Grammatical Values of Possession in Setswana

Anderson M. Chebanne

University of Botswana

Abstract. The possession values discussed in this chapter are akin to the expression of possession that is described in Bantu languages where there is a connective *-a* joined to pronominal elements. The grammatical constructions under consideration are commonly treated by Sotho-Tswana (the Southern Bantu cluster to which Setswana belongs) grammarians as an expression of possessor and possessed relationship. Yet, when analyzed, they present diverse grammatical and semantic values. The discussion will in the first instance attempt to define the structures that derive "possession" and how within a theory of grammaticalization they have evolved to innovatively derive subtle values of qualification, relativization and other associated semantic values in Setswana. The paper will argue that while these grammatical processes are concerned with the expression of inherent values of "possession," there is evidence that there is also a semantic shift which constitutes linguistic innovation, such as locativization which may express both qualities and possession. The discussion seeks therefore to demonstrate that limiting these grammatical constructions to possession becomes restrictive analytically and theoretically. The discussion will conclude by submitting that the possession demonstrates complex and versatile values in its evolution and association with other grammatical categories. These evolutionary processes are, therefore, not just uni-categorial, but multi-categorial.

How to Cite this Article:

1.0   Introduction

Setswana is spoken in Botswana and South Africa, mainly, and also in Zimbabwe (where it is cited in the constitution as one of the local languages) and in Namibia where it is taught in lower primary school classes in Tswanaland District). Setswana belongs to the Southern Bantu Sub-family, within the Sotho-Tswana cluster, classified in Zone S (Maho 2009; Guthrie 1967-1971). Missionaries have produced Setswana grammars in the mid-nineteenth century (see Archbell 1837; Livingstone 1858). Early gramamrs provided a sketch of the language and were not exhaustive. The most elaborate grammar was produced in 1956 by Cole, and the other major contribution from a sister language was by Doke and Mofokeng (1957). These grammars were descriptive but provided a fair overview of various structures of the Sotho-Tswana languages. As intended to be textbooks, they are prescriptive than theoretical. Poulos and Louwrens (1994) provided a good base of the theoretical analysis of the Sotho-Tswana languages. Most of the grammatical nomenclature used in the grammar of Setswana and in this paper comes from the tradition of these grammarians.

The question of the possession treated in this chapter seeks to contribute to some of these important linguistics aspects of Setswana and to the theory of grammaticalisation. The notion of the possessive treated here are overarching grammatical categories of all that is described to constitute expressions of possessions, such as "X owns Y or Y belongs to X" (Creissels 1991; Chebanne 2005). Such expressions qualify a relation that links one entity to another entity by a value of possession. In this structure, it is possible to determine the grammatical status of which entity establishes a relation of belonging between the possessée and the possessor (cf. Danon-Boileau and Morel, 1996:7). In Setswana and in many Bantu languages, there is a connecting morpheme that has always been treated as the sole qualify of possession (Cole 1956). In linguistics, it is important to extend the treatment of possessive constructions to be inclusive of all semantic and syntactic values that can be accounted for under the possessive grammatical category even to those that express the

determination of attachment and detachment in whole or in part (cf. Danon-Boileau and Morel 1996:7) or the alienable and inalienable possession. According to Creissels (1991: 138-139), a nominal complement shows a possession when its underlying structure can be the subject of a sentence with the verb "to have." This verb has then a noun being the object complement in the resulting sentences demonstrated in (1a-d).

1. a. Kgomo ya   ga Mothusi.
  cl.9. cow cl.9.CONN POSS Mothusi
  'Mothusi's cow.'

  b. Mothusi o na le kgomo.
  Mothusi cl.1.sg have with cl.9.cow
  'Mothusi has a cow.'

And both these structures can be understood as having the following values:

  c. Mothusi o   ruile   kgomo.
  Mothusi cl.1.sg AGR own-PERFECT cl.9.cow
  'Mothusi owns a cow'.

  d. Kgomo ke ya   ga Mothusi
  cl.9 cow COP Cl.9-CONN POSS Mothusi
  'It is Mothusi's cow.'

This determination of possession is therefore a mechanism that a language avails to express belonging relationships through various means. As it shall be seen later on, the possessive elements can be adjectives or pronouns which indicate that the objects to which they are associated belong to an entity. By belonging here, it should be understood all sorts or relationships which are far from being reduced to only possession (Chebanne, 2005). The possessives can present themselves with a double variation; in number and in person; in gender and in number according to the gender and number of the noun that they determine (cf. Danon-Boileau and Morel, 1996:7). In Setswana, it is the nominal class gender that presents these morphological variations (see Table 2 later on). Certain theoretical issues of possession will be raised to demonstrate the bi-directional processes of this expression and to account for its varied values that Cole (1956: 165-166) presents as peculiar.

