Nordic Journal of African Studies 18(2): 154–174 (2009)

The Passive and Stative Constructions in Ndebele[1]: A Comparative Analysis

Langa KHUMALO
University of KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa

ABSTRACT

This paper presents a comparison between the passive and the stative derivations. The stative derivation, which is variously referred to in the literature as the neuter, neuter-passive, quasi-passive, neuter-stative, metastatic-potential, descriptive passive[2] (Satyo 1985), is described by Doke (1947) as closely similar to the passive derivation. Doke (1947) refers to what we will call the stative derivation here as the 'Middle or Quasi-passive'. This closeness has motivated detailed comparisons of the two derivational forms. While there is no uniformity in the literature as to what the stative derivation is, our choice of the label 'stative' is well motivated. As stated in Mchombo (2004: 95), 'stative' is based on the observation that the verb denotes the result state of the base verb. It is also a label that is widely used. Mchombo (1993, 2004) looks at the passive and the stative constructions, as two distinct types of verbal extensions, working within the lexicalist theory of syntax, the Lexical Functional Grammar (LFG) theoretical framework. He proposes that the passive morpheme suppresses the agent of the transitive predicate, while the stative morpheme deletes it. Dubinsky and Simango (1996) go further arguing that the passive alters mapping from arguments to grammatical functions, as currently assumed in the Lexical Mapping Theory (henceforth LMT), and the stative performs a perfectly analogous operation on the Lexical Conceptual Structure (LCS), that is argument structure, itself. They present several differences between the two derivations beyond those originally proposed by Mchombo (1993) but are later noted in Mchombo (2004). We use the LMT to analyse the passive and stative derivation in Ndebele. The paper demonstrates that Ndebele deviates from the assumptions arrived at by both Dubinsky and Simango (1996) and Mchombo (1993 & 2004). This paper also demonstrates that the stative derivation is more restricted in Chichewa[3] than is the case in Ndebele.

Keywords: *Passive, Stative, Derivation, LMT, Applicative, Causative.*

---

1 The Ndebele language we are here describing is a scantily documented language spoken in Zimbabwe. It has been described as 'barely studied' (Hachipola, 1998: 3, Chimhundu 1997: 129). As a matter of fact, there is also Ndebele spoken in South Africa, but there are no known studies that compare the Zimbabwean and South African Ndebele (Khumalo 2007: 22).

2 According to Mchombo (2004), such a proliferation of labels indicates uncertainty among Bantuists about how to characterize the process involved.

3 Chichewa is a Bantu language spoken in some parts of Malawi where it is an official national language. It is also spoken in Zambia, Mozambique and Zimbabwe. It is a well documented language.

1. MAPPING PRINCIPLES

The argument structure in all LMT models is assumed to be hierarchical. This means that the arguments in the argument structure follow a thematic hierarchy. The hierarchy that we are going to use is as given below.

The Thematic Hierarchy: (Khumalo 2007: 148)
agent>beneficiary/maleficiary> experiencer/ goal /source>theme/patient>motive >locative[4]

We will use the hierarchy to represent the focal point of our lexical mapping operations when we later on map arguments to various syntactic functions. An argument structure comprises of lexical roles of a verb, their intrinsic syntactic classifications, and an ordering that represents the relative prominence of the roles. According to the LMT framework this relative prominence is not arbitrary but is semantically determined, the most prominent roles being those of the more causally active or topical participants in events. This is a very pertinent import of the thematic hierarchy according to which roles descend in prominence from agent through beneficiary, abstract goal (recipient or experiencer), instrumental, patient and theme, to locative.

The primary function of the thematic hierarchy in the LMT is to define the highest theta role of a predicate. The highest theta role is sometimes referred to as the 'logical subject' (Kiparsky, 1987, 1988, Joshi 1989) or is referred to as the 'thematic subject' in Bresnan and Kanerva (1989). It corresponds to the agent argument of active and passive verbs, the experiencer argument (whether subject or object) of noncausative psychological verbs, and the theme argument of unaccusative verbs (Joshi 1989, Bresnan and Kanerva 1989, Alsina and Mchombo 1988, T. Mohanan 1989). Further, the LMT also provides principles for assigning syntactic features to thematic roles, (Bresnan and Zaenen 1990, Bresnan, 2001). Patient-like thematic roles are assigned feature [-r], secondary patient-like thematic roles are assigned feature [+o], while other thematic roles are assigned feature [-o]. For an example, the theme is a patient-like role hence is assigned [-r], while the agent and the locative are assigned [-o] as 'other roles'. These principles are codified as follows.

[1] **Principles for assigning syntactic features**
(a) Patient-like roles are: $\theta \rightarrow$[-r]
(b) Secondary patient-like role are: $\theta \rightarrow$[+o]
(c) Other roles are: $\theta \rightarrow$[-o]

4 The standard notation '>' means 'the preceding role is higher than' or 'is more prominent than', while the slash sign '/' indicates that it is at the same level as the thematic role it is separated with by the slash, for instance where there is agent >beneficiary/maleficiary, on the one hand, it means that the agent is higher than the beneficiary/maleficiary thematic role while on the other hand beneficiary and maleficiary are viewed as enjoying equal status in the hierarchy.

