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The article probes into the nature of secondary noun class prefixes in the morphology of some Nguni languages and Ndebele in particular. The secondary prefixes are known as commentary prefixes mainly because they carry overtones of sarcasm, criticism and caricature among other elements, through loading an implied meaning onto a noun construction. The overtones in reference are a reflection of how people view each other and how they evaluate other objects in their immediate environment. In some African languages like Shona, these overtones are embedded in the noun class prefixes, that is, the basic prefix. It is alleged that Ndebele, along with other Nguni languages, do not have secondary prefixes. It is argued that the semantic overtones are entrenched in the augmentative and diminutive suffixes. Contrary to what we find in Nguni literature, however, Ndebele speakers also use evaluative (commentary) prefixes to express semantic values of contempt and endearment. Consequently, this paper confirms the presence of commentary secondary prefixes in Ndebele on the one hand and discusses their categorical status in the noun classification system on the other.

Introduction

Studies on Ndebele grammar are primarily based on Zulu grammar texts and have perpetuated the debate on whether Ndebele is a dialect of Zulu or not. Doke’s (1947) A textbook of Zulu grammar, first published in 1927, has been the main text in the study of Ndebele grammar in secondary schools, colleges and universities. There have been other Zulu grammar books that have come after Doke (Nyembezi, 1973; Taljaard & Bosch, 1988) which have treated grammatical concepts primarily in the same ‘Dokean’ way (Khumalo, 2003:23). Canonici (1995) is the only one who has digressed from the Dokean school of thought. The Isichazamazwi SesIndebele by Hadebe (2001) and the first and only Ndebele grammar book by Khumalo (2003) are also Dokean in outlook. All the linguists we have mentioned, accept Carl Meinhof’s (1932) system of classifying Bantu nouns and concur that Ndebele/ Zulu does not have class 12 and class 13 noun constructions (commentary secondary prefixes [PRs]¹). An example of a language that has classes 12 and 13 is Shona. The class prefixes are ka-as in ka-komana ‘insignificant boy’ and tu- as in tu-komana ‘insignificant boys’ respectively. A reading of the mentioned texts gives one the impression that the evaluative function in Ndebele nouns is formally expressed by diminutive and augmentative suffixes only. As a result, the treatment of evaluative affixes in Ndebele literature is inconsistent with the spoken Ndebele. In speech, the use of secondary prefixes is normal, yet in the literature they are said to be an alien phenomenon in the language. Accordingly, this article discusses Ndebele secondary prefixes and their categorical status. It will investigate the commentary prefixes, which have not been hitherto studied, and will recommend their official acknowledgment.

Evaluative affixes in Ndebele

Evaluation in morphology is secondary in the sense that it derives new meaning from a basic meaning. Evaluative morphology is defined by Amiot and Stosic (2014:17) as the range of processes which enable a linguistic system to build word constructions expressing diminution, augmentation, derogation and appreciation from a word base through affixation and/or reduplication. Thus evaluative affixes are used to derive evaluative meaning from a base word or root, hence evaluative affixes are also known as secondary affixes. Albair (2010:1) notes that evaluative affixation is a special component of derivational morphology in which affixes are attached to bases to form new derivations that convey meaning of either size or emotion, in the form of diminutives or augmentatives. These affixes are usually ‘…attached to bases such as nouns, adjectives, adverb-verbs, pronouns and interjections in order of importance…’ (Prieto, 2005:23). This implies that nouns are more likely to host evaluative affixes than other bases. Accordingly, the focus of this study is on evaluative nouns. The evaluative function may be fulfilled by prefixes, infixes, suffixes or reduplication (Garbo, 2013:117). Languages express the evaluative function differently. Some languages prefer using prefixes whereas some prefer suffixes. As mentioned before, suffixes convey this function in Ndebele. However, the use of suffixes does not rule out the existence of evaluative prefixes. Grandi (2005:3) posits that a language can have both evaluative prefixes and suffixes. Evaluative suffixes in Ndebele/Zulu are discussed in detail by
Madondo (2000), Khumalo (2003), Hadebe (2006) and Mawadza (2009) among others. Madondo (2000) briefly discusses ‘evaluative prefixes’ in Zulu and argues that isi- and oku- are secondary prefixes. In the following sections we will consider Madondo’s claim further using Ndebele data and attempt to classify these evaluative prefixes. The terms secondary prefixes and evaluative prefixes are used interchangeably in this article because they seem to serve the same function.

