

The prosodic infrastructure of focus in Benue-Kwa*

Victor Manfredi, Boston University
(*manfredi@bu.edu*)

1. Four characterizations in search of an architecture

1.1 Focus in syntax

- (1)a. “[S]tress rules must have access to F[ocus] B[ackground] S[tructure]. But... stress rules cannot be applied directly to semantic representations... Rather, they must be applied to syntactic structures of a suitable kind. Therefore we need FBS in syntax. Furthermore, in many (if not all) languages of the world, certain purely syntactic processes or restrictions interact with FBS...” (Jacobs 1991, 3).
- b. Horvath (2000): configurational focus phenomena factorize into effects of morphosyntactic structure and those of the interpretive interface.

1.2 Focus in prosody

- (2)a. “[F]ocus is *always* marked by prosodic means, by main stress. [FN:] This is of course not true for languages that have a tonal system, rather than a stress system. It is also unlikely that the generalisation would hold true for languages with morphological focus markers.” (Szendrői 2001, 12*f.*, original emphasis; cf. Reinhart 1997; Neeleman & Reinhart 1998)
- b. “[T]he intonational contour that always accompanies Focus is a morpheme present in the lexicon as an independent lexical entry. ...[A] theory where focus is encoded in the syntax in the form of an intonational morpheme allows us to dispense with a feature [+Focus].” (Brunetti 2003, 182, 188, cf. Bolinger 1958; Heusinger 1999).

2. Synthesis: prosody in syntax

2.1 Problem: lexical tone languages (= Szendrői’s footnote)

2.2 Program: revisit Benue-Kwa¹

pure polarity (§3)

- (3)a. **Background.** The morphosyntactic part of focus is limited to assertion/negation i.e. the nuclear scope of the Gleitman/Laka polarity head Σ . In English, this is Nuclear Stress (Chomsky & Halle 1968; Cinque 1993). In principle, one single computation (“diagonalization”) yields the nuclear stress of compounds and phrases in accordance with headedness/direction of branching (Wagner 2003). Conversely, polarity is excluded from the extra-syntactic (‘interface’) part of focus, to which is left a residue of economy-flavored rules like anaphora/ellipsis resolution (Williams 1997) and exhaustiveness implicature (Wedgwood 2003).
- b. **Claims.** B-K languages employ pitch accents to signal affirmative, negative and interrogative polarity. Such elements are well known at the sentence periphery, but those of a phrase-internal, inflectional character also exist—oft obscured by postulation of “floating tones” and “tonal morphemes”. More generally across B-K, tonemes (vs. tones) are epiphenomena, with affixation (syntagmatic prosody) and pitch contrast (paradigmatic prosody) in complementary distribution (Manfredi 2003). By this logic, Yorùbá *ni* ‘replaces’ affirmative pitch accent in three contexts: (i) sentence-final position under the scope of sentential Σ , where it induces either emphasis or a polar question (Adéşolá 1997); (ii) word-internally in *wh*-interrogative expressions (4b); and (iii) above sentential Σ where it induces antiscrambling (argument focus), (5b).

polarity scope for wh-in situ (§4)

- (4)a. **Background.** *Wh-in situ* is licensed by Q polarity in the form of an affix or pitch accent (Hagstrom 1998; Cheng & Rooryck 2000).
- b. **Claims.** In Yorùbá, *in situ wh* is marked by *ni*, the affixal version of positive polarity, unless preceded by an *ex-situ wh* (Awóyalé 1996). Ìgbo has two series of *wh*-expressions (Goldsmith 1981a); the one that occurs either *in* or *ex situ* is inherently marked for polarity; *in situ* it must occur in a yes-no question—optionally if the *in situ* item is also the subject, i.e. adjacent to Σ .²

polarity scope ex situ (§5)

- (5)a. **Background.** Material which is deaccented or scrambled away from Σ is thereby shielded from the scope of sentence focus (Vallduví 1990); This can be generalized as Diesing-style “tree-splitting” so as to map onto tripartite quantificational structure (Drubig 2003). The Cinque-Wagner diagonalization predicts a second mechanism: not removing the argument from the scope of polarity, but removing the polarity from the sentence—another form of tree splitting. In Italian, a potential case is the abstract negation effect which licenses negative NPis in left-peripheral position: *Nessuno ho visto* versus **Ho visto nessuno* (Brunetti 2003, 128 citing Alonso-Ovalle & Guerzoni 2002).
- b. **Claims.** Antiscrambling is the source of Benue-Kwa “compulas” (Manfredi 1987, 110, cf. Bergvall 1987a,b)—left-peripheral affirmative copulas. The complement of a B-K compula translates in English as distressed/pseudoclefted material, in effect passively scrambled, like a free relative clause. In Yorùbá, left peripheral *wh* has been thought to inhabit Spec, FocP to the left of the focus head *ni* (Bòdè 2004, cf. Awóyalé 1985), but its construal is insensitive to WCO, superiority or *wh*-islands (Adéşolá 2003; Jones 2004), nor is focused material necessarily contrastive (as long acknowledged for “predicate cleft”)—all anomalous if the compula inhabits a dedicated contrastive focus position. On the other hand, *ni*’s own structure is not fully sentential: it doesn’t inflect, nor is the remnant a true relative clause (as noted by Jones 2004). Across B-K, copular linearization correlates with polarity morphosyntax: in Yorùbá, polarity is an aux and the compula licenses inverse predication (in the sense of Ruwet 1974), in Bantu and Ìgbo, polarity is a suffix and copular predication is canonical. Consequent proliferation of non pitch sigmas in a single sentence strengthens the comparison to Nuclear Stress.

*. This study began as Déchaine & Manfredi (1997)—a writeup of which is long-owed to Dr. K. Sààh. Thanks subsequently to Q. Aboh, S. Adéşolá, Q. Ajíbóyè, Y. Awóyalé, A. Bachrach, M. Bamba, W. Bisang, L. Brunetti, G. Cinque, L. Domínguez, C. Keach, K. Kinyalolo, M. Liberman, R. Manzini, A. Neeleman, J. Ndayiragije, A. Nwáchukwu, O. Owómóyèlá, F. Oyéebádé, S. Oyéeláran, J. Rooryck, U. Shlonsky, R. Şónaiya, K. Szendrői, C. Uchéchúkwu and Q. Yusuf.

1. The “dialect continuum... Benue Kwa/East Volta-Congo” (Williamson & Blench 2000, 17*f.*, 27; cf. Givón 1975; Elugbe & Williamson 1977) is the largest subgroup of Niger-Congo, uniting Greenberg’s Benue-Congo and Kwa/Kru. Absent clear criteria such as sound shifts, the precise location of an alleged boundary between Kwa vs. Benue-Congo, and the precise affiliation of Kru, have been unstable in the literature ever since Greenberg’s doubtful diagnosis (1963, 39, *fn.* 13, cf. Nurse & Philippson 2003, 5). I am tempted to call this program “the continuation of philology by other means” (Koster 2003).

2. In Ọmáàhyá (Green & Ígwè 1963), the affirmative prosody of the finite verb “flops” leftward to the grammatical subject (Goldsmith 1973).