The feature [+/-r] and [+/-o] constrain the way in which the arguments are mapped onto grammatical functions and group grammatical functions into natural classes as shown below.

The following examples illustrate the principle stated in [1.1] a-c.

[2]

(a) *-khangela*	<agent>
'look'	[-o]
(b) *galula*	<theme>
'drown'	[-r]
(c) *hlaba*	<agent, patient>
'pierce'	[-o] [-r]
(d) *fika*	<theme, location>
'arrive'	[-r] [-o]
(e) *beka*	<agent, theme, location>
'put'	[-o] [-r] [-o]

According to LMT, the thematic roles in a-structures are mapped to any compatible grammatical function. However, these would be restricted by a small number of simple and general principles. Function-Argument Bi-uniqueness is viewed by Bresnan (2001) as the 'most important principle' Lødrup (2004). The principle states that each a-structure role must be associated with a unique function, and conversely. This is to say that a thematic role must be associated with one (and not more than one) grammatical function, and that one grammatical function cannot be associated with more than one role, (Lødrup 2004: 8). There is also a principle within the LMT that requires a subject, i.e. the subject condition. The subject condition states that every predicator must have a subject.

[3] **Mapping Principle**

According to Lødrup (2004) the extent to which this condition can be universal seems to be unclear.[5] According to this condition, if the most prominent thematic role is [-o], it has to be realized as a subject. Let us take the example of an agent, if there is no such role available, a role that is [-r] will be subject. A typical example would be a theme. The subject condition can be codified as follows.

[5] According to Khumalo (2007: 192) Ndebele presents challenges for the LMT by having agentive objects which are not predicted by the theory hence it cannot account for them. French and Norwegian (Lødrup 2004: 16) also provide such evidence.

[4] **Subject Roles**:
(i) $\theta\acute{e}_{[-o]}$ argument is mapped to SUBJ;

otherwise

(ii) $\theta_{[-r]}$ argument is mapped to SUBJ.

Other roles are mapped onto the lowest (that is, the most marked) compatible function on the Markedness Hierarchy. It should be noted that in all cases the central mapping principle is that the thematic roles are mapped onto the most marked argument function compatible with their syntactic feature. The markedness hierarchy assumed here is: SUBJ>OBJ/OBLɵ >OBJɵ, and the markedness hierarchy with its argument functions is as follows:

SUBJ[-r -o]>OBJ[-r +o]/ OBLɵ[+r -o]> OBJɵ[+r +o]

According to this hierarchy the least marked function is SUBJ, which can be found in almost all sentences in all languages of the world. On the other hand the most marked function is the OBJɵ, which does not exist in all languages of the world. OBJ and OBLɵ functions come in between. The following is an example of features in the hierarchy above.

[5]

Izinja	*zidla*	*inyama*	*yabantu*
SUBJ-dog	Pred-eat	OBJ-meat	OBLɵ-people

'Dogs are eating meat that belongs to people'[6]

The SUBJ gets two minuses, the OBJɵ gets two pluses, and the OBJ and OBLɵ get one each. The outcome of this is the default principle [6], which is operational after the subject has been selected.

[6] **Default Principle**
The default principle dictates that we insert a plus with an unspecified feature. This is consistent with the mapping principle and has the same effect as the principle for assigning syntactic features [1] b above. An example is as follows.

[7]

-khaba	<agent	theme >	
'kick'	[-o]	[-r]	syntactic features by principles [1] (a) and (c)
	|		agent is SUBJ by principle [4] (i)
		[+o]	insertion of plus by principle [6]
	SUBJ	OBJ	

6 The sentence can also mean 'The dogs are eating human flesh'.

The agent thematic role is θé, as a result it has to be mapped to the SUBJ. The Subject Condition is fulfilled as a result. Theme is submitted to the default principle, which assigns a plus for its unspecified objective feature. The feature combination of the theme is thus [-r] [+o], which makes it an OBJ.

Another example helps illustrate the principle.

[8]

-fika	<theme	location >	
'arrive'	[-r]	[-o]	syntactic features by principles [1] (a) and (c)
	|		theme is SUBJ by principle [4] (ii)
	|	[+r]	insertion of plus by principle [6]
	SUBJ	OBLlocation	

In [8] there is no θé that is [-o]. Because the theme is [-r], it is then mapped to SUBJ. This is imposed by the Subject Condition, which requires that it be mapped to subject and not object. The default principle gives location a plus for its unspecified restricted feature. This then makes it [-o] [+r], which is OBLɵ, and in this particular case OBL$_{location}$.

Morphological Derivations

Since our focus is on passive derivation, we state hereunder the passive rule which is perceived to be universally acceptable and explains the effect passives have on the argument structure, as illustrated using Chichewa in Bresnan and Kanerva (1989).

[9] Passive: θé => Ø — …the highest argument becomes suppressed, i.e., the mapping principles cannot apply to it.

