



- Sikuku et al. (2018) propose that the doubling OM and non-doubling OM in Lubukusu have distinct syntactic derivations.
  - Non-doubling OMs are incorporated pronouns.
  - Doubling OMs are agreement morphemes arising on an Emphasis head, which introduces a verum focus reading.
- This analysis predicts that **OM-doubling should always require a verum reading**.
- We have recently discovered, however, that the empirical generalizations reported in Sikuku et al. (2018) are incomplete.

Notably, there are additional contexts where OM-doubling is licensed without a verum reading:

- (4) Q: w-a-teekh-a ka-ma-kanda **o-rieena** ?  
 2SG-PST-cook-FV 6-6-beans 2SG-how  
 ‘How did you cook the beans?’
- A: N-a-(ka) teekh-a (ka-ma-kanda) **bwaangu**  
 1SG-PST-6OM-cook-FV 6-6-beans quickly  
 ‘I cooked the beans QUICKLY.’ (not: ‘I DID cook the beans quickly.’)

- This shows that the analysis from Sikuku, Diercks, & Marlo (2018) **cannot be correct**.
- The purpose of this paper is to clarify the conditions under which OM-doubling is possible in Lubukusu (and its various syntactic/pragmatic correlates).

## Roadmap

- §2 Focus licenses OM-Doubling
- §3 Focus must be vP-internal to license OM-doubling
- §4 Interpretation of OM-doubling
- §5 Empirical parallel: conjoint/disjoint
- §6 Initial evidence regarding shifts in word order
- §7 Preliminary Analytical Comments
- §7.3 and §8 Additional OM-licensing conditions
- §9 Conclusions
- §11 Appendix: Additional examples of preceding patterns

## 2 Focus licenses OM-doubling

### 2.1 NEW INFORMATION FOCUS LICENSES OM-DOUBLING

#### 2.1.1 New Information Focus on Temporal Adverbials

When a temporal adjunct is questioned, or when a temporal adjunct bears new information focus, OM-doubling an object is licit without a verum reading:

- (5) Q: Ba-ba-ana ba-a-(ka) kes-a (ka-ma-indi) **liina**?  
 2-2-children 2SM-PST-(6OM)-harvest-FV 6-6-maize when  
 ‘When did the children harvest the maize?’ *Doubling OK without verum*
- 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.’ *Doubling OK without verum*

### 2.1.2 New Information Focus in Benefactive Ditransitives

Likewise, when a THEME bears focus, a BENEFACTIVE object can be OM-doubled without *verum*.<sup>3</sup>

- (6) Q: Ba-ba-ana ba-a-(ba)- kes-el-a (ba-b-ebusi) **siina?**  
 2-2-children 2SM-PST-(2OM)-harvest-APPL-FV 2-2-parents what  
 ‘What did the children harvest for their parents?’ *OK without verum*
- A1: Ba-ba-ana ba-a-(ba)- kes-el-a (ba-b-ebusi) **ka-ma-indi**  
 2-2-children 2SM-PST-(2OM)-harvest-APPL-FV 2-2-parents 6-6-maize  
 ‘The children harvested maize for their parents.’ *OK without verum*

### 2.2 FOCUS WITH -ONG’ENE ‘ONLY’ LICENSES OM-DOUBLING

OM-doubling is licensed if you put focus on a constituent in the vP using *-ong’ene* ‘only’:

- (7) Benefactive ditransitive, focus on THEME  
 Ba-ba-ana ba-a-(ba)- rer-er-a (ba-b-ebusi) **ka-m-echi k-ong’ene**  
 2-2-children 2SM-PST-(2OM)-bring-APPL-FV 2-2-parents 6-6-water 6-only  
 ‘The children brought their parents only water.’ *OK without verum*

We also see similar patterns with contrastive focus on vP-level constituents (see the Appendix for examples).

## 3 Focused phrases must be vP-internal to license doubling

### 3.1 EX SITU FOCUS DOES NOT LICENSE OM-DOUBLING

Only *in situ* questions license OM-doubling:

- (8) Qa: Ba-ba-ana ba-a-(ka)- kes-a (ka-ma-indi) **liina?**  
 2-2-children 2SM-PST-6OM-harvest-FV 6-6-maize when  
 ‘When did the children harvest the maize?’ *Does not require verum*
- Qb: **Liina** ni-lwo ba-ba-ana ba-a-(#ka)- kes-a (ka-ma-indi) ?  
 when COMP-11 2-2-children 2SM-PST-6OM-harvest-FV 6-6-maize  
 ‘When did the children harvest the maize?’ *Requires verum*

In response to either question above, only *in situ* focus licenses OM-doubling:

- (9) A1: Ba-ba-ana ba-(ka)- kes-ile (ka-ma-indi) **lu-kolooba**  
 2-2-children 2SM-6OM-harvest-PRF 6-6-maize 11-yesterday  
 ‘The children harvested maize yesterday.’ *Does not require verum*
- A2: **lu-kolooba** ni-lwo ba-ba-ana ba-(#ka)- kes-ile (ka-ma-indi)  
 11-yesterday COMP-11 2-2-children 2SM-6OM-harvest-PRF 6-6-maize  
 ‘It was yesterday that the children harvested maize.’ *Requires verum*

<sup>3</sup>For the sake of space we don’t include the data here, but similar patterns arise with lexical ditransitives, with instrumental and causative double object constructions, and with reason adjuncts (as well as with manner adverbials (4)).