3. Pure prosodic polarity

3.1 Èwè (Westermann 1930)

- (6)a. Ameka nè kpó ò? (7)a. Atí la kó ò.
 WH.pers 2S see Σ tree DEF tall Σ
 ‘Who did you see?’ ‘Of course the tree is tall’
- b. *Ameka nè kpó? b. Atí la kó.
 WH.pers 2S see tree DEF tall
 ‘The tree is tall’

3.2 Yorùbá (Awóyalé 1987, 1997; Adéşolá 1997, p.c.; Déchaine 2000; Ajíbóyè & al. 2004)

- (8)a. O fẹ ẹ-ẹ? (9)a. O rà á-á? (10)a. O jẹ ẹ-ẹ?
 2S want 3S- Σ 2s buy 3S- Σ 2s eat 3S- Σ
 ‘You really want it?’ ‘You really bought it?’ ‘You really ate it?’
- b. Mo fẹ ẹ-ẹ. b. Mo rà á-á. b. Mo jẹ ẹ-ẹ.
 1S want 3S- Σ 1S buy 3S- Σ 1S eat 3S- Σ
 ‘No, the truth is, I wanted it’ ‘No, the truth is, I bought it’ ‘No, the truth is, I ate it’
- c. Mo fẹ ẹ .o. c. Mo rà á .o. c. Mo jẹ ẹ .o.
 1S want 3S Σ 1S buy 3S Σ 1S eat 3S Σ
 ‘I really want it’ ‘I really bought it’ ‘I really ate it’
- d. Mo mà fẹ ẹ ò! d. Mo mà rà á ò! d. Mo mà jẹ ẹ ò!
 1S AUX want 3S Σ 1S AUX buy 3S Σ 1S AUX eat 3S Σ
 ‘I very much want it!’ ‘I very much bought it!’ ‘I very much ate it!’

	tone	segment
(11) echo (a)	\emptyset	empty x-slot (vowel copy)
correction (b)	L	empty x-slot (vowel copy)
exclamation (c)	. \emptyset (downstepped M)	[o]
surprise (d)	L	[o]

- (12)a. Ayò-ò sùn. (13)a. Wọn sọ pé Ayò-ò sùn.
 A.- Σ sleep 3P. Σ say C A.- Σ sleep
 ‘A. slept’ ‘They said that Ayò was sleeping’
- b. Ayò-ò sùn ni? b. Wọn sọ pé Ayò-ò sùn ni.
 A. Σ sleep Σ 3P. Σ say C A. Σ sleep Σ
 ‘Did A. (go to) sleep?’ (i) ‘They said it was the case that Ayò was sleeping’
 [n.b. no factive reading, unlike (13b)] (ii) ‘Did they say that Ayò was sleeping?’
- (14)a. Sáré lọ! (15)a. Èni tí ó wá ni Ayò.
 run go person REL 3s. Σ come Σ A.
 ‘Go quickly!’ ‘The person who came was A.’
- b. Sáré lọ ni! b. Èni tí ó wá ni Ayò ni?
 run go Σ person REL 3s. Σ come Σ A. Σ
 ‘What you must do is go quickly’ ‘Was the person that came A.?’
- c. Ayò ni èni tí ó wá ni?
 A. Σ person REL 3s. Σ come Σ
 ‘Was A. the person that came?’
- (16)a. aṣọ funfun (17)a. Aṣọ funfun.
 cloth white cloth. Σ white
 ‘white cloth(ing)’ ‘[The] cloth(ing) is white’
- b. Aṣọ funfun ni. b. Aṣọ kò funfun.
 cloth white Σ cloth NEG white
 ‘It is white cloth(ing)’ ‘[The] cloth(ing) isn’t white’
- (18) Tí Şàròn-òn-òn bá fi Àràfààti sí ilẹ̀ ni (pause) Òsámà kò bá má gbèè ogun ti N.Y.³
 REL S.-AGR meet use A. to ground Σ O. NEG meet NEG lift war of N.Y.
 ‘If S. had left A. alone, O. would not have attacked N.Y.’

3.3 Ìsókó (Donwa 1984); Ùrhòbò (Aziza 2003) [\underline{x} = extra H]

Note double polarity marking in (19a) and probably also (19c). Apparent polarity switch in the questions: (19b) = (20d), (19d) = (20b)?

- (19)a. Ọmọ ná ò t[ò] úghó.
 child DEF. Σ AGR steal money. Σ
 ‘The child stole money’
- b. Ọmọ ná ò t[ò] úghó-ò.
 child DEF AGR steal money- Σ
 ‘Did the child steal [any] money?’
- c. Ọmọ ná ò t[ò] úghó-ò hòò.
 child DEF AGR steal money- Σ NEG
 ‘The child didn’t steal any money’
- d. Ọmọ ná ò t[ò] úghó?
 child DEF AGR steal money. Σ
 ‘Didn’t the child steal any money?’
- (20)a. [Example missing from source.]
 ‘I stole a cup’
- b. Mì ch[ó] úkó?
 1s steal cup. Σ
 ‘Did I steal [a] cup?’
- c. Mì ch[ó] úkó òò.
 1s steal cup Σ
 ‘I didn’t steal [a] cup’
- d. Mì ch[ó] úkó-ò?
 1s steal cup- Σ
 ‘Didn’t I steal a cup?’

3. The initial L of [gbèé] ‘carry’ (lexically gbé) derives from the preceding aux *má(à)* ‘nonfinite NEG’ ≠ the aspectual aux *má(a)* ‘HAB’ (Abraham 1958).

3.4 Ìgbo (Swift & al. 1962; Green & Ígwè 1963; Ûwalaàka 1981)

- (21)a. ì-hùn Eze
INF-see E.
'to see E.'
- b. Í hù-rùn Ézè.
2S see-Σ E.
'You saw E.'
- c. Ì hù-rùn Ézè?
Σ.2S see-Σ E.
'Did you see E.?'
- d. Ò (bù)-kwa í hù-rùn Ézè?
Σ.3S COP-also 2S see-Σ E.
'Is it the case that you saw E.?'
- (22)a. Ó dí kà ì hù-rùn Ézè.
3S LOC.Σ COMP 2S see-Σ E.
'It seems that you saw E.'
- b. Ézè; dí kà ì hù-rùn yá.
E. LOC.Σ COMP 2S see-Σ 3S
[variant of (21a)]

3.5 KiHaya (Byarushengo & al. 1976)

(23b-d) all answer "The women don't see the child". No pause before right dislocated material, no pitch accent after left dislocated material. The authors suggest that the accent iterates after right dislocated phrases because they add to the assertion, despite being old info.

- (23)a. Bà-bòn[a] ómwaàna.
3P-see-T child.Σ
'They see [a/the] child'
- b. Bà-mù-bón[a] ómwaàna.
3P-3S-see-T.Σ child.Σ
'They see 3S, the child'
- c. Bà-mù-bón[a] ómwaàna àbàkàazi.
3P-3S-see-T.Σ child.Σ women.Σ
'They see 3S, the child, the women'
- d. Bà-mù-bón[a] àbàkàazi ómwaàna.
3P-3S-see-T women.Σ child-Σ
'They see 3S, the child, the women'
- (24)a. Nì-bà-jùn-á Kàkùlù mbwéènú.
ASP-3P-help-T K.Σ today.Σ
'They are helping K. today' (all predicate new)
- b. Nì-bà-jùn-á Kàkùlù mbwéènú.
ASP-3P-help-T K.Σ today.Σ
'Today they are helping K.'
- c. Nì-bà-mù-jùn-á Kàkùlù mbwéènú.
ASP-3P-help.Σ-T K.Σ today.Σ
'K., today they are helping him'
- d. Nì-bà-mù-jùn-á mbwéènú Kàkùlù.
ASP-3P-help.Σ-T today.Σ K.Σ
'Today they are helping K.'
- (25)a. Kàkùlw àbàkàzi bà-mù-bón-à
K. women 3P-3S-SEE.Σ-T
'K., the women, they see him'
- b. Àbàkàzi Kàkùlù bà-mù-bón-à
K. women 3P-3S-SEE.Σ-T
'The women, K., they see him'

3.6 KiKóngo (Odden 1991)

A pitch accent cannot occur before a universal quantifier or in a nonfocused argument. *Kà* (for Odden, "NEG") must precede a post-focus VP.

- (26)a. bì-kúní byáBànduùndù
NUM-farmer CL.B.
'farmers of B.'
- b. bì-kùnì byábinsó
NUM-farmer CL.✓
'all the farmers'
- (27)a. Bì-kùnì bifwiídí.
NUM-farmer CL.died
'The farmers died'
- b. Mù-àna bí-kúní kà vóóndídí.
NUM-child NUM-farmer Σ CL killed
'The child killed the farmers'
- (28)a. Twéti tékísá.
1P.be CL.sell
'We are selling'
- b. Kà twéti tékísá kò.
Σ 1P.be CL-sell NEG
'We are not selling'

4. Polarity scope for *wh-in situ*

4.1 Yorùbá (Awóyalé 1996)

- (29)a. Ta.ni ó ra kí(ni)?
who.Σ 3S.Σ buy what.Σ
'Who bought what?'
- b. Ó ra kí*(ni)?
3S.Σ buy what.Σ
'S/he bought what?'

