

## EMPHATIC INTERPRETATIONS OF OBJECT MARKING IN BANTU LANGUAGES\*

Hannah Lippard<sup>1</sup>, Justine Sikuku<sup>2</sup>, Crisófia Langa da Câmara<sup>3</sup>, Rose Letsholo<sup>4</sup>,  
Madelyn Colantes<sup>5</sup>, Kang (Franco) Liu<sup>6</sup>, & Michael Diercks<sup>5</sup>

University of California, Los Angeles<sup>1</sup>; Moi University<sup>2</sup>; Universidade Eduardo Mondlane<sup>3</sup>;  
University of Botswana<sup>4</sup>; Pomona College<sup>5</sup>; University of California, Berkeley<sup>6</sup>

This paper investigates emphatic interpretations of object marking in various Bantu languages. We focus on Lubukusu (spoken in Kenya) and Cinyungwe (spoken in Mozambique) in particular, but we also report initial evidence from other Bantu languages (mainly Tiriki, Wanga, and Ikalanga). In these languages, OM-doubling—the co-occurrence of an object marker with a lexical DP object—is infelicitous in neutral pragmatic contexts. However, we show that certain contexts make OM-doubling possible. In these contexts, OM-doubling constructions receive particular emphatic interpretations that are very different from interpretations of non-doubling object marking constructions. We identify at least four types of these interpretations: *verum*, mirativity, exhaustivity, and intensity. We show that emphatic interpretations of OM-doubling are widespread among Bantu languages, and we provide strategies for identifying and analyzing them. While this paper is primarily descriptive, we discuss a possible analysis of these interpretations as conventional implicatures, influenced by recent work on a similar range of emphatic interpretations arising from focus fronting in Indo-European languages.

### 1. Introduction

This paper explores the interpretation of object markers (OMs) in various Bantu languages.<sup>1</sup> We focus primarily on Lubukusu (E31c), which is spoken in western Kenya and eastern Uganda, and Cinyungwe (N43), which is spoken in Mozambique (Guthrie, 1948; Lewis et al., 2016). We show that the co-occurrence of OMs with their corresponding DP objects (OM-doubling, i.e., clitic-doubling) is associated with a range of previously unreported emphatic interpretations.

These findings are impactful in multiple domains. First, we report novel data aggregated from ongoing projects to show that emphatic interpretations of OM-doubling are widespread and central to the nature of OM-doubling. Second, we show that

---

\* **Acknowledgements:** This paper developed from a presentation prepared for an online workshop, *Miratives and evidentiality in Bantu*, held on October 7, 2021. We thank the organizers, Hannah Gibson and Jenneke van der Wal, for telling us about this workshop and inviting us, and we thank our fellow presenters and attendees for their feedback!

This project collects and organizes a discussion that is occurring in parallel in multiple distinct projects on object marking in different languages, including a wide array of novel data presented here. Justine Sikuku and Michael Diercks have a long-standing project on object marking in Lubukusu, including a manuscript-in-development that all of the Lubukusu data here are drawn from (Sikuku and Diercks, 2023). Crisófia Langa da Câmara (and collaborators) has an ongoing project on object marking and object properties in Cinyungwe, which includes an initial syntactic analysis (Langa da Câmara et al., to appear) and which is currently being extended into concerns of interpretation: those results are presented here. Rose Letsholo, Madelyn Colantes, and Michael Diercks are applying these same analytical questions to Ikalanga currently, and Franco Liu's master's thesis (Liu, 2022) addressed similar questions in Tiriki.

There are many authors here, so please allow us to clarify our contributions. The first author (Hannah Lippard) is a participant in the parallel projects and was the lead author for compiling relevant information from each of the above projects into this format, writing and presenting the talk this paper developed from, and writing this manuscript. Sikuku is responsible for the Lubukusu data and analytical work, together with Diercks. Langa da Câmara is responsible for the Cinyungwe data and analytical work, which was done collaboratively with Colantes, Lippard, and Diercks. Liu is the primary researcher on Tiriki. Diercks is a primary investigator involved in all of these projects except Tiriki (where he was a consultant/advisor).

Our financial support has come from a wide variety of places. We have benefited from research leaves from both Moi University and Pomona College. Portions of this research were funded from a Doctoral Dissertation Research Improvement Grant (BCS-0843868), a Hirsch Research Initiation Grant from Pomona College, and a NSF Collaborative Research Grant (Structure and Tone in Luyia: BCS-1355749), the NSF-funded Afranaph project (BCS-1324404) and ongoing research support from Pomona College including from the Paul and Susan Efron fund and the Robert Efron Lectureship in Cognitive Science.

<sup>1</sup> The Lubukusu data throughout this paper was provided by Justine Sikuku, Cinyungwe data by Crisófia Langa da Câmara, Tiriki data by Kelvin Alulu, Wanga data by Alfred Anangwe, and Ikalanga data by Rose Letsholo.

Bantu OM-doubling replicates a range of emphatic interpretations that have been associated with focus fronting in Indo-European languages, suggesting that there is some cross-linguistic consistency in focus-associated emphatic interpretations. Finally, this project demonstrates the importance of accounting for these kinds of emphatic interpretations when analyzing OMs and related phenomena.

**1.1 Object markers (OMs).** An object marker is a morpheme within the Bantu verb form that refers to an object in the sentence. Basic examples of object marking in Lubukusu and Cinyungwe are shown below in (1) and (2).

- |     |   |                  |
|-----|---|------------------|
| (1) | <p>a. N-á-βon-a                      paapá.<br/>         1SG.SM-REM.PST-see-FV      1father<br/>         ‘I saw father.’</p> <p>b. N-á-<b>mu</b>-βon-a.<br/>         1SG.SM-REM.PST-1OM-see-FV<br/>         ‘I saw him.’ (Sikuku et al., 2018, 366)</p>   | <b>Lubukusu</b>  |
| (2) | <p>a. Baba      a-da-phik-a      ci-mbamba.<br/>         1father    1SM-PST-cook-FV    7-beans<br/>         ‘Father cooked beans.’</p> <p>b. Baba      a-da-<b>ci</b>-phik-a.<br/>         1father    1SM-PST-7OM-cook-FV<br/>         ‘Father cooked them (beans).’ (Langa da Câmara et al., to appear, i)</p> | <b>Cinyungwe</b> |

Bantu languages vary in terms of how many OMs can appear on the verb (Marlo, 2015; Marten et al., 2007). Lubukusu allows only a single OM. As (3) shows, either the structurally higher or lower object in a ditransitive can be represented with an object marker, but not both—regardless of the order of the OMs.

- |     |  |                 |
|-----|--|-----------------|
| (3) | <p>a. N-á-a                              wéékésá    síi-tabu.<br/>         1SG.SM-REM.PST-give.FV    1Wekesa    7.7-book<br/>         ‘I gave Wekesa the book.’</p> <p>b. N-á-<b>mu</b>-a                              síi-tabu.<br/>         1SG.SM-REM.PST-1OM-give.FV    7.7-book<br/>         ‘I gave him the book.’</p> <p>c. N-á-<b>si</b>-a                              wéékésá.<br/>         1SG.SM-REM.PST-7OM-give.FV    1Wekesa<br/>         ‘I gave it to Wekesa.’</p> <p>d. *N-á-<b>mu-si</b>-a.<br/>         1SG.SM-REM.PST-1OM-7OM-give.FV<br/>         Attempted: ‘I gave it to him.’</p> <p>e. *N-á-<b>si-mu</b>-a.<br/>         1SG.SM-REM.PST-7OM-1OM-give.FV<br/>         Attempted: ‘I gave it to him.’ (Sikuku et al., 2018, 406)</p> | <b>Lubukusu</b> |
|-----|--|-----------------|

In Cinyungwe too, only one OM is permitted on the verb, as shown in (4). However, Cinyungwe is also more restrictive than Lubukusu: in a pragmatically neutral context, only the structurally higher object (in this case, *akazi* ‘women’) can be acceptably represented with an object marker.<sup>2</sup>

- (4) a. Kapenu a-ndza-gas-ir-a a-kazi moto. **Cinyungwe**  
 Kapenu 1SM-FUT-start.fire-APPL-FV 2-women 3.fire  
 ‘Kapenu will start fire for the women.’
- b. Kapenu a-ndza-**wa**-gas-ir-a moto.  
 Kapenu 1SM-FUT-2OM-start.fire-APPL-FV 3.fire  
 ‘Kapenu will start fire for them.’
- c. #Kapenu a-ndza-**wu**-gas-ir-a a-kazi.  
 Kapenu 1SM-FUT-3OM-start.fire-APPL-FV 2-women  
 ‘Kapenu will start it for the women.’
- d. \*Kapenu a-ndza-**wu-wa**-gas-ir-a.  
 Kapenu 1SM-FUT-3OM-2OM-start.fire-APPL-FV  
 Attempted: ‘Kapenu will start it for them.’ (Langa da Câmara et al., to appear, iii)

We present these patterns not only to illustrate that multiple OMs on a verb are ungrammatical in Lubukusu and Cinyungwe, but also to provide examples of (non-doubling) OMs behaving like pronouns. As we show in later sections, however, the range of interpretations of object marking is much broader than these initial examples suggest. Specifically, various emphatic interpretations arise from OM-doubling constructions in both languages, which are introduced in §1.2.

**1.2 OM-doubling.** Some Bantu languages allow OM-doubling, where an OM co-occurs with its corresponding lexical DP object. This type of co-occurrence is not unique to the Bantu language family; clitic doubling has also been identified in, for example, Spanish (Anagnostopoulou, 2017), Amharic (Kramer, 2014), Inuktitut (Yuan, 2021), and Greek (Philippaki-Warbuton et al., 2004) (to name just a few of the many examples). The possibility of doubling is a potential diagnostic for whether OMs/clitics in a particular language are incorporated pronouns or agreement morphemes (Kramer, 2014; Baker and Kramer, 2018; Sikuku and Diercks, 2023). This is because, if an OM is a pronoun, it is an object of the verb; it arose not through agreement but through movement and incorporation into the verb form. Therefore, the OM should be in complementary distribution with an in situ lexical DP object.<sup>3</sup>

In Lubukusu and Cinyungwe, OM-doubling is typically infelicitous in neutral pragmatic contexts, unless there is a prosodic break (.) between the verb and the OM-doubled object. This prosodic break is often analyzed as signaling that the object is outside vP (Cheng and Downing, 2009; Zeller, 2015; Sikuku et al., 2018; Langa da Câmara et al., to appear). This suggests that OM-doubling where the doubled object is in situ is impossible in neutral pragmatic contexts in both languages. (5) and (6) below are examples of OM-doubling in Lubukusu and Cinyungwe with a prosodic break.

- (5) N-á-**ki**-bon-a , ée-m-bwa. **Lubukusu**  
 1SG.SM-REM.PST-9OM-see-FV 9-9-dog  
 ‘I saw it, the dog.’ (Sikuku et al., 2018, 368)
- (6) Baba a-da-**ci**-phik-a , ci-mbamba. **Cinyungwe**  
 1father 1SM-PST-7OM-cook-FV 7-beans  
 Approximately: ‘Father cooked beans.’ (Langa da Câmara et al., to appear, ii)

<sup>2</sup> Note that (4c) is infelicitous but not ungrammatical; in a context where the structurally higher object is focused, this sentence is acceptable.

<sup>3</sup> A pronominal incorporation analysis does not, however, predict that an OM cannot appear in a sentence with a DP object that has been dislocated out of the vP.



- (10) A: Martina, tuo padre mi ha detto che avete visto un leone ieri allo zoo.  
 ‘Martina, your father told me that you saw a lion yesterday at the zoo.’
- B: Un tigre abbiamo visto, non un leone.  
 a tiger have.1pl seen not a lion  
 ‘We saw a tiger, not a lion.’ (Cruschina, 2021, 6–7)

In contrast to this view of FF as related to a contrastive/non-contrastive dichotomy, Cruschina (2021) observes that some studies have reported instances of FF with non-contrastively focused constituents. He therefore argues against a binary distinction between contrastive and non-contrastive focus; instead, all types of focus involve contrast to varying degrees. He identifies several types of focus ranging from lowest to highest contrast: information focus, exhaustive focus (a subtype of information focus), mirative focus, and corrective focus. According to Cruschina (2021), languages are more likely to permit FF with types of focus with a higher degree of contrast.

