The Semantic-pragmatic Theory of Definiteness: A Grammaticalisation Account of Indefiniteness Markers in the Determiner Phrase in Kinyakyusa

Amani Lusekelo*
Dar es Salaam University College of Education
University of Dar es Salaam

ORCID: 0000-0001-6275-237X

Abstract
This work contributes to the discussion on the realisation of indefinite determiner phrases, whose physical manifestation is rare, except in a few languages of the world. However, language-specific mechanisms to indicate indefiniteness are available in each language. The semantic-pragmatic theory of definiteness helps to discuss with precision the concept of indefiniteness in the nominal domain in Kinyakyusa. Evidence shows that the lexical element -mo 'certain/some', which was grammaticalised from the numeral -mo 'one', has developed to the indication of specific indefinites in the language. Evidence also shows that the reduplication of the lexical element -osa 'any' signals the non-specific indefinite nouns. The pre-prefix is also used to mark definiteness in Kinyakyusa. Briefly, occurrence of the pre-prefix together with prenominal demonstratives provides indefinite interpretation of the DP. This is obvious for circumstances of interrogative sentence, which basically provides non-specific indefinite interpretation. But in the same context, when the pre-prefix is used on the lexical nouns, we obtain definite interpretation.

Key words: *Indefiniteness, determiners, modifiers, Bantu, Kinyakyusa*

Introduction[††]

This article contributes to the discussion on the marking of indefiniteness in Bantu languages which appeared in previous studies (cf. Alcock, 2000; Kerr, 2020; Louwrens, 1981). These studies indicate that the numeral 'one' has been grammaticalised to denote

Corresponding author:
Amani Lusekelo, P.O. Box 2329, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania.
E-mail: amanilusekelo@gmail.com

indefiniteness within a determiner phrase. This phenomenon is not unique to Bantu languages. Rather it occurs in other languages beyond the languages spoken in Africa (cf. Erteschik-Shir, 2014; Haspelmath, 1997; Heine, 1997; Wong, 2016). However, not all languages reveal the grammaticalisation of the numeral to denote indefinite determiner phrases. Therefore, the main contribution of this article is to show the grammaticalisation path of the indefiniteness markers and the functions of the indefinite markers in Kinyakyusa. This target is achieved by conducting a comparative work, albeit in library research, of the mechanisms used to mark indefinite DP across languages.

An Overview of Realisation of Indefiniteness
The Debate
Interesting research output on the realisation of indefinite determiner phrases is provided by Haspelmath (1997) and Lyons (1999). On the one hand, Haspelmath (1997) regards the formal nature of indefiniteness being realised by indefinite expressions like *a person*, and the grammatical expression like *someone* and *anybody*. On the other hand, he regards the main function of indefinite pronouns as to express indefinite reference. However, not all pronouns express indefiniteness. Some expressions of indefiniteness co-occur with definite articles. Hence drawing a boundary between definite and indefinite interpretation becomes difficult (Haspelmath, 1997). In this regard, Lyons (1999) points out that although prototypical indefinite markers are rare in the world's languages, languages have developed mechanisms to realise indefiniteness based on discourse-semantic environments. In addition, in some contexts the cardinal markers of indefiniteness sometimes become vague and hard to pin down indefiniteness. It is in such context that discourse-pragmatic environments can be used to draw evidence to differentiate definiteness and indefiniteness (Lyons 1999).

Research on the signalling of indefiniteness is required because it appears that each individual language provides language specific mechanisms. Alexiadou et al. (2007) argue that this is important towards understanding the structure of the determiner phrase because in languages with physical realisation of indefiniteness. They point out that both definite and indefinite articles realise determination. Even in languages without overt mechanisms to signal indefiniteness, the position of a determiner phrase realises indefiniteness. For instance, Alexiadou et al. (2007) point out that indefinite determiner phrases remain in the post-verbal position

because they occupy a lower position than the definite determiner phrases.

Apart from the physical and discourse-pragmatic nature of indefinites across the world languages as stipulated in previous studies by Alexiadou et al. (2007), Haspelmath (1997) and Lyons (1999), referentiality and non-specificity of indefiniteness are also central in understanding the structure of the determiner phrase (Gundel et al., 2019; Ihsane, 2008; Louwrens, 1987; Mischke, 1998;). For instance, Ihsane (2008) points out that the literature may refer to indefinite noun phrases as referential, quantificational and nonspecific but Lyons (1999) highlights that some indefinite noun phrases can be specific once the speaker is aware of the entity that the reference picks out. This research examines the indication of the indefinite determiner phrases in Kinyakyusa.

Grammaticalisation of the Indefinite Markers across the World Languages

Research on grammaticalisation of indefinite markers in Bantu languages is still virgin. While studies on the grammaticalisation of the indefinite markers in world languages appeared (cf. Amfo, 2010; Belaj & Matovac, 2015; Chen, 2003; Lyons, 1999), strictly speaking the genesis of indefinite articles in African languages is absent, except general mentions in comparative studies (Heine & Kuteva 2002; Haspelmath 1997; Heine 1997) and a few individual studies (Kerr, 2020).

Lyons (1999:1) points out that studies have shown that "in many languages a noun phrase may contain an element which seems to have as its sole or principal role to indicate the definiteness or indefiniteness of the noun phrase." But Lyons (1999:1) cautions that "definiteness and indefiniteness are not limited to noun phrases introduced by *the* or *a*." This means that proper understanding of indefinite nouns requires mastery of the linguistic environments which yield indefinite readings in other languages rather than English which makes use of the grammaticalised lexical article *a* for indefiniteness.

An interest on research about indefiniteness arises due to the claim that there exists physical markers of indefiniteness in the world languages. In the literature, it is shown that some languages have grammaticalised completely an indefinite marker designated to perform the role of signalling indefiniteness, e.g. the article *a* in

English (as in example 1 (Lyons, 1999: 2)), the suffix *-i* in Persian (Iran and Afghanistan) (as in example 2 Lyons, 1999: 90)), the element *yi* in Chinese, the article *te* in Salish languages (North America), among others (see also Hedberg et al., 2019; Chen, 2003;Haspelmath, 1997; Heine, 1997).

(1)　　*I bought **a car** this morning.*

(2)　　*ketab-i*　　'a book'　　　　　　　　　　[Persian]

Other languages make use of the word order and quantificational words to express indefiniteness, e.g. Turkish *bir* 'one' associated with the accusative case (as in example 3 (Türker, 2019: 86)) (see also Hedberg et al. 2019; Lyons 1999). In addition, some expressions which mark indefiniteness introduce referentiality of the specific indefinite nouns, together with quantification purposes, e.g. the determiner *bi* in Akan (West Africa) (Amfo, 2010) and the indefinite determiners *jedan* and *neki* in Croatian (Belaj & Matovac, 2015).

(3)　　*Ali **bir** piano-yu kiralamaki-du istiyor.*
　　　　[Turkish]
　　　　Ali　**one**　piano-ACC　to-rent　　　　　wants
　　　　'Ali wants to rent a certain piano.'

Research shows that the grammaticalisation of the lexical words into functional categories, which is reported for many languages (Heine, 1997), concerns the cardinal number *one* grammaticalised into indefinite marker (cf. Wong, 2016; Chen, 2003; Heine &Kuteva, 2002; Lyons, 1999; Haspelmath, 1997). However, this is not the only case because other languages grammaticalised two indefinite markers, e.g. Croatian contains *jedan* 'one' and *neki* 'certain/some' with different grammaticalisation stage (Belaj & Matovac, 2015).

