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Preface

In KENGA (Nilo-Saharan, Sara-Bagirmi), one special form of verbal doubling occurs:

(1) M-ɔɔc k-ɔɔc.\(^1\)

1S-semer INF-semer

{Que fais-tu ici? – Ne vois-tu pas? –} Je sème. (Neukom 2010: 130)

{{What are you doing here? – Can’t you see it? –} I am sowing. – PJ}

(1) shows the following structure:
- two occurrences of one and the same verb form appear in one and the same clause
- the first verb form is finite, the second verb form is non-finite

→ this construction is called “non-finite in-situ doubling”

In KENGA, it is used to signal to more than one function:
- first, it expresses progressive; Neukom (2010: 130), referring to Vandame (1968: 37), argues that the progressive is expressed by verbal doubling as shown in (1)
- second, it indicates predicate-centered focus; as seen from the context in (1), the example expresses focus on the lexical meaning of the verb (“SoA focus”)

→ Why is one special structure be used for realizing two different functions? or What is the link between progressive and predicate-centered focus?

I will use a data corpus (Neukom 2010) for
1. a quantitative study for investigating the distribution of PCF in general and
2. a qualitative study for focussing on the function of non-finite in-situ doubling

\(^1\) In the literature for KENGA, all three tones are marked (á, ā and ã). For consistency reason (with other Sara-Bagirmi langauges), I will abstain here to explicit marking of middle tones.
1 Theoretical background

1.1 Information structure

Information structure reflects the formal means exploited to organize utterances, sentences and texts according to the common ground of the interlocutors (Chafe 1976, Krifka 2007). Here, the most important categories are topic and focus.
- for focus, different scopal types are distinguished in the literature. Depending on the syntactic category of the element in focus we differentiate (beyond other types) term focus and “predicate-centered focus” (Güldemann 2009).
- Predicate-centered focus (PCF) refers to non-nominal elements of the clause. It subsumes focus on the lexical meaning of the verb (SoA focus) and focus on sentence operators. Operator focus can be split into focus on the tense, aspect or mood operators (TAM focus) and focus on the truth value of the utterance (Polarity focus).

1.2 General remarks on Kenga

- SVO language:

(2) m táá-d-n mét-n tàar tūpiyù.

1S:FUT dire-CONN après-CONN parole:CONN lion

Je vais raconter l’histoire du lion. (Neukom 2010: 265)

(I will tell you the story of a lion. – PJ)

- predominantly agglutinative with synthetic features
- tone language with three level tones (high: á, middle: a, low: à):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAM system</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General form (3a)</td>
<td>$V_{\text{FIN}}$</td>
<td>Events with no reference of time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive (3b)</td>
<td>$V_{\text{FIN}} - V_{\text{INF}}$</td>
<td>Ongoing events, for PCF marking (and more)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future (3c)</td>
<td>$a^2 - V_{\text{INF}}$</td>
<td>Uncertain events with future tense reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfect (3d)</td>
<td>$V_{\text{FIN}}$gà</td>
<td>Completed events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resultative (3e)</td>
<td>$V_{\text{FIN}}$gà $- V_{\text{INF}}$</td>
<td>“Focusing on the result of the action”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definite future (3f)</td>
<td>$a$-kà $- V_{\text{INF}}$</td>
<td>For certain events with future tense reference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: TAM system in Kenga (based on the data in Neukom 2009, Neukom 2010)

2 The future is realized by a periphrastic structure containing auxiliary a, which is derived from the verb ëdà ‘go’ (Neukom 2010: 124), and a following non-finite verb.
information-structure is expressed by morpho-syntactic means
- IS marked elements usually occur in sentence-initial position
- this position can be used for focal and topical elements as well
- its concrete interpretation is disambiguated by the usage of several markers
- the markers refer to preceding elements and occur in different structures

**Focus on nominal elements** is realized by extra-posing and additional marking:

(4) Korrà (ki) bó m-ɛɗ-iŋ gûrs.
    PN    LOC  FOC  1S-donner-3S argent
    [IO bó]_{FOC} [(S_{PRO})-V-(IO_{PRO}) DO]_{BG}

    {À qui as-tu donné l’argent?} C’est à Korra que je l’ai donné.
    (Neukom 2010: 224)

    {{To whom did you give the money?}
    It is Korra, to whom I gave the money. – PJ)

