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This paper uses the concept of discourse cohesion as a basis for looking at certain sentence emphasis patterns in Pulaar (Fula). In particular, four patterns of focus are examined, first syntactically and then pragmatically. Focus in Pulaar can be divided according to clefting and pseudo-clefting patterns for subject and non-subject focus. These four patterns are discussed in depth. Then, I suggest that the idea of discourse connectedness provides a model for explaining the choice of a focus pattern in a given environment. Examples of this are drawn from a transcription of the story of Gelaajo Ham Bodeejo, performed by Mammadu Non Gliise, a griot from northern Senegal.

1. Introduction

Linguistic literature in recent years has been full of references to the pragmatic concept of sentence emphasis. This paper looks at the feature of [+focus] in Pulaar as one special type of sentence emphasis in that language. Drawing from theoretical work in pragmatics, functional sentence perspective, and discourse analysis, I will move from a discussion of the shape of non-verb focus in Pulaar to a discussion of the use of focus in a Pulaar text. Language is viewed as a text-forming, cohesive phenomenon in which certain features, emphasis being one of them, must be studied in a context or environment. I will discuss first the syntactic rules (insertion

---

1 Pulaar is a language of the West Atlantic branch of Niger-Congo. It is spoken throughout the West African sahel. It is known as Fulfulde in all dialects spoken from Mali eastward. (In the literature it is most commonly referred to as "Fula", "Fulani", or "Peul".) The particular dialect under consideration here is that of the Haalpulaar'en (or "Toucouleur") in northern Senegal.

2 This article is based upon research carried out in Senegal from 1976-1981 for a doctoral dissertation. The text examples which are used in this paper come from a transcription of the narrative of Gelaajo Ham Bodeejo. This text, of roughly 500 lines, is included in the appendix of the dissertation. (See bibliography.)
rules, deletion rules, movement rules, copying rules, etc.) which mark the feature of focus in Pulaar. And then I will discuss some of the semantic implications of and pragmatic reasons for the use of emphasis, and for the choice of one emphatic pattern over another in a given context. Throughout I am indebted to the distinction which Givón [1979:32] draws between "categorial" rules and "strategy" rules. According to him:

"The human communicator is not a deterministic user of an autonomous, subconscious grammar as Chomsky would have us believe. Rather, he makes communicative choices. He uses rules of grammar for a communicative effect."

The following discussion should bring out both the categorial rules of focus in Pulaar, and some of the strategy "rules" (or reasons) for its use. We will look at both the shape or form of non-verb focus, as well as the possible rules governing the choice to use or not to use focus. And when it is used, we will examine the factors determining the choice of one focus pattern from four possibilities.

2. The Shape of Focus

Semantically, I am taking "focus" to mean a sentence which has a marked assertion which contrasts with its presupposition. In Pulaar, focus can first be divided into two types: verb focus and non-verb focus. Verb focus is achieved through the use of a special set of suffixes replacing the tense-aspect-mood markers, and will not be considered here. Non-verb focus is achieved through the addition of the focusing particle ko to a

---

3The particle ko carries a very heavy load in this particular dialect. (It is interesting to note that it has dropped many or most of these functions in the eastern dialects, including its function as a marker of emphasis or focus.) Among its most important functions are: 1) as the copula joining two nominals in a relationship of equivalency, identity, location, or role, 2) as the "presentative" marker ('it is...') followed by a nominal, 3) as the relative pronominal equivalent to the English 'what', 4) as the interrogative question word equivalent to "what?", 5) as the complementizer before an S-complement. It can also take several idiomatic roles and meanings.
neutral sentence with the incumbent morpho-syntactic changes which accompany ko insertion. The use of the emphatic particle ko activates three additional focus features, which may be optional or obligatory. These include: 1) a change in the neutral SVO word order (optional), 2) the use of the relative (dependent or consecutive) verb form (obligatory), and 3) a non-clitic pronoun or NP from the independent series of pronominals (either emphatic, deictic, or referential) when the NP is in focus (obligatory).

