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1. Introduction

In general Bantu languages have a head-before-dependent (HD) basic word order, leaving aside some exceptional languages such as Nen (A44)\(^1\). Nominal objects and adverbs follow the verb, there are prepositions and almost all adnominal modifiers follow their head noun. The only exception on clause level is the initial position of the subject, which is common in HD languages and which I will not account for here. Below clause level the most common exception is the sometimes optional prenominal position of demonstratives and some other words such as the word for 'other' in a number of Bantu languages. Note that languages for which a basic order can be recognised, such as the Bantu languages, allow to different extents pragmatically motivated departures from this basic order, especially on the level of the clause. Thus, occurrences of the nominal object before the verb, for instance, are likely to be found in texts, even if grammars do not mention them. Word order on lower levels tends to be much stricter crosslinguistically, even in so-called discourse configurational languages such as Russian. Many Bantu languages are exceptional in this respect in that they have a lot of freedom in the mutual ordering of postnominal modifiers (see below)\(^2\).

This study is about the most notable exception of head-dependent serialisation below clause level: the prenominal position of demonstratives in a number of Bantu languages. Heine (1976: 52-3) gives special prominence to this word order feature in his Typology of African Languages, where he divides the Bantu languages (except Nen (A44)) between two subtypes of a language type he calls type A, viz. the Bantu type and the

---

\(^1\) I wish to thank Simon Bizimana, Sybilla Ingabire, Tharcisse Mutake, Dmitrij Idiatov, Michael Meeuwis, Wilhelm Möhlig, an anonymous reviewer and Bertie Neethling for their help and the editors for their kind invitation.

\(^2\) The term *freedom* is understood in syntactic terms here and does not imply a total absence of restrictions. Syntactic word order freedom means that words can have different mutual orderings while remaining in the same morpho-syntactic category and retaining the same mutual syntactic relations. Syntactic word order freedom does not exclude that the order of words is strictly pragmatically conditioned.
Duala (A24) type. The main difference between both subtypes is that the demonstrative precedes its governing noun in the Duala (A24) type whereas it follows in the Bantu type. I did not see other notable differences between the subtypes. According to Heine (1976), the Bantu languages of the Duala (A24) subtype are mainly found in the Northwest. He cites Nyang (S-Bantoid), Ewondo (A72), Basa (A43), Mpongwe (B11a), Bulu (A74), Kundu (A11c), Nkosi (A15b), Duala (A24) and Bankon (A42). However, at least Bulu (A74) and Ewondo (A72) only allow NDem order and in general I found no differences between the northwestern languages and the others as to the placement of the demonstrative. All areas largely behave the same. It is therefore very improbable that areal factors can account for the tendency for prenominal placement of the demonstrative in Bantu, the more so because Africa is the only large linguistic area in the world where there is no general preference for DemN order (Dryer 1992). Hence, an explanation for DemN in Bantu must be found in universal principles and in structural characteristics of the Bantu languages. In this paper no attention will be given to the word order universals that are relevant to the topic. Although large crosslinguistic generalisations are statistically real, it is usually difficult or impossible to prove their influence on the word order of an individual language. It suffices to say here that special initial positions (on clause level and phrase level) are very common crosslinguistically. The preposed demonstrative in Bantu languages obviously occupies such a special initial position. I should also mention the widespread idea that the determiner is the head of the noun phrase (or better DP). According to this idea, preposed demonstratives are to be expected in HD languages such as the Bantu languages. See Van Langendonck (1994) for arguments against the claim that determiners are heads. Finally I should mention Hawkins’ (1994) Early Immediate Constituents (EIC) principle that states that mother node construction is crucial in word order typology, rather than head-dependent serialisation. In ‘left-mother-node-constructing’ languages such as the Bantu languages, it does not matter whether the noun or the demonstrative comes first. In either case the human parser recognises the noun phrase at its left periphery. I will not criticise this theory in this paper. After giving an overview of the variation (§2) I will try to account for it (§3), taking NDem order as a point of departure (most probably also the historical order, but see Wald 1973). Not surprisingly, the augment plays a crucial role here. It was clear from the outset that the results could only be of a preliminary nature, a set of typologically informed hypotheses for future comparative and descriptive research. This is partly due to a lack of time, but partly also to a lack of detailed descriptive and comparative studies on the noun phrase in Bantu languages. It will be concluded that much of the apparent variation in the placement of demonstratives is not due to word
order freedom, but involves more profound syntactic differences. In fact, the relation between a demonstrative and a noun appears to be appositional in many cases, rather than involving dependency, so that the problem goes beyond the structure of the noun phrase. Although I try to be theory neutral, some readers might want to know that this paper is written from the general background of dependency theory and that I regard words as the elements of which the order must be specified, not constituents, which are secondary concepts in a dependency approach.

