

**UCLA**

**UCLA Electronic Theses and Dissertations**

**Title**

The Pragmatics of Cinyungwe Object Marker Doubling

**Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/4781p897>

**Author**

Lippard, Hannah

**Publication Date**

2024

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Los Angeles

The Pragmatics of Cinyungwe Object Marker Doubling

A thesis submitted in partial satisfaction of the  
requirements for the degree Master of Arts  
in Linguistics

by

Hannah Lucia Lippard

2024

© Copyright by  
Hannah Lucia Lippard  
2024

ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS

The Pragmatics of Cinyungwe Object Marker Doubling

by

Hannah Lucia Lippard

Master of Arts in Linguistics

University of California, Los Angeles, 2024

Professor Jessica L. Rett, Chair

This paper investigates the emphatic meaning of object marker doubling (OMD) constructions—constructions in which a DP object and an associated object marker (OM) co-occur—in Cinyungwe, a Bantu language spoken in Mozambique. I propose that OMD has two licensing conditions: first, that an argument DP in the sentence is salient, and second, that the prejacent of the sentence addresses the Question Under Discussion (QUD). If these conditions are met, OMD introduces a manner implicature that the prejacent is atypical in some way. I provide original Cinyungwe data to support this analysis. I also discuss a previous approach to Bantu OMD (as introducing a mirative and/or verum conventional implicature), and I draw comparisons between OMD and another means of marking emphasis in Cinyungwe, as well as between OMD and Indo-European clitic doubling. Cinyungwe is an understudied language; as such, this research contributes not only to our understanding of Cinyungwe object marking but also to our understanding of the diversity of emphasis marking strategies crosslinguistically.

The thesis of Hannah Lucia Lippard is approved.

Jesse Aron Harris

William Harold Torrence

Jessica L. Rett, Committee Chair

University of California, Los Angeles

2024

## DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to the Palestine Solidarity Encampment,  
which stood at UCLA from April 25 to May 2, 2024,  
and to the community I have found in the fight for a free Palestine  
and our university's divestment from occupation and genocide.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	Cinyungwe and the linguistic landscape of Mozambique	1
1.1	Previous linguistic work	1
1.2	Morphosyntactic background	2
1.2.1	Noun classes	2
1.2.2	Verbal morphology	3
1.2.3	Syntax	4
2	Object marking	5
2.1	Solitary OMs	5
2.2	Object marker doubling	7
2.3	Object right dislocation	8
3	Alternate analyses	9
3.1	Mirativity	9
3.1.1	OMD in mirative contexts	10
3.1.2	Problems with a mirative analysis	11
3.1.3	Interim summary: OMD does not encode mirativity	12
3.2	Verum	13
3.2.1	OMD in verum contexts	15
3.2.2	Problems with a verum analysis	16
3.2.3	Interim summary: OMD does not encode verum	17
3.3	Beyond verum and mirativity	17
4	Manner implicature analysis	
4.1	Licensing conditions of OMD	19
4.1.1	DP salience	20

4.1.2	Addressing the QUD	21
4.2	OMD introduces an atypicality manner implicature	23
4.2.1	Manner implicature diagnostics	25
4.3	Why OMD?	26
5	OMD, <i>-di</i> , and clitic doubling	29
5.1	The emphatic post-final-vowel particle <i>-di</i>	29
5.2	Indo-European clitic doubling	32
6	Conclusion	35
	Bibliography	36

#### LIST OF TABLES

Table 1:	Word classes in Cinyungwe	2
Table 2:	Agreement with <i>mphaka</i> ‘cat(s)’	3
Table 3:	Reported manifestations of verum crosslinguistically	15



## LIST OF BANTU-SPECIFIC ABBREVIATIONS

OM	object marker
SM	subject marker
FV	final vowel
EXT	verbal extension

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Thank you to Crisófia Langa da Câmara for generously sharing her time and knowledge with me, and to my MA committee for their ongoing mentorship and support. Thank you as well to Mike Diercks for introducing me to object marking, to Giuseppina Silvestri for introducing me to Verbicarese, and to the attendees of my talks at KUBantu (University of Kansas, Fall 2023) and the Syntax-Semantics Seminar (UCLA, Winter 2024) for their questions and comments. Finally, thank you to Laura and Holtzy, my family. This work was supported in part by the Graduate Research Mentorship (GRM) Program at UCLA and a Ladefoged Scholarship Award from the UCLA Linguistics Department.

# 1 Cinyungwe and the linguistic landscape of Mozambique

Mozambique is a linguistically diverse country where more than twenty Mozambican Bantu languages are spoken, alongside Portuguese and Mozambican Sign Language (INE 2019; Ngunga 2021). Although more than eighty percent of the population speak a Bantu language as their first language (L1), the sole official language of Mozambique is the colonial language Portuguese, which is spoken by less than half of Mozambicans and is the L1 of only 16.6% (INE 2019).

Cinyungwe, the focus of this paper, is spoken in central Mozambique, in the provinces of Tete and (to a lesser extent) Manica. It belongs to the N40 group of Bantu languages, along with Cinsenga, Cikunda, and Cisena (Maho 2009). Cinyungwe and Cisena are two of the few non-tonal Bantu languages (Hyman 2017).

According to the 2017 national census, about 470,000 people (ages 5+) in Tete and 50,000 people in Manica speak Cinyungwe at home more often than other languages (INE 2019). This amounts to 22% of the population of Tete, 3.3% of the population of Manica, and 2.3% of the whole population of Mozambique. In some rural primary schools, students are initially taught in their L1 alongside Portuguese. Portuguese gradually replaces Bantu languages as the language of instruction, and students study their L1 as a subject until grade 5 or 6 (Langa da Câmara, personal communication). As of 2022, there are 57 Cinyungwe-Portuguese bilingual schools in Tete and 16 in Manica (Langa da Câmara 2024).

## 1.1 Previous linguistic work

The published descriptive and theoretical work on Cinyungwe is somewhat limited. There are two grammars of Cinyungwe, but both were written by European Christian missionaries (Courtois 1900; Martins 1991). Courtois (1900) defines his book's purpose as the religious "instruction of the natives" (x).

There are three doctoral dissertations written on topics in Cinyungwe (Rego 2012; Ivanov 2018; Langa da Câmara 2018). Crisófia Langa da Câmara is the (co)author of most recent linguistic work, primarily examining morphosyntactic and sociolinguistic aspects of the language (Duarte et al. 2017; Ngunga and Langa da Câmara 2019; Langa da Câmara and Lusekelo 2023; Langa da Câmara and Ngunga 2023; Langa da Câmara et al. 2024; Lippard et al. 2023).

## 1.2 Morphosyntactic background

### 1.2.1 Noun classes

Word classes are a central aspect of Bantu morphology. Cinyungwe has 13 noun classes, an infinitive class, and 3 locative classes, as shown in Table 1. Most of the noun classes are organized into singular-plural pairs; for example, classes 1 and 2 contain singular and plural human nouns. One exception is class 14, which contains uncountable nouns such as *udziwi* ‘knowledge’ and *uci* ‘honey’.

Table 1: Word classes in Cinyungwe (based on Ivanov 2018)

<b>Noun classes</b>				
class	prefix	example	SM	OM
1	mu-	munthu ‘person’	a-	-mu-
2	(w)a-	wanthu ‘people’	(w)a-	-wa-
3	mu-	muti ‘tree’	u-	-u-
4	mi-	miti ‘trees’	yi-	-yi-
5	li-	livu ‘book’	li-	-li-
6	ma-	malivu ‘books’	ma-/ya-	-ma-/ya-
7	ci-	cisu ‘knife’	ci-	-ci-
8	bzi-	bzisu ‘knives’	bzi-	-bzi-
9	n-/m-	mbwaya ‘dog’	yi-	-yi-
10	n-/m-	mbwaya ‘dogs’	zi-	-zi-
12	ka-	kapoto ‘small pot’	ka-	-ka-
13	tu-	tupoto ‘small pots’	tu-	-tu-
14	u-	udziwi ‘knowledge’	bu-	-bu-
<b>Infinitive class</b>				
15	ku-	kudya ‘to eat’		
<b>Locative classes</b>				
16	pa-	pamuyi ‘in the garden of the house’	pa-	-pa-
17	ku-	kumuyi ‘to the house’	ku-	-ku-
18	mu-	m’muyi ‘inside the house’	mu-	-mu-

Many nouns bear a prefix indicating their noun class, as with *cirewedwe/bzirewedwe* ‘language(s)’. In other cases, singular and plural prefixes “stack”, as with *livu/malivu* ‘book(s)’. Some nouns only have an overt class prefix in their plural form, as with *poto/mapoto* ‘pot(s)’. Finally, class 9/10 nouns like *mbwaya* ‘dog(s)’ have the same form regardless of number.

Noun class can be deduced from agreement, such as subject and object markers on the verb. Other elements that inflect for noun class are pronouns, numerals (e.g. *-bodzi* ‘one’, *-wiri* ‘two’), adjectives (e.g., *-svipa* ‘black’), possessives, and demonstratives. The paradigm for *mphaka* ‘cat(s)’ is shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Agreement with *mphaka* ‘cat(s)’ (based on Ivanov 2018)

class	noun	prn.	SM	OM	‘one/two’	‘black’	pssr.	pssd.	prox. dems.	dist. dems.
9	mphaka	iyo	yi-	-yi-	yibodzi	yisvipa	ya-	-yene	ino, iyi	iyo, ire
10	mphaka	izi	zi-	-zi-	ziwiri	zisvipa	za-	-zene	zino, izi	izo, zire

### 1.2.2 Verbal morphology

The structure of a Cinyungwe verb is shown in (1).

(1) Cinyungwe verb form

SM-TNS/ASP-OM-verb.root-EXT-FV-PART

The obligatory first prefix is the subject marker (SM), which agrees with a third-person subject in noun class. For first- and second-person subjects, the relevant person/number agreement morpheme appears here. The SM is followed by tense/aspect morphology and the object marker (OM), which refers to an object in the sentence. When an OM appears, it always immediately precedes the verb root.

