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Abstract

This study is an examination of the adjectives in Shona. It employs the prototype theory of Cognitive Grammar (inter alia Langacker 1987 and 2008; Taylor 2002; Croft and Cruse 2004) as its theoretical framework. Previous Shona grammars have focused on morphological criteria that specified that the defining criterion of the adjective is the form adjective prefix + adjective stem. This study argues that this criterion is too restrictive because the Shona adjective class comprises of other adjectives that do not have this morphological form. The study will highlight at the onset the existence of loanwords and other adjectives that had not been hitherto identified in previous studies. The existence of these other adjectives is proof that firstly, there are more adjectives in Shona than had previously been described; and secondly that the Shona adjective class warrants a comprehensive analysis through the use of criteria that take into account their different morphological and syntactic characteristics. As such, this inventory of adjectives will be analysed using syntactic, morphological and semantic criteria, and will give precedence to syntactic function rather than morphological form.

The prototype theory allows for membership gradience in a category and therefore views categories as having prototypical and peripheral members. The study will highlight the category structure of the Shona adjective class in relation to prototypicality and membership gradience. The notions of frequency of occurrence and entrenchment vis à vis prototypicality will also be incorporated into the discussion.

The semantic criterion will encompass the adjective semantic types propounded by Dixon (2004). This semantic analysis will reveal that some semantic types are not found in the adjective class, but that these are expressed by nouns and verbs. The overt structural coding mechanisms that nouns and verbs require in order to function as modifiers will be the other objective of the study. Croft (2003) postulates that in their unmarked status, parts of speech discharge their prototypical functions; and that they can also perform nonprototypical functions when they are marked, taking on extended category functions. The markedness of nouns and verbs will be discussed in light of the semantic types that they denote.
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<th>Abbreviation</th>
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<td>first person singular</td>
</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>second person singular</td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>3sg</td>
<td>third person singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3pl</td>
<td>third person plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADJ</td>
<td>adjective</td>
</tr>
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<td>adverb</td>
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<td>AS</td>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>cl</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>COBUILD</td>
<td>Collins Birmingham University International Language Database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONJ</td>
<td>conjunctive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP</td>
<td>copulative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D-)</td>
<td>class 5 prefix (voiced)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deg</td>
<td>degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>demonstrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[DGS]</td>
<td><em>Duramazwi Guru reChiShona</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[E]</td>
<td>elicitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENUM</td>
<td>enumerative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FV</td>
<td>final vowel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAB</td>
<td>habitual tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[I]</td>
<td>introspection/intuition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF</td>
<td>infinitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT</td>
<td>intensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTER</td>
<td>interrogative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N-)</td>
<td>nasal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>negation/negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>np</td>
<td>noun prefix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>noun phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM</td>
<td>numeral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>object concord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASS</td>
<td>passive extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB</td>
<td>Proto-Bantu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERF</td>
<td>perfective aspect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PN</td>
<td>proper noun</td>
</tr>
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<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSS</td>
<td>possessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POT</td>
<td>potential mood</td>
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<td>PP</td>
<td>prepositional phrase</td>
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<td>REC.PST</td>
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<td>REL</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>sentence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>subject concord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEL</td>
<td>selector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[SSD]</td>
<td>Standard Shona Dictionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAT</td>
<td>stative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subj</td>
<td>subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSO</td>
<td>Standard Unified Shona Orthography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAM</td>
<td>tense-aspect marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP</td>
<td>verb phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VR</td>
<td>verb root</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>null/zero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>»</td>
<td>becomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>ungrammatical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 1 Introduction

1.1 The Shona Language Group

Shona is a Bantu\(^1\) language spoken by approximately 75% of the people in Zimbabwe out of a population of around 13 million. According to Williamson and Blench (2000), Bantu languages belong to the South Bantoid languages, which are a subgroup of the Bantoid languages, which in turn are also a subgroup of the East Benue-Congo phylum. Guthrie (1971) divided the Bantu speaking areas into fifteen zones (A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, K, L, M, N, P, R, S), while the more recent contributions in Nurse and Philippson (2003) cite sixteen zones, the additional zone being J. Each zone is further divided into a number of groups. The total number of language groups in these zones is between eighty and eighty four, depending on the source. Each language in these groups was given a unique code. Shona belongs to Zone S10.

This classification of the language zones is geographical and not genetic because the basis for the classification of the languages into these different zones is according to the geographical locations in which they are found and not according to any linguistic properties. The geographical areas which cover Zone S are: Zimbabwe, Mozambique, Zambia, Botswana, South Africa, Namibia, Swaziland and Lesotho. Doke’s (1931b) report

\(^{1}\) The term “Bantu” will be used in this thesis in its neutral linguistic sense to refer to a group of languages that form one language family. The term Bantu was coined by Wilhelm Heinrich Immanuel Bleek in 1856. Though the term carried derogatory connotations during the era of apartheid in South Africa, it is used in this study in the Bleekian sense as a linguistic label.
identified the following Shona varieties: Karanga, Zezuru, Manyika, Korekore and Ndau. The varieties in the Shona group were recently updated in the Standard Unified Shona Orthography (SUSO) of 2006, which was produced through the harmonization efforts spearheaded by the Centre for the Advanced Studies of African Society (CASAS) in conjunction with the African Languages Research Institute (ALRI) to harmonize the Shona dialects. An updated list of the Shona varieties is presented in Table 1.

Table 1 The Shona Varieties: Zimbabwe, Mozambique, Zambia, Botswana

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Zone</th>
<th>Language Group</th>
<th>Varieties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S10</td>
<td>Shona Group</td>
<td>Karanga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Korekore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zezuru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hwesa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Barwe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Manyika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ndau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lilima (Kalanga)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nambya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teve (Ute)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2 Aims of the Study

This thesis is a morphological, syntactic, and semantic analysis of the Shona adjective class. There has been no doubt in the analyses by early Shona grammarians as to the existence of an adjective category in Shona (Louw 1930, O’Neil 1935; Fortune 1955, 1967 and 1980). These grammarians defined the adjective on the basis of morphology alone, that is, that it has an adjective prefix and an adjective stem. As such the only adjectives that were identified were those covered by this definition. The study will show that while an adjective class has always been identified for Shona, it has not been adequately defined because grammarians have tended to make morphology the only criterion for analysis. This study aims to show that this definition is not descriptively adequate, and will therefore propose an alternative approach where morphology, syntax as well as semantics are taken into account.
The rationale for proposing a morphological, syntactic and semantic approach is an attempt to provide a descriptively adequate account of the characteristics of adjectives in Shona. A purely morphological analysis for the Shona adjective class fails to capture all the generalisations pertaining to its heterogenous nature.

The other objective of the study is to investigate the overt structural coding mechanisms that can be applied to nouns and verbs in Shona to enable them to assume the extended function of modification.

This study will not attempt to come up universal features of adjectives. Our line of argument for this standpoint is influenced by Croft (2001: 63) who argues that the major parts of speech (noun, verb, and adjective) are not categories of particular languages, but are typological prototypes. In point of fact, the categories in a particular language are determined by the constructions in which they occur. Subsequently, these constructions are in turn language specific, for as Croft (ibid: 29) argues, “Languages differ in the constructions that they possess”. Our argument is that the morphological, syntactic and semantic criteria that we will propound are best suited to describe the Shona adjective class because the adjectives in Shona conform to these criteria.

1.3 The Word Class Adjective in Shona

Within the word class adjective in Shona, we can point out that some adjectival functions are performed by lexemes\(^2\), for instance, -KURU\textsubscript{Adj} ‘big’ which has such forms as mukuru (cl.1), guru (cl.5), chikuru (cl.7), huru (cl.9). Another example of an adjective lexeme is -REFU\textsubscript{Adj} ‘tall’ with the forms varefu (cl.2), zvirefu (cl.8), chirefu (cl.8), ndefu (cl.10). The forms of these lexemes can be analysed morphologically as having class markers that are realised as prefixes such that when they modify a noun, the gender and number information represented on the noun prefix and the adjective prefix are identical. Most of the ‘indigenous’ Shona adjectives have these morphological and syntactic characteristics, apart from nzvere ‘with young’, siri ‘small’, siri ‘pure, true, genuine’ and hofu ‘hollow’, as well as the class 5 and 9/10 forms that have modifications of the class markers. As such,

\(^2\) We are using the term “lexeme” in the spirit of Matthews (1974: 22) who describes a lexeme as the fundamental unit of the lexicon of the language.
we cannot posit a purely morphological analysis even for the indigenous Shona adjectives because of these morphological disparities.

There are also loanwords in the Shona adjective class from other Bantu languages, English and Afrikaans that have different morphological and syntactic characteristics from the indigenous Shona adjectives, but which need to be analysed in their own right. These adjectives are different from the lexical adjectives and they cannot be analysed morphologically, but have been attested to be adjectives because of their syntactic function as well as the fact that semantically they designate the property of a noun. We will argue that through morphological and syntactic means these other adjectives that have a different form can be defined.

1.4 Overview of the Study

This thesis is organised into nine chapters. Chapter 2 traces the history of the parts of speech from as early as the first millennium BC in the Greek and Roman traditions up to the present century in Europe and America. This chapter is essential for it provides the background of the thesis by outlining developments in descriptions of parts of speech from Antiquity to current approaches. The influence of past approaches on current linguistic trends will be made apparent.

Chapter 3 traces developments in parts of speech descriptions from the seventeenth century to the present in the Bantu linguistics tradition, in order to show their influence on more recent approaches. The chapter will also look at previous descriptions of the adjective in Shona and other related Bantu languages as well as in selected African languages. The justification for this analysis is to compare the characteristics of the Shona adjective class with those of other African languages. This historical progression will show how definitions and analyses of parts of speech in later centuries have underpinnings in these earlier traditions.

Chapter 4 discusses cognitive grammar, the theoretical framework that informs this thesis. Cognitive grammar has several guiding assumptions, among which is the notion of prototypicality. The prototype theory was the most suitable theory for this study because it
allows for graded category membership. The prototype theory postulates that category membership is a matter of degree and that within a category there are central or prototypical members. From the prototype there is gradience in membership to the least prototypical member or the peripheral member of the category. The argument for using the prototype theory is that it enables us to describe the hierarchical structure of the Shona adjective class.

Chapter 5 presents the methodology that will be used in the study. This study makes use of the resources of the African Languages Lexical (ALLEX) Project, namely the Shona corpus and the monolingual Shona dictionary, *Duramazwi Guru reChiShona* (2001) from which sixty nine of the ninety adjectives that will be analysed in this study are taken. The corpus is used for empirical data and as the source for examples. The corpus was also used to establish the type and token frequencies of the adjectives in Shona, and these frequencies of occurrence are among the criteria for analysing the Shona adjective class. Chapter 6 serves as a background to Chapter 7 by providing a description of the Shona noun class system.

Chapter 7 constitutes the analysis of the adjective class in Shona based on morphological, syntactic and semantic criteria. On the basis of the prototype theory of cognitive grammar, the adjectives are divided into seven subgroups according to their morphological, syntactic, and semantic characteristics. The discussion will portray which of the subgroups constitutes the prototype and why. As such, the study takes into cognisance the fact that the Shona adjective category constitutes a prototypical structure whose members are prototypical and nonprototypical instances of this category. The aspect of prototypicality will, in addition, be discussed in light of the type and token frequencies from the Shona corpus. This part of the discussion correlates the frequency of occurrence of an adjective, its level of entrenchment and its prototypicality. The semantic criterion will incorporate a discussion of the adjectives in relation to the semantic types propounded by Dixon (2004).

Within cognitive grammar is a functional-typological approach referred to as the universal-typological theory of parts of speech, propounded by William Croft. This approach highlights that the prototypical function of parts of speech is to function in unmarked ways, and that it is also possible for parts of speech to function in marked ways. These marked
ways translate to non-prototypical functions which are made possible through some overt structural coding. The discussion in Chapter 8 will investigate the different structural coding mechanisms that permit a part of speech to function in marked ways thereby discharging extended category functions. The semantic types that are outside the adjective class will be shown to be expressed by marked nouns and verbs. Chapter 9 presents a summary and discussion of the research findings and also offers suggestions for further research.

1.5 Contributions to Shona Grammatical Analysis

Some of the adjectives that this study will analyse have already have been identified by earlier Shona grammarians. The other adjectives have not been previously described. As a result, the first achievement of this study is that it managed to identify and describe more adjectives than had been identified in Shona grammars and dictionaries. The earlier grammars of Shona identified thirty five adjective stems, whereas in Duramažwi Guru reChiShona (2001), sixty nine adjectives are lemmatized. This study identifies ninety adjectives, thereby underscoring the fact that there are more adjectives in Shona than had previously been identified. The contribution of this study to Shona grammar is an in-depth morphological, syntactic and semantic analysis of these ninety adjectives.

This will be the first study that recognises the existence of loanwords in the Shona adjective class, hence it can be regarded as an analysis of the Shona adjective class from a more recent and modern perspective. Further, the novelty of this thesis is also manifested in the theoretical application of some tenets of cognitive grammar that include the prototype theory and the semantic analysis. The semantic analysis of the Shona adjective class according to Dixon’s adjective semantic types is also another original contribution. The universal-typological theory of parts of speech as applied to the major parts of speech also lends credence to the original contribution of this study to Shona grammatical analysis.

The method of using empirical data from the corpus apart from lending credibility to the results and arguments of this analysis, also introduces another perspective to the analysis which links the theory and method components of this study. By incorporating the
frequency of occurrences of adjectives as another criterion, this study discusses adjectives from a usage-based perspective which relates the issues of frequency of occurrence, entrenchment and prototypicality.

1.6 Use of Existing Linguistic Terminology

We would like to point out from the onset that the goal of this thesis is to use already existing linguistic terminology in the analysis of Shona adjectives. It is not the aim of this thesis to come up with new terminology specific for the Bantu languages in particular, and the African languages in general. Our view is that creating ‘Africa-specific’ terminology is not in accordance with general linguistics. Linguists working in African languages do not subscribe to the idea that African linguistics should be explained by ‘Africa-specific’ terminology. Therefore, for the purposes of this study, we did not regard the creation of new terminology as a necessary exercise because, firstly, any new term that is created would need to be clearly defined and accepted by other scholars involved in African language research.

Secondly, it is not desirable that every study should come up with new terminology that is specific to a particular topic or language; otherwise this can result in an unenviable situation of terminological disparities. Furthermore, there is already a limitless corpus of terminology in the field of general linguistics, which is adequate for describing African languages. For that reason, it is more worthwhile to have a standard or general pool of accepted and clearly defined terminology that is relevant for cross-linguistic analyses.
Chapter 2 History of the Parts of Speech: Europe and America

2.1 Introduction

This chapter serves as an overview of the descriptions of the parts of speech in Europe and America from the Greek and Roman eras up to the present century. This synopsis is significant insofar as it brings to light the fact that the methods and criteria of the European and American traditions have had a profound influence on the way African languages have been described and studied. For that reason it is essential to provide an outline of the development in the theory and procedures in parts of speech from Antiquity to the present, for as Robins (1997: 3) observes, linguistic science today is the product of its past. This chapter should also be seen as a backdrop to Chapter 3.

The layout of this chapter is as follows: sections 2.2 to 2.6 discuss developments in the descriptions of the parts of speech from Greek and Roman Antiquity to the nineteenth century. Section 2.7 will look at the twentieth century in terms of the theoretical schools during that period and the criteria they used in defining parts of speech. Section 2.8 is a summary of the chapter.

2.2 Greece

The Greek era is associated with the names of the two philosophers, Plato and Aristotle.

2.2.1. Plato (428-348 BC)

Hovdhaugen (1982: 21) states that among Plato’s books, Cratylus is the only one that had linguistics as its main theme. On the aspect of grammar Plato is said to have divided the Greek sentence into the nominal (ónoma) and the verbal (rhēma) components. He identified the sentence (lógos) as being made up of ónoma (the name of a thing) and rhēma (a thing about names = predicate). He is also said to have identified the noun-verb
distinction in the sentence and that he used semantic criteria to make a distinction between the different units in the sentence (Dinneen 1967: 78). Plato only identified these two parts of speech as his analysis was centered on names and what is to be said about those names.

2.2.2 Aristotle (384-322 BC)

The analysis given by Hovdhaugen (1982) on Aristotle is based on three of Aristotle’s works, Poetics, On Interpretation and The Categories, which are said to contain extensive linguistic analyses. Aristotle maintained the noun-verb distinction of Plato, and he also went on to add more parts of speech. Hovdhaugen (ibid: 32) states that in The Poetics, Aristotle is said to have made the following linguistic postulations:

Speech [léxis] as a whole is made up of these parts: elements [stoikheîon], syllables [sullabē], conjunctions [súndesmos], nouns [ónoma], verbs [rhēma], joints [ará thrōn], inflections [ptōsis] and sentences [lógos].

From Hovdhaugen’s (ibid) citation of Aristotle’s definitions of the parts of speech, we will point out only those of the noun and verb:

A noun [ónoma] is a composite sound with meaning, without time reference, no part of which has a meaning by itself; for in compounds we do not use each part as having a meaning of its own […]

A verb [rhēma] is a composite sound which has meaning and indicates time reference, no part of which has a meaning by itself […] bādīzei ‘walks’ and bebdīken ‘has walked’ cosignify present and past time, respectively.

Aristotle defines the parts of speech on the basis of meaning. The noun and verb are said to be phonological units with meaning, and that this meaning is contrasted in respect of the reference to time which is absent on the noun but is present in the meaning of the verb. The ensuing discussions will bring to light how Aristotle’s definitions of the noun and verb influenced later descriptions.

2.2.3 Dionysius Thrax (100 BC)

The name of Dionysius Thrax is associated with the history of the Alexandrians, and this history is found in Robins (1997: 36-45). Dionysius Thrax is said to have authored the Téchnē Grammatikē which was a short treatise that sought to describe the Greek language. This work had tremendous influence in the Western grammatical tradition, and it marked
the beginning of what is called ‘linguistics’ as we know it today. The basic units of description were the sentence and the word. The sentence was said to be the upper limit of grammatical description and that it expresses a complete thought, with the word being the minimal unit in grammatical description. According to Dinneen (1967: 99-100) eight word classes are distinguished in the *Téchnē Grammatikē*, as presented in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Speech</th>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ónoma (noun)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Concrete/abstract entity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhēma (verb)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Activity or process performed or undergone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metochē (participle)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Shares features of noun and verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athron (article)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Preposed or postposed to nouns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antōnymia (pronoun)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Substitutable for a noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prōthesis (preposition)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Placed before other words in composition and in syntax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epírrēma (adverb)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Modification of or in addition to a verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syndesmos (conjunction)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Binding together the discourse and filling gaps in its interpretation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The adjective was considered to be part of the noun. Dionysius Thrax defined the parts of speech in relation to their position in a sentence. Also, the noun and verb are given purely semantic descriptions.

2.2.4 Summary of the Greek era

Plato and Aristotle used semantic definitions for the noun and verb. This method is also adopted by Dionysius Thrax, whose improvement upon Plato and Aristotle was the identification of more categories.

2.3 Rome

The similarities in structure between the Greek and Roman languages enabled the Romans to apply Greek thought and categories to Latin.
2.3.1 Marcus Terentius Varro (116-27 BC)

Varro’s six chapters of his *De Lingua Latina* concentrated on etymology, morphology and syntax. According to Varro, words either varied in form or not. He used morphological classifications of the inflected Latin words to define the categories that had been adopted from Greek. Like his Greek predecessors he also recognized case and tense as the defining categories of inflected words (Robins 1997: 63). He defined the four classes, nouns, verbs, participles and adverbs in the manner shown in Table 3.

**Table 3 Varro’s definitions of the parts of speech**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>part of speech</th>
<th>case inflexion</th>
<th>tense inflexion</th>
<th>semantic/syntactic function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>noun (including adjectives)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>naming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verb</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>making statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participle</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>joining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adverb</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>supporting verbs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We can deduce from Varro’s descriptions that the noun, which includes the adjective, is inflected for case, and its semantic function is to name. The verb, on the other hand, is tense inflected and semantically its function is to make statements. The participle is inflected for both case and tense and its syntactic function is to join words in a sentence. The last part of speech, the adverb, is not inflected for case or tense and it serves a subordinate function to the verb. The definitions of these parts of speech are morphological and semantic, and to a lesser extent syntactic.

2.3.2 Priscian (A.D. 500)

Priscian distinguishes eight parts of speech. His analysis can be said to be similar to that of Dionysius Thrax in that they both came up with eight word categories. Priscian’s inventory of parts of speech only differs from that of Dionysius Thrax in that instead of the article – which is found in Greek but not in Latin – he identifies the interjection. The other difference is that Dionysius Thrax used five criteria upon which he delineates and describes the parts of speech, namely, case, gender, tense, person and number. Priscian on the other hand, introduced mood, and he used four criteria, as shown in Table 4.

From the table it can be surmised that morphologically, the noun is marked for case and lacks tense, mood and person features. Semantically it denotes substances or qualities, a
description which suggests that the noun category is seen as comprising of words that
denote quality, hence it could be concluded that the adjective was regarded as being a
subclass of nouns. The verb, on the other hand, is inflected for tense and mood, but lacks
case and person; person being a feature found on the pronoun. The participle has the
features tense and case. The remaining parts of speech do not take any of the four
inflections.

Table 4 Priscian’s descriptions of the parts speech

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>part of speech</th>
<th>property</th>
<th>tense</th>
<th>mood</th>
<th>case</th>
<th>person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nómen (noun)</td>
<td>substance/quality</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verbum (verb)</td>
<td>action</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participium (participle)</td>
<td>referable to verbs</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prōnōmen (pronoun)</td>
<td>substitutable for nouns</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adverbium (adverb)</td>
<td>subordinate to verbs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>praepositiō (preposition)</td>
<td>word used with case inflected and non-case inflected words</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interiectiō (interjection)</td>
<td>expresses feeling or state of mind</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coniunctiō (conjunction)</td>
<td>joining two or more forms</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.3 Summary of the Roman era

What is noticeable about the analyses by Varro and Priscian is the difference in the number
of parts of speech that they each identified. This could be attributed to the fact that Priscian
used more parameters to delineate the word classes; whereas Varro used case and tense
inflection only. The adjective was treated as part of the noun class by both Varro and
Priscian. We have also highlighted the similarity of Priscian’s approach to that of
Dionysius Thrax. This underlines the statement we gave at the beginning of the section that
the Greek and Roman languages were similar in structure, as such Greek categories could
be applied to Latin.

2.4 The Middle Ages

It was during the second half of the Middle Ages that significant linguistic work started.
The most noteworthy development during this time was what was referred to as
‘speculative grammars’. These, according to Robins (1997: 88), were a

[…] product of the integration of the grammatical description of Latin as formulated by Priscian
and Donatus into the system of scholastic philosophy. Scholasticism itself was the result of the
integration of Aristotelian philosophy, at the hands of such thinkers as St Thomas Aquinas, into Catholic theology.

2.4.1 Thomas of Erfurt (1310)
The *Grammatica Speculativa* (Speculative Grammar) written by Thomas of Erfurt (1310) was written using the modistic theory which makes the claim that things possess modes of being (*modi essendi*). The *modi essendi* that are found in all things and form the basis of our understanding of language and the world around us are the *modus entis* (property of permanence or persistence) and the *modus esse* (property of change or succession). Parts of speech were as such defined in relation to their representation of reality through a particular mode or point of view. Seuren (1998: 32) states that:

Speculative Grammar is essentially an attempt at establishing a relation of regularity between the ontological and metaphysical categories thought to structure the real world, the mental categories of thought, and the grammatical categories of language. The term invariably used for these categories was ‘modes’ (*modi*): the ‘modes of being’ (*modi essendi*) were said to be mirrored in both the ‘modes of thought’ (*modi intelligendi*) and the ‘modes of signifying’ (*modi significandi*), found in language. This school of philosophy of language is therefore normally called the *Modists* (Modistae). All formal categories in grammar were called ‘modes’: word classes, case, genders, verb inflections, etc.

Thomas of Erfurt’s classification of the parts of speech is as illustrated in Table 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mode</th>
<th>modi significandi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nomen</td>
<td>signifies by the means of the mode of an existent or of something with distinctive characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verbum</td>
<td>signifies through the mode of temporal processes, detached from the substance (of which it is predicated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participium</td>
<td>signifies through the mode of temporal process, not separated from the substance (of which it is predicated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pronomen</td>
<td>signifies through the mode of an existent, without distinctive characteristics (~ mode/property of being primal matter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adverbium</td>
<td>signifies by being constructed with another part of speech that modifies through temporal processes. Qualifies the mode but without other syntactic relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coniunctio</td>
<td>signifies through mode of joining two items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>praepositio</td>
<td>signifies through the mode of syntactic construction with a case-inflected word, linking it and relating it to an action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interiectio</td>
<td>signifies through the mode of qualifying a verb or a participle, and indicating a feeling or an emotion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Aristotelian influence is apparent in this classification. The point of departure for the Modists was their emphasis on form and matter. The noun and pronoun represent ‘being’
and are thus the matter, while the other word classes are ‘forms’. This implies that the noun
and pronoun are more stable and permanent than the verb, participle, and adverb which
signify through temporal processes which symbolize change over time. The adjective is
also not recognized as a separate category, but as part of the noun, as evidenced by the fact
that his definition of the noun takes into account both the reference to an entity that exists
and its characteristics. Thomas of Erfurt’s analysis of the parts of speech is worthy of
attention because the definitions of the parts of speech by Givón that will be discussed in
Chapter 4, are comparable to this classification by Thomas of Erfurt.

2.5 The Renaissance

2.5.1 Port Royal Scholars
In their grammar published in 1660, the Port Royal Scholars adopted the nine classical
word classes: noun, article, pronoun, participle, preposition, adverb, verb, conjunction and
interjection. They propounded the theory of the ‘sign’ and stated that it contains two ideas:
the idea of the thing which represents and the idea of the thing which it represents. To put
it in another way, the first idea stands for the signifier while the second idea stands for that
which the sign signifies (the signified). This linguistic sign as propounded by the Port
Royal Scholars is said to have no meaning; hence their grammar does not include a theory
of meaning. But rather, sounds are used by humans as symbols of the representations of
things as given by the mind (Malmkjær 1991: 347).

The Port Royal Scholars divided these word classes on the basis of the sign: the first six
denoting ‘the objects’ of our thoughts and the last three to the ‘form or manner of our
thought’. Their grammar rejects Aristotle’s definition of the verb as signifying actions and
passions. Instead, they define the verb as a word whose main use is to signify affirmation
(ibid: 349). They distinguish two types of verbs: the first being the archetypal verb ‘to be’
which marks affirmation. They also refer to the archetypal verb as the ‘substantival verb’.
The other verb is the ‘adjectival verb’ which contains the meaning of an attribute. For
example: *Petrus vivit* ‘Peter lives’ is said to be equivalent to ‘Peter is alive’. The analysis
of the substantival verb shows that within the noun class there may have been a subclass of
words that portrayed different characteristics from the prototypical nouns in that they had
attributive characteristics. The same applies to the subclass of verbs which had a subclass of adjectival verbs that had a similar function as the substantival verbs.

The analysis of the Port Royal Scholars is similar to that of the Modists who made a ‘form’ and ‘matter’ distinction between the word classes, while the Port Royal scholars laid emphasis on human reason and thought. The Port-Royal grammar, being based on mental processes, was envisaged to be applicable to all human languages.

2.5.2 James Harris (1751)
James Harris (1709-1780) continued along the path of the philosophical view of language that had been initiated by thinkers like Plato and Aristotle. In his publication *Hermes or a philosophical enquiry concerning language and universal grammar* (1751), Harris is said to have applied Aristotelian thought and methods in his examination of language. His object of study focused on the difference between the structural distinctions of individual languages. Like Donatus (fourth century AD), Harris also refers to nouns and verbs as the principal parts of speech. His system of classification comprises of the principals (nouns and verbs) and accessories (definitives and conjunctions), as illustrated in Table 6.

Harris explained language in terms of how it expressed logical propositions. The deviation from his predecessors is that Harris regarded the adjective as being a subclass of the verb; whereas previously it had been regarded as a subcategory of the noun.

**Table 6 Harris’ system of grammar**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>class</th>
<th>part of speech</th>
<th>subclass</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>principals</td>
<td>noun</td>
<td>pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>verb</td>
<td>participle adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>adverb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accessories</td>
<td>definitives</td>
<td>articles pronomin words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>conjunctions</td>
<td>conjunctions prepositions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The history of linguistics so far outlined up to the eighteenth century looked at language and its grammar in philosophical terms. Language was not explained according to the structure it displayed but according to philosophical reasoning. This can be attributed to the fact that the scholars who first sought to describe language were not linguists but philosophers. They also used the structures of Greek and Latin to explain other languages; hence they took no account of the structural differences between languages.

2.6 The Nineteenth Century

The nineteenth century period ushered in a new dimension to linguistic study, comparative philology. Unlike in the preceding centuries, the scholars of this period realized that languages could be compared and this became the object of their study. Bits and pieces can be gleaned from the literature pertaining to how parts of speech were analysed during this period as most linguistic work that was being undertaken during this period was comparative.

**Rasmus Rask (1787-1832)** wrote the grammars of Old Norse (1811), Anglo-Saxon (1817), Spanish (1824), Frisian (1825), Italian (1827), Danish (1830), and Lappish and English (1832). These grammars were descriptive grammars and they consisted of sections on spelling and phonology, morphology, word formation and syntax. Rask’s analysis of the parts of speech was on the basis of morphology and syntax. On the parts of speech Rask concentrated more attention on substantives and verbs. On the morphology of the substantives, he treats nouns and adjectives as one class and he describes them according to the inflections that they take, for example, that they both take three numbers; that they take five cases in the singular and four cases in the plural.

**Franz Bopp’s (1791-1867)** work was centered on discovering the origin of grammatical forms and for his basis he used Sanskrit forms. His publication in 1816, *Über das Conjugationssystem der Sanskritsprache in Vergleichung mit jenem der griechischen, lateinschen, persischen und germanischen Sprache* (On the system of conjugation in Sanskrit in comparison to that of Greek, Latin, Persian and Germanic) was a comparative study of the verb and its inflectional forms. His definition of the verb was that it is a part of speech by which a subject is connected with its attribute. The verb that Bopp identified was the substantive verb (for example, *esse* in Latin and *to be* in English) which was said to
take the following inflections: past time, perfect, imperfect, pluperfect (Jespersen 1969). Lehmann (1967: 40) however, refers to this verb as an abstract verb (verbum abstractum) and it is said to have no meaning in itself but merely acts as a bond between the subject and its predicate. Another part of speech, the participle was also identified and it was said to take case endings. The pronoun is also made reference to in Bopp's analysis of the verb.

Bopp focused exclusively on morphology and this is attested by his analyses of the conjugation of the verb in Greek, Latin, Persian and Old Germanic. He can be said to have made reference to four parts of speech in his comparative analyses: noun (including adjectives), verb, participle, and pronoun.

2.7 Twentieth Century Linguistics

Linguistics in the twentieth century moved away from the comparative philology of the nineteenth century period to theoretical aspects of language study. We will now trace how some important linguistic traditions during the twentieth century defined the parts of speech. In the literature that we referred to in the foregoing sections, the adjective had not been described as a separate category, but more as a subclass of nouns and to a lesser extent as part of the verb. This section looks at how the three categories, noun, verb and adjective have been defined in the different linguistic traditions.

2.7.1 Traditional Grammar

According to Malmkjær (2004: 477), the term traditional grammar is usually used to refer to the grammars written from the period of the Greek scholars up until the prescriptive approach of the eighteenth century. She further points out that many school grammars used to teach both the native and foreign grammars of language take their terminology from this tradition, therefore the term traditional grammar is also used in some cases to refer to the grammar that people have been taught at school.

Palmer (1984: 56) points out that traditional grammar described eight parts of speech, and he suggests that the number eight may be arbitrary and could be attributed to Dionysius
Thrax who identified eight parts of speech for Greek. The parts of speech according to traditional grammar shown in Table 7 are taken from Palmer (1984: 55).

Table 7 Parts of speech according to traditional grammar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>part of speech</th>
<th>definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>noun</td>
<td>name of a person, place, or thing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verb</td>
<td>word used for saying something about something; a doing word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adjective</td>
<td>word that qualifies a noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pronoun</td>
<td>word used in place of a noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preposition</td>
<td>word used to indicate place or directionality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adverb</td>
<td>word used to modify a verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conjunction</td>
<td>a word that joins words and sentences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interjection</td>
<td>a word used as an exclamation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The definitions of the parts of speech in traditional grammar were purely semantic. Taylor (2003: 210) points out the inadequacy of these semantic definitions by pointing out that some words that do not conform to the definition of the particular grammatical category are excluded. For instance, because nouns are defined as being names of people, places or things, those nouns that do not refer to concrete objects are eliminated. For instance, abstract nouns such as kindness, love, justice, etc. are not included in this definition. The other criticism by Taylor is that in a phrase such as my late husband, the traditional definition of an adjective is that it assigns characteristics to nouns and pronouns, yet when one considers the statement ‘my late husband’, ‘being late’ is not a characteristic of ‘my husband’. As a result, traditional grammar can be criticized for advancing descriptions of parts of speech whose applicability is limited. For example, to simply define an adjective as a word that qualifies a noun is an overgeneralisation in the sense that other parts of speech besides the adjective can also qualify a noun. Meaning is of paramount importance in categorization, but the definitions of traditional grammar show its inadequacy as a sole criterion.

The influence of traditional grammar on descriptions of the parts of speech in the African linguistics tradition has been strong. The analyses of the parts of speech by Torrend (1891), Doke (1935; 1954), Fortune (1955-1980) and Chigidi (1986), discussed in Chapter 3, all use semantic definitions which have been associated with traditional grammar.
2.7.2 Structuralism

Structuralism in linguistics came into prominence with the work of Ferdinand de Saussure. Lepschy (1982: 33) points out that the term structuralism is derived from the Latin word *struere* which means 'to construct’, as such structuralism can be said to be concerned with rules and patterns. Saussure’s work influenced later developments in linguistic study with different versions of structuralism emerging in different parts of the world.

2.7.2.1 Ferdinand de Saussure

The basis for structuralism was laid by the work of Ferdinand de Saussure (1857-1913) in his *Cours de linguistique générale* (1916). Saussure’s two colleagues, Charles Bally and Albert Sechehaye, collected together his course notes from his students and published them using the model of the synchronic study of language that he had established. The book was not written by Saussure but it became the vehicle through which his ideas were transmitted. Saussure is said to have reexamined language on three basic assumptions:

- that language is a system of signs, with the sign being a combination of a concept and a sound or acoustic image;
- that linguistic entities are relational and should be defined relatively to each other;
- that linguistic elements are arbitrary.

In the *Cours* Saussure is also said to have made a distinction between the signified (signifié) and the signifier (significant). This distinction is manifested in his assumption that the sign is arbitrary. On the parts of speech Saussure (1959:109-10) makes the following statement:

Take as an example the distinction between the parts of speech. What supports the classing of words as substantives, adjectives, etc.? Is it done in the name of a purely logical, extra-linguistic principle that is applied from grammar [...]? Or does it correspond to something that has its place in the system of language and is conditioned by it? In a word, is it a synchronic reality? The second supposition seems probable, but the first could also be defended. [...] the division of words into substantives, verbs, adjectives, etc. is not an undeniable linguistic reality [...] to say for example that the parts of speech are the constituents of language simply because they correspond to categories of logic – is to forget that there are no linguistic facts apart from the phonic substance cut into significant elements.

Saussure proposes two methods for classifying the parts of speech, one based on logic and the other on synchronic reality. His view of a language was that it was composed of a system of arbitrary signs, hence language to Saussure was a form and not a substance. Saussure questioned the methods by which parts of speech were being identified in
language and he does not deny that words can be put into categories. But because his system of analysis was based on the linguistic sign as a basic unit of language and the sign being made up of a concept and a sound image, then for Saussure that was enough means by which language could be described. Saussure’s linguistic analysis was thus centred on phonetics (sound) and an arbitrary sign, with no reference to meaning.

That being said, we may point out at this juncture that Saussure’s reference to the sign was not novel in linguistic study, for the Port Royal Scholars (cp 2.5.1) had also earlier on made references to the arbitrariness of the sign. Other theories such as cognitive grammar also make reference to the sign, though in a different way, because the sign is cognitive grammar is symbolic and meaningful (cf. 4.3.1).

2.7.2.2 American Structuralism: Leonard Bloomfield

Leonard Bloomfield (1887-1949) is widely associated with the American structuralist tradition together with Edward Sapir. While Sapir’s approach was deemed mentalist, Bloomfield’s approach was said to be behaviourist. Bloomfield (1970: 196) highlights that in traditional grammar the term parts of speech was applied to the most inclusive and fundamental word-classes of a language. Although Bloomfield does not mention the word structuralism, his analyses of language were nevertheless structuralist. Bloomfield further highlights that English has at least eight parts of speech: substantive, verb, adjective, adverb, preposition, co-ordinating conjunction, subordinating conjunction, and interjections. The description of noun-expressions (nouns), action forms (verbs) and adjective-expressions (adjectives) by Bloomfield (1933: 202-206) can be summarized as follows:

Noun-expression
Noun or endocentric phrase with a noun as center. Defined in terms of grammatical features; object of a species. Subclasses: proper nouns, common nouns, bounded nouns, unbounded nouns, mass nouns, abstract nouns.

Action form
Preceded by the actor form
Adjective-expression
Attribute in construction – adjective or endocentric phrase with an adjective as center. Defined according to its function in the character-substance construction; character of specimens of a species of objects. The adjective-expression has two subclasses: (i) limiting adjective - precedes group of descriptive adjective plus noun. Made up of determiners and enumeratives; (ii) descriptive adjective - precedes noun

Bloomfield maintains that the substantive is always the head of the attributive construction and that the substantive is also a word class that should be defined according to grammatical features. The noun is thus the object of a species. The adjective expression, on the other hand, is defined as the attribute in the construction. It is defined according to its function in the character-substance construction. Bloomfield makes a distinction between what he refers to as descriptive and limiting adjectives. The limiting adjective is one that precedes and modifies the construction of the descriptive adjective plus noun. For example, in the construction this fresh milk, this is said to be the limiting adjective.

Bloomfield’s analysis focusses on what he refers to as constructions and form-classes (words and phrases). He looks at the arrangement of words and how phrasal constructions can be extended by the addition of other words. The structuralist influence will also be evident in the discussion on George Fortune (cf. 3.4.2) where he asserts that his approach focuses on word forms and constructions.

2.7.3 Generative Grammar

Generative grammar is the term given to the branch of linguistics which was formulated by Chomsky in the 1950s. The generative view of language is also that it is the grammar that generates all and only the grammatical sentences of that language. The early generative grammar advanced by Chomsky in the 1950s was rule-based and it consisted of three components: a syntactic component, a phonological component, and a semantic component.

The semantic and phonological components were referred to by Chomsky (1970: 16) as being interpretive while the syntactic component was said to be the creative component. Generative grammar also consists of rewrite rules of the form S → NP, VP where NP and VP are the immediate constituents of S. The sentence was rewritten as being composed of
a nominal phrase and a verbal phrase. The representation of the different phrasal elements was as follows:

\[
S \rightarrow NP \ VP \\
NP \rightarrow \text{Art N} \\
VP \rightarrow \text{V NP}
\]

Parts of speech in Chomsky’s generative grammar were defined according to subcategorization rules which list all the elements found in the respective category. This rule schema is also a representation of the contexts in which an element occurs according to the syntactic conditions. These conditions are what are referred to as selection restriction rules. The words in a sentence are therefore regarded as forming a hierarchy and they are analysed according to the constituents that they form in the syntagm. For example, a phrase like ‘leave the book on the table’ would be analysed as:

\[
[\text{leave}] [\text{the book}] [\text{on \ [the table]}]]
\]

where ‘leave’ is a verb, ‘the book’ is a noun phrase, ‘on the table’ is a prepositional phrase. This rule schema operated with phrase structure trees where the categories Noun, Verb, Adjective, Article, etc. were treated as terminal nodes which in a tree structure, appeared at the very bottom of the tree.

In the 1970s a new aspect of generative grammars was adopted which proposed feature systems for the four lexical categories noun, verb, adjective and adposition (preposition and postposition). The lexical categories were either +/- N or +/- V, where N and V were regarded as universal primitive categories. Chomsky (1970) distinguished the four categories based on the following binary system:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{noun} &= \quad +N, \quad -V \\
\text{verb} &= \quad -N, \quad +V \\
\text{adjective} &= \quad +N, \quad +V \\
\text{adposition} &= \quad -N, \quad -V
\end{align*}
\]

The early generative grammar had nothing to say about parts of speech but took them for granted in that it used traditional categories without any discussion. Chomsky (1970: 65) labels the parts of speech “category symbols” and he states that they are elements selected from a fixed universal vocabulary.
Chomsky (1975) proposed a semantically-based generative grammar which looked at the correspondence between sound and meaning. In this particular theory Chomsky (ibid: 63) states that his aim is to show,

the ways in which the inherent meaning of a sentence, characterized in some still-to-be-discovered system of representation, is related to various aspects of its form.

The semantic component was added to the components of grammar, and it consisted of rules that govern the well-formedness of surface structures. Baker (2003) slightly modified Chomsky’s system and came up with the following schema:

- noun is +N = ‘has a referential index’
- verb is +V = ‘has a specifier’
- adjective is -N, -V
- preposition is part of a different system (functional)

Baker argues that adjectives are -N, -V, that is to say, they are neither nouns nor verbs and that one needs no new features or principles to account for their basic properties across languages. He further states that adjectives have no distinctive properties that underlie their various morphological and syntactic characteristics. Generative grammar also does not define parts of speech but takes them for granted and instead uses primitives such as +/-N and +/-V.

Baker’s claim that adjectives have no distinctive properties and for that reason do not require new features to describe them across the languages appears to be an assertion based on ‘universal features’ that typologists such as William Croft (1991 and 2001) have refuted. The universal-typological approach postulated by Croft (cf. 4.6.3) proposes language-particular formal representations of grammatical structure (Croft 2001: 4). In the same vein, Taylor (2003: 212) observes that the features offered for categories in generative grammar are binary, universal, primitive and innate, and that they establish either-or category membership. The treatment of categories in generative grammar can be likened to that of the classical model in that membership to a category is also an all-or-nothing affair, where a word possesses a certain feature or lacks that feature.
2.7.4 Functional Grammar

The major premise of functional grammar is that the major purpose of language is communication. Thompson (2004: 7) points out that if we use this premise as a starting point then it automatically becomes the determinant that the form of language be explained by examining its functions. Functional grammar focuses on the functions that a word plays in a sentence or a phrase. According to Dik (1981) there is a difference between the functional property and the categorial property of a word in functional grammar. For example, the phrase ‘the old man’ is a noun phrase and it is also a subject in functional terms. Dik (1981: 162) defines predicates in terms of their categorial differences on the basis of their prototypical functions. The categories of predicates are thus defined as:

a. A Verbal predicate (V) is a predicate which is primarily used in predicative function.

b. A Nominal predicate (N) is a predicate which is primarily used as head of a term.

c. An Adjectival predicate (A) is a predicate which is primarily used in attributive function.

Hengeveld (1992: 37) on the other hand, defines parts of speech on the basis of propositional acts. He defines the verb, noun, adjective and adverb in the following way:

A Verbal predicate is a predicate which, without further measures being taken, has a predicative use only.

A Nominal predicate is a predicate which, without further measures being taken, can be used as the head of a term.

An Adjectival predicate is a predicate which, without further measures being taken, can be used as a modifier of the nominal head.

An Adverbial predicate is a predicate which, without further measures being taken, can be used as a modifier of a non-nominal head.

Hengeveld assigns the functions of head of a term, predication and modification to the noun, verb and adjective respectively. He states that his definitions exclude the possibility of a verbal predicate being used in a non-predicative function but that they leave the possibility of nominal, adjectival and adverbial predicates being used in a predicative function. According to Hengeveld, therefore, a verbal predicate cannot assume another function but serves the predicative function only. Croft (2001: 66) states that Hengeveld’s statement, “without further measures being taken”, refers to the obligatory presence of additional morphemes in order to use the lexical item in a particular function.
2.7.5 Cognitive Grammar

The 1970s period marked the emergence of a new approach, cognitive grammar, as a result of dissatisfaction with the formal rigor of generative grammar. Chapter 4 (section 4.2) will present the background to cognitive grammar in relation to its point of departure from generative grammar.

2.8 Summary

Lyons (1968: 3) states that linguistics builds on the past by challenging and refuting traditional doctrines as well as developing and reformulating them. The chapter has shown that the recognition of the parts of speech in language started during Antiquity when only two parts of speech, the noun and verb had been identified as separate categories. The discussion also demonstrated that the adjective was said to be part of the verb by Plato and Aristotle, while the Alexandrians and later thinkers took them to be part of the noun. It was also evident from the presentation in each era how it was similar and/or different from the preceding or succeeding era. The discussion in Chapter 3 will show how the early trends in the European linguistics tradition had an influence on the analysis of parts of speech in the African languages.
Chapter 3 History of the Parts of Speech: African Linguistics

3.1 Introduction

Chapter 2 traced the history of parts of speech research in the European and American linguistics tradition. This chapter continues that exposition by focussing on the concurrent developments in research in the African languages from the seventeenth century to the present century. The chapter will start by focussing on descriptions of parts of speech in general; then it will shift its thrust to focus specifically on the adjective in Shona by looking at selected Shona grammars. This chapter is organised as follows: section 3.2 traces the development in parts of speech descriptions from the seventeenth century and it will trace this development from what has been referred to as the Age of Brusciotto up to the present century where we will focus on the recent contributions in Nurse and Philippson (2003).

Section 3.3 discusses how adjectives in particular have been described in Bantu languages. The first part of this section focuses on Swahili grammars by E. O. Ashton (1947), P. M. Wilson (1970) and E. N. Myachina (1981); with the second part presenting analyses of the adjective in Chichewa/Chinyanja by N. Salaïn (1969) and Sam A. Mchombo (2004). The third part of the Bantu section presents an analysis of adjectives in KiVunjo-Chaga by Lioba Moshi (1992). Section 3.4 deals with the Shona grammars by C. S. Louw (1930), J. O’Neil (1935), George Fortune’s contributions (1955, 1967 and 1980), and the contribution of Willie L. Chigidi (1986). Section 3.5 looks briefly at descriptions of adjectives in Hausa, a Chadic language (Newman 2000); Akan, a Ghanaian language (Osam 1999) and Ngamambo, a Cameroonian language (Siegel 1980). The aim of this
section is to draw parallels between the Bantu languages and the African language family as a whole. Section 3.6 constitutes a summary of the chapter.

