

Chapter 10

Grammaticalisation of the Kimakunduchi demonstrative: Insights into the emergence of post-stem object markers in Bantu

Makoto Furumoto

Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa,
Tokyo University of Foreign Studies

This study examines contracted forms of the demonstrative in the Kimakunduchi dialect of Swahili. Unlike uncontracted demonstratives, the contracted demonstrative always refers to a topic, which can be expressed by preverbal noun phrases. After describing this feature, the study proposes that the Kimakunduchi contracted demonstrative is at an early stage of the development of a pronominal suffix, and provides insights into the hypothesis related to the emergence of post-stem object markers widely observed in Bantu languages.

1 Introduction

In the Kimakunduchi dialect of Swahili,¹ there are contracted forms of the demonstrative in addition to uncontracted basic forms. The contracted and basic forms

¹In the coastal areas of Eastern Africa, there are several language varieties regarded as local dialects of Swahili (Nurse & Hinnebusch 1993). Kimakunduchi, also known as Kihadimu and Kikae, is one such dialect spoken in the southeastern part of Unguja (where Makunduchi District is located), the largest island of the Zanzibar archipelago in Tanzania. In Guthrie's referential classification, Kimakunduchi has been assigned the code G43c (Guthrie 1948, 1967–1971, Maho 2009).



can occur in different contexts. For example, the basic form *yuno* in (1a), but not the corresponding contracted form *=yu* in (1b), can modify nouns.²

- (1) a. m-m-ono *mwalimu yuno*
SM1SG-OM1-see:PFV 1.teacher DEM.PROX.1
‘I saw this teacher.’
b. * m-m-ono *mwalimu=yu*
SM1SG-OM1-see:PFV 1.teacher=DEM.PROX.1
Intended: ‘I saw this teacher.’

Furthermore, contracted forms differ from basic forms in that they can be co-referential with preverbal noun phrases (see also Racine-Issa 2002: 59). This can be seen in (2).³

- (2) a. *mwalimu yuno* *ka-ja=yu*
1.teacher DEM.PROX.1 SM1-COME:PFV=DEM.PROX.1
‘This teacher came.’
b. #*mwalimu yuno* *ka-ja* *yuno*
1.teacher DEM.PROX.1 SM1-COME:PFV DEM.PROX.1
Intended: ‘This teacher came.’

The above-mentioned two features suggest that contracted forms of the demonstrative are in the process of diverging from basic forms in terms of its function. The present study focuses on this point, which has previously received little attention. More specifically, I propose that the contracted demonstrative has grammaticalised into a bound pronoun, which only refers to a topic, and is at a very early stage of the development of post-stem object markers, which are widely observed in Bantu languages.

²Unless otherwise noted, the examples in this article are provided by the Kimakunduchi native speakers, Sigombe Haji Choko and Zainabu Khatibu Bonde, who are listed in the acknowledgements. Examples are transcribed using the orthography of Standard Swahili with the following modifications: aspiration and nasal syllabicity are marked with the respective IPA symbols, the first characters of sentences and proper nouns are written in lower case, periods are not added at the end of sentences, \emptyset is used for a prefix without phonological form, and morpheme boundaries are shown with hyphens (for affixes) and equal signs (for clitics). Numbers in the gloss primarily demonstrate noun class information. While the first and second persons are also represented by numbers 1 and 2 in the same way as classes 1 and 2, they, unlike the class numbers, are shown together with SG or PL. Other abbreviations glossed to functional morphemes are listed at the end of this article.

³When the same basic forms occur both in the preverbal and postverbal positions, they are construed as having different referents.

Following the introduction, §2 describes basic formal features of the contracted demonstrative, while §3 deals with its topic-marking. §4 provides an analysis from a diachronic perspective and summarises new insights which the Kimakunduchi contracted demonstrative provides for the hypothesis regarding the development of post-stem object markers in Bantu. §5 concludes the article with a summary.

2 Basic formal features of the contracted demonstrative

2.1 The form of the demonstrative

Kimakunduchi has a three-term system of the demonstrative; more precisely, there are proximal, medial, and distal forms. In addition to the location of the referent, the noun class information of the corresponding noun also controls the form of the demonstrative. Assuming that Kimakunduchi nouns can be categorised into noun classes numbered from 1 to 18 (minus 12–14) in the same way as Standard Swahili (Meinhof 1932: 128; Racine-Issa 2002: 30ff.), forms of the demonstrative can be summarised as in Table 1.⁴ Note that for class 15, there seem to be no forms of the demonstrative (see also Racine-Issa 2002).

As can be seen in this table, the proximal and medial contracted forms almost correspond to the first and second syllables of the uncontracted basic forms, respectively.⁵ For the distal, there are no contracted forms.

