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Research in Bantu languages has revealed Topicality Hierarchies (TH) for NP arguments which follow certain parameters (person, function, animacy) and which determine relative likelihood that an NP will be available for various syntactic processes. In some Bantu languages, a verb complex may take more than one prefixed Object Marker (OM). Two Bantu languages where this is possible, Shambala and Haya, are investigated to see if the order of the OM's correlates in any way with TH's. It is found for both languages that NP's with "higher TH status" will govern OM's closer to the verb stem than those lower in the hierarchies. In cases where different TH's are in conflict, the languages differ: Shambala simply does not permit conflicting combinations, but Haya weighs the different factors to establish relative strength of TH combinations which will govern order. A Flexibility Principle allows some freedom of order among "low status" NP's.
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1. Introduction

The discussion of a so-called "Topicality Hierarchy" (hereafter TH) started a few years ago with a paper by Hawkinson and Hyman [1974] on a Bantu language, Shona. It examined the degrees to which different types of NP arguments were allowed to undergo Passivization. More recently, Morolong and Hyman [1977] have shown that the same hierarchy is at work with respect to other linguistic rules, e.g. Object Agreement in Sesotho. These works show that there are certain grammatical processes in Bantu languages that "favor" certain kinds of NP types (or Referents) over others. That is, given more than one "candidate" to undergo (or trigger) a certain rule, certain types of NP arguments will be "more likely" to do it than others. One version of the TH is here reproduced in (1) below. I have changed some of the names of the features involved in order to achieve more consistency, e.g. I have replaced "Dative" and "Accusative" with "Goal" and "Patient" respectively to be consistent with "Benefactive" and "Instrument", which are usually considered as "semantic cases", whereas "Dative" and "Accusative" are more often used for surface cases:

(1) a. 1st > 2nd > 3rd
   b. Benefactive > Goal > Patient > Instrument/Locative
   c. Human > Animate > Inanimate

The sign > stands for "more likely to undergo/trigger certain grammatical processes than". I have left the relationship between Instrument and Locative unspecified because I do not think there is enough evidence of either one being "higher" than the other. The TH must be interpreted in a "loose" way so that not every language for which it is at work must draw all the distinctions made in (1). That is, a language may "collapse" any number (probably never more than two) of subsequent features along any branch of the hierarchy. Thus, a language may treat Benefactive and Goal or first and second person, or animate and human in the same way. In such cases the TH would read Benefactive/Goal > Patient ...; 1st/2nd > 3rd; animate > inanimate. However, no language should in any case reverse the features, e.g. no language should behave so that Patient > Benefactive, or 3rd > 1st/2nd, etc.

In this paper I will examine a number of properties of pronominal infixes in two Bantu languages (Shambala and Haya) and show that they follow the TH. More specifically, I will demonstrate that the sequential order and the combinability, i.e. which ones can cooccur, of the pronouns in the verb complex can be predicted on the basis of the ranks defined by the TH. Although I will here examine in detail only two languages, I believe the relevance of the TH with respect to pronominalization phenomena to be a characteristic of Narrow Bantu as a whole.

2. Defining "Object Clitic Pronouns"

It is typical of Narrow Bantu languages, given the appropriate pragmatic conditions, to express certain NP arguments of the verb by means
of pronominal infixes, which appear in the verb complex between the tense marker and the verb stem, as illustrated in the examples below:

NYAKYUSA (Tanzania)

(2) a. Ambwene j - ku- lya inguku he- PR - eat chicken 'Ambwene is eating a/the chicken'
b. Ambwene j - ku- jì- lya he- PR - it- eat 'Ambwene is eating it'

KIMBUNDU (Angola)

(3) a. Ngunza w - a - lambe o kudya he- PST- cook the food 'Ngunza has cooked the food'
b. Ngunza w - a - ku - !ambe he- PST- it- cook 'Ngunza has cooked it'

SHONA (Zimbabwe)

(4) a. nda- ka- pa mwana tsamba I - PST- give child letter 'I gave the child the letter'
b. nda- ka- mu- pa tsamba I - PST- him- give letter 'I gave him the letter'
c. nda- ka- i- pa mwana I - PST- it- give child 'I gave it to the child'

