Focus abbreviated “FOC” refers to that part of the clause that provides the most salient information in a given discourse situation. It is also a grammatical category that determines which part of the sentence contributes new, non derivable or contrastive information. Focus is related to information structure. This article looks at focus from several theoretical and methodological perspectives, ranging from a detail generative analysis to careful typological generalization. Their common aim is to deepen our understanding of whether and how the information –structured category of focus is represented and marked in the Kenyang language. Focus marking refers to the overt realization of focus by special grammatical means which is subject to cross linguistic variation. Topics investigated in this article are among others the focus particles, the structure of focus, and their graphical representations, question formation, the information structure on word order, situ versus in-situ strategies of focus marking, and related constructions.
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1.0 Introduction

Generally speaking, focus refers to the potion of utterance which is especially informative or important with the context and which is marked as such via some linguistic means. It can be difficult to provide a single precise definition as the term is used somewhat differently to different languages and in different research traditions. Most often it refers to linguistic markings of contrast, question-answering status or discourse un-expectability. Focus can be signed prosodically example, in the form of a strong pitch accent, syntactically for example by moving focus phrases to a special position in the sentential or morphologically for example by appending a special affix to focus elements with different cross linguistic focus marking strategies often carrying slightly different restrictions on their use. Focus is regularly treated as a cross linguistically stable category that is merely manifested by different structural means in different languages such that a common focus feature may be realized through or example. a morpheme in one language and syntactic movement in another. Focus is variously reflected in prosodic phrasing,.. Constituent ordering via special focus morphemes and perhaps in some cases not at all ... Languages just choose some aspects of their grammatical structures, prosodic, syntactic or morphological, to realized focus .(Büring 2010:177) The heterogeneity of (non-neutral) focus marking mechanisms attested in natural languages –positional-prosodic and morphological, only differ in terms of superficial realizations of an identical feature (Kidwai 1999:224)

While some analyses apparently treat the universality of focus as established empirical facts, others overtly prejudge the issue by raising this assumption to the status of morphological principles. Thus Erteschik-shir (2007:40) states that “any definition of focus must measure up to the requirement that it be universal”. Similarly, Valduvi & Engdahl (1996:459) say that “a set of information-packing primitives that are cross-linguistically sufficient and methodologically useful needs to be identified” It is clear that Valladuri & Engdahl mean that the set of information-packing primitives should be both minimal and directly involve in determining the status of the worlds languages: They proceed simply to claim that a variety of structural effects in a range languages are a manifestation of these simple primitives
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Focus is also defined as that increment of information in a sentence which the speaker signals either structurally or contextually to be the most important. The “increment of information” may be anything from a specific lexical item to the entire sentence, and to the sentential operators. The speaker indicates which increment is important either by using a marked syntactic, morphological or phonological form which unambiguously identifies the increment, or by using an unmarked form in a specific context, in which case the increment is identifiable only in relation to the context in which the sentence is uttered. The importance of this increment is relative to the speaker’s understanding of the addressee’s pragmatic knowledge of the word. The speaker believes that the addressee needs this information in order to correct, reaffirm, and add to his present knowledge. It is in this line of thinking that we will divide the paper into five sections, starting with the focus particles in Kenyang, linking them with examples from the language under study. Furthermore we will also discuss the structure of focus in Kenyang, showing how they are represented graphically. Next we will present question formation here we discussed the various types. Finally the last section is the conclusion.

1.1 Focus particles in Kenyang

In Kenyang, two ways are used to mark focus in clauses or in sentences. Phonologically, we used intonation to mark contrastive focus, while morphologically, we used the morpheme /ká/ which allows the focus particles to be displaced. Below are the different clauses where the focus particles can be found. Examples of structures using intonation

1. Ayuk a den Agbor eyu
   ayuk sm beat abgor yesterday
   “Ayuk beat Agbor yesterday”

   From the sentence above, we can highlight or mark as focus different elements of the sentence examples as follows
   a) Ayuk a den AGBOR eyu´
   b) Ayuk a den Agbor´ EYU
   c) AYUK a den Agbor eyu´
   In sentence (a) the focus is on the object “Agbor”. In (b) on the locative adverb “áyu” and (c) on the subject “Ayuk”.

