

INDIRECT OBJECTS IN SISWATI\*

Videa P. De Guzman  
The University of Calgary

Contrary to the view that in Bantu languages the two unmarked nominals following the verb in ditransitive constructions need not be distinguished because both possess the same object properties, this paper shows the necessity of making a distinction between the direct object and the indirect object relations. Evidence comes from SiSwati, the language of Swaziland, and the analysis of the data is cast in the Relational Grammar framework. The arguments presented refer to word order, object concord (or pronominal copy) and the interaction between object concord and some syntactic phenomena such as passivization, topicalization, relativization, and clefting. By distinguishing the direct object from the indirect object in SiSwati, the grammar is able to provide a more natural account for a number of related double object constructions.

0. Introduction<sup>1</sup>

One problem that remains unresolved in accounting for the grammatical relations in Bantu languages is determining the status of the two unmarked nominals, i.e. occurring without a marker, following the verb in ditransitive constructions. Two proposals are in competition. On the one hand, Gary and Keenan's [1977] "Two Objects Analysis" (TOA) for Kinyarwanda claims

---

\*This is a revised version of the paper read at the 2nd Biennial Conference on Relational Grammar and Grammatical Relations, Columbus, Ohio (May 1986) and at the 13th LACUS Conference, Arlington, Texas (August 1986).

<sup>1</sup>I would like to express much appreciation to Joyce Sukumane, an MA graduate from our Department, for providing the language data for analysis and for passing grammaticality judgments on other sentences in this paper. Also, I thank William O'Grady for his helpful questions and comments. For any errors in data and analysis, I remain responsible. In examples, ' represents High tone, ` Low tone, ' Lowered High tone, and ^ Rising-falling tone.

that the grammatical relations direct object (DO) and indirect object (IO) are collapsed into the single grammatical relation DO and that more than one NP in a clause can bear the DO relation to the verb. Since these two NP's both possess DO properties, they need not be distinguished. (See also Hodges [1977], Kisseberth and Abasheikh [1977], Kimenyi [1980], Hyman and Duranti [1982].) On the other hand, it has been suggested and argued that the DO is distinct from the IO in these languages, although quite similar in their syntactic properties. (Dryer [1983], Perlmutter and Postal [1983], Frantz [1984].)

This paper, cast in Relational Grammar (RG), presents some arguments to support what Dryer calls the "Indirect Object Analysis" (IOA) which follows the suggestion made by Peter Cole. Evidence comes from Siswati, a Bantu language spoken in Swaziland. It will be shown that a distinction between DO and IO needs to be maintained in order to make certain predictions of grammaticality. In so doing, the validity of the Stratal Uniqueness Law is upheld. The constructions involving two unmarked nominals that are considered here are: (a) active verbal ditransitive sentences; (b) morphological causative sentences with a transitive complement clause; and (c) sentences with a benefactive, a locative or goal, or an instrumental nominal as one of the unmarked nominals. The last set of sentences are included because these oblique nominals manifest either an IO or a DO function when occurring as an unmarked nominal.

The object properties discussed by Hyman and Duranti [1982:220-221], which according to them are assumed by Bantuists, are as follows: (a) access to the position immediately following the verb; (b) capability of assuming the subject role through passivization; and (c) its expression as a clitic object marker within the verbal complex. The onus on the IOA position is to distinguish the two grammatical terms on the basis of these properties. Following the advancement rules and causative clause union rules that RG uses to explain revaluations of grammatical relations, we will point out some significant behaviour of the two terms in question.

## 1. Arguments for the Existence of IO in SiSwati

Three syntactic arguments to support the distinction between IO's and DO's are shown in (a) word order, (b) object concord (OC) and passivization, and (c) OC and topicalization, relativization, and clefting.

1.1. Word order. A common observation in Bantu languages is that when a verb allows two unmarked nominals to cooccur with it, the NP corresponding to the recipient, traditionally labelled IO, comes before the NP that indicates the patient, which is associated with the DO. SiSwati is an SVO type of language and the order IO before DO is observed to an inviolable degree. For example:

- (1) Jôhn ú-ník-è sínínì bànánà  
 SC-give-tns friend (SC = subject concord)  
 'John gave a/the friend a banana'

If the order IO followed by DO is reversed, the interpretation continues to be that of the sequence recipient followed by patient, resulting in pragmatically unacceptable sentences. This linear precedence holds for causative constructions as well.

