

Emphatic Interpretations of Object Marking in Bantu Languages

Hannah Lippard (Pomona College), Justine Sikuku (Moi University), Crisofia Langa da Camara (Universidade Eduardo Mondlane), Madelyn Colantes (Pomona College), Jackson Kuzmik (Pomona College), and Michael Diercks (Pomona College)
Online Workshop: Miratives and evidentiality in Bantu, October 7, 2021

1 Introduction

1.1 Introduction to object markers (OMs)

- An object marker is a morpheme within the Bantu verb form that refers to an object in the sentence.

- (1) a. N-á-βon-a paapá. **Lubukusu**
1SG.SM-REM.PST-see-FV 1father
'I saw father.'
- b. N-á-(mu-) βon-a.
1SG.SM-REM.PST-1OM-see-FV
'I saw him.' (Sikuku et al., 2018, 366)

- (2) a. Baba a-da-phik-a ci-mbamba. **Cinyungwe**
1father 1SM-PST-cook-FV 7-beans
'Father cooked beans.'
- b. Baba a-da-(ci-) phik-a.
1father 1SM-PST-7OM-cook-FV
'Father cooked them (beans).' (Langa da Camara et al., 2021, i)

1.2 Introduction to OM-doubling

- Some languages allow OM-doubling, where an object marker (OM) co-occurs with a lexical DP object.
- We are finding that OM-doubling is often associated with various emphatic interpretations.
- OMs can co-occur with lexical DP objects in both Lubukusu and Cinyungwe.
- In many instances of OM-doubling, there is a prosodic break (,) between the verb and the OM-doubled object.
- This prosodic break is often analyzed as signaling that the lexical object is outside the vP (Sikuku et al., 2018; Langa da Camara et al., 2021).

- (3) N-á-(ki-) bon-a , (ée-m-bwa) . **Lubukusu**
1SG.SM-REM.PST-9OM-see-FV 9-dog
'I saw it, the dog.' (Sikuku et al., 2018, 368)

- (4) Baba a-da-(ci-) phik-a , (ci-mbamba) . **Cinyungwe**
1father 1SM-PST-7OM-cook-FV 7-beans
Approx: 'Father cooked beans.' (Langa da Camara et al., 2021, ii)

- OM-doubling without this prosodic break is also possible in both languages.
- Emphatic interpretations of monotransitive constructions without a prosodic break often (though not exclusively) apply to the whole predicate, not a single element.

- (5) N-aa-(βu-) l-ílé (βúu-suma) . **Lubukusu**
1SG.SM-PST-14OM-eat-PFV 14.14-ugali
'I DID eat the ugali!' (Sikuku et al., 2018, 360)

- (6) Baba a-da-(ci-) phik-a (ci-mbamba) dzulo. **Cinyungwe**
1father 1SM-PST-7OM-cook-FV 7-beans yesterday
'Father really/certainly COOKED THE BEANS YESTERDAY.' (Langa da Camara et al., 2021, v)

- The goal of this talk is to outline our ongoing realization about the role that emphatic/expressive interpretations (including verum, mirativity, and exhaustivity) play in the grammar of object marking constructions in Bantu languages.

- This work compiles observations from a range of ongoing studies, some farther along than others.
- We will focus on Lubukusu and Cinyungwe, where our work is farthest along, but some initial evidence from other languages is included in the Appendix.

1.3 Introduction to focus-associated conventional implicatures

- This work is heavily influenced by recent work on emphatic interpretations of focus fronting in Romance and Indo-European languages (Cruschina, 2012, 2019a,b, 2021; Bianchi et al., 2016, 2015).
 - Cruschina (2021) 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 focus fronting with types of focus with a higher degree of contrast.
 - Cruschina (2021) proposes that each type of focus is introduced through conventional implicatures, which will be discussed in more detail in the Conclusions.
 - The table in (7) shows the availability of different types of emphatic interpretations of focus fronting in certain languages.

(7) 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 | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ |

- In this presentation, we restrict ourselves to a descriptive-analytical discussion for the most part, leaving a more abstract and formal analysis for another time.

2 Verum interpretations

- Verum-like meanings are often translated into English with the adverb *really* or emphatic *do*.

(8) 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 & Castroviejo Miró, 2011; Gutzmann et al., 2020).
- These interpretations are often intuitively connected to speaker certainty.

2.1 Verum interpretations in Lubukusu

- 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). This will be discussed in more detail below.
- Without an appropriate discourse context, OM-doubling sounds extremely infelicitous in Lubukusu, to the point of being ungrammatical. It is often interpreted as unnecessarily argumentative, as if the speaker thinks the listener disagrees with them.
- OM-doubling in Lubukusu can be used to address listener doubt.

