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1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper we will try to define the category of "direct object" in Haya and show how an NP can change its grammatical status according to the way in which its semantic role is expressed. In so doing, we will assume that such grammatical relations as "subject" and "direct object" are used in sentences in describing and comparing natural languages in Universal Grammar. The same assumption can be found, differently expressed, in recent work such as Keenan and Comrie (1972), Perlmutter and Postal (1974), Johnson (1974a,b, 1976), Fillmore (1976), and Keenan (1975, 1976), among others. Some of the claims that these linguists have made will be confronted with the Haya data.

Very recently, Gary and Keenan (1976) have questioned the claim made by Perlmutter and Postal (1974) that only one NP at a time can bear a certain grammatical relation to the verb. They have tried to show that in Kinyarwanda, a Bantu language closely related to Haya, a verb can have, under certain circumstances, two direct objects. They also proposed a weaker version of an important principle presented by Perlmutter and Postal, namely the Relational Annihilation Law. In this paper we will show that Haya can have even three DO's in the same sentence, and we will discuss the implications of this fact for Universal Grammar. Before the conclusion, we briefly present a case of partial demotion (of a direct object) due to the nature of the referents more than to the syntactic or semantic relation of the NP's involved.
The paper is organized in the following way: in section 2 we characterize the category of direct object in Haya by selecting a number of rules to apply to what we term "basic" direct objects. In section 3 we show that the same set of rules does not usually apply to prepositional phrases or other kinds of prepositionless obliques. In section 4, the system of marking is described and it is shown that those NP's which have their role marked on the verb behave like "basic" direct objects. In section 5 we discuss the consequences of defining the verb marking rules as ones of advancement-to-direct object rules. We show that Haya violates the Uniqueness Assumption and the Relational Annihilation Law. We also state there is not enough evidence in favor of the Weak Relational Annihilation Law proposed by Gary and Keenan (1976) and discuss the possible consequences for a theory based on grammatical relations. *

Properties of Direct Objects

In the following discussion we will assume that each verb, in its or "lexical" form (i.e., without semantic markers to indicate semantics and without syntactic markers to indicate the application of rules such as passivization) takes a certain number (from one to three NP arguments. We call these NP's "basic arguments" and distinguish terms of the grammatical relation that they bear to the verb. We then speak of "basic subject", "basic direct object", etc. Such NP's are characterized as having their semantic role implied in the meaning of the verb itself and conveyed by means of such coding properties as agreement subject-verb agreement) and word order (the unmarked word order is the following three basic NP arguments, the (semantic) dative pre-nominal (semantic) patient (or accusative). Whether these two NP's can be uniquely distinguished is discussed below.

According to the approach adopted by Keenan (1976) in defining of "subject of" in any given language, we will characterize the role of direct object (DO) in Haya by means of (a subset of) the proper basic DO's in simple, basic sentences. 1

1. Coding properties. Even if Haya could be said to have a fairly word order (cf. Byaruhango and Tenenbaum 1976), the unmarked word order is clearly Su-V-DO-OO (where OO = oblique NP, that is prepositional as well as other kinds of NP's discussed in 3.2 and 3.3 below). It should be noted that the verb obligatorily agrees with the surface Su, and this prepositionless, as seen in (1) and (2).

bantu bá-ka-bón' ómukázi 'the people saw a/the woman'
people they-P3-see woman

ómukázi' a-ka-lóét' óbitooke n'émótoke 'the woman brought the woman she-P3-bring bananas with car bananas by car'

The positional phrase (PP) n'émótoke in (2) cannot take over the DO position. Thus (3) is unacceptable:

ómukázi' a-ka-lóét-a n'émótoke óbitooke 'the woman brought by woman she-P3-bring with car bananas car the bananas'
2.2. Reflexivization. A DO can be reflexivized under subject control (in Haya only Su can control reflexivization). The reflexive morpheme is realized [-ee-] or [-ye-], depending on the preceding environment.

(4) kat' ɓ-k-ɓ-bona  'Kato saw himself'
    Kato he-P3-RBFL-see

2.3. Subjectivization. A DO (if definite or generic\textsuperscript{2}) can be promoted to Su via passivization, as shown in the following examples:

(5) omukâzy a-ka-cumb’ ébitoke  'the woman cooked the bananas'
    woman she-P3-cook bananas

(6) ébitoke b\textsuperscript{1}-ka-cumb-w’ omukâzi  'the bananas were cooked by the woman'
    bananas they-P3-cook-PASS woman

(7) kat’ ɓ-ka-shâl’ ényama  'Kato cut the meat'
    Kato he-P3-cut meat

(8) enyâm’a e\textsuperscript{1}-ka-shâl-w-a kato  'the meat was cut by Kato'
    meat it-P3-cut-PASS Kato

As can be seen in the above examples, it is the "new" Su that triggers verb agreement in the passive sentences. The verb is marked by the suffix -w’ (pronounced -bw’ after a vowel), which is inserted immediately before the final vowel. The basic Su is moved immediately after the verb, with the DO being marked by any preposition (cf. 3.3 below).

2.4. Pronoun-incorporation (or "cliticization"). A DO can trigger pronoun-incorporation. The clitic pronoun agrees in noun class with the referential NP, as shown in the following examples:

(9) n-ka-gul’ égítaj  'I bought the guitar'
    I-P3-buy guitar

(10) n-ka-gef’-gula  'I bought it'
    I-P3-it-buy

(11) n-ka-bônh’ òmňi-kej  'I saw smoke'
    I-P3-see smoke

(12) n-ka-guj-bônh-a  'I saw it'
    I-P3-it-see

We consider such clitics as gi in (10) and gu in (12) as \textit{true pronouns}, not agreement markers,\textsuperscript{5} not only because of their "optionality" (as opposed to the obligatory subject-verb agreement illustrated in 2.1), but also crucially, because (under appropriate circumstances) the tone configuration of the sentence marks a clause boundary after the verb even when the referential DO appears in the sentence in its "usual" position immediately following the verb. The verb -bônh- 'see' for instance, which has an underlying high tone (cf. (11)) shows a falling tone not only when penultimate to a pause.
(2)), but also in (13), which expresses the DO with both a clitic preceded a full NP:

\[ \text{ŋ-ka-gu₁-bōn-}' \text{omwîk} \text{aj} \] ‘I saw it, the smoke’

I-P₃-it -see smoke

Byarushingo, Hyman, and Tenenbaum (1976), the DO in sentences (13) must be considered a right-dislocation, separated from the rest sentence by a phrase boundary which causes the high tone of /-bōn-/ to come a falling tone (see also Tenenbaum 1977). Furthermore, notice, as Duranti (1977) that the clitic pronoun cannot appear in the sentence corresponding NP is relativized. Thus, (14) is ungrammatical.

\[ \text{omwîk}' \text{döwō n-ka-gu₁-bōn-e} \] ‘the smoke that I saw it’

smokej that I-P₃-it-j-see/P₂

were to be considered as an optional agreement marker, we do not see

a perceivable reason for not allowing sentences like (14), which appear in

such languages as SeSotho (Morolong and Hyman 1977). Finally, in (15),

\[ \text{egf[t]} \text{i}' \text{i-ka-gł₁-gu₁-w-a inye} \] ‘the guitar was bought by me’

guitar i-P₃-it-buy-PASS me

\[ \text{lita has been promoted to Su, the coreferential clitic pronoun -gi- co-occur.} \]

5. Left-dislocation. With concomitant pronoun-incorporation, a DO left-dislocated and assume the position immediately before the verb it, it can assume other positions as well, as shown by Byarushingo and Tenenbaum 1976, but we will be concerned only with this option). A rough formulation of the rule would be as follows:

\[ \text{(Su) - V - DO₁ } \rightarrow \text{ (Su) - DO₁ - V[+PRO₁]} \]

