

# John Benjamins Publishing Company



This is a contribution from *Information Structure and Reference Tracking in Complex Sentences*.

Edited by Rik van Gijn, Jeremy Hammond, Dejan Matic, Saskia van Putten and Ana Vilacy Galucio.

© 2014. John Benjamins Publishing Company

This electronic file may not be altered in any way.

The author(s) of this article is/are permitted to use this PDF file to generate printed copies to be used by way of offprints, for their personal use only.

Permission is granted by the publishers to post this file on a closed server which is accessible to members (students and staff) only of the author's/s' institute, it is not permitted to post this PDF on the open internet.

For any other use of this material prior written permission should be obtained from the publishers or through the Copyright Clearance Center (for USA: [www.copyright.com](http://www.copyright.com)).

Please contact [rights@benjamins.nl](mailto:rights@benjamins.nl) or consult our website: [www.benjamins.com](http://www.benjamins.com)

Tables of Contents, abstracts and guidelines are available at [www.benjamins.com](http://www.benjamins.com)

PART I

## **Information structure in complex sentences**



# Subordinate clauses and exclusive focus in Makhuwa<sup>\*</sup>

Jenneke van der Wal  
University of Cambridge

In Makhuwa the element immediately after the conjoint verb form is interpreted as exclusive focus (Van der Wal 2011). This paper shows that the relation between the conjoint verb form and focus in Immediate After Verb (IAV) position holds not only for nouns and simple adverbs, but also for adverbial subordinate clauses with a relative or Situative verb, which are clearly focused when they follow a conjoint verb form. I propose that the reason that sentential complements do *not* receive a focus interpretation in the same position is due to the absence of internal information structure in the adverbial clauses. Hence, adverbial clauses but not complement clauses function as a single integrated informational unit in the information structure of the main clause.

**Keywords:** Makhuwa; exclusive focus; subordinate clause; information structure

## 1. Introduction

Information structure is an important factor in the grammar of Makhuwa. The word order is largely determined by it, restricting the preverbal domain to accessible elements functioning as topics and leaving the postverbal domain for non-topical elements (Van der Wal 2009). Information structure also determines the use of special verb forms known as conjoint and disjoint: what follows a conjoint verb form in

---

\* First fieldwork on Makhuwa-Enahara (2005, 2006, 2008) was carried out in a project sponsored by the Dutch Organisation for Scientific Research NWO. Additional fieldwork for this research (2011) was supported by the Fonds Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek Vlaanderen (FWO) which is hereby gratefully acknowledged. Further research was conducted within the project 'Rethinking Comparative Syntax' (European Research Council Advanced Grant No. 269752). I want to thank my Makhuwa informants Ali Pwanale, Joaquim Nazário, Momade Ossumane and Adelino Armindo Raposo for their kind and patient explanations, and I am indebted to Thilo Schadeberg, Theresa Biberauer, Tom Güldemann, Dejan Matic and Saskia van Putten for helpful discussion and suggestions. The views expressed in this paper remain my responsibility.

Makhuwa is interpreted as the exclusive focus of the sentence (Van der Wal 2009, 2011). The question arises how these information structural properties work when the element following the verb is not a noun phrase but a subordinate clause. Although the situation is still far from clear, this paper provides a first examination of the influence of information structure in the main clause on that in the subordinate clause, encoded in the conjoint-disjoint alternation, and the interpretation of relative and ‘situative’ adverbial subordinate clauses.

Makhuwa is a Bantu language, classified as P31 (Guthrie 1948), with SVO as canonical word order. The data for this study were collected in fieldwork on Ilha de Moçambique, where the variety Makhuwa-Enahara is spoken.

The paper first presents the conjoint-disjoint alternation in Makhuwa (Section 2) and the Situative tenses (Section 3), and then discusses the possibilities of focused situative and relative adverbial clauses (Section 4). Section 5 seeks to explain the different behaviour of adverbial subordinate clauses and complement clauses by proposing that adverbial clauses, but not complement clauses, are presupposed. Hence, only the latter but not the former clause type has an internal information structure. This is what allows adverbial but not complement clauses to be integrated into the information structure of the main clause. Section 6 summarises the paper and points out further questions.

## 2. The conjoint-disjoint alternation

Several southern and eastern Bantu languages have pairs of conjugational categories known as the conjoint-disjoint alternation. This section presents the basic formal and interpretational characteristics of this alternation in Makhuwa, illustrating their use in combinations of verbs with nouns or adverbs.

### 2.1 Followed by a noun

As mentioned in the introduction, the Makhuwa conjugational system not only distinguishes different tenses, aspects and moods (TAM), but also encodes focus. Some tenses differentiate two kinds of verb forms that are known as conjoint and disjoint. These verb forms express the same TAM semantics but differ in their relation with the following element: what follows the conjoint verb form is interpreted as focused; when the disjoint form is used, this interpretation is absent. A first illustration of the conjoint-disjoint alternation can be found in the contrast between (1a) and (1b). In the presence of the focus particle *paáhi* ‘only’, a focused noun is only grammatical after a conjoint form (1a) but not after a disjoint form (1b).

- (1) a. CJ *o-lomw-é*            *ehopa paáhi*  
           ISM-fish-PERF.CJ 10.fish only  
           ‘He caught only fish.’

- b. DJ \*oo-lówá                    ehópá paáhi  
       1SM.PERF.DJ-fish 10.fish only  
       intended meaning: 'He caught only fish.'<sup>1</sup>

The conjoint and disjoint forms are distinguished by their sentence-final distribution, the formal properties of the verbal morphology and the tonal pattern on the following element. These characteristics are illustrated in (2). The CJ form is marked by the prefix *-n-* (2a) and cannot be sentence-final, i.e. some element has to follow it (2b). The DJ form is marked by the prefix *-náá-* and is allowed to occur on its own in sentence-final position (2c) but may also be followed by some other element (2d). The tonal pattern of the following element also varies according to the preceding verb form. After a DJ verb form, the tonal pattern is as in citation form, i.e. LHL (2d–e). When following a CJ verb form, it loses the first H (which in this example is the only H) and adds a boundary H tone on the right, resulting in the pattern LLH, as in (2a) (see Stucky 1979 and Van der Wal 2006 for more information on this tonal process).<sup>2</sup>

- (2) a. CJ *ki-n-lówá*                    ehópá  
       1SG.SM-PRES.CJ-fish 9.fish  
       'I catch fish.'
- b. CJ \**ki-n-lówa*
- c. DJ *ki-náá-lówa*  
       1SG.SM-PRES.DJ-fish  
       'I am fishing.'
- d. DJ *ki-náá-lówá ehópa*  
       'I catch fish.'
- e.     *ehópa*  
       'fish'

Note that in some other Bantu languages, such as Zulu, the distribution of these verb forms is primarily determined by constituency (Doke 1927; Van der Spuy 1993; Buell 2006): the conjoint verb form is phrased together with an element that follows the verb within the same constituent, whereas the disjoint form is always constituent-final (and possible following elements are placed outside that constituent). The associated focused interpretation is in these languages only indirectly connected to the conjoint-disjoint alternation, whereas in Makhuwa the alternation is directly linked to focus.

1. High tones in examples are indicated by an acute accent, low tones are unmarked. Numbers refer to noun classes, or to persons when followed by SG or PL. The spelling ⟨tt⟩ represents a retroflex voiceless stop.

2. This process is known as Predicative Lowering. There are two other tone rules in Makhuwa: High Tone Doubling which doubles an underlying H onto the following mora, and Final Lowering which prevents a H tone in sentence-final position.

