African Journal of Social Issues 6(1): 2023
Available online at https://ajosing.com;
https://www.ajol.info/index.php/ajosi

DOI: **https://dx.doi.org/10.4314/ajosi.vol6i1.9**

p-ISSN 2672 – 5142; e-ISSN 2734 – 3324

Original Research

PORTMANTEAU MANIFESTATIONS OF *-J-* AND *-K-* MORPHS OF VERB EXTENSION IN HANGAZA

CHIPANDA Simon
ORCID.ORG/0009-00005-8574-6104

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the portmanteau manifestations-j- and -k-verb morphs in Hangaza language spoken in Tanzania. The study was motivated by the language's peculiarities in its post-radical semantic elasticity; especially the way the -j- and -k- morph behave. Lexical Mapping Theory was the tool of analysis used to explain the-j- and -k- implications. The study employed a case study design and its data were collected from the Hangaza area. Focus group discussion and documentary analysis were used in the collection of data. The collected data were represented basing on the Leipzig Glossing Rules. It was found that the -j- and -k- morphs have portmanteau senses. Thus, -k- can serve as causative or a stative while -j- can serve as an applicative or a causative. That is to say, the same form can be productive or non-productive. Lexical Mapping Theory's theoretical apparatus explain well the -j- and -k- argument structure together with their semantics. Generally, Hangaza's lexical peculiarities, including the nature of its prosodic features, attract further investigation into the way how polymorphic morphs are ordered and the way they function.

Key words: Hangaza, morphs, lexical mapping theory, verb extension

INTRODUCTION

The semantics of allomorphs in the causative and applicative domains has been treated and explained by various linguists (Cf:-Alsina 1992; Baker 1988a; Li 1990; Mwangi 2001:387; Shibatani, 1976; Mchombo, 2004; Peterson, 2007). A number of these scholars have shown that each morph has its own meaning, e.g. if Y syntactically functions as a causative then X will function as an applicative. With regard to the function, an applicative suffix allows the verb to take one more object and, in so doing, it leads to conversion of an intransitive verb into a transitive one. While this is true, syntactically, a causative, just like an applicative, increases the valence of the verb by adding one object to the predicate argument. In other words, a causative introduces a new agentive NP as a subject (causer), either demoting the original subject (causee), and the original object to the second object or demoting the original subject to some sort of an indirect object. The new object may be associated with the experiencer/goal thematic role, (Ibiden, 2008:116).

However, within the scope of the current study, valence increasing and decreasing is not new in linguistic contexts. The new fact that X can be Y needs to be reanalyzed.

The function of either applicative or causative allomorphs in Bantu languages has been treated as a one-to-one function. In other words, each attached morph has its own morphological shape and function. The existence of one morph having portmanteau manifestation is a new discovery that needs reanalysis.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Various scholars have extensively researched on Bantu causatives and applicative as valence-increasing arguments of the predicate structure. Muhdhar (2006) investigated five verb extensions in Kisukuma language of Tanzania and found that *-il-* and *-el-* are applicative while-*ij-* and *-ish-* are causative allomorphs in that language. Muhdhar did not find semantic variants – meaning that each morph (shape of the morph) had its own meaning. This is unlike in Hangaza language, which seems to have peculiar semantic variants. Thus, the current study sought to understand them.

The Kipsigis language spoken in Kenya exhibit both argument-increasing morphs and argument-decreasing morphs (Cf. Kibet*et al.*, 2014). The argument-increasing morphs are: the applicative morph *-a-*, benefactive morph *-w-*, *-chi-*, instrumental *-en-* and directional *-y-* and causative morph *-i-*. Research evidence shows that none of these has as semantic variants, for example, allomorph *-ch-* has only one semantic scope. However, Hangaza is of a different nature, thus there is a need to study the language to see the forms of variability which would be very important to linguistic theories and analysis.

Lothi did a comparative study on verb extensions in Nyamwezi and Kiswahili and found that*-y-*, *-ch-*,*-j-*, are causative allomorphs and *-il-* is an applicative allomorph. However, the syntax and semantics of the applicative or causative in his investigation had no peculiarities such as those predicted from Hangaza language of Tanzania. It is predicted that the Hangaza language use a single morph for various grammatical intricacies; this needs reanalysis to see what is within its lexicon.

In Kisukuma, thirteen (13) verb extensions were reported by Batibo (1976). These are inversive neuter or stative, repetitive, reflexive, intensive reciprocal, complex causative, applicative, simple causative, benefactive-directive, reciprocal, passive, fotitive, contactive, and inversive neuter. To be specific as per the current study, *-sy-*, *-y-* were identified as causative in which *-sy-* as complex and *-y-* as simple causative and *-el-*, *-il-* as applicative morphs. It must be noted that each morph in this language has a one-to-one function according to Batibo. This is different from what is observed in Hangaza language is that its applicative and causative morphemes have each multiple semantics and it is the focus of the current study.

