

Chapter 7

The expression of information structure in Kinyakyusa

Amani Lusekelo^a, Jenneke van der Wal^b & Simon Msovela^c

^aUniversity of Dar es Salaam ^bLeiden University ^cUniversity of Gothenburg

This chapter presents strategies for the expression of topic and focus in sentences of Kinyakyusa (spoken in Tanzania and Malawi). In Kinyakyusa, there is no dedicated focus position immediately after the verb or elsewhere, and remarkably, focus may occur preverbally. Topic doubling, which is common in Kinyakyusa, can provide a verum, intensive or depreciative reading. Furthermore, the interpretation of the focused element in the cleft is mainly for identificational purposes. Lastly, Kinyakyusa has the V augment and CV prefix in the nominal structure. The CV prefix is an exhaustive marker.

1 Introduction

Kinyakyusa is spoken in south-west Tanzania and north-east Malawi by more than one million people (Felberg 1996, LoT 2009). It is classified as M31 in Maho's (2009) update of Guthrie's (1948) classification and has ISO code [nny]. The three dialects of Kinyakyusa include the southern dialect called Ngonde (spoken along the shores of Lake Nyasa/Malawi in Malawi), the eastern dialect called Selya (spoken in the mountainous parts north-east of Lake Nyasa/Malawi in Tanzania) and the western dialect called Mwamba (spoken in the mountainous parts north-west of Lake Nyasa/Malawi Tanzania). The existing literature covers the emphatic marker(s) (Mwangoka & Voorhoeve 1960), locative clitics (Persohn 2017), tense, aspect, and modality (Persohn 2020), object marking (Lusekelo 2024), the structure of conditional sentences (Lusekelo 2016), noun phrase structure (Lusekelo



2009), the V and CV “augment” (van der Wal & Lusekelo 2022), and subject inversion (Msovela et al. 2023).

The description is based on data gathered from three native speakers of Kinyakyusa aged between 48 and 66 during fieldwork in November 2020 in Kiwira and come from spontaneous conversation, narratives, and elicitation. Additional data were provided by the first author, who is a Kinyakyusa native speaker, and checked with speakers remotely. We used the BaSIS project methodology, available through the Leiden Repository.¹ The data were transcribed and stored in an Online Language Database accessible through the Dative user interface that allows data sharing in collaborative research. More information about Dative can be accessed via <https://www.dative.ca> (and see the introduction to this book). This database will be accessible through The Language Archive. We also refer to the introduction to this book for further background on the terms and diagnostics used for information structure.

Kinyakyusa is not a tonal language as it lost its inherent (lexical) tone (Persohn 2020: 38). While other Kinyakyusa variants have 7 contrastive vowels, the variant spoken in Kiwira (probably much of Mwamba dialect) does not make a phonological distinction between ɪ/i and ʊ/u. Variation between ʊ/u is mostly absent in speech, and although two of our speakers did produce both ɪ and i, neither they nor the first author differentiated them meaningfully as far as we could test. We therefore represent five vowels only. Similarly, we write /l/ for the tap sound that has [l] and [ɾ] as allophonic variants. We do not represent the vowel length caused by automatic compensatory lengthening in syllables with a labialised or palatalised onset (Cy-/Cw-) and/or a prenasalised coda (-nC). Finally, note that there are two series of subject markers, where series 2 (class 1 u-/i-, class 2 bi-, class 6 gi-) is used preceding the tense marker *-ku-*, and series 1 (class 1 a-, class 2 ba-, class 6 ga-) is used elsewhere (see Persohn 2020: 3).

The aim of this chapter is to present the morphosyntactic ways in which Kinyakyusa speakers organise the information in a sentence. We start in Section 2 by showing to what extent information structure influences word order, including subject inversion constructions. Then in Section 3, we show the interpretations of two predicate doubling constructions: topic doubling and in-situ doubling. A topic marker *po* is discussed in Section 4; three types of clefts are analysed regarding their form and function in Section 5 (the basic cleft, pseudocleft, and reverse pseudocleft), and the CV exhaustive marker is shown in Section 6.

¹<https://scholarlypublications.universiteitleiden.nl/handle/1887/3608096>

2 Word order

Kinyakyusa shows interesting word order properties compared to other Bantu languages. Three properties stand out. First, there is no dedicated focus position (Section 2.1). Second, the left periphery of the sentence is preferred for various kinds of topic, though nouns in focus can also occur there (Section 2.2). Third, while some verbs allow locative inversion, in general only agreeing inversion is attested in the language (Section 2.3). See also Kerr et al. (2023) and Msovela et al. (2023).

2.1 No dedicated focus position postverbally

Kinyakyusa canonical word order can be characterised as SVO, although given referents are typically expressed pronominally (in the form of subject and object markers). There is no dedicated focus position immediately after the verb or elsewhere. This section discusses the possibilities of focusing a noun postverbally, drawing on Kerr et al. (2023).

In the postverbal position, both the Recipient and Theme can be in focus, in either position. One of the tests for a dedicated position of focus concerns question words, as they are inherently focused. Both the Recipient and the Theme can be questioned postverbally. The Theme is questioned in (1), while the Recipient is questioned in (2).

- (1) a. Untupe ukump' **ifiki** unsekele?
u-n-tupe a-ku-m-p-a i-fi-ki u-n-sekele
AUG-1-fat 1SM-PRS-1OM-give-FV AUG-8-what AUG-1-thin
'What is the fat one giving the thin one?'
b. Untupe ukumpa unsekel' **ifiki**?
u-n-tupe a-ku-m-p-a u-n-sekele i-fi-ki
AUG-1-fat 1SM-PRS-1OM-give-FV AUG-1-thin AUG-8-what
'What is the fat one giving the thin one?'
(2) a. Untupe ukumpa **juani** ikipale?
u-n-tupe a-ku-m-p-a ju-ani i-ki-pale
AUG-1-fat 1SM-PRS-1OM-give-FV 1-who AUG-7-calabash
'Who is the fat one giving a calabash?'
b. Untupe ukumpa ikipale **juani**?
u-n-tupe a-ku-m-p-a i-ki-pale ju-ani
AUG-1-fat 1SM-PRS-1OM-give-FV AUG-7-calabash 1-who
'Who is the fat one giving the calabash?'

Kinyakyusa allows any noun, the Recipient or the Theme, to be an answer to a content question (and hence be in focus) postverbally, as illustrated in (3). Both examples in (3) can be an answer to either (1a) or (1b) and also (2a) and (2b). Therefore, both Theme and Recipient can be focused in any postverbal position. Note also that the relative animacy of the two objects has no influence on the word order.

- (3) a. Untupe ukumpa ikipale unsekele.
u-n-tupe a-ku-m-p-a i-ki-pale u-n-sekele
AUG-1-fat 1SM-PRS-1OM-give-FV AUG-7-calabash AUG-1-thin
'The fat one gives the thin one a calabash.'
- b. Untupe ukumpa unsekele ikipale.
u-n-tupe a-ku-m-p-a u-n-sekele i-ki-pale
AUG-1-fat 1SM-PRS-1OM-give-FV AUG-1-thin AUG-7-calabash
'The fat one gives the thin one a calabash.'

Modification by the exhaustive particle *-ene* 'only' is also used to test the noun in focus in any postverbal position, because the particle associates with focus. In (4a), the Recipient can be modified by 'only' in postverbal position. Likewise, the Theme modified by 'only' can occur after the Recipient, as illustrated in (4b).

- (4) a. Ampele mwene Sekela isoda.
a-m-p-ile mu-ene Sekela i-soda
1SM-1OM-give-PFV 1-only 1.Sekela AUG-9.soda
'S/he has given only Sekela soda.'
- b. Ampele Sekela jeene isoda.
a-m-p-ile Sekela ji-ene i-soda
1SM-1OM-give-PFV 1.Sekela 9-only AUG-9.soda
'S/he has given Sekela only soda.'

The focus constituent therefore does not need to appear in a dedicated position, but can appear anywhere postverbally, as shown with respect to the arguments in (1–4) above. The same is true also for adverbs, as illustrated in (5), where we also show the possibility for multiple questions.

- (5) a. Atu a-biik-ile i-ki-pale kugu?
1.Atu 1SM-put-PFV AUG-7-calabash 17.where
'Where did Atu put the calabash?'

- b. Atu a-biik-ile kugu i-ki-pale?
 1.Atu 1SM-put-PFV 17.where AUG-7-calabash
 ‘Where did Atu put the calabash?’
- c. Abiikile ifiki kugu?
 a-biik-ile i-fi-ki kugu
 1SM-put-PFV AUG-8-what 17.where
 ‘What did s/he put where?’

In constructions where multiple elements are questioned, however, the order is restricted. This is shown for adverbs whereby the reverse of (5c) is not allowed; hence example (6a) is not accepted. Furthermore, there seems to be a restriction for sentences with multiple question words, as not all combinations of arguments and/or adverbials are accepted. This is illustrated in (6b). Further research is necessary to determine what the precise restrictions are.

- (6) a. * Abiikile kugu ifiki?
 a-biik-ile kugu i-fi-ki
 1SM-put-PFV 17.where AUG-8-what
 ‘What did s/he put where?’
- b. * Untupe ukumpa juani ifiki?
 u-n-tupe a-ku-m-p-a ju-ani i-fi-ki
 AUG-1-fat 1SM-PRS-1OM-give-FV 1-who AUG-8-what
 ‘Who is the fat one giving what?’

To summarise, constituents can be focused in the postverbal domain, without positional restrictions, as was shown for adverbs and object arguments (see Section 2.3 for subjects). There are restrictions on multiple content question words, but these require further investigation.

2.2 Topic and focus in the left periphery

Kinyakyusa prefers the preverbal domain for topics. While familiar topics are typically expressed by just a subject marker, a full NP is used for shift topics, contrastive topics, and scene-setting topics. Shift topics are illustrated in part of a narrative given in (7). Note that the distal demonstrative (in boldface) is also used here to mark the shift in topic.

- (7) (That old woman asked: “Why do you sing and lament?” She replied: “My friend said to throw away the child; she is the one who cheated me; she is called Kisugujila.” Then...)

- a. Ubibi **jula** atile “mma isaga umyande amatiti aga kuti ngupe umwana”.

u-bibi ju-la a-ti-ile mma is-ag-a
 AUG-1.grandmother 1-DEM.DIST 1SM-say-PFV no come-HAB-IMP
 u-myand-e a-ma-titi aga kuti
 2SG.SM-lick-SBJV AUG-6-eye.discharge 6.DEM.PROX COMP
 n-ku-p-e u-mu-ana.
 1SG.SM-2SG.OM-give-SBJV AUG-1-child

‘That old woman said “No, you should come and lick these sleepies and I will give you a baby”.’

- b. Looli unkiikulu **jula** amyandile amatiti mwa bibi jula.

looli u-n-kiikulu ju-la a-myand-ile a-ma-titi
 but AUG-1-woman 1-DEM.DIST 1SM-lick-PFV AUG-6-eye.discharge
 mu-a bibi ju-la
 18-CONN 1.grandmother 1-DEM.DIST

‘Then the woman licked the sleepies (on the eyes) of that old woman.’

(When she finished that old woman told her “Go to that house, when you enter you will find a baby.” When she arrived in there, she indeed found a child.)

- c. Looli umwana **jula** ali n’ ikilundi kimo kyene; akalinakyo ikilundi ikingi.

looli u-mu-ana ju-la a-li na i-ki-lundi ki-mo ki-ene
 but AUG-1-child 1-DEM.DIST 1SM-be with AUG-7-leg 7-one 7-only
 a-ka-li-na=kio i-ki-lundi i-ki-ngi.
 1SM-NEG-be-with=7.PRO AUG-7-leg AUG-7-other

‘But that child had one leg, he did not have the other leg.’