The conjoint form in Makhuwa is not just linked to ‘new information’ but in fact encodes exclusive focus: alternatives are triggered for the referent of the element directly following the conjoint verb form and at least part of the alternatives are excluded. This focus interpretation, as argued for extensively in Van der Wal (2011), is evident in a number of contexts, a couple of which I illustrate here. One example involving the focus particle *paáhi* ‘only’ has been provided in (1), where the action of ‘catching’ only applies to ‘fish’, excluding possible alternatives, such as ‘octopus’ or ‘shoes’. Another example is the opposite grammaticality of verb forms occurring with the particle *hatá* ‘even’, as (3). This particle indicates that there have been other instances of the same event, including other referents, and that the asserted instance is the most unlikely one. This entails that there are none of the instances/alternatives can be excluded.

The particle is therefore incompatible with the exclusive focus reading after the conjoint form, hence the ungrammaticality of (3a).

- (3) a. CJ \**ki-n-thotol-alé*                      *hatá Láúra/Laurá*  
 1SG.SM-1OM-visit-PERF.CJ even 1.Laura  
 intended meaning: ‘I visited even Laura.’
- b. DJ *ko-ń-thótólá*                      *hatá Láúra*  
 1SG.SM.PERF.DJ-1OM-visit even 1.Laura  
 ‘I visited even Laura.’

Further support for the analysis of the conjoint form as encoding exclusive focus is its use in alternative questions. A general yes/no question is typically asked with a disjoint verb form, as in (4). However, when the question offers a choice between two alternatives, the exclusive selection of a referent is required and hence the conjoint form is used, as in the question and answer in (5).

- (4) DJ *woo-tthúk’*                      *écanéla*  
 2SG.SM.PERF.DJ-close 9.window  
 ‘Did you close the window?’
- (5) a. CJ *o-m-phéélá*                      *ekafé*      *o-m-phéélá*                      *eshá*  
 2SG.SM-PRES.CJ-want 9.coffee 2SG.SM-PRES.CJ-want 9.tea  
 ‘Do you want tea or coffee?’
- b. CJ *ki-m-phéél’*                      *ekafé*  
 1SG.SM-PRES.CJ-want 9.coffee  
 ‘I want coffee.’

As a last example of the exclusive focus reading after the conjoint form, consider the contrastive context in (6). The focus is on *epaashitá* ‘bag’, which follows a conjoint verb form; the alternative *eliívúru* ‘book’ is explicitly negated. The exclusive focus interpretation of the post-CJ noun is obvious.

- (6) *kha-kush-álé*            *eliívúru ya*            *meniná,*  
 NEG.1SM-carry-PERF 9.book 9-CONN 1.girl  
*o-kush-álé*            *epaashitá*  
 1SM-carry-PERF.CJ 9.bag  
 ‘He didn’t take the girl’s book, he took (her) bag.’

## 2.2 Followed by an adverb

As mentioned above, the conjoint verb form is not allowed in sentence-final position. This distributional constraint is obeyed not only when the verb is followed by a complement noun phrase, but also when an adjunct takes the postverbal position. This can be a manner adverb as in (7a), a locative nominal adjunct as in (7b) or a prepositional phrase as in (7c).

- (7) a. CJ *eshímá e-ruw-iy-é*            *tsiítsáale*  
 9.shima 9SM-stir-PASS-PERF.CJ like.that  
 ‘(The) shima is cooked like that.’
- b. CJ *ni-n-rúpá*            *wakhaámá-ni*  
 1PL.SM-PRES.CJ-sleep 16.bed-LOC  
 ‘We sleep in a bed.’
- c. CJ *ki-naan-álé*            *n’ iipulá*  
 1SG.SM-wet-PERF.CJ with 9.rain  
 ‘I got wet by the rain.’ (literally: ‘I was wetted with rain.’)

The interpretational properties of the conjoint-disjoint alternation are the same for nouns and adverbs: if an adverb directly follows a CJ verb form, it has an exclusive focus. This is illustrated in the question-answer pair in (8), the contrastive contexts in (9) and (10), and the alternative question in (11). The disjoint counterparts to these sentences would be judged inappropriate in the given contexts.

- (8) CJ *a-n-límá*            *lini?*  
 2PL.SM-PRES.CJ-farm when  
 ‘When do they cultivate?’
- CJ *a-n-límá*            *saápátu*  
 2PL.SM-PRES.CJ-farm Saturday  
 ‘They cultivate on Saturday.’
- (9) *kha-mor-álé*            *mwintháli-ní,*  
 NEG.3SM-fall-PERF 18.3.tree-LOC
- CJ *o-mor-álé*            *wá-tsulu w-a*            *’núpa*  
 3SM-fall-PERF 16-top 16-CONN 9.house  
 ‘It didn’t fall out of a tree, it fell from the top of a house.’

- (10) *nki-c-aalé*                      *ni*    *kuyéri*,  
 NEG.1SG.SM-eat-PERF with 1.spoon  
 CJ *ki-c-aalé*                      *ni*    *matáta*  
 1SG.SM-eat-PERF.CJ with 6.hands  
 ‘I didn’t eat with a spoon, I ate with my hands.’
- (11) CJ *anámwáne a-n-cá*                      *vákhaani*    *vákháani*  
 2.children 2SM-PRES.CJ-eat slowly      slowly  
*a-n-cá*                      *yaakúvíhatsaka*  
 2SM-PRES.CJ-eat hastened  
 ‘Do the children eat slowly or quickly?’

In summary, both arguments and adjuncts can fill the obligatory position after the conjoint verb form, where their denotations are interpreted as exclusive focus.

This postverbal position is in fact narrowed down to the position immediately after the verb (IAV). Watters’ (1979) analysis of focus in Aghem shows that this language has a dedicated position for focus: the IAV position. In recent years, this term has also been applied to strikingly similar focus effects in other Bantu languages (Buell 2006, 2007; Cheng & Downing 2012 for Zulu; Van der Wal 2006, 2009 for Makhuwa; Yoneda 2011 for Matengo). The IAV phenomenon generates restrictions on word order, because focused elements must occur in IAV position. This is illustrated in (12) for a clause with a ditransitive verb in which one object is focused with the particle *paáhi* ‘only’. This focused object, whether theme (12c) or recipient (12a–b), must occur immediately after the verb, otherwise the sentence is ungrammatical (12b).

- (12) a. CJ *Mariyá o-m-vanh-é*                      [*Apútaála paáhi*] *ekamítsa*  
 1.Maria 1SM-1OM-give-PERF.CJ 1.Abdallah only 9.shirt  
 ‘Maria gave only Abdallah a shirt.’
- b. CJ \**Mariyá o-m-vanh-é*                      [*ekamítsa*] [*Apútaála paáhi*]  
 1.Maria 1SM-1OM-give-PERF.CJ 9.shirt 1.Abdallah only  
 intended meaning: ‘Maria gave only Abdallah a shirt.’
- c. CJ *Mariyá o-m-vah-alé*                      [*ekamítsa paáhi*] [*Apútaála*]  
 1.Maria 1SM-1OM-give-PERF.CJ 9.shirt only 1.Abdallah  
 ‘Maria gave Abdallah only a shirt.’

As verbs can be followed not only by nouns or simple adverbs but also by clauses, the question arises what happens in a combination of the conjoint-disjoint alternation and complex clauses. In order to pave the way for the discussion of that question in Section 4, the next section first presents a special type of subordinate clause in Makhuwa.

### 3. Situatives

The Makhuwa verbal conjugational system distinguishes temporal reference, aspect, mood and focus. In addition, there are also special tenses for certain dependent clauses. These are the so-called Situative tenses.<sup>3</sup> They are similar to the dependent verb forms known as ‘participial mood’ or ‘participial tense’ in Southern Bantu languages.

