

Incomplete subordinate clauses and exclusive focus in Makhuwa

Jenneke van der Wal

LSA Left Periphery workshop, 13-14 July 2013, Ann Arbor

1. Makhuwa

- Bantu language
- spoken in Mozambique and Tanzania
- fieldwork on variant Enahara, spoken on Ilha de Moçambique
- appr. 5 million speakers of all variants in Mozambique (Sebastian Floor, p.c.)

Basic properties Bantu

- canonical word order SVO
- noun class system
- agreement in class on the verb (prefix)
- verbal morphology: SM-TAM-OM-V

- (1) CJ n-lópwaná o-n-lówá e-hopá
1.man 1SM-PRES.CJ-fish 9.fish
'the man catches fish'

2. The conjoint-disjoint alternation

In several southern Bantu languages, including Makhuwa (Mozambique), some tenses distinguish two verb forms, referred to as conjoint (CJ) and disjoint (DJ). The formal differences between these verb forms are visible in

- the sentence-final distribution (only DJ allowed sentence-finally);
- the TAM morphology (*-naa-* in 2a, *-n-* in 2a);
- and the tonal pattern on the element following the verb (LHL in 2a, LLH in 2b).

- (2) a. CJ ki-n-rúwá eshimá
1SG-PRES.CJ-stir shima

- b. DJ ki-náá-rúwá eshíma
1SG-PRES.DJ-stir shima
'I am cooking shima'

- (3) CJ ki-n-lépá epapheló DJ ki-náá-lépa 'I write (a letter)'
ki-lep-alé epapheló k-oo-lépa 'I have written (a letter)'
k-aa-lépá epapheló k-aánaa-lépa 'I wrote (a letter)'
k-aa-lep-álé epapheló k-aahí-lépa 'I had written (a letter)'

- (4) * kinlepa.
int. 'I write/am writing'

3. Conjoint-disjoint: what does it mean?

What follows the conjoint verb form is interpreted as **exclusive focus**.

Exclusive focus = triggers the relevant alternatives for the referent of that element and excludes at least some of these

(cf. Rooth 1992, 1996, Krifka 2007, Kenesei 2007, Horvath 2007).

Questions and answers

- (5) a. CJ o-n-c' éshéeni?
2SG.SM-PRES.CJ-eat 9.what
'what are you eating?'
- b. DJ *o-náá-ca eshéeni?
2SG.SM-PRES.DJ-eat 9.what
- (6) a. CJ a-n-aápéyá esheení?
2SM-PRES.CJ-cook 9.what
'what are they cooking?'
- b. CJ a-n-aápéyá nramá
2SM-PRES.CJ-cook 3.rice
'they are cooking rice'

Focus particles 'only' and 'even'

- (7) a. CJ ki-n-thúm' étomati paáhi
1SG.SM-PRES.CJ-buy 10.tomatoes only
'I buy only tomatoes'
- b. DJ *ki-náá-thúma etomátí paáhi
1SG.SM-PRES.DJ-buy 10.tomatoes only
- (8) a. CJ *áshíiná a-ni-ń-khúúra hatá mwálápwa
2.Chinese 2SM-PRES.CJ-1OM-eat even 1.dog
int: 'the Chinese eat even dogs'
- b. DJ áshíiná a-ná-ń-khúúra hatá mwálápwa
2.Chinese 2SM-PRES.DJ-1OM-eat even 1.dog

Contrastive context

Prediction: CJ form required

- (9) nki-var-álé ehópá, ki-var-alé ephwetsá
NEG.1SG.SM-grab-PERF 9.fish 1SG.SM-grab-PERF.CJ 9.octopus
'I didn't catch fish, I caught octopus'
- (10) anámwáne y-aa-kunsh-é anamanriíyá m-matátá-ni,
2.children 2SM-2OM-carry-PERF.CJ 2.cameleons 18-6.hands-LOC
alópwáná a-kush-ants-é ehópá
2.men 2SM-carry-PLUR-PERF.CJ 10.fish
'the children held cameleons in their hands, the men held fish'

- (11) nki-c-aalé ni kuyéri, ki-c-aalé ni matáta
 NEG.1SG.SM-eat-PERF with 1.spoon 1SG.SM-eat-PERF.CJ with 6.hands
 ‘I didn’t eat with a spoon, I ate with my hands’

