Chapter 14

Object marking in Lubukusu: Information structure in the verb phrase

Justine Sikuku[a] & Michael Diercks[b]

[a]Moi University [b]Pomona College

Object marker (OM) doubling (i.e. clitic doubling) in Lubukusu has previously been argued to necessarily generate a verum (focus) reading of the clause. We argue for a new empirical generalization: OM-doubling is licit when there is focus in/on the verb phrase, and verum results when that is not otherwise possible (as an elsewhere case). We demonstrate these patterns with a large range of novel empirical data, providing a fuller picture of clitic doubling in Lubukusu.

1 Background and summary of core contributions

The properties of object markers/clitics (OMs) have long been areas of deep syntactic interest. This paper addresses Lubukusu (Bantu, Luyia subgroup, Kenya), building on Sikuku, Diercks & Marlo (2018) and falsifying some key details of their proposals.[1] Example (1b) illustrates the OM in Lubukusu, showing that it generally cannot co-occur with a transitive object in neutral pragmatic contexts.[2]

(1) a. N-á-βon-a   Weekesa.   Lubukusu
         1SG.SM-PST-see-FV 1Wekesa

         'I saw Wekesa.' (Sikuku et al. 2018: 360)

---

[1]Lubukusu is a (Luyia) Bantu language; it has been estimated that there are at least 23 different Luyia varieties spoken in Western Kenya and Eastern Uganda (Marlo 2009). Lewis et al. (2016) list the number of Lubukusu speakers at 1,433,000 based on the 2009 census. Originally classified as E31c, an earlier edition of the Ethnologue reclassified it to J30, and Maho (2008) to JE31c.

[2]Examples cited from Sikuku et al. (2018) have tone marking as provided by Michael Marlo, a co-author on that paper; new data in this paper are not marked for tone.

    b. N-á-⌐mu-⌐ βon-a   (#Weekesa).   No OM-doubling
       1SG.SM-PST-1OM-see-FV (#Wekesa)

    'I saw him.' (*licit in a context where Wekesa is salient in the discourse*)
    *'I saw Wekesa.' (Sikuku et al. 2018: 360)

Investigations of OMs in Bantu languages have usually centered on whether they can co-occur with (i.e. *double*) overt objects (and, if so, under what conditions), how they come to occur in the positions that they occur in, and therefore whether OMs are pronominal forms, or agreement markers, or fall under some more nuanced designation. These alternatives center on a core diagnostic of whether or not the OM is in complementary distribution with an overt, *in situ* lexical object.[3]

    OMs in Lubukusu monotransitives can co-occur with a postverbal object, but that object obligatorily occurs after a clearly discernable prosodic break (marked by a comma below) and receives an afterthought topic reading, both of which are typical characteristics of right-dislocated phrases, suggesting that the lexical object in (2) is right-dislocated (Riedel 2009, among many others).

(2)   N-á-⌐ki-⌐ βon-a   #(,) ⌐ée-m-bwa⌐ .
     1SG.SM-REM-9OM-see-FV   9-9-dog
     'I saw it, the dog.' (Sikuku et al. 2018: 366)

This suggests a pronoun analysis of the OM, as the OM and the *in situ* lexical object are in complementary distribution, and Sikuku et al. (2018) confirm this pattern with various diagnostics.

    There are, however, some systematic exceptions to Lubukusu's restrictions on OM-doubling, as illustrated in (3):

(3)   n-aa-⌐βu-⌐ l-íílé   ⌐βúu-suma⌐ .
     1SG.SM-PST-14OM-eat-PFV 14.14-ugali
     'I *did* eat the ugali!' (Sikuku et al. 2018: 360)

Sikuku et al. (2018) show that co-occurrence of an OM and an object (OM-doubling) is in fact available, but only in pragmatic contexts that license VERUM

---

[3]A host of relevant references lay behind these core syntactic proposals in the Bantu syntax literature. See Marten & Kula (2012) and Marten et al. (2007) for broad typological overviews; Bresnan & Mchombo (1987), Jelinek (1984), Baker (2003), van der Spuy (1993), Zeller (2009), Zerbian (2006), Byarushengo et al. (1976), Marlo (2014), Marlo (2015a,b), Duranti & Byarushengo (1977), Tenenbaum (1977), Riedel (2009), Henderson (2006), Zeller (2012; 2015; 2014), Letsholo (2013), Marten & Ramadhani (2001), Keach (1995), Woolford (2001), Bax & Diercks (2012), Diercks et al. (2014), among others.

FOCUS, similar to English emphatic *do*. Sikuku et al. (2018) propose that the doubling OM and non-doubling OM in Lubukusu have distinct syntactic derivations: non-doubling OMs are incorporated pronouns, and doubling OMs are agreement morphemes arising on an Emphasis head, which introduces a verum focus reading. Centrally for our concerns here, this analysis predicts that OM-doubling should always require a verum reading. We have recently discovered, however, that the empirical generalizations reported in Sikuku et al. (2018) are incomplete. Notably, there are additional contexts where OM-doubling is licensed without a verum reading:

(4) Q: W-a-teekh-a   ka-ma-kanda **o-rieena** ?
         2SG.SM-PST-cook-FV 6-6-beans   2SG-how
         'How did you cook the beans?'

   A: N-a-ka- teekh-a   ka-ma-kanda **bwaangu**
         1SG.SM-PST-6OM-cook-FV 6-6-beans   quickly
         'I cooked the beans *quickly*.' (not: 'I *did* cook the beans quickly.')

This shows that the analysis from Sikuku et al. (2018) cannot be correct in a strict sense. The purpose of this paper is to clarify the conditions under which OM-doubling is possible in Lubukusu (and its various syntactic/pragmatic correlates). In this brief paper we do not give an explanatory analysis – more research is necessary before that is within reach. But we are able to demonstrate a broader set of generalizations licensing OM-doubling in Lubukusu, concluding that the verum doubling analyzed in our previous work reflects only a subset of the possible OM-doubling contexts. The new set of generalizations suggests that the reason that (4) is acceptable without verum is that OM-doubling triggers conjoint/disjoint-like effects within the verb phrase: doubling creates a focal effect in vP that requires focused material in the verb phrase.[4] In the absence of such material, verum focus results (which is the set of patterns described by Sikuku et al. 2018). §2 shows that focus licenses OM-doubling, and §3 shows that the focused material must be vP-internal to do so. §4 gives some initial data on the interpretation of OM-doubling. §5 points out an empirical parallel in conjoint/disjoint constructions that heavily factors into the informal analysis that we offer in §7. §7.3 and §8 show OM-licensing conditions that are predicted by the informal analysis that we present.

---

[4]As we will show in §7 and §8, this is a mild simplification.

2 Focus licenses OM-doubling

In this section we illustrate the generalization that focused material licenses OM-doubling on a distinct object in the verb phrase.