Having presented shift topics, we now turn to contrastive topics. Examples (8) and (9) illustrate an explicit comparison between people, referring to them by proper names. Note that subjects and objects can be placed in the preverbal domain when functioning as contrastive topics.

- (8) Amani numbwene; Saimoni ngambona.
 Amani n-m-bon-ile Saimoni n-ka-m-bon-a
 Amani 1SG.SM-1OM-see-PFV 1.Simon 1SG.SM-NEG-1OM-see-FV
 ‘Amani I have seen; Simon I have not seen.’
- (9) (How many votes did Leo and his friends get?)
 ULeo n’ abinaake bakakabile nyingi. ULeo ihano, ujungi uju sita.
 u-Leo na a-ba-in-aake ba-ka-kab-ile nyingi u-Leo
 AUG-1.Leo and AUG-2-friend-POSS.1 2SM-NEG-get-PFV many AUG-Leo
 i-hano u-ju-ngi uju sita
 AUG-9.five AUG-1-other 1.DEM.PROX 9.six
 ‘Leo and his friends did not get many (votes). Leo got five, another got six.’

Scene-setting topics are illustrated for a temporal adverb in (10) and a location in (11).

- (10) (Context: Beginning of a recipe.)
 Na mmajolo nnyonyilwe ukuti mbijje umpunga.
 na mu-ma-jolo n-nyonyu-il-e ukuti n-pijj-e u-m-punga
 and 18-6-yesterday 1SG.SM-desire-PFV COMP 1SG.SM-cook-SBJV AUG-3-rice
 ‘Yesterday, I felt that I should cook rice.’
- (11) (QUIS map task)
 Looli pang’ombe apa une nsyagile ina.
 looli pa-ng’ombe apa une n-si-ag-ile ina
 but 16-10.cow 16.DEM.PROX 1SG.PRO 1SG.SM-10OM-find-PFV four
 ‘But here at the place of cows, I found four (cows).’

Multiple topics may also appear preverbally, as in (12), taken from a recounting of the Frog Story. The comment ‘they looked at the frog’ is anchored to an ever more specified referent: temporal ‘one day’ is specified to ‘at night’ (scene-setting), then we learn that this statement is about Jackson and his dog (shifting back from the frog to Jackson), and then the time is even further specified as ‘when they wanted to go to sleep’.

- (12) (Jackson has a dog which he loves very much. Also, he has a frog which he put in a bottle. It stayed and slept there.)

[Akabalilo kamo] [pakilo] [Jakisoni n'mbwa jake] [bo bikulonda ukubuuka nkulambalala] bakikeetile ikyula.
a-ka-balilo ka-mo pa-kilo Jakisoni na mbwa ji-ake bo
AUG-12-time 12-one 16-night 1.Jackson and 9.dog 9-POSS.1 when
ba-ku-lond-a u-ku-buuka mu-ku-lambalala ba-ki-keet-ile
2SM-PRS-want-FV AUG-15-go 18-15-lie.down 2SM-7OM-look-PFV
i-ki-ula
AUG-7-frog

'One day, at night, when Jackson and his dog wanted to go to sleep, they looked at the frog.'

Nevertheless, the preverbal domain is not reserved for topics in Kinyakyusa. First, an indefinite noun can appear preverbally, for example in (13) and (14). Note that in example (13) the word *mundu* 'person' does not have an augment and could thus be analysed as focused/clefted (see the discussion further on in this section and in Section 5.2).

- (13) Ngimba mundu ali pakusenga iliisu.

ngimba mu-ndu a-li pa-ku-senga i-li-isu
EXCLAM 1-person 1SM-be 16-15-slash AUG-5-grass

'Oh! Someone is slashing grass / it is someone slashing grass.'

- (14) Linga siku umundu linga ikukubuula gwinogonengepo.

linga siku u-mu-ndu linga a-ku-ku-buul-a
COND 9.day AUG-1-person COND 1SM-PRS-2SG.OM-tell-FV
gu-inogon-ang-e=po
2SG.SM-think-?-SBJV=16

'If during another day someone tells you something you must think.'

Second, the subject may be preverbal in athetic sentence, as in the out-of-the-blue sentences in (15) and (16).

- (15) Ifula jikutima kula.

i-fula ji-ku-tim-a ku-la
AUG-9.rain 9SM-PRS-rain-FV 17-DEM.DIST

'It's raining there.'

- (16) (Context: You are sitting in a house as a small group. Someone stares out through the window. Another person asks: Why do you stare through the window?)

Ikyula kikolile ulubwele.

i-ki-ula ki-kol-ile u-lu-bwele

AUG-7-frog 7SM-catch-PFV AUG-11-fly

‘A/The frog caught a fly!’ (Kerr et al. 2023: 13)

Third, focus may appear in the preverbal position. This is discussed more extensively in Section 5.2 on basic clefts, and is evidenced by the fact that the preverbal subject can be questioned (17), it can form the answer to a question (18), and it can be modified by exhaustive ‘only’ (19).

- (17) Juani akuuliile ifilato?

ju-ani a-ku-ul-il-ile i-fi-lato

1-who 1SM-2SG.OM-buy-APPL-PFV AUG-8-shoe

‘Who bought you shoes?’

- (18) a. (*i)Fiki fisatwike?

i-fi-ki fi-satuk-ile

AUG-8-what 8SM-fall-PFV

‘What has fallen?’

- b. Imbwa jasatwike paasi.

i-mbwa ji-a-satuk-ile pa-asi.

AUG-9.dog 9SM-PST-fall-FV 16-down

‘The dog fell down.’ (Kerr et al. 2023: 11)

- (19) Beene abapuuti batikubomba imbombo (abangi boosa bikubomba).

ba-ene a-ba-puuti ba-ti-ku-bomb-a i-mbombo a-ba-ngi

2-only AUG-2-priest 2SM-NEG-PRS-work-FV AUG-9.job AUG-2-other

ba-osa ba-ku-bomb-a

2-all 2SM-PRS-work-FV

‘Only the priests do not work (all the other people work).’ (Kerr et al. 2023: 11)

The CV prefix, which introduces exhaustive focus (see Section 6 and van der Wal & Lusekelo 2022), may also occur on preverbal nouns as in (20–22), although this possibility needs specific contexts for it to express exclusive reading.

- (20) (Context: Friends visit a park. One asks about the behavior of animals in the park. A special hunter replies.)

Jingalamu jikulya ifinyamaana ifinine.

ji-n-galamu ji-ku-li-a i-fi-nyamaana i-fi-nine

EXH-9-lion 9SM-PRS-eat-FV AUG-8-animal AUG-8-friend

‘(Only) the lion eats other animals.’

- (21) (Context: The priests have the ability to work but they have been exempted from doing so.)

Babapuuti batikubomba imbombo (abangi boosa bikubomba).

ba-ba-puuti ba-ti-ku-bomb-a i-mbombo a-ba-ngi ba-osa

EXH-2-priest 2SM-NEG-PRS-work-FV AUG-9.job AUG-2-other 2-all

ba-ku-bomb-a

2SM-PRS-work-FV

‘Only priests do not work (all the other people work).’

- (22) (Context: There are banana plants, avocado trees, and firewood trees; out of these, the firewood trees have dried.)

Gimipiki (gyene) gymile – ifijinja fikuuma.

gi-mi-piki gi-ene gi-um-ile i-fi-jinja fi-ka-um-a

EXH-4-tree 4-only 4SM-dry-PFV AUG-8-banana.tree 8SM-NEG-dry-FV

‘Only the trees have dried – the banana plants are not dry.’

Object nouns with the CV exhaustive prefix cannot appear preverbally (23) – they can only occur initially with the marking for a reverse pseudocleft (*fyō ifi* in this case), further discussed in Section 5.4.

- (23) Fiftwalo *(fyō ifi) batwele. Indalama bakatwala.

fi-fi-twalo fyō ifi ba-twal-ile i-ndalama

EXH-8-luggage 8.IDCOP 8.DEM.PROX 2SM-bring-PFV AUG-9.money

ba-ka-twal-a

2SM-NEG-bring-FV

‘Only the luggage that is what they brought. As for money, they did not bring (it).’ (van der Wal & Lusekelo 2022: 336)

In summary, unlike in many other Bantu languages (see for example Chapter 8 on Makhuwa-Enahara and Chapter 9 on Cicopi in this volume, as well as for example Zerbian 2006 and Yoneda 2011 among others), whose preverbal domains are strictly dedicated to topics, the preverbal domain in Kinyakyusa may in addition host focal subjects, although preposing topical constituents is common.

2.3 Subject inversion

The logical subject in Kinyakyusa can appear preverbally, as in (24a), or postverbally, as in (24b) for the subject *amiisi* ‘water’.² Unlike many other eastern Bantu languages, Kinyakyusa only features Agreeing Inversion (henceforth AI), whereby the subject marker on the verb agrees with the postverbal subject. In the case of example (24b), the postverbal subject is a class 6 noun, determining the subject marker on the verb in class 6 *ga-*.

- (24) a. *Amiisi gingiile nnyumba.*
 a-ma-isi ga-ingil-ile mu-nyumba
 AUG-6-water 6SM-enter-PFV 18-9.house
 ‘Water entered the house.’
- b. *Kusofu gingile amiisi.*
 ku-sofu ga-ingil-ile a-ma-isi
 17-9.bedroom 6SM-enter-PFV AUG-6-water
 ‘In the bedroom entered water.’ (Msovela et al. 2023: 158)

Locative inversion (LI) is a syntactic manifestation when the locative NP becomes a grammatical subject of the inverted construction, and the logical subject follows the verb. The locative subject in this case determines agreement on the verb (Bresnan & Kanerva 1989: 2, Thwala 2006: 336). While LI is quite pervasive throughout the Bantu area, it is not used as a productive construction in the Kiwira variant of Kinyakyusa. When we asked the speakers for grammaticality judgements, LI constructions were judged as unacceptable, as shown in (25a–25b), and the suggestion for improving the sentences involved a change to AI, as in (25c).

- (25) a. * *Pa-chunya pa-bon-ik-e a-ma-bwe.*
 16-chunya 16SM-see-STAT-PFV AUG-6-stone
 int. ‘Minerals are discovered at Chunya.’
- b. * *Mu-chunya mu-bon-ik-e a-ma-bwe.*
 18-chunya 18SM-see-STAT-PFV AUG-6-stone
 int. ‘Minerals are discovered in Chunya.’
- c. *Mu-chunya ga-bon-ik-e a-ma-bwe.*
 18-chunya 6SM-see-STAT-PFV AUG-6-stone
 ‘Minerals are discovered in Chunya.’ (Msovela et al. 2023: 161)

²This section is based on Msovela et al. (2023). For a detailed analysis, reference to the article is recommended.

An interesting exception where locative inversion seems to be acceptable is found with alternating verbs, specifically *-soka* ‘exit’ in the ‘bloody nose’ construction (26), and *-fwana* ‘be enough’ for ‘be fitting’ (27), where either the locative or the figure can be the subject. The precise semantic and/or pragmatic differences in interpretation and use between the two variants of these sentences remain to be determined.

- (26) a. Mu-m-bulo mu-ku-sok-a i-i-noge.
 18-9-nose 18SM-PRS-exit-FV AUG-5-nose.blood
 ‘In the nose comes out blood.’
 b. I-i-noge li-ku-sok-a mu-m-bulo.
 AUG-5-nose.blood 5SM-PRS-exit-FV 18-9-nose
 ‘Blood comes out the nose.’ (Msovela et al. 2023: 162)
- (27) a. Mw-igali mu-no mu-ku-fwan-a a-ba-ndu ba-na.
 18-9.car 18-DEM.PROX 18SM-PRS-be.enough-FV AUG-2-person 2-four
 ‘(Inside) this car fits four people.’ (Msovela et al. 2023: 162)
 b. A-ba-ndu ba-na bi-ku-fwana mw-igali mu-no.
 AUG-2-person 2-four 2SM-PRS-be.enough-FV 18-9.car 18-DEM.PROX
 ‘Four people fit in this car.’