### 3.2 SUBJECT FOCUS DOES NOT LICENSE OM-DOUBLING WITHOUT VERUM

Subject questions and answers cannot contain OM-doubling without verum:

- (10) Q: **Naanu** w-a-(#ka)- kes-ile (ka-ma-indi) ?  
 1who 1SM-PST-6OM-harvest-PFV 5-5-maize  
 ‘Who harvested the maize?’ *requires verum for OM-doubling*
- A: **Ba-ba-ana** ba-a-(#ka)- kes-ile (ka-ma-indi)  
 2-2-children 2SM-PST-6OM-harvest-PFV 6-6-maize  
 ‘The children harvested the maize.’ *requires verum for OM-doubling*

*-ong’ene* ‘only’ on the subject does not license OM-doubling without verum:

- (11) **Ba-ba-ana b-ong’ene** ba-a-(#ba)- rer-er-a (ba-b-ebusi) ka-m-echi  
 2-2-children 2-only 2SM-PST-(2OM)-bring-APPL-FV 2-2-parents 6-6-water  
 ‘Only the children brought their parents water.’ *requires verum for OM-doubling*

Contrastive focus on the subject does not license OM-doubling without verum:

- (12) **Ba-ba-ana** ba-a-(#bu)- ly-a (bu-suma), se-li ba-b-ebusi ta.  
 2-2-children 2SM-PST-14OM-eat-FV 14-ugali NEG-be 2-2-parents NEG  
 ‘The children ate ugali, not the parents (i.e. the parents didn’t eat ugali).’ *requires verum for OM-doubling*

### 3.3 LOCATIVE ADJUNCTS DO NOT LICENSE DOUBLING

- (13) New information focus on a locative adjunct does not license OM-doubling without verum

- Q: Ba-ba-ana ba-a-(#ka)- kes-a (ka-ma-indi) **wae?**  
 2-2-children 2SM-PST-(6OM)-harvest-FV 6-6-maize where  
 ‘Where did the children harvest maize?’ *Doubling requires verum*
- A: Ba-ba-ana ba-a-(#ka)- kes-a (ka-ma-indi) **mu-mu-kunda.**  
 2-2-children 2SM-PST-6OM-harvest-FV 6-6-maize 18-3-shamba  
 ‘The children harvested maize in the shamba.’ *OK with verum.*

Locative adjuncts are not within the domain where focus licenses OM-doubling. (We assume this domain to be *vP*: see §6)

## 4 On the Interpretation of OM-doubled Objects

### 4.1 OM-DOUBLING YIELDS SPECIFIC READINGS

As is common for clitic-doubling cross-linguistically, OM-doubled objects in Lubukusu are interpreted as *specific*:

- (14) a. N-a-w-a o-mw-aana ka-ma-beele  
1SG.SM-PST-give-FV 1-1-child 6-6-milk  
'I gave a child milk.' (could be any child)  
*assuming focus conditions are met to license doubling*
- b. N-a-(mu-) w-a (o-mw-aana) ka-ma-beele  
1SG.SM-PST-1OM-give-FV 1-1-child 6-6-milk  
'I gave a specific child milk.' (i.e. it is known who the child is)  
*assuming focus conditions are met to license doubling*

### 4.2 OBJECTS WITH DEMONSTRATIVES ARE MORE READILY OM-DOUBLED

As would be expected based on the observation above, an object DP that contains a demonstrative allows OM-doubling much more naturally than a bare nominal object:

- (15) n-a-(ba-) bon-a (babaana ?(abo))  
1SG.SM-PST-2OM-see-FV 2-2-children 2DEM  
'I DID see those children.' (*requires verum*)

- (15) requires a *verum* reading to be acceptable, but the presence of the demonstrative marks a significant improvement in naturalness over its absence.
- Likewise, (16) shows that when the focal requirements of OM-doubling are met, OM-doubling is more natural with a demonstrative than without one:

- (16) Q: Naanu ni-ye w-a-bon-a?  
1who COMP-1 2SG.SM-PST-see-FV  
'Who did you see?'
- A: n-a-(ba-) bon-a (ba-ba-ana ?(abo)).  
1SG.SM-PST-2OM-see-FV 2-2-children 2DEM  
'I saw those children.' *OK without verum*

### 4.3 OM-DOUBLING ACCEPTABLE WITH WH-PHRASES IF THEY ARE D-LINKED

It is unacceptable to OM-double a bare wh-phrase:

- (17) Ba-ba-ana ba-a-(\*ba-) kes-el-a (naanu) ka-ma-indi?  
2-2-children 2SM-PST-(\*2OM)-harvest-APPL-FV 2who 6-6-maize  
'Who did the children harvest maize for?'

D-linked wh-phrases can be readily OM-doubled:

- (18) Ba-ba-ana ba-a-(ba-) kes-el-a (ba-andu siina) ka-ma-indi?  
2-2-children 2SM-PST-2OM-harvest-APPL-FV 2-people 7what 6-6-maize  
'Which people did the children harvest maize for?'

#### 4.4 OM-DOUBLING POSSIBLE WITH FOCUSED OBJECTS

(19) OM-doubling a RECIPIENT with new information focus in a benefactive DOC:

Q: Ba-ba-ana ba-a-kes-el-a **naanu** ka-ma-indi?  
 2-2-children 2SM-PST-harvest-APPL-FV 1who 6-6-maize  
 ‘Who did the children harvest maize for?’

A1: Ba-ba-ana ba-a-(ba-) kes-el-a **(ba-b-ebusi)** ka-ma-indi  
 2-2-children 2SM-PST-2OM-harvest-APPL-FV 2-2-parents 6-6-maize  
 ‘The children harvested maize for (their) parents.’ *OK without verum*

(20) Lexical ditransitive, focus on RECIPIENT

Ba-ba-ana ba-a-(b-) okesy-a **(ba-a-khaana b-ong’ene)** ka-ma-reeba  
 2-2-children 2SM-PST-2OM-show-FV 2-2-girls 2-only 6-6-questions  
 ‘The children showed ONLY THE GIRLS the questions.’ (i.e. they didn’t show the boys) *OK without verum*

#### 4.5 OM-DOUBLED OBJECTS ARE “ABOUTNESS” TOPICS

- OM-doubled phrases receive an ‘aboutness’ interpretation that can be discerned by explicitly requiring an aboutness interpretation of the relevant object:

(21) *Prompt: ‘Tell me something about Wekesa.’*

N-a-#?(mu)- w-el-a **(Wekesa)** ba-ba-ana bi-anwa  
 1SG.SM-PST-1OM-give-APPL-FV 1Wekesa 2-2-children 8-gifts  
 ‘I gave the children gifts for Wekesa.’

