

# Grammatical Coding of PCF in Bantu

Yukiko Morimoto

Workshop on Information Structure in Bantu Languages

December 10, 2013

**Aim of this talk:** provide an overview of various coding devices for the expression of predicate-centered focus (PCF).

## Overview of Talk

- 1 Conjoint/disjoint morphology
- 2 In-situ dummy verb construction
- 3 Focus constructions with *nĩ* in Kikuyu and related languages
- 4 Domain reduction: left- and right-dislocation, pronominalization, null anaphora
- 5 Word order permutation
- 6 Other phenomena: tone lowering, metatony, tone cases, reduplication
- 7 Summary

## 1 Conjoint/disjoint morphology

Table 1 Recurrent properties of the CJ/DJ opposition (cf. Güldemann 2003:328)

Formally marked verb form (DJ)	Formally unmarked verb form (CJ)
a. Verb can be clause-final	Verb can never be clause-final
b. Postverbal material out-of-focus	Postverbal material in-focus
c. pronominal object possible	pronominal object impossible
d. Emphasis on positive truth value	Emphasis on postverbal constituent
e. In polar questions and answers	In constituent question and answers
f. Only in asserted main clause	Formal counterpart in non-asserted clause
g. W/o formal negative counterpart	Formal negative counterpart
<i>predicate-centered focus</i>	<i>Term focus</i>

### a. Clause finality

- One formal property shared by all languages with CJ/DJ alternation discussed in the literature: *the conjoint form is never clause-final.*

- (1) Makhuwa (P31, van der Wal 2009: 218 (679))
- a. **ni-n-thípa**      **nlittí.**      CJ + OBJ  
 1pl-PRS:CJ-dig    5:hole  
 ‘We dig a hole.’
- b. **\*ni-n-thípa .**      \*CJ
- c. **ni-náá-thípa.**      DJ  
 1pl-PRS:DJ-dig  
 ‘We are digging.’
- (2) Sambia (G23, Riedel 2009:32)
- a. **ni-it-iye**      **kaya .**      CJ + LOC argument  
 1sg-go-PERF.CJ    16.home  
 ‘I went home’
- b. **\*ni-it-iye.**      \*CJ
- c. **n-za-ita.**      DJ  
 1sg-PERF.DJ-go  
 ‘I went’
- (3) Ha (JD66, Harjula 2004:167)
- a. **ba-rima**      **ibiharagi.**      CJ + OBJ  
 2-cultivate beans  
 ‘They cultivate beans.’
- b. **\*barima.**      \*CJ
- c. **ba-ra-rima**      **(ibiharagi).**      DJ (+ OBJ)  
 2-PRS.DJ-cultivate    beans  
 ‘They cultivate/are cultivating (beans).’
- (4) Xhosa (S41, Du Plessis and Visser 1992:93)
- a. **umfazi**      **u-pheka**      **inyama.**      CJ + OBJ  
 1.woman    1-cook      9.meat  
 ‘The woman is cooking meat.’
- b. **\*umfazi upheka.**      \*CJ
- c. **umfazi**      **u-ya-pheka.**      DJ  
 1.woman    1-PRES.DJ-cook  
 ‘The woman is cooking.’

- The element following the CJ form need not be an argument.

- (5) Matengo (N13, Yoneda 2009)
- a. **Maria ju-a-telek-aje mu-kindámba.** CJ + LOC adjunct  
 PN 1-PST-cook-CJ 17LOC-7hut  
 'Maria cooked in the hut.'
- b. **ju-a-jemb-aje Tómasi (nga: María).** CJ + SBJ  
 3S-PST-sing-CJ PN not PN  
 'Thomas sang (not Maria).'

**b. Focal status of postverbal material**

- Verbs in wh-questions typically appear in the CJ form.

Matengo (N13, Yoneda 2000: 251)

- (6) Kinúnda ju-a-sekul-aje ki? past tense, conjoint  
 PN 3S-PST-cut-CJ what  
 'What did Kinunda cut?'

- (7) a. Ju-a-jemb-aje Tómasi (nga: María).  
 3S-PST-sing-CJ PN not PN  
 'Thomas sang (not Maria).'
- b. ??Ju-a-jemb-iti Tómasi (nga: María).  
 3S-PST-sing-DJ PN not PN  
 'Thomas sang (not Maria).' (Yoneda 2009)

- The element following the CJ form cannot be a non-referential NP (= cannot be focus) or a focus-sensitive operator like only.

- (8) Matengo (N13, Yoneda 2009)
- a. **??ju-a-jemb-aje múndu.** ??CJ + non-ref.NP  
 1-PST-sing-CJ someone
- b. **ju-a-jemb-iti múndu.** √DJ + non-ref.NP  
 1-PST-sing-DJ someone  
 'Somebody sang.'
- (9) Matengo (N13, Yoneda 2009:158)
- \*María ju-a-jemb-aje pená.** \*CJ + V focusing particle  
 PN 1-PST-sing-CJ only  
 'Maria only sang (and did not do anything else).'

(10) Makhuwa SoA focus (van der Wal 2009: 233 (730))  
*nki-ń-rúpa nkaláwá-ni ki-náá-lówá nkaláwáni.*  
 NEG.1sg-PRS:DJ-sleep 18.boat-LOC 1sg-PRS.DJ-fish there  
 ‘I don't sleep on the boat, I fish there.’

(11) Kinyarwanda SoA focus (Kimenyi 1980:175 (5)-(6))

- a. *tweé, tu-ra-ankik-a, mweébwého, mu-ra-som-a.*  
 we 1pl-PRS.DJ-write-ASP you 2sg-PRS.DJ-read-ASP  
 ‘We are writing, but you are reading.’
- b. *wówe, w-a-gii-ye, jyeéwého, n-á-siga-ye.*  
 you 2sg-PST.DJ-go-ASP me 1sg-stay-ASP  
 ‘You went, but I stayed.’