- (2) mákè ú-gèz-fs-è Tòzí líbhòdò  
 mother SC-wash-caus-tns pot  
 'mother made Tozi wash the pot'

Following the clause union analysis of causative constructions where the subject of the transitive complement clause, Tòzí in this case, becomes the IO in the upstairs clause, and the downstairs DO, líbhòdò 'pot', is upstairs DO, we find the same order of IO followed by DO applying in this type of causative construction. If we were to change líbhòdò with an animate noun, say, ínjà 'dog', and reverse the position of the two animate nouns, the only interpretation that can be associated with the sequence is 'mother made the dog wash Tozi' which once more is pragmatically odd. This implies that the two unmarked NPs are distinguished positionally. The IO has a fixed position as far as its cooccurrence with the DO and the unmarked verb (for OC)

is concerned.<sup>2</sup> The DO may register a corresponding OC marker or clitic in the verb, and when it does, the word order changes.

1.2. OC marking and passivization. In the literature cited, it has been observed that both unmarked NPs following the verb are capable of being expressed as a pronominal clitic or OC in the verb. While it is true that in Kinyarwanda both unmarked NPs may be indicated simultaneously in the verb, and thus show a strict clitic ordering of DO followed by IO, this situation does not obtain in SiSwati. Unfortunately, the fact that only one OC marker at a time can be registered does not strengthen the argument for making a distinction between IO and DO. Moreover, the ability of either NP to be expressed as a pronominal clitic seems to confirm the proposal that both nominals exhibit this particular property of true objects. For example:

(1) a. Jôhn ú-wù-ník-è sínínì (bànána)  
 SC-OC-give-tns friend

'John gave-it (banana) to a friend'

b. Jôhn ú-sí-ník-è bànána (sínínì)  
 SC-OC-give-tns friend

'John gave-him (friend) a banana'

Similar to the observation in Kimeru [Hodges 1977:115], it will be noted that when an OC is registered in the verb, the referent NP object gets shunted to the end of the predicate or is deleted. Despite the fact that the TOA may be said to account for the structure in (1a) and (1b), there is no compelling reason to reject the RG account for (1b) as an instance of an initial IO or term 3 having advanced to DO or term 2 in final stratum, especially when it has relevant syntactic consequences which will become apparent subsequently. A general constraint proposed here states that only final 2 may optionally trigger an OC. Following this constraint, *sínínì* 'friend' in (1a) is initial and final 3 and *bànána* is initial and final 2. In (1b), however, *sínínì* is final 2 via 3 to 2 advancement. Thus, it is allowed to be marked

---

<sup>2</sup>It is significant to note that the putative IO function is not only aligned with "recipients" but also with "causees".

with its appropriate OC clitic *-si-* and *bànána* is final 2-chômeur. The same constraint may be seen as applying to the causative construction given in (2). Without any advancement rule applying, (2) may alternatively be rendered as follows when final 2 registers an OC:

- (2) a. *mákè ú-lí-gèz-ís-è Tòzí (líbhòdò)*  
 mother SC-OC-wash-caus-tns pot  
 'mother made Tozi wash it (pot)'

With a 3 to 2 advancement, the initial IO, *Tòzí*, now takes OC and is shunted or deleted as follows:

- (2) b. *mákè ú-m-gèz-ís-è líbhòdò (Tòzí)*  
 mother SC-OC-wash-caus-tns pot  
 'mother made her (Tozi) wash the pot'

One other piece of evidence used to support the TOA is the capability of either the DO or the IO to assume the subject relation through passivization. The following passive sentences, indicated by the affix *-w-* in the verb, show each unmarked NP in question (1) and (2) in the subject position:

- (1) c. *bánána ú-ník-w-è síníni ngú Jôhn*  
 SC-give-pass-tns friend by  
 'the banana was given to a friend by John'
- d. *síníni sí-ník-w-è bánána ngú Jôhn*  
 friend SC-give-pass-tns by  
 'the friend was given a banana by John'
- (2) c. *líbhòdò lí-gèz-ís-w-è Tòzí ngú mákè*  
 pot SC-wash-caus-pass-tns by mother  
 (lit.) 'the pot was made to be washed by Tozi by mother'
- d. *Tòzí ú-gèz-ís-w-è líbhòdò ngú mákè*  
 SC-wash-caus-pass-tns pot by mother  
 'Tozi was made to wash the pot by mother'

