Studies in African Linguistics
Volume 53, Number 2, 2024

EXPRESSION OF REFERENTS IN KÎÎTHARAKA*

Patrick Kanampiu
University of Edinburgh
Tharaka University

This study investigated the strategies of expression of referents in Kîîtharaka in information structure are found in expression of referents. The data for this research was gathered from narratives collected through story telling sessions organized during the field study. The study finds that although accessibility status of the referent is the main factor determining the choice of referring expressions, there are other factors that come into play, further influencing the amount of linguistic material a speaker uses. These factors include referential properties of the referent, the predicate type, presence of competing referents and the saliency of the referent, among others.

Keywords: expression of referents, accessibility status, information structure, predicate type, referent saliency

1. Introduction

Across the languages of the world, speakers are known to package information with the local context in mind. New information is structured and expressed differently from what the speaker considers already known to the hearer. Sometimes, the textual environment in which an utterance is made also determines how the speaker structures an utterance. This is known as information structure. By means of information structure, "[h]uman languages are organized in ways that reflect the content and purpose of utterances—that is, the information that is contained in the words and structures that make up sentences" (Anold et al 2013). This fosters effective communication. One area where this notion of information structure applies is the choice of referring expressions. A number of discourse related factors are known to influence the choice of referring expressions cross-linguistically. The main factors involved relate to the saliency of the referents, involved verb semantics, grammatical role of the referent, recency or accessibility status of the referent in discourse (Chafe 1994, Ariel 1991 and later works), and topicality (see e.g., Arnold 1998). In this respect, discourse theorists have proposed models such as the scale of topicality (Givón 1998) and accessibility hierarchy (Ariel 1990) or implicature hierarchy (Gundel et al. 1993) to account for this relationship between discourse and choice of referential expressions.

According to Ariel (1985, 2001), referential expressions are represented in differing degrees of accessibility in the mind of the speakers. The amount of information in the referring expression is inversely correlated with the degree of accessibility, so that a less accessible referent is represented with more material and vice versa. As such a full name (NP) and a modifier would represent a referent with low accessibility at one side of the continuum, while a pronoun, a gap, a trace or agreement marker would represents a highly accessible one on the other end.

Accessibility also interacts dynamically with other factors such as the presence of competing referents in the discourse (see e.g., Fukumura et al 2011), visual saliency (see e.g., e.g., Fukumura et al 2010) and the cost of production (see e.g., Rohde et al 2012). Rohde and collaborators, based on the results of a series of artificial language experiments argue that speakers of a language may make a

* Special thanks to Jenneke van der Wal for facilitating a collaborative fieldwork at Marimanti, Tharaka, whose data is the basis of this paper. She also read and provided feedback on earlier versions of the paper.

strategic selection of referents based on their cost of production their estimates of the cost and benefit of a successful communication (see Van Deemter 2009), and the extent of coordination between the speaker and the hearer.

Therefore, the fact that there are several factors involved in the choice of referring expressions beyond discourse related factors such as the cost of production e.g., due to word length or the content associated with it (see Rohde et al 2012) implies a likely variation in what factors come into play and how they interact with the discourse due to cross-linguistic idiosyncrasies. The aim of this paper is to establish the paradigm for subject and object expressions in Kîîtharaka, ascertain to what extent accessibility status predicts expression of these referents in the language and establish other (non)discourse factors that interact with accessibility status.

Kîîtharaka [E 54] is a central Kenya Bantu language spoken by Atharaka people mainly residing in Tharaka Nithi County of Kenya. It has approximately 220,000 speakers (KNBS 2019). It has about 61,0000 monolinguals and L1 literacy level of 15% compared to about 45% in L2 (Eberhard et al. 2023).

2. Methodology

The data used in this study was collected during a collaborative fieldwork exercise conducted in Marimanti, Kenya by "author", unless otherwise stated. These data comprise of a collection of a range of stories as narrated by three Kîîtharaka consultants (all male), including a retelling of the story 'Frog where are you? (Mayer 1969). Some data were also elicited from these consultants using the Bantu Syntax and Information Structure (BaSIS) methodology document (van der Wal 2021).

This methodology involves elicitation of linguistic forms using pictures that certain contexts using two approaches–from interpretation to form, and from form to interpretation. Interpretation to form involves asking respondents questions that trigger production of linguistic forms, such as showing them a picture and asking them to describe it. Form to interpretation, on the other hand, involves asking respondents to make meaning judgements on given target forms. These data were then transcribed and recorded in the Kîîtharaka Online Linguistic Database (OLD) accessed with the Dative software (https://app.dative.ca).

Most of the illustrations herein therefore come from the naturalistic data–the collected stories. However, where need be elicited examples were also included to illustrate phenomena that wasn't captured in the stories.

3. Kîîtharaka referential expression paradigm

This research finds six possible ways of expressing referents in Kîîtharaka. They include full lexical NP, demonstratives and their combinations, NP + relative clause, object marking, independent pronoun and also object drop. Below, we briefly exemplify each of them and later look at the factors that influence their use.

3.1 Full lexical NP. A full lexical NP is one of the common ways of expressing an entity particularly used when introducing new referents. Example (1) is extracted from the first line of a paragraph in a story, where the main characters are mbiti 'hyena' and kayûgû 'hare'. Another new participant nkáánga 'guinea fowl' is introduced in (2):

(1) Téné mű́nó mbiti na kayûgű́ baarî acooré

tene	mûno	m-biti	na	ka-yûgû	ba-a-rî	a-coore
long.time	very	9-hyena	and	12-hare	2SM-PST-be	1-friends

'Very long time ago, hyena and hare were friends'

(2) Bakîgwî'mága gwa ûgú, booná **nkáánga**

ba-kî-guîm-ag-a	wa	ûgu	ba-on-a	n-kaanga
2SM-DEP-hunt-HAB-FV	like	that	2SM-saw-FV	9-guineafowl

'As they were still hunting, they saw **a guinea fowl**.'

3.2 Demonstratives and their combinations. Kĩĩtharaka demonstratives fall into three classes– proximal demonstratives those denoting referents close to the speaker) medial demonstratives (denote referents close to the addressee) and distal demonstratives (signal referents far from both the speaker and the addressee). These three demonstratives are typical in Bantu language family (see, e.g., Leonard 1985; van de Velde 2005; van der Wal 2010; and Poeta 2016; Asiimwe 2024; Taji 2024 and others) and can either appear alone (pronominal), or in combination with NPs (adnominal). According to the data collected for this study, it appears that demonstratives, both in their pronominal form and in combination with the lexical NP are a common way of referents expression in Kĩĩtharaka.

Pronominal demonstratives. Some cases of such demonstratives were found in the stories collected, as illustrated in (3) and (4):

(3) Babá bari **aagá** i bááû?

ba-ba	ba-rîa-ga	ni	ba-ûû
2-DEM	2SM-be	16-DEM.PROX	FOC 2-who

'These who are here belong to who?'

(4) (The chickens cawed and bulged to scare the mongoose)
Mîrûngûûru yóoná **ûgu** …

mî-rûngûûru	î-a-ona	ûgu…
4-mongooses	4SM-PST-see	14.DEM.MED

'When the mongooses saw that…'

Out of the five stories, there were 30 uses of the demonstrative out of which 23 of the cases were adnominal and 7 were pronominal. These 30 cases, however, were sourced from four stories. The speaker who reconstructed the frog's story hardly used demonstrative–there were only two cases in which they distal demonstratives were used as relative markers. This is interesting given that in some other Bantu languages, demonstratives have been associated with key discourse functions in e.g., in narrative texts hence fairly common (see e.g., van der Wal 2010, Nicolle 2014). Furthermore, a similar retelling of the 'frog's story produced nearly as many demonstratives as other stories in Makhuwa (see van der Wal 2010). Since the data on retelling of the frog's story is from one speaker, I lack a comparative dimension for Kĩĩtharaka, so I leave the matter for future research. However, for an account of what differences may arise in such an elicitation method, see Klamer & Moro (2020: 239).[1]

Adnominal demonstratives (NP + DEM). Another common way of referent expression is by an NP + DEM combination. This may involve various types of demonstratives as evident in the proximal and medial uses in (5):

[1] A reviewer inquired whether the 'frogs' story may have been significantly shorter than the others hence the difference from other stories. Indeed, the translated frog's story was about 450 the other three were longer, with the longest having about 1250 words.