4.2 Ìgbo (Goldsmith 1981a; Nwáchukwu 1995; Ígwè 1999, 611; C. Úchèchúkwu p.c.)

- (30)a. *Ó mè-re (n)gíní?
3S do-Σ Σ.what
- b. *Ó hù-rùn onyé?
3S see-Σ Σ.person
- (31)a. (Ézè) ò me-re (n)gíní?
E. Σ.3S do-Σ Σ.what
'E./He did what?'
- b. (Ézè) ò hù-rùn onyé? n.b. *...ónyé?
E. Σ.3S see-Σ Σ.person person
'E./He saw who?'
- (32)a. (Ò bù kwa) onyé/(n)gíní?
Σ.3S COP-also Σ.person/Σ.what
'Who/what is it?'
- b. Ò bù kwa Ézè?
Σ.3S COP-also E.
'Is it E.?'
- (33)a. *Ò bù kwa Ézè me-re (n)gíní?
Σ.3S COP-also E. do-Σ Σ.what
- b. *(Ò bù kwa ò)gíní kà onyé mè-re?
Σ.3S COP-also Σ.what COMP Σ.person do-Σ
- (34)a. (Ò bù kwa) onyé mè-re (n)gíní?
Σ.3S COP-also Σ.person do-Σ Σ.what
'Who did what?'
- b. #(Ò bù kwa) (n)gíní mè-re onyé?
Σ.3S COP-also what do-Σ Σ.person
'What affected [FOC who]?'
- (35)a. Èléé ihe ònyé mè-re? n.b. *...ihe onye mè-re
which thing Σ.person do-Σ thing person do-Σ
'What did each person do?'
- b. íhe ònyé mè-re n.b. *...íhe onye mè-re
thing Σ.person do-Σ thing person do-Σ
'what each person did'

5. Polarity scope *ex-situ*: antiscrambling by sigmatic inflation

5.1 Yorùbá (Abraham 1958, Awóbùlúyì 1978; Adesọlá 2003; Jones 2004; Awóyalé p.c.)

Left peripheral *ni* cannot bear the affirmative pitch accent and is supplanted by focus negation *kó*—itself distinct from predicate negation *kò*.

- | | | | | | |
|--------|---|--------|---|--------|---|
| (36)a. | Fílà ni.
hat Σ
'It's [a] hat' | (37)a. | Àràbà ni.
A. Σ
'It's Mr. A.' | (38)a. | Fílà/Àràbà wà ní ibè.
hat. Σ A. Σ [_v exist] at there
'[A] hat is there'/'Mr. A. is there' |
| b. | Fílà kó.
hat NEG
'It's not [a] hat' | b. | Àràbà kó.
A. NEG
'It's not Mr. A.' | b. | Fílà/Àràbà kò sí ní ibè.
hat A. NEG [_p exist] at there
'No hat is there'/'Mr. A. is not there' |
| c. | Şé àláfíá ni?
Q health Σ
'Are [you] well?' | c. | Àláfíá [kó bí]?
health not Q
'[You're] well, aren't [you]?' | | |

A focused or relativized direct object optionally LF-pied-pipes the rest of the predicate.

- | | |
|--------|---|
| (39)a. | Emu ni Àràbà rà.
palmwine Σ A. Σ buy
'What Mr. A. bought was palmwine (not beer)' OR 'What Mr. A. did was buy palmwine (not sell beer)' |
| b. | emu tí Àràbà rà
palmwine REL A. Σ buy
'the palmwine that Mr. A. bought' OR 'the fact that Mr. A. bought palmwine' |
| c. | Òrẹ̀ mi tí ó kú ni kò jẹ́ kí n wá.
friend 1S REL 3S. Σ die Σ NEG allow COMP 1S come
'It was [my friend's having died] that prevented me from coming' (Bámgbósé 1975, 205) |

Overt left peripheral focus need not be contrastive (cf. *C'est un chien qui m'a mordu*).

- (40) Eji wéré-wéré ní n lé ọ̀mọ̀dẹ̀ wọ̀'lé; àgbàrà ọ̀jò nlá ní n mi ọ̀gòrò tìtì l'ẹ̀sẹ̀.⁴
rain gentle Σ PROG drive child indoors mighty rain big Σ PROG shake raphiapalm tremble at foot
'Light rain drives a small child indoors; a deluge makes [even] a palmtree tremble/totter at the base'

Left-peripheral *wh*-expressions and focus disregard weak crossover (41) and *wh*-islands (42), and in the case of questions, superiority (43) as well (Adesọlá 2003; Jones 2004). *In situ* variants exist for all three *wh*-types, though not for focus.

- | | | | |
|--------|---|--------|---|
| (41)a. | Kí ni olówó orẹ̀ ẹ́ kọ sí ilẹ̀?
WH.thing Σ owner 3S.GEN Σ reject to ground
'What _i did its _i owner reject?' | (44)a. | Olówó orẹ̀ ẹ́ kọ kí ni sí ilẹ̀?
owner 3S.GEN Σ reject WH.thing Σ to ground
'[echoic version of (41a)]' |
| b. | Fílà ni olówó orẹ̀ ẹ́ kọ sí ilẹ̀.
hat Σ owner 3S.GEN Σ reject to ground
'Its _i owner rejected a [_{FOC hat}] _i ' | b. | *Olówó orẹ̀ ẹ́ kọ fílà ni sí ilẹ̀.
owner 3S.GEN Σ reject hat Σ to ground |
| c. | Kí ni wọn rọ olówó orẹ̀ láti kọ sí ilẹ̀?
WH.thing Σ 3P. Σ coax owner 3S.GEN to reject to ground
'What _i did they persuade its _i owner to reject?' | b. | Wọn rọ olówó orẹ̀ láti kọ kí ni sí ilẹ̀?
3P. Σ coax owner 3S.GEN to reject WH.thing Σ to ground
'[echoic version of (41c)]' |
| d. | Fílà ni wọn rọ olówó orẹ̀ láti kọ sí ilẹ̀.
hat Σ 3P. Σ coax owner 3S.GEN to reject to ground
'They persuaded its _i owner to reject a [_{FOC hat}] _i ' | c. | *Wọn rọ olówó orẹ̀ láti kọ fílà ni sí ilẹ̀.
3P. Σ coax owner 3S.GEN to reject hat Σ to ground |
| (42)a. | Kí ni wọn bèèrè pé bí mo rà?
WH.thing Σ 3P. Σ ask say whether 1S buy
'What did they ask whether I bought?' | (45)a. | Wọn bèèrè pé bí mo rà kí ni?
3P. Σ ask say whether 1S buy WH.thing Σ
'[echoic version of (42a)]' |
| b. | Kí ni wọn bèèrè bóyá mo rà?
WH.thing Σ 3P. Σ ask whether 1S buy
[= (42a)] | b. | Wọn bèèrè bóyá mo rà kí ni?
3P. Σ ask whether 1S buy WH.thing Σ
'[echoic version of (42b)]' |
| c. | Fílà ni wọn bèèrè {pé bí/bóyá} mo rà.
hat Σ 3P. Σ ask say whether 1S buy
'They asked whether I bought a [_{FOC hat}] | c. | *Wọn bèèrè {pé bí/bóyá} mo rà fílà ni l'áná.
3P. Σ ask say whether 1S buy hat Σ yesterday |
| (43)a. | Kí ni ta ní rà?
WH.thing Σ WH.person Σ .3S. Σ buy
'What did who buy?' | (46)a. | Ta ni ó ra kí(ni)? [talórákí(ni)]
who. Σ 3S. Σ buy what. Σ
'Who bought what?' [= (29a)]' |
| b. | Kí ni wọn rọ ta ní láti rà?
WH.thing Σ 3P. Σ coax WH.person Σ to buy
'What did they persuade who to buy?' | b. | Wọn rọ ta ní láti ra kí ni?
3P. Σ coax WH.person Σ to buy WH.thing Σ
'[echoic version of (43b)]' |

Σ -island effect: left peripheral focus can't mix with *in situ wh* or vice-versa.

