

Chapter 14

Emphatic properties of object marking in Ikalanga

Rose Letsholo

University of Botswana

Madelyn Colantes

Pomona College

Michael Diercks

Pomona College

This paper builds on Letsholo (2013), documenting additional properties of object marking in Ikalanga (Bantu, Botswana and Zimbabwe). We show that the ability of object markers to co-occur with overt objects is highly constrained by pragmatic context. These co-occurrence constructions are linked with corrective focus readings and mirative focus readings, along with verum focus readings (as first noticed by Letsholo 2013). We also detail some persistent analytical puzzles regarding the focus interpretations associated with OM-Obj co-occurrence in Ikalanga.

1 Introduction

Object marking is a linguistic strategy to refer to discourse-familiar objects, similar to English pronominalization. Across Bantu languages, the object marker appears as a prefix within the verb form, typically affixing before the verb stem and after the tense morpheme. (1b) below illustrates object marking in Ikalanga, a



Bantu language spoken in Botswana and Zimbabwe: the object marker *-i-* affixes to the verb and replaces the noun *búka* ‘book’.¹

(1) Ikalanga (Botswana)

- a. Joni w-áká-bál-á búka.
1.John 1SM-PST-read-FV 9.book
‘John read the book.’
- b. Joni w-áká-i-bál-a.
1.John 1SM-PST-9OM-read-FV
‘John read it.’

There is a broad range of previous work on object marking (OMing) in Bantu languages (Bresnan & Mchombo 1987, Riedel 2009, Zeller 2012, 2015, van der Wal 2015, 2020, 2022, Sikuku & Diercks 2021a). A central area of investigation is whether the object marker may co-occur with the *in situ* lexical object that it refers to, a mechanism generally referred to as OM-doubling. The acceptability of OM-doubling in Bantu languages is heavily dependent on discourse contexts. Recent work on Lubukusu (Sikuku et al. 2018, Sikuku & Diercks 2021a), Tiriki (Liu 2022), Wanga (Kuzmik 2022), and Cinyungwe (Langa da Câmara et al. 2023, Lipard et al. forthcoming) has investigated this interface of syntax and pragmatics, delving into the precise discourse conditions that license doubling. In this paper, we expand on earlier work on Ikalanga object marking (Letsholo 2013) to further describe a subset of the interpretive effects of Ikalanga object marking.

Specifically, we investigate how Ikalanga co-occurrence of OMs and their associated objects interacts with focus, and what emphatic interpretations arise from an OM-Obj co-occurrence (OOC) sentence. We summarize basic Ikalanga morphology and parameters of object marking in §2, and key generalizations of Ikalanga OM-Obj co-occurrence in §3 as background. §4 discusses object marking in verum contexts, and §5 explores the interaction between object marking and focus within *vP*. In §6 we show that the co-occurrence of OMs and their associated objects is also associated with a mirative reading. §7 outlines areas for future research, and §8 concludes.

We find that Ikalanga shares a number of properties that have been recently documented for related Bantu languages like Lubukusu, Cinyungwe, and Zulu. Notably, it shares properties with all of them, but in a different configuration

¹All uncited data points are provided by the first author. We annotate surface tone, though more research is necessary to understand the tonology of Ikalanga more generally and of these constructions specifically.

than has been previously documented. As in Zulu, object marking in Ikalanga is correlated with right-dislocation of objects (which is unlike Cinyungwe and Lubukusu). But Ikalanga is similar to Cinyungwe and Lubukusu in that the co-occurrence of OM_s and overt objects is necessarily linked with emphatic readings of the clause (which is unlike Zulu). The result leaves a lot of unsettled questions for Ikalanga, but continues to contribute to understanding the conditions on OM-ing in Bantu languages, and the typological patterns that recur across Bantu languages.

2 OMing basics in Ikalanga

2.1 Morphology of OM_s

Like most Bantu languages, Ikalanga has a rich noun class system. Nouns are organized into one of 17 classes, each distinguished by its own prefix. Ikalanga's noun class system also dictates the morphological forms of object markers: each OM agrees in noun class with its co-referent. Table 1 below shows the prefixes for each noun class and pronominal, as well as the corresponding object marker in Ikalanga.

2.2 Basic parameters of Ikalanga OM_s

Typological descriptions of Bantu OM_s have often been categorized along the following parameters (as delineated in van der Wal 2020):²

- (2) Properties of Bantu object markers (van der Wal 2020):
 - Position of object markers – Is it a pre-stem affix or an enclitic?
 - Types of objects marked – Does animacy, definiteness, or other factors influence whether an object can be OM_{ed}?
 - Number of object markers – How many OM_s can a verb stem take?
 - Behavior in ditransitives – Can either object in a ditransitive be OM_{ed}?
 - Nature of object markers – Are they a form of agreement morphology (and thus allow doubling), or are they pronominal enclitics (and thus cannot double)?

Regarding the first two parameters, Ikalanga OM_s are pre-stem affixes, and to our knowledge animacy does not affect object marking (in any obvious/direct

²Also see Marten & Kula (2012), Marlo (2014, 2015), and Riedel (2009) for relevant overviews.

Table 1: Ikalanga noun class and object marker morphology (adapted from Letsholo 2002)

Class	Prefix	Noun example	OM	OM example	Gloss
1st sg	n-	-	ndi-	bánóndítóla	'They'll take me.'
1st pl	ba-	-	ti-	bánótítóla	'They'll take us.'
2nd sg	n-	-	ku-	bánókútóla	'They'll take you.'
2nd pl	ba-	-	mu-	bánómútóla	'They'll take you (pl).'
3rd sg/1	n-	nthu 'person'	n-	bánóntóla	'They'll take him/her.'
1a	-	mme 'mother'	ba-	bánóbatóla	'They'll take him/her.'
2	ba-	bathu 'people'	ba-	bánóbatóla	'They'll take them.'
3	n-	nti 'tree'	u-	bánóútóla	'They'll take it.'
4	mi-	miti 'tree'	i-	bánóítóla	'They'll take them.'
5	-	zhani 'leaf'	li-	bánólítóla	'They'll take it.'
6	ma-	mazhani 'leaves'	a-	bánóátóla	'They'll take them.'
7	chi-/i-	chibululu 'lizard'	chi-	bánóchítóla	'They'll take it.'
8	zwi-	zwibululu 'lizards'	zwi-	bánózwítóla	'They'll take them.'
9	N-	mbga 'dog'	i-	bánóítóla	'They'll take it.'
10	N-/dzi-	mbga 'dogs'	dzi-	bánódzítóla	'They'll take them.'
11	li-	likuni 'log'	gu-	bánógútóla	'They'll take it.'
14	bu-	bushwa 'grass'	gu-	bánógútóla	'They'll take it.'
15	ku-	ku izela 'to sleep'	k-	únókuda	'He likes it.'
16	pa-	pa ngwina 'by the hole'	-	-	-
17	ku-	ku nzi 'at home'	-	-	-
18	mu-	mu ngumba 'in the house'	-	-	-
21	zhi-	zhingwana 'enormous child'	li-	bánólítóla	'They'll take it.'

manner). Letsholo (2013) does report that co-occurrence of object markers and overt objects yields a definite reading of the object noun phrase in question. Ikalanga generally allows just one object marker on a verbal stem. Attempts to add two OMs on either a lexical ditransitive or benefactive applicative verb both result in ungrammaticality:

- (3) *Nchídzi w-áká-(bá-) (i-) pa.
 1.Nchidzi 1SM-PST-2OM-9OM-give
 Intd. ‘Nchidzi gave it (the toy) to them (the children).’
- (4) *Ludó w-áká-(zwí-) (m-) bík-il-a.
 1.Ludo 1SM-PST-8OM-1OM-cook-APPL-FV
 Intd. ‘Ludo cooked it (food) for him.’