It is pertinent to point out that pairs of active and passive predicates are standardly not to differ with respect to their lexical semantics, though their participants display alternative assignments of grammatical functions. Cross-linguistically, in an active transitive sentence the agent nominal is a subject, while the patient or theme nominal is a direct object. In its passive counterpart, however, the patient nominal bears the subject function, while the agent nominal, if it is syntactically expressed, has the grammatical status of an adjunct. The fact that passivization involves a change in the mapping of arguments to syntax is now uncontroversial in lexicalist accounts, and it is explained in the LMT by resorting to the syntactic underspecification of the arguments. The following are assignments of grammatical functions in the predicates 'tshaya' (active) and 'tshaywa' (passive) respectively:

[10]	< *x*	*y* >
tshaya	[-o]	[-r]
'beat'	|	|
	SUBJ	OBJ

And

[11]

	< *x*	*y* >	**passive**
	[-o]	[-r]	
	|	|	
	Ø	SUBJ	

[12]

tshaywa	<agent	theme>	
tshay-w-a	[-o]	[-r]	syntactic features by principles [1] (a) and (c)
VR_{hit}-PASS-FV		|	θé maps to zero in passive
'be beaten'		|	theme is SUBJ by principle [4] (ii)
	Ø	|	
		SUBJ	

The agent does not take part in the mapping since it is the highest thematic role. Theme, which is [-r], is mapped to SUBJ according to the principle for selection [4] (ii). As a consequence the subject condition is satisfied.

2. PASSIVE DERIVATION

The general rule in Ndebele is that to transform a verbal stem from active to passive one adds the derivational suffix **/-iw- ~ -w-/** to it. The following is an example where we add the suffix **-w-**:

[13]

hleka	hlekwa
hlek-a	hlek-w-a
laugh-FV	$laugh_{VR}$-PASS-FV
laugh'	'be laughed at'

However, in the case of monosyllabic and/or is a vowel-commencing stems, we add the passive suffix **/-iw-/.** The following is an example:

[14]

(a)	*dla*	*dliwa*	(b) *osa*	*osiwa*
	dl-a	dl-iw-a	os-a	os-iw-a
	eat_{VR}-FV	eat_{VR}-PASS-FV	$roast_{VR}$-FV	$roast_{VR}$-PASS-FV
	'eat'	'be eaten'	'roast'	'be roasted'

There are exceptions to this general rule. Some monosyllabic stems take the passive suffix -w- instead of -iw- and some disyllabic stems take the passive -iw- instead of -w-. The following are examples.

[15]

(a) *thi*	*thiwa*	(b) *azi*	*aziwa*
th-i	th-iw-a	az-i	az-iw-a
say_{VR}-FV	say-PASS-FV	know-FV	know-PASS-FV
'say'	'be said'	'know'	'be known'

It can be postulated that in both cases there is vowel elision, since Ndebele does not allow vowel sequencing. The final vowel for the verb *thi* is elided and the root takes the passive suffix -iw- consistent with the passive rule above. The verb *azi* can also be said to take the passive form -iw- after eliding the final vowel -i, again consistent with the generalization for vowel-commencing stems.

Verbs can be either transitive or intransitive. That is, expressing an action that is passing on to something/object or action that does not pass on respectively. In Ndebele both transitive and intransitive verbs can assume a passive form. Intransitive and transitive verbs are exemplified in (i) and (ii) respectively:

[16]

(i) uyakhala	(ii) utshaya inyoka
u-ya-khal-a	u-tshay-a i-nyoka
1-TENSE-cry_{VR}-FV	1-hit_{VR}-FV 9-snake
'S/he is crying'	'S/he is hitting a snake'

In example (ii) the subject (class 1) is clearly acting on (i.e. hitting) the direct object (snake) and there is clear action being carried out.

2.1 LMT ANALYSIS

It has been claimed in the literature that a central topic in any grammatical theory is valency alternations (Lødrup 2004). These alternations include passivization, locative inversion, causativization, and so on. Our main focus here is the process of passivization. The passive construction has received a great deal of attention both within the Lexical Functional Grammar (LFG) and other theories (Chomsky 1965, Perlmutter 1983). The status of the passive within linguistic theory was made prominent by its role in the original formulations of the theory of transformational generative grammar (Chomsky 1965) and later it was to play a significant role in the articulation of lexicalist approaches to grammatical theory (Mchombo 2004). However, there seems to be a theory neutral approach to passive analysis, an approach that is in some way inter-theoretical, which states that the verb's highest thematic role is not available for the subject position, (Lødrup 2004). This seems to be accepted as the central universal feature of passive.

According to the LMT, the statement above means that the θé of the verb is "mapped to zero". This means that the θé is not available for mapping. The other thematic roles are mapped as usual, as in the following example of a passive construction.