Research has shown that the grammaticalisation of the numeral *one* into the indefinite article results into the fusion of both the quantification and referentiality into an indefinite marker (Chen, 2003; Kerr, 2020; Wong, 2016). But each language shows different stages of grammaticalisation of the indefiniteness (Haspelmath, 1997; Heine, 1997). In other cases, individual languages reveal different grammaticalisation stages of the two indefinite markers (Chen, 2003; Wong, 2016). For instance, Chen (2003: 1179) accepts that "each of the two more remarked semantic features of the numeral 'one', namely quantification and referentiality, are bleached out, leaving only the connotation/genericity of the nominal expression introduced by the indefinite marker." But Lyons (1999) reports that languages have developed different mechanisms of signalling indefiniteness, with the majority of the languages still

making use of the quantification words because there are no fuller-developed indefinite articles.

Chinese presents a case in which the indefinite marker bears both functions, as a quantification and referentiality marker. Based on example (4) below, Chen (2003: 1180) highlights that "'*yi* + classifier' in the numeral and the presentative use, as well as in its uses with nonidentifiable specific or nonspecific reference, is always to be interpreted as referring to a singular noun regardless of whether or not *yi* is omitted."

(4) *Tamen fuzi kanshangqu   xiang   **(yi)** ge faguoren*
     [Chinese]
     they   father-son look   like   **one** CL
     Frenchman
     'The father and the son look like Frenchmen.'

Based on Heine's (1997) observations, Chen (2003: 1180) concludes that "the five stages of grammaticalization of the indefinite determiner in various languages all relate to the quantification and referentiality of the nominal introduced by the determiner." In Chinese, the grammaticalization of the indefinite marker is complete (Chen, 2003; Wong, 2016). But, based on the stages summarized in (5) below, the complete grammaticalisation of the indefinite marker is not manifest across world's languages (Heine, 1997). The evolution of the indefinite marker adheres to these stages:

(5) a. There is a numeral *one*, e.g. Swahili: *gari moja* 'one car' vs. *gari* 'a car'
     b. The presentative marker of referent unknown to the hearer in discourse
     c. The specifier marker: introduces any unknown without discourse
     d. Non-specifier marker: introduces specific indefinite noun, e.g. *Buy me **a dog***.
     e. Generalized article which occurs on all the nouns

It appears that the kind of grammaticalisation which is reported in English, which is stage (d), is rare in the world languages. Research has shown that the world's languages have attained different stages of grammaticalisation of the indefinite marker (Belaj & Matovac, 2015; Chen, 2003; Heine, 1997). It becomes necessary, therefore, to investigate the grammaticalisation of indefinite markers in Kinyakyusa to establish how they fit in the discussion about this property in this family (cf. Kerr, 2020).

Indefinite Markers in the Theory of Information Structure

Research has shown two components of information structure that manifests in the world's languages, namely 'old' referent and 'new' information (Aboh, 2004; Erteschik-Shir, 2014; Lyons, 1999; van der Wal, 2009). For instance, Van der Wal (2009) points out that accessible concept or information could be accessed by looking at the previous discourse. The accessibility of information is associated with topic and focus in that they both reveal mechanisms to their realisations in a sentence (Aboh, 2004; Van der Wal, 2009). Indefiniteness is one of the mechanisms which allow accessibility of 'old' and 'new' information in discourse (Erteschik-Shir, 2014) as it allows to mark specific and non-specific referents (Kerr, 2020).

The co-occurrence of the definite and indefinite markers appears to frustrate the separation of 'old' and 'new' referents. The literature shows that one of the strategies used to realise indefinite nouns in the languages of the world concerns the combination of an optional morpheme (dependent element) and lexical (independent) element. For instance, Lyons (1999: 90) points out that the grammar of Persian contains the suffix -*i* which is used to signal singular indefinite noun phrases, as shown in (6a). However, it may co-occur with the determiner *yek* 'one', as in (6b). In other cases, *yek* 'one' occurs without the suffix -*i*, but still signals an indefinite noun phrase, as in (6c). As compared to the article *a* in English, the foregoing discussion informs us that the suffix -*i* is not fully developed as a sole indefinite marker in Persian language. Perhaps the grammaticalisation stage of the suffix has not been completed, which Heine (1997) pointed out to be a possibility in the world languages.

(6) a.   *ketab-i*   'a book'   [Persian]
      b.   *yekketab-i*
      c.   *yekketab*

Lyons (1999: 91) argues that the suffix -*i* in Persian (see example (6) above) "represents a quasi-indefinite cardinal article". This claim appears to be plausible because Lyons (1999: 89) points out that since indefinite articles are rare, world languages developed mechanisms to indicate indefinite nouns through cardinality expressions, vis-à-vis *any*, *some* and *other* in English. In many languages, the quasi-indefinite markers manifest with agreement to the lexical nouns in number. Lyons (1999: 95) highlights that "phonological identity between the quasi-indefinite cardinal article and the numeral 'one' is found in many languages." As shown in (7),

in Yoruba, the element *kan* 'one' marks indefinite noun phrases (Lyons 1999: 99).

(7) *Mo ri okunrin* **kan** *lode.*   [Yoruba]
       I   see   man   **one**   outside
       'I see a man outside.'

In the theory of information structure, there is a possibility to express specific indefinite DP (Erteschik-Shir, 2014; Kerr, 2020). The mechanisms used to realise specific indefinite is through the partitive words in the English language, as in example (8) (Erteschik-Shir 2014: 29). In this example, a set of students is contextually given, hence it is the topic of the sentence.

(8) **Two** *of the students are intelligent.*

Based on example (8) above, linguistic issues emanating from discourse-pragmatic come into play when dealing with the marking of indefiniteness across the world languages. In information structure, research output shows that indefinite noun phrases are obtained in the domain of focus in a sentence because the subject of any sentence does sit in the topic, but the indefinite noun phrase is a new information (Erteschik-Shir, 2014). Consequently, in many languages of the world, e.g. Hebrew, Kwa and Danish, the order of elements which realise topic and focus is alike, namely topic>focus (Aboh, 2004; Erteschik-Shir, 2014).

In Bantu languages, word order is used to express specific and non-specific indefiniteness but with some implications. For instance, Kerr (2020) found in Tunen [A44] that *mondo ɔmɔtɛ* 'someone' yields specific indefinite as a grammaticalised element *mɔtɛ* 'one' occurs postnominally. But in another instance, it functions as a numeral in the postnominal position, e.g. *bolíabo mɔtɛ* 'one tree'. This claim is frustrated by the possibility for the numeral to occur pre-nominally to mark indefinite specific, e.g. *wɔ̀mɔtɛ muàndu* 'one of the women'. It also marks indefinite non-specific in the prenominal position, as in *ɔ́mɔ̀tɛ̀ mondo* 'a man'.

It is the discourse pragmatic situation that helps to disambiguate the anomaly provided in the Tunen datasets above (Erteschik-Shir, 2014; Kerr, 2020; Lyons, 1999). Specifically, Erteschik-Shir (2014) pointed out that topic is basically old information hence it is manifested in definite noun phrases. In addition, topicalisation creates a definite noun phrase because it allows it to move to the position where the definite noun phrase sits. In Chinese, Lyons (1999) points out that noun phrases in post-verbal position are regarded as indefinite.

Therefore, word order plays a vital role in the expression of topic, indefinite and definite noun phrases.

With regard to word order, the Bantu structure permits the indication of indefiniteness based on the position of the DP in a clause (Haspelmath, 1999; Visser, 2008). Apart from the indefinite and definite markers within a DP, the introduction of the new information related to the object noun phrases has implications on the status of the referents in discourse. Both Mojapelo (2013) and Louwrens (1981) state that the role of the indefinite marker is required to be examined through the use of data gathered from discourse-pragmatic texts. This is because object prefixes may appear for definite and indefinite noun phrases. In Sotho and Xhosa, the marking of the object prefix on the verb has special implications to the status of the object noun which occupies the post-verbal position (Louwrens, 1981; Visser, 2008), which is the slot for the focus. In fact, indefiniteness relates with object marking associated with the immediate post-verbal position, as shown by Swahili (examples 9 (Lyons 1999: 210) and Sotho (Mojapelo, 2013; Louwrens, 1981). In example (9a), the post-verb object noun is indefinite, while in example (9b) it is definite due to object prefix. This claim is not always correct because bare nouns can also be used to mark indefiniteness which obtains the semantic interpretation through discourse-pragmatic mechanisms (Hedberg et al., 2019).