The table in (11) shows the availability of different types of emphatic interpretations of FF in certain languages, as identified by Cruschina (2021). Most relevant for our purposes is the observation that a range of emphatic interpretations—similar to the ones we are finding with OM-doubling in Bantu languages—arises from FF in a different family of languages. In the remainder of this section, we provide an overview of these interpretations of FF in the languages in (11).

- (11) Availability of focus fronting with different types of focus (Cruschina, 2021)

	information focus	exhaustive focus	mirative focus	corrective focus
French			✓	
Italian/Spanish			✓	✓
Hungarian		✓	✓	✓
Sicilian/Sardinian	✓		✓	✓

The first type of focus listed in the table, information focus, involves contrasting new information with “a contextually open set” (Cruschina, 2021, 5). Cruschina discusses information focus in the context of answers to *wh*-questions. Among the languages under consideration, only Sicilian and Sardinian permit FF with information focus. (12) is an example of information focus fronting in Sicilian. (See (9) above for an example of postverbal information focus in Italian, a language that does not permit FF in this context.)

- (12) A: Unni ti nni jisti airi sira? **Sicilian**  
 where you there.from went.2sg yesterday evening  
 ‘Where did you go last night?’
- B: Au cinema jivu.  
 to-the cinema went.1sg  
 ‘I went to the cinema.’ (Cruschina, 2016, 605)

Exhaustive focus, a subtype of information focus, involves an additional layer of meaning: the exclusion of any alternatives. Hungarian, but none of the other languages in (11), permits exhaustive readings of focus fronting, as shown in (13) below.

- (13) Mary egy kalapot nézett ki magának. **Hungarian**  
 Mary a hat.ACC pick.PST.3sg out herself.ACC  
 ‘It was (only) a hat that Mary picked for herself.’ (É. Kiss, 1998, 249)

The third type of focus listed in (11) is mirative focus, which emphasizes information that is “particularly surprising or unexpected” compared to a set of likelier alternatives (Cruschina, 2021, 9). Cruschina identifies FF with this type of focus in each of the languages under study; an example from French is provided in (14).

- (14) Trois heures il avait de retard, le train! **French**  
 three hours it had of delay the train  
 ‘The train was delayed by three hours!’ (Abeillé et al., 2008, 2361)

Although mirative focus is typically associated with information being surprising to a speaker, there is evidence of mirative meanings having a broader range; crosslinguistically, they sometimes overlap with reprimand meanings (Aikhenvald, 2012; Trotzke, 2017; Frey, 2010; Cruschina, 2021). There are several different ways to think about reprimand interpretations. First, they can be understood as instances where a proposition is considered surprising or unexpected from the addressee’s perspective rather than the speaker’s perspective. This is consistent with Aikhenvald (2012)’s observation that each type of mirative meaning (shown in (15)) “can be defined with respect to (a) the speaker, (b) the audience (or addressee), or (c) the main character” (Aikhenvald, 2012, 473).

- (15) Range of mirative meanings (Aikhenvald, 2012, 473)  
 a. sudden discovery, sudden revelation or realization;  
 b. surprise;  
 c. unprepared mind;  
 d. counterexpectation;  
 e. new information.

Reprimands can also be understood as instances where, from a speaker’s perspective, a proposition is particularly (or even most) likely out of a set of alternatives. As Trotzke (2017) explains, when a speaker uses a marked word order—for instance, fronting—to “state the obvious,” the emphatic interpretation “often has a reprimand character” (Trotzke, 2017, 34). An example of a reprimand reading from German is shown in (16). (16a) uses the standard word order and has a neutral interpretation; (16b) uses a fronting construction, resulting in an interpretation that this answer is obvious, because sleeping is an expected activity at night.

- (16) Was hast Du heute Nacht gemacht? **German**  
 ‘What did you do last night?’  
 a. Ich habe geSCHLAFen.  
 I have slept.  
 b. GeSCHLAFenhabich! Was denn sonst? (‘What else?’)  
 (Frey, 2010, 1426); paraphrases are Trotzke’s (2017, 34)

A third way of thinking about reprimands is that, like standard mirativity, they convey the speaker’s surprise; however, this surprise is directed not at the information itself but at the fact that the addressee does not already know the information. In this paper, we treat reprimands as a subtype of mirativity, based on intuitions that this is the case from the authors who are speakers of the relevant languages. This choice is also based on the fact that reprimand interpretations, like surprise mirative interpretations, depend on a ranking of alternative propositions based on expectedness.

The final type of focus listed in the table in (11), corrective focus, involves explicitly contrasting the focused constituent with an alternative (Cruschina, 2021, 5). Cruschina (2021) identifies FF with corrective focus in each of the languages in (11) except for French. (17) below shows an example of corrective focus fronting in Spanish. The possibility of continuing the sentence by negating the alternative (*y no peras* ‘and not pears’) provides further evidence for its corrective interpretation.

- (17) Manzanas compró Pedro ( y no peras ). **Spanish**  
 apples bought.3sg Pedro and not pears  
 ‘Pedro bought apples (and not pears).’ (Zubizarreta, 1999, 4239)

Cruschina (2021) proposes that the types of focus described above are introduced through conventional implicatures. Conventional implicatures are distinct from conversational implicatures in that they are semantic, not pragmatic—i.e., they are a “conventional” meaning. We discuss conventional implicatures in more detail in §9 and §10.

### 3. Previous work on interpretations of OM-doubling

This section provides a brief overview of previous work on the interpretative effects of OM-doubling in Bantu languages. In particular, we mention the interaction of OM-doubling with conjoint and disjoint patterns in §3.1 and the interaction of OM-doubling with givenness and topicality in §3.2.

**3.1. Conjoint/disjoint patterns and OM-doubling.** Conjoint and disjoint verb forms, which are present in many Bantu languages, mark the closeness of the relationship between a verb and the material that follows it (if any). The conjoint form indicates that this relationship is close, whereas the disjoint form indicates that it is less close or that there is no postverbal material (van der Wal and Hyman, 2017, 2).

Examples of conjoint/disjoint patterns from Kinyarwanda are shown in (18). In Kinyarwanda, the (unmarked) conjoint form is used when certain constituents follow the verb, such as an object, as in (18a), or an adjunct, as in (18c). The disjoint form is used when nothing follows the verb, as in (18b), or when the constituent that follows the verb has been moved and follows a prosodic break, as in (18d).

- (18) a. A-ba-áana ba-á-nyó-ye a-ma-tá. **Kinyarwanda**  
 AUG-2-child 2SM-REM-drink-PFV AUG-6-milk  
 ‘The children drank milk.’ (Ngoboka and Zeller, 2017, 368)
- b. A-ba-áana ba-á-**ra**-nyó-ye.  
 AUG-2-child 2SM-REM-DJ-drink-PFV  
 ‘The children drank.’ (Ngoboka and Zeller, 2017, 370)
- c. A-ba-áarimú ba-á-kór-ye néézá.  
 AUG-2-teacher 2SM-REM-work-PFV well  
 ‘The teachers worked well.’ (Ngoboka and Zeller, 2017, 373)
- d. A-ba-áarimú ba-á-**ra**-kó-ye \*(,) ejó.  
 AUG-2-teacher 2SM-REM-DJ-work-PFV yesterday  
 ‘Teachers worked, yesterday.’ (Ngoboka and Zeller, 2017, 372)

Conjoint and disjoint forms are often linked with focus (see van der Wal (2011); van der Wal and Hyman (2017)). Güldemann (2003) notes that formally marked (disjoint) verb forms place emphasis on the positive truth value, which we analyze as verum emphasis in this paper. By contrast, formally unmarked (conjoint) verb forms place emphasis on the postverbal constituent.

In addition and related to the connection between conjoint/disjoint forms and whether or not there is postverbal material inside vP, conjoint and disjoint forms often interact with object marking. In Zulu, for example, the conjoint form appears in a sentence like (19a) without an object marker, but the disjoint form is required in an OM-doubling sentence like (19b). This disjoint pattern is typically analyzed as the dislocation of the OM-doubled object out of vP, which is a focus domain in Zulu (Van der Spuy, 1993; Buell, 2005, 2006; Halpert, 2016, 2017; Zeller, 2012). Similar patterns occur in many other Bantu languages that show conjoint/disjoint distinctions, including Tswana (Creissels, 1996) and Kinyarwanda (Ngoboka and Zeller, 2017).

- (19) a. Ngi-theng-a le moto. **Zulu**  
 1SG.SM-buy-FV 9DEM 9.car  
 ‘I’m buying this car.’

- b. Ngi-\*(ya)-yi-theng-a le moto .  
 1SG.SM-DJ-OM9-buy-FV 9DEM 9.car  
 ‘I’m buying (it) this car.’ (Zeller, 2012, 222)

**3.2. Givenness/topicality and OM-doubling.** OM-doubling has also been linked to givenness and topicality. Bax and Diercks (2012) conclude that OM-doubling in Manyika Shona “is only felicitous in contexts where the object receives a non-focus interpretation” (Bax and Diercks, 2012, 191). For example, OM-doubling in (20b) is acceptable, because the context—the question in (20a)—makes the object *bhuku* ‘book’ familiar (and thus non-focused) information.

- (20) a. Tendai w-aka-ite-nyi nge bhuku? **Manyika Shona**  
 1Tendai 1SM-PST-do-what with 5book  
 ‘What did Tendai do with the book?’
- b. Tendai w-aka-ri-werenga bhuku nekukasika.  
 1Tendai 1SM-PST-5OM-read 5book quickly  
 ‘Tendai read the (particular) book quickly.’ (Bax and Diercks, 2012, 191)

However, the same OM-doubling sentence is infelicitous in a context where the doubled object is focused. In (21), the focused constituent is the vP, which the doubled object falls within.

- (21) a. Tendai w-aka-ite-nyi? **Manyika Shona**  
 1Tendai 1SM-PST-do-what  
 ‘What did Tendai do?’
- b. Tendai w-aka-(#ri-)werenga **bhuku** nekukasika.  
 1Tendai 1SM-PST-5OM-read 5book quickly  
 ‘Tendai read the (particular) book quickly.’ (Bax and Diercks, 2012, 191)

A similar pattern exists in Zulu. Focused phrases must appear within vP in Zulu, and as mentioned in §3.1, Zulu conjoint and disjoint patterns suggest that OM-doubled objects move out of vP. It follows that focused phrases cannot be OM-doubled in Zulu, and (22) shows that this is the case; the focused wh-phrase *iphi ingoma* ‘which song’ cannot be OM-doubled. Zeller (2015) analyzes the doubled object’s dislocation as the result of an Agree relation triggered by an anti-focus feature.

- (22) a. U-cul-e i-phi i-n-goma?]<sub>vP</sub> **Zulu**  
 2SM-sing-PST 9-which AUG-9-song  
 ‘Which song did you sing?’
- b. \*U-yi-cul-ile]<sub>vP</sub> i-phi i-n-goma ?  
 2SM-9OM-sing-PST 9-which AUG-9-song (Buell, 2008, 5)

Additionally, Mursell (2018) notes that OM-doubling in Swahili is usually unacceptable if the object to be doubled is modified by *pekee* ‘only’ and therefore part of the sentence’s focus. In (23), for instance, OM-doubling is possible in (23a), but (23b) is most natural without an object marker.<sup>4</sup>

- (23) a. Ni-na-ki-penda **kipindi hiki.** **Swahili**  
 1SG.SM-PRS.PROG-7-OM-like 7.series  
 7.this ‘I like this series.’

<sup>4</sup> Mursell (2018) explains that OM-doubling in sentences like (23b) is exceptionally possible in “contrastive focus contexts.” Mursell’s (2018) approach to contrast is similar to Cruschina’s 2021 definition of corrective focus.



- b. Ni-na-penda ku-angalia kipiki hiki pekee.  
 1SG.SM-PRS.PROG-like INF-watch 7.series 7.this only  
 ‘I like watching only this series.’ (Mursell, 2018, 433)

However, if an object is a left peripheral topic, OM-doubling is obligatory. In left-topicalization, the object is dislocated to the left periphery and is interpreted as an aboutness topic. In (24), *maneo haya* ‘these words’ is a left peripheral topic, and object marking is required.