In (4), the indirect object (recipient) appears sentence-initially
- it is followed by the generic focus marker bó
- the rest of the sentence provides the background (without further marking)
- term focus structure: [NP bó]_{FOC} – [...]_{BG}

PCF types are realized by other means:
some structures are related to TAM marking strategies, e.g.
- operator focus is marked by using perfect structures (suffix -gà/-kà) and
- SoA focus is expressed by using progressive structures

Before I go in detail to KENGA data, I will give an overview over the structural and functional characteristics of the progressive
1.3 The progressive

“Progressive views an action as ongoing at reference time” (Bybee et al. 1994: 126)

Historically, most progressive structures are based on locative expressions or - structures with the meaning of continuity of an activity (Bybee/Dahl 1989: 77ff.)

For encoding means, progressives
- show a tendency to be marked periphrastically (85 % of all cases in Dahl 1985: 91)
- (due to high iconicity) often expressed by “reduplication” (Parkvall 2003: 20f.)

Bybee et al. (1994) propose the paths for the functional extension of reduplication:
- it starts as iterative (in the sense of “more of the same”) and can be split into
  - continuative (which extends to progressive) and
  - frequentative (which extends to habitual),
- both come together again to imperfective (which extends further to intransitive)

Figure 1: Tentative paths for the extension of reduplication (Bybee et al. 1994: 172)

Functionally,
- progressive could be classified as a special case of imperfectivity (Comrie 1976)

Dahl (1985: 92f.) lists three features for the contradistinction to imperfective aspect:
1. time reference: perfective/imperfective is strongly correlated between past and non-past time reference; progressive is almost independent (for present, past, and future)
2. habitual meaning: progressive is quite infrequently extended to habitual meaning
3. dynamic verbs: progressive is often used only for dynamic (non-stative) situations

Progressive is characterized by the “pragmatic component of inherent focality“:
- it occurs frequently in direct communicative interaction of dialogues and
- it is excluded from sentences in which the focus is not on the predicate
(Güldemann 2003: 352ff.)
2 Data analysis (Neukom 2010)

2.1 Data and methods

I select 10 texts from Neukom (2010) – in total 112 sentences with 1,137 words:
1. Dialogue 1: Greetings in the morning (19 sentences with 64 words)
2. Dialogue 2: Living in village or in town? (39 sentences with 553 words)
3. Story 1: The lion (6 sentences with 49 words)
4. Story 2: The fire (8 sentences with 61 words)
5. Description 1: Beer production (5 sentences with 43 words)
6. Story 3: Name of Mount Kenga (4 sentences with 50 words)
7. Description 2: Game at school (13 sentences with 114 words)
8. Description 3: The pelican (8 sentences with 59 words)
9. Explanation 1: Kenga dialects (8 sentences with 102 words)
10. Description 4: Divorce (2 sentences with 42 words)

For analyzing, I have subdivided all sentences in the text in 211 clauses, and subtract:
- 13 clauses (6,16 %) as questions
- 14 clauses (6,64 %) as thetic utterances
- 7 clauses (3,31 %) as non-verbal clauses and
- 59 clauses (27,96 %) as subordinated and provide background information only:

(5) kɛ̃ mãm  m-á̃k-fĩ  nŭm, ...
    SUB    1S  1S-voir-3S  si
    [kɛ̃ SBJ  V_{FIN}  nŭm]_{BG}

Comme je vois les choses, ... (Neukom 2010: 263) (As far as I can see, ... – PJ)

The remaining 118 clauses (55,93 %) can be classified as categorical:

Figure 2: The distribution of all clauses in the corpus

- The quantitative study (in 2.2.) contains all categorical clauses
- The qualitative study (in 2.3.) concentrates on non-finite in-situ doubling
2.2  *The quantitative analysis*

For investigating the *scope of focus*, the 118 clauses can be subdivided in:
- 83 clauses (70,34 %) with **VP focus**,  
- 18 clauses (15,26 %) with **term focus**,  
(12 (10,17 %) subject focus, 5 (4,24 %) object focus, 1 (0,85 %) adverbial focus)  
- 17 clauses (11,01 %) with **PCF**  
(5 clauses (4,23 %) with SoA focus and 12 clauses (10,17 %) with polarity focus):

![Occurrences of focus in categorical clauses](image)

Figure 3: Occurrences of focus: VP focus vs. other focus types

- the majority of clauses contains VP focus\(^3\) (more than two-thirds) and  
- the remaining one third expresses in nearly equal parts term focus and PCF