(5) a. **Mûntû ûyû** ngûkwîragîîra ti mweega.

mû-ntû	ûyú	n-gû-kw-îragîîr-a	ti	mw-eega
1-person	1.DEM.PROX	1SG.SM-PRS-2SG.OM-tell-FV	NEG.COP	1-good

'That person I was telling you about is not good.'

b. Akarága **kîrîmaaní gîkú mîtî'îni înú** mîraayá.

a-kar-ag-a	kî-rima-ni	gî-ku	mîtî-ni	înu	mî-raaya
1SM-stay-HAB-FV	7-hill-LOC	7-DEM.MED	4-trees-LOC	4-DEM.MED	4-tall

'He stays in in that hill in those tall trees.'

NP + Rel. clause. In a story involving hyena and hare as hunters, at some point the guinea fowl (which the hare and hyena had earlier killed) is referred to by NP+ rel. clause in (6):

(6) Mbíti na kayû'gû' báákámata **nkáánga îrá báû'ragiré**, báathí n'yó bántû kathakáaní.

mbiti	na	ka-yûgû	ba-a-kamat-a	n-kaanga	î-ra ba-ûrag-ire
9.Hyena	and	1-hare	2SM-PST-carry-FV	9-guineafowl	9-DEM.DIST 2SM-kill-PFV

bá-a-thi	na=yo	ba-ntû	ka-thaka-ni
2SM-PST-go	with=it	16-someplace	12-bush-LOC

'Hyena and hare carried that guinea fowl that they had killed and took it to some place in the bush'

Pronouns. In our data, the independent pronoun surfaces in very restricted environments specifically after *na* 'and' as in (7) and in a structure that appears like a cleft construction in which the pronoun and it's antecedent noun in the left periphery of the embedded clause co-refers, as in (8) (see van der Wal & Kanampiu (forthcoming) for a detailed analyses of this structure):

(7) I ndaatûlire ǹkǘ baabá ábuá naci**o** mwaanki.

ni-ra-atûr-ire	n-kû	baaba	a-bu-a	na-ci-o	mw-aanki
FOC-PST-split-PFV	9-firewood	1.father	1SM-light-FV	with-10-PRO	3-fire

'I split firewood for father to light the fire with it.'

(8) (Are the mangoes and pineapples in the sack?)
Arî, ndigû na mananáci icio irí́ îgûrû rí́a caríca

arî	n-digû	na	ma-nanaci	i-ci-o	i-rî îgûrû	rî-a	carica
no	10-bananas	and	6-pineapples	FOC-10-PRO 8-be	5-on-top	5-of	9.sack

'No, it is bananas and pineapples that are on the sack'

Subject and object markers. In Kîîtharaka, both subject markers (SMs) and object markers (OMs) occur preverbally. In this regard, Kîîtharaka can be categorized as a type 1 language under Beauddoin-Lietz et al's (2004) classification of languages according to the position of object markers in respect to the verb. In type 1 languages, the object marker appears before the verb. The language also disallows occurrence of OMs with overt objects at canonical position unless the object is left or right dislocated, in which the dislocated object is outside the VP. In this regard, Kîîtharaka appears as a non-doubling language–disallowing an overt object and its OM in the same VP, like some other Bantu languages–Otjiherero and Chaga–and differs from doubling languages like Kiswahili and Bemba which allow OMs with overt objects (see Marten & Kula 2012, van der Wal 2022). In example (2) for instance (repeated here as example (9) for purposes of illustration) The OM mî- is untenable in the presence of the object nkáánga 'guinea fowl':

(9) Bakîgwî'mága gwa ûgú, ba(*mî)oná **nkáánga.**
ba-kî-guîm-ag-a wa ugu ba-mî-on-a n-kaanga
2SM-DEP-hunt-HAB-FV like that 2SM-9OM-saw-FV 9-guineafowl
'As they were still hunting, they saw **a guinea fowl**.'

The study finds a regular occurrence of SMs for subject referents which have already been mentioned in discourse. The SM *ba-* in (10) and (11) refer to the two bosom friends hare and hyena:

(10) **Ba**athíyánágíá rîónthé **ba**táatígánágá, n'wá ta mûtíro na ará.
ba-a-thi-an-ag-i-a ri-on the ba-ti-a-tig-an-ag-a
2SM-PST-go-RECIP-HAB-IC-FV 5-always 2SM-NEG-PST-leave-RECIP-HAB-FV

ni-w-a ta mû-tiro na ara
FOC-?-CONN like 3-tail and 9.sirloin
'They were always walking together, like a tail of a cow and the sirloin.'

(11) Ntúgû îmwé, **bá**athí kûgwíma.
n-tugu î-mwe ba-a-thi kû-guîm-a
9-day one 2SM-PST-go 15-hunt-FV
'One day they went to hunt.'

OMs, as expected, occur if their respective antecedents are in immediate discourse as illustrated in (12):

(12) a. **Mwekűrű** akíúna nkű áákûrûtwá í mûti (…)
mû-ekûrû a-kî-una n-kû a-a-kûrût-w-a ni mûtî
1-wife 1SM-DEP-break 9-firewood 1SM-PST-scratch-PASS-FV COP 3.stick
'The wife was injured by a stick while collecting firewood.'

b. Aagea na **kîronda** kînéne mûno kûgûrû.
a-a-gea na kî-ronda kî-nene mûno kû-gûrû
1SM-PST-get with 7-wound 7-big very 15-leg
'She developed a very big wound on the leg.'

c. Áathi kûrî mûragűri, á**mw**íkírá mîtheéga (…) **kî**arema kwora
a-a-thi kû-rî mû-ragûri, a-mû-îkîr-a mî-theeg-a{...}
1SM-PST-go 17-be 1-medicineman, 1SM-1OM-put-FV 4-medicine-FV [...]

kî-a-rema kû-or-a
7-PST-fail 15-heal-FV
'She went to a medicine-man so s/he may treat her but it (the wound) didn't heal'

However, as will be demonstrated in section 4, the OMs do not occur regularly due to interaction with other factors. Furthermore, their occurrences are a bit restricted in Kîîtharaka, being a non-doubling language. In a normal declarative statement like the elicited example in (13), a verb marked for object is ungrammatical if the object is overtly expressed.

(13) Mwarimû aga(*tu)óóna twáána.
mû-arimû a-ka-tu-ona tû-aana
1-teacher 1SM-FUT-OM-see 12-children
'The teacher will see (*them) the children.'

