Word order, information structure and agreement in Teke-Kukuya

Li, Z.

CHAPTER 4

On the origin of IBV focus

In many examples in the previous chapter we have noticed that the shape of the class 1 subject marker on the verb can vary according to word order. A straightforward example of this morphological alternation is given in (1).

(1) a. Taará ná **á**-béer-i?
1.father 1.who 1SM.PST-beat-PST
'Who beat father?' [OSV subject focus]

b. Taará ná **ká**-béer-i?
1.father 1.who 1SM.PST-beat-PST
'Whom did father beat?' [SOV object focus]

In (1a) the word order is OSV in which the subject is focused in IBV, and the class 1 subject marker takes the shape ***á***-; while in (1b) it is the object that is focused and the subject marker shifts to ***ká***-. Since in the canonical SVO word order, the class 1 subject marker always takes the form ***á***- in past tense, I assume the prefix ***á***- to be the default and unmarked form

of the class 1 subject marker, while ***ká***- is considered to be a marked allomorph. As observed from (1), it seems that the SM alternation takes place when some element other than the subject is fronted to the IBV position. Considering what I have presented in chapter 3 that the exploitation of the IBV position is always related to some type of focus expression, we may want to know whether this SM allomorphy is actually a dedicated morphological device to encode focus or it is just indirectly associated with focus. In fact, this SM alternation is not only attested in IBV focus constructions but also in relative clauses, which may imply a connection between the two constructions. I take the class 1 SM alternation as the starting point of this chapter on investigating the origin of the IBV focus strategy.

In this chapter, I corroborate the hypothesis that the IBV focus strategy originates from a cleft, based on segmental and tonal evidence connecting these two constructions. I first present the distribution of the subject marking allomorphy in different tenses and aspects and with subjects of different persons/noun classes. I show that this allomorphy only occurs with subjects of class 1 and class 3[1] and speech participants, and it is attested in the past and future tenses as well as in negative sentences. This morphological alternation is not directly related to focus marking but may have its precursor in a cleft construction which always involves a relative clause. In addition, some tonal evidence also suggests that the verbal tones in the IBV focus construction pattern with relative constructions. I attempt to propose a possible grammaticalisation path of the IBV focus construction and give the diachronic motivation for it. Section 4.5 makes reference to some other West-Coastal Bantu languages in which the IBV focus position is also attested, displaying some micro-variation with regard to this focus strategy.

[1]In many Teke varieties, class 1 and class 3 have merged, which may be due to their identical prefix shape (Hyman et al. 2019, also see chapter 2 section 2.3.2). The distinction on class 1 and class 3 nouns can only be distinguished in Kukuya from the different tone pattern of the connective marker, e.g. *mu-lúmi* (*cl.1*) ***aa*** *me* (my husband) and *mu-tímá* (*cl.3*) ***áá*** *me* (my heart). For simplicity, I only refer to class 1 nouns thereafter in this section.

4.1 Hypothesis: IBV focus originates from a cleft

I hypothesise that diachronically, the IBV focus strategy has its origin in a biclausal cleft construction and has been grammaticalised to become a monoclausal focus construction. That a focus construction can originate from a (pseudo-)cleft construction is not a brand new proposal in the studies of Bantu languages. In some previous studies of Bantu focus constructions, similar hypothesis was made for the IBV focus position in Kisikongo (Ndonga Mfuwa 1995; De Kind 2014), for the focus expressions in canonical word order in Hungan (H42, Takizala 1972, 1974). In Luganda there is also a preverbal focus construction that has developed from a biclausal cleft to a monoclausal focus construction, showing characteristics of both (van der Wal and Namyalo 2016). In Lingala and Kikongo speaking areas there is a *moto* construction expressing subject focus which is also analysed to have grammaticalised from a cleft (van der Wal and Maniacky 2015). Some northeastern Bantu languages such as Kikuyu have a verb-initial ***ni***- that can be used to express term focus and predicate focus, which was considered to be derived from a copula in a cleft construction (Bennett et al. 1985; Güldemann 2003; Nurse 2006).

Particularly, in De Kind's (2014) analysis of the IBV focus strategy in Kisikongo (H16a), he observes that the large variation in cleft constructions in Kisikongo actually forms a continuum on the word order level from a biclausal inverted pseudo-cleft to a monoclausal SOV focus structure. The same class 1 SM ***ka***- is used in SOV and non-subject relatives, alternating with other SMs in SVO or subject relative clauses, which can also show the connection between IBV focus and cleft. Nonetheless, he also admits that this hypothesis needs further corroboration by more tonal data. He points out that it should be investigated whether the tonal pattern of preverbal objects in monoclausal focus constructions correlates with that of focused constituents in biclausal clefts, and the verbal tone pattern in these two constructions should also be compared.

Now we consider some more grammatical properties of the IBV focus construction in Kukuya. One minimal pair of sentences is given in (2): the canonical word order SVOO in (2a) and the IBV focus construction with

SOVO order in (2b). If we compare these two sentences which superficially differ only in word order (and interpretation), some segmental and tonal variation on the focused element and the verb can also be noticed. We see the ***a***- versus ***ka***- alternation of the class 1 SM on the verb. The IBV focused element *má-désu* "beans" has a H toned prefix (2b), while the postverbal object in (2a) takes the default L toned prefix. In addition, the verb *ki-wâ* "to give" is realised as its unmarked HL tone pattern *-wî* in the canonical word order (2a), while its tone becomes H as *-wí* in the IBV focus construction (2b). In the IBV focus construction there is also a H tone observed on the postverbal noun prefix *bá-*, and it seems that there is a grammatical H tone occurring between the verb and the following prefix.

(2) a. Taará **áá**-**wî** **ba**a-ndzulí **ma**-désu.
1.father 1SM.PST-give.PST 2-cat 6-bean
'Father gave the cats some beans.' [SVOO]

b. Taará [**má**-désú]$_{[FOC]}$ **káá**-**wí** **bá**a-nzulí.
1.father 6-bean 1SM.PST-give.PST 2-cat
'Father gave some BEANS to the cats.' [SOVO]

In summary, in the SOVO order we have observed the class 1 SM *ka-* instead of class 1 SM *a-*, the H tone prefix on the IBV focused element, and the postverbal H tone. Given these characters of the IBV focus construction, next I discuss them in turn to investigate whether they can also be attested in cleft sentences.

4.2 Subject marking alternation in IBV focus and relatives

4.2.1 Subject marking alternation in IBV focus

First I introduce in which situations the subject marking alternation occurs and what shapes the allomorphs can have. This alternation does not only correlate with word order variation, but it is also entangled with tense/polarity of the sentence and is restricted to only speech participants (1/2SG/PL) and class 1 subjects. I will present different combinations of these determining factors of the SM in turn.

For class 1 subjects, the SM alternation with regard to word order and tense/polarity is summarised in Table 4.1. From the table we see that the default class 1 subject marker in both past and future tenses takes the form ***a***- in SVO and OSV; while it alternates to ***ka***- in a negative sentence and in SOV/S(O)XV, namely when a non-subject constituent is fronted to the IBV position. Some examples to help better understand the table are illustrated

word order	recent past	remote past	future
SVO and OSV	á	â	â
SOV and S(O)XV	ká	kâ	kâ
negative	ká	kâ	kâ

Table 4.1: The allomorphy of class 1 subject markers in Kukuya

in (3)-(11). In (3a) in the recent past tense, the subject marker occurs as the H toned prefix ***á***- when the sentence surfaces in SVO; and in (3b) the prefix shifts to ***ká***- when the theme object is fronted to the IBV position and gets focused. Similarly in (4a,b) when an adjunct is focused and placed in the IBV position, the subject prefix on the verb also appears as ***ká***-, regardless of the position of the object.

(3) a. Mu-loí **á**-wî báana wúna maa-nkúru.
1-teacher 1SM.PST-give.PST 2.children only 6-pen
'The teacher gave the children only pens.'

b. Mu-loí **wúna maa-nkúru ká**-wí báana.
1-teacher only 6-pen 1SM.PST-give.PST 2.children
'The teacher gave the children only pens.'

(4) a. Ndé nká **bu-ní** **ká**-dzwî?
1.PRO 1.antelope 14-which 1SM.PST-kill.PST
'How did s/he kill the antelope?'

b. Ndé **mu** **mbielé ká**-dzwí nká.
1.PRO 18.LOC 9.knife 1SM.PST-kill.PST 1.antelope
'S/He killed the antelope with a knife.'

In example (5a) I show that in the near future tense, the class 1 SM takes the ***â***- prefix with a falling tone in the SVO word order; in (5b) when there is a focused object in the IBV position, the SM alternates to ***kâ***-. From the examples presented so far, we see that this SM allomorphy underlyingly alternates between two segmental forms ***a***- and ***ka***-. The alternation does not trigger tonal change and the tone on the prefix is only determined by the grammatical tone of the tense (see chapter 2 section 2.4.2 on the tone patterns in different tenses).

(5) (*What will father buy at the market?*)
a. Ndé **â**-fúúm-á má-láala.
1.PRO 1SM.FUT-buy-FV 6-orange
'He will buy some oranges.'

b. Ndé **má-láálá kâ**-fúum-a.
1.PRO 6-orange 1SM.FUT-buy-FV
'He will buy some oranges.'

Example (6) shows that in the OSV order where the subject is focused and the object(s) is/are topicalised, the canonical subject marker ***á***- is used. Assuming that the subjects in (6a,b) are focused in the IBV position, here we

see that the SM alternation does not only correlate with IBV focus, but that there seems to be a dichotomy between subject and non-subject (object, adjunct) which can influence the choice of the prefix.

(6) a. Maa-ntséke **ná** **á**-yi-pfuk-á má-dza?
6-field 1.who 1SM.PST-IMPF-water-FV 6-water
'Who watered the fields?' [OSV subject focus]

b. Mó ma-dzá **taará** **á**-pfuk-í.
6.PRO 6-water 1.father 1SM.PST-water-PST
'They were watered by FATHER.' [OSV subject focus]

The SM in negative conjugations also participates in the alternation without word order change. In the affirmative SVO sentence (7), the SM is ***á***- as expected, while its negative counterpart takes the ***ká***- prefix. Similarly in (8), the SM following the negative marker also shows up as ***ká***-. In (9) the negative verb in the subject relative clause also takes the SM ***ká***-. In these negative sentences there is no word order change at the clause level, in particular no object or adjunct is fronted from the postverbal domain to the IBV position as in the SOV/S(O)XV examples above.

(7) a. Mwá wúa **á**-kwî.
1.dog 1.DEM.II 1SM.PST-die.PST
'That dog died.'

b. Mwá wúa ka-**ká**-kwî ni.
1.dog 1.DEM.II NEG-1SM.PST-die.PST NEG
'That dog did not die.'

(8) Káli mvúla ka-**ká**-nók-i ni, kéne bhií
if 1.rain NEG-1SM.PST-rain-PST NEG CF 1PL.PRO
líi-báan-i mu-sálá.
1PL.SM.PST-begin-SBJV 3-work
'If it did not rain, we would have started the work.'

(9) Mbuurú wu-kítĭ ka-**ká**-sál-i ni kâ-bvă
1.person 1-COMP NEG-1SM.PST-work-PST NEG 1SM.IMPF-fall
ntsíina ŋa mu-ŋwá áá nzó aa ndé ná
9.ground 16.LOC 3-mouth 3.CONN 9.house 9.CONN 1.PRO every
tsúku.
5.day
'The person who never worked sits in front of his house everyday.'