The morphemes following the verb root include verbal extensions (e.g., passive and applicative morphology), the obligatory final vowel (*-a* or *-e*), and certain particles (*-mbo* ‘also’, *-di* ‘really’, and *-tu* ‘quickly’).<sup>1</sup> Two examples of complex verb forms, which stand alone as full sentences, are shown in (2).

<sup>1</sup>*-di* is briefly discussed and compared to OMD in §6.1.

- (2) a. *Ndi-ku-bzi-won-a-mbo*  
 1SG-PRS.PROG-8OM-see-FV-also  
 ‘I agree’ (lit. ‘I am seeing them too’)
- b. *Yi-ndza-yetim-ir-idw-a*  
 9SM-FUT-lighten-APPL-PASS-FV  
 ‘It (animal) will be lightened for someone’

### 1.2.3 Syntax

The standard word order in Cinyungwe is SVO, as shown in (3). However, postverbal subjects are possible, as are locative subjects, and pro-drop is common. Minimal pairs for these constructions are shown in (4), (5), and (6), respectively.

- (3) *Suwe a-da-nemb-a li-vu.*  
 Suwe 1SM-REM.PST-write-FV 5-book  
 ‘Suwe wrote a book.’

- (4) a. *Mu-ti u-da-gw-a.* preverbal subject  
 3-tree 3SM-REM.PST-fall-FV  
 ‘A tree fell.’

- b. *U-da-gw-a mu-ti.* postverbal subject  
 3SM-REM.PST-fall-FV 3-tree  
 ‘A tree fell.’

- (5) a. *M-bwaya ya-Ø-gon-a m’-mu-yi.* locative adjunct  
 9-dog 9SM-REC.PST-sleep-FV 18-3-house  
 ‘The dog slept in the house.’

- b. *M’-mu-yi mwa-Ø-gon-a m-bwaya.* locative subject  
 18-3-house 18SM-REC.PST-sleep-FV 9-dog  
 ‘In the house slept the dog.’

(6) Q: What did the girl give to the rabbit?

A: (*Iye*) *a-mu-pas-a*      *dzi-luwa*.

overt pronoun vs. pro-drop

1PRO 1SM-1OM-give-FV 5-flower

‘She gave it a flower.’

There are two types of ditransitives in Cinyungwe: lexical ditransitives and benefactive/malefactive applicatives (henceforth “applicatives” because, to the best of my knowledge, Cinyungwe does not have instrumental, locative, or comitative applicatives). In a neutral pragmatic context, the object word order is DO<IO in lexical ditransitives and IO<DO in applicatives.

(7) *Yavu*              *a-ku-pas-a*              *ma-luwa m-wana*.

lexical ditransitive:

1.grandmother 1SM-PRS.PROG-give-FV 6-flower 1-child

DO<IO

‘Grandmother is giving flowers to the child.’

(8) *N-da-gul-ir-a*              *a-zi-baba wa-ko caya*.

applicative:

1SG-REM.PST-give-APPL-FV 2-10-father 2-2SG.POSS 9.tea

IO<DO

‘I brought your parents tea.’

## 2 Object marking

### 2.1 Solitary OMs

As mentioned in §2, OMs appear within the verb form and refer to an object of the same noun class. Most commonly, an OM replaces the object it refers to and functions like a pronoun; I will call this type a “solitary” OM. For example, the class 7 object *cimbamba* ‘beans’ in (9a) is replaced by the class 7 OM *-ci-* in (9b).

(9) a. *Baba a-da-phik-a ci-mbamba bwino*.

1.father 1SM-REM.PST-cook-FV 7-beans well

‘Father cooked the beans well.’

b. *Baba a-da-(ci-)phik-a bwino*.

1.father 1SM-REM.PST-7OM-cook-FV well

‘Father cooked them well.’

In a ditransitive, an OM can replace either object, but only one OM can appear on a single verb.

- (10) a. *Yavu a-ku-(mu-)pas-a ma-luwa.*  
 1.grandmother 1SM-PRS.PROG-1OM-give-FV 6-flower  
 ‘Grandmother is giving her flowers.’
- b. *Yavu a-ku-(ma-)pas-a m-wana.*  
 1.grandmother 1SM-PRS.PROG-6OM-give-FV 1-child  
 ‘Grandmother is giving them to the child.’
- c. \**Yavu a-ku-(ma-)(mu-)pas-a.*
- d. \**Yavu a-ku-(mu-)(ma-)pas-a.*

Nouns in Cinyungwe are not marked for definiteness or specificity, as shown by the ambiguous interpretation of *mwana* ‘child’ in (11a). The ambiguity can be removed by, for example, continuing the sentence with the NPI phrase *ne na m’bodziyo* ‘at all’, which is only compatible with the indefinite reading (11b). In contrast, solitary OMs must have a specific referent (11c) and are not compatible with the ‘at all’ continuation.

- (11) a. *Ndi-ribe ku-won-a mwana.*  
 1SG-NEG 15-see-FV 1.child  
 ‘I didn’t see any child.’ **OR** ‘I didn’t see the/a (particular) child.’
- b. *Ndi-ribe ku-won-a mwana ne na m’-bodzi-yo.*  
 1SG-NEG 15-see-FV 1.child NEG with 1-one-NPI  
 ‘I didn’t see any child at all.’
- c. *Ndi-ribe ku-(mu-)won-a (#ne na m’-bodzi-yo).*  
 1SG-NEG 15-1OM-see-FV NEG with 1-one-NPI  
 ‘I didn’t see them (a particular person).’



## 2.2 Object marker doubling

In some Bantu languages, OMs and the objects they co-refer with can co-occur (e.g., Zeller 2014).<sup>2</sup> In Cinyungwe, OMD only occurs in particular pragmatic contexts. In neutral contexts, it is infelicitous.<sup>3</sup>

(12) in response to “How was your dinner?” or “What happened tonight?”

#*Baba a-da-ci- phik-a ci-mbamba bwino.*

1.father 1SM-REM.PST-7OM-cook-FV 7-beans well

‘Father cooked the beans well.’

However, in certain pragmatic contexts, OMD is completely natural.

(13) *Baba a-da-ci- phik-a ci-mbamba bwino!*

1.father 1SM-REM.PST-7OM-cook-FV 7-beans well

‘Father really cooked the beans well!’

✓ Father is bad at cooking and does so very infrequently. Tonight he made beans, and they’re nice: an extraordinary event.

✓ Someone denied that Father cooked the beans well (or at all), because he believes women should do the cooking. But the speaker saw the beans Father cooked.

Bantu OMD has recently been linked to various emphatic interpretations (Sikuku et al. 2018; Liu 2019; Colantes and Letsholo 2022; Lippard et al. 2023).<sup>4</sup> Languages differ with respect to object dislocation and available emphatic interpretations, but Lippard et al. (2023) report verum and mirative interpretations of OMD in Lubukusu, Cinyungwe, Tiriki, Wanga, and Ikalanga. Despite similarities between OMD in Cinyungwe and mirative/verum constructions, I will show that OMD does not specifically encode either of these meanings, although it is felicitous in both types of contexts.

However, before further discussing OMD in further detail, it is necessary to disambiguate it from a distinct construction that can appear very similar on a surface level: object dislocation.

---

<sup>2</sup>OMD often interacts with conjoint/disjoint alternations, which are associated with the relationship between the verb and any postverbal material (van der Wal 2017; Buell 2005; van der Spuy 1993; Zeller 2015). So far, I have not observed explicit conjoint/disjoint marking on Cinyungwe verbs.

<sup>3</sup>A hashtag # indicates infelicity in a given context. An asterisk \* indicates syntactic ungrammaticality.

<sup>4</sup>I use the words *emphasis* and *emphatic* throughout this paper as descriptive umbrella terms.

### 2.3 Object right dislocation

Distinguishing between object dislocation and OMD is important, because when controlling for the presence of a prosodic break, dislocation and OMD consistently pattern differently in terms of the contexts in which they are felicitous, and only the presence of a prosodic break can reliably predict these differences.

In Cinyungwe, a DP object can be dislocated outside of the vP. Sometimes this is evident from word order, but a more reliable diagnostic is the presence of a prosodic break between the verb and the object. Object right dislocation is possible both with and without the associated OM appearing on the verb.

- (14) a. *Siriza a-da-(li-) b-a* , *li-vu.* dislocation with OM  
 Siriza 1SM-REM.PST-5OM-steal-FV 5-book  
 ‘Siriza stole it, the book.’
- b. *Siriza a-da-b-a* , *li-vu.* dislocation without OM  
 Siriza 1SM-REM.PST-steal-FV 5-book  
 ‘Siriza STOLE the book.’

The presence of an OM affects the interpretation of a sentence with object right dislocation. (14a) has a clarification interpretation. It is acceptable in a neutral context (where a speaker adds the DP object as an afterthought to avoid miscommunication), in response to certain *wh*-questions, or in a polite corrective context (where the speaker is offering a mild correction in response to someone who claimed that Siriza did something else with the book). By contrast, (14b) is only acceptable in a corrective focus context where the speaker is confident that the proposition is true and is getting tired of discussing the topic.

The sentences in (15) and (16) are identical strings except for the presence/absence of a prosodic break. In response to a *wh*-question about the direct object, only the dislocation construction can be used. By contrast, in a disagreement about whether the whole event occurred, only the OMD construction can be used.