Hyman (2002, 2003) offers enlightening insights into verb extensions and their ordering in Bantu languages. In his study entitled '*Suffix Ordering in Bantu: A Morphocentric Approach (Cf: - 2002:5-6).* The author frames a default Pan-Bantu template abbreviated as CARP-_causative,

applicative, reciprocal and passive. The present study seeks to find out if that template captures the ordering of verbal extensions in Hangaza language.

McPherson and Paster (2007) investigated the evidence for the Mirror Principle and Morphological Templates in Luganda Affix Ordering. The former postulates that 'the order of affixes reflects the order in which the associated syntactic 'operations' apply (Baker 1985) while the latter postulates that that affix ordering in Luganda obeys the so-called 'CARP' template, which Hyman (2003) reconstructs for Proto-Bantu: (2) Causative Applicative Reciprocal Passive *-*ic*- > *-*id*- > *-*an*- > *-*u*- respectively. The current study tests these principles. Along with other things, McPherson and Paster described that -*is/er*- is the causative and -*ir/er*- is an applicative in Luganda e.g., *n-a-mu-zin-**is**-a* 'I made him dance' and, a-*n-zin-**ir**-a* 'he is dancing for me' (Ibiden, 2007:57). Under the level of analysis, it is observed that each morph has a single meaning, which is simple to describe. This is quite different in Hangaza language where the native speakers use the same morph to convey various semantic senses, thus there is a need to investigate the semantics of Hangaza verb allomorphs', specifically the applicative-causative allomorphs.

Simango (1995:27) studied applicative construction in *Chinsenga by using* Relational Grammar. According to his findings, each applicative predicate assigns a unique thematic role to its argument and determines the specific grammatical relation its argument bears at the point of initialization. Simango further argues that grammatical relations are language-specific rather than universal, for example a benefactive applicative predicate may very well require a direct object relation in one language and select an indirect object in another. Although Simango's argument seems to reflect the reality of some Bantu languages, in *Kikongo* the benefactive object behaves as a direct object rather than an indirect object. However, his argument makes sense since the form; meaning and functions of allomorphs are normally language-specific. That is why each language cannot be regarded as the same as other languages that have been studied before it is studied. This explains why a study on these allomorphs in Hangaza language is necessary, given that the language seems to have peculiarities in its applicative and causative semantics.

Ngonyani (2016), in his study on Pairwise combinations of the Swahili applicative with other verb extensions established that -*i*- or -*e*-on final consonant stems and (-*il*- or -*el*- *)are applicative allomorphs while -z-, -y-, -sh*-and (b) the long causative -*ish-, -esh-, -ez-, -iz)* are causative allomorphs in Kiswahili language. It was observed that the form that takes –*i*- or –*e*- is used most frequently. The original forms -*il*- and -*el*- now appear in fewer words, such as the causativized form of *tosha* 'be enough,' which has become -*tosh-el-ez-a* 'to satisfy or be sufficient.' This is caused by the historical loss of /*l*/ in many environments. Thus, we notice, for example, that /*l*/ reappears when the applicative is attached to a verb that ends in two vowels. For example, -*kaa* 'sit' becomes -*kalia*'sit on.' On the other hand when it comes to causative allomorphs, the causative suffix triggers changes in the stem-final consonants as in *takata* 'be clean' and *takasa* 'clean'. Two issues arise here. One, the Swahili causative and applicative are one to one functions. Second, Ngonyani's analysis leaves much to be desired due to the fact that the meaning analysis of some available data needs explanation. For instance, *takata*' be clean' and *takasa* 'clean' are

merely written, thus it is difficult to judge or compare them with manifestations of causative and applicative allomorphs' in other languages.

Theories Guided the Study

The study employed the Lexical Mapping Theory in the analysis of data. On realizing that this theory could on to handle some issues in Kihangaza language, especially semantic representation, the Mirror Principle was applied to complement it.

The Lexical Mapping Theory

Lexical Mapping Theory (LMT) is a sub-theory under the Lexical Functional Grammar (LFG) which appeared first in print as "*the Mental Representation of Grammatical Relations"* edited by Bresnan 1982. The theory recognizes the syntactic importance of the information that derives from the lexicon (Chabata, 2007:135). It establishes an association between thematic structure and syntactic functions (Bresnan and Kanerva, 1989:27). This means that argument structure plays a significant role in mapping thematic roles and grammatical functions. LMT comprises three basic principles namely: semantic role hierarchy, morpholexical operation on argument structure and classifying grammatical functions as it has been encoded in Bresnan and Moshi, (1990), Bresnan and Zaenen (1990) and Bresnan(2001).