3.2 Parts of Speech in the History of Bantu Linguistics

Linguistic analysis of Bantu languages at the outset was characterized by the descriptions of the languages that missionaries and travelers came into contact with during their journeys to Africa. According to Doke (1943: 54) the term ‘Bantu’ was first used by Wilhelm Heinrich Immanuel Bleek (1827-1875) to refer to the languages that are spoken in the southern half of Africa, excluding the Khoisan languages. Our historical analysis starts with the seventeenth century because this is when work in Bantu languages began and to this end Gregersen (1977: 85) highlights that,

No truly scholarly work seems to have been attempted on any African language, except Arabic, until the seventeenth century.

3.2.1 Giacinto Brusciotto (1659)

Doke (1935a: 15-18) discusses the work of the Capuchin priest Father Giacinto Brusciotto (Hyacintho Brusciotto à Vetralla), who published what is today known as the first Bantu grammar in 1659 whose Latin title is: Regulae quaedam pro difficillimi Congensium idiomatis faciliori captu ad grammaticae normam redactae – “Some rules for the more easy understanding of the most difficult idiom of the people of the Congo, brought into the form of a grammar”. This grammar was subsequently translated into English in 1882 by H. Grattan Guinness under the title Grammar of the Congo Language as spoken two hundred years ago, translated from the Latin of Brusciotto. It was also translated into Portuguese in 1886 by Antonio Thomaz da Silva Leitão e Castro under the title Regras para, mais facil inteligencia do difficil idioma do Congo, reduzidas á forma de grammatical por Fr. Jacintho Brusciotto.

Brusciotto is credited for being the first to discover the Bantu noun class and concord system as well as the verbal derivatives. According to Doke (1935a: 16), Brusciotto identified nine parts of speech, namely, noun (substantive), verb, pronoun, adverb, conjunction, preposition, interjection, number and ideophone. Brusciotto describes the noun as follows:
Of the Declension of Nouns, or, as it is better expressed, their Principiation, and their Rules; wherein it is shown what Articles are to be attributed to each noun, both in direct and oblique cases, for their correct construction in themselves, or when they are joined to other words; and generally this is first to be noted, that in the present tongue we must not look for declensions, but rather Principiations […]

Doke (1935a:16) remarks that Brusciotto used the term “articles” to refer to concords. Concord is what is referred to in other literature as agreement. Brusciotto states that each noun has the concord feature that assigns agreement. The noun is said to have a first element, the principiation (prefix), which has the function of assigning nouns to different classes. As will become apparent later, it is not only the prefix that is the determinant of assigning nouns to different classes, but agreement as well. There is insufficient information in the commentaries on his grammar to ascertain whether he recognized the adjective as part of the substantive, as a result we cannot conclusively say that he did not mention the adjective in his grammar. Although Brusciotto does not make reference to the adjective in his table of contents (Doke 1935a: 17-18), he is said to have identified such ideophones as çee ‘a very white thing’, bua ‘red’ and rima ‘black’. It is thus likely that in Brusciotto’s so called ideophone class there were also adjectives or words derived from adjectives.

Brusciotto is also said to have identified eighteen principiations, which according to Doke (1935a: 16-17) were based on concord and not prefixes. We will highlight three of these principiationstions here:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>principiation</th>
<th>first element</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st principiation</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd principiation</td>
<td>mu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th principiation</td>
<td>cu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Brusciotto’s principiations are what were later called noun classes. Nouns, as Doke states, are defined according to their principiations and the concordial agreement that they form with the words with which they come into various combinations. Brusciotto’s analyses of the noun and verb in particular seem to have been based on morphology and syntax because of their emphasis on concord, joining, conjugation and tense which are morphological and syntactic elements.
To sum up Brusciotto’s descriptions of the parts of speech, we will reiterate the following main points: Brusciotto identified nine parts of speech which he analysed according to principiations and concord on the noun and tenses and conjugation on the verb. What is apparent in this analysis is the influence of method from the European languages tradition. For instance the identification of declensions and case on the Bantu noun by Brusciotto; case is generally not applicable to Bantu nouns.

3.2.2 J. Torrend (1891)
Torrend’s contribution to Bantu linguistic analysis was in the form of a comparative grammar. He identifies four parts of speech: substantives, adjectives, pronouns, and verbs. Torrend highlights that one of the characteristic features of the parts of speech of the Bantu family of languages is that they have prefixes which are expressed before the substantive and which subsequently control agreement. He also highlights that Bantu languages have stems which express different meanings. Torrend’s part of speech descriptions are outlined in Table 8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>part of speech</th>
<th>description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>substantives</td>
<td>Marked by a prefix (classifying element or classifier). Subclasses: locative classifiers; prepositions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adjectives</td>
<td>Determinatives which express: (i) quantitative, intrinsic and permanent properties of things (i.e. nature, dimension, age); (ii) external or changeable qualities and relations (colour, qualities, position, relation) Types: quantitative adjectives and non-quantitative adjectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pronouns</td>
<td>Main type: Connective pronoun – connects verbs and determinatives with their substantive. Other types: substantive personal pronouns; demonstrative pronouns; relative pronouns; numerals; interrogative pronouns; determinatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verbs</td>
<td>Forms of the verb: verb stem, class and person, mood Types: auxiliaries; derivative verbs; “to be” and “to have”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Torrend highlights that he does not recognize adverbs, prepositions and conjunctions as distinct categories because they can all be expressed through locatives. Torrend’s analysis is both morphological and semantic. In some of his analyses one does not find definitions of the parts of speech, but only their form and semantic classifications. For instance, the
description of the adjective is from a purely semantic perspective in that he divides the
adjectives into two semantic groups according to their semantic characteristics, that is, the
permanent and changeable properties. This semantic classification is similar to that of
Givón in that he classifies adjectives according to their stability in time (cf. 4.6.2.2). The
other descriptions of the parts of speech concentrate on the prefix and its unity with the
stems with which it comes into combination. Hence there are no definitions of the parts of
speech per se.

3.2.3 Alice Werner (1919)

In the *Introductory Sketch of the Bantu Languages* (1919), Werner presents the
grammatical descriptions of the languages Zulu, Herero, Ila, Nyanja, Swahili and Ganda.
Werner’s (1919: 13) observations of the Bantu languages are that,

The first point which strikes one on beginning to examine these languages is the employment
of prefixes where we should expect to find suffixes – e.g. to indicate the plural of nouns, the
agreement of adjectives, etc. We shall find that suffixes are also used in certain cases; but the
system of prefixes is so characteristic and peculiar that Bleek rightly regarded it as a
distinguishing feature of this family, which – before finally adopting the designation ‘Bantu’ –
he called the ‘prefix-pronominal languages’. It was also noted by Brusciotto who, at the very
outset of his Grammar, says: ‘In the first place it must be observed, in general, that in this
language we have to attend, not to Declensions (i.e., terminations), but rather to Principiations
(i.e., Prefixes).’

Werner acknowledges Bleek’s and Brusciotto’s findings on prefixes and agreement, and as
such, her descriptions of the parts of speech are not very different to those of Bleek and
Brusciotto. She defines parts of speech according to their roots and prefixes. Werner
further states that the principal characteristic features of the Bantu family are: the absence
of grammatical gender, the system of prefixes, and the alliterative concord (ibid: 14).
Werner’s claim that Bantu languages do not have gender may be because she associates
gender with the semantic system of gender assignment found in Indo-European languages,
namely masculine, feminine and neuter. On the contrary, Bantu languages have gender
systems that are assigned syntactically through agreement. A discussion on gender in the
Bantu languages will be carried out in Chapter 6.

Werner describes the noun and adjective using morphological and syntactic criteria. The
morphological perspective recognises the presence of prefixes on both the noun and the
adjective; with the syntactic element being the concordial agreement of the noun with its qualifiers.

**Table 9 Werner’s descriptions of the parts of speech**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>part of speech</th>
<th>description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>noun</td>
<td>Nouns are divided into several classes, usually eight or nine; distinguished by their prefixes. The noun prefix is the indicator of agreement – the alliterative concord.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adjective</td>
<td>Have roots which are used with the prefix of the noun with which it is to agree, e.g. -nene ‘large’ (Kongo); -fupi ‘short’ (Swahili).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verb</td>
<td>The Bantu verb normally consists of two syllables and ends in a, e.g. lema ‘cultivate’ (Chwana/Setswana); manga ‘tie’ (Nyanja). It also has roots and prefixes – prefixes of the verb can be pronouns, moods, tenses, negative particles, etc. Bantu verbs also have derived forms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>numeral</td>
<td>A kind of adjective, but their agreements are not always the same as those of adjectives. They consist of a prefix and a root, e.g. -mwe ‘one’ (Herero); -tweru ‘one’ (Gisu); lalo ‘three’ (Duala).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adverb</td>
<td>Regular adverbs: formed from adjectives with the prefix ka-, e.g. kale ‘long ago’ (Zulu). Locative adverbs: preceded or followed by a locative particle, e.g. pano ‘here’ (Lla) Invariable adverbs: those which are not derived from other parts of speech, e.g. lero ‘today’ (Nyanja); soni ‘again’ (Yao).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The morphological forms of the verb are given as well as its derivations. We can also observe that though Werner acknowledges the numeral to be part of the adjectival category, she still treats it as a separate category probably for the reason that it has different agreement features from the adjective. As can be noted from her examples, lalo ‘three’ is not a root and this gives it a different form from the other numerals. One can thus conclude that the overriding criterion was the morphological criterion in that words were categorised as belonging to the same word class if they had the same form. Because of words such as lalo in the class of the numerals, this group of words had then to be treated as a distinct category from the adjectives.

3.2.4 Clement M. Doke (1935b)
Clement Doke (1893-1980) published *Bantu Linguistic Terminology* (1935b) in which he identified six ‘fundamental’ parts of speech which he further subdivided. His grammatical
analysis is outlined in Table 10. Doke’s qualificative category includes the adjective, relative, numeral and possessive, all of which modify the noun in a noun phrase.

### Table 10 Doke’s (1935) parts of speech analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>part of speech</th>
<th>subclasses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>substantive</td>
<td>noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qualitative</td>
<td>adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>relative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>numeral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>possessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>predicative</td>
<td>verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>copulative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>descriptive</td>
<td>ideophone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>adverb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conjunction</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interjection</td>
<td>vocatives of nouns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>imperatives of verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>exclamatory words</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We can deduce from this classification that his description of qualificatives is that they are words or elements which qualify substantives. This class of qualificatives consists of categories that modify the noun. In this grammar, Doke identifies four such qualificatives, but we will see in the subsequent grammar of 1954 that the numeral is replaced by the enumerative. Lestrade (1993: 182) points out that Doke’s grouping together of these parts of speech was on the basis of meaning, function and form. He however criticizes Doke’s grouping of these parts of speech by pointing out that some of them are different semantically, functionally and morphologically and as such he does not see the theoretical justification for these groupings.

#### 3.2.5 Clement Doke (1954)

In *The Southern Bantu Languages*, Doke, like his predecessors also observes that the Bantu languages have a unique combination of morphological characteristics which distinguish them from other language families. Doke’s descriptions of the parts of speech are similar to his 1935b work. In the current work he states that there are twelve parts of speech in Bantu that he defines using morphological, semantic and syntactic criteria. In the current work he still maintains the six groups, a grouping based on grammatical function.
We will now proceed to highlight Doke’s descriptions of the noun, adjective and verb:

**Noun**

The noun consists of two parts: stem and prefix, e.g. *umfazi* ‘woman’ (Nguni/Xhosa); *tshilthu* ‘thing’ (Venda). Nouns are cases linked together semantically and morphologically i.e. they have a common element in their meaning and form. The prefix is the governing element in the sentence.

**Adjective**

It contains an element which is closely related to the prefix of the noun class with which the concord agrees. In some cases the adjectival concords and the noun prefixes are virtually identical, e.g. *abantu abadala* ‘old people’ (Nguni/Xhosa).

(1)  
*abantu abadala*  
aba-ntu aba-dala  
cl.2-person SC2-old  
‘old people’

**Verb**

The verb may be studied under two headings:

(i) Its varieties, including its derivatives: Bantu verbs are to be considered according to their import which governs their syntactical use. There are six types of verbs according to their import:
  - intransitive verbs - are self-contained in their action, e.g. *gula* ‘be ill’ (Zulu);
  - transitive verbs - need an object to complete their action, e.g. *shaya* ‘hit’ (Zulu);
  - locative verbs - need a locative adverb to complete their action, e.g. *vela* ‘come from, originate in’ (Zulu);
- agentive verbs - need an agentive verb to complete their action, e.g. *bonwa* ‘be seen’ (Zulu);
- conjunctive verbs - need a conjunctive expression to complete their action, e.g. *fana* ‘resemble’ (Zulu);
- instrumental verbs - require an instrumental adverb to complete their action, e.g. *hamba* ‘travel’ (Zulu).

Species: passive, applied, neuter, causative, intensive, extensive, reciprocal, reversive, perfective, stative, contactive, repetitive/diminutive

(ii) Its conjugation: the verb consists of at least two parts: subjectival concord and stem. The latter may undergo certain inflexions, while the former is also capable of change in certain instances, notably for tense and mood.

Most of Doke’s descriptions of the individual parts of speech are morphological. On the noun, for instance, he also gives a semantic analysis of the noun classes and their derivations. He also discusses the concordial agreement between the noun and its modifiers, for instance that the adjective concord agrees with the prefix of the noun. He also mentions that Bantu languages have few adjectives which are complemented by other parts of speech. On the verb, he also outlines the species (extensions) and the deficient verbs. Doke’s descriptions of the parts of speech can therefore be summarised as being based on morphological, semantic and syntactic criteria.

The labels substantive, qualificative and predicative adopted by Torrend and Doke are terms used in descriptive grammars in the classification of words. Lyons (1968: 339) points out that these terms were influenced by both traditional logic and traditional grammar. He states that the Aristotelian influence is apparent in these labels for the world was viewed as being made up of persons, animals and things (substances) which had certain qualities and were the agents or victims. These philosophical underpinnings were said to have had a fundamental influence on the grammatical structure of the classical languages.

3.2.6 Recent Studies: Nurse and Philippson (2003)

Nurse and Philippson (2003: 7-9) give an overall typological characterization of the Bantu languages, in terms of phonology, vowels and consonants, tones, morphology and syntax. Since this study is on parts of speech we will disregard the other typological aspects and
focus specifically on morphological and syntactic aspects since they have a bearing on parts of speech descriptions.

In terms of morphology, Bantu languages are said to be agglutinating. Verbs are said to have an elaborate set of affixes; and nouns are either underived and have inflectional affixes or are derived and hence have derivational affixes. Nouns are also described as having a class prefix, with some languages having a pre-prefix. Nurse and Philippson further state that all Bantu nouns can be assigned to a class, with about twenty classes having been reconstructed for Proto-Bantu. They also state that a noun class has a distinct prefix, a specific gender (singular/plural pairing), and agreement with other constituents. For instance, for the Zone S languages, Gowlett (ibid: 620) describes nouns according to their morphology, that is, nouns have a prefix whose structure can be monomorphemic with a CV structure, e.g. class 3: \(\text{mu}\) (Shona), \(\text{mu}\) (Venda), \(\text{um(u)}\) (Nguni). Gowlett also explains the system of concordial agreement in relation to the subject marker and other constituents. Agreement is also said to be characteristic of the Bantu languages and that it starts from the head noun, to the noun phrase and across to the verb. The verb is said to be the pivotal entity in the sentence in that Bantu languages have been described as being “verby”. The verb takes prefixes and suffixes, which between them express negation, relativization, tense, aspect, conditional, subject (person/noun class), object (person/noun class) focus/assertion, derivational extensions and mood.

Nurse and Philippson also point out that most Bantu languages have few real adjectives or prepositions, and neither do they have articles. To this end, Gowlett (ibid: 627), in his characterization of the Zone S languages does not identify the adjective among the qualificatives, but makes reference to the fact that some numerals, especially the stems for two, three, four and five are said to be adjectival. Schadeberg (ibid: 149) also points out that the number of underived reconstructable adjectives in the Bantu languages is very small, with some adjectives derived from verbs and ideophones also being reconstructed.

In terms of syntax, Bantu languages are said to be SVO. The noun thus precedes its modifiers within the noun phrase. Nurse and Philippson point out that while the normal order in an NP is \(N + Adj + Numeral + other constituents\), however, other pragmatic factors lead to flexibility.
3.2.7 Summary of Section

Early Bantu grammatical descriptions all concur to the fact that Bantu languages are based on a system of prefixes, stems and concord and that the noun is the agreement source. The analyses of early Bantu grammarians are also similar in that they recognise that nouns in Bantu are divided into different classes on the basis of prefixes and the stems to which they are attached.

Prior to Doke, the two criteria that were predominant in the descriptions of the parts of speech were morphology and semantics. The syntactic aspect was only alluded to in relation to the agreement between the noun and its modifiers. We have been consistent in maintaining that agreement is a syntactic component, yet in these grammars it has been treated as being part of the morphology of nouns, that Bantu languages assign their agreement morphologically, but we will maintain that it is erroneous to describe agreement as being simply morphological because it is also syntactic. As such, it is more accurate to state that Bantu languages assign their agreement both morphologically and syntactically, as will be demonstrated in Chapter 6. The syntactic component was more pronounced in Doke’s (1954) descriptions of the verb in relation to its syntactic use.

The descriptions of the parts of speech that were treated in this section are summarized in Table 11. It is evident from Table 11 that there was no consensus on the number of parts of speech in the Bantu languages, for the parts of speech identified range in number from 4 to 12. Doke (1954) identified the most number of parts of speech, and Torrend the least. The criteria that were used were morphology, syntax (agreement) and semantics. There is no evidence of the definitions of the parts of speech in the literature, and there are also no lists of the adjectives identified in these grammars, as such we were not able to draw conclusions on the words that they identified as belonging to the adjective class.
Table 11 Summary of parts of speech descriptions: Brusciotto to Doke

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>grammarian</th>
<th>no. of word classes</th>
<th>list of word classes</th>
<th>criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brusciotto</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>noun (substantive) verb pronoun adverb conjunction preposition interjection number ideophone</td>
<td>morphology and agreement (syntax)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torrend</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>substantives adjectives pronouns verbs</td>
<td>morphology; semantics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Werner</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>noun adjective numeral verb adverb</td>
<td>morphology and agreement (syntax)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doke (1935b)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>substantive qualificative predicative descriptive conjunctive interjection</td>
<td>morphology; grammatical function; semantics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doke (1954)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>noun pronoun adjective relative enumerative possessive verb copulative adverb ideophone conjunctive interjective</td>
<td>morphology and syntax</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3 Descriptions of the Adjective in the Bantu Languages

The emphasis in this section will be on how the adjective in particular has been analysed in Bantu grammars from the twentieth up to recent studies. Scholars who have described the adjective in Bantu languages concur on the fact that adjectives are not numerous in the Bantu languages. What follows is a brief overview of how the category *adjective* has been described in the following Bantu languages: Swahili, Chichewa/Chinyanja, and KiVunjochaga. The justification for the selection of Swahili, Chichewa/Chinyanja and KiVunjochaga among the other Bantu languages is that firstly, there was available literature on these three languages in general, and secondly, they had more detailed descriptions of the adjective.

3.3.1 Swahili

3.3.1.1 E. O. Ashton (1947)

Ashton highlights the morphological structure of Swahili which is reflected in the system of roots, stems and affixes. Her analysis of these roots, stems and affixes can be said to be based on inflectional and derivational morphology. Ashton (1947: 6) states:

(i) Some roots are basically nominal, as for instance [...] -ti giving rise to m-ti tree; ki-ti native stool; [...] In addition some nominal roots have a common form with adjectives: m-ke wife; -ke female.

(ii) Other roots give rise to verbs and nouns, or to verbs, nouns and adjectives: shinda-a conquer; m-shinda-i or m-shinda-ji a conqueror; [...] 

There are no definitions of the parts of speech provided but they are identified according to the roots or stems and affixes that shape them. On adjectival concords Ashton states that they have the same form as class prefixes. She also notes that there are few words which may be termed “adjectives” in Swahili, but that adjectival concepts can be expressed in other ways.

A. adjectives of Swahili origin

These are formed by roots and stems taking the adjectival concord, including numerals, for example:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>adjective</th>
<th>gloss</th>
<th>adjective</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-dogo</td>
<td>little, small</td>
<td>-zii</td>
<td>old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-gumu</td>
<td>hard</td>
<td>-zuri</td>
<td>nice, fine, beautiful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-geni</td>
<td>foreign</td>
<td>-eupe</td>
<td>white, light</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-baya</td>
<td>bad</td>
<td>-ema</td>
<td>good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-vivu</td>
<td>idle</td>
<td>-paa</td>
<td>broad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tatu</td>
<td>three</td>
<td>-moja</td>
<td>one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-chungu</td>
<td>bitter</td>
<td>-kubwa</td>
<td>big</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-pya</td>
<td>new</td>
<td>-ke</td>
<td>female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. uninfluenced loanwords from Arabic:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>adjective</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hodari</td>
<td>clever, strong, able</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tele</td>
<td>plenty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>safi</td>
<td>clean, honest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kamili</td>
<td>complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haba</td>
<td>few</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following examples illustrate the other ways in which other word categories complement the adjective class.

C. by phrases based on the -A of Relationship

-A + noun

(2) kiti cha mti
   ki-ti ch-a m-ti
   cl.7-chair cl.7-GEN cl.3- wood
   ‘chair of wood’

This -a of relationship is the genitive marker which in example (2) denotes the meaning of the constituent material out of which the chair is made.

D. -A + verb in the Infinitive

(3) chakula cha kutosha
   cha-kula ch-a ku-tosha
   cl.7-food cl.7-GEN INF-sufficient
   ‘food that is sufficient’

E. -A + cardinal number

(4) mtoto wa tatu
   m-toto w-a tatu
   cl.1-child cl.1-GEN three
   ‘lit. child of three = third child’
F. \(-A + \) adverb

\[(5)\]  
\textit{chakula cha jana}  
\textit{chakula ch-a jana}  
cl.7-food cl.7-GEN yesterday  
‘food of yesterday = yesterday's food’

G. by phrases based on the \(-O\) of Reference as a relative particle

\[(6)\]  
\textit{mwezi ujao}  
\textit{mw-ezi u-jao}  
cl.3-month REL-coming  
‘lit: the month that is coming = next month’

H. by other nouns

\[(7)\]  
\textit{mbwa mwitu}  
\textit{mbwa m(w)-itu}  
cl.9-dog cl.3-wild  
‘wild dog’

This example shows two juxtaposed nouns with the first noun being modified by the second noun.

I. by means of \(-\text{eny}e + \) object

\[(8)\]  
\textit{mwenye mali}  
\textit{mw-enye m-ali}  
cl.1-owner cl.9-money  
‘lit: owner of money = person with wealth’

The Swahili adjective class as shown by Ashton comprises of the adjectives of Swahili origin and the loanwords from Arabic. Her analysis also illustrates how the adjective class is complemented by other parts of speech.

\textbf{3.3.1.2 P. M. Wilson (1970)}

Wilson states that there are three types of adjectives in Swahili, namely:

(i) those which take agreements with the nouns they qualify, for example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>adjective</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-baya</td>
<td>bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-chafu</td>
<td>dirty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-gumu</td>
<td>difficult</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(ii) those which take agreements but have a vowel stem, for example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>adjective</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-epesi</td>
<td>light, easy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-embamba</td>
<td>thin, narrow, slender</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iii) Arabic adjectives, for example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>adjective</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>safi</td>
<td>clean, pure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laini</td>
<td>soft, smooth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ghali</td>
<td>expensive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These Arabic adjectives according to Wilson, generally do not take the agreement of the nouns they qualify. Wilson (1970: 70) mentions that they behave like other adjectives as far as word order is concerned. Apart from these, Wilson also highlights that Swahili has what he refers to as compound adjectives. He states that the reason for the existence of these compound adjectives is because Swahili is said to have very few ‘simple’ adjectives. These compound adjectives are said to be formed by adding the possessive in front of a noun, verb or any other word as the examples in (9) show:

(9)
- a baridi ‘cold’
- a hatari ‘dangerous’
- a mwisho ‘last’
- a zamani ‘old’

Wilson further states that any noun can be compounded in this way to form an adjective. Contrary to Wilson’s claims, the examples in (9) are not adjectives but they are simply constructions with a genitive particle and a noun. For instance, the noun *hatari* means ‘danger’, while the noun *zamani* means ‘time’. In the examples in (9) -a is the genitive particle which is the same particle described by Ashton in example (2) in the previous section as being the -a of relationship. Wilson further states that verbs in Swahili can also be used in the infinitive as adjectives. For example:

(10)
- a kutosha ‘sufficient, enough’
- a kufaa ‘suitable’
In the two examples in (10), *kutosha* and *kufaa* are infinitives which can also function adjectivally. This is the same infinitive described by Ashton in example (3).

### 3.3.1.3 E. N. Myachina (1981)

Myachina (1981: 33) states that in Swahili, the adjective is classified as a separate part of speech for semantic reasons. She highlights that semantically the Swahili adjective is said to denote the qualities and dimensions of objects. She also points out that syntactically the adjective comes after the noun, and that morphologically it is said to take the prefix of the “object” (noun), there being concordial agreement between the qualified and the qualifier, with the only exception being with class 11 (*u*-) where the adjective takes the prefix *m-* as in *ufunguo mzito* ‘heavy key’. Myachina also states that very few adjectives are of Swahili origin. Within this group of the ‘true’ Swahili adjectives, she classifies them semantically into four types, viz.:

(i) those that denote the qualities of a thing or person:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>adjective</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-zuri</td>
<td>beautiful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-zito</td>
<td>heavy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-zee</td>
<td>old</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ii) colour adjectives:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>adjective</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-eupe</td>
<td>white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ekundu</td>
<td>red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-eusi</td>
<td>black</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iii) adjectives denoting dimension or size:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>adjective</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-dogo</td>
<td>small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-fupi</td>
<td>short</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iv) adjectives that give quantitative data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>adjective</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-ingi</td>
<td>numerous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-chache</td>
<td>few in number</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to these adjectives that Myachina refers to as ‘adjectives of Swahili origin’ are also the numerals *moja/mosi* ‘one’, *mbili/pili* ‘two’, *tatu* ‘three’, *nne* ‘four’, *tano* ‘five’ and *nane* ‘eight’ which are the adjectives of Swahili origin and that they also take the class prefix of the noun they will be enumerating, as in *visu vitatu* ‘three knives’, *watu wawane* ‘eight men’. The other numerals *sita* ‘six’, *saba* ‘seven’, *tisa* ‘nine’ are borrowed from Arabic and they do not take the agreement prefix of the noun, as in *visu saba* ‘seven knives’, *watu tisa* ‘nine men’. Myachina points out that the numeral -*kumi* ‘ten’ is a noun in origin in Swahili and in other Bantu languages. She gives the example of Zulu where *isikumi* is a noun of class 7.

Further according to Myachina, some adjectives are borrowed from Arabic and these semantically fall into the four semantic groups that have already been referred to under (i) to (iv). She points out that one of the characteristics of these borrowed adjectives is that they do not take the prefix of the noun but that their function as adjectives is expressed by contiguity alone as examples (11) and (12) show.

(11) *mtu hodari*
    m-tu hodari
    cl.1-person able
    ‘able person’

(12) *chumba safi*
    ch-umba safi
    cl.7-room clean
    ‘clean room’

These adjectives are invariable and we will encounter similar cases in Shona where the adjective does not have a class marker that signals agreement with the noun.

### 3.3.1.4 Summary

From the analyses of Ashton and Myachina it is evident that Swahili has a group of adjectives that resemble the noun in form and that take their agreement from the noun. These have been referred to by the grammarians as the ‘true’ adjectives. In addition, Ashton and Myachina show that there are some adjectives that were borrowed from Arabic and these do not have the prefix and stem form and there is no agreement between the noun and the adjective. It is also stated that Swahili does not have many words that can be referred to as adjectives, and as such it has to use other means to express adjectival
meaning. These other means are explained in detail by Ashton. Wilson’s analysis is not accurate in that he classifies as adjectives words and phrases that are not adjectives but that can perform the function of modification.

3.3.2 Chichewa/Chinyanja

Chichewa is a language spoken in Malawi, Zambia, Mozambique and Zimbabwe. In Malawi it is referred to as Chichewa, while in Zambia, Mozambique and Zimbabwe it is referred to as Chinyanja, hence our reason for referring to this language with a double label.

3.3.2.1 N. Salaün (1969)

Salaün (1969: 3) states that his is a practical approach of the Cinyanja/Cicewa (Chinyanja/Chichewa) language. In relation to adjectives in particular, he notes that they have a prefix and stem. Salaün claims to be describing adjectives but on close scrutiny at his examples, one observes that in fact he describes those forms that translate as adjectives in English. He fails to distinguish between adjectives and words that function as adjectives. He claims that the following constructions are adjectives:

i. possessive constructions with the qualifying particle wa- or a-.

The first type of construction that he claims are adjectives are those that have the same rule as the notion of possession. That is, they have a genitive particle, for instance, wa- or a- as example (13) illustrates:

(13)  mwana wa ulesi
      mw-ana wa u-lesi
      cl.1-child GEN cl.14-laziness
      ‘lit: child of laziness = lazy child’

ii. constructions denoting origin, direction or location have the prepositions pa ku or mu following the qualifying particle, as (14) shows:

(14)  ulendo wa pa ndege
      u-lendo wa pa Ø-ndege
      cl.14-journey GEN LOC cl.9-aeroplane
      ‘journey by aeroplane’
iii. the suffix -nji joined to a qualifying prefix

He also claims that when the suffix -nji is joined to a verb it makes the item a pronoun, but when joined to a qualifying prefix it is an adjective meaning ‘what?’ For example:

(15)  *munafika nthawi yanji ku mudzi?*
  mu-na-fik-a nthawi ya-nji ku m-udzi
  2pl-TAM-arrive-FV cl.9-time INTER LOC cl.3-village
  ‘what time will you arrive at the village?’

iv. adding the qualifying prefix to the prefix ci-

He also notes that the prefix ci- usually denotes the characteristics of a community or a tribe, as in *Cicewa* (Chichewa) (the ways of the Chewa people). In Chichewa, as claimed by Salaün, if the qualifying prefix is added to the prefix ci- the result is an adjective.

(16)  *zobvala za cikazi*
  zo-bvala za ci-kazi
  cl.8-clothes GEN cl.7-female
  ‘clothes of women = women’s clothes’

Salaün also claims that there is also a category of adjectives which he refers to as special adjectives, special in the sense that, unlike their counterparts, they take double prefixes, qualifying *wa-* and concordial *m*.-

(17)  *mwana wa mfumu*
  mw-ana wa m-fumu
  cl.1-child GEN cl.1-king
  ‘child of a king’

Contrary to Salaun’s claims, *wa* is a genitive particle which functions as a connector for the two nouns, *mwana* ‘child’ and *mfumu* ‘king’, hence there is no adjective in this phrase. We will reiterate the observation we made at the onset that Salaun was not describing adjectives but words that can perform the function of modification.

**3.3.2.2 Sam A. Mchombo (2004)**

In his analysis of Chichewa syntax, Mchombo (2004: 24) observes that it resembles the patterning of the other Bantu languages in that its nominal system is also made up of a number of gender classes. Like in many other Bantu languages, these nominal classes are the ones that control agreement between a noun and its modifiers. Chichewa nouns also
have the prefix and stem form. Mchombo also states that Chichewa has very few ‘pure’ adjective stems. He gives the following as the full set of adjective stems in Chichewa:

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|}
\hline
\text{adjective} & \text{gloss} \\
\hline
-muna & \text{male} \\
-kazi & \text{female} \\
-ng’ono & \text{small} \\
-kulu & \text{big} \\
-wisi & \text{unripe} \\
-fupi & \text{short} \\
-tali & \text{long} \\
-kali & \text{fierce, ferocious} \\
-nyinji & \text{plenty, many} \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

Bentley and Kulemeka (2001: 22) also give a similar list of the adjective stems in Chichewa, with the exception of -nyinji ‘plenty, many’ which they do not include in their list.

3.3.3 KiVunjo-Chaga

Moshi (1992: 111) defines adjectives as items which either specify the attributes of the noun or predicate a property of that noun. She identifies what she calls two forms of adjectives in KiVunjo-Chaga: (i) dependent adjectives and (ii) independent adjectives. Dependent adjectives are said to take the agreement patterning of the noun while the independent adjectives are said to lean more towards the behaviour of verbs (1992: 114). Moshi postulates that the dependent adjectives have the form [Np+adj-stem] while the form of the independent adjectives is [Vp+adj-stem]. She shows that most words in KiVunjo-Chaga that characterize as adjectives in the language are either derived from nouns or from verbs.

i. Dependent adjective stems:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
(19) \quad \text{mndu mleshi} \\
\text{m-ndu m-leshi} \\
\text{cl.1-person cl.1-tall} \\
\text{‘tall person’} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
(20) \quad \text{maimba maili} \\
\text{ma-imba ma-ilili} \\
\text{cl.6-corn cl.6-white} \\
\text{‘white corn’} \\
\end{array}
\]
What Moshi refers to as the dependent adjective stems are those adjectives that take the class agreement marker from the noun.

ii. Independent adjective stems:

(21)  
\[ mn\text{du a-shimbi } \]
\[ m-\text{ndu a-shimbi} \]
\[ \text{cl.1-person vp-root-fat} \]
\[ \text{‘fat person’} \]

(22)  
\[ m-fi u-nganyi \]
\[ m-fi u-\text{nganyi} \]
\[ \text{cl.3 arrow vp-root-big} \]
\[ \text{‘big arrow’} \]

Moshi (1992: 116) states that an adjective which is derived from a verb or adverb will not select a nominal prefix. She states from the outset that she is looking at words in KiVunjochaga which are comparable to adjectives in other languages.

3.4. Shona

3.4.1 Early Shona Grammars

Shona grammars before the 1900s were in the form of glossaries and/or dictionaries. They were targeted at foreign mission workers, settlers, miners, and prospectors to aid them in their interactions and contacts with the local Shona speakers. Most can best be referred to as grammar books because they set out to describe the structure of the language to foreigners. These Shona grammars were written by missionaries with the aim of providing reference materials that would assist in the teaching of Shona as a second language to foreigners. All the grammars are therefore either descriptive grammars with exercises at the end or a combination of a grammatical sketch and a glossary of terms in Shona translated into English. For instance, in the Introduction to her grammar, Louw (1930: 1) points out that,

In the following pages an attempt has been made to provide for the European student a gradual introduction to the grammar of this important branch of the African Native languages, known as the Bantu family.
Most of the grammars were as a result written with the intention of them being instructional and reference material for the foreign learners. They represented, in the words of Fortune (1987: iii),

[...] an attempt to provide people who know no Shona with a graded guide to a reasonable, if still elementary grasp of this language.

The term ‘Shona’ was only used after the 1931 orthography by Doke. Before 1931 it was referred to as the Mashona language (Hartmann 1893); Chiswina (Biehler 1927); Chikaranga (Louw 1930; Marconnes 1931).

3.4.1.1 C. S. Louw (1930)

One of the very first attempts to describe Shona was made by C. S. Louw (1930) in a grammar titled, *Manual of the Chikaranga Language*, whose title clearly illustrates that it is a manual designed for the foreign learner. It is written in the form of lessons with a grammar, exercises and conversational sentences. On the short lesson on adjectives, Louw (1930: 38) does not give a definition of the adjective but instead presents its morphological and syntactic characteristics:

As a rule the adjective takes the prefix of the noun it qualifies, always following it. The prefixless nouns of the first *mu* class take the prefixes *mu* and *va*; e.g. *she mukuru*, the great chief. In all other cases in which the prefix of the noun is not expressed, the adjective is also used without a prefix; e.g. *imba refu*, the high house; *mvura zhinji*, much rain; *banga refu*, the long knife […]

Louw identified the following adjectives:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>adjective</th>
<th>gloss</th>
<th>adjective</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-bamhi</td>
<td>wide, stout</td>
<td>-nyoro</td>
<td>soft, gentle, kind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-benyu</td>
<td>alive, whole</td>
<td>-pfumbu</td>
<td>blue or grey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-dete</td>
<td>thin</td>
<td>-refu</td>
<td>tall, long, deep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-doko (diki, duku)</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>-sharu</td>
<td>old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-fupi</td>
<td>short, low</td>
<td>-shava</td>
<td>red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-gobyu</td>
<td>thick, stout</td>
<td>-shoma</td>
<td>little, few</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-gukutu</td>
<td>hard, cruel</td>
<td>-shora</td>
<td>dark red, brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-guru</td>
<td>big, great</td>
<td>-tsva</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-jena</td>
<td>white, yellow, light-coloured</td>
<td>-vuya</td>
<td>fine, handsome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-mbishi</td>
<td>unripe</td>
<td>-zhinji</td>
<td>much, many</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Louw identifies 20 adjectives and in addition to these are also the numerals, which she classified under adjectives. Louw also observed that the small number of adjectives in
Shona was complemented by other parts of speech such as nouns and verbs that can function as adjectives.

3.4.1.2 J. O’Neil (1935)

Besides the numerals, the adjectives that were described by O’Neil (1935: 75) are as shown in (24):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>adjective</th>
<th>gloss</th>
<th>adjective</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-chena</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>-pfupi (-fupi)</td>
<td>short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-diki (-doko, -duku)</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>-saru</td>
<td>old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-kobvu</td>
<td>wide</td>
<td>-shava</td>
<td>light brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-kukatuka</td>
<td>hard</td>
<td>-shoma</td>
<td>few</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-kuru</td>
<td>big</td>
<td>-shora</td>
<td>yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-mbishi</td>
<td>raw</td>
<td>-tete</td>
<td>thin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-nyoro</td>
<td>soft</td>
<td>-tsva</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-pamhi</td>
<td>wide</td>
<td>-tsvene</td>
<td>pure, holy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-penyu</td>
<td>alive</td>
<td>-tsvuku</td>
<td>red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-pfumbu</td>
<td>grey</td>
<td>-zhinji</td>
<td>many</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Like Louw (1930), O’Neil goes on to identify other parts of speech which may be used to function as adjectives in constructions, such as nouns, verbs, and possessive particles. We will only mention in passing that both Louw (1930) and O’Neil (1935) recognised that the small adjective class in Shona is augmented by other parts of speech but we will not go into the details of their analyses as some of their examples are inaccurate and do not constitute adjectival functions.

The essential difference between some of the adjective stems listed by Louw and O’Neil as presented in Table 12 is that of the class of the noun that the adjective modifies. Most of Louw’s adjective stems are adjective lexemes of class 5. Louw and O’Neil each identify 20 adjective stems, but in total they identify 23 stems. The two lists are very similar, with the difference being that they each identify two adjectives that were not identified by the other. O’Neil’s list also includes -tsvene ‘pure, holy’ and -tsvuku ‘red’; whereas Louw also identifies -vuya ‘good, fine, handsome’ and -refu ‘tall, long’.
### Table 12 Comparison of Louw’s and O’Neil’s adjectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Louw</th>
<th>O’Neil</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>adjective</strong></td>
<td><strong>gloss</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-bamhi</td>
<td>wide, stout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-benyu</td>
<td>alive, whole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-dete</td>
<td>thin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-doko/diki/duku</td>
<td>small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-fupi</td>
<td>short, low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-gobvu</td>
<td>thick, stout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-gukutu</td>
<td>hard, cruel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-guru</td>
<td>big, great</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-jena</td>
<td>white/yellow/light-coloured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-mbishi</td>
<td>unripe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-nyoro</td>
<td>soft, gentle, kind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-pfumbu</td>
<td>blue or grey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-refu</td>
<td>tall, long, deep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-shava</td>
<td>red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-shoma</td>
<td>little, few</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-shora</td>
<td>dark red, brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tsva</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tsvene</td>
<td>-tsvuku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-vuya</td>
<td>fine, handsome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-zhinji</td>
<td>much, many</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.4.2 George Fortune

The most sustained study in Shona grammar was carried out by George Fortune (1955, 1967, 1980) whose achievements in Shona have earned him the title the father of Shona grammar. The contribution by Fortune to the study of Shona grammar has had tremendous influence on scholars after him.

#### 3.4.2.1 Fortune (1955)

Fortune identified six parts of speech in Shona, these being, the substantive, the qualificative, the predicative, the adverbial, the conjunctive and the exclamation. The constituent members of each of these six parts of speech according to Fortune (1955: 45) are as follows:
I. *The substantive*: the noun and pronoun
   The pronoun is either absolute, e.g. *ini* (I), or qualificative.
   qualificative pronoun: adjectival, demonstrative, enumerative, quantititative, possessive, relative

II. *The qualificative*: adjective, demonstrative, enumerative, quantititative, possessive, relative

III. *The predicative*: verb and copulative

IV. *The adverbial*

V. *The conjunctive*

VI. *The exclamation*: ideophone and interjective

The classical influence that we attributed to the Doke scheme is also apparent in the grouping of the parts of speech in Shona by Fortune and in their examination which is based on grammatical function. In this grammar Fortune refers to the adjective as the adjectival qualificative. He states that there is an adjectival qualificative pronoun and an adjectival qualificative. The former, he says, is used without an accompanying substantive as in example (25).

(25)  
   *mukuru wangu wauya*
   mu-kuru w-a-ngu w-a-uy-a
   cl.1-elder cl.1-GEN-my 3sg-REC.PST-come-FV
   ‘my elder has come’

In (25), the adjective *mukuru* ‘elder’, functions as the head of the NP and is said to qualify an understood substantive. Fortune (1955: 152) defines the adjectival qualificative as,

[...] a word which expresses a property as possessed by a substantive and which is brought into concordial relationship with it by the adjectival concord.

In this grammar Fortune did not recognise the adjective as a separate category but he classified it as part of the qualificative pronoun. He also notes that a noun may function in the qualificative position when it is in apposition to a substantive. That is, a noun will be qualifying another noun, as illustrated in (26):

(26)  
   *mukadzi bofu*
   mu-kadzi Ø-bofu
   cl.1-woman cl.5-blind
   ‘blind woman’
Bofu and nherera are classified as nouns and not as adjectives because the difference between a noun and an adjective in Shona is that adjectives can take all noun prefixes while the noun can only take the singular and plural prefixes. Thus bofu can only take the plural of class 6 ma- to become mapofu; while nherera is a noun of class 9 which indicates plural in class 10 through agreement. We will return to this discussion in Chapters 6, 7 and 8.

### 3.4.2.2 Fortune (1967)

In the 1967 work Fortune treats the adjective as a separate category from the noun, though his analysis of the adjective is not as detailed as his treatment of either the noun or the verb. Fortune (1967: 61) defines the adjective in the following way:

> Adjectives in Shona, as in English, are used to qualify nouns, viz., to say something about the noun they accompany.

He states that adjectives follow the nouns they qualify and that they are made up of two parts: (i) the concord, and (ii) the stem. The concord is said to make the adjective agree in class with the noun being qualified. Fortune is consistent in his treatment of the adjective in his grammars, describing it on the basis of its morphological form. The adjectives in (28) are the “common adjective stems” described by Fortune (1967). In addition to these 20 adjective stems, Fortune also indicates that the numerals 1 to 9 are also adjective stems. In total he identified 29 adjective stems in this work.

(28)  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>adjective</th>
<th>gloss</th>
<th>adjective</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-chena</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>-refu</td>
<td>tall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-diki</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>-shoma</td>
<td>few</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-hombe</td>
<td>big</td>
<td>-shora</td>
<td>yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-kobvu</td>
<td>thick</td>
<td>-svinu</td>
<td>good, clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-kukutu</td>
<td>hard</td>
<td>-tema</td>
<td>black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-kuru</td>
<td>big</td>
<td>-tete</td>
<td>thin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-mbishi</td>
<td>unripe, uncooked</td>
<td>-tsara</td>
<td>old, worn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-nyoro</td>
<td>soft</td>
<td>-tsva</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-pamhi</td>
<td>broad</td>
<td>-tsvene</td>
<td>pure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-pfupi</td>
<td>short</td>
<td>-zhinji</td>
<td>many</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3.4.2.3 Fortune (1980)

The 1980 grammar is a sequel to the grammar of 1955. Fortune (1980: iii) is explicit in the introductory sections that his aim is to describe the word forms of Shona according to their phonological and morphological structures. He states:

By morphology is understood the study of grammatical constructions. In this part of the study, the basic unit is the morpheme and the analysis is concerned with the combinations into which morphemes enter, or in other words, the constructions they form […] A construction is any significant group of morphemes.

Based on morphological structure he identifies three hierarchies of the grammatical construction of Shona, viz. substantival, verbal and ideophonic. With particular reference to the substantive, Fortune (ibid: 29) remarks:

The term substantive is used in this study to indicate any example or realisation of any one of seven distinct types of construction, viz. nouns, adjectives, enumeratives, quantitatives, selectors, demonstratives and pronouns […] Nouns are substantival constructions with the same constructional pattern in common. Adjectives are substantival constructions with the same constructional pattern in common. Nouns and adjectives, though both substantival constructions, differ from each other in virtue of their constructional patterns.

The only difference between the noun and the adjective cited by Fortune is in their constructional patterns. This is our first point of departure from Fortune in that the distinction between the noun and the adjective that this study proffers goes beyond morphological form. Fortune’s (1980: 108) description of the adjective is that it is the second type of construction at the level of the substantive and that its constructional pattern is: adjectival prefix (AP) + adjectival stem (AS). Twenty six adjectival stems and nine numeral stems are described in this grammar. This brings the total number of adjective stems identified by Fortune to thirty five, as demonstrated in (29). This means that in this work he identified more adjectives than in the 1967 one.