2.2 The wordhood of the contracted demonstrative

Monosyllabic verb stems are accompanied by the empty morph *ku-* when preceded by particular prefixes. In (3a), for example, *ku-* occurs between imperfective *na-* and the stem *-nywa* ‘drink’. Only when the verb is followed by another constituent in the same clause, can the empty morph optionally be omitted, as the parentheses in (3b) suggest. Its omission is impossible when the verb occurs in the clause-final position.

- (3) a. tu-na-ku-nywa
 SM1PL-IPFV-KU-drink
 ‘We are drinking.’

⁴While there are also reduplicated and compounded forms, they are not discussed in detail in this article.

⁵According to an informant of this study, the first syllable of the basic form of the class 18 proximal is the syllabic nasal *m̩*, lacking the vowel *u*, although Racine-Issa (2002: 69) describes it as *mu*.

Table 1: Forms of the demonstrative (Racine-Issa 2002: 69)

	Proximal		Medial		Distal
	Basic	Contracted	Basic	Contracted	Basic
cl1	<i>yuno</i>	= <i>yu</i>	<i>uyo</i>	= <i>yo</i>	<i>yulya</i>
cl2	<i>wano</i>	= <i>wa</i>	<i>wao</i>	= <i>o</i>	<i>walya</i>
cl3	<i>uno</i>	= <i>u</i>	<i>uo</i>	= <i>o</i>	<i>ulya</i>
cl4	<i>ino</i>	= <i>i</i>	<i>iyoy</i>	= <i>yo</i>	<i>ilya</i>
cl5	<i>lino</i>	= <i>li</i>	<i>ilyoy</i>	= <i>lyoy</i>	<i>lilya</i>
cl6	<i>yano</i>	= <i>ya</i>	<i>yayoy</i>	= <i>yo</i>	<i>yalya</i>
cl7	<i>kino</i>	= <i>ki</i>	<i>ichoy</i>	= <i>cho</i>	<i>kilya</i>
cl8	<i>vino</i>	= <i>vi</i>	<i>ivyoy</i>	= <i>vyo</i>	<i>vilya</i>
cl9	<i>ino</i>	= <i>i</i>	<i>iyoy</i>	= <i>yo</i>	<i>ilya</i>
cl10	<i>zino</i>	= <i>zi</i>	<i>izoy</i>	= <i>zo</i>	<i>zilya</i>
cl11	<i>uno</i>	= <i>u</i>	<i>uo</i>	= <i>o</i>	<i>ulya</i>
cl16	<i>vano</i>	= <i>va</i>	<i>avoy</i>	= <i>vo</i>	<i>valya</i>
cl17	<i>kuno</i>	= <i>ku</i>	<i>ukoy</i>	= <i>ko</i>	<i>kulya</i>
cl18	<i>muno</i> (~ <i>mno</i>)	= <i>mu</i>	<i>umoy</i>	= <i>mo</i>	<i>milya</i>

- b. tu-na-(ku-)nywa maji
 SM1PL-IPFV-KU-drink water
 ‘We are drinking water.’

When monosyllabic verbs lack *ku-*, they can be followed by basic forms of the demonstrative such as the class 16 proximal *vano* in (4a), but not by contracted forms such as *va=* in (4b). Contracted forms can be used only when the verb is accompanied by *ku-*, as in (4c).

- (4) a. ka-na-ja vano
 SM1-IPFV-COME DEM.PROX.16
 ‘S/he is coming here.’ ‘S/he comes here.’
- b. *ka-na-ja=va
 SM1-IPFV-COME=DEM.PROX.16
 Intended: ‘S/he is coming here.’ ‘S/he comes here.’
- c. ka-na-ku-ja=va
 SM1-IPFV-KU-COME=DEM.PROX.16
 ‘S/he is coming here.’ ‘S/he comes here.’

Assuming that independent, but not dependent, forms can follow monosyllabic verbs when *ku-* is omitted, the difference in terms of acceptability between (4a) and (4b) can be attributed to the wordhood of the demonstrative; that is (4b) was not accepted because the contracted form lacks independence as a word. Based on this observation, I analyse the contracted demonstrative as a bound morpheme.

The contracted demonstrative can be attached not only to verbs, but also to other word classes. In (5), for example, the adjective *-tamu* ‘sweet’ hosts the class 7 medial form =*cho*, while in (6), the noun *ruhusa* ‘permission’ is followed by the class 1 medial =*yo*.

- (5) kit^hu kitamu=cho
 7.thing sweet.7=DEM.MED.7
 ‘That is an attractive thing.’
- (6) u-si-m-k^he ruhusa=yo
 SM2SG-NEG-OM1-give:SBJV permission=DEM.MED.1
 ‘Don’t give her permission (to go to take bathe).’

Amongst bound forms, clitics, but not affixes, tend to attach to almost any word class (Haspelmath & Sims 2010: 198, cf. Aikhenvald 2003). Against this background, I describe the contracted demonstrative as a clitic.