We can analyse these examples either as locative inversion that is lexically restricted, or as exhibiting a causative-inchoative alternation – we will leave this open. That the alternation is present in a restricted number of predicates (as is typical in other languages, see e.g., Haspelmath 1993: 3–7, Creissels 2022) can be seen in the fact that a similar predicate, *ingila* ‘enter’, does not allow the alternation, as in (28). Systematic research into which predicates belong to the group of alternating verbs is welcome to clarify the interpretational and/or structural restrictions at play here.

- (28) a. Amasiugusi gingiile musukali.
 a-ma-siugusi ga-ingil-ile mu-sukali
 AUG-6-ant 6SM-enter-PFV 18-9.sugar
 ‘Ants entered in(to) the sugar.’
 b. Musukali gi/*mw-ingiile amasiungusi.
 mu-sukali mu-/ga-ingil-ile a-ma-siungusi
 18-9.sugar 18SM-/6SM-enter-PFV AUG-6-ant
 ‘Into the sugar entered ants. (Msovela et al. 2023: 162)’

It is also interesting to note that, although the Mwamba dialect is said to cover both villages of Kiwira and Lwanga, Kinyakyusa spoken in the former (source of this study) differs in locative agreement with the one spoken in the latter described by Persohn (2020). The examples provided by Persohn (2020: 95) were not accepted by our speakers (see Msovela et al. 2023 for further comparison).

Regarding the valency types that AI can occur with in Kinyakyusa, it is accepted with the copula ‘be’, the two types of intransitives (unergatives and unaccusatives), and passives, but is not acceptable in VSO and VOS sentences. AI with the verb ‘be’ is illustrated in (29) and (30). Although LI is not accepted, note that the verb in these inversions takes the locative enclitic (=po, =ko, =mo).

- (29) Leelo baaliko abandu bahano.
leelo ba-a-li=ko a-ba-ndu ba-hano
but 2SM-PST-be=17 AUG-2-person 2-five
‘But there were five people (contestants).’ (Msovela et al. 2023: 166)

- (30) Keeta silimo imbatata mundeko.
keeta si-li=mo i-mbatata mu-ndeko
look 10SM-be=18 AUG-10.potato 18-9.pot
‘Look, there are potatoes in the pot.’ (Msovela et al. 2023: 166)

For unaccusative and passive predicates, the single argument takes the patient role. AI with unaccusatives in Kinyakyusa is exemplified in (31) and (32), and AI with a passive verb is illustrated in (33).

- (31) Kusofu gingiile amiisi.
ku-sofu gi-ingil-ile a-ma-isi
17-bedroom 6SM-enter-PFV AUG-6-water
‘Water entered in the bedroom.’ (Msovela et al. 2023: 158)

- (32) Gyumile gimipiki.
gi-um-ile gi-mi-piki
4SM-dry-PFV EXH-4-tree
‘Only the trees dried.’

- (33) Sikulondwa syene milioni ibili ukumalikisya inyumba.
si-ku-lond-w-a si-ene milioni i-bili
10SM-PRS-want-PASS-FV 10-only 10.million AUG-10.two
u-ku-mal-ik-isya i-nyumba
AUG-15-finish-STAT-CAUS-FV AUG-9.house
‘Only two million (not more) are needed to finish the house.’ (Msovela et al. 2023: 166)

Unergatives also allow subject inversion. These are intransitive verbs that, unlike unaccusatives, have an Agent argument. They include verbs such as *run*, *talk*, *laugh* etc. We illustrate in (34) AI with the verb *-bopa* ‘run’.

- (34) Lyabopile ijenje!
li-a-bop-ile i-jenje
5SM-PST-run-PFV AUG-5.cockroach
‘There ran a cockroach!’ (Msovela et al. 2023: 167)

AI in Kinyakyusa cannot occur with both the subject and the object expressed as NPs postverbally; neither VOS nor VSO order is accepted in (35) and (36), respectively, whether in athetic context or with simple focus on the subject or object (i.e. as answer to a subject or object content question). We refer to Msovela et al. (2023) for evidence that the restriction is not on transitive predicates as such in Kinyakyusa, but rather the postverbal appearance of both the subject and object NP. This is because subject inversion with a transitive predicate is accepted if the object NP is either dislocated or pronominalised as an object marker.

- (35) *Aapiijiile ifindu uSekela.
a-a-piij-ile i-fi-ndu u-Sekela
1SM-PST-cook-PFV AUG-8-food AUG-1.Sekela
‘Sekela has cooked (some) food.’ (Msovela et al. 2023: 167)
- (36) *Akuunyile underefwa umpiki.
a-kuuny-ile u-n-delefwa u-m-piki
1SM-push-PFV AUG-1-driver AUG-3-tree
‘The driver hit a/the tree.’ (Msovela et al. 2023: 167)

Besides the formal properties of inversion that we just presented, the interpretational aspects presented hereunder cover the contexts in which VS order is used. In short, the postverbal subject in Kinyakyusa is non-topical – we find VS order being used inthetic sentences and in focusing the postverbal logical subject. In comparison with SV order, VS order is found to express a contrast. We discuss these contexts and interpretations in turn.

An SV sentence has a topic-comment articulation. The statement identifies a referent (i.e., the topic) and then comments on that referent, adding new information. In athetic sentence, the entire proposition presents a state of affairs as new information. This means that thetics do not feature a topic expression. Athetic sentence typically marks the subject as non-topical (Sasse 1996, 2006, Lambrecht

1994). In many Bantu languages, this detopicalisation is expressed by placing the subject in a postverbal position, as also happens in Kinyakyusa.

Thetic sentences are typically used presentationally, for example at the beginning of a story as in (37); they are used to state the existence of a referent, as in (38); they are also found in “hot news”/“out of the blue” announcements as in (39).

- (37) Ulwa ijolo fiijo [aliko unnyambala jumo]. Aali n’ abakiikulu babili.
 u-lu-a ijolo fiijo a-a-li=ko u-n-nyambala ju-mo a-a-li
 AUG-11-CONN long INT 1SM-PST-be=17 AUG-1-man 1-one 1SM-PST-be
 na a-ba-kiikulu ba-bili
 with AUG-2-woman 2-two
 ‘A long time ago, there was a man. He had two wives.’ (Msovela et al. 2023: 170)
- (38) (QUIS map task) Linga ufikile apo, kupingama papo apo silipo injila ibili.
 linga u-fik-ile apo ku-pingam-a papo apo
 COND 2SG.SM-arrive-PFV 16.DEM.MED 2SG.SM-turn-FV as 16.DEM.MED
 [si-li=po i-njila i-bili]
 10SM-be=16 AUG-10.path AUG-10.two
 ‘If you have arrived there, turn as there are only two paths there.’
 (Msovela et al. 2023: 170)
- (39) Ukulinga nkiina; ikwaga jikusoka imbeba.
 u-ku-ling-a mu-ki-ina a-ku-ag-a [ji-ku-sok-a
 1SM-PRS-peek-FV 18-7-hole 1SM-PRS-find-FV 9SM-PRS-get.out-FV
 i-mbeba]
 AUG-9.rat
 ‘He peeped in the hole; he saw a rat getting out.’ (Msovela et al. 2023: 170)

The postverbal subject may also be in focus (not just detopicalised). Simple (new information) focus can be seen in question-answer pairs, illustrated in (40) and (41): The interrogatives are inherently focused; the constituents that replace them in the answers are also in focus.

- (40) a. Bafwile (a)baani?
 ba-fw-ile a-ba-ani
 2SM-die-PFV AUG-2-who
 ‘Who(pl) died?’

- b. Bafwile Abdala, Hamisi na Juma.
 ba-fw-ile Abdala Hamisi na Juma
 2SM-die-PFV 1.Abdala 1.Hamisi and 1.Juma
 ‘Abdala, Hamisi, and Juma died.’ (Msovela et al. 2023: 171)
- (41) a. Jo jiliku (iji) jifwile?
 jo ji-liku iji ji-fw-ile
 9.IDCOP 9-which 9.DEM.PROX 9SM-die-PFV
 ‘Which (animal) died?’
- b. Jifwile indemba indiitu.
 ji-fw-ile i-n-temba i-n-titu
 9SM-die-PFV AUG-9-hen AUG-9-black
 ‘A/the black hen died.’ (Msovela et al. 2023: 171)

Among the possible interpretations of subject inversion, we note that exhaustively focused subjects are also accepted postverbally, as illustrated using the particle *ene* ‘only’ and the CV prefix in (42).

- (42) (What exact thing has fallen?)
 Jisatwike jeene jisimbilo.
 ji-satuk-ile ji-ene ji-simbilo
 9SM-fall-PFV 9-only EXH-9.pen
 ‘Only the pen has fallen.’

Given the fact that Kinyakyusa also allows preverbal focus, a follow-up research question is: What is the difference in interpretation between the preverbal and postverbal focused subject? In Msovela et al. (2023), we suggest that if a contrast is present with alternatives or expectations, the subject stays in a postverbal position, whereas if the referent is topical or no contrast set is present, the subject moves to a preverbal position. The contexts for the preverbal vs. postverbal position of *juani* ‘who’ in (43) illustrate this: The SV order is interpreted as an open question in (43a), whereas the VS order suggests a selection from a set of alternatives in (43b).

- (43) a. (Context: The chief has passed away and we are not sure whether the person who will now lead us will be as good.)
 Juani atulongolele?
 ju-ani a-tu-longol-el-e
 1-who 1SM-1PL.OM-lead-APPL-SBJV
 ‘Who should lead us?’

- b. (Context: In a choir, each of the singers can be the leader.)

Atulongolele juani?

a-tu-longol-el-e ju-ani

1SM-1PL.OM-lead-APPL-SBJV 1-who

‘Who should lead us?’ (Msovela et al. 2023: 173)

For further data and discussion of subject inversion in Kinyakyusa, we again refer to Msovela et al. (2023).

3 Predicate doubling

In predicate doubling, a finite and non-finite form of the same predicate co-occur in the sentence. Kinyakyusa exhibits two types of predicate doubling, i.e. topic doubling and in-situ doubling, but it does not allow the third type, cleft doubling, which is attested in other languages (Güldemann & Fiedler 2022). The ungrammaticality of cleft doubling is shown in (44), and we discuss the form and interpretation of the other two types of predicate doubling in turn.

- (44) * Ko kulima uku balimile.

ko ku-lima uku ba-lim-ile

15.IDCOP 15-cultivate 15.DEM.PROX 2SM-cultivate-PFV

int. ‘It is cultivating that they did.’

3.1 Topic doubling

Topic doubling is common in Kinyakyusa. In topic doubling, the infinitive precedes an inflected form of the same predicate. The infinitive either appears as it is, in class 15, and takes the augment, as illustrated in (45), or alternatively it may be derived into a locative class 16 with *pa-*, as illustrated in (46).

- (45) (Context: Friends are talking about sugarcanes during rain season when sugarcane is not harvested. One friend asks: Do you guys want to eat sugarcane? The other friends reply.)

U-ku-londa³ tu-ku-lond-a.

AUG-15-want 1PL.SM-PRS-want-FV

‘We *do* want it.’

lit. ‘As for wanting, we want (but we cannot get sugarcane this season).’

³The final vowel is not separated or glossed in the infinitive, as we view these as nouns.