**c. Possibility of pronominal object**

- In Zulu (S42), when the verb is followed by an indefinite object, the CJ form is used with no pronominal object on the verb; when followed by a definite object, the DJ form is used with the pronominal object.

Zulu (S42, Doke 1992:§803-804)

- (12) a. u-hlakaza u:-thango CJ Ø  
 1-shake.PRS 11-fence  
 ‘He shakes a fence.’
- b. u-ya-lu-hlakaza u:-thango DJ -ya-  
 1-DJ-11-shake.PRS 11-fence  
 ‘He shakes the fence.’

Tswana (S31, Creissels 1996:112,113)

- (13) a. re-thusa Kitso CJ w/o OM  
 1PL.SM-help Kitso  
 ‘We help Kitso’
- b. re-a-mo-thusa Kitso DJ w/ OM  
 1PL.SM-DJ-1OM-help Kitso  
 ‘we help him, Kitso’
- c. \*re-mo-thusa Kitso \*CJ w/ OM
- d. \*re-a-thusa Kitso \*DJ w/o OM

**d. Emphasis positive polarity**

Zulu (Doke 1992:§809-810)

- (14) a. *ngi-dla*      *isi-nkwa*      CJ Ø  
          1sg-eat.PRS    7-bread  
      b. *ngi-ya-si-dla*      *isi-nkwa*      DJ -ya-  
          1sg-DJ-7-eat.PRS    7-bread  
          ‘I do eat bread.’

- (15) a. *ngi-funa*      *uku-hamba*  
          1sg-want.PRS    INF-walk  
          ‘I want to go.’  
      b. *ngi-ya-funa*      *uku-hamba*    *kodwa ...*  
          1sg-DJ-want.PRS    INF-walk      but  
          ‘I do want to go, but ...’

Xhosa (S41, Jokweni 1995:94)

- (16) *bá-ya-fudúuka*    *ngowésihláánu.*      polarity focus  
          2-DJ-emigrate    Friday  
          ‘They do emigrate on Friday.’

- (17) *ba-yá-zaam’*      *ukú-lim’*      *úmbóóna.*      SoA focus  
          2-DJ-try      15-cultivate    maize  
          ‘They TRY to cultivate maize.’

**e. Polar questions and answers**

Matengo (N13, Yoneda 2012)

- (18) a. *ju-many-iti*    *lée*    *sámaténgo?*      polarity Q: DJ  
          1-know-DJ Q    Matengo  
          ‘Does he/she know Matengo?’  
      b. *ju-many-iti.*  
          1-know-DJ  
          ‘Yes, he does/knows.’

Makhuwa (P31, van der Wal 2009:232 (727))

- (19) a. *o-lomw’*      *éshéeni?*      wh-question: CJ  
          1-.fish.PRF.CJ    9.what  
          ‘what did he catch?’

- b. o-lomwé            ehopá  
     1-.fish.PRF.CJ    9.fish  
     'He caught fish.'
- c. #oo-lówá            ehópa  
     1.fish.PRF.DJ    9.fish

Tenses displaying the alternation differ across languages in terms of (i) number of tenses and (ii) presence/absence of the alternation in negative, relative, and other moods.

- In most languages CJ/DJ forms are a pair within a single tense. In others (only in Matengo?), there are 'CJ only' tenses without a DJ counterpart and 'DJ only' tenses without a CJ counterpart.
- If a language has CJ/DJ alternation, it will be present in the affirmative indicative tenses, most commonly in the present tense (van der Wal 2013:8). In Venda (Poulos 1990) and N. Sotho (Zerbian 2006), the alternation is observed only in the present tense; Makhuwa displays four CJ/DJ pairs of segmentally marked tenses (van der Wal 2009).
- Nguni languages (S40) display the alternation in the relative perfect (20); Sesotho displays the alternation in some negative tenses (21) (van der Wal 2013).

(20) Zulu (S42, van der Wal 2013:9)

- a. **íncwàdí é-ngì-yí-bón-ê**            **kàhlé.**            CJ in relative perfect: *-e*  
     9.book REL-1sg-9-see-PERF well  
     'the book that I saw well'
- b. **íncwàdí é-ngì-yí-bón-îlè-(yó).**            DJ in relative perfect: *-ile*  
     9.book REL-1sg-9-see-PERF-REL  
     'the book that I saw'

(21) Sesotho (S33, Letsch'eng 1995:57)

- a. **ha-kí-ja-búá**            **hahólo.**            CJ in negative perfect: HH  
     NEG-1sg-PERF-talk much  
     'I haven't talked much'
- b. **ha-kí-ja-búá.**            DJ in negative perfect: HL  
     NEG-1sg-PERF-talk  
     'I haven't talked'

**More on formal properties**

*FP 1:* The CJ/DJ morphology is always combined or fused with either the tense (prefixed) or aspect (suffixal) morphology: the prefixed/suffixal difference is observed across Bantu and sometimes within a single language.

(22) Kinyarwanda (J61, Kimenyi 1980:193, 185)

- a. **Yohaâni a-kor-a**            **mu** **gítóondo.**            present tense CJ: -∅-  
John    1-work-ASP    in morning  
'John works in the morning.'
- b. **Yohaâni a-rá-kor-a,**            **mu** **gítóondo.**            present tense DJ: -*ra*-  
John    1-PRS-work-ASP in morning  
'John works, in the morning.'
- c. **b-iib-ye** **igitabo.**            past tense CJ: -∅-  
2-steal-ASP 7.book  
'They stole the book.'
- d. **b-á-k-iib-ye.**            past tense DJ: -*a*-  
2-PST-7OM-steal-ASP  
'They stole it.'