- (15) Context: Semo asks Kapenu, “What did the girl give to the rabbit?”
- a. *A-(mu-) pas-a dzi-luwa* , *sulu* dislocation  
 1SM-1OM-give-FV 5-flower 1.rabbit  
 ‘She gave it a flower, the rabbit’

b. # A-mu- pas-a    dzi-luwa sulu OMD  
 1SM-1OM-give-FV 5-flower 1.rabbit

(16) Context: Semo sees a girl hold out a flower to a rabbit, who takes it—a bizarre event. Semo says, “Did you see that? The girl gave a flower to the rabbit!” Kapenu does not believe him, so Semo insists:

a. # A-mu- pas-a    dzi-luwa , sulu dislocation  
 1SM-1OM-give-FV 5-flower 1.rabbit

b. A-mu- pas-a    dzi-luwa sulu OMD  
 1SM-1OM-give-FV 5-flower 1.rabbit  
 ‘She really gave a flower to the rabbit’

### 3 Alternate analyses

Lippard et al. (2023) report that mirative and verum interpretations arise from OMD in (at least) five Bantu languages: Lubukusu (Kenya, JE31c), Cinyungwe (Mozambique, N43), Tiriki (Kenya, JE413), Wanga (Kenya, JE32A), and Ikalanga (Botswana and Zimbabwe, S16). They also report intensity and reprimand interpretations in Lubukusu and exhaustive interpretations in Tiriki and Wanga. Lippard et al. (2023) propose that these emphatic interpretations are introduced through conventional implicatures. In this section, I will explore the categories of mirativity and verum to show that, despite their compatibility with OMD in Cinyungwe, OMD does not encode either of these meanings *per se*.

#### 3.1 Mirativity

Mirativity is most often associated with speaker surprise, but several other subtypes have been defined: sudden discovery/realization, counterexpectation/unprepared mind, and new information (Aikhenvald 2012; Anderbois 2024; Bianchi et al. 2016).<sup>5</sup> In *surprise* mirativity, as the name suggests, the speaker feels surprised by the proposition. In *sudden discovery/realization* mirativity, the speaker suddenly learns or remembers information or recognizes a pattern. In *counterexpectation/unprepared mind* mirativity, the proposition is unexpected to the speaker. In *new information* mirativity, the proposition constitutes new information for the speaker.

<sup>5</sup>Following Anderbois (2024), I do not treat counterexpectation and unprepared mind as distinct categories.

In this framework, although a mirative meaning may encompass multiple or all of these meanings, it is also possible to disentangle them. For example, suppose a speaker misses their bus almost every day. Today, they glance at their watch and suddenly realize they are running late. This information is not unexpected or surprising for them; it's nearly a daily occurrence. However, in a language with a mirative construction that specifically encodes sudden discovery/realization, mirativity would be felicitous in this context. Anderbois (2024) argues that the Tagalog particle *pala* is of this type.

### 3.1.1 OMD in mirative contexts

OMD is compatible with all four types of mirativity. For example, in (17), the speaker has suddenly discovered that the woman is not young and beautiful. This information is new and counter to their expectations, and they feel surprised.

- (17) Context: A young man has married an older woman. He brings his wife to meet his family. They are shocked; knowing how happy the young man has been, they expected someone young and beautiful.

[+sudden discovery, +surprise, +counterexpectation, +new information]

*U-da-mu-lowol-a                      n-kazi    umweyi?*

2SG-REM.PST-1OM-marry-FV 1-woman already

'You already married this woman?!'

Sudden discovery is not sufficient to license OMD in Cinyungwe, in contrast to Tagalog *pala*. This is not an argument against a mirative analysis, simply against an analysis of OMD as sudden discovery mirativity.

- (18) Context: Kapenu's father asks what happened while he was gone. Kapenu lists several things but forgets about his cat, a good hunter, catching a rat. Then he suddenly remembers.

[+sudden discovery, -surprise, -counterexpectation, -new information]

*#Na m-phaka y-angu ya-Ø-li-phat-a                      khoso*

and 9-cat    9-my    9SM-REC.PST-5OM-catch-FV 5.rat

'And my cat caught a rat'

### 3.1.2 Problems with a mirative analysis

OMD is possible in a context where no mirative meaning is available. In (19), Maria already knows that Suwe wrote a book. The information does not constitute a sudden discovery, and it is not new or surprising to Maria or counter to her expectations. Nevertheless, OMD is acceptable. This is in contrast to a mirative English exclamatory sentence: (*Wow,*) *Suwe wrote the book!* would be infelicitous in the context in (19).

(19) Context: Maria says that Suwe wrote a book, but her friend is doubtful. Maria shows a copy of the book as proof and says:

[–sudden discovery, –surprise, –counterexpectation, –new information]

*Suwe a-da-li- nemb-a li-vu !*

Suwe 1SM-REM.PST-5OM-write-FV 5-book

‘Suwe DID write a book!’

Another problem with a mirative analysis is that mirativity is often assumed to be optional, but there is at least one type of context in which OMD is obligatory for the sentence to be felicitous.

(20) Context: Semo and Siriza are debating whether their mother bought maize. Siriza predicts yes; Semo predicts no. Their mother comes home with maize in her shopping bag. Semo says:

*U-Ø-khan-a lazawu! Mayi a-Ø-#(ci-)gul-a ci-manga !*

2SG-RECPST-have-FV reason 1.mother 1SM-RECPST-7OM-buy-FV 7-maize

‘You were right! Mother bought maize!’

A third problem is that OMD seems to require that an argument DP be salient. A salient DP’s referent is in the common ground, either introduced linguistically or situationally. This would be unexpected with mirativity, assuming it is optional and speaker-oriented.

(21) *M-phaka na Kapenu ya-Ø-(li-) phat-a* (khoso)!

9-cat of Kapenu 9SM-RECPST-5OM-catch-FV 5.rat

‘Kapenu’s cat caught a/the rat!’

*Acceptable contexts:*

# Kapenu’s sisters are talking about movies when Kapenu’s cat passes by with a rat in its mouth. (*neither DP salient*)

✓ Kapenu’s sisters are talking about the cat. Even though it’s old, they all believe it’s still useful. Just then, the cat passes by with a rat in its mouth. (*salient subject*)

✓ Kapenu’s sisters are talking about a notorious one-eared rat that has been destroying gardens. Just then, Kapenu’s cat passes by with the rat in its mouth. (*salient object*)

Recall that the referents of non-doubling OMs are necessarily specific. This is not the case with OMD. The salience requirement can be met by any argument DP; it is not a requirement of the doubled object DP in particular. As (22) shows, a negative indefinite DP can be doubled.

(22) Context: You’re looking for help with a task. Someone told you to go to the street where boys are always playing football. You went to the street expecting a large group of kids, but it was empty.

*Ndi-ribe ku-(mu-) won-a (m-wana) na m’-bodzi-yo.*

1SG-NEG 15-1OM-see-FV 1-child with 1-one-NPI

‘I really didn’t see any child at all’

### 3.1.3 Interim summary: OMD does not encode mirativity

Aikhenvald (2012) and Anderbois (2024) break down mirativity into several components: sudden discovery, surprise, counterexpectation, and new information. OMD is compatible with each of these meanings, independently or in combination, but it is also felicitous without them. Unlike mirativity, OMD is sometimes obligatory and has discourse licensing conditions. Based on these facts, I argue that OMD does not encode mirativity *per se*, despite its compatibility with mirative meanings.

### 3.2 Verum

The concept of verum was introduced in Höhle (1992), but there is still no single, well-established definition of the phenomenon.<sup>6</sup> It is often intuitively described as emphasis or focus on the truth of a proposition, particularly in contexts of conflict or disagreement. Researchers continue to debate how this emphasis is accomplished. Some authors base their analysis on the introduction of focus alternatives (Wilder 2013; Littell 2016; Lohnstein 2018; Lee 2019; Goodhue 2022) and others on a lexical operator (Hartmann 2013; Kandybowicz 2013; Gutzmann et al. 2020; Bill and Koev 2021). Given the ongoing debate, it is necessary to clearly define verum before determining whether a language phenomenon constitutes an example of it. Two claims about verum are particularly common in the literature.

#### (23) Common claims about verum

1. *discourse licensing condition*: For a sentence VERUM(*p*) to be felicitous, *p* must appear in the prior discussion, which various authors define as a previous utterance of *p*,  $\neg p$ , *?p*, MODAL-*p*, or some combination of these.
2. *syntactic generalization*: The linguistic manifestation of verum appears relatively high, i.e., above *vP*, such as at the CP or Pol(arity)P level.

One of the least controversial examples of verum is English emphatic *do*, a type of *do*-support that is not syntactically motivated and often bears prosodic stress. Compare (24), which is (according to Wilder 2013) consistent with the claims above, with examples of syntactically motivated *do*-support.

(24) They said he didn't have a lot of patients but... he DOES have a lot of patients.

(Wilder 2013:145)

✓ *p* in prior discussion: "they said that  $\neg p$ "

✓ syntactic position: according to Wilder (2013),  $\Sigma P$  (=PolP) just below T

Previous studies have identified a number of characteristics of verum meaning. There is variation among them, but they often include a requirement for disagreement in some form. Romero and Han (2004) link verum in polar questions to speaker certainty that a proposition *p* should be added to the common ground,

---

<sup>6</sup>I use *verum* as a theory-neutral cover term for verum, verum focus, polarity focus, polarity emphasis, auxiliary focus, and truth value focus.

particularly in cases of conflict. This conflict can be overt disagreement between the speaker and addressee, but it can also be speaker-internal conflict that the addressee is unaware of, such as the speaker's previous bias on an issue having been contradicted by the addressee's assertion (Romero and Han 2004).

Gutzmann and Miró (2011) show that *verum* does not affect truth conditions and argue that it is an instruction to downdate the question under discussion (QUD), that is, to remove a (sub)question from the QUD, a question that conversation participants are attempting to answer through the course of the conversation. The QUD consists of an overarching question and various subquestions. Gutzmann and Miró (2011) discuss several features of *verum* in German, which is realized through prosodic stress. They argue that *verum* is syntactically located in C, so it applies to propositions, not the expressions it stresses. Second, *verum* does not affect a sentence's truth conditions. Third, *verum* is available in different clause types, such as questions, imperatives, and embedded clauses.

Lee (2019) defines *verum* as a strategy a speaker uses to overcome addressee resistance to a proposition. The speaker must have asserted  $p$  and then encountered resistance in some form, such as explicit disagreement or avoidance of agreement/expression of uncertainty.