Much like the observation on OC, it may be said that the (c) and (d) sentences above make no distinction between a DO and an IO in their ability to passivize. However, within the RG framework, passivization may be accounted

for via a 2 to 1 advancement, for (1c) and (2c), or via a 3 to 1 advancement, for (1d) and (2d). The significant distinction between the IO and the DO can now be shown in the corresponding OC-marked passive sentences:

- (1) e. \*bànáà ú-sí-ník-w-è                      ngù Jòhn (sínínì)  
           SC-OC-give-pass-tns by                      friend  
           'the banana was given him (friend) by John'
- f. sínínì sí-wù-ník-w-è                      ngù Jòhn (bànáà)  
           friend SC-OC-give-pass-tns by  
           'the friend was given it (banana) by John'
- (2) e. \*líbhòdò lí-m-gèz-ís-w-è                      ngù mákè (Tòzì)  
           pot            SC-OC-wash-caus-pass-tns by            mother  
           'the pot was caused to be washed by her (Tozi) by mother'
- f. Tòzì ú-lí-gèz-ís-w-è                      ngù mákè (líbhòdò)  
           SC-OC-wash-caus-pass-tns by            mother    pot  
           'Tozi was made to wash it (pot) by mother'

In (1e) and (2e), we have the typical case of 2 to 1 passivization, but with the additional OC marking corresponding to the other unmarked NP, our putative IO. Unlike (1c) and (2c) with the same type of passivization, (1e) and (2e) are ungrammatical. This is evidence to show that with a 2 to 1 advancement, the nominals sínínì and Tòzì are not legitimate 2's or DO's, at this level, thus, they cannot take OC. It is reasonable to claim that these nominals are final 3's or IO's. In (1f) and (2f), the type of passivization exhibited here is identical to (1d) and (2d), where the supposed initial IO or 3 advances to 1. The striking difference is that the cooccurring initial 2, after 3 advances to 1, remains to be a 2, as evidenced by its ability to register an associated OC.<sup>3</sup> Thus, it is not enough to show that either un-

<sup>3</sup>It may also be argued that the (d) and (f) sentences manifest 3 to 2 advancement and then 2 to 1 passive, resulting in a cooccurring 2-chômeur. Concomitantly, OC is taken by acting 2's, i.e. final 2 or final 2-chômeur, instead of just final 2's. This line of argument, however, is withheld until further investigation. For now, this is seen as serving only the rule for OC, whereas limiting OC to final 2 generalizes to other syntactic phenomena.

marked nominal is capable of being expressed as the subject of the sentence to justify positing the same grammatical relation for both NP's. The more important and relevant structure is the contrast between a final 2 and a final 3 in terms of their ability to take optional OC in both types of passive constructions.

1.3. OC and topicalization, relativization, and clefting. Three other syntactic phenomena which attest to the same type of distinction between the two unmarked NP's are topicalization, relativization, and clefting. Each process will be illustrated as it interacts with OC. Let us begin with topicalization. Given sentence (1), final 2 may be topicalized rendering:

- (1) g. bànáà Jôhn ú-(wù)-ník-è sínínì  
 SC-(OC)-give-tns friend  
 'the banana, John gave to a friend'

Compared with (1b) where we claim that initial 3 advanced to 2, as evidenced by its ability to take OC, we cannot topicalize on bànáà because it has become a final2-chômeur. Thus,

- (1) h. \*bànáà Jôhn ú-sí-ník-è (sínínì)  
 'the banana, John gave him (friend)'

On the other hand, topicalizing on sínínì in (1b) results in a grammatical sentence. If indeed the recipient nominal, sínínì in (1), were also a DO just like the patient nominal bànáà, then topicalizing it without its corresponding OC should not render an ungrammatical form, yet it does. Furthermore, if these two nominals were actually identical in grammatical function, the following construction, where the patient is marked with OC and the recipient is topicalized, should not be blocked:

- (1) i. \*sínínì Jôhn ú-wù-ník-è (bànáà)  
 'the friend, John gave it (banana) to'

Evidently, the TOA will need some constraints to prevent these ungrammatical sentences from being generated. The IOA, on the contrary, can account for them quite naturally by saying that the verb unmarked for OC cooccurs with

the initial DO as final 2 and the initial IO as final 3. As a final 3, the IO does not topicalize. Similarly, in (1i), *bànáńà* marked with a corresponding OC is final 2, and *sínínì* is not final 2, but final 3, hence, it cannot be topicalized. Having shown this difference in behaviour between the two nominals, we can claim that they start with different functions, one being a DO and the other an IO. These facts are further reinforced by applying topicalization in passive causative constructions. With a 3 to 1 passive, the cooccurring final 2 can be topicalized.