(23) Swati (S43, Ziervogel and Mabuza 1976:97, 98)

- a. **ngi-natsa...**            present tense CJ: -∅-  
1sg-drink  
'I drink...'
- b. **ngi-ya-natsa.**            present tense CJ: -*ya*-  
1sg-PRS.DJ-drink  
'I am drinking.'
- c. **ngi-nats-é...**            perfective CJ: -*e*-  
1sg-drink-PFV.CJ  
'I have drunk...'
- d. **ngi-nats-ile.**            perfective DJ: -*ile*-  
1sg-drink-PFV.DJ  
'I have drunk.'

*FP 2:* Some languages show CJ/DJ alternation morphology in one tense and tonally in others (e.g. Tswana); in other languages, the alternation is only tonal (e.g. Haya).

(24) Tswana (S31, Creissels 1996:109)

- a. **dikgomó dí-fúla kwa nokeng.** present tense CJ -∅-  
 10.cows 10-graze at river  
 ‘The cows graze/are grazing at the river.’
- b. **dikgomó dí-á-fúla.** present tense DJ -a-  
 10.cows 10-PRS.DJ-graze  
 ‘The cows are grazing.’
- c. **bá<sub>i</sub>-tsamá-íle lé boné<sub>i</sub>.** perfect CJ verb: HLHHL  
 2SM-go-PERF with 2.PRO  
 ‘They have gone with them.’
- d. **bá<sub>i</sub>-tsáma-ile lé boné<sub>i</sub>.** perfect DJ verb: HLLLL  
 2-go-PERF with 2.PRO  
 ‘They too have gone.’
- e. **ke-tlaa-bína lé ené.** future CJ verb: -HL  
 1sg-FUT-dance with 1.pro  
 ‘I shall dance with him/her.’
- f. **ke-tlaa-bíná lé nná.** future DJ verb: -HH  
 1SM-FUT-dance with 1sg.pro  
 ‘I too shall dance’, ‘I shall dance, me too.’

- In Haya, tonal reduction is observed in the CJ form in “unmarked” tenses; there is no tonal reduction in “marked” tenses.

(25) Haya (JE22, Hyman 1999:160-161)

A. CJ/DJ tonal reduction in unmarked tenses

	DJ: ‘they tie’ etc.	CJ: ‘they tie Káto’ etc.
Pr. hab.	<b>ba-kóm-a</b>	<b>ba-kom-a káto</b>
Pst 1	<b>bá-á-kôm-a</b>	<b>ba-a-kom-a káto</b>
Pst 2	<b>ba-kom-íl-e</b>	<b>ba-kom-il-e káto</b>
Pst hab .	<b>ba-a-kóm-ag-a</b>	<b>ba-a-kom-ag-a káto</b>
Fut.1	<b>ba-laa-kôm-a</b>	<b>ba-laa-kom-a káto</b>
Fut.2	<b>ba-li-kóm-a</b>	<b>ba-li-kom-a káto</b>

B. No tonal alternation in “marked” tenses

	DJ: ‘they are tying’ etc.	CJ: ‘they are tying Káto’ etc.
Prog	<b>ni-ba-kóm-a</b>	<b>ni-ba-kom-á káto</b>
Perf	<b>bá-ákóm-il-e</b>	<b>bá-á-kóm-il-e káto</b>
Experiential	<b>ba-lá-kom-íl-e</b>	<b>ba-lá-kom-il-e káto</b>



Persistentive	ba-kyáá-kôm-a	ba-kyáá-kóm-a káto
Subj	ba-kóm-a	kom-á káto
Past 3	bá-ka-kôm-a	bá-ka-kóm- káto

- relation between progressive and other “marked” tenses and focus: cf. Hyman & Watters (1984).

**More on interpretational properties**

Marked temporal categories such as progressive, perfect, experiential, persistentive are inherently focused categories (Hyman & Watters 1984); this is manifested in the CJ/DJ alternation.

IP 1: Marked categories are expressed in the DJ form.

(26) Matengo CJ/DJ alternation, indicative mood (Yoneda 2009)

CJ		DJ	
simple far past	SM-a-Vstem-aje		
		perfect past	SM-a-Vstem-iti
simple today past	SM-Vstem-áje		
		perfect present	SM-Vstem-ití
simple present	SM-Vstem-a		
simple future	SM-í-Vstem-aje	definite future	SM-í-Vstem-a
simple altriloc fut.	SM-aká-Vstem-aje	definite altriloc fut.	SM-aká-Vstem-a

(27) Perfect reading of  $\emptyset$ -verb-iti

ju-hík-ití.

3S-arrive-DJ

‘He has (already) arrived.’

(Yoneda 2000:184 (29))

(28) Experiential reading

a. uhambo gwá kijápani ju-gu-jógwan-ití.

14.song 14.of 7.Japanese 1-14OM-listen-DJ

‘I’ve listened to Japanese songs (before).’

(Yoneda 2000:179 (10))

b. twé tu-pí-ití kujelumáni.

1pl 1pl-go-DJ 17.Germany

‘We’ve been to Germany (before).’

(Yoneda 2000:179 (11))

(29) Progressive reading

- a. **Ju-gonel-iti mu-súmba ense.** DJ, progressive  
1-sleep-DJ 18-7room 7this  
'He/she is sleeping here.'  
(Q: "Where is he/she sleeping now?")
- b. **Ju-gonel-aje mu-súmba ense.** CJ, habitual  
1-sleep-CJ 18-7room 7this  
'He/she sleeps here.'  
(Q: "Where does he/she usually sleep?") (Yoneda 2009 (10))

(30) Truth-value focus reading

- losí lu-ténd-iti kúngoleka.**  
11.river 11-do-DJ to.be.deep  
'The river is deep.'  
(as an answer to whether the river is deep or shallow/fast-flowing)

*IP 2:* DJ form is used to express predicate-centered focus. Languages seem to differ as to which PCF types are expressed just by the DJ morphology: operator focus in Matengo (30) vs. state-of-affairs focus in Makhuwa (10) & Kinyarwanda (11).