Examples (10) and (11) display sentences in the remote past tense. Recall that the remote past tense with a class 1 subject is expressed by an auxiliary-like copula ***âli*** and an inflected verb with a HL toned SM (see chapter 2 section 2.4.2). Here we see that when an element, in this case the object, is fronted to the IBV focus position, both the copula and the main verb takes the ***kâ***- prefix.

(10) Ndé **báa-ntsúí kâ**-li **kâ**-yi-fúum-a.
1.PRO 2-fish 1SM.RPST-COP 1SM.RPST-IMPF-buy-FV
'S/He bought some FISH.'

(11) Mu-káli aa mu-kokó **ná** **kâ**-li **kâ**-béer-i?
1-wife 1.CONN 1-king 1.who 1SM.RPST-COP 1SM.RPST-beat-PST
'Whom did the queen beat?'

In (12) and (13) the sentences are expressed in OSV order and the SM on the verb appears as ***ká***-, which runs counter to the OSV examples in (6). However, I suppose that (12) and (13) are intrinsically different constructions. As seen from the context and the translation, it is the sentence-initial rather than the IBV element that is in focus. These examples are in fact the reduced biclausal cleft construction (see chapter 3 section 3.4), which also surfaces in OSV order. I will discuss by the end of the chapter that I treat the reduced cleft as an intermediate construction between the basic cleft and the IBV focus construction. So here it should be distinguished from the OSV order expressing subject focus.

(12) (*Did the thief steal many goats?*)
Baa-ntaba **bá-bíibi** ŋjíibi **ká**-túr-i.
2-goat 2-few 1.thief 1SM.PST-steal-PST
'It was a FEW goats the thief stole.' [reduced cleft]

(13) Wúna **ma-biríki** taará **ká**-fúum-i ku mfaí.
only 6-brick 1.father 1SM.PST-buy-PST 17.LOC 9.capital
'(It was) only BRICKS that father bought in Brazzaville.' [reduced cleft]

From the many examples with class 1 subjects illustrated above, we have a preliminary observation that the SM alternation occurs 1) when some focused element other than the subject is fronted to the IBV position; 2) in a reduced cleft OSV where a non-subject constituent is focused in the sentence-initial position; and 3) in negative sentences. So far the only generalisation that can be made is that this morphological alternation seems to encode the focus-related movement of a postverbal element to the preverbal domain, either to the IBV position or the sentence-initial position. Nonetheless, this generalisation cannot account for its occurrence in negative sentences.

For all the languages in the literature that have reported this SM alternation (Takizala 1972; Gueldemann 1996; Bostoen and Mundeke 2012; De Kind 2014), as far as I know, the allomorphy is restricted to class 1 subjects. Interestingly, in Kukuya the SM alternation also happens with 1SG, 2SG, 1PL and 2PL subjects, namely the speech participant subjects, but the alternation becomes purely tonal. We first consider the 1SG subject. It should be noted here that the 1SG SM always has a nasal part which assimilates with the following consonant, and the nasal part can be preceded by another prefix encoding tense information. In the glossing I parsed the two parts as separate prefixes. However, I would treat the tense prefix and the nasal prefix together as the 1SG SM to unify the formation of subject markers in this language, and the nasal prefix is placed after the tense prefix for morphophonological reasons (see chapter 2 section 2.4.1). The 1SG SM alternation is summarised in Table 4.2.

1SG	remote past	future
SVO and OSV	aN	aN
SOV and S(O)XV	**â**N	**â**N
negative	**â**N	**â**N

Table 4.2: The tone pattern of 1SG subject markers in Kukuya

We see from the table that the 1SG SM alternation does not involve segmental allomorphy as the ***a***-/***ka***- opposition for class 1 subjects, but only the tonal change as a H tone insertion rule. Since the 1SG SM bears a L tone only in the remote past and future tenses in canonical word order, so the addition of the H tone can only be detected in these tenses. Two examples are given in (14) and (15).

(14) a. Me lía **a**-m-fúúm-á bí-ko.
1SG.PRO FUT FUT-1SG.SM-buy-FV 8-clothes
'I will buy the clothes.' [SVO]

b. Me lía bí-ko **â**-m-fúum-a.
1SG.PRO FUT 8-clothes FUT-1SG.SM-buy-FV
'I will buy the CLOTHES.' [SOV]

(15) a. Me âli **a**-ma-í ki-ko.
1SG.PRO RPST PST-1SG.SM.put.away-PST 7-clothes
'I had put away the clothes.' [SVO]

b. Me âli **kǎ**-ma-í kí-ko ni.
1SG.PRO RPST NEG.PST-1SG.SM.put.away-PST 7-clothes NEG
'I had not put away the clothes.' [SNegVO]

In (14a) in the near future tense with the SVO order, the 1SG SM occurs as a L tone prefix, while in SOV (14b) in which the object is focused in IBV, the SM bears a falling tone. In (15a) the subject prefix with L tone is attested in the remote past tense, while in its negative counterpart (15b) the negative prefix ***ka***- is fused with the HL toned subject prefix ***â***- (which can only be

perceived when the speakers pronounce it morpheme by morpheme), and phonetically they are jointly realised as a mid tone prefix [kā].

The alternation on the 2SG SM is summarised in Table 4.3. In the recent past tense, the 2SG SM always occurs as a null prefix in SVO/OSV, while it takes the form ***á***- in SOV/S(O)XV and negative sentences. In the remote past and the future tenses, the 2SG SM is realised as the L tone prefix ***a***- in SVO/OSV, and as the HL tone prefix ***â***- in the SOV/S(O)XV and negative sentences.

2SG+tense	recent past	remote past	future
SVO and OSV	∅	a	a
SOV and S(O)XV	**á**	**â**	**â**
negative	**á**	**â**	**â**

Table 4.3: The tone pattern of 2SG subject markers in Kukuya

Some examples on the 2SG SM alternation are given in (16) and (17). Example (16) shows the ∅- versus ***á***- alternation in the recent past tense with regard to different word orders and polarity.

(16) a. We Ø-yáab-i ki-líira ya kí-kila?
2SG.PRO 2SG.SM-know-PST INF-read with INF-write
'You know reading and writing?' [SVO] (Paulian 2001: 7, glossing adapted)

b. We ka-Ø-**á**-mún-i Zacharie ni?
2SG.PRO NEG-2SG.SM-PST-see-PST 1.Zacharie NEG
'You did not see Zacharie?' [SNegVO]

c. We kí-má ké Ø-**á**-min-í ŋaaŋaa?
2SG.PRO 7-what 7.PRO 2SG.SM-PST-swallow-PST just.now
'What did you swallow just now?' [SOV]

It should be noted here that for the 1SG subject *me* and the class 1 subject pronoun *ndé*, their subject prefix *á*(N)- in the canonical word order can sometimes be suppressed on the verb while compensated by lengthening the

vowel of the preceding subject pronoun; for the 2SG subject *we* the lengthening of the final vowel is not attested, so I assume that the canonical 2SG SM in the recent past tense takes a null form, which is also consistent with Paulian's (1975, 2001) observation. Example (17) shows that in the remote past tense the L tone on the 2SG SM shifts to a falling tone in SOV/S(O)XV.

(17) a. We âli Ø-**a**-fúum-i baa-ntaba.
2SG.PRO RPST 2SG.SM-RPST-buy-PST 2-goat
'You had bought some goats.' [SVO]

b. We âli kí-má Ø-**â**-fúum-i?
2SG.PRO RPST 7-what 2SG.SM-RPST-buy-PST
'What had you bought?' [SOV]

c. Ka we ndzií yǐ-Ø-fúum-i bu-ká
EMP 2SG.PRO 9.money 9REL-2SG.SM-buy-PST 14-cassava
ku-ní Ø-**â**-bák-i?
17-which 2SG.SM-RPST-get-PST
'Where had you got the money to buy the cassava?' [SOXV]

The tonal alternation on SM is also attested with 1/2PL subjects, which always have the same SM shape ***lii***-, as summarised in Table 4.4. In the table we see clearly that the tonal change occurs as if a H tone is imposed to the L tone subject prefix in SOV/S(O)XV and negation. Again, the tonal alternation is only observable in remote past and future tenses in which the 1/2PL SM in the canonical word order bears a L tone.

1PL/2PL	remote past	future
SVO and OSV	lii	lii
SOV and S(O)XV	**líi**	**líi**
negative	**líi**	**líi**

Table 4.4: The tone pattern of 1/2PL subject markers in Kukuya

Examples with 1/2PL SM alternation are given in (18) and (19). In (18) the L tone SM ***lii***- in the far future tense changes to ***líi***- with a falling tone when preceded by the negative prefix. Example (19) shows that in the remote past

and the far future tenses, the 1/2PL SM also bears a falling tone when an object is focused in the IBV position.

(18) a. (*How are we going to celebrate the new year?*)
Bhií yǎ we lía **lii**-dzwá ntaba.
1PL.PRO with 2SG.PRO FUT 1PL.SM.FUT-kill.PST 1.goat
'We are going to kill a goat.' [SVO]

b. Bhií yǎ we lía ka-**líi**-dzwá ntaba ni.
1PL.PRO with 2SG.PRO FUT NEG-1PL.SM.FUT-kill.PST 1.goat NEG
'We are not going to kill a goat.' [SNegVO]

c. Biábe ka-**líi**-wol-í baarí ba-kítǐ
1PL.PRO NEG-1PL.SM.RPST-take-PST 2-people 2-COMP
ka-báá-yáab-i ki-líra ni.
NEG-2SM.PST-know-PST INF-read NEG
'We did not employed people who did not know reading.' [SNegVO]

(19) a. Bhií lía bí-ko **líi**-fúum-a.
1PL.PRO FUT 8-clothes 1PL.SM.FUT-buy-FV
'We will buy some CLOTHES.' [SOV]

b. Bé âli kí-má **líi**-fúum-i?
2PL.PRO RPST 7-what 2PL.SM.RPST-buy-PST
'What had you(pl.) bought?' [SOV]

So far in this subsection I have presented the distribution of the SM alternation with class 1 and [+PARTICIPANT] subjects in different word orders, tenses and polarities. I have shown that the SM allomorphy can be either segmental as the ***a***-/***ka***- opposition for class 1 subjects, or tonal as the L versus HL alternation for the [+PARTICIPANT] subject prefixes. In the next subsection I will show that almost the same SM alternation patterns are found in relative constructions, which forms one of the arguments for the hypothesis in section 4.1.

4.2.2 Subject marking in relative (cleft) constructions

In the grammar sketch provided in chapter 2, I have presented the formation of relative constructions in Kukuya. In this subsection I focus on the SM alternation in cleft constructions which always involve a relative clause. I will demonstrate that the alternation has almost the same distribution in relative and IBV focus constructions for class 1 and [+PARTICIPANT] subjects, pointing towards an origin in the relative verb form. I will also point out the cases in which the SM occurrence in these two constructions does not match.

In a subject relative with a class 1 subject in the recent past tense, the relative marker on the verb agrees with the head NP in noun class and is spelled out as the same shape as the class 1 demonstrative marker ***wu-***. The tone of the SM slot on the relative verb is always realised as H, and if the SM takes a null form, this H tone just joins to the preceding L tone on the relative marker, which is realised as a rising tone. In (20) we see that the relative marker agrees with the class 1 subject NP and is realised as a rising tone, which is the most common way of class 1 subject relative marking.

