Relative Clauses in Haya[*]

Kristina Riedel
ZAS

This paper gives an overview of the morphology and syntax of Haya relative clause constructions. It extends previous work on this topic (Duranti, 1977) by incorporating data from a number of different dialects and by introducing new data on locative relative clauses. The dialects discussed in addition to the Kihanja data from Byarushengo *et al.* (1977) include Kiziba, Muleba and Bugabo dialects. Nyambo data taken from Rugemalira (2005) is also compared to Haya in places. The focus of the discussion is on the grammaticality of pronominal elements attached to the verb that refer back to the relativized entity with different types of relativized constituents in Haya. It is shown that there are differences between subjects, objects and locatives in terms of this kind of morphology inside the relative clause, as well as differences between these kinds of morphemes and resumptive pronouns.

---

1 Introduction

Haya, a language spoken in Kagera Region in Tanzania (Guthrie code – following the Tervuren system – J22), has two main morphological strategies for marking relative clauses. The first one uses a relative marker that is attached to the verb (which will be referred to as "verbal relative marker" here), as in (1a), or a copula.[1] The second strategy, which is illustrated in (1b), uses a demonstrative (which will be referred to as the "relative pronoun" here). A third strategy,

---

[1] Abbreviations used in glosses: APPL = applicative; AUG = augment; COMP = complementizer; CONJ = conjunction; COP = copula; DEM = demonstrative; FUT = future; HAB = habitual; INF = infinitive; NC = noun class prefix; NEG = negation; OM = object marker (numbers refer to noun classes); P = (person) plural; PAST = past (followed by 1-3, where 3 is the most remote past); PRES = present; PRO = pronoun; PROG = progressive (aspect); REL = relative; RM = relative marker; S = (person) singular; SM = subject marker (numbers refer to noun classes); STAT = stative

using *mbali*, is restricted to locative relative clauses. This is shown in (1c).[2]

(1)   a.   A- ba- shaija **a**- ba- guz- ile   e- bi- tabo ...
                AUG- NC2- man   RM- SM2- buy- PAST2 AUG- NC7- book
                'The men who bought books...'   [Bugabo Haya]

    b.   E- mótoka **éy'**   ó- mu- sháíja y- a- gúla ...
                AUG- 9car   9REL.DEM AUG- NC1- man   SM1- PAST1- buy
                'The car that the man has bought...'

                                          [Kihanja Haya, Duranti 1977, 121]

    c.   Lushoto **mbali** n- a- ikalaga e- njura e- gwa muno.
                Lushoto   where   SM1S- PAST1- live.HAB AUG- 9rain SM9- fall   a lot
                'In Lushoto, where I used to live, it rains a lot.'   [Kiziba Haya]

In Haya, the verbal relative marker appears with subject relatives, while the strategy using the relative pronoun is used for objects and most adjuncts. For locative adjuncts, *mbali* can be used instead of the relative pronoun. There is subject marking in (1a). Subject marking for the relativized subject is obligatory in Haya. But there is no object marking for the object relative in (1b). In fact, object marking any kind of relativized object is ungrammatical in Haya. There is no "agreement" with the locative inside the relative clause in (1c). However, it is possible to have an enclitic on the verb that refers back to the relativized locative adjunct. This is shown in (2). The locative enclitic is always optional.

(2)   E- sehemu **eyo**   n- a- m- tangaiwe- (**ho**) e- induk-
            AUG- 9place   9REL.DEM SM1S- PAST1- OM1- meet.PAST2- LOC16 SM9- become-
            ire   ku- ba bulime.
            PAST2 INF- be 14farm
            'The place where I met him has been turned into farmland.'
                                          [Kiziba Haya]

Haya, then, shows three different patterns with regard to the grammaticality of resuming a relativized entity inside the relative clause: obligatory morphological marking (for subjects), ungrammatical morphological marking (for objects), and optional morphological marking (for locatives). These patterns will be discussed in detail in turn. Haya data from speakers of the Kiziba, Bugabo and Muleba varieties is compare to the Kihanja dialect discussed in Byarushengo *et al.* (1977) and Nyambo data from Rugemalira (2005). Section 1.1 gives a brief overview of the relative morphology in Haya. Section 2 discusses subject relatives. Section 3 introduces object relatives. Section 4 presents the patterns found with relativized prepositional phrases. Section 5 discusses Haya locative

---

[2]   The "word" *mbali* might be based on *mba* 'where' and *-li* 'be'. This word is not generally used in *where*-questions and, while *mbali* was used by speakers of all dialects that I collected data on, the word *mba* rarely appears. Because the relative clauses using *mbali* do not appear to have a cleft structure, I gloss it as 'where' here.

constructions and locative relative clauses.

