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1 Introduction

+ Meeussen (1967: 121) reconstructs an “Advance verb construction” for Proto-Bantu involving a fronted infinitive:

A peculiar kind of sentence, with twice the same verb, the first occurrence being an infinitive, is attested frequently, and will have to be ascribed to Proto-Bantu. The meaning varies between stress of “reality”, stress of “degree”, and even “concession”: kutáku ñá báátáku ñá, “they chewed as (much as) they could”; “(as for chewing) they did chew, (but ...)”.

> infinitive before cognate finite verb, hence in the preverbal domain, cf. Suundi (H31b)

(1) kù-tá:ngà ndyèká-tá:ngà vs. ndyèká-tá:ngà
INF-read 1S:FUT-read 1S:FUT-read je vais LIRE. je vais lire. (Hadermann 1996: 161)

> since then much more data on such constructions have come up, both cross-linguistically and for Bantu - the latter will be surveyed in the following

+ Güldemann (2003: 335-7) viewed this construction as pertaining first of all to the marking of information structure (IS), notably of so-called “predicate-centered focus (PCF)”, but had to leave open some important structural and functional details:

Two structural interpretations of the fronted-infinitive pattern are conceivable. Since the available sources do not give enough information, I cannot decide here which is the more appropriate one. The first analysis, which accounts in a straightforward way for the focus function, is that the initial infinitive is a preposed focus constituent in the form of a nominal term and the following finite verb is the predicate.

The second possibility is more complex, involving some form of functional reanalysis. That is, the construction may have originally had a topic-focus organization, best paraphrased as ‘As for VERBing, (I assert that) X VERB’, and this has yielded the conventionalized reading ‘X does VERB’. Such a pattern is parallel to a similar German expression, which is typically followed by an adversative clause. In a sentence like Spielen tut er, aber ihm fehlt ein eigenes Instrument. ‘he does play’ [lit.: to play, does he], but he needs an instrument of his own’, a clear contrast holds between the two clauses. Important for the present discussion is that this contrast is not only conveyed by the conjunction aber ‘but’, but also by the structure [infinitive + dummy verb + subject] in the initial clause by virtue of its focus on the predicate.

Figure 1: Basic subclassification of predicate-centered focus

2 IS-sensitive verb preposing in a cross-linguistic perspective

2.1 The concept of predicate-centered focus

+ predicate-centered focus (PCF) subsumes roughly non-term focus (as opposed to term focus in terms of Dik 1997), cf. “auxiliary focus” (Hyman and Watters 1984):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State of affairs (SoA)</th>
<th>Polarity (esp. truth value)</th>
<th>TAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>{What did the princess do with the frog?}</td>
<td>I cannot imagine that the princess kissed the slippery frog. (right now?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{Is the princess kissing the frog (right now)?}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) a. She KISSED him. b. Yes, she DID kiss him. c. She HAS kissed him.

2.2 Verb preposing from a cross-linguistic perspective

+ extensive literature on “predicate-clefts”, “verb doubling” etc. but inconclusive analyses for individual languages and cross-linguistically

> cf. Akan (Kwa, Niger-Congo) with two superficially similar cleft-like constructions:

(3) [FOC] <I [               BG ]
1S FOC 1S come-PST here yesterday I it was who came here yesterday; I (FOCUS) came here yesterday (Boadi 1974: 5-6)

(4) [ ? ] <I [               ? ]
1S ?FOC 1S come-PST here yesterday I (?) came here yesterday (Boadi 1974: 6)

- de (in opposition to na for “exclusive focus”) analyzed as marking “inclusive/non-exclusive focus”, but actually marks a topic (cf. Marfo and Bodomo 2005, Ameke 2010)
+ attempt towards a unitary typology of the entire domain by Güldemann (in prep.) with respect to three parameters, including two distinct types of PCF-related verb preposing
  a. verb focus preposing (aka “predicate cleft”) vs. verb topic preposing
  b. verb preposing vs. “in-situ” verb
  c. verb doubling vs. dummy-verb structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Verb preposing</th>
<th>III Verb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I Topic</td>
<td>II Focus</td>
<td>in-situ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Verb doubling</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>II.A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Dummy-verb structure</td>
<td>I.B</td>
<td>II.B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Dissected predicate constructions in PCF

+ central distinction between II.A (verb focus preposing) and LA (verb topic preposing), correlating robustly with two different subtypes of PCF, viz. SoA vs. operator focus
  > e.g., Akan (see above); or Amharic (Semitic, Afro-Asiatic):

(5) [ FOC ]<I [ BG ]

mäkina-w-n mäti’aggàn nā-w yā-t’aggàn-ā

repair:VN COP-3M.S REL-repair:3M.S

He REPAIRED the car. [lit.: It is repairing the car that he repaired] (A. Wetter, p.c.)

