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Abstract
Aspects of the grammar of proper names in the Gabonese Bantu language Orungu are described and tentatively explained, with special attention for agreement and definiteness marking. Proper names have a mixed agreement pattern that differs from that of the common nouns with which they are related. Definiteness marking is redundant on proper names, which are inherently definite. The difference between definite and non-definite tone patterns is recuperated to express other semantic-pragmatic values. Although the main focus is on personal names and place names, we pay attention to different types of names, including autonyms and names for numbers and languages. A noteworthy conclusion is that in order to arrive at a satisfying description, we need to define a new grammatical category, viz. that of deproprial nouns.

1. Introduction
This paper provides a description and analysis of the grammatical behaviour of proper names in the Gabonese Bantu language Orungu (B11b).¹ Orungu is spoken in

---

¹ The research for this chapter was carried out while Mark was a postdoctoral researcher at the Center for Grammar, Cognition and Typology at the University of Antwerp, funded by a grant from the Research Foundation - Flanders. We wish to thank Georgette Assakouno, Gertrude Azizè, Elie Mensah, Jean-Claude Ngaka and Céline Nkondo-Igana for sharing their grammatical intuitions with us, as well as Claire Grégoire and Dmitry Idiatov for their useful comments. The following abbreviations are used: 1, 2, 3, … overt noun class markers; I, II, III, … agreement markers; DEM
the Ogooué-Maritime province, in the city of Port Gentil and its surroundings. It is part of the Myene dialect cluster, which also includes the variants Adjumba, Nkomi, Mpongwe, Galwa and Enenga. The second author’s PhD thesis (Ambouroue 2007) is the first description of Orungu. It provides a thorough analysis of the (morpho-) phonology and morphology of the language, and pays special attention to its tonology, which is very complex.

Proper names have recently received significant theoretical attention, among others in monographs by Van Langendonck (2007) and Anderson (2007). Theoretical claims on proper names tend to be based on data from European languages, which is partly due to a lack of detailed descriptions of the grammar of proper names in lesser studied languages. One of our goals is to provide such a description. We follow Van Langendonck’s approach of proper names, which is itself inspired by (Radical) Construction Grammar. In this approach the term *proper name* does not refer to a member of a lexical class, but to a word that has certain semantic-pragmatic characteristics in a specific usage.² Van Langendonck (1999, 2007) proposes the term *proprial lemma* for lexical items such as Homer, Marge and Springfield, which are typically, but not necessarily construed as proper names. The proprial lemma *Marge* is construed as a proper name in *Marge has blue hair* but as a common noun in *That’s funny, I also know a Marge who has blue hair*. Appellative lemmas such as barbecue can only marginally be construed as proper names, viz. in autonymic usage (see Section 4.1). Finally, proprio-appellative lemmas are as likely to be construed as proper names as they are to be construed as common nouns. Brand names are typical examples.

---

² Van Langendonck (2007:87) provides the following definition of proper names, containing pragmatic, semantic and syntactic criteria: “A proper name is a noun that denotes a unique entity at the level of established linguistic convention to make it psychosocially salient within a given basic level category [pragmatic]. The meaning of the name, if any, does not (or not any longer) determine its denotation [semantic]. An important formal reflex of this pragmatic-semantic characterization of proper names is their ability to appear in such close appositional constructions as *the poet Burns, Fido the dog, the River Thames, or the City of London* [syntactic].”
Some languages have no or very few proprial lemmas. Name giving in these languages usually implies the selection of an appellative lemma or phrase. For instance, Orungu has personal names such as òɣándáɣá, ɲgùwà and Ʌwèŋgà, which mean ‘good health’, ‘shield’ and ‘choir’ when not used as proper names. Some place names are àbélóɣò, òkòlòŋgò and àɾáŋgá, which respectively mean ‘he was desired’, ‘a dry tree’ and ‘don’t you hope’ if not used as a proper name. The selection of a word or phrase in the act of name giving sometimes had a wish character or an anecdotic motivation in the traditional name giving system: the noun mbùndá ‘war fetish’ could be chosen as the name for a child born during a war, or àzízà ‘comfort you’ for a child that comes after a number of miscarriages or stillbirths. Today, children are more often named after their father and another family member or dear friend; and more anecdotic motivations are disappearing. Anyway, the ‘meaning’ of names in languages with no or few proprial lemmas is at most a connotative meaning. Proper names in the world’s languages have in common that they have no asserted meaning and that their (presupposed) meanings do not determine their denotation (see Van Langendonck 2007:90).

In this paper we will focus on proper names as a grammatical category defined by morpho-syntactic properties regarding agreement and definiteness. Proper names trigger surprising agreement patterns in Orungu. Although they can be perfectly homonymous to common nouns, because they are based on the same appellative lemma, they do not trigger the agreement pattern predicted by their overt class prefix, nor can their agreement be explained in terms of semantic agreement based on human/animate reference. As for definiteness, it is marked by means of a special tone pattern in Orungu. Since proper names are inherently definite, definiteness marking is redundant and can be recuperated for other means, e.g. marking sarcasm or depreciating connotations.

---

3 In the new naming pattern children receive three names: a Christian first name, the name of their father and the name of another family member.

4 It is sometimes useful to explicitly distinguish between semantic-pragmatic comparative concepts on the one hand and language particular descriptive categories on the other, e.g. by capitalising the latter. We will not do so here, at the cost of a certain ambiguity in the use of the term proper name. See the analysis of Kirundi proper names in Van de Velde (to appear) for a discussion.
In the absence of a text corpus, our analysis is necessarily based on introspection and elicitation with native speakers. We worked with seven consultants between the ages of forty and eighty, men and women, all fluent in Orungu. We asked them to judge the grammaticality of Odette’s examples, to translate utterances from French and to produce utterances for which we provided the context in Orungu. The notation of examples and most of their morphological analyses follow the conventions used in Ambouroue (2007). We will first describe agreement (Section 2) and then definiteness marking (Section 3). Section 4 discusses some non-prototypical types of proper names. Finally, we will argue that the grammatical categories common noun and proper name do not suffice to describe all the facts and that we need another grammatical category for nouns meaning ‘individual called X’, which are derived from proper names. We call this category deproprial nouns (Section 5).

2. Noun class and agreement

2.1. Introduction

One of the grammatical features that distinguish proper names from common nouns is their agreement. As is typical for Bantu languages, Orungu nouns have a nominal prefix that provides a good indication of the noun class to which they belong (so-called overt noun class marking). Also typical is the noun class agreement triggered by a noun (the agreement controller) on demonstratives, adjectives, verbs and pronouns (the agreement targets). Noun classes are defined by the groups of nouns that trigger the same agreement pattern. We will first briefly introduce the class system, then look at the behaviour of common nouns (2.2.) and then show how proper names deviate from this (2.3.). In what follows, we distinguish between syntactic agreement and semantic agreement, which are “cover terms to describe contrasting agreement properties” (Corbett 2006:156). Syntactic agreement refers to agreement based on the noun class of the controller, as predicted by its nominal prefix (and singular-plural noun class pairing). Semantic agreement, in contrast, refers to the choice of alternative agreement based on the semantic-pragmatic properties of the controller. A typical example of semantic agreement is the choice of agreement patterns I & II with animate or human controllers, whatever their noun
class (prefix), found in many Bantu languages. But semantic agreement need not be linked to semantic properties of the referent of the controller. In some Bantu languages controllers can also trigger semantic agreement because they are not in need of referential disambiguation, e.g. because they have unique denotation or because they are used generically (Van de Velde 2006).