  Cole (1956: 159-170) presents an impressive formation of possessives. He recognizes the two main types, the direct possessive and

the descriptive possessives. Poulos and Louwrens (1994: 101) also account for the possessive in these two broad categories. Both types use the same set of possessive agreement markers in their formation. While the numbers of possession determination which can be expressed are practically infinite, the numbers which are grammaticalized are considerably fewer (Chebanne, 2005). The discussion will therefore pursue the formal marking of possessive, as well as the semantic generation or characterization of the notion of "belonging-construction" or "have-construction" (Heine, 1996:15) in Setswana. Other categories that derive or express the "possessive" value will be considered with the argument that the processes of grammaticalization are multi-categorial (Batibo, 1999). The following sections will form the basis of this discussion.

Theoretically, a possession establishes a possession relation of belonging, which could be inalienable or alienable, and that is the primary function of its grammatical label (Creissels 1991: 139). However, it becomes evident in the analysis of Setswana that in the grammatical evolution of this possession structure could either derive qualification or attribution values (Chebanne 2005). This is because in the theory of possession intrinsic qualities are inalienably attached (permanently and immutably), just as those other qualities or entities that could be alienably attached (temporarily or alternatively) to the possessor entity (cf. Herslund 1996; Yariv-Laor 1996). Note that the *ga-* that appears together with the possessive connective occurs only with personal names.

Y of X / X of Y

2. a. Kgomo   ya   ga   Mothusi.
      cl.9 cow   cl.9 CONN   POSS   Mothusi
      'The cow of Mothusi.' or 'Mothusi's cow.'

    b. Bolwetse   jwa   ga   Mothusi.
      cl.14 sickness cl.14 CONN   POSS   Mothusi
      'The sickness of Mothusi.'

    c. Seatla   sa   ga   Mothusi.
      cl.7 hand   cl.7 CONN   POSS   Mothusi
      'The hand of Mothusi.'

which is interpreted as the following:

X has Y

3. a. Mothusi   o   na   le   kgomo.
       Mothusi   cl. 1AGR.   have   with   cow
       'Mothusi has a cow.'

    b. Mothusi   o   na   le   bolwetse.
       Mothusi   cl.1 AGR   have   with   disease/sickness
       'Mothusi has a disease.'

    c. Mothusi   o   na   le   seatla.
       Mothusi   cl1. AGR   have   with   hand
       'Mothusi has a hand.'

As it can be seen the canonical expression of possession of belong-construction can also be translated through a predicative expression of have-construction. This is what Cole (1956:159) describes as direct possessives. What needs to be said here then is that at the formal or structural level the construction of possession brings together possessive mechanisms that may imply different values of inalienability and alienability. The distinctions come about from the context and from the psycholinguistic presentation of this attachment or detachment in part or in whole (Danon-Boileau and Morel 1996).

2.0   The Nominal Possessor and Descriptor

In most cases of the grammatical possessive determination construction, the nominal that is possessing (owning) or is possessed (owned) has the function of a possessor (the one attaching another entity) or descriptor (qualifier) (cf. Cole 1956, Lombard 1985 [1993], and Guma 1971).

4. a. Mosadi   wa   me   (possession)
       cl.1 woman   cl.1 POSS of 1st pers. poss. me
       'my wife'

    b. Maši   a lebese. (description)
       cl.6.milk   cl.6.POSSof cl.5.fresh
       'fresh milk'

Theoretically, the possessive/genitive relation translates the underlying grammatical canonical relation (3a. and b.)

5. a. Mothusi   o   na   le   mosadi.
       cl.1 Mothusi   cl.1.SAM   has   with   cl.1 wife
       'Mothusi has a wife.'

    b. Mosadi   wa   ga   Mothusi.
       cl.1 wife   cl.1.POSS   of   Mothusi
       'the wife of Mothusi'

These are some of the evident structures in the expression of the possessive. However, as it will be amply demonstrated later, there are many other structures that provide the same structure and semantic value of possession.

3.0   The Possessive in the [Determined+Connective+Determiner] Structure

In Setswana, most grammatical relations of determination must necessarily have a connective, that is, a morpheme or a series of morphemes that allow two lexical or grammatical structures to relate to each other. The possession/genitive is one of such expression that requires a linker to determine the possessor-possessed relationship. The following table shows how the possessive/genitive expression relates to other structures that may also translate its value (Chebanne, 2005).