2.1 New information focus licenses OM-doubling

We saw in (4) that when a manner adverbial is focused, OM-doubling the direct object is licensed (without a verum reading). Likewise, when a temporal adjunct is questioned or bears new information focus, OM-doubling an object is licit without a verum reading:

(5) Q: Ba-ba-ana   ba-a-(ka)- kes-a   ka-ma-indi **liina**?
        2-2-children 2SM-PST-6OM-harvest-FV 6-6-maize   when
        'When did the children harvest the maize?' *OK without verum*

    A: Ba-ba-ana   ba-(ka)- kes-ile   ka-ma-indi **likolooba**.
        2-2-children 2SM-6OM-harvest-PFV 6-6-maize   yesterday
        'The children harvested the maize yesterday.' *OK without verum*

For the sake of space we don't include the data here, but similar patterns arise with lexical ditransitives, with instrumental, benefactive, and causative double object constructions, and with reason adjuncts. In all of these instances, OM-doubling an object is licit in the event that some other constituent in the verb phrase (argument or adjunct) is interpreted as focused.[5]

2.2 Focus with *-ong'ene* 'only' licenses OM-doubling

OM-doubling is licensed if you put focus on a constituent using *-ong'ene* 'only':

(6) Ba-ba-ana   ba-a-(ba)- rer-er-a   ba-b-ebusi **ka-m-echi**
      2-2-children 2SM-PST-(2OM)-bring-APPL-FV 2-2-parents 6-6-water
      k-ong'ene.
      6-only
      'The children brought their parents only water.' *OK without verum*

Additional instances of this 'only' pattern appear throughout the rest of the paper.

---

[5]All of these data are being compiled in our ongoing work (Sikuku & Diercks 2021).

2.3 Contrastive focus licenses OM-doubling

Contrastive focus shows the same effects as the patterns shown above. When a *v*P-internal constituent is contrastively focused (here diagnosed by a continuation that clarifies which constituent is contrastively focused), OM-doubling is natural without a verum reading.

(7) Ba-ba-ana   ba-a-⌊bu-⌋ly-a   ⌊bu-suma⌋ **bwangu**, se-li   kalaa
     2-2-children 2SM-PST-14OM-eat-FV 14-ugali   quickly   NEG-be slowly
     ta.
     NEG
     'The children ate the ugali QUICKLY, not slowly.' *OK without verum*

3 Focused phrases must be overtly *v*P-internal for doubling

We have seen that OM-doubling is facilitated by focused material without the need for a verum reading; that said, the structural position of the focused material is relevant. The preceding examples are all instances of focused phrases that are likely internal to the verb phrase. Here, we show that material that is external to the verb phrase cannot license OM-doubling.

3.1 *Ex situ* focus does not license OM-doubling

It is the the surface positions of focused phrases that is relevant for licensing doubling. To illustrate, the *in situ* questions in (8) license OM-doubling (8a), but doubling an object that occurs inside a wh-cleft (with nothing else in the verb phrase apart from the doubled object) results in a verum reading of the clause (8b).

(8) a. Ba-ba-ana   ba-a-⌊ka-⌋kes-a   ⌊ka-ma-indi⌋ **liina**?
         2-2-children 2SM-PST-6OM-harvest-FV 6-6-maize   when
         'When did the children harvest the maize?' *Does not require verum*
     b. **Liina** ni-lwo   ba-ba-ana   ba-a-⌊(#ka)-⌋kes-a   ⌊ka-ma-indi⌋?
         when   COMP-11 2-2-children 2SM-PST-6OM-harvest-FV 6-6-maize
         'When did the children harvest the maize?' *Requires verum*

A parallel set of facts emerges in the answers to the questions in (8). Either sentence in (9) can answer either question in (8), but only the *in situ* focused

temporal adjunct licenses OM-doubling (9a). As with the questions, focus on an object via a cleft construction when nothing else remains postverbal with the doubled object necessarily results in a verum reading (9b).

(9) a. Ba-ba-ana   ba-[ka-] kes-ile   [ka-ma-indi] **li-kolooba**.
         2-2-children 2SM-6OM-harvest-PFV 6-6-maize   11-yesterday
         'The children harvested maize yesterday.' *Does not require verum*

   b. **Li-kolooba** nilwo ba-ba-ana   ba-[(#ka)-] kes-ile   [ka-ma-indi] .
       11-yesterday COMP11 2-2-children 2SM-6OM-harvest-PRF 6-6-maize
       'It was yesterday that the children harvested maize.' *Requires verum*

3.2 Subject focus does not license OM-doubling without verum

Focus on preverbal subjects is incapable of licensing OM-doubling an object. (10) shows that subject questions and answers cannot contain OM-doubling without verum:

(10) Q: **Naanu** w-a-[(#ka)-] kes-ile   [ka-ma-indi] ?
          1who   1SM-PST-6OM-harvest-PFV 5-5-maize
          'Who harvested the maize?' *Doubling requires verum*

    A: **Ba-ba-ana**   ba-a-[(#ka)-] kes-ile   [ka-ma-indi]
        2-2-children 2SM-PST-6OM-harvest-PFV 6-6-maize.
        'The children harvested the maize.' *Doubling requires verum*

Likewise, *-ong'ene* 'only' on the subject does not license doubling without verum:

(11) **Ba-ba-ana**   **b-ong'ene** ba-a-[(#ba)-] rer-er-a   [ba-b-ebusi]
      2-2-children 2-only   2SM-PST-2OM-bring-APPL-FV 2-2-parents
      ka-m-echi.
      6-6-water
      'Only the children brought their parents water.' *Doubling requires verum*

And in the same way, contrastive focus on the subject does not license OM-doubling without verum:[6]

---

[6]Note that subject focus does not *exclude* OM-doubling an object; rather, subject focus itself cannot license doubling. OM-doubling may occur with subject focus if the conditions for doubling are met independently of the subject focus.

(12) **Ba-ba-ana** ba-a-(#bu)- ly-a   bu-suma , se-li   ba-b-ebusi ta.
2-2-children 2SM-PST-14OM-eat-FV 14-ugali   NEG-be 2-2-parents NEG
'The children ate ugali, not the parents.' (i.e. the parents didn't eat ugali)
Doubling requires verum

3.3 Locative adjuncts do not license doubling

In addition to subjects, focus on locative adjuncts is insufficient to license OM-doubling an object without verum focus.