Orungu has twelve classes. As is typical for the north-western Bantu languages, there are no locative classes. There are three series of agreement prefixes, one for adjectives, interrogatives and numerals (called nominal in Ambouroue (2007), because it is formally identical to the overt class marker on the noun), one for demonstratives, possessive modifiers, connectives (i.e. genitive markers) and pronouns (called pronominal) and one for verbs\(^5\) (called verbal). The pronominal and verbal series are identical, except in their form for class 1 agreement. Table 1 summarises the forms of the overt class prefixes and the agreement prefixes as proposed in Ambouroue (2007: 86). The form of the prefixes and their interaction with the following stem show some complications, which we will not discuss here. A more elaborate description can be found in Ambouroue (2007). We use Arabic numbers to refer to classes and overt noun class markers on nouns and Roman numbers to refer to agreement patterns.

\(^5\) Depending on the construction, relative verb forms have a pronominal prefix, or (apparently) free variation between a verbal and a pronominal prefix.
Table 1. Orungu agreement prefixes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>agreement pattern</th>
<th>nominal augment + prefix</th>
<th>pronominal prefix</th>
<th>verbal prefix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>ò-mò-ó-à-</td>
<td>ò-</td>
<td>à-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>à-wà-wá-wá-</td>
<td>wá-</td>
<td>wá-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>ò-mò-ó-ó-</td>
<td>ó-</td>
<td>ó-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>i-mí-</td>
<td>i-</td>
<td>i-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>í-ní-</td>
<td>ní-</td>
<td>ní-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>à-mà-mà-</td>
<td>mà-</td>
<td>mà-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>è-zè-zè-</td>
<td>zè-</td>
<td>zè-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>í-i-</td>
<td>i-</td>
<td>i-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>i-à-</td>
<td>i-</td>
<td>i-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>(s)ì-ì-</td>
<td>sè-</td>
<td>sè-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xb</td>
<td>(s)ì-ɗì-</td>
<td>sè-</td>
<td>sè-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>ò-wò-ó-ó-</td>
<td>ó-</td>
<td>ó-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The singular plural class pairings in Orungu are as follows:

Table 2: Singular-plural pairings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>singular</th>
<th>plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>10b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2. Noun class and agreement of common nouns
Non-human common nouns, including nouns denoting (higher) animals, always show “syntactic agreement”, i.e. on all agreement targets they trigger the prefix that can be expected on the basis of their overt noun class marker (1-3).\(^6\)

(1) a. èwón ìbòlò zínò zá*póswà, zó záɗyúwì
   7.lid VII.big VII.DEM VII.that.has.fallen VII.it VII.is.broken
   ‘This big pot lid that has fallen, it is broken.’
   
   b. èwón ìzámì
   7.lid VII.my
   ‘my pot lid’

(2) a. wó*ná ìbòlò yínò yá*póswà yó yáɗyúwì
   8.lid VIII.big VIII.DEM VIII.that.have.fallen VIII.they VIII.are.broken
   ‘These big pot lids that have fallen, they are broken.’
   
   b. wón iyá*mì ‘wánì
   8.lids VIII.my VIII.two
   ‘my two pot lids’

(3) a. ìrúwàn ìbòlò nyínò nyà*ràndìy ìŋkóndò nyáɗyúwì
   5.pelican V.big V.DEM V.who.liked 10.carps V.is.dead
   ‘This big pelican who liked carps is dead.’
   
   b. ìrúwànì nyámì
   5.pelican V.my
   ‘my pelican’

---

\(^6\) Claire Grégoire (p.c.) points out that there may be dialectal or idiolectal variation concerning the agreement properties of nouns denoting higher animals. She once worked with a speaker of a Myene variety who treated nouns denoting higher animals like human nouns with respect to agreement. Note in this respect that semantic agreement with common nouns denoting higher animals should be distinguished from the unusual agreement properties that animal names can have in tales, where they tend to be construed as proper names.
Common nouns with human reference also obligatorily trigger syntactic agreement (4-5), with two exceptions. First, subject agreement on non-relative verb forms and agreement on personal pronouns is optionally semantic, i.e. agreement pattern I in the singular and II in the plural (4a, 5a, 5c). Agreement on pronominal targets is much more likely to be semantic than subject agreement on verbs. Second, a definite class 3 head noun with human reference can trigger semantic subject agreement (pattern I) on a relative verb (6a). In both cases syntactic agreement is still preferred on verbal targets (4c, 5d, 5e, 6b). Thus, animate agreement in Orungu is much more restricted than in Kiswahili, for instance, where nouns for humans and higher animals obligatorily trigger agreement pattern I/II on every agreement target (Wald 1975).\(^7\) Also, the Orungu data confirm the typological generalisation that targets higher on the agreement hierarchy (attributive > predicate > relative pronoun > personal pronoun) are more likely to trigger semantic agreement (Corbett 1979).

\[(4)\]
\[\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{íšésà nyíŋò nyíɗyínà ìréɗwànà ɣùnù} \\
& 5.\text{girl } V.\text{DEM } V.\text{who.is.dancing } I.\text{does.not.live here} \\
& \text{‘This girl who is dancing does not live here.’} \\
\text{b. } & \text{íšés ‘inyámì} \\
& 5.\text{girl } V.\text{my} \\
& \text{‘my girl’} \\
\text{c. } & \text{íšésà nyíŋò nyíɗyínà nyéρéɗwànà ɣùnù} \\
& 5.\text{girl } V.\text{DEM } V.\text{who.is.dancing } V.\text{does.not.live here} \\
& \text{‘This girl who is dancing does not live here.’}
\end{align*}\]

\[(5)\]
\[\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{ášésà mínò mfɗyínà wéρéɗwànà ɣùnù} \\
& 6.\text{girls VI.these VI.who.are.dancing II.do.not.live here} \\
& \text{‘These girls who are dancing do not live here.’}
\end{align*}\]

\(^7\) There are some minor exceptions to this rule in Kiswahili, viz. when the agreement target is a possessive modifier or when the agreement controller is a diminutive or augmentative, derived by means of a preposed noun class marker of respectively class 7 or 5.
b. ásés  ويميَّمُبٍ
6.girls 1.my
‘my girls’

c. ásésa َنَعْتُوُدُمَأَرَىَمَاْلا
6.girls 11.they 11.are.dancing
‘The girls, they are dancing.’

d. ásésa ِمَنَأَرَىَمَاْلا
6.girls 611.they 611.are.dancing
‘The girls, they are dancing.’

e. ásésa َمِنَأَرَىَمَاْلا َمِرَعْدْوَنَأْرَىَمَاْلا ُغَنَّمَأْلا
6.girls 6111.these 61111.who. 61111111.who. 61111111.are.dancing 61111111.do.not.live 61111111 here
‘These young girls who are dancing do not live here.’

(6) a. َكَلََغَاَرَىَمَاْلا َدَيْمَأُرَىَمَاْلا َكَأَرَىَمَادَأْلا
3.youngster 1. 11.who. 11.is.dancing 3.stranger
‘The youngster who is dancing is a stranger.’

b. َكَلََغَاَرَىَمَاْلا َدَيْمَأُرَىَمَاْلا َكَأَرَىَمَادَأْلا
3.youngster 3111.who. 3111.is.dancing 3.stranger
‘The youngster who is dancing is a stranger.’

