ADVANCEMENT IN SOME ASIAN AND AFRICAN LANGUAGES*

Nkonko M. Kamwangamalu
University of Swaziland

'Advancement', a Relational Grammar rule which promotes a nominal bearing a given grammatical relation in a clause to a higher relation in the same clause (Perlmutter 1983), has been one of the central themes in Relational Grammar (RG) for the past twenty years or so. In RG, examples of advancement include such traditional rules as dative movement, raising, and passive. This paper discusses advancement of accusative, dative, and locative nominals in passive constructions in some South Asian and African languages, with a focus on Hindi and Ciluba. The paper is especially concerned with the claim in RG that 'the relational network of every passive clause in any human language has a nominal bearing the 2-relation and the 1-relation in successive strata (Perlmutter & Postal 1983:17). The data presented not only challenges this claim, but also has far-reaching implications for the relational laws resulting therefrom, viz. the Agreement Law, the Chomeur Law, and the Stratal Uniqueness Law. The implications of the data for relational concepts such as 'Terms' will also be discussed. It will be suggested that RG modify its claim, laws, and concepts to accommodate the data presented here and elsewhere in the literature on South Asian (e.g. Y. Kachru et al. 1976, Pandharipande 1981, Hock 1982, Mohanan 1990) and African (e.g. Dalgish 1976) languages.

1. Introduction

The subject of this paper is 'advancement', a Relational Grammar (RG) rule that promotes a nominal bearing a given grammatical relation in a clause to a higher relation in the same clause (Perlmutter 1983). The paper aims to discuss advancement of accusative, dative and locative nominals in passive constructions in some Asian and African languages, and in Hindi and Ciluba in particular. More specifically, the paper addresses the claim in RG that the 'relational network of every passive clause in any human language has a nominal bearing the 2-relation and the 1-relation in successive strata (Perlmutter & Postal 1983:17). Before I discuss this claim and the conditions or laws resulting therefrom, I shall, by way of background, first present a brief introduction to RG theory. Subsequently, 1 shall discuss accusative advancement in Hindi, and accusative, dative, and locative advancement in Ciluba, with a focus on how these nominals achieve subjecthood in passive constructions. This will be followed by a discussion of the implications of the Hindi and Ciluba data for the RG's claim under consideration. It is worth noting here that the discussion of advancement in Hindi will draw heavily from previous works in which this topic has received extensive coverage (e.g. Y. Kachru

1980, Pandharipande 1981, Hock 1982, Mohanan 1990). This discussion will be limited to accusative nominals only because these are the only ones that can advance to subject in passive constructions in Hindi and related languages (e.g. Y. Kachru et al. 1976, Hock 1982).

2.0 Relational Grammar

2.1 Background

Central to RG theory is the notion of grammatical relations in a clause. RG views a clause as consisting of a network of grammatical relations such as SUBJECT (SU), DIRECT OBJECT (DO), INDIRECT OBJECT (IO), LOCATIVE (Loc), INSTRUMENTAL (Ins), BENEFACTIVE (Ben), etc. These are referred to as primitives of syntactic theory. The primitives are divided into two main categories: central relations and oblique relations. Central relations include SU, DO, and IO, known as TERMS or as the 1-relation, the 2-relation, and the 3-relation, respectively. Oblique relations include the remaining relations, viz. Loc, Ins, Ben, etc. These are known as NON-TERMS.

Also central to RG is the notion of linguistic levels. RG argues that multiple syntactic levels must be recognized in the analysis of clause structure. This is because in a clause a nominal may bear a range of relations to the predicate at different syntactic levels and also because certain syntactic phenomena are sensitive to some grammatical relations but not to others. For example, in (1a) below the term *banana* bears the 2-relation to the predicate, while in (1b) it bears the 1-relation. Similarly, in (2a) the term *Paul*, for instance, bears the 3-relation to the predicate, whereas in (2b) and (2c), it bears the 2-relation and the 1-relation, respectively. Related to the question of linguistic levels is the distinction in RG between initial and final grammatical relations. For instance, in (1a) the term *child* is an initial 1, while the term *banana* is an initial 2. In (1b), however, the term *child* bears the chomeur relation to the predicate, while the term *banana* bears the final 1-relation.

(1) a.   The child ate **the banana**.
     b.   **The banana** was eaten by the child.

(2) a.   John gave food to **Paul**
     b.   John gave **Paul** food
     c.   **Paul** was given food by John

Similar examples can be drawn from Asian languages, e.g. Malayalam and Hindi, or from African languages, e.g. Ciluba and Lingala, as shown in (3)-(4). In (3a) the highlighted terms each bear the 2-relation to the predicate, while in (3b) they bear the 1-relation. The data in (4a) shows that the term *Paul* bears the 3-relation in the initial stratum, while where applicable in the final stratum in (4b) it bears the 1-relation.