(13) Q: Ba-ba-ana   ba-a-(#ka)- kes-a   ka-ma-indi **wae**?
2-2-children 2SM-PST-6OM-harvest-FV 6-6-maize where
'Where did the children harvest maize?' *Doubling requires verum*

A: Ba-ba-ana   ba-a-(#ka)- kes-a   ka-ma-indi **mu-mu-kunda**.
2-2-children 2SM-PST-6OM-harvest-FV 6-6-maize 18-3-shamba
'The children harvested maize in the shamba.' *Doubling requires verum*

Locative adjuncts are clearly not within the domain where focus licenses OM-doubling. A broad range of postverbal focused material *does* qualify, including manner adjuncts, temporal adjuncts, themes, recipients, benefactives, causees, and instruments: all of these are plausibly *v*P-internal. Locative adjuncts consistently occur to the right of all of these, suggesting that locative adjuncts are outside the *v*P (see §6 for additional evidence in this regard). Given this and the subject facts, we therefore assume the relevant domain for focus to license OM-doubling is *v*P.

4 On the interpretation of OM-doubled objects

We have not yet arrived at a formal analysis of the interpretation of OM-doubling; that said, we can report a broad range of relevant empirical facts, some of which are very familiar from clitic-doubling constructions cross-linguistically.

4.1 OM-doubling yields specific readings

As is common for clitic doubling cross-linguistically, OM-doubled objects in Lubukusu are interpreted as *specific*:

(14) a. N-a-w-a   o-mw-aana ka-ma-beele.
          1SG.SM-PST-give-FV 1-1-child   6-6-milk
          'I gave a child milk.' (could be any child)

    b. N-a-[mu-] w-a   [o-mw-aana] ka-ma-beele.
          1SG.SM-PST-1OM-give-FV 1-1-child   6-6-milk
          'I gave a specific child milk.' (i.e. it is known who the child is)
          Assuming focus conditions are met to license doubling

As would be expected based on the observation above, an object DP that contains a demonstrative allows OM-doubling much more naturally than a bare nominal object:

(15) n-a-[ba-] bon-a   [ba-ba-ana   ?(abo)]
      1SG.SM-PST-2OM-see-FV 2-2-children 2DEM
      'I *did* see those children.' (*requires verum*)

(15) requires a verum reading to be acceptable, but the presence of the demonstrative marks a significant improvement in naturalness over its absence. Likewise, (16) shows that when the focal requirements of OM-doubling are met, OM-doubling is more natural with a demonstrative than without one:

(16) Q: **Naanu** ni-ye   w-a-bon-a?
          1who   COMP-1 2SG.SM-PST-see-FV
          'Who did you see?'

    A: n-a-[ba-] bon-a   [**ba-ba-ana ?(abo)**] .
          1SG.SM-PST-2OM-see-FV 2-2-children 2DEM
          'I saw those children.' *OK without verum*

4.2 OM-doubling acceptable with D-linked wh-phrases

It is unacceptable to OM-double a bare wh-phrase:

(17) Ba-ba-ana   ba-a-[(*ba)-] kes-el-a   [**naanu**] ka-ma-indi?
      2-2-children 2SM-PST-(*2OM)-harvest-APPL-FV 2who   6-6-maize
      'Who did the children harvest maize for?'

However, D-linked wh-phrases can be readily OM-doubled.

(18) Ba-ba-ana   ba-a-[ba-] kes-el-a   [**ba-andu siina**] ka-ma-indi?
      2-2-children 2SM-PST-2OM-harvest-AP-FV 2-people   7what 6-6-maize
      'Which people did the children harvest maize for?'

4.3 OM-doubling possible with focused objects

Throughout §2 we showed that focused phrases license doubling an object. The same focus requirement continues to hold, but there is no restriction against an OM-doubled object itself being focused. (19) shows that it is possible to OM-double a RECIPIENT that bears new information focus in a benefactive double object construction:

(19) Q: Ba-ba-ana   ba-a-kes-el-a   **naanu** ka-ma-indi?
           2-2-children 2SM-PST-harvest-APPL-FV 1who   6-6-maize
           'Who did the children harvest maize for?'

      A1: Ba-ba-ana   ba-a-⟨ba-⟩kes-el-a   ⟨**ba-b-ebusi**⟩ ka-ma-indi.
           2-2-children 2SM-PST-2OM-harvest-APPL-FV 2-2-parents   6-6-maize
           'The children harvested maize for (their) parents.' *OK without verum*

The same pattern emerges in a lexical ditransitive with *-ong'ene* 'only' focus on the recipient, where that same recipient can be doubled:

(20) Ba-ba-ana   ba-a-⟨b-⟩okesy-a   ⟨**ba-a-khaana b-ong'ene**⟩
      2-2-children 2SM-PST-2OM-show-FV 2-2-girls   2-only
      ka-ma-reeba.
      6-6-questions
      'The children showed *only the girls* the questions.' (i.e. they didn't show the boys) *OK without verum*

   And in fact, we saw above in (16) that it is possible to OM-double a monotransitive object with nothing else in the *v*P, as long as that object bears focus.

4.4 "Aboutness" topics require OM-doubling

OM-doubled phrases receive an "aboutness" interpretation that can be discerned by explicitly requiring an aboutness interpretation of the relevant object:

(21) Prompt: "Tell me something about Wekesa."
      N-a-⟨#?(mu)-⟩w-el-a   ⟨Wekesa⟩ ba-ba-ana   bi-anwa.
      1SG.SM-PST-1OM-give-APPL-FV 1Wekesa   2-2-children 8-gifts
      'I gave the children gifts for Wekesa.'

   We see in (21) that an object that is an aboutness topic is preferably OM-doubled. In this sense there is some "topicality" to an OM-doubled phrase, but it's

important to note that this does not exclude focused phrases and discourse-new information being OM-doubled. Sikuku et al. (2018) report that focus does not license OM-doubling on an object (in apparent contrast to what we have reported above):[7]

(22) Lionéeli k-á-(#ku)- ly-a   kú-mú-chéele , se-k-á-ly-á
      1Leonnel 1SM-PST-3OM-eat-FV 3-3-rice   NEG-1SM-PST-eat-FV
      búu-sumá tá.
      14.14-ugali NEG
      'Leonell ate the rice, he didn't eat the ugali.' (Sikuku et al. 2018: 376)
      (*OM-doubling requires verum*)
      (*See comments below for alternative licensing conditions*)

Adding a demonstrative to the doubled object in (22) is not sufficient to license doubling without verum. But if (22) is a response to the prompt "Tell me about what Lionell ate," (22) becomes acceptable without verum.

Clearly specificity, aboutness, and focus are all important aspects of OM-doubling. An aboutness interpretation appears to be central to licensing OM-doubling. Specificity is also linked with OM-doubling, but it appears to be insufficient to license OM-doubling on its own.[8] We are proposing that OM-doubled phrases are aboutness topics in a topic-comment information structure, but they are *not* topical in the sense of being necessarily discourse-old.