- We see in (21) that an object that is an aboutness topic is preferably OM-doubled.
- In this sense there is some ‘topicality’ to an OM-doubled phrase, but it’s important to note that this does not exclude focused phrases and discourse-new information being OM-doubled.
- Sikuku et al. (2018) report that focus does not license OM-doubling on an object (in apparent contrast to what we have reported above):<sup>4</sup>

(22) lionéeli k-á-(#ku)- ly-a **(kúmú-chéele)**, se-k-á-ly-á búu-sumá tá.  
 1Leonnel 1SM-PST-3OM-eat-FV 3-3-rice NEG-1SM-PST-eat-FV 14.14-ugali NEG  
 ‘Leonell ate the rice, he didn’t eat the ugali.’ (Sikuku et al., 2018, 376)  
 (*OM-doubling requires verum*)  
 (*See comments below for alternative licensing conditions*)

- Adding a demonstrative to the doubled object in (22) is not sufficient to license doubling without verum.
- If (22) is a response to the prompt: “Tell me about what Lionel ate,” (22) acceptable without verum.
- Clearly specificity, aboutness, and focus are all important aspects of OM-doubling.
  - An aboutness interpretation appears to be central to licensing OM-doubling.
  - Specificity is also linked with OM-doubling, but appears to be insufficient to license OM-doubling on its own.<sup>5</sup>
- We are proposing that OM-doubled phrases are aboutness topics in a topic-comment information structure, but are *not* topical in the sense of being necessarily discourse-old.

<sup>4</sup>Minor aspects of the transcriptions in (22) were altered to match our transcription conventions in this paper.

<sup>5</sup>Our current thought is that it’s an effect of OM-doubling, but not a cause or licensing condition of OM-doubling.

## 5 Conjoint/Disjoint + OMing in Zulu (Zeller, 2015)

It is well known that information structure has central grammatical effects across a range of African languages, to the extent of being a fundamental organizing principle of some grammatical systems.<sup>6</sup>

- Conjoint forms on a verb show a closer connection between a verb and what follows, and disjoint forms are used when there is a looser connection with what follows, or when nothing follows the verb (van der Wal & Hyman, 2017).
- In Zulu, the predominant analysis is that the conjoint/disjoint distinction tracks the presence of overt morphosyntactic content inside *vP* (see Halpert 2016, Zeller 2015, and references cited therein):
  - conjoint is used when a constituent is inside *vP*;
  - disjoint is used when *vP* is empty.

- (23) a. U-mama u-phek-a i-n-yama ]<sub>vP</sub> (**conjoint**) [Zulu]  
 AUG-1a.mother 1SM-cook-FV AUG-9-meat  
 ‘Mother is cooking the meat.’
- b. \*U-mama u-phek-a ]<sub>vP</sub> (**conjoint**)  
 AUG-1a.mother 1SM-cook-FV  
 Intended: ‘Mother is cooking.’
- c. U-mama u-ya-phek-a ]<sub>vP</sub> (**disjoint**)  
 AUG-1a.mother 1.SM-DJ-cook-FV  
 ‘Mother is cooking.’

There is a long history of research on Zulu object marking.<sup>7</sup> The data and discussion below are from Zeller (2015).

- (24) OM-doubling in a transitive requires the disjoint verb form  
 U-mama u-\*(ya)-(yi-) phek-a ]<sub>vP</sub> (i-n-yama) . [Zulu]  
 AUG-1a.mother 1SM-DJ-9OM-cook-FV AUG-9-meat  
 ‘Mother is cooking it, the meat.’ (Zeller, 2015, 20)

- (25) ‘Symmetrical’ OMing in Zulu ditransitives; the doubled object is dislocated:

- a. Ngi-(m-) theng-el-a u-bisi ]<sub>vP</sub> (u-Sipho) . (**conjoint**)  
 1SG-1OM-buy-APPL-FV AUG-11.milk AUG-1a.Sipho  
 ‘I’m buying him milk, Sipho.’
- b. \*?Ngi-(m-) theng-el-a (u-Sipho) u-bisi. ]<sub>vP</sub> (**conjoint**)  
 1SG-1OM-buy-APPL-FV AUG-1a.Sipho AUG-11.milk
- c. Ngi-(lu-) theng-el-a u-Sipho ]<sub>vP</sub> (u-bisi) . (**conjoint**)  
 1SG-11OM-buy-APPL-FV AUG-1a.Sipho AUG-11.milk  
 ‘I’m buying it for Sipho, the milk.’ (Zeller, 2015, 22)

- (26) Double Right Dislocation: both objects dislocated:

- Ngi-ya-(m-) theng-el-a ]<sub>vP</sub> (u-Sipho) u-bisi. (**disjoint**)  
 1SG-DJ-1OM-buy-APPL-FV AUG-1a.Sipho AUG-11.milk  
 ‘I AM buying milk for Sipho.’ Zeller (2015, 23)

- (26) uses the disjoint form: both objects have vacated the *vP*.
- Notice that (26) bears a verum reading, a point which Zeller (2015, fn 8, fn 14) reports but does not analyze.

<sup>6</sup>See, for example: Hyman & Watters 1984, Schwarz 2007, Abels & Muriungi 2008, Hyman (2010), Hyman & Polinsky (2010), Landman & Ranero 2018).

<sup>7</sup>Selected references include Adams 2010, Buell 2005, Buell 2006, Cheng & Downing 2009, Halpert 2016, Van der Spuy 1993, Zeller 2012, Zeller 2014, Zeller 2015).