Note that syntactic agreement is also in all cases obligatory on predicatively used demonstratives.

(7) a. َكَلََغَاَرَىَمَاْلا َكَأَرَىَمَادَأْلا َكَأَرَىَمَادَأْلا
3.young.person 11.his 111.unique 111.DEM
‘This is his only young person.’ (e.g., the only one in his group)

2.3. Proper names: rules of agreement
Rules of agreement with proper name controllers are different from those triggered by common nouns. Interestingly, all types of proper names have the agreement properties of proper names: personal names (including bynames), the rare names for domestic animals and all kinds of place names, including hydronyms (see also
Section 4). Proper names with a non-nominal etymology as well as those derived from common nouns of class 1, 2, 3, 6 or 9 trigger agreement pattern IX on all agreement targets, except on pronominal and predicative targets, where they take agreement pattern I. Note that all nominal modifiers in the examples of this section have a non-restrictive interpretation.

(8) amɛ̀njɛ̀ woman’s name < ‘peace’ (cl 6)
    amɛ̀njɛ̀ yámì ‘nyàngónyàngò àɗyúwì
    Amɛ̀njɛ̀ IX.my IX.little 1.died
    ‘My little Amendje died.’

(9) òkéró woman’s name < ‘a part’ (cl 3)
    a. òkéró yínó
       Okero IX.DEM
       ‘Okero here’
    b. òkéró yámrì
       Okero IX.my
       ‘my Okero’
    c. òkéró àɓwáŋgwì
       Okero 1.arrives
       ‘Okero arrives.’

(10) òŋwá’ntínɔ́ŋgɔ̀ woman’s name < ‘a woman of the clan’ (cl 1)
    a. òŋwá’ntínɔ́ŋgɔ̀ èkɛ́ndà
       Ongwantinongo 1.leaves
       ‘Ongwantinongo leaves.’
    b. òŋwá’ntínɔ́ŋgɔ̀ yámrì
       Ongwantinongo IX.my
       ‘my Ongwantinongo’

---

8 With predicative targets we mean non relative verbs and predicatively used demonstratives.
9 This is a phrasal name headed by the class 1 noun ‘woman’.
(11) *ziza* woman’s name < ‘wipe!’ (imperative singular of the verb *ziza* ‘wipe’)

*ziz* *fyazò* àtònd òsàngè

Ziza IX.our 1.likes 3.beans

‘Our Ziza likes beans.’

(12) *òkolòngò* village name < ‘a dry tree’ (cl 3)

a. *òkolòngò* àkàò n ìyà

Okolongo 1.is.overrun by 5.forest

‘Okolongo is overrun by the forest.’

b. *òkolòngò* yìnò

Okolongo IX.DEM

‘Okolongo here’

c. *òkolòngò* àyè (nò) wìnò

Okolongo 1.PRO (PRE) 1.DEM

‘Behold/here is Okolongo’

(13) *àlòmbìyè* name of a lake (etymology unknown)

a. *àlòmbìyè* àlùwò éljò̀w éwyà

Alombye 1.was 7.lake VII.beautiful

‘Alombye was a beautiful lake.’

b. *àlòmbìyè* àyè wìnò

Alombye 1.PRO 1.DEM

‘Behold / here is (lake) Alombye.’

(14) *áyóyò* dog’s name < ‘the notables’ (cl 2)

a. *áyóyò* yázò ǎdyònl ìndjò̀yònl

[2]Ayogo IX.our 1.has.killed 10.chickens

‘Our Ayogo has killed the chickens.’

b. *áyóyò* àyè n ǎdíéndà yò

Ayogo 1.PRO PRE 1.did VIII.PRO (or: IX.PRO)

‘Ayogo, he is it who did it.’
c. ạ́yọ́yọ́, yérè mbwá y ólúndà, …
   Ayogo IX.who.is 9.dog IX.CON 3.well.behaved
   ‘Ayogo, who is a well-behaved dog, …’

Proper names derived from common nouns of class 7 or 5 trigger the same agreements as other proper names on predicative and pronominal targets, viz. pattern I (15, 16). But on adnominal targets they can alternatively take the normal proper name agreement of pattern IX or the agreement of their source nouns, with a preference for the latter.¹⁰

(15) èliwà woman’s name < ‘a laguna’ (cl 7)
   èliwà ądýómbì
   Eliwa t.has.married
   ‘Eliwa has married.’

(16) ìywàngá woman’s name < etymology unclear, but initial segments identical to a class 5 prefix
   a. ìywàngá nyìnɔ́ / ìywàngá yìnɔ́
      Igwanga V.DEM / Igwanga IX.DEM
      ‘Igwanga here’
   b. ìywàng iyázdɔ / ìywàng iyázdɔ
      Igwanga V.our / Igwanga IX.our
      ‘our Igwanga’

(17) ìrɛ́bá name of a peninsula, etymology unknown (cl 5)
   ìrɛ́bá àlùwó mbó’rá mbyá
   Ireva t.was 9.place IX.beautiful
   ‘Ireva was a beautiful place.’

¹⁰ In some cases, e.g. ìywè, the etymology of the name is not clear, but the word is nevertheless formally identifiable as a noun of a certain noun class (in this case 5), due to formal resemblance of its initial segment(s) with an overt class marker (in this case 1-).
(18) èsirà village name < Gisira (a B40 language/population) (cl7)
èsirà àlùwóɣ íɣà ɣ áŋgà
Eshira I.was 5.forest LOC 2.first
‘Eshira was a forest in the past.’

The few examples of proper names derived from class 10b nouns trigger agreement pattern V (preferred) or IX on the agreement targets lower on the agreement hierarchy, never Xb (19-20). This can be explained by the fact that Xb is a plural agreement pattern, whereas proper names are inherently singular. The choice for pattern V instead may be motivated by the fact that in many contexts the overt noun class markers of class 5 and 10b are identical. We found no proper names derived from nouns of class 4, 8, 10 and 14, which may or may not be a coincidence.

(19) ìɗyáβí man’s name < ‘the leaves’ (cl 10b)
ìɗyáβí nyínó/ yínó
Idyavi V.DEM / IX.DEM
‘Idyavi here’

(20) ìsàsà village name < ‘ferns’ (cl.10b)
a. ìsàsà àyɛ́ wínó
Isasa I.PRO I.DEM
‘Behold/here is Isasa.’
b. ìsàs àlùwó ŋká’lá mbyà
Isasa I.was 9.village IX.beautiful
‘Isasa was a beautiful village.’

2.4. Discussion of noun class and agreement of proper names
The data presented in the previous section bring up at least three questions, viz. (i) given their mixed agreement pattern, to which class do proper names belong?, (ii) how can the use of agreement patterns I and IX with proper name controllers be explained? and (iii) why do proper names derived from class 5, 7 or 10b nouns
behave differently from the others. We will address these three questions, without being able to provide definitive answers.

There are three possible answers to the question regarding the class assignment of proper names. Proper names could be analysed as hybrid nouns, as nouns belonging to a dedicated proper name class or as classless nouns that trigger enforced agreement. We will consider these three options in turn.