5 Conjoint/disjoint + OMing in Zulu (Zeller 2015)

It is well known that information structure has central grammatical effects across a range of African languages, to the extent of being a fundamental organizing principle of some grammatical systems.[9] A relatively well-studied example of this is the conjoint/disjoint distinction that appears on verbal forms in many Bantu languages and which reflects focal properties of the clause (see van der Wal & Hyman 2017 for an overview). Conjoint forms on a verb show a closer

---

[7]Minor aspects of the transcriptions in (22) were altered to match our transcription conventions in this paper: following orthographic conventions in the Lubukusu-speaking community, in this paper we represent the velar fricative as ⟨kh⟩ and the bilabial fricative/stop as ⟨b⟩. And note that while we have shown in (7) that contrastive focus can license doubling, what is at issue in (22) is that the object itself is focused, as opposed to a manner adverb in (7).

[8]Our current thought is that it's an effect of OM-doubling but not a cause or licensing condition of OM-doubling.

[9]See, for example: Hyman & Watters (1984), Schwarz (2007), Abels & Muriungi (2008), Hyman (2010), Hyman & Polinsky (2010), Landman & Ranero (2018).

connection between the verb and what follows, and disjoint forms are used when there is a looser connection with what follows or when nothing follows the verb (van der Wal & Hyman 2017).

In Zulu, the predominant analysis is that the conjoint/disjoint distinction tracks the presence of overt morphosyntactic content inside *v*P and that focal effects are secondary (see Halpert 2016, Zeller 2015, and references cited therein). Conjoint is used when a constituent is inside *v*P; disjoint is used when *v*P is empty.[10]

(23) a. U-mama   u-phek-a   i-n-yama   ]$_{vP}$ (conjoint)
          AUG-1a.mother 1SM-cook-FV AUG-9-meat

          'Mother is cooking the meat.'

      b. *U-mama   u-phek-a   ]$_{vP}$ (conjoint)
          AUG-1a.mother 1SM-cook-FV

          Intended: 'Mother is cooking.'

      c. U-mama   u-**ya**-phek-a   ]$_{vP}$ (disjoint)
          AUG-1a.mother 1.SM-DJ-cook-FV

          'Mother is cooking.' (Zeller 2015)

There is a long history of research on Zulu object marking.[11] The data and discussion below are from Zeller (2015). In Zulu, OM-doubling in a transitive requires the disjoint verb form:

(24) U-mama   u-*(**ya**)-⎡yi-⎤ phek-a]$_{vP}$ ⎡i-n-yama⎤ .
      AUG-1a.mother 1SM-DJ-9OM-cook-FV   AUG-9-meat

      'Mother is cooking it, the meat.' (Zeller 2015: 20)

Zulu also has "symmetrical" OMing in ditransitives, wherein either object can be OMed. The resulting word order shows that the doubled object is dislocated, as it must appear on the right edge:

(25) a. Ngi-⎡m-⎤ theng-el-a   u-bisi   ]$_{vP}$ ⎡u-Sipho⎤ .   (conjoint)
          1SG-1OM-buy-APPL-FV AUG-11.milk   AUG-1a.Sipho

          'I'm buying him milk, Sipho.'

      b. *?Ngi-⎡m-⎤ theng-el-a ⎡u-Sipho⎤   u-bisi.   ]$_{vP}$ (conjoint)
          1SG-1OM-buy-APPL-FV AUG-1a.Sipho AUG-11.milk

---

[10]We follow Zeller in not marking tone or phrasal penult lengthening in the Zulu data, though these prosodic properties have also been shown to mark the edge of the verb phrase (van der Spuy 1993; Cheng & Downing 2009).

[11]Selected references include Adams (2010); Buell (2005; 2006); Cheng & Downing (2009); Halpert (2016); van der Spuy (1993); Zeller (2012; 2014; 2015).

  c. Ngi-⌐lu-⌐ theng-el-a u-Sipho]*ᵥP* ⌐u-bisi⌐.   (conjoint)
    1SG-11OM-buy-APPL-FV AUG-1a.Sipho AUG-11.milk
    'I'm buying it for Sipho, the milk.' (Zeller 2015: 22)

Note that all of the examples above use the conjoint form, because the non-doubled object in each case is inside *v*P, creating a conjoint environment. It is possible to double an object in a ditransitive with a disjoint verb form, however, as Zeller (2015: 23) shows:

(26) Double right dislocation: both objects dislocated:
   Ngi-**ya**-⌐m-⌐ theng-el-a]*ᵥP* ⌐u-Sipho⌐ u-bisi. (disjoint)
   1SG-DJ-1OM-buy-APPL-FV AUG-1a.Sipho AUG-11.milk
   'I AM buying milk for Sipho.'

(26) uses the disjoint form: both objects have vacated the *v*P.

> As indicated by the translations, constructions such as [(26)] are typically interpreted as expressing verum (polarity) focus, an interpretation that is not available for [other] right dislocation constructions. Other interpretations occasionally reported by speakers are narrow verb focus, or habituality of the activity expressed by the verb. All these interpretations fall under the category 'auxiliary focus' discussed in Hyman and Watters (1984), which is defined as focus 'placed on any of the semantic parameters which serve as operators on propositions: tense, aspect, mood, polarity.' (Zeller 2015: 236)

Zeller's analysis is that anti-focus features on a functional head F in the middlefield of the clause probe and find an anti-focus object. The agreed-with object raises to a right-facing Spec,FP, arising at the right-edge. If the *v*P doesn't have additional content, a disjoint form appears on the verb: the typical case of OMing. In double-right-dislocation constructions like (26) the RECIPIENT undergoes this OMing process. However, the THEME is unfocused and can't remain inside *v*P (a focus domain in Zulu) and therefore is right-dislocated (without interacting with the probe on F).

The pattern that we see in Zulu, then, is that OM-doubled objects move to the right edge of *v*P: if *v*P still has content, the verb appears in a conjoint form, but if *v*P is empty, it appears in a disjoint form. It is possible to use a disjoint form when doubling a single object in a double object construction, but Zeller analyzes both of the objects as dislocated, and a verum-like reading of the clause results. And this pattern of facts reflects common cross-linguistic patterns from related constructions, as shown in Table 14.1.

Table 14.1: Cross-linguistic properties of conjoint vs. disjoint (and similar constructions) (modified from Güldemann 2003: 328)

	Disjoint form	Conjoint form
Postverbal XP	optional	obligatory
Verb position	can be clause-final	not clause-final
Postverbal material	discourse-old	discourse-new, asserted
Complement is	anaphoric, definite, generic	indefinite
Object marking is	possible	impossible
Emphasis on	positive truth value (verum)	postverbal constituent
Focus pattern	predicate within the scope of focus, complement/adjunct extrafocal	complement/adjunct within the scope of focus, predicate extrafocal

6 Initial observations regarding word order

It is tempting to analyze Lubukusu like Zulu, correlating OM-doubling with movement out of *v*P. Potential evidence for this is that OM-doubling makes it sound more natural for an object to be moved to the right edge. Parenthetical judgments in the following examples are alternative positions for the doubled object.

