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Grammatical relations appear in every grammatical theory. The notion is sometimes connected with thematic roles such as "agent" or "theme" and other times with case roles and structural relations such as nominative or accusative. Such notions are very much favoured in descriptions of grammatical relations of various languages and are the basis for the assumption that grammatical relations are given. As a result, linguists working on individual languages tend to think that they have to work towards distinguishing which among given referents fits into which of the determined categories instead of addressing the question whether the categories are suitable for describing grammatical relations in that language. While it is hoped that this study provides insights into particular aspects of Swahili grammar and discourse, it has also attempted to give a non-biased
account of grammatical relations in Swahili using discourse data. The dissertation emphasizes that in order to give a fair description of grammatical relations of a given language, one needs to adopt language specific strategies internal to that language.

The dissertation makes four fundamental assertions. First, it is claimed that there is no single universal account of grammatical relations, rather language specific definitions have to be sought for each language described.

The second assertion is that Swahili shows evidence for only two grammatical relations, the subject and the object, which are defineable with respect to grammatical morphology shown on the verb.

The third assertion evolves from the relationship between discourse and grammatical relations. It is claimed that speakers and writers have a certain amount of choice as to referents that appear in discourse as grammatical relations. The choice is, however, influenced by discourse factors such as the salience of a referent in the discourse, active and passive participation of the referent in the successive actions of the discourse, and the definiteness and animacy status of the referent.

The fourth assertion has its source in the relationship between grammatical relations and semantic relations. The claim is that grammatical relations are distinct from semantic relations. Swahili makes that distinction in the way grammatical
and semantic relations are signaled in the discourse. It is pointed out in the thesis that, although the two relations are closely related, one cannot be used to define or describe the other.
Chapter One

1.0 Introduction

The main purpose of the dissertation is to provide a non-biased discourse account of grammatical relations in Swahili. The study shows that by looking at the grammar and structure of Swahili, it becomes evident that the account of the grammatical relations is biased because it takes non-Swahili concerns as the justification for the existence of grammatical relations in Swahili. Thus it is emphasized in this dissertation that in order to give a fair description of grammatical relations of a given language, language specific strategies internal to the language have to be sought and exploited. The study does not deny the universal tendencies that have been the source for the considerations given to grammatical relations. The study acknowledges the tendencies but sounds a note of caution that the tendencies should not be taken as evidence for designating the existing notions of grammatical relations as universal. The study notes that the extent to which universal tendencies such as definiteness and animacy status can be exploited in one language does not necessarily reflect the way they are manifested in another language. Thus the study points out that there is no universal way of defining or describing grammatical relations.
1.1 Traditional views

1.1.1 The Structural-generative Approach

Bantuists have tried to describe grammatical relations in various Bantu languages with respect to the notions of "subject of" and "object of" as perceived by European languages. Some analyses have adopted structural-generative grammar (cf. Gary (1977), Dalgish and Sheintuch (1977), following Chomsky's (1965) analysis of grammatical relations in English. The structural-generative analysis appeals to phrase marker configuration (linear order and immediate constituency) in terms of which the grammatical relations are defined. The analysis thus distinguishes between "terms" (derived grammatical relations) and "non-terms" (non-grammatical relations), and the notions of "subject", "direct object" and "indirect object" are said to be terms. "Terms" are considered to bear grammatical relations to their main verbs. Considerable emphasis has been put on transformations involving such constructions as passive, clefting, pseudo-clefting, relativization, and reflexivization as further evidence for identifying a referent as having a grammatical relation to the verb. The hypothesis is that only grammatical relations can undergo such transformations.

Three problems emerge from the generative model. First, the analysis is based on isolated (and sometimes artificial) sentences outside their discourse context and detached from their communicative function. One obvious reason is that such
sentences are easier to deal with and can be manipulated to suit the needs of the analyst. However, in understanding grammar, our foremost need is to know what goes on when people communicate with each other. Thus, basing an analysis on isolated and artificial sentences does not help us to understand the type of choices available to speakers and the conditions that govern these choices. The second problem is that the supporters of the structural-generative approach, by relying on the analysis of English, have allowed themselves to transfer into Bantu languages categories for which Bantu languages may show no evidence. The third problem lies with the confusion in distinguishing grammatical relations.

1.1.2 The Relational Grammar Approach

The theory of Relational Grammar has gained much favour in Bantu linguistics and several Bantuists have attempted the description of grammatical relations within the framework of relational grammar (cf. Gary and Keenan 1976, Hodges 1977, Trithart 1979, Kimenyi 1980, Hyman and Duranti 1982). Their exposition derives largely from Perlmutter and Postal (1974), but as well from Johnson (1974) and from unpublished lectures.

Analyses of grammatical relations made within the theory of relational grammar have claimed to differ from the structural-generative grammar theory. In the theory of relational grammar, the grammatical relations considered are the subject, direct
object, indirect object and the oblique object. In some accounts, the semantic relations agent, patient, benefactive recipient, goal, instrumental and locative are also considered grammatical relations. Gary (1977), Kimenyi (1980) consider only the agent, benefactive recipient and goal as terms, while the instrumental and locative are non-terms. Gary considers the instrumental and locative to be equivalent to the oblique object which to her are non-grammatical relations. Hodges (1977) on the other hand, distinguishes the semantic relations as non-terms (i.e. non-grammatical relations) and the grammatical relations as terms.

This demonstrates the confusion that exists within the description of grammatical relations. What Hyman and Duranti call grammatical relations (i.e. oblique objects), Gary considers non-grammatical relations. The semantic relations which by Gary's analysis are grammatical relations are non-grammatical relations by Hodges' analysis. Although there is not much agreement on the components that constitute grammatical relations, there is agreement on the role of grammatical relations. The major role of the grammatical relations in the framework of relational grammar is the description of syntactic transformations similar to those cited above with respect to structural-generative grammar (although the theory of relational grammar claims to differ from that of the structural-generative grammar). Relational grammar assumes that the notions of
subject, direct object and indirect object are primitives, that is, that they are not derived from tree structures as is claimed by proponents of structural-generative grammar. Transformations in relational grammar are stated in terms of the relationship between the grammatical relations and the verb rather than structural categories. The grammatical relations are said to be "verb oriented". That is the verb controls the assignment of grammatical relations to nominals within the sentence/clause. In addition, the verb can associate with only one of each of the grammatical relations. However, the theory of Relational grammar is far from being adequate in describing grammatical relations. It fails to show how these grammatical relations are exploited in a given language. The emphasis in this dissertation is that the study of grammatical relations in any language must take into consideration these relations with respect to the way speakers exploit them to meet their communicative needs.

1.1.3 The Discourse Approach

In much of the literature of the 70's, attempts have been made to provide a more revealing analysis of Bantu grammatical relations. For example, some discussions of grammatical relations take discourse parameters as the basis for an adequate description of grammatical relations in a language (cf. Hawkinson and Hyman 1974, Morolong and Hyman 1977, Duranti 1979). The discourse parameters used include animacy, word order, semantic
relations, pragmatics, coding processes (i.e. verb agreement, verb extensions and the ranking of arguments in the discourse).

These analyses, even though they try to take discourse factors into account, still suffer from not looking at real discourse. By translating isolated sentences from English into the language they are describing, they fail to distinguish the grammatical and semantic relations a particular nominal has with the main verb. The analyses, therefore, reflect a combination of the structural-generative approach, the relational grammar approach and a sentence level analysis of grammatical relations using generalized discourse factors. Comrie (1979) makes an attempt to view grammatical relations from a discourse point of view showing evidence for his judgments on the effects of discourse factors on the selection of grammatical relations in discourse. The only drawback in his attempt is that his analysis assumes the universality of the grammatical categories.

1.1.4 Present Analysis

This study proposes a more individualistic approach which will first look at language specific features before making generalizations that may not be relevant for other languages. Thus, the analysis presented in this study will not use a specific model as its theoretical framework, since the available models tend not to take account of language-specific features characterizing grammatical relations. Thus, we will present the
data and then give a descriptive discussion which will aim at explaining the distribution of the designated grammatical relations in Swahili.

Although we will adopt some terminology already known and used in other models, it does not imply that we are also adopting the model. Rather, the terminology will be used as a matter of convenience.

1.2 Data Base

The bulk of the data for this study comes from spoken and written texts. The spoken data base is comprised of three taped informal conversations among adult speakers of Swahili. In text one, the participants are native speakers of Swahili and the conversation centers on an attempt to revive a car which has been designated useless. In text two, the participants are not native speakers of Swahili, but second language speakers (their first language is another Bantu language). The conversation is about the advantages and disadvantages of living in the city/town. Text three has participants who are also native speakers of Swahili. Their conversation features everyday life reflecting on what has happened and is happening in the community they live in.

The written data base is drawn from literary writings. These include selected readings from essays written by Julius K. Nyerere (the current President of the Republic of Tanzania), whose first language is not Swahili. The essays are: Uhuru na
Maendeleo "Freedom and Development", Uhuru na Ujamaa "Freedom and Socialism". Also included are three stories: Rosa Mistika by E. Kezilahabi, a well known literary writer from Tanzania whose native language is not Swahili, Nitakuja kwa siri by M. Musokile, also a literary writer from Tanzania, who represents a much younger generation of users of Swahili, and for whom Swahili is also not his first language, and Mzimu wa watu wa kale by M.S.Abdulla, a native of Zanzibar for whom Swahili is a native language. The data base is limited to one thousand (1,000) clauses in each text.

1.3 Body of Dissertation

The main purpose of Chapter two is to show that Swahili has evidence for only two grammatical relations, the subject and the object. These are defineable with respect to grammatical morphology shown on the main verb.

The subject will be defined formally as that nominal which has a subject marker (traditionally the subject prefix) or the subject marker itself, which may be coreferential with an entity in the preceding discourse.

The object likewise will be defined as that nominal which shows object marking (traditionally object prefix) on the verb or the object marker itself, which may be coreferential with an entity in the preceding discourse. The claim is that the entity considered to bear a grammatical relation to a particular verb
must be expressed within the clause containing that verb and not derived by inference. Thus, the only formal criterion for comes to identifying grammatical relations in discourse grammatical morphology. Nominals for which there is no such morphological marking will not be considered to be in any grammatical relation with the main verb. These may have a non-grammatical relation function in the discourse. By taking this stand we hope to discourage tendencies for an intuitive definition of grammatical relations.

In Chapter three, the main purpose is to show that grammatical relations as defined may be determined by discourse factors. Three claims are made in this chapter. First, speakers tend to make the most salient entities in the discourse the grammatical relations. That is the entities that humans tend to talk about are the ones that often appear in discourse. In the discourse, these will be successively referred and will be indicated as the grammatical relations by grammatical morphology.

Second, the tendency is for grammatical relations to be definite especially where only the grammatical markers (absence of full NPs) represent a particular grammatical relation.

Third, discourses tend to be mostly about animates (humans in particular) and as a result animates are generally presented as grammatical relations in the discourse. Following from the three claims we will show that what appear as grammatical relations in the discourse are the most salient entities, and
definite and animate entities.

Chapter Four concentrates on the distinction between grammatical relations and semantic relations. The claim is that, while the grammatical relations may relate to the semantic relations such as agent (subject), benefactive, recipient, patient, goal, instrumental, locative (subject/object), a nominal with such a semantic relation need not also be a grammatical relation. Thus, the descriptions that use semantic relations to define grammatical relations are misleading. In this chapter, we show how semantic relations are manifested in Swahili discourse and how they relate to the possible grammatical relations. In so doing, we will be involved with the structure and the semantic interpretation of the verb. The claim is that the semantic interpretation of the verb will provide clues to the semantic relation of the referent.

In terms of the verb's structure, we will be concerned with verb extensions such as the -I- marker (traditionally the prepositional marker), the -W- marker (traditionally the passive marker), the -S- marker (traditionally the causative marker) and the -K- marker (traditionally the stative marker). It will be shown that not only do these affixes affect the semantic interpretation of the verb but also the selectional restriction of the verb with respect to the nominal that may bear grammatical relations to it. For example, while the -I- marker allows the verb to expand its scope over more than one nominal one of the
nominals has to be the grammatical object. On the other hand, the _w_ and _k_ markers limit the number of grammatical relations that the verb may govern.

Chapter five is a review of the accomplishments of the study. In this course of the review, we make reference to previous analyses of grammatical relations in Bantu languages. We look at the typological properties as stated in various analyses (cf. Hawkinson and Hyman 1974, Kunene 1975, Hodges 1977, Dalgish 1977, Morolong and Hyman 1977, Comrie 1979, Trithart 1979, Hyman and Duranti 1982) and discuss their applicability to the grammatical relations as found in Swahili discourse. Such typological properties include: the left-most position which is the assumed position for the subject, the control of agreement by a nominal of the status subject, and the lack of case marking for the subject, word order, the person and animacy hierarchy and the cliticization of objects. The discussions in this chapter focus on the interpretation of these properties within the approach to grammatical relations offered in this dissertation.

Chapter Six is a summary of the chapters of this dissertation, pointing out the main findings and the conclusions drawn from the findings.
Chapter Two.

2.0 Grammatical Relations

"...in order to say that a given grammatical relation exists in a given language, this claim must be justified both language internally and cross-linguistically."

Comrie (1981:60)

The above quotation is the basis of the discussion in this chapter in which we make the claim that grammatical relations in Swahili are language specific and can best be described using Swahili as the source. That is, in order to claim that a certain grammatical relation exists in Swahili, we need internal evidence from Swahili.

By "language internally", Comrie means that a number of logically independent criteria must be established in the language in question that serve to identify the grammatical relation(s) in question as being syntactically significant in that language. Much of the work on grammatical relations has not taken this into consideration, which explains the assumption found in traditional descriptions which take grammatical relations as given by the general theory. In particular, it is often taken for granted that the subject, direct object, indirect object are primitives in languages as opposed to other noun phrases that have relations to the predicate. Such an assumption has led many linguists working on individual languages to think that they have to work towards distinguishing which among given
nominals in a given language fits into which of the determined
categories. Comrie correctly questions the validity of the
approach that makes assumptions without internal evidence. He
questions for example, the evidence internal to English for the
establishment of a separate grammatical relation "indirect
object" which is loosely used in traditional grammar in contrast
with "direct object". He notes for example in:

1. I gave John the book

2. I gave the book to John

that John is said to be the "indirect object" and book the
"direct object. Comrie observes that what we have here is
different encodings of the same semantic role of John in (1) and
(2) and that the use of the term "indirect object" seems to be
referring to a semantic role rather than a grammatical relation.
By implication, if we do away with the term "indirect object" we
can likewise discard the term "direct object" since the two are
used contrastively.

The use of the term "indirect object" in Bantu languages has
its source in English. Its unproductivity in Bantu has been
noted (cf. Hyman and Duranti 1982) and in this study it will not
be considered a necessary term. Consequently, the term "direct
object" is unproductive in Swahili grammar.

The terms "subject" and "object" will therefore be used to
refer to the grammatical relations that obtain in Swahili
discourse. That is, the claim in this chapter will be that Swahili shows evidence for only two grammatical relations, subject and object.

By taking a particularistic view in defining grammatical relations in Swahili, we do not mean that we cannot treat grammatical relations cross-linguistically. As Comrie (1981:60) notes, cross-linguistically we can still use the established terminologies in describing grammatical relations if a grammatical relation in a given language can be identified with another as perceived in a particular language. However, its identification should be language internal and not influenced by criteria that are language internal in another. In other words, while we can make use of the universal notions of subject, object..., languages should be allowed to have independent criteria to distinguish these grammatical relations.

The rest of the sections in this chapter, therefore, address the issues of what the grammatical relations in Swahili are and how we distinguish them from entities that are found in natural discourses which do not necessarily bear grammatical relations.

2.1 Defining grammatical relations in Swahili.

We noted above that in Swahili we can establish without controversy the grammatical relations subject and object. These are defineable with respect to grammatical morphology shown on the verb.
We are adopting grammatical morphology as our basic criterion in defining grammatical relations in order to distinguish between the semantic and discourse roles of a nominal and its grammatical (syntactic) role in the discourse. Grammatical relations are to be considered surface relations while semantic relations and discourse relations are those that can be inferred from the on-going discourse. It is conceivable that grammatical relations cannot be understood in their entirety unless they are related to semantic and discourse roles. However, we cannot reduce the grammatical roles to what is inferable from the discourse. We have to identify the grammatical relation primitives independent of the semantic and the discourse primitives. We take grammatical morphology as our criterion.

2.1.1 The Subject

The subject as a grammatical relation in Swahili is defined as either:

(i) a NP which is coindexed with the subject marker on the verb (traditionally called the subject prefix).

(ii) the subject marker itself, referring to an entity in the preceding or immediate discourse context.

The subject marker, which is part of the verb's morphology, occupies an initial position on the verb and agrees in class with the entity in reference. The following examples illustrate
(i) and (ii) above.

(3) [ Zakaria a - li - po - fika nyumbani ]
SU SM ts rel V
" he pst when arrive home

[a - li - fungua ile baru] [na kuisoma.]
SM ts V
he pst open that letter and to-it-read

[A - li - i - soma kwa shida.]
SM ts OM V
he pst it read with difficulty

"When Zakaria got home, he unfolded the letter and read it. He read it with difficulty."

In example (3) above, Zakaria, which is coindexed with a on the verb fika in clause 1, has the grammatical relation subject for that verb. In clauses 2 and 4, the subject is a and we may add that it refers to the same entity as Zakaria in clause 1.

2.1.2 The object

The formal definition of the grammatical relation object will be either:

(i) a NP coindexed with the object marker on the verb (the verb prefix in traditional terms).

(ii) the object marker itself, referring to a NP in the preceding or immediate discourse context.

The object marker forms a part of the verb's morphology and occupies a position immediately before the verb stem. Like the subject marker, it agrees in class with the entity in reference.
Example (4) below provides an illustration of both (i) and (ii).

(4) [ Msumari wa mwavuli a - li - u - tafuta]1
    O SM ts OM V
    nail of umbrella he pst it look-for

[ A - li - kuwa a - me - u - weka juu ya
SM ts V SM ts OM V
he pst be he perf. it put top of

dirisha kusudi]2 [kwa ku - u - safishia]3
inf. OM V
window purposely for to it clean

[ a - li - u - vuta]4
SM ts OM V
he pst it pull

[ a - ka - u - shindilia kikoni mwahe ]5
SM asp OM V
hc rec. it push pipe+in its

"The umbrella nail, he searched for it where he especially put it on the window to clean his pipe with it. He pulled it out and then pushed it into the pipe."

MZ: 4

In example (4) above, clause 1, msumari, which is coindexed with the object marker u on the verb, is the grammatical object of the verb tafuta. In the subsequent clauses 2-5, u is the object of the verb in each of the clauses and refers to the same entity as msumari in clause 1.

2.1.3 Implications

The definitions of subject and object in sections 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 respectively, as illustrated by the accompanying examples (3) and (4), imply that we are claiming that without grammatical morphology we have no evidence for designating an entity a
grammatical relation to a given verb. Thus, entities for which there is no such morphological evidence will not be considered to be in any grammatical relation with the main verb. Further discussion on such cases can be found in section 2.3. In section 2.2, we will look at the characteristic features of grammatical relations in Swahili discourse. The discussion will focus on the support for judgements such as that in (3) above, Zakaria in clause 1 is not the subject in clauses 2-4 and mwavuli in example (4) clause 1 is not the object of clauses 2-5. Because grammatical relations are defined by both the full NPs and their clitics, both will be subsumed under the term "nominal" in this study.

