The V and CV augment and exhaustivity in Kinyakyusa[1]

Jenneke van der Wal & Amani Lusekelo

Leiden University   University of Dar es Salaam

In addition to the stem and noun class prefix, the structure of nouns in Bantu languages may contain an augment. This augment typically is a vowel, but some languages show a CV augment. Interestingly, the Bantu language Kinyakyusa shows nouns with a V as well as with a CV prefix, both of which have been analysed as augments (De Blois 1970). In this paper we clarify the formal and functional properties of the 'CV augment' in Kinyakyusa. First we show that it does not behave like the V augment, but is a separate marker that is attached to the noun phrase. Second, we narrow down the previous analyses of the CV marker that describe it as 'emphatic' (De Blois 1970, Persohn 2020): On the basis of a range of focus tests, we argue that the CV marker functions as a marker of exhaustivity. This is remarkable, as exhaustive focus is in Bantu languages typically associated with marking in the clause and not on the noun itself.

Keywords: augment, definiteness, focus, exhaustivity, Bantu

1.   Introduction

The contribution of this paper concerns the function of the linguistic materials that appear before the noun class prefix in the internal structure of nouns in Kinyakyusa. While nouns of almost all Bantu languages bear (overt or covert) noun class prefixes, nouns in some Bantu languages in eastern and southern Africa (e.g. Dzamba, Kagulu, Luguru, Lubukusu, Luganda, Nata, Rukiga, Xhosa and Zulu) contain pre-prefixes referred to as the augment (see Asiimwe 2014; Bokamba 1971; De Dreu 2008; Gambarage 2019; Hyman & Katamba 1993; Petzell & Kühl 2017; Visser 2008; Wasike 2007). In many languages, the augment takes the shape V, exemplified in (1) from Rukiga, but some languages (also) show CV augments, as in (2) from Lubukusu.

Rukiga (Asiimwe 2014: 7)
(1)   **A**-ba-ishiki   ni-ba-kund-a   **e**-bi-muri.
        AUG-2-girl   PROG-2SM-like-FV   AUG-8-flower
        'Girls like flowers.'

Lubukusu (Wasike 2007: 239)

(2)   a.   **ba**-ba-ana
               AUG-2-child
               'children'

        b.   **ku**-mu-saala
               AUG-3-tree
               'tree'

In some Bantu languages the CV augment is the standard augment, such as Lubukusu (2), but in others we find both the V and CV augment (see De Blois 1970; Lusekelo 2009; Meeussen 1967; Mwangoka & Voorhoeve 1960; Persohn 2020; Van de Velde 2019). Kinyakyusa[2] is one of those languages. Nouns in Kinyakyusa typically have a V augment, an initial vowel preceding the noun class prefix (glossed as AUG). The examples in (3) show the augment in the shapes *u-* and *a-*.[3]

(3)   a.   u-mu-ndu
               AUG-1-person
               'a/the person'

        b.   a-ma-bifu
               AUG-6-banana
               '(the) bananas'

        c.   (Context: An answer to the question: 'Is Frida holding a banana?'
               Mma   a-ka-kol-a   a-ma-bifu   a-kol-ile   u-mu-embe.
               no   1SM-NEG-catch-FV   AUG-6.banana 1SM-catch-PFV AUG-1-mango
               'No, she is not holding a banana, she is holding a mango.'

Interestingly, in addition to the V augment, Kinyakyusa also features what has been called a CV augment (glossed with the noun class number for now, following Persohn 2020). The examples in (4) show the CV prefixes *ju-*, *ga-*, and *fi-*.

(4)   a.   ju-mu-ndu
               1-1-person
               'only a person'

        b.   ga-ma-bifu
               6-6-banana
               'only bananas'

---

[2] Kinyakyusa is classified as Guthrie code M31, iso nny, and is spoken in south-west Tanzania by approximately 1,2 million people (Ethnologue online, consulted June 2022).

[3] Data in this paper come from fieldwork in Kiwira, November 2020, with three Kinyakyusa speakers, making use of the BaSIS methodology (https://bantusyntaxinformationstructure.com/methodology/). While other Kinyakyusa variants have 7 contrastive vowels, the variant spoken in Kiwira does not make a phonological distinction between ɪ/i and ʊ/u, as far as we could determine. The latter distinction is mostly absent in speech, and although two of our speakers did produce the former distinction, they did not differentiate them meaningfully. We therefore represent five vowels only. Similarly, we write <l> for the tap sound that is variably more like [l] or [ɾ], but not phonemically distinguished.

c.   (Is he washing cups and plates?)
        Ikusuka fifikombe.
        /i-ku-suk-a   fi-fi-kombe/
        1SM-PRS-wash-FV 8-8-cup
        'He is washing only the cups.'

Both the V and CV augment occur across noun classes 1 to 15. Table 1 shows the forms for all the classes, as well as the proximal demonstrative, which the CV augment resembles (see also section 3).

noun class	V	CV	prox. dem.	translation
1	u-mu-ndu	ju-mu-ndu	uju	person
2	a-ba-ndu	ba-ba-ndu	aba	people
3	u-m-piki	gu-m-piki	ugu	tree
4	i-mi-piki	gi-mi-piki	igi	trees
5	i-(l)i-bifu	li-li-bifu	ili	banana
6	a-ma-bifu	ga-ma-bifu	aga	bananas
7	i-ki-kota	ki-ki-kota	iki	chair
8	i-fi-kota	fi-fi-kota	ifi	chairs
9	i-m-bene	ji-m-bene	iji	goat
10	i-m-bene	si-m-bene	isi	goats
11	u-lu-kama	lu-lu-kama	ulu	milk
12	a-ka-pango	ka-ka-pango	aka	story
13	u-tu-pango	tu-tu-pango	utu	stories
14	u-bu-bine	bu-bu-bine	ubu	illness
15	u-ku-jooba	ku-ku-jooba	uku	to talk

Table 1 Shapes of nouns in Kinyakyusa noun classes and the similarity with demonstratives

Locative classes 16 to 18 do not bear a V augment (as shown in column 'base form' in Table 2), but the CV augment can be used with locative nouns (column CV Table 2). This pattern has implications for the analysis of the functions of the CV augment in the language.

noun class	base form	CV	prox. dem.	translation
16	_-pa-kaaja	pa-pa-kaaja	apa	at home
17	_-ku-kaaja	ku-ku-kaaja	kuno[4]	to home
18	_-mu-ndeko	mu-mu-ndeko	muno	in the pot

Table 2 Occurrence of CV marker on locative nouns in Kinyakyusa

Why would Kinyakyusa show two augments? In languages where CV is the standard form of the augment (e.g. Lubukusu), this is thought to be a retained form from Proto-Bantu, which was reconstructed as having a CV augment (Meeussen 1967). However, not all CV augments in current languages are reflexes of the reconstructed form. Instead, the development from demonstrative to augment is a recurring process, as Van de Velde (2019: 255) points out:

---

[4] The proximal demonstratives in classes 17 and 18 deviate from the pattern in taking the *-no* form. We assume that the regular forms *uku* and *umu* used to exist as well.

