Aim of this talk: provide an overview of various coding devices for the expression of predicate-centered focus (PCF).
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1 Conjoint/disjoint morphology

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>predicate-centered focus</th>
<th>Term focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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-thípá nlittí.  
      CJ + OBJ
      1pl-PRS:CJ-dig 5:hole
      ‘We dig a hole.’
   b. *ni-n-thípá.  
      *CJ
   c. ni-náá-thípá.  
      DJ
      1pl-PRS:DJ-dig
      ‘We are digging.’

(2) Sambaa (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-rama ibiharagi.  
      CJ + OBJ
      2-cultivate beans
      ‘They cultivate beans.’
   b. *barima.  
      *CJ
   c. ba-ra-rama (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.**   
      PN 1-PST-cook-CJ 17LOC-hut
      'Maria cooked in the hut.'
   b. **ju-a-jemb-aje ** Tómasi (nga: María).   
      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?   
    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.   
      1-PST-sing-CJ someone
      ??CJ + non-ref.NP
   b. ju-a-jemb-iti múndu.   
      1-PST-sing-DJ someone
      √DJ + non-ref.NP
      'Somebody sang.'

(9) Matengo (N13, Yoneda 2009:158)

*María ju-a-jemb-aje pená.   
*PN 1-PST-sing-CJ only
*CJ + V focusing particle
'n 'Maria only sang (and did not do anything else).'

(10) Makhuwa SoA focus  (van der Wal 2009: 233 (730))

\[ nki-\text{ñ-rúpa} \quad nkaláwá-ni \quad ki-\text{náá-łówá} \quad nkaláwáni. \]
\[ \text{NEG.1sg-PRS:DJ-sleep} \quad 18.\text{boat-LOC} \quad 1\text{sg-PRS.DJ-fish} \quad \text{there} \]
‘I don’t sleep on the boat, I fish there.’

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

a. \[ \text{tweé, tu-ra-ankik-a,} \quad \text{mweébwého,} \quad \text{mu-ra-som-a.} \]
\[ \text{we} \quad 1\text{pl-PRS.DJ-write-ASP} \quad \text{you} \quad 2\text{sg-PRS.DJ-read-ASP} \]
‘We are writing, but you are reading.’

b. \[ \text{wówe,} \quad \text{w-a-gii-ye,} \quad \text{jyeéwého,} \quad \text{n-á-siga-ye.} \]
\[ \text{you} \quad 2\text{sg-PST.DJ-go-ASP} \quad \text{me} \quad 1\text{sg-stay-ASP} \]
‘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. \[ \text{u-hlakaza} \quad \text{u:-thango} \quad \text{CJ} \quad \text{Ø} \]
\[ 1\text{shake.PRS} \quad 11\text{-fence} \]
‘He shakes a fence.’

b. \[ \text{u-ya-lu-hlakaza} \quad \text{u:-thango} \quad \text{DJ} \quad -\text{ya-} \]
\[ 1\text{-DJ-11-shake.PRS} \quad 11\text{-fence} \]
‘He shakes the fence.’

Tswana (S31, Creissels 1996:112,113)

(13) a. \[ \text{re-thusa Kitso} \quad \text{CJ} \quad \text{w/o OM} \]
\[ 1\text{PL.SM-help Kitso} \]
‘We help Kitso’

b. \[ \text{re-a-mo-thusa Kitso} \quad \text{DJ} \quad \text{w/ OM} \]
\[ 1\text{PL.SM-DJ-1OM-help Kitso} \]
‘we help him, Kitso’

c. \[ *\text{re-mo-thusa Kitso} \quad *\text{CJ} \quad \text{w/ OM} \]

d. \[ *\text{re-a-thusa Kitso} \quad *\text{DJ} \quad \text{w/o OM} \]
d. Emphasis on 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 léé sámátiengo? 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-lőwá 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 paring 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-nɡi-yí-bón-ē kàhlé.  CJ in relative perfect: -e
      9.book REL-1sg-9-see-PERF well
      ‘the book that I saw well’
   b. íncwàdí é-nɡi-yí-bón-îlè-(yó).  DJ in relative perfect: -île
      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 (prefixal) or aspect (suffixial) morphology: the prefixal/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 gitóondo.  
   John 1-work-ASP in morning  
   ‘John works in the morning.’

b. Yohaâni a-rá-kor-a, mu gitóondo.  
   John 1-PRS-work-ASP in morning  
   ‘John works, in the morning.’

c. b-iib-ye igitabo.  
   2-steal-ASP 7.book  
   ‘They stole the book.’

d. b-a-k-íib-ye.  
   2-PST-7OM-steal-ASP  
   ‘They stole it.’