- (46) (Context: You and your wife have quarreled, and a friend wants to know whether this has gone beyond repair. You answer this, to say that there is a conflict, but there is still conversation.)
Pa-ku-joba tu-ku-job-a.
16-15-say 1PL.SM-PRS-say-FV
'We (do still) talk.'
lit. 'As for talking, we talk.'

The interpretation of topic doubling depends largely on the context. A first possible interpretation is that of polarity focus or verum, as illustrated in (47). The marker *ko* (a pronoun used as a topic marker) optionally follows the topical infinitive and is further discussed in Section 4.

- (47) (Context: Father told us to sweep when he left. Now he comes back, and we are sitting watching TV. He says: 'Why are you lazy watching TV and haven't swept?')
Ukupyagila ko tupyagiile!
u-ku-pyagila ko tu-pyagil-ile
AUG-15-sweep 15.PRO 1PL.SM-sweep-PFV
'We DID sweep!'

Second, we find an intensive reading, where the action described in the predicate is carried out above expectation, as in (48). The unexpectedness can be reinforced by the exclamation *mwé*, suggesting a mirative interpretation, as in (49) and (50).

- (48) (Context: Speaker compliments on someone's outfit.)
Ukufwala afwele.
u-ku-fwala a-fwal-ile
AUG-15-wear 1SM-wear-PFV
'He has really dressed up!'
- (49) (Context: Speaker is astonished by good state of the house.)
Mwé ukujenga ajengile.
mwe u-ku-jenga a-jeng-ile
EXCLAM AUG-15-build 1SM-build-PFV
'He really built something.' (a special house)

- (50) (Context: From Mbeya to Kiwira takes 10 hours to walk but someone arrives in 6 hours, which is extraordinary.)

Mwé, ukwenda umwana endile!⁴

mwe u-ku-enda u-mu-ana a-end-ile

EXCLAM AUG-15-walk AUG-1-child 1SM-walk-PFV

‘The child (really) walked!’

A depreciative reading is also possible, indicating the bare minimum that would count as carrying out the action in the predicate but nothing that reaches expectations. In (51) and (52), the pejorative suffix *-any-*,⁵ which occurs on the verb in the clause that follows the clause with predicate doubling, highlights the depreciative meaning.

- (51) Pakulima (po) alimile (lelo asengeenye).

pa-ku-lima po a-lim-ile leelo a-seng-any-ile

16-15-cultivate 16.PRO 1SM-cultivate-PFV but 1SM-slash.grass-PEJ-PFV

‘As for cultivation, s/he did cultivate (but s/he did so sloppily).’

- (52) Pakusona umwenda (ko/po) asonile leelo asonenie.

pa-ku-sona u-mu-enda ko/po a-son-ile leelo

16-15-sew AUG-3-clothes 15.PRO/16.PRO 1SM-sew-PFV but

a-son-any-ile

1SM-sew-PEJ-PFV

‘As for the sewing the clothes, s/he sewed, but did so badly.’

As already shown in example (47), and here in examples (51) and (52), the pronoun/topic marker *po/ko* may be added to introduce the infinitival topic (see Section 4). Example (53) illustrates the use of the marker once more.

⁴Note also that the lexical subject here is placed after the infinitive, showing that the initial infinitive is indeed a topic in the left periphery.

⁵In the contexts discussed in this chapter, insertion of the suffix *-any-* adds pejorative meaning to the verb. A more detailed analysis is offered in Persohn (2020: 108) who analyses the form *-ania-* as a “combination of the reciprocal and causative extensions often gives a pluralational reading. The range of possible meanings includes reiteration, intensification or the involvement of multiple subjects or objects.”

- (53) (Context: Speaker A was talking about the contribution to water supply in the village that Speaker B did contribute. Speaker A wanted to insist on the offer Speaker B provided. Speaker A says:)
 Ukubomba ko ubombile amiisi.
 u-ku-bomba ko u-bomb-ile a-ma-isi
 AUG-15-work 15.PRO 2SG.SM-work-PFV AUG-6-water
 ‘You did well for the water.’
 lit. ‘As for doing, you did well, as regards the water.’

3.2 In-situ doubling

The second type of predicate doubling is in-situ doubling, shown in (54). The infinitive here follows an inflected form of the same predicate, and it must occur with the CV exhaustive prefix and cannot occur with the V augment (see Section 6 on the CV prefix), as shown in (55).

- (54) (Is Lydia washing dishes and cooking?)
 Ikusuka kukusuka.
 a-ku-suk-a ku-ku-suka
 1SM-PRS-wash-FV EXH-15-wash
 ‘She is just washing.’
- (55) Alimile kukulima / *ukulima.
 a-lim-ile ku-ku-lima / u-ku-lima
 1SM-cultivate-PFV EXH-15-cultivate / AUG-15-cultivate
 ‘He (only) cultivated.’

When an object is present in this construction, it follows the infinitive and not the inflected verb, as shown in (56).

- (56) (Context: Guests visit their friend. They are offered tea while food is being prepared. They agree on taking only tea.)
 a. Tunwe kukunwa ikyai. (Tungagulila ifindu.)
 tu-nu-e ku-ku-nua i-kyai tu-nga-agul-il-a
 1PL.SM-drink-SBJV EXH-15-drink AUG-9.tea 1PL.SM-PROH-wait-APPL-FV
 i-fi-ndu
 AUG-8-food
 ‘Let us only drink tea. (We should not wait for food.)’

- b. * Tunwe ikyai kukunwa.
 tu-nu-e i-kyai ku-ku-nua
 1PL.SM-drink-SBJV AUG-9.tea EXH-15-drink
 int. 'Let us only drink tea.'

In-situ doubling brings about an interpretation as state-of-affairs focus, and (because of the CV prefix) an exhaustive reading on the predicate: Only this action and no other was performed, as seen in the context and following clause in (56) above, and illustrated again in the contrastive context in (57). Although superfluous, speakers may also add the exhaustive particle *-ene* 'only' to emphasize on the action, as in (58).

- (57) (Context: Malundi was supposed to do two activities, graze cows and cultivate a farm. He did one activity. Speaker A asks: Did Malundi graze cows and cultivate the farm? Speaker B knows exactly what Malundi did and replies.)

Mma atimile kukutima ing'ombe.
 mma a-tim-ile ku-ku-tima i-ng'ombe
 no 1SM-graze-PFV EXH-15-graze AUG-10.cow
 'No. He only grazed cows.'

- (58) (Context: The parents travelled and expected the children to wash clothes, sweep the yard and water the flowers. Upon their return, they ask: Did you complete your tasks?)

Twasukile (kwene) kukusuka.
 tu-a-suk-ile ku-ene ku-ku-suka
 1PL.SM-PST-wash-PFV 15-only EXH-15-wash
 'We only washed.'

In summary, topic doubling in Kinyakyusa is used to express verum and a contrast between predicates, with additional pragmatically-licensed intensive, mirative, and depreciative interpretations. In-situ doubling uses the postverbal infinitive with the CV prefix and expresses exhaustive state-of-affairs focus.

4 Topic markers *ko* and *po*

The pronominal expressions *ko* and *po*, which we call topic markers, can be used in topic doubling in Kinyakyusa (see Section 3), and in marking a conditional clause as topic. Depending on whether the initial predicate is an infinitive in class

15 or a locative in class 16, the topic marker is *ko* or *po*, respectively, as shown in (59) and (60). Considering that both *ko/po* and the topic doubling construction mark the predicate as the (contrastive) topic, their combination is said to give extra emphasis.

- (59) Mwé, ukwenda **ko** endile!

mwe u-ku-enda ko a-end-ile

EXCLAM AUG-15-walk 15.PRO 1SM-walk-PFV

‘He (really) walked!’

- (60) Ikinyangwa pakusya (**po**) bikusya.

i-ki-nyangwa pa-ku-sya po ba-ku-sy-a

AUG-7-banana.flour 16-15-grind 16.PRO 2SM-PRS-grind-FV

‘As for banana flour, they do the grinding.’

In conditional sentences with *linga* ‘if/when’, *po* may be added at the end of the protasis, as illustrated in (61). The marker *po* is analysed as occurring in the protasis here, because it appears to be cliticised onto the verb and may be followed by a pause.

- (61) (QUIS map task)

Linga gwendile**po** kusyaga ing’ombe itatu.

linga gu-end-ile=po ku-si-ag-a i-ng’ombe i-tatu

COND 2SG.SM-walk-PFV=16 2SG.SM-10.OM-find-FV AUG-10.cow 10-three

‘When you have walked some distance, you will find three cows.’

Note that *po* may also be added in the apodosis, as illustrated in (62). Here the marker is said to be in the apodosis because a possible prosodic pause would be placed before *po*.

- (62) (QUIS map task)

Linga ufikile piikolokotwa pala **po**⁶ kupingama.

linga u-fik-ile pa-i-kolokotwa pala po

COND 2SG.SM-arrive-PFV 16-5-butterfly 16.DEM.DIST 16.PRO

ku-pingam-a

2SG.SM-turn-FV

‘When you arrive at the place of the butterfly, (then) you turn.’

⁶One of the reviewers thinks that *po* in the apodosis reads like the Swahili expression *ndipo* ‘it is there/there it is...’. This reading is not straightly available in Kinyakyusa. The available reading of *po* in the apodosis in Kinyakyusa is ‘then...’.

It is, however, not obligatory, as illustrated in (63), though it sounds more natural with the *po* than without.⁷

(63) (QUIS map task)

Linga kwisa kumyangu, kujaaga injila iji jikufyuka bwalulu. Kufyuka
najo.
linga ku-is-a ku-mi-angu ku-ji-aga i-njila iji
COND 2SG.SM-come-FV 17-POSS.1SG 15-9OM-find AUG-9.path 9.DEM.PROX
ji-ku-fyuk-a bwalulu ku-fyuka na=jo
9SM-PRS-climb-FV northward 15-climb with=9
'If you want to reach my place, you will find a path that moves
northward. You use that path.'

The information-structuring use in conditionals seems to have developed from the use of *po* as a temporal pronoun translated as 'then', illustrated in (64) from the Frog Story.

(64) Po akasya kalyandile ukubopa.

po a-ka-sya ka-li-and-ile u-ku-bopa
then AUG-12-antelope 12SM-PST-start-PFV AUG-15-run
'Then the antelope began running.'

It seems that the marker is further developing into a pragmatic particle, introducing new topics, as in (65) – this, however, requires further investigation and is outside of the scope of this chapter.

(65) (Context: Discussion about elections and a local candidate.)

Po ikampeni akomelaga kugu?
po i-kampeni a-kom-el-ag-a kugu
then AUG-10.campaign 1SM-hit-APPL-HAB-FV 17.where
'Now where did he do campaigns?'

Unlike in some other Bantu languages (see Rukiga, Kĩtharaka, and Kirundi in this volume), the *-o* pronoun is not used as a topic marker for other noun classes, as the failed attempt at a contrastive topic marking in (66) shows. This is potentially the case because in Kinyakyusa the pronoun has developed into an identificational copula, as shown in the contrast between predication and identificational non-verbal predication in Section 5.1.

⁷This example also illustrates a narrative use of the infinitive *kujaaga*, i.e., the absence of subject inflection on the verb, and the *de facto* non-expression of the subject.

- (66) Abalimi (*bo) mbapeele ifijinja; abafwimi (*bo) ngabapa.
 a-ba-limi bo n-ba-p-ile i-fi-jinja
 AUG-2-farmer 2.PRO 1SG.SM-2OM-give-PFV AUG-8-banana.tree
 a-ba-fwimi bo n-ka-ba-p-a
 AUG-2-hunter 2.PRO 1SG.SM-NEG-2OM-give-FV
 ‘The farmers I gave banana trees; the hunters I didn’t give.’

