Journal of Language and Literature
Vol. 24 No. 2, October 2024, pp. 455 – 465
DOI: 10.24071/joll.v24i2.7959
Available at https://e-journal.usd.ac.id/index.php/JOLL/index

Analyzing the Impact of Verb Extensions on Semantic Role Variability in Kiha

Prisca Boniphace Makulilo
prismakulilo78@gmail.com
College of Business Education, REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA

Abstract

The research analyzes the impact of verb extensions on semantic role variability in Kiha. In doing so, the study explores how verb extensions affect the semantic roles of arguments in a sentence, spotting trends and patterns in the usage of verb extensions, and the differences in their corresponding semantic roles. Verb extensions on semantic role variability are linguistic aspects that scholars did not find particularly fascinating to research. This study is interested in examining how verb extensions affect semantic role variability. Due to their proficiency in both writing and speaking Kiha, two informants who are native speakers, aged 83 and 73, were selected for the data collection process using the qualitative approach and elicitation technique. Data is presented using the fragmentation method, and coding is applied to ensure that the study is consistent with other studies that were cited in the literature. Lexical Mapping Theory is the framework for examining the data. The study concludes that the applicative verb extension has four semantic roles: beneficiary, recipient, reason/cause, and locative. Likewise, causative verb extension has two semantic roles: causee and instrument. Reciprocal and passive verb extensions have shared participant semantic roles.

Article information

Received: 10 January, 2024

Revised: 22 August 2024

Accepted: 25 August 2024

***Keywords**: verb extension; semantic role; variability; Kiha*

Introduction

Around the world, ethnic languages are those in which people's cultures are preserved and passed down from one generation to the next (Duranti, Alessandro, Ochs, Elinor, & Schieffelin, Bambi, 2014). Thus, studying ethnic languages is a technique to gather linguistic information and examine their unique characteristics in order to shed light on their relationship to linguistic universals. The study's findings can also be preserved in various formats for use in the future, such as when teaching or studying the languages or when using them as a medium of instruction in educational institutions. The abundance of verbal derivatives produced by various suffixes is one of the primary characteristics of most Bantu languages (Muhdhar, 2006). They are sometimes referred to as verbal extensions since they give the word additional shades of meaning or diverse roles. Bantu verbal

extension is one of the linguistic areas that has been studied by several scholars for a long time. (Githinji, Peter, and Ngonyani, 2005), for instance; Khamisi (1972, 1985); Rugemalira (1986, 1993, 2005) and Satyo (1985); to mention a few. Verb extension in Bantu languages has been approached differently by different researchers.

Some researchers approach the topic from a syntactic perspective like The Role of Verbal Extensions in Bantu Syntax and Verbal Extensions and Syntactic Structure in Bantu Languages by Khamisi (1972, 1985). According to these studies, the Bantu verbal extensions affect the syntax of the Bantu language, creating extensions on the root of the verb which introduces syntactic and semantic changes on the Bantu language sentences. They prove that these verbal extensions are responsible for a plenty of syntactical variations in Bantu languages, which makes it possible to construct rather complex constructions and express rather narrow sections of semantical connections. Other studies take syntactic and morphological one (Rugemalira, 1986, 1993, 2005). With regards to Rugemalira's studies, the findings show that syntax and morphology are interconnected in the Bantu languages. It also proves that the verbs not only shift the meaning of the root verb but also causes shift in the syntactic distribution, namely the valency and the argument structure. This partly emphasizes the importance of verbal extensions in the formation of grammatical structure of Bantu languages. There is inextricably link between the Bantu morphological and semantics systems. This connection receives a very little attention in studies done on Bantu verb extensions with scholars such as Rugemalira (1986, 1993, 2005) and Khamisi (1972, 1985). Therefore, the purpose of this study is to examine how verb extensions affect the variability of semantic roles in Kiha[1]. By doing this, the study shows how verb extensions impact the semantic roles of arguments in a sentence, uncover patterns and trends in the usage of verb extensions, and changes on their semantic roles in Kiha ethnic language. According to (Hyman, 2003), an extension can be analyzed for form and meaning in which it is referred to as a suffix, a radical, or an extension.

The foundation of a verb is the root of the verb into which inflectional and derivational elements may be added. This idea relates more to the fact that verbs are many and variable depending on the different modifications that are put on them. For instance, in Kiha the verb stem is a base to which relevant prefixes and suffixes are added such as, *-lim-* for 'dig', *ku-lim-a* for Indicative mood (Harjula, 2004). This particular example shows how Kiha language introduced the general principle of verbal morphology which is generally a core feature of most Bantu languages.