- (2) g. *Ífìbhòdò* *Tòzì* *ú-íí-gèz-ís-w-è* *ngù* *mákè*  
 pot SC-OC-wash-caus-pass-tns by mother  
 'the pot, Tozi was made to wash it by mother'

In contrast, the putative IO which is final 3 in a 2 to 1 passive construction cannot be topicalized:

- (2) h. \**Tòzì* *Ífìbhòdò* *íí-gèz-ís-w-è* *ngù* *mákè*  
 'Tozi, the pot was made to be washed by mother'

And, of course, neither can we topicalize the final 2-chômeur when *Tòzì* advances from an initial 3 to a final 2 in the active causative counterpart, as seen in (2i) (cf. (1h)):

- (2) i. \**Ífìbhòdò* *mákè* *ú-m-gèz-ís-è* (*Tòzì*)  
 'the pot, mother made her wash (Tozi)'

Thus far, we have shown topicalization as a good test for the inoperativeness of the 2-chômeur and, conversely, its functioning on final 2 and not on final 3.

Turning to relativization, we will observe that it operates on final 2 as well. According to the accessibility hierarchy, if this is the case, then final 1's also relativize. In contrast, final 3 and final 2-chômeur are banned from this process. For example:

- (1) j. *bànáńà* *úmúńtfù* *lá-wù-nfík-è* *sínínì* *ú-lúńgílè* (RM = relative  
 man RM-OC-give-tns friend SC-good marker)  
 (lit.) 'the banana which the man gave-it to a friend was good'

- k. úmúntfù ló-ník-è sínínì bànánà ú-lúngílè  
 man RM+SC-give-tns friend SC-good  
 'the man who gave a banana to a friend was good'
- l. \*sínínì úmúntfù lá-wù-ník-è bánánà sí-lúngílè  
 'the friend who the man gave-it a banana was good'

Without the distinction between IO and DO, the difference between the grammaticality of the sentences above cannot be accounted for in a simple, natural way.

In cleft constructions, the two unmarked NP's behave in the same way as in the relativized ones. Easily, final 2 as well as final 1 may be clefted, but not a final 2-chômeur, as in the following:

- (1) m. ngú bánánà là-wù-ník-è sínínì Jóhn  
 'it was a banana that John gave to a friend'
- n. \*ngú bánánà là-sí-ník-è Jóhn (sínínì)  
 'it was a banana that John gave-him (friend)'

With a corresponding low tone on the clefted element below, the putative initial IO, sínínì is preferred to cooccur with the passive verb form (initial 3 to final 1) as follows:

- (1) o. sínínì là-sí-ník-w-è bánánà ngú Jóhn  
 'it was a friend that was given a banana by John'

However, the following form, where sínínì takes OC, i.e. with 3 to 2 advancement, is also acceptable, but certainly not if it is a final 3:

- (1) p. sínínì là-sí-ník-è bánánà Jóhn  
 'it was a friend that John gave a banana to'
- q. \*sínínì là-wù-ník-è Jóhn (bánánà)  
 'it was a friend that John gave-it (banana) to'

Thus we have shown evidence that topicalization, relativization, and clefting may operate on a final 2 but not on a final 3 nor a final 2-chômeur.

## 2. Oblique Advancements

Three other types of structure that may consist of two unmarked nominals following the verb have a Ben(efactive), a Loc(ative), or a G(oal) cooccurring with a DO. They appear in the IO position. Unlike the Ben, which is always unmarked, the Loc and the G nominals may be identified by the markers *e- -eni* and *ku-*, respectively. In the subsequent sections, we will determine the characteristics of each of these nominals, when occurring marked, in terms of functioning as an IO or a DO. One other oblique nominal which may be of interest for comparative purposes with other Bantu languages is the Ins(trumental) marked by *nge-*. This nominal usually occurs in its unmarked form. However, there is a structure which contains two unmarked nominals, one of which appears to have originated from an initial Ins. This will be discussed briefly in a later section.