2. Comparative overview

2.1. The sample

The convenience sample for this study contains 138 languages from all zones (A: 14, B: 4, C: 14, D: 10, E: 6, F: 1, G: 10, H: 5, J: 14, K: 6, L: 17, M: 8, N: 4, P: 7, R: 3 & S: 15). Most of the data are taken from Weier (1985) and consist of only a very brief statement about the placement without specifying, for instance, when demonstratives precede the noun and when they follow in languages that have both orders. It would be impossible to cite all primary sources of such statements. References without a date are cited via Weier (1985) and can be found there. Checking the primary sources rarely added supplementary information. Especially the older sources are more focused on the paradigmatic axis, describing the meaning and morphophonological form of the demonstratives. This lack of attention for syntactic description may partly explain the many differences between authors who worked on the same language. A striking example is Hemba (L34) that has NDem order according to one description (Vandermeiren 1912) and DemN order according to another (Mpunga wa Ilunga 1972). But it is also possible that the language has changed between the first and the second half of the 20th century and/or that different authors described different dialects of the same language. For another example, see Kete (L21): NDem according to Mukash (1971-1972) (Kapang-dialect), but NDem/DemN according to Mbuiy-Kabandanyi (1972) and Mpandajila (1972-1973) (Kete Nord). Consequently, the data cited below must be interpreted with some care. There will be inevitable mistakes in the lists presented in this section, but very little hinges on the exact classification of an individual language. The goal is rather to give a general overview of the variation in the Bantu family. The large number of languages must suffice to compensate for mistakes.
2.2. NDem

Languages in which the demonstrative always follows the noun can be found throughout the Bantu area. In the Northwest: Lundu (A11), Kundu (A12), Banoo (A32a), Bafia (A53), Eton (A71), Fang (A75), Mvumbo (A81), Tsogo (B31), Punu (B43), Duma (B51), Mbete (B61), Nduumo (B63), Ngul (B66) and Fumu (B77). These are all zone B languages in the sample.

In the North and the Centre there are Mboshi (C25), Bolia (C35b), Mbudza (C36c), Lingala (C36d), Lombo (C54), Kele (C55), Mongo (C61), Tetela (C71), Dengese (C81), Songomeno (C82), Bushoong (C83), Enya (D14), Konzo (J41), Nande (J42), Nyanga (J43), Hunde (J51), Havu (J52), Cokwe (K11), Ngangela (K12b), Luyana (K31), Samba (L12), Binji (L22), Ruund (L53), Fipa (M13), Nyakyusa (M31).

In the West, we have W.Kongo (H16d), Hungana (H42), Mbundu (R11) and Ndonga (R22).

And in the East: Hema (J10), Ganda (J15), Haya (J22), Bukusu (J31c), Saamia (J34), Kikuyu (E51), Tharaka (E54), Ilwana (E81), Ruguru (G35), Kami (G36), Pogoro (G51), Hehe (G62), Kinga (G65), Tumbuka (N21), Nyanja (N31a), Nyungwe (N43), Sena (N44), Matumbi (P13), Makonde (P23), Mabiha (P25) and Lomwe (P32).

The South, finally, is represented by: Zezuru (S12), Manyika (S13), Karanga (S14), Tswana (S31), Zulu (S42) and Tsonga (S53). The NDem languages represent half of the sample. They differ from each other in the exact place of the demonstrative among the postnominal modifiers. In Lingala (C36d) (Michael Meeuwis pers. comm.) and Logoli (E41) (Heine 1980:184), for instance, the internal ordering of postnominal modifiers is relatively free. In languages such as Eton (A71) (my fieldnotes) the order is strict. The preferred position of the demonstrative in Logoli (E41) is before the relative clause, but after all other modifiers. In Eton (A71), the demonstrative follows all other modifiers, including the relative clause.

2.3. DemN

The languages that always put the demonstrative before the noun are much rarer. In zone A there is Kwiri (A22) and possibly Duala (A24) (cf. Heine's Duala subtype, but according to Ittmann (1939) 'old forms' are put after the noun). Then there are Lega (D25) and Sile (D25a). Finally Rundi (J62) is also sometimes cited as a language in which the demonstrative always precedes the noun.
2.4. DemN/NDem

The group of languages that have both orders definitely do not constitute one single type. There are languages that are said to have a semantic/pragmatic difference between preposed and postposed demonstratives (without formal differences other than position). In Bankon (A42) postnominal demonstratives have emphatic value. The same is said about *prenominal* demonstratives in Nkore (J13), Kanyoka (L32), Bemba (M42) and Bolia (C35b) (Mamet 1960: 33). In Xhosa (S41) emphatic demonstratives can either precede or follow the noun, whereas normal demonstratives can only precede. Judging from the following Xhosa example taken from Malinga (1980: 7), *emphatic* can mean that the demonstrative expresses contrastive focus (the emphatic demonstrative is underlined).