Similarly, Bantu verb extensions are not really simple as it looks as there is slight difference in the Vowel Harmony rules and the manner of Assimilation rules applied. This brings out the necessity of going further in understanding the morphological processes which make complexity in the verb forms. Considering the verbal extensions in Bantu languages, post-radical elements are the morphemes of affixes which are attached to the root of the verb (radical part) and follow it in order to change its meaning and its use in the grammar. Often that elements can be unambiguous and semiotic, this gives them multiple meanings and sometimes opposite meanings, which is another confusing of the meaning and function of the verb extensions. Hence, the functional-systematic and componential analysis of the word form is required. Furthermore, post-radical elements in verbal extensions are quite important morphological mechanisms that play a role in increasing the syntactic and semantic utility of the verbs in the Bantu languages. It is said that

[1] Kiha is one of Bantu language spoken in a large part of Kigoma region in Tanzania. It is affiliated to zone D group 66 according to Guthrie (1971) classification. Thus, Maho (1999) modified the Guthrie's list by adding the letter J before the zone D code by which Kiha (D66) is to be replaced by DJ66. According to Grimes & Grimes, 2000), this language is among the 135 Bantu languages spoken in Tanzania. Research conducted by Language of Tanzania Project (LoT) in 1999 indicates that there are 937,516 people who speak Kiha. The number of Kiha speakers, according to the 2002 census was estimated to be 1,680,000.

they enable a multiplicity of meaningful articulations and pertain to the architecture of the function of these languages. The following are the function of these elements.

Causative Suffix Variations: The causative suffix has the short and long forms causing the consonant alterations which are as a result of historical linguistic changes. This has therefore indicated the suitability of trying to comprehend the forms as well as their histories. It also means that subject result in someone else doing the action of the verb. For instance, in Runyambo, -*rim*- (cultivate) when prefixed with -*is*- will become -*rim*-*is*- 'cause to cultivate' (Rugemalira, 2005).

Applicative Suffix: This suffix permits another object (dative or, less frequently, possessive or other) which affects the valency and argument pattern of the given verb. The concept which is being proposed here is that of, how the accumulation of morphologic alterations can influence the syntax. It therefore, provides an object to the verb most of which symbolize the action is performed for the benefit of someone or something. For instance, in Chingoni, while the prefix -*gul*- means 'buy' the corresponding benefactive is -*gul*-*il*- meaning 'buy for'(Miti, 2006).

Passive Forms: Different kinds of the passive extension according to the stem of the verb mainly based on consonant and vowel show that morphonology of passives. This is underscored the correlation between morphology and syntax. It also shows that the subject is inactive and the action is done unto them. For instance, in Kiha, the morpheme -*zana* 'bring' is replaced through the addition of morpheme -*zawo* and becomes -*zanwa* 'be brought' (Harjula, 2004).

Reciprocal Extension: This is used when the sources of actions are expressing and agents and involves both simultaneous and conflicting actions. It also stresses that morphology is capable of a providing a receptor with some equations of the semantic connection. Thus, it implies that the action is reciprocated by the subjects acting within the endangered species context. Indeed, in Nyamwezi, -*diima* 'seize' results to -*diim*-*an*- 'accuse each other' (Schadeberg & Maganga, 1992).

Stative Extension: Refers to the ability, possibility or chance of the action done by the subject. This brings up the concept of morphological markers affecting the meaning of the verb in as far as its formation is concerned. It suggests that as a result of the action the state or condition of the subject is described. For instance, in Nyamwezi, the relative -*buta* 'cut' when verbalized becomes -*but*-*ik*- 'be cut off' (Schadeberg & Maganga, 1992).

Nonetheless, Rugemalira (2005) speaking of morphological productivity stresses a high productivity of the extremely causative and applicative compared to other productive forms as passive, reciprocal and stative extension. He states that productivity on the part of the verb extension can be defined in two ways at best. Compositional identifiability also known as how well the whole root plus extension formation resembles the whole at the semantic level. And attachment frequency which concerns the extent to which a given extension can be attached to different verb stems. Causative and applicative extensions can also be claimed to have 100% productivity in the sense that each of them can be used on any verb root in the language according to Rugemalira. Thus, only passive, reciprocal, and stative extensions have low productivity and are usually used together with explicitly limited sets of lexical and phonotactic patterns. Likewise, adding to the current literature, Harjula (2004) selects Kiha as the focus and analyzes the efficiency of different verb extensions. She identifies nine extensions: Applicative, Causative, Passive, Reciprocal, Positional, Neuter (stative), Impostive, Reduplication and Separative. From these, she concludes that while the first four of applicative, causative, passive, and reciprocal are fully productive. She also discusses how these extensions combine with verb roots depending on the syllabic weight, monosyllabic roots may be affected in a different way than dis-/trisyllabic ones especially the passive extension.

