ON THE OBJECT RELATION IN BANTU

LARRY M. HYMAN
ALESSANDRO DURANTI

The object relation in Bantu has been the subject of a number of excellent papers (see references). Whether descriptive or theoretical in orientation, these studies have revealed an intricate network of (direct) object properties which, although varying from language to language, expose a general Bantu character. In the present study an initial attempt is made to synthesize these findings on the basis of the Bantu languages studied thus far.[1] We begin by addressing the nature of grammatical relations in Bantu. We then discuss the grammatical properties characteristic of objects in Bantu, and the factors that determine which arguments of a verb have access to these properties. Finally, we consider some tentative conclusions concerning the typology and the history of the object relation in these Bantu languages.

[1] These include Haya, Sesotho, Logooli, Shona, Nyakyusa, Kimbundu, Shambala, and parts of Sukuma, Ciluba, Chaga, Punu, and Basaa, in addition to the published sources represented in the references.

Syntax and Semantics, Volume 15

ISBN 0-12-613515-0

1. GRAMMATICAL RELATIONS IN BANTU

In Bantu we can establish without controversy the following grammatical relations: (*a*) subject, (*b*) (direct) object, and (*c*) oblique. These three relations are illustrated in the following sentence from Haya:[2]

(1) *Kat' á-ka-téél' ómwáána n'énkoni.*
Kato he-P_3-beat child with stick
'Kato beat the child with a stick'. (P_3 = before yesterday past)

Here *Kató* is the subject, *ómwáána* the object, and *énkoni* the oblique. In a "neutral" or "unmarked" sentence, the subject precedes and conditions agreement on the verb, which is in turn directly followed by the object. An oblique then follows an object (if present) and is normally, but not always, preceded by a preposition (here by *na* 'with'). Except in the imperative, each verb must have an explicit subject (either nominal or pronominal) and can have, the sense permitting, an oblique (preposition + noun or pronoun). Only transitive verbs can support an object when there is no verbal extension present, as will be discussed in what follows.

The major difficulty arises as soon as the notion of an "indirect" object is considered. In each Bantu language there exist a small number of simplex (monomorphemic) verbs which, in addition to the subject, can take two nominal complements without marking either one with a preposition. Among the verbs frequently found in this category are 'to give', 'to steal', 'to smear', 'to hide', 'to ask', and 'to teach'. Two Haya examples are seen in (2) and (3).

(2) *A-ka-h' ómwáán' ébitooke.*
he-P_3-give child bananas
'He gave the child bananas'.

(3) *A-ka-siig' ómwáán' ámajûta.*
he-P_3-smear child oil
'He smeared the child with oil' or 'He smeared oil on the child'.

In these examples we observe two nouns in succession which follow the verb without being preceded by a preposition. In a typical European language one might identify these nouns as an indirect followed by a

[2] For further discussion of the Haya in this and later sections, see Duranti and Byarushengo (1977), Hyman (1977), and Duranti (1979).

direct object. The same would be said about the examples in (4) and (5).

(4) *A -ka-túm -il' ómwáán' ébitooke.*
he-P_3-send-app child bananas
'He sent the child bananas'.

(5) *A-ka-cumb-il' ómwáán' ébitooke.*
he-P_3-cook-app child bananas
'He cooked the child bananas'.

In these examples, *ómwáána* 'child' would be the indirect object (sometimes called the "applied" or "prepositional" object in Bantu) and *ébitooke* 'bananas' the direct object. These examples differ from (2) and (3) by the presence of the applied (app) extension *-il-* which marks the imminence of an applied object, either a recipient as in (4) or a beneficiary as in (5). (In other cases the applied extension introduces a locative, and in other Bantu languages it introduces an instrument.) Other extensions that make possible a sequence of nouns without prepositions are the causative/instrument *-is-* and the locative enclitics which "objectivize" the locatives of classes 16, 17 and 18 (cf. Trithart 1975; Dalgish 1976a, 1976b; Stucky 1976).

In a final situation which we shall consider here, two nouns are possible in sequence when the first represents a possessor "affected" by the action of the verb. Thus, instead of the construction in (6), we find that in (7).

(6) *?A-ka-hénd' ómukono gw' ómwáána.*
he-P_3-break arm of child
'He broke the child's arm'.

(7) *A-ka-hénd' ómwáán' ómukôno.*
he-P_3-break child arm
'He broke the child's arm'.

In (6) the associative construction is used only if the possessor ('child') is not affected by the action of the verb ('to break'). In this context this would mean that the arm was not part of the child—that is, the arm had already been severed from the body (of someone, not necessarily the child) before being broken in (6).[3] In (7) we have two successive nouns since the affected possessor is treated as an object.

[3] For discussion of this construction, see Voeltz (1976), Hyman (1977), Morolong and Hyman (1977), Hinnebusch and Kirsner (1980), and Fox (1981).

2. OBJECT PROPERTIES

We have seen in the preceding section three circumstances where two postverbal nouns follow each other without a preposition: (*a*) certain rare verbs like 'to give' can take two nouns without a preposition; (*b*) certain extensions such as the applied extension introduce a second object; and (*c*) an affected possessor can be realized as an object. In the foregoing we have avoided the term "indirect object," which we feel is not appropriate for Bantu. (For further discussion of the nonuniversality of "indirect object," see Faltz 1978.)

In each of the above three cases we must ask what the grammatical relations are between each noun and the verb. In order to determine this we shall consider the three most frequently used tests, namely: (*a*) word order, (*b*) subjectivization, and (*c*) cliticization. As has always been assumed by Bantuists, a true object should (*a*) have access to the position immediately following the verb; (*b*) be capable of assuming the subject role through passivization; and (*c*) be expressable as a clitic object marker (OM) within the verbal complex. Although other tests are applied in the literature,[4] we will content ourselves with these three, which already provide enough variation in Bantu languages to draw certain conclusions about the status of objects. Let us apply these tests, then, to Sentences (2), (5), and (7).

As we can see from (8), the two nouns in (2) can be placed in either order in Haya [cf. (2)]:

(8) *A-ka-h' ébitook' ómwáana.*
he-P_3-give bananas child
'He gave bananas to the child'.