From all 118 categorical clauses, only 31 clauses (26,27 %) are marked for focus,  
- 87 clauses (73,73 %) show “weak” or default focus:

![Occurrences of focus in categorical clauses](image)

Figure 4: Occurrences of focus: Marked and unmarked focus

For **subject focus**, all instances (12 clauses) are marked:  
- 11 clauses are marked by (fronting and) focus marker *bó*,  
- 1 clause is marked by (fronting), additive particle *kic*, focus marker *bó* and *këè*\(^4\)

---

\(^3\) Even if I categorized the clauses carefully by pragmatic issues (and sort contextual given elements out from the focus part), it cannot be excluded that clauses with VP focus contain (default) object focus or (default) PCF as well.
For **object focus**, all 5 occurrences are marked:
- 4 clauses are marked by fronting and focus marker ɓó,
- 1 clause is marked by fronting, additive particle kic and focus marker ɓó

For **adverbial focus**, the one and only occurrence is marked:
- by fronting and focus marker ɓó,

→ **Term focus marking occurs obligatorily** – always in the same way:
- the focused element is fronted and **morphologically marked** (in all cases by ɓó),
- the co-occurrence of focus marker and **additive particle** is possible

→ **VP focus** is always unmarked

For **SoA focus**, all 5 clauses are marked by **non-finite in-situ doubling**

**Polarity focus** is unmarked in 4 clauses, 8 clauses are marked:
- 2 clauses are marked by topic preposing (with focus marker kéé),
- 1 clause is marked by topic preposing (without morphological marking),
- 2 clauses are marked by verbal suffix -gà (simple form – for indicating perfect),
- 1 clause is marked by clause-final focus marker ɓó,
- 1 clause is marked by -gà (periphrastic form) and clause-final focus marker ɓó,
- 1 clause is marked by -gà (periphrastic form) and clause-final marker bès

→ **Polarity focus is not obligatorily** marked, but it can be expressed
- by **topic preposing** constructions⁶ (cf. Güldemann 2010) or
- by using in **TAM structures** with suffix -gà

---

⁴ Marker kéé emphasizes the element it follows. In most cases, it is used to express PCF:

(i) Naañ sé m-jèël kéé, è k-ɛ̄ŋ.

3S BG 1S-savoir FOC 3:FUT INF-trouver

Je suis sûr qu'il passera (à l'examen). (Neukom 2010: 175)

(I'm sure he will pass (an exam). – PJ)

⁵ Marker bès emphasizes the element it follows. It seems to express predominately PCF:

(ii) Gàɔ kom m-deek-iñ sé bès.

comme SUB 1S-dire-3S BG FOC

{Quelles parties du bœuf est-ce qu'on mange? – On mange tout. – Même les jambes? –}

Comme je l'ai dit. (Neukom 2010: 175) ({Which parts of the beef do we eat? – We eat everything. – Even the legs? –} As I have said. – PJ)

⁶ Even if the morphological marking of the topic part not occurs in the corpus, it is used frequently in KENGA.
2.3 The qualitative investigation

2.3.1 The structure: Non-finite in-situ doubling in KENGA

Cross-linguistically, verbal doubling is characterized by
- the co-occurrence of two (lexically identical) verb forms in one sentence

The doubling can be embedded
- in split structures, e.g. preposing strategies, or
- in structures without preposing, e.g. as “non-finite in-situ doubling”

→ Non-finite in-situ doubling is always structured in the same way:
- the first verb form is finite, the second verb form is non-finite: $[V_{\text{FIN}}] [V_{\text{INF}}]$

In KENGA, sentences with this doubling structure fulfill several functions:
Vandame (1968) describes it as indicating progressive meaning
- but the given examples imply more imperfective meaning:

(6a) m-ɔ́sk-ɔ́sɔ́
1S-manger INF-manger
{Que fais-tu?} je mange (Vandame 1968: 37)
((What do you do?) I eat/I’m eating – PJ)

(6b) m-ai k-ài màne
1S-boire INF-boire eau
{Que fais-tu?} je bois de l’eau (Vandame 1968: 37)
((What do you do?) I drink water/I’m drinking water – PJ)

Neukom (2010) adopts the classification of Vandame (1968), and presents more data:
- the verbal doubling often indicates an iterative meaning:

(7) kaaga kɔ̀-cɔ́c-ìñ còɔ̀còɔ̀.
bois 1P-tailler-3S tailler
Le bois, on le taille (longtemps). (Neukom 2010: 132)
(The wood was treated several times (or for a long time). – PJ)