2.2 The subject and object in Swahili discourse.

In section 2.1 above, we noted that Swahili has only two grammatical relations—the subject and the object. These were defined through grammatical morphology. In this section we will explore further the salient characteristics of these grammatical relations in Swahili discourse.

2.2.1 The subject

In section 2.1.2 above, we noted that the subject is a full NP signaled by the subject marker which is prefixed onto the verb. In cases where there is no overt NP the subject marker
itself is the subject. NPs that are subjects are either nouns or noun-phrases or un-bound pronouns.

For a NP to be designated the grammatical relation subject in a particular clause it has to belong to that clause. That is, it has to be in the same clause as the verb to which it is said to bear a grammatical relation. This explains the fact that in example (3) the NP Zakaria, is said to be the subject of the verb in clause 1, but not in subsequent clauses. The subject marker acquires the status of the subject in cases where there is no overt mention of the same referent. In other words, a NP which is a grammatical relation subject is allowed to have scope within the limits of its clause. The implication is that we are discouraging the tendency to disregard the subject marker and rely on intuitions based on semantic or pragmatic factors in determining grammatical relations.

2.2.2 Distribution of subject-NPs in discourse.

The subject as a bare nominal may appear in pre- or post-verbal position. Examples (5) and (6) below illustrate.

(5) [Mawazo haya ya - li - kuwa ya - ki - zunguka
SU SM ts V SM asp. V
thoughts these they pst be they cont. revolve
kichwani mware]1
head-in his

"These thoughts were revolving in his head".

NK: 2
(6) [Sebuleni kwa bwana Musa [a - li - ko - ingia SM ts rel V
living-room of Mr. Musa he pst where enter
Najum]2 [ha - pa - kuwa ni mahali maalum
not there be is place special
pa ku -zungumzia]1.
of to converse
"Musa's living room into which Najum entered,
was not a special place for conversation".
MZ: 1

In example (5) we show the subject, mawazo, 'thoughts' in
pre-verbal position, while in (6) the subject, Najum, in clause 2
is in post-verbal position. These two examples show that the
subject in Swahili need not always precede its verb. Example (6)
exemplifies our earlier claim that grammatical relations cannot
be understood in their entirety unless they are related to what
is going on in the discourse. With Musa immediately preceding
the verb and Najum immediately following the verb, we need the
semantics and pragmatics of the discourse content in order to
decide on the clause boundary and consequently on the subject of
the clause. Notice also that Musa and Najum belong to the same
noun class and may be thought to be ambiguously related to the
subject marker a on the verb ingia. While examples (5) and (6)
may be used to illustrate the two possible positions the subject
may occupy with respect to the main verb, Table 1 below is
intended to show the distribution of pre-verbal and post-verbal
subjects.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>discourse type</th>
<th>pre-verbal subjects</th>
<th>post-verbal subjects</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fiction</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>90.4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-fiction</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conversation</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: The preferred subject position in discourse.

Clearly the results show that the preferred subject position is pre-verbal —here between 80% and 100%. Thus, the pre-verbal position of bare nominal subjects in Swahili discourse is the normal position while the post-verbal position is the abnormal position.

Observations also show that "post-verbal position" means immediately after the verb. That is, in all the texts examined, there were no cases recorded in which the NP designated "subject" occurred in a non-immediate post-verbal position. However, the pre-verbal position need not also be immediately before the verb. The following examples show that subject NPs may be separated from their main verbs by material such as adverbial phrases, adjectival phrases, and relative clauses, as well as vocatives.
Example (7) is a case in which the subject mtu coindexed with the subject marker a on the verb simama is separated from its verb by an adjectival phrase. Example (8) illustrates both
an adverbial and a vocative intervening between the subject mwanamke 'woman' and the main verb kua 'grow' to which this nominal bears a grammatical relation. (9) serves as an illustration of a vocative and (10) an intervention by a relative clause.

Table 2 below shows the distribution of subject NPs that are immediately before the verb and those that are separated from their main verbs. As the results will demonstrate, the normal cases seem to be those in which the verb and the NP are in immediate juxtaposition. The abnormal cases are those in which there is intervening material.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>discourse type</th>
<th>immediate pre-verbal</th>
<th>non-immediate pre-verbal</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N  %</td>
<td>N  %</td>
<td>N  %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fiction</td>
<td>99  80.5</td>
<td>24  19.5</td>
<td>123  100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-fiction</td>
<td>57  100.0</td>
<td>0  0.0</td>
<td>57  100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conversation</td>
<td>12  15.6</td>
<td>65  84.4</td>
<td>77  100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>168 89</td>
<td></td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Subject NPs in pre-verbal positions.

It seems from the results, that in general the subject will be in immediate pre-verbal position. Notice, however, that this is true of fiction and non-fiction only, in which we find over 80% of the subjects in immediate pre-verbal position. In conversations, subject NPs in non-immediate pre-verbal positions have a higher distribution than those in immediate pre-verbal
position. We do not intend to offer explanations for this observation since we are not giving an account of the effects of genre on the distribution of grammatical relations. In any case, the observations are interesting and merit further investigation.

2.2.3 Subject marker as subject in discourse.

In defining the subject in Swahili, we noted that the subject marker may be the only representation of the subject in a clause. Consider the following example:

(12) [Mbona u - me - kaa nje ]1 [u - me - vaa tau]

\[ \text{SM ts V} \quad \text{SM ts V} \]

why you perf. sit out you perf. wear towel

[ Ni - me - toka hapa ]3 [ kuja kupunga upepo

SM ts V

I perf. come here to come to breeze wind

kidogo]4 [kama u - na - vyo - fahamu]5 [ ndani

SM ts rel V

little as you pres. how know inside

joto sana]6

heat much

"Why are you seated here wearing only a towel? Ah well, I came out here to enjoy the breeze a little. As you know it is very hot inside".

GB: 1

The subject marker in each of the clauses in example (12) above is the only representation of the subject. In each case it has an understood referent. In clauses 1, 2 and 5, the referent is the second person singular and in clauses 3 and 4, the referent is the first person singular.
The examples we have already looked at can also be used to demonstrate the utilization of the subject marker as the grammatical subject in the discourse. Reconsider example (3). For clauses 1–4, only clause 1 has a full NP which represents the subject. The subject in clauses 2 and 4 is represented by the subject marker a which is correferential with the full NP Zakaria in clause 1.

Traditional analyses (cf. Chapter One) would here have considered Zakaria to be the subject in clauses 1 through 4. The present analysis shows evidence against such a treatment by considering it necessary for the subject and the verb in grammatical relations to be in the same clause. Thus, in example (3) we have a full NP which is the subject of clause 1 and the subjects in the remaining clauses are the subject marker a. In example (12), all instances of the grammatical subject are represented by the subject marker itself.

2.2.4 The object

As noted in section 2.1.2, the object, like the subject, is defineable through grammatical morphology. That is, a NP may be designated the object of a particular verb if it is coindexed with an object marker incorporated in the morphological structure of the verb. We have to add also that for a NP to be designated the object of a particular verb, both the verb and its object have to be in the same clause.
2.2.5 Distribution of object -NPs in discourse.

NPs that may be designated objects in Swahili may occur in pre-verbal or post-verbal positions as exemplified below:

(13) [Najum a-li-ondoka juu ya kiti]1
    SU      SM ts V
    " he pst leave top of chair

[ a-ka-ki-tafuta kitabu hicho juu ya meza ]2
SM asp. OM V
he rec. it look-for book that top of table

"Najum left the chair, then looked for the book on top of the table."

Mz : 3

(14) [Najum ki-li-m-ja kicheko]1[a-ka-cheka
    0      SM ts OM V         SM asp V
    " it pst him come laughter he rec. laugh

"Najum was overcome with laughter, he then laughed."

MZ : 3

In example (13), kitabu which is coindexed with ki is the object of tafuta, the main verb. In this case, kitabu is in immediate post-verbal position. In (14), however, the object is Najum, which is in immediate pre-verbal position and is coindexed with the object marker on the verb jia. The two examples demonstrate the fact that object NPs are not always found in post-verbal position although the texts that were used for this study show more object NPs in post-verbal position than elsewhere in Swahili. For that reason we are claiming that the
normal position for the object in Swahili is post-verbal. Table 3 below can be used as an illustration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>discourse types</th>
<th>pre-verbal</th>
<th>post-verbal</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fiction</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-fiction</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conversation</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Distribution of full NP-objects in discourse.

As noted above, the results show post-verbal position to be the most popular position for object NPs in the majority of the cases i.e. over 50% of the post-verbal objects in the texts examined.

By the criterion that an object and its verb must of necessity belong to the same clause, no objects were found in a position other than immediately post-verbal if they occurred after the verb. Pre-verbal object NPs, on the other hand, show two possible positions, either immediately before the verb or with possible intervening material. Where intervening material was noted, the material happened to be the subject of the same verb. Consider the following example:
The motivation for preposing the object NP as in (15) above can be explained by the speaker's intention to focus on a nominal representing a referent which is crucial in the discourse but nevertheless not the primary topic. For the purpose of this example we can say that kicheko 'laughter' is postposed to allow the object NP to occupy an immediate pre-verbal position with respect to the verb.

2.2.6 Object markers as objects in discourse.

Like the subject marker, the object marker may appear in a given clause as the sole representation of the grammatical relation object. Consider the following examples:

(17) [Nikija kwako kwa siku moja]1 [huwezi I-if-come to-you for day one neg-can
    u - ka - ni - ita mrija kwa siku moja]2
    SM asp OM V
    you rec. me call straw for day one

    [huwezi ku - ni - ona mnyonyaji ]3
    inf. OM V
    neg.can to me see sucker
[ni - ta - kuja labda na debe langu la mahindi]
SM ts V
I fut. come perhaps with can mine of corn

[basi haiwezi mboga tu ku - ku - shinda]
inf OM V
then neg-can vegetable only to you defeat

"If I come to your house for a day or two, you
can't call me a leach, (lit. straw) for just one
day, you can't think I am living off you. I will
come may be with a can of corn, just vegetables,
should that be a problem to you?"

MA : 16 - 24

(18) [Palikuwa na msumari wa mwavuli juu ya dirisha]1
there was with rib of umbrella top of window

[a - li - o - u - weka]2 [kusudi kwa kusafishia
SM ts rel OM V
he pst which it put purpose for to-clean

kiko tu]3 [a - li - u - vuta]4
SM ts OM V
pipe only he pst it pull

[a - ka - u - shindilia kikoni mwake]5
SM asp. OM V
he rec. it push pipe in its

"There was an umbrella rib on the window which he had
put there in order to clean his pipe with, he
pulled it, then pushed it into his pipe."

MZ: 4

In example (17), we are concerned with clauses 2, 3 and 5 in
which the object markers ni and ku occur. These refer to first
and second person singular which are not mentioned anywhere in
the dialogue. This can be explained by the fact that what we
have here is actual interaction (face to face) between the
participants. We can refer to ni in clause 2 and 3 and ku in
clause 5 as the objects of their respective verbs. Similarly in
example (18), the object markers in clauses 2, 4 and 5 are the representations of the grammatical relation object. Notice that traditional analysis would have considered the NP *msumari* in clause 1 to be also the grammatical object for clauses 2, 4 and 5 (cf. Ashton 1947, Loogman 1965, Kunene 1975, Duranti and Byarushengo 1977, Morolong and Duranti 1977). The present analysis argues that since *msumari* is not syntactically a part of these clauses with the object markers u, then *msumari* has no grammatical relation with any of these verbs. However, there exists a semantic relation which we will address in Chapter Four.

2.2.7 Summary

In the discussion on grammatical relations we have shown that both bare nominals (full NPs) and special morphemes (subject and object markers) are used in Swahili discourse to represent the grammatical relations. We emphasized that grammatical relations are characterized by grammatical morphology which serves as the only link between the verb and the entity designated the grammatical relation. Other structural characteristics included the various positions the grammatical relations subject and object may occupy in a clause. This positional variation provides motivation for taking grammatical morphology to be essential in distinguishing grammatical from non-grammatical relations in discourse. In the next section we intend to look into what was not exclusively dealt with,
namely the consideration of NPs and other syntactic forms that we would want to designate non-grammatical relations in the discourse.

2.3 Non-grammatical relations in discourse

We noted in describing grammatical relations that by basing the definition on grammatical morphology we are implying that NPs in discourse which appear unlinked by grammatical morphology to the main verb do not qualify to be considered for grammatical relations. We also mentioned that inferred participants are not grammatical relations simply because they are not syntactically related to the verb.

2.3.1 Unspecified subject relations

Because we are defining grammatical relations through grammatical morphology, by "unspecified subject relations" we mean the lack of subject marking on the verb.

Non-marking of the subject in Swahili seems to be largely controlled by tense and aspect. The tenses in question are na 'present', ta 'future', li 'past' and me 'perfect'. The aspects are: ka 'recursive', and hu 'habitual'. In addition, certain tenseless constructions have an effect on the non-marking of the subject. These include imperatives and ku + verb constructions (roughly equivalent to English infinitives and gerunds).

Texts show that in all cases of na, li and me tenses, there is always subject marking on the main verb. That is, no cases
were recorded in which the subject marker was missing in constructions with any of these three tenses. Therefore, we can claim that the use of these tenses (for reasons not clear to me at present) necessitates specified subject relations.

On the other hand, such an obligation does not seem to hold in cases involving the future tense, the aspectuals, the imperatives and ku + verb constructions. However, we need to point out that the aspectual marker ka and the future tense ta and some forms of the imperatives do occur with subject markers. The remaining two members of this group (i.e. hu, ku) cannot occur with the subject marker, as will be shown later.

Consider example (19) below, in which the future tense is used where the subject is unspecified.

(19) [Sasa time zile a - li - kuwa na wewe]1 [hata now time those he pst. be with you even
kama wewe kipofu]2 [munugu Ø ta - ku - pa fahamu - ts. OM V
if you blind god - fut. you give sense
kidogo]3 [lazima Ø ta - ku - saidia tu.]4 - ts OM V
little must - fut. you help only

"Now, the times she is with you, even if you are blind God will give you a little understanding, indeed he will help you."

MU: 10

In (19) we are interested in clauses 3 and 4. Notice that the slot which is normally occupied by the subject marker is unfilled (here indicated by Ø). Both clauses have a future tense
20) [Najum a - li - kuwa kijana wa kiarabu wa umri wa miaka
SU SM-pst-was youth of Arabic of age of years
ishirini na tano]1 [Najum Ø - ka - rudi jana
- asp V
twenty and five rec. return yesterday
kutoka shamba yeye na bwana Musa]2 [ baada ya
from village him and Mr. Musa after of
kukunjwa tanga la bwana Ali.]3
to fold cloth of Mr. Ali

"Najum was a young man of Arabic origin of about 25
years of age...Najum and Mr. Musa just returned from
the village after attending the funeral of Mr. Ali..."

MZ:1

In (20) above, we have two occurrences of the nominal
Najum. In clause 1 this nominal is grammatically marked by the
morpheme a to identify it as the subject of the verb kuwa. In
clause 2, there is no such a morpheme that is associated with the
second occurrence of the nominal Najum. In the example we have
indicated the space left empty by Ø. By our defining criteria,
Najum in clause 2, does not have any grammatical relation with
the main verb rudi.
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(21) [Flora a - ki - enda]1 [kuoga]2 [hu - ji - angalia
SU SM asp. V asp ref. V
Flora she if go to bathe usual self look

kabla ya kuoga] [Hu - tazama matiti yake]4 [ambayo
before of to bath usual look breasts hers which

sasa yanaanza kuwa makubwa]5 [ hu - ji - papasapapasa
asp ref V
now they start to be big usual self caress

kwa mikono]6 [ mpaka pale mako yalipotelemkia]7
by hands until there hips they-drop

"If Flora goes to take a bath, she usually looks at herself before she bathes. She usually looks at her breasts which by now are getting big, she usually caresses herself with her hands up to where her hips curve in."

RM: 9

Clauses 3, 4 and 6 have the habitual aspect marker hu. It is not strange that we do not have a subject marker since clauses with the habitual marker hu do not at the same time have subject markers. As with ku clauses, which we will look at shortly, the interpretation assumes knowledge of the referent in question from previous discourse. Thus, from the definition of subject as given in this study, although clauses 3, 4 and 6 are semantically related to clause 1 in terms of topic, they are not grammatically linked to the nominal Flora, the subject of this clause. Needless to say, even if there were subject markers in clauses 3, 4 and 6, they would not strictly speaking be grammatically linked to the nominal in clause 1, since according to our definition, subject NPs and subject markers have scope only within the
clauses in which they occur.

(22) [Sasa mimi ku-ona]1 [ku - m - fikisha
inf. V inf. OM V
now I to see to him arrive-cause
mbele ya serikali]2 [ni ku - m - sumbuza bure]3
inf. OM V
before of government it to him disturb uselessly

"Now, I thought, to take him to the law is to disturb him unnecessarily."

MS : 174

In this example, we neither have a full NP + a subject marker nor a subject marker in terms of which to identify the grammatical relation subject. All three clauses have ku on the verb which, like hu, constrains the occurrence of the subject marker on the verb's morphology. Like the hu cases, we are considering ku clauses to lack grammatical relations. That is, the verbs in these clauses do not have any grammatical relations.

Example (22) above is an illustration of the tenseless clauses mentioned at the beginning of this section. Example (23) below is another instance, but one in which the ku is also omitted.

(23) [ A - li - fahamu mtu huyo a - li - kuwa nani]1
SM ts V SM ts V
he pst know person that he pst be who
[ na a - li - kuwa na hali gani]2 [ Sauti hiyo
SM ts V
and he pst be and condition what voice that
a - li - kuwa a - me - kwisha Ø i - zoea]3
SM ts V SM ts V - OM V
he pst be he perf.complete it accustom

35
"She knew who that person was and the condition he was in. That voice, she was already accustomed to it."  

RM : 10

In example (23) we are interested in clause 3 in which the symbol $\emptyset$ has been used to show that the expected morpheme that would have indicated that the verb is in grammatical relation with the subject is not present. We also observe that there is no tense or aspect marking on that clause.

From the discourse context, we can infer the referent and the time reference from the preceding verbs kuwa and kwisha. That is, the covert reference is the same as that overtly expressed by the subject marker a on the verbs kuwa and kwisha. The time reference is also the same as that represented by the perfect tense marker me. We are considering the $\emptyset$ in clause 3 to represent a case of an omitted ku. We noted earlier (cf. example 22) that ku clauses do not accommodate a nominal of the status subject, grammatically related to the verb of that clause. A similar generalization is by inference possible in cases where the ku is also omitted.

Our last example in this section illustrates imperatives and the non-marking of subjects.
Example (24) illustrates both what we will refer to in this study as a "simple imperative" and a "complex imperative". A "simple imperative" will be defined as a command in which the verb morphology does not include a subject or an object marker. In other words, simple imperatives do not at the same time show grammatical relation marking. In example (24), clause 1 illustrates a simple imperative. On the other hand, a "complex imperative" is defined as a command in which the verb morphology includes either a subject marker, an object marker or both. Clauses 2 and 4 are illustrations of a complex imperative. Simple imperatives also differ from complex imperatives in that the verb of a simple imperative is marked by an indicative mood marker (usually a for verbs of Bantu origins: e.g. kaa 'stay' in clause 1). In a complex imperative, the verb is marked by a subjunctive mood marker (usually e as in elekez-e "direct" in clause 4 for verbs of Bantu origin).