There are four affirmative Situative tenses and four negative counterparts, distinguished with respect to their aspectual semantics. What makes Situative tenses special is their dependence on the main clause: Situatives do not have an independent time reference, but encode the relative temporal relation with respect to the time of the event in the main clause instead. That is, all Situative tenses indicate a certain state of affairs with respect to which the event in the independent clause holds (see Noonan 2007 on dependent time reference).

This state of affairs is underspecified in the Conditional Situative, where it is usually interpreted as a temporal or logical condition, as in (13). The event occurs simultaneously with the main clause event and may be continuous in the Durative Situative, as in (14). In the Perfective Situative, the subordinate clause sketches a situation of a completed state of affairs resulting in a sequential interpretation of the events in dependent and main clause, translated as ‘after’ in (15). Finally, in the Counterexpectational Situative, we find a situation occurring earlier (affirmative) or later (negative) than expected, which results in a sequential interpretation of the events in dependent and main clause, as illustrated in (16) and (17).

#### Conditional Situative

- (13) *nikhwáttá na-khalá ni-kíthi o-hááná o-loól-áka*  
 5.wound 5.SIT-stay 5-unripe 2SG.SM-have 2SG.SM-treat-DUR  
 ‘When the wound is fresh, you have to treat it.’  
 [‘Strike while the iron is hot.’]

#### Durative Situative

- (14) *o-h-iípúríla o-h-iípúríla a-pheél-ák’ ocáwa*  
 1SM-PERF.DJ-crawl 1SM-PERF.DJ-crawl 1SM.SIT-want-DUR 15.flee  
 ‘He crawled and crawled, wanting to flee.’

---

3. I use the term ‘tense’ here in the traditional sense of the French *tiroir*, referring to a conjugational form (in a paradigm of tenses). The term *situative* appears in Doke’s (1935) ‘Bantu Linguistic Terminology’; noticing that the term has not quite ‘caught on’, he refers to it as ‘Participial mood’. Centis (2000), in his basic grammar of Makhuwa, calls these tenses ‘gerúndio’ (Durative), ‘conjunctivo futuro oração hipotética’ (Conditional) and ‘conjunctivo perfeito’ (Perfective). As these tenses are neither participles nor gerunds in Makhuwa, and they typically describe a situation holding with respect to the main event, I opt for the label *situative*.

## Perfective Situative

- (15) *a-khúúr-ale*            *ehópá oo-rúpa*  
 1SM.SIT-chew-PERF 9.fish 1SM.PERF.DJ-sleep  
 ‘(After) having eaten fish, she went to sleep.’

Counterexpectational Perfective Situative<sup>4</sup>

- (16) *o-ra-alé*            *ontékó-ní*            *o-ná-ń-ttikh-ale*            *poóla*  
 1SM-go-PERF.CJ 17.work-LOC 1SM-CE-1OM-play-PERF 1.ball  
 ‘He went to work when he had already played football.’

## Negative Counterexpectational Situative

- (17) *ki-hí-ná-phíyé*            *waámpúlá*            *ki-náá-téléfonári*  
 1SG.SM-NEG-CE-arrive 16.Nampula 1SG.SM-PRES.DJ-telephone  
 ‘When I have not arrived in Nampula yet, I will call.’

For the purposes of this paper, the most important property of Situatives is that they are dependent tenses, meaning they cannot appear by themselves in a main clause. An exception is their use in supPLICATIONS and rhetorical questions, illustrated in (18) and (19), where a Situative appears in an independent clause. This use will not be discussed further, but is mentioned here for completeness.

- (18) *hatá a-hí-cá-aká*            *masi áá-wúrya*  
 even 1SM.SIT-NEG-eat-DUR but 1SM.CF-drink  
 ‘Even if he does not eat, if he would at least drink.’
- (19) [Come here!]  
*kaa-hí-w-é*            *valé?*  
 1SG.SM.SIT-NEG-come-SIT PP  
 ‘And if I didn’t come?’

As dependent tenses, Situatives are restricted to subordinate clauses. There are various tests to check the subordinate status of a clause, one of which is the presence of a subordinator.<sup>5</sup> Situative subordinate clauses in Makhuwa are not introduced by a

4. In Van der Wal (2009) I call this tense *Counterexpectational Perfective Situative*, as it adds a counterexpectational aspect to the otherwise similar Perfective Situative. In the current paper I refer to it simply as *Counterexpectational Situative*, in order to be able to refer to both the affirmative and the negative forms, as the negative has neither the perfective meaning, nor the morphology.

5. Other tests to diagnose the subordinate status of adverbial clauses include cataphoric pronouns, extraction, tag questions, gapping, sentential negation, sentential questioning, case suffixes and word order (Diessel 2001:437–438; Cristofaro 2003). However, these are either not applicable in Makhuwa, or the data are not available. Therefore, I am concentrating on the presence of subordinators, finiteness (TAM and subject agreement), the position with respect to the main clause and focusability.

complementiser or subordinator, i.e. their subordinate character is due only to the Situative tense of the verb. In other words, it is a case of asyndetic subordination. We can say that the Situatives are ‘deranked’, where deranking is defined as the inability to appear independently and having a different (usually reduced or absent) verbal TAM morphology (Stassen 1985; Cristofaro 2003; cf. the factor of ‘desententialisation’ in Lehmann 1988). Indeed, Situatives have their own segmental morphology and tonal pattern which cannot be derived from any other tense.

The morphology of Situative tenses tells us something about the deranked status and finiteness of clauses with a Situative tense, which will be relevant in Section 5. The inflection of Situatives consists of TAM-related affixes attached to the verb stem and the subject prefix. Crucially, none of the Situatives have a dedicated time-related affix, nor are they interpreted as referring to a specific time: as mentioned before, their temporal reference depends on the tense used in the main clause. In this sense, they can be called non-finite. However, the Perfective, Counterexpectational Perfective and Durative Situatives do mark aspect: completed actions marked by the suffix *-ale* (15) or simultaneous continuous actions marked by the suffix *-aka* (14), respectively.

Any finite verb shows agreement with the subject in the form of a subject prefix, agreeing in noun class; thus, *o-* in (20) agrees with the subject *Maárkú* in class 1. The fact that a subject prefix is present on Situatives is another indication of their finiteness. However, the subject prefix is special for some of the Situative tenses, where it can take a variant form for class 1 (3SG). In the independent tenses and in Counterexpectational Situatives, the subject prefix is *o-* (20), and in Conditional, Perfective and Durative Situatives the subject prefix is *a-*, as shown in (21).

(20) *Maár'kú o-náá-rukunéya*  
 1.Mark 1SM-PRES.DJ-play  
 ‘Mark is playing.’

(21) *ki-nú-m-phwányá Maizínyá a-rúkúnéy-áka*  
 1SG.SM-PERF.PERS-1OM-find 1.Maezinha 1SM-play-DUR  
 ‘I met/found Maezinha (while she was) playing.’

The same subject prefix *a-* is also found with the Optative tense. This tense can be used in independent clauses as an optative/hortative/imperative (22),<sup>6</sup> as well as in dependent clauses, where it functions as a kind of Subjunctive, illustrated in (23) and (24).

6. Example (22) does not have the class 1 prefix *a-*, but it shows that the Optative tense can be used independently. If the example were ‘may beans (class 1) choke me’, the subject marker would have to be *a-*.

