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1 Overview

In many languages, clefts consisting of a copular clause plus a cleft clause change over time into focus constructions with a simpler structure (Harris 2001, Harris & Campbell 1995, Heine & Reh 1984, Jendraschek 2009, Van der Wal & Maniacky 2015).

A common grammaticalization path from cleft to simple focus construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biclausal:</th>
<th>(pronoun)</th>
<th>copula</th>
<th>cleft phrase</th>
<th>cleft clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monoclausal:</td>
<td>(focus marker)</td>
<td>focused phrase</td>
<td>rest of clause</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Shona ([sna], Bantu, Zimbabwe) and Kîîtharaka ([thk], Bantu, Kenya) constructions in (2) appear quite similar.

(2) a. 1-O-mbavha ___ yaka-pind-a.¹
    cop-9-thief se.9.sm.rem.pst-come.in-fv³
    'It's a thief who came in.'
    (2014-09-20-02-TD)

b. 1-Maria ___ a-kiny-ir-e.³
    foc-1.Maria LSM-arrive-pfv-fv
    'Maria arrived.'
    (Abels & Muriungi 2008:692 (10b))

¹I am grateful to Mark Baker, Vicki Carstens, Sandy Chung, Jessica Coon, Mike Diercks, Dave Embeck, Bob Frank, Bill Haddican, Jason Kandybowicz, Richie Kayne, David Pesetsky, Ken Safir, Patricia Schneider-Zioga, Harold Torrence, Jim Wood, Raffaella Zanuttini, two anonymous LSA abstract referees, and audiences at LSA 2015, ACAL 46, Yale University, and Queens College for feedback about aspects of the research presented here. My consultant Thabani Dhlakama deserves special thanks for providing the Shona data and judgments. All responsibility for errors remains my own.

²Shona examples appear in the standard orthography, which does not mark tone (though I have added tone diacritics where they alone mark a relevant contrast). The graphemes that depart from IPA usage are given here with their IPA equivalents: <b> [ɓ], <ch> [tʃ], <mb> [ᵐb], <nd> [ⁿd], <ng> [ᵑɡ], <nzv> [ⁿz̤ᶹ], <sh> [ʃ], <th> [t], <v> [ʋ], <vh> [v̤], <y> [j].

³For the sake of clarity and consistency, I have occasionally adjusted glosses and translations in examples cited from other sources, following the Leipzig Glossing Rules wherever possible. Abbreviations used include: 1pl = first person plural, 1sg = first person singular, 2pl = second person plural, 2sg = second person singular, appl = applicative, cop = copula, foc = focus, fut = future, fv = final vowel, nse = non-subject extraction, pfv = perfective, pst = past, rec = recent, rem = remote, se = subject extraction, sm = subject marker. Bare numerals (and also 1a) in glosses indicate noun class, encoding both number and gender features.
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The structure of these Bantu constructions has been the topic of some debate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biclausal</th>
<th>Monoclausal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lubukusu</td>
<td>Diercks 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinande</td>
<td>Schneider-Zioga 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lingala</td>
<td>Van der Wal &amp; Maniacky 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiyoombe</td>
<td>Van der Wal &amp; Maniacky 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Sotho</td>
<td>Zerbian 2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Today, I will argue that Shona has a biclausal cleft construction, in contrast to the Kîîtharaka construction, which Abels & Muriungi (2008) have convincingly argued is monoclausal.

Roadmap:

- §2: The basic facts of Shona and Kîîtharaka focus fronting
- §3: Biclausal or monoclausal?
- §4: An analysis of the Shona biclausal cleft
2 The basics of focus fronting in Kĩĩtharaka and Shona

(3) a. Clefted subject of an intransitive verb

\[ \text{Shona} \]
\[
\text{I-Ø-mbavha} \quad \text{yàka-pind-a.} \quad \text{[Shona]}
\]
\[
\text{cop-9-thief} \quad \text{se.9.sm.rem.pst-come.in-fv} \quad \text{It’s a thief who came in.} \quad (2014-09-20-02-TD)
\]

b. Clefted subject of a transitive verb

\[ \text{Shona} \]
\[
\text{Ndi-Ø-Tendai} \quad \text{àka-teng-er-a} \quad \Ø-Thandi \quad \text{[Shona]}
\]
\[
\text{cop-1a-Tendai} \quad \text{se.1a.sm.rem.pst-buy-appl-fv} \quad 1a-Thandi \quad \Ø-rokwe \quad \text{5-dress}
\]
\[
\text{It’s Tendai who bought Thandi a dress.} \quad (2014-08-29-03-TD)
\]