1.1 The morphology of Haya relative clauses

Table 1: Haya relative morphology (following Muzale 2006; Grégoire 1975)

Class	Aug	NC	SM	OM	enclitic	RM	Rel Dem
1	o-	mu-	a- /(y-)	-mu-	⊘	á- /(é-)	ówó
2	a-	ba-	ba-	-ba-	⊘	á-	ábó
3	o-	mu-	gu-	-gu-	⊘	ó-	ógwó
4	e-	mi-	e-	-gi-	⊘	é-	éyó
5	e-	ri-	ri-	-ri-	⊘	é-	éryó
6	a-	ma-	ga-	-ga-	⊘	á-	ágó
7	e-	ki-	ki-	-ki-	⊘	é-	ékyó
8	e-	bi-	bi-	-bi-	⊘	é-	ébyó
9	e-	⊘/N	e-	-gi-	⊘	é-	éyó
10	e-	⊘/N	zi-	-zi-	⊘	é-	ézó
11	o-	lu-	lu-	-lu-	⊘	ó-	órwó
12	a-	ka-	ka-	-ka-	⊘	á-	ákó
13	o-	tu-	tu-	-tu-	⊘	ó-	ótwó
14	o-	bu-	bu-	-bu-	⊘	ó-	óbwó
15	o-	ku-	ku-	(-ku-)	⊘	ó-	ókwó
16	a-	ha-	ha-	-ha-	-ho	á-	áhó
17	o-	ku-	ha-	-ha-	⊘	ó-	ókwó
18	o-	mu-	ha-	-ha-	-mu	ó-	ómwó
25	e-	⊘	ha-	-ha-	-yo	?	?

An overview of the verbal morphology and the free relative pronouns is presented in table 1. There are some morphological and phonological differences between relative clauses and non-relatives in Haya. These hold for all dialects studied. But the verbal relative marker of class 1 has different patterns in Haya and Nyambo,[3] as well as in the various dialects of Haya. The relative pronoun is morphologically identical to the demonstrative 3 but has the tone pattern HH in Haya and LH in Nyambo (Rugemalira, 2005, 103), while the non-relative demonstrative 3 has LL.

Haya only has remnants of a conjoint/disjoint system. The language has only one "pair" of tense markers that receive a conjoint/disjoint reading respectively (Hyman, 1999). All other tense markers are neutral. However, Haya also has tonal reduction in the verb phrase under certain conditions, which patterns similarly to the conjoint tense (Hyman & Byarushengo, 1984; Hyman, 1999) and this also holds for relative verbs. This means there is no clear connection between relativization and either part of the conjoint/disjoint system. In spite of this, the far past (past 3) *-ka-* and the progressive marker *ni-* – both of which are neutral in terms of conjoint/disjoint distinctions – are not used in relative

---

[3]   Nyambo is spoken in Karagwe district, Tanzania and its Guthrie code (following the Tervuren system) is J21.

clauses (cf. also Duranti 1977, 132 and Muzale 1998). There is also a special auxiliary in relative clauses, *-li/i* 'be',[4] while the auxiliary *-ba* 'be' that appears in non-relatives is apparently never used in relative clauses. Most dialects of Haya, other than Muleba Haya, also have a zero copula, but, although its use is grammatical in relative clauses, it is less commonly used here. *Ni* 'be' and *ti* 'not be' tend to be used instead.

The use of the zero copula in clefts is illustrated in (3). In this case, as in any other zero copula contexts, there is no augment on the noun.

(3) Ba- isiki **a**- ba- i ku- zanira a- ha- nyanja.
     NC2- girl   RM- SM2- be INF- play.APPL AUG- LOC16- 9river

     'It's the girls who are playing by the river.'   [Kiziba Haya]

In Muleba Haya, instead of a augment-less noun the overt copula *ni* is used:

(4) n' a- ba- isiki
     COP AUG- NC2- girl

     'it's the girls'   [Muleba Haya]

When the overt copula is used in cleft constructions, the relative pronoun cliticizes to it, as in (5).