"Indications for the renewal of augments can also be found in languages with two paradigms of augments, one of which typically has a CV-shape and the other a V-shape. This can be found in Safwa M25, Kinga G65 and Nyakyusa M31, where the CV-augment is claimed to have a special 'emphatic' use (De Blois 1970: 98)". We will indeed show that the CV marker in Kinyakyusa is a more recent development than the V augment.

The use of the CV augment for an emphatic interpretation is described in the literature for Kinyakyusa (De Blois 1971; Lusekelo 2009; Mwangoka & Voorhoeve 1960; Persohn 2020: 44). For instance, Mwangoka & Voorhoeve (1960) characterise the use of the CV augment in Kinyakyusa as follows: "A noun with structure PP-PN-noun stem can be translated by 'only…'", where PP stands for pre-prefix, another term for the augment, and PN for the nominal prefix. To illustrate the meaning, they give the example "*gamaheelu* (only abusive language, nothing but abusive words)" (Mwangoka & Voorhoeve 1960: part III p.6). However, the role played by the CV augment as a sort of emphatic marker has not received in-depth attention, and the notion of 'emphasis' is in need of further precision. To this end, we use the analytical tools for testing focus within the theory of information structure.

Our aim in this paper is to clarify the status of the CV augment in Kinyakyusa, specifically answering the following two research questions:

A. Is the CV marker an augment?
B. What is the interpretation of the CV marker? Specifically: in which information-structural contexts is the CV marker used felicitously?

The current paper is therefore the first systematic investigation of the CV marker in Kinyakyusa, reaching surprising results both concerning its form and its function. After discussing the distribution of the V augment in section 2, we will conclude in section 3 that the CV marker is *not* an augment but a marker that precedes the V augment. Section 4 confirms Mwangoka & Voorhoeve's characterisation of the CV marker as translated by 'only': we claim on the basis of a range of focus tests that the CV marker functions as an exhaustive marker. Such marking of exhaustive focus is striking in the Bantu context, as exhaustive focus is typically expressed through marking in the clause. In section 5 we consider whether the CV marker can be likened to 'restrictive' morphology in Oceanic languages, concluding that it differs too much to be informative. Section 6 concludes.

2. Function and structural position of the V augment

We first present the distribution of the V augment, in order to be able to compare the CV marker to it. The V augment has been analysed to be a determiner in other Bantu languages (see De Dreu 2008, Visser 2008, Ndayiragije et al. 2012, Gambarage 2013, 2019 for specific languages, and Halpert to appear for an overview). We propose the same for the V augment in Kinyakyusa, on the basis of indirect and direct evidence. The indirect evidence shows that the augment is absent in those environments where we would expect an NP rather than a DP, such as nominal predication (these environments are elaborated on below). The direct evidence hides in a small corner of optionality in questions, where the presence of the augment brings about a specific or definite interpretation. We present each in turn.

The V augment is present on Kinyakyusa nouns in most environments. This means it can be characterised as a 'default-present' language, where the absence of the augment can be characterised more easily than its presence (see Van de Velde 2019 on the default presence vs. absence languages; also Halpert to appear). In Kinyakyusa, the V augment occurs on the noun as a subject, for example, but also on postverbal objects in both negative and affirmative clauses, as shown in (1c) above. The V augment is obligatorily absent, however, in the following six environments:

1) The V augment cannot be present on the basic noun in a locative derivation, where the locative prefix must be adjacent to the basic prefix, without intervening augment, as shown in (5)b and (6)b.

(5)   a.   i-ki-tala
              AUG-7-bed
              'a/the bed'

        b.   pa-(*i-)ki-tala
              16-AUG-7-bed
              'on a/the bed'

(6)   a.   i-sefulilo
              AUG-9.pan
              'a/the pan'

        b.   mu-(*i-)sefulilo
              18-AUG-9-pan
              'in a/the pan'

2) After a connective *-a* 'of', the V augment is disallowed, as illustrated in (7)b and (8)b.

(7)   a.   u-n-kiikulu
              AUG-1-woman

        b.   i-ki-lundi   ky-a   (*u-)n-kiikulu
              AUG-7-leg   7-CONN AUG-1-woman
              'a/the leg of a woman.'

(8)   a.   i-ki-su
              AUG-7-land

        b.   u-n-kulumba   gw-a   (*i-)ki-su
              AUG-1-big   1-CONN   AUG-7-land
              'president'

3) On the second noun of a compound, the V augment is disallowed, as illustrated in (9) and (10).

(9)   u-n-swila-(*a-)ba-pina
       AUG-1-attend-AUG-2-orphan
       'type of potato', lit. 'who attends to orphans'

(10)   u-m-tenga-(*u-)mojo
       AUG-1-make.bed-AUG-3.soul
       'peaceful person'

4) After *kukuti* 'every', which is described as a pre-determiner element that always precedes the lexical noun in the noun phrase structure (Lusekelo 2009):

(11)   Kukuti (*u)mwaana abuukege kusukulu.

/kukuti   u-mu-ana   a-buuk-ag-e   ku-sukulu/

every   AUG-1-child   1SM-go-HAB-SBJV   17-9.school

'Every child should go to school.'

(12)   Kukuti (*i)kisyeesye iki naagoonjile naakiiganile.

/kukuti   i-ki-syeesye   iki   n-a-goonj-ile   n-a-kii-gan-ile/

every   AUG-7-baked.good 7.DEM.PROX 1SG.SM-PST-taste-PFV 1SG.SM-PST-7OM-like-PFV

'Every cake that I tasted, I liked.'

5) In the context of an interrogative word *-liku* 'which', the V augment is disallowed, as illustrated in (13).

(13)   Ukolile (*i)kinyamaana kiliku?

/u-kol-ile   i-ki-nyamaana   ki-liku/

2SG.SM-catch-PFV   AUG-7-animal   7-which

'Which animal have you caught?'

6) For vocatives that are proper nouns, the V augment is disallowed. Example (14)b and (15) illustrate vocative contexts.

(14)   a.   a-ba-ana
                AUG-2-child
                'children'

        b.   Mwe (*a)baana amwiise!
                /mwe   a-ba-ana   a-mu-is-e/
                2PL.PRO   AUG-2-child   FUT-2PL.SM-come-SBJV
                'Hey, you children, come!'

(15)   (*u)Sekela, iisa!
        /u-Sekela   iisa/
        AUG-Sekela   come.IMP
        'Sekela, come!'[5]

7) In nominal predication the augment is absent on the predicative noun, whether the interpretation is predicational (no extra marking, (16)b) or specificational (identificational copula in *-o* in addition to absence of augment, (17)):

(16)   a.   i-ki-tenge
                AUG-7-wrap
                'a/the wrap'

---

[5] Augments may appear on proper names as well in the Kiwira dialect, though they are not systematically used. When used as a vocative the augment is obligatorily absent.

b.   I-ki-o   (*i-)ki-tenge.
      AUG-7-DEM.MED   AUG-7-wrap
      'That is a wrap.'