c. Clefted direct object

\[ \text{Shona} \]
\[
\text{I-Ø-rokwe} \quad \text{ra-aka-teng-er-a} \quad \Ø-Thandi \quad \text{[Shona]}
\]
\[
\text{cop-1a-rokwe} \quad \text{se.5.nse-sm.rem.pst-buy-appl-fv} \quad 1a-Thandi \quad \text{5-dress}
\]
\[
\text{It’s a dress that s/he bought Thandi.} \quad (2014-09-06-02-TD)
\]

d. Clefted locative adjunct

\[ \text{Shona} \]
\[
\text{Kú-chí-toro} \quad \text{kwa-aka-teng-er-a} \quad \Ø-Thandi \quad \text{[Shona]}
\]
\[
\text{cop-17-toro} \quad \text{kwa-17.of-sm.rem.pst-buy-appl-fv} \quad 17a-Thandi \quad \Ø-rokwe \quad \text{5-dress}
\]
\[
\text{It’s at the store that s/he bought Thandi a dress.} \quad (2014-08-04-01-TD)
\]

(4) a. Focus-marked subject of an intransitive verb

\[ \text{Kĩĩtharaka} \]
\[
\text{N-ii-buku} \quad \text{Maria} \quad \text{a-gùr-i-ir-e} \quad \text{[Kĩĩtharaka]}
\]
\[
\text{roc-5-book} \quad 1.\text{Maria} \quad 1.\text{SM-buy-appl-PFV-FV} \quad \text{mw-arîmû} \quad \text{1-teacher}
\]
\[
\text{‘Maria bought the teacher a book.’} \quad (\text{Abels & Muriungi 2008:691 (6b)})
\]

b. Focus-marked subject of a transitive verb

\[ \text{Kĩĩtharaka} \]
\[
\text{N-i-buku} \quad \text{Maria} \quad \text{a-gùr-i-ir-e} \quad \text{[Kĩĩtharaka]}
\]
\[
\text{roc-11-morning} \quad 1.\text{Maria} \quad 1.\text{SM-read-PFV-FV} \quad \text{mbibiria} \quad \text{9.Bible}
\]
\[
\text{‘Maria read the Bible IN THE MORNING.’} \quad (\text{Abels & Muriungi 2008:704 (55a)})
\]

c. Focus-marked direct object

\[ \text{Shona} \]
\[
\text{N-ii-buku} \quad \text{Maria} \quad \text{a-gùr-i-ir-e} \quad \text{[Kĩĩtharaka]}
\]
\[
\text{roc-5-book} \quad 1.\text{Maria} \quad 1.\text{SM-buy-appl-PFV-FV} \quad \text{mw-arîmû} \quad \text{1-teacher}
\]
\[
\text{‘Maria bought the teacher a book.’} \quad (\text{Abels & Muriungi 2008:691 (6b)})
\]

d. Focus-marked locative adjunct

\[ \text{Shona} \]
\[
\text{I-mûciî} \quad \text{gw-a mw-arîmû} \quad \text{Maria} \quad \text{[Kĩĩtharaka]}
\]
\[
\text{roc-17.home} \quad 1.\text{teacher} \quad 1.\text{Maria} \quad \text{a-thi-ir-e} \quad \text{1.SM-go-PFV-FV}
\]
\[
\text{‘Maria went to the TEACHER’S HOME.’} \quad (\text{Abels & Muriungi 2008:702 (47d)})
\]

e. Focus-marked temporal adjunct

\[ \text{Shona} \]
\[
\text{I-rû⁻kîîrî} \quad \text{Maria} \quad \text{a-thom-ir-e} \quad \text{[Kĩĩtharaka]}
\]
\[
\text{roc-11-morning} \quad 1.\text{Maria} \quad 1.\text{SM-read-PFV-FV} \quad \text{mbibiria} \quad \text{9.Bible}
\]
\[
\text{‘Maria read the Bible IN THE MORNING.’} \quad (\text{Abels & Muriungi 2008:704 (55a)})
\]

3 Biclausal or monoclausal?

Both languages have some properties that might suggest grammaticalization away from a classical biclausal cleft, but these are not conclusive:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Shona</th>
<th>Kĩĩtharaka</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cleft pronoun not required</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copula/focus marker</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot bear subject marking or tense</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phonologically dependent</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Properties of Shona and Kĩĩtharaka focus fronting (interim)
3.1 Allomorphy

If a copula is on its way to becoming a focus marker, we might expect it to crystallize into an invariant form. However, both the Kiitharaka focus marker and the Shona copula display allomorphy, and the morphological shapes of these allomorphs appear to be cognate.

