

**Silozi, a Mixed Language:  
An Analysis of the Noun Class System and Kinship Terms**

A minor dissertation submitted to the Faculty of Humanities at the University of Cape Town  
in *partial fulfillment* of the requirements for the award of the degree of Master of Arts in Linguistics, by

Gustav Nyambe Mbcha

[MBHGUS001]



**COMPULSORY DECLARATION**

This work has not been previously submitted in whole, or in part, for the award of any degree. It is my own work. Each significant contribution to, and quotation in, this dissertation from the work, or works, of other people has been attributed, and has been cited and referenced.

Signature: 

Signed by candidate
---------------------

 Date: 13/09/2017

The copyright of this thesis vests in the author. No quotation from it or information derived from it is to be published without full acknowledgement of the source. The thesis is to be used for private study or non-commercial research purposes only.

Published by the University of Cape Town (UCT) in terms of the non-exclusive license granted to UCT by the author.

**SUPERVISOR'S APPROVAL OF SUBMISSION OF DISSERTATION FOR  
EXAMINATION**

I confirm that I have seen/have not seen the final version of Gustav Nyambe Mbeha [MBHGUS001]  
dissertation and that it is submitted for examination with/without my approval.

Signed by candidate

13.09.2017

Supervisor's Signature

Date

**FACULTY OF HUMANITIES**

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My deepest gratitude goes to the following financial donors for generously funding my studies; the National Research Foundation (NRF SARChI chair grant by **Prof. R. Mesthrie**), the Centre for African Language Diversity (CALDi), The University of Cape Town for the Lestrade scholarship and the Namibian Student Financial Assistance Fund (NSFAF).

The composition of this research paper would have been a not possible without the support and contributions of the following people:

Since the inception of the topic, **Dr. Matthias Brenzinger** as my supervisor, was fully engaged in this Masters' project. He supported me in the preparations for my fieldtrip and drove all the way up to Zambia to join me at the research site. There, he assessed my data collection and offered much needed guidance. During the write up back in Cape Town, he was readily available for consultations and was always open to discuss my ideas. He read through my drafts, making comments and suggestions that always came with words of encouragement. He shared his knowledge and provided me with food for thought. Working with him will remain a highlight of my studies at UCT.

Thanks also to **Derrek Gowlett** for discussing my language data and for sharing his insights on Silozi. I appreciate the support I received from my academic family, the **Linguistics** seminar of AXL, at the University of Cape Town as well as **Faiza Steffenson**. Faiza, you are a great administrator, thanks a lot for your support. Special thanks to **Dr. Josephine Ola-Busari** and **Dr. Sarala Krishnamurthy** for introducing me the fun side of Linguistics.

To my family and friends who agreed to be **my participants**, I am grateful to each one of them for having so much patience and taking the time to answer my questions and for allowing me to observe them. I would like to thank my grandmother **Reginah Mpambo Mubita** for helping me arrange meetings with some of my participants and meeting Dr. Brenzinger.

**Maureen Mbeha**, my mother and best friend, thank you for believing in me and always cheering me on, I can never repay you and **Dad** for all your sacrifices, may he continue to rest in peace. To **Simataa, Pumulo, Simunja** and **Mpambo** sorry your big brother was not home, thank you for your prayers and encouragement that kept me going even during the hard days.

I would like to thank **Moosa, Obakeng** and their families for the translations; **Kathy** for editing every chapter. **Fritz, Humphrey, Every Nation Baxter** and everyone that has been family away from home, thank you so much. All these amazing people prove that it indeed takes a village to raise a child.

Most of all, I would like to thank my Lord and saviour **Jesus Christ** for making all of this possible, for Your word never returns void...

*For John Lopa Mbeha...*

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....	ii
Index of Tables .....	x
ABSTRACT.....	xi
<b>ABBREVIATIONS</b> .....	<b>xii</b>
<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>1.1 Introduction</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>1.2 Research Questions</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>1.3 Research Problem</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>1.4 Significance of the Study</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>1.5 Purpose Statement</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>1.6 Present Situation of the Malozi and their Language</b> .....	<b>4</b>
1.6.1 People of Barotseland .....	4
1.6.2 Silozi in Zambia and Namibia Today .....	5
1.6.3 Standardization and Attitude towards Silozi.....	5
<b>1.7 History of Barotseland</b> .....	<b>6</b>
1.7.1 Arrival of first Bantu Speaking People .....	6
1.7.2 Migration and Arrival of the Luyana .....	6
1.7.3 Migration of Makololo.....	8
1.7.4 Makololo in Barotseland.....	8
1.7.5 Fall of the Makololo.....	9
1.7.6 “New” Malozi Chiefs.....	10
1.7.7 Siluyana under Malozi .....	10
1.7.8 Missionaries’ Influence on Silozi .....	11
<b>1.8 Summary</b> .....	<b>12</b>
<b>2. LITERATURE REVIEW</b> .....	<b>14</b>
<b>2.1 Introduction</b> .....	<b>14</b>
<b>2.2 Silozi as a Mixed Language</b> .....	<b>14</b>
2.2.1 Classification Silozi .....	15
<b>2.3 Comparative Studies</b> .....	<b>16</b>
<b>2.4 Bantu Noun Class Systems</b> .....	<b>17</b>
2.4.1 Silozi .....	17
2.4.2 Siluyana, Sesotho and Setswana .....	18
<b>2.5 Kinship Terms</b> .....	<b>19</b>

2.5.1 Kinship Systems.....	19
2.5.2 Kinship in Southern Africa .....	20
2.5.3 Use of Kinship Terms .....	21
<b>2.6 Summary.....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>3. METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>3.1 Introduction.....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>3.2 Research Design .....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>3.3 Data Collection and Published Sources .....</b>	<b>22</b>
3.3.1 Participants.....	23
3.3.2 Written Materials .....	24
<b>3.4 Collection Methods .....</b>	<b>24</b>
3.4.1 Questionnaires.....	24
3.4.2 Observations .....	25
3.4.3 Interviews.....	25
<b>3.5 Sesotho and Setswana Translations.....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>3.6 Research Ethics .....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>3.7 Data Analysis.....</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>3.8 Limitations.....</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>3.9 Summary.....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>4. SILOZI NOUN CLASS SYSTEM.....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>4.1 Introduction.....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>4.2 Silozi Noun Class.....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>4.3 Noun Classes 1-10, 14 and 15.....</b>	<b>29</b>
4.3.1 Classes 1/2 and 1a/2a .....	31
4.3.2 Classes 3/4 .....	32
4.3.3 Classes 5/6 .....	33
4.3.4 Classes 7/8 and 7/8x.....	34
4.3.5 Classes 9/10 .....	36
4.3.6 Class 14.....	37
4.3.7 Class 15.....	37
<b>4.4 Reinvented Noun Classes in Silozi.....</b>	<b>38</b>
4.4.1 Comparative Noun Class Table .....	38
4.4.2 Classes 11-13 .....	39
4.4.3 Classes 11/6 .....	40

4.4.4 Classes 12/13 .....	41
4.4.5 Classes 16, 17 and 18.....	42
<b>4.5 Demonstratives and Genitive .....</b>	<b>44</b>
4.5.1 Demonstratives .....	44
4.5.2 Genitive Markers.....	46
<b>4.6 Summary.....</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>5. KINSHIP TERMS .....</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>5.1 Introduction.....</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>5.2 Iroquois Kinship System .....</b>	<b>48</b>
5.2.1 <i>Ndate</i> - Father .....	49
5.2.2 <i>Mme</i> - Mother .....	52
5.2.3 <i>Ndate yo Muinyani</i> - Patrilineal Uncles .....	53
5.2.4 <i>Malume</i> - Matrilineal Uncles .....	54
5.2.5 <i>Ndate Nengo</i> - Patrilineal Aunts .....	55
5.2.6 <i>Mme yo Muinyani</i> - Matrilineal Aunts .....	56
5.2.7 <i>Bashemi [ba Mutose]</i> - Step parents .....	57
5.2.8 <i>Makwenyani</i> - Parents-in-law.....	58
<b>5.3 Generational Terms .....</b>	<b>59</b>
5.3.1 Banyeni, Bahulwani ni Likaizeli - Siblings and Cousins.....	59
5.3.2 <i>Balamu</i> - Siblings, cousins and in-laws .....	61
5.3.3 <i>Ba banyalani</i> - Spouses.....	61
5.3.4 <i>Libali</i> - Co-wives and co-husbands.....	62
5.3.5 <i>Nyazi</i> - Lover.....	63
5.3.6 <i>Mwana</i> - Children, nieces and nephews.....	64
5.3.7 <i>Bokuku ni Bosukulu</i> - Grandparents.....	65
5.3.8 <i>Batuhulu</i> - Grandchildren.....	66
5.3.9 Great-grandchildren and Great-grandparents.....	68
5.3.10 <i>Bonyandi</i> - Deceased kin.....	68
<b>5.4 Semantic Clarity.....</b>	<b>69</b>
<b>5.5 Summary.....</b>	<b>69</b>
<b>6. CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>71</b>
<b>6.1 Introduction.....</b>	<b>71</b>
<b>6.2 Noun Class System.....</b>	<b>71</b>
<b>6.3 Silozi Kinship Terms.....</b>	<b>73</b>

<b>6.4 Questions for Future Research .....</b>	<b>74</b>
<b>6.5 Summary.....</b>	<b>75</b>
<b>REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>76</b>
<b>Appendix A: Table of Kinship Terms .....</b>	<b>82</b>
<b>Appendix B: Questionnaire.....</b>	<b>85</b>
<b>Appendix C: Wordlist (questionnaire).....</b>	<b>86</b>

## Index of Tables

Table 1 - Questionnaire participants.....	23
Table 2 - Silozi noun class formatives.....	30
Table 3 - Diminutive and augmentative.....	36
Table 4 - Diminutive and augmentative.....	39
Table 5 - Class 11.....	40
Table 6 - Class 12/13.....	41
Table 7 - Class 16 .....	43
Table 8 - Class 17.....	44
Table 9 - Class 18.....	44
Table 10 - Silozi and Sesotho genitive markers and genitive pronouns.....	46
Table 11 - Parental kinship terms.....	49
Table 12 - Siblings, cousins and in-laws' kinship terms.....	59
Table 13 - Spousal kinship terms.....	61
Table 14 - Children, nieces and nephews' kinship terms.....	64
Table 15 - Great /grandparents, great/grandchildren's kinship terms .....	65
APPENDIX A - Table of Kinship Terms.....	82

## **ABSTRACT**

Silozi, the language of the Malozi people in Zambia and Namibia is a mixed language that has been the subject of a classification debate between scholars. Doke (1943) classifies Silozi in the same zone as Sesotho languages due to linguistic similarities. Guthrie (1948) in contrast, classifies it independently because of its geographic location.

Therefore, this study analyses and describes the mixed character of Silozi with focus on two areas. Firstly, the noun class system of Silozi is compared to those of Sesotho and the neighbouring languages to identify the origins of Silozi's noun classes. Secondly, present-day Silozi kinship terms are compared to Sesotho terms to determine which kinship terms are borrowed from Sesotho and which are not. The Silozi terms collected by early scholars are also compared with the present-day terms to identify differences.

First hand language data was collected in the Kavuyu village (Zambia) and the Mahohoma settlement (Namibia) by employing a mixed methods approach. This involved the use of tailor-made questionnaires which included open-ended questions and a wordlist. Furthermore, participant observations and open interviews were conducted. Twelve participants between the ages of 15 and 56 completed the questionnaire. Additionally, one family from each of the research sites was observed and for natural language data. The data used for comparative analysis was drawn primarily from Stirke and Thomas (1916) and Jalla (1936). Sesotho and Setswana native speakers were consulted for translations into the respective languages.

The data analysis led to the following conclusions. Sesotho, Siluyana and some of the neighbouring languages contributed to Silozi significantly. The noun classes 1-10, 14 and 15 of Silozi are shared with Sesotho but the use has been modified due to contact with Siluyana. The diminutive classes 12-13 and locative classes 16-18 which have been lost in Sesotho were reinvented in Silozi through borrowing from Setswana and Siluyana.

Most of Silozi's kinship terms from Sesotho have retained their semantic meanings but some have undergone semantic expansion. The kinship terms of non-Sesotho origin were borrowed from Siluyana and Simbunda. Though Silozi has more noun classes than its parent languages, it contains fewer kinship terms. The aim of this study is to illustrate the mixed character of Silozi in the noun class system and the kinship term, thus aiding the better understanding of Silozi.

## ABBREVIATIONS

Ø.	Zero marker	NEG.	Negative
ABS.	Abstract Pronoun	OM.	Object Marker
CL.	Class (1, 2, 3 etc.)	PFV.	Perfective
CONJ.	Conjunction	PL.	Plural
COP.	Copula	PREP.	Preposition
D. (1, 2)	Demonstrative (degree)	PROG.	Progressive
FUT.	Future Tense	PST.	Past Tense Marker
FV.	Final Vowel	SP.	Species
GM.	Genitive Marker	Q.	Question Marker
GP.	Genitive Pronoun	RESP.	Respect Marker
INF.	Infinitive Verb	REL.	Relative Pronoun
LOC:	Locative	SG.	Singular
		SM.	Subject Marker

# **1. INTRODUCTION**

## **1.1 Introduction**

Silozi is a Bantu language spoken by approximately 750 000 people in the modern-day Zambia and Namibia. This language did not exist prior 1834. In 1823, during the period of warfare known as Mfecane (in isiZulu) or Difaqane (in Sesotho), a group of Southern Sotho people gathered under the leadership of Sebituane and fled from their homes in Bafokeng and migrated northwards to escape Shaka Zulu's regiments.

They identified themselves as Makololo and predominantly spoke Southern Sotho (Sesotho) varieties. On their way to Barotseland, they were joined by Setswana speakers whose own language variety had an impact on the language initially spoken among the Makololo. When the group arrived in Barotseland, in the south-western part of Zambia, they overthrew the Luyana Chief Mubukwanu and established themselves as rulers.

Despite being a minority group, the Makololo's language became the dominant medium of communication and, to this day, has remained the lingua franca of the region. Makololo men married local women who spoke Siluyana and other Bantu languages spoken in Barotseland at the time. After rapid change, the Kololo version of Sesotho became known as Silozi. Within a short period of time, it had developed into a mixed language of a Sesotho stock with heavy influence from Setswana, Siluyana and other neighbouring Bantu languages.

On the one hand, this mixed language Silozi has been standardized to serve as the main language of Zambia's Western Province and Namibia's Zambezi Region alongside English. On the other hand, Siluyana is limited to the Malozi royal house.

## **1.2 Research Questions**

The underlying research question of the thesis is: "Which linguistic features in the mixed language Silozi are of Southern Sotho origin and which are not?" Where Silozi differs from Southern Sotho, contact induced change through borrowing is the most likely explanation for these deviations. Therefore, the sub-question is, "which languages are the most likely donors of these borrowings?" These questions will be answered with reference to the noun class system and the

semantic field of kinship terms. With the underlying research questions in mind, the specific research questions of the present study are:

1. What contact impact from Siluyana and Setswana can be identified in the noun class system of Silozi?
2. What contact-induced changes in Silozi kinship terms can be identified in comparison with the original Sesotho terms?

### **1.3 Research Problem**

There are conflicting stands among scholars on where to classify Silozi within the sub-branches of the Bantu languages. Maho (2005) revising Guthrie's *The Classification of the Bantu languages* reaffirms the classification of Silozi as K21. The letter K represents the geographic region in which Silozi is spoken today and thus Maho states "K21 is a reflection of Lozi's 'odd' geographic location" and should remain classified separate from the Sesotho languages in zone S (Maho, 2005:56).

In contrast, Bastin (1978) and many other scholars, including the ethnologue of the Summer Institute of Linguistics classify Silozi among the S30 languages alongside Sesotho languages [S301/2/3 etc.]. Gowlett (1967; 1989) supports this classification of Silozi and notes that it is a genetically Southern Sotho language which has changed due to heavy influence from Siluyana, Setswana and other languages spoken in the south-western part of Zambia (Gowlett, 1989).

The regional varieties of Silozi spoken in Namibia and Zambia differ slightly and remain largely mutually intelligible. Unfortunately, no in-depth studies on the differences between the two Silozi varieties have been undertaken up to now. Even though the difference between the two regional varieties is not dealt with in greater detail in this study, some of the differences that appear in the language data are indicated.

Gowlett (1989) discusses the phonology, morphology, and lexicon of Silozi in a cross linguistic comparison with the original Sesotho and the languages the Makololo came into contact with during their journey north and after their arrival in Barotseland. The present study is based on research results and provides an in-depth analysis of the mixed character of Silozi by focusing on the noun class system and kinship terms.

## **1.4 Significance of the Study**

Silozi is one of the very few African languages considered in the global academic discourse on mixed languages. Limiting the investigation of the mixed character of Silozi to the noun class system and kinship terms, this study allows for a micro analysis of the contact induced changes on the original Sesotho variety spoken by the Makololo after their arrival in Barotseland about 200 years ago.

By accepting the set of noun classes reinvented for Proto-Bantu and using them as a basis of comparison, the conclusion is that Sesotho has lost a significant number of noun classes. Some of the lost noun classes in Sesotho re-emerged in Silozi due to language contact with other Bantu languages which had retained the classes. This research project therefore provides evidence for a process which can be described as the re-establishing of previously lost noun classes through borrowing into Silozi. The kinship terms hold core cultural concepts, but at the same time they were the most vulnerable parts of the lexicon when the languages came into contact.

Being a Silozi native speaker allows me to provide detailed first-hand data on the use of kinship terms among the different generations and in the different research sites. Most of the language and ethnographic data analysed in this study was collected with friends and relatives in Kavuyu village in Zambia and Mahohoma settlement in Namibia. The kinship terms provided by the participants in the questionnaires demonstrate the mixed character of the language and borrowings from different Bantu languages into Silozi. The study also compares the contemporary Silozi kinship terms with those recorded by Jalla (1936) and Stirke and Thomas (1916).

## **1.5 Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the study is to provide answers to the research questions stated above. Being a member of the Namibian Silozi speaking community with close family ties to Silozi speakers in Zambia has allowed me to gather language data on Silozi language use to the extent and depths that would not have been possible for community outsiders. The role of being an “insider” is a central concern one needs to reflect on when collecting natural language data.

While this study mostly relies on published sources for answering the first question concerning the borrowing of lost noun class, the main contribution of the thesis is to provide data and an analysis

on the origin of the kinship terms. The presented results, informed by the previous studies and the collected data, present a tentative evaluation of the maintenance and stability of a Silozi “standard” variety. Further research would be required however, in order to answer the question on whether mixed languages are more vulnerable to language change.

## **1.6 Present Situation of the Malozi and their Language**

In the following section of the chapter, an overview of the current distribution of the Malozi and their language will be presented.

### **1.6.1 People of Barotseland**

Otherwise known as Buloziland, Barotseland stretches over five countries, namely Namibia, Angola, Zimbabwe, Botswana, and the largest part of Barotseland being the Western Province of Zambia. Barotseland is located on the Barotse Floodplain, a wetland along the Zambezi River. The Barotse Floodplain has an abundant water supply and provides ideal conditions for crop farming and animal husbandry. The Bantu speaking groups that settled in Barotseland had a copious food supply for themselves and their animals. Additionally, the Makololo found it ideal because they easily conquered the inhabitants and established control over the resources.

During the annual rainy season, the water rises and some of the inhabitants along with their animals move to higher land to escape the flooding (Baidu-Forson et al., 2014:5). Other occupants build their houses on mounds called “*mazulu*” and are not forced to move during the flood season.

The inhabitants of Barotseland are an amalgamation of Bantu speaking communities that collectively refer to themselves as Malozi. Different Bantu speaking groups migrated into the Barotse Floodplain and settled there permanently over several centuries. The Malozi as a distinct people did not ‘exist’ until the 1830s when the Makololo arrived in the area and established their dominion.

As a result of the Makololo rule, Silozi [K21] became the most widely-spoken language in Barotseland (Turner, 1952:9). Various other Bantu languages are spoken by the inhabitants of Barotseland as their mother tongue language; these include Cisubiya [K42], Simbunda [K15] and

Sitotela [K41] to mention some. Native speakers of these languages speak Silozi as a second language.

### **1.6.2 Silozi in Zambia and Namibia Today**

Silozi is the lingua franca for people living in the Western province of Zambia and in the Zambezi Region (formerly Caprivi) of Namibia. Pockets of Silozi speakers also exist in Botswana and Zimbabwe (Ethnologue, 2017). This study however limits its focus on Silozi speakers in Zambia and Namibia. In this study, the terms Western Province and Zambezi Region refer to the above mentioned geographical areas in which Silozi is spoken. Silozi is taught as a subject in state administered schools. Printed materials in Silozi are used in advertisements, prayers and songs in churches, and in the dissemination of official information in public offices. There are full time Silozi radio stations and selected television shows that are translated into Silozi.

### **1.6.3 Standardization and Attitude towards Silozi**

After independence in 1990, the Namibian government kept Silozi as the official language of the then Caprivi Region. This language choice was initially made by the South African apartheid government. The motive was to keep the people of the region united and to avoid tribal conflict between the different Bantu speaking groups.

Silozi is standardized and adopted as the official language alongside English in the Western Province of Zambia and the Zambezi Region of Namibia. The two countries agreed on different “standard” varieties of Silozi and there are differences in grammar, lexicon and in the orthography between the Namibian and Zambian standard Silozi varieties.

In the Western Province, Silozi is the first language for the majority of the population while a minority speak it as a second language (Zambia 2010 Census, 2012:66). The wide distribution of Silozi in Zambia creates a sense of ‘ownership’ of the language. In contrast, in the Zambezi Region, Cifwe and Cisubiya are the dominant first languages. Silozi, as well as Siyeyi [R41] and Ruciriku [K332] are only first languages of numerical minorities (Caprivi.biz, 2017).

The claim of ‘ownership’ of Silozi among the Zambian speakers results in negative attitudes towards the Silozi variety spoken by Namibians. During the interviews, Zambian participants

regularly stated that the variety of Silozi spoken in Namibia was of a “lower standard” compared to their own. Namibian participants conceded that the Zambian Silozi is “better” and pointed out their own “mistakes” and “deficiencies” in Silozi.