Gutzmann et al. (2020) state that *verum* requires “an open conflict between salient alternatives or the final settlement of a question” (14). For a speaker to say *VERUM*( $p$ ), the possibility of  $\neg p$  must be salient. Thus *verum* is an instruction to prevent the QUD from being resolved with  $\neg p$ . They also identify contexts in which *verum* is optional (with an emphatic effect): answers to polar questions and explicit alternative questions, affirmations of a preceding truth value, and opposite polarity contexts.

Examples of reported manifestations of *verum* in different languages are shown in Table 3, organized into four categories. The last category—insertion of a clitic/affix on the verb—may seem the least likely to involve a relatively high syntactic associate (and the most similar to OMD). However, Littell (2016) notes that the Kwak'wala *verum* marker can “modify the sentence as a whole” but attaches “to the first word in the sentence” (44), and Schuh (2005) analyzes the Bole & Ngizim totality extensions as “auxiliary focus” on TAM or polarity, following Hyman and Watters (1984).



Table 3: Reported manifestations of verum crosslinguistically

how manifested	languages	examples	sources
prosodic stress	German	on verb or C	Höhle (1992)
	Dutch	on finite verb	Sudhoff (2012)
	English	on aux/copula	Gutzmann et al. (2020)
syntactic movement	English	neg preposing	Romero and Han (2004)
	Spanish	DP fronting	Leonetti and Escandell-Vidal (2009)
	South Marghi	verb raising	Hartmann and Zimmermann (2012)
preverbal element	English	<i>really</i>	Romero and Han (2004)
		emphatic <i>do</i>	Gutzmann and Miró (2011)
	Bura	particle <i>kú</i>	Hartmann and Zimmermann (2012)
	Dutch	particle <i>wel</i>	Sudhoff (2012)
clitic/affix on verb	Bole	suffix -tu	Schuh (2005)
	Ngizim	suffix -na	Schuh (2005)
	Kwak'wala	prefix ?m-	Littell (2016)

### 3.2.1 OMD in verum contexts

Like verum constructions, OMD in Cinyungwe is infelicitous out of the blue, as previously shown in (12). Many instances of OMD are consistent with common characterizations of verum. For example, (25) meets the licensing condition above (*p* in prior discussion): *p* is ‘mother bought maize,’ and both *p* and  $\neg p$  are part of the background discussion. (25) can also be translated into English using emphatic *do*.

- (25) Context: Semo and Siriza have been debating whether their mother bought maize. Siriza predicts yes; Semo predicts no. Their mother arrives with maize in her shopping bag. Siriza says:

*Ni-Ø-khan-a lazawu! Mayi a-Ø-(ci-) gul-a (ci-manga)!*

1SM-RECPST-have-FV reason 1.mother 1SM-RECPST-7OM-buy-FV 7-maize

‘I was right! Mother DID buy maize!’

### 3.2.2 Problems with a verum analysis

There are two main problems with a verum analysis: syntactically, OMD appears to associate with the object, and pragmatically, OMD has weaker licensing conditions than verum. First, consider the syntactic associate of verum constructions. As previously mentioned, verum theories are often grouped into focus-based and operator-based theories. In both types, the semantic associates of verum are propositions, and the syntactic associates are above  $vP$ , often at the CP level (Höhle 1992; Gutzmann and Miró 2011; Gutzmann et al. 2020) or PolP/ $\Sigma P$  level (Sudhoff 2012; Wilder 2013; Samko 2016; Lee 2019; Goodhue 2022).

In many (if not all) cases, OMD semantically associates with propositions. However, its syntactic associate intuitively seems to be the object. Assuming manner adverbs can be used to mark the edge of  $vP$ , the doubled object is  $vP$ -internal (Ernst 2020; Langa da Câmara 2024). A syntactic/semantic associate mismatch is not unheard of (see Branan and Erlewine 2023), but it differs from the patterns reported for verum.

- (26) *N-da* ci- *phik-a*                      ci-mbamba *mwakankulumize*.  
 1SG-REM.PST-7OM-cook-FV 7-beans              quickly  
 ‘I really cooked the beans quickly.’

- (27) *Semo a-libe*                      *ku-*ma- *won-a* ma-luwa .  
 Semo 1SM.REM.PST-NEG INF-5OM-see-FV 5-flower  
 ‘Semo really didn’t see flowers.’

Second, consider the licensing conditions of verum constructions. For now, I will assume that the semantic associate of OMD is the proposition denoted by the sentence, which I will call the “prejacent”. Most previous work on verum argues that the prejacent  $p$  must be salient or familiar. Gutzmann and Miró (2011) propose that  $?p$  is maximal in the QUD. Wilder (2013) argues for an alternative set  $\{\neg p, p\}$  evoked by the antecedent utterance and discourse context. Goodhue (2022) proposes that  $\neg p$  is available as a focal target through contextual salience or other means, such as presupposition accommodation. Lee (2019) argues that the speaker must be committed to  $p$ .

While OMD readily occurs in contexts where the prejacent is salient, this is not a requirement. The salience of an argument DP is sufficient—if the DP appears in a proposition that is relevant to the OMD prejacent.

(28) *Mphaka ya Kapenu ya-Ø-(li-) phat-a* khoso!

9.cat of Kapenu 9SM-RECPST-6OM-catch-FV 6.rat

‘Kapenu’s cat caught a/the rat!’

# neutral context, no cat/rat discussion

✓ in response to ‘There’s no way Kapenu’s cat caught a/the rat!’ (salient prejacent)

✓ in response to ‘Kapenu’s cat is really old.’ (salient subject)

✓ in response to ‘The rat in our garden is really fast.’ (salient object)

This does not align with, for example, emphatic *do* in English.

(29) Kapenu’s cat DID catch a rat!

# neutral context, no cat/rat discussion

✓ in response to ‘There’s no way Kapenu’s cat caught a rat!’ (salient prejacent)

# in response to ‘Kapenu’s cat is really old.’ (salient subject)

# in response to ‘The rat in our garden is really fast.’ (salient object)

### 3.2.3 Interim summary: OMD does not encode verum

Many authors assign verum particular syntactic and pragmatic properties. The syntactic associate is structurally high and the semantic associate is the proposition. OMD, however, seems to have a syntactic/semantic associate mismatch. Verum reportedly requires the prejacent to be salient, but OMD does not. Based on these facts, I conclude that, as with mirativity, OMD is compatible with verum but does not specifically encode verum these meanings.

## 3.3 Beyond verum and mirativity

Although mirative and verum-like interpretations of OMD are the most common, other interpretations are possible. For example, (30) communicates that Semo not only drank beer, but drank a lot of it, which Lippard et al. (2023) refer to as an intensity interpretation. However, since this interpretation is more readily available with *bwadwa* ‘beer’ than *madzi* ‘water’, they conclude that the intensity interpretation likely does not arise independently from OMD.

(30) Context: Semo, who is not walking well, arrives home. Someone asks what happened.

*Semo a-da-li- mw-a bwadwa* .

Semo 1SM-REM.PST-5OM-drink-FV 5.beer

‘Semo drank (an extraordinary amount of) beer.’

(Lippard et al. 2023:93)

The sentence in (31) has an exhaustive interpretation. Again, Lippard et al. (2023) note that the exhaustive meaning only arises in particular contexts; (31) cannot be used in a more neutral context with the same exhaustive meaning.

(31) Context: Someone denied that Kapenu would start a fire or claimed that he would do so for his (male) friend. The speaker knows that, since the women have no dry wood, Kapenu will help them, but he will not start a fire for anyone else.

*Kapenu a-ndza-wu- gas-ir-a a-kazi moto* .

Kapenu 1SM-FUT-3OM-start.fire-APPL-FV 2-woman 3.fire

‘Kapenu will start fire for the women only’ (not for anyone else).

(Lippard et al. 2023:92)

There are some instances of Cinyungwe OMD which are clearly distinct from verum and mirativity, even in combination with another interpretation. In the English dialogue in (32), speaker A cannot use a mirative or verum construction in (29A2). Mirativity is infelicitous because A expected the red team to win, and verum is infelicitous because the verum prejacent—WIN(red team, game)—was not previously stated or negated.

(32) A1: There’s no way the red team will lose the game.

B1: Definitely not, I agree.

... [the red team wins] ...

A2: ✓ The red team won the game.

# Wow, the red team won the game!

# The red team DID win the game!

However, in the Cinyungwe version of this dialogue, OMD is acceptable in (33A2).

(33) A1: *A-nya-kubval-a bz-akubvala bzi-fwira a-ni-luz-a m'-pikixanu wa mpira lero cipo.*

‘There’s no way the red team will lose the football match today!’

B1: *Indedi! Ndi-ku-bzi-won-a-mbo.*

‘Indeed! I agree.’

... [the red team wins] ...

A2: *A-nya-kubval-a bva-kubvala bzi-fwira a-wu- win-a m'-pikixanu wa m-pira !*

1-NOM-wear-FV 8-clothes 8-red 1SM-3OM-win-FV 3-game 3.POSS ball

‘The red team (*lit.* the people dressed in red) really won the football match!’

These examples, along with others throughout this paper, show that OMD is highly context-dependent, which is a characteristic not of conventional implicatures but of conversational implicatures.

## 4 Manner implicature analysis

I have shown that OMD in Cinyungwe marks a form of emphasis that, while compatible with both verum and mirativity, does not directly encode either of these meanings. This raises two important questions. First, what are the precise licensing conditions of OMD? They must be weaker than those of verum but strong enough to rule out OMD in neutral/out of the blue contexts. Second, how does OMD semantically associate with propositions but syntactically associate with objects?

### 4.1 Licensing conditions of OMD

To define the licensing conditions of OMD, we first need a precise definition of what qualifies as an OMD construction.

(34) A construction is an OMD construction iff

1. an overt DP object and an associated OM (an OM that agrees in noun class with the object) co-occur in the construction, and
2. they are not separated by a prosodic break.