(1) **abo bafana and bazi kova ndiyamazi lo umfana.**

'Those young men I do not know, but I know this young man.'

A recurrent description of the difference is that postnominal demonstrative forms function as demonstratives proper whereas prenominal demonstratives have the same function as the article in western European languages, e.g. Chaga (E62), Giryama (E72a), Digo (E73), Nyamwezi (F22), Dciriku (K62) and Swahili (G42) (Wilhelm Möhlig pers. comm., also citing Ashton's (1951) Swahili grammar). As far as I was able to control it is never stated in which respect(s) these preposed demonstratives function as articles. It is unlikely that they are equally obligatory as articles in English, for instance. This question will be dealt with in §4. Furthermore, there are languages in which some demonstrative paradigms are preposed, whereas others are postposed, as in (ci)Luba (L31a), where close demonstratives precede the noun and others follow. In Topoke (C53), the anaphoric demonstrative always follows the noun, whereas other demonstratives can either precede or follow.

In some languages there are obvious formal differences between preposed and postposed demonstratives, whereas in others both are formally identical. One rather common formal difference is that prenominal demonstratives have an initial vowel that their postnominal counterparts lack, e.g. Mbo cluster (A15) (Hedinger 1987:88), Kaonde (L41) (but here again, different sources give different accounts), Songye (L23), Sanga (L35) and Gisu (J31a). In Songye (L23) this initial vowel is an a-, as in *au mulami* 'this guard' versus *muntu'u* 'this person' (Stappers 1964: 63, the demonstrative is underlined).
Then there are languages in which demonstratives can follow or precede the noun or both, i.e. follow and precede. In the latter case they are often called circumdemonstratives, e.g. Linga (C50) and (ki)Luba (L33) (but here not all demonstratives have all the placement options). I also encountered languages where all demonstratives can follow the head noun and some can precede, but only if they are repeated after the noun. Such is the case in Mbole (D11), Cokwe (K11) (according to Tubomeshi 1966, not described in Van den Eynde 1960) and in Makua (P31). When a demonstrative precedes the noun without being repeated afterwards, it is not an adnominal demonstrative but a identificational demonstrative in Makua (P31) (see section 3.2.1 for these terms). Judging on the glosses under the examples in Stucky (1985: 175), the preposed demonstrative is analysed as an article.

(2)   a. ni věkë (ṃ̄s̄)  
     spear-(DEM)   '(the/that) spear'
   b. ṃ̄s̄-ni věkë ṃ̄s̄  
     (DEM)-spear-dem  'that (the) spear'
   c. ṃ̄s̄ ni věkë  
     DEM-spear        'that one is a spear'

For a number of languages I have no further information regarding possible differences between preposed and postposed demonstratives: Kusu (C72), Lengola (D12), Mituku (D13), Holoholo (D28), Buyi (D55), Casu (G22), Shambala (G23), Zigula (G31), Lwena (K14), Subiya (K42), Kete (L21), Budia (L25), Luluia (L31b), Salampasu (L51), Taabwa (M41), Lamba (M54), Ila (M63), Tonga (M64), Mwera (P22), Venda (S21), Pedi (S32a), Swati (S43), Ndebele (S44), Tsonga (S53), Tonga (S62).

2.5. Conclusion

The most important conclusion from this brief overview is that there appear to be no formal and/or functional similarities shared by all preposed demonstratives. Moreover, there are no clear areal or genetic patterns in the variation. The only type that can be rather easily located, is DemN, found between Lake Tanganyika and Lake Kivu and in the Northwest, but this is only because the type is very rare. Hence, the DemN/NDem and DemN patterns must have developed independently and along different lines throughout the Bantu area. In other words, there must be something in the structure of the Bantu languages that facilitates initial placement of the demonstrative. §3 tries to identify it.
3. Discussion

3.1. Word order freedom among the modifiers of a noun

Before looking at specific explanations for the variation in the placement of demonstratives, it might be useful to point to a typological peculiarity of the Bantu languages. Languages that have a basic order differ in the extent to which they permit pragmatically motivated departures from this order. Usually these are more common on the level of the clause than on lower levels (Rijkhoff 1990: 6). In many Bantu languages it seems to be the other way round. The following examples from Lingala (C36d) (Michael Meeuwis pers. comm.) suggest that almost all orders are acceptable.