Generally, simple imperatives involve the second person. In
Swahili, second person participants are taken for granted as understood, from the actual interaction of the participants. Consequently, marking second person for the grammatical relation subject is rare. For simple imperatives to lack subject marking, therefore, is not surprising following from the fact that such commands typically involve the second person.

Complex imperatives may involve the second or the third person. Example (24) above involves the second person, which explains the omission of the subject marker in clauses 2 and 4. It is worth mentioning here (though there was no discourse example found) that if the command involves the third person, then there is an obligatory subject marking to distinguish the third person interpretation from the second person interpretation.

The lack of tense in clauses 1, 2, and 4 in example (24) implies that both simple and complex imperatives, like kу- clauses, fail to include time reference, which explains our decision to put the two in the same category.

Having described the environments in which we can find unspecified subject relations, it is instructive to show the distribution of these environments in discourse. Below in Table 4 we show that distribution. A total number of 174 verbs which did not have subject markers (i.e. Ø plus verb) to assign a potential nominal to the grammatical relation subject were noted. The distribution is as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>feature</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ta</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ka</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hu</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ku</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imperative</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>174</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Distribution of subjectless clauses

From these results it is evident that these six environments provide a common place for unspecified subject relations. However, the only environment in which the subject is consistently unspecified in the discourse context is where ku also appears. Therefore in the case of ku, we can say that there is no discourse pressure (Du Bois 1984) to mark the subject. ta, ka and the imperatives do show subject marking in other cases.

2.3.2 Unspecified object relations

By our grammatical criterion, the nominals in caps in example (25) below are automatically disqualified for the grammatical relation object.

(25) [ Kila mara a - li - tukan -w - a na MAMA yake]l
    SM ts V pass. ind.
    every time he pst insult by mother hers
    [ kwamba a - li - kuwa mvivu]2 [Regina a- ki- sema
    SM ts V SU SM asp. V
    that he pst be lazy " she cond. say
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kulima]3 [ye ye hu - beba MTOTO UBAVUNI]4
asp. V
 to farm  she usual carry child rib-loc.
[A - ki - amhi -w- a kuweka MOTO JIKONI]5
SM asp. V pass.ind.
she cond. tell to put fire hearth-lock.
[hu - chukua MAJANI kutoka PAA LA JIKONI]6
asp. V
usual take grass from roof of kitchen

"Every time she is scolded by her mother who says she is very lazy. If Regina tells her to go and work on the garden, she picks up the baby. If she tells her to go start a fire in the kitchen, she takes grass(fire starter) f..m the kitchen roof."

RM: 9

Following traditional analysis, the nominal *mama* in clause 1 would be considered an "oblique object" since it is associated with the passive verb indicated by the morpheme *-w-* on the verb *tukan-w-a* and *na* 'by' which precedes the nominal. Such a consideration has its source in English in which a nominal with such a characteristic might be thus designated. Notice that *mtoto* in clause 4, *moto* in clause 5, and *majani* in clause 6 might be considered objects of the verbs *beba*, *weka* and *chukua* respectively, though the criterial characteristics are not agreed on, as noted in Chapter One. That is, the decision is sometimes based on the structural position a nominal occupies with respect to the main verb, sometimes on the ability to undergo certain syntactic processes, and sometimes on the semantic relations of the nominal. *Ubayuni* in clause 4 and *jikoni* in clause 5 would be
designated locative nominals and by some analyses (cf. Hodges 1977, Gary 1977) cannot be grammatically related to any predicate. Presumably paa la jikoni in clause 6 would be similarly considered since it also denotes location.

The present analysis, however, considers all the nominals in question in example (25) above to have no specific grammatical relation since they lack the necessary grammatical morphology that is characteristic of Swahili grammatical relations.

2.3.3 Summary

In the foregoing section, we have shown that nominals in Swahili that are not related to grammatical morphology on the main verb are not to be considered grammatical relations. We showed that unspecified subjects are commonly found in clauses with the future tense te, the aspect markers ka and hu, and in tenseless clauses that involve ku- and imperatives both simple and complex. In general, we have tried to demonstrate that grammatical relations in Swahili discourse are essentially characterized by grammatical morphology shown on the verb.

2.4 An overview of the general distribution of Referents.

One of the most interesting findings in this study is that NPs in Swahili discourse are generally unmarked for grammatical relations. Tables 5 and 6 below show evidence for this. In table 5, we show the general distribution of grammatically specified and grammatically unspecified NPs in discourse. In
In Table 6, we split the grammatically specified NPs into grammatical subject and grammatical object.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>discourse type</th>
<th>grammatically specified NPs</th>
<th>unspecified NPs</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fiction</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-fiction</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conversation</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>353</td>
<td></td>
<td>589</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: General distribution of NPs in Swahili discourse.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>discourse type</th>
<th>grammatical subject</th>
<th>grammatical object</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fiction</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-fiction</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conversation</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>281</td>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Distribution of grammatical subject and object

The results in Tables 5 and 6 confirm the following:

(i) Most of the NPs in Swahili discourse appear unmarked for grammatical relations.

(ii) Of the marked NPs, the majority are the grammatical relation subject.
With respect to (i), table 5 shows over 50% unmarked NPs. (ii) is illustrated in table 6 in which also over 50% of the marked NPs appear as the grammatical subject.

Looking at the individual texts, it is interesting to note that marking and non-marking of grammatical relations seem to reflect both the text's genre and the language background of the speaker or writer, that is, whether the text is spoken or written and whether the speaker or writer's first language (L-1) is Swahili. Observations show that, in general, spoken discourse tends to have a lower distribution of grammatically marked NPs than written discourse. However, speakers whose Swahili is their second language (L-2), tend to have a lower distribution of grammatically marked NPs in spoken discourse than in written discourse. On the other hand, for spoken discourse, speakers of Swahili as their first language show a higher distribution of grammatically marked NPs than speakers of Swahili as their second language.

With respect to non-marking, in general, written discourse tends to show a lower distribution of unmarked NPs than spoken discourse for all speakers of Swahili. In spoken discourse, first language speakers show a higher distribution of unmarked NPs than do second-language speakers. Tables 7 and 8 below are intended to illustrate these observations. In table 7 we show the distribution of marked NPs in relation to the genre and the language background of the speaker. In table 8 we show the
distribution of unmarked NPs also in relation to the genre and the language background of the speaker.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>language background</th>
<th>spoken</th>
<th>written</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L - 1</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L - 2</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Language background and genre effects on grammatical relations marking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>language background</th>
<th>spoken</th>
<th>written</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L - 1</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L - 2</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Language background and genre effects on non-marking of grammatical relations

In general, the marking of grammatical relations is higher in written discourse than in spoken discourse: 57.4% compared to 42.6%. Also, speakers whose Swahili is their second language (L-2) less frequently mark their NPs for grammatical relations than do first language (L-2) Swahili speakers — here 37.9% and 43.7% for L-2 Swahili speakers compared to 62.1% and 56.3% (in Table 7)
for L-1 Swahili speakers. In the case of non-marking of grammatical relations, generally, spoken discourse shows more NPs unrelated grammatically to the main verbs in the clauses in which they both occur. Compare 73.2% for spoken with 53.9% for written (in Table 8). With respect to L-1 and L-2 Swahili speakers, L-1 speakers tend not to mark their NPs for grammatical relations as frequently as L-2 speakers: 61.5% (spoken) and 53.8% (written) (in Table 8) for L-1 speakers compared to 38.5% (spoken) and 46.2% (written) (in Table 8) for L-2 speakers. It is interesting that genre and the language background of the speaker should show effects on the distribution of grammatical relations in Swahili discourse. At the present we do not have explanations for these facts. We might consider first-language interference on the part of the L-2 speakers as a possible explanation but this is subject to further study. For the time being we leave it at the level of interesting observations. Furthermore, although we have singled out genre and language background as having a clear causal relationship with respect to the distribution of marking and non-marking of NPs for grammatical relations in Swahili discourse, these are by no means the only factors. We intend to show in Chapters Three and Four that there are other discourse and semantic factors to be considered.

2.5 General Summary

In this chapter we have tried to argue for the hypothesis that Swahili has only two grammatical relations, subject and
object. We noted that these terms may be used cross-
linguistically so long as they describe similar phenomena in
different languages. However, it should not be taken for granted
that, what is subject or object in one language is necessarily
the same in another language. In Swahili, the subject and object
are defined through grammatical morphology. By considering
grammatical morphology as the criterion in designating a
particular grammatical relation, we are trying to discourage
arguments for grammatical relations that are based on intuitions
and inference.

In the discussion we also described the possible positions
that may be occupied by the two grammatical relations as revealed
by the texts used for this study. We concluded that the
grammatical subject and object have no fixed position in a clause
and that they may appear in pre-verbal or post-verbal positions
depending on discourse factors whose discussion we have reserved
for Chapter Three. By implication, the analyses that suggest
word order as a criterion for grammatical relations (cf. Gary
1977, Hawkinson & Hyman 1974, Kunene 1975, Duranti & Byarushengo
1977, Morolong and Hyman 1977 and Hyman and Duranti 1982) have
problems with Swahili because Swahili discourse does not support
that criterion.

Although the position of grammatical relations in Swahili is
not invariable, we can nevertheless speak of normal and abnormal
positions for both the grammatical subject and object. We noted
that the normal position for the grammatical subject is pre-verbal and the normal position for the grammatical object is post-verbal. This conclusion was established by statistical evidence based on the percentage of time each of the grammatical relations occurred in the two established positions, namely pre-verbal and post-verbal positions.

Finally, we noted that the distribution of NPs that are grammatically related to the verb and those that were not related may be influenced by genre and the language background of the speaker/writer. We did not attempt to give arguments or explanations for the results that suggest the possibility of such an influence but rather, we called for further investigations. However, the significance of these results as well as the arguments that were given for the grammatical relations in this chapter are support for our hypothesis that Swahili has two grammatical relations and that these are best defined through grammatical morphology. We also maintained a particularistic view that grammatical relations are language-specific.
FOOTNOTES

1. The Swahili agreement system is based on a noun class system categorized into sets of singular and plural. Each singular and plural noun class governs a set of agreement morphemes on the verb. For example, class 1/2, which includes animate nouns, are indicated by a noun prefix m / wa for singular and plural respectively. The subject is indicated by a / wa morphemes on the verb while the object is indicated by M / wa also on the verb. For inanimates, the subject and object markers are different from the noun prefixes. For example, class 3/4 nouns are indicated by a noun prefix m for singular and mi for plural. As both the subject and object, the nouns are indicated by u for singular and i for plural.

2. cf. footnote 1 above.

3. Unbound pronouns refer to free morphemes in Swahili which represent the three persons. These morphemes appear unattached to the verb. The bound pronouns on the other hand, have to be attached to the verb and occur as a part of the verb's morphology. Below is a summary of the bound and unbound pronouns:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>bound</th>
<th>unbound</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ni</td>
<td>mimi</td>
<td>I/me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u / ku</td>
<td>wewe</td>
<td>you / you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a / m</td>
<td>yeye</td>
<td>he / she, him / her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tu</td>
<td>sisi</td>
<td>we / us</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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m/wa  ninyi  you all  
wao  wa  they/them

4. Here we are taking the standard definition of a clause, that is, the verb and its associated arguments (NPs). In Swahili, we may also add that the verb in its complex form (i.e. a conjugated verb which may include a subject marker, the tense and the mood marker, the object marker and other verb extensions (cf. Ashton 1947) may be considered a clause. For example:

\[
\text{a - li - m - pik - i - a} \\
\text{SM ts OM V ext mood} \\
\text{he pst him cook for indicative}
\]

"she cooked for him".

This is a complex verb which may also be called a clause.

5. The texts selected for fiction are RM. (Rosa Mistika by E. Kezilahabi (1971)) and MZ. (Msimu wa watu wa kale by M.S. Abdulla (1960)). Non-fiction include UJ (Ujamaa vijijini by Julius K. Nyerere (1970b)). Conversation include taped conversations referred to as MU. (Mustafa), GB. (Gari Bovu) and MS. (Maisha).

6. When individual texts are compared, the results show that only Swahili speakers whose Swahili is their first language use both immediate pre-verbal position and non-immediate preverbal position. Those whose Swahili is their second language do not show this option. Thus, we find 100% distribution of subject in immediate pre-verbal position for our
non-fiction category which is a text written by a second language Swahili speaker.

7. Negative si- 'not+I', hu 'not+you', ha 'not+he/she' hatu 'not+us', ham 'not+you all' and hawa 'not+them' are to be considered cases of subject marking when prefixed onto the verb since they distinguish subject from object.

8. The terms "simple" and "complex" are also used in Swahili grammar to distinguish conjugated from non-conjugated verbs (cf. fn. 4. also Ashton 1947, Loogman 1965, Polome 1967, Maw 1969). For example the verb pika "cook" is considered to be a simple form of the verb made up of the verb root and the indicative mood marker a. The verb anapikia (cf. fn. 4 for the morpheme to morpheme translation) is considered the complex form made up of the subject marker, the tense marker, the verb root, the -i- marker (extension) and the indicative mood marker. By adopting the same terminology for the imperatives, we are distinguishing the simple imperatives from the complex imperative along the same lines. In fact the imperatives have the same verb forms differing only in their semantic implications.

9. L-1 (speakers of Swahili as their first language) include the following texts: Mzimu wa watu wa kale, Gari bovu and Mustafa. L-2 (speakers whose Swahili is second language) include: Rosa Mistika, Nitakuja kwa siri, Uhuru na Maendeleo and Maisha.
10. Word order and grammatical relations will be discussed in Chapter five.
Chapter Three

3.0 Discourse Parameters influencing Grammatical relations.

3.0.1 Introduction

In this chapter, we will be concerned with the discourse parameters that may influence the speaker's choice of a particular nominal (i.e. NP and its clitics) for a particular grammatical relation. The hypothesis is that the choice is made on the basis of discourse parameters including: the salience of referents, the definiteness of nominals and the animacy status of the referents in the discourse. These parameters should not be considered to operate individually, but rather, they function as a set since each reflects a natural interaction with the other parameters in the set. As will be shown in the discussion, a referent that is high in salience will also be high in animacy, and will be mentioned by definite nominals.

3.1 Definiteness

Definiteness is defined on the basis of the ability by the hearer or reader to identify the referent in the discourse context or situation (i.e. known argument). From the speaker's point of view, it will be the speaker's assumption that the hearer can pick out and establish the referents provided that information is already available within the universe of discourse (cf. Chafe 1976, Du Bois 1980). Referentiality takes part in the
wider definition of definiteness in that it entails the entities or concepts treated as existing within that universe of the discourse. Such entities have a continuous identity (participant / topic continuity) over time (Du Bois 1980, Givon 1983). In the case of Swahili, nominals whose referents have already been mentioned in earlier discourse as well as proper names and entities that are common knowledge to both the speaker and the hearer will be considered definite.

The claim is that, a nominal selected for grammatical relation may have a definite status if it receives further mentions in the on-going discourse. This claim lends support to the assumption held about other Bantu languages that grammatical relation marking depends on the speaker's assumption about what the hearer already knows about the referent (cf. Kunene 1975).

3.1.1 Definiteness and the grammatical Relation Nominals

A nominal which is a grammatical relation will be considered definite depending on whether its referent can easily be identified by the hearer in the discourse. One way in which the hearer can identify the referent is when it has been mentioned before. Consider the following example:
(1) [Mtua - ki - zaliwa shamba] 1
   SU SM asp. V
   person he cond. born farm

   [nadhani maisha yake yote ya - na - kuwa ya
   SU SM ts V
   I think life his all they pres. be of

   shamba pale pale]2 [Kumbe mtu ni
   farm there there so person is

   ku - kaa shamba kidogo]3 [ na mjini kidogo]4
to stay farm little and city little

   [Hivyo huwezi kuwa mtu wa shamba tu.]5
   thus cannot be person of farm only

   [U - ta - ya - jua maisha mbali mbali]6
   SM ts OM V O
   you fut. them know life various

   "If a person is born in the village his whole life is
   in the village. But a person should stay in the
   village for a while and in the city for a while. In
   that way he cannot be just a village person. One should
   experience different lifestyles."

   Ma : 101 -110

In example (1) we identify the nominal mtu in clause 1 as
the subject of the verb zaliwa since it is coindexed with the
subject marker a on the same verb. Because this is the first
mention of the referent in the opening of the discourse, it is
not to be considered definite. Similarly for the nominal maisha
coindexed with the subject marker ya on the verb kuwa in clause
2. shamba in clause 1, on the other hand, is unspecified for
grammatical relation status and is also indefinite since it is
the first mention of this referent. Notice, however, that all
three of these referents we just mentioned get subsequent mentions
as NPs in later clauses. _mtu_ occurs is referred to in clause 3 and 5, _shamba_ in clauses 3 and 5 and _maisha_ in clause 6. _mtu_ in the subsequent mentions is unspecified for grammatical relation and so is _shamba_. _maisha_ is the grammatical object in clause 6, since it is coindexed with the object marker _ya_ in the verb _jua_. In their subsequent mentions as opposed to their first mentions, these nominals are all definite.

Notice also that in example (1) we considered the definiteness of full NPs with a marker for those nominals in a grammatical relation and only full NPs for those unspecified for a grammatical relation status. In our next example we show a case in which definiteness can be attributed to subsequent mentions made by just the subject or object markers.

(2) [Barua yenye stampu]_1_ [Rosa alisema kwa sauti]_2_
     letter with stamp " said in voice
     
     [i- li - m- shangaza]_2_ [i - li - m - fanya]_3_
     SM ts OM V SM ts OM V
     it pst her astonish it pst her make
     
     [a - i - fungue upesi upesi]_4_ [i - li - kuwa
     SM OM V SM ts V
     she it open quick quick it pst be
     
     i - me - andikwa "kwa Roja" juu ya bahasha]_5_
     SM ts V
     it perf. write to " top of envelope
     
     [i - li - kuwa kama kwamba i - li - andikwa]_6_
     SM ts V SM ts V
     it pst be as that it pst written
[na mtu a-li-ye soma katika shule ya SM ts rel V and person he pst who read in school of wazee]7 old people

"a letter with a stamp", Rosa exclaimed. It surprised her, it made her open it very quickly. It had been written "to Roja" on the envelope. It was as if it had been written by a person who has been in adult literacy classes".

RM: 10

In example (2), our interest is the nominal, barua. The occurrence in clause 1, is its first mention, which is therefore, indefinite. Notice however, that we do not have further mentions by a full NP. The subsequent mentions are made through grammatical markers on the verbs expressing the successive actions in the discourse contexts. In clauses 3, 5 and 6 the nominals are the grammatical subject represented by the subject marker 1. In clause 4, the nominal is the grammatical object since the verb is prefixed by the object marker -i-. We consider the subsequent mentions made by the grammatical markers to be definite.

We have used examples (1) and (2) above to show that we consider first mentions as indefinites and subsequent mentions as indication that the nominal has attained a definite status. However, not all subsequent mentions in the discourse are to be considered definite. There will be cases that we will consider indefinite as the following example shows.
The fruits of cooperative labour were not divided equally. However, there were laws intended to see that they were equally divided...[33]...The fruits of their labour were the property of the entire community."