There are four patterns of ko insertion, two being used for subject focus and two for non-subject focus. As we shall see, these result in two cleft patterns and two pseudo-cleft patterns, distinguished in Pulaar by the position of ko and/or the focused NP. These four patterns are variants of a neutral sentence. If we take the following neutral SVO sentence:

(1) a. a wallli mo 'you helped him'
   you have-helped him
   S V 0
   clitic

it can be permuted in the following four ways:

PATTERN 1 - Subject focus through clefting

(1) b. ko aan wallli mo 'it is you who helped him'
   it-is you help him
   FOCUS S V 0
   emphatic relative

This sentence pattern could be formulated as follows. (The parentheses indicate something which is syntactically, though not pragmatically, optional. The forms which the pronominal and verb may take are listed below each symbol. The X represented all non-subjects.)

---

4The following discussion is based upon the assumption that there is a distinction between a neutral sentence and a sentence with a morpho-syntactic marker for emphasis. I take the following two features as indicative of a neutral sentence pattern in Pulaar: 1) that it take the word order (Ad)SVO(Ad), and 2) that at least the first verb takes as its tense-aspect-mood marker or suffix an independent morpheme, rather than a consecutive or relative form.
PATTERN 1: \((\text{ko } S V (X)\)  
- emphatic  relative  
- deictic  referential  nominal

PATTERN 2 - **Subject focus through pseudo-clefting**

(1) c. mo walli mo ko aan 'the one who helped him was you'  
  he-who help him it-is you  
  S COPY V 0 FOCUS S  
  REL PRO relative emphatic

Expressed in a formula, we get:

PATTERN 2: \(S V (X) ko S\)  
- relative copy relative  
- pronoun deictic referential nominal

PATTERN 3 - **Non-subject focus through clefting**

(1) d. ko kaŋko mba’llu -daa 'it is he whom you helped'  
  it-is him help you  
  FOCUS 0 V S  
  emphatic relative postposed clitic

The formula for this pattern is a bit more complex because the order of subject and verb depends upon the person, a regular feature in the relative verb forms. Basically, first and second person subject clitics follow the verb, while the third person clitics precede. This fact is indicated by the symbol \(S-V\).

PATTERN 3: \((\text{ko } X S-V\)  
- emphatic relative  
- deictic referential nominal

PATTERN 4 - **Non-subject focus through pseudo-clefting**

(1) e. mba’llu -daa ko kaŋko 'whom you helped was him'  
  help you it-is him  
  V S FOCUS 0  
  relative postposed clitic emphatic
Or we can formulate this pattern as:

\[ S-V \]

PATTERN 4: \[ V-S \quad ko \quad X \]

relative  
emphatic  
deictic  
referential  
 nominal

These four patterns illustrate the four primary syntactic forms which focus can take. In order to correctly interpret the above patterns, notice the following features. First, the concept of non-verb focus hinges upon the introduction of the particle ko into the neutral sentence. However, ko in S-initial position is optional syntactically and may be deleted. In a focused sentence, ko deletion has no impact upon the syntax of the sentence itself. The syntactic adjustments related to the use of ko as a particle of emphasis remain (i.e. a focused pronominal cannot be a clitic and the verb must take the relative form). Whether or not it is deleted seems to be a communicative choice, not a syntactic one. Statistically, ko is deleted in a minority of cases, and usually in a context where several focused sentences follow one upon the other, the first one using ko while the others delete it.

However, ko deletion does not apply to anything but S-initial position. Within the sentence, ko must appear. For example:

(2) a. ko aan walli mo 'it is you who helped him'
   b. \( \emptyset \) aan walli mo 'it is you who helped him'
   c. mballu-daa ko kaŋko 'who you helped was him'
   d. *mballu-daa \( \emptyset \) kaŋko

The final example in the series is incorrect because ko in that position cannot be deleted. To generalize, one could say that ko is optional in cleft sentences, but obligatory in pseudo-clefts.

Secondly, for the non-verb focus patterns, the relevant NP's can be divided into subject (marked by S) and non-subject (marked by X). That is we can talk about patterns of subject focus and patterns of non-subject focus. And any NP in the sentence may be focused upon in both a cleft
(S-initial) and pseudo-cleft (S-final) pattern.

