

Title	Objects and Object Markers in Lunyole
Author(s)	Miyazaki, Kumiko
Citation	スワヒリ&アフリカ研究. 2016, 27, p. 121-130
Version Type	VoR
URL	https://doi.org/10.18910/71120
rights	
Note	

Osaka University Knowledge Archive : OUKA

<https://ir.library.osaka-u.ac.jp/>

Osaka University

Objects and Object Markers in Lunyole

MIYAZAKI Kumiko

0. Introduction

In this paper, I reviewed the objects and object markers in Lunyole, focusing on their occurrence and its restrictions in different types of verbal constructions. In section 1, the grammar of Lunyole is overviewed. In section 2, the occurrence of objects and objects markers in Lunyole and its restriction which relates to animacy is discussed. In Lunyole there are some verbs which can take two objects and object markers. Data is examined in single object construction where a verb can take only one object and in double objects construction where a verb can take two objects. Finally in section 3, I discuss applicative construction in Lunyole, emphasising the animacy hierarchy in Lunyole applicative construction together with the grammatical function and various semantic roles of applied objects. In Bantu languages, applicative constructions are morphologically marked on the verb. The newly added objects (applied object) express semantic roles different from the ones base verbs are originally assigned. These applicative constructions have been of interest for researchers in terms of the status of those objects (either in symmetric or asymmetric languages), word order of objects and object markers in the constructions and animacy hierarchy (Bresnan & Moshi 1990, Shinagawa, Yoneda 2008, among others). Using these criteria as parameters, studies have been conducted on the morpho-syntactic variation (Lutz 2007, Shinagawa 2015).

Lunyole is spoken in the Butaleja district, Tororo prefecture, in the eastern part of Uganda¹. The data presented in this study was collected by the author in Namulo village of Butaleja district in Uganda². Studies by Wondela (2004) and Douglas (2006) are examples of the literature on Lunyole grammar.

1. Lunyole grammar overview

The Lunyole verbal construction is as follows. The underlined elements are always required.

(1) PreSM/NEG₁-SM-NEG₂-TAM-OM/REL-Verb Root-Verbal Extensions-FV-PreF³

¹ According to Guthrie's classification, Lunyole is classified as E33.

² The research was conducted during August–September in 2004 and in February in 2006. The research was supported by JSPS KAKENHI(Grant Number 13301027, KAJI Shigeki) and the Sasakawa Scientific Research Grant. The data may include any mistake and can be collected after further research.

³ Abbriations in this paper are 1, 2, 3 ...: noun class number, although the number before SG/PL stands for person(1st, 2nd and 3rd) 1SG/1PL: 1st person singular/1st person plural., APPL: Applicative, CAUS: Causative, FV: Final Vowel, INF: Infinitive, Neg: Negative marker (NEG₁ precedes SM. NEG₂ is used in

in (5)⁵.

- (5) a. hu-η-a ómw-aná áma-téma.
SM1PL-give-FV 1-child 6-banana
‘We gave children bananas.’
b. * hu-η-a áma-téma ómw-aná.
SM1PL-give-FV 6-banana 1-child

Both of these objects can be marked by object markers at the same time, and object markers which agree with a direct object precede the one which concurs with an indirect object marker as shown in (6).

- (6) a. hu-ga-mú-η-a.
SM1PL-6OM-1OM-give-FV
‘We gave them (6-banana) him/her (1-child).’
b. *hu-mu-ga-η-a.
SM1PL-1OM-6OM-give-FV

As already seen in 2.1, in the simple verbal construction, object noun cannot occur together with object markers and this restriction does not relate to animacy of object nouns. However the rule differs in double objects construction where a verb takes two objects. Depending on the animacy of object nouns there is a restriction on co-occurrence of objects and object markers. When objects nouns are [+animate], these objects nouns generally co-occur with object markers as shown in (7a), although these object markers are not always required when the object nouns which concord are understood out of the context as shown in (7b). When object nouns are [–animate], these object nouns and objects markers cannot co-occur as shown in examples (7c) and (7d).