- (24) Maneo haya a-li-ya-sema kwa sauti kubwa. Rosa a-li-\*(ya)-sikia. **Swahili**  
 6.words these 1SM-PST-6OM-say with 9voice 9big Rosa 1SM-PST-6OM-hear  
 ‘He said the words loudly. Rosa heard them.’ (Seidl and Dimitriadis, 1997, 376)

Based on these and other patterns, Mursell (2018) proposes that OM-doubling in Swahili arises from agreement between a topic head at the periphery of vP and an object with a givenness feature.

Specificity has long been a notable property of clitic doubling constructions (and other differential object marking constructions) in Indo-European languages (Anagnostopoulou, 2017; Lopez, 2012, among many others). Furthermore, in some languages (e.g. Greek and Albanian) clitic doubling has been explicitly linked to topicality in topic/focus bifurcations of information structure (Kallulli, 2000, 2001, 2008).

#### 4. Verum interpretations of Bantu object marking

The first type of emphatic interpretation of OM-doubling we address is verum. Cruschina (2021) does not include verum as a possible interpretation of focus fronting in Indo-European languages, but as we will demonstrate, verum interpretations of OM-doubling in Bantu languages are common. Verum-like meanings are often translated into English with the adverb *really* or emphatic *do*, as shown in (25).<sup>5</sup>

- (25) Alex DID eat my cookies!! **English**

They often involve a context where listeners are expressing doubt or disagreement and where a speaker is making a move to end a conversation or settle an issue (Sikuku et al., 2018; Gutzmann and Castroviejo Miró, 2011; Gutzmann et al., 2020). These interpretations are also often intuitively connected to speaker certainty/confidence.

**4.1. Verum interpretations in Lubukusu.** As noted in §1.2, OM-doubling is often judged unacceptable in Lubukusu, but Sikuku et al. (2018) found that verum contexts make doubling acceptable. (However, these are not the only contexts that facilitate OM-doubling in Lubukusu, contrary to the presumption in Sikuku et al. 2018; see §5.) Without an appropriate discourse context, OM-doubling sounds extremely infelicitous in Lubukusu, to the point of being ungrammatical. In a neutral context, it is often interpreted as unnecessarily argumentative, as if the speaker thinks the listener disagrees with them.

One example of a verum interpretation of OM-doubling in Lubukusu is that OM-doubling can be used to address listener doubt, as shown in (26).

- (26) A: Lionéeli a-l-iilé kú-mú-chéele kwéeli? **Lubukusu**  
 1Leonell 1SM-eat-PFV 3-3-rice really  
 ‘Did Lionell really eat the rice?’
- B: Lionéeli a-kú-l-iile kú-mú-chéele.  
 1Leonell 1SM-3OM-eat-PFV 3-3-rice  
 ‘Lionell DID eat the rice.’ (Sikuku et al., 2018, 378–9)

OM-doubling in Lubukusu can also be used to address listener denial, as shown in (27) below.

<sup>5</sup> We address the extent to which Bantu verum-like meanings are translatable into English in §10.

- (27) A: Wéékésá se-k-aa-nyw-ééle ká-ma-lwá tá. **Lubukusu**  
 1Wekesa NEG-1SM-PST-drink-PFV 6-6-beer NEG  
 ‘Wekesa didn’t drink the beer.’
- B: Wéékésá k-aa-ká-nyw-ééle ká-ma-lwá!  
 1Wekesa 1SM-PST-6OM-drink-PFV 6-6-beer  
 ‘Wekesa DID drink the beer!’ (Sikuku et al., 2018, 383)

Additionally, OM-doubling in Lubukusu can be used as a move to end a conversation. This can be illustrated by (26) and (27) above. It would be largely infelicitous for the disagreements in these exchanges to continue after (26B) and (27B), because the second speaker’s use of OM-doubling is intended to settle the issue.

Another example of OM-doubling used as a move to end a conversation is shown below in the biblical story of Peter denying Jesus three times. In this particular context, OM-doubling is unacceptable in Peter’s first and second denials (28c and 29c) but is very natural in (30c), his third and final denial. When it occurs, it is a discourse move to end discussion on the issue. In principle, OM-doubling could be available in (29c), but it would then be infelicitous for the questioning to continue, because the use of OM-doubling is meant to settle the issue once and for all.

- (28) a. Bá-báá-ndú b-á-reeb-a pétero, “o-mány-ile ó-muu-ndu yu-no?” **Lubukusu**  
 2-2-people 2SM-REM-PST-ask-FV 1Peter 2SG.SM-know-PFV 1-1-person 1-DEM  
 ‘So people asked Peter, “Do you know this person?”’
- b. Pétero k-á-chiib-a, “see-mú-many-ile tá.”  
 1Peter 2SM-REM-PST-answer-FV NEG.1SG.SM-1OM-know-PFV NEG  
 ‘Peter answered, “I don’t know him.”’
- c. #“see-mú-many-ile ó-muu-nd’ u-yú tá.”  
 NEG.1SG.SM-1OM-know-PFV 1-1-person 1-DEM NEG  
 ‘I DON’T know this person.’
- (29) a. B-á-mu-réeb-a luundi, “o-mány-ile ó-muu-ndu yu-no?”  
 2SM-REM-PST-1OM-ask-FV again 2SG.SM-know-PFV 1-1-person 1-DEM  
 ‘They asked him again, “Do you know this person?”’
- b. Pétero k-á-chiib-a, “see-mú-many-ile tá.”  
 1Peter 2SM-REM-PST-answer-FV NEG.1SG.SM-1OM-know-PFV NEG  
 ‘Peter answered, “I don’t know him.”’
- c. #“see-mú-many-ile ó-muu-nd’ u-yú tá.”  
 NEG.1SG.SM-1OM-know-PFV 1-1-person 1-DEM NEG  
 ‘I DON’T know this person.’
- (30) a. B-á-mu-réeb-a lw-á xááataru, “o-mány-ile ó-muu-ndu yu-no?”  
 2SM-REM-PST-1OM-ask-FV 11-ASSOC three 2SG.SM-know-PFV 1-1-person 1-DEM  
 ‘They asked him a third time, “Do you know this person?”’
- b. Pétero k-á-chiib-a, “see-mú-many-ile tá.”  
 1Peter 2SM-REM-PST-answer-FV NEG.1SG.SM-1OM-know-PFV NEG  
 ‘Peter answered, “I don’t know him.”’

- c. “see-**mú**-many-ile                    **ó-muu-nd’** u-yú tá.”  
 NEG.1SG.SM-1OM-know-PFV 1-1-person 1-DEM NEG  
 ‘I DON’T know this person.’ (Sikuku et al., 2018, 380)

OM-doubling in Lubukusu can also be used to express a speaker’s confidence even when they are affirming a previously mentioned proposition, as in (31B) below.

- (31) A: Wéékésá se-k-aa-nyw-ééle                    ká-ma-lwá tá.                    **Lubukusu**  
 1Wekesa NEG-1SM-PST-drink-PFV 6-6-beer NEG  
 ‘Wekesa didn’t drink the beer.’
- B: Yéé, wéékésá se-k-aa-**ká**-nyw-ééle                    **ká-ma-lwá** tá.  
 yes, 1Wekesa NEG-1SM-PST-6OM-drink-PFV 6-6-beer NEG  
 (In agreement) ‘Yes, Wekesa didn’t drink the beer.’ (Sikuku et al., 2018, 383)

**4.2. Verum interpretations in Cinyungwe.** OM-doubling in Cinyungwe, as in Lubukusu, is consistent with several diagnostics for verum meaning. The OM-doubling sentence in (33) is an appropriate response to each of the sentences in (32) but not out of the blue.

- (32) a. Father certainly didn’t cook the beans.  
 b. Did Father really cook the beans?  
 c. Father cooked the beans.
- (33) Baba a-da-**ci**-phik-a                    ci-mbamba.                    **Cinyungwe**  
 1father 1SM-PST-7OM-cook-FV 7-beans  
 ‘Father really/certainly cooked the beans.’
- Out of the blue: #
  - In response to (32a): ✓                    *Addressing listener denial*
  - In response to (32b): ✓                    *Addressing listener doubt*
  - In response to (32c): ✓                    *Affirmation of preceding truth value*

By contrast, a non-doubling version of the sentence is marginal or unacceptable in response to listener denial or doubt. It is acceptable out of the blue and as an affirmation of a previous assertion (but, in the latter context, communicates only agreement, not an additional layer of speaker certainty like the OM-doubling version of the sentence).

- (34) Baba a-da-phik-a                    ci-mbamba.                    **Cinyungwe**  
 1father 1SM-PST-cook-FV 7-beans  
 ‘Father cooked the beans.’
- Out of the blue: ✓
  - In response to (32a): ??                    *Addressing listener denial<sup>6</sup>*
  - In response to (32b): #                    *Addressing listener doubt*
  - In response to (32c): ✓                    *Affirmation of preceding truth value*

Notably, as Langa da Câmara et al. (to appear) show, object movement in Cinyungwe can appear independently of OM-doubling, and its interpretative effects are distinct from those of OM-doubling. A possible analysis is that movement is linked to corrective focus while OM-doubling is linked to verum (among other emphatic interpretations). A sentence with both OM-doubling and object movement results in a combination of these interpretations. In the following example, only the final sentence (35B2) has an ending-the-conversation interpretation (one of the effects of verum) in addition to the corrective focus on *mafigu* ‘bananas’ (i.e., Kapenu bought mother bananas, not maize).

<sup>6</sup> This response can be acceptable if the speaker raises their voice trying to convince the listener.

- (35) A1: Kapenu a-gul-ir-a mayi ci-manga **Cinyungwe**  
 1Kapenu 1SM.PST-buy-APPL-FV 1mother 7-maize  
 ‘Kapenu bought mother maize.’
- B1: Neye, Kapenu a-(#**mu**)-gul-ir-a ma-figu, **mayi**.  
 no 1Kapenu 1SM.PST-(#1OM)-buy-APPL-FV 6-bananas 1mother  
 ‘No, Kapenu bought mother BANANAS.’
- A2: Neye, Kapenu a-gu-lir-a ci-manga, mayi.  
 no 1Kapenu 1SM.PST-buy-APPL-FV 7-maize 1mother  
 ‘No, Kapenu bought mother MAIZE.’
- B2: Neye, Kapenu a-**mu**-gul-ir-a ma-figu, **mayi**.  
 no 1Kapenu 1SM.PST-1OM-buy-APPL-FV 6-bananas 1mother  
 ‘No, Kapenu really did buy mother BANANAS!’ (Langa da Câmara et al., to appear, xiv)

In (35B1), as in the Lubukusu example of Peter’s first and second denials (28c and 29c), the sense is that it would be too argumentative or aggressive to OM-double the object at this point in the conversation. Speaker A has not proven themselves to be recalcitrant; they merely need a correction, and the focus interpretation generated by movement is sufficient. In (35A2), however, once Speaker A shows they are unwilling to assent to Speaker B’s assertion, the OM-doubling construction in (35B2) becomes very natural. The third author (Langa da Câmara) translates the verum interpretation in (35B2)—and in other similar sentences—as ‘I know what I’m talking about.’

## 5. Mirative interpretations of Bantu object marking

As noted in §2, Cruschina (2021) includes mirativity as one of the conventional implicatures associated with focus fronting in Indo-European languages. Mirative interpretations convey that information is unexpected, surprising, or noteworthy (i.e., less likely than some alternative (Bianchi et al., 2016)). Mirativity may also include reprimand readings, which appear to have the opposite interpretation: that information is the most expected of potential alternatives (Aikhenvald, 2012; Trotzke, 2017; Frey, 2010; Cruschina, 2021).<sup>7</sup>

**5.1 Mirative interpretations in Lubukusu.** OM-doubling in Lubukusu can be used without a verum interpretation to convey that a situation is surprising, as shown in (36) below.<sup>8</sup>

- (36) a. *Context: Nafula loves milk and always drinks a lot of it.* **Lubukusu**  
 Nafula a-**ka**-nyw-a-kho **ka-ma-bele!**  
 1Nafula 1SM.PST-6OM-drink-FV-KHO 6-6-milk  
 ‘Nafula drank milk JUST A LITTLE BIT!’ (Sikuku and Diercks, 2023, 271)
- b. *Context: Ugali is a staple food and culturally foundational. It is never wasted.*  
 Wafula a-**bu**-mwat-a **bu-suma!**  
 1Wafula 1SM-14OM-throw.out-FV 14-ugali  
 ‘Wafula THREW OUT THE UGALI!’ (Sikuku and Diercks, 2023, 272)

However, if the situation is expected (due to the context), OM-doubling is unacceptable without a verum interpretation:

<sup>7</sup> See §10.3 for a discussion of the potential relationships between different types of emphasis discussed in this paper.