The OM can only be allowed when its referent is outside the VP that hosts it[2]. In example (14a)[3], the referent *twaana* is right dislocated while in (14b) the same referent is left dislocated:

(14) a. Nga**tu**cereria mabuku, twaana.
n-ka-tu-cere-îr-i-a ma-buku tû-aana.
1SG.SM-FUT-12**OM**-find-APPL-IC-FV 6-books 12-children
'I will find for them books, (the) children'

b. Twáána ngát**û**cereria mabuku
tû-aana n-ka-tû-cer-îr-i-a. ma-buku
12-children 1SG.SM-FUT-12**OM**-find-APPL-IC-FV 6-books
'Children, I will find books for them'

Subject drop (excursion). As demonstrated in example (2), (10) and (11) accessible referents that are still the topic and functioning the subject may be expressed in SMs for several subsequent clauses. However, it is also possible to be dropped altogether, in which case the verb in the clause is usually an infinitive. This is seen in (15) where hare (class 12) is the subject marked on the verbs in the first clause, but the verbs in the second and third clause are infinitives. The infinitival prefix can be seen as a narrative tense marker which could be associated with a special meaning (e.g., a surprising turn of event) in the narrative, same as the Kiswahili *ka-* (see e.g., Leornard 1980, Nicolle 2015):

(15) a. Kámîgwatá kámĺogá bwéega, kámĺoga muumá
ka-mî-guat-a ka-mî-og-a bu-eega ka-mî-og-a mu-uma
12SM-9OM-catch-FV 12SM-9OM-tie-FV 14-well 12SM-9OM-tie-FV 3-absolutely
'He got hold of hyena and tied him firmly.'

b. na **kû**rűma mûcíoro
na kû-rûm-a mû-cioro
and NARR-pick-FV 3-stick
'then collected a strong stick,'

c. na **kû**miúgia mmá! mmá! Kámîbűűra.
na kû-mî-ug-i-a mma mma ka-mî-buur-a
and NARR-9OM-do-IC-FV IDEO IDEO 12SM-9OM-beat-FV
'and went on him whack! whack! He beat him.'

Object drop. In the previous sub-section, I have shown instances in which overt ways of expressing objects are used. Here, I demonstrate yet another way of expressing objects that does not involve overt markers or lexical devices, known as zero anaphora or object drop. It involves a complete drop of the object in a context that does not affect the meaning of the clause bearing the drop. In example (16a), *panga*, the object of the verb 'buy' is optionally marked, as the OM can be dropped. However,

[2] A reviewer asked whether there is a syntactic evidence to prove that the extraposed objects are indeed outside VP and whether the comma is optional or obligatory. I confirm that the comma (prosodic break) is obligatory and without it, the sentence would be rendered ungrammatical. Additionally, a vP adverb like 'well' would only be allowed immediately after *mabuku* 'books' in 0a and not after *twaana*, showing that *mabuku* is the internal argument (direct object) of the verb, having been base generated at SPEC VP. The verb having been generated at SPEC v(oice)P (the highest position in the predicate-argument structure, *twaana*, can then have been generated outside the vP (see e.g., Kratzer 1996).

[3] Data in this example and that in 0 was elicited via introspection and confirmed with two other native speakers.

the OM cannot be dropped when used with the verb 'see' in (16b). This shows that predicate type plays some role in object expression, and will be discussed later, in section 4.5:

(16) a. (Did you buy that panga?)
Yii in(kî)gûrire
yii ni-n-kî-gûr-ire
yes FOC-1SG.SM-OM-buy-PFV
'Yes I bought (it)'

b. (Did you see that panga?)
Yii in*(kî)onire
yii ni-n-kî-on-ire
yes FOC-1SG.SM-OM-see-PFV
'Yes I saw it'

4. Factors influencing choice of referring expressions

We have already seen that Kĩîtharaka has a choice between seven ways of expressing a referent, namely full lexical NPs, pronominal demonstratives, adnominal demonstratives, NP + REL, independent pronoun, SMs/OMs, and subject/object drop. The next question that we need to answer is what discourse factors influence the use of the various referring expressions. In section 1 we evaluate to what extent accessibility status hypothesis is supported by Kĩîtharaka data by running some tests before looking at other factors involved.

4.1 Accessibility status of the referent. The accessibility marking scale for Kĩîtharaka can be presented as follows:

(17) *Lexical NP+modifier > Lexical NP > DEM > Pron/SM/OM > Object Drop*

The hierarchy has full lexical NP + modifier at the left-most- and high accessibility markers like SMs and OMs at the rightmost end of the continuum. The referential expressions in the hierarchy are therefore ordered from the expression with the most linguistic material to the one with the least, in an inverse correlation with the accessibility of the referents. The modifier slot may be occupied by a genitive phrase, a prepositional phrase, a demonstrative or a relative clause.

Although the data collected from the stories showed full lexical NP as the most common expression used to introduce new referent, this does not conflict with the above hierarchy and the accessibility theory in general. Looking closely at the referents involved, one notices that most of them are names of specific animals or things–hyena, hare, guinea fowl, wound etc. In my view, this gives the referents some degree of accessibility (through world knowledge), thus requiring less linguistic encoding. For instance, if someone tells you, *'I have seen a hyena,'* s/he requires you to retrieve the memory you already have the animal and so as to understand what animal is being talked about. Accessibility through world knowledge can be reduced if there are two animal characters of the same species, e.g., two hyenas. In this case, the speaker is likely to use more linguistic encoding–e.g., NP+ modifier, or NP + long definite description–to identify the specific hyena being referred to. The case is, however, different for human referents–specific humans are identifiable on the basis of personal names–the use of a general (kind) name *muntû* is less accessible through world knowledge, hence requires more material. For example, in (18), the narrator refers to a (unnamed) specific person

and his daughter, and since *mwarî* in Kîîtharaka can be generic as it also refers a lady in general, they use the terms *muntû ûmwe* and *mwarî wake*.[4]

(18) Téne mûno I kwarî na muntû ûmwé, aarî na mwekûrû na mwarî wake.
Tenemûno ni kû-a-rî na mu-ntû
long very COP 17-PST-be with 1-person

û-mwe a-a-rî na mû-ekûrû na mû-arî wa-ke
1-one 1SM-PST-be with 1-wife and 1-daughter 1.CONN-1.PRO
'Very long ago, there was a man who had a wife and his daughter'

(19) Nthaka îrá kanthî, i nyamû néne mûno.
n-thaka î-ra kanthî ni n-yamu nene mûno
9-young.man 9-RM so COP 9-animal big very
'So that young man was a huge anaconda (lit: animal)!'

The relative clause on its part can be used to introduce an entirely new referent or re-introduce one that became inactive after several discourse boundaries as in illustration (6) and (22). Additionally, for Kîîtharaka, highly accessible referents are expressed either using OMs or dropped. The choice between the two will depend on some factors which will be discussed in section 4.5.

Testing the Hypothesis. Having shown how the accessibility hierarchy works in Kîîtharaka, in this sub-section, we show to what extent referent accessibility determines how referents are expressed. We do this for each of the referring expression described in section 3.

First, accessibility status correctly predicts that new referents are expressed with an expression at the far end of the hierarchy, that is, *full lexical NP+ modifier*, as illustrated in (18) and (19) and *full lexical NP* for specific entities (as illustrated in (1) and (2), repeated in (20) and (21)):

(20) Téné mû'nó mbiti na kayûgű baarî acooré
long very m-biti na ka-yûgû ba-a-rî a-coore
long very 9-hyena and 12-hare 2SM-PST-be 1-friends
'Long time ago, hyena and hare were friends'

(21) Bakîgwî'mága gwa ûgú, booná **nkáánga**
ba-kî-guîm-ag-a wa ûgu ba-on-a n-kaanga
2SM-DEP-hunt-HAB-FV like that 2SM-saw-FV 9-guineafowl
'As they were still hunting, they saw **a guinea fowl**.'