## **1.7 History of Barotseland**

This section of the introductory chapter will present a brief the migration history of the Bantu speakers of Barotseland as well as some of the historical events which took place after their arrival. The discussion will focus on aspects of the past that are relevant for the genesis of the Silozi language.

### **1.7.1 Arrival of first Bantu Speaking People**

Fagan (1966:90) reports that the Tonga [M64] speakers were the first Bantu speaking group to arrive in the Barotse Floodplain. They first settled in the central north-west in the Sebanzi area around the 12<sup>th</sup> century. Factions of the Tonga speakers migrated west into the Barotse Floodplain.

Between the 1100's (AD) to the 1500's, other Bantu speaking groups also came to settle in the Barotse Floodplain, namely the Ila [M63], Totela [K41 and K411], Mashi [K34], Luvale [K14], Lukulwe [L601], Luchazi [K13], Mbunda [K15], Shanjo [K36], Kwangwa [K37], Kwandi [K371], Nkoya [L60], Toka [C313], Subiya [K42] and Leya [M64] (Roberts, 1976:70). The following Bantu speaking groups arrived later and also settled in the Barotse Floodplain, namely the Fwe [K402], Luiwa [K322], Simaa [K35], Makoma [K353], Mbukushu [K333], Imilangu [K354], Mbowe [K32], Muyeni [K352] and Ndundulu (?<sup>1</sup>) Mainga (1973:11).

Each of the Bantu speaking groups was led by a chief and the groups lived peacefully together with minimal disagreement or involvement in each other's affairs (Mainga, 1973).

### **1.7.2 Migration and Arrival of the Luyana**

The Luyana/Luyi/Lui were a Bantu speaking group that arrived in the Barotse Floodplain around the 1500's (Mainga, 1973:7). According to Caplan the name Luyi/Luyana was given to them by one of the Bantu speaking people with the original meaning “foreigner” (Caplan, 1970:1).

---

<sup>1</sup> No classification available in Maho (2009) or previous publications.

As with the previously mentioned Bantu speaking groups who settled in the area, the Luyana made a living from agriculture, fishing and hunting (O'Sullivan, 1993:v).

Research conducted by archaeologists, linguists, and historians strongly suggests that the origin of the Luyana is the Congo basin of the modern-day Democratic Republic of Congo, specifically from the Katanga area (Mainga, 1966:121). The evidence includes linguistic analysis and historical artefacts which exhibit similarities with other Bantu speaking groups in Zambia that had originated from the Congo basin among the Lunda [L52] speaking group. The Lunda were a Bantu speaking people who had formed the Lunda Kingdom under the leadership of Chief Mwata Yamvo in the Katanga Region.

Siluyana speakers arrived and imposed many changes to the previously existing political and social structure of Barotseland. The various Bantu speaking groups that were overthrown by the Luyana were given Siluyana speakers as chiefs and headmen. Thus, the Luyana established centralized power and control in the Barotseland (Caplan, 1970:1).

They imposed Siluyana as the primary language of communication between the various groups. Siluyana became the lingua franca of the region, while many other Bantu languages were spoken by members of smaller language communities. In the following years, many speakers of the smaller Bantu language communities in the area abandoned their own languages in favour of Siluyana while others acquired Silozi as a second language and maintained their own ancestral languages (O'Sullivan, 1993:v).

The Luyana chiefs had an internal power struggle for the paramount chieftaincy which was vacant after the death of chief Silumeme who had inherited it from his father, chief Mulumbwa. Different factions backed their own chief as heir to the throne which was taken over by chief Mubukwanu, chief Silumelume's older brother. Even though there were several minor revolts against the Luyana from the smaller Bantu speaking groups, they failed to overthrow the Luyana (Mainga, 1966:121). On a greater scale, the Luyana were not united and this was one of their major weakness.

### **1.7.3 Migration of Makololo**

In 1823, a group of Sesotho [S33] speakers fled northwards. Most of these migrants were from the Vet River in the modern-day Orange Free State in the Republic of South Africa. As a collective, the group adopted the name “*Kololo*” (Makololo) derived from the verb “*kuikolola*” meaning ‘to shave your own head’ in Sesotho (O’Sullivan, 1993:vi). The Makololo did not speak one common language; the majority spoke Sesotho varieties and they were joined by people who spoke other Bantu languages. The different Bantu speaking groups had all been defeated by Shaka Zulu’s regiments and united in their struggle for survival and in search for new homes to live.

Sebituane (1790-1851) was the leader of the Basotho people who spoke the Fokeng dialect. He had been one of Shaka Zulu’s military commanders but fled Shaka Zulu’s brutal regime when he had lost a major battle (Roberts, 1976:126). He led the Makololo.

In the north, they were joined by more people who spoke different Bantu languages. Most notably, in Bechuanaland (modern day Botswana) Setswana [S31] speakers joined the Makololo (Jalla, 1920:5) and their language had a significant impact on Sikololo, among others on their noun class system (discussed in greater detail in chapter four).

On the Makololo’s first attempts to settle, they were defeated by groups that had numerical advantages and were better prepared for war. For example, in Ndebeleland (present day Zimbabwe) and Bechuanaland they saw defeat at the hand of Mzilikazi who was the leader of the Ndebele [S44] speakers. The Ndebele had also fled from Shaka but long before Sebituane and his people. The Makololo were forced to flee further northwards, this time from Mzilikazi and the Ndebele who were more powerful (Roberts, 1976:126).

### **1.7.4 Makololo in Barotseland**

After crossing the Zambezi River at Kazungula around the 1830’s, the Makololo arrived in Barotseland and took advantage of the divisions among the Siluyana speakers. The death of Chief Mulumbwa of the Luyana had resulted in an internal struggle for the paramount chieftaincy. Roberts (1976:126) notes that most of the Luyana men became embroiled in a civil war and did not expect an attack from outsiders. Using military techniques adopted from Shaka Zulu, the

Makololo conquered the Luyana who were in a state of disorder. Many of the Luyana leaders were killed and those who survived fled to other areas.

Like the Luyana, Makololo installed their own people as chiefs and headmen in the place of the former Siluyana leadership who reported to Sebituane the new paramount chief. The Luyana women and children were spared. This was one of the earliest points of integration between the Makololo and the Luyana.

During the Makololo rule, the number of Siluyana speakers declined and of the remaining speakers were mostly the exiled Siluyana leaders and their followers. Siluyana was undermined as Sikololo became the lingua franca of Barotseland (Robert, 1976:132). Part of the lexicon from the Bantu languages spoken in Barotseland became absorbed into Sikololo (Jalla, 1937:5).

Sikololo which was later recognized as Silozi is the language that resulted from the contact situation of Makololo and the Bantu speaking groups they found in Barotseland. The Makololo who became integrated with the Luyana population, renamed themselves and took the name Malozi.

### **1.7.5 Fall of the Makololo**

The Makololo's reign over Barotseland lasted for three decades from about 1830 until 1864. In 1851, Sebituane invited English missionary David Livingstone (1813-1873) who had done work in Kolobeng, Bechuanaland (Botswana). During their reign, the Makololo lived in constant fear of the possibility of an attack by the Ndebele from the south. Consequently, Sebituane sought to equip himself against the Ndebele by seeking new trade relations with the Europeans to obtain guns.

As a measure to increase trade, Sebituane tried to expand his territory and influence by attempting to eliminate Chief Imasiku, the recognized heir to the Malozi chieftaincy. Chief Imasiku who was at Lukulu in the north of the floodplain managed to flee to Lukwakwa.

Shortly after the arrival of the missionaries, Sebituane died from what was suspected to be pneumonia. Sekeletu (1835-1863) took over chieftaincy from his father and moved the Malozi capital from Sesheke to Linyanti. Chief Sekeletu continued seeking the help of the missionaries in

finding a solution to the conflict with the Ndebele. In this regard, Livingstone continued to negotiate peace terms between the Ndebele and Makololo as a neutral party.

The Makololo's defeat was the culmination of several circumstances. Firstly, Sebituane's death caused a decline of Makololo influence over the territory (Jalla, 1936:5). Secondly, a faction of the Makololo did not support Chief Sekeletu's instalment as the new chief. Thus, by 1863, the Makololo also became entangled in a fight for power. Thirdly, tropical diseases plagued the population and killed many Makololo. Finally, the remaining Makololo men focused on trade and formed regiments to anticipate an attack from the Ndebele, but in vain. The Makololo were not prepared for the Malozi uprising (Roberts, 1976:131).

### **1.7.6 “New” Malozi Chiefs**

The exiled Luyana/Malozi chiefs had become more organized, and managed to overthrow the Makololo in 1864 (Roberts, 1976:132). In their purge of the Makololo, the Malozi conquerors killed off most of the Makololo male population to prevent a potential uprising in the future. The Malozi kept the women of the Makololo and married them off to chiefs, headmen and soldiers. The Makololo women raised the children and continued to pass Sikololo on to the younger generations (Jalla, 1936:5).

After defeating the Makololo, the Malozi factions continued with the old feud for the paramount chieftaincy. Each faction wanted to rule the entire Malozi populous as well as control over trade and resources. The time they had been separated in exile calcified the division between the leaders of the different factions and their followers.

### **1.7.7 Siluyana under Malozi**

After the Malozi returned to power, there was minimal focus on restoring Siluyana in Barotseland. Siluyana's former status as a lingua franca had been taken over by Silozi with in a period of 30 years.

As briefly mentioned, today Siluyana is used solely in the Royal house of the Malozi by the Chief, his subjects and praise singers (Mainga, 1977:221). People who are not royalty are not allowed to

enter the Royal house. The Malozi chief, his subjects, and his praise singers rarely make public appearances and for that reason Siluyana is hardly heard spoken in public.

When Siluyana is heard, it is at public occasions like the annual “*kuomboka*” ceremony where the chief makes a public appearance (Barotseland.com, 2006). Mukena (2015:iv) states that Siluyana is used to maintain exclusivity. The praise singers use Siluyana to ensure the people do not understand the content of the songs. Mukena (2015:iv) notes that the songs to the chief are not only praise, they are used to advise, reprimand or instruct him, and this is information that must be kept from the people who not part of the royal house.

Siluyana rhyme and poetry continues to be present in some Silozi folktales. In some traditional stories, the storyteller includes a short song (poetic verse) in Siluyana while the rest of story is told in Silozi. A short description of what the song means and why it is relevant to the story is included by the storyteller. A participant who is a storyteller stated that she did not understand the rhyme and poetry word for word, but she had a general idea of what the whole rhyme meant.

By 1916, ‘pure’ Siluyana was no longer spoken, and even the variety of Siluyana spoken by the people in the Royal house of the paramount chief has borrowed words from Simbunda and the other neighbouring languages (Stirke & Thomas, 1916:5). The competence in Siluyana got lost as native speakers of Siluyana shifted to Silozi in their regular day to day communication (Givón, 1970:2).

### **1.7.8 Missionaries’ Influence on Silozi**

The power struggle amongst the Malozi did not stop the work of the missionaries, who had permission to continue their work in Barotseland. The missionaries' main aim was to spread the word of God. Thus, they built churches and schools. However, some missionaries such as David Livingstone also got involved in trade and local politics as they worked closely with the chiefs.

The Paris Mission missionaries obtained permission to start working in Barotseland, a move facilitated by David Livingstone with whom they had shared a good working relationship (Gann, 1958:23). Out of Basutoland (modern day Lesotho), French missionaries Francois Coillard (1834–1904) and Joseph Adolphe Jalla (1864–1946) along with their families launched a mission to Barotseland and were accompanied by Sesotho speaking men and women. Upon arrival in

Barotseland, the missionaries noticed that Sikololo/Silozi and Sesotho were similar (O’Sullivan, 1993:vii).

The French missionaries set up their missionary work and an evangelical school in 1886. Despite the differences between the two languages, all teachings, and interactions with the Silozi speakers were conducted in Sesotho (Jalla, 1936:6). They used Sesotho materials they had produced and brought with them from Basutoland.

Silozi was meant to lose its ‘errors’ and become more like Sesotho. For example, the term “*khaitselie*” in Sesotho appeared to have been simplified to “*kaizeli*” in Silozi. Furthermore, Silozi was also said to be ‘contaminated’ with words borrowed from the Bantu languages spoken in Barotseland, such as Siluyana and Simbunda.

In 1913, the missionaries decided to give up ‘correcting’ Silozi and to accept it as the language spoken by the people of Barotseland (Ambrose, 2007:2). Jalla (1936:6) summarizes the developments he observed in Silozi as follows: “Sikololo vocabulary went on losing Sesuto words and gaining Luyana ones”. Jalla goes on to state that the Malozi were resistant to the language ‘corrections’ that the missionaries wanted to enforce. Silozi, the mixture of Sesotho and Siluyana became the established language of Barotseland.

The missionaries recognized Sikololo/Silozi as the main language of the people of Barotseland (O’Sullivan, 1993:vii) and started to produce the lexicon and Silozi based books. Jalla wrote *Dictionary of the Lozi Language* of 1936 and *Elementary Grammar of the Lozi Language with Graduated Exercises* of 1937 and these remain important publications on Silozi till today. In 1935 *Bibele Ye Kenile*, the first Silozi Holy Bible was published.

The materials written and printed by the Paris Mission Society were also aimed at encouraging non-native speakers to learn Silozi. For instance, in 1950, Gorman wrote *Simple Silozi: A Guide for Beginners*, a self-study resource for Silozi.

## **1.8 Summary**

This chapter introduces the main questions and objectives of the study. A brief outline of the history of Barotseland where the people speaking different Bantu languages migrated into the

Barotse Floodplain between the 12<sup>th</sup> to the 19<sup>th</sup> century. These migrations culminated in a contact situation in the 1840's primarily between Sesotho and Siluyana speakers which resulted in the genesis of Silozi, a mixed language. In the following years, Silozi became the main language spoken in the Western Province of Zambia and the Zambezi Region in Namibia.

During their periods of reign, the Siluyana and Sikololo speakers both imposed their languages on the other Bantu speakers. The role played by women in the formation of Silozi was key as each conquering group of fighters did not kill them, but kept them as wives. Thus, creating a space for the Silozi's formation.

Both the Luyana and Makololo were destabilized by civil unrest. After the Luyana chiefs attacked and won back control of Barotseland, they did not impose Siluyana as a lingua franca, but kept it as an exclusive language for the royal house. Silozi continued to be spoken by everybody.

The missionaries tried to 'correct' Silozi by using the Holy Bible and other texts written in Southern Sotho for more than 30 years. When they finally accepted Silozi as a distinct language, the Paris Mission missionaries became an important agent in establishing Silozi in writing. The missionaries translated the Holy Bible, produced dictionaries and grammars in Silozi. Today, standard Silozi is used as an official language in parts of Zambia and Namibia. Silozi is also spoken by many as a first or second language.

## **2. LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **2.1 Introduction**

This chapter begins in section 2.2 by discussing the literature on the nature of mixed languages and two significant positions that scholars have taken pertaining the classification of Silozi as a mixed language within Southern Bantu languages. This debate has contributed to the inquiry on the mixed status of Silozi which, however, still remains a language requiring more investigation.

Section 2.3 reviews the literature on Silozi and related Southern African Bantu languages such as Sesotho and Siluyana. The focus is on studies that employ a synchronic comparative method and which have contributed to a better understanding of those languages. Section 2.4 and 2.5 discuss the scholarly works on the noun class system and kinship terms of Southern Bantu languages. The sections also draw to some similarities and contradictions within the noun class system and kinship terms of Silozi and Sesotho or any other languages that were influential to Silozi in its formative stages.

### **2.2 Silozi as a Mixed Language**

According to Matras and Bakker (2003:1), a mixed language is a language that develops from a contact situation involving two or more languages, this mixed language becomes the native language of the people, who at one point had many distinct languages come into contact. Meakins (2013:159) states that a fusion happens between the formerly distinct languages. In addition, Velupillai (2015:81) notes that borrowing is the most common method through which languages become mixed and the power dynamics involved determine which group's language contributes the majority of the lexicon, but also borrows lexicon from the other languages (Velupillai, 2015:82). In the case of Silozi, Sesotho was the language of the dominant people and thus, Sesotho borrowed lexicon and some grammatical features from other languages such as Siluyana (Jalla 1937:5). This paper aims to provide evidence to support the latter argument.

Both Stirke and Thomas (1916) and Jalla (1936; 1937) note that from the early arrival of missionaries in Barotseland, Silozi has been identified as a mixed language mainly composed of Sesotho. This position is not contested by any scholars to date. In fact, numerous contemporary

scholars acknowledge the mixed status of Silozi, such as Gowlett (1967; 1989), Mwikisa (1994) and Fortune (2001).

### **2.2.1 Classification Silozi**

An area of contention concerning Silozi, has been where to classify it amongst the Bantu languages (Maho, 2005:8). On one hand, Doke (1943:4) classifies Silozi along with Setswana and Sesotho as a member of the South-Eastern zone. The Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL) maintain this classification of Silozi among the Sesotho languages (Gowlett, 1989:127). Lisimba (1985) and Gowlett (1989) also support this classification.

In addition to the previous arguments, Mwikisa (1994) argues that Silozi is closer to the Sesotho languages due to mutual intelligibility between them, which Silozi does not share with its neighbouring languages. In fact, it is easier for a Silozi speaker to learn Setswana and Sesotho and vice versa, than it is to learn the neighbouring languages, such as for example Simbunda (Mwikisa, 1994:9). As a speaker of Silozi, I found that it was easier to understand Sesotho and Setswana than it was with Simbunda. The language data presented in this paper provides further evidence for this mutual intelligibility.

On the other hand, Guthrie (1948) grouped the Bantu languages in an alphanumeric system with fifteen major zones. Guthrie (1948) passed his classification on similarities in the lexicon and grammar. In Guthrie's reference system of the Bantu languages, Sesotho languages are in zone S whereas Silozi appears in zone K (Guthrie, 1948). Maho (2005; 2009) updated and revised Guthrie's Bantu reference system. Maho (2005; 2009) also adds a third digit the previously two in Guthrie's language codes. He adds missing languages but leaves Silozi in zone K as [K21], thus maintains it as set out by Guthrie in 1948 (Maho 2005:8).

As a researcher and speaker of Silozi, I support Guthrie's (1948) classification, and follow Mwikisa's (1994) arguments. Mwikisa (1994:13) argues though Silozi is a linguistic outsider to the languages of Barotseland and it is not developing towards Sesotho; this is attributed to three main reasons. Firstly, Mwikisa (1994:13) notes the geographic distance between Silozi and Sesotho, secondly, even Setswana which is geographically closer to Silozi, is separated by a political border that is maintained by the governments of Botswana and Namibia. Thirdly, in both former cases, Mwikisa (1994:13) argues that the lack of regular contact between the three

languages means that they will continue to develop separately. Silozi will therefore be more influenced by its surrounding languages, and will borrow from them more.

The South West African (former name colonial for Namibia) Department of Education noticed differences in the Silozi spoken between Zambia and Namibia, and decided on separate orthographies for Namibia and Zambia (South West African Department of Education, 1985). This paper does not analyse the difference of these varieties of Silozi. The aim is rather to show the complexity of Silozi and how the classification by Doke (1943) does not seem to recognise the development of Silozi. Guthrie's (1948) classification recognises Silozi as a language on its own right on account of its mixed status.

### **2.3 Comparative Studies**

While several scholars discuss Silozi, comparative studies are rare. Most of the comparative studies herein take a synchronic approach in the data analysis. Saussure (1959:92) posits that the synchronic method enables linguists to study language as it exists at a certain point in time. Several languages influenced the Sesotho variety spoken by the Makololo and the synchronic method gives insight on the differences and/or similarities between Silozi and these donor languages.

Stirke and Thomas (1916) compiled a wordlist, which is one of the earliest synchronic comparisons of Silozi and its parent or neighbouring languages. Stirke and Thomas (1916) do not exhaust Silozi's (Sikololo) lexicon or analyse the semantics between Silozi, Siluyana and Simbunda. The comparisons demonstrate that many Silozi words were borrowed from Siluyana and Simbunda. Gowlett (1989) and Mwikisa (1994) are more recent comparative studies that contrast Silozi to its contact languages. Firstly, Mwikisa (1994) concludes that though Silozi is still quite similar to Sesotho languages, the difference between the two is increasing and will continue to do so. Gowlett (1989) analyses mixed character of Silozi and discusses the shared features of the phonetic, grammatical and morphological structure between Silozi, Siluyana and Sesotho.

Jalla (1937:7) one of the pioneers in the study of Silozi and Sesotho applied a synchronic method and notes the differences between these two languages. Mabile and Dieterlen (1961:xii) point out that the production of the consonant [l] in Sesotho is articulated as [d] whenever it appears before

the vowels [i] and [u]. Thus, the term for woman, is written as “*mosali*” but pronounced as “*mosadi*” and the name “*Limpho*” is “*Dimpho*”. Mwikisa (1994:15) offers a supporting argument and states that in Silozi, the articulation of [l] is according to the Latin alphabet. Therefore, “*musali*” is spoken as it is written, “*musali*”.

## **2.4 Bantu Noun Class Systems**

The literature presented in this section discusses the noun class systems of Silozi and of the parent languages, namely Sesotho and Siluyana. Various scholars have worked on Bantu linguistics with Wilhelm Bleek, (1862) and Carl Meinhof (1932) being the most prominent with regards to Proto-Bantu noun class reconstructions. More recent studies consulted in this work are Gowlett (1967; 1989); Lisimba (1985); Givón (1970); Demuth (2000) and Mabilile and Dieterlen (1961; 1988).

Meinhof’s (1932) reconstruction of the Proto-Bantu noun class system is the basis for all historical work on Bantu languages. Demuth (2000) and Mwendende (2010) make no difference in that and discuss the noun classes from 1 to 23; some of these noun classes appear in widely shared singular/plural pairings, such as 1/2, 1a/2a, 3/4, 5/6, 7/8, 9/10 and 12/13. With other noun classes, such as 11, in the Bantu languages assigned different plural classes, mainly 6 or 10. 15, 16, 17, 18 do not pair with any plural class, and so on. Compared to the Proto-Bantu state of noun classes, all Bantu languages have lost noun classes over time. For example, Siluyana contains 18 of the 23 classes, but not all remain fully productive (Givón, 1970:19). This study illustrates how Silozi reinvented noun classes that are lost in parent languages Sesotho and Setswana. Jalla (1937); Demuth (2000) and Mwendende (2010) all discuss the concordance system of the respective languages they are working on.

