

**THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN
VENDA AND WESTERN SHONA**

by

Petrus Johannes Wentzel

submitted in accordance with the requirements for
the degree of

D Litt et Phil

in the subject

African Languages

at the

University of South Africa

Promoter: Professor J A Louw
Joint promoter: Professor E J M Baumbach

June 1981

SUMMARY

This thesis was aimed at determining what the affinities of Venda are with the Bantu languages spoken immediately to the north of the Venda region.

It was during the early stages of the research done on this relationship of Venda that traces were found which pointed towards Western Shona as the Shona cluster which has closer affinity with Venda. Hitherto linguists were looking towards Karanga of the Central Shona group of clusters for a possible link with Venda.

In order to be able to follow up this clue, fieldwork had to be undertaken on the dialect situation of the Western Shona cluster.

This research resulted in several dialects being identified for the first time as definitely belonging to this western cluster. The ones which were found to be directly connected with the research project are Lemba, Lembethu, Twamamba and Pfumbi (and to a lesser extent Jaunda), because they are geographically closer to Venda than any other dialect to its north. Of these dialects, it was only Twamamba that was previously classified with the Western Shona cluster. Three of the dialects were found to be spoken - though to a lesser extent in recent years - even within the borders of Venda. They are Lemba, Lembethu and Twamamba. Of these three Lemba had the longest contact with Venda because they stayed together in the present Zimbabwe already before the final migration of the Venda to their present country.

Apart from the above, historical and archaeological findings pointed towards a link with the Kalanga dialect spoken towards the west of Zimbabwe. This important clue was the final motivation to link up into a single project what was originally embarked upon as two completely different projects: (a) determining what the relationship between Venda and the dialects to its north could be, and (b) the publication of the history of the Kalanga as recorded by Masola Kumile.

This resulted in two volumes on Kalanga being made an integral part of the thesis by adding them as supplement.

Volume I contains transcriptions and translations of manuscripts which were written in the Kalanga dialect of the Western Shona cluster of dialects -- one of the six Shona clusters spoken mainly within the borders of Zimbabwe.

Volume II contains annotations -- both linguistic and historical -- based on the Kalanga texts of Volume I.

The Kalanga manuscripts provided the most valuable linguistic material in written form in a field where almost nothing is available in print. This is even more important in view of the fact that the dialects mentioned above are all to greater or lesser extent falling into disuse, making it very difficult to obtain linguistic information on an extensive scale.

Together with the identification of the various Western Shona dialects, a study was made of those features which are characteristic of this cluster.

When finally taking into consideration the historical background of Venda as well as its geographical contact and linguistic relationship with Western Shona, sufficient proof was found to come to the conclusion that Venda has its closest affinity not with Karanga but with Western Shona.

In the last instance Venda was proved to be a Bantu language in its own right. It is not a *bridge* language. It is closely related to Western Shona by which it was considerably influenced for many centuries.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincerest thanks to:

Professor J A Louw, my promoter, for his advice and especially for the encouragement I received from him in the past years. His very useful suggestions are deeply appreciated.

Dr Rosalie Finlayson for the immense task she so willingly took on herself, of carefully checking the final draft for the most obvious errors in the English text. This she had to do at a stage when she had a very full program of her own. Her enthusiastic encouragement I am equally grateful for.

Miss Marie Velthuysen for her excellent typing work to which she devoted not only many late hours, but also her precious Christmas vacation time.

Mr Israel Ndiela for the many tiresome hours he spent with me on checking the translations of Volume I.

My wife, children and parents-in-law for their patience, encouragement and help with the proof reading of the final drafts. In this my daughter Mienie proved to be the tireless one when it came to late night sessions.

The Human Sciences Research Council for the financial assistance I received from it.

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Author's Note	v
<i>Chapter</i>	
1 Introduction	1
2 Kalanga (Western Shona)	9
2.1 Kalanga as part of the Shona language group	9
2.1.1 The origin of the name Kalanga/Karanga	9
2.1.2 The various Shona groups	13
2.1.2.1 Introduction	13
2.1.2.2 The origin of these Shona groups	15
2.2 The Kalanga (Western Shona) dialect cluster	20
2.2.1 Introduction	20
2.2.2 Geographical region covered by Western Shona	22
2.2.3 (Major) dialects still in use	24
2.2.3.1 Kalanga	24
2.2.3.2 Nambya	25
2.2.3.3 Lilima (Humbe)	27
2.2.4 Rozwi (Nyayi), the dialect of the Rozwi-Moyo Dynasty	28
2.2.5 Lesser dialects falling into disuse	32
2.2.5.1 Lemba (Remba)	32
2.2.5.2 Lembethu (Rembethu/Rembatu)	39
2.2.5.3 Twanamba (Twanamba/Xwanamba)	42
2.2.5.4 Pfumbi	44
2.2.5.5 Ja(w)unda	47
2.2.6 Dialects now almost extinct (Romwa, Peri, Talahundra)	49
2.2.7 Summary of the Western Shona cluster	52
3 Western Shona: its characteristics	55
3.1 Introduction	55
3.2 Phonological features typical of Western Shona	57
3.2.1 Phonetic (and phonemic) characteristics	57
3.2.1.1 Nasalized vowels	57
3.2.1.2 Aspirated plosives	57
3.2.1.3 Voiced plosives	58
3.2.1.4 Velar fricatives: voiceless [x] and voiced [ɣ]	58
3.2.1.5 Rolled [r] vs lateral [l] vs tapped [ɾ]	60
3.2.1.6 Nasal consonants	61

<i>Chapter</i>	<i>Page</i>
3.2.2 Morphophonological characteristics	62
3.2.2.1 Vowel elision	62
3.2.2.2 Labialization	63
3.2.2.3 Vocalization	66
3.2.2.4 Velarization	70
3.3 Morphological features	73
3.3.1 Class prefixes typical of Western Shona	73
3.3.1.1 Table of prefixes	73
3.3.1.2 Class 1 and 3 prefixes typical of Western Shona	75
3.3.1.3 Those examples where Western Shona and Venda differ from Central Shona	79
3.3.1.4 Class 21 *χɛ-	85
3.3.2 Deverbatives from vowel verb stems in class 1	92
3.3.3 Omission of class prefixes	93
3.3.4 The class 10 prefix (i)dziN-/(i)jin- < *ɛni-	96
3.3.5 Locative classes and their concords	97
3.3.6 Absolute pronouns with typical form	100
3.3.7 The demonstrative pronoun	102
3.3.8 The quantitative	104
3.3.9 The possessive	105
3.3.9.1 2nd person singular and 3rd person cl 1 possessives	106
3.3.9.2 The possessive concords ku- and mu- in indirect relative constructions	111
3.3.10 The verbal relative	113
3.3.11 The agent of the passive	115
3.3.12 Conjugational formatives of the verb	116
3.3.12.1 The concords of classes 11 and 14	116
3.3.12.2 The object concord 3rd person singular cl 1	117
3.3.12.3 Negative formatives	119
3.3.12.4 The future tense formative	123
3.3.12.5 The consecutive tense form	125
3.3.12.6 The imperative form	127
3.3.12.7 Formatives of the participial mood	129
3.3.13 The auxiliary verb stem -be	132
3.3.14 The form of the copulative	132
3.3.14.1 The identifying copulative	133
3.3.14.2 The negative formative -te	134
3.3.14.3 The copulative verb stem -li	135
3.4 Typical Western Shona lexicon	136
4 The relationship between Venda and Western Shona	143
4.1 Introduction	143
4.2 Brief historical background of the Venda	147
4.2.1 The name of the people	147
4.2.2 Venda origins	150
4.3 Geographical contact of Venda with Shona dialects	157

<i>Chapter</i>	<i>Page</i>
4.4 Linguistic relationship between Venda and (Western) Shona	159
4.4.1 Sound systems	160
4.4.2 Morphophonological features	161
4.4.3 Morphological correspondences	161
4.4.3.1 The noun class systems	161
4.4.3.2 The demonstrative pronoun	163
4.4.3.3 The qualificative	164
4.4.3.4 The verb	166
5 Conclusions	169
Bibliography	173

AUTHOR'S NOTE

1. ABBREVIATIONS

Most of the abbreviations used in these volumes are the normal ones and do not need special mention.

The languages and dialects referred to were normally not abbreviated, except the few which recurred very often, viz

C Sh	Central Shona
Kl	Kalanga
Kr	Karanga
Li	Lilima
Pf	Pfumbi
Tw	Twamamba
Ve	Venda
W Sh	Western Shona

2. ORTHOGRAPHICAL DEVIATIONS

(a) Practical orthography

It was found necessary to make an exception in the practical (conventional) orthography devised in the introduction of Vol I for Western Shona when reference was made to examples from Central Shona and from Venda because the orthographies of these two languages are widely known. The exceptions affected mainly the following symbols

		vi		
I P A	W Sh	C Sh		Ve
[β]	b	v/-		v̥h
[b]	bh	bh		b
[β̥]	-	b		-
[d̥]	ɟ	ɟ		dzh
[tʰ]	ch	ch		tuh
[s]	sw	sv		sw
[z]	zw	zv		zw

(b) I P A phonetic orthography

The square brackets normally used for bracketing phonetic script are for practical reasons replaced by oblique brackets, i.e. [].

There are two generally acceptable ways in which syllabic nasals are indicated in phonetic transcription. In these Volumes the horizontal mark *above* the nasal, e.g. [m̥], was given preference. Marks underneath symbols were avoided as far as possible.

(c) Lepsius-Meinhof phonetic orthography

As this research project was not aimed at a full-fledged scientific comparative study according to either the Guthrie or the Meinhof approach, it was decided to use the simpler Ur-Bantu as point of reference in those instances where it was essential to make comparisons based on a reference language. The reason for this choice arose from the fact that the only comparative work ever done between Western Shona and Central Shona (Wentzel 1961) was based on Meinhof's approach. And seeing that this was the major source referred to in this regard, the logical consequence was to use the orthography of that source.

It was found necessary, however, to adapt that orthography in a few instances:

secondary vowels *e, *o were written as *ɛ, *ɔ
 bilabial fricative *ɸ was written as *β
 palatal consonants *k̟, *t̟, *ɟ, ɟ were written as *k^ɟ, *t^ɟ,
 *ɣ^ɟ, *z^ɟ

All Ur-Bantu symbols, stems and words used in the texts were merely identified by the asterisk * preceding them.

3. SUPPLEMENT

The supplement regularly referred to in this thesis, consists of the two volumes on the history of the Kalanga mentioned in the introduction.

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

The contents of this thesis differs almost entirely from what was originally envisaged for a research project on Venda. At the outset the intention was to determine what the situation was of that part of the Venda language spoken to the north of the Limpopo River.

Figures obtained from an interim report on the 1969 Population Census of what was then Rhodesia, showed that the Venda, who then lived to the north of the Limpopo, made up at least 10% of the entire Venda population.

This fact acted as a stimulus to undertake fieldwork among the Venda who had emigrated to the Beitbridge district of Zimbabwe towards the end of the previous century. These Venda became almost completely isolated from those who stayed behind in South Africa. These northern Venda had very limited access to literary sources and eventually such sources became almost non-existent. The fact that Nlebele was chosen as the medium of instruction in their schools, contributed to this unfortunate situation.

It was furthermore assumed that the other Bantu languages spoken in the area where these Venda had settled, would have influenced their language, and the question now was whether sufficient differences had developed between the Venda spoken in Zimbabwe and that spoken south of the Limpopo, to justify research.

It was found, however, during the early stages of the fieldwork, that no major differences had developed and that the minor phonological and other differences which were observed did not justify extensive research.

This initial research, though within itself was not worth proceeding with, did not prove to be fruitless, because while busy with this preliminary survey, some other interesting facts regarding the dialect situation in the Beitbridge district where the Venda settled, came to my attention. I found that several dialects spoken in the said area, were definitely related to Shona, but that they were hitherto not classified and grouped with any of the six Shona clusters. Furthermore it was found that traces of these dialects were also to be found to the south of the Limpopo among the Venda.

This information opened up the way to a new and most interesting field of research. It was realized that the identification and classification of those dialects spoken among and directly north of the Venda of South Africa and Zimbabwe and the investigation of the relationship which exists between these dialects and Venda, would provide more than ample material for the thesis I intended to write.

It was very soon after directing my research towards the 'other' unclassified dialects as I preferred to think of them, that sufficient proof was found to recognize them as dialects which belong

to the Western Shona cluster of dialects. Hence I could decide on the following topic for the thesis:

The relationship between Venda and Western Shona

For two reasons I found myself in a privileged position as far as embarking on such a project was concerned. In the first instance, when I took up a teaching post in Venda at the University of South Africa, I became the first one to have close contact with both Venda and Shona. Though gifted and well equipped linguists before me had done intensive research on either Shona and to a lesser extent Venda, none of them had interested themselves in both.

In the second instance I had previously done research on two of the better known dialects of Western Shona, namely Kalanga and Lilima. While busy with this research I also became fully acquainted with the work of two prominent linguists who had published on these dialects before me, namely C M Doke and G Fortune.

The natural consequence of the above was that I could devote my initial effort to an investigation of the Western Shona dialect cluster with reference to its characteristics and the dialects belonging to it. Only after identifying and classifying all the Western Shona dialects, would it be possible to determine what the relationship between Venda and this western cluster may be.

The investigation of such a relationship implied a divergence from earlier findings in works by people such as N J van Warmelo who had consistently pointed towards Karanga of Central Shona when there was speculation about possible influence on Venda from languages to the north and about a possible closer relationship that exists between Venda and such languages.

Soon after I had commenced with my fieldwork in this new direction regarding the dialects of Western Shona, I managed to follow up a long standing promise made to the late Mr Masola Kumile (he died in 1968) to assist him in his attempt to publish texts which he had collected on the history and various other aspects of the Kalanga tribe to which he belonged.

These texts in addition to information obtained from the fieldwork, proved to be invaluable in a situation where almost no written literary material is available.

Since these texts turned out to be an integral part of the research programme, they had to be made fully accessible. They were therefore supplemented to the thesis.

This supplement in its turn, had to be divided into two volumes. This division was mainly the result of the need to facilitate cross references. Volume I consists of the transcriptions and translations of the original texts, whereas Volume II is devoted to extensive linguistic annotations and historical references with a view to a better understanding of the texts. Some of the linguistic annotations are very brief though, because where possible reference has been made in this thesis to the more detailed discussions of those linguistic features which distinguish Western Shona from Central Shona.

In the introduction to Volume I of the supplement a full discussion of these texts is given.

With Kalanga (the dialect in which Kumile wrote his manuscripts) being perhaps the most prominent dialect of this cluster, it can be understood that the texts were found most valuable and useful from a linguistic point of view.

The next step in my research project was to follow up the clues about the various dialects geographically closest to Venda.

This brought me to the eastern parts of Venda in the area of Chief Mutele at Hamutele with whose kind co-operation I managed to contact an old Lembethu woman, VhoTsamwani, in October 1974. She could still speak Lembethu and it was possible to make useful recordings of her speech.

A few Lembethu men whom I met in the same area, could no longer speak the language, but they could still recall a considerable number of words. These people were all aware of the existence of Lembethu people living north of the Limpopo in the Beitbridge district where I had met and interviewed such people before and after my visit to Hamutele. The two major places where the Lembethu were contacted were at Chituripasi and Chikwarakwara. At Chituripasi on the way to Chikwarakwara most research was done with an old woman called Chelele. At Chikwarakwara which is at the confluence of the Sabi and Limpopo rivers four women who could still speak Lembethu, were interviewed. Their information contained valuable linguistic material. They were:

- Matula, the wife of Masiti;
- Chidzibane and Muneba, the wives of Andries;
- Nwamasiti, the wife of Manyama.

Information about some Lembethu living on top of a nearby mountain Chironwe was also followed up, but unfortunately without success. The plateau on top of the mountain, which can only be reached on foot, is inhabited but no Lembethu-speaking people could be found.

I also did research in the area surrounding the hill Malungudze, which is situated about 80 kilometres east of Beitbridge. This hill is well known in the Shona traditions regarding their early

history. Today it is especially the Pfumbi who still revere it as a sacred hill of their ancestors' graves.

Here the Pfumbi, though in the minority, form the ruling clan. Fortunately the assistance of a very intelligent Pfumbi-speaker could be obtained. He was the ex-school teacher Mr Timba Matibe Mbedzi of Madaulo School, P O Box 5, Beitbridge who was at the time acting chief of that region and who was still able to converse in the Pfumbi dialect.

His death early in 1975 was a loss to me as he was a most co-operative and reliable informant on his Pfumbi dialect.

Moving further north-west from Beitbridge I found mainly Venda-speaking people towards Majini School at the Umzingwane river where research was done with chief Siwoka and some of his sub-ordinates on the form of Venda spoken in that remote area. It very soon became obvious that their language did not deviate from the Venda spoken south of the Limpopo, and that it would not be worth doing research on such dialectal variations as do exist.

Moving still further west towards West Nicholson in the Gwanda district some Jaunda-speaking people were interviewed.

It was soon clear that all these dialects mentioned above, could be related to the known Western Shona dialects. These dialects together with Lemba and Twamamba, which are also found in the Beitbridge and northern Transvaal regions had never before been classified with one of the Shona clusters.

For the research on the almost extinct Lemba dialect Dr N J van Warmelo was kind enough to make available an extensive list of Lemba words and phrases which he collected in the 1930's. With

this list at my disposal, and being fortunate to obtain the assistance of a very old Lemba man in 1974 who could still remember a lot about his dialect, it was possible to decide where Lemba fits into the picture. This old man must have been over 90 years old when he died recently. He was known by many names, viz *Muchavhi* (clearly a reference to his Lemba origin), *Tshidade Sadiki* (which must be a reference to the Lemba clan name Sadike as given by Von Sicard (1953b, 57) and quoted by Van Warmelo (1974, 82) as one of about thirteen clans, each of which was named after its founding ancestor — *Sadiki*, Van Warmelo says, has its origin in the Arabic word 'sadih') and *Dzhan* (which obviously dates from the time of his conversion to the Christian faith). He belonged to the congregation of Tshilidzini and lived at the nearby Shayandima.

Who Tshidade was one of the few old people who could still converse in a form of Lemba which was little influenced by Venda, his 'second' language. His death was therefore an equally great loss for the research on these dialects as that of the Pfumbi informant, Timba Matibe.

These dialects which were hitherto unclassified, are the dialects which at the outset of the research were considered as 'other dialects'.

The other more westerly dialects of the Western Shona cluster have in modern times at least not been in a geographic position which could imply influence, linguistic and otherwise, on Venda.

They are, however, also of direct interest, because apart from the valuable written sources in Kalanga and Nambya for example, the Venda history shows that Venda could have been influenced by these dialects long before the Venda reached their present country to the south of the Limpopo. According to their history they stayed for a long time near Bulawayo where the Kalanga also arrived very early in the history of the Bantu migrations to the south.

A dialect like Kalanga which was described linguistically (Wentzel, 1961), and for which a great treasure of linguistic data is now made accessible through the publication of Kumile's manuscripts, supplies the key to research which must be continued, on the comparison of Venda with the Western Shona dialect cluster.

The first objective of this study has been to identify the dialects among and north of the Venda which do not belong to this language. Having identified these dialects, the second task was to make available the material needed for in depth research.

This study has been aimed at complying with these objectives.

Chapter 2

KALANGA (WESTERN SHONA)

2.1 KALANGA AS PART OF THE SHONA LANGUAGE GROUP

2.1.1 The origin of the name Kalanga/Karanga

The name Kalanga/Karanga (the use of *l* versus *r* is merely a minor difference in the sound systems of some Western Shona dialects in opposition to the other dialects) is of very early origin and the original meaning of the name should throw light on the region from where the people who spoke this language, originated.

Three suggestions worthy of note as to what the meaning of Kalanga (more often seen in writing as *Vakaranga* or some similar spelling; i.e. the plural form of the noun referring to the people) might be, have been offered in various publications through the years.

The following statements are representative of these:

Liebegang (1977, 172 & 180 note 41) published the very old documents known as *Mahumane's Account of 1730* in which Mahumane gave

his version of the meaning of the word *Kalanga* when he says

And it seems that the Okalange which is nearby is looked upon as a despised nation, because they only call it Okalange, that is slave or slaves, and most of the slaves which they sell here are taken from there.

(Liesegang 1977, 172)

About this account I agree with Liesegang when he maintains that the author was biased, by saying

This passage reflects certain ethnocentric attitudes of the Ronga near Delagoa Bay.

(Liesegang 1977, 180, note 41)

This interpretation from Mahumane's account need not be taken into consideration here.

Theal (1910, 225) says that the Mocarangas as termed by the Portuguese call themselves Makaranga. He found that in his time most modern writers took it to mean 'the people of the sun'. A point of view which he could not agree with because in Karanga the word for 'sun' is not *ilanga*, but *izhuba* or *iwari* (his spelling).

He suggested that the first chief may have been named *Karanga* or else that it may be derived from *karanga* a word no more in use which meant 'honey guide'. (Support for these two suggestions could not be found anywhere else.)

In the last instance *Theal* refers to a Bantu-speaking community the *Wakaranga*, east of Lake Tanganyika, which probably was the oldest community to move south of the Zambezi. By the time the Portuguese came into contact with them, they had already stayed at that original spot for hundreds of years.

Marodzi (1924, 88) says that the name 'Mukaranga' means the son of a young wife or little root.

Posselt (1935, 137) says

According to Native interpretation the word "mukaranga" means a junior wife, consequently the offspring of the junior wives of the paramount rulers may have been called generally "vakaranga". But it would be misleading to dogmatise on this point. It has been asserted by several writers that "Makalanga" means "the people of the sun", derived from "langa" the sun. It may be definitely stated that this is a wholly erroneous interpretation, for "langa" is not the Chikaranga name for sun, "Makalanga" being the Zululised [sic] form of the name of the people.

Posselt mentions in support of his statement that no form of sun worship has been shown by modern investigations.

Von Stead (1953a, 56) also says that it is extremely doubtful if *Karanga* has anything to do with the Sun. He is thus in line with Posselt mentioned above.

Chinyandura (1947, 74) says that *Vakaranga* means the punishers (arbiters) as derived from the verb *kuranga* 'to punish'.

Abraham (1959, 62 & 75) presents the following annotation (page 75) to the answer on question 6 (page 62) about the tribe to which Mutota (first Mwene-mutapa, cf Suppl, Vol II, CH 2, note 5) and his clan belonged:

An ancestral branch of the vaKaranga appears to be still in existence in Tanganyika, dispersed among the baNyamwezi, and other tribes to the east and south of Lake Tanganyika. The country of these northern vaKaranga was apparently Uranga, situated on the River Rufiji, east of Lake Tanganyika, "ranga" being the Nyamwezi word for "sun" (vide L Homburger), and "Uranga" meaning "land of the sun". The word "Vakaranga

would mean then "People living in the land of the sun" (cf the Swahili prefix "muka-", pl "vaka-" meaning "inhabitant(s) of").

(Abraham 1959, 75)

Abraham then refers to Posselt who rejected this interpretation on ground of the fact that *ilanga* 'sun' is a Zulu word which does not appear in Shona, overlooking the fact that *ranga* which means 'sun' does occur in the Bantu languages of East Africa.

He also shows that as far back as 1706 Aguiano observed the ethnic similarity between the northern Karanga and those to the south in the Kingdom of Mwene-mutapa.

Wilmot (1969, 145) supports the interpretation that the word means 'children of the sun'. He says that as early as 1560 reference was made in a letter to the 'Mocarangas' west of Inhambane and he also draws attention to the fact that 'Mocaranga' was used in early records as reference to the people, their language and the country they lived in (*Wilmot 1969, 164 & 145*).

Such a letter is the one of 24 June 1560 written by André Fernandes (*Theal 1901, Vol II, 66*).

Bayen (1977, 388) does not present an acceptable interpretation when he says that the word is derived from the verb stem *-rangana* 'co-operate, confer'.

Considering the above mentioned interpretations, one must come to the conclusion that one should make one's choice between two possibilities:

- (a) The point of view held by inter alia Marodzi and Posselt above, namely that it means the son (offspring) of a young

(junior) wife. Compare in this regard Hannan (1974, 380) for the entry *mukaranga* which in Manyika means 'first wife of chief' and in Karanga and Zezuru 'wife in addition to first wife'.

- (b) The point of view that the word means 'people living in the land of the sun' or rather 'people of the sun'.

It may be concluded that Abraham has made a strong enough case for the last mentioned interpretation. Finally it may be mentioned that Theal, though rejecting the 'sun' theory, comes very close to Abraham's interpretation as far as the origin of the people -- and therefore the meaning of the name -- is concerned.

What these people who reject the 'sun' theory do not seem to bear in mind either, is the fact that the names of tribes are often derived from what other tribes call them so that it does not necessarily mean that the word *ranga* 'sun' must be a Karanga/Kalanga word.

The fact that there is a tribe in East Africa with the same name which is obviously derived from their word *ranga* for 'sun' and together with the knowledge that the southern people with the same name have originated from the same region, lends more validity to this interpretation -- therefore:

Bakalanga/Vakaranga means 'people of (the land of) the sun'.

2.1.2 The various Shona groups

2.1.2.1 Introduction

The dialect cluster known as Western Shona or Kalanga belongs to the Shona language group, which in its turn consists of six

dialect clusters - Kalanga plus five others, namely:

Karanga, Zezuru, Korekore, Manyika and Ndau.

The term Shona which has become the generally acceptable name for this south-central language group of the Bantu language family, is argued in Suppl, Vol II, CH 3, note 4 to be originating from those times in the history of these people when they were not yet settled in the areas presently occupied by them - i.e. mainly within the borders of the state Zimbabwe and covering almost the whole of this territory.

A discussion of the whole language group does not fall within the scope of this work. The concern of this research is only with the Western Shona dialect cluster, because the results of the research clearly points towards a close relationship between this cluster and Venda.

However reference to this dialect cluster will obviously necessitate reference to its historical and linguistic links with the other Shona clusters.

Much work has already been done on the identification and classification of all the individual clusters and their dialects, except the Western Shona cluster on which much has yet to be done.

C M Doke's research in Zimbabwe during 1929-1930 which culminated in two most informative publications in 1931 (Doke 1931a; 1931b) is today still considered to be of the most useful contributions in this field of study.

The work of G Fortune is of equally high scientific value. Among various publications which came from his pen, the following

contains a brief and accurate summary of the language situation in Zimbabwe -- *The Bantu Languages of the Federation, a Preliminary Survey*, Lusaka: 1959.

On page 8 of this publication he divides the six clusters as follows:

Kalanga (Western Shona), *Ndau* (Eastern Shona) and *Zesuru*,
Karanga, *Manyika* and *Korekore* (Central Shona)

2.1.2.2 *The origin of these Shona Groups*

Though in this work the stress falls on Western Shona (Kalanga), it is impossible to discuss its origin without any reference to the other closely related Shona dialect clusters.

As was indicated in the previous paragraph, the name Kalanga/Karanga through its meaning gives a clue as to the origin of the people who speak these languages -- languages because, though the pronunciation of the names differs only slightly (*l* vs *r*), and though there definitely is only one original root, there is today a distinct difference between the two dialect clusters. A difference so distinct that Doke, for example, found it impossible to suggest that an orthography be developed which would serve Western Shona (Kalanga) together with the other dialect clusters of which Karanga is one (cf Doke 1931a, 99 recommendation 9).

In Suppl, Vol II, CH 1, note 29 under (b) *The builders of the stone structures*, it was shown that it is today a widely accepted theory that the stone buildings of this southern part of this Sub-Continent, like the Great Zimbabwe, are 'essentially African' and that the African people to whom the building of these structures

should be attributed, are the first Shona peoples who reached the country south of the Zambezi (cf Summers 1970, middle of page 164).

In the same note 29 it was furthermore stated that of all the stone buildings in Zimbabwe and the countries to the east and south of it, the Great Zimbabwe is the earliest and that the first building work dates from the 8th century AD at the earliest, but most probably from around the year 1000 AD.

The above data leads one to the following conclusion about the origin of the Shona:

They came from East Africa from somewhere near Lake Tanganyika from a country which was possibly called *Uranga* and they reached the southern side of the Zambezi after the 8th century, but not later than the 11th. Von Sicard, however, mentions that the Mbire moved from the same area as late as 1450 to the Zambezi-region (Sicard 1952a, 78, note 1). And in a later publication Von Sicard says that according to tradition it is stated that the country of origin of Kongolo who founded the Luba Kingdom, is said to have been the Kalanga country on the western shores of Lake Tanganyika. As a group of these Kalanga migrated to the south as far as the Lamba country, he maintains that there can be no doubt that they are related to the Karanga of Zimbabwe (Sicard 1955, 82).

Another very old reference to Lake Tanganyika being the place of origin of the Shona, is that of Marodzi (1924, 88) where he says that the Rozwi came from the said Lake and crossed the Zambezi together with the Korekore and Sotho.

The question which arises from this is as to which dialect clusters these earliest Shona belonged and whether they all shared the same

language-form originally, at what stage then and why did the present dialect clusters start to deviate from each other. An attempt at a very brief answer to this extremely complex situation will be made here.

As was stated before, the first Bantu-speaking peoples to cross the Zambezi towards the south, were Shona-speaking. They founded several states. Of these the Butwa-Torwa state was possibly the earliest, preceding the Zimbabwe and Mutapa (Mwene-mutapa) states - in that sequence, and that of Changamire being the most recent (cf Beach 1976, 1).

The Butwa-Torwa kingdom was founded by Karanga-speakers, perhaps around 1300 (Sicard 1955, 82). In a later publication Von Sicard (1967, 187) refers to the possible date of the founding of the Torwa state in a more cautious manner when he says that by 1495 there was already a Torwa ruler - these rulers possibly being the oldest carriers of the so-called Zimbabwe-culture.

This Torwa state was eventually extended towards the south-west to the country of the Kalanga who were descended from the people of the Leopard Kopje Culture who occupied the area from about 1000 AD (Beach 1974, 634). This happened in the 15th century and, says Beach

... some time after 1450 the Torwa dynasty ruled over a state that was a successor to Zimbabwe, based on Khami. Some time between 1644 and 1683 the Torwa dynasty was succeeded by that of the Changamire Rozvi, whose main centres were the stone buildings of Danangombe (Dhlo-dhlo) and Manyanga (Tabazika-mambo).

(Beach 1974, 634)

The Kalanga, however, remained the basic population causing the Changamire-Rozvi to speak by the 19th century a form of Kalanga.