- it can be used to express ingressive meaning:

(8) nàañ ɔ́s k-ɔ́sɔ́
3S manger INF-manger
il se met à manger (Neukom 2010: 132) (He starts to eat – PJ)
- it can occur to denote **ongoing events in the past**:  
(9) Naán 量产 k-量产 tàa dóob ki.  
3S 3s:asseeor INF-s:asseeor bord:CONN chemin LOC  
{Que faisait-il quand tu es arrivé? –} Il était assis devant la porte.  
(Neukom 2010: 131) {(What was he doing when you arrived? –}  
He was sitting outside the front door. – PJ)

Neukom (2010) gives also examples, which are non-typical for the progressive:  
- verbal doubling occurs with **non-dynamic verbs**:  
(10) ðin teít-ìy, naán ðor k-ðor sum.  
chose faire-3S NEG 3S 3:se_fatiguer INF-fatiguer seulement  
{Qu’a-t-il? –} Rien, il est seulement fatigué. (Neukom 2010: 131)  
{(What is with him? –} Nothing, he is only tired. – PJ)

- even the combination with the perfect is possible, which is called **“resultative”**:  
(11) ì-s-gà kòsò  
1S-manger-PERF INF-manger  
j’ai mangé (Neukom 2010: 132) (I ate – PJ)

As seen in (11), non-finite in-situ doubling expresses not exclusively progressive  
- the construction must be analyzed more pragmatically:  
- it implies the **intensification of the verb**, which serve more than only one function

### 2.3.2 Analysis (non-finite in-situ doubling in the corpus)

In the corpus, there are **10 occurrences** of non-finite in-situ doubling  
- in the following, I will present the occurrences and  
- analyze them structurally and functionally in detail

(12) Example 1: Text 2 (Dialogue 2, sentence 16):  
Gòt-ñì àr sé, maám m-ñs k-ñs bèè, …  
lieu-REL ici BG 1S 1S-manger INF-manger bien  
[lé]_BG [VFIN]_BG [VINF ]FOC  
Ici, on mange bien, {là-bas vous mangez les feuilles du savonnier, les résidus de l’arbre cáâmi, et toutes les choses qui n’ont pas d’huile.} (Neukom 2010: 262)  
(Here, we eat well, {there you eat soap leaves, the rests of caami tree leaves,  
and all the things that have no oil.} – PJ)
Structurally, (12) starts with a local frame, which is indicated as background by sé,  
- the subject follows and precedes the finite form, which includes subject agreement,  
- the non-finite form follows immediately and precedes an adverbial

Functionally, the construction effects **intensification**  
- this includes the **(lexical meaning of the) verb** and the following **adverbial** and  
- can be interpreted as SoA focus or **focus on the VP**

Concerning TAM, it expresses more **imperfective** or “aorist” than progressive

(13) Example 2: Text 2 (Dialogue 2, sentence 32):

```
Jéé měttiŋ sé, naadé mala' ààr k-ààr nààba, ...
gens certain BG 3P même 3:craindre INF-craindre travail  
```

Certains ne veulent pas (lit. craignent) travailler eux-mêmes, {sinon, ici en ville,  
il y a beaucoup de travail.} (Neukom 2010: 264)

(Some people don’t want to (lit. fear the) work, {but, here in the city, there is a  
lot of work.} – PJ)

(13) starts with an aboutness topic marked by sé and a pronoun with particle mala,
- the next element is the finite form, which includes the (inherent) subject agreement,
- the non-finite form follows immediately and precedes the object

The structure effects **intensification**  
- this includes the **(lexical meaning of the) verb** and the **object**,  
- thus, it can be interpreted as SoA focus or **focus on the VP**

It is not used to express the progressive, it expresses more **imperfective** or “aorist”

---

7 Neukom (2010) glossed mala as “emphatic element”. It functions as scalar particle (‘even’)  
and precedes often focus marker bó (iii), which is necessary for indicating the focus part (iv):

(iii) Maám kic maám mala bó ní-túg kál-ûm.  
1S aussi 1S EMPH FOC 1S-laver habit-1S.POSS  
Moi, je lave aussi mes habits moi-même. (Neukom 2010: 89)

(I do even my laundry myself. – PJ)

(iv) Naaí mala  ámb-gààrge gen déè.  
2S même 2-chef pour tête  
Tu es autonome (lit. tu es le chef pour la tête toi-même). (Neukom 2010: 262)

(You are autonomous (lit. You are your own boss on your own head). – PJ)
(14) Example 3: Text 2 (Dialogue 2, sentence 33):

{Certains veulent (lit. disent) choisir leur travail} et sont orgueilleux.