(27) a. Ba-ba-ana   ba-a-(ka)- kes-a   ka-ma-indi **liina**?
          2-2-children 2SM-PST-6OM-harvest-FV 6-6-maize   when
          'When did the children harvest the maize?' *Doubling OK without verum*

  b. Ba-ba-ana   ba-(ka)- kes-ile   ka-ma-indi **likolooba** (✔).
      2-2-children 2SM-6OM-harvest-PFV 6-6-maize   yesterday
      'The children harvested the maize yesterday.' *Doubling OK without verum*

The Lubukusu facts are non-identical to Zulu, however: while a doubled object can occur at the right edge of the verb phrase, the preferred position of a doubled object is the leftmost position in (28) (which in this example is the position immediately after the verb).

(28) o-mw-alimu a-a-[mu-] w-a   [o-mw-aana chana] **si-i-tabu**
1-1-teacher 1SM-PST-1OM-give-FV 1-1-child   ABOUT 7-7-book
sy-ong'ene (✓) bulayi (?) khu-soko   (*).
6-only   well   17-9market
'The teacher gave the child (that I'm talking about) only a book well in
the market.' (i.e. did a good job giving) *Doubling OK without verum*

We include a locative adjunct here because we have shown above that they
behave as if they are outside *v*P: if a doubled object were to appear to the right
of a locative adjunct, it would be strong evidence for dislocation of that object.
The unacceptability of a doubled object outside the locative is consistent with
our conclusions that locatives are structurally higher than manner adjuncts and
are outside the relevant domain of OM-doubling.[12] The available positions on
either side of the manner adverb are amenable to an account of a position being
available at the edge of *v*P.[13]

We could attempt to maintain a Zulu-like account of OM-doubling linked with
movement out of *v*P by claiming that apparent *in situ* doubling is actually move-
ment to the left edge of *v*P. In fact, it looks like quite the opposite is happening:
when a temporal adverb is included that is plausibly analyzed as being adjoined
at the left edge of *v*P, the undoubled object preferably occurs to the left of it (29a),
and the OM-doubled object is preferably to the right (29b).

(29) a. Wekesa a-a-w-ele   [ba-ba-ana] luno   (??) bi-anwa
     1Wekesa 1SM-PST-give-PFV 2-2-children this.time   8-gifts
     bi-ong'ene.
     8-only
     'Wekesa gave the children only gifts this time.'
    b. Wekesa a-a-[ba-] w-ele   (??) <u>luno</u> [ba-ba-ana] bi-anwa
     1Wekesa 1SM-PST-2OM-give-PFV   this.time 2-2-children 8-gifts
     bi-ong'ene.
     8-only
     'Wekesa gave the children only gifts this time.'

Therefore a Zulu-like account of doubled objects vacating the *v*P appears to
be unlikely. (29b) suggests that OM-doubled phrases are quite natural *in situ*.

---

[12]The impossibility of the object to the right of the locative adjunct does not imply that the object
is not moved to a position at the right edge of *v*P that is below the locative adjunct, of course.
[13]It remains to be seen if there are interpretive distinctions between those two object positions.

7 The beginnings of an analysis

7.1 Generalizations

(30)   a. OM-doubled lexical DP objects are interpreted as *specific*.

   b. There is a link between OM-doubling and interpretation of those objects as ABOUTNESS TOPICS.

   c. OM-doubling is a generally available operation in Lubukusu, but the pragmatic interpretation of the sentence is highly dependent on the content of *v*P.

As noted above, the particular content of *v*P is central to the resulting interpretations from OM-doubling. OM-doubling is possible without verum when the *v*P contains a focused constituent distinct from the doubled object. If there is a constituent in the *v*P distinct from the doubled object, but this remaining constituent does *not* bear focus, the clause receives a verum reading. A range of patterns from Sikuku et al. 2018 demonstrate this to be the case, as well as all of the sentences marked as # in this paper. If the doubled object itself bears focus, the sentence is acceptable in (otherwise) neutral pragmatic contexts. But if the doubled object does not bear focus and there is no other focused element in the verb phrase, the sentence requires verum to be acceptable.

Table 14.2: Pragmatics of Lubukusu doubling configurations

focus on/in *v*P?	*v*P configuration	verum-like reading?
yes	[(Doubled Object) $\mathbf{XP}_{FOC}$]$_{vP}$	no verum
yes	[(**Doubled Object**$_{FOC}$)]$_{vP}$	no verum
no	[(Doubled Object) XP]$_{vP}$	verum
no	[(Doubled Object)]$_{vP}$	verum

7.2 Toward an informal analysis

Informally speaking, it appears that OM-doubling activates a conjoint/disjoint-like system, in that it appears to be dependent on overt *v*P content and directly correlates with focus properties of the verb phrase. In this conjoint/disjoint-like system, OM-doubling appears to remove the doubled object from consideration in this system. Apart from the doubled object, then, there are similarities to conjoint/disjoint systems, such as focus on/in the *v*P, patterns of OM-doubling de-

pendent on *overt* *v*P content, and verum/predicate focus in the absence of relevant *v*P content (a common property of disjoint forms) (Güldemann 2003; van der Wal & Hyman 2017).

That said, there are important distinctions from other such systems. Elsewhere, conjoint/disjoint patterns exist independently of OMing but interact with it; in Lubukusu, the presence of the conjoint/disjoint-like system only emerges when OM-doubling occurs. Since surface *v*P constituency clearly matters in Lubukusu with respect to OM-doubling, it is tempting to claim that (like Zulu) OM-doubling removes an object from *v*P, and an empty *v*P results in verum focus. This appears to not be the case, however: verum occurs in OM-doubling with an additional *v*P constituent *if* that constituent is unfocused, doubled objects appear to be able to remain *in situ*, and the doubled object "counts" with respect to the focus requirement – a focused object can license OM-doubling on itself. A final point is that intransitive verbs don't show this system of interpretations in Lubukusu. Conjoint/disjoint systems generalize across verbs of different valencies in other languages (i.e. intransitive verbs bear disjoint forms). But in Lubukusu, intransitive verbs don't necessarily require verum readings – it would be difficult to draw a strict correlation between the verum properties that sometimes result from object marking and an empty *v*P. Rather, it does seem that OM-doubling somehow activates this system.

