

The hidden conjoint/disjoint alternation in Chichewa

Qiūshí Chén

1. Introduction

As is well-known, in many Bantu languages, a verb may take different forms depending on whether it is the linearly final element in its domain. In Kirundi (1) and Zulu (2), for example, an extra affix obligatorily occurs on the verb if there is no complement directly following it (1b&2b); by contrast, if the verb is not domain-final, the extra affix is missing (1a&2a). Traditionally, the two forms are called the *disjoint* form and the *conjoint* form, respectively (Meeussen 1959). Note that across Bantu, the conjoint form is uniformly zero-marked (1a&2a), whereas the disjoint form involves an extra exponent (1b&2b):

- (1) a. imuúngu [zi=ry-a i-gǐti]
10.woodworms 10SM=eat-FV 7-wood
'(the) woodworms eat wood (and nothing but wood)'
b. imuúngu [zi=ra=ry-á] uruugi
10.woodworms 10SM=PRES.DJ=eat-FV 11.door
'(the) woodworms eat through the door' (Kirundi; Meeussen 1959:216)
- (2) a. a-ba-fana [ba=cu-l-a i-ngoma]
2-2-boys 2.SM=sing-FV 9-9.song
'the boys are singing a song'
b. a-ba-fana [ba=ya=cu-l-a]
2-2-boys 2.SM=DJ=sing-FV
'the boys are singing' (Zulu; Buell 2006:10)

At first glance, the conjoint/disjoint alternation does not seem to be found in Chichewa, another Bantu language. As shown in (3a) and (3b), while a complement may or may not cooccur with the optionally transitive verb *phunzitsá* 'to teach', the verbal morphology looks the same:¹

- (3) a. mavúto [a=ku=phúnzít-s-á]
Mavuto 1SM=PROG=teach-FV
'Mavuto is teaching'
b. mavúto [a=ku=phúnzít-s-á cí-céewa]
Mavuto 1SM=PROG=teach-FV 7-Chewa
'Mavuto is teaching Chichewa'

Because the alternation is found in Bantu languages that are not necessarily geographically adjacent (see van der Wal 2017), and multiple scholars have argued that it already existed in Proto-Bantu (Meeussen

* Qiūshí Chén, University of Connecticut, qiushi.chen@uconn.edu. Thanks to Željko Bošković, Vicki Carstens, and the audience of WCCFL 42 for helpful comments and suggestions. I am especially grateful to Chifuniro Chagomerana and Chioma Okafor, my two Chichewa informants. All errors are mine.

¹ Examples without a reference are from my own fieldwork. I follow Downing & Mtenje's (2017) system in transcribing Chichewa data (cited examples are adapted accordingly). As an independent low-level phonological phenomenon, the penult vowel of a phonological phrase-final element is automatically lengthened (indicated as vowel doubling).

1967, Nurse 2008, among others), it is reasonable to posit that Chichewa used to be a conjoint/disjoint language morphophonologically, at an earlier historical stage, but it has systematically lost the alternation. Since the disjoint form is invariably the formally marked one, i.e., languages showing the alternation have a dedicated morpheme for disjoint contexts, the loss of the alternation in Chichewa may be understood as the loss of an overt disjoint exponent.

In this paper, I argue that the loss of disjoint morphology in Chichewa is only a surface one, and that the conjoint/disjoint alternation still plays an important role in modern Chichewa grammar, though in a more abstract manner. It will be shown that transitive verbs without object markers in Chichewa in general are non-final in their domain, postverbal in-situ object DPs being unable to be overtly dislocated. I will argue that this is because the disjoint morpheme is not lost entirely in Chichewa, but becomes phonologically defective; it is obligatorily contracted at PF, and thus cannot be followed by an unpronounced copy.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 first introduces Halpert's (2015) syntactic analysis of the conjoint/disjoint alternation. Section 3 shows that a transitive verb in Chichewa without object markers cannot be the linearly final element of its domain in general; thus there is a striking parallelism between Chichewa transitive verbs and conjoint verbs attested in other Bantu languages. In addition, it is where a disjoint form is expected that one finds a number of peculiarities of Chichewa grammar, which I argue in section 4 is a result of the defectiveness of the disjoint morpheme. Section 5 discusses why the covert disjoint morpheme is only found in transitive constructions in Chichewa. It will be suggested that the licensing head L responsible for the conjoint/disjoint alternation is bundled with v^* , but not v , the later being unable to agree. Section 6 concludes the paper.