- | | | | |
|--------|--|----|--|
| (47)a. | *Fílà ni wọn rọ ta ní láti rà?
hat Σ 3P. Σ coax WH.person Σ to buy | b. | *Ta ni wọn rọ láti ra fílà ni?
WH.person Σ 3P. Σ coax to buy hat Σ |
|--------|--|----|--|

4. Owómóyèlà (2004) translates "It is a light rain that chases a child indoors; it is a raging torrent that shakes the raffia palm to its roots. (Every person, however lowly or mighty, has his or her nemesis)" but I doubt the salient reading is effable via English cleft. Prof. Owómóyèlà (p.c.) concurs, alluding to "syllogistic quirks". Considering pragmatic connotations of the four lexical arguments, Prof. Oyèélarán (p.c.) says that "the proverb emphasizes the threshold of the onset of insecurity to individuals, depending on their level of capacity to cope with specific realities." Prof. Awóyalé (p.c.) posits an implicit comparative frame—"Just as (*Bí i*) light rain..., so also (*bẹ̀ẹ̀ nàà ni*) a downpour..."—locating the contrast between the parallel sentences not the left-peripheral items, and cites this variant:

(i) Ọ̀jò kékeré ní í lé ọ̀mọ̀dẹ̀ wọ̀'lé; ọ̀jò gírìgírì ní í mi igi ọ̀gùrò tegbò-tegbò.
rain small Σ PROG drive child indoors rain heavy Σ PROG shake tree raphiapalm from.root-from.root

Abraham (1958, 433, 436, 627) notes the regular allomorphy by which, *ni* plus the progressive aux becomes *ni*, as occurs in both variants of the text. For the "splitting" predicate *mì... tìtì* '(cause to) tremble', see Abraham (1958, 420).

Left peripheral focus is preserved even in the canonical interpretation of simplex copula (48); the inverse (predicate-focus) reading (cf. (39a)) can be derived by ellipsis of a light/equative verb (Bámgbóṣé 1967, 40), or in other words by Moro-style raising from a small clause with expletive head.

- (48)a. Olórún ni ọba.
skyowner Σ king
'It is God that is king' (pious reading) OR 'It is God that a king is' (impious reading)
- b. Olórún kó ni ọba. (49) Olórún ni ọba-á jé.
skyowner NEG Σ king skyowner Σ king- Σ equal
[negates either reading of (48a)] [= impious reading of (48a)]

Object *pro* is restricted to nonfocused anaphoric items, *ceteris paribus* after copular *ni* or a lexical predicate (cf. Bámgbóṣé 2000).

- (50)a. Ta ni *(í)? (51)a. Sé wón kí ọba? Rára, wón kò kí *(í).
WH.person Σ 3S Q 3P. Σ greet king no 3P NEG greet 3S
'Who is it?' 'Did they greet the king?' 'No they didn't'
- b. Èmi ni *(í). (51)b. Sé wón fẹ ọbakóba? Rára, wón kò fẹ *(é).
1S Σ 3S Q 3P. Σ want any.king no 3P NEG want 3S
'It's me' 'Do they want any old king?' 'No, they don't'
- c. Àràbá ni *(í). (51)c. Sé wón fẹ ọba? Rára, wón kò fẹ (é).
A. Σ 3S Q 3P. Σ want king no 3P NEG want 3S
'It's Mr. A' 'Do they want [a/the] king?' 'No, they don't' (want him)'

(51) supports Jones' (2004) free relative analysis of the focus remnant *except* where the relative contains an island and no overt resumptive (53) = (42):

- (52)a. Kí /Fílà ni mo rà *(á) (53) Kí /Fílà ni wón bèèrè pé bí mo rà *(á)
WH.thing hat Σ 1S buy 3S WH.thing hat Σ 3P. Σ ask say whether 1S buy 3S
'What did I buy?' 'What did they ask whether I bought?'
'I bought a [FOC hat]' 'They asked whether I bought a [FOC hat]'
- b. Kí /Fílà ni wón yò lẹ̀hìn tí mo rà *(á)
WH.thing hat Σ 3P. Σ rejoice at.back REL 1S buy 3S
'What did they rejoice after I bought it?'
'They rejoiced after I bought a [FOC hat]'

The role of polarity in sigmatic inflation is also shown by s-selectional effects, noted by Jones (2004) citing Bòdé (2004) for (54b):

- (54)a. *Wón mò pé kí ni mo rà. (55)a. Wón mò pé aṣọ ni mo rà.
3P. Σ know say WH.thing Σ 1S buy 3P. Σ know say cloth Σ 1S buy
[bad even as echo question] 'They know that what I bought is *cloth(ing)*'
- b. Wón bèèrè pé kí ni mo rà. (55)b. *Wón bèèrè pé aṣọ ni mo rà.
3P. Σ ask say WH.thing Σ 1S buy 3P. Σ ask say cloth Σ 1S buy
'They asked what I bought'

Jones' free relative analysis of the focus remnant also accommodates the possibility of a number-agreeing demonstrative on the right edge of a focus construction (Awóbùluyí 1978, 1992), assuming the presence of a remnant-initial null operator.

- (56) Òjò ni OP [ó n rọ] (*wón) yí. (57) Fílà.kan ni OP [ó n wò] (*wón) yí.
rain Σ 3S. Σ PROG fall 3P this hat one Σ 3S PROG regard PL this
'This is rain that is falling' 'This is a hat that s/he is looking at'

5.2 Kiswahili (Keach 2004)

- (58)a. kitabu [ni-li-cho_k-(ki_k)-penda t_k] (59)a. Juma a-li-ki-kamata gitara. [VP OM_i-V pro_i] gitara_i
book 1SG-TNS-REL-OM-like J. SM-TNS-OM-grab guitar
'the book which I liked...' 'Juma grabbed the guitar'
- b. kitabu [amba-cho_k [ni-li-(ki_k)-penda pro_k]] (59)b. Juma a-li-kamata gitara [VP ...V gitara]
book COMP-REL 1SG-TNS-OM-like J. SM-TNS-grab guitar
'the book which I liked...' 'Juma grabbed a guitar'
- c. "In Swahili, the post-verbal position is the unmarked FOCUS position." (59)c. Juma a-li-(ki)-kamata nini? *[VP OM_i-V pro_i] nini_i
(Keach 2004, 131) J. SM-TNS-OM-grab what [VP ...V nini]
'What did Juma grab?'

5.3 Kirundi (Ndayiragije 1998, p.c.)

A finite verb suppresses lexical accent unless preceded by the *-ra* aux of V(P) focus (Meussen 1959). Citing this fact, Edenmeyr still denies "that tone has any direct focus function in Kirundi" (2001, 30). Ndayiragije does countenance "prosodically motivated syntactic operations" (1998, 175, *fn* 1).

- (60)a. Yuvinari a-á-ra someye ibitabo. (61)a. Ibitabo bi-á (*-ra) someye Yuvinari.
Y. AGR-TNS- Σ read books books AGR-TNS- Σ read Y.
'Y. read/did read books' '[FOC Y.] read books'
- b. Yuvinari a-á (*-ra) someye iki? (61)b. Ni Yuvinari a-á (*-ra) someye ibitabo.
Y. AGR-TNS- Σ read what COP Y. AGR-TNS- Σ read books
'What did Y. read?' 'It's [FOC Y.] who read books'
- c. A-á (*-ra) someye ibitabo bande? (61)c. Ni ibitabo Yuvinari a-á (*-ra) someye.
AGR-TNS- Σ read books who COP books Y. AGR-TNS- Σ read
'Who read books?' 'Y. read [FOC books]'

Copular sentences, both matrix and embedded, have strictly canonical order, contrasting with the inverse order preferred by Yorùbá (48a).