(9) A: Lionéeli a-l-iilé kú-mú-chéele kwéeli?
 1Leonell 1SM-eat-PFV 3-3-rice really
 ‘Did Lionell really eat the rice?’

Lubukusu

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 be used to address listener denial.

(10) 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)

- OM-doubling in Lubukusu can be used as a move to end a conversation.
 - It would be largely infelicitous for the disagreements in (9) and (10) to continue after (9B) and (10B), because the second speaker’s use of OM-doubling is intended to settle the issue.
- This layer of emphatic meaning is non-deniable, suggesting that it is not a conversational implicature; speakers are committed to the emphatic meaning when an OM-doubling sentence is uttered. This also suggests that the verum-like reading is an expressive (non-propositional) meaning (Gutzmann & Castroviejo Miró, 2011).
- As we’ll see later, non-deniability is characteristic of conventional implicatures.

(11) A: Wéékésá k-á-(si-) sóm-a (síi-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-ηáli tá!
 NEG-14SM-be 14.14-truth NEG
 ‘That’s not true!’
 – ✓ It’s not true that Wekesa read the book.
 – #It’s not true that you are certain of that.
 (Sikuku et al., 2018, 391)

2.2 Verum interpretations in Cinyungwe

- A common translation of verum interpretations in Cinyungwe is ‘I know what I’m talking about.’
- OM-doubling in Cinyungwe is consistent with several diagnostics for verum meaning. The OM-doubling sentence in (13) is an appropriate response to both of the sentences in (12) but not out of the blue.

(12) a. Father certainly didn’t cook the beans.
 b. Did Father really cook the beans?

(13) 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 (12a): ✓ *Addressing listener denial*
 – In response to (12b): ✓ *Addressing listener doubt*

- By contrast, a non-doubling version of the sentence is acceptable out of the blue but marginal or unacceptable in response to listener denial and doubt.

(14) 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 (12a): ?? *Addressing listener denial*
 – In response to (12b): # *Addressing listener doubt*

- As in Lubukusu, the verum-like emphatic meaning in Cinyungwe is non-deniable.

(15) A: Baba a-da-(ci-) phik-a (ci-mbamba) .
 1father 1SM-PST-7OM-cook-FV 7-beans

Cinyungwe

(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.

3 Mirative interpretations

- Mirative interpretations convey that information is unexpected, surprising, or noteworthy (i.e., less likely than some alternative (Bianchi et al., 2016)).
- Mirativity may include reprimand readings, which have the opposite interpretation: that information is the most expected of potential alternatives (Aikhenvald, 2012; Trotzke, 2017; Frey, 2010; Cruschina, 2021).
- Cruschina (2021) includes mirativity as one of the conventional implicatures associated with focus fronting.

3.1 Mirative interpretations in Lubukusu

- OM-doubling in Lubukusu can be used without a verum interpretation or context to convey that a situation is surprising.

(16) 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 & Diercks, 2021, 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 & Diercks, 2021, 272)

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

(17) 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 & Diercks, 2021, 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 & Diercks, 2021, 272)

- Mirative emphasis can fall on a particular constituent within the verb phrase, marking it as less likely than some alternative.

(18) 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 & Diercks, 2021, 292)

- Mirative emphasis can also fall on the whole sentence, if it's all surprising.
- A mirative reading was available for (19) in March 2020, at the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic.¹

(19) Coronavirus e-li khe-e-(ba-) tiil-a (ba-andu na ba-andu) . **Lubukusu**
 Coronavirus 9-be PROG-9SM-2OM-catch-FV 2-person CONJ 2-person
 'Coronavirus is infecting all sorts of people!' (Sikuku & Diercks, 2021, 302)

- The mirative aspect of a sentence's meaning cannot be denied by the speaker; the speaker is committed to the mirative content.

(20) 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.'

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 & Diercks, 2021, 290)

- The mirative meaning can, however, be challenged by the listener separately from the propositional meaning.
- In (21), person B implicitly accepts the propositional content from (21A), but challenges the mirative content, saying that it is in fact expected.

(21) 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 & Diercks, 2021, 291)

- Mirative and verum emphasis may not be distinct types of emphasis.
 - Crosslinguistically, mirative meanings sometimes overlap with corrective/reprimand meanings (Aikhenvald, 2012; Trotzke, 2017; Frey, 2010; Cruschina, 2021).
 - These are instances where the proposition is considered surprising or unexpected from the addressee's perspective but not from the speaker's perspective.