The Mutapa state, on the other hand, mainly consisted of Korekore and Zezuru peoples, i.e. the people of these two kingdoms belonged to what is today known as the Central Shona dialect clusters. The Changamire people on the other hand were Rozwi, i.e. Western Shona, or they at least adopted a speech form which is a Western Shona dialect as mentioned above. It is doubtful whether such a statement can hold water because it seems a stronger possibility that Rozwi originally was related to this very old form of Western Shona.

As a detailed discussion of the history of the various Shona peoples does not fall within the scope of this thesis, it will suffice to refer to the works of people like Roger Summers (1950), Beach (1974; 1976), Mudenge (1974) and the many papers from the pen of Harald von Sicard.

In many of these works reference is made to oral traditions about the land Guruswa (which is only one of many derivations of the spelling - cf Sicard 1952a, 187). Posselt (1935, 121) says that it is a legendary district from which the Rozwi and others are said to have started on their migratory courses. As almost every second tradition refers to a different region by this name, it means that one cannot take it seriously when investigating the origins of the various tribes.

One could therefore summarize the language situation as follows:

1. The Kalanga dialect of the Western Shona dialect cluster settled at a very early stage in the area where they are still found today and they are of the Shoko and Mbire Tribes (Summers 1950, 107).

2. The Karanga tribe of the Torwa dynasty is distinct from Kalanga and is of a more recent origin than Western Shona.

3. The Rozwi who under Changamire, revolted against the Mutapa regime (cf the many references to a civil war, e.g. Suppl, Vol I, CH 2, par 2.2; also in Theal 1916, Vol 1, 63-64; Theal (1916, Vol 1, 382-4) gives the year 1597 as the date on which such a civil war started) and founded their own dynasty by first overthrowing the Torwa kingdom and later the Shoko-Mbire state of the Kalanga - approximately in 1750.

The remnants of these Rozwi are today found all over Zimbabwe among the other tribes and a branch even went as far as Zambia north of the Zambezi where they merged with the Kololo of Sehitwane who moved to the north of the Zambezi not long before the Ndebele migration to the country of the Rozwi. This Ndebele migration in its turn triggered the migration of the Rozwi to the north of the Zambezi where they met the Kololo of Sotho origin.

4. Another very ancient people are the Goba (Gova) who were perhaps the earliest Bantu-speaking peoples to have settled in the area towards the south-east of Zimbabwe. They may have entered Zimbabwe as early as the 13th century and

..., at any event before the arrival of the founders of the pre-Monomotapa Gutwa-Torwa Kingdom.

(Sicard 1955, 79)

What is of interest about the Goba, is that their language also belongs to the Western Shona dialect cluster, with Lembethu, Pfumbi, Twamamba, Romwe all closely related to it or remnants of it (Sicard 1951, 19; 1952b, 53).

5. Lemba has a special position within the Western Shona dialect cluster.

2.2 THE KALANGA (WESTERN SHONA) DIALECT CLUSTER

2.2.1 Introduction

One can fully agree with Fortune (1959, 8) when he says

Kalanga is a highly interesting cluster.

On page 9 of the same publication he suggests that a comparative grammar in this cluster is a task which should not be delayed too long — a suggestion which I fully agree with, but which unfortunately has not yet been realized after 21 years.

The urgency of this need arises mainly from two factors:

(1) Some of the dialects which belong to this cluster are increasingly subjected to influence by surrounding dialects, while others are in danger of falling completely into disuse.

Fortune maintains that such a comparative grammar will not only

throw a good deal of light on the relation between Western Shona and the Eastern and Central Clusters from which it differs so markedly,

(Fortune 1959, 9)

but it will also indicate more clearly which lines should be followed when doing further research on the relationship, not only

of the dialects of this western cluster with the other Shona clusters, but also with languages from other groups of the Bantu language family — and then more particularly with Venda.

Western Shona has to be treated separately as it has developed to a great extent apart from the main sections (cf Doke 1931b, 7 par 7).

(ii) As will become clear from the discussion of the dialects of this cluster, they are not spoken in a uniform geographical area and their speakers are furthermore outnumbered by the speakers of the surrounding dialects.

These two factors may be the main reason for the fact that these dialects were almost completely neglected — and this is in spite of the fact that they represent a language cluster of those Bantu-speaking peoples who arrived in the area south of the Zambezi long before the speakers of the other Shona dialect clusters.

Western Shona which can be clearly distinguished from the other dialect clusters of Shona — both linguistically and historically — is the language of the earliest Shona peoples to settle south of the Zambezi. They moved via the south-central part of Zimbabwe and stayed for some time at Buxwa — i.e. in the Belingwe district whence they moved further south-westwards and south-eastwards. Kalanga probably was the earliest branch to reach their present area, with Goba almost at the same time moving to the south-east towards the Malungudze hill near the Limpopo.

The Zezuru, Korekore and Karanga all followed after them, founding the Butwa-Torwa, Mutapa and Changamire-Rozwi dynasties — in that sequence.

The first section to break away from the Mutapa Dynasty after an internal clash, moved eastwards to go and settle at the Inyanga Mountains forming the Manyika branch of the Shona. According to Theal (1916, 382-4) this civil war was started in 1597.

A similar uprising a century later in 1693 resulted in the founding of the Changamire-Rozwi Dynasty which in its turn was responsible for the overthrow of the Karanga based Butwa-Torwa Dynasty.

More or less at the same time yet another dynasty — that of the Pfumbi, called the Matibe Dynasty (cf Sicard 1952b, 43 & 48) — came into being in the south-west towards the Limpopo (cf par 2.2.5.4 below).

Only the Ndau (Eastern Shona) cluster does not fit in with this migratory route. They obviously moved southwards along the east coast and from there towards the north-eastern part of Zimbabwe where their language was influenced by Zulu (cf Doke 1931a, 35). It is therefore understandable that their language will differ considerably from the other clusters — mainly phonetically and lexically (cf Fortune 1959, 10).

As for the state of linguistic and literary achievements in Western Shona and of its position as far as a conventional orthography is concerned, reference may be made to the Introduction to Supplement, Vol I where these aspects are treated.

2.2.2 Geographical region covered by Western Shona

It is not the intention to provide a detailed sketch of the spreading of the dialects of this cluster here. The region where each

individual dialect is (or was) spoken, is given in the discussion of each dialect in par 2.2.3-2.2.6.

Events, as revealed through the early history of these peoples, caused them to be forced into a geographical area which is of considerable length, but never very wide.

This situation is the result of the fact that they were the fore-runners of the Shona migration to the south with the other Shona tribes following in their wake. By the time the Nguni movement reached them from the south, they found themselves in a position where they could no longer expand either south or north or east. Expansion in these three directions was prevented by the Central Shona tribes to the north; the Nguni, Sotho and Venda tribes to the south and the Tsonga to the east.

The only other way left open for them was the corridor to the north-west. The Rozwi (and Nambya perhaps) made use of this corridor by going as far as Zambia where they merged with the Kololo of South Sotho origin to form the Lozi of western Zambia.

As a result of thus being clamped in, the Western Shona are today found in a narrow strip of land more or less stretching along the border of Zimbabwe from north-west at the Zambezi to the south-east at the confluence of the Rubi and Limpopo rivers.

Outside this more or less straight stretch of land Western Shona peoples are found quite a distance into Botswana (cf par 2.2.3.3 below), to a limited extent in Northern Transvaal (Venda) (cf par 2.2.5.1) and north of Beitbridge into Zimbabwe as far north as the Belingwe district.

2.2.3 (Major) dialects still in use

2.2.3.1 *Kalanga*

Kalanga is spoken in the Bulilima-Mangwe and Nyamandlovu districts and in Botswana - mainly immediately south of the Plumtree district (cf Fortune 1959, B). By 1930 Doke (1931a, par 79) found Kalanga to be the most important member of the Western Shona cluster, also called the Kalanga cluster. This means that both the cluster and one of its dialects are known by the same name -- a situation which can easily cause misunderstanding.

In par 2.1.1 the meaning of the name was discussed and in par 2.1.2 it was mentioned that Kalanga-speakers were present in the area mentioned above as early as 1000 AD, being linked with the Leopard Kopje culture of Khami ruins (Beach 1974, 634).

This date for which there is archaeological proof does, according to Theal, not clash with the possible date of a little earlier than 900 AD for the first settlement of Bantu-speakers south of the Zambezi (called Makaranga by Theal (1964, 175)).

These Kalanga people who had links with the Leopard Kopje culture were possibly related to the Mbire-Shoko who reached them from the north in the 15th century, leaving some of the tribe on the way in the Belingwe district at Buxwa (Vhuhwa). They were closely related to the Rozwi-Moyo who left the Zambezi area with them according to Von Sicaud (1952a, 135). This is also in agreement with the tradition of the Civil War in the Mutapa Regime which caused the disintegration of the tribes between the Zambezi and Sabi rivers (cf par 2.1.2.2 above).

The manuscripts transcribed in Suppl, Vol I were written in the Kalanga dialect, the language of the author, Masola Kumile. For this reason and because it is the only Western Shona dialect on which fairly extensive research has been done (Wentzel 1961), the two supplements form an indispensable part of this Thesis. This dialect clearly differentiates itself from Lilima and the other dialects of the cluster. In this regard Duke says

Kalanga further differentiates itself phonetically from the other dialects of the same group by using [h] for [ʃ] and [ʀ] (voiced-h) for [ʒ], a change which creates a remarkable difference in pronunciation.

(Duke 1931a, 36)

I agree with this statement to a large extent. The speech sounds which he indicated as [h] and [ʀ] I found were pronounced respectively closer to [x] and [χ], i.e. they are closer to a velar position than to a glottal position. In the case of [x] I have no doubt about its velar qualities. For [χ] I found variant pronunciations ranging from [χ] to [ʀ]. When pronounced at the velum it is accompanied by very slight friction.

2.2.3.2 *Nambya (Nanzwa)*

(For the difference in pronunciation compare Suppl, Vol II, CH 6, note 27.)

This is another dialect of the Kalanga cluster which is still a 'living' language — it is in less danger of falling into disuse than perhaps even Kalanga (the speakers of which are inclined to lean towards the use of Ndebele). As was mentioned in the Introduction of Suppl, Vol I, fresh efforts to develop an orthography for it have been made in recent years.

The dialect is spoken in the north-western parts of the Western Shona area as far north as the banks of the Zambezi at the Victoria Falls, including the Wankie Game Reserve and Wankie and Nyamandlovu districts.

According to Kumile's accounts they are an offshoot of the Rozwi (Nyayi). Doke agrees with this when he says

The Nambzya, commonly called Nanzwa or Nambya, were an offshoot of the Nyai, and are found in Wankie and Nyamandlovu districts.

(Doke 1931b, end of page 14)

Posselt (1935, 149-50) agrees with this when he states that the Wange dynasty was originally a 'Moyo' clan, and so does Fortune when he says

Hwange, from whom the name Wankie derives, is the name of a chief whose subjects speak Nambia, a Kalanga dialect.

(Fortune 1969, 56)

According to oral traditions one of Mambo Nichasike's sons was found guilty of an immoral act with his sister — a deed which led to his deportation, together with his followers, to the north. The name of this prince was Zange (or Hwange). The name of the town Wankie is a 'corrupted' form of the name of this prince (cf Suppl, Vol II, CH 6, note 14 and Posselt 1935, 149-50).

Zange is the Rozwi and Hwange the Kalanga pronunciation; the Kalanga dialect substitutes [ɲ] or [ɣ] for Rozwi [z]. (Cf *ɣuβɪ 'sun' Rozwi [zuβa] and Kalanga [ɲuβa/ɣuβa]). This is the reason for Zange being pronounced Hwange by the Kalanga — a pronunciation which was realized as Wankie in English.

These Moyo (Rozwi) people who speak a Western Shona dialect were obviously not the first people to settle in this region. The people who were there before them, are most probably the Tonga (Tonka) who were found in the area immediately south of the Zambezi near the Falls (cf Fortune 1969, 56 top righthand column).

As for the position of this dialect Nambya, within the Western Shona cluster, there is no doubt that it belongs to this cluster as will be shown in the discussion of the characteristics of this cluster (CH 3 below).

2.2.3.3 *Lilima (Humbe)*

This Western Shona dialect is mainly spoken in Botswana among the Mangwato and in the Tati concession. Fortune says

In Khama's country, where the dialect is called Lilima, the Shona are more numerous than the Mangwato.
(Fortune 1969, 56)

Very little has yet been published about this dialect. It is sometimes regarded to be the same dialect as Humbe, but Marodzi (1924, 88) records it as a dialect distinct from Lilima when he refers to the *Ba Wumbe* and the *Ba Ririma*. The author Kumile also gives them as separate dialects belonging to Western Shona (Suppl. Vol I, par 3.1). In the same paragraph he also says that the Kalanga and Lilima are one people.

Fortune (1949) published a collection of Lilima Texts to which he added translations and useful notes on the phonetic and morphological differences between Lilima and Kalanga.

In my MA thesis (Wentzel 1961) differences between these two dialects were also pointed out. In par 99 of the said thesis a comparative summary of the sounds of Liliima and Kalanga as compared with Central Shona was given. In these two publications one can find sufficient proof to differentiate between these two dialects.

Like Nambya and Kalanga, Liliima is still widely used in everyday speech.

2.2.4 Rozwi (Nyayi), the dialect of the Rozwi-Moyo Dynasty

This dialect which was spoken by the people of a once powerful dynasty (known as the Rozwi or Changamire or Mambo Dynasty), has almost completely fallen into disuse. In this regard Fortune says

Rozwi, the language of the people of Mambo, once the ruler of a good deal of this country, and still spoken by small scattered groups in this country in places like Bikita and Wedza, is a Kalanga dialect.

(Fortune 1969, 56)

Should one agree with the fairly generally accepted point of view that Rozwi and Nyayi are but two names for one dialect (cf Posselt 1935, 134-5 and also 119-20 where he quotes Livingstone saying that Mwene Mutapa was a chief of the Mbire-Nyayi), then one may assume that apart from the scattered groups under the name Rozwi, as mentioned by Fortune, there are also those scattered groups under the name Nyayi who also still speak Nyayi (Rozwi). Such a group of people are still found in Zimbabwe between the lower Bubi and the Nuanetsi (Mwanezi) Rivers in the south-east of the country. They must be remnants of the Nyayi of 'Banyaland' situated

between the Rivers Sabi and Lundi close to the above mentioned region as referred to by Hole (1926, 266).

The Rozwi who had the same origin as the Korekore of the Mwene-mutapa Dynasty, founded a separate dynasty after successfully rebelling against the Mwene-mutapa in 1693 (a date which can be accepted as authentic because of the general agreement on it in many publications (cf Thompson 1942, 83 for example)).

Latham recorded the following about what the Rozwi themselves could recollect about their origin:

The earliest recollections of the Rozwi historians are of 'crossing the ocean' (sometimes interpreted as the Great Lakes) and settling in Rhodesia in very ancient times.
(Latham 1970, 24)

This reference to the origin of the Rozwi must be linked up with the Karanga/Kalanga and their origin (cf par 2.1.1 above).

The capital of this Rozwi Dynasty was situated at Danangombe and Manyanga (cf par 2.1.2.2 above and also Beach 1974, 634).

The rebellion mentioned above, was led by Baswi with Mutota his generic title and he was said to be the grandfather of Dlembeu, one of the first Rozwi kings (cf Latham 1972, 82). It was noted before that this name obviously has obtained a mythical connotation as it appears in the genealogical king-lists of all related tribes like the Rozwi, Karanga, Kalanga (the speakers of this dialect) and Venda.

Edward Alpers (1970, 203) differs from Latham as for the name Dlembeu and the Rozwi dynasties. He found that the name of the *first* Mambo was Chikura Wadyambeu — a semi-historical figure —

and that there were two Rozwi dynasties, the Rozwi-Togwa (Torwa) and the Rozwi-Changamire dynasties. This last assumption about two dynasties explains why there are different interpretations in sources on this topic as to the situation of the Rozwi capital. In some sources it is maintained that the Rozwi capital was at the Great Zimbabwe and others for example that it was at Dhlo dhlo. It would mean that the Rozwi-Torwa people had their capital at the Great Zimbabwe and the Rozwi-Changamira people theirs at Dhlo dhlo further west.

In Fortune's (1956, 80) record of Makuvise's comment of certain Rozwi texts, Dlembeu (Lembeu) is the *last* Mambo who died at the hands of the Ndebele Invaders (and not Nichasike (Chilisamhulu as recorded by Kumile)).

Von Sicard (1955, 80) points out that according to the Lemba historian Solomon Hamandishe Zhou there were at least four Rozwi groups, two of which were the Mbire and the Moyo-Rozwi. This more or less agrees with what Alpers stated.

From Great Zimbabwe they spread their kingdom out to the south and south-west and they eventually conquered the related Shoko-Mbire under Chief Chibundule. They in their turn were conquered by the Nguni invaders and were subsequently hunted down by the Swazi and after them the Ndebele who knew that the power of the Mambo people had to be broken if they wanted to rule in peace. This caused the Rozwi to merge with the other Shona tribes, abandoning their own language and identity. In the process they moved to the north-west and north-east whence they came. Some even moved into Mocambique where traces of them are still found under the name Nyayi; and others crossed the Zambezi to the north-west (end of 18th century - Posselt 1935, 149) where they merged with the Kololo to form a united people, speaking the language

Lozi. The Kololo with whom the Rozwi merged, were a Southern Sotho group that invaded the western province of Zambia under Sebetwane in 1838 (Gowlatt 1971, 15). The invaders imposed the Sotho language on the Luyana (Rozwi). Then in 1864 the Luyana revolted and took over control and henceforth the language has been known as Lozi. Many Lozi words are of Luyana origin, but as Gluckman (1942, p 105, note 1) notes, the Lozi can understand Sotho in which the Bible was first taught in Barotseland. Also Posselt (1935, 149) refers to these 'Barotse' who speak a dialect of the 'Sesuto' language.

The history of the Kololo does not fall within the scope of this project, but it is necessary to refer to it briefly because of its contact and eventual merging with Rozwi. For that reason it seems fit to refer to the article by Edwin W Smith on the history of the Kololo. The following comes from the synopsis of this article

Sebetwane, one of the most notable figures in southern Bantu history, was chief of the Patsa branch of the BaFokeng, one of the Sotho tribes. Uprooted in the Difaqane, they migrated under his leadership from the Orange Free State to Northern Rhodesia in search of a tranquil home. Repulsed from Dithakong in June 1823, the BaFokeng (now known as MaKololo), fought their way through the BaHurutse, the BaKgatla and the BaTlokwa. ... and went on to Lake Ngami where they overcame the BaTawana. Thereafter in about 1840 they crossed the Zambezi and Sebetwane mastered the BaRotse and other tribes.

(Smith 1956, 49)

Of the original Rozwi language as spoken in Zimbabwe, very little was left, and virtually nothing is found in published form about it. Almost the only publication is the Rozwi text with translation and notes by Fortune (1956). This, in spite of its limited extent, provides ample proof for it to be classified as a Western Shona dialect.

Unfortunately it seems as though Von Sicard did not succeed before his death, to comply with his intention to publish an article about what he called the southern Rozwi (or elusive southern Rozwi) (cf Sicard 1971, 97). This also might have thrown more light on the complex language situation which exists in the southern regions of Zimbabwe.

2.2.5 Lesser dialects falling into disuse

2.2.5.1 *Lemba (Ramba)*

The Lemba people have for many years drawn the attention of research workers, mainly in the anthropological field. Very little, however, has been published in the past about their language.

Harald von Sicard devotes a whole chapter to these people (Sicard 1952a, CH 7, 140-169). He discusses the situation regarding their origin and migration to the south in this chapter and presents a very acceptable theory about these aspects.

The Lemba as we have come to know them in Zimbabwe and the Transvaal cannot be seen as a tribe or even a sect. They are a Cult community (Sicard 1952a, 141-2). This 'community' is built up of at least three elements. The first is a Semitic element with its origin in Ethiopia (i.e. what Von Sicard still called Abyssinia) with a group of people called Falashas fleeing to the south after upheavals in that country. This Semitic element was much smaller than the Mohammedan element which met and merged with this first group in the vicinity of the Lower Zambezi. Also this second group might have had its origin in Ethiopia. Apart from these two groups there was a third which came from the east via Kitevhe's

Kingdom into Zimbabwe moving up to the Sabi river in Zimbabwe before the end of the 16th century.

It is thus reasonable to conclude from the above that these people whom non-Lemba called Lemba (meaning 'those who abstain'), would not have had one common language.

The most common name these people had for themselves, was *Mwenyi* 'Stranger or Guest' (Sicard 1952a, 141-2). Also compare Posselt (1927, 7) who stated that the Lemba call themselves 'Wamwenye'. The Venda refer to them by the name 'Vhashavhi' which may be taken to be derived from *-shavha* 'barter', i.e. 'the traders/barterers'. Von Sicard also refers to this possibility when he says

In der Nähe des Sabi-Flusses, am Hofe Kitevhes, haben wir die Lemba zum ersten Mal als *ma-rombe* erwähnt gefunden. Auch sei an alles das erinnert, was im Kapitel über sie zu *-shavha* und *vha-shavhi* gesagt worden ist. Darf man da nicht vermuten, dass Masapa der Marktplatz hellfarbiger Ausländer war und dass Sabia vor allem von ihnen bewohnt wurde?
(Sicard 1952a, 171)

Here therefore, a direct reference is found to the Lemba being 'traders'.

After having merged, the first two elements came into contact with the Mbire-people at Sena (Sicard 1953b, 57) in the vicinity of the Zambezi. These were the Shona people with whom the Lemba moved southward. Van Warmelo (1966, 278) also states that the Lemba commenced their southward journey from Sena on the lower Zambezi, as he puts it. By 1693 when established orders were overthrown by the Rozwi under Changamire (Mutota), the Lemba were also forced to move from their area and start wandering about with many other clans (cf Sicard 1952a, 155-6).

At the time when Baswi had to leave Great Zimbabwe because of a drought which lasted for three years the Lemba arrived there and left with a group of Mbire-Shoko for Belingwe. According to Von Sicard (1958, 79-80) this happened about 1761 and at Belingwe (Mbelongwa) they met Chibundule's Mbire who had settled there by 1740. He furthermore ascribes the building of the Masvingo stone structures to these Lemba who built them in about 1770 after having settled there from Sena in the middle of the 18th century (Sicard 1957, 18). (As will be seen below in par 4.2.2 these datings of Von Sicard cannot be taken too seriously, but the rest of the information about the migrations compare well with other sources.)

It was also at Belingwe that these eastern Lemba met the section that came from Matongoni (DhloDhlo, 67 kilometres to the north-east of the present Bulawayo) with the Mbira (Venda/Senzi) - the people with whom they left for the Transvaal with Dlembewu's Tribe of Venda whom the Lemba called Senzi. (Note the name *Dlembewu* which, as was stated before, has obtained a mythological connotation.) The Lemba group that moved the furthest south was the group that left for Natal in about 1819 (Sicard 1958, 80).

So by the end of the 18th century the Lemba are found spread over large areas of Zimbabwe and Northern Transvaal, from where there was also a movement of Lemba back to Zimbabwe, as late as 1850.

From the above summary of the history of the Lemba it becomes clear that they would not have retained their own language - even if one would reason that such a language form existed before the three major Lemba groups merged with the Shona south of the Zambezi at Sena (cf Warmelo 1974).

By the time they became settled in various small isolated groups, they were speaking a form of language which must be classified as belonging to the Western Shona dialect cluster.

Van Warmelo unknowingly touches upon this affinity of Lemba with Western Shona when he says

Das Lemba von Nord-Transvaal (das von Rhodesien ist mir unbekannt) ist offenbar ein Dialekt des Shona, oder vielmehr, da die Lemba einen Fremdkörper darstellen, wie wir weiter unten sehen werden, eine besondere Art, das Shona zu sprechen.
(Warmelo 1966, 275)

As will be seen e.g. in par 3.3.9 below, this peculiar form of Shona is indeed Western Shona with which Van Warmelo was not familiar.

Further support for this is found in a very old publication titled *The Native Tribes of the Transvaal* (1905, 60) where the following is said about the Lemba

There are remnants of a tribe called Balemba among the Bavenda. These people are chiefly found in the Shivasa district; they have no chiefs of their own, but have distinct customs, which point to Semitic origin ... They speak the Lukalanga language.

From this one can also deduce that by 1905 there must have been many speakers of this dialect who still remembered what was the origin of their language.

This means that during the long period of continued contact with the Mbire-Shoko peoples which lasted for centuries they adopted the language of these people.

Some linguistic features indeed tend to show that the Lemba as it was spoken south of the Limpopo had a closer relationship inter alia with Kalanga of Chibundule's Mbire-Shoko than with the Rozwi-Moyo subgroup (cf par 3.3.1.2 below and par 2.2.4 above). Some features of the Lemba dialect, however, also point towards affinity with Rozwi of the Rozwi dynasties.

To a certain extent Von Sicard is correct when he says

Eine Lemba-Sprache gibt es jetzt nicht. 'There is now no Lemba language'

(Sicard 1952a, 168)

The Lemba *now* speak that form of language which the people amongst whom they stay, speak. So, for example, the Lemba of Northern Transvaal all speak Venda (and perhaps Sotho) today and in Zimbabwe they speak one or other Shona dialect which means that the Western Shona dialect that they adopted centuries ago, has now almost completely been replaced.

There are, however, even today still Lemba in Venda who can recall much about the language spoken by their ancestors from before the end of the 17th century when they arrived south of the Limpopo.

During his early research work in Northern Transvaal Van Warmelo noted the difference between the Lemba dialect and Venda. He said

Amongst themselves they spoke a language not understood by their hosts in the Transvaal. We now know Tshilemba to be a form of Karanga. Only a few speakers survive today.

(Warmelo 1974, 81)

In yet another publication he made a similar statement when he said

The oldest amongst them is the one who must pray in that form of Tshikalanga which is the Lemba language.

(Warmelo 1940, 67)

In these two quotations the two words Karanga and Tshikalanga will be considered to be the same word spelt in two different ways. This is exactly how Van Warmelo interpreted it. He was never aware of the fact that Karanga and Kalanga are two distinct dialects from different clusters.

This assumption is based on what he said in another publication

They have no quite distinct language of their own, but use the language of the people who are, or were, their hosts. Thus the Lemba amongst the Sotho and Tonga use, or rather formerly used, the Venda language which they had brought from the Zoutpansberg. But amongst the Venda they use tshiLemba, which is a form of Karanga of Southern Rhodesia. A number of forms, however, are not to my knowledge encountered in Karanga, or any other Shona dialect.

(Warmelo 1935, 122)

One can understand this misinterpretation better when taking into consideration the extremely unstable situation around the pronunciation of the phonemes /l/, /r/ and /c/ in Venda and the various Western Shona and Central Shona clusters. Moreover Karanga is a much better known cluster than Kalanga. The Venda informants of Van Warmelo would in any case not have distinguished in their pronunciation between Karanga and Kalanga.

So Van Warmelo unknowingly touches upon the gist of the matter when he says that Lemba is related to Karanga but that it has some forms which are quite different from Karanga.

The situation is as follows

Lemba does correspond with Karanga in as far as general Shona characteristics are concerned - a correspondence which can equally well be applied to Western Shona (Kalanga). But when it comes to specific Western Shona characteristics, like the one about the possessive for the 2nd person singular and 3rd person class one mentioned by Van Warmelo as well, Lemba is distinguished as a Western Shona dialect (cf par 3.3.9.1 below).

This feature seems to be typical Western Shona and appears nowhere else in Shona or for that matter in any other Bantu language.

Fortunately it was possible to obtain valuable information on the Lemba dialect as spoken in Venda from two sources:

1. An unpublished list of Lemba words and phrases which Van Warmelo collected many years ago and which he kindly made available to me (as mentioned in the introduction).
2. The assistance of an old Lemba man, Tshidade (referred to in chapter 1 above), was obtained for research on the dialect. He could still recall full Lemba phrases and sentences in Lemba in 1974. Unfortunately he has since died, and there are very few Lemba people still alive who know anything worthwhile about the dialect.

From both these sources it was possible to obtain sufficient proof for Lemba to be classified as a Western Shona dialect. It was unfortunately impossible to obtain any information about the Lemba (Remba) spoken in Zimbabwe. Room must be left, however, for the possibility that, apart from the Lemba spoken south of the Limpopo (and possibly in the Belingwe district of Zimbabwe), there could have been those Lemba in Zimbabwe who never came into contact with the Western Shona dialects. Such Lemba would then have

spoken a form of Karanga assuming that they were in contact with Karanga-speakers from the time they reached Sena (the lower Zambezi region).

In this study attention was only given to the Lemba as spoken in Venda.

2.2.5.2 *Lambethu (Rembathu/Rembatu)*

Lambethu, like Lemba, is another Western Shona dialect which is rapidly falling completely into disuse. This is to a large extent to be ascribed to the fact that as with most of the other Western Shona dialects, it did not achieve status as an official language. Neither has it yet been used for educational or literature purposes. But perhaps the major reason for the disappearance of the languages of the conquered tribes, was the tendency from the side of the ruling tribes to ridicule the speech of those subjugated. Of this I was a witness when in 1974 an old Lambethu woman was interviewed (cf chapter 1 above) at Hamutele in the north-east of Venda. The Venda onlookers burst out into derisive laughter the moment this old woman started speaking in Lambethu. It was only after they were convinced by her son that my interpretation of what she said was quite correct, that they changed their attitude. They came to realize that she was not making queer noises but that she spoke a language which they could not understand.

In the article by Eloff and De Vaal reference is also made to this tendency when they say

Vha-Lambethu still live in the area of the confluence of the Luvuvhu and Mutale rivers, but the majority of this tribe prefer to keep their origin secret and are simply

known as Venda. The reason for this can be traced back to the fact that their conquerers looked down on them and regarded them with contempt.

(Eloff/De Vaal 1974, 24)

This dialect of which remnants are today still found on both sides of the Limpopo, belongs to one of the oldest Shona groups that arrived to the south of the Zambezi. They are part of the Goba (Govha/Gova) cluster which entered Zimbabwe not later than the 13th century, but at any event before the arrival of the founders of the Pre-Mwene-mutapa Butwa-Torwa kingdom (cf Sicard 1955, 79). South of the river, mainly at Hamutele and north of it mainly in the southeastern corner of Zimbabwe along the lower course of the Subi (Vhubwe) River down to its confluence with the Limpopo at Chikwarakwara, these Lembethu share the country with the Hlengwe - a Tsonga tribe. Von Sicard (1971, 99) found that of the 15 villages under Chikwarakwara, only three were Hlengwe, seven Ndebele and five Lembethu.

