is that not just malice?”

It emerges that in examples (11) and (12)a-d all the constructions have declarative syntax. What makes them interrogatives is a rising intonation. In this case we have some sort of illocutionary conversion in which the form of an utterance is different from its function. Formally the constructions are declaratives but in the context of their utterance they function as interrogatives. As observed elsewhere, intonation is one device that can be used to assign pragmatic status and mark constituent order variation. This is very common in spoken text, a point recognized by other scholars. Payne (1997) and Sadock and Zwicky (1985) argue that some interrogatives (questions) universally tend to involve distinctive intonation patterns.

8.2.1.1.7. Negative constructions

The following examples illustrate the negative constructions that occur in the spoken discourse. These are characterised by the negative marker is “ha-” which is placed in the initial position.

13 a. Bo-Mwanakatwe ba-ng’o-zi buhata...
    Mwanakatwe SM-PAST-write-PERF lies...

    -->kono ha-ba-si-ka-ba-tama.
    But, NEG-SM-PRES-PERF-OM-arrest
    Mwanakatwe has written lies. But they have not arrested him.
b *Ha-si-kata-ha*

NEG+SM-PRES-come-PERF

He has not come.

c *Sinkwa sa mwa bukuwa ha-si-feli*

Bread of in city NEG-SM-end

Bread of the city does not end

Lit. "The good things of the city do not end"

Before tabulating the statistical information about the relative frequencies of the clearly marked constructions, here are some guidelines. The first column of percentages reflects the percent out of a total of all the marked constructions. The second column of percentages is calculated out of a population of 176 constructions. This represents the total of all the SVX constructions. Put in other words, 44 (25) out of a total of 176 (75%) constructions are marked. These facts are consistent with the hypothesis that marked constructions are less frequent than unmarked ones. We believe the distributions of constituents reflected in the table may be explained in terms of their underlying functions in discourse. They are alternatives to the canonical, more usual constructions in Silozi.

**Table 15: Relative frequencies of marked constructions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSTRUCTION TYPE</th>
<th>NUMBER IN SAMPLE</th>
<th>% in 44</th>
<th>% in 176</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left dislocation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right dislocation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg-Existential</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraposition</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleft</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogative</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although it is not the main aim of this study to investigate the various functions of these constructions, it might be useful to provide some explanations for their distributions. Having recourse to discourse-pragmatic considerations can best do this. The explanations offered are only suggestive. When we compare the frequency distribution of marked constructions with unmarked ones, we find that the latter far outnumber the former. This distribution is consistent with the claim that statistical frequency is a criterion in determining the markedness of constructions (Connolly 1991, Givon 1995). However, as the figures in the table show, negative existential constructions are the most frequent constructions. It is difficult to explain this. However, we might suggest that the speakers seem to be talking about the non-existence (or potential non-existence) of certain “objects” which may be physical or non-physical. In particular, a substantial portion of the discourse is about the history of Kaunda and the non-existence of people who do not know that it exists. Another chunk is about the corrupt leadership and the non-existence of international donor funding. Closely related to this, is the issue of the possible non-existence of a place where they may run to when they are out of power. These constructions are repeated more often than the others are. Other scholars (see for instance Fowler 1966) have documented the functions of repetition in spontaneous spoken language. Cardinal among these are highlighting, emphasis and attention holding. For example, the participants repeatedly state that there is no hiding place for the corrupt political elite. Chafe (1984) refers to this as “wheel-spinning”, arguing that the repetition does not imply that the speaker is wasting his or her interlocutor’s time as he may have judged his answer important enough to dwell on it. Its function is to emphasize the speaker’s sincerity in verbalising a particular idea. In this context, the repetition is marked by the use of the expressions “ha kana kuaya” (there is no place for him to run to) or simply “ha kuna” (ha kuna). I will now consider the distribution of marked constructions, which place an adverbial in the initial position.

8.3. ASVX constructions.

In this section we deal with the syntactic characteristics of constructions which place an adverbial in the initial position. We start with the distribution of adverbials and then move on to other constituents. As we shall show, the distributions of adverbial clauses does not match the expected distribution. This can be explained by the different functions of adverbials in different positions.
8.3.1. Distribution of adverbials

Three adverbial categories, namely, adverb, adverb phrase and adverb clause are fronted. The following examples illustrate the constructions which place an adverbial in the initial position. The adverbials are highlighted in each case.

**Adverb**

14 a **Cwale** lwa-mi-swala.  
   Now **SM+PRES-OM-catch**  
   Now **We are catching you**

b **Mwendi** u-ka-taha kamuso.  
   Perhaps **SM-FUT-come tomorrow**  
   Perhaps he will come tomorrow.

c **Of course**, ba-bulela.  
   Of course, **SM+PRES-speak**  
   Of course, They speak (it)

In example (14)c, the speaker uses an English word **“of course”** to emphasize the point that the speaker’s children speak his first language in addition to the Zambian language that they speak most frequently. Another category that is fronted is the adverbial phrase which we illustrate below:

15 **Mwa library mo**, kutezi  
   In library this, **SM+PRES+be.full**  
   In this library, there are plenty.

Example (15) is a marked construction in two ways. First it has a fronted adverbial phrase **“Mwa library mo...”** (in this library). It also has a presentative existential construction “ku tezi” which is equivalent to **“there are plenty of references on Kaunda”**. The participants are talking about the availability of references on Kaunda’s history. This particular text extract emphasizes that there are many such references “in this library”. Finally, there are adverbial clauses in the initial position. To illustrate constructions in which adverbial clauses are placed in the initial position consider the following extracts. In the following extract, the participants are talking about the possibility of a prominent Zambian politician considering resigning his position. The speaker feels that he might not do that because this might cost him his legal immunity and he would have to stand court trial.
16 A: *Mwendi* u-ta-eza resign.
   Probably SM-FUT-do resign
   He will probably resign.
B: *A-sa-eza*  *feela cwalo* wa-luza immunity.
   SM+PRES-once-do just that SM+PRES-lose immunity
   Once he just does that he loses immunity.

Another illustration for a construction with a fronted adverbial clause is in (17).

17 Bonyandi bonda-te ne-ba-sa-lati milili...*Ba-sa-ku-bona*
   Late father-POSS PAST-SM-NEG-like hair... SM+PRES-soon-OM-see
   *feela* ba-li taha kwanu.
   just SM+PRES-say come here
   My late father did not like (long) hair.... As soon as he sees you he says come here.

The speaker is talking about how his late father could force him to have a hair cut when he was younger. The example in (17) illustrates two marked constructions. The first construction “*Bonyandi bondate...*” illustrates a negative. In this example the regular negative particle “*ha-*” is not used. We have, instead, “*ne-*” which triggers the terminative “-i” of the verb “*lata*”. This change results from the effect of tense and agreement. In the second construction, the markedness is marked by the fronting of an adverbial clause “*Basa kubona feela ...*”

8.3.1.1. Distribution of constructions in ASVX

In this section we consider constructions in which an adverbial is placed in the initial position. As in the previous chapters, we shall compare constituents which share the same functional characteristics.

8.3.1.1.1. Results of text counts for the distribution of adverbials

The distribution of adverbials is summarised in Table 16. The results of the text counts show that there are 32 adverbials. It should be stated that the distribution of adverbials, particularly adverbial clauses, does not match the expected distribution. As we shall demonstrate in Chapter 9 and elsewhere, this can best be explained by
the different discourse-pragmatic functions of adverbials in different positions. The percentages presented are calculated out of a total of 27 for initial adverbials and 5 for final adverbials. The percentage figures which are in brackets are calculated out of a total of 32.

Table 16: Distribution of Adverbials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>INITIAL %</th>
<th>FINAL %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADV</td>
<td>30(25)</td>
<td>20(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVP</td>
<td>11(9)</td>
<td>20(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>59(50)</td>
<td>60(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Starting with adverbs which are the simplest on the scale, there is evidence for the effect of LIPOC on the distribution of these constituents. That this is so is supported by the fact that out of a population of 32 adverbials 8 (25%) occur in the initial position while only 1 (3%) occurs in the final position. This suggests that simple adverbal constituents have a tendency to be placed earlier in the construction. As for the phrases, the figures show that they are the least occurring constituents with a relative preference to occur earlier rather than later in the construction. Because of the low frequency, it is difficult to measure the effect of the two principles under investigation in their distribution. We can only suggest that they would not be expected to be more frequent in the initial position than in the final on account of their relative “heaviness”. In this case, the frequencies neither confirm nor disconfirm the effect of LIPOC and EW in any empirical and statistical way. Moving on to adverbial clauses, which are the most complex on the scale, the figures show that 16 (approximately 50%) adverbial clauses occur in the initial position while 3 (9%) occur in the final position. This is at odds with the LIPOC and EW which predict that subordinate clauses, particularly adverbials, prefer to be placed towards (or at) the end of the clause. This pattern is reflected in the over all distribution of adverbials. Contrary to the predictions of LIPOC and EW, the figures show that clauses are the most frequent constituents in both the final and initial position. The frequency of occurrence of the simplest constituent among adverbials is not the most dominant in the initial position. Although the figures are relatively small, the differences in their distributions are statistically significant: P < .001.
An explanation for this apparent counter-expectation lies in what we have already seen in the other tables. This is that linear principles of internal complexity are subordinate to discourse-pragmatic factors in some contexts. Specifically, we noted that constituents which precede the subject have special pragmatic status. We have already observed that the placement of adverbials in the initial position is highly desirable from the discourse-pragmatic point of view. They are necessary for textual and discourse organisation. Since text is a dynamic act of communication in real time, we should expect some devices to achieve this. This is best done by preposed adverbials. Hence the greater frequency of preposed adverbial clauses than postposed ones. This view is supported by a cross-linguistic observation that all languages seem to allow the preposing of adverbial clauses while many disallow postposed adverbial clauses (c.f. Haiman 1978, Thompson and Langacre 1985, Givon 1990). The tendency to place such constituents in the initial position is, therefore due to the discourse-pragmatic factors. Siewierska (1988, 1993) confirms this explanation, adding that there are also other aspects of order which are simply not covered by the linearization hierarchies, such as variation in order determined by sentence type (e.g. main Vs subordinate clause, declarative Vs interrogative, etc.). We return to a more detailed account of the distributions and functions of adverbials in Chapter 9.

8.3.1.1.2. Distribution of nominals.

In this section we report on the distribution of nominals in the subject, object (direct and indirect) and complement positions. Table 17 provides a summary of their frequency distribution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>OI</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>DO</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRO</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRON</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As in the other tables, the dominant constituents in the subject position are pronominal prefixes (SM). While they occur with low frequency in the direct object position, they are very rare in both the indirect and complement position. With respect to LIPOC and EW, this pattern is not surprising, as simple constituents would be expected to exhibit a preference to be placed earlier in the construction. The distributions of pronouns, nouns and noun phrases do not represent a significant pattern. In this case, it is not easy to explain, in empirical terms, whether the principles have any effect in their distributions in the positions. However, the values decrease as we move towards the end of the sequence. Clauses only occur in the complement position. The non-occurrence of clauses seems to be attributable to the constraints that are imposed on speakers. Since they are hard pressed for time, it is difficult for them to produce complex syntax. In this case, the constructions are predominantly preceded by adverbial clauses. It would be difficult to place one clause immediately after another. This is consonant with "one-clause-at-a-time hypothesis" proposed by Pawley and Syder (1983). This hypothesis claims that people are cognitively unequipped to deal smoothly with more than one clause at a time. Juxtaposing creates complex syntax, which is rarer in casual conversation than in writing.

In terms of overall frequency, we can only state that the distributional patterns for nominals in ASVX constructions exhibit striking similarities with those in SVX. In particular, simple constituents are most frequent in the subject position and do not occur in the final position (complement). Clauses, on the other hand, do not occur in the subject position and only occur in the complement position. With respect to NPs, we can only repeat what we have already said by hypothesizing that independent NPs occur with very low frequency in spoken discourse.

8.3.1.1.3. Distribution of non nominals in the complement position.

In addition to clauses which we have already presented in Table 18, the two constituents that occur in this position are adjectives and obligatory locative phrases. The information about their distribution is summarized in Table 18.
Table 18: Distribution of non-nominals in complement position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>NUMBER IN SAMPLE</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADJ</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures show that there are more phrases than single words. These figures are too small to be tested statistically. However, if we take into account the pronouns and clauses (see table 6), we can conclude that the most frequent constituent is the most complex and the least are pronouns. Out of all the 13 constituents 7 (54%) are clauses, 3 (23%) are adverb phrases, 2 (15%) are adjectives and only 1 (8%) is a pronoun. On the basis of these meagre frequencies, there is some extent to which it can be claimed that there is a correlation between the internal structure or weight of both nominal and non-nominal constituents and their placement in the complement position.