(20) a. Ndé **wǔ**-banám-i á-tok-í ndziimi.
1.PRO 1REL-wake.suddenly-PST 1SM.PST-sweat-PST much
'S/He who waked up suddenly sweated a lot.'

b. Mbuuru **wǔ**-yi-tsék-e me á-bvǐ mu
1.person 1REL-IMPF-mock-FV 1SG.PRO 1SM.PST-fall.PST 18.LOC
ntsá dzuná kii-ntsíiba.
9.inside 5.hole 7-sudden
'The person who was mocking me suddenly fell into a hole.'

However, it remains to be investigated whether this ***wǔ-*** prefix should be analysed as a relative prefix plus a floating H tone, or the relative marker ***wu-*** is fused with a H tone class 1 subject prefix ***ú-*** as an anti-agreement marker when the subject is extracted, which is documented in some other WCB languages (e.g. in the Kikongo cluster H10 and in Hungan H42) (Givón 1975). For the latter account, recall that the class 1 SM has a canonical

shape ***a***- in past tenses, but here it does not appear in the subject relative. Nonetheless, for some consultants the class 1 SM ***a***- can still occur, and the REL-SM sequence can be realised as ***wu-á***-, which depends on geographical locations of the speakers, upper or lower side of the Kukuya plateau. Therefore, I suppose that the occurrence of the ***a***- prefix in subject relatives may have regiolectal variation, and whether there is the anti-agreement effect in subject relativisation needs further exploration.

Importantly, we see that the use of the allomorphic class 1 SM ***ká***- in a subject relative is always ungrammatical, as illustrated in (21).

(21) Mu-kái ná ndé wu-(***ká**)-mún-i Gilbert?
1-woman 1.who 1.PRO 1REL-1SM.PST-see-PST 1.Gilbert
Int: 'Which woman (is the one who) saw Gilbert?'

As for non-subject relatives with a class 1 subject, recall the differential subject marking of the pronominal and the lexical subject (see chapter 2 section 2.5.2). In (22) we see that when the postverbal subject in a non-subject relative is a class 1 pronoun *ndé*, the SM is realised as ***ká***-, which is of the same shape as the class 1 SM allomorph in the IBV focus construction. Example (23) shows that subject marking for *ndé* can also appear as the default class 7 SM **ki**-, which is further discussed in chapter 5 section 5.3.

(22) Ndé kal-í yǎ nyama wu-**ká**-dzwí **ndé**,
1.PRO 1.NARR.stay-PST with 1.animal 1REL-1SM.PST-kill.PST 1.PRO
ŋa kí-kíni ma-táli mu ki-yá naama.
16.LOC 7-period 6-sunshine 18.LOC INF-go 9.top
'He stayed with the animal that he killed, (until) when the sun rose to the top.'

(23) Bhií lií-tsuk-í mu ku-**ká**/**kí**-túr-í **ndé**
1PL.PRO 1PL.SM.PST-talk-PST 18.LOC 17REL-1/7SM.PST-steal-PST 1.PRO
mi-pará.
4-money
'We talked about the fact that s/he stole the money.'

Example (24) shows that when the postverbal subject is a lexical DP, the SM on the relative verb can only take the default marker **kí**- and the class 1 SM ***ká***- cannot be used.

(24) ŋa-**kí**/***ká**-yĭ **múu-ndziá**, mu-kái bvi-kídzá
16REL-7/*1SM.PST-come.PST 1-foreigner 1-woman 8-food
ká-yî-télek-e.
1SM.PST-IMPF-prepare-FV
'When the guest came, the woman was preparing food.' (Paulian 2001: 16, glossing adapted)

In cleft constructions, we find that in the reverse pseudo-cleft (25a) which exploits a non-subject relative, the relative prefix is present on the verb and the subject is postverbal. Here the SM can only be the default marker instead of the class 1 SM. As for (25b) which is a reduced cleft (see more in chapter 2 section 2.5.3 on nominal predication and chapter 3 section 3.4 on clefts), the relative marker on the verb is deleted and the subject is no longer inverted, and here only the class 1 SM can be used whereas the default marker is impossible. Here I consider the subject prefix ***ká***- to be the same SM as in non-subject relatives. In this sense, the verb in the reduced cleft (25b) still maintains some properties of a relative construction.

(25) a. Kí-taabí ki-**kí**/***ká**-fúúm-í taará ku dzándu.
7-shelf 7REL-7/*1SM.PST-buy-PST 1.father 17.LOC 5.market
'A shelf was what father bought at the market.'

b. Ka-kí-li kí-taabí taará **ká**/***kí**-fúum-i ni.
NEG-7SM-COP 7-shelf 1.father 1/*7SM.PST-buy-PST NEG
'It was not a shelf that father bought.'

From the examples above, three types of asymmetries pertaining to class 1 subject marking in relative constructions can be summarised, which are the asymmetries between subject and non-subject, preverbal and postverbal placement of the subject, as well as pronominal and lexical postverbal subjects, as illustrated in Table 4.5 (for recent past tense).

SM form	relativised element		subject type and position[a]			
	subject	non-subject	pronominal		lexical	
			preverbal	postverbal	preverbal	postverbal
á-	✓	✗	✓	–[b]	✓	–
ká-	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗
kí-	✗	✓	✗	✓	✗	✓

[a] The values under "subject types and position" are only applicable in the presence of a true value under "relativised element";
[b] "–" means this condition never happens, in this case the subject in a subject relative is never postverbal;

Table 4.5: SM of class 1 subjects in relative constructions (*recent past tense*)

For relative constructions in other tenses, the class 1 SM alternation behaves similarly to that in the recent past tense, with only the prefixal tone being modified for that tense. For lexical class 1 subjects, example (26a) shows a remote past tense subject relative in which the SM takes the canonical form **â-** with a falling tone. This **â-** prefix can be contracted with the preceding relative marker on the auxiliary, and it also appears on the lexical verb. Example (26b) illustrates that in object relatives the default marker ***kíi-*** occurs both on the auxiliary and the main verb, with the falling tone encoding the remote past tense.

(26) a. taará wǔ-(**â**)-li **â**-ték-i mfú
1.father 1REL-1SM.RPST-COP 1SM.RPST-sell-PST 10.hair
'father who had sold hair'

b. mfú yi-**kíi**-li **kíi**-ték-í taará
10.hair 10REL-7SM.RPST-COP 7SM.RPST-sell-PST 1.father
'the hair that father had sold'

For the pronominal class 1 subject, in a subject relative (27a) the canonical SM is used; in the object relative (27b), the class 1 SM appears as ***káa-*** with a falling tone marking future tense; in (27c) both the SMs on the remote past auxiliary and the lexical verb occur as ***káa-***. We also notice that in relative constructions of compound tenses in which an auxiliary is employed, the relative marker only appears on the auxiliary but is not reduplicated on the lexical verb.

(27) a. ndé wŭ-(**â**)-li **â**-fúum-i baa-ntaba
1.PRO 1REL-1SM.RPST-COP 1SM.RPST-buy-PST 2-goat
's/he who had sold the goats'

b. baa-ntaba (lía) ba-**káa**-fúúm-á **ndé**
2-goat FUT 2REL-1SM.FUT-buy-FV 1.PRO
'the goats that s/he will buy'

c. bi-ko bi-**káa**-li **káa**-ték-i **ndé**
8-clothes 8REL-1SM.RPST-COP 1SM.RPST-sell-PST 1.PRO
'the clothes that s/he had sold'

So far I have presented the SM alternation in subject and non-subject relatives with class 1 subjects. Once we compare the alternation pattern with that attested in the IBV focus constructions in 4.2.1, the connection between them can be observed. If we map the subject focus expressions in SVO/OSV word order with subject relatives, and SOV/SO(X)V word order expressing non-subject focus with non-subject relatives, the ***a***- versus ***ka***- allomorphy has almost the same distribution in these constructions, as summarised in Table 4.6. What remains to be explained is why the use of the default class 7 SM ***ki***- is impossible in the IBV non-subject focus strategy (see the analysis in chapter 5 section 5.3), but is obligatory in non-subject relatives for lexical subjects. We will take up this question in the next chapter, and for now we continue the presentation on SMs by considering subjects other than class 1.

class 1 SM	IBV focus	relative
subject	**a-**	**a-**
non-subject	**ka-**	**ka-**/**ki-**

Table 4.6: The ***a***-/***ka***- alternation in IBV focus and relatives

Tonal variation on the [+PARTICIPANT] SMs is also attested in relative constructions, which again correlates with the IBV focus constructions. Since 1PL and 2PL subject prefixes surface in the phonologically identical CV-shape ***li***- which is not fused with any preceding prefix, it is easier to capture the tonal change on this SM prefix without influence from the preceding

prefix even in rapid speech. Some examples of the 1/2PL SM in subject (28) and non-subject (29)(30) relatives are given below. In (28a) in the present tense, the 1PL SM bears a H tone on the relative verb and a L tone on the matrix verb; in (28b) the SM which otherwise appears as the L-toned ***lii***- on the future-tensed matrix verb, occurs as a HL-toned prefix ***líi***- in the subject relative; (28c) is in remote past tense, and the SMs on both the auxiliary and the lexical verb have a falling tone, which are otherwise realised as L in the non-relative form. In all the sentences in (28) the relative marker takes the class 2 ***ba***- prefix, and it can only occur on the auxiliary in a compound tense.

(28) a. Bhií ba-**lí**-kâ-sál-á máa-ntséke
1PL.PRO 2REL-1PL.SM-IMPF-work-FV 6-field
li-kâ-sílik-a bú-su.
1PL.SM-IMPF-wake-FV 14-front
'We who work in the fields wake up early.'

b. bhií lía ba-**líi**-fúúm-á báa-ntaba
1PL.PRO FUT 2REL-1PL.SM.FUT-sell-FV 2-goat
'we who will buy the goats'

c. bhií ba-**líi**-li **líi**-ték-i bi-ko
1PL.PRO 2REL-1PL.RPST-COP 1PL.SM.RPST-sell-PST 8-clothes
'we who sold the clothes'

In non-subject relatives, the relative verb agrees with the postverbal 1/2PL subject and the default marker ***ki***- cannot be inserted, as shown in (29). In (30) in the remote past tense, both the auxiliary and the main verb agree with the inverted 1/2PL subject, and the SM bears a falling tone.

(29) Ma-lúa ma-**líí**/***kíí**-lak-í **bhií** kína
6-disease 6REL-1PL/*7SM.PST-say-PST 1PL.PRO yet
ka-báá-bák-í bu-báa-sá-a mó ni.
NEG-2SM.PST-get-PST 14REL-2SM.FUT-conquer-FV 6.PRO NEG
'The diseases that we talked about, (people) did not get to conquer them yet.'

(30) a. mfú yi-**líi**-li **líi**-ték-í **bé**
10.hair 10REL-2PL.SM.RPST-COP 2PL.SM.RPST-sell-PST 2PL.PRO
'the hair that you(pl.) had sold'

b. ma-meé ma-**líi**-li **líi**-tí
6-stone 6REL-1PL.SM.RPST-COP 1PL.SM.RPST-launch.PST
bhií bví
1PL.PRO 9.falling
'the stones that we threw away'

As for the SM morphology of 1SG and 2SG subjects, when overtly realised, it always takes the V(N) shape. In a relative construction the vowel-initial SM can always converge with the preceding relative marker and sometimes triggers vowel coalescence. Thus the tonal variation of the SM prefix can only be attested in elicited slow utterances. In a non-relative sentence in the remote past, the 1SG SM bears a L tone. The sentences in (31) illustrate relative constructions with a 1SG subject. In the subject relative (31a) the nasal 1SG SM occurs on both the auxiliary and the lexical verb, and the tense prefix bears a falling tone. In contrast, in the object relatives (31b,c) the nasal prefix cannot occur on the auxiliary but only on the lexical verb, while the tense marker also bears the falling tone. Example (31c) also shows that the tense marker ***â***-, on which a H tone is inserted, is fused with the relative marker ***ki***- on the auxiliary, and they are realised as ***keé***- in which the two adjacent vowels undergo centralisation.