2.3 Difference from the bound pronoun

In Kimakunduchi, the defective verb *-na* ‘have’ and the copula verb *-wa* can be followed by bound morphemes which pronominally refer to a possessed item (7) and a place (8), respectively.⁶

- (7) kisu ka-na-cho
 7.knife SM7-have-PRON7
 ‘For the knife, s/he has it.’ (Furumoto & Gibson 2022)
- (8) ka-cha-wa-ko
 SM1-FUT-COP-PRON17
 ‘S/he will be there.’

⁶The copula stem *-wa*, unlike other monosyllabic verbal stems, obligatorily lacks the empty morph *ku-*.

These bound morphemes mostly share the shape with contracted forms of the medial demonstrative, as can be seen in Table 2. As their glosses suggest, however, they are analysed not as the demonstrative, but as a different morpheme, which I call the bound pronoun.

Table 2: Forms of the bound pronoun and medial demonstrative

	Bound pronoun	Medial demonstrative
cl1	-e ~-ye	=yo
cl2	-o	=o
cl3	-o	=o
cl4	-yo	=yo
cl5	-lyo	=lyo
cl6	-yo	=yo
cl7	-cho	=cho
cl8	-vyo	=vyo
cl9	-yo	=yo
cl10	-zo	=zo
cl11	-o	=o
cl16	-vo	=vo
cl17	-ko	=ko
cll8	-mo	=mo

This analysis stems from the observation that contracted forms of the proximal demonstrative cannot appear in the same position. For example, the class 17 proximal form =ku cannot follow the copula directly (9). If what the the copula verb hosts in (8) is the contracted demonstrative, the proximal form would also similarly co-occur with the copula.

- (9) *ka-cha-wa=ku
 SM1-FUT-COP=DEM.PROX.17
 Intended: ‘S/he will be here.’

For the difference between the two kinds of bound morphemes, there is an additional indication. In (10a), for example, the bound pronoun -ko refers to the same object as the co-occurring contracted proximal demonstrative =ku. The demonstrative never exhibits such a co-occurrence (10b).

- (10) a. ka-cha-wa-ko=ku
 SM1-FUT-COP-PRON17=DEM.PROX.17
 ‘S/he will be here.’
- b. *ka-cha-ku-ja=ko=ku
 SM1-FUT-KU-come=DEM.MED.17=DEM.PROX.17
 Intended: ‘S/he will come (t)here.’

Note that synchronically, the contracted demonstrative and the bound pronoun should be distinguished. Diachronically, however, they may be related, considering that they can possibly be traced back to the same origin (cf. Nurse & Hinnebusch 1993: 206).

3 Reference to a topic

The contracted demonstrative can be co-referential with preverbal noun phrases, as already mentioned in §1. Below, I first re-articulate this syntactic feature and then analyse whether the contracted demonstrative only refers to a topic.

3.1 Correspondence to preverbal noun phrases

When the preverbal noun phrase is modified with a proximal basic form, the proximal, but not medial, contracted form of the same noun class can occur postverbally, as can be seen in (11a). In contrast, the medial basic form in the preverbal position can only correspond to the medial contracted form (11b). This observation confirms that the referent of the postverbal contracted form is the same as that of the preverbal noun phrase.⁷

- (11) a. baskeli ino i-bomoko{=i/*=yo}
 9.bicycle DEM.PROX.9 SM9-break:NEU:PFV=DEM.PROX.9/=DEM.MED.9
 ‘This bicycle is broken.’
- b. baskeli iyo i-bomoko{=yo/*=i}
 9.bicycle DEM.MED.9 SM9-break:NEU:PFV=DEM.MED.9/=DEM.PROX.9
 ‘That bicycle is broken.’

⁷For the distal, which lacks contracted forms (see also §2.2), basic forms in the postverbal position can be co-referential with preverbal noun phrases. This does not hold for the proximal and medial.

The contracted demonstrative can correspond not only to the subject, but also to other syntactic functions. For example, the contracted demonstrative =*yu* corresponds to the preverbal object *mwalimu yuno* ‘this teacher’ in (12).

- (12) *mwalimu yuno nyi-m-kut^hu=yu*
1.teacher DEM.PROX.1 SM1SG-OM1-meet:PFV=DEM.PROX.1
‘For this teacher, I met her/him.’

In Kimakunduchi, the word order, which is SVO by default, can change according to the information structure. Assuming that the preverbal position hosts the topic constituent as in other Bantu languages (Kimenyi 1980, Yoneda 2011, van der Wal 2015, Downing & Hyman 2016), it is conceivable that the contracted demonstrative, which corresponds to preverbal noun phrases, refers to a topic.

Not only the subject and object, but also other constituents, such as locative nouns (13), temporal expressions (14), and possessor nouns (15) can co-occur with their corresponding contracted demonstratives. This observation suggests that the use of the contracted demonstrative is not related to indexing of any one syntactic function or semantic role, and supports that it serves to mark a topic (cf. Gundel 1988: 216).

