



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Comparing CJ-DJ discrepancies in Matengo and Bemba

Kula, N.C.

Citation

Kula, N. C. (2024). Comparing CJ-DJ discrepancies in Matengo and Bemba. *Journal Of Swahili And African Studies*, 35, 51-60. doi:10.18910/95319

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licensed under Article 25fa Copyright Act/Law \(Amendment Taverne\)](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4209767>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Comparing CJ-DJ discrepancies in Matengo and Bemba

KULA Nancy C.*

1. Introduction

Yoneda (2017) presents an excellent account and analysis of the conjoint-disjoint distinction (CJ-DJ) in Matengo (N13). In contrast to Bemba where the CJ-DJ applies in a high number of tenses with a wide range of morphological markers, the CJ-DJ in Matengo applies in 3 tenses. There is a contrast on the patterning of the CJ-DJ between these tenses with a competition between three characteristics of the CJ-DJ namely, whether they play an informational, syntactic or aspectual role (Yoneda 2017: 442). These features are shown to sometimes clash because there are cases where there are no paired CJ-DJ, e.g., the fact that the CJ only exists in the non-perfect and the DJ only in the perfect.

These non-paired cases present some interesting scenarios that reflect a deviation from the “standard” use of the CJ-DJ in the language. In addition, there are cases when there is a blurring of the expected CJ-DJ uses due to different factors, such as for example, the interaction with aspect. These cases will be the basis of comparison between Matengo and Bemba in this short squib, with the purpose of understanding whether the patterning of unmatched pairs, and also the varying use of CJ-DJ in relation to how VP focus, rather than IAV term focus, is expressed, is a window into expected future changes and/or ongoing change. Since Bemba (still) has a wide range of aspectual markers for CJ-DJ marking similar patterning would suggest that perhaps one trajectory of change in CJ-DJ systems would lead to the pattern now seen in Matengo. Within this limited data set, the paper tries to better understand language change on the basis of comparing differing contemporary CJ-DJ patterns.

In Matengo (Yoneda 2017: 440) the following patterns hold with respect to focus in the CJ-DJ as reflected in the data discussed in Yoneda (2017) and also in foregoing work.

(1) Matengo (N13) CJ-DJ and focus patterns.

- a) Term focus is expressed in the IAV position with the CJ form
- b) VP focus is expressed with the CJ form

* University of Leiden (LUCL)

- c) Narrow focus on the verb is expressed by a Light Verb Construction
- d) Truth-value focus is expressed by the DJ form
- e) TAM focus: Focus on perfect aspect is expressed by the perfect form = disjoint form, while focus on progressive aspect is expressed by a copular expression.

2. Disjoint forms with focus

In the past tense in Matengo, aspectual differences are overridden in favour of expressing post-verbal IAV focus when CJ-DJ forms of the past tense are used. This is however not the case in the present tense particularly for inchoative and stative verbs. Because the aspectual distinction is in this case retained it creates a situation where the CJ-DJ distinction is disregarded, or downgraded and in this case focused constituents can occur with the disjoint form contra (1a). In these cases, a present/ongoing situation is expressed by the present perfect, while habitual situations are marked by the simple present. See examples (2a-b) below (Yoneda 2017: 443) using the verb *-gonel-* ‘to fall asleep’ expressing a present and ongoing situation in (2a) and a habitual situation in (2b).

- (2) a. ju-gonel-ití mu-súmba senzé. [perfect present – DJ]
 1SM-fall.asleep-PF 18LOC-7.room 7.this
 ‘She is (now) sleeping in this room.’
 (Response to: Where is she sleeping?)
- b. ju-gonel-a mu-súmba senzé. [simple present – CJ]
 1SM-fall.asleep-BF 18LOC-7.room 7.this
 She (usually) sleeps in this room.’
 (Response to: Where does she usually sleep?)
- (3) a. jóó ju- gonel-ití nyane ? [perfect present – DJ]
 1RM 1 SM -fall.asleep-pf who
 ‘Who is sleeping?’
- b. ju-gonel-ití María [perfect present – DJ]
 1 SM -fall.asleep-pf Maria
 ‘Maria is sleeping.’