- (62)a. Yuvinari ni umwarimu. (63)a. Umwarimu ni Yuvinari.
'Juvéna! is a teacher' (unmarked focus) '[FOC Juvéna!] is a teacher' (e.g. not Bush)
- b. Ndazi ko Yuvinari a-ri umwarimu. (63)b. Ndazi ko umwarimu a-ri Yuvinari.
I.know COMP Y. EXPL-COP teacher I.know COMP teacher EXPL-COP Y.
'I know that Juvéna! is a teacher' (unmarked focus) 'I know that [FOC Juvéna!] is a teacher' (e.g. not Bush)

5.4 Gikūyū (Bergvall 1987a,b; cf. Myers 1971a, b)⁵

Clitic doubling, optional with topics (64), is excluded for anything inside polarity scope (65) - (66). Σ itself has scopal allomorphy (67) - (71).

- (64) Marigũ maya nĩ-tũ-(ma-)on-ire rũũcĩine.
bananas these Σ -1P-6-see-ASP this morning
'These bananas, we saw (them) this morning'
- (68) Kamau nĩ murĩmi.
K. Σ peasant
'K. is a peasant'
- (65)a. Nĩ-nj-ũĩ mwanake ũrĩa Kamau o-on-ire. (*...a-mu-on-ire.)
 Σ -1S-know youngman COMP K. 3S-see-ASP 3S-3S-see-ASP
'I know the young man that K. saw'
- (69)a. Nũũ Kamau (*arĩ)?
 Σ .who K. Σ
'Who/what is K.?''
- b. Nĩ mwanake ũrĩa Kamau o-on-ire. (*...a-mu-on-ire.)
 Σ youngman COMP K. 3S-see-ASP 3S-3S-see-ASP
'K. saw [FOC *that young man*]'
- b. mũũdũ urĩa (*arĩ) murĩmi
person COMP Σ peasant
'the person who is a peasant'
- (66)a. Nũũ Kamau o-on-ire? (*...a-mu-on-ire?)
 Σ .who K. 3S-see-ASP 3S-3S-see-ASP
'Who did K. see?'
- (70)a. Nĩ kũ Kamau *(arĩ)?
 Σ where K. Σ
'Where is K.?'
- b. Kamau o-on-ire ũũ?
K. 3S-see-ASP who
'K. saw [FOC *who*]?'
- b. mũũdũ urĩa *(rĩ) Nairobi
person COMP Σ N.
'the person who is in N.' (no prefix on copula)
- (67)a. Nĩ nyũmba yake tu-gu-aka.
 Σ house hers 1P-T-build
'We will build [FOC *her house*]'
- (71)a. Nĩ ma Kamau nĩ murĩmi.
 Σ true K. Σ peasant
'It's true that K. is a peasant'
- b. E-gũ-tũ-atha ta arĩ nyũmba yake tu-gu-aka.
3S-T-1P-command COMP Σ house hers 1P-T-build
'She's giving orders like it's [FOC *her house*] we will build'
- b. Nĩ ma nĩ mwanake ũrĩa Kamau o-on-ire.
 Σ true Σ youngman COMP K. 3S-see-ASP
'It's true that K. saw [FOC *that young man*]'

5.5 Ígbo (Green & Ígwè 1963; Robinson 1974; Úchèchúkwu p.c.)

Weak crossover does not affect either type of question (72); in *wh*-islands, resumptives are required in both types, (73).

- (72)a. Kè-dú onye nne yá hụ-rụ n'anya?
COMP \exists person mother 3S.GEN see- Σ in-eye
'Who does his mother love?' (with coreference)
- b. Ònyé kà nne yá hụ-rụ n'anya?
 Σ .who COMP mother 3S.GEN see- Σ in-eye
'Who does his mother love?' (with coreference)
- c. Kè-dú ihe ndị ùwé ojii gwa-ra onye nwe yá kà ó hafù?
COMP \exists thing people shirt black.REL tell- Σ person own.REL 3S COMP 3S relinquish
'What did the police tell its owner to relinquish?' (with coreference)
- d. Gíńí kà ndị ùwé ojii gwa-ra ónyé nwe yá kà ó hafù?
what COMP people shirt black tell- Σ person own.REL 3S COMP 3S relinquish
'What did the police tell its owner to relinquish?' (with coreference)
- (73)a. Gíńí kà Ézè é-lotè-kwa-ghị ma Ndu me-re *(yá)?
what COMP E. T-remember-even-NEG if N. do- Σ 3S
'What does E. not remember whether N. did (it)?'
- b. Kè-dú ihe Ézè e-lotè-kwa-ghị ma Ndu me-re *(yá)?
COMP \exists thing E.REL. T-remember-even-NEG if N. do- Σ 3S
'What does E. not remember whether N. did (it)?'

Robinson (1974): relative tone changes are "almost wholly" missing from the predicate in a focus construction. Proposal, given (72): the spurious H on the right edge of the subject of the remnant of an object focus/question is Jones' pseudocleft operator (glossed D).

- (74)a. Ézè re-re ákwà.
E. sell- Σ cloth
'E./the chief sold cloth'
- (76)a. (Ó bụ) ákwà ka Ézè rè-re.
3S COP cloth COMP E.D sell- Σ
'E. sold [FOC *cloth*]'
- b. Ézè re-re nkhu.
E. sell- Σ firewood
'E./the chief sold firewood'
- b. Ó bụ Ézè re-re nkhu.
3S COP E. sell- Σ firewood
'[FOC *E.*] sold firewood'
- (75)a. ákwà Ézè rè-re
cloth E.D.sell- Σ
'the cloth E. sold'
- (77)a. (Ó bụ n) gíńí kà Ézè rè-re?
 Σ .3S BE Σ .what COMP E.D sell- Σ
'What did E. sell?'
- b. ézè ré-re nkhu
chief.D REL.sell- Σ firewood.GEN
'the chief who sold firewood'
- b. (Ó bụ) onyé rè-re nkhu?
 Σ .3S BE Σ .person sell- Σ firewood
'Who sold firewood?'

Possible further example: "overapplication" of relative tone change in adjunct relative. [crucial adverb paradigm]

- (78)a. Ósọ Àdhá chụ-rụ anyị mè-re íkhe jì-ri gwú anyị.
race A. chase- Σ 1P make- Σ strength hold-ASP finish 1P.GEN
'A.'s pursuing us tired us out'
- b. Ósọ Àdhá chụ-rụ anyị mè-re íkhe jì-ri gwú anyị.
race A. REL.chase- Σ 1P.GEN make- Σ strength hold-ASP finish 1P.GEN
'A.'s *manner* of pursuing us tired us out' [unglossed form from Green & Ígwè (1963, 89); gloss from Úchèchúkwu p.c.]

Polarity scope islands versus quantifier reading of *onyé* inside a relative clause, cf. Giannakidou (2001).

5. Bergvall's data omit tonemarking, which is not part of current orthography (Githiora 2004).

- (79)a. * (\dot{N}) gíní kà onyé mè-re?
 Σ -what COMP Σ -person do- Σ
- b. ?Kè-dú ihe ònyé mè-re?
 COMP \exists thing Σ .person do- Σ
 ‘What did each person do?’
- c. Èléé ihe ònyé mè-re?
 which thing Σ .person REL.do- Σ what
 ‘What did *each* person do?’
- (80)a. # (\dot{N}) gíní mè-re onyé ?
 Σ -what do- Σ Σ -person
 ‘What affected [FOC *who*]?’
- b. Kè-dú onye mé-re gíní?
 COMP \exists person REL.do- Σ what
 Who did what?

M̀bàisén-type dialects optionally double the Σ at the end of intransitive subject relative clauses and corresponding *wh*-questions.⁶

- (81)a. ónyé byá-ra (ní)
 person REL.come- Σ Σ
 ‘the person who came’
- b. ífe mé-re (ní)
 thing REL happen- Σ Σ
 ‘the thing that happened’
- c. ónyé rí-ri (*nri) ní (*nri)
 person REL.eat- Σ food Σ food
 ‘the person who ate’
- d. (\dot{N}) gíní me-re ní...?
 Σ -what REL.do- Σ Σ
 ‘What, which happened...?’ (‘incomplete sentence’)
- (82)a. Kè-dú onye byá-ra (ní)?
 COMP \exists person REL.come- Σ
 ‘Who came?’
- b. Kèdú ife mé-re (ní)?
 COMP \exists thing REL happen- Σ Σ
 ‘What happened?’
- c. Kè-dú onye rí-ri (*nri) ní (*nri)?
 COMP \exists person REL.eat- Σ food Σ food
 ‘Who ate?’
- d. (\dot{N}) gíní mè-re (*ní)?
 Σ -what do- Σ Σ
 as ‘What happened?’