- (13) *kajengwa nyi-okoto embe=ko*
17.Kajengwa(PN) SM1SG-pick.up:PFV mango(es)=DEM.MED.17
‘In Kajengwa, I picked up mangoes.’

- (14) *wakati a-Ø-o-vyaliḡwa mwanangu ny-evu*
11.time SM1-PFV-REL11-bear:PASS my:child SM1SG-PST:COP
mji-ni=o
town-LOC=DEM.MED.11
‘When my son was born, I was in the town.’

- (15) *yuno mwanak^hele baskeli yake i-bomoko=yu*
DEM.PROX.1 1.child 9.bicycle his.9 SM9-break:NEU:PFV=DEM.PROX.1
‘For this child, his bicycle is broken.’

Note that if the contracted demonstrative actually refers to topics, the above three examples allow us to consider that the contracted demonstrative covers a frame-setting topic, which specifies a spatial, temporal, or individual domain within which the proposition holds (Chafe 1976: 50; Jacobs 2001: 656; Krifka 2008: 268–269).

3.2 Givenness/familiarity

It has been proposed that topic referents typically have a givenness/familiarity status; they are introduced in the discourse previously or identifiable for the hearer (Chafe 1987: 37; cf. Kuno 1973; Gundel 1988; Tomioka 2020). Although this is probably not always the case (see also Lambrecht 1994: 160ff; Krifka 2008: 265), we can consider that the contracted demonstrative is likely related to topic-marking if discourse givenness/familiarity is mandatory for the use of the contracted demonstrative.

The following two tests investigate whether the contracted demonstrative requires its referent to have already been given in the discourse. If the contracted demonstrative refers to a topic, the results of the two tests would be negative.

- Whether the contracted demonstrative corresponds to the subject when the entire clause is focused
- Whether the contracted demonstrative can have a brand-new referent

3.2.1 Correspondence to the subject of an ‘event-reporting sentence’

Sentences which in their entirety convey new information are called event-reporting sentences (Lambrecht 1994: 124, 137ff., 166).⁸ For example, the sentence used by B in (16), which answers A’s question ‘What happened’, is a typical event-reporting sentence.

- (16) A: What happened?
 B: The children went to school.

In Kimakunduchi, the use of the contracted demonstrative in event-reporting sentences was not accepted. This is shown in (17), where A elicits an event-reporting sentence from B by using the verb *-na* ‘have’ accompanied by the class 16 subject prefix *va-*.

- (17) A: *va-na nini mbona wat^hu wengi*
sm16-have what why 2.people many.2
 ‘What is happening here? (lit. What are there here?)
 Why are there many people?’

⁸Event-reporting sentences are otherwise called ‘neutral descriptions’ (Kuno 1972) and ‘news sentences’ (Schmerling 1976).

- B: *mzungu* *ka-na-cheza* *ngoma*
 1.white.person SM1-IPFV-play dance
 ‘A white person is dancing.’
- B’: #*mzungu* *ka-na-cheza* *ngoma=yo*
 1.white.person SM1-IPFV-play dance=DEM.MED.1
 Intended: ‘A white person is dancing.’

In this context, the subject *mzungu* ‘a white person’, the correspondent of the contracted demonstrative =*yo*, is newly introduced in the discourse together with remaining part of the sentence. Accordingly, it appears that B’ in (17) was not accepted because of the gap between the context where this sentence was used and the information structure by which the use of the contracted demonstrative is licensed; the subject *mzungu* cannot be retrieved from the the hearer’s previous knowledge, whereas the contracted demonstrative requires the subject to be already known.

3.2.2 Brand-new referents

The contracted demonstrative does not necessarily require the presence of corresponding preverbal noun phrases. In (18), for example, the class 16 proximal contracted form =*va* is used in a similar manner as the basic form *vano*.

- (18) A: *juma* *k-evu* *ka-ja* *vano*
 Juma(PN) SM1-PST:COP SM1-come:PFV DEM.PROX.16
 ‘Did Juma come here?’
- B: *ee juma* *k-evu* *ka-ja* *vano*
 yes Juma(PN) SM1-PST:COP SM1-come:PFV DEM.PROX.16
 ‘Yes, Juma came here.’
- B’: *ee juma* *k-evu* *ka-ja=va*
 yes Juma(PN) SM1-PST:COP SM1-come:PFV=DEM.PROX.16
 ‘Yes, Juma came here.’

However, the use of the contracted demonstrative is not allowed in some cases. Example (19) is one such case.

- (19) A: *juma* *k-evu* *ka-ja* *wapi*
 Juma(PN) SM1-PST:COP SM1-come:PFV where
 ‘Where did Juma come?’

- B: juma k-evu ka-ja vano
 Juma(PN) SM1-PST:COP SM1-COME:PFV DEM.PROX.16
 ‘Juma came here.’
- B’: #juma k-evu ka-ja=va
 Juma(PN) SM1-PST:COP SM1-COME:PFV=DEM.PROX.16
 Intended: ‘Juma came here.’