(3) a.   'The child ate the banana.'
          (M=Malayalam, H= Hindi, C=Ciluba, L= Lingala)

          M: **kutti** param tunnu
                child-N / banana-N / eat-PT

      H: **bacce**-ne kelaa k^{h}aayaa
           child-Erg / banana-N / eat-Perf

      C: **mu-ana** u-aku-di-a ci-bota
           pf-child / Ag-PT-eat-FV / pf-banana

      L: **mu-ana** a-li-aki e-tabi
           pf-child / Ag-eat-PT / pf-banana

  b. 'The banana was eaten by the child.'

      M: **kutti**yaal param tinnappetu.
           child-Ins / banana-N / eat-PSV-PT

      H: **bacce**-dvaaraa kelaa k^{h}aayaa gayaa
           child-through / banana-N / eat-Perf go-Perf

      C: **ci-bota** ci-aku-di-ibwa kudi mu-ana
           pf-banana / Ag-PT-eat-PSV / by / pf-child

      L: **e-tabi** e-li-am-aki na mu-ana
           pf-banana / Ag-eat-PSV-PT / by / pf-child

(4) a. 'John gave food to Paul (gave Paul food).'

      M: **John** Paul b^{h}aksanam kotu^{tt}u.
           John-N / Paul-D / food / give-PT

      H: **John** Paul k^{h}aanaa diyaa
           John-E / Paul-D / food-N / give-Perf

      C: **Jean** u-aku-pa *ci-akudia Paul (Paul ci-akudia)
           John / Ag-PT-give / pf -food / Paul (Paul / pf-food)

      L: **Jean** a-pes-aki *bi-lei Paul (Paul bi-lei)
           John / Ag-give-PT / pf-food / Paul (Paul / pf-food)

    b. 'Paul was given food by John'

      M: X (no equivalent)

      H: **Paul**-ko John-dvaaraa k^{h}aanaa diyaa gayaa
           Paul-D / John-through / food-N / give-Perf / go-Perf

      C: **Paul** u-aku-p-ibw-a ci-akudia kudi Jean
           Paul / Ag-PT-give-PS-FV / pf-food / by / John

      L: **Paul** a-pes-am-aki bi-lei na Jean
           Paul / Ag-give-PSV-PT / pf-food / by / John

Considering data such as (1)-(4), the question is how does RG explain the fact that the term *Paul*, for instance, which is an initial 3 in (2a), turns out to be a final 1 in (2c). This is where the notion of 'advancement' comes into the picture, a point to which I turn below.

Studies in the Linguistic Sciences 23:2 (Fall 1993)

2.2 Advancement and passive in RG

In view of data such as (1)-(4), and in particular the English data in (1) and (2), Perlmutter (1983:17) makes the claim given in (5) about advancement in passive clauses not just in English but in human languages in general:

(5)   the RN of every passive clause in any human language has a nominal bearing the 2-relation and the 1-relation in successive strata

In line with this claim Perlmutter 1983 defines passive as:

(6)   a rule which sanctions 1-hood in an immediately successive stratum for a nominal which is a 2 of a clause at a stratum in which some nominal is a 1.

In other words, what both (5) and (6) mean is that in passive constructions nothing can be a final 1 (i.e. subject) which was not a 2 (i.e. direct object) in a preceding stratum. Advancement in passive constructions, as defined above, is governed by certain restrictions or laws in RG terminology, including the following (Perlmutter & Postal 1983:88-101, Frantz 1981:71):

(7)   a.   The AGREEMENT LAW:
             'only Terms can trigger verb agreement. That is, only a nominal bearing Term relation in some stratum may trigger verb agreement.'

      b.   The CHOMEUR LAW:
             If some nominal N_a, bears a given Term relation 'n' in a given stratum S_i, and some other nominal N_b bears the same Term relation in the following stratum, S_{i+1}, then N_a bears the chomeur relation (n) in S_{i+1}.

      c.   The STRATAL UNIQUENESS LAW:
             Each Term bears one and only one grammatical relation to the predicate.

It is the above claims and laws that I shall be concerned with in this paper. It should be pointed out that these claims and laws have been challenged in recent literature on the syntax of Hindi and related languages (e.g. Pandharipande 1981). My concern here is to determine to what extent the claims and laws are applicable in passive constructions involving accusative, dative and locative nominals in Ciluba. First, I shall argue that contrary to the RG view of passive, in Ciluba dative and locative nominals may passivize directly from their initial grammatical relation as 3 or loc to the 1-relation, and that attempting to advance these nominals to 1 via 3>2 or loc>3>2 would yield ungrammatical sentences. Second, I shall show that in Ciluba the distinction between terms and non-terms does not hold since, contrary to the Agreement Law, non-terms do also trigger verb agreement in this language. Third, I shall show that the facts of Ciluba receive support from previous works on languages as distant as Asian languages, such as Hindi. For instance, there is evidence from the literature on Hindi syntax that shows that contrary to one of the RG laws referred to earlier, viz. the Stratal Uniqueness Law, in Hindi a term may simultaneously bear two grammatical relations to the predicate, the subject relation on the one hand, and the direct object relation on the other (e.g. Y. Kachru 1980, Pandharipande 1981).