This Goba cluster most probably also included other dialects still spoken in these regions, like Twamamba and Romwe. The Lembethu interviewed at Hamutele were for example, aware of the close relationship which exists between this dialect and Twamamba. This impression was gathered from a remark by a woman who heard that the Lembethu woman Tuamwani was going to have her dialect recorded. She said: 'Today we shall hear our Twamamba language.'

At one place Von Sicard (1950b, 10) says that the Twamamba should be linked with the 'ancient Rembetu' and in another publication (Sicard 1950c, 198) he says that Lembethu is 'no pure Karanga' but that its origin may be traced back to the Pfumbi and also the 'Rozwi-Xwamamba' dialect. As early as 1948 Von Sicard (1948, 101) says that he was informed by chief 'Matipe' that the Lembethu are Goba. A similar statement was made to me by the late acting chief Timba Matibe in 1974.

This Goba cluster is part of the larger Western Shona cluster and therefore when E Mudau states that the speech of the Lembethu resembles Kalanga, he is quite correct (provided he understood by Kalanga the Western Shona dialect and not Karanga) (cf Warmelo 1940, 71). Eloff and De Vaal (1974, 24) gathered from their informants that the Lembethu, Twanamba and Mbedzi (the Pfumbi are also Mbedzi) were the early inhabitants of Venda and that they even preceded the Ngoni in the Zoutpansberg region. They trekked over the Limpopo many centuries ago from Zimbabwe where some of their people are still to be found today.

Even before the date of this publication this situation was observed and followed up by making use of the tape recordings which were made of Tsamwani's Lembethu speech at Hamutele in Venda. These recordings were replayed in Zimbabwe to Lembethu people at Chituripasi in the Beitbridge district.

The reaction of the people was most convincing. They immediately recognized it as their language and it was difficult to convince them that the recordings were indeed made far from their area to the south of the Limpopo as they were no longer aware of other Lembethu living there.

The recordings made at the three places where Lembethu people were contacted — at Hamutele in Venda, Chituripasi and Chikwarakwara in Beitbridge district — provide sufficient proof for the assumption that Lembethu together with several other Goba dialects all belong to the same Western Shona cluster. The few words which were included in Von Sicard's (1950c, 198) publication on the 'Rembetu' do not in themselves supply sufficient proof for such a connection, but on the other hand they do not clash, but fully coincide with Western Shona words.

2.2.5.3 *Twamamba (Twanamba/Xwamamba)*

Together with Lemba and Lembethu this is the third Western Shona dialect which originally was spoken on both sides of the Limpopo River in those regions which were eventually occupied by the Venda. These three dialects, though suppressed by the Venda (Senzi) conquerers, must therefore have had influence on Venda which by the time it was carried into Northern Transvaal, had already been in close contact for some time with other Western Shona dialects as well.

Fortune (1959, 8) mentions that this dialect is spoken in Northern Transvaal west of Messina and in the Gwanda and Belingwe districts. I also found traces of it at Hamutele as mentioned above. This is also supported by the traditions of the Venda about their arrival in the Nzhelele area where the Lembethu and Twamamba by then lived. Some of these Lembethu and Twamamba then fled to Hamutele according to the traditions (cf chapter 4 furtheron).

Van Warmelo (1940, 92-3) considered himself lucky to have found an old woman who could still speak the language. He found that the people themselves referred to the language as 'Tshixwamamba'. Compare also Von Sicard (1950b, 10) who says that the tribal name is 'Vaxwamamba'.

Van Warmelo found that Twamamba is not very dissimilar to Karanga. But the words and phrases that he recorded (1940, 92-3) clearly indicate that the dialect belongs to the Western Shona cluster. The one sound that he specifically mentions, namely *x*, leads one to assume, however, that it resembles Kalanga more closely than any other dialect as this speech sound does not occur in similar environments in the other Western Shona dialects.

Von Sicard refers to an informant who said that his language was 'Cirozhi or Citwamamba' and he comments thus

It shows close affinities to what has been styled the Rozwi Language. I should say, it is the same language.

(Sicard 1950b, 13)

Von Sicard is of the opinion that these Twamamba were of the earlier Rozwi stock which existed before the Rozwi-Changamire Dynasty came into being. He maintains that the inhabitants of Butwa-Torwa were Twamamba or 'Vhatwa'. He says

To the west and south of the Hunyani (Manyame) River there existed a Rozwi people before Shangamire, comprising first of all the Twamamba or Vhatwa. Many of the Ruins which have been ascribed to the 18th century Rozwi, have been built by the Twamamba and kindred tribes. It can also be taken for almost certain that the occupants of Great Zimbabwe who succeeded the founders, were Twamamba ... Mapungubgs can also be regarded as an exponent of the Twamamba-Zimbabwe Culture.

(Sicard 1950b, 15)

From the above quotation it is obvious that Von Sicard gives the Twamamba a very prominent place in the early Zimbabwe history. And furthermore he considers Twamamba to be the same as Rozwi or then an older form of it.

These Twamamba who were first settled in central and eastern Zimbabwe, were pushed further south by the time the great Changamire conquered Butwa-Torwa at the beginning of the 18th century, and, says Von Sicard

about half a century later they were more or less disintegrated by the advancing "Venda". About 1800 some sibs of Sebola's Twamamba, including Chitawudzo's ancestors, re-entered Rhodesia.

(Sicard 1950b, 15-16)

(The date mentioned by Von Sicard must not be taken seriously, as will be shown in chapter 4 below.)

This is in agreement with what Van Warmelo (1940, 74) recorded about the Venda invasion of the Nshelole Valley in Venda by the middle of the 18th century. It is said that the Venda drove out the Twamamba and Lembethu whom they found in the valley. (Date also incorrect, cf chapter 4.)

2.2.5.4 *Pfumbi*

In 1972, while engaged in a preliminary survey of the Venda spoken in Zimbabwe in the Beitbridge district immediately north of the Limpopo river, a group of people who lived amongst these Venda were encountered. These people called themselves Pfumbi and their main area was situated at the hill (mountain) Malungudze, 80 km east of Beitbridge, which was a sacred burial place. Their acting chief, Timba Matibe, aged 46 at the time and an ex-school teacher, willingly acted as my informant for research on his language. Surprisingly, it was found that his dialect Pfumbi fitted in with the phonological and morphological structure of Western Shona. Chief Matibe, when asked about this relationship, was fully aware of it. He stated that his language resembled the dialect which is spoken at Plumtree in the west of Zimbabwe close to the Botswana border. He referred to this dialect as Chiprami (from plum of Plumtree).

He, however, did not maintain that the Pfumbi were closely related to the Plumtree people (Kalanga) or that they originated from that region. He told me that the Pfumbi came from the south from the country of the Pedi to whom they were related — the names Mbadzi and Pedi being etimologically the same and showing the same sound

shifts. Compare:

^h mb	>	Pfumbi mb	;	Pedi p
^h ɪɪ	>	dzi	;	di, hence
^h mbulɪ	>	mbudzi ;		podɪ, and therefore
		Mbedzi ;		Pedi

When comparing the results of the linguistic material gathered on the Pfumbi dialect and the information obtained from published sources with Chief Timba Matibe's version, one finds that he obviously was very close to the true facts about his people.

As far as the language is concerned, Pfumbi definitely forms part of the Western Shona cluster.

In this regard Von Sicard (1952b, 53) quotes some of the earlier researchers like Stayt, Van Warmelo and Bullock on the one hand, who considered the Pfumbi to be part of 'Venda' and on the other hand Coillard who in 1877 called Matibe a 'Khalaka' (Sotho for Kalanga) chief, while Frobenius speaks of 'Matimba's Rozwi'.

The last mentioned two persons were close to the true situation in realizing that Pfumbi is to be linked with Kalanga and Rozwi - two well-known Western Shona dialects.

According to historical facts revealed through the mainly anthropological research of Von Sicard, the Pfumbi who are Mbedzi, can be divided into two groups: Pfumbi-Mbedzi proper and the Pfumbi of the mighty Matibe dynasty.

The Pfumbi-Mbedzi proper emigrated from Zimbabwe at their ancestral home around Malunguze Hill to the Transvaal. He says

Most probably they were one of those numerous small sibs, which together with the Rembatu, Pai, Niya (with whom the

Shangaan people in the Vuhwa Hills in 1951 identified the Pfumbi!) and the much larger group of the Twamamba (see NADA, 1950, pp 7-17; cp 1948, p 101), together formed the Govha cluster.

(Sicard 1952b, 53)

This 'Govha' cluster (cf par 2.2.5.2) which

can be regarded as the oldest traceable group of Bantu-speaking invaders from the north, who arrived on the Limpopo not later than in the 13th century, but probably a couple of centuries earlier.

(Sicard 1952b, 53)

It is necessary to include Romwa in the 'Govha cluster' because this clan is a section of the Lembethu with whom the Pfumbi also have close affinities (Sicard 1951, 19).

The Pfumbi of the Matibe dynasty can be traced back to about 1700 in Northern Transvaal at Njerere (in Venda spelt Nzhelele) where they lived under their own chief.

Von Sicard, however, referred to Thenqwa in the south (i.e. in Venda) as the original home of Matibe's Pfumbi — an area shared by them with the Lembethu.

This chief, whose name possibly was Mugondori, had a son Marungudze (Malungudze) who

went to the north-east, crossed the Limpopo and expelled Chief Cidaka's Pfumbi, whereupon he settled at the hill which is now called after him.

(Sicard 1952b, 48)

Von Sicard maintained that the Pfumbi of the Matibe dynasty included a large area of south-west Zimbabwe. He says

Actually the whole stretch of country on both sides of the Vhubge River, from its source to its mouth, seems originally to have been Pfumbi territory under the mighty Matipe dynasty, including what is to-day Liebig's Section 9 and Nyamhondo's country.

(Sicard 1952b, 43)

Thus the Pfumbi area originally stretched as far as Delingwe where Von Sicard found that up to a few years before 1952 two Pfumbi chiefs existed.

From the above it is clear that both the ancient Pfumbi proper and the dialect of the later Pfumbi dynasty belong to the Western Shona cluster of dialects as was also proved by the linguistic material obtained from chief Timba Matibe — a name which appears also in Von Sicard's genealogical list of chiefs of the Matibe dynasty (Sicard 1952b, 46).

2.2.5.6 *Ja(w)unda*

Very little is known about this dialect which is mainly spoken in the Matopo and Gwanda districts.

In 1974 I first stumbled upon it when investigating the situation of the Lemba dialect of Venda with the help of a retired teacher Mr M M Mutenda-Mbelengwa of Tenda School, Sweetwaters, Box 2716, Louis Trichardt. When reading excerpts from the manuscripts of Kumile which I gave him, he said that the language of the manuscripts reminded him of the language he heard spoken at West Nicholson and Gwanda in Zimbabwe — a language called Jaunda.

This clue was followed up the following year and it was found that a dialect with this name was indeed spoken in the said district of Gwanda. My informants at West Nicholson said that their tribe

originated from the south-west, Lilima country - their dialect being related to Lilima, but slightly different from it. Their forefathers came to settle at a hill called Jawunda from which the name of their tribe and dialect derives.

Masola Kunilo, though not classifying the dialects that he mentions in Suppl, Vol I, par 3.1 as belonging to Western Shona, mentions Jaunda together with the other Western Shona dialects which moved to the 'south-east'.

Von Sicard published an article on the Jawunda in which he also agrees with the point of view above. He, for example, also refers to the hill called Jawunda (originally Zhawunda), the name of which was eventually given to the tribe by the chief (Sicard 1959, 103). This kopje, he furthermore states in a footnote on the same page, is some twelve miles south-south-east of Gwanda, and the name Gwanda, he maintains, is not a corruption of the name Jawunda - though this is a popular assumption among the Shona themselves. He does not, however, give a reason for this statement.

About the language itself Von Sicard was told that

though ciJawunda has some similarities with the Pfumbi
Language, there is a great difference between them, ...
(Sicard 1959, 116)

Another informant told him that

ciJawunda is the same as ciRozi, ...
(Sicard 1959, 116)

He also mentions that an enquiry he made with Fortune about Jawunda did not throw any further light on the language because in a letter to him from Fortune

he confirms that he has no knowledge of a Jawunda language.
(Sicard 1959, 117)

The few lexical items and morphological features which appear on page 121 and in the few brief texts on page 122 of the article referred to above, together with my very superficial survey in March 1975, contain however sufficient proof for the assumption that Jawunda definitely is a dialect of Western Shona. It is more closely related to Rozwi and Lilima than to Kalanga (cf the discussion of the Western Shona characteristics in chapter 3 below).

2.2.6 Dialects now almost extinct (Romwe, Peri, Talahundra)

There are another three dialects of which no linguistic information could be obtained, but which are mentioned in published sources. They are merely referred to for interest sake, as it was impossible to obtain any linguistic material by means of field-work either. They are therefore classified with the Western Shona cluster only because previously they were classified as such.

C M Doke (1931b, 15) refers to two of these, viz Talahundra of which the speakers by the time of his investigation numbered less than a 1000, then living about 16 kilometres south of Plumtree, and Peri. This last mentioned dialect, he said, was a branch of the Lilima in Khama's country (Botswana).

Von Sicard (1952b, 54) also refers to these Peri as being part of the Mbedzi proper who must be connected with the earliest 'Bantu' invaders.

The last dialect to be mentioned is Romwe which, as mentioned earlier, also belongs to the ancient Goba (Govha) cluster. Von Sicard (1951) also wrote an article on these people who speak this dialect, based on his anthropological research in the Beitbridge district. He found that this dialect is a section of Lembethu with which Pfumbi also has close affinities. It is therefore a part of Western Shona (Sicard 1951, 19).

It will suffice to refer to Von Sicard's conclusions about the Romwe whose ancestors, he says, arrived on the Lower Zambezi before the Mwene-mutapa Kingdom was founded. Here they established close contact with the Lemba ancestors at Sena and with Mutapa's Mbire in the 15th century. About this mutual influence Von Sicard reports thus

All three groups influenced one another profoundly and as a result new cultural ideas developed ... Yet, the Romwe being the older inhabitants of the country, still inspired awe among their neighbours, and for centuries to come they held a unique position as rain-makers of the ruling class.

(Sicard 1951, 22)

By the 16th century some Romwe clans moved south with large groups of the Mbire-Shoko. The Romwe moved as far as Malungudze at the Limpopo where they established their ancient rain-cult. Von Sicard says

Other groups had settled at Kitevhe's *zimbabwe* between Sofala and the Sabi River, while still others remained with the Shoko Mbire and the Lemba at Great Zimbabwe, ... Some groups had probably also settled at an early date in Beilingwe, ...

(Sicard 1951, 22)

By 1790 when Mambo Baswi left Great Zimbabwe, some Romwe were invited back there to settle near the Lemba who remained behind.

Contact was maintained through the centuries between the different Romwe groups at Malungudze, on the Sabi and in Belingwe.

From the above it is clear that this dialect must be classified within the Western Shona cluster. It is doubtful, however, whether traces of the language will still be found. The only clue about them was the remark of Timba Matibe, my Pfumbi informant, when he referred to a mountain called Chikomwe near to the confluence of the Bubi and Limpopo rivers. The plateau on top of this mountain formed a very suitable area for farming and there, he maintained, lived a people who still spoke Lembethu (cf par 2.2.5.2 above).

The above name of the mountain is mentioned here in connection with the dialect Romwe, because Von Sicard (1951, 19), when referring to the same region on the lower Bubi (Vhubge as he spells it), mentions a clan called 'Tshi-Romwe'. This is the same name as that of the mountain Chikomwe, spelt in the Venda orthography (which Von Sicard consistently preferred to use in his publications).

What is interesting about this is the fact that the prefix *chi-*/*tshi-* is normally used for languages and also for mountains, but not for clans as recorded here by Von Sicard. Did he misinterpret a reference to a language for one to a tribe? As for the name of the mountain, the people in its vicinity did know it by that name.

The above information is sufficient evidence for the existence of such a people, but the language situation of these people needs further investigation.

2.2.7 Summary of the Western Shona Cluster

The situation regarding the various dialects can be summarized as follows:

C M Doke (1931a, 35 par 79) lists seven dialects - Nyayi, Nambya, Rozwi, Kalanga, Talahundra, Lilima or Humba and Peri. Seeing that Rozwi and Nyayi are two names for the same dialect, Doke distinguished only six dialects. Doke himself is aware of this as he says

The Nyai were very closely related, if not identical with, Rozwi.

(Doke 1931a, 36 par 79)

When comparing this list with that of Fortune (1959, 8) one finds that of the six dialects he gives, four overlap with those of Doke's list. He then mentions two which Doke left out, namely Twamamba and Lemba (about whose classification he has doubt), bringing the total mentioned by the two to eight distinct dialects.

The results of this research project has caused the list to grow to twelve dialects with the following four being added for the first time: Lembethu, Pfumbi, Ja(w)unda and Romwe.

Sufficient evidence has been found in the course of my research to confirm Fortune's preliminary inclusion of Twamamba and Lemba as dialects of Western Shona. This viewpoint will be substantiated in the following chapter on the characteristics of this dialect cluster.

The speakers of these dialects moved southwards in various waves and over a long period, the first groups crossing the Zambezi as early as the year 1000 AD, or even a century earlier. One section

moved through to where the Khami Ruins are found in the south-west of Zimbabwe. A second group was the ancient Goba which moved to the south-east of Zimbabwe. A third group was the Shoko-Mbire who in Chibundule's time moved from the Buxwa mountain in Belingwe district further to the south-west.

Around 1700 two dynasties became powerful - the Rozwi-Moyo Dynasty of the Rozwi Mambos and the Matibe Dynasty of the Mbedzi-Pfumbi. And to complicate the picture even more, the Venda with some Lemba in their midst, moved during this same period from the vicinity of the present Bulawayo via Belingwe/Chibi to the Limpopo. The Lemba did not only merge with the Venda, but they moved all over Zimbabwe as well, merging with the various Shona groups. In this way they must have had an influence on the dialects of the peoples with whom they merged.

Though the Western Shona people formed a strong group ruling in ancient times over vast areas of the present Zimbabwe, they eventually lost most of their glory as they were gradually overcome by other tribes. The result was that by the nineteenth century with the power of the last dynasty - that of the Rozwi - finally broken, the Western Shona peoples were no longer a factor when decisions were made about aspects like the medium of language instruction at school in modern times.

In future research on this dialect cluster the following two points will have to be taken into consideration:

(a) It may be possible to divide the cluster into two sub-groups - the Mbire-Shoko and the Rozwi-Moyo groups. This suggestion is based on the clear distinction between the class prefixes of classes 1 and 3 as discussed in par 3.3.1.2 below. From the geographical spreading of the dialects no clear solution presented

itself because the three dialects which presumably form the Rozwi-Moyo sub-group are the furthest apart. Nambya is the furthest to the north-west and Lembethu the furthest to the south-east, with Rozwi scattered inbetween.

The history of the people and the differences in the morphology, however, provided a solution to the problem. The Rozwi-Moyo sub-group consisting of Rozwi, Nambya and Lembethu makes use of the nasalized back vowel [ŭ] as prefix for classes 1 and 3, whereas the Mbire-Shoko sub-group makes use of the homorganic nasal *N*. See the discussions of the various dialects for their historical background and geographical spreading.

(b) In view of the new classification of the dialects of Western Shona, the very name Western Shona must be reconsidered. It is an equally inappropriate term as the older form Kalanga. The one is referring to a geographical region which is much too limited to include all the dialects which are spread out from the northwestern border to the southeastern border of Zimbabwe. The other derives from that dialect that was possibly first recognized as belonging to a separate cluster. As was seen in par 2.1 the name Kalanga goes far back in the earliest history of the Shona peoples.

The name Western Shona is not as out of place, however, as is the case with the much more misleading name Kalanga which is also used for one of the dialects of this cluster. For this reason it must be avoided as a name for the cluster as well.

Chapter 3

WESTERN SHONA: ITS CHARACTERISTICS

3.1 INTRODUCTION

This dialect cluster of the Shona Group differs to such an extent from the other five clusters; Karanga, Zezuru, Manyika, Korekore and Ndau, that it is impossible to group it with these dialects for the purposes of for example orthography.

As early as 1931 Doke (1931a, par 79 bottom of page 35) could not suggest a Standard Orthography for Shona which would include Western Shona as well. He says

The whole group, though definitely belonging to the Shona, has evidently been strongly influenced from the north, and it is very questionable whether it can be brought into the scheme of unification which is proposed in this report.

Now, half a century later, the situation has still not changed. A Standard Shona orthography has been developed during the last fifty years and a Shona Literature of a standard comparable with those of languages like Zulu and Sotho was built up in recent years by making use of Standard Shona. (Cf Fortune 1969 for a review of the history of writing in Shona.)

For Western Shona fresh attempts have recently been made to develop an orthography that will be suitable for the Western Shona dialects. The Diocese of Wankie (Roman Catholic) has taken the lead in this attempt by publishing in 1977 a Prayer and Hymnbook in Nambya (Untebulo WeJu, 1977).

Though Nambya is not regarded as the major dialect of this Western cluster, it is significant that at least an attempt was made to move towards an orthography for these dialects. What is now needed is a scientific survey of all the existing dialectal forms in order to be able to standardise an orthography on a sound linguistic basis.

The need to have a separate orthography does not only originate from the differences in the speech sound systems, but other factors like vocabulary and differences in morphological structures also necessitate the printing of separate literary works like the Bible and other religious texts and reading material in general.

In order to establish this as a written language, it will be necessary to teach a form of standard Western Shona at school level as was previously done with Kalanga in the lowest school grades. The need for this obviously still exists today. If one considers the fact that in the north of Botswana Lilima is treated as a separate dialect from Tswana which has its own rightful place in the field of education, it becomes clear that this development will also be of benefit to a large number of people outside the borders of Zimbabwe.

Those characteristics which distinguish the Western Shona cluster from the other Shona clusters, can briefly be discussed under the following headings:

Phonological (phonetic and morphophonological) characteristics;
 Morphological characteristics;
 Lexical differences.

3.2 PHONOLOGICAL FEATURES TYPICAL OF WESTERN SHONA

3.2.1 Phonetic (and phonemic) characteristics

3.2.1.1 *Nasalised vowels*

This phonetic feature is the result of a morphological feature which is characteristic of Western Shona only, namely the class prefixes of classes 1 and 3 and the object concord of the third person singular (class 1) which is a homorganic nasal or the nasalized vowels [ã] or [ũ]. In the other Shona clusters it is *mu-* in all these instances.

For a discussion of this and for examples of words which contain these vowels, compare par 3.3.1.2 and 3.3.12.2.

3.2.1.2 *Aspirated plosives*

The aspirated plosives *ph*, *th* and *kh* appear in Western Shona, but not to the same extent in all dialects. Lilima is more prominent in the use of these plosives than are the other dialects like Kallanga.

For a diachronic survey of the origin of these sounds which throws light upon the situation, compare Wentzel 1961, par 24, 43, 62-3, 60.

An extract from the above shows that *ph* occurs mainly in Lilima (because in other dialects like Kalanga it corresponds with the murmured *mh*; compare Li *phuka*: Kl *mhuka* 'wild animal'), whereas *th* and *kh* have a wider distribution. *th*, for example, is derived both from **nt* (primary nasal compound as in **ntu* 'human being') and from **tʰ*, compare **tʰmo* 'spear' = *thumo* both in Li and Kl.

3.2.1.3 Voiced plosives

In Western Shona voiced plosives are pronounced only with an egressive airstream initiated by the lungs and not with an ingressive aircurrent (with glottal initiation) as well, as is the case in Central Shona.

Although this is a negative aspect and not a characteristic of Western Shona as such, it is mentioned here because the implosive bilabial [ɓ] and alveolar [ɗ] are typical of the other Shona clusters. Compare:

W Sh [-bata] (-bhata) : C Sh [-bata] (-bata) 'catch, hold'
 [ɓanga] (ɓanga) : [ɗanga] (ɗanga) 'cattle kraal'

3.2.1.4 Velar fricatives: voiceless [x] and voiced [ɣ]

(a) [x]

Strictly speaking this is not a characteristic speech sound of Western Shona as such, but only of Kalanga, and possibly Twamamba. This sound is derived from the secondary (palatal) consonants of Ur-Bantu — as independent phonemes as well as in secondary nasal compounds derived from **nɪ*-plus **tʰ* and **kʰ*. Compare Wentzel 1961, par 66, 69 for examples of such shifts in Kalanga. In Lilima its

equivalent is *sh* and in Central Shona *s* or *sh*. Compare:

Kl <i>xoko</i>	: Li <i>shoko</i>	: C Sh <i>shoko</i>	'monkey'
<i>hixo</i>	<i>xhiho</i>	<i>xiso</i>	'eye'
<i>xango</i>	<i>shango</i>	<i>shango</i>	'country', 'desert'
<i>mxolo</i>	<i>msholo</i>	<i>musoro</i>	'head'
<i>mxana</i>	<i>mpxana</i> (Pfumbi)	<i>mxana</i>	'back'

Van Warmelo (1940, 92) refers to this sound as one typical of Twamamba as well. The words that he gives as examples include *xango* 'country' which also occurs in Kalanga (see above list).

Another two examples were, however, possibly wrongly interpreted by the author as they both include the voiced form of this velar fricative spelt with *h* in the old Kalanga orthography. Compare the following examples from Van Warmelo (1940, 92):

Twa <i>-xa</i>	'come'	: cf Kl <i>-ha</i>	[<i>-ha</i>] or [<i>-xa</i>]
<i>xuxha</i>	'sun, day'	:	<i>huba</i>
but: <i>xango</i>	'country'	:	<i>xango</i>
<i>dzixo</i>	'eye'	:	<i>hixo</i>
<i>-laxa</i>	'throw away'	:	<i>-laxa</i>
<i>mxolo</i>	'head'	:	<i>mxolo</i>

From these examples it is clear that the first two Twamamba entries should not have been spelt with *x* but with *h*, as in the case of *hehulu* 'above' (cf Kl *pehugwi*) where the Twamamba stem *-hulu* equals the Kalanga *-hugwi* (cf (b) below).

(b) [*χ*] or [*ʁ*]

This sound is realized as *s* or *sh* in most Western Shona dialects and also in Central Shona. (Compare the dental *ɖ* of Venda which corresponds with these sounds.) It is realized as *h* only in Kalanga

and perhaps also in Twamamba as may be gathered from the very limited amount of information supplied by Van Warmelo on this dialect. Compare the stem for 'above, on top of' in the following examples from various dialects:

Twamamba : *hehulu/pehulu*

Pfumbi : *panyezulu*

Lembethu : *zezulu*

Kalanga : *pehugwi*

and in Central Shona : *kuuzuru*

As for the exact pronunciation there is difference of opinion. Fortune describes it as a voiced glottal fricative h. This largely agrees with my own observations (cf Wentzel 1961, 16, Op-marking). I found that with individual speakers this sound varied from a pure glottal sound to a sound which tends to approximate a voiced velar fricative.

For its derivation from Ur-Bantu compare Wentzel 1961, par 28, 67-69.

3.2.1.6 *Rolled [r] vs lateral [l] vs tapped [ɾ]*

Western Shona is no exception as far as the variant derivations from *r is concerned.

It is generally accepted that Western Shona is distinguished from the other clusters through the use of the lateral l instead of the rolled r used by the Central Shona clusters, for example. This assumption is however not a true reflection of the situation. All that can be said is that Central Shona does not make use of lateral l, whereas certain Western Shona dialects do. Not all

Western Shona dialects make use of this sound. The position is as follows:

Kalanga, Lilima, Nambya, Twamamba, Jawunda, Lemba and Lembethu use *ɺ*; Rozwi has *r* and Pfumbi seems to use both as facultative variants and -- possibly under influence of Venda -- the tap sound [*ɺ*] also occurs in Pfumbi as a further variant of *r* and *ɺ*.

3.2.1.6 Nasal consonants

Western Shona has the same number of nasals as Central Shona, but Western Shona distinguishes itself from Central Shona in the use of syllabic nasals which are foreign to Central Shona. This feature is however not typical Western Shona because such nasals form part of the speech sound systems of other related Bantu languages as well, such as Venda.

Both Venda and Western Shona have a full range of syllabic nasals -- Venda six and Western Shona five, lacking the dental nasal of Venda.

The origin of these syllabic nasals in the two languages differ completely, however. The Venda ones originate mainly in the homorganic nasal of the class 9 and 10 prefixes (the adjective concord included) and of the object concord first person singular.

A very common exception to this is the class 1a noun *name* 'mother' which happens to be the same for Western Shona. Compare Ziervogel 1972, par 8.1 and 20.6 for such syllabic nasals in Venda.

The Western Shona syllabic nasals, on the other hand, originate mainly in the class 1 and 3 prefixes (cf the above exception of

mu). These nasals may be homorganic, i.e. pronounced at the same place of articulation as the following stem consonant, as is the case in Kalanga and Liliwa for example. Otherwise the prefix *mu-* may merely lose its vowel, causing the nasal to become syllabic as is the case in Pfumbi for example, e.g.

mpwana [m̥psana] 'back'; cf Central Shona *muwana*

For examples of Kalanga and Liliwa syllabic nasals compare Wentzel (1961, par 37), but ignore the reference to the object concord of class 1 as it is a nasalized vowel [ɔ̃] or [ɔ̃m] and not a syllabic [m̥] (cf par 3.3.12.2 below). Here one syllabic nasal is left out, namely [m̥] (denti-labial). Examples of such syllabic denti-labial nasals do appear in par 50 (Wentzel 1961), but they are incorrectly realized in phonetic script as [m̥] instead of [m̥], e.g.

Kl *mpfudze* [m̥ɸfudze] 'manure';
cf C Sh *mpfudze*

3.2.2 Morphophonological characteristics

3.2.2.1 Vowel elision

In Western Shona when the secondary adverbial formatives *na* (connective) and *sa* (of comparison) precede the absolute pronouns of the first and second persons singular and plural, the initial vowel *i-* of these absolute pronouns are elided (cf Wentzel 1961, par 101B, 157).

This is a very obvious distinctive feature of Western Shona because in Central Shona the vowel *-a* of the formative and the

initial vowel *i-* of the pronoun undergo coalescence in all these instances.