Our initial analytical thoughts are that OM-doubling is linked with a topic-comment structure inside the *v*P (using the term topic-comment relatively pre-theoretically here to refer to some version of the well-attested distinctions between presupposition and assertion, givenness and focus, theme and rheme). OM-doubling requires an aboutness topic reading of the doubled object because it is generated via Agree with Topic features at the edge of *v*P (precise position to be determined) (see Mursell 2018). However, identification of a TOPIC requires a COMMENT about that TOPIC: the content of *v*P therefore bears focus. We suggest that the focus requirement on *v*P is realized in various ways. If there is one distinct (non-topical) constituent within the *v*P, either its semantics or the discourse context must be naturally compatible with it bearing a focused interpretation; we deem this a pragmatic effect of a single constituent being the entire comment about the topic. If there is no other (non-topical) constituent within the verb phrase, however, verum focus results (interpreted here as focus on the entire predicate itself).

This approach makes several predictions. By analyzing the locus of the focus requirement as *v*P instead of individual constituents, it naturally captures how *any* *v*P-internal constituent can bear focus and license the OM-doubling of a separate object argument. Because there is not in fact a requirement for term focus

inside the *v*P, but instead a focus requirement on the *v*P itself, we would expect *v*P-level properties to be capable of licensing OM-doubling without verum. This is in fact what we find: §7.3 shows that if there are *multiple* non-topical constituents inside the *v*P, these constituents collectively can bear broad focus and are sufficient *v*P-content to license OM-doubling both without verum and without term focus on an individual constituent. §8 shows that a (structurally low) predicate focus marker licenses OM-doubling as well.

7.3 Term focus is unnecessary when *v*P contains sufficient material

As mentioned above, a major prediction of this preliminary analysis is that the strong focal effects on a single constituent should be mitigated if additional constituents are inside *v*P when an object is OM-doubled. This is because on the approach sketched here, those focal effects are only the result of a single constituent serving as the comment about the topic. This is in fact what happens. In the intuitions of the first author, the more things there are in *v*P, the more natural OM-doubling sounds, and term focus becomes unnecessary.

(31) N-a-[mu-] w-el-a   [Wekesa] ba-ba-ana   bi-anwa.
      1SG.SM-PST-1OM-give-APPL-FV 1Wekesa 2-2-children 8-gifts
      'I gave the children gifts for Wekesa.'
      OK without verum, without additional context

In general, adding more *v*P-level material makes an OM-doubled sentence sound increasingly natural. The following sentences are very natural with OM-doubling and without any exclusive focus on a single constituent:

(32) a. N-a-[mu-] w-el-a   [Wekesa] ba-ba-ana   bi-anwa bulayi.
          1SG.SM-PST-1OM-give-APPL-FV 1Wekesa 2-2-children 8-gifts well
          'I gave the children gifts well for Wekesa.'
          OK without verum, without additional context
      b. N-a-[mu-] w-el-a   [Wekesa] ba-ba-ana   bi-anwa
          1SG.SM-PST-1OM-give-APPL-FV 1Wekesa 2-2-children 8-gifts
          likolooba.
          yesterday
          'I gave the children gifts yesterday for Wekesa.'
          OK without verum, without additional context

8 NE-focus marking licenses OM-doubling

An additional piece of evidence supporting a *v*P-level topic-comment approach is NE-focus. Wasike (2007: 335) documents a morpheme in Lubukusu that appears on the main verb in compound tenses which he analyzes as wh-agreement, a reflex of A'-movement:

(33) Siina ni-syo mw-a-ba   **ne**-mu-khol-a?
     7what COMP-7 2PL.SM-PST-be **NE**-2PL.SM-do-FV
     'What was it that you were doing?'

It is clear that N(E)- cannot itself be wh-agreement, as it readily appears in non-extraction contexts:[14]

(34) Wekesa a-ba (**n**)-a-a-nyw-a   ka-ma-lwa buli nyanga
     1Wekesa 1-be **NE**-1SM-PST-drink-FV 6-6-alcohol every 9day
     'Wekesa (certainly) used to drink alcohol everyday.'

The interpretive contribution of N(E)- is hard to pin down, but it has some kind of connection to FOCUS or EMPHASIS. With N(E)-, the speaker is more committed to the truth of (34). Without N(E)-, (34) is more or less neutral.[15]

8.1 OM-doubling in compound tenses with NE-

If OM-doubling results in focus on the *v*P, OM-doubling should be acceptable if the *v*P is focused independently of its internal content. OM-doubling sounds natural with the N(E)- focus morpheme in a compound tense (without verum).

(35) a. Wekesa a-ba   a-a-(#ka)- nyw-a   ka-ma-lwa buli nyanga.
        1Wekesa 1SM-be 1SM-PST-6OM-drink-FV 6-6-alcohol every 9day
        'Wekesa used to drink alcohol everyday.'
        Requires verum for OM-doubling to be acceptable
     b. Wekesa a-ba **n**-a-a-ka- nyw-a   ka-ma-lwa buli nyanga
        1Wekesa 1-be **NE**-1SM-PST-6OM-drink-FV 6-6-alcohol every 9day
        'Wekesa (certainly) used to drink alcohol everyday.'
        Doubling OK without verum

---

[14]There certainly are interactions with extraction: even for the first author on this paper, certain extraction environments make N(E)- obligatory. So there is still work to be done to explain these patterns.

[15]There are a variety of complex facts related to agreement and extraction around the properties of N(E)-, but for now we focus on a few core properties relevant to OMing.

8.2 NE- and imperatives (and doubling)

The focus morpheme NE- can also occur on imperatives; this tends to have the interpretive effect of increasing the force/urgency of the speaker's command.

(36)   a.   kh-o-nyw-e   echai yoo
            KH-2SG.SM-drink-SBJV 9tea   9your
            'Drink your tea.'

       b.   **n**-o-nyw-e   echai yoo!
            NE-2SG.SM-drink-SBJV 9tea   9-your
            'Drink your tea!'

OM-doubling the object is acceptable but requires a verum interpretation (37a). If NE- is used, doubling does not require a verum interpretation (37b).

(37)   a.   #⎡Ki-⎤ nyw-e   ⎡echai yoo⎤ !
            9OM-drink-SBJV 9tea   9-your
            'Drink your tea!' *Requires verum, i.e. 'DO drink your tea.'*

       b.   **n**-o-⎡ki-⎤ nyw-e   ⎡echai yoo⎤ !
            NE-2SG.SM-9OM-drink-SBJV 9tea   9-your
            'Drink your tea!' *OK without verum*

8.3 Intermediate summary, NE-focus

What we see from this section, then, is that the NE-focus marker is capable of licensing OM-doubling an object independently of any other focused phrase inside the verb phrase. Like the pattern discussed in §7.3, this is another process centered on the broader verb phrase itself, rather than any particular constituent inside the verb phrase. This therefore further supports an approach where the focus requirement for OM-doubling applies to the verb phrase as a whole, despite the fact that it is often realized by term focus on an individual constituent inside the verb phrase.