These pronominal infixes follow the rules of Bantu nominal concord system (cf. Weimers [1975:ch.6]), that is, they agree in noun class with the "corresponding" noun. Thus, ji in (2b) is class 9 like inguku 'chicken', ku in (3b) is class 15 like kudya 'food' (lit. 'to eat'), mu in (4b) is class 1 like mwana 'child', and i in (4c) is class 9 like tsamba 'letter'. I will refer to these infixes as "object clitic pronouns" (OC). The term "object" was primarily chosen to distinguish these pronominal forms from the Subject agreement prefixes (see examples above), which very often have the same phonological shape (except for class 1 and class 9). But I also believe that the types of NP arguments that can be expressed by such pronouns form a coherent set which has been identified as the grammatical role of "object" in Bantu (see Hyman, Duranti and Morolong [in press]).

In the interlinear glosses I will use the following abbreviations:
PR = present tense, PST = past tense, FUT = future tense, A = aspect marker (Bantu "final vowel"), APP = Applicative suffix, INST = Instrumental suffix, LOC = Locative suffix. I wish to thank Prof. Jan Vorhoeve for pointing out to me some inadequacies in my transcription of Nyakyusa, Mshihiri Juma Abukabar for the Shambala examples, and Ernest Byarushengo for the Haya data. I would also like to thank Annarita Puglielli for having hosted in her Linguistics Department in Rome my Field Methods Course on Kimbundu in the academic year 1976-77.

This is actually an oversimplification. See Wald [1975].
All the above examples show OCP's that express "basic" objects, that is, non-subject arguments whose semantic role and existence is implied by the verb in its "basic" form, i.e. with no "semantic markers". Examples (5) - (7) below show cases of non-basic objects whose semantic role is coded on the verb through semantic markers:

KIMBUNDU

(5) a. o muhatu w - a - lambe o shitu phala o mona  
the woman she- PS1- cook the meat for the child  
'the woman cooked the meat for the child'

b. *o muhatu w - a - mu- lambe o shitu (phala)  

himm
'the woman cooked the meat for him'

c. o muhatu w - a - mu- lamb- el- a o shitu  
himm- cook- APP-A
'the woman has cooked (for) him the meat'

SESOTHO [Morolong and Hyman 1977]

(6) a. ke -phehetse mokete lijo  
I -cooked/APP feast food  
'I cooked-for feast food'

b. ke -o -phehetse lijo  
I -it -cooked/APP food  
'I cooked-for it food'

SHONA

(7) nda- ka- ri-chek - es- a nyama  
I -PST- it-cut -INST-A meat  
'I cut-with it the meat'

Notice that when one tries to cliticize a prepositional phrase, keeping the verb unmarked with respect to that particular semantic relation, i.e. with no semantic markers as in (5b), the resulting structure is unacceptable. Cliticization of the object is instead possible if the verb has the Applicative suffix (APP), as in (5c) or (6), or the Instrumental suffix, as in the Shona example (7).

All the examples given so far are taken from languages that can have only one OCP at a time in the verb complex. There are, however, also languages that can have more than one OCP in the same verb form. Thus, Lomongo [Hulstaert 1965], Kirundi [Satukuru/Stevick, n.d.], Umbundu [Valente 1964], and Shambala can have two OCP's, and languages like KinyaRwanda [Kimenyi 1976] and Haya [Duranti and Byarusheng'o 1977] can have more than two OCP's in the same verb complex. Here are a few examples:

KIRUNDI [Satukuru/Stevick n.d.]

(8) nzoo- ki- kw- iiiza  
I/FUT- it- you -teach  
'I'll teach it to you'
As noticed by some linguists, e.g. Hulstaert [1965], Grégoire [1975], Kimenyi [1976], when a language allows more than one pronoun in the same verb complex, the sequential orders of the OCP's are often constrained and reduced to fewer combinations than the ones theoretically possible. Thus, there is a tendency for the first person singular (usually a nasal consonant) to occur next to the verb stem, regardless of its semantic role. As shown below, this explains why structures like (9) and (11) are ambiguous.

In what follows, I will examine in detail the principles according to which the proper sequences of OCP's are determined in Shambala and in Haya. These two languages allow basically the same sequential orders (although Shambala can have no more than two and Haya up to four OCP's), but they deal quite differently with conflicting cases, e.g. in the case of two pronouns where one should occur in one slot because of its status in one hierarchy and in another slot because of its status in another hierarchy.