Table 1: *Possessive-Epithetic-Relative Structure Interrelations*

1. Possessive
ngwana   wa   mosimane cl.1 baby   cl.1POSS   cl1.boy 'a baby boy'
2. Epithetic
ngwana   o   mosimane cl.1 baby   cl.1 EPI   cl1.boy 'a baby is a boy'
3. Relative
ngwana   yo o   leng   mosimane cl.1 baby   cl.1REL verb BE.   cl1.boy 'a baby who is a boy'

In Table 1, structure 1 is a possessive, structure 2 is epithetic (copulative), and structure 3 is a relative (which may be considered to be a regular relative of 1 and 2) and the three structures are in syntactical competition, but semantically analogous and only the context would tell them apart. In the construction of the type: "Substantive + connective +

determinant", Setswana has two different connectives, the "Connective A" and the "Connective B" (Creissels 1991), which have syntactically different expression and origins.

Table 2: *Connective Types* (cf. Chebanne 2005)

Class	Prefix(es)	Connective A (Possessive)	Connective B (Relative)
1	o/a	wa	yo
2	ba	ba	ba
3	o	wa	o
4	e	ya	e
5	le	la	le
6	a	a	a
7	se	sa	se
8	di	tsa < di-a	tse
9	e	ya	e
10	di	tsa < di-a	tse
11	lo	lwa	lo
14	bo	jwa < bwa	jo < bwo
15	go	ga	fa, mo, kwa

These connectives have a bi-morphemic form in which can be recognized as the first formative, the class marker of the determined substantive. Classes 16 to 18 are locative but now function as prepositions and, therefore, have a single connector *[ga]*.

6. a. mosadi   wa   bošeng.   **(Connective A)**
    cl.1-wife   cl1.POSS   recent-LOC.
    'a new wife'

    b. mosadi   yo   moša.   **(Connective B)**
    cl.1 wife   cl.1.REL   cl.1.SAM new
    'a new wife'

Syntactically, the two connectives are different and entail different grammatical relations.

From a general perspective, therefore, the expression of possession's versatility is derived not from common or specific morpho-syntactic markers, but (it is derived) from different sources, categorially and morpho-syntactically. Thus, the whole presentation of the possessive presents a delimitation, as well as an application problem. Theoretically, the problem that the genitival value presents is complex. In the expression of possession, that is, belonging or being "possessed", the possessive could simply relate a simple or common relation of being attached in whole or in

part to the "possessor", or it could express a detachment in part or in whole from the natural or physical context. For instance, in

7.   a. Kgang   ya   ga   Mothusi.
      cl.9 matter   CONN POSS Mothusi
      'Mothusi's matter'

the context or the situation may demand that one should not gloss it as either of the following:

    b. Mothusi   o   na   le   kgang.
       Mothusi   3ps.sg have   with   matter
       'Mothusi has a matter.'

    c. Mothusi   o   dirile   kgang.
       Mothusi   3ps.sg do-PERF   matter
       'Mothusi has made a matter.'

because it may well be "Mothusi ke kgang (e re buang ka yone)" ((Mothusi is the subject of the matter (we are talking about)). In this case, Mothusi is a contextual referent of a matter that the speakers have seized themselves with.

4.0   The Possessive in Association with Nominalized Verb-Forms

Syntactic structures that are associated with an expression of possession values can also appear in association with nominalized verb forms (or infinitive structures, Creissels and Godard 2005). This structure is a distinctive feature in the function of a possessive. This type of structure confers a nominal version to the transitive verbal construction. The function of this possessive is to transpose into nominal dependence, the relation of the accusative regime of a transitive verb.

8.   a. Motho   wa   go-rata kagiso.
      cl1. Person   cl.1CONN   POSS   cl.15 LOC-love Peace
      'Peace lover / peace-loving person'

    b. Motho   wa   go-   lwala.
      Cl1. person cl.1CON.POSS cl.15 LOC-sick
      'Sickly person / sickness-prone person'

    c. Ngwana   wa   go   lebala   thata.
      Cl1. child   cl.1CONN   POSS   cl.15 LOC-forget a lot
      'A very forgetful child.'

As it can be observed, these verbal constructions participate in possessive construction when it is infinitivised, that is, when it has become

a nominalized form. This is not surprising in Setswana as a Bantu language since verbs participate in the nominal class system (class 15) by a process which creates infinitives through the affixation of a locative prefix "go-" to the verbal stem. For example, the possessive construction in (8c) is made up of an infinitive verbal form that may be transcribed word for word: "a person of peace loving." The two interpretations of *go rata*: an infinitive and a name of an "action," are in verbal dependence, and not vice versa (go rata ga motho "the will of a person", is a nominal dependence), and the structure they constitute with the genitival connective morpheme -*a* should be interpreted as derived by the transposition of the relative or personal attributive verbal construction. We have here, therefore, a possessive in a special function resulting from the conversion of the relational verbal form to a nominal verbal form.