As is generally the case in Bantu languages, the agreement pattern triggered by a noun can be predicted on the basis of its morphological form, i.e. its overt noun class marker. The semantics of a noun, in contrast, predicts virtually nothing. Nevertheless, sometimes the semantics of a noun does have some influence on its agreement pattern, as we saw in section 2.2 with respect to human common nouns, which optionally trigger pattern 1 on predicative and pronominal targets. If the human common noun in question is not originally of class 1, the resulting agreement pattern is mixed. Corbett (1991) calls nouns that trigger such a mixed agreement pattern hybrid. Their noun class specification is the result of two conflicting noun class assignment principles: a formal and a semantic one. The mixed agreement pattern triggered by Orungu proper names (i.e. pattern 1 on predicative/pronominal and pattern IX on adnominal targets) cannot be straightforwardly analysed along these lines for at least two reasons. First, neither agreement pattern is formally motivated. Second, the selection of agreement pattern 1 on predicative targets with proper name controllers cannot be equated with that of human common noun controllers, since it is obligatory (rather than optional) and it is not restricted to personal proper names.

The second possible analysis is to reject the idea of a mixed agreement pattern and to simply define a thirteenth noun class to which all proper names belong. The resulting description would be relatively simple and elegant, if it weren’t for the proper names related to common nouns of class 5, 7 and 10b, for which other (sub)classes would need to be defined. The theoretical problem with this thirteenth class is that it requires a class assignment rule that differs profoundly from the usual

---

11 But note that the following reverse prediction can be made in most Bantu languages: if a noun is of class 1, it is most probably human. Note that unpredictable does not necessarily mean entirely unmotivated.
assignment rules, viz. one that assigns nouns to a class purely on the basis of their semantic-pragmatic characteristics, rather than on their formal characteristics.

The third solution is to claim that proper names lack a class specification, i.e. that they are classless. This is the analysis put forward in Van de Velde (2006) for proper names in the Cameroonian language Eton and suggested in Van de Velde (forthcoming) for proper names in Kirundi. Note that proper names have profoundly different agreement properties in these three closely related languages. Thus, a requirement for nouns to belong to a noun class in languages such as Eton, Kirundi and Orungu could be that they have a meaning that determines their reference.

This brings us to the question as to why agreement patterns I and IX are selected by these controllers that do not belong to either class 1 or 9. A partial answer can be given by pointing out the functions that agreement patterns I and IX have synchronically (functions other than marking class agreement, that is). We already saw that agreement pattern I optionally marks agreement with any human controller on targets high on the agreement hierarchy. Animacy can be seen as a manifestation of the more general property of salience/prominence, shared by all individuals that receive a proper name. A possible diachronic motivation is therefore that agreement pattern I marks agreement with inherently salient controllers on pronominal and predicative targets. Also, pattern I could be a default pattern on predicative targets, since it provides the verbal prefix in impersonal constructions (21). Proper names could then be said to trigger the default pattern due to their lack of a noun class specification.

(21) a. èsóká sǐŋkɛ́má
   1.scream 10.monkey
   ‘There are monkeys screaming.’ (lit. ‘It screams monkeys.’)

b. ěpóswá sìɗyàβí
   1.fall 10b.leaf
   ‘There are leafs falling.’ (lit. ‘It falls leafs.’)

c. èɗyánjà ànómé
   1.work 2.person
   ‘There are people working.’ (lit. ‘It works people.’)
A problem for investigating the functions of agreement pattern IX is that its markers are formally identical to those of pattern VIII (except on adjectives), so that often one cannot be sure whether VIII or IX is selected in a given situation. A possible way of dealing with this ambiguity is to analyse an agreement marker as pattern VIII when it clearly agrees with a plural controller and as IX when it does not.\footnote{One reviewer commented that we should specify that the controller must be \textit{semantically} plural in order to trigger agreement pattern VIII, since “we have seen examples where formal plurals are not treated as such.” Presumably what is meant are examples such as (8) and (14 a, c), where a proper name which originates in a plural common noun of respectively class 6 & 2 triggers agreement pattern IX on non-predicative targets. However, these proper names are not formally plural. They are monomorphemic. Their initial segments, which correspond to the class prefix of the common noun from which they originate, are not commutable (i.e. not formally separable) and do not have any meaning of their own, be it lexical or grammatical.} Evidence that agreement pattern IX is selected for agreement on adnominal targets with controllers that are directly referring (i.e. whose reference is not determined by a definitional meaning) comes from examples such as (22), where a pronominal controller is the antecedent of a non-restrictive relative clause. Again, it is not clear whether the plural pronouns trigger agreement of pattern IX or VIII in (22b).

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{myɛ́ yɪ́kó’kó nɛ̀ ŋkółó}
\textit{I IX.who.am.called that Nkolo}
\end{enumerate}
\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{àwɛ́ / àyɛ́ / àzwɛ́ / anwɛ́ yá’myénì yó táŋgünà}
\textit{you (sg.) / I.PRO / we / you (pl.) IX.who.can LOC read}
\end{enumerate}
\begin{enumerate}
\item ‘I, who am called Nkolo’
\item ‘You / he / we, who can read’
\end{enumerate}

When the antecedent is a third person pronoun of an agreement pattern other than I, agreement on the relative verb is syntactic.
(23) wáwó wá’myénì yó tángúŋà
    II.PRO II.who.can LOC read
    ‘They, who can read’

(24) [With what do you feed your sheep (sg.) (cl.5)?)
    o h  V.PRO V.who.eats 10b.leaves Xb.CON 4.young.bananas
    ‘Oh, him, who eats the leaves of young banana trees?’

Incidentally, in examples such as (24), pronouns referring to a cat or a dog can behave as those referring to humans, i.e., they can be of agreement pattern I and trigger agreement IX on the relative verb (25), contrary to pronouns referring to other animals. Note that cats and dogs are the only animals that receive a proper name in Orungu communities.

(25) [How do you feed your cat (cl.9)?)
    o h  I.PRO IX.who.catches 10.mice X.all
    ‘Oh, him, who catches all those mice?’

The choice of pattern IX for marking agreement with different types of unusual (classless) controllers throughout the Bantu languages could also have a formal motivation in that class 9 often lacks an overt prefix that commutes with another prefix in the plural (to a certain extent this is also the case in Orungu, since the initial s of the class 10 prefix appears in very few contexts). Therefore, it may be interpreted as the pattern that should be selected for controllers that lack noun class marking.

