

Rachéle Gauton
Department of African Languages, University of Pretoria

A Critique of the Dokean approach towards the lexical classes ‘adjective’, ‘relative’ and ‘enumerative’ in Zulu

ABSTRACT

In Doke’s word class classification, so-called ‘adjective’, ‘relative’ and ‘enumerative’ stems can belong to any of **three** different word classes, depending on the way in which they are used. Doke regards only **qualificatively** used adjective, relative and enumerative stems as belonging to the word classes ‘adjective’, ‘relative’ and ‘enumerative’ respectively. When these word stems are used in so-called ‘copulative’/‘attributive’ constructions, they are relegated to the word class ‘copulative’ and are therefore no longer regarded as adjectives, relatives and enumeratives, but as **copulatives**. When ‘adjectives’, ‘relatives’ and ‘enumeratives’ precede their noun antecedents, or when they are used without their antecedents, Doke regards them as ‘qualificative **pronouns**’. What is clear, however, is that all of these categories contain a number of word stems that are found as the complements of (frequently underlying) copulatives, and which can either be used in embedded (relative) constructions, or in ‘copulative’/‘predicative’ constructions as the predicate of the sentence/clause. It is also concluded that the basic function of these forms remains that of **noun modification**, even though they can at times function pronominally.

Keywords:

Dokean approach; enumerative; qualificative; copulative; noun modification.

Introduction

Doke’s distinction between the word classes ‘adjective’, ‘relative’ and ‘enumerative’ as detailed in his *Text-book of Zulu Grammar* in 1927, follows a period in the description of the syntax of the Bantu languages, usually referred to as the so-called ‘classical period’, during which Zulu’s adjectives and relatives were not described in terms of their own distinctive nature, but in terms of principles peculiar to the classical and European languages.¹ With the exception of Döhne

1. The word class classification applied in *Text-book of Zulu Grammar* is based on Doke’s original 1926 classification as set out in *The phonetics of the Zulu language*. In his 1926 classification he does not, however, identify the class ‘enumerative’. This word class is only recognised in his 1927 classification. (Cf. Gauton 1990: 44 for a more detailed discussion). According to Wilkes (1978: 108–109) the so-called ‘classical’ period commenced in 1832 and ended in 1927 with the publication of Doke’s said *Text-book of Zulu Grammar*.

(1857) and Wanger (1917 and 1925) who regard the Zulu adjectives as basically nouns, the majority of those writing during this period view the adjectives in the Nguni languages from a perspective that is conditioned by the position of adjectives in the European and classical languages. Consequently, writers such as Appleyard (1850) and Davis (1872) on Xhosa, and Colenso (1890), Grout (1893), Roberts (1902) and Samuelson (1925) on Zulu, view the word class ‘adjective’ as encompassing, (apart from the so-called ‘adjectives’, ‘relatives’ and ‘enumeratives’), also those words that correlate (semantically) with adjectives in English. Compare the following Zulu examples where the adjectival concepts ‘old’, ‘tired’, ‘dusty’ and ‘rural’ are represented by descriptive clauses formed from verbs in (1a), a noun in (1b) and a locativised noun in (1c) respectively:

- (1) (a) Yizindonga ezifana nemibimbi ebusweni **obugugile** (= *verb*), **obukhathele** (= *verb*).
‘They are dongas like the wrinkles on an **old, tired** face.’
(Nyembezi 1976: 5)
- (b) Isihlalo sekalishi **sasinothuli** (= *descriptive clause with noun preceded by ‘connective na-’ as base*).
‘The seat of the cart was **dusty**.’
(Nyembezi 1976: 28)
- (c) Yingalokho sengizijubele ukuba ngihambele izindawo **ezisemaphandleni** (= *descriptive clause with locativised noun as base*), ngilethe usizo kulabo bantu abaludingayo kakhulu kodwa bengenakuluthola.
‘It is for that reason that I ordered myself to visit the **rural** areas, so that I can bring assistance to those people who need it desperately but will never receive any (assistance).’
(Nyembezi 1976: 7)

Welmers (1973: 249) states the following in this regard:

“Many works on African languages, including some that might be expected to be among the most reliable, show a remarkable lack of linguistic sophistication in their treatment of noun modifiers. The term “adjective” may be applied to any form which is reflected by an English adjective in translation, without reference to its derivation or grammatical function in the language being described.”

As was stated earlier, the ‘classical period’ came to an end with the publication of Doke’s *Text-book of Zulu Grammar* in 1927. This work introduced a new approach to the study of the Bantu languages according to which these languages were described in terms of their own distinctive characteristics. In 1955, Doke’s *Zulu Syntax and Idiom* was published which was ‘[...] intended as a supplementary volume to the *Text-book of Zulu Grammar* [...]’ (Doke 1955: iii).

Doke’s categorisation of the word classes remains influential to this day in the description of the grammar of Zulu. It is therefore important that teachers and students of Zulu take cognisance of those instances where Doke’s word class categorisation is flawed and in need of modification or reinterpretation, as is the case with his lexical classes ‘adjective’ and ‘relative’.²

2. It is not the intention of this article to either provide an in-depth discussion of word class categorisation in Zulu nor to present an alternative word class classification. Issues such as what does and what does not constitute a word in Zulu, the various principles underlying word class categorisation in Zulu, etc. will not be addressed here, as this would form a separate study which does not fall within the ambit of the current article. For more on issues such as these, the reader is referred to Poulos & Msimang (1998: 8–16). This article will focus on inconsistencies in Doke’s treatment of the categories ‘adjective’, ‘relative’

Doke's lexical classes 'adjective' and 'relative'

In *Text-book of Zulu Grammar* Doke distinguishes between adjectives and relatives on the basis of the difference in agreement morphemes between these two classes of words. Although both adjectives and relatives serve to qualify, or modify, the noun, adjectives agree with their noun antecedents by way of 'adjectival concords', whereas relatives agree with their antecedents by way of 'relative concords'. The following is an exhaustive list of Zulu's 'adjectival' stems as identified by Doke (1973⁶: 100–101):

(1)	-bi	'evil, bad'	-hle	'nice, good, beautiful'
	-khulu	'big, great'	-ncane/-nci/-ncinyane	'small, young, a little'
	-de	'long, tall'	-fuphi/-fishane/-fushane/-fusha/-fisha	'short'
	-sha	'new, fresh'	-dala	'old'
	-ningi	'much, many'	-nye	'other, some' ³
	-bili	'two'		
	-thathu	'three'		
	-ne	'four'		
	-hlanu	'five'		
	-ngaki? / -ngaphi?	'how many?'		

