

# ANAPHORA IN AFRICAN LANGUAGES- QUESTIONNAIRE version 1.5

## PART 1- General Information

### 1.1 Language

1. **Name of the language:** Lubukusu
2. **Ethnologue code:** BUL.
3. **Dialect and/or area:** Lubukusu is one of the wider Luhya dialects (languages?) spoken mainly in Bungoma District, Western Province of Kenya.
4. **Basis of Information:** My own judgment.

### 1.2 Identify yourself

1. **Name:** Justine Sikuku
- 2a. **Address:** Moi University, Department of Linguistics and Foreign Languages, P.O Box 3900, 30100 Eldoret. KENYA.
- 2b. **E-mail address:** [jastinosikuku@yahoo.com](mailto:jastinosikuku@yahoo.com)
3. **Revelation:** I am willing to be identified.
4. **Level of Training in Linguistics:** PhD student
5. **Extent of exposure to the following sub-fields;**
  - (a) **Syntax:** Intimately? Familiar
  - (b) **Typological Linguistics:** some
  - (c) **Formal semantics:** some
  - (d) **Pragmatics or discourse analysis:** some
  - (e) **Stylistics:** Intimately familiar
6. **Language biography.**
  - a. **Languages spoken at home by parents:** English, Kiswahili and Lubukusu
  - b. **Languages spoken natively:** Lubukusu
  - c. **Languages of Instruction In School:** Kiswahili and English in lower primary, but later, English only.
  - d. **Age when first learned the subject language:** Around 1 year plus.
  - e. **Identifiable sub- dialect:** Lubukusu has no significant sub-dialect.
  - f. **Other dialects of the same language:** Lubukusu is a language/dialect that has no distinct variations. It is, however, considered as a dialect of Luluhya together with other languages /dialects? Like Lulogooli, Lunyaala, e.t.c. I do not speak any of the other dialects but they are mutually intelligible with Lubukusu.

**1.3 Additional Consultants:** There were no additional consultants.

**1.4 References:** There are no published references on Lubukusu anaphora. My M.phil thesis and PhD project are based on Lubukusu Anaphora. I also have an incomplete manuscript entitled, A linguistic Profile of Lubukusu.

**Note:** I cannot find the consent form, but I am willing to have my identity revealed.

NOTE TO READERS: The consultant has chosen not to provide any representation of tone because he is not sure of how it should be marked and he does not want to introduce errors.

## **PART 2      An Inventory of Reflexive and Reciprocal Strategies.**

### **2.1 Co reference in a single clause.**

#### **2.1.1 “Primary” reflexive strategy.**

**A1 a** Yohana a-e-bon-a            omweene.  
Yohana SM-RFM-saw-fv Agr-own  
‘John saw himself’

**Comment:** Strategy RFM+ AGR-*eene*

#### **2.1.2**

**A1 b**      Yohana a-e-bon-a  
Yohana SM-RFM-saw-fv  
‘John saw himself’

**Comment:** Strategy RFM only

#### **2.1.3– Other verb types**

**A2a)** Yohana a-e-siing-ang-a            omweene  
Yohana SM-RFM-wash-HAB-fv Agr-own  
‘John washes himself’

**b)** Maria a-e-rem-a            omweene  
Maria SM-RFM-cut-fv Agr-own  
‘Mary cut herself’

**c)** Yohana a-e-sony-a            omweene  
Yohana SM-RFM-ashamed-fv Agr-own  
‘John shamed himself’

**d)** Yohana a-e-yonak-a            omweene  
Yohana SM-RFM-destroyed-fv Agr-own  
‘John destroyed himself ‘

**e)** Efwe khwa-e-biiyil-a      fwabeene  
We SM-RFM-hate-fv Agr-own  
‘We hate ourselves’

**Comment:** Sentences (A2a-e) can also use the second strategy where the *Agr-eene* reflexive is omitted leaving only RFM to indicate reflexivization.

#### 2.1.4 - Obliques and other argument types

**A3a)** Yohana a-kachul-a khu Maria  
Yohana SM-talked- fv to Maria  
'John talked to Mary'

**Comment:** The preposition *khu*, literally translated refers to 'on', but is used for English prepositions 'to', 'about', 'for' and 'on'. Sometimes, 'for' may be marked by the applicative affix *-il*.

**bi)** Yohana a-e-lom-a khu omweene  
Yohana SM-RFM-spoke -fv on Agr-own  
'John spoke about himself'

**bii)** Yohana a-e-lom-a kho  
Yohana SM-RFM-spoke-fv on  
'John spoke about himself'

**Comment:** The syntactic direct object corresponds to the 'about' argument while the prepositional object of '*khu*' either represents 'to' or 'about' arguments. This implies that it is the latter argument that may not be represented by RFM. Consequently, the interpretation of A3b(i) can still remain, even without the preposition. In addition, the same sentence may have a 'meditative' interpretation where 'John spoke about himself to himself'. Similarly, A3b(ii) may be interpreted to mean 'John spoke about him to some other person'. For A3a(i) to be interpreted as suggested, '*khu*' must be added. Otherwise as it is, the only meaning (though odd because of the verb) is that denoting 'about'. 'to' argument is always possible whenever there is '*kho*', impossible in a direct object, but possible in cases of double preverbal arguments (probably where one is direct object, and the other, indirect object). *bi*" can only be interpreted to mean 'John spoke about her to himself'. The order of affixes in *bi*' is not possible – for the sense suggested to be expressed, the 'to' argument should be shifted to be an object of '*khu*' i.e.

Yohana a- e-lom-a khu niye  
Yohana SM-RFM-spoke- fv to her  
John spoke about himself to her'

**biii)** Yohana a-mu-lom-a kho  
Yohana SM-OM-spoke-fv on  
'John spoke about him'

**biv)** Yohana a-lom-a khu niye  
Yohana SM-spoke-fv on him  
'John spoke about him'

**bv)** Yohana a-mu-lom-a khu niye  
Yohana SM-OM-spoke-fv to him  
'John spoke about him to him'

**Comment:** In A3b, the RFM corresponds to the oblique object. In such a case the RFM plays some sort of disambiguating role where the antecedent of *omweene* is strictly *Yohana*. If the RFM is omitted, then *omweene* permits an extra-sentential

antecedent. The RFM corresponds to a null direct object *omweene*, which then yields an interpretation where Yohana spoke about himself to himself, if the PP is retained. In bii) and biii), both the RFM and OM correspond to a null oblique object, which, obligatorily, must yield a reflexive reading where the coreference is with Yohana in bii) and with the individual denoted by the OM in biii). In biv) and bv), ‘niye’ has an independent reading. In v), coreference with the OM is also possible(?). The use of an *Agr-eene* form in place of ‘niye’ in both sentences introduces a reflexive reading.

- ci)** Yohana a-kachul-il-a Maria khu omweene  
 Yohana SM-told-APP-fv Maria on Agr-own  
 ‘John told Mary about himself’
- cii)** \*Yohana a- e-kachul-il-a Maria khu omweene  
 Yohana SM-RFM-told-APP-fv Maria on Agr-own  
 ‘John told Mary about himself’

**Comment: Strategy *Agr-eene* only for the *khu* object.**

- di)** Billi a-khu-kachul-il-a efwe khu fwabeene  
 Billi SM-OM1PP-told-APP-fv us on Agr-own  
 ‘Bill told us about ourselves’
- dii)** Billi a-khu-kachul-il-a efwe khu-efwe  
 Billi SM-OM-told-APP-fv us on-us  
 ‘Bill told us about us’
- diii)** Billi a-khu-kachul-il-a efwe khu niye  
 Billi SM-OM-told-APP-fv us on him  
 ‘Bill told us about him’

Comment: The RFM and the OM are in complementary distribution. Further, if the object of *khu* were a simple pronoun as in dii) and diii) coreference will still be possible; with the object in dii) and the subject in diii). There is, predictably, the possibility of an extra-sentential antecedent in Diii).

- e)** Maria a-w-a ba-baana babeene  
 Maria SM-gave-fv CL2-child Agr-own  
 ‘Mary gave the children themselves’
- f)** Maria a-bon-a si-tabu enyuma wewe omweene  
 Maria SM-saw-fv CL7-book behind her Agr-own  
 ‘Mary saw a book behind her’
- gi)** Yohana a-e-kul-il-a omweene si-tabu  
 Yohana SM-RFM-bought-APP-fv Agr-own CL7-book.  
 ‘John bought himself a book’
- gii)** Yohana a-kul-a si-tabu khu omweene  
 Yohana SM-bought-fv CL7-book for Agr-own  
 ‘John bought a book for himself’ (Benefactive)

**A4a)** Etta a-e-siim-a omweene

Etta SM-RFM-likes-fv Agr-own  
'Etta likes herself'

b) Etta a-e-r-isy-a omweene  
Etta SM-RFM-scaries-Caus-fv Agr-own  
'Etta scares herself'

c) Etta a-e-indekhelel-a omweene  
Etta SM-RFM-worries-fv Agr-own  
'Etta worries herself'

### 2.1.5 Person and Number

A5ai) Ese na-e-bon-a samweene  
I SM-RFM saw-fv Agr-own  
'I saw myself'

aii) Na-e-bon-a samweene  
SM-RFM-saw-fv Agr-own  
'I saw myself'

bi) Ewe wa-e-rem-a wamweene  
You SM-RFM-cut-fv Agr-own  
'You cut yourself'

bii) Wa-e-rem-a wamweene  
SM-RFM-cut-fv Agr-own  
'You cut yourself'

ci) Efwe khu-kha-e-siing-e fwabeene  
We SM-TS-RFM-wash-fv Agr-own  
'We will wash ourselves'

cii) Khu-kha-e-siing-e fwabeene  
SM-TS-RFM-wash-fv Agr-own  
'We will wash ourselves'

di) Enywe paka mu-i-yeet-e mwabeene  
You must SM-RFM-help-fv Agr-own  
'You must help yourselves'

dii) Paka mu-i-yeet-e mwabeene  
Must SM-RFM-help-fv Agr-own  
'You must help yourselves'

**Comment:** Notice the change in the RFM from '-e-' to '-i-' especially with 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> person imperative-like constructions. This change cannot be attributed to assimilation because other clause types have the conventional 'e' form regardless of the nature of the preceding sound. '-is' is a causative affix. Also note that '-il' can be both a benefactive or applicative marker depending on usage. It is possible for the two roles to be distinguished, and even occur with the same verb. Consider the example below:

Nafula a- mu- ch- il-il- a kamechi bikele  
 Nafula SM-OM-went-App-App-fv CL4water CL8feet  
 ‘Nafula fetched water for him on her feet (not by car)’

The first of the two applicatives is benefactive.

**Comment:** Tense is marked in two ways: By affixation and by Tone. When a tense affix appears, I have made an effort to gloss it as so. I do not know what to do with tonal tense-I cannot trust my ability to mark tone accurately.

## 2.1.6 Strategies for Other Clausemate Environments

### a) Aspectual class of verbs

**A6) a** Petero a-e-many-il-e omweene  
 Peter SM-RFM-know-Tns-fv Agr-own  
 ‘Peter knows himself’

**b** Petero a-e-lek-ang-a omweene  
 Peter SM-RFM-criticizes-Hab-fv Agr-own  
 ‘Peter (habitually) criticizes himself’

**c** Petero a-nyal-a a-e-fumy-a omweene  
 Peter SM-can-fv SM-RFM-praise-fv Agr-own  
 ‘Peter can praise himself’

**Comment:** No new strategy for special aspectual class of a verb. The *a-* SM is not pronounced in A6a-c), but there is reason to believe it should be glossed. When A6a-c) are not reflexive, the subject marker automatically becomes *a-*. The most logical conclusion would then be that there is assimilation of the SM.

**d** Wekesa ba-e-siim-a ne Marko babeene  
 Wekesa SM2-RFM-like-fv and Marko Agr-own  
 ‘Wekesa and Mark like themselves’

**e** Wekesa a-kachul-il-a Marko khu- babeene  
 Wekesa SM-told-PST-APP-fv Marko on Agr-own  
 ‘Wekesa told Marko about themselves’

**Comment:** Note that the reflexive sometimes allows split antecedents as a property of the *Agr-eene* strategy. If (A6e) were to contain an RFM, then the result would be unacceptable.

**f** Wekesa omweene a-e-ir-a omweene  
 Wekesa Agr-own SM-RFM killed-fv Agr-own  
 ‘Wekesa himself killed himself’

**g** Omweene a-e-siim-a omweene  
 Agr-own SM-RFM-like-fv Agr-own  
 ‘(the) owner likes himself’

Comment: The *Agr-ene* form may be used within an NP to show emphasis. It may occur alone in the subject position without a sentential antecedent but with an extra sentential one that is under discussion or the one whose perspective is reported. In such cases, there is always no need for a reflexive marker.

**b) Quantificational constructions**

**A7 a** Buli omu-soleeli a-e-lol-a omweene  
 Every CL1-boy SM-RFM-looked-fv Agr-own  
 ‘Every boy looked at himself’

**b** Ba-khasi ba-osi ba-fwochol-a Yohana khu babeene  
 CL2-woman Agr-all Agr-described-fv John to Agr-own  
 ‘All women described John to themselves’

**c** Buli omwalimu a-e-many-isy-a omweene khu Bob  
 Every CL1-teacher SM-RFM-introduced-Caus-fv Agr-own to Bob  
 ‘Every teacher introduced himself to Bob’

**d** Babaana ba-lala ba-e-yeet-a babeene bo-ng’ene  
 CL2-child Agr-some SM-RFM-helped-fv Agr-own Agr-only  
 ‘Some children only helped themselves’

**Comment:** No new strategy for quantificational constructions.

**c) Honorifics**

**A8 a)** Omwaami Sikuku  
 CL1leader Sikuku  
 ‘Sikuku the leader’

**b)** Bakhaaye be e-ng’anana yi-no  
 CL2ladies of CL9meeting Agr-this  
 ‘The ladies of this meeting’

**c)** Bapapa bakoosi  
 CL2fathers Agr-loved  
 ‘The fathers who are loved’

I cannot think of any new strategy for honorifics.

**d) Subordinate clauses**

**A9 a** Sol a-lom-a a-li Alice a-e-siim-a omweene  
 Sol SM-says-fv Agr-that Alice SM-RFM-loves-fv Agr-own  
 ‘Sol says that Alice loves herself’

**b** Sol e-ny-a a-li Alice a-e-fumy-e omweene  
Sol SM-wants-fv Agr-that Alice SM-RFM-praise-fv Agr-own  
'Sol wants Alice to praise herself'

**c** Sol a-uk-a a-li Alice yenyekha a- e-fumy-e omweene  
Sol SM-thought-fv Agr-that Alice should SM-RFM-praise-fv Agr-own  
'Sol thought that Alice should praise herself'

**d** Sol a-reeb-a Alice khu-khwe-fumy-a omweene  
Sol SM-asked-fv Alice to-RFM-praise-fv Agr-own  
'Sol asked Alice to praise herself'

**e** Sol e-ny-a khu-khwe-fumy-a  
Sol SM-wants-fv to-RFM-praise-fv  
'Sol wants to praise himself'

**f** Sol e-basy-a Alice khu-khwe-fumy-a omweene  
Sol SM-expected-fv Alice to- RFM-praise-fv Agr-own  
'Sol expected Alice to praise herself'

**Comment:** It appears that the *-khwe-* RFM is an allomorph of the reflexive affix whose distribution is syntactically conditioned i.e. it occurs in infinitive clauses. It will henceforth be treated as a version of strategy RFM only.

**g** Sol a-ulil-a Alice ne a-e-fumy-a omweene  
Sol SM-heard-fv Alice as SM-RFM-praise-fv Agr-own  
'Sol heard Alice as she praised herself'

## 2.2 Ordinary (Potentially Independent) Pronouns.

### 2.2.1

**A10a)** Ese na-kachuul-e nende Abraham likolooba  
I SM-spoke-fv with Abraham yesterday  
'I spoke with Abraham yesterday'

(Niye) a-bon-e Lela  
He SM-saw-fv Lela  
'He saw Lela'

**b)** Abraham a-li wahe?  
Abraham SM-is where  
'Where is Abraham?'

(Ese) na-mu-bon-e (niye) mu- soko  
I SM-OM-saw-fv him in market  
'I saw him in the market'

**c)** (Efwe) khwa-khu-boon-a (ewe)



We SM-OM-saw-fv you  
'We saw you'

d) (Ewe) wa-m/khu-bon-a (ese/efwe)?  
(you) SM-OM/OM-sa-fv me/us  
'Did you see me/us?'

**Comment:** Note that *Agr-li* in A10b is a copula verb distinct from the complementizer, which incidentally has similar morphological patterning.

### 2.2.2- Other types of pronouns.

See table 2 in section 3.5.1 for personal pronouns, SMs and OMs. Demonstrative pronouns fall in two broad categories: those that indicate HERE and those that indicate THERE. These are either plural or singular. Consider the following;

O- yu- (no) (This) a- ba- (no) (These)  
Prfx-CL1-here Prfx-CL2-here

o- yo- (o) (That) a- bo- (o) (Those)  
Prfx-CL1-there Prfx-CL2-there

The structure of demonstratives in Lubukusu could then be summarized as follows;  
Prfx(a/e/o) +N.CL+no(singular)/o (plural).

I presume here that the structure of the prefixes is determined by some phonological aspects of the Noun Class. We can then predict that 'bindu'(CL8) will have the following demonstratives;

'e- bi- no' and 'e- bi- o' for HERE and THERE respectively.

Relative pronouns on the other hand have the following structure;

'ni+ CL+o' . 'Books that' will be 'bi-tabu ni-bi-o'  
CL8-books foc-N.-CL-suffix

### 2.2.3- Null Arguments

Subject- a) Ø ne-er-a Wanyama  
Null pro SM-killed-fv Wanyama  
'I killed Wanyama'

Object- b) Wanyama a-mu-ir-a Ø  
Wanyama- SM-OM-killed-PST-fv null  
'Wanyama killed him'

Comment: Unless the object marker is reflexive, the null object can never be coconstrued with the subject. Also, as far as I know, virtually all transitive verbs can drop the object so long as there is an OM embedded in the verb

## 2.3 Reciprocal Co-reference

2.3.1- No such reflexive strategy with reciprocal meaning has been listed.

### 2.3.2

A11a) Ba-khasi ba-bon-an-ang-a babeene khu beene  
CL2-woman SM-see-RCM-HAB-fv Agr-own on own  
'Women see each other'

**Comment: Strategy - RCM+ Phrasal Reciprocal**

b) Ba-soleli ba-siing-an-a babeene khu beene  
CL2-boy SM-washed-RCM-fv Agr-own on own  
'(The) boys washed each other'

c) Ba-soleli ba-siing-an-a ∅  
CL2-boy SM-washed-RCM-fv null  
'(The) boys washed each other'

**Comment: Strategy - RCM only**

d) Ba-sani ba-chanu-an-a ka-machune ∅  
CL2-man SM-combed-RCM-fv CL6-hair null  
'(The) men combed each other's hair'

ei) Ba-sani ba-chanu-an-a ka-machune ka-bwe babeene khu beene  
CL2-man SM-combed-RCM-fv CL6-hair Agr-theirs Agr-own on own  
'(The) men combed each other's hair'

Comment: If, say, a comb was used in combing and the speaker wants to put focus on it, then the applicative will be introduced as follows:

eii) Ba-saani ba-chanu-an-il-a ka-machune si-chanuwo.  
CL2-man SM-combed-RCM-APP-fv CL6-hair CL7-comb  
'(The) men combed each others hair with (a) comb'

The possessive pronoun *kabwe* can be left out of (e) as a null element.

eiii) Ba-saani ba-chanu-an-a ka-machune babeene khu beene  
CL2-man SM-combed-RCM-fv CL6-hair Agr-own on own  
'(The) men combed each others hair'

Comment: Further, it is possible to leave out the RCM but the reciprocal meaning will be lost for (A11eiii) without it, leaving the interpretation where every man combed his own hair. The addition of a Reflexive marker may however yield reciprocity. This is shown below.

eiv) Ba-saani ba-e-chanu-a ka-machune babeene khu beene  
CL2-man SM-RFM-combed-fv CL6-hair Agr-own on own  
'(The) men combed their own hair'

In addition to the reflexive interpretation, this sentence may also have a reciprocal interpretation. We can then talk of **Strategy- RFM + Phrasal reciprocal**. See the discussion of the mixed reading in the anaphora sketch.

f) Nibo ba-ingan-a babeene khu beene

They SM-argued-fv Agr-own on own  
'They argued with each other'

**Comment: Strategy 'Inherent RCM'** -The inherently reciprocal verbs cannot occur without the *an* affix and retain the intended meaning. The verb *inga*, for example, literally means 'stretch' while *ingana* means 'argue'. Also no RCM can occur with such verbs except the one that already exists in the root, which interestingly also triggers a null internal argument reciprocal.