3.0 Hindi and Ciluba

3.1 Background

Hindi is an Indo-Aryan language spoken on the Indian subcontinent. Ciluba is a Bantu language spoken in the Republic of Zaire. Both languages differ in many important respects. Here I shall highlight some of the features that are relevant to this paper. In terms of word order, Hindi is an SOV language, while Ciluba is an SVO language. In Hindi direct daughters of S can scramble freely, but this is not allowed in Ciluba, the latter being a strict word order language. Hindi has a case-marking system whereby in a clause the syntactic function of a given nominal is signaled. In the clause *Ninaa-ne bacce-ko kitaab dii* 'Nina gave the child a book', the nominal *Ninaa* carries the ergative case while the nominal *bacce* carries the dative case, as signaled by the clitics *-ne* and *-ko*, respectively. In Hindi syntax, a nominal that does not bear a clitic, such as *kitaab* 'book' is conventionally assumed to bear a nominative case (Y. Kachru et al. 1976, 1977; Y. Kachru 1980; Pandharipande 1981, 1990; Mohanan 1990). In terms of agreement, in Hindi a verb agrees in number, gender, person with its subject if it is nominative. And if the subject is not nominative, the verb agrees with the object if that is nominative (Mohanan 1990:14).

In Ciluba, as in most Bantu languages (e.g. Bresnan & Kanerva 1989), a finite verb must agree with its subject noun in person, number and noun class by means of an agreement prefix. To ensure subject-verb agreement, each Bantu language, and Ciluba is not an exception, has a noun class system whereby each noun consists of two basic morphemes, a noun prefix and a noun stem. In the noun *ba-ana* 'children', for instance, *ba-* is the noun prefix, and *-ana* the noun stem. The noun prefix provides a clue to determining the type of agreement that must obtain between a subject noun and a verb (Kamwangamalu 1985:110). For instance, in the clause *ba-ana ba-di ba-dila* 'the children are crying' the prefix *ba-* in *ba-ana* ensures that whatever verb comes after the noun *ba-ana* 'children' must bear this same prefix for agreement, as evidenced by the presence of the prefix *ba-* in *ba-di* 'are' and *ba-dila* 'crying'.

Hindi and Ciluba may be different from each other in many other important respects, but describing such differences is beyond the scope of this paper: advancement of accusative nominals in Hindi, and accusative, dative and locative nominals in Ciluba.

3.2 Accusative/dative/locative nominals and subjecthood in Hindi and Ciluba

It is generally agreed that a nominal that bears an accusative case ranks higher in the subject accessibility hierarchy. The questions I would like to raise in this section concern mainly accessibility to subject of dative and locative nominals. First, can dative and locative nominals advance to 1-relation (i.e. subject) in passive constructions in Hindi and Ciluba and, if they can, how is this advancement process done? Is it the case that a dative/locative nominal that advances to 1 does so in one step, that is from its initial grammatical relation as 3/loc to the sub-

ject relation; or does it achieve subjecthood through intermediate stages, such as exemplified in (2a-c) above?

Let us first address the question of subjecthood of accusative/ dative/locative nominals in Hindi and Ciluba, digressing briefly on the concept of subject. I shall start with Hindi, drawing heavily on the works of Y. Kachru 1980, 1981, 1990, Pandharipande 1981, and Mohanan 1990. According to the works just cited, in Hindi there are two types of nominals that are considered canonical or unmarked subjects, viz. the ergative subjects and the nominative subjects. However, such nominals are not the only ones that can function as grammatical subject in a Hindi clause. Other nominals that behave like subject include those I am concerned with in this paper, viz. the accusative, dative and locative nominals. Determining the subjecthood of these nominals is not a straightforward affair in Hindi. To deter- mine the subjecthood of these or any other nominals most Hindi grammarians usu- ally appeal to syntactic phenomena such as case-marking, agreement, word order, pronominal coreference, passivization, gap control, reflexive binding, conj- unction reduction, etc. Here I shall refer to few of these phenomena, as discussed in recent works on Hindi syntax (Y. Kachru 1990, Mohanan 1990). In their works, Y. Kachru and Mohanan are of the opinion that in Hindi a nominal that is claimed to be a subject must behave like one that is, it must have the properties associated with subject in the language, including the following, among others:

i)   it must be able to control reflexivization
ii)   it must be able to control conjunction reduction
iv)   it must be able to control equi-NP deletion

No universality is claimed for these conditions on subjecthood. That is, a nominal that meets these conditions and therefore qualifies for subjecthood in Hindi, for in- stance, may not necessarily qualify as subject in other South Asian languages and vice versa. It is not surprising, then, that in languages such as Maithili, for in- stance, dative nominals are treated as objects rather than subjects (e.g. Mishra 1990).