Assigning Thematic Role Hierarchy

This is the argument of LMT which assumes a certain universal hierarchy of semantic roles within the argument structure of every predicate in a linear order. In other words, there is a mapping between argument structure and grammatical functions mediated by a set of universal principles. The theory assumes the existence of a Universal Thematic Hierarchy which reflects a scale of thematic prominence (Austin, 2005:30). In the scale of thematic prominence, the most prominent – highest, argument can be selected as the logical subject. The scale of thematic prominence observes the order Agent > Beneficiary > Goal > Instrument > Patient > Locative (Wong & Hancox, 1998:335; Khumalo, 2007: 148).

Morpholexical operations on verbal extensions

This is the second tenet of LMT in respect to verbs. According to this tenet, argument structures can be altered by morpholexical operations which add, suppress or bind argument roles (Bresnan & Moshi, 1990:169). For instance, the Applicative increases the arguments of the verb while the Passive suppresses argument or valence and the Reciprocal binds or associates valences.

Classifying grammatical functions into features

Classification of grammatical functions into features is achieved by restricting two features – [±r] and [±o]. This decomposition of feature restrictedness yields four syntactic functions illustrated below:

1

[-r] [-r] [+r] [+r]

[-o] SUBJ, [+o] OBJ, [-o] $OBL_{\theta,}$ [+o] OBL_{θ} (Bresnan & Moshi, 1990:167)

From the above function features, it is observed that the subject and object are represented by [-r] and are said to be unrestricted since they can be associated with many/any semantic roles. On the other hand, objects that complement the transitive predicator and not the intransitive predicator are propertilized with [+0]. Oblique [OBL_{θ}] are restricted in their semantic roles [+r] and are non-object like (complementing basic nouns and adjectives [-o] (Bresnan & Moshi, 1990:167).

The core grammatical functions are the subject, object, thematic (or second) object, and (thematic) oblique (Austin, 2005:30). In other words, these mapping features which are schematized as patient-like thematic roles are assigned feature [-r], secondary patient-like thematic roles are assigned feature [+o], while other thematic roles are assigned feature [-o]. For example, the theme is a patient-like role, hence it is assigned [-r], while the agent and the locative are assigned [-o] to mean 'other roles' (Simon, 2018). For simplicity these principles are codified as *principles for assigning syntactic features* in (2).

2.	[i]	Patient-like roles are:	$\theta \longrightarrow$ [-r]
	[ii]	Secondary patient-like role are:	$\theta \longrightarrow$ [+0]
	[iii]	Other roles are:	$\theta \longrightarrow$ [-0]

Source: Khumalo (2014:155)

In (2), [i] – [iii] principles, it can be observed that the features [+/-r] and [+/-o] demonstrate the way arguments are mapped onto grammatical functions and group grammatical functions are mapped into natural classes is shown in (2) representing (3).

3. (a) *On-a*.	agent				
'Look.'	[-o]				
(b). *Uwa –a.*	theme				
'Kill.'	[-r]				
(c). *Pig-a*	agent				patient
'Beat.'	[-o]	[-r]			
(d). *Fika - a*.	<theme				location>
'Arrive.'	[-r]	[-o]			
(e). *Weka-a*.	<agent		theme		location>
'Put.'	[-o]	[-r]	[-o]		

In (3), it can be observed that thematic roles in argument structures are mapped onto their relevant grammatical functions. These features are restricted by some simple and general principles of Lexical Mapping Theory, namely Function-Argument Bi-uniqueness (FAB), Default Principle (DP) and Subject Condition (SC). Two of these principles are explained as follows:

4. Subject Condition states that: every predicator must have a subject and that if the most prominent thematic role is [-o], it must be realized as a subject

5. The Default Principle dictates insertion of a plus with an unspecified feature e.g [+r/o] (Austin, 2005:31). This has the same effect as the principle for assigning syntactic features which has been presented in (2ii)

6. Function-Argument Bi-uniqueness: states that each argument structure must be associated with a unique function, and vice versa (Lødrup (2004)

The three simple principles of LMT account very well for both grammatical and syntactic mapping of -k- and -j- morphs in Kihangaza language. Yet, despite its suitability in the analysis of the topic under discussion, LMT lacks a mechanism for properly ordering and assigning thematic roles to all arguments of the verb. In other words, the theory cannot explain the semantics of all extended morphs attached to the verb root. This is what made the author of the present study to apply the Mirror Principle.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study used a qualitative approach to identify and analyze Hangaza semantic variants and the ordering of causative and applicative allomorphs in Hangaza language of Tanzania. A case study design was employed where the Hangaza area was visited for data collection. The language was considered as a case following the fact that it possesses some features that do not appear in other Bantu languages, thus qualifying to be a *'critical case'*. Focus group discussion and documentary analysis were used as instruments of data collection. The former was used to obtain data from three Hangaza speakers who were born and raised in the Hangaza community. The informants were selected by virtue of their competence in the language under discussion, in the sense that they could tell and write or correct ill-formed structures. During the FGD, one hundred (50) extended verbs from Kiswahili language were used as a guide in the discussion.