8.3.1. Other construction types in ASVX

There are four other construction types. The markedness of these constructions is effected by the presence of an adverbial in the initial position which is followed by a clearly marked clause. The constructions are passive, negative, right dislocation and interrogative. We illustrate each one below.

8.3.1.1. Passive constructions

The passive is illustrated by the following:

18 a: Ba University ba-bata ku beya batu fa half pay.

University SM+PRES-want to send people on half pay

The university want to send people on half pay.

--> b: ...Kakuli i-kwalil-we.

...Because SM-PRES-close-PASS

... Because it is closed.
The construction in (18)b is an amalgam of a fronted adverbial of reason and a passive construction. The fronted constituent is the adverbial of reason "kakuli" which indicates the reason for the University's plan to send the workers on half pay. This example also indicates the nature of spontaneous spoken syntax in which a clause can begin with a subordinator. The passive is indicated by the SWC "ikwaliwe". The morpheme "-we" which is a variant of "-wa" is the passive marker. It is delivered as an explanation for the University sending people on half pay.

8.3.1.2. Negative constructions

19 Ha-lu-inzi onafa ha-lu-zibi.  
SC-SM+PRES-be here NEG-SM+PRES-know.  
As we are here, we do not know.

The adverbial clause "Haluinzi onafa" precedes the main clause "haluzibi".

8.3.1.3. Right dislocations

There are only two clear cases of right dislocations which we illustrate with the examples (20)a-b. The complement clauses in both the examples are delivered in direct speech although I have used quotation marks to enclose them in the transcription and the glossing.

20 a Neba ha-shwa u-li ne-ni-mu-boni, mwanaka.  
Even SC+SM+PRES-die SM+PRES-say SM-PAST-OM-see, child my  
Even when he dies he says I saw him, my child.  

b Na-mi-siya fani u-li ni-mu-boni, mwanaka.  
SC+SM+PRES-OM-leave there SM+PRES-say SM+PAST-OM-see, child my  
When he leaves you there, he says "I have seen him my child.

In each of these cases, the right dislocated NP is "mwanaka", which are both vocatives. In (20)a the pronominal element with which it is anaphorically related is "ne". In (20)b, it is "ni". The difference between the forms of the two proforms (SM) is an effect of verb conjugation due to tense. Example (20)a is in the past while (20)b is in the present.
8.3.3.4. Interrogatives

There is only one interrogative construction, which we illustrate in (21).

21 Cwale se ba-ka-eza prove ki sikamang’i?
   Now what SM-FUT-do prove is what
   Now what are they going to prove?

As in the other interrogative constructions, the example in (21) is structurally a declarative clause, which is marked by intonation.

8.4. Other marked constructions in spoken discourse

These are constructions which place nominal constituents in the initial position and after the clause. They may be categorized together with ASVX constructions in that they place a non-subject element in the initial position. There are only 6 occurrences of these construction types which we illustrate in the following subsections.

8.4.1. Left dislocations

The following constructions illustrate left dislocations in the data. (22)a is extracted from a portion of the conversation in which one of the participants vows not to have a hair cut in one of the saloons in Edinburgh because it much more expensive than it would be in Zambia. In (22)b, the speaker is commenting on a Zambian politician who is standing trial in court.

22 a Na, ni-hani-le ku kutiwa milili mo.
   Me, SM+PAST-refuse-PERF to cut hair here
   Me, I have refused to have my hair cut here.

b...Mubita, ba-mu-zieli-ze kono...
   Mubita, SM-OM-fix-PERF but...
   Mubita, they have fixed him but...

In example (22)a, the left dislocated element is the pronoun “Na”. In fact, this is one of the rare examples of independent emphatic pronouns that are attested in the data. Its referent in the main clause is coded by the pronominal prefix “ni-”. In (22)b, “ba” acts as the pronominal which is in anaphoric reference to “Mubita”. Before closing
this section, let me introduce another construction, which is akin to left dislocation. In this particular example, the construction exhibits the characteristics of left dislocation and postposing. We briefly consider it in the following section.

8.4.2. Left dislocation/ Postposing.

The context of this is that the participants are talking about a young man (the refugee) who spends a lot of money on buying expensive new musical CDs from high street shops like HMV and Virgin records. In particular, the speaker is expressing surprise that the young man does not seem to worry about the cost, which is roughly about fifteen pounds for an imported CD.

23 Yena, he doesn’t care, Ma-pound a.  
Him, he doesn’t care, Pounds these  
Him, he does not care, these pounds  
Lit. “He does not care about how many pounds he spends”.

Example (23) is another construction which consists of a mixture of structures from English and Silozi. The dislocated NP is “yena”, which is coreferential with “he” in the main clause. “Mapaund a” is the postposed element. It does not have a referent in the main clause.

8.4.3. Right dislocations

The following examples illustrate right dislocated constructions.

24 a I-ng'oz-wi,       history ya Kaunda.  
It+PRES+be-write-PASS, history of Kaunda  
It is written, Kaunda’s history.  
b ...Kono ba-mu-beile mwa butata, Mubita.  
...But SM+PAST-OM-put in trouble, Mubita  
...But they have put him in trouble, Mubita.

In example (24)a, the participants are talking about the history of the first president of Zambia, Kenneth Kaunda whose origins are being questioned in the courts of law. In (24)b, they are discussing one of the politicians who is being prosecuted. The dislocated constituents in the (24)a is “history ya Kaunda” (Kaunda’s history) and it
is coreferential with the pronominal “I”. In (24)b it is Mubita and the pronominal it refers to in the main clause is the object marker “mu”.

8.5. Overall distributions

In this section I compare the relative frequencies of SVX constructions with ASVX constructions. The counts show that there are 176 (87%) constructions which place a subject in the initial position as opposed to 27 (13%) which place the adverbial in the initial position. This distribution is highly significant: $P < .001$. This biased frequency distribution confirms the hypothesis that the typically marked category is less frequent, while the unmarked is more frequent (Greenberg 1976, Dryer 1995, Givon 1995). These facts also apply to the lower statistical frequencies of what I have termed clearly marked constructions as compared to the unmarked and marked construction types.

8.6. Some idiosyncrasies: Counter examples to LIPOC and EW

In section 8.1. we stated that there is a difference between written language and spoken language. The aim of this section is to provide further evidence for these observations with data from Silozi spoken discourse. In the course of our analysis, we discovered some intriguing phenomena, which consist of a set of structures, which I have termed “idiosyncrasies”. They are so called because they seem to be typical of the spoken discourse. Further, they counter the generalisations made about constituent order in a significant way. Precisely, these structures are exceptions to the predictions made about constituent order as predicted in the literature. I will argue that the putative value of the tendency to place lighter constituents before heavier ones is questionable in certain contexts. The use of the term “idiosyncrasy” may be a misnomer. As Khyu-hyun (1991) suggests, the peculiarities of conversational texts should be seen as fundamental indicators of the syntactic capabilities of the language, rather than as deviations from the standard, especially that a grammar of a language is bound to be shaped by or adopted to the primordial interactional context where it is situated and actualized.

The purpose of this section is to briefly discuss and illustrate some of these constructions. Before discussing them, it might be useful to present a brief background to their emergence in the Silozi language. It is widely known that rules of speaking and, more generally norms of interaction are both culture-specific and
largely unconscious. Jalla (1936) observes that the Malozi (speakers of Silozi) have a custom to express politeness in spontaneous speech. There are certain grammatical structures which have evolved for this purpose. Juniors mostly use them when talking to their seniors in age. Adults also use them when speaking to people who are older than them or people who are not intimately related. Generally, they are used in both formal and informal spoken language as respect markers. They are integral aspects of the Silozi language and are used in ordinary daily speech. Structurally, they are mostly simple words, which are obligatorily tacked on at the end of utterances (main clauses).

The constructions we are dealing with are main clauses that combine with "external" single units. They are external because they are not necessary for the grammatical structure of the clause to which they are attached. According to the discourse-pragmatic rules of Silozi, they are necessary for optimal communication. On these grounds, the two constituents presumably form a unitary grammaticalized or syntacticized category. The motivation for these structures may be as a result of processes in which loose, paratactic, "pragmatic" discourse structures develop over time into "grammaticalized" syntactic structures (Givon 1979). The constructions are thus by default patterned in such a way that single words are postposed. The rightmost constituent is obligatorily a single word. And this order is strictly fixed. As can be seen in the functional pattern and placement rules underlying them, these constructions place main clauses before words. Obviously, this is contrary to what is conventionally expected in all these principles that affect constituent order. These respect markers are contextually part of the clause.

To illustrate these orders with some concrete examples, consider the following ("Sha" is the shortened form of "Shangwe". These are equivalent to the English "sir/madam" or "please"). In some instances, the word "ndate" is used

25 a Neo, Neo ki-ona mushobo "shangwe"
   Neo, Neo be-it language RM
   Neo, Neo is the language sir.

   Ba-kaeza pick up Sitonga, sha
   SM+FUT-do pick up Tonga RM.
   They will pick up some Tonga, sir
They have put him in trouble sir.

As can be seen from the examples, the linearization pattern is based on “lightness to the right” principle instead of “heaviness to the right”. Contrary to the predictions of LIPOC the constituents are ordered in terms of decreasing internal complexity. In a similar manner, contrary to the predictions of weight principles, long and heavy constituents precede short and light elements. The preference for the placement of short before long material is not effected. Clearly, this is a significant deviation from the fundamental principles of both heaviness/weight and LIPOC. Although the formal and syntactic arrangement of constituents is “odd”, the constructions are in accord with discourse-pragmatic principles. Important information is placed earlier in the clause than less important information. The speaker first produces the basic proposition which contains the important information. This is the information that must be communicated and must be communicated first. I would like to propose that these orderings are primarily motivated by discourse and pragmatic factors such as Givon’s (1988) “attend to the urgent task first”. It should also be pointed out that extra-grammatical factors, particularly socio-cultural ones, are crucial in the construction of these patterns. We can generalize that underlying these structures is the need for speakers to communicate information with a measure of respect. Presumably, the addition of a politeness marker makes the information more appropriate, optimal and suited for the context.

Apart from utterances that mark respect, another structure which contravenes the principles of weight and LIPOC in its linearization is one in which the complement of the verb is an ideophone. This construction is typical of spontaneous spoken language although it is also attested in the written texts. The difference is that in the written texts, the ideophone occurs as an adjunct where as it is a complement in this the spoken text.

26 Nako ye ni-inzi hande... Ni-ka-eza-nga feela “fa-fa”
Time this SM+PRES-be well... SM+FUT-do-PROG just “fa-fa”
This time I am comfortable... I will just be doing “fa-fa”.
“I am now comfortable as my hair is manageable”.
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c Ba-muzielize, ndate.
SM+PERF-fix, RM
They have put him in trouble sir.
After having had his hair cut in a typical Zambian fashion, the speaker is apparently impressed. He describes how he is going to manage his hair as below. “fa-fa” is an ideophone used here to express the sound made by the comb and it indicates the ease with which he is going to move it through hair. The comb will be producing the sound “fa fa” as it is used to comb the hair.

Away from constructions that inherently place simpler constituents before more complex ones, there is yet another interesting example which reverses the heaviness to the right principle. This involves the placement of a single word which is basically an agreement marker as a complement. In this case, the speaker is stating that he understands and is in agreement with whatever is arranged. These units are akin to what Greenbaum (1996) calls “back channels” or “hear signals”. These single-word complements would probably be expressed in indirect speech in written language. For, convenience, I have put them in inverted commas. For illustration, consider the following examples:

27 a Se-nili  
SM+PAST-say Oho
I said “Oho”.

27 b Se-nili  
SM+PAST-say “eni”
I said yes

In some instances, the particle “sha” is added to “eni” to add more respect to the utterance. This is illustrated in (28).