Fortune’s list of adjectives also includes the numerals two to nine as well as the interrogative -ngani ‘how many’, but it does not include the numeral -mwe ‘one’. The interrogative -ngani has been termed an adjective because it enquires about the number of things being talked about. Hannan (1981) refers to it as an interrogative adjective; and Chimhundu (2001) refers to it simply as an interrogative. It is an interrogative stem than is used to ask the number of things.
In addition to the numerals, Fortune also identifies four additional adjectives that were not given by either Louw or O’Neil, viz., -hombe ‘big’, -svinu ‘good, nice, pleasing’, -tema ‘black’ and -vi ‘bad’. The adjective -hombe ‘big’ is a synonym of the adjective -kuru ‘big’. In terms of meaning they are similar and their scope of reference has a one-to-one correspondence. We looked at the corpus concordances of -hombe and we saw that in all the sentences where -hombe occurs, it can be substituted with -kuru without altering the meaning of the construction. For example:

(30a) mazino mahombe [C]  
ma-zino ma-hombe  
cl.6-teeth cl.6-big  
‘big teeth’

(30b) mazino makuru [C]  
ma-zino ma-kuru  
cl.6-teeth cl.6-big  
‘big teeth’

The other divergence of this study from Fortune is on the criteria for analysing the adjectives. Fortune used one criterion, morphology, whereas this study will use morphological, syntactic and semantic criteria. A comparison of Louw, O’Neil and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>adjective</th>
<th>gloss</th>
<th>adjective</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-chena</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>-shava</td>
<td>red, tawny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-diki</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>-shoma</td>
<td>few, little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-hombe</td>
<td>big</td>
<td>-shora</td>
<td>yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-kobvu</td>
<td>thick</td>
<td>-svinu</td>
<td>good, nice, pleasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-kukutu</td>
<td>hard</td>
<td>-tema</td>
<td>black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-kuru</td>
<td>big</td>
<td>-tete</td>
<td>thin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-mbishi</td>
<td>unripe</td>
<td>-tsaru</td>
<td>worn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-nyoro</td>
<td>soft</td>
<td>-tsva</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-pamhi</td>
<td>broad</td>
<td>-tsvene</td>
<td>pure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-penyu</td>
<td>alive</td>
<td>-tsvuku</td>
<td>red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-pfambu</td>
<td>blue, grey</td>
<td>-uya</td>
<td>good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-pfupi</td>
<td>short</td>
<td>-vi</td>
<td>bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-refu</td>
<td>long</td>
<td>-zhinji</td>
<td>many</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-viri</td>
<td>two</td>
<td>-tatu</td>
<td>three</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-na</td>
<td>four</td>
<td>-shanu</td>
<td>five</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tanhatu</td>
<td>six</td>
<td>-nomwe</td>
<td>seven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-sere</td>
<td>eight</td>
<td>-pfumbamwe</td>
<td>nine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ngani</td>
<td>how many?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fortune is shown in Table 13. We will not compare the numerals because they are standard in Shona. In total 35 adjectives were presented in these grammars.

### Table 13 Comparison of Louw, O’Neil and Fortune

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Louw</th>
<th>O’Neil</th>
<th>Fortune</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>adjective</td>
<td>adjective</td>
<td>adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-bamhi</td>
<td>-pamhi</td>
<td>-pamhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-benyu</td>
<td>-penyu</td>
<td>-penyu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-dete</td>
<td>-tete</td>
<td>-tete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-doko/-diki/-duku</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-fupi</td>
<td>-pfupi</td>
<td>short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-gobvu</td>
<td>-kobvu</td>
<td>wide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-gukutu</td>
<td>-kukutu</td>
<td>hard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-guru</td>
<td>-kuru</td>
<td>big</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-jena</td>
<td>-chena</td>
<td>white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-mbishi</td>
<td>-mbishi</td>
<td>raw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-nyoro</td>
<td>-nyoro</td>
<td>soft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-pfumbu</td>
<td>-pfumbu</td>
<td>grey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-refu</td>
<td>-refu</td>
<td>long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-shara</td>
<td>-saru</td>
<td>old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-shava</td>
<td>-shava</td>
<td>light brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-shoma</td>
<td>-shoma</td>
<td>few</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-shora</td>
<td>-shora</td>
<td>yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tsva</td>
<td>-tsva</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-vuya</td>
<td>-uya</td>
<td>good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-zhinji</td>
<td>-zhinji</td>
<td>many</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Carter and Kahari (1986) and Dembetembe (1987: 3-4) also classify the adjective in the same way that Fortune defined it, that adjectives consist of a stem to which is attached the prefix of the class of the noun controlling agreement.
3.4.3 Willie L. Chigidi (1986)

Chigidi (1986) refers to adjectives, copulatives, demonstratives, quantitatives, enumerators and possessives as *zvidudziramazita* (that which defines a noun), the equivalent of the qualificative. He defines these qualificatives in the following words:

\[
\text{Zvidudziramazita manzwi anotsanangura pamwe nokududzira mazita. Manzwi anotaura zvakawanda pamusoro pemazita.}
\]

(Qualificatives are words that describe and at the same time define nouns. They are words that tell us more about nouns).

Chigidi’s description of *zvipauro* (adjectives) is:

\[
\text{Zvipauro manzwi anotitaurira mamiriro echinhu kuti chakaita sei. Zvinoita kuti tikwanise kutsaura chimwe chinhu kubva pane chimwe.}
\]

(Adjectives are words that tell us about the state of a thing. This enables us to separate one thing or one quality from another).

But like his predecessor Fortune, he also describes the adjective using the morphological criterion only. He also highlights that in Shona there are what are called the true adjectives that have the \( AP + AS \) form and then there are also other categories that are not adjectives but can function adjectivally. For example:

(31) \text{Netsai musikana akanaka}\n
PN-Netsai mu-sikana a-ka-nak-a
PN-Netsai cl.1-girl 3sg-STAT-beautiful-FV

‘Netsai is a beautiful girl’

Chigidi says such expressions as *akanaka* are verbs in the relative mood.

3.4.4 Summary of Section

The notional definitions of the adjective that is presented by the Shona grammarians are that they embrace word forms that possess the following criterial characteristics:

(i) have a concord and stem;
(ii) the concord enables the adjective to agree with the noun (substantive);
(iii) qualifies the substantive

The weakness of this traditional definition is in its treatment of the adjective on purely morphological and semantic basis. Such definitions are only suitable for describing a closed set of words that conform to these criteria. Admittedly, the Shona adjective class has acquired loanwords and other adjectives that require other criteria that take into account the fact that a word may fail to possess characteristics (i) and (ii) but still be an
adjective. This study will use morphological and syntactic criteria to describe the characteristics of Shona adjectives. Their differences are explained within the framework of the prototype theory of cognitive grammar.

3.5 Descriptions of the Adjective in other African Languages

Other African languages such as Hausa (Newman 2000), Akan (Osam 1999) and Ngamambo (Siegel 1980) also have relatively small adjective classes. We have selected these three African languages to show that small adjective classes are not only peculiar to Bantu languages but that it is simply a common feature of languages in most parts of the world.

3.5.1 Hausa

Hausa is a member of the Chadic language family, which is a member of the Afroasiatic phylum. The nominal system of Hausa is based on concordial agreement which has a two term system: feminine, masculine and plural or unspecified. Newman (2000: 22) highlights that adjectives in Hausa are defined syntactically by their use as nominal modifiers and semantically by their meaning. He further states that morphologically the adjectives are indistinguishable from nouns as they undergo the same morphological processes as nouns, that is, forming plurals and feminines and using the same genitive linker as nouns. He adds that adjectives in Hausa can however be distinguished from nouns functionally in that they are noun modifiers and that they depend on the noun for their agreement feature. Four types of adjectives are recognised in Hausa:

(i) Simple adjectives that consist of morphologically nonderived words, for example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>masculine form</th>
<th>feminine form</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bēbē</td>
<td>bēbiyā</td>
<td>mute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>huntū</td>
<td>huntuwā</td>
<td>naked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dōgō</td>
<td>dōguwā</td>
<td>tall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ii) Derived adjectives

From Newman’s descriptions of the derived adjectives it is evident that there are several processes that Hausa uses to derive adjectives from other parts of speech. Newman (ibid: 24-26) shows that there are several types of derived adjectives in Hausa which include agential adjectives, ethnonymic adjectives, adjectival past participles, derived adjectives of
sensory quality, augmentative adjectives, diminutive adjectives, and reduplicated adjectives. We will not go into the details of the various derivational processes of these adjectives, but we will instead provide some examples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>adjective type</th>
<th>adjective</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>agential adjective</td>
<td>madādaicī</td>
<td>average, medium-sized’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>derived adjective</td>
<td>zàzzafā</td>
<td>very hot’ (&gt;zāfī ‘heat’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>augmentative adjective</td>
<td>santalēliyā</td>
<td>‘extremely tall and slender’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iii) Attenuated reduplicated adjectives
Newman states that when some adjectives are reduplicated the resultant adjective is semantically attenuated thus reducing the effect of the simple adjective to something lesser than the norm. For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>simple adjective</th>
<th>gloss</th>
<th>reduplicated attenuated adj.</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>farī</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>fari-fari</td>
<td>off-white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dōgū</td>
<td>tall</td>
<td>dōgo-dōgo</td>
<td>medium height</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gājērē</td>
<td>short</td>
<td>gājērē-gājērē</td>
<td>a bit short</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iv) Compound adjectives
Newman (2000: 29 and 113) highlights that there are about twenty compound adjectives in Hausa, most of which have the structure ruwan X ‘colour of X’. Besides the colour terms some of the adjectives cited by Newman denote dimension, human propensity, physical property, etc. For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>adjective</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ruwan-gwāl</td>
<td>gold coloured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gāmā-gāri</td>
<td>common, ordinary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shā-kā-tāfi</td>
<td>stupid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Like the other African languages, Hausa also does not have many adjectives but it makes use of other processes such as reduplication, attenuation, compounding, and augmentatives to complement its adjective class.

3.5.2 Akan
Akan is a Niger-Congo language spoken in Ghana. Osam (1999) highlights that there are basically two types of adjectives in Akan: (i) underived adjectives and (ii) derived adjectives. He states that underived adjectives do not originate from any word class and that such adjectives tend to be monomorphemic and gives examples of such adjectives as
"nwen" ‘bitter’, "dzen" ‘hard, difficult’, and "tsia" ‘short’. The derived adjectives, on the other hand, are said to be those that are formed from other word classes through various morphological processes. Such adjectives are either derived from nouns or verbs. The adjectives derived from nouns are said to be formed by reduplicating the root noun, as shown in (32):

\[(32)\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>noun</th>
<th>gloss</th>
<th>adjective</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>abo</td>
<td>rocks</td>
<td>aboabo</td>
<td>rocky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anhwea</td>
<td>sand</td>
<td>anhweaanhwea</td>
<td>sandy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nsu</td>
<td>water</td>
<td>nsuinsu</td>
<td>watery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The adjectives derived from verbs are said to be formed by suffixing a long vowel -I/-i on the verb, realised as "ee" in the orthography. Dolphyne (1988) refers to the suffix as the derivational suffix -e. Osam gives the following examples that are shown in (33):

\[(33)\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>verb</th>
<th>gloss</th>
<th>adjective</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>guan</td>
<td>to be dry</td>
<td>guanee</td>
<td>dried</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>how</td>
<td>to smoke (fish)</td>
<td>howee</td>
<td>smoked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toto</td>
<td>to roast/grill</td>
<td>totoee</td>
<td>grilled/roasted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Osam highlights that while Akan has an adjective category, it also uses nouns and verbs in place of adjectives. The nouns used as adjectives mark human propensity, one of Dixon’s semantic types. For example, "ohianyi" ‘poor person’, "onyansafo" ‘wise’, "sansanyi" ‘useless’. Osam also states that there is symmetry in between the adjectives and the verbs that express adjectival meaning (ibid: 208) and that evidence for this symmetry is that for each verb expressing an adjectival concept, there is a corresponding adjective, as (34) shows:

\[(34)\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>adjective</th>
<th>gloss</th>
<th>verb</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>memen</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>ber</td>
<td>to be ripe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tsenten</td>
<td>long</td>
<td>war</td>
<td>to be long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tuntum</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>bir</td>
<td>to be black</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5.3 Ngamambo

Ngamambo is a Cameroonian language of the Niger-Congo phylum. Siegel (1980: 157-8) states that there are only four words in Ngamambo that are considered as real adjectives because they are not derived from verbs. These four words denote dimension (big, small) and human propensity (good, bad). Ngamambo also has only three colour terms denoting ‘black’, ‘red’ and ‘white’. Siegel (ibid: 152) highlights that a large majority of words that translate English adjectives are verbs in Ngamambo. For example:

(35) *kapinta we ka*
    carpenter the is strong
    ‘the carpenter is strong’

(36) *kapinta kaa we*
    carpenter strong the
    ‘the strong carpenter’

Siegel further points out that an example such as (35) would also have a corresponding form that occurs as a post-nominal attributive construction as shown in (36) and that the meanings of expressions such as in the two examples illustrated are intersective.

3.6 Summary

This chapter has traced descriptions of parts of speech in the Bantu languages from the seventeenth century. It has revealed that the noun class and concord system were discovered by Brusciotto in 1659. The numbering system of these concord prefixes that is still being used today was subsequently devised by Bleek in 1851, as the discussion in Chapter 6 will show. The chapter has also shown the different criteria that were used to describe these parts of speech. It also discussed how the adjective in particular has been analysed in the Bantu languages. The discussion on Shona gave a comparative analysis of the data from Louw, O’Neil and Fortune and it revealed that their analyses were predominantly morphological. The last section presented brief descriptions of the adjective in three African languages and it has shown how the adjectives in these languages are also complemented by other parts of speech in noun modification.
The thread that runs throughout the chapter is that Bantu languages and African languages generally have a class that can be defined as an adjective class, albeit a small class. Small adjective classes are not unique to African languages but there are many languages with few adjectives all over the world. Dixon and Aikhenvald (2004) provide ample evidence of other languages with small adjective classes. Dixon (2004: 28-9) highlights that Hua, a Papuan language, has four adjectives, while Malayam, a Dravidian language has about fifteen adjectives. Dixon (ibid: 177) also highlights that Jarawara, a south Amazonian language, has about fourteen adjectives; while in the same volume, England (2004: 125) states that Mam, a Mayan language, has about fifty adjective roots.
Chapter 4 Theoretical Framework

4.1 Introduction

This chapter outlines the theoretical basis of this study, cognitive grammar. Section 4.2 is a discussion of cognitive grammar’s similarities and differences with the approaches discussed in Chapter 2. A discussion of some of the tenets of cognitive grammar is given in section 4.3. Section 4.4 defines key cognitive grammar terminology that is of relevance to this study while section 4.5 will discuss the two approaches that have been used predominantly in categorization, namely, the classical approach and the non-classical approaches. Section 4.6 is an exposition of how parts of speech are defined within cognitive grammar, notably by Ronald Langacker, Talmy Givón and William Croft. Section 4.7 is a summary of the chapter.

4.2 Background to Theoretical Framework

Cognitive grammar (originally called space grammar) is a theory of linguistic structure that has been developed by Ronald W. Langacker since the mid-1970s. The term ‘cognitive’ in its general sense refers to the mental process of knowing, learning, and understanding things (Collins COBUILD English Language Dictionary 1991: 263). Cognitive grammar as propounded by Langacker, lays emphasis on language as an integral part of cognition and cognitive processing. Cognition can be said to be the determinant of linguistic processes. That is, linguistic expressions are derived from what people conceptualize in their mind. The cognitive view is that language is part and parcel of the human mind or human cognition.

Cognitive grammar developed out of dissatisfaction with the way linguistic enquiry was being carried out; as a result it ushered in a new approach to linguistic study that marked a
shift from the current linguistic trends. Langacker (1987: 4) states that he offers cognitive grammar as an alternative to the generative approach, though he admits that cognitive grammar has similarities with generative grammar’s semantic component and the lexicon and grammar interface. Meaning is also of paramount importance in cognitive grammar and it is regarded as being symbolic and it is seen as a combination of a semantic and a phonological pole.

In Chapter 2 we also discussed structuralism and generative grammar vis à vis the centrality of syntax. Cognitive grammar recognizes the importance of syntax in grammar, though unlike structuralism and generative grammar, it does not regard syntax as autonomous. Rather, syntax in cognitive grammar is said to be inherently symbolic and it is treated as a symbolic relation that is integrated with the lexicon of a language. Hence, cognitive grammar uses a unified approach to the various aspects of linguistic structure thus deemphasizing some of the boundaries that have been overstated in other linguistic approaches, such as that between lexicon, morphology and syntax. We will return to the morphology-syntax interface in later sections of this chapter.

The cognitive grammar approach to parts of speech is also different from the methods used by the theoretical models discussed in Chapter 2. We will not repeat the discussion of Chapter 2, but we will simply highlight the major points. The 1950s generative grammar, for instance, was based on rewrite rules that listed the elements that are found in a category; while the 1970s generative grammar posited feature systems such as adjective = +N, +V (Chomsky 1970) or adjective = -N, -V (Baker 2003). In functional grammar, parts of speech are defined as predicates and the function of the predicate in a sentence. The functional-typological approach to be discussed in 4.6.3 is similar to the functional approach in that it also postulates that categorization is based on function. Cognitive grammar, on the other hand, claims that parts of speech are semantically definable. Langacker defines parts of speech as symbolic units with a semantic and phonological pole; and he also defines them according to the nature of their profiles, as we will discuss in more detail in 4.6.
4.3 Underlying Assumptions of Cognitive Grammar

4.3.1 The Symbolic Nature of Language

Language, according to cognitive grammar, is symbolic in nature. By virtue of its symbolization, language avails to the speaker an open-ended set of linguistic signs or expressions (Langacker 1987: 11). A linguistic expression can be a single morpheme or a complex construction. The linguistic sign or expression is an embodiment of semantic and phonological components. Linguistic expressions are therefore manifestations of the phonological and semantic structures. Langacker propounds that the only structures that are permitted in grammar are the phonological, semantic and symbolic structures that are found in a language. The symbolic structure is bipolar and combines the semantic unit and the phonological unit, as Figure 1 demonstrates.

Figure 1 The symbolic nature of language

![Symbolic Nature of Language](image)

The semantic unit is a location or configuration within a semantic space while the phonological unit is the range of the phonic potential, or the sounds associated with the particular sign. Grammatical structures in cognitive grammar are as a result also inherently symbolic and meaningful. Langacker uses the Saussurean concept of the linguistic sign being made up of a semantic and phonological pole. The sign is therefore what gives grammar its symbolic structure.

Cognitive grammar posits the interrelationship between lexicon³, morphology and syntax. These are said to form a continuum of symbolic units. Grammar and lexicon are thus said to be symbolic and meaningful, such that there is no justification for their separate treatment, for as Langacker (ibid: 12) states, grammar is simply the structuring and

---

³The cognitive grammar definition of a lexicon is that it is a set of fixed expressions in a language (Langacker 2008: 16).
symbolization of semantic content. Langacker’s grammar comprises of minimal symbolic
units or morphemes. These morphemes have semantic poles, that is, they are meaningful.
By way of illustration we will make use of the morpheme *dog* as exemplified in Langacker
(1980: 26). The morpheme *dog* has a phonological structure and a semantic structure. It is
a minimal unit in that it cannot be analyzable into smaller components. At the phonological
level the morpheme *dog* is composed of smaller phonological units [(d]-[ɔ]-[g]], the
hyphens indicating contiguity and a syntagmatic relationship.

At the semantic level it is abbreviated as [DOG] and it can be described in terms of it being
a symbolic unit formed from the symbolic association of the semantic pole [DOG] and the
phonological pole [(d]-[ɔ]-[g]]. At another level of analysability there is also a symbolic
relationship between the semantic unit [DOG]-[PL] and the phonological unit [dɔɡ]-[z] to
give the plural morpheme *dogs*. At a higher level we then have structures such as [the dog]
or [big dog] that are syntactic and above the phonological level. Langacker states that the
symbolic nature of language transcends lexicon and grammar, because morphological and
syntactic structures are also inherently symbolic. In that case we can contrast the
morpheme *dog* with the composite structure *dog collar* which is more complex
phonologically and semantically. Unlike the morpheme *dog*, the composite structure *dog
collar* can be analysed into smaller meaningful parts, *dog* and *collar*.

4.3.2 Centrality of Meaning in Cognitive Grammar

Langacker states that the centrality of meaning in cognitive grammar stems from the
realisation of the symbolic nature of language. Cognitive grammar is a theory that has
meaning as its central component and this meaning is regarded as a cognitive phenomenon.
Meaning in cognitive grammar is equated to conceptualization. Langacker (1987: 12)
states that,

> Meaning is what language is all about; the analyst who ignores it to concentrate solely on
> matters of form severely impoverishes the natural and necessary subject matter of the discipline
> and ultimately distorts the character of the phenomena described.

Heine (1997: 3) and Lakoff (1987: 583) also substantiate that observation, for as Lakoff
states:
The primary function of language is to convey meaning. A grammar should therefore show as directly as possible how parameters of form are linked to parameters of meaning.

The cognitive view of meaning is that it is encyclopedic. That is to say, the meaning of a word is regarded as being elaborate and is thereby able to be conceptualized within more than one domain. Langacker (2008: 39) points out that the meaning of a lexical item is arrived at through accessing an open-ended body of knowledge. Meaning in cognitive grammar is also said to be schematic, and this semantic network schema is referred to by Lee (2001) as radial categories. In relation to attributes, Lee (ibid: 58) states that the character of an attribute tends to vary according to the nature of the entity with which it is associated. As a result, the meaning of an entity is regarded as comprising of interconnected networks of semantic structure, which are the equivalent of polysemy. Lexical items that are entrenched and conventional are in most cases polysemous. Our data to be discussed in Chapter 7 will corroborate the cognitive grammar view that the more conventionalized and entrenched adjectives are polysemous, whereas the less prototypical adjectives are less entrenched as well as less polysemous.

4.3.2.1 Image Schemas

Meaning is a cognitive phenomenon in view of the fact that it resides in the mind of an individual speaker. Language is part of human experience, therefore even the same scene can be construed in different image schemas because the meaning of an entity or the interpretation of a scene is abstracted from world experience. As such, a speaker conceptualizes a scene through various images that are symbolic and are instantiations of the conceptual scene. The Langackerian (1980: 31ff) sense of imagery corresponds to the different ways of interpreting or explaining a conceived situation. He explains it as follows:

Observe that imagery does not necessarily involve semantic shift or metaphorical extension: it simply refers to alternative ways of construing a conceptual scene […] The figurative or extended use of linguistic expressions represents a more complex type of imagery, where one conceptual configuration is implicitly compared to another, and is construed as being parallel to it in certain ways.

These images are conceptualized as schemas or interconnections that are related to the scene being described. The idea of image schemas was developed in the 1970s and 1980s by Mark Johnson (1987) and George Lakoff (1987) who regarded them as structures emanating from everyday bodily experience. Lakoff (1987: 267) gives the following
examples of image schemas: CONTAINERS, PATHS, LINKS, FORCES, BALANCE, BACK, PART-WHOLE, UP-DOWN, FRONT-BACK, CENTRE-PERIPHERY, etc. Hampe (2005: 2-3) provides the following image schema list:

(1) a. CONTAINMENT/CONTAINER, PATH/SOURCE-PATH-GOAL, LINK, PART-WHOLE, CENTRE-PERIPHERY, BALANCE

b. the FORCE schemas: ENABLEMENT, BLOCKAGE, COUNTERFORCE, ATTRACTION, COMPULSION, RESTRAINT, REMOVAL, DIVERSION

(2) a. CONTACT, SCALE, NEAR-FAR, SURFACE, FULL-EMPTY, PROCESS, CYCLE, ITERATION, MERGING, SPLITTING, OBJECT, COLLECTION, MASS-COUNT, SUPERIMPOSITION

b. UP-DOWN, FRONT-BACK

(3) a. INANIMATE MOTION, ANIMATE MOTION, SELF MOTION, CAUSED MOTION, LOCOMOTION

b. EXPANSION, STRAIGHT, RESISTANCE, LEFT-RIGHT, ETC.

A more recent discussion of image schemas is by Langacker (2008: 32) who pronounces that they are

[…] schematic patterns of activity abstracted from everyday bodily experience, especially pertaining to vision, space, motion, and force. Image schemas are seen as basic, “preconceptual” structures that give rise to more elaborate and more abstract conceptions […] through combination and metaphorical projection.

Langacker (2008: 33-34), while still maintaining the notion of image schemas, proposes the following concepts as being more applicable to complex structures:

1. Basic/Minimal concepts
   Spatial domain: line, angle, curvature
   Vision domain: brightness, focal colours
   Time: precedence
   Kinesthetic sensation of exerting muscular force

2. Configurational concepts
   Contrast, boundary, change, continuity, contact, inclusion, separation, proximity, multiplicity, group, point vs. extension

3. Conceptual archetypes
   physical object, an object in location, an object moving through space, the human body, the human face, a whole and its parts, a physical container and its contents, seeing something, holding something, handing something to someone, exerting force to effect a desired change, a face-to-face social encounter.
Langacker points out that the conceptual concepts are more akin to the original essence of image schemas. Some discussions of image schemas are also found in Langacker (1990), Croft and Cruse (2004), Clausner and Croft (1999) and Hampe (2005). These and other examples of image schemas are by no means exhaustive, and as Hampe (2005: 2) remarks, “the image schema list has never constituted a closed set.”

Adjectives are nonprocessual relational predications, as such their image schemas will demonstrate this atemporality. The schema that is most relevant to Shona adjectives is SCALE. As propounded by Johnson (1987) and Clausner and Croft (1999), this schema profiles words such as more, less, up, increase, decrease, etc. Johnson (1987: 122) notes that the SCALE schema encompasses both the quantitative and qualitative aspects of our bodily experience. The quantitative aspect pertains to the fact that experientially the world we live in comprises of objects which can continue to be increased or which can be decreased in several ways. The qualitative aspect refers to perception of our world experience according to a norm or standard upon which something is judged. Clausner and Croft (ibid: 17) observe that the SCALE domain is analogous to gradability insofar as gradable adjectives are semantically measured according to a scale. The adjectives -refusa ‘very tall’ and refu refu ‘very tall’ for instance, are schematized according to some vertical dimension which is measured as extending beyond a scalar norm; whereas their opposites -pfupisa ‘very short’ and pfupi pfupi ‘very short’ are schematized on the same vertical dimension and are measured as being below a scalar norm of height. Other adjectives such as -tsvene ‘holy, good’, -svinu ‘good, pleasant’ are perceived according to the qualitative aspect of the SCALE schema because they are evaluative. More discussion of the image schemas of Shona adjectives is found in Chapter 7.

4.3.2.2 Dixon (2004)

Our analysis of meaning will also include the contribution of Dixon (2004) who advances what he terms the universal typical semantic types associated with noun, verb and adjective classes. Dixon posits that there is a one-to-one mapping between semantic types and grammatical word classes. He states that the words in a language can be grouped together into classes that have a common meaning element. In this study we are mainly concerned with the semantic types associated with the adjective class, which are:
13. **CARDINAL NUMBERS**

We will refer to these semantic types in our analysis of Shona adjectives. Our semantic analysis should then be able to come up with the semantic types that are applicable to the Shona adjective class. This discussion will be carried over to Chapter 8 where we will enunciate how those adjectival concepts that are not in the adjective class are coded.

### 4.3.3 Prototypicality vs. Discreteness

Cognitive grammar also posits that much in language is a matter of degree (Langacker 1987: 14) and for that reason it rejects the notion of discreteness. Cognitive grammar subscribes to the notion of prototypicality and it rejects the premise that category membership should be based on necessary and sufficient features as set out in the classical model (criterial-attribute model). The prototype model and the classical model will be discussed in section 4.5.

### 4.3.4 Frequency of Occurrence, Entrenchment and Prototypicality

Cognitive grammar is a usage-based model, and as such it recognises the importance of the cognitive abilities of the speaker of language which pertain to knowledge of a language and the use of a language manifested through conventional linguistic units. For a linguistic item to become a conventional unit, its status is determined by continued use which results in its entrenchment in a language. Our methodology included the counting of the type and token frequencies of the adjectives in Shona, as we will explain in Chapter 5. Cognitive linguists (inter alia Croft and Cruse 2004, Langacker 1987 and 2008, Evans and Green 2006) point out that type and token frequencies play a pivotal role in a usage-based model.
of language, in that token frequency is said to correspond to the degree of entrenchment of a word; while a high type frequency corresponds to the entrenchment of a schema. In other words, the more a word is used the more established it becomes in a language; whereas a high type frequency points to the fact that a particular form is used more when compared to other forms related to it. For example, if a schema such as \([\text{MAN-PL}]\) has a high type frequency then it means that it would be more entrenched than the singular form. Langacker (1987: 380) points out that a high degree of entrenchment is a major determinant of prototypicality. This exposition will be continued in Chapter 7.

4.4 Definition of Relevant Cognitive Grammar Terminology

4.4.1 Predicate and Predication

Langacker’s use of the terms predicate and predication refers to the units that make up a language. Langacker (1987: 197) defines them thus,

> The building blocks of grammar are minimal symbolic units, i.e. morphemes. I refer to the semantic pole of a morpheme as a predicate, and to the semantic pole of any linguistic expression as a predication. All predicates are therefore predications, but the converse is not so.

According to Langacker’s definition, the semantic poles of morphemes are predicates, while predications are the semantic poles of linguistic expressions. Predicates (the semantic poles of morphemes) are also predications (the semantic poles of linguistic expressions), but predications cannot be predicates. In other words, morphemes are linguistic expressions, but the converse is not true because by their make-up linguistic expressions are larger than morphemes. Predicates in cognitive grammar are defined according to a domain.

4.4.2 Profile and Base

The base, according to Langacker (1987: 183) is the scope of a predication while the profile is its designatum. The semantic value of a linguistic expression is said to be derived from a combination of both the profile and the base. Langacker’s sense of the word designation refers to the relationship between a cognitive domain and its subparts. The profile is the concept that is symbolized by the linguistic expression, while the base is the background knowledge within which a predicate is explained. Taylor (2002: 195) states that the base of an expression is the conceptual content that is inherently, intrinsically, and
obligatorily invoked by the expression. For example, *knuckle* is profiled in relation to *finger* which is its base, while *finger* is profiled in relation to the *hand*, with the *hand* being profiled in relation to the arm and so on. Taylor (ibid: 193) uses the concept hypotenuse to explain profile and base. He states that,

> The straight line is what the word profiles, or designates. The straight line, however, is one which functions as one side of a right-angled triangle. The right-angled triangle itself is not profiled; the profile picks out one facet of the base and renders it particularly prominent.

With reference to parts of speech, we will refer to nominal profiles and relational profiles and how parts of speech are distinguished on the basis of what they profile. Nouns have a nominal profile in that they profile things. Other parts of speech such as verbs, adjectives, adverbs and prepositions have a relational profile in that they profile relations.

### 4.4.3 Domains

Semantic units in cognitive grammar are also characterized in relation to some cognitive domain. In other words, semantic units are conceptualized in relation to contexts, and these contexts are what are referred to as domains. A domain can be called a background against which something is conceptualized, or the frame of reference used by the mind to place concepts; or the conceptual content within which meaning is conceptualized. Meaning is thus described in terms of semantic structures (predications) which are in turn described according to cognitive domains. For example, we explained that the base for *knuckle* is *finger*, and at the same time, these body parts have to be conceptualized in relation to the human body which is their domain. Similarly, *Monday* is conceptualized with reference to the seven day *week*, hence *week* is the domain for *Monday*, because Monday is understood as being a part of a full week. Similarly, the conceptualization of *red* is against the domain of colour. A domain is therefore any knowledge configuration which provides the context for the conceptualization of a semantic unit (Taylor 2002: 196).

### 4.4.4 Figure and Ground Alignment

Semantic structure also requires hierarchies of figure-ground organization. Langacker (1987: 120) states that,

> […] the figure within a scene is a substructure perceived as “standing out” from the remainder (the ground) and accorded special prominence as the pivotal entity around which the scene is organised and for which it provides a setting.
In other words, the aspect in a visual scene that stands out is the figure (foreground), while the salient entity is the ground (background). For example,

1a. The hunter killed the bear.
1b. The bear was killed by the hunter.

Examples (1a) and (1b) describe the same scene. In (1a) the scene describes what the hunter did and in this scene the hunter is the figure because he is the one who is given significance over the bear. In (1b) the situation is reversed and the bear becomes the figure because the scene describes what happened to the bear. Figure and ground alignment is characteristic of the participants in a relational profile in that one participant is construed in relation to the other. The figure in the relational profile is characterized in reference to the salient entity, the ground; and in a reversal, where the ground becomes the figure, it is also characterized according to the ground. For instance, Langacker postulates that expressions such as: \( X \) resembles \( Y \) and \( Y \) resembles \( X \), are semantically distinct and in the first instance \( X \) is described in relation to its resemblance to \( Y \). In \( Y \) resembles \( X \) it is \( Y \) that is being described according to its resemblance to \( X \).

### 4.4.5 Trajector and Landmark Asymmetry

A distinction is also made between a trajector and a landmark. Langacker (1987: 217) defines them thus,

In virtually every relational predication, an asymmetry can be observed between the profiled participants. One of them, called the trajector, has special status and is characterized as the figure within a relational profile […] Other salient entities in a relational predication are referred to as landmarks, so called because they are viewed (in prototypical instances) as providing points of reference for locating the trajector.

In a relational predication, one of the profiled participants is given prominence and it is the one referred to as the trajector, while the other participant is the landmark. We will make use of the prepositions above and below to illustrate this asymmetry.

2a. The mirror above the table.
2b. The table below the mirror.

In (2a) the mirror is the trajector and the table is the landmark. This is reversed in (2b) where the table is given the focus of attention and becomes the trajector and the mirror being salient becomes the landmark. The trajector/landmark symmetry may be said to be
equivalent to the subject/object relation. Langacker (ibid: 232), however, states that the trajector/landmark distinction is more applicable than the subject/object distinction in that subject and object are in most cases regarded as noun phrases with specific roles in a clause. Trajectors and landmarks, on the other hand, do not have to be overtly specified and they are also relational rather than nominal. Adjectives have one focal participant, the trajector.

### 4.5 Approaches to Categorization

A category can basically be defined as a number of objects that are considered equivalent (Rosch 1978: 30). Labov (1973: 342) points out that:

> If linguistics can be said to be any one thing it is the study of categories: that is, the study of how language translates meaning into sound through the categorization of reality into discrete units and sets of units. Questions like: Do categories have any basis in the real world […]? What is their internal structure? What kinds of relationships exist amongst categories? must inevitably be of vital importance to linguists […]

There are two main approaches to categorization: the classical approach and the non-classical approaches. The classical approach (also referred to as the logical approach, the Aristotelian approach, or the criterial-attribute model) treats categories as homogenous units with discrete and clear-cut boundaries. The non-classical approaches include the family resemblance model and the prototype model. These two non-classical models are based on family resemblances and prototype notions with fuzzy boundaries.

#### 4.5.1 The Classical Model

The classical view of categories is based on the premise that categories are defined in terms of the common properties that are shared by their members. Lakoff (1987) refers to the classical view as the traditional way of categorization which regards things to be in the same category if and only if they have certain properties in common. The classical approach makes four basic claims:

1. **Categories are defined according to necessary and sufficient features**

   The features of members in a particular category are viewed as binding to all the members of the category, and for that reason, a member has to have all the necessary features in order to belong to the category. Failure to have all the necessary features
disqualifies an entity from belonging to a category. As such, an entity either belongs to a category or it does not.

ii. Features are binary

Features have a [+ ] or [- ] value, hence an entity in a category either has a particular feature or it does not.

iii. Categories have clear boundaries – boundaries are clear and sharp.

iv. All members of a category have equal status

No member in the category is a better member in comparison to other members. There are no degrees of membership in a category.

According to the classical approach, categories are made up of clear-cut, discrete features. Entities are therefore either inside or outside the category. A category is as a result defined by a limited set of necessary and sufficient conditions. To use the BIRD example cited by Ungerer and Schmid (1996: 22), a creature is only a bird if it has two wings and two legs, a beak, feathers and lays eggs. If a creature has some of these necessary conditions but has one missing wing, then according to the classical view, it can no longer be regarded as a bird because it has failed to meet all the criterial conditions to belong to the BIRD category. As a result, flightless birds or birds that do not lay eggs are excluded from category membership because they lack the necessary conditions required for the category. Category membership is thus an all-or-nothing affair, with no in-between members. Lakoff (1987: 45) states that:

A category has clear, well-defined members and membership in the category is defined by necessary and sufficient conditions shared by all the members of the category.

Givón (1984: 13) presents this possession or non-possession of criterial properties diagrammatically as shown in Figure 2. According to Givón, A is the determinant of the necessary and sufficient properties, while B is a member of category A which has the features required to fit into category A membership. C is not a member of A because it lacks the features required by A, hence its position outside of A.
Rosch and Mervis (1975) and Rosch (1978) criticized the classical view to categories as being too rigid. Croft and Cruse (2004: 76) also cite the shortcomings of this model as being firstly that necessary and sufficient features are simply not available for all members of a category; secondly, there are no degrees of membership but all members are judged equally; and finally, that the classical model fails to address issues of the vagueness or fuzziness of category boundaries. A parallel can be drawn between the generative approach and the classical model in that they both use the feature system, thereby driving the point that a word belongs to a particular category only if it satisfies the criterial properties of that category.

Applying this model to our study, we will point out the fact that the weakness of the morphological criterion is that it can also be likened to the classical approach in positing rigid criterial features for the adjectives. The adjectives that have so far been identified were only those that had the same morphological form, but as our data reveals, not all the adjectives have the same morphological and syntactic characteristics, but they have some features in common and some resemblance to the prototype. As a result, the prototype theory and the family resemblance model are the most suitable models for describing the mixed morphological and syntactic characteristics of the Shona adjective class.

4.5.2. Non-classical Approaches
4.5.2.1 Family Resemblance Model
The family resemblance model was proposed as an alternative to the classical model. The model was first proposed by Ludwig Wittgenstein (1958) and it is based on the principle of
family members, in that they may all not look alike but they can have one or two distinctive features. Wittgenstein (1953: 20) stated that when one looks at the category Spiel ‘GAME’, one will not see something that is common to all games, but rather, one sees similarities and relationships:

Consider for example the proceedings that we call ‘games’. I mean board-games, card-games, ball-games, Olympic games, and so on. What is common to them all? – Don’t say: ‘There must be something common, or they would not be called “games”’ – but look and see whether there is anything common to all. – For if you look at them you will not see something that is common to all, but similarities, relationships, and a whole series of them at that. To repeat: don’t think but look! - For example at board-games, with their multifarious relationships. Now pass to card-games; here you find many correspondences with the first group, but many common features drop out, and others appear. When we pass next to ball-games, much that is common is retained, but much is lost. – Are they all ‘amusing’? Compare chess with noughts and crosses. Or is there always winning and losing, or competition between players? […] And the result of this examination is: we see a complicated network of similarities overlapping and criss-crossing: sometimes overall similarities, sometimes similarities of detail. I can think of no better expression to characterize these similarities than ‘family resemblances’: for the various resemblances between members of a family: build, features, colour of eyes, gait, temperament etc. etc. overlap and criss-cross in the same way. – And I shall say: ‘games’ form a family […]

According to Wittgenstein, games share some similarities, but it is neither possible nor logical to expect to find a feature that they all share. Instead, they all belong to the category GAME because of some shared similarities. Rosch and Mervis (1975: 575) state that a family resemblance relationship consists of a set of items of the form $AB$, $BC$, $CD$, $DE$, as shown in Figure 3.

**Figure 3 Family resemblance relationship**

That is, $A$ will share properties with $B$, $B$ with $C$, $C$ with $D$, $D$ with $E$. $A$ and $E$ may not have any common properties, hence no resemblance. Each item will have at least one, and probably several, elements in common with one or more other items, but no, or few, elements are common to all items. Category membership is also defined by an item’s possession of a simple set of criterial features and those possessing these criterial features have an equal degree of membership. The relationship of family resemblances is one of
similarity and overlap. According to Taylor (1995: 173), the family resemblance model is a
cognate of the prototype theory in that prototype categories can be coordinated in family
resemblance structures.

4.5.2.2 Prototype Theory

The pioneering work on the prototype theory was carried out in the 1960s and 1970s by
Brent Berlin and Paul Kay (1969), Eleanor Rosch (1973 and 1975) and Caroline Mervis
(1975), among others. They looked at natural categories such as COLOUR and
FURNITURE and how they are perceived in different languages. The research and
conclusions of Berlin and Kay and Rosch offered an interpretation to categorization that
was different from the classical approach and its rigid definition of category membership.
The work of these researchers was based on ‘focal’ category membership that postulated
best exemplars of a category as well as graded category membership. Langacker’s notion
of prototypes stems from this research in cognitive psychology. Langacker (1987: 17 and
371) defines a prototype as follows:

[...] prototypical instances are full, central members of the category, whereas other instances
form a gradation from central to peripheral depending on how far and in what ways they
deviate from the prototype.

A prototype is a typical instance of a category, and other elements are assimilated to the
category on the basis of their perceived resemblance to the prototype; there are degrees of
membership based on degrees of similarity.

The prototype theory postulates that categories are formed around prototypes and
resemblance to the prototype, and not according to a yes-or-no distinction (Ungerer and
Schmid 1996: 14). A prototype may be defined as the most representative, or most salient,
instance of a schema (Taylor 2003: 591). In other words, a prototype is the clearest, central
or best member of a category. Rosch and Mervis state that the prototypical members of a
category have more attributes in common with other members of the same category, but
display fewer attributes with members of contrasting categories. The major premise of the
the prototype theory are the following:

i. A category has central and peripheral members

Categories are structured according to best examples of the category. It follows, therefore,
that some members of the category are better members than others. The existence of a
prototype or a better member in a category implies the existence of not so good examples
or peripheral members of the category. These peripheral members will share only a few features with other members of the category. Hence, the core or prototypical members will have the properties requisite for that category, while the peripheral members are not expected to display all the features possessed by the other category members. If a category lacks some of the category values, it is a nonprototypical member of the category. The theory of prototypes is enmeshed in family resemblances. Category membership is based on resemblance or similarity to the prototype. Category members also share similar features. Langacker (1987: 17) points out that,

The prototype theory thus avoids the problems inherent in the criterial-attribute model. First, it does not require that every member of a category possess a given feature (or even that there be any salient property shared by all members). Flightless birds, egg-laying mammals, and voiceless vowels are thus unproblematic; the absence of an obviously essential property does not force their removal from a category, but merely renders them nonprototypical.

ii. *Category membership is a matter of degree*

Prototypicality and peripheral category membership imply that category members do not have equal status but that some members are better members of a category than others. There is gradience of best case exemplars to not so good category members. Unlike in the classical model where all members of a category are treated equally, in the prototype model not all members have the same status (Croft and Cruse 2004: 77). There is rather, a gradation of membership from best case examples or the prototype, to less prototypical category members.

iii. *Categories have fuzzy boundaries*

Category boundaries are fuzzy and not clear-cut. There is gradation and overlap in the similarities of the category members. There is also overlap and similarity with members of other categories. Categories are also nondiscrete. This is best illustrated by Labov’s (1973) experiment of cups and cup-like objects. In this experiment, nine containers with different shapes and sizes, but which resembled a cup, were used as shown in Figure 4. Vessel number 1 in the experiment was the prototypical cup, and prototypical instances decreased from vessel 2 downwards, with some vessels being identified by the informants as bowls rather than cups.
The experiment revealed that there is gradience in category membership between the best example and the peripheral examples of a category. Taylor (1995: 60) highlights that entities are assigned membership in a category by virtue of their similarity to the prototype; and the closer the entity to the prototype, the more central its status within the category. The experiment also showed that there is no clear-cut boundary where one may say this is where the boundary for cups ends and that of bowls begins but rather, their boundaries are fuzzy.

Cognitive grammar therefore regards categories as prototype notions with fuzzy boundaries and that a category consists of prototypical and non-typical members (Langacker 1987; Croft 2003; Taylor 2003). The prototype theory has been extended to other fields of study such as grammatical categories. Parts of speech are also seen as consisting of a prototype, that is, the central or core member that has all the necessary features for that category; and boundary cases that extend from the prototype to other members in other categories, what Croft (2004: 163) refers to as peripheral members and that these members do not display the full behavioral potential that a central member displays. Langacker’s (1987: 14) characterizations of language is that it,

[...] is a matter of degree. Linguistic relationships are not invariably all-or-nothing affairs, nor are linguistic categories always sharply defined and never fuzzy around the edges.
4.6 Cognitive Grammar Approach to Parts of Speech

4.6.1 Langacker

In relation to his approach to parts of speech Langacker (1987: 189) states that,

Counter to received wisdom, I claim that basic grammatical categories such as noun, verb, adjective, and adverb are semantically definable. The entities referred to as nouns, verbs, etc. are symbolic units, each with a semantic and a phonological pole, but it is the former that determines the categorization. All members of a given class share fundamental semantic properties, and their semantic poles thus instantiate a single abstract schema subject to reasonably explicit characterization.

Two points can be noted from Langacker’s statement. Firstly, his definitions of the parts of speech go beyond traditional definitions in that his framework suggests that the parts of speech are symbolic units that have a semantic and phonological pole. Secondly, the semantic pole is the determinant of categorization in that members of a particular class are said to share similar semantic properties. These two points will be expanded upon in the ensuing discussion. Langacker (1987: 183) identifies two types of predicates:

i. a nominal predicate which designates a thing;

ii. a relational predicate which designates either an atemporal relation or a process.

Langacker (1987: 214) states that:

Relational predications divide into two groups depending on whether they designate a process or an atemporal relation.

Relational predications are said to have a trajector and landmark which forms part of their profile. The difference between temporal relations and atemporal relations is that with temporal relations their profile involves a span of time over which the process occurs, while atemporal relations do not have this span of time in their profile. Atemporal relations are said to correspond to categories such as adjectives, adverbs, prepositions, infinitives and participles. Nouns are also atemporal in that they do not designate processes. This distinction between nouns being atemporal and verbs as temporal was recognized as far back as the Greek era by Aristotle. Parts of speech in cognitive grammar are therefore defined according to the nature of their profiles or their designatum.

4.6.1.1. Nouns

In his definition of the nominal predicate THING, Langacker (1987: 183) says,
The definition of a thing is abstract: it makes reference not to physical objects but rather to cognitive events. A symbolic structure whose semantic pole designates a thing is categorized as a noun.

A thing is also defined as being a region in some domain. Every nominal predication is therefore said to designate a region which is a set of interconnected entities. A region is bounded, meaning that it does not extend indefinitely (Langacker 1990: 67). Langacker (1987: 214) adds that a nominal predication designates a thing, and functions as the semantic pole of a noun. In other words, a noun profiles a thing.