Secondary prefixes

Secondary prefixes, as stated earlier, convey additional meaning whereas primary prefixes (preprefix+basic prefix) express basic meanings such as number, class and person. Secondary prefixes are made up of a preprefix and something like a basic prefix. The preprefix is either a front mid vowel e- or a back mid vowel o- and it seems the feature +back/+front is determined by the vowel of the ‘basic prefix’ (-si-, -zi-, -lu-, -ku-, and -yi-) which could suggest that maybe the underlying preprefix is a- (a- raises to be e- if the vowel of the ‘basic prefix’ is i- and it becomes o- if the ‘basic prefix’ vowel is u-). We refer to the second component of the secondary prefix as a ‘basic prefix’ mainly because they control concords in a sentence and they are identical to their concords except for -yi-. The -yi² element controls the -yi- concords as seen in (4b). As will be shown later, these secondary prefixes almost resemble some of the relative PRs. Beuchat (1964:21) notes that some noun PRs indicate number, class and person whereas others, in addition to these basic meanings, have a specialized significance of indicating diminution, augmentation, derogation, location, etc. The particular connotations are added to a stem through pre-posing a secondary PR. The primary prefix is sometimes totally replaced by the secondary prefix (as illustrated in examples 2c, 2d and 2e) or the secondary prefix is added before the primary prefix (as in examples 2cc, 2dd and 2ee). The commentary secondary prefixes carry overtones of sarcasm, criticism and cartoon as they make their implied comment on an item’s size or quality (Fortune, 1980:35). We can therefore claim that any noun construction which is associated with disapproval, disparagement, denigration, censure, scorn, cartoon, irony, belittling, mockery or cynicism has a secondary affix (prefix, infix or suffix). The nominal prefixes in (1c) and (1cc) fit well in the bracket of commentary noun prefixes. Consider example (1).

(1a) uThixo 1a-God
u-Thixo 'God'
(1bb) uNkulunkulu 1a-9-big-big
u-(i)N-khulu-khulu (lit. the greatest) ‘God’
(1cc) iSithixo 7-god
isi-thixo (lit. an insignificant god) ‘a god’

The nouns in (1aa) and (1bb) are unacceptable in some pronouns because there is only one true God. Though the constructions are potential class 2a nouns, they are deemed unacceptable when we are talking about ‘true God’. These constructions are deemed grammatical and acceptable when we are talking about ‘gods’ as in onkulunkulu/ othixo. In this case, the primary class 2a prefix conveys evaluative meaning. It is believed that God has human characteristics both in Christianity and in Ndebele religion. Accordingly, the noun for God is found in class 1a which is a subclass of class 1 referring to human beings. The use of the root -thixo (god) with class 7 and class 8 prefixes is meant to denigrate the type of ‘god’ being talked about. The constructions in reference have an evaluative meaning, thus the prefixes in these constructions are secondary prefixes. Mohlaba (2003:7) confirms in classes 7 and 8 we can find diminutives, derogatives and ameliorations among other things. Therefore, examples in (1) point to the fact that primary noun prefixes can express evaluation just like original secondary prefixes. However, it is important to note that this behavior seems to be limited to these noun stems only.

There are some evaluative nouns that do not make use of the primary prefix in expressing the evaluative function in the manner in which the examples used in example (1) do. The primary prefixes for the examples used in (2) are u- as in u-MaMthembu ‘Miss Mthembu’ and o- as in o-MaMthembu ‘Miss Mthembu’. The prefixes expressing evaluation in example (2)

(2a) okuMaMthembu
oku-(u)MaMthembu
PR-1a-Miss Mthembu
‘the little Miss Mthembu’
PR-COP-1a-Miss Mthembu
‘the little Miss Mthembu’

(2b) oku ngoMaMthembu
oku-ng-o-MaMthembu
PR-2a-Miss Mthembu
‘the little Miss Mthembu’
PR-COP-2a-Miss Mthembu
‘the little Miss Mthembu’