- (22) *ólé a-thelá, eshímá e-kí-ttíp-e*  
 1.DEM.III 1SM.SIT-marry 9.shima 9SM.SIT-1SG.OM-choke-OPT  
 ‘If he marries, may shima choke me!’
- (23) *mwá-ń-rum-e nańtékw’ ínyú*  
 2PL.SM.SUBS-1OM-send-OPT 1.worker 1.POSS.2PL  
*a-w-eél-é owáání olávílávi*  
 1SM-come-APPL-OPT 17.home 14.trick  
 ‘Send your worker to come to my home for the trick.’
- (24) *oo-mánáníhá wiírá a-var-é numímé ńne*  
 1SM.PERF.DJ-try COMP 1SM-grab-OPT 5.frog 5.DEM.III  
 ‘He tried to get that frog.’

This effect has also been noticed in other Bantu languages, where the generalisation is that the class 1 subject marker takes the form *a-* in dependent clauses (Güldemann 1996). We should, however, be careful in taking this as a diagnostics for finiteness or dependent status, as not all subordinate verbs take the prefix *a-* (see the affirmative Counterexpectational Situative). Vice versa, if we assume that the tenses that do show the *o-/a-* alternation are all dependent tenses, the directive use of the Optative as in (22) would have to be seen as a case of insubordination: the conventionalised use of a formally subordinate clause as a main clause (Evans 2007). This is not at all uncommon in the languages of the world.

Another criterion for subordination used by Haspelmath (1995) is that subordinate clauses are more flexible in their position. Clauses with Situatives have quite a flexible position in the sentence: initial and final positions are illustrated in examples (13)–(17) above as well as in (25) and (26) below. Crucially, these examples show that the interpretation does not change, i.e. the meaning of the situative clause is independent of its position before or after the main clause.<sup>7</sup> This is unlike coordinate clauses such as ‘he goes to the mosque *and* he prays’, where a different order results in a different interpretation: ‘he prays and he goes to the mosque’. It is also possible to insert a situative clause inside the main clause, as in (27); this shows a high level of integration of these clauses.

- (25) a. *o-náá-vóna [wa-wuryá mirétt’ íiya]*  
 2SG.SM-PRES.DJ-cure 2SG.SM.SIT-drink 4.medicine 4.DEM.I  
 ‘You get better if you take this medicine.’
- b. *[mwa-wuryá nrétt’ óola,] o-náá-vóna*  
 2PL.SIT.SM-drink 3.medicine 3.DEM.I 2SG.SM-PRES.DJ-cure  
 ‘If you take this medicine, you get better.’

7. The interpretation of the clause in terms of information structure does crucially change depending on its position. This is the main point of Section 4.



- (28) *eshapéú t' í-ń-thum-ak-ááwé Hamisi*  
 9.hat COP 9-PRES-buy-DUR.REL-POSS.1 1.Hamisi  
 'It is a/the hat that Hamisi bought.'

Note that the non-subject relatives as used in these clefts have the structure of a participle: the first prefix on the relativised verb is in the same class as the noun that is in focus (class 9 *eshapéú*), while the subject is coded on the verb by means of a possessive (*-ááwé* 'his'; see also Section 4.2, and Van der Wal 2010 for an analysis).

All four Situatives can appear as the focus in this cleft construction in Makhuwa, as illustrated in (29)–(32).<sup>10</sup>

- Conditional Situative
- (29) *wa-ki-nanar-íhá t-ú-múu-man-áaka*  
 2SG.SM.SIT-1SG.OM-be.ugly-CAUS COP-PX-2SG.OM-hit.REL-POSS.1SG  
 'When you annoy me is when I hit you.'
- Durative Situative
- (30) *ni-rup-áká t-ú-vír-aly-ááwé Terésa*  
 1PL.SM-sleep-DUR COP-PX-pass-PERF.REL-POSS.1 1.Teresa  
 'When we were asleep/sleeping is when Teresa passed by.'
- Perfective Situative
- (31) *o-n-í'll-alé t-ú-ń-row-ééhũ óca [nańńáano*  
 PX-CE-darken-PERF COP-PX-PRES-go.REL-POSS.1PL 15.eat now  
*vá kha-ni-ń-ca]*  
 right NEG-1-PL.SM-PRES-eat  
 'When it is already dark is when we are going to eat [right now we will not eat].'
- Counterexpectational Situative
- (32) *ki-hi-ná-cé t-ú-m-vól-ty-ááká etála*  
 1SG.SM-NEG-CE-eat COP-PX-PRES-torment-PASS.REL-POSS.1SG 9.hunger  
 'When I haven't eaten yet is when I am hungry.'

If we combine the finding that situative clauses are subordinate clauses functioning as verbal adverbials which can be focused with the analysis according to which the position immediately following the conjoint verb form is a focus position, the prediction

10. These examples have a generalised agreement on the relative clause which in combination with the copula comes out as *tu-*. Some informants have more specified agreement, as in (i).

- (i) *hĩ ni-rup-áká tí-tsí-vír-aly-ááyá enyómpe*  
 1PL.PRO 1PL.SM-sleep-DUR COP-10-pass-PERF.REL-POSS.2 10.cows  
 'When we were sleeping is when the cows passed.'

is that situative clauses should also be able to surface in the IAV position and receive an interpretation similar to exclusive focus in that position. This prediction is indeed borne out. A first argument for the focus interpretation in IAV is the fact that a situative clause can form the answer to a *wh*-question, as in (33) and (34).

- (33) a. *eshímá e-ruw-iy-é líni?*  
 9.shima 9SM-stir-PASS-PERF.CJ when  
 ‘When was the shima prepared?’
- b. *(e-ruw-iy-é) Coáo o-hi-ná-tthí ophiya*  
 9SM-stir-PASS-PERF.CJ 1.João 1SM-NEG-CE-AUX 15.arrive  
 ‘(It was prepared) when João hadn’t arrived yet’
- (34) a. *ki-n-váh-iyá lini ntsúrukhu?*  
 1SG.SM-PRES.CJ-give-PASS when 3.money  
 ‘When will I be given the money?’
- b. *(o-m-váh-iyá) o-vár-ále ntéko<sup>11</sup>*  
 2SG.SM-PRES.CJ-give-PASS 2SG.SM-grab-PERF.SIT 3.work  
 ‘(You will receive it) after you have worked.’

The exclusive meaning is clearer in the following examples. The Conditional Situative in (35) forms a conditional clause which, in IAV position, is interpreted as restrictive and exclusive: only when a cat is black is it beautiful, excluding cats of other colours. The IAV effect can also be seen when the verb is followed by a situative clause, as illustrated in (36). The situative clause is only interpreted as exclusive if it directly follows the conjoint verb form, as in (36a). However, if an adverb such as *vinceene* ‘much’ is in IAV position, as in (36b), the exclusive interpretation applies to this adverb and not to the situative clause.

- (35) CJ *ákwaátú a-n-réerá ya-khal’ oóriipa*  
 2.cats 2SM-PRES.CJ-be.good 2SM.SIT-stay 2.black  
 ‘Cats are beautiful (only) if they’re black.’  
 [Other cats are not pretty.]
- (36) a. CJ *ehópá tsi-n-khwá ya-rup’ epúla*  
 10.fish 10SM-PRES.CJ-die 9SM.SIT-fall 9.rain  
 ‘Fish is caught when it rains.’  
 (literally: ‘Fish die when it rains’)  
 [Only in the rainy season is fish caught; if it doesn’t rain, no fish is caught.]

11. In this example, the Perfective Situative can only be distinguished from the Perfective in an independent clause by its tonal pattern.

- b. CJ *ehópá tsi-n-khwá vińcéene ya-rup' epúla*  
 10.fish 10SM-PRES.CJ-die much 9SM.SIT-fall 9.rain  
 'A lot of fish is caught when it rains.'  
 (literally: 'A lot of fish die when it rains')  
 [In other periods it is not so much.]