Causatives seem to be a possible exception to this generalization.

- (5) Nchídzi w-áka-(bá-) (dzi-) séng-és-a.
 1.Nchidzi 1SM-PST-2OM-10OM-carry-CAUS-FV
 ‘Nchidzi made them (the children) carry it (the firewood).’

Not all instances of causative constructions, however, naturally take multiple OMs; further research is needed to establish when this is possible.

Regarding the fourth parameter, in double object constructions, either object can be object marked in Ikalanga – that is, it displays object marking symmetry.³

- (6) a. Ludó w-áká-(m-) bík-il-á nyama.
 1.Ludo 1SM-PST-1OM-cook-APPL-FV 9.meat
 ‘Ludo cooked meat for him.’
- b. Ludó w-áká-(i-) bík-il-a Nchídzi.
 1.Ludo 1SM-PST-9OM-cook-APPL-FV 1.Nchidzi
 ‘Ludo cooked it for Nchidzi.’

The final typological parameter seeks to classify the OM as either agreement morphology or a pronominal enclitic. One key diagnostic for this classification is whether the OM is allowed to co-occur with its associated lexical object DP when that object is *in situ* inside the verb phrase.

Letsholo (2013) argues for a pronominal incorporation analysis of Ikalanga OMs. Namely, while an OM can co-occur with a lexical object, the object cannot

³For background on the properties of (a)symmetrical object properties in Bantu languages, see Bresnan & Moshi (1990), Jerro (2015), Riedel (2009), and Zeller (2015), among others.

remain within the verb phrase. In (7) below, the OMed object is obligatorily offset by a prosodic break, suggesting it has been dislocated to a different syntactic position. (§3.2 will discuss in more detail the evidence for dislocation of the OMed object.)

- (7) Nchídzí w-á-(gu-)ngw-á *,(.) bú súkwa).
 1.Nchidzi 1SM-PST-14OM-drink-FV 14.beer
 ‘Nchidzi DID drink the beer.’

(7) also provides evidence against an analysis of the OM as agreement morphology, per Letsholo (2013); agreement morphemes are generally assumed to be grammatically obligatory and should not alter the sentence’s meaning in any way. As the translation in (7) suggests, OOC in this sentence creates an emphatic reading.⁴ Removing the OM is not only grammatical, but also removes this emphatic effect:

- (8) Nchídzí w-á-ngw-á bú súkwa.
 1.Nchidzi 1SM-PST-drink-FV 14.beer
 ‘Nchidzi drank the beer.’

Letsholo (2013) thus argues that because Ikalanga OMing results in dislocation of the associated object, does not require the overt object, and introduces an emphatic reading, Ikalanga OMs are best analyzed as pronominal clitics rather than agreement morphemes. This paper doesn’t specifically comment on this analysis, though these new observations add complexity that any analysis of OMing will need to account for.

3 Basics of OM-Obj co-occurrence in Ikalanga

This section presents two core generalizations about the co-occurrence of object markers and lexical DP objects in Ikalanga: OOC is unnatural in discourse-neutral contexts, and OOC and object dislocation are obligatorily linked. The co-occurrence of OMs and objects has generally been discussed under the term *OM-doubling* (based on the familiar term *clitic-doubling*): this is generally used to refer to the co-occurrence of a clitic or object marker with an *in situ* lexical object. As we will show, languages that unambiguously display OM-doubling (e.g. Lubukusu and Cinyungwe) share a broad range of patterns with Ikalanga. Nonetheless, Ikalanga behaves relatively Zulu-like in that it appears that an OM

⁴The specific emphatic interpretation generated here will be further discussed in §4.

on the verb is incompatible with an *in situ* lexical object. As such, we avoid the term *doubling* for the most part, using the pre-analytic term *OM-Object co-occurrence* instead.

3.1 OOC is unnatural in all-new contexts

In all-new contexts, such as out-of-the-blue situations where no prior knowledge is assumed between interlocutors, OOC is infelicitous:

- (9) *Out of the blue:*
 #Nchidzi w-á-(gu-) ngw-á , (búsúkwa) .
 1.Nchidzi 1SM-PST-14OM-drink-FV 14.beer
 Intd. ‘Nchidzi DID drink the beer.’

As noted in the translation, OOC in (9) creates an emphatic, insistent reading that we identify as *verum* (see §4). In an out-of-the-blue context, however, there is no one doubting the speaker; the emphatic reading introduced by OOC therefore sounds unnatural. Similar *verum* readings have been identified in OM-doubling in Lubukusu (Sikuku et al. 2018, Sikuku & Diercks 2021a), Tiriki (Liu 2022), Wanga (Kuzmik 2022), Cinyungwe (Langa da Câmara et al. 2023, Lippard et al. forthcoming), and Rukiga (Allen Asiimwe, pc).

3.2 OM-Obj co-occurrence requires dislocation

3.2.1 Relevant case study: Zulu OM-Obj co-occurrence

Zeller (2015) shows that in the Southern Bantu language Zulu, OM and object dislocation are obligatorily linked. (10) below shows the canonical word order, with the manner adverb right-adjoined to *vP* and thus following the object. (This is consistent with the generalization across languages that ‘low’ adverbs mark the edge of *vP*).

- (10) Zulu
 Si-bon-a i-n-kosi kahle.
 1PL-see-FV AUG-9-chief well
 ‘We are seeing the chief well.’ (Zeller 2015: 20)

When an object co-occurs with its OM, it obligatorily moves to the right, past the adverb and outside of *vP* (11a). Leaving the object *in situ* as in (11b) is ungrammatical, as is moving the object without an OM appearing on the verb (11c).

(11) Zulu

- a. Si-(yi-) bon-a kahle (i-n-kosi).
1PL-9OM-see-FV well AUG-9-chief
'We are seeing him well, the chief.'
- b. *Si-(yi-) bon-a (i-n-kosi) kahle.
1PL-9OM-see-FV AUG-9-chief well
Intd. 'We are seeing him well, the chief.'
- c. *Si-bon-a kahle i-n-kosi.
1PL-see-FV well AUG-9-chief
Intd. 'We are seeing the chief well.'
(Zeller 2015: 20)

In OOC double object constructions in Zulu where the verb is in its conjoint form (signaling that the *vP* is non-empty), the OM-doubled benefactive object is obligatorily dislocated to the right of the theme object, as we might expect (12b). Leaving the object in its canonical position is ungrammatical (12c).

(12) Zulu OMing: conjoint verb forms

- a. Ngi-theng-el-a u-Sipho u-bisi.
1SM-buy-APPL-FV AUG-1a.Sipho AUG-11.milk
'I'm buying milk for Sipho.'
- b. Ngi-(m-) theng-el-a u-bisi (u-Sipho).
1SM-1OM-buy-APPL-FV AUG-11.milk AUG-1a.Sipho
'I'm buying him milk, Sipho.'
- c. *?Ngi-(m-) theng-el-a (u-Sipho) u-bisi.
1SM-1OM-buy-APPL-FV AUG-1a.Sipho AUG-11.milk
Intd. 'I'm buying him milk, Sipho.'
(Zeller 2015: 21)

The word order rigidity of objects disappears, however, when the verb takes on its disjoint form, indicated by the *-ile* affix below. That is, while the two objects were restricted in their order in (12), using the verb's disjoint form allows the two objects to occur in *either* order:

(13) Zulu OMing: disjoint verb forms

- a. U-John u-(ba-) nik-ile (a-ba-ntwana) i-mali.
AUG-1a.John 1SM-2OM-give-PST.DJ AUG-2-child AUG-9.money
'John *did* give the children the money.'