(2c) oluMthembu
olu-(u)Mthembu
PR-1a-Mthembu
‘the silly man Mthembu’
PR-COP-1a-Mthembu
‘the silly man that is Mthembu’

(2d) eyiMthembu
eyi-(u)Mthembu
PR-1a-Mthembu
‘the guy Mthembu’
PR-COP-1a-Mthembu
‘the guy it is Mthembu’

(2ee) esiMaMthembu
esi-(u)MaMthembu
PR-1a-Miss Mthembu
‘the worthless Miss Mthembu’
PR-COP-1a-Miss Mthembu
‘the worthless it is Mthembu’

(1aa) ng-MaMthembu
oku-MaMthembu
oku- ng-u-MaMthembu
PR-1a-Miss Mthembu
‘the little Miss Mthembu’
PR-COP-1a-Miss Mthembu
‘the little Miss Mthembu’

(1bb) nguMaMthembu
esi ng-o-MaMthembu
PR-COP-2a-Miss Mthembu
‘the little Miss Mthembu’
PR-COP-2a-Miss Mthembu
‘the little Miss Mthembu’

(1cc) ng-MaMthembu
oku-MaMthembu
oku- ng-u-MaMthembu
PR-1a-Miss Mthembu
‘the little Miss Mthembu’
PR-COP-1a-Miss Mthembu
‘the little Miss Mthembu’

(1dd) ng-MaMthembu
oku-MaMthembu
oku- ng-u-MaMthembu
PR-1a-Miss Mthembu
‘the little Miss Mthembu’
PR-COP-1a-Miss Mthembu
‘the little Miss Mthembu’
The proper nouns to which the secondary prefixes are added in example (2) are uMaMthembu and oMaMthembu. The highlighted prefixes convey evaluative meanings and the constructed words are nouns. This could mean that the prefixes in reference are noun class prefixes. These morphemes can be prefixed to copulative words in the derivation of evaluative nouns. Refer to (2bb) and (2ee).

It should be noted that noun class prefixes are used in the derivation of nouns from other categories such as verbs, ideophones and copulatives. This therefore implies that because of the fact that secondary prefixes in (2aa), (2bb), (2cc), (2dd) and (2ee) convert copulatives to nouns, they are indeed noun class prefixes. The resultant nouns are evaluative in nature which could be an indication that these prefixes are evaluative prefixes.

A primary PR normally and regularly appears with a noun stem in the construction CL + NS. A secondary PR is, first of all, one which usually substitutes a primary PR (Fortune, 1980:35) as is the case in example (3). In example (3) the CL.1a PR u- is substituted by oku-, olu-, esi-, eyi- and ezi- respectively.

(3a) okuLobhengula
(3aa) okuMzilikazi
oku-(u)-Lobhengula
oku-(u)-Mzikazi
PR-1a-Lobhengula
PR-1a-Mzikazi
‘the insignificant Lobhengula’
‘the insignificant Mzikazi’
(3b) eyiLobhengula
eyiMzikazi
eyi-(u)-Lobhengula
eyi-(u)-Mzikazi
PR-1a-Lobhengula
PR-1a-Mzikazi
‘the guy Lobhengula’
‘the guy Mzikazi’

Evaluative prefixes assume the place of a primary prefix u- in the preceding examples. The affixation of an evaluative prefix introduces commentary meaning to the base. As a result, the combination of a secondary PR and a NS indicates a special or an abnormal specimen of an item referred to by a NS. This abnormality feature conveyed differs according to the evaluative prefix used. The commentary introduced to the noun construction through the substitution of u- by evaluative prefixes in the preceding examples could be an indication that the prefixed morphemes are secondary noun class prefixes.