The same exclusive interpretation is found for Durative (37), Perfective Situative (38) and Counterexpectational Situative (39) in IAV position.

Durative Situative

- (37) *átthú ootéene a-n-théyá y-iin-áká áháálú Alí*  
 2.people 2.all 2SM-PRES.CJ-laugh 2SM-dance-DUR 2.uncle Ali  
 'Everyone laughs when uncle Ali dances.'  
 [When Antonio dances or when Pedro dances, nobody laughs.]

Perfective Situative

- (38) a. DJ *ki-náá-cá wé o-c-áale*  
 1SG.SM-PRES.DJ-eat 2SG.PRO 2SG.SM-eat-PERF.SIT  
 'I'll eat when you have eaten.'  
 [situation: You can only eat after the oldest person has started,  
 tradition of respect.]
- b. CJ *ki-n-cá wé o-c-áale*  
 2SG.SM-PRES.CJ-eat 2SG.PRO 2SG.SM-eat-PERF.SIT  
 'I will eat (only) when you've eaten / after you've eaten.'  
 [situation: You distrust the food; e.g. a mafia situation where the  
 plates may have been switched or the food may be poisoned.]

Counterexpectational Situative

- (39) *ntáthá ni-n-réera ni-ná-ttíy-el-iyé ni Cosé*  
 5.roof 5SM-PRES-be.good 5SM-CE-COVER-APPL-PASS by 1.José  
 'The roof is good having (already) been fixed by José.'  
 [situation: There is no-one who does the job like him.]

## 4.2 Relative clauses

Another type of verbal adverbials is relative clauses. The basic properties of the non-subject relative verb are illustrated in (40): the prefix (*e-*) on the relative verb is in the same class as the head noun (*ewórá* 'hour') and the pronominal subject is expressed through a possessive suffix (*-ááyá* 'their').

- (40) [*ewórá e-rup-aly-ááyá*] *numímé noo-khúma*  
 9.hour 9-sleep-PERF.REL-POSS.2 5.frog 5SM.PERF.DJ-exit  
 '(At) the time they slept, the frog came out'

Relative clauses in Makhuwa are best analysed as participial modifiers (Van der Wal 2010), i.e. they are independent nomino-verbal phrases. As such, they function as independent nominals and are quite free in their syntactic behaviour: they can, for

example, function as the subject or the object of a sentence, as illustrated in (41). When the referent of the relative clause – what one may think of as the head noun – is a locative, the relative verb has a locative prefix (in (42), it is class 16, *wa-*).

- (41) *o-kí-váh-é* [e-n-tthún-áú] *ophwánya*  
 2SG-1SG-give-OPT 9-PRES-want.REL-POSS.2SG 15.find  
 ‘Give me what(ever) you will find.’
- (42) *ki-hoó-wá* [waa-k-áátsim-ínyu]  
 1SG.SM-PERF.DJ-come 16.IMP-1SG.OM-call.REL-POSS.2PL  
 ‘I have come (to) where you called me.’

These free relative clauses can also be adjoined to a noun phrase as an adjectival modifier, or to a verb phrase or a sentence as an adverbial or sentential modifier. The adverbial use is common for the locative class 16 (*wa-*), especially when it is metaphorically extended to a temporal meaning as in (43).

- (43) [*wa-tuph-aly-ááka*] *khúút-eya* *mwétto*  
 16-jump-PERF.REL-POSS.1SG 16.NARR.break-STAT 3.leg  
 ‘When I jumped, I broke my leg.’

In the same way, a relative clause with a class 10 prefix *tsi-* functions as a complement clause expressing manner (44) or a manner adverbial (45).

- (44) *kááhiki tsi-n-c-íy-áaya*  
 uncertain 10-PRES-eat-PASS.REL-POSS.2  
 ‘I don’t know how they are eaten.’
- (45) *só mwi-i-tthyaw-ih-é* *ntokó*  
 just 2PL.SM-NEG-run-CAUS-OPT like  
*tsi-n-iir-ih-ák-ááyá* *akhw-iínyu*  
 10-PRES-do-CAUS-DUR.REL-POSS.2 2.companion-POSS.2PL  
 ‘Just don’t let them escape like your colleagues did.’

These relative verbal adverbials can also be focused. I do not have examples of a class 16 relative clause in a cleft, which should theoretically be possible,<sup>12</sup> but as predicted, the IAV position triggers a focus interpretation for the adverbial relative clause as well, as shown in (46).

- (46) *epúlá y-aa-ru’mp-é* *mahútté wa-riip-ály-áaya*  
 9.rain 9SM-PAST-rain-PERF.CJ 6.clouds 16-be.dark-PERF.REL-POSS.2  
 ‘It rained after the clouds had become dark.’  
 [It rained, but not all day, only when the clouds were there.]

12. A cleft construction would come down to an identificational copular clause consisting of two free relative clauses (‘When I was bathing is when you called me.’).

Summarising, subordinate clauses with situative or relative verbs can be focused in the IAV position after a conjoint form. This strengthens the analysis of the conjoint form as a marker of exclusive focus, but it may also teach us about the syntax of situative clauses and the way information structure works, which is the topic of the next section.

## 5. Focus, presupposition and incomplete clauses

If two types of subordinate clauses can be focused after the conjoint form in Makhuwa, then the next questions are whether other subordinate clauses can also appear after the conjoint form and whether they get the same focus interpretation. Unfortunately, I do not have clear data on this matter, but so far it seems that both the conjoint and the disjoint form are possible before sentential complements without any apparent difference in meaning. As illustrated in (47) and (48), the complement clause can be introduced by a conjoint (a) or a disjoint form (b) (examples from Van der Wal & Veenstra submitted).

- (47) a. CJ *n-himy-alé* [wiírá Zainábú  
2PL.SM-tell-PERF.CJ COMP Zainab  
*o-n-thotonl-é* *pani?*]  
1SM-1OM-visit-PERF.CJ 1.who  
'Who did you say that Zainab visited?'
- b. DJ *moo-hímyá* [wiírá Zainábú  
2PL.SM.PERF.DJ-tell COMP Zainab  
*o-n-thotonl-é* *pani?*]  
1SM-1OM-visit-PERF.CJ 1.who  
'Who did you say that Zainab visited?'
- (48) a. CJ *ki-n-tsuwéla* *wiírá etthépó* *tsi-háána mpwína*  
1SG.SM-PRES.CJ-know COMP 10.elephants 10SM-have 4.trunks  
'I know that elephants have trunks.'
- b. DJ *koo-tsuwélá* *wiírá etthépó* *tsi-háána mpwína*  
1SG.SM.PERF.DJ-know COMP 10.elephants 10SM-have 4.trunks  
'I know that elephants have trunks.'

Even if we do not have a perfectly clear picture of the behaviour of the conjoint/disjoint alternation before sentential complements, the preliminary data on sentential complements do suggest a difference when situative and relative subordinate clauses are involved. This difference can be understood in terms of the internal information structure of these two types of subordinate clauses (Güldemann 1996).

As mentioned in the introductory chapter of this volume, adverbial clauses typically involve ad-subordination, not daughter subordination, whereas complement clauses typically involve daughter subordination (Van Valin 2005, see also peripheral subordination vs. adsentential subordination in Bickel 1993). A particular property of ad-subordination is that ad-subordinate clauses are always non-asserted or presupposed (cf. Hooper & Thompson 1973; Harris & Campbell 1995:302; Cristofaro 2003). I take Lambrecht's (1994: 52) definition of pragmatic presupposition here, which contrasts with pragmatic assertion. Note that on this definition of assertion, it cannot be equated with a particular speech act or diagnosed by the appearance of main clause phenomena (see especially Hooper & Thompson 1973).