The comparison of the two examples indicates that basic forms can be used regardless of the information structure; in contrast, contracted forms can be used when the referent of the demonstrative has already been introduced in the discourse, but not when the referent is newly introduced. This observation is also compatible with the expectation for the result of the test, indicating that the contracted demonstrative refers to a topic.

Note that in Kimakunduchi,⁹ noun phrases cannot appear in the preverbal position when conveying new information, as exemplified by the object *embe* ‘mangoes’ in (20).¹⁰ Therefore, it is impossible to examine whether the contracted demonstrative can co-occur with a preverbal noun phrase introducing new information since the unacceptability of such a sentence is attributable to the illicit word order, rather than the presence of the contracted demonstrative.

- (20) A: ku-okoto nini
 SM2SG-pick.up:PFV what
 ‘What did you pick up?’
- B: nyi-okoto embe
 SM1SG-pick.up:PFV mangoes
 ‘I picked up mangoes.’
- B’: #embe nyi-okoto
 mangoes SM1SG-pick.up:PFV
 Intended: ‘I picked up mangoes.’

3.3 Aboutness

3.3.1 Co-occurrence with *kila* ‘every’

A prototypical feature of topic-marking strategies can be spelled out in the following way: using a topic construction or a topic marker, the speaker identifies

⁹According to an anonymous reviewer, other dialects of Swahili allow the object to occur preverbally in a context such as (20).

¹⁰While preverbal objects tend to require the corresponding object prefix to accompany verbs, the presence of the object prefix is not mandatory in (20) regardless of the object position.

an entity (topic) and expresses information (comment) *about* it (Hockett 1958: 201; Gundel 1988: 210; Lambrecht 1994: 131; Krifka 2008: 265). According to Jacobs (2001: 652), whether aboutness is encoded can be tested using non-referring expressions; when a strategy (e.g. a morphological marker, a particular word order) is specialised to encode the aboutness relation, it does not allow non-referring expressions such as universally quantified noun phrases to occur in the position hosting the topic constituent. This proposal is built on the following analysis: the knowledge and information that the speaker and hearer share at a given moment in the discourse can be perceived as a set of propositions. This set of propositions is updated constantly as information is newly added in the discourse. Newly added information is not stored in the form of unrelated/unstructured propositions, but associated with propositions already in the discourse. The aboutness topic functions as an identifier or address of the proposition (or the set of propositions) to which newly added information is linked (Reinhart 1981: 78–80; Jacobs 2001: 650–655; Krifka 2008: 264ff.). Therefore, topic constituents must be referential, which is incompatible with non-referring expressions.

In Kimakunduchi, the contracted demonstrative cannot co-occur with noun phrases including the quantifier *kila* ‘every’, as can be seen in (21).

- (21) a. *kila m̄t^hu nyi-m̄-kut^hu*
 every 1.person SM1-OM1-meet:PFV
 ‘I met everyone.’
- b. **kila m̄t^hu nyi-m̄-kut^hu=yo*
 every 1.person SM1-OM1-meet:PFV=DEM.MED.1
 Intended: ‘I met everyone.’

Noun phrases including *kila* are considered non-referential. If non-referring expressions cannot serve as an ‘address’ of the proposition(s), it appears that the contracted demonstrative can be used only when there is an aboutness relation between the referent of the contracted demonstrative and the proposition expressed by the rest of the same clause.¹¹

¹¹For the incompatibility of topic expressions with ‘every’, Endriss (2009: 40, 241) presents an alternative analysis through her observation on German. According to her, noun phrases quantified by ‘every’ can be construed as an address of the proposition, and its unacceptability in the left-dislocated position is attributable to the conflict of number: the singular quantifier like ‘every’, when left-dislocated, has to be resumed by a singular resumptive pronoun, whereas its referent is a plural object and thus requires a resumptive pronoun to be plural. Assuming that the Kimakunduchi contracted demonstrative functions as a similar resumptive pronoun, the unacceptability of (21b) might be attributed the same conflict, rather than the referentiality.

3.3.2 Restriction to the double occurrence of the contracted demonstrative

When there are two preverbal noun phrases, the contracted demonstrative in the postverbal position agrees with either of them. In (22a), the class 1 medial form =yo corresponds to the subject *fatuma*, whereas in (22b), the class 10 medial form =zo corresponds to the preverbal object *embe* ‘mangoes’.¹² Notably, these contracted forms cannot co-occur, as exemplified in (22c). Their co-occurrence is impossible regardless of their order.

- (22) a. *fatuma embe ka-zi-okoto=yo*
 1.Fatuma(PN) 10.mangoes SM1-OM10-pick.up:PFV=DEM.MED.1
 ‘Fatuma picked up the mangoes.’
- b. *fatuma embe ka-zi-okoto=zo*
 1.Fatuma(PN) 10.mangoes SM1-OM10-pick.up:PFV=DEM.MED.10
 ‘Fatuma picked up the mangoes.’
- c. **fatuma embe*
 1.Fatuma(PN) 10.mangoes
ka-zi-okoto=yo=zo
 SM1-OM10-pick.up:PFV=DEM.MED.1=DEM.MED.10
 Intended: ‘Fatuma picked up the mangoes.’