(5) A- ba- isiki ni- **bo**   y- a-   tweeke- ire e- bi-
     AUG- NC2- girl   COP- 2REL.DEM SM1- PAST1- send.APPL- PAST2 AUG- NC8-
     gemuro.
     present

     'It's the girls who she sent presents to.'   [Kiziba Haya]

2 Subject relative clauses

Subject marking is obligatory in (subject) relatives in Haya. This can be seen in (6a), (6b) – where the two adjacent vowels are merged in a phonological process not specific to relative clauses – and (6c). Subject marking patterns in the same way in relative clauses as in non-relative clauses. It does not appear to be affected by the extraction of the head. The subject marker is commonly considered to be an agreement morpheme in Bantu languages such as Haya. Because of that, the subject marker would not generally be considered to be a resumptive pronoun. This is in contrast to the way the object marker in Haya is analysed in the literature (Hyman & Duranti, 1982; Byarushengo *et al.*, 1977), as well as for the Bantu languages in general, where object markers are considered to be resumptive elements (Henderson, 2006).

---

[4] This auxiliary is also used in locative constructions where a locative enclitic follows it.

(6) a. O- mu- hyo **o**- gw- a-   hendek- ile   gu- kulu.
         AUG- NC3- knife RM- SM3- PAST1- break.STAT- PAST2 NC3- big
         'The knife which broke (is) big.'   [Bugabo Haya]

     b. mba **a**-   ta- li a-   hango
         where RM.SM16- NEG- be NC16- big
         'the place that is not big'   [Bugabo Haya]

     c. e- ki- ntw' **é**- ki- tá- li ki- hângo
         AUG- NC7- thing RM- SM7- NEG- be NC7- big
         'the thing that is not big'   [Kihanja Haya, Duranti 1977, 120]

The verbal relative marker that is used with subject relatives looks rather like
the augment on nouns. Duranti (1977) claims that the verbal relative marker
agrees in noun class with the head noun. This works for sentences such as (6a),
(6b) and (6c), because with these noun classes the relative marker has exactly
the same form as the augment on the head of the relative clause. However, in
class 1, as shown in (7), the two morphemes differ. The augment on the noun
is *o-*, but the relative prefix on the verb is *a-*. Duranti (1977) calls class 1 an
exception.

(7) o- mu- sháíj' **á**- y- a-   bon' ó- mu- kâzi
     AUG- NC1- man   RM- SM1- PAST1- see   AUG- NC1- woman
     'the man who saw the woman'   [Kihanja Haya, Duranti 1977, 120]

Instead of agreeing with the noun class of the head of the relative clause, one
might think of the verbal relative marker as matching the vowel quality of the
subject prefix or first syllable of the verb it attaches to, in the case of an initial
glide. This would predict the patterns in (6a), (6b) and (6c) as well as (7). In
Nyambo and in Bugabo Haya, on the other hand, the pattern is phonologically
conditioned in a more complex way. Here, and in Haya in general, the subject
marker for class 1 is *y-* when followed by a tense marker which starts with a
vowel and *a-* when followed by a tense marker that has an initial consonant. In
Nyambo, this creates a special pattern in relative clauses: the *e-* marker is used
with *y-* and *a-* is used where the subject prefix is *a-*. This is illustrated in (8a)
and (8b).

(8) a. á-   rima
         RM.SM1.HAB- cultivate
         'one who cultivates'

     b. **e**- y- a-   rim-   íre
         RM- SM1- PAST1- cultivate- PAST2
         'one who cultivated'   [Nyambo, Rugemalira 2005, 101]

In Bugabo Haya, the *a-/e-* alternation is also observed, as shown in (9a) and
(9b).

(9) a. o- mw- isiki **e-** y- a- boine e- ki- tabo
      AUG- NC1- girl   RM- SM1- PAST1- see.PAST2 AUG- NC7- book
      'The girl who saw the book'

    b. o- mw- isiki **a-** li ku- bona e- ki- tabo
      AUG- NC1- girl   RM.SM1- be INF- see   AUG- NC7- book
      'The girl who is seeing the book'   [Bugabo Haya]

In Duranti (1977, 120), first and second person plural forms are shown with *á-*. In my data from Bugabo Haya, the second person singular appears with *o-*, as in (10).

(10) **o-** rug- ile- **yo** kala
     RM.SM2S- leave- PAST2- LOC25 early
     'you who left early'   [Bugabo Haya]

The relative pronoun, on the other hand, has just one form for each noun class, as shown in table 1, and it can be said to agree with the head of the relative clause, while the verbal relative marker just seems to receive its phonological shape from the prefix it attaches to.