3. **Shambala**

I will now describe the sequential orders found in Shambala when two object clitic pronouns cooccur according to the following categories/features: (A) Person (first, second, or third); (B) Semantic Role (Patient, Benefactive, Instrument, etc.); (C) Humanness (nonhuman or human); (D) Number (plural or singular).
Further constraints: (i) First and second person pronouns cannot cooccur in the same verb complex; (ii) no other OCP can cooccur with a reflexive OCP; (iii) no sequence of two identical pronouns is allowed, e.g. *wa-wa; *mu-mu; *ji-ji, etc.

(14) GENERAL STRATEGY FOR CONFLICTING CASES (strong version):
When a conflict arises among the prescribed preferred orders (A) - (D) in (13), the sequence of clitics is ruled out.

I will now illustrate the way in which (13) and (14) work. Consider the following examples:

(15) a. a -za -m -ni-et -e -a 's/he has brought him to me'
   s/he-PST-him-me-bring-APP-A *'s/he has brought me to him'

   b. *a -za -ni- mw- et -e -a 's/he has brought me to him'
      me- him

   c. a -za -ni- eta kwa yeye 's/he has brought me to him'
      s/he-PST-me- bring to him

In (15) we can see both (A) Person and (B) Semantic Role at work. Because of (A), only (15a) is acceptable and because of (Bi) only one interpretation is possible, i.e. in accordance with the general principle stated in (14) the reading in which the first person pronoun (ni) is a Patient is ruled out. The only way for having a third person Goal and first person Patient expressed by pronouns is given in (15c), with an OCP for the first person Patient and an independent pronoun for the third person Goal. (Notice that in this case there is no Applicative suffix on the verb, since the coding of the Goal role is done by means of a preposition.)

The examples below show the relevance of (C) Humanness, and (D) Number for the sequential order of two OCP's:

(16) a. na- i -mw- itang- i -a  'I call it (meeting) for him'
    I - it-him-call -APP-A  *'I call him for it'

   b. *na-mw- i- itang- i -a  'I call him for it'
      I -him-it-call -APP-A  'I call it for him'

(17) a. a- i- wa- mw -et -e -e 's/he brought them to him'
    s/he-PST-them-him-bring-APP-A *'s/he brought him to them'
b. *a - i - mw- wa- e† - e - e  
   him- them  
   's/he brought them to him'  
   's/he brought him to them'  

c.  a - i - mw- e† - i - e kwa wao  
   s/he-PST-him-bring-PST-A to them  
   's/he brought him to them'  

(18)  a -ya - i - dik -i - a  
   she-PR-him-it-cook-APP-A  
   'she cooks them for it'  

Examples (16a,b) show that nonhuman referent pronouns must occur before human ones according to (C) in (13). The reading of the human pronoun being the Patient and the nonhuman one the Goal is ruled out by (B) in (13). Examples (17a,b) and (18) show that, given a plural and a singular, the order must be the one prescribed in (D), namely Plural - Singular. Here too, violations of the sequence constraints are ruled out, i.e. in (17a) the plural pronoun wa, which comes first, must be the Patient, and the singular mu must be the Goal. Example (17c) shows that if the plural pronoun is the Goal, it must be expressed by a prepositional phrase with an independent pronoun.

The order Instrument - Patient (Bii) is illustrated in example (10) above, which also follows the Humanness order (cf. (C) in (13)). I reproduce here example (10) as (19):

(19)  a - a -ji -m -kom - e - a  
   he - PR-it -him-kill -APP-A  
   'he kills-with it him'  

A different type of example is provided in (20), which follows the Instrument - Patient order but violates the Plural - Singular prescribed order:

(20)  a -a -ji-zi -chinj -i - a  
   he-PR-it-them-slaughter-APP-A  
   'he slaughters them with it'  

Example (20) clearly violates the general principle for dealing with conflicting cases, as it was stated in (14) above. We will have to say that in such cases the Semantic Role order constraint (Bii) is "stronger" than the Number constraint (D) (as I will discuss below, this is also the case for Haya). This means that, unless some other explanation can be found that would justify this exception to (14), we will have to restate that principle in terms of a "preferred" strategy more than an "absolute" one.3

What is interesting, however, is that

3Shambals would then turn out to be not completely consistent in dealing with conflicting cases. Given that exceptions can probably be found to any rule or universal of human languages (in fact we know from language typology studies that languages are often inconsistent with respect to alleged ideal "types") the phenomenon discussed here will not be the first nor the last stretching along a continuum of some kind. To
there seems to be some consistency within the exceptions. That is, as will be demonstrated below, violations of the sequential order constraints, when they occur, tend to occur with certain kinds of pronouns more than with others.