The shape of secondary prefixes
The shape of what we have termed a secondary PR is identical with most relative prefixes. Except for CL.2a, the rest of the CL.PRs begin with a high vowel i-/u- or a low vowel a-. On the contrary, the highlighted PRs in example in (3) begin with a mid vowel e-/o-. The difference between the above PRs and the primary prefixes is that in the latter the initial vowel (V1) and the terminal vowel (V2) of the PRs are identical whereas the vowels in the former PRs are dissimilar. The latter almost resemble some of the relative PRs (CL. 7 e-si, CL. 8 e-zi, CL. 9 e-t, CL. 11 o-lu- and CL.15 o-ku-), which are a combination of a relative vowel (a-) and a subject concord. The evaluative prefixes (esi-, ezi-, olu- and oku-) we have been discussing resemble the relative prefixes of class 7, 8, 11 and 15 respectively. Looking at the shape of the prefixes alone, one might think that evaluative nouns probably use relative prefixes. However, the difference between the e-yi- PR as in examples (3b) and (3bb) and that of the CL.9 relative prefix (e-) could suggest that the similarity between the units in reference (subject concords and ‘basic prefixes’ is a sheer coincidence just like in the case of class 1 and class 3 noun prefixes u-mu-). In consequence, labeling the evaluative prefixes in question as relative prefixes based on their shape would give faulty findings and will be tantamount to arguing that the evaluative nouns under study are instances of relative word constructions. However, if the concordial principle can confirm that the type of ‘evaluative nouns’ in question are controlled by noun class prefixes like relatives, we can then argue that these ‘evaluative nouns’ are actually relatives.

Concordial agreement principle
The concordial principle is useful in distinguishing noun class prefixes from other prefixes. The principle posits that there are word forms that depend on a noun in a sentence. The dependency is represented by agreement affixes. These affixes usually resemble the classifier in some noun class prefixes. As a result, concordial affixes sound like class prefixes. McLaren (1944:16) says, ‘[a]greement between a noun and words which depend on it is expressed by the use of, in most cases, prefixes of the same or similar sound thereby giving a language in question an alliterative quality’. These affixes have an anaphoric and/or a cataphoric function in a sentence structure thus they always make reference to a governing noun and its class prefix. According to this principle, noun class prefixes are independent whereas other prefixes such as relative prefixes are always dependent on a class prefix. This implies that relative prefixes are incapable of generating and governing concords. The sentences in example (4) illustrate the syntax of ‘evaluative nouns’.

(4a) ENE-MaNdaba ezi sonsa ezi fitshane simthanda...
ezi-Ma-Ndaba si-i-ona la si- ezi fitshane s-m-thand-a
PR-Miss-Ndaba AGR-ABS-it DEM-AGR ADJ
PR-short SM-OM-loveVR-TV
‘This short MaNdaba loves …’

(4b) Yona leyi eyimdala yethu jhanda....
i-o-ona la yi eyi-(u)m-dala i-a-ithu jhand-a
AGR-ABS-it DEM-AGRPR-1-old SM-POS-our
SM-loveVR-TV
(Lit. it this the old man our loves…)
‘This old man of ours loves…’

(4c) Zonke zona lezi ezingamadoda ozi bonayo...
zi-o-nke zi-o-na la zi ez i-ng-ama-doda o zi bon-a-ya
AGR-QUAN-all these-DEM-AGR-ABS-it PR-COP-
6-man REL-SM-seeVR-REL suffix
(lit. All them these the guys are men whom you see…)
‘All these men that you see…’

(4d) Lonke lofu onlukabi onumileyo lutshaywa...
Lu-o-ona la lu olu-(u)-(in)-khabi a lu-m-i-leyo lu-tshaywa
AGR-ABS-it DEM-AGR PR-1-9-ox REL-SM-stanVR-
PPT-REL suffix-AGR-beaten
(Lit. it this the man that you see is beaten …)
‘This standing dude is beaten…’

AGR-QUAN-all DEM-AGRPR-COP-2-Tshabi SM-FT-put VR- TV 9-spear
(Lit. All these the insignificant Tshabi people we will stab them by spears)

‘In the near future we will stab all these insignificant Tshabi people using spears.’

The above examples demonstrate that the evaluative prefixes esi-, ezi-, eyi- and olu- are independent and that they control agreement in a sentence like other noun class prefixes. The syntax of evaluative noun prefixes therefore indicates that they are noun class prefixes. Wilkes (1990:35) also notes that evaluative nominals have much in common with other nouns as far as their syntax is concerned. Moreover, their semantics is incompatible with that of relatives which further proves that they belong to the class of nouns. After making known the existence of secondary prefixes in Ndebele, it is now vital for us to look into their classification.