- The DJ form to express operator (polarity) focus is also reported in other languages such as Aghem (Hyman & Watters 1984), Zulu (Doke 1992, discussed in Güldemann 2003:326-327) ...
- The DJ form to express SoA focus is reported in Tsong (S53, Baumbach 1987:219), Shambaa (G23, Nurse 2008:213) ...

## 2 The in-situ dummy verb construction

PCF can also be expressed by a construction in which a semantically generic/'light' verb carrying inflection takes a non-finite content verb as its complement.

- In Matengo, SoA focus is expressed by a light/dummy verb construction.

(31) Matengo SoA focus (based on Yoneda 2009:159, pc December 2013)

Question: What did Maria do with the sweet potatoes? (b = most appropriate)

- a. **María ju-a-tend-aje kú-teleka mbátata.**  
PN 1-PST-do-CJ INF-cook 10.sweet.potato  
'Maria cooked sweet potatoes.'

- b. **ju-a-tend-aje kú-teleka.** do-CJ + INF.V  
 1-PST-do-CJ INF-cook  
 ‘She cooked (it).’
- c. **#María ju-a-telek-aje mbátata.** #CJ + OBJ  
 PN 1-PST-cook-CJ10.sweet.potato
- d. **\* María ju-a-telek-aje** \*CJ + Ø
- e. **# María ju-a-telek-iti.** #DJ

- (32) **A-tend-a ku-pomulela.** Matengo (Yoneda 2009:160)  
 2-do-CJ INF-rest  
 ‘They are resting.’

- In other languages (e.g. Ndendeule), the dummy verb construction expresses polarity focus.

Ndendeule (Güldemann 2003:340 (32)-(33))

- (33) a. **ti-lëma malombi.** OBJ = focus  
 1p.PRS-cultivate maize  
 ‘We cultivate [maize].’
- b. **bi-tenda ku-memena?** truth-value focus  
 2.PRS-do INF-eat  
 ‘Do people really eat them?!’

- (34) Context: the addressees are blamed for something they’re not supposed to do.  
**mwe n’-tenda ku-pëta.**  
 2p 2p-do INF-pass  
 ‘You still/do go through.’

A similar construction is reported in Ngoni (N12) with the dummy verb *-kita* (Ebner 1951:29, cited in Güldemann 2003).

### 3 Focus constructions with *nĩ* in Kikuyu

Focus constructions involving the proclitic *nĩ* are reported in Kikuyu (E51, Bergvall 1987, Schwarz 2003) and closely related languages—e.g., Vunjo (E62) (Dalgish 1979, Moshi 1988), Kuria (E43) (Cammenga 2004), Kamba (E55) (Ndumbu and Whiteley 1962).

- The clitic *nĩ* is used as an identificational copula, which always bears H tone.

- (35) a. **Peter nĩ mwarimũ.**  
 PN ID teacher.  
 ‘Peter is a teacher.’  
 b. **morothi nĩ nyámũ.**  
 lion ID animal.  
 ‘Lion is an animal.’

### **Operator focus**

*Polarity focus* is expressed by placing the proclitic **nĩ** in front of the canonical V(O) structure.<sup>1</sup> Crucially for truth-value focus, **nĩ** always appears in H tone, showing that truth-value focus is *additionally prosodically marked* on the clitic **nĩ**.

Kikuyu (E51)

- (36) Polarity question & answer  
 a. **mutumía nĩ arí:ré mbóso?**  
 1.woman FOC 1.eat.ASP.FV 6.bean  
 ‘Did the woman eat the beans?’  
 b. **ee, nĩ arí:re mbóso.**  
 yes FOC 1.eat.ASP.FV 6.bean  
 ‘Yes, she did (eat the beans).’

- (37) Corrective assertion  
 a. **Neguó, nĩ maí:re.**  
 true FOC 2.steal.ASP.FV  
 {‘They didn’t steal it (did they?) } ‘Yes, they did steal it.’  
 b. **#neguó, maí:re.** [not emphasizing the positive polarity]

*TAM focus* is also expressed by **nĩ** in front of the finite predicate. The focus particle **nĩ**, however, has L tone.

- (38) a. **nĩ kóreya aráreya mbóso kana nĩ asíreire?**  
 FOC INF.eat.FV 1.PROG.eat.FV 6.bean or FOC 1.OM.eat.ASP.FV  
 ‘Is she still eating the beans or has she eaten them already?’

---

<sup>1</sup> It has been claimed (cf. Güldemann 1996, 1999) that the predicate following **nĩ** has the dependent verb form. In my data, however, there was no tonal or morphological evidence that the **nĩ**-marked verb in question is dependent.

- b. **nīasíreíre.**  
 FOC 1.OM.eat.ASP.FV  
 ‘He has eaten (them).’

A similar focus marking is reported in Mbala (K51) with a pre-initial marker *mu-* (discussed by Güldemann 2003:341).

(39) Mbala (K51, Ndolo 1972:40)

- a. **gá-gòsuna ga-ga-loombulula gilùungu.** OBJ = focus  
 12-woman 12-FUT-demand.back calabash  
 ‘The woman will ask for [the calabash] back.’
- b. **gá-gòsuna mu-ga-ga-lóombulula gilùungu.** TVF  
 12-woman PCF-12-FUT-demand.back calabash  
 ‘The woman [will] ask for the calabash back.’ (cf. Ndolo 1972:40)

### **SoA focus**

A constructional difference is observed between non-contrastive vs. contrastive SoA focus.

- Non-contrastive SoA focus is expressed by a canonical structure with **nī** in front of the predicate. As with TAM focus, **nī** has L tone.
- Contrastive SoA is expressed by the (*medial*) *focus preposing* construction: [**nī** + non-finite V + finite V]. The subject, when present, is positioned before the doubling.

(40) Non-contrastive SoA focus

- nī araméthodékire.**  
 FOC 1.PST.9.fix.ASP.FV  
 {Audu loves his car. Yesterday he took care of it. What exactly did he do with the car?} ‘He FIXED it.’