- b. U-John u-(ba-) nik-ile i-mali (a-ba-ntwana) .
 AUG-1a.John 1SM-2OM-give-PST.DJ AUG-9.money AUG-2-child
 ‘John *did* give the children the money.’
 (Zeller 2015: 23)

Zeller (2015) analyzes these Zulu constructions where both objects can follow the disjoint verb form in either order as *double right dislocation* constructions – that is, both object DPs are dislocated out of the vP. Per Zeller, the two dislocated objects become right-adjoined to a higher maximal projection as adjuncts, and it is this adjunct classification that accounts for the flexible word order.

Zulu OMing patterns are characterized by an obligatory association between OMs and dislocation, and by double right dislocation constructions: while word order of objects is asymmetrical when the verb is in its conjoint form, a verb in its disjoint form requires both objects to be right-dislocated as adjuncts, allowing for word order flexibility between the objects.

3.2.2 Ikalanga: Similarities to Zulu

Just as in Zulu, Ikalanga requires that objects co-occurring with OMs be dislocated outside of vP, and disallows OOC and dislocation to occur independently from each other. (14) below establishes a context that facilitates OOC (corrective focus on an adverb, discussed in §5.1), and offers four attempted responses:⁵

- (14) a. W-áká-bón-a baná íbábájé bé ikwélé tshípi yáká píndá?
 1SM-PST-see-FV 2.child 2.DEM ASSOC 7.school week last
 ‘Did you see those students last week?’
 b. Á, nd-aká-bon-a baná íbábájé **mádékwe**.
 No 1SG.SM-PST-see-FV 2.child 2.DEM yesterday
 ‘No, I saw those children yesterday.’
 c. *Á, nd-aká-bon-a **mádékwé**, baná íbábáje.
 No 1SG.SM-PST-see-FV yesterday 2.child 2.DEM
 Intd. ‘No, I saw those children yesterday.’
 d. *Á, nd-aká-(bá-) bón-á (báná íbábájé) **mádékwe**.
 No 1SG.SM-PST-2OM-see-FV 2.child 2.DEM yesterday
 Intd. ‘No, I saw those children yesterday.’

⁵Note that the two words *yáká píndá* in (14a) together mean ‘last’.

- e. Á, nd-aká-(bá-) bón-á mádékwe , (baná íbábáje) .
 No 1SG.SM-PST-2OM-see-FV yesterday 2.child 2.DEM
 ‘No, I saw those children yesterday.’

(14b) shows the canonical word order in a monotransitive sentence, with the object to the left of the temporal adverb. Dislocating the object outside of *vP* – indicated by the prosodic break preceding the object, and its position to the right of the adverb – is ungrammatical without OOC (14c), as is OOC without dislocation (14d). (14e), which has both OOC and dislocation, is a grammatical and natural response.⁶ We see then that, similar to the Zulu patterns, Ikalanga OM-Obj co-occurrence requires object dislocation, and object dislocation requires an OM on the verb.

We see further similarities to Zulu in Ikalanga’s flexible word order when both the adverb and object are dislocated. Above, when just the object DP was dislocated, the word order was obligatorily Adv OMed-Obj (14e). However, just as dislocating both objects in Zulu allows for word order symmetry, dislocating both the adverb and OMed object in Ikalanga allows for the otherwise unacceptable order of OMed-Obj Adv. In (15), both the adverb *madekwe* ‘yesterday’ and OMed object DP *bana ibabaje* ‘those children’ are offset by a prosodic break (indicated by a comma), suggesting both elements have been dislocated outside of *vP*. In this case of double dislocation with an OM on the verb, the word order can either be OMed-Obj Adv or Adv OMed-Obj.

- (15) a. Did you really see those children yesterday?⁷
 b. Nd-aká-(bá-) bón-á , (baná íbábáje) mádékwe!
 1SM.SG-PST-2OM-see-FV 2.child 2.DEM yesterday
 ‘I did see those children yesterday!’⁸
 c. Nd-aká-(bá-) bón-á , mádékwe (baná íbábáje) !
 1SM.SG-PST-2OM-see-FV yesterday 2.child 2.DEM
 ‘I did see those children yesterday!’

This pattern of flexibility (when both elements are dislocated) is consistent with the Zulu patterns of double right dislocation constructions; it is also consistent with Letsholo’s (2013) analysis of objects co-occurring with OMs as adjuncts

⁶Though both (14b) and (14e) are acceptable responses to (14a), there is a slight interpretive difference between the two, with the OOC in (14e) implying there is something noteworthy and important about the statement. §6 will discuss this interpretation further.

⁷The context provided here that facilitates OOC in the response will be explored in detail in §5.1.

⁸Though this is still an acceptable response to the given question, it is slightly less natural compared to (15c).

outside of *vP*: if the dislocated object is assumed to be an adjunct along with the temporal adverb, it follows logically that the two adjuncts would have flexible word order relative to each other.

With these two key generalizations about OOC – its unacceptability in discourse-neutral contexts, and its obligatory association with object dislocation – we are now equipped to delve into the particular pragmatic contexts that allow for OOC.

4 *Verum facitates* OOC

As noted above, Letsholo (2013) first observed that OOC has an emphatic bearing on a sentence. Here, we expand on her observation, identifying this emphatic effect as a *verum* reading. *Verum* readings are licit when the proposition at hand is being doubted, and the speaker is attempting to assert their confidence and settle the issue, similar to the use of English emphatic *do* (Gutzmann & Castroviejo Miró 2011, Gutzmann et al. 2020, Güldemann 2003, 2016, Kerr & van der Wal 2023). Natural contexts for *verum* interpretations include addressing listener denial or doubt, affirmation of a preceding assertion, and opposite polarity contexts. As noted above, *verum* readings are becoming a well-documented property of object marking constructions across Bantu languages.

Another key property of *verum* constructions that we can apply to Ikalanga is their non-deniability; that is, the speaker-certainty portion of the meaning ought to be considered non-propositional. Gutzmann & Castroviejo Miró (2011) analyze *verum* as a multidimensional conversational operator, whose propositional content is separable from its *verum* dimension. Building on a diagnostic from Gutzmann & Castroviejo Miró (2011), we see that this is true for the *verum* interpretation created by OOC in Ikalanga: denying the propositional content of an utterance does not simultaneously deny the speaker's certainty.

- (16) A: Nchídzi w-á-gu- ngw-á , busukwá .
 1.Nchidzi 1SM-PST-14OM-drink-FV 14.beer
 ‘Nchidzi DID drink the beer.’ (*in an appropriate context*)
- B: Até málébeswa!
 NEG truth
 ‘That’s not true!’
- OK: It’s not true that Nchidzi drank the beer.
 - #It’s not true that you are certain of that.

We see, then, that Ikalanga OOC displays patterns that are hallmarks of verum interpretations: namely, OOC introduces a sense of speaker confidence that is separable from the sentence's propositional content, and is thus appropriate in classic verum contexts such as addressing listener doubt and denial. As far as we know, non-OOC sentences are acceptable in verum contexts (as in the other contexts noted below) but do not carry the emphatic import of the OOC sentences.

