Chapter 8

The expression of information structure in Makhuwa-Enahara

Jenneke van der Wal

Leiden University

This chapter describes which morphosyntactic strategies Makhuwa-Enahara uses to structure the information in a sentence. Makhuwa-Enahara is a language in which word order plays an important role in expressing information structure: the preverbal domain is reserved for topics, non-topical subjects occur in subject inversion, and there is an immediate after verb (IAV) focus position. The conjoint verb form expresses exclusive focus on the IAV constituent, whereas the disjoint verb form is an elsewhere form. A topic doubling construction involving a fronted infinitive may be used to express verum, and three types of cleft sentences are used to express focus. Pronouns and (emphatic) demonstratives are used to indicate referent activation and contrast.

1 Introduction

Makhuwa is spoken in the north of Mozambique and the south of Tanzania. It is coded P31 in Guthrie's classification, ISO code [vmw], but there are many variants of the language: Emeetto, Emihavani, Emoniga, Enlayi, Empamela, Emarevone, Esaakha, Imithupi, Erati, Exirima, Emwaja, and the variant studied for this chapter: Enahara (P31E).

An estimated 26.5% of the Mozambican population has (a variant of) Makhuwa as their first language or language spoken most at home, which means around 5,890,000 speakers (INE 2017). This makes it the largest language in Mozambique, even before the official language Portuguese (16.8%).

Previous literature on the language includes various dictionaries, e.g. Pires Prata (1960, 1973, 1990), as well as work on tone (Cassimjee & Kisseberth 1999,

Ikorovere: Cheng & Kisseberth 1979, 1980, 1981, 1982) and morphosyntax (Esaaka: Katupha 1983, 1991; Central: Centis 2001). Specifically on information structure, Stucky (1979a,b, 1985) analyses the interaction of tone and focus, and the influence of discourse on word order for Imithupi; Kröger (2010) discusses the discourse function of inverted passives; Poeta (2016) studies referent tracking in Swahili and Emeetto; and my own work on Enahara investigates focus in the conjoint/disjoint alternation (van der Wal 2009, 2011, 2014) and the influence of information structure on word order (van der Wal 2008, 2009, 2012). For information on general grammatical properties of Makhuwa-Enahara, I refer to van der Wal (2009: chapter 2).

The data were collected during various visits to Ilha de Moçambique between 2005 and 2022; if no source is mentioned, the example comes from the two Enahara databases (one in FileMaker Pro and one Online Language Database via Dative – see https://www.dative.ca and the introduction to this volume), but I also draw on earlier publications and indicate the source for examples from these publications. For the data in Dative, I used the BaSIS project methodology, available through the Leiden Repository.[1] The data are presented in three lines, or at times in four to make the morphology transparent (transcription with surface tone, morpheme break, morpheme gloss, free translation).

The goal of the current chapter is to provide a general overview of the linguistic strategies used in Makhuwa-Enahara to structure the information in a sentence. As each sentence has a verb, I first introduce the conjoint/disjoint alternation in Section 2, so that its influence can be understood in the other sections. Most important regarding this alternation in verb forms is that the constituent directly following the conjoint verb form is interpreted as exclusive focus. Word order is a second important strategy to express information structure, with a non-focal preverbal domain, and a dedicated immediate after verb focus position, as explained along with subject inversion in Section 3. Section 4 presents a phenomenon that has not been discussed for Makhuwa previously: predicate doubling. Makhuwa uses topic doubling to express verum and contrast. In addition to the exclusive focus in the position following the conjoint verb form, Makhuwa also uses three types of copular constructions to express focus, as presented in Section 5: the basic cleft, pseudocleft, and what looks like a reverse pseudocleft. Finally, Section 6 discusses independent pronouns and (emphatic) demonstratives in their use as contrastive topic markers and referent trackers marking the relative activation of referents.

---

[1]https://scholarlypublications.universiteitleiden.nl/handle/1887/3608096

2 Conjoint/disjoint alternation

In four verbal conjugations,[2] Makhuwa shows two verb forms: the conjoint and the disjoint form, illustrated per conjugation in (1–4). The two forms differ in the verbal morphology, but also in the tone pattern on the following constituent: after the disjoint form, the noun appears as in citation form, e.g. *epaphélo* 'letter', whereas after the conjoint form, the tonally lowered form occurs: *epapheló* 'letter' (see also Section 3.2 on the immediate after verb position).[3] Note also that each conjugational category has its own tonal melody – see van der Wal (2009: 89–91) for a full overview of verbal conjugations.[4]

(1) CJ Ki-**n**-lép-**á** e-papheló.
 1SG.SM-PRS.CJ-write-FV 9-letter
 'I'm writing a letter.'

 DJ Ki-**náá**-lép-**a**.
 1SG.SM-PRS.DJ-write-FV
 'I'm writing (it).'

(2) CJ Ki-lep-**alé** e-papheló.
 1SG.SM-write-PFV.CJ 9-letter
 'I've written a letter.'

 DJ K-**oo**-lép-**a**.
 1SG.SM-PFV.DJ-write-FV
 'I've written (it).'

(3) CJ K-**aa**-lép-**á** e-papheló.
 1SG.SM-IPFV-write-FV.CJ 9-letter
 'I wrote a letter.'

 DJ K-**aánáa**-lép-**a**.
 1SG.SM-IPFV.DJ-write-FV
 'I wrote (it).'

---

[2]The alternation is not present in other conjugations; see van der Wal (2017) for a discussion of which conjugational categories typically show the alternation.

[3]Note that this tonal pattern is the same that occurs with a nominal predicate and is therefore called "predicative lowering" (Schadeberg & Mucanheia 2000 for Ekoti, van der Wal 2006 for Makhuwa-Enahara, Guérois 2015 for Cuwabo), also known under the name "focus lowering" (Devos 2017 for Shangaji).

[4]The perfective alternatively appears in an imbricated form, where a nasal precedes the last consonant of the verbal base, e.g. *ki-le<m>p-é* 'I have written'.

(4) CJ K-**aa**-lep-**álé**   e-papheló.
         1SG.SM-PST-write-PFV.CJ 9-letter
         'I had written a letter.'

     DJ K-**aahí**-lép-**a**.
         1SG.SM-PST.PFV.DJ-write-FV
         'I had written (it).'

The two forms do not differ in their tense-aspect semantics, as they can be used for example in a question-answer pair, as in (5), where tense and aspect are typically kept constant.

(5) Q (CJ) Aniíríhani[5] ehópá iye?
            a-n-iir-ih-a=ni   e-hopa iye
            2SM-PRS.CJ-do-CAUS-FV=what 10-fish 10.DEM.DIST
            'What is s/he doing with/to the fish?'

     A (DJ) Anámwááríka.
            a-na-arik-a
            2SM-PRS.DJ-fry-FV
            'S/he is frying them.'

Instead, the forms differ in the relation between the verb and following constituent. The conjoint form cannot occur clause-finally, whereas the disjoint form can, as illustrated in (6).[6]

(6) CJ Ki-n-tthár-á   e-seetá.
         1SG.SM-PRS.CJ-follow-FV 9-sign
         'I'm following the sign.'

     CJ *Ki-n-tthár-a.

     DJ Ki-náá-tthár-a.
         1SG.SM-PRS.DJ-follow-FV
         'I'm following (it).'

The constituent following the conjoint form is in focus. In earlier work (van der Wal 2009, 2011), I argue that the conjoint form encodes exclusive focus on

---

[5]Class 2 (plural) marking is also used for singular referents to express respect, both on nouns and in agreement.

[6]Note that this concerns main clauses, as the formally identical form may be used finally in a relative clause – but the relative form does not show the alternation. See Section 5 for discussion on relative forms in clefts.

the constituent directly following it (in the immediate after verb position, see Section 3.2). The focus interpretation can be seen, for example, in the requirement for inherently focused interrogative constituents to follow a conjoint (not a disjoint) verb form, as in (7).

(7) CJ Mwaapeyalé tsáyi nhútsí ulá?
    mu-apey-ale   tsayi n-hutsi ola
    2PL.SM-cook-PFV.CJ how 3-sauce 3.DEM.PROX
    'How did you cook this sauce?'

   DJ * Ohaápéya tsáyi nhútsí ulá?
    o-o-apey-a   tsayi n-hutsi ola
    2SG.SM-PFV.DJ-cook-FV how 3-sauce 3.DEM.PROX
    int. 'How did you cook this sauce?'

Among a range of tests that show the exclusive aspect of focus is the incompatibility with the inclusive focus-sensitive particle *hata* 'even'. If the predicate is true for *even* the least likely referent, then no referents are excluded. This predicts the incompatibility with the exclusive meaning of the conjoint verb form, as borne out in (8).

(8) (I ate many animals…)

   CJ * …hatá kinkhuuralé mileká.
    hata ki-n-khuur-ale   mileka
    until 1SG.SM-1OM-eat-PFV.CJ 1.giraffe
    int. '…I even ate giraffe.'

   DJ …hatá końkhúúrá miléka.
    hata ki-o-n-khuur-a   mileka
    until 1SG.SM-PFV.DJ-1OM-eat-FV 1.giraffe
    '…I even ate giraffe.'

The exhaustive particle *paahi* 'only' on the other hand is compatible with the conjoint form and not the disjoint, as shown in (9).

(9) CJ Ki-n-thúm'   é-tomati paáhi.
    1SG.SM-PRS.CJ-buy 10-tomato only
    'I buy only tomatoes.'

   DJ * Ki-náá-thúm'   é-tomati paáhi.
    1SG.SM-PRS.DJ-buy 10-tomato only
    int. 'I buy only tomatoes.' (van der Wal 2011: 1739)

Exclusivity is also seen in the interpretation of the object *ntthu* 'person': following the disjoint verb form, it is interpreted as a non-specific indefinite 'someone' as in (10a), but the exclusive focus following the conjoint form in (10b) requires a set of alternatives to be generated and (partially or fully) excluded. The only way to exclude alternatives is to force a generic interpretation as 'human being'.

(10) a. DJ Koḿwéha ńtthu.
          ki-o-n-weh-a   n-tthu
          1SG.SM.PFV.DJ-1OM-look-FV 1-person
          'I saw someone.'

     b. CJ Ki-m-weh-alé   n-tthú, nki-weh-álé   e-náma.
          1SG.SM-1OM-look-PFV.CJ 1-person NEG.1SG-look-PFV 9-animal
          'I saw a person/human being, not an animal.' (van der Wal 2011: 1740)

Similarly, a conjoint form cannot felicitously be used in a "mention some" situation. When there are clearly multiple referents for which the predicate is true, and therefore exclusion is not warranted by the context, you have to use the disjoint form, as illustrated in (11).

(11) (Context: You went to the market and met many people; upon coming home you are asked 'Who did you meet?')

     DJ Koḿphwánya Fernáántu.
         ki-o-n-phwany-a   Fernaantu
         1SG.SM-PFV.DJ-1OM-find-FV 1.Fernando
         'I met Fernando.'

     CJ #Ki-m-phwany-alé   Fernaantú.
         1SG.SM-1OM-find-PFV.CJ 1.Fernando
         'I met Fernando.'

As mentioned in van der Wal (2011), a universal quantifier cannot follow the conjoint verb form unless a contrast is made with another referent. Therefore, if there is only shima and no other dishes (context 2 in (12)), only the disjoint form may be used and not the conjoint. As shown in the different context 1 for the CJ and DJ forms in (12), the conjoint form is felicitous when shima can be selected from among alternatives. The disjoint form, on the other hand, is felicitously used in a polarity-focus context.

(12) CJ (Context 1: Various dishes on the table, which s/he hasn't touched.
          *Context 2: There was just a pan of shima on the table, no other
          dishes.)
          Ocaal' éshima yootéene.
          o-c-ale   e-shima e-oteene
          1SM-eat-PFV.CJ 9-shima 9-all
          'S/he ate all the shima.'

       DJ (Context 1: Has the sick person eaten?
          Context 2: There was just a pan of shima on the table, no other
          dishes.)
          Ohoóc' éshima yootéene (oomálíha).
          o-o-c-a   e-shima e-oteene o-o-mal-ih-a
          1SM-PFV.DJ-eat-FV 9-shima 9-all   1SM-PFV.DJ-finish-CAUS-FV
          'S/he ate all the shima (and finished it).'

However, we need to be a bit more precise: the conjoint form is used when the following constituent is the focus *or part of the focus*. The conjoint form is also used when focus is percolated from the constituent in the immediate after verb (IAV) focus position to the verb phrase, as seen in the question-answer pair in (13), expressing VP focus.

(13) (Context: Watching a video of a woman on the market. 'What is the
      woman doing?')
      O-m-phím-á   maakhá.
      1SM-PRS.CJ-measure-FV 6.salt
      'She is measuring salt.'

The constituent following the conjoint verb form can be an object (as in 13 and other examples above), an adverb as in (14), or even a dependent clause, such as the negative counterexpectational situative *ohinátthi ophiya* 'not yet having arrived' in (15) forming the answer to a content question, or the adverbial relative *mahútté wariípáyáaya* 'when the clouds became dark' in (16). The latter was indicated to have an exhaustive reading on the whole adverbial phrase: only when there were dark clouds did it rain.

(14) CJ Killímá n' iihipá.
          ki-n-lim-a   ni e-hipa
          1SG.SM-PRS.CJ-cultivate with 9-hoe
          'I am cultivating with a hoe.'

CJ E-shímá e-ruw-iy-é   tsiítsáale / nańnáanová.
9-shima 9SM-stir-PASS-PFV.CJ like.that / right.now
'(The) Shima was cooked like that/right now.'

CJ Ni-n-rúp-á   wa-khaámá-ni.
1PL.SM-PRS.CJ-sleep-FV 16-bed-LOC
'We sleep in a bed.' (van der Wal 2014: 49, cf. van der Wal 2009: 221)

(15)   (When was the shima prepared?)
E-ruw-iy-é   Coáó o-hi-ná-tthí   o-phíya.
9SM-stirr-PASS-PFV.CJ 1.João 1SM-NEG-CE-AUX 15-arrive
'It was prepared when João hadn't arrived yet.'
(van der Wal 2014: 57)

(16)   Epúlá yaarumpé mahútté wariípályáaya.
e-pula e-aa-rup-ale   ma-hutte wa[7]-riip-ale-aaya
9-rain 9SM-PST-rain-PFV.CJ 6-cloud   16-become.dark-PFV.REL-POSS.2
'It rained after the clouds had become dark.'
[It rained, but not all day, only when the clouds were there.] (van der Wal
2014: 59)

Further discussion on focused clauses can be found in van der Wal (2014),
where I also indicate that the focused interpretation of complement clauses is
still unclear: either verb form can be used preceding a complement clause (17),
and the possible subtle differences in interpretation and/or use between the two
is as yet unclear.

(17)   CJ Ki-n-tsúwél-a   wiírá e-tthépó   tsi-hááná mpwína.
1SG.SM-PRS.CJ-know-FV COMP 10-elephant 10SM-have 4.trunk
'I know that elephants have trunks.'