The data collected from the field were analyzed using *Leipzig Glossing Rule*s. This is the way of glossing languages for the readers to understand even if the language is foreign to them. The *Leipzig Glossing Rules* postulate three levels of representations, namely: word order and/or parsing level, the literal translation level, and free translation level, (Christian, (1982).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The data for this paper were collected through focus group discussion and documentary review. In the focus group discussion, the informants were asked to translate Swahili verbs and their extensions. For example, the three informants were asked to translate Kiswahili verbs such as chemsh-w-a 'be boiled' into Kihangaza, which they translated it as *shush-w-a*. The second objective was to analyze semantic variants of the identified allomorphs from Kihangaza language. During the discussion, it appeared that some allomorphs represented more than one semantics

sense though with the same shape. This made the researcher seek to identify all semantic variants (portmanteau) in Hangaza language. In the next section, we start with the first objective of identifying causative and applicative allomorphs in Hangaza.

Allomorphic Portmanteau Manifestations in Hangaza

A portmanteau morph is nothing but a physical realization of variants of meanings. This means that when a morph represents physically different grammatical entities, it is referred to as a portmanteau morph. For instance, English language has been evidenced having portmanteau allomorphs manifestations as in the *-s-* ending in English language represents different grammatical entities of their own units.

Semantic Manifestations of -k- morph

In Hangaza, portmanteau manifestations of the *-k-* morph are quite evident. It has been observed that the morph *-ik-* has different grammatical entities. Consider the following data in 8 below

7. *Kora*

   Kor-a

   Do-Fv

   'Do'

8. *Koreka*

   *Kor-**ek**-a*

   Do-ST-Fv

   'Doer able'

The data in 7 shows that the verb *Kora* means 'do or act' in Hangaza language, it has been attached with stative morph *-ek-* in 8 that reads *Koreka* meaning the state of being done or being able to be done. It must be noted that stative morph shows the ability or state of something to be done and that the Proto-Bantu stative morpheme is *-ik-, also called neuter suffix (Hyman (2007).

Theoretically, the stative eliminates the subject, leaving a covert object in the subject position in Bantu languages. sThis means that the subject no longer exists physically in the sentence structure once the stative is attached to the verb. Let us consider the Kihangaza verb *kubhita* 'to beat' that derives to *kubhitika* 'beatable' in 9(a-b) below:

9. (a) *kubhita*. <agent theme>
to beat-FV [-o] [-r] syntactic features by principle 2 i& iii)
'to Beat.' agent is SUBJ by principle (2b)
[+o] insertion of plus by principle (4)
SUBJ OBJ

(b) *kubhit-ik-a.*
Inf- *beat-ST-FV* '<theme>
'Beatable.' [-r] syntactic features by principles (2 and iii)
[-o] SUBJ by principle (5) above
SUBJ

In (9), the verb *kubhita* 'to beat' needs both the agent [-o] which is its internal argument and the patient [-r] which is an external argument. In (9b), the theme is assigned the internal argument feature [-r], and the absence of an external argument causes the subject principle to assign the feature [-o] to it. This results in the theme being syntactically realized as a subject. The former subject is not expressed, not even as an oblique function or an adjunct phrase. For simplicity, the stative derivation shown in (9) b can be schematized in 10below:

10 (a) yá*tek-a* X (SUBJ) (OBJ)
SP-cook-FV
'H/S cooks x' <arg th>

(b) X yá*tek-ek-a.* (SUBJ) (OBJ)
x-*cook-ST-FV'*
'X is cook (able)' <Ø th>

The mapping above shows that when the stative affix is attached to the verb *teka meaning* 'cook' is derived to *tekeka* meaning 'able to be cooked'. After this derivation, the subject of the structure has been suppressed and the object remains as object in which the action is acted upon. Under the level of discussion, the-*ik*- stative morph plays different roles compared unlike in the data provided in (8) above. This means that, apart from serving as stative, it represents other roles though its form remains the same. Consider the data in 11 below:

11. (a) *Ambala*

Ambal-a

Wear-Fv

'Wear'

(b) *Ambika*

*Amb-**ik**-a*

Wear-C-Fv

'Cause (to) wear'

In 11(a), the verb *ambala* 'wear' has been extended with the causative morph -*ik*-to produce the form *ambika* 'make or cause to wear something such as a cloth'. Syntactically, the causative has increased the verb's valence here since there is addition of an argument in 11 (b) (somebody who is made to wear).