### **2.4.1 Silozi**

Jalla’s (1937:7) initial description of the noun class system of Silozi distinguishes nine major categories in which the singular/plural pairs constitute one category. Jalla’s (1937) categorisation of the Silozi noun class system is confusing because of the non-paired noun classes are not placed into set classes. Gowlett (1967; 1989) and Fortune (2001:10) used Bleek’s (1862) and Meinhof’s (1932) noun class numbering, which will also be adapted into the present study. Fortune (2001:10) for example, distinguishes eighteen nominal classes in Silozi.

Mwendende (2010:331/2) argues that Silozi has twenty noun classes. He states that class 19 “*bi*” is paired with class 20 “*si*” (Mwendende, 2010:331). However, there are two challenges to Mwendende’s (2010) claim of the existence of classes 19 and 20. Firstly, the concord and derivational formation prefix is similar to classes 7 and 8 in Gowlett (1967:100). Secondly, none of Silozi’s donor or neighbouring languages as presented by scholars like Givón (1970), Lisimba (1985) and Demuth (2000) contain these classes.

More importantly, Gowlett (1989) highlights that class 8 contains multiple subcategories that pair with class 7, and these originate from Siluyana, Sesotho and Proto-Bantu. This paper provides linguistic evidence to support Gowlett (1989). Lastly, Gowlett (1989) notes that the noun class system of Sesotho is basically maintained in Silozi, but extended due to influence from Setswana and Siluyana. Finally, classes 8 “*bi*”, 11 “*lu*”, 12 “*ka*” and 13 “*tu*” originate from Siluyana.

#### **2.4.2 Siluyana, Sesotho and Setswana**

Givón (1970); Lisimba (1985) and Mukena (2015) conclude that Silozi replaced Siluyana as a lingua franca in the 1840s. They further observe that the use of Siluyana today is limited to the Malozi royal house. Despite the limitation, Givón (1970) and Lisimba (1985) discuss the noun class system of Siluyana. In particular, Givón (1970:96-108) provides Siluyana proverbs that are translated into English. These illustrate the grammatical structure of Siluyana and semantic features. Lisimba (1985) focuses on an analysis of the languages of the Luyana [K30] group. Both Givón (1970) and Lisimba (1985) note that Siluyana is one of the parent languages of Silozi, Sesotho being the other.

Both Givón (1970) and Lisimba (1985) demonstrate that classes 1 to 14 in Siluyana still contain many nouns and the classes are productive. For example, prefixes from classes 7, 8 and 11 are used to form the augmentative while the diminutive is formed by class 12/13 prefixes. Givón (1970) observes that even though Siluyana contains locative classes 15 to 18, they are not very productive in the language and play a minimal role in the concord system. For example, “*ku*” takes the stabilizer “*li*” in the Siluyana phrase “*kuli uyu*” meaning ‘to this one’ (Givón, 1970:22).

Demuth’s (2000:272) study on the semantic productivity and morphological processes of Bantu languages compares Sesotho’s and Setswana’s noun class systems to Proto-Bantu. Demuth (2000) concludes that classes 1 to 10, 14 and 15 in Sesotho like most Bantu languages remains highly

productive as nouns are marked via the prefix (or zero). In addition, Demuth (2000) finds that the locative prefixes in Sesotho are not productive and thus, Sesotho marks the locative via the suffix “-eng”. Class 17 prefix “ho” remains minimally productive while the classes 16 and 18 are not productive. The locative classes 16 “fa”, 17 “kwa” and 18 “mo” in Setswana however, remain productive as derivative prefixes but also makes uses of the “invariant locative suffix -(e)ng” (Demuth, 2000:277).

## **2.5 Kinship Terms**

Velioti-Georgopoulos (2006:1371) defines kinship as “social relationships” that are created through either affinity or consanguinity. Meaning that family relationships are formed either through marriage or through birth (Dykstra, 2009:951). Biesanz and Biesanz (1971:211) conclude that the relational distance between family members can either be nuclear/immediate (siblings, children and parents) or extended (all other family members). These relationships between family members are expressed and labelled by ‘kinship terms’ (i.e. cousin or sister) (Edmonson, 1957:394).

### **2.5.1 Kinship Systems**

Murdock (1949) analyses numerous kinship systems of different cultures worldwide. In this paper, the focus is on what he calls the Iroquois and Hawaiian kinship systems. Hammond-Tooke (2004:74) argues that most Southern Bantu languages fall under the Iroquois (bifurcate merging) kinship system. However, data collected by me reveal also similarities to the Hawaiian (generational) system. This is discussed in more detail in chapter four.

Murdock (1949:223) states that in the Iroquois kinship system, the mother of Ego and matrilineal aunt share a kinship term while the matrilineal uncle is referred to by a different term; similarly, the father and his brothers share the same kinship term and while the sister is referred to by a different term. Furthermore, Ego's cousins and siblings go by different terms. Hammond-Tooke (2004) analyses variations of the kinship term “*motswala*” (cousin) in various Bantu languages including Sesotho (S30), Cilala (M52), Cilamba (M54), Cinsenga (N41) and Chikunda (N42). Hammond-Tooke (2004:77) concludes that the term is common in most of these languages in different variations, and this supports Murdock (1949) claims.

Mbikusita-Lewanika (1983) and Gluckman (1950) discuss Silozi kinship terms and illustrate features of the Iroquois system such as with the parental kinship terms. Additionally, Mbikusita-Lewanika (1983:7) notes that the kinship terms for siblings are also used for cousins in Silozi. This follows the Hawaiian kinship system where all cousins and siblings go by the terms of sibling, namely “*munyeni*” (younger sibling).

### **2.5.2 Kinship in Southern Africa**

Gluckman (1950) discusses kinship terms in Southern Africa and focuses on Silozi terms that are created through marriage; Silozi kinship terms are compared to those from isiZulu. Mbikusita-Lewanika (1983) provides brief insights on the cultural elements that influence the kinship terms in Silozi. Sheddick (1953) analyses social relationships of the Basotho people and highlights selected kinship terms as well as how they are used. Most kinship terms presented by the three latter scholars show that a majority of Silozi’s kinship terms are similar to those found in Sesotho. In fact, an analysis of a sample Silozi words from Siluyana, Silozi and Sesotho draws to the conclusion that majority of Silozi’s lexicon is of Sesotho origin (Gowlett, 1989:143).

Sheddick (1953:30) in an ethnographic survey of the Southern Sotho speaking groups discusses Sesotho kinship terms and provides insight on the various terms that exist as well as which kin they are applied to. For example, there are terms that are gender specific such as “*mora*” (son) and while others are not such as “*mochana*” (niece or nephew) (Sheddick, 1953:31). With an anthropological approach, Gluckman (1950) compares Silozi and isiZulu’s kinship and marriage systems (Gluckman, 1950:166). The social norms allow for certain kinship terms to exist, for example, polygamy creates a need for the term “*muhalizo*” (co-wife) (Gluckman, 1950:176). This is also found as “*mohalitso*” in Sesotho.

Some Sesotho terms are replaced or simply no longer used, in Silozi. For example, the notion of ‘step-relatives (father, daughter and so on) do not exist (Mbikusita-Lewanika, 1983; Gluckman, 1950:171). These terms are also not mentioned by Sheddick (1953:30). This research paper aims to take a more in-depth look at the terms and compare them more explicitly across the languages.

### **2.5.3 Use of Kinship Terms**

Prinsloo and Bosch (2012:296) argue that the use of kinship terms for relatives among Bantu speakers depends on elements beyond language such as the relationship between the speaker and listener, age, gender and social context. This also applies in Silozi, for example, a husband would use a more respectful term for wife “*muhalizo*” in a formal context. Furthermore, Akindele (2008:14) adds that in many African societies, including Sesotho and related languages, kinship terms are not used, and people rather use first names. The lack of use of the terms support the argument that kinship terms are lost or forgotten by speakers if they are no longer relevant (Mbikusita-Lewanika, 1983:4). For the purpose of this research, when some “lost” terms were identified, the speakers were approached to discuss the possible reasons for the difference in the terms.

In addition, Radcliffe-Brown (1952) states that in a joking relationship, people interact or refer to each other in a manner that would otherwise be rude or insulting. Admittedly, Mbikusita-Lewanika (1983) and Gluckman (1950) refer to this type of relationship between family members in the Bantu languages they study.

## **2.6 Summary**

This chapter reviewed relevant literature pertaining mixed languages, the Bantu noun class systems and kinship terms. The first section discussed the literature on mixed languages and the academic debate on the mixed character of Silozi, as well as on its classification among the Southern Bantu languages. Section 2.3 discussed the literature consulted on the comparative method and comparative studies.

Section 2.4 introduced the literature on Bantu noun class systems and highlighted the different sets of the noun class system of Silozi established by the different authors. The sources for the noun classes of the possible donor languages were presented with a focus on those relevant for Silozi. Finally, section 2.5 looks at sources that deal with kinship systems and more specifically with the kinship system and kinship terms of Silozi, Sesotho, and Siluyana.

## **3. METHODOLOGY**

### **3.1 Introduction**

This chapter describes the research methods and instruments used in the data collection process. The language data was collected in Zambia and Namibia from early December 2016 to late January 2017. Qualitative and quantitative data was gathered through ethnographic methods. The language data analysis was mainly synchronic, but some diachronic aspects were included when possible. In addition to the data collected with language consultants, published and online resources contributed significantly to the answering of the research question.

### **3.2 Research Design**

The data was collected through a mixed methods approach which is a combination of “quantitative and qualitative methods” (Edmonds & Kennedy, 2017:178). Rasinger (2010:52) defines the different aspects addressed in these research methods as follows:

...qualitative research is concerned with structures and patterns, and how something is; quantitative research, however, focuses on how much or how many there is/are of a particular characteristic or item.

Qualitative data was collected through observations, interviews, the open-ended section of the questionnaires and the word lists. The qualitative data was used to analyze the shared feature of Silozi in the noun class system and kinship terms. The semantics of kinship terms and the formatives of the noun class system were assessed mainly through the Silozi sentences collected.

The quantitative data in this study is limited to the assessment of the number of non-Sesotho terms mentioned in the questionnaires filled out by the participants. This provides an indication as to how many of the original terms are passed on or replaced by terms from neighboring languages.

### **3.3 Data Collection and Published Sources**

The data used in this study was elicited from published sources such as books and from research conducted through field work involving participants.

### **3.3.1 Participants**

The research was conducted on two research sites, namely at Kavuyu village, east of Sesheke, Zambia, and at Mahohoma settlement in Katima Mulilo, Namibia. Silozi is the dominant language spoken by most people in both research sites.

Kavuyu village is located less than 20 km from the border of Zambia and Namibia and most of the inhabitants are communal farmers. In Mahohoma, on the other hand, the inhabitants are either employed or self-employed and live a more ‘urban’ lifestyle. Members of both communities travel regularly into the other country for business or to visit friends and family.

All the participants who were involved in the overall research are first language speakers of Silozi. They all acquired Silozi at home first and some of them had formal Silozi classes in government schools as well. The married participants use Silozi with their spouses and children. Silozi is spoken by the participants at home, school and within the community. In other spaces, such as at work or at the market place, languages like English, Cisubia and Cibemba are used.

The questionnaire was completed by twelve participants in total. Therefore, there were six from each research site composed of three males and three females. Three age groups were considered, namely 15-35, 36-55 and 56+. The data collected from the different generations allows for identifying age related variation. The following Silozi speakers participated in this component of the research (pseudonyms have been used).

Table 1: Questionnaire participants

<b>Participants name</b>	<b>Age group</b>	<b>Gender</b>	<b>Location</b>
1 - Inambao	15-35	M	Mahohoma
2 - Monde	15-35	F	Mahohoma
3 - Wabei	15-35	M	Sesheke
4 - Tawila	15-35	F	Sesheke
5 - Saboi	36-55	M	Mahohoma
6 - Sibeso	36-55	F	Mahohoma
7 - Sitali	36-55	M	Sesheke
8 - Sepo	36-55	F	Sesheke
9 - Waluka	56 +	M	Mahohoma
10 - Inonge	56 +	F	Mahohoma
11 - Musa	56 +	M	Sesheke
12 - Mbuyoti	56 +	F	Sesheke

### **3.3.2 Written Materials**

Written sources from early scholars of Silozi were consulted such as the Silozi dictionary by Jalla (1936) and the comparative wordlist compiled by Stirke and Thomas (1916). They provide insights into the Silozi kinship terms used during the formative years of Silozi. For the comparative analysis of the Silozi noun class system, the studies by Gowlett (1967; 1989), Givón (1970), Lisimba (1985), Stirke and Thomas (1916) and Demuth (2000) were the most important sources.

### **3.4 Collection Methods**

The following section will provide information on the methods employed in the data collection. These comprised of participant observation and the elicitation of questionnaires.

#### **3.4.1 Questionnaires**

The participants completed English based questionnaires (see Appendix B). For participants who did not speak English or were non-literate, the researcher explained the questionnaire and assisted in the filling out of the questionnaire.

The questionnaire was divided into three sections. The first section included questions on the participants' personal background, such as place of residence, level of educational and age group. Open ended questions, such as where Silozi was acquired, where it is used and which other languages spoken form part of section two. These questions also aim at to assess the degree of daily exposure to Silozi.

The final section of the questionnaire was a wordlist (see Appendix C). More kinship terms were added to the original word list published by the University of Auckland. The participants were required to provide Silozi translations of the English terms and to mention any additional or alternative Silozi terms that they knew.

A trial run of the first version of the questionnaire was carried out with non-Silozi speakers at the University of Cape Town in October 2016. It was noted that the initial questionnaire was too long. For that reason, the word list was shortened and the questions were redesigned to encourage shorter answers and explanations.

### **3.4.2 Observations**

Participant observation is defined as “the conscious noticing and detailed examination of the participants’ behavior in a naturalistic setting” (Cowie, 2009:166). To keep the setting as natural as possible, the research observations took place in the participants’ homesteads, plantations or workplaces (if the participants gave permission to join them at work).

During the observation, participants socialized with other people in a natural manner. Participant observation allowed for collecting data on language use in that natural setting and notes were taken for conversational analysis. The main focus was on the use of kinship terms, but observations also contributed data on the use of the noun classes and the concordances.

An anticipated challenge was the observer’s paradox which is identified by Labov (1972:209), as a situation in which participants are aware of the researcher and consequently behave in a different manner, such as alter speech. However, the effects of the observer paradox were reduced because researcher is a regular visitor to both of the research sites, is known to most people and thus, was unobtrusive when making observations.

### **3.4.3 Interviews**

The interviews were unstructured and took the form of a conversation between the interviewer and the participant, usually in the participant’s homestead. Schilling (2013:108) argues that the observer’s paradox is overcome through interviews because participants are encouraged to speak on a topic with which they are comfortable. Silozi seemed to be a topic that all the participants enjoyed talking about. Other issues discussed included the socio-cultural factors that influence the use or non-use of kinship terms.

The participants were asked to explain the kinship terms that are used in Silozi. The interviews were also used to follow up on some the terms that were provided by the participants (in the questionnaires) or noticed by the researcher during observation sessions. During the interviews, questions on Silozi grammar (for the noun class system) resulted in some of the younger participants noting that their Silozi was not ‘proper’ and stating that the elders were in a better position to answer.

Most of the participants refused to be recorded on any digital recording devices but agreed for the researcher to take written notes during the conversations. One participant agreed to be recorded but opted to tell folktales only.

### **3.5 Sesotho and Setswana Translations**

The English sentences were translated into Setswana and Sesotho by first language speakers from Botswana and Lesotho respectively. The native speakers were regularly consulted on all translations into their respective languages. The languages of the sentences in this paper are indicated as follows, Silozi (Loz), Sesotho (Sot), Setswana (Tsw) and Siluyana (Luy).

The interlinear translations from Silozi into English were transcribed in accordance to the Leipzig Glossing Rules updated in 2015. While the Leipzig Glossing Rules do not cover all the category classifications (Leipzig Glossing Rules, 2015:1), they allow translators to use alternative categorical classifications if required.

The noun class systems and kinship terms in this paper are noted in consultation with the speakers where possible. In addition, the following published texts were consulted: Jalla (1936; 1937), Gowlett (1967; 1989); O’Sullivan (1993); Mwendende (2010); Stirke and Thomas (1916), Givón (1970); Lisimba (1985); Wookey (1940) and Demuth (2000).

### **3.6 Research Ethics**

In ethical research, it is important for the participants to give consent and also know that they are free to opt out of the research at any given (Rasinger, 2013:52). Therefore, appointments were set with all the participants for a detailed explanation of the research purpose and the planned use of their information. If the participants agreed to be part of the study, follow up meetings to fill out the questionnaires were scheduled. Meetings were conducted in English or Silozi, depending on the participants.

All participants who took part in the questionnaires and interview component of the research were above legal consenting age. They either signed an agreement to participate on the printed questionnaires or gave verbal consent in front of witnesses. During observations where minors (i.e. persons below 18 years of age) were involved, consent was sought from their parents or legal

guardians to observe the minors. However, they were only involved when they were interacting with their legal guardians or parents. All participants were reminded that they were voluntarily taking part in the research project and that they could opt out at any time without providing reasons.

Finally, all of the participants were assured anonymity, that their real names would not be published, as seen in Table 1. Their information would be kept confidential and would not be issued to any third parties.

### **3.7 Data Analysis**

There are two areas of Silozi that were analysed via the synchronic method in this research. The first was a comparison of Silozi's noun classes to those of Sesotho, Setswana and neighbouring languages in order to identify possible donors for borrowings of classes. The second was the analysis of Silozi kinship terms, which was conducted by first comparing them with Sesotho terms, then the kinship terms noted by Stirke and Thomas (1916) and Jalla (1936; 1937) were compared with those collected by the researcher in fieldwork in Zambia and Namibia in order to identify donor languages and changes in the terms.

### **3.8 Limitations**

The December to January period is the planting season and this created a logistical difficulty in getting people to complete the questionnaires, especially during the weekdays. People left early in the morning (before sunrise) for their plantations and they returned in the late afternoon to attend to household duties (i.e. fetching water). During the busy times, conversations were limited. However, in the evenings the people would come together and this was when most observations and interviews were conducted. The questionnaires were filled out on Sundays or on the days the participants would decide to stay home. Appointments had been postponed frequently.

While some people travelled away for the festive season, there were also many people visiting their relatives in the research sites and, thus, people preferred to spend most of their free time with their relatives as opposed to fill out questionnaires. This meant that questionnaires had to be filled out in the presence of the participants' visiting relatives, who at times wanted to assist in the responses to the questionnaire. The influx of visiting relatives made the inquiry on the nature of relationships between relatives easier to explain the kinship terms. I would mention two people

and ask how they were related, this made understanding the questionnaire easier for those who were not literate.

Finally, finding native speakers of Simbunda and Siluyana proved to be a limitation because Siluyana is spoken in the royal court, a place to which I was not granted access and Simbunda speakers reside further north of the research sites. Peer reviewed research on both languages is also limited, which further limited data. Contact with speakers of both languages was not established and thus I had to rely on written resources such as Stirke and Thomas (1916); Givón (1970); Lisimba (1985) and Gowlett (1989).

### **3.9 Summary**

This chapter discusses the mixed methods employed in the data collection. This data collected through questionnaires, observations and interviews was analysed primarily through the synchronic method, with the diachronic method used minimally. Written data was used to compare contemporary Silozi kinship terms to those collected about a hundred years ago. All of the participants were Silozi native speakers from an area where Silozi is widely spoken.

The concerns relating to the ethics of the research are addressed and the participants guaranteed anonymity to any third parties as well as not having their real names published. Finally, though there were limitations, alternative measures were put in place to mediate some of the limitations.

## **4. SILOZI NOUN CLASS SYSTEM**

### **4.1 Introduction**

This chapter is divided into six sections including the introduction and summary. Section 4.2 briefly introduces the Silozi noun class system while section 4.3 presents a detailed description of the individual noun classes and shared features with Sesotho or other languages are indicated. Section 4.4 discusses Silozi's noun classes which do not exist in Sesotho and their possible origins. Finally, section, 4.5, discusses the nature of the demonstrative and genitive markers in Silozi. Not all the noun classes contain kinship terms, therefore other nouns are provided to present a complete list of the noun class system of Silozi.

### **4.2 Silozi Noun Class**

Silozi contains noun classes 1 to 18. Most noun classes take prefixes except for classes 1a and 9 with zero markers ( $\emptyset$ ). Classes 11 to 13 and 16 to 18 are found in Silozi but are lost in Sesotho. In all Bantu languages, the concordance in sentences depends on the class membership of the head noun (Demuth, 2000:270). Nouns can take on prefixes from various classes to inflect their meanings, such as indicating plurality or singularity; augmentative or diminutive.

Classes 1 to 10 and 12/13 are singular and plural pairs. In general, countable nouns are paired in singular and plural classes, for example “*mu-sizana*” (girl) singular class 1 is paired with “*ba-sizana*” (girls), plural class 2. Some classes also contain uncountable nouns such as “*nama*” (meat) class 9 and “*mubu*” (soil) class 3. Class 11 is paired with class 6. Classes 14 to 18 contain nouns of qualities, manner, and location. The semantic categories underlying the noun classes correspond mainly to those of Sesotho, Siluyana, and Setswana.

### **4.3 Noun Classes 1-10, 14 and 15**

Silozi contains all noun classes which exist in Sesotho which are class 1-10, 14 and 15. In addition, however, Silozi reintroduced noun classes from Setswana and Siluyana (see table 3) which have been lost in Sesotho. Table 2 illustrates the noun classes and the concordance system of Silozi based on Mwendende (2010:331) and Gowlett (1967:100).