(6) [ TOP ]<I [ FOC ]

mäti’aggàn-ā t’aggan-o-all

repair:VN-TOP repair:CONV-3M.S-AUX:3M.S

He DID repair (the car). [lit.: As for repairing, he repaired.] (A. Wetter, p.c.)

+ variation between II.A (ex-situ verb focus preposing) and III.A (in-situ verb doubling) in closely related languages used both for PCF, corresponding with two focus positions
  > e.g., Sara-Bagirmi (Bongo-Bagirmi, Central Sudanic) with SoA focus:

(7) [ FOC ]<I [ BG ]<I (Mbay)

nā ndēssā lā ndēssā yē

but INF.worm.eaten G.FOC worm.eaten BG

{A: Your wood is bad. B: No, the wood is fine.} It’s just that it’s WORM-EATEN. [lit.: It’s worm-eaten that it’s worm-eaten] (Keegan 1997: 148)

(8) [ BG ]<I [ BG ]’ [ FOC ] (Bagirmi)

a. Džüm t’ød nā, Boukar tād tādā.

gruel millet BG PN PFV.do INF.do

{Did Boukar cook millet gruel or did he eat it?} Boukar COOKED millet gruel. [lit.: Boukar cooked (millet gruel) cooking] (Jakob 2010: 129)

b. Boukar tād djüm t’ød tādā.

PN PFV.do gruel millet INF.do

+ all three verb doubling constructions have close counterparts in dummy-verb structures
  > e.g., German (Germanic, Indo-European) with II.B (verb focus preposing) for SoA focus in (9) vs. I.B (verb topic preposing) for truth focus in (10), disambiguated just by prosody:

(9) [ FOC ] [ BG ]

LESEN tut er

read:INF does he

He READS (rather than sleeps). [lit.: reading he does]

(10) [ TOP ] [ FOC ]

L.Esen TUT er

read:INF does he

he DOES read (but ...) [lit.: as for reading, he does]

+ some languages with recourse to both verb doubling (A) and dummy-verb structure (B) without change of IS reading, and to preposing of both verb topic (I) and verb focus (II)
  > e.g., Hausa (Chadic, Afro-Asiatic) with LA in (11)a., LB in (11)b., and ILB in (12):

(11) [ TOP ]<I [ FOC ]

a. sāyē-n abincī kāo, sūn sāyā

buy:VN-GEN food moreover 3P.PFV buy

b. sāyē-n abincī kāo, sūn yī

buy: VN-GEN food moreover 3P.PFV do

[lit.: Buying food moreover, they bought/did. [they DID ...] (after Jaggar 2001: 542)

(12) [ FOC ]<I [ BG ]

sāyē-n abincī nī, sūkā yī

buy:VN-GEN food FOCS 3P.PFV,DEP do

They BOUGHT FOOD. (Green 2007: 60)

+ summary: three construction schemas (in SBJ-V-OBJ languages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preposing</th>
<th>I Topic</th>
<th>II Focus</th>
<th>III In-situ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B Dummy-verb structure</td>
<td>(10) German, (11)b. Hausa</td>
<td>(9) German, (12) Hausa</td>
<td>‘do’-support; e.g. English, Ndendeule</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Function: Operator focus SoA focus PCF

Table 2: Dissected predicate constructions in PCF across above examples
3 Preposed—“fronted” infinitives in Bantu
+ "predicate cleft" as a rampant feature in (West) African and Atlantic creole languages: cf., e.g., Gilman (1985), Mufwene (1987), Manfredi (1993), ...