<sup>8</sup> Note that *-kho* is a partitive modifier that means ‘a little bit.’

- (37) a. *Context: A sick person is expected to lose their appetite, and this person already ate only a little yesterday.*  
 Luno, o-mu-lwaale a-(#bu)-l-ile-kho **bu-suma**.  
 today 1-1-sick.person 1SM-14OM-eat-PFV-KHO 14-ugali  
 ‘Today, the sick person ate ugali (a little).’ (unacceptable without verum)  
 (Sikuku and Diercks, 2023, 271)
- b. *Context: Wafula has been throwing out the ugali almost every day because his friends are not eating it.*  
 Wafula a-(#bu)-mwat-a **bu-suma** luundi.  
 1Wafula 1SM-14OM-throw.out-FV 14-ugali again  
 ‘Wafula threw out the ugali again.’ (unacceptable without verum)  
 (Sikuku and Diercks, 2023, 272)

Mirative emphasis can fall on a particular constituent within the verb phrase, communicating that it is less likely than some alternative.<sup>9</sup>

- (38) *Context: The beans were very tough and dry and were clearly going to require a lot of cooking to be edible.*  
 A: W-a-teekh-a ka-ma-kanda o-rieena?  
 2SG.SM-PST-cook-FV 6-6-beans 2sg-how  
 ‘How did you cook the beans?’
- B: N-a-ka-teekh-a **ka-ma-kanda** bwaangu.  
 1SG.SM-PST-6OM-cook-FV 6-6-beans quickly  
 ‘I cooked the beans QUICKLY.’ (Sikuku and Diercks, 2023, 292)

Mirative emphasis can also fall on the whole sentence, if the proposition is surprising in its entirety. A mirative reading was available for (39) in March 2020, at the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic. Notably, (39) is a much less felicitous sentence presently.

- (39) Coronavirus e-li khe-e-**ba**-tiil-a **ba-andu** na **ba-andu**.  
 9coronavirus 9-be PROG-9SM-2OM-catch-FV 2-person CONJ 2-person  
 ‘Coronavirus is infecting all sorts of people!’ (Sikuku and Diercks, 2023, 302)

As discussed in §2, mirative meanings sometimes overlap with reprimand meanings, and this appears to be the case in Lubukusu.<sup>10</sup> For example, OM-doubling is acceptable in (40), where the proposition may be unexpected from the addressee’s perspective, but from the speaker’s perspective, it is the most likely of the potential alternatives. The speaker may still be surprised, however—about the fact that they have been asked an obvious question.

- (40) *Context: I come home and see dinner on the table. I ask, “Where did Wekesa cook the beans?” Address can respond:*  
 Wekesa a-a-**ka**-tekh-el-a **ka-ma-kanda** mu-chikoni.  
 1Wekesa 1SM-PST-6OM-cook-APPL-FV 6-6-beans 18-kitchen  
 ‘Obviously, Wekesa cooked the beans IN THE KITCHEN.’

<sup>9</sup> An anonymous reviewer raised the question of whether mirativity and emphasis are distinct categories, i.e., if non-emphatic mirativity exists. In this paper we used the term ‘emphasis’ to take a neutral position on what precise type of meaning interpretations of OM-doubling are best categorized as, but this will be an important question in future work.

<sup>10</sup> For a brief discussion of why we approach reprimands as a subtype of mirativity, see §10.3. Additionally, an anonymous reviewer pointed out that the mirative emphasis we discuss may be linked to evidentiality, i.e., source of knowledge. On the connection between mirativity and evidentiality, see Rett and Murray (2013); DeLancey (2001); Peterson (2010).

**5.2. Mirative interpretations in Cinyungwe.** OM-doubling in Cinyungwe can be used to convey that a situation is significant or surprising, i.e., that there is something ‘more’ going on than was originally stated. In (41B) below, this interpretation persists even without the modifier *mazinji* ‘many’.

- (41) A: Siriza a-da-dy-a ma-figu. Cinyungwe  
 1Siriza 1SG-PERF-eat-FV 6-bananas  
 ‘Siriza ate bananas.’
- B: Inde, tsono Siriza a-da-**ma**-dy-a **ma-figu** (**ma-zinji**).  
 yes but 1Siriza 1SG-PERF-6OM-eat-FV 6-bananas 6-many  
 ‘Yes, but Siriza ate MANY bananas.’

However, when an event is no longer noteworthy or unexpected, OM-doubling is unacceptable without a verum interpretation.

- (42) *Context: Every time Siriza visits her grandmother, she eats many, many bananas, and always gets a stomachache from eating so much. The most recent time this happened, someone said:*  
 Tani mu-n’dziw-a kale Siriza a-da-(#**ma**-)dy-a pomwe **ma-figu ma-zinji**.  
 as you-know-FV already 1Siriza 1SG-PERF-6OM-eat-FV again 6-bananas 6-many  
 ‘As you already know, Siriza ate many bananas again.’ (OM-doubling unacceptable without verum)

As in Lubukusu, mirative emphasis in Cinyungwe can fall on a particular constituent within the verb phrase. For example, in most contexts with new information focus, non-doubling constructions are most natural. However, if the context makes the new information surprising or noteworthy as in (43), OM-doubling becomes natural.

- (43) *Context: The beans typically take a long time to cook, so it is surprising if they were cooked quickly.*  
 A: W-a-phik-a tani ci-mbamba?  
 2SG-PERF-cook-FV how 7-beans  
 ‘How did you cook the beans?’
- B: Nd-a-**ci**-phik-a **ci-mbamba** mwakankulumize.  
 1SG-PERF-7OM-cook-FV 7-beans quickly  
 ‘I really cooked the beans QUICKLY.’

Mirative emphasis can also fall on an entire sentence, resulting in an interpretation that the whole event is unexpected.

- (44) *Context: A young man has married an older woman and brought her to see his family. His family is shocked and asks the young man the following question in front of his new wife.*  
 Lwepo u-da-**mu**-lowol-a **n-kazi** umweyi? Cinyungwe  
 you 2SG-PST-1OM-marry-FV 1-woman already  
 ‘You already married this woman?’

Unlike in Lubukusu, mirative interpretations in Cinyungwe do not appear to include reprimand readings in addition to surprise readings. OM-doubling cannot be used to convey that information is obvious or to express a speaker’s surprise at someone else’s doubt or lack of knowledge, at least not in a context where a verum reading is unavailable. For example, in the reprimand context provided for (45), an OM-doubling sentence is unacceptable, whereas a non-doubling sentence is natural.

- (45) *Context: I come home and there is dinner on the table. I ask, “Where did father cook the beans?”*
- a. ?? Baba a-da-**ci**-phik-a                      **ci-mbamba** mu-nkozinya.                      **Cinyungwe**  
 Ifather 1SM-PST-7OM-cook-FV 7-beans 18-kitchen  
 Attempted: ‘(Obviously,) father cooked the beans in the kitchen.’  
 (unacceptable without verum/mirativity)
- b. Baba a-da-ci-phik-a                      mu-nkozinya.  
 Ifather 1SM-PST-7OM-cook-FV 18-kitchen  
 ‘Father cooked them in the kitchen.’  
 Interpretation: Why are you asking that? We all know we have a kitchen where the beans are cooked.

## 6. Exhaustive interpretations of Bantu object marking

Exhaustivity emphasizes that among a set of possible elements, only one is relevant, and is therefore often translated as ‘only’ in English (É. Kiss, 2009). Cruschina (2021) includes exhaustivity as one of the conventional implicatures associated with focus fronting in Indo-European languages (along with mirativity and others). In Lubukusu and Cinyungwe, exhaustivity is sometimes compatible with OM-doubling constructions with a mirative or verum interpretation. However, to the best of our knowledge, these interpretations do not arise independently from other types of emphasis.

**6.1. Exhaustive interpretations in Lubukusu.** Exhaustive interpretations do not appear to independently arise from OM-doubling in Lubukusu. They can, however, appear as part of a mirative interpretation, i.e., if an exhaustive reading would be surprising or noteworthy. For example, (46) below has several possible emphatic interpretations that can include exhaustivity, but an exhaustive interpretation cannot arise independently of a mirative interpretation.

- (46) Ba-ba-ana                      ba-**ba**-kul-il-a                      **ba-b-ebusi**                      chi-ngubo.                      **Lubukusu**  
 2-2-children                      2SM-2OM-buy-APPL-FV                      2-2-parents                      10-clothes  
 ‘The children bought the parents clothes.’  
 Available interpretations:
- OK: The children have never done this before. (mirative, not exhaustive)
  - OK: The children are so selfish that they only consider their parents and not other people. (mirative and exhaustive)
  - # statement of fact that clothes were purchased for only the parents (exhaustive, not mirative)

**6.2 Exhaustive interpretations in Cinyungwe.** Similar to Lubukusu, exhaustive interpretations of OM-doubling in Cinyungwe require particular pragmatic contexts, suggesting that they may arise alongside a verum or mirative interpretation. In contrast to Lubukusu, we have only encountered these apparent exhaustive interpretations in a particular configuration of benefactive applicatives. In a benefactive applicative, OM-doubling the theme (the structurally lower object) places exhaustive emphasis on the recipient, as in (47) below.

- (47) Kapenu                      a-ndza-**wu**-gas-ir-a                      a-kazi                      **moto.**                      **Cinyungwe**  
 1Kapenu 1SM-FUT-3OM-start.fire-APPL-FV                      2-women                      3fire  
 ‘Kapenu will start fire FOR THE WOMEN ONLY’ (i.e., not for anyone else).  
 Available interpretations:
- OK: Someone denied that Kapenu will start a fire or claimed that Kapenu would start a fire for his (male) friend. The speaker knows that, since the women do not have dry wood in their house, Kapenu will help them. But he will start a fire for the women only, not for anyone else.
  - # statement of fact that fire will be started only for the women
  - # out of the blue
  - # in response to “What will Kapenu do today?”

Verum interpretations can complicate diagnostics for exhaustivity. This is because many diagnostics for exhaustivity involve continuations that are ruled out by exhaustive readings—but verum sentences are moves by the speaker to end discussion, so adding continuations sounds infelicitous regardless.<sup>11</sup> That said, as far as we can tell, exhaustive readings of OM-doubling only appear in the configuration noted in (47). At the time of writing, it is still unclear to us why exhaustive interpretations of OM-doubling (in addition to being unavailable out of the blue) are limited to this very particular syntactic context in Cinyungwe.

## 7. Intensity interpretations of Bantu object marking

Recently, we have observed a fourth distinct emphatic interpretation of OM-doubling: intensity, or emphasis that an amount is very large. This meaning is similar to ‘a lot’ or ‘many’ in English.

**7.1. Intensity interpretations in Lubukusu.** In addition to verum and mirative interpretations, OM-doubling in Lubukusu can be used to emphasize a large amount. For example, (48) below has a range of possible interpretations, which largely depend on the context in which it is uttered. Our focus here is on the final interpretation, intensity. This reading does not need to be contrary to expectation (as with mirative emphasis) or a confirmation of the event as a whole (verum). It simply emphasizes the amount of beer Wekesa drank.

(48) Wekesa a-ka-nywa kamalwa. Lubukusu  
 1Wekesa 1SM.PST-6OM-drink 6beer  
 ‘Wekesa drank beer.’

Available interpretations:

- The sentence is an emphatic confirmation of the act. (verum)
- It is a well-known fact that Wekesa does not drink, so seeing him drink is surprising. (mirative surprise)
- It is a well-known fact that Wekesa is a drunkard, so any doubt is met with this sentence. (mirative reprimand)
- The sentence expresses the sheer amount of alcohol consumed. (intensity)

It is reasonable to ask if the intensity reading is an independent interpretation or if it depends on an additional layer of meaning, such as an emotive or judgmental interpretation, which would be readily accessible in the context of someone drinking a great deal of alcohol. This does not appear to be the case, based on the possibility of an intensity reading of (49) below.

(49) Context: *The speaker and addressee both know the amount of rice Maisha can consume if left unchecked.*  
 Maisha a-ku-lya ku-mu-chele. Lubukusu  
 1Maisha 1SM.PST-3OM-eat 3-3-rice  
 ‘Maisha ate (a lot of) rice.’