5 Focus on *v*P-internal constituents facilitates OOC

Apart from verum contexts, OOC in Ikalanga can also be facilitated by certain types of focus: specifically, OOC is natural when corrective or exhaustive focus falls on a structurally low adverb or on a distinct object. New information focus, however, has no such effect.⁹ Focus on a *v*P-external constituent also fails to facilitate OOC. Sikuku & Diercks (2021a) present robust evidence for the effect that focus on *v*P-internal elements has on OM-doubling – they show that new information focus, ‘only’ (exhaustive) focus, and contrastive focus on a distinct *v*P-internal constituent facilitate doubling, a pattern that persists across monotransitives and ditransitives alike. In all instances, though, doubling constructions have a strong emphatic sense (e.g. a mirative reading, or other intensity-type readings). (17) illustrates a Lubukusu example where OM-doubling creates an emphatic interpretation on a low temporal adverbial.

(17) Lubukusu (Sikuku & Diercks 2021a)

Q: Ba-ba-ana ba-a-kes-a ka-ma-indi liina?
 2-2-children 2SM-PST-harvest-FV 6-6-maize when
 ‘When did the children harvest the maize?’

A: Ba-ba-ana ba-(ka)- kes-ile (ka-ma-indi) likolooba.
 2-2-children 2SM-6OM-harvest-PFV 6-6-maize yesterday
 ‘The children harvested the maize YESTERDAY.’

(It is particularly notable, for some reason, that it was yesterday that this happened.)

5.1 Corrective focus facilitates OOC

A number of the patterns seen in Lubukusu are similar to those in Ikalanga – for one, we see that corrective focus¹⁰ on a *v*P-internal element facilitates OOC in

⁹These patterns align with the hierarchy of degrees of contrast proposed by Cruschina (2021).

¹⁰For the purposes of this paper, we assume corrective and contrastive focus to be equivalent.

Ikalanga. (18) establishes a context where corrective focus falls on the temporal adverb *mádékwe* ‘yesterday’; in turn, the object *baná íbábáje* ‘those children’ naturally co-occurs with an OM. Notably, a verum reading is not necessary here.¹¹

- (18) Q: W-aká-bón-á baná íbábáje bé ikwélé tshípí yáká pindá?
 1SM-PST-see-FV 2.child 2.DEM ASSOC 7.school week last
 ‘Did you see those students last week?’
 A: Á, nd-aká-bá- bón-á mádékwe, baná íbábáje.
 No 1SG.SM-PST-2OM-see-FV yesterday 2.child 2.DEM
 ‘No, I saw those children YESTERDAY.’

Ditransitive constructions follow a similar pattern: in a lexical ditransitive, corrective focus on the recipient object facilitates OOC for the theme object, as in (19)A1. Consistent with our previous observations of OOC and dislocation, we see the OMed object *shangu* ‘shoes’ right-dislocated outside of the verb phrase. The focused recipient object *Lúdo* remains within vP. Notably, (19)A2 shows that the object cannot co-occur with an OM and be correctively focused; that is, corrective focus and OOC must be done on *different* objects, and dislocating the focused object is infelicitous.

- (19) Q: A Nkádzi w-áka-p-á Shátho shangú?
 Q 1.Nkadzi 1SM-PST-give-FV 1.Shatho 10.shoes
 ‘Did Nkadzi give Shatho shoes?’
 A1: Á, Nkádzi w-áka-dzi- p-á Lúdo, shangu.
 No 1.Nkadzi 1SM-PST-10OM-give-FV 1.Ludo 10.shoes
 ‘No, Nkadzi gave LUDO shoes.’¹²
 A2: #Á, Nkádzi w-áka-m- p-á shángú, Lúdo.
 No 1.Nkadzi 1SM-PST-1OM-give-FV 10.shoes 1.Ludo
 Intd. ‘No, Nkadzi gave LUDO shoes.’

These facts are strongly reminiscent of Zulu, where it has been analyzed that vP is a focal domain (Cheng & Downing 2012 and Zeller 2015, among others);

¹¹Here we adopt the common assumption that temporal adverbs like *mádékwe* ‘yesterday’ are low adverbs, adjoined to vP (see Henderson 2006, Sikuku & Diercks 2021a for similar assumptions and similar behaviors of low temporal adverbials).

¹²There seem to be multiple interpretive layers to this sentence beyond the corrective focus aspect. This sentence is emphasizing the fact that without a doubt, Nkadzi gave the shoes, and not anything else, to Ludo. It seems that the OMed object *shangu* ‘shoes’ is perhaps receiving some exhaustive emphasis, but a verum reading of certainty is also seemingly intertwined here.

focused material remains within *vP*, while non-focused material moves outside of *vP* (Buell 2006).

Corrective focus can also fall on the theme object, in which case it facilitates OOC for the recipient object:

- (20) Q: A Nchídzi w-áka-p-á Lúdó búrukhwí?
 Q 1.Nchidzi 1SM-PST-give-FV 1.Ludo trousers
 ‘Did Nchidzi give Ludo trousers?’
 A: Á, Nchídzi w-áka-(m-) p-á shángú , (Lúdo) .
 No 1.Nchidzi 1SM-PST-1OM-give-FV 10.shoes 1.Ludo
 ‘No, Nchidzi gave Ludo SHOES.’

Benefactive applicatives follow the same pattern: in (21), corrective focus on the benefactive object facilitates OOC for the theme object. And again, we see that OOC for the same object that is correctively focused is unnatural.

- (21) Q: A Lúdó w-áka-bík-íl-á Mpaphi nyama?
 Q 1.Ludo 1SM-PST-cook-APPL-FV 1.Mpaphi 9.meat
 ‘Did Ludo cook meat for Mpaphi?’
 A1: Á, Lúdó w-áka-(i-) bík-íl-á Nchídzi , (nyáma) .
 No 1.Ludo 1SM-PST-9OM-cook-APPL-FV 1.Nchidzi 9.meat
 ‘No, Ludo cooked meat for NCHIDZI.’¹³
 A2: #Á, Lúdó w-áka-(m-) bík-íl-á nyáma , (Nchídzi) .
 No 1.Ludo 1SM-PST-1OM-cook-APPL-FV 9.meat 1.Nchidzi
 Intd. ‘No, Ludo cooked meat for NCHIDZI.’

5.2 Exhaustive focus facilitates OOC

Exhaustive focus shows the same general effect as the patterns outlined above: when a *vP*-internal constituent is exhaustively focused with a focus particle, OOC is natural. (22) demonstrates this with a temporal adverb:

- (22) Nd-aká-(bá-) bón-á mádékwé kóga , (baná íbábáje) .
 1SM.SG-PST-2OM-see-FV yesterday only 2.child 2.DEM
 ‘I saw those children ONLY YESTERDAY.’ (*i.e. not any other day*)

¹³ Again, here we get an interesting multi-layered interpretation: per the first author, this sentence is emphasizing the fact that without a doubt, Ludo cooked the meat, and not anything else, for Nchidzi.