(Another example)

g) Ba-baana ba-loman-a babeene khu beene  
CL2-child SM-quarreled-fv Agr-own on own  
'(The) children quarreled (with)each other'

h) Ba-soleeli ba-itaal-an-a babeene khu beene  
CL2-boy SM- kicked-RCM-fv Agr-own on own  
'(The) boys kicked each other'

**Comment:** There is something about the verb that motivates the use of the RFM. I cannot quite put my finger on it, but I can only hypothesize that such verbs normally involve doing something on ones own 'body'. They could be verbs of destruction, grooming, e.t.c! (A12ai) is not consistent with this. Without the RFM, the reflexive interpretation, where one also does something to oneself, will be excluded. As noted in the follow up queries, I have noticed a significant difference between morpheme representation and actual articulation. The latter normally applies phonological rules, especially to avoid vowel clusters (Lubukusu, like most African languages, has a reduced vowel system). This could be what is happening in A11h. There is no RFM. See follow up comments on section 4.2.1.2 for related arguments.

i) Nibo ba-biiyila-an-a babeene khu beene  
They SM hate- RCM-fv Agr-own on own  
'They hate each other'

### 2.3.3 Oblique Arguments

A12ai) Ba-sani ba-e-many-isy-an-a-kho Billi babeene khu beene  
CL2-man SM-RFM-know-Caus-RCM-fv on Billi Agr-own on own  
'(The) men introduced Bill to each other'

**Comment: Strategy - RFM+ RCM+ Phrasal reciprocal**

aii) Ba-sani ba-e-many-isy-an-a- kho Billi ∅  
CL2-man SM-RFM-know-Caus-RCM-fv on Bill ∅  
'The men introduced Bill to each other'

**Comment: Strategy - RFM+RCM**

bi) Ba-keendi ba-e-kachul-an-a-kho babeene khu beene

CL2-traveler SM-RFM spoke-RCM-fv-on Agr-own on own  
'The travelers spoke to each other'

**bii)** Ba-keendi ba-e-kachul-an-a-kho ∅  
CL2-traveler SM-RFM-spoke-RCM-fv-on null'  
'The travelers spoke to each other'

Comment: The RFM can be left out in both A12bi and A12bii and still have a reciprocal interpretation. What may be missing is the reflexive interpretation where the individual travelers also talked to themselves.

**A12c1i)** Ba-khulundu ba-ulil-a chimbakha khu babeene khu beene  
CL2-priest SM-heard-fv CL4-stories on Agr-own on own  
'Priests heard stories about each other'

1ii)\*Ba-khulundu ba-e-ulil-a chimbakha khu babeene khu beene  
CL2-priest SM-RFM-heard-fv CL4-stories on Agr-own on own  
'Priests heard stories about each other'

1iii)\*Ba-khulundu ba-ulil-an-a chimbakha khu babeene khu beene  
CL2-priest SM-heard-RCM-fv CL4-stories on Agr-own on own  
'Priests heard stories about each other'

**Comment: Strategy - RECIPROCAL ONLY.** The introduction of either the RFM or RCM or both will definitely be unacceptable because of the presence of a direct object that is not coreferential with the subject.

**c2)** Ba-khulundu ba-ulil-a chimbakha khu babeene  
CL2-priest SM-heard-fv CL4-stories on Agr-own  
'The priests heard stories about themselves'

**d)** Nibo ba-lekh-a bi-anua e-bweni we babeene khu beene  
They SM-left-fv CL8-presents in-front of Agr-own on own  
'They left presents in front of each other'

### 2.3.4 Other Persons and Numbers

**A13a)** Efwe khwa-bon-an-a (babeene khu beene)  
We SM-saw-RCM-fv Agr-own on own  
'We saw each other'

**b)** Enywe paka mu-yet-an-e (mwabeene khu beene)  
You must SM-help-RCM-fv Agr-own on own  
'You must help each other'

**c)** Efwe khu-khe-e-siing-e fwabeene  
We SM-FUT-RFM-wash fv Agr-own  
'We will wash ourselves'

**d)** Nibo ba-e-fwochol-an-ang-a babeene khu beene  
They SM-RFM-criticize-RCM-HAB-fv Agr-own on own  
'They always criticize each other'

- e) Ba-soleli ba-kali ba-itaal-an-a babeene khu beene  
 CL2-boy Agr-many SM-RFM-kick-RCM-fv Agr-own on own  
 ‘Many boys kicked each other’

### 2.3.5 Other Clause Types

**Comment:** No new strategy found for reciprocals in embedded clauses.

## 2.4 Other Types of Local Coreference

### 2.4.1 Possessives alienable and inalienable

**A15 ai** Paulo a-tib-i-a bi-raro bi-ewe  
 Paulo SM-lost-asp-fv CL13-shoe Agr- his  
 ‘Paul lost his shoes’

**aii** \* Paulo a-e-tib-i-a bi-raro bi-ewe  
 Paulo SM-RFM-lost-asp-fv CL13-shoe Agr- his  
 ‘Paul lost his shoes’

**Comment:** In A15a, the RFM is not possible mainly because the verb used requires a direct object that is not dependent on the speaker for interpretation. One loses something that can be detached from oneself!

**bi** Paulo a-sut-a ku-mukhono ku-ewe  
 Paulo SM-raised-fv CL19-hand Agr-his  
 ‘Paul raised his hand’

**bii** \*Paulo a-e-sut-a ku-mukhono ku-ewe  
 Paulo SM-RFM-raised-fv CL19-hand Agr-his  
 ‘Paul raised his hand’

**Comment:** A15b sounds odd. Why? Although the direct object may correspond to *Paulo* (or at least part of him), the use of the RFM implies first, that ‘*Paulo carried the whole of himself*’.

**ci** Paulo a-rem-a ku-mukhono ku-ewe  
 Paulo SM-cut-fv CL19-hand Agr-his  
 ‘Paul cut his hand’

**cii** Paulo a-e-rem-a ku-mukhono (ku-ewe)  
 Paulo SM-RFM-cut-fv CL19-hand (Agr-his)  
 ‘Paul cut his hand’

**Comment:** A15ci is likely to be interpreted as being intentional (e.g., Paul cut his hand because he wanted to have a scar). In fact, A15ci cannot be used to express the accidental interpretation. On the other hand, A15cii may have both accidental and intentional interpretations, with the former being more likely than the latter. Further note that the interpretation of the pronoun in ci and di may correspond to an extra-sentential antecedent whereas that of cii and dii is obligatorily with *Paulo*. The difference is brought about by the presence of the RFM.

**di** Paulo a-lol-a ku-mukhono ku-ewe  
 Paulo SM-examined-fv CL19-hand Agr- his

‘Paul examined his hand’

Comment: **Same as Agr-*eene* only strategy**

dii) Paulo a-e-lol-a ku-mukhono ku- ewe  
Paulo SM-RFM-examined-fv CL19-hand Agr- his  
‘Paul examined his hand’

## 2.4.2 Reflexives in Nominals

A16 Li-li-suubila li-a Andrea omweene li-a-belel-isy-a Maria  
CL5-self-believe Agr-of Andrea Agr-own SM-did-annoyed-Caus-fv Maria  
‘Andrew’s self-confidence annoyed Mary’

Comment: Reflexive in NP

A17 Li-li-many-is-ya li-a Andrea omweene li-a sim-is-ya  
CL5-self-know-Caus-fv Agr-of Andrea Agr-own SM-did impress-Caus-fv  
omwalimu  
CL1-teacher

‘Andrew’s introduction of himself impressed the teacher’

**Comment:** The first *li* is a noun class agreement but the second of two *li* in a row is glossed as ‘self’. The second occurrence of *li* indicates a reflexive interpretation in nouns, reminiscent of English *self-organization*. Other examples include:

*Lilibiiyila-* self hatred *libiiyila-* hatred

*Lilipaanga-* self organization *lipaanga-* organization

This strategy appears peculiar to nominalized verbs. In Lubukusu such nominalization involves CL5 or CL15 affixes. When it is the former, ‘self’ formation involves *-li* (as above) while the latter involves *-khwe-*, the infinitival RFM (and *Agr-eene*) as in i.

i) Khu-khwe-many-is-ya khwa Andrea omweene khwa-siim-isy-a omwaalimu  
CL15-RFM-know-caus-fv Agr-of Andrew Agr-own Agr-pleased-caus-fv teacher  
‘Andrew’s introduction of himself impressed the teacher’.

Note that CL15 affixes are always gerundial/infinitival and the main verb agrees with CL15.

## 2.4.3 Special Verbal Inflections to Indicate Relations Between Arguments of a Predicate

### 2.4.3.1 ‘To Do Something’

A18 a) Wekesa a-p-a omundu  
Wekesa SM-beat-fv CL1-person  
‘Wekesa beat a person’

### 2.4.3.2 ‘To Make One to Do Something’ (Causative)

b) Wekesa a-khol-isy-a omundu ekaasi  
Wekesa SM-do-Caus-fv CL1-person CL3-work  
‘Wekesa made a person to do some work’

b’) Ba-khasi ba-nyw-esy-a ba-baana kamabeele  
Cl2-women SM-drunk-caus-fv Cl2-children Cl6-milk  
‘The women made the children drink milk’

b’’) Petero apya Wanjala omweene

Petero a-p-y-a                      Wanjala omweene  
 Petero SM-beat-Caus-fv Wanjala Agr-own  
 ‘Peter made Wanjala beat him’

Comment: The second object of the causative can be construed with Peter or an extrasentential antecedent.

**2.4.3.3 ‘To Make People/ Things to Do Something to each other’ (Reciprocal)**

c) Wekesa a-p-an-isy-a                      ba-baana    (ba-beene khu beene)  
 Wekesa SM-beat-RCM-Caus-fv CL2-child (Agr-own on own)  
 ‘Wekesa made the children to beat each other’

Comment: It is possible for the causative to precede the RCM, but there will be a change of meaning. In A18c, it is possible to have a reading (in addition to the one already given) where the children are used as objects to facilitate the action of the verb (Wekesa makes it to come about that the children hit against each other, e.g., as if Wekesa hit the children against each other (in the same way one can hit plates, spoons, e.t.c against each other).

ci) Wekesa a-p-is-an-ya ba-baana ba-baana  
 Wekesa SM-beat-Caus-RCM-fv CL2-child  
 ‘Because of Wekesa, the children made a decision to hit each other’

Comment: When the causative precedes the RCM, as in (18ci), the agent of the action must be the children. Wekesa only causes the agency of the children, by whatever means including incitement, and so the subject does not have to be plural. In cases where the causative precedes the RCM, the children as agents is the only interpretation available. This means that such usage is odd with non-living things.

**A18’ci)** Wekesa a- e- khup- isy- an-a                      omweene ne babaana  
 Wekesa SM-RFM-beat-Caus-RCM-fv Agr-own with CL2children  
 ‘Wekesa made himself fight the children’

**cii)** Wekesa a- e- khup- isy-a                      omweene babaana  
 Wekesa SM-RFM-beat-Caus-fv Agr-own CL2 children  
 ‘Wekesa made himself beat/ hit the children’

c’ii) Ba-khasi    ba-e-nyw-esy-a                      kamabeele  
 Cl2-women SM-RFM-drunk-caus-fv Cl6-milk  
 ‘The women made themselves drink milk’

**ciii)** Wekesa a-e-tim-isy-a                      omweene kumutoka  
 Wekesa SM-RFM-drive-Caus-fv Agr-own CL3 car  
 ‘Wekesa made himself drive a car’

c’iii) Ba-khasi    ba-nyw-esy-an-a                      kamabeele  
 Cl2-women SM-drunk-caus-RCM-fv Cl6-milk  
 ‘The women made each other drink milk’

civ) Wekesa e-ye- kesy-a                      omweene khu-tim-y-a                      kumutoka  
 Wekesa SM-RFM-taught-fv Agr-own INF-drive-Caus-fv CL3 car  
 ‘Wekesa taught himself how to drive a car’

cv) Wekesa a-e-fum-isy-a                      omweene babaana  
 Wekesa SM-RFM-praise-Caus-fv Agr-own CL2 children  
 ‘Wekesa made himself praise the children’

Comment: From these, the following can be noted:

- i) There are three arguments; the subject ‘Wekesa’, the reflexive, and the children/ a car.
- ii) The second and third arguments count as objects, but the decision as to which one is direct is in no way straightforward. However, all the verbs in (A18c) and related examples are causativized (even (A18’civ) is inherently causative). This means that the causation is on the reflexive (which is in coconstrual with the subject), making it the direct object. The third argument only suffers the action of the verb via the second argument.

More support for the reflexive as a direct object is in its position. We have said before that the RFM usually triggers an Agr-eene form in the verb’s internal position. Such a position is always immediately after the verb because of subcategorization issues. In the examples, the Agr-eene forms must occur in the positions indicated. Any change will slightly change the meaning of the sentence- shifting emphasis from RFM to subject.

- cvi) Wekesa a-p-an-y-a                      babaana      kimirwe  
       Wekesa SM-hit-RCM-Caus-fv CL2children CL4heads  
       ‘Wekesa caused the children to hit their heads against each other’
- cvi) Wekesa a-p-isy-an-a                      babaana      kimirwe  
       Wekesa SM-hit-Caus-RCM-fv CL2children CL4heads  
       ‘Wekesa caused the children to hit their heads against each other’

Comment: Here, Y is *babaana* which antecedes the RCM. Z specifies the body part (*kimirwe*) that suffers the action of the verb. I agree with you regarding the force of causation in relation to RCM-Caus ordering. When the RCM precedes the causative, X is the ‘direct’ force, while it is more ‘indirect’ if the causative comes first.

- cvi) Wekesa a-ba- p-isy-an-a                      kimirwe  
       Wekesa SM-OM-Caus-RCM-fv CL4heads  
       ‘Wekesa made them hit each other’s heads’

Comment: OM and RCM cooccur.

- civ) Wekesa a- mu-e- l-isy-a                      busuma  
       Wekesa SM-OM-RFM-Caus-fv CL14maize meal  
       ‘Wekesa made him feed himself on maize meal’

Comment: OM and RFM cooccur.

A18c’i) Babaana bapanila kumukaati

- Ba-baana      ba- p-an-il-a                      ku-mukaati  
       CL2-children SM-fought-RCM-Appl-fv CL3-bread  
       ‘The children fought (each other or other people) for/ with bread’

c’ii) Babaana bapanilana kumukaati

- Ba-baana      ba- p-an-il-an-a                      ku-mukaati  
       CL2-children SM-fought-RCM-Appl-RCM-fv CL3-bread  
       ‘The children fought (each other or other people) for bread for each other’

c’iii) Emuuna yapanya chisaang’i

- Emuuna      ya- p-an-y-a                      chisaang’i  
       CL9Squirrel SM-fought-RCM-Caus-fv CL10animals  
       ‘The squirrel caused the animals to fight (each other or other people)



- c'iv) Emuuna yapanisyana chisaang'i  
 Emuuna ya-p-an-isy-an-a chisaang'i  
 CL9Squirrel SM-fought-RCM-Caus-RCM-fv CL10animals  
 'The squirrel caused the animals to fight each other'

#### 2.4.3.4 'To Do Something to Each Other' (Reciprocal)

- A18di)** Wekesa a-p-an-a ne Wanjala  
 Wekesa SM-fought-RCM-fv with Wanjala  
 'Wekesa and Wanjala fought each other'
- dii) Wanjala esiima ne Wafula  
 Wanjala a-e-siim-a ne Wafula  
 Wanjala SM-RFM-like-fv with Wafula  
 'Wanjala and Wafula like themselves' or  
 'Wanjala likes himself and he also likes Wafula'
- diii) Wanjala ekhiinga no omwaana  
 Wanjala a-e-khiing-a ne omwaana  
 Wanjala SM-RFM-defended-fv with CL1child  
 'Wanjala shielded himself with a child' or 'Wanjala and the child defended themselves' or 'Wanjala defended himself and he also defended the child'

Comment: The possibility of different interpretations makes the comitative inappropriate to mark reflexivity in a split subject clause. Such interpretations are not available with the reciprocal. Note, however, that the possibility of a comitative with reflexives is not totally excluded. To disambiguate the sentences above one needs only to change the SM to plural in anticipation of the additional noun in the *ne*-phrase.

#### Comment: Strategy - Split Antecedent +RCM (Comitative)

#### 2.4.3.5 'To Do Something for Each Other'

- e) Ba-baana ba-p-an-il-an-a kumukati  
 CL2-child SM-fought-RCM-asp-RCM-fv CL19-bread  
 'Children fought for bread for each other'

#### Comment: Strategy- RCM+RCM

**Ken:** Is the marker *-an* reduplicating on the applicative? Does this mean that the children were fighting each other for each other, or does it mean that they fought with unspecified others in order to supply bread for each other? In the former case, the two affixes do different work, in the latter case, it really is a repetition of the first affix.

**Sikuku:** My take is slightly different from yours here: The two interpretations are all possible, but if the reading is antipassive for *-p-* then the antipassive interpretation is very rare in LuBukusu. In addition, the *-il* affix may be an applicative (as opposed to having a benefactive interpretation) in which case, the interpretation will be slightly different: The children used bread as a tool to fight each other. The second *-an* is used to emphasize the reciprocity.

A18'ei) Yohana a-loman-e luno  
John SM-quarreled-fv today  
'John likes quarreling'.

Comment: An antipassive reading is possible here, implicit 'with people'

eii) \*Nekesa a- siim-an-a  
Nekesa SM-likes-RCM-fv  
\*'Nekesa likes'

Comment: Antipassive reading fails here.

eiii) Wanjala a-p-an-il-a sicholon'go  
Wanjala SM-fought-RCM-APPL-fv CL7 mallet  
'Wanjala fought (other people) with a mallet'

Comment: Antipassive reading succeeds

eiv) \*Wosyanju a-nyw-esy-an-a echayi  
Wosyanju SM-drink-Caus-RCM-fv CL9 tea  
'Wosyanju made people to take tea with each other'

#### 2.4.3.6 'Something to be Done to One' (Passive)

f) Wekesa a-p-w-a ne omukhasi  
Wekesa SM-beaten-Pass-fv by CL1-woman  
'Wekesa was beaten by a woman'

#### 2.4.3.7 'To Do Something for One' (Benefactive)

g) Wekesa a-p-il-a wandaye omwaana  
Wekesa SM-beat-APP-fv brother-his CL1-child  
'Wekesa beat a child for his brother'

### PART 3- GENERAL DETAILS ABOUT THE STRATEGIES

#### 3.1 Marking

##### RFM only

This is the '-e-' prefix left adjacent to the verb which indicates reflexivization. This is therefore a case of marking on the verb only. Note also that the presence of such an affix presupposes the dropping of a co construed argument (DP). The morpheme *-khwe-* is the RFM for infinitival verbs.

##### RCM only

The suffix *-an-*, a 'verb extension', marks reciprocity without an overt coconstructed argument. The position of this suffix, e.g., its proximity to the verb root, depends on whether there are other verb extensions.

##### Agr-eene only

Lubukusu can also mark reflexivity by means of *Agr-eene* alone, where *Agr-eene* appears to correspond to an argument position. However, note that when this happens, the DP is

potentially independent as well as coreferential. This is used, for example, in cases where the object antecedes the reflexive, see (A3d).

### **Reciprocal phrase only**

In Lubukusu, it is also possible to have reciprocal marking by a coconstrued argument phrase only, without marking on the verb. This is especially so if the argument is oblique. The reciprocal phrase has the form *Agr-eene-Preposition-Agr-eene*, but the *Agr* portion of the second *Agr-eene* is phonologically truncated (omission of first syllable).