Pragmatic presupposition: the set of propositions lexicogrammatically evoked in a sentence which the speaker assumes the hearer already knows or is ready to take for granted at the time the sentence is uttered. (Lambrecht 1994: 52)

Pragmatic assertion: the proposition expressed by a sentence which the hearer is expected to know or take for granted as a result of hearing the sentence uttered. (Lambrecht 1994: 52)

With this definition of presupposition, the claim is that in adverbial clauses, more specifically in situative and relative adverbial clauses in Makhuwa, the proposition of those clauses does not contain new information. This confirms Güldemann's (1996) findings on the 'background' status of asyndetic hypotactic clauses and relative clauses in other Bantu languages. He notes that this status as background "necessitates a compact, largely unstructured presentation of the state of affairs. In order to meet this requirement, the internal (information) structuring of the dependent clause – by focusing the predicate, a term or any other part of the sentence – would be obstructive" (Güldemann 1996: 178).

This absence of information structure *within* the adverbial subordinate clause is visible in the fact that a situative or relative clause cannot host a focused element (cf. Givón 1975: 192). Unlike complement clauses as (47) and (48), there is no conjoint/disjoint alternation within relative and Situative tenses and no associated focused IAV position. Another argument, although this is not easy to test, is found in the interpretation of *wh*-words. As Makhuwa *wh*-words are always focused, they are expected to be banned from situative clauses. As a matter of fact, *wh*-words do appear with situatives, but crucially the interpretation is that of an echo question, as in (49). A similar non-interrogative interpretation ensues when a *wh*-word is used after a disjoint verb form, as in (50a). A normal question would have to use the CJ form, as in (50b).

- (49) *o-mi-phwánya*                      *Kaásimu iir-ák'*                      *éshéeni?*  
 2SG.SM.PERF.DJ-1OM-meet    1.Casimo    1SM.SIT.DO-DUR    9.what  
 'You met Casimo doing what?'

- (50) [Talking about the moon at a time when everybody was asleep, person A says that someone saw the moon. Person B does not believe him, because everybody was asleep, and expresses disbelief in variant a.]
- a. DJ *oo-wéhá* *tsayi?*  
 2SG.PERF.DJ-watch how  
 ‘So how did you see it?’, ‘You saw it? How?’
- b. CJ *o-weh-alé* *tsáyí?*  
 2SG-watch-PERF.CJ how  
 ‘How did you see it?’

The absence of internal information structure results in these subordinate clauses functioning as a single unit of information. It does not mean, as Lambrecht (1994) also notes, that the relation these clauses bear with respect to the main clause cannot form the new information. Indeed, Güldemann (1996: 182) concludes that the functioning of subordinate clauses as a conceptual unity with compact information structure “(has) as a consequence (that) dependent predicates, in particular those highly integrated from a semantic perspective, can be in the scope of focus within the complex clause.”<sup>13</sup> He illustrates this for several languages, among which is Kikuyu, where the absence of the predicate focus marker *ni* indicates that the dependent clause is in focus, as illustrated in (51a vs. 51b, from Bennett et al. 1985, quoted in Güldemann 1996).

- (51) a. *nī ndī-ra-mw-on-ire* *agī-thī* *mūcīī*  
 PF 1SG-PAST-IOM-see-PAST 1SM.SIT-go home  
 ‘I saw him go home.’
- b. *ndī-ra-mw-on-ire* *agī-thī* *mūcīī*  
 1SG-PAST-IOM-see-PAST 1SM.SIT-go home  
 ‘I saw him go home.’

So the lack of a proper information structural profile allows the clause to be more integrated into the information structure of the main clause. From the perspective of information structure, Situatives and relatives are integrated proper parts of the main clause and their relation within the main clause is established as in a non-complex clause. For Makhuwa, this means that there is more at play than a flow of information which goes “from that which is more familiar, expected, or unpredictable to that which is more unfamiliar, unexpected or unpredictable” as Chafe (1984: 440) notes in describing the use of adverbial clauses in English. The adverbial clause is interpreted as a part of the comment when it is postverbal, just like the exclusive focus when immediately following the conjoint verb form (as shown in Section 4.1). Also, in accordance

13. Güldemann (2005) suggests that some dependent predicates in Xhosa (similar to situative tenses) can be analysed as depictives if they form the assertive focus of the sentence.

with the rules of encoding topics in Makhuwa, if the adverbial clause occurs in the preverbal domain, as in (52) and (53), it functions as a topic.<sup>14</sup>

- (52) *mwa-tthukula pásáro pásáro*  
 2PL.SM.SIT-open slowly RED  
*n-ná-móóná e-ná-múú-tthyáwá-ni*  
 2PL.SM-PRES.DJ-see 9.SM-PRES.DJ-2PL.OM-flee-PLA  
 ‘When you open it carefully, you will see that he will escape from you.’

- (53) *wa-khum-aly-ááwé, o-r-aalé mpákhá wa-mfálúme*  
 16-exit-PERF.REL-POSS.1 1SM-go-PERF until 16-1.authority  
 ‘When she went out, she went to the police.’

Complement clauses, on the other hand, are daughter-subordinate. As such, they are not necessarily presupposed. That is, they can fall under the pragmatic assertion (even if being subordinate, *pace* Cristofaro 2003: 31). I take this to mean that complement clauses do have an internal information structure, which is corroborated for Makhuwa in (54) and (55). These examples show that a complement clause can host a (preposed) topical object and a focused *wh*-phrase, respectively.

- (54) *moo-hímýá wiírá ntsíná n-áwé kha-mwi-ń-tsíwela*  
 2PL.SM.PERF.DJ-say COMP 5.name 5-POSS.1 NEG-2PL.SM-PRES-know.DJ  
 ‘You said that his name, you don’t know (it).’

- (55) *o-n-uúpúwela wiírá Folórá o-m-w-él’ ésheeni?*  
 2SG.SM-PRES.CJ-think COMP 1.Florá 1SM-PRES.CJ-come-APPL 9.what  
 ‘Why do you think Flora will come?’  
 (literally: ‘You think Flora will come for what?’)

Given that they form a part of complex clauses, complement clauses have a function in the information structure of the main clause. As they additionally have a certain information structure themselves, the interpretation of complement clauses as part of the main clause is blurred. This mix of information structure in complex clauses could be the reason why the complement CPs in Makhuwa like the ones in (47) and (48) do not get a clear focus interpretation after a conjoint form, whereas the relative participles and the Situatives do.

14. Haiman (1978) observed that conditionals, such as Conditional Situative, can function as topics. The parallel, as also sketched here, is that both nominal phrases and conditional clauses “constitute the framework which has been selected for the following discourse” (Haiman 1978: 583). However, as is also apparent in Makhuwa, I argue that it is not the nature of the conditional clause per se that makes it a topic, but rather the fact that it occurs sentence-initially.

From a more formal perspective, the behaviour of adverbial clauses can be motivated by their nature as ‘incomplete’ clauses. This is quite straightforward for adverbial relative clauses: like the other non-subject relative clauses, adverbial relative clauses can best be analysed as participles, as proposed in Van der Wal (2010). This means that they are verbo-nominals: they start out as a verb, taking complements, negation and tense, but they do not have regular verbal subject marking and are headed by a participial node. The participial node is nominal, which is why it assigns genitive case to the subject; therefore, the pronominal subject appears as a possessive pronoun. This is why relative clauses function as nominals in Makhuwa. The status of adverbial relative clauses as nominals motivates their full integration into the clause and their capability to function as exclusive focus.