In terms of the level of argument, it can be said that the morph -*k*- and its physical realization -*ik*- or -*ek*- are portmanteau allomorphs in Hangaza. In other words, the -*k*- morph appears to be (i) stative (ii) causative (iii) valence-increasing and decreasing argument in Hangaza language of Tanzania. With this regard, the Lexical Mapping Theory presents the –k- causative in a way quite different from 11data above. The data in 12 exemplifies:

12 (a). *ambal –a*. >agpt 'wear' <ag pt>>
wear -FV
'wear'

(b). *amb-ik-a* >agpt 'wear' <ag pt>>
wear -CAUS-FV
'Make to wear'

In (12), we observe fusion of the patient of causation with the agent and with the patient of the embedded predicate, respectively, which is shown by a line that joins the patient of causation with the agent of the verb base in 12(a) and another one joining the patient of causation with the patient of the base predicate in 12(b). For simplicity, the mapping expressions in 12 can be simplified in 13 below:

13 (a) *ambal - a* SUB OBJ
wear -FV
'wear' <arg th>

(b). *amb-ik-a* SUB OBJ2 OBJ1
wear -CAUS-FV
'cause to wear' <arg exp th>

The data in 13(b) shows that causative verbs in Kihangaza like in other Bantu language usually acquire new meanings as a result of a gradual lexicalization process. This means that -*ich*- causative has added a new argument to the predicate structure. From this base, the schematized data in 13 co-occurs with Shibatani's (1976:1) definition of a causative in the context of its occurrence. The author establishes two conditions:

(i) The relation between the two events is such that the speaker believes that the occurrence of one event, the "caused event" has been realized at t2, which is after t1 time of causing the event.

(ii) The relation between the causing and the caused event is such that the speaker believes that the occurrence of the caused event is wholly dependent on the occurrence of the causing event; the dependency of the two events here must be to the extent that it follows the speaker to entertain a counterfactual inference that the caused event would not have taken place at that particular time if the causing event had not taken place, provided that all else had remained the same.

With reference to 13 above, the two definitions meet the phenomena of causative manifestation in Bantu languages.

It can be argued that when the two physical realizations lineup together, the valency-increasing one comes first and the valency-decreasing one follows. The structure in 14 exemplifies:

14. *UyuUmwna alambika*

Uyu -u- mwana a lamb ***-ik -ik*** *–a*

This-SP-child-SP-wear- CAUS -ST-FV

'This child is being made wearable'

The data in 14 attest the peculiarities of the Hangaza causative and stative morphs. Native speakers of Hangaza use double *-k-* allomorphs when speaking. Thus, the first morph- ik- is a causative and the second morph is a stative. It has to be noted that, it is the tense and aspect of the verb that sanction such ordering; thus, if it were not for the present progressive aspect, such ordering could not have been lined up. With this peculiarity, it is difficult to judge which one is the causative and which was is the stative morphologically. The native speakers can only judge its grammaticality from the phonotactics point of view.

What has been observed in 14 is deferent manifestations in Chichewa language (N.31b) spoken in Zambia. Consider the following examples from Baker (1988):

15. (a) *Anyani a namenyambuzi*

Anyani a – na –meny- ambuzi

Baboons –SP-PAST-Hit –goats

'The baboons hit the goats'

(b) *Kalulu a namenyets a mbuzikwaanyani*

Kalulu a- na- meny-ests-a mbuzikwaanyani

Hare SP PAST- hit- CAUS-FV-goats to baboons

'The hare made the baboons hit the goats'

(c) ? *Mkangounamenyetsetsambuzikwaanyani*

Mkango u – na- meny-ets-ets- mbuzikwaanyani

Lion SP- PAST- hit-CAUS-CAUS- goats to baboons

'The lion made someone make the baboons hit the goats'

In 15 (a), the Chichewa verb *menya 'hit '*is not attached with a causative but in 15(b) it has been attached with the post-radical causative -*ets*-to produce *menyestsa,* which means 'cause to hit'. However, in 15(c), the causative morph has been doubled and its reading concurs. This means that *menyestsestsa* has a double causative and its meaning shows that there is a double causative morph. Baker's argument on this fact is that the double causatives are somewhat hard to process and understand but with thought they are judged to be grammatical. This is not the case in Hangaza, where the meaning of a double causative is not hard to process simply because native speakers actualize and use it in order to be understood well. It must be noted that such structure is used to satisfy Case Theory and Morphological Theory. In other words, the former implies the syntactic agreements of the assigned NPs in the structure and the later actualizes morph ordering from the root of the verbs.