**7.2. Intensity interpretations in Cinyungwe.** Intensity interpretations of OM-doubling are also available in Cinyungwe. In an appropriate context, the OM-doubling sentence in (50) can receive an intensity reading.

(50) Context: *Semo, who is not walking well, arrives home with his friend. Someone asks what happened, and Semo’s friend responds:*  
 Semo a-da-li-mw-a bwadwa. Cinyungwe  
 Semo 1SM.PST.PERF-5OM-drink-FV 5.beer  
 ‘Semo drank (an extraordinary amount of) beer.’

However, it is unclear if intensity readings can arise completely independently of other emphatic interpretations, as appears to be possible in Lubukusu. In a sentence with the object *madzi* ‘water’ instead of *bwadwa* ‘beer,’ a more extensive pragmatic context is required for the intensity reading to arise. This may indicate that the intensity reading in Cinyungwe requires an extra layer of emotive content which is inherent when discussing beer but not when discussing water.

<sup>11</sup> For examples of exhaustivity diagnostics, see §9.



- (51) *Context: Semo and his friend walked a long way to visit his grandmother. Along the way, they saw streams that they knew were unsafe to drink from. However, Semo was so thirsty that he drank from the stream anyway. Upon arriving, Semo feels sick, and his friend says the following sentence:*

Semo            a-da-**ma**-mw-a                            **madzi.**                            **Cinyungwe**  
 1Semo            1SM-PST.PERF-6OM-drink-FV            6.water  
 ‘Semo drank (a lot of) water.’ (i.e., I am impressed by the amount of water he was drinking)

Similarly, in (52), an intensity interpretation is only available alongside a mirative interpretation, in contrast to the Lubukusu example in (49).

- (52) Siriza            a- da-**wu**-dy-a                            **m-punga.**                            **Cinyungwe**  
 1Siriza            1SM-PST.PERF-3OM-eat-FV            3-rice  
 Approximately: ‘Siriza ate rice.’  
 Available interpretations:
- OK: Siriza’s parents return home from a party to find Siriza asleep with a very big stomach and realize that she ate too much. (mirative, intensity)
  - #: Siriza’s parents know that she can eat a lot of rice if given the opportunity. (intensity)

## 8. Initial evidence from additional languages

This section presents initial evidence of emphatic interpretations of OM-doubling from five additional languages: Tiriki, Wanga, Ikalanga, Rukiga, and Zulu. For Lubukusu and Cinyungwe, although research is still ongoing and our syntactic and semantic analyses are not fully developed, we have a relatively clear sense of the different emphatic interpretations that arise from different syntactic configurations. For the languages in this section, the interpretations and corresponding configurations are much less clear, but some of this research is underway (e.g., Letsholo et al., to appear).<sup>12</sup>

**8.1. Tiriki.** Tiriki (JE413) is a Bantu language spoken in western Kenya and eastern Uganda. OM-doubling in Tiriki is only acceptable in neutral discourse contexts if the doubled object appears after a prosodic break, as shown in (53). The doubled object then receives an afterthought reading. However, other specific contexts can facilitate OM-doubling without this prosodic break.

- (53) A-**mu**-lol-i                            ??(,)                            **Ø-raisi .**                            **Tiriki**  
 1SM-1OM-see-FV.PST                            1-president  
 ‘He saw him, the president.’ (Liu, 2019a, 2)

OM-doubling in Tiriki can be used to address listener doubt, a verum context. In (54A1), the OM-doubling version of the sentence is unacceptable, as previously shown in (53). However, in (54A2), after the addressee has questioned whether the event happened, OM-doubling without a prosodic break becomes acceptable.

- (54) Q1: Shina    shi-kholekh-ang-a?                            **Tiriki**  
                           what    7SM-happen-PROG-FV  
                           ‘What’s happening?’

<sup>12</sup> The languages included in this section were selected based on the authors’ own work or familiarity with other scholars’ work. That is, this section should not be viewed as an exhaustive list of Bantu languages with emphatic interpretations of object marking. The subsections on Tiriki, Wanga, and Ikalanga are based on work by the last four authors, as well as by Jackson Kuzmik. We thank Allen Asiimwe for contributing the Rukiga data. The subsection on Zulu is based on a pattern reported in Zeller (2015).

A1: A-(??**mu**-)lol-i      **Ø-raisi**.  
 ISM-1OM-see-FV.PST 1-president  
 ‘He saw the president.’

Q2: Toto?  
 really  
 ‘Really?’

A2: A-**mu**-lol-i      **Ø-raisi**.  
 ISM-1OM-see-FV.PST 1-president  
 ‘He DID see the president!’ (Liu, 2019a, 9)

OM-doubling can also be used to emphasize that information is surprising or noteworthy, according to Liu (2022). For example, in (55), the context makes the fact that Alulu ate ugali surprising.

(55) *Context: Alulu has been sick and therefore hasn’t been eating anything. Today, Ebby reported with excitement:*  
 Alulu      a-**vu**-lil-e                              **vu-shuma!**                              **Tiriki**  
 Alulu      ISM-14OM-eat-FV.PST              14-ugali  
 ‘Alulu ate ugali!’

Additionally, while (55) appears to be an example of emphasis on the vP or sentence as a whole, mirative emphasis can also fall on a smaller constituent, such as the manner adverbial in (56).<sup>13</sup>

(56) *Context: Michael is germophobic. But today, when Ebby put away his dishes after he finished eating ugali for dinner, she didn’t see any used utensils. Seeing the confusion on her face, Vusu commented:*  
 Mikayili      a-**vu**-lachil-e                              **vu-shuma** na      mi-khono!                              **Tiriki**  
 Michael      ISM-14OM-eat-FV.PST              14-ugali      with      6-hand  
 ‘Michael ate ugali with hands!’

OM-doubling in Tiriki can also be used (in non-mirative, non-verum contexts) to place a distinct type of emphasis on the OM-doubled object, as in (57), or the entire vP, as in (58). Liu (2019b) identifies this emphasis as contrastive focus, often marked with the word ‘only’.

(57) Ebby      a-**vi**-tekh-i                              **vy-apati** **vy-onyene** (vu-shuma      taawe ).                              **Tiriki**  
 Ebby      ISM-8OM-cook-FV.PST              8-chapati 8-only      14-ugali      NEG  
 ‘Ebby cooked only CHAPATIS (not ugali).’ (Liu, 2019b, 13)

(58) Ebby      a-**vi**-tekh-i                              **vy-apati**      **vutsa** a-rikh-its-e                              tsi-ngookho      taawe.  
 Ebby      ISM-8OM-cook-FV.PST              8-chapati      only      ISM-eat-CAUS-FV.PST 10-chicken      NEG  
 ‘Ebby only COOKED CHAPATIS; she didn’t feed the chickens.’ (Liu, 2019b, 13)

This use of OM-doubling is also possible without the word ‘only’ if the context makes the emphatic interpretation of the OM-doubled object exhaustive. Without this context, OM-doubling in the answer in (59) is unacceptable. Tentatively and based on this data, contrastive focus as defined by Liu (2019b) and exhaustive focus as defined by Cruschina (2021) could be the same type of emphasis.

<sup>13</sup> A reviewer asks a good question, specifically, how verb-focus (to the exclusion of other constituents) occurs for examples like this. That is an area for future investigation, though an interesting observation is that these interpretations are frequently achieved via predicate clefting constructions in related languages. Notably, recent work has shown that predicate fronting shares a very similar range of emphatic interpretations to those documented here for OM-doubling (Lusekelo et al., 2023).

- (59) Q: Vusu a-lil-e shina? Tiriki  
 Vusu 1SM-EAT-FV.PST what  
 ‘What did Vusu eat?’
- A: Vusu a-**vu**-lil-e **vu-shuma**.  
 Vusu 1SM-14OM-eat-FV.PST 14-ugali  
 ‘Vusu ate only ugali.’ (only acceptable if Vusu ate only ugali, not anything else)

**8.2. Wanga.** Wanga (E32a) is a Bantu language spoken in Kenya. OM-doubling sentences in Wanga, as in the languages previously discussed, have different emphatic interpretations from non-doubling sentences. (60a) below has a neutral interpretation and is acceptable out of the blue, whereas (60b) is infelicitous out of the blue.

- (60) a. A-ba-na ba-tesh-ere o-mu-chele mungolobe. Wanga  
 2-2-children 2SM-cook-PFV 3-3-rice yesterday  
 ‘The children cooked rice yesterday.’
- b. #A-ba-na ba-**ku**-tesh-ere **o-mu-chele** mungolobe.  
 2-2-children 2SM-3OM-cook-PFV 3-3-rice yesterday  
 ‘The children cooked rice yesterday.’ (OM-doubling infelicitous out of the blue)

With appropriate pragmatic contexts, the available interpretations of an OM-doubling sentence such as (61), repeated from (60b) above, include both verum and exhaustive readings. This sentence can be used in an argument (a verum context), in response to listener denial. It can also be used to express that the cooked food was only rice (an exhaustive context). In both cases, the emphatic interpretation falls on the OM-doubled object itself.

- (61) A-ba-na ba-**ku**-tesh-ere o-mu-chele mungolobe Wanga  
 2-2-children 2SM-3OM-cook-PFV 3-3-rice yesterday  
 ‘The children cooked the rice yesterday.’  
 Available interpretations:
- Another speaker claimed that it was not rice that the children cooked. (verum)
  - The children only cooked rice, not something else. (exhaustive)

If the same OM-doubling sentence is used in response to a temporal question, as in (62) below, an exhaustive interpretation is still available. However, in this context, mirative interpretations are also available. The mirative emphasis can fall on the temporal adverb or on the verb phrase in general. (62A) can be used to express surprise that the children cooked the rice yesterday in particular (rather than another day) or that they cooked the rice at all.

- (62) Q: A-ba-na ba-tesh-ere o-mu-chele liina? Wanga  
 2-2-children 2SM-cook-PFV 3-3-rice when  
 ‘When did the children cook the rice?’
- A: A-ba-na ba-**ku**-tesh-ere **o-mu-chele** mungolobe.  
 2-2-children 2SM-3OM-cook-PFV 3-3-rice yesterday  
 ‘The children cooked the rice yesterday.’  
 Available interpretations:
- The children were busy yesterday and were not expected to finish their chores.
  - The children are very young (and therefore unlikely to cook rice).

**8.3. Ikalanga.** Ikalanga (S16) is a Bantu language spoken in Zimbabwe and Botswana. OM-doubling is possible in Ikalanga, provided that (a) there is an appropriate pragmatic context and (b) the OM-doubled object is moved outside vP. This object dislocation is indicated by a prosodic break. An example of OM-doubling in Ikalanga is shown in (63b). In response to the

question in (63), two possible responses are a non-doubling construction without object movement (63a) or an OM-doubling construction with object movement (63b). (For details about the interpretation of (63b), see §8.3.)

- (63) W-aka-bon-a bana ibabaje be ikwele tshipi ya-ka pinda? **Ikalanga**  
 ISM-PST-see-FV 2.child 2.DEM 2.ASSOC 7.school week last  
 ‘Did you see those students last week?’
- a. A, nd-aka-bon-a bana ibabaje madekwe.  
 no 1SM.SG-PST-see-FV 2.children 2.DEM yesterday  
 ‘No, I saw those children yesterday.’
- b. A, nd-aka-**ba**-bon-a madekwe, **bana ibabaje**.  
 no 1SM.SG-PST-2OM-see-FV yesterday 2.children 2.DEM  
 ‘No, I saw those children YESTERDAY.’ (Letsholo et al., to appear)

OM-doubling in Ikalanga can be used to address listener denial or doubt but is infelicitous out of the blue, consistent with verum interpretations.

- (64) a. Nchidzi didn’t drink the beer.  
 b. Did Nchidzi really drink the beer?

- (65) Nchidzi w-a-**gu**-ngw-a, **busukwa**. **Ikalanga**  
 Nchidzi 1SM-PST-14OM-drink-FV 14.beer  
 ‘Nchidzi did drink it, the beer.’
- Out of the blue: #
  - In response to (64a): ✓
  - In response to (64b): ✓ (Letsholo et al., to appear)

A mirative interpretation of OM-doubling is also available in Ikalanga. (66) can be used to express surprise that the children ate the beans slowly rather than quickly. More research is needed to determine if the mirative emphasis is falling on a particular constituent (like the manner adverb) or the entire verb phrase.