9 Conclusions

9.1 Empirical generalizations

The main contribution of this paper is in expanding the empirical generalizations on the properties of OMing and OM-doubling in Lubukusu. (38) summarizes the

relevant pre-existing empirical generalizations that were arrived at in Sikuku et al. (2018), and (39) summarizes the new empirical generalizations reached in this paper.

(38) Selected empirical generalizations from Sikuku et al. (2018)

    a. Doubling in simple monotransitives is unacceptable in neutral discourse contexts.

    b. Doubling in simple monotransitives requires a verum-licensing context to be acceptable.

(39) New generalizations: Lubukusu OM-doubling

    a. OM-doubled lexical DP objects are interpreted as SPECIFIC.

    b. Objects that are interpreted as ABOUTNESS TOPICS require OM-doubling.

    c. OM-doubling is a generally available operation in the language, but the pragmatic interpretation of the sentence is highly dependent on the content of vP.

As for the pragmatic effects in particular, if there are 2+ distinct constituents in the vP other than the doubled object, there are no discernible pragmatic effects (i.e. no focus effects). OM-doubling is possible without verum when the vP contains a focused constituent distinct from the doubled object. If there is a constituent in the vP distinct from the doubled object, but this remaining constituent does *not* bear focus, the clause receives a verum reading. If the doubled object bears focus, the sentence is acceptable in neutral pragmatic contexts. If the doubled object does not bear focus, the sentence requires verum to be acceptable. We have also identified one additional pathway to non-verum OM-doubling: if the verb bears the N(E)- emphatic marker, OM-doubling is natural without any additional term-level focus inside the vP (this N(E)- morpheme only appears in a compound tense or imperative). Table 14.3 sketches the core configurations of OM-doubling that we considered in this paper, including their interactions with focus effects.

9.2 Future research

There are a number of persistent analytical questions, and the work is ongoing. First, the project is still a work in progress; as we mentioned above, our current direction of analysis is to analyze OM-doubling as a result of topic agreement

Table 14.3: Pragmatics of Lubukusu doubling configurations

focus on/in vP?	vP configuration	verum-like focus?
yes	[Doubled Object XP YP]$_{vP}$	no verum
yes	[Doubled Object $\mathbf{XP_{FOC}}$]$_{vP}$	no verum
yes	[**Doubled Object**$_{FOC}$]$_{vP}$	no verum
no	[Doubled Object XP]$_{vP}$	verum
no	[Doubled Object]$_{vP}$	verum
yes	**NE**-[Doubled Object]$_{vP}$	no verum

or givenness agreement, but the nature of topicality/givenness puts explicit semantic requirements on the complement of the head generating this agreement. As pointed out to us by Rose Marie Déchaine, these Lubukusu patterns show a large degree of similarity to destressing patterns in English focalization (an area of particularly intense analytical and theoretical work) (Wagner 2012; Williams 1997; Schwarzschild 1999).

Wagner (2012) proposes a semantics of accent shift in English that analyzes givenness and focus as two mutually necessary sides of the same coin: marking something as given necessitates marking something else as focused. Our ongoing work looks to integrate these observations from the English destressing/focus literature with the properties of Lubukusu OM-doubling.

Beyond the analysis itself, there are a number of empirical domains to be looked into, including investigating properties of variable word order postverbally both with and without OM-doubling. The patterns are quite complex and finding reliable diagnostics of syntactic position has been a challenge, but we continue to work in this area. Likewise we continue to investigate the properties of NE-emphasis and to look for additional diagnostic contexts to specifically clarify the interpretation of the OM-doubling itself.

As raised by several reviewers, there are two important areas of research on object marking that need additional work. First, an active area of research is whether both objects in a ditransitive may be OM-doubled (and if so, under what conditions: i.e. whether object marking is (a)symmetrical). Our ongoing research suggests that structurally lower objects in Lubukusu may be OM-doubled, but that this significantly changes the focus properties of the sentence (restricting the focus to only the OM-doubled object). This intersects with another question raised by a reviewer: we have shown a few instances where an OM-doubled object itself may bear focus, rather than some other element in the verb phrase (e.g.

(16)). This does not straightforwardly translate to a topic/focus bifurcation in the verb phrase where the OM-doubled element is the topic and something else is the focus. While addressing this goes far beyond what we can accomplish in this short paper, we expect that both of these empirical areas will be central to resolving a precise analysis of Lubukusu OMing and are a part of the investigation in Sikuku & Diercks (2021).

Work is still underway, but it appears that very similar patterns appear in Wanga, Tiriki, and Logoori (which are all Luyia languages). That said, we have encountered speakers of each of these varieties who appear to lack these patterns, instead appearing to allow what looks like an incorporated pronoun analysis of OMs (doubling is always impossible). Given the deep contextual dependence of these patterns, it's impossible to rule out pragmatic licensing of some sort for those speakers, but the best we can tell, some speakers of these languages completely lack these patterns. So while we can say (based on our preliminary work in these other languages) that patterns like this are relatively broadly attested in Luyia languages, it's unclear whether it is appropriate to say they are pervasively present among all speakers of any particular language (including Lubukusu).

Abbreviations

Below are listed only those abbreviations that do not adhere to or are beyond the scope of the Leipzig Glossing Rules.

AUG	Augment	FV	Final vowel	SM	Subject marker
CJ	Conjoint	OM	Object marker		
DJ	Disjoint	REM	Remote		

Acknowledgments

References

Abels, Klaus & Peter Muriungi. 2008. The focus marker in Kiitharaka: Syntax and semantics. *Lingua* 118. 687–731.

Adams, Nikki. 2010. *The Zulu ditransitive verb phrase*. University of Chicago. (Doctoral dissertation).

Baker, Mark C. 2003. Agreement, dislocation, and partial configurationality. In Andrew Carnie, Heidi Harley & MaryAnn Willie (eds.), *Formal approaches to function in grammar*, 107–132. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Bax, Anna & Michael Diercks. 2012. Information structure constraints on object marking in Manyika. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies* 30. 185–202.

Bresnan, Joan & Sam Mchombo. 1987. Topic, pronoun, and agreement in Chichewa. *Language* 63. 741–782.

Buell, Leston. 2005. *Issues in Zulu morphosyntax*. Los Angeles, CA: UCLA. (Doctoral dissertation).

Buell, Leston. 2006. The Zulu conjoint/disjoint verb alternation: Focus or constituency? *ZAS Papers in Linguistics* 43. 9–30.

Byarushengo, Ernest R., Larry M. Hyman & Sarah Tenenbaum. 1976. Tone, accent and assertion in Haya. In Larry M. Hyman (ed.), *Studies in Bantu tonology*, 183–205. Los Angeles: Department of Linguistics, University of Southern California.

Cheng, Lisa Lai-Shen & Laura J. Downing. 2009. Where's the topic in Zulu? *The Linguistic Review* 26. 207–238.