Further, this possession mechanism seems to work quite evidently when the antecedent is syntactically the object of the relative predicate. In such a case, the antecedent is represented in the relative structure by its indirect relative marker, and also by the appropriate object marker in the relative predicate. This genitival relative structure works grammatically because of the passivisation of the infinitive verbal predicate:

9. a. Mosadi yo banna ba mo lwelang = mosadi wa go lwelwa ke banna
cl.1 woman cl.REL. men.SAM 3p.pl. OAM cl.1 fight-for-REL
'The woman whom the men fight for.'

b. Pina e bana ba e opetseng = pina ya go opelwa ke bana
cl.9 song cl.9 REL. cl.2 children cl.9 OAM sing-REL
'The song that the children sing.'

This structure in (9) implies the identification of a modified noun to an implicit subject of the infinitive, which explains the obligation to use the passive in example (9). These structures are conditioned by the meaning implied in them. With some relative constructions this possibility is not available or is very limited. This semantic unavailability concerns essentially relatives that are not verbal predicates (adjectival, nominal), but also the locative relations, the manner-comparative relations. This syntactic blockage may be explained by suggesting that since the possessive seems to simplify the rather onerous direct or indirect relative construction, a

possessive construction that will require complex contours would be unacceptable.

5.0   The Possessive and the Qualificative

The possessive category contains a number of semantic properties, which are frequently grammaticalized (Chebanne, 2005; Cole 1958: 163). The qualificative in this sense is what Cole (1956: 135) defines in function of the agreements that the substantive presents in syntax with determination of quality. These possessive structures occur with adjectives, enumeratives, quantitatives, possessives, and relatives. These categories therefore belong to an overarching grammatical domain of the QUALIFICATIVE. In Setswana, the qualificative function is pervasive and is found even in verbal and adverbial expressions Cole (1956). In the sense that the possessive structure can mark or show features of possession whenever it occurs, it can be likened to possessive marking in pronominal structures (Chebanne, 2011). An evident representation of the processes of possessive grammaticalization involving possession may be seen when a consideration is made of the "qualificative" (determiner (of quality) of the substantive) in Setswana (see Cole 1956). Almost all grammatical categories in Setswana may in relationship with other categories qualify, that is, modify the reference of the substantive. In this regard, the function of qualifying, or determining the substantive may entail an establishment of a relation of attachment, belonging, or determination, and this is what brings genitivisation to the core of the determination of the substantive. The inter-connectivity of categories that are subsumed under the notion of qualification (cf. Cole 1956:62) characterizes or concern other grammatical categories, not only the adjectives.

Additionally, what the preceding discussion proves is that the possessive structures or the semantic values that they generate are diverse and cannot be narrowed to simple possession as is commonly treated by Sotho-Tswana grammarians, where only the expression of belonging or being possessed are recognized. However, when this question of possessive structures is critically analyzed, it shows that grammatically and

semantically that there are versatile and wide-ranging values that limiting these grammatical constructions to a single value of possession becomes analytically and theoretically superficial. Even in its simply formal presentation of the possessive, Cole (1956:159), the possessive construction has derived, by its function of "description", many subtle and multipurpose semantic representations. For example, the possessive connective *-a* expresses various values.

10. a. Bana   ba   Gaborone
        Cl.2 child   POSS   Gaborone
        'Gaborone children / children from Gaborone.'

The structure derives a possessive of location:

    b. Pitsa ya   go   apeeela
       Cl.9 sg pot   POSS   INF-cook-APPL
       'a pot for cooking (= cooking pot),

The possessive derives the locative as well as the instrumental values, and also in

    c. TB   ke   bolwetse   jwa   AIDS
      TB   COP   cl.14 sickness   POSS   AIDS
      'TB is an AIDS-related disease (= TB is with AIDS, or vice versa)'

The possessive derives a commutative value, and further,

    d. TB   ke   bolwetse   jwa   go   lwalwa
      TB   COP   cl.14 sickness   POSS   cl.15.   INFIN-be sick

      ke   motho   wa   AIDS
      COP   person   POSS   AIDS
      'TB is the disease suffered by an AIDS patient.'

The possessive derives an agentive value, and in

    e. Monna   wa   legatlapa
      man   POSS   coward
      'a cowardly man'

The possessive derives the value of quality or character, and again

    f. Mosadi   wa   lorato
      woman   POSS   love
      'a woman of love / a loving woman.'