28 Se-nili  
SM+PAST-say “eni sha”
yes sir/madam
I said yes sir/ madam

These are a few examples. However, they illustrate, quite clearly, the fact that although weight principles are considered to be the dominant triggers of constituent order in discourse, not all occurring constructions in our text can be accounted for by them. These counterexamples point to the limitations of these two principles. Since a longer constituent (an entire sentence at that) precedes a shorter one, syntactic weight cannot be used to explain the patterns. The same may be said about LIPOC.
8.7. Conclusion

The central concern of this chapter has been the distribution of constituents in Silozi spoken discourse. Although it is not our main concern to investigate the syntactic characteristics of this type of discourse, there are certain issues that have emerged from our investigation that deserve commenting on. These are related to the nature of spoken language itself and the conditions under which it is delivered. One of these is that independent grammatical arguments are very rare. Due to its rich morphology, these are coded by pronominal affixes. Recall that Silozi exhibits some characteristics of “pro-drop” in discourse. Another observation is that complex constructions such as nominal subject clauses and postposed subordinate adverbial clauses do not occur. Most of the clauses are simple in structure with some having the structure of complex words (SWCs). Mithun (1992) observes that because of the presence of pronominal prefixes, single verbs can stand alone as predications in themselves in Cayuga, and often do. She further argues that although it is perfectly grammatical to include separate nominal arguments within sentences (clauses for our purposes), such full sentences occur relatively rarely in spontaneous discourse. These observations have also been made with respect to Ngandi, an Australian language of Eastern Arnhem Land which, like Silozi and Cayuga, is polysynthetic with obligatory pronominal prefixes within the verb. Closely connected to this is the observation that system sentences are not common in our data. In a similar spirit, Chafe (1992: 268) argues that there are two constraints that appear to be difficult for speakers to overcome in casual, unplanned conversation. He refers to them as one-new-idea-at-a-time constraint and the light-subject constraint. The one-new-idea-at-a-time assumes that a basic unit of spoken language is the intonation unit and is limited to no more than one idea. The light-subject constraint has to do with grammatical subjects. Specifically, it limits subjects to information that is not new, limiting it to information that is either given and or at least accessible. Other scholars dealing with spontaneous spoken language have corroborated this characteristic (Gibson et al 1966, 1984).

Because complex constituents are not abundant, in our sample as indeed in spontaneous spoken language, we find that most of the constituents in the clause gravitate towards the initial and medial positions. There are markedly fewer constituents which occur towards the end. The final position, which for Silozi is the

---

60 Chafe (1992) adds that such the intonation unit may at the same time express additional ideas that have the status of either given or accessible information.
adverbial when present is the least occupied in the unmarked clause (SVX in our terms). This skewing to the left suggests that a fair balance in the distribution of constituents in terms of categorial complexity may be untenable. An important implication of all this for LIPOC and EW is that we do not have enough independent and complex constituents with which to test their heuristic validity. Consequently, it is not easy to validate their effect on constituent ordering with empirical statistical evidence. There are also numerous constructions which contradict the predictions of these weight principles by default. The principles are more applicable to written language, which has system sentences, than they are to spoken language, which is marked by fragmented syntax. More importantly complex syntax is hard to come by in spoken language making it difficult for principles that are founded on complexity and heaviness (weight) to be relevant.
Chapter 9

The Distribution of Adverbials in Silozi Sentences

9.1. Introduction

The present chapter discusses the distribution of adverbials in the Silozi clause or sentence. The main aim is to find explanations for the violations of LIPOC and EW which we pointed out in chapters 7 and 8. It thus seeks to provide explanations for the existence of ASVX constructions. From the data, these appear to constitute the bulk of constructions that are in contradiction to the predictions of LIPOC. Specifically, I want to call attention to the behaviour of adverbial clauses with respect to their position with the main clause. The chapter is organised as follows: Section 2 provides a description of Silozi subordinate adverbial clauses. Section 3 deals with the frequency distribution of adverbial clauses in both the written and spoken texts. In Section 4, we consider the placement of adverbials, with the focus on the implications for LIPOC and EW. In Section 5, we provide explanations for the placement of clausal adverbials in the initial position.

9.2. The formal characteristics of adverbial clauses in Silozi

In the previous chapters we presented examples of adverbial clauses and discussed their syntactic characteristics. However, we did not describe their formal characteristics. The aim of this section is, therefore to describe the formal characteristics of Silozi adverbial clauses. As in many languages, subordinators formally mark Silozi subordinate clauses. Silozi seems to use subordinating markers in a way that may be said to be radically different from what has been described in the literature for many other languages (see for instance Thompson and Longacre 1985, Dik 1997). Unlike other languages, agreement morpho-syntax is required in ADV-clauses, which tends to precede the main clause. By this is meant that dependent adverbial clauses must always carry a marker which agrees with the subject of either the preceding or following clause. The resultant surface structures are adverbial clauses which are preceded by NP elements. In this way, the subject

---

61 Givon (1990) reports a similar phenomenon in the ergative Panoan languages of Amazonian Peru. In these languages, case-agreement morphology is required for adverbial clauses that precede the main clause.
agreement marking associated with ADV-clauses have been effectively extended into the grammar of referential tracking in preposed subordinate clauses. On the basis of this, two different types of subordinators may be identified. The first group of subordinators consists of a combination of an NP and a subordinating conjunction. Clearly, this makes Silozi different from many languages that have been described hitherto. The second group consists of subordinating conjunctions, which must co-occur with a subject marker. In this case the subordinating morpheme combines the functions of subordinating marker and agreement marker, which are in essence prefixes. In this sense, these elements are similar, if not the same, as what we have termed incorporated pronominal arguments. As in other SVO languages, these subordinators precede the clauses that they introduce. In this light two main surface structures as relevant for the present chapter may be formulated:

(i) NP + SC-Cl +S+V+X,
(ii) SC + Cl + S +V +X.
(iii) and a third subtype, which has the pattern A+A+SVX is recognised.

I will now illustrate the instantiation of these constructions.

9.2.1. NP+SC-Cl+S+V+X

In these constructions, the subordinating conjunction is in second place after a full NP. When there is an incorporated pronoun, the subject marker is conflated with the subordinating conjunction. As the examples show, noun phrases of varying structures perform this function.

1 a Kulu ha-yo-fita fa fasi ka mukokoto,a-utwa
Tortoise SC-SM+PAST-land on ground with back SM+PAST-hear

linzwi la-na-ziba ha-kalo.
voice REL-SM-know a-lot

When tortoise landed on the ground on his back, he heard a voice that was very familiar.
b *Asika-alaba puzo, kulu a-lindula lifasi ŋ’indi*
   SC+SM-answer question, tortoise SM+PAST-hit ground fist.
   Before answering the question, tortoise hit the ground with a fist.

c *Litaka zahae hane ba-sweli-kumanaga-na, kutongola mashela,*
   Peers his SC SM-PAST-wrestle-PROG, to gather fruit,

   *ku hama ni kuanya milokozo, yena na-bapala ni*
   to milk and to suck second milking, him SC+PAST-play with

   silabo mwa nuka ya Lungwagwa.
   paddle in river of Lungwangwa.
   While his peers were wrestling, gathering fruits, milking and sucking from
   the udders of cows, he was playing with a paddle on Lungwangwa river.

In example 1(a) a noun “*kulu*” precedes the subordinating conjunction “*ha*” which
introduces the subordinate clause “*hayo fita fafasisa ka mukokoto*”. This structure has
similarities with a relative clause. It is different in that it functions as an adverbial.
The main clause in this example is “*autwa linzwi lana ziba hakalo*”. In 1(b), the
initial constituent is a cliticized pronominal “*a-*”, which combines the functions of a
subject marker and a subordinating conjunction. These then mark the subordinate
clause “*Asika alaba puzo*”, which is followed by the main clause “*Kulu alindula
lifasi ng’indi*.” In 1(c), the noun phrase “*Litaka zahae*” and the subordinating
conjunction “*hane*” mark the complex subordinate clause “*Litaka zahae hane
basweli kumanaga, kutongola mashela, kuhama ni ku anya mulokozo*” whose
main clause is “*yena na bapala ni silabo fahala nuka ya lungwagwa*.” What should
be noted here is that the surface structures of the Silozi constructions place a noun
phrase in the initial position. These clauses receive an adverbial clause interpretation
in English translation.

9.2.2. **SC + S + V + X**

In these construction types, only a subordinating conjunction marks the embedded
clause. The subordinating conjunctions take various forms. However, most of them
are temporal adverbials. We illustrate some of these in the following examples.
2 

a. *Nihaike na-sa-lemu-le bulamu bobufitisisa,* a-lumela  
   SC  SM-PAST-note-PERF relationships suspicious,  SM+PAST-agree  

   kuli Kamuyongole a-ye ni mulamwae.  
   COMP Kamuyongole SM+PRES-go with in law.  

   Although he had noticed a suspicious relationship, he accepted that  
   Kamuyongole accompany his sister in law.

b *Habanze ba-zama-ya cwalo,* Kamuyongole ka  
   SC  SM+PAST-walk-PROG thus, Kamuyongole with  

   bunca bwa hae mwa lika ze cwalo, a-lakaza  
   inexperience his in things like these SM+PAST-wish  

   kuli lizazi li-sike-la-pazula  
   COMP sun SM+PAST-NEG-FUT-rise  

   While they were walking, Kamuyongole with his inexperience in such  
   activities, wished that the sun would not rise.

c *Kakuli na-si-ka-nyalwa sina Katekwe,* Jesika na-na-ni  

   Because SM-NEG-PAST-marry like Katekwe, Jesica  SM+PAST-have  

   sepo yetezi ya kuli Kamuyongole u-ta-mu-nyala.  
   hope great of COMP Kamuyongole SM+FUT-OM-marry  

   Because she was not married, Jesica was very confident that Kamuyongole  
   would marry her.

The subordinate clause “*nihaike nasalemuhile bulamu bobufitisisa*” in (2)a is  
marked by the conjunction “*nihaike*”. In (2)b the subordinating conjunction  
“*habanze*” introduces the subordinate clause “*Habanze bazamaya cwalo*”. The main  
clause in this example is “*Kamuyongole ka bunca bwa hae mwa lika ze cwalo,  
alakaza kuli lizazi lisike lapazula.*” The subordinating conjunction “*kakuli*” marks  
the subordinate clause “*kakuli nasika nyalwa*” whose superordinate clause is  
“*Jesika nanani sepo yetezi ya kuli Kamuyongole utamunyala*” in example (2) c.
9.2.3. A+A+S+V+X

In these construction types, an adverbial precedes another adverbial to create complex adverbial clauses. Specifically, we may have a simple adverb, adverbial phrase or an adverbial clause preceding an adverbial clause. Henceforth, I will refer to the adverbial clauses that contain other adverbial clauses as complex adverbial clauses. Examples are given in (3).

3  a  Nihakuli cwalo, zazi la-fita Punga ba-mu-amuhela hande
Despite this day SC-arrive Punga SM+PAST-OM-receive well
Despite this, when Punga arrived, they received him well.

3  b  Kono  shangwe nihaiba fa  tukiso ye  benya-benya,
But RM even where preparation good-good,

ku-kona-kutaha butata
PART-PRES-come problems
But, sir/ madam, even where preparation is very thorough, there can be problems.

3  c  A-sa-apula  feela mulomo, kuli abulele ni  sicaba
SC+SM-PAST-open just mouth, SC talk to people

se-ne-kubukani  fafasi,  kulu  awa
REL-PAST-gather underneath tortoise fell.
Once he opened his mouth so that he could talk to the people who were gathered on the ground tortoise fell.

In (3)a, an adverb phrase “Nihakuli cwalo...”, precedes the adverbial clause of time “zazi la-fita Punga...”. The respect marker “shangwe” and “nihaiba” precede the locative adverbial clause “fa tukiso ye benya-benya” in (3)b. In (3)c, the adverbial clause “Asaapula feela mulomo” precedes the adverbial clause “kuli abulele ni sicaba senesi kubukani fafasi”. Note that the adverbial clause in (3)c, is introduced by an element that combines the functions of a subordinator and agreement marker. In sum, adverbial clause marking is intricately associated with grammatical agreement and referential coherence. When there is no independent NP or overt adverbial morpheme, an element which exhibits morphosyntactic characteristics
(agreement and reference) as well as subordination marking is employed. The element "Ha-" and its variant "A-" are commonly used in agreement morphology.

9.3. Distribution of adverbial clauses

In this section, I present the frequency distribution of adverbial clauses in the written texts and the spoken texts in the constructions that we have dealt with. In the previous chapters, we have established two main linearization patternings of constituents, namely SVX and ASVX. We also established a subdivision of SVX constructions, which we have termed clearly marked constructions. Our findings are that in SVX constructions adverbial clauses are typically placed in the final position. Further, with the exception of fronting and left dislocations, most clearly marked constructions inherently place light constituents (e.g. particles and cliticized pronouns) in the initial position and all the complex constituents are placed towards the end of the construction. A further finding is that in ASVX constructions, adverbial clauses may occur in the initial position and in the final position. From these orders, it is only in ASVX constructions that adverbial clauses have the freedom to occur in more than one position (see the relevant tables). Accordingly, the comparison that we make in this section is restricted to ASVX constructions only.