(3) a. bana na ngai nībale ya nībalī ya kitoko
   children CONN 1SG two CONN male CONN beautiful
   'My two beautiful male children'

   bana na ngai ya nībalī nībale ya kitoko
   children CONN 1SG CONN male two CONN beautiful
   'My two beautiful male children'

b. bana ki tokō oyo ni bale
   children beautiful these two
   'these two beautiful children'

   bana ki tokō nībale oyo
   children beautiful two these
   'these two beautiful children'

c. bana oyo nosusu nībale
   children these other two
   'these two other children'

   bana nosusu oyo nībale
   children other these two
   'these two other children'
d. bana ki toko nasusu oyo
children beautiful other these
‘these other beautiful children’

In cases like Lingala it is not clear whether there is a basic order among postnominal modifiers, with many departures, or whether there is none. Some Bantu and Bantoid languages (Aghem, Noni) that do have a basic order in the noun phrase made Hawkins (1983: 119-20) come to the conclusion that nothing can be predicted about the internal order of postnominal modifiers in the languages of the world (at a time when he was still looking for exceptionless universals). The question is whether this kind of freedom in the internal ordering of postnominal modifiers can have facilitated the movement of some modifiers to the prefield (i.e. before the head word).

3.2. Some of the variation is only apparent

3.2.1. Different categories

In most primary sources, in Weier (1985) and also in the previous paragraph, the alternative positions of the demonstrative in the languages of §2.4 (the DemN/NDem languages) have been presented as mere word order alternatives, whereas very often they are not. The problem is rather widespread in word order typology and can be illustrated by the treatment of English in word order surveys (e.g. Hawkins 1983). English is said to have alternative orderings for the pair Genitive-Noun: NGen and GenN, where NGen refers to examples such as the corner of the house and GenN to phrases as John’s book. Speaking of word order alternatives is unacceptable in cases like these, where elements with a different form and a different meaning are treated as a single variable: *genitive*. These are different encoding strategies for a similar function, not word order alternatives. The problem arises from relying too much on broad semantic definitions, without paying sufficient attention to constructions. The term *demonstrative* is similar to the term *genitive* in that it subsumes a number of different grammatical categories under the same semantic label. Diessel (1999: 4, 57) distinguishes four different distributions of lexical elements with a demonstrative meaning: pronominal, adnominal, adverbial and identificational demonstratives. Pronominal demonstratives are used as independent pronouns in argument position of verbs and adpositions, as in *Did you see that?* Adnominal demonstratives cooccur with a noun in a noun phrase, e.g. *this house.*
Adverbial demonstratives, such as *there*, function as verb modifiers and identificational demonstratives are found in copular and non-verbal clauses. If demonstratives show formal differences according to their distribution, Diessel (1999) divides them into different categories, viz. demonstrative pronouns, determiners, adverbs and identifiers respectively. There is some disagreement in the typological literature as to which categories can be distinguished crosslinguistically. Dixon (2003) does not distinguish between demonstrative pronouns and demonstrative determiners, which he both calls *nominal demonstratives*. He also does not accept a separate category of demonstrative identifiers. This discussion is of little relevance for our purposes. The only thing that matters are the syntactical relations between a demonstrative word and the other words in the same clause. The difference between a pronominal demonstrative followed by a noun and an adnominal demonstrative followed by a noun (as in French *celui-ci, le livre* versus *ce livre-ci*) is relevant because there is a dependency relation in the second case but not in the first.

3.2.2. Adnominal or identificational demonstratives?

The difference between adnominal and identificational demonstratives is usually rather easy to make on the basis of their translation, as in the following examples from Lega (D25). Adnominal demonstratives precede the noun and identificational demonstratives follow the noun phrase in Lega. The examples are from Kinyalolo (1991:10).

(4)  bi-bi-o bishúmbí bi-soğa 8AGR-8AGR-DEM 8-chair 8AGR-nice
     ‘those nice chairs’

     bishúmbí bi-soğa bi-bi-o
     8-chair 8AGR-nice 8AGR-8AGR-DEM
     *‘those nice chairs’
     ‘Those chairs are nice’

3 These examples are literally quoted from Kinyalolo's PhD thesis (1991) and contain two minor mistakes (Kinyalolo pers. comm.). One is typographical, viz. the omission of a high tone marker on the first syllable of the demonstrative in (4a). The second concerns the translation of example (4b). A more accurate English translation had been 'Those are nice chairs' (with a contrastive accent on *those*), or, even better, French 'Voilà des jolies chaises'.

Kinyalolo (pers. comm.) calls the construction in (4b) *presentative* and points out that the order is predicate-subject. He insists that the utterer of (4b) must be pointing out some contrast. The difference between preposed and postposed demonstratives is syntactically reflected in the fact that nouns followed by a demonstrative cannot function as the subject in a clause whereas nouns preceded by a demonstrative can (Kinyalolo 1997: 189).

It is very probable that some languages cited under the DemN/NDem type present no genuine word order variation, but have only been cited there because the difference between identificational and adnominal demonstratives has been ignored. There are also languages with preposed and postposed adnominal demonstratives in which identificational demonstratives are formally identical to the former only. Wilhelm Möhlig (pers. comm.) cites the case of Herero (R31), where preposed adnominal demonstratives have an initial vowel that postposed demonstratives lack and where preceding demonstratives often have an emphatic meaning. According to Wilhelm Möhlig (pers. comm.) ‘the emphatic meaning is achieved by a hidden presentative construction that comes only out, if the intonation is taken into account’. Hence, the sentence in (5) (cited from Booysen (1982: 121), via Wilhelm Möhlig pers. comm.) should be rendered *this is the person working* in English.