This distinction applies only to the first and second persons because for the third person — the classes — elision of the initial vowel of the absolute pronoun is the rule for all Shona dialect clusters, including Western Shona. Compare:

	W Sh		C Sh	
	<i>nami</i>	< <i>na + imi</i>	:	<i>neni</i> < <i>na + ini</i> 'also me'
	<i>naswi</i>	< <i>na + iswi</i>	:	<i>nevu</i> < <i>na + isu</i> 'also us'
	<i>nawe</i>	< <i>na + iwe</i>	:	<i>newe</i> < <i>na + iwe</i> 'also you (sing)'
	<i>namn'i</i>	< <i>na + inm'i</i>	:	<i>nemi</i> < <i>na + imi</i> 'also you (pl)'
	<i>sami</i>	< <i>sa + imi</i>	:	<i>seni</i> < <i>sa + ini</i> 'like me'
but	<i>nabo</i>	< <i>na + ibo</i>	:	<i>navo</i> < <i>na + ivo</i> 'also they'
	<i>sacho</i>	< <i>sa + icho</i>	:	<i>sacho</i> < <i>sa + icho</i> 'like it'

3.2.2.2 Labialisation

Under this term a morphophonological feature is usually understood which occurs when the semivowel *w* follows on non-labial consonants causing them to become labialized. This means that the liprounding with which the *w* is pronounced also causes the preceding consonant to be pronounced with liprounding.

This type of labialization does occur in Western Shona, as it does also in many other Bantu languages. In Western Shona it is mainly in Lilima where it occurs in this form. Compare Wentzel 1961, par 109 for examples of this kind of labialization where the *w* is retained.

As this is a feature which figures in many Bantu languages, it is of no relevance here.

There is, however, another kind of labialization which occurs in Western Shona only of all the Shona clusters. Originally I thought that this is the only instance where one will encounter this change. However later it was found that this peculiar form of labialization also occurs in the closely related Venda - a fact which was previously overlooked, probably because of the misleading conventional orthography, as will be observed from the examples.

The change is in this instance also caused by the semivowel *w* of the passive and diminutive formatives, but in this instance the labio-velar *w* is absorbed in the consonant which is subject to the influence. It is furthermore only the voiceless and voiced alveolar fricatives and affricates which are influenced by the passive *w*, being changed to labio-alveolar fricatives and affricates. Bilabials and one alveolar nasal compound are influenced by the diminutive formative *-(w)ana*.

In Western Shona this change is effected also by the variant causative extension **-y-* when suffixed to the velar plosive *k*.

For discussions of this feature compare Wentzel 1961, 85-87; 1974, 58 and Fortune 1949, 84.

Examples:

(a) *passives*

Western Shona:

s+w > sw [ʃ] : *-duc+wa* > *-duswa* [-duʃa] 'be taken out'
z+w > zw [ʒ] : *-bus+wa* > *-buzwa* [-buʒa] 'be brought back'

ts+w > *tnw* [tɛ] : *-natc+w+a* > *-natowa* [-natɛa] 'be improved'
dz+w > *dzw* [dɛ] : *-kudz+w+a* > *-kudzwa* [-kudzɛa] 'be honoured'

Venda:

s+w > *sw* [ɛ] : *-lis+w+a* > *-liswa* [-riɛa] 'be herded'
dz+w > *dzw* [dɛ] : *-vhids+w+a* > *-vhidzwa* [-βidzɛa] 'be called'

(b) *diminutives*

Western Shona

b+(w)ana > *dzwana* : *zebe* > *zedzwana* [zedzɛna] 'small ear'
p+(w)ana > *tswana* : *nhopi* > *nhotswana* [nhotɛna] 'some pumpkin pulp'
mb+(w)ana > *ndzwana* : *n'ombe* > *n'ondzwana* [ɲondzɛna] 'small beast'
nd+(w)ana > *ndzwana* : *ganda* > *gandzwana* [gandzɛna] 'small skin'

For examples also compare the text of Suppl, Vol I:

p 200, 4 lines from end : *bhetswana* < *bhepe* 'calabash'
p 204, 5 lines from end : *zwifutswanana* < *zwifupi* 'short ones'
p 232, line 6 last word : *n'ondzwanana* < *n'ombe* 'beast'

(c) *causative*

k+ŋ > *sw* [ɛ] : *-sek+ŋ+a* > *-seɛwa* [-seɛa] 'cause to laugh'
-swik+ŋ+a > *-swiswa* [-ɛɛɛa] 'cause to arrive'

Also compare Suppl, Vol I, par 4.15, page 64 line 7 from end for

kanounswiswa < *ka+no+un+swik+ŋ+a*

If one does not take into consideration the phonetic transcription as well, one could wrongly conclude that in both Venda and Western Shona, it is the passive *-w-* that is being retained causing the

preceding consonant to be pronounced with lip rounding as mentioned above. The phonetic transcription reveals however that the ordinary fricatives and affricates are changed to the so-called whistling labio-alveolar equivalents.

This feature distinguishes Western Shona from the other Shona clusters and at the same time it points to the close relationship which exists between Western Shona and Venda.

Note that the orthography used here differs from that in the works referred to, i.e. *sw* versus *ʒv* and *zw* versus *zv* as explained in the introduction of Supplement, Vol I.

3.2.2.3 *Vocalisation*

This sound change occurs in all Shona clusters as well as in Venda. In Venda, however, it is not as extensively developed as in Shona. It is therefore as such not a feature peculiar to Western Shona. Yet in this cluster there occurs an aspect of vocalization which does not have an equivalent elsewhere and for that reason it is discussed here.

This sound change is caused by the following:

- (i) the prefix **ʒi-* of class 5 (both in Shona and Venda)
- (ii) the prefix **ni-* of class 9 (in W Sh only)
- (iii) the **yi* as initial syllable (in certain Shona verb stems)

The change affects voiceless consonants causing them to be changed to voiced forms (for which reason Fortune (1955, par 86) prefers to call it 'voicing').

Examples:

(1) the prefix **li-*

For examples of this change compare Fortune 1955, par 86; Wentzel 1961, par 110 and 1974, par 8.

This sound change has a wider scope in Shona than in Venda. In Shona the initial stem-consonants of nouns of class 5 as well as of adjective stems which qualify such nouns, are subject to this change, whereas in Venda only initial consonants of noun stems are subject to it.

The irregularity of this change in Venda and the fact that it is not fully developed as in Shona, is an indication that Venda was influenced by Shona in its sound system.

The following examples from the two languages will illustrate this:

W Sh *danda gulu* 'big pole'; cf pl *matanda makulu*, i e
**li+tanda > danda*, **li+kulu > gulu* (adjective)
 Venda *danda lihulu* 'big pole' ; cf pl *matanda mahulu*
 but: *danga lihulu* 'big cattle kraal'; cf *madangu mahulu*

From the last example it is clear that in Venda the sound *t* in identical environment, is not always vocalized to *d*, or approaching it from another side, it can also be reasoned that Venda must have borrowed the word in its singular form without being aware of the sound change involved in the original language, hence, the plural form *madanga*. Furthermore this is no isolated case. There are many such instances.

The examples also clearly show that the sound change did not develop to include the adjective in Venda.

(ii) the prefix **ni-*

It was earlier mentioned (Wentzel 1961, par 168) that a very interesting morphophonological feature which is peculiar to Western Shona, is the fact that the cause of this sound change is not restricted to the prefix **li-*, but that the nasal prefixes of classes 9 and 10 as derived from **ni-* and **lɛni-* are also responsible for the sound change 'vocalization'. Their influence is however not as extensive as that of **li-*. Only two voiceless consonants which are changed to voiced by these two prefixes have yet been encountered, viz

ch [tʃ] > *j* [dʒ]
tsw [tʃw] > *dzw* [dʒw]

Compare:

ngubo njena (<**ni+chena*) 'white blanket(s)'
ngubo ndzwa (<**ni+twawa*) 'new blanket(s)'

(Note that the nasal of the prefix is retained.)

What is written in the manuscripts (cf Suppl, Vol II, CH 1, note B) as *njaba* (<**ni+chaba*) and *njelele* (<**ni+chelele*) are therefore examples of this feature. The spelling is correct in the manuscript as can also be seen from the following example as found in Suppl, Vol I, par 3.3, the 2nd sentence:

Oku kwakafanila sibwa ngenjaba, nezwickaba ...

When compared with examples from class 5 where **li-* causes the influence, it is found that *ch* also changes to *j* as in

jila jena 'white cloth', cf pl *machila machena*

Compare in this respect also those instances where Kumile in the manuscripts clearly differentiated between the two spellings *nj* and *nch*. It is only the nasal of the prefixes of classes 9 and 10 which forms a nasal compound and which causes vocalization when combined with *ch* and *tsw*. The other homorganic nasal - that of the prefixes of classes 1 and 3 - retains its syllabic value and thus has no influence on the following consonant, e.g.

nnhu nohena-chena 'a very poor/thin/hunger-stricken person'

(iii) the syllable **yi*

There are a few instances in Shona where one encounters this change through diachronic comparison, e.g.

**-yikala* . shona *-gara/-gala* 'sit down'
**-yikuta* > *-guta* 'become satiated'

The fact that the prefixes **li-* and **ni-* as well as the syllable **yi* cause the same change, supports the view that it is the vowel *i* which causes the change because of its highly palatal qualities. This point of view is in accordance with what Meinhof (1932, 37 (g), 38 par 15) said about this type of sound change. He says in line 2 of page 38 that in Venda through palatal influence **k*, **t*, **p* > Venda *g*, *d*, *b*.

This palatal influence derives from the vowel *i* and he found that nasal influence and vowel influence often tend to have the same results.

A point in support of this influence which actually is caused by the vowel *i* is found in Venda where the **yi* of **-yikuta* 'become satiated' equals Venda *-fura*. The **y* had undergone elision and the

i penetrated the consonant *k, changing it to *f* (with the 'normal' shift being *k > h). This same change, called 'fortization', is also caused by *li- (ve *li-*) in Venda; with nouns (cf Wentzel 1974, par 5.3, the 4th example) and in one instance also with the adjective stem *-hulu*, viz

dakalo fulu (li+kulu) 'great joy'

In Venda under the sound change 'occlusivation' a similar situation results whereby the prefixes *ni- and *li- give rise to the same sound changes. For examples compare Wentzel 1974, 50-51.

To summarise one can say that in Western Shona the influence of the *i* of the prefixes *li- and *ni- of classes 5 and 9/10 (the singular pref): *ni- is retained in the plural **li-ni-*) and that of the syllable **xi* results in the same sound change 'vocalization'.

In Venda as well the influence of *i* of the prefixes *li- and *ni-/ **li-ni-* of classes 5 and 9/10 results in the same sound change 'occlusivation', and **xi* and **li-* may also cause a change which results in the same change 'fortization'.

3.2.2.4 Velarization

The morphophonological sound change velarization is not a typical characteristic of Western Shona. It also forms part of the sound systems of e.g. Central Shona and the closely related Venda. Doke (1931b, the whole of CH 12) treated this aspect in depth for the Shona dialects. He says

One of the main features of the phonetics of the Shona dialects is the occurrence of velarization, due to the action of the velar semivowel *w*. This is a peculiarity of this cluster of

Bantu languages, but we find it also occurring outside of Shona in certain languages which must have been influenced from the Shona. In Venda, for instance, a language owing much of its parentage to Shona, velarization in the case of bilabial consonants occurs. ... It may therefore be considered a Shona or Shonoid characteristic.

(Doke 1931b, par 199)

For a discussion of its occurrence in Western Shona compare Wentzel 1961, par 108, 192 and for Venda Wentzel 1974, par 9.3; Doke 1954, 157 and Ziervogel 1961, par 02.58.

Though velarization as such is therefore not a typical Western Shona feature, there is a certain aspect of it which is part of Western Shona only.

Whereas in Venda velarization is limited to the influence of a following semivowel *w* on preceding labial consonants, it occurs in Shona with consonants pronounced at any place of articulation (cf Doke 1931b, par 210-241).

The alveolar *t* which is velarized by passive *w* is a good example in support of this statement. Compare the verb stem *-hata* (C Sh) /-bhata (W Sh) 'hold, catch' of which the passive is in various dialects as follows:

W Sh (K1) *-bhakhwa* < *-bhat+wa*
 C Sh (Ze) *-batkwa*
 (Kr) *-bat:cwa/-ba:cwa*

The Karanga *-ba:cwa* and Kalanga *-bhakhwa* are examples of the most complete velarization.

The variant form of the passive *-w-*, viz *-i-w-* does not cause this change as can be seen from the following example from the

manuscripts, Suppl, Vol I, par 4.12, lines 8-9 where in the same sentence there is written

kubhatlwa ngebanhu, ... kubhakhwa ndimi

The aspect of this sound change which is typical Western Shona only, and which should therefore be mentioned here, is where the bilabial voiced fricative *b* and the lateral continuant *l* are velarized to become the voiced velar plosive *g* in the subject concords derived from the class prefixes *lu-* (class 11) and *bu-* (class 14). These concords have the form *gu-* (i.e. without the occurrence of *w*). This may be ascribed to analogy working from the possessive concord where velarization is a common feature in all Shona dialect clusters, e.g. *luta* > **lwa-* > *gwa-* and *buta* > **bwa-* > *gwa-*.

Therefore, in a possessive construction like

**bugalo gugwe* 'in his place' (Suppl, Vol I, par 2.2, line 3)

the noun *bugalo* with its prefix *bu-* governs both the possessive concord *gu-* and the possessive stem *-gwe*. (For a discussion of the possessive form observed here cf par 3.3.9 below.)

For examples of these concords and their use compare Wentzel 1961, par 139, 140 where tables of concords are followed by examples of such concords used in sentences.

(Note that the adjective concords are not subject to this change. The reason for this is the fact that the adjective concord is not only identical with the class prefix in Shona (and in Venda), but it *is* the class prefix; the adjective being a noun as any other noun in structure and use, but with additional specialized qualifying function.)

3.3 MORPHOLOGICAL FEATURES

3.3.1 Class prefixes typical of Western Shona

In general there is considerable difference between the noun class systems of Central Shona and Western Shona — differences so striking that they must be taken into account when describing those morphological features which are characteristic of Western Shona.

What is of equal significance concerning the class prefixes, is the very close relationship of Western Shona with Venda — especially in those instances where Western Shona differs from Central Shona. Although this aspect will be discussed in par 4.4.3 below, reference will here be made to these correspondences with Venda. This implies that what is characteristic of Western Shona is evaluated with reference to Central Shona in the first instance, and does not mean that such features do not appear in any language other than Western Shona.

3.3.1.1 Table of prefixes

Ur-Bantu	C Sh	W Sh	Venda
1 *mu-	(u)mu-	(u)ṽ- / (u)ṽ- / un- [ũ-]	mu-
1a *ṽ	ṽ	ṽ	ṽ
2 *ba-	(a)va- [(a)ba-]	(a)bu- [(a)ba-]	vha- [ba-]
2a *βo-	va- / mu(dzi)-	ho- [βo-]	vho- [βo-]
3 *mu-	(u)mu-	(u)ṽ- / (u)ṽ- / un- [ũ-]	mu-
4 *mi-	(i)mi-	(i)mi-	mi-
5 *li-	(i)ri-	(i)li- / (i)ri-	li-
6 *ma-	(a)ma-	(a)ma-	ma-
7 *ki-	(i)chi- [(i)tshi-]	(i)chi- [(i)tshi-]	tchi- [tshi-]

8	*Bɛ-	(i)svi- [(i)zi-]	(i)zwi- [(i)zi-]	svi- [zi-]
9	*ni-	(i)N-	(i)N-	N-
10	*ɛni-	(i)N-	(i)(dzi-/ji-)N-	(dzi)N-
11	*zu-	(u)nu-	(u)lu- / (u)nu-	zu-
12	*ka-	(a)ka-	-	-
13	*tu-	(u)tu-	-	-
14	*bu-	(u)hu- [(u)bu-]	(u)bu- [(u)bu-]	vhu- [bu-]
15	*ku-	(u)ku-	(u)ku-	u-
16	*pa-	(a)pa-	(a)pa-	(fha-)
17	*ku-	(u)ku-	(u)ku-	(ku-)
18	*mu-	(u)mu-	(u)mu-	(mu-)
19	*pɛ-	(i)svi-	-	-
20	*xu-	-	(u)ku-	ku-
21	*ɛ-	(i)ni-	(i)hi- / (i)shi-	di-

From the table of prefixes four striking points are observed:

- (a) The Shona dialect groups and Venda have noun class systems which form a much closer unit among themselves than with any of the other surrounding languages.
- (b) The Shona groups differentiate themselves from Venda in the latent initial vowel which is present in all prefixes except that of 2a.
- (c) In the prefixes of classes 1 and 3 Western Shona distinguishes itself from Central Shona and Venda.
- (d) The most outstanding feature is, however, the fact that in five of the twenty-one classes listed, Western Shona and Venda correspond, while at the same time distinguishing themselves from Central Shona.

3.3.1.2 Class 1 and 3 prefixes typical of Western Shona

These two classes do not make use of the *mu-* which is so common in other Bantu languages. The slight variations which exist among the dialects of the cluster, can be divided into two trends: those dialects which have a syllabic nasal as prefix and those which have a nasalized vowel [ū-].

The dialects which make use of a syllabic nasal are Kalanga, Lilima, Ja(w)unda, Lemba, Twamamba and Pfumbi (i.e. those dialects which are of Mbire-Shoko origin).

Of these the first four have a syllabic homorganic nasal (u)ṅ-,
e.g.

cl 1:	<i>nnhu/nthu</i>	[ṅṅṅu/ṅṅṅu]	'person'
	<i>nkadzi/nkadzi</i>	[ṅkadzi/ṅkadzi]	'woman'
cl 3:	<i>nti</i>	[ṅti]	'tree'
	<i>nxolo/nxolo</i>	[ṅxolo/ṅxolo]	'head'
	<i>mpanga</i>	[ṅpanga]	'habit, custom'

(For further examples cf. Wentzel 1961, par 127, 131.)

In Twamamba and Pfumbi the process of change has not developed that far. Here the prefix *mu-* has lost its vowel and the nasal obtained syllabic value. (In Pfumbi before velar consonants the prefix makes use of the homorganic nasal like the other dialects.)

Examples:

cl 1	Pfumbi :	<i>umhu</i>	[ṅṅṅu]	'person'
	Tw	: <i>mdu</i>	[ṅṅdu]	'person'

cl 3	Pfumbi :	<i>mti</i>	[<i>m̃ti</i>]	'tree'
		<i>mxolo</i>	[<i>m̃psolo</i>]	'head'
		<i>msana</i>	[<i>m̃psana</i>]	'back'
Tw		<i>mxolo</i>	[<i>m̃xolo</i>]	'head'

Before stems commencing with velar consonants Pfumbi makes use of a syllabic homorganic nasal, corresponding with Kalanga and the other three dialects mentioned above, e.g.

cl 1	<i>nkaji</i>	[<i>ŋkadʒi</i>]	'wife'
cl 3	<i>nkaka</i>	[<i>ŋkaka</i>]	'milk'

This does not regularly apply to adjectives it seems, because here the following examples from Pfumbi were recorded:

mti mkugwane (and not *nkugwane*) 'a big tree'
but, *nkaji nkugwane* 'a big wife'

(Note the velarization rule which causes *lw* to become *gw*. This change was discussed in par 3.2.2.4 above.)

For Twanamba the situation is not clear when comparing the examples recorded by Van Warmelo (1940, 92). Some of his class 1 and 3 examples have retained the prefix *mu-*, while others have the syllabic nasal, e.g.

cl 1	<i>mdu</i>	'person'	but: cl 1	<i>mulume</i>	'man'
	<i>nkegulu</i>	'old woman'		<i>musikana</i>	'girl'
3	<i>mnda</i>	'garden'	3	<i>mulomo</i>	'mouth'
	<i>mxolo</i>	'head'		<i>muti</i>	'tree'

The dialects which have a nasalized vowel [*ũ*], are Rozwi, Nambya and Lembethu (i.e. the dialects of Rozwi-Moyo origin). These three

form a unit within the Western Shona cluster because they presumably have the same Rozwi-Moyo origin, while the other six show closer relationship with the Mbire-Shoko (cf CH 2 for a discussion of the various dialects). The present geographic distribution of these three dialects must therefore be disregarded, Nambya reaching the furthest point to the north-west of the Western Shona region and Lembethu the furthest to the south-east. According to Nambya tradition they are descendants of the last Rozwi Mambo, Nicholasike. The Lembethu still say that they are one people with the Nyayi, which is but another name for the Rozwi.

Compare the following examples which correspond in the three dialects Rozwi, Lembethu and Nambya:

cl 1	<i>unhu</i>	[ũnɦu]	'person'
	<i>unkazi</i>	[ũkadzi]	'woman'
3	<i>uti</i>	[ũti]	'ree'
	<i>unlomo</i>	[ũlomo]	'mouth'
	<i>unofu</i>	[ũfu]	'head'
	<i>unhana</i>	[ũhana]	'back'

The variant forms found in the individual Western Shona dialects reflect a situation where there is development away from the original prefix *mu-*, and this development has reached different stages.

The various steps, in sequence, as observed in the present forms, are as follows:

mu- : original form of prefix

Step one The vowel is deleted and the bilabial nasal is retained, but becomes syllabic with Twamamba being somewhere between the

original form and step one. Pfumbi has, on the other hand, completely discarded the original form and is on its way to step two. Note that a language like Venda also shows signs of development towards step one as in *mutukana* 'boy' which is in normal speech often pronounced as *mtukana*. The Venda word *mpengo* 'lunatic' (cl 1) with plural *mipengo* (cl 4) which was included in Van Warmelo's (1937) dictionary is an example of such a development almost 50 years ago. This must, however, be treated as an exception because the word deviates from the normal morphological structure in other respects as well: class 1 does not take its plural in class 4 (the concords of *mpengo* proves that it indeed belongs to class 1 and not to class 3) as is the case here; the deverbative terminating vowel *-o* is not a normal terminating vowel for classes 1 and 2.

Step two The nasal which has become syllabic in step one, now becomes fully homorganic as is the case with Kalanga, Lilima, etc.

Step three At this stage in the development, the nasal qualities of the prefix are retained by deflecting it to the vowel which becomes nasalized.

Step four The entire prefix is deleted as will be seen in par 3.3.3 below.

It is quite possible that step three did not develop from step two, but that it developed independently. This view will find support in the Rozwi-Moyo versus Shoko-Mbire theory for the grouping of the dialects.

An equally strong argument in favour of seeing it as step two in the development sequence, is found in the object concord of class one in those dialects which have reached step two only. These dialects, like those of step three, have a nasalized vowel as

object concord for the said class 1 (cf par 3.3.12.2 furtheron for a discussion of the form of this concord).

Though not falling within the scope of this research project, it should be noted that Tsonga provides a much better parallel to this feature about the class 1 and 3 prefixes. Is this perhaps the result of influence from the Rozwi (Nyayi) people who fled eastwards during the Nguni invasion of Zimbabwe during the nineteenth century? Van Warmelo, when discussing the Lemba dialect of the Transvaal, refers to this feature in Lemba, giving typical Western Shona examples like *nnhu*, *nnda*, *nkuyu*, *mbbili*. He also refers to this trend in Tsonga when saying

Abweichend vom Shona und Venda, jedoch sich einer Neigung im Tsonga nähernd, ist die Assimilation des *mu*-Präfixes, ...
(Warmelo 1966, 274)

To conclude the discussion of these two class prefixes it must be mentioned that the homorganic nasal in these instances never forms a nasal compound with the stem initial consonants, as is the case with the homorganic nasal of classes 9 and 10 prefixes. (In Nambya instances were observed where this *N + l* does change to *nd* in deverbatives, but it is not clear whether the nasal then loses its homorganic value.)

3.3.1.3 *Those examples where Western Shona and Venda differ from Central Shona*

(a) *Class 2a prefix 'Bo-*

The prefix *'bo-* was retained in Western Shona (written *bo-*) and in Venda (written *ʋho-*), whereas it was changed to *va-/madzi-* in Central Shona. The tone of this prefix is high (compared with the

others which all have low tone) and in Western Shona it does not have the typical latent initial vowel of the other prefixes.

Example:

W Sh *bonne*; Ve *vhombe* (C Sh *madzimai*) 'mothers'

(b) Classes 12 and 13, *ka-, *tu-

These two diminutive classes (which form a singular-plural pair) do not have equivalents in Western Shona and Venda. They make use of class 20 *ku-* instead, to add this meaning to a noun stem.

(c) Class 19 *pɛ-

The same applies to this class which occurs in Central Shona only, and then also as diminutive class (often with an additional content indicating affection).

(d) Class 20 *ɣu-

Western Shona and Venda do not make use of the normal diminutive classes of which all three are used by Central Shona with this meaning as seen in (b) and (c) above. They both make use of the prefix *ku-* (derived from *ɣu-) instead.

For examples of such nouns compare for Venda:

Meinhof 1901, 9 and 1948, 58
Westphal 1946, 86-87
Ziervogel 1972, par 12.1 et seq

and for Western Shona:

Wentzel 1961, 127.

Although a detailed discussion of the various class prefixes does not fall within the scope of this thesis as the stress falls on comparison, it has been deemed necessary to refer to some outstanding aspects of this noun class and its prefix.

In the first instance the form *ku-* of the prefix as realized in Western Shona and Venda, is not a 'normal' derivation through sound shift from **χu-*. Meinhof (1948, 58) refers to this 'abnormal' shift when he says

Ich nehme daher an, dass das Präfix *χu-* über *ngu-* zu *'ku-* geworden ist in Assimilation an die nach *'ku-* häufig auftretenden Laute *'k 't 'p², ...*

In the footnote that follows on the above statement, Meinhof mentions his original reference to this prefix *ku-* of Venda as derived from **χu-* (Meinhof 1901, 9 and 39).

In the second instance in Venda and Western Shona the meaning of this class prefix changed from augmentative/derogative to diminutive. This feature further emphasizes the remarkable correspondence regarding this prefix which exists between Venda and Western Shona.

When Meinhof (1948, 57-58) describes the meaning of this prefix, he mentions the fact that when used as an augmentative prefix, such augmentatives have a derogatory significance. With reference to its diminutive significance in Venda he says

Die Bedeutung ist deminutiv, sie ergibt sich wohl zwanglos aus der Bedeutung des Schmähprefixes.

(Meinhof 1948, 58)

Today, in both Venda and Western Shona, the prefix has a purely diminutive significance.

Apart from this diminutive meaning of the prefix in Venda, Westphal (1946, 86) and Ziervogel (1972, 35) also refer to another significance of this prefix. In such instances the nouns can be formed of verb stems only and the plural prefix used for these nouns, is *ma-* of class 6, otherwise the prefix *swi-* of class 7 is used as a plural prefix for *ku-*. Such nouns derived from verb stems are furthermore characterized by the suffixal formative *-ele* and they indicate an 'habitual' or 'characteristic' way of acting, e.g. *kuambela* 'habitual way of speaking', cf. *-amba* 'speak'. This additional meaning is peculiar to Venda and is not shared by Western Shona.

Another point of correspondence between Venda and Western Shona regarding the forming of diminutives in this class, is their use of the diminutive suffix *-ana* together with the prefix *ku-*, e.g.

W Sh *kubudzana* [kʉʉdzana] 'small goat', cf. *mbudzi* 'goat'
 Ve *kubudzana* [k'ubudzana]

Note the difference in pronunciation of the initial root consonants in the two examples as exemplified by the phonetic script.

As may be concluded from the meaning of the above example, *ku-* is a secondary prefix used to form diminutives from nouns which primarily belong to other noun classes. If such nouns in Venda are removed from classes 9/10, where the initial root consonant is subject to the sound change traditionally known as *nasalization* (cf. Meinhof 1901, 6 et seq) and put in class 21, another sound change affects the initial root consonant. This feature is typical of Venda only.

Should the influence of the nasal in the prefixes of classes 9/10 be 'undone' by shifting the nouns concerned to class *ku-*, the

'nasalized' initial root consonants do not return to the form they had before the influence changed them. They are liable to a further morphophonological change which results in speech sounds related to, but different from both the original sound and the one which results from the nasal influence.

Regarding terminology suitable to describe this sound change, I am convinced that such terminology has yet to be suggested. For the purposes of this discussion it will suffice to refer to the following terms used in various publications on Venda:

Meinhof (1901, 27) calls it 'halber Nasalierung';

Doke (1954, 157) calls it 'denasalization' it being according to him a reverse process of 'nasalization'

The terminology used by Westphal (1946, 87) and Ziervogel (1961, 46) is in line with that of Doke.

The term which refers to the reverse process of 'nasalization', namely 'd-nasalization', can however only be used if the term 'nasalization' is found to be acceptable. When it was suggested that the term 'occlusivation' rather than 'nasalization' should be used (Wentzel 1974, 50), the term 'denasalization' therefore had to be abandoned. As it was maintained in the article on suitable terminology for the sound changes which affect Venda sounds (Wentzel 1974), that all terms should be derived from the *results* of the morphophonological processes, both the terms 'nasalization' and 'denasalization' were no longer acceptable, being based on the *names* of the changes. In my attempt to replace the term 'denasalization' by a term as suitable as 'occlusivation' which was introduced instead of 'nasalization', I introduced the term 'de-aspiration' (Wentzel 1974, 53-55). It had to be admitted, however, that the term falls short as it fails to cover all speech

sounds affected by the change, hence a suitable term for this sound change has yet to be found.

The two examples which follow will illustrate the situation with reference to both voiced and voiceless sounds. In this regard reference may also be made to Meinhof's discussion of the same issue (Meinhof 1901, 27).

The forms **-kunt* 'firewood' and **-bulɛ* 'goat' are used to illustrate the situation as it occurs in Venda in comparison with Western Shona where this secondary sound change does not occur with the prefix *ku-*.

**-kunt* > ve *kukuni* (cl 11) 'piece of firewood' > *kuni*
 (< *N+kuni*) (cl 9/10) 'firewood' > *kukuni* (cl 20)
 'small piece of firewood', i e
**k* > ve *h* (normal shift) > *kh* (< *N+h*) > *k* with nasal influence removed, as in cl *ku-*, and it does not go back to *h*, the original shift.

Compare this with Western Shona:

**-kunt* w Sh *lukuni* (cl 11) > *huni* (< *N+kuni*) (cl 9/10)
 > *kukuni* (cl 20), i e
**k* remains *k* in Western Shona and *N+k* > *h* and with prefix *ku-* the *h* goes back to original *k*.

(Note that in class 20 the word is *kukuni* for both languages in spite of the difference in original sound shifts.)

**-bulɛ* > ve *mbudzi* (< *N+bulɛ*) (cl 9/10) > *kubudzi* [*k'ubudzi*]
 (cl 20), i e the original [*β*] is not returned to.