3.1 Grassfield and northwesternmost zone A
+ IILA (in-situ verb doubling) and IILA (cleft-like ex-situ verb focus preposing) also attested recurrently in the homeland area of Narrow Bantu

Nweh (Grassfield): in-situ doubling
+ in-situ doubling (IILA) after verb phrase
(13) [BG] [FOC]
a. Atem a kɛ̀ʔ nčú ū akend ɔ̀ŋ čú ū akend ɔ̀ŋ
Atem BOILED plantains (Nkemnji 1995: 138) SoA focus
b. Atem a kɛ̀ʔ te nčú ū akend ɔ̀ŋ čú ū bɔ
Atem did not BOIL plantains (Nkemnji 1995: 140) SoA focus

Limbum (Grassfield): in-situ doubling and verb focus preposing
+ in-situ position for term focus as in (14).a. as source for IILA (in-situ doubling) as in (14).b.
(14) [BG] [FOC]
a. Nfɔ gɛ̀ ye ĺa byɛ;
It is food that Nfor is eating. [Nfor eats FOOD] (Ndamsah 2012: ex.(11).b.)
b. Nfɔ gɛ̀ bāmī ĺa bāmī (last verb in citation form, Ndamsah p.c.)
It is sleeping that Nfor is sleeping, not ... [Nfor SLEEPs rather than ...] (Ndamsah 2012: ex.(11).a.) SoA focus

3.2 Zones B and H
+ preposed infinitives as a common feature: first surveyed by Hadermann (1996); generic PCF analysis by Güldemann (2003); recent, more extensive survey by De Kind (2014)

Solongo (H16?, south)
(17) [FOC] [BG]
pe ke-be-nwananga ko, kina be-kinanga
No! NEG-2-fight:PROG NEG INF:dance 2-dance:PROG
It is not they're not fighting, they're DANCING. (De Kind et. al 2014: ex.(10).b.) SoA focus

Woyo (H16?, west)
(18) [FOC] [BG]
NCYA ka-tub-izi ba-saliliza u N-ti zenga ba-zeng-eza wao
What did she say that they did to the tree? They CUT it. (De Kind et. al. 2014: ex.(11)) SoA focus

Ndibu (H16?, central)
(19) [FOC] [BG]
mona mbwene N-kenda za zula ki-ame kina ...
INFS:see 1S:see:PERF 10-affliction 10:GEN 7.people 7-1S.POSS 7.DEM
I have surely seen the affliction of that people of mine there ... (De Kind et. al 2014: ex.(12)) SoA focus
3.2.1 Structure I: [Verb\_non-finite [SBJ Verb\_finite Other]]
+ only example encountered in the available data - coincidence or really rare?

3.2.2 Structure II: [SBJ [Verb\_non-finite Verb\_finite] Other]
+ preposed infinitive analyzed by Hadermann (1996: 158-9) as occurring in a preverbal focus position (quite unusual for “main-stream” Bantu):

Cependant, Grégoire (1993) a montré que l’antéposition de l’objet n’est pas exceptionnelle en zones B, C, H et K, c’est-à-dire au Nord-Ouest du domaine bantou. L’apparition de l’ordre SOV est, selon elle, liée à « l’expression de la focalisation portant sur l’objet du verbe transitif » ... ou à « l’emploi d’une forme composée de la conjugaison, ... » ....

Vili (H16?)
(23) [FOC] [ BG ]

Zali (H16?)
(27) [ TOP ] [ FOC] [ BG ]

Ndibu (H167, central)
(28) ye ma-toko ma-eno mana me-mona m-mona za ma iso and 6-younster 6-2P.POSS INF:see 6-see 10-vision 10:GEN 6-eye and your youth will see visions. (De Kind et al. 2014: ex.(3)) FUT
3.2.3 Structure III: [SBJ (OBJ) [Verb_{non-finite} Auxiliary] Other]

+ locative PROG periphrasis frequent typologically (Bybee and Dahl 1989) and in Bantu:

\[(SBJ) \ [\text{LOCATIVE}\text{-}\text{Copulative} \ \text{Verb}_{\text{non-finite}}] \ \text{Other} \]

= 'be in/at VERBing'

> e.g. Shona (S10)

(29) ndi-ri ku-taura
1S-be INF-talk
I am talking.

+ inversion of auxiliary and non-finite verb creates partial isomorphism with PCF structure:

The initial infinitive is followed here by a copulative auxiliary. It can be argued that the progressive meaning arises exclusively from the locative semantics of this final verb ...