Table 2: Silozi noun class formatives – [based on Gowlett (1967) and Mwendende (2010)]

	Class Pref.	Subj	Obj	Gen	Abs	Gen	Rel	Demonstratives			
		Mar	Mar	Mar	Pro	Pro		1 deg	2 deg	3 deg	4 deg
1 SG	-	ni	ku	-	nna	ka	-	ye	-	-	-
1 PL	-	lu	-	-	luna	luna	-	-	-	-	-
2 SG	-	mu	-	-	wena	hao	-	yo	-	-	-
2 PL	-	-	mi	-	mina	mina	-	-	-	-	-
CL. 1	mu (mu-una)	u	mu	wa	yena	hae	ya	yo	yoo	Yani	yale
CL. 1a	∅ (malume)	u	mu	wa	yena	hae	ya	yo	yoo	Yani	yale
CL. 2	ba (ba-ana)	ba	ba	ba	bona	bona	ba	ba	bao	Bani	bale
CL. 2a	bo (bo-malume)	ba	ba	ba	bona	bona	ba	ba	bao	Bani	bale
CL. 3	mu (mu-shitu)	u	u	wa	wona	wona	wo	wo	woo	Wani	wale
CL. 4	mi (mi-shitu)	i	i	ya	yona	yona	ye	ye	yeo	Yani	yale
CL. 5	li (li-zazi)	li	li	la	lona	lona	le	le	leo	Lani	lale
CL. 6	ma (ma-zazi)	a	a	a	ona	ona	a	a	ao	Ani	ale
CL. 7	si (si-mbotwe)	si	si	sa	sona	sona	se	se	seo	Sani	sale
CL. 8	bi (bi-shimani)	bi	bi	bya	byona	byona	bye	bye	byeo	byani	byale
CL. 8x	li (li-mbotwe) ~zi	zi	zi	za	zona	zona	ze	ze	zeo	Zani	zale
CL. 9	∅- (nyazi)	i	i	ya	yona	yona	ye	ye	yeo	Yani	yale
CL. 10	li (li-nyazi)	zi	zi	za	zona	zona	ze	ze	zeo	Zani	zale
CL. 11	lu (lu-chwani)	lu	lu	lwa	lona	lona	lo	lo	loo	lwani	lwale
CL. 12	ka (ka-chwani)	ka	ka	ka	kona	kona	ka	ka	kao	Kani	kale
CL. 13	tu (tu-chwani)	tu	tu	twa	tona	tona	to	to	too	twani	twale
CL. 14	bu (bu-twa)	bu	bu	bwa	bona	bona	bo	bo	boo	bwani	bwale
CL. 15	ku (ku-nata)	ku	ku	kwa	kona	kona	kwa	kwa	koo	kwani	kwale
CL. 16	fa (fa-teni)	fa	fa	fa	fona	fona	fa	fa	foo	Fani	fale
CL. 17	ku (kwa-nu)	ku	kwa	kwa	kona	kona	kwa	kwa	koo	kwani	kwale
CL. 18	mu (mwa-le)	mu	mwa	mwa	mona	mona	mwa	mo	moo	mwani	mwale

### 4.3.1 Classes 1/2 and 1a/2a

These noun classes are similar in Silozi and Sesotho. Most human nouns (i.e. occupations) appear in classes 1/2 and 1a/2a, including the majority of kinship terms. Names of people are usually in class 1a/2a. The singular classes 1 and 1a pair with the plural classes 2 and 2a respectively. Nouns in class 1 take the class prefix “*mu*”, for example, “*mu-nyeni*” (younger sibling of same sex), “*mu-tatehi*” (a cook), with the plural forms “*ba-nyeni*” and “*ba-tatehi*”. Human nouns may also take a zero marker ( $\emptyset$ ) of class 1a. Nouns in class 1a are, for example “*malume*” (matrilineal uncle) and “*kuku*” (grandmother) or names, such as “*Nyambe*”. In class 2a, the prefix “*bo*” expresses respect and/or plurality. This is a feature that is found in the Lunda based languages as illustrated by Mutunda (2006:7)

1. Sot. “***Malome*** *ke ngoaneno?*”

Loz. “***Malume*** *ki munyeni wa hao?*”

$\emptyset$ -ma-lume                      ki      mu-nyeni                      wa                      hao  
CL1a-mother-male    COP    CL1-younger.sibling    CL1.GM    2SG.GP

*Is my uncle your younger brother? (CL1a non-respect form)*

2. Sot. “***Malome*** *ke ngoaneno?*”

Loz. “***Bomalume*** *ki banyeni ba mina?*”

bo-ma-lume                      ki      ba-nyeni                      ba                      mina  
CL2a-mother-male    COP    CL2-younger.sibling    CL2.GM    2PL.GP

*Is my uncle your younger brother? (CL2a - respect form)*

In Silozi, the prefixes of noun classes 2 “*ba*” and 2a “*bo*” not only indicate plurality, but can also be used as politeness markers to express respect, usually employed for elder people (Gowlett, 1967:100). In Sesotho class 2 and class 2a markers only signify plurality such as in (2).

Unless the use of the class 2 prefix is analysed within a given context, the meaning can be ambiguous. For example, in (3), the meaning of Silozi “*ba*” is ambiguous. The class prefix “*ba*” can either refer to a group of men who are the farmer’s employees or to a single man for who “*ba*” is used to show respect.

In (3), “*ba*” in the words “*ba-ana*”, “*ba*”, “*ba-limi*” and “*ba-nani*” is used to express respect. The following three “*ba*” all express plurality, thus referring to several employees. This becomes

more obvious in the use of the number “*ba-lalu*” (three). The prefix “*ba*” can be used in one and the same sentence to express plurality and respect. The Sesotho prefix “*ba*” always expresses plurality, such as in “*ba-ts’ebelets*” (workers). While the prefix markers used here are of Sesotho origin, their application is of non-Sesotho origin. This exemplifies the mixed character of Silozi.

3. Sot. “*Monna eo ke moleme, o na le bats’ebelets **ba** bararo*”

Loz. “*Baana ba ki **ba**limi, **ba** nani **ba**beleki **ba** balalu.*”

<b>ba</b> -ana	<b>ba</b>	ki	<b>ba</b> -limi	<b>ba</b> -nani	<b>ba</b> -beleki
CL2-man	CL2.D1	COP	CL2-farmer	CL2.OM-have	CL2-employee
ba	<b>ba</b> -lalu				
CL2.REL	CL2a-three				

*This man is a farmer who has three employees.*

Class 1 and 1a singular with “*mu*” and (∅) respectively, do not have the ambiguity challenge. The prefix “*mu*”, changes the concordance of the sentence to class 1 from class 2 making it “*mu-una yo ki mu-limi*” (This man is a farmer).

In storytelling, animals or inanimate objects can take class 1a, and class 2a markers which give them humanlike qualities. In (4), a rabbit, the moon and the sun appear in class 2a thus giving them ability to marry.

4. Sot. “*Mutlanyana e nyetse khoeli le letsatsi, bohlae ba mutlanyana.*”

Loz. “*BoShakame **ba**nyezi **bo**Kweli ni **bo**Lizazi, butali bwa shakame.*”

<b>bo</b> -shakame	<b>ba</b> -ny-ezi	<b>bo</b> -kweli	ni	<b>bo</b> -lizazi	<b>bu</b> -tali
CL2a-rabbit	CL2-marry-PROG	CL2a-moon	CONJ	CL2a-sun	CL14-wit
bwa	∅-shakame				
CL14.REL	CL1-rabbit				

*Mr. Rabbit is married to [Mrs.] Moon and [Mrs.] Sun, the witty rabbit.*

#### **4.3.2 Classes 3/4**

The nouns in these two classes take the prefixes “*mu*” in the singular class 3 and “*mi*” in the plural class 4. In example (5), the prefixes of Sesotho and Silozi are the same. Most tree names, for example “*mu-buyu*” and “*mu-zinzila*”, inanimate objects “*mu-kata*” and abstract nouns like colours “*mufubelu*” are members of these two classes. Some animates like “*mu-kolozwani*” (lizard) and “*mu-kombwe*” (cock) are also in these classes. Body parts are the only human nouns that appear in classes 3 and 4. For example, plural body parts “*mu-nwana/mi-nwana*” (finger/s)

or singular body parts like “*mu-lomo/mi-lomo*” (mouth/s). Kinship terms do not feature in these two classes. Some liquids like “*mu-zilili*” (milk) are part of this class.

5. Sot. “***M**okholutsoana o **me**bala **e** **me**beli e matetse muhonono*”

Loz. “***M**ukolozwani wa **mi**bala **ye** **mi**beli **u** matezi mwa muhonono*”

**mu**-kolozwani wa **mi**-bala **ye** **mi**-beli u-mat-ezi  
 CL3-lizard CL3.GM CL4-color CL4.REL CL4-two CL4.SM-run-PST.PROG

mwa **mu**-honono  
 CL17.GM CL6-tree.SP

*The lizard with two colours ran into the tree.*

In Silozi, this class can be used for augmenting objects that are already large such as elephants. This is not the case in Sesotho. For example, “*tou*” (elephant) is a class 9/10 noun in both, Sesotho and Silozi. In (6) Silozi, “*tou*” (elephant) can take on the class 3 marker “*mu*” which then puts extra emphasis on the large size of the elephant. The same strategy of using class 3 for augmenting already big objects is also found in Siluyana, which makes Siluyana a possible candidate for this contact induced interference. The difference in concordance with Sesotho is because Silozi in (6) follows the class 3 membership of the head noun while Sesotho remains in class 9.

6. Sot. “***(Ø)**Tlou **e** keni tsimong ea rona.*”

Loz. “***M**utou **u** keni mwa masimu a luna.*”

**mu**-tou **u** ken-i mwa ma-simu a  
 CL3-elephant CL3.SM enter-PST CL18.GM CL6-plantation CL6.REL

luna  
 1PL.ABS

*The big elephant entered our plantation.*

### **4.3.3 Classes 5/6**

The nouns belonging to these classes have the prefix “*ma*” and “*li*” and include paired body parts such as “*li-hutu*” and “*ma-hutu*” (leg/s), inanimate objects like “*li-chwe*” and “*ma-chwe*” (stone/s) are also members of this class. However, not all nouns belonging to class 5 have a class 6 pairing. Nouns like “*li-tatla*” (noise) and “*lizwayi*” (salt) are only found in class 5 because they

have no plurals. Some liquid nouns such as “mezi” (water) and “lienge” (saliva), others are in classes 3/4. Kinship terms do not feature in this class.

7. Loz. “**Malao** a ni lumile fa **lizoho**”

ma-lao            a            ni            lum-ile    fa            li-zoho  
 CL6-hornet    CL6.SM    1SG.ABS    bite-PFV    CL16.OM    CL5-arm

*The hornets stung me on the arm.*

#### **4.3.4 Classes 7/8 and 7/8x**

This class contains some human nouns such as “si-bofu” (blind person) and “si-kombwa” (steward). Borrowed words of non-Bantu languages like “si-patela” from English ‘hospital’ and “si-ntolo” which is from the Afrikaans word “stoor” (store) are in classes 7/8. Animates like insects “si-buku” (worm) and animals “sitongwani” (hyena); inanimates are also in this category, for example “silepe” (traditional axe).

Singular class 7 “si” pairs with plural class 8x which can have either the noun class prefix “li” (example 9), or “zi” (example 11). Plural class 8 with the prefix “bi” is another possible pairing (example 13) class. “Li” is the most common and neutral plural pairing for class 7 (Gowlett, 1989:134). Gowlett (1967:100) only mentions the noun class prefixes “li” and “bi”. “Li” and “zi” both take the concordance marker of class 8x, which shares the same forms with class 10. Plural class 8 with the noun class prefix “bi” (example 13) has its own concordance.

8. Loz. “**Simbotwe** **sa** luma kwa minwana.”

**si**-mbotwe    **sa**-lum-a            kwa            mi-nwana  
 CL7-frog        CL7.SM-bite-FV    CL17.LOC    CL4-finger

*A frog bites fingers.*

9. Loz. “**Limbotwe** **za** luma kwa minwana.”

**li**-mbotwe    **za**-lum-a            kwa            mi-nwana  
 CL8x-frog    CL8x.SM-bite-FV    CL17.LOC    CL4-finger

*Frogs bite the fingers.*

A limited number of nouns can take both prefixes “li” and “zi”. For example, “li-kokwani” can be “bi-kokwani” with class 8 concordance or “zi-kokwani” in (11) with the concordance of class 8x.

10. Loz. “**Sikokwani sani si maswe.”**
- |                    |             |           |       |
|--------------------|-------------|-----------|-------|
| <u>si</u> -kokwani | <u>sani</u> | <u>si</u> | maswe |
| CL7-insect         | CL7.D4      | CL7.SM    | ugly  |

*That insect is ugly.*

11. Loz. 1. “**Bikokwani byani bi maswe.”**
2. “**Li/Zikokwani zani zi maswe.”**
- |                    |             |           |       |
|--------------------|-------------|-----------|-------|
| <u>zi</u> -kokwani | <u>zani</u> | <u>zi</u> | maswe |
| CL8x-insect        | CL8x.D4     | CL8x.SM   | ugly  |

*Those insects are ugly.*

Silozi nouns can take class 7/8 prefixes to form augmentative (pejorative) nouns (examples 12 and 13). When human nouns appear in class 7/8, they take on the quality of enlargement or dislike. In examples 12 and 13, the noun “*mu-shimani*” (boy) class 1 is moved into class 7/8 to exaggerate the size and attribute a negative quality to the boy. In joking relationships or in the creation of an insult, human nouns can be used with class 7/8 noun class prefixes. Sesotho, on the other hand, does not have this augmentative meaning. In example 13, Sesotho “*ba*” *only* expresses plurality and not augmentative.

12. Sot. “**Moshemane eo ke oa manganga”**
- Loz. “**Sishimani seo ki sa mahanyi.”**
- |                    |            |     |           |              |
|--------------------|------------|-----|-----------|--------------|
| <u>Si</u> -shimani | <u>seo</u> | ki  | <u>sa</u> | ma-hanyi     |
| CL7-boy            | CL7.D2     | COP | CL7.GM    | CL6-stubborn |

*This boy is stubborn.*

13. Sot. “**Bashemane bao ba manganga”**
- Loz. “**Bishimani byeo ki bya mahanyi”**
- |                    |             |     |            |              |
|--------------------|-------------|-----|------------|--------------|
| <u>bi</u> -shimani | <u>byeo</u> | ki  | <u>bya</u> | ma-hanyi     |
| CL8-boy            | CL8.D2      | COP | CL8.GM     | CL6-stubborn |

*These boys are stubborn.*

The augmentative feature of Silozi is shared with Siluyana. Classes 7/8 in expressing augmentative meanings, are opposites for classes 12/13 with diminutive meanings. These Silozi classes are shared with Siluyana, which is the most likely donor, see table 3.

Table 3: Diminutive and augmentative

CL7	CL8	CL12	CL13
<b>si</b> -kota	<b>bi</b> -kota	<b>ka</b> -kota	<b>tu</b> -kota
big tree	big trees	small tree	small trees

The stabilizer “-nga-” is added to some class markers when kinship terms appear in the class 7/8. “Ndate” (father) becomes “*si-nga ndate*” (singular augmentative of ‘father’) or “*zi-nga ndate*” (plural augmentative of father). Kinship terms referring to family members of the same generation or following generations do not take on the “-nga-” morpheme. With them, the following compositions are possible, “*si-nyenyeni*” (younger sibling) and “*bi-hulwani*” (older siblings).

#### **4.3.5 Classes 9/10**

Plant nouns like “*mbonyi*” (maize) and “*ndongo*” (peanuts) are in class 9. In Silozi, tree is in singular class 9 “*kota*”, and plural class 10 “*li-kota*”. In Sesotho, tree is in singular class 7 “*se-fate*” and plural class 8 “*di-fate*” (Demuth, 2000:273).

Kinship terms not found in classes 1, 1a, 2 or 2a are part of class 9 and 10. “*Nyazi*” is an example of a class 9 kinship term and it takes on the class prefix “*li*” to form plural. Uncountable nouns like “*nama*” (meat) in (14) takes a zero marker in Silozi and Sesotho, but does not take on class 10 prefix “*li*” pairing. “*Nama*” is paired with class 6 and forms “*ma-nama*” the augmentative and plural form for meat.

14. Sot. “*Nama ea mutlanyana e monate.*”

Loz. “*Nama ya shakame i munati.*”

∅-nama	<b>ya</b>	ka-shakame	<b>i</b>	mu-nati
CL9-meat	CL9.GM	CL12-rabbit	CL9.OM	CL3-delicious

*Rabbit meat is delicious.*

Non-paired and paired body parts are found in classes 9/10 like “*numbu*” and “*li-numbu*” (calf/calves), “*ngo*” and “*li-ngo*” (nose/noses). Sentence (15) takes on the class 10 prefix “*li*” and concordance.

15. Sot. “Hloho **ea** hao e kholo”

Loz. “Toho **ya** hao ki **ye** tuna”

∅-toho      **ya**      hao      ki      **ye**      tuna  
CL9-head   CL9.GM   1SG.GP   COP   CL9.REL   big

*Your head is big.*

16. Sot. “Lihloho **tsa** hao likholo”

Loz. “**Li**toho **za** hao ki **ze** tuna”

**li**-toho      **za**      hao      ki      **ze**      tuna  
CL10-head   CL10.GM   2SG.GP   COP   CL10.REL   big

*Your heads are big.*

#### **4.3.6 Class 14**

Abstract nouns in Silozi take the class 14 marker “*bu*”, which is closer to Sesotho “*bo*” than to the Siluyana “*u*” prefix. Compare for example, Silozi “*bu-sihu*” (night) with Sesotho “*bo-siho*” and Siluyana “*u-siku*”. Siluyana, class 14 nouns are paired with class 6 (Givón, 1970:14). My own data collected does not show evidence for a class 14/6 pairing in Silozi. To illustrate, in Siluyana class 14 “*u-siku*” pairs with class 6 “*ma-siku*”, while Silozi holds only “*bu-sihu*” for both plural and singular. Class 14 has own concordance. For example,

17. Sot. “**Botsoali** oa **bo** rata, hase lethetsi.”

Loz. “**Bu**shemi wa **bu** lata, **boo** aki **buhata**.”

**bu**-shemi      wa      **bu**-lat-a      **boo**      a-ki      **bu**-hata  
CL14-parent   CL1.GM   CL14.OM-love-FV   CL14.D2   NEG-COP   CL14-lie

*He loves parenthood, that is not a lie.*

The grammatical construction is the same in Sesotho and Silozi. Only some of the human nouns from class 1, 1a, 2 and 2a such as generational kinship terms can take on the class 14 marker “*bu*”.

#### **4.3.7 Class 15**

The infinitive marker “*ku*” is also the noun class prefix of class 15. Kinship terms are not found in this class. “*Ho*” in the Sesotho corresponds to Silozi “*ku*”, which is also the form used in Siluyana.

18. Sot. “**Ho** tsamaea **hoa** ntate oa hao, **ha** oa loka.”

Loz. “**Ku**zamaya **kwa** bondata ho **ku** maswe.”

<b><u>ku</u></b> -zamaya	<b><u>kwa</u></b>	bo-ndat-a-ho	<b><u>ku</u></b>	maswe
CL15-walk	CL15.GM	CL2a-father-CL1a.GM-2SG.GP	CL15.SM	ugly

*Your father walks around too much.*

#### **4.4 Reinvented Noun Classes in Silozi**

This section of the chapter discusses the noun classes 11 to 13 and 16 to 18 in Silozi that have been lost in Sesotho. When the Makololo arrived in the Barotseland they spoke a variety of Sesotho, but due to language contact, they reinvented these noun classes which had been lost in their original language. Gowlett (1989:100) does not mention the two locative classes 16 and 18, which are found in Silozi.

##### **4.4.1 Comparative Noun Class Table**

Per table 4, there are noun classes that appear in Silozi but are not present in Sesotho, Siluyana or Setswana. These classes appear to have been reinvented in the language due to language contact situations between Silozi and these three languages. Class 8x “*li*” is not shared with any languages, however, it could be directly from the Proto-Bantu form, “\**di*” (Gowlett, 1989:134). With the reinvented and fully productive noun classes, the Silozi noun class system is closer to the Proto-Bantu’s noun class system than Sesotho, Siluyana and Setswana.

The Sesotho and Setswana noun class systems are drawn from Demuth (2000:272) and the Siluyana is taken from Givón (1970) and Lisimba (1985). The Silozi language data is from Gowlett (1967) and from own field work.

Table 4: Diminutive and augmentative

Class	Silozi (Gustav F.N.)	Silozi (Gow. 1967)	Sesotho (Dem. 2000)	Setswana (Dem. 2000)	Siluyana (Giv. 1970)
1	mu	mu	mo	mo	mu
1a	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅
2	ba	ba	ba	ba	ma
2a	bo	bo	bo	bo	aa
3	mu	mu	mo	mo	mu
4	mi	mi	me	me	mi
5	li	li	le	le	li
6	ma	ma	ma	ma	ma
7	si	si	se	se	si
8x	bi	bi	-	-	-
8	li/zi	li	di	di	ii
9	∅	∅	(N)	N	n/m
10	li	li	di (N)	di N	tin/tim
11	<u>lu</u>	lu	-	lo	<u>lu</u>
12	<u>ka</u>	ka	-	-	<u>ka</u>
13	<u>tu</u>	tu	-	-	<u>tu</u>
14	bu	bu	bo	bo	u
15	ku	ku	ho	go	kw
16	<u>fa</u>	-	-	<u>fa</u>	ti
17	ku	ku	ho	<u>ku</u>	-
18	<u>mu</u>	-	-	<u>mo</u>	-

#### 4.4.2 Classes 11-13

Classes 12 and 13 are lost in Sesotho and Setswana (Gowlett, 1989:136). Class 11 is still found in Setswana with the noun class prefix “*lo*” (Demuth, 2000:272). These classes are present and actively employed in Siluyana and Silozi. They express augmentative or diminutive meanings. In Sesotho, the augmentative or diminutive meanings are indicated through suffixes (see 4.5.3.).

Based on the similarity in form and application, classes 12 and 13 were most likely borrowed from Siluyana (Gowlett, 1989:136). Since class 11 also exists in Setswana (Demuth, 2000:272), it is possible that the Makololo borrowed this class from the Setswana speakers when the latter joined them on their way north. However, when the Setswana form of the prefix “*lo*” came into contact with “*lu*” from Siluyana, there was likely a change in the prefix from the Setswana to the Siluyana form.