Thus, it can be concluded that insufficiency of interest to semantic variation in the previous researches with the topic of Bantu

verbal extensions points to further research area. This is because it refers to a wider practical usable knowledge on how the morphology and semantics interrelate.

The analysis of the data starts by compiling a pool of sentence examples of Kiha language, with variability in verbs, arguments and morphological markers identified. The predicate is marked in each sentence, and its role and related arguments such as agent, patient, beneficiary, etc are also marked as per universal hierarchy of thematic roles which the arguments are named according to the context and the meaning of the main verb. The roles are then ordered in the sentence in accordance to the thematic tier that is postulated as Agent > Beneficiary > Instrument > Patient > Locative, with such pivotal roles as Agent being the first. Furthermore, any derivational operations like passivation or applicativization which change the argument structure of the verb are also noted, explaining the consequences of the change made in the number of semantic roles introduced or deleted. Altogether, this research approach comprises the following steps: the first one is the identification of predicates and a subset of their arguments; the second step is the attribution of the hierarchical thematic roles to the arguments; the third step is the organization of the arguments in terms of their prominence; and the fourth step is the consideration of the morphological properties that influence argument structure of predicates. When done methodically over a wide range of texts, it contributes to the comprehension of how those constructions in the language assign arguments to semantic roles.

Methodology

A qualitative method design was adopted, and sixty (60) Kiha verbs were collected from Harjula's Ha-English vocabulary (Harjula 2004: 183–209). The verbs were chosen based on their size (monosyllabic, disyllabic, and trisyllabic words) and morphological shape (if a verb has an initial and final vowel). The study uses elicitation technique[2] to gather primary data from two elderly respondents[3] aged 83 and 73. They were given the task to use the verbs that had been collected in various forms, which the verb extensions markers were noted down. On the other hand, secondary data were gathered from other linguistic documentaries such thesis, books, dissertations, and articles. The study uses a fragmentation analysis, where verbs are divided into fragments in order to distinguish the extensions from their roots and other affixes. The approach is suitable since most Bantu word-building processes are agglutinative (Guthrie 1970:11). Each fragment is arranged in this way to prevent repetition. To make the study align with other studies cited in the literature, coding is applied.

Results and Discussion

The specific research question to the study therefore is to identify how the use of verb extensions influences semantic role variation in Kiha. In particular, the need to investigate how the usage of verb extensions influences the arguments' semantic roles and (or) pattern of usage with the verb extensions, are highlighted. In that regard, five productive extensions in Kiha, causative, applicative, passive, reciprocal, and stative are analyzed and discussed based on verb extensions' forms

[2] This technique usually revolves around providing the participants with specific tasks with a view of eliciting Kiha verb forms. However, the use of an elicitation technique, it can be largely considered as a structured or semi-structured approach in which the participants encouraged to use specific verbs in various forms.

[3] Participants were given a standard description of the study's objectives, processes, possible and expected hazards, and advantages of the study. They also agreed to this by producing a consent form that was signed by them to part take in the research. Nonetheless, the study was cleared and recommended by the director of research, consultancy and publication at CBE. The participants' identity is being concealed and all identifiable data is secured and kept safe.

Journal of Language and Literature
ISSN: 1410-5691 (print); 2580-5878 (online)

and/or terminology, thematic roles, and argument structure.

1. Causative Verb Extension

The forms of the causative extension and their distribution in Kiha, which are descended from Proto-Bantu [*-*ic*-], are described in this section. The causee and instrument roles are discussed together with the contextualization of the causative thematic roles. The causative is argued to be a valency increase in the argument structure of the causative.

In Kiha, there are two types of causative extension. The Proto-Bantu [*-i-] is the source of the first form, which is [-i]. Proto-Bantu [*-ic-] is the source of the second form. Following a vowel harmony, this form is realized as {-iʃ-} with a variation {-eʃ-}. The spelling of this causative, [-ish-/-esh-], is used in the current study. Since the form [-i-] is phonologically shorter than the form [*-ic-], it is also referred to as the 'short causative'. The 'transitive suffix' or 'causative suffix' are other names for it. In this study, the term 'causative' in its forms [*-i-] and [*ic-] is used. In Kiha, the [-i-] causative is neither productive nor regular. Only a few consonants in the base-final position are affected by it. The applicative in APP-CAUS co-occurrence, however, takes this causative because it is often used in some consonant terminal roots. This extension implies 'cause to act', as in guza from *gura*, 'buy', which meaning 'cause to buy'. In (14-15) are some illustrations of causal extensions in the form of [-i-].