(5) Shona copula allomorphs (simplified)
  ndi-  ℄/ˌ{1sg, 1pl, 2sg, 2pl, 1a}
  i-  ℄/ˌ{5, 9, 10}
  H-  ℄/ˌelsewhere

(6) Kiitharaka focus marker allomorphs
  n-  ℄/ˌV
  i-  ℄/ˌC
  (Abels & Muriungi 2008:690)

Note, though, that the allomorphy is phonologically conditioned in Kiitharaka but morphologically conditioned in Shona.

3.2 Copular constructions of copula/focus marker

We might also expect a grammaticalized focus marker to no longer be able to be used as a copula, or at least it might take a different form (Harris & Campbell 1995). However, both Kiitharaka and Shona use the same forms in copular constructions as in the focus fronting constructions.⁴

(7) Shona ndi-/i-/H- used in copular constructions
  a. Ø-Taurai ndi-Ø-mambo. [Shona]
     1a-Taurai cor-1a-king
     ‘Taurai is the king.’ (2014-09-13-01-TD)
  b. Mu-rume u-ya i-Ø-mbavha. [Shona]
     1-man 1-that cor-9-thief
     ‘That man is a thief.’ (2014-09-13-01-TD)
  c. Ø-Rumbi mü-biki. [Shona]
     1a-Rumbi cor.1-cook
     ‘Rumbi is a cook.’ (2014-09-13-02-TD)

⁴Both languages have another copula ri that will not be considered here.

(8) Kiitharaka i-/n- used in copular constructions
  a. Karimi i-mubiasara. [Kiitharaka]
     Karimi roc-businesswoman
     ‘Karimi is a businesswoman.’ (Muriungi 2005:82 (98))
  b. David n-obisa. [Kiitharaka]
     David roc-officer
     ‘David is an officer.’ (Muriungi 2005:82 (98))

Of course, this by itself does not constitute an airtight argument for a biclausal cleft. The copula could be left-peripheral, the focus marker and copula could simply be homophones, or as Abels & Muriungi (2008) argue for Kiitharaka, the copula could be null, in which case the focus marker would simply mark focus.

3.3 Obligatoriness of copula/focus marker

In the late stages of grammaticalization from a cleft into a focus construction, the focus marker may become optional or disappear (Harris & Campbell 1995, Van der Wal & Maniacky 2015). This has not happened in either Shona or Kiitharaka. Again, though, this diagnostic is inconclusive because focus markers may be overt even in simple focus constructions.

3.4 Interim summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Shona</th>
<th>Kiitharaka</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cleft pronoun not required</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copula/focus marker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot bear subject marking or tense</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phonologically dependent</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphologically invariant</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate form in copular constructions</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Properties of Shona and Kiitharaka focus fronting (interim)

All of these properties could be explained under either analysis. But next, we will examine differences between the focus fronting constructions in the two languages and look for better diagnostics for determining the clausal structure.
3.5 Focus marking on non-fronted elements

As discussed in detail by Abels & Muriungi (2008), the distribution of the focus marker \( n-/i- \) is not limited to the prenominal focus construction shown in (9a). Verbs, too, may bear the focus marker, as in (9b).

(9) a. Focus-marked direct object
   
   N-ii-buku Maria a-gûr-îr-e _____ [Kiitharaka]
   
   'Maria bought a book.' / 'Maria bought a book.'
   
   (Abels & Muriungi 2008:707 (64b))

b. Focus-marked verb
   
   Maria n-a-gûr-îr-e 1-buku. [Kiitharaka]
   
   'Maria bought a book.' / 'Maria bought a book.'
   
   (Abels & Muriungi 2008:706 (60))

This preverbal focus construction looks considerably less like a cleft because there is no fronting. Abels & Muriungi (2008) argue that the preverbal and prenominal focus markers are in complementary distribution within a clause, indicating that they cannot be analyzed simply as a homophonous copula and focus marker.