Our interest is in the nominal matunda. The ...[33].. in the example indicates the number of clauses intervening between the previous mention of matunda and the next mention. The first occurrence of matunda is indefinite because clause 1 is the opening clause of the text. The first mention of this nominal is the subject coindexed with the subject marker ya on the verb kuwa. Its subsequent mention, which is considered definite, is in clause 2 and is the grammatical object coindexed with the
object marker ya on the verb gawanya. There are no further mentions of this nominal until 33 clauses later. This gap is long enough for the definiteness of the previous mention nominal to have "decayed" (Givon 1983). Therefore, a nominal which re-appears in the discourse after a long period of absence is considered indefinite. We are adopting Givon's (1983) standard measure of 25 clauses as a reasonable gap between previous mention and the subsequent mention for "decayed" definiteness.

To conclude this section, we showed what we would consider definite and indefinite in Swahili discourse. We showed that definiteness can be a property of by subsequent mentions of a referent as either a full NP and or a grammatical marker for the nominal having grammatical relations. Nominals that are unspecified for grammatical relations can also be definite. In the next section we would like to consider further the definiteness of unspecified grammatical relation nominals to show that definiteness is not a defining characteristic of grammatical relations in Swahili.

3.1.2 Definiteness of non-grammatical relation nominals

Nominals that are unspecified for grammatical relations also appear as definite or indefinite in the discourse. Where the nominal is definite, it may have been mentioned in previous but immediate discourse, it can be identified through eye contact, or it is common knowledge that is shared by the speaker and the
hearer. An indefinite nominal, on the other hand, is that nominal whose referent the speaker assumes the hearer will not be able to pick out. We make reference to example (1) in which we identified the nominal shamba as unspecified for grammatical relations. This nominal is indefinite in its first mention in clause 1 and definite in its subsequent mentions in the discourse. The following examples (4) and (5) further exemplify definite and indefinite non-grammatical relation nominals.

(4) [Tatizo la pili ni maisha wa - li - yo - penda
problem of second is lif they pst which like
wananchi]1 [Ni kweli ]2 [kwamba tu - li - ishi
citizen is true that we pst live
maisha ya usawa.]3 [Usawa huo tu - na - taka
life of equality equality that we pres want
ku - u - dumisha.]4 [Umasikini ni lazima
inf OM V
to it preserve poverty is must
tu - u - ondooe]5 [maana ha - u -
SM OM V neg SM
we it remove meaning not it
kutokana na misingi yenye we ya maisha ]6
V
originate and basis itself of life
"The second problem, is the standard of life aspired by the citizens. It is true that we enforce equality in the standard of life and that we want to preserve that kind of equality. As for poverty, we must get rid of it, because our ancestors did not lead that kind of life (life of in poverty).

UJ: 3

The underlined nominal maisha 'life' is considered indefinite in clause 1. It is also unspecified for grammatical relation. It is indefinite because this is its first mention. It is designated no-grammatical relation, because it is not coindexed on the verb penda 'like' in clause 1. Although it is unspecified for grammatical relations in its subsequent mentions in clauses 3 and 6, it is nevertheless considered definite in these mentions.

Now consider example (5) below:

(5) [Wa- li- kuta Seif]1 [Ø- ka- funga mlango wake SM ts V - asp V
they pst find ' ' rec close door his
bado]2 [na i - li - onekana]3 [ha - u - ta- funguliwa SM ts V neg SM ts V
still and it pst seem not it fut open
ten[a]4 [Pili a - li - gonga mlango kwa nguvu]5 SM ts V
again ' ' she pst knock door in strength
[lakini Seif Ø- ka- nyamaa makusudi]6 [kama yeye SM ts V
but ' ' rec be silent intention as if he
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"They found Seif's door still locked and it seemed it would remain like that. Pili knocked hard on the door but Seif pretended to be deaf. They called (him) again and again but Seif remained quiet as if someone had blocked his ears with cotton wool."

NK: 6

In this example, our interest is in the nominal Seif in clauses 1, 6 and 9. In clause 1, the occurrence of Seif is considered indefinite because it is the first mention after a long period of absence from the discourse (we shall return to this point shortly). In the subsequent mentions, it is definite. However, the nominal is unspecified for grammatical relations in all its mentions. This example is interesting because it shows an instance where the nominal that is definite, but unspecified for grammatical relations, is also animate (human). The assumption held by Bantuists who have interest in grammatical relations, is that nominals that represent animate referents, and which are definite, are also grammatical relations. The example shows that Swahili has evidence contrary to that assumption. This will be discussed in section 3.3 in which definiteness of nominals is compared to the animacy status.

To conclude, we just showed examples of definite non-grammatical relation NPs. We noted that their definiteness may
be determined from previous mention followed by other successive
mentions. In our discussion of example (5) we mentioned that
the nominal Seif, in clause 1, was indefinite because it was the
first mention after a long period of absence from the discourse.
In our next example we will show that the definiteness of non-
grammatical relation nominals, just like that of grammatical
relation nominals, can also decay if there is a gap of absence
between previous mention and subsequent mention(s) of the same
nominal. We are using the same measure we used for definite
grammatical relation nominals, which is 25 clauses.

(6) [Baba, baba, Stela a - li - ita ]1
   SU SM ts V
   father, father " she pst call

[Rosa a - li - pata barua pamoja na shilingi
   SU SM ts V
   " she pst get letter with and shilling
   ishirini]2 [A - me - tu - onyesha]3
   SM ts OM V
twenty she perf. us show

[Zakaria a - li - chafuka]4 [Rosa a - li - itwa]5
   SU SM ts V SU SM ts V
   " he pst vexed " she pst call

...............[41]...........

[lete barua]45 [i - ko wapi]46 [pamoja na
SM V+loc.
bring letter it be where with
shilingi u - li - zo - pewa]47 [U - na - fikiri
SM ts rel V SM ts V
shillings you pst which given you pres.think
sisi ni maskini]48 ........[36].......
"Father, father today Rosa received a letter with twenty shillings. She showed us. Zekaria was disturbed. Rosa was called. ....[41]....Bring that letter, where is it, with the money you were given. Do you think we are poor?.....[36] You must show me the letter. You want to be a prostitute like your mother.....[1]....inside her geography books she took out the letter and five shillings. She gave her father the money but the letter, she folded it up and threw it into her mouth."

RM : 13.

In the example, our interest is barua which at its first mention in clause 1 is considered indefinite. This is the same nominal we used in example (2). The gap between the mention of
barua in example (2) and that shown in example (6) above is 106 clauses. By our measure this is adequate to consider the mention in example (6) as indefinite. The next mention after clause 1 is 42 clauses away which again is sufficient for us to take the mention in clause 45 to be indefinite. The next occurrence in clause 85 is likewise considered indefinite. However its mention in clause 88 is definite because the previous mention is only three clauses away which is below our set limit for "decayed" definiteness.

To conclude we have shown that the definiteness status of nominals that are unspecified for grammatical relations share the same characteristics as those of the nominals that have a grammatical relation status. Thus the occurrence of the subject and object marker in discourse is neither a necessary nor sufficient to guarantee that a nominal is definite. Previous mention of a nominal has to be within a reasonable distance if the definiteness status is to obtain. We posited a maximum of 25 clauses after which an earlier mention will no longer render a nominal identifiable.

Having defined what the study considers definite and indefinite nominals, we will now show the distribution in discourse of both the nominals designated for a grammatical relation and those that appear unspecified for grammatical relations.
3.1.3 Definiteness and the distribution of Nominals

The claim is that the nominals selected for grammatical relation by speakers tend to be definite from previous mention or are common knowledge to both the speaker and the hearer (e.g. the moon, the sun etc....). Furthermore, given a number of nominals in the discourse, the majority of the definite nominals will also be the grammatical subject and object. But when the definite subjects and the definite objects are compared, we will find that subjects more than objects tend to be definite. Table 9 is intended to show support for these claims. Although in the table, we compare the definite status of nominals in general, the comparison between subject and object is also clear from the results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominals</th>
<th>Definite</th>
<th>Indefinite</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subject</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>object</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-gram.</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>482</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: The Definiteness of Nominals in Discourse.

The results indicate that in Swahili discourse, nominals that are grammatical relations tend to be definite. In the table we see that over 60% of the occurrences of the subjects and objects that are definite. Non-grammatical relation nominals tend to be indefinite - here showing over 50% of the total occurrences.
Thus, we can claim that there is a tendency for grammatical relations more than non-grammatical relation nominals to be definite. However, both subjects and objects tend to be definite, to the same extent.

The results also reflect our earlier observations about the frequency of occurrence of subjects in the discourse. We saw that the majority of the grammatical relation nominals in discourse are the subjects. We would expect this to be reflected in the frequency of occurrence of definite nominals in the discourse. We will show later that the definiteness of a nominal correlates with the salience of its referent in discourse (sect. 3.2), and the animacy status of the referent (sect. 3.3). With respect to salience, the correlation is obvious since both factors are measured by the frequency of occurrence of the nominal in question. The claim with regard to animacy is that the tendency is for discourse nominals to be animate (human) and therefore more salient with more definite mentions.

We have shown in table 9 that, given a number of nominals that are unspecified for grammatical relations, the majority will be indefinite. However, at least 40% of them will be definite nominals. These findings are interesting because they show that definiteness is not a characteristic of grammatical relations only and that there must be other factors that explain the definiteness tendencies of nominals in discourse.
One other observation from the results is that over 30% of the subjects are indefinite. This finding contradicts the claim by Givon (1979: 26) that subjects cannot be indefinite since the subject position in a sentence is one in which new information cannot be introduced. He notes that in order to violate this categorial constraint, speakers resort to existential presentative constructions, citing Bantu languages in particular Swahili, Bemba and Rwanda, as examples where speakers do just that. The data for this study provide no evidence in support of Givon's claim. That is, no cases were noted in which the speaker resorted to existential presentatives to avoid indefinite subjects. The findings also contradict Kimenyi's (1980) similar claim. Kimenyi claims that subjects in Bantu languages are either definite or generic. However, their claims are drawn from isolated sentences and not based on discourse counts. The Swahili data based on actual discourse counts evidence for subjects that are not common knowledge to the speaker and hearer.

To conclude this section, we have shown that, in discourse subject and object will be definite. Non-grammatical relation nominals also appear definite but the majority are indefinite. We also showed that it is not always the case that subjects and objects are definite. In fact grammatical relations cannot be defined by definiteness. The assumption that subject and object marking in Bantu indicates the definiteness of a nominal is not supported by our results. Thus, we cannot assume that in
Swahili, if a nominal is a grammatical relation then it is automatically definite.

3.2 Salience

Salience is to be understood in terms of the frequency of occurrence of a particular nominal. It will be shown that the nominal that is selected by the speaker for a grammatical relation (either as subject or as object) reflect the salience of the referent in the discourse.

The salience of a referent was measured by the frequency of mentions. Example (7) below is intended to show the salience of a particular nominal, kanuni "principle(s)".


"This kind of life was possible because of three main principles. These principles were agreed upon without objections and without even thinking about them, but they were the foundation on which the family was built and the family itself protected them and preserved them. They were the basis for their traditions and customs and everybody’s traditional teaching, and although they were not closely followed by everybody there was no one who dared object to them or refuse to follow them. The reputation of a person depended on his efforts to keep these principles. The first
principle can be referred to as to love one another or to respect each other....This principle concerned people. The second principle concerned wealth....These principles protected the wealth that was shared by all........" UJ:1

Each mention of the referent of kanuni 'principle(s)' has been underlined throughout. In its initial mention, it is not specified for grammatical relation. In its subsequent mentions it is either the grammatical subject or the grammatical object. Thus its salience has been measured by the number of times reference has been made to it. In other words salience is equal to the number of mentions and the claim is that the most frequently mentioned referents will tend to show up as subjects and objects. In this example the nominal is salient by fourteen (14) mentions. Of these fourteen mentions, only one mention is unspecified for grammatical relation status.

The claim is that speakers tend to make the most salient participants of the discourse the grammatical relations. That is, the subject and the object will be found in discourse to refer to the most salient entities as measured by the frequency of their mention in the discourse. However, the subject will tend to represent a more salient referent than the object. Table 10 below provides evidence based on data from one text Mzimu wa watu wa kale (M.S. Abdulla 1977).

Before we look at the data in table 10, we would like to give our readers an orientation to the text. The text, which is

69
limited to one thousand words (1,000), is the beginning part of a murder story. There are thirteen thematic paragraphs and each paragraph focuses on certain participants. In paragraph one, the main participants, Najum and Musa, are introduced to the reader. In paragraph two, Najum, receives a lengthy description which includes his ethnicity and physical features. In the third paragraph we get to know the relationship between the two participants as well as their relationship with the victim of the murder, Ali. In paragraphs four through five, is a description of Musa's room. In this room, Najum is waiting for Musa who was not in the room at Najum's arrival. In addition we get an account of the activities in which Najum engages while he waits for his host. He looks at the contents of the papers that are scattered on the table and finding nothing really interesting, he starts to look for a special book in which he believes Musa keep all his secrets about the tactics he uses in solving mysterious murder cases. In paragraphs six through nine, we get a description of Musa, his personality and how it affects his job as a private detective. Finally, in paragraphs ten through thirteen, the writer describes how Musa reacts when he returns to the room and finds his guest busy in his room. In addition there is a description of the activities in which Musa engages before he settles down to talk with his guest. These include his attempt to light his pipe, which, because it is very hard to light, he has to poke, take all the tobacco out, clean, put the
tobacco back, and try once more to light. After successfully lighting it, he settles down, and takes a couple of puffs and then comments on the murder that he is about to start investigating.

Apart from the three participants we have just mentioned in our description, the writer uses forty nine other nominals within the thirteen paragraphs. Some receive only one mention others between two and fifty one mentions in the entire text. In table 10 we only show those referents that had three or more mentions made of them, considering any referent which has at least three mentions to be a crucial participant in the discourse. With the exception of Musa and Najum, the occurrences of most of the selected referents are within one paragraph. We took this to indicate that the nominal was crucial in that particular paragraph and therefore its three occurrences in that paragraph are sufficient for it to be considered salient. The nominals Musa and Najum, which have more mentions than any of the other selected nominals (as we will see shortly), occur throughout the entire text. We took this to be an indication that they are the main participants in the story line.
Now compare the mentions of the selected referents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>referent</th>
<th>trans.</th>
<th>subject</th>
<th>object</th>
<th>unspec.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Najum</td>
<td>(name)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musa</td>
<td>(name)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chembe</td>
<td>'match'</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kitabu</td>
<td>'book'</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ali</td>
<td>(name)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kiti</td>
<td>'chair'</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kiko</td>
<td>'pipe'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tumbako</td>
<td>'tobacco'</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>msumari</td>
<td>'nail'</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meza</td>
<td>'table'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mdomo</td>
<td>'mouth'</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>koti</td>
<td>'coat'</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pua</td>
<td>'nose'</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rafu</td>
<td>'shelf'</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ukuta</td>
<td>'wall'</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Salience and the grammatical relations

Note: The data in the table represent the actual tokens.

The results show that in general the tendency is for speakers to make the most salient referents the grammatical relations. That is, a salient referent will tend to occur as either the grammatical subject or the grammatical object unless there are other interfering factors, which we will discuss shortly.

From the table it is obvious that the most salient referents are Musa and Najum, each of which have (51) mentions. The mentions are made both by overt NP+SM/OM (subject marker/object marker) or the subject marker or the object marker.
itself. The next most salient referents include chembe 'match-stick', kitabu 'book', Ali (the murder victim), kiti 'chair' and kiko 'pipe' as the table shows, their salience is very low compared to that of Najum and Musa. With the exception of Ali, these nominals are inanimate. Compared to the salience of Najum and Musa, which are animate, we suggest the existence of an interplay between animacy and salience. The most salient referents should turn out to be animate (human) as exemplified by the high salience of Musa and Najum. We will elaborate on this factor in section 3.3. There also seems to be a correlation between salience, animacy, and the referents in the discourse content, as will become clear shortly. If the nominal represent a referent that is capable of participating in the successive actions in the discourse content, then it is likely that the nominal is animate and will be more salient than those nominals representing referents that are not capable of such participation. In addition, capable participants will be coded as either subject or object. The differences in salience between the animate and inanimate referents compared above seem to allow that assumption to be made.

The low salience of Ali compared to that of the other two animate referents reflects Ali's status in the story: he is the victim of a murder, i.e. he is already dead, he has no active role in the story line and will therefore receive fewer mentions than his counterparts. Notice also that Ali receives more
mentions as object than as subject while Musa and Najum receive more mentions as subject than as object. This seem to indicate that the salient nominals representing the less active participants will appear as the object.

We attributed the animacy and degree of participation factors to the low salience of the referents chembe 'matchstick', kitabu 'book', kiti 'chair', and kiko 'pipe. We need to comment on their higher salience compared to the others listed and those we did not list. The salience of kiti is in paragraph four in which Musa's room is described. It seems to be the most crucial item (apart from meza 'table', which has 5 mentions) compared to rafu 'shelf', koti coat' and ukuta 'wall'.

The conclusion we can draw from the results in Table 10 and the discussion is that salience and the distribution of grammatical relations correlate as measured by the frequency of occurrence of nominals that are also the grammatical relations. There is a tendency for the most salient nominals to also be the grammatical relations. However, salience on its own is not sufficient to explain this tendency. It can only be used in conjunction with the animacy factor. The interplay between salience and the animacy factor was only touched upon. In the next section 3.3 we discuss the animacy factor and comment further on its significance with respect to the distribution of grammatical relations in discourse.
3.3 Animacy

The linguistic relevance of animacy in this study is essentially in the fact that texts show a high correlation between grammatical relations and the animacy status of the referent. As will be shown in my data, discourses tend to involve animate (mostly human) nominals more than inanimate nominals. Consequently, more animate than inanimate nominals tend to be chosen for grammatical relations.

Animacy as a discourse parameter is correlated with salience and definiteness status of the nominals that appear as the grammatical relations in the discourse.

The claim is that there is a tendency for animates more than inanimates in the discourse to be the most salient referents and the definite nominals. The correlation between animacy, salience, and the choice of grammatical relations is evident in Table 11 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>referent</th>
<th>subject</th>
<th>object</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>animate</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inanimate</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11: Animacy effects on the choice of grammatical relations in discourse.

In all three columns, we see that the frequency of occurrence of the animate nominals is higher than that of the inanimates. Since we are basing our judgements on the frequency
of occurrence of animate nominals in the discourse, it is evident that there is a correlation between the animacy status of the nominal and its salience in the discourse. Thus we can claim from the results that animates are more salient than inanimates in discourse.

It has been claimed that in Bantu languages, animacy determines what will be selected for grammatical relations in discourse (cf. Morolong and Hyman 1977, Duranti 1972, Byarushengo and Tenenbaum 1976, Dalgish 1977). Swahili has often been cited as one of those languages. Table 12 below shows how animacy correlates with the distribution of grammatical and non-grammatical relation nominals in discourse.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>referent status</th>
<th>subject</th>
<th>object</th>
<th>unspecified</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>animate</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>49 6.8</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inanimate</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>23 10.6</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>281</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>589 942</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12: Animacy status and the distribution of grammatical relations.

The results show that both grammatical relation and non-grammatical relation nominals tend to refer to animates. The fact that we have some nominals referring to inanimates that are also grammatical relations enables us to modify the claim cited above that animacy determines the nominals that will be the grammatical relations, to a language specific claim, that there
is a tendency in Swahili for nominals referring to animates not to also be the grammatical relations in discourse. However, it is true that nominals referring to animates more than those referring to inanimates occur as the grammatical relations subject and object. For those nominals that refer to inanimates, the tendency is also for these nominals to occur unspecified for grammatical relations. These findings are interesting because we would have expected the animacy status to correlate with the distribution of grammatical relations in the discourse. However, the fact that in Swahili, the majority of the nominals in discourse occur unspecified for grammatical relations (cf. Chapter Two section 2.4 and Table 5), correlates with these findings. That is, because the majority of the nominals are unspecified for grammatical relation we would not expect grammatical relation marking to correlate with the animacy status of the referents.