In (2a), despite the fact that the verb is in the DJ, focus is still expressed in the IAV position and indeed the focus is within the same clause as the verb. In this case aspectual requirements lead to the overriding of the IAV focus only with CJ forms normally held in the CJ-DJ distinction. By contrast also in (2b) the conjoint is used with a habitual when the information following the verb is not in focus. Similarly, in (3), the new information provided in (3b) in response to the *who* information question in (3a) is given in the DJ where the complement *Maria* is focused in IAV position. Thus, in Matengo in these cases standard use/marking of the CJ-DJ is overridden in order to adhere to aspectual distinctions.

However, in Matengo, this overriding is restricted to verb types with icoative and stative verbs distinction behaving differently from dynamic verbs. Thus in (4b) where the verb *-soma* ‘read’ is used, the CJ rather than the DJ is used in the simple present.

- (4) a. *ju-tend-a kike?* [simple present – CJ]
 1sm-do-bf what
 ‘What is he doing?’
- b. *ju-som-a mu-sumba sangu* [simple present – CJ]
 1sm-read-bf 18loc-room 7.my
 ‘He is studying in my room.’

This further indicates that the overriding is dependent on verb type and on aspectual requirements.

In Bemba, there are also cases where a form in the DJ verb form can have a following constituent that’s focused but unlike Matengo it is not based on aspectual considerations. In fact, there is no comparable aspectual focus marking in the CJ-DJ in Bemba. The table below, drawn from (Kula 2017) shows the TAMs that contrast CJ-DJ forms in Bemba which are mainly perfective or perfect (anterior) plus the habitual.

Table 1: Conjoint-Disjoint markers in Bemba

	PRESENT/ HABITUAL	P1/F1 (PERFECTIVE)	P3 (PERFECTIVE)	P4 (PERFECTIVE)	P4 (ANTERIOR)	ZERO (ANTERIOR)
CONJOINT	-Ø- -a	-á- -a	-á- -ile	-a- -ile	-a- -a	-Ø- -ile
DISJOINT	-la- -a	-áa- -a	-álii- -a	-alí- -ile	-alí- -a	náa--Ø- -a

In Bemba while conjoint forms are the ones mainly associated with post verbal focus (Costa and Kula 2008), disjoint forms can also indicate focus but in this case it's mainly on the verb (new information, corrective or truth value). When focus is indicated in disjoint forms, also for VPs, the verb is always part of the focus. Consider the examples below contrasting the information structure of conjoint versus disjoint forms drawn from Sharman (1956: 40).

- (5) a. *Bushé mu-la-peep-a?* DJ
 Q 3PL.SM-HAB.DJ-smoke-FV
 'Do you smoke?'
- b. *Ee tu-peep-a sekeléeti* CJ
 Yes 2PL.SM-smoke-FV cigarettes
 'Yes, we smoke cigarettes. (i.e. we smoke *cigarettes*, and not a pipe)'

Example (5a) with the disjoint form marked by *-la-* has the verb final in a question and not in focus. In the answer (5b) with the conjoint form, the object following the verb is focused contrastively with the implied meaning that they don't smoke other things, e.g., snuff or a pipe. A simple affirmation would use the disjoint: '*ee, tu-la-peepa* 'yes we smoke'.

In addition to the expected pattern in (5) the disjoint form may have following constituents which can be focused (new information). The examples below from Kula (2017) illustrate this.