What remains to be discussed is the optional agreement of patterns V and VII triggered on targets lower on the agreement hierarchy by proper names derived from common nouns of class 5, 10b and 7. These facts may reflect two alternative scenarios. Either such names are frontrunners in a tendency to integrate proper names in the noun class system, or, conversely, they are the last ones to resist a tendency to extract proper names from the noun class system. If there is a single
tendency in the Bantu languages, it would take a thorough comparative study to find out which direction it takes. But in order for a comparative study to be possible, we would first need a sufficiently large number of descriptive studies on the grammatical behaviour of proper names. In the meantime we have to content ourselves with educated guesses. For two commentators on an earlier version of this paper, the second scenario, the one in which proper names gradually lose their class membership, is the more likely one, since it is functionally motivated. That is, proper names would acquire peculiar agreement properties in order to make them more easily distinguishable from their common noun homonyms. For some reason classes 5, 7 and 10b lag behind. We, in contrast, think that the first scenario is more likely to be correct. The functional motivation for the second scenario is not convincing for a number of reasons. First, situations of possible ambiguity between a proper name and the common noun on which it is based are highly unlikely. Moreover, non-restrictive modification of proper names is probably very rare. If there were a functional need for formal differentiation between proper names and common nouns, one would not expect it to arise in and be restricted to such a marginal construction. Second, in the Cameroonian Bantu language Eton, proper names can be formed by adding a suffix |-à| to an appellative lemma, which means that names are clearly formally distinguished from their related common nouns. Nevertheless, all proper names (including place names) trigger agreement pattern I in Eton, whatever their origin. The special agreements triggered by proper names in Orungu and Eton are arguably manifestations of the phenomenon commonly referred to as class 1a in Bantu linguistics (see Van de Velde 2006). The so-called class 1a is a set of nouns that trigger an agreement pattern (usually agreement pattern I) that is not foreseeable on the basis of the morphological class of the noun, often because the latter lacks an overt noun class marker. Depending on the language, this set of nouns contains proper names, kinship terms, borrowings, personified animals (see note 5) and the interrogative ‘who?’ The phenomenon referred to as class 1a must be ancient. Meeussen (1967:100), for instance, reconstructs it in Proto Bantu. Therefore, in order for the second scenario to be correct, we would have to assume either that Orungu passed through a phase of insertion of proper names into the noun class system (i.e. loss of the PB “class 1a”)
and that most proper names were subsequently extracted again, except those derived from class 5, 7 and 10b nouns, or that the exceptional behaviour of names based on class 5, 7 and 10b nouns is ancient itself. We find both assumptions unlikely. Moreover, if the agreement properties of Orungu proper names are a manifestation of the class 1a-phenomenon found widely within Bantu, which we think is correct, then they cannot be functionally motivated by a tendency to differentiate proper names from common nouns, because this functional motivation would fail to explain why proper names and kinship terms often behave the same in the Bantu languages (though not in Orungu). Rather, the explanation must be sought in the semantic-pragmatic characteristics that proper names and kinship terms have in common, viz. the fact that they refer uniquely, for proper names at the level of established linguistic convention within a certain community (Van Langendonck 2007:29) and for kinship terms at the level of usage, i.e. the reference of ‘(my) father’ depends on who is speaking.

3. Definiteness
3.1. Introduction
In Orungu, every common noun has two tone patterns in isolation, one overtly marked for definiteness and one not so marked. We can call these tone patterns DTP (Definite Tone Pattern) and NTP (Non-definite Tone Pattern) respectively. Tonal definiteness marking is illustrated in the examples in (26), which, incidentally, also show that the difference is not one of specificity.\(^{13}\)

(26) a. myákólì náɣó
   1SG.bought 9.house.NTP
   ‘I bought a house.’

   b. myákólì náɣò
   1SG.bought 9.house.DTP
   ‘I bought the house.’

\(^{13}\) This is the conclusion we reached on the basis of elicitation and introspection. Possible influence of French cannot be ruled out entirely.
The NTP corresponds best to the reconstructed Proto-Bantu nominal tone patterns, which are to a certain extent neutralised in the DTP. Table 3 presents the tone schemes of nouns in isolation. All nouns with a monosyllabic stem have the same structural tone, whereas the other stems come in four tone types, called A, B, C and D (with some minor differences between di-, tri- and polysyllabic stems, which should not bother us here). Note that these tone schemes undergo many changes and neutralisations depending on the construction and tonological context in which they are used. We will not explain the surface tonality of the examples in what follows, since this would bring us too far from the central topic of this paper (see Ambouroue 2007 for a description). The tone pattern of nouns in examples will be marked in the glosses.

Table 3: Definite and Non-definite tone patterns of Orungu nouns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-definite</th>
<th>Definite</th>
<th>gloss (noun class)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>monosyll.</td>
<td>ò-ɣá</td>
<td>ò-ɣà</td>
<td>king (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pá</td>
<td>pà</td>
<td>bones (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>òŋw-áná</td>
<td>òŋw-ánà</td>
<td>child (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ò-råmbáká</td>
<td>ò-råmbàkà</td>
<td>root (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>ò-màmbà</td>
<td>ò-mámbà</td>
<td>snake (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>èz-álìnà</td>
<td>èz-álìnà</td>
<td>comb (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>ò-ɣɔ́lí</td>
<td>ò-ɣɔ́lì</td>
<td>liana (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>im-pʰùŋgíní</td>
<td>im-pʰúŋgìnì</td>
<td>ways of throwing (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>à-lásà</td>
<td>á-ì-lásà</td>
<td>oranges (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>j-ì-mbólòŋgọ́</td>
<td>i-ìmbólọŋgọ́</td>
<td>eggplant (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ë-pòkólɔ́</td>
<td>è-pó’kólọ́</td>
<td>hat (7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The morphological structure of nouns is analysed as \( \ddot{v}-c\ddot{v} + \text{stem} \) in Ambouroue (2007), where \( \ddot{v} \)- is the augment or preprefix and \( c\ddot{v} \)- the overt class prefix. The tonality of definite nouns is due to a floating high tone inserted between the augment and the overt class prefix. This high tone is most probably the original tone of the augment, a morpheme that is reconstructed in Proto-Bantu as a separate word functioning as a (weak) demonstrative or anaphoric marker (Meeussen 1967:99).
Interestingly, the tonal and segmental parts of this morpheme seem to have gone their own way in the history of Orungu. The segmental part developed into a stage III-article (i.e. a mere noun class marker), whereas the tonal part became or remained a stage I article, i.e. a definite article (see Greenberg (1978) for the notion of stage I, II, III articles).

3.2. Definiteness as a characteristic of noun phrases
Definiteness is a characteristic of entire noun phrases. Demonstratives and anaphoric markers occur only in definite noun phrases and therefore cannot combine with indefinite nouns.

(27) a. náɣó yínó
9.house.DTP IX.DEM
‘this house’
b. *náɣó yínó
9.house.NTP IX.DEM
*‘this a house’

(28) a. náɣó mɛ̀yínó
9.house.DTP IX.aforementioned
‘the aforementioned house’
b. *náɣó mɛ̀yínó
9.house.NTP IX.aforementioned
*‘an aforementioned house’

Qualifying adjectives and numerals have a definite and a non-definite tone pattern, just like nouns. A noun and its dependent adjective or numeral have to be both definite or both non-definite (29-30).

---

14 It is not clear how the segmental part of the original augment acquired a low tone. This has little importance here.
(29) a. náŋó mpólò
   9.house.NTP IX.big.NTP
   ‘a big house’
b. náŋó mpólò
   9.house.DTP IX.big.DTP
   ‘the big house’

(30) a. náŋó mbání
   10.house.NTP X.two.NTP
   ‘two houses’
b. náŋó mbání / ìnáŋó mbání
   10.house.DTP X.two.DTP / 10.house.DTP X.two.DTP
   ‘the two houses’

Likewise, in connective (genitival) constructions the nouns linked by a
connective morpheme have to be either all definite or all indefinite (31).

(31) a. èwónà z ínçwánà
    7.lid.DTP VII.CON 9.kettle.DTP
    ‘the lid of the kettle’
b. *èwónà z ínçwánà
    7.lid.DTP VII.CON 9.kettle.NTP
    ‘the lid of a kettle’
c. èwónà z ínçwánà
    7.lid.NTP VII.CON 9.kettle.NTP
    ‘a lid of a kettle, a kettle lid’
d. *èwónà z ínçwánà
    7.lid.NTP VII.CON 9.kettle.DTP
    ‘a lid of the kettle’

Definiteness of the antecedent noun is also marginally relevant for the form of
a relative clause, in that the subject agreement prefix can be either pronominal or
verbal if the antecedent is definite, but only pronominal if it is indefinite. But remember that there is only one agreement pattern that differentiates between a pronominal and a verbal prefix, viz. pattern i.