(31) a. me **wu-â-n**-li **â**-n-ték-i bi-ko
1SG.PRO 1REL-RPST-1SG.SM-COP RPST-1SG.SM-sell-PST 8-clothes
'I who had sold clothes'

b. mu-ti **wu-â-**(***n**)-li **â**-n-kwá-í me
3-tree 3REL-RPST-1SG.SM-COP RPST-1SG.SM-cut-PST 1SG.PRO
'the tree that I had cut down'

c. ki-ko **keé**-li **â**-n-ték-í me
7-clothes 7REL.1SG.SM.RPST-COP RPST-1SG.SM-sell-PST 1SG.PRO
'the clothes that I had sold'

Relative constructions with a 2SG subject are shown in (32), in which the same H tone insertion rule is observed. Since the 2SG SM always takes a null form, the tonal alternation is observed on the following tense prefix. In (32) the SM-tense markers on the auxiliary and the lexical verb both have a falling tone. For both 1SG and 2SG subjects, the relative marker on the auxiliary verb takes the class 1 form ***wu***- which is underspecified for the [PERSON] distinction.

(32) a. we wu-Ø-**â**-li Ø-**â**-ték-i bi-ko
2SG.PRO 1REL-2SG.SM-RPST-COP 2SG-RPST-sell-PST 8-clothes
'you who had sold clothes'

b. li-meé **leé**-li Ø-**â**-tí we
5-stone 5REL.2SG.SM.RPST-COP 2SG.SM-RPST-throw.PST 2SG.PRO
bví
9.falling
'the stone that you had thrown away'

From the examples above, I have shown that there is a consistent correlation between the tone of the SM in IBV focus and relative constructions with [+PARTICIPANT] subjects, as summarised in Table 4.7. We observe that there is always a floating grammatical H tone on the SM slot of the relative verb, which can be considered as part of a compositional tonal means of relative marking. Since the [+PARTICIPANT] SMs bear an underlying L tone, when they occur on a relative verb the grammatical H tone attaches to the left of the L tone on the SM and their combination is realised as a falling tone. For all the other 3rd person SMs which always have underlying H tone, I assume that the grammatical H tone attachment on the relative verb is still applied but does not affect the surface tone realisation, which is still H. Therefore

the H toneme on the SM in IBV focus/negative and relative constructions can be extended to all kinds of subjects.

SM+tense	canonical	IBV focus	relative
1SG	**a**N-	**â**N-	**â**N
2SG	Ø**a**-	Ø**â**-	Ø**â**-
1/2PL	**lii**-	**líi**-	**líi**-

Table 4.7: The tonal alternation of 1/2/SG/PL subjects in IBV focus and relatives (*remote past/future tense*)

In this subsection, I have shown that the SM alternation in relative constructions, whether segmental or tonal, correlates with those attested in the IBV focus strategy. Specifically, the ***a***-/***ka***- alternation of class 1 SM is attested in the opposition between canonical word order/IBV focus as well as between subject/non-subject relatives. The grammatical H tone on the SM in relative constructions is also present on the SM in the IBV focus construction. These facts indicate that the verb in the IBV focus construction actually still manifests some relative marking properties, which can provide preliminary evidence that the IBV focus is associated with the cleft construction which always engages relative marking. Next I continue to consolidate this hypothesis with some more tonal evidence.

4.3 More tonal evidence on the connection between IBV focus and cleft

In this subsection I provide an overview of the tonal variation on the nominal prefix with regard to its position in a sentence as well as its information structural status. I first distinguish all the different environments in which a H tone occurs on the nominal prefix, identifying the primitive H tones such as the predicative H tone, and epiphenomenal H tones such as metatony effect and H tone spreading. Then I show that some tonal properties of the IBV focus construction can provide further evidence on its origin in a cleft.

In many Bantu languages, tonal morphology on NPs has much relevance for syntactic relations, one example is the so-called "tone case" that has been reported in languages such as Kikongo (Daelemann 1983, Blanchon 1998) Umbundu (Schadeberg 1986), Giphende (Hyman and Ngalasso 1998) and Herero (Kavari et al. 2012). In Kukuya only the nominal prefix but never the stem can undergo tonal change under different syntactic environments. The nominal prefixes of all noun classes in Kukuya have a default L tone in the citation form of a noun, or when the noun is non-focal or dislocated; a H tone on the prefix is considered to be marked. A nominal prefix usually contains only one mora, but is realised as two moras if the stem starts with a nasal, and in this case only the first mora is subject to tone change rules. A monomoraic nominal prefix never bears a rising or falling tone. I first list all the possible situations in which the tone on the NP prefix shifts to H, as in Table 4.8, and then I disentangle different types/functions of these tonal variation cases in turn.

In the phonology sketch in chapter 2, I have shown that in Kukuya a phonological domain contains a stem plus any following prefix and five fixed tone patterns can be mapped onto this domain. Here I suppose that the occurrence of the H tone in the first two situations in the table, namely when the NP occurs after the possessive marker or after the particle *yǎ* "with", is an epiphenomenon triggered by the spreading of the H tone on the possessive marker, rather than pertaining to an independent type of grammatical H tone. In (33a,b) the possessive marker has an underlying

Situation	Example	Translation
after possessive marker	bi-síkí bíí **mí**-féme	"the organs of pigs"
after *yâ* "with"	ndé ya **mú**-lúmi	"she and husband"
object of infinitive verb	ki-mana **mú**-sála	"to finish work"
object in certain tenses	Taará kâ-nywá **má**-keé.	"Father smokes tobacco."
predicative NP	Ndé **mú**-tsúli.	"He is a blacksmith."
IBV focused NP	Mvá **bí**-pfúó ká-dzí.	"The dog ate the BREAD."
postverbal subject in relatives	ntaba wu-kí-fúúmí **mú**-kái	"the goat that the woman bought"
postverbal object in SOVO/SXVO	Ndé mvá ká-wí **má**-désu.	"S/He gave the DOGS beans."
NP after negative verb	Ndé kíni ka-ká-bvúúrí **mí**-pará ni.	"S/He did not return the money yet".

Table 4.8: Situations of H tone occurrence on the nominal prefix

H tone and it forms a prosodic domain with the preceding stem as seen from the H tone plateauing in (33a) and stem-final lowering in (33b) (to avoid LHH sequence). The H tone on the possessive marker also carries over onto the following prefix, if there is one. In (33c) the class 9 possessive marker bears an underlying L tone, and the tone on the following nominal prefix is also L, which shows that the tone on the nominal prefix is actually determined by the preceding possessive marker.

(33) a. bi-[bú-bááná bíí **bá**]a-ndzulí
8-DIM-child 8.CONN 2-cat
'the small children of the cats' [*báana* 'children']

b. ki-[bhiima kíí **mú**]-kóko
7-corpse 7.CONN 1-king
'the corpse of the king' [*ki-bhiimá* 'corpse']

c. [nzó yii **mu**]-kái
9.house 9.CONN 1-woman
'the house of the woman'

As for the associative marker *yă* which has an underlying rising tone, when followed by a nominal prefix, the rising tone is realised on two tone-bearing units: the associative marker bears a L tone and the following prefix with a H tone; when there is no following prefix, the rising tone just appears on

the associative marker, as shown in (34). The *yă* differs from the possessive marker in that it does not form a phonological domain with the preceding stem, which may be due to different syntactic relations with the preceding element. In (34a) the "stem+yă+prefix" sequence surfaces in a HLH tone pattern which does not fit into any of the five fixed tone patterns; similarly in (34b), if the nominal stem *nkígá* were in the same prosodic domain with *yă*, the final tone on the stem should undergo lowering to avoid HHL realisation. These facts show that *yă* does not prosodically join into the preceding stem but forms a phonological domain with what follows.

(34) a. Ndé á-láam-i bi-kwá [**ya** **má**]-ko **yă** nzŭ.
1.PRO 1SM.PST-cook-PST 8-yam with 6-banana with 10.peanut
'S/He cooked some yams, some bananas and some peanuts.'

b. Bhií lií-kunim-i nkígá [**ya** **mú**]u-ndziá.
1PL.PRO 1PL.SM.PST-go.down-PST 9.hill with 1-foreigner
'We went down from the hill with a stranger.'

The H tone on prefix of the complement of an infinitive verb is attributed to the metatony effect (see chapter 2 section 2.1.3). Metatony is a tonal process whereby in certain tense/aspects a H tone replaces a L/falling tone on the verb-final vowel, if and only if the verb is followed by a complement (Meeussen 1967; Nurse 2008; Hyman 2013). The H tone is also seen on the following nominal prefix of the complement. The contrast on the tonal realisation of an infinitive verb with regard to whether there is a following complement is shown in (35). The origin of the verb-final H tone is speculated to be diachronically linked to the *H augment of the following complement NP that has been lost (Dimmendaal 1995; Schadeberg 1995), while there are also counterarguments (Hyman and Lionnet 2011; Hyman 2013, 2017).

(35) a. ki-bvúúr-**á** **mí**-pará
INF-return-FV 4-money
'to return the money' [*ki-bvúura* "to return"]

b. ki-mún-**á** **má**-kinima
INF-see-FV 6-pain
'to suffer' [*ki-múna* "to see"]

c. ki-s**á** **mí**-táami
INF-do 4-amusement
'to have fun' [*ki-sâ* "to do"]

In certain tenses/aspects, the conjugated verbs also exhibit tonal alternation that is similar to metatony. In (36a,b), in the near future tense and the perfect aspect the tone on the verb-final vowel is realised as H and is extended onto the following nominal prefix. Examples (36c,d) show that the verb-final vowel does not become H in the recent past tense and imperative, where the tone on the nominal prefix of the complement remains L. In (36e) even the verb has an underlying H tone FV, the following prefix still carries a L tone in the recent past tense. If we view metatony in the infinitives as the default transitive VP tone pattern, the modified tone pattern on the inflected verbs can be accounted for by some intervening grammatical tones between the verb and its complement, encoding TAM distinctions. As seen in (36), this floating grammatical tone can be a H tone or zero in the future tense (36a), and L in the past tense and imperative (36c-e). An intervening L tone can block the metatonic H tone on the FV which may have originated from the following prefix, but does not impact a lexical H tone (36e).

(36) a. Bó báa-bvúúr-**á** **mí**-para.
2.PRO 2SM.FUT-return-FV 4-money
'They will return the money.' [*ki-bvúura* "to return"]

b. Bó báá-maa-bvúúr-**á** **mí**-para.
2.PRO 2SM.PST-PERF-return-FV 4-money
'They have returned the money.'

c. Bó báá-fúum-**i** **ba**a-ntaba.
2.PRO 2SM.PST-buy-PST 2-goat
'They bought some goats.' [*ki-fúuma* "to buy"]

d. **Sâ** **mu**-tere áá me taataa.
do.IMP 3-basket 3.CONN 1SG.PRO well
'Make a good basket for me!' [*ki-sâ* "to do"]

e. Bó báá-swaak-**í** **ma**-sáani.
2.PRO 2SM.PST-wash-PST 6-plate
'They washed the plates.' [*ki-swaakí* "to wash"]

The table above also shows that predicative NPs have a H tone prefix. In Kukuya the copula is usually absent in affirmative sentences, therefore a predicative construction is mostly expressed by juxtaposition of two NPs, as illustrated in (37) in which the predicative NP takes a H tone prefix.