(14) *-bwiira* ⟶ 'tell'
-bwiir + i + a (*-i-* derivation)
say+CAUS+FV
-bwiiza ⟶ 'cause to tell'
(15) *-ruhuuka* ⟶ 'rest'
-ruhuuk + i + a (*-i-* derivation)
rest + CAUS+FV
-ruhuutsa ⟶ 'cause to rest'

Only roots with a C-final, not CV verb roots, can use the [-i] causative. These are the only C-final roots in the sample verbs that take the [-i-] causative in Kiha. Examples 16-17 demonstrate how the [-i-] causative initiates consonant alternations such as l>z and k>ts. Therefore, the [-i-] causative gives rise to a variety of phonological forms in the derived verb. Examples in (16-17) illustrate other C-final roots that only take [-ish-] causative.

(16) *-fata* ⟶ 'hold'
**fat + i + a* ⟶ (*-i-* derivation)
fat + ish + a ⟶ *fatiisha*
hold+CAUS+FV ⟶ 'cause to hold with'
(17) *-gesa* ⟶ 'harvest'
**ges + i + a* ⟶ (*-i-* derivation)
ges + esh + a ⟶ *gesesha*
harvest+CAUS+FV ⟶ 'cause to harvest'

Similar to the [-i-] causative, the causative suffix [-ish-/-esh-], which meaning 'cause to do with someone/something', can be used with any base. As a reflex of Bantu [*-ic-], this is the only suffix used with the CV verb roots. An example is shown in (18-19).

(18) *-ha* ⟶ 'give'
-ha + esh + a ⟶ *-heesha*
give+ CAUS+FV ⟶ 'causeb to give'
(19) *-va* ⟶ 'leak'
-v + ish + a ⟶ *-viisha*
leak+CAUS+FV ⟶ 'cause to leak'

The findings, however, show that while it is true that all verbs that take the [-i-] causative extension can also take the [-ish-] extension, the opposite is not true. Most verbs that take the latter are only able to use this extension, as is illustrated in (20-21) below.

(20) *-kura* ⟶ 'grow'
-kuza (*-i-* deriv.) ⟶ 'raise'
-kurisha (*-ish-*) ⟶ 'cause to grow'
(21) *-kubhita* ⟶ 'hit'
-kubhitisha ⟶ 'cause to hit'
(22) *-sari* ⟶ 'pray'
-sarisha (*-ish-*) ⟶ 'cause to pray'

When both derivations are conceivable, the meanings are distinct and the two forms do not complement one another. Consonant alternations brought on by the [-i-] causative are the cause of this. Example in (21) demonstrates that some verbs can only accept the [-ish] causative but not the [-i-] causative. The borrowed word in (22), which has a final [r], does not take the [-i-] causative. As with other borrowing verbs in Kiha, *-sari* 'pray' in (22) is supplemented with [-ish-], a regular causative.

2. Causative Thematic Role

In Kiha, the causee and instrument roles are directly related to the causative extension. Two senses are connected to this role. The situation where the two participants, the causee and the causer, perform the verb's action jointly is referred to as the first sense. The second sense is that one of the parties executes the action while being directed by the other person. These are referred to as 'helpee sense' and 'manipuletee sense', respectively, by Rugemalira (1993). The examples in (23-24) below illustrate.

(23) *a+la+mu+nyw+esh+a umwaana amata*
s/he+FUT+he+drink+CAUS+FV+child+milk
(i) 's/he will feed the child milk'
(ii) 's/he will make the child drink milk'
(24) *tu+la+mu+haamb+ish+a Ali umuvyiimba*
we+FUT+he+bury+CAUS+FV+Ali dead body
(i) 'we will help Ali bury the dead body'
(ii) 'we will make Ali bury the dead body'

The meaning of (i) based on examples (23–24) is that both participants the causee and the causer participate in the verb's action jointly. According to the meaning of (ii) in 23-24, one of the participants performs the action specified by the verb under the direction of a different participant who is not a part of the action. There is no common meaning in any individual verb that may contrast the two senses because an individual verb may have only one sense.

One of the two broad causative thematic roles is the instrument role. As shown in (25-26) below, the instrument's role might be interpreted in a number of different ways.