Compare this with Western Shona:

^h-gũt > W Sh mbudzi (cl 9/10) > kubudzi [kuβudzi] (cl 20),
 i.e. the original [β] is returned to.

Therefore:

voiceless plosive ^hk > Ve voiced fricative h > aspirated plosive
 kh > voiceless plosive k
 > W Sh voiceless plosive k > voiced fricative
 h > voiceless plosive k

voiced fricative ^hβ > Ve voiced fricative v̄h > nasal compound
 mb with voiced plosive > voiced plosive b
 > W Sh voiced fricative b̄ > nasal compound
 mb with voiced plosive > voiced fricative
 b [β]

So with *voiceless plosives* the original shifts differ, whereas under influence of ku- they become the same. But with *voiced fricatives* the original shifts are the same, whereas under influence of ku- they differ.

3.3.1.4 Class 21 *χt-

Meinhof was the first linguist amongst those who published on the Bantu languages, to recognize the formative *χt- as a separate noun class prefix. He says

Das Vergrößerungspräfix Kl. 21 χt- ist, wo es noch erhalten ist, schon stark mit Kl. 5 verschmolzen. Den zugehörigen Pronominalstamm habe ich bisher nicht gefunden, sondern nur das Präfix vor dem Nomen, also in der Wortbildung. Als zugehöriges Pronomen ist das von Kl. 5 in Gebrauch.

(Meinhof 1948, 58-59)

From the above quotation it is clear that Meinhof considers it an augmentative prefix which no longer has its own concords or pronouns as it makes use of those of class 5. It also takes its plural form in the same class as class 5 nouns, namely class 6 **ma-*. Here the **ma-* is however used as a preprefix before the singular derivation from **yi-*.

Meinhof (1901, 39-40) distinguished such an augmentative prefix in Venda, viz *di-* (with plural *ma:di-*), being the reflex of **yi-*. The shift Meinhof (1901, 17) regards as the normal one is exemplified by the following examples:

mu:di (cl 3) 'village', cf. **yi*
ma:di (cl 6) 'water', cf. **yiyi*

Other well-known linguists such as Doke (1954, 163 & 215) for Venda and Shona; Fortune (1955, 103 et seq; 1949, 54) for Central Shona and Lilima of Western Shona respectively; Louw (1915, 13) for Karanga as one of the Shona clusters and Ziervogel (1972, 37) for Venda, recognized such an augmentative prefix and recorded it as an independent class 21 prefix as did Meinhof before them. I also recognized it as such for the Kalanga dialect of Western Shona (Wentzel 1961, 127-128). Louw mentioned above, said that the prefix *si-* (*masi-*) in Karanga is used in 'magnifying'.

Van Warmelo, as one of the early linguists who wrote on the South African Bantu Languages, also refers to such a prefix. When discussing the class prefixes of Venda, he mentions such a class, but he does not include it in his table of class prefixes. He says

21. *di-* forms a small number of nouns from other nouns, giving them the meaning of "huge, contemptible, ridiculous or monstrous", e.g. *di:thi* "monster" from *tshithi*, *da:nga* from *li:anga*, *da:nga* from *tshanga*. These nouns are, however,

treated as belonging to cl. 5, there being no distinct concord for this class, and in forming the pl. in cl. 6 the pref. *di-* remains.

(Warmelo 1937, 17)

When he includes such nouns in the dictionary, he numbers them as (21) 5 - i.e. originally from cl. 21 but now in class 5 (cf Warmelo 1937, 48).

So for Venda and Shona it seems that a plausible conclusion to arrive at, is that from the prefix **ɣt-* the following prefixes are derived. The nouns to which they are prefixed as secondary prefixes, thus obtain augmentative/derogatory significance. In both languages the prefix *ma-* is used as preprefix to form plurals of such nouns.

Venda: *ɣi-* (*maɣi-*)

C Sh : *zi-* (*mazi-*)

W Sh : *hi-/zhi-/zi-* (*mahi-/mazhi-/mazi-*)

However it remains a debatable point whether these prefixes can indeed be considered independent, or whether they are to be included in class 5 as did Westphal (1946, 61 & 66) and Van Warmelo (1937, 17) for Venda.

In this connection it is worth referring to Tsonga where augmentatives are formed by means of the prefix *dyi-*. This prefix can, however, not be considered to be a direct reflex of class 21 **ɣt-*.

E B van Wyk in a most informative article, found that

Since the augmentative class and class 5 occur as distinct classes in Tsonga it seems that there can be no ground for the theory that the augmentative prefix is a transformed variant of the prefix of class 5.

(Wyk 1957, 35)

He furthermore states that this Tsonga prefix *dyi-* differs from the prefixes derived from $^*χf-$ because *dyi-* cannot be taken to be a direct reflex of it (Wyk 1957, 28). Another point mentioned by him in support of this viewpoint is the fact that this prefix *dyi-* has its own set of concords and pronouns whereas the so-called class 21 prefixes make use of class 5 concords and pronouns (as is the case in Venda and Shona).

E J M Baumbach presents a plausible solution for the etymology of this prefix *dyi-* of Tsonga in an article which is to be published in *oIMI* during the course of 1981. He finds that:

$^*li-χi- > ^*li-yi- > ^*lyi- > dyi-$

This postulation leads him to the conclusion that the class 5 prefix is a part of this prefix and that therefore this class prefix *dyi-* has to be numbered as class 5a and that it cannot be classified as class 21.

For Tsonga, where augmentatives are formed only by means of the prefix *dyi-*, the situation is clear, but for Venda and Shona the situation is a more complex one.

An attempt will not be made here at offering a conclusive answer to the question as to whether this $^*χf-$ is an independent class prefix in Venda and Shona. The main argument which can be raised against such an assumption is the fact that the system of class prefixes in the Bantu languages goes hand in hand with the feature of concordance and this last aspect is lacking completely in the case of $^*χf-$.

Should one, however, consider the semantics of nouns with the prefixes derived from $^*χf-$, one finds that the situation does

allow for the viewpoint that a class 21 does exist in Venda and Shona.

This semantic feature very strongly supports the viewpoint that Venda and Shona (and then more specifically Western Shona) are very closely related.

Both languages form augmentatives in two ways:

1. Nouns which do not belong to class 5 ⁴zi- may make use of this prefix to form augmentatives with their plural forms in class 6 ⁶ma-, e.g.

Venda (cf Westphal 1946, 66):

liḽu 'large house' cf *unḽu* (cl 9)
liṽi 'large tree' cf *muri* (cl 3)
dukana 'monstrous boy' cf *mutukana* (cl 1)

(For the morphophonological process of *vocalization* which in a case like the last example, is responsible for the change of the stem initial consonant *t* to *d*, compare par 3.2.2.3 above.)

Shona (cf Fortune 1955, 77 & 104; Wentzel 1961, 127-128):

buku (C Sh)/*bhuka* (W Sh) 'large beast' cf *mhuka* (cl 9)
gadzi 'large woman' cf *mukadzi* (cl 1)

(As may be observed in the above examples, the class prefix no longer appears in Shona — only its influence is retained.)

- 2.(a) Nouns from any noun class may form augmentatives in the noun class the prefix of which is derived from ⁴zi-, e.g.

Venda

dikolomo (*madikolomo*) 'large beast' cf *kholomo* (cl 9)

C Sh

zitewanda (*mazitewanda*) 'large basket' cf *twanda* 'basket'

W Sh

himdzambila (*mahimdzambila*) 'large mamba' cf
midzambila (cl 9)

In Venda the type of augmentative mentioned under 1. above seems to be given preference while the *di-* forms are in the process of being phased out. This results for example in *golomo* being preferred to *dikolomo*.

In both C Sh and W Sh, however, the prefixes derived from **ɣt-* are still regularly used. Compare for examples the Kalanga texts of supplement Vol I, e.g.

hizu 'large antheap' (par 4.21, note 34) cf *ehulu* (cl 7)

himbo 'great song' (page 82 last word in 1st line) cf
lumbo (cl 11)

himdzambila 'large mamba' (par 3.3, note 10) cf *midzambila*
(cl 9)

muhiyenga gulu-gulu 'in a large potsherd' (page 266, line 2)
cf *yenga* 'potsherd' (cl 9)

(b) In Shona nouns which in their basic form belong to class 5, form augmentatives by means of *si-/hi-/zhi-* (< **ɣt-*), e.g.

siḡumbo (C Sh)/*hiḡumbo* (K1)/*zhiḡumbo* (L1) 'large leg' cf
ḡumbo (*makumbo*) (cl 5) 'leg'

Both in Shona and Venda also augmentative nouns of class 5 (mentioned under 1. above), may take a reflex from **ɣt-* as preprefix, e.g.

buka (C Sh)/*bhuka* (W Sh) > *zibuka/hibhuka/zhibhuka* (*mazipuka/ mahipuka/mazhipuka*) 'huge beast' cf *mhuka* (cl 9) 'beast'

In Venda, however, in such instances the reflex *di-* only appears in the plural form, e.g.

dukana 'monstrous boy' with plural *maḍidukana*

(As is clear from the above examples, the vocalizing influence of the class 5 prefix on the stem initial consonant is therefore retained (cf the stem *-dukana* in the plural *maḍidukana* with the stem *-tukana* cf *mutukana* (cl 1)), whereas in Shona this influence disappears in the plural form, e.g. *zibuka* (*mazipuka*).

Therefore the significance of such nouns is that of augmentatives of 'great/monstrous size'.

This last type Fortune (1955, 77 & 104) calls augmentatives of second degree and the other forms augmentatives of first degree.

The way in which augmentatives are formed in Venda and Shona in general as discussed above therefore supports the argument that a close relationship exists between these languages.

Some of the other noun classes also reveal interesting evidence of the closer relationship between Venda and Western Shona, e.g. the way in which the days of the week are treated in the various languages. Venda and Western Shona make use of the prefix of class 14 *ʔβu-* and Central Shona of *ʔki-* (cl 7).

Compare the various versions for 'Tuesday':

Western Shona: *Bubili* [βuβili]

Central Shona: *Chipiri* [tʃhipiri]
 Venda : *ḽavhvhili* [ḽaβuβici]

Classes 9 and 10 and the locative classes 16-18 will be dealt with in par 3.3.4 and 3.3.5 respectively.

3.3.2 Deverbatives from vowel verb stems in class 1

In par 3.3.1.2 the characteristic prefixes of classes 1 and 3 were discussed. This discussion did, however, not include the form of these prefixes when prefixed to vowel (or semivowel) verb stems. The prefix for class 1 in this case differs even more drastically from the original form *mu-* and is therefore also even more useful as testing material in the identification of the Western Shona dialects.

The deverbative noun *iyeti* [ʔjeti] 'doer' was written *iyenti* in the original text. The disjunctive writing must be a result of uncertainty as to how such words should be written in practical orthography. In the transcription it was written as *iyeti*, because *iyenti* is a combination of two different dialectal pronunciations. Compare the detailed discussion by Fortune (1949, par 57-58) as well as that by Wentzel (1961, par 147). These refer to two dialects only and the examples are not representative of the whole range of Western Shona dialects. Further research is needed on this topic in order to determine what the complete dialectal picture is.

According to Fortune *iyeti* represents the Lilima pronunciation and *yenti* the Kulanqa. Both could have been derived from the stem *-eta/-yetu* 'do'. Lilima makes use of a nasalized vowel which in practical orthography is realized by *ī-*. Kulanqa does not add such an

initial vowel, but true to the Kalanga pattern, operates with a homorganic nasal as prefix which in this case penetrates the verb stem -- something unheard of in surrounding dialects. In *zyenti*, which should have been written *yenti* (cf Fortune 1949, 58), the homorganic nasal before alveolar *t* represents the class prefix of class 1.

Kalanga informants consulted by me, however also pronounced this word like the Liliima people, viz *iyeti* [ʔjcti].

Fortune (1949, 58) includes two examples *nti* 'doer' and *nsi* 'bringer' to his list of deverbatives with vowel verb stems. They do not belong with such nouns, because they are derived from the monosyllabic versions of these verb stems, viz *-ta* and *-sa* to which Kalanga seem to give preference (cf Suppl, Vol II, Ch 2, note 21). Compare Central Shona *-ita* and *-isa* respectively.

3.3.3 Omission (deletion) of class prefixes

In Shona it is normal practice to leave out the class 5 prefix ((*i*)*ri*-/(*i*)*li*-). Only the influence of the latent initial vowel as well as that of the second vowel is retained. Compare Fortune 1955, par 141; Wantzel 1961, par 133.

The omission of part of the class 10 prefix is discussed in par 3.3.4.

The omission of these prefixes are not typical of Western Shona or even of Shona only, because it also occurs in languages like Venda, though there it has not developed to the same extent as in Shona.

In Western Shona this tendency has developed further to include also the prefixes of classes 1, 3, 7 and 15. This is then what is characteristic of Western Shona.

I did not encounter any instance where the prefix of class 1 is omitted, but this was observed and recorded by Fortune (1949, 58-9), and in Tsonga this feature also includes the prefix of class 1. In Kumile's manuscripts there are many examples of such omissions of the class 3 prefix, e.g. *sepanga* (< *sa+panya*) (Suppl, Vol I, par 4.11, note 21). In the transcription preference was given to writing this word as *sempanga* because the author of the texts was inconsistent and tended to prefer the retention of the prefix. Note the substitution rule which applies here changing the *a* of *sa-* to *e*. The *sa-* expresses comparison.

In the case of the class 7 prefix *chi-* and the class 15 prefix *ku-* (infinitive), the prefixes are left out so regularly that nouns belonging to these classes had to be left unchanged in the transcription. Compare the following references to Suppl, Vol I:

class 7 chi- omitted

- par 2.2; 5.1 *chaba chabakalanga (chichaba)*
- 3.8.1 *kwzle chiche (chikwele)*
- 4.16 *choba chatate (chichaba)*
- 5.2 *tulo chatate (chitulo)*
- 5.3 *mukonyo chalo (muhikonyo ...)*
- 5.14 *bechaba kulu (bechichaba chikulu)*

In the last example also the adjective concord is omitted, but such examples, being very scarce, point towards a more recent development.

(Note that the plural of such nouns which are in class *zwi-* (8) never has the prefix omitted.)

class 15 ku- omitted

- par 2.2 *bhuda kwamavimba (kubhuda ...)*
pasi kobusa kukwe (pasi kwakubusa ...)
 3.8.1 *lobola konkalanga (kulobola ...)*
 5.1 *nobusa kukwe (nokubusa ...)*

Even in the negative of the infinitive the *ku-* may be omitted, e.g.

sabusa zwubuya (kusabusa ...) 'not to rule well'

This tendency of omission of these prefixes seems to be of more recent origin. This assumption is based on the fact that in the later recording of chapter 5 such omissions occur much more regularly than in the older version of chapter 4. Another indication is the fact that in borrowings like *kwele* (par 3.8.1) and *tulo* (par 5.2) the borrowings obviously originally included the prefix *chi-*, because the normal rule regarding the adaptation of borrowings to the morphological structure of languages like Western Shona, is that nouns which commence with the consonant *s* in the language from where the borrowing originates, will be fitted into the *chi-* class.

It is therefore reasonable to accept that the word *kwele*, for example, originally was borrowed as *chikwele* — an assumption which is substantiated also by the plural form *zwikwele* (which never loses its prefix).

Note that the omissions mentioned above only occur in word groups of which the concord agreement shows the class relationship of the

noun. Note that the examples all consist of possessive constructions, except in the case of *bechaba kulu* (par 5.14).

3.3.4 The class 10 prefix *(i)dziN-/(i)jiN- < *ʔɔni-*

This prefix characterizes Western Shona as compared with Central Shona in the fact that it is used much more regularly in the first mentioned cluster. In Central Shona the prefix *(i)dziN-* (class 10) retained only the nasal influence of the *N*, whereas the *(i)dzi-* part (< *ʔɔ-) became obsolete. It was retained only in the one word *dzimba* 'houses' (cf. sing *imba* (cl 9)).

In Western Shona where the prefix is *(i)dziN-* or *(i)jiN-* (as in Pfumbi and Nambya), it is retained with a higher frequency. The situation is more or less the same as that which prevails in Venda where the use of the *dzi-* part of the prefix is optional.

In the texts of Kumile's manuscripts it also appears often in nouns of class 10. Compare Suppl. Vol I:

- par 3.2 *dzimwana*
- 3.6 *dzinduna*
- 5.36 *ngedzihali ngehali*
- 6.3 *dzimbudzi nedzimbudzi*
- 6.7 *mudzihombo*

This use of the full prefix is also found in sources like the Bible translation into Kalanga (BFBS 1957, *Matu* (Gospel of St. Matthew) 27:12) where we find the example *dzihosana hulu* 'chief priests'.

In this last example the adjective *hulu* which qualifies *dzihosana* only retains the influence of the nasal ($N+k > h$) and this illustrates that the rule does not include the adjective, but concerns the noun only.

This characteristic of Western Shona is therefore the opposite of the feature of omission discussed in the previous paragraph. But then, and that links up with the tendency towards omission of prefixes, the full prefix of class 10, viz *dziN-/jiN-*, may be deleted in Western Shona, leaving only the influence of the latent initial vowel (*i-*). For this there is no equivalent in Central Shona where the homorganic *N-* must be retained before voiced consonants. Compare:

<i>vula</i> 'water, rain'	(C Sh <i>mvura</i>)
<i>vubu</i> 'hippopotamus'	(C Sh <i>mvuu</i>)
<i>zila</i> 'path'	(C Sh <i>nzira</i> - In Karanga <i>shira</i>)

As seen in the last example, Karanga differs from Central Shona in this respect, also deleting the *N-*.

3.3.5 The locative classes and their concords

The locative classes *pa-*, *ku-* and *mu-* are still in use as a means of expressing the locative. In this respect Western Shona is fully in line with Central Shona and differentiates itself from the southeastern Bantu languages with their suffixal locative formatives which replace the locative class prefixes.

Western Shona differs however from Central Shona in its use of the locative concords (cf Wentzel 1961, 125 'Opmerking'). Western

Shona differentiates between

- (a) locatives with basic locative stems and
- (b) locatives with nouns of other classes as basis.

In the case of the (a)-type the concords are derived from the prefixes *pa-*, *ku-* and *mu-* (except the possessive concord which is the same for all three classes, viz *kwa-*, as derived from the prefix of class *ku-*).

The difference with Central Shona occurs in the (b)-type where the locative base is a noun of another class. Western Shona makes use of the prefix of such a basic noun for the derived form of the concords, whereas Central Shona in such instances makes use of the locative concords. Compare:

(a)-type Locatives

- W Sh *mukati men'uniba mopisa* 'in the house it is hot'
- C Sh *mukati meimba munopisa* 'in the house it is hot'

(i.e. the same for both Shona groups)

(b)-type Locatives

- W Sh *mudanga langu* 'in my cattle kraal' (with the possessive concord *la-* derived from the noun *danga* of cl 5 (*i)li-*)
- C Sh *mudanga mangu* 'in my cattle kraal' (with the possessive concord *ma-* derived from the locative prefix *mu-*)
(Fortune (1955, 103) says that in C Sh, as an alternative to the locative concord, the concord of the basis-noun may also be used - as is the case in W Sh)

This (b)-type reveals a distinction between the Western and Central Shona clusters.

In the texts of the Kunile manuscripts there are many examples to support these rules. Compare Suppl., Vol I:

par 4.13, note 24

mumbili wangu, and on the same page
pombili wangu

Both are (b)-type locatives with the meaning of 'on my body'. Here the prefix *mu-* conveys the meaning of 'on' which never can happen in Central Shona where this prefix can only mean 'in'.

par 4.33, note 51

pakati kwemizolo 'in the middle of the heads'

par 4.34, note 52

pehugwi konti 'on top of the tree'

par 6.7, note 16

seli kweGungwa 'on the other side of the Zambezi'

page 244, 7th line from end

chipakati kweGungwa 'which is in the middle of the Zambezi'

These last four examples are all of the (a)-type with the possessor nouns being basic locative nouns; *pakati*, *pehugwi* and *seli*.

Two of these nouns deserve special attention:

1. *pehugwi* 'above' and the variant dialectal forms like *pezhugwi* (Li), *sezulu* (Lembethu), *pehulu/hehulu* (Tw), *panyezulu* (Pf) are typical Western Shona forms. In Central Shona the form closest to these is *kunzuru* which is an alternative for *kunusoro/pamusoro* 'above'. They are locatives derived from the stem **y.hulu* with velarization (cf par 3.2.2.4 above) causing the final syllable *-lu* to be changed to *-gwi* ~ with no apparent reason, however for the presence of *w* or *i*.

For Lembethu another very significant form was recorded:

paunzulu wounti [paũzulu wũti] 'above the tree'

with the possessive noun *paunzulu* consisting of locative prefix *pa-* + *unzulu* (cl 3 noun); hence the poss conc *wo-* of cl 3. The exceptional here is the use of the stem *-zulu* in cl 3. Otherwise it follows the normal rule for the (b)-type locatives. The opposite of the above, viz

pasi pounti 'under the tree'

also follows the normal rule, being an (a)-type locative.

2. *sali* 'across' is alternatively also used in class 9 in the manuscripts — something which is impossible in Central Shona —, e.g

veli yaGungwa (Suppl, Vol I, page 244, line 13; page 248, line 2)

3.3.6 Absolute pronouns with typical form

The only distinctive feature concerning the form of the absolute pronoun is found with the pronouns of the 1st person singular and plural and the second person plural. (CF Wentzel 1961, par 154

with Fortune 1955, par 251 for comparative tables of W Sh and C Sh.)

Compare the following 1st and 2nd person forms for W Sh, C Sh and Venda:

	W Sh	C Sh	Venda
1st p sing:	<i>imi</i>	<i>ini</i>	<i>nne</i>
pl :	<i>iswi</i>	<i>isu</i>	<i>riŋe</i>
2nd p sing:	<i>iwe</i>	<i>iwe</i>	<i>iwe</i>
pl :	<i>imn'i/in'wi</i>	<i>imi</i>	<i>inwi</i>

The use of *imi* for the 1st person singular in Western Shona is the most obvious distinctive feature of the absolute pronoun (cf Warmelo 1966, 276 for this pronoun *imi* in Lemba). Central Shona uses the identical form *imi* for the 2nd person plural. In this second person plural form Western Shona and Venda again distinguish themselves from Central Shona, cf the above forms.

It should furthermore be mentioned that in Western Shona, elision of the initial vowel of all absolute pronouns is the rule when preceded by secondary formatives like connective *na-* and *sa-* of comparison. In Central Shona, however, the *i* coalesces with the preceding *a* with pronouns of the 1st and 2nd person changing to *e* (< *a + i*). Compare:

W Sh	<i>namí</i>	C Sh	<i>není</i>	'and/with me'
	<i>naawi</i>		<i>nesu</i>	'and/with us'
	<i>sawe</i>		<i>sewe</i>	'like you'
	<i>samn'i</i>		<i>semi</i>	'like you (pl)'
but 3rd p	<i>saye</i>		<i>saye</i>	'like him/her'
	<i>sadzo</i>		<i>sadzo</i>	'like them'
	<i>nacho</i>		<i>nacho</i>	'with it'

3.3.7 The demonstrative pronoun

Though we are in the first instance concerned with the distinctive features of Western Shona, it is appropriate to refer here to the remarkable similarity of the various demonstrative forms of all the Shona clusters and Venda. These languages are characterized by the four basic forms which are very close to each other in the different languages – both in form and content. These basic forms are furthermore characterized by many compound demonstrative forms built on them. (Compare Ziervogel 1972, 69-72; Fortune 1955, par 315-19; Wentzel 1961, par 160 for Venda, C Sh and W Sh compound forms.)

It is, however, in the basic forms that Western Shona distinguishes itself from Central Shona and Venda. Compare:

		1	2	3	4
W Sh	cl 1	<i>uno</i>	<i>oyu</i>	<i>oyo</i>	<i>oya</i>
	10	<i>dzino</i>	<i>edzi</i>	<i>edzo</i>	<i>dziya</i>
C Sh	cl 1	<i>uno</i>	<i>uyu</i>	<i>uyo</i>	<i>uya</i>
	10	<i>dzino</i>	<i>idzi</i>	<i>idzo</i>	<i>dziya</i>
Venda	cl 1	<i>uno</i>	<i>uyu</i>	<i>uyo</i>	<i>uŋa</i>
	10	<i>dzino</i>	<i>idzi</i>	<i>idzo</i>	<i>dziŋa</i>

The positions as numbered here (cf Wentzel 1961, 140 and Doke 1954, 164, 216 for the origin of this numbering) are open to criticism. I believe that further research will result in the acceptance of Fortune's (1955, 312-14) view for Western Shona and Venda as well. He takes positions 2 and 3 above as the two basic positions and 1 and 4 as the precised positions for 2 and 3 respectively. Hence,

- position 1 (e.g. *uyu*, *idzi*) with its precised position
(e.g. *uno*, *dzi^{no}*), and
position 2 (e.g. *uyo*, *idzo*) with its precised position
(e.g. *uya/u^{la}*, *dziya/dzi^{la}*).

This arrangement will also fit in better with the distinguishing feature of Western Shona which mainly concerns positions 2 and 3 above (i.e. the basic positions of Fortune). In Western Shona it is not the vowel of the root which is reduplicated which forms the initial syllable, but the 'secondary' vowel closest to it, i.e. *i* > *e* and *u* > *o*. (The root syllable is in all these languages the basic subject concord.) This change in the vowel points towards a vowel *a* (cf. the demonstrative formative *la-* of Nguni) which is prefixed to these basic demonstratives. Therefore:

a + *uyu* > *oyu*
a + *idzi* > *edzi*, etc

It is the adding of this *a* which is the real distinguishing feature of Western Shona.

In position 4 this distinction occurs only in the so-called 'nasal' classes, i.e. where the basic subject concord consists of only a vowel. This basic subject concord forms the root of all the demonstratives (see above).

Should one compare these typical Western Shona forms with Venda, then one finds that for these two positions Venda has alternative forms which are almost identical with the Western Shona forms. Compare Ziervogel (1972, 70-71) I(b)(ii) and II(ii) in the tables given for the following:

cl 1 *hoyu* vs *uyu*; *hoyo* vs *uyo*
hedzi vs *idzi*; *hedzo* vs *idzo*

The only difference therefore is that Venda has a demonstrative formative *ha-* which precedes the basic forms, e.g.

ha + uyu > hoyu (cf W Sh *oyu*)
ha + idzi > hedzi (cf W Sh *edzi*)

This Venda form, which is very regularly used instead of the basic form, must not be confused with the Central Shona form of the locative demonstrative copulative (cf Fortune 1955, par 860) which also commences with *ha-*, but which has a different meaning.

3.3.8 The quantitative

Western Shona has three quantitative stems:

-se 'the whole, all'
-ga 'only, alone'
-mene 'self'

Of these, Central Shona has the first two in common with Western Shona and the third one also occurs in the Karanga cluster of Central Shona.

The concords are derived from the basic subject concord plus pronominal *-o*, e.g.

cl 2 *ba+o+ga/se/mene > boga/bose/bomene*
 9 *i +o+ga/se/mene > yoga/yove/yomene*

This rule applies to both Western Shona and Central Shona concords, but Central Shona has a variant form where the 'pronominal' *o* is

replaced by *e*, e.g.

cl 2	<i>vose</i>	;	<i>veee</i>
4,9	<i>yose</i>	;	<i>yese</i>
6	<i>oga</i>	;	<i>ega</i>
10	<i>dzoga</i>	;	<i>dzega</i>

This replacement of *o* by *e* is in Western Shona only in class 1 and then not with the stem *-se*, but only with *-ga* and *-mene*.

The quantitative does not contribute any significant means of distinguishing Western Shona dialects.

3.3.9 The possessive

The possessive construction in general does not differ within the Shona language group. It has the fixed word order of possession + possessive concord + possessive stem/possessor in all dialects of all clusters.

Some individual forms within this construction provide, however, the most striking characteristics of Western Shona. They are considered of vital importance in determining which dialects belong to the Western Shona cluster. These exceptional forms do to my knowledge not occur in any other Bantu language and makes of them a most useful instrument in the identification of the dialects of this cluster.

The irregular forms concern the possessive forms for the 2nd and 3rd persons singular (cl 1 only) and certain possessive concords of the locative classes.

3.3.9.1 2nd person singular and 3rd person class 1 possessives

These exceptional forms were noticed by Van Warmelo as early as 1935 in the Lemba language as spoken in Venda. He recognized them as certainly remarkable enough, but he did not know that in them he had the key to the identification of the dialect cluster to which Lemba belongs. The fact that he did not mention that these forms link Lemba with Western Shona arose from the fact that by that time virtually nothing was published on this cluster's morphological structure. His comments are worth quoting at length. He says about the Lemba language

But amongst the Venda they use *tshiLemba*, which is a form of the Karanga of Southern Rhodesia. A number of forms, however, are not to my knowledge encountered in Karanga, or any other Shona dialect. While it would be out of place to refer at any length to what I have found in the Lemba dialect, there is one set of forms that appears to me so out of the common that I cannot refrain from mentioning it. I mean the possessive forms for the second and third person singular, in which there is a different form for each noun class in the casus regens. Thus they say *nāovani* (cl 1) *uwo* "your cross-cousin", and *nāovani uwe* "his cross-cousin", but in class 5 it is *sino lilo* "your tooth" and *lile* "his"; ... cl 6 *maxino awo*, *awe* "your, his teeth"; cl 7 *tshitswu tshitsho* "your razor" and *tshitsho* "his"; and so on for cl 9 *iyo*, *iye*, cl 10 *dzidzo*, *dzidae*, cl 11 *gugwo*, *gugwe*, etc. These forms are certainly remarkable enough.

(Warmelo 1935, 122 2nd column)

When these forms are compared with the complete list for Kalanga (Wentzel 1961, par 175), then it is clear that these Lemba forms are identical with those of Kalanga, except for *gugwo* (cl 11) which I recorded as *gugo*. But even this is no major difference. It can be accounted for as follows: Originally the form would have been *gugwo* (cf par 3.2.2.4 above for the velarization which results in *-gwo* from **-lwo* and par 3.3.12.1 below for the concord *gu-* of cl. 11 *lu-*), but a natural further development would be to drop the semivowel *w* and have *gugo*.

This quotation serves a dual purpose -- it shows that these forms are most exceptional and limited in use and at the same time Lemba, which uses these forms, is identified through them as belonging to the Western Shona cluster.