The same semantic scope has been observed in Kisukuma language of Tanzania. This is evidenced by the co-occurrence two Applicative morphs. According to Simon, (2018), Applicative>Applicative ordering can involve repetition of the same form or of different forms. The ordering of morphs of the same type is illustrated in 16:

16. (a). *Bhit-a*.
pass-FV
'Pass.'
(b). *Bhit-il-a*.
pass-APPL-FV
'Pass to/from.'
(c) *Bhit-il-il-a*.
Pass-APPL-APPL-FV

'Take something from somebody for some one.'

The meaning which is observed in 16(c) indicates that each morph performs one function, i.e. one has argumentative role and the other has locative roles. Semantically, the first applicative is for valency increasing while the second is for valency decreasing. This is justified in 16(b) in which there is no addition of valency other than showing the place where a person has passed through or come from.

This is not the same case in Kimashami language spoken in Arusha, Tanzania (Lema, 2011) Lema investigated on five morphs of verbal extensions viz. applicative, causative, reciprocal, passive and stative. An interesting finding from her study is that the Kimashami verb root/stem takes two to four morphs. In other words, the maximum number of verbal morphs that can co-occur on a single root is four. It is observed that two pairs of ordering are possible namely: (i) reciprocal, applicative, causative and applicative, (ii) applicative, causative, applicative and (ii) reciprocal. Examples are offered below:

17. (a) kwaan -an -y -is -y -a
Spread-REC-APPL-CAUS-APPL-FV
"Make to spread for each other" (Lema, 2011:85)

(b) Iyanan-y -is -y -an -a
match -APPL-CAUS-APPL-REC-FV
"Make to match for each other" (Lema, 2011:86)

In 17, the verb root *kwaan* 'cover' is attached with four suffixes, namely a reciprocal, an applicative, a causative and an applicative simultaneously, producing *kwaananyisyana* 'make to cover for each other'. However, semantically, the gloss shows as if there are three morphs and not four as claimed by Lema.

Semantic Manifestations of *-j-* morph

This is one of the roles of the *-j-* morph in Hangaza language. It is noteworthy to remember that the term causative means "to cause or to make somebody do something" or "to cause something to become something different" (Mataka and Tamanji 2000:177). As Mataka and Tamanji point out, "the causative has the effect of changing monovalent verbs to bivalent verbs". The -j- morph in Hangaza language has been found having different semantic manifestations. Like the -k- morph, syntactically, *-j-*and its allomorphs *-ij-/-ej-* can increase valence in the predicate structure. Also, it should be noted that, this morph appears with other morphs in the language under discussion. Consider the data in 18 below:

18. *ßárishuje*
*ßá-ri -shu-**j**-e*
SP-PT-relpy-CAUS-ASP
'They made to reply'

In 18, the morph *-j-*functions as a causative as it adds one argument to the predicate structure. This supports the Morpholexical Operations principle of Lexical Mapping Theory which postulates that argument structures can be altered by morpholexical operations, which add, suppress or bind argument roles (Bresnan & Moshi, 1990:169). For instance, the applicative and the causative increase arguments while the passive suppresses the arguments or valence while the reciprocal binds or associates valences.

The -j- morph can manifest as an applicative**.** It can have different implications depending on the context in which the verb to which it is attached is used. It can be used as instrumental, locative (maleficiary), benefactive, etc. That is why, according to Mataka and Tamanji (2000:179), the applicative extension is sometimes called benefactive or dative, as "it indicates that the state or the action described is for the benefice of somebody else". Matsinhe (1994:165-166) firmly argues that this verbal extension can also be regarded as a maleficiary, in the context where it introduces an object associated with a locative. The Kihangaza applicative *-ij-* has the instrumental role as shown in 19 below:

19. *NishurishijeIkalaamu*

*Ní-shur-**ish-ij**-e Ikalaamu*

SP-PT-reply -CAUS-APPL-ASP-pen

'I have made to reply with a pen'

In 19 it is observed that *-ij-* morph performs the instrumental function under the cover of applicative semantics. It is seen that, in some contexts, the same causative can function as causative and sometimes as an applicative. The two causatives are ordered in such a way that, when-*ish-* comes first and functions as a causative and then *-ij-* follows and functions as an applicative. The data in 6 (b) shows that causativization must apply first before applicativization according to the Mirror Principle (Baker, 1988). Thus, the causative suffix is attached first and is closer to the verb root than the applicative suffix.