   Intonation can also be found on yes/no questions. For example
   a. Ayuk a ròñ ?
      Ayuk sm went
      “Did Ayuk go”? ?
   b. Besong a nye nya ?
      Beson sm eat meat
      “Did Besong eat meat”? ?
   c. Mbi a kòñ Arah ?
      Mbi sm love Arah
      “Does Mbi loves Arah”

Intonation on constituent questions

Examples
   a. yì´ áwaj mán
      what kill goat
      “What killed the goat?”
   aèÔa´ a’ ku´ ákatì’
   who sm buy book
   “who bought a book”
   yìò wòò nye?
   What sm eat
   “What are you eating”??

   Structurally in Kenyang we use the focus morpheme /ká/. Constructions with /ká/ can also be subjected to some sorts of movements. For example
   a. Achiu kâI a´ wa´ j mâ´n
Achuo foc kill goat
Achuo killed the goat.
On the sentence above, focus is on the subject. If we lay focus on the object of the verb then we will have (b) below
b. Men ke Achuo a´ wa´j
   Goat foc Achuo sm kill
We notice that in this construction, when we compare (a) and (b), we notice intonation difference on the subject marker and the fronting of dp constituents of the verb. When we look at the simple sentence Achou a waj men But when we use focus, the intonation changes so the focus marker conditions or modifies the intonation of the subject marker and movements. Let us look at Mâln kâl Achuo a´ wa´j we notice that there is a change in intonation because of the focus which has shifted from Achuo to Men.

2.0 The structure of focus sentences in Kenyang
(a) Agbor a ku´ eket nta ngore wi´ eyu´
   Agbor sm buy house for wife his yesterday
   “Agbor bought a house for his wife yesterday”
(b) Chi´ AGBOR ke a´ ku´ eket nta ngore wi´ eyu´
   It is Agbor who sm buy house for wife his yesterday
   “It is a Agbor who bought a house for his wife yesterday”
(c) Chi´ eket ke Agbor a´ ku´ nta ngore wi´ eyu´
   It is house that Agbor sm buy for wife his yesterday
   “It is a house that Agbor bought for his wife yesterday”
(d) Chi´ nta ngore wi´ ke Agbor a ku´ eket eyu´
   It is for wife his that Agbor sm buy house yesterday
   “It is for his wife that Agbor bought a house yesterday”
(e) Chi´ eyu´ ke Agbor a´ ku´ nta ngore wi et
   It is yesterday that Agbor sm buy wife his house
   “It is yesterday that Agbor bought his wife a house”
From the above examples it can be seen that every time a constituent is focused, it comes after /chì´/ and the focus constituent is followed by /ke/. Let us look at the (f) below
(f) BaÌßa´ka´ne m    ba´    kóñ     bóh          ßa
   Men       sm   love   children    their
   “Men love their children”
Chì´ baÌßa´ka´ne m ká ba´ kóñ bóh ßa
   It is     Men       sm   love children    their
   “It is men that love their children”
The number of the focus constituent does not matter; /Chì´/ is always invariant.

2.1 Graphical representation of focus structure in Kenyang
It is what indicates that an element has been focalized.

2.2 FALSE PHRASE

*Agbor a rinñбе Tabe
Agbor sm know that Tabe
“Agbor knows that Tabe
“bá” is the lexical complementiser. Note should be taken that the lexical complementiser /bá/ is different from the focus marker/ ká /

The lexical complementiser is a subordinator which is different from the focus marker. Xp stands for focus elements whereas the focus word is ká in the above examples. In the next section, it is shown that the structure of matrix wh –questions is very similar to the structure of focus sentences in Kenyang.