2.1. Ben nominal. The Ben nominal is closely associated with the IO, not only in being unmarked, but also in occurring immediately after the verb. The formal difference between the two, however, is the presence of the affix *-e|-* in the verb whenever a Ben NP occurs. Compare (1) and (1a) with the following:

- (4) *índvùnà í-yà-kh-é|-è*            *bántfù (íhòlà)*  
 chief SC-OC-build-ben-tns people hall  
 'the chief built a hall for the people'

Because of this difference, Frantz [1984] suggested that in Chi-Mwi:ni the registration of a similar benefactive affix in the verb denotes the advancement of the initial Ben to final 2. In SiSwati, I propose that, since the Ben behaves like an IO, and its cooccurring DO is not a 2-chômeur until the former takes an OC, the Ben advances to term 3. As such, it manifests the properties of IO's discussed previously, namely, (a) advancement to 2, thus triggering OC, and (b) advancement to 1 while still cooccurring with a final 2. For example,

(4) a. Ben to 3 to 2<sup>5</sup>

índvùnà í-bà-kh-él-è íhhòlà (bántfù)  
 SC-OC-build-ben-tns hall people

'the chief built them (people) a hall'

b. Ben to 3 to 1

bántfù bá-yà-kh-él-w-è yì-ìndvùnà (íhhòlà)  
 people SC-OC-build-ben-pass-tns by-chief hall

'the people were built it (hall) by the chief'

Again, when initial 2 advances to 1, the Ben as a final 3 cannot take OC as shown by the following:

(4) c. \*íhhòlà í-bà-kh-él-w-è yì-ìndvùnà (bántfù)  
 hall SC-OC-build-ben-pass-tns by-chief people

'the hall was built for them (people) by the chief'

The other tests for DO-hood may be applied to the initial-final 2 and the results will all be grammatical. Now, if we adopt the same 3 to 2 advancement for the initial Ben, we get the following constructions showing topicalization, relativization, and clefting:

(4) d. Topicalize on Ben to 3 to 2

bántfù índvùnà í-bà-kh-él-è íhhòlà  
 people chief SC-OC-build-ben-tns hall

'the people, the chief built them a hall'

Note that where íhhòlà is initial-final 2 (may take OC -ya-), bántfù as a final 3 cannot be topicalized.

Relativizing on either a Ben to 3 to 1 or a Ben to 3 to 2 is acceptable, but not on a Ben to 3.

(4) e. ngí-bòn-è bántfù índvùnà lé-bà-kh-él-è íhhòlà  
 I-see-tns people chief RM+SC-OC-build-ben-tns hall

'I saw the people that the chief built a hall for'

To be able to undergo clefting, the initial Ben has to be either a final

<sup>5</sup>Henceforth, consider similar transitions as an abbreviation of two advancements, e.g. Ben to 3 and 3 to 2.

1 or a final 2. Thus, with a low tone on *bantfu*, we get:

- (4) f. bántfù là-bà-kh-él-w-è                    íhhòlà yì-índvúnà  
 people RM-SC-build-ben-pass-tns hall by-chief  
 'it is the people that were built a hall for by the chief'
- g. bántfù índvúnà lé-bà-kh-él-è                    íhhòlà  
 people chief RM+SC-OC-build-ben-tns hall  
 'it is the people for whom the chief built a hall'

The behaviour of final 2 in (4f) may be confirmed by its ability to take -ya- OC and that of final 2-chômeur in (4g) by the inadmissibility of a corresponding -ya- OC.

The absence of a structure without a Ben to 3 advancement creates some doubts as to the validity of an obligatory Ben to 3 rule. Moreover, the intermediate transition of the Ben to 3 appears to be superfluous. In fact, there is no evidence against a direct Ben to 1 or Ben to 2 advancement, except that as we will see in the next section, assuming the intermediate transition, Ben to 3, simplifies the account of the Ben and unifies it with the two other Oblique nominals, Loc and Goal.

2.2. Loc and Goal nominals. The two marked oblique nominals, exemplified below, are the Loc with the affix *e- -enì* and the Goal with *ku-*. Both are similar to the Ben in their related unmarked structure in that they also take the position of the IO when cooccurring with a DO.