The 'relatives' are more numerous than the adjectives and are, in the majority of cases, derived from nouns by omitting the noun's pre-prefix, as illustrated by the following examples:

and 'enumerative' in order to enable learners and teachers confronted with this categorisation (which is inevitable giving the all-pervasive influence of Doke's word class classification in the grammar of Zulu), to deal with it appropriately. For more on alternative classifications of the categories 'adjective', 'relative' and 'enumerative' in Zulu, see Gauton (1994), Posthumus (2000) and Van der Spuy (2001).

3. In terms of Doke's word class classification, this stem ceases to be an adjective and becomes a so-called 'enumerative' when it is used to convey the meaning 'one'. Although the stem *-nye* takes the same prefix whether it is used with the meaning of 'other, some' (= adj.), or 'one' (= enum.), there is a difference in the syntactic behaviour of this stem, correlating with the change in meaning. See the following example in this regard:

- (a) **'One' - 'enumerative':**

Qualificative:

Ngibona umuntu mu-nye.
enum.pref.

'I see one person.'

Predicative:

Lo muntu mu-nye.
enum.pref.

'This person is one.'

- (b) **'Other, some' - 'adjective':**

Qualificative:

Ngibona o-mu-nye umuntu.
r/c-adj.pref.

'I see another person.'

Predicative:

Lo muntu u - ng - o - mu-nye.
s/c - cop.pref.-r/c - adj.pref.

'This person is another (one).'

From example (a) it is clear that the qualificatively used enumerative stem *-nye* 'one', does not appear in an embedded relative clause as is the case with the qualificatively used adjectival stem *-nye* 'another' in (b). The difference between the 'qualificative' and 'predicative' forms of the enumerative in (a) is a tonal one, where the 'predicative' form has a higher tone on the enumerative prefix *mu-* than is the case with the 'qualificative' form. Furthermore, the 'predicative' form of the adjective in (b) is not, as would be expected, *munye* for 'he is another', but *ungomunye*; probably to avoid confusion with *munye* 'he is one'. It does therefore seem as if there are enough (syntactic) grounds for distinguishing between the 'adjectival' and 'enumerative' uses of the stem *-nye*.

(2) Relatives:			Nouns:	
-manzi	‘wet’	<i>derived from:</i>	amanzi	‘water’
-buhlungu	‘painful’	<i>derived from:</i>	ubuhlungu	‘pain’
-lukhuni	‘hard’	<i>derived from:</i>	ukhuni	‘firewood’
-mnyama	‘black’	<i>derived from:</i>	umnyama	‘darkness’

(Doke 1973⁶: 105–106)

The following relatives are regarded as so-called ‘primitive’ or ‘original relatives’, since their origin, (usually from nouns), cannot be as clearly shown as in the case of the majority of relative stems:

(3) -banzi	‘wide’	-duma	‘tasteless’
-ngcono	‘better, recovered from sickness’	-qatha	‘strong’
-qotho	‘honest’ ⁴		

Doke (1973⁶: 105–106) also distinguishes a number of ‘demonstrative relatives’, as well as a few ‘miscellaneous relatives’. These stems are:

(4) Demonstrative relatives:	
-ngaka	‘as big as this’
-ngako	‘as big as that’
-ngakaya	‘as big as yonder’
-nje	‘like this’
-njalo	‘like that’
-njeya	‘like yonder’

Miscellaneous relative stems:

-thile, -thize	‘a certain’
-ngakanani?	‘how much, how many?’
-njani?	‘of what sort?’
-ngakanana, -ngakanyana	‘so small’

Doke’s analysis of the word classes ‘adjective’ and ‘relative’ can be criticised regarding two aspects, namely:

- (a) his contention that only so-called ‘attributive’ (=qualificative) adjectives and relatives belong to the word classes ‘adjective’ and ‘relative’; and
- (b) the rules that he formulates for the derivation of the adjectival and relative concords.

‘Attributive’ / ‘qualificative’ adjectives and relatives in a Dokean framework

Doke’s (1955 and 1973⁶) analysis of the lexical classes ‘adjective’ and ‘relative’ proves unsatisfactory since he regards only **qualificatively** used adjective and relative stems as belonging to the word classes ‘adjective’ and ‘relative’ respectively. When these stems are used ‘predicatively’, they are regarded as belonging to the word class ‘copulative’ and therefore do not function as ‘adjectives’ and ‘relatives’ any longer, but as ‘copulatives’. Doke (1973⁶: 215) states the following in this regard:

4. According to Doke *et al.* (1990: 713) the relative stem *-qotho* ‘genuine, thoroughly experienced, sincere; reliable, strong, of good quality’ is derived from the verb stem *-qotha* ‘grind dry; powder, pulverise; complete work thoroughly; wipe out’. This stem thus forms part of a small group of relative stems that have been derived from verbs. Cf. Gauton (1990: 64–65) in this regard.

“When adjectives, for instance, are used “predicatively”, they become copulatives in Zulu.”

Compare the following example where the highlighted (qualificative) clauses listed under *A* are regarded as belonging to the word classes ‘adjective’ and ‘relative’, while those (‘predicative’) examples listed under *B* belong to the word class ‘copulative’:

<p>(2) A</p> <p>Adjective: izwi elihle ‘a nice voice’</p> <p>Relative: izinkomo ezimhlophe ‘white cattle’</p>	<p>B</p> <p>Copulative: izwi lihle ‘the voice is nice’</p> <p>Copulative: izinkomo zimhlophe ‘the cattle are white’</p>
--	--

(Doke 1973⁶: 221–222)

Clearly such a description is not economical since the same word stem can belong to two different word classes, depending on the way in which it is used. Wilkes (1988: 253) justifiably points out that this would imply that adjectives in Zulu differ from adjectives in other languages, since the Zulu adjective can only be used qualificatively and never ‘predicatively’ without losing its status as an adjective.