2. The conjoint/disjoint alternation as a consequence of Agree

Buell (2006) makes the descriptive generalization that (i) a disjoint verb form is final in its domain, and (ii) a conjoint verb form is non-final in its domain. The distribution of the two forms is captured by Halpert's (2015) syntactic analysis, which I introduce very briefly in this section. Halpert (2015) proposes that there is a functional head L right above vP that is responsible for the conjoint/disjoint alternation. Consider the Zulu data (2) for instance. The agreeing L head merges with vP and probes into the entire verbal domain searching for elements with phi-features. The probing is successful in (2a), since there is a DP complement within vP ; L therefore gets conjoint morphology (i.e., zero), as in (4a). In (2b), by contrast, the probing fails; L is then spelled out as the marked disjoint form (4b) (it is assumed here that the failure of probing does not lead to ungrammaticality; see Preminger 2014):

- (4) a. $[_{LP} \emptyset = [_{vP} \text{cula} \boxed{[_{DP} \text{ingoma}]}]]$ [probing is successful]
 |-----|
 ↑ ↑
 b. $[_{LP} \text{ya} = [_{vP} \text{cula}]]$ [probing fails]
 |-----|
 |-----x-----|

Furthermore, Halpert (2015) points out that the alternation is sensitive to movement; that is, an element that is moved out of the vP is not visible to L. As (5) shows, an unaccusative verb takes the disjoint form if the internal argument moves out of vP (5a), otherwise only the unmarked conjoint morphology is possible (5b):

- (5) a. $i\text{-ncwadi } i\text{=fik-il-e}$
 9-9letter 9SM=arrive-DJ-FV
 ‘a letter arrived’
 b. $ku\text{=fik-é } \boxed{i\text{-ncwadi}}$
 17SM=arrive-FV 9-9letter
 lit. ‘(there) arrived a letter’ (Zulu; Carstens & Mletshe 2015)

This analysis, which I will follow throughout, derives the fact that a conjoint/unmarked verb is always non-final in its domain. The next section shows that in Chichewa, even though an overt disjoint exponent is missing systematically, transitive verbs without object markers are non-final as well.

3. The non-finality of transitive verbs in Chichewa

This section discusses the distribution of Chichewa transitive verbs, which demonstrates several intriguing properties that call for an explanation. I first show that fronting the object DP entirely is generally banned in Chichewa (3.1). However, if the object DP involves more than one phonologically independent piece (e.g., the object is a DP with [N modifier] structure), it is possible to dislocate part of the DP (3.2). I then show that while Chichewa *wh*-objects occur in situ (they cannot be fronted), they are strikingly sensitive to island effects in the absence of question particles, suggesting that those *wh*-objects in Chichewa in fact move in narrow syntax (3.3). The last subsection points out that Chichewa transitive verbs show parallel distribution to conjoint verbs in languages that have overt disjoint exponents (3.4).

3.1. Obligatory VO order

First, as observed by Bresnan & Mchombo (1987), when an object marker is missing, the base VO order is obligatory in Chichewa (note that the subject may be dislocated freely, so VOS is also possible):

- (6) a. njúuci zi=ná=lúm-a a-leenje
 10.bees 10SM=PST=bite-FV 2-hunters
 ‘the bees bit the hunters’
- b. *a-leenje njúuci zi=ná=luum-a
 2-hunters 10.bees 10SM=PST=bite-FV
 intended: ‘the hunters, the bees bit’ (Bresnan & Mchombo 1987)
- (7) a. ndi=ná=péz-á ci-thúnzi cá=óphunziila
 1P.SG=PST=find-FV 7-picture 7.ASSOC=1.student
 ‘I found the/a picture of the student’
- b. *ci-thúnzi cá=óphunziila ndi=ná=péz-á
 7-picture 7.ASSOC=1.student 1P.SG=PST=find-FV
 intended: ‘the/a picture of the student, I found’

The ungrammaticality of (6b) and (7b) indicates that object DPs cannot be fronted overtly in Chichewa. While this may simply be a coincidental though perhaps typologically uncommon fact, it will be clear soon that the two examples are not ruled out due to the unavailability of object topicalization per se; their problem actually lies in the verb.

3.2. Partial object dislocation

While total dislocation of the object DP is in general banned in Chichewa (6b&7b), it is in fact possible to front part of the DP. This is represented in (8):

- (8) ci-thúnzi ndi=ná=péz-á cá=óphunziila
 7-picture 1P.SG=PST=find-FV 7.ASSOC=1.student
lit. ‘the/a picture, I found the student’s’

Another set of examples is given in (9). As demonstrated by both (8) and (9c), the noun within the object DP with [N modifier] structure can actually be fronted, while leaving its modifier behind (note that using different types of modifiers does not change the pattern).

There is also evidence that partial object dislocation involves syntactic movement; the fronted noun is not just a base-generated aboutness topic. As shown in (10–12), discontinuous DPs are island-sensitive in Chichewa (note that partial dislocation can be long-distance in principle, as long as no island intervenes).