In this instance, the possessive value is that of purpose/goal and therefore commitative. The foregoing discussion and the illustrations of the examples above corroborate what Heine (1996:13) states in his discussion

as derived values of the possessive in the expressions of belonging. These may resemble or be represented by identification, description, existence, equation, and/or location. Also, in this relation of possession, and the genitival value or the structure that derives it, there are possibly many morpho-syntactic and semantic distinctions. The following examples will momentarily illustrate:

11. a. Mothusi   o   na   le   mosadi.   **(Predicative)**
     Mothusi   3ps.sg   has   with   wife.
     'Mothusi has a wife.'

    b. Mosadi   wa   ga   Mothusi. **(Attributive)**
     Cl1.sg wife   POSSCONN   POSS   Mothusi
     'Mothusi's wife.'

    c. Mothusi   o   mosadi.   **(Attributive)**
     Mothusi   COP   wife
     'Mothusi is wifed.'

    d. Mothusi   o   mosading.   **(Locative)**
     Mothusi   3ps.sg-AGR   wife-LOC
     'Mothusi is (at) wife(d)'

    e. Mothusi   wa   mosadi.   **(Qualificative Possession)**
     Mothusi   POSS   wife
     Mothusi of the wife.'

6.0   Locativisation and the Value of Possession

Some of the subtlety and versatility of the possessive is in the domains where possession derives genitival relation/value through a mechanism where the substantive has a locative determiner, which expresses, "X is at/in Y," and where X and Y are either substantives or its pronominal representatives. In Setswana, however, this is an area that is still in the processes of grammaticalizing and therefore it is still limited, both dialectally and semantically. The examples in (12) illustrate.

12. a. Ke   lehumeng.
     1pers.sgl.SAM poverty-loc
     'I am poor'

    b. Re   mathateng.
     1pers. pl.SaM difficulties-loc
     'We have difficulties.'

    c. Ba   (mo) letlepung.
     3pers.pl. SAM plenty-loc
     'They have copious means.'

Locativisation is one grammatical innovation in Setswana. As the examples in (13) show, a substantive, which is in the subject position, can be "located" at another entity. This way, an association is created which then qualifies the possessor entity. As an innovation in the grammar, this instance of "possession" may create some semantic ambiguities, as (18c) may be interpreted as "they are in/with plenty." Conversely, it is possible that the context can effectively provide disambiguation strategy. Noteworthy also is that locatives take the direction of possession and qualification and inversely it is the possession is also grammaticalizes to express various values of the possessive examples discussed earlier in the article. This also collaborates what Frajzyngier (1997) qualifies as instances of bi-directionality of grammaticalization. The examples that follow hereunder demonstrate these subtle values of grammatical categories in the expression of the POSSESSIVE, have-possession, and the qualificative, the to-be-possession (Chebanne 2005).

13. a. O   na   le   mosepele.
     3pers.SAM   have   with   journey
     'S/he has a journey.'

    b. O   mo   mosepeleng.
     3pers.SAM   cl.15loc.   journey-loc
     'S/he is in a journey' / 's/he has a journey.'

    c. O   mosepele.
     SM1pers.   journey
     'S/he has a journey.'

These three examples translate each other, and this grammatical possibility derives from processes that are not necessarily syntactically related, but are however, related at the level of semantics.

14. a. Ke   batho   le   go-tsamaela   South Africa
     COP Cl.2 people   with   go-APPL   South Africa
     'They are people who often go to South Africa.'
     (Association)

    b. Ke   batho   ba   ba   tsamaelang   South Africa
     COP Cl.2 people   #prs.pl/AGR. #ps REL. go-APPL   South Africa
     'They are people who go (habitually) to South Africa.'
     (Relativization Possessive)

    c. Ke   batho   ba   go-tsamaela   South Africa
     COP Cl.2 people   POSS   go-APPL   South Africa
     'They are people who have the habit of going to South Africa.'
     (Possession)

The question of substantives or nominal sequencing or juxtaposition in the creation of genitival and qualificative values needs to be dealt with at this point. There are few cases in Setswana where a bi-nominal sequence without a connective or prepositional element can be used for the determination of have/belong construction. It occurs in certain substantival construction that the juxtaposition of two substantives implies genitivization or an expression of quality (Chebanne 2005).

15. a. polo   metsi
       iguana   water
       'water iguana'

    b. metsi   motlhabe
       water   sand
       'water of/from the sand'

As it can be observed, the characterization of a substantive or nominal by juxtaposition to another occurs in a formal framework and may derive a genitival value or qualification. This genitival structure is different from the canonical one by its morphological "compactness." There is evidently absence of the connective, as in (16). However, it can still be extended to the canonical structure, which would be descriptive than appellative.

16. a. polo   ya   metsi
       iguana   POSS   water
       'the iguana of/that lives in the water'

    b. metsi   a   motlhaba
       water   POSS   sand
       'the water from/of the sand'

What can be said is that while examples in (16) give a genitival characterization, its evolution has its origin from the structures in (15), where the possessive expressed a characterization of quality (cf. Creissels, 1991:140). Compactness is economic for appellation. The structures in (15) have for such examples evolved into epithetic structures, and no longer express a possessive relation even as it is a genitival structure.