In Doke’s classification of adjectives and relatives the ‘attributive / qualificative’ form is thus regarded as underlying the ‘predicative / copulative’ form. Doke (1935: 43) contends that ‘[...] all adjectives are therefore attributive.’ Van Eeden (1956: 150, 167, 395 and 643 et seq.) does not, however, agree with Doke in this regard and argues that the attributive / qualificative use of adjectives is underpinned by the copulative / predicative form. Meinhof (1906: 32) also regards the derivation of the predicative form from the qualificative as being highly unlikely. Writers such as Meinhof (1906), Van Eeden (1956), Jordan (1967), Lanham (1971), Von Staden (1973), Wilkes (1974), Ungerer (1975), Posthumus (1978, 1988 & 2000), Gauton (1990 & 1994) and Van der Spuy (2001) are furthermore in agreement that these so-called ‘attributive’ adjectives and relatives contain an underlying copulative, as is the case with their ‘copulative / predicative’ counterparts. Jordan (1967: 144–145) states the following in this respect:

“In the two major language-groups of Southern Africa (Sotho-Tswana & Nguni), the adjective is used far more extensively in predicative constructions than as a direct substantival qualificative.”

In his analysis of the word classes ‘adjective’, ‘relative’ and ‘copulative’, Doke was clearly bound by his definition of the Zulu word. Doke (1973⁶: 33) states the following with regard to the word in Zulu:

“The complete word [...] contains *one and only one* main stress [...]”

On the basis of this definition of the Zulu word, Doke is forced to regard adjectives and relatives as **complete words**; words that **either** comply with the definition of the word classes ‘adjective’ and ‘relative’ respectively, **or** with the definition of the word class ‘copulative’. Doke therefore fails to recognise these categories as essentially containing a number of word **stems** that can either be **used** qualificatively as part of embedded (relative) structures, or as part of so-called ‘copulative’ or ‘predicative’ structures.⁵ Doke’s ‘copulative’ word class is fundamentally a **usage**

5. The distinction between ‘copulative’/‘predicative’ and ‘qualificative’ can strictly speaking not be applied to Zulu, as all adjectives and relatives in this language are found as complements of (frequently

category, meaning that this word class consists of words from **other** word classes that are all **used** copulatively or predicatively.

Adjectives, relatives and relative clauses in a Dokean framework

Although Doke (1955: 55) takes cognisance of the viewpoint that all qualificatively used adjectives and relatives are basically copulative constructions, he rejects this on the basis of two arguments, as will be discussed in the following paragraphs. Doke (1955: 55) states:

“It has been suggested that even the simple adjective should be similarly considered, as really a relative clause, i.e. that *umuntu omkhulu* really signifies “the person who is big” and not basically “the big person”. That this is a fallacy, however, is demonstrable.”

In the first place qualificative adjectives such as *omkhulu* ‘the big one’ do not conform to what Doke (1955: 5–6) regards as ‘relative clauses’, i.e. clauses that contain a predicate – either a verb or a copulative. According to Doke (1955: 55) relative clauses are formed ‘[...] by substituting the relative concord in each case for the initial predicative concord.[...]’. Since adjectives do not take ‘predicative concords’, but agree with the noun by way of a prefix that is similar to the noun prefix in form, Doke concludes that, although qualificative adjectives have a surface resemblance to qualificative relatives and verbs in relative clauses, there are sound differences between these forms. Compare the following example:

(5)	<i>A: Predicative</i>	<i>B: Qualificative</i>
(a)	<p><i>Adjective:</i> umuntu m - khulu adj.prefix ‘the person is big’</p>	<p>umuntu o - m - khulu r/c-adj.pref. ‘a big person’</p>
(b)	<p><i>Relative:</i> umuntu u-qotho s/c ‘the person is honest’</p>	<p>umuntu o-qotho r/c ‘an honest person’</p>
(c)	<p><i>Verb:</i> umuntu u- hambile s/c ‘the person left’</p>	<p>umuntu o-hambileyo r/c ‘a person that left’</p>

As can be seen from examples (5b) and (5c), the ‘predicative’ form of both the relative and the verb contain a subjectival concord that is replaced by a relative concord in order to derive the qualificative form. The ‘predicative’ form of the adjective in (5a) does not, however, contain a subjectival concord. Regarding examples such as the one in 5(a), Doke (1955: 55) states:

“[...] this is markedly distinct from the predicative form corresponding to a relative (whether relative stem or relative clause) [...]”.

On closer analysis Doke’s (1955: 51 et seq.) discussion on what constitutes a relative clause in

underlying) copulatives. This distinction is, however, retained here in order to avoid unnecessary complication. In this regard, Posthumus (2000: 156–157) notes:

“No brief and convenient terms (which are sufficiently descriptive) exist to refer to the various occurrences of the so-called adjectives, since a precise description will have to include reference to the implication, mood, tense and actuality of the copulative verb (or copulative particle in the word group). A clear distinction will also have to be maintained between the so-called adjectives and relatives.”

Zulu, seems to be contradictory. Although a qualificative relative such as the example under **B** in (5b) **does** conform to Doke's description of a relative clause, he does not regard it as such, but describes it as a 'relative', in much the same way as the qualificatively used adjective under **B** in (5a) is regarded as an 'adjective'.

Furthermore, Doke apparently regards **positive** forms such as those under **A** in the following example as adjectives and relatives, whilst corresponding **negative** examples such as those under **B**, are regarded as relative **clauses** with an adjectival or relative base:

(6)	A	B
	Adjective:	Relative clause with an adjectival base:
	umuntu omkhulu	umuntu ongemkhulu
	'a big person'	'a person who is not big'
	Relative:	Relative clause with a relative base:
	umuntu oqotho	umuntu ongeqotho
	'an honest person'	'a person who is not honest'

(Doke 1955: 78)

Also, Doke regards all adjectives and relatives preceded by a relative concord, with the noted exception of those in the present positive form of the indicative mood, as relative **clauses**. See the following example in this regard:

(7)	Adjectival clauses:	
	abantu ababebakhulu	'people who were big'
	umuntu ongaba mkhulu	'a person who can be big'
	Relative clauses:	
	indoda engakabi mnene	'a man who is not yet kind'
	izinkomo ebeziseqatha	'cattle which were still strong'

(Doke 1955: 79)

Such an analysis is clearly not satisfactory since it does not reflect the true nature and usage of these (adjectival and relative) categories as basically containing **stems** that are usually found as complements of a (frequently underlying) copulative; either in 'predicative' constructions as in the examples under **A** in (5a) and (5b), or in embedded (relative) clauses as in the examples under **B** in (5a) and (5b), and the examples in (6) and (7). Doke's analysis thus misses an important generalisation.