### 4.4.3 Classes 11/6

Long and/or thin animates like “*lu-wawa*” (jackal) and, inanimates “*lu-taka*” (reed) are members of class 11 in Silozi and Siluyana. Gowlett argues that most class 11 nouns derive from Siluyana (Gowlett, 1989:136).

Setswana singular class 11 is paired with plural class 8, for example “*lo-leme*” (tongue), “*di-teme*” (tongues). In contrast, Siluyana and Silozi singular class 11 is a pair with plural class 6 (see table 5) “*lu-konga*” (white sorghum) with the plural “*ma-konga*”. The examples in table 5 demonstrate that Silozi shares the pairing of class 11 and class 6 with Siluyana.

Table 5: Class 11

Language	CL. 11	Root	Noun	English	Plural
Silozi	<u>lu</u>	konga (bag)	lu-konga	white sorghum	[Cl.6] ma/konga
	<u>lu</u>	kota (tree)	lu-kota	tree	[Cl.6] ma/kota
Setswana	<u>lo</u>	leme (tongue)	lo-leme	tongue	[Cl.8] di/teme
	<u>lo</u>	bone (candle)	lo-bone	candle	[Cl.8] di/pone
Siluyana	<u>lu</u>	limi (tongue)	lu-limi	a tongue	[Cl.6] ma/limi
	<u>lu</u>	wawa (jackal)	lu-wawa	a jackal	[Cl.6] ma/wawa

In Siluyana and Silozi, nouns from other noun classes can take on the class 11 prefix “*lu*” as an augmentative marker. In example 19, “*lu-nja*”, “*nja*” (dog) from noun class 9 takes the class 11 noun class prefix “*lu*” for a pejorative meaning. This emphasizes the largeness or thinness of a dog, and is pejorative. Setswana does not employ class 11 in this meaning, thus the Setswana phrase in example 19 is not possible.

Due to the class 11/6 pairing in Silozi, “*lu-nja*” in (19) can become “*ma-nja*”, which then expresses disgust for dogs.

19. Tsw: \****Lontsa la gago***” (not possible)

Loz: ***Lunja lwa hao***” (sentence possible)

lu-nja      lwa      hao  
 CL11-dog    CL11.GM    2SG.GP

*Your dog*

#### 4.4.4 Classes 12/13

Small animates (insects, birds, or other small animals) and inanimate objects (pebbles, beads, etc) are members of class 12/13. For example, “*ka-ci*” (Jalla, 1937:82) is a small pest that spoils food. Uncountable nouns can be found in the plural class 13 such as “*tu-mezi*” (a little water) or “*tu-lelu*” (small beard). The classes 12/13 express smallness, but can also indicate scarcity.

The singular class 12 “*ka*” and plural class 13 “*tu*” are the only singular/plural pairing beyond class 10. Nouns from other classes can take on class 12 to form the diminutive. For example, “*mu-una*” (man) from class 1 becomes “*ka-ana*” (small man) in class 12.

Table 6: Class 12/13

Language	CL. 12/13	Root	Noun	English
Siluyana	ka/ tu	limi (tongue)	ka/tu-limi	small tongue/s
	ka/ tu	tondo (tree)	ka/tu-tondo	small tree/s
Silozi	ka/ tu	kotana (bag)	ka/tu-kotana	small bag/s
	ka/ tu	kota (tree)	ka/tu-kota	small tree/s

When kinship terms are used with class 12/13 prefixes, they become diminutive and are perceived as an insult, especially when used for people older than oneself. Where a joking relationship exists, speakers use the diminutive for each other and then even for older relatives. For instance, old people are sometimes referred to as “*ka-chembele*” (small old person), the plural being “*tu-chembele*”. Speakers do not use this form in the presence of the elderly as they would feel offended.

On the other hand, class 12/13 marker are used frequently by speakers when referring to or addressing younger family members, usually small children. For example, “*ka-nyeni*” (small younger sibling) and the plural form “*tu-nyeni*”. These terms can be used with the referents present and the children do not feel offended. Otherwise, class 11 “*lu*” can be added within the context of a joking relationship or to form an insult.

Some kinship terms from class 1, 1a, 2, and 2a take “*-nga-*” between class 11, 12 or 13 markers and the noun to create the augmentative or diminutive form. For example, class 11, “*lu-nga maho*” (your big mother), class 12 “*ka-nga maho*” (your small mother) with the plural form (class 13) being “*tu-nga maho*”, all three forms are derogatory.

The class 12/13 form of ‘small mother’ denotes disrespect and contains a different semantic meaning from class 1a/2a “*maho yo mu-inyani*” (younger matrilineal aunt).

#### **4.4.5 Classes 16, 17 and 18**

From the onset, Sikololo did not contain the locative classes and this is evident in the fact that they are completely lost (no longer existent) in Sesotho, Demuth maintains that class 17 is minimally active (Demuth, 2000:277). Givón (1970:22) argues that the locative classes in Siluyana are not productive.

In Silozi, the locative classes were reinvented when the Makololo encountered Setswana speakers in Bechuanaland (modern day Botswana). The three locatives reflect Proto-Bantu locative classes and are realized through a prefix marker. Classes 16 and 18 are omitted by Gowlett (1967:100).

The locatives in Setswana and Silozi function in a similar manner. The locative prefix does not replace other class markers weather the noun is plural or singular, they are added to a morpheme that already contains a prefix. For example, in (20) class 6 plural prefix “*ma*” in “*ma-simu*” (plantation) is kept when the class 18 locative “*mwa*” is added. If the noun was singular, then the locative marker would be the only class marker as “*simu*” class 9, thus “*mwa-simu*”.

20. Loz. “*BoKuku ba mwa masimu.*”

bo-kuku	ba	<u>mwa</u>	ma-simu
CL2a-grandmother	CL2a.SM	CL18.LOC	CL6-plantation

*My grandmother is in the plantation.*

Kinship terms do not take on the locative class, but can appear in the same utterance to indicate the physical position of the referent. As such, in (20), “*Kuku*” is not inflected by the locative class 17.

#### **Class 16**

Silozi shares the Setswana locative “*fa*”, which equates to the English word ‘by’ (Demuth, 2000:277). However, the data collected in examples (21) and (22) suggests that an additional meaning is ‘on’ and in example 21, “*fa*” indicates that the water “*mezi*” is ‘on’ the table “*tafule*”, “*fa*” implies closeness and in addition the meaning “on”.

The corresponding locative prefix in Siluyana is “*ba*” Givón (1970:22) and it is therefore most likely that Silozi borrowed the noun class 16 prefix “*fa*” from Setswana.

Table 7: Class 16

Language	prefix	Root	Noun	English
Setswana	fa	tafole-ng	fa tafoleng	on the table
	fa	lebota-neng	fa lebotaleng	on the wall
Silozi	fa	tafule	fa tafule	on the table
	fa	limota	fa limota	on the wall

21. Tsw. “*Metsi a fa tafoleng mo ntlong ko motseng*”

Loz. “*Mezi a fa tafule mwa ndu kwa hae*”

mezi	a	<u>fa</u>	∅-tafule	<u>mwa</u>	∅-ndu
C6.water	CL6.SM	CL16.LOC	CL9-table	CL18.LOC	CL9-house
<u>kwa</u>	∅-hae				
CL17.LOC	CL9-village				

*The water is on the table in the house at the village.*

22. Tsw. “*O kwala fa lebotaneng.*”

Loz. “*U ngola fa limota.*”

u-ngol-a	<u>fa</u>	limota
CL1.SM-write-FV	CL16.LOC	CL9.wall

*He/she writes on the wall.*

### Class 17

The locative “*ku*” indicates that the objects referred to and the speaker are not in the same place. Silozi locative prefix 17 “*ku*” is equivalent to Setswana “*ko*” ‘at’ (Demuth, 2000:278). Class 17 is the only locative class that is mentioned by Gowlett (1967:100). In example 21 and in the table 8 below, the speaker is not in the village or the house, but at a distance away.

Table 8: Class 17

Language	CL. 17	Root	Noun	English
Setswana	<u>ko</u>	ntlo-ng	ko-ntlong	at the house
	<u>ko</u>	motse-ng	ko-motseng	at the village
Silozi	<u>ku</u>	ndu	kwa-ndu	at the house
	<u>ku</u>	hae	kwa-hae	at the village

## **Class 18**

This locative class “*mu*” is used when the referee is in an interior position like in a “*lapa*” (compound) or in a “*si-zuma*” (basket). The marker “*mu*” means ‘in’ and can be used for any object and also for abstract nouns such as ideas (in a mind).

Table 9: Class 18

Language	CL. 18	Root	Noun	English
Setswana	<u>mo</u>	ntlo-ng	mo-ntlong	in the house
	<u>mo</u>	legano-ng	mo-leganong	in the mouth
Silozi	<u>mu</u>	ndu	mwa-ndu	in the house
	<u>mu</u>	mulumo	mwa-mulomo	in the mouth

Classes 16, 17 and 18 of Silozi share the semantic meanings with Setswana.

## **4.5 Demonstratives and Genitive**

### **4.5.1 Demonstratives**

The demonstratives in Silozi and Sesotho are applied in a similar manner (Gowlett, 1989:136). Silozi class 1 demonstratives are “*ba, bao, bani and bale*” which correspond with Sesotho “*ba, bao, bane and bale*”. In each class, there are four degrees of demonstrative pronouns, all dependent on time and/or distance between speaker and referent. The following analysis discusses how the demonstratives function in Silozi and Sesotho. It is based on the discussion of demonstrative markers by Jalla (1937:17)

The first-degree (D1) demonstratives, i.e. “*yo*”, “*ba*”, refer to things or people close to the speaker. The English equivalents are ‘this’ and ‘these’. The demonstrative of this degree is used when the person or object referred to is visible and can be pointed to by Ego. For example, “*yo*” in (24), is used to refer to a boy who is next to the speaker.

23. Sot. “Moshemane eona ke setloholo sa ntate ea emeng mane.”

Loz. “Mushimani yo ki muikulu wa muuna yale ya yemi fale.”

mu-shimani yo ki mu-ikulu wa mu-una yale  
 CL1-boy CL1.D1 COP CL1-grandchild CL1.GP CL1-man CL1.D4

ya yem-i fale  
 CL1.REL stand-PROG CL16.D4

*This boy is the grandson of that man standing over there.*

The second-degree (D2) demonstratives are not to be confused with the first-degree (D1). The D1 demonstratives have a short vowel while D2 demonstratives have a longer vowel. The D1 demonstrative marker of class 11 is “lo” while the D2 demonstrative is “loo”. Jalla (1937:17) does not mention this difference in vowel length. The vowel length results in a tonal difference. The two demonstratives are not interchangeable and are in other classes, such as for example class 10, easily distinguishable as they have different final vowels, such as class 8 “ze” (D1) and “zeo” (D2).

When reference is made to things or objects that are not too far from the speaker, the second-degree demonstratives are used. The English equivalent is ‘there’. The referent may or may not be visible to the speaker. In example 24, “yoo” refers to someone who is approaching. When the old lady in this example arrives, and is close to the speaker the demonstrative “yoo” changes to “yo”.

24. Sot. “Me eane oa mabane ke yoo wa tla”

Loz. “Muchembele yani wa mabani ki yoo wa taha.”

mu-chembele yani wa ma-bani ki yoo wa-tah-a  
 CL1-old.person CL1.D3 CL1.GM CL6-yesterday COP CL1.D2 CL1.SM-come-FV

*That old lady from yesterday is coming.*

The third and fourth degree demonstratives are used to refer to a subject that is far from the speaker in distance and/or time, the English equivalent is “that” [over there, yonder] (Jalla, 1937:17). For example, “yani” in (24) is used to indicate that the old lady was seen in the past. In example 23, “yale” is used to show that there is distance between the speaker and the man referred to. “Yani” can be used instead of “yale” without any change in meaning in the sentence.

### 4.5.2 Genitive Markers

The genitive markers and genitive pronouns in Silozi are suffixed to kinship terms (Jalla, 1937:15). While there is wide range of rules that apply to how markers are applied, this section only discusses the rules relevant to kinship terms. The application of the genitive markers is similar in Silozi and Sesotho. Table 10 compares the genitive markers of Silozi and Sesotho.

Table 10: Silozi and Sesotho genitive markers and genitive pronouns

Example	<u>Noun + GM + GP</u>	<u>Phrase</u>	<u>English</u>
A.i ii	' <u>me</u> <u>mme</u>	' <u>me</u> <u>mme</u>	my mother
B.i ii	moena + <u>oa ka</u> munyeni + <u>wa ka</u>	moena <u>oa ka</u> munyena <u>a ka</u>	my younger sibling
C.i ii	ntate + <u>ao hao</u> ntate + <u>wa hao</u>	ntate <u>oa hao</u> ndata <u>a ho</u>	your father
D.i ii	moena + <u>oa hao</u> munyeni + <u>wa hao</u>	moena <u>oa hao</u> munyena <u>a hao</u>	your younger sibling
E.i ii	moena + <u>oa hae</u> munyeni + <u>wa hae</u>	moena <u>oa hae</u> munyena <u>a hae</u>	his/her younger sibling
F.i ii	mme + <u>oa hae</u> mme + <u>wa hae</u>	' <u>me oa hae</u> <u>mma he</u>	his/her mother

The rules below present the manner in which the genitive marker and genitive pronoun are applied in Silozi and Sesotho kinship terms.

Rule one: In the first person-singular, kinship terms ending with /e/, have under gone a semantic expansion and the /e/ acts as a genitive marker and genitive pronoun though it is part of the root noun. “Mme” (mother) for example also means “my mother”, the same goes “ndate” (father). Secondly, in all other positions, the genitive marker is inserted but it loses the /w/ while the /e/ is deleted at the root. The genitive pronoun on the other hand remains disjunctive. Therefore, “ndate wa hae” (his/her father) is realized as “ndata hae”.

Rule two: For all kinship terms ending with the vowel /i/, the /w/ from the genitive marker and the /i/ from the kinship term are deleted. Thus, “mu-nyeni” becomes “mu-nyeni ka/hao/hae” (my/your/his younger sibling). This rule is applied to singular and plural (1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> person) forms.

Rule three: Nouns with /u/ as final vowel do not change and there are no deletions at the genitive marker or genitive pronoun. Therefore, “*kuku*” (grandmother) becomes “*kuku wa hao*” (your grandmother).

#### **4.6 Summary**

Through language contact with Siluyana and Setswana, the Makololo reinvented noun classes that have been lost in Sesotho into Silozi. Silozi has the full set of noun classes from 1 to 18 without any gaps and therefore, Silozi shows the more complete noun class system compared to the languages that have had an impact on it. With Sesotho, Silozi shares the classes 1-10, 14 and 15. Siluyana had an impact on some of these classes because its uses were added such as augmentation. The Locative, diminutive and augmentative meanings are marked via suffixes in Sesotho. Silozi borrowed the noun class usages from Siluyana and Setswana.

When considering the original set of the Proto-Bantu noun class system, Silozi reinvented classes 11 to 13 and 16 to 18 through borrowings from Siluyana and Setswana. Classes 12 and 13 are most likely from Siluyana while class 11 may possibly be borrowed from Setswana and later adjusted to the Siluyana pronunciation. The locatives classes 16, 17 and 18 are borrowed from Setswana. Finally, the demonstrative and genitive markers of Silozi are shared with Sesotho.

## **5. KINSHIP TERMS**

### **5.1 Introduction**

This section discusses the kinship terms elicited through the various data collection methods described in chapter 3. While most Silozi kinship terms are derived from Proto-Bantu forms, i.e. Silozi “*mwana*” from Proto-Bantu is similar to \**jánà* (child), the focus in this discussion is on differences and similarities of kinship terms of Silozi in relation to Sesotho, Siluyana and Simbunda.

The chapter also highlights the changes in some of the kinship terms and discusses factors that might have caused these changes, such as acculturation. Appendix A provides an overview of the kinship terms from Silozi and the different languages discussed in this chapter.

### **5.2 Iroquois Kinship System**

Silozi and Sesotho both have an Iroquois kinship system, this implies that parental kinship terms are not exclusively for parents (Murdock, 1949). The biological father or step-father and the patrilineal uncle/s are referred to with the same kinship term, “*ndate*” (father). Similarly, the term “*mme*” (mother) is used to refer to the biological mother of step-mother and matrilineal aunt/s. The patrilineal aunt and the matrilineal uncles are referred to by different terms, but their kinship terms still indicate whether they are Ego’s (self) father or mother’s sibling.

Table 11: Parental kinship terms

	<b>Silozi</b>	<b>English</b>	
Parents	<i>ndate</i> <i>ndata ho</i> <i>ndata he</i> <i>bondate</i> <i>bondata ho</i> <i>bondata he</i>	<i>my father</i> <i>your father</i> <i>his/her father</i> <i>my fathers</i> <i>your fathers</i> <i>his/her fathers</i>	
	<i>tate or ita</i> <i>ndate Monde</i>	<i>father (address terms)</i> <i>father of Monde</i>	
	<i>mme/mma</i> <i>mma ho</i> <i>mma he</i> <i>bomme</i> <i>bomma ho</i> <i>bomma he</i> <i>mma Inonge</i> <i>ima</i>	<i>my mother</i> <i>your mother</i> <i>his/her mother</i> <i>my mothers</i> <i>your mothers</i> <i>his/her mothers</i> <i>mother of Inonge</i> <i>mother (address term)</i>	
Uncles	<i>ndate</i> <i>ndate yo muinyani</i> <i>malume</i>	<i>uncle (patrilineal)</i> <i>uncle (patrilineal)</i> <i>uncle (matrilineal)</i>	
	Aunts	<i>ndate nengo</i> <i>ndate wa musali</i> <i>mme</i> <i>mme yo muinyani</i>	<i>aunt (patrilineal)</i> <i>aunt (patrilineal)</i> <i>aunt (matrilineal)</i> <i>aunt (matrilineal)</i>
		Step parents	<i>ndate [wa mutose]</i> <i>mme [wa mutose]</i>
Parents-in law			<i>mukwenyani</i> <i>makwenyani</i>

### **5.2.1 Ndate - Father**

“*Ndate*” is the term for father, it also applies to patrilineal uncles (Gluckman, 1950:175). For that reason, Ego can have ‘many’ fathers. The term “*ndate*” is shared with Sesotho term “*ntate*”. The Proto-Bantu \**tààtá*, is closer to the Silozi address (term used when talking to someone) term for father, which is “*tate*”.

In both Sesotho and Silozi, the root word “*ndate*” takes on a plural class 2a prefix “*bo*” to express plurality. Silozi in addition, also employs plural classes 2 and 2a to express respect, a feature that is not found in Sesotho. This feature is common amongst languages of the Lunda group where Siluyana originates (Mutunda, 2006). In (26) for example, Ego uses “*bondate*” as a term of reference (term used when talking about someone). The term “*ndate*” is used with the class 2a marker “*bo*” because Ego is referring to his own father.

When referring to someone else’s father, the term of reference remains in class 2a. If Ego is older than the father of the person he is talking about, the use of the plural marker “*bo*” is still required. “*Bondate Mukela*” as a form of address can be extended to any grown man to express respect.

Using “*ndate*” as a singular noun with the concordance of class 1a is considered disrespectful in Silozi. Sesotho in contrast uses the singular noun classes 1 and 1a, regardless of age and social standing; in Sesotho, this use is not considered disrespectful. Sesotho uses the noun class prefix of class 2a “*bo*” only to mark plurality. “*Ntate*” itself is a term used to indicate respect. In example (27), the Sesotho speaker refers to an older man by the name of Moka as “*ntate Moka*”, this is considered a polite form of addressing an older man.

In the context of a joking relationship that exists between the speaker and the person referred to, there is an option to omit the noun class 2a marker. In example (25), Mr. Linyunga uses the singular class 1a marker to refer to the father of Imasiku, a person to whom he speaks; Mr. Linyunga uses the same class to refer to himself.

25. Sot. Mr. Linyunga: “*Ntate oa hao* u romile ho *mang?*”

Loz. Mr. Linyunga: “*Ndata ho* u ku lumile ku *mangi?*”

<u>Ø-ndat-a-ho</u>	u-ku-lum-ile	ku	<u>mang-i</u>
CL1a-father-GM-2SG.GP	CL1a.SM-2SG.OM send-PFV	PREP	who-Q

Mr. Linyunga: *To whom did your father send you?*

26. Sot. Imasiku: “*Ntate* u ni rumile ho *oena.*”

Loz. Imasiku: “*Bondate* ba ni lumile ku *mina.*”

<u>bo-ndate</u>	ba	ni-lum-ile	ku	<u>mina</u>
CL2-father	CL2a	1SG.OM-send-PFV	PREP	2PL.ABS

Imasiku: *My father sent me to you.*

A joking relationship exists between the two older men in examples 25 and 26 and does not extend to Imasiku. When addressing or referring to older people who use class 1a for each other, younger speakers do not reciprocate in class 1a, but use class 2a. Therefore, even though in example (25) Mr. Linyunga uses the class 1a to refer to Imasiku’s father and himself, Imasiku responds with the plural class 2a marker to express respect in example (26).

The participants mentioned the terms “*ita*” and “*tate*” as the address terms for father in Silozi. These terms are shared with Siluyana and Simbunda respectively. “*Ita*”, appears to be the shortened form of “*it’a nge*” (my father) from Siluyana. “*Tate*” is the same form in Silozi and Simbunda (Stirke & Thomas, 1916:16). Sesotho uses “*ntate*” for both address and reference forms as in example (27).

27. Sot. “***Ntate, ntate Moka*** o rekisa nama”

Loz. “***Tate, boMoka*** ba lekisa nama.”

<b><u>∅-tate</u></b>	<b><u>bo-Moka</u></b>	ba-lek-isa	∅-nama
CL1a-father	CL2a-Moka	CL2.SM-sell-INF	CL9-meat

*Father, Mr. Moka is selling meat.*

Though “*tate*” and “*ita*” are in singular class 1a, they nonetheless follow the concordance of plural class 2a. For instance, in example (28) there is no plural marker “*bo*” but the expression is class 2a from “*mu-bone*” onwards. “*Tate*” does not denote disrespect. In the presence of more than one father, i.e. “*tate*”, the term of address remains in class 1a. Sesotho in example (28) unlike Silozi, keeps the singular class 1a concordance.