DJ K-oo-tsúwél-a   wiírá e-tthépó   tsi-hááná mpwína.
1SG.SM-PFV.DJ-know-FV COMP 10-elephant 10SM-have 4.trunk
'I knew that elephants have trunks.' (van der Wal 2014: 60)

Where the conjoint form has been analysed as expressing exclusive focus on
the following constituent, the function of the disjoint verb form is less clear, and
disjoint can hence be said to be an "elsewhere form" (van der Wal 2009, see also
Stucky's (1985: 56) characterisation for Makhuwa-Imithupi as "simply used to

---

[7]Class 16 can head an adverbial relative clause with a locative ('where…'), temporal ('when…'),
or conditional meaning ('if…'). See van der Wal (2012) for details.

indicate that the action took place"). That is, the disjoint form is used sentence-finally, and when the following constituent is not in exclusive focus. This may be when the directly postverbal constituent cannot be focused, for example in the case of idiomatic objects (18) (see also van der Wal 2021), or when there is simply no exclusive focus on a constituent. This is the case, for example, in a subject inversion construction (see Section 3.4), a polar question (19), or when the object is already given and is not the point of the assertion, as further explained and illustrated in Section 3.3.

(18)   a. M-o-kí-ítth-á   m-ma-khúvá=ni.
            2PL.SM-PFV.DJ-1SG.OM-pour-FV 18-6-bone-LOC
            'You have made me demoralised.'
            [?]'You have poured me in the bones.'

        b. N-ki-itth-alé   m-ma-khúvá=ni.
            2PL.SM-1SG.OM-pour-PFV.CJ 18-6-bone-LOC
            *'You have made me demoralised.'
            [?]'You have poured me in the bones.'

(19)   W-oo-khúúr'   e-hópa?
        2SG.SM-PFV.DJ-eat-FV 9-fish
        'Have you eaten fish?'

For state-of-affairs focus (focus on the lexical value of the verb), speakers prefer that the verb be the only element left in the comment, being located at the end of the sentence. This automatically makes the verb form disjoint. A possible object therefore typically precedes the verb, but may also follow. This is exemplified in (20), where the object can appear in the periphery on either side – although the most natural answer would consists of just the inflected verb (and see Sections 3.1 and 3.2 on the preverbal topical status and postverbal background status of peripheral objects). Another example of state-of-affairs focus is given in (21).

(20)   (What are you doing with the fish? Are you frying or grilling it?)
        (Ehóp' éela) Kinámwáaneéla (ehópa).
        e-hopa ela   ki-na-aaneel-a   e-hopa
        9-fish   9.DEM.PROX 1SG.SM-PRS.DJ-grill-FV 9-fish
        '{This fish} I'm grilling it {, the fish}.'

(21) (Context: The government financially supports people during the
      Covid-19 crisis. The officials want a bribe to put your name on the list. So
      you pay the bribe but you didn't get on the list and didn't receive the
      money.)
      Só ninúúlíva paáhi (masi khaninaakénle).
      so   ni-nuu-liv-a   paahi masi kha-ni-aakel-ale
      just 1PL.SM-PFV.PERS-pay-FV only   but   NEG-1PL.SM-receive-PFV
      'We only paid (but we didn't receive).'

The conjoint/disjoint alternation goes hand in hand with the immediate after
verb (IAV) focus position, as word order in Makhuwa is a major marker of in-
formation structure. We turn to the influence of information structure on word
order next.

3 Constituent order

Constituent order in Makhuwa is better characterised in terms of information
structure than grammatical roles such as subject and object, and it can in that
sense be called "discourse configurational" (see Kerr et al. 2023, É. Kiss 1995, van
der Wal 2009). Stucky (1985: 56) writes for Makhuwa-Imithupi that:

> If there is an NP at the beginning of the sentence, then that NP is what is
> being talked about (i.e. the topic). […] The rest of the sentence then consti-
> tutes a comment. The organization within the comment is, so far as I can tell,
> based on putting novel information after the verb and expected information
> before the verb. (Stucky 1985: 56)

In this section I first discuss the preverbal domain with its ban on focus and
preference for topics (Section 3.1), then the postverbal domain with focus imme-
diately after the conjoint verb (Section 3.2) and non-focal information in the right
periphery and/or following the disjoint verb form (Section 3.3), and finally the
subject inversion construction for thetics (Section 3.4).

3.1 Preverbal domain

Makhuwa has a clear restriction against preverbal focus. Neither inherently fo-
cal interrogative phrases (22), nor arguments modified by the exhaustive focus-
sensitive particle *paahi* 'only' are accepted preverbally (23). Instead, subjects
should appear in a cleft, and objects either in a cleft (see Section 5) or directly
following the conjoint form (see Section 3.2).

(22)   a.   * Pani   o-naa-w-a?
           1.who 1SM-PRS.DJ-come-FV
           int. 'Who comes?'

   b.   * Eshééní o-náá-wéh-a?
           9.what   2SG.SM-PRS.DJ-look-FV
           int. 'What do you see?' (van der Wal 2009: 170)

(23)   a.   * E-kanétá y-oóríipa paáhi y-oo-mór-él-a   va-thí.
           9-pen   9-black   only 9SM-PFV.DJ-fall-APPL-FV 16-down
           int. 'Only the black pen fell down.'

   b.   * Coakí   paáhí k-aahí-ḿ-weh-a.
           1.Joaquim only 1SG.SM-PST.PFV.DJ-1OM-look-FV
           int. 'I saw only Joaquim.' (van der Wal 2009: 171)

Furthermore, indefinite non-specific referents, which cannot form the topic, are not allowed in preverbal position. For the non-specific reading, the presentational construction in (25) is most appropriate.

(24)   [#] Ńtthú oomóra masi nkiníńtsúwéla ti paní.
       n-tthu   o-o-mor-a   masi nki-n-n-tsuwel-a   ti
       1-person 1SM-PFV.DJ-fall-FV but   NEG.1SG.SM-PRS-1OM-know-FV COP
       pani
       1.who
       'Someone fell but I don't know who it is.'

(25)   Oháávo omonré masi nkiníńtsúwéla (ti paní).
       o-haavo   o-mor-ale   masi nki-n-n-tsuwel-a   ti
       1SM-be.there 1-fall-PFV.REL but   NEG.1SG.SM-PRS-1OM-know-FV COP
       pani
       1.who
       'There is someone who fell but I don't know who it is.'

Instead, the preverbal domain is reserved for topics. The prototypical topic is the subject, which may be in its canonical position, or further fronted in the left periphery. A left-peripheral position of the subject is clear in (26), as an adverbial phrase 'a long time ago' intervenes between the subject and the verb, and there is a prosodic break; in (27) the subject is marked by demonstratives (see further Section 6.2) and separated from the rest of the sentence by the adverbial clause *wahalalyááwé* 'when he stayed behind'.

(26) Namárókoló, ekhálái ekhalaí, aa-rí   m-patthaní a
     1.hare   long.ago RED   1SM.PST-be 1-friend.PRL 1.CONN
     nsátóro.
     1.administrator
     '(the) Hare, a long time ago, (he) was the friend of the administrator.'
     (van der Wal 2009: 183)

(27) Ólé   n-lópwán' oolé   wa-hal-aly-ááwé,   o-h-iv́v'
     1.DEM.DIST 1-man   1.DEM.DIST 16-stay-PFV.REL-POSS.1 1SM-PFV.DJ-kill
     é-púri.
     9-goat
     'That man, when he stayed behind, (he) killed a goat.'

Objects often occur in a left-peripheral position as well, clearly functioning as a topic. It seems to be the case that objects can be preposed in order to "evacuate" the postverbal focus position, for example when another constituent is questioned, as in (28) and (29). A resumptive pronoun (the object marker in (30)) is present if one exists (only speech act participants and classes 1 and 2 have object markers, other classes do not).

(28) Ekólé   elá   ki-pwesh-ék-é   ni   sheéni?
     9.coconut 9.DEM.PROX 1SG.SM-break-DUR-SBJV with 9.what
     'This coconut, what should/shall I break it with?'

(29) (Context: You see that your friend has money.)
     Ntsúrúkhu uyo ophwannyé váyî?
     n-tsurukhu oyo   o-phwany-ale   vayi
     3-money   3.DEM.MED 2SG.SM-find-PFV.CJ where
     'Where did you get that money?'

(30) (Context: a radio programme on child nutrition.)
     Mwaáná apiha mweérí sitá ohááná antséráka oḿváha maháatsa.
     mw-aana a-phiy-ih-a   mweeri sita o-haan-a
     1-child 1SM.SIT-arrive-CAUS-FV 4.months six 2SG.SM-have-FV
     o-ants-er-ak-a   o-n-vaha   ma-haatsa
     2SG.SM.SIT-begin-APPL-DUR-FV 15-1OM-give 6-porridge
     'The child, when s/he reaches six months, you have to start to give him/her porridge.'

Contrastive topics also appear in the left periphery, as illustrated in (31) where *enanahi* 'pineapples' is fronted and contrasted with bananas, both being topics, and as is typical for contrastive topics, the sentence also contains a contrastive focus; in this case the quantifiers are constrasted. In (32), a particular bunch of grass is selected for the protagonist and contrasted with other bunches of grass, and again the second contrast is the addressee (hence expressed as an independent pronoun *wé*) vs. the friends.

(31) Kithumalé enika yińcéene, **enanáhí** kithumalé vakhaáni.
ki-thum-ale   e-nika   e-inceene e-nanahi   ki-thum-ale
1SG.SM-buy-PFV.CJ 9-banana 9-much   9-pineapple 1SG.buy-PFV.CJ
va-khaani
16-small
'I bought many bananas; pineapples I bought few.'

(32) (Context: A mother is trying to trick her son by having the Hyena hide in the middle bunch of the cut grass. The next day she said 'My child, fetch the grass that is in the middle.')
Ari veeríyári wákúshe wé, makín' áawó poótí okúshátsa ashíkwáawo.
a-ri   va-eriyari w-a-kush-e   we   ma-kin-aawo
6-be.REL 16-middle 2SG.SM-SUBS-carry-SBJV 2SG.PRO 6-other-POSS.2SG
pooti o-kush-ats-a   a-shi-khw-aawo
can   15-carry-PLUR-FV 2-DIM-fellow-POSS.2SG
'The one that is in the middle you should go and carry, the other ones your friends can carry.'

Topic shifts are typically marked by demonstratives (see also Section 6.2) and a position in the left periphery, as in (33) and (34). As can also be seen in these examples, the pragmatic marker *vano* 'now' is often used to mark an episode boundary – a prototypical place in narratives and discourse to switch topics.

(33) (A: Muhammad had seven wives. B: Seven wives! I have only one and it is heavy... Now with 7 wives and not be jealous? A: But jealousy hurts. B: Jealousy hurts. A: Jealousy hurts.)

A: Vánó **ntthú úle** wuútsívelé... íi!
vano n-tthu   ole   o-u-tsivel-e   ii
now 1-person 1.DEM.DIST 1SM-2SG.OM-please-SBJV EXCLAM
'Now about that person that you like... Eh!'

(34)   (He_i jumped into the tree. His_i friend_k, when he_k saw the lion_m, he_k
       fainted. The lion_m came, he_m smelled him_k, threw sand on him_k, peed on
       him_k. He_m left.)
       Váno **ólé_i**   **n-tsulú ḿmwe**,   masi a-wehá~wéh-ak-a
       now 1.DEM.DIST 18-up   18.DEM.DIST but   1SM.SIT~RED-look-DUR-FV
       e-tthw' íye   ts-ootéene.
       10-thing 10.DEM.DIST 10-all
       'Now the one up there seeing everything,...'

Multiple topics are equally allowed, and occur with some frequency in narra-
tives and spontaneous discourse, as illustrated in (35–37). This can be a mix of
arguments and adverbial phrases, as was also seen above in (26) and (27). Note
also that a boundary high tone may be present to indicate continuation, which in
(36) results in a rising tone on the last vowel of the topic 'the/a child who starts
to eat'.

(35)   (There once were a man and his wife. They got a daughter. Their
       daughter grew up and reached puberty. The man said:)
       Numwáár' uulá,   ń-tthú   o-ni-ń-thél-a,
       1.virgin   1.DEM.PROX 1-person 1-PRS-1OM-marry-FV.REL
       a-kush-ék-é   e-ttánká nlokó iya-íya.
       1SM-carry-DUR-SBJV 10-basket 10.ten 10.DEM.PROX-RED
       'This girl, the one who wants to marry her should take these ten baskets.'
       (van der Wal 2009: 182)

(36)   (We wanted to know, this child who is starting to eat, how many times
       each day should s/he be fed?)
       Mwaámáne ompácéra ocǎ, kula nihíkú, nihááná nincíháká, ekóhá tthaarú.
       mwaamane o-n-pacer-a   o-ca   kula ni-hiku ni-haan-a
       1.child   1-PRS-start-FV.REL 15-eat each 5-day 1PL.SM-have-FV
       ni-n-c-ih-ak-a   ekoha   tthaaru.
       1PL.SM-1OM-eat-CAUS-DUR-FV 10.times three
       'The/a child who starts to eat, every day we have to feed him/her three
       times.'

(37) Átthw' úúlúpale íyó etthw' íyu anámwáne ntokó híyáánó khiívó
      entsúwéleҽhu.
      a-tthu   a-ulupale eyo   e-tthu   eyo   anamwane ntoko
      2-person 2-big   9.DEM.MED 9-thing 9.DEM.MED 2.child   like
      hiyaano kha-e-haavo   e-n-tsuwel-ҽҽhu
      1PL.PRO NEG-9SM-be.there 9-PRS-know.REL-POSS.1PL
      'Old people; those things; children like us don't know anything about.'
      lit. 'Old people; those things; children like us; there isn't what we know.'

Finally, tail-head linking also structures the information: after an event is pre-
sented in the comment, it is then repeated at the start of the next sentence so as
to establish it as the new anchoring point. In Makhuwa, this is done by using the
resumptive infinitive, as in (38).

(38) (A long time ago, when the world was virgin, there was a man and his
      wife.)
      Hú-nyar-ák-á   mwan' áyá   n-thíyána.
      NARR-bear-DUR-FV 1.child 1.POSS.2 1-woman
      'They gave birth to a daughter.'

      Nuunyara mwan' áya, mwaáná ohuńnúwá.
      nuu-nyar-a mw-aana aya   mw-aana o-o-unnuw-a
      RSM-bear-FV 1-child 1.POSS.2 1-child 1SM-PFV.DJ-grow-FV
      'Having given birth to their child, the child grew.'

In summary, the preverbal domain preferentially contains topics, establishing
the anchoring point for the new information in the comment. We now turn to
the postverbal domain, where a dedicated focus position can be distinguished
from the non-focal part of the comment, as presented in Sections 3.2 and 3.3,
respectively.