In Shona, it is impossible to attach the copula and the verb as in (9b).

3.6 Lack of relative clause morphology

The cleft clause is classically analyzed as a relative clause (see Hartmann & Veenstra 2013 and Reeve 2012 for a survey). In many Bantu languages, complementizers or verbs in relative clauses have dedicated morphology (Cheng 2006, Henderson 2006, Zentz 2015a), which would be expected to disappear if the cleft grammaticalized into a monoclausal structure.

The verb in the Shona cleft clause bears the same morphology it would have in a relative clause (a floating low tone prefix for subject extraction and a \( \theta \)-agreeing prefix for non-subject extraction):

(10) Relative clause morphology in the cleft clause

a. Class 1a clefted subject
   
   Ndi-Ø-Tendai _____ \( \{\vphantom{a}a/\vphantom{a}\}\)ka-teng-er-a Ø-Thandi [Shona]
   
   cop-1a-Tendai SE.1a.SM.REM.PST-buy-APPL.FV 1a-'Thandi
   
   Ø-rokwe.
   
   5-dress
   
   'It’s Tendai who bought Thandi a dress.' (2014-08-29-03-TD)

b. Class 5 clefted object
   
   I-Ø-rokwe ra-aka-teng-er-a Ø-Thandi _____ [Shona]
   
   cop-5-dress 5.NSE-1.SM.REM.PST-buy-APPL.FV 1a-'Thandi
   
   'It’s a dress that s/he bought Thandi.' (2014-09-06-02-TD)

c. Class 17 clefted locative adjunct
   
   Kú-chí-toro kwa-aka-teng-er-a Ø-Thandi [Shona]
   
   cop.17-7-store 17.NSE-1.SM.REM.PST-buy-APPL.FV 1a-'Thandi
   
   Ø-rokwe _____.
   
   5-dress
   
   'It’s at the store that s/he bought Thandi a dress.'
   
   (2014-08-04-01-TD)

Kiitharaka has no such morphological alternations in either relative clauses or focus constructions.\(^5\)

But even if it did, that would not necessitate a relative structure. Abels & Muriungi (2008) and Zentz (2011, 2015a) argue that these alternations could simply mark A′-movement in general rather than relativization specifically, so the test is inconclusive.

3.7 Fronted temporal modifiers

3.7.1 Kiitharaka

In the spirit of Schwarz’s (2003:78–82) argument from topicalization out of focus constructions in Kikuyu, Abels & Muriungi (2008) introduce a new diagnostic for the clause boundary.

If the focus construction were biclausal, then the fronting of the temporal modifier out of the focus construction in (11b) should be just as bad as fronting it out of the relative clause in (12b), contrary to fact.

(11) Temporal modifiers may be fronted out of a focus construction
   a. Temporal modifier within focus construction
   \[1-Ø-mwamba\] Peter a-ra-on-ir-e \(t_i\) 1.Peter 1.SM.REC.PST-SEE-PFV-FV
   \[i-goro\]. 5-yesterday
   ‘The thief Peter saw yesterday.’ (Abels & Muriungi 2008:725 (99a))
   b. Temporal modifier fronted out of focus construction
   \[1-goro\] \[i-Ø-mwamba\] Peter 1.Peter a-ra-on-ir-e \(t_i\) \(t_j\)
   1.SM.REC.PST-SEE-PFV-FV
   ‘Yesterday the thief Peter saw.’ (Abels & Muriungi 2008:725 (99a))

(12) Temporal modifiers may not be fronted out of a relative clause
   a. Temporal modifier within relative clause
   Borisi ba-ka-thaik-a \[RelCl\] mw-amba\(i\) û-ra 9-thief 9.nse-1.sm.rem.pst-see-fv
   \[RelCl\] 2.police 2.SM-FUT-arrest-fv 1-thief 1-that
   1.Peter a-ra-on-ir-e \(t_i\) \[i-goro\]. 5-yesterday
   ‘The police will arrest the thief that Peter saw yesterday.’
   (Abels & Muriungi 2008:725 (98a))
   b. Temporal modifier fronted out of relative clause
   \[Nezuro\] *boriisi ba-ka-thaik-a \[RelCl\] \[RelCl\]
   5-yesterday 2.police 2.SM-FUT-arrest-fv 1-thief 1-that
   1.Peter a-ra-on-ir-e \(t_i\).
   1.SM.REC.PST-SEE-PFV-FV
   ‘Yesterday the police will arrest the thief that Peter saw.’
   (Abels & Muriungi 2008:725 (98b))

Because of the contrast between (11b) and (12b), Abels & Muriungi (2008) argue against Harford’s (1997) claim that the Kîîtharaka prenominal focus construction is a biclausal cleft, instead positing that it is monoclausal.