Diercks, Michael, Rodrigo Ranero & Mary Paster. 2014. Evidence for a clitic analysis of object markers in Kuria. In Ruth Kramer, Elizabeth C. Zsiga & One Tlale Boyer (eds.), *Selected Proceedings of the 44th Annual Conference on African Linguistics*, 52–70. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Duranti, Alessandro & Ernest R. Byarushengo. 1977. On the notion of "direct object." In Ernest R. Byarushengo, Alessandro Duranti & Larry M. Hyman (eds.), *Haya grammatical structure*, 45–71. Los Angeles: Department of Linguistics, University of Southern California.

Güldemann, Tom. 2003. Present progressive vis-à-vis predication focus in Bantu: A verbal category between semantics and pragmatics. *Studies in Language* 27(2). 323–360.

Halpert, Claire. 2016. *Argument licensing and agreement.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Henderson, Brent. 2006. *The syntax and typology of Bantu relative clauses.* Urbana, IL: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. (Doctoral dissertation).

Hyman, Larry M. 2010. Focus marking in Aghem: Syntax or semantics? In Ines Fielder & Anne Schwarz (eds.), *The expression of information structure: A documentation of its diversity across Africa*, 95–116. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Hyman, Larry M. & Maria Polinsky. 2010. Focus in Aghem. In Malte Zimmerman & Caroline Féry (eds.), *Information structure: Theoretical, typological, and experimental perspectives*, 206–233. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hyman, Larry M. & John R. Watters. 1984. Auxiliary focus. *Studies in African Linguistics* 15. 233–273.

Jelinek, Eloise. 1984. Empty categories, case, and configurationality. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 2(1). 39–76.

Keach, Camillia. 1995. Subject and object markers as agreement and pronoun incorporation in Swahili. In Akinbiyi Akinlabi (ed.), *Theoretical approaches to African linguistics* (Trends in African linguistics), 109–116. Trenton, NJ: Africa World.

Landman, Meredith & Rodrigo Ranero. 2018. Focus marking in Kuria. In Jason Kandybowicz, Travis Major, Harold Torrence & Philip T. Duncan (eds.), *African linguistics on the prairie: Selected papers from the 45th Annual Conference on African Linguistics*, 393–412. Berlin: Language Science Press.

Letsholo, Rose. 2013. Object markers in Ikalanga. *Linguistic Discovery* 11(1). 105–128.

Lewis, M. Paul, Gary F. Simons & Fennig Charles D. (eds.). 2016. *Ethnologue: Languages of the world, nineteenth edition.* Dallas: SIL International.

Maho, Jouni. 2008. NUGL online: The web version of the new updated Guthrie list, a referential classification of the Bantu languages. Version dated March 25th, 2008. Available online at http://goto.glocalnet.net/maho/bantusurvey.html.

Marlo, Michael R. 2009. Luyia tonal dialectology. Handout from a talk given at the University of Nairobi, December 16.

Marlo, Michael R. 2014. Exceptional patterns of object marking in Bantu. *Studies in African Linguistics* 43. 85–123.

Marlo, Michael R. 2015a. Exceptional properties of the reflexive in Bantu languages. *Nordic Journal of African Studies* 24. 1–22.

Marlo, Michael R. 2015b. On the number of object markers in Bantu languages. *Journal of African languages and linguistics* 36. 1–65.

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

Marten, Lutz, Nancy C. Kula & Nhlanhla Thwala. 2007. Parameters of morphosyntactic variation in Bantu. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 105(3). 253–338.

Marten, Lutz & Deograsia Ramadhani. 2001. An overview of object marking in Kiluguru. *SOAS Working Papers in Linguistics* 11. 259–275.

Mursell, Johannes. 2018. Object marking in Swahili is topic agreement. *Jezikoslovlje* 19(3). 427–455.

Riedel, Kristina. 2009. *The syntax of object marking in Sambaa: A comparative Bantu perspective.* Leiden, The Netherlands: Universiteit Leiden. (Doctoral dissertation).

Schwarz, Florian. 2007. Ex-situ focus in Kikuyu. In Enoch Oladé Aboh, Katharina Hartmann & Malte Zimmermann (eds.), *Focus strategies in African languages: The interaction of focus, grammar in Niger-Congo & Afro-Asiatic*, 139–160. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Schwarzschild, Roger. 1999. Givenness, Avoid F and other constraints on the placement of accent. *Natural Language Semantics* 7(2). 141–177.

Sikuku, Justine & Michael Diercks. 2021. Object marking in Bukusu: At the interface of pragmatics and syntax. Ms, Moi University and Pomona College.

Sikuku, Justine, Michael Diercks & Michael R. Marlo. 2018. Pragmatic effects of clitic doubling: Two kinds of object markers in Lubukusu. *Linguistic Variation* 18(2). 359–429.

Tenenbaum, Sarah. 1977. Left- and right-dislocations. In Ernest R. Byarushengo, Alessandro Duranti & Larry M. Hyman (eds.), *Haya grammatical structure*, 161–170. Los Angeles: Department of Linguistics, University of Southern California.

van der Spuy, Andrew. 1993. Dislocated noun phrases in Nguni. *Lingua* 90(4). 335–355.

van der Wal, Jenneke & Larry M. Hyman (eds.). 2017. *The conjoint/disjoint alternation in Bantu.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Wagner, Michael. 2012. Focus and givenness: A unified approach. In Ivona Kučerová & Ad Neeleman (eds.), *Contrasts and positions in information structure*, 102–147. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wasike, Aggrey. 2007. *The left periphery, Wh-in-situ and A-bar movement in Lubukusu and other Bantu languages*. Cornell University. (Doctoral dissertation).

Williams, Edwin. 1997. Blocking and anaphora. *Linguistic inquiry* 28(4). 577–628.

Woolford, Ellen. 2001. Conditions on object agreement in Ruwund (Bantu). In Elena Benedicto (ed.), *The UMass volume on indigenous languages* (University of Massachusetts Occasional Papers in Linguistics 20), 75–106. Amherst, MA: GLSA.

Zeller, Jochen. 2009. On clitic left-dislocation in Zulu. In Sonja Ermisch Ruediger (ed.), *Frankfurt African studies bulletin 18: Focus and topic in African languages*, 131–156. Frankfurt: Koeppe Verlag.

Zeller, Jochen. 2012. Object marking in Zulu. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies* 30. 219–325.

Zeller, Jochen. 2014. Three types of object marking in Bantu. *Linguistische Berichte* 239. 347–367.

Zeller, Jochen. 2015. Argument prominence and agreement: Explaining an unexpected object asymmetry in Zulu. *Lingua* 156. 17–39.

Zerbian, Sabine. 2006. *Expression of information structure in the Bantu language Northern Sotho*. Humboldt University. (Doctoral dissertation).