### **RFM+Agr-eene**

Marking involves (a) and (b) i.e. marking on a coconstrued argument which carries a morpheme with the properties of the antecedent and also marking on the verb with ‘-e-’ reflexive marker. Regarding whether or not the *Agr-eene* is in an argument position, let us consider the following sets of data:

#### **Set 1**

- a) Wekesa a- p-a omwaana  
Wekesa SM-beat-fv CL1 child  
‘Wekesa beat (a) child’
- b) \*Wekesa a-mu-p-a omwaana  
Wekesa SM-OM-beat-fv C1 child  
‘Wekesa beat (a) child’.
- c) Wekesa a-mu-p-a niye  
Wekesa SM-OM-beat-fv him  
‘Wekesa beat him’.
- d) Wekesa a-mu-p-a  
Wekesa SM-OM-beat-fv  
‘Wekesa beat him’.
- e) Wekesa a-p-a niye  
Wekesa SM-beat-fv him  
‘Wekesa beat him’.
- f) Wekesa a-p-a naanu? Omwaana.  
Wekesa SM-beat-fv who? CL1 child  
‘Whom did Wekesa beat?’. ‘A child’.
- g) Wekesa a-mu-p-a naanu? \*Omwaana/ Niye.  
Wekesa SM-OM-beat-fv who? C1 child/ Him  
‘Whom did Wekesa beat? A child/ him.
- h) \*Wekesa a-p-a likolooba omwaana  
Wekesa SM-beat-fv yesterday C1 child  
‘Wekesa beat (a) child yesterday’.
- i) Wekesa a-p-a omwaana likolooba  
Wekesa SM-beat-fv C1 child yesterday  
‘Wekesa beat (a) child yesterday’.
- j) \*Wekesa a-mu-p-a likolooba niye  
Wekesa SM-OM-beat-fv yesterday him  
‘Wekesa beat him yesterday’.
- k) Wekesa a-mu-p-a niye likolooba

Wekesa SM-OM-beat-fv him yesterday  
'Wekesa beat him yesterday'.

**Set 2**

- a) \**Wekesa* a- siim-a *omweene*  
Wekesa SM-loves-fv Agr-own  
'Wekesa loves himself'
- b) *Wekesa* a- e-siim-a *omweene*  
Wekesa SM-RFM-loves-fv Agr-own  
'Wekesa loves himself'
- c) \**Wekesa* a- e-siim-a  
Wekesa SM-RFM-loves-fv  
'Wekesa loves himself'
- d) *Wekesa* a- siim-a naanu? *Omweene*  
Wekesa SM-loves-fv whom? Agr-own  
'Whom does Wekesa love? Himself'
- e) \**Wekesa* a- e-siim-a naanu? *Omweene*  
Wekesa SM-RFM-loves-fv whom? Agr-own  
'Whom does Wekesa love? Himself'
- f) ?*Wekesa* a- e-siim-a lukali *omweene*  
Wekesa SM-RFM-loves-fv much Agr-own  
'Wekesa loves himself much'
- g) *Wekesa* a- e-siim-a *omweene* Lukali  
Wekesa SM-RFM-loves-fv Agr-own much  
'Wekesa loves himself much'
- h) *Wekesa* a- mu-siim-a niye *omweene*  
Wekesa SM-OM-loves-fv him Agr-own  
'Wekesa loves him himself'
- i) *Wekesa omweene* a- e-siim-a *omweene*  
Wekesa Agr-own SM-RFM-loves-fv Agr-own  
'Wekesa himself loves himself'
- j) *Wekesa omweene* a- ch-a engo \**omweene*  
Wekesa Agr-own SM-went-fv home Agr-own  
'Wekesa himself went home \*himself'

(Comments below not inserted in database – see anaphora sketch for further context)

In set 1 data, the following can be noted:

- i) R-expressions and OMs are in complementary distribution (b).
- ii) Pronouns optionally occur with OMs (c, d).
- iii) An adjunct cannot be freely inserted between the verb and the object even when the OM is present (h, j).
- iv) When the object is questioned, the OM can still be retained but the expected answer should only be pronominal (g).

The same issues arise in set 2 data:

- i) Within the same clause, *Agr-eene* can occur in an argument position when the RFM is absent (a). A discursial antecedent is however required.

- ii) *Agr-eene* is optional when the RFM occurs (c), but when it does, the subject of the clause is the only available antecedent (b).
- iii) *Agr-eene* cannot be questioned when the RFM is present (e). This is however possible without the RFM, but the *Agr-eene* answer may select a discoursal antecedent (d).
- iv) An adjunct cannot be scrambled between a verb with a RFM and *Agr-eene* (f). The verb and *Agr-eene* must be adjacent (g).
- v) When a verb has a RFM (meaning also that it is transitive), it may allow both pre-verbal and post-verbal *Agr-eene* with distinct roles (i). The same is not true in an intransitive verb implying that the roles are now similar (j).

The two sets of conclusions provide evidence indicating that when a verb has an OM/RFM, the post verbal position may either be argumental or otherwise. For the latter, one may consider the usual issues of optionality, while for the former, adjacency issues take centre stage. Adjunct positions should not be part of the subcategorization information of lexical heads.

### **RCM+ Reciprocal phrase**

Marking involves a coconstructed reciprocal phrase that is in agreement with the antecedent and the RCM *-an-* attached to the verb.

### **RFM + Reciprocal phrase**

Marking involves a coconstructed reciprocal phrase that is in agreement with the antecedent and the RFM *-e-* attached to the verb.

### **Inherent RCM**

There are certain verbs that inherently describe ‘arguments’ between two or more parties but whose root includes the ‘*-an-*’ reciprocal marker which can however not be analyzed as an independent morpheme. Such verbs are therefore reciprocal in nature and will always trigger the presence of a phrasal reciprocal in the VP’s internal position whenever they are used.

### **RFM+RCM+ Reciprocal phrase**

This is where the RFM combines with RCM and a phrasal reciprocal to indicate reciprocity. There is therefore double marking on the verb; one for reflexivity and the other for reciprocity but both enhance coconstruction between the antecedent and the VP internal argument.

### **RFM + RCM**

Marking in both the preverbal RFM slot and the postverbal RCM slot. In this case, the coconstructed argument is missing but its properties are interpreted as being recoverable from the reciprocal marker attached to the verb. This is therefore a case of verb marking of reciprocity.

### **RCM + RCM +RCM + ...**

It is possible to express the notion of double or even multi reciprocal especially with intervening causatives and/ or applicatives marked on the verb.

### **OM**

The object marker on the verb behaves more like agreement than like a pronoun:

*Nekesa a- ly-a kama- tore ka- bili ne Wanjala ye- esi a- ka -ly-a*  
*Nekesa SM-ate-fv CL4-banana Agr-two and Wanjala Agr-also SM-OM-ate-fv*  
*'Nekesa ate two bananas, and Wanjala also ate them'.*

Comment: Notice how the OM in the second conjunct is obligatory, but without a specific interpretation as should be the case if it was a pronoun. One would expect an unusual interpretation where the two bananas eaten by Nekesa are the same ones eaten by Wanjala. The possibility of a freer interpretation (the two bananas eaten by Nekesa are different from those eaten by Wajala) indicates the OM is an agreement affix whose appearance can only be explained by the fact that underlyingly, the second conjunct contains the object *kamatore kabili* (a different set from that of the first conjunct). This object is elided after going through different positions in the course of the derivation.

## **3.2 Productivity**

### **3.2.1- How productive is the strategy with respect to the types of verbs or predicates that allow it?**

### **3.2.2- Is the strategy restricted or unrestricted to certain verb classes?**

These two sections are examined below, in combination.

#### **RFM + Agr-eene**

Extremely productive. Just like the English agr-self strategy, this strategy applies to the greatest majority of Lubukusu verbs. It is also not restricted to any particular group of verbs except that the verbs must be **transitive** in order to allow the reflexive as an object.

#### **RFM only**

Since this strategy is similar to RFM+Agr-eene and it is also extremely productive. It occurs with transitive verbs to allow a null object position.

#### **Agr-eene only**

This strategy can be used with virtually all verbs, but the reflexive's reference will depend on whether the verb is transitive or intransitive. If the verb is transitive, the use of Agr-eene only means the object has different reference with the subject i.e. there is no coconstrual e.g.

a) Wekesa a-p-a omweene

Wekesa SM-beat-fv Agr-own  
Wekesa beat \*himself/ him'

Here, the subject Wekesa and the object omweene do not have the same reference. On the other hand, if the verb is intransitive, then the reflexive is interpreted as being coreferential with the subject e.g.

b) Wekesa a-ch-a omweene  
Wekesa SM- go-fv Agr-own  
? 'Wekesa went himself'

The Agr-*eene* alone strategy is extremely productive and is used with all classes of verbs.

### **RCM + phrasal reciprocal RCM only**

These two strategies can be considered together because they occur in similar environments i.e. RCM only is a reduction of RCM+phrasal reciprocal. They are both extremely productive in the sense that they occur with virtually all types of verbs. In a way, the verbs that readily allow the strategies are inherently transitive. However, intransitive verbs can also be used as long as they acquire transitive characteristics.

Consider the examples below;

- a) \*Ba-soleeli ba-ch-a babeene khu beene  
CL2-boy SM-go-fv Agr-own on own  
'Boys went each other'
- b) Ba-soleeli ba-chi-ch-an-a babeene khu beene  
CL2-boy SM-go-red-RCM-fv Agr-own on own  
'Boys went for each other'

In (a) the intransitive verb '-*cha*' cannot allow a reciprocal element in its internal position. The form *-ich/-ech* combines with the conventional RCM to indicate reciprocal in monosyllabic verbs such as *-rya (fear) -(richana), -sya (grind)- (syechana), -ra (put) -(rechana)*. We may then consider these as allomorphs of the RCM.

### **RFM+Phrasal reciprocal**

Occurs with all transitive verbs, and hence is extremely productive.

### **Inherent RCM**

There are at least two or so verbs in Lubukusu whose structure is inherently reciprocal. I have labeled them as 'argument' verbs because they involve some sought of argument or quarrel between two parties. The *-an-* reciprocal marker is part and parcel of their meaning since the basic forms alone have a different meaning. Known examples include, '*ingana*' and '*lomana*'. The strategy is hence the least productive.

### **RFM + RCM + Phrasal reciprocal**

This strategy is extremely productive as it occurs with most of the verbs and does not discriminate verb classes. The RFM within reciprocals is common with verbs of self grooming, self destruction, e.t.c

### **RFM + RCM**

This is a reduction of RFM+RCM+Reciprocal and has essentially the same productivity.

### **Phrasal Reciprocal only**

This is fairly productive as it occurs only in oblique arguments and even here, the reflexive element is more acceptable than the reciprocal. The strategy does not however discriminate on the class of verb that it occurs with.

### **RCM +RCM**

All these classes are extremely productive as they occur with a majority of verb classes.

## **3.3 Context of Use**

**Comment: Henceforth, the strategies will be referred to as above. Also, the discussion below will combine sections 3.3.1, 3.3.2, 3.3.3 and 3.3.4 without any reference to the said sections.**

**RFM+Agr-*eene***- This strategy is typical of a formal context with special emphasis falling on the reflexive pronoun probably to put focus on the patient of the action described in the proposition. The strategy does not require any special context. This can be considered the ideal way of reflexivization that is often used by a great majority of native speakers. It has a special meaning of double marking making it appropriate in more formal set-ups.

**RFM alone**- The omission of *Agr-eene* makes the strategy rather informal or casual. In normal conversation, it is the strategy that will be more predominant. There is special emphasis put on the ‘-e-‘ RFM. Infact, in very rapid speech, the subject marker is not distinctly pronounced and is assimilated in the RFM. This is shown in the sentences below;

- a) Maria e-siim-a  
Maria SM/RFM-like-fv  
‘Maria likes herself’
- b) Yohana e-bon-a  
Yohana SM/RFM-saw-fv  
‘Yohana saw himself’

Also note that a particular discourse context is not necessary for reflexivization to occur. Perhaps the most significant point to note is the omission of *Agr-eene* corresponding to an argument position. The argument content is recoverable through the inflections on the verb. This appears to be a form of pro-drop.

**Agr-*eene* alone**- This is a very rare strategy making it rather formal and awkward. It is discussed more fully in the Anaphora sketch.

**RCM+Phrasal reciprocal** -This is a highly formal strategy especially if we consider the fact that Lubukusu allows the dropping of pronouns both in the subject and object



positions. A strategy that allows the realization of these arguments is therefore very formal. There is more stress put on the phrasal reciprocal.

**RCM only** This is typical of more casual and informal contexts. The stress usually falls on the RCM.

**RFM+Phrasal reciprocal-** This is quite formal, especially with the emphatic reciprocal.

**RFM+RCM+Phrasal reciprocal -** This is also quite formal as it carefully marks all the necessary morphemes. The stress is on both the reflexive marker and the phrasal reciprocal. It is common in oblique argument structures. Note that the addition of the reflexive marker makes it different from the other strategies.

**RFM+RCM -** This is a contraction of RFM+RCM+Reciprocal above. It is more conversational and casual. The stress is on both the RFM and the RCM. It is common in oblique argument structures and the addition of a reflexive marker is unique in a reciprocal structure.

**Phrasal Reciprocal only-** This is more formal because of the realization of the full reciprocal at the end. There is marked stress on the reciprocal. It is also common in oblique argument structures where the verb is neither reflexive nor reciprocal.

**Multiple RCMs-** The strategy is more informal and casual. Stress is on the RCMs. A special context of multi reciprocal is required. For example where X verb each other for each other or X causes each other to verb each other.

### 3.4 Morphology

#### 3.4.1 Does the reflexive or reciprocal element in its entirety, have a stateable lexical translation?

**RFM-** The reflexive marker attached to the verb cannot be translated.

**Agr-eene** If we take the agreement feature to be 'x', then the reflexive is translated as 'x-own' or 'agr-own'. The same form can be used to indicate owner. See 3.4.2 below.

**RCM-** Like the reflexive, the reciprocal marker *-an-* cannot be translated.

**Phrasal reciprocal** The phrasal reciprocal is marked by a form of reflexive reduplication. It therefore has reflexive parts i.e. agr-own reduplicated as 'Agr-own on Agr-own'. In most cases however, the second occurrence of the agreement feature is truncated to avoid repetition.

#### 3.4.2 Are the terms used as reflexives and reciprocals capable of having a non-reflexive/ non- reciprocal meaning?

Comment: *Agr-eene* can be used for non- reflexive meaning. It can be used as an independent pronoun e.g.

- a) Babeene ba-ch-il-e  
Agr-own SM-go-asp-fv  
'Themselves/ the owners went'
- b) Si-chiko si-no si-o omweene  
CL7-spoon Agr-this SM-of Agr-own  
'This is the owner's spoon'
- c) Omweene bi-kapo a-li-a bu-suma  
Agr-own (owner) CL8-basket SM-eat-fv CL14-maize meal  
'The owner of baskets ate maize meal'

In all the three sentences above, the reflexive element has a non- reflexive function i.e. it is interpreted as a 'possessor'. In (a) and (c), it is an independent pronoun in the subject position, while in (b), it is an NP within a PP that is introduced by the preposition 'sio' (of).

### 3.4.3 Syntactic context

Note that, as mentioned above, *Agr-eene* can occur independently and behave as an argument. This then means that it can be modified by other elements in a phrasal category. For example;

- a) Omweene omu-bi + Sentence  
Agr-own Agr-bad  
'(The) owner is bad'
- b) Si-o omweene  
Agr-of Agr-own  
'of owner'

Comment: It appears 'omweene' cannot be modified by an adjective without triggering a sentence that has 'is' ellipted. This is different from other nouns that can form a phrase not a sentence with similar modification.

**RFM-** The RFM does not show any agreement features overtly i.e. it will remain the same even when number and other features change. Consider;

- a) Babaana ba-e-siim-a babeene  
CL2-child SM-RFM-like-fv Agr-own  
'Children like themselves'
- b) Omu-aana a-e-siim-a omweene  
CL1-child SM-RFM-like-fv Agr-own  
'(A) child likes himself'

The RFM is always interpreted as reflexive and its presence can license the absence of an argument in object position, just as the OM does.

**Agr-eene-** *Agr-eene* is divided into two morphological parts; the agreement morpheme and the 'own'. The agreement features are determined by the noun class that the antecedent belongs to. (See section 3.5 for details of noun classes).

**Reciprocal Marker-** Represented as '-an-' and marked as 'RCM' in the gloss. The reciprocal marker does not show agreement features overtly. It is however fully interpreted with lexical meaning because its presence licenses the absence of a corresponding non-subject argument and the optional presence of a phrasal reciprocal corresponding to the missing argument.

**Phrasal Reciprocal** – This can be represented as '*x-eene khu x-eene*' where *x* is an agreeing subject marker while *khu* is the preposition *on* (and occasionally other prepositions). This shows that the action is on each other. The phrasal reciprocal must show agreement features of the noun class of the antecedent.

**Comment:** The phrasal reciprocal is a sort of reduplication of the reflexive carrying the morphological features of number and person. As mentioned in the introduction to part 4, the *Agr-eene* form has three morphemes: person, number and OWN. *Babeene* is for example divided into *ba-* 3<sup>rd</sup> person prefix, *be-* number Agr-affix, and *-ene-* 'OWN'. When this is made a reciprocal, the underlying structure will be *babeene khu babeene*. However to avoid repetition, the second occurrence deletes the person affix to produce the structure; *babeene khu beene*. It would then be predictable that *fwabeene khu fwabeene* will become *fwabeene khu beene*, *omweene khu omweene* will be ... (guess) *omweene khu mweene*. Refer to Table 3 for reflexives that would give more reciprocals. Lubukusu, like other Bantu languages, is fond of morpheme reduction. Kinship relations are typical examples: *Mayi Owewe-* (mother his-'his mother') becomes *mawe*, *wandaye owase* (brother mine-'my brother') becomes *wandayase*. As for A3d, *khu* means 'about' and in any case, this is not a reciprocal sentence.

### 3.5 The Agreement Paradigm

**3.5.1** In Lubukusu, the reflexive is the key element in coconstrual relations and therefore the description of its agreement features will suffice as a description of all the strategies. We have already noted the significance of the noun classes in determining the initial affix attached to '-eene'. Like most Bantu languages, LuBukusu characterizes an elaborate noun class system that is structured according to number affixes based on broad categories like human, abstract, body parts, things, e.t.c. Below is a table showing the general noun class system in LuBukusu. **Note that this is subject to refining as it is a draft. Notice the changes made to classes 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, and 23.**

CLASS	REPRESENTATION	PRE-PREFIX	PREFIX	EXAMPLES
1	Human/agentive- Sing.	O-	Mu-	Omuundu- person Omuteekhi- cook
2	Human/ agentive- Plur.	Ba-	Ba-	Babaandu- people Bateekhi-cooks
3	Non- human animates, bodyparts, things, plants.	Ku-	Mu	Kumukhono- hand Kumubano- Knife
4	Non- human animates, body parts, things, plants..	Ki-	Mi-	Kimikhono- hands Kimibano- Knives

<b>5</b>	Mass nouns, some animals, some body parts, some plants- Sing.	Li-	Li-	Litiisi- dam Libuumbi- heap of rubbish
<b>6</b>	Mass nouns, some animals, some body parts, some plants – Plur.	Ka-	Ma-	Kamatiisi- dams Kamabuumbi-heaps of rubbish
<b>7‘thing Class’</b>	Things,instruments, some body parts –Sing	Si-	Si-	Sisiindu- thing Sikele- leg
<b>8</b>	Things, Instruments, some body parts- Plur.	Bi-	Bi-	Bibiindu- things Bikele- legs
<b>9 ‘N’ class</b>	Names of animals and Some plants	E-	N-	Enkaani- taboo Enda- stomach
<b>10</b>	Things having length, some body parts, and utensils/ instruments.	Chi-	N-	Chinguulo- poles Chinjika- horns Chindeko- traps
<b>11/10</b>	“	Lu-	Lu-	Lukuulo- pole Lulwiika- horn Lureko- trap
<b>12</b>	Diminutive, derogatory.	kha-	Kha-	Khakhaandu-small thing Khatebe- small chair
<b>14</b>	Abstract nouns / State	Bu-	Bu-	Busiime- love Busaangaafu- happiness Bubini- night running
<b>15</b>	Gerundial/ infinitival verb forms.	Khu-	Khu-	Khusiima- to love Khukhwiima-to stand Khuteekha- to cook
<b>16</b>	Locative- ‘on’	Khu-	-	Khunju- on house Khumesa- on table
<b>17a)</b>	Locative- ‘at/by’	A-	-	Anju- at/by house Amesa-at/ by table
<b>b)</b>	Lacative- ‘towards’	Sya-	-	Syaanju- towards house
<b>18</b>	Locative- in/ from /to.	Mu-	-	Muunju- in house Mumesa-in table Musitanda-in bed
<b>19</b>	Augmentative,derogatory,some plants, things and body parts.	Ku-	Ku-	Kuliango- big door Kukwaana-big child
<b>23</b>	Locative- ‘at’	E-	-	Ebung’oma-at Bungoma

**Table 1: A Representation of LuBukusu Noun Classes**

Apart from marking number, pronouns also inflect for person but not gender. A summary of such agreement is shown below.