Unlike Maithili, there seems to be enough evidence from recent works on Hindi syntax that in Hindi accusative/dative/locative nominals also behave like subjects (e.g. Pandharipande 1981, Mohanan 1990). While accusative nominals may function as subject with any class of predicate, there are in Hindi certain classes of predicates which govern dative/locative subjects. For instance, Y. Kachru 1990 notes that predicates that denote a set of 'inherent properties' such as *utsaah* 'enthusiasm', *dhairy* 'patience', *himmat* 'courage', etc. require a locative subject, while those that denote perception (e.g. *dikhaaii denaa* 'to be visible'), liking (e.g. *pasand aanaa* 'to like'), knowledge (e.g. *maaluum honaa* 'to come to know'), etc. require a dative subject. In what follows I present data which show that accusative, dative and locative nominals do indeed have properties associated with subject, for they meet the above and other diagnostics for subjecthood in Hindi.

3.2.1 Accusative/dative/locative subjects in Hindi

3.2.1.1 The reflexive *apnaa* binding

According to Kachru & Bhatia 1977 and Pandharipande 1981, in Hindi the reflexive *apnaa* can take as its antecedent a subject, grammatical or logical, but no other argument. In the literature this phenomenon is also known as reflexive binding. The data in (8)-(9) is illustrative. In both (8a) and (9a) the dative nominals *Rita* and *Vijay* are the logical subjects in their respective structures and, therefore, they qualify as antecedent of the reflexive *apnaa*. (8b) and (9b) show that in contrast to the reflexive, a pronoun cannot be coreferent with the subject of its minimal clause (Mohanan 1990). The dative subjects in the (b) sentences in (8)-(9) therefore cannot be coreferential with the pronoun *uske*.

(8)　a.　ritaa-ko apnaa ghar bahut yaad aa rahaa thaa
　　　　　Rita-Dat / self's / home / much / memory / coming / was
　　　　　'Rita$_i$ was missing self's$_i$ home very much.'
　　　　　(Y. Kachru 1990:70)
　　b.　ritaa-ko ghar uska bahut yaad aa rahaa thaa
　　　　　Rita-Dat / home / pron / much / memory / coming was
　　　　　'Rita$_i$ was missing her$_{j/*i}$ home very much.'

(9)　a.　vijay-ko kitaab apnee g^{h}ar-me milii
　　　　　Vijay-Dat / book-N / self-Gen house-L / find-Perf
　　　　　'Vijay$_i$ found the book in self$_{i/*j}$ house.'
　　　　　(Mohanan 1990:197)
　　b.　vijay-ko kitaab uske g^{h}ar-me milli
　　　　　Vijay-Dat / book-N / pron / home-L / find-Perf
　　　　　'Vijay$_i$ found the book at his$_{j/*i}$ home.'

Reflexive binding, as described above, holds not only for dative nominals but also for locative nominals, as can be seen in (10). (10a) shows that the locative nominal, *niina-me*, is the only eligible antecedent of the reflexive *apnaa*. In the Hindi grammarians' view, this suggests that either the logical subject, namely the locative *niina-me* is the subject, or that there is no subject at all in (10a). It is noted that the facts of pronominal coreference support the former alternative. Pronouns cannot be coreferent with the subject in their minimal finite clause. This is borne out in (10b), where it is shown that the pronoun *uskii* is not coreferent with the locative nominal *Ninaa-me*. This suggests that the latter is indeed the subject in both (10a) and (10b) (e.g. Mohanan 1990:235-36). (The list of abbreviations used in the data below is given in the footnotes section[1]).

(10)　a.　niinaa-me apnii mausii-ke liye badii mamtaa h
　　　　　Nina-Loc / self-Gen / aunt-Gen / for / much / affection-N / be-pres
　　　　　'Nina$_i$ has a lot of affection for self's$_i$ aunt.'
　　　b.　niinaa-me uskii mausii-ke liye badii mamtaa hai
　　　　　Nina-Loc / pron-Gen / aunt-Gen / for / much / affection / be-pres
　　　　　'Nina$_i$ has a lot of affection for her$_{*i}$ aunt.'

The facts of reflexive binding presented in (8)-(10) obtain also in construc-

tions with accusative nominals, as illustrated in (11). Note that (11a) is the active counterpart of the passive construction in (11b). In (11a) the ergative nominal *John*, the unmarked subject, is obviously the eligible antecedent of the reflexive *apne*, as required in Hindi. In (11b), however, the ergative nominal under consideration has been demoted from its initial grammatical relation of subject to the chomeur relation as a result of passive, thus leaving the initially accusative nominal, *Paul*, as the binder of the reflexive *apne*. Since the latter can only have a subject, logical or grammatical, as its antecedent, it is correct to assume that the nominal *Paul* is the grammatical subject, and it is, in the passive construction in (11b). It is worth pointing out here that in addition to (11b), there is an alternative passive to the construction in (11a). This alternative, which I shall discuss later, is given in (11c). This construction differs from (11b) in terms of case-marking: in (11c) the nominal *Paul* is case-marked, while in (11b) it is not case-marked.

(11) a.   John-ne Paul-ko apne kamre me dekhaa
            John-Erg / Paul-Acc / self / room / in / saw-Perf
            'John$_i$ saw Paul$_j$ food in self$_{i/*j}$ home.'
     b.   Paul apne kamre me dekhaa gayaa
            Paul / self / room / in / seen / was-Perf
            'Paul$_j$ was seen (by John$_i$) in self$_{j/(*i)}$ home.'
     c.   Paul-ko apne kamre me dekhaa gayaa
            Paul-Acc / self's / room / in / seen / was-Perf
            'Paul$_i$ was seen in self's$_i$ room.'