- (9) a. a-tsíkána á=mfúumu a=a=gul-á mbúzi zákúuda
 2-girls 2.ASSOC=9.chief 2SM=PERF=buy-FV 10.goats 10.black
 ‘the chief’s girls have bought black goats’
- b. *mbúzi zákúuda a-tsíkána á=mfúumu a=a=guúl-á
 10.goats 10.black 2-girls 2.ASSOC=9.chief 2SM=PERF=buy-FV
 intended: ‘black goats, the chief’s girls have bought’
- c. mbúuzi a-tsíkána á=mfúumu a=a=gul-á zákúuda
 10.goats 2-girls 2.ASSOC=9.chief 2SM=PERF=buy-FV 10.black
lit. ‘goats, the chief’s girls have bought black [ones]’
 (Mchombo 2006; supplemented with personal fieldnotes)
- (10) *vúuto cikoondi a=ná=péz-á [yankho li-méné lí=ma=kónz-á lá=kále
 5.problem 1.Chikondi 1SM=PST=find-FV 5.answer 5-COMP 5SM=HAB=solve-FV 5.ASSOC=old
 lii-ja]
 5-that
 intended: ‘Chikondi found an answer that solves that old problem’ [complex DP]
- (11) *gálímooto ndi=ma=wéléng-a búukhu [n-thawi i-méné mavúto a=ná=gúnd-a
 5.car 1P.SG=HAB=read-FV 5.book 9-when 9-that 1.Mavuto 1SM=PST=crash-FV
 lá=kaale]
 5.ASSOC=old
 intended: ‘I was reading a book when Mavuto crashed the old car’ [adjunct]
- (12) *muu-nthu [ku=ímb-il-a wá-m-kúlúu=yo] ndí=kósávúuta
 1-person INF=call-APPL-FV 1-1-old=that COP=not.hard
 intended: ‘to call that old person is easy’ [sentential subject]

Importantly, the above data do not actually tell us what exactly is moving. It is also worthwhile to point out that it is typologically not common for a language to allow the object DP to be discontinuous, while excluding total dislocation of the object in general.²

3.3. Island-sensitive wh-objects

Chichewa shows an interesting subject/object asymmetry that wh-subjects are not able to occur in situ (Downing 2011, Downing & Mtenje 2017), while wh-objects normally do (13a);³ (13b) demonstrates that fronting of a wh-object is not an option in Chichewa:

² For example, Czech allows both (ia) and (ib) (Corver 1990):

- (i) a. její knihu čte Petr b. její čte Petr knihu
 her.ACC book.ACC reads Peter her.ACC reads Peter book.ACC
lit. ‘her book Peter is reading’ *lit.* ‘her Peter is reading book’ (Corver 1990:9)

Normally, if a language allows the object to split (e.g., traditional left-branch extraction), it also allows dislocation of the entire object (i.e., (ib) implies (ia), but not vice versa).

³ Another common strategy for forming a wh-question is clefting, which I ignore in this paper.

- (13) a. m-kángó u=ku=sáúts-á ndaání ?
 3-lion 3SM=PROG=bother-FV who
 ‘who is the lion bothering?’
- b. *ndaání m-kángó u=ku=sáúuts-a?
 who 3-lion 3SM=PROG=bother-FV
 ‘it is who that the lion is bothering?’

One may take it for granted that Chichewa wh-objects in this respect are just like wh-objects in ‘canonical’ wh-in-situ languages such as Chinese or Japanese. However, the following examples illustrate that wh-objects in Chichewa unexpectedly show island effects (similar to the discussion of partial dislocation, embedded wh-elements do not cause a problem as long as no island intervenes):⁴

- (14) *mu=ná=kúman-a ndí= [mú-nthu a-méné á=ma=phuzíts-á ci-yáani]?
 2P.PL=PST=meet-FV with= 1-person 1-COMP 1SM=HAB=teach-FV 7-what
 ‘*what did you meet a person who teaches ___?’ [complex DP]
- (15) *mavúuto a=ná=gúl-a gálimooto [ci-fukwá w=a=mang-a ci-yáani]?
 1.Mavuto 1SM=PST=buy-FV 5-car 7-for.reason 1SM=PERF=build-FV 7-what
 ‘*what did Mavuto buy a car because he built ___?’ [adjunct]
- (16) * [ku=ímb-il-a ndaání] ndi=kósávúuta?
 INF=call-APPL-FV 1.who
 ‘*whom is to call ___ easy?’ [sentential subject]

As exemplified in (14–16), an object cannot be questioned if it occurs within a complex DP, an adjunct, or a sentential subject. By contrast, as is well-known, the counterparts of these examples are grammatical in ‘canonical’ wh-in-situ languages like Chinese or Japanese. The presence of island sensitivity of in-situ wh-objects in Chichewa strongly suggests that these wh-objects in fact move in narrow syntax, while in Chinese or Japanese they do not, as is generally assumed.⁵