Doke (1955: 55–56) also advances a second argument rejecting the view that qualificatively used adjectives and relatives, (particularly in the present positive form of the indicative), are basically relative clauses containing a copulative. He states that (qualificative) adjectives and relatives may be used as noun qualifiers **unchanged in form** even in sentences which are not in the present tense.

Compare the following example in this respect:

- (8) Ezweni laKwaZulu kwakukhona izinkomo **ezingi** (*adj.*) **ezimnyama** (*rel.*).
'In Zululand there used to be **many** (*adj.*) **black** (*rel.*) cattle.'

Doke contends that should the adjective *ezingi* and relative *ezimnyama* in example (8) in effect be relative clauses, the sentence under discussion would have the following anomalous meaning: 'In Zululand there used to be cattle which **are** many and which **are** black.' This anomaly could consequently only be resolved by rewriting the sentence in the past tense as follows:

- (9) Ezweni laKwaZulu kwakukhona izinkomo **ezazizingi ezazimnyama**.
'In Zululand there were cattle **which were many and were black**.'

Doke (1955: 55–56) concludes this discussion as follows:

'The use of the plain adjective and the plain relative, however, is the Zulu normal construction; and this fully justifies the conclusion that both the adjective and the relative constitute parts of speech within the functional designation of the qualificative.'

Although Doke's second argument is more convincing than the first, most Zulu grammarians are in agreement that Zulu's adjectives and relatives are basically copulative constructions which can appear either as the predicate of the sentence, or as an embedded qualifying clause. Van Eeden (1956: 635) states:

'In hierdie verband moet daarop gewys word dat die kwalikatief (sic) wat onderskei word as die relatief, in 'n mate ook 'n relatiefkonstruksie is, waarin 'n kopulatief optree, ... Tewens ook die adjektief kan as 'n tipe relatiefkonstruksie beskou word.'

Attributive vs. Predicative

Although Doke (1935: 43) admits that there can be no division into 'attributive' and 'predicative' in the Bantu languages, he continues to use these terms without any further clarification. Posthumus (1978: iv–v & 2000: 154–155) agrees that such a division in Zulu is untenable on the basis of the linear ordering of lexical items, as is the case in languages such as English and Afrikaans, where 'attributive' adjectives tend to precede the noun, while 'predicative' adjectives usually follow the noun antecedent. Jordan (1967: 135) also regards this traditional distinction as being based on false premises as both so-called 'attributive' and 'predicative' constructions contain a predicate in the form of a (frequently underlying) copulative. If the basic tenet is that these terms are taken from the European languages and applied as is to the Bantu languages, it must be concluded that such a distinction is indeed based on false premises. This problem could, however, largely be solved if a different definition of the terms 'attributive' and 'predicative', is accepted, such as that of Van Schoor (1983: 260). According to this definition, an attributive adjective determines **about which person / entity** the speaker wants to say something (else / more), whereas a predicative adjective **is that** which a speaker says about a certain person / entity. Such a definition could also be applied to Zulu so that the distinction between 'attributive' and 'predicative' does not necessarily rest on the sequential ordering of language symbols. Siegel (1976: 2) has the following to say in this regard:

'The semantic duality for adjectives can be stated this way: The property that an adjective represents may be bound to the meaning of a common noun it modifies in some way, or it may be free, a simple predicate.'

The use of the term 'qualificative' instead of 'attributive' would probably also lessen some of the resulting confusion and uncertainty.

Wilkes' (1988) proposed re-evaluation of Doke's word classes 'adjective', 'relative' and 'copulative'

Wilkes (1988: 255) suggests a pragmatic approach to the solution of the existing situation whereby adjective and relative stems in Doke's word class categorisation can move between the categories 'adjective', 'relative' and 'copulative'. Based on the arguments that the Dokean model is already

firmly entrenched in the description of the grammar of Zulu, and that any radical changes to this system would have very little chance of being accepted in Zulu academic circles, Wilkes (1988: 255) does not propose any drastic amendments to this system, but instead endeavours to realign these word categories slightly.

Wilkes (1988: 239 *et seq.*) therefore advocates a cautious approach, based on the following assumptions:

- ❑ New word class categorisations tend not to be universally accepted in Zulu academic circles, as was the case with the (scientifically superior) word class categorisation proposed by Van Wyk in 1958.
- ❑ From a didactical point of view, the choice of the (familiar) Dokean model as a framework for teaching Zulu, seems to be justified.

Regarding the then new Zulu core school syllabus of 1987, Wilkes (1988: 239 *et seq.*) indicates that even though this syllabus is based on the Dokean framework to a large extent, a number of amendments have been made. Regarding Doke's word classes 'adjective' and 'relative', Wilkes (1988: 255) proposes the following changes:

- ❑ That the membership of the word classes 'adjective' and 'relative' be extended, so as to include both 'predicatively' and qualificatively used adjectives and relatives.⁶
- ❑ That the membership of the word class 'relative' be restricted to relative **stems**, such as those in examples (2), (3) and (4) only. This would mean that qualificatively used verbs such as *abakhuthele* 'who are diligent' in a clause such as *abafana abakhuthele* 'the boys who are diligent', would be regarded as a verb, and not as a 'relative'.

Wilkes' approach seems more capable of generalisation than Doke's, and holds the added advantage that the terms 'adjective', 'relative' and 'enumerative', which are already firmly entrenched in the description of Zulu grammar, need not be replaced. Wilkes therefore advocates the continued use of these terms, but subject to a certain amount of redefinition, as set out in the previous paragraphs.

Wilkes (1988: 255) concludes as follows:

"[...] the present system of word classes in Zulu is still in need of improvement and [...] the changes proposed in the new syllabus regarding adjectives and relatives might be a first step in the right direction."

and:

"From a didactical point of view too the choice of the Dokean model as a framework for teaching Zulu at school seems to be justified. It has been in operation in Zulu schools for a great many years and to replace it now with a completely new and unfamiliar approach may do the teaching of Zulu grammar more harm than good. Nevertheless, it is obvious that as a model for teaching Zulu grammar Doke's approach cannot be continued indefinitely, and sooner or later it will have to make way for a more modern and no doubt more scientific linguistic approach. Such a transition can be much facilitated if writers of new school grammar books progressively take note of what is happening on the modern linguistic scene and present at least some part of their material, especially the syntax, in a more modern linguistic framework. This will ensure that the linguistic model used for teaching

6. One can assume that this amendment could also be extended to the so-called 'enumeratives', but taking into account that these stems (unlike adjectives and relatives) are not normally used in (embedded) relative constructions.