3.7.2 Shona

In Shona, fronting the temporal modifier out of a focus construction is disallowed (13b), just like fronting it out of a relative clause (14b).

(13) Temporal modifiers may not be fronted out of a cleft clause
   a. Temporal modifier within cleft clause
   \[1-Ø-mbavha\] ya-aka-on-a \(t_i\) \[Nezuro\]. 5-yesterday
   ‘It’s a thief that s/he saw yesterday.’ (2015-04-14-02-TD)
   b. Temporal modifier fronted out of cleft clause
   \[Nezuro\] *i-Ø-mbavha\(i\) ya-aka-on-a \(t_i\) \(t_j\).
   ‘Yesterday it’s a thief that s/he saw.’ (2015-04-14-02-TD)

(14) Temporal modifiers may not be fronted out of a relative clause
   a. Temporal modifier within relative clause
   Ma-purisa a-cha-sung-a \[RelCl\] Æ-mbavha\(i\) ya-aka-on-a \(t_i\) \[Nezuro\].
   ‘The police will arrest the thief that s/he saw yesterday.’
   (2015-04-14-02-TD)
   b. Temporal modifier fronted out of relative clause
   \[Nezuro\] *ma-purisa a-cha-sung-a \[RelCl\] Æ-mbavha\(i\)
   ‘Yesterday the police will arrest the thief that s/he saw.’
   (2015-04-14-02-TD)
Given that Shona temporal modifier fronting is acceptable within a single clause (15b) but not across even a simple declarative clause boundary (16b), the unavailability of (13b) suggests that the focus construction is a biclausal cleft.

(15) Temporal modifiers may be fronted within a single clause
   a. No fronting of temporal modifier
      Aka-on-a Ø-mbavha ¥nezuro, 1.SM.REM.PST-see-fV 9-thief yesterday
      'S/he saw a thief yesterday.' (2015-04-14-02-TD)
   b. Fronting of temporal modifier
      [¥nezuro] i yesterday aka-on-a Ø-mbavha ti,
      1.SM.REM.PST-see-fV 9-thief
      'Yesterday s/he saw a thief.' (2015-04-14-02-TD)

(16) Temporal modifiers may not be fronted across clauses
   a. Temporal modifier within embedded clause
      Va-cha-ti [CP aka-on-a Ø-mbavha ¥nezuro], 2.SM.FUT-say 1.SM.REM.PST-see-fV 9-thief yesterday
      'They will say s/he saw a thief yesterday.' (2015-07-31-TD)
   b. Temporal modifier fronted out of embedded clause
      *[¥nezuro] i va-cha-ti [CP aka-on-a Ø-mbavha ti],
      2.SM.FUT-say 1.SM.REM.PST-see-fV
      9-thief
      'Yesterday they will say s/he saw a thief.' (2015-07-31-TD)

3.8 Summary of diagnostics

Most of the properties in Table 4 are not definitive diagnostics, as they could be consistent with either a monoclausal or biclausal structure. For Kîîtharaka, the fact that the focus marker appears on verbs and that temporal modifiers can be fronted out of the focus construction indicate that it is monoclausal. For Shona, the impossibility of a fronted temporal adjunct modifying the cleft clause points to a biclausal structure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Shona</th>
<th>Kiîtharaka</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cleft pronoun not required</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copula/focus marker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot bear subject marking or tense</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phonologically dependent</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphologically invariant</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate form in copular constructions</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May appear on verbs</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleft clause</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacks relative clause morphology</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In scope of fronted temporal modifier</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Properties of Shona and Kiîtharaka focus fronting (final)

4 Analysis

4.1 Kîîtharaka

For the monoclausal focus construction in Kiîtharaka, Abels & Muriungi (2008) propose that the focused phrase moves to a specifier position between two Focus heads in the left periphery:*

(17) Proposal for the Kiîtharaka prenominal focus construction (Abels & Muriungi 2008:719 (93))

They actually argue for three Focus heads; the subject moves to the specifier of the lowest of these heads. See the paper for further explanation.