From a later publication (Warmelo 1966) on the Lemba, it is obvious that he unfortunately never had the opportunity to follow up this observation. After 31 years he no longer referred to these forms which he described in 1935 as 'certainly remarkable enough'.

Where he discusses the possessive pronouns of Lemba (Warmelo 1966, 276) he gives the normal Central Shona forms *-ko* (2nd p sing) and *-ke* (class 1) and nowhere does he refer to the forms he mentioned in 1935. But a Lemba prayer which he recorded (1966, 279) contains the form *uwo* (his first example in the quotation above from his 1935 publication) in two lines

Kuḽi myana uwo 'Dass dieses Kind'
Kuḽi nhawi myana uwo 'Dass heute dieses Kind'
 (for translation cf Warmelo 1966, 280)

He misinterpreted *uwo* 'your' (referring to a possession noun *myana* of class 1) as being a demonstrative pronoun meaning 'this' ('dieses'). Such a demonstrative form does, however, not exist in Lemba (cf par 3.3.7 above). The translations quoted above should therefore have been 'That *your* child' and 'That today *your* child'. Neither is it a matter of such forms not existing in Lemba as spoken among the Venda. The informant, Tshidade, referred to in the introduction, did use these possessive forms when interviewed in 1974.

When analysing the structure of these forms, it is found that the possessive concord lacks the possessive *-a* which is regarded an

indispensable element of this concord. These remarkable forms consist of the following elements:

2nd person singular

basic subj conc duplicated + -o

e g

cl 1	<i>uwo</i>	(< <i>u+u+o</i>),	cf	<i>m'ana uwo</i>	'your child'
2	<i>babo</i>	(< <i>ba+b(a)+o</i>),	cf	<i>bana babo</i>	'your children'
4	<i>iyu</i>	(< <i>i+i+o</i>),	cf	<i>min'we iyo</i>	'your fingers'
7	<i>chionu</i>	(< <i>chi+ch(i)+o</i>),	cf	<i>chana chicho</i>	'your baby'
10	<i>dzidzo</i>	(< <i>dzi+da(i)+o</i>),	cf	<i>n'ombe daidzo</i>	'your cattle'

3rd person class 1

basic subj conc duplicated + -a

e g

cl 1	<i>uwe</i>	(< <i>u+u+e</i>),	cf	<i>m'ana uwe</i>	'his child'
2	<i>babe</i>	(< <i>ba+b(a)+e</i>),	cf	<i>bana babe</i>	'his children'

From the above examples it is easy to deduce the patterns for all the classes. The terminating vowels -o (2nd p sing) and -a (ci 1) are not peculiar to the Bantu languages. Compare the Central Shona -*ko* and -*ke*, Nguni -*kho* and -*khe* or Venda -*u* and -*we*. The Venda roots are strikingly close to the Western Shona forms.

The two exceptional features are:

(a) The possessive concord which does not contain a possessive -a (as is the case with the concords before all other stems, cf *daangu*, *nwabo*, *chadzo*, etc), but consists of the basic subject concord only.

(b) The possessive stem consists of the basic subject concord plus the root *-o* or *-e*.

It is this last aspect for which there is no known equivalent. This is the only instance where the possessive stem which forms part of the possessor word in the possessive construction, contains an element which is derived from the possession word — a feature which normally belongs with the possessive concord. The *possession* is therefore brought into concordial agreement with the possessor both via the concord and the stem. In all other instances the possessive stem contains an element which is identical to the subject concord of the class to which the *possessor* belongs. Compare:

n'ombe dsabo 'their cattle'

where *dsabo* consists of possessive concord *dsa-* < *dzi-* (of *n'ombe* cl *dzil-*) + poss *-a* and possessive stem *-bo* < *b(a)* (of cl *ba-*) + pronominal root *-o*.

As mentioned above the possessives of these two persons deviate so completely from what is accepted as the norm, that they can safely be used as key to any investigation concerning the classification of the dialects which make use of such forms. It is furthermore a construction which is very easy to arrive at with an informant.

Apart from the quotation from Van Warmelo's (1935, 122) work on the Lemba forms, I recorded such forms for Lemba from Tshidade (as mentioned above); for Lembethu from the informant Tsamu'ani at Hamutele and from the Lembethu at Chikwarakwara and Chikuripasi in Zimbabwe; from my Pfumbi informant, Thomas Matibe, near Malungudze hill; for Ja(w)unda at West Nicholson; for Rozwi from Fortune (1956, Bb C(11)); for Nambya from a Bible translation (BFBS 1961) and from a Prayer and Hymnbook (1977). The Kalanga/Lilima forms were discussed in Wentzel 1961, par 175.

Kumile's Kalanga texts also abound with such forms. It will suffice to refer only to two locative class forms which at the same time will illustrate what was said about locative class concords in par 3.3.5 above. There it was maintained that the concords of class 17 (*ku-*) are used for all three locative classes.

In Suppl, Vol I, par 2.1, note 4 reference was made to the construction *paŋi kukwe* 'under him'. The possession noun *paŋi* (cl 16) takes the concord of class 17 (*ku-*) (cf Wentzel 1961, par 175).

In Suppl, Vol I, par 4.40, note 56 the construction

zimukati mune (kukwe) 'that is inside him'

occurs. Here we have the interesting instance where the possessive noun *mukati* of cl 18 (*mu-*) governs the possessor by its own concords, but then the author himself gives in brackets the form that fits the rule, viz the use of the class *ku-* concords for the class *mu-* possession.

This shows that, as can be expected also by comparing Central Shona forms, originally the individual locative classes each had their own set of concords. This is what Fortune (1956, 88) also accepted to be the case for Rozwi when he drew up a table of these forms. It is possible, however, that this table was based on a hypothesis for some classes for which he did not have examples. This assumption is based on two facts:

(a) I have not yet anywhere encountered an example of cl 16 (*pa-*) as given by Fortune in

paŋsha papo/pape 'at your/his village'

(b) The rule for the locative classes as given in par 3.3.5 does not allow for the possession noun *paŋŋha* to take the locative concord *pa-* → *ŋsha* (cl 3) requires *ə*s locative base that the concord should be *u-*. Hence, it should have been

paŋŋha uwo/uwe

kuŋŋha uwo/uwe

Compare the Central Shona *zwiri mukati make* 'which is inside him' as equivalent for the Western Shona *zwimukati muma* where the possessive *make* consists of poss conc *ma-* < *mu-* (subj conc of *mukati*) + poss *-a* and the poss stem *-ke* (cl 1).

3.3.9.2 *The possessive concords ku- and mu- in indirect relative constructions*

Apart from the two possessive forms mentioned in the previous paragraph there is another structure typical of Western Shona, which uses two locative possessive concords without the possessive *-a*.

This is indeed also a 'strange construction' as Fortune (1949, 75, note 116) called it. Apart from its strange structure, it also appears in environments which are semantically completely different.

This structure consists of either the locative prefix *ku-* or *mu-* + obj conc + copulative verb stem *-li* 'be', e.g.

kundili (also *mundili* as in Suppl, Vol I, par 5.9, line 1)

(*-ndi-* = obj conc (OC) 1st p sing)

kutili (*-ti-* = OC 1st p pl)

kukuli (*-ku-* = OC 2nd p sing)

kumulí (*-mu-* = OC 2nd p pl)

kunli/kuunli (-n-/-un- [ū] = OC cl 1)

kubali (-ba- = OC cl 2)

kuuli (-u- = OC cl 3)

kuili (-i- = OC cl 4/9), etc

The different environments in which it appears, are:

(a) It may follow on the defective verb stem *-ti* 'say' (defective in the sense that it does not have the normal terminative vowel *-a* of all infinitive verbs and that as a result of this defect, its passive form is *-yi* -- without the passive formative *-w-/-iw-*), in which it conveys the meaning of 'say unto'. Compare BFBS 1957, Matu 5:26 for the phrase

Ndolebesa ndoti kukuli 'Truly, I say unto you'

(b) It may also be used in those instances where it forms part of an indirect relative construction of locative adverbial relationship (cf Wentzel 1961, par 181(c)(i) and Fortune 1955, par 734: 1949, 75, note 116). When comparing this rather unusual structure with its equivalent structure in Central Shona, e.g

kwandiri/kwendiri; cf W Sh *kundili/mundili* 'unto me'

kwauri; cf W Sh *kukuli* 'unto you (sing)'

kwari; cf W Sh *kunli/kuunli* 'unto him/her'

two differences are prominent:

- (i) the first formative is *kwa-* in Central Shona as opposed to Western Shona *ku-* or *mu-*;
- (ii) the second syllable in Central Shona is not an OC as in Western Shona, but a subject concord (SC) of the participial mood.

The first difference stands directly in connection with the exceptional possessive concords discussed in the previous paragraph.

Though this highly 'irregular' morphological structure is an equally useful key to dialect classification as the two possessive forms of par 3.3.9.1, it is not so easy to get an informant to use it in everyday conversation.

3.3.10 The verbal relative

The verbal relative for the whole Shona language group, the Western Shona cluster included, is not characterized by relative formatives like relative pronouns or relative suffixal formatives as is the case with the southeastern languages. The only difference from the predicate which acts as relative base, is the relative concord (RC). This concord has the same form as the subject concord, but the tone in the case of the relative concord is always low and for class 1 it is *a-* and not *u-* in the present and future tense. Compare Fortune 1955, par 359 et seq and Wentzel 1961, par 178-181 for Central Shona and Western Shona examples.

The only reason why the verbal relative should be mentioned as characteristic of Western Shona, exists in the use of the formative *-no-*. In Central Shona this formative is part of the verb in the plain present tense positive only. It forms an essential part of this tense, e g

ndinovaka 'I build'

unovaka 'he builds'

In Western Shona this formative is used in the same tense, but here it is often contracted - always in the first and second person, e.g.

ndobaka (*ndo-* < *ndi+no*) 'I build'
bobaka/banobuka 'they build'

(Compare Wentzel (1961, 182) for a more detailed discussion of the contraction of *-no-*.)

In Western Shona the use of this formative is not restricted to the present tense; it also appears in the future tense positive with the future formative *-wo-*, e.g.

banowobaka 'they will build'
ndowobaka 'I shall build'

If such forms now are the base of the verbal relative, the *-no-* is retained, e.g.

banhu banobaka ... 'people who build ...'
banhu banowobaka ... 'people who will build ...'

In Venda this *-no-* is used exclusively as relative formative for one of the three variant forms of the verbal relative. As in Western Shona it appears both in the present tense and in the future tense positive, e.g.

muthu anovhaka ... 'a person who builds ...'
muthu anodovhaka ... 'a person who will build ...'

The comparative value of this formative *-no-* is therefore restricted to its use as a relative formative, because in Venda it does not

act as a predicative formative. If in Venda it is a borrowing from Western Shona, as it quite possibly is, it was borrowed in its verbal relative form.

3.3.11 The agent of the passive

Western Shona differentiates itself from the Central Shona clusters, excluding Manyika with which W Sh is in line in this instance, by the use of copulative and instrumental formatives (cf Fortune 1955, par 392).

In Western Shona and Manyika the real agent is indicated by a copulative formative *ndi-* if the agent is a noun of class 1a or a pronoun; otherwise by the instrumental formative *nga-* (cf Wentzel 1961, par 191-3). In Central Shona the formative *na-* is used with both connotations.

A further correspondence between Western Shona and Manyika is the substitution rule which functions in the case of the instrumental/agentive *nga-*, changing it to *nge-*.

Compare Western Shona:

todan'wa nditate 'we are called by father'
kubhakhwa ndimi 'to be caught by me'
kubhathiwa ngebanhu 'to be caught by people'

(The last two examples are from Suppl, Vol I, par 4.12, lines 8 & 9.)

For Central Shona and Manyika examples see Fortune (1955, par 392).

3.3.12 Conjugational formatives of the verb

3.3.12.1 The concords of classes 11 and 14

This aspect has already been touched on in par 3.2.2.4 under *velarisation*.

There is no apparent morphophonological reason for the sound change which is observed with the concords of these two classes — both *lu-* (cl 11) and *bu-* (cl 14) taking concords which commence with *g* instead of *l* and *b* respectively. Compare Wentzel (1961, 139-40) for tables of concords of these two classes.

For the possessive concord *gwa-* for class 14 (*bu-*) there is a parallel in Venda where *gwa-* is one of the variant forms as derived from *bwa-* (cf Wentzel 1974, 57-8).

Compare Suppl. Vol I for excellent examples, e.g

- par 1.3 line 6 *ngelupango gunopfusiwa*
 7 *ngeluswingo gwamabwe*
 par 4.31 line 5 *Lukadaikulu gunolebeleka guli muguru gusinga*
 bon'we agupiwe ...
 par 3.7 line 1 *kwebuchilo gwemweni*

Also compare Wentzel (1961, 122):

buseho gwabalisana gunobaba; ndoguhwa 'the relish
 of the boys tastes bitter; I taste it'

The following example is from the Lembethu at Chikwarakwara:

Luboko gwangu gwakavuka 'my arm is broken'
Lulimi gumwe nbero 'only one language'

Note that, as may be expected, the adjective concords remain unchanged, i.e. for cl. 11 *lu-* and for cl. 14 *bu-*, because the adjective is but another noun with specialized qualifying usage added to its 'normal' substantival uses.

As opposed to that, the relative concord is also *gu-* for both classes, but with low tone as opposed to the high tone of the subject concord.

These two series of concords which are identical for two completely different prefixes, very clearly differentiate Western Shona from the other Shona clusters.

3.3.12.2 *The object concord 3rd person singular class 1*

The concords of classes 1 and 3 will differ also in Western Shona as can be expected from one's knowledge of other Shona clusters and of Venda, where the object concord of cl. 1 retains the nasal of the prefix *ma-*, as opposed to cl. 3 *mu-* where the object concord is *u-*.

For class 3 the normal rule applies resulting in the object concord *u-*, whereas for class 1 the concord is the same as the class prefix.

This means that for the *Mbire-Shoko* sub-group of dialects which use the homorganic nasal *N* (cf. par. 3.3.1.2) as class prefix, the object concord will also be the homorganic nasal *N*. For the *Rozwi-Moyo* sub-group with the nasalized vowel *un-* [ũ] as class prefix, the object concord will be this nasalized vowel.

This results in the object concord of class 1 being as important as the class prefix as a distinguishing feature of Western Shona.

Compare par 3.3.9.2 above for examples of this difference in the list of indirect relative forms given, e.g.

kunli/kuunli 'unto him/her' (cl 1)
kuuli 'unto it' (cl 3)

The way this formative is written in the practical orthography is explained in the introduction to Suppl, Vol I and therefore examples in practical orthography with phonetic script in brackets from Suppl, Vol I will suffice. This practical orthography also agrees with that used in the Prayer and Hymnbook (1977). Compare the following examples from Suppl, Vol I:

par 2.7.2.4 line 6

kaumbva [kaũmbva] (< ka+um+bva)

par 4.2 last word

wakanoubudza [wakanpũbudza] or [wakanũmbudza]

par 4.4 line 9 last word

unoubikila [unũmbikila] or [unũbikila]

par 4.7 middle of line 4

unoubudza [unũmbudza] or [unũbudza]

par 4.23 middle of 4th last line

kounpa [kaũpa] (i.e. also before voiceless bilabial stops
the concord is written as *un-* above)

par 5.2 line 16 the 2nd word

yakaunakila [jakaũnakila]

par 5.8 note 9

eunambamba [eũambamba] (cf same par, 3 lines after note 9:
unouliambamba [unũliambamba])

par 5.24 6th line from end

baunyange [βaũnangɛ]

par 6.19 page 282, middle of 2nd line

bakaununga [βakaũnunga]

par 6.19 page 282, 1st word after note 37

wakaumusa [wakaũmusa]

From the above it is possible to deduce the variations in the practical orthography as explained in the introduction of Suppl, Vol I.

3.3.12.3 *Negative formatives*

Negative formatives may have different positions within the structure of the verb:

- (a) initial position before the subject concord (SC)
- (b) after the S_v but before the verb stem
- (c) as terminating vowel

In all three instances there are differences between Western and Central Shona which must be given attention to.

(a) *word initial negative formative*

This formative functions in the indicative mood only. It has the form *a-* or *ha-* in Shona. Western Shona gives preference to *a-*, though at least one of its dialects, Nambya, also makes use of *ha-* as alternative for *a-*, whereas Central Shona mainly makes use of *ha-*. Compare:

W Sh pos *banotenga* 'they buy'
 neg *abatotenga* 'they do not buy'

C Sh pos *vanotenga* 'they buy'
 neg *havatengi* 'they do not buy'

In class 1 and class 6 it should be noted that in W Sh the *a-* and the negative SC *-a-* coalesce to form a single *a-*, e.g.

atotenga (< *a+a+to+leng+a*) (cl 1) 'he does not buy'
atopisa (< *a+a+to+pis+a*) (cl 6) 'they are not hot (the days)'

This feature does not occur in Central Shona under similar circumstances. The two *a* vowels are both retained, e.g.

haximi (< *hata+rim+i*) 'he does not plough.'

Whereas Western Shona is in opposition to Central Shona in these instances, it is closely linked with Venda which also has *a-* as initial negative formative and which also has a peculiar negative form for classes 1 and 6, e.g.

normal pattern:

cl 2 pos *vha a renga* 'they buy'
 neg *a vha rengi* 'they do not buy'

exceptional pattern:

cl 1 pos *u a renga* 'he buys'
 neg *ha rengi* (< *a+a+reng+i*) 'he does not buy'

In Western Shona this type of coalescence of the vowels of two formatives of which the second is the class 1 subject concord, occurs in other environments as well, e.g.

buchenjebvu gwangayeta (< *gwata+ngat+yeta*) (cf Suppl, Vol I, par 4.4 four lines from end)

This is an indirect relative construction of possessive relationship with the possession object of the predicate. Here the possessive concord *gwa+SC -a* coalesce to form *gwa-*.

ngahē (< *nga+a+h+e*) 'let him come' (cf Suppl, Vol I, par 4.5 last word of line 4)

ngabulawē (< *nga+a+bulaw+e*) 'let him be killed' (cf Suppl, Vol I, par 6.8, note 17)

Here the hortative formative *nga+SC -a* coalesce to form *nga-*. For this there again is a parallel in Venda where the hortative *kha+SC -a* coalesce to form *kha-*, e.g.

kha de (< *kha+a+d+e*) 'let him come'

The resemblance is even more obvious where Venda makes use of *nga-* as alternative formative for *kha-*, i.e.

ngu de instead of *kha de*

In both Western Shona and Venda one finds that this coalescence rule does not apply in slow speech. Therefore in Venda the full form is normally only used in writing. With the Venda situation in mind, it was decided in the transcription of the texts to follow the Venda pattern by changing the single *a* to double *aa* in such instances. On occasion it was left as one *a*, e.g.

ngabulawē (Suppl, Vol I, par 6.8, note 17)

(b) *formatives which follow the subject concord but precede the verb stem*

There are several such prefixal negative formatives like *-sa-* and *-yi-* which are common in all the Shona dialects.

However, there are two which are typical Western Shona, viz *-to-* and *-zo-*. They follow on the negative subject concord.

These formatives are both foreign to Central Shona. They represent the more archaic way of forming negatives.

The two prefixal formatives are used — the *-to-* for present and future tense and the *-zo-* for perfect/past tense — in verbal forms of which the terminating vowel *-a* is left unchanged.

These two formatives are verbal auxiliary forms which are contractions from verb stem plus infinitive prefix *ku-*, e.g.

-ta 'do' + infinit *ku-* > **-taku* > **-tau* > *-to*

present tense:

pos *banobona* 'they see'
neg *abutabona* 'they do not see'

future tense:

pos *ndinouxolima* 'I shall plough'
neg *anditouxolima* 'I shall not plough'

perfect tense:

pos *ndalima* 'I ploughed'
neg *andizolima* 'I did not plough'

remote past tense:

pos *ndakalina* 'I ploughed (long ago)'
neg *andizolima* 'I did not plough' (same form as for perfect tense because time indication is not relevant if an action did not take place)

In Central Shona such prefixal negative formatives do not exist for the indicative mood.

(a) the terminating vowel

Western Shona does not make use of a negative terminating vowel *-i* in any mood or tense. Instead prefixal negative formatives like those under (b) are used. This was illustrated by the examples under (b).

In Central Shona this terminating *-i* is regularly used in the indicative mood.

In Venda the tendency is also away from the use of the *-i*.

In Western Shona even in the negative of the subjunctive there is no negative terminating vowel — the *-e* of the positive being retained. This feature is not typical of this cluster because Zezuru shares it with Western Shona, e.g.

W. Sh pos *kuti atole* 'that he may take'
neg *kuli asitole* 'that he may not take'

Zezuru pos *kuti atore* 'that he may take'
neg *kuti asatore* 'that he may not take'

The only aspect about this third feature which is characteristic of Western Shona, is therefore the complete absence of a negative terminative *-i* in the negative conjugation of the verb.

3.3.12.4 *The future tense formative*

The future tense formative *-wo-* does not only differ in form from the Central Shona *-cha-* or Venda *-do-*, but it is also found in

combinations with verbal formatives which are considered impossible in Central Shona and Venda.

The formative *-ho-* which is found in some publications, e.g. Fortune (1949), is not a variant of *-wo-*, but is only the result of a deviation in orthography as explained in the introduction of Suppl. Vol I.

Should one compare this 'variant' form *-ho-* with the *-do-* of Venda, then one could make out a case for its being the correct form as opposed to *-wo-*.

It is accepted that Venda *-do-* derives from a contraction of the verb stem *-da* 'come' plus infinitive prefix *u-*. In Kalanga the same would apply to *-ho-* (< *-ha* 'come' plus *ku-* infinitive prefix). Such a deduction would then, however, only suit the dialect Kalanga, because the verb stem *-ha* is typical of this dialect. All the other dialects have the stem *-sha* as equivalent for Kalanga *-ha*. Liliwa also has *-sha*. This is the result of a difference in sound shift from ^hχl. Compare:

^h-χJa 'come' Kl *-ha* [-ha/-χa], Li *-sha* [-sa]

It therefore seems reasonable to ascribe the difference to the practical orthographies which differ in this respect.

This formative in Western Shona can be used together with the formative *-no-* which in Central Shona can only be used in the present tense (cf. Wentzel 1961, par 239). Compare:

W Sh *banolima* 'they plough'
banowolima 'they will plough'

C Sh *unorima* 'they plough'
vacharima 'they will plough'

This combination of the formatives *-no-* and *-wo-* is therefore a characteristic of Western Shona, and in the negative it finds a parallel with the negative formative *-to-* combining with *-wo-*, e.g.

pos *ndinowolima* 'I shall plough'
 neg *anditowolima* 'I shall not plough'

3.3.12.5 *The consecutive tense form*

This tense form is sometimes called the past subjunctive or even the narrative mood.

In the entire Shona language group this tense form is characterized by the formative *-ka-* which follows on the subject concord — both in the positive and negative.

The patterns of the tense are:

positive

SC + *ka* + verb stem with terminative *-a*, e.g.

tikabona 'and we saw'

ukabona 'and you (sing) saw'

negative

for W Sh

SC + *ka* + neg format *si* + verb stem with terminative *-e* e.g.

tikasibone 'and we did not see'

ukasibone 'and he did not see'

for C Sh

SC + *ka* + neg format *sa* + verb stem with terminative *-a*, e.g.

tikasaona 'and we did not see'

ukasaona 'and you did not see'

The general pattern for the positive is therefore the same in all Shona clusters, but for the negative there are two aspects of difference:

the neg format which is *si* (W Sh) and *sa* (C Sh)

the terminating vowel which is *-e* (W Sh) and *-a* (C Sh)

Apart from this difference in the general pattern of the negative, there are also two particular structural differences. As these affect the concords, the differences occur in both positive and negative:

(a) *first person singular*

The pattern for this person is the most striking. It does not contain the *ka* by which the tense form is characterized, neither does it contain the normal subject concord *ndi-*. Instead of these two formatives, it has the initial formative *a-*. Compare:

C Sh *ndikaona* 'and I saw'
ndikasaona 'and I did not see'

but W Sh *abona* 'and I saw'
asibone 'and I did not see'

(b) *third person, class 1 and 8*

The pattern for these two classes is the same. Here the deviation from the normal pattern is less drastic. The consecutive tense marker *ka* is retained, but this *ka* is not preceded by a subject concord, i.e. these classes have a zero concord. Compare:

W Sh cl 1 *nnhu kabona* 'and the person saw'
nnhu kasibone 'and the person did not see'

cl 6 *mapango kapisawa* 'and the poles were burnt'
mapango kasipisawe 'and the poles were not burnt'

C Sh	cl 1	<i>munhu akaona</i>	'and the person saw'
		<i>munhu akasaona</i>	'and the person did not see'
	cl 6	<i>mapango akapisiwa</i>	'and the poles were burnt'
		<i>mapango akasapisiwa</i>	'and the poles were not burnt'

As can be expected the historical accounts as recorded by Kumile abound with verbal forms of this tense form of which the most common use is where it follows on the indicative past tense in narrations such as in the texts of Suppl, Vol I.

The following example is from Suppl, Vol I, par 4.10, the 4th line et seq and a literal translation follows below for each example:

Ngono ukabuya nalo vudzi lake,

And then if you return with it the hair of the Chief,
paya ndalibhata vudzi lake wabakalanga,

if I got hold of it the hair of the Chief of the Kalanga
ndolebesa ndounkunda Chibundule, angina

I 'confirm' I overcome him Chibundule, and I will enter
mucango iya, ayilaula, nawe

in the country of his, and I will rule it, and you
akupabo ntome kobusa kwangu.

I will give you also a share of the kingdom of mine.

3.3.12.6 The imperative form

The content and various uses of the imperative are the same for the different Shona clusters, but in form there are two distinct differences between Western and Central Shona.

(a) The plural form of the imperative (which may instead of number connotation, also have honorific connotation) has in Western

Shona a suffixal formative *-ni*, e g

xingani! 'work, ye!'

salani! 'stay, ye!'

Compare this with *-(y)i* of Zezuru and Karanga or with *-nyi* of Manyika (Fortune 1955, par 586) and especially with *-ni* of Venda.

(b) The negative pattern of the imperative is in Western Shona that of the subjunctive negative (cf Wentzel 1961, par 229-30), e g

sing pos *xinga!* 'work, you!'
neg *usixinge!* 'don't you work!'

pl pos *xingani!* 'work, ye!'
neg *musixinge!* 'don't ye work!'

The negative formative and terminating vowel, as for the subjunctive, are *si* and *-e* respectively.

In both these respects it differs with Karanga and Manyika — not in the use of the negative of the subjunctive, but in the formative *sa* of the subjunctive negative and in the retention of the terminating vowel *-a* of the verb stem, e g

pos *pinda!* 'come in!'
neg *usapinda!* 'don't come in!'

And with Zezuru it shares the terminating *-e*, but Zezuru also has the negative *sa*, e g

pos *tora!* 'take!'
neg *usatore!* 'don't take!'

So in the negative of the imperative the formative *si* is the only true distinctive feature of Western Shona as opposed to Central Shona.

3.3.12.7 *Formatives of the participial mood*

The participial mood in Western Shona has several features which are characteristic of this cluster. These features are all structural.

(a) About characteristic formative elements for the positive participial in Central Shona, Fortune (1955, par 678) states that it is only in the present simple indefinite that the formative *-chi-* is found, e.g.

	<i>indicative</i>	<i>participial</i>
1st p pl	<i>tinoimba</i> 'we sing'	<i>tichimba</i> 'we singing'
cl 1	<i>unoimba</i> 'he sings'	<i>achimba</i> 'he singing'
cl 2	<i>vanoimba</i> 'they sing'	<i>vachimba</i> 'they singing'

Venda also shares with Central Shona the use of this formative *-chi-* (spelt *-tshi-* in Venda), but here it is not restricted to the present simple indefinite. It also occurs in the progressive present, in the simple future and the progressive future tense (cf Ziervogel 1972, par 33.1(c); 34.1(a), (e) and (f)).

Western Shona (except for Rozwi perhaps, cf Fortune (1956, 90)), on the other hand, is characterized by the absence of this *-chi-*. This may be considered a negative point, but when looking at these closely related languages from a comparative point of view, the absence of such a striking feature in one of the clusters is quite

relevant. Compare:

W Sh	C Sh
<i>nditola</i> 'I taking'	<i>ndichitora</i> 'I taking'
<i>titola</i> 'we taking'	<i>tichitora</i> 'we taking'

(b) Certain subject concords of the present tense positive are distinguishing Western Shona from Central Shona. They are the concords of classes 1, 2 and 6. All three concords are characterized by the vowel *e*, e.g.

cl. 1	<i>elima</i> 'he ploughing'
2	<i>belima</i> 'they ploughing'
6	<i>eluma</i> 'they stinging' (mago 'wasps')

In Suppl. Vol I there are numerous examples of the use of these concords. Compare par 2.1 for the following examples:

etasela; etapa; betapa; betama; enopa; endu (a + enda); enoba

Should one consider only the author's dialect Kalanga, which has been in close contact with Ndebele of the Nguni group for the past 140 years, then one would be inclined to argue that here we have an example of Nguni influence on Western Shona.

This assumption is, however, proved wrong by referring also to the other dialects which had little or no contact with Ndebele. Compare the following quotations from the Bible:

Nambya Prayer and Hymnbook (1977, 57 Gospel of St. John 11:20)

Ndipo yopo Marita, wakati ewha kuti Jesu unorha ...

BFBS (1953, NT 105, Gospel of St John 11:20)

tino Marta wakati achinawa kuti Jesu wouuya

In the Nambya example the verb *ewha* (which should be written *ehwa*) corresponds with the Union Shona (Central Shona) *achinwa* 'she hearing' which is in the present tense positive of the participial mood. This verb illustrates both differences between Western and Central Shona — the absence of *-chi-* in Western Shona and the subject concord *e-* of class 1.

The Nambya did not have the same close contact with the Ndebele as the Kalanga. For another Nambya text compare:

BFBS (1961, Gospel of St Mark chapter 6: 31-33) where the class 2 concord *be-* (spelt *be-*) occurs five times:

31 Wakati kubali, Ishani imwi moga kubugalo bomushango, munyetutukwe pashoma; baluba bakawanda bakabebuya, na baka benda, baka besina unuhaji wokulya. 32 Bakenda kubugalo bomushango, beli boga. 33 Danku baka babona benda, banji bak'onzi ba, baka labukila kwakale namakumbo bebuda mumisha yose, ...