(Neukom 2010: 264)

((Some people want (lit. say) choose their work)
and they are arrogant. – PJ)

Here, the finite form is a **periphrastic structure** (an auxiliary and the finite verb)
- the non-finite form follows immediately

The structure effects **intensification** to the (lexical meaning of the) verb
- therefore, the structure must be interpreted as **SoA focus**

(14) contains **non-dynamic verbs** (which occur very unlikely in the progressive)
- the structure indicates more **imperfective** or “aorist” than progressive

(15) Example 4: Text 3 (Story 1, sentence 3):

Nous étions sur le chemin de retour (lit. nous nous sommes levés et nous sommes en train de monter, c’est-à-dire de rentrer vers le village) {quand nous avons vu des lumières.} (Neukom 2010: 266)

(We were on the way back (lit. we stand up and we are going up, for returning to the village) {when we saw the lights.} – PJ)

The sentence shows a **periphrastic structure**, which starts with a finite verb,
- followed by the finite form (with subject agreement and ventive marker),
- the non-finite form follows immediately and precedes the background marker sé,
- the marker indicates the whole clause as background

Functionally, the structure indicates **continuative**
- it characterized an ongoing process
- therefore, it is used to express exclusively **progressive**
(16) Example 5: Text 3 (Story 1, sentence 5):

\[
\text{Kàam mòɔt-ŋ sé, ká-ɓàà j-ŋ} \text{ tûpiyù } \text{îng k-ɓiŋ.}
\]

\[
\text{côté après-REL BG 1P-aller 1P-trouver lion 3:s’asseoir INF-s’asseoir [ sé]_{BG} [ V_{FIN} V_{INF}]_{FOC}}
\]

Après un moment, nous avons trouvé un lion couché sur le sol (lit. qui étais assis). (Neukom 2010: 266)

(After a while, we found a lion lying on the ground (lit. who was sitting). – PJ)

The first element in (16) is a temporal frame, marked by sé,
- it is followed by a VP, which includes the finite form and the non-finite form

The structure effects intensification, but it marks an ongoing process as well
- I assume, that this doubling structure is used to express exclusively **progressive**

(17) Example 6: Text 4 (Story 2, sentence 1):

\[
\text{ɓii kàlan sé naajé j-ŋg kà-tcól tóol mààk-...)}
\]

\[
\text{jour IDEF BG 1P 1P-rester 1P-tuer tuer ventre-1P.POSS [ sé]_{BG} V_{FIN} V_{FIN} V_{INF}}
\]

Un jour, on se reposait (lit. on restait et tuait notre ventre) {en brousse sous un arbre.} (Neukom 2010: 267)

(One day, we rested (lit. stayed and killed our bellies) {in the bush under a tree.} – PJ)

(17) is an (introductive) **thetic utterance** with a temporal frame (marked by sé),
- followed by an emphasized subject pronoun
- the finite form is a **periphrastic structure** (auxiliary and finite verb form),
- followed by the non-finite form and the object

Functionally, the construction expresses **simultaneity**
- this can be interpreted as indicating PCF (c.f. similar to ‘as soon as’ constructions),
- concerning TAM, the structure marks **progressive**

(18) Example 7: Text 5 (Description 1, sentence 1):

\[
\text{… kà-jàd-iŋ kààfà pòòd-ŋ.}
\]

\[
\text{1P-1P-faire_couler-3S INF-faire_couler feu-LOC [ V_{FIN} V_{INF} ]}
\]

\{L’argui est une boisson qu’on prépare} en la faisant couler goutte à goutte sur le feu. (Neukom 2010: 270)

{(Argui is a drink, that we prepare} in letting it drop into the fire. – PJ)
(18) is a thetic utterance (with introductive function)
- the relevant clause entails the finite form, the non-finite form and the object

The structure expresses iteration (“drop by drop”), a common domain of progressive

(19) Example 8: Text 5 (Description 1, sentence 3):
... naaí ááy-gà sé, tòol-i tòol. 
2S 2:boire-PERF BG 3:tuer-2S tuer