Examples are given in (16) and (17).

\[ \text{omwâ₂n}' \text{a-ka-lêet}' \text{èmbwa} \] ‘the child brought the dog’ \[ \rightarrow \]

child he-P₃-bring dog

\[ \text{omwâ₂n}' \text{i èmbwaj } \text{èi-ka-gł₁-lêetj} \] ‘the child, the dog, he

child dog he-P₃-it-bring brought it

\[ \text{ŋ-ka-gul}' \text{ômâwendo} \] ‘I bought cloth’ \[ \rightarrow \]

I-P₃-buy cloth

\[ \text{ômâwendo}' \text{n-ka-gł₁-gu₁-a} \] ‘the cloth, I bought it’

cloth I-P₃-it-buy

6. Impersonal "be-" construction. There is another construction

used to front a DO and to eliminate the Su. As shown in (18) and

the verb takes a clitic pronoun coreferential with the fronted DO, and

personal" plural human subject (meaning 'they', class 2).
(18) ekibocj bē-ka-kf1-gul-a 'the book, they bought it'
    book they-P3-it-buy

(19) ebitokej bē-ka-bf1-cumb-a 'the bananas, they cooked them'
    bananas they-P3-them-cook

These constructions can be appropriately translated in English as agentless passives: "the book was bought" (18) and "the bananas were cooked" (19). In fact, as noted by Givón (1976:180), there is another Bantu language, Kimbundu (Angola) that uses this kind of construction for the regular past tense, even allowing a prepositional agentive phrase:

(20) nzue a-mu-mon-o kwa meme 'John was seen by me' [lit. John, you are seen by me]
    sun him by me

A basic difference between Kimbundu and Haya is that in the latter language, the agent cannot be expressed in this construction.

2.7. Relative clause formation. Very informally, the relativization of DO's can be summarized as follows: a relative pronoun (of the underlying form V(C)V-c), agreeing with the head noun, introduces the relative clause and the DO is deleted (see Duranti 1977 for alternative secondary patterns). Examples are seen in (21)-(22).

(21) ebitokej [èby] ōmukāzi y-a-cumb-a 'the bananas which the woman REL woman she-P1-cook has cooked'

(22) anyam' [èyó katō y-a-shāl-a ] 'the meat that Kato has cut'
    meat REL Kato he-P1-cut

(23) omukāzy' [èw] ōnwāsna y-a-bōn-a 'the woman whom the child has seen'
    woman REL child he-P1-see

2.8. Pseudo-cleft formation. Pseudo-cleft formation involves a relative pronoun in sentence-initial position and the copula before the sentence clefted NP, which appears in sentence-final position. The copula (COP), expressed either by the absence of the preprefix, as in (24) and (25), or by the morpheme ni, with proper names as in (26).

(24) eby ōmukāzi y-á-cumb-á ø-bitoke 'what the woman has cooked in REL woman she-P1-cook COP bananas bananas'

(25) eyó katō y-a-shāl-á ø-nya 'what Kato has cut is meat'
    REL Kato he-P1-cut COP meat

(26) owó n-a-bon-á ní kató '(the one) who I have seen is Kato'
    REL I-P1-see COP Kato

3. PREPOSITIONAL AND PREPOSITIONLESS OBLIQUES

In this section we will show that the category of DO in Haya as defined in section 2 constitutes a proper set, that is, the properties that we so far described as typical of DO's allow us to distinguish between DO
repetitional phrases (PP's) and other kinds of "obliques". In 3.1 we show that PP's do not exhibit any of the properties of the DO's illus-
to above. In 3.2 we will discuss one kind of prepositionless oblique,
the body part NP in an "affected possessor" construction, and we will
whether to consider relative clause formation and pseudo-cleft for-
tests for objecthood. In 3.3 we will briefly examine the agent NP
five sentences.

1. Properties of PP's (or "what PP's cannot do"). 3.1.1. Coding

As already mentioned in 2.1, PP's cannot be placed immediately
the verb if there is an NP in the sentence bearing the relation of DO
verb.

2. Reflexivization. PP's cannot be reflexivized. In fact, Haya
even have an "independent" (i.e. non-clitic) reflexive pronoun.

3. Subjectivization. PP's cannot be subjectivized, and preposi-
tion cannot be "stranded". The parentheses in the following examples indi-
itle even taking some of the constituents away, the sentence remains
neutrical:

kato he-P3-cut meat with knife

omu

knife it -P3-cut PASS meat Kato with

The knife was cut (the meat) (with) (by Kato)

that any change of word order would not help in making the above sen-

(50) we have tried to subjectivize the whole locative omu-nju 'inside
se' (we tried both agreement markers mu (cl. 18) and he (cl. 16)).
sequent with locative phrases is not unusual in Haya, as often in
but in order for sentences like (34) to apply, a particular marker
attached to the verb, as we will illustrate in section 4.2 below.

Example (31) shows that no better results are obtained by trying to
the NP out of the prepositional phrase:

house it -P3-eat PASS Kato chicken in/there

The house was eaten (by Kato) (chicken) (in/there)

we have tried, unsuccessfully, to apply a pronoun-retaining strategy.
in the sentence the preposition mu- plus a pronominal marker -o
which, in other circumstances conveys the meaning of 'there, inside
3.1.4. Pronominalization. A PP cannot be pronominalized by pronoun incorporation. Preposition plus PRO is the only way in which prepositional phrases can be pronominalized in Haya, as illustrated in (32) and (33).

(32) "kat' á-ka-gu₁-shá' ényama' 'Kato cut [with] it₁ the meat.'
Kato he-P₂-it-cut meat (gu₁ = knife)

(33) 'kat' á-ka-shá' ényama ná-gwo 'Kato cut the meat with it'
Kato he-P₂-cut meat with-it (cf. (27))

3.1.5. Left-dislocation and impersonal "ba-" construction. Since two constructions involve pronoun-incorporation, which is not allowed for PP's, they are not available for PP's.

3.1.6. Relative-clause formation. PP's are relativized by either using the verb-coding strategy (but in this case, as we will argue in section 1.2.8, they cannot be considered as obliques) or by means of a pronoun-retaining strategy. However, they cannot, generally, be relativized in the same way as DO's (one possible exception would be relativization out of a complex prepositional phrase, but this kind of relative clauses are only marginally attested; cf. Duranti 1977). Example (34) illustrates the pronoun-retaining strategy:

(34) omuhy'₁ [ogwó₁ kató y-a-shal' ényama ná-gwo₁]
knife REL Kato he-P₁-cut meat with-it
'the knife that Kato has cut with' Recall, in contrast, that, as shown in 2.7, no copy pronoun can be left behind by a relativized DO (cf. ex. (14)).