5.6 B́ábe-Kanà (“Ogoni”) (Íkòrò 1996)

Overt exhaustiveness operator (cf. Horvath 2000): “A high tone refers exclusively to the focused element with absolute certainty... [T]his means of expressing exclusive focus is not extended to low tone verbs.” (Íkòrò 1996, 313).

- (83)a. Wíí ná ó sí á. [... HH]
 fam Σ 2S go.to REL.DET
 ‘Farming is what you will engage in’
- b. Dògò ná m kúé á. [... HH]
 D. Σ 1S call REL.DET
 ‘D. is who I will call’
- e. Dògò ná m ēb ā. [... MM]
 D. Σ 1S look.at REL.(DET)
 ‘D. is who I will look at’/‘I will look at D. (*inter alios*)’
- (84)a. Wíí ná ó sí ā. [... HM]
 fam Σ 2S go.to REL
 ‘You will engage in is farming (*inter alia*)’
- b. Dògò ná m kúé ā. [... HM]
 D. Σ 1S call REL
 ‘I will call D. (*inter alios*)’

6. Q.E.D.

- (85) In Benue-Kwa, focal stress is part of clausal infrastructure (1), not a lexical property (2b), therefore the footnote in (2a) can be deleted.

7. Consequences

- (86)a. Some aspects of interpretation are determined directly by configuration/representation (Hale & Keyser 1993; Barbiers 1995; Postma 1995) rather than indirectly by interface convergence/checking of lexical diacritics—“abstract triggers” in the perjorative sense (Williams 1980).
- b. Apart from focus, other zones of left peripheral superstructure (“cartography”) may also be derived from infrastructural elements plus scope, e.g. the linearization of Turkish aspectual, modal and temporal heads (Enç 2003).
- c. Base-generation/“top-down” derivation (Aoun & Li 2003) is not the only source of *Wh*-operator constructions; tree-splitting is another.
- d. Association with focus is adverbial modification of polarity (Jacobs 1984).

8. I.O.U.

- (87) Analysis of relative clauses.

References

- Aboh, E. [1998]. Focus constructions and the Focus Criterion in Gungbe. *Linguistique Africaine* 20, 5-50.
- . [2004]. *The Morphosyntax of Complement-Head Sequences: clause structure & word order patterns in Kwa*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Abraham, R. [1958]. *Dictionary of Modern Yorùbá*. University of London Press.
- Adéşòlá, O. [1997]. Sentence-final *ni*. 9th Niger-Congo Syntax & Semantics Workshop, University of Ghana, Legon, 30 June.
- . [2003]. On superiority effects. *ILA* 48, New York University, 5 April.
- . [2004]. A-bar dependencies in logophoric contexts. Workshop on Indexicals, Harvard University, 20 November.
- Aikhionbare, M. [1988]. The verbal suffixes in Èdó. *Afrika & Übersee* 71, 205-28.
- Àjáyí, B. [1997]. Focus constructions in the *gf* corpus. 9th Niger-Congo Syntax & Semantics Workshop, University of Ghana, Legon, 30 June.
- Àjibóyè, O. F. Oyècábádé & V. Manfredi. [2004]. Syntactic analysis of the two *ni*-constructions identified by Sónaiyà & Bisang. *Ms.*, 6 April.
- Akinlabí, A. [1985]. *Tonal underspecification and Yorùbá tone*. Dissertation, University of Ibádàn.
- Alonso-Ovalle, L. & E. Guerzoni. [2002]. Double negatives, Negative Concord and metalinguistic negation. *CLS* 38, 15-30.
- Àmèkà, F. [1992]. Focus constructions in È è and Àkán: a comparative perspective. *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 17, 1-25.
- Aoun, J. & Y. Li. [2003]. *Essays on the Representational & Derivational Nature of Grammar: the diversity of wh-constructions*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Arregi, K. [2000]. Definite articles as relative operators. *Ms.*, M.I.T., Cambridge, Mass.
- . [2003]. Focus and word order in Basque. *Ms.*, M.I.T., Cambridge, Mass.
- . [2002]. *Focus on Basque movement*. Dissertation, M.I.T., Cambridge, Mass.
- Awòbùlúyì, O. [1975]. Some traditional ‘adverbs’ in true perspective. *Journal of West African Languages* 10, 28-54.
- . [1978]. Focus constructions as noun phrases. *Linguistic Analysis* 4, 93-114.

6. Final *ni* is characteristic of southern Ígbo, including the dialect bases of Swift & al. (1962) and Nwáchukwu (1976). It is obligatory in all relatives in Ágbò.