[17]
Umntwana watshaywa
Um-ntwana wa-tshay-w-a
1-child PAST-beat$_{VR}$-PASS-FV
'The child was beaten'

-tshaywa	<agent	theme >	
'be beaten'	[-o]	[-r]	syntactic features by principles [1] (a) and (c)
		|	θé maps to zero in the passive
	Ø		theme is subject by principle [4] (ii).
		SUBJ	

The agent in the example above is θé, and according to the theory does not take part in thematic mapping. Theme is [-r], and therefore it is mapped to the SUBJ according to the principle for subject selection [4] (ii). This process results in the satisfaction of the Subject Condition. It should be noted that Lexical Functional Grammar (LFG) accounts for grammatical function changes from object to subject[7] through morphological processes that take place in lexical structure (as opposed to syntactic structure). Hence the change in grammatical function from objects to subjects of NPs that we have noticed in the above example follows the suppression of the original (active form) owing to the passive morphology /-w- ~ -iw-/ that has been acquired by the predicator. This morphological change that arises from the affixation of the passive morpheme accounts for the differences in passive morphology between the active predicates and their passivized counterparts.

The question that begs an answer is that since the θé is not mapped, what then happens to it since the semantic value of the active sentence is, according to this theory, the same as the passive equivalent, or is retained in the passive? In terms of meaning, the agent (i.e. the θé) is postulated to be conceptually there. In [17] there is the assumption that there was 'someone who did the beating'. It is therefore possible to add an agent phrase to bring this sense out as in [18].

[7] It was put to me that this view should be considered figuratively, since there is no actual change from subject to object involved in the LMT.

[18]

Umntwana watshaywa ngumama		
Um-ntwana	wa-tshay-w-a	ngumama
1-child	SC-beat$_{VR}$-PASS-FV	by-mother

'The child was beaten by the mother'

[19]

-tshaywa	<agent	theme >	**passive**
'be beaten'			
	[-o]	[-r]	syntactic features by principles [1] (a) and (c)
		|	θé maps to zero in the passive
	Ø		theme is subject by principle [4] (ii).
		SUBJ	

Lødrup (2004: 12) admits though, that this "agent phrase" raises some problems. One possibility is that it is an OBL$_{agent.}$ However, it does not seem to be selected by the passive verb, its distribution therefore is that of an adjunct (Keenan 1985; Åfarli 1992: 46–50). Its adjunct status, according to Lødrup (2004) is actually predicted by LMT since the theory states that the θé maps to zero, which in turn means that it cannot be realized by an argument function.

2.2 THE PASSIVE AND OTHER DERIVATIONS

In this section we discuss the passive construction in the context of other argument changing operations. We are going to restrict our discussion to the applicative and the causative constructions. We will first discuss the active applicative with an NP beneficiary object, and then see whether it can take the passive form. The first example is [20].

[20]

Ubaba wasengela abafana uchago			
U-baba	wa-seng-el-a	aba-fana	u-chago
1a-father	SC-milk$_{VR}$-APPL-FV	2-boys	3-milk

'Father milked milk for the boys.'

In hierarchical order, this example has an Agent (*Ubaba*), a Beneficiary (*abafana*), and the Theme (*uchago*). Both the beneficiary and the theme are "patientlike" roles. What role counts as secondary patientlike is a parameter variation. The traditional view, according to Lødrup (2004) is that the beneficiary is primary while the theme is secondary in English. According to LMT, the agent is assigned the feature classification [-o], the theme is assigned the feature classification [+o] and the beneficiary receives only the classification [-r]. However, the beneficiary must be mapped onto OBJ instead of SUBJ the other

[-r] role. This is because of the Biuniqueness Principle, which requires that only one role must be mapped onto each function. Since the agent is mapped onto SUBJ by virtue of receiving both [-r] and [-o], the beneficiary is left with the only other [-r] role represented as follows.

[21]

	< Ag	Ben	Th >
Applicative		Appl	
IC	[-o]		
IC		[-r]	[+o]
Principle [4] (i)			
Principle [6]		[+r]	
	SUBJ	OBJ	OBJθ

The beneficiary and not the theme is the primary patientlike role because this is consistent with the object symmetry in Ndebele. It must be pointed out that Ndebele does not allow the first or the highest object (in this case the beneficiary) to be realized as an object marker in the passive. When we generate the passivized beneficiary applicative object in example [20], we derive the following construction [22].

[22]

Abafana basengelwa uchago ngubaba.

aba-fana	ba-seng-el-w-a	u-chago	ngubaba
2-boys	2-milk$_{VR}$-APPL-PASS-FV	3-milk	by-1a/father

'The boys were milked milk by the father'

It is noted here that passive suppresses agent, which is the highest theta role, which is then expressed as an adjunct. The beneficiary is in this case then raised and must be mapped onto the SUBJ to satisfy the subject condition or requirement that one thematic role in a lexical form be mapped onto SUBJ, because it is the only available role. The theme is uniquely mapped onto OBJθ. This can be represented as follows.

[23]

	< Ag	Ben	Pt >
Passive	**Ø**		
Applicative		appl	
IC		[-r]	[+o]
Principle [1.6]			[+r]
		SUBJ	OBJθ

It is clear that the passive can co-occur with the applicative form in Ndebele. It should be noted that there are different kinds of applicative constructions in Ndebele, like the Motive Applicative, which we are not going to discuss here (see Harford (1993)). Below we examine the causative to see how it co-occurs with the passive in Ndebele.