- (66) *Context: The children love beans, and every time they are served beans, they eat them incredibly quickly because they like them so much. They are always gone within minutes. This time, however, when they sit down to eat, they eat the beans very slowly, which is very unusual for them. In response, someone could say:*
- Bana b-aka-**dzi**-j-a **nyemba** ngebunya.  
 2children 2SM-PST-10OM-eat-FV 10.beans slowly  
 ‘The children ate the beans slowly!’ (Letsholo et al., to appear)

Exhaustive focus on a temporal adverb can facilitate OM-doubling in Ikalanga, as shown in (67). However, we have not yet determined if exhaustive readings are available without the word *koga* ‘only’.

- (67) Nd-aka-**ba**-bon-a madekwe koga, **bana ibabaje**. **Ikalanga**  
 1SM.SG-PST-2OM-see-FV yesterday only 2.child 2.those  
 ‘I saw those children ONLY YESTERDAY.’ (i.e., not any other day) (Letsholo et al., to appear)

Corrective focus on a temporal adverb can also facilitate OM-doubling in Ikalanga, as shown in (68), which is partially repeated from (63).

- (68) Q: W-aka-bon-a bana ibabaje be ikwele tshipi ya-ka pinda? **Ikalanga**  
 SM1-PST-see-FV 2.child 2.DEM 2.ASSOC 7.school week last  
 ‘Did you see those students last week?’

A: A, nd-aka-**ba**-bon-a            madekwe , **bana**    **ibabaje**.  
 no ISM.SG-PST-2OM-see-FV yesterday 2.children 2.dem  
 ‘No, I saw those children YESTERDAY.’ (Letsholo et al., to appear)

**8.4. Rukiga.** In Rukiga (JE14), which is spoken in Uganda, OM-doubling appears to be linked to mirative and verum interpretations, as shown below in (69).

- (69) Mbiine            y-aa-**ka**-teer-a                            **a-ka-ruuru**.                            **Rukiga**  
 1.Mbiine            1SG.SM-N.PST-12OM-vote-FV            AUG-12-vote  
 ‘Mbiine voted.’ (Allen Asiimwe, personal communication)  
 Available interpretations:  
 • It is true, Mbiine voted.  
 • Surprisingly, Mbiine voted. (He had vowed not to vote.)

Additionally, OM-doubling in Rukiga can appear in a sentence with the particle *-o*, a mirative marker. (70) is an OM-doubling sentence with this particle, and a range of emphatic interpretations are available. (The intonation may vary depending on the interpretation.)

- (70) Taata            yaa-**bi**-teek-a                            **e-bi-himba**                            **by-o!**                            **Rukiga**  
 1.Father            1SG.SM-8OM-cook-FV AUG-8-bean                            8-MIR  
 ‘Father cooked the beans.’ (Allen Asiimwe, personal communication)  
 Available interpretations:  
 • Father was not expected to cook the beans.  
 • Indeed, father cooked the beans.  
 • The beans were not properly cooked (ironically disapproving or even disappointed in the manner in which the beans were cooked).

**8.5. Zulu.** Zulu (S42) is one of the better-researched Bantu languages with regard to object marking (Adams, 2010; Buell, 2005, 2006; Cheng and Downing, 2009; Halpert, 2012; Van der Spuy, 1993; Zeller, 2012, 2014, 2015). In general, however, there has not been extensive discussion in the literature with regard to the types of emphasis we discuss in this paper. One exception is double right dislocation constructions, which are instances of both objects in a ditransitive moving outside vP. The objects can appear in either order, and the recipient is OM-doubled. Zeller (2015) reports that these constructions have verum-like interpretations. This is in contrast to other OM-doubling constructions, for which similar emphatic interpretations are not reported. (71) is an example of a double right dislocation construction. Note that both sentences in (71) include disjoint verb forms, which, as mentioned in §3.1, are required in OM-doubling constructions in Zulu, and both sentences have a verum-like interpretation.

- (71) a. Ngi-ya-**m**-theng-el-a                            **u-Sipho**                            u-bisi.                            **Zulu**  
 1SM-DJ-1.OM-buy-APPL-FV AUG-1a.Sipho AUG-11.milk  
 ‘I AM buying milk for Sipho.’  
 b. Ngi-ya-**m**-theng-el-a                            u-bisi                            **u-Sipho**.  
 1SM-DJ-1.OM-buy-APPL-FV AUG-11.milk AUG-1a.Sipho  
 ‘I AM buying milk for Sipho.’ (Zeller, 2015, 23)

That said, apart from verum, Zulu appears to lack the range of other emphatic readings in OM-doubling constructions that appear in the other languages documented here (Jochen Zeller, pc). Given the range of patterns documented here, however, it will be worth investigating this further in Zulu.

For the languages in this section, we do not yet have evidence for or against all the emphatic interpretations described for Lubukusu and Cinyungwe. However, these initial similarities and differences are promising areas for future research, and they are suggestive that emphatic readings in this cluster of interpretations are a common property of OM-doubling constructions.

## 9. Diagnosing emphatic interpretations

In this section, we offer several diagnostics to aid in identifying certain emphatic interpretations we discuss in this paper. Additionally, in our ongoing work we are attempting to analyze OM-doubling constructions and their emphatic interpretations more formally, potentially as conventional implicatures. Therefore, we also include two important conventional implicature diagnostics in this section.

**9.1. Identifying exhaustivity.** There are a variety of diagnostics to distinguish exhaustivity from other types of emphasis, and we include two here. These examples come from Hartmann and Zimmermann (2007), who analyze the Hausa particle *nee/cee* as an exhaustivity marker. The first diagnostic, shown in (72), is the addition of an *also*-phrase. In Hausa, this addition is infelicitous if *nee/cee* follows a focused constituent in the sentence, because the focused constituent is interpreted exhaustively.

(72) also-phrase exhaustivity diagnostic

A: Wàa ya daawoo dàgà Kano? Hausa  
 who SG.REL.PERF return from Kano  
 ‘Who returned from Kano?’

B: #Musa nèe ya daawoo dàgà Kano dà kuma Hàliimà cee ya daawoo dàgà Kano.  
 Musa EXH 3SG.REL.PERF return from Kano and also Halima EXH 3SG.REL.PERF return from Kano  
 ‘MUSA returned from Kano and HALIMA, too, returned from Kano.’  
 (Hartmann and Zimmermann, 2007, 252)

The second diagnostic is a mention-some environment. As (73) shows, *nee/cee* cannot follow the focused constituent in (73B) because the context has already established that multiple people passed the exam, not just Umaru.

(73) mention-some exhaustivity diagnostic

*Context: Speaker A knows that many students passed last year’s exam, but not which ones.*

A: Kaa san wad’andà sukà ci jaññàbâwaa? Hausa  
 you know who.PL 3PL.REL.PERF eat exam  
 ‘Do you know who passed the exam?’

B: Î, dàgà ciki Ùmarù #nee / maa ya ci jaññàbâwaa.  
 yes from among Umaru EXH also 3PL.REL.PERF eat exam  
 ‘Yes, among them UMARU passed the exam.’ (Hartmann and Zimmermann, 2007, 253)

**9.2. Identifying mirativity.** Mirative meanings can be identified by setting up pragmatic contexts in which the information in a sentence will be unexpected, surprising, significant, or otherwise noteworthy to the addressee. Since this interpretation arises from the comparison of the uttered proposition with less likely one(s), one way of visualizing mirativity is to rank the alternatives based on their expectedness. A ranking of alternative propositions for the situation in (74) is shown in (75). The alternatives must have the same background content (i.e., Gabriel and Mary went somewhere on their honeymoon) but different focused information (i.e., where they went); this focus-background structure is shown in (76).

(74) ¿Sabes qué?! ¡A las Maldivas fueron de luna de miel! Spanish  
 know.PRS.2SG what to the Maldives go.PST.3PL of moon of honey  
 ‘Guess what?! TO THE MALDIVES they went on honeymoon!’ (Cruschina, 2019a, 138)

- (75) [ $\lambda x$ . went (gabriel, mary, x)]  
 $p_1$ Fueron a Madrid de luna de miel  
 $p_2$ Fueron a Roma de luna de miel  
 $p_3$ Fueron a París de luna de miel  
 $p_4$ Fueron a las Maldivas de luna de miel  
 ...  
 $p_n$ Fueron al Polo Norte de luna de miel  
 | - - - focus - - - |  
 (Cruschina, 2019a, 140)
- (76) ¡A las Maldivas fueron de luna de miel!  
 | - - - focus - - - | | - - - background - - - |  
 (Cruschina, 2019a, 140)

There are two additional points to note here. First, it is not necessary for the miratively focused constituent to be the least likely in the set, simply for it to be less likely than at least one alternative. Second, according to Cruschina (2019a), these alternatives refer to the speaker and addressee's knowledge; therefore, they are highly context-dependent and even person-dependent, and they do not need to be stated explicitly in the conversation.

We include additional diagnostics for mirativity identified by Cruschina (2019a) in §9.3 rather than here, because these diagnostics are also tests for conventional implicatures.

**9.3. Identifying conventional implicatures.** In ongoing work, we are investigating whether the emphatic readings facilitated by OM-doubling in Bantu languages are introduced through conventional implicatures. Unlike conversational implicatures, conventional implicatures are entailed (semantic), not context-dependent (pragmatic) meanings (Potts, 2005). This means that a speaker is committed to a conventional implicature and cannot deny it. Therefore, speaker non-deniability can be used as a diagnostic for conventional implicatures—but this can also be said of other entailed meanings (i.e., at-issue entailments and conventional presuppositions).

To illustrate this property, consider (77) and (78) below. In (77), the speaker's use of the word *damn* creates a conventional implicature about their negative attitude toward the at-issue content of their utterance. It would be infelicitous (and contradictory) for the speaker to attempt to deny this implicated meaning. By contrast, in (78), the speaker can felicitously deny the conversational implicature that arises from their utterance.

- (77) a. The damn cat went out in the rain. **English**  
*conventional implicature: The speaker feels negatively about the cat or the situation (the fact that it went out in the rain).*  
 b. #The damn cat went out in the rain, but I have no problem with that.
- (78) a. Mike has three tasks he forgot about.  
*conversational implicature: He has exactly three, not more.*  
 b. Mike has three tasks he forgot about ... hey, let's be honest, he has at least ten!  
 (adapted from Potts 2005)

Another important property of conventional implicatures is multidimensionality. A conventional implicature occupies a different dimension of meaning from at-issue meaning. It can therefore be challenged by an addressee separately from the at-issue meaning. (Often, however, addressing the conventional implicature dimension is more complicated than addressing the at-issue dimension.) A conventional implicature can also be infelicitously used without making the entire sentence (including the at-issue meaning) false. This is, naturally, not true of at-issue entailments, nor is it true of conventional presuppositions.

For example, in (79), if Speaker B denies A's statement with simple negation, as in (79B1), this is interpreted as negating the at-issue content of (79A), not the conventional implicature. However, Speaker B can challenge the conventional implicature independently, even while agreeing with the at-issue meaning, as (79B2) shows.

(79) A: The damn cat went out in the rain. **English**  
*conventional implicature: The speaker feels negatively about the cat or the situation (the fact that it went out in the rain).*

B1: No, that's not true!

- ✓ It's not true that the cat went out in the rain.
- #It's not true that you feel negatively about that.

B2: Yes, but don't pretend to be annoyed, I know you think it's funny when she does that.

For comparison, consider the at-issue entailment in (80). Speaker B's response can be interpreted as challenging the at-issue entailment as well as the proposition in its original form. Multidimensionality does not arise from sentences with only at-issue content.

(80) A: I broke your teapot. **English**  
*at-issue entailment: Your teapot broke.*

B: No, that's not true!

- ✓ It's not true that you broke my teapot. (e.g., 'That's not true, Miles broke it.')
- ✓ It's not true that my teapot broke. (e.g., 'That's not true, I just used it and it was fine.')

(adapted from Kroeger 2019)

In the remainder of this subsection, we apply non-deniability and multidimensionality diagnostics to OM-doubling constructions with verum and mirative interpretations in Lubukusu and Cinyungwe.

In Lubukusu, if an addressee challenges a sentence that includes a verum interpretation, this challenge is interpreted as applying to the at-issue meaning, not the emphatic meaning. This is illustrated by (81), where the verum interpretation is left unchallenged, suggesting it occupies a different dimension of meaning from the proposition that Wekesa read the book.