- (7) a. hu-ga-mu-η-a ómw-aná.
SM1PL-6OM-1OM-give-FV 1-child
‘We gave them(6-banana) to child.’
b. hu-ga-η-a ómw-aná.
SM1PL-6OM-give-FV 1-child
‘We gave them(6-banana) to child.’

⁵ There is not sufficient data to show if the priority of the animacy of the object relates to this word order or indirect object always has to precede direct object without depending on their animacy or animacy level.

- c. hu-mu-ŋ-a áma-téma.
 SM1PL-1OM-give-FV 6-banana
 ‘We gave bananas to him/her.’
- d. *hu-ga-mu-ŋ-a áma-téma.
 SM1PL-6OM-1OM-give-FV 6-banana
 ‘We gave bananas to him/her.’

2.3. In Applicative Construction

In Lunyole, applicatives are morphologically marked on the verb. The Lunyole applicative marker *-il* appears after the verb root. The applicative marker *-il* becomes *-el* according to the vowel harmony.

As in many Bantu languages, applicative construction in Lunyole licenses the introduction of a new object (applied object⁶). An intransitive verb can also license the verb to have an object as it is shown in (8b). These newly introduced object nouns cannot occur together with object markers and this restriction does not relate to animacy of object nouns as it is shown in examples (8b) and (8d).

- (8) a. ómw-ana a-dúlúm- á.
 1-child SM1SG-run-FV
 ‘He runs’
- b. ómw-ana a-dulum-il-a nina.
 1-child SM1SG-run-APPL-FV 1.mother
 ‘He/she runs toward his/her mother.’
- c. ába-aná ba-líl-ílé.
 2-child SM2-cry-PF.
 ‘Children cried.’
- d. ába-aná ba-líl-íl-ílé éhi-téteí.
 2-child SM2-cry-APPL-PF 7-dress
 ‘Children cried for a dress.’

A Transitive verb can have two objects after introducing new object. In the examples, (9a) shows that the object of the verb *-soma* ‘read’ is *ehitaabo* ‘a book’. As it is shown in (9b), the applicative verb introduces the new object *Tom* in the construction.

⁶ In this paper, newly introduced object is called ‘applied object’ and the object to the base verb is called ‘base object’. For example, in (8b), Tom is applied object and *ehí-táábó* in (8a) and (8b) is base object.

(13) a.	Máma	a-hub-íl-á	ómw-íbi	é-simbó.
	1.Mother	1SM-hit-APPL-FV	1-thief	9-stick
	‘Mother hit a thief with stick.’			
b.	*Máma	a-hub-íl-á	é-simbó	ómw-íbi.
	1.Mother	1SM-hit-APPL-FV	9-stick	1-thief
(14) a.	Máma	a-hub-íl-á	ómu-sóta	é-simbó.
	1.Mother	1SM-hit-APPL-FV	3-snake	9-stick
	‘Mother hit a snake with stick.’			
b.	*Máma	a-hub-íl-á	é-simbó	ómu-sóta.
	1.Mother	1SM-hit-APPL-FV	9-stick	3-snake

The phenomenon which is illustrated with examples above has no restriction depending on the semantic role of the applied objects as shown in example (15) and (16)¹⁰. These are the examples in benefactive applicative.

(15) a.	n-á-lang-il-a	ába-aná	ésh-ohúlya
	SM1SG-PAST-call-APPL-FV	2-child	7-meal
	‘I called the children for the meal’		
b.*	n-á-lang-il-a	ésh-ohúlya	ába-aná
	SM1SG-PAST-call-APPL-FV	7-meal	2-child
	‘(I called the children for the meal)’		
cf. (16) a.	n-á-lang-il-a	ómu-somésa	ába-aná
	SM1SG-PAST-call-APPL-FV	1-teacher	2-child
	‘I called the teacher for a child’		
b.	*n-á-lang-il-a	ába-aná	ómu-somésa
	SM1SG-PAST-call-APPL-FV	2-child	1-teacher
	‘(I called the teacher for a child)’		

In addition the same word order rule applies to the order of double object markers as shown in (17).

¹⁰ In Lunyole, newly introduced applied objects are given various semantic roles, such as beneficiary, reason/motive, location, direction, instrument and idiomatic use. Sometimes, depending on the context, the semantic roles can be more than one.