The causative morpheme is very productive in Ndebele. Let us take a look at the causative construction below.

[24]
Ubaba usengisa abafana.
u-baba u-seng-is-a aba-fana
1a-father 1a-milk$_{VR}$-CAUS-FV 2-boys
'The father is causing the boys to milk'

The subject in this sentence is the causer, i.e. the initiator or the trigger of the event(s). It is therefore an agent. The object however realizes two roles. The first one is that it is the causee, which means it is the theme of the causing event. Simultaneously, it doubles up as the agent of milking. As Alsina (1992) observes, the a-structure of such a construction is complex as one tries to incorporate these intuitions. The causative morpheme has to be represented as a separate predicate with its own a-structure, which embeds the a-structure of the root as follows.

[25]

cause	< Ag	Th	$<\theta_1$	$\theta_2 \ldots >>$
	[-o]	[-r]		

The theme of the causative predicate fuses with an argument of the embedded predicate as schematized below in [26].

[26]

Sengisa	< Agent	Theme	< Agent >>
Cause-to-milk	[-o]	[-r]	

The agent is then mapped to the SUBJ following the LMT's specifications, and the composite argument is mapped to OBJ as follows.

[27]

<agent	theme	< agent >>	
[-o]	[-r]		syntactic features by principles [1] (a) and (c)
			agent is SUBJ by principle [4] (i)
	[+o]		insertion of plus by principle [6]
SUBJ	OBJ		

When we passivize the causative construction [24], we realize the following construction.

[28]
Abafana basengiswa (ngubaba)
Aba-fana ba-seng-is-w-a (ngubaba)
2-boys 2-milk$_{VR}$-CAUS-PASS-FV (by father)
'The boys were made to milk by the father'

The passive demotes the highest theta role, that is may consequently be expressed as an adjunct phrase. In this case the theme is raised and must be mapped onto the SUBJ to satisfy the subject condition or requirement that one thematic role in a lexical form be mapped onto SUBJ, because it is the only available role. This can be represented as follows.

[29]

	< agent	theme	<agent >>
Passive	**Ø**		
IC		[-r]	
Subject by principle [4] (ii)		SUBJ	

It is clear from this discussion that the passive in Ndebele can co-occur with function changing operations like the causative and the applicative.

3. THE STATIVE DERIVATION

The stative in Ndebele is generally distinguished by the suffix **-ek-**. Doke (1927: 139), who refers to this derivation as the neuter, says it indicates 'an intransitive state or condition without any special reference to an agent determining that condition'. An example of the neuter extension is as follows:

[30]

(i) *thanda* [underived]	(ii) *thandeka* [derived]
thand-a	thand-**ek**-a
love$_{VR}$-FV	love$_{VR}$-NEU-FV
'love'	'be lovable'

The example demonstrates that stative verbal extension have no agent. While the general stative suffix is **-ek-**, there are a few stems that take the suffix **-akal-**. The following is an example of a verb that takes the neuter verbal extension **-akal-**:

[31]
Sizakala
siz-akal-a
help$_{VR}$-NEU-FV
'get helped'

The phonological distribution of the stative derivation in Ndebele is **/-ek-** and **/-akal-/.** This derivational suffix therefore describes an action done without the specification of an agent.

3.1 LMT ANALYSIS

The stative indicates an intransitive state or condition without any special reference to an agent determining that condition. This is because the suffixation of the stative eliminates the subject NP, making it inexpressible in the syntactic structure, while converting the object NP of the input verb into the subject. Let us look at the examples below.

[32]

Umfana uvala isivalo			*Isivalo savaleka*	
Um-fana	u-val-a	isi-valo	isi-valo	sa-val-ek-a
1-boy	SC-shut$_{VR}$-FV	7-door	7-door	SC-shut$_{VR}$-STAT-FV
'The boy closes the door'			'The door closes'	

According to the LMT this can be represented as follows, (a) representing the active transitive verb form '*vala'* (to close) and (b) the derived form '*valeka'* (be closed or become closed).

[33]

(a)

vala	< agent	theme >	
'close'	[-o]	[-r]	syntactic features by principles [1] (a) and (c)
	|		agent is SUBJ by principle [4] (i)
		[+o]	insertion of plus by principle [6]
	SUBJ	OBJ	

(b)

valeka	< theme >	
'be closed'	[-r]	syntactic features by principles [1] (a) and (c)
	[-o]	SUBJ by principle [4] (i)
	SUBJ	

In (b) the theme is assigned the internal argument feature [-r], and the absence of an external argument causes the subject principle to assign the feature [-o] to it. This results in the theme being syntactically realized as a subject. The former subject (of the active transitive verb) on the other hand is not expressed, not even as an oblique function or an adjuct phrase. It is totally eliminated.

Both the stative and the passive affixes are detransitivizing. They are however phonologically distinct. The former is realised by the affix -ek- or -akal- while the latter is realised by the affixes -w- or -iw-. [34] illustrates these constructions.

[34]
(a) *Isivalo savalwa*.
isi-valo sa-val-w-a
7-door SC-shut$_{VR}$-PASS-FV
'The door was closed.'