Duranti (1977) and Rugemalira (2005) state that all subject relatives take the verbal prefix. However, it is apparently possible in some cases to use the relative pronoun with subject relatives, as in (11a), or both the pronoun and the prefix, as in (11b). But using the verbal prefix in non-subject relatives seems to be entirely ungrammatical.

(11) a. A- ba- ntu **abo** ba- boine e- ki- ntu ekyo ...
      AUG- NC2- person 2REL.DEM SM2- see.PAST2 AUG- NC7- thing DEM7
      'The people who saw that thing...'   [Bugabo Haya]

    b. **abo** a- ba- guzile
      2REL.DEM RM- SM2- buy.PAST2
      'the ones who bought'   [Bugabo Haya]

3 Object relative clauses

Let us now turn to object relative clauses. As shown in section 1, these use a relative pronoun that agrees in noun class with the head of the relative clause. If there is a lexical subject, it appears in the preverbal position, as in (12).

(12) O- mw- isiki **owo** Juma y- a- ha- ire e- ki- tabo
     AUG- NC1- girl   1REL.DEM 1Juma SM1- PAST1- give- PAST2 AUG- NC7- book
     mu- rungi.
     NC1- nice
     'The girl whom Juma gave the book is nice.'   [Kiziba Haya]

In non-relative clauses, object marking is rather free. However, in relative clauses, object marking the relativized object is entirely ungrammatical in Haya, as shown in (13). This is a restrictive relative clause.

(13)　O- mu- ntu **owo**　　n-　a-　　(***mu**)- letela　e-
　　　　AUG- NC1- person 1REL.DEM SM1S- PAST1- OM1-　bring.APPL AUG-
　　　　shokolate . . .
　　　　9chocolate
　　　　'The person whom I gave chocolate . . .'　　　　　　[Bugabo Haya]

The same pattern is observed in non-restrictive relative clauses, as shown in (14).

(14)　Juliette **owo**　　　n- a-　　(***mu**)- ha- ile　e-　shokolate n-
　　　　1Juliette 1REL.DEM SM1- PAST1- OM1-　give- PAST2 AUG- 9chocolate PROG-
　　　　a- ba- keisa.
　　　　SM1- OM2- greet
　　　　'Juliette, whom I gave (the) chocolate, sends her greetings.'
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　[Bugabo Haya]

The ungrammaticality of object marking only holds for the relativized object, not for any other objects in the relative clause. For example, in (15) the direct object, which is not relativized is object-marked and this is grammatical.

(15)　o- mu- nda **mbali** tw- a-　　**mu**- boine
　　　　AUG- LOC18- inside where　SM1P- PAST1- OM1- see.PAST2
　　　　'inside where we saw him...'　　　　　　　　　　　[Bugabo Haya]

Duranti (1977) argues that this is because object marking is pronominal in Haya. In Riedel (2009), I provide evidence against that view. More generally, Henderson (2006) argues that not allowing object marking for a relativized object is evidence for pronominal object marking in a Bantu language. In the seminal paper by Bresnan & Mchombo (1987), object marking a relativized object is not used as a test for the agreement/pronoun distinction. As shown in Riedel (2009), there is no consistent relationship between allowing object marking in relative clauses and having other features associated with pronominal object marking. Chichewa, for example, allows and at times requires object marking a relativized object (Mchombo, 2004). In the case of Haya, this would also lead to a bizarre conclusion, because non-locative object marking would be considered pronominalization while locative "object" marking would be considered agreement.

Object marking a relativized object in Haya is ungrammatical. But can this be related to resumption? In the next section, we look at prepositional phrases where there are resumptive pronouns. A special case of object marking in relative clauses, with a locative "object marker", will be discussed below.

4 Prepositional Phrases

Bantu languages generally have very few prepositions. There are typically just two elements which function as prepositions: the conjunction *na* and the associative marker of class 17 (and potentially of other locative classes). Free pronouns can be cliticized onto the preposition *na* and this is required whenever there is no lexical noun phrase following *na* in Haya. In Bantu, prepositions generally cannot be fronted or stranded, neither in relativization nor in other kinds of extraction environments. When a PP is relativized while retaining its preposition (as opposed to being incorporated with an applicative) a resumptive pronoun is required. This phenomenon has been observed for many different types of languages, and has been described as far back as (Ross, 1967), where PPs were proposed to be islands (that is to be constituents from which extraction is impossible). Let us now look at the pattern found with prepositional phrases in Haya.