Corrective context

Prediction: CJ form required

- (12) a. nthiyána o-h-aápéya nrámá para mwan’ áwe
 1.woman 1SM-PERF.DJ-cook 3.rice for 1.child 1.poss.1
 ‘the woman cooked rice for her child’
- b. kha-mw-aáp-éel-ale mwan’ áwé,
 NEG.1SM-1OM-cook-APPL-PERF 1.child 1.POSS.1
 o-mw-aap-eel-alé Manínya
 1SM-1OM-cook-APPL-PERF.CJ 1.Maninha
 ‘she didn’t cook (it) for the child, she cooked for Maninha’

Indefinite noun

Prediction: CJ form not allowed

- (13) a. DJ ko-m’-wéha ntthu
 1SG.SM.PERF.DJ-1OM-look 1.person
 ‘I saw someone’
- b. CJ * ki-m-weh-alé ntthú
 1SG.SM-1OM-look-PERF.CJ 1.person
 int: ‘I saw someone’
- c. CJ ki-m-weh-alé ntthú, nki-weh-álé enáma
 1SG.SM-1OM-look-PERF.CJ 1.person NEG.1SG-look-PERF 9.animal
 ‘I saw a person/human being, not an animal’

Quantifiers

Prediction: CJ form not allowed –unless some referents can be excluded

- (14) a. CJ * o-lawih-alé kat’ epoólu/epoolú
 1SM-taste-PERF.CJ every 9.cake
 int: ‘he tasted every cake’
- b. DJ oo-láwihá kat’ epoólu
 1SM.PERF.DJ-taste every 9.cake
 ‘he tasted every cake’
- (15) CJ Kaásímú oon-alékút’ éfilímé
 1.Casimo 1SM.see-PERF.CJ every 9.film
 e-thum-iy-é n’ itáát’ ááwe
 9-buy-PASS-PERF.REL by 1.brother 1.POSS.1
 ‘Casimo watched every film bought by his brother’

Yes/no question

Prediction: DJ form -unless some referents can be excluded

- (16) a. DJ woo-várhéla ekanttiyéro?
2SG.SM.PERF.DJ-light 9.oil.lamp
'did you light the oil lamp?'
- b. CJ # o-varihel-alé ekanttiyeró?
2SG.SM-light-PERF.CJ 9.oil.lamp
- (17) CJ o-varihel-alé ekanttiyeró?
2SG.SM-light-PERF.CJ 9.oil.lamp
- o-ttip-ih-é o-m-párhel-é lám-pát' ooyó!
2SG.SM-put.out-CAUS-OPT 2SG.SM-1OM-light-OPT 1.lamp 1.DEM.II
'Did you light the *oil lamp*? Put it out, switch on that (electrical) light!'

Selective / Alternative questions

Prediction: CJ form

- (18) a. DJ n-náá-phééla o-n-théla?
2PL.SM-PRES.DJ-want 15-1OM-marry
'do you want to marry her?'
- b. CJ mwi-m-phééla o-n-théla mwi-m-phéél' oshupishú?
2.PL.SM-PRES.CJ-want 15-1OM-marry 2PL.SM-PRES.CJ-want 15.bother
'do you want to marry her, or do you want to bother?'
- (19) CJ o-m-phééla ekafé o-m-phééla eshá?
2sg-PRES.CJ-want 9.coffee 2sg-PRES.CJ-want 9.tea
'do you want tea or coffee?'

Complication? VP focus as focus projection

- (20) a. CJ o-n-iír' ésheeni?
1SM-PRES.CJ-do 9.what
'what is she doing?'
- b. CJ o-n-lép' épapheló
1SM-PRES.CJ-write 9.letter
'she is writing a letter'
- c. DJ # o-náá-lépá epaphélo
1SM-PRES.DJ-write 9.letter

Summary

- The referent of the element (directly) following the conjoint verb form is interpreted as exclusive focus
- The disjoint verb form? Elsewhere condition. Stucky (1985:56): the disjoint form "is simply used to indicate that the action took place"

4. Extending the analysis

- V + NP
- V + adverb
- V + PP
- V + clause?

- (21) a. CJ eshímá e-ruw-iy-é tsiítsáale
9.shima 9SM-stir-pass-PERF.CJ like.that
'(the) shima is cooked like that'
- b. CJ ni-n-rúpá wakhaámá-ni
1PL.SM-PRES.CJ-sleep 16.bed-LOC
'we sleep in a bed'
- c. CJ ki-naan-alé n' iipulá
1SG.SM-wet-PERF.CJ with 9.rain
'I got wet by the rain' lit. 'I was wetted with rain'

4.1 Situatives

Makhuwa has eight 'Situative' conjugations (four affirmative, four negative), which indicate a certain state of affairs with respect to which the event in the main clause holds.