(b) *Isivalo savaleka*.
isi-valo sa-val-ek-a
7-door SC-shut$_{VR}$-STAT
'The door closed.'

The differences are not only phonological, but since these are derivational morphemes, they also reflect different meanings. Consequentially, the difference between [34] (a) and (b) is that [34] (a) implies that the door was closed by someone, while [34] (b) refers to the state of the door, i.e., that it is closed or has closed on its own. Dubinsky and Simango (1996) observe for Chichewa, which is also true for Ndebele, that the differences in meaning are more magnified if we negate [34] (a) and (b) as is illustrated by [35] (a) and (b).

[35]
(a) *Isivalo asivalwanga*.
isi-valo a-si-val-w-ang-a
7-door NEG-SC-shut$_{VR}$-PASS-NEG-FV
'The door was not closed (at all).'

(b) *Isivalo asivalekanga*.
isi-valo a-si-val-ek-ang-a
7-door NEG-SC-shut$_{VR}$-STAT-NEG-FV
'The door did not close (properly).'

The negated passive sentence [35] (a) means that the door was never acted upon, i.e. that it was never closed. While its stative counterpart in [35] (b) means that the door is half-closed, i.e., not properly shut. The meanings generated by both assertions demonstrate the difference between the two derivational processes when tested under the same condition.

We can also observe that the passive construction can combine with agentive prepositional phrases as is shown in [36] (a) below, while the stative construction cannot as is also the case in Chichewa, Dubinsky and Simango (1996: 751).

[36]
(a) *Isivalo savalwa (nguThabo).*
isi-valo sa-val-w-a ngu Thabo
7-door SC-shut$_{VR}$-PASS-FV by Thabo
'The door was closed (by Thabo).'

(b) **Isivalo savaleka nguThabo.*
isi-valo sa-val-ek-a ngu Thabo
7-door SC-shut$_{VR}$-STAT-FV by Thabo
*'The door closed by Thabo.'

Agentive prepositional phrases are optional in passive constructions but cannot appear in statives, as shown in the example above. The addition of the by phrase *nguThabo* makes the stative construction ungrammatical.

In both Chichewa, Mchombo (1993) and Dubinsky and Simango (1996) and Ndebele, passive constructions can co-occur with purpose clauses and agent oriented adverbs while stative constructions cannot. Examples [37] (a)-(d) illustrate the differences between passive constructions and stative constructions. Examples (c) and (d) are adapted from Dubinsky and Simango (1996: page).

[37]
(a) *Isivalo savalwa ukuthi abantwana bangagodoli.*
Isi-valo sa-val-w-a ukuthi aba-ntwana ba-nga-godol-i
7-door 7-shut$_{VR}$-PASS-FV [so] that 2-children 2-NEG-cold-NEG
'The door was closed so that children do not get cold.'

(b) **Isivalo savaleka ukuthi abantwana bangagodoli.*
isi-valo sa-val-ek-a ukuthi aba-ntwana ba-nga-godol-i
7-door SC-shut$_{VR}$-STAT-FV [so] that 2-children SC-NEG-cold-NEG
'The door closed so that children do not get cold.'

(c) *Isivalo savalwa ngabomo.*
isi-valo sa-val-w-a ngabomo
7-door SC-val$_{VR}$-PASS-FV deliberately
'The door was closed deliberately.'

(d) **Isivalo savaleka ngabomo.*
isi-valo sa-val-ek-a ngabomo
7-door 7-val$_{VR}$-STAT-FV deliberately
'The door closed deliberately.'

The addition of the purposive clause in (b) above renders the stative construction unacceptable, as does the inclusion of the agent oriented adverb *ngabomo* in (d).

However, Ndebele differs from Chichewa when it comes to instrumental phrases. According to Dubinsky and Simango (1996) Chichewa instrumental phrases can only occur in clauses that involve an agent; below is an example taken from Dubinsky and Simango (1996: 751).

[38]
(a) *Naphiri a-na-lemba kalata (ndi pensula)*.
Naphiri AGR-PAST-write letter with pencil
'Naphiri wrote a letter (with a pencil).'

According to Dubinsky and Simango (1996), the semantic presence of an agentive argument in a passive construction is demonstrated by the fact that the instrument phrase is still acceptable in the passive of [38] (a), compare [39] (a). If [38] (a) is stativized, the instrumental phrase is no longer admissible in Chichewa as is exemplified by [39] (b), Dubinsky and Simango (1996: 752).

[39]
(a) *Kalata i-na-lemb-edwa (ndi pensulo)*.
letter AGR-PAST-write-PASS with pencil
'The letter was written (with a pencil).'

(b) ***Kalata i-na-lemb-eka ndi pensulo***.
letter AGR-PAST-write-STAT with pencil
'The letter was written (with a pencil).'

If we take the following instrumental phrase in Ndebele we observe that it surely varies with the conclusion arrived at in Chichewa.

[40]
(a) *Inkukhu yaqunywa (ngengqamu)*.
iN-kukhu ya-qum-w-a ngengqamu
9-chicken 9-qum$_{VR}$-PASS-FV with a knife
'The chicken was cut (with a knife).'