(37) Ndé **mú**-tsúli.
1.PRO 1-blacksmith
'He is a blacksmith.'

A construction like "it is..." is expressed by simply placing a H tone on the nominal prefix, as shown in (38a); when there is no segmental prefix attached to the stem, the stem-initial consonant is geminated and the H tone is realised on the first part of the geminated consonant (Paulian 1975; Hyman 1987) as in (38b); in (38c) the H tone is placed on the adnominal prefix of a predicative adjective.

(38) a. **Mú**-ti.
3-tree
'It is a tree.' [*mu-ti* "tree"]
b. **Ĺ**lege.
1.weaver
'S/He is a weaver.' [*lege* "weaver"]
c. Ma-téme **má**-bvé.
6-hoe 6-good
'The hoes are good.' [*ki-bvé* "good"]

In (39) and (40) two more examples on predicative NPs with the H tone prefix are shown. In (39) the predicative expression is realised by juxtaposing two NPs whereby the prefix of the second NP receives the predicative H tone. Example (40) is a pseudo-cleft which is formed by a free relative plus a predicative NP.

(39) Ki-báka **kí**-báka, bu-bila.nkele **mú**u-nkwáárá.
7-obtain 7-obtain 14-question 3-keeping
'To obtain is to obtain, the question is (how) to keep.'
(Paulian 1975: 194, glossing added by the author)

(40) Kǐ-n-dzií me ki-nywâ **má**-dzá maa-mfé.
7REL-1SG.SM-please 1SG.PRO INF-drink 6-water 6-cold
'What I like to drink is cold water.'

It remains to be investigated where this predicative H tone originates. In some previous studies on the tonal marking of predication in Bantu, there are constructions that express predication by tonal replacement. In some Bantu languages, a H tone can replace the inherent L tone on the noun class prefix or the augment. For example in Shona (S10, Zimbabwe), a H tone occurs on the nominal prefix to express identification as shown in (41); while in Herero (R30, Namibia) predication is achieved by the H tone being attached onto the the augment, which is the case both for nominal predicates (42b) as well as in adjectival predicates (42d). This predicative H tone may come from the H tone on a historical copula, which Meeussen (1967: 115) reconstructed as ***ní***.

(41) a. Shona (Welmers 1973: 323)
mù-nhù
1-person
'person'
b. **mú**-nhù.
1-person.PRD
'It is a person.'

(42) a. Herero (Möhlig and Kavari 2008: 122, Kavari et al. 2012)
ò-tjì-hávérò
AUG-7-chair
'chair'

b. **ó**-tjì-hávérò
AUG-7-chair
'It is a chair.'

c. ò-zò-ngòmbè ò-zò-néné
AUG-10-cow AUG-10-big
'big cows'

d. ò-zò-ngòmbè **ó**-zò-néné
AUG-10-cow AUG-10-big
'The cows are big.'

Through many examples in chapter 3 we have already seen that the prefix of a focused NP in the IBV position always carries a H tone, while the post-verbally focused NPs do not. In (43) both sentences in SVO and SOV order can be felicitous answers to an object question, but only the IBV focused NP has the H tone prefix. In (43b) the stem of the focused NP *ma-láala* "orange" also undergoes tonal change from HL to H, which is due to the H tone plateauing effect triggered by the immediately following H tone SM ***ka***- on the verb.

(43) (*What did father buy?*)

a. Ndé á-fúum-i **ma**-láala.
1.PRO 1SM.PST-buy-PST 6-orange
'S/He bought some oranges.' [SVO]

b. Ndé **má-láálá** ká-fúum-i.
1.PRO 6-orange 1SM.PST-buy-PST
'S/He bought some ORANGES.' [SOV]

When there are multiple NPs in the preverbal domain, only the IBV NP can and must have the H tone prefix (if they have a segmental prefix at all), as shown in the examples below. In (44) the correctively focused recipient object is placed in IBV with the H tone prefix. In (45) and (46) what occurs in IBV is a focal subject which also takes the H tone prefix. In all these examples the other preverbal non-focal elements cannot have the H tone prefix, which again shows that the occurrence of the H tone prefix correlates with the IBV position.

(44) (*Did the woman give the fish to the DOGS?*)
Mu-kái baa-ntsúi **bá**a-ndzulí ká-wî.
1-woman 2-fish 2-cat 1SM.PST-give.PST
'The woman gave the fish to the CATS.'

(45) (*Who gave the child the oranges?*)
Mwáana ma-láala **bí**-búrú bíí-wî.
1.child 6-orange 8-parent 8SM.PST-give.PST
'The child was given the oranges by PARENTS.'

(46) Mfúúlá yi-kâ-n-yé me yi **bá**a-sinwá
9.road 9REL-IMPF-1SG.SM-go 1SG.PRO 9.REL 2-Chinese
báá-sî (yó).
2SM.PST-do.PST 9.PRO
'The road on which I am walking was built by the CHINESE people.'

In the reduced cleft (47) the focused NP is not placed in IBV but occurs sentence-initially, but it also takes the H tone prefix. As seen from the context in (48), it is not the whole NP but only the numeral modifier that is correctively focused. Interestingly, here only the agreeing adnominal prefix bears the H tone, but not the prefix of the head NP. So it could be the case that the H tone prefix occurs on a preverbally focused NP or a subpart of it, whether it is in the IBV position or sentence-initial; or the modifier could be used pronominally (and predicatively), and (48) is effectively interpreted as 'the woman, as for knives, it's THREE that she is holding'.

(47) (*What did father buy?*)
Bú-ká taará ká-fúum-i.
14-cassava 1.father 1SM.PST-buy-PST
'It was the cassava that father bought.'

(48) (*Is the woman holding TWO knives?*)
Ndé maa-mbhielé **má**-tíri kâ-kwaal-a.
1.PRO 6-knive 6-three 1SM.IMPF-hold-FV
'She is holding THREE knives.'

The occurrence of a H tone on the nominal prefix is also attested on the postverbal subject in non-subject relatives. In (49), in the free relative clause the verb-final vowel and the following prefix of the postverbal subject both bear a H tone, which is at first glance reminiscent of the metatony effect mentioned above.

(49) Me kâ-n-kín-a ŋa-kí-yím-**á** **mú**-kálí aa
1SG.PRO IMPF-1SG.SM-dance-FV 16REL-7SM-sing-FV 1-wife 1.CONN
me.
1SG.PRO
'I am dancing while my wife is singing.' [*ki-yíma* "to sing"]

However, this should be an additional grammatical H tone rather than metatonic. In (50) and (51), according to my earlier analysis there should be a verb-final floating grammatical L tone encoding past tense and triggering a L tone on the following prefix (see (36) above). However in these examples the postverbal subject has a H tone prefix, which indicates that there should be another verb-final H tone occurring after the past tense L tone and spreading onto the following prefix.

(50) Mbuká yi-kíí-sweek-**í** **mú**-kái ntséke ŋjíibi
9.place 9REL-7SM.PST-hide-PST 1.woman 9.product 1.thief
á-swool-í (yó).
1SM.PST-find-PST 9.PRO
'The place where the woman hid food was found by the thief.'

(51) Baa-ntsúú ba-kíí-ká-**í** **bá**a-ndukú báá-bol-í
2-chicken 2REL-7SM.PST-grill-PST 2-friend 2SM.PST-get.wet-PST
mu mvúla.
18.LOC 3.rain
'The chicken that the friends grilled got wet due to the rain.'

In (52) a minimal pair of subject and non-subject relatives is displayed. Despite the asymmetry in the subject agreement morphology on the verb, we notice that in the subject relative (52a) the FV on the verb together with the following nominal prefix of the object both carry a L tone as in SVO sentences in past tense; while in the object relative (52b) the tone pattern on the verb shifts from HL to H (H tone plateauing) and the tone on the prefix of the postverbal subject NP is also realised as H, which indicates the emergence of a verb-final H tone.

(52) a. mu-kái wǔ-fúum-**i** **mi**-féme
1-woman 1REL-buy-PST 4-pig
'the woman who bought the pigs'
b. mi-féme mi-kíí-fúúm-**í** **mú**-kái
4-pig 4REL-7SM.PST-buy-PST 1-woman
'the pigs that the woman bought'

Further research needs to be carried out to explain why this verb-final H tone is limited to non-subject relatives but absent in subject relatives. This "H grammatical tone occurring between the verb and the (postverbal) subject" (Hyman 2012: 109) in non-subject relatives is also reported in languages such as Nzadi (B865, Hyman 2012), Haya (JE22, Hyman & Byarushengo 1984) and Giphende (L11, Hyman 2017). Hyman (2012) conjectured the H tone to be a trace of a postverbal relative marker or pronoun. The grammatical H tone may have replaced the past tense L tone between the non-subject relative verb and the postverbal subject and carries over onto the following prefix. The H tone spreading onto the prefix of the subject NP also suggests that the relative verb and the postverbal subject are in the same phonological domain. I will discuss more on the syntactic derivation of non-subject relatives and its surface tone pattern in chapter 5.

Notably, the tonal distinction discovered in subject/non-subject relatives has a similar occurrence in subject/non-subject focus in the IBV strategy. Example (53a) shows that in an SVO sentence in the past tense, the FV of the verb *ki-wâ* "to give" appears in its citational HL tone pattern, and the following nominal prefix bears the canonical L tone; while in (53b) when the IBV position is occupied by a focused object, the tone on the verb-final vowel and the prefix of the postverbal non-focal object both become H. The same tonal alternation occurs in (54) where the focused element in IBV is a locative adjunct. From these examples we see that similar to the non-subject relatives, a verb-final H tone occurs when a non-subject element is focused in the IBV position.

(53) a. Me á-m-**wî** **mu**-káli mi-pará.
1SG.PRO PST-1SG.SM-give.PST 1-wife 4-money
'I gave my wife the money.'

b. Me **mú-kálí** á-m-**wí** **mí**-pará.
1SG.PRO 1-wife PST-1SG.SM-give.PST 4-money
'I gave my WIFE the money.'

[*ki-wâ* "to give"]

(54) (*Where did father buy the wine?*)
Ndé **ku** **dzándú** ká-fúúm-**í** **má**-lí.
1.PRO 17.LOC 5.market 1SM.PST-buy-PST 6-wine
'He bought the wine AT THE MARKET.' [*ki-fúuma* "to buy"]

If the tone pattern of the IBV focus construction indeed reflects a mapping with relatives, we would expect that the emergence of the verb-final H tone should not occur in subject focus constructions since it is not attested in subject relatives (see (52a)), and this is borne out in Kukuya. Both sentences in (55) show that when the subject is focused in IBV and there is a postverbal object, no H tone appears on the verb-final vowel or the following nominal prefix. However, there is one counterexample in my corpus, i.e., the one in (56), in which the subject is in focus and a grammatical H tone is observed

between the verb and the following prefix of the object. I leave this for further research.

(55) a. Mwáana **ná** á-wî **ma**-láala?
1.child 1.who 1SM.PST-give.PST 6-orange
'Who gave the child the oranges?'

b. (*Who watered the tree?*)
Mu-tí **taará** á-mwáal-**i** **ma**-dzá.
3-tree 1.father 1.SM.PST-water-PST 6-water
'FATHER watered the tree.'