Similarly, in (9) it is observed that either 'child' or 'bananas' can be subject of the corresponding passive construction:

(9) a. *Omwáán' a-ka-háá-bw' ébitooke.*
child he-P_3-give-pass bananas
'The child was given bananas'.
b. *Ebitooke bí-ka-háá-bw' ómwáana.*
bananas they-P_3-give-pass child
'The bananas were given to the child'.

Finally, in (10) the two nouns occur as pronouns in the OM clitic position:

[4] Other tests are discussed and illustrated in Kimenyi (1979), Trithart (1976), Duranti and Byarushengo (1977), and Gary and Keenan (1977).

(10) a. *A-ka-mú-h' ébitooke.*
he-P_3-him-give bananas
'He gave him bananas'.
b. *A-ka-bí-h' ómwáana.*
he-P_3-them-give child
'He gave them to the child'.

In fact, in Haya (but not always in other Bantu languages), both nouns can be cliticized and cooccupy the OM slot:

(11) *A-ka-bi-mú-h-a*
he-P_3-them-him-give
'He gave them to him'.

Thus, given the three criteria (word order, subjectivization, cliticization) we must conclude that both 'child' and 'bananas' are objects when following the verb 'to give'. Similarly, in the following examples involving the app extension and its benefactive referent in (5), both 'child' and 'bananas' are objects (cf. Gary and Keenan 1977 for KinyaRwanda):

(12) *A-ka-cumb-il' ébitook' ómwáana.*
he-P_3-cook-app bananas child
'He cooked the bananas for the child'.

(13) a. *Omwáán' a-ka-cumb-il-w' ébitooke.*
child he-P_3-cook-app-pass bananas
'The child was cooked bananas'.
b. *Ebitooke bí-ka-cumb-il-w' ómwáana.*
bananas they-P_3-cook-app-pass child
'The bananas were cooked for the child'.

(14) a. *A-ka-mú-cumb-il' ébitooke.*
he-P_3-him-cook-app bananas
'He cooked bananas for him'.
b. *A-ka-bí-cumb-il' ómwáana.*
he-P_3-them-cook-app child
'He cooked them for the child'.

However, when we attempt to apply the three tests to (7), quite different properties result. First, as seen in (15), 'arm' cannot appear after the verb with 'child' following it. Also, as seen in (16), 'child' can subjectivize, but 'arm' cannot.

(15) **N-ka-hénd' ómukón' ómwáana.*
1-P_3-break arm child

(16) a. *Omwáán' a-ka-hénd-w' ómukôno.*
child he-P_3-break-pass arm
'The child's arm was broken' (Lit., 'the child was broken the arm').
b. **Omukóno gú-ka-hénd-w' ómwáana.*
arm it-P_3-break-pass child
Lit., 'the arm was broken the child'.

And, finally, we observe in (17) that 'child' can cliticize into the OM position, but 'arm' cannot.

(17) a. *N-ka-mu-hénd' ómukôno*
I-P_3-him-break arm
'I broke his arm' (Lit., 'I broke him the arm').
b. **N-ka-gu-hénd' ómwáana*
I-P_3-it-break child
Lit., 'I broke it the child'.

We therefore conclude that 'child' is an object in (7), but that 'arm' is not an object, but rather a "prepositionless oblique." Thus, one cannot determine solely from the absence of a preposition whether a postverbal noun is an object.[5] As a final demonstration of this last point, it should be noted that the agent of a passive sentence lacks a preposition in Haya, as seen in (18).

(18) *Ebitooke bí-ka-cumb-w' ómukâzi.*
bananas they-P_3-cook-pass woman
'The bananas were cooked by the women'.

The passive agent cannot cliticize as a pronoun, as seen in (19).

(19) **Ebitooke bí-ka-mú-cumb-w-a.*
bananas they-P_3-her-cook-pass
'The bananas were cooked by her'.

Since this nonobject passive agent can also appear with a (nonhuman) object following it, as in (20), this constitutes another example of two

[5] Other constructions have been found which exhibit the same object properties as in the affected possessor construction. For example, in the Haya sentence *A-ka-téél' ómwáán' énkoni* (lit., 'he beat child stick'), which should be compared with Sentence (1), *ómwáána* 'child' is an object, whereas *énkoni* 'stick' is an oblique. The meaning is something like 'he stick-beated the child'. This oblique is reminiscent of the adverbial objects found in Igbo and other West African Kwa languages and incorporated nouns such as the complex English verb 'to pistolwhip'.

prepositionless nouns following the verb, where only one ('bananas') is a real object.[6]

(20) *Omwáán' a-ka-cumb-il-w' ómukázy' ébitooke.*
child he-P_3-cook-app-pass woman bananas
Lit., 'The child was cooked bananas by the woman'.

Sentences (2), (4), and (5) have the sequence object + object, whereas (7) has object + oblique and (20) has oblique + object. The fourth possibility, oblique + oblique, is provided in (21), where neither the passive agent 'woman' nor the possessed body part 'arm' can cliticize, as seen in (22).

(21) *Omwáán' a-ka-hénd-w' ómukázy' ómukôno.*
child he-P_3-break-pass woman arm
Lit., 'the child was broken the arm by the woman'.

(22) a. **Omwáán' a-ka-mu-hénd-w' ómukôno.*
child he-P_3-her-break-pass arm
Lit., 'the child was broken the arm by her'.
b. **Omwáán' a-ka-gu-hénd-w' ómukâzi.*
child he-P_3-it-break-pass woman
Lit., 'the child was broken it by the woman'.

3. ACCESS TO OBJECT PROPERTIES

In the preceding section we have determined that word order, subjectivization, and cliticization serve as three criteria for object status. We have seen, also, that a postverbal noun not preceded by a preposition can either be an object or a prepositionless oblique. In this section we examine the following factors which may influence the likelihood that an NP argument will exhibit object properties: (*a*) semantic case relations, (*b*) person–animacy, and (*c*) determinedness.[7]

The first two factors can be summarized in terms of the following semantic hierarchies in (23) and (24).