To summarise, the pronoun in *-o* (Ashton’s 1945 *-o* of reference) has a meaning ‘then’ in class 16 *po*, and can be used to indicate the protasis or apodosis in a conditional clause. Both *po* and *ko* (class 15) are used in topic doubling constructions to mark the non-finite verb as the topic, thus functioning as a topic marker, but this use is not encountered for topics in other noun classes.

5 Clefts

Like other Bantu languages, Kinyakyusa has various types of cleft(-like) constructions. We present in turn the basic cleft (Section 5.2), pseudocleft (Section 5.3), and reverse pseudocleft (Section 5.4). As all types of clefts feature nominal predication, we first briefly introduce the three ways in which Kinyakyusa marks non-verbal predication in Section 5.1.

5.1 Non-verbal predication

The main strategy for non-verbal predication is the omission of the augment on nouns and adjectives, as illustrated in (67b).

- (67) a. u-m-manyisi
 AUG-1-teacher
 ‘a/the teacher’
 b. (What does Hobokera do for a living?)
 Hobokela m-manyisi.
 1.Hobokela 1-teacher
 ‘Hobokera is a teacher.’

Another strategy is to use an inflected form of the verb ‘to be’ and omission of the augment on the nominal complement. In the past tense, the inflected verb *-li* ‘to be’ is used, as in (68a). In the future tense, it manifests as *-ja* ‘to be’, as in (68b).

- (68) a. Imbunda jaali mbiine.
i-n-bunda ji-a-li n-biine
AUG-9-donkey 9SM-PST-be 9-ill
‘The donkey was ill.’
- b. Jibagile ukuja mbiiki, jibagile ukuja ngambaku.
ji-bag-ile u-ku-ja mbiiki ji-bag-ile u-ku-ja
9SM-be.able-PFV AUG-15-be 9.female 9SM-be.able-PFV AUG-15-be
ngambaku
9.male
‘It may be a female one, it may be a male one.’

The pronominal expression *-o* is the last strategy that marks non-verbal predication. The use of *-o* (in addition to the omission of the augment) results in an identificational reading, as illustrated in (67). While its origin is probably pronominal, it is analysable in contemporary Kinyakyusa as an identificational copula and we hence gloss it as such.

- (69) (Who is the teacher in this classroom?)
Umanyisi *(jo) nkiikulu uju.
u-m-manyisi jo n-kiikulu uju
AUG-1-teacher 1.IDCOP 1-woman 1.DEM.PROX
‘The teacher is this woman.’

5.2 Basic cleft

In Kinyakyusa, cleft sentences consist of a predicative noun followed by a relative clause. Non-subject clefts are clearly analysable as such, as they are marked by a predicative noun, and by the relativiser. We illustrate both in the following examples. Predication in the basic cleft is marked by omitting the augment as in (67) and sometimes by adding the identificational copula *-o* as in (69). The proximal demonstrative functions as the relativiser, as seen in the simple relative clause in (70), where we indicate the relative clause in square brackets. The same relativiser also appears in the basic clefts in (70) and (71). For non-subject relatives, the relativiser is obligatorily present, as indicated by the parentheses for **(ifi)*.

- (70) Findu fiki *(ifi) apiijile?
fi-ndu fi-ki ifi a-piij-ile
8-food 8-what 8.DEM.PROX 1SM-cook-PFV
‘What food is it that s/he cooked?’

- (71) Kyo kikota kiliku iki Sekela akonywile?
 kio ki-kota ki-liku iki Sekela a-konyol-ile
 7.IDCOP 7-chair 7-which 7.DEM.PROX 1.Sekela 1SM-break-PFV
 ‘Which chair did Sekela break?’
- (72) Ukatagege mmiisi umwana [uju tupapile].
 u-ka-taag-ag-e mu-ma-isi u-mu-ana uju
 2SG.SM-NEG-throw-HAB-SBJV 18-6-water AUG-1-child 1.DEM.PROX
 tu-paap-ile
 1PL.SM-give.birth-PFV
 ‘How dare you throw into the river the child who we parented.’

For subject “clefts” it is less straightforward to determine whether they are clefts and what their structure is. On the one hand, the augment is absent on the focused noun, as in (73), and often the identificational copula is present, indicating that it is a predicative noun as expected in a cleft. But on the other hand, the relativiser is optional, as seen in (74). This can lead to ambiguity as in (75), where *aba* may be interpreted as the proximal demonstrative, or as the relativiser, as indicated in the translations.

- (73) (Who has stolen the soda (between the adults and the children)?)
 (#A)Baana biibile.
 ba-ana bi-ib-ile
 2-children 2SM-steal-PFV
 ‘It’s the children that have stolen.’
- (74) Jo jiliku (iji) jifwile?
 jo ji-liku iji ji-fw-ile
 9.IDCOP 9-which 9.DEM.PROX 9SM-die-PFV
 ‘It is which (animal) that died?’
- (75) Bo baana aba biibile.
 bo ba-ana aba bi-ib-ile
 2.IDCOP 2-children 2.DEM.PROX 2SM-steal-PFV
 ‘It’s the children who have stolen.’ (demonstrative = relativiser)
 ‘It’s these children who have stolen.’ (demonstrative = deictic)

We postulate that the construction with either or both of the relativiser and the identificational copula is structurally a cleft, whereas the construction with neither relativiser nor copula merely focuses the preverbal element without a

cleft structure (see Section 2.2). This is also supported by the interpretational difference given for (76): Without *uju*, the implication is that the speaker does not know for certain if someone went to Mbeya, but with *uju* the speaker knows that someone went, but not the identity of the person. That is, the presence of *uju* adds a presupposition of existence.

- (76) Juani (*uju*) ikubuuka kumbeje?
 ju-ani uju a-ku-buuk-a ku-mbeje
 1-who 1.DEM.PROX 1SM-PRS-go-FV 17-Mbeya
 (no *uju*) ‘Who will go to Mbeya?’
 (with *uju*) ‘Who (of these people) is it that will go to Mbeya?’

The presupposition of existence is confirmed in the impossibility to answer (77) with *najumo* ‘nobody’. This can be compared to the question without *uju* in the preverbal focus position (not cleft) in (78).⁸

- (77) Q: Juani uju afwilepo (apa)?
 ju-ani uju a-fw-ile=po apa
 1-who 1.DEM.PROX 1SM-die-PFV=16 16.DEM.PROX
 ‘Who is it that has died here?’
 A: # Najumo.
 ‘Nobody.’
- (78) Q: Juani afwile (apa)?
 ju-ani a-fw-ile apa
 1-who 1SM-die-PFV 16.DEM.PROX
 ‘Who has died here?’
 A: Najumo.
 ‘Nobody.’

The interpretation of the focused element in the cleft can thus be said to at least be identificational. Interrogatives may be clefted, as illustrated above, and answers to such questions can similarly occur in a cleft, as in (79). In this example, we can see that this is a cleft by the identificational copula.

⁸We are not certain whether the presence of =*po* in the one but not the other example makes a difference in meaning.

- (79) (Who died here?)
Jo umpalamani afwile.
jo u-m-palamani a-fw-ile
1.IDCOP AUG-1-neighbour 1SM-die-PFV
'It's the neighbour who died.'

Furthermore, the identificational (and not correcting) function can be seen in the acceptability of (80) in context 1 but not context 2.

- (80) (Context 1: 'Who is it that you saw?')
#Context 2: 'Did you see *this* child?')
Jo jula (uju) nalimbwene.
jo ju-la uju n-ali-m-bon-ile
1.IDCOP 1-DEM.DIST 1.DEM.PROX 1SG.SM-PST-1OM-see-PFV
'It's that one (that) I saw.'

Similarly, the ungrammaticality of clefting 'nothing' as in (81) can also be explained by incompatibility with identificational focus.

- (81) *Fyo nafimo ifi fyonangike.
fio nafimo ifi fi-onang-ik-ile
8.IDCOP 8.nothing 8.DEM.PROX 8SM-destroy-STAT-PFV
int. 'It is nothing that was destroyed.'

The basic cleft should be compared to the preverbal focus described in Section 2.2 and the reverse pseudocleft described in Section 5.4. Relevant for the analysis of the reverse pseudocleft are the facts that personal and demonstrative pronouns may also be clefted, as shown in (82–84) – this will become clearer in Section 5.4.

- (82) (Did they put the flask outside or did you?)
(Une) jo une mbiikile.
une jo une n-biik-ile
1SG.PRO 1.IDCOP 1SG.PRO 1SG.SM-put-PFV
'(Me,) It's me who put (it) (there).'
- (83) (Context: You see that someone has climbed into the tree, you see traces, and there are various people you suspect. You ask one of them.)
Jo gwe gwakwelile mumpiki ugu?
jo gwe gu-a-kwel-ile mu-m-piki ugu
1.IDCOP 2SG.PRO 2SG.SM-PST-climb-PFV 18-3-tree 3.DEM.PROX
'Is it you who climbed this tree?'

- (84) (Recipe) Po lo ulu ngwega n' umwoto ngubiika pamwanya.
 po lo ulu n-ku-eg-a na u-moto
 then 11.IDCOP 11.DEM.PROX 1SG.SM-PRS-take-FV and AUG-3.fire
 n-ku-biik-a pa-mwanya
 1SG.SM-PRS-put-FV 16-top
 'Then it is at this time that I put fire on top (of the rice pot).'

- (85) (Did you vote at Ibililo?)
 Eee ko kuno twasalilaga.
 eee ko ku-no tu-a-sal-il-ag-a
 yes 17.IDCOP 17-DEM.PROX 1PL.SM-PST-choose-APPL-HAB-FV
 'Yes that is (the place) where we voted / it's there that we voted.'

In summary, Kinyakyusa basic clefts are marked by either or both of the identificational copula (plus absence of the augment) and the proximal demonstrative functioning as the relative marker. The clefted NP is in identificational focus, and this is where it differs from the simple preverbal focused subject, which does not come with the presupposition+identification interpretation.

5.3 Pseudocleft

Pseudoclefts consist of a free relative clause followed by a predicative identificational noun phrase. The free relative is marked as such by the relativiser (proximal demonstrative), as in (86) with *uju*. This sets up the presupposition that an entity described by the relative exists – in this case that there is someone who wrote this. This presupposition of existence is confirmed by the infelicity of answering the pseudocleft question in (87) by *najumo* 'nobody'.

- (86) (Who wrote this?)
 Uju aasimbile jila, mwana gwa nywili imbimba.
 uju a-a-simb-ile ji-la mu-ana gu-a nywili
 1.DEM.PROX 1SM-PST-write-PFV 9-DEM.DIST 1-child 1-CONN 10.hair
 i-mbimba
 AUG-10.short

'The one who wrote this is a/the child with short hair.'

- (87) (Context: You saw a group running past the window but didn't identify anyone.)

Q: Aba ubabwene bo baani?

aba u-ba-bon-ile bo ba-ani
 2.DEM.PROX 2SG.SM-2OM-see-PFV 2.IDCOP 2-who

'Who(pl) did you see?', lit. 'The ones that you saw are who?'

A: #Najumo./#Nabamo.
 na-ju-mo/na-ba-mo
 and-1-one/and-2-one
 ‘Nobody.’

The entity is then identified by the nominal predicate, and because of this specificational function, predication prefers the identificational copula *-o* (88). Note that a similar structure without the copula can be interpreted as a predicational copular clause, attributing a property to the referent of the free relative: In (89), the referent ‘what hurts me’ is said to be dangerous. There is no identification or specification here, i.e., it is not a pseudocleft.