3.2.1.2 Conjunction reduction[2]

The data in (12)-(13) shows that the dative subject behaves like a subject because it controls conjunction reduction, as in (12), though it does not undergo this process, as can be seen in (13) (e.g. Y. Kachru 1990:63).

(12) tasviir dekh kar use gussa aayaa
     picture / see / CP / him / Dat / anger came
     'He$_i$ became angry__$_i$/having seen the picture.'

(13) *gussa aa kar us-ne sab ko bahut DaaTaa
     anger / come / CP / he-Erg / all / DO / much / scolded
     'He$_i$ scolded everyone__*$_i$ having become angry.'

3.2.1.3 Equi-NP deletion

In Hindi, like subject the dative nominal both controls and undergoes equi, as shown in (14) and (15) (Y. Kachru 1990: 64).

(14) larke-ko film dekhnaa pasand hai
     boy-Dat / film / viewing / liking / is
     'The boy likes to view films.'

(15) larke-ne film pasand aane kii carcaa nahii kii
     boy-Erg / film / liking / coming of / mention / not / did
     'The boy did not mention (his) liking the film.'

As can be seen from the data presented above (e.g. (8)-(17)), dative, locative and accusative nominals prove to function as subject in Hindi, a point that is demonstrated at length by Y. Kachru and Mohanan. Rather than pursue this point any further, I shall assume the correctness of the conclusions reached by Y. Kachru and Mohanan and others regarding the subjecthood of the above-mentioned nominals in Hindi and will, instead, focus on how these nominals achieve their status as subject in this language. But first, a word on the subjecthood of accusative, dative and locative nominals in Ciluba.

3.2.2 Accusative/dative/locative subjects in Ciluba

We have seen that in Hindi one needs a number of diagnostics to show that accusative/dative/locative nominals can behave like subjects. In Ciluba, however, the situation is much simpler. Compared to Hindi, in Ciluba it simply takes one test to determine the subjecthood of not just accusative/dative/locative nominals, but of any nominal that claims subjecthood in a Ciluba clause. The most common test is agreement: In Ciluba, as in related Bantu languages (e.g. Swahili, Lingala, Kikongo), the verb must agree in person, number and noun class with nothing else but the subject, as can be seen from (16)-(17). In (16) and (17a) the verb agrees with the nominative nominals *mwana* 'child' and *bibota* 'bananas', respectively, while in (17b) the verb agrees with the inverted locative *pa-mesa* 'on the table.'

(16) mu-ana u-aku-di-a bi-bota
      pf/sg-child / Ag-PTs-eat-FV / pf.pl-bananas
      'The child ate the bananas.'

(17) a. bi-bota bi-di **pa-mesa**
          pf.pl-banana / Ag-are. / Loc.on-table
          'The bananas are on the table.'

      b. **pa-mesa** pa-di bi-bota
          Loc.on-table / Ag-are / pf.pl-banana
          'Lit: On the table is (are) bananas.'

Agreement, as shown in (16)-(17), obtains also in passive constructions with accusative, dative and locative nominals, as can be seen in (18)-(19). Note that in the active clause in (18a), the verb *-pa* 'give' agrees with the subject *John* by means of the (singular) agreement prefix *u-*. Note also that in (18) both the initially accusative nominal, *ci-akudia* 'food', and the initially dative nominal, *ba-ana* 'children' each can be passivized, as shown in (18b) and (18c), respectively. In the passive construction in (18b), the verb agrees with the initially dative nominal *ba-ana* 'children', which in this case is the grammatical subject of the clause under consideration. Here agreement is done by means of the (plural) agreement prefix *ba-*. In (18c), the verb agrees with the initially accusative nominal *ci-akudia* 'food' by means of the agreement prefix *ci-*. In (19a) agreement is the same as in (18a). In (19b), which is the passive counterpart of (19a), the verb agrees with the locative nominal *mu-cikuku* 'in the kitchen' by means of the locative prefix *mu-*.

(18) a. Jean u-aku-p-a ba-ana ci-akudia
John / Ag-PTs-give-FV / pf.pl-child / pf-food
'John gave the children food/food to the children.'

b. **Ba**-ana **ba**-aku-p-ibw-a ci-akudia kudi Jean
pf.pl-child / Ag-PTs-give-PSV-FV / pf-food / by / John
'The children were given food by John.'

c. **Ci**-akudia **ci**-aku-p-ibw-a ba-na kudi Jean
pf.sg-food /Ag-PTs-give-PSV-FV / children / by / John
'Food was given to the children by John.'

(19) a. Jean u-aku-p-a ba-ana ci-akudia mu-cikuku
John / Ag-PTs-give-FV / pf.pl-child / pf-food / Loc.in-kitchen
'John gave the children food in the kitchen.'

b. **mu**-cikuku **mu**-aku-p-ibw-a ba-ana ci-akudia kudi Jean
Loc.in-kitchen / Ag-PTs-give-PSV-FV / pf-child / pf-food / by / John
Lit: 'In the house was given the children food by John.'