(17)   Context: There are a man and a woman and you don't know who of them is the teacher. You ask 'Who is the teacher?')

    Unkiikulu jo mmanyisi.

/n-kiikulu	jo	(*u-)m-manyisi/
AUG-1-woman	1.ID.COP	AUG-1-teacher

    'The woman is the teacher.'

In all these environments we would indeed expect an NP instead of a DP with a determiner: DPs function as arguments, whereas NPs function as non-arguments (see Longobardi 1994), and noun-phrase internal modifications (connective, quantifier etc.) as well as derivations (locative, compound) also take the smaller NP rather than then DP. The most straightforward way to account for this is to assume that the V augment is a determiner in D.

    Unlike some other Bantu languages (see Halpert 2015 for Zulu, Carstens & Mletshe 2016 for Xhosa, Gambarage 2013, 2019 for Nata, Hyman & Katamba 1993 and Progovac 1993 for Luganda), the V augment in Kinyakyusa cannot be omitted in the scope of negation.[6]

(18)   Umwana akanwile *(u)lukama.

/u-mu-ana	a-ka-nw-ile	u-lu-kama/
AUG-1-child	1SM-NEG-drink-PFV	AUG-11-milk

    'The child didn't drink (any/the) milk.'

(19)   Ngambona *(u)mundu najuumo.

/n-ka-m-bon-a	u-mu-ndu	na-ju-mo/
1SG.SM-NEG-1OM-see-FV	AUG-1-person	and-1-one

    'I didn't see anyone.'

The only environment in which there is a choice between the presence and absence of the V augment is in questions. This small corner of optionality shows further evidence for the augment as a determiner: when the augment is present in polarity questions, the resulting reading is definite/familiar, whereas its absence results in an indefinite or general interpretation (comparable to noun incorporation like 'clothes-washing'), as illustrated in (20) and (21).

---

[6] This also argues against an analysis of the Kinyakyusa V augment as a marker of (belief of) assertion, as Gambarage (2013, 2019) proposes for Nata. Nominal predication showing no optionality in Kinyakyusa, and the consistent use of augments on modifiers also depart from the analysis proposed for Nata.

(20) a. The parent knows that the child is allergic to milk, and when coming home sees that the
          child is sick, asking:
          Umwaana anwile lukama?   [-AUG]

          /u-mu-ana   a-nw-ile   lu-kama/

          AUG-1-child   1SM-drink-PFV   11-milk

          'Has the child drunk (any) milk?'
          *'Has the child drunk the milk?'

       b. The parent leaves the child with other people and leaves milk for the child there as well,
          then they come back and ask:

          Umwaana anwile ulukama?   [+AUG]

          /u-mu-ana   a-nw-ire   u-lu-kama/

          AUG-1-child   1SM-drink-PFV   AUG-11-milk

          *'Has the child drunk (any) milk?'
          'Has the child drunk the milk?'

(21)   a.   Usukile myeenda?   [-AUG]

               /u-suk-ile   mi-enda/

               2SG.SM-wash-PFV   4-clothes

               *'Did you wash my/the clothes?'
               'Did you do the laundry?'

        b.   Usukile imyeenda?   [+AUG]

               /u-suk-ile   i-mi-enda/

               2SG.SM-wash-PFV   AUG-4-clothes

               'Did you wash my/the clothes?'
               *'Did you do the laundry?'

In wh-questions, the presence of the augment is associated with specificity due to a presupposition
of existence, whereas the absence is interpreted as an open question. The augmentless question in
(22)b) cannot be answered by 'nobody' and is uttered when it is clear that you saw a group of
people walking by and identification is requested, whereas the latter in (22)a) can be answered by
'nobody' and can felicitously be uttered even if it is uncertain whether anyone was seen.

(22)   a.   Ubabweene baani?   [-AUG]

               /u-ba-bon-ile   ba-ani/

               2SG.SM-2OM-see-PFV   2-who

                'Who(pl) did you see?' (if anyone)

        b.   Ubabweene abaani?   [+AUG]

               /u-ba-bon-ile   a-ba-ani/

               2SG.SM-2OM-see-PFV   AUG-2-who

                'Who(pl) did you see?' (please identify)

We take the foregoing as indirect and direct evidence that the V augment in Kinyakyusa functions as a determiner. However, this does not mean that the presence of the augment necessarily contributes a definite meaning, as AUG-NPx-stem (what we may call 'bare nouns') can have a definite or indefinite, and specific or non-specific meaning. The indefinite non-specific meaning is illustrated in (23)a and (24). To express indefinite specificity, the numeral *-mo* 'one' can be added, as in (23)b.

(23) a. I heard that someone was at the door but cannot point out who.

        Umundu isiilepo.

/u-mu-ndu	i-is-ile=po/
AUG-1-person	1SM-come-PFV=16

        'Someone has come.'

    b.

/u-mu-ndu	ju-mo	i-is-ile=po	looli	n-gamu	j-ake
AUG-1-person	1-one	1SM-come-PFV=16	but	9-name	9-POSS.1

n-ibw-ile/
1SG.SM-forget-PFV

       'Someone has come (but his name I forgot).'

(24)   Unyambala jula atile "linga siku **umundu** linga ikukubuula gwinogonengepo".

/u-nyambala	ju-la	a-ti-ile	linga	siku
AUG-1.man	1-DEM.DIST	1SM-say-PFV	COND	9.day

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

'That man said: "if during another day someone tells you something, you must think".'

In summary, the augment is not associated with definiteness, but still shows evidence of being a (weak) determiner (expressing reference). We leave the exact interpretational impact of the V augment for further research, and here proceed to consider the CV marker and compare its behaviour to the V augment.

3. CV is not an augment

The initial prefix on the noun can also have the CV shape, as illustrated again in example (25) collected from a recipe. Note that while the CV marker here and earlier is indicated as replacing the V augment (as previous literature also does), the V augment may in fact still be present but merged with the CV marker.

(25)   Nsopile gweene gumunyu.

/n-sop-ile	gw-eene	**gu**-mu-nyu/
1SG.SM-throw-PFV	3-only	EXH-3-salt

       'I put only salt.'

Despite it being called a CV augment, we argue that the CV morpheme is not in fact an augment but a separate morpheme (which we show to be an exhaustivity marker in section 4). We leave aside whether this marker is an independent morpheme, a proclitic, or a prefix, and instead refer to it as the 'CV marker'. Anticipating the argumentation in section 4, we gloss it as EXH (for exhaustive) and mark it in boldface in the examples.

Although the CV marker seems to replace the V augment, we think it is better to analyse it as a marker *preceding* the V augment (even if we do not indicate or gloss the V augment, as it is typically 'absorbed' by the CV prefix). Formal evidence for this analysis is found in the inability to coordinate two nouns with the CV marker (26)a, which is predicted to be possible if it were a parallel to the V augment. Instead, the CV marker precedes the whole conjoined DP, as in (26)b.

(26)   a.   *[CV-NPx-stem + CV-NPx-stem]
                   *Bikuula **ga**mapapaju na **fi**finanasi (itoolo).