- (6) *Bushe bamayo bá-á'lí-fík-ílé ulya mwaka?* (MH_{v2}-FV DJ)
 Q 2.mother 2SM-P4.DJ-arrive-P4 3DEM4 3.year
 'Did mother arrive the previous year?'
- (7) a. Q: *Bushe ba-Chocho bá-í'cít-à inshi?*
 Q 2SM-Chocho 2SM-do-FV what
 'What does Chocho do?'
- b. A1: *Bá-lá-sáámbílíl-á* DJ
 2SM-HAB.DJ-learn-FV
 'She studies/goes to school'
- c. A2: *Bá-lá-sáámbílíl-á palicisano na pacibelushi* DJ
 2SM-HAB.DJ-learn-FV 16Friday CONJ 16.Saturday
 'Yes she studies on Friday and Saturday' (VP focus)

- (8) a. Q: *Bushe ba-Chocho kanshi na-bo bá-lá-sáámbílíl-á?* DJ
 Q 2SM-Chocho so CONJ-2RCD 2SM-HAB.DJ-learn-FV
 ‘So Chocho also studies/goes to school then?’
- b. A1: *Ee, bá-sáámbílíl-à palicisano na pacibelushi* CJ
 yes 2SM-learn-FV 16.Friday CONJ 16.Saturday
 ‘Yes she studies/goes to school on Friday and Saturday’ (IAV focus)
- c. A2: *Ee, bá-lá-sáámbílíl-á, nanguline ni palicisano*
 yes 2SM-HAB.DJ-learn-FV although COP 16.Friday
na pacibelushi fye (DJ, V focus)
 CONJ 16.Saturday only
 ‘Yes she studies, although it is only on Friday and Saturday’

In questions like (6) with the disjoint marker the verb does not have to be in final position. This question is made with the question particle *bushe*. In (7) in response to the open question in (7a), which does not include the verb, the response can be either (7b) or (7c). In both cases the verb has to be in focus and specifically in (7c) the whole VP is in focus leading to the use of the DJ with following constituents that are in focus. In Bemba the CJ-DJ in the majority of cases matches with phonological phrasing marked by bounded and unbounded H tone spreading. Bounded H spreading indicates a following constituent and therefore mainly occurs with the CJ. Unbounded spreading indicates usually no following constituent and phonological phrase finality and hence matches the DJ. Thus (7c) with VP focus overrides both the expected phonological pattern and also the constituency expectations of DJ forms. In this case information structure is treated as more important than the former two conditions in a similar way as we saw for Matengo, where there was competition between the realisation of aspectual information and information structure.

The DJ pattern in (7) contrasts with that in (8) where the main verb is included in the question in (8a). In this case the response in (8b) is in the conjoint and only the IAV is in focus. In this case both new information but also contrastive focus assuming that that specific days are selected out of the other days of the week. In this case if the DJ is used in (7c), and additional information following the verb is post-clausal and also in a different phonological phrase. The examples in (7) and (8) also crucially show that both phonological phrasing marked by differing patterns of H tone spreading and TAM segmental morphemes (*-la-* for disjoint and nothing for

conjoint) occur at the same time suggesting that these are part of different systems contrasting morphology and phonology. In most cases, see further discussion in Kula (2017), CJ/DJ forms must match up with particular tone patterns correlating with the appropriate p-phrasing but this can be overridden in favour of information structure. If the focus is corrective then only the conjoint form is allowed as seen in (9b) in response to (9a). In this case the disjoint form response in (8c) is ungrammatical.

- (9) a. Q: *Bushe bamayo bá-bóómbà/ bá-lá-bóómbá palicisano?* (CJ or DJ)
 Q 2.mother 2SM-work/ 2SM-HAB.DJ-work 16.Friday
 ‘Does mother work on Friday?’
- b. A1: *Iyoo, bá-bóómb-à palicitatu* CJ
 no 2SM-work-FV 16.Wednesday
 ‘No, she works on Wednesday’
- c. A2: **Iyoo, bá-lá-bóómb-á palicitatu* DJ
 no 2SM-HAB.DJ-work-FV 16.Wednesday

Givón (1975) has also previously pointed out these two types of focus correlating with CJ/DJ forms in Bemba, termed complement focus (CJ forms) and VP focus (DJ forms). Givón treats the distribution as aspect focus and the CJ/DJ markers as focus scope markers. VP focus correlates with new information while IAV focus is either new, contrastive or corrective. The examples below from Givón (1975: 190) illustrate the pattern with the remote past (P4). Tone has been added.