- (17) a. n-á-hi-mu-gul-il-a
SM1SG-PAST-7OM-1OM-buy-APPL-FV
'I bought it for him'
- b. *n-á-mu-hi-gul-il-a
SM1SG-PAST-3OM-7OM-buy-APPL-FV

As shown in (17a), object marker which agrees with a base object precedes the one which agrees with applied object.

4. Conclusions

In this paper, I reviewed the objects and object markers in Lunyole, focusing on their occurrence and its restrictions in three different types of constructions. In the construction where a verb takes single object, object nouns and object markers cannot co-occur. The animacy of the object nouns, whether they are [+animacy] or [-animacy] does not make any difference in the restriction. However, in the double objects construction where a verb can take two objects nouns, there is a difference in restriction on co-occurrence of the object nouns and object markers. In the double object construction, restrictions on co-occurrence relates to animacy. When objects nouns are [+animate], these objects nouns generally co-occur with object markers, although these object markers are not always required when the object nouns are understood out of the context. When object nouns are [-animate], these object nouns and objects markers cannot co-occur.

In the last section I overviewed the applicatives in Lunyole, focusing on animacy hierarchy of objects. Lunyole is, typically, an asymmetry object language, but it is restricted to an animacy hierarchy of objects. There is a [+animate] > [-animate] hierarchy in Lunyole, and this hierarchy has greater priority than the syntactic hierarchy of objects. It is clear that there is a hierarchy between [+animate] and [-animate], but there is a possibility of a hierarchy between [human] > [animal] > [things] or [non-human]. There is insufficient data to examine this case, and further research is required. In the applicative construction, object markers and object nouns do not occur together and the restriction does not relate to the animacy of the object nouns. Again, the data is not insufficient to examine the detail as mentioned earlier. In addition, in this paper, I only discussed the applicative which can be formed with verbal extensions. As Lutz (2014) demonstrates, there can be other applicative forms which can be constructed with a locative marker. Although the data available is limited, there are examples of locative markers that are used in applicative construction in Lunyole. With the data from further research, I will discuss these phenomena in other papers.

References

- Bresnan, J and L. Moshi. 1993. Object Asymmetries in Comparative Bantu Syntax, In Mchombo, S. (ed), *Theoretical aspects of Bantu Grammar*, Cambridge University Press pp. 47-91.
- Douglas Allen Wicks. 2006. *A Partial Grammar Sketch of Lunyole with Emphasis on the Applicative Construction(s)*, Master thesis, Biola University.
- Hyman, L and A. Duranti 1982. On the object relation in Bantu, In Hopper, P. and S. Thompson (eds.) *Studies in Transitivity* (Syntax and Semantics 15), Academia, pp. 217-239.
- Marten, L. and N. C. Kula 2014. Benefactive and substitutive applicatives in Bemba, *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 35(1): 1-44
- Marten, L., N. C. Kula and T. Nhlanhla 2007. Parameters of morphosyntactic variation in Bantu, *Transaction of the Philological Society* 105, pp. 253-358
- Marten, L. 2003. The dynamics of Bantu applied verbs : an analysis at the syntax-pragmatics interface, In Lévikaza, Kézié K., (ed.), *Actes du 3e Congrès Mondial de Linguistique Africaine Lomé 2000*. Köln: Köppe, pp. 207-221.
- Schadeberg, Thilo C. 2003. Derivation, In Derek Nurse & Gérard Phillipson (eds). *The Bantu Languages*, 71-89. London: Routledge.
- Shinagawa, Daisuke. 2015. A tentative analysis on typological microvariation in Kilimanjaro Bantu. Abstract for 8th World Congress of African Linguistics, Kyoto, p.29
- Yoneda, Nobuko and Daisuke Shinagawa. 2008, Typology of Bantu applicative verbs and objectivities in Bantu. Abstract for The 137st Meeting of the Linguistic Society of Japan.
- Wandera, E. 2004. *Tense, Aspect and Mood in Lunyole Grammar and Narrative Discourse*. Master thesis, Nairobi Evangelical Graduate School of Theology, Nairobi.