                   /bi-ku-ul-a   ga-ma-papaju na   fi-fi-nanasi   itoolo/
                   2SM-PRS-buy-FV   EXH-6-papaya and EXH-8-pineapple   only

                   int. 'They (only) bought papayas and pineapples.'

        b.   CV-[V-NPx-stem + V-NPx-stem]
                   Bikuula **ga**mapapaju n' ifinanasi (itoolo/fyeene).

                   /bi-ku-ul-a   ga-ma-papaju   na   i-fi-nanasi   itoolo/fi-ene/
                   2SM-PRS-buy-FV EXH-6-papaya   and   AUG-8-pineapple   only/8-only

                        'They only bought papayas and pineapples.'

Locatives and adjectives also show that the V augment and the CV marker behave differently. Locatives never take an augment, but can take a CV marker, as shown in (27) and (28) (see also Table 2 above).

(27)   Ngubikapo (*a)pamwoto.
            /n-ku-bik-a=po   a-pa-moto/
            1SG.SM-PRS-place-FV=16   AUG-16-3.fire
            'I place (it) on fire(place).'

(28)   Ubiibi ikuliinda **pa**pakaaja.
            /u-biibi   i-ku-liind-a   pa-pa-ka-aja/
            AUG-1.grandmother   1SM-PRS-stay-FV   EXH-16-12-home
            'Grandma only stays at home.'

The opposite is true for adnominal adjectives, which can take a V augment (29)a, but not a CV marker (29)b. This is also where the Kinyakyusa CV marker differs from the Lubukusu CV augment, as the latter may also occur on adjectives (e.g. Lubukusu *ba-ba-ndu baa-bofu* 'big people' and *ku-mu-sala ku-mu-bofu* 'big tree', Wasike 2018: 330). Pronominal adjectives can of course take a CV marker, because they function as referential noun phrases, as in (29)c 'the big one'.

(29) a. Anwile **ji**sooda inywaamu.

/a-nw-ile   ji-sooda   i-nywaamu/

1SM-drink-PFV   EXH-9.soda   AUG-9.big

'He drank the big soda.'

b. *Anwile **ji**sooda **ji**nywaamu.

/a-nw-ile   ji-sooda   ji-nywamu/

1SM-drink-PFV   EXH-9.soda   EXH-9.big

'He drank the big soda.'

c. Anwile **ji**nywaamu.

/a-nw-ile   ji-nywamu

1SM-drink-PFV   EXH-9.big

'He drank only the big one.'

Another indication that hints at the separation of the CV marker in two parts (CV+AUG) is the fact that speakers may write it separately from the augmented noun. Furthermore, when asked to pronounce a word very clearly, speakers may separate the prefixes into two (e.g. *ji ingaramu* 'only the lion'), and at times the prefixes appear long, e.g. *ba-a-ba-ana* 'EXH-AUG-2-children' was sometimes pronounced [baabaana] rather than [babaana]. This was not consistent, but is still indicative of the CV marker being a separate morpheme and preceding the V augment.

For completeness, we mention that a likely origin of the CV marker is the proximal demonstrative (Heine & Reh 1984: 271, Heine et al. 1993: 67, Diessel 1999, Givón 1984), see also Table 1 above. The incompatibility of the CV marker with demonstratives,[7] as shown in (30), indicates that the CV marker has not grammaticalised as far as the V augment (assuming that this too developed from a demonstrative), and that the CV marker can hence not be seen as a determiner.

(30) a. **li**igauni lila

/li-i-gauni   li-la/

EXH-5-gown   5-DEM.DIST

int. 'that (very) gown' / 'only that gown'

b. iigauni lila

/i-i-gauni   li-la/

AUG-5-gown   5-DEM.DIST

'that gown'

c. **ji**falasi iji

---

[7] A reviewer asks whether the CV marker is still a demonstrative. If it were, it would interpretation-wise be in a completely different paradigm, as the CV marker no longer expresses deixis, as opposed to the three series of demonstratives.

/ji-falasi   iji/

EXH-9.horse   9-DEM.PROX

int. 'this (very) horse' / 'only this horse'

    d.   ifalasi iji

i-falasi   iji/

AUG-9.horse   9-DEM.PROX

'this horse'

From the evidence in this section, we deduce that the CV marker is not an augment, but instead that it is a marker that precedes the whole DP, forming the structure CV-(AUG-NPx-stem).

    To complete the overview of the formal properties of the CV marker, we note that the presence of the CV marker is not sensitive to grammatical role or position: Subjects, objects, and adverbs can all appear with the CV marker. It occurs with object nouns in the postverbal position (31),[8] with subject nouns in preverbal (32)b) and postverbal position (22a), and with adverbs in sentence initial or final position (33).

(31)   There was chai, water, soda, but…

Umwaana anwile **lu**lukama.

/u-mu-ana   a-nw-ile   lu-lu-kama/

AUG-1-child   1SM-drink-PFV   EXH-11-milk

'The child has drunk only (the) milk.'

(32)   a.   Jikiindile **ji**ngalamu.

/ji-kiind-ile   ji-ngalamu/

9SM-pass-PFV   EXH-9.lion

'Only the lion passed.'

        b.   **Ji**ngalamu jikiindile.

/ji-ngalamu   ji-kiind-ile/

EXH-9.lion   9SM-pass-PFV

'Only the lion passed.'

(33)   {**Ki**kilaabo} tukwa kumala ukulima n' uukubyaala{**ki**kilaabo}.

/ki-ki-laabo   tu-ku-a   ku-mala   u-ku-lima   na

EXH-7-tomorrow   1PL.SM-PRS-go.FV   15-finish   AUG-15-cultivate   and

u-ku-byaala   ki-ki-laabo/

AUG-15-plant   EXH-7-tomorrow

'We will cultivate and plant tomorrow in only one day.'

Having established formal status of the CV marker as a marker preceding the (augmented) noun, we now turn to its function.

---

[8] Objects cannot be focused preverbally except in a cleft construction.

4. Function of the CV marker

As mentioned above, Mwangoka & Voorhoeve (1960) translate nouns with a CV marker as 'only', and in this section we confirm and consolidate their intuition. If the CV marker is present, the resulting interpretation is exhaustive focus on the noun, which may project to the larger phrase. Exhaustivity entails that the marked constituent triggers a set of alternatives (following Rooth's 1985, 1992, 1996 Alternative Semantics) and excludes these alternatives (see Kenesei 1986 on exhaustive identification, and many after him). The exhaustive interpretation of nouns with the CV marker can be seen in the following eight tests, drawn from Van der Wal (2016) and references therein.

First, the context (wider situation in which the sentence was uttered) and co-text (surrounding discourse) provided by the speakers indicates that alternatives must be present for the CV noun. The spontaneous follow-up in (34) shows a contrast, and the failed attempt at an additive continuation in (35) shows that the alternatives must be excluded.

(34)   Abakangale batweele **fi**fitwalo (indalama bakatwala).

      /a-ba-kangale   ba-twal-ile   fi-fi-twalo   i-ndalama   ba-ka-twal-a/

      AUG-2-elder   2SM-bring-PFV   EXH-8-luggag AUG-10.money 2SM-NEG-bring-FV

      'The elders brought only the luggage. (They did not bring money.)'