(9) a. *Ni-li-som-a*   *ki-tabu*   [Swahili]
         SM1-PST-read-FV   7-book
         'I read a book.'
     b. *Ni-li-**ki**-som-a*   *ki-tabu*
         SM1-PST-**OM7**-read-FV   7-book
         'I read the book.'

Moreover, another linguistic environment that attracts the presence of indefinite noun phrase is the post-verbal position of the negative verb (Mojapelo, 2013; Visser, 2008; Haspelmath, 1997; Hyman & Katamba, 1993). This is exemplified in (10) for Swahili (Haspelmath, 1997: 215). In this example, the indefinite noun is disallowed in the subject position in Swahili (10b).

(10) a. *Si-ku-ona*   **m-tu**   [Swahili]
          SM1.NEG-PFV-see   **1-person**
          'I did not see anybody.'
      b. ***M-tu***   *ha-ku-fa*

> **1-person**   SM1.NEG-PFV-die
> 'Nobody has died.'

In languages with pre-prefixes, however, the object noun should not host the pre-prefix for it to provide an indefinite interpretation (Alcock, 2000; Hyman & Katamba, 1993; Visser, 2008). Specifically, Alcock (2000: 82-83) points out that "the absence of the initial vowel on the noun head results in a semantic interpretation of indefiniteness when influenced by the negative element", as shown in (11a). Whenever the object prefix is cliticised on the verb, the lexical object noun bears the pre-prefix which demonstrates definiteness effects (11b). In such a context, Xhosa provides specificity reading of the noun (Visser, 2008). This is not the case in Sotho in which object marking is not necessary for the known referents, as Louwrens (1981: 45) points out that "objects as given information appear in their basic syntactic position while their object agreement markers are absent in the verb."

(11) a. *A-ngi-dingi   mali*   [Zulu]
          SM1-NEG-need   money
          'I don't need (any) money.'

   b. *A-ngi-**yi**-dingi   i-mali*
          SM1-NEG-**OM9**-need   **PPX**-9money
          'I don't need the money.'

The motivation for the investigation of indefinite nouns in Kinyakyusa also arises from the variations in the findings about the (non-)occurrence of the object prefix on the verb and the pre-prefix on the lexical noun. Findings appear in Mojapelo (2013) and Louwrens (1981) that used the discourse-pragmatic approach in Sotho. An interesting point is that an object prefix is allowed for both definite and indefinite nouns in the post-verbal position, as discussed above. This is contrary to the findings obtained in Zulu and Xhosa in which an object prefixed on the verb licences specific noun phrases (Visser 2008) and definite noun phrases (Alcock, 2000; Visser, 2008).

So far, two of the linguistic environments trigger indefinite noun phrases: the position following the negative verb and the position after interrogative elements (Alcock, 2000; Hyman & Katamba, 1993; Petzell & Kühl, 2017; Visser, 2008). The main observation is that indefinite nouns do not host the pre-prefix in languages such as Xhosa, Zulu, Luganda and Luguru. However, variation across Bantu languages is reported. For instance, Petzell (2003) found that Kagulu permits the pre-prefix on the noun after the negative verb. Since lexical nouns in Kinyakyusa contain pre-prefixes and many quantification words are manifest (Persohn, 2020; Lusekelo, 2009a),

motivation for the investigation of the strategies to signal indefiniteness becomes apparent.‡‡

The Semantic-pragmatic Theory of Definiteness and Indefiniteness

Basic Tenets of the Theory: Familiarity, Specificity and Referentiality

The first tenet is familiarity on unfamiliarity of the indefinite nouns. This is central in the analysis of indefinite markers. The foregoing discussion has highlighted that the world languages contain indefinite markers which convey referentiality. For instance, Lyons (1999:2) points out that "this is clear from the fact that in English *this house* would usually be judged (at least by linguists and grammarians) to be definite and *several houses* indefinite." The expressions of this signal indefinite nouns which might be familiar to the speaker, but may be unknown to the hearer (Lyons, 1999; Haspelmath, 1997).

I reiterate that research has shown that strategies of marking indefiniteness differ across languages. I stated that word order has been highlighted to be important to indicate specific indefiniteness. In Turkish, for instance, Türker (2019: 79-86) points out that the suffix -*i* 'the' introduces the accusative object noun which becomes definite (example 12). An element *bir* 'a/one' introduces an indefinite noun (example 13). But the noun phrase is in the accusative position hence it becomes specific indefinite.

(12)   *Ali   kitab-i   oku-du.*   [Turkish]
       Ali   book-ACC   read-PST
       'Ali read the book.'

(13)   *Ali   **bir**   piano-yu   kiralamaki-du   istiyor.*
       Ali   **one**   piano-ACC to-rent   wants
       'Ali wants to rent a certain piano.'

The question of specific indefinite nouns attracts the attention of many researchers because of the absence of the common ground in a conversation in which indefinite noun phrases are introduced. Kerr (2020) has shown that in Tunen [A44], word order is not fully important as both prenominal and postnominal could be interpreted as indefinitely specific.

---

‡‡ It should be noted that specific analysis of the status and functions of the V- and CV- pre-prefixes in Kinyakyusa will appear in a separate paper by Jenneke van der Wal and Amani Lusekelo. Suffice to say at this point that the attention that the current article focuses on is on grammaticalisation of indefinite markers in the language.

It is important to notice that the familiarity of the referent by both the speaker and hearer is essential for the noun phrase to be definite (Kerr, 2020; Lyons, 1999). But "whereas in the case of an indefinite noun phrase the speaker may be aware of what is being referred to and the hearer probably not" (Lyons, 1999: 2). Given this assumption, "new referents are introduced into the discourse in this form because they are so far unfamiliar to the hearer" (Lyons 1999: 4). The mechanisms to introduce unfamiliar referents in discourse is by the use of indefinite articles, universal quantification words, and partitive words (Kerr, 2020; Lyons, 1999; Türker, 2019). These nouns become specific indefinite because they are known by the speaker but probably not known by the hearer. In this research, therefore, I assume that the distinction between definiteness and indefiniteness becomes clearer when familiarity is invoked. Nouns which are unfamiliar to the hearer, but known by the speaker, will yield specific indefinite noun phrases. The mechanisms to express specific indefiniteness was the subject matter of investigation for the materials presented in this article.

The other terms concern specificity that has to do with referentiality of the noun (Lyons, 1999). In this context, the utility of quantifiers to mark indefiniteness unfolds. Lyons (1999: 103) suggests that "in languages that have a quasi-indefinite article, there are almost invariably some types of indefiniteness in which it does not occur. These are usually the less specific or less referential types." The definite nouns can easily be identified by both the speaker and hearer because they are referential. But some of the indefinite nouns are known to the speaker and become referential though the hearer may not be in the position to identify them easily. An example in African languages is provided by Amfo (2010: 1787) who pointed out that the nouns modified by the determiner *bi* 'some' give specific reference. In example (14), the bare noun *mpoboa* 'shoes' gives non-specific indefiniteness, while example (15) provides specific indefiniteness introduced by the determiner *bi* 'some'. Amfo (2010: 1797) concludes that "*bi* provides information about the cognitive status of the relevant nominal referring expression and thus aids in identifying the intended referent."

(14) *Me   re-kɔ-tɔ   mpaboa.*   [Akan]
     I   PROG-go-buy   shoes
     'I am going to buy a pair of shoes.'

(15) *Me   re-kɔ-tɔ   mpaboa **bi.***
     I   PROG-go-buy   shoes   **some**
     'I went to town to buy a certain pair of shoes.'