In section 3.1.3 we noted that the definiteness factor correlates with the animacy factor. The claim is that animates are generally definite while inanimates will be found to be indefinite more than definite. We would expect more animate than inanimate subjects and objects in Table 12 above to be more definite than indefinite, and we expect more indefinite inanimate nominals than definite inanimate nominals. Table 13 below shows the correlation between animacy and the definiteness status of nominals.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>definiteness status</th>
<th>animacy status</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>animate</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>inanimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>definite SU</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>definite O</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total definite</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>81.7</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indefinite SU</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>81.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indefinite O</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total indefinite</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>73.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13: The correlation between animacy status and the definiteness status of grammatical relations.

From the results, it is evident that the referent representing a nominal which is a designated grammatical relation and is definite is also likely to be animate rather than vice versa. On the other hand, a nominal which is indefinite is likely to be inanimate. Thus, we can claim for a correlation between the animacy status and the definiteness status of a nominal with a grammatical relation.

From our discussion so far then, we have established a correlation between all three discourse parameters with respect to the distribution of grammatical relations in the discourse. What we have not established is whether we have total influence or just partial influence of the animacy status on the choice of grammatical relations in Swahili discourse. It is obvious from
the tables that we are far from total influence. To begin with, we have a substantial percentage of inanimates that are also grammatical relations (cf. table 12). What the data bear out is a tendency for speakers to choose animates rather than inanimates for grammatical relations. Because discourses are overwhelmingly about animates (human mostly) the tendency for more animate than inanimate nominals to appear in discourse and for these animates to be definite is not a surprise to us. It is a reflection of discourse tendencies rather than a general rule of grammar to which speakers have to abide when constructing their discourses.

3.4 Theoretical Implications.

We have shown that there is a relationship between the grammatical relations subject and object in Swahili and the discourse parameters salience, definiteness and the animacy status.

We noted that the salience of a nominal is measured by the frequency of mentions in the discourse. Judgements on the definiteness status of a nominal were based on whether its referent was common knowledge to both the hearer and the speaker or could easily be identified by the hearer. It was noted that the definiteness of a nominal was correlated with its salience in the discourse more strongly than with its being marked for grammatical relations. That is, the occurrence of subject and object markers is not a guarantee that the nominal coindexed with
the morphological markers has a definite status, as claimed for Swahili and other Bantu languages (cf. Morolong and Hyman 1977, Duranti 1972, Byarugasheng and Tennenbaum 1976 and Dalgish 1977). Such claims may have been based on the tendency for human referents to be mentioned with subject and object markers, where human nominals tend to be definite. Our findings show that animacy and grammatical marking are only two of the factors contributing to the identification of definite nominals in discourse. Others include the salience of the nominal in the discourse. These factors taken independent of each other show very little effect on definiteness.

3.5 Summary and Conclusion

In this chapter we were mainly concerned with the discourse parameters that influence speaker's choice of grammatical relations in Swahili discourse. We noted a set of discourse parameters which include salience, definiteness of nominals and the animacy status of the referents.

In the discussion, we established a correlation between these parameters and the speaker's choice of grammatical relations in Swahili. In general, a nominal representing a salient referent, a definite nominal, and an animate referent will primarily be coded the grammatical subject. The next salient referents will be coded objects. With respect to these tendencies we noted that they should not be taken as the general
rules of grammar, since there are cases that are contrary to these observations. That is, we have cases in which the subject and object are not salient, definite and animate. We noted that these tendencies can be used to explain the differences in distribution of the grammatical relations in Swahili discourse. We also found that the fact that the category subject constitutes the majority of the nominals that bear grammatical relations, correlates with the fact that the subject category more than the object category is also favoured by the salient referents, definite nominals and animate referents. However, in general subjects and objects are not necessarily the definite nominals or the nominals referring to animates. The majority of nominals that are definite, as well as those that refer to animates in the data for this study are unspecified for grammatical relations.
Footnotes

1. The following example will not have a morpheme to morpheme translation because we only need a general understanding of the context rather than a description of the structural features.

Chapter Four

4.0 The relationship between Semantic and Grammatical relations

4.0.1 Introduction

In this chapter we will show that grammatical morphology distinguishes grammatical relations from semantic relations, semantic relations being the only type of relation we can attribute to those nominals that we designated non-grammatical relations.

Much of the discussion about grammatical relations in Bantu languages (cf. Kimenyi 1976, Gary and Keenan 1976, Hodges 1976, 1977, Trithart 1976, 1979, Gary 1977, Duranti 1977, 1979, Morolong and Hyman 1977, Duranti & Byarushengo 1977, Marantz 1982, Givon 1981, Hyman & Duranti 1982) shows a confusion about the distinction between grammatical relations and semantic relations. Thus the notions of subject and object in Swahili are grammatical relations, since they include a number of semantic relations. The established semantic relations, such as agent, patient, goal, benefactive, recipient, instrumental, and locative, describe the semantic role a nominal is playing with respect to the verb.

The arguments and discussions in this chapter will be based on the hypothesis stated in Chapter One, that Swahili distinguishes between grammatical relations and semantic relations such that, while the grammatical relations may be
associated with specific semantic relations such as agent (associated with the subject), patient, goal, recipient, benefactive, instrumental and locative (associated with either the subject or the object), a nominal with such a semantic relation need not be a grammatical relation.

The use of the semantic relation labels with their inadequacies is strictly as used in the existing literature, in particular Fillmore (1968). We will take the definition of "agent" as that nominal naming the instigator of an action. "Patient" is the entity affected by the action, and "goal" will be the semantic relation of a nominal whose referent is associated with an action involving direction or motion towards that referent. "Beneficiary" is a role for referents that benefit from the action of the verb. "Recipient" will be the role of a nominal whose referent's relation with the action is receive. "Locative" will be a role of a nominal that is a location and the "instrumental" names an instrument. Our main aim here is to show that the use of the semantic labels as used in the literature to describe grammatical relations is inappropriate, and that however close the connection between the grammatical relation and semantic relation of a nominal are, one cannot be used to describe or define the other.

4.1 Defining semantic relations in Swahili

There are two major characteristic differences between grammatical relations and semantic relations.
(i) -grammatical relations but not semantic relations can be identified by overt morphological markers.

(ii) -semantic relations of a nominal or a zero \( (\emptyset) \) representing an inferred referent is determined by the interpretation of the verb within the clause it occurs.

From (i) the contrast is with the fact that although some of the semantic relations may be associated with some morphological markers, these morphological markers are not used primarily to identify a particular nominal as having a particular semantic relation. In (ii) the emphasis is on the fact that semantic relations are largely inferred from the interpretation of the verb.

The semantic relations we are dealing with in this study will be characterized as either "marked or unmarked". "Marked" will be used to describe the semantic relations that are signaled by a kind of morphological marker on the verb. "Unmarked" on the other hand will be used to describe cases that lack such characterization but whose interpretation is largely derived from inference depending on the meaning of the verb.

4.1.1 The unmarked semantic relations

The semantic relations which are usually unmarked in Swahili discourse include the agent and patient. The interpretation of such semantic relations is therefore by inference. That is,
there are no semantic coding properties which primarily distinguish agents and patients from other possible semantic relations. The interpretation of the verb and the nominal itself provide the interpretation of the semantic relation. Consider the following example:

(1) [Mimi ni - na - amini mashetani wapo ]1 me I pres. believe ghosts exist

[Juzi juzi hapna dereva mmoja bwana, a - na - toka recently here driver on Mr. he pres. come-

sehemu za huko Magomeni huko]2 [Basi section of there there] So

Ø - ka - fika pale karibu na Jangwani]3 - asp V rec. arrive there near and "

[he. mara peke yake bwana, Ø - ka - chepuka njia]4 oh time alone his Mr. - then leaves way

[a - ka - enda]5 [ku - li - laza basi miguu juu]6 SM asp V inf ts V he rec. go to pst lay bus legs up

"I believe ghosts do exist. Just recently, here, a man was driving from Magomeni. Well, he got to Jangwani. Oh! suddenly he crosses the road to the other side and turned the bus upside down."


The nominal we are interested in are underlined. In clause 2, dereva is agent. It is also the unmentioned (or understood) the agent in clauses 3-6. In these clauses, it is associated with the Ø on the verbs fika, chepuka, and Associating the semantic relation agent with the Ø in each of these verbs is determined by the semantic interpretation of the respective verbs. However the referent of the Ø can be inferred across the
clauses as being the same as that of dereva. Similarly, the interpretation of the semantic relation for the nominal basi depends on that of the verb laza 'put in a lying position' with which the nominal is associated. basi is the entity affected by the action of the verb laza.

In this section, therefore, we have shown by example (1) and the discussion that the nominals with the semantic relations agent and patient have no coding properties and that such relations are inferred zero the interpretation of the verb with which the nominal or the form representing an inferred referent co-occurs. In the following section, we will show that other semantic relations may be signaled by a type of morphological marking on the verb or on the nominal itself.

4.1.2 The marked semantic relations

The semantic relations which are usually marked in Swahili discourse include the benefactive, recipient, goal and instrumental. We refer to them as marked because their presence may be signaled by morphological marking on the verb (more so for benefactives and recipients). The marking may be indicated by the _I_ marker, which is a morpheme that is suffixed to the verb. In Swahili traditional grammar, a verb with the _I_ marker has been designated "the prepositional extended form" of the verb (cf. Ashton (1947), Loogman (1965)). The shape of the _I_ marker varies according to (1) vowel harmony and (2) preservation of _l_—
where verb roots without the extension have lost the liquid. Thus, for verb roots with a, i, u the shape of the -I- marker is i. For example, -pak- 'cook' will be extended to -pikia 'cook for/at/in/on', -ruk- 'jump' will be extended to rukia 'jump at/with/on/for. For verb roots with -e- and -o-, the shape of the -I- marker is -e-. For example -pelek- 'send' will be extended to -pelekea 'send to', -som- will be extended to somea 'read for'/ 'at'/ 'in'/ 'with'. The preservation of the -I- is as in verb roots that end in a vowel. For example, -ka- 'sit' will be extended to kalia 'sit on'. The term -I- marker is here used notationally (cf. also Mukama 1973, Moshi 1981) for lack of a more neutral term which covers both these cases and those that have an inherent extension interpretation. The following examples are intended to illustrate the occurrences of the -I- marker for the three different semantic relation interpretations.

(2) [ Mjukuu siku zote a - li - kuwa na shughuli grandchild days all he pst be with business moja ]1 [ku - m - tek - e - a bibi yake maji]2 inf.OM V -I- ind. one to her fetch for grandma hers water [ na kuwa mlinzi wake nyakati za usiku] 3 and to be guardian hers times of night "A grandchild always had one duty, to fetch water for her grandmother and to be her guardian at night". Ma. 33 – 36.
(3) ...[ basi wa - ka - amua ]1 [ ku - m - tuma
SM asp V inf OM V
then he rec. decide to him send
mtoto ]2 [ku - m- chuku - li - a bwana Shauri
inf. OM V -I- ind.
child to him take to Mr. Shauri
hilo troli]3
that cart
"......then they decided to send the child to take
the cart to Mr. Shauri."

(4) ...[ basi wa - ka - kata shauri]1
SM asp V
then he rec. cut matter
[ku - mw - end - e - a ndugu Shughuli]2
inf. OM V -I- ind.
to him go to "
[ku - azima hiyo mashine]3
inf V
to borrow that engine
"...then they decide to go to Ndugu Shughuli to
borrow his (car) engine".

(5) [Wakulima wa - na - weza ]1 [ ku - lim - i- a
farmers they pres. can to dig with
majembe ulaya ]2......
hoes foreign
"Farmers can farm with tractors....".

UJ : 5

In each of these examples we have underlined the nominal
associated with the -I- marker. We consider that nominal to have
a special semantic relation with the verb of the -I- marker.
Notice that the shape of the -I- marker does not tell us what semantic relation to expect. What it tells us is that the nominal following the verb has some particular semantic relation with the verb and that this semantic relation is one of the four that we listed at the beginning of this section. The type of semantic relation, i.e. benefactive, recipient, goal, locative, is inferred from the semantic interpretation of the verb, the nominal and the -I- marker. In other words, neither the verb, the nominal or the -I- marker individually can provide the criterion for associating a form with any of the four semantic relations listed above. Thus the -I- marker's primary function is to distinguish the semantic relations benefactive, recipient, goal and instrumental from other possible semantic relations.

In all four examples we have emphasized that the -I- marker does not by itself indicate the specific semantic relation and that the respective semantic relation is inferred primarily from the verb and also from the general interpretation of the clause. In terms of valence, the verb that plays a large role in determining which semantic relation its nominals will have regardless of whether the semantic relation is marked or unmarked. For example, locative is determined by verbs such as put, place, install; while goal is determined by verbs of movement towards —such as: carry, bring, transport etc... The roles of benefactive and recipient are determined by verbs that imply doing for and on behalf of. Thus by using the -I- marker,
we reduce the number of possible semantic relations that the hearer may want to consider on the basis of the verb alone. Thereafter, the hearer's task is limited to examining the verb and the nominal in question to make the final judgements on the type of semantic relation at stake.

Notice that in examples (2), (3) and (4), the underlined nominals are also marked for grammatical relations. These are: 

*bibi* in (2) coindexed with the object marker *m*, *bwana Shauri* in (3) coindexed with the object marker *m* and *ndugu Shughuli* in (4) coindexed with the object marker *mw*. The interplay between the grammatical relation marking and semantic relation marking will be commented on later in this Chapter (cf. section 4.3.2).

The semantic relation locative is an interesting case. In Swahili, we can identify at least three types of locatives. The first type we will refer to as "prepositional locative". This is exemplified by a *-ni* morpheme attached to a noun and whose interpretation is equivalent to the English prepositions normally used to imply location (i.e., in, at, on) as in the following example:

(6a) Hapana picha hata moja juu ya kuta zote tatu; not-be picture even one top of wall all three
ila katika ya ukuta wa mezani palikuwapo except mid of wall of table+loc. there was
kabati la ngu... Najum aliacha kukaa kochini locker of clothes " he left to sit couch+loc
akakivuta kiti... he then it pulled chair
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"There was not a single picture on all three walls, except the wall by the table...there was a wardrobe...Najum did not sit on the couch but pulled out a chair...."

Mz: 2

In this example, meza "table", pembe 'corner' and kochi 'couch' have been made locations by the attachment of the morpheme -ni.

The second type we will consider to be "eliptical genitives" (cf. Berman 1982:108). This is exemplified by the preposition kwa 'at', with which the noun in question occurs. For example:

(6b) Wageni walipofika kwa mzee Juma
visitors they when arrived at elder Juma

walishangazwa kwa ukarimu wake
they surprised by hospitality his

"When the visitors arrived at Juma's (house) they were astonished by his hospitality."

MA 26 -28

The location interpretation attributed to kwa Mzee Juma comes from the use of the preposition kwa, which is inherently locative. Otherwise, Mzee Juma on its own would be difficult to assign a semantic relation to.

The third type we will refer to as "inferred locatives", exemplified by nouns whose semantic interpretation of location can be inferred from the verb co-occurring with it. For example,
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(6c) Najum alikuwa karudi jana kutoka shamba
Najum he+had return yesterday from village

huko Baraste a-li - ko - kuwa kwa
SM ts Rel V
there '' he pst where be for

kukunja tanga la Bwana Ali
to fold cloth of Mr. Ali

"Najum had just returned from the village of
Baraste where he had attended Mr. Ali's funeral."

MZ: 1

The noun shamba 'village' (or farm-land, rural) refers to a
location, an interpretation may be inferred from the verb rudi
'return' and kutoka 'from'. The nominal Baraste also refers to a
location, and the inference may be obtained from huko 'there', a
demonstrative of location and the relative marker ko 'where' in
the verb alikokuwa.

We will consider cases of the first and second type to be
instances of marked locative semantic relations while the third
type constitutes an instance of an unmarked locative semantic
relation whose semantic relation is inferrable.

To conclude, in this section we exemplified marked semantic
relations. We showed that -I- marking on the main verb may be
used to signal a nominal with any of the semantic relations,
benefactive, recipient, goal and instrumental. We also showed
that the semantic relation locative may be indicated by the
attachment of the morpheme -ni on the referent or the occurrence
of the preposition kwa with the referent in question. Otherwise,
the semantic relation locative may be inferred from verb with
which the referent is associated. By these characteristics, we have distinguished marked and unmarked semantic relations in Swahili discourse. In the remaining part of this chapter we will show how these semantic relations relate to the grammatical relation subject and object in Swahili discourse.

4.2 The grammatical subject and the semantic relations

Generally, the grammatical subject is associated with the role agent. Comrie (1981:101) considers a prototypical definition of subject to be an "intersection of agent and topic." He claims that cross linguistically, subjects are prototypically agents which are topics, which acknowledges that subjects in many constructions in many languages are neither topics nor agents. Thus, although these notions play an important role in the characterization of subject, they cannot be used to identify the subject. He notes for example that in the case of English where verb agreement is used as a criterion, it is clear that in passive constructions the subject and the agent do not correspond. For example, in 'The children were given the food by the woman', the plural verb were agrees with the children but not with the agent woman.

The same can be said of Swahili, in which the subject of a passive is marked on the verb by the subject marker while the agent occurs as a "by phrase" with no marking on the verb. The claim in this section is that not all agents bear the grammatical
relation subject in Swahili discourse and not all grammatical subjects bear the semantic relation agent in the discourse. To begin with, we will consider Table 14 below, which compares the occurrences of agent and subject.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referent Status</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Subject</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Agent</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>85.1%</td>
<td>628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>80.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
<td>942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14: Distribution of subject/agents compared to subjects/ non-agents

The results show that a majority of the total agents are subjects (here 59.6% compared to 40.4% non-subjects). Similarly, more subjects are agents (here 66.5%) than non-agents (here 33.5%). However, the data make it clear that not all agents are subjects and also vice versa since we have at least some occurrences of agents as non-subjects and subjects as non-agents.

The four cells in Table 14 are exemplified in the data in the following way:

(i) agent/subject: a nominal with a subject marker, or a subject marker itself, of an active verb.
(ii) agent / non-subject: nominals occurring in a "by phrase", in a clause with a passive verb.

(iii) non-agent / subject: are nominals with a subject marker or the subject marker itself, of a passive or a stative verb.

(iv) non-agent /non-subject: are any other nominals without a subject marker (e.g. an object or a non-grammatical relation nominal).

In the following sections, we will exemplify these distinctions.

4.2.1 Subject / agent distinction

We noted above that agents that are also the grammatical subject may occur as bare nominals but with a subject marker on the main verb of the clause. The verb has to be active/action verb. Consider the following examples:

(7) [Juu ya meza vitabu na karatasi zi - me- tawayika
SU SM ts V
top of table books and papers they perf. scatter
mchafu koge]1 [lakini daftari moja i - li -yo-kuwa
SU SM ts re. V
dirty extreme but notebook one it pst which be
wazi]2 [ na kalamu yake [i - li - onye- sh-a ]3
SU SM ts V cause ind.
open and pen his it pst show
[kuwa bwana Musa a - li - andika]4 [kabla ha- ja- enda
SU SM ts V SM ts V
that Mr. Musa he pst write before neg.he perf. go
msalani]5 [kuoga]6
bathroom to shower
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"On the table, books and papers were scattered very untidily. But one notebook which was open and a pen showed that Mr. Musa had been writing before he left to take a shower".