(35)   Anwile **ji**nywaamu #n' iinaandi.

      /a-nw-ire   ji-nwamu   na   i-nandi/

      1SM-drink-PFV   EXH-9.big   and   AUG-9.small

      'He drank (only) the big one #and also the small one.'

The context for the predicate doubling construction in (36), where the infinitive takes a CV marker, also indicates exclusion of one of the supposed tasks. Additionally, the translation provided by the speakers frequently included Swahili *tu* or English 'only'.

(36)   Context: He was supposed to cook and sweep.

      Apiijile **ku**kupiija.

      /a-piij-ile   ku-ku-piija/

      1SM-cook-PFV   EXH-15-cook

      'He only cooked.'

A second argument showing the exhaustivity of the CV marker is the compatibility with the focus-sensitive particle 'only', but not with the focus-sensitive particles 'also' and 'even'. If the CV marker expresses exhaustivity, we expect it to be compatible with modification by exhaustive particle 'only', as borne out in (37) and (38).

(37)   Uulile (kyeene) **ki**kitala.

      /u-ul-ile   ki-eene   ki-ki-tala/

      1SM-buy-PFV   7-only   EXH-7-bed

      'S/he bought only the bed.'

(38)   Ampele mweene **ju**nnandi.

/a-m-p-ile   mu-eene   ju-n-nandi/

1SM-1OM-give-PFV   1-only   EXH-1-young

'S/he has given (it) only (to) the young one.'

On the other hand, we predict the CV prefix to be incompatible with the scalar particle *-ope* 'even' and the additive particle *na* 'also/even', considering the inclusive nature of the particles: if the proposition is true for even the least likely referent on the scale, this means that it is true for all the referents in the set, and therefore no alternatives can be excluded. This is also borne out, as shown in 0a) and (40): Robert ate all relevant food items along a scale of liking, up until and including the referent on the extreme end of the scale: cabbage. Nevertheless, 0b) was also accepted – we do not at present understand the precise circumstances which allow this.

(39)   Context: Robert does not like cabbage. He will eat any other thing. But this time he has
          eaten even cabbage.
          a.   *Lobati aliile na jikabiki (joope).
                  /Lobati   a-li-ile   na   ji-kabiki   ji-ope/
                  1.Robert   1SM-eat-PFV   and   EXH-9.cabbage   9-even
                  int. 'Robert ate even cabbage.'

          b.   Aliile (ifindu) fyoosa na jikabiki kolumo.
                  /a-li-ile   i-fi-ndu   fi-oosa   na   ji-kabiki   kolumo/
                  1SM-eat-PFV   AUG-8-food   8-all   and   EXH-9.cabbage   together
                  'He has eaten all (types of) food, even cabbage.'

(40)   (*Boope) **ba**baana baliile.

/ba-ope   ba-ba-ana   ba-li-ile/

2-even   EXH-2-child   2SM-eat-PFV

int. '(Even) Only the children have eaten.'

Third, the CV marker is not accepted with universal quantifiers like 'every' and 'all', as shown in (41)a). This is again because no alternatives can be excluded with these quantifiers, thus being incompatible with the exhaustive CV marker which requires exclusion of alternatives.

(41)   a.   *Ipyana aagoonjile **fi**fisyeesye fyoosa.

        /Ipyana   a-a-goonj-ile   fi-fi-syeesye   fi-osa/

        1.Ipyana   1SM-PST-taste-PFV   EXH-8-baked.good   8-all

        int. 'Ipyana tasted all the cakes.'

However, exclusion of alternatives becomes possible when subsets can be created using a restrictive relative clause, as in (41)b) below, or if the whole set is contrasted to another set, as in (42). These examples therefore allow the presence of a CV marker.

        b.   Ipyana aagoonjile **fi**fisyeesye (fyoosa/fyeene) ifi atendekisye unna.

        /Ipyana   a-a-goonj-ile   fi-fi-syeesye   fi-osa/fi-ene

        1.Ipyana   1SM-PST-taste-PFV   EXH-8-baked.good   8-all/8-only

ifi	a-teendekesy-ile	u-n-na/
8.DEM.PROX	1SM-bake-PFV	AUG-1-mother

'Ipyana tasted all/only the cakes that her mother baked.'

(42) **Ba**baandu boosa bikutuuja.

/ba-ba-ndu   ba-osa   bi-ku-tuuj-a/

EXH-2-person   2-all   2SM-PRS-breathe-FV

*'All people breathe.'
'Only all humans breathe.' (follow-up reaction: "But cows breathe too!")

Fourth, for the same reason of inclusivity, the CV marker is not accepted with non-specific indefinites – instead the word *umundu* 'person' with the CV marker must be interpreted as a generic 'human being', as in (43). Under our hypothesis, the CV marker necessarily triggers and excludes alternatives, which is only possible if *umundu* is interpreted as generic, because this allows for the exclusion of other species, and not if it is interpreted as indefinite (including anyone). See (23) above for the indefinite use of *umundu*.

(43) Context: You visit a national park, expecting to see trees, people, different animals, but instead…
      Numbweene **ju**mundu.

/n-m-bon-ile   ju-mu-ndu/

1SG.SM-1OM-see-PFV   EXH-1-person

'I saw only a person/human.'
*'I saw someone.'

Fifth, idioms and cognate objects (objects which are related to the verb they occur with, such as 'sleep a sleep' or 'dream a dream') are "unfocussable", as they cannot trigger alternatives. We thus predict them to be incompatible with the CV marker. At first sight, the acceptance of (44)-(46) seems to contradict this prediction, as the idiomatic object can have a CV marker. However, if we look at the context, we see that a contrast is indicated with other *actions* and not with other *objects*. This means that the given sentences are interpreted with the exclusion on the level of the verb phrase, and the set of alternatives is formed for the whole idiom in the case of (44), and the whole action in the case of the cognate objects in (45) and (46), and just not the object.

(44) Context: As soon as he gets up in the morning, he drinks, and straight from work he goes to the bar.
      Ikukoma **ga**miisi.

/i-ku-kom-a   ga-ma-isi/

1SM-PRS-hit-FV   EXH-6-water

'He is only getting drunk.' (lit. 'He is only hitting water.')

(45) Context: The calves stay at home and need to be fed, and the larger cattle are taken out to graze. Gwamaka is not interested in feeding the cows at home, he only goes out to do the herding.
      Gwamaka ikutiima **gu**ntiimo.

/Gwamaka   i-ku-tiim-a   gu-n-tiimo/

1.Gwamaka   1SM-PRS-graze-FV   EXH-3-grazing

'Gwamaka only grazed (the cows).'

(46)   Context: Why are you being so quiet?
        Ngwiinogona **si**nyiinogono.

        /n-ku-inogon-a   si-ny-iinogono/

        1SG.SM-PRS-think-FV   EXH-10-thought

        'I'm only thinking thoughts.'