The word thing as used by Langacker is not limited to physical objects, but it also includes abstract nouns. The abstract nouns are included in Langacker’s noun schema in that the noun schema refers to the cognitive abilities of grouping and reification. The cognitive process of grouping entails the recognition of entities as a group if they are interconnected and share similar properties. By reification is meant the ability to regard an abstract entity as a concrete thing. Based on these two cognitive processes, Langacker offers the definition of a thing as a product of grouping and reification, such that even nouns such as recipe, moment, setting, instant, period, etc. can be accommodated by this definition. The way the noun is defined is different from the definition offered by traditional grammar which only took into account people, places and things. Langacker also points out that the prototypical nouns are the physical objects.

4.6.1.2 Adjectives

Langacker (1987: 189) semantically defines adjectives as designating different kinds of atemporal relations. The trajector of an adjective is a thing (noun) which it describes as having a certain property. Atemporal relations have one focal participant, the trajector, while the landmark is not specified. This is explained as follows by Langacker (2008: 114):

There is just one focal participant because the adjective itself specifies both the property and the scalar position. Neither is construed as an independently existing entity requiring separate identification.

The focal participants and the nature of the trajectors are the two parameters that differentiate the classes of relational expressions. Adjectives and adverbs both have one
focal participant, and adjectives differ from adverbs in that adjectives have a thing for their trajector whereas the trajector for adverbs is a process.

Langacker (1987: 249) points out that there are two types of atemporal relations: (i) simple atemporal relations that profile only a single relational configuration; and (ii) complex atemporal relations that resemble processes and profile a series of relational configurations, such as infinitives functioning as noun modifiers. While complex atemporal relations may resemble processes, still their profile is static and does not involve movement in time. Langacker (1990: 81) further highlights that a simple atemporal relation, which is stative, is profiled in a single consistent configuration, hence its stativity. The complex atemporal relations in Shona correspond to the subclass of verbs that function as noun modifiers, as will be shown in Chapter 8. Langacker also points out that the prototypical adjectives are those that describe inherent characteristics.

The symbolic nature of linguistic expressions is also defined according to what Langacker (1987) refers to as valence relations. Valency is a term derived from chemistry and used in frameworks such as dependency grammar to refer to the number and kind of arguments that a verb may take. In the cognitive grammar sense these valence relations are combinations of two or more symbolic units. A symbolic unit in the valence relation is called a component structure and the resultant structure formed from the combination of two or more component structures is referred to as a composite structure. Langacker treats constructions according to four factors: correspondence, profiling, elaboration and constituency. Correspondence refers to how component and composite structures fit together in a coherent assembly. For instance, an adjective combines with a noun to form a composite structure. The valence of an adjective is one because its profile requires a noun which it can elaborate by specifying its characteristics. Langacker’s treatment of valency is similar to that of Croft (cf. 4.6.3). Though they use different terminology, the fact remains that valency is concerned with the relationship of the subparts in a composite structure.

4.6.1.3 Verbs

Processes are also referred to as temporal relations. Processual predications correspond to the class of verbs; and they are defined by Langacker (1987: 244) as follows:
A verb is a symbolic expression whose semantic pole profiles a *process* [...] the conceptualization of a process follows the temporal evolution of a situation. It involves a continuous series of states representing different phases of the process and construed as occupying a continuous series of points in conceived time. The span of time during which its evolution is tracked is referred to as the **temporal profile** of the process.

Langacker (ibid) points out that processes have a positive (i.e. nonzero) temporal profile because their evolution through time is criterial. The other characteristic of processes is that they involve sequential scanning which is a requisite characteristic for processual predications as it defines what it means to follow the evolution of a situation through time. By way of illustration we will make reference to the verb *walk* as described by Langacker (ibid: 268). Some processual predications require subtrajectories, and the verb *walk* is one such verb. A trajectory refers to the actions carried out by the trajector. Langacker states that the verb *walk* has two subtrajectories, one being reflexive and referring to the trajector’s leg motions and the other subtrajectory being nonreflexive and referring to the trajector’s movement through space in relation to his/her surroundings. Taylor (2002: 207) states that verbs are selective of the entities that can be their landmarks. In this case, the profile of *walk* requires a living thing that has legs and can move through space from one point to the next. Similarly, a verb such as *drink* would require a liquid as its landmark. Langacker also points out that the prototypical verbs are those that involve the use of energy and change.

4.6.2 Givón

4.6.2.1 Givón (1979)

In Chapter 2, we discussed the descriptions of the parts of speech by Thomas of Erfut in the *Grammatica Speculativa* and we alluded to their influence on Givón’s parts of speech descriptions. As such the notion of TEMPORALITY or TIME STABILITY was formulated in the thirteenth century within the modist theory of the Speculative Grammar (cf. 2.4.1). Givón (1979) defines parts of speech according to how they are cognized or construed on the basis of the spatio-temporal dimensions, that is, in terms of time and space. On these dimensions, Givón (1979) defines nouns, adjectives and verbs as follows:

**Nouns**

Nouns are entities that occupy a spatial deixis, that is to say, nouns occupy a space. Givón (1979: 320) explains it thus,
Phenomena which do not tend to change their identities over time tend to be lexicalized as nouns; they are thus considered entities [...] Thus the noun universe of languages [...] codes ‘more concrete’ entities, that is, those that exist in space and time. The primary modality of the noun universe is spatial deixis, nouns are characterized by space-indicating demonstratives, most commonly hinging the noun vis-à-vis the spatial position of the speaker and hearer.

**Adjectives**
Adjectives are defined as being intermediately time-stable, that is, they are said to depict states that have a varying degree of intermediate duration. Givón (ibid) also points out that, Phenomena which change over time at a certain intermediate rate are those which have the highest potential of lexicalizing as adjectives; that is, they are considered states. This is similar to Langacker’s definition of the adjective that also refers to adjectives as states.

**Verbs**
Verbs, on the other hand, are described by Givón (ibid: 266) as phenomena that change rapidly over time. Verbs are coded as events and actions. The notion of temporality also underlies Givón’s (ibid: 320) description of verbs. He states that,

On the other side of the lexical continuum we find verbs, which most commonly map actions and events. That is, they most commonly map entities that are ‘less concrete’ than nouns, that have most typically only existence in time. In fact, the most common linguistic modality associated with verbs involves time deixis, that is, tense-aspects.

### 4.6.2.2. Givón (1984)

Givón’s 1984 work is a continuation of the ideas he had developed in 1979. His thrust in the 1984 work is semantic-cognitive-functional and he suggests that the parts of speech noun, verb and adjective can be defined according to the semantic dimension that he refers to as the time-stability scale.

**Nouns**
Givón (1984: 51) refers to nouns as experiences which are stable over time. Experiences - or phenomenological clusters - which stay relatively stable over time, i.e. those which over repeated scans appear to be roughly ‘the same’, tend to be lexicalized in human language as nouns.

**Adjectives**
Adjectives occupy the middle of the time-stability scale. Most commonly they embrace at least the time-stable physical properties such as size, shape, colour, texture, smell or taste.
**Verbs**

At the other extreme of the lexical - phenomenological scale, one finds experiential clusters denoting rapid changes in the state of the universe. These are prototypically events or actions, and languages tend to lexicalize them as verbs.

To sum up Givón’s (1979 and 1984) assertions, nouns are the most stable over time, followed by adjectives which code stable qualities; and verbs are the least stable because they undergo rapid change over time. Givón’s hypothesis therefore takes the noun to be the most stable in comparison to the verb and the adjective. The noun is said to denote things which are long-term states of affairs and hence do no change their identity over time. The adjective is the intermediate category that denotes states and properties, which are medium-term states of affairs. The verb is the least stable because it denotes events which are short-term states of affairs that change rapidly over time. As such, the referents of verbs therefore have existence over a certain period in time while a noun’s referent is an identifiable enduring thing (Givón 1979). Croft (1991: 63) refers to this phenomenon as **stativity** and he states that it represents change over time, as we will show in the succeeding section. Givón’s analysis of parts of speech in also based on the cognitive and neurological paradigm, hence his assertions are in tandem with those of Langacker. The assertions by Langacker and Givón that the prototypical adjectives denote inherent or time-stable properties will also inform the semantic analysis of adjectives in Chapter 7.

**4.6.3 The Universal-Typological Theory of Parts of Speech**

Croft (1991, 2001 and 2003) presents a theory of parts of speech which he refers to as the universal-typological theory of parts of speech. It is a cognitive theory which investigates language facts on the basis of function and it asserts that grammatical structures are represented in the mind of the speaker (Croft 2001: 3). In other words, grammatical structures are conceptualizations. The universal-typological theory of parts of speech combines descriptions based on semantic class and discourse functions. The constructions in a language are said to be the basic elements of syntactic structure which are defined by the constructions of the language. That is, categories are derived from constructions, and not vice versa; moreover, a word’s function in a construction is what determines its categorization. In putting forward a universal-typological theory of parts of speech, Croft’s (2001: 87) assertion is that,

> [...] the semantic classes of OBJECTS, PROPERTIES, and ACTIONS are the TYPOLOGICAL PROTOTYPES of referring, attributive, and predicating constructions respectively.
Croft thus asserts that these three propositional acts should be able to describe the referring, predicative and attributive constructions of any language.

Croft further discusses the propositional acts on the basis of four semantic criteria, namely, VALENCY, STATIVITY, TRANSITORINESS and GRADABILITY. Valency refers to the inherent relationality of a concept or the number of ‘arguments’ required by the concept, that is, whether a concept needs to be explained with reference to another concept. Nouns are said to have a valency of zero because they are do not need reference to another concept. Both adjectives and verbs are inherently relational with adjectives having a valency of 1 whereas verbs have a valency of 1 and above. For instance, an action such as run requires that one refer to the runner, while a property such as short requires reference to an entity that can be described in relation to height. Relationality is therefore a characteristic of actions and properties. This aspect of the relationality of verbs and adjectives is in tandem with Langacker’s descriptions of adjectives and verbs as relational predications.

Stativity, on the other hand, refers to whether a concept is a state or a process, while transitoriness refers to whether the concept is a transitory state, a process or a permanent state. As Croft points out, only states are permanent. The last criterion, gradability, refers to whether a concept is gradable. Croft’s hypothesis is that these four semantic criteria should be able to describe the semantic classes of OBJECTS, ACTIONS and PROPERTIES, as shown in Table 14.

**Table 14 Semantic properties of prototypical parts of speech**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Relationality</th>
<th>Stativity</th>
<th>Transitoriness</th>
<th>Gradability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objects</td>
<td>nongradable</td>
<td>state</td>
<td>permanent</td>
<td>nongradable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Properties</td>
<td>relational</td>
<td>state</td>
<td>permanent</td>
<td>gradable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions</td>
<td>relational</td>
<td>process</td>
<td>transitory</td>
<td>nongradable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14 shows categories in their prototypical functions, what Croft (2001: 88) refers to as a typological prototype. Croft (ibid) states that:
A typological prototype category is a functionally defined category that is typologically unmarked with respect to the relevant constructions. In the case of parts of speech, the relevant constructions include those constructions used for reference, modification, and predication. 

Table 14 establishes that the typological prototypes are unmarked in their respective functions of reference, modification and predication. In their prototypical function, the parts of speech do not require any additional morphemes in order to encode a particular function. This unmarked function is also referred to by Croft (ibid: 89) as zero structural coding function. Croft further highlights that the semantic class and propositional act functions dichotomy constitute the typologically unmarked prototypes. In light of this hypothesis, Croft (ibid) defines the parts of speech as follows:

- **noun** = reference to an object
- **adjective** = modification by a property
- **verb** = predication of an action

However, a property word may also be used as a referring expression, while an action word may also be used as a modifier. In order to be able to perform these nonprototypical functions, the respective parts of speech would require to be overtly marked by additional morphemes, what Croft (2001: 88) calls overt structural coding or typological markedness, and this is presented in Table 15.

### Table 15 Overt structural coding constructions for parts of speech

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Modification</th>
<th>Predication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objects</strong></td>
<td>UNMARKED NOUNS</td>
<td>genitive, adjectivalizations, PPs on nouns</td>
<td>predicate nominals, copulas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Properties</strong></td>
<td>deadjectival nouns</td>
<td>UNMARKED ADJECTIVES</td>
<td>predicate adjectives, copulas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actions</strong></td>
<td>action nominals, complements, infinitives, gerunds</td>
<td>participles, relative clauses</td>
<td>UNMARKED VERBS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that in order for an object to function as a modifier, it requires the genitive morpheme, adjectivalizations or prepositions on nouns; while on the other hand, deadjectival nouns can function as property words. The various structural coding
mechanisms that are required by nouns and verbs in Shona to function as modifiers will be discussed in Chapter 8, and summarized in Table 26.

4.7 Summary

The chapter started by defining some of cognitive grammar’s key concepts that are pertinent to this study, and these include the symbolic nature of language, the morphology-syntax continuum, and the centrality of meaning under which we highlighted the notion of image schemas and Dixon’s semantic types. The chapter also compared the two approaches to categorization: the classical approach and the non-classical approaches. It highlighted the assumptions of these approaches and showed the weaknesses of the classical approach. The chapter discussed in detail the non-classical approaches, among which is the prototype theory. It also highlighted that the fundamental principle of cognitive grammar is its treatment of categories according to functional and semantic criteria and this enables it to explain notions such as prototypes and membership gradience, issues that are central to this study. The definitions of adjectives, nouns and verbs propounded by Langacker, Givón and Croft were also discussed.
Chapter 5 Methodology

5.1 Introduction

One of the purposes of a methodology is to demonstrate the authenticity of the data and techniques professed to have been employed. To that end this chapter describes the materials and guiding principles that shaped this study. McEnery and Wilson (2001: 76) highlight that the trend in research in general has become multi-method, that is to say, research is not only guided by a single research method but by several methods. This study used a multi-method approach. The inventory of adjectives that were analysed in this study are mainly the Shona dictionary *Duramazwi Guru reChiShona* whereas the method entailed an analysis of the adjectives from the dictionary and other sources using the Shona corpus as a resource for examples and concordances from which the arguments and conclusions arrived at were drawn. Both the dictionary and corpus are published products hence they have been proven to be authentic and authoritative. In that respect they are considered to be empirical data. The other sources that were drawn upon to complement the corpus include other dictionaries, and the methods of elicitation and introspection/intuition. The data that was used in this study is verifiable in the sense that the sources for examples is given in each instance. Accordingly, all sources of examples are indicated.

The chapter is organised as follows: section 5.2 brings to light the materials that were used in this study. Section 5.3 highlights the method employed in the analysis of the data taken from the materials treated in 5.2; this being the use of the corpus in linguistic studies. Section 5.4 offers a description of the ALLEX-ALRI Shona corpus from which the bulk of the examples used in this study were drawn. We also describe the concordance searches from the Shona corpus and we also detail how the frequency counts of the adjectives were
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conducted. The discussion in 5.5 highlights the limitations of the Shona corpus, and it points out that the study also had to use the methods of elicitation and introspection/intuition to supplement the corpus data. Section 5.6 is a summary of the chapter.

5.2 Grammars and Lexicographic Data
This section outlines the materials used in this study, namely, grammars and lexicographic data. These are discussed in turn.

5.2.1 Shona Grammars
The Shona grammars that we analysed were the grammars by C. S. Louw (1930), J. O’Neil (1935), George Fortune (1955-1984), and Willie L. Chigidi (1986). These grammars have already been discussed in Chapter 3. The purpose for using these grammars was to analyse how parts of speech, in particular adjectives, have been described in earlier Shona grammars. Each of these grammars was analysed in relation to the adjectives that they identified, their definition of the adjective and the criteria used. The analysis of the adjectives in these grammars was also in part comparative in that we analysed and highlighted their similarities and differences in relation to the content of their respective adjective classes.

5.2.2 Grammars of Bantu and African Languages
The discussion in Chapter 3 was informed by grammars of other Bantu languages (i.e. Swahili, Chichewa/Chinyanja and KiVunjo-Chaga) as well as by grammars of some African languages (i.e. Hausa, Akan and Ngamambo). These grammars served as reference material for analysing how the adjective has been described in other Bantu languages as well as in selected African languages. The other reason for their utilization emanated from the fact that we sought to compare the similarities in methods and analyses with grammars of Shona.

5.2.3 Lexicographic Data
The inventory of adjectives analysed in this study was taken from the dictionary, Duramazwi Guru reChiShona (2001). This dictionary was compiled by a team of mother
tongue Shona speakers, of whom the present researcher was a part. The number of entries in this dictionary is 36,409 headwords in 1228 pages. It was compiled electronically, as a result we were able to retrieve the headwords with the word class marker pr, the abbreviation for chipauro ‘adjective’ from the dictionary database. The inventory of adjectives taken from the *Duramazwi Guru reChiShona* is given in Appendix A and it comprises sixty nine adjectives. In addition, the dictionary was used a source for examples. All examples marked [DGS] are from this dictionary.

This study analyses ninety adjectives, among which are the sixty nine adjectives from *Duramazwi Guru reChiShona*. The rest of the twenty one adjectives were extracted from other sources which include other dictionaries and the Shona corpus. In particular, the adjective -dikwanwe ‘small’ is taken from the *Standard Shona Dictionary* (Hannan 1974) and is corroborated as an adjective by the researcher’s introspective knowledge. The Standard Shona Dictionary in addition served as a reference for the glossing of examples. All examples abbreviated [SSD] were taken from the *Standard Shona Dictionary*.

We also added the lexemes -kadzi ‘female’ and -kono ‘male’ which we will argue in Chapter 7 to be adjectives. These had previously been classified as nouns in *Duramazwi Guru reChiShona*. We also added to the inventory of adjectives the adjectives -e-bhuluul/-e-bhuruu ‘blue’ and -e-pungi ‘pink’ that were categorized as nouns in *Duramazwi Guru reChiShona*. The justification for this recategorization is that they are similar to the adjectives -e-redhi ‘red’, -e-girini ‘green’, -e-pepuru ‘purple’ etc. that belong to Subgroup D (cf. 7.3.4). The full list of words described as adjectives in this study is presented in Appendix B.

An analysis of these adjectives was carried out based on their morphological, syntactic and semantic behaviour and other criteria outlined in Chapter 7. Based on those criteria, the Shona adjectives were subsequently divided into seven subgroups. The subgroups did not display the same characteristics, as amply demonstrated in Chapter 7, thereby showing a graded category structure, with some subgroups being better members of the category adjective. We therefore posited a prototype structure of the subgroups following the prototype theory of cognitive grammar that was detailed in Chapter 4. We were able to identify the subgroup that we refer to as the prototypical adjective subgroup and
subsequently analysed the other subgroups in relation to how they differ from the prototype. The meanings of the adjectives were also discussed according to their contexts in the corpus and from other sources as outlined in 5.3.

5.3 The Corpus Linguistics Approach

The method of using the corpus as a source of data for linguistic analysis has been referred to as corpus linguistics. Corpus linguistics is a methodology that uses corpora to test or describe assumptions about a language. According to Hunston and Francis (1996: 15), corpus linguistics is a way of investigating language by observing large amounts of naturally-occurring, electronically stored discourse. In corpus linguistics, one studies language based on real life language use. Renouf (1996: 1) defines the corpus as follows:

The term ‘corpus’ will be used to refer to a collection of texts, of the written or spoken word, which is stored and processed on computer for the purposes of linguistic research.

The corpus (plural corpora) is thus as a collection of texts, collected with a specific purpose, either to study a language, or part of a language and it serves the purpose of providing textual evidence for statements about a language. The corpus is used for a number of purposes in linguistic studies. It has been regarded as an important source of data which enables the linguist to make statements which are objective and based on language as it really is (McEnery and Wilson 2001: 103). McEnery and Wilson (ibid) note that,

The importance of corpora in language study is closely allied to the importance more generally of empirical data. Empirical data enable the linguist to make statements which are objective and based on language as it really is rather than statements which are subjective and based upon the individual’s own internalised cognitive perception of the language […] Corpus linguistics proper, therefore, should be seen as a subset of the activity within an empirical approach to linguistics: corpus linguistics necessarily entails an empirical approach […]

The justification for using the corpus linguistics approach stems from the many merits of the corpus, among which is the possibility of studying patterned ways in which speakers use their language. Corpus linguistics is an empirical science because it uses data that is observable and testable. Empiricism is an approach based upon the analysis of external data. The findings of this research can therefore be proven against evidence from corpus data.
5.3.2 Corpus-driven vs. Corpus-based Approach

Corpus linguistics methodologies can either be corpus-based or corpus-driven. According to Tognini-Bonelli (2001: 65),

Corpus-based refers to a methodology that avails itself of the corpus mainly to expound, test or exemplify theories and descriptions that were formulated before large corpora became available to inform language study.

In the corpus-driven approach, according to Tognini-Bonelli (ibid: 84),

[…] descriptions are based on corpus evidence and the commitment of the linguist is to the integrity of the data as a whole, and the descriptions aim to be comprehensive with respect to corpus evidence. The corpus therefore is seen as more than a repository of examples to back pre-existing theories or a probabilistic extension to an already well defined system. The theoretical statements are fully consistent with, and reflect directly, the evidence provided by the corpus.

In the corpus-driven approach the corpus is the sole source of data. All statements and conclusions are drawn from corpus data. This study is corpus-based because it was not solely dependent on the corpus, but as has been indicated, it used other sources to complement the corpus.

5.3.3 Qualitative and Quantitative Methodology

McEnery and Wilson (2001: 76) state that,

The difference between qualitative and quantitative corpus analysis, as the names themselves imply, is that in qualitative research no attempt is made to assign frequencies to the linguistic features which are identified in the data. Whereas in quantitative research we classify features, count them and even construct more complex statistical models in an attempt to explain what is observed, in qualitative research the data are used only as a basis for identifying and describing aspects of usage in the language and to provide ‘real-life’ examples of particular phenomena.

This study used both qualitative and quantitative methods. The qualitative aspect of the research was the descriptive component which analysed the morphological, syntactic and semantic characteristics of the adjectives in Shona based on corpus and other evidence. The corpus data constitutes ‘real-life’ examples in the sense that the Shona corpus consists of natural language in the form of oral interviews. The exposition in Chapter 8 also deals with usage aspects that take cognisance of the marked way in which Shona speakers use nouns and verbs as modifiers. McEnery and Wilson also state that the qualitative method also takes the rare occurrences of a type into consideration. This was manifested in the study in the sense that the analysis itself also accommodated rare occurrences in the corpus.
where a word would have as little as 1 hit. As such, our data analysis was not only focussed on the adjectives that had many tokens, but it also described in as much detail even those adjectives that are not represented in the corpus.

The quantitative facet of the research involved the counting of the frequencies of occurrences of our inventory of adjectives. This is explained in detail in 5.4.2. The advantage of using both qualitative and quantitative methods is that the qualitative aspect of the research provided a detailed investigation and analysis of the behaviour of adjectives in Shona, whereas the quantitative aspect contributed verifiable data that has been counted and with conclusions being drawn from those frequency counts. However, the type and token frequencies which are regarded as quantitative aspects can be treated as qualitative too in that they portray usage in relation to entrenchment and frequency of use. As a result, we concur with McEnery and Wilson (2001: 77) pertaining to the vagueness in difference between these two methodologies.

5.4 The Shona Corpus

The Shona corpus was used in this study as a source for empirical data on how adjectives are used in Shona. The corpus that was used in this study was compiled by the African Languages Lexical (ALLEX) Project from 1992 to date. The Shona corpus is made up of 2 962 412 running words. It is a Text Encoding Initiative (TEI) tagged and parsed corpus. This corpus was constructed using oral and written materials that were collected from all the geographical regions of Zimbabwe where Shona is spoken. The oral materials were mostly in the form of interviews that covered a wide range of topics, for as Biber et al. (1998: 248) highlight, one of the concerns for corpus design is diversity. These topics included among others:

i. traditional rituals and ceremonies (veneration of ancestral spirits, funeral ceremonies, rainmaking ceremonies)
ii. oral art forms (proverbs, humour/jokes, stories, poetry)
iii. traditional and contemporary/modern games
iv. courtship and marriage negotiations
v. traditional courts
vi. recordings of church and religious ceremonies
vii. children’s games
viii. song lyrics
ix. recordings of general conversation between people
Written materials were also collected and sampled for their suitability to be included in the Shona corpus. These materials were collected from publishing houses, the print media, universities, colleges, church organisations, among others. These materials spanned a period covering the 1950s when the first Shona novel was published up to the late 1990s. The Shona corpus thus has a rich plethora of material. The written materials that were included in the Shona corpus are:

i. fiction (novels, drama texts)
ii. poetry
iii. non-fiction (books on different specialist areas, e.g. legal matters, gender issues, HIV/AIDS issues, etc.)
iv. academic texts (school textbooks)
v. magazines (e.g. Moto, a magazine published by Mambo Press)
vi. the Shona weekly newspaper, *Kwayedza*

The oral interviews and written materials were then transcribed following a Text Encoding Initiative (TEI) header which required the details of the person(s) interviewed, place and date of interview, the interview topic as well as demographic data such as age and sex, educational background, and profession. The transcribed interviews were then encoded, tagged, proofread and parsed using an SGML (Standard Generalized Mark-up Language) parser. The tagging programme converts the text to a machine-readable text. The parser would check the accuracy of the TEI tags that are in the text, or in other words, that the document is TEI conformant.

5.4.1 Concordancing

Kennedy (1998: 251) describes a concordance in the following way:

A concordance is a formatted version or display of all occurrences or tokens of a particular type in a corpus. The type is usually called a keyword […]

The keyword in a concordance program appears in the different contexts in which it is found in the language. The concordance program used in the Shona corpus displays the keyword in the centre in bold with the context appearing to the left and right of the keyword. The corpus searches were done using the KWIC (key words in context) format.
whereby a search is made by typing in the keyword or type. These corpus searches had two goals, the first of which was to analyse the syntactic environment in which a particular adjective occurs, and secondly, the different contexts in which an adjective appears in the corpus which subsequently provided examples and also assisted in describing the semantic structures of the adjectives.

We have extracted some concordances for -kuru to demonstrate that the keyword search always generates the keyword in the centre. Shona is an agglutinating language hence for lexemes such as -KURU we used the wild card characters (.*)) which instruct the programme to search for any string that begins with an unknown value represented by (.*)) and ends with -kuru. The result is that the wild card characters (.*)) will yield all the forms in which the stem -kuru occurs. It is not possible to omit the wild card characters for lexemes such as -kuru because we never find “kuru” as a word in the Shona language, but it is a lexeme that has different forms depending on the gender and number features of the noun it is modifying. By using the wild card characters we will be instructing the concordance programme to search for all forms of the lexeme -KURU, such as mukuru (cl.1), vakuru (cl.2), mikuru (cl.4), chikuru (cl.7), tukuru (cl.13), etc. The wild card characters can only be omitted for the adjectives that modify gender 9/10 and class 5 nouns since these have modifications of the class marker. For instance, nhema ‘black’, jena ‘white’, huru ‘big’, etc. can be searched without the wild card characters. For a discussion of these modifications of the class markers see section 6.3.1 in Chapter 6.

The results of the search for -kuru yields words such as azukuru ‘grandchildren, nieces/nephews’, babamukuru ‘uncle’, chizukuru ‘grandchild’, samukuru ‘go-between’, etc. all of which are irrelevant for the our purposes, therefore, we had to eliminate such results. The concordances that we were looking for were those in which the context of -kuru was a noun phrase where -kuru functions as an adjective, such as in lines 6, 7, 8 and 13. We also included contexts where the adjective functioned in the predicative position. The reasons why we took into consideration both the attributive and predicative functions of the adjective are that the characteristics of most adjectives is that they can function in both attributive and predicative positions; and secondly our analysis in Chapter 7 also describes the attributive and predicative functions of adjectives.
In all cases we had to eliminate other words that have a similar phonological form to some of the adjectives, but which belong to other word categories and which also bear no resemblance to the adjectives. Examples are *nhema* ‘lies’, *mbiri* ‘fame’, *-tsva* ‘burn’, *-mwe* ‘another’, etc. which are homonyms of the adjectives *nhema* ‘black’, *mbiri* ‘two’, *-tsva* ‘new’ and *-mwe* ‘one’, respectively.

5.4.2 Type and Token Frequency
The words in a corpus can be counted for statistical analysis. The different adjectives that will be analysed in this study are what are referred to as a type. The tokens are the total number of occurrences of each type. As has hitherto been indicated, the wild card characters (.* ) generate all occurrences of a lexeme, most of which are however, not relevant. Because of some irrelevant contexts, we had to carry out a manual count of the relevant types. For example the search for “.*bodzi” generated 30 hits, but the relevant ones where *bodzi* functions as a numeral were only 15. Further, in the search for “.*redhi”, out of the 221 hits where the form appears, almost half of them were of the words
komuredhi ‘comrade’, followed by giredhi ‘grade’; with only three tokens being of the type -redhi ‘red’.

These frequency counts were discussed in relation to the entrenchment and prototypicality of the adjectives. The relationship between frequency of occurrence, entrenchment and prototypicality is outlined in Chapter 4; and the results of the type and token frequencies of the adjectives are presented in Chapter 7.

5.5 Limitations of the Shona Corpus in this Study

Corpus linguists agree that a corpus can never be fully exhaustive of the words that are found in a language. While the Shona corpus provided some valuable data, nevertheless, as far as this research was concerned, this corpus had some gaps which had to be filled in by other methods. This included using sources that included elicitation and the researcher’s intuitive knowledge as a mother tongue Shona speaker, what has been referred to as intuition/introspection. We realised that there are some adjectives that had very few hits or no hits in the corpus and in those cases it then became difficult to draw conclusions about the morphological, syntactic and semantic behaviour of the adjective, hence it became imperative to use other methods. It is these other methods that we will now describe.

5.5.1 Elicitation

The other method that we used in order to complement the examples from the corpus was elicitation. According to Crystal (1991: 119) this method involves obtaining reliable linguistic data from the speakers of a language. The method of elicitation in most cases was in the form of informal discussions whose purpose was to elicit precise information from the informants. The study consulted five informants, four of whom are resident in Zimbabwe and one in Great Britain. In terms of gender, the group of informants comprises of four females and one male, and they are all aged between thirty four and forty five. In relation to their educational background, all the informants have been trained in Shona at tertiary level. We specifically selected this group of informants because their expertise in Shona linguistic structure made them conversant with what constitutes a part of speech.

These informants were Dr Moreblessings Busi Chitauro-Mawema (Great Britain), Ms Tsitsi Marufu (Chegutu, Zimbabwe), Dr Edgar Mberi (Harare, Zimbabwe), Ms Theresa Juru (Harare, Zimbabwe), and Ms Susan Mateko (Harare, Zimbabwe). My supervisor at the University of Zimbabwe, Chief Mr Kumbirai G. Mkanganwi, who is a mother tongue Shona speaker, controlled my examples.
Because of the distance between the researcher and the informants, the information was elicited via email, text messaging or personal communication by telephone.

The informants were consulted for four specific tasks. The first task was to provide example sentences or phrases in which a particular adjective had to be included. This was in cases where the type had no hits in the corpus or where it had very few hits. The second task for the informants was to provide the part of speech membership and meaning of a word from the corpus concordances. As such our inventory of adjectives is also corroborated by the informants. The third task was to make judgements on the acceptability or grammaticality of certain utterances. This was especially in the application of the criteria for describing adjectives, particularly, gradability. Questions such as: ‘Is it possible to say …?’ ‘Is such and such an adjective gradable?’ were posed to the informants to elicit their judgements and viewpoints. Apart from providing relevant contexts in which an adjective is used, the informants were also consulted for information on the schematic meanings of the adjectives. All examples that were elicited from informants are indicated with [E].

5.5.2 Intuition/Introspection
We would like to point out that this study also managed to draw on the mother-tongue knowledge of the researcher. Evans and Green (2006: 16) point out that:

Native speakers of any given human language will have strong intuitions about what combinations of sounds or words are possible in their language, and which interpretations can be paired with which combinations.

As a mother-tongue Shona speaker, the researcher also relied on introspective judgements about what is grammatical or otherwise. Knowledge of the language enabled the researcher to be able to fill in some of the gaps that were missing from the corpus. Those examples where the mother tongue knowledge of the researcher was relied upon are marked [I].

5.6 Summary
This chapter discussed the methodological aspects of this study. It highlighted that this study employed a multi-method approach. It has shown that the study relied on already existing data which provided the adjectives that were analysed in this study. The chapter
also described the method of corpus linguistics. The concordance program was also discussed in relation to how it was employed to extract examples from the corpus. The concordance program was additionally shown to be useful insofar as it provided the types and token frequencies of the adjectives analysed in this study. Furthermore, it explained how the Shona corpus was used as a source of examples for this study and the fact that because of its limitations the research also relied on other methods where the corpus fell short. The justifications for the use of both the corpus and other methods such as elicitation and intuition by highlighting the limitations of the Shona corpus have been presented.
Chapter 6 The Shona Noun Class System

6.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to present the Shona noun class system as background to the discussion in Chapter 7. This chapter is divided as follows: section 6.2 discusses noun class and gender; and in 6.3 we present the noun classes in Shona. Section 6.4 looks at class markers and agreement. Section 6.5 is a summary of the chapter.

6.2 Noun class and gender

Bantu languages have been said to use a morphological gender assignment system which divides nouns into classes according to the prefixes that they take and to their concord or agreement. A set of nouns which take the same agreement is what constitutes a noun class; whereas the singular-plural pairing of noun classes is what constitutes a gender. Guthrie (1967: 35-6) describes class in the following way:

The term class is used to refer to each of the patterns of agreement that occur in a given language [...] It is then to these distinct patterns of agreement that numbers are assigned.

Bleek (1851) devised a numbering system for Bantu languages that is based on this agreement phenomenon, with each noun class being assigned a number. According to Guthrie’s Proto-Bantu reconstructions, nineteen noun classes were identified. We will briefly highlight Guthrie’s (1970: 220-225) class prefixes in Proto-Bantu as well as Meeussen’s (1967) reconstructions. For the sake of consistency, however, we will adhere
to Guthrie’s classification as results and conclusions vary among different scholars because of the differences in the available source data. According to Bleek’s (1869) reconstruction of the Proto-Bantu noun classes, noun classes (and prefixes) were only attested up to class 16. It was in the reconstructions by Meinhof (1906) and Meeussen (1967) that classes 17 to 23 were added.

Table 16 Guthrie’s and Meeussen’s reconstructions of Proto-Bantu concord prefixes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Guthrie’s concord prefixes</th>
<th>Meeussen’s concord prefixes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>*mu</td>
<td>*mu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>*ba</td>
<td>*ba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>*mu</td>
<td>*mu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>*mi</td>
<td>*mi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>*di</td>
<td>*ɪ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>*ma</td>
<td>*ma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>*ki/kɪ</td>
<td>*ki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>*bi/bɪ</td>
<td>*bɪ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>*ny</td>
<td>*n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>*ny</td>
<td>*n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>*du</td>
<td>*du</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>*ka</td>
<td>*ka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>*tu</td>
<td>*tu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>*bu</td>
<td>*bu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>*ku</td>
<td>*ku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>*pa</td>
<td>*pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>*ku</td>
<td>*ku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>*mu</td>
<td>*mu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>*pi</td>
<td>*pi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>*(i)</td>
<td>*(i)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reconstructions by Guthrie and Meeussen are similar in many respects. Their most important differences are in class 5 and class 24. Guthrie’s reconstruction of the class 5 prefix is *di- while Meeussen postulates that it is *ɪ-. Meeussen (1967: 99) however, states that while he gives the class 5 prefix as *ɪ- and the PP or VP as *di-, in a number of languages the class 5 prefix would have been *di-. Although Meeussen suggests that the class 5 prefix is *ɪ-, he does not dismiss the possibility of it being realized as di- in some languages. Guthrie states that in some Zone S languages there are correspondences between *di and ri and that ri is the vestige of *di in other languages. Nouns of class 9 and 10, like those in class 5, have also changed from their Proto-Bantu forms. Guthrie
postulates that the Proto-Bantu original prefix for class 9 and 10 was *NY which is now realised as a nasal.

6.3 Noun classes and gender in Shona

The Shona noun classes and their singular-plural pairings are presented in Table 18. But first it is imperative that we explain the stem initial modifications of the class markers in classes 5 and 9.

6.3.1 Noun class markers and modifications
Each noun class has a class marker which is realised as a prefix or as a modification of the stem, but such differences are irrelevant in this context. For instance, the class marker for class 1 is mu-, that for class 2 is va-, and that for class 7 is chi-. Class 5 and 9 which do not have prefixes have modifications instead. The class 5 class marker is given as the symbol (D-) to indicate voicing. The prefix of class 5 does not appear as such and the only trace that remains today of the former presence of this prefix lies in the voicing of voiceless initial consonants of the stem. There is a phonetic change that occurs between some nouns in class 5 and their counterparts in class 6. Some class 5 nouns undergo this morphophonemic change while others do not. For class 9 and 10 the class marker is (N-) which, in combination with stem initial consonants results in certain modifications that are a result of the assimilation of the homorganic nasal. These modifications may affect some initial consonants, while in other cases they do not have any such effect. The modifications of the stem initial phonemes of the basic forms that occur in class 5 and 9 are illustrated in Table 17.

Table 17 Class 5 and 9 Morphophonemics in Shona

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>basic form</th>
<th>class 5</th>
<th>class 9/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ch</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>mh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pf</td>
<td>bv</td>
<td>pf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sv</td>
<td>dzv/sv</td>
<td>sv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>nh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ts</td>
<td>dz</td>
<td>ts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tsv</td>
<td>dzv</td>
<td>tsv</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The voiced implosive /b/ and the breathy voiced nasal stop /mh/ are modifications of the voiceless plosive /p/. By way of a concrete example, the initial stem of the adjective lexeme -penyu ‘alive’ is realised as a modification in some classes, notably in class 5 where it is realised as benyu and as mhenyu in class 9 where its initial phoneme is the breathy voiced nasal stop /mh/. This process of modification follows a systematic pattern according to the phonological rules of the language. Each noun stem in Shona has a base form which is modified in certain classes. In morphological typological terms this base form would be the unmarked form which does not undergo any modification. The voiceless phonemes in examples (1a) and (2a) are modified into the voiced consonants in examples (1b) and (2b) respectively.

(1a) matemo matsaru
ma-temo ma-tsaru
cl.6-axes cl.6-old
‘old axes’

(1b) demo dzaru
D-temo D-tsaru
cl.5-axe cl.5- old
‘old axe’

In (1) there is a morphophonemic change from the voiceless affricate /ts/ to its breathy voiced allophone /dz/ in class 5. There is no modification of /ts-/ in class 9. Examples (1a) and (1b) also illustrate that the voiceless alveolar plosive /t/ in matemo ‘axes’ is modified to a voiced alveolar implosive plosive /d/ in class 5. In class 9 the phoneme /t/ is realised as a breathy voiced alveolar nasal stop /nh/.

(2a) makudo makuru
ma-kudo ma-kuru
cl.6-baboons cl.6-big
‘big baboons’

(2b) gudo guru
D-kudo D-kuru
cl.5-baboon cl.5-big
‘big baboon’

The examples in (2) illustrate the modification of the voiceless velar plosive /k/ to a voiced velar plosive /g-/ in class 5. In class 9 the velar plosive /k/ is modified to the breathy voiced glottal fricative /h/.
The other stem-initial modifications illustrated in Table 17 are that of the voiceless alveolar labialised affricate /tsv/ whose allophone is /dzv/ in class 5. In addition, the voiceless affricate /pf/ is modified to the breathy voiced affricate /bv/ in class 5; whereas the allophonic variant for the voiceless affricate stop /ch/ is the breathy voiced affricate /j/ in class 5.

6.3.2 Singular-plural pairings of noun classes

Table 18 Singular-plural pairing of noun classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOUN CLASSES</th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(mu-)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(mu-)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>va-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>a-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>mu-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(D-)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/9</td>
<td>(D-/N-)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/9</td>
<td>(D-/N-)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>chi-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>(N-)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>(N-)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>ru-</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>ru-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>ka-</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>u-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>ku-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>pa-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>(ku-)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>mu-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>svi-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>zi-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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A noun stem typically can either occur with the singular prefix or the plural prefix. Stump (2001: 4) refers to this as a gender being associated with a pair \(<x, y>\) of noun classes, class \(x\) being the singular prefix and class \(y\) the plural prefix. The singular-plural pairings of the genders in Shona is illustrated in Table 18.

The noun prefix carries the information pertaining to number and class membership. These gender and number features are in cognitive grammar terms, meaningful symbolic elements that can be analysed semantically, with the gender 1/2 marker denoting human nouns which are in turn singular and plural respectively. As such, gender and number are semantic controllers in that a plural noun also requires a plural adjective. Nouns can basically be divided into two types: count nouns and mass nouns, and these conform to the archetypes object and substance respectively. Following this two-way division, it can be noted that count nouns have a number distinction, whereas mass nouns do not because they are uncountable.

The examples in (3) illustrate the gender pairings of some classes. These examples demonstrate that the noun stems -\(nhu\) ‘person/thing’, -\(ti\) ‘tree’, and -\(garo\) ‘seat’ can take the singular and plural prefix.

(3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>gender</th>
<th>singular</th>
<th>gloss</th>
<th>plural</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>mu-(nhu)</td>
<td>person</td>
<td>va-(nhu)</td>
<td>people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>mu-(ti)</td>
<td>tree</td>
<td>(mi-(ti)</td>
<td>trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/8</td>
<td>chi-(garo)</td>
<td>chair, seat</td>
<td>zvi-(garo)</td>
<td>chairs, seats</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some noun classes do not have a corresponding singular or plural class. For instance, class 6 in Table 18 is shown to have no corresponding singular, and this means that the nouns which belong to this class have no singulars in class 5. Examples of such nouns that do not have number distinction are \(mafu\(ta\) ‘oil’ and \(maheu\) ‘unfermented beer’. Similarly, classes 14 to 19 do not have singular-plural pairings – they do not have the feature NUMBER. In addition to occurring in the singular-plural gender, noun stems can also occur in the diminutive and pejorative classes, and most nouns behave this way.

The pattern of singular-plural pairings for Shona is as illustrated in Figure 5, with class 6 being the default plural class because it is paired with the majority of singular nouns.
6.4 Class markers and agreement

The class markers and agreement phenomenon that will be discussed in this section are as illustrated in Table 19. Agreement is a relation between words that share a morphosyntactic feature and it is also sometimes referred to as concord. It is apparent from Table 19 that the class markers of the noun and its modifiers are identical (except for the genitive marker, to which we will return later). This is because the noun is the controller in the phrase, its role being to assign agreement in the sentence. Agreement is a morphological and syntactic phenomenon, therefore we will observe that gender assignment in Bantu is not purely morphological but it is also syntactic. We can cite the following examples in Shona:

(4) *chisikana icho chipfupi chakamira*
    chisikana i-cho chi-pfupi cha-ka-mir-a
    cl.7-girl cl.7-that cl.7-short SC7-STAT-stand-FV
    ‘that small short girl who is standing’

(5) *zvisikana izvo zvipfupi zvakamira*
    zvi-sikana i-zvo zvi-pfupi zva-ka-mir-a
    cl.8-girl cl.8-those cl.8-short SC8-STAT-stand-FV
    ‘those small short girls who are standing’

In examples (4) and (5) the demonstrative, adjective and verb carry the agreement markers *chi*- for singular and *zvi*- for plural respectively that is assigned to them by the noun.
### Table 19 Class Markers in Shona

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pers/NC</th>
<th>Np</th>
<th>ADJ</th>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>DEM</th>
<th>QUANT</th>
<th>ENUM</th>
<th>SEL</th>
<th>SC/OC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1sg</td>
<td>mu-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>u-</td>
<td>wo-</td>
<td>u-</td>
<td>u-</td>
<td>a-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1pl</td>
<td>ti-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2sg</td>
<td></td>
<td>u-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2pl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key to Table 19**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pers</th>
<th>person</th>
<th>DEM</th>
<th>demonstrative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>noun class</td>
<td>QUANT</td>
<td>quantitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Np</td>
<td>noun prefix</td>
<td>ENUM</td>
<td>enumerative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADJ</td>
<td>adjective</td>
<td>SEL</td>
<td>selector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>genitive</td>
<td>SC/OC</td>
<td>subject concord/object concord</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further examples of how the quantitative, enumerative and selector carry the agreement of the noun are as follows:
Shona is a predominantly head-initial language in that the noun precedes its modifiers in the noun phrase. There are a few exceptions where the modifier precedes the head noun. For instance, in the case of adopted colour terms, the adjective may precede the noun. The reason for this is undoubtedly that the source language of the borrowed terms, English, is a head-final language. As a result, English syntax is used in the case of such loanwords. From corpus data one comes across examples such as *bhurauni shuga* ‘brown sugar’, *redhi sikavha* ‘red scarf’.

6.4.1 The genitive

We have also shown in Table 19 that the genitive marker has a different form from the other agreement markers. We have indicated this morpheme as 
...*-a*, and it has the variants 
*e* and 
*-o*. The ellipses (...) stand for the respective class markers. The genitive marker, though it prototypically invokes the meanings of possession, kinship, and part-whole relationships, its denotation however extends beyond these meanings. This is different from the other nominal agreement markers which signal one relationship with the head noun, for example, anaphora for the demonstrative or enumeration for the enumerative. The other nominal agreement prefixes also only attach to a specific type of
stem. The genitive morpheme, on the other hand, occurs with different types of word categories.

The genitive marker is also different morphologically from the other class markers. The base of the genitive construction is ...-a-, but with genitives that denote attributes, the structure is ...-e-. The change from ...-a- to ...-e- may be attributed to the fact that ...-a- assimilates to ...-e-. The genitive marker -e- shows the effects of a + i harmony.

The genitive has in most cases been referred to as a possessive and has most often than not been viewed as simply expressing relations of ownership. Recent studies (Nikiforidou 1991; Taylor 2000; Chebanne 2004) have shown that this construction is in fact versatile and should thus not be analyzed on the surface level of possession. Nikiforidou (1991: 149) observes that the genitive is polysemous – it displays a multiplicity of relationships and not just possession. It expresses meanings as diverse as the agent of an action and the constituent material (out of which something is made), as well as the possessor and the standard of comparison, among others. The various meanings of the genitive are related through metaphor. Taylor (2003: 345) proposes a prototype approach to the analysis of the possessive and he says:

Prototype accounts presuppose the reliable identification of the prototype. To propose a prototype account of possessive relations requires that one of the many relations invoked by the possessive morpheme is singled out as basic, from which all other senses can be related, in some way or other.