(c) In the perfect tense it is only the concord *ka-* of classes 1 and 6 which is characteristic of Western Shona. Compare:

W Sh	C Sh
<i>katola</i> 'he having taken'	<i>atora</i>

The negative forms use the same formatives in both Western and Central Shona which is another indication that Western Shona was not influenced by Ndebele in the use of *e-*, *be-*, *e-* and the perfect concord *ka-* (cl 1 and 6).

3.3.13 The auxiliary verb stem *-be*

This stem corresponds with *-nga* of Central Shona and *-vha* of Venda. The *-be* shows a closer relationship with Venda's *-vha* than with Central Shona *-nga*, but an even closer resemblance is with the Nguni *-be*.

The stem is used in compound tenses which express continuity in past tense actions, e.g.

ndabe ndilima 'I was ploughing'
wabe elima 'he was ploughing'

The complement is in the present tense of the participial mood as may be deduced from the examples. The Central Shona equivalents of these two examples are

ndanga ndichirima
wanga achirima

This auxiliary stem *-be* is used very extensively as is the case with *-nga* of Central Shona.

3.3.14 The form of the copulative

The form of the copulative is remarkably uniform in the various dialect clusters of Shona (cf Fortune 1955, par 826 et seq; Wentzel 1961, par 272 et seq).

In only three instances are there structural differences between the copulatives of Western and Central Shona. These differences occur with

- (a) identifying copulatives, positive, with nouns of classes 1 and 3 as copulative base
- (b) the negative formative of the identifying copulative
- (c) the copulative verb stem *-li*

3.3.14.1 The identifying copulative

Identifying copulatives, positive, with nouns and adjectives of classes 1 and 3 as copulative base, differ from similar forms in Central Shona. These prefixes being characteristic of Western Shona, the copulatives formed from such nouns will also have forms typical of Western Shona.

The identifying copulative, positive makes use of the copulative formative *ndi-* only when the copulative base is a noun of class 1a or 2a or a pronoun, e.g.

W Sh *nditate* 'it is father'

C Sh *ndihaha* 'it is father'

There is also a copulative formative *i-* with high tone which is used with those nouns and adjectives which do not have class prefixes — classes 5, 9 and 10 in all Shona clusters and also class 7 in Western Shona, e.g.

	W Sh	C Sh
cl 5	<i>ibhango</i> 'it is a pole'	<i>ibango</i>
9	<i>imbudzi</i> 'it is a goat'	<i>imbudzi</i>
7	<i>ikwele</i> 'it is a school'	—

In class 10 when *dzi-/ji-* of the prefix *dziN-/jiN-* is omitted (cf par 3.3.3), the *i-* is also prefixed to such nouns.

In Central Shona in all other instances the only change to form a copulative, is by changing the low tone of the prefix to high tone.

In Western Shona this rule also applies, except with the nouns of classes 1 and 3. In the case of these two classes a copulative formative *u-* (with high tone) is prefixed to the homorganic syllabic nasal which acts as prefix in the Mbire-Shoko group of Western Shona dialects, e.g.

Kalanga : *unkaka* 'it is milk' (cf *nkaka* 'milk')
 Pfumbi : *unkaji* 'it is a wife' (cf *nkaji* 'wife')
 Lhima : *unthu* 'it is a person' (cf *nthu* 'person')

Those dialects which have the nasalized *un-* [ū-] as prefix for these two classes also merely change the low tone on the nasalized vowel to high tone, e.g.

Kwisi : *unti* [ūti] 'it is a tree' (with high tone on *un-*)

3.3.14.2 The negative formative *-te*

The negative formative of the identifying copulative is *-te* suffixed to the negative formative *a-*. The *-te* appears to be a contraction of some verbal form which originally contained a subject concord as well. This assumption is based on Central Shona where the parallel for this form is *ha* + SC + copul form *-si/-zi* + the verb stem *-ri*. Compare:

W Sh	C Sh
<i>ata bhango</i> 'it is not a pole'	<i>harisiri bango</i>
<i>ate nlume</i> 'it is not a man'	<i>haasiri murume</i>

(Note that in Central Shona the verb stem *-ri* may be deleted, and that the shorter form *harisi* has a variant form *harisi*.)

The Western Shona form *ate* also has a variant *ata* and it is this very variant form which provides the clue to the possible origin of this copulative formative *-te/-ta*. It is possible that the full form was:

neg form *a* + SC + neg form *to* + verb stem *-(y)eta*, i.e.
alitojeta > *atojeta* > *ata* or *ate*

thus

alitojeta bhango > *ate bhango*

with *bhango* in class 5 with concord *li-*.

The negative copulative formative *ate* clearly distinguishes Western Shona from Central Shona.

3.3.14.3 The copulative verb stem *-li*

In this identifying copulative form a subject concord is essential, as is also the case with the negative form with formative *ate* discussed in par 3.3.14.2 above.

This copulative form with the stem *-li* (W Sh)/*-ri* (C Sh) is in general not used without substantival or adverbial complements (cf Fortune 1955, par 729).

Regarding this stem Western Shona distinguishes itself from Central Shona by regularly leaving it out in such copulative structures. In Central Shona the *-ri* cannot be deleted. Compare:

W Sh		C Sh
<i>tigumi</i>	'we are ten'	<i>tiri gumi</i>
<i>babakalanga</i>	'they are Kalanga'	<i>varo vakaranga</i>
<i>dzi dzooe</i>	'they are all'	<i>dairi dzooe</i>

The negative forms of such copulatives do not supply any additional distinguishing material. They make use of the same negative formative as discussed in par 3.3.14.2 above.

3.4 TYPICAL WESTERN SHONA LEXICON

It is the intention to give a detailed discussion of this aspect here. This will have to be treated as an independent field of research which will incorporate a detailed comparative study of the dialects of this cluster, including differences resulting from sound shifts.

A detailed diachronic study based on the dialects classified for the first time as definitely belonging to the Western Shona cluster, will open doors for comparative work on the languages of the south-central Zone and those languages which are spoken in the areas directly south and east of this cluster -- Venda, North-Sotho, Tswana and Tsonga.

It will suffice here to say that apart from a large vocabulary that Western Shona shares with the other Shona clusters, it also has an extensive vocabulary of its own. This includes verb stems, nouns, a few adjective stems, absolute pronouns (cf par 3.3.6 above), possessive stems (cf par 3.3.9.1 above) and also some basic adverbs (not derived from other word classes). Adverbs, conjunctions and ideophones are, however, not useful material for comparative work,

because they tend to differ greatly from language to language and even between dialects of the same dialect cluster.

An exhaustive list of vocabulary characteristic of Western Shona does not belong here, yet it has been found necessary to include a few of the most basic words and stems to illustrate that Western Shona differs also from Central Shona in this respect.

Verb stems

- alakana* 'consider, remember' cf C Sh -*rangarira*
- ambala* 'put on clothes' cf C Sh -*pfeka* (Ve -*ambara*)
- ambula* 'take off clothes' cf C Sh -*kuturura* (Ve -*lvula*)
- bambula* 'crucify' cf C Sh -*rovera* (Ve -*vhambo*)
- buyisa* 'greet' cf C Sh -*kwazisa* (Ve -*losha*)
- bva* 'move from, come from; mean; tell, address' (cf Supp. Vol II, CH 2, note 29)
- chenama* 'amaze (be amazed)' cf C Sh -*katyamara*
- chila* 'live, be alive' cf C Sh -*rarama* (Ve -*tshila*)
- chidza* 'help' cf C Sh -*batsira*, -*betsera* (cf Zezuru -*chiri-dza* 'help over' where the same root -*chir-* (W Sh -*chil-*) is observed)
- diya* 'teach' cf C Sh -*dzidzisa* (< -*dzidza*)

(Note the further difference. In W Sh the basic stem is -*diya* 'teach'; and from this stem is then derived -*zwidiya* 'learn', i.e. 'teach oneself'. In C Sh the position is the opposite. Here the basic form is -*dzidza* 'learn' from which is derived -*dzidzisa* 'teach' (the causative form).)

- dusa* 'remove from' cf C Sh -*bvisa* (which possibly is the causative of -*bva* 'come from')
- dziidsa* 'trouble' cf C Sh -*netsa*

- ezela (-yazela) 'sleep' cf C Sh -vata (cf the Korekore/ Manyika/Zezuru stem -enzera and the Venda -edela)
- enda (-nda) 'walk' cf C Sh -famba (in C Sh -inda means 'go', but in Venda -enda means both 'go' and 'walk' with -tshimbila meaning 'travel, walk')
- ha/-zha 'come' cf C Sh -uya (Ve -da)
- hula/-ahula 'open' cf C Sh -zarura (Ve -vula)
- kona 'be able' cf C Sh -gona (Ve -kona)
- kumbula 'think; remember' cf C Sh -funga, -rangarira (Ve -humbula)
- kubunganya 'gather' cf C Sh -ungana (Ve -kuvhangana)
- lebelaka 'speak' cf Zezuru -reveteka; Manyika -vereketa; Karanga -bwereketa; C Sh (general) -taura
- lecha 'leave off' cf C Sh -rega
- lesi 'bring' cf C Sh -unsa (Karanga -uya na-)
- ngina/-ngwina 'enter' cf C Sh -pinda
- nyaluluka 'rest' cf C Sh -zorora
- pfa 'spit' cf C Sh -pfira (cf Suppl, Vol II, CII 2, note 29)
- pota 'be cold' cf C Sh -tonhora
- vululuka 'close eyes' cf C Sh -tshinzinya
- zinga/-shinga 'work' cf C Sh -shanda (also -shinga 'be active, be diligent, exert oneself')
- zwinwa 'close' cf C Sh -pfiga

Nouns: class 1

- mbleana 'boy' cf C Sh mukomana
- mxanana 'girl' cf C Sh musikana
- ndiyi 'teacher' cf C Sh mudaidzisi
- ndiyiwa 'pupil' cf C Sh mudaidzwa

(The last two words are deverbatives from -diya 'teach')

nkhaha/nzhusha 'young man' cf C Sh *jaya* (cl 5)

nkwinya 'friend' cf C Sh *shamwari* (cl 9)

Nouns: class 1a

kuku 'grandmother' cf C Sh *mbuya*

mme (also *mayi*) 'mother' cf C Sh *mai* (Ve *mne*)

(Note the plural in class 2a *bonne* cf C Sh *vamai* (Ve *vhomme*))

tate 'father' cf C Sh *baba*

Nouns: class 3

nzingo/nehingo 'work' < *-zinga/-shinga* 'work' (vb) cf C Sh
basa (cl 5)

nai/unai (pl *mizai*) 'village' cf C Sh *musha*

Nouns: class 5

bhakasa (pl *mapakasa*) 'pole enclosure around living quarters'

bumbulu 'egg' cf C Sh *sai* (pl *masai*)

guvu 'cave' cf C Sh *bako*

hani/shani 'leaf' cf C Sh *shizha*

Nouns: class 6

malopa 'blood' cf C Sh *ropa* (cl 5) (Ve *malofha*)

chinanga 'maize' cf C Sh *chibahwe/chibarwe*

chipi 'church' cf C Sh *kereke* (cl 9)

Nouns: class 9

mwizi 'sheep' cf C Sh *hwai* (cl 9), *gwai* (cl 5) (cf the archaic
Venda form *phwidsi* (Warmelo 1937, 221) or *pwizi* of Shona

which Ehret (1972, 23) gives under Shona limited sharings with Ila-Tonga or Cawa)

n'umba 'house' cf C Sh *imba*

nyunyiri 'bird' cf C Sh *shiri* (Ve *tshirani*)

Nouns: class 14

Bubili 'Tuesday' cf C Sh *Chipiri*

(Note that with the four week days (from Tuesday to Friday) the stem is adjectival with no difference from C Sh except for the different classes to which they belong. Venda is close to W Sh by also making use of the class 14 prefix, with the only difference a possessive concord *la-* derived from *luvha* 'day', which is prefixed to the class 14 noun, e.g. *lavhuvhili* 'Tuesday'.)

buchilo 'life' cf C Sh *upenyu*

bupelo 'end' cf C Sh *mugumo*

Adjectives

-bi 'bad' cf C Sh *-ipa* (Ve *-vhi*)

-buya 'good' cf C Sh *-dzivinu* (Ve *-vhuya*); Karanga does not make use of the C Sh stem, but uses the verb stem *-naka* instead

Adverbs

shinyclocho 'quickly' cf C Sh *nokuchimbizika*

kakale 'again' cf C Sh *zwakare*

(Though both forms consist of a prefixal formative plus the same basic adverb *kale/kare* as adverbial base, there is a difference in the meaning of the basic adverbs; *kale* means 'already', whereas

kare of C Sh means 'long ago'. The prefixal formatives also differ — W Sh has *ka-* (adverbial formative) which gives rise to an exceptional adverb with adverbial prefix plus basic adverb as base. C Sh on the other hand, makes use of *sva-* (poss conc cl 8).

kale 'already'
kanyi 'at home' cf C Sh *kumusha*
kujali 'in this way'
kujalo 'in that way'
kujeno 'in this very way'

(These last three forms do not have equivalents in C Sh. They resemble the various positions of the demonstrative as is clear from the meanings and the form.)

mbero 'only' (Lembethu)

(for this adverb there are almost as many variations as dialects, e.g. *n'ompela* (K-langa), *mpeji* (Pfumbi), *chete* (C Sh), *bedzi* (Karanga) — the Karanga and the Pfumbi forms are the only two which show correspondence, with the only difference the sound shifts from **-li* as final syllable.)

<i>ngeno</i> 'here, thither'	cf C Sh <i>pano/apa</i> (Ve <i>ngeno</i>)
<i>ngwen(y)u</i> (Kl), <i>ngubenu</i> (Tw)	cf C Sh <i>zvino</i>
<i>ntolo</i> 'long ago, of old'	cf C Sh <i>kare</i>
<i>pehugwi</i> (Kl) 'on top of, above'	

(For this adverb there are even more variations than for the adverb 'only', but in this instance there is a common stem for W Sh dialects, viz **-yulu*, and another one for C Sh viz *m(u)soro* 'head'. Compare:

pehugwi (Li)
nyesulu/panyezulu (Pf)

*zazu*lu/*unzulu*/*paunzulu* (Lembethu)

hahulu/*pehulu* (Tw)

pamgoro/*kumgoro* (C Sh)

poni? 'where?'

cf C Sh *kupi?*

swiyo 'perhaps'

cf C Sh *kuda*

zwubuya 'well, nicely'

cf C Sh *svakanaka*

(The adverbial base in W Sh is the adjective stem *-buya* 'good' and in C Sh it is the verb stem *-naka* 'be/become good'. The adverbial prefixal formative *zwu-* of W Sh is an exceptional form which does not recur with other adverbs.)

The few words and stems listed here clearly show that Western Shona has a vocabulary which is characteristic of this cluster.

Chapter 4

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN VENDA AND WESTERN SHONA

4.1 INTRODUCTION

Venda's classification as a member of the Bantu language family is a generally accepted fact which does not require any discussion or motivation here.

What does need reconsideration is the assumption that it belongs to the South-Eastern zone of this family -- a zone which, according to C. M. Doke (1954, 23), consists of Venda, Tsonga, Nguni, Sotho and Inhambane.

The question is whether Venda should be classified here at all, or whether grouping it with Shona might not be a more plausible classification.

Statements made by linguists at a very early stage in the study of the Bantu language situation pointed towards this affinity of Venda with Shona as is clear from the following quotation

This tribe, which is known to the Basuto as Batsuetla and is also often called Baramapulana or Makhato's tribe, is classed

by Theal in his history as akin to the Basuto. Recent researches have shown that this assumption is incorrect as regards the tribe in general, which is now believed to belong to a separate division of the Bantu family, ...

(The Native Tribes of the Transvaal 1905,59)

Thus the anonymous author of this article was aware as early as 1905 of the fact that Venda is a language in its own right and that it is not to be linked too closely with Sotho.

The relationship that Venda has with Shona to its north, was also observed and recorded in early works of linguists. Compare Doke who says

In Venda, for instance, a language owing much of its parentage to Shona, velarization in the case of bilabial consonants occurs.

(Doke 1931b, par 139)

A few years later Jan Warmelo writes in support of this

The people of the *Venda* division form a culture complex of exceptional homogeneity. They are, it is true, neither very numerous (ca 160,000 souls) nor much scattered, and occupy a relatively small country, and this may partly account for it. They form a division by themselves by virtue of several characteristics. Their language is distinct from the Sotho and Tonga of their neighbours, though its affinities are clearly with Sotho; at the same time it is also reminiscent of Karanga.

(Warmelo 1935, 117)

Christopher Ehret, together with seven contributors, made a most valuable contribution towards a better understanding of the problem of the classification of Venda. They studied six Bantu languages (language groups) Nguni, Sotho, Tsonga, Venda, Chopi and Shona. They worked with a 90-word core vocabulary and inter alia found that

Of the nouns in the 90-word core vocabulary list used here, Venda shares ten unique word-innovations with other Southeast-Bantu languages and only two apparent innovations with Shona. The other several words which Venda shares with Shona, but not with Southeast languages, are all common retentions of earlier Bantu words or, in one case, a clear Shona loanword in Venda.
(Ehret 1972, 12)

These contributors with Ehret as editor, also gave special attention to non-Bantu Khoisan influence on the said languages. They came to the following conclusion about Venda

For Venda over the period since its differentiation out of proto-Southeast-Bantu, no case can yet be made for its having been influenced by non-Bantu speech. Imbedded between peoples of the earlier proto-Southeast dialect network on three sides and by Shona-speakers on the fourth side, Venda-speakers may well have faced social pressure primarily from their Bantu neighbors. In particular the number of possible word-borrowings from Shona and of Shona-influenced retentions of earlier Bantu words in Venda point to the special importance of people from north of the Limpopo River in the evolution of Venda-speaking communities. An especially high cognate count between North Sotho and Venda suggests that Sotho people from the south may similarly have influenced Venda history, though perhaps not so strongly.
(Ehret 1972, 19)

The conclusions to which the above contributors came is directly in line with the findings of research done at the same time, but quite independently from their work, by Rosalie Jones-Phillipson (1972). She applied Guthrie's approach to compare Zezuru and Manyika (two Shona clusters geographically separated from Venda by Karanga and some Western Shona dialects); Tswana and Southern Sotho (two Sotho clusters); Zulu and Xhosa (two Nguni clusters) with Venda as reference language. She concluded that

In the study as a whole it has been demonstrated that Venda, while showing notable affinities with the Sotho group in many respects and with the Shona group in others, should continue to be classified as a group on its own within Zone S.
(Jones-Phillipson 1972, 205)

Compare the first quotation of this paragraph for a very similar statement regarding the status of Venda as an independent language - a quotation from a source of as early as 1905 and based on a completely different approach.

To summarise the linguistic evidence regarding the position of Venda as depicted by the above authors the following two points are outstanding:

- (a) Venda cannot, as is sometimes done, be seen as a 'bridge' language or, as Ehret et al (1972: 12) put it:

a connecting link in a wider dialect network including both Shona and Southeast-Bantu ...

- (b) The Bantu languages in the eastern part of southern Africa south of the Zambezi clearly form two major groups with Shona standing apart from Southeast-Bantu and the position of Venda in this dual division up to the present has been uncertain.

Apart from the abundance of linguistic evidence ethnological classifications also often attach the Venda to the Shona. Archaeological evidence, which plays a more and more important part in the study of movements of peoples and their relationship with others, can also contribute as stated by Ehret et al

The role of Shona settlement in Venda-speaking lands south of the Limpopo seems evident in archeology and for more recent periods is clearly attested in Venda traditions.
(Ehret 1972, 12)

Even Venda traditions, as may be gathered from the above quotation, reflect the close contact that must have existed between Venda and Shona.

4.2 BRIEF HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE VENDA

4.2.1 The name of the people

The name by which these people are known today, is *Venda* (with dental *ḍ* in Venda orthography). The same stem, only with different class prefixes is also used to indicate the culture, language and country of the people, viz

Muvenda (*Vhavenda*) 'a Venda person'
Luvenda 'the Venda language'
Tshivanḍa 'the Venda culture and language'
(Li)Venda 'the country of the Venda'

This pronunciation seems to be of more recent origin, because all sources of an earlier origin give the name as *Vesha* (cf Suppl, Vol I, par 1.3, 2nd line of first stanza where Kumile also uses this name), or some version of it. The best source to consult for the various versions is Mahumane's Account of 1730 and Liesegang's annotations of the same. (Compare Liesegang 1977, 163-4, 175). He gives the following spellings:

Vetaha (a Venda spelling)
Veca (old Union Shona spelling)
Vesha
Fesa or *Beja* (Portuguese spelling)

There are even more variations in the spelling of the name, but they are all easy to recognize, except perhaps forms like *Beessa* and *Dzweda* (cf Liesegang 1977, 174-5). Junod (1927, 138) was of

the opinion that the word *Bvesha* could be a Thonga corruption of Venda.

But as for the possible origin and meaning of the word, there are almost as many speculations as spellings of the word. None of them are to my opinion satisfactory, however, and the best is to leave it at what Liesegang has to say about it

, "Bessa" may not be derived from the name of a king. Its original meaning remains obscure.

(Liesegang 1977, 174)

Another name by which the Venda were known, was *Genzi*. The various sources have a fairly uniform spelling of this word. The different speculations about the origin of the word all seem to point towards one concept; the name by which the circumcized referred to the uncircumcized. The different versions all have this as an underlying meaning — even the Swahili version of *Shanzi* by which the Swahili refer to all non-Swahili between Tanzania and Rukwa has such a connotation in its meaning of uncivilized, primitive native (cf Sicard 1952a, 3-4).

It is therefore quite a plausible assumption that the circumcized Lemba who lived among the Venda from a time long before their migration to their present country, would have referred to the 'heathen' Venda by this name. But the word having this meaning, could according to Von Sicard (1952a, 3) also be used to refer to Europeans etc. He quotes various sources in support of this. It seems that the Lemba referred to all non-Lemba people by this name to distinguish themselves from such people.

Von Sicard (1952a, 112) speculates that the name originally derives from *Zendj* — a name given by the Arabs for the Ethiopians or Abyssinians, which in its turn derives from what the Arab geographers

called the interior of Ethiopia, viz *Zinghi*. The name corresponds with Van Warmelo's (1966, 282) versions of *Zanġ*, *Zinj*, and the meaning that he suggests for it also has a geographical connotation. He says it refers to the East Coast of Africa. It seems to be a certainty that this meaning was attached to the word at a later stage by the early Arab geographers, and that its original meaning has some reference to 'black'. About this Wansbrough (1970, 99) says

... it would be hazardous to guess at the meaning of *Zanj*. One might tentatively propose the following: many, but by no means all, of the early recruits to the movement were black and were slaves.

He also says (page 97) that the Arabic word *zanj* (*zinj*) is almost certainly an ethnic designation. Black slaves with this name were responsible for a revolt in lower Iraq more than a century before the appearance of the word in writings of the Arab geographers.

Hunwich (1970) refers to other groups of people known by the name *zanj*. He says that it is clear that these groups who were found in the area of the Niger buckle in West Africa, had nothing to do with the *zanj* of the East African coast mentioned by Arab geographers. These *zanj*, he says, is a servile caste or castes (Hunwich 1970, 103).

Whatever the origin of the word *Senzi* may be, by the time it was used by the Lemba with reference to the Venda, they obviously already had migrated south, but not yet as far south as the present country of the Venda.

4.2.2 Venda origins

Should one try to probe into the origins of the Venda, it must be done against the background of the origins and migrations of the whole Bantu language family of which Venda forms a part.

This language family consists of languages which all are related to a proto-Bantu language which originally developed in the Congo region south of the Rain Forest. Huffman (1969, 3) quotes this as a widely accepted theory based on the linguistic work of people like Greenberg, Guthrie and Murdock in support of his own archaeological findings regarding certain Iron Age cultures in Sub-Saharan Africa. Of these migrations and expansions Huffman says

Of all the great cultural movements in the world, the Bantu migration is one of the most striking and impressive. The close similarities among widely separated Bantu languages have interested scholars for many years.

(Huffman 1969, 3)

Another archaeologist, D W Phillipson, in a more recent publication says about this cultural movement

To deal first with the archaeological evidence, from about 300 BC to AD 600 a major change took place in the greater part of Africa lying between the Equator and the Vaal River. The change was marked by the appearance of a characteristic type of pottery ...

(Phillipson 1977, 106)

His research on the Early Iron Age in Sub-Saharan Africa brought him to the following conclusion

We can therefore see what a marked degree of similarity there is between the archaeological sequence of the Iron Age in subequatorial Africa and the linguistic evidence for the

spread and development of the Bantu languages and their speakers.

(Phillipson 1977, 114)

Huffman, in the publication mentioned above, maintains that closer attention must be paid by linguists to the work done by other disciplines like archaeology. In this regard he says

Other sources of information — especially archaeological data — are merely adjusted until they fit the already set linguistic interpretations.

(Huffman 1969, 3)

Phillipson manages in a very satisfactory way to co-ordinate the findings of the two disciplines, linguistics and archaeology, and to incorporate his data in two maps which he drew of the 'pre-Bantu' and 'proto-Bantu' expansions (Phillipson 1977, 109).

As it is impossible to correlate the migrations of an individual language like Venda with archaeological evidence, it must be done within the framework of the language family as such. On the other hand archaeological evidence can be applied with great success in determining the relationships of languages like Venda and, for example, Western Shona. This is an aspect which needs further research by linguists. One has to agree with Huffman when he says

too little attention has been devoted to the evidence behind the assumptions scholars commonly make about the Bantu and early Iron Age archaeological remains.

(Huffman 1969, 3)

The Venda traditions are in agreement with the theory about their origin being somewhere in the Congo. These traditions are very vague about the exact migratory route however.

The picture becomes clearer only from the point where they are reported to have stayed at a large city, known as Matongoni in the Venda traditions and in written sources referred to as Dhlodhlo.

The remains of the ruins of this city are at a site about 67 kilometres to the north-east of Bulawayo in Zimbabwe (Sicard 1952a, 10).

In the traditions about the history of the Venda's immigration into Venda as recorded by Van Warmelo (1945, 9) reference is also made to the fact that the Venda, on their journey to the south, dwelt at Bulawayo in the Kalanga country.

There is no reference to the possible time of their arrival at this site. It is quite reasonable to conclude that they stayed here for a considerable time if one takes into account the influence that Western Shona had on the language.

At Dhlodhlo the Lemba already stayed with the Venda. Whether they met here or whether they came down together from the north, is not clear. If they did come down together, then it can be concluded that the Venda also came south via Sena where the Shona crossed the Zambezi.

There are arguments which can be raised against such an assumption. In the first instance there is the Venda tradition which says that the Venda originated from somewhere in the Congo. This would mean that they would have followed a more westerly route than the Shona who originated from the region west of the Great Lakes.

This reference to a westerly route must only be evaluated against the background of the different routes that the Venda and Western Shona followed from the point where they crossed the Zambezi. It

need not be seen as an equivalent of Phillipson's (1977, 109) 'two-stream phenomenon' -- an eastern and a western stream of Bantu migration.

Furthermore there is the language which was spoken by the Lemba. As was argued in par 2.2.5.1, the Lemba were the result of the merging of at least three separate groups and that -- even if they had had their own language originally -- they adopted the language of the people amongst whom they stayed. This language was a form of the Western Shona cluster and was spoken by the Lemba who left Dhlo dhlo and came further south with the Venda to cross the Limpopo. It is therefore obvious that the Lemba stayed among the Western Shona peoples for a very long time after they left Sena and that they did not easily switch over to Venda. This happened only in the last century, because the oldest Lemba can still today remember a lot about the language their forbears spoke.

If the Venda merged with the Shona and Lemba from the time they left Sena for the south, it can be taken for granted that the Shona traditions would have made mention of this. Furthermore the Lemba who were found with the Venda at Dhlo dhlo, would then quite obviously not have spoken a form of Western Shona, because they would have been equally long in contact with the Venda. This again would have resulted in their adoption of Venda as their language right from the start.

All these arguments clearly point to a more westerly migratory route for the Venda. If this is accepted then there are two possibilities as to the time of their arrival at Dhlo dhlo. It could have been in very ancient times before the arrival of the Western Shona and Lemba or after the arrival of these peoples. The last is more plausible because if the Venda stayed there for a very long period, they would have occupied a more extensive area and would

have influenced the Western Shona strongly — both culturally and linguistically.

This is where archaeological evidence can be of great help to ascertain what the situation was.

According to Venda tradition they worshipped their 'High God' Mwali who was God-King to them at Dhlodhlo (Matongoni) (cf Suppl, Vol II, CH 4, note 19 for similar parallelisms with the Jewish history).

They left this place after a disaster struck the city — presumably a fire. The son of the God-King Mwali, Tshilume, led them away under the sacred protection of the Holy Drum (Ngoma Lungundu) which formed part of their Mwali-worship.

Von Sicard (1952a, 10-36) gives a very exhaustive and beautiful description of the parallelism of the history of Ngoma Lungundu of the Venda with the Jewish Arc of the Covenant, dividing it under the Sacred Mountain (Dhlodhlo); the exodus and the entrance into the promised land — even Tshilume who led them on their way died before he could cross the Limpopo (as Moses did before he could cross the River Jordan). He climbed on top of a mountain called Mubvumela and never more returned (Moses and Mount Nebo) (Sicard 1952a, 24; Warmelo 1940, 22).

Tshilume did, however, not guide his people on a straight route to the Limpopo. They moved via Chibi's (Tshivhi in Venda) country, where they stayed for about three years. Here they were in close contact with the Karanga (whence the many borrowings from Karanga).

From Chibi's country the Venda moved via Buxwa (Vhuxwa in Venda) in the present Belingwe (Mbelengwa) district.

Concerning the date of this final move to their present region, there is considerable difference of opinion. It ranges from the end of the 17th century to the end of the 18th.

Von Sicard maintains that this last move of the Venda coincided with the drought catastrophe during Baswi's reign which caused the Shoko-Mbire to leave Mangwa (Great Zimbabwe) for the west in the direction of Buxwa. Here conflict developed between Mutinhima I and Dlembeu, which resulted in the last mentioned to cross the Limpopo and found the Venda-Kingdom. This, he says, occurred around 1790 (Sicard 1952a, 80).

There is support for Von Sicard's opinion about the name Dlembeu, the leader of the Venda/Senzi who led them across the Limpopo. This leader was in Venda also known by the name Dimbanyika (Warmelo 1940, 33-40; 74), but even Van Warmelo (1945, 6) raised a different view only five years later when he gave in his summary of the main line of Venda royalty the name of Dimbanyika as the father of Ndyambeu. (His spelling reminds one of a Western Shona noun structure and pronunciation, because the class prefix for cl 1 in part of this cluster is the homorganic nasal N.)