(32) a. òɣàŋgà wíɗyíŋg / *éɗyíŋg òɣówà  
1.healer.NTP lwp.who.heals lwp.who.heals 3.jaundice.DTP 
‘a healer who heals jaundice’

b. òɣáŋɡà wíɗyíŋg / éɗyíŋg òɣówà  
1.healer.DTP lwp.who.heals lwp.who.heals 3.jaundice.DTP 
‘The healer who heals jaundice’

Possessive pronouns, finally, like demonstratives have only one tone pattern, but unlike demonstratives they can modify definite and indefinite nouns.

(33) a. náɣò yámì  
9.house.DTP IX.my 
‘my house’

b. náɣó yámì  
9.house.NTP IX.my 
‘a house of mine’

3.3. Proper names and definiteness
It is striking that a majority of Orungu proper names have an NTP, i.e. they are based on indefinite common nouns.¹⁵ Unlike common nouns, proper names do not have the definite-indefinite opposition, since proper names are inherently definite. If a personal proper name is based on an indefinite common noun, it will normally have an NTP in referential use (34) and if it is based on a definite common noun, it will always have a DTP in referential use (35).¹⁶

¹⁵ This preference might be linked to the observation that proper names tend to lack an augment in Bantu languages that have such a morpheme (see Greenberg 1978, Van de Velde 2006).

¹⁶ There is also a special vocative tone pattern that is the same for all nouns, viz. high on the first syllable, low on all subsequent syllables.
(34) a. kóndó ètánd íŋkóndò  
Nkondo. NTP 1.likes 10.tilapia  
‘Nkondo likes tilapia.’
b. *kóndó ètánd íŋkóndò.  
Nkondo. DTP 1.likes 10.tilapia

(35) a. ɗyáβí èpéz ɗyáβí  
Idyavi. DTP 1.burns 10b.leaf  
‘Idyavi burns the leaves.’
b. *ɗyáβí èpéz ɗyáβí.  
Idyavi. NTP 1.burns 10b.leaf

The restriction on connective constructions that all nouns in it have to be either definite or indefinite does not apply to connectives that contain a proper name as a modifying noun. Their head noun may be indefinite. The modifying proper names in (36-38) have their usual tone pattern: NTP in the personal name in (36) and the place name in (38) and DTP in the personal name in (37).17

(36) a. ǹdéɣò y ókéðò  
9.friend. DTP IX.CON Okero. NTP  
‘Okero’s friend’
b. ǹdèɣò y ókéðò  
9.friend. NTP IX.CON Okero. NTP  
‘a friend of Okero’s’

17 Note that place names are usually preceded by the locative preposition in connective constructions such as (38), in which case they always have a DTP. The examples without preposition in (38) are grammatical, but rather unusual. The obligatorily definite tone pattern of place names after the locative preposition is another grammatical characteristic that sets proper names apart from common nouns. It might somehow be related to the fact that there is widespread incompatibility between the locative classes and nouns of the so-called class 1a (see Grégoire 1975:23 for this observation).
(37) a. ǹdèɣò  y  íɗyàβì
    9. friend.DTP  IX.CON Idyavi.DTP
    ‘Idyavi’s friend’

b. ǹdèɣò  y  íɗyàβì
    9. friend.NTP  IX.CON Idyavi.DTP
    ‘a friend of Idyavi’s’

(38) a. òkìlì  w  ísásà
    3. road.DTP  III.CON Isasa.NTP
    ‘the road to Isasa’

b. òkìlì  w  ísásà
    3. road.NTP  III.CON Isasa.NTP
    ‘a road to Isasa’

Since definiteness marking is redundant on proper names, it can in principle be recuperated to convey other meanings. Van Langendonck (2007:202-212) shows that definite articles have a classificatory function in place names in many European languages. Thus, the more a toponym names a prototypical unit of human organisation, the less likely it is to be formally marked, e.g. with an article. Units of human organisation are, in decreasing order of prototypicality, settlements (cities and villages), countries and provinces. In English and Dutch none of these have an article.\(^{18}\) In French, the cut-off point is between settlements and countries. Van Langendonck points out that, in English, former colonies tend to lose their article when they gain independence (The Lebanon > Lebanon; The Sudan > Sudan), likewise for former regions when they acquire the status of states (The Ukraine >

\(^{18}\) One reviewer wondered about names such as The Hague, Dutch *Den Haag*. It is relatively easy to show that the historical article *The / Den* has been integrated in the name and does no longer function as a separate article. The difference with river names such as *the Rhine / de Rijn* that do take an article becomes apparent in English close appositional constructions, where the article has to be omitted: *The river (*the) Rhine*, but *The city (of) *(The) Hague*. Likewise, with a non-restrictive qualifying adjective we have in English: *the beautiful (*the) Rhine* versus *the beautiful *(The) Hague*; and in Dutch: *de mooie (*de) Rijn* versus *het mooie *(Den) Haag*. Note the article *het* in the last example! *Den Haag* has neuter gender, whereas *den* is the non-neuter form of the article.
Ukraine). In (Belgian) Dutch, the use of an article with the name of a peripheral province is depreciating (e.g. de Limburg for the province of Limburg), presumably because it hints at a lack of human organisation. With personal proper names, articles tend to express emotive meanings such as familiarity in some European languages. In Orungu, there are some circumstances in which proper names with an NTP can acquire a DTP usually accompanied by a marked intonation pattern.

(39) òkéró woman’s name < ‘a part’ (cl. 3)
òkérò yìnɔ́ (kɛ̂)
     Okero.DTP IX.DEM (also)
     ‘Really, Okero here’ (depreciating)

Note that the DTP is not caused by the non-restrictive demonstrative in (39). In (40) òkéró keeps its original NTP in the presence of the same demonstrative. However, the demonstrative has to be present in order for the DTP to appear.

(40) òkéró yìnɔ́
     Okero.NTP IX.DEM
     ‘Okero here’

A DTP is not strictly necessary to achieve the depreciating meaning conveyed in (39). With the same intonation, the same or a similar emotive meaning can be expressed by means of the normal form of the name (41). The exact semantic-pragmatic difference between (39) and (41) is hard to describe in the absence of contextualised examples from spontaneous discourse.

(41) òkéró yìnɔ́ (kɛ̂)
     Okero.NTP IX.DEM (also)
     ‘Really, Okero here’ (depreciating)

With place names as well, a name with an NTP can acquire a DTP when it is used in a depreciating way.
(42) **Isasa** village name < ‘ferns’ (cl 10b)
   a. **Isasa** nyínsó
      Isasa.NTP.V.DEM
      ‘Isasa here’
   b. **Isasa** nyínsó
      Isasa.DTP.V.DEM
      ‘this Isasa (what a terrible place)’

   In contrast, there are no circumstances in which a proper name with a DTP can acquire an NTP.

   Another way in which definiteness marking is recuperated as a means of conveying emotive meanings with proper names is with non-restrictive qualifying adjectives. As expected, non-restrictive adjectives have a DTP with proper names (evidently also when the latter have an NTP).