Situative clauses are clearly not of the same type as relative participles: they do not occur as the subject or the object of a clause, they cannot be used adnominally and the subject does not surface as a possessive pronoun. Other properties that are often associated with verbo-nominals are also absent or not applicable: Makhuwa neither has a dedicated nominalisation morpheme nor does it have case marking. On the contrary, Situatives display most properties typically associated with verbs: they can take complements, have object marking and carry inflection. Nevertheless, some of the properties described in Section 3 suggest that situative clauses are not full clauses either. Verbal properties like tense/aspect marking, negation and subject agreement – although all are present – look a little different in main clauses than they look in subordinate complement clauses, that is, they show morphological signs of deranking.

As mentioned above, Situatives do express aspectual semantics (durative, perfective and counterexpectational), but true time reference of the type found in the main clause basic tenses is absent. The subject agreement prefix differs for class 1, which could indicate a difference between dependent and independent tenses. Importantly, TAM and agreement marking on the verb are the main criteria in defining finiteness (Nikolaeva 2007). If one takes the view that finiteness is not a binary distinction (finite vs. non-finite) but rather a continuum ranging from less to more finite, then the degree of finiteness depends on how many prototypically finite properties a clause displays (Givón 2001). The loss of some finite verbal properties then indicates that Situatives are less finite, not that they are non-finite. In Givón’s (2001: 338) words, they are “more finite than infinitival V-complements but less finite than main clauses”.

Negation was not addressed in the earlier discussion, but here we find variation, too. Only the basic, independent tenses display the negation prefix *kha-* whereas all the other negative tenses have the prefix *-hi-*. The prefix *kha-* surfaces in the morphology as a pre-initial morpheme of the negative verb before the subject marker (56), while the other prefix, *-hi-*, takes the post-initial slot, that is, after the subject marker (57). The negative morphology is especially striking when looking at the difference between

the dependent (58, *-hi-*) and the independent (59, *kha-* + *-u-*) counterexpectational tense. This confirms the wider cross-Bantu generalisation that pre-initial negation is restricted to main clauses (Güldemann 1996).

- (56) *kha-ni-ń-tthúna*  
 NEG-1PL.SM-PRES.DJ-want.DJ  
 ‘We don’t want to.’
- (57) *na-hí-ráp-ih-é* *eparátho ápáápá a-náá-vírúwá*  
 1PL.SM.SIT-NEG-wash-CAUS-SIT 10.plates 2.father 2SM-PRES.DJ-be.angry  
 ‘If we don’t do the dishes, dad will be angry.’
- (58) *ekóm’ éélé kaá-mwúín-áká*  
 9.drum 9.DEM.III 1SG.SM.PAST-dance-DUR  
*khalái ki-hi-ná-khál-etsá*  
 long.ago 1SG.SM-NEG-CE-stay-PLUR  
 ‘To that drum I used to dance a long time ago, before staying here.’
- (59) *nláttw’ úúlá khu-ná-phwány-an-ey-é*  
 3.problem 3.DEM.I NEG.3SM-CE-meet-ASSO-STAT-PERF  
*ephátt’ ááyá e-m-mál-áaya*  
 9.solution 9.POSS.3 9-PRES-finish.REL-POSS.9  
 ‘This problem has not found its complete solution yet.’

These morphological properties, combined with the lack of a complementiser and the syntactic behaviour of the Situative as ‘verbal adverbials’, point towards the status of situative clauses as less complete than a full CP clause. We may speculate that, if a clause lacks the CP layer, there is no room for illocutionary force or a complementiser. Moreover, if there is no (extended) “left periphery” (Rizzi 1997), or if this is truncated, there is no space to host information structural features such as focus (Haegeman 2006, 2010, 2012, cf. Munaro 2010). Hence, the absence or truncation of the top layer would account for the lack of internal information structure, forcing the clause to be integrated into the information structure of the main clause, which opens up the possibility to be focused.<sup>15</sup>

15. Even if this idea were to hold, we may wonder how the absence of high left periphery works in a language that has a low focus position, like Makhuwa. If the current analysis is on the right track, this suggests that there is a relation between a low focus position and the high left periphery, perhaps in terms of a focus operator in the CP domain (cf. Horvath 2007, 2010). This is the analysis Hyman and Polinsky (2009) proposed for focus in Aghem, where particles related to focus and *wh*-questions cannot occur in embedded clauses.

## 6. Summary and further questions

In earlier work (Van der Wal 2011), I have proposed that in Makhuwa the element immediately after the conjoint verb form is interpreted as exclusive focus. The current paper builds on that analysis by showing that the relation between the conjoint verb form and focus in IAV position does not only hold for nouns and simple adverbs, but also for certain types of subordinate clauses. Relative clauses and those clauses with a verb in one of the four Situative tenses are clearly focused when they follow a conjoint verb form.

This adds important data to the debate on the position of adverbial clauses. While some scholars claim that adverbial clauses typically occur in the initial position as ‘frame setters’ (Haiman 1978; cf. Chafe 1984), others emphasise their function in larger stretches of discourse (Thompson, Longacre & Hwang 2007), the influence of the type of clause – conditional, causal, temporal, result, purpose (Ford 1993) – and the initial or final position of the subordinator (Diessel 2001). It is also known that “consideration of conversational context is essential for understanding adverbial clause placement” (Ford 1993: 148; cf. Chafe 1984; Thompson 1985). Importantly, the data discussed in this paper show that in Makhuwa, which is a (partially) discourse configurational language, the verbal adverbial clauses are not just placed sentence-initially or sentence-finally according to the ‘information flow’, but that they form an integrated part of the main clause information structure.

Such a clear interpretation is not found in the preliminary data on complement clauses, where the use of the conjoint and disjoint verb form in the main clause are both allowed without an apparent difference in meaning. From a functional point of view, this difference between adverbial subordinate clauses and complement clauses can be attributed to the idea that, on the one hand, adverbial clauses are non-asserted or presupposed, which I propose to mean that they do not have an internal information structure. On the other hand, complement clauses are not necessarily presupposed, which means that they do have an internal independent information structure. This entails that adverbial clauses but not complement clauses can function as a single informational unit in the information structure of the main clause. This triggers a clear focus interpretation if they occur in the IAV focus position in Makhuwa.

Needless to say, more data and research are needed on other types of subordinate clauses in Makhuwa. For example, can a subordinate clause with an optative tense, as in (23), also have a clear exclusive focus interpretation? How can we account for the apparently optional use of the conjoint or disjoint form before a CP complement? And if presupposition is a determining factor for a clause to function as one piece in the main clause information structure, would we expect (presupposed) complements of factive verbs such as ‘regret’ to be easier to focus? It would be interesting to know the precise differences in interpretation between conjoint and disjoint verb forms before

complex clauses – or the absence thereof –, in order to draw firmer conclusions on the underlying syntactic and semantic-pragmatic properties that influence the information structure in complex clauses. The new data and sometimes speculative discussion in this paper are intended as a start in that direction.