9.3.1. Distribution of simple adverbial clauses in the written text

The frequency of occurrence of simple adverbial clauses is summarized in Table 19.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INITIAL</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINAL</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What Table 19 shows is that there are more adverbial clauses in the initial position than there are in the final position. Let us now consider the distribution of complex adverbial clauses in the two positions. This information is summarised in Table 20. There is a skewing towards the end of the construction. The figures show that there are more complex adverbial clauses in the final position than there are in the initial position. The figures confirm what we have already observed; that multiple
subordination occurs towards the end of the construction. Moreover, it seems to be the consistent with LIPOC’s prediction that there will be preferably no material after a subordinate clause, unless that material is of the same or greater complexity than the subordinate clause.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INITIAL</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINAL</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20: Distribution of complex adverbial clauses

9.3.2. Distribution of adverbial clauses in spoken language

As regards the data from spontaneous spoken language, adverbial clauses are significantly more frequent in the initial position than they are in the final position. There are 16 clauses in the initial position while there are only 3 in the final position. This distribution is very significant (p <.001). Further, there is no multiple subordination or embedding in both the initial and final positions. The explanation we offered for this skewed observation, which is endorsed by other scholars, is that speakers are hard pressed for time to produce complex syntax. Since adverbials are not essential to the syntactic structure of sentences, they are not very common in spontaneous discourse. I would like to add that as compared to written language, spontaneous spoken language as manifested in my data has fewer subordinate clauses. In this regard, our findings seem to be at odds with Poole and Field’s (1976) finding that spoken discourse had significantly more subordination, elaboration or syntactic structure. Rather, the findings consolidate the observation that spoken language contains fewer subordinate clauses than written language (Brown et al

62 There is disagreement on the incidence of main and subordinate clauses in spoken and written language among scholars. See Miller & Weinert (1998: 80) for a summary of the discrepancies. Halliday (1989) however, proposes that spoken language and written language are both complex but in their own way. Beaman (1984) reports that contrary to what Chafe (1982) and Kroll (1977) found that there are significantly more co-ordinated sentences in the written stories than in spoken. Her explanations are used to reject the use the percentage of subordination as a measure of greater syntactic complexity for spoken and written discourse. However, I would like to argue, along with Chafe and Miller & Weinert and DuBois (1985) that due to the time constraints under which speakers find themselves in the production of natural spoken language, it is reasonable to suppose that spoken language contains fewer subordinate clauses than written language. This is also supported by my own data.
1984, Beaman 1984, Halliday 1989, Chafe, 1987, M &W 1998). There is no doubt that speakers do not have the advantage to deliberate on and edit what they are producing in real time (Chafe 1982, 1984).

What is interesting about the distribution of adverbial clauses is that they choose to be skewed to the initial position. Despite the differences in frequency distribution, the morphosyntactic characteristics of adverbial clauses are, by and large, similar in both text types.

9.4. The positions of adverbials

One factor influencing the placement of adverbials is their structure, and in particular whether they are clausal (i.e. they comprise or contain a clause) or non-clausal. Although this chapter is mainly focused on the distribution of adverbial clauses (i.e. clause integration), I will present the placement of adverbials per se. This is because clausal adverbials must work in conjunction with non-clausal adverbials to perform their discourse functions. From my observations, it is not possible for clausal constituents to work in complete isolation in connected coherent discourse.

Following Connolly (1991), I will assume that, with the exception of comparatives, clausal adverbials tend to have much the same positional characteristics, whatever their semantic function, whereas this is not the case for non-clausal adverbials. To this extent, I will on certain occasions treat clausal adverbials as a single class.

Thompson and Longacre (1985) argue that a characteristic of adverbials in some languages is their position and cite Mandarin, Ethiopian Semitic and Turkish as languages in which an Adverbial must precede the main clause. In Silozi, however, adverbials can be placed in all the possible positions. They can be placed initially (i.e. preposed) or medially as in (4) below:-

4 a **Bung’ata bwa nako**, mutangana na-siya ndatahe **mwa**

Most of time young man SM+PAST-leave-PROG father his in

**lapa kunyakita silalosahabo, ku bata basali.**

yard to wander area his, to look women.

Most of the time, the young man was leaving his father in the yard, wandering in his area, looking for women.
b. \textit{Ka nako yeo}, Kamuyongole a-kal-a ku tabela.
At time that Kamuyongole SM+PAST-start-PERF to like

\textit{hahulu} mikiti
much parties
At that time, Kamuyongole had started liking parties a lot.

c. \textit{Mwa musebezi wa muso}, a-yo-sebeza hande.
In \textit{work of government}, SM-PAST-work \textit{well}
In the civil service, he worked well.

In 4 a, the adverbial phrase \textit{"Bung’ata bwa nako"}, is fronted and the phrase \textit{"mwa lapa"} is placed in the medial position. The two non-finite subordinate clauses \textit{"kunyakita silalo sahabo"} and \textit{"kubata basali"} are placed towards the end and in the final position respectively. The adverb phrase \textit{"Ka nako yeo"} is in the initial position while the adverb \textit{"hahulu"} is placed in the medial position in (4)b. Finally, in (4)c An adverb phrase \textit{"Mwa musebezi wa muso"} is fronted and the adverb \textit{"hande"} is placed in the final position. From the examples in (4) as well as those presented in (2) and (3), it is clear that adverbial clauses do not actually occur in the medial position in our data. It is only simple adverbs or phrases that have the freedom to occur in the three positions. We may thus claim that simpler adverbials have more freedom of mobility than more complex ones, the clauses. This information can be taken as evidence for the hypothesis that adverbial clauses prefer to be placed either at the beginning or at the end of the construction of which they form a part. Let us now turn to the more specific issues, the placement of adverbial clauses.

\textbf{9.4.1. The position of adverbial clauses in the matrix domain: implications for LIPOC and EW.}

The explanations that I offer in this section are based on the facts that are presented in the preceding sections. To explain the positions of adverbial clauses in the matrix domain in these texts, I once again employ some insights from FG. In FG, adverbial clauses are termed satellites and will be placed in the positions which are also occupied by first order categories of corresponding functions. Further, as we showed in chapter 2, the Prefield or Postfield character of a language is one factor which determines the position of embedded constructions in FG. If a language is organized
on a Prefield basis, we expect embedded constructions to occur in the Prefield (before the matrix predicate). On the other hand, if the language is organised on a Postfield basis, we expect the embedded constructions to occur in the Postfield.

How does this apply to our data? In terms of the Prefield and Postfield distinction, we have established that Silozi is organised on a Postfield basis as it is a relatively strong SVX language. Thus in neutral “canonical” constructions which do not involve fronting or left dislocation (SVX), all the embedded constructions occur in the Postfield. That is, toward the end or at the end of the construction of which they form a part. In these constructions, we found that a significant majority of simple constituents occur in the initial position while complex constituents occur towards the end or at the end of the construction. Subordinate clauses are significantly dominant towards the end of the construction and cliticized nominals are dominant in the initial position. The second type consists of clearly “marked” constructions in which the displacement can be interpreted as a means of reducing the complexity of constituents in the positions in which these occur. The clearest cases are clefts, extrapositions, some interrogatives and existentials. As we have noted, the constituents that are placed in the initial position of the clearly marked constructions are inherently cliticized pronouns, “dummy” subjects (ku-) and particles (e.g. Q-words). The constituents that are placed towards the end are complement and adverbial clauses. In these construction types then, the placement of constituents is in conformity with LIPOC and EW. In fact, it is one of the fundamental claims of the multifunctional theory of constituent ordering that (dis)placement of constituents for complexity reasons will bring constituents towards the end of the construction. The placement of a “dummy” element is assumed to be a means of preserving the canonical pattern of the clause in conditions in which the subject does not occur in its pattern position.

In some constructions which involve preposing of some constituents, we have found that the placement of constituents is not in terms of increasing complexity. Two types of constructions were found, namely left dislocations and preposed constructions. Given the fact that Silozi is a consistent Postfield language, all preposing of constituents may create problems for the principles governing it and Postfields in general. The basic, unmarked position for subordinate clauses may be in the Postfield in Prefield languages, but not in the Prefield in Postfield languages. The placement of complex constituents before subjects, particularly cliticized pronouns, which are the dominant ones, is non-preferred with respect to LIPOC and EW.
In short, the numerical differences in the distribution of constituents, which are further corroborated by the figures relating to the distribution of adverbials show that preposing of adverbial clauses is non-preferred or may not be the canonical pattern. Another observation is that the preposing of adverbial clauses is non-preferred with respect to both EW and LIPOC. A direct consequence of this is a clear mismatch between the functional pattern $A + S + V + X$ and the predictions of the two principles. This is so because in this pattern one would find a “heavier” item say, a subordinate clause occurring before a “lighter” one thereby violating the principles of increasing complexity. On the other hand, $S + V + X$ may provide support for the predictions incorporated in EW and LIPOC. We would expect constituents to be ordered in terms of increasing complexity in this pattern. We would expect embedding and subordination occurring towards the end of the clause.\(^{63}\)

In view of the foregoing, the crucial question that needs to be asked is why adverbials should be preposed, thereby creating a special constituent order. In the next section, I will attempt to provide an answer to this question.

### 9.5. Explanations

Various explanations, principles and parameters have been proposed in the literature for constituent ordering flexibility. Obviously, it is not within the scope of this study to explore the whole host of these. Nevertheless, to explain this phenomenon, one needs to have recourse to other factors which go beyond mere aspects of linearization and positional syntax (including the internal structure of a constituent). As we saw in Chapter 2, there is a mass of evidence to suggest that various discourse, pragmatic and semantic factors are crucial in determining the order of constituents within the literature. Thompson and Longacre (1985) argue that sentence margins (which are functional slots filled by adverbials) are of much greater usefulness than simply in reference to their internal structure of sentences. Along similar lines, Dik (1997) argues that in addition to the Postfield or Prefield character of the language, three other factors of quite a different nature co-determine the positioning of embedded constructions. Precisely, he argues that this is due to interactions or “competition” between different ordering principles: situations in which a principle A “wins out”

\(^{63}\) According to Dik (1997: 128) further consequence of LIPOC is the following: languages which are organised according to the Prefield pattern may nevertheless place their subordinate clauses in the Postfield; but Postfield languages will never systematically place their subordinate clauses in the Prefield. All languages allow some subordinate clauses to appear in the Prefield.
over another principle B, may thus create A-preferred orders which are non-preferred with respect to B (Dik ibid: 439). In this section, I explore these various factors.

The factors that dictate the placement of adverbials can really be seen when one examines their discourse-pragmatic functions. In FG, the appearance of subordinate clauses in the initial position P1, is due to their pragmatic function:

“...Although the favourite position for subordinate clauses according to LIPOC is at the very end of the construction, these subordinate clauses can nevertheless appear in P1 on account of their pragmatic function. We can only conclude that the tendency for Topic and Focus constituents to be placed in P1 is apparently stronger than the pressure exerted on them by LIPOC. There is, in fact, much evidence for the rule that subordinate clauses tend to be placed either at the very end of the construction through LIPOC, or in P1 position on account of their pragmatic status” (Dik ibid: 131)

The main explanation we offer is that the position of the adverbial clause is determined by its role in linking the main clause which it modifies to the preceding discourse. Various functions of preposed adverbials can be discerned. Chafe (1984, 1987) and Givon (1990) have produced evidence to suggest that preposed adverbials perform different functions than postposed ones. Harold (1995) proposes that this could be due to what he terms competing motivations, which are related to the meta-function “organisation”. He argues that clauses which occupy the initial position qualify to be organisers because they group several clauses and relate them to previous knowledge (in the context). Givon (1994), in fact, argues that all languages allow preposing and postposing of adverbial clauses but when this is allowed the grounding of the clauses turns out to be different. Let me start by looking at the functions of postposed adverbial clauses.

9.5.1. Functions of Postposed Adv-clauses

As noted above, postposed adverbials are not in conflict with the predictions of EW and LIPOC. Because of this I will be brief in the treatment of their discourse functions. Various studies that have been carried out in the behaviour of adverbials suggest that postposed adverbials have localised functions and depend for their interpretation on the immediately preceding clause. They have a very limited scope.
For example, a postposed purpose clause will serve to state the purpose for which an action named in the main clause is undertaken. Consider:

5 a Punga u-ile kwa Mongu ku yo tela
Punga SC-go-PERF to Mongu to go pay
Punga has gone to Mongu in order to pay (tax)

b Sa ezize kulu ki ku apula mulomo kuli a-bulelele sicaba.
What did tortoise is to open mouth SC SM+PRES-tell people
kuli ba-ta-ñona.
COMP SM+FUT-sorry
What tortoise did was to open his mouth in order to tell the people that they would be sorry.