(43) **Igouwe** men’s or women’s name (etymology unknown, cl5)
   a. **Igouwe** mbyà
      Igouwe.NTP IX.beautiful.DTP
      ‘the beautiful Igouwe’
   b. **Igouwe** mpòlò
      Igouwe.NTP IX.fat.DTP
      ‘the fat Igouwe’

   However, these adjectives mean the opposite in the sarcastic or ironic reading that results from their use with an NTP. This way of marking irony is restricted to proper names. With common nouns, the combination of a definite noun with an indefinite adjective would be ungrammatical.

(44) a. **Igouwe** mbyà
    Igouwe.NTP IX.beautiful.NTP
    ‘the “beautiful” Igouwe’
b. ìɣùwè  mpóló  
Igouwè.NTP  IX.fat.NTP  
‘the “fat” Igouwe’

4. Less typical proper names

The examples of proper names used in the previous sections are mostly instances of prototypical proper names, viz. names of persons and settlements. Persons and settlements are psychosocially so salient that they are likely to receive a proper name in all human languages. Languages differ, however, with respect to the margins of their grammatical class of proper names. In this section we will briefly survey some less prototypical proper names (based on an overview in Van Langendonck 2007) and find out whether they belong to the grammatical category of Orungu proper names.

4.1. Autonyms

Van Langendonck (2007:246) argues that linguistic expressions that refer to themselves (i.e. autonyms or metalinguistic names) are construed as proper names. The Orungu data confirm this analysis: autonyms have formal properties of proper names. Nominal autonyms always have the NTP (45).

(45) òɣàŋg  îná  ny  órúŋgù
Oganga.NTP  5.name  V.CON  Orungu
‘Oganga is an Orungu word.’

More revealingly, autonyms trigger agreement pattern I on predicative targets. Any other agreement pattern is excluded.

(46) ònɛ́mɛ́ ‘a tongue’ (cl 3)
ònɛ́mɛ́  èrê  n  împìβínyí  mbání
ònɛ́mɛ́.NTP.I.is with  10.meaning  X.two
‘Oneme has two meanings.’
4.2 Bynames for persons
Since bynames for persons are usually chosen on the basis of a characteristic or occupation of the name bearer, they tend to have much stronger connotations than other personal names. Therefore, it might be hypothesised that the grammatical behaviour is similar to that of their source common noun. It turns out, however, that bynames function exactly as prototypical proper names, in having the morphosyntactic properties of proper names. We can take the example of an older man who used to be a schoolteacher and is usually called ònènji ‘the schoolmaster’. Note that this byname is a genuine proper name. It continued to be used after the man had retired (i.e. when he could no longer be called ònènji ‘a schoolmaster’) also by his grandchildren who called him kàkà ònènji ‘grandfather Onenji’. Compare the agreement of the byname in (47a) with that of the common noun in (47b).

(47) ònènji ‘the schoolmaster’ (cl 3)
  a. ònènji yázò
     Onenji.DTP IX-our
     ‘our Onenji’
  b. ònènji wázò
     3.schoolmaster.DTP III-our
     ‘our schoolmaster’

4.3. Numbers
Numbers can be construed as proper names, as in the examples in (48), where numbers trigger proper name agreement on predicative targets, rather than the expected syntactic agreement.

(48) a. cárò èbíá àbílá mbánl
     9.three 1.comes after 9.two
     ‘Three comes after two.’
 b. òrówà èzêlè ntángó mbyá
     3.six 1.is.not 9.number IX.good
     ‘Six is not a sacred number.’
4.4. Languages
As is not surprising for non-prototypical representatives of linguistic categories, words for languages show only partial proper name behaviour. On the one hand they lack the definite-indefinite opposition, they always have a DTP, but on the other hand they show syntactic agreement.

(49) a. èɾúŋgwàŋì zéɾétòkàmbò pòlò
7. Orungu VII.is.not.spoken.anymore a.lot
‘Orungu isn’t spoken a lot anymore.’

b. páŋwè yáté‘kàmbò pòlò
9. Fang IX.is.spoken 9.a.lot
‘Fang is spoken more and more.’

b. òpóñò wéra’tòkàmbò pòlò
3. Punu III.is.not.spoken.anymore a.lot
‘Punu isn’t spoken a lot anymore.’

4.5. Diseases, time intervals, biological species
In the Cameroonian Bantu language Eton certain specialised names for biological species (low on the biological taxonomy) have grammatical properties typical of proper names in that language (Van de Velde 2008:111). The same goes for words for months and days and some serious diseases in Dutch (Van Langendonck 2007:225, 245). Orungu does not have names for months and days or other comparable time intervals (except the borrowings sónò ‘Sunday’ and sótàdè ‘Saturday’). We found no evidence for proper name behaviour of words for diseases and biological species.

5. Deproprial common nouns
In the introduction we distinguished, following Van Langendonck, between proprial lemmas construed as proper names, e.g. Marge in *Marge has blue hair*, versus proprial lemmas construed as common nouns, e.g. Marge in *That’s funny, I also know a Marge who has blue hair*. In the latter example *Marge* means ‘person called
We will call such examples *deproprial nouns*. Semantically, deproprial nouns are somewhere in between common nouns and proper names *stricto sensu*. On the one hand they do not have the same restrictions on grammatical meaning that proper names have, i.e., they are not inherently definite, nor are they inherently singular.19 Also, they have an asserted meaning that determines their reference, viz. ‘individual called X’. On the other hand, this asserted meaning is truly minimal. It is not possible to identify a referent of a deproprial noun on the basis of their physical appearance or other characteristics. As with genuine proper names, an individual needs to be linked to a name by means of some kind of introduction. The distinction between common nouns and deproprial nouns is necessary in languages that have no or few proprial lemmas, since the same appellative lemma X can be used as a common noun with a full lexical meaning, as a proper name for an individual and as a noun meaning ‘individual called X’.

Since most proper names are derived from appellative lemmas in Orungu, the question arises whether from a grammatical point of view, deproprial nouns behave more like proper names, or more like common nouns. It turns out that grammatically, as semantically, deproprial nouns are somewhere in between. The differences between proper names and deproprial nouns are clearest in the plural, where deproprial nouns behave the same way as common nouns. Since proper names are inherently singular, they do not have a genuine plural. Rather, personal proper names can have an associative “plural”, meaning ‘X and associates’. Associativity is marked by the nominal prefix of class 2, irrespective of the noun class of the source noun from which the proper name is derived.20

(50) a. *w-ìɣùwè* ‘Iguwe and company’ (2-Iguwe)
    b. *wà-ngùwà* ‘Nguwa and company’ (2-Nguwa)

19 Note that names such as *The Netherlands* and *The Alps* have plural morphology, but refer to a single country and mountain range respectively.

20 Other types of proper names do not have a (associative) plural in Orungu, in contrast to languages like Xhosa, where place names can have an associative plural, meaning ‘X and surroundings’. In fact even common nouns can have an associative plural in Xhosa, meaning ‘X and similar things’ (Hendrikse 1990:391).
Agreement between an associative plural proper name and a verb is of pattern II (51). Such associative plural names cannot be modified, except by means of a relative clause, which also has agreement of pattern II.

(51) a. \(\text{wà-ngùwà wáfyéni}\)
   2-Nguwa II.have.come
   ‘Nguwa and company have come.’
   b. \(\text{w-èlùmì wáfyéni}\)
   2-Eloumi II.have.come
   ‘Eloumi and company have come.’

Deproprial common nouns, in contrast, can have a genuine plural. Mostly, this is the plural of the common noun from which the proper name is derived, following the usual singular-plural class pairings of the language (but see example 54 below). The agreement is always syntactic.