With applied instrumentals, resumption is optional if the preposition *na* is not spelled out. This is illustrated in (16a). Crucially, these are applicative objects. The prepositional element is not required for the sentence to be grammatical. But when the preposition is spelled out, the resumptive pronoun is obligatory, as illustrated in (16b).

(16)   a.   O- mu- hyo **ogwo** tw- a- sharira o- mu- kate ti-
AUG- NC3- knife 3REL.DEM SM1P- PAST1- cut.APPL AUG- NC3- bread NEG-
gw- i ku- shara.
SM3- be INF- cut

'The knife with which we cut bread has become blunt.' [Bugabo]

   b.   O- mu- hyo **ogwo** tw- a- sharira o- mu- kate
AUG- NC3- knife 3REL.DEM SM1P- PAST1- cut.APPL AUG- NC3- bread
na- *(**gwo**) ti- gw- i ku- shara.
CONJ- PRO3   NEG- SM3- be INF- cut

'The knife with which we cut bread has become blunt.' [Bugabo]

However, with commitatives or discontinuous reciprocals, resumption is obligatory. In these constructions, the prepositional phrase is required to get a grammatical sentence.

(17)   a.   o- mu- isiki **owo** a- rwaine *(**na**- **we**)
AUG- NC1- girl 1REL.DEM SM1- fight.PAST2 CONJ- PRO1

'The girl who he fought with...' [Muleba Haya]

   b.   a- ba- tayi bange boona **abo** n- a- shom-
AUG- NC2- friend 2POSS.1S 2ALL 2REL.DEM SM1S- PAST2- read-
ire *(**na**- **bo**)
PAST1 CONJ- PRO2

'The friends who I studied with...' [Muleba Haya]

The commitative phrases are not objects and cannot be object-marked. However, they must be resumed under relativization. The same pattern is found in Bantu languages like Swahili, where object marking is grammatical and in some cases obligatory.

These resumptive elements appear in the position where a lexical noun phrase would occur, not on the verb. Resuming an instrumental object is grammatical, and is required in island contexts, whereas object marking is not.

5   Locative relative clauses

As shown in table 1, Haya has 4 locative classes in its noun class system. However, class 25 nominal morphology only appears on a small set of positional nouns that take a genitival complement, apart from the *-yo* enclitic which is productive.[5] In the verbal and adjectival domains, on the other hand, there is only one locative noun class, namely class 16. This means there is only one locative object prefix,[6] one locative subject marker, and one locative adjectival prefix (see Trithart 1977). Besides these prefixes, there are two "double noun class prefixes": *omu-* and *aha-*, which are morphologically identical to the near-speaker demonstratives (Trithart, 1977). These morphemes are not prefixes, but proclitics that take an entire noun phrase (DP) as their complement. There are also three locative enclitics, class 16 (*-ho*), class 18 (*-mu*) and class 25 (*-yo*), which can attach to verb stems and are somewhat similar to object markers in their meaning and use. In this section, I briefly present the morphosyntax of Haya locatives before discussing locative relative clauses. As will be shown here, unlike other object markers co-referential with a relativized object, locatives can be "object marked", apart from being "resumed" by a locative enclitic.

In Haya, unlike in Bantu languages such as Sambaa (Riedel, 2009), the locative object prefix cannot always be used. In contrast, the locative enclitics are productive. The locative object marker *-ha-* is shown in (18a) and (18b). In these sentences, the locative is object-like or a clear direct object (18a). However, in other contexts which are very similar, the class 16 marker is ungrammatical. This is illustrated in (18c) and (18d). In contrast, the locative enclitics are grammatical here, as shown in (18e) and (18f). The same pattern is observed with the intransitive verb 'sleep' in (18g) and (18h). In languages like Swahili and Sambaa, the verb 'sleep' can be used with a locative object marker.

(18)   a.   N-   ka-   **ha**-   gula.
              SM1S- PAST3- OM16- buy
              'I bought it (the place).'

---

[5]   This Haya pattern is different from that found in many other J zone languages in this respect (Grégoire, 1975, 170).