A similar situation is found in Makhuwa and Kiswahili where full lexical NPs is the most consistent way of introducing new referents (see e.g., Poeta 2019). In addition to introducing a purely new referent, full lexical NPs are used to reactivate referents at paragraph or episode boundary. In this regard, a referent that was mentioned in a previous paragraph or episode is considered less active, hence the need to reactivate it. This relates to Ariel's (2001) observation that textual distance between the referent and its anaphor plays a role in determining how referents are expressed. Ariel (ibid) identifies paragraphs and episode boundaries as some of the factors that increase this distance hence the need for reactivation. There are, however, exceptions where NPs pre-modified by anaphoric demonstratives or possessives are used to introduce new referents, not because they are inaccessible,

[4] See section 4.2 for additional possible trigger for the use of NP + possessive in this case.

but for other pragmatic purposes[5]. In section 4.2, I will show that referent saliency are responsible for such usage.

Second, apart from use of full lexical NP, a referent that was mentioned some paragraphs away can be referred to using full NP plus a relative clause. This, again, is a strategy of re-introducing a referent that was referred to some paragraphs away. The speaker feels it is inaccessible from the immediate discourse context, thus re-introduces it. The example given in (6) illustrates this.

Third, a highly active referent that has been mentioned in the previous clause can either be expressed using an SM if it occupies the subject position (as earlier illustrated in (2) or in case of an object, an independent pronoun or an OM. The choice of which is used depends on some conditions. First, if the complement is not a typical NP argument but a PP, the object will be expressed in form of an independent pronoun as in (22b) whose antecedent is the highlighted clause in (22a). See also the elicited illustration in (23).

(22) a. We! gina mûkûrû na kûthi na gûkunda **rûûyî rûra rûrî mwanki ûra mûnene**,
we gina mûkûrû na kû-thi na kû-kunda
gosh mother elder and 15-go and 15-fetch

rû-yûî rû-ra rû-rî mu-anki û-ra mû-nene
11-water 11-RM 11-PRO 3-fire 3-RM 3-big
'Gosh, the aunt rushed, fetched that very hot water,'

b. na kûûya **narú**, na nkumbo îra nene. "mûthonua gángûkundágie tutu ûnyunyage", pa!
na kû-ja na=ru na n-kumbo î-ra nene mû-thonua
and 15-come with=PRO with 9-calabash 9-RM big 1-in-law

ka-n-kû-kund-ag-i-e tû-tû û-nyu-ag-e pa
IND-1SG.SM-15-give-HAB-IC-FV 13-DEM.DIST 1OM-drink-HAB-FV-SBJV IDEO
'She brought it in a huge calabash. "my in-law, let me give you a little you be taking", pa!

(23) Mbaasiiní îrá mbű́yiré n'yo.
mbaaci-ni î-ra ni-û-y-ire na=y-o
5.bus-LOC 5-DEM.DIST 1SG.SM-T-come-PFV with=9-PRO
'In the bus that I came with (it).'

Second, in a bi-clausal structure, the independent pronoun will appear in the embedded clause whereas the referent is in the main clause[6]:

(24) Kîthaka ikyo gí́kű́nunka m̀bwé
kî-thaka ni-kî-o kî-kû-nunk-a m-bwe
7-bush FOC-7-PRO 7SM-PRS-stink-FV 9-fox
'The bush is what is stinking (of) fox.'

[5] This doesn't mean this is against the accessibility hierarchy, but as we stated in section 4.1, lexical NPs are more commonly observed in the data especially with non-human referents.

[6] A reviewer sought to know on what basis this construction is considered as bi-clausal and whether it is relevant to the choice for referring expression. In van der Waal and Kanampiu (forthcoming) we show that this structure is best analyzed as NP + cleft (The bush it is what…) based on its syntactic properties. For instance, adverbs if present, must always appear before the pronoun and not after it. The fact that the pronoun co-refers with the initial (accessible) noun is relevant to accessibility, hence relevant to the topic under discussion.

There are also instances when place and temporal adverbs are referred to with the pronoun as in (25) whose full lexical NP is introduced in (26), subsequently realised in form of a demonstrative *aaga* and then the pronoun *n'oo*:

(25) Mwanka ntugû îmwe, aathi muuroni, ndia yaakiri ki!

mûanka	n-tugû	îmwe	a-a-thi	**mu-uro-ni**	n-dia	î-a-kir-i	ki
until	9-day	one	1SG.SM-PST-go	3-river-loc	9-pool	9OM-PST-be.quiet-FV	IDEO

'Till one day she went to a river; a very calm pool.'

(26) Auga îndî **aga** nûûmba **n'oo** ngaateethekera.

a-ug-a	îndî	a-ga	ni-ûmba	ni-o	i-ka-teth-îk-îr-a
1SG.SM-say-FV	now	16-DEM.PROX	FOC-maybe	FOC-16.PRO	FOC-FUT-help-STAT-APPL-FV

'She said, "probably, this (place) is where I will get help."

The actual referent may be overtly stated or implied as is the case with temporal adverb in (27) where the pronoun co-refers with covert but contextually salient noun *îgita rîru* 'that time'.

(27) "Îî, wona aathaamba na rûûyî rwa ndia înu îtakwaria kîûra, i rîo akaabua

Ii	w-a-on-a	a-a-thaamb-a	na	rû-ûyî	rû-a	n-dia
Yes,	1-CONN-see-fv	1SM-PST-wash-FV	with	11-water	11-CONN	9-pool

î-nu	î-ta-kû-ar-i-a	kî-ûra	i-**rî-o**	a-ka-bu-a
9-DEM.DIST	9-NEG-15-speak-IC-FV	7-frog	FOC-**5-PRO**	1SM-FUT-heal-FV

'Yes, if she bathes with the water from the pool without voices of frogs, it's when she will heal.'

On their part, OMs (what Ariel refers to cliticized pronoun) are used as referring expressions for highly accessible referents in mono-clausal structures and where the verb takes a typical NP argument. In example (28b) the referent *nkáánga* is expressed in form of OMs because having been introduced in (28a) it is already accessible.

(28) a. Bakîgwî'mága gwa ûgú, booná nkáánga

ba-kî-guîm-ag-a	wa	û-gu	ba-on-a	n-kaanga
2SM-PRO-hunt-HAB-FV	like	that	2SM-saw-FV	9-guineafowl

'As they were still hunting, they saw a guinea fowl'

b. Mbiti yáárutá mûgwí yáugiá bwaa, ya**mî**rathá, ya**mî**ûraga

m-biti	î-a-rut-a	mu-guî	î-a-ug-i-a	bwaa
9-hyena	9SM-PST-remove-FV	3-arrow	9SM-PST-do-IC-FV	IDEO

î-a-mî-rath-a	ya-mî-u-rag-a
9SM-PST-9OM-shoot-FV	2OM-kill-FV

'The hyena took the arrows and aimed, shot and killed it.'

By the same token, and holding other factors constant[7], a highly accessible object referent can be dropped. However, this is sensitive to the type of predicate involved as earlier illustrated in (16). Additionally, Object drop is only possible for themes. Recipients and objects of preposition are not dropped. In (29b), the object of preposition *kîbanga* is replaced by a pronoun agreeing in class with the referent. In (30a), dropping of the recipient OM results to ungrammaticality–it in would imply that the carrots (theme) are the recipients:

7 There are restrictions surrounding object drop. This will be illustrated in section 4.5.

(29) a. Kîmathi náayire na kîbanga?
Kimathi ni-a-ya-ire na kî-bangá?
Kîmathi FOC-1SM-come-PFV with 7-panga"
'Did Kimathi come with a panga?'

b. Yii, náayire na *(kîo)
yii ni-a-ya-ire na kî-o
yes FOC-1SM-come-PFV with 7-PRO
'Yes, he came with it'

(30) Did you give Mary the carrots?
a. Yii i*(mû)néénkeeré
yes ni-mû-nenka-îre
yes FOC-1.OM-give-PFV
'Yes I gave her.'

b. Yii i mûneénkeeré **cio**
yes ni-mû-nenka-îre ci-o
yes FOC-1.OM-give-PFV 10-PRO
'Yes I gave her them.'