Taylor states that the possessive construction has a basic function which is to denote ownership; while at the same time its function can also be extended to denote other senses. We will illustrate some of the main metaphorical mappings of the genitive in Shona:

*Ownership/possession*

(8) *bhuku rangu* [C]
    Ø-bhuku r-a-ngu
    cl.5-book cl.5-GEN-my
    ‘my book’

*Part-whole*

(9) *vhiri rengoro* [C]
    Ø-vhiri r-e-ngoro
    cl.5-wheel cl.5-GEN-cl.9-wagon
    ‘the wheel of the wagon’
Kinship

(10) *mwana wamambo* [C]
    mw-ana w-a-mambo
    cl.1-child cl.1-GEN-king
    ‘child of the king’

Attribute

(11) *bhachi recheki* [C]
    Ø-bhachi r-e-cheki
    cl.5-jacket cl.5-GEN-chequered
    ‘chequered jacket’

The meaning of the genitive marker in (8) is to signal possession; it is a noun + POSS construction. This is contrary to example (9) where the genitive marker is not conceptualized as signalling possession, rather its meaning is part-whole in that the wheel is part of the wagon, which is the whole. Example (10) is a N + N construction where two noun phrases are syntactically connected by the genitive morpheme. In Chapters 7 and 8 we will also encounter similar examples such as illustrated in example (11).

### 6.5 Summary

This chapter has attempted to serve as an introductory background to Chapter 7. It has also highlighted the notions of gender and agreement and their pivotal position in the noun class system in Shona. The chapter has also analysed at length the Shona noun classes in relation to their patterns of agreement.
Chapter 7 The Shona Adjective Class

7.1 Introduction

This chapter constitutes an analysis of the Shona adjective class as a prototypical category. The chapter will show that the Shona adjective class comprises of adjectives that have different morphological, syntactic and semantic characteristics, and this makes the Shona adjective class a heterogeneous class. As a result, such a mixed class cannot be described on the basis of one criterion alone, morphology, as previous analyses have done. In Chapter 3 the discussion pointed out that in early Shona grammars emphasis was laid on morphological structure as the defining criterion for adjectives; and in Chapter 4 we discussed our justification for postulating a morphological, syntactic and semantic analysis for the Shona adjective class. This justification was based on the fact that Shona adjectives have disparate characteristics, hence our argument that morphological, syntactic and semantic criteria are more suitable for the reason that they can adequately describe the varied nature of this class. Based on these disparities we will propose that the most logical way to describe the Shona adjective class is to posit a prototypical structure.

All the words that will be discussed in this chapter are bona fide adjectives because semantically they are nonprocessual relational expressions that designate the property of the noun they modify. This chapter is organized as follows: Section 7.2 discusses criteria that will be used for the analysis of the adjectives with section 7.3 constituting the analysis using the criteria outlined in 7.2. Section 7.4 discusses the results of the analysis; and 7.5 is a summary of the chapter.
7.2 Criteria for Analysis of the Shona Adjective Class

Six criteria will be used to analyze the Shona adjective class. The criteria describe the syntactic functions of the adjectives, the morphological feature of agreement, their class range, their semantic characteristics, and the quantitative data from the Shona corpus which is discussed in relation to frequency of occurrence, entrenchment and prototypicality.

7.2.1 Syntactic Functions

7.2.1.1 Attributive position

Prototypical adjectives can occur in both attributive and predicative positions, while some less prototypical adjectives can occur either in the attributive position only or in the predicative position only. Attributive adjectives in Shona occur after the noun, as in muti mukuru uyu ‘this big tree’.

(1)  
\[
\text{muti mukuru uyu [C]} \\
\text{mu-ti mu-kuru u-yu} \\
\text{cl.3-tree cl.3-big cl.3-this} \\
\text{‘this big tree’}
\]

One adjective in Shona, nje ‘poor, ordinary, worthless’, as we will show, only occurs in the attributive position.

7.2.1.2 Predicative position

Predicative adjectives, on the other hand, occur as part of the predicate after an auxiliary verb or when they occupy the predicate position in a construction, as in this example:

(2)  
\[
\text{muti uyu mukuru [C]} \\
\text{mu-ti u-yu mu-kuru} \\
\text{cl.3-tree cl.3-this cl.3-big} \\
\text{‘this tree is big’}
\]

In muti uyu mukuru ‘this tree is big’ the adjective mukuru is in a predicative position because it is no longer part of the noun phrase but occurs as a complement in a copulative construction. The discussion will highlight that some adjectives in Shona can only function in the predicative position. These adjectives are discussed in detail in 7.3.5.
7.2.3 Agreement

Some adjectives show agreement with the head noun which is the agreement source. In terms of agreement, we can identify three kinds of morphological characteristics:

(i) adjectives that have a prefix which is an exponent of a noun class or a modification of the prefix, as shown in examples (3) and (4) respectively.

(3)  
\begin{align*}
\text{zvinyatera zvipfumbu} & \quad [C] \\
\text{zvi-nyatera zvi-pfumbu} & \\
\text{cl.8-sandals cl.8-grey} & \\
\text{‘grey sandals’} & 
\end{align*}

(4)  
\begin{align*}
\text{rokwe bvumbu} & \quad [C] \\
\text{Ø-rokwe Ø-bvumbu} & \\
\text{cl.5-dress cl.5-grey} & \\
\text{‘grey dress’} & 
\end{align*}

(ii) adjectives that are invariable and do not have a class marker, such as is shown in example (5). An adjective such as \textit{mbichana} ‘few, little’ is invariable and does not have a prefix that marks the class of the modified noun. For example:

(5)  
\begin{align*}
\text{mvura mbichana} & \quad [C] \\
\text{Ø-mvura mbichana} & \\
\text{cl.9-water a little} & \\
\text{‘little water’} & 
\end{align*}

(6)  
\begin{align*}
\text{zviyo mbichana} & \quad [C] \\
\text{Ø-zviyo mbichana} & \\
\text{cl.8-millet a little} & \\
\text{‘a little millet’} & 
\end{align*}

In such instances it is only the noun that displays its inherent gender features, and this information is not symbolized on the adjective.

(iii) the third syntactic characteristic is exhibited by those adjectives that require an additional marker which can either be the genitive marker or the auxiliary marker. The other difference between these adjectives and those in (i) and (ii) is that these adjectives that require an additional marker display some syntactic characteristics that differentiate them from those in (i) and (ii). For example in the noun phrase \textit{tebhuru yeraundi} ‘round table’ the genitive marker -\textit{e}- is an obligatory component, hence it is not grammatical to say *\textit{tebhuru raundi} ‘round table’ or *\textit{tebhuru ndaundi}.
As a result, adjectives such as -e-raundi ‘round’ and the colour adjectives such as -e-bhurauni ‘brown’, -e-yero ‘yellow’ obligatorily require the genitive marker; while the predicative adjectives obligatorily require the auxiliary marker.

7.2.4 Class range
The major significant difference between a noun and an adjective is that the noun stem can only occur with a selected number of noun prefixes, which are usually its singular and plural classes. For example, the noun demo ‘axe’ is a gender 5/6 noun, whereas munda is a gender 3/4 noun. A prototypical adjective, on the other hand, can modify nouns belonging to all or several classes. We will employ that distinction in this analysis and highlight that only prototypical adjectives can occur with nouns of all genders. The less prototypical adjectives can only modify nouns of specific genders, as this analysis will demonstrate.

7.2.5 Semantic Characteristics

7.2.5.1 Gradability
Gradability is a semantic feature that is a characteristic of many word classes, including nouns, verbs and adjectives. Gradable adjectives are those adjectives that denote a property which can be graded or compared. It should be pointed out that only gradable adjectives can be compared and intensified, but there are less prototypical adjectives that can be shown to be adjectives by the fact that they are comparable and intensifiable. Shona uses four strategies to express gradability, that is, by suffixing the intensifier -sa to an adjective, reduplication, the use of comparatives and modification by adverbs. These four strategies are explained in turn.
7.2.5.1.1 Intensification

7.2.5.1.1 The intensifier -sa ‘too, very, extremely’

The intensifier suffix -sa can be suffixed onto the adjective, for example:

(8a)  *hove huru* [C]
  Ø-hove Ø-huru  
  cl.9-fish cl.9-big  
  ‘big fish’

(8b)  *hove hurusa* [I]
  Ø-hove Ø-huru-sa  
  cl.9-fish cl.9-big-very  
  ‘very big fish’

(9a)  *hove duku* [I]
  Ø-hove Ø-duku  
  cl.9-fish cl.9-small  
  ‘small fish’

(9b)  *hove dukusa* [I]
  Ø-hove Ø-duku-sa  
  cl.9-fish cl.9-small-very  
  ‘very small fish’

The suffix -sa in (8b) and (9b) has an intensifying function. While in both huru and hurusa the meaning of being big is being described, there is however, a difference in their extent and this is what -sa brings out. Therefore, even in their construals, when a property or attribute is construed as being ‘very X’, then the property that has an intensified meaning stands out in comparison to the unintensified one. The image schemas for huru and hurusa are contrast and scale in that the height of one individual is being conceived as being in excess of a scalar norm in contrast to the other entity whose height or size does not exceed the scalar norm.

Gradable nouns are discussed at length in Chapter 8. Nevertheless, most nouns are not gradable and as such do not take -sa for intensification. It is ungrammatical to say *uchisa ‘very honey’, *munhusa ‘very person’, or *rudosa ‘very love’. The small group of nouns that are gradable and can be intensified by -sa are mwana ‘child’, murombo ‘poor’, and mupfumi ‘rich’. For example:

(10a)  *Tamai mwanasas a haangandidaro* [E]
  PN mw-ana-sa ha-a-nga-ndi-daro  
  PN cl.1-child-very NEG-3sg-POT-1sg-do
‘Tamai is very young (i.e. younger than ego), she cannot do that to me’

(10b) _Tamai mwana mudikisa haangandidaro_ [E]

PN mw-ana mudiki-sa ha-a-nga-ndi-daro  
Tamai cl.1-child cl.1-young-very NEG-3sg-POT-1sg-do  
‘Tamai is very young (i.e. younger than ego), you cannot do that to me’

(10a) and (10b) mean the same thing, example (10a) being the contracted form of (10b). In speech it is possible to have forms such as (10a) though when it comes to writing (10b) is the accepted form because -sa is an adjective intensifier. The nouns _murombo_ ‘poor’ and _mupfumi_ ‘rich’ are nouns that display both nominal and adjectival properties and in terms of prototypicality they are less prototypical. This is discussed in more detail in Chapter 8.

Verbs in Shona are also intensified, though their intensification is by the verbal extension -is- or -es-, for instance, _famba_ ‘walk’ → _fambisa_ ‘walk fast’; _dyisa_ ‘eat too much’, etc. From the exposition of the intensification of nouns, verbs and adjectives, it can be argued that the root for intensification for Shona is -s-. In intensifying all the parts of speech -s- is the common element: for adjectives and nouns it is -sa and for verbs it is -is-/es-. It can be further argued that historically it may have been the same extension that performed intensification.

7.2.5.1.1.2 The diminutive suffix -ana

Some adjectives can also be intensified by the diminutive suffix -ana or its reduplicated form -ana-ana. We will illustrate this with adjectives such as -shoma ‘few’ and -dukwan ‘small’. There is overlap between -sa and -ana in that some adjectives can be intensified by both forms. This suffix -ana is polysemous in that it also denotes the young of an animal or a very young child when it is suffixed to nouns. For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>base noun</th>
<th>gloss</th>
<th>suffixation</th>
<th>young of animal</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dhongi</td>
<td>donkey</td>
<td>dhongi-ana</td>
<td>dhongwana</td>
<td>foal of donkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gwayi</td>
<td>sheep</td>
<td>gwayi-ana</td>
<td>gwayana</td>
<td>lamb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>humba</td>
<td>pig</td>
<td>humba-ana</td>
<td>humbana</td>
<td>piglet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mbwa</td>
<td>dog</td>
<td>mbwa-ana-ana</td>
<td>mbwanana</td>
<td>puppy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mwana</td>
<td>child</td>
<td>mwana-ana</td>
<td>mwanana</td>
<td>very young child</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This means that the diminutive is a category whose applicability is not restricted to one part of speech, and as such is also has a range of meanings among which is reduction in size, age, scale, quantity or quality.

7.2.5.1.2 Reduplication

Reduplication also has the effect of intensifying the meaning of an adjective. The analysis will show the types of adjectives that can be reduplicated as well as the effects of reduplication on the particular adjectives. For instance, there is a semantic difference between *nguva duku* ‘short time’ and *nguva dukuduku* ‘very short time’ in that the latter has an intensified meaning in comparison to the former.

\[(12a) \quad \textit{nguva duku} \ [C] \quad \text{Ø-nguva} \ \text{Ø-duku} \quad \text{cl.9-time cl.9-short} \quad \text{‘short time’} \]

\[(12b) \quad \textit{nguva dukuduku} \ [C] \quad \text{Ø-nguva} \ \text{Ø-dukuduku} \quad \text{cl.9-time cl.9-very short} \quad \text{‘very short time’} \]

The analysis will also demonstrate that reduplication can change the word class membership of the adjective *mbichana* ‘few, little’ to the adverb category, cf. 7.3.7. This is the only adjective in Shona that displays this characteristic.

Reduplication is one of the characteristics that adjectives have in common with nouns and verbs. When a verb is reduplicated, the meaning of the resultant verb is not always predictable. With adjectives the resultant meaning is more predictable. When you have an adjective *X* which is reduplicated, the result is *XX*, meaning ‘very *X*’, i.e. its meaning is intensified. With verbs, the result can either be emphasis of the frequency of an incessant process or intensification. For example, *-chera* ‘dig’ when reduplicated gives *-chera-chera* which means ‘dig all over the place’; while *-famba* ‘walk’ can be reduplicated to give *-famba-famba* ‘walk around aimlessly’. In the case of *-chera-chera* and *-famba-famba*, the semantic structure of the reduplicated form still refers to the main meaning in the unreduplicated verb. With other verbs, however, the meaning of the reduplicated form is not as transparent and cannot be predicted from the base verb. For example, the verb *-chema* ‘cry’ when reduplicated gives the form *-chema-chema* ‘plead’ which is not an
intensified meaning of crying, but rather it emphasizes the extent of the action. Similarly, the verb -bata ‘hold, touch’ when reduplicated yields -bata-bata which means ‘feel with the hands’ and it refers to the repetition of an action and does not signal its intensification. Further discussion and illustrative examples of the reduplication of verbs is found in Chapter 8.

Most nouns cannot be reduplicated, except for the locatives which as the analysis in Chapter 8 will show, have both nominal and adjectival characteristics. Like adjectives, the locatives can also be reduplicated for intensification, and this makes them atypical nouns. Prototypical nouns cannot be reduplicated, hence it is not possible to say: *mucherochero ‘fruit fruit’ or *mucheromuchero ‘fruit fruit’, *musikanasikana ‘girl girl’. For the small group of nouns that can be reduplicated, reduplication has a different effect on the semantic features of these nouns. Reduplication instead changes the meaning of a noun, and this can be demonstrated with the noun meso ‘eyes’ which when reduplicated becomes mesomeso which refers to the behaviour of a person who is married or is in a committed relationship but who still continues to covet other people. Similarly, the noun mvura ‘water’ can be reduplicated to mvura mvura ‘watery’ which in terms of meaning does not mean *‘very water’ but rather there is emphasis on the consistency of the liquid. Also, the noun usiku can be reduplicated to usikusiku which does not mean *‘very night’ but it refers to ‘the last hour of the night’.

7.2.5.1.3 Comparatives

The other strategy that Shona uses for gradability is through the use of comparatives. Comparison in Shona is expressed syntactically through the use of words such as pana (pane, pano) ‘compared to’, kudarika ‘surpassing/more than’, kupfuura ‘surpassing/more than’, kuna (kune) ‘compared to’, kupinda ‘surpassing/more than’. All these words have the same meaning of surpassing or comparison, the only difference being in the choice of the comparative word. For example:

(13) ngoma iyi ihuru pane iyo [I]
  Ø-ngoma i-yi i-huru pane i-yo
  cl.9-drum cl.9-this COP-big cl.9-that
  ‘this drum is large compared to that one’
7.2.5.1.4 Modification by adverbs

In terms of function, adverbs are a versatile category in that they can modify nouns, verbs and adjectives. When they modify adjectives, their function is similar to that of gradability in that adverbs also intensify or weaken the meaning of an adjective. Some adjectives can thus be modified by such adverbs as chaizvo ‘very’, zvikuru ‘very’ and zvakanyanya ‘extremely’, and kwazvo ‘extremely’. For example:

(14)  *muti mukuru kwazvo* [C]
  mu-ti mu-kuru kwazvo
  cl.3-tree cl.3-big extremely
‘extremely big tree’

7.2.5.2 Semantic Structure

In 4.3.2 we examined the dominant role that meaning is accorded in cognitive grammar. In this section we will discuss the meanings of the adjectives in Shona and we will endeavour to correlate this analysis with 4.3.2 which underlined the fact that meaning is schematic and that a situation can be construed by image schemas. The schematicity of meaning that was alluded to in 4.3.2 will be elaborated in this analysis where we will examine how the meanings of adjectives are construed relative to their trajectors and to everyday human experience.

Our semantic analysis will also be discussed in light of the assertions by Givón (1984: 52) and Langacker (2008: 319) that the most prototypical adjectives are those that denote intrinsic or inherent characteristics of indefinite duration (e.g. big, strong, red, etc.); while the less prototypical adjectives denote locations, temporary states, quantities, evaluative assessments, and so forth.

The other contribution in relation to the semantic criterion that we will make reference to is that by Wierzbicka (1988: 484) who highlights that the prototypical function of an adjective is the attributive function, and that no other word category can perform this function. By the attributive function is meant the ability of the adjective to “enrich the image evoked by the noun”. She goes on to make the distinction between nouns and adjectives by stating that adjectives denote a single property or feature, whereas typically nouns denote complex properties. Adjectives denote single properties such as ‘tall’, ‘short’, ‘thin’, ‘good’, ‘bad’, etc. With nouns, on the other hand, the properties are more complex.
in that a noun like car designates a kind of thing that has a cluster of properties among which are: has four wheels, has two or more doors, can be driven, etc. Because of that, a physical object like a car cannot be described by a single property but by a multiplicity of properties. Wierzbicka (1988: 486) also observes that there are also atypical nouns which can denote single properties in the same way as adjectives, such as hero or saint in English. The adjective class in Shona will also be analysed in light of Dixon’s (2004) thirteen semantic types (cf. 4.3.2.2).

7.2.6 Frequency of Occurrence, Entrenchment and Prototypicality
The frequency of occurrence in the corpus of the adjectives will be discussed as another criterion. This criterion will be tied up with the discussion in Chapter 4 on the interrelationship between frequency of occurrence, entrenchment and prototypicality. The analysis will show that frequency of occurrence is the determinant of entrenchment and prototypicality. All the adjective subgroups will be discussed in relation to their average frequency based on the total members in the group and the group’s total frequency count. This investigation will also bring to light the group with the highest average frequency. The results of the frequency counts are presented in Tables 21 and 22 at the end of this chapter.

7.2.7 Other Characteristics
Other characteristics that are relevant to the discussion of some of the adjectives are also mentioned, specifically, part of speech membership. The part of speech membership discussion will bring to light the fact that there are words that have the same phonological forms as some of the adjectives, and these words belong to different word categories as depicted in their syntactic behaviour.

7.3 The Shona Adjective Class
This section is an analysis of the Shona adjective class. A total of ninety adjectives are analysed in this study and they have been divided into seven subgroups which are analysed using the criteria outlined in the previous section.
7.3.1 Subgroup A: Prototypical adjectives

(15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>adjective</th>
<th>gloss</th>
<th>adjective</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-chena</td>
<td>white, light</td>
<td>-pfumbu</td>
<td>grey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-dhara</td>
<td>old</td>
<td>-pfupi</td>
<td>short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-diki</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>-refu</td>
<td>tall, long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-doodoko/ doodori</td>
<td>very small</td>
<td>-sande</td>
<td>holy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-dukwane/-dukwana</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>-shava</td>
<td>light-brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-femu</td>
<td>wide</td>
<td>-shoma</td>
<td>few, little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-hombre</td>
<td>big, large</td>
<td>-shora</td>
<td>yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-kadzi</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>-svimu</td>
<td>good, pleasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-kobvu</td>
<td>thick, fat, stout</td>
<td>-svipa</td>
<td>dark, black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-kono</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>-tema</td>
<td>black, dark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-kukutu</td>
<td>hard, strong</td>
<td>-tete</td>
<td>thin, narrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-kuru</td>
<td>big, large</td>
<td>-tsaru</td>
<td>old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-mbishi</td>
<td>raw, uncooked</td>
<td>-tsva</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-naku</td>
<td>beautiful</td>
<td>-tsvene</td>
<td>holy, good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-nyoro</td>
<td>wet, soft</td>
<td>-tsvuku</td>
<td>red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-nyowani/-nyuwani</td>
<td>new</td>
<td>-uya</td>
<td>good, upright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-pamhi</td>
<td>wide</td>
<td>-vi</td>
<td>bad, evil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-penyu</td>
<td>alive</td>
<td>-zhinji</td>
<td>many</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The complete list of this subgroup presented in (15) are the basic non-derived adjectives, most of which are morphologically formed from adjectival roots or lexemes as we have previously referred to them. With the exception of nyowani ‘new’ and -sande ‘saint’ which are loanwords from English and Latin respectively, the rest of the adjectives in this subgroup are indigenous Shona adjectives. The majority of the adjectives in this subgroup, together with the numerals (cf. 7.3.2), are the only types of adjectives that have been identified and described in Shona grammars.

We will argue that -kadzi and -kono are in fact adjectives and not nouns as they have been previously described in Shona. Our reasons for claiming that they be treated as adjectives are the following: firstly, they can modify nouns that belong to several genders, a characteristic that differentiates adjectives from nouns. To illustrate our point, we have selected eight noun classes, shown in (16) whose nouns the adjective lexeme -kadzi ‘female’ can modify. Secondly, the grammatical characteristic of -kono and -kadzi is that they do not have inherent gender like nouns; thirdly, they can also function in both the attributive and predicative positions. And finally, semantically they denote single properties which are, according to Wierzbicka, an adjectival characteristic.
In Shona, there is a noun stem -kadzi which refers to ‘woman/wife’; and in addition there is this adjective lexeme -kadzi which means ‘female’. The difference between these two lexemes is that -kadzi ‘woman’ occurs with prefixes of class 1 and 2, whereas -kadzi ‘female’ as demonstrated in (16) can occur with nouns of several genders without any diminutive or pejorative connotations. Also, -kadzi ‘female’ refers to a property of a noun and not a kind. These two lexemes are therefore homonyms. This same phenomenon can be observed in Swahili. Ashton (1947: 6) (cf. 3.3.1.1) points out that some nominal roots have a common form with adjectives, for instance m-ke ‘wife’, -ke ‘female’. Madan (1992) in the Swahili-English Dictionary has two separate entries for -ke ‘wife’ and -ke ‘female’, as well as for -ume ‘man/husband’ and -ume ‘male’.

### 7.3.1.1 Attributive position

Syntactically, all the adjectives in subgroup A occur in an attributive position immediately following the noun.

(17)  
\[
\textit{musikana mukobvu} \ [C]  
\]
\[
\textit{mu-sikana mu-kobvu}  
\text{cl.1-girl cl.1-stout}  
\text{‘stout girl’}  
\]

(18)  
\[
\textit{n’ombe hono} \ [C]  
\]
\[
\textit{Ø-n’ombe Ø-hono}  
\text{cl.9-cow cl.9-male}  
\text{‘male cow’}  
\]

### 7.3.1.2 Predicative position

All the subgroup A adjectives can also occur in the predicative position.
(19) **musikana uyu mukobvu** [I]
    mu-sikana u-yu mu-kobvu
    cl.1-girl cl.1-this COP-stout
    ‘this girl is stout’

(20) **n’ombe iyi ihono** [I]
    Ø-n’ombe i-yi i-hono
    cl.9-cow cl.9-this COP-male
    ‘this cow is male’

### 7.3.1.3 Agreement
All the adjectives in Subgroup A are lexemes and for that reason they all take the agreement of the noun they modify. The examples in (17) and (18) demonstrate this agreement phenomenon. In (17) the class marker *mu-* is duplicated on the adjective; whereas in (18) the adjective *kono* is modified to *hono* in class 9.

### 7.3.1.4 Class range
Prototypical adjectives can modify nouns of all genders. The adjectives in this subgroup have an unlimited class range and they can modify nouns of all genders. That characteristic makes them prototypical adjectives.

### 7.3.1.5 Gradability

#### 7.3.1.5.1 Intensification
As already indicated in 7.2, some adjectives in Shona can also take the suffix *-sa* ‘too, very, extremely’ for intensification. This suffix is used on adjectives as the following examples in (21) show. It should be pointed out that as a result of the creativity of language, some adjectives that are not “normally” gradable can be made gradable. For instance, from the examples given in (21), the adjectives *-tsvene* ‘holy’ and *-sande* ‘holy’ are not gradable adjectives but someone can be said to be *mutsvenesa* ‘very holy’ or *musandesa* ‘very holy’. This is similar to *Christian* and *Catholic* in English whereby someone can be said to be *very Christian* or *very Catholic*. As such, the adjectives in subgroup A that can be intensified by *-sa* are not limited to the list in (21). Speakers use language in creative ways depending on the meaning they want to communicate, and as such adjectives such as *-tsvene* ‘holy’ and *-sande* ‘holy’ can also be intensified by *-sa*. We can also add that in language there is always the room for novelty, hence it is not always
The basic colour terms -tema ‘black’, -tsvuku ‘red’, -chena ‘white’, -pfumbu ‘grey’, -shora ‘yellow’ and -shava ‘light-brown’ can also be intensified. Nonprocessual predications that designate colour locate their trajectors within the vision domain of focal colours. When colour terms are intensified the hue of the colour that has been intensified is seen as being deeper or lighter than the focal hue. For example, -chenasa ‘very white’, -tsvukusa ‘very red’, -pfumbusa ‘very grey’, etc.

The adjectives, -shoma ‘few’ and -dukwan ‘small’ can also be intensified by the diminutive suffix -ana or by reduplicating this diminutive suffix to -ana-ana → -anana. The resultant meanings are -shomana ‘very little’, -shomanana ‘extremely few’, and -dukwanana ‘extremely small’.

### 7.3.1.5.2 Reduplication

Some Subgroup A adjectives can be reduplicated. As one will observe from the example in (22), it is only the adjective stem that is reduplicated.
The adjectives in (23) and (24) show a modification of the stem -kuru ‘big’. When the class marker is a modification of the initial consonant, then the whole adjective is reduplicated. For example:

(23a)  *imba huru* [C]  
Ø-imba Ø-huru  
cl.9-house cl.9-big  
‘big house’

(23b)  *imba huru huru* [C]  
Ø-imba Ø-huru Ø-huru  
cl.9-house cl.9-big cl.9-big  
‘very big house’

(24a)  *gudo guru* [C]  
Ø-gudo Ø-guru  
cl.5-baboon cl.5-big  
‘big baboon’

(24b)  *gudo guru guru* [C]  
Ø-gudo Ø-guru Ø-guru  
cl.5-baboon cl.5-big cl.5-big  
‘very big baboon’

7.3.1.5.3 Comparatives
Some Subgroup A adjectives are gradable and can therefore be compared. That is to say, they can express meanings that denote ‘surpassing the norm’ or ‘compared to’. As has already been explained in 7.2, Shona expresses comparison in the following way: in order to say Tawanda is taller than Chiyyedza, one can say *Tawanda murefu kudarika/ kupinda/ kupfuura/ pana/ kuna Chiyyedza*, all meaning that Tawanda is tall in comparison to Chiyyedza, with the only difference being in the choice of the comparative word. Comparatives characterize a schematic relation of comparison and contrast.
(25)  *Tawanda murefu kudarika Chiyedza* [I]
PN mu-refu kudarika PN
Tawanda cl.1-tall compared to Chiyedza
‘Tawanda is tall compared to Chiyedza’

Height is a scalar concept, therefore in (25) the figure is construed as possessing a height that is more than that of the ground. Other adjectives in Subgroup A that can take comparatives can also be used in this way.

(26)  *Gwenzi mukuru pana Nyakunama* [C]
PN mu-kuru pana PN
Gwenzi cl.1-big compared to Nyakunama
‘Gwenzi is bigger compared to Nyakunama’

7.3.1.5.4 Modification by adverbs

Subgroup A adjectives can also be modified by such adverbs as *chaizvo* ‘very’, *zvikuru* ‘very’, *zvakanyanya* ‘extremely’, and *kwazvo* ‘extremely’. We stated in Chapter 4 that like adjectives, adverbs are also nonprocessual relational predications. When the adverb meaning ‘very’ modifies an adjective in Shona, the construal of the adjective is incremented.

(27)  *muti mukuru kwazvo* [C]
mu-ti mu-kuru kwazvo
cl.3-tree cl.3-big cl.3-very
‘very big tree’

(28)  *chibage chidikidiki chaizvo* [C]
chi-bage chi-diki-diki chaizvo
cl.7-maize cl.7-small-small very
‘very small maize’

In (27) the size of the trajector is incremented from being simply ‘big’ to being ‘very big’. The image schema for ‘very big’ being seen as being beyond the size scale; whereas (28) shows that even the semantic features of reduplicated adjectives can be further intensified through modification by adverbs. It is also possible to have double intensification whereby both the intensifier -*sa* and the adverb are used on a single adjective, as (29) indicates.

(29)  *chinhu chikurusa chaizvo* [I]
chi-nhu chi-kuru-sa chaizvo
cl.7-thing cl.7-big-very very
‘extremely big thing’
7.3.1.6 Semantic structure

Adjectives are atemporal relations in that their construal does not involve processing over time, hence they are stative. The adjectives that denote colour such as -chena ‘white’, -tsvuku ‘red’, -tema ‘black’, -pfumbu ‘grey’ and -shora ‘yellow’ are construed in terms of hue in the colour domain. Semantically, these colour terms are not absolute but they are polysemous. As such, -tsvuku ‘red’ may not necessarily refer to the colour ‘red’ but may also refer to colours that are in the shade of red such as orange, pink, purple, mauve, etc. Likewise, -chena also refers to other colours such as cream, off-white etc. that are in the shade of white. Colour is a radial category which has a prototypical semantic structure, with a certain hue of red being seen as focal (prototypical) and the other shades of red being less prototypical. From the corpus concordances, we observed that the colour adjectives are the most radial. We will illustrate this point with the colour adjectives -tsvuku ‘red’ and -tema ‘black’.

(30) shuga tsvuku [C]
Ø-shuga Ø-tsvuku
cl.9-shuga cl.9-brown
‘brown sugar’

In the context that is illustrated by example (30), the denotation of -tsvuku is extended to the shade of colours in the brown range. The other schematic meanings for -tsvuku are:

(31) nhamo tsvuku [C]
Ø-nhamo Ø-tsvuku
cl.9-problem cl.9-red, grave/serious
‘grave/serious problem’

(32) hope tsvuku [C]
Ø-hope Ø-tsvuku
cl.9-sleep cl.9-fitfull
‘fitfull sleep’

In both nhamo tsvuku and hope tsvuku, tsvuku is used to denote difficulty and discomfort. These are negative connotations associated with the colour -tsvuku which emanate from the perception that -tsvuku is correlated with danger. As such, in both examples there is a metaphorical mapping of -tsvuku from the source domain of colour to the target domains of difficulty and discomfort.
In (33) and (34), the denotation of -tema is extended to denote ill fortune and evil because darkness is associated with evil. This can be contrasted with -chena ‘white’ which is construed as a good and positive colour, hence mwoyo muchena ‘lit. white heart = good heartedness’ and in this case the source domain of the colour -chena is extended to the target domain whereby -chena denotes the positive attributes of good, pure, kind, etc.

(33)  matenga matema [C]
   ma-tenga ma-tema
   cl.6-skies, heavens cl.6-black, dark
   ‘lit. black, dark forests = bad luck, ill fortune’

(34)  mwoyo mutema [C]
   Ø-mwoyo mu-tema
   cl.3-heart cl.3-black, dark
   ‘lit. black, dark heart = evil hearted’

The adjectives -kobvu ‘stout, thick’, -femu ‘wide’, -pamhi ‘wide’, -pfupi ‘short’, -refu ‘tall’, -diki ‘small’ are qualitative adjectives that designate some of the following meanings depending on their trajector:

(35)  vakadzi vakobvu [C]
   va-kadzi va-kobvu
   cl.2-women cl.2-stout
   ‘stout women’

The adjective -kobvu when modifying gender 1/2 nouns that denote humans means ‘stout’ or ‘fat’. When it modifies nouns of other genders, besides denoting width, -kobvu can also denote denseness and consistency as examples (36) and (37) show respectively:

(36)  makore makobvu [C]
   ma-kore ma-kobvu
   cl.6-clouds cl.6-thick, heavy
   ‘thick, heavy clouds’

(37)  tii hobvu [C]
   Ø-tii Ø-hobvu
   cl.9-tea cl.9-strong
   ‘strong tea’

The adjectives -kuru ‘big’ and -diki ‘small’ are prototypically used to refer to size and dimension. However, when they modify nouns such as nyaya ‘story, issue, case’ or chirwere ‘illness, disease’, their semantic denotation is extended to refer to the gravity or seriousness of the issue or condition.
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(38) *nyaya diki* [C]
Ø-nyaya Ø-diki
cl.9-issue cl.9-small, uncomplicated
‘uncomplicated issue’

(39) *chirwere chidiki* [C]
chi-rwere chi-diki
cl.7-illness cl.7-small, minor
‘minor illness’

Another adjective that helps to illustrate this semantic extension is *mbishi* which prototypically denotes meanings of ‘raw, unripe, uncooked’ when its trajector is a thing that is expected to ripen or be cooked. When it modifies nouns that do not have this inherent characteristic, then the meaning of *mbishi* is semantically extended in some of these ways:

(40) *hope mbishi* [C]
Ø-hope Ø-mbishi
cl.9-sleep cl.9-fitfull
‘fitfull sleep’

In *hope mbishi* the meaning of *mbishi* is not construed in relation to being raw or unripe but *mbishi* in this case is understood in the context of lack and the failure to fulfil the desired expectation. As such when a person is said to have slept *hope mbishi* then they would have a fitfull and unrestful night. Other corpus concordances gave us *nzara mbishi* ‘lit. raw hunger’ where *mbishi* profiles a relationship with its trajector that is connected with hunger that is gnawing at someone strongly and has not be fulfilled; whereas in *shungu mbishi* ‘lit. raw emotions’ the adjective *mbishi* refers to the emotions that are raw in the sense of being emotionally upsetting.

The semantic types for Subgroup A are as shown in (41). The Shona adjective class consists of eight semantic types, of which seven are found in Subgroup A. The cardinal numbers to be discussed in 7.3.2 form the eighth semantic type. It is apparent that semantically Sungroup A is a core adjective class. We will also make reference to the description of adjectives by Givón (1984: 52) and Langacker (cf. 7.2.5.3) where they state that adjectives that denote size, shape, colour, and texture constitute time-stable physical properties. The majority of the adjectives in Subgroup A denote inherent characteristics. In point of fact, **DIMENSION, COLOUR, VALUE, HUMAN PROPENSITY** adjectives and the **PHYSICAL PROPERTY** adjective *kukutu* denote states that are permanent. Less permanent
properties are denoted by adjectives that relate to AGE, QUANTIFICATION, and the rest of the PHYSICAL PROPERTY adjectives -mbishi and -nyoro. These adjectives describe temporary properties because being new, raw, or wet are states that do not extend indefinitely but which last for a short period.

(41)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>semantic type</th>
<th>adjective</th>
<th>gloss</th>
<th>adjective</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIMENSION</td>
<td>-diki</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>-kuru</td>
<td>big</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-doodoko</td>
<td>very small</td>
<td>-pamhi</td>
<td>wide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-dukwane</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>-pfupi</td>
<td>short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-femu</td>
<td>wide</td>
<td>-refu</td>
<td>tall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-hombe</td>
<td>big</td>
<td>-tete</td>
<td>thin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-kobvu</td>
<td>thick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYSICAL PROPERTY</td>
<td>-kukutu</td>
<td>hard</td>
<td>-nyoro</td>
<td>wet, moist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-mbishi</td>
<td>raw, uncooked</td>
<td>nzvere</td>
<td>with young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLOUR</td>
<td>-chena</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>-svipa</td>
<td>black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-pfumbu</td>
<td>grey</td>
<td>-tema</td>
<td>black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-shava</td>
<td>light-brown</td>
<td>-tsvuku</td>
<td>red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-shora</td>
<td>yellow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>-dhara</td>
<td>old</td>
<td>-sharu</td>
<td>old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-nyowani</td>
<td>new</td>
<td>-tsva</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VALUE</td>
<td>-sande</td>
<td>holy</td>
<td>-uya</td>
<td>good, upright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-svinu</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>-vi</td>
<td>bad, evil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-tsvene</td>
<td>pure, holy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUMAN PROPENSITY</td>
<td>-kadzi</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>-naku</td>
<td>beautiful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-kono</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>-penyu</td>
<td>alive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUANTIFICATION</td>
<td>-shoma</td>
<td>few</td>
<td>-zhinji</td>
<td>many</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The QUANTIFICATION adjectives -shoma and -zhinji refer to amounts and these are temporary states in that they can be altered by decrease or incrementation. We can conclude that semantically the time-stable adjectives are the most prototypical.

The classification of the adjectives according to time-stability is illustrated in (42). This adjective subgroup has 36 members. 23 of the 36 adjectives denote inherent characteristics, whereas 13 denote temporary states. The dimensional adjectives constitute the largest group of the adjectives designating inherent properties, with the adjectives denoting evaluative judgements also having the majority of the adjectives denoting temporary states.
7.3.1.7 Frequency of occurrence, entrenchment and prototypicality

The token frequencies of the adjectives in Subgroup A are shown in (43).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>adjective type</th>
<th>semantic type</th>
<th>adjective</th>
<th>frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>inherent property</td>
<td>dimensional</td>
<td>-diki, -doodoko, -dukwane, -femu,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-hombe, -kobvu, -kuru, -pamhi, -pfupi,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-refu, -tete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>colour</td>
<td></td>
<td>-chena, -pfumbu, -shava, -shora, -svipa, -tema, -tsvuku</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>human propensity</td>
<td></td>
<td>-kadzi, -kono, -naku, -penyu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physical property</td>
<td></td>
<td>-kukutu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temporary state</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physical property</td>
<td></td>
<td>-mbishi, -nyoro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluative judgement</td>
<td></td>
<td>-sande, -svina, -tsvina, -uya, -vi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age</td>
<td></td>
<td>-dhara, -nyowani, -tsaru, tsva</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quantitative</td>
<td></td>
<td>-shoma, -zhinji</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>adjective</th>
<th>frequency</th>
<th>adjective</th>
<th>frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-zhinji</td>
<td>1567</td>
<td>-tsvina</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-kuru</td>
<td>1428</td>
<td>-kukutu</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-diki</td>
<td>1038</td>
<td>-kono</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-shoma</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>-nyowani/-nyuwani</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-refu</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>-pfumbu</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tema</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>-naku</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tsva</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>-tsaru</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-hombe</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>-sande</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tsvuku</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>-svina</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-chena</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>-doodoko/-doodori</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-pfupi</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>-dukwane/-dukwana</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tete</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>-pamhi</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-nyoro</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>-shora</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-kobvu</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>-svipa</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-penyu</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>-dhara</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-shava</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-femu</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-mbishi</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>-uya</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-kadzi</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>-vi</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The QUANTIFICATION adjective -*zhinji* ‘many’ has the highest token frequency not only in this subgroup but it is also the adjective with the highest frequency count out of all the adjectives in the Shona adjective class. The two adjectives that belong to the semantic type DIMENSION and which are also polar antonyms, -*kuru* (*guru, huru*) ‘big’ and -*diki* (-*doko, -duku, ndiki, -tiki, -toko, -tuku*) ‘small’ have frequencies of 1428 and 1038 respectively.

This group is the largest adjective group with 36 members. The total frequency count for these 36 adjectives is 8333 and the average frequency for this subgroup is 231.5. The correlation between the average frequency and frequencies of individual members is that 10 of the members have frequencies that are above the average. We can conclude that these 10 adjectives are the most frequent and the most entrenched in this subgroup and overall in Shona as well. The adjective -*pfupi* may also be included among these 10 because it is not very far from the average as its frequency count is 222. As the figures show, the frequencies decrease sharply from -*penyu* downwards, with -*dhara, -femu, -uya, and -ni* not having any occurrences in the corpus. This means that out of the oral interviews and written texts that produced the 2.9 million words in the corpus, these words are not said or recorded at all. Though they are prototypical adjectives in other respects, their nil occurrences in the corpus demonstrate that they are not entrenched and hence are the less prototypical adjectives in this subgroup. The adjectives -*doodoko, -dukwane, -pamhi, -shora, and -svipa* which have low token frequencies are also less entrenched and less prototypical than the other adjectives in this subgroup.

In relation to the time-stability of the adjectives presented in (42), out of the 23 that we identified as denoting inherent characteristics, 8 of these adjectives, viz. -*hombe, -kuru, -pfupi, -refu, -diki, -chena, -tema* and -*tsvuku* have frequencies above the group average. These 8 adjectives belong to two semantic types: DIMENSION and COLOUR. Using those statistics, we can conclude that these eight adjectives are the most prototypical because firstly, they satisfy all the criteria, secondly, they denote inherent characteristics and lastly, they are the most frequent and subsequently the most entrenched adjectives in Shona. Token frequency is related to prototypicality and it is also an indicator of degree of entrenchment. The adjectives that have a high token frequency in the Shona corpus are also those that comply with all the criteria that we have outlined.
We referred back to our source of data, *Duramazwi Guru reChiShona*, and found out that the adjectives *-kuru*, *-pfupi*, and *-diki* had the most senses out of this group of prototypical adjectives: *-kuru* has 5 senses, *-pfupi* has 4 senses, and *-diki* has 6 senses. The adjective *-refu* has only 1 sense but we have shown that it is one of the most polysemous adjectives therefore its definition should have incorporated more senses because from the Shona corpus we identified at least 5 senses for *-refu*.

### 7.3.1.8 Summary and conclusion

We can sum up this discussion by pointing out that the adjectives in Subgroup A constitute the prototypical adjective subgroup. Firstly, this adjective subgroup is the only one that satisfies all the criteria that we outlined; secondly, in terms of meaning it also represents the subgroup with the most polysemous adjectives and the most number of semantic types. It is also the subgroup with the highest number of members and the highest number of total frequencies. It was also pointed out that there are some adjectives in this subgroup that are more prototypical than the other adjectives because they were more frequent and hence more entrenched.

### 7.3.2 Subgroup B: Cardinal Numbers

Subgroup B adjectives are formed from adjectival roots like the Subgroup A adjectives. Hence, they also take their agreement from the head noun. However, they differ from Subgroup A adjectives in that they are not gradable. Subgroup B adjectives are listed in (44).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>adjective</th>
<th>gloss</th>
<th>adjective</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-bodzi</td>
<td>one</td>
<td>-tanhatu</td>
<td>six</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-mwe</td>
<td>one</td>
<td>-nomwe</td>
<td>seven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-piri</td>
<td>two</td>
<td>-sere</td>
<td>eight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tatu</td>
<td>three</td>
<td>-pfemba</td>
<td>nine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-na</td>
<td>four</td>
<td>-pfumbamwe</td>
<td>nine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-rongomuna</td>
<td>four</td>
<td>-kumi</td>
<td>ten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-shanu</td>
<td>five</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cardinal numbers are a type of quantifier. Their function in a noun phrase is to instantiate a noun by designating quantity. As such, numerals are specific and they designate a bounded region in the quantity domain.
7.3.2.1 Attributive position

Subgroup B adjectives occur in the attributive position, as in (45):

(45)  
\[ \text{tsuro mbiri \ [C]} \]
\[ \emptyset \text{-tsuro} \emptyset \text{-mbiri} \]
\[ \text{cl.9-hares cl.9-two} \]
\[ \text{‘two hares’} \]

7.3.2.2 Predicative position

Subgroup B adjectives function in the predicative position:

(46)  
\[ \text{dzimba imbiri \ [C]} \]
\[ \text{dzi-mba i-imbiri} \]
\[ \text{cl.10-houses COP-two} \]
\[ \text{‘the houses are two’} \]

(47)  
\[ \text{mhandu dzangu imbiri \ [C]} \]
\[ \emptyset \text{-mhandu dza-ngu i-imbiri} \]
\[ \text{cl.10-enemies cl.10-my COP-two} \]
\[ \text{‘my enemies are two’} \]

7.3.2.3 Agreement

The form of these adjectives resembles that of the noun and as a result they take the agreement of the noun. For example:

(48)  
\[ \text{makore mapfumbamwe \ [C]} \]
\[ \text{ma-kore ma-pfumbamwe} \]
\[ \text{cl.6-years cl.6-nine} \]
\[ \text{‘nine years’} \]

(49)  
\[ \text{mazuwa marongomuna \ [C]} \]
\[ \text{ma-zuwa ma-rongomuna} \]
\[ \text{cl.6-days cl.6-four} \]
\[ \text{‘four days’} \]

In (48) and (49) we have used two different adjectives that show class agreement with class 6.

7.3.2.4 Class range

Cardinal numbers have an unlimited class range – they modify nouns from all classes. In exhibiting this characteristic they are prototypical adjectives in that respect.
7.3.2.5 Gradability
Cardinal numbers are not gradable. It is only those adjectives that denote properties which can be expressed in degrees or according to a scale that are capable of being graded. Cardinal numbers are precise, and as such, they cannot be graded.

7.3.2.5.1 Intensification with -sa
Cardinal numbers also cannot be intensified. It is not possible to say *zvitusa *‘very three’ or *zvinasa *‘very four’.

7.3.2.5.2 Reduplication
Subgroup B adjectives also cannot be reduplicated. One cannot say *zvingwa zviviriviri *‘two loaves of bread two’.

7.3.2.5.3 Comparatives
Cardinal numbers cannot be compared. It is not grammatical in Shona to say *zvingwa izvi zvitatu kudarika izvo *‘these three loaves of bread are more three than those’.

(50)  
*zvingwa izvi zvitatu kudarika izvo  
zvi-ngwa i-zvi zvi-tatu kudarika i-zvo  
c.l.8-bread cl.8-these cl.8-three compared to cl.8-those  
*‘these three loaves of bread compared to those’

7.3.2.5.4 Modification by adverbs
Cardinal numbers also cannot be modified by the degree modifiers zvikuru ‘very’, chaizvo ‘very’ zvakanyanya ‘extremely’. Thus, *zvitatu zvikuru *‘very three’ or *zvina chaizvo *‘very four’ is not possible’.