Additionally, in ditransitive constructions, exhaustively focusing one object facilitates OOC for the other:

- (23) a. Nchídzi w-áka-(m-) p-á shángú kóga, (Ludó) .
 1.Nchidzi 1SM-PST-1OM-give-FV 10.shoes only 1.Ludo
 ‘Nchidzi gave ONLY SHOES to Ludo.’
 b. Nchídzi w-áka-(dzi-) p-á Lúdó kóga, (shángu) .
 1.Nchidzi 1SM-PST-10OM-give-FV 1.Ludo only 10.shoes
 ‘Nchidzi gave ONLY LUDO shoes.’¹⁴

Unlike the patterns shown for contrastive focus, however, an exhaustively focused object can also be associated with a co-occurring OM, but only when both the adverb and object have been dislocated. Further research is needed to discern the reason for this difference.

- (24) a. Nd-áka-(bá-) bón-á , (baná íbábájé kóga) madekwé.
 1SM.SG-PST-2OM-see-FV 2.child 2.DEM only yesterday
 ‘I saw ONLY THOSE CHILDREN yesterday.’ (i.e. not any other children)
 b. #Nd-áka-(bá-) bón-á madekwe , (baná íbábájé kóga) .
 1SM.SG-PST-2OM-see-FV yesterday 2.child 2.DEM only
 Intd. ‘I saw ONLY THOSE CHILDREN yesterday.’ (i.e. not any other children)

5.3 New information focus does not facilitate OOC

While corrective and exhaustive focus on a vP-internal constituent allow for OOC, new information focus fails to do so on its own, regardless of whether it falls on an adverb (25), direct object (26), or indirect object (27):¹⁵

- (25) Q: How did the children eat the okra?
 A: #Baná b-áka-(lí-) j-á ngébúnya, (delele) .
 2.child 2SM-PST-5OM-eat-FV slowly 5.okra
 Intd. ‘The children ate the okra SLOWLY.’

¹⁴For both these examples, they seem to require a context of doubt about what was given to be entirely natural, though further investigation into this is required.

¹⁵(26) and (27) are unnatural responses to the question because they seem to overemphasize the object associated with the OM. For example, (26) sounds unnatural because though the question seeks emphasis on *shángú* ‘shoes’, OOC for *Lúdo* has the effect of overemphasizing it over *shángú*.

(26) Q: What did Nchidzi give Ludo?

A: #Nchídzí w-áka-(m-) p-á shángú , (Lúdo) .
 1.Nchidzi 1SM-PST-1OM-give-FV 10.shoes 1.Ludo
 Intd. ‘Nchidzi gave Ludo SHOES.’

(27) Q: Who did Nchidzi give shoes to?

A: #Nchídzí w-áka-(dzi-) p-á Lúdo , (shangú) .
 1.Nchidzi 1SM-PST-1OM-give-FV 1.Ludo 10.shoes
 Intd. ‘Nchidzi gave LUDO shoes.’

The answers in examples (25)–(27) are all grammatical sentences, but new information focus on its own is insufficient to license OOC; all of these examples would require additional emphatic readings (with appropriate licensing context) in order to be acceptable. In this way Ikalanga is similar to Lubukusu (which similarly requires emphasis in this way) and unlike Zulu, which appears to lack these emphatic readings with OMing constructions.

5.4 vP-external focus does not facilitate OOC

We have been careful to note thus far that the focus types discussed facilitate OOC when applied to an element *within the verb phrase* (namely, low adverbs and objects). This is an important specification to make, as focus on a vP-external constituent generally fails to facilitate OOC. For example, (28) below shows that corrective focus on a preverbal subject does not allow OOC.

(28) Q: Á Ludó w-áka-bón-a báná íbabájé bé íkwélé madékwé?
 Q 1.Ludo 1SM-PST-see-FV 2.child 2.DEM ASSOC 7.school yesterday
 ‘Did Ludo see those children yesterday?’

A: #Á, Nchidzí w-áka-(bá-) bón-á mádekwe , (baná íbabájé) .
 No 1.Nchidzi 1SM-PST-2OM-see-FV yesterday 2.child 2.DEM
 Intd. ‘No, NCHIDZI saw those children yesterday.’

The overall generalization from this section remains clear: focus on vP-internal constituents serves as another licensing condition for OOC. Specifically, we have seen that corrective and exhaustive focus on low adverbs and distinct objects facilitate OOC, while new information focus on the same elements does not, nor does focus on a vP-external subject. This connection to vP-internal focus enabling OMing is familiar from Lubukusu (Sikuku & Diercks 2021b,a), Tiriki (Liu 2022), Wanga (Kuzmík 2022), Cinyungwe (Langa da Câmara et al. 2023), Zulu (Zeller 2015), and others.

6 Mirative focus facilitates OOC

The previous section explored how focus on a particular constituent can facilitate OOC; however, it is also possible for an emphatic interpretation to arise on the entire sentence as a whole, generating an expressive reading. Specifically, OOC in Ikalanga is licit if there is something unexpected and/or surprising within the construction, an interpretation that we analyze as mirative focus constructions (following Sikuku & Diercks 2021a and Lippard et al. forthcoming).

Recent research by Sikuku & Diercks (2021a), Langa da Câmara et al. (2023), and Lippard et al. (forthcoming) has analyzed mirativity as one of the emphatic interpretations generated by OOC across various Bantu languages. Similarly, past research has identified mirativity as one of a similar range of interpretations for predicate clefting (Lusekelo et al. 2023, Jerro & van der Wal 2022) and for a nominal-modifying particle (Asiimwe & van der Wal 2021). The most recognizable mirative context, perhaps, is one that makes all or part of a sentence surprising, unexpected, or shocking. Consequently, mirative interpretations are highly context-dependent. Mirative contexts are one of multiple kinds of emphatic contexts that naturally license OM-doubling in Lubukusu and Cinyungwe. Also noted by Sikuku & Diercks (2021a) regarding OM-doubling and mirativity is that – just as discourse context can create the licensing conditions for OM-doubling – context can just as well ‘undo’ them. That is, if an utterance that was once surprising and thus naturally OM-doubled becomes expected and unsurprising in a different context, OM-doubling is no longer natural (Lippard et al. forthcoming note the same for Cinyungwe).

In Ikalanga – just as in Lubukusu and Cinyungwe – OOC is readily associated with a mirative interpretation, and is facilitated by mirative contexts. OOC is licit when an utterance is especially surprising or unexpected, as in (29a):

- (29) *Context: The children love beans, and every time they are served beans, they eat them incredibly quickly because they like them so much. This time, however, when they sit down to eat, they eat the beans very slowly, which is quite unusual for them. In response, someone could say:*

- a. Baná b-áka-(dzí-)j-á ngébúnya, (nyemba).
 2.child 2SM-PST-10OM-eat-FV slowly 10.beans

‘The children ate the beans slowly!’¹⁶

¹⁶ A double-dislocation construction is also possible here (notably, with two prosodic breaks): Baná b-áka-dzí-j-a, nyémba, ngebúnya.

- b. #Baná b-áka-j-á nyémbá ngebúnya.
 2.child 2SM-PST-eat-FV 10.beans slowly
 Intd. ‘The children ate the beans slowly.’

Notably, the canonical non-OMed sentence in (29b) is unnatural in the given context: the context makes the utterance unexpected, and without OOC, there is no surprise conveyed – a non-OMed sentence is thus less natural.¹⁷

The mirative emphasis can also fall on the entire sentence, indicating the whole event is shocking:

- (30) *Context: Nchidzi is known to not get along with Ludo; he is always very rude to her. But one day, he presents Ludo with a gift, and everyone is shocked.*
 Nchídzi w-áka-(m-)p-á shángú , (Lúdo) .
 1.Nchidzi 1SM-PST-1OM-give-FV 10.shoes 1.Ludo
 ‘Nchidzi gave Ludo shoes.’