However, it is worth noting that although accessibility status of the object referent is the main determinant of object expression paradigm, there are deviations. There are times when you expect a referent to be expressed in full lexical NP or a light coded paradigm, but it turns out differently. Other factors such as the presence of other competing referent within the immediate discourse, direct speech, predicate type and episode boundary play some role in determining whether a referent will be object marked or not. We will look at these in turn.

4.2 Referent saliency Reference saliency in more general terms refers to the prominence of a referent as a result of occupying a discourse central position in the mind of the speaker/hearer. This happens if a referent is for the topic of the discourse, hence occupying a more prominent grammatical position–the subject of the sentence (see e.g., Givón 1983; Gordon et al. 1983; Kaiser 2006; Lambrecht 2012 and others). In such a case, the referent is typically expressed in less linguistic material. However, there are other forms prominence that may have a reverse effect on the linguistic encoding of a referent. For instance, a referent may be visible or close to the speaker (see e.g., Piwek 2009, Fukumura et al 2010). Such contexts offer a good motivation for use of deictic expressions such as demonstratives (see e.g., Nicolle 2012; Nahkola et al. 2020; Ask Zaar 2021; Peeters et al 2021; Decker 2022). Remember, in section 3.2.2, we saw that a combination of demonstratives and lexical NPs is one way in which referents are expressed in Kĩĩtharaka.

Exceptionally, although accessibility theory would predict that the adnominal demonstratives would appear with new referents (since the expression has more linguistic material), they are also found with accessible referents. When used in this context, the NP+DEM (+MOD) combination may add prominence to the referent, making it more salient. In (31) for example, the speaker uses NP+DEM+POSS *kîronda gîkî giake "this wound of hers"* even when the referent "wound" is already the topic. Although this is a direct speech, the fact that the wound is visible makes it more prominent. The same visibility effect is seen in (32), where the speaker uses a medial adnominal demonstrative to point to the hearer the location of another referent:[8]

[8] The use of more linguistic material in this case is in line with the predictions of accessibility hierarchy, but as we saw in section 4.1, NP only would also be used in this case, i.e., the speaker would be okey to use locative NP *mîtîîni* only, if the location was out of sight. Visual salience, therefore, adds into the mix.

(31) Mwekûrû ûyû **kîronda gîkî** giake, gîkoorua i rûûyî rûra rûtaîtwe ndiani îtakwaria kî-ûra.

mû-ekûrû	u-yû,	kî-ronda	kîkî	kî-ake,	kî-ka-or-w-a	ni
1-lady	1-DEM.PROX	7-wound	7.DEM.PROX	7-POSS	7-FUT-heal-PASS-FV	FOC

rû-ûyî	rû-ra	rû-ta-ît-w-e	n-dia-ni	î-ta-kû-ar-i-a	kî-ûra
11-water	11-DEM.DIST	11OM-fetch-PFC-PASS-FV	9-pool-LOC	9SM-NEG-15-speak-IC-FV	7-frog

'This lady, this wound of hers will be healed by water fetched from a pool without voices of frogs.'

(32) Arî waagu **mîtûîni înu** mîraaya

a-rî	wa-agu	mî-tî-ni î-nu	mî-raaya
1SM-be	?-DEM.MED	4-trees-LOC	4-DEM.MED 4-tall

'He is just around those tall trees.'

Referent saliency can also be perceived in terms of the relationship between the speaker and the referent. If the speaker is related to the referent, they may tend to use more linguistic material to emphasize that relationship even when the referent is already given (see e.g., Murphy 1988). This may inform the use of the possessive in (18) and (33). In the latter, the speaker (who is an aunt to the referent) uses the possessive after the NP to appeal to the anaconda to release 'her' daughter:

(33) Ééra mûthonue atîrî, "mûthonua, rekia mwarî **wakwa**, aaye áangwatîre irio tûreete n'ûntû birî nyûngûûni."

a-îra	mû-thonue	atîrî	mû-thonua	rekia	mû-arî	wa-kwa	a-ye
1SM-tell	1-in-law	like	1-in-law	leave	1-daughter	1-1SG.POSS	1OM-come

a-n-gûat-îr-e	irio	tû-reet-e	nûntu	bi-rî	n-yûngû-ni
1OM-1SG.SM-help-APPL-FV	8.food	3SM-bring-FV	because	8-DEM.DIST	9-pot-LOC

'He told the in-law, "my in-law, let my daughter come so she can help me bring food to you.'

Notably, possessive relationship can be long distant, where something on someone's part of the body (e.g., a wound) is expressed in the possessive. We see this in (31) (*kîronda gîkî giake*, "this wound of hers").

4.3 Competing referents The presence of other accessible competing referents in discourse reduce referent saliency (in the general sense) and increases competition. As a result, referents are likely to be expressed with more linguistic material for purposes of clarity. In (35) both the subject and the object referents are expressed in full because there are several active referents in the immediate discourse (*kayûgû*,'hare', *mbiti*, 'hyena', *nkáánga*, 'guinea fowl', *mwanki*, 'fire'). The use of a subject or object marker in this case would create referential ambiguity (see e.g., Fukumura 2010).[9]

(34) Mbítí yámíîrá, "Nírírwe i mwanki mû'nyáánya–nkáánga nî'ríîrwé I mwanki."

m-biti	ya-mî-îr-a	ni-î-rî-îr-w-e	ni	mû-anki	mû-nyanya
9-hyena	9SM-9OM-tell-FV	FOC-9SM-eat-APPL-PASS-FV	COP	3-fire	1-friend

n-kaanga	ni-î-rî-îr-w-e	ni	mû-anki

[9] An anonymous reviewer mentioned that the ambiguity arising from referents competition could be diluted if the given referents belong to different noun classes. While I agree with the reviewer, the situation may be a little more complex where more than two referents are involved, making it easier to use full-NP expression.

9-guineafowl FOC-9SM-eat-APPL-PASS-FV COP 3-fire
'Hyena told him, it was eaten by the fire my friend, The guinea fowl was eaten by the fire.'

(35) **Kayűgű** gáákira, kááthűûrá, káámenya **mbítí,** káígûkéeneeria
ka-yûgû ka-a-kir-a ka-a-thûûr-a ka-a-meny-a
12-hare 12-PST-silent-FV 12-PST-annoy-FV 12-PST-know-FV

m-biti ka-î-kû-ka-eneeri-a
9-hyena IND-9SM-PRS-12SM-cheat-FV
'Hare kept quiet and got annoyed–he knew that hyena was cheating him.'

Competition also shows up in case of coordinated NPs where there are two or multiple referents acting as subject or object. In such cases, individual referents mentioned subsequently have to be fully expressed despite their activation status, as seen in (36) to (38). In cases of coordinated referents, active referents normally take plural subject or object markers as in (37)[10]

(36) Téné mûnó kwarí nyamú ciírí; kayûgű na mbítí
tene muno i-kû-a-ri n-yamu ci-îrî ka-yûgû na m-bítí
long.time much FOC-17SM-PST-be 9-animal 9-two 12-hare and 9-hyena
'A long time ago there were two animals; hare and hyena.'

(37) **Bá**arí na mbûri ínyingí, ngómbé…
Ba-a-ri na m-buri i-nyingî n-gombe
2SM-PST-be with 10-goats 10-many 10-cow
'They had many goats, cows...'