(41) Selective SoA focus

- a. **nī guthodéka araméthodékire.**  
 FOC INF.fix.FV 1.PST.9.fix.ASP.FV  
 {Audu loves his car. Yesterday he took care of it. Did he wash or fix it?}  
 ‘He FIXED it.’
- b. **#nī araméthodékire.** [not selective]

(42) Corrective SoA focus

a. **nĩ kómuigatá amuigátire.**

FOC INF.chase.FV 1.1OM.hit.ASP.FV

{The woman hit Peter.} 'She CHASED him away.'

b. **#nĩ amuigátire.**

- The fronted verb doubling constructions in the languages of zones B and H (Hadermann 1996): (i) *focus preposing* (VERB-ing X VERBs = SoA focus) or (ii) *topic preposing* (as for Verb-ing [it is the case that] X VERBs = truth-value focus)? Cf. Güldemann (2003:335)

(43) Suundi (H13b, Hadermann 1996:161)

a. **ndyèká-tá:ngà.**

1S:FUT-read

'je vais lire.'

b. **kù-tá:ngà ndyèká-tá:ngà.**

INF-read 1S:FUT-read

'je vais [lire].'

### ***Expression of present progressive***

The progressive morpheme in Kikuyu is **-raa (-ra:)**. The progressivity can also be expressed by verb doubling.

(44) a. **mwaná á-ra:-reyá mbó:so.**

1child 1-PROG-eat.FV 6.bean

'The child is eating beans.'

b. **mwaná nĩ kóreya ará:reyá mbó:so.**

1child FOC INF.eat.FV 1-PROG-eat.FV 6.bean

'The child is eating beans.'

c. **\*mwaná ára:reyá.**

d. **mwaná nĩ kóreya ara:reyá.**

De Kind et. al (2013) presents similar data from Kikongo (45).

(45) Kikongo (H16, De Kind et. al 2013)

a. **∅-sónik-a káka ba-sónikéni.**

SoA focus

15-write-FV only 2-write-PERF

'They only WROTE (a report).'

- b. **I-búlu** **∅-zawúl-a** **ci-zawul-a.** Progressive  
 7-cattle 15-run-FV 7-run-FV  
 'The cattle is running.' (de Kind et. al 2013)

Güldemann (2003:341 (34)-(35)) reports that in Yao (P21), a geographic neighbor of Ndendeule, the dummy verb construction with *-tenda* is used to express progressive.

Yao (P21, Hetherwick 1902:51, 52)

(46) a. n-gu-tawa.

1sg-PRS-bind

'I bind.'

b. **n-denda** **ku-tawa.**

1sg-do INF-bind

'I am in the act of binding.'

(47) **si-tenda** **ku-wola.** (Sanderson 1922:108)

10-do INF-rot

'They are getting rotten.'

There is a formal parallel between marking devices for predicate-centered focus and progressive. In some Bantu languages, there is evidence that PCF markers have been grammaticized to progressive markers (see Güldemann 2003).

(11) Haya (JE22, Hyman 1999:160-161)

B. No tonal alternation in "marked" tenses

DJ: 'they are tying' etc.

CJ: 'they are tying Káto' etc.

Prog

**ni-ba-kóm-a**

**ni-ba-kom-á káto**

***Syntactic restriction parallel to that observed in the CJ/DJ alternation***

The *nĩ* marked predicate can be clause-final, but the unmarked predicate can never be clause-final (also Güldemann 2008).

(48) a. **mwaná nĩ** **á-rá-reiré** **mbó:so.**

1.child FOC 1-PST-eat.ASP.FV 6.bean

'The child ate the beans.'

b. **mwaná** **á-rá-reiré** **mbó:so.**

- c. **mwaná nĩ á-rá-reíre.**  
 1.child FOC 1-PST-eat.ASP.FV  
 ‘The child ate (them).’
- d. \***mwaná á-rá-reíre.**

Conjoint/disjoint morphology: verbal affix, *ne* is cross-categorial proclitic. Despite the distributional difference, the formal and functional restrictions of *ne* parallel those of the conjoint/disjoint morphology.

### Summary

- The proclitic *nĩ*, which is also used as an identificational copula, figures centrally in the grammar of focus in Kikuyu and closely related languages.

### Use of *nĩ* in Kikuyu:

- Truth-value focus is expressed by H-toned *nĩ* in front of the predicate.
- TAM focused is expressed by L-toned *nĩ* in front of the predicate.
- Non-contrastive SoA focus is expressed by L-toned *nĩ* in front of the predicate.
- Contrastive SoA focus is expressed by L-toned *nĩ* with focus-preposing doubling.
- The verb doubling construction used for contrastive SoA focus also express progressive.
- The scope of *nĩ*: only the following element.

## 4 Domain reduction

*Doman reduction* whereby nominal complements and adjuncts are either preposed and/or pronominalized is probably the most wide-spread and productive strategy for the expression of PCF in Bantu.

### Left-dislocation

(49) Swahili (Edelsten et. al 2013:9)

Q: vi-azi tu-i-vyo-kul-a jana, bibi a-li-vi-pika-je?  
 8-potato 2pl-PST-8.REL-FV yesterday wife 1-PST-8-cook-how  
 'How did the wife cook the potatoes we ate yesterday?'

A: vi-azi vi-le, bibi a-li-vi-chemsha-a.  
 8-potato 8-DEM wife 1-PST-8-boil-FV  
 'As for these potatoes the wife (she) [cooked] them.'



- (50) Swahili (Edelsten et. al 2013:10)  
 Wa-tu we-ngine wa-na-chemsh-a vi-azi na we-ngine  
 2-person 2-other 2-PRS-boil-FV 8-potato and 2-other  
 wa-na-vi-kaang-a  
 2-PRS-8-fry-FV  
 'Some people cook potatoes and others fry them.'
- Q: A-na-vi-pika-je bibi?  
 1-PST-8-cook-how wife  
 'How does the wife cook them?'
- A: bibi yeye, vi-azi, a-na-vi-chemsh-a.  
 wife 1.PRO 8-potato 1-PRS-8-fry-FV  
 (lit.) 'The wife herself, the potatoes, she fry them.'