MZ : 1

In example (7) in clause 4, bwana Musa is both the subject and the agent of the verb andika. As the subject, it is coindexed with the subject marker a-. The verb andika is an action verb. From this verb, we can easily infer the semantic relation of agent for the nominal marked by the subject marker i_

Clause 5 is also an example of subject/agent. The subject is the subject marker a of the negative morpheme ha 'not-he' of the verb enda 'go'. The inferred agent is Musa from the preceding clause 4.

However, clause 1, has a subject, - karatasi, which is not the agent. This nominal is identified by the subject marker zi on the verb tawanyika. The morpheme -k- on this verb indicates that the verb has been "extended". Consequently, the verb is considered to be in a stative form and the morpheme -k- is understood as an indication of that. Because of the stative form of the verb, the agent is covert. That is, it can be inferred from the clause. In clause 2, daftari is the subject coindexed with the subject marker i- on the verb kuwa. Kuwa is inherently stative, so we again have no agent. In clause 3, we have another instance of subject /non-agent, where the subject is represented by i-. i-, however, refers to daftari in the preceding clause.

97
The verb onyesha is considered to be in its causative form. This is indicated by the causative morpheme -sh-. Thus, it exemplifies another instance in which the agent and the grammatical subject do not correspond. That is, the form referred to by the subject marker i on the verb onyesha is not also the agent.

Clause 6 is another instance of agent/non-subject. The inferred agent is also Musa. It is a case of non-subject because the main verb oga does not show subject coding. Rather, it has a ku "infinitive" prefix which is not a grammatical relation marker. In general, ku is used where the semantic referent and time reference can be inferred from the preceding discourse (cf. Moshi 1983).

Example (7b) below further exemplifies the subject/agent relationship.

(7b) [Najum a - li - acha]1 [ku - kaa kochini]2
Su   SM ts  V   inf. V
he pst leave to sit couch-in

[a -ka -ki -vuta kiti]3 [ki -li -cho - kuwapo
SM asp OM V   0   SM ts rel. V
he rec. it pull chair it pst which be

cini ya meza]4 [a - ka - kaa]5
SM asp V
under of table he rec sit

"Najum avoided sitting on the couch, he pulled out the chair which had been under the table and then sat down".

MZ : 1
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Najum, in clause 1, is both the agent and the subject of the verb acha. The subject is coindexed with the subject marker a- on the verb. Because it is not extended (i.e. it is in its basic form) it allows the agent interpretation. In clause 2, the inferred agent is Najum. But, there is no indication of the subject. In clause 3, the subject is the subject marker a- which makes reference to Najum. In clause 4, the subject is marked by ki- on the verb kuwa. In discussing example (7a) we noted that the verb kuwa is inherently stative and that stative verbs do not allow the semantic relation agent to be inferred from their semantic interpretation. Here, ki shares the same referent as kiti in clause 3. In clause 5, the subject of the verb kaa is the subject marker a. The referent of this a is inferred from the previous clauses since a refers to the same referent as Najum. In other words, Najum is the agent in clause 5 which makes this particular nominal the only agent in this particular portion of the on-going discourse.

In example (8), we have more cases of subject /non-agent but this time the passive verb extension is shown in addition to the stative extension.
(8) [...i - li - kuwapo saa nyeusi ya Japani]l
SM ts V+loc
it pst be there clock black of Japan

[i - li - tundik - w - a katikati ya ukuta juu ya
SM ts V pass, ind.
it pst hang middle of wall top of
meza]2
table

"...there was black Japanese clock hung in the
middle of the wall over of the table".

MZ : 1

In clause 1, the subject is saa 'clock', coindexed with the
subject marker i on the verb kuwa 'be'. Because the verb is
stative, there is no agent. Thus, it is an instance of
subject/non-agent.

In clause 2, the subject /non-agent is represented by the
subject marker i- on the verb tundikwa. This verb has been
extended twice. It has a stative morpheme -k- and the passive
morpheme -w-. Neither of the two allow the verb to include an
agent in its semantic interpretation. Consequently, the subject
indicated by the subject marker i-, is not also the agent.
Notice also that the subject marker i- is semantically related to
the nominal saa in clause 1.

In discussing examples (7a through (8) we showed that our
judgements for the semantic relation agent rely on the structure
and the semantic interpretation of the verb. We further showed
that the verb extensions -W- (passive), -K- (stative), and -SH-
(causative) may be an indication that the semantic relation agent
can not be inferred from the verb or clause. On the other hand, the grammatical morphology (subject markers) indicate the presence of the grammatical subject. In this section, while we discussed the subject/agent distinctions, we only mentioned the subject/non-agent distinction but did not indicate the semantic relation of the non-agent. In the following section, we will do just that.

4.2.2. The Semantic Relation of Subjects that are non-agents

As a starting point for the discussion in this section, let's consider examples (7b) and (8) again. In each case the clauses have been repeated here for easy access; we begin with clauses 3 and 4 of (7b):

\[(9) \quad \ldots[a - ka - ki - vuta \ kiti]3\]
\[\quad \text{SM asp OM V O}\]
\[\quad \text{he rec. it pull chair}\]
\[\quad [ki - li - cho - kuwapo \ chini ya meza]4\]
\[\quad \text{SM ts rel V+Loc}\]
\[\quad \text{it pst which be there under of table}\]

"....he then pulled a chair which had been under the table...."  

MZ. 1

Our interest is in clause 4 where we designated the nominal \textit{ki} the subject /non-agent. \textit{Ki} makes reference to \textit{kiti} in clause 3. \textit{Kiti} in clause 3 is considered the grammatical object of the verb \textit{vuta} 'pull' because it is coindexed with the object marker -\textit{ki}- in that verb. Its semantic relation is patient because it is
the nominal that is "acted upon" by the verb vuta. The subject in clause 4 has no specific semantic relation since it is associated with a stative verb. We are designating such relations "stative participants".

Now consider clauses 1 and 2 from example (8) here presented as (10).

(10) ....[i - li - kuwa - po saa ya Japani]1
     SM ts v loc. SU
     it pst be there clock of Japan

     [i - me - tundik - w - a katikat...ya ukuta juu ya meza]2
     SM ts v pass. ind.
     it perf. hang be middle of wall top of table

"...there was a Japanese clock which had been hung on the wall on top of the table."

MZ : 1

We noted earlier that the nominal saa which is the grammatical subject in clause 1 does not have the semantic relation agent in the same clause. Thus, it is an instance of a subject/non-agent. Because the verb is stative, none of the other semantic relations can be inferred from it. Therefore, as mentioned above, we will refer to subjects of the verb kuwa as "stative participants", since kuwa is inherently stative. However, the referent of saa is also related semantically to the subject marker i- in clause 2 which we are considering the grammatical subject of that clause. But the semantic relation of the subject in clause 2 is not the same as that of saa in clause
1. Notice we have an action verb _tundika_ whose structure includes the morpheme _-w_ which we indentified as the indicator of the passive extension. We noted that a verb with this extension does not allow its subject to be also the agent. Consequently, the nominal is non-agent. Since the referent of _saa_ is in this case the entity that is affected by the action expressed by the verb _tundika_ 'hang', the semantic relation of the subject in clause 2 is patient.

The following examples are intended to show other instances of subject/non-agent distinction where other semantic relations are involved.

(11) [ Lete hiyo baraatu ]1 [ i - ko wapi ]2
    0  SM V+loc.
    bring that letter it be where

[pamoga na shilingi u -li -zo - p - e - w - a]3
    SM ts rel V -i- pass.ind.
together with shillings you pst which give

"Bring that letter, where is it? and the money that you were given."

RM : 11

We are interested in the subject marker _u_ in clause 3, which represents the subject of the verb _pewa_ 'be given'. To begin with, notice that this verb has been extended by the passive marker _-w_. The passive marker allows us to interpenet interpret the subject indicated by _u_ not to have the semantic relation agent. The semantic interpretation of the verb _-pa_, allows us to interpret this subject as having the semantic relation recepient,
while *shilingi* 'shilling(s)', which is unspecified for grammatical relations, is the patient. Thus, *u* has the grammatical relation subject and the semantic relation recipient.

Now consider example (12) below which shows the relationship between the subject and the semantic relation benefactive.

(12)  

[SU  SM ts V]  

"he pst hit hello home of Mr. Musa, Kikwajuni karibu na Mnazi mmoja]1 near with 'one [a -li - itik - i - w - a na mtoto mdogo]2 SM ts V -I- pass ind. he pst respond to by child small

"Najum called at Mr. Musa's house, at Kikwajuni near Mnazi Mmoja. His call was received by a small child".  

MZ : I

Here we are interested in clause 2 in which the subject is represented by the subject marker *a* on the verb *itikiwa* 'respond to'. As in example (11) above, this verb is extended by the passive marker *-W-*. Since the passive marker rules out the possibility of the subject having the semantic relation agent, we can consider the possibility of other semantic relations. We know the semantic relations to expect when we also have an *-I-* marked verb and by the meaning of the verb we can infer the semantic relation benefactive. The interpretation of the verb implies that the referent of *a* is benefiting from the action represented by the verb *itika* 'respond to'.
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In example (13), we have a case of subject / goal.

(13) [Huyo Mmakonde kwa kawaida a- na - tembe - le
SM ts V -i-
that ' in usual he pres. walk
-w - a na hawa akina mama]l [wa - na - ingia
pass. ind. SM ts
and those those mothers they pres.enter
mle ndani]2 [ha - wa - toki kwa masaa]3
neg. SM V
in there not they leave for hours

"The Makonde man is usually visited by these
women, they enter his house and they do not come
out for hours".

MU : 21 - 23

In this example, we are interested in clause 1 in which we
have the subject Mmakonde coindexed with the subject marker a
on the verb tembelewa 'be visited' (literally, 'have some one walk
to him'). The verb also has two extensions, the -i- marker in
the shape of -le- and the passive marker -w-. The possibility of
the subject being also the agent is ruled out by the fact that
the verb has a passive extension. Also in this example, the
agent is overtly expressed. It is the nominal akina mama 'these
women' of the na 'by phrase'. The semantic relation of Mmakonde
the subject, is "goal" This we infer from the interpretation of
the verb in conjunction with the -i- marking extension.
Literally it is 'the women walk to the Mmakonde' making Mmakonde
the goal of the action.

Our last example involves the relationship between subjects
and the semantic relation locative.
(14) [Kijiji-ni pa - li - kutan - i - sh - a watu
SU -loc. SM ts V -I- cause ind.
people village-in there pst meet

wa kila aina|l [wenye nia moja ya meendeleo]2
of every type with intention one of development

"The village was a meeting place for the different
people who had one expectation which is progress".

U : l

In example (14) the subject is kijiji coindexed with the
subject marker pa on the verb kutanisha 'cause to meet'. Here,
the causative morpheme -sh- indicates the inability for the verb
to allow the semantic relation agent to be associated with it.
The marking of the nominal kijiji with the locative morpheme -ni
and the specific location agreement marker pa is sufficient to
signal the semantic relation "locative" for the nominal kijiji.
Thus, the subject here has the semantic relation "locative" with
respect to the verb kutana.

To summarize this section, we saw that the grammatical
subject may have apart from its prototypical semantic relation
agent, the semantic relation patient, benefactive, recipient,
goal, instrumental and locative. In general, such semantic
relations are attributed to the subject of passive, causative and
stative verbs. We also noted the difficulty in deciding on the
semantic relation of the subject of the verb kuwa 'be'. Because
the verb is inherently "stative", we designated such subjects the
"stative participants".
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4.2.3 The distribution of subject/non-agents

Having discussed the possible semantic relations that a subject may have, we would like to show the distribution in discourse. Table 15 below shows the distribution of the subject with the semantic relations we have so far discussed excluding the agent. The distribution is shown in actual tokens in each of these environments discussed above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semantic Relation</th>
<th>Passive</th>
<th>Stative</th>
<th>Causative</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefactive</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recipient</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>71</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>94</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15: The distribution of non-agent subjects

The results show that patients constitute the majority of the subject non-agents. By the low frequency of occurrence of the other semantic relations, we can predict that nominals with such semantic relations are less likely to occur as grammatical subject.

This observation contradicts claims made by Hawkinson and Hyman (1974) that patients are not grammatically favoured for the subject position and that the benefactives are more favoured. Their claim has an additional problem since they consider
patients and accusative objects to refer to the same semantic category. The problem is in the fact that patients can be subjects but accusative objects cannot be subjects.

Notice in Table 15 that the occurrence of patients which are subjects is not only more than four times higher than that of benefactives but also almost equal to that of all the rest put together (41 vs. 53). We therefore conclude that grammatical subjects in discourse may appear primarily as agents and next as patients and less often as any other semantic relation.

4.2.4 Summary

We have just shown that in Swahili discourse, we have evidence for subject/agent and subject/non-agent. Although subject/agents are more frequently used than subject/non-agents, we cannot claim that subjects in Swahili are characterized as agents. The fact that 1/3 of Swahili subjects are non-agents (cf. Table 14) is significant enough for us to claim that subjects are not necessarily agents in Swahili and that there is need to separate the grammatical relation of a nominal from its semantic relation with the main verb. We have shown that the possible environments for the subject/non-agents typically include cases where the verb has been extended to imply passive or stative mode. The semantic relation of non-agent subjects is typically patient, benefactive, goal, recipient, instrumental and locative. In other words, a nominal of any semantic relation can
be a subject but a form whose referent is either an agent or a patient is more likely to be selected for the grammatical relation subject.

The observations made about Swahili support observations made about other languages studied (cf. Schachter 1976; Comrie 1981) which show that however close the connection between grammatical relations and semantic relations is, one cannot be used to identify the other. Thus, the observations are best to be considered tendencies rather than evidence for generalizations.

In the next section we will look at the distinction between the grammatical object and the various semantic relations it can show in Swahili discourse.

4.3 The grammatical Object and the semantic relations

The category "object" in Bantu languages has received much attention (cf. references cited in 4.1). In trying to describe and define this category, linguists have resorted to the use of the semantic relations of the patient, benefactive, goal, recipient, instrumental and locative. The components of this category include the "direct" and "indirect" object. In Chapter One of this study we noted that Swahili does not require the component indirect object and thus does not require the distinction between "indirect" and "direct" object. We concluded that Swahili shows evidence for the category object which may have various semantic relations with the main verb. By
so stating, we are making a distinction between the grammatical relation object and the semantic relations patient, benefactive, recipient, goal, instrumental and locative which can be attributed to the nominal which shows proper identification for grammatical relation object. In this section, therefore, we shall attempt to show how these semantic relations can be nominals that are non-grammatical relation and non-agent.

4.3.1 Identifying the semantic relations of an object

In examples (2) through (5) in this chapter (cf. sect. 4.1.2) we exemplified the varying contexts in which the semantic relations associated with the grammatical relation object can be inferred. We briefly discussed the -I- marking environment. We noted that by the -I- marker and the semantic interpretation of the verb, we are able to infer the semantic relation of a given nominal as the object of the verb. We concluded that -I- marking in Swahili is a means of identifying the nominal that may be semantically related to the main verb. Consequently, -I- marking should not be taken as the indicator of the semantic relation.

Now we consider the semantics of the verb and the discourse context as crucial in order to explain cases in which -I- marking is not used. We will see that it is possible to infer the semantic relation in a similar way as when -I- marking is used. Consider the following example:
(15) [Regina a - li - ji - fungua mtoto
SU SM ts ref. V
" she pst self open child

wa kiume]1 [wanawake wa kijiji wa - li - kuja]2
SU SM ts V
of male women of village they pst come

[ku - m - pa pongezi]3
inf. OM V
to her give tribute

"Regina gave birth to a baby boy. The village women came to congratulate her."

RM : 33

In clause 1, the verb is in its basic form without any
-1- marking extensions. Of the two nominals, Regina and mtoto,
only Regina has been formally indicated for a grammatical
relation. That is, it is coindexed with the subject marker a on
the verb fungua which makes it the grammatical subject. The
semantic interpretation of the verb indicates that Regina is
the agent. It is not clear what the semantic relation of the
nominal mtoto is. By inference, it is the "affected
participant". That is, it is the entity that is affected by the
action expressed by the verb, fungua 'open' ('bring forth by
birth').

In clause 3, the grammatical relation object is indicated by
the object marker -m- on the verb -pa. The object of clause 3 is
semantically the recipient. -m-, which refers to Regina -the
subject of clause 1- is semantically the recipient of the pongezi
'congratulations'. pongezi, on the other hand, which is not
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indicated for grammatical relations is by inference the semantic patient since it is the entity that is both given by the women and received by the recipient —Regina. We are able to infer the semantic relation recipient even though the verb pa 'give' has not been extended by the -I- marker through the semantic interpretation of the verb itself (i.e. 'give' entails 'receive') in which it is used. Thus, in example (15), we have the relations object /recipient for the object marker -m-

Now consider example (16) below:

(16) [Sasa a - ka - i - toa tumbaku yote kwa
now he rec. it remove tobacco all by

msumari ule]1 [a - ka - i - puliza kwa
nail that he then it blow in

nguvi]2 [a - ka - i - choko - le - a
force he rec. it poke with

msumari tena]3 [kisha a - ka - i - washa]4
nail again then he rec. it light

"Now he took all the tobacco out with the nail, blew hadr on it, then poked it with the nail and then lit it". 

MZ : 2

In clause 1, the grammatical object is tumbaku which is coindexed with the object marker -I- on the verb toa. In clause 2 through 4, the object is represented by the object marker -i- in the verbs puliza 'blow', chokolea 'poke', and washa 'light' respectively. In each case too, the object has the semantic
relation patient. Notice the two occurrences of the nominal msumari 'nail'. In clause 1, it occurs with the preposition kwa 'with'. In clause 3, it occurs with an -I- marked verb. From the semantic interpretation of the preposition and the clause at large, the semantic relation of the nominal msumari in both clauses can be inferred as instrumental. That is, it is the instrument with which the tobacco is taken out of the pipe which Musa was smoking. The interpretation of the -I- marker in the verb itself is the same as that of kwa. That means msumari in clause 3 maintains the same semantic role which is instrumental. Thus, what we have here are instances in which the speaker chooses two different ways to identify a nominal with a particular semantic relation, in one, by an independent preposition kwa and in the other, by a cliticized form of the preposition the -I- marker.

The use of kwa and the -I- marker interchangeably in Swahili discourse is very common and it is not only in cases where the semantic relation instrumental is concerned but also with other semantic relations of nominals identified by the -I- marker. The following examples (17) and (18) show that:

(17) [U - li - ona - je]l [ ku - nunua nguo SM ts V adv. inf V you pst see how to buy clothes

kwa watoto wawili tu]2 [na huku mmoja for children two only and here one

113
ha - zi - ku - patikana]3 [ pesa za neg SM ts V SU not they pst find money of
ku - nunua hata shati moja]4 inf V to buy even sirt one

"How do you feel buying clothes for only two of the kids while you could not afford to buy one of them even one shirt?"

Ma : 63 - 67

(18) [Bwana we zi - ki - patikana pesa]1
SM asp V Mr. hey they con. available money
[mimi sina shida]2 [ni - ta - wa - nunu - li-a
SM ts CM V -i- ind. I not have problem I fut. them buy for
watoto wote sawa]3
children all equal

"Hey Mr., if the money were available, I'd have no problem, I would buy for all the children equally".