(22) Context: I come home and there is dinner on the table. I ask, "Where did Wekesa cook the beans?"
 Wekesa a-a-(ka-) tekhe-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.'

- Sikuku & Diercks (2021)'s current analysis is that verum-like readings in Lubukusu are instances of mirative predicate focus with a reprimand reading, but this analysis is under active consideration. Like reprimand contexts, verum contexts are situations in which the listener, not the speaker, finds something unexpected.

3.2 Mirative interpretations in Cinyungwe

- OM-doubling in Cinyungwe can be used to convey that a situation is significant or surprising, i.e., that something 'more' is going on.
 - In (23B) below, this interpretation persists even without *mazinji* 'many'.

(23) 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.'

¹Notably, (19) is a much less felicitous sentence presently.

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

(24) *Context: Every time Siriza visits her grandmother, she eats many, many bananas, and always gets a stomach ache 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.' (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 (25), OM-doubling becomes natural.

(25) *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.

(26) *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.*

U-da-(mu-) lowol-a (n-kazi) umweyi?
 2SG-PST-1OM-marry-FV 1-woman already
 'You already married this woman?'

- Also as in Lubukusu, the speaker is committed to the mirative content and therefore cannot cancel the mirative interpretation.
- For example, the speaker of (26) above could not continue with either of the options in (27) below.

(27) a. #... tsono palibe mi-lando. Cinyungwe
 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 (26), the young man could respond with (28) to question the mirative content but not the propositional content (the fact that he married the woman).

(28) Ca-ku-dabw-is-a ni cani? Cinyungwe
 7-PRS-surprise-CAUS-FV COP what
 'What is surprising about that?'

- Mirative interpretations in Cinyungwe are potentially connected to verum interpretations, as in Lubukusu.
- OM-doubling can be used in response to someone other than the speaker finding information surprising.

(29) *Context: Siriza has started going to school. She is still learning to write small sentences, but the teacher always tells her mother that she is smart. Her parents decide to test her skills and ask her to write a letter. Siriza's father is not confident about her skills, but Siriza gets the top score. Her mother says:*

Nd-a-kuwuz-a canyi ine? Siriza a-da-(li-) kwani-a ku-nemba (tsamba) !
 1SG-PERF-say-FV what I Siriza 1SG-PERF-5OM-did-FV 15-write 5.letter
 'What did I tell you? Siriza wrote the letter!'

4 Exhaustive interpretations

- Exhaustivity emphasizes that among a set of possible elements, only one is relevant, and is therefore often translated as ‘only’.
- Cruschina (2021) includes exhaustivity as one of the conventional implicatures associated with focus fronting (along with mirativity and others).

4.1 Exhaustive interpretations in Cinyungwe

- So far, we have only encountered exhaustive interpretations of OM-doubling in Cinyungwe 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.
 - In (30) below, the exhaustive interpretation persists even without *basi* ‘only’.
 - This interpretation seems distinct from verum, as this sentence could not be used in a verum context.
- (30) Baba a-da-(ci-) phik-ir-a **Semo (basi)** (ci-mbamba) mwakankulumize.
1father 1SM-PST-7OM-cook-APPL-FV 1Semo only 7-beans quickly
‘Father cooked beans quickly for ONLY SEMO.’ (Langa da Camara et al., 2021, xxiii)
- Verum interpretations can complicate diagnostics for exhaustivity.
 - Many diagnostics for exhaustivity include 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.
 - As far as we can tell, exhaustive readings of doubling only appear in the configuration noted in (30).

4.2 Exhaustive interpretations in Lubukusu

- To the best of our knowledge, exhaustive interpretations do not independently arise from OM-doubling in Lubukusu (in contrast to Cinyungwe).
- They can, however, appear as part of a mirative interpretation, i.e., if an exhaustive reading would be surprising or noteworthy.

(31) 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.’

Potential 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

5 Conclusions

5.1 Further questions

- Further investigation is needed on the pragmatic and syntactic contexts in which exhaustivity arises in Cinyungwe, as well as whether similar patterns exist in Lubukusu.
- Are the mirative and verum emphatic interpretations related, analytically speaking (i.e., are they instances of the same phenomena or distinct phenomena)?
- How should the doubling constructions that generate these readings be analyzed syntactically? (This is a work in progress, but Sikuku & Diercks (2021) attempt to do this for Lubukusu and Langa da Camara et al. (2021) attempt to do this for Cinyungwe.)