3.4. The parallelism

The above discussion suggests that a Chichewa transitive verb without object marking simply cannot occur domain-finally. This distribution is highly parallel to the distribution of conjoint verbs in languages that still clearly have the conjoint/disjoint alternation. However, in many cases in Chichewa, when verbs are expected to take the disjoint form, ungrammaticality arises. Recall from 3.3 that Chichewa wh-objects move in syntax but are just pronounced in situ; thus, it is reasonable to suggest that the in-situ wh-objects in (13) involve lower copy pronunciation. A more detailed analysis is given in the next section.

⁴ The presence of island effects is not attested in many other wh-in-situ Bantu languages (Zentz 2016), though Bergvall (1983) claims that *wh*-in-situ in Kikuyu also shows island sensitivity. It can be suggested that, within Bantu, the observation made in here is not just a Chichewa-particular one.

⁵ Wh-questions in Chichewa are optionally marked by a sentence-initial interrogative particle *kodí*, which I ignore in this short paper. Note that interestingly, when *kodí* is present, island-sensitivity is actually obviated for wh-objects. While I leave the status of *kodí*-marked questions to future research, it is worth pointing out that highly parallel patterns are found in Vietnamese, another wh-in-situ language: Bruening & Tran (2006) report that in Vietnamese, wh-elements are in fact sensitive to islands, but only in the absence of question particles; when a question particle occurs, island sensitivity disappears.

4. The analysis

4.1. Lower copy pronunciation

The copy theory of movement states that what is left behind by a moved element is not a trace, but a copy of the element itself, which bears all the features (including phonological features) contained in that element at the point the copy is created (Chomsky 1993, 1995). It is expected under this theory that pronouncing a lower copy is in principle possible (Bobaljik 1995, Franks 1998, Nunes 2004, among others), though importantly, to avoid overgeneration problems, lower copy pronunciation must be a restricted option (see next subsection). To begin with, the fact that Chichewa wh-objects are pronounced in situ even though they undergo syntactic movement is directly captured by the lower pronunciation approach, as illustrated below:

- (17) ndani_i mkángó ukusáútsá ndaání_i?
who lion is.bothering who

Because the theory of lower copy pronunciation must be highly restrictive, (17) implies that there must be an independent reason that the postverbal copy of an object is obligatorily pronounced. Though discussion of the exact condition of this operation is deferred slightly to 4.2, it suffices to point out now that the same condition also excludes (6), where the object DP is topicalized and fronted overtly (the only difference between the ban on overt topicalization and wh-fronting is that wh-objects must undergo syntactic movement, while other object DPs may stay freely in situ in syntax).

We now turn to the derivation of discontinuous DPs discussed in 3.2. Since total dislocation of the object is banned for surface reasons, namely transitive verbs in Chichewa cannot occur in domain-final positions, I propose that those partial dislocation cases, e.g., (8), are derived via scattered deletion: the entire object undergoes movement in syntax, but at PF, part of the moved element is pronounced in the highest copy, while the other part is pronounced lower (Bošković 2001, Fanselow & Ćavar 2002, among many others). This is illustrated in (18):

- (18) cithúunzi eá=óphunziila_i ndinápézá eithúnzi cá=óphunziila_i
picture of.student I.found picture of.student

That is, partial dislocation in Chichewa is in fact syntactic total dislocation *plus* scattered deletion at PF. Due to space limitations, I am not able to provide a full discussion of how scattered deletion works in Chichewa in general, which is not the major point of the current study; I am also unable to argue against an alternative what-you-see-is-what-you-get analysis in detail in this short paper (i.e., partial dislocation involves subextraction of the noun out of the object DP; c.f., Branan & Davis 2022), but it is necessary to note that the subextraction account is not immediately compatible with the assumption that N-initiality in Bantu is a result of head movement (thus the initial noun does not form a phrasal constituent by itself), which is standardly assumed (see Carstens 1997 particularly for Chichewa). The remaining question, then, is what exactly conditions the non-finality of Chichewa transitive verbs, which is the topic of the next subsection.