The adverbial clauses of purpose are “ku yotela” and “kuli a bulelele sicaba kuli batañona” in (5)a and b respectively. Similarly, a reason clause will serve to state the reason of the state or action named in the main clause as in:

6 a Libizo la Sandaula li-mu-hulisi-ze kabakalakuli na-nani
Name of Sandaula SM-OM-grow-PERF SC SM+PAST-have
musa ni sishemo.
kindness and generosity
He is known by the name of Sandaula because he was kind and generous.

b Luli, sizana ne-i-swanela ku-mu-tabela kakuli na-buheha.
Indeed, girls SM-PAST-supposeto-OM-admire SC was-attractive
Indeed the girls were supposed to admire him because he was attractive.

In (6)a, the adverbial clause “kabakalakuli nanani musa ni sishemo” while it is “kakuli nabuheha” in (6)b. We can summarise the discourse functions of postposed adverbials by stating that they are added comments in terms of time, condition or cause or whatever semantic function that is relevant to the main clause. Since they have localised functions and depend for their interpretation on the immediately preceding clause, they have no real contribution in the organisation of discourse.
9.5.2. Functions of Preposed Adverbials

An important characteristic of preposed adverbials is that they are thematically associated to the preceding discourse as well as to the main clause. As we have pointed out at various points in the preceding chapters, adverbials at the beginning of a sentence thus have a broader scope. Because of this they can be used to connect to the previous discourse and maintain a coherent point of view. They are, therefore, useful in the organisation of discourse. In the next section want to look at the various functions performed by preposed adverbials and provide explanations for their behaviour. In other words I will answer the question why adverbials are preposed. I should state that in some examples, I use non-clausal adverbials. This is in cases where clauses do not simply occur. The clearest examples are spatial/ location and direction adverbials. I will start by looking at the placement of adverbial clauses at the local level and then move on to the global. The relation between the adverbial clause and the main clause can be either local (pertaining to the very next clause) or global (referring to their immediate or less immediate context). I will start by looking at the links between adverbial and main clauses.

9.5.2.1. Semantic functions

Adverbial clauses can be grouped into different types based on their semantic characteristics, i.e. time, condition reason, place, etc. On the basis of this, they are placed in terms of their semantic relation with their main clause. We can thus posit semantic functions that adverbials serve. One such function is to establish semantic links between clauses. Following Givon (1990: 827), by “semantic” one means relations that may be defined between two adjacent clauses, with the wider discourse context deemed largely irrelevant. In Silozi, like many other languages, these semantic links characterize most adverbial subordinate clauses. I will use temporal relations between clauses to illustrate these constructions. It is not possible to cover all the adverbial clauses within the scope of this study. The choice of temporal clauses is thus for purely illustrative purposes. Furthermore, as Givon (1994: 371) observes temporal adverbial clauses are a grammar-cued device used extensively in establishing temporal cohesion in discourse. The subordinator of such clauses provides the specific cataphoric temporal relation between the adverbial and main clause. As stated above, this relation is in a sense local, since it is pertains to the very next clause:
7 a. *Amano-kena sikolo ka* 1936, Kamuyongole a-kona
   SC+SM+PAST-start school in 1936, Kamuyongole SM+PAST-be able
   ku fita mwa standard II ka 1942.
   to reach in standard II in 1942
   After starting school in 1936, Kamuyongole managed to reach standard II in 1942.

b. *Kuzwa kanako ye batimela bashemi bahae,* Kamuyongole
   From time REL die parents his, Kamuyongole
   a-keshebisa sikolo.
   SM+PAST-ignore school
   From the time his parents died, Kamuyongole lost interest in school.

c. *A-linze-lichimbau-ka cwalo,* lihuluhulu la-bon-wa
   SC+SM-PAST-float-PROG thus, fruit SM+PAST-see-PASS
   ki ngweshi.
   by tiger fish
   While it was floating, the fruit was seen by a tiger fish.

In (7)a, the adverbial clause “*amano kena sikolo ka 1936*” indicates precedence, while in (7)b “*kuzwa kanako yebatimela bashemi bahae*” expresses what Givon (1990) terms “initial boundary”. In (7)c, the adverbial clause “*alinze lichimbauka cwalo*” expresses simultaneity.

The next characteristic of preposed adverbial clauses is as not as a direct result of their functions. Rather it is a combination of external factors and discourse functions.

9.5.2.2. Discourse Genre

The type of genre dictates the positioning of adverbial clauses. Longacre (1980) and Siewierska (1988) have long argued that the nature of the text has a crucial effect on constituent order. The texts that constitute the data on which this discussion is based are fictional narratives in which the authors recount sequences of events. It is therefore expected that the selection of the orders of constituents is functional and
directly related to the goal of this particular discourse type. As Ramsey (1987) puts it, preposed adverbials form an integral part of the narrative in that they help to sequence the temporal contour of the main line narrative. Consequently, we find the occurrence of "when" clauses (introduced by "ha..." in Silozi) in a preposed position since this type of clause is most frequently used for sequencing the temporal events of the narrative. We would also expect spatial adverbials that provide the location of the actions and states embodied in the narrative. As stated above, the function of setting the location is highly restricted (but not exclusive) to non-clausal constituents in our data. Consider the following examples:

8 a **Kwa upa wa munzi** ne-kuinzi ndu ya mun’a munzi.
   In east of village EXIST+PAST-be house of owner village
   In the eastern side of the village there was the village headman’s house

b. **Mwa ndu** a-fumana kuli bunde bu-suluhile.
   In house SM+PAST-find COMP goodness SM+PAST-spill
   In the house, he found that the goodness was spilt.
   i.e. “He found the unexpected in the house.”

c. **Mwa mba ya ngweshi** a-fumana mulumesi o-kusi busafa.
   In stomach of fish SM+PAST-find fish REL-full very
   In the tiger fish’s stomach, he found fish which was very full.

In (8), the spatial adverbials are coded by “**Kwa upa wa munzi**”, “**Mwa ndu**” and “**Mwa mba ya ngweshi...**” all of which are adverb phrases stating the location of the state of affairs or an entity. Examples of temporal adverbials can be seen in (7).

9.5.2.3. Iconicity Functions

In certain constructions, adverbials have to be preposed in order to reflect iconicity. This was made clear in Greenberg (1966: 84) where the following two principles were formulated:
Universal 14: In conditional statements, the conditional clause precedes the conclusion as the normal order in all languages.

Universal 15: In expressions of volition or purpose, a subordinate verbal form always follows the main verb as the normal order except in those languages in which the nominal object always precedes the verb.

Greenberg (ibid: 133) attributed these universals to a general iconicity principle which says that “The order of elements in language parallels that in physical experience or the order of knowledge”. As we show in the examples below, these principles seem to be at work in temporal, purpose and conditional clauses (Thompson and Longacre 1985, Ford and Thompson 1986). The linear order of clauses reflects the conceptual relations. Thus Greenberg’s universals predict the following markedness relations (see also Dik 1997: 133)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>unmarked</th>
<th>marked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Conditional clause</td>
<td>if X, (then) Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Purpose clause</td>
<td>X in order that Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In most though apparently not all languages, it is conventional to interpret the linear order in which matters are presented as representing actual temporal succession (Haiman: 1980). In this case the order of clauses will reflect the order of events which they describe. We would, as a result of this factor, expect clauses with the meaning “after X” and temporal clauses more commonly occurring in the initial position contrary to its Postfield characteristic (Dik. 1989).

9 a Hato-kena mwa sitopa sa Sandaula banana kaufela bayema
SM+SC+PAST-enter in class of Sandaula children all stood
When he entered Sandaula’s class all the children stood up.

---

64 Psycholinguists have found that the interpretation of complex predications is co-dependent on what has been called the “order of mention” principle. This principle says that, other things equal, the interpreter will expect the complex predication to be organised on “first things first” basis: preceding events will be formulated before following events (Clark and Clark 1977). This is akin to Siewierska’s (1993) proposal that we have referred to in chapter 6. This is that sentence type determines variation in constituent order (e.g. subordinate Vs subordinate clause). In these sentence types an adverbial clause must precede the main clause.
b.  *Ha-ba-fita kwatuko ni munzi wa Katekwe ba-ina*
   SC-SM+PAST-reach near to village of Katekwe SM+PAST-sit
   When they reached near Katekwe’s village they sat down

The explanation behind these constructions can be formulated in the following
iconicity principle due to Dik (1997: 134)

**Iconicity Principle**

Clauses should preferably be ordered in accordance with the conceptual or
temporal relations which obtain between the facts or States of Affairs which
they designate.

Iconicity principles then may cause problems for Prefield language because
subordinate clauses must precede rather than follow the main clause.

### 9.5.2.4. Pragmatic Information Status

In many studies related to discourse, the notion of “grounding” has been recognised
(c.f. Givon 1990, Haiman 1980 and others). Grounding is an aspect of information
structure of a sentence in which an act of communication is more important than the
other information. Information, which is needed for the reader/listener to understand
new information, is “background” information and information which is new or
considered more important is “foregrounded”. Foregrounded information is
contained in the main clause of the sentence which comes after the subordinate
clauses containing background information. The placement of As in the first has to
do with grounding involving anaphora. According to Givon (1985: 180) this is
“grounding of a particular point in discourse vis-à-vis what the speaker can assume
about shared knowledge with the hearer. Here we find our traditional correlation of
“background” with information” or “topic”.

In this position, preposed adverbials are used as topics with respect to the sentence to
which they are orientation for the information in the upcoming main clause. Chafe
(1984) in his study of the discourse roles played by initial clauses concluded that
they present a limitation of a path of orientation in terms of which upcoming
information is to be understood. He argues (p.144) that “preposed adverbials orient
the listener or the reader temporally, conditionally, causally, or otherwise to the
information in the main clause that is to follow. They serve as frames for the text that is to follow”.

Having established that an adverbial whose role is to maintain cohesion within the discourse as a whole is functioning as a topic (see also Brown and Yule (1983), it would be appropriate to consider some of the general characteristics of foregrounded clauses that act as topics. I will be guided by Chafe (1979:50) and Li and Thompson(1976) in postulating these characteristics. These are:

a. they appear in sentence initial position
b. they are discourse dependent
c. they need not be arguments of the main prediction
d. they set a ‘spatial’, ‘temporal’ or ‘individual’ framework within which the main predication holds

Thompson (1987:448) states that this orientation function “is perhaps the most prominent function of initial adverbial clauses. The reason why they are able to function this way, I suggest, is precisely because a temporally sequenced event is being coded in a marked form, that is, in a form which makes it grammatically dependent on another clause”.

From what we have said about the characteristics of preposed adverbials as opposed to postposed adverbials it seems clear that the preposed adverbials act as topics. They seem to have the characteristics of what Hopper (1979:214-6) calls foregrounded clauses in that they carry main line information and reflect an iconic word order, among other things. I will use the following sentences to illustrate conditional orientation:
In example (10)a, the conditional clause is introduced by the subordinating conjunction “*Haiba*”. The subordinate clause is thus “*haiba ukato fumana butanya bobucwalo*” which is followed by a phrase “*hape mwa sikolo*”. In (10)b, the conditional clause is “*haiba aeza cwalo*”. It should be noted from these examples that the conditional clause is introduced by the conjunction “*haiba*” (if). Temporal orientation may be illustrated by the examples in (11):

**11** a. *Ha-ba-fita kwa tuko ni simu ya Ndate Mboma*

SC—SM+PAST-reach to near to garden of Ndate Mboma

ba-ina fafasi.

SM+PAST-sit down

When they reached near Ndate Mboma’s garden they sat down.

b *Ha-yo-lemuha kuli kubu i-sa buyel-a,*

SC+SM-PAST-realise COMP hippo SM+PAST-still-breathe-PROG

na-sa-talimezi kwena ye-neli mwamba ya yona.

SM-PAST-look crocodile REL+PAST-be stomach of it

When he realised that the hippo was still breathing, he was looking at a crocodile which was in its stomach.

The temporal adverbial clauses are “*habafita kwa tuko ni simu ya Ndate Mboma*” and “*hayolemuhu kuli kubu isabuyela*”.

In addition to this, preposed adverbial clauses serve as a kind of “guidepost” to information flow, signalling a path or orientation in terms of which the following
information is to be understood" (Chafe 1984: 444). Specifically, they provide a temporal, conditional, causal, or other such orientation for the information in the upcoming main clause. Chafe further suggests that this same function is served by the expressions like however (nihakulicwalo), anyway (mukwa ufi ni ufi), for example (ka mutala). The following is an example of such cases:

12 a Kakuli pilaelo ne-ili yaliilimo-limo, mukolozwani
Because problem SM+PAST-be years-years, lizard

wa-tokwa ku sinya nako.
SM+PAST+NEG-waste to waste time
Because the problem has been outstanding for years, lizard did not have to waste time.

In (12) a, the adverbial clause provides a cause or reason for what is stated in the main clause. We might go further and suggest that this function as proposed by Chafe applies to most of the examples we have cited above.