It was, however, noted before that the name *Dlambeu* through the years obtained a mythical connotation, causing it to crop up in the traditions of many of the southeastern tribes.

There is no support to be found in other sources -- both old and new, about the date that Von Sicard suggests of plus minus 1790-1800. In *Native Tribes* (1905, 59) it is maintained that the crossing to the south of the Limpopo took place about 1700 AD. Theal (1964, 186-88) agrees with this and so does Gründler as quoted by Liesegang (Liesegang 1977, 164).

Liesegang, apart from this quotation, refers to the most valuable account of Mahumane dated 1730, as well as other Dutch records. This account is based on Mahumane's journeys to the northeastern Transvaal, the territory of a Venda kingdom that already existed at that time. He says about this kingdom

This makes Mahumane's account and other data from the Dutch records on Delagoa Bay particularly valuable since they show that there was a relatively large Venda Polity before the Pedi kingdom and other Sotho-Tswana states started to expand.
(Liesegang 1977, 173)

The date of the earliest arrival of the Venda to the south of the Limpopo must therefore be pushed back to well before the beginning of the 18th century if one accepts the dates mentioned in the early Dutch reports as referred to by Liesegang, and there is no reason to question these dates. With a well established kingdom functioning in 1727/8 it is obvious that the people concerned must by then have been in the region for some time. The year 1800 as suggested by Von Sicard is too recent and this date would obviously not have been put forward by him, had he had access to the sources made accessible by Liesegang in 1977.

The Venda, or Senzi as they were also called, on their arrival in the country south of the Limpopo, found that other Bantu-speaking peoples who arrived there long before them, had already settled in the country in which they intended to stay.

The Lembethu and Twamamba of the Nzhelele (Venda spelling) Valley were easily overcome.

The Twamamba fled west and the Lembethu towards Mamutele in the east together with some of the Twamamba where remnants of them are still living.

Another people whom they encountered were the Ngoni who arrived in the region as early as 1550 according to Von Sicard (1952a, 108). This is a possible date because as was stated in par 2.2.5.2, the Lembethu, who arrived south of the Limpopo before the Ngoni, crossed the Zambezi as early as the 13th century. This means that they could have crossed the Limpopo before 1550.

4.3 GEOGRAPHICAL CONTACT OF VENDA WITH SHONA DIALECTS

The geographical spreading of Venda as it is at present, results in its contact with the following Shona dialects:

Within Venda there are remnants of at least three dialects belonging to the Western Shona cluster. They are Lemba, Lembethu and Twamamba. Of these three Venda had the longest direct contact with Lemba, because they migrated together from Matongoni/DhloDhlo as stated in the previous chapter. Lembethu again, is the only one of the three which is still used on a limited scale in the remote Mutele region in the north-east of Venda.

To the north of the Limpopo where Venda is still spoken, mainly in the Beitbridge district of Zimbabwe, there is also daily contact with Shona dialects.

In the second part of the interim report on the 1969 Population Census of the then Rhodesian Government, in table 16 the number of Vendas living in Matabeleland South (i.e. Beitbridge district) appears as 35 000, with another 2 730 being spread over other areas within Zimbabwe — quite a formidable percentage of the total Venda population.

A preliminary survey of the Venda spoken in this region shows that in spite of very little contact between the two groups north and south of the Limpopo, the linguistic differences are remarkably few. So the Venda of chief Siwoka's country at the Umzingwane River to the north-west of Beitbridge prefer for example the velar nasal compound *ng* [ŋg] instead of the palatal *ny* [ɲ] in de-verbative nouns of class 10 derived from vowel verb stems. Compare:

luambo (lu+amb+o) 'language' with plural
nyambo (in Venda south of the Limpopo)
ngambo (in Venda of Siwoka's country)

These Venda are mainly remnants of those people who followed chief Mphefu to the north in 1898 after a clash with the Afrikaners. Not all Venda in Zimbabwe are descendants of those people who returned north. There are also descendants of those Venda who never crossed the Limpopo to the south, but who stayed behind, when the bulk of the population left for the south.

Together these Venda-speakers have stood up remarkably well to influence from without on their language. They are up to the present in daily contact with the Pfumbi of the Malungudze area and with Lombethu further to the east with the overlap more or less at Chituripani.

Their present contact with the Karanga cluster is very limited and of no importance.

These Venda share the fate of their Western Shona neighbours in falling within the region where Ndebele is the medium of instruction at school. This and the fact that there is almost nothing available in the line of Venda books, results in a new generation of Venda who are forced by circumstances to make use of a Bantu language foreign to them and at the cost of their own language.

To conclude one may assume that the situation has not changed to any great extent since Van Warmelo (1945, 5) 35 years ago found that

The time has not yet arrived for a complete history of all the Venda tribes, for sufficiently reliable material is not available.

The references to oral traditions in the foregoing section do not imply that the data collected from them are considered to be authoritative. They are sometimes highly speculative and they can only be of value when used together with data from other fields of study like linguistics and archaeology.

This very brief reference to the Venda history is sufficient for the purpose of this study, which, in the first instance, is of a linguistic nature. The historical background must only serve as source for achieving guide lines in the linguistic research for the directions to be taken.

4.4 LINGUISTIC RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN VENDA AND (WESTERN) SHONA

In the previous chapter where the characteristics of Western Shona were discussed, several references were made to features which are shared by Venda and Western Shona as opposed to other Shona dialect clusters.

What follows here is a brief reference to such Western Shona/Venda correspondances which should serve as a point of departure for a fully-fledged survey aimed at a comparison of Venda with the various Shona clusters.

4.4.1 Sound systems

The well developed sound systems of Venda and Shona in general, is a most striking phonological feature when comparing these systems with those of the Sotho languages to the south of Venda. An underlying reason for this difference may, however, be found on the diachronic level. Sotho retained the number of vowel phonemes of the Ur-/Proto-Bantu language, whereas in Venda and Shona the seven original vowel phonemes were reduced to five with the two super close vowels $*\acute{e}$ and $*\acute{u}$ shifting to i and u . In Sotho where this distinction was retained, the vowels $*\acute{e}$ and $*\acute{u}$ did not cause any drastic change in the preceding consonants as was the case in Venda and Shona.

The result of this is a well developed vowel system with a less developed consonant system in Sotho while the situation is exactly the opposite in Venda and Shona.

Another reason for this is the velarized sounds which these languages have in common (Compare Doke 1954, 155 & 206.)

There are also the labio-alveolar 'whistling' fricatives $[ɸ]$ and $[ɺ]$ which these languages have in common.

In two instances Venda differs from Central Shona while it corresponds with Western Shona:

- (a) Venda and Western Shona do not make use of 'implosive' consonants (bilabial $[ɓ]$ and alveolar $[ɗ]$) as does Central Shona. Van Warmelo (1966, 275) refers to a third implosive, the velar $[ɠ]$, which he says, is shared by (Central) Shona and Lamba together with the other two sounds mentioned above.

The velar implosive does not occur in Shona, however, and neither did I observe any implosive in the speech of the Lamba informant Tshidada.

- (b) Venda and Western Shona (though not all dialects) share the use of aspirated plosives as opposed to Central Shona where these do not occur.

4.4.2 Morphophonological features

The sound changes *labialization* (par 3.2.2.2 above), *vocalization* (par 3.2.2.3) and *velarization* (par 3.2.2.4) have all been discussed in the previous chapter. Reference was made to Venda's close relationship with the Shona clusters in these instances.

As was mentioned in par 3.2.2.3, for example, it is obvious from a feature like vocalization, that these changes have not developed as consistently in Venda as in Shona. In the case of velarization this is reflected also by the much more extensive range of velarized sounds in Shona. This may be an argument in support of the view that Venda has developed these features only during its long and continuous contact with Shona — and then mainly with Western Shona when taking into consideration the type of labialization that occurs in Venda and Western Shona, but not in Central Shona.

4.4.3 Morphological correspondences

4.4.3.1 *The noun class systems*

In par 3.3.1 above the noun class systems of Venda and Shona were discussed in detail, also with reference to specific correspondences between Venda and Western Shona.

In the Bantu languages as a whole, the system of noun classes with its class prefixes is under constant pressure for change. The content of the classes has undergone considerable change over the years and with that also the classes themselves have developed in the direction of a decrease in the number of prefixes. This is a productive process which is also manifest in other languages. A good example of this is the prefix of cl 11 which has fallen into disuse in most of the Sotho dialects and which in the Nguni languages like Xhosa is also following the same pattern. It is only the awareness of the written form, where the prefix is still retained, which retards this process.

It is important that in such an instance the Western Shona cluster corresponds in so many respects with Venda. As was mentioned in the said paragraph it is remarkable that in all the instances where Western Shona shows differences from Central Shona with regard to its noun class system, it corresponds exactly with Venda.

This is a very clear indication of closer contact between Venda and Western Shona in opposition to Central Shona - at least in more recent years. Class 20 (ku-) is perhaps the best example. It does not occur in Central Shona, whereas Venda and Western Shona not only have the same form, but in both languages its content has undergone the same semantic change - from augmentative/derogative to diminutive. An example of the tendency to reduce the number of noun classes is found with class 10 where the *dsi-* of the prefix has become redundant in Central Shona, whereas in Venda and Western Shona its use has become optional, showing that it is on its way out as in Central Shona.

In Venda the process of the class prefixes becoming redundant has gone further regarding the locative classes where Venda has already introduced a locative suffixal formative with only very little left

of the locative class prefixes and their concords. For all three locative classes only the concords of class 17 **ka-* are used (cf Ziervogel 1971, par 5.2; 7.10), e.g.

shasi ha muri 'under the tree' (*shasi* - cl 16; *ha-* poss conc cl 17)

murau ha muri 'behind the tree' (*murau* - cl 18)

In the Shona languages the development has not yet reached the stage where the class prefixes of the locative are superceded by the suffix **-ni*. Here the prefixes are regular features, but whereas Central Shona uses either the possessive concord of the locative class or of the original noun (cf Ziervogel 1971, par 5.3), Western Shona no longer uses the concord of the locative classes. This applies only with those locatives which are derived from nouns which belong to other classes, in which instance the locative prefixes are preprefixes (cf Ziervogel 1971, par 1.2).

4.4.3.2 *The demonstrative pronoun*

The form of this pronoun provides one of the most striking examples of the close relationship that exists between Venda and Shona. Compare par 3.3.7 above.

The four basic forms do not only have the same structure (with the only difference the suffix *-la* of Venda as equivalent of *-ya* in Shona), but each also has four degrees of emphasis (cf Doke 1954, 164 & 216). These unique forms are the result of reduplication and/or combining the absolute pronoun with the demonstrative.

The difference in the grouping of the various forms derives from a difference of opinion about the meaning of these forms. It

seems that these differences are unnecessary because there is a closer relationship between the meanings of the forms of the two languages than accepted hitherto.

The division suggested by Fortune (1955, par 311-314) of two basic positions and two precised positions may be found to be the most plausible, not only for Shona, but also for Venda.

The structure of the various forms also point towards such a division - the two basic forms have the root (basic subject concord) as final syllable and the two 'precised' forms as initial syllable with two suffixal formatives as final syllable, e.g.

idzi/idzo (basic positions)

dzino/dziya, dziḽa (precised positions)

4.4.3.3 *The qualificative*

(i) the adjective

This is yet another feature of the morphology which links Venda very closely with Shona. In both languages the structure of the adjective is identical with that of the noun; the only difference from the noun being the specialized use of the adjective with its capacity to qualify other substantives.

This is a very clear distinction from the other southeastern languages where a relative formative forms part of the adjective concord.

In par 3.4 above mention was made of the two adjective stems [-ḽi] and [-ḽuḽa] which Venda and Western Shona have in common as opposed to Central Shona.

(ii) the relative construction

This qualificative deserves special attention because it throws light on the complicated composition of Venda. There are no less than three variants which are identical in meaning, though different in form.

The first form is typical of Venda alone. It consists of a relative pronoun as initial formative followed by a relative concord, which always contains a relative *-a*, plus a verb stem, e g

dzine dza nwa 'which drink' (with *dzine* the relat pron present)
dze dza nwa 'which drank' (with perfect relat pron *dze*)

The relative pronoun has both a present tense form and a perfect form (cf Ziervogel 1972, par 28.3-4; 29.1-2).

The second form contains a suffixal formative *-ho* which points towards influence of the Sotho languages. It consists of a relative concord (present/future or perfect form of subject concord without a relative *-a*) plus verb stem plus suffixal formative *-ho* (cf Ziervogel 1972, par 28.2), e g

dzi nuaho 'which drink'
dzo nuaho 'which drank'

The third form illustrates the influence of Shona on Venda. It makes use of an infixal formative *-no-* which follows the concord and precedes the verb stem, e g

dzi no nwa 'which drink'
dzi no do nwa 'which will drink'

There is no perfect form in this instance, which is a further argument in favour of the assumption that it derives from Shona where the *-no-* is basically a present tense marker in the conjugation of the verb. In Central Shona it only appears in the present tense, but in Western Shona it occurs in the future form as well. In Shona verbal forms may be used as qualifying words (relatives) without any change in the form of the verb — only the tone patterns will differ.

Here again the fact that the future form can be used in Venda and Western Shona only, points towards the closer relationship between them. This form was not recognised in previous sources.

It is the first form with the relative pronoun which supports the statement, referred to in par 4.1 above, that Venda is a group on its own, because this form has no parallel in the languages surrounding Venda. The relative construction with its variant forms therefore shows that though Venda might have been influenced heavily by languages like Shona and Sotho, it contains a basic Venda core.

4.4.3.4 *The verb*

In par 3.3.12 above several verbal formatives were discussed and extensive references to Venda were included in this discussion. A repetition of these is superfluous.

In most of the instances it became clear that Venda and Western Shona have also at this level more in common than Venda and Central Shona. Compare for example, the various negative formatives mentioned in par 3.3.12.3 or the formative *-ni* of the imperative positive (cf par 3.3.12.6).

There are, however, other aspects of the verb which did not come to the fore in the previous chapter because the focus there was on the characteristics of Western Shona.

One such feature is the form of the perfect tense of the verb. In this respect Venda and Shona very clearly distinguish themselves from the other southeastern languages.

Whereas language groups like Nguni and Sotho make use of a suffixal perfect formative *-ile* in the positive, Venda and Shona leave the verb stem unchanged and make use of a perfect marker which forms part of the perfect concord. In Venda this perfect marker is *-o* and its Shona equivalent is *-a*. Compare:

Venda: *ndo lina* 'I ploughed'
 W Sh: *ndalima* 'I ploughed'

When compared with a Nguni language like Xhosa with the form

ndilimile 'I ploughed'

this basic difference speaks for itself.

In the last instance the many auxiliary verbs which are derived from verb stems with the infinitive prefix suffixed to them forming a contraction of stem plus prefix, are typical of Venda and Shona. What is even more striking is that such auxiliary forms have the capacity to be used together, sometimes a whole string of them.

Compare the following sources for examples:

Ziervogel 1972, par 50.1 for Venda; Fortune 1955, par 744-768, for Central Shona; Wentzel 1961, 224 and Fortune (unpublished lecture notes on Kalanga (cont) p 5) for Western Shona.

From the above it is clear that Venda, though it is a language in its own right, has much in common with the Shona dialects to its north - common features which call for further research.

There is one aspect which had to be left out of this discussion because of lack of space but which will be of very great assistance in a detailed comparison, and that is *Tone*. The tonal structures will throw further light on Venda's affinities with Shona and then especially with Western Shona. This asks for specialized research and cannot be treated here.

Chapter 5

CONCLUSIONS

At the time that this research programme was launched, some of the dialects spoken directly to the north of Venda, were yet to be identified and classified.

It has now become clear that immediately to the north of Venda the dialects which were unidentified up to now and which could have influenced Venda linguistically, all belong to the Shona language group of the South-Central zone of the Bantu language family. More specifically they belong to the Western Shona dialect cluster of this language group.

Venda did not only have its major contact with dialects of this cluster of the Shona group in the distant past in what is now known as Zimbabwe, but this contact was continued through the years.

This situation of continued contact was the result of the fact that the Venda people on their arrival in Venda, met others of the Western Shona cluster whom they conquered and who then stayed on among them. These vanquished people were of Lembethu and Twamamba stock and though defeated the influence of their Western Shona dialects on the language of their conquerers must have remained a factor.

This influence might have been even greater was it not for the tendency to disparage and ridicule the language of these vanquished people.

However there was a third dialect of this cluster, namely Lemba, which was not subject to the treatment which was the destiny of the other dialects mentioned above. The Lemba people migrated with the Venda people to the south. They were regarded a 'priestly' people and were treated with great respect. For them and their language there was no disparagement, but they never formed larger units. They were merely family units spread all over Venda. This situation made it impossible for them to save their language from being replaced by Venda.

From the earliest research done on Venda, the relationship between Venda and Shona was observed by linguists. They were, however, not aware of the fact that even among the Venda dialects were spoken which were of Shona origin, dialects which must in those early years still have been spoken more generally than is the case today.

Instead these people looked abroad to Karanga for the Venda link with Shona. Here it was not merely a matter of ignorance, however. The assumption was based on two factors: It was a well-known fact, according to Venda traditions, that the Venda on their way to the south did stay for some time among the Karanga in Chibi's country south of Fort Victoria. Furthermore no clear distinction was ever made by these early linguists between Karanga and Kalanga. They obviously did not realize that Kalanga was the name of the most prominent Western Shona dialect, but misinterpreted it to be the same as the name Karanga. The Venda and Shona peoples, on the other hand, would have been aware of this distinction although their pronunciation of the two names would not necessarily have been clear to the linguists from outside the sphere of these languages.

Hence this misunderstanding continued to exist. Although linguists like N J van Warmelo realized that all foreign influence was not to be ascribed to Karanga, they could not determine what the origin of this foreign influence was. They could not imagine that the source of this influence had to be looked for much nearer to Venda. As was seen the influence can be ascribed to dialects spoken among the Venda and to other dialects geographically much closer to Venda than the far away Karanga.

Neither did these linguists take into account the fact that the Venda on their southward migratory route passed through Kalanga country to the north-west of Zimbabwe and stayed over in that country for a much longer period than during their brief stay in Karanga country.

Archaeological findings in the region of the early Kalanga near the present Bulawayo have pointed to such a relationship between Venda and Western Shona even before linguists were aware of it.

The above statement shows how linguistic findings may be substantiated by information from other disciplines like archaeology and history, that is in the case of the Bantu languages traditional history.

The linguist should, however, guard against relying too heavily on other disciplines in drawing conclusions from them which cannot also be accounted for linguistically.

Where reference in this thesis was made to specific dates for possible migrations of tribes, it is not implied that such references are justifiable linguistically. They are merely drawn from publications of historians as background information in instances where linguistic evidence is lacking completely. For Ngoni, the language

of a people who preceded the Venda south of the Limpopo, no linguistic evidence is, for example, available and though possible dates regarding their migration to the south may be obtained from historical sources, such dates cannot be verified from linguistic sources and they must be regarded as highly speculative. For the same reason it is impossible to prove that the Ngoni were in the Venda country before tribes like the Lembethu or, on the other hand, that the Lembethu were there first.

Finally it is clear that Venda, in spite of being heavily influenced by Shona on the one hand and Sotho on the other, is a language which stands on its own. It contains a core of linguistic features which cannot be attributed to the influence of other languages.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abraham, D.F.
1959 The Monomotapa dynasty. *NADA*, No 36, pp 59-84.
- Alpers, Edward A.
1970 Dynasties of the Mutapa-Rozwi complex. *Journal of African History*, XI, 2, pp 203-220.
- Beach, D.N.
1974 Ndebele raiders and Shona power. *Journal of African History*, XV, 4, pp 633-651.
1976 The Mutapa dynasty: a comparison of documentary and traditional evidence. *History in Africa*, vol 3, pp 1-17.
- BFBS.
1953 *Bariberi*. The Holy Bible in Union Shona. London: The British and foreign Bible society.
1957 *Ndebo mbuya yobuho gwe Ndzimu*. (The four Gospels and the Acts in Kalaŋa.) London: The British and foreign Bible society.
1961 *Indebo mbuya yakakwalwa na Marko: Ungano wokutanga*. (St Mark in Nambya.) London: The British and foreign Bible society.
- Chinyandura.
1947 The tribes of Mambo. *NADA*, No 24, pp 73-75.
- Doke, C.M.
1931a *Report on the Unification of the Shona Dialects*. Hertford, England: Printed for the Government of Southern Rhodesia by Stephen Austin & Sons, Ltd.
1931b *A Comparative Study in Shona Phonetics*. Johannesburg: The University of the Witwatersrand Press.
1954 *The Southern Bantu Languages*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.
- Ehret, Christopher.
1972 Outlining Southern African History — a Re-evaluation AD 100-1500 (Ehret contributor and compiler plus seven more contributors.) *Ufahamu*, vol III, pp 9-29.
- Eloff, J.F. & Vaal, J.B., de.
1974 The Vhalembethu of Makahane. *Custos*, May 1974, pp 21-28.

- Fortune, G.
 1949 *Njevo Yeqombe Luvizho and other Lilima texts*. Communications from the School of African Studies (New Series No 21.) University of Cape Town.
- 1955 *An Analytical Grammar of Shona*. Cape Town: Longmans, Green & Co Ltd.
- 1956 A Rozvi Text with Translation and Notes. *NADA*, No 33, pp 67-91.
- 1959 *The Bantu Languages of the Federation — A Preliminary Survey*. Lusaka: The Rhodes Livingstone Institute.
- 1969 75 Years of Writing in Shona. *Zambezia*, vol 1, No 1, pp 55-67.
- Gluckman, Max.
 1942 Prefix concordance in Lozi, Lingua Franca of Barotse-land. *African Studies*, vol 1, pp 105-114.
- Gowlett, D.F.
 1971 A selection of Lozi Folktales and Riddles (Part 1). *African Studies*, vol 30, No 1, pp 15-33.
- Hannan, M. (comp)
 1974 *Standard Shona Dictionary*. 2nd edition. Salisbury: Rhodesia Literature Bureau.
- Hayes, M.E.
 1977 The Nabiya People of Wange. *NADA*, vol 11, No 4, pp 385-393.
- Hole, Hugh Marshall.
 1926 *The making of Rhodesia*. London: Macmillan & Co Ltd.
- Huffman, Thomas N.
 1969 The Early Iron Age and the Spread of the Bantu. *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, 25, pp 3-21 (received May 1969).
- Hunwick, J.O.
 1970 The Term 'Zanj' and its Derivatives in a West African Chronicle, in Dalby David ed, *Language and History in Africa*, pp 102-108. London: Frank Cass & Co Ltd.
- Jones-Phillipson, Rosalie.
 1972 *Affinities between Venda and other Southern Bantu Languages*. University of London: Unpublished Ph D thesis.
- Junod, H.A.
 1972 *The life of a South African tribe*, vol 2, 2nd revised edition. London: McMillan and Co.

- Latham, C.J.K.
 1970 Dzimbadzemabgwe. *NADA*, vol 10, No 2, pp 24-30.
 1972 Munhumutapa: Oral traditions. *NADA*, vol 10, No 4, pp 77-82.
- Lieseegang, Gerhard.
 1977 New light on Venda traditions: Mahumane's account of 1730 (Probenius-Institut, Frankfurt). *History in Africa*, vol 4, pp 163-181.
- Louw, C.S.
 1915 *A manual of the Chikaranga language*. Bulawayo: Philpott & Collins.
- Marodzi.
 1924 The Barozwi (Translated: contributed by F P). *NADA*, No 2, pp 88-91.
- Meinhof, Carl.
 1901 *Das Tši-Vendu: linguistische Studie*. Leipzig: Kreysing. Article also in *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*. (Berlin), vol 55, 1901, pp 607-682
 1948 *Grundzüge einer vergleichenden Grammatik der Bantusprachen*. 2nd ed. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer.
- Meinhof, Carl & Warmelo, N.J., van.
 1932 *Introduction to the phonology of the Bantu Languages*. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer/Ernst Vohsen.
- Mudenge, S.I.
 1974 The role of foreign trade in the Rozwi empire: A re-appraisal. *Journal of African History*, XV, 3, pp 373-391.
- NADA - Southern Rhodesia Native Affairs Department Annual, published annually since 1923. (The name NADA was retained after 1964 when the annual's name changed to The Rhodesia Ministry of Internal Affairs annual.)
- Nanbya Prayer and Hymnbook. *Untebulo wedu*, Gwelo: Mambo Press 1977
- The Native tribes of the Transvaal*. Prepared for the General Staff, War Office. London: Printed for His Majesty's Stationery Office, by Harrison and Sons, St Martin's Lane (no author).
- Phillipson, D.W.
 1977 The spread of the Bantu Language. *Scientific American*, vol 236, 4, pp 106-114.
- Posselt, F.W.T.
 1927 *Survey of the Native tribes of Southern Rhodesia*. Salisbury: Printed for the Government of Southern Rhodesia.

- 1935 *Fact and Fiction*. Bulawayo: Printed by the Rhodesian Printing and Publishing Co Ltd.
- Prayer and Hymnbook
1977 (Cf Nambya Prayer and Hymnbook)
- Sicard, Harald, von.
1948 The origin of some of the tribes in the Belingwe Reserve. *NADA*, No 25, pp 93-104.
1950a The derivation of the name Mashona. *African Studies*, vol 9, No 3, pp 138-143.
1950b The origin of some of the tribes in the Belingwe Reserve (cont from *NADA*, 1948). *NADA*, No 27, pp 7-19.
1950c Die Rembetu. *Anthropos*, Band 45, pp 195-208.
1951 The origin of some of the tribes in the Belingwe Reserve (cont from *NADA*, 1950). *NADA*, No 28, pp 5-25.
1952a *Ngoma lungundu. Eine afrikanische Bundeslade*. Uppsala, Sweden: Studia Ethnographica Upsaliensia, V.
1952b The origin of some of the tribes in the Belingwe Reserve (cont from *NADA*, 1951). *NADA*, No 29, pp 43-64.
1953a Occazim's Razor. *NADA*, No 30, pp 53-56.
1953b The Lemba ancestor Baramina. *African Studies*, vol 11, pp 57-61.
1955 The origin of some of the tribes in the Belingwe Reserve (cont from *NADA*, 1953). *NADA*, No 32, pp 77-92.
1956 Places of ancient occupation in chief Negove's country (cont from *NADA*, No 33). *NADA*, No 34, pp 8-30.
1958 The Vuxwa Hills and their inhabitants. *NADA*, No 35, pp 71-83.
1959 The Jawunda. *NADA*, No 36, pp 103-128.
1967 Das Reich Butwa-Torwa. *Paideuma*, vol 13, pp 180-189.
1971 Chikwarakwara Chauke and his people. *NADA*, vol 10, No 3, pp 97-99.
- Smith, Edwin W.
1956 Sebetwane and the Makololo. *African Studies*, vol 15, No 2, pp 49-74.
- Summers, Roger.
1950 Iron Age cultures in Southern Rhodesia. *South African Journal of Science*, vol 47 (1950/51), pp 95-107.
1970 The Rhodesian Iron Age, in Fage J D & Oliver R A, ed, *Papers in African Prehistory*. Cambridge: At the University Press. pp 157-172.

Theal, George McCall.

- 1901 *Records of south-eastern Africa*. Printed for the Government of the Cape Colony. Volumes II, III, IV, V. London: Printed by William Clowes & Sons, Ltd.
- 1910 *History of South Africa before 1795*, vol iii (full title: *History and Ethnography of Africa south of the Zambezi from settlement of Portuguese at Sofala in Sept 1505 to conquest of Cape Colony by the British in Sept 1795*). London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co, Ltd.
- 1916 *History of South Africa before 1795*, vol i (third edition, Nov 1916). London: Printed by William Clowes & Sons, Ltd.
- 1964 *Ethnography and condition of South Africa before AD 1505*. (Reprint - being volume one of *History of South Africa before 1505*.) Cape Town: C Struik.

Thompson, Louis C.

- 1942 *The Ba-Lemba of Southern Rhodesia*. *NADA*, No 19, pp 76-86.

Wansbrough, John.

- 1970 *Africa and the Arab Geographers*, in Dalby David *ed Language and History in Africa*, pp 89-101. London: Frank Cass & Co Ltd.

Warmelo, N.J., van.

- 1935 *A preliminary survey of the Bantu tribes of South Africa*. *Ethnological publications vol V*. Pretoria: Government Printer.
- 1937 *Tshivenḡa-English dictionary*. *Ethnological publications vol VI*. Pretoria: Government Printer.
- 1940 *The Copper Miners of Musina and the early history of the Zoutpansberg*. *Ethnological publications vol VIII*. Pretoria: Government Printer.
- 1945 *Contributions towards Venda history, religion and tribal ritual; together with three reprinted essays on Venda affinities, Venda political organisation and Venda marriage laws by G.P. Lestrade*. *Ethnological publications, vol 3*. Pretoria: Department of Native Affairs.
- 1966 *Zur Sprache und Herkunft der Lemba*, in Lukas Johannes *ed Neue afrikanische Studien* (Hamburg Beiträge zur Afrikanistik, Band 5), pp 273-283. Hamburg: Deutsches Institut für Afrika-Forschung.
- 1974 *The classification of cultural groups*, in Hammond-Tooke W.D. *ed The Bantu-speaking peoples of Southern Africa*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, pp 56-84.

- Wentzel, P. J.
 1961 *Die fonologie en morfologie van Westelike Shona.* MA thesis, University of Stellenbosch.
 1974 A new practical method of describing sound changes in Venda. *LIMI*, vol 2, No 1, pp 45-65.
- Westphal, E.O.J.
 1946 *A scientific analysis of the Phonetics, Morphology and Syntax of the Venda Language.* MA thesis, University Witwatersrand.
- Wilmot, A.
 1969 *Monomotapa (Rhodesia).* Originally published in 1896, reprinted 1969. New York: Negro Universities Press.
- Wyk, E.B., van.
 1957 An augmentative noun class in Tsonga. *African Studies*, vol 16, No 1, pp 25-36.
- Ziervogel, D.
 1971 The Bantu Locative. *African Studies*, vol 30, pp 371-384
- Ziervogel, D. & Dau, R.S.
 1961 *A handbook of the Venda Language.* Pretoria: Handbook Series University of South Africa.
- Ziervogel, D., Wentzel, P.J. & Makuya, T.N.
 1972 *A handbook of the Venda language, (2nd revised edition).* Pretoria: Manualia 10, University of South Africa.