Examples (17) and (18) make one continuous dialogue. It has been split into two parts to show the use of the kwa in (17) and the use of the -I- marker in (18). However, both the kwa and the -I- marker perform the same function, that of identifying the nominal watoto 'children' as the semantic relation benefactive with respect to the verb nunua 'buy'. We may add that, in (17) the nominal with the semantic relation patient is overtly expressed --nguo 'clothes' --while in (18) the same reference can be inferred from the discourse context to be the semantic relation patient.
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Now consider example (19) in which *kwa* is used with a nominal whose semantic relation is goal.

(19) [Basi mimi ni-ka-onaj1 [ku-pleleka
SU SM asp. V inf. V
then I I rec. see to send
mashauri haya *kwa wazee wake*] 2 [ni
matters these to elders his is
ku-wa-vunja moyo]3 [hasa baada ya
inf. OM V
to them break heart especially after of
ku-gharamia pesa nyingi hivyo katika maisha
inf. V
to spend money lots that much in life
yake]4
his

"I then felt that to take the matters to his parents will break their hearts especially after spending so much money on his life."

Ma: 16 - 20

The nominal *wazee* 'elders' is linked semantically to the verb *pleleka* 'take to' by the preposition *kwa*. Without the preposition, the alternative would be the -I- marking on the verb which would not have affected the semantic interpretation nor the semantic relation goal for the nominal *wazee*. The decision to consider *wazee* as having the semantic relation goal is influenced by the verb's semantic interpretation which includes motion towards the entity we are considering for the semantic relation. Thus, this provides a way to distinguish between the semantic relation goal from the other semantic relations since they can be signaled by *kwa* as well as the -I- marker.
This is precisely what the three examples were intended to show. Once the signaling is done, the speaker depends on the semantic interpretation of the verb to assign the appropriate semantic relation to the nominal with respect to what is going on in the discourse.

The function of kwa resembles that of na in passive sentences which are used with nominals of the status agent and which cannot be the subject. We noted earlier that in passive constructions the na + NP is equivalent to the "by phrase" in English passive sentences. A nominal in a "by phrase" cannot be in a grammatical relation (subject) with the main verb. Kwa + NP analogously indicates that the NP cannot be the grammatical relation object. The same nominal would have been the grammatical object if the -I marker rather than kwa was used (cf. examples (17) and (18)). By using kwa, the speaker allows the verb to associate with a new nominal of the semantic relation patient in the presence of a nominal with any semantic relation other than patient. On the other hand, the -I- marker allows the verb to associate with a nominal of a semantic relation other than the patient. Thus, both the -I- marker and kwa allow the involvement of a number of semantic relations in the clause. This observation contradicts the claim that the -I- marker involves only the semantic relation benefactive (cf. Morolong and Hyman 1977; Trithart 1975). Our view is shared by Marantz (1982) who notes that a verb may associate with a number of "inherent"
semantic roles, roles that are inextricably connected with its meaning. However, some semantic roles are implied in the semantics of the verb itself in which case the verb determines the argument that may co-occur with it. In Swahili, the -I- marker may be used to signal the semantic relations: benefactive, recipient, goal, instrumental, and locative. Without the -I- marker on the verb, the same semantic interpretations can be inferred if the nominal in question is a part of a prepositional phrase consisting of the preposition kwa. Thus the semantic relations benefactive, recipient, goal, instrumental, and locative can be inferred from the verb and the preposition kwa. Otherwise, a nominal which is designated non-agent can have the semantic relation patient inferred from the verb. That is, if the verb lacks -I- marking, and the nominal is not a part of a prepositional phrase, the only possible semantic relation that can be associated with it, is that of patient if it is not the agent.

Having discussed the semantic relations of objects, we would now like to show the distribution of these objects with their semantic relations. Table 16 below shows that distribution. Included are non-grammatical nominals that had the same semantic relation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semantic Relation</th>
<th>Grammatical Object</th>
<th>Non-Grammatical Relation Nominals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefactive</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recipient</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16: The distribution of the semantic relations typical for objects.

Note: The percentage for non-grammatical benefactive, goal and instrumental are instances of *kwa* plus NP.

The results show that both the grammatical object and non-grammatical relation nominals are generally the patients, here 40% for grammatical objects and over 50% for non-grammatical relation nominals. In both cases, the difference in distribution is interesting too. In the case of grammatical relations none of the remaining semantic relations has over a 20% frequency. In the case of non-grammatical relations, none has over a 25% frequency.

Looking at the distribution of locatives as grammatical relations, we can also conclude that speakers tend to specify the location of the action involving the participants of the discourse. This is shown by the fact that texts show a high frequency of subjects and objects that have the semantic relation locative. This observation contradicts the claim that locatives have a non-grammatical relation (cf. Gary 1977, Kimenyi 1980,
Hodges 1977, who consider locatives to be non-terms = non-grammatical relations).

4.3.2 Object marking and the occurrences of -I- marking

In the discussions of the semantic relations, we noted that the semantic relations benefactive, recipient, goal and instrumental are usually signalled by -I- marking on the verb. Texts show that most nominals indexed by the -I- marking are also specified for the grammatical relation object. Table 17 below shows the distribution of objects where the verb is also -I- marked.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>grammatical object</th>
<th>-I- marked verb</th>
<th>non-I-marked verb</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patient</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>benef.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recep.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instr.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>locat.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17: Distribution of the semantic relations of object with respect to -I- marking of the verb.

It is quite obvious from the table that -I- marked verbs cannot have an object marker for a nominal whose semantic relation is patient—here the patient showed 100% occurrence with non-I- marked verbs. On the other hand, benefactives,
goals, and instrumentals that are also objects favour \( -I \)-marking --here showing 100\% occurrence with \( -I \)-marked verbs. The implication is that patient/objects can only occur with non-\( I \)-marked verbs while benefactive, goal and instrumental objects can occur only with \( -I \)-marked verbs, otherwise they occur in kwa + NP constructions.

In the case of recipients, it is interesting to see that in table 16 we showed 100\% occurrence as grammatical object and here we show that about 90\% of the occurrences are with \( -I \)-marked verbs and about 10\% occur with non-\( I \)-marked verbs. The question is, if we have 100\% occurrence of patients with non \( -I \)-marked verbs, how do we distinguish the patients from the recipients? The 10\% of the recipients that were found with non \( -I \)-marked verbs involved one verb, namely pa 'give' which is inherently a two argument verb.

Texts show that this verb always occurs with an object marker signaling the recipient and leaving the patient (the entity given) always unmarked for grammatical relations. This explains the 100\% frequency of occurrence for object/recipients. There is also an additional reason for the 100\% occurrence of object/recipient. The data show that while benefactives, goals and instrumentals can be signaled by the independent preposition kwa 'to', 'for' 'with', allowing the nominals with such semantic relations to occur as non-grammatical relations, no occurrences of recipients were signalled by this independent preposition.
Rather, all cases of recipients were in the environment of -ì- marking or the verb pa. Like the verb pa, all -ì- marked verbs always (as if obligatory) occur with an object marker coindexed with the same nominal that has the semantic relation inferred from the general meaning of the verb now with the object marker and the -ì- marker itself. Where kwa is used instead of the -ì- marker, observations show the opposite. That is, there is no object marking on the verb coindexed with the nominal occurring with the preposition. The implication is that, while the preposition kwa detaches the nominal from the verb, preventing it from having any grammatical relation with the verb, the -ì- marker does the opposite.

Going back to the results in table 17, it is not surprising that the frequency of occurrence of locative nominals occurring with non-ì- marked verbs is so high. Generally, locatives do not need -ì- marking to single them out for semantic relation with the verb since their referents are semantically distinct from other nominals. That is, a nominal whose semantic relation is locative will be evident from its general semantic interpretation which can be inferred from the type of locative the nominal is (cf. 4.1.2 on types of locatives).

4.3.3 Summary

In this section we argued for a separate treatment of the grammatical relation object and the various semantic relations attributed to that category. We noted that the semantic
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relations depend largely on the semantic interpretation of the verb with which the nominal is associated although we do have additional markers which aid in inferring semantic relations. We noted the association of the \(-I-\) marking with the identification of nominals that may be semantically related to the verb and we contrasted it with the occurrences of the independent preposition \textit{kwa} which seems to be doing the same job though in a different environment. We looked at the distribution of nominals designated grammatical object and those that have no grammatical relation. We noted that in general patients occur as a non-grammatical relations while recipients always occur as grammatical relations, since they occur with \(-I-\) marked verbs which generally include an object marker indexing the nominal semantically associated with the \(-I-\) marked verbs. In the following section we are going to try to show the effects of discourse parameters on the distribution of the semantic relations we have discussed so far.

4.4 Discourse parameters and the semantic relations.

The parameters involved here include : salience, definiteness, and animacy, all of which we discussed at length in Chapter Three. In this section, we would like to show how these parameters influence the selection of nominals with the semantic relations agent, patient, benefactive, recipient, goal, instrumental, and locative, which may also be potential
candidates for grammatical relations. Table 18 below shows the interaction between the discourse parameters and the semantic relations discussed in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominal form</th>
<th>salient</th>
<th>definite</th>
<th>animate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agent</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>80.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patient</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>benef.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recip.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goal</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instr.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>locative</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>49.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table: 18 Discourse parameters and the semantic relations.

Notes about the table (same applies for tables 19 and 20 below). The table contain only half of the information. We do not show non-salient, indefinite and inanimate tokens. The total from which the percentages are derived indicates the total of the tokens for each of the semantic relations being associated with the discourse parameter. Thus we have, for example, a total of 314 agents of which 182 are salient, 233 are definite, and 310 animate. Not shown are the 81 non-salient, 132 indefinites, and 4 inanimate agents.
The table shows that both agents and patients are generally salient, definite and animate occurring over 50% of the time in each case. Benefactives and recipients are 100% animate. This was expected considering that beneficiaries name referents that are capable of benefiting from the action of the verb and recipients name referents that are capable of receiving. Both characteristics best describe animates (human in particular).

We expected more definite beneficiary and recipient nominals considering that they are very high on the animacy scale. From the fact that the data do not show a strong corelation between animacy and definiteness, we claim that animacy is not a necessary criterion for designating a nominal definite.

We also said earlier that agents and patients are good candidates for the grammatical relation subject. However agents constitute the majority of the subjects while patients constitute the majority of the objects (cf. tables 16 and 17). We also showed in Chapter Three that subjects tend to represent salient entities and to be definite and animate. Looking at the distribution of agents and patients with respect to the selected parameters, it is clear that there is a corelation between the three categories of grammatical relation, semantic relation and discourse.

The claim that results from this corelation is that, a nominal whose referent is salient, and which is definite and animate will turn out to be the agent or the patient but more
often the agent. We know that the tendency is for agents to be the grammatical relation subject. Therefore, it is also very likely that the nominal will be the grammatical subject. A nominal of the semantic relation benefactive, recipient, and goal which are typical semantic relations for a nominal of the grammatical relation object, will rarely be selected for the role of subject unless they are also salient, definite and animate. The same can be said about locatives and instrumentals except that the category animate is not one of the characteristics of nominals with such semantic relations.

Having looked at the corelation between the semantic relations and the discourse parameters we will now look at the same corelation in the light of the distribution of the grammatical relations. Tables 19 and 20 below are intended to do just that. In table 19, we show the distribution of subjects and in table 20, we show the distribution of objects.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>semantic relations of subjects</th>
<th>salient</th>
<th>definite</th>
<th>animate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agent</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>74.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patient</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>73.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>benefactive</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recipient</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instrumental</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>locative</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19 Discusses influence on the semantic relations of grammatical subject.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>semantic relation of object</th>
<th>salient N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>definite N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>animate N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>total N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>patient</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>benefactive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recipient</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instrumental</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>locative</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table: 20 Discourse influence on the semantic relations of the grammatical object.

In Table 19, we show that a nominal which is a grammatical relation may also be salient, definite and animate and it will be the semantic relation agent or patient. However, over 60% of the time the nominal will be the semantic relation agent. For a nominal of the semantic relation benefactive or recipient to be the grammatical relation subject, it has to be salient, definite and animate — here showing 100% frequency of occurrence. For a goal, instrumental, and locative nominal to be the grammatical subject, it needs to be at least definite but not necessarily salient or animate. It is expected of the instrumental and
locative nominals because of their being typically inanimate.

In table 20, we show that a nominal which is the grammatical object and is the semantic relation patient will also tend to be salient definite and animate. If it has the semantic relation benefactive or recipient it is also animate. Locative objects are generally definite but not necessarily salient. Instrumental objects have a tendency to be both salient and definite.

To conclude, we acknowledge that there is a corelation between the discourse parameters and the semantic relations with respect to the distribution of the grammatical relations. However, none of the parameters can be claimed to be the defining characteristics of the semantic or the grammatical relations. Rather, they are a valuable part in the description of both the semantic and grammatical relations of discourse nominals. They contribute to the understanding of the occurrence of the grammatical relations and the way in which speakers utilize them in their discourses.

4.5 Summary and Conclusion

In this chapter we have concerned ourselves with the semantic relations associated with the grammatical relations subject and object in Swahili. We noted that, in general, semantic relations can be inferred from the semantic interpretation of the verb and the nominal in question. We also noted that the morphology of the verb may contribute to the identification of the semantic relation of certain nominals. For
example, while a subject/agent relationship is mainly inferred from the semantic interpretation of the verb, a subject/non-agent relationship may be indicated by the verb modification in the form of verb extensions which include the passive -W-, the causative -SH- and the stative -X-. Similarly, the semantic relations for the grammatical object may be indicated by the verb extension -I- marker. We argued that the -I- marker's primary function is to indicate that the semantic relation that obtains between a verb and a certain nominal is not patient. The semantic interpretation of the verb and the context will reveal that particular semantic relation. By implication the semantic relation patient lacks morphological identification on the verb. These changes on the morphology of the verb, therefore, constitute a major distinction between the semantic relations and the grammatical relations. In Chapter Two we defined the grammatical relations as signaled by special morphological markers on the verb, the subject marker and the object marker. These markers are distinct from the markers we cited above and which we associated with the semantic relations. In addition, these grammatical markers are prefixes while the semantic markers are suffixes. However, the semantic and grammatical markers have one common characteristic which has to do with their function in the discourse. They are used to identify a particular nominal in the discourse. The grammatical markers identify the nominals that have the grammatical relation with the verb while the
semantic markers identify the nominals that have the semantic relation with the verb.

Although there is a close relationship between the semantic relations and the grammatical relations, it has been shown in this study that this relationship is not a one-to-one. This is evident in the fact that Swahili discourse reveals subjects that may assume any of the semantic relations agent, patient, benefactive, recipient, goal, instrumental and locative. Similarly, the grammatical relation object may assume the semantic relations patient, benefactive, recipient, goal, instrumental, and locative (that is any semantic relation other than the agent).

We noted that the speakers tend to select subjects that are also agents more than subjects that are non-agents (cf. Table 14). Subjects that are non-agents are generally patients (cf. Table 15). Thus the generalization is that, subjects are primarily agents, otherwise they are patients. To a lesser extent subjects occur as benefactive, recipient, goal, instrumental and locative. The requirement is that the verb be modified by one of the three verb extensions we mentioned above and that the nominal be at least salient or definite.

Although the tendency is for speakers to select subjects that are also agents more often than subjects that are non-agents, we cannot make a generalization that subjects are agents in Swahili discourse, nor can we characterize subjects by using
the semantic relation agent or vice versa. In our discussion on the semantic relations that are associated with the grammatical relations, we concluded that in Swahili, the subject is not necessarily the agent nor is the agent necessarily the subject. The frequency of occurrence of subject/non-agents is significant enough to allow us to claim that the category subject is distinct from that of agent.

The grammatical object on the other hand was associated with the semantic relations patient, benefactive, recipient, goal, instrumental and locative. Like the subject, the category object is distinct from that which is occupied by the semantic relations that may be associated with it. We noted that the distinguishing characteristic of the object is the object marker while the semantic relations may be signaled by the _I_ marker or not signaled at all, but inferred from the meaning of the verb and the discourse context. Thus, the _I_ marker generally signals a semantic relation other than the patient. This observation leads us to posit that the _I_ marker is not an indicator of any particular semantic relation. Such an observation contradicts the assumption that the _I_ marker signals the semantic relation benefactive (cf. Trithart 1976, Morolong and Hyman 1977). Its semantic relation, we argued, is inferred from this association, the semantic interpretation of the verb and the discourse context. Observations also show that the tendency is for speakers to make the patient the grammatical object. Otherwise
and to a lesser extent, the semantic relations benefactive, recipient, goal, instrumental and locative are associated with the nominal that is the grammatical object. The tendency for speakers to select patient/object resembles that of agent/subject. Neither the agent nor the patient are signaled by any morphological changes on the main verb. In addition, unlike other semantic relations, the patient does not occur as the grammatical object where the -I- marker is a part of the verb's morphology.

Apart from the -I- marker, the independent preposition kwa was noted to indicate the presence of the semantic relations benefactive, goal, and instrumental in the discourse.

We also noted a correlation between discourse parameters and the frequency of occurrence of nominals with the various semantic relations. The semantic relations agent and patient are attributed to salient referents, definite nominals and animate referents. However, we sound a note of caution that the high frequencies of subject/agent and object/patient should be taken as mere tendencies and not generalizations to be adopted for Swahili. Thus we need to exercise caution when making generalizations about the relationship between the grammatical relations and the semantic relations. It is evident that there are close connections between the grammatical relations and the semantic relations but we cannot use one to identify the other.
FOOTNOTES

(1) Although _-I-_ marking is used for identifying purposes it is incorrect to assume that it is a strategy to make a would-be intransitive verb transitive (cf. Marantz 1982:272). Its occurrence with intransitive verbs as well as verbs associated with locatives is evidence against that assumption.

(2) The verb _-pa_ is an interesting case. Although it does not take the _-I-_ marker, it always takes two arguments just like a verb with the _-I-_ marker extension. Its inability to take the _-I-_ marker is still unclear since other verbs that are of monosyllabic roots like _-i-_ "eat", _-i-_ "come" are able to take the _-I-_ marker in the shape of _-i-_ . The verb root _-p-_ however can tolerate other extensions like _-W-_ for passive as in _pewa_ "be given".

(3) The preposition _kwa_ "to, for, with" is considered an independent preposition while the _-I-_ marker is the alternative bound form (cf. Moshi 1983). The main difference between the two is that the _-I-_ marker has a morphological subcategorization feature of an affix while _kwa_ is identified as a preposition.

(4) The tables have only half of the information. For example, table 19 shows 66.3% of salient agents but does not show the 43.7% of the non-salient nominals
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out of the total of 187 agents. Thus the results are to be interpreted in the same way the results of Table 18 were interpreted.
Chapter Five

5.0 Overview

5.0.1 Background

This chapter will review the accomplishments of the theoretical framework put forward in this study. The claims of this study were stated in Chapter One as our main hypotheses. These were:

(1) that there is no single universal way to describe grammatical relations and that grammatical relations of a particular language are best described by referring to strategies that are specific to that language.

(2) that Swahili shows evidence for only two grammatical relations, the subject and the object, defineable by grammatical morphology shown on the verb.

(3) that speakers are influenced by various discourse factors in their choice of grammatical relations.

(4) that grammatical relations are distinct from semantic relations but that they interact in important ways.

With the hypotheses thus stated, the study of grammatical relations in Swahili has revealed:
(1) that grammatical relations are distinct from the semantic relations although neither is independent of the other. We established a relationship between them and showed that the subject marker and object marker do not indicate the specific semantic relation a nominal may have in the ongoing discourse.