Zulu grammar will at least be more on par with those used in languages such as Afrikaans and English.”

(Wilkes 1988: 240)

More than a decade later, Wilkes (2000: 412–413) maintains that Doke’s word class classification still holds sway as the basis for the word division rules of Zulu, even though “[...] there is a discrepancy between what constitutes a word scientifically and what are orthographically regarded as words in Zulu.” Regarding the word class categorisation of the Zulu adjective, relative (and enumerative), alternative viewpoints have been advanced by researchers such as Gauton (1994), Van der Spuy (2001) (who arrives at the same conclusion as Gauton (1994)), and Posthumus (2000). However, neither of these alternative categorisations have as yet been universally accepted in Zulu academic circles.

It would seem, therefore, that the need for pointing out inconsistencies and deficiencies in Doke’s word class categorisation is as pertinent as ever, as this classification, albeit in amended form, still forms the basis of many grammars used in the teaching of Zulu at both secondary and tertiary levels.

The derivation of the adjectival and relative concords in a Dokean framework

Because Doke only regards qualificatively used adjectives and relatives as belonging to the word classes ‘adjective’ and ‘relative’, his analysis of the concordial systems of these word classes also proves unsatisfactory.⁷ Whereas Doke recognises that relatives are formed by substituting the predicative / subjectival concord with the relative concord (bearing in mind that he regards this rule as more applicable to relative verbs and relative clauses other than those in the present positive indicative), he does **not** acknowledge that qualificatively used **adjectives** are underpinned by the predicative form. Doke thus does not recognise that the (qualificative) adjective concord is in reality a combination of **two** morphemes, namely the relative concord followed by an adjectival concord, or better still, an adjectival prefix.⁸ From an example such as the following it can be clearly seen that whereas qualificatively used relative stems agree with their noun antecedents by way of a relative concord **only**, adjective stems agree with the antecedent by way of **both** a relative concord **and** an adjectival prefix:

(10) Relative:	Adjective:
umntwana <u>o-qotho</u>	umntwana <u>o-mu - hle</u>
r/c	r/c-adj.pref.
‘an <u>honest</u> child’	‘a <u>beautiful</u> child’
umntwana <u>o-nge-qotho</u>	umntwana <u>o-nge- mu - hle</u>
r/c-neg.	r/c-neg.-adj.pref.

7. See Doke (1973⁶: 101–102) for the rules for the formation of the so-called ‘adjectival concord’ and Doke (1973⁶: 107–108) for the rules for the formation of the relative concords. Cf. Gauton (1990: 38–43) for a more comprehensive discussion of this topic.

8. Doke’s analysis of the way in which the relative concord is formed is not criticised in this article since it has already been made abundantly clear by writers such as Van Eeden (1956), Ziervogel (1961), Jordan (1967), Ungerer (1975), Wilkes (1988) and Gauton (1990 & 1995: 267 *et seq.*) that the Zulu relative concord probably developed from a so-called ‘demonstrative base’ *la-*, plus the subjectival concord of the noun class in question.

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>(11) Relative:
 umntwana <u>u-qotho</u>
 s/c
 ‘the child <u>is honest</u>’
 umntwana <u>aka-qotho</u>
 neg. s/c
 ‘the child <u>is not honest</u>’</p> | <p>Adjective:
 umntwana <u>mu - hle</u>
 adj.pref.
 ‘the child <u>is beautiful</u>’
 umntwana <u>aka - mu- hle</u>¹¹
 neg. s/c-adj.pref.
 ‘the child <u>is not beautiful</u>’</p> |
|---|---|

Doke’s lexical class ‘enumerative’

In his 1927 word class categorisation Doke (1973⁶: 112) recognises the following four so-called ‘enumerative’ stems: *-nye* ‘one’, *-phi?* ‘which?’, *-ni?* ‘what?’ and *-mbe* ‘a different one’.¹²

According to Doke the ‘enumerative’ functions in much the same way as adjectives and relatives in order to qualify a substantive. As with adjectives and relatives, Doke regards the qualificative form as belonging to the word class ‘enumerative’, whilst copulatives can be formed from these forms through a change in tone. See the following example in this respect:

- (12) (a) **Enumerative:**
 Ngibona umuntu **munye**. (Low tone on *mu-*)
 ‘I see **one** person.’
- (b) **Copulative:**
 Lo muntu **munye**. (The tone on *mu-* is relatively higher than in (12a))
 ‘This person **is one**.’

As can be seen from example (12a), qualificative enumeratives do not ordinarily take relative concords and are therefore not used in embedded relative clauses.¹³ Because of this difference between the syntactic behaviour of enumeratives, as opposed to that of adjectives and relatives, writers such as Van Eeden (1956), Ziervogel (1961), Nkabinde (1975), Ungerer (1975) and Posthumus (1978) do not regard these stems as fundamentally qualificative in nature. These writers also emphasise the marked morphological similarities between the ‘enumerative concords’ and the adjectival prefixes. The ‘enumerative concords’ and adjectival prefixes only differ from each other as regards classes 9/10, and to a lesser degree class 8. These concordial morphemes differ as follows:

-
11. For the sake of economy, the concord **aka-** in these and other examples has been designated the ‘negative subjectival concord (neg. s/c)’ of class 1, as opposed to giving the following more detailed morphological breakdown: **a-** (negative morpheme) + **-ka-** (subjectival concord class 1, used in the negative of the indicative).
12. In Doke’s 1935 word class classification, he refers to these stems as so-called ‘numerals’ in order to distinguish them from the ‘enumerative pronouns’ which he first identified as such in 1926, but renamed ‘quantitative pronouns’ in his 1927 classification. As the term ‘enumerative’ when referring to the stems *-nye* ‘one’, *-phi?* ‘which?’, *-ni?* ‘what?’ and *-mbe* ‘a different one’, is already firmly entrenched in the description of the grammar of Zulu, it is proposed here that it be retained.
13. Van Eeden (1956: 198) does, however, give the following examples of qualificatively used enumerative stems: *omumbe; abambe; elimbe* ‘wat hy / sy / dit ’n ander / verskillende een (is)’. However, in a structured electronic Zulu corpus of 5 million running words (tokens), queried for the purpose of this study, **no** examples such as those listed by Van Eeden were found. This finding seriously calls into question Van Eeden’s assertion as to the existence of examples such as these. (Cf. also footnote 12 for more information on the Zulu corpus referred to here, i.e. the University of Pretoria Zulu Corpus (PZC)).