4.2. The defectiveness of the disjoint morpheme

From a cross-Bantu perspective, in Chichewa, no particular problems are caused in cases where a conjoint form is expected; it is in cases where one would expect the occurrence of the disjoint form that a number of peculiarities are observed. Because arguably, Chichewa used to have the conjoint/disjoint alternation overtly at an earlier historical stage (see section 1), it is reasonable to suggest that those peculiarities discussed in section 3 and 4.1 are residues of the loss of the disjoint form. To capture this, I hypothesize that the disjoint morpheme has not disappeared entirely, but has developed into one that is obligatorily contracted, as a result of the general process of phonetic reduction (Newmeyer 2000). Now, it is independently observed in English that a contracted auxiliary cannot be followed by an unpronounced copy (Bresnan 1971, Kaisse 1983):

- (19) a. I know where_i, John is where_i tonight
 b. *I know where_i, John's where_i tonight

It can then be suggested that the contracted disjoint marker in Chichewa, while itself being segmentally unmarked, induces the same effect. Cases like (6b) (repeated as (20b)) are ungrammatical exactly because the abstract disjoint marker (the verb stem being its host) is followed by an unpronounced copy left by the object. Following Halpert's (2015) approach to the conjoint/disjoint alternation (see section 2), the relevant structures of (20a) and (20b) are represented below. In (21a), since the object stays in vP, the probing of L is successful, resulting in conjoint/unmarked morphology, as expected. In (21b), however, the object moves out, so no goal is visible to L (recall that the conjoint/disjoint alternation is sensitive to movement). In this case one would expect disjoint morphology. However, since the disjoint morpheme in Chichewa is a defective one (it must be contracted), (21b) is correctly ruled out, for PF reasons (recall from section 2 that, by assumption, the failure of probing per se does not result in ungrammaticality):

- (20) a. njúuci zi=ná=lúm-a a-leenje
 10.bees 10SM=PST=bite-FV 2-hunters
 'the bees bit the hunters'
 b. *a-leenje njúuci zi=ná=luum-a
 2-hunters 10.bees 10SM=PST=bite-FV
 intended: 'the hunters, the bees bit' (Bresnan & Mchombo 1987)

- (21) a. [_{LP} \emptyset = [_{VP} luma alenje]] [conjoint morphology]
 |-----|
 b. * [_{LP} \overline{DJ} = [_{VP} luma alenje]] [disjoint morphology]
 |-----x-----|

Scattered deletion provides a way of obviating the defective effect. As shown in (22), since the conjoint/disjoint alternation is sensitive to movement, which is syntactic by nature, one would expect disjoint morphology here. Now, because part of the lower copy of the object is pronounced (as a sort of last resort), the defective disjoint morpheme does not cause a PF problem:

- (22) [_{LP} \overline{DJ} = [_{VP} gulá mbúzi zákúda]] [disjoint morphology]
 |-----x-----|

Recall that lower copy pronunciation is not free (otherwise serious overgeneration problems would arise): it has been argued by multiple authors that it is possible only if the default, pronouncing-the-highest-copy option is ruled out, for independent reasons (Franks 1998, Nunes 2004, Bošković & Nunes 2007). Moreover, since conceptually, deciding on which copies to pronounce is a process that happens at PF, conditions on lower copy pronunciation must be stated exclusively in PF terms, which, by essence, are language-particular; LF or narrow syntax should not play a role. Otherwise, non-trivial modularity problems may be caused. The current account of partial object dislocation in Chichewa is in line with this idea. Scattered deletion in (22) is possible because the defective disjoint morpheme requires that phonological features of the copy following the verb cannot be deleted completely; the defectiveness of the morpheme (i.e., it is contracted and needs a following overt element) is stated purely in PF terms. Again, both (21b) and (22) are unproblematic in syntax; it is PF that excludes the former.

5. The bundling of L and v*

We have focused on transitive constructions in Chichewa. This section discusses how intransitive verbs fit into the picture. Consider (23–25), which show that intransitives may occur freely in Chichewa with SV order. However, if unaccusatives and passives involve an internal argument moving out of the

vP domain, as standardly assumed, it is not immediately clear why (24) and (25) are grammatical, if they both involve a defective disjoint head which requires the postverbal copy to be pronounced. This issue is most obvious in a comparative view, as languages that have overt disjoint exponents do use them in these cases (c.f., Halpert 2015).

- (23) a-tsíkána a=ku=víin-a [unergative]
 2-girls 2SM=PROG=dance-FV
 ‘girls are dancing in the room’ (Mchombo 2004:93; adapted)
- (24) njovu i=náa=gw-a [unaccusative]
 9.elephant 9SM=PST=fall-FV
 ‘the/an elephant fell’ (Mchombo 2004:93; adapted)
- (25) ma-úngú a=ku=phík-iidw-a [passive]
 6-pumpkins 6SM=PROG=cook-PASS-FV
 ‘pumpkins are being cooked’ (Mchombo 2004:81; adapted)

While one can simply leave it as a descriptive fact that the licensing head L selects v*P but not vP in Chichewa (so L is absent in intransitives) without explaining why it is so, I show that this generalization is in fact derivable in a principled way. The proposal is that L is not only morphophonologically defective, it is also a syntactically defective one: L is obligatory bundled with the highest probing head in the verbal domain, and crucially, as discussed below, only v*, but not v, agrees in Chichewa. The conjoint/disjoint alternation in Chichewa can thus simply be viewed as the (covert) morphological realization of v*.