[6] Note that in (20) the passive agent *ómukázy'* 'woman' is in immediate postverbal position because of its human status. It is impossible to have two human nouns following a passivized verb in Haya. As the passive agent is an oblique rather than a true object, we conclude that word order is the weakest of the three criteria of object status.

[7] These three parameters were first pointed out for Bantu by Hawkinson and Hyman (1974) and have been further developed by Morolong and Hyman (1977), Duranti (1979), and Trithart (1979). For further discussion of animacy and determinedness in direct objects, see Comrie (1979) and Hopper and Thompson (1980).

(23) Benefactive > Recipient > Patient > Instrument

(24) 1st > 2nd > 3rd human > 3rd animal > 3rd inanimate

The sign > stands for "more likely to undergo/trigger certain grammatical processes than." These hierarchies must be interpreted relatively as not every language in which they are at work draws all of the distinctions made in (23) and (24), and some languages may make finer distinctions (particularly in degrees of animacy within third person referents). As seen in (23), benefactives (ben) have greater access to object properties than recipients (rec), which in turn have greater access than patients (pat) and instruments (inst). Other case relations will ultimately have to be added, including causative agents and, in Bantu, locatives. In (24) we have collapsed two separate hierarchies into one general statement. The first is a personal hierarchy whereby first person is higher than second person which is higher than third person in attracting object properties. The second is an animacy hierarchy whereby 3rd human is greater than 3rd animal which is greater than 3rd inanimate. Again, there is room for further distinctions (e.g., man versus woman versus child versus slave, according to the culture). We shall refer to (26) as the person–animacy (PA) hierarchy.

Finally, we note that a more "determined" (or "individuated," according to Hopper and Thompson (1980)) referent will have greater access to object properties than a less determined one. Thus, presupposed, definite singulars are higher in this hierarchy than asserted, indefinite, or nonspecific plurals, etc.

Although all three hierarchies play some role in most Bantu languages, by far the most influential factor is the PA hierarchy. In many Bantu languages a noun low in the case hierarchy (23) can receive object properties for the simple reason that its referent is human [i.e., high in the PA hierarchy (24)]. In order to isolate the human factor in determining object properties, a study based on Sesotho was undertaken by Morolong and Hyman (1977). In this study the following test sentences provided all four logical combinations of human/nonhuman benefactive and patient noun objects:

(25) A. 'I cooked food for the child'.
Ben–human Pat–nonhuman

B. 'I cooked food for the feast'.
Ben–nonhuman Pat–nonhuman

C. 'I called the children for the feast'.
Ben–nonhuman Pat–human

D. 'I called the children for the chief'.
Ben–human Pat–human

Each of the two nouns in each test sentence was submitted to the three tests for object status (word order, subjectivization, and cliticization).

(26)	A.	*Ke-phehétsé ngoaná lijó.*	I-cooked/app child food[8]
		**Ke-phehétsé lijó ngoaná.*	I-cooked/app food child
	B.	*Ke-phehétsé mokété lijó.*	I-cooked/app feast food
		Ke-phehétsé lijó mokéte.	I-cooked/app food feast
	C.	*Ke-bítselítsé baná mokéte.*	I-called/app children feast
		**Ke-bítselítsé mokété baná.*	I-called/app feast children
	D.	*Ke-bítselítsé morena baná.*	I-called/app chief children [A]
		Ke-bítselítsé baná morena.	I-called/app children chief [A]

As seen in the Sesotho sentences in (26), the two nouns occurring after the verb can occur in either order PROVIDED THAT a nonhuman noun does not precede a human noun—as in the starred second sentences of A and C. As indicated by [A], it can be noted that both sentences in D are ambiguous, meaning either 'I called the children for the chief' or 'I called the chief for the children'.

In (27) we observe that except for *mokéte* 'feast' in C, both nouns in each test sentence can be subjectivized:

(27)	A.	*Ngoaná ó-phehétsoé lijó.*	child he-was-cooked/app food
		Lijó lí-phehétsoé ngoaná.	food it-was-cooked/app child
	B.	*Mokété ó-phehétsoé lijó.*	feast it-was-cooked/app food
		Lijó lí-phehétsoé mokéte.	food it-was-cooked/app feast
	C.	*Baná bá-bítselítsoé mokéte.*	children they-were-called/app feast
		**Mokété ó-bítselítsoé baná.*	feast it-was-called/app children
	D.	*Morena ó-bítselítsoé baná.*	chief he-was-called/app children [A]
		Baná bá-bítselítsoé morena.	children they-were-called/app chief [A]

[8] As the intended meanings of the test sentences are given in (27), we shall not provide English translations for the Sesotho sentences. The abbreviation "app" stands for the applied extension which, because of fusion with the *-il-* past tense extension, will not be separated from the verb radical by hyphens.

And, finally, in (28), it is observed that except for *mokéte* 'feast' in the second sentence in C, either noun in each test sentence can be expressed through a corresponding pronoun in the clitic OM position:

(28)	A.	*Ke-mó-phehétsé lijó.*	I-him-cooked/app food
		Ke-lí-phehétsé ngoaná.	I-it-cooked/app child
	B.	*Ke-ó-phehétsé lijó.*	I-it[feast]-cooked/app food
		Ke-lí-phehétsé mokéte.	I-it[food]-cooked/app feast
	C.	*Ke-ba-bítselítsé mokéte.*	I-them-called/app feast
		**Ke-o-bítselítsé baná.*	I-it[feast]-called/app chief
	D.	*Ke-mo-bítselítsé baná.*	I-him-called/app children [A]
		Ke-ba-bítselítsé morena.	I-them-called/app chief [A]

Sesotho, unlike Haya, does not allow more than one pronoun in the clitic OM position.