*They actually argue for three Focus heads; the subject moves to the specifier of the lowest of these heads. See the paper for further explanation.
4.2 Shona

(18) Proposal for a Shona object cleft with a preverbal subject

\[
\text{CP} \quad \text{vP} \quad \text{DP} \\
\text{v} \quad \text{DP} \\
\text{cop} \quad \text{ForceP} \\
\text{D} \quad \text{ForceP} \\
\text{DP} \quad \text{TopP} \\
\text{object} \quad \text{Top} \\
\text{DP} \quad \text{YP} \\
\text{i} \quad \text{subject} \\
\text{DP} \quad \text{TP} \\
\text{Y} \quad \text{XP} \\
\text{XP} \quad \text{RM-XP} \\
\text{DP_{clrt}} \quad \text{DP_{cleft}} \\
\text{DP_{clrt}} \quad \text{DP_{cleft}} \\
\text{TP} \quad \text{MoodP} \\
\text{L-} \quad \text{T} \\
\text{DP} \quad \text{TP} \\
\text{pro} \quad \text{SM} \\
\text{V-fv...DP_{clrt}}
\]

Key points:
- Shona lacks a FocusP in the left periphery.
- Shona focus licensing happens in the semantics; in order for a focused phrase to be licensed, it must be within a vP (Zentz in prep: ch. 2).
- This leaves two possible structural positions for focused phrases:
  - In situ, within the lowest vP
  - Ex situ, but only if there is a higher v, hence the biclausal cleft
- Raising analysis of the relative clause due to reconstruction facts (Zentz 2015b, Zentz in prep: ch. 3)
- The copular clause has no inflectional layer, blocking tense, negation, and subject marking.

4.3 Topicalization and the biclausal cleft

In both Kîîtharaka and Shona, ex-situ wh-phrases must appear in the focus/cleft constructions discussed above. Kîîtharaka has an ex-situ wh-question strategy that Muriungi (2003, 2011) dubs "intermediate" because the wh-phrase stands between the subject and the verb (19a). He analyzes this as clause-bounded topicalization of the subject to the SpecTopP above the focused wh-phrase in SpecFocP, patterning with (19b).

(19) a. Subject may be topicalized above focus-marked wh-phrase [Kîîtharaka]

\[
\text{Nazario} \quad \text{i-mbi} \quad \text{a-gûr-ir-e} \quad \text{ti}\
\text{Nazario} \quad \text{foc-what} \quad \text{1SM-buy-PFV-PFV}\
\text{1SM-bius-pfv-fv}
\]

"Nazario, what did he buy?" (Muriungi 2003:86 (5a))

b. Subject may be topicalized above focus-marked direct object

\[
\text{Î⁻buku} \quad \text{5-book} \quad \text{i-Maria} \quad \text{foc-1.Maria} \quad \text{a-gûr-î-îr-e} \quad \text{1.sm-buy-appl-pfv-fv} \quad \text{mw-arîmû}.
\]

"The book, Maria bought (it) for the teacher." (Abels & Muriungi 2008:692 (7a))

In my analysis, Shona clefted wh-phrases are in the highest specifier of the cleft clause. Given the behavior of the temporal modifiers in (13–16), we might imagine that topicalization of the subject to a position higher than that would be impossible, making the Shona counterpart of (19a) ungrammatical.

(20) Subject may be topicalized above clefted wh-phrase [Shona]

\[
\text{Ø-Shumba} \quad \text{ndi-Ø-ani} \quad \text{wa-y-a-nanzv-a} \quad \text{ti}\
\text{9-lion} \quad \text{cop-1a-who} \quad \text{1a.nse-9.sm-rem.pst-lick-fv}
\]

"The lion, who is it that it licked?" (2015-07-31-TD)

However, this sentence is acceptable, suggesting that in Shona temporal modification is clause-bounded but topicalization is not. This is corroborated by the fact that the entire TopP may remnant-move to a SpecTopP in the matrix (copular) clause, leaving the cleft phrase pronounced at the end of the sentence, as argued by Letsholo (2007) for the closely related Ikalanga.

5 Conclusion

Shona’s cleft has not grammaticalized away from its biclausal structure, in contrast to the monoclausal focus construction in Kîîtharaka.
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