

Focalization in Musey

Brahim Adam¹

¹ University of Maroua

Received: 12 September 2021 Accepted: 3 October 2021 Published: 15 October 2021

Abstract

In this paper, we tackle the focalization in musey language. We analyze musey data in terms of Kayne's (1994) Antisymmetry. We uncover two focusing strategies (à la clause final comp and clause initial comp): the one sets the focused constituent at the end of the clause and the other moves the focused constituent to the beginning of the clause. In the focalization à la clause final comp, we observe two movements. The first moves the focused constituent from its initial position to the Specifier of the Focus Phrase. The second brings the rest of the clause to the Specifier of the Cleft Phrase. As regards the focalization à la clause initial comp, we observe one movement which goes from the initial position of focused constituent to the Specifier of the Focus Phrase.

Index terms— focalization, musey, antisymmetry, focus phrase, cleft phrase.

1 Introduction

Since Chomsky (1973, Chomsky (1977, Chomsky (1986a)), it is known that some syntactic constituents move from their initial position to a higher position. For example, Chomsky (1986) indicates that when a head is merged, movement into its specifier is obligatory. It is observed that movement goes always to the left. Kayne (1994) maintains that all movement must be leftward. It is what is known as Antisymmetry. This viewpoint was based on Indo-European languages analysis: English and Italian. However, some African languages seem to reject the left condition. Some moved constituents are rightward at the surface structure. For example, we can notice musgum language in which focused constituents and negation markers occupy the end of the clause (Brahim, 2018 and 2021). We want to analyze the focalization in musey language which is spoken in Chad and Cameroon. The main question is to know whether the musey focusing strategies allow for Kayne's (1994) left condition. We organize this work in four sections. The first section is interested in musey language family and words order. The second section tackles the focalization. The third section studies features checking and movement triggers. The last section approaches the semantic contents of functional heads.

2 a) Musey Language Family and Words Order

Musey is a chadic language from afro-asiatic family. Its words order is SVO:

(1) Sinà u viná zúm zoyrà.

Dog and monkey plow + perf. groundnuts "The dog and the monkey plowed groundnuts."

In this structure, we have the subject sinà u viná (the dog and the monkey), the verb zúm (plowed) and the object zoyrà (groundnuts).

3 b) Focalization

Let us consider the following musey basic structure:

(2) Aikomu hí É?"usla ma? Sukasya ká'à. Aikomu give + perf. cow to Sukasya yesterday "Aikomu gave a cow to Sukasya yesterday."

This sentence has the subject Aikomu, the verb hí (gave), the direct object É?"usla (a cow), the indirect object ma? Sukasya (to Sukasya) and time circumstantial complement ká'à (yesterday). Excepting the verb, all the other functions can be focalized.

4 i. Focalization à la clause final comp

This focusing strategy brings the focused constituent at the end of the clause. Let us observe the following structures:

(3) a.

Give + perf. cow to Sukasya yesterday Foc Aikomu In the first structure (3a), the focused constituent is Aikomu. It is preceded by focus marker ni. The focused constituent concludes the clause. In the second structure (3b), the focused constituent is É?"usla (a cow). It is also preceded by focus marker ni. Focused constituent closes the clause. In the following structure (3c), we focalize the prepositional phrase ma? Sukasya (to Sukasya). It is preceded by the focus marker ni. In the last structure (3d), the focused constituent is the verb ká'à (yesterday). It is preceded by the focus marker ni and ends the clause.

We notice that one of the focusing strategies in musey language moves constituents from their basic positions to the end of the clause. The focused constituents occupy a low position. This fact seems to reject ??ayne's (1994: 4) Antisymmetry Condition:

If syntactic theory allowed lowering a phrase to a position ccommanded by the original position, such movement would have to be rightward. If lowerings are not available at all, as ??homsy's (1993) proposals would lead one to expect then that possibility can be set aside.