(b) *Inkukhu yaqumeka (ngengqamu)*.
iN-kukhu ya-qum-ek-a ngengqamu
9-chicken 9-qum$_{VR}$-STAT-FV with a knife
'The chicken was cutable (with a knife).'

The instrumental phrase is perfectly acceptable in the stative construction in [40] (b) above. This is a departure from Chichewa as evidenced by data in [39] (b).

3.2 THE STATIVE AND OTHER DERIVATIONS

We want to examine the behavior of the stative construction when it is combined with other argument changing operations just like we did with the passive derivation. This will bring the differences of the two derivations to the fore. It was established that a predicate which hosts an applicative or a causative morpheme can be passivized in Ndebele and is repeated here as [41] (a) and (b) respectively.

[41]
(a) *Abafana basengelwa uchago ngubaba.*
aba-fana ba-seng-el-w-a u-chago ngubaba
2-boys SC-milk$_{VR}$-APPL-PASS-FV 3-milk by-1a/father
'The boys were milked milk by the father.'
{VERB-APPLICATIVE-PASSIVE}

(b) *Abafana basengiswa uchago (ngubaba).*
Aba-fana ba-seng-is-w-a u-chago (ngubaba)
2-boys SC-milk$_{VR}$-CAUS-PASS-FV 3milk (by father)
'The boys were made to milk by the father'
{VERB-CAUSATIVE-PASSIVE}

When we stativize examples [41] (a) and (b) respectively the following constructions are derived;

[42]
(a) ?*Abafana basengeleka uchago (ngubaba).*
aba-fana ba-seng-el-ek-a u-chago ngubaba
2-boys 2-milk$_{VR}$-APPL-STAT-FV 3-milk by-1a/father
'The boys were made being milked milk for by the father.'
{VERB-APPLICATIVE-STATIVE}

(b) ?*Abafana basengiseka uchago (ngubaba)*
Aba-fana ba-seng-is-ek-a u-chago (ngubaba)
2-boys 2-milk$_{VR}$-CAUS-STAT-FV 3-milk (by father)
'The boys were made to be milking by the father.'
{VERB-CAUSATIVE-STATIVE}

I should admit that it is difficult to tell whether the above constructions are grammatical and acceptable at once. However, a closer analysis of similar, more frequently used constructions demonstrate that Ndebele, unlike Chichewa, Dubinsky & Simango (1996), permits the verb-applicative-stative and verb-causative-stative sequences. Examples [43] (a) and (b) demonstrate this claim.

[43]

(a) *Ummango uqumeleka ezitolo*[8]

um-mango	u-qum-el-ek-a	e-zitolo
3-journey	SC-cut$_{VR}$-APPL-STAT-FV	LOC-stores

'The journey can be short-cutable at the stores'

(b) *Umvundla wagijimiseka emini*

Um-vundla	wa-gijim-is-ek-a	e-mini
3-hare	SC-chase$_{VR}$-CAUS-STAT-FV	LOC-day

'The hare was chaseable during the day'

Ndebele data also provides yet another departure from Chichewa. Dubinsky and Simango (1996) claim that stativization has a narrower range of application than does passivization. They point out that stativization can only be added to verbs that are 'accomplishments' and whose event structure involves an activity or process resulting in a change of state for the theme. As a result stativization in Chichewa is limited to verbs whose themes undergo a 'change of state,' (Ibid.755). However Ndebele examples below demonstrate that stativization, like passivization can occur with both change-of-state verbs and non-change-of-state verbs as in Figure 1 and 2 below.

Figure 1. *Change-of-state verbs*.

VERB	STATIVE	PASSIVE[9]
a. hamba$_{walk}$	hambeka	hanjwa
b. gubha$_{pick}$	gubheka	gujwa
c. khipha$_{take\ out}$	khipheka	khutshwa

Figure 2. *Non-change-of-state verbs*.

VERB	STATIVE	PASSIVE	*	PASSIVIZED STATIVES
a. luma$_{bite}$	lumeka	lunywa		lunyekwa
b. hlala$_{sit}$	hlaleka	hlalwa		hlalekwa
c. hleka$_{laugh}$	hlekeka	hlekwa		hlekekwa

It can be noted that Ndebele can stativize both change-of-state and non-change-of-state verbs. Ndebele can also passivize stative forms as is demonstrated by the examples in parenthesis in Figure 2.

---

8 It turns out that the stative can precede the applicative in Ndebele, e.g. -khathaz$_{VR}$-ek$_{STAT}$-el$_{APPL}$-a$_{FV}$ 'be worried for' while it is not possible for the stative to precede the causative.

9 Notice the phonological changes that take place in passive forms both in Figures 1 & 2. This is as a result of a process commonly refered to as palatalization and that Khumalo (2007: 125) refers to as dissimilation.