- Conditional situative: state of affairs or situation is underspecified, usually interpreted as a temporal or logical condition, as in (22) and (23);
- Durative situative: simultaneous and continuous situation, (24) and (25)
- Perfective situative: completed state of affairs, resulting in a sequential interpretation of the events in dependent and main clause translated as 'after' as in (26) and (27);
- Counterexpectational situative: situation holding earlier (affirmative) or later (negative) than expected, as in (28) and (29).

Conditional situative

- (22) nikhwáttá na-khalá ni-kíthi o-hááná o-loól-áka
5.wound 5.SIT-stay 5-unripe 2SG.SM-have 2SG.SM-treat-DUR
'when the wound is fresh you have to treat it'
('strike while the iron is hot')

Negative conditional situative

- (23) wé waa-hí-kí-vah-e ephaáú o-náá-tsúwela vó!
2SG.PRO 2SG.sm.SIT-NEG-1SG-give-SIT9.bread 2SG.SM-PRES.DJ-knowPP
'if you don't give me the bread, you'll find out!'

Durative situative

- (24) o-h-iípúrúla o-h-iípúrúlá a-pheél-ák' ocáwa
1SM-PERF.DJ-crawl 1SM-PERF.DJ-crawl 1SM.SIT-want-DUR 15.flee
'he crawled and crawled, wanting to flee'

Negative durative situative

- (25) a-ttikél-áka úwé w-aa-ry-ááyá makínákw' aale
2SM.SIT-throw-DUR 17.DEM.III 17-PAST-be.REL-POSS.2 6.others 6.DEM.III
'throwing to where the others were'

Perfective situative

- (33) o-n-í'll-alé t-ú-ń-row-ééhũ óca
 PX-CE-darken-PERF COP-PX-PRES-go.REL-POSS.1PL 15.eat
 (nańńáano vá kha-ni-ń-ca)
 now right NEG-1PL.SM-PRES-eat
 ‘when it is already dark is when we’re going to eat
 (right now we won’t eat)’

Counterexpectational situative

- (34) ki-hiná-cé t-ú-ń-vól-íy-ááká etála
 1SG.SM-NEG.CE-eat COP-PX-PRES-torment-PASS.REL-POSS.1SG 9.hunger
 ‘when I haven’t eaten yet is when I am hungry’

- Situatives can also be the answer to a wh question.

- (35) a. eshímá e-ruw-iy-é líni?
 9.shima 9SM-stir-PASS-PERF.CJ when
 ‘when was the shima prepared?’
- b. (e-ruw-iy-é) Coáo o-hi-ná-tthí ophíya
 9SM-stir-PASS-PERF.CJ 1.João 1SM-NEG-CE-AUX 15.arrive
 ‘(it was prepared) when João hadn’t arrived yet’

- And as predicted (Vcj + clause), a situative also has a focused interpretation after a conjoint verb form!

Conditional situative

- (36) CJ ákwáatú a-n-réerá ya-khal’ oóriipa
 2.cats 2SM-PRES.CJ-be.good 2SM.SIT-stay 2.black
 ‘cats are beautiful (only) if they’re black’ (other cats are not pretty)

Perfective situative

- (37) a. DJ ki-náá-cá wé o-c-áale
 1SG.SM-PRES.DJ-eat 2SG.PRO 2SG.SM-eat-PERF.SIT
 ‘I’ll eat when you’ve eaten’
 sit: you can only eat after the oldest person has started, tradition of respect
- b. CJ ki-n-cá wé o-c-áale
 2SG.SM-PRES.CJ-eat 2SG.PRO 2SG.SM-eat-PERF.SIT
 ‘I (will) eat (only) when you’ve eaten / after you’ve eaten’
 sit: you distrust the food; mafia situation where the plates may have been switched or the food may be poisoned.

- Extra factor: Immediate After Verb position

Watters (1979) discovered that the position immediately after the verb in Aghem is associated with focus. Same in Makhuwa: wh words and nouns modified by ‘only’ are only allowed in IAV position.