In addition to the facts presented in (18)-(19), elsewhere I have shown that in Ciluba, accusative, dative, and locative nominals behave like subject-Terms not only in terms of their ability to govern agreement on the verb, but also in terms of other properties associated with Terms, such as the ability to passivize, to relativize, to incorporate onto the verb, to cleft, and to topicalize (e.g. Kamwangamalu 1985)

Having shown that in both Hindi and Ciluba accusative/dative/locative nominals may also function as subjects, I shall now move on to the other concern of this paper, viz. how these nominals achieve their status as subject in passive constructions in the languages under consideration.

4. Accusative/dative/locative advancement to subject in Hindi/Ciluba

It was observed earlier that in Hindi, dative and locative subjects are base-generated rather than derived through processes such as advancement. Therefore, they will not be included in the discussion of advancement that follows. As background for this discussion, let us recall the claim in (5) regarding RG's conception of the relational network of a passive clause. Again, RG claims that the relational network of every passive clause in any human language has a nominal bearing the 2-relation and the 1-relation in successive strata. Applying this claim about passive to Hindi and Ciluba, the following analyses can be envisaged for accusative (in addition to dative/ locatives for Ciluba) advancement in passive constructions in these languages.

One analysis, which follows directly from and is consistent with the above-stated claim of RG, is that in Hindi and Ciluba, an accusative nominal behaves like a subject that has undergone 2 to 1 advancement. Following this analysis, Ciluba nominals such as locative/dative, for instance, cannot be promoted to subject unless they have first undergone loc>3>2 / 3>2 advancement, respectively.

The other analysis, one that I shall suggest in this paper, is that for Ciluba, locative/dative nominals do not have to undergo loc>3>2>1 / 3>2>1 advance-

ment, and that they undergo loc/3>1 advancement instead. For Hindi, the literature (e.g. Pandharipande 1981, Mohanan 1990) suggests that an accusative nominal may behave like subject in a given construction without necessarily having undergone 2>1 advancement. This analysis conflicts with the claim of Perlmutter and others (e.g. Johnson 1981), but it is consistent with the data of Hindi and Ciluba presented thus far in this paper. For the sake of illustration, let us look again at the passive constructions given earlier in (11) for Hindi and in (4) for Ciluba, repeated here below as (20) and (21), respectively.

Regarding Hindi, it is clear that in (20b) the accusative nominal *Paul* has advanced to 1, as can be concluded from the absence of the accusative case on the nominal under consideration. In (20c), however, there is no evidence that advancement has taken place. The presence of the accusative case on the nominal *Paul* attests to this conclusion. Of crucial importance regarding (20c) is that in this construction the accusative nominal *Paul* is the only eligible antecedent of the reflexive *apnee*. Recall that in Hindi *apnee* can have nothing else but a subject as its antecedent. It follows that the accusative nominal *Paul*, the only antecedent of *apne*, is the subject of the passive construction in (20c). In a sense, then, it can be concluded that in (20c) the subjecthood of the accusative-marked nominal *Paul* is not dependent on its promotion to 1, and that promotion of this nominal to 1 is actually optional. Hock (1985:66) draws similar conclusions regarding advancement in Sanskrit of non-terms and terms to direct object and subject, respectively. He notes (p. 66) that ... 'if a non-term, adverbial constituent shows case variation between, say, locative and accusative, promotion to direct object status is possible only if there is no other direct object ... and that even under these conditions, promotion of that accusative-marked NP to subject of the passive is only optional.' The point here is to show that the facts of Hindi presented in (20c) are not an isolated case, and that they obtain in other Southeast Asian languages as well, such as Sanskrit. While these facts accord well with Hindi syntax they, obviously, conflict with the 2>1 analysis as well as with some of RG laws presented earlier in this paper, such as the Stratal Uniqueness Law. Again, by virtue of this law, each term bears one and only one grammatical relation to the predicate (Perlmutter 1983:88). Now, reconsider the construction in (20c). As was pointed out above, in this construction the term *Paul* bears not one but two grammatical relations to the predicate: First, *Paul* is a direct object because of its case, it bears the accusative case; second, *Paul* is the grammatical subject in the construction under consideration because it is the only eligible antecedent of the reflexive *apne*: in Hindi, only a nominal that is a subject can be the binder of the reflexive *apne*.

(20) a.   John-ne Paul-ko apne kamre me dekhaa
            John-Erg / Paul-Acc / self / room / in / saw-Perf
            'John$_i$ saw Paul$_j$ food in self$_{i/*j}$ home.'
      b.   Paul apne kamre me dekhaa gayaa
            Paul / self / room / in / seen / was-Perf
            'Paul$_j$ was seen (by John$_i$) in self$_{j/(*i)}$ home.'

    c.   Paul-ko apne kamre me dekhaa gayaa
          Paul-Acc / self's / room / in / seen / was-Perf
          'Paul$_i$ was seen in self's$_i$ home.'