- (10) a. *bá-àlí-bóòmbéle sààná* ‘They worked hard’ DJ
 b. *bá-à-bóòmbéle sààná* ‘They worked hard’ CJ
 c. *bá-àlí-bóòmbéle mùmúshí* ‘They worked in the village’ DJ
 d. *bá-à-bóòmbéle mùmúshí* ‘They worked in the village’ CJ
 e. *bá-àlí-bóòmbéle nèèmfúmù* ‘They worked with the chief’ DJ
 f. *bá-à-bóòmbéle nèèmfúmù* ‘They worked with the chief’ CJ

Thus, although DJ forms can both have and focus complements in IAV position, the focus type is restricted to new information, while in CJ forms focus is broader including contrastive focus where a possible set of alternatives whether articulated or not are assumed. Thus, also cleft focusing of a complement obligatorily requires CJ marking where the complement is in

focus and the verb is presupposed. It also thus follows that disjoint forms are excluded from (restrictive) relative clauses and other pre-suppositional clauses since the verb could not be new information in these cases. Conversely this means that the verb is not part of the focus in conjoint forms. Although Givón (1975: 191) does not use the CJ-DJ terminology his analysis of focus directly correlates to this as:

Verb not new information = Complement focus	(CJ forms)
Verb new information = VP focus	(DJ forms)

3. Conjoint forms without focus

Considering the alternative scenario where conjoint forms are used when there is no focus Matengo has this in the non-perfect simple present which as Yoneda (2017) shows and seen above requires the use of the CJ form. In thesethetic sentences we have a dummy complement based on the verb. There are two competing requirements at play here – the aspectual requirement to have the conjoint, but also the CJ/DJ constituency requirement. In example (11) there is no focus but a constituent in IAV is required. Yoneda (2017:446) provides further exemplification.

- (11) a. *mwana ju-hog-a mási.* [thetic] [simple present – CJ]
 1.child 1sm-bathe-bf 6.water
 ‘A child is bathing water/a child bathes water.’
- b. **mwana ju-hog-a.* [simple present – CJ]
 1.child 1sm-bathe-bf

As Yoneda notes, in this case the addition of water is superfluous in the context and only serves to fulfil the constituency requirement to have a complement in IAV position in conjoint forms even when no focus is associated to it. In addition, in Matengo the CJ constituency requirement can also be fulfilled by using a light verb construction with the verb -tend- ‘do’ in combination with the main verb in the infinitive form. In these cases, the light verb has the CJ ending with the verb in the infinitive following it, thereby satisfying the constituency requirements. As in the case with the disjoint forms having following constituents that have focus, the drive is aspectual requirements which then leads to overriding the ‘standard’ pattern.

In Bemba, in all new information contexts in thetic sentences conjoint forms are generally used in answering questions like ‘what happened?’ (see Costa and Kula 2008). However, disjoint forms can also be used (to the exclusion of conjoint forms) in some all new information contexts. The examples below in (12) are drawn from Kula (2017).

- (12) a. *Kaunda à-àlí-'kúúú'-ílé amasukulu...* DJ
 1.Kaunda 1SM-P4.DJ-build-PERF 6.school
 ‘President Kaunda built schools,...’
- b. **Kaunda à-à-kúúú'-ílé amasukulu* CJ
 1Kaunda 1SM-P4.CJ-build-PERF 6.school
- c. *Kaunda à-à-kúúú'-ílé amasukulu* CJ
 1.Kaunda 1SM-P4.CJ-build-PERF 6.school
aya-sha-i-ful-il-a
 6REL-NEG-REFLX-be.many-APPL-FV
 ‘President Kaunda built many schools’

In (12a) we see that with all new information the disjoint form is used and the conjoint form is ungrammatical (12b). In order for the conjoint form to be permissible there has to be focus on the adjectival phrase which is in this case in (12c) provides some qualitative evaluation of the action of the verb. Given this type of examples, not all thetic sentences in Bemba take the conjoint form although that certainly is the predominant case. Hyman and Watters (1984) argue that usually such cases involve truth value focus so that some response is presupposed and thereby explaining the occurrence of disjoint forms. Like in Matengo, but to a lesser extent, there is also here a role of the tense used which is directly connected to the context which then helps to license the use of the disjoint form.