7.3.2.6 Semantic structure
Cardinal numbers are relational in that they require reference to the entity that is being quantified. They are construed in relation to the quantity domain. The construal of numerals is absolute in that when entities are quantified as being seven, then there is no possibility of them being anything else. There is no radiality in the semantic structure of numerals in that their meaning remains constant irrespective of their trajector. Therefore in terms of meaning they answer the question: how many?

The quantification terms in Shona include these cardinal numbers as well as the two adjectives that denote quantity, namely, -shoma ‘few’ and -zhinji ‘many’ of Subgroup A.
The semantic difference between the cardinal numbers (-mwe, -piri, etc.) and the quantification terms (-shoma and -zhinji) is that the former are absolute, they can be counted and as a result they have specific amounts, while the latter are not absolute that is why they are gradable. Image schematically -zhinji and -shoma are conceptualized as a mass whose amount can be increased or lessened, whereas cardinal numbers are conceptualized as individual entities that can be counted and that are incremented by adding another number. Their ability to be altered in value makes them temporary states.

7.3.2.7 Frequency of occurrence, entrenchment and prototypicality

This group has 13 members whose total frequency is 4401. The average frequency in this subgroup is 338.5. Among all the subgroups, this is the subgroup with the highest average frequency. In terms of total frequency it is the second after Subgroup A.

(51)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>adjective</th>
<th>frequency</th>
<th>adjective</th>
<th>frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-tatu</td>
<td>1294</td>
<td>-sere</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-piri/-viri</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>-nomwe</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-mwe</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>-pfumbamwe</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-shanu</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>-bodzi</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-na</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>-rongomuna</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tanhatu</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>-pfemba</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gumi</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of frequency of occurrence, the adjective -tatu ‘three’ has 1294 tokens and it has the most number of tokens in the subgroup and the second most number of tokens out of all the Shona adjectives. The adjectives with the least number of tokens in this subgroup are -pfemba ‘nine’ which has no tokens and -rongomuna ‘four’ with 5 tokens. This may be attributed to the fact that these adjectives are dialectal varieties of the adjectives -na ‘four’ and -pfumbamwe ‘nine’ which as the tokens show, are unquestionably more frequent and subsequently more entrenched than -pfemba and -rongomuna. The same applies to -bodzi ‘one’ which has 15 tokens compared to its synonym -mwe ‘one’ which has 586 tokens. Most of the adjectives in this subgroup have a sizeable number of tokens which demonstrates that this is a subgroup of adjectives that are entrenched and prototypical.
7.3.2.8 Summary and conclusion

This subgroup of adjectives is also a prototypical group. Its only difference with Subgroup A is in terms of gradability. Semantically Subgroup B adjectives denote one semantic type: CARDINAL NUMBERS which we have attested to be a temporary adjectival characteristic. Their meanings are concise and therefore they are not polysemous. The adjective -tatu is more frequent than other adjectives in Subgroup B, hence it is the most entrenched and the most prototypical adjective. The least entrenched adjectives in this subgroup are -pfemba ‘nine’, -bodzi ‘one’ and -rongomuna ‘four’

7.3.3 Subgroup C: Limited class range adjectives

(52)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>adjective</th>
<th>gloss</th>
<th>adjective</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-dodo</td>
<td>slim</td>
<td>nzvere</td>
<td>with young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hofu</td>
<td>hollow</td>
<td>siri</td>
<td>small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-kuma</td>
<td>naked</td>
<td>siri</td>
<td>genuine, pure, true</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nhuru</td>
<td>greyish-brown</td>
<td>-tano</td>
<td>healthy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The consonants /hl/ and /nhl/ are modifications as we have indicated in Chapter 6, but in the case of the adjectives hofu and nhuru we cannot claim that the base form for hofu is *kofu, and neither is *turu the base for nhuru. When the class marker is a modification then it is difficult to identify it, especially when the adjectives have a limited class range. Comparisons can be drawn with English which uses the suffix -er on verbs to form nouns that refer to the person who performs a particular action, hence rob ~ robber, paint ~ painter, protect ~ protector; but exceptions are found in nouns such as doctor and tailor that have are no corresponding verbs *to doct or *to tail.

Our list of adjectives shows the adjective siri ‘genuine, pure, true’ that has the same phonological form as siri ‘small’. The corpus concordances showed that siri ‘genuine, pure, true’ is a different adjective whose usage context is as follows:

(53)  Mwana akagarwa netsika siri dzechivanhu [C]
     Mw-ana a-ka-gar-w-a ne-Ø-tsika siri dz-e-chi-vanhu
     cl.1-child 3sg-PST-sit-PASS-FV CONJ-cl.10-manners genuine cl.10-GEN-cl.7-
     indigenous

‘child has genuine indigenous manners’
There was consensus among our informants that this was a different adjective which has a different meaning. This therefore means that these two adjectives siri ‘small’ and siri ‘genuine, pure, true’ are homonyms. In (55) the meaning of the nominal phrase tsika siri the meaning is that of true and genuine manners. In meaning it can also be taken to be synonymous to svinu, and in that respect it is thus possible to say tsika svinu ‘true, genuine manners’. Both tsika siri and tsika svinu are analysed below:

(55) tsika siri [C]
Ø-tsika Ø-siri
cl.10-manners cl.10-genuine, true
‘genuine, true manners’

(56) tsika svinu [E]
Ø-tsika Ø-svinu
cl.10-manners cl.10-genuine, true
‘genuine, true manners’

We will further demonstrate in 7.3.3.8 that in other constructions siri can also function as an adverb, hence underlining Croft’s argument that the categories in a language are determined by the constructions in which they occur.

7.3.3.1 Attributive position

All the adjectives in this subgroup can occur in the attributive position.

(57) ndiro hofu [C]
Ø-ndiro Ø-hofu
cl.9-plate cl.9-hollow
‘hollow plate’

(58) mhuru nhuru [C]
Ø-mhuru Ø-nhuru
cl.9-calf cl.9-blue-black
‘greyish-brown calf’

(59) nhume siri [C]
Ø-nhume Ø-siri
cl.9-messenger cl.9-genuine, true
‘genuine, true messenger’
7.3.3.2 Predicative position

Syntactically, the adjectives in this subgroup can all function in the predicative position.

(60) *ndiro iyi ihofu* [I]  
    Ø-ndiro i-yi i-hofu  
    cl.9-plate cl.9-this COP-hollow  
    ‘this plate is hollow’

(61) *mhuru iyi inhuru* [C]  
    Ø-mhuru i-yi i-nhuru  
    cl.9-calf cl.9-this COP-blue-black  
    ‘this calf is greyish-brown’

7.3.3.3 Agreement

All the adjectives in this subgroup take the class marker of the head noun. The adjectives *hofu* ‘hollow’, *nhuru* ‘greyish-brown, *nzvere* ‘with young’, *siri* ‘small’ and *siri* ‘genuine, pure, true’ are a type of adjective that have a regular class 9 structure. Their initial consonants resemble the gender 9/10 modifications discussed in Chapter 6.

7.3.3.4 Class range

Less prototypical adjectives only modify particular nouns. The adjectives of Subgroup C have a limited class range because they only modify specific nouns. For instance, *-tano* modifies nouns that refer to humans, but it can also be extended to other classes. Nonetheless its class range remains limited because it cannot be used in all genders. The adjective *siri* ‘small’ is specific to things that are naturally or abnormally small. Corpus evidence shows that its homonym *siri* ‘genuine, pure, true’ modifies nouns of class 9 and 10 hence its class range is also limited. The adjective *-kuma*, on the other hand, only modifies nouns that refer to humans and which have a class marker. Because of this morphological behaviour and limited semantic range, it only modifies nouns of specific classes. Similarly, *-dodo* also modifies nouns that refer to humans, specifically in genders 1/2, 7/8, 12/13 and class 19. This is because its semantic range is limited to these classes. It cannot modify class 5 and 21 nouns because these are pejorative classes whose meanings are not compatible with its meaning which describes the property of being ‘slim’.
7.3.3.5 Gradability

7.3.3.5.1 Intensification
Only -dodo, nhuru, hofu, and -tano can be intensified with -sa. The other adjectives cannot be intensified. It is not possible to say *sirisa ‘very abnormally small’ because the meaning of being very small is already inherent in siri. Also *nzveresa ‘very with young’ and *-kumasa are also not possible because there are no degrees of ‘being with young’ or ‘being naked’.

7.3.3.5.2 Reduplication
The adjectives in this subgroup cannot be reduplicated.

7.3.3.5.3 Comparatives
Only the adjectives -dodo ‘slim’, hofu ‘hollow’, -tano ‘healthy’ and nhuru ‘blue-black’ can be compared. The sentences in (62) and (63) are grammatical.

(62) ndiro iyi ihofu kudarika iyo [E]
Ø-ndiro i-yi i-hofu kudarika i-yo  
cl.9-plate cl.9-this COP-hollow compared to cl.9-that  
‘this plate is hollower compared to that one’

(63) mombe iyi inhuru kudarika iyo [I]
Ø-mombe i-yi i-nhuru kudarika i-yo  
cl.9-cow cl.9-this COP-blue black compared to cl.9-that  
‘this cow is more greyish-brown compared to that one’

7.3.3.5.4 Modification by adverbs
The adjectives hofu, nhuru, -dodo, -tano and siri ‘small’ can be modified by adverbs; nzvera, -kuma and siri ‘genuine, pure, true’ cannot.

(64) mombe nhuru chaizvo [I]
Ø-mombe nhuru chaizvo  
cl.9-cow cl.9-greyish-brown very  
‘cow that is very greyish-brown’

(65) nyimo siri zvikuru [E]
Ø-nyimo siri zvikuru  
cl.9-roundnut small extremely  
‘extremely small roundnut’
7.3.3.6 Semantic structure

(66)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>semantic type</th>
<th>adjective</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PHYSICAL PROPERTY</td>
<td>-hofu</td>
<td>hollow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-kuma</td>
<td>naked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-tano</td>
<td>healthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nzvere</td>
<td>with young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>siri</td>
<td>small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIMENSION</td>
<td>-dodo</td>
<td>slim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLOUR</td>
<td>nhuru</td>
<td>greyish-brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VALUE</td>
<td>siri</td>
<td>genuine, pure, true</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The adjectives *hofu*, -*kuma*, -*tano*, *nzvere* and *siri* belong to the PHYSICAL PROPERTY semantic type; with -*tano* and *nzvere* belonging to the corporeal domain of the PHYSICAL PROPERTY semantic type. The adjective -*siri* ‘genuine, pure, true’ denotes the semantic type VALUE. In terms of stability in time, *nzvere*, -*kuma*, and -*tano* denote temporary states. The adjective -*dodo* is a DIMENSION adjective that denotes an inherent property. *Hofu*, *siri* ‘small’ and *nhuru* also denote inherent properties. The adjective *siri* ‘genuine, pure, true’ is an evaluative adjective which is a temporary characteristic. This stability in time is presented in (67).

(67)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>adjective type</th>
<th>semantic type</th>
<th>adjective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>inherent property</td>
<td>physical property</td>
<td><em>hofu</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>siri</em> ‘small’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>colour</td>
<td><em>nhuru</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dimensional</td>
<td>-<em>dodo</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temporary state</td>
<td>physical property</td>
<td>-<em>kuma</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-<em>tano</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-<em>nzvere</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>evalulative judgement</td>
<td><em>siri</em> ‘genuine, pure, true’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.3.3.7 Frequency of occurrence, entrenchment and prototypicality

(68)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>adjective</th>
<th>frequency</th>
<th>adjective</th>
<th>frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-<em>dodo</em></td>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>hofu</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>nzvere</em></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-<em>tano</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>nhuru</em></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-<em>kuma</em></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>siri</em></td>
<td>2</td>
<td><em>siri</em> (small)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This subgroup has eight members whose total frequency count is 13. The average frequency for this group is 1.6. Out of these eight members, six of the members have very low frequencies. The adjective with the most tokens is -dodo, whereas siri ‘small’ and -kuma ‘naked’ have no tokens. Based on this low frequency, we can deduce that the adjectives in this subgroup are less frequent, less entrenched and subsequently less prototypical.

### 7.3.3.8 Part of speech membership

The adjective siri has dual class membership. In other constructions it can function as an adverb illustrated in (69) where it modifies the infinitive kukoka ‘to invite’.

(69)   **Kukoka siri kunonyorwa tsamba iri mu-first person** [C]

   Ku-koka siri ku-no-nyor-w-a Ø-tsamba i-ri mu-first person
   cl.15-invite properly cl.15-HAB-write-PASS-FV cl.9-letter cl.9-be cl.18-first person

   ‘to invite properly the letter is written in the first person’

The meaning of siri in this construction is synonymous to kukoka chaiko ‘to invite in a proper way’ or kukoka nomazvo ‘to invite properly, wholeheartedly’. In (69) siri belongs to the adverb category because semantically it denotes the manner of doing something and syntactically it is modifying an infinitive.

### 7.3.3.9 Summary and conclusion

This group has seven members that have a limited class range and they differ from the prototype in this respect. We can conclude from their grammatical behaviour and the statistics from the corpus that they this group comprises of nonprototypical adjectives.

### 7.3.4 Subgroup D: Genitive Group

Adjectives of Subgroup D are mostly loanwords, and among them are the colour terms as illustrated in (70). The adjectives in this subgroup were extracted from *Duramazwi Guru reChiShona* (2001). The only modification that we have effected on these adjectives is the addition of the genitive marker -e- before the adjectives. Our argument for this modification arises from the fact that the genitive marker is an obligatory and invariable
marker which always precedes the adjective. With the exception of -e-chisambi ‘chequered’, all the other adjectives in this subgroup are loanwords from English, and this may explain their different composition from the prototypical adjectives in Subgroup A.

As already discussed, most of the adjectives in Subgroup A are lexemes that take the class marker of the noun they modify as either prefixes or modifications. The adjectives that belong to this subgroup are different in that they have a prefix of the genitive constituent. This genitive marker is an obligatory element, without which the resultant composite structure is rendered ungrammatical. The composite structure of this subgroup relative to the head noun is: [head noun] + [agr+gen+adjective].

(70)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>adjective</th>
<th>gloss</th>
<th>adjective</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-e-bhurauni/-e-bhuravuni</td>
<td>brown</td>
<td>-e-meruni</td>
<td>maroon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-e-bhuleki/-e-bhureki</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>-e-orenji</td>
<td>orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-e-bhuruu/-e-bhuluu</td>
<td>blue</td>
<td>-e-pingi</td>
<td>pink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-e-chekicheki/-e-cheki</td>
<td>chequered</td>
<td>-e-pepuru/-e-pepo</td>
<td>purple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-e-chisambi</td>
<td>chequered</td>
<td>-e-raundi</td>
<td>round</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-e-gireyi</td>
<td>grey</td>
<td>-e-redhi</td>
<td>red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-e-girini</td>
<td>green</td>
<td>-e-vhayoreti</td>
<td>violet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-e-kaki</td>
<td>khakhi</td>
<td>-e-waiti</td>
<td>white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-e-kirimu</td>
<td>cream</td>
<td>-e-yero</td>
<td>yellow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The words pingi and bhuruu had been lemmatised in Duramazwi Guru reChiShona as nouns but we are claiming that they are adjectives both semantically and through their grammatical behaviour which is similar to that of the other adjectives in this subgroup.

This group of adjectives resembles the genitive construction in some but not all respects. For instance, these genitive-like adjectives differ from ordinary genitive constructions such as *muti wemuchero* ‘fruit tree’ which is a *N + N* construction that is conjoined by the genitive construction, while a construction like *dhirezi regirini* ‘green dress’ is a *N + ADJ* construction. As such the latter is not an ordinary genitive construction but an adjectival construction that is in the form of a genitive. The *N + ADJ* construction also differs from ordinary genitive constructions that signal possession in that the genitive of possession construction is not gradable. Semantically, *N + N* constructions such as *muti wemuchero* ‘fruit tree’ or *denga remba* ‘roof of the house’ are conceptualized as part-whole relations; whereas with a *N + ADJ* construction its construal is that of an attribute.

The other important difference between this subgroup of adjectives and nouns that occur in the genitive construction is that these adjectives never occur without the class marker and genitive particle. That is, the stems that follow the genitive particle never occur without that particle.

Forms have been identified in Shona which superficially resemble genitives but which still have to be analyzed as non-prototypical adjectives. It is worth mentioning that this phenomenon can be found not only in Shona, but also in other languages. Here, some Norwegian examples are presented, from Rolf Theil (personal communication). Norwegian genitives end in *-s*, as in *Johns bil* ‘John’s car’ or *Noregs hovudstad* ‘Norway’s capital’. Some adjectives end in this *-s* and are clearly related to nouns without this *-s*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOUN</th>
<th>ADJECTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>stakkar</em> ‘wretch, poor creature’</td>
<td><em>stakkars</em> ‘poor, wretched’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>helvete</em> ‘hell’</td>
<td><em>helvetes</em> ‘hellish, infernal, diabolical’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>fanden</em> ‘the Devil, Satan’</td>
<td><em>fandens</em> ‘damned, bloody, blasted’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Stakkars, helvetes, and fandens* are classified as adjectives in Norwegian dictionaries like *Nynorskordboka* and *Bokmålsordboka*. Such adjectives differ markedly from more prototypical Norwegian adjectives, by lacking inflection; most Norwegian adjectives have the inflectional pattern illustrated in (72) with the adjective *STOR* ‘big’.
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Indefinite masculine/feminine singular   \textit{stor}  
Indefinite neuter singular          \textit{stort}  
Indefinite plural or definite  \textit{store}  

There are several reasons why words like \textit{stakkars}, \textit{helvetes}, and \textit{fandens} should be analyzed as adjectives. First, they differ from regular genitives semantically, by expressing atemporal relations and not reference points. Secondly, they differ from genitives syntactically, by occurring for example between a definite article and a noun, as in \textit{det stakkars barnet} ‘the poor child’. Like in English, genitives do not occur in this environment in Norwegian, cf. \textit{*det Johns barnet} ‘*the John’s child’.

Adjectives of the type illustrated in (71) are also found in Danish and Swedish. Danish \textit{stakkel} / \textit{stakkels} and Swedish \textit{stackare} / \textit{stackars} correspond to Norwegian \textit{stakkar} / \textit{stakkars}. Particularly interesting from a Shona perspective are words like \textit{gjengs} ‘current, prevalent’ and \textit{alskens} ‘of every kind’. Although they are genitives historically, there are no related forms in modern Norwegian without the -\textit{s}.

\subsection*{7.3.4.1 Attributive position}

Syntactically Subgroup E adjectives occur attributively. In (73) and (74) \textit{regirini} and \textit{wewaiti} are part of the noun phrase.

\begin{itemize}
\item (73)  \textit{juzi regirini} [C]  
          \textit{	extdegree-juzi r-e-girini}  
          cl.5-jersey cl.5-GEN-green  
          ‘green jersey’
\item (74)  \textit{mucheka wewaiti} [C]  
          \textit{mu-cheka w-e-waiti}  
          cl.3-cloth cl.3-GEN-white  
          ‘white cloth’
\end{itemize}

\subsection*{7.3.4.2 Predicative position}

Subgroup D adjectives can also occur in the predicative position as in (75) where the adjective occupies the predicate position.

\begin{itemize}
\item (75)  \textit{juzi iri nderegirini} [I]  
          \textit{	extdegree-juzi i-ri nde-r-e-girini}  
          cl.5-jersey cl.5-this COP-cl.5-GEN-green  
          ‘this jersey is green’
\end{itemize}
7.3.4.3 Agreement

The genitive subgroup shows class agreement with the head noun. For example:

(76) butiro rekaki [C]
    Ø-butiro r-e-kaki
    cl.5-wrapping cl.5-GEN-khaki
    ‘khakhi wrapping’

(77) hovhorosi yeyero [C]
    Ø-hovhorosi y-e-yero
    cl.9-overall cl.9-GEN-yellow
    ‘yellow overalls’

In examples (76) and (77) the genitive marker is obligatory. It is not possible to say *butiro kaki or *hovhorosi yero because the obligatory agreement and genitive markers are absent on the adjective.

7.3.4.4 Class range

These adjectives can modify nouns in all classes. In that respect they resemble the prototype.

7.3.4.5 Gradability

We will posit that the adjectives in Subgroup D are gradable in varying ways. In our discussion of the gradability of Subgroup A adjectives, we postulated that even those adjectives that are not gradable can be coerced into being gradable. We are thus proposing the same semantic schematization for the adjectives in this subgroup, because according to Langacker (2008: 27), meanings are in the minds of the speakers who produce and understand the expressions.

7.3.4.5.1 Intensification with -sa

The adjectives in this group can also be suffixed with -sa for intensification. All the examples that we will make reference to are not in the corpus, but through elicitation some informants stated that they are also possible. These examples are: -e-redhisa ‘very red’, -e-bhuraunisa ‘very brown’, -e-girinisa ‘very green’, -e-merunisa ‘very maroon’, -e-yerosa ‘very yellow’, -e-raundisa ‘very round’, -e-chekisa ‘very chequered’.
7.3.4.5.2 Reduplication

It is worth pointing out that the way in which the adjectives in Subgroup D reduplicate also proves that -e- is simply a genitive marker. For instance, the pattern of reduplication for the adjective girini is -e-girini girini and not *-e-girini e-girini, hence the reduplication of the adjectives in this subgroup is partial. This is because the genitive particle always attaches to the first adjective. For example:

(78)  *shizha regirini girini [E]  
Ø-shizha r-e-girini girini  
c.l.5-leaf c.l.5-GEN-green green  
‘very green leaf’

(79)  *chingwa chebhurauni bhurauni [E]  
chi-ngwa ch-e-bhurauni bhurauni  
c.l.7 bread c.l.7-GEN-brown brown  
‘very brown bread’

Not all the adjectives in this subgroup can be reduplicated. For instance, chekicheki ‘chequered’, -e-chisambi and -e-vhayoreti ‘violet’ cannot be reduplicated.

7.3.4.5.3 Comparatives

As with Subgroup A adjectives the comparative forms kudarika/kupfuura/kupinda/pane can also be used with this adjective group. For example:

(80)  *chingwa ichi ndechebhurauni kupfuura icho [E]  
chi-ngwa i-chi nde-ch-e-bhurauni kupfuura i-cho  
c.l.7 bread c.l.7-this COP-cl.7-GEN-brown compared to cl.7-that  
‘this bread is more brown compared to that one’

(81)  *dhirezi iri ndereredhi kupinda iro [E]  
Ø-dhirezi i-ri nde-r-e-redhi kupinda i-ro  
c.l.5-dress c.l.5-this COP-cl.5-GEN-red compared to cl.5-that  
‘this dress is more red compared to that one’

7.3.4.5.4 Modification by adverbs

Colour adjectives can also be modified by the adverbs chaizvo ‘very’, zvikuru ‘very’ and zvakanyanya ‘extremely’. The noun phrase chingwa chebhurauni can also be modified by adverbs to give:

(82)  *chingwa chebhurauni chaizvo [E]  
chi-ngwa ch-e-bhurauni chaizvo  
c.l.7-bread c.l.7-GEN-brown very  
‘very brown bread’
The criterion of gradability is one criterion that differentiates ordinary genitive constructions from the adjectives of Subgroup D. For example, it is ungrammatical to have the two structures in (84) and (85) because ordinary genitive constructions cannot be reduplicated. They cannot take comparatives and in addition they cannot be modified by adverbs.

(84) *bhuku remukomana mukomana [I]
Ø-bhuku r-e-mukomana mu-komana
cl.5-book cl.5-GEN-cl.1-boy cl.1-boy
*’boy’s book boy’

(85) *bhuku remukomana zvikuru [I]
Ø-bhuku r-e-mukomana zvikuru
cl.5-book cl.5-GEN-boy very
*’very boy’s book’

7.3.4.6 Semantic structure
The adjectives in this subgroup refer to DIMENSION and COLOUR, as illustrated in (86). The colour adjectives in this subgroup do not possess a similar polysemous structure as the colour adjectives in Subgroup A. For instance, the adjective -e-redhi ‘red’ is a loanword which is equivalent to -tsvuku ‘red’. The adjective -tsvuku is more polysemous than -e-redhi because the latter only refers to colour and does not undergo any of the metaphorical mappings that were discussed in 7.3.1.5. It is therefore not possible to substitute nhamo tsvuku ‘serious problem’ with *nhamo yeredhi because the semantic structure of -e-redhi does not permit this semantic extension.

(86)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>semantic type</th>
<th>adjective</th>
<th>gloss</th>
<th>adjective</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIMENSION</td>
<td>-e-raundi</td>
<td>round</td>
<td>-e-meruni</td>
<td>maroon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLOUR</td>
<td>-e-bhurawuni</td>
<td>brown</td>
<td>-e-orenji</td>
<td>orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-e-bhuleki/-e-bhureki</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>-e-pepuro</td>
<td>purple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-e-bhuruu</td>
<td>blue</td>
<td>-e-pingi</td>
<td>pink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-e-chekicheki</td>
<td>chequered</td>
<td>-e-redhi</td>
<td>red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-e-chisambi</td>
<td>chequered</td>
<td>-e-vhagoreti</td>
<td>violet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-e-gireyi</td>
<td>grey</td>
<td>-e-waiti</td>
<td>white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-e-giriini</td>
<td>green</td>
<td>-e-yero</td>
<td>yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-e-kaki</td>
<td>khaki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-e-kirimu</td>
<td>cream</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In 7.3.1.5 we already referred to the fact that COLOUR and DIMENSION adjectives are permanent states; this also applies to the adjectives in this subgroup in that they describe inherent characteristics. In that respect, semantically they denote prototypical adjective characteristics.

7.3.4.7 Frequency of occurrence, entrenchment and prototypicality

This group has 18 members whose total frequency count is 54. The average frequency for each adjective in this subgroup is 3. This group exhibits mixed results in relation to token frequency. Out of the 18 members in this group, 7 members have frequencies above the group average, whereas the remaining 11 members have frequencies below the group average. These low frequencies of occurrence indicate that these adjectives are not entrenched in Shona, even though they represent prototypical semantic characteristics but they are certainly not prototypical adjectives. The other members in this group that have higher frequencies are more entrenched and hence more prototypical.

The other observation that can be arrived at from these statistics is that with the exception of only two adjectives, the rest of adjectives in this subgroup that have indigenous equivalents are generally less frequently used than the indigenous equivalents in Subgroup A. The adjective -e-yero which has more token frequencies than -shora with 2 tokens and within this subgroup -e-chisambi and -e-chekicheki are equivalents, and the statistics indicate that the loanword -e-chekicheki has a higher usage than -e-chisambi. By comparison, -shava has 45 tokens compared to -e-bhurauni which has 1 token; -tsvuku has 356 tokens whereas -e-redhi has 3; -tema has 564 tokens in comparison to -e-bhuleki which has 1 token; -chena has 292 tokens compared to -e-waiti with 0; -pfumbu has 18 and
-e-gireyi has 3 tokens. Therefore, it is only -e-yero and -e-chekicheki that have higher
token frequencies than their indigenous equivalents. Overall, the indigenous Shona colour
terms are used more frequently than the loanwords.

7.3.4.8 Part of speech membership

There are also some nouns that have the same phonological forms with some of the
adjectives in this subgroup, as shown in (88).

(88)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>word</th>
<th>adjective gloss</th>
<th>noun gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>raundi</td>
<td>round (shape)</td>
<td>chance, turn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kirimu</td>
<td>cream (colour)</td>
<td>cream (dairy product)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orenji</td>
<td>orange (colour)</td>
<td>orange (fruit)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Raundi is only used as a noun with the meaning of ‘chance’ or ‘turn’ hence it doesn’t occur
very frequently as a noun. Raundi is a loanword hence its having dual class membership is
not peculiar to Shona but is also the case in the source language, English. Quirk et al.
(1972: 231) show that round can be a noun (e.g. a round of golf), a verb (e.g. they round
the corner), an adjective (e.g. a round object), an adverb (e.g. he came round to see us) or a
preposition (e.g. they sat round the table). The adjective and noun homonyms are separate
words in Shona. Hence in (89a) kirimu functions as a noun, whereas in (89b) it is an
adjective.

(89a) Ipa vanhu kofi nhema, mukaka kana kirimu mukabhikiri [C]
i-p-a va-nhu Ø-kofi Ø-nhema mu-kaka kana Ø-kirimu mu-ka-bhikiri
SC-give-FV cl.2-people cl.9-coffee cl.9-black cl.3-milk or cl.19-cream cl.18-in-
c1.12-beaker
‘Give people black coffee, milk or cream in a beaker’

(89b) Ruomba rune ruvara rwekirimu [DGS]
ru-omba ru-ne ru-vara rw-e-kirimu
cl.11-butterfat cl.11-have cl.11-colour cl.11-GEN-cream
‘Butterfat has a cream colour’

In example (89a) kirimu is a noun because syntactically the conjunction kana ‘or’ is used
to connect words that belong to the same word class. The word mukaka ‘milk’ is a noun,
therefore in this construction the semantic and syntactic rules only permit a noun to occur
after the conjunction, hence kana ‘or’ functions as a connector for the two nouns mukaka
‘milk’ and kirimu ‘cream’. In the construction in (89b), kirimu ‘cream’ functions as an
adjective which is ascribing the property colour to butterfat – and *ruvara rwekirimu* cannot be translated as ‘the colour of cream’. As a result, the adjective *kirimu* ‘cream’ and the noun *kirimu* ‘cream’ are separate words that display different syntactic characteristics, and semantically the former designates a property and the latter designates a thing. The examples in (90) also show the syntactic variation between *orenji* functioning as a noun and as an adjective respectively.

(90a)  *Ndiyo michero mitsva nemaorenji etakapiwa kuti tisime* [C]
       ndi-yo mi-chero mi-tsva ne-ma-orenji e-ta-ka-p-iw-a kuti ti-sim-e
       PRES-these are cl.4-fruits cl.4-new CONJ-cl.6-oranges SC6-PRON-PST-give-
       PASS-FV CONJ 1pl-plant-FV
       ‘These are the new fruits and oranges that we were given to plant’

(90b)  *Tendai akapfeka siketi yeorenji* [I]
       PN a-ka-pfek-a Ø-siketi y-e-orenji
       Tendai 3sg-PST-wear-FV cl.9-skirt cl.9-GEN-orange
       ‘Tendai is wearing an orange skirt’

In (90a) *maorenji* functions as a noun which is denoting a concrete thing, oranges. In (90b), on the other hand, *orenji* is an adjective in that its function in this construction is to denote the property of the noun in terms of its colour. The word *orenji* in (90a) is a loanword which has an equivalent *ranjisi* ‘orange’. As such to show that these nominal and adjectival functions of orange (fruit) and orange (colour) are separate, we will modify example (90b) as follows:

(90c)  *Ranjisi/orenji rine ruvara rweorenji* [I]
       Ø-ranjisi ri-ne ru-vara rw-e-orenji
       cl.5-orange cl.5-have cl.11-colour cl.11-GEN-orange
       ‘An orange has an orange colour’

The examples in (91) also show the categoric differences between *raundi* as a noun and *raundi* functioning as an adjective.

(91a)  *Vakangowana raundi yechipiri yemaraundi mana* [C]
       va-ka-n-go-wan-a Ø-raundi y-e-chi-piri y-e-ma-raundi ma-na
       3pl-PST-POT-get-FV cl.9-round cl.9-GEN-cl.7-second cl.9-GEN-cl.6-rounds
       cl.6-four
       ‘They only got the second round out of four rounds’

(91b)  *Imba yeraundi* [SSD]
       Ø-imba y-e-raundi
       cl.9-house cl.9-GEN-round
       ‘Round house’
The use of the word *raundi* in (91a) refers to chances or turns. It is a noun in that in this construction it makes an abstract reference to the chances that were available. The noun *raundi* can be substituted by the noun *jana* ‘turn on rota’ and the construction would still maintain its grammaticality and a near equivalent meaning.

(91c)  
\[\text{Vakangowana jana rechipiri remajana mana [C]}\]  
\[\text{v-a-ka-ngo-wan-a 0-jana r-e-chi-piri r-e-ma-jana ma-na}\]  
\[\text{3pl-PST-POT-get-FV cl.5-turn cl.5-GEN-cl.7-second cl.5-GEN-cl.6-turns cl.6-four}\]  
‘They only got the second turn out of four turns’

The word *raundi* in (91b) is an adjective which is describing the trajector in relation to shape. The examples in (91) hence illustrate the fact that we have two words that belong to two separate word classes.

### 7.3.4.9 Summary and conclusion

These genitive-like adjectives have different class markers from other adjectives. They can function in both attributive and predicative positions and they have an unlimited class range. The frequency counts for this subgroup are relatively low, and this means that they are not entrenched and subsequently, they are less prototypical adjectives.

As we have seen from the examples discussed, the words *kirimu*, *orenji* and *raundi* are analysed in Shona as being both nouns and adjectives, but this dual class membership and the semantic differences can only be explicated syntactically. The analysis of these words is evidence of the complexity of linguistic structure and this points to the fact that using a single criterion such as morphology is inadequate for it leaves many generalizations unexplained.

### 7.3.5 Subgroup E: Predicative adjectives

(92)  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>adjective</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kokayi</td>
<td>mad, unbalanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mayazi</td>
<td>unreliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negetivhi</td>
<td>negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The lexicon of adjectives also includes the adjective *negetivhi* ‘negative’ which, from a modern medical perspective, is now used in Shona because of advances in HIV/AIDS research. This adjective is also a loanword like Subgroups C and D adjectives. Semantically it has limited reference because it only refers to blood status in reference to the presence or absence of the human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) and to a lesser extent to a person’s temperament. While *munhu ari negetivhi* may refer to a person with a negative temperament, the more common usage of the construction in Shona refers to blood status, and it is this usage which we will mainly make reference to in this discussion. This subgroup also includes the adjectives *kokayi* ‘mad, unbalanced’ and *mayazi* ‘unreliable’. These two adjectives are found in the *Duramazwi Guru reChiShona* and they are colloquial – their register is indicated as *manje* in the dictionary, the abbreviation for colloquial/informal/slang. These adjectives have special usage and we are including them in the analysis because this study is a descriptive study and not a prescriptive one.

The adjectives in this subgroup always occur in the predicative position immediately preceded by the auxiliary marker -*ri* in the construction: [Noun] [SC/OC+*ri* + negetivhi]. For example, *munhu ari negetevhi*, but never as *munhu negetivhi* or *munhu munegetivhi*.

### 7.3.5.1 Attributive position

The adjectives *kokayi*, *mayazi* and *negetivhi* never occur in the attributive position. It is ungrammatical to have a structure such as (93):

(93)   *ropa negetivhi*
   ropa negetivhi
   cl.5-blood negative
   *‘blood negative’*

### 7.3.5.2 Predicative position

Syntactically the adjectives of Subgroup F can only function in the predicative position after the auxiliary verb -*ri* ‘be’ in a relative clause construction.

(94)   *ropa riri negetivhi* [E]
   ropa r-ri negetivhi
   cl.5-blood SC5-be negative
   ‘blood which is negative i.e. free from virus’
7.3.5.3 Agreement

These adjectives do not exhibit class agreement. For example, in *ropa riri negetivhi* the adjective *negetivhi* does not take a class agreement marker from the noun *ropa*. Instead it is the auxiliary marker *-ri* ‘be’ that takes agreement from the noun. This can be demonstrated if we replace *ropa* with *munhu* to give *munhu ari negetivhi* ‘person who is negative i.e. has blood free from the HIV virus’. In both instances, *negetivhi* remains invariable.

7.3.5.4 Class range

The adjectives in this subgroup all have a limited class range. The adjective *negetivhi* can only modify nouns that refer to blood and humans, whereas the adjectives *mayazi* and *kokayi* only modify nouns that refer to humans and human behaviour. This characteristic makes them less prototypical adjectives for our determining characteristic for prototypicality is the ability of an adjective to modify nouns in all classes.

7.3.5.5 Gradability

The adjective *negetivhi* is not gradable because there are no degrees to the status of having blood that is free from virus. Our argument for claiming that *negetivhi* ‘negative’ is not gradable is that in terms of HIV status, one is either negative or positive, and there are no degrees of either status. The construal of *negetivhi* is absolute and it is bound within a domain that is divided into two converses, negative and positive. Being absolute thus makes it impossible for it to be construed in degrees on a scale. *Kokayi* and *mayazi* are partially gradable – they can take comparatives and be modified by adverbs.
7.3.5.5.1 Intensification with -sa
The adjectives in this subgroup cannot be intensified. It is not possible to say *negetivhisa, *kokayisa or *mayazisa.

7.3.5.5.2 Reduplication
All the adjectives in this subgroup cannot be reduplicated.

7.3.5.5.3 Comparatives
When it is used to denote the status of blood, the adjective negetivhi cannot be compared. It is not possible to say *ropa iri riri negetivhi kudarika iri * ‘this blood is more negative than that one’. However, in its other meaning that refers to a person with a negative attitude/temperament, then it is possible to say munhu uyu ari negetivhi kudarika uyo ‘this person is more negative than that one’:

(98) munhu uyu ari negetivhi kudarika uyo [I]

mu-nhu u-yu a-ri negetivhi kudarika u-yo
cl.1-person cl.1-this 3sg-be negative compared to cl.1-that
‘this person is negative compared to that one’

Though as we have indicated, we are more concerned with the medical context. The adjectives kokayi and mayazi can take comparatives as follows:

(99) gen’a iyi iri mayazi kudarika iyo [I]

Ø-gen’a i-yi i-ri mayazi kudarika i-yo
cl.9-gang cl.9-this SC9-be unreliable compared to cl.9-that
‘this gang is more unreliable in comparison to that one’

(100) mukadzi uyu ari kokayi pane uyo [I]

mu-kadzi u-yu a-ri kokayi pane u-yo
cl.1-woman cl.1-this SC1-be unbalanced compared to cl.1-that
‘this woman is more unbalanced compared to that one’

7.3.5.5.4 Modification by adverbs
When negetivhi is used to refer to blood status or a person who is negative in terms of being virus-free, then negetivhi cannot be modified by adverbs. It is not possible to say *ropa riri negetivhi chaizvo *‘blood that is very negative’. However, when negetivhi is used to refer to a negative temperament, then it is possible to say munhu ari negetivhi chaizvo ‘very negative person’. When negetivhi is used with this sense, then it can be modified by adverbs, as in:
(101)  *munhu ari negetivhi chaizvo* [I]
    mu-nhu a-ri negetivhi chaizvo
    cl.1-person 3sg-be negative very
    ‘person who is very negative’

As we have indicated, both *kokayi* and *mayazi* can be modified by adverbs.

(102)  *gen’a iri mayazi chaizvo* [I]
    Ø-gen’a i-ri mayazi chaizvo
    cl-9-gang SC9-be unreliable very
    ‘gang that is very unreliable’

### 7.3.5.6 Semantic structure

The adjective *negetivhi* ‘negative’ is relational in that it requires reference to the person who is being profiled in the atemporal relation. *Negetivhi* is also atemporal in that it describes the state of a person’s health. The meaning of *negetivhi* is construed in relation to the health domain. The adjective *negetivhi* belongs to the semantic type of PHYSICAL PROPERTY. Dixon (2004: 4) posits a subtype of the PHYSICAL PROPERTY semantic type which refers to corporeal properties such as ‘well’, ‘sick’, ‘tired’, ‘dead’, ‘absent’. In this semantic respect, *negetivhi* is similar to -*tano* ‘healthy’ (Subgroup C) which also belongs to the corporeal domain. The state of being negative is a short-term state and not one that can be considered as being an inherent characteristic. The adjectives *kokayi* and *mayazi* belong to the HUMAN PROPENSITY semantic type. Like *negetivhi* they also denote temporary characteristics.

### 7.3.5.7 Frequency of occurrence, entrenchment and prototypicality

(103)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>adjective</th>
<th>tokens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mayazi</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kokayi</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negetivhi</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This subgroup has 3 members whose total frequency is 4, therefore the average occurrence for this subgroup is 1.3. The adjective *kokayi* occurs only once in the corpus, while *mayazi* has the most tokens in this group with a frequency count of 3. The adjective *negetivhi* does not have any tokens in the corpus. Its low frequency counts also indicate that it consists of the least frequent, the least entrenched and the least prototypical adjectives.
7.3.5.8 Summary and conclusion

This subgroup lacks most of the properties that characterise other adjectives such as those in Subgroup A. This is one of the most peripheral adjective subgroups in Shona because its morphological, syntactic and semantic nature is at variance with the criteria that we have applied to the other adjective subgroups. However, the words in this subgroup cannot belong to any other word class. For instance, they cannot be nouns because they cannot head an NP. The defining characteristics for nouns are gender, number and agreement. These adjectives do not have inherent gender and they cannot be marked for number and agreement. For example, one cannot say *munegetivhi or *negetivhi aenda ‘negative has gone’. They are also not verbs because they are not roots and therefore cannot undergo the processes that characterise verb roots.

The adjectives in this subgroup are furthest from the prototype hence they are the most peripheral. They deviate from the prototypical adjectives in several respects: they can only occur in the predicative position; they have selectional restrictions in that they only able to instantiate a selected number of nouns; they are also not gradable. Furthermore, they have very low frequency counts in the Shona corpus and in that respect, they are not conventional adjectives in the Shona language. Semantically all the adjectives in this subgroup denote temporary characteristics. Its failure to satisfy most of the criteria as well as the fact that it has very few occurrences in the corpus seems to underscore its status as a peripheral adjective subgroup.

7.3.6 Subgroup F Adjective: nje ‘ordinary, poor, worthless’

The adjective nje ‘ordinary, poor, worthless’ is also part of the inventory of adjectives in the Duramazwi Guru reChiShona. It is the only adjective in this subgroup because it does not have many similar characteristics with the adjectives in the other subgroups. The adjective nje may be a loanword but we are not in a position to conclusively ascertain its etymology. However, we can point out that the word nje also exists in other Bantu languages. In Chinyanja it is an ideophone meaning ‘clear/bright’ or ‘empty’. Madan (1992: 283) in the Swahili-English dictionary lemmatises nje as an adverb meaning ‘outside’. According to some sources, in Ndebele, a language spoken predominantly in the western part of Zimbabwe (Nguni group S44), nje is used in some contexts to express
scorn or derison, as in *umuntu nje* where *nje* in this context means a mere, ordinary person.⁵ This closely resembles the way it is used in Shona.

(104) *umuntu nje* [E]

umu-ntu nje
cl.1-person ordinary
‘ordinary person’

In Shona *nje* is an evaluative adjective which has selectional restrictions in that it only modifies nouns that can be ascribed a value to, such as people or tangible objects. Phonologically, it is similar to the adjective -*tsva* ‘new’ in terms of being monosyllabic. It is also similar to the adjectives *negetivhi* ‘negative’ and *mbichana* ‘few, little’ (cf. 7.3.8) in that it is invariable and it does not take agreement from the noun.

### 7.3.6.1 Attributive position

The adjective *nje* occurs only in the attributive position.

(105) *munhu nje* [E]

mu-nhu nje
cl.1-person poor
‘ordinary, poor, worthless person’

(106) *banga nje* [E]

Ø-banga nje
cl.5-knife ordinary, useless
‘ordinary, useless knife’

### 7.3.6.2 Predicative position

The adjective *nje* cannot occur in the predicative position. As a result, *
munhu uyu nje*

*‘person that ordinary’ is ungrammatical.

### 7.3.6.3 Agreement

This adjective does not carry agreement with the head noun. In the noun phrases *munhu nje* and *banga nje* in examples (105) and (106) respectively, the adjective is invariable and it can be juxtaposed to any of the nouns that it can modify without changing its form or showing agreement with the head noun.

---

⁵ Personal communication with Ratidzayi Takawira-Nyenya
7.3.6.4 Class range

In the Duramazwi Guru reChiShona the word nje is lemmatized as an adjective whose meaning refers to a ‘poor, worthless and ordinary person’. This adjective is defined with munhu ‘person’ as the trajector, though it can also modify other nouns that can be described in relation to the qualitative aspect of the scale image schema. This adjective can modify nouns from a number of classes but its class range is limited because it cannot modify nouns in all classes.

7.3.6.5 Gradability

The adjective nje is not gradable.

7.3.6.5.1 Intensification with -sa

Nje also cannot be intensified. It is not possible to say *njesa.

7.3.6.5.2 Reduplication

Nje also cannot be reduplicated. It is not possible to say *munhu nje nje *‘person poor poor’.

7.3.6.5.3 Comparatives

The adjective nje also cannot be compared. One cannot say *munhu nje kudarika uyu *‘person poor more than that one.’

7.3.6.5.4 Modification by adverbs

Nje cannot be modified by adverbs. It is not possible to say *munhu nje chaizvo *‘person poor very’.

7.3.6.6 Semantic structure

The fact that nje is not gradable can be ascribed to the fact that it is absolute, hence it cannot be regarded as having the quantitative scalar values of ‘more’ or ‘less’. Instead it portrays the qualitative aspect of the SCALE schema because its meaning encompasses an evaluation of a standard or norm upon which something is judged. Hence munhu nje is a phrase that is conceived as being an evaluation or judgement of a person’s societal standing according to some expectation, which are usually wealth and the capability of that person being able to render assistance in times of need. When the trajector is an object as in banga nje ‘ordinary, useless knife’ then that knife is inadequate in terms of appearance,
not useful enough or maybe not sharp enough or not being handy in relation to the job at hand.

This adjective *nje* belongs to the semantic type VALUE which in this case denotes meanings of poor, imperfect, worthless, and ordinary. The value that an object or person is accorded is evaluative and at the same time it is also a subjective judgement. This evaluative judgement can change with time, hence the adjective *nje* does not constitute an inherent characteristic, but one that is temporary. A person or an object is not inherently useless or poor, but it is a description that is accorded by society.

**7.3.6.7 Frequency of occurrence, entrenchment and prototypicality**

The word *nje* occurs in the corpus, although in all the contexts there is none where it functions as an adjective, but as an adverb. Its failure to have any tokens in the corpus may suggest that it is not entrenched. As a result, it may be concluded that it is a less prototypical adjective.