Let us go back now to the Topicality Hierarchy. As is apparent from the way the TH and the sequential (linear) order constraints are stated in (1) and (13) respectively, the two are in a "mirror image" relationship. That is, whereas Patient appears to the left of Benefactive in (13), it appears to the right of it in (1), and whereas the persons are listed as third before second and first in (13), third person is the last one in (1).

In what sense then is the actual linear order of the morphemes related to the hierarchical order of their features? I like to think of the slot next to the verb stem (the slot furthest to the right in (13)) as the "high status" place. This means that, given two pronouns, the one that is higher in the TH is the one that will be more likely to be in the slot immediately before of the verb stem. In this way, the ranking given by the TH allows us to predict, between two pronouns which one is going to be immediately before the verb stem and which one is going to be in the other position. If a language allows more than two pronouns, the higher the status of the pronoun the closer to the verb stem it should get. This means that the Number branch of the TH will have to read

\[(1) \ d. \ \text{Singular} > \text{Plural}\]

We can return now to the violations of the sequential order constraints. The cases that do not conform to the prescribed orders tend to involve pronouns whose features are rather "low" in the Topicality Hierarchy. This tendency can be stated in the following principle:

\[(21) \ \text{THE FLEXIBILITY PRINCIPLE:}\]

Low status pronouns are looser about rules than high status pronouns.

The violations illustrated in (20), for instance, involve an Instrument and a Patient and third person inanimate referents. They are all quite low status features in the TH given in (1). In KinyaRwanda, Kimenyi [1976] cites the case of the locative clitic pronoun ha, which seems able to wander around in different spots ignoring the prescribed orders. In Haya, as I will discuss below, inanimate referent pronouns are looser with respect to some of the principles, e.g. Semantic Role order, and can appear in different orders.

us, it will be satisfying to say that the strategy outlined in (14) is adequate enough to deal with the great majority of the possible combinations and therefore should be maintained as a valid generalization until (and if) a better one is found.

"There seems to be evidence outside Bantu as well that even the most
4. Haya

As mentioned earlier, Haya allows more than two OCP's at the same time in the verb complex. An example of four OCP's is given in (22):

(22) ya- gi-ba -mu -siig -il -il- a- mu
he/PST-it- it-them-him-smear -APP-APP-A -LOC

'he smeared it (ga) on them (ba) for him (mu) in it (gi)'

However, since examples like (22) above seem to be quite rare (native speakers seem also to have a hard time decoding them), I will discuss the sequential orders for Haya mainly on the basis of verb forms with two clitic pronouns.

Here are the sequential orders of OCP's for Haya, given according to (A) Person, (B) Semantic Role, (C) Humanness, (D) Number.

(23)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(A)</th>
<th>3RD</th>
<th>2ND</th>
<th>1ST</th>
<th>VERB STEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>INSTRUMENTAL/PATIENT</td>
<td>GOAL/BENEFACTIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td>VERB STEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>NONHUMAN</td>
<td>HUMAN</td>
<td></td>
<td>VERB STEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>PLURAL</td>
<td>SINGULAR</td>
<td></td>
<td>VERB STEM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both the features involved and the orders prescribed for Haya are more or less the same as those illustrated above for Shambala, with the following differences: (i) first, second, and third person pronouns can cooccur, though, in the plural, Haya has the same morpheme for 2nd and 3rd person, i.e. ba can mean either 'you(pl.)' or 'them'; (ii) the reflexive pronoun (ye or e , according to the phonological environment) can cooccur with other clitic pronouns (I will discuss its order with respect to the other OCP's in 4.5 below); (iii) sequences of morphologically identical clitic pronouns are allowed, e.g. ba-ba, mu-mu, etc.; (iv) I found no evidence for ranking Instrument and Patient with respect to each other. Furthermore, an important difference between the two languages lies in the way they deal with conflicting cases. Whereas Shambala tends to avoid conflicting cases by simply ruling out such sequences as unacceptable, Haya establishes a rank among the different features (A) - (D) and decides each time which pronoun is going to "win" the higher status slot. This is stated in (24):