- (5) ngí-bhàdál-è ímàlì é-síkòl-w-énì  
 I-pay-tns money to-school  
 'I paid money to the school'
- (5) a. ngí-(yì)-bhàdál-è síkòlò ímàlì  
 I-(OC)-pay-tns school money
- (6) Jôhn ú-tsémbís-è úmsèbéntì kú Bîlî  
 SC-promise-tns job to  
 'I promised a job to Bill'
- (6) a. Jôhn ú-(wù)-tsémbís-è Bîlî úmsèbéntì  
 SC-(OC)-promise-tns job

Examples (5a) and (6a) are thus two further instances of superficial ditransitive constructions with two unmarked nominals. RG accounts for these structures by applying the Loc/Goal to 3 advancement rule, where initial 2 remains as a final 2. From this derived structure, all other structures discussed previously follow naturally. As final 2's (from a 3 to 2 advancement), the Loc/Goal takes OC, as in the following:

(5) b. ngí-sí-bhàdál-è ímàlì (síkòlò)  
 I-OC-pay-tns money school  
 'I paid it (school) some money'

(6) b. Jôhn ú-m-tsémbís-è úmsébéntì (Bíllì)  
 SC-OC-promise-tns job  
 'John promised him (Bill) a job'

As with the previous final 3's, these two nominals may also passivize via the 3 to 1 advancement rule and, likewise, maintain the cooccurring initial-final 2. However, they differ from the Ben in being able to undergo topicalization as final Loc/Goal. Other than this, advanced Loc/Goal to 3 to 2 may also be relativized and clefted.

2.3. Ins nominal. The Ins nominal is a curious grammatical relation. Unlike Kinyarwanda and Chi-Mwi:ni, the typical Ins nominal in SiSwati appears only in the oblique form marked by nge-, as in the following:

(7) a. úmfàtì ú-sík-è ínyàmà ngè-mésè  
 woman SC-cut-tns meat with-knife  
 'the woman cut the meat with the knife'  
 b. \*úmfàtì ú-sík-è ínyàmà mésè

However, for the purposes of this paper, we will consider a type of structure found in SiSwati which appears to share some features with the typical Ins nominal in the two Bantu languages mentioned, as exemplified below:

(8) ngí-gcòbís-è úmtímbà ngè-èmafútsà  
 I-smear-tns body with-oil  
 'I smeared the body with oil'  
 (8) a. ngí-wù-gcòbís-è ngè-èmafútsà (úmtímbà)

With *úmtímbà* as the only unmarked nominal occurring immediately after the verb and having the potential to trigger OC, this nominal qualifies as an initial-final 2 in (8) and (8a). In the following sentence, we find *émàfútsà* unmarked, giving two unmarked nominals after the verb:

- (8) b. *ngí-gcòbís-è úmtímbà émàfútsà*  
 I-smear-tns body oil  
 'I smeared oil on the body'

Since (8b) is perceived as being semantically equivalent to (8) or (8a), RG can account for (8b) as an instance of Ins to 2 advancement, supported by the alternant verb form containing its corresponding *-wa-* OC. One predictable consequence of this advancement is the possibility of this final 2 undergoing passivization. With Ins to 2 to 1, the cooccurring initial 2 cannot take OC.

- (8) c. *émàfútsà á-gcòtjís-w-è úmtímbà ngì mì*  
 oil SC-smear-pass-tns body by me  
 'the oil was smeared on the body by me'

- d. \**émàfútsà á-wù-gcòtjís-w-è ngì mì (úmtímbà)*

This indicates that the initial DO in (8c) and (8d), *úmtímbà*, is not a final 2. By the Chômeur Law, it should become a 2-chômeur when Ins advances to 2. However, this term continues to be accessible to passivization as in:

- (8) e. *úmtímbà ú-wà-gcòtjís-w-è ngì mì (émàfútsà)*  
 body SC-OC-smear-pass-tns by me oil  
 (lit.) 'the body was smeared it (oil) by me'

As has been suggested in previous works [Perlmutter and Postal 1983, Frantz 1984], initial 2 does not become a 2-chômeur in this case, but retreats to 3. As a term 3, it can advance to 1, as shown previously. As (8e) shows, final 2 (from Ins) is still a 2 as evidenced by *-wa-* OC. Sentence (8c), therefore, may be accounted for by saying that initial 2 retreats to 3 when Ins advances to 2, and then in the final stratum, 2 advances to 1. This structure has no final 2 to trigger OC.