- (88) (Context: A soda has been stolen. There is a group of adults and a group of children – who stole the soda?)
 Aba bahijjile isooda bo baana (aba). [specificational]
 aba ba-hij-ile i-sooda bo ba-ana aba
 2.DEM.PROX 2SM-steal-PFV AUG-9.soda 2.IDCOP 2-children 2.DEM.PROX
 ‘The ones who stole the soda are (these) children.’

- (89) Ifi fikumbaba fipala fijo. [predicational]
 ifi fi-ku-m-bab-a fi-pala fijo
 8.DEM.PROX 8SM-PRS-1SG.OM-hurt-FV 8-dangerous INT
 ‘What hurts me is very dangerous.’

The referent that is predicated in the pseudocleft is in identificational focus. The referent that is identified must therefore be specific enough. For the focused *mundu* ‘person’ in (90), the speakers commented that “It is grammatical, but it does not make sense” – this is because the free relative already gives away that it concerns a person, as it refers to class 1.

- (90) ? Uju aponile jo mundu.
 uju a-pon-ile jo mu-ndu
 1.DEM.PROX 1SM-recover-PFV 1.IDCOP 1-person
 ‘The one who recovered is a person/someone.’

Modification by ‘even’ (91) and ‘all’ (92) is ungrammatical, as these do not sufficiently identify a specific referent. They also test for exclusivity, but as shown below, the identification seems to play a more central role here than exclusivity.

- (91) Uju nalyaganiile nagwe jo (*joope) n'uFrida.
 uju n-ali-aganil-ile na-gwe jo ju-ope na
 1.DEM.PROX 1SG.SM-PST-meet-PFV with-1.PRO 1.IDCOP 1-even and
 u-Frida
 AUG-1.Frida
 'The one I met is (even) Frida.'
- (92) Ifi aagogile Kato fitana (*fyosa).
 ifi a-a-gog-ile Kato fi-tana fi-osa
 8.DEM.PROX 1SM-PST-kill-PFV 1.Kato 8-cup 8-all
 'What Kato broke is (*all) cups.'

Identificational focus may here be distinguished from exclusive focus, as the interpretation of a numeral in the pseudocleft is the lower boundary and not the exact amount as would be expected if the interpretation were exclusive (compare to the CV prefix in (125)).

- (93) Isi tukulonda ndalama imilioni ibili ukumalikisya inyumba.
 isi tu-ku-lond-a ndalama i-milioni i-bili
 10.DEM.PROX 1PL.SM-PRS-want-FV 10.money AUG-10.million AUG-10.two
 u-ku-mal-ik-isya-a i-nyumba
 AUG-15-finish-STAT-CAUS-FV AUG-9.house
 'What we need is two million to finish the house.' (can be more)

In summary, the pseudocleft describes an entity in the free relative and identifies that entity as the referent of the noun phrase that follows the identificational copula, expressing identificational focus.

5.4 Reverse pseudocleft/left-dislocation + cleft

Swapping the free relative and the identifying NP results in a reverse pseudocleft (NP COP FR), as in (94). The focus here, indicated by underlining, can be on the postcopular FR as in (94a) or the precopular NP as in (94b).

- (94) a. (Context 1: I'm talking about Bahati, but the name doesn't ring a bell for you. At that point she enters the store that we are in.)
 Bahati jo uju ikuingila.
 Bahati jo uju a-ku-ingil-a
 1.Bahati 1.IDCOP 1.DEM.PROX 1SM-PRS-enter-FV
 'Bahati is the one who is entering.'

- b. (Context 2: Someone enters the store that we are in, and you ask,
‘Who is the one that is entering?’)

Bahati jo uju ikuilingila.

Bahati jo uju a-ku-ingil-a

1.Bahati 1.IDCOP 1.DEM.PROX 1SM-PRS-enter-FV

‘Bahati is the one who is entering.’

We analyse the sentence with focus on the postcopular part (the FR, as in (94a)) as a straightforward copular construction. For the one with precopular focus (as in (94b)), we suspect that two underlying structures are possible: the first as a copular construction (i.e., a reverse pseudocleft: ‘Bahati is who is entering’) and the second with a left-peripheral NP followed by a basic cleft (‘Bahati, it’s her who is entering’), as also suggested for Kĩitharaka, Kirundi, Rukiga, and Cicopi (see chapters in this volume). We discuss properties of the sentences with focus on the initial referent to show evidence for both underlying structures, starting with the reverse pseudocleft and then indicating properties for left-dislocation.

In spontaneous discussion and narratives, the construction is typically used to identify a referent, as illustrated in (95) and (96). In (95) we indicate the initial constituent in square brackets.

- (95) [Ing’ombe iji jikulile buno] jo iji tukuti indama yaani jikutama.
i-ng’ombe iji ji-kul-ile buno jo iji
AUG-9.cow 9.DEM.PROX 9SM-grow-PFV like.this 9.PRO 9.DEM.PROX
tu-ku-ti i-ndama yaani ji-ku-tam-a
1PL.SM-PRS-say AUG-9.calf that.is(<Sw.) 9SM-PRS-moo-FV
‘The cow which has grown like this, it is the one we call a calf, as it moos.’
- (96) (How many votes did Leo and his friends get?)
Edom jo uju akabile ikula nyingi.
Edom jo uju a-kab-ile i-kula nyingi
1.Edom 1.IDCOP 1.DEM.PROX 1SM-get-PFV AUG-10.vote 10.many
‘Edom is (the one) who got the majority votes.’

Interestingly, the construction can be used for subject questions but not object or adverb questions, as shown in (97–99). Further research is needed to pinpoint why this is.

- (97) Juani jo uju ati atulongosye?
ju-ani jo uju a-ti a-tu-longosy-e
1-who 1.IDCOP 1.DEM.PROX 1SM-say 1SM-1PL.OM-lead-SBJV
‘Who is it that will lead us?’ (lit. ‘Who is the one that says s/he should lead us?’)

- (98) * Fiki fyo ifi uliile?

fi-ki fio ifi u-li-ile

8-what 8.IDCOP 8.DEM.PROX 2SG.SM-eat-PFV

int. 'What have you eaten?' (lit. 'What is what you've eaten?')

- (99) * Ndili lo ulu aakubuja?

ndiri lo ulu a=a-ku-buj-a

when 11.IDCOP 11.DEM.PROX FUT=1SM-PRS-return-FV

int. 'When is it that s/he will return?' (lit. 'When is when s/he will return?')

The answer to an alternative question may also be phrased in a reverse pseudocleft, as in (100), translated into English with an *it*-cleft to reflect the interpretation rather than the structure.

- (100) (Context: speakers see a drawing of two women entering through a door, with a question 'Did two women or two children enter the house?')

Abakiikulu babili bo aba baalingile nnyumba.

a-ba-kiikulu ba-bili bo aba ba-ali-ingil-ile

AUG-2-woman 2-two 2.IDCOP 2.DEM.PROX 2SM-PST-enter-PFV

mu-n-yumba

18-9-house

'It is two women who entered the house.'

Furthermore, the construction may be used to correct the interlocutor on the identity of the subject, as illustrated in (101) and (102).

- (101) (Are the cows jumping around in the field? No, the cows are not jumping in the ground, ...)

looli imbene syo isi sikunyela nkibanje.

looli i-mbene syo isi si-ku-nyel-a mu-ki-banje

but AUG-10.goat 10.IDCOP 10.DEM.PROX 10SM-PRS-jump-FV 18-7-ground

'But it is goats which play in the ground.'

- (102) (I did not find him/her in the river.)

Ubibi jumo jo uju ambele.

u-bibi ju-mo jo uju a-m-pa-ile

AUG-1.grandmother 1-one 1.IDCOP 1.DEM.PROX 1SM-1SG.OM-give-PFV

'An old woman gave (him/her) to me.'

The initial NP in the reverse pseudocleft may be modified by the exhaustive particle *-ene* ‘only’ (103) and (104), but not by ‘even’ (105) or ‘all’ (106), suggesting an exclusive focus interpretation. This is because for ‘even’, it must be true that the proposition is true for other referents lower on the scale, and therefore no alternatives can be excluded. For example (105), this means that in addition to Salima, who is not likely to laugh, others also laughed. The same reasoning holds for ‘all’, as this includes all the members of the set.

- (103) (Context: Speakers are sure that all attendees went to the dancing party on foot except Peter who came by car.)

Mwene Pita jo uju alyendile mwigali.

mu-ene Pita jo uju a-ali-end-ile mu-i-gali

1-only 1.Peter 1.IDCOP 1.DEM.PROX 1SM-PST-walk-PFV 18-5-car

?‘Only Peter it is who came by car.’

- (104) (Context: Speakers expected many people to arrive but only one person came.)

Mwene Salima jo uju ikufika.

mu-ene Salima jo uju a-ku-fik-a

1-only 1.Salima 1.PRO 1.DEM.PROX 1SM-PRS-arrive-FV

‘Only Salima is the one who arrives.’

- (105) Joope Salima (*jo uju) asekilepo.

ju-o-pe Salima jo uju a-sek-ile=po

1-even 1.Salima 1.PRO 1.DEM.PROX 1SM-laugh-PFV=16

‘Even Salima (*is the one who) laughed.’

- (106) * Abandu boosa bo aba bikufwala ifitili.

a-ba-ndu ba-osa bo aba ba-ku-fwal-a i-fi-tili

AUG-2-person 2-all 2.PRO 2.DEM.PROX 2SM-PRS-wear-FV AUG-8-hat

int. ‘All people are the ones wearing hats.’

The interpretation of the construction may be exclusive but is perhaps not inherently exhaustive, as the answer to an incomplete question can be answered by ‘yes’, as in (107). It is true that Moses washed shirts, therefore ‘yes’ is a good answer, but it is not true that he washed *only* shirts. Therefore, if the exhaustive interpretation were inherent to this construction, we would expect the answer to be ‘no’. This can be compared to the examples in (128) and (129) in the section on the CV exhaustive marker, where the answer is indeed ‘no’.

- (107) (Context: Speakers are shown a picture of a clothesline with various washed sheets and clothes, including shirts.)
 Bule isyati syo isi Mose asukile?
 bule i-syati syo isi Mose a-suk-ile
 Q AUG-10.shirt 10.IDCOP 10.DEM.PROX 1.Mose 1SM-wash-PFV
 ‘Is it shirts that Moses washed?’
 Eena Mose asukile isyati n’ imyenda igingi.
 eena Mose a-suk-ile i-syati na i-mi-enda i-gi-ngi
 yes 1.Moses 1SM-wash-PFV AUG-10.shirt and AUG-4-clothes AUG-4-other
 ‘Yes. Moses washed shirts and other clothes.’

While all these examples and contexts indicate the initial NP as a focus constituent in a reverse pseudocleft, there is some evidence that a second underlying structure is also possible. In this second analysis, the initial NP is in the left periphery, followed by a cleft in which the coreferring demonstrative is clefted (compare the chapters on Kĩitharaka, Kirundi, Rukiga, and Cicopi for similar discussion), with a literal translation of (107) as ‘Shirts, is it those that Moses washed?’. The same surface structure can thus be parsed in two different ways, represented in Table 1. Note that in the first structure, the demonstrative functions as the relativiser/head of the free relative clause, and in the second structure, the demonstrative is the clefted element and the relativisation is unmarked (see the optionality of the relative marker discussed in Section 5.2).

Table 1: Two underlying structures

	NP	IDCOP	DEM.PROX	(S) V	
1	NP	is		free relative	‘Sara is (<i>the one</i>) who we like’ reverse pseudocleft
2	(NP)	is	pro _{FOC}	relative	‘Sara, it is <i>HER</i> that we like’ left dislocation + cleft

There are at least two indications for the second analysis existing next to the reverse pseudocleft analysis. First, it is possible for a prosodic break to occur between the left-peripheral NP and the cleft, as in (108) and (109).