**Class status of secondary prefixes**

Secondary prefixes work with primary prefixes of classes 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 19 and 21, although Ndebele lacks classes 12 and 13. According to the examples in (1a/1aa) and (1b/1bb), *uThixo/ukulunkulu* /‘God’ has no plurals because there is only one true God. Should *othixo/ onkulunkulu* be used in the plural to refer to ‘gods’, we can argue that a noun class 2a prefix can convey both a primary and an evaluative function. The examples in (1c/1cc) point to the fact that classes 7 and 8 also express primary meanings and secondary meanings like class 2a. The class statuses of esi-, eyi- and ezi- are a bit tricky. It seems esi-, olu- and eyi- are singular forms of a plural form ezi-, as can be seen in example (5).

(5a)  
esi-MaNcube  ezingoMaNcube  *e*esoMaNcube

esi-MaNCube  ezi-ng-o-MaNcube  esi-ng-o-MaNcube

PR-Miss-Ncube  PR-COP-2a-Miss-Ncube  PR-COP-2a-Miss-Ncube
‘the useless’  ‘useless Miss Ncubes’  (lit. the useless is Miss Ncubes)

Miss Ncube’

(5b)  
eyiNcube  ezingoNcube  *eyingoNcube

eyi-Ncube  ezi-ng-o-Ncube  eyi-ng-o-Ncube

PR-Ncube  PR-COP-2a-Ncube  PR-COP-2a-Ncube
‘the guy Ncube’  ‘Ncube guys’  (lit. the guy Ncubes)

(5c)  
oluNcube  ezingoNcube  *oluongoNcube

olu-Ncube  ezi-ng-o-Ncube  olu-ng-o-Ncube

PR-Ncube  PR-COP-2a-Ncube  PR-COP-2a-Ncube
‘the silly Ncube’  (lit. the silly is the Ncubes) ‘the silly Ncubes’

The prefixes esi-, eyi- and olu- have their plurals in ezi- and it seems this plural in ezi- noun constructions is inherited from the primary noun class prefix 2a o- . Note that the secondary prefix is not immediately prefixed to a plural noun. The noun is inflected for copulative prior to accommodating evaluative prefixes. Singular-plural correspondence in example (5) might be thought to be an indication that the singulars belong to class 12 whereas the plural belongs to class 13 since these are the only remaining classes that indicate singular-plural correspondence. However, the concords of the singulars in example (5) are different from each other which make it to be unlikely that the three are members of the same class. *Isi*- uses *si, eyi* uses i-, whereas *olu- uses lu-. Example (4) provides the syntax of the prefixes in question. Members of the same noun class, though different in terms of shape, use a single concord. Consequently, this militates against the idea of classifying esi-, eyi- and olu- as noun class 12 members mainly because these prefixes use three different concords.

Furthermore, the SCs and the OCs generated by the ‘secondary’ PRs esi-, ezi-, eyi- and olu- correspond to the ones which are generated by the primary PRs isi-, izi-, in-, ulu- and uku- chiefly because the two groups of PRs have identical classifiers (note that we have italicized classifiers for the purpose of clarifying our contention). Moreover, the former group of nouns is modified by the same modifiers which modify the primary nouns of CLs 7, 8, 9, 11 and 14 which could be an indication that these evaluative prefixes, though they have different shapes, are subclasses of the primary classes in question like in the case of class 2 where we have aba-, a- and o- expressing the same function. This might mean that esi-, eyi-, ezi- and olu- will be sub-classes of 7, 8, 9 and 11. Interestingly, Canonici (1995:8) argues that the izi- prefix in Zulu is class 10, and not class 8 and that this prefix is either used alone as the plural of class 7 or is prefixed to the class 9 homorganic N prefix to form the class 10-9 prefix i-zi-N-. In other words, class 7 has class 10 as its plural and classes 9 and 11 have their plurals in class 10-9. If we take esi-, eyi-, ezi- and olu- to be sub-classes of 7, 9, 10-9 and 11 respectively then it will make sense too as to why esi-, eyi- and olu- have their plurals as ezi- because 10-9 serves as a plural for singular primary classes 7, 9 and 11. The question to tackle now will be that of the status of olu-. Is olu- a sub-class of class 15 or does it have its own class?