- (51) Matengo (Yoneda, pc, July 2013)  
*Liso, kibéga n-golol-ití.*  
 yesterday 7.pot 1sg-wash-DJ  
 'Yesterday, the pot, I washed (it).'

- (52) Kinyarwanda (Kimenyi 1980:193 (9))
- a. *ábáana ba-kuund-a gukina.*  
 2.child 2-like-FV INF.play  
 'The children like to play.'
- b. *gukina, ábáana ba-rá-bi-kuund-a.*  
 INF.play 2.child 2-PRS.DJ-15-like-FV  
 'To play, the children like it.'

### ***Right-dislocation***

- (53) Kinyarwanda (Kimenyi 1980:207 (60))  
*umugóre a-rá-mu-kuund-a, uyú mwáana.*  
 1.woman 1-PRS.DJ-1OM-like-FV this 1child  
 'The woman like him, this child.'

### ***Pronominalization and null anaphora***

- (54) Matengo (Yoneda 2000:122 (34))  
*gu-a-lómb-il-ití.*  
 2S-3P-buy-APPL-DJ  
 'You bought for them.'

(55) Kikuyu answer to a polar question

a. **mutumía nĩ arí:ré mbóso?**

1.woman FOC 1.eat.ASP.FV 6.bean

‘Did the woman eat the beans?’

b. **ee, nĩ arí:re.**

null anaphora (for object)

yes, FOC 1.eat.ASP.FV

‘Yes, she did.’

(56) Kikuyu confirmation

a. **mutumía arigíre Peter.**

1woman 1.hit.ASP.FV PN

‘The woman hit Peter.’

b. **neguó, né a-mú-rigíre.**

pronominalization

true FM 1-1OM-hit.ASP.FV

‘Yes, she did (hit him).’

## 5 Word Order

In the Imithupi dialect of Makhuwa, Stucky (1985) show that the SOV order expresses truth-value focus (discussed by Gjersøe 2013).

Makhuwa-Imithupi (1985:58, 61)

(57) **hiń-Sepété níkhác’ úlé á-hó-túpúla.** S O V

HON-PN 3.cashew.tree 3.DEM.III 1-PERF.DJ-cut.down

‘Sepete did cut down the cashew nut tree (as we expected him to)’

(58) {A: Sepete did not see Araaima.}

**Hín-Sepété Aráárima á-hó-ón-á.**

HON-PN PN 1-PERF.DJ-see-FV

B: ‘Sepete did see Araaima.’

## 6 Other phenomena

### *Predicative lowering*

Nouns and adjectives have a different tone pattern when used predicatively. When the noun or adjective have two primary high tones only the first one is deleted (relevance to PCF is discussed by Gjersøe 2013):

Ekoti (P311 variant of Makhuwa, Schadeberg & Mucanheia 2000:124)

(59) Predicative lowering

- a. sípa                    'lion'
- b. siipa                    'it is a lion.'
- c. sípá paakha        'the lion is a cat' (cf. paákha LHL)

This tonal pattern is used to express focus: the toneless object in (60) is in focus.

Ekoti (Schadeberg & Mucanheia 2000:129)

- (60) a.    ka-mu-úuzány-éla      laázu                    'I bouht her bananas.'
- b.    ka-mu-úuzány-éla      laazu                    ' I bought [bananas] for her.'
- 1.REC-1-buy-APPL    5.banana

- (61) a.    kinca      laázu  
          1sg.eat.FV 5.banana  
          'I do eat bananas'
- b.    knica laazu  
          'I eat bananas'

van der Wal (2013) reports that the same tonal alternation is observed in Makwe (G402), Shangaci, and other varieties of Makhuwa.

- In Makhuwa an object undergoes predicative lowering after a CJ verb form but not after a DJ verb (Stucky 1979, Katupha 1983, van der Wal 2006).
- Predicative lowering is therefore observed independently or combined with the CJ/DJ alternation.

### **Metatony**

Metatony is a tonal alternation in which a verb-final vowel is underlyingly L toned when utterance final, but H when followed by complement/adjunct (and the H tone may carry over to the first tone-bearing unit of the following element) (Nurse 2008:204).

- Nurse (2008:204): metatony marks a contrast between verb focus and post-verbal focus (also Schadeberg 1995, Guarisma 2003, Makasso 2012).
- Metatony is attested in languages of zones A, B, C, D10-50 and L10-20 (Nurse 2008:204), as well as zone H (van der Wal 2013), which suggests a complementary east-west distribution for metatony and the CJ/DJ alternation.

(62) Metatony (Nurse 2008:204 (31))

Duala	wána	vs.	a ma-wána matabato
	'(to) bring'		'she brings clothes'
	bító bá-manda	vs.	bító bá-mandá mabato
	'Women buy'		'Woman buy clothes.'
Basaa	a bí nuɲul	vs.	a bí nuɲúl bísel
	'he sold'		'he sold baskets'
Mituku	kukúlúmanisa	vs.	Kukúlúmánísá bantu
	'to assemble'		'to assemble people'

- Hyman and Lionnet (2012) explicitly argue against a link with the CJ/DJ alternation for metatony in Abo (A42), showing that metatony appears in unexpected contexts such as negative and imperative verb forms, and independently of where the focus is within the sentence.

### ***Tone cases***

Tone cases are phenomena in western Bantu where nouns differ in their tonal pattern depending on their position in the clause and their syntactic function.

(63) Umbundu (R11, Schadeberg 1986:434)

- a. onjalí y-á-!há ó!málá epakó.  
 9.parent 9-PST-give 2.child 5.fruit  
 'The parent gave the children the fruit.'
- b. onjalí y-á-!há épako komála.  
 9.parent 9-PST-give 5.fruit 2.child  
 'The parent gave the fruit to the children.'