3.1.7. Pseudo-cleft formation. The same considerations made for relative clause formation hold for pseudo-cleft formation. Example (35) illustrates the pronoun-retaining strategy in pseudo-clefting a (prepositionless) instrumental NP:

(35) ogwó₁ kató y-a-shal' ényama na-gwó₁ ð-muhyo 'what Kato has cut with'
REL Kato he-P₁-cut meat with-it COP-knife meat with is a knife

3.2. "Affected possessor" constructions. Haya possessive constructions involving body parts allow, or sometimes require, the possessor NP to be relativized as a DO (cf. Hyman 1977). In Haya sentences corresponding more closely to the English I broke the arm of the man, the possessor, namely man, is, in effect, more DO-like than the body part, i.e. arm. Thus, we have sentences like the following:

(36) n-a-hend' ómušá'íj' ómukono 'I broke the arm of the man' (lit.
1-P₁-break man arm I broke the man the arm)

In sentences like (36) the possessor (also an "experiencer") can be substituted, as in (37), pronominalized with a clitic, as in (38), and under all the other grammatical processes applicable to DO's.
omushájja y-a-hend-w-a inyó omukóno 'the man was broken the arm
man be-P₁-break-PASS me arm by me'

n-a-mu-hend' omukóno 'I broke him the arm'
I-P₁-him-break arm

by part, on the other hand, cannot be subjectivized and cannot be pro-
vised in the same way as the possessor NP:

omukóno₁ gw₁-a-hend-w-a (inyó) omushájja₁ 'the arm was broken (by me)
arm it-P₁-break-PASS me man (to) the man'

n-a-gu-hend' omushájja 'I broke it (to) the man'
I-P₁-it-break man

Our properties-based definition of DO's, we conclude that in such con-
ions as sentence (36) the possessor NP is syntactically a DO, whereas
possessed NP (i.e. the body part), which should be the "basic" DO of
a, is not a DO.

must notice, however, that an NP like omukóno 'arm' in (36) still
some of the properties of DO's. Such properties are relative clause
ation and pseudo-cleft formation, as shown in the following examples:

omukón [ àgwó n-a-hend' omushájja ] 'the arm that I broke the man'
arm REL I-P₁-break man

àgwó n-a-hend' omushájja ñ-mukóno 'what I broke the man is (his)
REL I-P₁-break man COP-arm

interpret these facts in at least two ways: one solution would be
not the idea that at some earlier stage of the derivation the body part
fact the DO of the verb and that it got denoted from its role because
promotion of the possessor NP to the role of DO. In this case, we
ay that the body part NP lost all the DO properties except the acces-
v to relative clause formation and pseudo-cleft formation. Another
would be to say that in fact relative clause and pseudo-cleft form-
as described in 2.7, are not limited to DO's. There are, in other
non-DO prepositionless NP's that can undergo that particular kind of
ization rule. The noun omukóno in (36) would be one of those. In
se relative clause formation (and pseudo-cleft formation) would turn
be not very good tests for objecthood in Haya. As a working hypo-
we retain these as tests for objecthood, keeping in mind their
ss". Such a decision will find some support in later discussion,
will see how (partially or totally) demoted DO's can "lose" their
be relativized or pseudo-clefted.

8. The agent NP in passive sentences. As shown in 2.3, after pas-
ion has applied, the "demoted" Su (semantic agent) is a preposition-
immediately following the verb. Thus, in terms of "surface" struc-
t looks like a DO. However, it is not available for any of the rules
have described as characteristic of DO's. Not even the relative
formation or the pseudo-cleft formation, which have been character-
ized as "weak" tests for objecthood in 3.2. Both (43) and (44) are completely unaccepta:

(43) *omukâzy [ów' ébitooke by-a-cumb-íl-w-e]
    woman REL bananas they-P1-cook-P-PASS
    'the woman that the bananas were cooked (by)'

(44) *ów' ébitooke by-a-cumb-íl-w-e 0-mukâzi
    REL bananas they-P1-cook-P-PASS COP-woman
    '(the one) who the bananas were cooked (by) is the woman'

This gives further support to the claim that the DO's are a particular class of the prepositionless NP's that follow the verb, and it shows that the properties that we outlined in section 2 are significant with respect to objecthood.

4. VERB MARKING

In this section we will show that some semantic roles of NP arguments can be marked on the verb by means of verb suffixes (or extensions) and that the NP's that are verb-marked share the properties of "basic DO's".

We will consider the following semantic relations: 1) instrumental; 2) locative: (i) 'in', (ii) 'at, on'; 3) dative (e.g. experiencer, goal).

4.1. The instrumental. The instrumental role of an NP argument is marked in the verb by the suffix -i- or -is/es/- (cf. Trithart 1977). An example is given in (45):

(45) kató y-a-shaz, [ómùhyó ónyama]
    Kato cut the meat with the knife
    Kato he-P1-cut/INSTR knife meat/meat knife

The stem of the verb 'cut' is -sháλ- (cf. ex. (7)). When the instrumental suffix (INSTR) -i- is added, the /l/ becomes [z] by spirantization (cf. Trithart 1977). The instrumental NP omùhyó 'knife' in (45) shares all the properties of basic DO's. For instance, not only can it appear immediately after the verb (however, as shown in (45), there is no "preferred order"), but it can also be subjectivized, as in (46), left-dislocated, as in (47), and relativized as a basic DO, as in (48).

(46) omùhyó₁ gwí-a-shaz₁-bw-a kató ónyama
    'the knife was used to cut the meat by Kato'
    knife it-P1-cut/INSTR-PASS Kato meat the meat by Kato'

(47) kató omùhyó y-a-gu-shaz ónyama
    Kato, the knife, he used it
    Kato knife₁ he-P₁-it₁-cut/INSTR meat with it the meat'

(48) omùhyó [ógwó kató y-a-shaz₁ ónyama]
    'the knife that Kato cut
    knife REL Kato he-P₁-cut/INSTR meat meat (with)'

The fact that omùhyó may be left-dislocated, as in (47), means that it also triggers pronoun-incorporation. If we try reflexivization, as in

(49) kató y-a-yé-shaz₁ ónyama
    Kato caused himself to cut the meat
    Kato he-P₁-REFL-cut/INSTR meat
2. Locatives. "Simple" locative relations, corresponding more or less to the English *in* + NP and *at/on* + NP can be marked on the verb by the locative markers -mu and -ho, respectively (sometimes these markers are also accompanied by the applicative morpheme -il/el-, also used for expressive benefactive relations, as illustrated in 4.3).

2.1. -mu locatives. Examples (50) shows that when the verb is marked (and, in this particular case, by the applicative morpheme), the NP expresses the location of the event referred to (or the location of a new object) can be subjectivized:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{enjw'i} & \quad \text{é}-\text{kà-lla-lla-nya-mu kat' ūnkóko} \\
\text{house} & \quad \text{it}_3-\text{P}_3-\text{eat-APP-PASS LOC Kato chicken} \\
\text{the house was eaten-in by Kato'}
\end{align*}
\]

As marked on the verb can also undergo pronoun-incorporation, as in (51):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{kat' é-ka-gi_3-lla-lla-nya-mu ūnkóko} & \quad \text{Kato ate the chicken in it (the house)} \\
\text{he-P}_3-\text{it-eat-APP LOC chicken house}'
\end{align*}
\]

so can undergo all the other syntactic processes characterizing DO's, flexivization, left-dislocation, relativization, and pseudo-cleft:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{kat' é-ké-bon-a-mu ūbukáma} & \quad \text{Kato saw chieftainship in himself} \\
\text{he-P}_3-\text{REFL see LOC chieftainship}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{enjw'i é-ka-gi_3-lla-lla-nya-mu ūnkóko} & \quad \text{Kato, the house, he ate} \\
\text{house he-P}_3-\text{it-eat-APP-LOC chicken the chicken in it'}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{enjw' [ éyo kat' y-a-lla-lla-nya-mu ūnkóko ]} & \quad \text{the house in which Kato ate the chicken} \\
\text{REL Kato he-P}_1-\text{eat-APP LOC chicken ate the chicken'}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{eyó kat' y-a-lla-lla-nya-mu ūnkóko ḣ-a-ju} & \quad \text{REL Kato he-P}_1-\text{eat-APP LOC chicken COP house} \\
\text{what Kato ate the chicken in is the house'}
\end{align*}
\]