A sixth test involves the focussing of a numeral. The meaning of numerals has been taken to have an underspecified interpretation either as the exact amount, or as a lower boundary 'at least this amount' (Horn 1972, Levinson 2000). However, in exhaustive focus, numerals lose their upward entailing quality and refer only to the exact quantity, because other amounts are excluded. In Kinyakyusa, a numeral in a DP with a CV marker is interpreted as the exact amount, as illustrated by the infelicity of the follow-up 'maybe more' in (47) and (48)a. This forms evidence for the exhaustive interpretation, especially when compared to the use with the V augment in (48)b, where a continuation 'maybe more' is felicitous.[9]

(47)   Bahati ikukaba **ji**milioni jimo kukyiinja.

        /Bahati   i-ku-kab-a   ji-milioni   ji-mo   ku-ki-inja/

        1.Bahati   1SM-PRS-get-FV   EXH-9.milioni   9-one   17-7-year

        'Bahati earns (exactly) one million a year.'

(48)   a.   **Si**-nguku ntandatu syo isyi syalyusigwe (#pamo n' iisiingi).

             /si-nguku   ntandatu   syo   isyi

             EXH-10-chicken   10.six   10.PRO 10.DEM.PROX

             si-ali-ul-is-igw-e   pamo   na   i-si-ngi/

             10SM-PST-buy-CAUS-PASS-FV   maybe   and   AUG-10-other

             'It's ten chickens exactly that were sold (#maybe more).'

        b.   Inguku ntaandatu syaalyulisiigwe (pamo n' iisiingi).

             /i-nguku   ntandatu si-ali-ul-is-igw-e   pamo   na   i-si-ngi/

             AUG-10.chicken 10.six   1SM-PST-buy-CAUS-PASS-FV maybe   and AUG-10-other

             'Six chickens were sold (maybe more).'

Seventh, negation targets the exhaustivity (rather than the truth of the sentence) when the CV marker is present on the object. That is, (49) does not deny that they drank soda, but rather negates that it was *only* soda that they drank. The fact that a grammatical operation like negation can target the exhaustivity also shows that exhaustivity is an inherent aspect of the meaning of the CV marker, and not a mere pragmatic implication.

---

[9] Note, however, that (48a) and (48b) also differ in their construction, with (48a) being a reverse pseudocleft. We do not have an exact parallel example for this test.

(49)　　Bakanwire **si**sooda (baaliile/baanwile n' ifiingi).

　　　/ba-ka-nw-ile　　　　　si-sooda　　　ba-a-li/nw-ile　　　　na　i-fi-ngi/

　　　2SM-NEG-drink-PFV　EXH-10.soda　2SM-PST-eat/drink-PFV　and　AUG-8-other

　　　'They didn't drink only soda (they also drank/ate other things).'

Finally, the corrective answer to an incomplete yes/no question with the CV marker needs to be 'no' and cannot be 'yes', as shown in (50)b. This negation in the answer targets the exhaustivity encoded by the CV marker in the question in (50)a, and can be compared to the felicitous answer 'yes' to an equally incomplete question with the V augment in (51). The question in both cases asks about a subset of the true answers (only shirts, where other things have been washed too), which means that the predicate is true for this subset (he did wash the shirts, after all) but the exhaustivity is false (he did not wash *only* the shirts).

(50)　a.　Context: Speakers are shown a picture of a clothesline with various washed clothes and
　　　　　sheets.

　　　　　Bule Mose asukile **si**syati?

　　　　　/bule　Mose　　　a-suk-ile　　　　　si-syati/

　　　　　Q　　1.Mose　　1SM-PRS-wash-PFV　EXH-10.shirt

　　　　　'Did Moses wash (CV-)shirts?'

　　　b.

　　　　　/mma/eena　　Mose　　a-suk-ile　　　　　i-syati　　　　na　　i-mi-eenda

　　　　　no/yes　　　1.Mose　1SM-PRS-wash-PFV　AUG-10.shirt　and　AUG-4-clothes

　　　　　i-gi-ngi./

　　　　　AUG-10-other

　　　　　'No/#Yes. Moses washed shirts and other clothes.'

(51)　a.　Context: Speakers are shown a picture of a clothesline with various washed clothes and
　　　　　sheets.

　　　　　Bule Mose asukile isyati?

　　　　　/bule　　Mose　　　a-suk-ile　　　　　i-syati/

　　　　　Q　　　1.Mose　　1SM-PRS-wash-PFV　　AUG-10.shirt

　　　　　'Did Moses wash shirts?'

　　　b.　Eena Mose asukile isyati palikimo n' amagolore.

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

　　　　　yes　　1.Mose　1SM-PRS-wash-PFV　AUG-10.shirt　16-be-one　and　AUG-6-sheet

　　　　　'Yes. Moses washed shirts together with sheets.'

In summary, there is overwhelming evidence that exhaustivity is an inherent aspect of meaning of the CV marker. The context and co-text indicate that alternatives are present and excluded, and other tests for focus and specifically for exhaustivity indicate the same for objects with the CV marker, as summarised in Table 3, in comparison with the V augment.

	CV	V
Focus particle only	OK	OK
Focus particle even	*	OK
Universal quantifier	* (unless restricted)	OK
Non-specific indefinite	* (instead generic)	OK
Idioms and cognate objects	* (unless VP)	OK
Numerals	Exact reading	Lower boundary
Negation	Targets exhaustivity	Targets truth
Answer yes to incomplete question	*	OK

Table 3 Overview of tests for focus and exhaustivity

We therefore propose that the CV marker should be analysed as a marker of exhaustive focus.

5. Marking exhaustivity on the noun

We have shown that (what was thought of as) the CV augment in Kinyakyusa by De Blois (1970), in supposed variation with the V augment, is actually not an augment at all, and should rather be analysed as a marker of exhaustivity, thereby answering the two research questions for this paper.

This is interesting, because (exhaustive) focus is in Bantu typically expressed by marking in the *clause* rather than on the *noun* (see e.g. Downing & Hyman 2015, Van der Wal 2015, Downing & Marten 2019 on the marking of focus in Bantu). Clausal focus can be expressed for example in the use of clefts or focus constructions with a dedicated position. These are exemplified in (52), where the focused referent is underlined and a morphological marker of focus is in boldface. In Kîîtharaka (52), we see the focus marker *ni* marking a clause-initial focused referent (see Abels & Muriundi 2008); Aghem (53) is famous for its Immediate After Verb focus position (but note that it is not just the Immediate After Verb position that indicates focus, but the shape of the noun too: *kɨ́-bɛ́* vs. *bɛ́-kó*); in Kituba (54) the focus marker (derived from the word for 'person') follows a clause-initial focused referent (see also the overview of focus positions and morphological marking in Gibson et al. 2017). These are only some examples of the wide variety of strategies to express focus in the Bantu languages (see also e.g. Morimoto & Yoneda to appear).

Kîîtharaka (Kanampiu & Van der Wal database)
(52)   Ndeera Kayûgû [**i** <u>mwanki</u> ûrɨ́ɨ́re].
         n-leer-a   Kayûgû   ni   mu-anki   û-rî-ire
         1SG.SM-tell-FV   1.Hare   FOC   3-fire   3SM-eat-PFV
         'I told Hare [it's the <u>fire</u> that ate (the guinea fowl)].'