(38) Ntúgû îmwé, **kayűgu** káámenya **mbítí** írí îkunûka mű́nó
n-tugû îmwe ka-yûgû ka-a-menya m-biti îrî î-kunûka muno
9-day one 12-hare 12-PST-know 9-hyena 9-have 9-greedy very
'One day, the hare knew that hyena is very greedy.'

4.4 The direct speech factor We have seen how accessibility influences referent tracking in Kĩĩtharaka. Depending on the accessibility status, a referent can be expressed in full lexical NP, in form of demonstratives or NP + DEM combinations, NP+ relative clause, use of OM or object drop. The smooth flow of referent tracking, however, is interrupted by direct speech. Direct speech seems to deviate from the expected norm in reference tracking in discourse. In fact, many discourse analysts are said to ignore discourse samples containing direct speech to avoid getting into complications associated with the same (see Givón 1984; Brown 1983:318; Fox 1983:220; Hinds 1983:58). Stirling (2010), while contributing to the debate, notes that direct speech tends to have two distinct deictic spaces; that of the ongoing current interaction and that of the reported situation in which the utterance took place.

Therefore, person, place and time deixis of the earlier discourse being quoted are encoded into the current one. Additionally, when speakers decide to use direct speech, they import the pragmatic properties of the quoted speech into the current one, hence, interfering with smooth referent tracking in the discourse. In (39b) the object 'frog' is realized in full lexical NP towards the end of the

[10] For various strategies of agreement in conjoined noun phrases in other Bantu languages (see, e.g., Diercks, Meyer, & Paster 2015; Taji & Mreta 2014).

sentence even after being referred to using the OM *'kû-'* earlier in the clause. This happens due to the fact that Ostrich is quoting his earlier speech verbatim.

(39) a. Nyága ûtiindûmia nyama?
Nyaga û-ti-n-rum-i-a nyama
1.Nyaga 1SM-NEG-1SG.OM-give-IC-FV 9.meat
'Ostrich, you won't give me a share of your meat?'

b. "Arî **kaûra** nda**kw**îra nti'î na cia kûrîa na cia gûkûnjûra **kaûra** makûnja."
Arî ka-ûra n-ra-kû-îr-a n-ti-rî na ci-a kû-ri-a
No 12-frog 1SG.SM-NPST-2OM-tell 1SG.SM-NEG-be with 10-CONN 15-eat

na ci-a kû-kûnjûr-a ka-ûra ma-kûnja
and 10-CONN 15-unfold-FV 12-frog 6-wrinkles
'Nope, I have told you, little frog, that I don't have meet to eat and for use to unfold a little frogs' wrinkles.'

4.5 Predicate type and referential properties Basically, transitive verbs are expected to take objects. With regard to object marking, however, variability is observed between predicates that express perception and those others that do not (I refer to them here as non-perception predicates). Predicates of perception like *ona* 'see' *enda* 'like' (40a) and (b) and *îgua* 'feel' (40c) must be accompanied by OMs when the object is left dislocated. Object drop is also not licensed in such cases:

(40) a. Ndígú í n*(ci)eendeeté
n-digu ni-n-ci-end-ete
10-bananas FOC-1SG.SM-10OM-want-STAT.PFV
'Bananas, I like (them).'

b. Kîthere in*(kî)endeete
kîthere ni-n-kî-end-îte
9.githeri FOC-1SG.SM-9OM-like-PFC
'Githeri[11], I like it.'

c. Mûrîo, ingû*(cu)îgua
mû-rîo ni-n-kû-cu-îgu-a
9-sweetness FOC-1SG.SM-PRS-9OM-feel-FV
'Sweetness, I feel it.'

On the other hand, object marking in non-perception verbs in Kîîtharaka will depend on the transitivity of the verb, and whether the object is human or non-human. Mono-transitive verbs require obligatory object marking with left and right dislocated class 1 human objects. For instance, the left dislocated human objects in (41a) as well as the right dislocated one in (c) attract obligatory object marking. Non-human animates are, however, optionally object marked (41b), as well as non-human objects in (42) both in LD and RD positions:

(41) a. Mwarimû nka*(mû)kamata
Mû- aarimû ni-n-ka-mû-kamat-a
1-teacher FOC-1SG.SM-FUT-1OM-carry-FV
'The teacher, I will carry him.'

[11] A meal consisting of a boiled mixture of maize and beans.

b. Mbûri nka(mî)kamata
Precious ni-n-muî-kamat-a
9.goat FOC-1SG.SM-1OM-carry-PFV
'The goat, I will carry (it).'

c. Nka*(mû)kamata, Mwarimû.
ni-ka-mû-kamat-a mwarimû
FOC-FUT-1OM-carry-PFV 1.teacher
'I will carry him, the teacher.'

(42) a. Gîciati ngû(kî)gûra
kî-ciati n-kû-kî-gûr-a
7-broom 1SG.SM-PRS-7OM-buy-FV
'(The) broom, I have bought it.'

b. Ngû(kî)gûra, gîciati
n-kû-kî-gûr-a kî-ciati
1SG.SM-PRS-7OM-buy-FV 7-broom
'I have bought (it), (the) broom.'

In a di-transitive (applicative) verb with a benefactive and theme objects, human benefactive objects belonging to class 1 often receive obligatory object marking when dislocated as illustrated in (43). On the other hand, diminutive human objects in class 12/13, and non-human objects are optionally object marked as illustrated in (44) and (45):

(43) Kágéndo nka*(mû)téméra kîûgwá
Kagendo n-ka-mû-tem-îr-a kî-ûgwa
1.Kagendo 1SG.SM-FUT-1OM-cut-APPL-FV 7-sugarcane
'Kagendo, I will cut for her a piece of sugarcane.'

(44) Twáána ngá(tû)cereria mabuku
Tû-ana n-ka-tû-cer-îr-i-a ma-buku
12-children 1SG.SM-FUT-12OM-find-APPL-IC-FV 6-books
'Children, I will find books for them.'

(45) Mbásí nká(mí́)cereria Nderéva
M-basi n-ka-mî-cer-er-i-a ndereva
9-bus 1SG.SM-FUT-9OM-search-APPL-IC-FV 1.driver
'The bus, I will find a driver for it.'

The phenomenon of the predicate type influencing object expression can be related to what is observed elsewhere in Bantu e.g., Luguru (Marten and Ramadhani 2001) and Nyakyusa (Lusekelo 2012). For these languages however, the contexts and predicates involved are different from the ones in Kîîtharaka. For Luguru for instance, the same predicate 'see' and others like 'meet' and 'give' receive obligatory object marking in transitive usage. Additionally, optional object marking is licensed in the context of exceptional case marking (ECM) where a complex non-verbal predicate in form of a clause functions as an object (See Marten & Ramadhani 2001). In Nyakyusa, certain verbs e.g., *bona* 'see', *bʊʊla* 'tell', inform' require OM and obligatorily indicate definiteness. However, there are some e.g., *piija* 'cook' and *bɪɪka* 'put' that do not require OM and may have definite readings.

The optionality of object marking naturally leads to the conclusion that object drop in Kîîtharaka is equally highly sensitive to predicate type in that it's only licensed in non-perceptive predicates.

The perceptive verb in (46a) obligatorily bears the OM, whereas in the non-perceptive ones in (46b) and (47) the OM/object drop are optional:

(46) a. (Did you see the panga?)
Yii in*(kî)orire
yii ni-n-kî-on-ire
yes FOC-1SG.SM-7OM-see-PFV
'Yes I saw it.'

(47) b. 'Did you buy the panga?'
Yii ingûrire/inkîgurire
yii ni-n-gûr-ire / ni-n-kî-gûr-ire
yes FOC-1SG.SM-buy-PFV / FOC-SG.SM-7OM-buy-PFV
'Yes I bought(it).'

c. Did you eat that food?
Yii ninrîire/imbirîîre
Yii ni-n-ri-ire / ni-n-bi-rî-ire
Yes FOC-1SG.SM-eat-PFV / FOC 1SG.SM-8OM-eat-PFV
'Yes I ate (it).'