2.2. -ho locatives. The -ho locatives, except for the different as they convey, behave in the same way as the -mu locatives we have illustrated in 4.2.1. The following examples thus illustrate subjection, pronoun-incorporation, and reflexivization:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ammezi' é}-\text{kà-lla-lla-nya-h' ūmwaan' ėbitooke} & \quad \text{the table was eaten by the child} \\
\text{he-P}_3-\text{eat-APP-PASS LOC child bananas banana's on by the child'}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ūmwaan' a-ka-gi_3-lla-lla-nya-h' ėbitooke} & \quad \text{the child ate the bananas on} \\
\text{he-P}_3-\text{it-eat-APP LOC bananas}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{umshàfí' a-ka-kéé-shang-a h' ėmahéia} & \quad \text{the man found money on} \\
\text{he-P}_3-\text{REFL-find LOC money himself'}
\end{align*}
\]
4.2.3. Subjectivization of the whole locative phrase. With the locative marker on the verb, and the verb agreeing with the locative phrase (the agreement marker is ha– for both -mu and -ho locatives), it is possible to subjectivize a whole locative phrase, as shown in the following examples:

\[(59)\] omu-njú há-ka-lí-fl-í-w-a mú kat’ éŋkóko  
\[\text{in-house there-P₃-eat-APP-PASS LOC Kato chicken}\]  
\[\text{in the house (there) was eaten the chicken by Kato’}\]

\[(60)\] aha-meezá há-ka-lí-fl-í-w-a hó kat’ éŋkóko  
\[\text{on-table there-P₃-eat-APP-PASS LOC Kato chicken}\]  
\[\text{on the table (there) was eaten the chicken by Kato’}\]

Although transformationally speaking, the locative NP’s marked on a verb behave in the same way as instrumental NP’s, there is an interesting difference. Whereas the NP expressing the instrument does not take the position if the verb has been marked for the instrumental relation, as in (45) (repeated with a different past tense in (61)), the NP expressing location cannot occur without a preposition unless a clitic coreferent pronoun appears in the verbal complex. Thus (62) is good, but (63) is not.

\[(61)\] kat’ á-ka-sháž’ [éñyam’ émúhyo]  
Kato he-P₃-cut/INSTR meat knife/knife meat

\[(62)\] kat’ á-ka-gíj₁-í-fl-í-a mw’ éŋkók’ éñju₁  
Kato he-P₃-it-eat-APP LOC chicken house  
\[\text{Kato ate the chicken in the house’}\]

\[(63)\] *kat’ á-ka-lí-fl-í-a mw’ éŋkók’ éñju  
Kato he-P₃-eat-APP LOC chicken house  
\[\text{Kato ate the chicken in the house’}\]

Notice, however, that éŋkóko in (62) shows a falling tone on the second syllable. This indicates a phrase boundary between éŋkóko and éñju (cf. Shengo, Hyman, and Tenenbaum 1976). As mentioned in 2.4, an NP such as in (62) must be interpreted as a "right-dislocated" constituent. In this sense it does not have the same syntactic status as émúhyo 'knife' in (63) (on the special status of locative NP’s in a Bantu language closely related to Haya, see Dalgish 1976).

4.2. Dative NP’s. A verb can also be marked for an NP argument in place, roughly, the range of meaning of Fillmore’s (early) dative. The morpheme used is the so-called "applicative" or "applied" morpheme -il/el- (the choice between the two vowels being determined by vowel harmony rules). As shown in the following examples, the dative NP in the unmarked word order immediately follows the verb:

\[(64)\] omukázy’ a-ka-cumb-il’ ábáán’ ébitooke  
\[\text{the woman cooked the woman she-P₃-cook-APP children bananas}\]  
\[\text{ren the bananas’}\]

\[(65)\] n-ka-lééél-eil’ émusháj’ égta  
\[\text{I brought the man the guitar’}\]

\[\text{I-P₃-bring-APP man guitar}\]
katō ɗ-ka-gul-ił' dùbugány ɗnfi 'Kato bought for the party a fish'
Kato he-P3-buy-APP party fish

Three sentences the dative NP exhibits all the properties of basic DO's. 
(67) and (68) show subjectivization of abâána in (64) and omushâfja
respectively.

abâána bâ-ka-cumb-ił-w' òmukâzý èbitooke 'the children were cooked
children they-P3-cook-APP-PASS woman bananas bananas by the woman'

omushâfj' a-ka-lâq-ei-w-a îny yégîta 'the man was brought the
man he-P3-bring-APP-PASS me guitar guitar by me'

(69) shows that reflexivization can apply when the dative NP is co-
tial with the subject:

omukâzý' a-k-ô-z-cumb-ił' èbitooke 'the woman cooked (for) herself
woman she-P3-REFL-cook-APP bananas the bananas'

Other tests can be successfully applied, such as relative clause forma-
pseudo-cleft formation, and pronoun-incorporation. Example (70) illus-
this last property:

omukâzý' a-ka-bôq-cumb-ił' èbitookej 'the woman cooked (for) them
woman she-P3-them-cook-APP bananas [children] bananas'

Significant characteristic of Haya datives is that they can be ex-
only in the just mentioned way. Whereas instrumentals and locatives
alternative prepositional coding (cf. section 3 for examples), there
ative preposition in Haya corresponding to English to or for. The
omenon has been noticed in another Bantu language (Kinyarwanda) by
Keenan (1976) and Kimenyi (1976). As they point out, this restrict
the coding of this semantic relation creates some problems for a
would like to account for the above mentioned marking-rules in
advancemente. We will discuss some of these problems in the next

A AND THE THEORY OF RELATIONAL GRAMMAR

In this section we would like to discuss the Haya data with respect to
the claims made by "relational grammarians" in terms of Universal
In particular we will provide further evidence for what Gary and
(1976) have called the Non-uniqueness Assumption, according to which
age can have more than one NP bearing the same grammatical rela
to same verb. Furthermore, we will show that if we consider the verb-
suffixes illustrated in section 4 as a result of advancement-to-DO
or "object-creating rules"), the Relational Annihilation Law (see
repeatedly violated. Finally, we will discuss whether the Haya
only support the weaker version of the Relational Annihilation Law pro-
by Gary and Keenan (1976).

7. Advancement rules in Relational Grammar. In the theory of Rela-
grammar, advancement rules are the only kind of rules that affect
the status of an NP with respect to its grammatical relation to the verb (or predicate). That is, given the primitive ("pure") grammatical relations "subject of", "direct object of", and "indirect object of" (called "terms" by Perlmutter and Postal) and the "impure" grammatical relations benefactive instrumental, locative, etc. (called "non-terms"), and given the Relative Hierarchy $SU^* DO < IO < non-terms$, a rule that affects the relation of an NP to its verb can only move NP up in the hierarchy. This is explicitly stated in the following (proposed universal) principles:

(71) **The Usurpation Principle** (Johnson 1974b): All usurpation rules [i.e. rules that make an NP take over the grammatical relation borne by another NP] move elements up in the Accessibility Hierarchy $H[\text{accessibility}]$ or else raise elements into a superordinate clause.

(72) **The Reranking Law** (Perlmutter and Postal 1974): A rule that alters the status of an NP with respect to termhood [i.e. the property of being a "term"] must increase the rank of that NP.

A rule like passivization, for instance, would be simply stated as $DO = SU$. The demotion of the "original" (or "basic") SU would not need to be stated in the rule because of the following principle:

(73) **The Relational Annihilation Law** (Perlmutter and Postal 1974): When an NP, $NP_i$, assumes the grammatical relation borne by another NP, $NP_j$ ($i \neq j$), then $NP_j$ ceases to bear any grammatical relation whatsoever [with the verb]. Such $NP_j$'s are called chômers.

The grammar of the particular language would specify the way in which these rules are concretely realized in terms of word order, agreement, case marking, and so forth. In Haya, for example, we would have to state that the "original" SU is moved immediately after the verb and marked by zero (see 2.3 above).