7.0   The Identificative Possessive

The identificative in Setswana is constructed using a copulative structure, that is, a grammatical structure that has no overt verb. Such structures can

be N+N, Pronoun+N, N+Adj, etc. Of interest here is that there are instances where identificative structures can effectively be construed as a possessive.

17. a. Ke   ka   bo   ke palama   mme   <u>ke   ntša</u>
     1ps   POT   TAM   1ps CONSEC climb CONJC 1ps.   dog
     'I could be riding, but I have a dog.'

   b. Nka bo a tsamaya mme <u>o bolwetse</u>.
     1ps-POT TAM 3ps go   CONJC 3ps sickness
     'She could be going, but she is sick / has sickness.'

   c. O   boitumelo   gotlhe, o   katlego.
     3ps   happiness   cl.15-all 3ps   success
     'She is all over happy, she has success / she is successful.'

   d. O   mo-ntle   ke   naledi
     3ps   3ps-beautiful COP   star
     'She is beautiful, like a star.'

These identificative structures are not widespread and may be limited to some dialects such as Ngwaketsi. This could be yet another area of grammatical innovation in Setswana.

8.0   Grammaticalization: "Possessive" Processes and Values

The concept of grammaticalization is defined, in diachronic terms, as the evolution of a category from one function, sense function or structure to another. Grammaticalization processes, therefore, do not necessarily take one direction that is proceeding from one structural or grammatical category to another, but can be A to B or B to A (Frajzyngier, 1997: 17-38). According to Heine (1996:13), grammaticalization may be viewed narrowly as entailing a process whereby lexical items develop into grammatical items, that is, the increase of the range of a morpheme advancing from a lexical to a grammatical or a less grammatical to a more grammatical status (see Batibo, 1999), for example, from a derivative to an inflectional one. These alternative grammatical constructions are conditioned by the meaning implied in the structure. With some relative constructions, this grammatical possibility is not available or is very limited. This seems to concern essentially relatives that are not verbal predicates (adjectival, nominal) but also the locative relations, the manner-

comparative relations. This syntactic blockage may be explained by suggesting that since the possessive seems to simplify the rather onerous direct or indirect relative constructions, a possessive construction, which will require complex contours, would be unacceptable.

In grammaticalization, the re-categorization of the possessive to assume the functions of descriptive relative, or precisely in the possible inter-categorial re-assignment of grammatical values, the relative assumes the value of possession and the possession structure assumes the value of relativization. A further indication of this affinity is shown in the construction with a relation of a quality possessed. The verbal form takes the infinitive, which in Bantu languages is a nominalized form, and effectively belongs to the noun class system:

18. a. Motho   wa   go-rata kagiso.
        cl.1 person   cl.1 POSS   to-love   peace
         'a person who loves peace'

      b. Pula   ya   go-tla   ka   merwalela.
        cl.9 rain   cl.9 POSS   to-come with   floods
         'a rain that brings floods'

      c. Kgomo   ya   go-tsala   dinamane tse pedi.
        cl.9 cow   cl.9 POSS   to-give birth calves   REL.that are two
         'a cow that bore two calves'

      d. Ngwana   wa   go-lwala   gantsi.
        cl.1 child   cl.1 POSS   to-be-sick   many-time
         'a child who is often sick'

These genitival structures express a relation of possession attributed to the nominal in the position or role of the subject. This relation of the possessive value conveys possession in a special syntactic function which basically has nothing much to do with the semantic value of possession. The possessive here ascribes a quality or capacity that governs the antecedent just as in the normal relative construction as the following examples (8) translate.

19. a. Motho   yo-o-rata-ng   kagiso.
        cl.1 person cl.1.REL.love   peace
         'a person who loves peace'
          (= motho wa kagiso; motho wa go rata kagiso)

    b. Pula   e-e-tlang   ka   merwalela
       cl.9 rain   cl.9 SAM REL comes-REL   by   floods
       'a rain that brings floods'
       (= Pula ya merwalela)

    c. Kgomo   e-e-tsetse-ng   dinamane   tse   pedi
       cl.9 cow   cl.9 SAM REL. bore-REL   calves two
       'a cow that bore two calves'
       (= kgomo ya go tsala dinamane tse pedi)

    d. ngwana   yo-o-lwala-ng   gantsi
       cl. 1.child   cl.1 SAM REL sick   many time
       'a child who is often sick'
       (= ngwana wa go lwala gantsi)

The examples in (20) above clearly illustrate how the relative can also grammaticalize to descriptive value, which can be translated into genitival values (see examples in 19).