**7.3.6.8 Part of speech membership**

The word *nje* also functions as an adverb as the following examples will illustrate:

(107)  
\[ \text{usaudza munhu wese nje} \]  
\[ \text{u-s-a-udz-a mu-nhu we-se nje} \]  
\[ 2\text{sg-NEG-tell-FV cl.1-person QUANT-everyone all} \]  
\`do not tell everybody i.e. do not tell all and sundry’

The full meaning implied by *usaudza munhu wese nje* is *usaudza munhu wese wese neasinei nazvo ‘do not tell just anyone even those who have no business knowing about it’*. The function of *nje* in this context is that it is a modifier of the quantitative *wese ‘everybody’* and it is being used as an adverb of emphasis. The argument for claiming that *nje* is functioning as an adverb is that it can be substituted by the adverb *zvake ‘all’*.

(108)  
\[ \text{usaudza munhu wese zvake} \]  
\[ \text{u-s-a-udz-a mu-nhu we-se zv-a-ke} \]  
\[ 2\text{sg-NEG-tell-FV cl.1-person QUANT-everyone all} \]  
\`do not tell everybody i.e. do not tell all and sundry’
In the Shona corpus nje has only two hits, and in the first hit it functions as an adverb shown in (109) while the other context is a statement in Ndebele, and this context is not relevant for this study.

(109) ngekuti zvinhu zvese zvatina zvo hatizi kuzviona nje [C]
gekuti zvi-nhu zve-se zva-ti-nazvo ha-ti-zvi-ON-a nje
CONJ-because cl.8-things cl.8-all OC8-1pl-possess NEG-2pl-not cl.15-OC-get-FV
easily
‘lit. because things all that we have did not get them easily = because we did not get all the things we have easily.’

In the construction in (109) nje modifies the infinitive kuzviona, and in the sense with which it is used here, it means ‘to acquire/get them’. This is equivalent to kuzviwana ‘to acquire/get them’. In this context nje is similar in meaning to nyore ‘easily’. In other words, this statement can also read hatizi kuzviwana nyore ‘we are not getting them easily’:

(110) hatizi kuzviwana nyore [E]
ha-ti-zvi ku-zvi-wan-a nyore
NEG-1pl-not INF-OC-get-FV easily
‘we are not getting them easily’

7.3.6.9 Summary and conclusion

Next to Subgroup E it may be the second most peripheral adjective because it can only function in one syntactic position. Secondly, it is not gradable. Semantically it denotes an evaluative judgement which represents a temporary state. It is also the only adjective subgroup with one member which means that it does not share many characteristics with the other adjectives. In those respects nje is one of the peripheral adjectives in the Shona adjective class.

7.3.7 Subgroup G: Invariable adjectives

We have referred to this subgroup as invariable adjectives because they do not take the class marker of the noun. They remain invariable irrespective of the class of the noun they are modifying.
From the Shona corpus we observed that the numerals 1 to 10 have adopted forms which are phonological assimilations from English. These forms do not represent code-switching; rather they are loanwords that have been borrowed from English and adapted into Shona. They are similar to the genitive adjectives (cf. 7.3.4) which are also loanwords and have been similarly phonologically adapted. These loanwords are synonyms of the cardinal numbers discussed in 7.3.2, the only difference between these two subgroups being that the loanwords are invariable adjectives which do not take the class marker of the head noun. This is our justification for treating them separately. The asterisk (*) after the adjective *thirii* ‘three’ serves to highlight that this form is only conventionalized in discourse but not in writing because the voiced dental fricative /th/ is not in the Shona consonant system.

The use of these numerals goes beyond the number 10, for instance, *fifitini* ‘fifteen’ *tuwendi* ‘twenty’, *handiredhi* ‘hundred’, *miriyoni* ‘million’, are all in the corpus. For the sake of this study we will restrict ourselves to the adjectives -*mwe* ‘one’ to *gumi* ‘ten’. Comparisons can also be drawn with Swahili where Myachina (cf. 3.3.1.3) observes that the numerals *sita* ‘six’, *saba* ‘seven’ and *tisa* ‘nine’ were borrowed and these do not take the agreement of the noun. These borrowed cardinal numbers in Shona display a characteristic similar to that described by Myachina for Swahili.

The adjective *mbichana* (*mbijana, bhichana, bhijana*) was also extracted from the dictionary, *Duramazwi Guru reChiShona*. Like the adjective *nje* in the previous section, *mbichana* is also found in other Bantu languages. In Chinyanja *mbichana* is also an adjective with the same meaning of ‘few, little’ as in Shona. Hannan (1984) notes that the adjective *bhichana* (*mbichana*) is derived from the Afrikaans word *bietjie* ‘small amount or

---

6 Personal communication with Alick Bwanali (Centre for Language Studies, Malawi and PhD Student NTNU).
short distance’. As stated in the discussion of nje, we will not attempt to establish the etymology of mbichana. Semantically mbichana denotes quantity and in meaning it is synonymous to the adjective -shoma ‘few, little’ that was discussed under Subgroup A.

7.3.7.1 Attributive position

The adjectives in this subgroup can occur in the attributive position as illustrated in the examples below.

(112) zvitoro mbichana [C]
zvi-toro mbichana
cl.8-shops few
‘few shops’

(113) chiremba hwani [C]
chi-remba hwani
cl.1a-doctor hwani
‘one doctor’

(114) vane mombe teni [C]
va-ne Ø-mombe teni
3pl-have cl.10-cows ten
‘they have ten cows’

7.3.7.2 Predicative position

The adjectives can also occur in the predicative position.

(115) zvitoro izvi zvimbichana [E]
zvi-toro i-zvi zvi-mbichana
cl.8-shops cl.8-these COP-little quantity
‘these shops are few’

(116) chiremba uyu ihwani [I]
chi-remba u-yu i-hwani
cl.1a-doctor cl.1-this COP-one
‘this doctor is one’

7.3.7.3 Agreement

The syntactic behaviour of the adjectives in this subgroup is that they are juxtaposed to the noun. They are invariable adjectives which do not take the class marker of the noun. The adjectives in this subgroup include cardinal numbers but on the basis of agreement we have separated the two groups of cardinal numbers because this group is invariable unlike the cardinal numbers in Subgroup B adjectives which take the class marker of the noun.
7.3.7.4 Class range

The adjectives in this subgroup have an unlimited class range. Like its synonym -shoma ‘few’ in Subgroup A, the adjective mbichana can similarly modify nouns from all classes. The cardinal numbers are similar to the cardinal numbers of Subgroup B in that they too have an unlimited class range.

7.3.7.5 Gradability

The adjective mbichana can be graded through intensification, comparison and modification by adverbs. The reduplication of mbichana changes its category membership to an adverb, therefore we will claim that mbichana is partially gradable. The other adjectives in this subgroup are not gradable.

7.3.7.5.1 Intensification with -sa

There are no examples in the Shona corpus where mbichana is intensified with -sa. As such we have had to rely on elicitation and introspection to arrive at the observation that the adjective mbichana can be suffixed with -sa to give mbichanasa ‘too little, too few’. Semantically, mbichanasa ‘very little, few’ weakens the meaning of the adjective to denote a quantity that is far much less than adequate.

7.3.7.5.2 Reduplication

The reduplication of mbichana to mbichana mbichana ‘slowly’ results in a change in category to an adverb. Therefore, mbichana as an adjective cannot be reduplicated for intensification. It is the only adjective in Shona which when reduplicated changes its word class. For example:

(117) \textit{Itai mbichana mbichana}\ [C]

\begin{verbatim}
i-t-a-i mbichana mbichana
SC-do-FV-PL slowly slowly
\end{verbatim}
‘Do it slowly’

7.3.7.5.3 Comparatives

The adjective mbichana can be compared. It is possible to say,

(118) \textit{mvura iyi imbichana kudarika iyo}\ [E]

\begin{verbatim}
Ø-mvura i-yi i-mbichana kudarika i-yo
cl.9-water cl.9-this COP-little quantity compared to cl.9-that
\end{verbatim}
‘this water is less compared to that one’
7.3.7.5.4 Modification by adverbs

*Mbichana* can also be modified by the adverbs *chaizvo* ‘very’, *zvikuru* ‘very’ and *zvakanyanya* ‘extremely’.

(119) *mvura mbichana zvikuru* [E]

Ø-<i>mvura mbichana zvikuru</i>
cl.9-<i>water a little very</i>
‘very little water’

(120) *mvura mbichana zvakanyanya* [E]

Ø-<i>mvura mbichana zvakanyanya</i>
cl.9-<i>water a little extremely</i>
‘extremely little water’

7.3.7.6 Semantic structure

The semantic types of the adjectives in this subgroup are as follows:

(121)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>semantic type</th>
<th>adjective</th>
<th>gloss</th>
<th>adjective</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CARDINAL NUMBERS</td>
<td>hwani</td>
<td>one</td>
<td>sikisi</td>
<td>six</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tuu</td>
<td>two</td>
<td>sevheni</td>
<td>seven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>thirii</td>
<td>three</td>
<td>eyiti</td>
<td>eight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>foo</td>
<td>four</td>
<td>naini</td>
<td>nine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>faifi</td>
<td>five</td>
<td>teni</td>
<td>ten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUANTIFICATION</td>
<td>mbichana</td>
<td>few, little</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The adjective *mbichana* denotes quantity, as such it belongs to the semantic type of QUANTIFICATION. Semantically this adjective is similar to the other QUANTIFICATION adjectives -*shoma* ‘few’ and -*zhinji* ‘many’ in Subgroup A. The rest of the adjectives in this subgroup are CARDINAL NUMBERS. Quantities and cardinal numbers are temporary states in relation to time-stability. They are also absolute and in that respect they are not polysemous.

7.3.7.7 Frequency of occurrence, entrenchment and prototypicality

(122)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>adjective</th>
<th>frequency</th>
<th>adjective</th>
<th>frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hwani</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>sevheni</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teni</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>sikisi</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faifi</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>eyiti</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mbichana</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>thirii</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tuu</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>naini</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foo</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This group has eleven members whose total frequency count is 97 and the average frequency for this group is 8.8. The adjective *hwani* has a frequency count of 32; it has the highest number of tokens in this subgroup; followed by *teni* and *faifi*. The adjectives *thirii* and *naini* have no tokens in the corpus. As such they are the least entrenched adjectives in this subgroup. The token frequency counts for the whole group are not very high, and the pattern we have observed is that the less prototypical adjectives have very low token frequencies.

If we correlate these statistics with those of Subgroup B, we can deduce that *hwani* is more frequent than *-bodzi* but less frequent than *-mwe*. The rest of the cardinal numbers in Subgroup B have more token frequencies than the loanwords in this subgroup, thus underscoring the fact that the indigenous terms are more entrenched than the loanwords. Needless to say, we will reiterate the point we made earlier that cognitive grammar is a usage-based model. From the data from the corpus there is evidence that the cardinal number loanwords are used in the language. Compared to Subgroup B however, whose group frequency count is 4401 this evidence suggests that the loanwords that belong to this subgroup are used less frequently than their counterparts in subgroup B. Hence they are less frequent and less entrenched than those in Subgroup B.

7.3.7.8 Part of speech membership

In its function as an adjective *mbichana* cannot co-occur in the same construction with adjectives from other subgroups. In other words, once it occupies the position after the adjective as shown in (123), then it is no longer an adjective but an adverb. This is also an interesting syntactic phenomenon that *mbichana* displays which is not a characteristic displayed by any of the other adjectives. For example:

(123) *dhirezi pfupi mbichana* [E]

 Ø-dhirezi Ø-pfupi mbichana
cl.5-dress cl.5-short little
‘dress that is a little bit short’

In example (123) *mbichana* modifies the adjective *-pfupi* ‘short’ but *mbichana* in this instance is not an adjective but an adverb. This is because its trajector is a relationship.
When *mbichana* modifies an adjective then in terms of word order it has to occur immediately after the adjective. Hence *dhirezi mbichana pfupi* ‘a little dress short’ is not grammatical because *mbichana* is specifying the shortness of the dress. Our reason for claiming that in (123) *mbichana* is an adverb is that in this context it can be replaced by another adverb *zvishoma* ‘a little bit’ without affecting the meaning of the construction, as shown in (124).

(124) dhirezi pfupi zvishoma [E]
    Ø-dhirezi Ø-pfupi zvishoma
    cl.5-dress cl.5-short little bit
    ‘dress that is a little bit short’

The categorical status of *mbichana* seems to overlap between the adjective and adverb categories. In (125) the sense of *mbichana* in juxtaposition with *doko* makes it an adverb.

(125) rakaita doko mbichana [C]
    ra-ka-it-a Ø-doko mbichana
    SC5-STAT-be-FV small little bit
    ‘that which is a little bit small’

Its function is as modifier of an adjective in (125) and in the same context it can be substituted with other adverbs such as *zvishoma* ‘a little’, *chaizvo* ‘very’, *zvikuru* ‘very’. In other contexts, such as *mvura mbichana* ‘little water’ it functions as an adjective. For instance, *rakaita doko zvishoma* ‘that which is a little bit small’ would have the closest meaning to *rakaita doko mbichana* ‘that which is a little bit small’:

(126) rakaita doko zvishoma [I]
    ra-ka-it-a Ø-doko zvishoma
    SC5-STAT-be-FV small little bit
    ‘that which is a little bit small’

We also highlighted that the reduplication of *mbichana* yields *mbichana mbichana* which is an adverb meaning ‘slowly’. We can thus conclude that *mbichana* can function as both an adjective and an adverb depending on whether it is modifying a thing or a relationship.

**7.3.7.9 Summary and conclusion**

This subgroup can function in both attributive and predicative positions, though it differs from the prototype in that it is invariable. The adjectives in this subgroup have an unlimited class range. This subgroup has few characteristics in common with the prototype.
in that they do not take the class marker of the head noun and the majority are not gradable. In comparison to -shoma ‘few’ which has a frequency of 635, mbichana is a less frequently used and less entrenched adjective than the former.

7.4 Conclusions from Analysis

Table 20 summarises the findings of the analysis pertaining to the morphological, syntactic and semantic characteristics of the adjective subgroups.

Table 20 Comparative table of the adjective subgroups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Attributive</th>
<th>Predicative</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Cl. range</th>
<th>Gradability</th>
<th>Prototypicality</th>
<th>Parts of speech membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>ADJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>ADJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>ADJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>ADJ/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ADJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ADJ/ADV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ADJ/ADV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key to Table 20

Attr: Attributive
Pred: Predicative
Agr: Agreement
Cl. range: Unlimited class range
Grad: Gradability
Prototype: Prototypicality
PoS: Parts of speech membership

In Chapter 4 we discussed the prototype theory and its implications on the internal structure of category membership. We will reiterate that a prototype is the clearest and most central member of a category. From the prototype there is gradience of membership to the least prototypical member of that category. This chapter has discussed the characteristics of each of the seven adjective subgroups that we have identified for Shona. With reference to the prototype theory, we can postulate that the prototypical adjective subgroup is one that satisfies all the criteria that were outlined in 7.2, namely: the ability to
function in both attributive and predicative positions, agreement, an unlimited class range, 
gradability, and a high token frequency.

From the analysis presented in this chapter as summarised in Table 20, we conclude that 
subgroup A and B adjectives constitute the prototypical adjective subgroups for Shona. 
This and other conclusions are as summarized as follows:

_Subgroup A_ adjectives are the prototypical adjective group because it is the only group that 
satisfies all the adjective criteria. Functionally, all the adjectives in this subgroup can 
function both attributively and predicatively, and morphologically they take the class 
marker of the head noun. They are also prototypical in the sense that they can modify 
nouns from all classes. Semantically, they are also the most polysemous and they are 
gradable. This subgroup also represents the adjectives with the highest token frequency. 
They are the most entrenched subgroup and hence the most prototypical.

_Subgroup B_ adjectives consist of cardinal numbers. They resemble Subgroup A adjectives 
in terms of all but one criterion, gradability. They are also a prototypical subgroup. In 
terms of frequency of use, this subgroup also has a high token frequency and they have the 
highest average frequency.

_Subgroup C_ adjectives function in both attributive and predicative positions and they also 
take the class marker of the noun. They differ from the prototype in that they have a 
limited class range and they are not gradable. They also have one of the lowest average 
frequencies. They are not entrenched and they also a peripheral adjective subgroup.

_Subgroup D_ adjectives resemble the prototype in that they can function both attributively 
and predicatively, they can modify nouns from all classes, and semantically they are also 
gradable. They however differ from the prototype in that they never occur without the 
genitive marker _-e_. In part of speech status some of the adjectives in this group overlap 
between the nominal and adjectival categories. The adjectives in this subgroup have a low 
token frequency hence they are less prototypical.
The Subgroup E adjectives are the furthest from the prototype for as the analysis has demonstrated, these adjectives can only function predicatively. They satisfy only one criterion out of the six. They have the lowest frequency count among the adjective subgroups constituted by more than one member. This is therefore the most peripheral adjective subgroup.

The Subgroup F adjective nje forms a class on its own because it does not share any characteristics with the other adjectives. Like Subgroup E it also satisfies one criterion, the attributive function. The adjective nje also has no tokens in the corpus. It is also a peripheral adjective.

The Subgroup G adjectives have more adjectival characteristics than either Subgroups E or F, and they also have more token frequencies than either E or F. Hence they are more entrenched than E or F. They have an unlimited class range. Yet they are also nonprototypical because they do not satisfy the agreement criterion and they have relatively low frequency counts in the corpus.

From these results it is evident that the Shona adjective category has a graded membership structure in that all the adjectives do not all possess the same characteristics, rather they share characteristics that are similar as well as different in varying degrees. This prototypical category structure serves to show that the Shona adjective category has disparate characteristics, hence there is no one set of criteria nor one set of characteristics nor pattern that can be used to define this category. Rather, we have used a multiple of criteria to describe the different characteristics that this category displays.

The adjectives in the seven subgroups that we have set up thus also show some family resemblance. Subgroup B resembles the prototype the most, with the most significant difference between them being the ungradability of subgroup B. Subgroup D resembles E in that they are both bound and only occur with additional obligatory markers. F resembles G in that they are both invariable. From the results in Table 20 it is apparent that no two subgroups have all the characteristics in common, hence no two subgroups are completely similar and there is also no specific characteristic that they all have in common, but this is a facet of the prototype theory that category structure is not based on a criterial attribute,
but instead on graded membership and family resemblance. They all belong to one
category because they have some characteristics in common.

The discussion in this chapter also highlighted the notion of entrenchment and
prototypicality. Tables 21 and 22 portray the token frequencies of the adjectives in Shona.
We will present the token frequencies of the adjectives in two separate tables. The first
table shows the tokens of all the forms of the adjectives. In Table 22 the tokens of the
different forms are tallied to show the overall tokens of a lexeme and its forms.

Table 21 Type and token frequency of Shona adjectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>type</th>
<th>gloss</th>
<th>tokens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bhichana</td>
<td>few, little</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mbichana</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mbijana</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-e-bhuleki</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-e-bhureki</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-e-bhurauni</td>
<td>brown</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-e-bhurawuri</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-e-bhuruu</td>
<td>blue</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-e-bhuluu</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-bodzi</td>
<td>one</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-e-chekicheki</td>
<td>chequered</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-e-cheki</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-chena</td>
<td>white, light</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jena</td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-e-chisamb</td>
<td>chequered</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-dhara</td>
<td>old</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-dodo</td>
<td>slim</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-diki</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-doko</td>
<td></td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-duku</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ndiki</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tiki</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-toko</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tuku</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-doodoko</td>
<td>very small</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doodori</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-dukwane</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-dukwa</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eyiti</td>
<td>eight</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faifi</td>
<td>five</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-femu</td>
<td>wide</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-feru</td>
<td>four</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foo</td>
<td>four</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-e-gireyi</td>
<td>grey</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-e-girini</td>
<td>green</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gumi</td>
<td>ten</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hofu</td>
<td>hollow</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-hombe</td>
<td>big, large</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hwani</td>
<td>one</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-kadzi</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gadzi</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hadzi</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-e-kaki</td>
<td>khaki</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-e-kirimu</td>
<td>cream</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-kobvu</td>
<td>thick</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gobvu</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hobvu</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-kono</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gono</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hono</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-kukutu</td>
<td>hard, strong</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gukutu</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hukutu</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-kuma</td>
<td>naked</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-kuru</td>
<td>big, large</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guru</td>
<td></td>
<td>615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>huru</td>
<td></td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mbishi</td>
<td>raw, uncooked</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mbisi</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-e-meruni</td>
<td>maroon</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-mwe</td>
<td>one</td>
<td>586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-na</td>
<td>four</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>naini</td>
<td>nine</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-naku</td>
<td>beautiful</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negetivhi</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negativhi</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nhuru</td>
<td>greyish-brown</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nje</td>
<td>ordinary, poor, worthless</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-nomwe</td>
<td>seven</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-nyoro</td>
<td>wet, soft</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-nyowani</td>
<td>new</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-nyuwani</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nzvere</td>
<td>with young</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-e-orenji</td>
<td>orange</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-pamhi</td>
<td>wide</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bamhi</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-penyu</td>
<td>alive</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mhenyu</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>benyu</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefix</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-e-pepuru</td>
<td>purple</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-e-pepuro</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-e-pepo</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-pfumbamwe</td>
<td>nine</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-pfemba</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-pfumbu</td>
<td>grey</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bvumbu</td>
<td>short</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-pfupi</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-fupi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-e-pingi</td>
<td>pink</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-e-raundi</td>
<td>round</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-e-redhi</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-refu</td>
<td>tall, long</td>
<td>497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ndefu</td>
<td></td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-rebu</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-rongomuna</td>
<td>four</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-sande</td>
<td>holy</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-sere</td>
<td>eight</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tsere</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sevheni</td>
<td>seven</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-shanu</td>
<td>five</td>
<td>469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-sharu</td>
<td>old</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dzaru</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-saru</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tsaru</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-shava</td>
<td>light-brown</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>java</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-shoma</td>
<td>few, little</td>
<td>635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-shora</td>
<td>yellow</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sikisi</td>
<td>six</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>siri</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>siri</td>
<td>genuine, pure, true</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-svinu</td>
<td>good, pleasant</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-svipa</td>
<td>dark, black</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tanhatu</td>
<td>six</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nhanhatu</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tano</td>
<td>healthy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tatu</td>
<td>three</td>
<td>1141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nhatu</td>
<td></td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tema</td>
<td>black, dark</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dema</td>
<td></td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nhema</td>
<td></td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teni</td>
<td>ten</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tete</td>
<td>thin, narrow</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dete</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nhete</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thirii</td>
<td>three</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tsva</td>
<td>new</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 21 is not in strict alphabetical order but it is arranged according to the alphabetical ordering of a lexeme and all its forms. The forms of a lexeme are indented and have not been glossed. From the results, the form -diki of the lexeme -DIKI has the highest type frequency, thus meaning that out of the other forms of the lexeme -DIKI it is the most entrenched. Similarly, for the lexeme -KURU, the form huru also has a high type frequency compared to the other forms, hence it can be said to be more established. The same can also be said of -tatu and nhatu, that -tatu is more entrenched because of its high type frequency. The results in Table 21 have been collated and presented in Table 22, where we have added the number of tokens for each lexeme type. The results are arranged in descending order from the highest token frequency to the lowest.

**Table 22 Lexicalized type and token frequency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>type</th>
<th>gloss</th>
<th>tokens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-zhinji</td>
<td>many, much</td>
<td>1567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-kuru (guru, huru)</td>
<td>big, large</td>
<td>1428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tatu (nhatu)</td>
<td>three</td>
<td>1294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-diki (-doko, -duku, -tiki, -toko, -tuku)</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>1038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-viri (-iri, mbiri)</td>
<td>two</td>
<td>907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-shoma</td>
<td>few, little</td>
<td>635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-refu (ndefu, -rebu)</td>
<td>tall, long</td>
<td>607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-mwe</td>
<td>one</td>
<td>586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tema (dema, nhema)</td>
<td>black, dark</td>
<td>564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-shanu</td>
<td>five</td>
<td>469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-na</td>
<td>four</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tsva (dzva)</td>
<td>new</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-hombe</td>
<td>big, large</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tsvuku (dzvuku)</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-chena (jena)</td>
<td>white, light</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-pfupi (-fupi)</td>
<td>short</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tanhatu (mhanhatu)</td>
<td>six</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gumi</td>
<td>ten</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-sere (-tsere)</td>
<td>eight</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tete (dete, nhete)</td>
<td>thin, narrow</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-nyoro</td>
<td>wet, soft</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-kobvu (gobvu, hobvu)</td>
<td>thick</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-nomwe</td>
<td>seven</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-penyu (benyu, mhenyu)</td>
<td>alive</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-pfumbamwe (-pfemba)</td>
<td>nine</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-shava (java)</td>
<td>light-brown</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mbishi (mbisi)</td>
<td>raw, uncooked</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-kadzi (gadzi, hadzi)</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tsvene (dzvene)</td>
<td>holy, good</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-kukutu (gukutu, hukutu)</td>
<td>hard, strong</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hwani</td>
<td>one</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-kono (gono, hono)</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teni</td>
<td>ten</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-nyowani (-nyuwani)</td>
<td>new</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-pfumbu (bvumbu)</td>
<td>grey</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-naku</td>
<td>beautiful</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-sharu (dzaru, -saru, -tsaru)</td>
<td>old</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-bodzi</td>
<td>one</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faifi</td>
<td>five</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-e-yero</td>
<td>yellow</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-e-kaki</td>
<td>khaki</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-e-pungi</td>
<td>pink</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-sandie</td>
<td>holy</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-svinu</td>
<td>good, pleasant</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-e-girini</td>
<td>green</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-doodoko (doodori)</td>
<td>very small</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-dukwane (-dukwana)</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhichana (mbichana, mbijana)</td>
<td>few, little</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-pamhi</td>
<td>wide</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-rongomuna</td>
<td>four</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-dodo</td>
<td>slim</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-e-girini</td>
<td>green</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foo</td>
<td>four</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tuu</td>
<td>two</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-e-gireyi</td>
<td>grey</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nzvere</td>
<td>with young</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sevheni</td>
<td>seven</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-e-redhi</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 22 indicates that the adjective -zhinji ‘many, much’ has the highest token frequency. As a result, it is more entrenched than the other adjectives in Shona. In order of frequency, -zhinji is followed by -kuru, -tatu, and -diki. These are the adjectives that have tokens above 1000 according to the collated results in Table 21. These four adjectives also belong to the prototypical adjective subgroups. In that respect it can be concluded that they are the most prototypical adjectives in Shona. The total tokens for all the adjectives in the Shona adjective class is 12 905, and the average frequency for each adjective is 145.

18 adjectives out of 90, that is, 20% of the entire group, have tokens above the average. This means that 80% of the adjectives have tokens below the group average. These adjectives that belong to this 80% range can be divided into three groups. The first group
comprises 16 adjectives (17.8%) that have no tokens in the corpus. This is quite a large percentage of adjectives that are not entrenched and hence are deemed less prototypical on that account. The second group consists of those adjectives that have tokens between 1 and 10, and in total 30 adjectives (33.3%) fall into this group. According to these statistics, more than a third of the adjectives in the Shona adjective class are less frequent. The third group, which is made up of 26 adjectives (28.9%), includes those adjectives that have tokens between 10 and 148. In general therefore, the tokens for the majority of the adjectives in Shona are quite low. The number of members in a subgroup, their total frequency counts and the average frequency of each group are summed up in Table 23.

Table 23 Average frequencies for the adjective subgroups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>No. of members</th>
<th>Total frequency</th>
<th>Average frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8333</td>
<td>231.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4401</td>
<td>338.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In relation to the frequency of occurrences of the adjectives in the Shona corpus, Subgroups A and B which are the prototypical subgroups had the most types and tokens in the corpus, and the highest average frequencies. The difference between these two prototypical subgroups and the rest of the subgroups is striking. The total frequency for Subgroup B is 4401 and its average frequency is 338.5; while Subgroup A has a total frequency of 8333 and an average frequency of 231.5. Next is Subgroup G with a total frequency of 97 and an average frequency of 8.8. The less prototypical adjective subgroups also had very few or no hits at all in the corpus. These statistics are evidence that the prototypical adjectives are used more frequently and hence are more entrenched in Shona than the less prototypical subgroups. There is no doubt that the adjectives in Subgroups G, D, C, E and F are less frequent, less entrenched and subsequently less prototypical than those in Subgroups A and B. In terms of frequency of occurrence, F represents the least prototypical adjective subgroup. The category structure in relation to these statistics suggests that we move from the centre which has prototypical adjectives to the peripheral adjectives, with nothing in between the centre and the periphery. The gradience from the
centre to the periphery is not gradual but abrupt. The less prototypical adjective subgroups form their own cluster on the periphery of the adjective category.

In relation to resemblance to the prototype, there is a correlation between the morphological and syntactic characteristics and their degree of usage. Table 20 revealed that Subgroups E and F have the least number of characteristics in common with the prototype, and Table 23 corroborates that peripheral membership in that these are the two subgroups with the least total and average frequency.

The semantic types of the Shona adjectives were also discussed. From this semantic analysis, we can conclude that from Dixon’s thirteen semantic types, Shona has eight: DIMENSION, PHYSICAL PROPERTY, COLOUR, AGE, VALUE, HUMAN PROPENSITY, CARDINAL NUMBERS and QUANTIFICATION. These are presented in Table 24. The remaining five semantic types from Dixon’s inventory of thirteen are not expressed by adjectives but by verbs and nouns. These semantic types that are not in the Shona adjective class are SPEED, DIFFICULTY, SIMILARITY, POSITION and QUALIFICATION. Chapter 8 will discuss how these other semantic types are expressed in Shona and the function-indicating morphosyntax required by nouns and verbs to function as modifiers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>semantic type</th>
<th>adjective</th>
<th>gloss</th>
<th>adjective</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIMENSION</td>
<td>-diki</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>-kuru</td>
<td>big</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-dodo</td>
<td>slim</td>
<td>-pamhi</td>
<td>wide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-doodoko</td>
<td>very small</td>
<td>-pfupi</td>
<td>short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-dukwane</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>-e-raundi</td>
<td>round</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-femu</td>
<td>wide</td>
<td>-refu</td>
<td>tall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-hombre</td>
<td>big</td>
<td>-tete</td>
<td>thin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-kobvu</td>
<td>thick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYSICAL PROPERTY</td>
<td>hofu</td>
<td>deep, hollow</td>
<td>-nyoro</td>
<td>wet, moist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-kukutu</td>
<td>hard</td>
<td>nzvere</td>
<td>with young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-kuma</td>
<td>naked</td>
<td>siri</td>
<td>small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-mbishi</td>
<td>raw, uncooked</td>
<td>-tan</td>
<td>healthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>negetivhi</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLOUR</td>
<td>-e-bhuleki</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>-pfumbu</td>
<td>grey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-e-bhurauni</td>
<td>brown</td>
<td>-e-pingi</td>
<td>pink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-e-bhuruu</td>
<td>blue</td>
<td>-e-pepuru</td>
<td>purple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-e-cekicheki</td>
<td>chequered</td>
<td>-e-redhi</td>
<td>red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-chena</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>-shava</td>
<td>light-brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-e-chisamb</td>
<td>chequered</td>
<td>-shora</td>
<td>yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-e-gireyi</td>
<td>grey</td>
<td>-svipa</td>
<td>black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-e-girini</td>
<td>green</td>
<td>-tema</td>
<td>black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-e-khani</td>
<td>khaki</td>
<td>-tsvuku</td>
<td>red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-e-kirinu</td>
<td>cream</td>
<td>-e-vhayoreti</td>
<td>violet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-e-meruni</td>
<td>maroon</td>
<td>-e-waiti</td>
<td>white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nhuru</td>
<td>blue-black</td>
<td>-e-yero</td>
<td>yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-e-orenji</td>
<td>orange</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>-dhara</td>
<td>old</td>
<td>-sharu</td>
<td>old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-nyowani</td>
<td>new</td>
<td>-tsva</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VALUE</td>
<td>nje</td>
<td>ordinary, poor, worthlessness</td>
<td>-svinu</td>
<td>good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-sandere</td>
<td>holy</td>
<td>-uya</td>
<td>good, upright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>siri</td>
<td>genuine, pure, true pure, holy</td>
<td>-vi</td>
<td>bad, evil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUMAN PROPENSITY</td>
<td>-kadzi</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>mayazi</td>
<td>unreliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kokayi</td>
<td>mad, unbalanced male</td>
<td>-naku</td>
<td>beautiful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-kono</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>-penyu</td>
<td>alive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARDINAL NUMBERS</td>
<td>-bodzi</td>
<td>one</td>
<td>-tanhatu</td>
<td>six</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-mwe</td>
<td>one</td>
<td>sikisi</td>
<td>six</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hwani</td>
<td>one</td>
<td>-nomwe</td>
<td>seven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-viri</td>
<td>two</td>
<td>sevheni</td>
<td>seven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tatu</td>
<td>two</td>
<td>-sere</td>
<td>eight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>thirii</td>
<td>three</td>
<td>eyiti</td>
<td>eight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>na</td>
<td>three</td>
<td>-pfemba</td>
<td>nine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>foo</td>
<td>four</td>
<td>-pfumbamwe</td>
<td>nine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-rongomuna</td>
<td>four</td>
<td>naini</td>
<td>nine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-shana</td>
<td>five</td>
<td>gumi</td>
<td>ten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>faifi</td>
<td>five</td>
<td>teni</td>
<td>ten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUANTIFICATION</td>
<td>-mbichana</td>
<td>few, little</td>
<td>-zhinji</td>
<td>many</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-shoma</td>
<td>few</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 25 demonstrates another semantic perspective of viewing the semantic classes of these adjectives. It shows the semantic classes in relation to their stability in time. We will reiterate the argument by Givón (1984: 52) and Langacker (2008) that adjectives that denote the properties of size, shape, colour and texture are the most time-stable, whereas the other properties are temporary states.

Table 25 Semantic classes and time-stability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>adjective type</th>
<th>semantic type</th>
<th>adjective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>inherent property</td>
<td>dimensional</td>
<td>-diki, -dodo, -doodoko, -dukwane, -femu, -hombe, -kobvu, -kuru, -pamhi, -pfupi, -refu, -tete, -e-raundi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>human propensity</td>
<td>-kadzi, -kono, -naku, -penyu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physical property</td>
<td>hofu, -kukutu, siri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temporary state</td>
<td>physical property</td>
<td>-mbishi, -nyoro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>evaluative judgement</td>
<td>-sande, -svinu, -tsvene, -uya, -vi, nje, siri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>age</td>
<td>-dhara, -nyowani, -tsaru, -tsva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>human propensity</td>
<td>kokayi, mayazi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>quantitative</td>
<td>-shoma, -zhinji, mbichana, -bodzi, -mwe, -virí, -tatu, -na, -rongomuna, -shanu, -tanhatu, -nomwe, -sere, -pfemba, -pfumbamwe, gumi, hwani, tuu, thiríi, foo, faifi, sikisi, sevheni, eyiti, naini, teni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>physical property (corporeal)</td>
<td>-nzvere, -tano, -kuna, negetivhi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The semantic classification in Table 25 demonstrates that 45 of the 90 adjectives in the Shona adjective class denote inherent characteristics, while the other half denote temporary states, while on the one hand, the colour terms constitute the largest group of the adjectives.
that designate inherent characteristics. On the other hand, the quantitative adjectives form the largest group denoting temporary states.

A correlation can be made in relation to the data in Table 23 and that in Table 25 is that between frequency of use and semantic type. The adjectives in Subgroups E and F which have been attested to be the peripheral adjectives in terms of total and average frequency are, in addition, less prototypical in semantic terms. Semantically, the adjectives in these two subgroups represent temporary states. That is *nde*, *mayazi* and *kokayi* belong to the semantic type VALUE and they denote evaluative judgements; whereas *negetivhi* belongs to the corporeal domain of the PHYSICAL PROPERTY semantic type. These four adjectives are in addition, not indigenous Shona adjectives as has already been ascertained in the relevant sections.

### 7.5 Summary

This chapter has discussed the prototypical structure of the Shona adjective class which is made up of prototypical and nonprototypical members as ascertained by their different characteristics according the the criteria in 7.2. The frequency of occurrences also shed light on the relationship between frequency of occurrence, entrenchment and prototypicality. The semantic analysis also included the adjective semantic types as posited by Dixon and we indicated those semantic types that are found in the Shona adjective class. Chapter 8 continues with this exposition and it will discuss how those semantic types that are not in the Shona adjective class are expressed.
Chapter 8 Nouns and Verbs as Modifiers

8.1 Introduction

Among the findings and conclusions in Chapter 7 was the fact that some semantic types are not expressed by adjectives in Shona. The remaining task of this study is to investigate how these other semantic types are expressed. The exploration of the markedness of nouns and verbs in their extended pragmatic function of modification will be discussed against the background of the semantic types that they denote. Apart from just expressing those semantic types that are not in the adjective class, the nouns and verbs overlap with the adjective in expressing the semantic types that are also in the adjective class. This chapter serves as a syntactic and semantic examination of how nouns and verbs complement the Shona adjective class. Table 27 at the end of this chapter is an expansion of Table 25 and it collates the results from both Chapters 7 and 8.

The discussion will also highlight the differences between adjectives and the nouns and verbs that function as modifiers. These differences will be discussed in light of the semantic process of gradability. This exploration will reveal to what extent nouns and verbs functioning as modifiers resemble adjectives.

This chapter is organised as follows: section 8.2 analyses the structural coding mechanisms used on nouns to function as modifiers. The semantic gradability of these nouns and two categories that we will refer to as gradable locatives and gradable nouns also form part of the analysis. In 8.3 the focus will be on how verbs are overtly marked to assume the function of modification. The findings of the analysis are presented in 8.4. Section 8.5 constitutes a summary of the chapter.
8.2 Nouns as modifiers

The discussion in Chapter 4 (4.6.1.2 and 4.6.3) pointed out that nouns are not inherently relational, hence they have a valency of zero. The effect of markedness on the valency of nouns is that when a noun functions as a modifier its valency is made to become 1. For instance, when a noun such as *usimbe* ‘laziness’ is structurally coded to function as a modifier, then semantically it denotes a kind of behaviour and not the abstract noun ‘laziness’. As a result, nouns functioning as modifiers assume a valency of 1, thereby requiring reference to the entity being described.

We will concentrate on two kinds of nouns in this section: derived nouns and underived nouns. Most of the derived nouns are nouns of class 14. There are derivational processes that derive class 14 nouns from nouns of other noun classes and from verbs. These class 14 nouns can be divided into two groups:

(1) Derived nouns

(a) nouns derived from nouns denoting a certain type of person:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>noun</th>
<th>gloss</th>
<th>derived noun</th>
<th>gloss</th>
<th>semantic type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>mbavha</em></td>
<td>thief</td>
<td><em>umbavha</em></td>
<td>thieving</td>
<td>HUMAN PROPENSITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ndyire</em></td>
<td>trickster</td>
<td><em>undyire</em></td>
<td>avarice</td>
<td>HUMAN PROPENSITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>simbe</em></td>
<td>lazy person</td>
<td><em>usimbe</em></td>
<td>laziness</td>
<td>HUMAN PROPENSITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>fuza</em></td>
<td>half-wit</td>
<td><em>ufuza</em></td>
<td>imbecility</td>
<td>HUMAN PROPENSITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>dununu</em></td>
<td>stupid person</td>
<td><em>utununu</em></td>
<td>stupidity</td>
<td>HUMAN PROPENSITY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) nouns derived from manner and value verbs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>verb</th>
<th>gloss</th>
<th>derived noun</th>
<th>gloss</th>
<th>semantic type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-dzvinyirira</td>
<td>oppress</td>
<td><em>udzvinyirira</em></td>
<td>oppression</td>
<td>HUMAN PROPENSITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-kosha</td>
<td>valuable</td>
<td><em>ukoshi</em></td>
<td>value</td>
<td>VALUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-dzama</td>
<td>deep</td>
<td><em>udzamu</em></td>
<td>depth</td>
<td>DIFFICULTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ngwaru</td>
<td>clever</td>
<td><em>ungwaru</em></td>
<td>wisdom</td>
<td>HUMAN PROPENSITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-chenjera</td>
<td>wise</td>
<td><em>uchenjeri</em></td>
<td>wisdom</td>
<td>HUMAN PROPENSITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-shinga</td>
<td>brave</td>
<td><em>ushingi</em></td>
<td>bravery</td>
<td>HUMAN PROPENSITY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(2) Underived nouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>noun</th>
<th>gloss</th>
<th>semantic type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mbiri</td>
<td>fame, popularity</td>
<td>HUMAN PROPENSITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>musikanzwa</td>
<td>naughtiness</td>
<td>HUMAN PROPENSITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mhanza</td>
<td>luck</td>
<td>HUMAN PROPENSITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mwoyochena</td>
<td>good-heartedness</td>
<td>HUMAN PROPENSITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>makaro</td>
<td>greed</td>
<td>HUMAN PROPENSITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>godo</td>
<td>jealousy</td>
<td>HUMAN PROPENSITY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the derived and underived nouns to function as modifiers in Shona, the following structural coding mechanisms are applied: the genitive marker -e-; the auxiliary marker -ne ‘with, have’; the auxiliary marker -ri ‘be’; and the juxtaposition of two nouns. The semantic types of DIMENSION, PHYSICAL PROPERTY, COLOUR, HUMAN PROPENSITY, AGE, VALUE, QUANTIFICATION, SPEED, QUALIFICATION, POSITION, DIFFICULTY and SIMILARITY can be denoted by nouns functioning as modifiers.

8.2.1 The genitive marker -e-

We have already discussed the metaphorical extensions of the basic meaning of the genitive construction in Chapter 6. Some nouns can occur with the genitive marker -e- to denote an attribute. For example:

(3) *mutikitivha wembiri* [C]
mu-tikitivha w-e-mbiri
c.l.1-detective cl.1-GEN-popular
‘popular detective’

Other nouns that take the genitive marker -e- can denote the semantic types of VALUE and DIFFICULTY as shown in (4) and (5) respectively:

(4) *chinhu cheukoshi* [C]
chi-nhu ch-e-u-koshi
c.l.7-thing cl.7-GEN-cl.14-value
‘thing of value’

(5) *mashoko eudzamu* [E]
ma-shoko e-u-dzamu
c.l.6-words GEN-cl.14-depth
‘words that have depth’
The semantic type of QUALIFICATION can also be denoted when nouns are used with the genitive morpheme. A subclass of nouns that refer to QUALIFICATION in Shona are nouns such as *chokwadi* ‘truth, authenticity’, *mazvirokwazvo* ‘truth, genuineness’, and *mandorokwati* ‘genuineness’. For example:

(6) \[
\text{chibage chechokwadi [C]}
\]
\[
\text{chi-bage ch-e-chokwadi}
\]
\[
\text{cl.7-maize cl.7-GEN-cl.7-authenticity}
\]
\[
\text{‘maize that is authentic’}
\]

(7) \[
\text{mashoko emazvirokwazvo [C]}
\]
\[
\text{ma-shoko e-mazvirokwazvo}
\]
\[
\text{cl.6-words cl.6-GEN-cl.6-truth}
\]
\[
\text{‘words that have truth’}
\]

The other semantic type that is expressed by nouns that occur with the genitive marker is POSITION. For instance:

(8) \[
\text{musha wekumavirira [C]}
\]
\[
\text{mu-sha w-e-kumavirira}
\]
\[
\text{cl.3-homestead cl.3-GEN-west}
\]
\[
\text{‘homestead on the west’}
\]

### 8.2.1.1 Gradability

Except for the group of locatives (cf. 8.2.3), nouns that are inflected by the genitive marker are not gradable. They cannot be intensified or reduplicated. The difference between these nouns that take the genitive marker for modification and the subgroup of adjectives that use the same marker is in gradability. These nouns and the genitive adjectives use the same marker to perform the same function, yet semantically these nouns are not gradable.

### 8.2.2 The auxiliary marker -ne ‘with, have’

The nouns that we discussed in 8.3.1 can also be overtly marked by the auxiliary marker -ne ‘with, have’ in order to function as modifiers. Semantically, the genitive marker -e- and the auxiliary marker -ne are synonymous, hence they are syntactically and semantically interchangeable. We will use the examples in (3) and (4) and substitute the genitive marker -e- with the auxiliary marker -ne to illustrate our point.
(9)  
\textit{chinhu chine ukoshi} [C]  
\textit{chi-nhu chi-ne u-koshi}  
c.l.7-thing cl.7-have cl.14-value  
‘thing that has value’

(10)  
\textit{mutikitivha ane mbiri} [I]  
\textit{mu-tikitivha a-ne \=O-mbiri}  
c.l.1-detective cl.3sg-have c.l.9-popularity  
‘lit. detective who has popularity = popular detective’

Nouns that occur with the auxiliary marker \textit{-ne} ‘with’ can also denote the semantic type \textit{SPEED}. For instance:

(11)  
\textit{munhu ane chinono} [C]  
\textit{mu-nhu a-ne chi-nono}  
c.l.1-person 3sg-have cl.7-slowness  
‘lit. person who has slowness = slow person’

8.2.2.1 Gradability

These nouns are partially gradable. They cannot be intensified or reduplicated; but they can take comparatives and be modified by adverbs, as illustrated below.