28. Sot. “***Ntate***, o bone ngoana oa hao o ntsa etsang?”

Loz. “***Tate***, mu bone mwana wa mina za eza?”

<b><u>∅-tate</u></b>	<b><u>mu</u></b> -bon-e	mw-ana	wa	<b><u>mina</u></b>	za-ez-a
CL1a-father	CL2a.SM-see-IMP	CL1-child	CL2a-GM	2PL-ABS	CL10.SM-do-FV

*Father, do you see what the games your child is playing?*

All of Ego’s children use “*ita*” or “*tate*” to address him regardless of their age. In the data collected, participants from all three age groups mentioned that they used both the terms of address. The middle aged and younger participants mostly mentioned “*tate*” while the elderly participants noted “*ita*” as the better term of address for the father.

In Silozi, the terms of address “*tate*” and “*ita*” and the terms of reference “*bondate*” cannot be used interchangeably, each applies in specific contexts as discussed above. The terms “*tate*” and “*ita*”, however, are interchangeable because they have a related semantic meaning and do not change the concordance.

### 5.2.2 Mme - Mother

The Proto-Bantu term for mother \**màà* is shared by both Silozi and Sesotho in the form of “*mme*”. The use of the term “*mme*” for mother extends to the step mother, matrilineal aunts and female cousins of the mother. At the speaker’s discretion, older women are shown respect or endearment by calling them “*mme*” (mother). Similar Sesotho, both parental terms “*ntate*” (father) and “*’me*” (mother) are used by Silozi speakers of all ages to refer to and to address their mothers.

The form of address for mother “*ima*” is in the singular class 1a. “*Ima*”, like “*tate*” are in the singular class 1a but both take the concordance makers of the plural class 2a in order to express respect. In example (29), the Silozi speaker is addressing the mother and does not add “*bo*” to have “*bo’ima*”, but “*mina*” indicates plural concordance.

29. Sot. “*Me*, *re qale ho sila poone e ao?*”

Loz. “*Ima*, *lu kale kusita mbonyi ya mina?*”

<u>Ø-ima</u>	lu	kal-e	ku-sita	Ø-mbonyi	ya	<u>mina</u>
CL1a-mother	1PL.SM	start-Q	INF-pound	CL9-maize	CL9.GM	2PL.GP

*Mother, must we start pounding your maize?*

Sesotho has the same term “*me*” for reference and address which takes on the noun class 1a concordance, but is still respectful.

The Silozi terms of reference are “*mme*” and “*mma*” and can be used interchangeably in the first-person singular as in example (30). Additionally, both terms require the class 2a prefix “*bo*” and receive the plural concordance in order to mark respect.

30. Sot. “*Me oa ka* *oa u bitsa*”

Loz. “*Bo mme* *ba ku biza.*”

<u>bo-mme</u>	ba-ku-biz-a
CL2a-mother	CL2a.SM 2SG.OM call-FV

*My mother is calling you.*

“*Mma*” is used in the second and third person as in (30), with the added class 2a prefix. When asking, or referring to the mother of someone else, the class 2a concord is used by the speaker. Class 1a is optional when a joking relationship exists.

31. Sot. “**Me [oa hao]** o ea <sup>2</sup> kopanong?”

Loz. “**Bo maho**, ba ya kwa mukopano?”

<b><u>bo-ma-ho</u></b>	ba-y-a	kwa	mu-kopano
CL2a-mother-2SG.GP	CL2a.SM-go-FV	CL17.DEM	CL3-meet

“Is your mother going to the meeting?”

During the observations, participants used terms for mother as discussed above. The use of “*mme*” and “*ndate*” today seem to be the same as it was a hundred years ago, Jalla (1936) notes exactly the same usage. This means that the uses of “*mme*” and “*ndate*” are stable in Silozi.

### **5.2.3 Ndate yo Muinyani - Patrilineal Uncles**

Most of the kinship terms for uncles and aunts in Silozi are similar to Sesotho (32). Patrilineal uncles, including father’s male cousins share the same terms as the father. In addition to the shared terms “*ndate*”, “*tate*” and “*ita*”, the patrilineal uncles have other terms of address or reference.

If the uncle is younger than the father of Ego, that uncle is “*bo-ndate ba ba-inyani*”, meaning ‘small father’ as shown in (32). By adding “*ba ba-inyani*” to “*ndate*” the speaker expresses two facts. Firstly, the father he speaks about is not his ‘main or biological’ father but rather his uncle. Secondly, this phrase also implies that Ego’s father is older than the uncle.

32. Sot. “**Ntate e monyane** o lisa likhomo”

Loz. “**Bo ndate ba bainyani** ba lisa likomu”

<b><u>bo-ndate</u></b>	<b><u>ba</u></b>	<b><u>ba-inyani</u></b>	ba-lis-a	li-komu
CL2a-father	CL2a.SM	CL2a-small	CL2a.SM-herd-FV	CL10-cow

*My uncle (small father) herds cattle*

When both fathers are spoken to or about, the speaker differentiates between them as expressed in example (33). The uncle can be called by his name or by the name of their first child and the “*tate*” is used for the father. In Silozi, the speaker of (33) can omit “*ni bo Matengu*” and the utterance would still refer to the ‘fathers’ because of the plural prefix “*bo*”. On the other hand, in Sesotho (33), omitting “*le ntate Matengu*” changes the meaning and only refers to one father who went to the river.

---

<sup>2</sup> The locative class CL17 has been lost in Sesotho.

33. Sot. “Ntate [oa ka] o ile nokeng le ntate Matengu”

Loz. “Bondate ba ile kwa nuka [ni bo Matengu.]”

<u>bo-ndate</u>	ba	ile	kwa-nuka	ni	<u>bo-Matengu</u>
CL2a-father	CL2a.SM	go.PST	CL17-river	CONJ	CL2a-Matentgu

*My father went to the river with Mr. Matengu*

When Ego is speaking to his uncle about his father or vice versa, Ego can address the ‘father’ he is speaking to as “*tate*” or “*ita*” and the absent one as “*bo-ndate*”. This usage gives more clarity on whether the father is part of the conversation or not. In example (34), the child is sent by ‘one’ of his fathers (i.e. older uncle) to go and call another father.

34. Sot. “Ntate, ntate moholo oa u bitsa”

Loz. “Tate, bondate ba bahulu ba mi biza”

<u>Ø-tate</u>	<u>bo-ndate</u>	<u>ba</u>	<u>ba-hulu</u>	ba-mi-biz-a
CL1a-father	CL2a-father	CL2a.SM	CL2a.OM-older	CL2a.SM-2PL.OM-call-FV

*Father, my big father (uncle) is calling you.*

Through the continued use of “*ndate*” for the patrilineal uncle in Silozi, the adjectival markers “*yo muinyani*” and “*yo muhulu*” are frequently dropped like in (33). The term “*rangoane*” or a close Silozi variation was not mentioned by either Jalla (1936), Stirke and Thomas (1916) or by any of the participants. This suggests that the term was not carried over into Silozi.

#### **5.2.4 Malume - Matrilineal Uncles**

The term used for a matrilineal uncle is “*malume*” which is the compound of “*ma*” (mother) and “*lume*” (male), (Jalla, 1937:12). This Silozi term is similar to the Sesotho form “*malome*”.

“*Malume*” is in the singular class 1a and takes on the plural class 2a prefix “*bo*” to express plurality and respect. A speaker will however not use “*malume*” in the singular class 1a when speaking about his/her own uncle. This would be disrespectful. In example (35), the plural class 2a prefix is used to mark respect.

35. Sot. “Ke boleletse malome ka mpa.”

Loz. “Ni bululezi bomalume za mba.”

ni-bulel-ezi	<u>bo-ma-lume</u>	za	Ø-mba
1SG.SM-speak-PST.PROG	CL2a-mother-male	CL10.GM	CL9-stomach

*I told my uncle about the pregnancy.*

The matrilineal uncle ‘malume’ plays a special, important role in Malozi families. Older participants in the survey often stated that the “malume” can act as mediator between the children and their parents. Gluckman (1950) also provides evidence to support this. For example, if a young man impregnates a girl, he would approach his “malume” to bring the issue to the parents as in example (35). In contrast the role of “malume”, the patrilineal uncle or aunt are culturally expected to be strict and authority figures to the children.

The term “malume” was exclusively used to for the matrilineal uncle initially. However, amongst the middle aged and younger Silozi speakers in both research sites, the use of “malume” was also extended for the patrilineal uncle. Though younger speakers also mentioned “anko” (uncle), a term borrowed from English, elderly participants, insisted that “malume” was the only correct Silozi term for the matrilineal uncle.

### 5.2.5 Ndate Nengo - Patrilineal Aunts

The father’s sisters and female cousins are referred to as “bo-ndate ba ba-sali” or “ndate nengo”; both terms literally mean ‘my father who is a woman’ (Mbikusita-Lewanika, 1983:5). Traditionally, these terms exclusively apply to patrilineal aunts. The term of address is “tate” while “bo-ndate” is the term of reference, similar to the patrilineal uncle and the father. In Sesotho, “rakhali” is used only for the patrilineal aunt.

36. Sot. “Ke rakhali a khileng metsi.”

Loz. “Ki bondate ba bakile mezi.”

ki	<u>bo-ndate</u>	ba-ba-k-ile	mezi
COP	CL2-father	CL2.SM-CL2.OM-draw-PFV	CL6.water

*It is my aunt (father’s sister) who drew the water.*

The extended use of term “ndate” in Silozi for the father, patrilineal aunt and uncle creates ambiguity because the listener may not know which father is being spoken to or about. In example

(36), Ego does not make it explicit which ‘father’ she talks about. However, by referring to an activity primarily performed by women within the village context, the listener knows that Ego is referring to a female father. Alternatively, Ego can add the adjectival marker “*ba ba-sali*” (female) or “*ba si-na*” (male) to clarify gender.

From the earlier texts on Silozi consulted, “*rakhali*” is not mentioned. Older Malozi provide two terms for the patrilineal aunt, namely “*ndate wa mu-sali*” and “*ndate nengo*”. Middle aged and younger speakers only use “*ndate wa mu-sali*”, along with the more general terms “*aunt*” and “*mme*”.

### **5.2.6 Mme yo Muinyani - Matrilineal Aunts**

“*Mme*” (mother) is the kinship terms of address and reference for matrilineal aunts and mother’s female cousins. The matrilineal aunt is considered to be a mother to the children of their sisters. Other address terms for matrilineal aunts are “*bo-mme ba ba-inyani*” and “*bo-’me ba ba-hulu*” meaning my younger and my older mother respectively.

37. Sot. “’*Me, mangoane o robetse*”

Loz. “*Ima, bo mme ba bainyani ba lobezi.*”

<u>Ø-ima</u>	<u>bo-mme</u>	<u>ba</u>	<u>ba-inyani</u>	ba-lob-ezi
CL1a-mother	CL2a.mother	CL2a.SM	CL2a.OM-small	CL2a.SM-sleep-PROG

*My small mother (aunt) is sleeping.*

To indicate plurality of mother, the plural class 2a prefix “*bo*” is added. Thus, the expression (37) “*bo-mme*” can be either respect form of (my mother) or the plural form for “*my mothers*”. The form “*bo-mme*” can also include the matrilineal uncle. The matrilineal aunts can also be addressed or referred to by using their own names or the names of their first-born children.

The terms mentioned by Jalla (1936) for aunt and uncle in Silozi are the same as those collected in the data. The participants did not mention “*rangoane*” (patrilineal uncle), “*mangoane*” (matrilineal aunt) and “*rakhali*” (patrilineal aunt). In Silozi, the kinship terms for the aunts follow the pattern which is found for uncles. The terms describe the type of father or mother (i.e. *mme yo muhulu*) which is a feature shared with Sesotho.

### **5.2.7 Bashemi [ba Mutose] - Step parents**

In Sesotho (38), there are no special terms for step-parents. The step-mother and step-father are not terminologically discriminated against in relation to biological parents. The same kinship terms are used for both as discussed in (5.2.2 and 5.2.3).

In Silozi, alternative kinship terms that were mentioned for step parents are namely, “*bo-ndate ba mu-tose*” for the step-father and “*bo-mme ba mu-tose*” for step-mother. These terms for step parents are rarely used and are considered to be obscene insults. “*Mu-tose*” is a maize cob that is left over after the kernels are removed. The “*mutose*” is thrown away or burnt because it is useless. Thus, the term “*bo-ndate ba mu-tose*” metaphoric for ‘a useless father’ in (38). Sesotho does not contain an expression for step parent.

38. Sot. “Ntate o ka thung.”

Loz. “**Bondate ba mutose** ba mwandu.”

<b><u>bo-ndate</u></b>	<b><u>ba</u></b>	<b><u>mu-tose</u></b>	ba	mwa-ndu
CL2a-father	CL2a.GM	CL3-cob	CL2a.SM	CL18-house

*My father of the cob (useless) is in the house.*

Alternatively, children can also address or refer to their step-parents with the name of their first child. For example, in Silozi “*bo-mma Inonge*” (mother of Inonge), which corresponds to “*me oa Inonge*” in Sesotho. If the step-parent has no children of their own, they can be addressed by his or her first name, for example “*Bo-Mundia*”. Both forms of address and reference are acceptable and are not considered disrespectful. Such is usually the case when a person marries someone with older children. This principle of kinship terms applies also in a polygamous family whereby a step-mother is addressed by the name of her first-born child.

The adjectival marker “*wa mu-tose*” was mentioned by the middle-aged and elder participants, but they cautioned about its offensive nature. Younger participants referred to step-parents either by name or parental kinship term (i.e. “*mme*”). This suggests that terms that are considered to be offensive are not used by the younger generation.

### 5.2.8 Makwenyani - Parents-in-law

According to the Malozi, a “*mu-kwenyani*” is one’s parent-in-law or child-in-law. The plural form is “*ma-kwenyani*” which is also the respect form. The prefix of the plural class 2 is used by Ego when speaking about parents-in-law to express respect. In (39), Ego says that Mr. Moka is his father-in-law by calling him “*ma-kwenyani*”. In Sesotho, “*mo-khoenyana*” is the term for son-in-law while a mother and father-in-law is referred to as “*me ma-tsala*” and “*ntate ma-tsala*” respectively (i.e. 39).

39. Sot. *Ntate Moka ke ntate matsala oa ka*

Loz. *Bo Moka ki makwenyani ba ka*

bo-Moka	ki	<u>ma-kwenyani</u>	ba	ka
CL2a-Moka	COP	CL2-in.law	CL2.GM	1SG.GP

*Mr. Moka is my in-law*

To show closeness or endearment, kinship terms used for parents like “*bo-ndate*” (father) and “*ima*” (mother) can also be used for parents-in-laws. In the presence of both sets of parents, Ego can revert back to “*ma-kwenyani*” for the in-laws or refer to both sets of parents by parental terms.

In a joking relationship, “*ma-kwenyani*” can also be used between people who are not in-laws. For example, the child referred to in (40) shares a name with the spouse of the speaker. Therefore, *Bomma Inonge* asks about *Matengu* and says that she is ‘married’ to him. The utterance in (40) is an expression of endearment which also shows closeness between the two women and their families.

Sot. “*Bomma Inonge: ‘me matsala, monna oa ka o kae?’*”

40. Loz. “*Bomma Inonge: makwenyani, bomuuna ka ba kai?’*”

<u>ma-kwenyani</u>	bo-muun-a-ka	ba	kai
CL2-in.law	CL2a-man-CL2a.GM-1SG.GP	CL2.SM	where

*My in-law, where is my husband?*

In the data collected, the Sesotho terms for parents-in-law “*me ma-tsala*” (mother-in-law) and “*ntate ma-tsala*” (father-in-law) are not mentioned by any of the Silozi speaking participants. Jalla (1936) and Stirke and Thomas (1916) likewise do not mention any of the terms, leading to the suggestion that these terms might have been lost from Silozi in the formative years of the language about 200 years ago.

### **5.3 Generational Terms**

Another kinship system that seems to be shared by Silozi and Sesotho is the generational kinship system. Schusky (1965:14) discusses generational kinship terms by using the Hawaiian social structure for illustration. In this system, members of the same generation can be referred to with identical kinship terms. These kinship terms emphasize less on the representation of biological relationships between people but rather express the social relationship between them. (Schusky, 1965:16).

For example, in Silozi, Ego refers to or address all older cousins and siblings as “*mu-hulwani*” which is “*mo-holoane*” in Sesotho while the younger ones are “*mu-nyeni*” with the Sesotho term being “*mo-ena*”. Siblings and cousins of the opposite sex are called “*kaizeli*” from Sesotho “*khaitsele*”. These terms are not reserved for biological siblings.

#### **5.3.1 Banyeni, Bahulwani ni Likaizeli - Siblings and Cousins**

Mbikusita-Lewanika (1983) and Gluckman (1970) both illustrate how siblings, step-siblings and cousins all share the same terms. Silozi shares most of these terms with Sesotho while Siluyana and Simbunda play a minimal role as donor languages for these kinship terms.

Table 12: Siblings, cousins and in-laws’ kinship terms

	<b><i>Silozi</i></b>	<b><i>English</i></b>
<u><i>Siblings</i></u>	<i>kaizeli</i> <i>li-kaizeli</i> <i>mu-nyeni</i> <i>ba-nyeni</i> <i>mu-hulwani</i> <i>ba-hulwani</i>	<i>brother/sister/cousin</i> <i>brothers/sisters/cousins</i> <i>younger sibling/cousin</i> <i>younger siblings/cousins</i> <i>older sibling/cousin</i> <i>older siblings/cousins</i>
<u><i>In-laws</i></u>	<i>mu-lamu</i> <i>ba-lamu</i>	<i>brother/sister/cousin-in-law</i> <i>brothers/sisters/cousin-in-law</i>

Opposite sex siblings are “*kaizeli*” (*khaitsele*), this term does not indicate if Ego is older than sibling referred to in (41). The Silozi speaker in example (41) is younger than the two people she is talking about and thus Silozi takes on the plural class 2a prefix “*bo*” to express respect.

41. Sot. “‘Me ke khatseli ea ntate”

Loz. “Basali ba ki bokaizeli ba bondate.”

ba-sali      ba      ki      bo-kaizeli      ba      bo-ndate  
CL2-woman   CL2.D1   COP   CL2a-sibling   CL2.GM   CL2a-father

*This woman is my father’s sister.*

A person referring to an older sibling or cousin of the same sex uses “*mu-hulwani*” in Silozi which is “*mo-holoane*” in Sesotho. For younger siblings, Silozi speakers use “*mu-nyeni*” while Sesotho speakers use “*mo-ena*”. An older sibling uses “*mu-nyeni*” to refer to the younger and “*mu-hulwani*” applies vice-versa. The plural form is also the respect form and in example (42), “*ba-nyeni*” and refers to a single sibling who is younger than Ego’s mother. In other contexts, the same form can refer to more than one sibling. The kinship term for cousins in Sesotho is “*mo-tsoala*” and this term is unfamiliar to Silozi speakers of all ages as the term for cousin. They mentioned that “*mo-tsoala*” sounded like “*mu-zwale*” which refers to a friend or companion.

42. Sot. “‘Me ke moena ea ‘me”

Loz. “Basali ba ki banyeni ba bomme.”

ba-sali      ba      ki      ba-nyeni      ba      bo-mme  
CL2-woman   CL2.D1   COP   CL2-younger.sibling   CL2.GM   CL2a-mother

*This woman is my mother’s younger sister.*

The Silozi speaking participants from Sesheke (Zambia) used the Siluyana terms “*mu-kulwange*” (older brother) and “*mi-nange*” (younger brother). These terms were however only used within the context of a joking relationship or during casual talk amongst men.

“*Mu-kulwange*” and “*mi-nange*” are not found in Silozi texts by Jalla (1936) or Stirke and Thomas (1916), but are mentioned in an online Silozi dictionary (<http://www.barotseiland.net/sil-eng2a.htm>) which notes that these terms are from Siluyana. The terms were unknown among the Silozi speakers interviewed in Namibia. Jalla (1936) mentions the term “*mw-anaheso*” with the meaning brother. None of the Silozi speakers confirmed this meaning, but some participants of the survey mentioned that this term might be used to refer to any relative.

### **5.3.2 Balamu - Siblings, cousins and in-laws**

Brothers, sisters and cousins-in-law are called “*mu-lamu*” in Silozi. It is similar to the term for sister-in-law “*mo-lamo*” in Sesotho, while the term for brother-in-law is “*soare*”. “*Mu-lamu*” was the only term mentioned by the participants in observations and questionnaires, and this supports the findings of Jalla (1936) and Stirke and Thomas (1916). The plural class 2 “*ba-lamu*” does not only express plurality but is also used to indicate respect.

### **5.3.3 Ba banyalani - Spouses**

Kinship terms for spouses in Silozi are shared with Sesotho. In Silozi, wife is “*mu-sala [Moka]*” and a husband is “*mu-una [Inonge]*” while in Sesotho “*mo-sali oa [Moka]*” (wife) and “*monna oa [Inonge]*” (husband). The nouns for spouses always take the genitive markers “*wa*” and the name of their spouse when Ego is speaking about own spouse. The genitive pronoun or a name is placed after the genitive marker to show that the person is the spouse of another. Without the genitive markers and genitive pronouns, the terms “*mu-una*” and “*mu-sali*” simply mean ‘man’ or ‘woman’ respectively.

Table 13: Spousal kinship terms

	<b>Silozi</b>	<b>English</b>
<b>Wife</b>	<i>mu-sala ka</i> <i>mu-sala hao</i> <i>mu-fumahali</i> <i>bomu-sala ka</i> <i>mu-halizo</i>	my wife your wife wife (honourable) my wives co-wife
<b>Husband</b>	<i>mu-una ka</i> <i>mu-una hao</i> <i>bomu-una ka</i> <i>mu-fubalume</i>	my husband your husband my husbands co-husband
<b>Lover</b>	<i>nyazi</i> <i>li-nyazi</i>	unmarried lover unmarried lovers

The class 2a marker “*bo*” is added to the terms for spouses like in example (43). “*Bomu-una ka*” and “*bomu-sala ka*” both denote respect and are both for address and reference. In an informal context, such as everyday conversation in the homestead, “*mu-sala ka*” is a commonly used expression.