Otjiherero (R30) distinguishes 4 tone cases; the so-called 'complement case' resembles the conjoint verb form (Marten, Kavari, and van der Wal, to appear, discussed by van der Wal 2013:25):

- (i) complement case marked nouns are found only when immediately following the verb, and only in a subset of tense-aspects;
- (ii) the set of nouns which can take complement case includes direct and indirect objects, adverbial nouns, raised subjects and inverted subjects;
- (iii) in the negative factive-habitual (and only in this tense) can the following element take either default or complement case depending on whether the noun is in focus.

Marten, Kavari, and van der Wal (to appear): tone cases seem to parallel (constituency-based) verbal CJ/DJ alternations, both being instances of grammaticalized information structure.

### **Reduplication**

Gjersøe (2013) discusses reduplication data from Ekoti (P311) as a potential candidate for the expression of PCF.

Ekoti (P311, Schadeberg & Mucanheia 2000:186 (21)-(22))

(64) {T.R's father goes to buy clothes for him. He buys camouflage cloths that are very old. When he [T.R] puts one leg into it,}

a. **kamafuláázhi eéttá m' oonyényéya-nyenyeya.**

1.camouflage:cloths 1.go.REC 18.POSS INF.break -RED

'the camouflage cloth tore into many pieces.'

b. **etilé y' oovírísa muúlú mмотé kaméza yeéttá**

7.DEMiii 7.POSS INF.pass.CAUS 3.leg 3.one 9.shirt 7.go.REC

**m' oovárúwa-varuwa.**

18.POSS INF.tear-RED

'When he put one leg into it, the shirt split completely'

(65) {His father went to the shop and there he bought some khaki cloth and brought it home.}

Terezéńto Roópa **omóó-omoona-ru**

T.R. 1.see.INF-RED-just

'T.R. just looked at it,'

**paasí kakí eéttá m' oovárúwa- varuwa.**

stop 1.khaki 1.go.REC 18.POSS tear -RED.INF

'and immediately the khaki cloth tore apart.'

- Note ... More focus-related phenomena: high-tone spread in N. Sotho (Zerbian 2006:58); discourse function of applicativization?

## **7 Summary**

		SoA focus	Polarity/TAM focus
1	CJ/DJ morphology	Makhuwa (Enahara), Kinyarwanda, Tsong, Shambaa	Matengo, Aghem, Zulu
2	In-situ dummy V	Matengo	Ndendeule, Ngoni

3	a	<i>nĩ</i> focus constructions	<i>nĩ</i> (L)	<i>nĩ</i> (H in polarity foc) <i>mu-</i> : Mbala
	b	(Medial) focus-preposing	Kikuyu, Kikongo, ?Suundi, ?Yao	
4		Domain reduction	Possible in all Bantu languages?	
5		Word order change		Makhuwa (Imithupi)
6	a	Tone lowering		Ekoti
	b	Metatony	?	?
	c	Tone cases	?	?
	d	Reduplication	Ekoti	

## References

- Baumbach, E. J. M. 1987. *Analytical Tsonga grammar*. Pretoria: University of South Africa.
- Bergvall, Victoria L. 1987. *Focus in Kikuyu and universal grammar*. Ph.D. Thesis, Harvard University.
- Buell, Leston. 2005. *Issues in Zulu morphosyntax*. Ph. D. thesis, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Buell, Leston. 2006. The Zulu conjoint/disjoint verb alternation: focus or constituency? *ZAS Papers in Linguistics* 43, 9-30.
- Cammenga, J. 1994. *Kuria phonology and morphology*. Ph. D. thesis. Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam.
- Creissels, Denis. 1996. Conjointive and disjunctive verb forms in Setswana. *South African Journal of African Languages* 16 (4), 109-115.
- Creissels, Denis. 2012. Conjoint and disjoint forms in Tswana. Ms.
- Dalgish, G. M. 1979. Syntax and semantics of the morpheme *ni* in Kivunjo (Chaga), *SAL* 10 (1), 47-64.
- de Kind, J., S. Dom, G-M. de Schryver, and K. Bostoën. 2013. Fronted-infinitive constructions in Kikongo (Bantu H16): verb focus, progressive aspect and future tense. Paper presented at Societas Linguistica Europaea: 46th Annual Meeting. September 2013.
- Doke, Clement M. 1992 [1945]. *Textbook of Zulu grammar*. Capetown: Maskew Miller Longman.
- Du Plessis, JA and Marianna Visser. 1992. *Xhosa syntax*. Pretoria: Via Afrika.
- Ebner Elzear. 1951. *Grammatik des Neu-Kingoni*. Peramiho: St. Benedictine Mission, manuscript.