To sum up, in the preceding discussion we have shown how various adverbial clauses combine with main clauses and the various functions they perform. We have also seen, albeit superficially, the factors that may lead to the placement of adverbials in the initial position. The discussion has been restricted to the relations between a subordinate clause and its main clause, i.e. to the internal structure of the sentence. In the next section, we look at the functions of adverbial clauses in discourse. We try to show that the position of the adverbial clause is determined by its role in linking the main clause which it modifies to the preceding discourse.

9.5.3. Discourse Cohesion

As stated earlier, because of their wider anaphoric and thematic scope, preposed adverbials can be used to provide cohesion in discourse at various levels.

9.5.3.1 Whole Discourse

In this function, adverbials are used to maintain discourse perspective relative to the discourse as a whole. In other words, if a sender wants to produce a narrative, he will constantly use As to maintain this perspective. This is something akin to the factor
of text type mentioned above. The receiver will be guided through the discourse which should be perceived as a narrative. In the extract below, I present an example of a piece of discourse in which the sender is presenting a series of events that lead to some problems in a village called Nangayula. Adverbials will be highlighted in all the examples.

The first sentence gives the background to the problems.

13 a. Mitangana ba munzi wa Nangayula ne-ba-tisi-ze mukwa
Youngmen of village of Nangayula SM-PAST-bring-PERFt way

wa kuikezezanga milisezo ya likomu.
of doing herding of cattle

The young men of the village of Nangayula had introduced shifts for tending to cattle

The second sentence lets us know what happens next through an adverbial “nako ye

b Nako yen’wi ne-ili mulisezo wa Kabisa.
Time one SM-PAST-be herding for Kabisa
One day it was Kabisa’s turn to herd the cattle.

The third sentence tells us what happens next and this is the thing that is going to spark the problem.
c Zazi la- yo-kala mulisezo waha e kabumai kwa shi tuka
Day SM-PAST-start herding his unfortunately there erupted
tabaye ne batile ku tisa butata mwa munzi wa Nangayula.
case which almost to bring problems in village of Nangayula.
On the day he started his shift there erupted a case which almost brought
problems in the village of Nangayula.
d Zazileo Kabisa hazwa kwa kulisa likomu, linja zahabo
Day that Kabisa SC+PAST-come from herding cattle, dogs his
zakala ku matisa-matisa manamani.
started to chase-chase calves
On that day, when he was coming from herding cattle, his dogs started
chasing calves.

Then the sentence that follows (which is not included here) tells us that the dogs
brutally attacked the calf until it lay unconscious on the ground. The case is then
reported and the owner of the attacked calf goes with Kabisa’s father to the kraal.
The sentence that follows then tells us what happened next through yet another
adverbial.

e Ha- bali kwa mulaka kwa- fumane ha kuli namani
SC-SM+PAST-be at kraal PART+PAST+be-find COMP calf
ne-iholofezi maswe.
SM+PAST+be-injure badly
While at the kraal it was established that the calf was badly injured

In between there are some intervening sentences about summoning of all the
villagers to discuss the case. And then the discourse closes with the adverbial

f Kwa mafelelezo Kupalelwa a-felisa taba.
At end Kupalelwa SM+PAST-finish case
At the end, Kupalelwa closed the case.

What can be seen in this piece of discourse is the sender’s systematic use of preposed
As to keep the temporal sequencing of events. Even if there are intervening
descriptive material not related to the temporal line, he still goes back to the use of a preposed adverbial to take the reader back to the on going temporal line and therefore discourse cohesion is achieved.

Following from this, a general statement about the behaviour of preposed adverbials can be made in terms of their semantic classifications and their functions as information guide posts. That is, temporal adverbials serve the function of orienting the reader or listener temporally. If it is a reason clause then it provides a reason orientation and so on.

9.5.3.2. Cohesion within the Paragraph

In this function, adverbials are used to create inter-sentential connections through back reference in the paragraph. This is done so that a succeeding sentence is seen as a build up to the one it precedes in the overall development of the paragraph. This process is prevalent in As relating to successive events in a piece of discourse. It should be borne in mind that these functions are almost the same as those covered in the previous section. The main difference is that they relate to the paragraph. In the following extract, a sequence paragraph, the author is outlining the events that lead to Kamuyongole committing adultery with a woman called Katekwe. The events occur in the order in which they are numbered. The first sentence sets the scene.

14.a. Kazazi leliïwi fa sipelu bamano nomana ni ku nguyana
   Day one at party after dancing and to sing
   Kamuyongole a-posa linzwi ku Katekwe sipelu
   Kamuyongole SM+PAST-throw word to Katekwe dance

   hasesi unguzi.
   had finished
   One day after dancing and singing Kamuyongole proposed to Katekwe at
   the end of the party.

b Mwa liseli la kweli bubeli bwa bona ba-siyalela.
   In light of moon two of them SM+PAST-remain
   Under the moonlight the two remained behind.
In each of the sentences there is an initial clause or phrase that is a back reference to the one it precedes. The end of the preceding sentence is linked to the head of the next sentence. This phenomenon is called tail-head linkage (Longacre 1985).

9.5.3.3.Cohesion between successive paragraphs

A similar function as that performed in the previous two sections is performed by preposed adverbials. Here they are seen to relate successive paragraphs in a discourse. Thompson and Longacre (1985) posit what they call “tail-head” linkage with reference to this kind of function. Basically, “what is said in the last sentence of the preceding paragraph is referred to by means of back reference in an adverbial clause in the following paragraph”(209). To illustrate, consider this extract in which sentence 1 is the last sentence of the preceding paragraph and 2 is the beginning of the next paragraph. The two paragraphs are about a man who lives with his teenage son. In the absence of the son who usually collects water for the home, the man becomes very thirsty and dry. He decides to go to the well to collect water for himself.
15 a Munna wa batu yena ndate he muchaha a-kwaula
Man of people him father of young man SM+PAST-grab

sikiso sahae ni ku liba kwa lisima.
container his and to head to well

The young man's father grabbed a container and headed for the well.

In the first sentence of the following paragraph reference is made to the same man through an adverbial clause "Hasamizize mikope yemibeli yatumezi totubata kamitolo...". A link is established between the two paragraphs.

b (next paragraph)

Ha-sa-mizi-ze mikope yemibeliya tumezi totubata
SC-SM+PAST-swallow-PERF cups two of water cold

kamitolo, a-bona basali babande bababeli bao.
very SM+PAST-see women beautiful two those

After he had taken two cupfuls of very cold water, he saw these two beautiful women.

9.6. Conclusions

In this chapter, I have provided the morphosyntactic description of adverbial clauses and shown how adverbials function. The evidence and the data that we have presented from the Silozi texts, however, show that certain functional constituent orders cannot be accounted for by the principles. An example of such a functional pattern is one in which an adverbial, particularly a clausal one, is preposed. These are the surface structures presented as A + S + V + X in the study. What this suggests is that the other factors considered above may be more appropriate in monitoring constituent ordering than linear principles connected with internal complexity. In particular, discourse functions are determinants of constituent order in these constructions. Preposing of adverbials can be used to provide cohesion for an entire discourse by assisting to maintain the discourse perspective and by helping to articulate the sections of the discourse. I have also shown that clausal adverbials work in conjunction with non-clausal adverbials to execute their functions. These facts can be taken to support the view that constituent ordering with respect to LIPOC will place complex constituents in the final position and the ordering that is
due to pragmatic factors will place them in the initial position. It should be stated that there are other factors which may be responsible for these orderings that have not been addressed in this chapter (notably, e.g. cognitive factors). Furthermore, the functions that are presented may not be the only ones that adverbials perform in discourse.
Chapter 10

Conclusion

In this chapter I shall summarise the findings of this study and point some limitations of the LIPOC and TOEW. I also indicate some topics for research.

10.1. Conclusion

This study has been undertaken with two main aims in mind. The first has been to provide a structural and functional description of constituent order in Silozi. The second has been to investigate the role of categorial complexity (Dik’s LIPOC hypothesis) and the theory of end weight in the ordering or placement of constituents. In its acknowledgement of the multifunctional theory of constituent ordering, the study has also investigated other factors that affect constituent ordering by using data from a corpus of spoken and written discourse. The question that has been addressed is whether there is a correlation between the internal structure of constituents and their position in the construction of which they form a part.

The following conclusions have been drawn from the preceding chapters. At the morphological level Silozi is all of synthetic, agglutinating, fusional and polysynthetic (incorporating) language. At the phrase level, it allows it is predominantly a head + modifier language, with the exception of the verb group. As we saw, the structure of the verb and its modifiers is such that the term phrase is inappropriate. At the clause level, Silozi is predominantly an SVO language in transitive clauses where S and O are explicit. Clause combination reflects characteristics of SVO languages in that conjunctions and subordinators precede the clauses they introduce. Most subordination occurs towards the end of the clause.

With respect to the effect of LIPOC and TOEW in the ordering of constituents, two results have been observed. At the phrase level, it has been found that the order of constituents in the phrase is rather fixed in Silozi, and there is little room for pragmatically significant alternatives. However, LIPOC has been found to be relevant to the placement of relative clause because they not only prefer the Postfield, but also preferably occupy the final slot in the phrase. Alternatively, they
may be even get “extraposed” (displaced) out of the phrase altogether to some later position in the clause.

At the clause and sentence level, the study has concentrated on three main types of constructions. These are SVX, XSVX and other special construction types which involve rearrangement of constituents. SVX constructions are generally regarded as the “basic”, “canonical”, “neutral” or “favoured” order. It is the order which is used unless there are special discourse-pragmatic reasons (such as emphasis) to depart from it. In short, they are “unmarked” constructions. On the other hand, the latter are considered to be the alternative constructions in which the order of constituents has been manipulated for various purposes. These include constructions that involve fronting, left and right dislocations.

In SVX constructions there is a significant correlation between the internal structure of a constituent and its position. According to the figures presented in our tables above, the majority of simple noun phrases- and the majority of pronominals and names- are subjects. In fact, this position is significantly dominated by incorporated pronominal arguments (in the sense of Mchombo and Bresnan 1987), which may be reinterpreted as “zero” subjects in other analyses. Our study shows that constituents which are neither simple nor complex dominate the object position. Moving on to the complement position, it is clear from the data that there are more “heavy” constituents in this position than there are in both the subject and object position put together. Finally, we consider the adverbial position. From our data adverbial clauses are restricted to the final position in these constructions. In other words, no adverbial clauses are placed in the medial position. The evidence for the effect of LIPOC and end weight is further borne out in the constructions that inherently place complex constituents towards the end of the clause or sentence. Examples of these are extrapositions, clefts and existentials. The preferences displayed in the construction types may be captured by the generalisation in (1).

1 Constructions that place a subject or a similar constituent in the initial position prefer to order their constituents in terms of categorial complexity.

In other words, the ordering patterns are consonant with the predictions of LIPOC and EW.
On the contrary, in XSVX patterns which consist of ASVX, left dislocations and constructions with fronting (topicalization, foregrounding), the study has found that there is no evidence for the effect of LIPOC and TOEW. This is because we find complex constituents such as subordinate clauses preceding simpler ones in a significant way. The position X is not their preferred position. Further very little subordination occurs in this position. As we show in Part II, discourse-pragmatic factors override LIPOC in certain contexts. The ordering pattern for these constructions can be captured as in (2)

2 Constructions that place a non-subject constituent in the initial position tend to order their constituents for discourse pragmatic purposes.

Although the study has focused on the effect of categorial complexity (LIPOC) and EW, there seems to be evidence that other factors may indeed be at work in the ordering of constituents. Other weight principles which are couched in the processing and performance explanations may well be applicable to our data. Two works in particular come to mind. One is Hawkins' weight principles which are founded on the performance theory of word order. This work is based on Early Immediate Constituency (EIC) which is a general processing principle. The other work is of Dryer, though not directly tested here, may be of relevance to the ordering of constituents in our data.

Although new results have not been yielded, the thesis is a contribution to the syntactic and typological studies that seek explanations to the factors that determine constituent order and the relationship between grammar and discourse. Most current and recent studies in this field are restricted to the Greenbergian tradition in that they consider the word order characteristics of languages from the point of view of the distribution of the well-known Greenbergian word order variables. That is, the order of the verb and its arguments and/or of the noun and its modifiers (see Bakker 1998, Dryer 1980, 1988, 1989, 1991, 1992, 1998, Siewierska 1988, 1993, 1996, 1998, Hawkins 1983, 1991, 1994, 1998 inter alia). The studies show a parametric bias. Unlike these studies, the thesis investigates the order of not only the central constituents of the clause but the peripheral constituents too. This means that it has investigated the ordering of all the possible constituents that make up clauses or sentences. It considers the ordering possibilities and the distribution of constituents which are highly constrained and those which are comparatively unrestricted or positionally mobile (Robins: 1980). Crucially, the study differs from its predecessors.
in that it is the first of its kind to employ data from an under-documented and little known Bantu language, as far as I know.