(13) Enumerative concord:	Adjectival prefix:
Class 8: zi-	zin- / zi-
Class 9:i- / yi-	in- / im-
Class 10:zi-	zin- / zim-

It is clear from example (13) that the difference between these morphemes lies in the absence of nasals in the ‘enumerative concords’, (or better still enumerative **prefixes**), when compared with the shape of the adjectival prefixes. Van Eeden (1956: 191–192) postulates that the enumerative prefixes also probably contained nasals originally, but that these nasals were subsequently lost. A possible explanation for the gradual disappearance of these nasals could be that because the enumerative stems *-nye* ‘one’, *-mbe* ‘a different one’ and *-ni?* ‘what?’ all commence on a nasal, the same rule would apply as when a nasal precedes an adjective commencing on a nasal, namely that the prefix will lose its nasal. This tendency to lose the nasal could then have spread analogously to the stem *-phi?* ‘which?’.

Regarding the variant forms *zin-* / *zi-* of the adjectival prefix of class 8, Van Eeden (1956: 152) cites the form containing the nasal as having originated analogously to the form in class 10. He also states that the regular form, *zi-*, appears in certain Zulu dialects as well as in Xhosa.¹⁴

Because of the great similarities between enumeratives and predicatively used adjectives, the question arises as to what the exact nature of the relationship between these two categories might be. Louwrens (1975) contends that the enumeratives of Northern Sotho are in the process of being reinterpreted as adjectives. Ziervogel (1961: 87) regards the enumerative form as basic to, and underlying, the adjectival constructions of the South Eastern Bantu languages.¹⁵

Adjectives, relatives and qualificative pronouns in Doke’s word class categorisation

As stated earlier, apart from belonging to variously the word classes ‘adjective’, ‘relative’ and ‘copulative’, it seems that adjectives and relatives in the Dokean framework can also belong to a further category namely ‘pronoun’. Doke (1955: 47 *et seq.*) contends that should an adjective or relative either appear without its noun antecedent, or precede such an antecedent, such an adjective or relative then syntactically becomes a so-called ‘qualificative **pronoun**’ and presumably ceases to be an adjective or relative. It seems that although qualificative adjectives, relatives, (and also

14. In a language such as Southern Ndebele (isiNdebele), however, the adjectival prefixes for classes 8 and 10 are identical, with both containing an underlying nasal. Compare the following examples in this regard:

(a)	cl. 7:	isalukazi esikhulu	cl. 8:	izalukazi <i>ezikulu</i> <i>adj.pref.</i>
		‘a big old woman’		‘big old women’
(b)	cl. 9:	ikomo ekulu	cl. 10:	iinkomo <i>ezikulu</i> <i>adj.pref.</i>
		‘a big head of cattle’		‘big cattle’

In this example it can be seen that the adjectival prefixes of **both** classes 8 and 10 contain an underlying nasal, since the adjective stem *-khulu* ‘big’ exhibits no aspiration when combined with the prefixes from classes 8 and 10, and instead appears as *-kulu* in these instances. This phenomenon is quite common in the Nguni languages where an aspirated plosive (such as *kh* [kh]) loses its aspiration when preceded by a nasal, and becomes ejective as in the examples from classes 8 and 10 above.

15. The relationship between enumeratives and adjectives in Zulu, as well as the possible (diachronic) derivation of these categories, are discussed in more detail in Gauton (1994).

enumeratives) that appear without their antecedents do indeed have a pronominal function, the same cannot always be said of **pre-nominally** used adjectives and relatives.

Grammarians agree that qualificatively used adjectives and relatives usually follow their noun antecedents. This does not apply to the adjective stem *-nye* ‘other, some’ which usually **precedes** the antecedent¹⁶ Van Eeden (1956: 154–155) contends that this stem very rarely follows its noun antecedent as in a sentence such as *Umfana omunye uyakubiza* ‘Some or other boy is calling you’. He suggests that a possible explanation for this phenomenon is that in a sentence such as *Enye inkabi ibalekile* ‘Some or other / another ox bolted’, the adjective *enye* refers to a certain or specific **one** of two or more oxen, and that the speaker therefore presupposes another ox or oxen than the one referred to directly. The noun antecedent that thus appears after *-nye* is therefore little more than an afterthought, and is only added in order to eliminate any possible uncertainty as to what *-nye* refers to. Such an analysis, however, is highly speculative. Greenberg (1961: 87) cites as one of the universal features of human language that when the general rule is that the descriptive adjective follows, there may be a minority of adjectives which usually precede, though the converse of this principle does not apply. When querying an electronic corpus of 5 million running Zulu words, (the University of Pretoria Zulu Corpus (PZC)), it is found that *-nye* ‘other, some’ **follows** its noun antecedent in only approximately 5% of cases.¹⁷ The post-nominal usage of *-nye* ‘other, some’ is therefore clearly the exception rather than the rule.

Zulu grammarians are in agreement that should the normal word order be disturbed so that a qualificative adjective or relative precede its antecedent, such a pre-nominal adjective or relative gains added emphasis. According to writers such as Doke & Mofokeng (1974: 385), Givón (1975: 76) and Harries-Delisle (1978: 444–445) it is an universal word order principle that the leftmost constituent is the more topical one and that the initial or frontal position is a position of emphasis. Wierzbicka (1986: 385) states the following in this regard:

“[...] the syntactic reversal between the head and the modifier serves the purpose of giving the property a special semantic prominence.”

As has been mentioned previously, Doke (1955: 47 et seq.) regards pre-nominal adjectives and relatives as ‘qualificative pronouns’, even though they appear in apposition to their noun antecedents. Such an analysis seems to arise from the semantic interpretation that Doke gives to clauses such as the following:

- (14) (a) indlu enkulu ‘a big house’
 (b) enkul’ indlu ‘a huge one; lit. a huge one, a house’

16. The enumerative stem *-phi?* ‘which?’ also usually precedes its noun antecedent as in *muphi umuntu?* ‘which person?’. As can be seen from the following example from Gumbi (1972: 82) however, the enumerative *-phi?* can, on occasion, follow the antecedent and also have, to a certain extent, a ‘qualificative meaning’:

Adideke ingqondo uJohn angatholi kahle ukuthi ngabe **nguFikile muphi** loyo osekuthiwa nguSister. ‘John is confused and can’t quite make out **which Fikile it is** that Sister is referring to.’