Third, the word order of the subject and verb in a focus sentence depends upon person. This is marked by the patterns S-V and V-S. Whenever the relative verb form is used, it is marked by a combination of verbal suffixes and the position (and form) of the subject clitic. In a relative or dependent verb form, the first and second person subject clitics follow the verb. However, the third person clitics, as well as the first person plural exclusive pronoun, precede it.

Fourth, a clitic pronoun can never be the NP in focus. The NP in focus must be either a full nominal, or one of the three independent forms—the emphatic, deictic, or referential pronouns. These pronominal forms can function similarly to full nominals in a variety of syntactic environments in Pulaar, focusing being one of them.

Finally, notice that pattern 2 depends upon a pronominal copy which holds the place of the focused subject, now shifted to S-final position. The copy is a relative pronoun. This particular pattern is used very rarely, perhaps because shifting the focused NP out of S-initial position into S-final position is not congruent with the function of focus. Focusing and S-initial position seem to be features which support each other. When it is a S-final non-subject which is focused upon, it can be left in it normal S-final position, or it can be frontshifted to S-initial position. But to consciously shift an S-initial subject into S-final position when it is the NP in focus, as a pragmatically ambiguous operation, requires an additional syntactic rule of pronominal copying. The place of the backshifted subject must be held by a pronominal copy of the subject, which now appears in S-final (or pseudo-cleft) position. As was already mentioned, this strategy for focusing is very rarely used in spontaneous speech.

The features relevant to non-verb focus in Pulaar can be summarized in Table 1. Patterns 1 and 2 have in common the fact that they both focus upon subjects, while 3 and 4 focus upon non-subjects. However, patterns 1 and 3 are similar in that they are both clefting patterns, whereas 2 and 4 are pseudo-clefts.
Table 1. Non-verb focus in Pulaar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern 1</th>
<th>Pattern 2</th>
<th>Pattern 3</th>
<th>Pattern 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ko in S-initial position</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clefting pattern</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ko in S-final position</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pseudo-clefting pattern</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>optional ko deletion</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subject focused</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-subject focused</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relative verb form used</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-clitic pronominal in focus position</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>word order changed</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frontshifting change</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>backshifting change</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pronominal place-holder</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asserted NP is S-initial</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asserted NP is S-final</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The feature of [+focus] as discussed above has been captured by the rule of ko insertion. That rule states that any NP of a sentence may be brought into focus through the addition of the focusing particle ko, plus some combination of the following three "rules":

(i) a movement rule: It is common to find the focused non-subject promoted to S-initial position (PATTERN 3). It is less common but still possible to find a focused subject demoted to S-final position (PATTERN 2). In that case, a special pronominal copying rule also applies.
(ii) a deletion rule: Whenever ko occurs in S-initial position it may optionally be deleted. Rules for the application of this feature are probably pragmatic, rather than syntactic. This applies to PATTERN 1 and PATTERN 3. Any application of rule (1) or rule (3) that applied before ko was deleted is maintained.

(iii) an agreement rule: The use of ko calls for two types of agreement rules: a) the use of the relative verb form, and b) the use of a non-clitic pronoun in focused position (either a full nominal or an independent pronoun).

The application of these rules is summarized in the following table.

| Pattern 1: | Pattern 2: | Pattern 3: | Pattern 4: |
| (subject) | (subject) | (non-subject) | (non-subject) |
| (cleft) | (pseudo-cleft) | (cleft) | (pseudo-cleft) |
| Movement rule | Deletion rule | Agreement rules | verb / pronoun |
| X | X | X |
| X | X | X |
| X | X | X | X |
| X | X | X |

The differing degrees of syntactic complexity between the four patterns become evident in this last chart. But it also should be clear that each pattern depends upon the manipulation of the same basic features. Only pattern 2, a statistically uncommon pattern, makes use of an additional syntactic operation.

3. The Pragmatic Features Governing the Choice of [+focus]

The above discussion has been primarily interested in the syntactic features of focus. According to the definition quoted earlier by Givón
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[1979], these were largely *categorial rules*—the 100% rules applied for grammatical "correctness". However, the question of *strategy rules* also came up. For example, the question of optional ko deletion was left to possible pragmatic factors.