Aghem (Hyman 1979: 56, 59)
(53)   a.   Ǹ mɔ̂ zì <u>kɨ́-bɛ́</u> ↓nɛ́.
               I   PST₁ ate   fufu   today
               'I ate fufu today.'

        b.   Ǹ mɔ̂ zì ↓<u>nɛ́</u> bɛ́-kó.
               I   PST₁ ate today fufu
               'I ate fufu <u>today</u>.'

Kituba (Van der Wal & Maniacky 2015: 2)

(54)   Pusu **muntu**   me   kudya   mbisi.
         cat   FOC   PRF   eat   fish
         'It's the cat that has eaten the fish.'

Marking exhaustivity on the noun itself is rarer or perhaps just less described for Bantu languages. Hyman & Katamba (1993) show that the *absence* of the augment in Luganda (plus associated tonal consequences) leads to a focus interpretation, which Van der Wal & Namyalo (2016) show to be exclusivity – the test with indefinites serves here to illustrate:

Luganda (Van der Wal & Namyalo 2016: 19)
(55)   a.   N-á-kúbyé   o-mu-ntu.
               1SG.SM-PST-hit.PERF   AUG-1-person
               'I beat someone.'

         b.   N-á-kúbyé   _-mu-ntú,   si   kkapa.
               1SG.SM-PST-hit.PERF   _-1-person   NEG.COP   9.cat
               'I beat a person, not a cat.'

But even in Luganda, augmentless nouns are restricted to the position after the verb (vP internal; Van der Wal & Namyalo 2016). In contrast, nouns with the CV marker in Kinyakyusa are relatively free in their sentence position, as seen in (31)-(33) above for different syntactic roles and positions, as well as (48)a) for a reverse pseudocleft construction. A question that remains to be studied in this respect is how the CV marker interacts with other markers of information structure in Kinyakyusa, especially with clausal marking of information structure (clefts, word order variation).

     Looking beyond Bantu, Bastian Persohn (p.c.) suggests that the CV marker is remarkably similar to the restrictive or limitative markers in Oceanic and Austronesian languages. These markers are mostly enclitics or suffixes, as illustrated in (56) and (57).

Rapa Nui (Polynesian, Kieviet 2017: 267)
(56)   'I   te   pō   **nō**   te   ika   nei   ana   hī.
         at   ART   night   just   ART   fish   PROX   IRR   to.fish
         'Only at night this fish can be fished.'

Nungon (Papuan, Sarvasy 2017: 379)
(57)   [Ibaa opmou]=**ho** ne-i-ha-k.
         leech small=FOC   1SG.O-bite-PRS.SG-3SG
         '(It is) a little leech (that) has bitten me.'

The difference between the CV marker and these restrictive markers is that the latter can also be used with verbs, and it is used with other functions – Schultze-Bernd (2002) presents a wonderful overview of the various functions associated with the restrictive clitic in Australian languages. For one of the languages, Gurindji, she cites McConvell (1983) as identifying the following interpretations (Schultze-Bernd 2002: 242): "'only' (on noun phrases), 'indeed, precisely; right there' (e.g. with locative phrases), 'even', 'intensive', 'still', and 'all the time'." The examples in (58) illustrate the readings 'only' and 'still'.

Gurindji (Australian, McConvell 1983: 17, 20; via Schultze-Bernd 2002: 242)

(58)   a.   Ngayi-ny=**parni**   ngu=yi   nyila-ma   kujingka-ma.
            1SG-DAT=**CLITIC**   AUX=1SG.OBJ   DEM-TOP   song.cycle-TOP
            'That song cycle belongs to me only.'

       b.   Ngu=ngku   parik   wanyja-ni   makin-ta=**rni**.
            AUX=2SG.OBJ   leave.behind   leave-PST   asleep-LOC=**CLITIC**
            'He left you (still) asleep.'

Such multifunctionality we have not found for the Kinyakyusa CV marker, and a question is whether a description as 'non-scalar restrictive marker' (McConvell 1983, Schultze-Bernd 2002) is specific enough for our purposes. On the one hand, we find Persohn (2020: 44) describing the CV marker as "express[ing] an emphatic notion translatable along the lines of 'just X; the very X'", which is in line with the proposed origin and/or current underspecified status of the Austro/Oceanic restrictive markers as 'emphatic assertion of identity' (Schultze-Bernd 2002, König 1991). On the other hand, the clear exhaustive semantics we found argue for a narrower label as 'exhaustivity marker'.

6.   Summary and conclusion

We started this paper with two research questions about the status of the CV marker:
    A.   Is the CV marker an augment?
    B.   What is the interpretation of the CV marker? Specifically: in which information-structural contexts is the CV marker used felicitously?
In order to answer these questions, we first described the form and function of the V augment in Kinyakyusa. We cautiously argue that the V augment in Kinyakyusa functions as a determiner, given that it is present when nouns function as arguments, but not when they function as predicates. In addition, the V prefix is absent in locative derivation, after the connective -*a* 'of', in the second noun of a compound, after the element *kukuti* 'every', with the interrogative word -*liku* 'which', and for vocatives. Although the augment does not express definiteness, in the context of polar questions we do find that the presence of the augment brings a definite/familiar meaning, as opposed to the indefinite interpretation in the absence of the augment.

        In contrast to the V augment, we show that the CV marker is dissimilar to the features of the V augment in four properties: the CV marker cannot participate in coordination of two nouns, while the V augment can; locatives never take an augment, but can take a CV marker; adnominal adjectives can take the V augment but not the CV marker; and demonstratives modify a noun with the V augment but not the CV marker. We also noted that the presence of the CV marker is not sensitive to grammatical role or position: Subjects, objects, and adverbs can all appear with the CV marker. This answers research question A negatively: the CV marker is not an augment.

        Instead, and answering research question B, we propose that the CV marker is a marker of exhaustive focus, given its consistently exhaustive behaviour in the eight diagnostics we tested.

        As already mentioned, further research within Kinyakyusa should reveal how this marker interacts with other strategies for the expression of information structure; a formal analysis of the position of the exhaustive marker in the left periphery of the DP will also provide further insight into the structure of the language as well as the structural aspects of information structure. We hope that this first systematic study of the exhaustive marker in Kinyakyusa may inspire similar description and analysis for other languages, and inform comparative studies.

Symbols and abbreviations

Numbers refer to noun classes, or to persons when followed by SG or PL.

APPL	applicative
ART	article
AUG	augment
CAUS	causative
COND	conditional
CONN	connective
COP	copula
DAT	dative
DEM	demonstrative
DIST	distal
FOC	focus
FV	final vowel
int.	intended reading
IRR	irrealis
LOC	locative
NEG	negation
NPx	noun prefix
OM	object marker
PASS	passive
PERF	perfect
PFV	perfective
POSS	possessive
PRO	independent pronoun
PROX	proximal
PRS	present
Q	question particle
PST	past tense
SBJV	subjunctive
SM	subject marker
TOP	topic marker

References

Asiimwe, Allen. 2014. *Definiteness and specificity in Runyankore-Rukiga*. Doctoral thesis, Stellenbosch University.