The above mentioned principles state that demotions are implied by advancements. In fact, since Perlmutter and Postal (1974) assume that only one NP can bear, at any given stage of derivation, a particular grammatical relation to the verb (e.g. there can be only one SU or only one DO), an advancement rule (e.g. Instrument $\rightarrow$ DO) should never be allowed to create another instance of an already present grammatical relation without causing the NP already bearing that relation to be demoted from it.

Similar kinds of verb-marking morphemes to the ones illustrated in section 4 have been described in other (Bantu and non-Bantu) languages as effects of advancement rules. Chung (1976), for instance, show that in Haya Indonesian when an indirect object (IO) or a benefactive NP, instead of being marked by prepositions, is marked on the verb (in a way very similar to the one illustrated for Haya), it exhibits all the properties of basic DO's. On the other hand, the basic DO loses its DO properties. Chung also shows that these facts can be explained by postulating a sort of Dative Move Rule (benefactive and IO advancement-to-DO) that respects the Relational Annihilation Law. When the IO or benefactive NP is advanced to DO, the basic DO is demoted (or "goes en chômage").

Following this kind of approach, we might argue that the instrumental and locative, and the dative NP's are marked on the verb as a result of
nt-to-DO rules. This would explain why they share the DO-properties as in section 4). However, Haya presents some problems with respect to kind of analysis. First of all, whereas we might argue that sentences (45) are derived from sentences such as (27) via an instrumental $\leftarrow$ kato cut the meat $\rightarrow$ kato cut meat with knife with a/the knife

kato cut the meat with a/the knife

kato cut meat with knife/knife meat

The analysis could not be adopted for sentences with a dative-marked NP (64):

omukázy' a-ka-cumb-il' ãmwañ' ébitouke 'the woman cooked the woman she-P3-cook-APP child bananas bananas for the child'

ady mentioned, for such sentences there is no corresponding prepositional phrase, and therefore, there is no "source" for an advancement-to-DO. Discussing the same phenomenon in Kinyarwanda, Gary and Keenan (1976) consider all the cases of dative NP's as "primitive" DO's. That is, those that are not "derived" by advancement rules. The applicative suffix (-Kinyarwanda -ir-) would be triggered by the semantic role of the NP in the sentence. In so doing, however, Gary and Keenan must reject the Nounness Assumption (only one instance of any grammatical relation) exposes in fact the Non-uniqueness Assumption, which allows a language to have more than one NP in the same grammatical relation to the verb. Kinyarwanda would be a language that can have two DO's. In the following section, we will discuss whether the Haya verbs that can take three basic NP arguments can be said to have two basic DO's.

3. Verbs with three basic arguments. As already mentioned in section 1, there are few verbs in Haya that take three basic NP arguments. We consider the verbs -síig- 'smear', -ölek- 'show', and -há- 'give'. (74) - (76) show sentences with three full NP's:

kato he-P3-smear child oil 'Kato smeared oil on the child/

kato he-P3-smear child with oil

kato he-P3-show child picture 'Kato showed the child a picture'

kato he-P3-give child book 'Kato gave the child a book'

above examples both the NP's following the verb share all the proper-basics DO's, as we shall now demonstrate.

1. Coding properties. As seen in (74) - (76) both NP's are prepositional. The semantic dative (i.e. ãmwañ' 'child' in all three examples)
must immediately follow the verb in the unmarked word order. As shown, the same order is found with verb-marked dative NP's. For both kinds of dative NP's, the order becomes fundamental when the other NP after the verb is eligible to the dative role (e.g., if it has a human referent). This is illustrated in the following sentences:

(77) ə-kʊ村落' əmʉwən' əmukəzí 'I showed the woman to the child'
      I-P3-show child woman
      *I showed the child to the woman'

(78) ə-kʊ村落' əmukəzí' əmʉwən'a 'I showed the woman to the child'
      I-P3-show woman child
      *I showed the woman to the child'

(79) ə-kəhɪf-g-il' əmuhɪfɪgy' əmbwa 'I found a dog for the hunter'
      I-P3-find-APP hunter dog
      *I found a hunter for the dog'

(80) ə-kəhɪf-g-il' əmbw' əmuhɪfɪgi 'I found a hunter for the dog'
      I-P3-find-APP dog hunter
      *I found a hunter for the hunter'

5.2.2. Subjectivization. Both NP's can be subjectivization via passivization. However, there is a constraint on the application of this

That is, whereas the dative NP can be subjectivized starting from the sentences given in 5.2, as seen below, the non-dative NP (let us call it "accusative") cannot be subjectivized if there is a full agent NP in the sentence, as shown in (84) - (86).

(81) əmʉwən' a-kə-siɪ-g-w-a kət' əmajúta 'the child was smeared oil
      child he-P3-smear-PASS Kato oil
      by Kato'

(82) əmʉwən' a-kʊ村落-w-a kət' əpɪća 'the child was shown picture
      child he-P3-show-PASS Kato picture
      by Kato'

(83) əmʉwən' a-kəhɪf-g-bw-w-a kət' əkitabo 'the child was given book
      child he-P3-give-PASS Kato book
      by Kato'

(84) *əmajúta əko-siɪ-g-w-a kət' əmʉwən'a 'the oil was smeared (on
      oil it-P3-smear-PASS Kato child
      the child by Kato'

(85) *əpɪć' ə-kʊ村落-w-a kət' əmʉwən'a 'the picture was shown (to
      picture it-P3-show-PASS Kato child
      the child by Kato'

(86) *əkitabo kə-ko-siɪ-bw-w-a kət' əmʉwən'a 'the book was given (to
      book it-P3-give-PASS Kato child
      the child by Kato'

The same constraint holds with dative NP's marked by the applicative morpheme, as seen in (87):

(87) *əbitoone kə-ko-cumb-l-w-a kət' əmʉwən 'the bananas were cooked
      bananas they-P3-cook-APP-PASS Kato child
      for the child by Kato'

We suggest that the unacceptability of these sentences is due not to the "demoted" status of the accusative NP (which is accessible to all the rules given in section 2; cf. below), but rather to a conflict between agent NP and the dative NP in occupying the immediately-after-the-verb
In fact, we have seen before that the only coding property of the P in a passive sentence is its immediate postverbal position. We have seen that dative NP's tend to occupy that same position. Our "conflict" analysis is supported by the acceptability of agentless passive sentences in the following:

amajůta gá-ka-sli̊g-w’ ōmwáana10 'oil was smeared (on) the child'
  oil it-P3-smear-PASS child
epíf' e-k-óólekt-w’ ōmwáana 'the picture was shown (to) the child'
  picture it-P3-show-PASS child
ekitabo kí-ka-háb-bw’ ōmwáana 'the book was given (to) the child'
  book it-P3-give-PASS child

sentences show that the accusative NP is subjectivizable when the dat- occurs in the sentence. Finally, sentences like (91) show that whenIVE NP is a clitic and leaves the postverbal position free, the ac-
  ve NP can be subjectivized even in a sentence with the agent expressed:

bá-ka-mu-óólekt-w-a kató 'they were shown him by Kato'
  they-P3-him-show-PASS Kato

in fact ambiguous between the two readings 'they (DAT) were shown C) by Kato' and 'they (ACC) were shown to him (DAT) by Kato'.

2.3. Reflexivization. Both non-subject NP's can be reflexivized,
  via the ambiguity of (92):

η̊-k-éé-h’ ōmwáana 'I gave a/the child to myself'
  1-P3-REFL-give child 'I gave myself to a/the child'

2.4. Pronoun-incorporation. Both NP's can trigger pronoun-incorpor-
  with multiple pronouns capable of cooccurring:

kat’ á-ka-ge-mú-sli̊g-a 'Kato smeared him with it/smeared it
  Kato he-P3-it-him-smear
  on him'
kat’ á-ka-gi-mw-óólekt-a 'Kato showed it to him'
  Kato he-P3-it-him-show
kat’ á-ka-ki-mú-h-a 'Kato gave it to him'
  Kato he-P3-it-him-give

2.5. Other tests. Also left-dislocation, impersonal "ba-", relative
  formation, and pseudo-cleft formation apply to both NP's.