- (27) Cross-linguistic properties of conjoint vs disjoint (and similar constructions) (modified from Güldemann 2003, 328)

	Disjoint Verb Form	Conjoint Verb Form
Postverbal constituent:	optional	obligatory
Verb position:	can be the only constituent and clause-final	not the only constituent, not clause-final
Postverbal material:	discourse-old	discourse-new, asserted
Complement is:	anaphoric, definite, generic	indefinite
Object marking is:	possible	impossible
Emphasis on:	positive truth value (verum)	postverbal constituent
focus pattern:	Predicate within the scope of focus, complement/adjunct extrafocal	Complement/adjunct within the scope of focus, predicate extrafocal

## 6 Initial Observations Regarding Word Order

- It is tempting to analyze Lubukusu like Zulu, correlating OM-doubling with movement out of vP.
- Potential evidence for this is that OM-doubling makes it sound more natural for an object to be moved to the right edge.
- (parenthetical judgments are alternative positions for the doubled object)

(28) Q: Ba-ba-ana ba-a-(ka-) kes-a (ka-ma-indi) liina?  
 2-2-children 2SM-PST-(6OM)-harvest-FV 6-6-maize when  
 ‘When did the children harvest the maize?’ *Doubling OK without verum*

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.’ *Doubling OK without verum*

- The Lubukusu facts are non-identical to Zulu, however: despite positions for a doubled object being possible to the right edge of the verb phrase, the preferred position of a doubled object is the leftmost position in (29).<sup>8</sup>

(29) o-mw-alimu a-a-(mu-) w-a (o-mw-aana chana) si-i-tabu sy-ong’ene (✓) bulayi (✓) khu-soko (\*)  
 1-1-teacher 1SM-PST-1OM-give-FV 1-1-child ABOUT 7-7-book 6-only well 17-9market  
 ‘The teacher gave the child (that I’m talking about) only a book well in the market.’ (i.e. did a good job giving)  
*Doubling OK without verum*

- We could attempt to maintain a Zulu-like account of OM-doubling linked with movement out of vP by claiming that apparent *in situ* doubling is actually movement to the left edge of vP.
- In fact, it looks like something the opposite is happening: when a left-branching temporal adverb is included, the undoubled object preferably to the left of it (30a), and the OM-doubled object is preferably to the right (30b).

(30) a. Wekesa a-a-w-ele (ba-ba-ana) luno (??) bi-anwa bi-ong’ene  
 1Wekesa 1SM-PST-2OM-give-PFV 2-2-children this.time 8-gifts 8-only  
 ‘Wekesa gave the children only gifts this time.’

b. Wekesa a-a-(ba-) w-ele (??) luno (ba-ba-ana) bi-anwa bi-ong’ene  
 1Wekesa 1SM-PST-2OM-give-PFV this.time 2-2-children 8-gifts 8-only  
 ‘Wekesa gave the children only gifts this time.’

<sup>8</sup>The unacceptability of a doubled object outside the locative is consistent with our conclusions that locatives are structurally higher than manner adjuncts, and outside the relevant domain of OM-doubling.

- (30b) suggests that OM-doubled phrases are quite natural *in situ*.
- The correlations between word order, doubling, and specificity do not seem to be direct, however.
- An object bearing a demonstrative may be either to the right or the left of *luno* ‘this time’ (31a), but an OM-doubled object bearing a demonstrative is preferred to the left of *luno* (31b).

- (31) a. Wekesa a-w-ele [ba-ba-ana abo] luno (✓) **bi-anwa bi-ong’ene**  
 1Wekesa 1SM-give-PFV 2-2-children 2DEM this.time 8-gifts 8-only  
 ‘Wekesa gave these children only gifts this time.’
- b. Wekesa a-(ba-)w-ele (babaana abo) luno (??) **bianwa biong’ene**  
 1Wekesa 1SM-give-PFV 2-2-children 2DEM this.time 8-gifts 8-only  
 ‘Wekesa gave these children only gifts this time.’

## 7 The Beginnings of an Analysis

### 7.1 GENERALIZATIONS

- Lexical DP objects that are doubled by OMs are interpreted as **specific**.
- Lexical DP objects that are doubled by OMs are interpreted as **aboutness topics**.
- OM-doubling is a generally available operation in the language, but the pragmatic interpretation of the sentence is highly dependent on the content of *vP*.

(32) Pragmatics of Lubukusu Doubling Configurations

<i>vP</i> focus?	<i>vP</i> Configuration	verum focus?
yes	[ (Doubled Object) $XP_{FOC}$ ] <sub><i>vP</i></sub>	no verum
yes	[ (Doubled Object) <sub>FOC</sub> ] <sub><i>vP</i></sub>	no verum
no	[ (Doubled Object) XP ] <sub><i>vP</i></sub>	verum
no	[ (Doubled Object) ] <sub><i>vP</i></sub>	verum

### 7.2 TOWARD AN ANALYSIS

Informal Observations

1. OM-doubling “activates” a conjoint/disjoint-like system (tracks *vP* content; correlates with focus).
2. OM-doubling appears to remove its object from consideration with respect to this conjoint/disjoint-like system.
3. Apart from the doubled object, then, there are similarities to conjoint/disjoint systems:
  - focus on/in the *vP*
  - patterns of OM-doubling are dependent on *overt vP* content
  - verum/predicate focus occurs in the absence of relevant *vP* content (a common property of disjoint forms)
4. But there are distinctions from other such systems:
  - Elsewhere, conjoint/disjoint patterns exist independently of OMing, but interact with it;
  - In Lubukusu, the presence of the conjoint/disjoint-like system only emerges when OM-doubling occurs.
  - Since surface *vP* constituency clearly matters in Lubukusu, it is tempting to claim that (like Zulu) OM-doubling removes an object from *vP*, and an empty *vP* results in verum focus. This appears to not be the case, however:
    - verum occurs in OM-doubling with an additional *vP* constituent IF that constituent is unfocused.
    - Doubled objects appear to be able to remain *in situ*.
    - The doubled object “counts” wrt the focus requirement - a focused object can license OM-doubling on itself.
    - Intransitive verbs don’t show this system of interpretations in Lubukusu; conjoint/disjoint systems generalize across verbs of different valencies in other languages. (i.e. intransitive verbs don’t require verum readings)

## Initial Analytical Thoughts

5. OM-doubling is linked with a topic-comment structure inside the *vP*.
6. OM-doubling requires an aboutness topic reading of the doubled object because it is generated via Agree with Topic features at the edge of *vP* (precise position TBD) (see Mursell, 2018).
7. Identification of a TOPIC requires a COMMENT about that TOPIC: the content of *vP* bears focus.
8. We suggest that the focus requirement on *vP* is realized in various ways.
  - If there is one distinct (non-topical) constituent within the *vP*, either its semantics or the discourse context must be naturally compatible with it bearing a focused interpretation; we deem this a pragmatic effect of a single constituent being the entire comment about the topic.
  - If there is no other (non-topical) constituent within the verb phrase, however, *verum* focus results (interpreted here as focus on the entire predicate itself).