(81) A: Wéékésá k-á-si-sóm-a **sii-taβu!** **Lubukusu**  
 1Wekesa 1SM-REM.PST-7OM-read-FV 7.7-book  
 (In an appropriate context) 'Wekesa DID read the book!'

B: Se-βú-lí βúú-ŋálí tá!  
 NEG-14SM-be 14.14-truth NEG  
 'That's not true!' (Sikuku et al., 2018, 391)

- ✓ It's not true that Wekesa read the book.
- # It's not true that you are certain of that.

The same pattern appears in Cinyungwe; in (82), the second speaker's accusation is interpreted as applying only to the at-issue content of the first speaker's utterance, not the emphatic verum meaning.

(82) A: Baba a-da-ci-phik-a **ci-mbamba.** **Cinyungwe**  
 1father 1SM-PST-7OM-cook-FV 7-beans  
 (In an appropriate context) 'Father really/certainly cooked the beans.'

B: U-ku-nam-a!  
 2SG-PRS-lie-FV  
 'You're lying!'

- ✓ You're lying about Father cooking the beans.
- # You're lying about being certain of that.

Cruschina (2019a) uses non-deniability and multidimensionality to identify mirative interpretations of focus fronting in Spanish. (83a), for example, in addition to communicating the fact that the couple went to the Maldives on their honeymoon,



conveys the speaker's surprise about the honeymoon location. Therefore, the speaker cannot felicitously continue with (83b) or (83c), because these continuations contradict their surprise.

(83) non-deniability mirative diagnostic

- a. ¿Sabes qué?! ¡A las Maldivas fueron de luna de miel! **Spanish**  
 know.PRS.2SG what to the Maldives go.PST.3PL of moon of honey  
 'Guess what?! To the Maldives they went on honeymoon!'
- b. #pero no es nada extraño...  
 but not be.PRS.3SG nothing strange  
 'but that's not strange...'
- c. #pero eso no me sorprende...  
 but that not me.CL surprise.PRS.3SG  
 'but that doesn't surprise me...' (Cruschina, 2019a, 138)

However, an addressee can challenge the mirative meaning independently from the at-issue meaning, as shown in (84). A second speaker can reply with (84B) to challenge the at-issue content of (84A) or with (84C) to directly challenge its mirative content instead.

(84) multidimensionality mirative diagnostic

- A: ¿Sabes qué?! ¡A las Maldivas fueron de luna de miel! **Spanish**  
 know.PRS.2SG what to the Maldives go.PST.3PL of moon of honey  
 'Guess what?! To the Maldives they went on honeymoon!'
- B: ¡Te equivocas! ¡No es verdad!  
 REFL be-wrong.PRS.2SG not be.PRS.3SG truth  
 'You're wrong! That's not true!'
- C: ¡No es nada extraño!  
 not be.PRS.3SG nothing strange  
 'There's nothing strange about it!' (Cruschina, 2019a, 138)

Each of these tests can be applied to Lubukusu and Cinyungwe. In Lubukusu, the mirative aspect of a sentence's meaning cannot be denied by the speaker; the speaker is committed to the mirative content. The first part of (85) below conveys that it is particularly significant that the event happened yesterday, perhaps because the children waited a long time for it. Therefore, the continuations in (85a) and (85b) are infelicitous.

- (85) Ba-ba-ana b-a-**mu**-bon-a o-**mwa-limu** likolooba ... **Lubukusu**  
 2-2-children 2SM-PST-1OM-see-FV 1-1-teacher yesterday  
 'The children saw the teacher YESTERDAY.' (Finally! They had been waiting a long time.)
- a. # ... nekakhali li-li-eneli se-li-li li-keni ta.  
 but 5-5-that.one NEG-5SM-be 5-news NEG  
 '... but that's not news.'
- b. # ... nekakhali li-li-eneli se-li-sindusy-a ta.  
 but 5-5-that.one NEG-5SM-startle-FV NEG  
 '... but that doesn't surprise me.' (Sikuku and Diercks, 2023, 290)

The mirative meaning can, however, be challenged by the addressee separately from the at-issue meaning (suggesting multidimensionality). In (86), Speaker B implicitly accepts the at-issue content from (86A) but challenges the mirative content, saying that it is in fact expected.

- (86) A: Ba-ba-ana b-a-mu-bon-a o-mwa-limu likolooba. Lubukusu  
 2-2-children 2SM-PST-1OM-see-FV 1-1-teacher yesterday  
 ‘The children saw the teacher YESTERDAY.’
- B: Nekakhali li-li-eneli se-li-li li-keni ta! E-ch-aang-a e-ndalo e-yo buli li-chuma.  
 but 5-5-that.one NEG-5SM-be 5-news NEG 1SM.come-HAB-FV 9-day 9-this every 5-week  
 ‘But that’s not news! She comes that day every week.’ (Sikuku and Diercks, 2023, 291)

Mirative interpretations are also non-deniable and multidimensional in Cinyungwe. For example, the speaker of (87) could not continue with (87a) or (87b) because they would contradict the mirative meaning.

- (87) *Context: A young man has married an older woman and brought her to see his family. His family is shocked and asks the young man the following question in front of his new wife.*
- Lwepo u-da-mu-lowol-a n-kazi umweyi? Cinyungwe  
 you 2SG.SM-PST-1OM-marry-fv 1-woman already  
 ‘You already married this woman?’
- a. # ... tsono palibe mi-lando.  
 but there.is.no 4-problem  
 ‘... but there is no problem with that.’
- b. # ... tsono palibe ca-ku-dabw-is-a.  
 but there.is.no 7-PRS-surprise-CAUS-FV  
 ‘... but there is nothing to be surprised about.’

However, the listener can question or deny the mirative meaning independently. In response to the question in (87), the young man could respond with (88) to question the mirative content but not the at-issue content (the fact that he married the woman).

- (88) Ca-ku-dabw-is-a ni cani? Cinyungwe  
 7SM-PRS-surprise-CAUS-FV COP what  
 ‘What is surprising about that?’

## 10. Conclusions

The table in (89) summarizes the range of emphatic interpretations that we are finding with OM-doubling across Bantu languages, given our current knowledge. Further investigation is needed on the pragmatic and syntactic contexts in which these interpretations arise. Additionally, the syntactic analysis of the OM-doubling constructions that generate these readings is a work in progress in each language. However, Sikuku and Diercks (2023) attempt to do this for Lubukusu and Langa da Câmara et al. (to appear) attempt to do this for Cinyungwe, and work is ongoing in Tiriki, Wanga, and Ikalanga.



Similarly, the fourth author (Rose Letsholo) initially translated the Ikalanga exchange in (92), in which the object is OM-doubled in both the question and answer, as ‘How did the children eat the okra? The children did eat the okra slowly.’

- (92) Q: Bana ba-ka-**li**-j-a chini , **delele** ? **Ikalanga**  
 2child 2SM-PST-5OM-eat-FV how 5okra  
 ‘How did the children eat the okra?’ (unacceptable out of the blue)
- A: Bana b-aka-**li**-j-a ngebunya , **delele**.  
 2child 2SM-PST-5OM-eat-FV slowly 5okra  
 ‘The children ate it slowly, the okra.’

Neither (91) nor (92) can be felicitously expressed with emphatic *do* in mainstream varieties of American and British English. These examples show that, although there is overlap between emphatic contexts for Bantu OM-doubling and English emphatic *do* (e.g., argument contexts), this overlap is not complete. It is therefore important for research on emphatic interpretations of OM-doubling to establish clear pragmatic contexts and avoid over-relying on translations.

**10.3. Relationships between different types of emphasis.** A major question for our research is whether the different emphatic interpretations are related, analytically speaking (i.e., whether they are instances of the same phenomena or distinct phenomena). This section explores several possible areas of overlap we are currently investigating.

In this paper, as stated in §2, we approach (standard) mirativity and reprimands as different subtypes of mirative interpretations: mirative surprise and mirative reprimands. Recall that there are (at least) three ways to view reprimands:

- emphasis that information is more expected than an alternative (or the most expected) (Trotzke, 2017)
- emphasis that information is surprising or unexpected to someone other than the speaker (Aikhenvald, 2012)
- emphasis that an addressee’s lack of knowledge or belief is surprising to the speaker

At present, our best sense is that the third perspective is most consistent with the intuitions of the authors (Sikuku, Langa da Câmara, Letsholo): that reprimands are simply a different type of surprise, e.g., a speaker’s surprise that they are being asked an obvious question or a speaker’s surprise at an addressee’s doubt. This perspective is also consistent with an analysis of mirative interpretations of OM-doubling as conventional implicatures, because one property of conventional implicatures is speaker-orientation.

Reprimand readings can appear very similar to verum readings, to the point that we have considered analyzing verum as an instance of mirative reprimand. Both interpretations often arise in contexts where an addressee is doubting a speaker. However, examples like (93) suggest that reprimands and verum are non-identical. While reprimands involve information being well-known or obvious from the speaker’s perspective, this is not required with verum interpretations. Verum emphasizes a speaker’s confidence in the truth of a proposition, but the speaker does not necessarily believe the information should be obvious to others. The existence of these two interpretations suggests that verum and (mirative) reprimands are distinct categories of emphasis, and we are currently attempting to tease them apart more clearly.

- (93) Wekesa a-**ka**-nywa **kamalwa**. **Lubukusu**  
 1Wekesa 1SM.PST-6OM-drink 6beer  
 ‘Wekesa drank beer.’  
 Available interpretations:
- The sentence is an emphatic confirmation of the act. (verum)
  - It is a well-known fact that Wekesa is a drunkard, so any doubt is met with this sentence. (mirative reprimand)

In Lubukusu, the focus particle *busa* has two different meanings depending on its position in the sentence. In a structurally low position, it receives an exhaustive reading and can be translated as ‘only.’ In a structurally high position, it receives a verum-like reading and can be translated as ‘indeed.’ In (94) below, *busa* is only acceptable sentence-initially or sentence-finally.

- (94) a. Wangila a-a-nyw-a e-chayi **busa**. Lubukusu  
 1Wangila 1SM-PST-drink-FV 9-tea only  
 ‘Wangila merely drank/took tea.’
- b. ?Wangilaa-a-nyw-a **busa** e-chayi.
- c. \*Wangila **busa** a-a-nyw-ae-chayi.
- d. **Busa** Wangila a-a-nyw-a e-chayi.  
 \*‘Wangila merely drank/took tea.’  
 OK: ‘Indeed Wangila drank tea.’ (Wasike and Diercks, 2016)

A similar pattern exists in Cinyungwe with the particle *basi*. The particle is interpreted exhaustively in both (95a) and (95c), albeit applied to different DPs. However, in (95b) and (95d), it receives very different emphatic interpretations. Langa da Câmara’s intuition is that only (95d) could accurately be translated using the English word ‘indeed.’

- (95) a. Siriza a-da-dy-a ma-figu **basi**. Cinyungwe  
 Siriza 1SG-PERF-eat-FV 6-bananas only  
 ‘Siriza ate only bananas.’ (i.e., she didn’t eat anything else)
- b. Siriza a-da-dy-a **basi** ma-figu.  
 ‘Siriza ate bananas.’  
*Available interpretations: Siriza ate a lot of bananas even though she knew she shouldn’t, and she had a stomachache. Even with her stomachache, she kept eating bananas. Also available: ‘She continued eating bananas.’*
- c. Siriza **basi** a-da-dy-a ma-figu.  
 ‘Only Siriza ate bananas.’ (i.e., no one else ate bananas)
- d. **Basi**, Siriza a-da-dy-a ma-figu.  
 ‘Siriza ate bananas.’  
*Available interpretation: The speaker hid the bananas, but Siriza loves bananas so much that she found them by smell! Upon seeing that the bananas have been eaten, the speaker knows it was Siriza and says, ‘Oh, it’s happening again, Siriza ate bananas.’*

One possible interpretation of these patterns is that verum readings could be a type of exhaustivity applied structurally high. In other words, verum could be an instance of exhaustive emphasis that excludes all alternative propositions, rather than alternatives to a specific constituent in the sentence. However, further research is needed.