To illustrate this idea further, it is necessary to consider the nature of object markers in Chichewa, which we have left aside in previous sections. Bresnan & Mchombo (1987) argue that object markers in Chichewa are incorporated pronouns, rather than pure agreement markers. While the readers are referred to the original paper for full arguments, I would like to address some of them here. First, as shown in (26), a wh-element cannot be associated with an object marker:

- (26)?*(kodí) mu=ku=cí=fúún-á ci-yáani ?
 Q 2P.PL=PROG=7OM=want-FV 7-what
 ‘what do you want (*it)?’ (Bresnan & Mchombo 1987)

Second, a full DP that is associated with the object marker is obligatorily pronounced outside the verbal domain. As in (27a), even though the DP *alenje* ‘hunters’ linearly follows the verb, they cannot be pronounced in the same phonological phrase (the clue is from phonological phrasing; recall from fn.1 that the penult vowel of a phonological phrase is automatically lengthened):

- (27) a. njúuci [_{vP} zi=ná=wá=luum-a] a-leenje
 10.bees 10SM=PST=2OM=bite-FV 2.hunters
 ‘the bees bit them, the hunters’
- b. a-leenje njúuci [_{vP} zi=ná=wá=luum-a]
 2.hunters 10.bees 10SM=PST=2OM=bite-FV
 ‘the hunters, the bees bit them’ (Bresnan & Mchombo 1987)

As indicated by (27b), with the presence of an object marker, the full DP associated with it can also occur clause-initially (note also that it is the disjoint form that is used in cases parallel to (27a&27b) in languages with overt conjoint/disjoint alternation; see below).

Furthermore, these obligatorily dislocated DPs are not sensitive to island effects (see Bresnan & Mchombo 1987 for examples). It can thus be concluded that they do not result from movement out of vP; instead, dislocated DPs associated with object markers are adjuncts base-generated outside the verbal domain, and it is the object marker itself, being a pronominal clitic, that is the ‘true’ object.

The surface distribution of ‘true’ objects in Chichewa is thus highly predictable: (i) weak pronominal objects are pronounced at the left edge of vP, as a result of cliticization, and (ii) full object DPs directly follow the verb, at least partially (3.3), due to the defectiveness of the disjoint morpheme. Following Baker (2018), I assume that clitic objects, though themselves not being agreement markers, express an Agree relation between the object and the verb. Crucially, if this is so, it is reasonable to suggest that there is also an Agree relation between transitive verbs and their internal arguments that are full DPs (in which case an object marker cannot occur). Suppose that the agreeing head v^* probes phi-features into its c-commanding domain; the process itself should not be able to discriminate the internal structure of the goal (either it is a weak pronoun or a full DP), as long as the goal has phi-features (see Carstens 2017, where it is argued that the phi-features of a Bantu nominal are all carried by D, due to N-to-D movement, making the phi-features visible to all clause-level probes). Thus, the fact that clitic pronouns and full DPs are pronounced in different positions can be viewed as a surface phenomenon: as suggested by Baker (2018), this may simply be because v^* in Bantu only tolerates heads but not full phrases as its specifier, possibly due to pronounceability reasons. In other words, object shift into SpecvP requires Agree, but Agree does not guarantee the occurrence of object shift, the latter being also subject to PF factors.

While the above suggests that transitive verbs *always* agree in Chichewa, I show that intransitive verbs *never* agree. As illustrated below, while the internal argument of an intransitive verb may occur postverbally, e.g., in cases of inversion (28a), it cannot be expressed by an object marker (28b):

- (28) a. pa=mu-dzí pá=dá=gw-a njaala
 16.in=3-village 16SM=PST=fall-FV 9.hunger
 ‘in the village fell hunger’
- b. *pa=mu-dzí pá=dá=íí=gw-á (njaala)
 16.in=3-village 16SM=PST=9OM=fall-FV 9.hunger
 intended: ‘in the village fell it (, the hunger)’ (Mchombo 2004:26)

Note that (28b) is ruled out not because of definiteness effects, which, as shown by Bresnan & Kanerva (1989), are not manifested in Chichewa locative inversion (29). (Additionally, it is reported by Bresnan & Mchombo (1987) that object marking in Chichewa does not even entail definiteness.)