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

a. ngi-natsa…  
   1sg-drink  
   ‘I drink…’

b. ngi-ya-natsa.  
   1sg-PRS.DJ-drink  
   ‘I am drinking.’

c. ngi-nats-é…  
   1sg-drink-PFV.CJ  
   ‘I have drunk…’

d. ngi-nats-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 –Ø-
   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-tsamá-íle lé boné. perfect CJ verb: HLHHL
   2SM-go-PERF with 2.PRO
   ‘They have gone with them.’

d. bá-tsáma-íle lé boné. perfect DJ verb: HHLLL
   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.


A. CJ/DJ tonal reduction in unmarked tenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DJ: ‘they tie’ etc.</th>
<th>CJ: ‘they tie Káto’ etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pr. hab.</td>
<td>ba-kóm-a</td>
<td>ba-kom-a káto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pst 1</td>
<td>bá-á-kóm-a</td>
<td>ba-a-kom-a káto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pst 2</td>
<td>ba-kom-il-e</td>
<td>ba-kom-il-e káto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pst hab.</td>
<td>ba-a-kóm-ag-a</td>
<td>ba-a-kom-ag-a káto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fut.1</td>
<td>ba-laak-kóm-a</td>
<td>ba-laak-kom-a káto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fut.2</td>
<td>ba-li-kóm-a</td>
<td>ba-li-kom-a káto</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. No tonal alternation in “marked” tenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DJ: ‘they are tying’ etc.</th>
<th>CJ: ‘they are tying Káto’ etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prog</td>
<td>ni-ba-kóm-a</td>
<td>ni-ba-kom-á káto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perf</td>
<td>bá-á-kóm-il-e</td>
<td>bá-á-kom-il-e káto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential</td>
<td>ba-lá-kóm-il-e</td>
<td>ba-lá-kom-il-e káto</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Persistive**

- Subj: ba-kóm-a
- Past 3: bá-ka-kóm-a

- ba-kyáá-kóm-a ba-kyáá-kóm-a káto
- kom-á káto
- bá-ka-kóm-a bá-ka-kóm- káto


**More on interpretational properties**

Marked temporal categories such as progressive, perfect, experiential, persistive 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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CJ</th>
<th>DJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>simple far past</td>
<td>SM-a-Vstem-aje</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simple today past</td>
<td>SM-Vstem-áje</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simple present</td>
<td>SM-Vstem-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simple future</td>
<td>SM-í-Vstem-aje</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simple altriloc fut.</td>
<td>SM-aká-Vstem-aje</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(27) Perfect reading of Ø-verb-iti

   ju-hfk-ití.

   3S-arrive-DJ

   ‘He has (already) arrived.’

   (Yoneda 2000:184 (29))

(28) Experiential reading

a. uhambo gwá kijápani ju-gu-jógwá-iti.


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

   (Yoneda 2000:179 (10))

b. twé tu-pí-iti kujelumáni.

   1pl 1pl-go-DJ 17.Germany

   ‘We’ve been to Germany (before).’

   (Yoneda 2000:179 (11))
(29) Progressive reading
   a. Ju-gonel-ití 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-ití 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.  
1-PST-do-CJ INF-cook  
‘She cooked (it).’

c. #María ju-a-telek-aje mbátata.  
PN 1-PST-cook-CJ10.sweet.potato  
#CJ + OBJ

d. * María ju-a-telek-aje  
*CJ + Ø

e. # María ju-a-telek-iti.  
#DJ

(32) A-tend-a ku-pomulela.  
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.  
1p.PRS-cultivate maize  
OBJ = focus  
‘We cultivate [maize].’

b. bi-tenda ku-memen?a  
2.PRS-do INF-eat  
truth-value focus  
‘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 nž mwarů.mů.  
    PN   ID teacher.  
      ‘Peter is a teacher.’  
 b. morothi nž nyámů.  
    lion   ID animal.  
      ‘Lion is an animal.’

**Operator focus**

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

**Kikuyu (E51)**

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

(37) Corrective assertion
    true   FOC 2.steal.ASP.FV  
    ‘They didn’t steal it (did they?)’ ‘Yes, they did steal it.’  
 b. #neguó, máí:re. [not emphasizing the positive polarity]

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

(38) a. nž kóreya aráreya mbóso kana nž asireire?  
    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?’