(25) *-henu+z+a* ⟶ *inkoni* 'stick'
push+CAUS+FV
'push with a stick'
(26) *-som+esh+a* ⟶ *imiwani* 'spectacles'
read+CAUS+FV
'read with spectacles'

The causative licensing arguments in cases (25-26) are read differently. The argument (*imiwani* 'spectacles') in (26) is regarded as 'means, but the argument (*inkoni* 'stick') in (25) is interpreted as 'tool'. Both serve as the causative extension's instrument responsibilities.

One of the extensions ending in increasing is the causative. The verb's argument structure is merged with the causative extension's single argument. A transitive verb becomes a ditransitive one due to the causative. As a result, the verb's argument structure gains one additional slot. See examples in (27-28) below.

(27) Kala *a+ra+hunir+a mu+bhuriri*
Kala she+FUT+sleep+FV+LOC+bed
'Kala will sleep (in bed)'
(28) Kala *a+ra+huni+z+a umwana mu+bhuriri*
she+FUT+sleep+CAUS+FV child LOC+bed
'Kala will make a child sleep (in bed)

Hunira, which means to sleep has one argument in (27). The causative in (28) generates another argument, *umwana* (child), to build a two-place predicate.

Therefore, it is demonstrated in this section that the causative increases of the verb are formed by fusing its single argument with the verb's argument structure. The person who initiates the activity (the causative) is licensed as an actor or agent. In the verb structure of Kiha, arguments can be either non-omissible or omissible.

3. Applicative Verb Extension

A description of the applicative extension in Kiha is given in this section with three major issues such as terminology used with this extension, applicative structure, and the key thematic roles. The forms of the applicative extension in Kiha are [-il-/-el-], which were reconstructed as [*-id-] in Proto-Bantu. Although they are now commonly used interchangeably, the terms 'applied' and 'applicative' (Harjula, 2004; Khamisi, 1985; Lodhi, 2002; Mreta, 1997; Rubanza, 1988) have become standardized. This study likewise prefers this commonly used word for the Kiha [-il-/-el-] variants. Examples are found in (29-31).

(29) *tuka* ⟶ 'abuse'
tuk+il+ a ⟶ tukila ⟶ 'abuse for'
abuse+APPL+FV

Journal of Language and Literature
ISSN: 1410-5691 (print); 2580-5878 (online)

(30) *guruka* ⟶ 'fly'
guruk+il+a ⟶ gurukila ⟶ 'fly for'
fly+APPL+FV
(31) *teeka* ⟶ 'cook'
teek+ el+a ⟶ teekela ⟶ 'cook for'
cook+APPL+FV

4. Applicative Thematic Roles

The applicative extension demonstrates that the described activity is actually implemented and/or for the benefit of. Additionally, it implies that a doer acts out of service to someone or something. The semantic effects that can be accomplished by utilizing the applicative extension are thoroughly described in this section. The semantic (or thematic) roles allowed by this affix are considered in relation to this description. The typical definition of a beneficiary role is one in which actions are taken 'for the benefit of', as shown in example (32) below.

(32) *-gabhur+il+a + abharaazi + ibhiliibwa*
Supply + APP + FV + guests + food
'Supply food for the guests'

The example in (32) demonstrates how the applicative licenses the noun phrase *abharaazi* 'guests', and bears the beneficiary role (i.e., the guests gain from receiving meals). A noun phrase that is subject to an action, as shown in (a), may be licensed by the applicative.

(33) *-som + el + a + umuntu + igitabho*
read+APP+FV + person + book
'Read a book to a person'

'The student' is the beneficiary of the reading activity in (a), if there is a recipient role or goal. As shown in (34) below, the recipient role can occasionally have a feeling of a goal.

(34) *Aza a+la+bha+twar+il+a+abhalimyi+ imbuto*
Aza she+FUT+they+bring+APP+FV + farmers + seeds
'Aza she will bring the seeds to the farmers'

The noun phrase 'farmers' is licensed by the applicative in (34) to carry the recipient role in terms of a goal.

Similar to other languages like Kikuyu, Chingoni, and Runyambo, the applicative in Kiha signifies a reason, purpose, or cause. All of them have been given the name 'motive role' by various Bantu language scholars. The examples are provided in (35).

(35) *a+la+bha+hamagar+il+a+amahela*
He+FUT+them+call+APP+FV+money
'He will call them for money'

The locative role (i.e., the applicative extension) grants permission for the location to serve as the site of the activity. The examples in (a) shows how to use and not utilize the applicative when licensing the locative role.