(56) Mwáana **lí**-meé líí-búl-**í** **mú**-tswê.
1.child 5-stone 5SM.PST-hurt-PST 3-head
'The child, the STONE hit her/his head.'

One question here is whether this grammatical H tone arises verb-finally and spreads onto the following prefix, or it starts from the nominal prefix itself. In the IBV focus construction, the emergent H tone can only be perceived when there is a complement or an adjunct following the verb, but it cannot be observed when the verb is final, since there is a general sentence-final H tone lowering rule in this language. In a non-subject relative, there is always a postverbal subject, so the H tone can be easily detected on the prefix of the subject NP. If the H tone were to start from the prefix of the postverbal NP and marks a "tone case", it is problematic to assume that in the IBV focus strategy the H tone originates from the prefix of an object NP while it comes from a subject NP in a non-subject relative. So here I suppose that the H tone emerges verb-finally, and the H tone on the prefix of the following NP in both constructions is spread from the verb-final H tone.

The last type of H tone occurrence on a nominal prefix is found with an object NP following a negative verb. For some consultants but not all, there is also a grammatical H tone occurring between the negative verb and the following object NP, as shown in (57). However, the H tone emergence is unexceptionally observed on a negative verb when there is

another non-subject element preceding the verb, in most cases it is the class 7 NP *ki-ni* "period" as in (58), which looks quite similar to the IBV focus construction in the linear word order. Recall that the segmental and tonal SM alternation are attested in IBV focus as well as in negative sentences (see section 4.2.1), here the presence of the verb-final H tone can add evidence on the diachronic connections among IBV focus, relatives, and negative sentences.

(57) %Ndé ka-ká-fúúm-**í** **má**-sáani ni.
1.PRO NEG-1SM.PST-buy-PST 6-plate NEG
'S/He did not buy the plates.'

(58) Me **kí-ni** ka-á-m-**bvúúr-í** **mí**-pará ni.
1SG.PRO 7-period NEG-PST-1SG.SM-return-PST 4-money NEG
'I did not return the money yet.'

In this section, I have presented various types of H tone occurrence on the nominal prefix. Crucially, we have found some tonal connections, both nominal and verbal, between the IBV focus and the relative constructions in addition to the SM alternation. The predicative and IBV focused NPs both have a H tone prefix; and there is a verb-final grammatical H tone occurring in the non-subject IBV focus context as well as in non-subject relatives. There are also some H tone occurrences that are attributed to the H tone spreading from a preceding element. A comparison of all these grammatical features between the cleft and IBV focus constructions is illustrated in (59), from which we can see the correspondences of each feature that point to the close connections between the two constructions. I take the SM alternation and the verb-final H tone as the features of a relative verb form. Next I try to provide a possible grammaticalisation pathway of the IBV focus strategy from the cleft in detail.

(59) a. (Kí-li) [**má**-désu]$_{[\text{FOC}]}$ ma-***áá**/**káá**-**wí** ndé
7SM-COP 6-bean 6REL-1SM.PST-give.PST 1.PRO
baa-ndzulí.
2-cat
'It was some BEANS that s/he gave to the cats.' [cleft]

b. Ndé [**má**-désú]$_{[\text{FOC}]}$ ***áá**/**káá**-**wí** **bá**a-nzulí.
1.PRO 6-bean 1SM.PST-give.PST 2-cat
'S/He gave some BEANS to the cats.' [IBV focus]

4.4 Origin and grammaticalisation of IBV focus

Given that the IBV focus and cleft constructions share many similar grammatical features, and that the innovation of a focus construction from a cleft is attested cross-linguistically, a diachronic scenario seems plausible. In this section, I investigate the origin of the IBV focus, showing that the IBV focus strategy has its precursor in a cleft construction. First I provide evidence on the mono-clausal properties of the IBV focus construction, arguing that it is no longer a cleft but has developed into a dedicated focus construction, though some biclausal characteristics still exist. Then I describe a possible way in which the IBV focus construction might have originated, illustrating each possible intermediate stage of this process.

4.4.1 IBV focus: mono-clausal or bi-clausal?

Talking about the origin of IBV focus, a natural question arises as why it should have an origin in some other constructions, rather than emerged independently. In other words, why diachronically the IBV focus construction should be considered to be innovated at a later stage than the cleft? In this section I show evidence that the IBV focus construction manifests many monoclausal properties, while some of its morphosyntactic features still reflect some residue of a relative/cleft, which implies that the focus construction originates from the latter.

To start, we first compare a pseudo-cleft and an IBV focus construction in (60). The main differences between the two constructions lie in the word order and agreement morphology on the verb. The pseudo-cleft in (60a) consists of a free relative and a predicative NP, as seen from the relative marker on the verb, the postposed subject and the predicative H tone on the nominal prefix. In the IBV focus construction in (60b), an apparent monoclausal property is the lack of (segmental) relative marking on the verb and the preverbal occurrence of the subject.

(60) a. Wu-**kíí**-fúúm-í taará **mú**u-ngwa.
3REL-7SM.PST-buy-PST 1.father 3-salt
'What father bought was some salt.'

b. Taará **mú**u-ngwa **káá**-fúum-i.
1.father 3-salt 1SM.PST-buy-PST
'Father bought some SALT.'

Prosodic evidence also suggests the monoclausal status of the IBV focus construction. The IBV focused element is always phrased together with the following verb without a phonological break. In (61) the focused object is phrased together with the following verb which starts with a vowel prefix, and vowel coalescence happens between the two adjacent vowels. In (62) the H tone plateauing effect is attested on the phonological domain that consists of the HL noun stem of the IBV focused object plus the H-toned SM on the verb. If (61) and (62) were actually biclausal cleft constructions, we expect a phonological break between the predicative focused NP and the free relative (Cheng and Downing 2007, 2013) to prosodically separate the two clauses. Therefore I take the conjoint phrasing of the focused element and the verb as evidence for the IBV focus construction to be monoclausal.

(61) Me máa-**lí** **á**-m-fúum-i.
/me máaláámfúumi/
1SG.PRO 6-oil PST-1SG.SM-eat.PST
'I bought some OIL.'

(62) Ndé má-**láálá** **káá**-fúum-i.
1.PRO 6-orange 1SM.PST-buy-PST
'S/He bought some ORANGES.' [*ma-láala* "oranges"]

Another crucial piece of evidence on the monoclausality of the IBV focus construction is that an SOV word order can be used to express VP focus, as illustrated in (63). In other words, focus in the IBV position can project onto the whole VP. Since the use of one focus marking for different scopes of foci is considered to be a monoclausal property (Jendraschek 2009, van der Wal and Maniacky 2015) and the focus interpretation expressed in a cleft can

never be extended to the VP, I take the VP focus expression in SOV in (63) as evidence for its monoclausal status.

(63) a. (*What did father do in the morning?*)
Ndé mí-fémé ká-dzwí.
1.PRO 4-pig 1SM.PST-kill.PST
'He [killed some pigs]$_{\text{VP focus}}$.'

b. (*Did you wash the plates or do your homework?*)
Me má-sáání á-n-swaak-í.
1SG.PRO 6-plate PST-1SG.SM-wash-PST
'I [washed the plates]$_{\text{VP focus}}$.'

The fact that an IBV focused element is mostly preceded by some other topical NPs may also indicate that this construction is more towards monoclausal, as shown in (64). An IBV focused subject/object/adjunct/infinitive can always be preceded by multiple other primary and secondary topical elements (see chapter 3 section 3.3). Since a monoclausal focus construction usually allows fronting of other topical elements or modifiers while this is degraded in a biclausal cleft (Schwarz 2013; Abels and Muriungi 2008), the occurrence of multiple topics in the preverbal domain also suggests that the IBV focus construction is monoclausal rather than a cleft.

(64) **Ngúku lóoso** munkí káá-dzí?
1.mother 5.rice when 1SM.PST-eat.PST
'When did mother eat the rice?'

However, there are still some residual properties of the cleft observed in the IBV focus strategy. Since a cleft always involves a predicative part and a relative clause, the SM alternation and the verb-final H tone that are only attested elsewhere in a (non-subject) relative, and the predicative H tone prefix on the IBV focused element could provide arguments for the cleft origin of IBV focus. In addition to these, there are also some other biclausal properties of the IBV focus construction. An example is that when negating the IBV focused element, a copula can optionally appear with the negative prefix

attached to it, which is very typical of the *it*-cleft construction, as shown in the negation on IBV subject focus (65a) and object focus (65b).

(65) a. Ngwangúlu ka-kí-**li** mvá áá-dzí ni.
1.gecko NEG-7SM-COP 1.dog 1SM.PST-eat.PST NEG
'The gecko was not eaten by the DOG.'

b. Me ka-kí-**li** báa-ntaba áá-m-fúum-i ni.
1SG.PRO NEG-7SM-COP 2-goat PST-1SG.SM-buy-PST NEG
'I did not buy the GOATS.'

Here one question is whether we should treat the affirmative and negative IBV focus sentences as the same constructions which only differ in polarity, or they are developed separately, namely the affirmative is more grammaticalised to become monoclausal, whereas the negative remains biclausal. I will come back to discuss this question in chapter 5 section 5.4.

In the negative question formation of IBV focus in (66) and (67), we see that the negation on the verb is expressed in the lexical strategy by using the word *ki-bía* "refuse" as in (66a) and (67a), but the canonical negation strategy *ka...ni* that is used in matrix SVO clause is infelicitous as in (66b) and (67b), which is reminiscent of the ban on the use of the negation strategy *ka...ni* in relative constructions (see chapter 2 section 2.5.2). This can also show that the IBV focus construction is at least not completely mono-clausal but does maintain some grammatical properties of a relative clause.

(66) a. Joní ku-ní káá-bí-í kí-ya?
1.John 17-which 1SM.PST-refuse-PST INF-go
'Where didn't John go?'

b. ??Joní ku-ní ka-káá-yení ni?
1.John 17-which NEG-1SM.PST-go.PST NEG
Int: 'Where didn't John go?'

(67) a. Ná áá-bí-í ki-mún-a we?
1.who 1SM.PST-refuse-PST INF-see-FV 2SG.PRO
'Who didn't see you?'

b. ??Ná ka-káá-mún-i we ni?
1.who NEG-1SM.PST-see-PST 2SG.PRO NEG
Int: 'Who didn't see you?'

Another intriguing use of the IBV focus construction that is reminiscent of a cleft comes from example (68). The question in (68) intends to identify the thing that the child broke, which caused mother to beat the child. In (68) there is no (segmental) relative marking on the matrix verb, and the verb needs an argument which is expressed by the SOV order (in brackets). From the intended meaning we see that the SOV order in which a *wh*-object is focused in IBV can function as a cleft, and the whole sentence is also a cleft.

(68) [Mwáana **kí-má** káá-búl-í] ngúku **káá**-béer-i?
1.child 7-what 1SM.PST-break-PST 1.mother 1SM.PST-beat-PST
Int: 'It was what that the child beat that (caused) mother to beat (him/her)?'

In summary, the IBV focus construction displays many monoclausal properties: 1) absence of the relative marker; 2) focus projection; 3) and conjoint prosodic phrasing. Nevertheless, it has still retained some characters of a biclausal cleft: 1) presence of the copula in negation; 2) H tone insertion on the SM; 3) verb-final H tone in non-subject extraction; 4) the H tone prefix on the IBV element which is suggestive of predication; and 5) unavailability of the *ka...ni* negation strategy. So this construction seems in a transitional stage where it has acquired some characteristics of a monoclausal structure and retains some biclausal properties. Apparently, the IBV focus construction involves less agreement relations (no relative marking) and less complicated clause structure than the cleft, based on which I propose that the IBV focus strategy has emerged at a later stage. Next I attempt to give the diachronic motivation for this grammaticalisation process, presenting the potential intermediate stages step by step.