In a more formal context or to show respect for another man’s wife, a speaker uses “*mu-fumahali*” (“*mo-fumahali*” in Sesotho). The plural classes 2 or 2a also provide the respectful forms “*ba-*

*fumahali*” or “*bo mu-fumahali*”. For example, the chief’s wife is referred to as “*ba-fumahali [ba-mulena]*” to honour her as in example (43).

43. Sot. “***Mosali oa ka*** o tsoana le ***mofumahali oa morena***”

Loz. “***Bomusala ka*** ba swana ni ***bafumahali ba mulena***.”

**bo-musali** wa ka ba-swana ni **ba-fumahali**  
 CL2a- woman CL2.GM 1SG.GP CL2.SM-same with CL2-honourable.wife

ba mu-lena  
 CL2a.OM CL1-chief

*My wife looks like the chief’s wife.*

In all contexts, the husband remains to be referred to as “*mu-una ka*” in both Sesotho and Silozi.

### **5.3.4 Libali - Co-wives and co-husbands**

In a polygamous marriage, Silozi co-wives refer to each other as “*mu-halizo*”, and “*mo-halitso*” in Sesotho. The term “*mu-halizo*” (co-wife) is for the exclusive use of the co-wives like in (44). All the other family members are expected to use other kinship terms first children’s names or by their own names when referring or addressing the co-wives. The collective term for co-wives is also “*libali*”. This can be used by any one when referring to them.

44. Sot. Wife 1: “***Mohalitso***, monna oa rona u bone kajeno?”

Loz. Wife 2: “***Bomuhalizo***, bo muuna ’luna mu ba boni kachenu?”

**bo-muhalizo** bo-muuna-luna mu-ba-bon-i kachenu  
 CL2a-fellow.wife CL2a-man-2PL.ABS CL1.SM-CL2.OM-see-PST today

*Fellow-wife, didn’t you see our husband today?*

Gluckman (1950) states that the term “*mu-fubalume*” is used by two men who have or had sexual relations with the same woman (Gluckman, 1950:175). For example, when a woman has an affair or divorces one man to be wed to another. A woman cannot have more than one husband at the same time. In the context of a joking relationship, two men who are married to sisters can refer to each other as “*mu-fubalume*”.

Unlike “*mu-halizo*”, the term “*mu-fubalume*” is not commonly used today but Mbikusita-Lewanika (1983) observed that it was used in the context of a joking relationship between Ego and the grandfather of his wife (Mbikusita-Lewanika 1983:8). Only the elder and middle-aged

participants mentioned “*mu-fubalume*” as a term for co-husband, and younger Silozi speakers did not mention this term at all. Co-wives are still common among the Malozi and thus all the participants mentioned “*mu-halizo*” as the term for fellow wife.

### **5.3.5 Nyazi - Lover**

O'Sullivan (1993) and Jalla (1936) both note “*nyazi*” (*nyatsi* in Sesotho) as the term used for a lover, equivalent to ‘concubine’ in English. Gluckman (1950) observed that the Malozi allowed minimal interactions between men and women who were not husband and wife. Gluckman (1950:179) writes the following.

By Lozi standards if a man walks along a path with another’s wife who is not related to him, or gives her snuff or a drink of beer, or even speaks to her when no one is by, he commits ‘adultery’, even if he does not sleep with her.

Considering Gluckman’s (1950) above statement, it is taboo to be involved in any form of affair with a woman or man that one is not married to. In line with traditional customs, a man’s family members would arrange the marriage and pay “*lobola*” (bride price) before a man and a woman could be together. People were either married, single or adulterers. To be a “*nyazi*” is shameful to oneself and the family.

In (45), the term “*nyazi*” is used in a joking relationship and is acceptable. Outside the joking relationship, the statement would be an insult. “*Nyazi*” is in the singular class 9 and does not take on the respect and plural markers “*bo*” or “*ba*” from plural classes 2 and 2a. The plural pairing of “*nyazi*” is class 10 which has the prefix “*li*”.

45. Sot. “*Le oena u na linyatsi?*”

Loz. “*Ni wena unani linyazi?*”

ni	wena	u-nani	<u>li-nyazi</u>
CONJ	2SG.ABS	CL1a.SM-have	CL10-lover

*Do you also have lovers?*

In a context where the traditional model of marriage is not followed, the term “*nyazi*” is avoided. Younger and middle-aged participants wrote the terms “*mu-una...*” and “*mu-sala...*”, the terms that were originally used for husband and wife as the term for an unmarried lover. Older participants insisted that “*nyazi*” was the correct term for lover.

### 5.3.6 *Mwana* - Children, nieces and nephews

The Proto-Bantu term for child is \**jánà*, and Silozi makes use of the term “*mw-ana*” which is similar to Siluyana term “*mw-ana*” (son). “*Mw-ana*” refers to any child, the plural term is “*ba-na*” which can also be used to express respect.

“*Mw-ana*” in Silozi is used for daughter, son, niece and nephew. There is no indication of a specific gender in this term. The kinship terms for son and daughter are different in Sesotho “*mo-ra*” (son) and “*mo-rali*” (daughter); and in Siluyana “*mw-ana*” (son) and “*mu-katana*” (daughter). The term “*mo-chana*” is used for niece and nephew in Sesotho is does not distinguish the gender of the child.

Table 14: Children, nieces and nephews’ kinship terms

<u>Silozi</u>	<u>English</u>
<i>mw-ana</i>	<i>son/daughter/niece/nephew</i>
<i>ba-na</i>	<i>children</i>
<i>mw-ana [mw-enda ku mongo]</i>	<i>step daughter/son</i>
<i>mw-ana [nyazi]</i>	<i>daughter/son born out of wedlock</i>
<i>mu-kwenyani</i>	<i>daughter/son-in-law</i>

The kinship term for children, nieces and nephews is not used regularly and the child’s given name is used instead. “*Mw-ana*” is usually followed by a genitive marker and name or genitive pronoun. In the example (46), the Silozi speaking mother uses the term “*mw-ana ka*” (my child) to refer to her son while in Sesotho the term used is gender specific.

46. Sot. “***Mora oa ka*** oo shebile”

Lot. “***Mwana ka*** wa ku buha?”

***mwana-ka***            wa            ku            buh-a  
 child-1SG.GP    CL1.GM    1SG.OM    watch-FV

*My child is watching you?*

Jalla (1936) notes the Silozi terms “*mwana-nyazi*” (child born out of wedlock) and “*mwana mwenda-ku-mongo*” (step-child). In contrast to these terms, the participants in the present survey used the term “*mwana*” for all children. Some of the older participants mentioned “*mwana-nyazi*” and “*mwana mwenda-ku-mongo*” but cautioned that these ‘offensive’ kinship terms are not to be used. This position is also mentioned by Mbikusita-Lewanika (1983:8)

The Silozi term used for children-in-law is the same as the term for parents-in-law, “*Mukwenyani*”, this is shared with Sesotho. The principle of extending of the term for in-law is possibly from Siluyana because the language uses one term “*namunwa*” for father-in-law, son-in-law and daughter-in-law. Sesotho on the other hand differentiates between “*ngoetsi*” for daughter-in-law and “*mo-khoenyana*” for son-in-law.

The Sesotho terms “*ngoetsi*”, “*mora*”, “*mochana*” and “*ngoana*” were neither mentioned by the participants in this survey nor by Jalla (1936) and Stirke and Thomas (1916).

### **5.3.7 Bokuku ni Bosukulu - Grandparents**

Silozi does not share the kinship terms for grandparents with Sesotho “*nkhon’o*” (grandmother) or “*ntate moholo*” (grandfather), but rather with Siluyana “*kuku*” and Simbunda “*sukulu*” respectively. These terms are extended to the siblings of Ego’s grandparents (i.e. grand-uncles and grand-aunts).

Table 15: Great /grandparents, great/grandchildren’s kinship terms

<b><u>Silozi</u></b>	<b><u>English</u></b>
<i>sukulu</i>	<i>grandfather</i>
<i>bosukulu</i>	<i>grandfathers</i>
<i>ndate</i>	<i>great-grandfather</i>
<i>kuku</i>	<i>grandmother</i>
<i>bokuku</i>	<i>grandmothers</i>
<i>mme</i>	<i>great-grandmother</i>
<i>mw-ikulu (wa mushimani)</i>	<i>grandson</i>
<i>ba-ikulu (ba bashimani)</i>	<i>grandsons</i>
<i>mw-ikulu (wa musizana)</i>	<i>granddaughter</i>
<i>ba-ikulu (ba basizana)</i>	<i>granddaughters</i>

When addressing the grandparents, class 2a concordance is required to show respect, but the address terms for grandparents “*kuku*” and “*sukulu*” are in the singular noun class 1a. For example, in (47), “*kuku*” is singular but “*mina*” is plural and marks respect.

47. Sot. “**Nkhon’o**, khooho ea hau e khubelu e lerata.”

Loz. “**Kuku**, kuhu ya mina ye fubelu inani lilata.”

<b><u>Ø-kuku</u></b>	Ø-kuhu	ya	mina	ye	fubelu	i-nani
CL1a-grandmother	CL9-chicken	CL9a.GM	2PL.ABS	CL3.REL	red	CL9.OM-have
li-lata						
CL10-noise						

*Grandmother, your red chicken is noisy.*

“Bo-kuku” and “bo-sukulu” are terms of reference. The class 2a marker “bo” is applied to both in the plural or singular and in example (48) acts as a respect marking prefix to the kinship address terms for grandfather.

48. Sot. “O tla bona **ntate moholo** oa hao hosane.”

Loz. “U ka babona **bosukulu** wa hao kamuso.”

u	ka	ba-bon-a	kamuso	<b><u>bo-sukulu</u></b>	wa	hao
CL1.SM	FUT	CL2.OM-see-FV	tomorrow	CL2a-grandfather	CL1.GM	2SG.GP

*You will see your grandfather tomorrow.*

Terms collected by Jalla (1936) and Stirke and Thomas (1916) show that Silozi only has the gender-neutral term “kuku” for both grandparents. Gender is distinguished by adding “ba si-na” (male) or “ba si-sali” (female). Data collected from the elderly participants supports Jalla (1936) and Stirke and Thomas (1916) suggests that grandparents were addressed and referred to as “kuku”.

Contrary to Jalla (1936) and Stirke and Thomas (1916), the term for grandfather stated by middle aged and younger participants is “sukulu”. The change in the terms can be attributed to borrowing from Simbunda “shukulu”. Some speakers mentioned that “sukulu” also means rhinoceros in Silozi but did not explain the reason for this semantic expansion of the term.

### **5.3.8 Batuhulu - Grandchildren**

Silozi has two terms for grandchild, “mu-ikulu” from Siluyana and “mu-tuhulu” from in Sesotho. All grandchildren are referred to and addressed by using the same kinship terms. “Ba-ikulu”, and “ba-tuhulu” are the plural forms for grandchild with class 2 prefix “ba”. The kinship terms do not indicate the gender of the grandchildren in Silozi, Siluyana or Sesotho.

The terms as used in Silozi are interchangeable and are up to the speaker’s discretion. The terms do not affect the concord of the sentence. For example, in (49) the speaker can use either “*mu-ikulu*” or “*mu-tuhulu*” and maintain the same class concord.

49. Sot. “N<sup>goana</sup> eo ke setloholo sa ka.”

Loz. “Mwana yo ki muikulu/mutuhulu wa ka.”

mw-ana	yo	ki	<u>mu-ikulu</u>	wa	ka
CL1-small.child	CL1.D1	COP	CL1-grandchild	CL1.GM	1SG.GP

This child is my grandchild.

Grandparents use the respect form for older grandchildren who are grown up and married. In example (50) below, the grandparent uses the concordance for plural to refer to herself “*luna*” and her grandchild “*ba-ikulu*”.

50. Sot. “Ditholo tsa ka li fihlile.”

Loz. “Baikulu ba luna bafitile.”

<u>ba-ikulu</u>	ba	luna	ba-fit-ile
CL2-grandchild	CL2.GM	1PL.ABS	CL2.SM-arrive-PFV

My grandchild has arrived.

In a joking relationship, a child that is the namesake of a grandparent can also be called grandfather. In example (51) an adult is referring to a child who shares the same name with his own grandfather as his grandfather. This joking relationship extends to the rest of the community as they comically address such a child with the form of respect.

51. Sot. “Ntate Ingunde o fihlile.”

Loz. “Bondate Ingunde bafitile.”

<u>bo-ndate</u>	Ingunde	ba-fit-ile
CL2a-father	Ingunde	CL2a.SM-arrive-PFV

Ingunde’s father has arrived.

Only two speakers from Sesheke mentioned “*mu-tuhulu*” while all others mentioned “*mu-ikulu*” as the term for grandchild.

During the survey, it became obvious that Silozi speakers do not use kinship terms for grandchildren often. They preferred to address and refer to grandchildren by their given names (proper nouns).

### **5.3.9 Great-grandchildren and Great-grandparents**

The Silozi kinship terms used between great-grandchildren and great-grandparents for each other are the same as those used between parents and children as discussed in sections (5.2.8) and (5.3.6). As such, a great-grandchild calls her/his great-grandmother “*mme*” (mother). In Sesotho on the other hand, the terms for grandparents are also used for great-grandparents, namely. “*nkhon’o*” and “*ntate moholo*” as discussed in (5.3.7).

Great-grandparents refer to a great-grandchild simply as “*mwana*” (child) in Silozi while in Sesotho the term used is “*setloholoholo*” singular, and “*ditloholoholo*” plural. In both languages, the gender of the grand-children is not marked.

Jalla (1936) mentions “*muzwala-kuku*” as the term for a great-grandparent. This descriptive term translates to ‘you gave birth to my grandmother/father’. All the participants did not mention this term and were not familiar with it as a kinship term, but of course could understand the meaning.

### **5.3.10 Bonyandi - Deceased kin**

Kin who are deceased keep their kinship terms, but an adjective with the meaning “deceased” is added to indicate that they are no longer alive. In Sesotho, this pronoun is “*mofu*” while in Silozi it is “*nyandi*”. Consider example (52). It is a taboo to use “*nyandi*” for living people, including in contexts of a joking relationship.

52. Sot. “*Ke ntlo ea mofu Inambao*”

Loz. “*Ki ndu ya nyandi Inambao.*”

ki	∅-ndu	ya	<u>∅-nyandi</u>	Inambao
COP	CL9-house	CL9.GM	CL1a-late	Inambao

*It is the house of the late Inambao.*

By adding the pronoun “*nyandi*” to the kinship term, the speakers avoid using a term like “*shwile*” (dead), which is broad, informal and is inappropriate for humans as it is also used for non-human entities. When a person passes away, the expression “*ku tokwahala*” (pass away), is the more sensitive and appropriate way of talking about this taboo topic.

## 5.4 Semantic Clarity

Within the communities, members usually know their relationship back to several generations and kinship terms are used to express the relationship between the community members. To outsiders, the network of internal relationship is not obvious and terms used by them might therefore be less specific or ambiguous.

The nature of the relationship between people is an important matter to be discussed. During an introduction of two relatives meeting for the first time or after an extended period of time apart, the kinship relation is often clarified by the one who has the best knowledge on their relationship. In examples (53) and (54) Inoke asks Likando to clarify ‘how’ Nyambe is his [younger] brother. Likando explains by stating that his father and Nyambe's mother are siblings who share a mother and therefore are cousins.

53. *Sot. Inoke: Nyambe ke ngoaneno joang?*

*Loz. Inoke: Nyambe ki munyeni wa hao chwani?*

Nyambe ki mu-nyeni wa hao chwani-i  
Nyambe COP CL1-young.sibling CL1.SM 2SG.GP like-Q

*Inoke: How is Nyambe your younger sibling?*

54. *Sot. Likando: “Me oa hae le ntate [oa ka] ke bana ba motho”*

*Loz. Likando: “Bommahe ni bondate ki bana ba mutu.”*

bo-ma-he ni bo-ndate ki ba-na ba mu-tu  
CL2a-mother-3SG.GP CONJ CL2a-father COP CL2-child CL2.SM CL1-person

*Likando: His mother and my father share a parent.*

Knowledge of ‘how’ people are actually related is passed on to younger Malozi by the elders in the communities. Despite this fact, Nyambe and Likando continue to refer to each other as ‘sibling’.

## 5.5 Summary

This chapter discusses Silozi kinship terms with the aim of identifying where there has been a deviation from the original Sesotho terms. Silozi kinship terms mirror those that are predominantly used in Sesotho. Some such as “*malume*” (matrilineal uncle) are currently going through the

process of semantic expansion. A small number of the terms seem to originate from Siluyana and Simbunda. In some cases, Silozi contains terms from more than one language such as “*mutuhulu*” and “*muikulu*” from Sesotho and Siluyana respectively.

There have been changes in Silozi in the manner the terms are used; for example, some terms are no longer used as they are considered to be insults. One most striking finding is that Silozi has much fewer kinship terms than Sesotho.

## **6. CONCLUSION**

### **6.1 Introduction**

The present study contributes to a better understanding of the mixed character of Silozi. In the course of this project and with a focus on the noun class system and the semantic field of kinship terms, first hand data was collected. The mother tongue competence in Silozi of the researcher allowed for the gathering of language data in natural conversations. In following conversations and other natural speech acts, participatory observation constituted an important method in gathering natural Silozi language data. By being a member of the language community, the researcher was able to discuss language related matters without outside interference and pressure.

Twelve Silozi mother-tongue speakers, six males and six females of three age categories participated in this study. The research was conducted in the Kavuyu village in Zambia and the Mahohoma settlement in Namibia, with six participants from each research site. Silozi data was collected, with the help of questionnaires, a wordlist and through observations. Interviews were used to follow up with individuals on kinship terms. Native speakers of Sesotho and Setswana were consulted when translations into these languages were required.

### **6.2 Noun Class System**

The noun class system of Silozi as a whole, is of Sesotho origin. However, due to language contact with Setswana and even more so with Siluyana, it changed dramatically. Silozi retained the original Sesotho noun classes 1 / 2, 3 / 4, 5 / 6, 7 / 8, 9 / 10, as well as 14 and 15. These Silozi noun classes which are shared with Sesotho did not remain without influence from the neighbouring languages spoken in Barotseland. For example, Silozi makes use of the prefixes and concordance markers of class 2 and 2a to express respect. These secondary meanings of class 2 and 2a are neither found in Sesotho nor Setswana, but in languages of Lunda origin.

Another difference to Sesotho in these shared Silozi noun classes, is the use of classes 3 and 4 for adding an augmentative meaning to objects that are already naturally big, such as elephants. Since Siluyana also uses classes 3 and 4 in the same way, this usage has most likely been borrowed from Siluyana. Sesotho in such cases would make use of an adjectival phrase, as opposed to shift the noun into another noun class.

A final example, which demonstrates the changes in the use of noun classes shared between Sesotho and Silozi, is found in classes 7 and 8. In Silozi, classes 7 and 8 can be used to form augmentative nouns, which are in a direct opposition to classes 12 and 13. Neither Sesotho nor Setswana show these uses of the classes as they do not have the classes 12 and 13. In fact, Cole (1967) states that Sesotho does not have the class 8 either, and claims that the singular class 7 pairs with the plural class 10 instead. This discussion, however, is beyond the scope of this study, but demonstrates nonetheless that the noun class system of Silozi differs from Sesotho in many respects.

The most obvious difference between the original Sesotho noun class system and today's Silozi noun classes, is the significant increase in the numbers of noun classes. This is due to the exposure to Setswana, and even more so due to intense contact with Siluyana. A more complete set of the original Proto-Bantu noun class system has been restored in Silozi; Silozi noun classes comprises of all noun classes from class 1 to 18 without any gap in between. Thus, it uses the same noun classes as Siluyana, but also other languages spoken in the area, such as Cisubiya.

It is generally assumed that Sesotho had lost the locative noun classes 16 to 18, as well as 12 to 13 more than 200 years ago. Hence, when the Makololo left Bafokeng in the 1820s, they spoke Sesotho which had the reduced noun class system of modern Sesotho. Class 11 might have however have been gained from Setswana and adapted to Siluyana later. For that and other reasons, the origin of class 11 in Silozi remains a difficult question to answer.

With the other noun classes that Sesotho had lost, namely the locative classes 16 to 18 and the classes 12 and 13, there is wide agreement among scholars that these were reinvented into Silozi. The reviving of lost classes started most likely when the Sesotho speaking Makololo came in contact with Setswana speakers. However, the major impact on the noun class system came when the Makololo lived with and married Siluyana speaking women. The noun class 11 as well as classes 16 to 17 might have already been borrowed from Setswana, even before the arrival of the Makololo in Barotseland. Their present forms, which resemble Siluyana could then have been later adjustments after arriving and living in Barotseland. The only class which, without doubt, is borrowed from Siluyana is class 13, as it does not exist in Setswana.

The augmentative and diminutive classes 12 and 13 in Silozi, are most likely borrowed from Siluyana, as Setswana no longer uses these noun classes. Eventhough these classes have only a

limited number of nouns as members, Silozi uses them widely to change nouns to augmentative or diminutive meanings. This also applies to Silozi nouns of Sesotho origin which can take the class 12 and 13 prefixes to modulate their meaning.

The most significant difference between Sesotho and Silozi is the occurrence of the locative classes 16, 17, and 18, which take the prefixes “*pa*”, “*ku*” and “*mu*” respectively. Based on the evidence presented in this thesis, it can be stated that only classes 1 to 10, as well as 14 and 15 in Silozi are of Sesotho origins. The most likely donor language for the classes 12 and 13 is Siluyana and 16 to 18 is Sesotho while class 11 contains influence from both languages. The noun classes of Silozi can be traced back to different origins, and this demonstrates the mixed character of the language.