3.2 Postverbal: IAV focus position

The position immediately after the conjoint verb form is reserved for exclusive
focus, as argued in van der Wal (2011). Constituent order and verbal conjuga-
tion thus act together: both the position and the conjoint form of the verb (see
Section 2) conspire to mark the focus in Makhuwa. We can see the effect of the
immediate after verb (IAV) position for inherently focused interrogatives, as il-
lustrated in (39) for the adverb 'how' and in (40) for the questioned Theme argu-
ment in a ditransitive: when postverbal (i.e. not in a cleft), these must occur in
IAV position.

(39) a. Mwaapeyalé tsáyi nhútsí ulá?
    mu-apey-ale   tsayi n-hutsi ola
    2PL.SM-cook-PFV.CJ how 3-sauce 3.DEM.PROX
    'How did you cook this sauce?'

 b. * Mwaapeyalé nhútsí ula tsayí?[8]
    mu-apey-ale   n-hutsi ola   tsayi
    2PL.SM-cook-PFV.CJ 3-sauce 3.DEM.PROX how
    int. 'How did you cook this sauce?'

(40) a. Apórosóóri yaakawenlé eliivuru shéeni anámwánê?
    a-porosoori a-aa-kaw-el-ale   [e-liivuru sheeni]
    2-teacher   2SM-2OM-distribute-APPL-PFV.CJ 10-book what
    [anamwane]
     2.child
    'Which books did the teacher distribute to the children?'

 b. * Yaakawenle anamwane eliivuru sheeni?
    a-aa-kaw-el-ale   [anamwane] [e-liivuru sheeni]
    2SM-2OM-distribute-APPL-PFV.CJ 2.children   10-book what
    int. 'Which books did s/he distribute to the children?'

As mentioned in Section 2, the conjoint form of the verb combines with yet another marker: predicative lowering (PRL). Regardless of the interpretation, the lowering only applies to the IAV position, as seen in (41). The citation tones (cit) of the two objects are *ánáńtéko* 'workers' and *ekamítsa* 'shirts'; the lowered forms are *anańtéko* and *ekamitsa*.

(41) a. Aakawenlé anańtéko ekamítsa.   PRL-cit
    o-a-kawel-ale   a-nanteko e-kamitsa
    1SM-2OM-distribute-PFV.CJ 2-worker 10-shirt
    'S/he distributed shirts to the workers.'

 b. * Aakawenlé ánáńtéko ekamitsá.   *cit-PRL

 c. Aakawenlé ekamitsa ánáńtéko.   PRL-cit
    o-a-kawel-ale   e-kamitsa a-nanteko
    1SM-2OM-distribute-PFV.CJ 10-shirt   2-worker
    'S/he distributed shirts to the workers.'

 d. * Aakawenlé ekamítsá anańtéko.   *cit-PRL

 e. * Aakawenlé ekamitsa anantéko.   * PRL-PRL

---

[8]One speaker said this might be possible as a sceptical question when the sauce is not as you think it should be. This can be understood as the question word forming its own phrase: 'You cooked the sauce. How?!'

It is also expected that arguments modified by the exhaustive focus particle 'only' are restricted to appear in IAV position. However, earlier data already showed that this was degraded but not completely ungrammatical (van der Wal 2009: 226), and the judgements in 2019 and 2022 allowed 'only' in a second (non-IAV) position, as in (42). This difference between focused interrogative phrases on the one hand and exhaustive focus with 'only' on the other requires further investigation.

(42) a. Eléló Aptúlí, omvanhé [kwaatu paáhi] [eyoóca], khamvánhé
          mwaánúni.
          elelo Aptuli   o-n-vah-ale   kwaatu paahi eyooca
          today 1.Abdul 1SM-1OM-give-PFV.CJ 1.cat   only 9.food
          kha-o-n-vah-ale   mwaanuni
          NEG-1SM-1OM-give-PFV 1.bird
          'Today Abdul gave food only to the cat, he didn't give to the bird.'

     b. Eléló Aptúlí, omvanhé [eyoocá] [kwaátú paáhi], khamvánhé
          mwaánúni.
          elelo Aptuli   o-n-vah-ale   eyooca kwaatu paahi
          today 1.Abdul 1SM-1OM-give-PFV.CJ 9.food 1.cat   only
          kha-o-n-vah-ale   mw-aanuni
          NEG-1SM-1OM-give-PFV 1-bird
          'Today Abdul gave food only to the cat, he didn't give to the bird.'

In fact, the scope of 'only' at the end of the phrase seems to be flexible between associating with the constituent it directly follows, the constituent in IAV, or the whole VP, as indicated in the possible follow-up phrases in (43).

(43) O-ni-ḿ-váh-a   kwaatu eyoócá paáhi...
      1SM-PRS.CJ-1OM-give-FV 1.cat   9.food   only
      'S/he only gives the cat food,...'

      ...kha-ni-ḿ-váh-a   é-tthú e-kínáku.   [Theme]
      NEG-1SM-1OM-give-FV 9-thing 9-other
      '...s/he doesn't give anything else.'

      ...mw-alápwá kha-ni-ḿ-váha.   [Recipient]
      1-dog   NEG.1SM-PRS-1OM-give-FV
      '...the dog s/he doesn't give.'

      ...areéke.   [VP]
      a-row-ak-e
      1SM-go-DUR-SBJV
      '...and goes away.'

For example (44), the two interpretations given were association of 'only' with the IAV object and with the VP.

(44) Amáátí   o-hel-el-alé   maakha n-karáfá=ni   paáhí.
      1.Amade 1SM-put-APPL-PFV.CJ 6.salt 18-bottle-LOC only

'Amade put only salt in the bottle.' (He put nothing else)

'Amade put salt in the bottle and that's it.' (He did nothing else)

Note also that the focus may not just be a *larger* constituent than the object, but can also be *smaller*, contrasting a part of the object, in sub-NP focus. As indicated in (45), the contrasted adjective can appear pronominalised by itself or as part of a full overt NP (and repetition of the verb is always optional). We can understand the focus on the adjective as still triggering alternatives on the level of the NP rather than the adjective, the alternative set consisting of {small cups, medium cups, big cups}.

(45) (Did you buy big cups?)
      Naáta, (nithummé) (ekoopo) tsikháani.
      naata ni-thum-ale   e-koopo tsi-khaani
      no   1PL.SM-buy-PFV.CJ 10-cup 10-small

'No, (we bought) small (cups).'

Regardless of the status of the IAV focus position, Makhuwa does not allow multiple interrogatives (i.e. multiple foci), neither in postverbal position (46a), nor in a cleft (47). Multiple postverbal interrogatives were only accepted as two independent questions, with a prosodic break, as in (46b).

(46) a. * Omvahalé páni eshéeni?
             o-n-vah-ale   pani esheeni
             2SG.SM-1OM-give-PFV.CJ 1.who 9.what

          'Who did you give what?' (database)

      b. O-m-vah-alé   pánî, eshéénî?
          2SG.SM-1OM-give-PFV.CJ 1.who 9.what

          'To whom did you give it? what?' (van der Wal 2009: 250)

(47) * Ti paní oraalé vayí?
        ti   pani o-row-ale   vayi
        COP 1.who 1-go-PFV.REL where

      'Who went where?'

For the focus interpretation of the element in IAV as exclusive, see Section 2 on the conjoint verb form and van der Wal (2011).

3.3 Postverbal domain: Non-focus

Apart from the IAV focus position, the domain following the verb may also contain information that is neither topical nor focal, as well as afterthoughts in the right periphery.

Afterthoughts follow the main information of the sentence, specifying referents that were assumed by the speaker to be identifiable, but added for explicit clarity or emphasis. There may be a pause preceding the afterthought, and there is typically a phonological phrase boundary. In (48), we see two referents in the right periphery: *hiyaano* 'we' refers back to the contrastive topic at the beginning of the sentence and is repeated to highlight the contrast with 'they'; and *Muhámat' ẹẹhu* 'our Muhammad' follows after a pause (indicated by the comma).

(48) (They believe strongly in God, when they marry in church "till death do us part".)
Vánó híyáaně, híyáánó ninin̜tthára Mohúmét' ẹẹhu [híyááno], [Muhámat' ẹẹhu].

vano	hiyaano	hiyaano	ni-n-n-tthar-a	Muhamat
now	1PL.PRO	1PL.PRO	1PL.SM-PRS.CJ-1OM-follow-FV	1.Muhammad

ẹẹhu	hiyaano	Muhamat	ẹẹhu
1.POSS.1PL	1PL.PRO	1.Muhammad	1.POSS.1PL

'We on the other hand, we follow our Muhammad, we, our Muhammad.'

This example also illustrates the marking of phonological phrase boundaries. In Makhuwa, high tones are normally doubled onto the next mora, unless that mora is final in the relevant constituent. The high tone on the first occurrence of *ẹẹhu* 'our' is not doubled onto the final syllable of the possessive (it is not *ẹẹhú*), which indicates a prosodic boundary preceding the first afterthought *hiyaano* 'we'.

The same phonological boundary and pause can be seen in (49), as the verb surfaces as *kóhoótta* (low toned final vowel), not *kohoóttá* (high toned final vowel). The afterthought here refers back to earlier in the conversation where the speaker explained that back in the day, it was the young girls who used to apply *nsiro* (a mixture of ground treebark and water applied to the skin as a mask).

(49) Mí kóhoótta, enúmwáari yáaka.

mi	ki-o-oott-a	e-numwaari	e-aka
1SG.PRO	1SG.SM-PFV.DJ-smear-FV	9-adolescence	9-POSS.1SG

'I (too) used (it), in my adolescence.'

Demonstratives are also used to mark that the information in the afterthought is information that should be familiar to the listener but may require reactivation. In (50), the radio DJ reminds the listeners where to find the station with the emphatic demonstrative *yoola* (see also Sections 6.2 and 6.3 on demonstratives).

(50)   ...wiírá mwiiréké mpántta wa prógram' ẹẹhu **yoolá** wa séntu trés ponto nóove.
wiira mu-iir-ak-e   mpantta o-a   programa   ẹẹhu
COMP 2PL.SM-do-DUR-SBJV 3.part   3-CONN 1.programme 1.POSS.1PL
yoola   o-a   sentu   tres   ponto nove
1.E.DEM.PROX 1-CONN hundred three point nine
'...so that you can be part of our programme, this one on 103.9.'

It is not always easy to distinguish afterthoughts from other constituents that are postverbal but not dislocated. A case in point are postverbal subjects: these follow the verb but are part of the new information. Subject inversion is used in thetic sentences (as further detailed in Section 3.4), where the information is presented as neither topical nor focal, but as one piece of information with the verb. In (51), the postverbal subject *ekalawa* 'boat' is presented as part of the presented information in the "out of the blue" sentence.

(51)   (Context: In a remote village on the river where boats hardly ever arrive, a child comes running from the river screaming.)
Yoophíyá ekaláwa!
e-o-phiy-a   e-kalawa
9SM-PFV.DJ-arrive-FV 9-boat
'A boat arrived!'

Other constituents following a disjoint verb form can similarly be analysed as neither topical nor focal, as opposed to the constituents following the conjoint form, which must be part of the focus (see Section 2). In (52), the children are not the topic about which the information is, and neither do they form the exclusive focus, as they are active referents in the conversation and are not contrasted – they follow the DJ verb form *ninámwáápwátíha* 'we make them lose out', together forming the comment.

(52)　(Context: A discussion about what we should feed babies, whether fish is harmful or not, after which it is said that fish is not the problem, but we caretakers are.)

Ninámwáápwátíh' **aan' e̱e̱hú** nláttú woóháavahatsa eyoólyá íyé tsimpwánéla.

ni-naa-aa-pwat-ih-a	aana	e̱e̱hu	n-lattu
1PL.SM-PRS.DJ-2OM-lose-CAUS-FV	2.children	2.POSS.1PL	3-problem

o-a-o-hi-aa-vah-ats-a	eyooca iye
3-CONN-15-NEG-2OM-give-PLUR-FV	10.food 10.DEM.DIST

tsi-n-pwanel-a
10-PRS-improve-FV.REL

'We are making our children lose out because of not giving them the food that makes them better.'

Similarly in (53), the adverbial phrase *yavoliyá* 'when they are hungry' is not the topic, but it is given together with the verb as the new information: about dogs, we assert that they bark when hungry, possibly in a verum context. Had the verb been in the conjoint form this would have meant 'dogs bark only when hungry but not otherwise'; with the disjoint form there is no such aspect of meaning and no alternatives are implied.

(53)　(You may not believe me because they are quiet now, but…)

DJ　Alápwá anáákhúwá yavoliyá.
　　alapwa a-naa-khuw-a　a-a-vol-iy-a
　　2.dogs　2SM-PRS.DJ-bark-FV 2SM-SIT-torment-PASS-FV
　　'(the) Dogs bark when they are hungry.'

The postverbal domain hence contains the IAV focus position after the conjoint verb, and may host non-focal non-topical information as part of the comment, as well as afterthoughts in the right periphery. There is a bit more to say about postverbal subjects, which we turn to now.

3.4 Subject inversion

In parallel with the preference for topics in the preverbal domain, non-topical subjects in Makuwa-Enahara appear postverbally. Of the various types of subject inversion constructions (see the overview in Marten & van der Wal 2014), Makhuwa only allows Agreeing Inversion, whereby the subject always determines the subject marker. Subject inversion in Makhuwa expresses a thetic statement,

announcing new information (see Sasse 1996, 2006 for overviews of theticity), as in (54) and (55). See also Kröger (2010) for the function of inversion in the larger discourse for Emarevone.

(54)   (Context: Sharing the news you just heard.)
Yootsámá ekaláwá oMasákása.
e-o-tsam-a   e-kalawa o-Masakasa
9SM-PFV.DJ-sink-FV 9-boat   17-Masakasa
'A boat sunk at Masakasa.'

(55)   O-náá-ki-weréy-á   n-thána.
3SM-PRS.DJ-1SG-hurt-FV 3-back
'My back hurts.' (van der Wal 2009: 198)

In subject inversion, the verb may also be inflected as the narrative (marked by prefix *khu-*), which is used in sequences of events (van der Wal 2009). This is shown in the following lines from a tufo[9] song about the history of Ilha de Moçambique.

(56)   a. Khíyátekiya manúpá ni misíkítthi (x2).
      khu-ya-tek-iy-a   ma-nupa ni   mi-sikitthi
      NARR-IPFV-build-PASS-FV 6-house   and 4-mosque
      'Houses and mosques were built,'

    b. Wasańtímíńkú khíyátekiya epońti (x2).
      wa-santuminku   khu-ya-tek-iy-a   e-ponti
      16-Santo.Domingo NARR-IPFV-build-PASS-FV 9-bridge
      'at Santo Domingo a bridge was built,'

    c. Khíyáw' apaphóro khíyákelá ápákéti.
      khu-ya-w-a   a-paphoro khu-ya-kel-a   a-paketi
      NARR-IPFV-come-FV 2-gasoline NARR-IPFV-enter-FV 2-ship
      'and there came gasoline and there entered ships.'