- (108) Amiisi aga, go aga tukupijila.
 a-ma-isi aga go aga tu-ku-pij-il-a
 AUG-6-water 6.DEM.PROX 6.IDCOP 6.DEM.PROX 1PL.SM-PRS-cook-APPL-FV
 ‘This water, it’s this that we cook with.’

- (109) (Context: We find a calabash among other calabashes and want to indicate that this particular one belongs to the thin person.)
 Ikipale iki, kyo iki apeeligwe unsekele.
 i-ki-pale iki kio iki a-p-el-igw-ile
 AUG-7-calabash 7.DEM.PROX 7.IDCOP 7.DEM.PROX 1SM-give-APPL-PASS-PFV
 u-n-sekele
 AUG-1-thin
 ‘This calabash, it is this one that the thin one was given.’

Second, the existence of the left-peripheral NP needs to somehow be presupposed, which makes sense if it is a topic. This can be seen in the felicitous and infelicitous contexts for (110), where some set of boys must be present, and also in the clearly topical interpretation in (111): ‘As for tea, I prefer this type’.

- (110) (Context 1: Which boy cut the banana?
 Context 2: Did the big boy or the small boy cut the banana?
 Context 3: #Did the big boy cut the banana?)
 (Mma) Undumyana unandi jo uju aasengile itoki.
 mma u-m-lumyana u-nandi jo uju a-a-seng-ile
 no AUG-1-boy AUG-little 1.IDCOP 1.DEM.PROX 1SM-PST-cut-PFV
 i-toki
 AUG-5.banana
 ‘(No) The little boy (it is him who) cut the banana.’
- (111) (Context 1: There are different types of tea to choose from (with milk, ginger, black)
 Context 2: #Do you want tea or coffee?
 Context 3: #You want coffee, right?)
 Ikyai jo iji ngulonda.
 i-kyai jo iji n-ku-lond-a
 AUG-9.tea 9.IDCOP 9.DEM.PROX 1SG.SM-PRS-want-FV
 ‘(as for) Tea, it’s *this* that I want.’
 *‘Tea is what I want.’

It seems, therefore, that the initial NP forms a topic expression, and the demonstrative is in focus. Since both the NP and the demonstrative refer to the same referent, for example *undumyana* and *uju* in (110) refer to the same boy, this construction manages to simultaneously express a topical/given status as well as a focus function of that referent.

Summarising the discussion on the three types of clefts, Kinyakyusa shows an identificational basic cleft and pseudocleft; the difference between the two requires further study in spontaneous texts and discourse. A third focus construction is a reverse pseudocleft (copular construction NP = FR), which can alternatively be analysed as an initial NP followed by a basic cleft. In this latter construction, the clefted demonstrative refers to the same referent as the initial NP, thereby in some way allowing that referent to be both topical and focal at the same time.

6 The CV exhaustive marker

Apart from the V augment, nouns in Kinyakyusa can also feature a CV prefix to the noun. This has been called the “CV augment”, but van der Wal & Lusekelo (2022) show that the CV prefix behaves quite differently from the V augment and is in fact better analysed as an exhaustive marker. The following section is taken from van der Wal & Lusekelo (2022) and shows the exhaustive interpretation of the CV prefix. We will here not go into the background and reconstruction of the augment but refer to Van de Velde (2019) and Halpert (2025) for general overviews.

Mwangoka & Voorhoeve (1960) translate nouns with a CV marker in Kinyakyusa with ‘only’, and we confirm and consolidate their analysis. If the CV marker is present, the resulting interpretation is exhaustive focus on the noun, which may project to the larger phrase. That the focus encoded by the CV marker is not just simple/new information focus, but exhaustive focus can be proven by the following tests.

First, the context and co-text provided by the speakers indicate that alternatives must be present for the noun bearing the CV exhaustivity prefix. The spontaneous follow-up in (112) shows a contrast, and the failed attempt at an additive continuation in (113) shows that the alternatives must be excluded.

- (112) Abakangale batwele ffitwalo (indalama bakatwala).
 a-ba-kangale ba-twal-ile fi-fi-twalo i-ndalama
 AUG-2-elder 2SM-bring-PFV EXH-8-luggage AUG-10.money
 ba-ka-twal-a
 2SM-NEG-bring-FV
 ‘The elders brought only the luggage. (They did not bring money.)’
 (van der Wal & Lusekelo 2022: 336)

- (113) Anwile jinywamu #n'iinandi.
a-nu-ile ji-nywamu na i-nandi
1SM-drink-PFV EXH-9.big and AUG-9.small
'He drank (only) the big one #and also the small one.' (van der Wal & Lusekelo 2022: 336)

The context for the in-situ doubling construction in (114), where the infinitive takes a CV marker (see also Section 3.2), indicates exclusion of one of the supposed tasks as well. Additionally, the translation provided by the speakers frequently included Swahili *tu* or English 'only'.

- (114) (Context: He was supposed to cook and sweep.)
Apiiijile kukupijja.
a-pij-ile ku-ku-pijja
1SM-cook-PFV EXH-15-cook
'He only cooked.' (van der Wal & Lusekelo 2022: 336)

A second argument showing the exhaustivity of the CV marker is the compatibility with the focus-sensitive particle 'only' (preceding or following the noun, though not both), as shown in (115) and (116).

- (115) Uulile (kyene) kikitala (kyene).
a-ul-ile ki-ene ki-ki-tala
1SM-buy-PFV 7-only EXH-7-bed
'S/he bought only the bed.' (van der Wal & Lusekelo 2022: 336)

- (116) Ampele (mwene) junnandi (mwene).
a-m-p-ile mu-ene ju-n-nandi
1SM-1OM-give-PFV 1-only EXH-1-young
'S/he has given (it) only to the young one.' (van der Wal & Lusekelo 2022: 337)

In contrast, the CV exhaustive marker is incompatible with the scalar particle *-ope* 'even' and the additive particle *na* 'also/even' which are inclusive in nature, as shown in (117a), and (118). Nevertheless, (117b) was accepted, which we do not understand at present – a reviewer suggests that there could be a contrast between 'together' and 'separately' here.

- (117) (Context: Robert does not like cabbage. He will eat any other thing. But this time he has even eaten cabbage.)

- a. * Lobati aliile na jikabiki (joope).
 Lobati a-li-ile na ji-kabiki ji-ope
 1.Robert 1SM-eat-PFV and EXH-9.cabbage 9-even
 ‘Robert has even eaten cabbage.’
- b. Aliile (ifindu) fyosa na jikabiki kolumo.
 a-li-ile i-fi-ndu fi-osa na ji-kabiki kolumo
 1SM-eat-PFV AUG-8-food 8-all and EXH-9.cabbage together
 ‘He has eaten all (types of) food, even cabbage.’ (van der Wal & Lusekelo 2022: 337)

- (118) (*Boope) Babaana baliile.
 ba-ope ba-ba-ana ba-li-ile
 2-even EXH-2-child 2SM-eat-PFV
 ‘(*Even) Only the children have eaten.’ (van der Wal & Lusekelo 2022: 337)

Third, the CV marker is not accepted with universal quantifiers like ‘every’ and ‘all’, again because no alternatives can be excluded – see (119a). However, exclusion of alternatives becomes possible when subsets can be created using a restrictive relative clause, as in (119b), or if the whole set is contrasted to another set, as in (120). These examples therefore allow the presence of a CV marker.

- (119) a. * Ipyana aagonjile fifisyesye fyosa.
 Ipyana a-a-gonj-ile fi-fi-syesye fi-osa
 1.Ipyana 1SM-PST-taste-PFV EXH-8-baked.good 8-all
 int. ‘Ipyana tasted only all cakes.’
- b. Ipyana aagonjile fifisyesye (fyosa) ifi atendeikiisye unna.
 Ipyana a-a-gonj-ile fi-fi-syesye fi-osa ifi
 1.Ipyana 1SM-PST-taste-PFV EXH-8-baked.good 8-all 8.DEM.PROX
 a-tendeikesy-ile u-n-na
 1SM-bake-PFV AUG-1-mother
 ‘Ipyana tasted only all the cakes that her mother baked (but did not taste any other cakes).’ (van der Wal & Lusekelo 2022: 337–338)

- (120) Babandu boosa bikutuuj-a.
ba-ba-ndu ba-osa ba-ku-tuuj-a
EXH-2-person 2-all 2SM-PRS-breathe-FV
#‘All people breathe.’
‘Only all humans breathe.’ (follow-up reaction: ‘But cows breathe too!’)
(van der Wal & Lusekelo 2022: 338)

Fourth, the CV marker is not accepted with non-specific indefinites, as here too there are no alternatives that can be excluded. In (120), instead the word *umundu* ‘person’, which could otherwise be interpreted as ‘someone’ must here be interpreted as a generic ‘human being’. Under our hypothesis, the CV marker necessarily triggers and excludes alternatives, which is only possible if *umundu* is interpreted as generic (excluding other species) and not if it is interpreted as indefinite non-specific (including anyone and everyone).

- (121) (Context: You visit a national park, expecting to see trees and different animals, but instead...)
Numbwene jumundu.
n-m-bon-ile ju-mu-ndu
1SG.SM-1OM-see-PFV EXH-1-person
‘I saw only a human/person.’
*‘I saw someone.’ (van der Wal & Lusekelo 2022: 338)

Fifth, idioms and cognate objects are “unfocussable” as they have no referential meaning and therefore cannot trigger alternatives. We thus predict them to be incompatible with the CV marker. At first sight, the acceptance of (122–124) seems to contradict this prediction, because the idiomatic object can take a CV marker. However, if we look at the context, we see that a contrast is indicated with other *actions* and not with other *objects*. This means that the given sentences are interpreted with the exclusion on the level of the verb phrase, and the set of alternatives is being formed for the whole idiom in the case of (122), and the whole action in the case of the cognate objects in (123) and (124), and not just the object.

- (122) (Context: As soon as he gets up in the morning, he drinks, and straight from work he goes to the bar.)
Ikukoma gamiisi.
a-ku-kom-a ga-ma-isi
1SM-PRS-hit-FV EXH-6-water
‘He is only hitting water.’
‘He is only getting drunk.’ (van der Wal & Lusekelo 2022: 338)

- (123) (Context: The calves stay at home and need to be fed, and the larger cattle are taken out to graze. Gwamaka is not interested in feeding the cows at home, he only goes out to do the herding.)
 Gwamaka ikutiima **guntiimo**.
 Gwamaka a-ku-tiim-a gu-n-tiimo
 1.Gwamaka 1SM-PRS-graze-FV EXH-3-grazing
 ‘Gwamaka only grazes (a/the graze).’ (van der Wal & Lusekelo 2022: 338)
- (124) (Context: Why are you being so quiet?)
 Ngwinogona sinyinogono.
 n-ku-inogon-a si-nyinogono
 1SG.SM-PRS-think-FV EXH-10.thought
 ‘I’m only thinking thoughts.’ (van der Wal & Lusekelo 2022: 339)

A sixth test involves the focussing of a numeral. As explained in the introduction to this volume, numerals lose their upward-entailing quality in exhaustive focus and refer only to the exact quantity, because other amounts are excluded. In Kinyakyusa, a numeral in a DP with a CV marker is interpreted as the exact amount, as illustrated by the infelicity of the follow-up ‘maybe more’ in (125) and (126a). This constitutes evidence for the exhaustive interpretation, especially when compared to the use with the V augment in (126b), where a continuation ‘maybe more’ is felicitous (but also notice that (126a) uses the reverse pseudocleft construction, whereas (126b) does not).