However, I also see a functional link between the additional infinitive fronting here and in the [PCF] construction ... (Güldemann 2003: 336-337)

De Kind et al. (2014: Table 1) confirm this hypothesized affinity by shared behavioral properties, in opposition to the canonical structure [AUXILIARY VERB]

+ non-finite verb can be marked by different elements

Suundi (H13b)

(30) bâkù kâ-tângâ dyô kâ-dî
5.book INF-read SDEM 1-be
il est en train de lire le livre (Hadermann 1996: 166) PROG

Tsotso (H33)

(31) kù-wélâ ngî-râ
INF-be_sick 1S-be
je suis malade (Hadermann 1996: 165) IPFV~PROG

(32) mw-ândâ mú-sâkânâ kë-na
1-child INE-play 1-be
l'enfant est en train de blaguer (Hadermann 1996: 164) PROG

Sikongo (H16?, south)

(33) tala o-neyisâele mu sauka ba-inà o N-koko a yodâni
look:IMP 2-israelite INE cross 2-be AUG3 3-river GEN GN
Look! The Israelites are crossing the Jordan River. (De Kind et. al 2014: ex.(5))

Ndibu (H16?, central)

(34) wa-tâ mu leka be-na m-benî andî u-îs-idî
DEM14 DEM14 2-person INE sleep 2-be 3-enemy POSS1 1-come-PFV
While the people slept, his enemy came. (De Kind et. al 2014: ex.(41))

3.3 Zone E

+ Kikuyu mentioned already by Bynoe-Andriolo and Yillah (1975: 234) in connection with predicate-clefts but little researched so far > ongoing field work by Y. Morimoto

+ as opposed to the phenomenon in the zones B/H, the structure here is overtly bisected and cleft-like involving an identificational/focus marker before the exposed infinitive and traces of dependent clause-marking in the background part

+ selective SoA focus: with intransitive verbs or when no nominal object is given, the focus marker ne must occur before the predicate

> constructional difference of non-contrastive vs. contrastive SoA focus: only contrastive focus is expressed by verb focus preposing

Kikuyu (E51)

(35) I> [ FOC ] [ BG ]
A: {Audu loves his car. Yesterday he took care of it.}

B: ne gu-thâbiâ a-ra-mé-thâbi-rié kuna ne gu-thodéka a-ra-mé-thodê-irê
FOC INF-wash 1-PST-9-wash-PFV or FOC INF-fix 1-PST-9-fix-PFV
Did he wash or fix it? SoA focus

A: ne gu-thodêka a-ra-mé-thodê-ire
FOC INF-fix 1-PST-9-fix-PFV
He FIXED it. (Morimoto field notes) SoA focus

3.3.1 Structure I: [Verb_{non-finite} [SBJ Verb_{finite} Other]]

+ more robustly attested than in zones B/H data

> possibly correlated with stronger cleft-like syntactic bisection

Tharakia (E54)

(36) I> [FOC ] [ BG ]

a. i-kâ-gùra Maria a-gû-irë nyîndo
FOC-INF-buy 1.Maria 1-buy-PERF 9.hammer
Maria BOUGHT the hammer. (she did not borrow it) (Abels and Muriungi 2008: 704) SoA focus

b. i-ku-noga Maria a-rî mú-nog-u
FOC-INF-tire 1.Maria 1-be 1-tired-ADJ
Maria is really tired. (she is not kidding!) (Abels and Muriungi 2008: 704)

?Truth focus
Kikuyu (E51)

(37) I> [FOC] [BG]

a. *ne ate*a Abdul *e-k-ire na mae?*
   FOC what PN 1-do-PFV COM 6.water
   (What did Abdul do with the water?)

b. *ne ko-nyua Abdul a-nyu-ire mae*
   FOC INF-drink PN 1-drink-PFV 6.water
   He DRANK the water. (Schwarz 2003: 96)

(38) *nĩ kĩũ-nyua Kamau a-nyu-ire njohi ny-ing.*
   FOC INF-drink PN 1-drink-PFV 9.beer 9-lot
   Kamau DRANK a lot of beer. (Mugane 1997: 148)

3.3.2 Structure II: [SBJ [Verbnon-finite Verbfinite] Other]

Kikuyu (E51)

(39) [TOP] [FOC] [BG]

a. *Abdul ne a-thek-ire?*
   PN FOC 1-laugh-PFV
   Did Abdul laugh?

b. *Afa. Abdul ne ko-rera a-rer-ire.*
   No! PN FOC INF-cry 1-cry-PFV
   No. Abdul CRIED. (Schwarz 2003: 95)

(40) *mw-anĩ ne kó-reya a-ra-reya*
   1-baby FOC INF-eat 1-PROG-eat
   The baby is eating. (Morimoto field notes)

(41) *fafa w-ányũ nĩ gĩ-kenyũ a-ra-kiyũ (reu)*
   1.father 1S.POSS FOC INF-arrive 1-PROG-arrive now
   Your father is arriving (now) [as we speak]. (Morimoto field notes)