## Abbreviations

APPL	applicative	OPT	optative
ASSO	associative	PASS	passive
AUX	auxiliary	PERF	perfective
CAUS	causative	PERS	persistive
CE	counterexpectational	PF	predicate focus
CF	counterfactual	PL	plural
CJ	conjunct verb form	PLA	plural addressee
COMP	complementiser	PLUR	plurative
CONN	connective	POSS	possessive
COP	copula	PP	pragmatic particle
DEM	demonstrative	PRES	present tense
DJ	disjunct verb form	PRO	pronoun
DUR	durative	PX	prefix
HORT	hortative	RED	reduplication
IMPF	imperfective	REL	relative
LOC	locative	SG	singular
NARR	narrative	SIT	situative
NEG	negative	SM	subject marker
OM	object marker	STAT	stative

## References

- Bennett, Patrick R., Biersteker, Ann J., Gikonyo, Waithira L., Herschberg, Susan, Kamande, Joel, Harford, Carolyn & Swearingen, Martha. 1985. *Gikūyū nī kioigire: A First Course in Kikuyu*. Madison: University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- Bickel, Balthasar. 1993. Belhare subordination and the theory of topic. In *Studies in Clause Linkage*, Karin Ebert (ed.), 23–55. Zürich: ASAS.
- Buell, Leston. 2006. The Zulu Conjunct/Disjunct Verb Alternation: Focus or Constituency? *ZAS WPiL* 43: 9–30.
- Buell, Leston. 2007. Evaluating the immediate postverbal position as a focus position in Zulu. In *Selected Proceedings of the 38th Annual Conference on African Linguistics: Linguistic Theory and African Language Documentation*, Masangu Matondo, Fiona Mc Laughlin & Eric Potsdam (eds.), 166–172. Somerville MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- Centis, Gino. 2000. *Metodo Macua*. Anchilo: Centro Catequético Paulo VI.
- Chafe, Wallace. 1984. How people use adverbial clauses. *Proceedings of the Tenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 437–449.

- Cheng, Lisa L.-S. & Downing, Laura J. 2012. Against FocusP: Arguments from Zulu. In *Information Structure. Contrasts and Positions*, Ivona Kučerová & Ad Neeleman (eds.), 247–266. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cristofaro, Sonia. 2003. *Subordination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Diessel, Holger. 2001. The ordering distribution of main and adverbial clauses a typological study. *Language* 77: 345–365.
- Doke, Clement M. 1927. *Text-book of Zulu Grammar*. London: Longmans, Green & Co., Pietermaritzburg printed (4th edition, on behalf of the University of the Witwatersrand).
- Doke, Clement M. 1935. *Bantu Linguistic Terminology*. New York, London: Longmans, Green.
- Evans, Nicholas. 2007. Insubordination and its uses. In *Finiteness: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations*, Irina Nikolaeva (ed.), 366–431. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ford, Cecilia E. 1993. *Grammar in Interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Givón, Talmy. 1975. Focus and the scope of assertion: Some Bantu evidence. *Studies in African Linguistics* 6(2): 185–205.
- Givón, Talmy. 2001. *Syntax*, volume II. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Güldemann, Tom. 1996. *Verbalmorphologie und Nebenprädikationen im Bantu: Eine Studie zur funktional motivierten Genese eines konjugationalen Subsystems*. Bochum: Universitätsverlag Dr. N. Brockmeyer.
- Güldemann, Tom. 1998. The relation between imperfective and simultaneous taxis in Bantu. Late stages of grammaticalization. In *Afrikanische Sprachen im Brennpunkt der Forschung*, Ines Fiedler, Catherine Griefenow-Mewis & Brigitte Reineke (eds.), 157–177. Cologne: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.
- Güldemann, Tom. 2005. Asyndetic subordination and deverbal depictive expressions in Shona. In *Secondary Predication and Adverbial Modification: The Typology of Depictives*. Nikolaus Himmelmann & Eva Schultze-Berndt (eds.), 323–353. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Guthrie, Malcolm. 1948. *The Classification of the Bantu Languages*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Haegeman, Liliane. 2006. Conditionals, factives and the left periphery. *Lingua* 116: 1651–1669.
- Haegeman, Liliane. 2010. The internal syntax of adverbial clauses. *Lingua* 120: 628–648.
- Haegeman, Liliane. 2012. *Adverbial clauses, main clause phenomena, and the composition of the left periphery*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Haiman, John. 1978. Conditionals are topics. *Language* 54: 564–589.
- Harris, Alice C. & Campbell, Lyle. 1995. *Historical Syntax in Cross – Linguistic Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 1995. The converb as a cross-linguistically valid category. In Haspelmath & König (eds.), 1–55. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter
- Haspelmath, Martin & König, Ekkehard (eds). 1995. *Converbs in Cross-Linguistic Perspective: Structure and Meaning of Adverbial Verb Forms – Adverbial Participles, Gerunds*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hooper, Joan & Thompson, Sandra A. 1973. On the Applicability of Root Transformations. *Linguistic Inquiry* 4.4: 465–491.
- Horvath, Julia. 2007. Separating “Focus movement” from Focus. In *Phrasal and Clausal Architecture*. Simin Karimi, Vida Samiian and Wendy Wilkins (eds.), 108–145. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Horvath, Julia. 2010. “Discourse features”, syntactic displacement and the status of contrast. *Lingua* 120: 1346–1369.

- Hyman, Larry M. & Polinsky, Maria. 2009. Focus in Aghem. In *Information Structure: Theoretical, Typological, and Experimental Perspectives*, Malte Zimmermann & Caroline Féry (eds.), 206–233. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- König, Ekkehard. 1995. The meaning of converb constructions. In Haspelmath & König (eds.), 57–96. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Lambrecht, Knud. 1994. *Information Structure and Sentence Form*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lehmann, Christian. 1988. Towards a typology of clause lineage. In *Clause Combining in Grammar and Discourse*, John Haiman & Sandra Thompson (eds.), 181–225. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Munaro, Nicola. 2010. Toward a hierarchy of clause types. In *Mapping the left periphery*. Paola Benincà and Nicola Munaro (eds.), 127–163. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nedjalkov, Vladimir P. 1995. Some typological parameters of converbs. In Haspelmath & König (eds.), 97–136. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Nikolaeva, Irina. 2007. *Finiteness*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Noonan, Michael. 2007. Complementation. In *Language Typology and Syntactic Description, vol. II: Complex Constructions*, Timothy Shopen (ed.), 52–150. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stassen, Leon. 1985. *Comparison and Universal Grammar*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Stucky, Susan. 1979. The interaction of tone and focus in Makua. *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 1(2): 189–198.
- Thompson, Sandra A. 1985. Grammar and written discourse: Initial vs. final purpose clauses in English. *Text* 5: 55–84.
- Thompson, Sandra A., Longacre, Robert E. & Hwang, Shin Ja J. 2007. Adverbial clauses. In *Language Typology, volume II: Complex Constructions*, Timothy Shopen (ed.), 237–300. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Van der Spuy, Andrew. 1993. Dislocated noun phrases in Nguni. *Lingua* 90: 335–355.
- Van der Wal, Jenneke. 2006. Predicative Tone Lowering in Makhuwa. *Linguistics in the Netherlands* 23: 224–236. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Van der Wal, Jenneke. 2009. *Word Order and Information Structure in Makhuwa-Enahara*. Utrecht: LOT.
- Van der Wal, Jenneke. 2010. The Makhuwa non-subject relative as a participial modifier. *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 31(2): 205–231.
- Van der Wal, Jenneke. 2011. Focus excluding alternatives: Conjoint/disjoint marking in Makhuwa. *Lingua* 121(11): 1734–1750.
- Van der Wal, Jenneke & Veenstra, Tonjes. Submitted. The long and short of verb alternations in Mauritian Creole and Bantu languages.
- Van Valin, Robert D. Jr. 2005. *Exploring the Syntax-Semantics Interface*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Watters, John. 1979. Focus in Aghem. In *Aghem Grammatical Structure*, Larry M. Hyman (ed.), 157–189. Los Angeles: University of Southern California.
- Yoneda, Nobuko. 2011. Word order in Matengo: Topicality and informational roles. *Lingua* 121(5): 754–771.