(52) \(\text{èlùmì woman’s name < ‘glory’ (cl 7)}\)
   a. \(\text{myámyénì lùmì wàñì}\)
      I.know 8.Eloumi.NTP VIII.TWO.NTP
      ‘I know two Eloumis.’
   b. \(\text{lùñì ‘wàñì yábyéni}\)
      8.Eloumi.DTP VIII.TWO.DTP VIII.have.come
      ‘The two Eloumis have come.’ (i.e. the two persons called *Eloumi*)

The deproprial noun in (53) ultimately derives from a noun of the “plural” class 6. The agreement is again syntactic.

(53) \(\text{àmènj ‘àmbànì máfyéni}\)
    6.Amendje.DTP VI.TWO VI.have.come
    ‘The two Amendjes have come.’
The plural of ìɗyáβì ‘the person called Idyavi’, ultimately derived from the class 10b noun ìɗyáβì ‘the leaves’, is a noun of class 6 (54). Normally class 10b is a plural class (viz. the plural of class 14), so we might have expected it to behave as the previous example, i.e., to remain unchanged in the plural. Instead, it behaves as if ìɗyáβì were a noun of class 5. This is related to the fact discussed in Sections 2.3 and 2.4 that proper names derived from class 10b words trigger agreement pattern V on adnominal targets and may be on their way to being integrated into class 5.

(54) myámyénì àɗyáβ ꜜáꜜmbánì
I.know 6.Idyavis.DTP VI.two
‘I know the two Idyavis.’

Plural deproprial lemmas are like common nouns with respect to definiteness marking as well. Indefinite plural deproprial nouns have an NTP, as against a DTP for definite ones. Compare (52a) to (55) and (54) to (56).21

(55) myámyénì lúꜜmí ꜜwánì
I.know 8.Eloumi.DTP VIII.two.DTP
‘I know the two Eloumis.’

(56) myámyénì àɗyàβ ꜜàmbànì
I.know 6.Idyavis.NTP VI.two.NTP
‘I know two Idyavis.’

In the singular, deproprial nouns behave more like proper names, with the difference that there is more variation in agreement patterns and definiteness marking. The most striking difference is that agreement on predicative targets is not (always) obligatorily of pattern I. Some of the variation can be seen in the elicited example sentences in (57-58). Introspection and elicitation did not allow to understand the difference in meaning or use between the NTP and the DTP in these

---

21 Another interesting observation with respect to the deproprial noun Idyavi is that its NTP is Low-Low, which is not the same as that of its source common noun ‘leafs’ (Low-High). We have not yet gathered more examples of this.
and similar examples. In (57a-b), for instance, the depripral noun behaves as a proper name in keeping its NTP, despite the definiteness of the noun phrase, whereas in (57c) it behaves as a common noun in adapting its tonality to the definiteness of the noun phrase. There is no clear semantic or pragmatic difference between the various choices of agreement patterns either. Note that there are two words for ‘other’, depending on the definiteness of the noun phrase.

(57) ìwèngà ‘person called Iwenga’ < Iwenga < ìwèngà ‘a choir’ (cl.5)

a. ìwèng ꜜíꜜmɔ́rì mɛ̀nyínɔ́ èɓéɓyé mɛ́nɛ̀
   Iwenga.NTP V.other V.DEM 1.will.come 9.tomorrow
b. ìwèŋgá ꜜmɔ́ mɛ́nyínɔ̀ èɓéɓyé mɛ́nɛ̀
   Iwenga.NTP IX.other IX.DEM 1.will.come 9.tomorrow
c. ìwèŋg ꜜíꜜmɔ́ mɛ́nyínɔ̀ yíɓéɓyé mɛ́nɛ̀
   Iwenga.DTP V.other V.DEM V.will.come 9.tomorrow
‘This (aforementioned) other Iwenga will come tomorrow.’

(58) a. ìwèng ꜜìnyɛ̀n ꜜìnyàngò èɓéɓyé mɛ́nɛ̀
   Iwenga.NTP V.other V.small 1.will.come 9.tomorrow
b. ìwèngá ꜜìnyɛ̀n ꜜìnyàngò èɓéɓyé mɛ́nɛ̀
   Iwenga.NTP IX.other IX.small 1.will.come 9.tomorrow
c. ìwèŋg ꜜìnyɛ̀n ꜜìnyàngò yíɓéɓyé mɛ́nɛ̀
   Iwenga.NTP IX.other IX.small IX.will.come 9.tomorrow
d. ìwèng ꜜìnyɛ̀n ꜜìnyàngò yíɓéɓyé mɛ́nɛ̀
   Iwenga.NTP V.other V.small V.will.come 9.tomorrow
‘Another little Iwenga will come tomorrow.’

The only generalisation we found at present is that if agreement on the verb is of a pattern other than 1, agreement on adnominal targets must be of the same pattern in the same clause (e.g., 58c-d). At present, we do not have a better description of the grammatical behaviour of singular depripral nouns.

6. Conclusions
Proper names have morphosyntactic characteristics that differ from those of other nouns. The agreement pattern they trigger cannot be predicted on the basis of their morphological form, contrary to that of common nouns. Instead, they trigger a mixed agreement pattern typical for proper names: agreement pattern I on predicative and pronominal targets and agreement pattern IX on adnominal targets. There are some exceptions to this general rule: proper names derived from nouns of class 5 and 7 optionally trigger syntactic noun class agreement on adnominal targets, and those derived from class 10b nouns optionally trigger agreement pattern V. The agreement triggered by proper names differs so much from the noun class agreement of common nouns that it makes sense to claim that proper names, like first and second person pronouns and non-nominal agreement controllers, do not belong to a noun class, a conclusion that is strengthened by the observation that proper name agreement strongly differs from common noun agreement in other Bantu languages as well (e.g., agreement pattern I in Eton, semantic agreement based on the basic level sense of names in Kirundi). Therefore, agreement with a proper name is a kind of enforced agreement, determined by principles other than the noun class of the controller. We tentatively suggested that inherent salience of the referent of proper names is responsible for the selection of pattern I on predicative and pronominal targets, whereas direct reference determines the choice for agreement pattern IX. A historical-comparative study might clarify and explain the different functions of these agreement patterns. The behaviour of names derived from nouns of class 5, 7 and 10b may be due to the fact that proper names are on their way to being integrated into the noun class system.

Van Langendonck’s observation that definiteness marking is redundant on proper names and is therefore often recuperated to mark other semantic-pragmatic values than definiteness in European languages turned out to be valid for Orungu as well. We found that proper names with an NTP can acquire a DTP when they are used to refer to an individual in a depreciating way. Moreover, adjectives have a DTP when they non-restrictively modify proper names, since names are inherently definite. An NTP on the adjective signals irony or sarcasm.

Finally, Orungu proved to be interesting because of the rarity of proprial lemmas, as in many other Non-Western languages. Consequently, proper names are
usually derived from appellative lemmas. This raised the question as to how common nouns derived from proper names would behave, rather like the proper name from which they derive, or rather like the common noun based on the appellative lemma. The hypothesis that such nouns behave just as other common nouns turns out to be false. However, the inverse hypothesis that nouns meaning ‘individual called X’ are in fact proper names proves to be equally false. Such nouns are somewhere in between genuine proper names and typical common nouns as far as their grammatical behaviour is concerned. In the plural they behave as common nouns, in the singular they can behave either as common nouns, or as proper names, or something in between.
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