(2) that none of the semantic relations are signaled by a specific morphological marker. Rather, the semantic relations are inferred from various features of the context.

(3) that the discourse parameters correlate with the grammatical relations.

Exploring the theoretical implications of these findings is the main concern of this chapter. We intend to review the hypotheses and the accomplishments while making reference to previous analyses of grammatical relations for other Bantu languages and in which reference to Swahili is made.

5.1 The Typology of Subject Properties

We noted in Chapter One that the general definition of subject in Bantu languages (c.f. Hawkinson and Hyman 1974, Kunene 1975, Comrie 1979) include the following properties:

1. the left-most position in a sentence.
2. control of "agreement" on the verb.
3. absence of case marking (i.e. lack of an overt marker on the noun)

The typology is based on the assumption that the subject is a full NP (bare nominal). In the following sections we will review the consequences with respect to the findings of this study.

5.1.1 Left-most position

With the assumption that the subject is a full NP, arguments for the left-most position follow from arguments for word order cross-linguistically. The most common word order types in order of frequency are believed to be SOV, SVO and VSO. Cases of free word orders (VOS /V-free /OVS) have also been reported (cf. Greenberg 1966, Comrie 1979). These orders are considered for simple active sentences. By looking at these possible word orders, it seems that the subject cannot be characterized by the "left-most" position.

The definition given to the subject in this study has some consequences with respect to the assumption that the subject should be a full NP and consequently in left-most position. Recall, we defined the subject as either the NP co-occurring with a subject marker or the subject marker itself. Since the subject marker without the full NP may be considered the subject rather than a mere anaphoric pronoun as has been proposed for some languages (cf. Kunene 1975), we will have to determine whether the position of the subject marker qualifies for the criterion
"left-most position". In Swahili the subject marker is the initial element and so it is in the left-most position of its predicate. However, we will need to explain cases in which the subject category includes full NPs which are not in initial position but are still within the clause boundary which was our condition for designating a nominal a grammatical relation of a particular verb. Such cases were noted in Chapter Two, in which we showed 32% of subjects in non-initial position (cf. Table 1 and example 6 in Chapter Two). It seems therefore, that the "left-most" criterion is not a favourable one for characterizing the subject in Swahili.

5.1.2 Control of "Agreement".

"Agreement marking", as is used in traditional grammars, implies the use of the subject marker on a verb which agrees in class and number with the nominal which it indexes. Although this "control of agreement" is considered a definition of the subject in many Bantu languages (cf Hawkinson and Hyman 1974, Kunene 1975, Hodges 1977, Dalgish 1977, Trithart 1979, Hyman and Duranti 1982), this is not a possible criterion in this study. We noted in this study that the subject marker in Swahili is not an agreement marker because the subject marker does not always co-occur with a nominal to which it has to agree in class and number. The subject marker is used in this study to define the grammatical relation subject. It is in itself the subject where
there is no overt nominal that can be considered the grammatical subject. From this consideration, the "control of agreement" criterion does not fit our definition accorded to the subject. The subject has neither something to control nor something by which it is controlled.

5.1.3 Lack of Case Marking

Givon (1979) uses this criterion to distinguish the subject from the object. The assumption is that a nominal of the status object is "case marked" on the verb by what traditional analyses (cf. Gary 1977, Gary and Keenan 1977) refer to as the prepositional marker and which in this study we have shown to be associated with the semantic relations benefactive and recipient. In this study we used the term "-I- marker" in place of the term "preposition". This study does not consider this criterion favourable because case marking is a characteristic of nouns (as is widely demonstrated in Indo-European languages). The marking shown on verbs and which is erroneously assumed to be case marking (i.e. -I- marking) is not equivalent to the case marking of nouns as found in Latin or any other Indo-European languages. Therefore, this criterion like the two we just discussed above does not characterize subjects in Swahili.

5.2 The Typology of Object Properties

As was noted in this study, the notion of "object" is more controversial than that of subject. The typological properties
that are assumed as criterial for the object in Bantu languages (cf. Hyman and Duranti 1982) include:

1. word order
2. cliticization (i.e. object marking)
3. person–animacy hierarchy (i.e. the preference shown in the use of the first, second and third person nominals with respect to the animacy status of referents)
4. passivizability of objects.

5.2.1 Word Order

With word order the concern is whether the order of nominals has a bearing on the grammatical status of a given referent. Morolong and Hyman (1977) note for Sesotho that a nominal in immediate post-verbal position is most likely to be the grammatical relation object. Like the subject, the object is taken to be a full NP, an assumption this study has not been able to accommodate. The assumption has its source in analyses of non Bantu languages in which word order is considered to have a grammatical function.

Gary (1977), on the other hand, notes that in Mashi and Luyia (both Bantu languages), a nominal in immediate post-verbal position need not be in a grammatical relation with the verb. She notes a possibility of a sequence of up to three nominals after the verb. Among these, only one can be coindexed with an
object marker on the verb and consequently secure a grammatical relation with the verb. The nominal controlling the object marker need not be in immediate post verbal position. She concludes that the proximity of a nominal with respect to its predicate is determined by the discourse context. That is, the nominal that gets to appear immediately after the verb has a special discourse function in the on-going discourse.

Dalgish (1977) notes that, for those Bantu language which allow multiple object markers, the order of the NPs associated with these object markers does not reflect their grammatical status (i.e. where the grammatical relation object is considered to include both direct and indirect object). Although this study does not embrace the notions of direct and indirect objects and consequently the distinctions that have been put forward, Dalgish's point is well taken in that we cannot use word order as a means to distinguish grammatical roles of nominals in discourse. Chaga, Logoli (Morolong and Hyman) Haya (Hyman and Byarushengo 1977), Lomongo (Hulstaerb 1965), Kirundi (Duranti 1979) Umbundu (Valente 1964) Kimeru (Hodges 1977) Chichewa (Trithart 1977) and Kiyaka (Kidima 1985) are other cases in which multiple object marking has been reported and in which the order of the nominals in question is not restricted to their grammatical relation status.

It seems, therefore, that word order is not a reasonable criterion for the grammatical relation object in some Bantu
languages. Certainly, Swahili shows no evidence in support of the word order criterion. In Chapter two, we showed that grammatical relations have variable positions which are by and large determined by the discourse content. In other words, word order has a discourse function rather than a grammatical function.

5.2.2 Person – animacy Hierarchy

The main issue with respect to this criterion is whether the order of "objects" is determined by the person-animacy hierarchy. Thus this criterion is based on the word order property. The claim is that the choice of the grammatical object is based on the person and animacy hierarchy which is: 1st person > 2nd person > 3rd human > 3rd animate > 3rd inanimate (cf. Hyman and Duranti 1982, Morolong and Hyman 1977, Kimenyi 1980). The assumption is that, if there is more than one nominal in a clause (sentence), there will be a competition for control of the object marker on the verb. To determine the eligible nominal previous analyses have posited the person-animacy hierarchy as the criterion. That is, the nominal highest on the hierarchy will be the object which will then be coindexed with the object marker on the verb.
The opinion in this study is that, if such were the case, discourses would be uniform regardless of the context. That is, if we examined any text, we would find marking for 1st > 2nd > 3rd >, human instead of animate and animate instead of inanimate where multiple nominals occurred in a clause. Apparently this is not the case. We noted in Chapter Three that both animates and inanimates are favoured for grammatical relations. However, the tendency is for animates more than inanimates to be selected for grammatical relations. The data does not bear out any correlation between the 1 > 2 > 3 hierarchy to the selection of nominals for the grammatical object.

5.2.3 Cliticization (object marking)

This criterion resembles "control of agreement" which is the criterion posited for subjects (cf. section 5.1.2). The object marker is considered a clitic which agrees in class and number with a particular noun. The criterion is used to distinguish nominals of the status object in a given sentence. Depending on the ability for a nominal to cliticize on the verb, that nominal is designated the direct object, indirect object or other type of object. In this study we noted that such a distinction is not useful for Swahili. We also consider the clitic which we refer to as the object marker as "object". Thus in so far as the object marker is a possible objects itself, it cannot be associated with "control of agreement" on the verb. Thus the
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criterion as it stands is not useful for Swahili.

5.2.4 Passivization

In Chapter Four, we related the passive to cases in which the semantic relation agent did not compare to the grammatical relation subject. The grammatical relation subject in such cases happened to relate to any of the semantic relations normally attributed to the grammatical object namely: benefactive, recipient, patient, goal, instrumental, and locative.

In previous analyses of grammatical relations based on isolated sentences (cf. Perlmutter and Postal 1974, Keenan 1975), the subject of a passive sentence has been referred to as a case of "advanced object". That is, it is considered that the subject of a passive sentence was originally the object of the sentence and through a passive transformation the object advanced to the subject position.

Attempts have also been made to relate the process of passivization to grammatical relations in Bantu languages (cf. Hawkinson and Hyman 1974, Givon 1979, Gary and Keenan 1977, Hodge 1977, Gary 1977, Kimenyi 1980). The assumption is that a nominal that can passivize, is a candidate for the category object. In addition, such nominals will occupy the immediate post-verbal position and will cliticize on the verb.

Passivizability has also been used to show that there is a correlation between the subject position and the semantic
relation of a nominal that occupies the subject position. Hawkinson and Hyman (1974) make a claim for Bantu languages, using sentence based data from Shona, that preference is given to nominals of the semantic relation benefactive when passivizing objects. The assumption is that a nominal of the semantic relation benefactive is necessarily the grammatical object which will be in immediate post-verbal position. Further, the nominal will be coindexed with an object marker in the verb to indicate that it is a grammatical relation.

Hyman and Duranti (1982) also note that there are some Bantu languages that do not have the category object. In such languages, only the patients can have access to the subject position through passivization.

Givon (1979) claims a general trend for Bantu languages not to allow nominals of the semantic relation instrumental to have access to the subject position through passivization because nominals that imply instrument are poor candidates for grammatical relations and therefore occur as non-grammatical relations. Similar views are expressed by Hodges (1977) about Kimeru and Gary (1977) about Kinyaruanda, Mashi and Luyia.

This study maintains that the "passivizability" issue as a criterion for object is a criterion proposed up by sentence-oriented linguists and is not really relevant for discourse approaches.
From the possible objects in the data for this study, none seem impossible to passivize. These are nominals of the semantic relations: patient (19 tokens), benefactive (9 tokens), recipient (13 tokens), goal (6 tokens), instrumental (4 tokens), and locative (11 tokens). Also in our discussion of agents in Chapter Four (cf. section 4.2.1 and Table 15), we noted that not all subjects are also agents. Those that are not agents may be the semantic relation: patient, benefactive, recipient, goal, instrumental, and locative. When they are also the grammatical relations and are designated non-agent, they may appear as subject of a passive verb. In this study, a total of 71 non-agent subjects were found with passive verbs and they were distributed as follows: patient (35 tokens), benefactive (8 tokens), recipient (21 tokens), goal (2 tokens), instrumental (2 tokens), and locative (2 tokens). This finding forms the basis for our claim that passivization is not restricted to nominals of any specific semantic relation. As we pointed out earlier, this study maintains that the passive process is discourse motivated and is used by speakers as a strategy to make an otherwise non-subject the grammatical subject for specific discourse purpose(s). In our understanding, the syntactization of a nominal follows from the discourse requirements. Thus, the creation of the grammatical subject from a non-subject through passivization is discourse motivated. The speaker's main reason is to make a non-agent the subject, because the referent in
question is playing an important role in the discourse.

Thompson (1982), in discussing passives in English, considers two main discourse considerations motivating speakers to choose passive over active. First, she notes that if the speaker does not intend to mention the agent, then the passive rather than the active will be used. The second consideration is a situation where the speaker mentions the agent but also intends to show that the non-agent more than the agent is closely related either to the "theme" of the paragraph or to a participant in an immediately preceding clause.

Swahili shows that speakers are motivated by similar considerations. At least 52% (37 tokens out of 71 total passive subjects) of the time a non-agent is used, the speaker does not mention the agent, and 28% (37 tokens out of a total of 71 total passive subjects) of the time, the speaker mentions the agent (in a "by phrase") while the non-agent appears as the subject.

Examples (1), (2) and (3) below exemplify the cases in consideration. We have underlined the subject nominals, the subject markers and the passive (-w-) morphemes. We have not given a morpheme to morpheme gloss because the underlining and the discussion is quite clear.

In example (1) we show a situation where the speaker does not intend to mention the agent.
(1) [Kina mama walifanya]1 [na bado wanafanya plural mothers they did and still they are doing kazi zaidi kuliko wengine]2 [Lakini hawakutunzwa work more than others but not they cared pass. kuliko akina baba]3 than plural father
"Women worked and still are working harder than anybody else but they are not cared for more than the men"
UJ: 2

In clause 1 of this example, the nominal akina mama coindexed with the subject marker wa is both the subject and the agent. In clause 2, only the subject marker wa is the subject but it shares the same referent with the nominal akina mama. Likewise, in clause 3, the subject marker wa makes reference to the nominal akina mama. In clause 3, the verb has been passivized and is indicated by the passive morpheme -r-. The subject, indicated by the subject marker wa on the passive verb tunzwa, is non-agent. The agent has not been expressed but it can be inferred from the interpretation of the clause. The implication is that the speaker did not intend to mention the agent because the main focus is on the participant akina mama with which the referent of the subject of this clause is related.

Now consider example (2) in which we show a situation where the speaker mentions the agent but also intends to show that the non-agent more than the agent is closely related to the "theme" of the paragraph.
(2) [Kanuni ya pili ilihu mali]1
principle of two it concern wealth
[Nayo ilikuwa kwamba]2
and it was that
[mali yote ya lazima ilikuwa ni mali ya wealth all of must it was is property of shirika]3
community
[na ilitumwiwa na jamaa yote]4
and it used pass. by family all
[Kama hapana budi hivyo]5
if not mut that
[ilitumwiwa na wengine]6
It used pass. by others
[kama kwamba ni ya shirika]7
as that is of community
"The principle involved wealth. The wealth belonged to the community and it was used by the whole family. Otherwise, it was used by anybody else because it was the property of the community."

UJ: 2

In this example, we have underlined the nominal mali which is the "theme" of the paragraph from which the example is drawn. This nominal is coreferential with the subject markers that have also been underlined in clauses 4 and 6. In these two examples, the subjects are not the agents. The agents are jamaa 'family' in clause 4 and wengine 'others' in clause 6. Although the agents are also mentioned, the non-agent is selected as the subject because that is what is being talked about in the paragraph. In other words, the non-agent is related to the "theme" of the paragraph.
In our last example, we show a situation similar to that of (2) above except that here the speaker intends to show that the non-agent is closely related to a participant in an earlier clause.

(3) [Najum alipiga hodi nyumbani kwa bwana Musa, Kikwajuni karibu na Mnazi Mmoja]1
of Mr. '1' '1' near of '1' '1'

[aliitikiwa na mtoto mdogo]2
he answer pass. by child small

"Najum called at Mr. Juma's house, at Kikwajuni near Mnazi Mmoja. His call was received by a small child." MZ: 1

The participant in question is indicated by the nominal Najum in clause 1. This participant is related to the subject indicated by the subject marker a on the passive verb in clause 2. The subject is not also the agent. The agent is expressed by the nominal mtoto mdogo in the same clause. It co-occurs with na the preposition in the "by phrase". Because the speaker expresses both the agent and the non-agent but chooses to make the non-agent the subject, it indicates the importance of this participant in the discourse. The referent is the "theme" in the preceding clause and the speaker intends to maintain it in the following clauses.

To conclude, we have shown that passivization is discourse motivated and that speakers use the passive when they want to
avoid mention of the agent as well as when their attention is on the non-agent.

5.3 Summary

In this chapter we have reviewed the accomplishments of the theoretical framework put forward in this study. We looked at the typological properties that are generally associated with the subject and object. We discussed these properties in the light of the findings in this study about the grammatical subject and object. The properties discussed include: the left-most position, control of agreement, and lack of case marking, for the grammatical subject, and word order, cliticization, person-animacy hierarchy, and passivizability, for the grammatical object. We noted that as far as the definitions for grammatical relations (as given in this study) are concerned, the properties do not characterize grammatical relations in Swahili.

With respect to passivization, we noted that passivization contributes to grammatical relations in that it is a strategy used to make a non-agent the subject. We noted two discourse considerations that motivate speakers to use the passive and these are shown in the speaker's intention not to mention the agent and the intention to show that the non-agent more than the agent is closely related to either the "theme" of a paragraph or to a participant in an immediately preceding clause.
Chapter Six

6.0 Conclusions

6.1 Major Findings

In this thesis, we have shown that Swahili shows evidence for only two grammatical relations, the subject and the object. These are defined through morphology. We chose morphology as the criterion in designating a particular grammatical relation in order to discourage analyses that are based on intuitions. Based on text counts, we established that nominals in Swahili discourse are generally unmarked for grammatical relations and those that are marked are largely subjects. We also noted that there are distributional differences depending on the genre and language background of the speaker. The tendency is for more marked for grammatical relations to appear in written discourse and in the writings of second language Swahili speakers. We did not offer explanations for this tendency but we suggested that the first language of the speaker may have some influence on this tendency. However, this matter awaits further research.

We also found out that the discourse parameters, namely, salience, animacy and the definiteness of nominals may have an influence over their potential to be selected for grammatical relations in Swahili. We noted that the general trend is for a salient, definite and animate referents to be marked for
grammatical relations. The priority is given to the subject. On the other hand, indefinite, non-salient, and inanimate referents will appear unspecified for grammatical relations in Swahili. However, we pointed out that these are only tendencies and should not be considered characteristics grammatical relations in Swahili. The data show cases where the correlation is not as strong.

The semantic relations agent, patient, benefactive, goal, recipient, instrumental, and locative were shown to have a close relationship with the grammatical relations. The data show that the subject may relate to any of the semantic relations but mostly with the agent and the patient. As the agent, the subject occurs with the active/action verbs. The subject as a non-agent occurs with the passive, causative and stative verbs. The object occurs mostly as a patient. It was pointed out that, even though the speaker tends to select subjects that are also the agents and objects that are also the patient, neither subject nor object can be defined in terms of these semantic relations. The frequency of occurrence of subject/non-agents and object/non-patients is significant enough to make a claim that the semantic relations are distinct from the grammatical relations.

Finally, we reviewed typological properties that have been previously used in Bantu languages to describe grammatical relations. These include the position occupied by the grammatical relation nominal in a sentence or clause, control of
agreement, case marking, word order, and the person–animacy hierarchy. The study concluded that these properties do not describe grammatical relations in Swahili.

6.2. Implications

The importance of looking at grammatical relations from a discourse perspective rather than from a sentence level analysis is evident from the discussions on grammatical relations in Swahili. Basically we showed that we can get both answers to the questions how and why. how question can be answered at the sentence level, leaving the why question unanswered. The why question is the hardest to answer which explains why sentence level analysis has been long preferred to discourse analysis. Descriptions of grammatical relations from a sentence base show only the fact that grammatical relations exist but does not make an attempt to answer the question why they exist. This study has made an attempt to answer this question by showing that grammatical relation marking reflects the way speakers manipulate participants in discourse. Grammatical relations tend to reflect the salient referents as opposed to the non-salient, and they correlate to some extent with the definite and animate nominals.

In this study we tried to show how grammatical relations are manifested in Swahili while we tried to explain why we think
grammatical morphology is the crucial characteristic of grammatical relations in Swahili discourse. We also proposed that other Bantu languages might make use of this characteristic in their analysis of the same relations.
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