4. CONCLUSION

The paper has focused on two derivational extensions that have in common a property that allows them to delete/suppress one NP from the range of required arguments within syntactic structure. Of the two extensions, the passive is the best known and most widely discussed in linguistic theory. However the two extensions have been characterised as closely linked prompting this detailed account with reference to a language that is not extensively documented. While both derivational processes result from a morpholexical rule which affects the argument structure of sentences in an almost identical fashion, the two have some differences. It was established that while the passive allows the overt expression of the agent as an adjunct or agentive prepositional phrases, the stative does not. Further, the passive can combine with purpose clauses and agent oriented adverbs while the stative cannot. Finally, it would seem from the evidence presented in this paper that in Chichewa the stative is more restricted than it is in Ndebele.

REFERENCES

Åfarli, Tor Anders. 1992.
The Syntax of Norwegian Passive Constructions. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Alsina, Alex. 1992.
On the Argument Structure of Causatives. **Linguistic Inquiry** 23: 517–555.

Alsina, Alex and Sam Mchombo. 1988.
Lexical Mapping in the Chichewa Applicative Constructions. Technical Report, Stanford University and San Jose State University, Stanford.

Bresnan, Joan. 2001.
Lexical-Functional Syntax. Oxford: Blackwell.

Bresnan, Joan & Annie Zaenen. 1990.
Deep Unaccusativity in LFG. In: K. Dziwirek, P. Farrell & E. Mejias-Bikandi (eds.), *Grammatical Relations: A Cross-Theoretical Perspective*, pp. 45–57. Stanford, CA: CSLI.

Bresnan, Joan & Jonni Kanerva. 1989.
Locative Inversion in Chichewa: A Case Study of Factorization in Grammar. **Linguistic Inquiry** 20: 1–50.

Chimhundu, Herbert. 1997.
Language Standardization without Policy or Planning: Zimbabwe as a Case Study. In: U. Royneland (ed.), *Language Contact and Language Conflict*. The Hague: Mouto Publishers.

Chomsky, Noam. 1965.
Aspects of the Theory of Syntax. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Doke, Clement M. 1927.
Textbook of Zulu Grammar. (Fourth Edition, 1947) Cape Town: Longmans, Green & Co. LTD.
Dubinsky, Stanley & Silvester Ron Simango. 1996.
Passive and Stative in Chichewa: Evidence for Modular Distinctions in Grammar. **Language** 72: 749–81.
Hachipola, Simooya J. 1998.
A Survey of the Minority Languages of Zimbabwe. Harare: UZP.
Harford, Carolyn. 1993.
The Applicative in chiShona and Lexical Mapping Theory. In: S.A. Mchombo (ed.), *Theoretical Aspects of Bantu Grammar 1*. Stanford: CSLI.
Joshi, Smita. 1989.
Logical Subject in Marathi Grammar and Predicate Argument Structure. **WCCFL** 8: 207–219.
Keenan, Edward L. 1985.
Passive in the World's Languages. In: T. Shopen (ed.), *Language Typology and Language Description*. Volume 1. Cambridge: CUP.
Khumalo, Langa. 2007.
An Analysis of the Ndebele Passive Construction. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Oslo.
Kiparsky, Paul. 1988.
Agreement and Linking Theory. Ms., Stanford University.
1987 *Morphology and Grammatical Relations*. Ms., Stanford University.
Lødrup, Helge. 2004.
Functional Structure: Preliminary Version. To appear In: R.D. Borsley and Kersti Börjars (eds.), *Non-Transformational Syntax: A Guide to Current Models*. Oxford: Blackwells.
Mchombo, Sam A. 2004.
The Syntax of Chichewa. Cabridge: CUP.
1993 *A Formal Analysis of the Stative Construction in Bantu*. **Journal of African Languages and Linguistics** 14: 5–28.
Mohannan, Tara. 1989.
Arguments in Hindi. Ph.D. Dissertation. Standford University.
Perlmutter, David M. 1983.
Studies in Relational Grammar. Chicago: University Press.
Satyo, Sizwe. C. 1985.
Topics in Xhosa Verbal Extension. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of South Africa.

About the author: *Langa Khumalo* is a MELLON POST-DOCTORAL FELLOW at the University of KwaZulu Natal, in the Department of Linguistics. His current research is in Bantu Morphology with a special focus on the syntactic and semantic properties of the passive derivation. He is also interested in the debate on passives of the unergatives and unaccusatives, impersonals and the syntactic role of the inverted locatives. The theoretical tools that he is working with are the Lexical Functional Grammar's Lexical Mapping Theory and the Cognitive Grammar frameworks.

Khumalo is also a Lexicographer, compiling monolingual general, advanced and specialized dictionaries in Ndebele. He works closely with the Ndebele Language Corpus in both his linguistic research and in the compilation of monolingual dictionaries. Khumalo has been the Research Leader of the Ndebele lexicography team since the year 2000, writing up style manuals, administering dictionary databases, training research assistants and coordinating and leading Ndebele field research. From January 2008 to August 2012 Khumalo will be involved in the compilation of the first-ever general bilingual dictionary in Shona and Ndebele. Khumalo and his colleague are currently developing the style-manual for the dictionary. Issues of language planning, language policy, language raising and harmonization are also germane in Khumalo's research through CASAS (short for Centre for Advanced Studies of African Societies) work which he has been part of since 2001.