Tomioka (2020: 18) has suggested that there can be only one aboutness topic per clause. If this suggestion is correct, the restriction to the double occurrence of the contracted demonstrative supports that the contracted demonstrative refers to an aboutness topic.

3.4 The role of the contracted demonstrative

Thus far, I have shown that the contracted demonstrative can refer to the same object as noun phrases in the preverbal position hosting a topic. The referent of the contracted demonstrative is obligatorily given in the discourse and can possibly be construed as an aboutness topic. These observations allow us to consider that the contracted demonstrative can be used only when its referent has a topic status. However, it is less likely that the contracted demonstrative is indispensable to topic-marking, considering that the contracted demonstrative does not always occur even when its corresponding lexical noun phrase expresses an aboutness topic. For example, in (23), retrieved from a narrated folktale, there

¹²The order of the subject and the object can be changed, and this does not affect the occurrence of the contracted demonstrative.

4 Diachronic analysis of the contracted demonstrative

4.1 Post-stem object markers in Bantu languages

The way of object indexing varies among Bantu languages. In some languages such as Kimakunduchi, verbs can host the object marker only in the pre-stem position, while other languages allow it to appear after the verb (Beaudoin-Lietz et al. 2004, Marlo 2015). Example (24) demonstrates that in the Shimaore dialect of Comorian, the recipient and theme objects of the ditransitive verb *-ba* ‘give’ can be indexed through the pre- and post-stem markers, respectively (cf. Rombi 1983).

- (24) tsi-m-ba-zo
 SM1SG-OM1-give-OM10
 ‘I gave it to her/him.’ (Alnet 2009: 269 fn.)

Notably, the Kimakunduchi contracted demonstrative appears similar to such post-stem object markers. In (25), for example, the medial form of the Kimakunduchi contracted demonstrative =zo accompanies the verb.

- (25) paukwa izo m-me=ga-tenda=zo
 10.story DEM.MED.10 SM1SG-PRF=INTS-do-DEM.MED.10
 ‘For those stories, I have already told them.’

For the development of the object marker in Bantu languages, it has been proposed that they can be traced back to anaphoric pronouns referring to topics (Givón 1976: 156–160; cf. Lambrecht 1981, Diessel 1999, Morimoto 2002, Siewierska 2004, Lehmann 2015). As already described, the Kimakunduchi contracted demonstrative only refers to a topic. Based on the observation of the formal and functional features, I propose that the Kimakunduchi demonstrative is on the path of change into a post-stem object marker.

4.2 Insights into the development of postverbal object markers

The contracted demonstrative has formally reduced and lost independence as a word. Furthermore, contracted forms occur in different contexts from uncontracted basic forms. These observations undoubtedly indicate that the Kimakunduchi contracted demonstrative has developed into a new grammatical item. However, it is necessary to underline that contracted demonstratives, like basic forms,

exhibit proximal and medial distinction, and do not cover first and second person referents. Because of these original features, I consider that the contracted demonstrative is at a relatively early stage of the diachronic change.

Following this analysis, Kimakunduchi can be viewed as showing the missing in-between stage of the grammaticalisation of post-stem object markers; the Kimakunduchi contracted demonstrative, analysed as a clitic, can be located at an intermediate stage between independent demonstratives/pronouns and dependent pronominal suffixes/agreement markers.

More specifically, the observation of Kimakunduchi allows us to hypothesise that in a very early stage of the development, post-stem pronominal markers are attached to any word class and cover any topic constituent including the subject; in succeeding steps, they gradually acquire the selectivity in terms of the grammatical class of their host and the syntactic restriction of their referent. Furthermore, Kimakunduchi provides a suggestion for the use of multiple object markers, which is allowed in a number of Bantu languages; the occurrence of multiple object markers is probably restricted at the beginning rather than that it becomes restrictive later. If there can be multiple objects, but only one aboutness topic per clause, this restriction may be lifted as a result of the shift of referent of the marker from a topic to object. For the functional development, the object marker which indexes the syntactic relation can conceivably be traced back to the pragmatic marker signaling topic continuation and topic maintenance.

5 Conclusion

This study described unique and remarkable characteristics of the contracted demonstrative in the Kimakunduchi dialect of Swahili. Formally, the contracted demonstrative can be described as a clitic as it has, along with formal reduction, lost independence as a word. In functional terms, it is specialised to mark a topic. One indication of this feature is that the contracted demonstrative can be co-referential with noun phrases in the preverbal position, which typically hosts a topic in Bantu languages.