- (38) a. CJ o-n-koh-al' éshéeni Apákhári?
2SG.SM-1.OM-ask-PERF.CJ 9.what 1.Apakhari
'what did you ask Apakhari?'
- b. CJ * onkohalé Apákhári eshéeni
- (39) a. CJ Mariyá o-m-vanh-é [Apútaála paáhi] ekamítsa
1.Maria 1SM-1OM-give-PERF.CJ 1.Abdallah only 9.shirt
'Maria gave only Abdallah a shirt'
- b. CJ * Mariyá o-m-vanh-é [ekamítsa] [Apútaála paáhi]
1.Maria 1SM-1OM-give-PERF.CJ 9.shirt 1.Abdallah only
int. 'Maria gave only Abdallah a shirt'

➤ And as predicted, the situative is only interpreted as focus when in IAV position.

- (40) a. CJ ehópá tsi-n-khwá viíncéene ya-rup' epúla
10.fish 10SM-PRES.CJ-die much 9SM.SIT-fall 9.rain
'a lot of fish is caught when it rains'
lit. 'very many fish die when it rains'
'In other periods it is not so much.'
- b. CJ ehópá tsi-n-khwá ya-rup' epúla
10.fish 10SM-PRES.CJ-die 9SM.SIT-fall 9.rain
'a lot of fish is caught *when it rains*', lit. 'many fish die when it rains'
'Only in the rainy season much fish is caught; if it doesn't rain, no fish is caught.'

5. Extending the analysis even further

Post-conjoint focus for NPs, adverbs, PPs and certain clauses. Also other clauses?

- Adverbial relative clauses

- (41) ki-hoó-wá waa-k-áátsim-ínyu
1SG.SM-PERF.DJ-come 16.IMPF-1SG.OM-call.REL-POSS.2PL
'I have come (to) where you called me'

- (42) wa-tuph-aly-ááka khúnt-eya mwétto
16-jump-PERF.REL-POSS.1SG NARR.break-STAT3.leg
'when I jumped I broke my leg'

➤ Also has an exclusive interpretation after conjoint form

- (43) epúlá y-aa-rúmp-é mahútté wa-riip-ály-áaya
9.rain 9SM-PAST-rain-PERF.CJ 6.clouds 16-be.dark-PERF.REL-POSS.2
'it rained after the clouds had become dark'
'it rained, but not all day, only when the clouds were there'

- Complement clauses?
- No clear data, but so far it seems that both conjoint and disjoint possible before sentential complements, without any apparent difference in meaning

(Van der Wal & Veenstra submitted)

(44) a. CJ n-himy-alé [CP wiírá Zainábú o-n-thotonl-é pani?]
2PL.SM-tell-PERF.CJ COMP Zainab 1SM-1OM-visit-PERF.CJ 1.who
'who did you say that Zainab visited?'

b. DJ moo-hímyá [CP wiírá Zainábú o-n-thotonl-é pani?]
2PL.SM.PERF.DJ-tell COMP Zainab 1SM-1OM-visit-PERF.CJ 1.who
-idem-

(45) a. CJ ki-n-tsúwéla wiírá etthépó tsi-háána mpwína
1SG.SM-PRES.CJ-know COMP 10.elephants 10SM-have 4.trunks
'I know that elephants have trunks'

b. DJ koo-tsúwélá wiírá etthépó tsi-háána mpwína
1SG.SM.PERF.DJ-know COMP 10.elephants 10SM-have 4.trunks
-idem-

Summary

- Adverbial relatives and Situative subordinate clauses have a clear interpretation as exclusive focus when following a conjoint form
- Complement clauses do not seem to show such a clear interpretation
- Why would this be the case?

6. Reduced clauses?

6.1 No independent information structure

Proposal: The difference is in the internal information structure of adverbial clauses and complement clauses, which is due to adverbial subordination being non-asserted, presupposed (Hooper & Thompson 1973, Harris and Campbell 1995:302, Cristofaro 2003).

(Lambrecht 1994:52)

(46) Pragmatic presupposition: the set of propositions lexicogrammatically evoked in a sentence which the speaker assumes the hearer already knows or is ready to take for granted at the time the sentence is uttered.

(47) Pragmatic assertion: the proposition expressed by a sentence which the hearer is expected to know or take for granted as a result of hearing the sentence uttered.

The status as non-assertive, presupposed units of information “necessitates a compact, largely unstructured presentation of the state of affairs. In order to meet this requirement, the internal (information) structuring of the dependent clause - by focusing the predicate, a term or any other part of the sentence – would be obstructive.” (Güldemann 1996:178).