In this section, I will take up the question of pragmatic features by trying to determine what differentiates between the two possible patterns of non-subject focus. In other words, when would one choose pattern 3, and when pattern 4 in a discourse situation? What I should like to determine is the distributional range of the two following sentences:

**PATTERN 3:** ko kəŋko mballu-ɗaa 'it is he whom you helped'
and:

**PATTERN 4:** mballu-ɗaa ko kəŋko 'whom you helped was he'

Both have focus marked by ko. Both focus upon the non-subject—in this case the object mo (him/her) represented here by the emphatic pronoun kəŋko. But I would like to suggest that their distribution within a text would not be the same.

Too much of the literature on focus (and topic) has been confused by attempts at a static, "semantic" definition of the focused NP as the "new" or "unknown" element being asserted in an uncontextualized sentence. This has led to definitions of the following sort:

"While *theme* is the given point of departure, *focus* is new information in the sense that it is textually and situationally nonderivable, nonanaphoric, although not necessarily factually new information" (Justus [1976:219].)

or:

5Theoretically, one should be able to draw the same distributions between patterns 1 and 2, differentiating the patterns of subject focus. However, after transcribing several hundred pages of various texts, I did not find a sufficient number of sentences using pattern 2 (which "demotes" the focused NP to S-final position) to draw any conclusions. And the text of *Gelaajo Ham Bodeejo*, which provides the basis of evidence for this paper, does not use this pattern even once.
"I use 'topic' to refer to a major constituent...that is usually in sentence-initial position, and that expresses known, given information...In contrast, I use 'focus' to refer to a major constituent carrying new information..." (McIntosh [n.d.:19]).

There seems to be some confusion over the idea of focus as being "new" and therefore "nonderivable". As we shall see shortly, focus in Pulaar may be derivable from either what precedes or what follows, depending upon whether it is a cleft or a pseudo-cleft pattern.

If we use the new/old information model, we immediately run into difficulties on the level of discourse. A focus sentence is not an entity in isolation with something in it presupposed and something else asserted, as so many of these definitions limited to the intrinsic value of the focused NP would have us assume. A focus sentence is one which is marked as having a special discourse function. The reason for choosing to use focus certainly has more to do with the needs of the discourse and the communicative choices open to the speaker than this static portrayal of its component parts would have us believe. After all, sentence emphasis is a preeminently contextualized phenomenon. It occurs within a larger context to meet the needs of that context--or more precisely, the needs of communicating within a speech context.

It seems to me that the pragmatic value of a focus sentence is less adequately defined by emphasizing the supposed nature (new/old, thematic/rhematic, known/unknown) of the focused NP itself, than by visualizing the environment in which the two types of focus patterns (cleft or pseudo-cleft) can occur, and marking the connections between them. Hetzron [1975:348] comes to the point with this simple definition:

"With Jesperson [1924:145] I feel that the "new information" is not always contained in the predicate (this term being used here in a sense equivalent to 'rheme'), but it is always inherent in the connexion of the two elements - the fact that these two elements are put together. At issue is not the novelty of the element, but what the speaker intends to build up in the discourse."

In this section, we are talking less about categorial rules and more about
strategy rules for effective communication. That is, rules or generalizations which can help to predict and understand communication choices when a language is actually in use. And generally speaking, with strategy rules we are probably always talking about "degrees of adequacy", rather than any grammatical absolutes measured as "correct" or "incorrect". The first definitions offered above I find inadequate to a number of situations when reading a Pulaar text. Whereas I find a much higher degree of adequacy—a higher degree of predictability and a less complicated model for describing—in the following definition offered by Hetzron [1975:364]:

"Both constructions, cleft and cataphora [or pseudo-cleft] are instances of focusing (mise en relief) which elevate the communicational importance of an element above the level of the rest of the sentence. Yet the motivation for such focusing may be varied. When an element is focused because it fills a gap in previous knowledge, it is brought forward in a cleft construction or another type of emphatic construction. When the focusing is necessary for paving the way for later use of the same element in the discourse or for a pragmatic reaction, the cataphoric construction that moves the focused element to the end of the sentence is created."