From the above data, it is not clear why the perceptive verbs do not allow object drop in the given contexts. However, this phenomenon may not be unique to Kîîtharaka. Baule, a *Kwa* language spoken in Côte d'Ivoire, does not license object drop in some verbs like 'see'. Larson (2002) thus argues that object drop is only available for those verbs that affect their objects. She sets a restriction for object drop in the language; that "a null object is permitted if and only if the verbal predicate triggers the presupposition that the verb solely and uniquely identifies its direct object throughout the entire course of the event (Larson 2002:2)."

Borrowing from the identification hypothesis developed by Jaegli (1982) and later modified by Farrel (1990), and observations on object dropping in Italian by Rizzi (1986), Larson (2002) observes that verbs that allow object dropping must meet the conditions of continuous identification in Baule, a formal condition on verbal predicates presupposition that constrains the distribution of null objects. Following Moens (1988) on the structure of event nucleus, Larson observes that each event in Baule has three phases; the preparatory phase, the culmination phase and the consequent state. For a predicate to meet the condition of continuous identification, each interval must respect the event structure. That is to say, every interval of reasonable partition should fully contribute to presupposition of the predicate. If any of the intervals partially contributes to the presupposition of the predicate, the condition for continuous identification is flouted. A verb can have at least one of the intervals.

Larsen further observes that verbs that meet the condition of continuous identification license object drop, while those that do not meet do not. She identifies the predicates that meet this condition in Baule, thus, allowing object drop as those that express processes, aspectual verbs and homogenous verbs. Those that do not meet the condition include causative verbs, experiencer verbs and verbs of perception. The same rationale can be applied on Kîîtharaka to explain why a verb of perception like 'see' doesn't license object dropping. The counterpart of 'see' in Kîîtharaka include the verb *îgua* which depending on context of use may mean to 'hear', 'feel', 'smell' or 'taste'. Further studies is needed to establish how the semantics of verbs interact with object marking.

Referent expression also depends on whether the antecedent referent is generic or specific. My data shows that generic referents tend to either be expressed in full NPs or full NPs followed by

adnominal demonstratives. In (49) *antu*, though accessible from the previous clause (48) is still expressed in full. The same applies to *mûtî* in (51):

(48) Akabééra, "menyá ûtéma mûtíro mûnó kûrî na **antû** béénu"

a-ka-ba-îra	menya	û-tema	mû-tiro	mûno	kû-rî	na	a-ntû	ba-aînu
1SG.SM-2OM-tell	do.not	1SM-cut	3-tail	much	17-be	with	2-people	2-2.POSS

'He would tell them, "don't cut the tail too much, your people are there.'

(49) Bagatema mpóóra **antû** bakauma

ba-ka-tema	mpoora	a-ntû	ba-ka-uma
2SM-PRS-cut	slowly	2-people	2SM-PRS-move

'They would cut gently and people would come out.'

(50) Mwekûrû akiuna nkû aakûrûtwa I **mûtî**

mû-ekûrû	a-kî-una	n-kû	a-a-kûrût-w-a	ni	mûtî
1-wife	1SM-DEP-break	9-firewood	1SM-PST-scratch-PASS-FV	COP	3.stick

'The wife was injured by a stick while collecting firewood.'

(51) **Mûtî ûyu** n'warî na cûmû.

mû-tî	û-yû	ni-w-a-rî	na	cûmû
3-stick	3-DEM.PROX	FOC-3-PST-be	with	poison

'This stick was poisonous

For further work on the role of semantics on source of variability in object marking in Kîîtharaka e.g., unexpectedness and verum, see Loviscach (2024).

5. Conclusion

The choice for referring expressions in Kîîtharaka is determined by a complex web of factors, key among them being accessibility hierarchy of the referent. In this regard, a new referent is considered inaccessible, hence expressed in full lexical NP. Immediately after this initial expression, the referent becomes highly active and can be expressed using SMs for subjects and or OMs for objects, or dropped altogether. Evidently, this study finds a number of factors that interact with accessibility in determining the choice of referring expressions. One of these is the episode shift. We have seen that a referent that has been mentioned a few clauses behind but within the same discourse unit (paragraph) is likely to be expressed through NP + DEM combination. However, if the referent is in a different paragraph or episode, this is considered to increase the distance between the referent and its anaphor (OM in this case) hence it is likely to be expressed in full, or inform of NP + relative clause.

We have also seen that both subject and object drop appear as rare phenomena, showing up only in very restricted contexts. While subject drop shows up in cases where infinitive form of the verb is used to unravel a chain of events, whether the object will be marked, unmarked or dropped depends mainly on properties of referents e.g., humanness and the predicate involved. In section 4.5, I have illustrated that left dislocated human object take obligatory OMs while the non-human animates and objects are optionally object marked. We have also seen that verbs of perception are obligatorily object marked and do not license object drop while other types allow optional marking and/or object dropping. Additionally, generic referents tend to be expressed with more linguistic material often with NP followed by modifiers unlike specific ones. Direct speech is also seen to interfere with the expected smooth flow of referent tracking, since it is known to import the discourse and pragmatic factors from the quoted speech into the current discourse. One is therefore likely to find all manner of expressions in areas where direct speech is used.

Other factors include competitors and referent saliency. While presence of competing referents tend to increase referential ambiguity hence occasioning the use of more specific expressions, in the latter a speaker denotes the saliency of the referent using a (locative) NP with an adnominal demonstrative or a post modifier.

Additionally, this study finds that the predicate has a role to play in determining whether the (left dislocated) object is marked or not. Predicates that denote perception license obligatory object marking in left dislocated context. Further investigation needs to be done, covering the semantics of various verbs and how they interact with object marking and related phenomena.

Abbreviations

1sg	1st person singular marker
2sg	2nd person singular marker
?	unknown morpheme
APPL	applicative
CONN	connective
COP	copula marker
DEM	demonstrative
DEM.DIST	distal demonstrative
DEM.MED	medial demonstrative
DEM.PROX	proximal demonstrative
DEP	dependent conjugation
FOC	focus marker
FUT	future tense marker
FV	final vowel
HAB	habitual marker
IC	immediate causative
IDEO	ideophone
IND	Indicative
LD	left dislocation
LOC	locative marker
NARR	narrative tense
NEG	negative marker
NEG.COP	negative copula marker
NP	noun phrase
OM	object marker
PASS	passive marker
PFV	perfective
POSS	possessive marker
PRO	pronoun
PRS	present tense marker
PST	past tense marker
RECIP	reciprocal marker
REL	relative
RD	right dislocation
RM	relative marker
SUBS	subsecutive

SBJV	subjunctive mood
SM	subject marker
SPEC	specifier position
STAT	stative
vP	voice phrase
VP	verb phrase

References

Ariel, M. 2001. Accessibility Theory: An Overview. In Sanders, Ted J. M, Joost Schilperoord, and Wilbert Spooren (eds.) *Text Representation: Linguistic and Psycholinguistic Aspects*.

Arnold, J. E., Kaiser, E., Kahn, J. M., & Kim, L. K. 2013. Information structure: linguistic, cognitive, and processing approaches. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Cognitive Science*, 4(4), 403-413.

Ask Zaar, B. 2021. What do Swedish demonstratives encode?: A study of exophoric demonstrative preferences.

Asiimwe, A. 2024. The structure, distribution and function of demonstratives in Runyankore-Rukiga. *Morphosyntactic variation in East African Bantu languages: Descriptive and comparative approaches*, 43-83.