[6]   This applies to all of zone J (Grégoire, 1975).

b.   N-   ka- **ha**- goba.
      SM1S- PAST3- OM16- arrive

     'I arrived there.'

c.   *N- ka- **ha**- ruga.
      SM1S- PAST3- OM16- leave

     Int: 'I left there.'

d. ??Nda- **ha**- gya
      SM1S.FUT- OM16- go

     Int: 'I will go there.'

e.   Nda-   gya- **ho**.
      SM1S.FUT- go-   LOC16

     'I will go there.'

f.   Nda-   gya- **yo**.
      SM1S.FUT- go-   LOC25

     'I will go there.'

g.   ?N- ka- **ha**- nyiama.
      SM1S- PAST3- OM16- sleep

     Int: 'I slept there.'

h.   N-   ka- nyiama- **ho**.
      SM1S- PAST3- sleep-   LOC16

     'I slept there.'   [Bugabo Haya]

In Haya, these locative enclitics can be derived from the demonstratives *aho* 'there' and *omu* 'in' and an equivalent for class 25 (which appears to be no longer in use) that have lost their initial vowel and appear in a fixed position (Muzale, 1998, 89).

(19)   a.   Ti- n-   ka-   gyaa- ga- **yo**.
          NEG- SM1S- PAST3- go-   HAB- LOC25

       'I have never gone there.'   [Haya, Muzale 1998, 162]

    b.   Ba- gura- **ho**.
         SM2- buy-   LOC16

       'They buy (from) there.'   [Haya, Muzale 1998, 89]

In the neighbouring and closely related Nyoro language, the locative even precedes certain verbal suffixes, such as the habitual.

(20)   Ti- n-   ka-   genda- **yo-** ga.
      NEG- SM1S- PAST3- go-   LOC- HAB

    'I have never gone there.'   [Nyoro, Muzale 1998, 162]

As in (19), a locative enclitic can replace an argument and sometimes even receive an applicative reading, as in (19b). But in other contexts the locative enclitic can appear together with an object marker. For example, in Nyambo, an object prefix and a locative enclitic referring to the same entity can optionally

co-occur, as shown in (21a) and (21b).

(21)   a.   Ecaaro a- ka- **cí**- goba.
              7village SM1- PAST3- OM7- arrive
              'The village, he arrived at it.'

        b.   Ecaaro a- ka- **ci**- goba- **mu**.
              7village SM1- PAST3- OM7- arrive- LOC18
              'The village, he arrived in it.'   [Nyambo, Rugemalira 2005, 96]

Here too, as can be seem from (22b), the enclitic can replace a lexical object, shown in (22a), just like the object marker in (22c).

(22)   a.   A- ka- reebá omu- nyungu.
              SM1- PAST3- look.into LOC18- 9pot
              'He looked in the pot.'

        b.   A- ka- reebá- **mu**.
              SM1- PAST3- look.into- LOC18
              'He looked in there.'

        c.   (Omu- nyungu) a- ka- **há**- reeba.
              LOC18- 9pot   SM1- PAST3- OM16- look.into
              '(The inside of the pot,) he looked at it.'
                                [Nyambo, Rugemalira 2005, 96]

Similar data is also reported for the Ziba dialect of Haya in Rubanza (1988). But Bugabo Haya differs from the Nyambo pattern in (21). The non-locative object marker is only acceptable with a non-locative topicalized phrase (23a), while the locative enclitic is ungrammatical here (23b). With the locative noun, the non-locative marker is ungrammatical, as shown in (23c), but either the locative object marker or the enclitic or both are acceptable, as shown in (23d), (23e) and (23f) respectively. The non-locative object marker is ungrammatical (23g), even in combination with a locative enclitic.

(23)   a.   E- nju yange n- ka- **gi**- bona.
              AUG- 9house 9POSS.1S SM1- PAST3- OM9- see
              'My house, I have seen it.' (non-locative OM)

        b.   *E- nju yange n- ka- **gi**- bona- **mu**.
              AUG- 9house 9POSS.1S SM1- PAST3- OM9- see- LOC18
              Int: 'My house, I have seen in it.' (OM and locative)

        c.   *O- mu- nju yange n- ka- **gi**- bona.
              AUG- LOC18- 9house 9POSS.1S SM1- PAST3- OM9- see
              Int: 'Inside my house, I have seen it.' (non-locative OM)

        d.   O- mu- nju yange n- ka- **ha**- bona.
              AUG- LOC18- 9house 9POSS.1S SM1- PAST3- OM16- see
              'Inside my house, I have seen it.' (locative OM)