3.3.3 Structure III: [?SBJ [Verbnon-finite Auxiliary] ?Other]

Kuria (E43)

+ PROG structures with infinitive inversion parallel to those in zone H in Kuria (E43) and Gusii (E42)

(42) *ku-tuna n-dli*
   INF-seek 1S-be
   I am (in the act of) seeking. (Güldemann 2003: 337)

3.4 Zone K

+ restricted data amount and accordingly least clear in structural and functional terms

Mbukushu (K333)

Der Infinitiv kann emphatisch vor andere Verbalzeiten gesetzt werden [the infinitive can be
dropped emphatically before any verb form]:

(43) *ku-wa thi-nq ku-wa thi-tondo*
   INF-fall 7-PRS-fall 7-tree
   Der Baum fällt gerade [the tree is falling right now] PROG

(44) *ku-yenda nga ni yendi*
   INF-go HEST.PST 1S go:PFV
   Ich ging bestimmt [I did go] (Fisch 1977: 95) Truth focus

Sehr gebräuchlich ist das Präsens mit vorausgehenem Infinitiv im Sinne von ‘in der Tat’,
’sicherlich’ [the present preceded by the infinitive is recurrent in the sense of ‘indeed’,
‘certainly’].

(45) *ku-yenda tu-na ku-yenda*
   INF-go 1P-PRS-go
   Wir gehen ja schon [we DO go, don’t we] (Fisch 1977: 103) Truth focus

+ Möhlig (p.c.) explicitly analyzes the preposed infinitive as a TOPIC, which happens to be
compatible with the apparent operator focus reading BUT:

Fwe (K402)

(46) *ta-ri ku-syimba ndi-syimba ku-nenga ndi-nenga*
   NEG-be INF-sing 1S-sing INF-dance 1S-dance
   I am not singing, I am dancing. (Gunnink 2014) SoA focus

3.4.1 Structure II: [SBJ [Verbnon-finite Verbfinite] Other]

Mbukushu (K333)

(47) *ka-kambe ku-tjira ka-na ku-tjira*
   11-horse INF-run.away 11-PRS-run.away
   Das Pferd läuft gerade weg […] runs away right now (Fisch 1977: 95) PROG

Fwe (K402)

(48) *e-ci-shamu ku-temiwa ci-temiwa*
   AUG-7-tree INF-chop:PASS 7-chop:PASS
   The tree is being chopped. (Gunnink 2014) PROG
4. Discussion

4.1 Methodology

+ Bantu may possess both verb focus preposing for SoA focus and verb topic preposing for operator focus, harboring the same diversity found cross-linguistically but the specific subtype of PCF may be hard to detect in an individual language, for at least two reasons:

a) segmental structures are superficially largely identical:

(49) [ ??? ] [ ??? ] Suundi
INF-read 1S:FUT-read
je vais LIRE [I will READ] (Hadermann 1996: 161) SoA focus

b. ku-yenda tu-na_ku-yenda Mbukushu
INF-go 1P-PRS-go
Wir gehen ja schon [we DO go, don’t we] (Fisch 1977: 103) Truth focus

> considerable risk of trusting short descriptions - detailed study in terms of semantic-pragmatic effects as well as prosodic and morphosyntactic properties necessary:

In a slightly different respect, it is not obvious either that, strictly speaking, all the cleft-related focus constructions invoked from African languages involve Clefting. For instance, Gilman (1986: 39) discusses them quite cautiously under the rather vague term of “front-focusing”. The following example from his paper [from Ntându (H16g)] seems more to involve Topicalization than Clefting, though it certainly involves nominalization of the verb by prefix-deletion (which is common in a number of Bantu languages):

(50) tálá ká-zól-ele ka-tálá
see 1-want?STAT 1:SUBJ-see

a. He [really] wants to see. (Lit.: see he wants he may see.) (Mufwene 1987: 81, fn. 12) [TOP] [FOC ]

or

b. see he wants might see (Gilman 1986: 39)

c. He/she wants to see; literally: see he wants he might see (Lubasa 1974: 22)

> Lubasa (1974), as the original source, gives (50) in connection with his so-called “determinative mood” which in a second example, (51), clearly involves focus fronting

(51) [FOC ] [BG ]

mw-dând nd-támini
1-child 1-send:PST
it is a child that he/she has sent. (Lubasa 1974: 22)

b) a construction can start out in a restricted subdomain of PCF (i.e., SoA vs. operator) but expand over time in use towards the entire domain

> cf. focus fronting in Aja (Kwa, Niger-Congo) for object focus (as in a., SoA focus (as in (52)b.), truth focus (as in (52)c.), and TA focus (as in (52)d.)