## Personal Pronoun

PERSON	SINGULAR		PLURAL	
	Nominative	Accusative	Nominative	Accusative
<b>First Affix</b>	Ese- I	Ese- me	Efwe- we	Efwe- us
	Na-	Khu-	Khu-	Khu-
<b>Second Affix</b>	Ewe- you	Ewe- you	Enywe- you	Enywe- you
	Wa-	Khu-	Mu-	Mu-
<b>Third Affix-HUM. NON-HUM</b>	Niye- s//he Ni +Agr- it	Niye- him/her Ni+Agr- it	Nibo- they Ni+ Agr- they-non-human	Nibo- them Ni+ Agr- them-non-human
	A-	Mu-	Ba-	Ba-
	N.CL-	N.CL-	N.CL-	N.CL-

**Table 2: Person and Number Inflection of the Personal Pronoun**

## Agr-eene

	SINGULAR		PLURAL	
	Nominative	Accusative	Nominative	Accusative
<b>First</b>	Samweene- myself	Samweene- myself	Fwabeene- ourselves	Fwabeene- ourselves
<b>Second</b>	Wamweene- yourself	Wamweene- yourself	Mwabeene- yourselves	Mwabeene- yourselves
<b>Third</b>	Omweene- himself/herself Agr+ -eene- itself	Omweene- himself/herself Agr +- eene- itself	Babeene- themselves Agr +-eene- non-human	Babeene- themselves Agr+ -eene- non- human

**Table 3: Person and Number inflection of the Agr-*eene***

Note that case is not morphologically marked.

### 3.5.2 What determines the value of the morphological features?

As shown above, all the morphological features identified (number and person) are obligatorily determined by the antecedent. There is almost a straightforward relation between the antecedent and the morpheme attached on *-eene*. **What happens in cases where conjoined antecedents belong to different noun classes?** Consider;

- a) Omw-aana nende e-mbwa bi-a-e-siim-a bi-bieene  
 CL1-child and CL9-dog CL8-SM-RFM-like-fv Agr-own  
 ‘(The) child and (the) dog like themselves’

Comment: It appears the strategy, where the antecedent has nouns that belong to different classes, is to use class 8 prefix, which refers to ‘things’. The alternative would be to use the commitative construction. In this case, the agreement features will be those of the subject. Class 8 prefix can also still be used especially with the reciprocal.

- b) Omw- aana bi-a-siim-an-a nende e-mbwa  
 CL1-child CL8SM-Tns-like-RCM-fv with CL9- dog  
 ‘The child and the dog like each other’

- c) Omw- aana a-siim-an-a nende e-mbwa  
 CL1-child SM-like-RCM-fv with CL9-dog  
 ‘The child and the dog like each other’

It is therefore interesting to note that, in special cases, the antecedent may not necessarily agree with the features on the reflexive. Also, a reciprocal marker may occur on a verb with singular prefix as in (c) above.

- b’) Omw- aana bi-a-e-siim-an-a nende e-mbwa  
 CL1-child CL8SM-Tns-RFM-like-RCM-fv with CL9- dog  
 ‘The child and the dog like each other’

Comment: b’) is OK with a reflexive, which delimits the boundaries of the set in which reciprocal takes place.

- ?c’) Omw- aana a-e-siim-an-a nende e-mbwa  
 CL1-child SM-RFM-like-RCM-fv with CL9-dog  
 ‘The child and the dog like each other’

Comment: The singular subject in (c’) makes it odd, but not entirely unacceptable. Incidentally, what looks like a CL1 SM is actually a tense marker, normally assimilated in the SM when the subject is singular, but distinct in cases like a) and b). Also note the change of class 3 to 9 in *embwa*. See table of classes in AQR for other changes.

## 3.6 Interaction with Verb Morphology

### 3.6.1 Incompatibilities

- B3 a) Gina a-e- siing-ang-a omweene  
 Gina SM-RFM-washes-Tns-fv Agr-own  
 ‘Gina (generally) washes herself’  
 b) Gina a-kha-e-siing-a omweene

Gina SM-Tns-RFM-washed-fv Agr-own  
 ‘Gina has washed herself’

b) Gina a-b-a a-e-siing-a omweene  
 Gina SM-was-fv SM-RFM-washing-fv Agr-own  
 ‘Gina was washing herself’

c) Gina ye-eny-ekh-a a-e-siing-e omweene  
 Gina it-should-middle-fv SM-RFM-wash-fv Agr-own  
 ‘Gina should wash herself’

Comment: Notice the use of the arbitrary SM that I interpret to be an expletive, and the middle affix all of which combine with the verb ‘*enya*’ (want) to give a general meaning of ‘it is wanted’.

Most verbal extensions are compatible with the reflexive and reciprocal strategies. We have already looked at the agreement prefixes. Let us now examine other extensions. The reflexive marker can occur with the causative, applicative and intensive, all of which are post- verbal. It is however incompatible with the passive, because a reflexive indicates that the subject is undertaking the action of the verb on himself, whereas the passive requires a person other than the subject to perform the action. It is also incompatible with the object marker because the RFM itself is inherently an object, hence does not require any other object. The same is also true for the reciprocal marker. This is illustrated below;

<b>Reflexive</b>	<b>Passive</b>	<b>Causative</b>	<b>Intensive</b>
a-e-siim-a love yourself	*a-e-siim-w-a be loved by yourself	a-e-siim-is-ya cause to love yourself	a-e-siim-ak-a love yourself intensively

**Table 4: RFM and verbal extensions**

<b>Reciprocal</b>	<b>Passive</b>	<b>Causative</b>	<b>Intensive</b>
ba-e-siim-an-a love each other	*ba- e-siim-an-w-a be loved by each other	ba- siim-an-isi-a cause to love each other	a-e-siim-an-ak-a love each other intensively

**Table 5: RCM and verbal extensions**

The phrasal reciprocal is usually incompatible with the object marker, but the reflexive is quite compatible so long as the reflexive does not corefer with the subject of the verb with the object marker. It is possible to conclude that the degree of incompatibilities in LuBukusu is very limited, perhaps to the object marker and the passive alone. Tense, aspect, mood and other operations have very little effect on the reflexive and reciprocal strategies described. The RFM and RCM are also incompatible with the passive because of the inherent difference in the agent of the action of the verb.

### 3.7 Non-coreference Uses

**3.7.1 Idiosyncratic-** Ideally in Lubukusu, a reflexive and a reciprocal must always have an antecedent with which it agrees in terms of number and person. I cannot think of any indefinite use of reflexives and reciprocals.

**3.7.2 Intensifiers or emphasizers-** As noted earlier, *Agr-eene* may occur as an intensifier or emphasizer within an NP.

### 3.7.3 Middles

#### Examples

- a) Kama-indi ka-p-ikh-a  
CL6-maize Agr-beat-asp-fv  
'Maize is beatable'
- b) Kama-lwa ka-nyw-ekh-a  
CL6-beer Agr-drink-asp-fv  
'Beer is drinkable'

It appears there is no reflexivization implied in such constructions.

### 3.7.4

There are no readily available examples.

### 3.7.5 Deictic Use

- B5a) Billi a-bon-a omweene  
Billi SM-see-fv Agr-own  
'Bill saw him/\*himself'
- b) Maria a-siim-a omweene  
Maria SM-like-fv Agr-own  
'Maria likes him/\*herself'
- c) Omweene a-ch-il-e  
Agr-own SM-go-asp-fv  
'He went'

Comment: In (B5a-c), *omweene* does not have an antecedent within the sentence within which it occurs.

- B6a) Billi a-khom-a samweene  
Billi SM-insult-fv 1ps-own  
'Bill insulted me.'
- b) Bandu ba- kali se-ba-siim-a ba-baana ta nekhali samweene na-ba-siim-a  
CL2-people Agr-many neg-SM-like-fv CL2-child not but 1ps-own SM-OM-like-fv  
'Many people do not like children but I like them.'

Comment: The pronouns are only added whenever there is need e.g. the need to put FOCUS or CONTRASTIVE FOCUS. Note also that the OM in a) is tonally marked.

Comment: In LuBukusu, there is no arbitrary pronoun instead the word for person 'omuundu' is used to show arbitrariness.

### 3.7.6



No other uses are readily available.

### 3.8 Proxy Readings

Consider;

- a) Wekesa a-siing-a e-sanaamu ye-we  
Wekesa SM-washed-fv CL3-statue Agr-his  
Wekesa washed his statue
- b) Wekesa a-e-sing-a bu-layi mala e-yanikh-a  
Wekesa SM-RFM-washed-fv CL14-well then SM/RFM-dried-fv  
Wekesa washed himself well then dried himself

Comment: If reference is being made to somebody's statue, then the mention of it will be more appropriate, as in a). b) to me only has an interpretation where Wekesa washed his own person. Proxy reading is a strange phenomenon in LuBukusu.

### Part 4- Exploration of Syntactic Domains

**NOTE:** In this section, I will try as much as possible to include the various reflexive and reciprocal strategies that seem to be so far clear, more often without indicating the specific strategy in use. These include; RFM+Agr-*eene*, RFM only, Agr-*eene* only, RCM+Phrasal reciprocal, RCM only, and Phrasal reciprocal only. As shall be seen later, there are a number of different combinations that are used in rather 'marked' circumstances to achieve coreference that is either reflexive or reciprocal (or even emphatic). These include; RFM+ RCM+Agr-*eene*, RFM+ RCM+ Reciprocal, RFM+ RCM, and RFM+ Reciprocal. Further note that the Agr-*eene* form has three morphemes; the subject Agr morpheme, the noun class morpheme and OWN. This will be made clear in the comments that I will make later on the earlier sections. Presently however, I will be glossing the said form as Agr-own.

#### 4.1 Clausemate Coconstrual

##### 4.1.1 Verb Class Restrictions

##### 4.1.1.1 Canonical Transitives

- C1ai) Bob a-e-bon-a omw-eene  
Bob SM-RFM-saw-fv Agr- own  
'Bob saw himself'
- aii) Bob a-e-bon-a  
Bob SM-RFM-saw-fv  
'Bob saw himself'
- aiii) \*Bob a-bon-a omweene  
Bob SM-saw-fv Agr- own  
'Bob saw himself'
- aiv) Bob ne Billi ba-bon-an-a ba-beene khu beene  
Bob and Bill SM-saw-RCM-fv Agr-own on own  
'Bob and Bill saw each other'
- av) Bob ne Billi ba-bon-an-a  
Bob and Bill SM-saw-RCM-fv  
'Bob and Bill saw each other'

avi) \*Bob ne Billi ba-bon-a ba-beene khu beene  
Bob and Bill SM-saw-fv Agr-own on own  
'Bob and Bill saw each other'

avii) \*Bob a-bon-a niye  
Bob SM-saw-fv him  
'Bob saw him'

Comment: (C1avii) cannot mean that him=Bob.

bi) Ba-khasi ba-e-fwochol-a ba-beene  
CL2-woman SM-RFM-described(dereg)-fv Agr-own  
'(The) women described themselves'

bii) Bakhasi ba-e-fwochol-a  
CL2-woman SM-RFM-described(dereg)-fv  
'(The) women described themselves'

biii) \*Ba-khasi ba-fwochol-a ba-beene  
CL2-woman SM-described(dereg)-fv Agr-own  
'(The) women described themselves'

biv) Ba-khasi ba-fwochol-an-a ba-beene khu beene  
CL2-woman SM-described-RCM-fv Agr-own on own  
'(The) women described each other'

bv) Ba-khasi ba-fwochol-an-a  
CL2-woman SM-described-RCM-fv  
'(The) women described each other'

bvi) \*Ba-khasi ba-fwochol-a ba-beene khu beene  
CL2-woman SM-described-fv Agr-own on own  
'(The) women described each other'

bvii) \*Ba-khasi ba-fwochol-a nibo  
CL2-woman SM-described-fv them  
'(The) women described themselves/\*them'

ci) Enywe mwa-e-itaal-a mwa-beene  
You SM-RFM-kicked-fv Agr-own  
'You kicked yourselves'

cii) Enywe mwa-e-itaal-a  
You SM-RFM-kicked-fv  
'You kicked yourselves'

ciii) \*Enywe mwa-itaal-a mwa-beene  
You SM-kicked-fv Agr-own  
'You kicked yourselves'

civ) Enywe mwa-itaal-an-a mwa-beene khu beene  
You SM-kicked-RCM-fv Agr-own on own  
'You kicked each other'

cv) Enywe mwa-itaal-an-a  
You SM-kicked-RCM-fv  
'You kicked each other'

cvi) \*Enywe mwa-itaal-a mwa-beene khu beene

- You SM-kicked-fv Agr-own on own  
 ‘You kicked each other’  
 cvii) \*Enywe mwa-itaal-a nibo  
 You SM-kicked-fv them  
 ‘You kicked them/\*each other’

**Comment:** As seen in examples aiii, biii and ciii, on the one hand, and avi, bvi and cvi, on the other, Agr-*eene* only and phrasal reciprocal only strategies cannot yield clausemate coconstrual without the appropriate verbal affixes. In both cases the addition of RFM would do the trick. Also as indicated in sections 2.1.4 and 2.3.3, such strategies are largely possible in cases of oblique arguments. Further, the reciprocal only strategy can be licensed in cases where the verb root contains a reciprocal-like morpheme (inherent reciprocal).

Comment. C1d of the questionnaire has been left out because the pattern is already predictable.

#### 4.1.1.2 Commonly Reflexive Predicates

C2- No questionnaire example.

- C3 ai) Donna a-e-siing-a omw- eene  
 Donna SM-RFM-washed-fv Agr-own  
 ‘Donna washed herself’  
 aii) Donna a-e-siing-a  
 Donna SM-RFM-washed-fv  
 ‘Donna washed herself’  
 aiii) \*Donna a-siing-a omw-eene  
 Donna SM-washed-fv Agr-own  
 ‘Donna washed herself’  
 aiv) \*Donna a-siing-a  
 Donna SM-washed-fv  
 ‘Donna washed herself’
- bi) Don a-e-bek-a omw-eene  
 Don SM-RFM-cut-fv Agr-own  
 ‘Don shaved himself’  
 bii) Don a-e-bek-a  
 Don SM-RFM-cut-fv  
 ‘Don shaved himself’  
 biii) \*Don a-bek-a omw-eene  
 Don SM-cut-fv Agr-own  
 ‘Don shaved himself’  
 biv) Don a-bek-a  
 Don SM-cut-fv  
 ‘Don shaved himself’

Comment: Whereas both C3bii and C3biv have reflexive readings, the former implies that the shaving was done by Don while in the latter, Don had his hair cut, probably by somebody else.

- ci) Omu-khaana a-e-khal-a omw-eene  
CL1-girl SM-RFM-cut-fv Agr- own  
'(The) girl cut herself'
- cii) Omu-khaana a-e-khal-a  
CL1-girl SM-RFM-cut-fv  
'(The) girl cut herself'
- ciii) \*Omu-khaana a-khal-a omw- eene  
CL1-girl SM-cut-fv Agr- own  
'(The) girl cut herself'
- civ) \*Omu-khaana a-khal-a  
CL1-girl SM-cut-fv  
'(The) girl cut herself'

**Comment:** Because of the unacceptability of aiii, aiv, biii, ciii and civ, it appears plausible to conclude that in LuBukusu, the so called verbs of 'grooming' do not license any implicit reflexivization. The acceptability of biv is however rather baffling. Let us consider other verbs that involve 'grooming'.

- C3di) Omu-khaana a-e-khal-a (kama-tere) omw-eene  
CL1-girl SM-RFM-cut-fv CL6-nails Agr-own  
'The girl cut her nails herself'
- dii) Omu-khaana a-e-khal-a (kama-tere)  
CL1-girl SM-RFM-cut-fv CL6-nails  
'The girl cut her nails herself'
- diii) ?Omu-khaana a-khal-a (kama-tere) omw-eene  
CL1-girl SM-cut-fv CL6-nails Agr-own  
'The girl cut her nails herself'
- div) Omu-khaana a-khal-a (kama-tere)  
CL1-girl SM-cut-fv CL6-nails  
'The girl cut her nails herself'
- ei) Omu-khaana a-e-futul-a (kama-ru) omw-eene  
CL1-girl SM-RFM-pierced-fv CL6-ears Agr-own  
'(The) girl pierced her ears herself'
- eii) Omu-khaana a-e-futul-a (ka-maru)  
CL1-girl SM-RFM-pierced-fv CL6-ears  
'(The) girl pierced her ears herself'
- eiii)?Omu-khaana a-futul-a (kamaru) omw-eene  
CL1-girl SM-pierced-fv CL6-ears Agr-own  
'(The) girl pierced her ears herself'
- eiv) Omu-khaana a-futul-a (ka-maru)  
CL1-girl SM-pierced-fv CL6-ears

‘(The) girl pierced her ears herself’

Comment: Notice that the verbs of ‘grooming’ also involve some form of ‘cutting’. Subject to further data, I would like to conclude that such verbs allow the implicit strategy. (Note that this strategy had not been mentioned before until now). The verbs that permit null object reflexives may also have transitive forms. In the additional examples below, Y1a and Y2a, the direct objects are obligatory in order to achieve the intended meaning. If they are left out, then it yields reflexive readings. In Y1b and Y2b, the object marker triggers an agreeing object that can still be left out. A reflexive reading is excluded.

- Y1a. Don a-bek-a omu-soleeli  
Don SM-shaved-fv CL1-boy  
‘Don shaved the boy’
- Y1b. Maria a-ba-bek-a (nibo)  
Mary SM-OM-shaved-fv (them)  
‘Mary shaved them’
- Y2a. Ba-khana ba-futul-a kama-ru ka Jane  
CL2-girls SM-pierced-fv CL6-ears of Jane  
‘The girls pierced Jane’s ears’
- Y2b. Ba-khana ba-ba-futul-a kamaru (kabwe)  
CL2-girls SM-OM-pierced-fv CL6-ears (theirs)  
‘The girls pierced their ears’

#### 4.1.1.3 Psychological Predicates

- C4a) Yohana a-e-biiy-il-a omw-eene  
John SM-RFM-hates-APP-fv Agr-own  
‘John hates himself’
- b) ?Yohana a-e-son-ya khu omw-eene  
John SM-RFM-shames-fv on Agr-own  
‘John is ashamed of himself’
- c) ?Yohana a-e-indekheleel-a khu omw-eene  
John SM-RFM-worries-fv on Agr-own  
‘John is worried about himself’
- d) Yohana a-e-lool-el-a khu omw-eene  
John SM-RFM-prides-APP-fv on Agr-own  
‘John is proud of himself’
- e) Yohana a-e-nan-is-ya omw-eene  
John SM-RFM-troubles-Caus-fv Agr-own  
‘John troubles himself’

**Comment:** A contrast is made between C4b and C4c on one hand and C4d on the other. The only element that is present in C4d and is lacking in C4b and C4c is the applicative marker. Indeed when this is added, the degree of acceptability increases. In Lubukusu, like in most Bantu languages, verb derivation determines the verb’s subcategorization. Perhaps the APPL is what is making the (C4d) example better, perhaps because the *khu omweene* then has the status of an adjunct in this example, whereas it is not an adjunct,

but a complement for (C4b,c), and perhaps that is why the RFM is less than perfect. See also the comment after (C8).

**Comment:** The presence of the glide before the final vowel deserves comment. Lubukusu marks causative in two ways: *-is-+y-* as in *a- p-is-y-a* (caused to fight) and *-y-* as in *a-p-y-a* (caused to fight). The two are often used interchangeably, in what could be dialectical differences. If this is true, then the fv in such structures would remain consistently *-a-* with *-y-* serving a specific morphological role. If so, the gloss would have to be adjusted, but we will leave it as it is in the absence of a more complete analysis.

#### 4.1.1.4- Creation and Destruction

C5a) Ba-khasi ba-khe-e-mal-e bab-eene  
CL2-woman SM-TNS-RFM-finish-fv Agr-own  
'(The) women will finish/ destroy themselves'

b) Ka-mashini ka-e-ng'oon-a kama-eene  
CL6-machine SM-RFM-made-fv Agr-own  
'(The) machines built themselves'

c) E-sabuni ya-e-nikul-us-ya eng'-eene  
CL3 soap SM-RFM-melted-caus-fv Agr-own  
'(The) soap melted itself/on its own'

d) Kameechi ka-e-bus-ya kama-eene  
CL6-water SM-RFM-collected-fv Agr-own  
'(The) water collected itself'

**Comment:** The verb class does not affect reflexivization.

#### 4.1.1.5 Verbs of Representation

C6a) Ba-soleeli ba-e-imel-el-a bab-eene  
CL2-boy SM-RFM- represented-APP-fv Agr-own  
'(The) boys represented themselves'

b) Yohana a-e-lom-el-a omu-eene  
John SM-RFM-spoke-APP-fv Agr- own  
'John spoke for himself'

**Comment:** The applicative affix indicates the object benefiting from the action. Verbs of representation always require such an affix.