5.2 Potential analysis: Conventional implicatures

- In our current analysis, the emphatic readings facilitated by OM-doubling in Lubukusu and Cinyungwe are introduced through conventional implicatures. As mentioned in the Introduction, this analysis builds on work by Cruschina (2019a,b,

2021) on emphatic readings of Romance and Indo-European focus fronting.

- Conventional implicatures are distinctive in several ways:
 - Conventional implicatures are semantic, not pragmatic, and therefore not context-dependent in the same way that conversational implicatures are (i.e., the interpretations of OM-doubling constructions are relatively restricted).
 - The speaker is committed to the content of the conventional implicature and therefore cannot felicitously cancel or deny it.
 - Conventional implicatures are a separate “dimension” of meaning that is not part of the asserted at-issue content. They can therefore be denied or accepted independently of the propositional meaning of a sentence (i.e., whether the sentence is true or false).
 - As mentioned previously, Cruschina (2021) identifies several types of focus introduced through conventional implicatures: information focus (of which exhaustive focus is a subtype), mirative focus, and corrective focus.
 - We are finding a similar range of emphatic interpretations (with the addition of *verum*) available for OM-doubling across Bantu languages.²

(32) Availability of OM-doubling with different types of emphasis in Bantu languages

| | exhaustivity | mirativity | verum |
|-----------|---------------------|-------------------|--------------|
| Lubukusu | * | ✓ | ✓ |
| Cinyungwe | */✓ ³ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Tiriki | ✓ | tbd | ✓ |
| Wanga | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Ikalanga | tbd | ✓ | ✓ |

6 Appendix: Initial evidence from additional languages

6.1 Tiriki

- OM-doubling in Tiriki can be used to address listener denial.

(33) *Context: Another speaker has challenged this fact.*

Tiriki

A-(**mu**-)lol-i (∅-raisi).

1SM-1OM-see-FV.PST 1-president

‘He DID see the president!’ (Liu, 2019)

- OM-doubling can be used to emphasize the OM-doubled object or the entire vP.
- Liu (2019) identifies this emphasis as contrastive focus, a subtype of new information focus that is often marked with the word ‘only’.

(34) Ebby a-(**vi**-)tekh-i (**vy-apati**) vy-onyene (vu-shuma taawe).

Tiriki

Ebby 1SM-8OM-cook-FV.PST 8-chapati 8-only 14-ugali NEG

‘Ebby cooked only CHAPATIS (not ugali).’ (Liu, 2019)

(35) Ebby a-(**vi**-)tekh-i (**vy-apati**) vutsa a-rikh-its-e tsi-ngookho taawe.

Ebby 1SM-8OM-cook-FV.PST 8-chapati only 1SM-eat-CAUS-FV.PST 10-chicken NEG

‘Ebby only COOKED CHAPATIS; she didn’t feed the chickens.’ (Liu, 2019)

- 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 (36) is unacceptable.
 - Tentatively, contrastive focus as defined by Liu (2019) and exhaustive focus as defined by Cruschina (2021) could be the same type of emphasis.

(36) Q: Vusu a-lil-e **shina?**

Tiriki

Vusu 1SM-eat-FV.PST what

‘What did Vusu eat?’

²Initial evidence from Tiriki, Wanga, and Ikalanga is reported in the appendix.

³Exhaustive interpretations only occur in very limited circumstances.

A: Vusu a-**vu-** lil-e **vu-shuma** .
 Vusu 1SM-14OM-eat-FV.PST 14-ugali
 ‘Vusu ate ugali.’ (only acceptable if Vusu ate only ugali, not anything else)

6.2 Wanga

- OM-doubling sentences in Wanga have different emphatic interpretations from non-doubling sentences.
- The non-doubling sentence below has a neutral interpretation and is acceptable out of the blue.

(37) 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.’

- The OM-doubling version of the same sentence is not acceptable out of the blue.
- The available interpretations of (38) include both verum and exhaustive readings.
 - This sentence can be used in an argument context, in response to someone who claimed that it was not rice that the children cooked.
 - It can also be used to express that the cooked food was only rice, not something else.
 - In both cases, the emphatic interpretation falls on the OM-doubled object itself.

(38) 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.’

- If the same OM-doubling sentence is used in response to a temporal question, as in (39) 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.
 - The answer in (39) can be used to express surprise that the children cooked the rice yesterday, perhaps because they were busy yesterday and were not expected to finish their chores.
 - The sentence can also be used to express surprise that the children cooked the rice at all, perhaps because they are so young.

(39) 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.’