For the introduction of referents (entity-central thetic) and for presentational and existential thetic utterances, Makhuwa uses Agreeing Inversion with -*haavo*. This is lexicalised from -*khala* 'stay, be' and the medial demonstrative in class 16 *vo* 'there'. The noun phrase referring to the introduced referent is typically followed by a relative clause. Examples (57) and (58) illustrate the affirmative and negative form.

---

[9]Tufo is a traditional dance performed in northern Mozambique, accompanied by drums and singing.

(57) Aháávó átthú amphééláká wiíshtárakári elaáré y' aṅkwáaya.
      a-haavo   a-tthu a-n-pheel-ak-a   o-istarakari elaare
      2SM-be.there 2-person 2SM.SIT-PRS-want-DUR-FV 15-ruin   9.home
      e-a   a-nkw-aya
      9-CONN 2-fellow-POSS.2
      'There are people who want to ruin the home of their mates.'

(58) …khaávó ṅtthú onlyá woóhíwuryá.[10]
      kha-haavo   n-tthu   o-n-c-a   o-a-o-hi-wurya
      NEG.1SM-be.there 1-person 1-PRS-eat-FV.REL 1-CONN-15-NEG-drink
      '(I just want to tell you that) there is noone who eats without drinking.'

As shown in van der Wal (2012), inversion constructions in Makhuwa-Enahara only take the disjoint form in conjugations that have the alternation (the conjoint form results in a pseudocleft; see Section 5.2), although conjugations without the alternation may also be used (the habitual, for example). The use and interpretation of subject inversion shows that it is only used in thetic utterances (as shown above). The postverbal subject cannot be in narrow focus, as shown for the question words in (59) and (60). This is where subject inversion in Makhuwa crucially differs from the Nguni languages, for example, which are ambiguous between theticity and subject focus in (default or locative) inversion (e.g. Buell 2005, Zerbian 2006); compare also the subject inversion constructions in other chapters in this volume.

(59) * Aahí-phíy-a   páni?
        1SM.PST.PFV.DJ-arrive-FV 1.who
        int. 'Who arrived?' (van der Wal 2009: 196)

(60) * O-náá-wóóv-a   á-ráṅttáatsi páni?
        1SM-PRS.DJ-fear-FV 2-spider   1.who
        int: 'Who is afraid of spiders?' (van der Wal 2012: 221)

Modification by the focus particle 'only' as in (61) is equally infelicitous in affirmative subject inversion – it is allowed in negative clauses though, negating the exhaustivity, as shown in (62). To express exhaustivity on the subject, a cleft should be used.

---

[10]This speaker speaks a slightly different variant, using *olya* for 'to eat' instead of *oca*.

(61) (Context: Many people are gathered in front of a house. What happened?)
A-núú-khw-á   á-páápa (#paáhí).
2SM-PFV.PERS-die-FV 2-father only
'(*only) Father died.'

(62) Khawaálé akúnyá paáhi, n' aálúp' óóríipá ahoówa.
kha-w-ale   a-kunya   paahi ni a-lupa
NEG.2SM-come-PFV 2-white.person only and 2-person
a-a-o-riipa   a-o-w-a
2-CONN-15-be.dark 2SM-PFV.DJ-come-FV
'Not only white people came, black people also came.'

Makhuwa allows subject inversion with unaccusative (63), unergative (64), and transitive predicates (65), as well as passives (66). In contrast with Agreeing Inversion in Matengo, inversion with a transitive predicate takes VOS order in Makhuwa (not VSO, see van der Wal 2012).

(63) (He sat down, leaned against the tree, and slept.)
Válé   ni-hoó-wá   n-láikha.
16.DEM.DIST 5SM-PFV.DJ-come 5-angel
'Now there came an angel.' (van der Wal 2009: 189)

(64) Ni-húkú ni-motsa ohíyú   waa-nú-mwááryá mw-eéri.
5-day   5-one   14.night 3SM.PST-PERS-shine 3-moon
'One night the moon was shining.' (van der Wal 2009: 189)

(65) (Context: You see trousers on the clothes line.)
O-núú-kátth-á   e-kaálásá Shavyére.
1SM-PFV.PERS-wash-FV 10-trousers 1.Xavier
'Xavier washed (the) trousers!'

(66) a. Noo-vár-íy-á   n-uḿmé ni-motsá.
      5SM-PFV.DJ-grab-PASS-FV 5-toad 5-one
      'One toad was caught.' (van der Wal 2009: 189)

   b. Aa-váh-íy-a   e-kanétá anámwáne.
      2SM-PFV.DJ-give-PASS-FV 10-pen 2.child
      'The children were given pens.' (van der Wal 2009: 198)

Given that negative indefinites such as 'nobody' and 'nothing' cannot form topics, these too have to be postverbal. Makhuwa forms such subjects in Agreeing Inversion with a negative verb, as in (67a), where the negation scopes over the postverbal subject. An alternative is the presentational construction in (67b).

(67) (Who came?)

    a. Kha-w-aálé   ń-tthu.
        NEG.1SM-come-PFV 1-person
        'Nobody came.'

    b. Khaávó owaalé.
        kha-haavo   o-w-ale
        NEG.1SM-be.there 1-come-PFV.REL
        'Nobody came.', lit. 'There isn't who came.'

To summarise, Makhuwa does not allow preverbal focus and strongly prefers a word order topic-verb-focus-rest. The IAV focus position is dependent on the use of the conjoint verb form, and what follows the disjoint verb form, if anything, is typically neither topic nor focus.

4 Predicate doubling

The preverbal topic can also be an infinitive, and when it is followed by an inflected form of the same predicate, as in (68), this is called predicate doubling. The predicate doubling construction (or more correctly, topic doubling) has not been described for Makhuwa.

(68) (Did you get water?)
    Oríká (maátsi) kooríkă.
    o-rika   maatsi ki-o-rik-a
    15-draw 6.water 1SG.SM-PFV.DJ-draw-FV
    'I did (already) draw water.', lit. 'To draw (water), I did draw (it).'

The infinitive can consist of just the verb, or the verb plus object. Note the rising tone on the final vowel in (68) to add emphasis on the truth value: I really did it. Even a postverbal subject is possible for the infinitive, as in (69).

(69) (Context: Someone discovered that Ali told a lie, and the fact that Ali lies is then confirmed in a conversation with someone who already knew that he lies.)
    W-oóth' Álí, o-h-oóth-a.
    o-otha Ali   o-o-oth-a
    15-lie   1.Ali 1SM-PFV.DJ-lie-FV
    'As for Ali lying, he lies indeed.'

Note also that the object marker (if one is present) must appear on the inflected verb, and optionally appears on the infinitive too. All four logical combinations, three of which are acceptable, are shown in (70). It is unknown at this point what determines whether the object marker is present on the infinitive to distinguish (70a) and (70b) – but note the different interpretation of (70d).

(70) a. O-thélá, o-ná-ń-thél-a.   [−OM,+OM]
          15-marry 1SM-PRS.DJ-1OM-marry-FV
          'He will marry her.'

      b. O-ń-théla   o-ná-ń-thél-a.   [+OM,+OM]
          15-1OM-marry 1SM-PRS.DJ-1OM-marry-FV
          'He will marry her.'

      c. * O-ń-théla   o-náá-thél-a.   [+OM,−OM]
          15-1OM-marry 1SM-PRS.DJ-marry-FV
          int. 'He will marry her.'

      d. O-thél-á o-náá-thél-a.   [−OM,−OM]
          15-marry 1SM-PRS.DJ-marry-FV
          'He will marry.' (He must; no specific person)

Although the infinitive functions as a topic here, the interpretation of the whole construction is typically that of verum, as can be deduced from the contexts for use in (68) and (71).

(71) (Don't you know how to swim?)
      O-ráḿpeléla, ki-náá-rampeléla.
      15-swim   1SG.SM-PRS.DJ-swim-FV
      'I do know how to swim.'

The infinitive can also be interpreted as a contrastive topic, contrasting it with a different action, as in (72).

(72) (Hey, are you even listening to me?)
      Wiẃwá, kińníẁwá, só kinááhítthúna[11] owáákhúla.
      o-iwwa ki-nni-iww-a   so ki-naa-hi-tthun-a   o-aakhula
      15-hear 1SG.SM-HAB-hear-FV just 1SG.SM-PRS.DJ?-NEG-want-FV 15-reply
      'I am hearing you, it's just that I don't want to reply.'

---

[11]At present I do not understand this verb form.

Note that polarity focus and verum can also be expressed simply by the verb itself, as in (73). That is, predicate doubling is possible but not necessary in a context of contrast on the truth.

(73)   (Daniel didn't arrive.)
       Oophíya (hị noomóona).
       o-o-phiy-a   hi   ni-o-m-oon-a
       1SM-PFV.DJ-arrive-FV 1PL.PRO 1PL.SM-PFV.DJ-1OM-see-FV
       'He did arrive (we saw him).'

As expected with a polarity focus interpretation, the disjoint verb form is used in predicate doubling for those conjugations that have the alternation. This is the only option when the verb is final, of course, but even when it is not, the conjoint form is not acceptable, as shown in (74). The interpretation of the object does not seem to be an afterthought; rather, the verb and object together are asserted.

(74)   (Context: You're ill and they want to know whether you have already eaten something.)
       a.   Ócá, kihoócá eshíma.
            o-ca   ki-o-c-a   e-shima
            15-eat-FV 1SG.SM-PFV.DJ-eat-FV 9-shima
            'I ate shima.'
       b.   ᵗ Ócá, kicaalé eshimá.
            o-c-a   ki-c-ale   e-shima
            15-eat-FV 1SG.SM-eat-PFV.CJ 9-shima
            int. 'I ate/did eat shima.'

Predicate doubling with a conjoint verb is not preferred, but judged acceptable only in a context that clearly indicates focus on the postverbal object, as in (75).

(75)   (What did you eat?)
       Ócá kicaal' éshimá; owúryá kiwunryé maatsí.
       o-ca   ki-c-ale   e-shima o-wurya ki-wury-ale   maatsi
       15-eat 1SG.SM-eat-PFV.CJ 9-shima 15-drink 1SG.SM-drink-PFV.CJ 6.water
       'As for eating I ate shima, as for drinking I drank water.'

Predicate doubling is most natural when a discussion has been going on and a point needs to be made, as illustrated by the contexts for (76). Context 1 is presumably out because the predicate forms the new information in the answer, but appears as a topic in the left periphery.

(76) (#Context 1: 'Where did you get that money?'
Context 2: After a discussion about being paid or not.)
Olívíya kinúúlívíya / koolívíya.
o-liv-iy-a   ki-nuu-liv-iy-a   /
15-pay-PASS-FV 1SG.SM-PFV.PERS-pay-PASS-FV /
ki-o-liv-iy-a
1SG.SM-PFV.DJ-pay-PASS-FV
'I was (indeed) paid.'

The depreciative interpretation that was found for other languages (see Kîî-tharaka, Rukiga, Kinyakyusa, Kirundi in this volume) is also found in Makhuwa-Enahara, as illustrated in (77) and (78), but interestingly the intensive reading does not seem possible.

(77) O-ttíkh-á ni-náá-ttíkh-a,   masi kha-ni-ń-tsúwel-á   feto
15-throw 1PL.SM-PRS.DJ-throw-FV but   NEG-1PL.SM-PRS-know-FV if
ni-náá-kanyári.
1PL.SM-PRS.DJ-win-FV
'We played, but we don't know if we'll win.'

(78) (If you want to lose weight, maybe you should run.)
O-tthyáwá ki-náá-tthyáw-a   masi nki-ḿ-vúkuw-a.
15-run   1SG.SM-PRS.DJ-run-FV but   NEG.1SG.SM-PRS-diminish-FV
'I do run, but I'm not getting slimmer.'

Instead, an intensive reading is found with a relative clause, or what looks like a reverse pseudocleft, modifying the infinitive, as illustrated in (79–81). It does not form an independent clause, however, and it remains uncertain at this point what the structure of the clause is.[12]

(79) Othéyá othennyáaká końkówa wiirutselátsa.
o-theya o-they-ale-aaka   ki-o-onkow-a
15-laugh 15-laugh-PFV.REL-POSS.1SG 1SG.SM-PFV.DJ-lack-FV
o-ii-ruts-el-ats-a
15-REFL-pee-APPL-PLUR-FV
'The way I laughed I nearly peed myself.'

---

[12]The same construction can also be used to indicate immediacy, as in (i).

(i) Okhúmá okhumalyááká kimwiitthenlé epuraatá.
o-khuma o-khum-ale-aaka   ki-n-iith-el-ale   epuraata
15-exit   15-exit-PFV.REL-POSS.1SG 1SG.SM-1OM-pour-APPL-PFV.CJ 9.slap
'As soon as I came out, I slapped him.'

(80) Wamoralyááwé, othéyá túthéǹnyááká...
wa-mor-ale-awe   o-theya   ti-o-they-ale-aaka
16-fall-PFV.REL-POSS.1 15-laugh COP-?-laugh-PFV.REL-POSS.1SG
'When s/he fell down, the way/how much that I laughed...'

(81) Othípá túthípalyááká, matátá otééne khíyákiweréya.
o-thipa ti-o-thip-ale-aaka   ma-tata a-otene
15-dig COP-?-dig-PFV.REL-POSS.1SG 6-hand 6-all
khiya-ki-werey-a
NARR.IPFV-1SG.OM-hurt-FV
'The way in which I dug, both hands are hurting me!'

An alternative to express the intensive reading is to use a negated form of the auxiliary *-reere* 'to lack' and an infinitive, as in (82).

(82) Anámwáne alé khareéré weétta!
anamwane ale   kha-reer-e   o-eetta
2.children 2.DEM.DIST NEG.2SM-lack-FV 15-walk
'Those children walked a lot!'

Unlike other languages (cf. Kîîtharaka, Kirundi, Rukiga), Makhuwa does not have in-situ doubling (83), where an infinitive follows the verb and is in focus, neither does it allow cleft doubling (84).

(83) * O-katth-alé   o-katthá.
      1SM-wash-PFV.CJ 15-wash
      int. 'S/he is really washing.'

(84) * Otheyá/*Ti othéyá othennyáaka.
      otheya/   ti o-theya o-they-ale-aaka
      15-laugh.PRL COP 15-laugh 15-laugh-PFV.REL-POSS.1SG
      int. 'It's laughing that I did.'

It remains for future research to establish the precise interpretational possibilities of predicate doubling, as well as the possible positions of an NP subject and object in this construction.

5 Clefts

As cleft constructions involve predicative nouns, I first briefly present nominal predication in Makhuwa. There are three ways to form a non-verbal predicate: by

predicate lowering, the copula *ti/pi*, and existential/locative verbs (*-ri* or *-khala*) (Kujath & van der Wal 2023).

