

**The non-reflexive functions of the reflexive prefix *-i-* in the Tanzanian Bantu languages
Hehe, Nilamba and Nyaturu
Lengson Ngwasi
University of Gothenburg**

In this paper, I present data¹ from three Bantu languages Hehe (G62), Nilamba (F31) and Nyaturu (F32) and show that, unlike in many Bantu languages (cf. Schadeberg (2003); Schadeberg and Bostoen (2018)), the reflexive prefix *-i-* has other functions besides encoding reflexive meaning, as in (1). The other functions of the reflexive prefix *-i-* in these languages is to encode reciprocal meaning, as in (2) where it is ambiguous with reflexive meaning, and middle voice situations such as grooming actions, as in (3), spontaneous events etc. In this paper, I will focus on two middle voice events which are grooming actions and spontaneous events.

1. Reflexive meaning

a. Hehe

Juma akiwene mukilole

Juma	a -	ka -	i -	on -	ile	mu -	ki -	lole
Juma	1.SM-PST-REFL-see-PERF					CL17-CL7-mirror		

‘Juma saw himself in the mirror’

b. Nilamba

uJuma ukiona mukioo

u-Juma	u -	ka -	i -	on -	a	mu -	ki -	oo
aug-Juma	1.SM-PST-REFL-see-FV					CL17-CL7-mirror		

‘Juma saw himself in the mirror’

c. Nyaturu

Juma ughiona ughiyoo

Juma	u -	gha -	i -	on -	a	u -	ghi -	yoo
Juma	1.SM-PST-REFL-see-FV					CL17-CL7-mirror		

‘Juma saw himself in the mirror’

2. Reciprocal meaning

a. Hehe

Naftali na Juma vakiwene

Naftali na	Juma	va -	ka -	i -	on -	ile
Naftali Conj	Juma	2.SM-PST-REFL-see-PERF				

‘Naftali and Juma will see each other/themselves’

b. Nilamba

uNaftali nu Kiliani ionile

u-Naftali	na	u-Kiliani	a -	i -	on -	ile
aug-Naftali Conj	aug-Kiliani	2.SM-REFL-see-PERF				

‘Naftali and Kiliani saw each other/themselves’

¹ The data used in this talk is in most cases field-work based.

c. Nyaturu

Naftali vina Kiliani vighiona

Naftali vina Kiliani vi - gha - **i** - on - a

Naftali Conj Kiliani 2.SM-PST-REFL-see-FV

‘Naftali and Kiliani saw each other/themselves’

3. Grooming actions

a. Hehe

Juma akyofwige

Juma a - ka - **i** - ofug-ile

Juma 1.SM-PST-REFL-wash-PERF

‘Juma washed himself’

b. Nilamba

uJuma wiyogyile

u-Juma u - **i** - ogy - ile

aug-Juma 1.SM-REFL-wash-PERF

‘Juma washed himself’

c. Nyaturu

Juma aghioya

Juma a - gha - **i** - oy - a

Juma 1.SM-PST-REFL-wash-FV

‘Juma washed himself’

The other functions of the reflexive prefix *-i-* can be explained from a cross-linguistic grammaticalization perspective as leading from reflexive to other functions such as reciprocal and middle voice events (cf. Geniušienė (1987); Heine (2000); Heine and Narrog (2009); Kemmer (1993). For instance, Heine (2000) argues that the grammaticalization from reflexive to other functions in African languages is unidirectional process leading from Nominal > Emphatic reflexive > Reflexive > Reciprocal > Middle > Passive. This grammaticalization chain by Heine (2000) implies that for the reflexive marker to become middle voice marker, it should pass via reciprocal stage. In this paper, in contrast with Heine (2000) grammaticalization cline, I argue that the grammaticalization from reflexive to reciprocal, and the grammaticalization from reflexive to middle should be treated as two independent grammaticalization processes (i) Reflexive > Reciprocal and (ii) Reflexive > Middle. This argument is motivated by Haspelmath (1990) grammaticalization from Reflexive > Anticausative > Passive as well as Fried (2007) on the extension of reflexive markers to spontaneous events.

References

- Fried, M. (2007). Constructing grammatical meaning: Isomorphism and polysemy in Czech reflexivization. *Studies in Language. International Journal sponsored by the Foundation "Foundations of Language"*, 31(4), 721-764.
- Geniušienė, E. (1987). *The typology of reflexives: Empirical Approaches to Language typology* (Vol. 2). Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Haspelmath, M. (1990). The grammaticization of passive morphology. *Studies in Language. International Journal sponsored by the Foundation "Foundations of Language"*, 14(1), 25-72.
- Heine, B. (2000). Polysemy involving reflexive and reciprocal markers in African languages. In Z. Frajzyngier & T. Walker (Eds.), *Reciprocals: Forms and functions* (Vol. 2, pp. 1-30). Amsterdam; Philadelphia.
- Heine, B., & Narrog, H. (2009). Grammaticalization and linguistic analysis. In B. Heine & H. Narrog (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of linguistic analysis* (pp. 401-423). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kemmer, S. (1993). *The middle voice* (Vol. 23). Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Schadeberg, T. (2003). Derivation. In D. Nurse & G. Phillipson (Eds.), *The Bantu Languages* (pp. 71-89). London: Routledge.
- Schadeberg, T., & Bostoen, K. (2018). Word formation. In M. Van de Velde, K. Bostoen, D. Nurse, & G. Phillipson (Eds.), *The Bantu Languages*. London and New York: Routledge.