## Predictions:

9. By analyzing the locus of the focus requirement as *vP* instead of individual constituents, it naturally captures how *any* *vP*-internal constituent can bear focus and license the OM-doubling of a separate object argument.
10. Because there is not in fact a requirement for term focus inside the *vP*, but instead a focus requirement on the *vP* itself, we would expect *vP*-level properties to be capable of licensing OM-doubling without *verum*.
  - §7.3 shows that if there are *multiple* non-topical constituents inside the *vP*, these constituents collectively can bear broad focus and are sufficient *vP*-content to license OM-doubling without *verum* **without term focus on an individual constituent**.
  - §8 shows that a (structurally low) predicate focus marker licenses OM-doubling as well.

## 7.3 TERM FOCUS IS UNNECESSARY IF SUFFICIENT MATERIAL IS IN *vP*

- One prediction of this preliminary analysis is that the strong focal effects on a single constituent should be mitigated if additional constituents are inside *vP* when an object is OM-doubled.
- This is in fact what happens. In the intuitions of the first author, the more things there are in *vP*, the more natural OM-doubling sounds, and term focus is unnecessary.

- (33) N-a-mu-w-el-a                      Wekesa ba-ba-ana bi-anwa.  
1SG.SM-PST-1OM-give-APPL-FV 1Wekesa 2-2-children 8-gifts  
'I gave the children gifts for Wekesa.' *OK without verum, without additional context*

- In general, adding more *vP*-level material makes an OM-doubled sentence sound increasingly natural.

## 8 NE-focus marking licenses OM-doubling

Wasike (2007, 335) documents a morpheme that appears on the main verb in compound tenses which he analyzes as wh-agreement, a reflex of A'-movement:

- (34) Siina ni-syo mw-a-ba        **ne**-mu-khol-a?  
7what COMP-7 2PL.SM-PST-be **NE**-2PL.SM-do-FV  
'What was it that you were doing?'

- It is clear that NE cannot itself be wh-agreement, as it readily appears in non-extraction contexts:<sup>9</sup>

- (35) Wekesa a-ba (**n**)-a-a-nyw-a                      ka-ma-lwa buli nyanga  
1Wekesa 1-be **FOC**-1SM-PST-drink-FV 6-6-alcohol every 9day  
'Wekesa (certainly) used to drink alcohol everyday.'

- The interpretive contribution of N(E)- is hard to pin down, but it has some kind of connection to FOCUS or EMPHASIS.
- With N(E)-, the speaker is more committed to the truth of (35). Without N(E)-, (35) is more or less neutral.

<sup>9</sup>There certainly are interactions with extraction: even for the first author on this paper, certain extraction environments make NE obligatory.

## 8.1 OM-DOUBLING IN COMPOUND TENSES WITH NE-

- If OM-doubling results in focus on the vP, OM-doubling should be acceptable if the vP is focused independently of its internal content.
- OM-doubling sounds natural with the NE focus morpheme in a compound tense (without verum).

- (36) a. Wekesa a-ba a-a-(#ka)-nyw-a ka-ma-lwa buli nyanga.  
1Wekesa 1SM-be 1SM-PST-drink-FV 6-6-alcohol every 9day  
'Wekesa used to drink alcohol everyday.' (requires verum for OM-doubling to be acceptable)
- b. Wekesa a-ba n-a-a-ka-nyw-a ka-ma-lwa buli nyanga  
1Wekesa 1-be FOC-1SM-PST-6OM-drink-FV 6-6-alcohol every 9day  
'Wekesa (certainly) used to drink alcohol everyday.' (Doubling OK without verum)

## 8.2 NE- AND IMPERATIVES (AND DOUBLING)

- The focus morpheme NE- can also occur on imperatives, which tends to have the interpretive effect of increasing the force/urgency of the speaker's command.

- (37) a. kh-o-nyw-e echai yoo  
KH-2SG.SM-drink-SUBJ 9tea 9-your  
'Drink your tea' (subjunctive)
- b. n-o-nyw-e echai yoo!  
FOC-2SG.SM-drink-SUBJ 9tea 9-your  
'Drink your tea!'

- OM-doubling the object is acceptable but requires a verum interpretation (38a).
- If NE- is used, doubling does not require a verum interpretation (38b).

- (38) a. #Ki-nyw-e echai yoo!  
9OM-drink-SUBJ 9tea 9-your  
'Drink your tea!' requires verum, i.e. 'DO drink your tea.'
- b. n-o-ki-nyw-e echai yoo!  
FOC-2SG.SM-9OM-drink-SUBJ 9tea 9-your  
'Drink your tea!' Ok without verum

# 9 Conclusions

## 9.1 EMPIRICAL GENERALIZATIONS

Selected Empirical Generalizations from Sikuku et al. (2018)

- Doubling in simple monotransitives is unacceptable in neutral discourse contexts
- Doubling in simple monotransitives requires a verum-licensing context to be acceptable

- Lexical DP objects that are doubled by OMs are interpreted as **specific**.
- Lexical DP objects that are doubled by OMs are interpreted as **aboutness topics**.
- OM-doubling is a generally available operation in the language, but requires a focused interpretation of the vP: the overall pragmatic interpretation of the sentence is highly dependent on the content of vP.