- How can we detect this internal difference in information structure?
 - a. no conjoint/disjoint distinction in Relative or Situative tenses
 - b. no IAV position in Relative or Situative tenses
 - no (interrogative) wh in in Relative or Situative tenses: echo interpretation (48); but interrogative OK in complement clause (50)
 - c. no preposed topic in Relative or Situative tenses; but OK in complements (51).

(48) o-m-phwanya Kaásímu iir-ák' éshéeni?
 2SG.SM.PERF.DJ-1OM-meet 1.Casimo 1SM.SIT.do-DUR 9.what
 'you met Casimo doing what?'

But: 'only' in Situative...

(49) wa-war' ekamísá paáhi vá, khu-ń-rów' efeéshta
 2SG.SM.SIT-wear 9.shirt only PP NEG.2SG.SM-PRES-go 9.party
 'if you only wear the shirt, you're not going to the party'

(50) o-n-uúpúwela wiírá Folóra o-m-w-él' ésheeni?
 2SG.SM-PRES.CJ-think COMP 1.Flora 1sm-PRES.CJ-come-APPL 9.what
 'why do you think Flora will come?'
 lit. 'you think Flora will come for what?'

(51) moo-hímyá wiírá | ntsíná n-áwé | kha-mwi-ń-tsówela
 2PL.SM.PERF.DJ-say COMP 5.name 5-POSS.1 NEG-2PL.SM-PRES-know.DJ
 'you said that his name, you don't know (it)'

The same holds in other Bantu languages. In Kĩĩtharaka, the focus marker *n(i)-* is not allowed in adverbial clauses (54a), neither is preposing of a topic constituent (54b):

Kĩĩtharaka (Abels & Muriungi 2008: 694)

- (52)
- a. Rira Maria (*n)- a- ku- rug- ag- a nyama John n- a- ku-
 when 1.Maria FOC- 1.SM- PRES- cook- HAB- FV 9.meat 1.John FOC- 1.SM- PRES.
 thamb- ag- a
 bathe- HAB- FV
 'When Maria was cooking meat, John was bathing.'
 - b. *Rira i- nyama Maria a- ku- rug- ag- a John n- a- ku-
 when FOC- 9.meat 1.Maria 1.SM- PRES- cook- HAB- FV 1.John FOC- 1.SM- PRES.
 thamb- ag- a
 bathe- HAB- FV
 'When Maria was cooking meat, John was bathing.'

This absence of internal information structure in adverbial clauses results in these subordinate clauses functioning as a single unit of information. It does not mean that the *relation* these clauses fulfill with respect to the main clause cannot form the new information. Indeed, Güldemann (1996:182) concludes that the functioning of subordinate clauses as a conceptual unity with compact information structure "(has) as a consequence (that) dependent predicates, in particular those highly integrated from a semantic perspective, can be in the scope of focus within the complex clause."

So the **lack of a proper information structural profile** allows the clause to be more integrated into the information structure of the main clause. From the perspective of information structure, Situatives and Relatives are integrated proper parts of the main clause, and their relation within the main clause is established as in a non-complex clause.

This means that the adverbial clause is interpreted as part of the comment when postverbal, as the exclusive focus when immediately following the conjoint verb form, and, consistent with the function word order fulfills in coding topics in Makhuwa, the adverbial clause has a topic relation if it occurs in the preverbal domain, as in (53) and (54). So there is more in play than the flow of information “from that which is more familiar, expected, or unpredictable to that which is more unfamiliar, unexpected or unpredictable” as Chafe (1984:440) describes for the use of adverbial clauses in English. Neither is it the case that all conditionals “constitute the framework which has been selected for the following discourse” (Haiman 1978:583), rather the circumstance of being in an initial position in Makhuwa makes them a topic.

(53) mwa-tthukula pásáro pásáro
 2PL.SM.SIT-open slowly RED
 n-ná-móóná e-ná-múú-tthyáwá-ni
 2PL.SM-PRES.DJ-see 9.SM-PRES.dj-2PL.OM-flee-PLA
 ‘when you open it carefully, you’ll see that he will escape from you’

(54) wa-khum-aly-ááwé, o-r-aalé mpákhá wa-mfálúme
 16-exit-PERF.REL-POSS.1 1SM-go-PERFuntil 16-1.authority
 ‘when she went out, she went to the police’

6.2 Left periphery

Proposal: The difference is in the “completeness” of the clause: adverbial clauses are in some sense deficient and are not full CPs, whereas complements are full embedded CPs.