In addition to being licit in mirative contexts where a sentence is surprising and unexpected, OOC in Ikalanga is also licit when an utterance is highly informative (similar to Lubukusu; Sikuku & Diercks 2021a):

- (31) *Context: You arrive home to find that Nchidzi is acting very strangely and stumbling around. You ask someone what has happened to him. They respond:*
 Nchídzi w-á-(gu-)ngw-á , (busukwá) .
 1.Nchidzi 1SM-PST-14OM-drink-FV 14.beer
 ‘Nchidzi drank beer.’

Here, the statement is particularly informative in that it offers an explanation to Nchidzi’s bizarre behavior; OOC is thus acceptable.

¹⁷ An anonymous reviewer points out that contexts like these suggest that there is focus on the adverb. “If Ikalanga, like many other Bantu languages, has the vP as a focus domain, or even has an immediate after verb (IAV) focus position, then what happens here is the non-focal object evacuating the focus domain (see Buell 2006).” The reviewer suggests that OOC here is not related to a mirative effect. If the analysis set forward by Sikuku & Diercks (2021a) and Lippard et al. (forthcoming) is on the right track for a variety of other Bantu languages, there is in fact a direct correlation between the emphatic reading and the focus semantics. Specifically, Sikuku & Diercks (2021a) argue that there is *both* a focal effect and an additional emphatic interpretation in Lubukusu OM-doubling, following the analysis of emphatic focus fronting by Bianchi et al. (2015) and Cruschina (2021). That is to say, the presence of a focal effect does not rule out the relevance of the emphatic readings, but rather the emphatic effects appear to themselves be focus-associated, requiring focus but adding a layer of interpretation in addition to focus.

Sentences can also be informative because of the sense of importance or gravity that they carry. In the example below, the speaker's use of OOC conveys the seriousness and newsworthiness of the situation; that is, it indicates there is something notable and important about having seen the children:¹⁸

- (32) *Context: Last week, a group of children were being naughty, playing with a water tap and wasting water, which is a rare commodity in their town.*
W-aká-(ba-) bón-á (baná íbábájé bé ikwélé) tshípi yáká pindá?
1SM-PST-2OM-see-FV 2.child 2.DEM ASSOC 7.school week last
'Did you see those students last week?'

Again consistent with Lubukusu (Sikuku & Diercks 2021a), we can see that if a mirative interpretation is 'undone,' OOC is no longer licit. The sentence in (33a) is surprising in the given context, and OOC is therefore natural (and preferred to a non-OMed sentence). When the same utterance becomes expected and no longer surprising in (34), however, OOC ceases to be acceptable, and the most appropriate response is a non-OMed sentence.

- (33) *Context: The children hate eating beans, and never want to eat them. But one day, they do eat the beans. Someone says, very surprised:*
a. Baná b-áka-(dzí-) j-a , (nyémba) !
2.child 2SM-PST-10OM-eat-FV 10.beans
'The children ate the beans!'
b. Baná b-áka-j-á nyémba!
2.child 2SM-PST-eat-FV 10.beans
'The children ate the beans!' (*Less felicitous than (33a)*)
- (34) *Context: After that one miraculous day, the children realize that they actually do like beans, and so now they eat them every day. One evening, someone asks what happened at dinnertime. You say:*
a. #Baná b-áka-(dzí-) j-a , (nyemba) .
2.child 2SM-PST-10OM-eat-FV 10.beans
Intd. 'The children ate the beans.'

¹⁸Example (32) is an apparent exception to the requirement that objects co-occurring with OMs require dislocation of the object. Notably, this context (where a whole situation is surprising/upsetting) is precisely the same context that Sikuku & Diercks (2021a) identify as exceptional in Lubukusu as well (in that case, OM-doubling is exceptionally possible absent the normal requirement of OM-doubled objects to be discourse-given).

- b. Baná b-áka-j-á nyémba.
 2.child 2SM-PST-eat-FV 10.beans
 ‘The children ate the beans.’

Following analyses of Romance focus fronting constructions (Bianchi et al. 2016, Cruschina 2021, 2019), Sikuku & Diercks (2021a) and Lippard et al. (forthcoming) analyze the emphatic readings in OM-doubling constructions as conventional implicatures, situated in a distinct tier of meaning from at-issue truth-conditional meaning. We can see that Ikalanga OOC in mirative contexts displays the expected characteristics of a conventional implicature. Specifically, the mirative ‘surprise’ aspect of an utterance is separable from the propositional content:

- (35) A: Baná b-áka-(dzí-)j-á ngébúnya, (nyemba)!
 2.child 2SM-PST-10OM-eat-FV slowly 10.beans
 ‘The children ate the beans slowly!’ (*In an appropriate surprising context*)
 B: A-kútó-chénámisa!
 NEG-PRS-surprise
 ‘It’s not surprising!’

Here, Speaker B denies that the event is surprising, but does so without denying the fact that the children ate the beans slowly. It is therefore evident that the not-at-issue (mirative) content and at-issue (propositional) content occupy different dimensions and are independent from the other, as is typical of a conventional implicature.

A second diagnostic for conventional implicatures, however, behaves unexpectedly in Ikalanga. Because conventional implicatures are non-cancellable, we would expect that a speaker who says a sentence with mirative focus *cannot* then deny that the sentence is surprising. That is, they must remain committed to the implicature that the utterance is surprising. However, this does not seem to be the case in Ikalanga; it seems to be possible for the speaker to deny their own surprise. This may be related to the fact that OOC in Ikalanga can convey a variety of interpretive effects beyond just mirativity (see Lippard et al. forthcoming).

- (36) a. Baná b-áka-(dzí-)j-á ngébúnya, nyemba ...
 2.child 2SM-PST-10OM-eat-FV slowly 10.bean
 ‘The children ate the beans slowly!’ (*In an appropriate surprising context*)

- b. ... Ngóno akúna chinó chénámísá ípápo.
 but NEG that surprise there
 ‘...but there is nothing surprising there.’

Further research is needed to clarify this data point.

7 Unsolved puzzles: Areas for future research

7.1 Focused objects with object markers

The most notable area for future research – hinted at in footnotes throughout this paper – is the pattern of OMed objects sometimes seemingly being focused, and sometimes not. §5 presented numerous pieces of data that substantiated the generalization that OOC is possible if *some other* vP-internal constituent was focused. This observation is consistent with other Bantu languages as well (cf. Sikuku & Diercks (2021a) for Lubukusu, Langa da Câmara et al. (2023) for Cinyungwe, and Zeller (2015) for Zulu). Though there is robust evidence for this pattern, there also remain a number of data points that complicate, if not contradict, it – that is, at times, the object that co-occurs with an OM seems to be the element receiving emphasis or focus, rather than some distinct element remaining in vP. As an initial foray into this puzzle, consider this example:

- (37) Q: Baná b-áka-j-á déléle chiní?
 2.child 2SM-PST-eat-FV 5.okra how
 ‘How did the children eat the okra?’
 A: #Baná b-áka-lí-j-á ngébúnya , déléle .
 2.child 2SM-PST-5OM-eat-FV slowly 5.okra
 Intd. ‘The children ate the okra slowly.’

Cruschina (2021) argues that different types of emphatic focus may be distinguished by the degrees of contrastive interpretation that they create. The low degree of contrast that new information focus carries can potentially explain why OOC is unacceptable in (37). However, there seem to be reasons beyond just this – the response in (37) is infelicitous because though the question searches for focus on the adverb *ngébúnya* ‘slowly’, the OMed object *déléle* ‘okra’ seems to be unnecessarily prominent; the sentence is emphasizing that it is the *déléle* that they ate, to the first author’s ear.