#### 4.1.2 Argument Position pairings

##### 4.1.2.1 Subject- Indirect object

C7a)\*Maria a-eles-ya si-anua khu omweene  
Mary SM-gave-fv CL7-gift to Agr-own  
'Mary gave the gift to herself'

b)\*Yohana a-ok-es-ya e-nju khu omweene  
John SM-showed-fv CL3 house to Agr-own  
'John showed the house to himself'

C8a) Maria a-e-eles-ya omweene si- anua  
Mary SM-RFM-gave-fv Agr-own CL7-gift  
Mary gave herself the gift'

b) Yohana a-e-ok-es-ya omweene khu baana  
John SM-RFM-showed-fv Agr-own to children  
'John showed himself to the children'

**Comment:** I am still trying to make out why (C7a,b) appear odd. This can easily be attributed to the absence of RFM element. What about C9b below? For now, I will assume the following:

- Oblique anaphoric arguments with subject antecedents must always occur in VPs with RFM for coreference to succeed. This is so especially with verbs whose 'action' is directed towards the antecedent. For other verbs, this condition does not matter. (See C9b below). We may need to follow this up to refine the explanations.

When the construction is an adjunct (C9b and C17c) then the structure is acceptable. Note that the verbs 'give' and 'show' in C7a, b are ditransitive- making the PP a complement.

#### 4.1.2.2 Oblique Arguments

C9a) Billi a-e-kachul-a khu omweene  
Bill SM-RFM-talked to Agr-own  
'Bill talked to himself'

b) Yohana a-kachul-il-a Maria khu omweene  
John SM-talked-APP-fv Mary about Agr-own  
'John told Mary about himself'

**Comment:** See 2.1.4 for more examples and 3.1 for comments.

#### 4.1.2.3 Subject- Adjunct

C10ai) ?Maria a-bon-a e-ndemu enyuma wo omweene  
Mary SM-saw-fv CL3-snake behind of Agr-own  
'Mary saw a snake behind her'

**Comment:** A preferred reading of (C10ai) is 'Mary saw a snake behind the (its) owner', which is not '?'.  
ii) Maria a-bon-a e-ndemu enyuma wewe omueene  
Mary SM-saw-fv snake behind her Agr-own  
'Mary saw a snake behind herself'

b) Maria a-nd-aang-a        ese khulwe li-andiko    khu omweene  
Mary SM-OM-called-fv me because CL5-writing on Agr-own  
'Mary called/telephoned me because of writings on herself'

c) Yohana a-kos-el-a        Maria khulwe omweene  
John    SM-offended-APP-fv Mary because Agr-own  
'John offended Mary because of himself/herself'

d) Efwe khwa-chekh-a mu-khw-e-fochol-a fwabeene  
We SM-laughed-fv in-CL15-RFM-spite-fv Agr-own  
'We laughed in spite of ourselves'

**Comment:** Like in 4.1.2.1 above, an adjunct can be coreferential with a subject antecedent in the absence of RFM if the 'action' of the verb is directed elsewhere.(C10b and c). In (C10d) coreference only succeeds with the introduction of RFM since the 'spite' is directed towards the subject. In all the cases, an extra-sentential antecedent is possible and indeed the 'oddness' of (C10ai) rests here.

#### 4.1.2.4 Ditransitives

C11a) Maria a-okes-ya Hali khu omweene  
Mary SM-showed-fv Hal to Agr-own  
'Mary showed Hal to himself'

b) \*Maria a-okes-ya omweene khu Hali  
Mary SM-showed-fv Agr-own to Hal  
'Mary showed himself to Hal'

c) ?Billi a-eles-ya Hali omweene  
Bill SM-gave-fv Hal Agr-own  
'Bill gave Hal himself'

d) \*Billi a-eles-ya omweene Hali  
Bill SM-gave-fv Agr-own Hal  
'Bill gave himself Hal'

**Comment:** In ditransitives the reflexive does not precede its antecedent. When it follows the antecedent immediately- as in c- the sentence appears odd because it also has an interpretation where the reflexive is emphatic.

#### 4.1.2.5 Two Internal Arguments or Adjuncts

C12ai)?Billi a-kachul-a    khu Hali khu omweene  
Bill SM-talked-fv to Hal about Agr-own  
'Bill talked to Hal about himself'



aii) Billi a-kachul-il-a Hali ko omweene  
Bill SM-talked-APP-fv Hal of Agr-own  
'Bill talked to/told Hal that of himself'

bi) \*Maria a-kachul-a khu omweene khu Hali  
Mary SM-talked-fv to Agr-own about Hal  
Mary talked to himself about Hal

bii) \*Maria a-kachul-il-a omweene ka Hali  
Mary SM-talked-APP-Agr-own of Hal  
'Mary talked to/told himself that of Hal

**Comment:** The acceptability of (C12aii) (where *omweene*=*Hal*) can be attributed to the presence of the applicative affix that is absent in (C12ai). Both (C12bi) and (C12bii) are however unacceptable despite the fact that (C12bii) has the affix in question. The only explanation is then that in LuBukusu anaphoric elements are not allowed to precede their antecedents.

#### 4.1.2.6 Possessives

C13a) Nicki a-laang-a mayi o-wewe omweene  
Nick SM-called-fv mother Agr-his/her Agr-own  
'Nick called his self's mother'

b) Nicki a-chanu-a li-chune li-ewe omweene  
Nick SM-combed-fv CL5-hair Agr-his Agr-own  
'Nick combed his self's hair'

c) Nicki a-kachul-a khu omukhoongo owewe omweene  
Nick SM-spoke-fv to CL1-boss Agr-his Agr-own  
'Nick spoke to his self's boss'

d) Nicki a-r-a si-tabu si-ewe omweene khu e-mesa  
Nick SM-put-fv CL7-book Agr-his Agr-own on CL3-table  
'Nick put his self's book on the table'

e) O-mwaami a-w-a Nicki si-anwa mu si-rekere si-ewe omweene  
CL1-king SM-gave-fv Nick CL7-gift in CL7-village Agr-his Agr-own  
'The king gave Nick a present in his self's village'

f) Ba-soleeli ba-sing-a mu-moni mu-ewe omweene  
CL2-boy SM-washed-fv CL18-face Agr-his Agr-own  
'The boys washed his self's face'

C14a) Papa o-wa Nicki a-mu-ikooomb-a niye omweene  
Father Agr-of Nick SM-OM-admires-fv him Agr-own  
'Nick's father admires him himself'

b) Li-lyeyenyela li-a Nicki li-a-mu-onak-a niye omweene  
 CL5-ambition Agr-of Nick Agr-Tns-OM-destroyed-fv him Agr-own  
 ‘Nick’s ambition destroyed him himself’

c) Mayi o-wa Nicki a- kus-ya li-toka li-ewe omweene  
 MotherAgr-of Nick SM-sold-fv CL5-car Agr-his Agr-own  
 ‘Nick’s mother sold his self’s car’

**Comment:** As discussed in section 4.1.2.3, a combination of a pronoun and *Agr-eene* increases the degree of coreference. This is the case in all the sentences above. However the possibility of an extra-sentential antecedent is not excluded.

#### 4.1.2.7 Demoted Arguments

C15ai) Polly a-fum-is-ibw-a ne Yohana  
 Polly SM-praised-Caus-Pass-fv by John  
 ‘Polly was praised by John’

aii) Polly a-fum-is-ibw-a ne omweene  
 Polly SM-praised-Caus-Pass-fv by Agr-own  
 ‘Polly was praised by herself’

bi) Polly a-yet-w-a ne Yohana  
 Polly SM-helped-Pass-fv by John  
 ‘Polly was helped by John’

bii) Polly a-yet-w-a ne omweene  
 Polly SM-helped-Pass-fv by Agr-own  
 ‘Polly was helped by herself’

ci) Si-titi si-many-ikh-e ne Polly khu Yohana  
 CL7-little Agr-known-Asp-fv by Polly on John  
 ‘Little is known by Polly about John’

cii) Si-titi si-many-ikh-e ne Polly khu omweene  
 CL7-little Agr-known-Asp-fv by Polly on Agr-own  
 ‘Little is known by Polly on herself’

di) Polly a-siim-is-ya Yohana  
 Polly SM-impressed-Caus-fv John  
 ‘Polly impressed John’

dii) \*Polly a-siim-is-ya omweene  
 Polly SM-impressed-Caus-fv Agr-own  
 ‘Polly impressed herself’

diii) Polly a-e-siim-is-ya omweene

Polly SM-RFM-impressed- Caus-fv Agr-own  
'Polly impressed herself'

**Comment:** In LuBukusu, passive constructions are distinct from causative and applicative ones, in marking reflexivization in that passive does not require an RFM, the latter constructions all require RFMs. The middle construction in (C15c) also behaves like passives in indicating reflexivization without an RFM.

### 4.1.3 Properties of Antecedents

#### 4.1.3.1 Pronouns, Person and number

- C16ai) Ese na-e-bon-a samweene  
I SM-RFM-saw-fv Agr-own  
'I saw myself'
- aii) Ese na-e-boon-a  
I SM-RFM-saw-fv  
'I saw myself'
- aiii) Ese na-boon-a samweene  
I SM-saw-fv Agr-own  
'I saw myself'
- aiv) Efwe khwa-bon-an-a fwabeene ne fwabeene  
We SM-saw-RCM-fv Agr-own with Agr-own  
'We saw each other'
- av) Efwe Khwa-bon-an-a  
We SM-saw-RCM-fv  
'We saw each other'
- avi) \*Efwe khwa-bon-a fwabeene ne fwabeene  
We SM-saw-fv Agr-own with Agr-own  
'We saw each other'
- avii) Efwe khwa-e-bon-a fwabeene ne fwabeene  
We SM-RFM-saw-fv Agr-own with Agr-own  
'We saw each other'
- bi) Ewe wa-e-bon-a wamweene  
You SM-RFM-saw-fv Agr-own  
'You saw yourself'
- bii) Ewe wa-e-bon-a  
You SM-RFM-saw-fv  
'You saw yourself'
- biii) Ewe wa-bon-a wamweene  
You SM-saw-fv Agr-own  
'You saw yourself'
- biv) Enywe mwa-bon-an-a mwabeene ne mwabeene  
You SM-saw-RCM-fv Agr-own with Agr-own  
'You saw each other'
- bv) Enywe mwa-bon-an-a

- You SM-saw-RCM-fv  
 ‘You saw each other’  
 bvi) \*Enywe mwa-bon-a mwabeene ne mwabeene  
 You SM-saw-fv Agr-own with Agr-own  
 ‘You saw each other’  
 bvii)\*Enywe mwa-e-bon-a  
 You SM-saw-fv  
 ‘You saw each other’

**Comment:** The first and second persons occur in almost similar environments as the third person antecedents. Notable is however the fact that, without the RFM, coreference is still realized with first and second person antecedents. This is easily explained by the fact it is only the third person that can take an extra-sentential antecedent and therefore if sentential coreference is intended then there is need for an RFM. Note also that the ‘reciprocal only’ strategy requires an RCM to implement coreference. I am not quite sure why this is the case but may be for now I will simply state that the overt phrasal reciprocal either requires an RFM or an RCM for coreference to succeed.

- C17a) Ese na-e-siing-a samweene  
 I SM-RFM-washed-fv Agr-own  
 ‘I washed myself’
- b) Ese na-e-biiy-il-a samweene  
 I SM-RFM-hate-APP-fv Agr-own  
 ‘I hate myself’
- c) Ese na-bool-el-a Yohana khu samweene  
 I SM-told-APP-fv John on Agr- own  
 ‘I told John about myself’
- d) Ese na-bon-a e-ndemu simbi ne samweene  
 I SM-saw-fv CL9-snake near to Agr-own  
 ‘I saw a snake near myself’
- e) Ese na-siim-w-a ne samweene  
 I SM-liked-Pass-fv by Agr-own  
 ‘I am liked by myself’
- f) Ese na-laang-a mayi wa samweene  
 I SM-called-fv mother of Agr-own  
 ‘I called my mother’
- g) Papa o-wa-ese a-siim-a samweene  
 Father Agr-of-I SM-like-fv Agr-own  
 My father likes myself’

**Comment:** Since there are no significant differences in the strategies, I will not include all the strategies in subsequent examples.

**Comment:** Again the role of the RFM is seen in a and b, while in the rest of the examples it is not required because the direct object of the verbs that may require an RFM is different from the subject in terms of reference.

#### 4.1.3.2 Animacy or Humanity

C18a) Kama-khale ka-e-kalukh-il-a mo kameene  
CL6-old SM-RFM-repeat-Rep-fv in Agr-own  
'Old/ history repeats itself'

b) E-ng'eeni yi-no ya-e-li-a eng'eene  
CL3 fish Agr-this SM-RFM-eat-fv Agr-own  
'This fish eats/cannibalizes itself'

c) Li-shini li-no Iya-e-yonak-a lilyeene  
CL5-machine Agr-this SM-RFM-spoil-fv Agr-own  
'This machine destroys itself'

**Comment:** The strategies appear not to be affected by whether or not the antecedents are animate/inanimate or human/non-human.

#### 4.1.3.2 Pronoun Types

See section 4.1.3.1 above.

#### 4.1.3.3 –Not included

#### 4.1.3.4 Quantifiers

C19a) Buli omu-khasi a-e-bon-a omweene  
Every CL1-woman SM-RFM-saw-fv Agr-own  
'Every woman saw herself'

b) Buli omu-ana a-e-siing-a omweene  
Every CL1-child SM-RFM-washed-fv Agr-own  
'Every child washed himself/ herself'

c) Buli omu-somi a-e-biiy-il-a omweene  
Every CL1-student SM-RFM-hates-APP-fv Agr-own  
'Every student hates himself/ herself'

d) Buli omu-aana a-bon-a endemu simbi ne omweene  
Every CL1-child SM-saw-fv CL3-snake near to Agr-own  
'Every child saw a snake near himself'

e) Buli omu-aana a-laang-a mayi we omweene  
Every CL1-child SM-called-fv mother of Agr-own

‘Every child called self’s mother’

- f) Buli papa we omu-aana a-mu-siim-a omweene  
Every father of CL1-child SM-OM-likes-fv Agr-own  
‘Every child’s father likes himself’

**Comment:** Nothing significant seems to be happening . (refer to C17 above).

C19a) Mbao omukhasi o-wa-e-bon-a omweene ta

No CL1 woman Agr-SM-RFM-saw-fv Agr-own not  
‘No woman saw herself’

b) Mbao omwaana o-wa-e-siing-a omweene ta

Every CL1 child Agr-SM-RFM-washed-fv Agr-own not  
‘No child washed himself/ herself’

c) Mbao omusomi o-wa- e-biiy-il-a omweene ta

No CL1 student Agr-SM-RFM-hates-APP-fv Agr-own not  
‘No student hates himself/ herself’

d) Mbao omwaana o-wa- bon- a endemu simbi ne omweene ta

No CL1 child Agr-SM-saw-fv CL3 snake near to Agr-own not  
‘No child saw a snake near himself’

e) Mbao omwaana o-wa-laang-a mayi we omweene ta

No CL1 child Agr-SM-called-fv mother of Agr-own not  
‘No child called self’s mother’

f) Mbao papa o-wo omwaana o-wa-mu-siim-a omweene ta

No father of-CL1 child Agr-SM-OM-likes-fv Agr-own not  
‘No child’s father likes himself’

**Comment:** There is nothing that is significantly new. Perhaps what is different is the change of the subject marker with the addition of the negative word.

#### 4.1.3.5 Questioned antecedents

C20ai) Nanu o-wa-e-bon-a omweene?

Who CL1-SM-RFM-saw-fv Agr-own  
‘Who saw himself’?

aii) O-wa-e-bon-a omweene nanu?

CL1-SM-RFM-saw-fv Agr-own who  
‘Who saw himself’?

bi) Nanu o-wa-e-siing-a omweene?

Who CL1-SM-RFM-washed-fv Agr-own

- ‘Who washed himself’?
- bii) O-wa-e-siing-a omweene nanu?  
CL1-SM-RFM-washed-fv Agr-own who  
‘Who washed himself’?
- ci) Nanu o-wa-bon-a endemu simbi ne omweene?  
Who CL1-SM-saw-fv CL3-snake near to Agr-own  
‘Who saw a snake near himself’?
- cii) O- wa- - a endemu simbi ne omweene nanu?  
CL1-SM-saw-fv CL3-snake near to Agr-own who  
‘Who saw a snake near himself’?
- di) Nanu o-wa-laang-a mayi o-wa-omwana?  
Who CL1-SM-Called-fv mother of Agr-own  
‘Who called self’s mother?’
- dii) O-wa-lang-a mayi o-wa-omweene nanu?  
CL1-SM-Called-fv Mother of Agr-own who  
‘Who called self’s mother?’
- ei) Papa o-wa-nanu o-mu-ikoomba omweene?  
Father CL1-of-who Agr-om –admires Agr-own  
‘Whose father likes himself’?
- eii) O-mu-e-ikoomba omweene papa o-wa nanu?  
CL1-om-RFM-admires Agr-own father Agr-of who  
‘Whose father likes himself?’

**Comment:** All these structures are acceptable whether the interrogative word is moved to [spec,CP] position or it remains in-situ. With the absence of an RFM, the anaphoric element may also have an extra- sentential antecedent as in c, d and e.

#### 4.1.3.6 Reverse Binding

- C21ai) \*Omweene a-e-bon-a Fred  
Agr-own SM-RFM-saw-fv Fred  
‘Himself saw Fred’
- aii) Omweene a-e-bon-a  
Agr-own SM-RFM-saw-fv  
‘Himself saw himself’
- b) Fwabeene khwa-e-boon-a efwe  
Agr-own SM-RFM-saw-fv us  
‘Ourselves saw us’
- c) \*Omweene a-boon-a endemu enyuma wa Fred  
Agr-own SM-saw-fv CL3-snake behind of Fred  
‘\*Himself saw a snake behind Fred’

- di) \*Omweene a-e-siim-is-ya Fred  
Agr-own SM-RFM-like-Caus-fv Fred  
'\*Himself likes Fred'
- dii) Omweene a-e-siim-is-ya  
Agr-own SM-RFM-like-Caus-fv  
'Himself likes himself'
- e) \* Billi a-kachul-a khu omweene khu Fred  
Bill SM-talked- fv to Agr- own about Fred  
'\*Bill talked to himself about Fred'
- f) \*Billi a-bool-el-a omweene ka Fred  
Bill SM- told-TNS-fv Agr-own of Fred  
'Bill told himself that of Fred'
- g) \*Omweene a-fum-is-bw-a ne Fred  
Agr-own SM-praised-Caus-Pass-fv by Fred  
'Himself was praised by Fred'
- h) Wamweene wa-siim-is-bw-a ne nawe  
Agr-own SM-liked-Caus-Pass-fv by you  
'Yourself was liked by you'

**Comment:** As expected, reverse binding with R-expressions is not possible in Lubukusu. It is however quite interesting to note that Agr-*eene* can be acceptable in subject position when the RFM is present, as (C21aii) and (C21dii).

- C22a) \*Omweene/niye a-laang-a mayi wa George  
Agr-own/him SM-called-fv mother of George  
'\*Himself/he called the mother of George'
- b) Mayi owewe omweene e-ny-a khu-ng'oon-a George  
Mother Agr-his Agr-own SM-wanted-fv to-improve-fv George  
'His own mother wanted to improve George'
- ci) ?Mayi owewe a-siim-is-ya George  
Mother Agr-his SM-impressed-Caus-fv George  
'His mother impressed George'
- cii) Mayi owewe omweene a-mu-siim-is-ya  
Mother Agr-his Agr-own SM-om-impressed-Caus-fv  
'His own mother impressed him'
- d) Maria a-bool-el-a mayi owe omweene ka George  
Mary SM-told-TNS-fv mother Agr-of Agr-own of Geogae  
'Mary told his own mother about George'



e) Si-fwanane sy-a mayi owewe omweene sya-kw-a khu George  
CL7-picture Agr-of mother Agr-his Agr-own SM-fell-fv on George  
'A picture of his own mother fell on George'

f) Si-fwanane sya mayi owewe omweene sya-siim-is-ya George  
CL7-picture Agr-of mother Agr-his Agr-own SM-fell-Caus fv George  
'A picture of his own mother impressed George'

**Comment:** The antecedent of the *Agr-eene* may also be extra-sentential and in d) Mary is also another possible antecedent.