(36) *a+la+mu+sang+il+a + mu+itekero*
he+FUT+her+find+APPL+FV+LOC+ kitchen
'He will find her in the kitchen'

The locative prefixes [*ha*-], [*mu*-], and [*i*-], which are associated with the noun classes (16), (17), (18), and (23) correspondingly, are represented by LOC. Although this is not the case in Runyambo, the applicative is permitted in (36) before the locative complement. The applicative extension in Kiha is a valency-increasing extension, just like the causative. It adds a new argument to the verb it is appended to. It adds an additional slot to the verb's argument structure. The example is provided in (37-38).

(37) *a+la+kubhit+a + umwigishwa + inkoni*
s/he+FUT+hit+FV + student + stick
's/he will hit the student with a stick'
(38) *a+la+bha+kubhit+il+a+ abhavyeyi+ Umwigishwa+ inkoni*
s/he+FUT+them+hit+APP+FV+parents student+stick
's/he will hit the student with a stick for the parents'

Abhavyeyi 'parents' (i.e., the beneficiary) slot is introduced by the applicative in (38). The three-place predicate verb *kubhita* 'hit' now gets an extra argument owing to the

applicative. By doing this, the applicative and the argument structure combine to form an argument structure with four locations. The pronominal prefix [-*bha*], meaning 'them', is used to designate the verb root of the applicativized verb, which includes the licensed beneficiary as one of its constituents. The applicative extension typically raises the verb it is attached to by at least one position. This argument position is eligible for a number of thematic roles, including beneficiary, recipient, reason, and locative roles. The applicative can be used in many idiomatic contexts, such as asking for something politely or making jokes. Finally, it should be emphasized that all verbs accept it, making it the most frequent extension among the others, as shown by the data.

5. The Reciprocal Verb Extension

According to the reciprocal extension (associative), the agents of the action carry out the action in the verb base in a reciprocal manner. It is not productive to use the extension form '-an-' to indicate reciprocity with any verb. Both shades of meaning are intended to be covered by the term 'associative'. In Kiha, there is just one type of reciprocal extension, represented by the form [-an-] in (39).

(39) Kaka na Maria+*bha+la+fat+an+a*
Kaka and Mary+they+FUT+hold+REC+FV
(i)'Kaka and Mary will make a friendship'
(ii) 'Kayoka and Mary will hold one another'

The examples in (39) demonstrate that reciprocalized verbs can have meanings that are similar to verb stems.The reciprocal extension indicates that the verb's action is don e 'by each other' or 'together'. There should be a minimum of two participants (i.e., an actor and a non-actor) when creating a reciprocal construction. Coordinators like na 'and' can be used to coordinate the participants indicated by noun phrases. Alternately, as seen in (40), they are realized using plural noun phrases.

(40) *abhantu+bha+la+voom+an+a+amazi*
People+they+FUT+fetch water+REC+FV
'People will fetch water together'

Although coordinated and multiple noun phrases differ in structure, the meaning is the same and there are still the same number of participants.

The reciprocal is a valence-decreasing extension in which two participants must be realized in a single argument position or a single plural noun phrase while maintaining their respective responsibilities of two participants. This is demonstrated by the examples in (41-42) below.

(41) (i) Denis+*a+la+mu+kumbatir+a+*Katarina
Denis she+FUT+he+hug+FV+Katarina
'Denis will hug Katarina'
(ii) Dina+*a+la+mu+kumbatil+a* + Denis
Dina+he+FUT+she+hug+FV + Denis
'Dina will hug Denis'

(42)Denis+*a+la+kumbatir+an+a+na+* Dina
Denis+she+FUT+hug+REC+FV+and+
Dina
'Denis will hug with Dina'
i.e., 'Denis and Katarina will hug one another'

The illustration in (41) demonstrates the existence of two arguments, Denis and Katarina, both of which are agents, i.e., 'Denis holds' and 'Katarina holds. In (42), despite still having two participant roles, the two arguments are suppressed by reciprocal extension to one argument position. Despite the fact that they are both agents, they are also one another's patients as a result of their action. The argument positions may be comparable to the participant roles when the reciprocal is used with the verb, with one argument containing a noun phrase and the other a prepositional phrase. This is demonstrated in (42), where Katarina appears to be a prepositional phrase but Denis is a noun phrase. However, because they both take part in the activity and are on an equal footing, they each perform the role of an agent. As a result, the reciprocal subtracts one from the number of arguments in a predicate.