Beaudoin-Lietz, C., Nurse, D., & Rose, S. 2003. Pronominal object marking in Bantu. In *Proceedings of the World Congress of African Linguistics*, New Brunswick (pp. 175-188).

Brown, C. 1983. Topic continuity in written English narrative. *Topic continuity in discourse*, 317-341.

Chafe, W. 1976. Giveness, contrastiveness, definiteness, subject, topics and point of view. In C.N.L (Eds), *Subject and topic* (pp. 25-55). New York: Academic Press.

Chafe, W. 1987. Cognitive constrains in information flow. In Russel. S, *Typological studies in language* (pp. 21-51).

Decker, A. A. 2022. *Demonstratives in Nsélišcn 'Montana Salish'* (Unpublished MA dissertation, University of Montana).

Diercks, M., Meyer, L., & Paster, M. 2015. Agreement with conjoined arguments in Kuria. *Studies in African Linguistics*, 44(1), 28-46.

Eberhard, David M., Gary F. Simons, and Charles D. Fennig (eds.) 2023. *Ethnologue: Languages of the World*. Twenty-fifth edition. Dallas, Texas: SIL International. Online version: http://www.ethnologue.com.ezproxy.is.ed.ac.uk.

Farrel, P. 1990. Null objects in Brazillian Portuguese. *Natural Language s and Linguistics*, 325-346.

Fukumura, K. 2010. *Choosing referring expressions* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Dundee).

Fukumura, K., Van Gompel, R. P., & Pickering, M. J. 2010. The use of visual context during the production of referring expressions. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 63(9), 1700-1715.

Fox, A. 1983. Topic continuity in biblical Hebrew narrative. In T. Givón. (Ed). *Typological Studies of Language*, 215-254

Givón, T. (1984). *Syntax: A functional introduction.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Gordon, P. C., Grosz, B. J., & Gilliom, L. A. 1993. Pronouns, names, and the centering of attention in discourse. *Cognitive Science*, 17(3), 311-347.

Gundel, J.K. 1993. Cognitive status and the form of referring expressions in discourse. *Language*, 274-307.

Hinds, J. 1983. Topic continuity in Japanese. *Topic Continuity in Discourse*, 43-93.

Jaeggli, O. 1982. *Topics in Romance syntax*. Holland: Foris.

Kaiser, E. 2006. Effects of topic and focus on salience. In *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung* (Vol. 10, No. 1, pp. 139-154).

Kanampiu, P. N., & Muriungi, P.K. 2019. Order of mordifiers in Kĩîtharaka determiner phrase. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature (IJSELL)*, 10-21. https://www.arcjournals.org/pdfs/ijsell/v7-i6/2.pdf

Klamer, M., & Moro, F.R. 2020. What is "natural speech?" Comparing free narratives of frogs stories in Indonesia. *Language Documentation and Conservation*, 238-313. https://rb.gy/4yfd3v

KNBS, K. 2019. *Kenya Population and Housing Census Volume I: Population By County and Sub-County*. Vol. I, 2019.

Kratzer, A. (1996). Severing the external argument from its verb. *Phrase Structure and the Lexicon*, 109-137.

Larson, M. 2002. *The semantics of object drop in Baule*. Germany: Fraunhofer IMK. Available at. https://rb.gy/1d9oe4

Leonard, R. A. 1980. Swahili e, ka, and nge as signals of meanings. *Studies in African Linguistics*, 11(2), 209-226.

Leonard, R. A. 1985. Swahili demonstratives evaluating the validity of competing semantic hypotheses. *Studies in African linguistics*, 16(3), 281-294. https://journals.flvc.org/sal/article/view/107498

Lusekelo, A. (2012). *Inflectional and derivational morphology in optimality principal: multiple object-nouns and co-occurence of verbal extensions in Kinyakyusa*. Unplublished PhD dissertation. https://rb.gy/9uz1bu

Loviscach, D. 2024. *Differential object marking in Kîîtharaka* (Unpublished MA dissertation, Leiden University).

Marten, L., & Kula, N. C. 2012. Object marking and morphosyntactic variation in Bantu. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 30(2), 237-253.

Marten, L., & Ramadhani, D. 2001. An overview of object marking in Kiluguru. *SOAS Working Papers in Linguistics and Phonetics*, 259-275. https://eprints.soas.ac.uk/7223/1/LuguruSOASWP11.pdf

Mayer, M. 1969. *Frog, where are you*? Chicago: Dial Press. https://www.phil-fak.uni-duesseldorf.de/fileadmin/Redaktion/Institute/Allgemeine_Sprachwissenschaft/Frogstory-2_01.pdf

Moens, M., & Steedman, M. 1988. Temporal ontology and temporal reference. *Computatonal Linguistics*, 15-28. https://aclanthology.org/J88-2003.pdf

Murphy, G. L. 1988. Personal reference in English. Language in society, 17(3), 317-349.

Nahkola, T., Reile, M., Taremaa, P., & Pajusalu, R. (2020). Space, contrast and joint attention: Demonstrative adverbs in Russian, Estonian and Finnish. *Demonstratives in Discourse*, 6, 243.

Nicolle, S. 2012. Semantic-pragmatic change in Bantu-no demonstrative forms. *Africana Linguistica*, 18(1), 193-233.

Nicolle, S. 2015. *Comparative study of Eastern Bantu narrative texts*. SIL International.

Peeters, D., Krahmer, E., & Maes, A. 2021. A conceptual framework for the study of demonstrative reference. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 28, 409-433.

Piwek, P. 2009, November. Salience in the generation of multimodal referring acts. In *Proceedings of the 2009 international conference on Multimodal interfaces*, 207-210.

Poeta, T. 2016. *Reference to objects in Makhuwa and Swahili discourse*. (Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of London) https://5dok.net/document/q7won4gd-reference-to-objects-in-makhuwa-and-swahili-discourse.html

Rizzi. 1986. Null objects in Italian and Theory of Pro. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 501-557. https://home.uni-leipzig.de/muellerg/prodrop2a.pdf

Rohde, H., Seyfarth, S., Clark, B., Jäger, G., & Kaufmann, S. 2012, September. Communicating with cost-based implicature: A game-theoretic approach to ambiguity. In *The 16th Workshop on the Semantics and Pragmatics of Dialogue*, Paris, September.

Taji, J. 2024. Demonstratives in Chiyao: An analysis of their form, distribution and functions. *Morphosyntactic variation in East African Bantu languages: Descriptive and comparative approaches*, 17-41.

Taji, J. J., & Mreta, A. Y. 2014. Subject-Verb Agreement in Chiyao Conjoined Noun Phrases. *Journal of Linguistics and Language in Education*, 8(2), 78-88.

Van Deemter, K. 2009. Utility and language generation: The case of vagueness. *Journal of Philosophical Logic*, 38, 607-632.

van de Velde, M. 2005. The order of noun and demonstrative in Bantu. *Studies in African comparative linguistics with special focus on Bantu and Mande*, 425

van der Wal, J. 2010. Functons of demonstratives in makhuwa narratives. *Africana Linguistica*, 183-213. https://www.persee.fr/doc/aflin_2033-8732_2010_num_16_1_991

Van der Wal, J. 2021. *The BaSIS basics of information structure*. Manuscript: Leiden University. (https://scholarlypublications. universiteitleiden. nl/handle/1887/3608096, accessed 15 Oct 2023).

van der Wal, J. 2022. *A featural typology of Bantu agreement.* Oxford University Press.

Patrick Njue Kanampiu
University of Edinburgh/Tharaka University
kanampi@ed.ac.uk/patrick.kanampiu@tharaka.ac.ke