Referentiality is engraved in the discussion of the presence or absence of the definite article. Referential nouns are assumed to bear the definite markers, while non-referential nouns tend to be introduced by indefinite markers (Mischke, 1998). But the use of definite markers is not a straightforward mechanism to differentiate referential nouns. For instance, the lexical marking of indefinite nouns is not reported in Bantu languages. Both Mojapelo (2013) and Louwrens (1981) pointed out that word order is the mechanism to introduce indefinite referents in Sotho in that the subject position attracts definite referents, while the post-verbal position hosts both indefinite and definite nouns. But not all Bantu languages assign topic immediately before the verb and focus immediately after the verb (van der Wal & Namyalo, 2016). Given this background, I found that an inventory of the position for indefiniteness in Kinyakyusa is required.

Apart from affixes and numerals, bare nouns and nouns modified by demonstratives could bear referentiality. Gundel et al. (2019) suggest that both indefinite nouns introduced by demonstratives and indefinite nouns introduced by definite markers become least restrictive. In the type identifiable, the addressees access the representation and meaning of any nominal expression without reference to any particular noun. In referentiality of the noun, the hearer must "either retrieve an existing representation of the speaker's intended referent or construct a new representation by the time the sentence has been processed" (Gundel et al., 2019: 69). Both circumstances present the hearer with unknown referent which is required to be understood from the common knowledge of the hearer. It turns out to be important to investigate the roles of other elements in marking indefiniteness in Kinyakyusa.

Further Motivation for the Current Research

Further motivation for this research is theoretical in nature. In the literature of semantic-pragmatic approach, two kinds of indefinites have been identified, vis-à-vis: (i) specific indefinite nouns in which the speaker has something in mind about the referent but the hearer doesn't know the referent; and (ii) non-specific indefiniteness, which both the speaker and hearer has no common ground about the referent, but the noun phrase is introduced in the conversation for some generic purposes (Amfo, 2010; Louwrens, 1981; Lyons, 1999; Türker, 2019). Each of these kinds of indefiniteness is introduced by different mechanisms. Since each of these two kinds of indefiniteness

is introduced by a different strategy, then it becomes necessary to examine how Kinyakyusa realises the two.

In the analysis of determiners in other Bantu languages, quantification words are treated as modifiers within the DP (Alcock, 2000; Goodness, 2015; Landman, 2016; Louwrens, 1987; Lusekelo, 2009a). But in previous analyses the sematic-pragmatic theory of definiteness is not invoked in the analysis. Nonetheless, I am aware that studies pointed out two more linguistic environments which attract indefinite nouns, vis-à-vis: (i) negative predicates and interrogatives emanating from verbs, but not particles (Louwrens, 1987). Also, studies have shown that "the influence of the negative element is seen on the internal argument and by the optional spread of indefiniteness to the genitive modifiers but it is not in evidence on the clausal modifier" (Alcock, 2000: 83); (ii) the nominal modifiers (*other*, *which,* and *what*) which imply an interpretation associated with indefinite quantity (Alcock, 2000: 84). Each of the linguistic environments that attract indefiniteness are discussed in section 4 of this article. Apart from the grammaticalisation of the numeral and universal quantifier, the different realisations of indefinites contribute to the strategies employed to signal indefinite noun phrases in Kinyakyusa. It also contributes to the literature of (in)definiteness and (non)specificity in Bantu languages.

Indefinite Determiners in Kinyakyusa
Indefinite Roots -mo 'certain/some' and -osa 'any'
Some quantificational roots manifest in Kinyakyusa to signal indefinite noun phrases vis-à-vis: -*mo* 'certain/some', -*osa* 'any', -*osa* 'all, whole', and -*ngi* 'other/another'. All the three quantification roots manifest with the nominal prefixes for singular and plural entries as captured in Table 1.

Table 1: The Indefinite Elements in Kinyakyusa

Class		-mo 'certain'	-osa 'any'	-osa 'all'	-ngi 'other'
1	*um(u)*	*Jumo*	*Jojosa*	*joosa*	*ujungi*
2	*Aba*	*Bamo*	*Bobosa*	*boosa*	*abangi*
3	*Um*	*Gumo*	*Gogosa*	*goosa*	*ugungi*
4	*Imi*	*Gimo*	*Gyogyosa*	*gyosa*	*igingi*
5	*i(li)*	*Limo*	*Lyolyosa*	*lyosa*	*ilingi*
6	*ama*	*Gamo*	*Gogosa*	*goosa*	*agangi*
7	*Iki*	*Kimo*	*Kyokyosa*	*kyosa*	*ikingi*
8	*Ifi*	*Fimo*	*Fyofyosa*	*fyosa*	*ifingi*

9	*In*	*Jimo*	*Jojosa*	*joosa*	*ijingi*
10	*iN*	*Simo*	*Syosyosa*	*syosa*	*isingi*
11	*Ulu*	*Lumo*	*Lolosa*	*loosa*	*ulungi*
12	*Aka*	*Kamo*	*Kokosa*	*koosa*	*akangi*
13	*Utu*	*Tumo*	*Totosa*	*toosa*	*utungi*
14	*Ubu*	*Bumo*	*Bobosa*	*boosa*	*ubungi*
15	*uku*	*Kumo*	*Kokosa*	*koosa*	*ukungi*
16	*pa*	*Pamo*	*Poposa*	*poosa*	*pangi*
17	*ku*	*Kumo*	*Kokosa*	*koosa*	*kungi*
18	*mu*	*Mumo*	*Momosa*	*moosa*	*mungi*

The morphology of the indefinite marker -*mo* 'certain/some' splits twice. In noun classes 1, 3, 4, 6, 9 and 10, it contains the root and the agreement prefixes, which manifest on the agreement with the verbs in sentences. In the rest of the noun classes, -*mo* 'certain/some' comprises the morphemes of nominal prefixes.

The marker -*mo* 'certain/some' introduces indefinite nouns in singular (16-17) and plural (18). It also introduces mass (non-countable) nouns such as *ulukama* 'milk' (19). Therefore, it does not reveal any quantificational function here.

(16)   *Nu-m-bweene*   *u-mu-ndu*   **ju-mo**[§§]
       SM1-OM1-see-PFVPPX-1-person   **1-one**
       'I saw someone/I saw a certain person.'

(17)   *Pa-tukuju*   *mu-ku-mw-ag-a*   *u-mu-ndu*   **ju-mo**
       16-Tukuyu   18-PRS-OM1-find-PFV   PPX-1-person   **1-certain**
       'In Tukuyu, you will find a certain person.'

(18)   *Pa-tukuju*   *mu-ku-ba-ag-a*   *a-ba-ndu*   **ba-mo**
       16-Tukuyu   18-PRS-OM2-find-PFV   PPX-2-person   **2-certain**
       'In Tukuyu, you will find certain people.'

(19)   *Pa-tukuju*   *mu-ku-lw-ag-a*   *u-lu-kama*   **lu-mo**
       16-Tukuyu   18-PRS-OM11-find-PFV   PPX-11-milk
       11-certain
       'In Tukuyu, you will find certain milk.'

The indefinite marker -*mo* 'certain/some' introduces specific indefinite nouns which are known by speaker. However, the hearer(s) will have no common knowledge of the referents. In the

---

examples (16-19) above, the speaker is aware of the referent, while the listener(s) is not.

It also introduces the noun which is mentioned for the first time in the discourse. In semantic-pragmatics approach, the speaker signals a new referent using the determiner -*mo* 'certain/some'. The hearer tracks the new referent in a discourse. Probably the following examples will help to illustrate this point. In this example, the specific indefinite determiner manifest with the nominal prefix of the lexical nouns.

(20) *Ijolo fiijo a-li-ko u-n-kikuulu **ju-mo.** A-li n-dondo.*
long   much   SM1-PST-pst-be   PPX-1-woman   **1-DET**   SM1-be   1-poor
'Once up on a time, there was a certain woman. She was poor.'