In predicate lowering, as expected the noun occurs in its lowered form, that is, without the underlying first high tone (and its surface doubling). As shown in (85), the noun *maráti* takes a LHL tone pattern in citation form, but functions as the predicate with the "lowered" LLH pattern. See van der Wal (2009: 119–125) and Kujath & van der Wal (2023) on nominal predication in Makhuwa, and van der Wal (2006) for an analysis of predicate lowering.

(85) a. maráti   LHL (citation form)
          'disease'

    b. O-síkhíni   ma-ratí.   LLH (lowered form)
        14-poverty 6-disease.PRL
        'Poverty is a disease.'

Predicate lowering is not possible on all (pro)nouns, and the alternative is to use the copula *ti* for the present tense, as in (86). This example also shows that for the past tense, the inflected verb *-ri* 'to be' is used.

(86) Shtóríya yaalankáaká ti / yaarí ya khálái.
      shtoriya e-alak-ale-aka   ti / e-a-ri   e-a   khalai
      9.story   9-tell-PFV.REL-POSS.1SG COP / 9-PST-be 9-CONN old.times
      'The story that I told is/was old.'

The verb *-ri* is also used to predicate presence in a location, e.g. 'they are in Nacala'. The future tense uses the verb *-khala* 'stay, be'. In Makhuwa non-verbal predication, tense, location, and morphophonology of the noun are the primary factors determining the predication strategy.[13] We will see each of these predication strategies in the different types of cleft constructions below.

All clefts also involve a relative verb. The relative form of the verb shows a prefix agreeing with the relativised noun: in (87) it is in class 5 agreeing with *ntsipo* 'song'. The subject in a non-subject relative may be expressed as a possessive suffix on the noun, as is the case for the 1st person plural *-ę́ę́hú* in (87). See van der Wal (2010b) for further analysis of Makhuwa relative clauses. Since neither the form of the verb nor the prefix show specific relative morphology, I indicate relativisation in the gloss as REL at the end of the verb gloss.

---

[13]There are cases when either PRL or *ti* is possible, and here the choice seems to depend on the interpretation as predication ('Liz is a researcher') vs. identification/specification ('the researcher is Liz'), as studied in Kujath (2022), and see Kujath & van der Wal (2023).

(87) Ntsípó niipaléé̩hú ninaátsímíyá "ophéńtána".
n-tsipo ni-iip-ale-e̩e̩hu ni-naa-atsim-iy-a o-phent-an-a
5-song 5-sing-PFV.REL-POSS.1PL 5SM-PRS.DJ-call-PASS-FV 15-love-RECP-FV
'The song that we sang is called *ophentana*.'

5.1 Basic clefts

The basic cleft consists of a predicative noun followed by a (free) relative clause. Subject focus obligatorily uses a (pseudo)cleft, which is why many subject questions (and answers) take the form of a cleft, as in (88), but objects (90) and adverbs (91) can be clefted as well. The copula *ti* is present in (88a), and (88b) uses predicative lowering (as indicated in the gloss); example (92) shows an alternative form of the copula, *pi*.

(88) a. Ti paní o-tthik-ale e-rrańca?
         COP 1.who 1-throw-PFV.REL 10-orange
         'Who has thrown oranges?'

      b. Namarokoló o-tthik-alé.
         1.hare.PRL 1-throw-PFV.REL
         'It was Hare who threw (them).' (van der Wal 2009: 172)

(89) (Is it Maria who is holding water?)
     Áyo, ti María o-kush-ale maátsi.
     yes COP 1.Maria 1-carry-PFV.REL 6.water
     'Yes, it is Maria who holds water'

(90) Etomatí tsintúmíhááwé nthíyána ola?
     e-tomati tsi-n-thum-ih-aawe n-thiyana ola
     10-tomato.PRL 10-PRS-buy-CAUS.REL-POSS.1 1-woman 1.DEM.PROX
     'Is it tomatoes that the woman is selling?'

(91) Ti vayí / nipuro shééni ninrówááká othúmá moóce?
     ti vayi / ni-puro sheeni ni-n-row-aaka o-thuma m-ooce
     COP where / 5-place.PRL what 5-PRS-go.REL-POSS.1SG 15-buy 6-egg
     'Where is it that I go to buy eggs?'

(92) A-tthw' aá-lé aa-rów-á: "Pi-ítthú
     2-person 2.DEM.DIST 2SM.IPFV-go-FV COP-9.thing
     e-nní-rúwan-el-áu?"
     9-HAB-insult-APPL.REL-POSS.2SG
     'Those people were like "Is this why you are insulting us?"'

Although examples with full NPs are accepted, the large majority of cleft examples concerns interrogatives, as well as demonstrative and personal pronouns. Full NPs seem to prefer the reverse pseudocleft construction discussed in Section 5.3.

The question-answer pairs above already indicate that the basic cleft is used to express focus. This is confirmed by the fact that part of an idiom loses its idiomatic meaning in a cleft (93).

(93) Maatsi   a-wury-aly-áawe.
      6.water.PRL 6-drink-PFV.REL-POSS.1
      'It's water that s/he drank.'
      *'It's that she gave birth.'

More specifically, the Makhuwa cleft seems to have an exclusive focus interpretation, as indicated by how a constituent modified by exhaustive 'only' can appear in a cleft, as in (94) but not by scalar inclusive 'even', as in (95).

(94) E-shima   paáhí e-c-aaly-áaka   (e-tthw' íí-kíná, naáta).
      9-shima.PRL only   9-eat-PFV.REL-POSS.1SG 9-thing 9-other no
      'It's only shima that I ate (other things not).'

(95) (*Hata) E-kokhola   tsi-m-vél-íy-a.
      until   10-rubbish.PRL 10-PRS-sweep-PASS-FV.REL
      'It's (*even) rubbish that is being swept.'

Furthermore, a continuation excluding other referents is spontaneously given (96), the universal quantifiers 'every' (97) or 'all' (98) are not accepted,[14] and in a mention-some situation, it is infelicitous to reply with a cleft, as in (99) (compare to (11)). All these diagnostics suggest that the clefted constituent is singled out to the exclusion of some alternatives.

(96) E-nupá   e-tek-ale   Hasáani, kha-tek-álé   e-kińtáali.
      9-house.PRL 9-build-PFV.REL 1.Hasan NEG.1-build-PFV 9-compound.
      'It is a house that Hamisi has built, he didn't build a compound.'

---

[14]The same surface structure with 'all' can be accepted but with a different underlying structure, where the relative clause modifies the noun rather than being a free relative. That is, the whole NP including the relative clause forms the predication.

(i) E-liivuru   ts-ootééne tsi-som-aly-áaka.
     10-book.PL 10-all   10-read-PFV.REL-POSS.1SG
     'They're all the books I've read.' (you see a stack of books that you recognise)
     *'It's all the books that I've read.'

(97)   * Kata   n-tthú   o-m-múmúl-a.
       every 1-person.PRL 1-PRS-breathe.REL
       int. 'It is every person who breathes.'

(98)   Ti nyúwááno (*otééné) uuphwanyantsáákáni.
       ti   nyuwaano a-oteene uu-phwany-ats-ale-aaka=ni
       COP 2PL.PRO   2-all   2PL-find-PLUR-PFV.REL-POSS.1SG=PLA
       'It's (*all of) you that I met.'

(99)   # (You went to the market and met many people. When you get home
       someone asks 'Who did you meet at the market?')
       Fernaantú   o-phwany-aly-áaka.
       1.Fernando.PRL 1-find-PFV.REL-POSS.1SG
       'It's Fernando I met.'

As the IAV position after the conjoint form is also analysed as encoding exclusive focus, one of the questions is whether (and if so, how) the interpretation of the basic cleft differs from that of the post-conjoint form, i.e. what distinguishes (100a) and (100b)?

(100)   a. Mwinttharalé páni?
          n-n-tthar-ale   pani
          2PL.SM-1OM-follow-PFV.CJ 1.who
          'Who did you follow?'
       b. Ti paní onttharalényu vá?
          ti   pani   o-n-tthar-ale-inyu   va
          COP 1.who 1-1OM-follow-PFV.REL-POSS.2PL PP
          'Who is it that you followed?'

While more targeted investigation is required to answer that question satisfactorily, there are two clear differences: first, subjects can only be focused in clefts and not in IAV position; and second, the post-conjoint focus can project to the verb phrase, whereas in a cleft that part of the clause which is not the clefted and focused constituent is explicitly backgrounded in a relative clause.

5.2 Pseudoclefts

A pseudocleft is basically a copular structure in which the first part consists of a free relative and the second, predicative, part identifies the referent, e.g. 'Who I met was Theresa'. The predicative postcopular noun is in focus here. Subjects (101) as well as objects (102) can be focused in a pseudocleft.

(101) Iitthukenlé nlénsó noóshéerya ti páni?
o-ii-tthuk-el-ale   n-lenso ni-a-o-sheerya   ti   pani
1-ʀᴇꜰʟ-tie-ᴀᴘᴘʟ-ᴘꜰᴠ.ʀᴇʟ 5-cloth   5-ᴄᴏɴɴ-15-be.red ᴄᴏᴘ 1.who
'Who is the one wearing a red tie?'

(102) Álé yaarúḿmyááká, yaarí ashinamwáne.
ale   a-a-rum-ale-aaka   a-a-ri   a-shi-namwane
2.ᴅᴇᴍ.ᴅɪsᴛ 2-ᴘsᴛ-send-ᴘꜰᴠ.ʀᴇʟ-ᴘᴏss.1sɢ 2sᴍ-ᴘsᴛ-be 2-ᴅɪᴍ-child
'The ones that I sent were my children.'

The predicative element is in focus in this construction, illustrated for inter-rogatives (103), answers (104), and constituents modified by 'only' (105).

(103) Onuúpúwela wiira ivvale ti paní?
o-n-upuwel-a   wiira o-ivv-ale   ti   pani
2sɢ.sᴍ-ᴘʀs.ᴄᴊ-think-ꜰᴠ ᴄᴏᴍᴘ 1-kill-ᴘꜰᴠ.ʀᴇʟ ᴄᴏᴘ 1.who
'Who do you think is the murderer?'
'lit. You think that the one who killed is who?'

(104) (I can't see what is in the pan and ask what there is.)
Orivó nramá.
o-ri=vo   n-rama
3-be=16.ᴅᴇᴍ.ᴍᴇᴅ 3-rice.ᴘʀʟ
'What is there is rice.'

(105) (The teacher gave pencils to the adults.)
Naáta, amváhiya só anamwáne.
naata a-m-vah-iy-a   so   anamwáne
no   2-ᴘʀs-give-ᴘᴀss-ꜰᴠ.ʀᴇʟ only 2.children.ᴘʀʟ
'No, (the ones) who were given were only the children.'

As expected, idiomatic objects lose their interpretation in a pseudocleft, as in (106).

(106) Wookolalyááwe mwettó.
u-ookol-ale-awe   mwetto
3-stretch-ᴘꜰᴠ.ʀᴇʟ-ᴘᴏss.1 3.leg.ᴘʀʟ
'What s/he stretched is the leg.'
*'What s/he did is die.'

The function of the pseudocleft is to identify the referent for which the predicate is true, as is particularly clear in (107) but can be seen throughout this subsection.

(107) (A woman went to the well and couldn't carry her container of water. So
she was stuck. She saw a rustle in the grass (and said) 'Hmm, who is it?')
"Ti mí",   o-n-iír-á   khutsupá.
COP 1SG.PRO 1-PRS-say-FV.REL 1.hyena.PRL
'It's me – who spoke is Hyena.'

Identification requires singling out one referent, which is why *ntthu* 'person', which can in other contexts be used for 'someone/anyone', cannot form the focus unless modified by 'one' in (108) or interpreted generically as in (109).

(108) O-wa-alé   n-tthu   *(m-mótsá).
1-come-PFV.REL 1-person.PRL 1-one
'(Only) one person came.'

(109) E-shímá elá,   o-c-aalé   ń-tthu;   khacaálé
9-shima 9.DEM.PROX 1-eat-PFV.REL 1-person.PRL NEG.1SM-eat-PFV
e-náma.
10-animal
'This shima, who ate it was a human being, animals didn't eat it.'

Pseudoclefts thus identify one referent to the exclusion of other referents. This can be seen in correction, as in the nice combination in (110) of the basic cleft followed by a pseudocleft, as well as the ungrammaticality of inclusive 'even' in (111).

(110) (Context: QUIS picture of three monkeys – Did that monkey steal the
bread?)
Naáta, kahi yéná iiyalé, iiyalé t' uúla.
naata kahi   yena o-iiy-ale   o-iiy-ale   ti ola
no   NEG.COP 1.PRO 1-steal-PFV.REL 1-steal-PFV.REL COP 1.DEM.PROX
'No, he wasn't the one who stole (it), the one who stole (it) is this one.'

(111) * A-furahiy-ale   hata alapwa.
2-be.happy-PFV.REL until 2.dog
int. 'Even the dogs are happy.' (lit. 'The ones who are happy are even
the dogs.')

The focus here may be exclusive, but it does not seem to be exhaustive, as the pseudocleft can be used in the mention-some context in (112). Notice the different contexts in (113) and (114), where alternatives are required to make the selection.

(112)   (What is sold in this shop?)
        Entúmíhíyá makhurá, ntsóró, meéle, sapáu...
        e-n-thum-ih-iy-a   ma-khura n-tsoro meele   sapau
        9-PRS-buy-CAUS-PASS-FV.REL 6-oil.PRL   3-rice   6.fine.maize 9.soap
        'What is sold is oil, rice, maize, soap, ...'

(113)   (#Context 1: We're doing research into hair length. I need someone with
        short hair.
        Context 2: I'm pointing out Nando in a group of people who don't have
        short hair.)
        Orin' ekharárí tsoókhúvéya Naantú.
        o-ri-na   e-kharari tsi-a-o-khuveya   Naantu
        1-be-with.REL 10-hair   10-CONN-15-be.short 1.Nando.PRL
        'The one who has short hair is Nando.'

(114)   (#Context 1: There is only one pot on the table, containing porridge.
        Context 2: There are various dishes on the table but they chose only this
        one.)
        Aciyé mahaatsa otéene.
        a-c-iy-ale   ma-haatsa   a-oteene
        6-eat-PASS-PFV.REL 6-porridge.PRL 6-all
        'What was eaten is all the porridge.'

In this respect the pseudocleft is similar to the reverse pseudocleft, which we turn to now.

5.3   COP-V (reverse pseudo) clefts

Makhuwa also uses a reverse pseudocleft, in which the focused element is followed by the copula *ti*/*pi*+relative clause, as in (115) and (116). The prefix on the relative verb (determined by the focused referent) is often invisible/unclear/ merged with the copula. Therefore, the gloss contains a question mark in some examples, and in the first line of the examples the copula is written together with the relative verb (which is how it is pronounced).

(115) (Context: Picture of 3 different animals. Between these animals, which one flies?)
Mwaánúni tímváva.
mw-aanuni ti   o-n-vav-a
1-bird   COP 1-PRS-fly-FV.REL
'The bird is the one that flies.'