Because this stem, (like the other enumeratives, but unlike qualificative adjectives and relatives), does not usually appear in embedded (relative) clauses, it and the other enumeratives will not be considered any further in this discussion.

17. The University of Pretoria Zulu Corpus (PZC), built at the University of Pretoria by Mr. G-M De Schryver, Mr. M.J. Dlomo and Prof. D J Prinsloo, is organised chronologically and consists of a number of sub-corpora stratified according to genre. The sizes of the corpora built at UP’s Department of African Languages are in constant evolution. For the latest developments, the reader is referred to the Home Page of *ELC for ALL* (Electronic Corpora for African-Language Linguistics): <http://www.up.ac.za/academic/libarts/afrilang/elcforall.htm>

From Doke's translation of a clause such as (14a) as 'a big house' when the adjective appears in its normal post-nominal position, but as 'a huge one; lit. a huge one, a house' when the adjective is used pre-nominally as in (14b), it can be concluded that not only does Doke regard the pre-nominal adjective in (14b) as having a pronominal meaning, i.e. 'one', but also as having added emphasis, *vide* 'huge' instead of 'big'. When the adjective is therefore used pre-nominally as in (14b), the noun antecedent seems to be added as an afterthought only, probably to avoid any ambiguity that might result. Although such an interpretation of pre-nominally used adjectives, in terms of which they not only function as pronouns, but also have added emphasis, is possible in certain contextual environments, it cannot be shown that it will be the case in **all** discourse contexts. It seems that pre-nominally used adjectives and relatives have essentially the same function as their post-nominal counterparts, namely that of noun modification, but with the difference that the semantic property embodied by such a pre-nominal modifier enjoys a special prominence *vis-a-vis* those properties embodied by the head noun. Compare the following contrasting pair where the semantic property embodied by the adjective *-khulu* 'big' enjoys more prominence in (15b) when it is used pre-nominally, than in (15a) where it appears in its normal post-nominal position:

- (15) (a) "Ngena sithandwa lapha kusemzini wakho." Usho **ngegunya elikhulu** ubambe isivalo ukuba umkakhe angene endlini.
"Enter, my darling, this here is your home." He says **with great authority** and holds the door open for his wife to enter the house.'
(Gumbi 1972: 89)
- (b) "Hayi sithandwa ungabi novalo entanyeni njengesele nginguJohn ophilayo mina ungenqeni lutho." Washo **ngelikhulu igunya** nokuzithemba qede wasusa imoto wayishaya yazula wayibhekisa eDube lapho beyobona khona izindlu ezithengiswayo.
"Hey baby, don't be a scared little rabbit, never fear when John is near".¹⁸ He says **with loads of authority** and self-confidence just as he pulls away and steers the car in the direction of Dube where they are going to view the houses on show."
(Gumbi 1972: 85)

If it is accepted that both pre- and post-nominal adjectives and relatives are essentially noun modifiers, as has been argued here, there is no basis for the Dokean analysis in terms of which adjectives and relatives become part of a different word class, i.e. 'pronoun', when they are used pre-nominally.

Regarding the use of adjectives, relatives and enumeratives without their head nouns, it must be conceded that these modifiers do indeed have a pronominal semantic import in such instances. This pronominal function should, however, be regarded as only a **secondary** function of what is essentially a noun modifier. Compare the following examples in this respect:

- (16) (a) Ngifuna **umfana** (*head noun*) **oqotho** (*rel.*).
'I am looking for **an honest boy**.'
- (b) Ngifuna **oqotho** (*rel.*).
'I am looking for **an honest one** (= boy).'

18. Note that this is an **idiomatic** translation of this section of the Zulu source text. A more literal translation would be as follows:

"No darling, you musn't be scared (lit. have fear in your throat like a toad), I am the genuine, one and only John, you musn't worry about a thing".

From the previous example it is clear that (16b) has been derived from (16a) by deleting the head noun *umfana* 'boy'. While the relative *oqotho* 'who is honest' does indeed function pronominally in (16b), it is the relative concord *o-* that embodies the pronominal attributes. The relative *oqotho* 'honest' still retains its basic function as modifier of an (albeit deleted) head noun. There does therefore not seem any reason why adjectives, relatives and enumeratives such as the relative *oqotho* in (16b) should be regarded as belonging to the word class 'pronoun'. Rather, these forms should be regarded as adjectives, relatives and enumeratives that can function pronominally under certain circumstances, i.e. when the head noun is deleted.

Conclusion

Doke's classification of adjectives, relatives and enumeratives in Zulu, wherein the same stem can alternate between the word classes 'adjective', 'relative' and 'enumerative' on the one hand, 'copulative' on the other, and even 'pronoun' depending on how they are used, was found to be inadequate since it misses an important generalisation. These categories essentially contain a number of stems that are found as the complements of (frequently underlying) copulatives, and which can either be used qualificatively in embedded (relative) structures, or 'predicatively' / 'copulatively' as the predicate of the sentence or clause. Although these forms can have a secondary pronominal function when the head noun has been deleted, their basic function still appears to be that of noun modification.

Although it is true, as indicated by Posthumus (2000: 151), that Zulu grammarians have in recent years moved away from the Dokean approach towards describing the categories 'adjective' and 'relative', none of the alternative classifications and descriptions have as yet become universally accepted. Wilkes' (1988:255) statement that '[...] Doke's classification has already become such a part and parcel of Zulu grammar that any radical change in the present system will have very little chance of being accepted in Zulu academic circles', still rings true more than a decade later.

It is therefore essential that cognisance be taken of instances where Doke's classification is flawed, as many grammars currently used in both secondary and tertiary institutions still use Doke's word class classification as their point of departure. Teachers as well as learners should therefore be armed with the requisite knowledge regarding inconsistencies and discrepancies in Doke's word class classification, so that they can deal with this categorisation appropriately.