- . [1992]. Issues in the syntax of standard Yorùbá focus constructions. *Journal of West African Languages* 22, 69-88.
- Awóyálé, 'Y. [1985]. Focus as an unbounded movement rule in Yorùbá. *Journal of the Linguistic Association of Nigeria* 3, 75-84.
- . [1987]. The role of sentence-boundary elements in grammar. 18e Colloque de Linguistique Africaniste, Université du Québec à Montréal, 26 April.
- . [1996]. Class notes on Yorùbá phonology and syntax. 24.942, M.I.T., Cambridge, Mass.
- . [1997]. The interrelationship between focus and sentence-final phenomena in Yorùbá; evidence from within and beyond the syntax. 9th Niger-Congo Syntax & Semantics Workshop, University of Ghana, Legon, 30 June.
- Aziza, R. [2003]. Negation in Southwestern E.doid. 34th Annual Conference on African Linguistics, Harvard University, 21 June.
- Bamba, M. & M. Liberman. [1997]. Focus in Mandeng. 9th Niger-Congo Syntax & Semantics Workshop, University of Ghana, Legon, 2 July.
- Bámgbósé, A. [1966]. The assimilated low tone in Yorùbá. *Lingua* 16, 1-13.
- . [1967]. *A Short Yorùbá Grammar*. Heinemann, Ìbàdàn.
- . [1973]. The modifying serial construction; a reply. *Studies in African Linguistics* 4, 207-17.
- . [1975]. Relative clauses and nominalised sentences in Yorùbá. *OSU Working Papers in Linguistics* 20, 202-09.
- . [1976]. Are Yorùbá adverbs really nouns? *Journal of West African Languages* 11, 21-40.
- . [1992]. Relativisation or nominalisation: a case of structure vs. meaning. *Research in Yorùbá Language & Literature* 3, 87-109.
- Barbiers, S. [1995]. *The syntax of interpretation*. (= HIL Dissertations 14). Holland Academic Graphics, the Hague.
- Bergvall, V. [1987a]. *Focus in [G]ìkàyù & universal grammar*. Dissertation, Harvard University.
- . [1987b]. Pronominalization and discourse function in [G]ìkuyù. *Niger-Congo Syntax & Semantics* 1, 97-113. African Studies Center, Boston University.
- Bisang, W. & 'R. Šónaiyà. [2000]. Information structuring in Yorùbá. *Linguistics* 38, 169-97.
- Bolinger, D. [1958]. A theory of pitch accent in English. *Word* 14, 109-49.
- Bòdè, O. [2004]. *Wh-phrases & complementizers in Yorùbá; evidence for a multi-layered C-system. Kinyira Njira! Step Firmly on the Pathway! (= Trends in African Linguistics 5)*, edited by C. Githiora et al., 43-52. Africa World Press, Lawrenceville, New Jersey.
- Bresnan, J. & S. Mchombo. [1987]. Topic, pronoun and agreement in Chichewa. *Language* 63, 741-82.
- Brody, M. [1990]. Some remarks on the focus field in Hungarian. *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics* 2, 201-26.
- . [1995]. Focus and checking theory. *Approaches to Hungarian* 5, edited by I. Kenesei, 29-44. Szeged, JATE. [Not personally consulted; cited by Horvath (2000).]
- Brunetti, L. [2003]. *A unification of focus*. Dissertation, Università di Firenze.
- Byarushengo, E, L. Hyman & S. Tenenbaum. [1976]. Tone, accent and assertion in Haya. *Southern California Occasional Papers in Linguistics 5: Studies in Bantu Tonology*, edited by L. Hyman, 183-205. University of Southern California, Los Angeles.
- Carstens, V. [1986]. *Proper government in Yorùbá*. M.A. thesis, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Chen,
- Cheng, L. & J. Rooryck. [2000]. Licensing *wh*-in situ. *Syntax* 3, 1-19.
- Chomsky, N. & M. Halle. [1968]. *The Sound Pattern of English*. Harper, New York.
- Cinque, G. [1993]. A null theory of phrase and compound stress. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24, 239-98.
- . [1999]. *Adverbs & Functional Heads; a crosslinguistic perspective*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Clements, N. [1980a]. A syntactic account of [G]ìkuyù *ni*. 4th Groningen Round Table on Linguistics. [Not personally consulted; cited by Bergvall (1987a).]
- . [1980b]. FOCUS as a syntactic category; evidence from Bantu. *Ms*, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. [Not personally consulted; cited by Bergvall (1987a).]
- Collins, C. [1994]. The factive construction in Kwa. Vakgroep Afrikaanse Taalkunde, Leiden University, 30 May.
- Connell, B. [2003]. Pitch realization of questions vs. statements in Mambila. 34th Annual Conference on African Linguistics, Rutgers University, 21 June.
- Déchaïne, R.-M. [1993]. *Predicates across categories; towards a category-neutral syntax*. Dissertation, UMass, Amherst.
- . [2000]. Yorùbá sentence-peripheral phenomena. University of British Columbia, Vancouver.
- . [2001]. On the left edge of Yorùbá complements. *Lingua* 111, 81-130.
- Déchaïne, R.-M. & V. Manfredi. [1997]. Focus in and on typology. 9th Niger-Congo Syntax & Semantics Workshop, University of Ghana, Legon, 30 June.
- Domínguez, L. [2004]. *Mapping focus; the syntax and prosody of focus in Spanish*. Dissertation, Boston University.
- Donwa-Ifode, S. [1984]. The intonation system of Ìsókó. *Studies in African Linguistics Supplement* 9, 83-89.
- Drubig, H. [2003]. Toward a typology of focus and focus constructions. *Linguistics* 41, 1-50.
- Edenmyr, N. [2001]. *Focus constructions in Kirundi*. M.A. thesis, University of Stockholm.
- Elugbe, B. & K. Williamson. [1977]. Reconstructing nasals in Proto-Benue Kwa. *Linguistic Studies Offered to Joseph Greenberg*, edited by A. Juillard, 339-63. Anna Libri, Saratoga.
- Émènanjo, E. [1971]. *Aspects of the phonology & morphophonemics of Ònícha*. B.A. thesis, University of Ìbàdàn.
- Enç, M. [2003]. Copulas and functional categories in Turkish. Altaic Workshop, M.I.T., Cambridge, Mass. 18 May.
- Erteschik-Shir, N. [1997]. *The Dynamics of Focus Structure*. Cambridge University Press.
- Frascarelli, M. [2000]. *The Syntax-Phonology Interface in Focus & Topic Constructions in Italian*. Kluwer, Dordrecht.
- Giannakidou, A. [2001]. The meaning of free choice. *Linguistics & Philosophy* 24, 659-735.
- Githiora, C. [2004]. Gìkuyù orthography: past and future horizons. *Kinyira Njira! Step Firmly on the Pathway! (= Trends in African Linguistics 5)*, edited by C. Githiora et al., 85-95. Africa World Press, Lawrenceville, New Jersey.
- Givón, T. [1975]. Serial verbs and syntactic change: Niger-Congo. *Word Order & Word Order Change*, edited by C. Li, 49-112. University of Texas Press, Austin.
- Gleitman, L. [1969]. Coordinating conjunctions in English. *Modern Studies in English Readings in Transformational Grammar*, edited by D. Reibel & S. Schane, 80-112. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.
- Goldsmith, J. [1981a]. The structure of *wh*-questions in Igbo. *Linguistic Analysis* 7, 367-93.
<<http://humanities.uchicago.edu/faculty/goldsmith/Papers/IgboQuestions.pdf>>
- . [1981b]. Complementizers and root sentences. *Linguistic Inquiry* 12, 541-74.
<<http://humanities.uchicago.edu/faculty/goldsmith/Papers/ComplementizersAndRootSentences.pdf>>
- Green, M. & G. Ígwè. [1963]. *A Descriptive Grammar of Ígbo*. Akademie, Berlin
- Greenberg, J. [1963]. *The Languages of Africa*. Mouton, the Hague. [= *International Journal of American Linguistics* 29 1].
- Hagstrom, P. [1998]. *Decomposing questions*. Dissertation, M.I.T., Cambridge, Mass.
- Hale, K. & S. J. Keyser. [1993]. On argument structure and the lexical expression of syntactic relations. *The View from Building 20; Essays in Linguistics in Honor of Sylvain Bromberger*, edited by K. Hale & S.J. Keyser, 53-109. MIT Press, Cambridge Mass.
- Heusinger, K. von. [1999]. *Intonation & information structure*. Dissertation, University of Konstanz.
- Horvath, J. [2000]. Interfaces vs. the computational system in the syntax of focus. *Interface Strategies*, edited by H. Bennis & al., 183-206. Koninklijke Nederlands Akademie van Wetenschappen, Amsterdam.
- Ígwè, G. [1999]. *Ígbo-English Dictionary*. University Press, Ìbàdàn. [Original manuscript completed in 1985.]
- Íkòrò, S. [1996]. *The Kanà Language*. [= CNWS Publications Vol. 40.] Center for Non-Western Studies, Leiden University.
- Jacobs, J. [1984]. Funktionale Satzperspektive und Illokutionsemantik. *Linguistische Berichte* 91, 25-58. [Not personally consulted; cited by von Stechow & Uhmman 1984.]
- . [1991]. Focus ambiguities. *Journal of Semantics* 8, 1-36.
- Jones, S. [2004]. Syntax of Yorùbá questions. 35th Annual Conference on African Linguistics, Harvard University, 2 April/*Ms.*, Linguistics 531, University of British Columbia, Vancouver.
- Keach, C. [2004]. On the obligatory presence of object marking in Swahili relative clauses. *Kinyira Njira! Step Firmly on the Pathway! (= Trends in African Linguistics 5)*, edited by C. Githiora et al., 125-34. Africa World Press, Lawrenceville, New Jersey.
- Koopman, H. [2000]. Unifying predicate cleft constructions. *The Syntax of Specifiers & Heads*, 366-82. Routledge, London.