While the above rules appear to account adequately for the forms so far treated, we have further the uncanny situation in which the initial 2, after

the Ins advances to 2, continues to behave like a final 2 in terms of allowing OC registration:

(8) f. ngí-wù-gcòbís-è émàfútsà (úmtímbà)

Compared with (8a), (8f) seems to have frozen the initial 2 to a final 2, even after Ins to 2 advancement. Curiously enough, while it seems possible to take initial 2, which retreats to 3 when initial Ins advances to 2, back to final 2 via the available 3 to 2 advancement rule discussed earlier, this account appears to be counterintuitive. A more plausible analysis of (8b) is to relate it to structure (8g):

(8) g. ngí-gcòbís-è émàfútsà émtímbènì  
 I-smear-tns oil on-the-body  
 'I smeared oil on the body'

Here émàfútsà is initial 2 and émtímbènì is initial Loc. With Loc to 3 advancement, we get (8b), which manifests the consequent deletion of the Loc marker e- -eni leaving úmtímbà and its shift in the IO position. With this analysis, (8c)-(8f) may now be explained as following naturally from the advancement rules, namely, 2 to 1, 3 to 1, and 3 to 2. And from these structures topicalizing, relativizing, and clefting on final 2, but not on a final 2-chômeur nor on final 3 can be confirmed.

From the above data, we can conclude that SiSwati differs from other Bantu languages in treating its Ins nominal only as a marked form. Finally similar to Loc and Goal, it may also be topicalized as a final Ins.

### 3. Summary and Conclusion.

In support of the IOA, SiSwati has been shown to employ the following re-valuation rules in RG: (a) 2 to 1 and 3 to 1 advancement (passivization) and (b) Ben/Loc/Goal to 3, and 3 to 2 advancements. Moreover, the syntactic phenomena investigated show that they operate as follows: (a) OC registration triggered by final 2; (b) Topicalization on final 2 (and on marked non-terms); (c) Relativization and clefting on final nuclear terms. Evidently, the grammar of SiSwati regards nuclear terms very highly to the extent that it provides specific rules whereby other nominals can also optionally func-

tion as nuclear terms. However, when two or more nominals appear to exhibit the same grammatical function, the grammar need not recognize one and the same relation for the cooccurring nominals in a clause at all levels of analysis. Positing an initial IO different from an initial DO not only simplifies the account for the above processes but also unifies the syntactic behaviour of the Ben/Loc/Goal with the IO. Furthermore, by maintaining a distinction between IO and DO based on the arguments presented, we are able to explain (i) the ungrammaticality of a final 3 taking OC when initial 2 advances to 1, and the grammaticality of a final 2 taking OC when an initial or an advanced 3 advances to 1; and (ii) the ungrammaticality of final 3 taking OC where the cooccurring DO is topicalized, relativized, or clefted and, conversely, the ungrammaticality of final 2-chômeur taking OC where the putative 3 to final 2 is topicalized, relativized, or clefted.

At least for SiSwati, the above syntactic phenomena are better accounted for by the Indirect Object Analysis.

## REFERENCES

- Dryer, Matthew. 1983. "Indirect objects in Kinyarwanda revisited." In David Perlmutter (ed.), *Studies in Relational Grammar I*, pp. 129-140. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Frantz, Donald. 1984. "Advancements to direct object in Chi-Mwi:ni." Ms. [Earlier version appeared in SIL Workpapers XXVII, 1983.]
- Gary, Judith O. and Edward L. Keenan. 1977. "On collapsing grammatical relations in Universal Grammar." In Peter Cole and Jerrold M. Sadock (eds.), *Syntax and Semantics 8*, pp. 83-120. New York: Academic Press.
- Hodges, Kathryn Speed. 1977. "Causatives, transitivity and objecthood in Kimeru." In Martin Mould and Thomas J. Hinnebusch (eds.), *Papers from the Eighth Conference on African Linguistics*, pp. 113-125. *Studies in African Linguistics*, Supplement 7.
- Hyman, Larry M. and Alessandro Duranti. 1982. "On the object relation in Bantu." In Paul Hopper and Sandra Thompson (eds.), *Syntax and Semantics 15*, pp. 217-239. New York: Academic Press.
- Kimenyi, Alexandre. 1980. *A Relational Grammar of Kinyarwanda*. University of California Publications in Linguistics, Volume 91. Los Angeles and Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Kisseberth, Charles W. and Mohammad Imam Abasheikh. 1977. "The object relationship in Chi-Mwi:ni, a Bantu language." In Peter Cole and Jerrold M. Sadock (eds.), *Syntax and Semantics 8*, pp. 179-218. New York: Academic Press.
- Perlmutter, David and Paul Postal. 1983. "Some proposed laws of basic clause structure." In David Perlmutter (ed.), *Studies in Relational Grammar I*, pp. 81-128. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