2.6. Discussion. We have shown that the verbs that take three basic
  arguments have two NP's behaving like DO's. This might be construed as
  support for Gary and Keenan's proposal, which would give equal basic
to two underlying objects. However, one might claim that other rules
  exist which distinguish, say, datives and accusatives. This
  analysis might be preferred for the sake of saving the Uniqueness Assump-
tion, which makes a much stronger claim than the Non-uniqueness Assumption proposed by Gary and Keenan.

In the following sections we will provide additional data supporting a multiple DO analysis in Haya. We will show that Haya can have up to two NPs bearing the grammatical relation DO to the same verb. Our data will violate both the Relational Annihilation Law and its "weak" version proposed by Gary and Keenan (1976).

5.3. Violation of the Relational Annihilation Law. One of the main arguments presented by Chung (1976) in favor of a "relational" analysis of Dative Movement (i.e. benefactive and IO → DO) in Bahasa Indonesian was the loss of properties that the "basic" (or "deep") DO undergoes whenever the IO or benefactive NP is marked on the verb. Chung shows how difficult it is to account for these facts within the framework of Transformation Grammar using structural descriptions. Relational Grammar, on the other hand, offers a very satisfactory account of this phenomenon by means of the Relational Annihilation Law (cf. (73) above). When the IO of benefactive NP is "advanced" to DO (the marking on the verb coocurs with the change of grammatical relations, i.e. as a side-effect of the rule, the original IO is denoted to an oblique status. Thus, it loses all its DO properties.

We will show in this section that the same argument cannot be adopted for Haya, because in our case the basic DO keeps all its properties whereas its verb gets marked for any of the semantic roles illustrated in section 5.2.

5.3.1. A "basic" DO and an instrumental NP. When the instrumentalization is marked on a verb that already has a DO, such as -léél- 'hit' (96), the basic DO can still be subjectivized as in (97), it can trigger pronoun-incorporation as in (98), and (99), and satisfy all the other tests for direct objecthood.

(96) kat'á-ka-tééž' ómwán' ékíti  'Kato hit the child with a piece of wood'
    Kato he-P3-hit/INSTR child wood

(97) ómwán' a-ka-tééž-i-bw-a kat' ékíti  'the child was hit by Kato'
    child he-P3-hit/INSTR-PASS Kato wood

(98) kat'á-ka-mu-tééž' ékíti  'Kato hit him with a piece of wood'
    Kato he-P3-him-hit/INSTR wood

(99) kat'á-ka-ki-mu-tééž-a  'Kato hit him with it'
    Kato he-P3-it-him-hit/INSTR

5.3.2. A "basic" DO and a locative NP. The following examples show that the basic DO keeps all the DO properties when the locative relation is marked on the verb.

(100) abáána bé-ka-bón-el-w-a mú kat'ómu-kyáalo [SUBJECTIVE]
       children they-P3-see-APP-PASS LOC Kato in-village
       'the children were seen in the village by Kato'

(101) kat'á-ka-ki-ba-bón-el-á nu    [PRONOUN-INCORPORATION]
    Kato he-P3-it-them-see-APP LOC
    'Kato saw them in it'
babáan? [ábó kató y-a-ki-bon-el-é mu] 'the children that Kato saw
children REL Kato he-P1-it-saw-APP LOC in it' [REL CLAUSE]

3. A "basic" DO and a dative NP. We have already discussed in 5.2.2
which conditions the accusative NP can be subjectivized. Examples (103)
show pronoun-incorporation of the accusative NP and of both the
zero and dative NP respectively:

eta-ka-bl-cumb-ill' òmwáana 'I cooked them [bananas] for the child'
I-P3-them-cook-APP child

eta-ka-bi-mi-cumb-ill-a 'I cooked them for him'
I-P3-them-him-cook-APP

(105) shows that the reflexive pronoun can refer to either one of the
NP's and therefore, both NP's can be reflexivized:

eta-ka-b-e-it-ill-a 'he killed them for himself'
I-P3-them-REFL-kill-APP

eta-ka-b-e-it-ill-a 'he killed himself for them'
I-P3-them-REFL-kill-APP

The data illustrated above provides further support to the claim that
there are two DO's. It is difficult to see how one could still argue
ences like (96) or (100) have a DO and an IO instead of simply ac-
the idea of two NP's having the same syntactic status, i.e. two DO's.

The Weak Relational Annihilation Law. Similar data to the ones
reported above were found in Kinyarwanda by Gary and Keenan (1976) and
(1976). In order to save the general assumption made by Relational
on the relation between advancements and demotions, Gary and Keenan
a weaker version of the Relational Annihilation Law, which is also
at their Non-Uniqueness Assumption.77

77 The Weak Relational Annihilation Law (Gary and Keenan 1976): If
in a given language, L, application of a promotion to X rule ex-
ceeds the valence of X in L then one of the X's is demoted to non-

term status.

ence" of a grammatical relation X to a given verb they mean "the max-
ber of full NP's that can simultaneously bear the relation X to a
verb in a relationally primitive sentence. A sentence is relationally
just in case no term changing rules are involved in its deriv-

Weak Relational Annihilation Law allows a language to have more
NP bearing the same grammatical relation to the verb, and at the
same, saves the basic assumption made by Perlmutter and Postal (1974)
demotion of an NP from its grammatical relation X to the verb can
ated for by a general principle instead of case by case. In what
we will show that Haya can have sentences with three DO's and there-
order to provide evidence for the Weak Relational Annihilation Law,
be able to demonstrate that Haya can have three DO's in a relation-
primitive sentence.
5.5. Three DO's. In sentences like (107) and (108) three NP's can be shown to have DO status.

(107) kato he-P₃-smeared-INST child oil handkerchief
'Kato smeared the oil on the child with the handkerchief'

(108) kato he-P₃-cook-APP-APP LOC child bananas in-pot
'Kato cooked the bananas in the pot for the child'

In (107) omwända (DAT), amajúta (ACC), and ekitambála (INSTR) all share properties of basic DO's and can therefore undergo both pronoun-incorporation and subjectivization as seen in the following examples:

(109) kato he-P₃-it-it-him-smeared-INSTR
'Kato smeared it on him with
Kato he-P₃-it-it-him-smeared-INSTR (ki = handkerchief; ga = oil)

(110) a. omwända' a-ka-smeared-isa bw-a kato he-P₃-smeared-INSTR-PASS child oil handkerchief
'the child was smeared with oil by the handkerchief by Kato'

b. amajúta ga-ka-smeared-isa bw-omwända' ekitambála
'oil it-P₃-smeared-INSTR-PASS child handkerchief
'the oil was smeared on the child with the handkerchief'

b. ekitambála ki-ka-smeared-isa bw-omwända' amajúta
'handkerchief it-P₃-smeared-INSTR-PASS child oil
'the handkerchief was used to smear the oil on the child'

The other tests also apply. 

In (108) the nouns omwända, ebitooke, and omu-nyúngu all have DO Examples in (111) show the application of passivization.

(111) a. omwända' a-ka-cook-APP-APP-PASS LOC Kato bananas in-pot
'the child was cooked for bananas in the pot by Kato'

b. enyungw' é-ka-cook-APP-APP-PASS pot-APP-APP-PASS LOC child bananas
'the pot was cooked in bananas for the child'

b. ebitooke bf-ka-cook-APP-APP-PASS bw-omwända' omu-nyúngu
bananas they-P₃-cook-APP-APP-PASS LOC child in-pot
'the bananas were cooked for the child in the pot'

In (112) all three nouns are incorporated as pronouns:

(112) kato he-P₃-it-them-him-cook-APP-APP LOC
'Kato cooked them for
Kato he-P₃-it-them-him-cook-APP-APP in it'

The other tests also apply.