(21) *Ijolo fiijo ba-li-ko a-ba-kikuulu **ba-mo.** Ba-li ba londo.*
long   much   SM2-PST-pst-be   PPX-2-woman   **2-DET**   SM2-be   2-poor
'Once up on a time, there were certain women. They were poor.'

The indefinite determiner -*mo* 'certain' is used to introduce the new referent in the story. The referent is known to the speaker. The hearer makes reference to the determiner in order to relate the current conversation with the noun referred to. Therefore, the -*mo* 'certain/some' has referentiality, which is attained in the discourse.

Within the theory of referentiality as discussed by Louwrens (1981), the specific indefinite noun still falls within the restrictive referentiality because the hearer will have no knowledge of the actual noun referred to by a given expression. It means that the common ground between both the speaker and hearer has not yet been introduced until when the referent is known by both parties. Therefore, the determiner -*mo* 'certain/some' still introduces the restricted referential nouns in Kinyakyusa.

Another determiner is the indefinite expression -*osa* 'any'. It has morphophonological influence on the reduplicated agreement prefixes. The mid-back vowel [*o*] manifests in all the reduplicated prefixes. Based on Lusekelo (2009b) who discusses the reduplication processes in the language, partial reduplication is involved for the indefinite expression -*osa* 'any'.

The reduplicated indefinite expression -*osa* 'any' introduces non-specific indefinite nouns in Kinyakyusa. For instance, the examples below show that both the speaker(s) and hearer(s) are unaware of the referents. In singular and plural, the car referred to in (22) and the dresses in (23) are not known to the speaker and hearer. In addition, it introduces mass nouns such *asuluuki* 'honey' (24).

(22) *Linga   mu-fik-ile,   mu-ki-pak-ile   i-gari*
     lyoly-osa.
     when   SM2-arrive-PFV   SM2-fut-board-PFV   PPX-5.car
     5-any
     'When you arrive, you should board any car.'

(23) *Ndile,   na-mu-fwale   i-my-enda   gyogy-osa.*
     SM1.say.PFV   COND-SM2-wear.PFV PPX-4-dress   **3-any**
     'I said that you should wear any dresses.'

(24) *Linga   tu-fik-ile,   a-tu-ku-nwa   u-luuki*
     lwolw-osa.
     when   SM2-arrive-PFV   FUT-SM1PL-INF-drink   PPX-11.honey
     5-any
     'When we arrive, we will drink any honey.'

This grammar of Kinyakyusa allows to make a distinction between two similar indefinite markers. Reduplication separates the role of the non-specific indefinite expression -*osa* 'any' from the universal quantifier -*osa* 'all, whole' in Kinyakyusa. Lusekelo (2009a:315) shows that the quantifier -*osa* 'all', which is also an indefinite marker, manifests as a modifier in nouns such as *abandu boosa* 'all people' and *ifikota fyosa* 'all chairs'.

The morphology of the universal quantifier -*osa* 'all, whole' also splits twice. In noun classes 1, 3, 4, 6, 9 and 10, it contains the root and the agreement prefixes, which manifest on the agreement with the verbs in sentences. In the rest of the noun classes, it constitutes morphemes of the nominal prefixes.

The universal quantifier -*osa* 'all, whole' introduces either specific indefinite count nouns with the interpretation -*osa* 'all' or generic indefinite mass nouns with the interpretation -*osa* 'whole'. Probably, the following examples will help us have a better understanding of the count noun vs. mass noun distinction using -*osa* 'all, whole' in Kinyakyusa.

(25) *A-ba-ana   ba-ba-kol-ile   a-ba-hesya   ba-osa*
     PPX-2-child SM2-OM2-call-PFV PPX-2-guest **2-all**
     'Children have called all guests.'

(26) *a-ba-ndu*   **ba-osa**   *bi-ku-fwal-a*   *î-fi-tirî**********
      PPX-2-person   **2-all**   SM2-PRS-wear-FV   PPX-8-hat
   'All people are wearing hats.'

(27) *I-mbwa*   *si-nwile*   *u-lu-kama*   **lw-osa**
     PPX-10-rat SM10-PRS-tear.PFV   PPX-11-milk   **11-all**
    'Dogs drank the whole (entire) milk.'

The count noun *abahesya* 'guests' in (25) and *abandu* 'people' in (26) are modified by the universal quantifier *-osa* 'all'. The non-count noun *ulukama* 'milk' in (26) above is modified by the universal quantifier *-osa* 'whole'. The interpretation of this quantifier is controlled by the semantic content of the lexical noun it modifies. The quantifier modifies both count and non-count nouns; therefore, the non-count interpretation is generated from the lexical noun rather than the quantifier.

The notion *entire* or *completeness* is also manifest when the universal quantifier *-osa* 'all' is used. In example (28), the reference is made to the generic term *amisi* 'water'. The reading we obtain in this example is that the whole water got drunk; no water remained hence completeness. Likewise, in example (29), the speaker shows that the entire carpet was damaged.

(28) *I-nguku*   *si-nwile*   *a-mi-isi*   **g-oosa**
     PPX-10-rat SM10-PRS-drink.PFV PPX-6-carpet   **6-all**
    'Chickens have drunk the whole carpet.'

(29) *I-mbeba*   *si-ta-lwile*   *u-lu-teefu*   **l-oosa**
     PPX-10-rat SM10-PRS-tear.PFV   PPX-11-carpet **11-all**
    'Rats damaged a whole carpet.'

Studies have shown the different interpretations of the universal quantifier *-osa* as 'all' or 'whole' in Bantu languages. While Swahili [G42] contains other proportionality quantifiers, e.g. *kiasi* 'most' and *idadi* 'most' (Zerbian & Krifka, 2008), Logooli [JE41] comprises one morpheme for both, i.e. *-oosi* 'all, whole' (Landman, 2016). The lexical nouns establish whether to use *-oosi* 'all' for count nouns or *-oosi* 'whole' for mass nouns.

The behaviour of Logooli is similar to Kinyakyusa. The interpretation of *-osa* as 'all' depends on plural and/or mass nouns.

********* Data exported from Nyakyusa database in the BaSIS project.

The universal quantifier -*osa* is interpreted as 'whole' for the mass nouns.

The morphology of the indefinite expression -*ngi* 'other, another' is similar to adjectives in Kinyakyusa. It bears the pre-prefix element, the nominal prefix, and the indefinite root. It introduces non-specific indefinite nouns, as shown in (30-31). Both the speaker and hearer have nothing in mind about the referents.

(30) *Linga*   *mu-fik-ile,*   *mu-ki-pak-ile*   *i-gari*
     i-li-ingi.
     when   SM2-arrive-PFV   SM2-fut-board-PFV   PPX-5.car
     PPX-5-another
     'When you arrive, you should board another car.'

(31) *Ndile,*   *na-u-fwale*   *u-mw-enda*   **u-gu-ngi.**
     SM1.say.PFV   COND-SM2-wear.PFV PPX-3-dress   **PPX-3-another**
     'I said that you should wear another dress.'

At this juncture, we have established two kinds of indefiniteness in Kinyakyusa. On the one hand, the indefinite determiner -*mo* 'certain/some' which provides specific indefiniteness. On the other hand, the non-specific lexical element -*osa* 'any' introduces indefinite nouns. Further investigation is offered below to substantiate the realisation of specific and non-specific indefiniteness in Kinyakyusa.

Grammaticalisation of the Indefinite -mo 'certain/some' and -osa 'any'

Grammaticalisation of the indefinite markers -*mo* 'certain/some' and -*osa* 'any' reveals two different sources in Kinyakyusa. It is obvious that the specific indefinite marker grammaticalised from the numeral -*mo* 'one', while the non-specific indefinite marker grammaticalised from the universal quantifier -*osa* 'all'. The outcome of the specific and non-specific indefinite markers emanates from the source, i.e. the former obtains one referent while the latter entails generic or numerous referents.