(116) (I bought a bucket but there was something else, I forgot…)
Eparáthó títsíliyanlyáwo.
e-paratho ti   tsi-liyal-ale-au
10-plate   COP 10-forget-PFV.REL-POSS.2SG
'Plates is what you forgot.'

Not just subjects, but objects (117) and adverbials (118) can also occur in the initial position.

(117) (Do you prefer my shirt or his shirt?)
Ekamis' aáwé pí/tímpheeláaka.
e-kamisa e-awe   pi/ti e-m-pheel-aka
9-shirt   9-POSS.1 COP 9-PRS-want.REL-POSS.1SG
'His shirt is what I want.'

(118) Ntsúwá noóthékuwá tímwáaka.
n-tsuwa n-a-o-thekuwa ti   ?-m-w-aka
3-sun   3-CONN-15-set COP ?-PRS-come.REL-POSS.1SG
'In the afternoon is when I come.'

The construction can also be used without an initial NP, and in such use it typically refers to earlier statements (discourse deixis) as in (119), or to a manner, or it may be used as a sort of conclusion, as in (120).

(119) Tíkíwaanale vá.
ti   e?-ki-waan-ale   va
COP 9?-1SG.OM-bring-PFV.REL 16.DEM.PROX
'That's why I came here.' / 'That's what brought me here.'

(120) Tínkhalááya wiírá akhílí ahááná ekúrú vińcééné khaḿpá owáli.
ti   ?-n-khal-aya   wiira akhili   a-haana e-kuru
COP ?-PRS-stay.REL-POSS.2 COMP intelligence SM-have 9-strength
vinceene khampa o-wali
much   than   14-strength
'Therefore intelligence is stronger than force.'

Presumably to highlight the exhaustive identification (on which see below), the reverse pseudocleft is also used with the verb 'to be' in the free relative, as in (121) and (122).

(121)   Patáréro kanalisatóré kalápíǹtééró, kaÍpínteéró tárí / tírí / tákhánle
        mpátthány' ááká muúlúpale.
        patarero kanalisatore kalapinteero kalapinteero ti   a-ri/   ti
        1.builder 1.plumber   1.carpenter   1.carpenter   COP 2-be.REL/ COP
        o-ri/   ti   a-khal-ale   m-patthani aka   m-ulupale
        1-be.REL/ COP 2-stay-PFV.REL 1-friend   1.POSS.1SG 1-big
        'Of the builder, plumber and carpenter (who are my friends), the
        carpenter is my best/biggest friend.'

(122)   (You follow Muhammad. Why?)
        Tári muúlúpale etiíní áaka.
        ti   a-ri   m-ulupale etiini   aka
        COP 1-be.REL 1-big   9.religion 9.POSS.1SG
        'That's who is the leader of my religion.'

The initial NP in the reverse pseudocleft must be identifiable, and hence it cannot be an interrogative, as shown in (123) and (124), and neither can it be an indefinite non-specific: *ntthu* 'person' in (125) is instead interpreted generically.

(123)   * Eshééni tícáalyáwo?
          esheeni ti   e-c-ale-au
          9.what COP 9-eat-PFV.REL-POSS.2SG
          int. 'What is it that you eat?'

(124)   * Pani tilepale va?
          pani ti   o-lep-ale   va
          1.who COP 1-write-PFV.REL 16.DEM.PROX
          int. 'Who (is the one who) has written here?'

(125)   Ńtthú táshókonlé (enámá khińshókhola).
        n-tthu   ti   a-shokhol-ale   e-nama
        1-person COP 2-gather.shellfish-PFV.REL 9-animal
        kha-e-n-shokhol-a
        NEG-9-PRS-gather.shellfish-FV
        'People are the ones who gather shellfish (animals don't).'

Like the pseudocleft, the reverse pseudocleft is also typically used in contexts where a referent is identified to the exclusion of others, as in (115) above. Similarly, in (126), the speaker conveys that out of the possible people to be wearing *nsiro*, it is the young girls.

(126) Masi ílé, hat' éwórá yaaryáááká eteḿpú el' eélé, ashínúmwaarí, **álé tíyóotta** máís nsíro.

masi ile   hata ewora e-yar-iy-aka   e-tempu
but 9.DEM.DIST until 9.hour 9-bear-PASS.REL-POSS.1SG 9-time

ele   ele   a-shi-numwaari ale   ti a-ootta
9.DEM.DIST 9.DEM.DIST 2-DIM-maiden 2.DEM.DIST COP 2-smear.REL

mais n-siro
more 3-nsiro

'But that, until the time I was born, that very time, girls, they are (the ones) who put nsiro more.'

Furthermore, the initial NP seems to require exhaustive focus. We use the same diagnostics again, showing that (some or all) alternatives must be excluded. First, the universal quantifier 'every' cannot appear in this construction (127).

(127) * Kuta mmakhuwa tímphéélá oca saána.

kuta m-makhuwa ti   o-m-pheela   o-ca   saana
every 1-Makhuwa COP 1-PRS-want.REL 15-eat well

'It is every Makhuwa that wants to eat well.'

Second, the felicitous use with 'only' (128) and association of 'only' with the initial NP in (129) rather than the final NP, as well as the ungrammatical 'even' (130) also show the exclusive interpretation of the reverse pseudocleft.

(128) Manínyá paáhí tá-wá-alé.

Maninya   paahi ti   a-w-ale
1.Maninha only COP 2-come-PFV.REL

'Only Maninha came.' / 'Maninha was the only one who came.'
(van der Wal 2009: 260)

(129) Nánsi tíkúshale maátsi paáhi?

Nansi ti   o-kush-ale   maatsi paahi
1.Nancy COP 1-carry-PFV.REL 6.water only

'Is Nancy the only one holding water?'
*'Is Nancy holding only water?'

(130) (*Hatá) Ashílópwáná táníina.
    hata a-shi-lopwana ti   a-n-iina
    until 2-ᴅɪᴍ-man   ᴄᴏᴘ 2-ᴘʀꜱ-dance.ʀᴇʟ
    '(Even) The men (are the ones who) dance.'

Third, a numeral receives an exact reading in this construction, as in (131), where a minimum amount reading is not possible (as indicated by the follow-up phrase). Here, it differs interestingly with a numeral following the conjoint verb form, as in (132). Even though this is only one example, and judgements on minimum vs. exact amount are tricky, this may be one of the few environments in which we can see a difference between exclusive focus (some alternatives are excluded, but maybe not all) and exhaustive focus (all alternatives are false).

(131) Sínku míl tí/píḿpheeléę́hú par' otthúnél' enúpa ([#]poótí ophéélakátho).
    sinku mil   ti-?-n-pheel-ęęhu   o-tthunela e-nupa
    five   thousand ᴄᴏᴘ-ᴘʀꜱ-want.ʀᴇʟ-ᴘᴏꜱꜱ.1ᴘʟ for   15-cover   9-house
    pooti o-pheel-ak-a=tho
    can   15-want-ᴅᴜʀ-ꜰᴠ=ʀᴇᴘ

    'Five thousand is what we need to cover the house ([#]maybe more).'

(132) Nimphééla sínku míl par' otthúnél' enúpa (poótí ophéélakátho).
    ni-n-pheel-a   sinku mil   para o-tthunela e-nupa   pooti
    1ᴘʟ.ꜱᴍ-ᴘʀꜱ.ᴄᴊ-want-ꜰᴠ five   thousand for   15-cover   9-house can
    o-pheel-ak-a=tho
    15-want-ᴅᴜʀ-ꜰᴠ=ʀᴇᴘ

    'We need five thousand to cover the house (maybe more).'

Otherwise, it has proven difficult to find a context in which the reverse pseudocleft can be distinguished from the pseudocleft, and in many situations either construction can be used, as illustrated in (133) and (134).

(133) X: 'Who is sleeping inside? Abdul?'
    Y: 'No, it's not Abdul, …'

    a. o-n-rúp-á   ti Coána.
       1ꜱᴍ-ᴘʀꜱ-sleep-ꜰᴠ.ʀᴇʟ ᴄᴏᴘ 1.Joana
       lit. '… the one who sleeps is Joana'

    b. Coáná t'   í-ń-rupa.
       1.Joana ᴄᴏᴘ 1-ᴘʀꜱ-sleep-ꜰᴠ.ʀᴇʟ
       lit. '… Joana is the one who sleeps' (van der Wal 2009: 261)

(134)   (In this picture, who is drinking?)

    a. Nthíyán' ola vá tímwúrya. (pointing)
        n-thiyana ola   va   ti   o-n-wury-a
        1-woman 1.DEM.PROX 16.DEM.PROX COP 1-PRS-drink-FV.REL
        'This woman here is the one who is drinking.'

    b. Amwúryá maátsí athiyána.
        a-n-wury-a   maatsi a-thiyana
        2-PRS-drink-FV.REL 6.water 2-woman.PRL
        'Who is drinking water is the woman.'

In (135), the speaker first uses the pseudocleft 'who will know are grown-up people' (with predicative lowering on *atthu* 'people', and then rephrases it as an inverse pseudocleft 'they are the ones who will know'. The NP *átthú a khálái* 'old people' could be an afterthought after *atthu uúlúpalé*, or a topic of a (repetitive) next sentence, or the initial NP in a reverse pseudocleft. Given the break following this NP, though, the last analysis seems less likely.

(135)   (B: How did the capulana begin? B: I don't know. That's what I said, that the capulana I don't know how it emerged, because I when I was born, I found it being worn and I also wore it.)

    B: Éyó [antthúná otsúwéla atthu uúlúpalé], átthú a khálái, [táńtthún' ótsúwéla], aá.
        eyo   a-n-tthun-a   o-tsuwela a-tthu   a-ulupale
        9.DEM.MED 2-PRS-want.REL 15-know   2-person.PRL 2-big
        a-tthu   a   khalai   ti a-n-tthun-a   o-tsuwela aa
        2-person 2.CONN old.times COP 2-PRS-want.REL 15-know   yes
        'This, [who will know are older people], very old people, [that's the ones who will know], yes.'

It is uncertain whether this construction can be analysed as a left-peripheral NP plus a basic cleft, as suggested for other languages in this volume (i.e. a literal translation as "Joanna, it is HER who is sleeping") – one vital difference is the lack of an independent pronoun in the Makhuwa construction. That construction is only found for personal pronouns, as in (136).

(136) (present tense: In a group of people preparing there is no cook so
       someone is appointed to do the cooking.)
       Wé ti w' óri/waarí shawuríya.

       we   ti   we   o-ri   /o-a-ri   shawuriya
       2SG.PRO COP 2SG.PRO 2SG.SM-be.REL /2SG.SM-PST-be.REL 1.cook

       'You are (the one who is/was) the cook.'
       'You, it's you who is/was the cook.'

In summary, Makhuwa-Enahara shows three types of clefts, all of which express focus. Since there is no other way of focussing a subject, focused subjects must always choose a cleft construction. The precise factors determining the choice of cleft require more detailed investigation, but two hypotheses are that 1) the pseudocleft expresses identification while the basic cleft and the reverse pseudocleft express exhaustive focus, and 2) the basic cleft is used for pronouns whereas full noun phrases are focused in the reverse pseudocleft.

In the description and analysis so far, we have seen how in Makhuwa-Enahara, verb form, constituent order, predicate doubling, and clefts are used to express the information-structural functions (topic, focus) and we have seen their precise interpretations. There is, however, another vital aspect of information structure, which is the status of referents and their degree of mental accessibility. How this influences the language is taken up in the next (and final) section.

6 Referent tracking

The choice of expression to refer to a referent largely depends on the status of the referent in terms of mental accessibility – see the introduction to this volume. Inspired by Ariel (1990, 2001) (and see further references on activation in van der Wal et al. 2025 [this volume]), I proposed an accessibility hierarchy of referential expressions specifically for Makhuwa (van der Wal 2010a: 195), modified as in (137), where more accessible referents tend to be coded by expressions on the right side of the hierarchy, and less accessible referents prefer expressions on the left:

(137)   N+modifier > N > DEM N DEM > N+DEM > DEM/pronoun > prefix > zero

Brand-new referents are presented by full NPs in postverbal position (see Section 3.4 on subject inversion and the presentational construction with -*haavo*), and on the other end of the continuum of accessibility, highly accessible referents are encoded as subject prefixes for subjects and object prefixes or zero for objects.

Illustrating the right end of the hierarchy, Theme objects can easily be omitted altogether if they are highly accessibly and in a class other than 1/2, as illustrated in (138) and (139). There are no examples of Recipient drop, as Recipients are typically in class 1/2 or 1st/2nd person and therefore need to be expressed by an object marker on the verb.

(138)   (Did you buy fish and wash the dishes?)
        Áyo, k-oo-thúm-á   ni   k-oo-ráp-íh-a.
        yes   1SG.SM-PFV.DJ-buy-FV and 1SG.SM-PFV.DJ-wash-CAUS-FV
        'Yes, I bought (it) and I washed (them).'

(139)   (But he knew what she wanted to do; he took the cloth,)
        o-o-pér-ák-ats-ááá...
        1SM-PFV.DJ-tear-DUR-PLUR-FV
        'He tore (it)...'

        ohaáváha ashíkhwáawe yaarí atháńn' ámótsa.
        o-h-a-vah-a   a-shikhw-aawe a-a-ri   a-thanu ni
        1SG.SM-PFV.DJ-2OM-give-FV 2-fellow-POSS.1 2-PST-be.REL 2-five   and
        a-motsa
        2-one
        'he gave (it/them) to his six friends.'

Poeta (2016) investigated the hypothesis that Makhuwa would show more object drop than Swahili, given the fact that Swahili has the option of expressing the object by an object marker for all relevant noun classes, whereas Makhuwa only has object markers for 1st and 2nd person and class 1/2. Her study did not confirm this for Makhuwa-Emeetto: she found a similar amount of object drop in Swahili as in Makhuwa texts. Interestingly, Makhuwa does use full NPs more often for anaphoric reference – see Poeta (2016) for details.

Where the encoding at the far ends of the accessibility hierarchy is relatively (!) clear, the situation in between shows interesting uses of pronominal expressions, discussed in Sections 6.1–6.3. It should be kept in mind that referent tracking is influenced by, and plays a role in structuring, the higher level of discourse and narration as well – something I will not go into in this chapter.

6.1 Personal pronouns

Makhuwa has independent pronouns for 1st and 2nd person, and classes 1 and 2 – see Table 1. For 1st and 2nd person, a short and a long form exist, where the

long form seems to be "more emphatic" (whatever this turns out to be in future research).

Table 1: Personal pronouns (van der Wal 2009: 64)

SG	1	mi / miyaano	PL	1	hĭ/ hiyaano
	2	we / weyaano		2	nyutse / nyuwaanotse
	2RESP	nyu / nyuwaano		cl.2	ayena(tse)
	cl.1	yena			

These independent pronouns are used after prepositions (140), in non-verbal predication, as in (107) above and (141), but more relevant for information structure, they are also used in contrastive topics and foci, illustrated in (32) and (49) above, and below in (142) for topic and (143) for focus.