(24) GENERAL STRATEGY FOR CONFLICTING CASES:

When a conflict arises among any of the prescribed orders in (23), rank their status according to the features involved.

rigid systems must allow some "black sheep" pronouns to wander around. Vattuone [1977], for instance, must posit an optional Accusative Forward rule in his otherwise beautifully worked out system for Zenejze (Genoese). Something similar happens in Shambala, where the pronoun wa 'them', when expressing the Semantic Role Patient, can be switched to a position that should not otherwise assume.
4.1. **Person and Semantic Role.** Consider the following examples:

(24) a. a -ka -mu- n-deet- ela
   he-PST-him-me-bring-APP
   'he brought him to me'
   'he brought me to him'

   b. *a -ka- n- mu- leet- ela
      me-him
      'he brought me to him'
      'he brought him to me'

(25) a. a -ka -ku- n-deet- ela
   he-PST-you sing-me-bring-APP
   'he brought you to me'
   'he brought me to you'

   b. *a -ka- n- ku- deet - ela
      me-you
      *'he brought him to me'

(26) a. a -ka- mu- ku- leet- ela
   him-you
   'he brought you to you'
   'he brought you to him'

   b. *a -ka -ku -mu -leet - ela
      you-him

Examples (24a,b) show that given first and third person singular/human pronouns, it is the first person singular pronoun (n) that gets the slot immediately before the verb stem, and the other order is not acceptable, regardless of Semantic Role. This means that since the reading with the first person pronoun as the Patient is still possible in (24a), Person is stronger than Semantic Role. That is, the order of the pronouns is still **third - first** even if the third person pronoun expresses a Goal and the first person pronoun expresses a Patient. The same thing happens with second (ku) and first person, and with second and third (mu), as illustrated in (25a,b) and in (26a,b). This can be summarized in the statement **PERSON > SEMANTIC ROLE.**

4.2. **Semantic Role and Number.** Haya assigns to Semantic Role and Number the same ranking, that is, **SEMANTIC ROLE = NUMBER.** This means that given two pronouns, if one should get into the slot next to the verb because it is higher in the Semantic Role Hierarchy (e.g. Goal > Patient) and the other should get in the same spot because of the Number Hierarchy, both possible orders will be acceptable. This is shown in (27):

(27) a. a -ka -ba -mu -leet- ela
    he-PST-them-him-bring-APP
    'he brought them to him'
    'he brought him to them'

    b. a -ka - mu - ba -leet - ela
       him-them
       *'he brought them to him'

---

*I will use the same verb (okuleeta 'to bring) over and over again simply to help the reader to follow the discussion without having to pay too much attention to the glosses. It is, however, implied that what is said about the examples with that verb should be true for other Haya verbs as well.*
Thus, in (27e,h) both orders Singular - Plural (mu-ba) and Plural - Singular (ba-mu) are possible when the plural (ba) is the Goal, but only one order, viz. Plural - Singular (ba-mu), is possible when the plural is Patient and the singular is Goal.

4.3. Humanness and Semantic Role. I will now show Humanness and Semantic Role are also ranked in the same way, that is HUMANNESS = SEMANTIC ROLE. That Humanness does play a role in determining the order of the OCP's can be demonstrated by the following examples:

(28) a. a-ka-ki-gu-shaza 'he cut it(ki) with it(gu)', he-PST-it-it-cut+INST
b. a-ka-gu-ki-shaza 'he cut it(ki) with it(gu)',
(29) a. a-ka-ki-mu-teeza 'he hit him(mu) with it(ki)', he-PST-it-him-hit+INST
b. *a-ka-mu-ki-teeza 'he hit him(mu) with it(ki)',

Whereas the order of Instrument and Patient is not fixed when the two are expressed by pronouns from nonhuman noun classes, as in (28a,b), only one order is acceptable, viz. non-human - human, if the Patient is a person, expressed by the noun class 1 OCP mu, as shown in (29a,b).