Then, ??ayne (1994: 4) defends the "Antisymmetric prohibition against right-hand specifiers": "All movement must be leftward".

As from this fact, we can think that in the surface structure, the focused constituent occupies a low position but in the deep structure, it is a high position. Let us observe the following tree representation of (3a): Foc° IP [+Foc] Spec I' [+EPP] I° VP V' AdvP V' PP Adv°V ' NP V° N°N i Aikomu

5 It is Aikomu

We notice that the focus marker ni (it is) is generated in the Cleft Phrase (CleftP) head. This fact can be accounted for by Koopman (2000), Biloa (2012b) and Brahim (2018) viewpoints. Koopman (2000) suggests that if the Focus Phrase cannot accommodate the focus marker or if the focus marker precedes the focus constituent, it occupies a higher position that she calls: YP. Biloa (2012b) and Brahim (2018) state that this position is Cleft Phrase (CleftP).

The focused constituent Aikomu moves from Spec-IP position to Spec-Foc. FocP head is only endowed with implicit features [+Foc] and ??+EPP]. After the first movement of the focused constituent, IP goes to Spec-Cleft. It is what is known in the literature as heavy pied-piping (see Nkemnji, 1995). This latter raising movement is called remnant movement (den ??esten and Webelhut, 1987; Cecchetto, 2004).

The focusing strategy à la clause final comp is not specific to musey language. It is found in musgum, another Chadic language mainly spoken in Cameroon and Chad:

(5) À sà yém gíná á Sali SM drink + perf. water today Foc Sali . ??Brahim, 2018:195 In the first structure (6a), the focused constituent is Aikomu. It is preceded by focus marker ni (it is). We notice that the focused constituent is at the beginning of the sentence. In the second structure (6b), the focused constituent is É?"usla (a cow). It is preceded by ni and begins the sentence. In the following structure (6c), the focused constituent is the Preposition Phrase ma? Sukasya (to Sukasya). It is preceded by focus marker ni and starts the sentence. In the last structure (6d), the focused constituent is ká'à (yesterday). It is preceded by focus marker ni and also begins the clause.

In the focusing strategy à la clause initial comp, the focused constituent moves from its initial position to a higher position. It occupies Spec-Foc as follows:

This diagram represents (6a). We notice that what we call focus marker occupies the head of CleftP seeing that it precedes the focused constituent. The focused constituent Aikomu moves from Spec-IP to Spec-Foc. FocP head is endowed with implicit features [+Foc] and [+EPP].

In the focalization à la clause initial comp, we have one movement which raises focused constituent to Spec-FocP. It apparently respects the Left Condition of Kayne (1994).

6 c) Features Checking and Movement Triggers

We previously indicated that the focused constituent à la clause final comp occupies Spec-FocP. We also show that the focused constituent à la clause initial comp occupies the same position. The focused constituent goes to this position by the focalization.

7 Ni Aikomu

In the diagram, we notice that Foc and EPP in Foc head attract focused constituent to Spec-FocP.

[Foc] and [EPP] are crossed out when this condition is satisfied. Thus, we can say that in (4)', Aikomu moves from Spec-IP to Spec-FocP. The condition of [Foc] and [EPP] features is satisfied. That is why they are crossed out as it is indicated in (4)'.

In the focalization à la clause initial comp in mosey, the focused constituent goes to Spec-FocP. But, there is not remnant movement. Let us re-observe (6a) and (??). We also notice that in the focalization à la clause initial comp, [Foc] and [EPP] features trigger the focalization of the subject position Aikomu.

8 d) Semantic Contents of Functional Heads

In both focusing strategies (à la clause final comp and clause initial comp) in mosey language, the focus marker ni precedes focus constituent. Since it precedes, it moves to a higher position: CleftP-Cleft. The focused constituent occupies Spec-FocP. We identify two functional heads: FocP and CleftP. Which are the semantic contents of these functional heads?