In the lexicon of the language, the numeral -*mo* 'one' is used to mark singular nouns. Therefore, it occurs only with singular noun classes, as shown in Table 2. Likewise, the universal quantifier -*osa* 'all' is still functional in the Kinyakyusa lexicon. It occurs only with the plural nouns, as illustrated in Table 2.

Table 2: Sources of the Indefinite Markers in Kinyakyusa Lexicon

Class		-mo 'one'		Class		-osa 'all'	
1	um(u)	umundu jumo	one person	2	aba	abandu boosa	all persons
3	um	umpiki gumo	one tree	4	imi	imipiki gyosa	all trees
5	i(li)	ilino limo	one tooth	6	ama	amino goosa	all teeth
7	iki	ikikota kimo	one chair	8	ifi	ifikota fyosa	all chairs
9	N	inguku jimo	one fowl	10	N	inguku syosa	all fowls
11	(u)lu	ulukili lumo	one stick			ingili syosya	all sticks
12	(a)ka	akakuku kamo	one chick	13	utu	utukuku twosa	all chicks

The same root-word -*mo* 'one' can function as indefiniteness marker. This happens because the root-word -*mo* is grammaticalised to mean 'certain/some'[†††]. The grammaticalised specific indefinite marker -*mo* 'certain/some' ceased to denote number rather it occurs with both singular and plural nouns, as shown in Table 3 below. This means that the specific indefinite marker -*mo* 'certain/some' ceased to function as a numeral and had become a grammatical marker.

Table 3: Grammaticalised Indefinite Marker -*mo* 'certain/some' in Kinyakyusa Lexicon

Class		-mo 'one'		Class		-osa 'all'	
1	um(u)	umundu jumo	certain person	2	aba	abandu bamo	certain persons
3	um	umpiki gumo	certain tree	4	imi	imipiki gimo	certain trees
5	i(li)	ilino limo	certain tooth	6	ama	amino gamo	certain teeth
7	iki	ikikota kimo	certain chair	8	ifi	ifikota fimo	certain chairs
9	N	inguku jimo	certain fowl	10	N	inguku simo	certain fowls
11	(u)lu	ulukili lumo	certain stick			ingili simo	certain sticks
12	(a)ka	akakuku kamo	certain chick	13	utu	utukuku tumo	certain chicks

In the literature for the semantic grammaticalisation of indefinite markers, it is argued that lexical entries which ceased to indicate quantification (numeral *one*) have their inherent semantic contents being bleached out (weakened or generalized) (Belaj & Matovac, 2015; Chen, 2003; Heine, 1997; Haspelmath, 1997; Kerr, 2020). This kind of semantic analysis is not true for the specific indefinite marker -*mo* 'certain/some' whose semantic content of quantification is extended from the quantification to reference. The point to underscore here is that the quantification word -*mo* 'one' is still in use in Kinyakyusa. However, it has developed another semantic

---

[†††] I am grateful to the reviewer who pointed out that in Shinyiha -*mo* which means 'certain/some' can be used with both singular and plural nouns, e.g. *umwana jumo* 'certain child' vs. *abhana bhamo* 'certain children'. This substantiates that -*mo* referred here is the grammaticalised 'certain/some' indefiniteness marker even in Shinyiha.

meaning of reference through semantic expansion rather than bleaching its inherent semantic content.

The root-word -*osa* is grammaticalised to non-specific indefinite marker *osa* 'any'. Now it gives a generic interpretation for both singular and plural nouns, as shown in Table 4 below. The grammaticalisation path involved yielded the reduplication to arrive at the interpretation of non-specific referent. Here the root-word -*osa* 'any' occurs with a reduplicated nominal prefix for the purpose of marking non-specific indefiniteness.

Table 4: Grammaticalised non-specific Indefinite Marker -osa 'any' in Kinyakyusa Lexicon

Class		-mo 'one'		Class		-osa 'all'	
1	*um(u)*	*umundu jojosa*	any person	2	*aba*	*abandu bobosa*	any persons
3	*Um*	*umpiki gogosa*	any tree	4	*imi*	*imipiki gyogyosa*	any trees
5	*i(li)*	*ilino lyolyosa*	any tooth	6	*ama*	*amino gogosa*	any teeth
7	*Iki*	*ikikota kyokyosa*	any chair	8	*ifi*	*ifikota fyofyosa*	any chairs
9	*N*	*inguku jojosa*	any fowl	10	*N*	*inguku syosyosa*	any fowls
11	*(u)lu*	*ulukili lolosa*	any stick			*ingili syosyosa*	any sticks
12	*(a)ka*	*akakuku kokosa*	any chick	13	*utu*	*utukuku totosa*	any chicks

As we highlighted above, the grammaticalisation of -*osa* 'all' as an indefinite marker is associated with the extension of its former inherent semantic content related to universal quantification. The semantic content has branched into another meaning. Apart from the remaining quantification -*osa* 'all', now the non-specific indefinite marker -*osa* 'any' bears the semantic content related to reference, in which case, it means 'certain'.

Based on Heine and Kuteva (2002), the grammaticalisation of the specific indefinite marker is thus obtained through NUMERAL -*mo* 'one' > INDEFINITE -*mo* 'certain/some'. The semantic expansion of the role of numeral allowed the presence of both readings, i.e. inherent numeral interpretation and newly developed role of introduction of indefinite nouns.

Also, based on Heine and Kuteva (2002), the grammaticalisation of the non-specific indefinite marker is achieved through QUANTIFIER -*osa* 'all' > INDEFINITE -*osa* 'any'. The reduplication process allows

the indefinite marker to function as a grammatical category which co-exists with the lexical entry for the universal quantifier.

The characterisation of typical determiners is provided though with some reservations (Heine, 1997: 68-71). Differences of the properties of the Kinyakyusa indefinite determiners -*mo* 'certain' and -*osa* 'any' are captured in Table 5.

Table 5: Properties of the Grammaticalised Indefinite Markers in Kinyakyusa

S/N	Properties of indefinites	-*mo* 'certain/some'	*osa* 'any'
1	Indefinite articles are short; never more than two syllables	v	x
2	Indefinite markers are stressless	v	v
3	They employ the same position in the clause as the numeral *one*	v	v
4	The indefinite article determines singular of count nouns, with exceptions	x	x
5	Indefinite article determines mass nouns, plus plural nouns	v	v
6	If it determines plural nouns, then it also determines singular nouns.	v	v
7	Indefinite (specific) marker may not be used for all instances	v	x
8	Indefinite articles are confined to singular nouns, but definite articles are not	x	x
9	Indefinite article has numeral reading *one* in some contexts	V	x
10	A grammaticalized indefinite article co-exists with a definite article	V	v

The properties of indefinites provided in Table 5 above confirm further that the specific indefinite determiner *mo* 'certain/some' is far more grammaticalised than the non-specific indefinite determiner -*osa* 'any'. This observation does not fit well in the grammaticalization path suggested by Heine (1997). In fact, the grammaticalisation path of these indefinite markers in Kinyakyusa appears to favour the indefinite determiner -*osa* 'any', as shown in Figure 1 below.

	numeral	»	presentative marker	»	specific indefinite marker	»	non-specific indefinite marker	»	generalized article
-*mo*					X				
-*osa*							X		

Figure 1: The Grammaticalisation Path of Indefinite Determiners in Kinyakyusa

Comparison with other languages reveal that numerals and/or quantifiers tend to appear in different stages of grammaticalisation. For instance, in Croatian, 'the grammaticalization of *jedan* has fully reached the specific indefinite marker stage and partially the non-specific indefinite marker stage in contexts in which *jedan* and *neki* are interchangeable' (Belaj & Matovac, 2015: 17). This means that it resembles the stage three (marked by X in Figure 1 above) reached by the indefinite marker -*osa* 'any' in Kinyakyusa. Also, Belaj & Matovac (2015: 17) point out that 'Croatian uses *neki* to mark indefinite referents as well.' This means the indefinite marker *neki* 'certain/some' has become an article, similar to the indefinite article in English.