Notice that the above sentences provide decisive support to the Naïve Uniqueness Assumption. In fact we cannot simply say for Haya that the
Critical relations DO and 10 are "collapsed". We still would have another justify. Thus even accepting the claim that what in some languages look the same grammatical relation" are in fact the realizations of two differ-
grammatical relations that lost their differentiating features, we still have to allow one of the two grammatical relations to "double".

E. Three DO's in relationally primitive sentences. As mentioned above,
that to validate the Weak Relational Annihilation Law in Haya, we must
uses of relationally primitive sentences with three DO's. Examples (107)
are not appropriate because they would involve at least one advance-
ment: instrumental → DO (for (107)) and locative → DO (for (108)).
On the hypothesis made by Gary and Keenan (1976) on the dative marking
by the semantic relation and not by an advancement-to-DO rule, we
three possible ways in which to come up with three DO's in a relation-
primitive sentence (i.e. without applying any relation-changing rule):
(i) finding a verb with three basic DO's; (ii) by marking with an applica-
tion morpheme (for dative) a verb that already has two DO's; (iii) by marking
a applicative morphemes a verb that already has one DO.

all three possibilities, (i) and (iii) are not realized in Haya.
there are no verbs with three basic DO's (i.e. verbs with four "basic NP ar-
'), and it is not possible to mark two dative relations on the same
means of the applicative morpheme. 24 Thus we are left with (ii).
briefly examine one case (but other examples would exhibit the same
ies) and show that the three NP's that should behave as DO's do not
hibit all the properties outlined in section 2 above.

begin, sentences like (113) with three full NP DO's are hardly ac-

'kat' á-ka-siig-ii abantw omwáana amajúta
Kato he-P3-smear-APP people child oil
'Kato smeared the child with oil for the people'

ceptability of (113) does not improve with different word orders. If
ominalize one of the dative NP's, as in (114), we get a more accept-

'kat' á-ka-bá-siig-ii amajúta omwáana
Kato he-P3-them-smear-APP oil child
child for them'

ence with three (clitic) pronouns is the only one that is completely
le:

'kat' á-ka-ga-be-mú-siig-ii
Kato he-P3-it-them-him-smear-APP
'Kato smeared it on him for them'

'kat' á-ka-ga-bésiig-ii
Kato he-P3-it-them-REFL-smear-APP
'Kato smeared it on himself for them'

above reflexivization has applied.

orting from (114), only omwáana can be subjectivized via passivization
if the other NP's (except the agent) are pronominalized, as in (117):


(117) omwàán' a-ka-ga-bá-siig-ìl-w-a káto 'the child was smeared
child he-P3-it-them-smear-APP-PASS Kato for them by Kato'

Given the fact that even sentences like (118) and (119) are unacceptables:

(118) *omwàán' a-ka-bá-siig-ìl-w-a kát' òmàjòta 'the child was smeared
child he-P3-smeared-child APP-PASS Kato oil them the oil by Kato

(119) *abantu bá-ka-siig-ìl-w-a òmwaán' òmàjòta 'the people were smeared
people they-P3-smeared-child APP-PASS oil (on) the child

one cannot simply argue that passivization cannot apply because of combinations among the various NP's trying to get the immediate postverbal position. We recall from (110a) that òmàjòta does not have to occupy the position immediately after the verb. Nevertheless, both (118) and (119) are unacceptables. In (118) we have removed the dative NP abantu 'people' by pronominalizing it and in (119) we have left the agent unexpressed. If the unacceptability of passive sentences derived from (113) (which is also unacceptables) was due to the coding conflict of different NP's wanting to take over the immediate postverbal position, both (118) and (119) should have been acceptable. It appears that the predicate in such examples is somehow "overloaded" as there are not free to apply as in the other cases illustrated in previous sections. It is then at least problematic to argue for relationally pronominal position with three DO's as being "normal" or "well-accepted" in Haya. Further it is notable that the number of verbs like -siig- 'smeared', which take two DO's, is highly restricted, the number of possible sentences with two "itive" DO's is even more restricted. We are still confronted with the acceptability of sentences like (115) and (116). So far pronoun-incorporation seemed to be a very strong test for objecthood. It may happen, however, partially denoted DO's will lose properties such as subjectivization as a relative clause formation, but they will retain pronoun-incorporation. The case is when an instrumental relation is marked on a verb which also has one basic DO and a dative DO marked by the applicative morpheme. Sentences like (120) both omwàana 'child' and èbitóoko share all the properties of DO's, whereas n'àmùhùy 'with knife' behaves as a regular prepositional phrase (cf. (3) above).

(120) kat' è-ka-shá-l-il' òmwaán' èbitóoko n'àmùhùy
Kato he-P3-cut-child App child bananas with knife
'Kato cut the bananas for the child with the knife'

If we mark the semantic relation of the instrumental on the verb, as in the result is an unacceptable sentence:

(121) *kat' è-ka-shá-l-ìz' òmwaán' èbitóok' àmùhùy
Kato he-P3-cut-APP/INSTR child bananas knife
'Kato cut the bananas for the child with the knife'

None of the three postverbal NP's can be subjectivized via passivization, even if the agent is eliminated:

(122) a. *omwàán' a-ka-shá-l-ìz-i-bw-a (kátó) àmùhùy' èbitóoko
child he-P3-cut-APP-INSTR-PASS Kato knife bananas
'the child was cut-for the bananas with the knife (by Kato)
*ebitoeke bī-ka-shāl-iz-1-bw-a (katō) ǭmwaän’ ǭmūhyo
bananas they-P3-cut-APP-INSTR-PASS Kato child knife
'the bananas were cut for the child with the knife (for Kato)'

*omūhyo gū-ke-shāl-iz-1-bw-a (katō) ǭmwaän’ ebitoeke
knife it-P1-cut-APP-INSTR-PASS Kato child bananas
'the knife was used to cut the bananas for the child (by Kato)'

In (123), relative clause formation on the basic DO ebitoeke and the
(benefactive) ǭmwaän also yields unacceptable sentences:

*ebitoeke ébyō katō y-a-shāl-iz ǭmwaän’ ǭmūhyo
bananas REL Kato he-P1-cut-APP/INSTR child knife
'the bananas that Kato cut with the knife for the child'

*omwaän’ Ówō katō y-a-shāl-iz ǭmūhyo’ ebitoeke
child REL Kato he-P1-cut-APP/INSTR knife bananas
the child for whom Kato cut the bananas with the knife'

both pronoun-incorporation and reflexivization are allowed on all
P's, as seen in (124) and (125).

Katō he-P3-them-it-him-cut-APP/INSTR
katō ǭ-ka-bi-gu-mu-shāl-iz-a
'Kato cut them for him with it'

Kato he-P3-them-it-him-cut-APP/INSTR
katō ǭ-ka-gu-mw-ǭ-šāl-iz-a
'Kato cut himself for him with it'

'Kato cut him for himself with it'

'Kato caused himself to cut it for him'

attempts to interpret the Su as coreferential with the instrumental NP
into a reflexive), a causative reading is obtained (cf. Trithart 1977).

7. The Human Constraint. Another case of partial deomission we would
mention is related to the nature of the referents involved in the
rather than to the syntactic/semantic relations borne by the NP's to
b. It turns out that certain grammatical processes of DO's having a
different can be blocked by the advancement to Su of another nonhuman
consider the following example:

Kato he-P3-hit/INSTR child wood
kató ǭ-ka-tēǣz’ ǭmwaän’ ékiti
'Kato hit the child with a piece
of wood'

from what was said earlier that both ǭomwaän and ékiti are DO's.