(5) **i ngwi onandu na ungura**

‘this person works’

Given the formal resemblance between identificational and preposed adnominal demonstratives in Herero (R31), it is tempting to assume that the latter developed out of the former.4

3.2.3. Adnominal or pronominal demonstratives?

The difference between adnominal and pronominal demonstratives is sometimes more difficult to make, but is equally important. The hypothesis here is that the preposed demonstrative in some DemN/NDem languages is actually (or historically) an independent pronominal demonstrative in a kind of focalising or re-instantiating appositional construction translatable as *this one, (this) X*. In many Bantu languages, the pronominal demonstrative is formally different from the adnominal demonstrative.

---

4 In Möhlig et.al. (2002: 62) only two examples are given of demonstratives with an initial vowel. In one example the demonstrative follows the noun and is said to be emphatic. In the other example the demonstrative precedes the noun and the resulting construction is called *presentative*. 
because it is preceded by an augment or pre-prefix. The augment serves as a kind of
nominaliser in these cases and can also be put before possessives, relative clauses and
other nominal modifiers in order to make them independent, e.g. Eton (A71) (own field
notes):

(6)  í mínŋá nā   'this woman'
    í nā   'this one'
   wǎnD   'my'
  & wǎnD   ‘mine’

An independent pronominal demonstrative is not part of the noun phrase and its
placement is in theory more free than that of an adnominal demonstrative. Some
languages put it after the NP, some before and in many cases both orders are acceptable.
The translation equivalents of this construction often involve emphasis on the
demonstrative. Note that an emphatic reading can also result from an identificational
construction and that identificational demonstratives can be formally identical to
pronominal demonstratives. A possible way to find out the difference between adnominal
and pronominal demonstratives if they are not formally distinguished is to ask an
informant to replace the demonstrative by a question word. If the preposed demonstrative
cannot be replaced by ‘which’, i.e. if the question word always has to follow the noun,
then there is a syntactic argument to say that preposed and postposed demonstratives do
not belong to the same category.5 There might also be Bantu languages with a difference
between interrogative pro-determiners (‘which’, ‘quel’) and interrogative pronouns
(‘which one’, ‘lequel’). Intonation data might provide an argument as well.

3.2.4. Articles

We can now briefly come back to the demonstratives that are said to function as articles
when they are preposed, as described for Chaga (E62), Nyamwezi (F22), Dciriku (K62)

5 An anonymous reviewer remarked that this test rests crucially on whether question words occur in the
same slot as demonstratives. I agree. The relevance of this remark is demonstrated by a language such as
Lega, in which they do not occur in the same slot. If one replaces the demonstratives by a question word
‘which’ in the examples in (4), the preposed question word has an identificational (i.e. predicative) value,
whereas a construction with a postposed question word is ambiguous between an adnominal (‘which nice
chairs’) and an identificational (‘which ones are nice chairs’) reading (Kinyalolo pers. comm.). The
usefulness of the proposed tests differs from language to language. I assume that there are profound
differences between individual Bantu languages, but it falls outside of the scope of this paper to develop
this further.
and Digo (E73), among others. For Dciriku, Möhlig (1967: 164) remarks 'Die selbständigen Dem. Pron. können dem Bezugswort vorangestellt werden, wenn es dem Sprecher auf den demonstrativen Charakter seiner Aussage nicht besonders ankommt. Sie erfüllen dann die Aufgabe des deutschen Artikels. Die selbständigen Dem. Pron. werden regelmässig vorangestellt, wenn auf ein Nomen als etwas Bekanntes oder Erwähntes Bezug genommen werden soll.' There is an enormous literature full of controversy about the evolution from demonstratives to (definite) articles, see Himmelmann (1997) for an overview. The question to be answered here is whether preposed and postposed demonstratives belong to different parts-of-speech categories, viz. articles versus adnominal demonstratives. According to Greenberg (1978: 61) 'the point at which a discourse deictic becomes a definite article is where it becomes compulsory and has spread to the point at which it means "identified" in general.' I do not have the impression that the use of preposed demonstratives is compulsory in languages such as Dciriku. The Swahili examples in (7) (Wilhelm Möhlig pers. comm.) suggest that preposed demonstratives are instances of textual anaphora, i.e. they refer to something that has been described in the discourse (Dixon 2003: 63). Postposed demonstratives tend to be either exophoric or instances of substitution anaphora. In the latter case they substitute a phrase in the preceding discourse. Preposed demonstratives appear to have the same distinctions between close, intermediate and far as their postposed counterparts, whereas the development of a definite article tends to involve one particular demonstrative which gradually assumes the role of an article.