In Bantu linguistics, it has been proposed that the object marker attached to the verb is derived from an anaphoric pronoun referring to a topic. Against this background, I proposed that the Kimakunduchi contracted demonstrative, which has developed into a bound pronoun, can be located at an initial stage of the grammaticalisation into a post-stem object marker. This analysis is compatible not only with the observation that the contracted demonstrative denotes a topic but also with the fact that it still retains some original features of the demonstra-

tive (e.g. proximal and medial distinction, incompatibility with first and second persons).

For the role of the contracted demonstrative, its morphosyntactic features suggest that it serves as an antitopic marker which facilitates topic maintenance. To confirm this suggestion, it may be helpful to re-examine the function of object markers in other Bantu languages, as well as investigate the use of the contracted demonstrative in Kimakunduchi. If the Kimakunduchi contracted demonstrative has actually taken a possible pathway of development of object markers, object markers in other Bantu languages conceivably hold a similar function.

I finally note that to the best of my knowledge, similar grammaticalisation of demonstratives has rarely been reported in other languages; accordingly, further descriptive studies are required to investigate the precise process and mechanism of the emergence of pronominal/agreement markers in Bantu. The present study may have shed a new light on the ongoing cross-linguistic discussion through the description and analysis of Kimakunduchi.

Abbreviations

1	first person	HORT	hortative
2	second person	IMP	imperative
3	third person	IMPF	imperfective
ACC	accusative	INCL	inclusive
APPL	applicative	IND	indicative
AUG	augment	INF	infinitive
CAUS	causative	INTS	intensive
CLA	class agreement	IPFV	imperfective
COMP	complementizer	IRR	irrealis
COP	copula	LOC	locative
DEM	demonstrative	MED	medial
DIST	distal	NEG	negative
DJ	disjoint	NEU	neuter
DOWN	down particle	NONPAST	nonpast tense
EXPL	expletive	OBJ	object
FIN	finite	OM	object marker
FUT	future	PASS	passive
FV	final vowel	PAST	past tense
HAB	habitual	PFV	perfective

PL	plural	REA	realis
PN	proper noun	REC	recent
PRES	present tense	REL	relative
PRF	perfect	REM	remote
PROG	progressive	SBJ	subject
PRON	pronoun	SBJV	subjunctive
PROX	proximal	SG	singular
PRS	present	SM	subject marker
PST	past	SUBJ	subjunctive mood
QUOT	quotative	TEMP	temporal/conditional marker

Acknowledgements

This study is a product of my fieldwork research in Zanzibar since 2012. I would like to express my special gratitude to Girish Zalera, Hidayat Seti Hassan, Kadhija Ramadhan Moh'd, Sigombe Haji Choko, Zainabu Khatib Bonde, Zimba Khatib Bonde, and Zuwena Rajabu Ali, who not only provided the invaluable natural language data reported herein, but also supported my life in Zanzibar. My gratitude goes also to Hannah Gibson, Lukas Rieser, Muye Yang, Yuka Hayashi, and two anonymous reviewers for their insightful comments and suggestions, which helped strengthen the paper, as well as audiences of various conferences and workshops such as the 154th Meeting of the Linguistic Society of Japan and the Annual Conference on African Linguistics 51-52, where I presented part of this study. I also appreciate the generous support of funders. This includes Grant-in-Aid for JSPS (Japan Society for the Promotion of Science) Fellowship, JSPS KAKENHI Grants (13J03150, 16J03295, 21K20009), the ILCAA (Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies) joint research project 'A new perspective on descriptive linguistics in Africa based on the translingual ecology', the ILCAA Core Project 'Linguistic Dynamics Science3' and the JSPS Bilateral program (JSPS-FWO) 'The Past and Present of Bantu Languages: Integrating Micro-Typology, Historical-Comparative Linguistics and Lexicography'. Any mistakes and shortcomings remain my own.