- (29) ku=mu-dzi ku=na=bwér-á a-lendóo=wo
 17.to=3-village 17SM=PST=come-FV 2-visitors=2.those
 ‘to the village came those visitors’ (Bresnan & Kanerva 1989)

I take the above facts to mean that the intransitive v is not an agreeing head in Chichewa, as object makers are never associated with it. Furthermore, Bresnan & Mchombo (1987) report a case (30) where a wh-subject occurs in the so-called immediately-after-the-verb position (Hyman 1979):

- (30) ci=na=ónék-a ci-yani ?
 7SM=PST=happen-FV 7-what
 ‘what happened?’ (Bresnan & Mchombo 1987:775)

The verb *oneka* ‘happen’ is unaccusative (inversion constructions are available only for unaccusative verbs in Chichewa). Evidence from phonological phrasing shows that the wh-subject is located in the vP domain. Importantly, in (30), the postverbal wh-element agrees with T, as indicated by the subject marker *ci=*.⁶ (By contrast, in many other Bantu languages that show VS order similar to (30), T only exhibits default agreement (Carstens & Mletshe 2015).) The reason why T can agree with a postverbal element within the verbal domain in (30), I suggest, is that an intransitive v is not a probe in Chichewa. Assuming that a goal is deactivated when an Agree relation is first established between it and a probe, i.e., it becomes

⁶ As shown by Bresnan & Mchombo (1987) and Mchombo (2004), in contrast to object markers, which are unambiguously clitic pronouns, subject markers in Chichewa are ambiguous between a pronoun and an agreement marker.

invisible to other probes that come into play later in the derivation (Chomsky 2000), the presence of a probe in the verbal domain would prevent the postverbal subject from being agreed with T.⁷

If v^* always agrees but v never does so in Chichewa, one notices immediately that whether the highest head in the verbal domain (v^* or v) can agree is related to the presence/absence of L responsible for the conjoint/disjoint alternation, which in Chichewa appears to be able to select only v^* but not v . This is hardly a coincidence. I thus suggest that L and v^* are in fact bundled: related to the diachronic loss of the conjoint/disjoint alternation in morphology, L arguably also lost its independence in syntax. It is then a single head, labeled as L- v^* for ease of convenience, that is responsible for everything: it takes care of transitivity; it probes into the verbal domain for phi-features; it triggers the shift of clitic objects to its left; it is the locus of covert disjoint morphology if the probing fails, which is contracted obligatorily, and needs its following element in the domain to be pronounced. Consider again (27). Here, the transitive verb is object-marked and is domain-final, in which case a disjoint marker is expected (this is directly observable in other Bantu languages), but the two sentences are just grammatical even though the disjoint morpheme is argued to be morphologically defective. However, since L and v^* are syntactically bundled, it is reasonable to suggest that it is the object marker that is the morphological realization of the L- v^* head in (27), in which case the dedicated disjoint morpheme is simply absent. Of course, the object marker invariably has a full syllabic structure and is morphologically not defective. (Note finally that in languages where L and v^* are not bundled, object markers and the disjoint morpheme are separate, and may cooccur.)

6. Conclusion

I have argued in this paper that Chichewa is a concealed conjoint/disjoint language, even though the alternation may not be detectable in terms of the presence of an overt disjoint exponent. I proposed that due to the gradual historical loss of an overt disjoint exponent, the disjoint morpheme in Chichewa has become a defective one both morphophonologically and syntactically. In morphophonology, the morpheme is obligatorily contracted, which requires its following element in the same domain to be pronounced. This gives rise to a number of cases involving lower copy pronunciation, as discussed in sections 3–4. In syntax, the defectiveness of L is realized as the unavailability of it to project independently. L, being responsible for the conjoint/disjoint alternation, is obligatorily bundled with v^* . This explains why the disjoint effect in Chichewa is only attested in transitives; Chichewa intransitive verbs simply do not agree.

References

- Baker, Mark. 2018. On the status of object markers in Bantu languages. In Oluseye Adesola, Akinbiyi Akinlabi & Olanike Ola Orié (eds.), *Data-rich linguistics: papers in honor of Yiwola Awoyale*, 2–40. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Bergvall, Victoria L. 1983. Wh-questions and island constraints in Kikuyu: A reanalysis. In Jonathan Kaye, Hilda Koopman, Dominique Sportiche & André Dugas (eds.), *Current approaches to African linguistics*, vol. 2, 245–259. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan David. 1995. *Morphosyntax: The syntax of verbal inflection*. Massachusetts Institute of Technology dissertation.
- Bošković, Željko. 2001. *On the nature of the syntax-phonology interface: Cliticization and related phenomena*. Amsterdam: Elsevier Science.
- Bošković, Željko & Jairo Nunes. 2007. The copy theory of movement: A view from PF. In Norbert Corver & Jairo Nunes (eds.), *The copy theory of movement*, 13–74. John Benjamins Publishing.
- Branan, Kenyon & Colin Davis. 2022. Edges and extraction: Evidence from Chichewa. In Galen Sibanda, Deo Ngonyani, Jonathan Choti & Ann Biersteker (eds.), *Descriptive and theoretical approaches to African linguistics: Selected papers from the 49th Annual Conference on African Linguistics*, 149–163. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Bresnan, Joan. 1971. Contraction and the transformational cycle. Manuscript, MIT.
- Bresnan, Joan & Jonni M. Kanerva. 1989. Locative inversion in Chichewa: A case study of factorization in grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry* (1). 1–50.