In fact, Rizzi and Cinque (2016: 139-157) indicate that the functional elements make up the functional lexicon and they partake in the triggering of syntactic actions: "Functional heads endowed with the appropriate morphosyntactic features trigger syntactic actions" (Rizzi and Cinque, 2016: 141).

As for Rizzi and Cinque (2016: 143), "functional structures are richly articulated objects". Their heads are endowed with semantic contents. After analyzing Italian, Rizzi and Bocci (2015) bring out a functional sequence in which the criterial positions have a specific order within the Complementizer domain.

As we say, the focusing strategies analysis in mosey language revealed the existence of two functional projections in the complementizer field: FocP and CleftP. FocP is already uncovered by Rizzi (1997). CleftP is relatively recent in the specialized literature. Biloa (2012b), for example, talked about it. At the internal interface with meaning, functional heads express how their specifier and complement must be interpreted. Let us comment both heads:

. Foc. In mosey language, Foc can express new information focus or corrective focus. The focused constituent occupies Spec-FocP. The movement is triggered by [Foc] and [EPP] features that are not expressed phonetically by material element.

. Cleft. In mosey language, CleftP head precedes FocP. The interpretation of clause is such that it is the element in Cleft head that is in fact Foc head. CleftP precedes FocP when the focus marker precedes the focused constituent.

In focusing strategy à la clause final comp, when the focused constituent merges to Spec-FocP, the rest of the clause is massively pied-piped to Spec-CleftP. Whereas in focusing strategy à la clause initial comp, remnant movement of the rest of the clause does not exist. We also notice that in the focalization à la clause initial comp, [Foc] and [EPP] features trigger the focalization of the subject position Aikomu.

9 e) Semantic Contents of Functional Heads

In both focusing strategies (à la clause final comp and clause initial comp) in mosey language, the focus marker ni precedes focus constituent. Since it precedes, it moves to a higher position: CleftP-Cleft. The focused constituent occupies Spec-FocP. We identify two functional heads: FocP and CleftP. Which are the semantic contents of these functional heads?

In fact, Rizzi and Cinque (2016: 139-157) indicate that the functional elements make up the functional lexicon and they partake in the triggering of syntactic actions: "Functional heads endowed with the appropriate morphosyntactic features trigger syntactic actions" (Rizzi and Cinque, 2016: 141).

As for Rizzi and Cinque (2016: 143), "functional structures are richly articulated objects". Their heads are endowed with semantic contents. After analyzing Italian, Rizzi and Bocci (2015) bring out a functional sequence in which the criterial positions have a specific order within the Complementizer domain.

As we say, the focusing strategies analysis in mosey language revealed the existence of two functional projections in the complementizer field: FocP and CleftP. FocP is already uncovered by Rizzi (1997). CleftP is relatively recent in the specialized literature. Biloa (2012b), for example, talked about it. At the internal interface with meaning, functional heads express how their specifier and complement must be interpreted. Let us comment both heads: . Foc. In mosey language, Foc can express new information focus or corrective focus. The focused



Figure 1:

				(10a))
"It is Sali who drank water today."				
ii. (6) a. Ni Aikomu	hí	É?"usla ma?	Sukasya	ká.
Foc Aikomu	give + perf. cow to	Sukasya	yesterday	
d. Ni	ká'àAikomu	hí	É?"usla ma?	Sukasya .
Foc yesterday Aikomu	give + perf. cow		to Sukasya	

[Note: "It is Aikomu who gave a cow to Sukasya yesterday." b. Ni É?"usla Aikomu hí Foc cow Aikomu give + perf. to Sukasya yesterday ma? Sukasya ká'à. "It is a cow that Aikomu gave to Sukasya yesterday." c. Ni ma? Sukasya Aikomu hí É?"usla Foc to Sukasya Aikomu give + perf. cow yesterday ká'à. "It is to Sukasya that Aikomu gave a cow yesterday." "It is yesterday that Aikomu gave a cow to Sukasya."]