- (125) Bahati ikukaba **ji-milioni jimo** kuckyinja.
 Bahati a-ku-kab-a ji-milioni ji-mo ku-ki-inja
 1.Bahati 1SM-PRS-get-FV EXH-9.million 9-one 17-7-year
 ‘Bahati earns (exactly) one million a year.’ (van der Wal & Lusekelo 2022: 339)
- (126) a. Singuku ntandatu syo isi syalyulisigwe ([#]pamo n’ iisiingi).
 si-n-guku ntandatu si-o isi
 EXH-10-chicken 10.six 10-IDCOP 10.DEM.PROX
 si-ali-ul-is-igw-e pamo na i-si-ngi
 10SM-PST-buy-CAUS-PASS-PFV maybe and AUG-10-other
 ‘It’s six chickens exactly that were sold ([#]maybe more).’
- b. Inguku ntandatu syalyulisiigwe (pamo n’ iisingi).
 i-n-guku ntandatu si-ali-ul-is-igw-e pamo na
 AUG-10-chicken 10.six 10SM-PST-buy-CAUS-PASS-FV maybe and
 i-si-ngi
 AUG-10-other
 ‘Six chickens were sold (maybe more).’ (van der Wal & Lusekelo 2022: 339)

Seventh, negation targets the exhaustivity (rather than the truth) of the sentence when the CV marker is present on the object. That is, (127) does not deny that they drank soda, but rather negates that it was *only* soda that they drank. The fact that a grammatical operation like negation can target the exhaustivity also shows that exhaustivity is an inherent aspect of the meaning of the CV marker, and not a mere pragmatic implication.

- (127) Bakanwile sisooda (baaliile/baanwile n' ifingi).
ba-ka-nu-ile si-sooda ba-a-li-ile /ba-a-nu-ile
2SM-NEG-drink-PFV EXH-10.soda 2SM-PST-eat-PFV /2SM-PST-drink-PFV
na i-fi-ngi
and AUG-8-other
'They didn't drink only soda (they also drank other things).'

(van der Wal & Lusekelo 2022: 340)

Finally, the corrective answer to an incomplete yes/no question with the CV marker needs to be 'no' and cannot be 'yes' – compare to the same test in (107) above. This negation in the answer targets the exhaustivity encoded by the CV marker in the question, and can be compared to the felicitous answer 'yes' to an equally incomplete question with the V augment in (129). The question in both cases asks about a subset of the true answers (only shirts, where other things have been washed too), making the predicate true for this subset (he did wash the shirts, after all), but making the exhaustivity false (he did not wash only the shirts).

- (128) (Context: Speakers are shown a picture of a clothesline with various washed sheets and clothes, including shirts.)

- a. Bule Mose asukile sisyati?
bule Mose a-suk-ile si-syati
Q 1.Moses 1SM-wash-PFV EXH-10.shirt
'Did Moses wash only shirts?'
- b. Mma/#eena, Mose asukile isyati n' imyenda igingi.
mma/eena Mose a-suk-ile i-syati na i-mi-enda
no/yes 1.Moses 1SM-wash-PFV AUG-10.shirt and AUG-4-clothes
i-gi-ngi.
AUG-4-other
'No/#Yes. Moses washed shirts and other clothes.' (van der Wal & Lusekelo 2022: 340)

(129) (Context: Speakers are shown a picture of a clothesline with various washed sheets and clothes, including shirts.)

a. Bule Mose asukile isyati?

bule Mose a-suk-ile i-syati

Q 1.Moses 1SM-wash-PFV AUG-10.shirt

‘Did Moses wash shirts?’

b. Eena Mose asukile isyati pa-li-kimo n’ amagolole.

eena Mose a-suk-ile i-syati pa-li-kimo na

yes 1.Moses 1SM-wash-PFV AUG-10.shirt 16-be-one with

a-ma-golole

AUG-6-sheet

‘Yes. Moses washed shirts together with sheets.’ (van der Wal & Lusekelo 2022: 340)

In summary, there is overwhelming evidence that exhaustivity is inherent to the CV marker. Van der Wal & Lusekelo (2022) therefore propose that it should be analysed as an exhaustive marker; we refer to that paper for further details on the formal and interpretational properties of the marker.

7 Conclusion

Four concluding remarks can be summarized for this chapter. First, Kinyakyusa has no dedicated position for focus postverbally, nor does it have a dedicated position for topic preverbally. Unlike many eastern Bantu languages, Kinyakyusa allows preverbal focus (see Kerr et al. 2023), and it features only Agreeing Inversion as a productive subject inversion construction (see Msovela et al. 2023). Second, the pronominal expression *po* functions as a topic marker in the language. Third, as in other languages, cleft constructions are employed to express focus in the language. The basic cleft and pseudocleft involve identificational focus, and a construction with an initial NP and relative clause is shown to have two possible underlying structures: either a reverse pseudocleft or a topical initial NP followed by a basic cleft in which the demonstrative coreferring to the same referent is focused. Lastly, the CV prefix is shown to function as an exhaustive marker (see van der Wal & Lusekelo 2022) – it selects a noun out of the available alternatives and excludes those alternatives as false. This chapter forms the first overview of the morphosyntactic strategies used in Kinyakyusa to express information structure. While it is obviously quite incomplete, and much remains to be discovered, we hope that it may inspire further research on Kinyakyusa, as well as other Bantu languages.

Acknowledgements

This research was supported by NWO Vidi grant 276-78-001 as part of the BaSIS “Bantu Syntax and Information Structure” project at Leiden University. We thank Bahati Laikon Mwakasege, Peter Mwasyika Mwaipyana, and Yona Mwaipaja for sharing their insights on their language with us. We also thank the two reviewers for their comments, and we thank our BaSIS colleagues for their support and discussions. Any remaining errors are ours alone.

Abbreviations and symbols

Numbers refer to noun classes unless followed by SG/PL, in which case the number refers to first or second person.

*	ungrammatical	IDCOP	identificational copula
#	infelicitous in the given context	int.	intended
		INT	intensifier
*(X)	the presence of X is obligatory and cannot grammatically be omitted	HAB	habitual
		MED	medial (demonstrative)
		N	place-assimilating nasal
(*X)	the presence of X would make the sentence ungrammatical	NP	noun phrase
		OM	object marker
(X)	the presence of X is optional	PEJ	pejorative
AI	agreeing inversion	PRO	pronoun
AUG	augment	QUIS	questionnaire on information structure (Skopeteas et al. 2006)
CONN	connective		
EXH	exhaustive marker	SM	subject marker
EXCLAM	exclamative	STAT	stative
FV	final vowel	Sw.	Swahili
FR	free relative		

References

- Ashton, E. O. 1945. Notes on form and structure in Bantu speech. *Africa* 15(1). 4–20. DOI: 10.2307/1156825.
- Bresnan, Joan & Jonni M. Kanerva. 1989. Locative inversion in Chicheŵa: A case study of factorization in grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20(1). 1–50.

- Creissels, Denis. 2022. The noncausal/causal alternation and the limits of ambitransitivity in a sample of sub-Saharan languages. *Linguistique et langues africaines* 8(2). DOI: 10.4000/lla.4514.
- Felberg, Knut. 1996. *Kinyakyusa-English-Swahili dictionary*. Dar es Salaam: Mkuki na Nyota Publishers.
- Güldemann, Tom & Ines Fiedler. 2022. Predicate partition for predicate-centred focus and Meeussen's Proto-Bantu "advance verb construction". In Koen Bostoen, Gilles-Maurice Schryver, Rozenn Guérois & Sara Pacchiarotti (eds.), *On reconstructing Proto-Bantu grammar*, 537–580. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Guthrie, Malcolm. 1948. *The classification of the Bantu languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press for The International Africa Institute.
- Halpert, Claire. 2025. The augment. In Lutz Marten, Nancy C. Kula, Ellen Hurst & Jochen Zeller (eds.), *The Oxford guide to the Bantu languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 1993. More on the typology of inchoative/causative verb alternations. In Bernard Comrie & Maria Polinsky (eds.), *Causatives and Transitivity*, vol. 23 (Studies in Language Companion Series), 87–120. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/slcs.23.05has.
- Kerr, Elisabeth J., Allen Asimwe, Patrick N. Kanampiu, Zhen Li, Ernest Nshe-mezimana & Jenneke van der Wal. 2023. Bantu word order between discourse and syntactic relations. *Linguistique et langues africaines* 9(1). DOI: 10.4000/lla.9496.
- Lambrecht, Knud. 1994. *Information structure and sentence form: Topic, focus, and the mental representations of discourse referents* (Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 71). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511620607.
- Languages of Tanzania Project (LoT). 2009. *Atlasi ya lugha za Tanzania*. Dar es Salaam: University of Dar es Salaam.
- Lusekelo, Amani. 2009. The structure of the Nyakyusa noun phrase. *Nordic Journal of African Studies* 18(4). 305–331.
- Lusekelo, Amani. 2016. The nature of conditional sentences in Nyakyusa. *Journal of Education, Humanities and Sciences* 5(1). 36–51.
- Lusekelo, Amani. 2024. The morphosyntax of object marking in Nyakyusa. In Eva-Marie Ström, Rozenn Guérois, Hannah Gibson & Lutz Marten (eds.), *Approaches to morphosyntactic variation in Bantu*, 85–108. Oxford: Oxford University Press. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.10663767.

- Maho, Jouni Filip. 2009. *NUGL online: The online version of the new updated Guthrie list, a referential classification of the Bantu Languages*. <http://goto.glocalnet.net/mahopapers/nuglonline.pdf>.
- Msovela, Simon, Jenneke van der Wal & Amani Lusekelo. 2023. Subject inversion in Kinyakyusa. *Africana Linguistica* 29. 157–178. DOI: 10.2143/AL.29.0.3292607.
- Mwangoka, Ngapona & Jan Voorhoeve. 1960. *Cursus ki-Nyakyusa*. Leiden: Rijksuniversiteit Leiden.
- Persohn, Bastian. 2017. Locative and extra-locative clitics in Nyakyusa. *Africana Linguistica* 23. 151–165.
- Persohn, Bastian. 2020. *The verb in Nyakyusa: A focus on tense, aspect, and modality* (Contemporary African Linguistics 2). Berlin: Language Science Press. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.4287412.
- Sasse, Hans-Jürgen. 1996. *Theticity*. Working paper 27. Cologne: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität zu Köln.
- Sasse, Hans-Jürgen. 2006. Theticity. In Giuliano Bernini & Marcia L. Schwarz (eds.), *Pragmatic organization of discourse in the languages of Europe*, 255–308. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Skopeteas, Stavros, Ines Fiedler, Samantha Hellmuth, Anne Schwarz, Ruben Stoel, Gisbert Fanselow, Caroline Féry & Manfred Krifka. 2006. *Questionnaire on Information Structure QUIS* (Interdisciplinary Studies on Information Structure 4). Potsdam: University of Potsdam.
- Thwala, Nhlanhla. 2006. On the subject-predicate relation and subject agreement in SiSwati. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies* 24(3). 331–359.
- Van de Velde, Mark. 2019. Nominal morphology and syntax. In Mark Van de Velde, Koen Bostoen, Derek Nurse & Gérard Philippson (eds.), *The Bantu languages*, 2nd edn., 237–269. London: Taylor and Francis.
- van der Wal, Jenneke & Amani Lusekelo. 2022. The V and CV augment in Kinyakyusa and exhaustivity. *Studies in African Linguistics* 51(2). 324–346.
- Yoneda, Nobuko. 2011. Word order in Matengo (N13): Topicality and informational roles. *Lingua* 121(5). 754–771. DOI: 10.1016/j.lingua.2010.11.008.
- Zerbian, Sabine. 2006. *Expression of information structure in the Bantu language Northern Sotho*. Berlin: Humboldt University. (Doctoral dissertation).