6. Passive Verb Extension

The Proto-Bantu form [*-u-] of the passive in Kiha is most frequently represented by the [-w-] affix (see Table 1 for PB Reconstruction). When the passive extension comes before the

Journal of Language and Literature
ISSN: 1410-5691 (print); 2580-5878 (online)

final vowel [-a], the base-final consonant is labialized because the extension solely consists of a vowel. The Proto-Bantu reconstruction of the passive extension for monosyllabic stems is [*-ibu-] in the form of [-bw-], where the vowel before the passive extension is lengthened. See examples (43-44).

(43) *-haamba* → 'bury' → *haamb+u+a*
haambwa → 'be buried'
(44) *-ha* → 'give' → *ha+bu+a* → *haabwa* →
'be given'

The passive extension in (43) is [-w-]. For monosyllabic verbs in (44), the root-final vowel is lengthened before the passive [-u], and the vowel of the monosyllabic stem is added before this extension. A decreasing extension is the passive. It eliminates one argument and leaves just one argument and two participant roles 'agent,' which is realized as an adjunct, and patient, which fills the subject position. The example is presented in (45-47).

(45) *umuntu+a+la+terur+a+inaga*
Person+he+FUT+lift+FV + pot
'A person will lift a pot'
(46) *Inaga+i+la+terur+w+a+na+umuntu*
pot+it+FUT+lift+PASS+FV+with+person
'The pot will be lifted by the person'
(47) Inaga+i+la+terur+w+a
Pot+it+FUT+lift+PASS+FV
'The pot will be lifted'

The post-verbal argument provided by the preposition na 'with' is omitted in the passive form in (45), whereas both arguments *umuntu* 'person' and *inaga* 'pot' are required in the active form in (46). As a result, the passive construction in Kiha does not require two arguments because one of them serves as an argument and the other as an adjunct. The passive form in (47) is accurate even when the agent (the doer/actor) is absent. Additionally, it is asserted that the active form necessitates that the actor, the one performing the action, occur in the preverbal position. On the other hand, for the passive form, the non-actor must be in the preverbal position and the actor must be in the post-verbal position.

Although *inaga*, 'pot,' the object of the active phrase in (45), is elevated to the position of subject in the passive construction, *umuntu*, 'person', never does. It continues to be seen as the action's performer. As a result, the verb's and sentence's modifications in structure have no impact on the thematic roles that have been ascribed to the arguments. This is demonstrated in (45) and (46), where *umuntu*, the word for 'person,' functions as the agent in the active and passive constructions, respectively, and *inaga*, the word for 'pot', functions as the patient in both constructions. The passive extension is therefore less common because it does not occur with all verbs. To summarize, the passive extension just changes the syntactic structure of the active construction without having any impact on thematic roles. It does not raise the valency of the predicate structure.

7. Stative Verb Extension

The stative extension, also known as 'neuter' denotes that the subject is capable of, likely to, or has already engaged in the action. However, since those forms are intransitive, there is no agent in the constructions. The stative suffix is [*-ik-*(*-Ik-)], which also comes in the form [-ek-]. The stative suffix [*-ek/ik-*] takes part in the pattern of vowel harmony. As a transitive verb becomes intransitive after being suffixed with the stative, the stative lowers the verb's valency. Examples are illustrated in (48-51).

(48) *-fata* 'hold' → *fatika* 'capable of being held'
(49) *-bhona* 'see' → *bhoneka* 'visible'
(50) *-mira* 'swallow' → *-mirika* 'swallowable'
(51) *-vyina* 'dance' → *-vyinika* 'danceable'

The verbs in the instances in (48 - 51) are transitive, but they become intransitive when the stative is attached. When the stative prefix is added, the transitive verb fata, which means 'to hold', which has the actor and the acted upon, becomes intransitive and simply has the non-actor. The data indicate that, with a few exceptions, the majority of Kiha's monosyllabic verbs do not take stative extension. The examples in (52-54) illustrate.

(52) *-va* 'leak' → **viika*
(53) *-ha* 'give' → **heeka*
(54) *-nywa* → *-nyweeka* 'drinkable'

The verb in (52) is intransitive, thus it does not take the stative. Because of this, it is challenging to add the extension that intransitivise the verb. The verb roots in (53) that have three missing arguments (such as -*ha* 'give') do not have stative derivations. Because the action can be acted upon, the verb in (54) becomes intransitive when the stative is used. The subject noun phrase (NP) of the construction (the agent) is dropped in the stative, and the object NP (the patient) is changed into the subject while the agent (the doer of action) is left out. Examples of these are shown in (55-56).