From the preceding it becomes clear that animacy is an important factor in determining object status in Sesotho. Although details vary from language to language,[9] we have found no Bantu language where animacy is irrelevant in determining which arguments will acquire object properties in such utterances. In Sesotho we have seen that a nonhuman noun cannot precede a human noun. In addition, in (27) and (28) we observe that when the benefactive is nonhuman and the patient is human, it is the patient that acquires *all* of the object properties—and at the expense of the benefactive, which is not an object at all, but a prepositionless oblique. This last fact comes as a surprise since in the A sentences we see that Sesotho can in fact accommodate a human and a nonhuman object in sequence after the verb—but only if the human is the benefactive and the nonhuman is the patient! In (29)–(31) we observe that the affected possessor construction lines up exactly with the properties of the preceding C sentences:

(29)	a.	*Ke-robílé ngoaná letsóho.*	I-broke child arm
	b.	**Ke-robílé letsóhó ngoaná.*	I-broke arm child
(30)	a.	*Ngoaná ó-robíloé letsóho.*	child he-was-broken arm
	b.	**Letsóhó lé-robíloé ngoaná.*	arm it-was-broken child
(31)	a.	*Ke-mó-robílé letsóho.*	I-him-broke arm
	b.	**Ke-lé-robílé ngoaná.*	I-it-broke child

[9] One has but to compare the Shona situation reported by Hawkinson and Hyman (1974) with that reported in Morolong and Hyman (1977) for Sesotho to see that two languages can be animacy-oriented in very different ways (cf. also Duranti 1979 for a comparison of Shambala and Haya).

In (29b) *letsóho* 'arm' cannot precede the affected possessor *ngoaná* 'child'.[10] In (30b) it cannot subjectivize, and in (31b) it cannot cliticize as a pronoun. Therefore, we conclude that in the affected possessor construction in Sesotho, as in Haya, the (body) part is not an object. It is in this sense parallel to the nonhuman benefactive in the C sentences in (26), (27), and (28). As has been argued by Hyman (1977) and Morolong and Hyman (1977), both the C sentences and the affected possessor construction involve an argument acquiring object properties because of its higher status along an "affectedness" scale. When one breaks a child's stick, the stick is affected; when one breaks a child's arm, the CHILD is affected. Thus, in Bantu languages, being an object MEANS being an important participant in an event (cf. Hinnebusch and Kirsner (1980).

4. TYPOLOGY OF OBJECT PROPERTIES

We have indicated that there are differences in the ways in which individual Bantu languages treat objects. In this necessarily programmatic statement, we shall consider the following parameters: (*a*) word order, (*b*) cliticization; and (*c*) the PA hierarchy.

In approaching the question of word order in the comparative study of the object relation in Bantu, we are concerned primarily with the following questions:

1. Is the order of objects fixed, variable, or free?
2. Is the order of objects determined by case, the PA hierarchy, and/or determinedness?

Important related questions involve the role or relevance of ambiguity, the ability of an object to be left dislocated (in the presence of another object), and the number of object nouns permitted after the verb. In determining word order variability, it is necessary to consider potentially ambiguous versus potentially nonambiguous combinations (e.g., test sentences D versus A, respectively). In some Bantu languages, for example, Logooli,[11] the equivalents of the two sentences in (28D) unambiguously mean 'I called the children for the chief' and 'I called the chief for the

[10] This is not because the affected possessor is human, since it need not be, as seen in the following examples (cf. also Voeltz 1976):

(i) *Ke-robílé sefáté lekala* (I-broke tree branch);
(ii) **Ke-robílé lekala sefáte* (I-broke branch tree).

[11] We are indebted to Rachel Angogo for all of the statements and examples concerning Logooli, a Luhya language spoken in Kenya.

children'. That is, the first human noun is always interpreted as the benefactive. In others, such as Sesotho, as we have seen, such sentences are ambiguous. Similarly to Logooli, in Shona (Hawkinson and Hyman 1974), nouns can be moved out of the benefactive–patient order if there is recoverability of the case relations from the previous discourse. This is related to the role of determinedness in word order. In general, a noun whose referent is presupposed (from discourse or otherwise) will tend to come earlier than one which is not so presupposed. An ultimate typology will not only consider the above factors (case, PA, determinedness), but also treat their interaction. At the moment it appears that some languages (e.g., Logooli) are case oriented, whereas others (e.g., Sesotho) are animacy oriented. Determinedness seems to play a lesser role in the languages we have intestigated, although the singular–plural distinction contributes potentially to the ordering of object clitics (Duranti 1979).

Turning to cliticization, it is important to ask the following questions:

1. What function or functions can the clitic fulfill?
2. How many clitics can occur in sequence (in what order, and under which cooccurrence constraints)?
3. What is the interaction between clitics and other grammatical processes?

In (1) we refer to the following four attested functions of clitic OM markers in Bantu: (*a*) pronominalization, (*b*) left dislocation, (*c*) relativization, and (*d*) object agreement. As seen in (32a)–(32d), Sesotho exhibits all four uses of clitics:

(32) a. *Ke-a-mo-bón-a.*
I-pres-him-see
'I see him'.

b. *Ngoaná ke-a-mo-bón-a.*
child I-pres-him-see
'The child, I see him'.

c. *Ngoaná éò ké-mo-bón-á-ǹg.*
child that I-him-see-rel
'The child that I see (him)'.

d. *Ke-a-mo-bón-a ngoaná.*
I-pres-him-see child
'I see the child'.

Because cliticizability may depend on the MEANS by which a clitic is obtained, it is important to distinguish whether the OM is a true pronoun [e.g., (32a)] or a copy of a noun present in the same construction [e.g.,

(32b)–(32d)]. A particularly clear example of the need to distinguish the different functions of the OM comes from Sukuma (Herman Batibo, personal communication). In this language the following sentence is ungrammatical:

(33) **A-ka-bii-nh-w-á.*
he-past-them-give-pass-asp
'He was given them [human cl. 2]'.

This shows that a passive construction will not tolerate a human pronoun in the OM slot. However, as seen in (34), the human OM is acceptable in the passive if a preprefixed (=[+determined]) coreferential object noun occurs with the clitic.

(34) *A-ka-bii-nh-w-á abaana.*
'He was given the children'.

What cannot cliticize as a pronoun in (33) CAN cliticize as an agreement marker in (34)!