#### 4.1.4 Some matters of Interpretation

##### 4.1.4.1 Distribution, reflexivity and reciprocity

C24) Interpretations:

- a) Each woman helps all (or almost all) of the women, excluding herself.
- b) Each woman helps all of the women, including herself.
- c) Each woman helps at least some of the other women.
- d) Each woman helps herself.
- e) The women together as a group help the women together as a group.
- f) Each woman helps one of the women other than herself, such that all of the women are helped by one of the others.

C23i) Ba-khasi ba-e-yeet-a babeene/babeene ne babeene  
CL2-woman SM-RFM-help-fv Agr-own/Agr-own with Agr-own  
'(The) women helped themselves/each other'

Comment: All interpretations are possible except (a) and (f)

C23ii) Ba-khasi ba-e-yeet-an-a babeene/babeene ne babeene  
CL2-woman SM-RFM-helped-RCM-fv Agr-own/Agr-own with Agr-own  
'(The) women helped themselves/each other'

Comment: All interpretations are possible except (d).

C25ai) Ba-khasi ba-e-fumy-a babeene  
CL2-woman SM-RFM-praised-fv Agr-own  
'(The) women praised themselves'

Comment: All interpretations are possible except (a) and (f).

aii) Ba-khasi ba-e-fumy-an-a babeene ne babeene  
CL2-woman SM-RFM-praised-RCM-fv Agr-own with Agr-own  
'(The) women praised each other'

Comment: All interpretations are possible except (d).

[Carlo, this replaces a previous very similar example with this number]

bi) Ba-khasi ba-kha-e-yeet-e babeene  
CL2-woman SM-TNS-RFM-help-fv Agr-own

‘(The) women will help themselves’

Comment: All interpretations are possible except (a) and (f).

bii) Ba-khasi     ba-kha-e-yeet-an-e   babeene ne babeene  
CL2-woman SM-TNS-RFM-help-RCM-fv Agr-own with Agr-own  
‘(The) women will help each other’

Comment: All interpretations are possible except (d)

ci) Ba-khasi     ba-e-khos-ya   babeene  
CL2-woman SM-RFM-photographed-fv Agr-own  
‘(The) women photographed themselves’

Comment: All interpretations are possible except (a) and (f).

cii) Ba-khasi     ba-e-khos-an-ya   babeene ne babeene  
CL2-woman SM-RFM-photographed-RCM-fv Agr-own with Agr-own  
‘(The) women photographed each other’

Comment: All interpretations are possible except (d).

di) Ba-khasi     ba-e-chong-el-a   babeene  
CL2-woman SM-RFM-betrayed-TNS-fv Agr-own  
‘(The) women betrayed themselves’

Comment: All interpretations are possible except (a) and (f).

dii) Ba-khasi     ba-e-chong-an-il-a   babeene ne   babeene  
CL2-woman SM-RFM- betrayed-RCM-TNS-fv Agr-own with Agr-own  
‘(The) women betrayed each other’

Comment: All interpretations are possible except (d).

**Comment:** In LuBukusu, the RCM always triggers reciprocal readings whether there is a phrasal reciprocal or a reflexive one in the verb’s internal position. On the other hand the RFM without RCM triggers reflexive readings whether the VP’s internal position has a reflexive or phrasal reciprocal. When there is both an RFM and an RCM then the reciprocal reading is required.

#### 4.1.4.2 Reciprocal readings

C26a) Ba-khasi     ba-lom-an-il-a                 babeene ne   babeene  
CL2-woman SM-spoke-RCM-APP-fv Agr-own with Agr-own  
‘The women spoke for each other’

b) Ba-khasi     ba-kanan-a   babeene ne babeene  
CL2-women SM-met-fv Agr-own with Agr-own  
‘The women met each other’

c) Ba-khasi     ba-bon-an-a         babeene ne babeene  
CL2-women SM-saw-RCM-fv Agr-own with Agr-own

‘The women saw each other’

- d) Ba-khasi    ba-p-an-a        babeene ne babeene  
CL2-women SM-hit-RCM-fv Agr-own with Agr-own  
‘The women hit each other’

Comment: The strategy can be applied to all the verbs except ‘speak’ which is inherently intransitive. However if it can be made transitive to indicate the idea of speaking for each other, then reciprocal reading is possible as in (C26a)

- C27a) Yohana ba-bon-an-a        babeene ne Billi  
John    SM-saw-RCM-fv Agr-own with Bill  
‘John and Bill saw each other’  
b) Yohana ba-kanan-a    babeene ne    babeene ne Billi  
John    SM-met-fv    Agr-own with Agr-own with Bill  
‘John and Bill met each other’

Comment: To me, there is no contrast in interpretation. This can be attributed to the fact that Lubukusu allows split antecedents in comitative constructions.

- C28a) Yohana ne Maria ba-fumy-an-a    babeene ne    babeene  
John    and Mary SM-praised-RCM-fv Agr-own with Agr-own  
‘John and Mary praised each other’

- b) Ba-khasi    ba-fumy-an-a        babeene ne    babeene  
CL2-woman SM-praised-RCM-fv Agr-own with Agr-own  
‘The women praised each other’

- C29a) Yohana ne Maria ba-kachul-an-a    kho babeene ne    babeene  
John    and Mary SM-spoke-RCM-fv to    Agr-own with Agr-own  
‘John and Mary spoke to each other’  
b) Yohana ne Maria ba-e-akanan-a    ne    babeene ne    babeene  
John    and Mary SM-RFM-met-fv with Agr-own with Agr-own  
‘John and Mary met with each other’.

Comment: Apparently, the verb *-akanan* in (C27b) and (C29b) involves the lexicalization of the reciprocal. There is no verb *-akan* in Lubukusu. Consider;

*Wekesa a- kanan- a Wanjala NOT Wekesa a-kan-a Wanjala*  
*Wekesa SM-met-fv Wanjala*  
*‘Wekesa met Wanjala’*

It appears then that the verb ‘meet’ in Lubukusu is inherently reciprocal with *-an-* marking reciprocity but unlike other reciprocal verbs, the affix is part of the verb root- its omission yields unacceptability.

- c) Yohana ne Maria ba-e-lesy-an-a                    si-tabu        sino khu babeene  
John    and Mary SM-RFM-gave-RCM-fv CL7-book    this to Agr-own  
‘John and Mary gave this book to each other’

Comment: Although (C29b) sounds odd but according to my judgement, reciprocity between a subject and an indirect object is possible.

### **Long-distance reciprocal readings.**

C30) Billi ne Maria ba-kanakan-a ba-li ba-e-siim-an-a babeene ne babeene  
Bill and Mary SM-think-fv Agr-that SM-RFM-like-RCM-fv Agr-own with Agr-own  
'Bill and Mary thought that they like each other'

Comment: Indeed such a long-distance reciprocal reading is allowed.

## **4.2 Cross-clausal binding**

### **4.2.1 Coreference relations across typical tensed clausal complement.**

#### **4.2.1.1 Tensed complement, long distance relations, anaphor in situ.**

D1a) Jack a-lom-a a-li omweene a-li omu-miliyu  
Jack SM-said-fv Agr-that Agr-own Agr-is Agr-smart  
'Jack said that he is smart'

b) Jack a-many-il-e a-li George a-mu-siim-a omweene  
Jack SM-knows-TNS-fv Agr-that George SM-om-like-fv Agr-own  
'Jack knows that George likes him'

c) Jack a-many-il-e a-li Billi a-lom-a a-li omweene a-li omu-miliyu  
Jack SM-knows-TNS-fv Agr-that Bill SM-said-fv Agr-that Agr-own SM-is Agr-smart  
'Jack knows that Bill said that he is smart'

d) Jack a-kanakan-a a-li Lisa a-many-il-e a-li Wendy a-mu-siim-a  
Jack SM-thinks-fv Agr-that Lisa SM-knows-TNS-fv Agr-that Wendy SM-OM-like-fv  
omweene  
Agr-own  
'Jack thinks that Lisa knows that Wendy likes him'

e) Jack a-kanakan-a a-li Lisa a-many-il-e a-li omweene a-siim-a Alice  
Jack SM-thinks-fv Agr-that Lisa SM-knows-TNS-fv Agr-that Agr-own SM-like-fv  
Alice  
'Jack thinks that Lisa knows that he likes Alice'

f) Sarai a-bool-el-a Jack a-li Lisa a-mu-siim-a omweene  
Sarah SM-told-APP-fv Jack Agr-that Lisa SM-OM-loves-fv Agr-own  
'Sarah told Jack that Lisa loves him'

g) Sarai a-bool-el-a Jack a-li omweene a-siim-a Wendy  
Sarah SM-told-APP-fv Jack Agr-that Agr-own SM-loves-fv Wendy  
'Sarah told Jack that he loves Wendy'

**Comment:** I should, from the onset, note that long-distance relations in LuBukusu are closer to the Chinese relations you have exemplified above. Beginning with reflexives,

LuBukusu makes use of such pronouns in long-distance environments. However, their reference is much freer, i.e. they may have strictly sentential or extra-sentential antecedents. In (D1a) Agr-own is coreferential with Jack first and foremost. However, it may also have an extra-sentential antecedent, as a last resort. Such ‘near-strict’ sentential coreference is attributed to the fact that ‘Jack’ could be the only person whose thoughts are reported. Again, the coreference can be made even more restrictive if we introduce forms that have a higher coreference value (refer to the hierarchy explained in section 4.1.2.3 above). The same is true for (D1b) because the OM on the lower verb blocks George from being the antecedent, leaving Jack alone and, remotely, an outside/extra-sentential antecedent. For the rest of the sentences, there are three possibilities: Jack, the subjects of the other clauses and an extra-sentential antecedent. Here, the sentence internal antecedents are selected first before the extra-sentential one. It appears to me that with the introduction of a RFM on the verbs of ‘thinking’ whose subject is Jack in (D1b-D1e), the anaphoric element may strictly refer to Jack and nobody else. Consider (D1bi-D1ei) below to see how the RFM is added.

b) Jack a-e-many-il-e a-li George a-mu-siim-a omweene  
 Jack SM-RFM-knows-TNS-fv Agr-that George SM-om-like-fv Agr-own  
 ‘Jack knows that George likes him’

ci) Jack a-e-many-il-e a-li Billi a-lom-a a-li omweene a-li omu-miliyu  
 Jack SM-RFM-knows-TNS-fv Agr-that Bill SM-said-fv Agr-that Agr-own SM-is Agr-smart  
 ‘Jack knows that Bill said that he is smart’

di) Jack a-e-kanakan-a a-li Lisa a-many-il-e a-li Wendy a-mu-siim-a  
 Jack SM-RFM-thinks-fv Agr-that Lisa SM-knows-TNS-fv Agr-that Wendy SM-OM-like-fv  
 omweene  
 Agr-own  
 ‘Jack thinks that Lisa knows that Wendy likes him’

ei) Jack a-e-kanakan-a a-li Lisa a-many-il-e a-li omweene a-siim-a Alice  
 Jack SM-RFM-thinks-fv Agr-that Lisa SM-knows-TNS-fv Agr-that Agr-own SM-like-fv  
 Alice  
 ‘Jack thinks that Lisa knows that he likes Alice’

It is also possible to adjust D1b-e) to appear with an OM in these constructions, where the OM refers to some third party, but for the OM to be introduced, the applicative extension is required, here interpreted as benefactive.

**Consider:**

1. Jack a-mu-many-il-e a-li George a-mu-siim-a omweene  
 Jack SM-OM-knows-APP-fv Agr-that George SM-OM-likes-fv Agr-own  
 ‘Jack knows (on his behalf) that George likes him’

2. Jack a-mu-kanakan-il-e a-li Lisa a-many-il-e a-li Wendy a-mu-siim-a  
 Jack SM-OM-thinks-APP-fv Agr-that Lisa SM-knows-tns-fv Agr-that Wendy SM-OM-likes-fv  
 omweene

Agr-own

‘Jack thought (on his behalf) that Lisa thinks that Wendy likes him’

In these cases, the thoughts being reported are not those of Jack but somebody else’s seen through Jack. In both 1 and 2, *Agr-eene* is coreferential with the OM only (the person whose thoughts are being reported). It is not allowed to be free. The role of OM is thus similar to that of RFM in the same context.

D2a) Jack a-fukilil-a            a-li        Maria a-mu-siim-a    omweene  
Jack SM-admitted-fv Agr-that Mary SM-OM-loved-fv Agr-own  
Jack admitted that Mary loved him’

b) Jack a-uk-a                a-li        Maria a-mu-siim-a        omweene  
Jack SM-suspected-fv Agr-that Mary SM-OM-loved-fv Agr-own  
‘Jack suspected that Mary loved him/

**Comment:** There is a semantic distinction between sentences D2a & b, but such a difference is not morphologically marked. I cannot visualize any additional differences.

D3a) Jeff e-looch-a                khu    Maria nga    Ella a-mu-lil-a omweene  
Jeff SM-complained-fv about Mary when Ella SM-OM-blamed-fv Agr-own  
‘Jeff complained about Mary when Ella blamed *him*’

Comment: It seems the e- SM in (D3a) is an allomorph of *a-* whose distribution is lexically conditioned- it only occurs in certain verbs (perhaps those with an initial vowel in their root forms). Or may be this is a case of inherent reflexivization. I am not sure for now.

b) Jeff a-kalukh-a        engo        nga    omweene a-ba            ne-a-lwi-il-e  
Jeff SM-returned-fv CL3-home when Agr-own SM-became PERF-Agr-tired-TNS-fv  
‘Jeff returned home when *he* became tired’

c)?Nga Maria    a-mu-andik-il-a omweene,            Jeff a-kalukh-a engo  
When Mary SM-OM-wrote-APP-fv Agr-own Jeff SM-returned-fv home  
‘When Mary wrote to *him*, Jeff returned home’

d) Jeff a-rekukh-a Maria ne a-kha-mu-boon-a            omweene ta  
Jeff SM-left-fv Mary Neg SM-Asp-OM-see-fv Agr-own not  
‘Jeff left without Mary seeing *him*’

e) Maria a-lom-a                Jeff ne    a-kha-mu-akanan-a    omweene ta  
Maria SM-condemned-fv Jeff Neg SM-Asp-OM-meet-fv Agr-own not  
‘Mary condemned Jeff without meeting *him*’

Comment: I cannot quite get my fingers on the main difference between adjuncts and complements but I have strong feelings that in (D3), *Agr-eene* has a more strict reading than it does in (D1). This can be explained by the fact that the interpretation of the adjuncts in (D3) is more dependent on the main clause as instantiated in the dependent word ‘nga’. One would expect adjuncts to be freer, from their peripheral nature.

On reciprocals, I think they could be more local especially with the RCM. However, it is possible to substitute *Agr-eene* in all the sentences with an overt phrasal reciprocal to indicate even more strict coreference.

Plurality and person will definitely have an effect on the patterning.

#### 4.2.1.2 Climbing from tensed complements.

D3' ai) Edgar e-komb-a omweene khu-khil-a  
 Edgar SM-(RFM?)-expects-fv Agr-own to-win-fv  
 'Edgar expects himself to win'

ai) Edgar e-komb-a omweene a-khil-e  
 Edgar SM-(RFM?)-expects-fv Agr-own SM-win-fv  
 'Edgar expects himself (to) win'

Comment: I think the morphology of *-komb-* is rather unique - nothing in the constructions prevents the RFM from being represented even if it is assimilated in the SM. The root may actually be *-ikomb-*, in which case the RFM *-e-* is hidden by its association with the following vowel. The same comments pertain for 4.2.1.2 below. I should however add here that (though hypothetically) if the root form of a verb begins with *-i-* then the SM is always *e-* whether the object is reflexive or different from the subject.

ai') Ba-soleeli be-komb-an-a babeene khu beene khu-khil-a  
 CL2-boys SM-expect-RCM-fv Agr-own on own to-win-fv  
 '(The) boys expect each other to win'

ai'') Ba-soleeli be-komb-an-a babeene khu beene ba-khil-e  
 CL2-boys SM-expect-RCM-fv Agr-own on own SM-win-fv  
 '(The) boys expect each other to win'

b) Yohanna a-e-bukul-a omweene khu-b-a omu-miliyu  
 John SM-RFM-considers-fv Agr-own to-be-fv CL1-smart  
 'John considers himself (to be) smart'

c) Ba- saani ba-e-ulil- a babeene ne-be-loch- a khu- b-a ba- sakhulu  
 CL2-men SM-RFM-heard-fv Agr-own as-Agr-complaining-fv to-be-fv Agr-old  
 '(The) men heard themselves complaining about being old'

[CARLO: These last two are revisions of sentences already in the database]

Comment: The omission of *Agr-eene* is possible here, but a null subject for the complement clause is understood as coconstructed with the matrix subject.

b') Ba-soleeli ba-bukul-an-a babeene khu beene khu-b-a ba-miliyu  
 CL2-boys SM-consider-RCM-fv Agr-own on own to-be-fv CL2-smart  
 '(The) boys consider each other to be smart'

c') Ba-saani ba-ulil- an-a babeene khu beene ne-be-looch- a khu- b-a ba- sakhulu  
 CL2-men SM-heard-fv Agr-own on own as-Agr-complaining-fv to-be-fv CL2-old

‘(The) men heard each other complaining about being old’

#### 4.2.2 Long distance relations and the variety of clausal embedding types.

Comment: Apart from the embedded complement clauses already examined, Lubukusu also has a variety of other embedded clausal types. An exhaustive list of such a variety may require a bit of time. Presently however, I will exemplify two major types; the infinitive, both bare and ‘khu’ (to) and the participle clauses, both present and past – identified by initial ‘ne’ (which may also be used to negate or as a marker of condition in different contexts).

D4a) Edgar a-reeb-il-e Billi khu-mu-ikin-a omweene  
Edgar SM-asked-TNS-fv Bill to-OM-trust-fv Agr-own  
‘Edgar asked Bill to trust him’

bi) Edgar a-reeb-il-e Billi khu-an-a si-tabu khu omweene  
Edgar SM-asked-TNS-fv Bill to-give-fv CL7-book to Agr-own  
‘Edgar asked Bill to give a book to him’

bii) Ba-khasi ba-reeb-il-e ba-saani khu-eles-an-ya bi-tabu  
CL2-woman SM-asked-TNS-fv CL2-man to-give-RCM-fv CL8-book  
babeene ne babeene  
Agr-own with Agr-own

‘(The) women asked (the) men to give the books to each other’

Comment: Just like the RFM, the RCM also ensures coconstrual with the subject of the verb in which it occurs. In this sentence therefore, the reciprocal is construed with the men only.

ci) Edgar a-reeb-il-e Billi khu-kachul-a khu omweene  
Edgar SM-asked-TNS-fv Bill to-talk-fv to Agr-own  
‘Edgar asked Bill to talk to *him*’

cii) Ba-khasi ba-reeb-il-e Billi khu-kachul-a khu babeene ne babeene  
CL2-woman SM-asked-fv Bill to-talk-fv to Agr-own with Agr-own  
‘(The ) women asked Bill to talk to *them*’

d) Edgar a-reeb-il-e Billi khu-kachul-a khu omweene(same as c)

e) Edgar e-ny-a Billi khu-mu-ikin-a omweene  
Edgar SM-wanted-fv Bill to-OM-trust-fv Agr-own  
‘Edgar expected Bill to trust *him*’

f) Edgar a-lom-a Billi khu-ruung-a omweene  
Edgar SM-ordered-fv Bill to-pay-fv Agr-own  
‘Edgar ordered Bill to pay *him*’



g) Edgar a-lom-a Billi khu-bool-a a-li omweene a-b-a omu-miliyu  
 Edgar SM-ordered-fv Bill to-say-fv Agr-that Agr-own SM-was-fv CL1-smart  
 ‘Edgar ordered Bill to say that *he* was smart.’  
 ‘Edgar ordered *Bill* to say that *he* was smart.’

hi) Edgar a-lom-a Billi khu-bool-a a-li Maria a-mu-siim-a omweene  
 Edgar SM-ordered-fv Bill to say-fv Agr-that Mary SM-OM-like Agr-own  
 ‘Edgar ordered Bill to say that Mary loved *him*’  
 ‘Edgar ordered *Bill* to say that Mary loved *him*’

hii) Edgar a-lom-a Billi a-bol-e a-li Maria a-mu-siim-a omweene  
 Edgar SM-ordered-fv Bill SM-say-fv Agr-that Mary SM-OM-like-fv Agr-own  
 ‘Edgar ordered Bill (to) say that Mary loved *him*’  
 ‘Edgar ordered *Bill* (to) say that Mary loved *him*’

**Comment:** From such examples a number of issues can be noted

- Both the *Agr-eene* and the phrasal reciprocal in infinitive clauses allow long-distance binding to a subject of a higher clause.
- There is room for an extra-sentential antecedent.
- The RCM can only occur in the clause in which the anaphoric element occurs and in such a case the reference of the anaphoric element is made local. The same is true for the RFM.
- As exemplified in (D4hii), bare infinitive clauses also function in the same way as *khu*-infinitive clauses: The anaphoric element has a long-distance marking with the possibility of having an extra-sentential antecedent.