(55) *umuntu+a+la+mir+a+ibhiriibwa*
Person+s/he+FUT+swallow+FV+food
'a person will swallow some food'
(56) *ibhiriibwa+bhi+la+mir+ik+a*
Food+they+FUT+swallow+STAT+FV
'Food is swallowable'

The example in (55-56) demonstrates how the stative transforms the *mira* 'swallow' predicate structure by removing one argument slot and one participant role. This results in a predicate with only one argument: *mirika*, 'swallowable.' This is the case because the verb *kumira*, which means to swallow, contains two participants; however, when it is combined with the stative, it loses one of them (*umuntu* 'person' who performs the action), leaving only the patient *ibhiriibwa* 'food'. As a result, the stative extension eliminates the actor, leaving the non-actor to occupy the subject position. The stative extension reduces a verb's number of arguments by one, the data show. Stative construction becomes intransitive by eliminating the actor role and leaving only the non-actor. The stative is irregular compared to other decreaser extensions since relatively few monosyllabic verbs and only a few disyllabic and trisyllabic verbs can use it.

Conclusion

The results of the research on verb extensions and the variability of semantic roles in Kiha prove that affixes indeed affect argument structures and meanings. The causative, applicative, reciprocal, passive, and stative extensions may change the number of arguments or the types of them, add or remove the value of a semantic role. Similarly, the research firmly grounds verb extensions as primary factors in syntactic frames and participant roles in Kiha. Extensions as characteristic grammatical processes of Bantu languages provide shifts in transitivity, the number of the verb's arguments, and the semantic value.

The results further emphasize the tight connection between morphosyntax in Bantu languages; where arguments realized and their semantic interpretation depend on the verb affixation. For the reasons aforementioned, although the analysis was limited to only particular extensions in Kiha, the study clearly suggests how verbal affixes permeate core syntax/semantic fields in Bantu languages. More work across other Bantu languages can yield even more insights on the variations, changes, and usage of these highly interactive verb extensions. Further research in the area of additional extensions as well as comparing the extensions with regards to their morphological and syntactic features in different languages will prove useful in enhancing the knowledge that is required in Bantu grammar.

References

Duranti, Alessandro., Ochs, Elinor, & Schieffelin, Bambi, B. . (2014). *The handbook of language socialization*. Wiley Backwell.

Githinji, Peter, and Ngonyani, D. (2005). The Asymmetric Nature of Bantu Applicative Constructions. *Lingua*, *116*, 31–63. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2005.03.006

Grimes, F. B. & Grimes, E. J. (2000). *Ethnologue: Language of the World*. SIL International.

Guthrie, M. (1971). *Comparative Bantu*. Gregg International Publishers.

Harjula, L. (2004). *The Structure of the Verb in Kiha: A Bantu Language of Tanzania*. Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

Hyman, L. M. (2003). *Suffix ordering in Bantu: a morphocentric approach* (Issue January 2003).

https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/0-306-48223-1_8
Khamisi, A. M. (1972). *A consideration of grammatical roles in Swahili*. University of New York.
Khamisi, A. M. (1985). *Swahili verb derivation*. University of Hawaii.
Lodhi, A. Y. (2002). Verbal Extension in Bantu: The Case of Swahili and Nyamwezi. *Goteborg Working Papers on Asian and African Languages and Literatures*, *2*, 4–26.
Maho, J. (1999). *A Comparative Study of Bantu Noun Classes*. Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis.
Miti, L. G. (2006). *A Linguistic Analysis of CiNyanja: A Bantu Language Spoken in Malawi and Zambia*. CASAS.
Mreta, A. Y. (1997). *An Analysis of Tense and Aspect in Chasu: Their Form and Meaning in the Affirmative Constructions.* Transaction Publishers.
Muhdhar, R. (2006). *Extensions verb in Kisukuma: Jinakiiya dialect*. University of Dar es Salaam.
Rubanza, Y. I. (1988). *Linear order in Haya verbal morphology: Theoretical implications*. Michigan State University.
Rugemalira, J. M. (1986). *Causative constructions in Swahili*. University of Lancaster.
Rugemalira, J. M. (1993). *Runyambo verb extensions and constraints on predicate structure*. University of California.
Rugemalira, J. M. (2005). *A grammar of Runyambo: Occasional papers in linguistics* (1).
Satyo, S. C. (1985). *Topics in Xhosa verbal extension*. University of South Africa.
Schadeberg, T. C. & Maganga, C. (1992). *Kinyamwezi: Grammar, Texts, Vocabulary*. Koln.