Returning to Sesotho, we observe in (35) that when the affected possessor *ngoaná* 'child' of (29a) is subjectivized, the possessed part *letsóho* 'arm' cannot be cliticized as a pronoun:

(35) **Ngoaná ó-le-róbiloe.*
child he-it-broke-pass
Lit., 'the child was broken it [the arm]'.

However, as seen now in (36), cliticization of 'arm' can cooccur with the subjectivization of 'child', *if* the clitic OM is the result of relativization rather than pronominalization.

(36) *Letsóhó léò ngoaná á-lé-robíloé-ńg*
arm that child he-it-broke-pass-rel
Lit., 'the arm that the child he [it] was broken'.

As we would not want to claim that 'arm' miraculously BECOMES an object in (36), we must conclude that the constraints on cliticization are relaxed depending on the source of the clitic. And, finally, we conclude that if cliticization is to be seen as a determinant of objecthood, then we must further specify that the clitic must be a pronoun, and not simply a resumptive marker required by the relativization process in Sesotho.

In any typology of cliticization in Bantu one must seek to hierarchize these clitic functions and determine the relative strength of each type. Except for the northwestern end of the Bantu zone (and a few exceptional languages), all Bantu languages appear to use the clitic OM slot for pronominalization. In addition, all of the Bantu languages we have ex-

amined exhibit clitic OMs with a left dislocation process. Only some Bantu languages require clitic resumptive pronouns in relative clauses or have "true" object agreement.[12] By "true" object agreement we mean that a noun can cooccur with a coreferential OM clitic without there being a syntactic break characteristic of right dislocation.[13] Sesotho permits this kind of object agreement only in the "long" form of the present tense, as seen in (32d) above. In order to show that (32d) is not a case of right dislocation (in which case the sentence would be translated 'I see him, the child'), it is necessary to show that asserted information can follow the coreferential noun and that what precedes is therefore not a complete sentence. A proper frame is provided in (37).

(37) *Ke-a-mo-bótsa ngoaná lepótso.*
I-pres-him-ask child question
'I am asking the child a question'.

In this sentence 'child' cannot be seen as a right dislocation, because this would automatically imply that the full assertion was what precedes it, that is, *ke-a-mo-bótsa* 'I am asking him'. As the assertion is not completed until the noun *lepótso* 'question' is uttered, *ngoaná* 'child' must be part of the assertion, rather than right dislocation. In (38), however, where 'child' occurs AFTER 'question', the resulting sentence is necessarily analyzed as the assertion 'I am asking him a quêstion' followed by right dislocation 'the child'.

(38) *Ke-a-mo-bótsa lepótsó ngoaná.*
I-pres-him-ask question child
'I am asking him a question, the child'.

This is necessarily correct, because, as we have seen, the language does not permit a nonhuman postverbal noun to precede a human noun. Thus, (38) must be analyzed as containing a major syntactic break between *lepótsó* and *ngoaná*. In this case the clitic *-mo-* 'him' is a true pronoun and not an object agreement marker.

Turning now to the PA hierarchy, we typologize Bantu languages according to (*a*) the DEGREE to which person and animacy play a role in determining the object properties of arguments, and (*b*) the MEANS by which they do so. Some languages such as Logooli show relatively little

[12] The presence of object agreement is required in some languages when the object noun is human (Givón 1979, Wald 1979). When the object noun is nonhuman, the presence of an OM agreeing with the noun may mean that the latter is presupposed information.

[13] For a discussion of right dislocation in Haya, see Byarushengo and Tenenbaum (1976), Byarushengo, Hyman, and Tenenbaum (1976), and Tenenbaum (1977a, 1977b).

concern for animacy, while others (e.g., Sesotho and Shona) make a major effort to organize referential material along the PA scale. In languages where animacy plays a major role, either word order or access to grammatical processes can be affected. We have already seen that Sesotho requires human nouns to precede nonhuman nouns. In addition, in languages with multiple clitics in the OM slot, participants that are higher in the various hierarchies are generally placed closer to the verb radical, as seen in the Haya utterance in (39).

(39) *N-ka-ga-ba-kú-siig-il-a.*
I-P_3-it-them-you-smear-app
'I smeared it [oil] on them [people] for you (sg.)'.

In this example we not only have the order instrument–patient–benefactive (following the case hierarchy in reverse), but also 3rd inanimate followed by 3rd human followed by second person, in accordance with the PA hierarchy. As we have mentioned, only some Bantu languages allow more than one clitic in the OM slot.[14] In languages that have multiple clitics, their combinability and relative ordering are determined by case, person–animacy, and determinedness. In Duranti (1979) a rigorous study was made of all of the possible manipulations of these features in both Shambala and Haya. The purpose of the study was to determine how different Bantu languages deal with conflicts arising between the different hierarchies. For example, in a sentence such as *I hit you for him*, the benefactive is third person, and the patient object is second person. According to the case hierarchy, the benefactive is higher than the patient, but according to the PA hierarchy, second person is higher than third person. We thus have a conflict. Duranti (1979) shows that whenever a conflict arises in Shambala, cooccurrence of the two clitics is blocked. In Haya, on the other hand, different strategies are employed to resolve the conflict. Whenever there is a conflict between the case and PA hierarchies, the latter wins out, as seen in (40).

(40) a. *A-ka-mu-ku-léét-el-a.*
he-P_3-him-you-bring-app
'He brought him to you'.
'He brought you to him'.
b. **A-ka-ku-mu-léét-el-a.*
he-P_3-you-him-bring-app

[14] In fact, in many languages, for example, Shi (Polak-Bynon 1975), there can be two OM clitics only when one of them is a first person singular or a reflexive. The first person singular is of course highest on the PA and number hierarchies and therefore least likely to begrudge the OM slot to a cooccurring clitic.