(52) [FOC ] [BG ]

a. ñéü (yó) é ñékü
bean GF 3S eat
She ate BEANS [not ...].

b. ñó, ñá (yó) é ñá
No! cook GF 3S cook
(The woman ate the beans.) No, she COOKED them. SoA focus

c. ñó, nyá (yó) é nyávi
No! be.beautiful GF 3S be.beautiful
(She is not beautiful.) No, she IS beautiful. Truth focus

d. ñó, xó-i a xó-i
No! hit-3S.OBJ 3S.FUT hit-3S.OBJ
(The woman has hit Peter.) No, she WILL hit him. (Fiedler 2010) TA focus

4.2 Semantic-functional change

+ functional change captured by an assumed semantic map which has implications for expected historical change, notably pragmatics changes to semantics

> unclear whether operator focus can directly yield progressive (cf. Mbukushu, §3.4)

Figure 1: Preliminary semantic map for verb preposing constructions across Bantu
4.3 Morphosyntactic variation
+ presumed historical shift from I to II, viz. post-infinitive subject to clause-initial subject:

\[ \text{Ver}_1 \text{non-finite} \ [\text{SBJ} \text{Ver}_2 \text{finite} \text{Other}] > [\text{SBJ} [\text{Ver}_1 \text{non-finite} \text{Ver}_2 \text{finite}] \text{Other}] \]

> shift from bisected to monoclausal syntax, tightening the bond between the two verbs and potentially reestablishing a compact predicate constituent
> formal cline may correlate with above semantic cline, test whether I can(not) be semantic

4.4 Historical-comparative aspects
+ in spite of considerably increased documentation and understanding of infinitive fronting in Bantu we are thrown back to Meeussen (1967), which is short and hence quite vague:

*What exactly should be reconstructed for Proto-Bantu?*

> topic preposing as per Meeussen (1967) vs. more robust attestation of focus preposing?
> construction cross-linguistically frequent and quite diverse across Bantu: historical relation between or independent innovation in the different Bantu clusters?
+ as the construction encodes PCF, question of relation to other PCF strategies in Bantu (e.g., “conjunct–disjoint” > geographical survey for partly complementary distribution

Synchronic cases of polyfunctional infinitive preposing in Bantu must be evaluated in their wider structural, genealogical, and geographical context.

### Appendix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Language(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grassfields</td>
<td>Ndamsah (2012)</td>
<td>Limbum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone A</td>
<td>Biloa (1995)</td>
<td>Tuki (A601)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone B</td>
<td>Hadermann (1996)</td>
<td>Pumu (B43), Nzebi (B52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone H</td>
<td>Hadermann (1996)</td>
<td>Manyanga (H16b), Yombe (H16c), Ntandu (H16g), Kaamba (H17b), Yaka (H33), Suundi (H13b), Mbundu (H21), Tsotsot (H33), Holu (H33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone E</td>
<td>Bynoe-Andriolo and Yillah (1975)</td>
<td>Kikuyu (ES1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gültemann (2003)</td>
<td>Gusii (E42), Kuria (E43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abels and M. (2008)</td>
<td>Tharaka (E54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone K</td>
<td>Gültemann (2003)</td>
<td>Mbukushu (K333)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gunnink (2014)</td>
<td>Fwe (K402)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3: Infinitive preposing in Bantoid**

### Abbreviations

AUX Auxiliary, CJ Conjoint, CONN Connector, COP Copula, DEF Definite, DEM Demonstrative, DEP Dependent, EMPH Emphatic, F Feminine, FOC (Generic) focus, FUT Future, GEN Genitive, GN Geographical name, HAB Habitual, I Index, INE Inessive, INF Infinitive, IPFV Imperfective, LOC Locative, M Masculine, NEG Negative, OBJ object, P Plural, PERF Perfect, PFV Perfective, PN Proper name, POSS Possessive, POT Potential, PRON Pronoun, PROG Progressive, PROX Proximal, PRS Present, PST Past, REL Relative, S Singular, SBJ subject, SoA State-of-affairs, TA(M) Tense-aspect-(modality), TOP Topic, VN Verbal noun
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