(7) a. kitabu hi ki
   ‘this book (at my place)’

   kitabu hi cho
   ‘this book (at your place)’ or ‘the book already mentioned’

   kitabu kile
   ‘that book (far from us)’

b. hi ki kitabu
   ‘the book (that I introduced into our conversation)’

   hi cho ki tabu
   ‘the book (that you introduced or mentioned)’
As I see it, the preposed demonstratives are on a path of grammaticalisation from textual anaphora markers to definite articles. Why this evolution affects their position vis-à-vis their head noun is not clear at this point. Dryer (1992: 104) notes that there is a statistically significant tendency for articles to precede the noun in VO-languages. Curiously, the languages of Africa form an exception to this generalisation. Most importantly, the preposed demonstratives discussed in this section are adnominal. Contrary to identificational and pronominal demonstratives they belong to the same noun phrase as the following noun. I did not find statements about the function of preposed demonstratives in languages such as (ki)Luba (L33), that allow a preposed and a postposed demonstrative to co-occur in the same noun phrase. Probably they also function as preposed demonstratives in Swahili. This situation exists outside of the Bantu family, for instance in Berbice Dutch Creole, where di is used as both a definiteness marker and a proximate demonstrative, but the former precedes and the latter follows the noun (Rijkehoff 2002: 188):

(8)  di  wari  di  
     the  house  this  ‘this house’

3.2.5. co-occurrence with the augment

Subsections 3.2.2-3 have explained part of the variation in the placement of demonstratives in the Bantu languages in two ways. The first is that much of the variation is only apparent and due to a lack of distributional analysis of all the demonstrative forms involved. In other words, some demonstratives that precede the noun are not dependents of that noun and therefore head-dependent serialisation makes no predictions about their placement. The second way is related to the first. It suggests that some preposed adnominal demonstratives might have developed from pronominal and presentational demonstratives. These words have changed categories, not places. A syntactical test has been proposed to find out whether preposed and postposed demonstratives belong to the same category in a given language (replacement by a question word). There is another way to find out whether a demonstrative is adnominal, viz. by looking at whether the adjacent head noun is marked by an augment or not. In some languages the presence of
an augment on the head noun means that a following demonstrative is adnominal, whereas in other languages it means that a preceding demonstrative is not adnominal. The first type is exemplified by Basa (A43) and Eton (A71). In these languages the noun is preceded by an augment if and only if it is followed by a relative clause or an exophoric adnominal demonstrative. The following examples are from Basa (A43) (Hyman 2003: 267).

(9) a. ìíì liwândá
   that friend ‘that friend’

   b. ììwândá íí
   friend that ‘that friend’

   c. liwândá íí
   friend that is ‘here’s a friend’

In (9a) the head noun is preceded by a demonstrative and therefore receives no augment. In (9b) the postposed adnominal demonstrative triggers the floating high tone augment on the head noun. When a postposed demonstrative is not part of the noun phrase as in (9c), there is again no augment. Xhosa (S41) can serve as an example of the second type. Unlike Basa (143), nouns usually have an augment in Xhosa (S41). A noun preceded by a "normal" (i.e. non-emphatic) demonstrative loses its augment (Du Plessis & Visser 1992). The following examples are from Malinga (1980), who does not mark tone:

(10) umntú ‘person’
    lo o mntú ‘that person’

The noun retains its augment when preceded by an emphatic demonstrative.

(11) lovo umntú ‘that person’ (emphatic)
    umntú lovo ‘person that’ (emphatic)

Some statements might be too restricted. The condition that the demonstrative determiner have exophoric value exists at least in Eton (A71), where anaphoric demonstratives do not trigger the augment. My information on the other languages is too restricted, but these details do not matter here.
The emphatic demonstrative is freer in its placement. It can either precede or follow the noun, whereas the normal demonstrative must precede. This is because the normal demonstrative is a dependent of the noun while the emphatic demonstrative stands in an appositional relationship to it. This analysis is confirmed by the behaviour of the possessive, where there is a clear formal difference between adnominal and pronominal possessives. The pronominal possessive has an initial vocalic morpheme (Du Plessis et al. 1992: 388). Du Plessis & Visser (1992) call this initial morpheme a definiteness marker, but judging on their description it is rather a nominaliser that makes independent nominals from nominal modifiers such as adjectives, relative clauses and possessives.

\[(12)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{o-nhle} & \quad \text{‘beautiful one’} \\
\text{e-zim} & \quad \text{‘red ones’} \\
\text{e-yam} & \quad \text{‘mine’}
\end{align*}
\]

The initial vowel is a grounding device that can be replaced by a demonstrative.

\[(13)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{lo nhle} & \quad \text{‘this beautiful one’} \\
\text{ezi zim} & \quad \text{‘these red ones’} \\
\text{le yam} & \quad \text{‘this one of mine’}
\end{align*}
\]

The fact that it appears on the preposed possessive means that the latter is an independent nominal that stands in an appositional relation to the following NP, just as the emphatic demonstrative. When the pronominal possessive precedes the noun, the latter does not drop its augment (underlined in the example).

\[(14)\]
\[
\text{eyam} - \text{noto yaphukile}
\]

‘My car has broken down’

This extraposition of modifiers by making them independent by means of an augment is common in Bantu. In Ganda (J15), for instance, the adnominal demonstrative comes after the adjective, except when the latter has an augment.