This definition singles out OMD as it occurs in Cinyungwe; object right dislocation is excluded, even with the presence of an OM, because dislocation always involves a prosodic break.

An OMD construction must meet two licensing conditions to be felicitous. These conditions do not account for the range of emphatic meanings contributed by OMD; they are pragmatic preconditions for its use.

(35) In a discourse context *C*, an OMD construction with a preadjacent proposition *p* is felicitous iff

1. at least one argument DP in the construction is salient in *C*, and
2. *p* addresses the QUD in *C*.

Recall that a salient DP is a DP whose referent is in the common ground, either introduced linguistically or situationally, and the QUD is a question that conversation participants are trying to answer (Roberts 2012; Büring 2003). A proposition can address the QUD by answering it, answering one of its subquestions, or providing a new subquestion (Benz and Jasinskaja 2017).

#### 4.1.1 DP saliency

OMD requires an argument DP to be salient, which can be accomplished through prior discussion, background discussion, or implicit discourse. One example of this requirement is (21); another is shown in (36), which is only acceptable if the subject *Suwe* and/or object *livu* refers to an individual in the common ground.

(36) Context: At the bookstore, Siriza and Maria see a book on display by their old school friend *Suwe*.

*Suwe a-da-li- nemb-a li-vu !*

Suwe 1SM-REM.PST-5OM-write-FV 5-book

‘*Suwe* wrote a/the book!’

*Acceptable contexts:*

- ✓ Siriza and Maria were talking about *Suwe*, who is notoriously bad at writing. (*salient subject*)
- ✓ Siriza and Maria were talking about their interest in the book, which they may or may not have known was written by *Suwe*. (*salient object*)
- # Siriza and Maria were talking about their interest in Mozambican literature. (*neither DP salient*)

In (37), both the subject and object are negative indefinites and thus cannot be salient. Although (37a) is a natural sentence, (37b) is marginal regardless of pragmatic context.

(37) a. *Palibe mu-nthu a-gwal-a mu-ti na u-bodzi-wo.*

NEG 1-person 1SM-sow-FV 3-plant with 3-one-3.NPI

‘No one planted any plant.’

b. ?*Palibe mu-nthu a-wu-gwal-a mu-ti na u-bodzi-wo.*

NEG 1-person 1SM-sow-FV 3-plant with 3-one-3.NPI

Although a salient argument DP is necessary to license OMD, it is not sufficient. If an argument DP in the prejacent is salient but the prejacent does not address the QUD, OMD is infelicitous.

(38) Kapenu’s cat is a decent hunter. Kapenu’s sisters are talking about the cat’s uncommon pattern: black with white patches all over. Just then, the cat passes by with a rat in its mouth.

#*M-phaka ya Kapenu ya-Ø-li-phat-a khoso!*

9-cat of Kapenu 9-REC.PST-6OM-catch-FV 6.rat

Intended: ‘Kapenu’s cat caught a rat’

#### 4.1.2 Addressing the QUD

There are several ways for an OMD prejacent to address the QUD, which helps explain the range of contexts in which OMD appears.

*OMD prejacent directly addresses QUD*

One way for an OMD prejacent  $p$  to address the QUD is for  $p$  or  $\neg p$  to have been uttered previously. If the speaker previously said  $p$ , this can result in verum-like OMD, which emphasizes that  $p$  is true (39). If the speaker previously said  $\neg p$ , it can result in mirative-like OMD, which emphasizes that  $p$  is surprising (40).

(39) Context: Semo and Siriza are debating whether their mother bought maize. Siriza predicts yes; Semo predicts no. Their mother comes home with maize in her shopping bag. Siriza says:

*Ni-Ø-khan-a lazawu! Mayi a-Ø-ci-gul-a ci-manga!*

1SM-RECPST-have-FV reason 1.mother 1SM-RECPST-7OM-buy-FV 7-maize

‘I was right! Mother really bought maize!’

(40) Context: As before, but both Semo and Siriza agree it is unlikely that their mother bought maize.

*Ti-Ø-kha-libe lazawu! Mayi a-Ø-(ci-) gul-a (ci-manga) !*

‘We were wrong! Mother really bought maize!’

*OMD prejaçant indirectly addresses QUD*

If an OMD prejaçant  $p$  indirectly addresses the QUD,  $p$  (or its negation) has not been previously uttered but  $p$  answers a subquestion of the QUD. The QUD can be visualized as discourse trees, where the main question branches into subquestions (Büring 2003). For example, the question ‘What goes where?’ could have subquestions like ‘What goes on the table?’, ‘What goes on the bookshelf?’, etc. as well as subquestions like ‘Where does the candle go?’, ‘Where does the minifigure go?’, etc. Different responses can address different subquestions while still addressing the same overarching question.

Assume the QUD in (41) is something like ‘Is Kapenu’s cat useless?’ A subquestion could be ‘Can she catch rats?’, and a subsubquestion could be ‘Did she catch a rat (today)?’ In this way, the sentence in (41) addresses the QUD, suggesting that the answer is *no* (or at least, likely to be *no*).

(41) Context: Kapenu’s sisters are talking about how old and lazy his cat is. Just then, they see the cat pass by with a rat in its mouth.

*M-phaka ya Kapenu ya-Ø-(li-) phat-a (khoso) !*

9-cat of Kapenu 9-REC.PST-6OM-catch-FV 6.rat

‘Kapenu’s cat caught a rat!’

In the context in (41), the speaker is biased toward the answer to the QUD being *yes*. The prejaçant  $p$  is contrary to this expectation, resulting in a mirative-like interpretation of the sentence. In a context where the speaker’s expectation differs from that of the addressee, and  $p$  supports the speaker’s expectation, a *verum*-like interpretation is more likely.

*OMD prejaçant addresses a background QUD*

In this case, the QUD is established through common knowledge, rather than through prior utterances. Even out of the blue, there is a QUD; it is just a background QUD, something like “What is the world like?” (Stokke 2018). A background QUD does not need to be this broad, though; it can be established by background



discussion or nonlinguistic means (i.e., information that the conversation participants all know but have not stated explicitly).

For example, although the topic is not discussed as in (41), the QUD in (42) may also be ‘Is Kapenu’s cat useless?’ The interpretation of (42) is the same as (41); given the discourse context, the prejacent *p* contradicts the expected answer to the QUD.

(42) Context: Kapenu’s cat is famously lazy. The idea of it catching small animals is obviously ridiculous; it doesn’t even need to be mentioned. Kapenu’s sisters see the cat pass by with a rat in its mouth.

*M-phaka ya Kapenu ya-Ø-li- phat-a*      *(khoso)!*  
9-cat      of Kapenu 9-REC.PST-6OM-catch-FV 6.rat  
‘Kapenu’s cat caught a rat!’

#### Questions

A question can also address the QUD, if it provides a subquestion to the current QUD (Roberts 2012; Büring 2003). OMD is possible with questions in Cinyungwe, both polar questions and *wh*-questions. For example, if the QUD in (43) is ‘What happened to the curry?’, which is consistent with the context, the OMD prejacent ‘Who ate the curry?’ is a more specific subquestion.

(43) Context: You have been talking about the curry for some time. You are getting frustrated trying to find out what happened to it.

*Mbani a-da-ci- dy-a*      *(ci-sayi) ?*  
who 1SM-REM.PST-7OM-eat-FV 7-curry  
‘Who really ate the curry?’

The sentence in (43) seems to emphasize the importance of the prejacent question. For a verum-like interpretation, the prejacent ‘Who ate the curry?’ must have already been explicitly asked.

## 4.2 OMD introduces an atypicality manner implicature

If the licensing conditions in (35) are met and a speaker utters an OMD sentence, the interpretation of the sentence will include something ‘extra’ beyond the semantic meaning of the OMD prejacent itself. This something extra is a form of emphasis that marks the prejacent as atypical in some way. In a mirative-like

interpretation, the prejacent is understood to be atypically surprising. In a verum-like interpretation, it is atypically true. Another interpretation is that the prejacent is atypically important. This is consistent with non-mirative, non-verum examples such as (33) and (43).

I propose that this atypicality emphasis is a manner implicature. Manner implicatures are conversational implicatures that result from flouting Grice's (1975) Maxim of Manner, one of four maxims that are subparts of the Cooperative Principle. Conversational implicatures arise when a speaker flouts one or more maxims but the addressee assumes they are still trying to be cooperative and must have a good reason for "breaking the rules".

(44) **Maxim of Manner:** Be perspicuous.

1. Avoid obscurity of expression.
2. Avoid ambiguity.
3. Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity).
4. Be orderly.

(Grice 1975:46)

OMD can be viewed as flouting the maxim of manner, specifically the third instruction to "be brief." Compared to an otherwise identical sentence that lacks an OM, an OMD construction contains an additional morpheme. This makes OMD morphologically marked. However, an OMD construction does not contribute any additional descriptive information that is not already entailed by its prejacent.

According to Rett (2020), markedness is a closely related concept to manner implicatures that flout the instruction to be brief, which she terms "atypicality implicatures". By using a marked construction instead of an unmarked alternative, a speaker indicates that "the situation described is atypical in a way pertinent to the marked phrase" (Rett 2020). In the case of OMD, the morphologically marked phrase is the VP, but the marked meaning applies to the whole prejacent proposition *p*.

#### 4.2.1 Manner implicature diagnostics

Grice's diagnostics for conversational implicatures in general include calculability, non-detachability, and cancelability, although the latter property is not expected to always apply to manner implicatures (Grice 1975). Later work identified additional diagnostics: conversational implicatures, including manner implicatures, are reinforceable, discourse-sensitive, and embeddable (Rett 2020). I will apply several of these diagnostics to OMD in Cinyungwe.

Discourse sensitivity is the most obviously satisfied diagnostic. Rett (2020) notes that all conversational implicatures, including manner implicatures, are QUD-sensitive. For example, their cancellability depends on whether they are at-issue content (Rett 2020). Sensitivity to the discourse context and, more specifically, the QUD is not only a characteristic of OMD; it is one of the licensing preconditions for the construction.