- Koopman, H. & D. Sportiche. [1986]. A note on long extraction in Vā̀tā and the ECP. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 4, 357-74.
- Koster, J. [1999]. The word orders of English and Dutch; collective vs. individual checking. *Groninger Arbeiten zur germanistischen Linguistik*, edited by W. Abraham, 1-42. University of Groningen.
- . [2003]. Not philology by other means. Review of: A. Belletti & L. Rizzi (eds.) *Noam Chomsky on nature & language. Glot International* 7, 171-72.
- Laka, I. [1990]. *Negation in syntax; on the nature of functional categories and projections*. Dissertation, M.I.T., Cambridge, Mass.
- Manfredi, V. [1987]. Anti-logophoricity as domain extension in Ìgbò and Yorùbá. *Niger-Congo Syntax & Semantics* 1, 97-113. African Studies Center, Boston University.
- . [1991/93]. Spreading and downstep. *Ágbò & Èhùgbò; Ìgbò linguistic consciousness, its origins & limits*. Dissertation, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., 61-93. Reprinted as Spreading and downstep: prosodic government in tone languages. *The Phonology of Tone; the Representation of Tonal Register*, edited by H. v.d. Hulst & K. Snider, 133-84. De Gruyter, Berlin.
- . [1993]. Verb focus in the typology of Kwa/Kru and Haitian. *Focus & Grammatical Relations in Creole Languages*, edited by F. Byrne & D. Winford, 3-51. Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- . [1995]. Tonally branching *s* in Yorùbá is [LH]. *Niger-Congo Syntax & Semantics* 6, 171-82. African Studies Center, Boston University.
- . [1997]. Aspectual licensing and object shift. *Object Positions in Benue-Kwa*, edited by R.-M. Déchaine & V. Manfredi, 87-122. Holland Academic Graphics, The Hague/Holland Institute of Generative Linguistics.
- . [2003]. A fonosyntactic parameter within Benue-Kwa and its consequences for Èdó. *Typologie des langues d'Afrique et universaux de la grammaire, vol. 2 Benue-Kwa, Soninke, Wolof*, edited by P. Sauzet & A. Zribi-Hertz, 127-62. Presses Universitaires de Vincennes/Éditions de l'Harmattan, Paris.
- . [2004]. A toneless theory of 2-and-a-half tonemes in Gbè. 35th Annual Conference on African Linguistics, Harvard University, 3 April. Département de Linguistique, UParis 7, 1 December.
- Marchese, L. [1983]. On assertive focus and the inherent focus nature of negatives and imperatives: evidence from Kru. *Journal of African Languages & Linguistics* 5, 115-29.
- Melzian, H. [1942]. *Vergleichende Charakteristik des Verbums im Bini (Südnigerien)*. (=Arbeiten aus dem Institut für Lautforschung an der Universität Berlin 12). Harrassowitz, Leipzig.
- Meussen, A. [1959]. *Éssai de grammaire rundi*. Musée Royal du Congo Belge, Tervuren.
- . [1971]. Relative clauses in Bantu. *Studies in African Linguistics, Supplement* 2, 3-10.
- Moro, A. [1997]. *The Raising of Predicates; predicative noun phrases & the theory of clause structure*.
- Myers, A. [1971a]. On the similarities between interrogatives and emphatics in Gikuyu and English. *Studies in African Linguistics, Suppl.* 2, 11-17.
- . [1971b]. Assertion and presupposition in [G]ikuyu. *Papers in African Linguistics*, edited by C.-W. Kim & H. Stahlke, 135-40. Linguistic Research, Edmonton.
- Ndayiragije, J. [1998]. TP-internal focus in Kirundi and "Attract-F". *Proceedings of Workshop on Focus*, edited by E. Benedicto & al., 175-90. [= *University of Massachusetts Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 21.] G.L.S.A., Amherst, Mass.
- . [1999]. Checking economy. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30, 399-444.
- Neeleman, A. & T. Reinhart. [1998]. Scrambling and the PF interface. *The Projection of Arguments; lexical & compositional factors.*, edited by M. Butt & W. Geuder, 309-53. CSLI Publications, Stanford.
- Ngonyani, D. [1999]. X⁰-movement in Kiswahili relative clause verbs. *Linguistic Analysis* 29, 137-59.
- Nurse, D. & G. Philippson. [2003]. Introduction. *The Bantu Languages*, edited by D. Nurse & G. Philippson, 1-12. Routledge, London.
- Nwáchukwu, P. [1976]. *Noun Phrase sentential complementation in Ìgbò*. Dissertation, University of London.
- . [1995]. Topic, focus and Move-alpha in Ìgbò. *Issues in African Languages & Linguistics; essays in honour of Kay Williamson*, edited by E. Émánanjó & O. Ìndíméle, 181-92. National Institute for Nigerian Languages, Abá.
- Odden, D. [1991]. The intersection of syntax, semantics and phonology in Kikongo. *Berkeley Linguistic Society* 17, 188-99.
- Òmòrúyí, T. [1986]. On the formation of questions in Èdó. *Journal of African Languages & Linguistics* 10, 19-31.
- Owómoyèlà, O. [2004]. Prepublication advertising copy for *Yorùbá Proverbs*. University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln.
- Oyéélarán, O. [1982/92]. The category aux in Yorùbá phrase structure. 15th West African Languages Congress, Port Harcourt/Research in Yorùbá Language & Literature 3, 59-86.
- . [1989]. Morphological and syntactic constraints on verbal auxiliaries in Yorùbá. 4th Niger-Congo Syntax and Semantics Workshop, Tilburg, 2-3 June.
- Oyéélarán, O. & V. Manfredi. [2000]. Weak focus-movement islands in Yorùbá. 31st Annual Conference on African Linguistics, Harvard University, 2 March.
- Postma, G. [1995]. *Zero Semantics; a Study of the Syntactic Conception of Quantificational Meaning*. (= HIL Dissertations 13). Holland Academic Graphics, The Hague.
- Reinhart, T. [1997]. Interface economy; focus and markedness. *Studia Grammatica* 40, 146-69.
- Riemsdijk, H. [2001]. A far from simple matter; syntactic reflexes of syntax-pragmatics misalignments. *Perspectives on Semantics, Pragmatics & Discourse; a Festschrift for Ferenc Kiefer, 21-41*. Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Rizzi, L. [1997]. The fine structure of the left periphery. *Elements of Grammar a Handbook of Generative Syntax*, ed. by L. Haegeman, 281-337. Kluwer, Dordrecht.
- . [1999]. On the position "Int(errogative)" in the left periphery of the clause. *Ms.*, Università di Siena.
- Robinson, J. [1974]. Focus-presupposition and *wh*-questions in Ìgbò. *Third Conference on African Linguistics*, edited by E. Voeltz, 243-49. Indiana University Press.
- Ruwet, N. [1974]. Phrases copulatives. *Recherches linguistiques de Vincennes* 3, 143-91.
- Saah, K. [1988]. *Wh*-questions in Àkán. *Journal of West African Languages* 18, 17-28.
- . [1994]. *Studies in Àkán syntax, acquisition & sentence processing*. Dissertation, University of Ottawa.
- Stahlke, H. [1973]. Ross' constraints and related problems in Yorùbá. *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences* 3, 192-230.
- . [1974]. Pronouns and islands in Yorùbá. *Studies in African Linguistics* 5: 171-204.
- Szendrói, K. [2001]. *Focus & the syntax-phonology interface*. Dissertation, University College, London.
- Ùwaláàka, M. [1981]. *The syntax & semantics of the Ìgbò verb; a Case Grammar analysis*. Dissertation, University of Ìbàdàn.
- . [1988]. *The Ìgbò Verb; a Semantico-Syntactic Analysis. Beiträge zur Afrikanistik*, Bd. 35, Nr. 48. Wien.
- Vallduví, E. [1990]. *The informational component*. Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.
- Wagner, M. [2004]. Prosody as a diagonalization of syntax; evidence from complex predicates. To appear in *NELS* 34.
- Wedgwood, D. [2003]. *Predication & informational structure; a dynamic account of Hungarian pre-verbal syntax*. Dissertation, University of Edinburgh.
- Westermann, D. [1930/1954]. *A Study of the Èwè Language*. Oxford University Press.
- Williams, E. [1977]. Discourse and Logical Form. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8, 101-39.
- . [1980]. Abstract triggers. *Journal of Linguistic Research* 1, 71-82.
- . [1997]. Blocking and anaphora. *Linguistic Inquiry* 28, 577-628.
- . [2003]. *Representation Theory*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Williamson, K. [1979]. Sentence tone in some southern Nigerian languages. Proceedings of the Ninth International Congress of Phonetic Sciences, Copenhagen, edited by E. Fischer-Jørgensen & al., 424-29. Institute of Phonetics, University of Copenhagen.
- Williamson, K. & R. Blench. [2000]. Niger-Congo. *African Languages; an introduction*, edited by B. Heine & D. Nurse, 11-42. Cambridge University Press.
- Xu, L. [2004]. Manifestation of informational focus. *Lingua* 114, 277-99.
- Yusuf, O. [1989/91]. The derivation of the focus construction in Yorùbá; a problem for the trace theory. *Journal of the Linguistic Association of Nigeria* 5, 56-71/Odù 38, 27-43.
- . [1990]. The Yorùbá copula *ni*. *Journal of West African Languages* 20, 83-93.
- Zubizarreta, M.-L. [1998]. *Prosody, Focus & Word Order*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.