9.0   Possession and Adjectivisation

The possessive can also introduce a noun, which has an attributive role to the first noun. The determiner substantive is semantically "a name of a quality", and this can be demonstrated below where grammatically the attributive and predicative structures translate each other:

Table 2: *Attributive from Predicative*

ngwana wa mosimane child cl.1 CON.POS. boy 'a baby boy'	ngwana ke mosimane child COP boy 'the baby is a boy'
namane ya poo calf cl.9 CON.POS. bull' 'bull calf'	namane ke poo calf COP bull 'calf is a bull'
ntlo ya borutelo house cl.9 CON.POSS classroom 'a teaching room'	ntlo ke burutelo cl.9 house COP classroom 'the room is for teaching'
monnamogolo wa motsofe room cl.1 CON.POSS old man 'old man'	monnamogolo ke motsofe old man COP old 'the old man is old'

The above sentences can be reformulated using a relative construction of a verbal domain as follows:

20. a. Ngwana   yo-o-le-ng   mosimane.
          cl.1 child   cl.1 REL-cl1.SAM-be boy
          'a baby who is a boy'

      b. Namane   e-e-le-ng poo.
          cl.9 calf   cl.19 REL-cl9.SAM-be bull
          'a calf that is a bull'

131

    c. Ntlo   e-e-rutela-ng / ntlo e-e-le-ng borutelo.
       cl.9 house   cl.9 REL-cl9.SAM teach-REL
       'a teaching room'

    d. Monnamogolo   yo-o-leng   motsofe.
       cl.1 old man   cl.1 REL-cl1.SAM-be   old
       'an old man who is old'

It is therefore evident that these expressions whether they arise from attributive or predicative verbal expression have semantic motivations that associate them.

10.0   Possessive Structure as Topic Reference

The possessive structure can be used in common expressions that refer to a topic or a theme that is contextually understood, similar to the manner by which a pronoun would work. However, with this type of such possessive expression, the referent is not necessarily a nominal, but the topic or the issue raised about it. In this structure, the idea of possession is pragmatically marked by association, and this association can be indicated in a discourse, a topic, or a theme about which the entity is being referred to.

   21. a. Monna   wa   teng   o   bogale   thata.
          man   POSS-cl.1   there   3ps.sg aggressive   very
          'The man (in question) is very aggressive.'

      b. Motho   wa   lona   o fitlhelwa a le   sematla
          person   POSS-cl1   2ps.pl   3ps.sg.find ps.sg-COP fool
          'the type of a person like you is foolish'

The above examples demonstrate not a possessive value, but an associative value of a topic or theme with the referent, and translates, "X about which…"

11.0   Functionality and Evolutional Versatility

Possessive or grammatical categories that derive its value or from which some of its values are derived, have in the evolution grammaticalized [see in particular A. W. de Groot (1956, p. 8-65). There are language specific mechanisms, and the processes of this grammaticalization may entail different categories. The following captures some of the grammatical

functions that may be derived arising from various grammatical processes in the Setswana language (cf. Batibo, 1999). The diagram below shows how various grammatical processes and structures may derive a possession, which can be grammatically marked as genitive and an expression of quality.

Table 3: *The Genitivisation Processes (Adopted from Chebanne 2005)*

Possession Determination	Genitivisation	Qualification
↔	↔	↔

The diagram assumes that the grammaticalization process may be bi-directional, and may have its onset from any point A. B, and C. However, the example of other categories such as locativisation may express qualities and possession that demonstrate the complex and versatile nature of this grammaticalization. The semantic values that are derived as a result of these various processes are therefore not just uni-categorial, but multi-categorial; not just monovalent, but polyvalent as the discussion has demonstrated. While, as the discussion has underscored, the main move in this grammaticalization is concerned with "possession", there are other categories that move towards it, or from it, and the directions that suggest the possible evolution of grammatical derivations according to word categories. The variability or precisely the versatility therefore is not uni-categorial, but multi-categorial (Chebanne, 2005). In classical languages, where the possessive offers alternatives for the expression of the ablative, the locative, and the possessive, there are interesting clues in the manner in which grammaticalization can be handled in languages such as Setswana. It is therefore evident that in the evolution of the possessive, the domain of the possession is the primary but has the aptitude to derive semantically diverse values that are implied, ranging from temporary, to permanency, to inalienability, and to abstract possession (cf. Heine 1996:15).

12.0   Conclusion

The discussion in this chapter has shown that in Setswana, the possessive has evolved into multi grammatical category values. The emerging innovative structures derive categories that may vary possession. It is evident from the discussion that while the determination of possession is

the main and the most evident one; the innovations are in the values of attributive/adjectival expressions. The various genitival structures that were discussed have also proved in its evolution the Setswana possessive presents an efficient grammatical mechanism to express syntactic relations of the antecedent and the predicate or the attribute, which may otherwise require complex structure. Linguistically, it means that in this categorization, certain possessive expressions in Setswana must be revisited in the grammatical description. All these semantic innovations seem to occur under the overarching domain of the qualificative, which is made up of the adjective, relative, demonstrative, quantitative, enumerative, and the possessive. Therefore, the possessive permeates them all because it readily articulates attachment and detachment in part or whole.