However, sometimes the–*ej*-allomorph of *-j-* can stand alone and function as an applicative in Hangaza. Consider the following examples in 20:

20. *Ø koshejeémarekani*

Ø -kosh -ej-e- é - marekani

SP/PF-marry-APPL-ASP-SP- USA

'Married to USA'

In 20, the *-ej-* morph functions as an adverbial of place under the cover of an applicative morph in Hangaza. This means that the morph is hybrid in its syntactic operations. Theoretically, the mapping of the predicate argument structure of the verb *kosheja* 'makes to marry' in (20) can be formally represented as in 21:

21. (a) Kosh-e (OBJ) (SUBJ)
Marry-ASP
'Marry' <arg th>

(a) Kosh-ej-e (OBJ) (OBJ2) (OBJ1)
Marry-APPL-ASP
'Marry for'
<arg Ben th>

The mappings of the Lexical Mapping Theory in 8 above show that, as in (8a) and (8b), the *-ej-*morph demotes the base verb in (21a) and demotes the derived verb in (21b). However, according to the data, the causative indicates location though there is some sense of a benefactive (Cf, 21). The LMP might indicate location as in 22 below:

22. Kosh-ej -e SUBJ OBJ
Marry-APPL-ASP
<arrg Loc>

The mapping in 22 indicates that the applicative *-ej-* introduces an object associated with the thematic role of the locative. That is why Haegeman (1991:61) defines locative as "the place in which the action or state expressed by the predicate is situated." For more details on this, see more in Givón (1984:127 and Bresnan (1994:75).

Another observation is that the *-j-* applicative can co-occur with another applicative morph that has a different shape such the-*il-* applicative in Hangaza. The data in 23 exemplifies:

23. *Yáranshuhilije*

Yá -ra-n-shuhi-il-ij-e

SP-PT-SP-boil-APPL-CAUS-ASP

'S/H made to boil for me'

In 23 above,*-il-* serves as an applicative morph while *-ij-* serves as a causative morph, which is quite different from the applicative shown above (Cf. 20, 21,22). A different case is

found in Kisukuma language of Tanzania where the two morphs with different shapes perform the same function when they are ordered next to each other. Consider the data in 24:

24. *K-ímb -ɪg -íj- a ng'oma.*
SM- sing -APPL-APPL-FV-drum
'He has sung for by using a drum.' (Simon, 2018)

The data in 24 shows that the *-ɪg-* applicative is a formative morph due to the fact that it cannot stand alone and makes sense. Unlike the *-ɪg-* applicative morph, the*-ij-* morph can stand alone and make semantic sense as in *kímbiija* 'he or she has sung by using something'. Something worth noting is that the ordering of extended morphs in 24 above means that, semantically, the first applicative strata *-ɪg-* has greater relevancy, that is why it is placed near the root and the vice versa is true for the*-ij-* strata. That is why Bybee (1985) argues that those affixes which have greater 'relevance' to the action of the VR appear close to the root than those with less 'relevance'.

CONCLUSION

The goal of this paper was to describe and analyse the portmanteau manifestations of the -j- and -k- morphs' in Hangaza. No other study on this topic is known so far. The findings have indicated that the morph -j- and -k- play different semantic and syntactic roles. It has also been noted that when the two morphemes co-occur (Cf: - -ik-ik), the productive one, which has greater relevancies placed closer to the root rather than the one with less relevance or the non-productive one. This is within the scope of Relevance Theory of the Lexical Mapping Theory. The study then argues that Lexical Mapping Theory is the best tool for analyzing verb extensions as it worked well in the analysis of portmanteau implications of the causative, applicative and stative manifestations in Hangaza.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that other studies can be done on the Hangaza prosodic features and the way they trigger the affix ordering of verb extensions. It seems that the phonology of Hangaza language has greater influence on the order of verb morphs and their functions. Additionally, Hangaza language's peculiarities offer challenges like the case of other Non Bantu languages such as Maa language. For instance, it was found that the same morph may have multiple implications and positions in Hangaza, something that is found in the non Bantu language Tanzania as in Maa language. This calls for a study that will compare the behaviour of Maa and Hangaza verb extensions. This may enable linguists to know theoretical frameworks for treating the two dissimilar languages.

WORKS CITED

Austin, P. (2005). *Causative and applicative constructions in Australian Aboriginal Languages*. Unpublished thesis: Department of Linguistics, SOAS University of London.