While (40b) is ungrammatical because a second person clitic precedes a third person clitic, (40a) has both of the readings indicated. Whenever there is a conflict between animacy and case, it can be resolved with either winning out, as seen in (41).[15]

(41) a. *A-ka-bi-ba-léét-el-a*
he-P_3-them-them-bring-APP
'He brought them (*bi*) to them (*ba*)'.
'He brought them (*ba*) to them (*bi*)'.
b. *A-ka-ba-bi-léét-el-a*
he-P_3-them-them-bring-APP
'He brought them (*ba*) to them (*bi*)'.
*'He brought them (*bi*) to them (*ba*)'.

In these examples *ba* is the human clitic, while *bi* is the nonhuman clitic. In (41a) either interpretation is possible: In the first gloss animacy and case line up; in the second gloss, where the human clitic is the patient, it still can appear closer to the verb stem by virtue of its higher position in the animacy hierarchy. In (41b), on the other hand, where the inanimate clitic stands before the verb stem, the only interpretation is that it is the benefactive (i.e., higher on the case hierarchy than the patient). Haya also treats singulars as higher on the determinedness hierarchy. The data in (42) should be thus compared with those in (41).

(42) a. *A-ka-ba-mu-léét-el-a*
he-P_3-them-him-bring-app
'He brought them to him'.
'He brought him to them'.
b. *A-ka-mu-ba-léét-el-a*
he-P_3-him-them-bring-app
'He brought him to them'.
*'He brought them to him'.

Both readings are possible in (42a): In the first gloss the singular clitic lines up with the higher case (benefactive) and therefore appears close to the verb. In the second gloss, where the plural clitic is the benefactive (higher case), *mu* still stands closer to the verb because it is singular, whereas *ba* is plural. In (42b), only one reading is possible, as the second gloss violates BOTH the case and determinedness hierarchies. The con-

[15] Since Duranti (1979) demonstrates that person is stronger than case whereas animacy and case are equal in strength, this provides some motivation for separating our conflated PA hierarchy into two parts: (*a*) 1st > 2nd > 3rd, and (*b*) 3rd human > 3rd animal > 3rd inanimate.

clusion drawn by Duranti is that person is stronger than case or number, and that case = animacy = number. It is only when case and number COMBINE that their cumulative effect is equal in strength to person.

As far as access to clitic position is concerned, we have said that the subjectivization of a less animate referent can block the cliticization of a more animate referent. Logooli offers an exception to this rule, since sentences such as (43b) are ruled out in most Bantu languages:

(43) a. *Ichú'kúríá ch-a-ḿ-deek-er-w-a.*
food it-past-him-call-app-pass
'The food was cooked for him'.

b. *Isúguukú 'ẏ-á-ḿ-'rááŋg-ir-w-â*
feast it-PAST-him-call-APP-PASS
Lit., 'the feast was called him (for)'.

5. HISTORY OF OBJECT PROPERTIES

It is clear from the preceding discussion that there is considerable variation in how the object relation is treated by different Bantu languages. Not only do the actual criteria for object status vary from one Bantu language to the next, but so do the strategies or factors influencing which arguments will acquire these criteria. In distinguishing between the criteria themselves and the factors influencing the acquiring of these criteria, we hope to have employed a framework which can be applied with success to the typological study of the object relation in all parts of the Bantu zone.

One question that immediately arises is a historical one: Which one, if any, of the languages discussed here or in the literature represents the properties of objects in Proto-Bantu? For example, was Proto-Bantu a case-oriented or an animacy-oriented language? How many objects could occur in the same sentence in Proto-Bantu?

While certain phenomena appear to be recent innovations (e.g., the object agreement found in Swahili, Nyakyusa, and certain coastal languages [see Wald 1979]), the questions are complicated by a number of unresolved side issues which bear on the nature of objects in PB:

1. What was the function of extensions (e.g., the app) in PB?
2. What was the word order in PB?
3. How does PB relate to the rest of Benue- and Niger-Congo (higher order phyla to which it belongs)?

We shall briefly address only questions (1) and (2).

The app extension is perhaps central to the problem of reconstructing the object properties of the protolanguage. While it is apparently always the case that this extension "introduces" or "makes possible" a benefactive or recipient object, its other functions cannot be ignored. In particular, it frequently can introduce an instrument, as in Logooli and in ChiMwi:ni (Kisseberth and Abasheikh 1977), or a locative, as in Tunen (Dugast 1971) and Haya. In Haya, as seen in the following examples, the app extension can even result in a meaning difference (cf. also Trithart 1977).

(44) a. *N-ka-gw' ómú-nju.*
I-P_3-fall in -house
'I fell into the house'.
b. *N-ka-gw-el' ómú-nju.*
I-P_3-fall-app in -house
'I fell in the house'.

In (44b) the falling took place while I was in the house, while in (44a) I fell from outside *into* the house.[16] Similar additional examples show that the app extension allows one to "upgrade" a noun to being outside the scope (or selectional restrictions) of the verb. Thus, compare the two sentences in (45).

(45) a. *N-ka-bón-a kat' ómú-nju.*
I-P_3-see Kato in -house
'I saw Kato [while he was] in the house'.
b. *N-ka-bón-el-a kat' ómú-nju.*
I-P_3-see-APP Kato in -house
'I saw Kato [while I was] in the house'.

While it is the case in so many Bantu languages that the app extension introduces an object, it would be hard to argue that the locatives in (44b) and (45b) represent higher CASE relationships than those in (44a) and (45a). Rather, it is their relationship to the CLAUSE that is different: In the (a) sentences the locatives are part of the verb complement; in the (b) sentences they are not part of the verb complement, but rather relate to the entire proposition (including the subject's relationship to the action). Reconsidering sentences with an app extension introducing a benefactive or recipient argument, we can say that the app extension here

[16] Since the app extension is normally associated with the dative (recipient) case in Bantu, the parallel situation represented by the following German sentences is particularly striking: *Ich fiel in das [acc.] Haus* 'I fell into the house' versus *Ich fiel in dem [dat.] Haus* 'I fell in(side) the house'.

also elevates its object to being outside the verb complement (e.g., to cook food FOR someone). Thus, instead of saying that the app extension orients the verb toward the benefactive, we may say that it DISORIENTS the verb away from its (patient or locative) complement. In-depth analysis of the app extension in representative Bantu languages is a necessary prerequisite, then, to establishing the nature of the object in PB.