References

- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2003. Typological parameters of clitics, with special reference to Tariana. In R. M. W. Dixon & Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald (eds.), *Word: A cross-linguistic typology*, 1–41. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Alnet, Aimee Johansen. 2009. *The clause structure of the Shimaore dialect of Comorian (Bantu)*. University of Illinois. (Doctoral dissertation).
- Beaudoin-Lietz, Christa, Derek Nurse & Sarah Rose. 2004. Pronominal object marking in Bantu. In Akinbiyi Akinlabi & Oluseye Adesola (eds.), *Proceedings of the 4th World Congress of African Linguistics*, 175–188. Cologne: Rüdiger Köppe.
- Chafe, Wallace L. 1976. Givenness, contrastiveness, definiteness, subjects, topics and point of view. In Charles N. Li (ed.), *Subject and topic*, 27–55. New York: Academic Press.
- Chafe, Wallace L. 1987. Cognitive constraints on information flow. In Russel Tomlin (ed.), *Coherence and grounding in discourse*, 21–51. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Diessel, Holger. 1999. *Demonstratives: Form, function, and grammaticalization*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Downing, Laura J. & Larry M. Hyman. 2016. Information structure in Bantu languages. In Caroline Féry & Shinichiro Ishihara (eds.), *Oxford handbook of information structure*, 790–813. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Endriss, Cornelia. 2009. *Quantificational topics: A scopal treatment of exceptional wide scope phenomena*. Berlin: Springer.
- Furumoto, Makoto & Hannah Gibson. 2022. Variation in Kimakunduchi and Standard Swahili: Insights from verbal morphosyntax. *Linguistique et Langues Africaines* 8(1). DOI: 10.4000/lla.1994.
- Givón, Talmy. 1976. Topic, pronoun and grammatical agreement. In Charles N. Li (ed.), *Subject and topic*, 149–188. New York: Academic Press.
- Gundel, Jeanette K. 1988. Universals of topic-comment structure. In Mark Hammond, Edith A. Moravcsik & Jessica R. Wirth (eds.), *Studies in syntactic typology*, 209–239. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Guthrie, Malcolm. 1948. *The classification of the Bantu languages*. London: International African Institute.
- Guthrie, Malcolm. 1967–1971. *Comparative Bantu. 4 volumes*. Farnborough: Gregg Publishers.
- Haspelmath, Martin & Andrea D. Sims. 2010. *Understanding morphology*. 2nd edn. London: Hodder Education.
- Hockett, Charles F. 1958. *A course in modern linguistics*. New York: Macmillan.
- Hyman, Larry M. 1975. On the change from SOV to SVO. In Charles N. Li (ed.), *Word order and word order change*, 113–147. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Jacobs, Joacim. 2001. The dimensions of topic-comment. *Linguistics* 39. 641–681.
- Kimenyi, Alexandre. 1980. *A Relational Grammar of Kinyarwanda*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Krifka, Manfred. 2008. Basic notions of information structure. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 55(3-4). 243–276.
- Kuno, Susumu. 1972. Functional sentence perspective: A case study from Japanese and English. *Linguistic Inquiry* 3. 269–320.
- Kuno, Susumu. 1973. *The structure of the Japanese language*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Lambrecht, Knud. 1981. *Topic, antitopic and verb agreement in non-standard French*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Lambrecht, Knud. 1994. *Information structure and sentence form*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lambrecht, Knud. 2001. Dislocation. In Martin Haspelmath, Ekkehard König, Wulf Oesterreicher & Wolfgang Raible (eds.), *Language typology and language universals*, vol. 2, 1050–1078. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Lehmann, Christian. 2015. *Thoughts on grammaticalization*. 3rd edn. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Maho, Jouni Filip. 2009. *NUGL Online: The online version of the New Updated Guthrie List, a referential classification of the Bantu languages*. https://brill.com/fileasset/downloads_products/35125_Bantu-New-updated-GuthrieList.pdf. accessed. (24 August, 2021).
- Marlo, Michael. 2015. On the number of object markers in Bantu languages. *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 36(1). 1–65. DOI: 10.1515/jall-2015-0001.
- Meinhof, Carl. 1932. *Introduction to the phonology of the Bantu languages*. (translated and revised by N. J. van Warmelo). Berlin: Verlag von Dietrich Reimer.
- Morimoto, Yukiko. 2002. Prominence mismatches and differential object marking in Bantu. In Miriam Butt & Tracy Holloway King (eds.), *Proceedings of the LFG-02 Conference*, 292–314. Stanford: CSLI.
- Nurse, Derek & Thomas J. Hinnebusch. 1993. *Swahili and Sabaki: A linguistic history*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Racine-Issa, Odile. 2002. *Description du kikae: Parler swahili du sud de Zanzibar: Suivie de cinq contes*. Leuven: Peeters.
- Reinhart, Tanya. 1981. Pragmatics and linguistics: An analysis of sentence topics. *Philosophica* 27(1). 53–94.
- Rombi, Marie-Françoise. 1983. *Le shimaore (île de Mayotte, Comores): Première approche d'un parler de la langue comorienne*. Paris: SELAF.
- Schmerling, Susan F. 1976. *Aspects of English sentence stress*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Siewierska, Anna. 2004. *Person*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Tomioka, Satoshi. 2020. Topic. In Daniel Gutzmann, Lisa Matthewson, Cecile Meier, Hotze Rullmann & Thomas E. Zimmerman (eds.), *The Wiley Blackwell companion to semantics*, 1–31. New York: John Wiley & Sons. DOI: 10.1002/9781118788516.sem125.
- van der Wal, Jenneke. 2015. *Bantu syntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199935345.013.50.
- Yoneda, Nobuko. 2011. Word order in Matengo (N13): Topicality and informational roles. *Lingua* 121(5). 754–771. DOI: 10.1016/j.lingua.2010.11.008.
- Ziv, Yael. 1994. Left and right dislocations: Discourse functions and anaphora. *Journal of Pragmatics* 22. 629–645.