The evaluative prefix olu- is the only secondary prefix that can be attached to either a singular word base or a plural word base. This quality complicates its class status because the prefix can either function as a singular or as a plural depending on whether it is prefixed to a singular base or a plural base. Consider example (6).

(6a)  
okungumfana  okungabafana

oku-ng-um-fana  okungabafana

PR-COP-1-boy PR-COP-2-boys
(lit. the insignificant is the boy)
(lit. insignificant are the boys)

‘the insignificant boy’ ‘the insignificant boys’

(6b)  
okungubaba  okungobaba

oku-ng-u-baba  okungobaba

PR-COP-1a-father PR-COP-2a-father
(lit. insignificant is the father)
(lit. insignificant are the fathers)

‘the insignificant father’ ‘the insignificant fathers’

A comparison of examples in (6) and those in (5) may indicate the peculiarity of olu-. The prefix olu- is neutral
in terms of indicating number like class 15 and any other

neuter class. Class 15, like classes 14, 16-19, 21 and 23, does not indicate number. However, treating oku- as a
class 15 prefix might not be convincing especially when
we consider that class 15 is a class of infinitives and a few
nouns. Taking into cognizance the derogatory nature of the
oku-COP PR-CL-NS evaluative noun constructions, we can
treat oku- as a class 19 prefix.

Conclusion

We have established that isiNdebele has secondary prefixes
on the one hand and primary prefixes that have a secondary
function on the other. The primary prefixes that can convey
secondary function are o-, isi- and isi-. The secondary PRs
are esi-, eyi-, ezi-, olu- and oku-. Except for eyi-, the identified
secondary PRs have classifiers which are identical to those
of the primary PRs of CL 7, 10/10-9 and 11. The two sets
of PRs in reference generate identical modifier agreement
morphemes and identical predicative concords. Modifiers
that modify nouns in CLs 7, 10/10-9, 9 and 11 can modify
nouns that have the PRs esi-, ezi-, eyi- and olu- respectively.
This may influence one to think that maybe the secondary
PRs being investigated constitute subclasses of the primary
classes which will imply that we have 7a esi-, 8a ezi-, 9a eyi-
and 11a olu-. Note that, 2a o- is the subclass of CL 2 aba-
and they use the same concords ba-/ba- although the former
PR (CL 2a) starts with a mid vowel like the secondary PRs
under investigation. However, the constructions in example
(5) suggest that eyi- is a form of esi- and that the two PRs are
singular forms of a plural ezi-. This militates against the view
that eyi- could be a subclass of CL 9. Furthermore, the oku-
nouns are so belitigious and offensive such that they undoubt-
edly fit well in Meinhof’s derogative slots (CL 12, 13, 19, 20
and 21); thus we proposed that oku- should be considered
for class 19 membership. The rest of the secondary nouns
are relatively derogatory which may, if we are uncomfort-
able with doing away with Meinhof’s noun classification
system, qualify them to be considered as subcategories of
primary classes 7, 9, 10/10-9 and 11. We recommend that
Nguni linguists should look into the classification problem of
primary classes 7, 9, 10/10-9 and 11. We recommend that

Notes

1 All abbreviations used in this article are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>Absolute Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADJ</td>
<td>Adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGR</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP</td>
<td>Copulative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>Noun Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>Demonstrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Future Tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Noun Stem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OM</td>
<td>Object Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS</td>
<td>Possessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPT</td>
<td>Perfect Past Tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>Prefix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUAN</td>
<td>Quantifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>Relative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Subject Marker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TV: Terminal Vowel
VR: Verb Root
V1: Initial Vowel
V2: Terminal Vowel of the PR

1 One might argue that the basic prefix here is i- and that the -y-
element is a result of glide insertion mainly because vowels
cannot follow each other in a Ndebele syllable.

2 The relative vowel a- merges with the subject concord i- to form e-.
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