¹ It has been claimed (cf. Güldemann 1996, 1999) that the predicate following nž has the dependent verb form. In my data, however, there was no tonal or morphological evidence that the nž-marked verb in question is dependent.
b. nǐasíreíre.
   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 nǐ in front of the predicate. As with TAM focus, nǐ has L tone.
- Contrastive SoA is expressed by the (medial) focus preposing construction: [nǐ + non-finite V + finite V]. The subject, when present, is positioned before the doubling.

(40) Non-contrastive SoA focus
nǐ aráméthodékire.
   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. nǐ guthodéka aráméthodékire.
   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. #nǐ aráméthodékire. [not selective]
Corrective SoA focus

- \( n\)\(\bar{n}\) k\(\bar{o}\)muig\(\bar{a}\)t\(\bar{a}\) amuig\(\bar{a}\)t\(\bar{a}\)ire.

  FOC INF.chase.FV 1.1OM.hit.ASP.FV
  \{The woman hit Peter.\} ‘She CHASED him away.’

b. \( \#n\)i amuig\(\bar{a}\)t\(\bar{a}\)ire.

- 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)

Expression of present progressive

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

- mwan\(\bar{a}\) \(\bar{a}\)-ra:rey\(\bar{a}\) mb\(\bar{o}\):so.
  1child 1-PROG-eat.FV 6.bean
  ‘The child is eating beans.’

- mwan\(\bar{a}\) n\(\bar{i}\) k\(\bar{o}\)rey\(\bar{a}\) ara:rey\(\bar{a}\) mb\(\bar{o}\):so.
  1child FOC INF.eat.FV 1-PROG-eat.FV 6.bean
  ‘The child is eating beans.’

- *mwan\(\bar{a}\) ára:rey\(\bar{a}\).

- mwan\(\bar{a}\) n\(\bar{i}\) k\(\bar{o}\)rey\(\bar{a}\) ara:rey\(\bar{a}\).

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

Kikongo (H16, De Kind et. al 2013)

- 0-s\(\bar{o}\)nik-a k\(\bar{a}\)ka ba-s\(\bar{o}\)nik\(\bar{e}\)ni. SoA focus
  15-write-FV only 2-write-PERF
  ‘They only WROTE (a report).’
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 nǐ marked predicate can be clause-final, but the unmarked predicate can never be clause-final (also Güldemann 2008).

(48) a. mwaná nǐ 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 ní 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**

*Domæn 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?’

   8-potato 8-DEM wife 1-PST-8-boil-FV
   ‘As for these potatoes the wife (she) [cooked] them.’
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-pi-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.'

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

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

Pronominalization and null anaphora
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 nį arĩ:ré mbóso?
      1.woman FOC 1.eat.ASP.FV 6.bean
      ‘Did the woman eat the beans?’
   b. ee, nį arĩ:re. null anaphora (for object)
      yes, FOC 1.eat.ASP.FV
      ‘Yes, she did.’

(56) Kikuyu confirmation
   a. mutumía arigire Peter.
      1.woman 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) hĩń-Sepété ŋkháč’ ūlé 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.}
    Hĩń-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. siípa 'lion'

b. siipa 'it is a lion.'

c. siípá 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))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duala</th>
<th>wána</th>
<th>vs.</th>
<th>a ma-wáná matabato</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'to bring'</td>
<td>bító bá-manda</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>bító bá-mandá mabato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Women buy'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'Woman buy clothes.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basaa</td>
<td>a bí nujul</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>a bí nuŋul bísl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'he sold'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'he sold baskets'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mituku</td>
<td>kukúlúmanisa</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>Kukúlúmánisá bantu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to assemble'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'to assemble people'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• 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-lhá  ómálá  epakó.
   9.parent 9-PST-give 2.child 5.fruit
   ‘The parent gave the children the fruit.’

b. onjalí  y-á-lhá  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. kamafuláázhí eéttá m’ oonyényéya-nyenyeya.
      1.camouflage:cloths 1.go.REC 18.POSS INF.break -RED
   ‘the camouflage cloth tore into many pieces.’
   b. etílé y’ oovírísa muúlú mmoté kaméza yeéttá
      7.DEMiii 7.POSS INF.pass.CAUS 3.leg 3.one 9.shirt 7.go.REC
      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.}
   Terezénto 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SoA focus</th>
<th>Polarity/TAM focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ/DJ morphology</td>
<td>Makhuwa (Enahara), Kinyarwanda, Tsong, Shambaa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Matengo, Aghem, Zulu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>In-situ dummy V</td>
<td>Matengo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ndendeule, Ngoni</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3  a  ni focus constructions  
      (L)  
      (H in polarity foc)  
      mu:: 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
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