### **6.3 Silozi Kinship Terms**

Quite a number of Silozi kinship terms can be traced back to Proto-Bantu and as such are shared among many Bantu languages. This makes it difficult at times to identify the origin of given Silozi terms. However, many Silozi kinship terms used today seem to be original Sesotho terms. Sesotho kinship terms are often more specific than those found in Silozi, and they are also more numerous. Therefore, while some Sesotho kinship terms have extended their meanings to include more family members in their reference, others have disappeared in Silozi altogether. Thus, while Sesotho speakers would be able to understand most Silozi terms, Silozi speakers no longer know several of the more specific kinship terms of Sesotho.

The differences in use of kinship terms between Sesotho and Silozi are analysed with regards to the noun class formatives where influence is identified and relevant to this discussion. Silozi seems to have borrowed from Siluyana the use of the plural class 2a to not only express plurality, but also to indicate respect. In these cases, the concordance shifts from the singular class 1 or 1a to the plural classes 2 and 2a. Sesotho uses the terms “*ntate*” and “*me*” but retain the concords of the singular class.

Silozi uses the gender-neutral terms “*mwana*” for child, whereas Sesotho differentiates between “*mora*” (son), and “*morali*” (daughter). Sesotho also differentiates between “*ngoetsi*” (daughter-in-law) and “*mo-khoenyana*” (son-in-law). Silozi kinship terms tend to not include gender distinctions, and this seems to follow a Siluyana semantic rule, which for example has one term “*namunwa*” which covers the meanings father-, son- and daughter-in-law. Silozi also lost for

example the gender specific Sesotho terms “*nkhono*” (grandmother) and “*ntate moholo*” (grandfather). Silozi borrowed the terms “*kuku*” (grandmother) from Siluyana and “*sukulu*” (grandfather) from Simbunda.

“*Malume*” was formerly used exclusively for the maternal uncle, a person, who plays a central role in the family. In more recent years, the younger generation of Malozi speakers use “*malume*” in the general meaning of uncle; thus, also to refer to a patrilineal uncle.

These Silozi kinship terms discussed demonstrate that this semantic field reveals the same pattern of contact induced change. However, what makes the study of kinship terms more challenging is that intergenerational variation is more severe with kinship terms; the younger generation of Silozi speakers generalize meanings, and use kinship terms more loosely.

A second observation made which adds to the complexity of the study of this semantic field is the fact that some terms might be considered as insults and are for that reason less or no longer used. For moral reasons, some Silozi speakers for example did not mention “*nyazi*”, the Silozi term for lover. The phrase “*bo-ndate ba mu-tose*”, literally ‘father of the maize cob’ had been used to refer to the step-father, but since the association with a useless maize cob is insulting, most Malozi do not use this phrase.

That being so, Silozi has lost a significant number of the original Sesotho kinship terms and borrowed some from the neighbouring languages Siluyana and Simbunda. With the rapidly changing ways of life and the spread of world religions, consumerism, and so forth, kinship terms might also be adapted to express and capture modern relationship patterns.

#### **6.4 Questions for Future Research**

Silozi is a mixed language, since its genesis over one hundred years ago, it has changed considerably due to contact with neighbouring Bantu languages. One of the questions which would be of interest in theoretical linguistics would be: Does the mixed character of Silozi make the language more vulnerable and perceptive to external influence in language contact situations than less mixed languages? And would this mean that Silozi is changing more rapidly than less mixed languages such as Cisubiya?

## **6.5 Summary**

This chapter summarized the main findings of the research project in the noun class system and kinship terms of Silozi. The analysis of the language data demonstrated that the mixed character of Silozi is evident in its noun class system and the kinship terms. Silozi maintains a strong Sesotho affiliation, however, contact induced changes from languages such as Siluyana, Setswana and Simbunda had a major impact, on the noun class system as well as on the kinship terms. Silozi speakers live in areas of high linguistic diversity, and in addition, the Malozi are highly mobile. It is possible to conclude in this regard that continued social interaction and the mobility of Malozi will further reshape the Silozi languages, in ways which cannot be predicted at present.

## REFERENCES

- Akindele, D.F. 2008. Sesotho Address Forms. In *Linguistik Online*. 34(2): Pp. 3-15.
- Ambrose, D. 2007. *Lozi*. Roma, Lesotho: House 9 Publications, National University of Lesotho.
- Baidu-Forson, J.J., Phiri, N., Ngu'ni, D., Mulele, S., Simainga, S., Situmo, J., Ndiyoi, M., Wahl, C., Gambone, F., Mulanda, A., and G. Syatwinda. 2014. *Assessment of Agrobiodiversity Resources in Borotse Flood plain, Zambia*. Penang, Malaysia: CGIAR Research Program on Aquatic Agricultural Systems. *Working Paper: AAS-2014-12*.
- Biesanz, J. and M. Biesanz. 1971. *Modern Sociology: With Revisions*. Rev. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. London: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Bleek, W.H.I. 1862. *Comparative Grammar of South African Languages*. London: Trübner.
- Caplan, G.L. 1970. *The Elites of Barotseland*. London: C. Hurst & Company.
- Cole, D.T. 1967. The prefix of Bantu Noun Class 10. In *African Studies*. 26: Pp. 119-137.
- Cowie, N. 2009. Observation. In *Qualitative Research in Applied Linguistics: An Introduction*. J. Heigham and R.A. Croker, Eds. London: Palgrave Macmillan. Pp. 165-181.
- Demuth, K. 2000. Bantu Noun Class Systems: Loan Word and Acquisition Evidence of Semantic Productivity. In, *Classification Systems*. G. Senft, Ed. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge. Pp. 270-292.
- Department of National Education. 1985. *Lozi Orthography No.2*. Windhoek, SWA/Namibia: Department of National Education.
- Doke, C.M. 1943. *Outline Grammar of Bantu*. Johannesburg, Witwatersrand University Press.
- Dykstra, P.A. 2009. Kin Relationships. In *Encyclopaedia of Human Relationships*. V.H.T. Reis and S. Sprecher, Eds. Los Angeles: SAGE. Pp. 951-954.

- Edmonds, W.A. and T.D. Kennedy. 2017. *An Applied Guide to Research Designs: Quantitative, Qualitative, and Mixed Methods*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Edmonson, M.S. 1957. Kinship Terms and Kinship Concepts. In: *American Anthropologist*. 59: Pp. 393–433.
- Fagan, B.M. 1966. Early Farmers and Ironworkers (100 B.C. to 1500 A.D.). In *A Short History of Zambia: From the Earliest Times until A.D. 1900*. B.M. Fagan, Ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Pp. 80-92.
- Fortune, G. 2001. *An Outline of Silozi Grammar*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Lusaka, Zambia: Bookworld Publishers.
- Gann, L.H. 1958. *The Birth of a Plural Society: The Development of Northern Rhodesia under the British South Africa Company*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Givón, T. 1970. *The Si-Luyana Language: A Preliminary Linguistic Description*. Lusaka, Zambia: University of Zambia-Institute for Social Research.
- Gluckman, M. 1950. Kinship and Marriage among the Lozi of Northern Rhodesia and the Zulu of Natal. In *African Systems of Kinship and Marriage*. A. R. Radcliffe-Brown, Ed. London: Oxford University Press. Pp. 166-206.
- Gorman, W.A.R. 1950. *Simple Silozi: A Guide for Beginners*. London: Longmans Green and Co.
- Gowlett, D.F. 1967. *Morphology of the Verb in Lozi*. B.A. Honours. Dissertation. University of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.
- Gowlett, D.F. 1989. The parentage and development of Lozi. *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics*. 11(2): Pp. 127-149.
- Guthrie, M. 1948. *The Classification of the Bantu Languages*. London: Oxford University Press.

- Hammond-Tooke, W.D. 2004. Southern Bantu Origins: Light from Kinship Terminology. In, *Southern African Humanities*. 16: Pp. 71-78.
- Jalla, A. 1936. *Dictionary of the Lozi Language*. Rev. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. London: The United Society for Christian Literature.
- Jalla, A. 1937. *Elementary Grammar of the Lozi Language: With Graduated Exercises*. London: The United Society for Christian Literature.
- Labov, W. 1972. *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Lisimba, M. 1985. *A Luyana Dialectology*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms International.
- Mabille, A., Dieterlen, H. and R.A. Paroz. 1961. *Southern Sotho-English Dictionary*. Rev. 8<sup>th</sup> ed. Morija, Lesotho: Morija Sesutho Book Depot.
- Mabille, A., Dieterlen, H. and R.A. Paroz. 1988. *Southern Sotho-English Dictionary*. Morija, Lesotho: Morija Sesutho Book Depot.
- Mainga, M. 1966. The Lozi Kingdom. In *A Short History of Zambia: From the Earliest Times until A.D. 1900*. B. M. Fagan, Ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Pp. 121-127.
- Mainga, M. 1973. *Bulozi under Luyana Kings*. London: Longman Group Limited.
- Matras, Y and P. Bakker. 2003. The Study of Mixed Languages. In *The Mixed Language Debate: Theoretical and Empirical Advances*. Y, Matras and P, Bakker. Eds. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. Pp. 1-20.
- Mbikusita-Lewanika, I.M. 1983. Kinship Terms and Family Relationships: The Case of Bulozi, Zambia: *Prepared for the UNESCO Seminar on the Changing Family in the African Context*. 5-9 September 1983. Maseru, Lesotho.
- Meakins, F. 2013. Mixed Languages. In *Contact Languages: A Comprehensive Guide*. P, Bakker and Y, Matras. Eds. Boston: de Gruyter Mouton. Pp. 159-228.

- Meinhof, C., Van Warmelo, N. J. and A. Werner. 1932. *Introduction to the Phonology of the Bantu Languages*. English Version of *Grundriss Einer Lautlehre der Bantusprachen*. Berlin, D. Reimer/E. Vohsen.
- Murdock, G. P. 1949. *Social Structure*. New York: Macmillan.
- Mutunda, S. 2006. A Sociolinguistic Study of Politeness Strategies in the Lunda Culture. In *International Journal of Language, Society and Culture*. 17: 1-21.
- Mwendende, B.M. 2010. *Dikishinali ya SiLozi-SiLozi*. Cape Town: Centre for Advanced Studies of African Society (CASAS).
- Mwikisa, P.W. 1994. African Languages in Education and Development: Challenges for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: the Case of the Sesotho, Setswana and Silozi. *Paper Presented at Colloquium on Harmonising and Standardising Languages for Education and Development*. 11-14 July 1994. Cape Town, South Africa.
- O'Sullivan, O. 1993. *English-Silozi Dictionary*. Lusaka, Zambia: Zambia Educational Publishing House.
- Prinsloo, D.J. and S.E. Bosch. 2012. Kinship Terminology in English–Zulu/Northern Sotho Dictionaries: A Challenge for the Bantu Lexicographer. In *Proceedings of the 15th Euralex International Congress*. R.V. Fjeld and J.M. Torjusen, Eds. 7-11 August 2012. Oslo: Representralen. Pp. 296-303.
- Radcliffe-Brown, A.R. 1952. *Structure and Function in Primitive Society: Essays and Addresses*. Glencoe: The Free Press.
- Rasinger, M.R. 2013. *Quantitative Research in Linguistics: An Introduction*. Rev. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Rasinger, S.M. 2010. Quantitative Methods: Concepts, Framework and Issues. In *Research Methods in Linguistics*. L. Litosseliti, Ed. London: Continuum International Publishing Group. Pp. 49-67.

- Roberts, A. 1976. *A History of Zambia*. London, UK: Heinemann Educational Books Ltd.
- Saussure, F. 1959. *Course in General Linguistics*. New York: Philosophical Library.
- Schilling, N. 2013. Surveys and Interviews. In *Research Methods in Linguistics*. R.J. Podesva and D. Sharma, Eds. New York: Cambridge University Press. Pp. 96-115.
- Schusky E.L. 1965. *Manual for Kinship Analysis*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Sheddick, V.G.J. 1953. *The Southern Sotho*. London: International African Institute.
- Stirke, D.E.C. and A.W. Thomas. 1916. *A Comparative Vocabulary of Sikololo-Silui-Simbunda*. London: Bale & Danielsson.
- Turner, V.W. 1952. *The Lozi Peoples of North-Western Rhodesia*. London: International African Institute.
- Velioti-Georgopoulos, M. 2006. Kinship and Descent. In *Encyclopaedia of Anthropology*. H.J. Brix, Ed. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, Inc. Pp. 1370-1371.
- Velupillai, V. 2015. *Pidgins, Creoles and Mixed Languages: An Introduction*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Wookey, A.J. 1940. *Secwana Grammar with Exercises: English to Secwana and Secwana to English*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. London: London Mission Society.
- Zambia 2010 Census of Population and Housing: National Analytical Report*. 2012. Lusaka, Zambia: Central Statistical Office.

### **Online Resources**

- BarotseLand.com. 2006. *Silozi Language*. Available: [03 March 2017] at <http://www.barotseLand.net/silozi1.htm>
- Bastin, Y. 1978. *Zones et Groupes de Langues Bantoues*. Available [18 July 2017] at <http://www.bantu-languages.com/tervur.html>

Caprivi Region. 2017. *People and Traditions*. Available: [03 March 2017] at <http://www.caprivi.biz/people.html>

Ethnologue of Languages. 2017. *Lozi* Available [08 May 2017] at <https://www.ethnologue.com/language/loz>

Maho, J. 2001. The Bantu Area: (Towards Clearing Up) a Mess. In: *Africa & Asia, 1*. Department of Oriental and African Languages: Göteborg University. Pp. 40-49. Available [28 April 2017] at [http://www.sprak.gu.se/digitalAssets/1324/1324035\\_the-bantu-area.pdf](http://www.sprak.gu.se/digitalAssets/1324/1324035_the-bantu-area.pdf)

Maho, J. 2005. *A Referential Classification of the Bantu Languages: Keeping Malcolm Guthrie's System Updated*. Available: [03 March 2017] at [http://www.ibrarian.net/navon/paper/A\\_referential\\_classification\\_of\\_the\\_Bantu\\_languages.pdf?paperid=3855936](http://www.ibrarian.net/navon/paper/A_referential_classification_of_the_Bantu_languages.pdf?paperid=3855936)

Maho, J. 2005. *Select Proto-Bantu Vocabulary*. Available [08 July 2017] at <http://goto.glocalnet.net/jfmaho/pbapp.pdf>

Maho, J. 2009. *The Online Version of the New Updated Guthrie List: A Referential Classification of the Bantu Languages*. Available [28 April 2017] at <http://goto.glocalnet.net/mahopapers/nuglonline.pdf>

Mukena, N. 2015. *Comparative Analysis of Lozi Royal Praise Poetry between the Male and Female Litunga of Western Province of Zambia in form, Content, Function and Performance*. MA. Thesis. University of Zambia. Available [08 May 2017] at <http://dspace.unza.zm:8080/xmlui/bitstream/handle/123456789/4373/FINAL%20DISSERTATION%20-%20KAREN.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>

## Appendix A: Table of Kinship Terms

<u>English</u>	<u>Silozi: (Gustav-FN)</u>	<u>Silozi: Jalla (1936) and Stirke and Thomas (1916)</u>	<u>Sesotho: Mabile, Dieterlen and Paroz (1988)</u>	<u>Siluyana: Stirke and Thomas (1916)</u>	<u>Simbunda: Stirke and Thomas (1916)</u>
My father	ndate	ndate	ntate oaka	it'ange	tate
Your father	ndata ho	ndata ho	ntatao	it'oe	tate
His/her father	ndata he	ndata he	ntatae	it'ae	ishe
Our father	ndata luna	ndata luna	ntat'a rona	-----	-----
Your father	ndata mina	ndata mina	ntat'a lona	it'enu	ishe
Their father	ndata bona	ndata bona	ntat'a bona	-----	-----
Father of Inonge	ndata Inonge	ndata Inonge	ntate oa Inonge	-----	-----
Father-in-law	mukwenyani	mukwenyani	ntate matsale	namunwa	isho mweno
Father (address)	tate/ita	tate/ita	ntate	-----	-----
Step father	ndate	ndate [wa mutose]	ntate	-----	-----
Uncle (patrilineal)	ndate ndate yo muhulu ndate yo muinyani -----	ndate ndate yo muhulu ndate yo muinyani -----	ntate ntate moholo ntate e monyane rangoane	----- ----- ----- -----	----- ----- ----- -----
Aunt (patrilineal)	ndate wa musali ndate nengo	ndate wa musali ndate nengo	rakhali -----	----- -----	----- -----
My mother	mme/mma	mme/mma	'me oaka	mawe	banana
Your mother	mma ho	mma ho	mao	inyoko	banyoko
His/her mother	mma he	mma he	mae	nyina	baina
Mother of Inonge	mma Inonge	mma Inonge	me oa Inonge	-----	-----

Mother-in-law	mukwenyani	mukwenyani	me matsale	-----	-----
Mother (address)	ima	ima	'me	-----	-----
Step mother	mme	mme [wa mutose]	'me	-----	-----
Uncle (matrilineal)	malume	malume	malome	nalumia	nananu
Aunt (matrilineal)	mme	mme	mangoane	-----	-----
	mme yo muinyani	mme yo muinyani	'me e monyane	-----	-----
Sister (MS)	kaizeli	kaizeli	khaitselie	manda	ndokazi
Younger (MS)	munyeni	munyeni	moena	-----	-----
Older (MS)	muhulwani	muhulwani	moholoane	-----	-----
Sister-In-law	mulamu	mulamu	molamo	-----	-----
Brother (FS)	kaizeli	kaizeli	khaitselie	mwaba	mbwembwa
Younger (FS)	munyeni/minange	munyeni	moena	minange	-----
Older (FS)	muhulwani/mukulwange	muhulwani	moholoane	mukulwange	-----
	-----	mwanaheso	-----	-----	-----
Brother-In-law	mulamu	mulamu	soare	-----	-----
Cousin (FS/MS)	kaizeli	malumahi	motsoala	nalumia	nananu
Younger (FS/MS)	munyeni	munyeni	-----	-----	-----
Older (FS/MS)	muhulwani	muhulwani	-----	-----	-----
Wife (my)	musala ka	musala ka	mosali oa ka	mukatange	munakazi wa nge
Wife (Honorable)	mufumahali	mufumahali	mofumahali	-----	-----
Co-wife	muhalizo	muhalizo	mohalitso	-----	-----
Husband	muuna ka	muuna ka	monna oa ka	-----	-----
Co-husband	mufubalume	mufubalume	mofobe	mufubalume	-----

Lover	nyazi	nyazi	nyatsi	-----	-----
Son	mwana	mwana [mushimani]	mora' ka	mwana	muna
Son-in-law	mukwenyani	mukwenyani	mokhoenyana	namunwa	nyetumweno
Daughter	mwana	mwana [musizana]	moralis	mukatana	mumbanda
Daughter-in-law	mukwenyani	mukwenyani	ngoetsi	namunwa	nyetumweno
Niece / nephew	mwana	mwana	mochana	-----	-----
Step-son	mwana	mwana [mwenda ku mongo]	mora	muenda-ku-mongo	-----
Step-daughter	mwana	mwana [mwenda ku mongo]	moralis	muenda-ku-mongo	-----
Child (love child)	mwana	mwana [nyazi]	ngoana	-----	-----
Grandson / daughter	muikulu/mutuhulu	muikulu/mutuhulu	setloholo	mwikulu	mutekulu
Great grand-child	mwana	mwana	setloholoholo	-----	-----
Grandmother	kuku	kuku	nkhon'o	kuku	-----
grandfather	sukulu	kuku [ba sina]	ntate moholo	kuku	shukulu
Great-grandmother	mme	mme	nkhon'o	-----	-----
Great-grandfather	ndate	ndate	ntate moholo	-----	-----

## Appendix B: Questionnaire

### A study of Silozi in Namibia and Zambia: Questionnaire by Gustav Mbeha, 2016-12-12

#### Survey metadata

Date: .....  
Place: .....  
Interviewer: .....  
Language used in the interview: .....

#### Personal data (Interviewee):

1. Name: .....
2. Male  Female
3. Age group:  15-25  26-35  36-45  46-55  56-65  66+
4. Work/occupation: .....
5. Highest education qualification: .....
6. Tribal group (Mulozi, Mufwe etc.): .....
7. Town/ village and country of residence: .....
8. Citizenship: .....

#### Language use

1. Who taught you Silozi?
2. Is Silozi your first language?
3. What languages do you speak? List in order from best to least spoken.
4. Are you married? If yes, what language(s) do you speak with your spouse?
5. Do you have children? What language(s) do you use with your children?
6. What language(s) does your spouse speak with your children?
7. If your children speak Silozi, who did they learn it from?
8. Where do you use Silozi? List the places. (i.e. work, school, etc.)
9. Who do you speak Silozi with? List the people. (i.e. husband, friends etc.)
10. What languages are spoken in the following places or situations?  
Family: .....  
Friends: .....  
Village: .....  
Town: .....  
Work place: .....  
Church: .....
11. Can you read and write in Silozi?
12. What language do you write text messages in? (Silozi, English or Both?)
13. Are you on any social networks (Facebook, Twitter, etc.)? If yes, what language do you use on social media?
14. Do you like advertisements and news in English or Silozi? (Why?)

## Appendix C: Wordlist (questionnaire)

### KINSHIP TERMS

<u>English</u>	<u>Silozi</u>	<u>Alternative</u>
Father		
Mother		
Father-in-law		
Mother-in-law		
Step-father		
Step-mother		
Patrilineal uncle		
Patrilineal aunt		
matrilineal uncle		
matrilineal aunt		
Brother		
Sister		
Cousin		
Brother-in-law		
Sister-in-law		
Husband		
Co-husband		
Wife		
Co-wife		
Lover		
Son		
Step-son		
Son-in-law		
Daughter		
Step-daughter		
Daughter-in-law		
Child born out of wedlock		
Niece		
Nephew		
Grand-daughter		
Grand- son		
Great-grand- daughter		
Great-grand- son		
Grandmother		
Grandfather		
Great-grandmother		
Great-Grandfather		

The information collect through this questionnaire will be used to compare the varieties of Silozi spoken in Zambia and Namibia. The study will pay special attention to how Silozi is learnt in the two countries and how other languages affect this process.

This study is part of a Master's in Linguistics degree programme at the University of Cape Town. All information will be treated as highly confidential and will be used for research only. No personal information will be published in the research papers or distributed to third parties.

**Signature of interviewee: .....**