3.0 Question Formation

In relevant literature, every clause must be typed, that is, identified as declarative, interrogative or exclamative in the sentence syntax. (Cheng 1997) A clause is typed interrogative, if it contains an interrogative head, or specifier. Main-clause, Wh-questions are Cps headed by a movement in terms of “the fine structure of the periphery” proposed by Rizzi (1997, 2001b, 2004). It is advocated in Kenyang through the focus element subsequently followed by pied-piping of the left clause [IP], to spec [x] foc p1
3.1 Matrix Wh questions

Kenyang Wh-term are classified below into arguments, referential and non referential adjuncts.

3.1.1 Arguments
a-Θa = who
yìo = what

3.1.2 Referential Adjuncts
fa’a = where
ntìko’kpo = when

3.1.3 non-Referential Adjuncts
nà’ = how
yì’ rá/ á’ yì’ = why

The following constructions serve to illustrate their use in the language under study. It should be observed that Wh expressions appear in-situ in clause –final or clause medial position.

C ) Besong a’ ku’ yi’
Besong sm buy what
What has Besong bought?
(d) Bate a’ róóñ fa’
Bate sm go where
Where has Bate gone to?
(e) Bate a’den moh á’ yi’
Bate sm beat child why
“Why has Bate beaten the child?”
(f) Besong a’ śíñ ná móh nà’
Besong sm write exam how
How did Besong write the exams?

We can note from the proceeding examples that the Wh-expressions identified above, are interrogative pronouns or adverbs and are used to form interrogative constructions in the Kenyang Language. Kenyang marks reference and definiteness, distinctions in interrogative clauses in every systematic way with the generic interrogative expressions [ntìko] “which”. It must co-occur with some nominal /adverbial elements to be qualified as an interrogative phrase.

Let us consider the following sentences illustrating the interrogative pronoun /adverb in (a) and their corresponding generic interrogative phrase in (b).

1a) aΘa “who”
1b) ntìko’ mmu’
which person
“who”
2a) yi’ what
2b) ntìke -ányĩĩ’
which thing
“What”
3a) fa’ “where”
3b) ntìke’ epo’k
“where”
4a) nà’ “how”
4b) ntìk e ewaj
Which way
5) “How”
6) ci’ yì’ “why”
none
We note from (5) above that [áti`yî]\“why” lacks a generic interrogative equivalent. While in (6a) the generic phrase /ntIkpok/ \“when” lacks a corresponding wh-pronoun.

In Co wh –questions, Co carries, tense, (Tns), wh-and Tpp features that triggers the movement of the wh-expressions to the specifier position of Cp well as 1o, to Co movement. The unmarked syntactic position of wh-elements is In-situ sentences, Madrid of final position. The wh-element base-generated in these positions can be raised into a high position in the matrix clause.

### 3.2 WH-Phrases In situ

(a) Agbor a kong aΩa
    Agbor sm love who
    “Agbor loves who”

(b) Agbor a róni Kenyang ntI’kpok
    Agbor sm go village when
    “Agbor goes to the village when”

3.2.1 Fronted wh-phrases

(a) Chi’aΩa Agbor a kôn
    It is who Agbor sm love
    “who does Agbor love”

(b) aΩa Agbor a kôn
    who Agbor sm love
    “Who does Agbor loves”

(c) aΩa rá ná Bate a´ purí`
    Who scp rel Bate sm push
    “Who did Bate Push?”

Examples with ntI’kpok

a) Chi’ ntIkpok Agbor a´ róni-ó Kenyang
    It is when Agbor sm go village
    “when did Agbor go to the village?”

b) ntI’kpok Abgor a róni kenyang
    when Agbor sm go village
    “When does Agbor go to the village?”