3.3. The adnominal demonstrative took the position of the augment

---

\(^7\) This might be an augment, but I have not been able to check this.
We saw that the noun loses its augment in Xhosa (S41) when preceded by an adnominal demonstrative. This is not uncommon in Bantu. De Blois (1970: 126) observed it in Sukuma (F21), Nkore (J13), Shi (J53), Rwanda (J61), Rundi (J62), Ha (J66), Bemba (M42), Aushi (M43), Zulu (S42) and Ronga (S54). It is rather evident to assume that the preposed adnominal demonstrative fills the position of the augment in these languages, or as De Blois (1970: 150) puts it, following a lead by Meeussen: ‘The augment and the demonstrative are thus seen to be in complementary distribution as constituting conjointly one grammatical phenomenon.’ The existence of a prenominal augment, that is somehow functionally equivalent to the demonstrative, is probably the strongest structural characteristic of the Bantu languages that permitted the demonstrative to move to prenominal position. The question remains to be answered in what sense an initial demonstrative can fulfil the function of the augment and this inevitably entails the question: What is the function of the augment? Hyman & Katamba (1993) convincingly argue that the use of the augment, at least in Ganda (J15), is syntactically defined, not pragmatically. I agree with the analysis that Bantu augments do not behave as definite articles in European languages, in the sense that they do not normally mark definiteness, or specificity. Yet, the syntactic environments that determine the appearance or non-appearance of the augment are clearly motivated, although not always predictable. For instance, the recurrent observation that objects of negative verbs and nouns modified by a question word do not have an augment is reminiscent of the role of the determiner in Salish languages. According to Matthewson (1998), Salish determiners encode assertion of existence. In the Salish languages there are determiners that assert the existence of a referent and there are determines that do not assert existence (without, however, denying it). The non-assertion of existence marker in St'at'imcets is ku. It is restricted in its syntactic distribution. ‘When it appears on argument DPs, it must fall within the scope of a non-factual operator, such as negation, a yes-no question marker or the modal kelh ‘might’. [...] the determiner ku cannot be used in a context which induces existential force, such as an ordinary declarative sentence’. As I see it, the determiner ku in St'at'imcets corresponds to a certain extent to the absence of the augment in Ganda (J15), whereas the assertion of existence determiners correspond to the augment. Obviously, the presence of a demonstrative does not depend on the syntactic environment, but a demonstrative automatically asserts existence within a particular universe of discourse.

---

8 But note that the use of articles in Western European languages is also much more complicated than that. The choice of an article does not only depend on pragmatic choices, but also on syntactical and even lexical constraints.
Therefore, a demonstrative, if present, can take over the function of the augment, which must be expressed at the beginning of the noun phrase. The augment has another, closely related function in languages such as Ganda (J15), viz. to mark that an element fulfils the propositional act of referring\(^9\). The difference between absence and presence of the augment is in this sense comparable to the difference between class 1a, the prototypical centre of which is formed by uniquely referring nouns, and the other noun classes (see Van de Velde 2003). The presence of an augment can be explained in terms of Croft's (1991, 2001) typological characterisation of parts of speech, based on the notion of typological markedness. This states that ‘there is an unmarked correlation between the semantic class of object and the function of reference so that a word denoting an object is unmarked in the function of reference but marked in other functions. A similar pattern holds between properties and modification and between actions and predication’ (Croft 1991:55). Following Van Langendonck (1999) I argue that proper names are prototypical nouns, because they have an individually referring function. ‘By contrast, common nouns are less prototypical nouns since they contain a predication, which is in the first place a verbal feature’ (Van Langendonck 1999: 131). The theory of typological markedness therefore predicts that common nouns receive extra morphological marking when used referentially. This is the case in many languages. In Western European languages most common nouns must be preceded by a determiner, in Bantu languages they must either take a noun class prefix or an augment plus a class prefix. This explains why proper names, certain kinship terms and common nouns used predicatively (i.e. after a copula) do not have an augment in languages like Ganda (J15)\(^{10}\). Proper names lack the augment because they are already fully referential, kinship terms do so for the same reason (at least when they contain a deictic element, e.g. different stems for ‘my father’, ‘your father’ etc.). Common nouns that follow a copula do not take the special marker for referential use (i.e. the augment) because they fulfill the propositional act of predication.