That is to say, there is a relationship implied and established by a focus construction. That relationship may either go backwards or forwards in the discourse. It is that relationship which is the essence of a focus construction. It is that relationship which determines the choice, in English, between an it-cleft and a Wh-pseudo-cleft (see Prince [1978]). And as we shall see, in Pulaar it is that relationship which determines the choice between pattern 3 and pattern 4.

In fact, I would like to present a simple hypothesis about the use of these two patterns which is related to the position of the asserted NP. It is simply this: that in Pulaar an asserted NP is brought forward in the sentence when it is "connected" to something which has preceded it in the discourse, whereas the asserted element is postposed if it is connected to something which is still to come. Frontshifting or backshifting are simply factors in the larger backward or forward connection.

This very simple model for explaining the choice may, of course, be
elaborated upon with more "semantic" explanations. Obviously, when the connection runs between the focus sentence and something which follows in the discourse, the focus sentence in its entirety is probably introducing something new which is now picked up upon in the following discourse. Thus the definitions "new", or "theme", or even "introduction" could be tacked onto this focused sentence. And when the focus sentence comes in final position after a flow of discourse, connecting the focused piece with what has preceded, the entire focus sentence could be called "old" or "given", or even a "summary" of what came before. But these definitions must consider the total focus sentence and its environment, not simply the focused NP in an isolated sentence. Only then can these kinds of definitions and explanations of the focus function have a place.

Throughout the Pulaar narratives which I have transcribed to date, the forwards or backwards connection is generally marked by either: a) direct repetition of a lexical item, b) duplication of a given semantic range by two lexically distinct items, or c) pronominalization. These clear and easily observed syntactic features therefore become the primary means for identifying the direction of the connection; and thereby for explaining the choice between a cleft and a pseudo-cleft pattern. (Other features may of course exist to mark connection. However, the three markers listed above account for all the data collected so far.) Taking the text of Gelaajo Ham Bodéeko\(^6\) as a basis for testing the above hypothesis, I found that there was 100% correlation between the placement of ko (and/or the focused NP) and the direction of a clear connection with the other elements in the discourse for the thirty examples of non-subject focus occurring in the text. That is, as a model it explained and predicted the phenomenon every time.

In the following example from the story of Gelaajo, the focus sentence

---

\(^6\)This text, recited by Mammadu Êon Giise, a griot from northern Senegal (Hoore Fonde), is included at the end of my doctoral dissertation. It is roughly 500 lines in length, and includes numerous examples of focus in operation.
(using the particle ko 7) comes second. This sentence is an example of frontshifted non-subject focus (pattern 3). The placement of ko within the focused sentence is to the left. And the connection between the focused sentence and the larger discourse is also to the left, marked in this case by repetition.

(3) Sabu o wi'll ko o hirataa mi laarat golle makko.

because he said that he isn't-jealous I look-at deeds his
PERF. COMP. NEG.IMPERF. IMPERF.

Ko siisil golle makko ÿeewan -mi.
FOCUS OBJECT RELATIVE SUBJECT
IMPERFECT

'Because he said that he isn't/wouldn't be jealous, I am going to check on his actions. It is the reality of his actions (not just his words) which I am going to examine.'

The connection between these two sentences is indicated through repetition. Notice the direct repetition of golle makko 'his deeds, actions', which establishes a clear link between the sentences. Secondly, the semantically similar idea of 'to look at, examine' is given in two lexically distinct verbs, ÿeewa and laarat . The connection between the first non-focused sentence and the second sentence with the focused element in initial position is made twice; once through word-for-word repetition and once through the repetition of a semantic idea.

In the following example which illustrates the same set of relationships, all of the elements occur within one sentence which has two clauses. The second clause is a focus construction. Using pattern 3 again, it fronts an S-final non-subject to S-initial position.

---
7Notice that the first ko in (3) is the complementizer, not the focus particle.
(4) Fado pi-i maa-mi adan, ko ngoo pi-no-das Geelajo.  
shoe hit you I first it-is that hit you Geelajo  
RELA. O S FOCUS I.O. RELA. S D.O.  
PERF. PERF.  
'(The) shoe (which) I hit you (with) first, it is that (with which) you had hit Geelajo.'