4.4.2 From cleft to IBV focus: the grammaticalisation path

In this subsection, I discuss how the IBV focus construction may have grammaticalised from a cleft, illustrating what kind of semantic and syntactic changes are involved in different stages of this process. I start by looking into the structural and interpretational properties of the cleft construction, and track the development from it towards the monoclausal IBV focus construction by making reference to a mediating construction, namely the reduced cleft which places a focused element in the initial position. Then I investigate how the IBV focus strategy is ultimately innovated, discovering the motivation behind this diachronic development.

As illustrated in (69), clefts in Kukuya include the basic cleft (69a), pseudo-cleft (69b), and inverted pseudo-cleft (69c) (also see chapter 3 section 3.5). To start, it should be clarified which type of the three clefts the IBV focus is derived from. Here I first exclude the inverted pseudo-cleft in which the copula follows the predicate NP, since we have seen that when negating the IBV focus the copula always *precedes* the focused element, therefore in the original construction the copula should also precede the predicative NP. Deciding between the basic cleft and the pseudo-cleft which can be derived from each other, I take the basic cleft (69a) as the original construction, since in a basic cleft the focused NP is placed preverbally, so we don't need to additionally postulate a fronting rule for the predicative NP if we would consider the pseudo-cleft as the starting point.

(69) a. (Kí-li) báa-ntaba ba-kíí-fúúm-í mú-kái.
7SM-COP 2-goat 2REL-7SM.PST-buy-PST 1-woman
'It was the GOATS that the woman bought.' [basic cleft]

b. Ba-kíí-fúúm-í mú-kái (báá-li) báa-ntaba.
2REL-7SM.PST-buy-PST 1-woman 2SM.PST-COP 2-goat
'What the woman bought were the GOATS.' [pseudo-cleft]

c. Báa-ntaba (báá-li) ba-kíí-fúúm-í mú-kái.
2-goat 2SM.PST-COP 2REL-7SM.PST-buy-PST 1-woman
'The GOATS were what the woman bought.'
[inverted pseudo-cleft]

Syntactically, a basic cleft usually consists of two clauses: one contains a nominal predicate and the other contains a free relative clause, which are often linked by a copula. It should be noted that in a basic cleft the predicative NP does not have a focus function by itself, but the (exclusive) focus reading arises from the combination of the relative clause and the nominal predicate. The relative part of the cleft is presented as the maximal group of referents to which the predicate applies and is equated to the referent in the nominal predicate, and in this way an identificational and exclusive focus reading arises (van der Wal and Maniacky 2015).

In the next step towards developing into a focus construction, some bi-clausal properties of the cleft construction would be reduced and some characteristics of a monoclausal structure would emerge. In Harris and Campbell's (1995) studies on the universal changes from a cleft to a focus construction, they propose some indicators on the changes from biclausal to monoclausal, from which I list some relevant properties to Bantu languages, as shown in (70).

(70) *Changes biclausal > monoclausal* (Harris and Campbell 1995: 166, 167)

- dropping the copula or relativiser altogether
- reordering of constituents
- (re)introducing agreement according to monoclausal structure
- ceasing to use a special verb form

I suppose that the reduced cleft, as shown in (71), can reflect a diachronically intermediate stage in the development from the cleft to the IBV focus construction, though synchronically it co-exists with the two constructions. In the reduced cleft we see the deletion of the relative marker on the verb and reordering of the constituents. The postverbal subject in the cleft is fronted to a preverbal position in the reduced cleft, leaving the subject postverbal is ungrammatical, as in (72). Since the copula is always optional in affirmative nominal predication in Kukuya, so its absence in the reduced cleft may be irrelevant to the ongoing grammaticalisation. In the reduced cleft, the

focused element occurs sentence-initially and retains the same exclusive focus interpretation as in the basic cleft (also see chapter 3 section 3.4).

(71) **Bá**a-ntaba mu-kái **káá**-fúum-i.
2-goat 1-woman 1SM.PST-buy-PST
'It was the GOATS that the woman bought.' [reduced cleft]

(72) ***Bá**a-ntaba **káá**-fúum-i mu-kái.
2-goat 1SM.PST-buy-PST 1-woman
Int: 'It was the GOATS that the woman bought.'

Similar constructions that place focus in the sentence-initial position are attested in many other West-Coastal Bantu languages and some other varieties of Teke, in many of which the IBV focus strategy is not observed or is only marginal. I suppose that in these languages the development of focus construction only attains the stage of a reduced cleft or an initial focus construction but the IBV focus has not emerged, which can also suggest that the reduced cleft is an intermediate stage which predates the IBV focus. I will return to present this in the next section.

We also notice that the class 1 subject agreement morphology in the reduced cleft (71) differs from the basic cleft (69a). In the basic cleft the postverbal class 1 lexical subject triggers the default SM ***ki***- on the verb, whereas in the reduced cleft the preverbal class 1 subject is co-indexed as ***ka***- on the verb, which does not fit into any agreement pattern we've seen so far. In all other cases where the class 1 subject is linearly adjacent to the verb, it takes the canonical SM prefix ***a***-. So here it should be explained why the allomorph ***ka***- is used and how this is related to the grammaticalisation of the focus construction.

I provide one possible account of the SM change in the reduced cleft. Recall that the ***ka***- form also appears in a non-subject relative when the postverbal subject is a class 1 pronoun *ndé* (see examples (22) and (23) above). We may wonder whether the SM ***ka***- in the reduced cleft can be associated with the postverbal pronominal subject. Here I provide support

from a related construction attested in the Nzadi language, which is a West-Coastal Bantu language spoken by a community of fishermen on the Kasai River in the Democratic Republic of Congo and has been classified as B865 in Maho (2009)'s updated list. In Nzadi non-subject relatives, while the subject is commonly placed postverbally as in (73a), a lexical subject NP can also appear in a preverbal position but only if there is an agreeing pronoun co-occurring immediately after the verb, as in (73b). This was described in Hyman (2012) as the VS/SVs alternation in this language. Similar to Kukuya, in Nzadi non-subject relatives, there is also a floating H tone occurring between the verb and the postverbal subject, which is absent in subject relatives and in the main clause. Hyman (2012) suggested the H tone to be a trace of a postverbal relative marker or pronoun, i.e. perhaps an older *SVs.

(73) a. mwaán (na) (ŋg) o mɔ́n **okáar**
1.child that which PST see woman
'the child that the woman saw' [Nzadi, VS] (Hyman 2012: 8a)

b. mwaán (na) **okáar**$_{i}$ o mɔ́n **ńdé**$_{i}$
1.child that woman PST see she
'the child that the woman saw' [Nzadi, SVs] (Hyman 2012: 10a, index added)

Nzadi has developed a sentence-initial focus strategy, as exemplified in (74)-(76), where the non-subject *wh*-words occur in the initial position. The subject can be postverbal (74), or preverbal when there is the co-referring pronoun after the verb as in (75). In this sense, the initial focus strategy in Nzadi is analogous to the reduced cleft in Kukuya which involves a (non-subject) relative clause without segmental relative marking, but the SVs/VS alternation is still attested. It is noteworthy in (76) that in the presence of an initial focus, the subject can also be preverbal *without* the postverbal pronominal copy, which resembles the Kukuya reduced cleft in word order and may suggest a further grammaticalisation stage of an initial focus strategy than (75). In this stage, the postverbal pronominal copy, as a remaining indicator of the relative clause, is deleted. However, since in Nzadi there is a systematic lack of subject-verb agreement, the grammaticalisation pathway cannot be corroborated by its agreement morphology.

(74) nɛ̌ ò mɔ́n **báàr?**
who PST see people
'Who did the people see?' [Nzadi] (Hyman 2012: 107)

(75) oŋgér ŋge **okáar**$_i$ o pé **ńdé**$_i$ bɔ̌?
thing what woman PST give she them
'What did the woman give them?' [Nzadi] (Crane et al. 2011: 10.78, index added)

(76) nɛ̌ bààr ó mɔ̂n?
who people PST see
'Who did the people see?' [Nzadi] (Hyman 2012: 107)

If the development of the initial focus construction in the two languages is indeed comparable, then the class 1 SM alternation in Kukuya may be explained by analogy to the Nzadi pattern. I conjecture that at some historical point there was also a VS/SVs alternation in Kukuya reduced clefts similar to (74) and (75), and the verb always agrees with the postverbal NP, namely with the **S** in VS and with **s** in SVs. Later the postverbal pronominal copy in SVs was deleted or became unpronounced for some reason, which is the same as in (76), but the class 1 SM which once agreed with the postverbal pronoun **s** was retained. One question here is why synchronically there is no VS/SVs alternation in non-reduced clefts and non-subject relatives. It seems that the deletion of the relative marker in the reduced cleft provides the necessary condition for the fronting of the subject, which is not applicable in the non-reduced version. Another question is how to account for the class 1 SM alternation with regard to different positions of the subject NP from the synchronic point of view, and which structural position the preverbal subject occupies in the reduced cleft. These are discussed in the next chapter (chapter 5 section 5.4.1).

The development process presented above can be summarised as in (77).

(77) *Stage I: Basic cleft>reduced cleft*
(COP)-NP$_{[PRED]}$ **REL**-SM-Verb-SUBJ$\Longrightarrow$
NP$_{[PRED]}$ SUBJ$_i$ SM-Verb-PRO$_i$$\Longrightarrow$
NP$_{[PRED]}$ SUBJ SM-Verb

I suppose the next step in the grammaticalisation to be a "hypoanalysis" process, in which the listener reanalyses a contextual semantic/functional property as an inherent property of the syntactic unit (Croft 2000: 126). The focus reading in the reduced cleft is generated from the whole construction, and at some later point the focus interpretation must have been linked to the predicative NP itself rather than to the whole sentence. In other words, the initial NP has gained a [FOCUS] feature, and the new construction consists of one clause with one verb and a focused constituent, rather than being a combinational focus construction. This hypoanalysis and the introduction of the [FOCUS] feature are also crucial conditions in the transition from a biclausal to a monoclausal focus construction.

To derive the IBV focus construction in (78), the question here is why the focused constituent requires verb-adjacency. Especially, why didn't the reduced cleft just develop towards a monoclausal initial focus construction but instead evolved into IBV focus, since they have similar functions of (exclusive) focus expression? Why should the preverbal subject move further to the sentence-initial position when the object is in focus?

(78) Mu-kái **bá**a-ntaba **káá**-fúum-i.
1-woman 2-goat 1SM.PST-buy-PST
'The woman bought some GOATS.' [IBV focus]

In Bostoen and Mundeke's (2011) analysis of the functional passive OSV construction in Mbuun (B87), in which the subject is focused in IBV position, they claim that the patient NP is fronted in order to "make the focused agent NP less topical". I agree with their proposal in that topic fronting is an important factor in deriving the word order. I also propose that, to place the focused element in the IBV position is a further step towards monoclausality,

in which the IBV focused element becomes clause-internal. This step also creates the necessary precondition for further reanalysis such as focus projection and pragmatic neutralisation. The exclusive focus reading inherited from the original cleft sentence was retained in the early stage of reanalysis, and becomes pragmatically neutral later, namely the focus expression is not necessarily exclusive/contrastive (see chapter 3 section 3.2.4). The development from the reduced cleft to the IBV focus construction is schematised in (79).