The same is true of word order. It has been hypothesized by Givón (1971) that the reason why the OM clitic position precedes the verb radical is that at an earlier stage PB was an SOV language. The older order is thus preserved when the object is a pronoun, but a new SVO order has come into being when the object is a noun. (The same SVO order is observed with pronouns in the northwestern part of the Bantu zone.) The question that is of relevance here concerns the relative chronology of the development of SVO word order and cliticization (as a criterion for object status). One weakness of Givón's reconstruction is that he has restricted his data base to only one sub-branch of Bantu, which, although admittedly covering a vast geographic expanse, is not representative of the whole family. Most of the languages of the numerous sub-branches of Northwest Bantu show little or no trace of clitics. An extreme example is Tunen, which, as reported by Dugast (1971), not only has full pronouns instead of clitics, but also has SOV word order even when the object is a noun! Two interesting observations about Tunen are (*a*) the presence of the same extensions found elsewhere in Bantu, and (*b*) the presence of preverbal tense markers preceding the object noun or pronoun. One of these concerns the same past tense marker seen earlier in the Haya and Sukuma examples:

(46) *Bá ká nekaka bílíhàni m"ɔ̀sɛ́ máléndólónum.*
they past meeting fixed days seven
'They fixed the meeting at seven days'.

There is considerable evidence that Tunen has innovated this SOV*X* word order, rather than (46) representing a remnant from the PB stage. In either case we would probably have to maintain that prefixed tense/aspect markers such as PB **kà* appeared as separate words rather than as part of what we know today as the agglutinative verbal complex. If this is correct, then it is also possible that PB did not have clitics—that is, that it either had full object pronouns or, more likely, that it only had [+human] object pronouns. The hierarchies that have been exposed in this paper would therefore have come into being as a result of innovating clitics and the OM position itself!

Although the evidence for this view is inconclusive at present, there are important signs in present-day NW Bantu languages that point to

such an interdependency between clitics and hierarchies. Consider Basaa, one such language spoken in Cameroon.[17] Basaa is an SVO language having the same extension system noted universally in Bantu. It differs from its easterly relatives, however, in having full pronouns occurring after the verbal complex, whether first, second, or third person. In (47)–(49) we apply our three tests of objecthood to the proposition 'I cooked food for the child'. [As there are no clitics, pronominalization will be substituted for cliticization in (48).]

(47) a. *Mɛ nlémbél máŋgé bijék.*
I cooked-app child food
'I cooked the child food'.

b. ?*Me nlémbél bíjék maŋgé* [*A*].
I cooked-app food child
'I cooked food (for) the child'.

(48) a. *Mɛ nlémbél nyé bijék (*bíjék nyé).*
I cooked-app him food food him
'I cooked him food'.

b. *Mɛ nlémbél gwɔ́ maŋgé / máŋgé gwɔ́.*
I cooked-app it child child it
'I cooked it (for) the child'.

c. *Mɛ nlémbél nyé gwɔ́.*
I cooked-app him it
'I cooked him it'.

d. **Mɛ nlémbél gwɔ́ nyé* [*R*].
I cooked-app it him
'I cooked it (for) him'. (=intended)
('I cooked him for it' = actual)

(49) a. **Maŋgé i nlémbná bíjék.*
child he was cooked-app food
'The child was cooked food'.

b. *Bijék bí ńlémbná máŋgé*
food it was cooked-app child
'Food was cooked (for) the child'.

The normal word order involving two noun objects is as seen in (47a): The benefactive precedes the patient. In (47b), where the two are reversed, ambiguity results between the intended meaning and the reading

[17] The Basaa materials were worked out in conjunction with Marie Anne Boum, to whom we are greatly indebted for this information.

'I cooked the child for the food'. In (48a) and (48b) we observe that the order "pronoun followed by noun" is always possible, and in addition, in (48b), the order "noun followed by pronoun" is acceptable if the noun is the benefactive and the pronoun the patient.[18] Sentence (50c) shows that both the benefactive and the patient can be pronominalized simultaneously, but as seen from the ungrammaticality of (48d) in its intended meaning, the order of the pronouns must be benefactive–patient. (The [R] indicates that only the reverse meaning is inferable, i.e., 'I cooked him for it'.) What is of crucial importance to our study of objecthood is the fact that only the patient can be subjectivized. The passive construction in (49a), where the benefactive has been made subject, is ungrammatical. The construction in (49b), on the other hand, with its patient subject, is completely acceptable. The generalization seems to be as follows: If a Bantu language has clitics, then the benefactive object has equal or greater access to subjectivization. (In fact, as we saw from the Sesotho test sentences, case relations often subside almost completely in the face of the PA hierarchy.) On the other hand, if a Bantu language does not have clitics, the patient object has exclusive access to subjectivization.[19] Thus, Bakundu is another Cameroonian language without clitics and has the same subjectivization properties as Basaa (Erhard Voeltz, personal communication), whereas Bakweri, a nearby Bantu language WITH clitics, looks very Haya-like in character (Hawkinson, personal communication). The conclusion is that, within Bantu as well as without, when a language has clitics, semantic hierarchies acquire an upper hand in determining object properties, while grammatical considerations step to the side.

[18] It should be noted that in Tunen, Basaa, Bakundu, Hunde, and other Bantu languages having full object pronouns, these pronouns are clearly derived from demonstratives as secondary and often independent developments.

[19] This statement needs to be tempered somewhat, since the verb 'to give' allows only its recipient object to subjectivize:

(i) *Maŋgé a ntí -bá bíjék.*
child he give-pass food
'The child was given food'.

(ii) **Bijék bí ńtí -bá máŋgé.*
food it give-pass child
'The food was given (to) the child'.

While the few verbs like 'to give' are oriented toward the recipient object in all of Bantu, only clitic languages have the property of orienting verbs extended by the app suffix toward the corresponding recipient or benefactive object. Perhaps this is a later innovation occasioned by the development of clitics?