This time, the connection is made both through repetition and pronominalization. The verb fi'a (realized in both cases in the form pi-i- meaning 'to hit' is repeated. Secondly, the nominal fado 'shoe' from the first clause is pronominally copied by the concordant class pronoun ngoo in the deictic form. The focused or asserted NP is brought forward, and the connection is drawn between the focus sentence and what has preceded, as my hypothesis would have predicted. In contrast, postponing the focused element is due to a connection between the focus sentence and something which follows in the discourse. Once again, there are several clear examples in the text of Geelajo Ham Bodeejo which use direct repetition and pronominalization to mark this feature.

(5) O yonta ko to debbo jeewo to. O raangani suudu  
he is-due-at it-is at wife first the he draw-towards room  
S FOCUS COMPLEMENT  
debbo jeewo o.  
of-wife first the  

'Where he is due is at his first wife's (room). He drew near his first wife's room.'

This passage introduces completely new material within the text where it occurs. Up to this point, the narrator has been concerned with the exploits of Geelajo in a far-off village. Suddenly, he now introduces Geelajo in his own home. Semantically, the focused sentence provides a certain amount of new material in a new setting, which makes what follows comprehensible. It introduces something new through a focus construction with the ko clause in S-final position. The repeated element shared by these two sentences is debbo jeewo o 'the first wife'. The focused non-subject NP remains to the right in the sentence, and it is connected by this repetition
One final example of this rightward connection appears in the text sentence:

(6) N\text{garnoo-mi ko yoptaade. Mi yo}\text{ptima pade de.}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
\text{came} & I \text{it-is to-get-revenge I got-revenge shoes the} \\
\text{REL}\text{A.} & \text{S FOCUS COMPLEMENT S PERF.} \\
\end{tabular}

'What I came (for) is revenge. I have avenged (the slap across the face with) the shoes.'

Here we find the idea of yo\text{ptoo 'to get revenge, to avenge'} repeated, once in the infinitive form and once in the perfect. Focus is to the right within the sentence, as is the discourse connection.

Marking the focus on the right in the above example connects it to what follows (on the right as well). That describes the inter-sentence relationships which we are observing here. Semantically, we can perhaps say now that the focused sentence is being used to introduce new materials into the narrative. The idea of revenge, which is the focused element, is mentioned here for the first time. However, while this might explain the "why" of focus, it does not explain why this particular pattern of focus is used, rather than another. The explanation involving discourse connectedness (\textit{cohesion}) does explain the choice of pseudo-clefting over clefting.

4. Conclusions

This paper has considered some of the basic features of focus, as one type of sentence emphasis, in Pulaar. It began with a look at four of the primary sentence patterns which can be identified syntactically as focus patterns. Each involved the introduction of the focusing particle ko. It became evident that the position of ko (or the focused clause in the case of ko deletion) is relevant to the interpretation of the patterns as cleft or pseudo-cleft. Both types of pattern can be applied to any NP in the sentence, but the NP's can be grouped as either subjects or non-subjects.

Secondly, I suggested an hypothesis which might account for the distri-
butional differences between the two common forms of non-subject focus patterns, one a cleft pattern and the other a pseudo-cleft. The hypothesis is simple: that a focused sentence is one which expresses connections in discourse, and that the type of focus sentence chosen depends upon the direction of the connection and the sentence-internal position of the ko clause. A focused NP in S-initial position is mirrored by a connection branching to the left. And a focused element in final position signals connections to the right. The semantic interpretations of these syntactic features may include readings such as "new", "old", "given", etc. But the model of connection is much simpler to use. Secondly, these semantic definitions must apply to the entire focus sentence and its role in the discourse, not simply to the component parts of the focus construction. Finally, these definitions may be able to explain the feature of [+focus] in the sentence, but they are not adequate for explaining the choice between a clefting pattern (patterns 1 and 3) and a pseudo-clefting pattern (patterns 2 and 4).
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