Finally, this is the first study to investigate the efficacy of LIPOC and the theory of end weight to the positioning of words, phrases and clauses in the grammars of Silozi and possibly other Bantu languages. The two mediums of Silozi exhibit different structural and functional characteristics. Most of these are attributable to the circumstances under which they are encoded and decoded. However, in so far as our main aims are concerned, there seems to be a tendency for ordering constituents in terms of categorial complexity in all the construction types. The thesis espouses the view that spoken and written language and spontaneous language exhibit different syntactic structures. However, the text counts results for the distribution of the constituents in the constructions under consideration are basically similar. This is probably because the study is limited to the investigation of the observable aspects of grammar.

10.2. Some limitations of LIPOC and the theory of End weight.

In this section, I briefly outline some weaknesses of LIPOC and weight principles in general. Looking at most of the examples cited to test the efficacy of LIPOC and weight principles in general, one gets the impression that the data is based on written discourse which is characterised by complex and integrated syntax. Spontaneous spoken discourse hardly has such constructions. Accordingly, the first problem is related to the fact that these principles do not seem to be very useful when dealing with spontaneous spoken discourse whose syntax is essentially fragmented. It is difficult to delineate constituents in terms of categorial complexity in such structures. The second limitation deals with the circumstances and nature of spoken language itself. As we have shown in chapter 8 and as argued elsewhere, the syntax of spoken language is not complex. Since the participants are hard pressed for time, they do not produce elaborate and complex syntax. Hence the preponderance of single word clauses and the use of deictics rather than complex noun phrases to refer to objects. As the hypothesis stands it seems to offer no useful explanations for the ordering of constituents in the various syntactic patterns that are unique to spoken discourse. This leads to the issue of terminology. The treatment of the prefixed affixes, which agree with the subject and object (referred to in this study as and SM and OM) is still the locus of controversy and debate in Bantu linguistics research. Apart from the work of Bresnan & Mchombo (1987) and Mchombo (1993) and a few others, this
area still remains largely controversial. We can only presume that the treatment of grammatical relations in FG is still dependent on Euro-centric terminology and analysis and may need modifying.

10.3. Topics for further research

With respect to studies concerned with typology and constituent ordering, I suggest one topic of study. First, several questions are left unanswered with respect to the structure of the language produced by Silozi speakers and, possibly, multi-linguals. As we have shown, our data contains numerous incidences of code switching and code shifting. The consequence of this is that the data contains lexical and syntactic features of different languages. It might be useful to carry out research to establish the impact of code switching and shifting on the grammatical (morpho-syntactic) structure of the language. One practical problem arising from this is deciding whether a particular category should be considered a part of Silozi or part of the host language.

The topic may involve issues of terminology and methodology. Although linguistic theory has greatly advanced, there are some structures in little studied languages which can not be easily described and analysed. One such case is the coding of grammatical arguments in agglutinating languages. This is of paramount importance in establishing the distribution of grammar in discourse, which is the mainstay of many recent studies on the pragmatics of word order. It is not clear yet as to what would count as a constituent and what would not in such languages. It would also be interesting to investigate constituent ordering using data from older speakers or speakers of “pure” Silozi, albeit this might be an unattainable goal.
Appendix I

To enable others to confirm or refute the results reached in this study, some extracts of the texts are provided here.

Sample of Written Data

Except 1: *Kamuyongole* by Lubasi Mufekela

Ku bullelwa kuli kamita munna ki mutu ya pepelwa makandauko ku fita musali. Luli hanata ku walo, kono ha ki munna kaufela ya kandaukile ku fita musali. Kamuyongole ha pepwa ka silimo sa 1924 ne ku sina ni ha ili naka kapa mulauli ni alimunwi ya na ta zibamba kuli yena ku ta zwa sinaneli kapa sifwinondo sa munna. Bashemi ba hae ha pepwa ne ba itumba ka yena ba sa zibi kuli mikwa ya hae i taba ye komokisa sina sifateho sa hae se ne ba buha nako ni nako.

Kamuyongole na pepezwi mwa sikiliti sa Mongu ili mwa silalo sa Makuku mwa munzi o bizwa Sikupi. Bashemi ba hae bubeli bwa bona hakuna ya na keni sikolo kono ne kuli cwalo ndathini Manyando na tabela kuli a kene sikolo kakuli likomu li kaliswa ki Punga mululwana Kamuyongole. A mano kena sikolo ka 1936 Kamuyongole a kona ku fita mwa Standard 2 ka 1941 mi ka sona silimo seo bubeli bwa bashemi ba hae ba lwela munda ha ba omboka mi ba bulaiwa ki mezi. Kuzwa nako yeo ba timela bashemi ba hae ili ka Liatamanyi. Kamuyongole a keshebisa sikolo. Nako kaufela nanza i kupula kuli ki ndiala, ki munyandi mi hakuna sa kona ku eza fafasi. Punga a lika ku susueza munyana hae kono mihupulo ya yomunyinyani ne sa lumelelani ni ya Punga.

Punga ni munyana hae ba fumana kuli sicaba ne si ba tabela hane ba sa pilelwa ki bashemi ba bona. Liluo la ndata bona lena ba nani lona neli fela kapili hahulu kabala batu ba sishemo sa buhata ba ne ba ba puma-puma kuli ki mali a limanwi ni manyando ndata bona. Kamita ne ba kupa manamani a mafisa ku Punga kono na sa kuti. Likomu za na siile ndata bona mwa mafisa za tokwa ku bonwa. Balisana ba li pata-pata.

Nihakuli cwalo Punga ne seli mutu yo muhulu. Kasilimo sa 1943 Punga a hupula ku nyala. Ka nako yeo kaufela ye felile kuzwa lifu la Manyando Punga ni Kamuyongole

Punga a mano nyala a pila ni Kamuyongole mwa lapu la hae. Kamuyongole ni yena na sali mutangana wa lilimo ze 19. Punga ni yena neli mutangana ya na nazi kutwisiso mwa bupilo mi a pila ni munyana hae ka kozo.Babanata fa silalanda ne ba se ba kala kutabela bupilo bwa hae ni sishemo sa hae,misane ne ba mu swanisa ni mahe Mushoke ka sishemo sa hae. Musal'a hae ni yena a ituta kapili bupilo bwa munna hae bwa ku tabela batu.

Kamuyongole ni yena ne seli munna-tuna mi mane ba mushengu wa hae nese bakalile kumu bululisanga za ku nyala kuli ni yena a i patele musali. Makande a na se a kala ku hupulisa Kamuyongole kuli kanti seli munna ni yena mwa meto a batu. Ka nako yeo Kamuyongole a kala ku tabela hahulu mikiti. Na sa kona ku yela mukiti wa utwa kai ni kai mane neli mwa buse bwa nuka. Hanata na zamaya ni mitangana ye minwi. Kono fokunwi mane na se a yanga a linosi. Na sa kona ku nwa busihu kaufela a sa bubei mwa meto buloko. Kwa sipelu na kona ku takeleza pina kaufela. Mwa mikiti mo kamuyongole na sa tabelwa hahulu ki basizana mi mitangana ba banwi ba se ba mu toya. Luli Kamuyongole na swanezi ku tabelwa ki sinalianga kakuli ne li mutangana ya na buheha kufita ba banata. Luli sizana ne i lukela ku mu tabela kakuli na buheha. Mwa lipina zemu za sipelu ne ba munguya ka bunde bwa hae. Hanata basizana fa lishengo la sipelu ne ba lata ku mu noma ni ku opela lipina ze mu lumba. Luli mwa mikiti ku tabelwa ze fapana kona bunata bwa ba ba nca ba tabela za bunca bwa bona. Punga a lemuha takazo ya munyan'a mwa mikiti mi a mu eleza kuli a nyale ka ku ziba lika ze telanga ba ba tabela mikiti ya ba ba nca.

Mwa mikiti mo Kamuyongole na tabela ba banata sina ni yena ha ne ba mu tabela. Musizana yo munwi ya na tabela hahulu Kamuyongole ki Katekwe. Katekwe ne li musal'a Mbooma,kono Mbooma ka nako yeo na ile kwa Jubeke. Bo Katekwe ni Kamuyongole ne ba bonana hanata mwa mikiti. Kono Kamuyongole a mano tonela ze ne li ezahala mwa mikiti na sa sina sabo ya ku bulela ni haiba ni musala mutu.

Ka zazi le linwi fa sipelu,ba mano nomana ni ku nguyana Kamuyongole a posa linzwi ku Katekwe sipelu ha se si unguzi. Katekwe ni yena a amuhela linzwi la Kamuyongole ka mazoho a mabeli. Mwa liseli la kweli bubeli bwa bona ba sialela. Ba ambola ba nze ba zamaya ba ngukekile mazoho. Kamuyongole ya na sali kuba a


Ku zwa foo hape Kamuyongole a amuhela linolo le li zwa ku Mboma ku mu zibisa kuli bumaswe bwa hae bu tilo fita mwa lizebe za hae. Linolo le ne li tisizwe ki Katekwe luli. Kamuyongole a lobeha hahulu pilu a hupula ni kezo ya mabani. A kuna sa na bulezi ni haike katekwe na lika ku mutiisa pilu. Kamuyongole sa na konile fela ku bulela ki kuli ni tato ku bona kamuso mulatiwa. Habusa Kamuyongole a yo bona mulatiwa wa hae nihaike na sa mulibezi ka bakala Namutesuko. Ha ba kopana katekwe a fa Kamuyongole mulamu wa hae wa na libezi kwa tuko a simu ya bo ndate-Mboma zazi la ba zwa kwa sipelu. Bo ndate-Mboma ki bona ba ne ba u nopile ba mano swala kamuyongole mi ne ba u bulukezi Mboma kuli a to u bona. Mulamu wa hae wo wa mu hupulisa fela milatu ya hae mwa tas’a lifasi. Mutangana a hupula za na ta eza zazi Mboma a fita. Kamuyongole na sali mutangana ya na si ka kala ku nahana za bubulai kapa ku bulaiwa. Mihupulo yeo ya ngundana mwa pilu ya hae kono akuna sa na hupula ku eza Nako yeo ya na kuzize kamuyongole a nza nahana sa ta eza Katekwe yena na mu kechula fela ka lito la namani. Mwa meto a Kamuyongole mona ne ku tezi mioko ya sabo ni lila. Mihupulo ya kataza Kamuyongole hahulu mwa pilu kuli na sa buleli sina kamita. A bulelela Katekwe kuli munna hae ha ka taha u ka mu lindaula

Except 2 from Sandaula uhola mendulu by Robert., M. Mukuni

Ku kala kwa bwanana bwahae, Alexander Sandaula u bile mutu ya hulile ni lilato ku ba habo mane ni kwa batu kaufela. Libizo la sandaula la zibahala hahulu ka lona ha ki lona libizo la hae la sipepo. La hae luli Ki Alexander Mungole Liholosi. La Sandaula li muhulisize ni mumukombelela kabala musa ni sishemo sa hae ni kulata ku tusa batu kamita, baziba ni ba sazibi cwalo. Munzi wa habo, Kamuhelo wa Liholosi, ufa munanga wa nuka ya Lungwangwa mi kihona kuli batu ba munzi wo ki bana ba nuka tota, baana, basali mane ni banana babanyinyani. Hape ki bafuluhi ni bayambi ba litapi ba batuna. Ba fumile likomu, mikolo, mataka, tunyandi, miwayo mane ni ona mezi. Kamuhelo hape se ufetuhile likamba leli tumile kwa bazamai kaufela baba pazula libala la bulozi fahali kuzwamushitu mwa Nyunyi kuya Lukona, kamba babzwa Wiko ku taha Upa.


Balikani bahae neba mu bona bukuba mi kamuhupulo wa kumuzwafisa ba kala kumuseha nikumusheununa mane bamubeya libizo la Sandaula. Baswaba. Ba palelwa kumu tepeleza, mane ba ikutwa maswe mwa lipilu haba bona kuli yena ka sibili na lilata hahulu, mane akala ku ipiza "Alexander Liholosi Sandaula". Haili libizo la Mungole lona la kala ku shwa mane haki batu ba banata baba li ziba. La Sandaula la tuma mi la mu kombelela kabakala bunde bwa likezo za hae.