6.3 Ikalanga

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

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

(41) Nchidzi w-a-**gu-** ngw-a , **busukwa** . **Ikalanga**
 Nchidzi 1SM-PST-14OM-drink-FV 14.beer
 ‘Nchidzi did drink it, the beer.’ (Rose Letsholo, personal communication)
 – Out of the blue: #
 – In response to (40a): ✓
 – In response to (40b): ✓

- A mirative interpretation of OM-doubling is also available in Ikalanga.
 - (42) 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.

(42) *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!’ (Rose Letsholo, personal communication)

7 Acknowledgments

We want to thank the workshop organizers for telling us about this workshop and inviting us!

This project collects and organizes a discussion that is occurring in parallel in multiple distinct projects on object marking in different languages. Justine Sikuku and Michael Diercks have a long-standing project on object marking in Bukusu, including a manuscript-in-development that all of the Bukusu data here are drawn from (Sikuku & Diercks, 2021). Crisofia Langa da Camara (and collaborators) has an ongoing project on object marking and object properties in Cinyungwe, which includes an initial syntactic analysis (Langa da Camara et al., 2021) which is currently being extended into concerns of interpretation, as discussed here. Rose Letsholo, Mady Colantes, and Michael Diercks are applying these same analytical questions to Ikalanga currently, and Franco Liu is currently working on the same in Tiriki, connected to Diercks’ ongoing work on Luyia syntax (which also includes Logoori and Wanga).

There are many authors here, so please allow us to clarify our contributions. The first author (Lippard) is a participant in the parallel projects, and was the lead author for compiling the relevant information from all of the projects above into this format, for drafting this handout, and on the manuscript-in-development on this topic. Sikuku is responsible for the Bukusu data and analytical work, together with Diercks. Langa da Camara is responsible for the Cinyungwe data and analytical work, which was done collaboratively with Colantes, Lippard, Kuzmik, and Diercks. Diercks is the primary investigator involved in all of these projects.

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.

8 References

- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2012. The essence of mirativity. *Linguistic Typology* 16(3). 435–485. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/lity-2012-0017>.
- Bianchi, Valentina, Giuliano Bocci & Silvio Cruschina. 2015. Focus fronting and its implicatures. In Enoch Oladé Aboh, Jeanette Schaeffer & Petra Sleeman (eds.), *Romance languages and linguistic theory 2013: Selected papers from ‘going romance’ amsterdam 2013*. 1–20. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1075/rllt.8.01bia>.
- Bianchi, Valentina, Giuliano Bocci & Silvio Cruschina. 2016. Focus fronting, unexpectedness, and evaluative implicatures. *Semantics and Pragmatics* 9. Article 3: 1–54.
- Langa da Camara, Crisofia, Michael Diercks, Madelyn Colantes, Brendan Ly, Jackson Kuzmik & Hannah Lippard. 2021. An initial look at object marking in Cinyungwe. Ms, Universidade Eduardo Mondlane and Pomona College. Under review for publication in the Proceedings of ACAL 51/52.
- Cruschina, Silvio. 2012. *Discourse-related features and functional projections*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cruschina, Silvio. 2019a. Focus fronting in Spanish: Mirative implicature and information structure. *Probus* 29(1). 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(1). 3. 1–30. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5334/gjgl.1100>.
- Frey, Werner. 2010. A'-movement and conventional implicatures: About the grammatical encoding of emphasis in German. Lingua 120(6). 1416–1435. [Http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2008.09.016](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2008.09.016).
- Gutzmann, Daniel & Elena Castroviejo Miró. 2011. The dimensions of verum. In O. Bonami & P. Cabredo Hofherr (eds.), Empirical issues in syntax and semantics 8. 143–165. Available online at <http://www.cssp.cnrs.fr/eiss8/>.
- Gutzmann, Daniel, Katharina Hartmann & Lisa Matthewson. 2020. Verum focus is verum, not focus: Cross-linguistic evidence. Glossa: A Journal of General Linguistics 5(1). 51. 1–48.
- Liu, Kang (Franco). 2019. 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.
- Sikuku, Justine & Michael Diercks. 2021. Object marking in Bukusu: At the interface of pragmatics and syntax. Ms, Moi University and Pomona College.
- Sikuku, Justine, Michael Diercks & Michael Marlo. 2018. Pragmatic effects of clitic doubling: Two kinds of object markers in Lubukusu. Linguistic Variation 18(2). 359–429.
- Trotzke, Andreas. 2017. The grammar of emphasis: From information structure to the expressive dimension. Boston/Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.