There are three ways of fronting the wh-phrases. The first two ways consist in focusing them or focalizing them. When the wh-phrases is focused, it is proceeded by / Chi/ and optionally followed by /mbu’/. The wh-phrase may also be fronted without being focused morph- syntactically. In that case, it is fronted and it is neither preceded by Chi’ nor followed by mbu’. When the wh-phrase is focused, Kenyang matrix wh-questions are structured this way.
We can also fine sentences with more than one wh-element in Kenyang. The morpheme “rá, which marks scope in Kenyang can immediately follow each of the wh-elements for the latter to become more emphatic over the other. The presence of the scope morpheme however is not obligatory in Kenyang. Let us look at some examples

a) chí’ Besong re’, ke a’ ku’ yi’, nta’ aØa eyu’?
   it is Besong foc buy what for who yesterday
   “it is Besong, who bought what, for who yesterday?”

b) yi’ Besong aku’nta’ ‘ aØa eyu’?
   what Besong buy for who yesterday
   “What did Besong buy for who yesterday?”

From the examples above, wh-phrases appear in-situ in the majority clauses. The fronting of wh-phrases is optional.

3.3. Embedded Wh-question

In Kenyang, just as in English and French, embedded questions are introduced by [mbaka] “if” or “whether” preceded by a verb of knowledge such as “rám”, /say/tell/ “báp”, /ask/, “rÎ’ñáö” /know/, etc. These embedded questions is what Barker (1970) calls the yes/no particles. Mba’ka⁰ “if or whether are called lexical complementiser because they introduced complement clauses or independent clause

   Agbor a bî’ki’ ringe mba’Øa’ ngore wî a’ twó tSôñ mbo’re
   Agbor sm neg know if/wether wife his sm come fut tomorrow
   “ Agbor doesn’t know whether his wife will come tomorrow”

   a) Agbor a báá’ moh wî’ ntÎ’kpo’ k tSôñ wî’ a’ so ndenå’ wî’
   Agbor sm ask child his when fut his sm wash dresses his
   “Agbor asked his child when he will wash his dresses”

3.4. Indirect questions

a. Agbor a báá’ a’Øa’ Tabi a’ Øó
   Agbor sm ask who tabi sm see
   “Agbor asked who tabi saw”

b* Agbor a báá, chí’ a’Øa’ mbú’ tabi a ’ Øó
   Agbor sm ask it is who p2 tabi sm see
   “Agbor asked who Tabi saw”

C* Agbor a báá’ yi tabi a ku’
Agbor sm ask what tabi sm buy

“Agbor asked what Tabi bought”

D. Agbor a ßáb ntìkpok tabi a na’ ã’a’bá te’ ñ jeket wi’
Agbor sm ask when tab ism finish that build house his

“Agbor asked when tabi finished building his house”

E. Agbor a ßáb áti’i’i’ tabi a den moh wi’
Agbor sm asked why’ tabi sm beat child his

“Agbor asked why tabi beat his child”

### 3.5. Yes/No Questions

Yes/No questions are also called question tags. They are used mostly during discussions where by “A” would ask a question (direct question) and “B” would answer by yes or no. Kenyang has a zero declarative marker [Ø] and a question marker which appear at the end of the question. Let us consider the following examples:

| Statement | Questions |
|-----------|-----------|
| yi’ á rôn’ he sm go | yi’ á rôn’ ñ ká he sm go qm |
| “he has gone” | “has he gone?” |
| a) Agbor a ßón’ ñgo | Agbor a ßón’ ñ ká |
| b) Agbor sm has gun | Agbor sm has gun qm |
| “Agbor has a gun” | “Does Agbor has a gun?” |

So far, when [Ø] is substituted, by /ká/, the declarative clause automatically turns into a yes/no question

### 4. Conclusion

In this paper, we set out to discuss focus in Kenyang and we came out with the conclusion that the Kenyang focus is phonologically marked through intonation and morphologically through the morpheme /ká/ and it is marked on the subject, subject pronominal and on the object. In addition the initial position in a pragmatically neutral clause is fronted. Concerning the function of the constituent focus categories, we realised that they were found mostly in relative clauses, Cleft sentences and the answer to interrogative questions. It is important to note that they are restricted to the perfective and the imperfective aspect within the overall TAM system.
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