Examples (30a,b) show that Humanness and Semantic Role are given the same rank, so that, other things being equal, two orders are possible when there is a conflict only between those two features:

(30) a. a-ka-bi-ba-leet-ela 'he brought them(bi) to them(ba)', he-PST-them-them-bring+APP
   non-hum-hum (bi = inanimate; ba = human)
   'he brought them(bi) to them(ba)'
b. a-ka-ba-bi-leet-ela 'he brought them(ba) to them(bi)',
   *he brought them(bi) to them(ba)'

Example (30a) is ambiguous because the pronoun ba (noun class 2, human) can either be in the slot next to the verb stem because of its Semantic Role, Goal, or because of its Humanness. Example (30b), on the other hand, is accepted only in the case in which the human pronoun ba is the Patient and the inanimate pronoun bi (noun class 8) is the Goal. The starred reading ('he brought them (inanimate) to them (human)') would in fact violate both the Semantic Role and the Humanness hierarchies.

4.4. Person, Semantic Role and Number. Given the three features Person, Semantic Role and Number at play at the same time, it turns out that Person is the strongest one and can be counterbalanced only by both Semantic Role and Number combined together. This is shown in the following examples:
(31) a. a-ka-tu-mu-leetela
   \[
   \text{us-} \ \text{him}
   \]
   \(\text{he brought us to him}\)
   *\(\text{he brought him to us}\)
   
   b. a-ka-mu-tu-leetela
   \[
   \text{him-} \ \text{us}
   \]
   \(\text{he brought us to him}\)
   *\(\text{he brought him to us}\)

(32) a. a-ka-\(tu\)-ku-leetela
   \[
   \text{us-} \ \text{you sing.}
   \]
   \(\text{he brought us to you}\)
   *\(\text{he brought you to us}\)
   
   b. a-ka-\(ku\)-\(tu\)-leetela
   \[
   \text{you sg-} \ \text{us}
   \]
   \(\text{he brought you to us}\)
   *\(\text{he brought you to us}\)

Sentence (31a) is acceptable only if the third person singular pronoun (\(mu\)) is the Goal, whereas (31b) is ambiguous. That is, the third person pronoun needs to be higher both in the Number and in the Semantic Role hierarchies in order to take the "high status" slot (next to the verb stem), whereas the first person pronoun (\(tu\)) is allowed to get there no matter what its Semantic Role and Number. Let me try to illustrate this in a different way.

There are theoretically two possible readings for each order (\(tu-mu\) and \(mu-tu\)). I will illustrate them below, assigning to each pair of features a plus (+) or a minus (-). If they follow the hierarchies they get a plus, if they violate it, they get a minus:

(31a) i. \(tu - mu\)

   (A) 1st - 3rd (-)
   (B) Pat. - Goal (+)
   (D) Pl. - Sg. (+)

   (31a) ii. \(tu - mu\)

   (A) Goal - Pat. (-)
   (B) 1st - 3rd (-)
   (D) Pl. - Sg. (+)

(31b) i. \(mu - tu\)

   (A) 3rd - 1st (+)
   (B) Goal - Pat. (-)
   (D) Sg. - Pl. (-)

   (31b) ii. \(mu - tu\)

   (A) 3rd - 1st (+)
   (B) Pat. - Goal (+)
   (D) Sg. - Pl. (-)

In (31ai) both the Semantic Role and the Number hierarchies are respected, but the Person hierarchy is violated. Since the sequence is acceptable, we do not know whether this means that Semantic Role and Number are stronger than or equal to Person. But (31bi) clears our doubts. Since the inverse order is also acceptable, it must be that \(\text{PERSON} = \text{SEMANTIC ROLE} + \text{NUMBER}\).

In (31aii), on the other hand, Semantic Role and Person are violated and Number is respected. The sequence is unacceptable. This means that Number by itself cannot win over Person and Semantic Role together, whereas the latter two can win over Number, as shown in (31bii). We have then evidence for another ranking (which logically follows from the one stated above): \(\text{PERSON} + \text{SEMANTIC ROLE} > \text{NUMBER}\).
The latter two principles hold also for examples (32a,b).