### Abbreviations

APPL	Applicative
ASSOC	Associative Marker
AUG	Augment
CAUS	Causative
CJ	Conjoint
CONJ	Conjunction
DEM	Demonstrative
DJ	Disjoint
FUT	Future
FV	Final Vowel

INF	Infinitive
N.PST	Near Past
NEG	Negation
OM	Object Marker
PERF	Perfect
PFV	Perfective
PL	Plural
PROG	Progressive
PRS	Present
PST	Past
REM.PST	Remote Past
SG	Singular
SM	Subject Marker

## References

- Abeillé, Anne, Danièle Godard, and Frédéric Sabio. 2008. Two types of pre-posed NP in French. In *Head-driven phrase structure grammar (HPSG) conference 15*, 306–324. Keihanna, Japan: CSLI on-line Publications.  
<https://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/halshs-00751057>.
- Adams, Nikki. 2010. The Zulu ditransitive verb phrase. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Chicago.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2012. The essence of mirativity. *Linguistic Typology* 16: 435–485.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/lity-2012-0017>.
- Anagnostopoulou, Elena. 2017. Clitic doubling. In *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Syntax, second edition*, eds. Martin Everaert and van Riemsdijk Henk C. John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Baker, Mark, and Ruth Kramer. 2018. Doubled clitics are pronouns: Amharic objects (and beyond). *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 36: 1035–1088.
- Bax, Anna, and Michael Diercks. 2012. Information structure constraints on object marking in Manyika. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies* 30: 185–202.
- Bianchi, Valentina, Giuliano Bocci, and Silvio Cruschina. 2015. Focus fronting and its implicatures. In *Romance languages and linguistic theory 2013: Selected papers from 'Going Romance' Amsterdam 2013*, ed. Enoch Oladé Aboh, Jeanette Schaeffer, and Petra Sleeman, 1–20. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1075/rllt.8.01bia>.
- Bianchi, Valentina, Giuliano Bocci, and Silvio Cruschina. 2016. Focus fronting, unexpectedness, and evaluative implicatures. *Semantics and Pragmatics* 9: Article 3: 1–54.
- Buell, Leston. 2005. Issues in Zulu morphosyntax. Doctoral Dissertation, UCLA, Los Angeles, CA.
- Buell, Leston. 2006. The Zulu conjoint/disjoint verb alternation: focus or constituency? *ZAS Papers in Linguistics* 43: 9–30.
- Buell, Leston. 2008. VP-internal DPs and right dislocation in Zulu. In *Linguistics in the Netherlands*, ed. Marjo van Koppen and Bert Botma, 37–49. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Cheng, Lisa Lai-Shen, and Laura J. Downing. 2009. Where's the topic in Zulu? *The Linguistic Review* 26: 207–238.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2000. Minimalist inquiries: The framework. In *Step by step: Essays on Minimalist syntax in honor of Howard Lasnik*, ed. Roger Martin, David Michaels, and Juan Uriagereka, 89–156. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2001. Derivation by phase. In *Ken Hale: A life in linguistics*, ed. Michael Kenstowicz, 1–52. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Creissels, Denis. 1996. Conjunctive and disjunctive verb forms in Tswana. *South African Journal of African Languages* 16: 109–115.
- Cruschina, Silvio. 2012. *Discourse-related features and functional projections*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cruschina, Silvio. 2016. *The Oxford guide to the Romance languages*, chapter: Information and discourse structure, 596–608.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199677108.003.0034>: Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cruschina, Silvio. 2019a. Focus fronting in Spanish: Mirative implicature and information structure. *Probus* 29: 119–146.  
<https://doi.org/10.1515/probus-2018-0008>.

- Cruschina, Silvio. 2019b. Syntactic movement and focus-associated implicatures in Hungarian. *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa (RGG)* 41: 1–37. Available at: <<https://lingbuzz.com/j/rgg/2019/2019.01/>>.
- Cruschina, Silvio. 2021. The greater the contrast, the greater the potential: On the effects of focus in syntax. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics* 6:3.1–30. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.5334/g\\_jgl.1100](https://doi.org/10.5334/g_jgl.1100).
- DeLancey, Scott. 2001. The mirative and evidentiality. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33: 369–382. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(01\)80001-1](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(01)80001-1).
- É. Kiss, Katalin. 1998. Identificational focus versus information focus. *Language* 74: 245–273.
- É. Kiss, Katalin. 2009. *Information structure: Theoretical, typological, and experimental perspectives*, chapter: Structural focus and exhaustivity, 64–88. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Frey, Werner. 2010. 2010. A'-movement and conventional implicatures: About the grammatical encoding of emphasis in German. *Lingua* 120: 1416–1435. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2008.09.016>.
- Güldemann, Tom. 2003. Present progressive vis-à-vis predication focus in Bantu: A verbal category between semantics and pragmatics. *Studies in Language* 27: 323–360.
- Guthrie, Malcolm. 1948. *The classification of the Bantu languages*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Gutzmann, Daniel. 2019. *The grammar of expressivity*. Oxford Studies in Theoretical Linguistics. Oxford University Press.
- Gutzmann, Daniel, and Elena Castroviejo Miró. 2011. The dimensions of verum. In *Empirical Issues in Syntax and Semantics 8*, ed. O. Bonami and P. Cabredo Hofherr, 143–165. Available online at <http://www.cssp.cnrs.fr/eiss8/>.
- Gutzmann, Daniel, Katharina Hartmann, and Lisa Matthewson. 2020. Verum focus is verum, not focus: Cross-linguistic evidence. *Glossa: A Journal of General Linguistics* 5: 51.1–48.
- Halpert, Claire. 2012. Argument licensing and agreement in Zulu. Doctoral Dissertation, MIT.
- Halpert, Claire. 2016. *Argument licensing and agreement*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Halpert, Claire. 2017. Prosody-syntax mismatches in the Zulu conjoint/disjoint alternation. In *The conjoint/disjoint alternation in Bantu*, ed. Jenneke van der Wal and Larry M. Hyman, 329–349. de Gruyter.
- Hartmann, Katharina, and Malte Zimmermann. 2007. In place – out of place? focus in Hausa. In *On information structure, meaning and form: Generalizations across languages*, ed. Kerstin Schwabe and Susanne Winkler, volume 100 of *Linguistics Today*, 365–403. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/la.100.20har>.
- Kallulli, Dalina. 2000. Direct object clitic doubling in Albanian and Greek. In *Clitic phenomena in European languages*, ed. Frits Beukema and Marcel den Dikken, *Linguistik Aktuell* 30, 209–248. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kallulli, Dalina. 2001. Direct object clitic doubling in Albanian and Greek. In *Comparative syntax of Balkan languages*, ed. María Luisa Rivero and Angela Ralli, 127–160. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kallulli, Dalina. 2008. Clitic doubling, agreement, and information structure. In *Clitic doubling in the Balkan languages*, ed. Dalina Kallulli and Liliane Tasmowski, *Linguistik Aktuell* 130, 227–255. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Kramer, Ruth. 2014. Clitic doubling or object agreement: The view from Amharic. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 32: 593–634.
- Kroeger, Paul R. 2019. *Analyzing meaning: An introduction to semantics and pragmatics*. Textbooks in Language Sciences 5. Language Science Press, 2nd edition.
- Langa da Câmara, Crisófia, Michael Diercks, Madelyn Colantes, Brendan Ly, Jackson Kuzmik, and Hannah Lippard. To appear. An initial look at object marking in Cinyungwe. Ms, Universidade Eduardo Mondlane and Pomona College. To appear in the Proceedings of ACAL 51/52.
- Letsholo, Rose, Mady Colantes, and Michael Diercks. To appear. Emphatic properties of object marking in Ikalanga. To appear in *ACAL in SoCAL: Selected Papers from the 53rd Annual Conference on African Linguistics*, edited by Yaqian Huang, Nina Hagen Kaldhol, Jun Jie Lim, Sharon Rose, and Anthony Struthers-Young. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Lewis, M. Paul, Gary F. Simons, and Fennig Charles D., ed. 2016. *Ethnologue: Languages of the world, nineteenth edition*. Dallas: SIL International, online version: <http://www.ethnologue.com/>. edition.
- Liu, Kang. 2022. Object marking in Tiriki. MA dissertation, Cambridge University.
- Liu, Kang (Franco). 2019a. Information structure constraints on object marker doubling in Tiriki. Thesis, Pomona College.
- Liu, Kang (Franco). 2019b. Information structure constraints on object marker doubling in Tiriki. Talk Presented at

- the Southern California Annual Meeting on Syntax, November 2 2019 at Pomona College.
- Lopez, L. 2012. *Indefinites: Scrambling, choice functions, and differential marking*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Lusekelo, Amani, Allen Asimwe, Patrick Kanampiu, Nelsa Nhantumbo, Ernest Nshemezimana, and Jenneke van der Wal. 2023. Predicate doubling and information structure in eastern Bantu languages. Presentation at the BaSIS conference at Leiden University, June 8-9, 2023.
- Marlo, Michael. 2015. On the number of object markers in Bantu languages. *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 36: 1–65.
- Marten, Lutz, Nancy Kula, and Nhlanhla Thwala. 2007. Parameters of morpho-syntactic variation in Bantu. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 105: 253–338.
- Mursell, Johannes. 2018. Object marking in Swahili is topic agreement. *Jezikoslovlje* 19: 427–455.
- Ngoboka, Jean Paul, and Jochen Zeller. 2017. The conjoint/disjoint alternation in Kinyarwanda. In *The conjoint/disjoint alternation in Bantu*, ed. Jenneke van der Wal and Larry M. Hyman, Trends in Linguistics, 350–389. De Gruyter.
- Peterson, Tyler. 2010. Examining the mirative and nonliteral uses of evidentials. In *Evidence from evidentials*, ed. Uli Peterson, Tyler & Sauerland, volume 28 of University of British Columbia Working Papers in Linguistics (UBCWPL), 129–159. Vancouver, BC: UBC Department of Linguistics.
- Philippaki-Warbuton, Irene, Spyridoula Varlokosta, Michalis Georgiagentis, and George Kotzoglou. 2004. Moving from theta positions: Pronominal clitic doubling in Greek. *Lingua* 114.
- Potts, Christopher. 2005. *The logic of conventional implicatures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Potts, Christopher. 2012. Conventional implicature and expressive content. In *Semantics: An international handbook of natural language meaning*, ed. Claudia Maienborn, Klaus von Stechow, and Paul Portner, volume 3, 2516–2536. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Rett, Jessica, and Sarah E. Murray. 2013. A semantic account of mirative evidentials. *Semantics and Linguistic Theory* 31 (SALT) 23:453–472. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3765/salt.v23i0.2687>.
- Seidl, Amanda, and Alexis Dimitriadis. 1997. The discourse function of object marking in Swahili. In *CLS 33: Papers from the main session, April 17–19, 1997*, 373–389.
- Sikuku, Justine, and Michael Diercks. To appear. Object marking in Lubukusu: At the interface of pragmatics and syntax. *Open Generative Syntax at Language Science Press*.
- Sikuku, Justine, Michael Diercks, and Michael Marlo. 2018. Pragmatic effects of clitic doubling: Two kinds of object markers in Lubukusu. *Linguistic Variation* 18:359–429.
- Van der Spuy, Andrew. 1993. Dislocated noun phrases in Nguni. *Lingua* 90:335–355.
- Trotzke, Andreas. 2017. *The grammar of emphasis: From information structure to the expressive dimension*. Boston/Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- van der Wal, Jenneke, and Larry M. Hyman, ed. 2017. *The conjoint/disjoint alternation in Bantu*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- van der Wal, Jenneke. 2011. Focus excluding alternatives: conjoint/disjoint marking in Makhuwa. *Lingua* 212: 1734–1750.
- Wasike, Aggrey, and Michael Diercks. 2016. Lubukusu adverbial syntax. Presentation at the 47th Annual Conference on African Linguistics, University of California, Berkeley.
- Yuan, Michelle. 2021. Diagnosing object agreement vs. clitic doubling: An Inuit case study. *Linguistic Inquiry* 52.1: 153–179. <https://doi.org/10.1162/linga.0.0366>.
- Zeller, Jochen. 2012. Object marking in Zulu. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies* 30: 219–325.
- Zeller, Jochen. 2014. Three types of object marking in Bantu. *Linguistische Berichte* 239: 347–367.
- Zeller, Jochen. 2015. Argument prominence and agreement: Explaining an unexpected object asymmetry in Zulu. *Lingua* 156: 17–39.
- Zubizarreta, María-Luisa. 1999. Las funciones informativas: tema y foco. In Ignacio Bosque & Violeta Demonte (eds.), *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*, 4215–4244. Madrid: RAE.