In other Bantu languages, definiteness is achieved by the introduction of the elements before the head-noun in a DP (Lusekelo, 2009a; Kerr, 2020). In Tunen, Kerr (2020: 263) found that "prenominal use of -*mɔ̀tɛ́* is a determiner rather than a true numeral, having been grammaticalised." The indefinite markers in Kinyakyusa occur only post-nominally. Given the absence of pre-prefix and prenominal demonstrative in Kinyakyusa DP with indefinite markers, it becomes plausible to argue that the non-specific indefinite marker -*osa* 'all' maintains the property of the determiner within the DP of Kinyakyusa. Also, I will show evidence in the next section which supports that argument that the specific indefinite determiner -*mo* 'certain/some' functions as a determiner within the DP of Kinyakyusa.

More on Environments of Indefinite Determiners in Kinyakyusa Nominal Domain

Indefinite Interrogative Modifiers -*liku* 'which' and -*ki* 'which'

The nominal modifier -*liku* 'which one' introduces an interrogative noun in a sentence in Kinyakyusa. Morphologically, it bears the nominal prefix across the 18 noun classes. It does not take the pre-prefix element.

(32) *Mu-m-p-ele*   *(u)-m-puuti*   **a-liku**   *i-fi-ndu?*
SM2SG-OM1-give-PFV   PPX-1-priest   **SM1-which**   PPX-8-food
'Which priest did you give food?'

(33) *Mu-ba-p-ele*   *(a)-ba-puuti*   **ba-liku**   *i-fi-ndu?*
SM2SG-OM2-give-PFV   PPX-1-priest   **SM2-which**   PPX-8-food
'Which priests did you give some food?'

(34) *Mu-ji-p-ele*   *(i)-sekwa*   *ji-liku*   *a-mi-isi?*
SM2SG-OM9-give-PFV   PPX9.duck   **SM9-which**   PPX-4-water

'Which duck did you give water?'

(35) *Mu-si-p-ele*   *(i)-sekwa*   **si-liku**   *a-mi-isi?*
SM2SG-OM10-give-PFV   PPX10.duck   **SM10-which**   PPX-4-water

'Which ducks did you give water?'

Generally, indefinite interpretation is obtained in both examples (32-33) above. Specifically, two kinds of indefiniteness are obtained in these examples. On the one hand, specific indefinite nouns are obtained when the pre-prefix is used in the sentence. In this case, the speaker becomes aware of the specific referent (*umpuuti* 'priest' and *isekwa* 'duck') in the sentence. In these sentences, however, the speaker is not aware of the exact priest who has been given some food, as in examples (34-35). Likewise, the speaker is unaware of the duck which was given water, as in examples (34-35). On the other hand, the non-occurrence of the pre-prefix on the lexical noun is signalling the non-specific indefinite nouns. In these examples, once the pre-prefix is absent, we obtain non-specific indefinite nouns which the speaker is unaware of in the conversation.

The interrogative modifier *-ki* 'which' introduces non-specific indefiniteness in Kinyakyusa. Persohn (2020) points out correctly that it does not allow the pre-prefix to occur on the lexical nouns, as shown in the examples below.

(36) *A-ba-sungu*   *a-bo*   *ba-fum-ile*   *(*i)-ki-su*   **ki-ki?**
PPX-2-European   DEM-2   SM2-come-PFV   **PPX-7-land**   **7-which**

'Which country do those Europeans come from?'

(37) *A-ba-ana*   *a-ba*   *ba-l-ile*   *(*a)-ma-toki*   **ma-ki?**
PPX-2-European   DEM-2   SM2-eat-PFV   **PPX-6-banana**   **6-which**

    'Which kind of bananas did these children eat?'

The examples (36-37) above show that the pre-prefix is restricted in the environment of the interrogative modifier *-ki* 'which'. This means that the pre-prefix introduces definite nouns, which cannot occur in this environment.

The indefinite reading obtained in this context is not specific. In example (36), the speaker is unaware of the country where the Europeans come from, while in (37) the speaker is unaware of the kind of bananas that children ate. Both circumstances of speech introduce the non-specific indefinite nouns.

Indefinite Verbal Element -ko 'once be' and the Indefinite Modifier -ingi 'another'

The hypothetical indefinite nouns are introduced by lexical entry -*ko* 'once be: there were/was'. It is similar to the existential determiner (Türker 2019) in that it introduces the referent which is abstract in nature. The semantics of the -*ko* 'once be' is that it yields specific indefinite nouns because the speaker attracts the attention of the hearer to the known referent. However, the hearer may not have the referent in mind.

The other modifier is -*ingi* 'another' which provides non-specific indefinite. Probably the example below will help to illustrate this point.

(38) *Ijolo*   *fiijo*   *ba-li-**ko***   *a-ba-kikuulu*   *ba-bili.*   *Ju-mo*   *a-li*

long   much   SM2-be-PST-**DET**   PPX-2-woman   2-two   1-DET   SM1-be

n-kasi   *gwa*   *n-ndondo.*   ***U-ju-ngi***   *a-li*   *n-kasi*   *gwa*

1-wife   ASSOC   1-poor   **PPX-1-another**   SM1-be   1-wife   ASSOC

n-noge

1-rich

'Once upon a time, there were two women. One was a wife of a poor (man).

Another one was a wife of the rich (man).

Both nominal modifiers introduce indefinite nouns. In example (38) above, -*ko* 'once be' introduces hypothetical women in the story. However, the speaker has in mind the referent, while the hearer may not.

In this case, the modifier -*ingi* 'another' also introduces a specific indefinite noun. However, this modifier may also introduce non-specific referent, as exemplified in (39-40). In these examples, the speaker is unaware of the referents, hence non-specific indefiniteness.

(39) *A-ba-ana*   *a-ba*   *ba-l-ile*   *a-ma-toki*   ***a-ga-ngi**?*

PPX-2-European   DEM-2   SM2-eat-PFV   PPX-6-banana   **PPX-6-other**

'These children have eaten other bananas?'

(40) *A-ba-ana*   *a-ba*   *ba-l-ile*   *a-li-toki*   ***i-li-ngi**?*

PPX-2-European   DEM-2   SM2-eat-PFV   PPX-5-banana   **PPX-5-another**
   'These children have eaten another banana?'

A number of the quantification words still maintain their inherent lexical semantic content. They have not been grammaticalised to indicate the indefinite nouns. Therefore, they remain nominal modifiers rather than nominal determiners.

Conclusion

An indefinite marker in Kinyakyusa is the lexical element *-mo* 'certain/some' which appears to have been grammaticalised from the numeral *-mo* 'one'. It provides specific indefinite readings, as opposed to other quantification words which result in non-specific indefinite interpretation. In narrations, this determiner is used to introduce the referents which the hearer can trace in discourse, e.g. a new character which is introduced by the speaker. Based on Heine and Kuteva (2002), the grammaticalisation of the specific indefinite marker follows the path: NUMERAL *-mo* 'one' > INDEFINITE *-mo* 'certain/some'. But the semantic expansion resulted into inherent numeral interpretation and newly developed role of introduction of indefinite nouns.

The typical non-specific lexical element is *-osa* 'any' which obtains indefinite reading through reduplication of the nominal prefix. It appears that this non-specific indefinite marker derived from the universal quantifier *-osa* 'all, whole, entire', which still agrees with the lexical noun by the noun class prefix. The reduplication of the determiner *-osa* 'any' yields indefinite nouns in singular, e.g. *umundu jojosa* 'any person' and *ikikota kyokyosa* 'any chair', as well as plural nouns, e.g. *abandu bobosa* 'any persons' and *ifikota fyofyosa* 'any chairs'. Based on Heine and Kuteva (2002), the grammaticalisation path of the non-specific indefinite marker is QUANTIFIER *-osa* 'all' > INDEFINITE *-osa* 'any'. As stated, the reduplication process allows the indefinite marker to function as a grammatical category which co-exists with the lexical entry for the universal quantifier.