Crucial, there is a difference in their status. Whereas the advance-
subject of ǭomwaän does not affect the status of ékiti (which can
rigger or undergo some of the rules that characterize DO's, e.g.
-incorporation in (127) and relative clause formation in (128)),

ǭomwaän’ ǭ-ka-ki-tēǣz-1-bw-a kató
child he-P3-it-hit-INSTR-PASS Kato
'the child was hit with it
by Kato'

ekiti’ ékī’ ǭomwaän y-a-tēǣz-1-bw-a kató
the piece of wood that
REL child he-P1-it-INSTR-PASS Kato the child was hit with
by Kato'
the advancement to subject of ekiti affects the objecthood of omwána, now cannot trigger pronoun-incorporation or be relativized, as seen in (129) and (130), respectively.

(129) *ekiti‘ kf-ka-mu-téez-1-bw-a káto  'the piece of wood was used
  wood it-P3-him-hit-INSTR-PASS Kato  hit him by Kato'

(130) *omwána’ éw’ ékití‘ ky-a-teez-1-bw-e káto
  child REL wood it-P-hit-INSTR-PASS-P3 Kato
  'the child that the piece of wood was used to hit by Kato'

Notice that a sentence like (129) but with a full NP instead of the pronoun -mu- 'him' is fully acceptable:

(131) ekiti‘ kf-ka-téez-1-bw-a káto  omwána  'the piece of wood was
  wood it-P3-hit-INSTR-PASS Kato  child
  by Kato to hit the chi

This phenomenon seems to be independent from semantic relations. In (131) the human NP is an accusative; in (132) it is a locative, and in (133) it is a dative.

(132) a.  káto  é-ka-bón’ énshwe’  ásha-muwána
     Kato he-P3-see 'fly' on-child  ásha-muwána
     'Kato saw the fly on the child'
  b.  omwána’ a-ka-gl-bón-w-a hó káto
     child  he-P3-it-see-PASS LOC Kato
     'the child was seen it on by Kato'
  c. *enshwe’ é-ka-mu-bón-w-a hó káto
     fly  it-P3-him-see-PASS LOC Kato
     'the fly was seen on him by Kato'

(133) a.  káto  é-ka-cumb-il’  omwána’ ébítoko
     Kato he-P3-cook-APP child bananas
     'Kato cooked the bananas for the child'
  b.  omwána’ a-ka-bí-cumb-il-w-a káto
     child  he-P3-them-cook-APP-PASS Kato
     'the child was cooked (for) by Kato'
  c. *ebítoko bí-ka-mú-cumb-il-w-a káto
     bananas  they-P3-him-cook-APP-PASS Kato
     'the bananas were cooked (for) him by Kato'

In (132b) the locative DO has been subjectivized and the basic DO énshwe’ 'fly' has been pronominalized. The sentence is acceptable. In (132c), on the other hand, the basic (nonhuman) DO is subjectivized and the locative (human) DO is pronominalized, and the sentence is not acceptable. If we were to apply the other tests we would find the same behavior illustrated with examples (126)–(131). The same is true for the sentences in (133). However, when the DO's are either both human or both nonhuman, as in (134) and (135), respectively, the constraint does not hold:

(134) abáána bá-ka-mu-léét-ol-w-a káto
     children they-P3-him-bring-APP-PASS Kato
     'the children were brought him by Kato'
     'he was brought the children by Kato'

(135) ébítoko bí-ka-gí-cumb-il-w-a káto
     bananas they-P3-it-cook-APP-PASS Kato
     'the bananas were cooked (for) it (e.g. dog) by Kato'
We tentatively call the constraint here mentioned the Human Constraint, and will state it informally in the following way:

**The Human Constraint:** In a sentence with more than one DO, the advancement to subject of a DO with a nonhuman referent affects the objecthood of any other present DO with a human referent.

This constraint can be thought of as related to the higher likelihood that a sentence will be human rather than nonhuman (cf. Hawkins and Hyman 1974, 1976). It seems that in order for a nonhuman DO to become Su, the human) DO must be "not in play". Pragmatically, one could argue that a human referent must be of lesser importance with respect to the action verb than the nonhuman referent. Because this violates one's expecta-

**Summary and Conclusion**

In this paper, we have provided further evidence for the Non-uniqueness of the manner proposed by Gary and Keenan (1976) by showing that in Haya three appear the grammatical relation DO to the same verb. We have also shown that if we consider verb-marking as related to advancement rules, e.g. (verbal → DO), locative → DO), Haya regularly violates the Relational Content Law proposed by Perlmutter and Postal (1974) and probably the version stated by Gary and Keenan (1976) as well.

The case has also been presented in which a (partial) demotion seems to be related to the nature of the referents rather than to the grammatical or syntactic relations of the NP's. This has been tentatively related to the likelihood in discourse of human referents to occupy the subject or nonhuman referents.

We must conclude then that, in terms of Universal Grammar, demotions may not be independent from promotions (e.g. advancements), even if in languages they may depend on one another. A similar suggestion has been made by Comrie (1976) in discussion of emotional passives in several different languages of the world.

**Notes**

This paper is a revised version of a paper (with the same title) presented June 24, 1976 at the African Workshop organized by Larry M. Hyman and Hel G. Schuh. We wish to thank all the people who gave us comments and suggestions, in particular, Jim Heringer and Larry Hyman for their help, encouragement, and comments on earlier drafts of this paper.

For the concept of "basic" sentence, see Keenan (1976).

The same constraint does not hold for subjects of active sentences. Even though pronouns and agreement markers are usually related dialectally (cf. Givón 1976a), synchronically speaking they may be substantially different.

Without inye 'me', sentence (39) is acceptable with the meaning 'the
arm was broken by the man', that is, with omusha'ja 'man' acting as the agent NP. The source of this sentence would be omusha'ja a-ka-hed' oni 'the man broke the arm' and not (36).

5We are not really concerned here with the problem of whether or not there might have been a DO at an earlier stage of the derivation (cf. Hyman 1974).


7Cf. Perlmutter and Postal (1974) and the papers in Cole and Sadow (1972).

8Johnson refers to the Accessibility Hierarchy given in Keenan and Sadow (1972): Su > DO > IO > Obj. of Prep. > Possessive NP > Obj. of Complement = Obj. of Conjunction (where > means "greater or equal in accessibility").

9The same argument holds for locatives, since there are prepositions and locatives from which to derive the ones marked on the verb. We must point out, however, that locatives, as shown earlier (cf. 4.2), keep the "position" when the full NP is expressed in its postverbal position.

10The three sentences (88), (89), and (90) are all in fact ambiguous. The postverbal NP can also be interpreted as agent. In this case these sentences would mean 'the oil was smeared by the child', 'the picture was given by the child', and 'the book was given by the child'.

11Both the Weak Relational Annihilation Law and the Non-uniqueness assumption contradict one of the predictions made by Relational Grammar of the effect of passivization on the verb. According to Perlmutter and Postal (1974) and Keenan (1975) one of the generalizations captured by the relational definition of passivization (DO → Su for Perlmutter and Postal; Su → DO or Φ for Keenan) would be the fact that the verb of a passive sentence is by definition "intransitive" (having lost its DO). However, in a language is allowed to have more than one DO (like Kinyarwanda and Haya for instance) the verb of a passive sentence can still have an NP acting as DO. Therefore we cannot affirm that passivization makes the verb intransitive.

12This sentence as well as (c) must be agentless for the same constellation illustrated in 5.2.1. Note in all of these examples that the instrumental verb marking is effected by means of the two extensions -is-i- as argued by Trithart (1977).

13For relative clause formation, see Duranti (1977).

14It is, however, possible to have two applicative morphemes when both are both a dative and a locative, as in example (108).
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