(79) *Stage II: Reduced cleft>IBV focus*
NP$_{[\text{PRED}]}$ SUBJ SM-Verb$\Longrightarrow$
NP$_{[\text{FOC}]}$ SUBJ SM-Verb$\Longrightarrow$
SUBJ$_{[\text{TOP}]}$ [NP$_{[\text{FOC}]}$ SM-Verb]

In the above analysis I have presented a plausible grammaticalisation path of non-subject focus in the IBV position. As for subject focus, a similar grammaticalisation process starting from a subject cleft can be proposed, in which the relative marking deletion, hypoanalysis, and topic fronting also occur and ultimately the subject is focused in the IBV position. The whole pathway is summarised in Table 4.9 with illustrative examples.

Structure	Scheme	Example
Basic cleft	(COP)-NP$_{[\text{PRED}]}$ **REL**-SM-Verb-SUBJ	(Kí-li) **bá**a-ntaba ba-kíí-fúúm-í mú-kái.
Reduced cleft	NP$_{[\text{PRED}]}$ SUBJ SM-Verb	**Bá**a-ntaba mu-kái **káá**-fúum-i.
IBV focus	SUBJ$_{[\text{TOP}]}$ [NP$_{[\text{FOC}]}$ SM-Verb]	Mu-kái **bá**a-ntaba **káá**-fúum-i.

Table 4.9: Grammaticalisation pathway of the IBV focus construction

One further question here is why the language simultaneously develops IBV focus for both subject and non-subject. Since in an SVO language the subject is often the default topic (Lambrecht 1994), subject focus is usually more marked than non-subject focus, for example in Kukuya a subject question is often expressed in a pseudo-cleft (see chapter 3 section 3.4). If so, why would subject focus be derived from a reduced cleft and to occur in the preverbal position again? How does this process void the rigid constraint against the preverbal subject to be focal as in many other Bantu languages (Morimoto 2000; Zerbian 2006; van der Wal 2009, 2015;

Downing and Marten 2019)? Is there any kind of subject-object asymmetry overlooked here? One possible approach would be that once a dedicated focus position was established in the language, it can just attract the subject to be focused there. I will continue to discuss this in the next chapter.

In this section I investigated the grammaticalisation process of the IBV focus construction. I first showed that there is a mixture of monoclausal and biclausal properties in the IBV focus strategy. Then I presented a possible grammaticalisation pathway from the biclausal cleft to a monoclausal focus construction. I proposed that in this process, relative marker deletion, hypoanalysis and introduction to a [FOCUS] feature, and topic fronting rules occur in sequence, resulting the IBV focus construction, which also shows that Kukuya has moved from more syntax-configurational to more discourse-configurational. Another question is where to situate the cleft origin of the IBV focus strategy, it would be interesting to investigate whether it is an independent development in Kukuya or an older ancestral evolution inherited in Kukuya and its closest relatives.

4.5 Microvariation in preverbal focus in West-Coastal Bantu

In this section, I shed some light on the IBV focus in some other West-Coastal Bantu languages to see if any generalisation on the origin of this focus strategy can be made, and what types of microvariation can be observed.

The class 1 subject marking alternation is also attested in many other West-Coastal Bantu languages neighbouring to Teke. For example in Mbuun (B87), which also employs the IBV focus position, the ***á***- versus ***ká***- alternation is attested in subject focus and non-subject focus in the past/perfective tense as well as in some other tenses/aspects (Bostoen and Mundeke 2012). Where it differs from Teke is that in Mbuun the canonical class 1 SM in the past/perfective tense is ***ká***- when there is no focused argument, as in (80a), while it keeps the form ***ká***- when the object is focused (80b) and shifts to ***á***- when the subject is focused (80c). In other tenses/aspects, the canonical subject marker is ***á***- and shifts to ***ká***- in the context of object focus. For adjunct focus in the IBV position, the SM alternation only optionally occurs. The OSV functional passive construction in Mbuun does not only involve object topicalisation but the fronted topical element also shows many subject properties, which suggests that Mbuun is in a further stage of grammaticalisation of the IBV focus construction (Bostoen and Mundeke 2011).

(80) a. ŋgwɛ́n **ká**-wó-kér i-sal ka kwil
his.mother 1SM-PST-do 7-work LOC Kikwit
'His mother worked in Kikwit.'

b. mo-an ná **ká**-mwɛ́n-ii?
1-child which 1SM-see-PERF
'Which child did she see?'

c. ná **á**-wéén le ndza?
who 1SM-go.PERF with him
'Who has accompanied him?'

[Mbuun B87] (Bostoen and Mundeke 2012)

In Kisikongo (H16a) which has also been reported to have the IBV focus position, the class 1 SM takes a null form when there is no argument focus, as in (81a); in (81b) the adjunct is focused preverbally, and the SM appears as ***ka***- (De Kind 2014). The same class 1 SM ***ka***- is used in SOV and non-subject relatives, alternating with other SMs in SVO or subject relative clauses, which can also show the connection between IBV focus and cleft.

(81) a. yandi **Ø**-zol-idi zay-a vo kuna N-banza Kongo
1.PRO 1SM-want-PERF know-FV if 17.DEM 9-city Kongo
ma-dyoko tu-lamb-ang-a
6-cassava 1PL.SM-cook-IMPF-FV
'She wants to know if we prepare cassava in Mbanza Kongo.'

b. o-Ø-se ve **ka**-vat-idi?
1AUG-1SM-father where 1SM-cultivate-PERF
'WHERE did the father cultivate?'

[Kisikongo H16a] (De Kind 2014)

In Hungan (H42), the class 1 subject marker surfaces in the form ***a***- when expressing subject focus (82a), and appears as ***ká***- when an object or adjunct is focused (82b,c). It is also noteworthy that in Hungan, argument or adjunct focus does not trigger word order change, as we see in (82b) that the focused object is placed in its canonical postverbal position rather than fronted to a preverbal position (Takizala 1972, 1974).

(82) a. Kipés **á**-swíím-ín kit zóónó.
Kipese 1SM-buy-PST 7.chair yesterday
'KIPESE bought a chair yesterday.'

b. Kipes **ká**-swíím-ín kít zóónó.
Kipese 1SM-buy-PST 7.chair yesterday
'Kipese bought a CHAIR yesterday.'

c. Kipes **ká**-swíím-ín kit zoon.
Kipese 1SM-buy-PST 7.chair yesterday
'Kipese bought a chair YESTERDAY.'
[Hungan H42] (Takizala 1972: 11-13)

The grammaticalisation process synchronically shows different levels reached in the various languages in West-Coastal Bantu and even within the Teke cluster itself. In Tege (B71) (Linton 2013) (non-subject) *wh*-words are commonly placed postverbally, as shown in (83a); in (83b) the *wh*-word occurs sentence-initially and the subject is inverted; in (83c) the object *wh*-word is placed in the IBV position; the subject is focused preverbally in (83d); in (83e) adjunct focus occurs in the IBV position and the topical object is fronted to the preverbal domain.

(83) a. Taará ká-lag-a **na**?
1.father 1SM.PROS-talk-FV who
'Who is father going to talk with?' [object focus]

b. **Ngondo ó-ma** ká-ye taará Ngabon?
1.month 1AGR-which 1SM.PROS-go 1.father Libreville
'In which month will father go to Libreville?' [adjunct focus]

c. Mbali brǐ **é-má** lê-yíríg-a?
tomorrow 1PL.PRO 8-what 1PL.SM.FUT-teach-FV
'What will we teach tomorrow?' [object focus]

d. **O-ngébé ó-má** â-bíl-á bila?
1-child 1AGR-which 1SM.FUT-bring-FV 8.food
'Which child will bring the food?' [subject focus]

e. We a-mbílí **kákuní** â-sur-a?
2SG.PRO 6-food where 2SG.SM.FUT-deposit-FV
'Where will you deposit the food?' [adjunct focus]
[Teke-Tege B71] (Linton 2013: 5-8, glossing adapted)

In Teke-Boma (B74), the IBV focus strategy is also observed, as shown in the sentences in (84). In these examples subject and object focus are placed in the IBV position, and we see that a H tone occurs on the nominal prefix or the first stem syllable of the focused NP.

(84) a. Bihí **bá-káhá** lií-luó.
1PL.PRO 2-wife 1PL.SM.PST-teach
'We taught the WIVES (not the husbands).' [object focus]

b. **Wé** aá-béére ŋomo.
2SG.PRO 2SG.SM.PST-beat 9.drum
'YOU (not me) played the drum.' [subject focus]

c. We **ŋómo** aá-béére.
2SG.PRO 9.drum 2SG.SM.PST-beat
'You played the DRUM (not the guitar).' [object focus]
[Teke-Boma B74] (Raharimanantsoa: p.c., glossing added)

In Iyaa (B73, Mouandza 2001) and Fumu (B78, Makouta Mboukou 1976) *wh*-words occur sentence-initially but are not seen in the IBV position. Two interrogative sentences of Iyaa are given in (85).

(85) a. **Ná** we món-i?.
1.who 2SG.PRO see-PST
'Who did you see?' [object focus]

b. **Bû-ni** we dîbíli i-ku:ku:?
14-which 2SG.PRO cook-PST 7-meal
'How did you cook the meal?' [adjunct focus]
[Teke-Iyaa B73] (Mouandza 2001: 323, 326, glossing added)

The examples above show that the grammaticalisation process of the IBV focus strategy is in different stages in West-Coastal Bantu languages. Notably, we see that the languages that display IBV focus all make use of the initial focus strategy, but no language only employs the IBV focus position alone, which can corroborate the hypothesis that the initial focus, namely the reduced cleft construction, is prior to IBV focus in this process.

In Table 4.10 below, I list several checkpoints on some grammatical features in Mbuun, Kisikongo and Kukuya that are generalised from some available corpus and literature. It is interesting to see that even within the three languages that belong to the West-Coastal Bantu and that all have been reported to have the IBV focus strategy, there is much variation on

the other grammatical properties which are associated with IBV focus. It is worthwhile investigating if there are any dependencies or correlations among these features, and why some constructions especially subject inversion is allowed in languages like Kisikongo and Tege (see (83)b above) but not in the others.

	Mbuun	Kisikongo	Kukuya
object marking	✓	✓	✗
subject inversion	✗	✓	✗
augment	✗	✓	✗
use of focus particle	✓	✓	✗
focus projection	✗	✓	✓
in situ object focus	✗	✗	✓
anti-agreement effect	✗	✓	✗
preverbal subject in non-subject relatives	✗	✓	✗
agreement with postverbal lexical subject	✗	✓	✗
subject properties of the fronted topic	✓	✗	✗
class 1 SM ***ka-*** in SVO	✓	✗	✗

Table 4.10: Some microvariation with regard to the IBV focus strategy in three WCB languages

* * *

This chapter is dedicated to investigating the possible origin of the IBV focus construction. In the first two sections, I introduced the connections between the IBV focus and relative/cleft constructions on the SM alternation and tonal variation including the H tone on the SM, predicative H tone on the focused element, and the verb-final H tone, corroborating the hypothesis that the IBV focus strategy is very likely to have been derived from a basic cleft. I also showed that the IBV focus construction exhibits both monoclausal and biclausal properties, and proposed a grammaticalisation process of this focus strategy. In the next chapter, I will give a fine-grained analysis on the structural derivation of the IBV construction

from the synchronic point of view, and will also provide an explanation on the mechanism of the class 1 subject marking allomorphy.