Both *-mo* 'certain/some' and *-osa* 'any' occur only post-nominally, together with modifiers such as adjectives. Nonetheless, the co-occurrence of the pre-prefix and prenominal demonstratives is restricted, which is a signal that they occur in a determiner slot of the Kinyakyusa DP. Eventually, I argue that they have become

determiner of indefiniteness in the language, as opposed with pre-prefixes and prenominal demonstratives which are determiners of definite nouns.

In the interrogative environments, two lexical elements are used. On the one hand, the indefinite interrogative element -*liku* 'which' may introduce specific indefinite nouns when the pre-prefix is used on the modified lexical noun. In this case, the speaker becomes aware of the specific referent in the sentence. It also introduces non-specific indefinite nouns when once the pre-prefix is absent. In the non-specific indefinite nouns, the speaker is unaware of in the conversation. On the other hand, the interrogative modifier -*ki* 'which' introduces non-specific indefiniteness in Kinyakyusa. This determiner restricts completely occurrence of the pre-prefix on the lexical nouns.

The nominal modifier -*ko* 'once be' introduces hypothetical women in the story. The speaker has in mind the referent, while the hearer may not, hence specific indefinite noun. The modifier -*ingi* 'another' also introduces non-specific indefinite noun.

References

Aboh, O. E. (2004). Topic and focus within D. *Linguistics in the Netherlands,* 21: 1 Uganda Focusing on the Position of African languages. University of Gothenburg: 12.

Alcock, J. L. (2000). Indefiniteness in the Zulu noun phrase (NP). *South African Journal of African Languages*, 20(1): 80–94. DOI: doi.org/10.1080/02572117.2000.10587415

Alexiadou, A., Haegeman, L. & Stavrou, M. (2007). *Noun Phrase in the Generative Perspective*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. DOI: doi.org/10.1515/9783110207491

Amfo, N. A. A. (2010). Indefiniteness Marking and Akan *bi. Journal of Pragmatics*, 42: 1786–1798. DOI: doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2009.02.002

Belaj, B. & Matovac, D. (2015). On the Article-like Use of the Indefinite Determiners *jedan* and *neki* in Croatian and other Slavic Languages. *Suvremena Lingvistika*, 41(79): 1–20.

Chen, P. (2003). Indefinite Determiner Introducing Definite Referent: A Special Use of '*yi* 'one' + classifier' in Chinese. *Lingua,* 113: 1169–1184. DOI: doi.org/10.1016/S0024-3841(02)00163-8

Erteschik-Shir, N. (2014). Information Structure and (In)definiteness. In C. Hofherr & A. Zribi-Hertz (eds.). *Crosslinguistic Studies on Noun Phrase Structure and References.* Leiden: Brill. 23–51. DOI: doi.org/10.1163/9789004261440_003

Goodness, D. (2015). The Properties of Quantifiers and Numerals in Shinyiha. *Journal of Humanities, Education and Sciences*, 4(1): 60–74.

Gundel, J. K., Hedberg, N. & Zacharski, R. (2019). Cognitive Status and the Form of Referring Expressions in Discourse. J. K. Gundel & B. Abbott (eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of Reference*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 67–99. DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199687305.013.5

Haspelmath, M. (1997). *Indefinite Pronouns.* Oxford: Oxford University Press. DOI: 10.1093/oso/9780198235606.001.0001

Hedberg, N., Gundel, J. K. & Borthen, K. (2019). Different Senses of 'Referential'. In J. K. Gundel & B. Abbott (eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of Reference*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 101–116. DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199687305.013.6

Heine, B. & Kuteva, T. (2002). *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI: doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511613463

Heine, B. (1997). *Cognitive Foundations of Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. DOI: doi.org/10.1017/S002222679923784X

Hyman, L. & Katamba, F. (1993). The Augment in Luganda: Syntax or Pragmatics? S. Mchombo (ed.). *Theoretical Aspects of Bantu Grammar*. Stanford: Centre for the Study of Language and Information (CSLI), Stanford University. 209–256.

Ihsane, T. (2008). *The Layered DP: Form and Meaning of French Indefinites*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: doi.org/10.1075/la.124

Kerr, E. J. (2020). The Grammaticalisation of a Specific Indefinite Determiner: Prenominal -*mɔ̀tɛ́* in Tunen. J. van der Wal, H. Smits, S. Petrollino, V. Nyst & N. Kossmann (eds.). *Essays on African Languages and Linguistics in Honour of Maarten Mous.* Leiden: African Studies Centre Leiden. 241–265.

Landman, M. (2016). Quantification in Logoori. In D. L. Payne, S. Pacchiarotti & M. Bosire (eds.). *Diversity in African Languages.* Berlin: Language Science Press. 219–234. DOI: 10.17169/langsci.b121.483

Louwrens, L. J. (1987). Some Pragmatic Functions of Interrogative Particles in Northern Sotho. *South African Journal of African Languages*, 7(4): 121–124. DOI: doi.org/10.1080/02572117.1987.10586695

Louwrens, L. J. (1981). The Relevance of the Notions "given" and "new" Discourse Information in the Study of North Sotho Syntax. *South African Journal of African Languages*, 1(1): 21–49. DOI: doi.org/10.1080/02572117.1981.10586453

Lusekelo, A. (2009a). The Structure of the Nyakyusa Noun Phrase. *Nordic Journal of African Studies*, 18(4): 305–331.

Lusekelo, A. (2009b). A Description of Kinyakyusa Reduplication. *SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics*, 6(2): 23–43.

Lyons, C. (1999). *Definiteness.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI: doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511605789

Mischke, G. (1998). The Reference Status of Southern Sotho Predicative Nouns. *South African Journal of African Languages*, 18(3): 80–84. DOI: doi.org/10.1080/02572117.1998.10587194

Mojapelo, M. L. (2013). Re-examining the Relationship between the Subject Agreement Morpheme and (In)definiteness in Northern Sotho. *Literator*, 34(1): 1–8.

Türker, L. (2019). *Noun Phrases in Article-less Languages.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: doi.org/10.1075/la.253

Persohn, B. (2020). *The Verb in Nyakyusa: A Focus on Tense, Aspect and Modality* (2nd Edition). Berlin: Language Science Press. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.4287412

Petzell, M. & Kühl, K. (2017). The Influence of Non-linguistic Factors on the Usage of the Pre-prefix in Luguru. *Linguistic Discovery*, 15(1): 35–48. DOI: 10.1349/PS1.1537-0852.A.474

Petzell, M. (2003). What is the Function of the Pre-prefix in Kagulu? In M. Andréasson & S. Karlsson (eds.). *Langue.doc.* Göteborg University Open Archive.

Van der Wal, J. (2009). *Word Order and Information Structure in Makhuwa-Enahara*. Utrecht: LOT.

Van der Wal, J. & Namyalo, S. (2016). The Interaction of Two Focus Marking Strategies in Luganda. In D. L. Payne, S. Pacchiarotti & M. Bosire (eds.). *Diversity in African Languages.* Berlin: Language Science Press. 355–377. DOI: 10.17169/langsci.b121.490

Visser, M. (2008). Definiteness and Specificity in the isiXhosa Determiner Phrase. *South African Journal of African Languages*, 28(1): 11–29. DOI: doi.org/10.1080/02572117.2008.10587298

Wong, A. (2016). Indefinite Markers, Grammaticalization, and Language Contact Phenomena in Chinese. *Proceedings of the Linguistic Society of America*, 1–9.

Zerbian, S. & Krifka, M. (2008). Quantification across Bantu Languages. In L. Matthewson (ed). *Quantification: A cross-linguistic Perspective.* Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing Limited: 384–414.