Also, Setswana, as perhaps other Southern Bantu languages, is now at a phase where verbal constructions are clearly establishing their grammatical domain, but the relics of the once pervading nominal and attributive/qualificative systems are still attested. Even in the domain of verbs, once it is established that a verbal construction may assume "names of action," and as such falling under the domain of substantives, it may take the role of the qualificative, there is therefore nothing very much exceptional in the grammatical possibility where the possessive is used in Setswana as an alternate to the relative constructions of verbal predicative structures. While it is not grammatically possible that the possessive could replace other categories in the determination of the substantive, it is certainly taking an important role in grammaticalization processes within the domain of qualificative in the Setswana language. This is just an aspect of an otherwise extensive process in the language, and more analyses will be required to elaborate on this possessive grammaticalization.

Abbreviations

AGR	agreement	CL	nominal class
CONJC	conjunction	CONN	connective
CONSEC	consecutive	COP	copula
EPI	epithetic	GEN	genitive
PS	person	PL	plural

POSS	possessive	REL	relative
SAM	subject agreement marker	SG	singular
OAM	object agreement marker		

References

Archbell, James. 1837. *A Grammar of the Bechuana Language*. Cape of Good Hope: Meurant and Godlonton.

Batibo, H. 1999. "The Process of Grammaticalization in Setswana." *Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere*, 59: 131-150.

Chebanne, A. 2011. "Case System or Case Traces in Derivational Formations in Setswana." In A. Love, M. Machobane, T. Khati, B. Ekanjume, and T. Qhala (eds), *Language Contact, Identity and Socioeconomic Mobility [Proceedings of LASU Conference, NUL]*, pp. 275-287.

———. 2005. "Some Subtle and Versatile Values of the Possessive in Setswana." *PULA Journal,* 19(1) : 4-13.

Chebanne, A, D. Creissels, and H. Nkhwa. 1997. *Tonal Morphology of the Setswana Verb*. LINCOM Studies in African Linguistics.

Cole, D.T. 1975 [1956]. *An Introduction to Tswana Grammar*. Longman, South Africa.

Creissels, D. 1991. *Description des Langues Négro-Africaines et Théorie Syntaxique*. France : ELLUG, Université Stendhal.

Creissels, D. and Danièle Godard 2005. "The Tswana Infinitive as a Mixed Category." In Stefan Muller (ed), *Proceedings of the HPSG05 Conference*.

Danon-Boileau, L. and Morel, M-A (eds). 1996. *Faits de Langues: La Relation d'Appartenance*. Paris, France : Editions OPHYRS.

de Groot, A.W. 1956. "Classification and Uses of a Case Illustrated on the Genitive in Latin." *Lingua*, 6: 8-65.

Doke, C. and M. Mofokeng. 1957. *Textbook of Southern Sotho Grammar*. Cape Town, South Africa: Longman.

Frajzyngier, Zygmunt. 1997. "Bidirectionality of Grammaticalization." In Robert K. Herbert (ed), *African Langugaes at the Cross Roads, Papers from Kwaluseni*. Köln, Germany: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.

Guma, S.M. 1991 [1971]. *An Outline of Southern Sotho*. Pietermaritzburg, South Africa: Shutter and Shooter (Pty) Limited.

Guthrie, M. 1967–71. *Comparative Bantu: An Introduction to the Comparative Linguistics and Prehistory of the Bantu Languages*. Farnborough: Gregg Press.

Heine, Bernd. 1996. "Grammaticalization and Language Universals." In *Faits de Langues: La Relation d'Appartenance*. Paris, France: Éditions OPHYRS.

Herslund, M. 1996. "Faits de Langues." *Revue Linguistique*, 7.

Livingstone, David. 1858. *An Analysis of the Language of the Bechuanas.* London: Clowes.

Lombard, D.P. 1993 [1985]. *Introduction to the Grammar of Northern Sotho.* Pretoria, South Africa: J. L. Schaik.

Maho, Jouni. 2009. *NUGL Online: The Online Version of the New Updated Guthrie List, a Referential Classification of the Bantu Languages*.

Poulos, G. and L. Louwrens. 1994. *A Linguistic Analysis of Northern Sotho*. Via Afrika Limited, Pretoria.

Yariv-Laor, L. 1996. "L'expression de la Possession Inaliénable. L'exemple du Chinois Moderne." In *Faits de Langues: La Relation d'Appartenance,* Revue Linguistique no. 7. Ophrys, Paris.

Wookey, Alfred John. 1905. *Secwana Grammar*. London, UK: District Committee of the London Missionary Society.