{Et si quelqu’un – si tu n’as pas mangé et) tu en bois, cela te tue.  
(Neukom 2010: 270)

(If anyone –) if you drink it (although you didn’t eat), it will kill you.  – PJ)

After a conditional clause (marked by sé), the finite form and the non-finite form occur

This structure effects intensification to the (lexical meaning of the) verb
- it can be interpreted as SoA focus (with predominately imperfective meaning)

(20) Example 9: Text 5 (Description 1, sentence 5):
kààd-ń aра naadé ing ááy k-àaye. 
moment-REL ici 3P 3:rester 3:boire INF-boire
[ ]BG [ V FIN V FIN]BG [V INF]FOC

À ce moment là, ils sont déjà assis et boivent. (Neukom 2010: 270)

(At this time, they sit down and drink. – PJ)

The first element in (20) is an unmarked temporal frame, followed by the pronoun
- the finite form occurs as periphrastic structure and precedes the non-finite form

The construction expresses simultaneity and can be interpreted as indicating PCF
- even if the structure marks progressive as well

(21) Example 10: Text 6 (Story 3, sentence 1):
... jéé gè-ń tê ààn k-ààn mét-n cëñ ki sé.
gens P-REL CONT 3:arriver INF-arriver sous-CONN PN LOC BG
V FIN V INF

{Le mont Kenga, on l’appelle Kenga dans le sens que, premièrement,}
les gens qui venaient au pied du mont Kenga. (Neukom 2010: 270)

((Mount Kenga was called Kenga, at the first time) people came to this
mountain. – PJ)
(21) is a monomial **thetic utterance** (with introductive function)
- the relevant clause contains the finite form, the non-finite form and an adverbial

Even if the structure effects intensification on the (lexical meaning of the) verb
- it marks an ongoing process, thus, it is used to express exclusively **progressive**

### 2.3.3 Summary

The occurrences of non-finite in-situ doubling can be characterized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Glosses</th>
<th>TAM</th>
<th>Verb semantic</th>
<th>Scopus</th>
<th>IS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dialogues:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ṣs</td>
<td>to eat</td>
<td>IPFV/PROG active, intransitive</td>
<td>+ ADV</td>
<td>SoA/VP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ààr</td>
<td>to fear</td>
<td>IPFV/PROG stative, transitive</td>
<td>+ OBJ</td>
<td>SoA/VP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>òòn</td>
<td>to be arrogant</td>
<td>IPFV/PROG stative, intransitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Narratives:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>òòk</td>
<td>to walk up</td>
<td>PROG active, intransitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ìŋ</td>
<td>to sit down</td>
<td>PROG active, intransitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>tɔɔl</td>
<td>to kill</td>
<td>PROG active, transitive + OBJ</td>
<td>Thetic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>ààɗ</td>
<td>to drain</td>
<td>PROG active, transitive + OBJ</td>
<td>Thetic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>tɔɔl</td>
<td>to kill</td>
<td>IPFV/PROG active, transitive</td>
<td>SoA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>àày</td>
<td>to drink</td>
<td>PROG active, intransitive</td>
<td>SoA/PCF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>ààn</td>
<td>to arrive</td>
<td>PROG active, transitive + ADV</td>
<td>Thetic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: The occurrences of non-finite in-situ doubling in the present corpus

Every example of non-finite in-situ doubling
- shows the (for the progressive) typical **periphrastic structure** and
- refers (even with **imperfective meaning**) to the **progressive**

The progressive in KENGA seems to be special in one point:
- it is applicable for **non-dynamic verbs**
- cross-linguistically, this usage is possible – even if it is not very common
  ⇒ In all of the examples, the structure can be analyzed as **expressing progressive**

Pragmatically, non-finite in-situ doubling is used to **indicate PCF**
- it occurs in **direct communicative interaction** and
- the scope of focus is – at least – on the **VP or the lexical meaning of the verb**

The structure appears in **thetic utterances** as well
- this confirms the correlation between theticity and PCF (c.f. Güldemann 2013)
As seen from the corpus data, the concrete meaning depends on the text type:
- in dialogues, all the examples are predominantly used for expressing focus
- in narratives, only two occurrences are used for indicating focus

→ KENGA shows a co-occurrence of (special) TAM marking and PCF expression

Historically, it raises the question, whether the marking is the primarily one? For an overview, I will include data from other Sara-Bagirmi languages

In BAGIRMI,
- non-finite in-situ doubling marks exclusively focus on the lexical meaning of the verb
- the object occurs either in the left periphery (22a) or remains in-situ (22b):