⁷ This is subject to variation, as it is cross-linguistically not rare that a goal may be agreed with multiple probes (see Deal to appear and references therein). At any rate, it seems to be a descriptive fact that T and v in the same clause are not able to agree with the same DP in Bantu in general.

- Bresnan, Joan & Sam Mchombo. 1987. Topic, pronoun, and agreement in Chicheŵa. *Language*. 741–782.
- Bruening, Benjamin & Thuan Tran. 2006. Wh-questions in Vietnamese. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 15(4). 319–341.
- Buell, Leston. 2006. The Zulu conjoint/disjoint verb alternation: Focus or constituency? *ZAS Papers in Linguistics* 43. 9–30.
- Carstens, Vicki. 1997. Empty nouns in Bantu locatives. *The Linguistic Review* 14. 361–410.
- Carstens, Vicki. 2017. Noun-to-determiner movement. In Martin Everaert & Henk van Riemsdijk (eds.), *The wiley blackwell companion to syntax, 2nd edition*, vol. 5, 2758–2783. Somerset, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Carstens, Vicki & Loyiso Mletshe. 2015. Radical defectivity: Implications of Xhosa expletive constructions. *Linguistic Inquiry* 46(2). 187–242.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1993. A minimalist program for linguistic theory. In Kenneth Hale & Samuel J. Keyser (eds.), *The view from building 20*, 1–52. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1995. *The minimalist program*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2000. Minimalist inquiries: The framework. In Roger Martin, David Michaels & Juan Uriagereka (eds.), *Step by step: Essays on minimalist syntax in honor of Howard Lasnik*, 89–155. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Corver, Norbert. 1990. *The syntax of left branch extractions*. Tilburg University dissertation.
- Deal, Amy Rose. to appear. Current models of Agree. In James Crippen, Rose Marie Déchaine & Hermann Keupdjio (eds.), *Move and Agree: Towards a formal typology*. John Benjamins.
- Downing, Laura J. 2011. Wh-questions in Chewa and Tumbuka: Positions and prosodies. In Laura J. Downing (ed.), *Questions in Bantu languages: Prosodies and positions*. *ZAS papers in linguistics*, vol. 55. Berlin: ZAS.
- Downing, Laura J. & Al Mtenje. 2017. *The phonology of Chichewa*. Oxford University Press.
- Fanselow, Gisbert & Damir Ćavar. 2002. Distributed deletion. In Artemis Alexiadou (ed.), *Theoretical approaches to universals*, 65–107. John Benjamins Publishing.
- Franks, Steven. 1998. *Clitics in Slavic*. Paper presented at the Comparative Slavic Morphosyntax Workshop, Spencer Creek, Indiana.
- Halpert, Claire. 2015. *Argument licensing and agreement*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hyman, Larry M. 1979. Focus in Aghem. In Larry M. Hyman (ed.), *Aghem grammatical structure*, 137–197. Southern California Occasional Papers in Linguistics 7.
- Kaisse, Ellen M. 1983. The syntax of auxiliary reduction in English. *Language* 59(1). 93–122.
- Mchombo, Sam. 2004. *The syntax of Chichewa*. Cambridge University Press.
- Mchombo, Sam. 2006. Linear order constraints on split NPs in Chichewa. *ZAS Papers in Linguistics* 43. 143–160.
- Meeussen, Achille E. 1959. *Essai de grammaire Rundi*. Tervuren: Musée Royal de l’Afrique Centrale.
- Meeussen, Achille E. 1967. Bantu grammatical reconstructions. *Africana Linguistica* 3. 79–121.
- Newmeyer, Frederick J. 2000. *Language form and language function*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT press.
- Nunes, Jairo. 2004. *Linearization of chains and sideward movement*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT press.
- Nurse, Derek. 2008. *Tense and aspect in Bantu*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Preminger, Omer. 2014. *Agreement and its failures*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT press.
- van der Wal, Jenneke. 2017. What is the conjoint/disjoint alternation? Parameters of crosslinguistic variation. In Jenneke van der Wal & Larry M. Hyman (eds.), *The conjoint/disjoint alternation in Bantu*, 14–60. Berlin/Boston: Walter de Gruyter GmbH.
- Zentz, Jason. 2016. *Forming wh-questions in Shona: A comparative Bantu perspective*. Yale University dissertation.