Calculability means that an addressee can work out an implicature based on a sentence's conventional semantic meaning, the conversational maxims, the discourse context, and the common ground (Grice 1975). For example, in (45), an addressee might calculate the implicature as follows: *Siriza could have omitted the OM -ci- and the meaning would have been the same. She must be indicating that something about the situation isn't typical. We've been telling her she's wrong all day, and she just found out she was right. She must have used OMD to emphasize that she knew what she was talking about—she was right about Mother buying maize.*

(45) Context: All day, Siriza's siblings and cousins have been saying her mother didn't buy maize. Siriza insists that she did. Her mother comes home with maize in her shopping bag.

Mayi a-da-ci-gul-a ci-manga! Ni-khan-a lazawu!

1.mother 1SM-REM.PST-7OM-buy-FV 7-maize 1SG-have-FV reason

'Mother really did buy maize! I was right!'

(45) can also be seen as an example of reinforceability. The continuation *Nikhana lazawu!* 'I was right' is acceptable even though this is communicated, at least partially, through the implicature.

Manner implicatures differ in terms of embeddability. The implicature in the English sentence (46) is that Jane is not directly responsible for the sheriff's death; it arises from the use of the phrase *caused to die* instead of *killed*. However, it is ambiguous whether it is the judge or the speaker who believes this about Jane. In other words, the implicature can be interpreted locally (at the level of the embedded clause) or

globally (at the level of the matrix clause).

(46) The judge believes that Jane caused the sheriff to die.

(Rett 2020:68)

In Cinyungwe, an OMD construction can appear in an embedded clause, but the emphatic meaning cannot be embedded. This is shown in (47).

(47) *Maria a-lew-a kuti Semo a-da-li- wereng-a li-vu .*

Maria 1SM-say-FV that Semo 1SM-REM.PST-5OM-read-FV 5-book

‘Maria said that Semo really read a book.’

*Acceptable contexts:*

# Maria was surprised that Semo read a book, but the speaker was not.

OK: Both Maria and the speaker were surprised that Semo read a book.

Cinyungwe OMD appears to be more speaker-oriented than the manner implicature in (46). This is consistent with (46) being a descriptive manner implicature, whereas the meaning of OMD is more expressive.

### 4.3 Why OMD?

Despite the diagnostics discussed above, the connection between the syntactic construction of OMD and an atypicality manner implicature may still seem strange. The only morphological difference between a typical transitive sentence and an OMD sentence in Cinyungwe is the presence of an object marker. How is it that this morpheme results in emphasis on an entire proposition?

First, it is possible that focus and emphasis in Cinyungwe can only be communicated morphosyntactically, through movement or affixation. I have not yet observed any prosodic methods of marking focus in Cinyungwe (such as English stress and intonation). Recall that corrective focus, for example, can be accomplished through object right dislocation. There is also the emphatic post-final-vowel particle *-di*, which I will introduce in the next section. Thus, it is not surprising that manner implicatures would be introduced morphosyntactically.

Furthermore, the emphatic meanings of object dislocation and *-di*-insertion are more narrow in scope. Dislocation seems to result in focus on postverbal material that remains in VP (or if none exists, on the verb

itself). As I will show in §6, *-di* seems to emphasize the verb it attaches to rather than the entire proposition. Potentially, the only way to emphasize an entire proposition in Cinyungwe is to emphasize an event, and that the only way to emphasize an event is to increase the morphological markedness of the *vP* without adding descriptive content.

This analysis is supported by another difference between dislocation and OMD. Recall that there are two types of ditransitives in Cinyungwe with different default object word orders: lexical ditransitives (DO<IO) and applicatives (IO<DO). In object right dislocation constructions, these word order differences disappear. With both types of ditransitives, the focused object must appear immediately after the verb, and the given, non-focused object must be dislocated. This is true regardless of which object is focused.

The lexical ditransitive examples are shown in (48) for corrective focus on a direct object and in (49) for corrective focus on an indirect object. The applicative examples are shown in (50) for corrective focus on a direct object and (51) for corrective focus on an indirect object.

(48) A: Did you see that? The girl gave a flower to the rabbit!

B: No, it was grass, not a flower!

a. *Neye, a-pas-a dzi-luwa , sulu.*

no 1SM-give-FV 5-flower 1.rabbit

‘No, she gave a FLOWER to the rabbit.’

b. #*Neye, a-pas-a sulu , dzi-luwa.*

no 1SM-give-FV 1.rabbit 5-flower

(49) A: Did you see that? The girl gave a flower to the rabbit!

B: No, it was a cat, not a rabbit!

a. #*Neye, a-pas-a dzi-luwa , sulu.*

no 1SM-give-FV 5-flower 1.rabbit

b. *Neye, a-pas-a sulu , dzi-luwa.*

no 1SM-give-FV 1.rabbit 5-flower

‘No, she gave the RABBIT a flower.’

(50) A: Did you see that? The girl bought cakes for the dog!

B: No, it was dog treats, not cakes.

a. *Neye, a-gul-ir-a mi-kate , m-bwaya.*

no 1SM-buy-APPL-FV 4-cake 9-dog

‘No, she bought CAKES for the dog.’

b. #*Neye, a-gul-ir-a m-bwaya, mi-kate.*

no 1SM-buy-APPL-FV 9-dog

(51) A: Did you see that? The girl bought cakes for the dog!

B: No, it was a cat, not a dog.

a. #*Neye, a-gul-ir-a mi-kate , m-bwaya.*

no 1SM-buy-APPL-FV 4-cake 9-dog

b. *Neye, a-gul-ir-a m-bwaya, mi-kate.*

no 1SM-buy-APPL-FV 9-dog

‘No, she bought the DOG cakes.’

In contrast, in the case of OMD with a verum-like interpretation, the word order difference is preserved, and with the “default” word orders, only the indirect object can be doubled. (52) shows this for a lexical ditransitive and (53) shows this for a benefactive applicative.

(52) A: Did you see? The girl gave a flower to the rabbit!

B: You’re lying! That would never happen.

a. #*N-da-bzi-won-a, ni cadidi! A-(li-) pas-a (dzi-luwa) sulu!*

1SG-REM.PST-8OM-see-FV COP true 1SM-5OM-give-FV 5-flower 1.rabbit

‘I saw it, it’s true! The girl really gave a flower to the rabbit!’

b. *N-da-bzi-won-a, ni cadidi! A-(mu-) pas-a dzi-luwa (sulu) !*

1SG-REM.PST-8OM-see-FV COP true 1SM-1OM-give-FV 5-flower 1.rabbit

(53) A: Did you see? The girl bought cakes for the dog!

B: You're lying! That would never happen.

- a. *N-da-bzi-won-a*,                    *ni cadidi!* A-(*yi-*) *gul-ir-a*                    (*m-bwaya*) *mi-kate!*  
1SG-REM.PST-8OM-see-FV COP true 1SM-9OM-buy-APPL-FV 9-dog 4-cake  
'I saw it, it's true! The girl really bought cakes for the dog!'
- b. #*N-da-bzi-won-a*,                    *ni cadidi!* A-(*mi-*) *gul-ir-a*                    *m-bwaya* (*mi-kate*) !  
1SG-REM.PST-8OM-see-FV COP true 1SM-4OM-buy-APPL-FV 9-dog 4-cake

While OMD is of course possible with direct objects (as in monotransitives), and more work is needed on OMD in ditransitives, these examples suggest a preference for doubling indirect objects. As I mention in the next section, this pattern is also seen in Indo-European clitic doubling. Additionally, assuming indirect objects occupy a structurally higher position than direct objects, this is potentially consistent with OMD's semantic association with events and propositions.

Finally, the manner implicature analysis helps explain the range of interpretations of OMD. Since atypicality implicatures are sensitive to the discourse context both for acceptability and interpretation, we would expect to see more interpretative variation with this type of implicature than with (for example) a conventional implicature.

In the next section, I will compare OMD to *-di*, another apparent emphasis marker in Cinyungwe. I will also present similarities between Cinyungwe OMD and Indo-European clitic doubling, focusing on Verbicarese.

## 5 OMD, *-di*, and clitic doubling

### 5.1 The emphatic post-final-vowel particle *-di*

As another form of emphasis marking, a brief comparison between *-di* and OMD is helpful. The particle *-di* is one of three particles that attach to the right of the final vowel (typically, as its name suggests, the final vowel is the rightmost morpheme). The other particles are *-mbo* 'also' and *-tu* 'quickly'.

(54) *N-da-won-a-di*

1SG-REM.PST-see-FV-really

‘I really saw (that)’

The particle *-di* appears in many of the same contexts as OMD, either independently (55b) or alongside OMD (55c). The interpretive differences among these sentences are subtle and often not immediately clear. However, whereas (55a) can only be used by the “convincer” (the individual trying to convince someone else), the sentences with *-di*, (55b) and (55c), could also be used by the “convinced” to acknowledge that they were wrong and have changed their mind.

(55) *Context: The speaker is arguing with someone who doesn’t believe Father cooked the beans.*

a. *Baba a-da-ci phik-a ci-mbamba !* (OMD)

1.father 1SM-REM.PST-7OM-cook-FV 7-beans

*approx.* ‘Father really cooked the beans!’

b. *Baba a-da-phik-a-di ci-mbamba* (-di)

1.father 1SM-REM.PST-cook-PART 7-beans

*approx.* ‘Father really cooked the beans!’

c. *Baba a-da-ci phik-a-di ci-mbamba !* (OMD + -di)

1.father 1SM-REM.PST-7OM-cook-FV-PART 7-beans

*approx.* ‘Father really cooked the beans!’

Additionally, the addition of *-di* sometimes seems to intensify the emphatic interpretation of an OMD sentence.