- This is obvious for relative clauses, as they are best analysed as participial modifiers (Van der Wal 2010): they function as NPs, not full clauses.
- How can we detect the difference in formal status for Situatives?
 - a. no complementiser
 - b. no Tense, only Aspect → see Sitaridou 2007 and others, who show that finiteness is connected to Tense, not phi agreement
 - c. different negation
 - d. different SM

Negation

- Basic, independent tenses have pre-initial negation prefix *kha-*
- Other negative tenses have post-initial negation *-hi-*
- “Pre-initial negation is restricted to main clauses” (Güldemann 1996)
- Laka’s (1990) Σ projection (polarity, focus)??

(55) *kha-ni-ń-tthúna*
 NEG-1PL.SM-PRES.DJ-want.DJ
 ‘we don’t want to’

- (56) na-hí-ráp-ih-é eparátho ápáápá a-náá-vírúwá
 1PL.SM.SIT-NEG-wash-CAUS-SIT 10.plates 2.father 2SM-PRES.DJ-be.angry
 ‘if we don’t do the dishes, dad will be angry’
- (57) ekóm’ éelé kaá-mwíín-áká khalaí ki-hí-ná-khál-etsá
 9.drum 9.DEM.III 1SG.SM.PAST-dance-DUR long.ago 1SG.SM-NEG-CE-stay-PLUR
 ‘that drum I used to dance to long time ago, before staying here’
- (58) nláttw’ úúlá khu-ná-phwány-an-ey-é ephátt’ ááyá
 3.problem 3.DEM.I NEG.3SM-CE-meet-ASSO-STAT-PERF 9.solution 9.POSS.3
 e-m-mál-áaya
 9-PRES-finish.REL-POSS.9
 ‘this problem has not found its complete solution yet’

Different subject marker

The subject prefix is special for some of the Situative tenses, because it takes a variant form for class 1 (3sg)

- independent tenses and Counterexpectational Situative: SM = *o-*
- Conditional, Perfective and Durative Situative: SM = *a-*

Note: we do not know what this means: finiteness? dependency? deficiency?

- (59) Maár’kú o-náá-rukunéya
 1.Mark 1SM-PRES.DJ-play
 ‘Mark is playing’
- (60) ki-nú-m-phwányá Maizínyá a-rúkúnéy-áka
 1SG.SM-PERF.pers-1OM-find 1.Maezinha 1SM-play-DUR
 ‘I met/found Maezinha (while she was) playing’

- Cartographic implementation of Hooper & Thompson’s generalisation:
 Haegeman (2006): some adverbial clauses are structurally deficient, i.e., they have a **truncated left periphery**, which does contain a complementiser and Fin, but not Force/Speaker Deixis and hence no Top or Foc. (cf. Munaro 2010).

Situatives and relatives would be ‘central adverbial clauses’ in her distinction, not peripheral. Central adverbials lack independent illocutionary force and are part of the speech act expressed in the superordinate clause (Haegeman 2012:172).

(Haegeman 2012:187)

Root clause		Mod	Top	Foc	Top	Force	Mod	Fin	TP
Central adv clause	Sub						Mod	Fin	TP
Peripheral adv clause	Sub	Mod	Top	Foc	Top	Force	Mod	Fin	TP

For Makhuwa, this analysis seems to neatly account for the lack of internal information structure in Situatives and Relatives, and for the presumed difference between adverbial clauses and clausal complements. However, there are some concerns:

- Is the left periphery truncated or simply reduced? No complementiser... Test: do adverbial clauses with a complementiser show the same interpretational effects?

- Could Haegeman's (2010/2012) revision in terms of operator movement and locality work for Makhuwa?
- How can the absence of a high left periphery work in a language that has a low focus position, like Makhuwa?

This suggests that there is a relation between a low focus position and the high left periphery. There are four ways this could be implemented:

- o there is covert movement of the low focused element to the high periphery (Chomsky 1976)
- o the high focus head Agrees downwards (Frascarelli 2000)
- o an Exhaustive Identification operator binds the focus (Horvath 2007, 2010)
- o a focus operator binds the element in vP/VP (Hyman&Polinsky 2007) → unselective binding does not seem to work for Makhuwa: the postverbal non-IAV element shows no clear sign of being extraposed and should hence be the focus and both objects should be able to be bound by this operator, which is not true:

- (61) a. he gave only Irene a shirt
 b. * [only Irene a shirt] did he give
 c. * it is [only Irene a shirt] that he gave