Figure 2:

Year 2021 constituent occupies Spec-FocP. The movement is triggered by ??Foc] and ??EPP] features that are not expressed phonetically by material element.

. Cleft. In mosey language, CleftP head precedes FocP. The interpretation of clause is such that it is the element in Cleft head that is in fact Foc head. CleftP precedes FocP when the focus marker precedes the focused constituent.

In focusing strategy à la clause final comp, when the focused constituent merges to Spec-FocP, the rest of the clause is massively pied-piped to Spec-CleftP. ??hereas In the first structure, we talk about Aikomu who is known. Meanwhile in the second structure, we suppose that there are persons whose name is Aikomu. We identify one we talk about. The complement of Cleft should be interpreted as focus.

.1 II.

.2 Conclusion

There are two focusing strategies in musey language: à la clause final comp and clause initial comp. the one sets the focused constituent at the end of the clause and the other moves the focused constituent to the beginning of the clause. In the focalization à la clause final comp, we observe two movements. The first moves the focused constituent from its initial position to the Specifier of the Focus Phrase. The second brings the rest of the clause to the Specifier of the Cleft Phrase. As regards the focalization à la clause initial comp, we observe one movement which goes from the initial position of focused constituent to the Specifier of the Focus Phrase. The focused constituent is attracted by Focus Phrase head for checking [Foc] and [EPP] features. So, these features trigger the movement of the focused constituent. We bring out two functional heads: Foc and Cleft. Both heads have semantic contents: Foc expresses new information focus and corrective focus; Cleft should be interpreted as focus.

This research concerning musey language enriches the theories about the movement. It shows that the movement is leftward. Deep structure analyzing is important for identifying the real direction of the movement. The study of more African languages can be important for explaining movement theory.

[Chomsky ()] , N Chomsky . 1986a. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

[Chomsky ()] 'Conditions on transformations'. N Chomsky . *Festschrift for Morris Halle*, S Anderson, P Kiparsky (ed.) (New-York) 1973. Reinhart and Winston. p. .

[Rizzi (ed.) ()] *Elements of Grammar, Handbook of Generative Syntax*, L Rizzi . Haegeman L. (ed.) 1997. Dordrecht: Kluwer. p. . (The fine structure of the left periphery)

[Rizzi and Cinque ()] 'Functional Categories and Syntactic Theory'. L Rizzi , Cinque . *Annual Review of Linguistics* 2016. 2 (1) p. .

[Nkemnji ()] *Heavy Pied-Piping in Nweh*, M Nkemnji . 1995. Los Angeles. University of California (Ph.D. dissertation)

[Brahim ()] *La syntaxe generative du musgum*, A Brahim . 2018. Université de Ngaoundéré. Cameroon (Thèse de doctorat)

[Rizzi and Bocci ()] 'Left Periphery of the Clause'. L Rizzi , Bocci . *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Syntax*, 2015.

[Brahim ()] 'Negation in musgum'. A Brahim . *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation* 2021. p. .

[Chomsky (ed.) ()] *On wh-movement*, N Chomsky . Culicover, P. W. et al. eds. Formal syntax (ed.) 1977. p. .

[Cecchetto ()] 'Remnant Movement in the Theory of Phases'. C Cecchetto . *The Structure of CP and IP*, L Rizzi (ed.) (Oxford) 2004. Oxford University Press. p. .

[Besten et al. ()] *Remnant topicalization and the constituent structure of VP in the Germanic SVO languages*, H Besten , Den & G , Webelhuth . 1987. GLOW Newsletter. 18 p. .

[Kayne ()] *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*, R Kayne . 1994. Cambridge/Mass: MIT Press.

[Koopman (ed.) ()] *The syntax of specifiers and heads. Collected essays of*, H Koopman . Hilda J. Koopman (ed.) 2000. New-York: Routledge.

[Bilola ()] *Wh-phrases, sentence mood and the structure of the left periphery*, E Bilola . 2012b. Ms. University of Yaoundé I. Cameroon