For Ciluba, the data in (21)-(22) suggest that accusative nominals can undergo 2>1 advancement, much as they can in English and other languages. For dative nominals, however, the data show that when such nominals advance to subject, they do so in one leap only that is, from their initial relation as dative to subject relation, and not through 3>2>1 advancement. Any attempt to advance a dative nominal for instance to 2 first and then to 1 results in an ungrammatical structure, as can be concluded from (21b).[2]

(21) a.   Jean u-aku-p-a **ba-ana** ci-akudia
          John / Ag-PTs-give-FV / pf.pl-child / pf-food
          'John gave the children food/food to the children.'
    b.   *Jean u-aku-p-a ci-akudia **ba-ana**
          Jean / Ag-PTs-give-FV / pf-food / pf.pl-child
    c.   **Ba-ana** ba-aku-p-ibw-a ci-akudia kudi Jean
          Pr.pl-child / Ag-PTs-give-PSV-FV / pf-food / by / John
          'The children were given food by John.'

Similar conclusions obtain also for locative advancement in this language, as shown in (22). Here, note that the locative *mu-cikuku* 'in the kitchen' advances directly to 1, as in (22d), and that attempting to advance it to 1 via Loc>3>2>1 advancement would yield unacceptable sentences, as evidenced by (22b,c).

(22) a.   Jean u-aku-p-a ba-ana ci-akudia **mu-cikuku**
          John / Ag-PTs-give / pf.pl-child / pf-food / Loc.in-kitchen
          'John gave the children food in the kitchen.'
    b.   *Jean u-aku-p-a ba-ana **mu-cikuku** ci-akudia
          John / Ag-PTs-give / pf.pl-child / Loc.in-kitchen / pf-food
          'John gave the children in the kitchen food.'
    c.   *Jean u-aku-p-a ***mu-cikuku** ba-ana ci-akudia
          John / Ag-PTs-give / Loc/in-kitchen   pf/pl-child / pf-food
          *'John gave in the kitchen the children food.'
    d.   **mu-cikuku** mu-aku-p-ibw-a ba-ana ci-akudia kudi Jean
          Loc.in-kitchen / Ag-PTs-give-PSV-FV / pf.pl-child / pf-food / by / Jean
          'Lit: In the house was given the children food by John.'

The fact that locatives in Ciluba can advance to 1 via loc>1 rather than Loc>3>2>1 advancement is not an isolated case. Dalgish 1976 makes a similar claim with respect to Olutsootsoo, a Bantu language of Kenya, and so does Kimenyi 1974 with respect to Kinyarwanda, a Bantu language of Rwanda. Both Dalgish and Kimenyi show respectively that in Olutsootsoo and Kinyarwanda advancement to 1 is not limited to terms and that locatives can advance to 1 as well. That locatives can advance to 1 is not unique to Bantu languages, but it is also attested to in non-Bantu languages. For instance, quoting Bell 1974 on advancement in Cebwano, a language of the Philippines, Perlmutter and Postal (1984:90) acknowledge that Cebwano allows with great freedom advancement[3] to 1 not only

of 2s and 3s but also of instrumentals, locatives, benefactives, temporals, etc. This freedom of advancement of both terms and non-terms to 1 is also evident in Ciluba, as can be seen from the data in (21) and (22). But what are the implications of such advancement of non-terms to 1 for the relational distinction between terms and non-terms, and for relational laws such as the Agreement law.

Consider, for instance, the Agreement Law. According to this law, which was stated earlier in (7a), only Terms can trigger subject-verb agreement in a clause. Now, consider agreement in (22d), above. This clause shows that the locative nominal *mu-nzubu* 'in the house' agrees with the verb *-pa* 'give' by means of the locative agreement prefix *mu-*. The question that arises here is whether locatives should be treated as Terms. Based on the data presented here, I would like to suggest that the scope of termhood in RG be extended so as to include locatives in languages such as Ciluba, since locatives are shown to behave like subject and especially so with respect to the Agreement Law.

5. Conclusions

In this paper I have been concerned with one of central claims in RG regarding passive, viz. the claim that the relational network of every passive clause in any human language has a nominal bearing the 2-relation and the 1-relation in successive strata. While this claim receives support from languages such as English and other languages around the world, it fails to accommodate data from some Asian and African languages, and from Hindi and Ciluba in particular.

The literature on Hindi provides evidence that in Hindi, there are cases where an accusative nominal can be the subject of a passive clause without necessarily having undergone 2>1 advancement. As a result, contrary to the Stratal Uniqueness Law, in Hindi it is possible that a term bear two grammatical relations to the predicate: the direct object relation on the one hand, and the subject relation on the other, as illustrated in (20c).