This appears to contradict the interpretation of the same sentence in a corrective focal context:

(38) Q: Did the children eat the okra quickly?

A: A, baná b-áka-(lí-)j-á ngébúnya, (déléle).
 No 2.child 2SM-PST-5OM-eat-FV slowly 5.okra
 'No, the children ate the okra slowly.'

In (38), the OMing sentence sounds natural in response to the given question, and focus falls on the adverb as intended, rather than the doubled object. Yet the unexpected emphasis on the OMed object appears in a different contrastive focus context:

(39) Q: A Nchídzi w-áka-p-á Lúdó búrukhwí?

Q 1.Nchidzi 1SM-PST-give-FV 1.Ludo trousers
 'Did Nchidzi give Ludo trousers?'

A: Á, Nchídzi w-áka-(m-)p-á shángú, (Lúdo).
 No 1.Nchidzi 1SM-PST-1OM-give-FV 10.shoes 1.Ludo
 'No, Nchidzi gave Ludo shoes.'

The response in (39) is appropriate, and contrastive focus falls on *shángú* 'shoes' as expected, but the OMed object *Lúdo* does indeed feel emphasized here. Because OOC is not obligatory (leaving *Lúdo* out of the response would be a felicitous answer), it seems as if the speaker is including *Lúdo* for some significant reason. In the intuitions of the first author, whatever co-occurs with an OM feels like information that can be left out, and so by deliberately including the object, the speaker is emphasizing *Lúdo* (though we have yet to clarify the nature of the emphasis).

Exhaustive focus contexts also illustrate this puzzle – an object can co-occur with an OM and be exhaustively focused, which diverges from the patterns seen with corrective focus in (19) and (21) from §5.1:

(40) a. Nchídzi w-áka-(m-)p-á shángú, (Lúdó kóga).
 1.Nchidzi 1SM-PST-1OM-give-FV 10.shoes 1.Ludo only
 'Nchidzi gave only Ludo shoes (no one else).'

b. Nchídzi w-áka-(dzi-)p-á Lúdó, (shángú kóga).
 1.Nchidzi 1SM-PST-10OM-give-FV 1.Ludo 10.shoes only
 'Nchidzi gave Ludo only shoes (nothing else).'

Clearly, in both examples above, the object that co-occurs with an OM is also focused – yet, if we are to assume again here that OMed objects are 'extra' information that can optionally be left out, it is unclear how an OMed object could

also be focused and carry key information. It is also unclear why the non-doubled objects remaining in *vP* (above, *shángú* and *Lúdó*, respectively) do not appear to be receiving any emphasis or focus. This is a clear divergence from the generalization that focusing one object facilitates OOC of the other.

Although exhaustive focus fell on the co-occurring objects above, it is still possible to focus and OM distinct objects. (41) below follows the expected pattern:

- (41) Nchídzi w-áka-(m-)p-á shángú kóga, (Ludó).
 1.Nchidzi 1SM-PST-1OM-give-FV 10.shoes only 1.Ludo
 ‘Nchidzi gave Ludo only shoes (nothing else).’

We are thus presented with a puzzle in which an object co-occurring with an OM is sometimes simultaneously focused, and sometimes not; still other times, the OMed object seems to receive some type of emphasis by virtue of being included in the utterance. Future research is needed to, first, more precisely delineate the empirical facts of these patterns, and ultimately analyze it from a theoretical standpoint.

7.2 Overlapping interpretive readings

Though in this paper we present verum, *vP*-internal focus, and mirative interpretations as distinct phenomena, there are multiple instances in which various readings seem to be intertwined. Lippard et al. (forthcoming) broach the idea that various emphatic interpretations (such as mirativity, reprimand readings, verum, and exhaustivity) may be related to others. Indeed, in Ikalanga, it is difficult at times to disentangle different readings.

As an example of possibly overlapping interpretations, consider (42), replicated from (21) in §5.1:

- (42) Q: A Ludó w-áka-bík-íl-á Mpaphi nyamá?
 Q 1.Ludo 1SM-PST-cook-APPL-FV 1.Mpaphi 9.meat
 ‘Did Ludo cook meat for Mpaphi?’
 A: Á, Ludó w-áka-(í-)bík-íl-á Nchídzi, (nyáma).
 No 1.Ludo 1SM-PST-9OM-cook-APPL-FV 1.Nchidzi 9.meat
 ‘No, Ludo cooked meat for NCHIDZI.’

The response in (42) is emphasizing the fact that, without a doubt, Ludo cooked the meat and not anything else for Nchidzi. There are multiple layers to this comment. First, because the response is licit in the established corrective focus context, we know the recipient object *Nchídzi* is being correctively focused. Yet the

meaning extends beyond this focus: there also seems to be a verum-like reading, since the sentence is uttered “without a doubt”. Furthermore, the interpretation that Ludo cooked meat “and not anything else” suggests an exhaustive reading is also present. The question therefore arises of whether some of these various readings are related, or if they are all indeed distinct phenomena. If the latter is true, it must then also be determined in which situations they all arise.

8 Conclusions

From the empirical facts presented in this paper, it is abundantly clear that the focal and emphatic effects that OOC has in Ikalanga are wide-ranging. Though OOC is infelicitous in out-of-the-blue situations, specific pragmatic contexts can make OOC entirely natural – specifically, OOC can create a verum reading, licit in verum contexts where the speaker intends to assert their confidence and address listener denial or doubt, similar to English emphatic *do*. OOC is also associated with a mirative reading of surprise: when context makes all or part of an utterance shocking, newsworthy, or highly informative, OOC is acceptable. We have also seen that OOC is facilitated by certain focus environments. When a *vP*-internal constituent is focused with corrective or exhaustive focus, OOC is licit; new information focus on a *vP*-internal constituent or focus on a *vP*-external element, however, are insufficient licensing conditions. In all cases of OOC, we saw that the OMed object is obligatorily dislocated, and that OOC and dislocation cannot occur independent of each other.

The Ikalanga facts here are significant in how they corroborate and overlap with ongoing work in other related Bantu languages, yet also offer new and distinct patterns that further enrich the current research on Bantu OOC. There is a lot of similarity between Lubukusu and Ikalanga in that there are clear emphatic interpretations associated with OMing constructions that appear to be focus-related; that said, Lubukusu OM-doubling leaves all relevant objects and emphasized elements inside the *vP*. Ikalanga is in this way more Zulu-like, with necessary links between OMing and dislocation of the associated object. But Zulu OMing appears to be strictly a backgrounding operation, whereas a broader range of interpretive effects are associated with Ikalanga OMing. In this way, Ikalanga appears to be adding a new constellation of facts regarding object marking, but more work is necessary to fully understand (and analyze) the relevant constructions.

Acknowledgments

All judgments in the paper are the intuitions of the first author, who consulted other Ikalanga speakers as relevant to generate insights. This paper is a revised version of Madelyn Colantes' senior seminar paper at Pomona College (Fall 2021), which was supervised by Diercks and the result of extended investigation in collaboration with Letsholo. We are grateful to our partners in working on object marking who have interacted with this work (directly or indirectly), including Crisófia Langa da Câmara, Justine Sikuku, Franco Liu, Hannah Lippard, and Jackson Kuzmik, among others. Our thanks to the audience at ACAL 53 for their comments and feedback. Any remaining errors are our own.