(56) *Context: Someone asks if it’s true that Sekerani plucked the bananas.*

*Sekerani a-da-ma ch-a-di ma-figu .*

Sekerani 1SM-REM.PST-6OM-pluck-FV-DI 6-banana

‘(I’m certain of it,) Sekerani really plucked the bananas.’

There is not a complete overlap between acceptable contexts for OMD and *-di*. For example, OMD would be felicitous in the contexts in (57) and (58), but *-di* is not.



(57) Context: Maria’s friends are making fun of Kapenu’s cat, saying that it too old and lazy to be helpful. Maria is defending the cat. Just then, the cat passes by with a rat in its mouth. Maria says...

#*M-phaka ya Kapenu ya-Ø-phat-a-di* *khoso!*  
 9-cat of Kapenu 9-REC.PST-catch-FV-DI 6.rat  
 ‘Kapenu’s cat really caught a rat!’

(58) Context: A notorious one-eared rat has been destroying people’s gardens. Maria and her friends believe it cannot be caught. Just then, Kapenu’s cat passes by carrying the rat in its mouth. Maria says...

#*M-phaka ya Kapenu ya-Ø-phat-a-di* *khoso!*  
 9-cat of Kapenu 9-REC.PST-catch-FV-DI 6.rat  
 ‘Kapenu’s cat really caught the rat!’

Note that all of the acceptable *-di* examples above are cases where emphatic *do* could be used in English, and both of the infelicitous *-di* examples are cases where emphatic *do* would be infelicitous. The particle *-di* seems to pattern more closely with verum meaning than OMD.

Additionally, OMD and *-di* interact slightly differently with negation. Consider the paraphrases of (59) and (60) below.

(59) *Siriza a-libe ku-b-a-di li-vu, a-da-li-kumbir-a -di*  
 Siriza 1SM-NEG INF-steal-FV-really 5-book 1SM-REM.PST-5OM-borrow-FV  
 ‘Siriza really didn’t steal the book, she borrowed it’ (We are sure she didn’t steal it; we have more information about what happened to it)

(60) *Siriza a-da-li- b-a lini li-vu, a-da-li-kumbir-a OMD*  
 Siriza 1SM-REM.PST-5OM-steal-FV NEG 5-book 1SM-REM.PST-5OM-borrow-FV  
 ‘Siriza really didn’t steal the book, she borrowed it’ (Regardless of what others say, we know Siriza and we know she wouldn’t do that)

Whereas (59) seems more closely linked to the verb, (60) concerns the subject. One possible explanation for the difference between OMD and *-di* is that *-di* has a narrower scope; its semantic associate is not a proposition. Further research is needed, but this could provide further evidence for the manner implicature

analysis of OMD.

## 5.2 Indo-European clitic doubling

There are a number of relevant similarities between Indo-European clitic doubling (CD) and Cinyungwe OMD, which suggest that the patterns I report in Cinyungwe OMD may be present in other language families. Note that it is debated whether OMs in different Bantu languages are agreement morphemes or clitic pronouns (see Baker and Kramer 2018). Langa da Câmara et al. (2024) propose that Cinyungwe OMs in OMD constructions arise through  $\phi$ -agreement. This question is not my focus in this paper, and my use of hyphens is intended to be theory-neutral.<sup>7</sup>

Anagnostopoulou (2006) defines CD as “a construction in which a clitic co-occurs with a full DP in argument position forming a discontinuous constituent with it” (520). CD has been reported in various Romance and Slavic languages, as well as Albanian and Greek. Many authors distinguish between clitic doubling and object left/right dislocation (with a clitic), as I have done for Cinyungwe (e.g., Anagnostopoulou 2006; Di Tullio et al. 2019).

For example, in Argentinian Spanish, non-right-dislocated doubled DPs are part of a focused constituent, whereas right-dislocated DPs are not (Di Tullio et al. 2019). The focus-sensitive *solo* ‘only’ is not acceptable with a right-dislocated object, but it is acceptable with CD. Additionally, only doubled objects are acceptable in contrastive focus contexts (corrective, in my terminology) (Di Tullio et al. 2019).

Crosslinguistically, CD of indirect objects is more common and less constrained than CD of direct objects. Some languages, such as Standard Spanish and Catalan, double indirect objects but do not double direct objects at all. Other languages double only specific direct objects, whereas indirect objects are doubled regardless of specificity.

In the rest of this section, I will focus on CD in Verbicarese, an Upper Southern Italian dialect (USID) spoken in the village of Verbicaro (Idone and Silvestri 2019; Ledgeway and Maiden 2016). To the best of my knowledge, the pragmatic emphatic aspects of CD in Verbicarese have not been previously reported.

---

<sup>7</sup>Additionally, the distinction between agreement marker and clitic pronoun may not be entirely clear-cut. Cournane (2010) argues that there is a grammaticalization pathway from clitic to agreement. She presents a continuum of least to most grammaticalized subject markers based on their behavior with respect to CD: Standard French, which never permits subject CD < Québec French, which only permits subject CD with definites < Pied Noir (Algerian) French, in which subject CD is optional and unrestricted < Northern Italian, which requires subject CD.

*Verbicarese dislocation and clitic doubling*

The standard word order in Verbicarese is SVO.<sup>8</sup>

- (61) *Viya*            *\*(a) Giusa craja.*  
see.1SG.PRS DOM Giusi tomorrow  
'I will see Giusi tomorrow.'

There are several dislocation constructions in Verbicarese, all of which are distinct from CD. Left dislocation is possible with a clitic (62a) or without a clitic (62b). Right dislocation with a clitic is also possible (62c). The dislocated direct object appears to be a topic in (62a), correctively focused in (62b), and a clarifying afterthought in (62c). The latter example is very similar to Cinyungwe object right dislocation with an OM.

Another possible similarity between the languages is that dislocation *without* a clitic or OM results in corrective focus; however, unlike in Cinyungwe, the focused element in (62b) is the dislocated object *a Giusa*, not the verb or remaining postverbal material.<sup>9</sup>

- (62) a. (A) *Giusa, a viya craja.*  
DOM Giusi CL.FSG see.1SG.PRS tomorrow  
'Giusi, I will see her tomorrow.'
- b. *\*(A) Giusa, viya craja.*  
DOM Giusi see.1SG.PRS tomorrow  
'I will see GIUSI tomorrow.' (e.g., not Maria)
- c. A *viya craja, \*(a) Giusa.*  
CL.FSG see.1SG.PRS tomorrow DOM Giusi  
'I will see her tomorrow, Giusi.'

Verbicarese clitic doubling, like Cinyungwe OMD, is only felicitous in certain pragmatic contexts. In a monotransitive sentence like (63), CD is infelicitous out of the blue, but it is acceptable in a verum context (e.g., an argument) or a mirative context (e.g., where the CD prejacents is unexpected)—both contexts in

<sup>8</sup>All Verbicarese data is courtesy of Giuseppina Silvestri.

<sup>9</sup>Note that the differential object marker *a* is distinct from the feminine singular clitic *a*. Differential object marking is optional in (62a) and obligatory in (62b) and (62c).

which OMD is felicitous in Cinyungwe.

(63) *A viya \*(a) Giusa craja!*

CL.FSG see.1SG.PRS DOM Giusi tomorrow

approx. 'I will see Giusi tomorrow!'

*contexts:*

# out of the blue

✓ in response to 'There's no way you'll see Giusi tomorrow! She's not here!' or background discussion on how no one sees Giusi anymore

For further comparisons with Cinyungwe, we can examine ditransitives. The standard object word order in ditransitives in Verbicarese is DO<IO, as shown in (64).

(64) *Aja data a giacchetta a Giusa.*

I.have given the jacket to Giusi

'I gave the jacket to Giusi.'

In response to a *wh*-question about the direct object, indirect object CD is obligatory. The object order remains the same (DO<IO). In contrast to the monotransitive example in (63), the discourse context in (65) does not involve disagreement or surprise, and the CD sentence does not have an emphatic interpretation.

(65) Context: "What did you give to Giusi?"

*Dd-aja data a giacchetta a Giusa.*

CL.to.her-I.have given the jacket to Giusi

'I gave the jacket to Giusi.'

In response to a *wh*-question about the indirect object, direct object CD is obligatory and indirect object CD is optional. Additionally, the order of the objects is reversed (IO<DO).

(66) Context: "Who did you give the jacket to?"

*(Dd-)\*(a-)aja data a Giusa a giacchetta.*

CL.to.her-CL.it-I.have given to Giusi the jacket

'I gave the jacket to Giusi.'

In sum, *wh*-questions about one DP object in a ditransitive require CD of the other object, and there does not appear to be an emphatic meaning in these ditransitive examples. This is significantly different from Cinyungwe, but there are three notable similarities: the preference for indirect object doubling, the sensitivity of the doubling construction to the QUD, and the salience of at least one argument DP. In monotransitives, the similarities are more striking, as verum-like and mirative-like CD both occur in Verbicarese.

Further study is required, but the Verbicarese facts suggest that OMD is not an isolated phenomenon but something more universal. This supports the atypicality manner implicature analysis, because we would not expect a manner implicature to be restricted to a single construction and a single language family. The asymmetry between monotransitive and ditransitive CD in Verbicarese could provide further support for this analysis, because if there is a non-emphatic motivation for CD in (65) and (66) because of the discourse context, the manner implicature may be cancellable (see Rett 2020).

## 6 Conclusion

In this paper, I have presented a pragmatic analysis of object-marker doubling constructions in Cinyungwe. In my analysis, OMD constructions have two licensing conditions. In order to be felicitous, at least one argument DP in the sentence must be salient, and the OMD prejacents must address the QUD. I discussed several ways in which the QUD can be addressed (directly, indirectly, with a background QUD, and through subquestions).

The second part of my analysis is that, as a morphologically marked construction that flouts part of the Maxim of Manner (“be brief”), OMD contributes an expressive manner implicature that the prejacents must be associated with a marked meaning. Specifically, OMD encodes atypicality emphasis, which makes it felicitous in many mirative and verum contexts despite the lack of a complete overlap between these meanings and atypicality emphasis.