8.2.2.1.1 Comparatives

(12)  
\textit{mudzidzi uyu ane musikanzwa kudarika uyo} [E]  
\textit{mu-dzidzi u-yu a-ne mu-sikanzwa kudarika u-yo}  
c.l.1-student DEM-this 3sg-with c.l.3-naughtiness more than DEM-that one  
‘this student is more naughty than that one’

(13)  
\textit{musikana uyu ane mhanza pane uyo} [E]  
\textit{mu-sikana u-yu a-ne \=O-mhanza pane u-yo}  
c.l.1-girl cl.1-this 3sg-with cl.9-luck more than DEM-that one  
‘this girl has more luck than that one’

8.2.2.1.2 Modification by adverbs

(14)  
\textit{mukadzi ane ungwaru chaizvo} [E]  
\textit{mu-kadzi a-ne u-ngwaru chaizvo}  
c.l.1-woman 3sg-with cl.14-wisdom very  
‘woman who has a lot of wisdom’

(15)  
\textit{munhu ane chinono zvikuru} [E]  
\textit{mu-nhu a-ne chi-nono zvikuru}  
c.l.1-person 3sg-with cl.7-slowness very  
‘person who is very slow’
8.2.3 The auxiliary marker -ri ‘be’

The auxiliary verb marker -ri ‘be’ is also used as an additional marker on nouns that designate location or POSITION. These nouns are those in class 16, 17 and 18 in the Shona nominal system. The locative classes have two types of noun stems. The first type of stems are the basic locative stems among which are -kati ‘inside’, -si ‘below’, and -zhe/-nze ‘outside’. For example: mukati (cl.18) ‘inside’, pakati (cl.16) ‘centre/middle’, pasi (cl.16) ‘below/under’, kunze (cl.17) ‘outside’, panze (cl.16) ‘outside’. The second type of stems comprise of existing nouns that refer to location. The prefixes of these locative classes are then superimposed onto already existing nouns to denote location, as presented in (16):

(16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>noun</th>
<th>form</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pamberi</td>
<td>pa- (cl.16) + mberi (cl.17)</td>
<td>in front/ahead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kumberi</td>
<td>ku- (cl.17) + mberi (cl.17)</td>
<td>in front/ahead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>padenga</td>
<td>pa- (cl.16) + denga (cl.5)</td>
<td>above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kudenga</td>
<td>ku- (cl.17) +denga (cl.5)</td>
<td>above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pamusoro</td>
<td>pa- (cl.16) + musoro (cl.3)</td>
<td>above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kumusoro</td>
<td>ku- (cl.17) + musoro (cl.3)</td>
<td>above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An example in context is:

(17)  gomo riri pamberi [C]
Ø-gomo ri-ri pa-mberi
cl.5-mountain SC5-be cl.16-cl.17-ahead
‘mountain that is ahead’

The four cardinal points maodzanyemb a ‘north’, chamhembe ‘south’, mabvazuva ‘east’ and mavirira/madokero ‘west’ semantically refer to location. For example:

(18)  nzvimbo dziri kumaodzanyemb a [C]
Ø-nzvimbo dzi-iri ku-ma-odzanyemb a
cl.10-places SC10-be cl.17-cl.6-north
‘places that are to the north’

(19)  zvitoro zviri kumavirira [C]
zvi-toro zvi-ri ku-ma-virira
cl.8-stores SC8-be cl.17-cl.6-west
‘stores that are to the west’
8.2.3.1 Gradable locatives

(20)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>locative</th>
<th>gloss</th>
<th>locative</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kudenga/mudenga/padenga</td>
<td>above</td>
<td>mukati</td>
<td>inside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kudhuze/mudhuze/padhuze</td>
<td>near</td>
<td>padyo/pedo</td>
<td>near</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kumusoro/pamusoro</td>
<td>above</td>
<td>pakati</td>
<td>middle, centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kunze/panze</td>
<td>outside</td>
<td>pasi</td>
<td>below, under</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kure</td>
<td>far</td>
<td>shure</td>
<td>behind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mberi/kumberi/pamberi</td>
<td>in front, ahead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The gradable locatives require the auxiliary marker -ri ‘be’ to enable them to function as modifiers. We are treating them separately from the other locatives because they display more adjective-like characteristics than any other group of nouns discussed so far.

Semantically, the locative nouns in (20) are gradable. They are ‘naturally’ gradable and do not have to be coerced like the other nouns we have dealt with so far. Apart from these locatives there is no other group of words in Shona that can be both intensified by -sa for intensification and reduplicated for intensification like adjectives. These locatives also resemble the adjective in that they have simple meanings that denote a single property. Our claim in this thesis is that this group of words in fact has “nouny” as well as adjectival properties, and they show in an interesting way how difficult it is to establish clear boundaries between word classes. Semantically the locatives refer to meanings such as ‘far’, ‘near’, ‘below’, ‘above’, etc. Although they display some adjective-like characteristics, still they are abstract nouns that are cognitively conceptualized through reification (cf. 4.6.1.1). They are also nouns in the sense that they are not inherently relational.

8.2.3.1.1 Intensification with -sa

The effect of intensification on these locatives is that they are construed according to the quantitative aspect of the SCALE schema thereby denoting degrees of ‘more’ or ‘less’.
8.2.3.1.2 Reduplication

The effect of reduplication on this group of locative nouns is that their meanings are intensified. This is akin to the effect of reduplication on adjectives.

(22)
It is evident from the examples in (22) that these locatives reduplicate in two ways. The locatives that have less than three syllables accept full reduplication, as in *pasi pasi, mberi mberi; and those that have three syllables or more undergo partial reduplication where only the stem is reduplicated, for instance, *pakatikati and not *pakatipakati; *pamusorosoro and not *pamusoropamusoro.

8.2.3.1.3 Comparatives
These locatives can also take comparatives:

(23) *chikoro chavo chiri padyo pane chedu [E]  
chi-koro cha-vo chi-ri pa-dyo pane che-du  
c.l.7-school POSS-their SC7-be cl.16-near compared to POSS-our  
‘their school is near compared to ours’

8.2.3.1.4 Modification by adverbs
The gradable locatives can also be modified by adverbs, for instance:

(24) *chikoro chiri kure zvikuru [C]  
chi-koro chi-ri kure zvikuru  
c.l.7-school SC7-be far very  
‘school that is very far away’

(25) *nyika iri kure kwazvo [C]  
Ø-nyika i-ri kure kwazvo  
c.l.9-country SC9-be far very  
‘country that is very far away’

8.2.3.2 Semantic structure
The locatives possess a single property in their semantic structure. For instance, *kure ‘far’ only denotes far distance, *pedo (pedyo, padyo) refers to near distance, *pamusoro denotes the horizontal position above the trajector. The similarity of this subgroup of locatives with adjectives is that their meanings resemble adjectival meanings by the fact that they are simple semantically and they are also single properties. We will make reference once again to the claim by Wierzbicka (1988) that adjectives denote a single property; hence this group of locatives displays semantic characteristics that are similar to those of adjectives in this respect. Prototypical nouns denote physical objects, whereas the locatives are atypical nouns because they are abstract nouns.
8.2.4 Noun + noun syntax (juxtaposition of two nouns)

Nouns can also modify other nouns through juxtaposition. In such instances the second noun is the modifier of the first noun. Juxtaposed nouns are noun phrases with an attributive function. The idea behind juxtaposition is that two nouns from different and unrelated classes with totally different meanings can be brought together to form a noun phrase whose syntax is N + N. For example:

(26) *murume bofu* [E]  
    mu-rume Ø-bofu  
    cl.1-man cl.5-blind  
    ‘man who is blind’

(27) *vasikana nherera* [C]  
    va-sikana Ø-nherera  
    cl.2-girls cl.9-orphans  
    ‘girls who are orphans’

In both cases where a noun modifies another noun the meaning of ‘X that is Y’ is denoted. With noun juxtaposition there are no additional morphemes involved, hence there is no overt structural coding. These constructions are still marked however, because a noun is functioning as a modifier, which is not its prototypical function but an extended function. As such, not all cases of markedness have overt structural coding. The examples in (26) and (27) are not compound noun phrases and the evidence for this is that compounds form a composite syntactic and semantic unit which does not permit any word to be inserted between them. For instance, with a compound such as *chivonde pasi* ‘dwarf species of fig tree’ it is not possible to insert anything between the two words. But in the case of the juxtaposed nouns in (26) and (27), it is possible to insert another word between them, as demonstrated in (28) and (29):

(28) *murume murombo bofu* [E]  
    mu-rume mu-rombo Ø-bofu  
    cl.1-man cl.1-poor cl.5-blind  
    ‘poor blind man’

(29) *vasikana vadiki nherera* [E]  
    va-sikana va-diki Ø-nherera  
    cl.2-girls cl.2-small cl.9-orphan  
    ‘small orphan girls’
8.2.4.1 Gradable nouns

In discussing our criteria in 7.2 we highlighted that prototypical nouns are not gradable. This section discusses two nouns in particular that are gradable. The nouns *murombo* and *mupfumi* are used to describe the wealth status of people in classes 1 and 2 and in the pejorative and diminutive classes.

(30)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>noun</th>
<th>gloss</th>
<th>noun</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mupfumi</td>
<td>rich one</td>
<td>murombo</td>
<td>poor one</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The nouns *murombo* and *mupfumi* display different syntactic characteristics from the juxtaposed nouns we have discussed in the preceding section. This is because *mupfumi* and *murombo* take the agreement of the noun they modify. For example:

(31)  *munhu murombo* [C]

mu-nhu mu-rombo
cl.1-person cl.1-poor
‘poor person’

(32)  *vakadzi varombo* [C]

va-kadzi va-rombo
cl.2-women cl.2-poor
‘poor women’

These examples show that it is possible to juxtapose two nouns from the same gender. Normally noun juxtaposition involves nouns that are from different classes, as we have highlighted in the preceding discussion. When *murombo* functions as a modifier of nouns from other classes that refer to humans, there are two agreement possibilities, the first of which is illustrated in (33) where a noun may retain the prefix of its typical gender and take on an additional prefix from the diminutive or pejorative class.

(33)  *kamunhu kamurombo* [E]

ka-mu-nhu ka-mu-rombo
cl.12-cl.1-person cl.12-cl.1-poor
‘poor person’

The other probability is that the noun will drop its prefix and just take that of the diminutive or pejorative class as (34) and (35) illustrate.
The noun *mupfumi* is more selective when it comes to the nouns that denote humans with which it can be combined, because unlike *murombo*, when someone is referred to as being ‘rich’ then pragmatically they cannot be referred to with secondary prefixes such as *ka-* (cl.12) or *zi-* (cl.21) because these are commentary prefixes that denote scorn. As such, *mupfumi* is in most cases combined with gender 1/2 nouns.

The morphological characteristic of the majority of noun stems is that they take the prefixes of the singular and plural genders, such as is the case with *murombo* (cl.1)/varombo (cl.2) and *mupfumi* (cl.1)/vapfumi (cl.2). However, the two stems -rombo and -pfumi also take class 7 and 8 prefixes and in such instances describe the status of institutions such as schools, hospitals, etc. Hence, *chikoro chirombo* ‘poor school’ and *chikoro chipfumi* ‘rich school’ have been said to be acceptable. These characteristics displayed by the stems -rombo and -pfumi suggest that these lexemes may actually be both adjectives and nouns. It is possible for words to behave this way and we echo Croft (2001: 38) who notes that:

> Words like rich/poor are usually analyzed as being both Nouns and Adjectives, that is, as having multiple class membership.

We will therefore argue that in examples (31) to (35) the lexemes -rombo and -pfumi are functioning as adjectives. When we analyse them as adjective lexemes it can be observed that they modify nouns in classes 1, 2, 7, and 8. They have a limited class range and as such they can be analysed in the same manner as the limited class range adjectives in Subgroup C (cf. 7.3.3). This confirms the Cognitive Grammar and Radical Construction Grammar premise that categories are defined by the constructions in which they occur. As such, from the evidence and arguments we have put forward, we will claim that -rombo and -pfumi are both nouns and adjectives.
8.2.4.1.1 Gradability
The nouns *murombo* and *mupfumi* can be intensified, they can take comparatives, and they can be modified by adverbs, but they cannot be reduplicated.

8.2.4.1.1.1 Intensification with -sa

The nouns *murombo* ‘poor’ and *mupfumi* ‘rich’ can take the suffix -sa for intensification.

For example:

(36)  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>noun</th>
<th>gloss</th>
<th>intensification</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mupfumi</td>
<td>rich one</td>
<td>mupfumisa</td>
<td>very rich one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>murombo</td>
<td>poor one</td>
<td>murombosa</td>
<td>very poor one</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.3.4.1.1.2 Reduplication

The nouns *murombo* ‘poor’ and *mupfumi* ‘rich’ cannot be reduplicated. It is not possible to say: *muromborombo or *mupfumipfumi.*

8.2.4.1.1.3 Comparatives

The nouns *murombo* and *mupfumi* can take comparatives.

(37)  
*Chenai murombo pana Nyasha*  
[I]  
PN mu-rombo pana PN  
Chenai cl.1-poor compared to Nyasha  
‘Chenai is poor compared to Nyasha’

(38)  
*murimi uyu mupfumi pane uyo*  
[I]  
mu-rimi u-yu mu-pfumi pane u-yo  
cl.1-farmer cl.1-this cl.1-rich compared to cl.1-that  
‘this farmer is rich compared to that one’

8.2.4.1.1.4 Modification by adverbs

(39)  
*vanhu vapfumi zvikuru*  
[I]  
va-nhu va-pfumi zvikuru  
cl.2-people cl.2-rich very  
‘very rich people’

(40)  
*munhu murombo zvakanyanya*  
[I]  
mu-nhu mu-rombo zvakanyanya  
cl.1-person cl.1-poor extremely  
‘extremely poor person’
8.2.4.1.1.5 Semantic structure

The nouns in this gradable subgroup denote single properties. The noun *murombo* only refers to ‘poor’ while the noun *mupfumi* means the opposite of *murombo* in that it means ‘rich’. Their possession of a single property makes them atypical nouns because nouns typically have complex semantic structures. This simple semantic structure is what enables them to be gradable. These gradable nouns express the semantic type of VALUE. From the discussion in 7.2 we pointed out the semantic distinction between nouns and adjectives. These nouns behave like adjectives semantically in that they have a simple structure and they denote a single meaning. Furthermore, they denote properties and not objects. Another point is that they have a valency of 1 because they require an argument that possesses the property being described. In a discourse situation, if the speaker says “*murombo*”, the other discourse participant is inclined to ask: *ani* ‘who?’ because the referent is not included in the profile of *murombo*. This is different from a noun such as *munhu* ‘person’ which is not relational. This characteristic of inherent relationality that they have in common with adjectives further supports the claim that we made in the foregoing discussion on gradable locatives, that categories are not discrete, but have similar characteristics which may make it difficult to establish word class boundaries.

8.2.5 Summary of section

The section has highlighted that nouns in their marked status can function as modifiers when they are juxtaposed to other nouns and when they are overtly marked by the genitive marker and the auxiliary markers *-ne* ‘with’ and *-ri* ‘be’. In addition, the discussion focused on two groups of nouns that resemble the adjective in gradability. The locatives were shown to be closest to the adjective by virtue of the fact that they can be intensified and reduplicated. We will reiterate the point we have been making throughout the section that in some instances there are no discrete boundaries between categories. These fuzzy category boundaries are best explained by Labov’s cup experiment in Figure 4. The observations by Labov pertaining to the lack of clear boundaries between cups and cup-like objects are applicable in the case between adjectives and these nouns for as has been demonstrated, the resemblances between adjectives, the locatives and the gradable nouns *murombo* and *mupfumi* strengthen our argument that the boundaries between categories are not always clear-cut, but are at times fuzzy.
8.3 Verbs as modifiers

Langacker (2008: 123) states that the kinds of elements that can modify nouns are those that profile non-processual relationships. As a result, verbs have to be atemporalized in order for them to function as modifiers. In Shona this atemporalization takes place through relativization and infinitivization. The relative clause is atemporal because it functions as a modifier of the noun.

8.3.1 Relativization

Relativization is one of the strategies for noun modification. The relativisation on the verb is realised through the raising of tone on the subject concord thereby changing a declarative sentence into a relative construction, as the examples in (41) and (42) demonstrate.

Declarative constructions:

(41a)   móta yàkànàkà
         Ø-mota ya-ka-nak-a
         cl.9-car SC9-good-FV
         ‘a car is good’

(41b)   móta ìnòmhányá
         Ø-mota i-no-mhany-a
         cl.9-car SC9-HAB-run-FV
         ‘a car goes fast’

(41c)   vakadzi vàsàkùrà mumunda
         va-kadzi v-a-sakur-a mu-mu-nda
         cl.2-women 3pl-PERF-plough-FV cl.18-cl.3-field
         ‘the women ploughed in the field’

Relative constructions:

(42a)   móta yàkànàkà
         Ø-mota ya-ka-nak-a
         cl.9-car SC9-good-FV
         ‘a car that is good/beautiful’

(42b)   móta ìnòmhányá
         Ø-mota i-no-mhany-a
         cl.9-car COP-HAB-run-FV
         ‘a car that goes fast’
The examples in (41) illustrate declarative constructions, while in (42) the same statements are in their relativized forms. The difference between a declarative sentence and a relativized construction is that the declarative sentence is a statement that is indicative, whereas relativized constructions such as those in (42) function as modifiers of the noun. In this section our focus will be on the imperfective verbs such as those in (42a) and (42b) that are in the stative and habitual mood. Such verbs denote states and characteristics, and not actions.

8.3.1.1 The Stative Marker -ka-

The stative marker -ka- indicates the state of the subject/object which can be inherent or characteristic. Some verbal roots are derived from adjectival roots. These derived verbal roots can be prefixed with the stative marker -ka- ‘be’ thus enabling them to assume the function of modification. In addition, there are corresponding adjectives for the properties denoted by these verbs. Some verbs that are not derived from adjectives also have corresponding or equivalent adjective forms. Some illustrative examples of derived and underived verb roots are shown in (43) and (44). Additionally, their semantic types are highlighted.

(43) Derived verbs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>adjective</th>
<th>verb equivalent</th>
<th>gloss</th>
<th>semantic type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-chena</td>
<td>-chena</td>
<td>white, clean</td>
<td>COLOUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-femu</td>
<td>-femuka</td>
<td>stout, fat</td>
<td>DIMENSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-kobvu</td>
<td>-kobvuka</td>
<td>stout, fat, thick</td>
<td>DIMENSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tete</td>
<td>-tetepa</td>
<td>thin, narrow</td>
<td>PHYSICAL PROPERTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-nyoro</td>
<td>-nyorova</td>
<td>wet, soft</td>
<td>PHYSICAL PROPERTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-pfupi</td>
<td>-pfupika</td>
<td>short</td>
<td>PHYSICAL PROPERTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-shoma</td>
<td>-shomeka</td>
<td>few, little</td>
<td>QUANTIFICATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tsaru</td>
<td>-tsaruka</td>
<td>old</td>
<td>AGE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Examples (45) and (46) are verb phrases which show the position of the stative marker in relation to the verb as well as the different contexts in which the same verb stem can be used. Some of the verb stems in (44) such as -naka ‘good, beautiful’, -shata ‘bad, ugly, and -oma ‘dry, difficult’ can have different senses depending on the noun they are modifying. A different noun has an effect on the meaning of the construction and its semantic type that is why two different semantic types have been indicated for each verb stem. The verb stem -oma for instance, has the following senses:
(45) *mashizha akaoma* [C]
    ma-shizha a-ka-om-a  
    cl.6-leaves SC6-STAT-dry-FV  
    ‘leaves that are dry’

(46) *nguva yakaoma* [E]
    Ø-nguva ya-ka-om-a  
    cl.9-time SC9-STAT-hard, difficult-FV  
    ‘hard/difficult time’

In other instances it will be a case of polysemy. Hence *munhu akanaka* can mean both ‘a good person’ and ‘a beautiful person’.

8.3.1.1.1 Gradability

We have already mentioned in Chapters 4 and 7 that Shona verbs are gradable. This section will elucidate the gradability of verbs and its effects on the meaning of the verbs.

8.3.1.1.1.1 The intensive extension -is/-es-

The intensive extension has the function of intensifying the meaning of a stative verb. When it is suffixed to stative verbs the function of the intensive extension is comparable to the intensifier -*sa* that is suffixed to adjectives.

(47) *muswe wakatetepesa* [C]
    mu-swe wa-ka-tetep-es-a  
    cl.7-tail SC3-STAT-thin-very-FV  
    ‘a tail that is very thin’

(48) *mashizha akawandisa* [C]
    ma-shizha a-ka-wand-is-a  
    cl.6-leaves SC6-STAT-many-very-FV  
    ‘leaves that are very many’

8.3.1.1.1.2 Reduplication

We will reiterate the observation we made in Chapter 7 that when stative verbs are reduplicated the effect is either intensification or emphasis of a repeated action or process. Therefore the meaning of *zvinhu zvakawanda-wanda* in (49) may be interpreted as ‘things that are varied’ or ‘things that are very many and are all over the place’. There is no intensification in this instance, but emphasis on the amount of the things being referred to. In *chimiro chakanaka-naka*, it can be argued that there is both emphasis and intensification of the beauty of the stature of the subject.
8.3.1.1.3 Comparatives

Stative verbs can take comparatives.

(51)  *zita rakashata kudarika mazita ose* [C]
Ø-zita ra-ka-shat-a kudarika ma-zita ose
cl.5-name SC5-STAT-bad-FV compared to cl.6-names all
‘name that is bad in comparison to all names’

8.3.1.1.4 Modification by adverbs

Stative verbs can also be modified by adverbs to denote the meaning of ‘very X’. For example:

(52)  *mukwashawa wangu akanaka chaizvo* [C]
mu-kwasha wa-ngu a-ka-nak-a chaizvo
cl.1-son-in-law cl.1-my 3sg-STAT-good-FV very
‘my son-in-law is very good’

(53)  *machira aya akakosha zvikuru* [C]
ma-chira a-ya a-ka-kosh-a zvikuru
cl.6-blankets cl.6-these SC6-STAT-valuable FV very
‘these blankets are very valuable’

8.3.1.2 The Habitual Marker -no-

The present habitual tense-aspect marker -no- refers to situations that occur frequently or that are a characteristic of the subject/object. In terms of aspect it is imperfective because it indicates a situation that is ongoing. The verb roots listed in (54) take the present tense habitual marker -no-. Their semantic types are indicated as well.
verb | gloss | semantic type  
---|---|---
-vava | sour, bitter | PHYSICAL PROPERTY  
-tapia | sweet | PHYSICAL PROPERTY  
-tonhora | cold | PHYSICAL PROPERTY  
-pisa | hot | PHYSICAL PROPERTY  
-naka | delicious | PHYSICAL PROPERTY  
-shata | poor taste | PHYSICAL PROPERTY  
-rem | heavy | PHYSICAL PROPERTY  
-fara | happy | HUMAN PROPENSITY  
-kara | greedy | HUMAN PROPENSITY  
-ruta | greedy | HUMAN PROPENSITY  
-koma | rude, uncooperative | HUMAN PROPENSITY  
-mhanya | fast | SPEED  
-nonoka | slow | SPEED  
-kurumidza | fast | SPEED  
-goza | difficult | DIFFICULTY  
-netsa | difficult | DIFFICULTY  
-fanana | alike, similar | SIMILARITY  
-siyana | different | SIMILARITY  
-kodzera | suitable | QUALIFICATION  

8.3.1.2.1 Gradability  
The verbs in (54) are gradable. They can be intensified and reduplicated.  

8.3.1.2.1.1 The intensive extension -is/-es-  
Most of the non-stative verbs listed in (54) can be intensified, as follows:  

(57) *mvura inotonhoresa* [I]  
Ø-mvura i-no-tonhor-es-a  
cl.9-water SC9-HAB-cold-very-FV  
‘water which is very cold’
8.3.1.2.1.2 Reduplication

The meaning of -tapira ‘sweet’ is intensified when reduplicated. However, it should be noted that with the exception of examples such as (60), when most of the verbs in (54) are reduplicated, the result is emphasis of an action and not intensification in meaning. For example, pfungwa dzinomhanya-mhanya ‘wandering thoughts’ does not refer to thoughts that run very fast, but it instead emphasizes the restlessness in the thought process of the subject.

Furthermore, it is the verbs that denote PHYSICAL PROPERTY and SPEED that can be reduplicated with the effect of intensification in meaning.

The other verbs such as -koma which denotes HUMAN PROPENSITY and -kodzera which denotes QUALIFICATION cannot be reduplicated. It is not grammatical to say *mwana anokoma-koma *‘child who is rude rude’ or *chinhu chinokodzera-kodzera *‘thing which is suitable suitable’.

8.3.1.2.1.3 Comparatives

Semantically, the verbs that take the habitual marker can also be compared through the use of the comparative words kudarika, pana, kupinda, etc.

The other verbs such as -koma which denotes HUMAN PROPENSITY and -kodzera which denotes QUALIFICATION cannot be reduplicated. It is not grammatical to say *mwana anokoma-koma *‘child who is rude rude’ or *chinhu chinokodzera-kodzera *‘thing which is suitable suitable’.

8.3.1.2.1.3 Comparatives

Semantically, the verbs that take the habitual marker can also be compared through the use of the comparative words kudarika, pana, kupinda, etc.

The other verbs such as -koma which denotes HUMAN PROPENSITY and -kodzera which denotes QUALIFICATION cannot be reduplicated. It is not grammatical to say *mwana anokoma-koma *‘child who is rude rude’ or *chinhu chinokodzera-kodzera *‘thing which is suitable suitable’.

8.3.1.2.1.3 Comparatives

Semantically, the verbs that take the habitual marker can also be compared through the use of the comparative words kudarika, pana, kupinda, etc.

The other verbs such as -koma which denotes HUMAN PROPENSITY and -kodzera which denotes QUALIFICATION cannot be reduplicated. It is not grammatical to say *mwana anokoma-koma *‘child who is rude rude’ or *chinhu chinokodzera-kodzera *‘thing which is suitable suitable’.
8.3.1.2.1.4 Modification by adverbs
Adverbs can also modify verbs that take the habitual marker to denote a meaning that is
heightened. For example:

(62)  nzvimbo inopisa zvakanyanya [C]
   Ø-nzvimbo i-no-pis-a zvakanyanya
   cl.9-place SC9-HAB-hot-FV very
   ‘place which is very hot’

(63)  magaka anovava zvikuru [C]
   ma-gaka a-no-vav-a zvikuru
   cl.6-cucumbers SC-6-HAB-sour-FV-very
   ‘cucumbers that are very sour’

8.3.2 Infinitivization
An infinitive is created by adding the prefix *ku*- ‘to’ to a verb root. For instance, -*famba*
‘walk’ becomes *kufamba* ‘to walk’; -*nyara* ‘shy’ becomes *kunyara* ‘to be shy’; -*nyorova*
‘wet’ becomes *kunyorova* ‘to be wet’, etc. The strategy that enables an infinitive verb to
modify a noun is that the infinitive verb is preceded by the genitive marker -*e*-. For
instance:

(64)  munhu wekuzvida [E]
   mu-nhu w-e-ku-zvid-a
   cl.1-person cl.1-GEN-INF-proud-FV
   ‘person who is proud’

(65)  musikana wekunyara [E]
   mu-sikana w-e-ku-nyar-a
   cl.1-girl cl.1-GEN-INF-shy-FV
   ‘girl who is shy’

Semantically, examples (64) and (65) belong to the HUMAN PROPENSITY type.

(66)  banga rekugomara [I]
   Ø-banga r-e-ku-gomar-a
   cl.5-knife cl.5-GEN-INF-blunt-FV
   ‘knife that is blunt’

Example (66) denotes the semantic type PHYSICAL PROPERTY.

(67)  jira rekusakara [I]
   Ø-jira r-e-ku-sakar-a
   cl.5-blanket cl.5-GEN-INF-old-FV
   ‘blanket that is old’
The semantic type AGE is designated by example (67).

(68)  *masadza o-kushata* [C]
      ma-sadza o-ku-shat-a
      cl.6-sadza cl.6-INF-bad taste-FV
      ‘bad tasting sadza’

The genitive marker has the variant -o-, as is the case in (68). Semantically the example
denotes the semantic type VALUE.

### 8.3.3 Summary of section

This section has demonstrated the relativization and infinitivization of verbs to enable them
to function as modifiers. The discussion has also established that the verbs that are overtly
marked by the stative marker and the habitual marker are gradable. In addition, the section
has shed light on the semantic types denoted by these verbs.

### 8.4 Findings from Analysis

We have discussed the various overt structural coding and markedness strategies used by
nouns and verbs to function as modifiers, as summarized in Table 26 which has been
modified according to the results of the analysis. We have substantiated that nouns in
Shona can be juxtaposed to other nouns or be overtly marked by the genitive marker and
the auxiliary markers to function as modifiers. Verbs in turn undergo relativization or
infinitivization in order to perform the extended function of modification.

#### Table 26 Overt structural coding constructions for parts of speech in Shona

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Modification</th>
<th>Predication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Objects</em></td>
<td>UNMARKED NOUNS</td>
<td>predicate nominals,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>copulas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Properties</em></td>
<td>substantivized adjectives</td>
<td>UNMARKED ADJECTIVES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Actions</em></td>
<td>action nominals, complements, infinitives</td>
<td>relativization (stative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>marker; habitual marker)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>infinitivization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We have also drawn comparisons between nouns and verbs functioning as modifiers and adjectives in relation to the semantic criterion of gradability. We have ascertained that prototypical nouns are not gradable, except for the two groups of nouns constituted by the locatives and the gradable nouns *murombo* and *mupfumi*. The nouns *mupfumi* and *murombo* can be intensified, but they cannot be reduplicated. As a result, we can state that they are partially gradable. The locatives are the only group of nouns that resemble the adjective in terms of gradability in that they can be intensified and reduplicated, and they can also take comparatives and be modified by adverbs. In terms of parts of speech membership, we have suggested that the words *murombo* and *mupfumi* be considered as having dual category membership as a result of their syntactic and semantic characteristics. Verbs, on the other hand, are gradable but in a different way from adjectives. Verbs are intensified by the intensive extension -*es/-*is- and when they are reduplicated the effect may be emphasis of a repeated action or intensification.

In Chapter 7 in our discussion of the adjective semantic types highlighted that the adjectives in Shona can be divided into eight semantic types. It was concluded that SPEED, POSITION, DIFFICULTY, QUALIFICATION and SIMILARITY are not expressed by adjectives, but by nouns and verbs. In this chapter that discussion has been extended to include the semantic types expressed by nouns and verbs functioning as modifiers. We have discussed the overt structural coding mechanisms for nouns and verbs in Shona. This examination was closely tied in with the semantic types denoted by the overtly coded constructions. When nouns are overtly marked by the genitive marker, the auxiliary marker and in juxtaposition, they can express twelve semantic types. Verbs are overtly marked through relativization and infinitivization and thereby also denote twelve semantic types.

Table 27 summarises the entire discussion of the semantic types in relation to adjectives, verbs and nouns. From the table it is evident that SPEED, POSITION, DIFFICULTY, QUALIFICATION POSITION and SIMILARITY are not expressed by adjectives, but by nouns and verbs. Only CARDINAL NUMBERS are expressed exclusively by adjectives.
Table 27 Parts of speech membership of the semantic types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Part of speech membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIMENSION</td>
<td>A V N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYSICAL PROPERTY</td>
<td>A V N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLOUR</td>
<td>A V N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUMAN PROPENSITY</td>
<td>A V N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>A V N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VALUE</td>
<td>A V N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARDINAL NUMBERS</td>
<td>A V N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUANTIFICATION</td>
<td>A V N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPEED</td>
<td>V N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUALIFICATION</td>
<td>V N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSITION</td>
<td>V N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIFFICULTY</td>
<td>V N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIMILARITY</td>
<td>V N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dixon’s purpose in positing these semantic types was to investigate the word class affiliations of adjective-deficient languages. For Shona, therefore, the other word classes that can express adjectival concepts are nouns and verbs.

8.5 Summary

This chapter has demonstrated the overt structural coding mechanisms on nouns and verbs that enable them to function as modifiers. Our analysis has also established that the group of locatives have the properties of both nouns and adjectives. We will therefore reiterate the point that we have made concerning this subgroup, and that is, that it is difficult to draw boundaries between word classes. The chapter also discussed the group of gradable nouns that denote humans and how it shares characteristics with both nouns and adjectives. Their similarity with adjectives is semantic in that they denote a single semantic property and they are also gradable. Incorporated in our discussion was also the concept of semantic types as propounded by Dixon (2004).
Chapter 9 Conclusion

9.1 Introduction

This final chapter presents a summary of the study and it also offers a discussion of the main research findings of this thesis. Suggestions for further research are also offered.

9.2 Summary of the Study

The thesis was an analysis of the adjective class in Shona. We commenced our study by presenting an overall picture of the approaches in descriptions of the parts of speech, adjective, noun and verb, from Antiquity to recent studies. These background chapters included descriptions of nouns and verbs, the justification for this being that one cannot look at the adjective in isolation from nouns and verbs, because these three parts of speech are interrelated in some ways, as this study portrayed.

Chapter 2 highlighted that during the Greek and Roman period there was no consensus on the number of the parts of speech in any one language that was studied during this period. The number of the parts of speech identified varied from two to eight and the criteria used to describe them ranged from etymology to phonetics and morphology. This period can be described as a discovery period where each scholar made new findings on the language they were working on. In the nineteenth century the major trend was comparative philology and the methods of analysis used were morphology and syntax. It was highlighted that Rask described two parts of speech, the noun and the verb, with the adjective being treated as part of the noun class; while Bopp analysed mainly the verb and its inflectional forms, and to a lesser extent he also analysed nouns (including adjectives),
participles and pronouns. The section on the twentieth century showed that this was the period where a number of theories were formulated for linguistic description. Further, the chapter highlighted how parts of speech were defined in the different theoretical traditions and it attempted to present a critique of each theoretical method.

Chapter 3 focused on descriptions of parts of speech in Bantu linguistics. The European linguistics tradition and the Bantu linguistic tradition are not separate but occurred simultaneously; work in Bantu languages having been started by missionaries, to whom Bantu linguistics owe a great debt. We took this history from the seventeenth century when work in Bantu languages started and highlighted how scholars like Brusciotto analysed the noun and verb. The nineteenth century saw the use of mixed criteria which were mainly centered on morphology. The twentieth century section focused on the contributions of Doke and Fortune to Shona linguistic analysis and that morphology and semantics formed the basis of their descriptions of the parts of speech. In addition, the chapter looked at developments in the study of the adjective in previous Shona grammars, in other Bantu languages and in other African languages in order to show that the characteristics of the adjective class in Shona are not peculiar to it alone but that this is a characteristic of other African languages as well.

The theoretical approach that informed this thesis is cognitive grammar. The key tenets of cognitive grammar were highlighted as being the symbolic nature of language, the centrality of meaning, the syntax-semantics interface, the grammar-lexicon continuum and the notion of prototypicality. The chapter also discussed the approaches to categorization as espoused by cognitive grammar, these being the classical and non-classical approaches. The fundamental premise of the prototype theory as one of the non-classical approaches is that a category comprises of central members and that there is membership gradience from the central members to the other members in the category. The prototype theory also propounds that categories have fuzzy boundaries; and this was illustrated by Labov’s cup experiment in Figure 4. The other non-classical approach, the family resemblance model, regards category members as a family where each member has some feature in common with the other family members. These two models expounded the heterogeneity of the Shona adjective class. The section on the cognitive grammar approach to parts of speech discussed the definitions of adjectives, nouns and verbs by Langacker, Givón and Croft.
The methodology chapter outlined that the materials that shaped this study were mainly the Shona dictionary, *Duramazwi Guru reChiShona*; while the main method used was the corpus linguistics approach. We also highlighted that other methods such as elicitation and introspection were used to complement the corpus data. Chapter 6 presented a brief discussion of the Shona noun class system. The chapter explained the notions noun class and gender. It also presented the class markers in Shona in relation to their stem initial modifications in some classes, as well as the system of agreement.

Chapter 7 constituted the analysis. The objectives of the study were to analyse Shona adjectives using morphological, syntactic, and semantic criteria. One of the findings from the analysis was that Shona adjectives form seven subgroups according to how they behaved in relation to the criteria outlined in 7.2. Among the subgroups were two groups of adjectives whose members displayed characteristics which established them to be the prototypical members of adjectives in Shona. The other subgroups were shown to differ from these prototypical instances in various ways. The peripheral adjectives were those which were proven to have the most number of differences and fewer similarities with the prototype; but these were all defined as adjectives by virtue of some resemblance to the prototype as depicted by other criteria.

The semantic structure of the adjectives and the semantic types that they denote was also incorporated into the analysis. In addition, the aspect of prototypicality was discussed in relation to the frequency counts from the Shona corpus which depicted the degree of entrenchment of an adjective. The adjectives with a high token frequency were seen to be the most entrenched and the most prototypical. The less prototypical adjective subgroups had very few token frequencies and average frequencies. As such, it was demonstrated that a high token frequency is also a determinant for entrenchment and prototypicality.

The other objective of the study was to discuss the overt structural coding mechanisms required by nouns and verbs to function as modifiers. The universal typological theory of parts of speech as propounded by Croft, was discussed in light of the extra morphology that is required by nouns and verbs in Shona to function as modifiers. This exposition formed the basis of the discussion in Chapter 8.
9.3 Research Findings and Conclusions

A fundamental finding that this study made pertaining to the distinction between prototypical nouns and adjectives is that prototypical noun stems only take the prefixes of a few classes, whereas prototypical adjectives can modify nouns of all classes. We can conclude that this distinction provides the answer to the question: ‘What morphological, syntactic, and semantic characteristics differentiate prototypical adjectives from nouns?’

The answer to that question and the following characteristics describe the morphological, syntactic, and semantic characteristics of prototypical adjectives in Shona.

- they can function in both the attributive and predicative positions
- they show morphological agreement with the head noun
- they can modify nouns from all classes
- they are gradable

If an adjective possesses all four attributes then it is a prototypical adjective. We identified two prototypical adjective subgroups, A and B, whose only difference lies in the fact that B is not semantically gradable.

The adjectives in subgroups E, F, and G were shown to have fewer characteristics in common with the prototype but were attested to be adjectives in view of the fact that they designate the properties of nouns. In spite of the fact that these adjectives are not as entrenched in Shona as reflected in their frequencies of occurrence in the corpus, the analysis has revealed that they do bear some resemblance to the prototype, hence should be regarded as adjectives on that account. We have already stated that the adjectives in Subgroup E constituted the most peripheral adjectives because they have only one syntactic characteristic in common with the prototype, that being their ability to occur in the predicative position.

The next peripheral adjective is *nje* which can function only in the attributive position, this being its only significant syntactic resemblance to the prototype. The syntactic characteristic of *nje* is also that it is invariable. This invariability also characterizes the adjectives of Subgroup G which have more characteristics in common with the prototype
than either Subgroup E or the adjective *nje*. Based on these findings, we concluded that the least entrenched adjectives are also the least prototypical. Semantically, these less prototypical adjectives denote temporary states.

The semantic analysis revealed that eight semantic types are found in the Shona adjective class. The remaining semantic types are expressed by nouns and verbs which are in their marked status. Some nouns and verbs were shown to be capable of being structurally coded in several ways to express different meanings. It was established that only CARDINAL NUMBERS are expressed solely by adjectives, whereas from the remaining twelve semantic types five are expressed by nouns and verbs and seven by adjectives, nouns and verbs.

The discussion in Chapter 8 revealed that the behaviour of less prototypical nouns is akin to that of adjectives. This was demonstrated by the locative subgroup and the gradable nouns which were shown to resemble the adjective morphologically, syntactically and semantically. We demonstrated that these two groups of nouns are gradable and that semantically they denote single properties like adjectives. We therefore arrived at the conclusion that word class boundaries are not discrete, but are in some cases fuzzy. For the two words *murombo* and *mupfumi* we suggested that they be regarded as having multiple class membership whereby in some contexts they may function as nouns, whereas in other contexts they are adjectives.

We stated in Chapter 3 that the early Shona grammarians identified thirty five adjectives; whereas in *Duramazwi Guru reChiShona* sixty nine adjectives are lemmatized. This analysis analysed ninety adjectives. Hence as the most recent study on adjectives in Shona it has managed to document twenty one additional adjectives; these additional adjectives having been brought to light through corpus evidence. Corpus data also revealed that there are two homonymous adjectives that are similar in their phonological structures but are different semantically, namely, *siri* ‘small’ and *siri* ‘genuine, pure, true’. The other observation from corpus data was the occurrence of loanwords for the CARDINAL NUMBERS. We deduced that these loanwords deserved analysis just as much as the loanwords for the colour terms which were lemmatized in *Duramazwi Guru reChiShona*.
The conclusion we can draw from this finding is that there are more adjectives in Shona than had been previously described.

### 9.4 Suggested Further Research

This is an initial study that has used the inventory of the adjectives from one major source, the Shona dictionary, *Duramazwi Guru reChiShona*. The study of adjectives in Shona could be broadened by looking at the other varieties of Shona listed in Table 1. Such a study would be a topic-focussed study that has questions designed to elicit adjectives as well as other ways to express adjectival concepts in these Shona varieties.
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Appendix A: Adjectives from *Duramazwi Guru reChiShona*

- **bhurauni (bhurawuni)**
  - ‘brown’
  - ‘one’

- **bodzi**
  - ‘chequered’

- **chena (jena)**
  - ‘chequered’

- **chisambi**
  - ‘white, light’

- **dhara**
  - ‘old’
  - ‘slim’

- **dodo**
  - ‘small’
  - ‘very small’
  - ‘wide’

- **diki (-doko, -duku, -tiki, -toku, -tuku)**
  - ‘naked’

- **doodoko (doodori)**
  - ‘naked’

- **fenu (-feru)**
  - ‘naked’

- **gireyi**
  - ‘grey’

- **hofu**
  - ‘hollow’

- **hombe**
  - ‘big, large’

- **kaki**
  - ‘khaki’

- **kirimu**
  - ‘cream’

- **kobvu (gobvu, hobvu)**
  - ‘mad, unbalanced’

- **kokayi**
  - ‘hard, strong’

- **kukutu (gukutu, hukutu)**
  - ‘big, large’

- **kuma**
  - ‘naked’

- **kumi**
  - ‘ten’

- **kuru (guru, huru)**
  - ‘naked’

- **mayazi**
  - ‘unreliable’

- **mbichana (bhichana, mbijana)**
  - ‘few, little’

- **mbishi (mbisi)**
  - ‘raw, uncooked’

- **meruni**
  - ‘one’

- **mwe**
  - ‘four’

- **na**
  - ‘beautiful’

- **naku**
  - ‘negative’

- **negativhi (negativhi)**
  - ‘blue-black’

- **nhuru**
  - ‘ordinary, worthless, poor’

- **nge**
  - ‘seven’

- **nomwe**
  - ‘wet, soft’

- **nyoro**
  - ‘new’

- **nyowani (-nyuwani)**
  - ‘with young’

- **nzvere**
  - ‘orange’

- **orenji**
  - ‘wide’

- **pamhi**
  - ‘alive’

- **penyu (mhenyu)**
  - ‘purple’

- **pepuro**
  - ‘nine’

- **pfemba**
  - ‘nine’

- **pfumbamwe**
  - ‘grey’

- **pfumbu (bvumbu)**
  - ‘short’

- **pfupi (-fupi)**
  - ‘two’

- **piri (mbiri)**
  - ‘round’

- **raundi**
redhi
-refu (ndefu, -rebu)
-rongomuna
-sande
-sere (-tsere)
-shanu
-sharu (dzaru, -saru, -tsaru)
-shava (java)
-shoma
-svinu
siri
-svipa
-tanhatu (nhanhatu)
-tano
-tatu (nhatu)
-tema (dema, nhema)
-tete (dete, nhete)
-tsja (dzja)
-tsvene (dzvene)
-tsvuku (dzvuku)
vhayoreti
-vi
yero
-zhinji

‘red’
‘tall, long’
‘four’
‘holy’
‘eight’
‘five’
‘old’
‘light-brown’
‘few, little’
‘good, pleasant’
‘small’
‘dark, black’
‘six’
‘healthy’
‘three’
‘black, dark’
‘thin, narrow’
‘new’
‘holy, good’
‘red’
‘violet’
‘bad, evil’
‘yellow’
‘many, much’
Appendix B: Adjectives analysed in this study

-e-bhureki (-e-bhuleki)  ‘black’
-e-bhurauni (-e-bhuravuni)  ‘brown’
-e-bhuruu (-e-bhuluu)  ‘blue’
-bodzi  ‘one’
-e-chekicheki  ‘chequered’
-chena (jena)  ‘white, light’
-e-chisambi  ‘chequered’
-dhara  ‘old’
-dodo  ‘slim’
-diki (-doko, -duku, -tiki, -toko, -tuku)  ‘small’
-doodoko (doodor)  ‘very small’
-dukwane  ‘small’
eyiti  ‘eight’
-faiji  ‘five’
femu (-feru)  ‘wide’
foo  ‘four’
e-gireyi  ‘grey’
e-girini  ‘green’
hofu  ‘hollow’
hombe  ‘big, large’
hwani  ‘one’
kadzi (hadzi)  ‘female’
e-kaki  ‘khaki’
e-kirimu  ‘cream’
kobvu (gobvu, hobvu)  ‘thick’
kokayi  ‘mad, unbalanced’
kono (hono)  ‘male’
kukutu (gukutu, hukutu)  ‘hard, strong’
kuma  ‘naked’
kumi (gumi)  ‘ten’
kuru (guru, huru)  ‘big, large’
mayazi  ‘unreliable’
mbichana (bhichana, mbijana)  ‘few, little’
mbishi (mbisi)  ‘raw, uncooked’
e-meruni  ‘maroon’
mwe  ‘one’
na  ‘four’
naini  ‘nine’
naku  ‘beautiful’
negetivhi (negativhi)  ‘negative’
hhuru  ‘blue-black’
nje  ‘ordinary, worthless, poor’
nomwe  ‘seven’
nyoro  ‘wet, soft’
nyowani (-nyuwani)  ‘new’
nzvere  ‘with young’
-e-orenji  ‘orange’
-pamhi  ‘wide’
-penyu (mhenyu)  ‘alive’
-e-pepuru (-e-pepuro)  ‘purple’
-pfemba  ‘nine’
-pfumbamwe  ‘nine’
-pfumbu (bvumbu)  ‘grey’
-pfupi (-fupi)  ‘short’
-e-pingi  ‘pink’
-e-raundi  ‘round’
-e-redhi  ‘red’
-refu (ndefu, -rebu)  ‘four’
-rongomuna  ‘holy’
-sande  ‘eight’
-sere (-tsere)  ‘seven’
-sevheni  ‘five’
-shanu  ‘old’
-sharu (dzaru, -saru, -tsaru)  ‘light-brown’
-shava (java)  ‘few, little’
-shoma  ‘yellow’
-shora  ‘six’
-sikisi  ‘small’
-siri  ‘pure, true, genuine’
-siri  ‘good, pleasant’
-svina  ‘dark, black’
-svipa  ‘six’
-tanhatu (nhanhatu)  ‘healthy’
-tano  ‘three’
-tatu (nhatu)  ‘black, dark’
-tema (dema, nhema)  ‘ten’
-teni  ‘thin, narrow’
-tete (dete, nhete)  ‘three’
-thirii  ‘new’
-tsve (dzve)  ‘holy, good’
-tsvunu (dzvumu)  ‘red’
-tuu  ‘two’
-e-vhayoreti  ‘violet’
-e-waiti  ‘white’
-uya  ‘good, upright’
-vi  ‘bad, evil’
-viri (-iri, mbiri)  ‘two’
-e-yero  ‘yellow’
-zhinji  ‘many, much’