(39) Pragmatics of Lubukusu Doubling Configurations

vP focus?	vP Configuration	verum focus?
yes	[ (Doubled Object) XP YP ] <sub>vP</sub>	no verum
yes	[ (Doubled Object) XP <sub>FOC</sub> ] <sub>vP</sub>	no verum
yes	[ (Doubled Object) <sub>FOC</sub> ] <sub>vP</sub>	no verum
no	[ (Doubled Object) XP ] <sub>vP</sub>	verum
no	[ (Doubled Object) ] <sub>vP</sub>	verum
yes	NE-[ (Doubled Object) ] <sub>vP</sub>	no verum

## 9.2 PERSISTING ANALYTICAL QUESTIONS

- How to formalize this? (a work in progress)
- Evidence of variable word order postverbally, both with and without OM-doubling. The patterns are quite complex and finding reliable diagnostics of syntactic position has been a challenge. The work is underway.
- Zeller (2014) places a high importance on the ability/requirement (or not) of object relative clauses to OM the head of their relative clause in analyzing the nature of the OM. We are still investigating Lubukusu Oming with respect to these patterns, and the data are puzzling (at present, it appears that given conditions expected to license OM-doubling, Oming the extracted object of an object relative clause is impossible without verum, but possible with verum, despite the presence of a focused phrase in vP). \*shrug\*
- Work is still underway, but it appears that very similar patterns appear in Wanga, Tiriki, and Logoori (all Luyia).
- That said, we have encountered speakers of all FOUR varieties (Bukusu, Wanga, Tiriki, Logoori) that appear to lack these patterns, instead appearing to allow what looks like an incorporated pronoun analysis of OMs (doubling is always impossible). Given the deep contextual dependence of these patterns it's impossible to rule out pragmatic licensing of some sort for those speakers, but the best we can tell, some speakers of these languages completely lack these patterns.

## 10 References

- Abels, Klaus & Peter Muriungi. 2008. The focus marker in Kiitharaka: Syntax and semantics. *Lingua* 118. 687–731.
- Adams, Nikki. 2010. *The Zulu ditransitive verb phrase*: University of Chicago dissertation.
- Baker, Mark. 2003. Agreement, dislocation, and partial configurationality. In Andrew Carnie et al (ed.), *Formal approaches to function in grammar*. John Benjamins.
- Baker, Mark & Ruth. Kramer. 2017. Doubled clitics are pronouns: Amharic objects (and beyond). In press at *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*.
- Bax, Anna & Michael Diercks. 2012. Information structure constraints on object marking in Manyika. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies* 30. 185–202.
- Bresnan, Joan & Sam Mchombo. 1987. Topic, pronoun, and agreement in Chichewa. *Language* 63. 741–782.
- Buell, Leston. 2005. *Issues in Zulu morphosyntax*. Los Angeles, CA: UCLA dissertation.
- Buell, Leston. 2006. The Zulu conjoint/disjoint verb alternation: focus or constituency? *ZAS Papers in Linguistics* 43. 9–30.
- Byarushengo, Ernest, Larry Hyman & Sarah Tenenbaum. 1976. Tone, accent and assertion in haya. In Larry M. Hyman (ed.), *Studies in Bantu tonology*. 183–205. Los Angeles: Department of Linguistics, University of Southern California.
- Cheng, Lisa Lai-Shen & Laura J. Downing. 2009. Where's the topic in Zulu? *The Linguistic Review* 26. 207–238.
- Diercks, Michael, Rodrigo Ranero & Mary Paster. 2014. Evidence for a clitic analysis of object markers in Kuria. In Ruth Kramer,