We can therefore conclude that in terms of interpretational and the correlated distributional properties, the conjoint forms in Bemba show IAV focus which is either new information or contrastive focus, with the verb never included in the focus, unless it involves thetic sentences. The disjoint form on the other hand always includes the verb in the focus and is therefore the central means by which VP focus is marked. A further important connection in Bemba, not the focus here, is that non-contrasting TAMs (i.e. those that do not have a CJ-DJ pair) the verb form is distinguished by tone marking which indicates phrase-final and non-phrase-final forms and in this sense at least plays a clear role in the constituency property of Cj-DJ forms.

4. Conclusion

In comparing the CJ-DJ systems in Matengo and Bemba, we have particularly sought to compare those aspects where discrepancies occur in both systems and there is some deviation from the more dominant pattern within each language. Specifically, we have looked at cases where the disjoint marks focus and by contrast the conjoint does not. In Matengo these cases are particularly connected to aspectual requirements while in Bemba they are not, at least not directly. Both systems show how and when variation in CJ-DJ marking is allowed. A summary is given in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Summary comparison of CJ-DJ in Matengo and Bemba

	Matengo	Bemba
Term focus is expressed in the IAV position with the CJ form	Yes	Yes but also DJ for new info.
VP focus is expressed with the CJ form	Yes	No by the DJ
Narrow focus on the verb is expressed by a Light Verb Construction	Yes	No by the DJ
Truth-value focus is expressed by the DJ form	Yes	Yes
Aspectual restrictions control	Yes	No
Phonological Phrasing overlays the CJ-DJ systems allowing focus to be similarly marked in non-matched pairs	No	Yes
All tenses express the CJ-DJ (segmentally)	No	No
Aspectual requirements override the CJ-DJ	Yes	No

This distribution shows that the sources of variation between the two languages is different and perhaps this can be a window to our beginning to understand the evolution of these systems. In Matengo we see evidence of the widely discussed connection of Cj-DJ to specific tenses and how that specificity leads to closer aspectual interactions and dependencies, showing that the CJ-DJ can be attenuated and demoted in particular contexts. The Bemba case, perhaps because of the overlap with phonological phrasing on the whole system, shows more flexibility although at the same time there is a strict division between the marking contrast between IAV focus (only conjoint for contrastive and corrective focus) and VP focus (only disjoint). A future work will hope to make broader connections with other Bantu languages to evaluate whether more aspectual languages patterns with Matengo and those that aren't pattern more with Bemba.

References

- Costa, João & Nancy C. Kula. 2008. Focus at the interface: Evidence from Romance and Bantu. In Cecile de Cat & Katherine Demuth (eds.), *The Bantu-Romance Connection: A comparative investigation of verbal agreement, DPs, and information structure*, 293–322. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Givón, Talmy. 1975. Focus and the scope of assertion: Some Bantu evidence. *Studies in African Linguistics* 6(2). 185–205.
- Hyman, Larry, M. & John Watters. 1984. Auxiliary focus. *Studies in African Linguistics* 15(3). 233–273.
- Kula, Nancy C. (2017) The conjoint-disjoint alternation and phonological phrasing in Bemba. In Hyman, Larry M. & Jenneke van der Wal (eds.) *The conjoint-disjoint alternation in Bantu*. Berlin/NY: Mouton de Gruyter, 258-294.
- Yoneda, Nobuko. (2009) Information structure and sentence formation in Matengo. In Manghyu Pak (ed.), *Current issues in unity and diversity of languages* (Selected papers from CIL 18), 443–453. Seoul: Linguistic Society of Korea.
- Yoneda, Nobuko. (2017) Conjoint-disjoint distinction in Matengo (N13). In Hyman, Larry M. & Jenneke van der Wal (eds.) *The conjoint-disjoint alternation in Bantu*. Berlin/NY: Mouton de Gruyter, 426-452.