Sandaula ki libizo la butokwa mwa bupilo bwa batu ba Bulozi. Sandaula ki libizo la musebezi sina ona cwalo Minister ha etelezi ministry. Sandaula ki mutu ya silisa bazamai fa likamba mi ili ona musebezi wa hae fa holela mali amupilisa ni kupilisa lubasi lwahe. Fapano yetuna mwahala Alexander Sandaula ni bo Sandaula babañwi babafumaneha mwa Bulozi kikuli yena nasa amuheli tifo. Natusa feela batu ba munzi wa habo, ni bazamai babañata bana ziba niba nasa zibi kaufela. Kunani yaka hanyeza kuli Sandaula ki yomunwi wa batu ba pili mwa Zambia kuba ni kutwisiso yetuna ya mutomo wa naha ya luna ‘Humanism- Butu Sakata?’. 

Malukwe ni tuputula ki litino za sikuwa zenca ku luna. Lihembe, Linjekete ni Likausu ni zona ha kiza luna ki sikuwa. Litino za luna ki liziba mane ni miyoka, kamba milamba kwa baana. Makatulo ni masokisi ni zona ki lika zenca kuluna nihaike babañwi neba ikezeza makatulo a masandulusi fa mawili akale a limota. Na tusa kwa seto nikwa lizazi mweendi, kono ki makatulo anasa bonahali hande.


Yana ituma pilu ku apala kuwani kamba ku beya mazoho mwa lipokoto fa pila mukuwa na bata feela ku itabulela litaba. Mukuwa kaelsea neli mulena ase sitoto sesi cwani.


Except 3: *Utwa Muhaesu* by Charles Muyunda

Kamembe Kulu, Ngunga ni Nameke...ne ku inzwi mwatasi a sikota sa muzauli senesitibani, sa mitai-tuna yeyolepelela fafasi mwa matuko mwaale ni moo, ili mwahalaa lishitu lalikoñe. Muzauli obuzwize neu cabukile mwatasi mi kona fana patehezi Nameke kukushuka. Haili Kulu ni Ngunga bona ne ku pytwa kande ya siina luli. Hana bulelela ka bufokoli ni situhu sa Kamunu yanatamanga misipili pula haisehula kuyo nopala nopanga mai ni mabasi a likulu, Ngunga na kalooka kakuli kamembe nasa isangi pilu kuze buluwa kuzenwi. Zemunati kuti konji ze bulezwi kiyena!


Makalelo a musipili neasina kainole nikakana. Ku siilwe mushitu wa likoñe, nese kufufwa halimu a kashitu ku ya kwa mikulo ni libala la bulozi neselibonahala.

Utwa muhaesu...Muunana pila ni mwaa hae yanasa fitile fa nako ya kunyala. Buñata bwa nako na siya ndatehe mwa lapa kunyakita silalo sa habo mwa mako ku bata basizani. Zazi leliñwi a a libala kusiyela ndatehe mezi mwa likiso. Kwa mulaho lizazi lalila kueza acu mi ndatehe akwaulwa ki linolwa lelituna mane a kala ku omelela nifa lulimi. Muuna wa batu yena ndatehe mucaha a kwaula sikiso sa hae ni kuliba kwa lisima. Utwa cwale...Hasa mizize mikope yemibeli yetezi ya tumezi totu bata ka mitolo a inama kuli a kale kukela mezi mwa sikisso sa hae mi foo ki fona fa bonezi basali bababeli bao. Babande kuli mane bamutongola pilu yahae isali onafo.


Appendix II

Sample of spoken data

A: Mu-nani collection yeng'ata...
B: u-nani mutangana cwana ya-ni-fanga matepu...Ki yena ya-ni-tisezanga matepu kaufela- Bo Franco, Bo madilu system kaufela.
A: U-latata hahulu muziki..
B: U-latatahulu muziki....
A: Neba-na ni-latata hahulu muziki.. kakuli ha-usina muziki wa kona kutakana, men.
B: Unani byebing'ata-ng'ata...
A: Oho!.. kanti esi kubata.. manto… matepu… maodio tape.. kueza dub.
B: Nako kaufela hataha uni-tiseza CD.
C: Uuh.. Today he brought another CD...He has brought another CD..
B: He has brought another CD. Imagine... Yena he doesn’t care, Ma pound a!
A: I will go and listen to this one. Kubonahala kuli scholarship yahaye ki yende hahulu.
B: Ku bonahala cwalo, ndate.
A: Kubonahala kuli ki marefauses.
B: Eni, Ah ok.
A: Marefauses ba bapila hande.
B: Ma refugees bapila hande kakuli bona ba-tusiwa.
A: You see...
B: Eni
A: Inge bafiwa, inge bafiwa, inge bafiwa...Cwale luna banana babo Mubita.
B: Uh! Ki kutiya, Kikutiya..
A: Kikutiya mwa mang'wele.
C: Kono Mubita ba muzielize, ndate
B: Ha!.. bamuzielize, ni DNA yeo.. kakuli butata kikuli.. Butata ki kuli ha koni ku eza resign..
A: ..Ha ,Eni.
B: ...> asaeza feela cwalo ba muisa kwa kuta
A: Eni.sha..
B: Asa eza feela resign kipeto wa luza immunity.
A: Wa luza immunity..
B: kena kuli za uzwize kaufela ba muamuha.. bo pelekelo bale kaufela ki kutamakiwa.
A: Kikutamakiwa kaufela, ha!
B: Ki zona za saba..
C: Ehe..ki zona
B: Kizona za saba , luli.
C: Kono umwa butata.
D: Hakuna kwaya, hakuna kwaya... Umwa butata, batamueza.
B: Huu!.. Hakuna
A: *(laughter)* Uhu ...umwa butata...
B: Mubita, Bamu zielize, ndate.
A: Kono wa kona ku doja-doja.
B: Wa kona kudoja-doja.
A: Ba-kamuswala.
B: Baka muswala , bona
...> Akuna... Taba ye komokisa ki yona ye yabo Mushota ya kueza sue Kaunda.
C ...Eeeeh..Ah!
D ..:Uh! Esi ki sibi feela sani!
A: Bo Mshota babata feela fa ku shwela..
B: ..Fa ku shwela...
A: ...> Fakuswhela kakuli habakashwa bakali kaunda..
B: Kaunda wakwa malawi ki yena yani bulaille.
D: ... kandi mutu uswa ni za hae..
A: Cwale se bakaesa prubu kisikamang'i... Kwa zibahala kuli Kaunda bashemi bahae a ki ma Zambian.
B: Kunani yasa zibi?
C: Ha kuna...
B: History ya Kaunda ing’ozwi.
A: Hakuna ya sazibi..
C: Ing’ozwi, ing’ozwi,... history ya Kaunda..
B: Ung’ozwi.. He is well documented.
A: Ing’ozwi, history...Mwa libray mo kutezi...bo Betty kaunda ba kaufela.
B: Akuna mbali mwanana ya pepilwe ka 1980 was ziba kuli Kaunda bashemi bahae ki ba kwa Malawi.
C: Kaunda is very well documented..
B: Nikuli luna buñata bwa luna hakuna ya pepezwi mwa Zambia... Lu babahulu.
A: Lubabahulu.... Luba Northern Rhodesia.
C: Akuna yomuhulu yakona kuba president ya pepwelwa mwa Zambia...kupepelwa mwa Zambia.
A: Batili sha.
C: Kono batu ba
A: A luzibi...
B: Chiluba ki zakuipiseza...Taba ye ni bata kubuza ki yona ye ya Bo Mwanakatwe...Bo Mwanakatwe bañözi buhata kono habasikabatama.. Muchaha yani yana ſozi rumour ni kueza admit kuli ki rumour bamutamile.
C: You see!
A: Lukamune kuisa kwa pata
B: A muwze momukaezeza kaufela.. (laughter)
A: Kono neili ye mitelele, men.
...> Lukamune kuisa kwa pata....ne ili ye mitele, ndate...Eni. I think..ku kamuna kuisa kwa pata..
B: Eni,... Eni..
A: Your husband looks nice...smart ...ehi..
C: Uh...You look smart..
B: Ah ..Bo Synkwilimba bayla lili... Bo Synkwilimba babulelela kuli bayla lili?
A: Uh Bo Synkwilimba ba saliteni.
B: Ehe..Ehe..
A: Ah.. Bo synkwilimba ba saliteñi..Kono eh.. mendi mwa September..
B: ...Uhu...
A: Ba akaleza kuli mwa September...Balukela kuya mwa September kamba October cwalo.
B: Eni...
A: Kono bafumahali ba kaina.
B: Oho..
A: Bafumahali kono bayla...kuyobona bashemi babona.. ona fa mwa July.
B: Kono basali bale....musipili wo..
A: Babata kuyo bona bashemi.. kaku bashemi ba kula..
C: Musipili wo ki wakale.. Mawe ni bukiñile...
A: Kono bayla kakuli..musipili wo niutwile..
...> Ni utwezi kwa..kwa Zambia..Niutwezi ku bo Miss Smith.. Kunani musali wa mukuwa ya luta fa sikolo... Ki yena yanañola kuli batu bao bataha...haiba kunani ze babata kuli lumelwe baka bashimbela . ...senili oho..
B: O.k.
A: Cwale babasali bayla... kakuli..esi bana babona bataha hape kono...
...> kono kutwahala kuli basemi babona ki bona baba kula..Boma bona ki bona baba kula..Cwale babañolezi kuli baye.
B: O.K.
A: Cwale kanti ki hande..
C: Ki hande.. Ki hande ku bona batu habasakula... kakuli hape asashwile hape..
B: uh..Ku butuku...
C: Kutohwala kuli nashwa mwa mubona.
A: Eni sha.
C: Neba butata butahe uli ni muboni, mwnaka..
D: Eni..
A: Nihamimisiya fani uli nimuboni, mwanaka.
B: Aha
A: Kono kuli asinyehe imi nañozi kumizibisakuli nakula
B: uh..Uh
A: ....>Kipeto mutu wa ikinela kabakala kuli nica sinkwa sa mwa bukuwa...
B: Sinkwa sa mwa bukuwa.. Hasifeli.
A: Chinkwa ca mwa Scotland.
B: Uh Hasifeli...Hasifeli sha..
D: Hasifeli sha or Paundi..
A: It remains..If your parents say come and they are very sick, Go.
B: Eni, sha
A: ....> Unless you can’t afford...but if you can it’s better to go.
B: Nako ye ni innzi hande.. Ni ka ezanga feela fa, fa, fa... Kina yale niile.. (Silence).
B: ....> Bo nyandi bo ndate ne basalati milili..
A: Ha, ha, Nebana Bo ndate, Bo nyandi bondate nebasalati milili..
B: ....> Basakubona feela bali taha kwanu tahakwanu...ikele i hula..taha kwanu taha kwanu.
A: It is coming out very smart...It is coming out very smart.
B: Aha..
C: It is different from the way I do it.
B: Ah, You Tongas are not fit to do anything, good..., new..
A: No, Me I learnt it on my children..They want to look smart..nice..
C: Ah..I tried and tried but no success...So I said I will never do it again.
A: That is the problem with me. I also do not allow my wife to cut me..
C: So Inywe bana full time Batonga.
A: Ba ambaula Chinyanja.
C: Aha..From Chipata?
A: Kona ko kwa Chipata, shangwe..
C: Neo, Neo...
A: Neo, Neo...Ki peto ki ona mushobo ona o...
B: Neba ba nebazielehile maswe...neba bulela sinyanja.
C: Confusion ya mu Zambia!..Intermarriage..
A: Intermariage..
C: Intermarriage ila shupa, mwe.But it is nice you see.
B: It is nice!..
C: Lozi, Bemba, Nynja, Tonga... Children are confused.
A: My children speak Nyanja. Babulela sinyanja..
C: Uh
A: Basali babulela Silozi.. Ki ma bemba... Nani bulela a mixture: Silozi, Sibemba, sinyanja, Sitonga...They are picking up some Tonga.
B: Taba ye tisa butata kiona masanctions a.
C: Ehe.
B: Ah.. masanctions a katsa kuli batu bale babe merciless kwa tax.
A: Ehe
B: Akuna koba kona ku fumana mashelleñi.
A: Batili... Akuna
C: Babasweli..
A: Eni. Ku baswala, kuli fa lwa miswala.. Mashelleñi one muisepisize kuli lukamifa atahi.
B: Uhu
A: Cwale bali Batu ba..Kalumba Katele nalila... Mashelleñi a ministry ya health halusisika aca.
C: Babatimile?
A: Babatimile.
B: Cwale konji ba palelwe kulifa batu neba masalary..
C: Lukatuwa lufita fateñi..
A: Lwafita mane..., ki Zaire ona cwalo...Lwa fita..
B: Ba university nebabata kueza send batu fa half pay..
A: Faaa!
C: Eni..sha.
B: ...> Kakuli ikwalilwe...
A: Half pay?
B: Eni..
C: Kipeto kaufela bona ba zwa misebezi.
B: Haluzibi.. Aluinzi onafa haluzibi.
C: A kusana misebezi fa University.
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