D5ai) Edgar e-koomb-a omweene khu-khil-a  
 Edgar SM-expects-fv Agr-own to-win-fv  
 ‘Edgar expects himself to win’

aii) Edgar e-koomb-a omweene a-khil-e  
 Edgar SM-expects-fv Agr-own SM-win-fv  
 ‘Edgar expects himself (to) win’

bi) Edgar e-koomb-a Billi khu-khil-a omweene  
 Edgar SM-expects-fv Bill to-win-fv Agr-own  
 ‘Edgar expects Bill to defeat him’

bii) Edgar e-koomb-a Billi khu-mu-khil-a omweene  
 Edgar SM-expects-fv Bill to-OM-defeat-fv Agr-own  
 ‘Edgar expects Bill to defeat him’

b’i) Basaani bekombana bafwe  
 Ba-saani ba-ikomb-an-a ba-fw-e  
 CL2-men SM-expect-RCM-fv SM-die-fv  
 ‘The men expect each other to die’

b’ii) Basaani babukulana balwaala

Ba-saani ba-bukul-an-a                      ba-lwaal-a  
 CL2-men SM-considered-RCM-fv SM-sick-fv  
 ‘The men considered each other sick’

b’iii) Basaani bebukula balwaala  
 Ba-saani ba-e-bukul-a                      ba-lwaal-a  
 CL2-men SM-RFM-considered-fv SM-sick-fv  
 ‘The men considered themselves sick’

c) Edgar a-ch-a            engo Billi ne    a-mu-khil-il-e omweene  
 Edgar SM-went-fv home Bill PART SM-OM-defeat-Asp-fv Ag-own  
 ‘Edgar went home Bill having defeated him’

**Comment:** Example c) shows that participle clauses also allow long-distance *Agr-eene*. For the other examples, it seems nothing significant has changed. Perhaps what is notable is the fact that in (bi) the *Agr-eene* is freer; it may refer to Edgar, Bill or an extra-sentential antecedent. In (bii), however, the OM blocks coreference with Bill.

**Comment:** Whether the subject is plural or singular, the verbs that may be described in English as ECM do not make a distinction between the SM and RFM. One cannot for example say ‘ba-komb-a’. Another common ECM verb is ‘-loch-a’ (complain).

a) Ba- soleeli be-koomb-a khu-khil- a  
 CL2-boys SM-expected-fv to-win-fv  
 ‘The boys expected to win’

b) Ba- soleeli be-koomb-a ba-khil- e  
 CL2- boys SM-expected-fv SM-win-fv  
 ‘The boys expected \*them/themselves to win’

c) Ba-soleeli be-koomb-a Billi khu- ba- khil-a  
 CL2- boys SM-expected-fv Bill to-OM-win-fv  
 ‘The boys expected Bill to defeat them’

D6 a) Edgar a- e- suubil- a            (omweene) khu- khil-a  
 Edgar SM-RFM-hopes-fv Agr-own to-win-fv  
 ‘Edgar hopes for himself to win’

b) Edgar a-e- suubil- a            Billi khu- mu- khil- a  
 Edgar SM-RFM-hopes-fv Bill to-OM-win-fv  
 ‘Edgar hopes for Bill to win’

**Comment:** What is notable is the fact that there could be some form of violation of the PRO-Theorem-PRO is in free variation with ‘omweene’ and ‘Bill’.

D7ai) Edgar e-koomb-a Billi khu-khil-a wandaye we omweene  
 Edgar SM-expects-fv Bill to-defeat-fv brother of Agr-own  
 ‘Edgar expects Bill to defeat his brother’

aii) Edgar e-koomb-a Billi khu-khil-a wandaye owewe omweene  
 Edgar SM-expects-fv Bill to-defeat-fv brother Agr-his Agr-own

‘Edgar expects Bill to defeat his own brother’

- b) ‘for’ structures are not acceptable in Lubukusu.
- ci) Edgar e-koomb-a wandaye owe omweene khu-khil-a niye  
Edgar SM-expects-fv brother Agr-of Agr-own to-defeat-fv him  
‘Edgar expects his brother to defeat him’
- cii) Edgar e-koomb-a wandaye owewe omwene khu-khil-a niye  
Edgar SM-expects-fv brother Agr-his Agr-own to-defeat-fv him  
‘Edgar expects his own brother to defeat him’
- d) Not acceptable

**Comment:** As noted before, the *Agr-eene* in (D7ai) and (D7ci) refers to Edgar but may also have an extra-sentential antecedent with the addition of a pronoun, the coreference to Edgar is even made more explicit.

- D8) a) ?Tom a-e-bukul-a omweene omu-kesi  
Tom SM-RFM-considers-fv Agr-own CL1-intelligent  
‘Tom considers himself intelligent’
- b) \*Tom a-bukul-a Maria a-mu-siim-a  
Tom SM-considers-fv Mary SM-OM-like-fv  
‘Tom considers Mary fond of her’
- c) \*Tom a-bukul-a Maria a-mu-kasirik-il- a  
Tom SM-considers-fv Mary SM-OM-angry-APP-fv  
‘Tom considers Mary angry with him’

Comment: D8a is odd but not as odd as D8b and D8c. This is probably due to the fact RFM is a better marker of coreference than the OM.

IIIa) Basaani ba-e-ulil-a nge ba- el-a  
CL2men SM-RFM-heard-fv as SM-breath-fv  
‘The men heard themselves breathing’

ai)1 Basaani ba-ulil-an-a ne ba- el-a  
CL2men SM-heard-RCM-fv when SM-breath-fv  
‘The men heard each other when breathing’

ai)2 Basaani ba-ulil-an-a nge ba- el-a  
CL2men SM-heard-RCM-fv as SM-breath-fv  
‘The men heard each other breathing’

IIIb) Basaani ba-e-boon-a nge be-ibeen-a

CL2men SM-RFM-saw-fv as SM-bleed-fv  
'The men saw themselves bleeding'

**bi)1** Basaani ba-boon-an-a ne be-ibeen-a  
CL2men SM-saw-RCM-fv when SM-bleed-fv  
'The men saw each other while bleeding'

**bi)2** Basaani ba-boon-an-a nge be-ibeen-a  
CL2men SM-saw-RCM-fv as SM-bleed-fv  
'The men saw each other bleeding'

**IIIc)** Basiimani ba-e-ulil-a nge be-iseend-a  
CL2lovers SM-RFM-fv as SM-move-fv  
'The lovers heard themselves moving'

**ci)1** Basiimani ba-ulil-an-a ne be-iseend-a  
CL2lovers SM-RCM-fv when SM-move-fv  
'The lovers heard each other while moving'

**ci)2** Basiimani ba-ulil-an-a nge be-iseend-a  
CL2lovers SM-RCM-fv as SM-move-fv  
'The lovers heard each other moving'

Comment: The -i- in *-ibeena* and *-iseenda* is not pronounced in rapid speech.

#### 4.2.3 Backwards Anaphora

D9) Indeed, Lubukusu allows 'that' clauses in subject positions but they are normally non-finite and involve some form of foregrounding e.g.

- a) Bali omundu a-tim-a aba a-li Edgar  
That CL1-person SM-runs-fv then Agr-is Edgar  
'If a person is running, then it is Edgar'

Comment: Here the reference of 'omundu' is the same as that of Edgar.

#### 4.3 Principle C-type effects

E1 a) Niye e-ikiich-a Malik  
He SM-criticized-fv Malik  
'He criticized Malik'

b) Niye a- lom-a a-li Mariam e-ikiich-a Malik  
He SM-said Agr-that Mariam SM-criticized-fv Malik  
'He said Mariam criticized Malik'

c) Niye e-ikiich-a omusoleeli  
He SM-criticized-fv CL1boy  
'He criticized the boy'

d) Niye a- loom-a a-li Mariam e-ikiich-a omusoleeli  
He SM-said Agr-that Mariam SM-criticized-fv C1boy  
'He said Mariam criticized the boy'

**Comment:** In normal discourse circumstances, it is not possible to interpret *niye* as *Malik* or *omusoleeli*.

E2 a) Mayi owewe e-ikiich-a Malik  
Mother Agr-his SM-criticized-fv Malik  
'His mother criticized Malik'

b) Mayi owewe a- lom-a a-li Mariam e-ikiich-a Malik  
Mother Agr-his SM-said Agr-that Mariam SM-criticized-fv Malik  
'His mother said Mariam criticized Malik'

c) Mayi owewe e-ikiich-a omusoleeli  
Mother Agr- his SM-criticized-fv CL1boy  
'His mother criticized the boy'

d) Mayi owewe a- lom-a a-li Mariam e-ikiich-a omusoleeli  
Mother Agr-his SM-said Agr-that Mariam SM-criticized-fv CL1boy  
'His mother said Mariam criticized the boy'

**Comments:** Though the interpretation of the pronoun as Malik or the boy is not possible under normal discourse conditions, the chances are not as remote as in E1 above. The genitive pronoun is not involved in the actions of the verb, hence increasing its chances of coconstrual. What makes it difficult is reverse binding.

E3 a) Omusaani niye niye a- siim-a e-ikiich-a Malik  
CL1man that he SM-liked-fv SM-criticized-fv Malik  
'The man who he liked criticized Malik'

b) Omusaani niye niye a- siim-a e-ikiich-a omusoleeli  
CL1man who he SM-liked-fv SM-criticized-fv CL1boy  
'The man who he liked criticized the boy'

c) Omusaani o-wa-mu- siim-a niye e-ikiich-a omusoleeli  
CL1man who-SM-OM-liked-fv him SM-criticized-fv CL1boy  
'The man who liked him criticized the boy'

**Comment:** No coconstrual under normal discourse conditions.

E4 a) Malik e-ikiich-a Malik  
Malik SM-criticized-fv Malik  
'Malik criticized Malik'

b) Malik a- lom-a a-li Mariam e-ikiich-a Malik  
Malik SM-said Agr-that Mariam SM-criticized-fv Malik  
'Malik said Mariam criticized Malik'

c) Omusoleeli e-ikiich-a omusoleeli  
CL1boy SM-criticized-fv CL1boy  
'The boy criticized the boy'

d) Omusoleeli a- lom-a a-li Mariam e-ikiich-a omusoleeli  
CL1boy SM-said Agr-that Mariam SM-criticized-fv CL1boy  
'The boy said Mariam criticized the boy'

Comment: Special conditions required. Perhaps similar to those of English.

E5 a) Mayi ow-a Malik e-ikiich-a Malik  
Mother Agr-of Malik SM-criticized-fv Malik  
'Malik's mother criticized Malik'

b) Mayi ow-a Malik a- lom-a a-li Mariam e-ikiich-a Malik  
Mother Agr-of Malik SM-said Agr-that Mariam SM-criticized-fv Malik  
'Malik's mother said Mariam criticized Malik'

c) Mayi ow- a omusoleeli e-ikiich-a omusoleeli  
Mother Agr-of CL1boy SM-criticized-fv CL1boy  
'The boy's mother criticized the boy'

d) Mayi ow-a omusoleeli a- lom-a a-li Mariam e-ikiich-a omusoleeli  
Mother Agr-of CL1boy SM-said Agr-that Mariam SM-criticized-fv CL1boy  
'The boy's mother said Mariam criticized the boy'

**Comments:** No extra discourse conditions are required for the said interpretation. This could be for the reason stated in the comments after E2.

E6 a) Omusaani niye Malik a- siim-a e-ikiich-a Malik  
CL1man who Malik SM-liked-fv SM-criticized-fv Malik  
'The man who Malik liked criticized Malik'

b) Omusaani niye omusoleeli a- siim-a e-ikiich-a omusoleeli  
CL1man who CL1boy SM-liked-fv SM-criticized-fv CL1boy  
'The man who the boy liked criticized the boy'

c) Omusaani o-wa- siim-a omusoleeli e-ikiich-a omusoleeli  
CL1man who SM-liked-fv CL1boy SM-criticized-fv CL1boy  
'The man who liked the boy criticized the boy'

**Comments:** The said interpretation is possible without any special conditions. In fact it could be the only interpretation available in each case.

E7 a) Omusoleeli e-ikiich-a Malik  
CL1boy SM-criticized-fv Malik  
'The boy criticized Malik'

b) Omusoleeli a-loom-a a-li Mariam e-ikiich-a Malik  
CL1boy SM-said-fv Agr-that Mariam SM-criticized-fv Malik  
'The boy said Mariam criticized Malik'

c) Malik e-ikiich-a omusoleeli  
Malik SM-criticized-fv CL1boy  
'Malik criticized the boy'

d) Malik a-loom-a a-li Mariam e-ikiich-a omusoleeli  
Malik SM-said Agr-that Mariam SM-criticized-fv CL1boy  
'Malik said Mariam criticized the boy'

E8 a) Mayi ow-a omusoleeli e-ikiich-a Malik  
Mother Agr-of CL1boy SM-criticized-fv Malik  
'The boy's mother criticized Malik'

b) Mayi ow-a omusoleeli a-loom-a a-li Mariam e-ikiich-a Malik  
Mother Agr-of CL1boy SM-said Agr-that Mariam SM-criticized-fv Malik  
'The boy's mother said Mariam criticized Malik'

c) Mayi ow-a Malik e-ikiich-a omusoleeli  
Mother Agr-of Malik SM-criticized-fv CL1boy  
'Malik's mother criticized the boy'

d) Mayi ow-a Malik a-loom-a a-li Mariam e-ikiich-a omusoleeli  
Mother Agr-of Malik SM-said Agr-that Mariam SM-criticized-fv CL1boy  
'Malik's mother said Mariam criticized the boy'

E9 a) Omusaani niye omusoleeli a-siim-a e-ikiich-a Malik  
CL1man who CL1boy SM-liked-fv SM-criticized-fv Malik  
'The man who the boy liked criticized Malik'

b) Omusaani niye Malik a-siim-a e-ikiich-a omusoleeli  
CL1man who Malik SM-liked-fv SM-criticized-fv CL1boy  
'The man who Malik liked criticized the boy'

c) Omusaani o-wa-siim-a Malik e-ikiich-a omusoleeli

CL1man who-SM-liked-fv Malik SM-criticized-fv CL1boy  
'The man who liked Malik criticized the boy'

- d) Omusaani o-wa- siim-a omusoleeli e-ikiich-a Malik  
CL1man who-SM-liked-fv CL1boy SM-criticized-fv Malik  
'The man who liked the boy criticized Malik'

**Comments:** In all the examples, special discourse conditions required for interpretation to occur.

#### 4.4 More on long-distance anaphor strategies.

- D10a) Olu a-lom-a a-li omweene a-e-bon-a omweene  
Olu SM-said-fv Agr-that Agr-own SM-RFM-saw-fv Agr-own  
'Olu said that he saw himself'

Comment: Here the reflexive forms, also used in clausemate anaphora, both refer to Olu. Lubukusu therefore has no special pronouns in long-distance references. Perhaps what is unique is a form used for 'inter-clause anaphora'. An antecedent in a different clause will be referred to by a form with the structure 'Agr-chana' as in the example below.

- b) Olu a-li-a kamatuunda mala owa-chana a-ch-a engo  
Olu SM-ate-fv CL6-fruits then Agr-same SM-went-fv home  
'Olu ate fruits then he went home'

Comment: It seems to me that such coreference is common in compound clauses.

- D11 a) Larry a-bool-el-a Zeke a-li Mike se a-mu-siim-a omweene ta  
Larry SM-told-TNS-fv Zeke Agr-that Mike Neg SM-OM-like-fv Agr-own not  
'Larry told Zeke that Mike does not like him'

- b) Zeke a-bool-el-a Larry a-li Mike se a-mu-siim-a omweene ta  
Zeke SM-told-TNS-fv Larry Agr-that Mike Neg SM-OM-like-fv Agr-own not  
'Zeke told Larry that Mike does not like him'

- c) Zeke a-bool-el-a Larry a-li omweene se a-siim-a Mike ta  
Zeke SM-told-TNS-fv Larry Agr-that Agr-own Neg SM-like-fv Mike not  
'Zeke told Larry that he does not like Mike'

- d) Larry a-bool-el-a Zeke a-li omweene se a-siim-a Mike ta  
Larry SM-told-TNS-fv Zeke Agr-that Agr-own Neg SM-like-fv Mike not  
'Larry told Zeke that he does not like Mike'

- e) Larry a-many-il-e a-li Zeke a-kanakan-a a-li Mike se  
Larry SM-knows-TNS-fv Agr-that Zeke SM-thinks-fv Agr-that Mike Neg  
a-mu-siim-a omweene ta  
SM-OM-like-fv Agr-own not  
'Larry knows that Zeke thinks that Mike does not like him'



- f) Zeke a-many-il-e a-li Larry a-kanakan-a a-li Mike se  
 Zeke SM-knows-TNS-fv Agr-that Larry SM-thinks-fv Agr-that Mike Neg  
 a-mu-siim-a omweene ta  
 SM-OM-like-fv Agr-own not  
 ‘Zeke knows that Larry thinks that Mike does not like him’
- D12 a) Mayi owa Zeke a-kanakan-a a-li Mike se a-mu-siim-a  
 Mother Agr-of Zeke SM-thinks-fv Agr-that Mike Neg SM-OM-like-fv  
 omweene ta  
 Agr-own not  
 ‘Zeke’s mother thinks Mike does not like him’
- b) Mayi owa Zeke a-kanakan-a a-li omweene se a-siim-a Mike ta  
 Mother Agr-of Zeke SM-thinks-fv Agr-that Agr-own Neg SM-like-fv Mike not  
 Zeke’s mother thinks that he does not like Mike’
- c) Zeke a-kanakan-a a-li Mike se a-mu-siim-a omweene ta  
 Zeke SM-thinks-fv Agr-that Mike Neg SM-OM-like-fv Agr-own not  
 ‘Zeke thinks that Mike likes him’
- d) E-barua e-ya Zeke ya-lom-a a-li Mike se a-mu-siim-a  
 CL3-letter Agr-of Zeke SM-said-fv Agr-that Mike Neg SM-OM-like-fv  
 omweene ta  
 Agr-own not  
 ‘Zeke’s letter said that Mike does not like him’
- e) Zeke a-ulil-a a-li Maria se a-mu-siim-a omweene ta  
 Zeke SM-heard-fv Agr-that Mary Neg SM-OM-like-fv Agr-own not  
 ‘Zeke heard that Mary does not like him’
- f) Zeke a-bool-el-w-a a-li Maria se-a-mu-siim-a omweene ta  
 Zeke SM-told-TNS-PASS-fv Agr-that Mary Neg-SM-OM-like-fv Agr-own not  
 ‘Zeke was told that Mary dies not like him’
- D13 a) Zeke a-lom-a a-li omweene a-ba a-e-fwar-a omweene  
 Zeke SM-said-fv Agr-that Agr-own SM-had SM-RFM-dressed-fv Agr-own  
 ‘Zeke said that he had dressed himself
- b) Zeke a-lom-a a-li omweene a-ba a-e-umis-ya omweene  
 Zeke SM-said-fv Agr-that Agr-own SM-had SM-RFM-wounded-fv Agr-own  
 ‘Zeke said that he had wounded himself’
- c) Zeke a-lom-a a-li omweene a-ba a-e-sal-a omweene  
 Zeke SM-said-fv Agr-that Agr-own SM-had SM-RFM-tattooed-fv Agr-own  
 ‘Zeke said that he had tattooed himself.’

Comment: One thing is clear: The position of the antecedent in Lubukusu is not confined to the subject position. As noted earlier, the anaphoric elements are always free to refer to

- Any higher NP, within the sentence so long as the RCM is not attached to any verb, in which case the subject of the reflexivised verb will be the natural antecedent regardless of the number of clauses that may intervene.
- *Agr-eene* can itself occur in a subject position and hence can be antecedent to another *Agr-eene* within the same sentence.
- In possessive constructions, both NP's can be antecedents. In Zeke's case, however, the introduction of an object marker will block 'mother' from being an antecedent leaving Zeke as a possible antecedent. (D12d) is slightly different because a letter in non-human and cannot antecede a human reflexive.