- (62) a. CJ Mariyá o-m-vanh-é [Apútaálá paáhi] ekamitsa
 1.Maria 1SM-1OM-give-PERF.CJ 1.Abdallah only 9.shirt
 'Maria gave only Abdallah a shirt'

- b. CJ * Mariyá o-m-vanh-é [ekamitsá Apútaálá paáhi]
 1.Maria 1SM-1OM-give-PERF.CJ 9.shirt 1.Abdallah only
 int. 'Maria gave only Abdallah a shirt'

6.3 Predictions to be tested

- Factive complements are non-assertive and should also receive a clear exclusive focus meaning.
- Other MCP in complement but not situative clauses?
- Situatives and Relatives in IAV position should be okay with the focus particle *paahi* 'only' modifying the whole clause. But how do we know what 'only' modifies: the clause or a constituent in that clause? Cf. (49).
- Other scope-related differences? Haegeman (2012): central (not peripheral) adverbials can be in the scope of matrix negation.
- Restructuring contexts are known to have deficient complement clauses, which according to this account should also have a clear exclusive interpretation. Are infinitives (with complements) clauses or nominals? What about the optative?

- (63) mwi-m-phéélá namárokolo a-khum-é?
 2PL.SM-PRES.CJ-want 1.Hare 1SM-exit-OPT
 lit. 'do you want (for) Hare that he leave?'

- Other adverbial clauses (reason, purpose, manner) should behave like temporal, conditional adverbial clauses, unless they are peripheral rather than central. Problems: "complementiser" *nlattu wa* 'problem of' = nominal; use of applicative to make argument.

- Chafe, Wallace. 1984. How people use adverbial clauses. *Proceedings of the tenth annual meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 437-449.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1976. Conditions on rules of grammar. *Linguistic Analysis* 2:303–351.
- Cristofaro, Sonia. 2003. *Subordination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Frascarelli, Mara. 2000. *The syntax-phonology interface in focus and topic constructions in Italian*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Givón, Talmy. 1975. Focus and the scope of assertion: some Bantu evidence. *Studies in African Linguistics* 6 (2), 185-205.
- Givón, Talmy. 2001. *Syntax*, volume II. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Güldemann, Tom. 1996. *Verbalmorphologie und Nebenprädikationen im Bantu: Eine Studie zur funktional motivierten Genese eines konjugationalen Subsystems*. Bochum-Essener Beiträge zur Sprachwandelforschung 27. Bochum: Universitätsverlag Dr. N. Brockmeyer.
- Güldemann, Tom. 1998. The relation between imperfective and simultaneous taxis in Bantu. Late stages of grammaticalization. In Ines Fiedler, Catherine Griefenow-Mewis and Brigitte Reineke (eds), *Afrikanische Sprachen im Brennpunkt der Forschung*, 157-177. Cologne: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.
- Güldemann, Tom. 2005a. Asyndetic subordination and deverbal depictive expressions in Shona. In Nikolaus P Himmelman and Eva Schultze-Berndt (eds.), *Secondary predication and adverbial modification: the typology of depictives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 323-353.
- Haegeman, Liliane. 2006. Conditionals, factives and the left periphery. *Lingua* 116, 1651-1669.
- Haegeman, Liliane. 2010. The internal syntax of adverbial clauses. *Lingua* 120, 628-648.
- Haegeman, Liliane. 2012. *Adverbial clauses, main clause phenomena, and the composition of the left periphery*. Oxford: OUP.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 1995. The converb as a cross-linguistically valid category. In Haspelmath & König (eds), *Converbs in cross-linguistic perspective: structure and meaning of adverbial verb forms*, 1–56. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Haspelmath, Martin & König, Ekkehard (eds). 1995. *Converbs in Cross-Linguistic Perspective: Structure and Meaning of Adverbial Verb Forms – Adverbial Participles, Gerunds*. Empirical approaches to language typology 13. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hooper, J.B., Thompson, S.A., 1973. On the applicability of root transformations. *Linguistic Inquiry* 4, 465–497.
- Horvath, Julia (2007). Separating “Focus movement” from Focus. In: Simin Karimi, Vida Samiiian and Wendy Wilkins (eds). *Phrasal and Clausal Architecture*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 108-145.
- Hyman, Larry M. & Maria Polinsky. 2009. Focus in Aghem. In Malte Zimmermann & Caroline Féry (eds), *Information structure: theoretical, typological, and experimental perspectives*, 206-233. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kenesei, Istvan. 2006. Focus as identification. In Molnár, V., Winkler, S., *The architecture of focus*. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, pp. 137-168.
- König, Ekkehard. 1995. The meaning of converb constructions. In Haspelmath & König (eds), *Converbs in cross-linguistic perspective: structure and meaning of adverbial verb forms*, 57-96. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Krifka, Manfred. 2007. Basic notions of information structure. In Féry, C., Fanselow, G., Krifka, M., *Working Papers of the SFB 632, Interdisciplinary Studies on Information Structure (ISIS)*. Universitätsverlag Potsdam, Potsdam, pp. 13-55.
- Laka, Itziar. 1990. *Negation in Syntax: On the Nature of Functional Categories and Projections*. PhD dissertation. MIT.
- Lambrecht, Knud. 1994. *Information structure and sentence form*. Vol. 71, *Cambridge Studies in Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Munaro, Nicola. 2010. Toward a hierarchy of clause types. In Paola Benincà and Nicola Munaro (eds), *Mapping the left periphery*, 127-163. Oxford: OUP.
- Nikolaeva, Irina. 2007. *Finiteness*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Noonan, Michael. Complementation. In Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Language Typology, volume II: Complex Constructions*, 52-150. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Rooth, Mats. 1992. A theory of focus interpretation. *Natural Language Semantics* 1 (1), 75-116.
- Rooth, Mats. 1996. Focus. In Lappin, Shalom, *The handbook of contemporary semantic theory*. Blackwell, Oxford, pp. 271-297.
- Sitaridou, Ioanna. 2007. The (dis)association of tense, phi-features and nominative case. In João Costa and Maria Cristina Figueiredo Silva (eds), *Studies on Agreement*, p243-260. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Van der Wal, Jenneke. 2009. *Word order and information structure in Makhuwa-Enahara*. Utrecht: LOT.
- Van der Wal, Jenneke. 2010. The Makhuwa non-subject relative as a participial modifier. *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 31 (2), p. 205-231.
- Van der Wal, Jenneke. 2011. Focus excluding alternatives: conjoint/disjoint marking in Makhuwa. *Lingua* 121(11), special issue 'Focus marking strategies and focus interpretation', ed. by Malte Zimmermann and Edgar Onea, p. 1734-1750.
- Van der Wal, Jenneke. Subordinate clauses and exclusive focus in Makhuwa. To appear in Van Gijn, Rik; Jeremy Hammond; Dejan Matić; Saskia van Putten & Ana Vilacy Galucio (eds.), *Information Structure and Reference Tracking in Complex Sentences*.
- Watters, John. 1979. Focus in Aghem. In *Aghem grammatical structure*, edited by L. Hyman, 157-189. Los Angeles: University of Southern California.