e. O- mu- nju yange n- ka- bona- **mu**.
AUG- LOC18- 9house 9POSS.1S SM1- PAST3- see- LOC18
'Inside my house, I have seen it.' (locative enclitic)

f. O- mu- nju yange n- ka- **ha**- bona- **mu**.
AUG- LOC18- 9house 9POSS.1S SM1- PAST3- OM16 see- LOC18
'Inside my house, I have seen it.' (two locative markers)

g. *O- mu- nju yange n- ka- **gi**- bona- **mu**.
AUG- LOC18- 9house 9POSS.1S SM1- PAST3- OM9 see- LOC18
Int: 'Inside my house, I have seen it.' (OM and locative enclitic)
[Bugabo Haya]

This means that, aside from the differences in acceptability with particular verbs, the locative enclitics seem to be able to be used interchangeably with the locative object marker in Haya and Nyambo.

Turning now to the pattern with locative relative clauses, we see that the locative enclitics and the locative object prefix referring to a relativized constituent can be used, but non-locative object markers that refer to the head of the relatives clause are ungrammatical.

Consider locatives suffixes first. In locative relative clauses such as (24a) and (24b), the locative enclitic can optionally be added.

(24) a. Omwo o- mu- nda **mbali** tw- a- mu- boine-
18DEM AUG- LOC18- inside where SM1P- PAST1- OM1- see.PAST2-
(**mu**) a- li- mu o- mw- ilima.
LOC18 LOC16- be- LOC18 AUG- NC3- darkness
'In there, where we saw him it is dark (lit. there is darkness).'

b. E- sehemu **eyo** n- a- mu- tangaiwe- (**ho**) e-
AUG- 9place 9REL.DEM SM1S- PAST1- OM1- meet.PAST2- LOC16 SM9-
induk- ire ku- ba bu- lime.
become- PAST2 INF- be NC14- farm
'The place where I met him has been turned into farmland.'
[Bugabo Haya]

More surprisingly, the same holds for locative prefixes. A locative prefix is shown in (25a). Again, it can co-occur with a locative enclitic, as in (25b). The non-locative prefix referring to 'house', on the other hand, is ungrammatical. This holds both if it appears on its own, as in (25c), and when it appears with a locative enclitic, as in (25d).

(25) a. O- mu- nju **omwo** n- ka- **ha**- bona ha-
AUG- LOC18- 9house 18REL.DEM SM1S- PAST3- OM16- see NC16-
lungi.
nice
'The house which I saw the inside of is nice.' (locative prefix)

b. O-   mu-   nju   **omwo**   n-   ka-   **ha-**   bona-**mu**
AUG- LOC18- 9house 18REL.DEM SM1S- PAST3- OM16- see-   LOC18
ha-   lungi
NC16- nice

'The house which I saw the inside of is nice.' (locative prefix and locative enclitic)

c. *O-   mu-   nju   **omwo**   n-   ka-   **gi-**   bona ha-   lungi.
AUG- LOC18- 9house 18REL.DEM SM1S- PAST3- OM9- see   NC16- nice

Int: 'The house which I saw the inside of is nice.' (non-locative prefix)

d. *O-   mu-   nju   **omwo**   n-   ka-   **gi-**   bona-**mu**
AUG- LOC18- 9house 18REL.DEM SM1S- PAST3- OM9- see-   LOC18
ha-   lungi
NC16- nice

Int: 'The house which I saw the inside of is nice.' (non-locative prefix and locative enclitic)   [Bugabo Haya]

Locative prefixes are grammatical but not non-locative class prefixes, even when they refer to a locative noun. This indicates that, although there are differences in their use with particular verbs, locative enclitics are more similar to locative object markers than to non-locative object prefixes.

Locative enclitics and prefixes are grammatical with relativized entities, unlike object markers, but optional, unlike subject markers or resumptive elements with prepositions.

A pattern which is similar to the one found with Haya relative clauses has also been reported for Bukusu (Diercks, 2009). In Bukusu, object markers appear to be pronominal, insofar as doubling an object marker with a lexical object is generally ungrammatical (unlike in Haya). Object marking is also ungrammatical in relative clauses. But, as shown in (26a), just like in Haya, locative clitics are grammatical in relative clauses while non-locative object markers are not, as shown in (26b). There are more differences between the two patterns. In Bukusu locative clitics can also double an agreeing "subject", for example in locative inversion. This does not hold for Haya.