References

- Appleyard, J.W. 1850. *The Kafir Language*. King William's Town: The Wesleyan Mission Printing-Establishment.
- Colenso, J.W. 1890. *First steps in Zulu: being an elementary grammar of the Zulu language*. Maritzburg and Durban: P Davis & Sons.
- Davis, W.J. 1872. *A Grammar of the Kaffir Language*. London: William Nichols.
- Döhne, J.L. 1857. *A Zulu-Kafir Dictionary etymologically explained with copious illustrations and examples, preceded by an introduction on the Zulu-Kafir language*. Cape Town.
- Doke, C.M. 1926. The Phonetics of the Zulu Language. *Bantu Studies*. Vol.II. Special Number. Johannesburg: University of the Witwatersrand Press.
- Doke, C.M. 1935. *Bantu Linguistic Terminology*. London, New York, Toronto: Longmans, Green and Co.
- Doke, C.M. 1955. *Zulu Syntax and Idiom*. London, Cape Town, New York: Longmans, Green and Co.

- Doke, C.M. 1973⁶. *Textbook of Zulu Grammar*. Cape Town, Johannesburg: Longman Southern Africa (Pty) Ltd.
- Doke, C.M. & Mofokeng, S.M. 1974. *Textbook of Southern Sotho Grammar*. Cape Town, Johannesburg: Longman Southern Africa (Pty) Ltd.
- Doke, C.M., Malcolm, D.M., Sikakana, J.M.A. & Vilakazi, B.W. 1990. *English-Zulu, Zulu-English dictionary*. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.
- Gauton, R. 1990. Adjektiewe en relatiewe in Zulu. Unpublished M.A. dissertation, University of Pretoria.
- Gauton, R. 1994. Towards the recognition of a word-class 'adjective' for Zulu. *South African Journal of African Languages* 14(2): 62–70.
- Gauton, R. 1995. The Zulu locative – a diachronic perspective. Unpublished D.Litt. thesis. Pretoria: University of Pretoria.
- Givón, T. 1975. Promotion, accessibility and case marking: toward understanding grammars. *Working Papers on Language Universals* 9: 55–125.
- Greenberg, J.H. 1961. *Universals of language. Second edition*. Cambridge, Massachusetts & London, England: The M.I.T. Press.
- Grout, L. 1893. *The isiZulu: A revised edition of a grammar of the Zulu language; with an introduction and an appendix*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., Ltd.
- Gumbi, J.N. 1972. *Baba Ngixolele*. Johannesburg: Voortrekkerpers.
- Harries-Delisle, H. 1978. Contrastive emphasis and cleft sentences. Pp. 419–486 in J H Greenberg (ed.), *Universals of human language. Volume 4. Syntax*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Jordan, A.C. 1967. The adjective in the Nguni languages of Southern Africa with special reference to Xhosa. *Journal of African Languages* 6(2): 132–145.
- Lanham, L.W. 1971. The noun as the deep-structure source for Nguni adjectives and relatives. *African Studies* 30(3–4): 299–311.
- Louwrens, L.J. 1975. Enumeratiewe as 'n onproduktiewe klas in Noord-Sotho. *Studies in Bantoetale* 2(1): 37–45.
- Meinhof, C. 1906. *Grundzüge einer vergleichenden Grammatik der Bantusprachen*. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer (Ernst Vohsen).
- Nkabinde, A.C. 1975. A revision of the word categories in Zulu. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of South Africa.
- Nyembezi, C.L.S. 1976. *Inkinsela YaseMgungundlovu*. Pietermaritzburg: Shuter and Shooter.
- Posthumus, L.C. 1978. Die kopulatiewe in Zulu met verwysing na ander Bantoetale. Unpublished M.A. dissertation, Universiteit van die Oranje-Vrystaat.
- Posthumus, L.C. 1988. Identifying copulative in Zulu and Southern Sotho. *South African Journal of African Languages* 8(2): 61–64.
- Posthumus, L.C. 2000. The so-called adjective in Zulu. *South African Journal of African Languages* 20(2): 148–158.
- Poulos, G. & Msimang, C.T. 1998. *A linguistic analysis of Zulu*. Cape Town: Via Afrika Limited.
- Roberts, C. 1902. *The Zulu-Kafir Language simplified for beginners*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., Ltd.
- Samuelson, R.C.A. 1925. *Zulu Grammar*. Durban: Knox Printing and Publishing Co.
- Siegel, M.E.A. 1976. Capturing the adjective. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts.
- Ungerer, H.J. 1975. Die kwalifikatiewe van Zulu. Unpublished M.A. dissertation, P.U. vir C.H.O.
- Van der Spuy, A. 2001. In defence of the Zulu adjective. *South African Journal of African Languages* 21(2): 148–162.
- Van Eeden, B.I.C. 1956. *Zoeloe-Grammatika*. Stellenbosch, Grahamstad: Die Universiteits-uitgewers en -Boekhandelaars (Edms) Bpk.

- Van Schoor, J.L. 1983. *Die Grammatika van Standaard-Afrikaans*. Kaapstad en Johannesburg: Lex Patria.
- Von Staden, P.M.S. 1973. Adjektiewe en relatiefstamme in Zulu as soortlike naamwoorde. *Limi* 1(1): 20–25.
- Welmers, Wm.E. 1973. *African language structures*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press.
- Wanger, P.W. 1917. *Konversations-Grammatik der Zulu-Sprache*. Mariannhill: St. Thomas Aquins Druckerei.
- Wanger, P.W. 1927. *Scientific Zulu Grammar. Vol. I*. Stuttgart: W.Kohlhammer, Publishing and Printing firm.
- Wierzbicka, A. 1986. What's in a noun? (Or: How do nouns differ in meaning from adjectives?). *Studies in Language* 10(1–2): 353–389.
- Wilkes, A. 1974. Oor die sogenaamde eksklusiewe kwantitatiewe van Zulu. *Studies in Bantoetale* 1(1): 76–86.
- Wilkes, A. 1978. Bantoetaalstudies in Suid-Afrika sedert 1826. *Studies in Bantoetale* 5(1): 107–167.
- Wilkes, A. 1988. Zulu grammar and the new school syllabuses for Zulu. Pp. 238–257 in A C Nkabinde (ed), *Anthology of articles on African linguistics and literature. A Festschrift to C L S Nyembezi*. Johannesburg: Lexicon Publishers.
- Ziervogel, D. 1961. 'n Vergelykende benadering van die omskrywingskonstruksie in die Suid-Afrikaanse Bantoetale. *Feesbundel vir Prof. Dr. Jan Antonie Engelbrecht*. Johannesburg: Afrikaanse Pers Beperk: 86–93.

Dr Rachéle Gauton
Department of African Languages
University of Pretoria
PRETORIA
0002
Tel: (012) 420 3715
Fax: (012) 420 3163
rgauton@postino.up.ac.za (Office)
lgauton@global.co.za