Contact information

jennekevanderwal@gmail.com

www.jennekevanderwal.nl

Acknowledgements

First fieldwork on Makhuwa-Enahara (2005, 2006, 2008) was carried out in a project sponsored by the Dutch Organisation for Scientific Research NWO, and further fieldwork for this research (2011) was supported by the Fonds Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek Vlaanderen (FWO), which is hereby gratefully acknowledged. Further research was conducted within the project 'Rethinking Comparative Syntax (European Research Council Advanced Grant No. 269752). I want to thank my Makhuwa informants Ali Pwanale, Joaquim Nazário, Momade Ossumane and Adelino Armindo Raposo for their kind and patient explanations, and I am indebted to Thilo Schadeberg, Theresa Biberauer, Tom Güldemann, Vieri Samek-Lodovici, John Payne, Dejan Matić and Saskia van Putten for helpful discussion and suggestions. The views expressed in this paper remain my responsibility.

Abbreviations and symbols

High tones are indicated by an acute accent, low tones are unmarked. Numbers refer to noun classes, or to persons when followed by SG or PL

A	aspect	LF	long form
APPL	applicative	LOC	locative
ASSO	associative	NARR	narrative
CAUS	causative	OM	object marker
CE	counterexpectational	OPT	optative
CF	counterfactual	PERS	persistive
CJ	conjoint verb form	PL	plural
COMP	complementiser	PL	predicative lowering
CONN	connective	PLUR	plurative
CONS	consecutive	POSS	possessive
DEM	demonstrative	PP	pragmatic particle
DJ	disjoint verb form	PX	prefix
DUR	durative	REL	relative
HAB	habitual	SF	short form
HORT	hortative	SIT	situative
IMPF	imperfective	SM	subject marker

STAT stative

SUBS subsecutive