---

\(^9\) I avoid to call it a referentiality marker, because referentiality is often used as a synonym of specificity, i.e. the fact that reference is made to a specific referent (definite or not).

\(^{10}\) For several reasons, Hyman et al. (1993) argue that these words do have an augment, but that it does not appear on surface. As they state it, these elements are [+A] (they have an Augment), but, rather arbitrarily, [-IV] (the augment does not surface as an Initial Vowel). I strongly disagree with this account and propose elements of my alternative here, but discussing all arguments would bring us too far from the topic of this paper. Much of the discussion is centred on Luganda, because the paper by Hyman et.al. on Luganda gives a very good and detailed description of the use of the augment.
rather than reference\textsuperscript{11}. The augment is the default marker for reference in many Bantu languages, but can be replaced by other determiners, if they occupy the initial position on the noun phrase. This is a reason why demonstratives and augments can constitute a single paradigm of preposed determiners. This section is concluded with evidence from Rwanda (J61) and Rundi (J62) for the hypothesis that postposed adnominal demonstratives moved to prenominal position by filling the slot of the augment. Weier (1985) presents Rwanda (J61) as a DemN/NDem language and Rundi (J62) as DemN, but as far as I know the two are very similar in the placement of the demonstrative. Usually the demonstrative precedes and when it does, the noun loses its augment, but for pragmatic reasons the demonstrative can follow (with retention of the augment). Coupez (1980: 292) gives the following Rwanda example, where the postposed demonstrative has ‘une connotation de vivacité (avec appréciation ou dépréciation)’.

(15) \textit{a-bagab aba baragoby}e

‘These husbands are difficult!’

More interestingly, adnominal demonstratives usually follow the noun if the latter is a proper name or a class 1a kinship term. Proper names can be formed by leaving away the augment from a common noun. The word for ‘house’ is \textit{i-nzu} (\textit{i-} is the augment). From this word one could derive a proper name Nzu (Simon Bizimana pers. comm.).

(16) \textit{i yi nzu}

‘this house’

\textit{Nzu uyu}

‘this Nzu’ (proper name, agreement in class 1)

\textit{daat &}

‘my.father’

\textit{daat & uyu}

\textsuperscript{11}By the way, the use of the augment before possessives, relative clauses and other adnominal modifiers to make them independent can be explained in the same vein. These elements typically fulfill the propositional act of modification and need extra marking by the augment to make them fulfill a referential function.
‘this father’

Thus, in at least some environments without an augment, the demonstrative did not move to prenominal position in Rwanda (J61). Prenominal position is possible, be it exceptional, probably due to analogy. This is a very strong argument for the claim that demonstratives were (and still are) able to move to prenominal position because they can replace the augment. It also invalidates Wald's (1973) view that demonstratives historically preceded the noun and moved to the back afterwards: ‘In fact, it appears that the original Pre-Proto Bantu order was Dem-N. This order is still possible in most Bantu languages, while the order N-Dem, although more frequently used in many Bantu languages, is not found in a few languages (e.g. Rwanda, which is a PP language that does not exhibit the PP when the noun is modified by a demonstrative)’ (Wald 1973).

4. General conclusion

It was shown that the Bantu languages present a lot of variation in the position of demonstratives vis à vis the noun. Since Bantu languages generally have a rather strict head-dependent order, it is best to try to account for this variation in terms of deviation from the order noun-demonstrative. Disposing of a rather restricted amount of empirical data, I forwarded some typologically informed hypotheses. The first is that much of the variation found in the corpus is only apparent. Especially the group of DemN/NDem languages is predicted to become much smaller as soon as one is able to differentiate truly adnominal demonstratives from other demonstratives. The southern Bantu language Xhosa (S41), for instance, has been classified as DemN/NDem on the basis of word order information from primary and secondary sources. Upon scrutiny, it turned out to be strictly DemN, because postnominal demonstratives are never dependents of the preceding noun. No attempt has been made to reclassify the languages of the sample, due to a lack of data and time. The second and weakest hypothesis is that some preposed adnominal demonstratives developed from preposed non-adnominal demonstratives. I have no empirical data in favour of this hypothesis. Finally, the third hypothesis is that demonstratives can fulfil the functions of the augment and that the existence of the augment is a structural characteristic of Bantu languages that allows adnominal demonstratives to move to the front of the noun. This must have happened independently

12 PP stands for pre-prefix, i.e. the augment.
in different areas and different periods and will probably happen in the future. Rwanda (J61) provides the most convincing evidence for this hypothesis. It is basically a DemN-language, but the adnominal demonstrative follows nouns that never have an augment. Languages with preposed adnominal demonstratives and without augments can have changed the position of the demonstrative before the disappearance of the augment. However, there are no reasons to assume that the preposing of the demonstrative has triggered the disappearance of the augment in these languages. Although the demonstrative can assume the functions of the augment, the two are not functionally equivalent.
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