Bokamba, Georges D. 1971. Specificity and definiteness in Dzamba. *Studies in African Linguistics*, 2. 217-38.

De Blois, Kornelis F. 1970. The augment in the Bantu languages. *Africana Linguistica* IV. 87-165.

De Dreu, Merijn. 2008. *The internal structure of the Zulu DP*. Leiden: University of Leiden MA thesis.

Downing, Laura, and Larry M. Hyman. 2015. Information structure in Bantu. In Féry, Caroline & Shinichiro Ishihara. *The Oxford handbook of information structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Downing, Laura, and Lutz Marten. 2019. Clausal morphosyntax and information structure. In Van de Velde, Mark et al. (eds), *The Bantu Languages, second edition*, 270-307. London: Routledge.

Drubig, Hans Bernard. 2003. Toward a typology of focus and focus constructions. Linguistics 41 (1). 1-50.

Drubig, Hans Bernard. 2007. Phases and the typology of focus constructions. In S. Winkler and K. Schwabe (eds.), *On information structure, meaning and form*, 33-66. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Gambarage, Joash Johannes. 2013. The pre-prefix in Nata: An interface account. In *Selected Proceedings of the 43rd Annual Conference on African Linguistics*, ed. Olanike Ola Orie & Karen W. Sanders, 163-176. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project. http://www.lingref.com/cpp/acal/43/paper2965.pdf

Gambarage, Joash Johannes. 2019. *Belief-of-existence determiners: Evidence from the syntax and semantics of Nata augments*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia, PhD thesis.

Gibson, Hannah, Andriana Koumbarou, Lutz Marten and Jenneke van der Wal. 2017. Locating the Bantu conjoint:disjoint alternation in a typology of focus marking. In van der Wal, J. and L. M. Hyman (eds.), The conjoint/disjoint alternation in Bantu, 61-99. Berlin: De Gruyter. https://www.degruyter.com/document/doi/10.1515/9783110490831-003/html

Horn, Laurence R. 1972. On the semantic properties of logical operators in English. UCLA PhD dissertation.

Hyman, Larry & Francis X. Katamba. 1993. The augment in Luganda: Syntax or pragmatics? In *Theoretical aspects of Bantu grammar,* ed. Sam Mchombo, 209-256. Stanford: CSLI, Stanford University.

Kieviet, Paulus. 2017. *A grammar of Rapa Nui*. Berlin: Language Science Press. https://langsci-press.org/catalog/book/124

König, Ekkehard. 1991. *The meaning of focus particles: A comparative perspective.* London: Routledge.

Levinson, Stephen C. 2000. *Presumptive meanings*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Longobardi, Guiseppe. 1994. Reference and proper names: A theory of N-movement in syntax and logical form. *Linguistic inquiry* 25(4). 609-665.

Lusekelo, Amani. 2009. The structure of the Nyakyusa noun phrase. *Nordic Journal of African Studies* 18(4). 305–331. http://www.njas.helsinki.fi/pdf-files/vol18num4/lusekelo.pdf

McConvell, P. 1983. 'Only' and related concepts in Gurindji. Manuscript, Northern Territory University Darwin.

Meeussen, Achille E. 1967. Bantu grammatical reconstructions. *Africana Linguistica,* 3: 80-122.

Mwangoka, Ngapona & Voorhoeve, Jan. 1960. Cursus Ki-Nyakyusa. Leiden: Rijksuniversiteit Leiden.

Persohn, Bastian. 2020. *The verb in Nyakyusa*: *A focus on tense, aspect and modality.* Second revised edition (Contemporary African Linguistics 2). Berlin: Language Science Press. https://langsci-press.org/catalog/book/297

Petzell, Malin & Karoline Kühl. 2017. The influence of non-linguistic factors on the usage of the pre-prefix in Luguru. *Linguistic Discovery* 15(1): 35-48.

Rooth, Mats. 1985. *Association with focus*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Massachusetts at Amherst.

Rooth, Mats. 1992. A theory of focus interpretation. *Natural Language Semantics*, 1(1): 75-117.

Rooth, Mats. 1996. Focus. In *The handbook of contemporary semantic theory*, ed. Shalom Lappin, 271-297. Oxford: Blackwell.

Schultze-Berndt, Eva. 2002. Grammaticalized restrictive on adverbials and secondary predicates: Evidence from Australian languages. *Australian Journal of Linguistics*, 22(2): 231-264.

Savarny, Hannah. 2017. *A Grammar of Nungon: A Papuan Language of Northeast New Guinea*. Leiden: Brill. https://brill.com/view/title/34142

Van de Velde, Mark. 2019. Nominal morphology and syntax. In *The Bantu Languages, 2nd edition,* ed. Van de Velde, Mark, Koen Bostoen, Derek Nurse & Gérard Philippson, 237-269. London and New York: Routledge.

Van der Wal, Jenneke. 2015. Bantu syntax. *Oxford Handbook Topics in Linguistics (online edition).* https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199935345.013.50

Van der Wal, Jenneke. 2016. Diagnosing focus. *Studies in Language* 40(2). 259–301.

Van der Wal, Jenneke. 2022. *A featural typology of Bantu agreement*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Van der Wal, Jenneke & Jacky Maniacky. 2015. How 'person' got into focus: Grammaticalization of clefts in Lingala and Kikongo areas. *Linguistics,* 53(1): 1-52. https://www.degruyter.com/document/doi/10.1515/ling-2014-0033/html

Van der Wal, Jenneke & Saudah Namyalo. 2016. The interaction of two focus marking strategies in Luganda. In *Diversity in African languages,* ed. Doris L. Payne, Sara Pacchiarotti & Mokaya Bosire, 355-377. Berlin: Language Science Press. http://langsci-press.org/catalog/book/121

Visser, Marianna. 2008. Definiteness and specificity in the isiXhosa determiner phrase. *South African Journal of African Languages,* 28(1): 11-29. https://www.degruyter.com/database/IABO/entry/iab20092428/html

Wasike, Aggrey. 2007. *The left periphery, wh-in-situ and A-bar movement in Lubukusu and other Bantu languages*. Ithica: Cornell University dissertation. https://ecommons.cornell.edu/handle/1813/4029

Wasike, Aggrey. 2018. Adjectives in Lubukusu. In *African linguistics in prairie: Selected papers from the 45th Annual Conference on African Linguistics,* ed. Jacob Kandybowicz, Travis Major, Harold Torence & Philip T. Duncan, 325-339. Berlin: Language Science Press. https://langsci-press.org/catalog/view/120/1329/1107-2

Jenneke van der Wal
Leiden University Centre for Linguistics
Leiden University
g.j.van.der.wal@hum.leidenuniv.nl

Amani Lusekelo
Dar es Salaam University College of Education
University of Dar es Salaam
alusekelo@duce.ac.tz or amanilusekelo@gmail.com