- Edelsten, Peter, L. Marten, and C. Lijongwa. 2013. Information structure constraint to Swahili word order. Paper presented at Bantu 5. June, 2013.
- Gjersøe, Siri. 2013. Data sheet -- Ekoti. ms. Humboldt University, Berlin.
- Guarisma, Gladys. 2003. Kpa<sup>2</sup> (A53). In Nurse, Derek and Gérard Philippson (eds.), *The Bantu languages*. Routledge Language Family Series 4. London: Routledge, 307-34.
- Güldemann, Tom. 1996. *Verbalmorphologie und Nebenprädikationen im Bantu: Eine Studie zur funktional motivierten Genese eines konjugationalen Subsystems*. Bochum-Essener Beiträge zur Sprachwandelforschung 27. Bochum: Universitätsverlag Dr. N. Brockmeyer.
- Güldemann, Tom. 1999. The genesis of verbal negation in Bantu and its dependency on functional features of clause types. In Hombert, J-M. and L.M. Hyman (eds.), *Bantu Historical Linguistics: Theoretical and Empirical Perspectives*. CSLI Publications. Stanford, CA.
- 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.
- Güldemann, Tom. 2008. The relation between predicate operator focus and theticity: How preverbal clause operators in Bantu betray functional affinity. Paper presented at the Workshop on Predicate Focus, Verum Focus, Verb Focus: Similarities and Difference. University of Potsdam, November 2008.
- Hadermann, P. 1996. Formes verbales complexes et grammaticalisation de la structure infinitif + verbe conjugué dans quelques langues bantoues de zones B et H. *SAL* 25(2): 155-170.
- Harjula, Lotta. 2004. *The Ha language of Tanzania: grammar, text and vocabulary*. Cologne: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.
- Heatherwick, A. 1902: *A Handbook of the Yao Language*. London.
- Hyman, Larry M. 1999. The interaction between focus and tone in Bantu. In Rebuschi, Georges and Laurice Tuller (eds.), *The grammar of focus*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 151–178.
- Hyman, Larry M. and Florian Lionnet. 2012. Metatony in Abo (Bankon), A42. In: Michael R. Marlo, Nikki B. Adams, Christopher R. Green, Michelle Morrison, and Tristan M. Purvis (eds), *Selected Proceedings of the 42nd Annual Conference on African Linguistics: African Languages in Context*, 1-14. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- Hyman, L.M. & J.R. Watters. 1984. Auxiliary focus. *Studies in African Linguistic*. 15(3), 233-273.

- Jokweni, M.W. 1995. *Aspects of Isixhosa Phrasal Phonology*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Illinois.
- Letsh'eng, 'Makhauta C. 1995. *Les tiroirs verbaux du Sesotho*. Mémoire, Université Stendhal (Grenoble III), sous direction de Denis Creissels.
- Katupha, José M. M. 1983. *A preliminary description of sentence structure in the Esaaka dialect of Emakhuwa*. M. Phil. thesis, SOAS, London.
- Kimenyi, Alexandre. 1980. *A relational grammar of Kinyarwanda*. University of California Publications, Linguistics 91. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Makasso, Emmanuel-Moselly. 2012. Metatony in Basaa. In: Michael R. Marlo, Nikki B. Adams, Christopher R. Green, Michelle Morrison, and Tristan M. Purvis (eds), *Selected Proceedings of the 42nd Annual Conference on African Linguistics: African Languages in Context*, 15-22. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- Marten, Lutz, Jekura U. Kavari and Jenneke van der Wal. To appear. Tone cases in Otjiherero: head-complement relations, linear order, and information structure. *Africana Linguistica XVIII*.
- Moshi, Lioba. 1988. A functional typology of "ni" in Kivunjo (Chaga). *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences* 18(1): 105-134.
- Ndumbu, J.M.G. and W.H. Wteley. 1962. Some problems of stability and emphasis in Kamba one-word tenses. *JAL* 1/2: 167-180.
- Ndolo, P. 1972. *Essai sur la tonalité et la flexion verbale du Gimbala*. Tervuren: MRAC.
- Nurse, Derek. 2008. *Tense and aspect in Bantu*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Poulos, George. 1990. *A linguistic analysis of Venda*. Venda: Via Afrika.
- Riedel, Kristina. 2009. *The syntax of object marking in Sambaa: a comparative perspective*. Utrecht: LOT
- Sanderson, G. M. 1922. *A Yao Grammar*. London: SPCK.
- Schadeberg, Thilo C. 1986. Tone cases in Umbundu. In *Africana Linguistica* 10. *Annalen Menselijke Wetenschappen* 121. Tervuren: Koninklijk Museum voor Midden-Afrika, 423-447.
- Schadeberg, Thilo C. 1995. Object diagnostics in Bantu. In EmananjO, E. 'NOLue and Ozo-mekuri Ndimele (eds.), *Issues in African languages and linguistics: essays in honour of Kay Williamson*. Aba: National Institute for Nigerian Languages, 173-180.
- Schadeberg, Thilo C., and Francisco U. Mucanheia. 2000. *Ekoti: the Maka or Swahili language of Angoche*. Cologne: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.
- Schwarz, Florian. 2003. Focus Marking in Kikuyu. *ZAS Papers in Linguistics* 30, 41-118.



- Stucky, Susan. 1979. The interaction of tone and focus in Makua. *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 1, 189-198.
- Stucky, Susan. 1985. *Order in Makua syntax*. New York: Garland Publishing.
- Van der Spuy, Andrew. 1993. Dislocated noun phrases in Nguni. *Lingua* 90:335-355.
- Van der Wal, Jenneke. 2006b. Predicative Tone Lowering in Makhuwa. In *Linguistics in the Netherlands* 23, 224-236. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Van der Wal, Jenneke. 2009. *Word order and information structure in Makhuwa-Enahara*. Utrecht: LOT.
- Van der Wal, J. 2013. What is the conjoint/disjoint alternation in Bantu languages? Ms.
- Yoneda, N. 2000. *A Descriptive Study of Matengo, a Bantu Language of Tanzania—with focus on Verbal Structure*. Ph.D. thesis. Tokyo University of Foreign Studies, Tokyo.
- Yoneda, N. 2009. Matengo-no doushi-katsuyoukei-to shouten (Verb inflection and focus in Matengo). *Swahili and Africa Research* 20, 148-164.
- Yoneda, Nobuko. 2012. A sketch of Magengo. In Katsuhiko Shiota (ed.), *Africa Shogo Bunpo Youran (Grammatical Sketches of African Languages)*, 241-256. Hiroshima, Japan, Keisui-sha.
- Zerbian, Sabine. 2006. Expression of information structure in the Bantu language Northern Sotho. *ZAS Papers in Linguistics* 45. Berlin: Zentrum für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft, Typologie und Universalienforschung.
- Ziervogel, Dirk. and Enos J. Mabuza. 1976. *A grammar of the Swati language*. Pretoria: J.L. van Schaik.