Abbreviations

Abbreviations in this chapter follow the Leipzig Glossing Rules, with the following additions.

ASSOC	associative marker	FV	final vowel
AUG	augment	OM	object marker
DJ	disjoint	SM	subject marker

References

- Asiimwe, Allen & Jenneke van der Wal. 2021. The multifunctionality of -o in Rukiga: Pronoun, contrastive topic, and mirative marker. *Nordic Journal of African Studies* 30(1). 1–26.
- Bianchi, Valentina, Giuliano Bocci & Silvio Cruschina. 2015. Focus fronting and its implicatures. In Enoch Oladé Aboh, Jeanette Schaeffer & Petra Sleeman (eds.), *Romance languages and linguistic theory 2013: Selected papers from 'Going Romance' Amsterdam 2013*, 1–20. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bianchi, Valentina, Giuliano Bocci & Silvio Cruschina. 2016. Focus fronting, unexpectedness, and evaluative implicatures. *Semantics and Pragmatics* 9. Article 3: 1–54. DOI: DOI:10.3765/sp.9.3.
- Bresnan, Joan & Sam Mchombo. 1987. Topic, pronoun, and agreement in Chichewa. *Language* 63. 741–782.
- Bresnan, Joan & Lioba Moshi. 1990. Object asymmetries in comparative Bantu syntax. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22(2). 147–186.
- Buell, Leston. 2006. The Zulu conjoint/disjoint verb alternation: Focus or constituency? *ZAS Papers in Linguistics* 43. 9–30.

- Cheng, Lisa Lai-Shen & Laura J. Downing. 2012. Against FocusP: Arguments from Zulu. In Ivona Kučerová & Ad Neeleman (eds.), *Contrasts and positions in information structure*, 246–266. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cruschina, Silvio. 2019. Focus fronting in Spanish: Mirative implicature and information structure. *Probus* 29(1). 119–146. DOI: DOI:10.1515/probus-2018-0008.
- Cruschina, Silvio. 2021. The greater the contrast, the greater the potential: On the effects of focus in syntax. *Glossa: A journal of general linguistics* 6(1). 3. 1–30. DOI: DOI:10.5334/gjgl.1100.
- Güldemann, Tom. 2003. Present progressive vis-à-vis predication focus in Bantu: A verbal category between semantics and pragmatics. *Studies in Language* 27(2). 323–360. DOI: DOI:10.1075/sl.27.s.05gul.
- Güldemann, Tom. 2016. Maximal backgrounding = focus without (necessary) focus encoding. *Studies in Language* 40(3). 551–590. DOI: 10.1075/sl.40.3.03gul.
- Gutzmann, Daniel & Elena Castroviejo Miró. 2011. The dimensions of verum. In Oliver Bonami & Patricia Cabredo Hofherr (eds.), *Empirical issues in syntax and semantics* 8, 143–165.
- Gutzmann, Daniel, Katharina Hartmann & Lisa Matthewson. 2020. Verum focus is verum, not focus: Cross-linguistic evidence. *Glossa: A Journal of General Linguistics* 5(1). 51. 1–48.
- Henderson, Brent. 2006. *The syntax and typology of Bantu relative clauses*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. (Doctoral dissertation).
- Jerro, Kyle. 2015. Revisiting object symmetry in Bantu. In Ruth Kramer, Elizabeth Zsiga & One Tlale Boyer (eds.), *The Selected Proceedings of the 44th Annual Conference on African Linguistics*, 130–145. Somerville, MA: Cascadia Proceedings Project.
- Jerro, Kyle & Jenneke van der Wal. 2022. Contrastive topic and predicate doubling in Bantu. Poster presented at Sinn und Bedeutung 27.
- Kerr, Elisabeth J. & Jenneke van der Wal. 2023. Indirect truth marking via backgrounding: Evidence from Bantu. Ms, Leiden University.
- Kuzmik, Jackson. 2022. *Object marking in Wanga*. Cambridge University. (MA thesis).
- Langa da Câmara, Crisófia, Michael Diercks, Madelyn Colantes, Brendan Ly, Jackson Kuzmik & Hannah Lippard. 2023. An initial look at object marking in Cinyungwe. To appear in the Proceedings of ACAL 51/52.
- Letsholo, Rose. 2002. *Syntactic domains in Ikalanga*. University of Michigan. (Doctoral dissertation).
- Letsholo, Rose. 2013. Object markers in Ikalanga. *Linguistic Discovery* 11(1). 105–128.

- Lippard, Hannah, Justine Sikuku, Crisófia Lánga da Câmara, Madelyn Colantes, Kang (Franco) Liu & Michael Diercks. Forthcoming. Emphatic interpretations of object marking in Bantu languages. *Studies in African Linguistics*.
- Liu, Kang. 2022. *Object marking in Tiriki*. Cambridge University. (MA thesis).
- Lusekelo, Amani, Allen Asimwe, Patrick Kanampiu, Nelsa Nhantumbo, Ernest Nshemezimana & Jenneke van der Wal. 2023. Predicate doubling and information structure in eastern Bantu languages. Presentation at the BaSIS conference at Leiden University, June 8–9, 2023.
- Marlo, Michael R. 2014. Exceptional patterns of object marking in Bantu. *Studies in African Linguistics* 43. 85–123.
- Marlo, Michael R. 2015. On the number of object markers in Bantu languages. *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 36. 1–65.
- Marten, Lutz & Nancy Kula. 2012. Object marking and morphosyntactic variation in Bantu. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies* 30(2). 237–253.
- Riedel, Kristina. 2009. *The syntax of object marking in Smbaa: A comparative Bantu perspective*. Leiden: Universiteit Leiden. (Doctoral dissertation).
- Sikuku, Justine & Michael Diercks. 2021a. *Object marking in Bukusu: At the interface of pragmatics and syntax*. Ms, Moi University and Pomona College. <https://research.pomona.edu/mjkd/papers/>.
- Sikuku, Justine & Michael Diercks. 2021b. Object marking in Lubukusu: Information structure in the verb phrase. In Akinbiyi Akinlabi, Lee Bickmore, Michael Cahill, Michael Diercks, Laura J. Downing, James Essegbey, Katie Franich, Laura McPherson & Sharon Rose (eds.), *Celebrating 50 years of ACAL: Selected papers from the 50th Annual Conference on African Linguistics*, 305–330. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Sikuku, Justine, Michael Diercks & Michael R. Marlo. 2018. Pragmatic effects of clitic doubling: Two kinds of object markers in Lubukusu. *Linguistic Variation* 18(2). 359–429.
- van der Wal, Jenneke. 2015. Bantu object clitics as defective goals. *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* LX(2-3). 277–296.
- van der Wal, Jenneke. 2020. The AWSOM correlation in comparative Bantu object marking. In Peter W. Smith, Johannes Mursell & Katharina Hartmann (eds.), *Agree to agree: Agreement in the Minimalist Programme*, 199–234. Berlin: Language Science Press. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.3541755.
- van der Wal, Jenneke. 2022. *A featural typology of Bantu agreement*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Zeller, Jochen. 2012. Object marking in isiZulu. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies* 30. 219–325. DOI: 10.2989/16073614.2012.737600.

Zeller, Jochen. 2015. Argument prominence and agreement: Explaining an unexpected object asymmetry in Zulu. *Lingua* 156. 17–39. DOI: 10.1016/j.lingua.2014.11.009.