Unlike Hindi, accusative advancement in Ciluba accords well with the above RG claim about the relational network of a passive clause. However, the challenge to this claim comes from dative/locative advancement. I have shown that in Ciluba passivization of dative/locative nominals is a one-step process, 3>1 /loc>1 advancement, and that these nominals do not need to undergo 3>2 /loc>3>2 advancement prior to advancing to 1, as claimed in Relational Grammar. Since in Ciluba it is not just dative nominals that passivize directly from 3 to 1, and locatives behave the same way as well, the question is whether taking into account RG laws such as the Agreement Law passivizing locatives should be treated as Terms. In light of the available evidence I have suggested that they should: In Ciluba and related Bantu languages locative nominals behave like Terms not only in terms of their ability to govern subject-verb agreement but also, as I have shown elsewhere (e.g. Kamwangamalu 1985), in terms of their ability to do other things that Terms can do, including the ability to relativize, the ability to passivize, the ability to cleft, to list just a few.

NOTES

*An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 13th South Asian Languages Analysis (SALA) Roundtable, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Illinois, U.S.A., 25-27 May 1991. I would like to thank the National University of Singapore, where I was then working as a Visiting Lecturer, for sponsoring my participation in the SALA Roundtable. Also, I would like to thank Yamuna Kachru and Tara Mohanan for providing me with the Hindi data which have made this paper possible. Finally, I would like to acknowledge with gratitude the comments of Yamuna Kachru and Hans H. Hock on an earlier version of this paper. I alone am responsible for any remaining errors of interpretation or analysis of the data presented in this paper.

[1] Below are the abbreviations used in this paper:

Dat = dative;	Erg = ergative	Nom = nominative
Loc = locative;	pf = prefix	Perf = perfective
PSV = passive	pl = plural	sg = singular
PTs = past tense	Gen = genitive	Ag = agreement
FV = final vowel	pres = present tense	
CP = conjunctive participle		

[2] Besides, it should be pointed out that in Ciluba a dative (i.e. indirect) object has prominence over an accusative (i.e. direct) object. This explains why in ditransitive constructions a dative object must always be close to the verb, regardless of whether the accusative object is animate or inanimate. For further details, see Kamwangamalu 1985.

[3] Perlmutter and Postal 1984:90 do not specify whether in Cebwano advancement of instrumentals, locatives, benefactives, temporals and other non-terms to subject is done via intermediate stages, such as Inst/Loc/Ben/Temp >3>2>1, or whether it is done in one leap, e.g. Inst/Loc/Ben/Temp >1, as is the case in Ciluba and related Bantu languages (e.g. Lingala, Swahili, Kikongo).

REFERENCES

BRESNAN, Joan, & J. M. Kanerva. 1989. Locative inversion in Chichewa: a case study of factorization in grammar. Linguistic Inquiry 20:1.1-50.

DALGISH, Gerard M. 1976. Passivizing locatives in Olutsootsoo. Studies in the Linguistic Sciences 6:1.57-68.

FRANZ, Donald G. 1981. Grammatical relations in universal grammar. Monograph, Summer Institute of Linguistics: University of Lethbridge.

HOCK, Hans Henrich. 1982. The Sanskrit passive: Synchronic behavior and diachronic development. South Asian Review 6.127-37.

——. 1985. Sanskrit Double-Object Constructions: Will the real object please stand up? Indian Journal of Linguistics 12.50-70.

KACHRU, Yamuna. 1980. Aspects of Hindi grammar. New Delhi: Manohar Publications.

——. 1981. Transitivity and volitionality in Hindi-Urdu. Studies in the

Linguistic Sciences 11.2.191-93.

——. 1990. Experiencer and other oblique subjects in Hindi. Experiencer subjects in South Asian languages, ed. by M. K. Verma and K. P. Mohanan, 59-75. Stanford: The Center for the Study of Language and Information.

——, Braj B. Kachru, & Tej K. Bhatia. 1976. The notion 'subject': A note on Hindi-Urdu, Kashmiri and Panjabi. The notion of subject in South Asian Languages, ed. by M. K. Verma, 79-108. University of Wisconsin, Madison: South Asian Studies.

——, & Tej K. Bhatia. 1977. On reflexivization in Hindi-Urdu and its theoretical implications. Indian Linguistics 38:1. 21-38.

KAMWANGAMALU, Nkonko. 1985. Passivization in Bantu languages: implications for relational grammar. Studies in the Linguistic Sciences 15:1.109-133.

KIMENYI, Alexandre. 1976. A relational grammar of Kinyarwanda. UCLA Ph.D. dissertation in Linguistics.

MISHRA, Mithilesh K. 1990. Dative/experiencer subjects in Maithili. The notion of subject in South Asian Languages, ed. by M. K. Verma, 105-117. University of Wisconsin, Madison: South Asian Studies.

MOHANAN, Tara W. 1990. Arguments in Hindi. Stanford University Ph.D. dissertation in Linguistics.

PANDHARIPANDE, Rajeshwari. 1981. Syntax and semantics of the passive construction in selected South Asian languages. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Ph.D. dissertation in Linguistics.

PERLMUTTER, David. 1983 (ed.). Studies in relational grammar 1. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

——, & P. Postal. 1984. The 1-Advancement Exclusiveness Law. Studies in relational grammar 2, ed. by D. Perlmutter and Carol G. Rosen, 81-125. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.