Note also that (D13) instantiates cases of coreference by an intermediary. Since the higher reflexive corefers with Zeke and it is in turn the antecedent of the lower reflexive, then it turns out that the lower reflexive is also coreferential with Zeke. (Remember that under normal circumstances, RFM block long-distance anaphora).

#### 4.4.2 Antecedent properties

##### 4.4.2.1 Person

D11'a) Larry a-m-bool-el-a      Ese a-li Mike se a-ya-siim-a samweene ta  
 Larry SM-OM-told-TNS-fv me Agr-that Mike Neg SM-OM-like-fv Agr-own not  
 'Larry told me that Mike does not like me'

b) Ewe wa-bool-el-a      Larry o-li      Mike se a-khu-siim-a      wamweene ta  
 You SM-told-TNS-fv Larry Agr-that Mike Neg SM-OM-like-fv Agr-own not  
 'You told Larry that Mike does not like you'

c) Ese na-bool-el-a      Larry n-di samweene se na-siim-a Mike ta  
 I SM-told-TNS-fv Larry Agr-that Agr-own Neg SM-like-fv Mike not  
 'I told Larry that I don't like Mike'

d) Larry a-khu-bool-el-a ewe a-li      wamweene se wa-siim-a Mike ta  
 Larry SM-told-TNS-fv you Agr-that Agr-own Neg SM-like-fv Mike not  
 'Larry told you that you do not like Mike'

e) Larry a-many-il-e      a-li efwe khu-kanakan-a khu-li Mike se  
 Larry SM-knows-TNS-fv Agr-that Zeke SM-thinks-fv Agr-that Mike Neg  
 a-khu-siim-a fwabeene ta  
 SM-OM-like-fv Agr-own not  
 'Larry knows that we think that Mike does not like us'

f) Enywe mu-many-il-e      mu-li Larry a-kanakan-a a-li Mike se  
 You SM-know-TNS-fv Agr-that Larry SM-thinks-fv Agr-that Mike Neg  
 a-mu-siim-a mwabeene ta

SM-OM-like-fv Agr-own not  
'You know that Larry thinks that Mike does not like you'

D12'a) Mayi ow-a ese a-kanakan-a a-li Mike se a-ya-siim-a  
Mother Agr-of me SM-thinks-fv Agr-that Mike Neg SM-OM-like-fv  
samweene ta  
Agr-own not  
'My mother thinks Mike does not like me'

b) Mayi ow-a owo a-kanakan-a a-li wamweene se wa-siim-a Mike ta  
Mother Agr-of you SM-thinks-fv Agr-that Agr-own Neg SM-e-fv Mike not  
'Your mother thinks that you do not like Mike'

c) Enywe mu-kanakan-a mu-li Mike se a-mu-siim-a mwabeene ta  
You SM-thinks-fv Agr-that Mike Neg SM-OM-like-fv Agr-own not  
'You think that Mike does not like you'

d) Ebarua ey-a efwe ya-lom-a e-li Mike se a-khu-siim-a  
CL9 letter Agr-of us SM-said-fv Agr-that Mike Neg SM-OM-like-fv  
fwabeene ta  
Agr-own not  
'Our letter said that Mike does not like us'

e) Ese na-ulil-a n-di Maria se a-ya-siim-a samweene ta  
I SM-heard-fv Agr-that Mary Neg SM-OM-like-fv Agr-own not  
'I heard that Mary does not like me'

f) Enywe mwa-bool-el-w-a mu-li Maria se-a-mu-siim-a mwabeene ta  
You SM-told-TNS-PASS-fv Agr-that Mary Neg-SM-OM-like-fv Agr-own not  
'You were told that Mary does not like you'

D13'a) Ese na-lom-a n-di samweene na-ba na-e-fwaar-a samweene  
I SM-said-fv Agr-that Agr-own SM-had SM-RFM-dressed-fv Agr-own  
'I said that I had dressed myself'

b) Ewe w-lom-a o-li wamweene wa-ba wa-e-umis-ya wamweene  
You SM-said-fv Agr-that Agr-own SM-had SM-RFM-wounded-fv Agr-own  
'You said that you had wounded yourself'

c) Efwe khwa-lom-a khu-li fwabeene khwa-ba khwa-e-sal-a fwabeene  
We SM-said-fv Agr-that Agr-own SM-had SM-RFM-tattooed-fv Agr-own  
'We said that we had tattooed ourselves'

**Comment:** First and second persons are very restrictive in the sense that they will always pick out a reflexive however deeply embedded it is in the structure. The reflexives can also be antecedents to other reflexives in the same sentence.

#### 4.4.2.2 Quantified antecedents

- D11" a) Larry a-bool-el-a buli omwaana a-li Mike se a-mu-siim-a  
Larry SM-told-TNS-fv every child Agr-that Mike Neg SM-OM-like-fv  
omweene ta  
Agr-own not  
'Larry told every child that Mike does not like them'
- b) Mbaomwaana owa-bool-el-a Larry a-li Mike se a-mu-siim-a  
No child SM-told-TNS-fv Larry Agr-that Mike Neg SM-OM-like-fv  
omweene ta  
Agr-own not  
'No child told Larry that Mike does not like them'
- c) Ba-baana ba-kali ba-bool-el-a Larry ba-li babeene se  
CL2-child Agr-many SM-told-TNS-fv Larry Agr-that Agr-own Neg  
ba-siim-a Mike ta  
SM-like-fv Mike not  
'Many children told Larry that they do not like Mike'
- d) Larry a-ba-bool-el-a a-li babeene se ba-siim-a Mike ta  
Larry SM-OM-told-TNS-fv Agr-that Agr-own Neg SM-like-fv Mike not  
'Larry told them that they do not like Mike'

**Comment:** for D11" a) and b) *Agr-eene* behaves in the same way as with non-quantified antecedents: It is free to refer to Larry, the quantified NP or an extra-sentential antecedent. Not the agreement features of the quantified NP. In c, Larry is excluded as a possible antecedent because of agreement. In d), making the NPs null triggers a plural object marker and therefore, also excludes Larry as a potential antecedent.

#### 4.4.2.3 Split Antecedents

- D14 a) Ozzie a-kachul-a khu Harriet khu babeene  
Ozzie SM-talked-fv about Harriet to Agr-own  
'Ozzie talked about Harriet to themselves'
- b) Ozzie a-kachul-a khu babeene khu Harriet  
Ozzie SM-talked-fv about Agr-own to Harriet  
'Ozzie talked about themselves to Harriet'
- c) Ozzie a-kachul-il-a Harriet ke babeene ne babeene  
Ozzie SM-talked-APP-fv Harriet of Agr-own with Agr-own  
'Ozzie talked to Harriet about each other'
- d) Ozzie a-bol-el-a Harriet a-li babeene ba-khoy-a ba-ch-e  
Ozzie SM-told-TNS-fv Harriet Agr-that Agr-own SM-should-fv SM-go-fv  
'Ozzie told Harriet that they should go/leave'

e) Ozzie a-bol-el-a Harriet a-li Billi se a-ba-siim-a babeene ta  
 Ozzie SM-told-TNS-fv Harriet Agr-that Bill Neg SM-OM-like-fv Agr-own not  
 ‘Ozzie told Harriet that Bill does not like them’

f) Ozzie a-lom-a a-li Harriet a-kanakan-a a-li Billi se  
 Ozzie SM-said-fv Agr-that Harriet SM-thinks-fv Agr-that Bill Neg  
 a-ba-siim-a babeene ta  
 SM-OM-like-fv Agr-own not  
 ‘Ozzie said that Harriet thinks that Bill dislike them’

**Comment:** Lubukusu allows split antecedents to be referred to collectively by *Agr-eene* or even the phrasal reciprocal. These anaphoric elements may also have extra-sentential antecedents.

D14’a) Wanjusi aboleela omukhasi wewe ali yenyekha besiime (babeene)  
 Wanjusi a-boleel-a omukhasi o-wewe a-li ya-enyekh-a ba- e-siim-e babeene  
 Wanjusi SM-told-fv CL1wife Agr-his Agr-that it-supposed-fv SM-RFM-love-fv  
 Agr-own

‘Wanjusi told his wife that they are supposed to love themselves’

b) Wanjusi aboleela omukhasi wewe ali yenyekha basiimane  
 Wanjusi a-boleel-a omukhasi o-wewe a-li ya-enyekh-a ba-siim-an-e  
 Wanjusi SM-told-fv CL1wife Agr-his Agr-that it-supposed-fv SM-love-RCM-fv  
 ‘Wanjusi told his wife that they are supposed to love each other’

**Comment :**Both the RFM and the RCM in these sentences are construed with the split antecedent. There is also a possibility of an extra-sentential antecedent.

**Ken:** I think the split antecedent is only possible for RFM and RCM because the local antecedent, the local pro-drop subject, can take a split antecedent. The antecedent that the RFM+AGR-*eene* takes, for example, is simply the plural subject of that clause.

#### 4.4.2.4 Discourse antecedents

**Comment:** In this case, I presume, the focus is on referring pronouns in discourse. I will therefore not provide a word for word gloss of the examples provided. Instead, I will underline those pronouns that help in creating coreference with the discourse antecedent in question. I will then make generalisations on what, in my view, could be the general trend.

D15 Mark a-ri-ir-e a-li omwaana owewe omweene se a-ba omulekhule  
 Mark SM-feared-Asp-fv Agr-that CL1child Agr-his Agr-own Neg SM-was CL1-free  
 ta. Owa-chana a-e-son-ya a-li omweene ne omweene se a-nyal-a  
 not. Agr-same SM-RFM-ashamed-fv Agr-that Agr-own with Agr-own Neg SM-can-fv  
 khu- lind-a ba-lebe bewe ba simbi ta. Bawandaye ba-kha-mu-kanakan-  
 to-protect-fv CL2-relatives Agr-his Agr-of near not. CL2-brothers SM-Asp-OM-think-  
 il-e siina?

APP-fv what?

‘Mark feared that his child was not safe. He was ashamed that he could not

protect his closest relatives. What would his cousins think of him?’

D16 Mark e-sindukh-a khu- bon-a sifwane siewe omweene mulikaseti.  
Mark SM-shocked-fv to-see-fv CL7picture Agr-his Agr-own CL18paper.  
Balondi bewe boosi ba-la-mu-ilukh-a omweene. A-la-bool-el-a  
CL2followers Agr-his Agr-all SM-Asp-OM-abandon-fv Agr-own SM-Asp-tell-APP-fv  
a-rie mayi o-wewe.  
Agr-how mother Agr-his  
‘Mark was shocked to see his picture in the paper. All of his supporters would  
abandon him. How would he tell his mother?’

**Comment:** Once the first pronoun refers to Mark, the rest will automatically do the same whether they are reflexive or not. Note also the use of ‘Agr-*chana*’ in D15 as a discourse pronoun. In addition, the special discourse pronoun ‘Agr-*chana*’ interchanges with other pronouns to emphasise the fact that it is the same person being referred to. Its selection is free as it may occur in any pronoun position.

D17 Morris a-lom-a a-li ya-b-a e-suku e-ndume khu Mark. Ebweni, Morris  
Morris SM-said-fv Agr-that SM-was-fv CL3-day Agr-hard to Mark. CL3first, Morris  
a-mu-bool-el-a omweene a-li li-toka li-ewe li-ab-a  
SM-OM-told-APP-fv Agr-own Agr-that CL5-car Agr-his SM-was-fv  
li-eb-w-a. Mala owa-chana e-l-a khu-bukul-a e-takisi  
Agr-stolen-Pass-fv Then Agr-same SM-came-fv to-take-fv CL3-taxi  
khu-mu-yiil-a omweene khu milimo. A-uk-a a-li owa-chana  
to-OM-take-fv Agr-own to work SM-thought-fv Agr-that Agr-same  
a-kha-kasirik-e.  
SM-Asp-angry-fv  
‘Morris said it was a difficult day for Mark. First, Morris told him that his car  
had been stolen. Then he had to hire a taxi to take him to work. Morris  
thought he might be angry’.

D18A: Lola, Ao Mark!

Look, there Mark

B: Owa-chana a-li omu-miliyu po.

Agr-same Agr-that CL1-handsome so

A: Ese se e-nyal-a ne-ny-a khu-ba omu-khasi o-wewe ka-kha-b-a

I Neg SM-can-fv SM-want-fv to-be CL1-wife Agr-his it-Asp-is-fv

ka-rio. Ba- khasi b-oosi kha-ba-mu-lond-a kho omweene.

Agr-that CL2-women Agr-all Asp-SM-OM-follow-fv on Agr-own

B: Lundi, ese en-kanakana en-di owa-chana a-e-fum-ya omweene lukali

Also, I SM-think Agr-that Agr-same SM-RFM-praised-fv Agr-own much

po!

so

A: Look, there's Mark!

B: He is so handsome.

A: I would not want to be his wife though. All the women are chasing him.

B: Also, I think he praises himself too much.

### 4.4.3 Blocking effects

#### 4.4.3.1 Features of intervening subjects

- D19 a) Larry a-kanakan-a a-li Yohana a-mu-ri-a omweene  
Larry SM-thinks-fv Agr-that John SM-OM-respects-fv Agr-own  
'Larry thinks that John respects him'
- b) Larry a-kanakan-a a-li ese na-mu-ri-a omweene  
Larry SM-thinks-fv Agr-that I SM-OM-respect-fv Agr-own  
'Larry thinks that I respect him/
- c) Larry a-kanakan-a a-li Maria a-mu-ri-a omweene  
Larry SM-thinks-fv Agr-that Mary SM-OM-respects-fv Agr-own  
'Larry thinks that Mary respects him'
- d) Larry a-kanakan-a a-li ba-soleli ba-mu-ri-a omweene  
Larry SM-thinks-fv Agr-that CL2-boy SM-OM-respects-fv Agr-own  
'Larry thinks that (the) boys respects him'
- e) Ba-saani ba-kanakan-a ba-li ba-soleeli ba-ba-ri-a babeene  
CL2-man SM-think-fv Agr-that CL2-boy SM-OM-respect-fv Agr-own  
'(The) men think that (the) boys respect them'
- D20 a) Larry a-kanakan-a a-li Billi a-many-il-e a-li Dave  
Larry SM-thinks-fv Agr-that Bill SM-knows-TNS-fv Agr-that Dave  
a-mu-ri-a omweene  
SM-OM-respects-fv Agr-own  
'Larry thinks that Bill knows that Dave respects him'
- b) Larry a-kanakan-a a-li ese e-many-il-e endi Dave  
Larry SM-thinks-fv Agr-that I SM-know-TNS-fv Agr-that Dave  
a-mu-ri-a omweene  
SM-OM-respects-fv Agr-own  
'Larry thinks that I know that Dave respects him'
- c) Larry a-kanakan-a a-li Maria a-many-il-e a-li Dave  
Larry SM-thinks-fv Agr-that Mary SM-knows-TNS-fv Agr-that Dave  
a-mu-siim-a omweene  
SM-OM-like-fv Agr-own  
'Larry thinks that Mary knows that Dave likes him'
- d) Ba-saani ba-kanakan-a ba-li ba-soleeli ba-many-il-e bali Dave  
CL2-man SM-think-fv Agr-that CL2-boy SM-know-TNS-fv Agr-that Dave  
a-ba-ri-a babeene  
SM-OM-respect-fv Agr-own  
'(The) men think that (the) boys know that Dave respects them'

Comment: In (D19), *Agr-ene* has only two possible antecedents; Larry and an extra-sentential one. Number, person and gender of intervening subjects play no role in blocking coreference. In (D20), the same is true only that if intervening subjects share agreement features with the target antecedent, then coreference with such NPs is possible (a, c, d). Conversely if intervening subjects have different agreement features from the target antecedent, then such an antecedent will be the only possibility within the sentence (see b). Instead of having a blocking effect, Lubukusu has a ‘transparent effect’. Remember blocking may only occur in clausemate coconstrual where an object marker blocks the subject of that clause.

Consider:

- D20’ a) Jack a-ba-kanakan-il-e a-li Lisa a-many-il-e a-li Wendy  
 Jack SM-OM-thinks-APP-fv Agr-that Lisa SM-know-tns-fv Agr-that Wendy  
 a-ba-siim-a babeene  
 SM-OM-likes-fv Agr-own  
 ‘Jack thought for them that Lisa thinks that Wendy likes them’
- b) Jack a-ba-kanakan-il-e a-li ba-baana ba-many-il-e ba-li Wendy  
 Jack SM-OM-thinks-APP-fv Agr-that CL2-child SM-know-tns-fv Agr-that Wendy  
 a-ba-siim-a babeene  
 SM-OM-likes-fv Agr-own  
 ‘Jack thought for them that the children think that Wendy likes them’

Comment: Notice that the complementizers agree with the matrix subject of the subordinate clause in which they occur. This is why when ‘Lisa’ changes to *babaana* in b), agreement also changes correspondingly. However construal remains with the OM whose thoughts are being reported.

#### 4.4.3.2 Positions of the intervener

- D21 a) Walter a-kanakan-a a-li Billi a-bol-el-a Harry a-li Dave  
 Walter SM-thinks-fv Agr-that Bill SM-told-TNS-fv Harry Agr-that Dave  
 a-mu-ri-a omweene  
 SM-OM-respect-fv Agr-own  
 ‘Walter thinks that Bill told Harry that Dave respects him’
- b) Walter a-kanakan-a a-li Billi a-m-bol-el-a ese a-li Dave  
 Walter SM-thinks-fv Agr-that Bill SM-told-TNS-fv me Agr-that Dave  
 a-mu-ri-a omweene  
 SM-OM-respect-fv Agr-own  
 ‘Walter thinks that Bill told me that Dave respects him’
- c) Walter a-m-bol-el-a ese a-li Dave a-mu-ri-a  
 omweene  
 Water SM-OM-told-TNS-fv me Agr-that Dave SM-OM-respects-fv Agr-own  
 ‘Walter told me that Dave respects him’



- d) Walter a-lom-a a-li Dave a-m-ba si-tabu khu omweene  
 Walter SM-said-fv Agr-that Dave SM-OM-gave-fv CL7-book on Agr-own  
 ‘Walter said that Dave gave me a book on him’

#### 4.4.4 Islands

Note that syntactic islands do not affect the coreference strategies under investigation. To save time I will only mention one example.

- D22a) Ira a-lob-a kamakuwa mbo Maria a-mu-biyiil-a omweene  
 Ira SM-refused-fv CL6-words that Mary SM-om-hates-fv Agr-own  
 ‘Ira resents the fact that Mary hates her’

#### 4.4.5 De se reading

- D23) Pavarotti a-many-a a-li e-suruali eyewe omweene e-khe-y-a  
 Pavarotti SM-knew-fv Agr-that CL3-pants Agr-his Agr-own SM-TNS-burning-fv  
 ‘Pavarotti knows that his own pants are burning’

- D24a) Pavarotti a-lom-a a-li omweene a-khe-mb-e lu-lwiimbo  
 Pavarotti SM-said-fv Agr-that Agr-own SM-TNS-sing-fv CL7-song  
 ‘Pavarotti said that he would sing the song’

- b) Pavarotti a-many-a a-li babaa-ndu ba-mu-siim-a omweene  
 Pavarotti SM-believe-fv Agr-that CL2-people SM-OM-like-fv Agr-own  
 ‘Pavarotti believes that people like him’

Comment: In all the sentences both de se and non- de se readings are possible i.e. Pavarotti knows Agr-*eene* refers to him or may refer to somebody else (when in fact it refers to him). There is no special way of ensuring one reading alone.

A potential perspective effect:

- D24’a) Jack a-e-kanakan-il-e a-li Lisa a-many-il-e a-li Wendy  
 Jack SM-RFM-thinks-APP-fv Agr-that Lisa SM-know-tns-fv Agr-that Wendy  
 a-mu-siim-a omweene  
 SM-OM-likes-fv Agr-own

‘Jack thought for himself that Lisa thinks that Wendy likes him’

- b) Jack a-e-kanakan-e a-li Lisa a-many-il-e a-li Wendy  
 Jack SM-RFM-thinks-fv Agr-that Lisa SM-know-tns-fv Agr-that Wendy  
 a-mu-siim-a omweene  
 SM-OM-likes-fv Agr-own

‘Jack thought (for) himself that Lisa thinks that Wendy likes him’

Comment: The applicative is obligatory in cases where one is doing something on behalf of another person. If it is on ones own behalf, then the applicative is optional, but the RFM is obligatory to ensure construal with the antecedent of the RFM.