- Elizabeth C. Zsiga & One Tlale Boyer (eds.), *Selected proceedings of the 44th annual conference on African linguistics*. 52–70. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- Duranti, Alessandro & Ernest R. Byarushengo. 1977. On the notion of “direct object.” In Ernest R. Byarushengo, Alessandro Duranti & Larry M. Hyman (eds.), *Haya grammatical structure*. 45–71. Los Angeles: Department of Linguistics, University of Southern California.
- 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.
- Halpert, Claire. 2016. *Argument licensing and agreement*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Henderson, Brent. 2006. *The syntax and typology of Bantu relative clauses*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign dissertation.
- Hyman, Larry M. 2010. Focus marking in Aghem: Syntax or semantics? In Ines Fielder & Anne Schwarz (eds.), *The expression of information structure: A documentation of its diversity across Africa*. 95–116. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hyman, Larry M. & Maria Polinsky. 2010. Focus in aghem. In Malte Zimmerman & Caroline Féry (eds.), *Information structure: Theoretical, typological, and experimental perspectives*. 206–233. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hyman, Larry M. & John R. Watters. 1984. Auxiliary focus. *Studies in African Linguistics* 15. 233–273.
- Jelinek, Eloise. 1984. Empty categories, case, and configurationality. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 2(1). 39–76.
- Keach, Camillia. 1995. Subject and object markers as agreement and pronoun incorporation in swahili. In Akinbiyi Akinlabi (ed.), *Theoretical approaches to African linguistics Trends in African Linguistics*. 109–116. Trenton, NJ: Africa World.
- Landman, Meredith & Rodrigo Ranero. 2018. Focus marking in kuria. In Jason Kandybowicz, Travis Major, Harold Torrence & Philip T. Duncan (eds.), *African linguistics on the prairie: Selected papers from the 45th annual conference on African linguistics*. 393–412. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Letsholo, Rose. 2013. Object markers in Ikalanga. *Linguistic Discovery* 11(1). 105–128.
- Lewis, M. Paul, Gary F. Simons & Fennig Charles D. (eds.). 2016. *Ethnologue: Languages of the world, nineteenth edition*. Dallas: SIL International online version: <http://www.ethnologue.com/>. edn.
- Maho, Jouni. 2008. NUGL online: the web version of the new updated Guthrie list, a referential classification of the Bantu languages. Version dated March 25th, 2008. Available online at <http://goto.glocalnet.net/maho/bantusurvey.html>.
- Marlo, Michael. 2009. Luyia tonal dialectology. Handout from a talk given at the University of Nairobi, December 16.
- Marlo, Michael. 2015a. On the number of object markers in bantu languages. *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 36. 1–65.
- Marlo, Michael R. 2014. Exceptional patterns of object marking in Bantu. *Studies in African Linguistics* 43. 85–123.
- Marlo, Michael R. 2015b. Exceptional properties of the reflexive in bantu languages. *Nordic Journal of African Studies* 24. 1–22.
- Marten, Lutz & Nancy Kula. 2012. Object marking and morphosyntactic variation in bantu. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies* 30(2). 237–253.
- Marten, Lutz, Nancy Kula & Nhlanhla Thwala. 2007. Parameters of morpho-syntactic variation in Bantu. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 105(3). 253–338.
- Marten, Lutz & Deograsia Ramadhani. 2001. An overview of object marking in Kiluguru. *SOAS Working Papers in Linguistics* 11. 259–275.
- Mursell, Johannes. 2018. Object marking in Swahili is topic agreement. *Jezikoslovlje* 19(3). 427–455.
- Riedel, Kristina. 2009. *The syntax of object marking in Sambia: A comparative Bantu perspective*. Leiden, The Netherlands: Universiteit Leiden dissertation.
- Schwarz, Florian. 2007. Ex-situ focus in Kikuyu. In Hartmann Katharina Zimmermann Malte Aboh, Enoch Oladé (ed.), *Focus strategies in african languages: The interaction of focus, grammar in niger-congo & afro-asiatic*. 139–160. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Sikuku, Justine, Michael Diercks & Michael Marlo. 2018. Pragmatic effects of clitic doubling: Two kinds of object markers in Lubukusu. *Linguistic Variation* 18(2). 359–429.
- Van der Spuy, Andrew. 1993. Dislocated noun phrases in Nguni. *Lingua* 90(4). 335–355.
- Tenenbaum, Sarah. 1977. Left- and right-dislocations. In Ernest R. Byarushengo, Alessandro Duranti & Larry M. Hyman (eds.), *Haya grammatical structure*. Los Angeles: Department of Linguistics, University of Southern California.
- van der Wal, Jenneke & Larry M. Hyman (eds.). 2017. *The conjoint/disjoint alternation in Bantu*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Wasike, Aggrey. 2007. *The left periphery, wh-in-situ and A-bar movement in Lubukusu and other Bantu languages*: Cornell University dissertation.
- Woolford, Ellen. 2001. Conditions on object agreement in Ruwund (Bantu). In Elena Benedicto (ed.), *The umass volume on indigenous languages* University of Massachusetts Occasional Papers in Linguistics 20. Amherst, MA: GLSA.
- Zeller, Jochen. 2009. On clitic left-dislocation in Zulu. In Sonja Ermisch Ruediger (ed.), *Frankfurt African studies bulletin 18: Focus and topic in African languages*. 131–156. Koeppel Verlag.
- Zeller, Jochen. 2012. Object marking in Zulu. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies* 30. 219–325.

- Zeller, Jochen. 2014. Three types of object marking in bantu. *Linguistische Berichte* 239. 347–367.
- Zeller, Jochen. 2015. Argument prominence and agreement: Explaining an unexpected object asymmetry in Zulu. *Lingua* 156. 17–39.
- Zerbian, Sabine. 2006. *Expression of information structure in the Bantu language Northern Sotho*: Humboldt University dissertation.

## 11 Appendix: Additional examples of preceding patterns

### 11.1 MORE EXAMPLES OF FOCUS LICENSING OM-DOUBLING

#### 11.1.1 Contrastive Focus licenses OM-doubling

- (40) Ba-ba-ana ba-a-(bu-)ly-a (bu-suma) bwangu, se-li kalaa ta. **Contrastive Manner Adverb**  
 2-2-children 2SM-PST-14OM-eat-FV 14-ugali quickly NEG-be slowly NEG  
 ‘The children ate the ugali QUICKLY, not slowly.’ *OK without verum*
- (41) Ba-ba-ana ba-a-(bu-)ly-a (bu-suma), se-ba-a-timany-a chi-ngokho ta. **Contrastive Verb Phrase**  
 2-2-children 2SM-PST-14OM-eat-FV 14-ugali NEG-2SM-PST-chase-FV 10-chickens NEG  
 ‘The children ate ugali, they didn’t chase the chickens.’ *OK without verum*

#### 11.1.2 Focus on reason adjuncts licenses OM-doubling

New information focus on a reason adjunct (answering a reason question) is also sufficient context to license OM-doubling.

- (42) Q: Ba-ba-ana ba-a-(ka-)kes-a (ka-ma-indi) khubela si?  
 2-2-children 2SM-PST-(6OM)-harvest-FV 6-6-maize because what  
 ‘Why did the children harvest the maize?’ *OK without verum*
- A: Ba-ba-ana ba-a-(ka-)kes-a (ka-ma-indi) khubela ba-b-ebusi ba-a-ba-bolel-a  
 2-2-children 2SM-PST-6OM-harvest-FV 6-6-maize because 2-2-parents 2SM-PST-(2OM)-tell-FV  
 ‘The children harvested the maize bc their parents told them to.’ *OK without verum*

#### 11.1.3 ‘only’ focus on locative adjunct does not license doubling without verum

#### 11.1.4 ‘only’ focus licenses doubling in causative DOCs

- (43) Causative DOC, focus on THEME  
 O-mw-aana a-a-(chi-)li-is-y-a (chi-khafu) ka-ma-indi k-ong’ene  
 1-1-child 1SM-PST-10OM-eat-CAUS-FV 10-cows 6-6-maize 6-only  
 ‘The child fed the cows ONLY MAIZE (didn’t feed them anything else).’ *OK without verum*
- (44) ‘only’ focus on locative does not license OM-doubling
- a. Ba-ba-ana ba-a-(\*ka-)kes-a (ka-ma-indi) mu-mu-kunda mw-ong’ene.  
 2-2-children 2SM-PST-6OM-harvest-FV 6-6-maize 18-3-shamba 18-only  
 ‘The children harvested the maize ONLY IN THE SHAMBA (not anywhere else).’