(26)   a.   Mu- nju   ni-   **mwo** Peter a-   la-   bona-(**mo**) ba-
18-   house COMP-   18   1Peter SM1- FUT-   see-   LOC18 AUG2-
baandu. . .
2people

'The house in which Peter will see the people...' (locative RC)

b. Ka- matunda ni- **ko** ba- bandu ba- a- (*ka)- kula
AUG6- 6fruit COMP- 6 AUG2 -2people SM2- PAST- OM6- buy
likoloba. . .
yesterday

'The fruit that the people bought yesterday...' (object RC)
[Bukusu, Diercks 2009, 2]

Note that this relativization strategy resembles the Haya cleft construction in (5), but there is a clear difference in the structure assumed and the meaning it has in the two languages.

6   Conclusions

This paper has presented an overview of the relativization patterns found in Haya. It has been shown that there are differences between subjects and non-subjects in terms of the relativization strategy, as well as with the morphological marking of the relativized constituent inside the relative clause. Subjects, objects and locatives differ in terms of the acceptability or obligatoriness of verbal "agreement" morphology. In Haya, apart from subject markers and object markers, there are more clear-cut resumptive elements which differ in their syntactic properties from subject and object markers.

Locatives have special properties in relative clauses in Haya, as well as in Bukusu, both of which do not allow object marking of a relativized element in general. Bantu locative object markers also have special properties in general. They do not interact with the verbal argument structure in the same way as other object markers. More research is needed on the properties of the different types of locative morphemes and their differences from morphologically similar non-locative elements in order to understand better how subject and object marking work in languages like Haya and Bukusu.

7   References

Bresnan, Joan & Sam Mchombo (1987). Topic, Pronoun, and Agreement in Chichêwa. *Language* 63, 741–782.

Byarushengo, Ernest R., Alessandro Duranti & Larry M. Hyman (eds.) (1977). *Haya Grammatical Structure*. Los Angeles: Department of Linguistics, University of Southern California.

Diercks, Michael J. (2009). Arguments for a Motion Phrase: The Bukusu Locative Clitic. Paper presented at the 40th Annual Conference on African Linguistics.

Duranti, Alessandro (1977). Relative Clauses. In Ernest R. Byarushengo, Alessandro Duranti & Larry M. Hyman (eds.), *Haya Grammatical Structure*, 119–132. Los Angeles: Department of Linguistics, University of Southern California.

Grégoire, Claire (1975). *Les locatifs en bantou*. Ph.D. thesis, Universiteit Leiden.

Henderson, Brent (2006). *The Syntax and Typology of Bantu Relative Clauses*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Hyman, Larry M. (1999). The interaction between focus and tone in Bantu. In Georges Rebuschi & Laurice Tuller (eds.), *The Grammar of Focus*, 151–177. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Hyman, Larry M. & Ernest R. Byarushengo (1984). A Model of Haya Tonology. In G. N. Clements & J. Goldsmith (eds.), *Autosegmental Studies in Bantu Tone 3*, 53–103. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.

Hyman, Larry M. & Alessandro Duranti (1982). On the Object Relation in Bantu. In S. A. Thompson & P. Hopper (eds.), *Studies in Transitivity*, 217–239. New York: Academic Press.

Mchombo, Sam (2004). *The Syntax of Chichewa*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Muzale, Henry (1998). *A reconstruction of the Proto-Rutaran tense/aspect system*. Ph.D. thesis, Memorial University of Newfoundland.

Muzale, Henry (2006). *Ikaningambo ya Oruhaya: Ruhaya Dictionary*. Dar es Salaam, Tanzania: LOT Publications.

Riedel, Kristina (2009). *The Syntax of Object Marking in Sambaa: A Comparative Bantu Perspective*. Ph.D. thesis, Universiteit Leiden.

Ross, John R. (1967). *Constraints on Variables in Syntax*. Ph.D. thesis, MIT.

Rubanza, Yunus I. (1988). *Linear Order in Haya Verbal Morphology: Theoretical Implications*. Ph.D. thesis, Michigan State University.

Rugemalira, Josephat M. (2005). *A Grammar of Runyambo*. Dar es Salaam, Tanzania: LOT Publications.

Trithart, Lee (1977). Locatives. In Ernest R. Byarushengo, Alessandro Duranti & Larry M. Hyman (eds.), *Haya Grammatical Structure*, 89–98. Department of Linguistics, University of Southern California.