(140) Nihááná nimváháka eyoólyá ekhwááwé para **yéná** okhálá saáná.
     ni-haan-a   ni-m-vah-ak-a   eyooca e-khw-aawe   para
     1PL.SM-have-FV 1PL.SM-1OM-give-DUR-FV 9.food 9-fellow-POSS.1 for
     yena o-khala saana
     1.PRO 15-stay well
     'We have to give other food so that s/he stays well.'

(141) Vá óle orí ntsulú ḿmwĕ kahi **yéná** mpáttháni áwo.
     va   ole   o-ri   n-tsulu mmwe   kahi   yena
     16.DEM.PROX 1.DEM.DIST 1SM-be.REL 18-up   18.DEM.DIST NEG.COP 1.PRO
     m-patthani au
     1-friend   1.POSS.2SG
     'Now the one who is up there is not your friend.'

(142) **Hḭ**, nimpéél' otthyawá, **yéná** omphééla weettá.
     hi   ni-n-pheel-a   o-tthyawa yena o-n-pheel-a   o-eetta
     1PL.PRO 1PL.SM-PRS.CJ-want 15-run   1.PRO 1SM-PRS-want-FV 15-walk
     'We want to run, s/he wants to walk.'

(143) **Áyéná** tahiwaale.
     a-yena ti   a-hi-w-ale
     2-PRO COP 1-NEG-come-PFV.REL
     'They (are the ones who) didn't come.'

Furthermore, in a list of topics all with the same predicate, the last topic can optionally be marked by *ni yena* 'and 1.PRO', roughly translatable as 'him/her/it

too', which may be called marking of an "additive topic". This is possible for both subjects and objects, but only for class 1 referents that are animate, as seen in (144–146).[15] As mentioned, there are no independent pronouns for other classes, and demonstratives are not used in this way, as can be seen in the comparison between (144a) and (144b).

(144) a. E-nyómpé e-n-khúúr-a   ma-lashí, n' ii-púrí e-n-khúúr-á
           9-cow   9sm-prs.cj-eat-fv 6-grass   and 9-goat 9sm-prs.cj-eat-fv
           ma-lashí, namárókolo **ni yéná** (també) o-n-khúúr-á   ma-lashí.
           6-grass   1.hare   and 1.pro   also   1sm-prs.cj-eat-fv 6-grass
           'The cow eats grass, the goat eats grass, the hare too eats grass.'

       b. Namárókolo o-n-khúúr-a   ma-lashí, e-nyómpé
           1.hare   1sm-prs.cj-eat-fv 6-grass   9-cow
           e-n-khúúr-a   ma-lashí, n' ii-púrí (***ni yéná**/ ***n' iílé**)
           9sm-prs.cj-eat-fv 6-grass   and 9-goat and 1.pro and 9.dem.dist
           e-n-khúúr-a   malashí (també).
           9sm-prs.cj-eat-fv 6-grass   also
           'The hare eats grass, the cow eats grass, and the goat eats grass (too).'

(145) Zyórzyé ki-nú-ń-kanyárí,
       1.Jorge 1sg.sm-pfv.pers-1om-win

       Amáátí   ki-nú-ń-kanyárí,
       1.Amade 1sg.sm-pfv.pers-1om-win

       Ambási   també / **ni yéná** / *n' uúlé   ki-nú-ń-kanyárí.
       1.Ambasse also   / and 1.pro / and 1.dem.dist 1sg.sm-pfv.pers-1om-win
       'I won from Jorge, I won from Amade, and Ambasse him too I beat.'

(146) Sinkíyá końkhúura, kohoócá mathaápá, ni kharáká (***ni yéná**/*n' uúle)
       końkhúura.
       sinkiya   ki-o-n-khuur-a   ki-o-c-a   ma-thaapa
       1.pumpkin 1sg.sm-pfv.dj-1om-eat-fv 1sg.sm-pfv.dj-eat-fv 6-mathapa
       ni kharaka ni yena / ni ole   ki-o-n-khuur-a
       and 1.cassava and 1.pro / and 1.dem.dist 1sg.sm-pfv.dj-1om-eat-fv
       'Pumpkin I ate, I ate mathapa, and cassava I ate (too).'

For 3rd persons, Makhuwa typically uses demonstratives for pronominal reference, in contexts further specified in the following subsections.

---

[15]I have not seen a plural counterpart.

6.2 (Circum)demonstratives for less accessible referents

Makhuwa has three series of demonstratives distinguished according to distance from the speaker and addressee, plus an emphatic form of each, as in Table 2.[16] Demonstratives are a conspicuous tool for referent tracking in Makhuwa-Enahara (although see Poeta 2016 for a different conclusion for Makhuwa-Emeetto).

Table 2: Overview demonstratives (based on van der Wal 2009: 47)

Class		Standard			Emphatic		
		PROX	MED	DIST	PROX	MED	DIST
1 *mwaáná*	'child'	óla	óyo	óle	yóola	yóoyo	yóole
2 *aáná*	'children'	ála	áyo	ále	yáala	yáayo	yáale
3 *nvéló*	'broom'	óla	óyo	óle	yóola	yóoyo	yóole
4 *mivéló*	'brooms'	íya	íyo	íye	yéyya/ tséyya	yéyyo/ tséyyo	yéyye/ tséyye
5 *ntátá*	'hand'	ńna	ńno	ńne	nénna	nénno	nénne
6 *matátá*	'hands'	ála	áyo	ále	yáala	yáayo	yáale
9 *emáttá*	'field'	éla	éyo	éle	yéela	yéeyo	yeéle
10 *emáttá*	'fields'	íya	íyo	íye	yéyya/ tséyya	yéyyo/ tséyyo	yéyye/ tséyye
14 *orávó*	'honey'	óla	óyo	óle	yóola	yóoyo	yóole
16		vá	vó	vále	vááva	váavo	váavale
17		ńno	űwo	űwe	wénno	wéwwo/ wówwo	wéwwe
18		mú	ńmo	ńmwe	móomu	mómmo	mwémwe/ wómwe

My study of Makhuwa narratives (van der Wal 2010a) revealed that demonstratives are used to refer to accessible (but not active) referents, that is, demonstratives help the reactivation of referents. The pronominal demonstrative is typically found in topic shifts, and after an episode boundary. I illustrated this with the sequence in (147) (van der Wal 2010a: 197). In (147a), the topic and subject is *the Portuguese* (class 2 'they'). The topic shifts to the just-introduced fisherman in (147b), where the demonstrative *ole* is used. Continuing the same topic, (147c) refers to the fisherman only by a subject prefix, but in (147d) the topic shifts to the Portuguese again, and the demonstrative *ale* occurs.

---

[16]Vowel liaison may result in a pronunciation as *ula*/*uyo*/*ule*, *ila*/*iyo*/*ile*. and in lengthening.

(147) (The Portuguese went to India. Passing on open sea, when they looked
around, they saw this very island and they thought "Let's take our boat,
let's go and take a rest on that island". When they arrived there, …)

  a. A-ḿ-phwányá   n-lópwáná m-motsá.
     2SM.PFV.DJ-1OM-meet 1-man   1-one
     'They met a man.'

  b. **Ólé**   aa-rí   nákhavokó,
     1.DEM.DIST 1SM.PST-be 1.fisherman.PRL
     'He was a fisherman,'

  c. aa-ríná   e-kalawa ts-áwé   ts-a   khavóko.
     1SM.PST-have 10-boat   10-POSS.1 10-CONN fishing
     'he had his fishing boats.'

  d. **Álé**   a-ḿ-wéh-áts-a.
     2.DEM.DIST 2SM.PFV.DJ-1OM-look-PLUR-FV
     'They looked at him.' (van der Wal 2010a: 197)

The distal adnominal demonstrative is also used anaphorically, and it is similarly used for reactivation of earlier-mentioned referents. In example (148), the owl (*etsíítsí*) is referred to in sentence 6 of the story, again four sentences later and again two sentences later, when it is referred to with a noun modified by a demonstrative (van der Wal 2010a: 93).

(148) Hw-íir-a   "Mí   e-tsíítsí, ki-náá-vár-á,
     NARR-say-FV 1SG.PRO 9-owl   1SG.SM-PRS.DJ-grab-FV
     ki-náá-khúur-a".
     1SG.SM-PRS.DJ-eat-FV
     'And he (the fox) said: the owl, I will catch him and eat him.'
     […]
     Hatá ni-húkú ni-motsá, ólé   khweelí o-ḿ-phwány'
     until 5-day   5-one   1.DEM.DIST certainly 1SM.PFV.DJ-1OM-meet
     e-tsíítsí…[17]
     9-owl
     'Until one day he found the owl…'
     […]

---

[17]Note also that the verb form *oḿphwánya* here is disjoint, as the point of the sentence if not to focus the owl (as opposed to other animals), but rather the fact that the owl was caught (which may be seen as polarity focus).

O-o-phíy-á		válé,		o-o-túph-á,	
1SM-PFV.DJ-arrive-FV		16.DEM.DIST		1SM-PFV.DJ-jump-FV	

o-o-vár-á		**e-tsííts' íile**.	
1SM-PFV.DJ-grab-FV		9-owl	9.DEM.DIST

'He arrived there, he jumped, (and) he caught the/that owl.'

Both the adnominal and pronominal use are illustrated in (149), where the pronominal demonstrative is used (*ólé ookhúmá*) rather than only the subject marker, in order to switch from one referent (Tortoise) to another (Leopard). But then the narrator realises that it may at that point not be entirely clear who is who, adding the full name plus demonstrative afterwards (*havárá ole*).

(149)   (Leopard$_i$ saves Tortoise$_m$ from the fire. Tortoise says "Tomorrow you must come to my$_m$ house, when the fire has stopped." He$_i$ said "I have heard you." So he$_m$ went away, crawling crawling crawling to his$_m$ house. He$_m$ arrived but the fire didn't reach (the house).)

Masi	seertú	nróttó	áyá,	nuu-thowa-thówá	moóró
but	truly	day.after.tomorrow	POSS.2	RSM-extinguish-RED	3.fire

olé,	**ólé**		oo-khúm-á,		oo-rów-a,	
3.DEM.DIST	1.DEM.DIST		1SM.PFV.DJ-exit-FV		1SM.PFV.DJ-go-FV	

'But as promised, the day after, when the fire had extinguished, he$_i$ went out, he$_i$ went...'

havárá	**ole**		oo-rów-á		wa-khápá	**óle**.[18]
1.Leopard	1.DEM.DIST		1SM.PFV.DJ-go-FV		16-1.Tortoise	1.DEM.DIST

'... Leopard$_i$ went to Tortoise's$_m$.'

There is yet another way in Makhuwa to (re)activate referents: circumdemonstratives. Demonstratives may occur both before and after the noun in three (re)activating contexts: first, when reactivating a referent that has not been mentioned for some time; second, in tail-head linking; and third, at episode boundaries. I repeat the illustration and explanation I gave in my earlier paper (van der Wal 2010a: 200–201):

The last mention of the subject of the first sentence in [(150)], was in sentence 70. After an episode speaking solely about the man whose wife was taken from him, the story comes back to the one who took the wife, which

---

[18]The tonal patterns on the demonstratives here derive from a combination of the following factors: adnominal vs. pronominal use, final lowering, and boundary continuation tones. See van der Wal (2009: chapter 2) for further information on tone rules.

is sentence 98 of the story. The narrator starts by referring to him with a pronominal demonstrative *ólé*, but realises that the referent is not sufficiently accessible to be identified directly. In a pseudocleft construction (who answered was the/that man who…), he adds information so as to make sure that the listeners pick the right referent, and uses the doubled demonstrative to refer to the less accessible referent.

(150)   ólé khwíira
        ole   khu-ira
        1.DEM.DIST NARR-say
        'and he said,'
        aakhulle t' **uúlé** nlópwán' **oolé** aamwaákhálé mwaár' áw' oole
        a-a-akhul-ale   ti   ole   n-lopwana ole
        1-PST-answer-PFV.REL COP 1.DEM.DIST 1-man   1.DEM.DIST
        a-a-m-akh-ale   mwaara awe   ole
        1-PST-1OM-pull-PFV.REL 1.woman 1.POSS.1 1.DEM.III
        '(the one) who answered was that man who had snatched his wife away,'
        hwíra mpattháni…
        khu-íra   m-pattháni…
        NARR-say 1-friend
        'he said: my friend…' (van der Wal 2010a: 201)

Newly introduced referents that are presented in the comment of a sentence are often repeated at the start of the following sentence. In this repetition, two demonstratives may be used to enhance activation of the referent and make them more prominent for future reference as well. Examples (151) and (152) are from different stories, and both show the introduction of a woman (one in subject inversion, the other as object), who in the next sentence is marked by two demonstratives in order to function as the topic of that sentence.

(151)   (A long long time ago, when the world was bald, water had a tail, and the trees jumped,)
        Aanúúkhálá nthíyána mmotsá, aarí n' iirukulu yuulupále.
        a-a-nuu-khal-a   n-thiyana m-motsa a-a-ri   ni   e-rukulu
        2SM-PST-PERS-stay-FV 1-woman 1-one   2SM-PST-be with 9-belly
        e-ulupale
        9-big
        'There was a woman, she had a big belly.'

> **Ólé nthíyán' ole** aakúshá ncómá áwé, oorééla maátsi opuúsu.
> ole   n-thiyana ole   a-o-kush-a   n-coma
> 1.DEM.DIST 1-woman 1.DEM.DIST 2SM-PFV.DJ-carry-FV 3-container
> awe   o-o-row-el-a   maatsi o-puusu
> 3.POSS.1 1SM-PFV.DJ-go-APPL-FV 6.water 17-well
> 'This woman carried her container and went to fetch water at the well.'

(152) O-ḿ-phwány-a   n-thíyáná m-motsá.
      1SM.PFV.DJ-1OM-meet-FV 1-woman 1-one
      'He met a woman.'
      Ólé nthíyán' **uule** khoóthá aapáh' ólumweńku.
      ole   n-thiyana ole   kha-a-oth-a   a-aa-pah-a
      1.DEM.DIST 1-woman 1.DEM.DIST NEG-1SM.IPFV-lie-FV 1SM-IPFV-light-FV
      o-lumwenku.
      14-world
      'This woman didn't just lie, she set the world on fire!' (van der Wal 2009:
      180)

According to Ariel (2001), referents are also less accessible when they occur after an episode boundary. They need to be reestablished in the current episode, and this too happens by demonstratives in Makhuwa – pronominal or circum-demonstrative. The episode in (153) ends with the mother's death, and the new episode starts with the protagonist as the (shifted) topic, marked by two demonstratives.