(22a) non-finite in-situ doubling construction with topically focused object:

Djùm  tēŋ  ná,  Boukar  tād  tādâ.
gruel  millet  BG  PN  PFV.do  INF.do

(22b) non-finite in-situ doubling construction with included object:

Boukar  tād  djùm  tēŋ  tādâ.
PN  PFV.do  gruel  millet  INF.do

{Did Boukar cook millet gruel or did he eat it?}
(Boukar COOKED millet gruel. (Jacob 2010: 129)

Structurally, the finite form appears in its canonical position

- the non-finite verb form follows the finite verb form (without any marking)

The progressive in BAGIRMI
- is expressed by a periphrastic structure with a particle with locative meaning:

(23) (née)  n-ēt°  ndugo  kitàb  kéde
3S  3S-PROG  buy  book  IDEF
he is buying a book (Jacob 2006: 31)

° This analysis is based on examples with “marked” infinitives (by prefix k-). This prefix occurs only with verbs of conjugation class I and II, cf. Stevenson (1969: 112).
° The auxiliary ēt(u) ‘be in a place’ is used to indicate continuous actions in present time, past time, or in the future (Stevenson 1969: 122).
MBAY shows the same differences of TAM expressions and PCF marking as BAGIRMI:
- the non-finite in-situ doubling is used for indicating SoA focus only:

(24) Njór dá åtə k-åtə ko mājə sə ãí.

The eggplant was so bitter that it wasn’t good to eat. (Keegan 1997: 150)

- progressive is expressed by a periphrastic structure that uses a suffix with locative meaning in the finite part (Keegan 1997: 69f.)

In KENGA, the structural co-incidence of TAM and PCF marking
- illustrates the functional correlation of both categories
  ➔ it is possible to encode TAM and PCF by the same means
- in Sara-Bagirmi, this co-incidence of TAM and PCF must be considered as exception

From historical perspective,
- KENGA seems to be more archaic than other members of the language family
  ➔ it cannot assumed, that KENGA loses (once existing) progressive structures
- other languages have developed new strategies (for disambiguating TAM and PCF)
  ➔ the progressive structures, which uses TAM suffixes, seem to be the innovation
  (this strategy cannot be a “traditional” one, because it is unknown in KENGA)

Bases on Sara-Bagirmi, I argue that doubling always starts with pragmatic function:

Figure 5: Modified path for extension after Bybee et al. (1994: 172)

I assume, that “intensification” is the universal concept for expressing focus, therefore
- the grammaticalization extends from PCF marking to special TAM expressions,
  i.e. the (primary) pragmatic function is expanded to a (special) grammatical function

In Sara-Bagirmi languages, both level of grammaticalization co-exist:
1. Level: The co-incidence of PCF and TAM (non-finite in-situ doubling in KENGA)
2. Level: The disambiguating of PCF and TAM (in BAGIRMI and MBAY):
  - non-finite in-situ doubling will be restricted to pragmatic function (SoA focus only)
  - for marking TAM (progressive), another strategy is used (suffixes with local meaning)
3 Summary

The corpus study has shown
- the majority of categorical clauses (two-thirds) entails VP focus,
- term focus and PCF are almost balanced (in the remaining third)
- only one quarter of all categorical clauses are marked for focus:
  - term focus is obligatorily marked (and in all cases by the same means)
  - Polarity focus shows variation: there are default clauses and several encoding means
  - SoA focus is always marked by the same means

The structure “non-finite in-situ doubling” is used for
- expressing progressive and indicating focus as well
- the function depends on text type: focus in dialogues and TAM in narratives

With this overlapping function, KENGA represents an exception in Sara-Bagirmi

Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONN</td>
<td>Connective</td>
<td>PERF</td>
<td>Perfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONT</td>
<td>Continuative</td>
<td>PFV</td>
<td>Perfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPH</td>
<td>Emphatic</td>
<td>PN</td>
<td>Proper name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>Finite</td>
<td>POSS</td>
<td>Possessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOC</td>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>PRO</td>
<td>Pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>Future</td>
<td>PROG</td>
<td>Progressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEF</td>
<td>Indefinite</td>
<td>REL</td>
<td>Relative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF</td>
<td>Infinitive</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>Locative</td>
<td>SBJ</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>SUB</td>
<td>Subordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBJ</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>VENT</td>
<td>Ventive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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