Alsina, A. (1992). *On the argument Structure of causatives*. Linguistic Inquiry 23 (4) 517-555.Alsina, A and Mchombo, S. A . (1993). Object asymmetries and the Chichewa applicative construction. In S.A. Mchombo (Ed), theoretical aspect of Bantu grammar. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Alsina, A. (1996). The *Role of Argument Structure in Grammar*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

Baker, M. (1985). "The Mirror Principle and morphosyntactic explanation", *Linguistic Inquiry* 16: pp. 373-415

Baker, M. (1988). *Incorporation*, Chicago, Chicago University Press

Batibo, H.M. (1976). *Le Kesukuma: Langue Bantu de Tanzanie : Morphologie & Phonologie*. The de doctorat. Universite de la Sorbonne Nouvelle Paris III.

Bresnan, J. (1994). Locative inversion and Universal Grammar. *Language* 70 (1): 72-131.

Bresnan, J. (2001). Lexical-Functional Syntax. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers

Bresnan, J &Zaenen, A. 1990. *Deep Unaccusativity in LFG. Grammatical Relations*: A Cross-Theoretical Perspective, ed. K. Dziwirek, P. Farrell, and E. Mejías-Bikandi, 45–57. Stanford: CSLI Publications

Bresnan, J & L. Moshi (1990) "*Object asymmetries in comparative Bantu Syntax*". Linguistic Inquiry. Vol. 21. pp. 147-186.

Chabata, E. (2007). *The Nambya Verb with Special Emphasis on the Causative*.Un published PhD thesis. Department of linguistics and Scandinavian studies university of OSLO.

Givón, T. (1984). Syntax: a functional-typological introduction. Volume I. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Haegeman, L. (1991). *Introduction to Government and Binding theory*. Cambridge: Basil Blackwell.

Hyman, L. (2002). "Suffix Ordering in Bantu: A Morphocentric Approach", Yearbook of Morphology.

Hyman, L. (2003). Suffix ordering in Bantu. A Morphocentric approach. *Morphology Yearbook 2002*. 245-281.

Katamba, F. 1993. *Morphology*. New York: St. Martin's Press

Kibet*et al* (2014). *Verbal Extensions in Kipsigsi*. International Journal of Humanities and Social Science. Vol. 4, No. 9(1); July 2014

Khumalo, Langa. 2007. An Analysis of the Ndebele Passive Construction. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Oslo.

Khumalo, L. (2009). *The Passive and Stative constructions in Ndebele: A comparative analysis.* Nordic Journal of African Studies 18 (2):154-174 (2009). University of KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa.

Khumalo, L. (2014). *On the Reciprocal in Ndebele*. *Nordic Journal of African Studies* 23(3): 140–161 (2014). University of KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa.

Lema, E. I. (2011). *Morphosyntax of Kimashami verbs*: Principle of morpheme occurrences. Unpublished M.A dissertation. University of Dar es salaam.

Li, Y. (1990). X-Binding and Verb Incorporation, *Linguistic Inquiry* 21 (3): 399-426.

Lothi, A. (2002). *Verbal extensions in Bantu*: The case of Swahili and Nyamwezi. Africa & Asia 2:4-26pp.

Lødrup, H. (2006). Functional Structure. http://folk.uio.no/helgelo/f-structure.pdf

Matsinhe, S. F. (1994). The status of verbal affixes in Bantu languages with special reference to Tsonga: problems and possibilities. *South African journal of African languages*, 14, 4, p 163-176.

Mutaka, N. M.; Tamanji, P. N. (2000). *An introduction to African linguistics*. Lincom handbooks in linguistics, n 16. Munich: Lincom Europa.

Mchombo, S. (2004). *The Syntax of Chichewa*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. McPherson, L., & Mary, P. (2009). Evidence for the Mirror Principle and Morphological Templates in Luganda Affix Ordering. In Selected Proceedings of the 39th Annual Conference on African Linguistics, ed. Akinloye Ojo and Lioba Moshi, 56-66. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project. www.lingref.com, document #2186.

Mwangi, P. (2001). The syntax and semantics of causative affixes in central Kenya . S. Afr. J. Afr. Languages 4: 387-395

Ngonyani, S. D. (2016). Pairwise Combinations of Swahili Combinations with Other Verbal Extensions: Nordic Journal of African Studies 25(1): 52 - 71 (016).

Peterson, D.A. (2007). *Applicative Constructions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Simon, C. (2018). Investigation of Morph Ordering Structures in Kisukuma Verbal Extensions and how they are accounted for within the Lexical Mapping Theory. A Thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of doctor of philosophy in linguistics of the Open University of Tanzania.

Shibatani, M. (1976). The Grammar of Causative Constructions. In Masayoshi Shibatani (ed.), *The Grammar of Causative Constructions*, Vol. **6**. New York: Academic Press: 1-39.

Simango, S.R (1995). The Syntax of Bantu Double Object Constructions. PhD dissertation. University of South California.