(153) (Now his mother became ill. She called her son and said: "[…]. Do you remember?" He said "I remember". "That's what I am telling you")

   a. Ólé   khú-khw-a.
      1.DEM.DIST NARR-die-FV
      'and then she died.'

   b. **Ólé**   rapásy' **úúlé**   oo-khál-á   oo-khálá
      1.DEM.DIST 1.boy 1.DEM.DIST 1SM.PFV.DJ-stay-FV RED
      oo-khálá.
      RED
      'The boy stayed and stayed and stayed.'

   c. Oo-phíy-á   okáthí w'   oóthéla.
      14SM.PFV.DJ-arrive-FV 14.time 14.CONN 15.marry
      '(Until) it was time to get married.' (van der Wal 2010a: 203–204)

For further discussion and examples of demonstratives and reference tracking, I refer to van der Wal (2010a).

6.3 Emphatic demonstrative

The emphatic form of the demonstrative consists of the demonstrative with an agreeing prefix, glossed as E as in (154–157). Its function seems to be an emphatic (re-)identification of a previously established referent, or in Floor's (1998) words a "confirmative demonstrative", translated as 'the very (same)'. It is typically used pronominally.

(154) Yaanúḿvól' etálá hatá khúc' éshíma (**yééle** ehiníńtsivelaka).
e-a-nuu-n-vol-a   e-tala   hata khu-c-a   e-shima
9SM-PST-PERS-1OM-torment-FV 9-hunger until NARR-eat-FV 9-shima
yeele   e-hi-n-n-tsivel-ak-a
9.EDEM.DIST 9-NEG-PRS-1OM-please-DUR-FV.REL
'He was hungry to such an extent that he ate shima (the same that he doesn't like).'

(155) Válé   o-khúmá ni-húkú **néńné**...
16.DEM.DIST 15-exit   5-day   5.EDEM.DIST
'as of that day/ from that day on...' (van der Wal 2009: 48)

(156) (He searched and searched for a woman. He found one woman – this woman didn't just lie, she set the world on fire (with her lies). So when he heard about this lying woman, ...)
...hw-íira: "Paáhi, ki-n-iń-thél-a   **yóoyo**."
NARR-say only   1SG.SM-PRS-1OM-marry-FV 1.EDEM.MED
'... he said: "That's it, I will marry that very one".'

(157) (She went straight to the police. She said 'my husband at home has killed!'. 'He has killed?' She said 'Yes. Go there and blood will be found.')
Yoólé   mpákhá wa-ámútsy' aáwe
1.EDEM.DIST until   16-2.family 2.POSS.1
'She/the same went to his family's place.' (van der Wal 2009: 48)

The emphatic demonstrative can be formally distinguished from the reduplicated demonstrative, illustrated in (158), which consists simply of a repetition of the simplex demonstrative (compare again the columns in Table 2).

(158) ni   mwalápw' **ool'**   **oólé** oo-lúm-ák-ats-íy-á...
       and 1.dog   1.DEM.DIST RED 1SM.PFV.DJ-bite-DUR-PLUR-PASS-FV
       'and that dog was bitten...' (van der Wal 2009: 48)

It remains to be studied when exactly the reduplicated demonstrative is used, compared to a single demonstrative, and compared to the emphatic demonstrative.

7 Summary and conclusion

In summary, information structure has a rather fundamental impact on the grammar of Makhuwa-Enahara. Primarily, it influences the constituent order in placing topics preverbally and having a dedicated immediate-after-verb focus position, and it is expressed in four main clause conjugations (present, present perfective, imperfective, and past perfective) where a choice is forced between the conjoint form (exclusive focus on the following constituent) and the disjoint verb form (elsewhere). The general template for a Makhuwa phrase not involving a copular construction (including clefts), is as in Figure 1, and illustrated from different spontaneous discourse and narratives in (159–163).

discourse marker	topic	comment		afterthought
		focus	background	

Figure 1: Template of Makhuwa constituent order

(159) [Vánó...]_DM [élé ekuw' éele valé]_TOP [ekhumalé [tsáyi?]_FOC]_COMM
       vano ele   ekuwo ele   vale   e-khum-ale   tsayi
       now 9.DEM.DIST 9.cloth 9.DEM.DIST 16.DEM.DIST 9SM-exit-PFV.CJ how
       'Now, the capulana, where did it come from/how did it start?'

(160) [Mí]_TOP [kóhoótta]_COMM, [enúmwáari yáaka.]_AFT
       mi   ki-o-oott-a   enumwaari e-aka
       1SG.PRO 1SG.SM-PFV.DJ-smear-FV 9.adolescence 9-POSS.1SG
       'I too used (it), in my adolescence.'

(161) [Vánó]_DM [hw-íyá-w-aak-á khutsúpa.]_COMM
       vano khu-iya-w-ak-a   khutsupa.
       now NARR-IPFV-come-DUR-FV 1.hyena
       'Then came Hyena.'

(162) [O-r-aalé [w-eetheyá ettuúra.]₍FOC₎]₍COMM₎
       o-row-ale   o-eetheya ettuura
       1SM-go-PFV.CJ 15-wet   9.ashes
       'He went to make the ashes wet.'

(163) [Mahíkw' éény' áala vá]₍TOP₎ [ashínúmwaary' otééné]₍TOP₎ [amphéélá
       [weettakátsá pwitipwíiti.]₍FOC₎]₍COMM₎
       ma-hiku ene ala   va a-shi-numwaari a-oteene
       6-day   INT 5.DEM.PROX PP 2-DIM-maiden   2-all
       a-m-pheel-a   o-eett-ak-ats-a   pwitipwiti
       2SM-PRS.CJ-want-FV 15-walk-DUR-PLUR-FV naked
       'These days, all the girls want to walk naked.'

To express polarity focus and verum in Makhuwa, a simple verb form suffices, but an infinitive may be placed in the left periphery of the sentence functioning as a (potentially contrastive) topic, with the same verb repeated as an inflected form – the construction known as topic doubling. Topic doubling had not been previously described for Makhuwa, and the possibilities for lexical subjects and objects in this construction, together with their interpretation and possible contexts for use, remain to be studied. This will likely also provide further insight into the expression of predicate-centred focus in general.

As in all languages, cleft sentences can also be formed to express focus in Makhuwa-Enahara, whether as a basic cleft, pseudocleft, or reverse pseudocleft. All three constructions show signs of an exclusive interpretation, and further investigation should reveal whether the distinction should be sought in a categorial difference (pronoun vs. full NP), a grammatical difference (subject vs. object), or an interpretational difference (explicit backgrounding, implied vs. encoded exclusivity).

Finally, pronouns and demonstratives are used for reactivation and contrast of mental referents. The interaction between the lack of object markers and the anaphoric use of other pronominal elements as well as NPs is currently being investigated by Teresa Poeta.

While there are numerous areas for further investigation (as indicated throughout the chapter), it can certainly be concluded that it would be impossible to analyse Makhuwa morphosyntax and constituent order without reference to information structure.

Jenneke van der Wal

Acknowledgements

Abbreviations and symbols

Numbers refer to noun classes except when followed by SG/PL, in which case they refer to persons. Commas indicate a pause. The orthographic ⟨tt⟩ reflects a retroflex voiceless stop and nasalisation is indicated by a tilde under the vowel ⟨Ṿ⟩.

*	ungrammatical	INT	intensifier
#	infelicitous in the given context	MED	medial
		NARR	narrative
*(X)	the presence of X is obligatory and cannot grammatically be omitted	OM	object marker
		OPT	optative
		PERS	persistive
(*X)	the presence of X would make the sentence ungrammatical	PLA	plural addressee
		PLUR	plurative
(X)	the presence of X is optional	PP	pragmatic particle
CE	counterexpectational	PRL	predicative lowering
CJ	conjoint	PRO	pronoun
cit.	citation form	RED	reduplication
CONN	connective	RSM	resumptive infinitive
DIM	diminutive	REP	repetitive
DJ	disjoint	RESP	respect
DM	discourse marker	SIT	situative
E.DEM	emphatic demonstrative	SM	subject marker
EXCLAM	exclamative	SUBS	subsecutive
FV	final vowel		

References

Ariel, Mira. 1990. *Accessing noun-phrase antecedents*. London: Routledge.

Ariel, Mira. 2001. Accessibility theory: An overview. In Ted Sanders, Joost Schilperoord & Wilbert Spooren (eds.), *Text representation: Linguistic and psycholinguistic aspects*, 29–88. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Buell, Leston C. 2005. *Issues in Zulu morphosyntax*. Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles. (Doctoral dissertation).

Cassimjee, Farida & Charles W. Kisseberth. 1999. Tonal variation across Emakhuwa dialects. In S. Kaji (ed.), *Cross linguistic studies of tonal phenomena: Tonogenesis, typology and related topics*, 261 287. Tokyo: Tokyo University of Foreign Studies. Institute for the Study of Languages and Cultures (ILCAA).

Centis, Gino. 2001. *Método macua*. Achilo: Centro Catequético Paulo VI.

Cheng, Chin-Chuan & Charles W. Kisseberth. 1979. Ikorovere Makua tonology (part 1). *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences* 9(1). 31–64.

Cheng, Chin-Chuan & Charles W. Kisseberth. 1980. Ikorovere Makua tonology (part 2). *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences* 10(1). 15–44.

Cheng, Chin-Chuan & Charles W. Kisseberth. 1981. Ikorovere Makua tonology (part 3). *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences* 11(1). 181–202.

Cheng, Chin-Chuan & Charles W. Kisseberth. 1982. Tone-bearing nasals in Makua. *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences* 12(1). 123–139.

Devos, Maud. 2017. Shangaji paired tenses: Emergene of a conjoint/disjoint system? In Jenneke van der Wal & Larry M. Hyman (eds.), *The conjoint/disjoint alternation in Bantu*, 122–146. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

É. Kiss, Katalin. 1995. *Discourse configurational languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Floor, Sebastian. 1998. *Confirmative demonstratives*. Ms. SIL Nampula.

Guérois, Rozenn. 2015. *A grammar of Cuwabo (Mozambique, P34)*. Lyon: University of Lyon. (Doctoral dissertation).

Instituto Nacional Estatistica. 2017. *Censo 2017: IV Recenseamento Geral da População e Habitação. Indicadores Sócio-demográficos Moçambique*.

Katupha, José M. M. 1983. *A preliminary description of sentence structure in the E-Sáaka dialect of e-Mákhuwa*. SOAS University of London. (MA dissertation).

Katupha, José M. M. 1991. *The grammar of Emakhuwa verbal extensions*. SOAS University of London. (Doctoral dissertation).

Kerr, Elisabeth J., Allen Asiimwe, Patrick N. Kanampiu, Zhen Li, Ernest Nshemezimana & Jenneke van der Wal. 2023. Bantu word order between discourse and syntactic relations. *Linguistique et langues africaines* 9(1). DOI: 10.4000/lla. 9496.

Kröger, Oliver. 2010. Discourse function of inverted passives in Makua-Marevone narratives. In Ines Fiedler & Anne Schwarz (eds.), *The expression of information structure: A documentation of its diversity across Africa*, 165–192. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kujath, Elizabeth. 2022. *Copular constructions in Makhuwa-Enahara*. Leiden University. (MA thesis).

Kujath, Elizabeth & Jenneke van der Wal. 2023. Copular constructions in Makhuwa-Enahara. In Sterre Leufkens & Marco Bril (eds.), *Linguistics in the Netherlands 2023*, 155–177. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Marten, Lutz & Jenneke van der Wal. 2014. A typology of Bantu subject inversion. *Linguistic Variation* 14(2). 318–368.

Pires Prata, P. António. 1960. *Gramática da lingua Macua e seus dialectos*. Cucujães: Sociedade missionária Portuguesa.

Pires Prata, P. António. 1973. *Dicionário Português-Macua*. Cucujães: Sociedade Missionária Portuguesa.

Pires Prata, P. António. 1990. *Dicionário Macua-Português*. Lisbon: Instituto de Investigação Tropical.

Poeta, Teresa. 2016. *Reference to objects in Makhuwa and Swahili discourse*. London: SOAS University of London. (Doctoral dissertation).

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.

Schadeberg, Thilo C. & Francisco Ussene Mucanheia. 2000. *Ekoti: The Maka or Swahili language of Angoche*. Cologne: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.

Stucky, Susan. 1979a. Focus of contrast aspects in Makua: Syntactic and semantic evidence. In Christine Chiarello et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the fifth annual meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 362–372. Berkeley, CA: Berkeley Linguistics Society.

Stucky, Susan. 1979b. The interaction of tone and focus in Makua. *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 1(2). 189–198.

Stucky, Susan. 1985. *Order in Makua syntax*. New York: Garland Publishing.

van der Wal, Jenneke. 2006. Predicative tone lowering in Makhuwa. In Jeroen van de Weijer & Bettelou Los (eds.), *Linguistics in the netherlands 2006*, 224–236. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/avt.23.22wal.

van der Wal, Jenneke. 2008. Agreement in thetic sentences in Bantu and Romance. In Cecile Cat & Katherine Demuth (eds.), *The Bantu-Romance connection: A*

comparative investigation of verbal agreement, DPs and information structure, 323–350. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

van der Wal, Jenneke. 2009. *Word order and information structure in Makhuwa-enahara*. Utrecht: LOT.

van der Wal, Jenneke. 2010a. Functions of demonstratives in Makhuwa narratives. *Africana Linguistica* XVI. 183–213.

van der Wal, Jenneke. 2010b. The Makhuwa non-subject relative as a participial modifier. *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 31(2). 205–231.

van der Wal, Jenneke. 2011. Focus excluding alternatives: Conjoint/disjoint marking in Makhuwa. *Lingua* 121(11). 1734–1750. DOI: 10.1016/j.lingua.2010.10.013.

van der Wal, Jenneke. 2012. Subject agreement and the EPP in Bantu Agreeing Inversion. *Cambridge Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 6. 201–236.

van der Wal, Jenneke. 2014. Subordinate clauses and exclusive focus in Makhuwa. In Rik van Gijn, Jeremy Hammond, Dejan Matić, Saskia van Putten & Ana Vilacy Galucio (eds.), *Information structure and reference tracking in complex sentences*, 45–70. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

van der Wal, Jenneke. 2017. What is the conjoint/disjoint alternation? Parameters of crosslinguistic variation. In Jenneke van der Wal & Larry M. Hyman (eds.), *The conjoint/disjoint alternation in Bantu*, 14–60. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

van der Wal, Jenneke. 2021. On the use of idioms for testing focus. *Semantic Field Methods* 3(2).

van der Wal, Jenneke, Allen Asiimwe, Patrick N. Kanampiu, Elisabeth J. Kerr, Zhen Li, Amani Lusekelo, Nelsa Nhantumbo & Ernest Nshemezimana. 2025. On the expression of information structure in Bantu. In Jenneke van der Wal (ed.), *The expression of information structure in Bantu*, 1–51. Berlin: Language Science Press. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.14833604.

Zerbian, Sabine. 2006. *Expression of information structure in the Bantu language Northern Sotho*. Berlin: Humboldt University. (Doctoral dissertation).