As further support for my analysis, I have also discussed the Cinyungwe particle *-di* and clitic doubling in the Upper Southern Italian dialect Verbicarese. There are many avenues for future work involving comparisons between Bantu OMD and Indo-European CD, as well as for investigating methods of emphasis and focus in Cinyungwe more broadly.

## Bibliography

- Aikhenvald, A. Y. (2012). The essence of mirativity. *Linguistic Typology*, 16:435–485.
- Anagnostopoulou, E. (2006). Clitic doubling. In Everaert, M. and van Riemsdijk, H., editors, *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax*, volume 1, pages 519–581. Blackwell.
- Anderbois, S. (2024). Tagalog *pala*: An unsurprising case of mirativity. In McCready, E. and Nomoto, H., editors, *Discourse particles in Asian languages*, volume 1. Routledge.
- Baker, M. and Kramer, R. (2018). Doubled clitics are pronouns: Amharic objects (and beyond). *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 36:1035–1088.
- Benz, A. and Jasinskaja, K. (2017). Questions under discussion: From sentence to discourse. *Discourse Processes*, 54(3):177–186.
- Bianchi, V., Bocci, G., and Cruschina, S. (2016). Focus fronting, unexpectedness, and evaluative implicatures. *Semantics and Pragmatics*, 9.
- Bill, C. and Koev, T. (2021). Verum accent is verum, but not always focus. In *Proceedings of the Linguistic Society of America*, volume 6. Linguistic Society of America.
- Branan, K. and Erlewine, M. Y. (2023). Anti-pied-piping. *Language*, 99(3):603–653.
- Buell, L. C. (2005). *Issues in Zulu verbal morphosyntax*. PhD thesis, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Büring, D. (2003). On D-trees, beans, and B-accent. *Linguistics & Philosophy*, 26(5):511–545.
- Colantes, M. and Letsholo, R. (2022). Object marking in Ikalanga. Undergraduate thesis, Pomona College.
- Cournane, A. (2010). Using synchronic microvariation to understand pathways of change: Subject clitic doubling in Romance dialects. In *Proceedings of the 2010 annual conference of the Canadian Linguistic Association*, pages 1–13.
- Courtois, V. J. (1900). *Elementos de gramática tetense, lingua chi-nyai ou chi-nyungue*. Imprensada Universidade de Coimbra.
- Di Tullio, A., Saab, A., and Zdrojewski, P. (2019). Clitic doubling in a doubling world: The case of Argentinian Spanish reconsidered. In Gallego, A. J., editor, *The syntactic variation of Spanish dialects*, pages 213–242. Oxford University Press.
- Duarte, F. B., Langa da Câmara, C., and Valias, T. (2017). Análise das estruturas causativas bieventivas em Nyungwe. *PAPIA: Revista Brasileira de Estudos Crioulos e Similares*, 27(1):119–147.
- Ernst, T. (2020). The syntax of adverbials. *Annual Review of Linguistics*, 6:89–109.

- Goodhue, D. (2022). All focus is contrastive: On polarity (verum) focus, answer focus, contrastive focus and givenness. *Journal of Semantics*, 39:117–158.
- Grice, P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In Cole, P. and Morgan, J., editors, *Syntax and Semantics*, volume 3. Academic Press.
- Gutzmann, D., Hartmann, K., and Matthewson, L. (2020). Verum focus is verum, not focus: Crosslinguistic evidence. *Glossa*, 5.
- Gutzmann, D. and Miró, E. C. (2011). The dimensions of verum. *Empirical Issues in Syntax and Semantics*, pages 143–165.
- Hartmann, K. (2013). Verum blocking effects in Chadic languages. *Lingua*, 136:103–124.
- Hartmann, K. and Zimmermann, M. (2012). Focus marking in Bura: Semantic uniformity matches syntactic heterogeneity. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 30:1061–1108.
- Hyman, L. M. (2017). Bantu tone overview. *UC Berkeley Phonetics & Phonology Lab Annual Report*, 13(1):162–177.
- Hyman, L. M. and Watters, J. R. (1984). Auxiliary focus. *Studies in African Linguistics*, 15:233–273.
- Höhle, T. N. (1992). Über Verum-Fokus im Deutschen. In Jacobs, J., editor, *Informationsstruktur und Grammatik*, pages 112–141. VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Idone, A. and Silvestri, G. (2019). Verbicarese. Technical report, University of Zurich. The Zurich Database of Agreement in Italo-Romance (DAI).
- INE (2019). Recenseamento geral da população e habitação, 2017: Resultados definitivos. Instituto Nacional de Estatística.
- Ivanov, V. (2018). *Some considerations on conceptualization of time in Nyungwe (Bantu N43, Mozambique)*. PhD thesis, Universidade do Porto.
- Kandybowicz, J. (2013). Ways of emphatic scope-taking: From emphatic assertion in Nupe to the grammar of emphasis. *Lingua*, 128:51–71.
- Langa da Câmara, C. (2018). *Análise minimalista das extensões verbais em Nyungwe*. PhD thesis, Universidade Eduardo Mondlane.
- Langa da Câmara, C. (2024). Linguistic human rights and textbook writing: Experience from bilingual education in Mozambique. Manuscript, Centro de Estudos Africanos, Universidade Eduardo Mondlane.
- Langa da Câmara, C., Diercks, M., Colantes, M., Ly, B., Kuzmik, J., and Lippard, H. (2024). An initial look at object marking in Cinyungwe. In Essegbey, J., Henderson, B., McLaughlin, F., and Diercks, M.,

- editors, *Pushing the Boundaries: Selected papers from the 51-52 Annual Conference on African Linguistics*, Contemporary African Linguistics. Language Science Press.
- Langa da Câmara, C. and Lusekelo, A. (2023). Language contact and the state of multilingualism in the linguistic landscape of Tete Province in Mozambique. *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 12(1):90–111.
- Langa da Câmara, C. and Ngunga, A. (2023). Agreement in Cinyungwe verb-verb constructions. *Estudos Linguísticos e Literários*, 8(1):11–33.
- Ledgeway, A. and Maiden, M. (2016). *The Oxford guide to the Romance languages*.
- Lee, J. (2019). *The semantics of emphatic strategies in discourse*. PhD thesis, Brown University.
- Leonetti, M. and Escandell-Vidal, M. V. (2009). Focus fronting and verum focus in Spanish. In Dufter, A. and Jacob, D., editors, *Focus and background in Romance languages*, pages 155–204. John Benjamins.
- Lippard, H., Sikuku, J., Langa da Câmara, C., Colantes, M., Liu, K. F., and Diercks, M. (2023). Emphatic interpretations of object marking in Bantu languages. *Studies in African Linguistics*, 52(Supplement 14: Mirativity and evidentiality in Bantu):78–109.
- Littell, P. W. (2016). *Focus, predication, and polarity in Kwak-wala*. PhD thesis, University of British Columbia.
- Liu, K. F. (2019). Information structure constraints on object marker doubling in Tiriki. Undergraduate thesis, Pomona College.
- Lohnstein, H. (2018). Verum focus, sentence mood, and contrast. In *The grammatical realization of polarity contrast*, volume 249 of *Linguistics Today*, pages 55–88. John Benjamins.
- Maho, J. (2009). NUGL Online: The online version of the New Updated Guthrie List, a referential classification of the Bantu languages.
- Martins, M. d. A. (1991). *Elementos da língua Nyungwe: Gramático e dicionário*. Editorial Além-Mar.
- Ngunga, A. and Langa da Câmara, C. (2019). Passive construction in Bantu: The case of Nyungwe and Yaawo. In Doerr, M., Eide, O., Grønvik, O., and Kjelsvik, B., editors, *Humanists and the digital toolbox*, pages 197–217. Novus Forlag.
- Ngunga, A. S. A. (2021). Os desafios da investigação linguística em África: O caso de Moçambique. *África: Revista do Centro de Estudos Africanos*, (42):86–108.
- Rego, S. V. (2012). *Descrição sistémico-funcional da gramática do modo oracional das orações em Nyungwe*. PhD thesis, Universidade de Lisboa.
- Rett, J. (2020). Manner implicatures and how to spot them. *International Review of Pragmatics*, 12(1):44–79.



- Roberts, C. (2012). Information structure in discourse: Towards an integrated formal theory of pragmatics. *Semantics and Pragmatics*, 5(6):1–69.
- Romero, M. and Han, C.-H. (2004). On negative yes-no questions. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 27:609–658.
- Samko, B. (2016). *Syntax and information structure: The grammar of English inversions*. PhD thesis, University of California, Santa Cruz.
- Schuh, R. (2005). The totality extension and focus in West Chadic. Paper presented at the International Berlin Focus Conference.
- Sikuku, J., Diercks, M., and Marlo, M. (2018). Pragmatic effects of clitic doubling: Two kinds of object markers in Lubukusu. *Linguistic Variation*, 18:359–429.
- Stokke, A. (2018). *Lying and insincerity*. Oxford University Press.
- Sudhoff, S. (2012). Negation der negation: Verumfokus und die niederländische polaritätspartikel *wel*. In Blühdorn, H. and Lohnstein, H., editors, *Warheit – fokus – negation*, pages 105–136. Buske.
- van der Spuy, A. (1993). Dislocated noun phrases in Nguni. *Lingua*, 90(4):335–355.
- van der Wal, J. (2017). What is the conjoint/disjoint alternation? Parameters of crosslinguistic variation. In van der Wal, J. and Hyman, L., editors, *The conjoint/disjoint alternation in Bantu*. De Gruyter Mouton.
- Wilder, C. (2013). English ‘emphatic do’. *Lingua*, 128:142–171.
- Zeller, J. (2014). Three types of object marking in Bantu. *Linguistische Berichte*, 239:347–367.
- Zeller, J. (2015). Argument prominence and agreement: Explaining an unexpected object asymmetry in Zulu. *Lingua*, 156:17–39.