- b. Ba-ba-ana ba-a-(#ka)- kes-el-a (ka-ma-indi) mu-mu-kunda mw-ong'ene.  
 2-2-children 2SM-PST-6OM-harvest-APPL-FV 6-6-maize 18-3-shamba 18-only  
 'The children harvested the maize ONLY IN THE SHAMBA (not anywhere else).' *OK with verum*

## 11.2 ADDITIONAL EXAMPLES OF FOCUSED PHRASES BEING DOUBLED

OM-doubling a THEME with new information focus in a benefactive DOC:

- (45) Q: Ba-ba-ana ba-a-kes-el-a ba-b-ebusi siina?  
 2-2-children 2SM-PST-(2OM)-harvest-APPL-FV 2-2-parents what  
 'What did the children harvest for their parents?' *OK without verum*  
 A3: Ba-ba-ana ba-a-(ka)- kes-el-a ba-b-ebusi (ka-ma-indi)  
 2-2-children 2SM-PST-(2OM)-harvest-APPL-FV 2-2-parents 6-6-maize  
 'The children harvested maize for their parents.' *OK without verum*
- (46) Causative DOC, focus on CAUSEE  
 O-mw-aana a-a-(chi)- li-is-y-a (chi-khafu ch-ong'ene) ka-ma-indi  
 1-1-child 1SM-PST-10OM-eat-CAUS-FV 10-cows 10-only 6-6-maize  
 'The child fed ONLY THE COWS maize (didn't feed any of the other animals maize).' *OK without verum*

## 11.3 MORE ON THE INTERPRETATION OF OM-DOUBLED PHRASES

### 11.3.1 Ungrammatical to OM-double quantified phrases

Baker & Kramer (2017) claim that the ability to OM quantified phrases (or not) can be used to distinguish agreement (OK with quantified phrases) from clitic doubling (not), claiming that clitics are pronouns.

- (47) \*N-a-(mu)- w-a (buli mw-aana) ka-ma-beele k-ong'ene  
 1SG.SM-PST-1OM-giveFV every 1-child 6-6-milk 6-only  
 'I gave every child only milk (no snacks).'  
*OM-doubling either object in either word order is ungrammatical*

### 11.3.2 Interpretation of Doubling: Specific Reference Sets in Mind

We have seen above that more specific objects are more readily OM-doubled (DPs with demonstratives, D-linked wh-phrases). But it is not strictly necessary for an OM-doubled object to be either specific, or discourse familiar: a non-specific (and non-given, non-familiar) object can be OM-doubled if the other conditions on OM-doubling are present:

- (48) Wafula se-a-a-(mu)- tek-h-el-a (o-mu-ndu y-esi y-esi) echai y-ong'ene tawe  
 1Wafula NEG-1SM-PST-1OM-cook-APPL-FV 1-1-person 1-any 1-any 9tea 9-only NEG  
 'Wafula didn't (OM-)prepare only tea for anyone at all.' (i.e. he prepared everyone tea + a snack) *OK without verum*
- (49) Q: Wafula a-a-tek-h-el-a ba-ba-andu siina?  
 1Wafula 1SM-PST-cook-APPL-FV 2-2-people 7what  
 'What did Wafula prepare/cook for people?'  
 A: Wafula se-a-a-(mu)- tek-h-el-a (o-mu-ndu y-esi y-esi) si-ndu ta  
 1Wafula NEG-1SM-PST-1OM-cook-APPL-FV 1-1-person 1-any 1-any 7-thing NEG  
 'Wafula didn't prepare/cook anything for anyone.' *OK without verum*

- OM-doubling is optional in the example above.
- The OM –doubled version gives a sense of expectation that Wafula was supposed to prepare something for some specific people, but none of these people got the favour. The speaker’s attitude is not explicit in the statement (he may be in support or against Wafula’s actions).
- The non-doubled one is more neutral. It is also possible that in the non-doubled sentence the speaker doesn’t have any specific people that were not cooked for in mind. It may as well simply mean that Wafula did not just cook.
- In doubled one however the implication is that in a given group of people, none was cooked for.
- Therefore, while it IS possible to OM-double an NPI, it nonetheless creates an interpretation of a discourse-familiar set which the NPI quantifies over.

#### 11.4 FOCUS ACCEPTABLE OUTSIDE vP IF OM-DOUBLING LICENSED OTHERWISE

- And in fact, we can see that nothing about focus outside the vP constrains against OM-doubling, as long as the vP-internal conditions are met (even if they are met without a particularly focused vP-internal constituent):

(50) ESE s-eng’ene n-a-mu-w-el-a                      Wekesa ba-ba-ana bi-anwa  
 I 1SG.SM-PST-1OM-give-APPL-FV 1Wekesa 2-2-children 8-gifts  
 ‘Only I gave the children gifts for Wekesa (nobody else did so).’  
*OK without verum, without additional context*

#### 11.5 MORE CONTENT IN vP INCREASES NATURALNESS OF OM-DOUBLING

(51) a. N-a-(mu-) w-el-a                      (Wekesa) ba-ba-ana bi-anwa bulayi  
 1SG.SM-PST-1OM-give-APPL-FV 1Wekesa 2-2-children 8-gifts well  
 ‘I gave the children gifts well for Wekesa.’  
*OK without verum, without additional context*

b. N-a-(mu-) w-el-a                      (Wekesa) ba-ba-ana bi-anwa likolooba  
 1SG.SM-PST-1OM-give-APPL-FV 1Wekesa 2-2-children 8-gifts yesterday  
 ‘I gave the children gifts yesterday for Wekesa.’  
*OK without verum, without additional context*