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Colloque "Expansion Bantu" organized by the L.P. 3-121 team of the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique in Viviers, France (April 1977). We would like to acknowledge the considerable input of Mr. Ernest Byarushengo and Ms. Malillo Morolong, whose many insights into the analysis of their respective languages (Haya and Sesotho) have led to some of the positions taken in the present study. Research on comparative Bantu syntax, especially within the Cameroonian context, was supported in part by a National Science Foundation grant BNS76-81261.

REFERENCES

Byarushengo, E., L. Hyman, and S. Tenenbaum (1976) "Tone, Accent and Assertion in Haya," in L. Hyman, ed., *Studies in Bantu Tonology* (*Southern California Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 3), Department of Linguistics, University of Southern California, Los Angeles.

Byarushengo, E. and S. Tenenbaum (1976) "Agreement and Word Order: A Case for Pragmatics in Haya," *Proceedings of the Second Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 89–99.

Comrie, B. (1979) "Definite and Animate Direct Objects: A Natural Class," *Linguistica Silesiang* 3, 13–21.

Dalgish, G. (1976a) "Passivizing Locatives in Olutsootso," *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences* 6, 57–68.

Dalgish, G. (1976b) "Locative NPs, Locative Suffixes, and Grammatical Relations," in *Proceedings of the Second Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 139–148.

Dugast, I. (1971) *Grammaire du Tùnen* (Langues et Littératures de l'Afrique Noire VIII), Editions Klincksieck, Paris.

Duranti, A. (1976) "Contributi delle Lingue Bantu alla Teoria della Grammatica Relazionale," *Rivista de Grammatica Generativa* 1.3, 1–57.

Duranti, A. (1979) "Object Clitic Pronouns in Bantu and the Topicality Hierarchy," *Studies in African Linguistics* 10, 31–45.

Duranti, A. and E. Byarushengo (1977) "On the Notion of 'Direct Object'," in E. Byarushengo, A. Duranti, and L. Hyman, eds., *Haya Grammatical Structure* (*Southern California Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 6), Department of Linguistics, University of Southern California, Los Angeles.

Feltz, L. M. (1978) "On Indirect Objects in Universal Syntax," in D. Farkas, W. Jacobsen, *Papers from the Fourteenth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, Chicago Linguistics Society, University of Chicago.

Fox, B. (1981) "Body Part Syntax: Towards a Universal Characterization," *Studies in Linguistics*.

Gary, J. and E. L. Keenan (1977) "On Collapsing Grammatical Relations in Universal Grammar," in P. Cole and J. Saddock, eds., *Syntax and Semantics 8: Grammatical Relations*, Academic Press, New York.

Givón, T. (1971) "Historical Syntax and Synchronic Morphology: An Archeologist's Field Trip," in Chicago Linguistic Society, University of Chicago. *Papers from the Seventh Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*,

Givón, T. (1979) *On Understanding Grammar*, Academic Press, New York.

Hawkinson, A. and L. Hyman (1974) "Hierarchies of Natural Topic in Shona," *Studies in African Linguistics* 5, 147–170.

Hinnebusch, T. and R. Kirsner (1980) "On the Inference of 'Inalienable Possession' in Swahili," *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 2.1, 1–16.

Hopper, P. and S. Thompson (1980) "Transitivity in Grammar and Discourse," *Language* 56, 251–299.

Hyman, L. (1977) "The Syntax of Body Parts," in E. Byarushengo, A. Duranti, and L. Hyman, eds., *Haya Grammatical Structure* (*Southern California Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 6), Department of Linguistics, University of Southern California, Los Angeles.

Kimenyi, A. (1979) *A Relational Grammar of Kinyarwanda*, University of California Press, Los Angeles and Berkeley.

Kisseberth, C. and M. Abasheikh (1977) "The Object Relationship in Chi-Mwi:ni, a Bantu Language," in P. Cole and J. Saddock, eds., *Syntax and Semantics 8: Grammatical Relations*, Academic Press, New York.

Morolong, M. and L. Hyman (1977) "Animacy, Objects, and Clitics in Sesotho," *Studies in African Linguistics* 8, 199–218.

Polak-Bynon, L. (1975) *A Shi Grammar*, Musée Royal de l'Afrique Centrale, Tervuren.

Stucky, S. (1976) "Locatives as Objects in Tshiluba: A Function of Transitivity," *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences* 6, 174–202.

Tenenbaum, S. (1977a) "Left- and Right-Dislocation," in E. Byarushengo, A. Duranti, and L. Hyman, eds., *Haya Grammatical Structure* (*Southern California Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 6), Department of Linguistics, University of Southern California, Los Angeles.

Tenenbaum, S. (1977b) "On Reference in Haya," in E. O. Keenan and T. Bennett, eds., *Discourse across Time and Space* (*Southern California Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 5), Department of Linguistics, University of Southern California, Los Angeles.

Trithart, L. (1975) "Relational Grammar and Chichewa Subjectivization Rules," in R. Grossman, L. J. San, and T. J. Vance, eds., *Papers from the Eleventh Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, Chicago Linguistic Society, University of Chicago.

Trithart, L. (1976) *Relational Grammar and Chichewa Subjectivization Rules*, unpublished master's thesis, University of California, Los Angeles.

Trithart, L. (1977) "Locatives," in E. Byarushengo, A. Duranti, and L. Hyman, eds., *Haya Grammatical Structure* (*Southern California Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 6), Department of Linguistics, University of Southern California, Los Angeles.

Trithart, L. (1979) "Topicality: An Alternative to the Relational View of Bantu Passive," *Studies in African Linguistics* 10, 1–30.

Voeltz, E. (1976) "Inalienable Possession in Sotho," in L. Hyman, L. Jacobson, and R. Schuh, eds., *Papers in African Linguistics in Honor of Wm. E. Welmers* (*Studies in African Linguistics*, Supplement 6), 255–266.

Wald, B. (1979) "The Development of the Swahili Object Marker: A Study in the Interaction of Syntax and Discourse," in T. Givón, ed., *Syntax and Semantics, 12, Discourse and Syntax*, Academic Press, New York.