Another logical consequence of Person being counterbalanced only by both Semantic Role and Number together is that Semantic Role should not be able to win out over Person and Number together (this also follows from the principle given in 4.1 above): PERSON + NUMBER > SEMANTIC ROLE. This can be demonstrated by examples like (33a,b) which involve the first person singular pronoun:

(33) a. a -ka - ba-n- deëtelä
    he-PST-them-me-bring+APP
    'he brought them to me'
    'he brought me to them'

b. *a -ka - n - ba - leëtelä
    me- them

In several languages it has been pointed out that there are no other (non-reflexive) pronouns that can occur to the right of the first person singular clitic pronoun (OCP). In Haya (and I suspect the same could be said about those other languages) this fact follows from/is consistent with the principle that in order for a pronoun to win over another pronoun that is "higher" in the Person Hierarchy, it must be higher in both the Semantic Role Hierarchy and the Number Hierarchy. But there is no other pronoun that can be higher than 'me' in Number and Person.

4.5. The reflexive pronoun. As I mentioned above (section 4), the reflexive pronoun (which in Haya can only be a clitic, that is, there is no independent reflexive pronoun) must always occur next to the verb stem, even when it cooccurs with a first person singular pronoun, as in (34) below:

(34) a. ba -ka -nn-e- itila
    they-PST-me-self-kill+APP
    'they killed themselves for/because of me'
    'they killed me for/because of themselves'

b. *ba- ka- e- nn- itila
    self-me

There are several ways in which we could account for this: (1) we could add another branch of the Hierarchy that would say Reflexive > Non-reflexive; (2) we could put Reflexive in the Person Hierarchy, which would read Reflexive > 1st > 2nd > 3rd; (3) we could leave this pronoun outside the Hierarchy and simply say that it has a fixed position no matter what. For the time being, I will leave this question open.

4.6. The Flexibility Principle in Haya. Haya also provides evidence for the Flexibility Principle stated in (21) above. Thus, third person nonhuman pronouns can violate sequential constraints such as Semantic Role and Number. In (35) below, for instance, where two nonhuman pronouns are used, Patient and Benefactive can occur in either order (this also demonstrates that Haya tends to group animate nonhuman with inanimate):
(35) a. omukazy' a -ka -ki-gi-cumbila (gi = embwa 'dog')
   woman she-PST-it-it-cook+APP
   'the woman cooked it(ki) for it(gi)' 6
b. omukazy' a -ka- gi- ki- cumbila
   'the woman cooked it(ki) for it(gi)'

The examples in (36) show that the Number and the Semantic Role
Hierarchies can be violated at the same time if two nonhuman pronouns
are involved:

(36) a. omukazy' a -ka -cumbil' obugen' ebyakulya
   woman she-PST-cook APP+party foods(pl.)
   'the woman cooked the foods for the party'
b. omukazy' a ka- bu - bi -cumbila
   it - them
   Goal-Patient
   'the woman cooked them for it'
c. omukazy' a -ka - bi - bu- cumbila
   them- it
   'the woman cooked them for it'

In example (36b) the sequence bu-bi (Singular(Goal) - Plural (Patient))
violates both the Number and the Semantic Role orders.

5. Conclusions

I have shown above that the features and the ranking represented
in the Topicality Hierarchy come into play in the linear order constraints
of object clitic pronouns in two Bantu languages, Shambala and Haya. I
have also speculated that this might hold true for Narrow Bantu as a
whole. In particular, with respect to the relationship between the TH
in (1) and the actual linear order of OCP's, I have proposed considering
the position next to the verb stem as the high status slot, which only
high status pronouns can occupy. If more than two pronouns must be
expressed, their order will follow the principle the higher the status,
the closer to the verb stem. The status of a pronoun is decided according
to the ranking of its features in the TH. When a conflict arises among
different hierarchies, e.g. when, given two pronouns, one is higher with
respect to the Person Hierarchy, but the other is higher with respect to
the Semantic Role Hierarchy, different solutions are possible: Shambala,
as shown above, tends to rule out such cases treating them as ungrammatical.
Haya, on the other hand, weighs the different factors involved and decides
on the basis of their respective strength which pronouns can have access to
which slots, with Person being the strongest factor, etc.

6 The other reading ('the woman cooked it (= the dog) for it') is
ruled out by pragmatic reasons.
I have also shown that although there might be exceptions to the constraints/hierarchies, they will tend to occur only with certain kinds of pronouns, namely those whose features are lower in the TH, e.g. inanimate 3rd person pronouns. Stated in different terms, this means that the higher the status of a pronoun the more rigid its position (and the lower the status of a pronoun the more flexible its position).
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