Afranaph Technical Report #12: Linkers and Relators in Kinande[1]

Patricia Schneider-Zioga & Philip Ngessimo Mutaka

1 Introduction

The Bantu language of Kinande (ISO 639-3) is particularly rich in functional morphemes which appear to link together various syntactic objects in a sentence. In this paper, we investigate such functional elements. We first discuss a variety of copular clauses and present a preliminary description of their syntax. In this we are responding to the implicit invitation of the KiNande Case File at *The Afranaph Project* website to further develop the section of the *Kinande: A Grammar Sketch* entitled 'The Copula.' (http://www.africananaphora.rutgers.edu/images/stories/downloads/casefiles/KinandeGS.pdf. It provided us with a starting point and general reference for this topic. In the second section of this report, we consider small clauses, or nearly small clauses. Next, we focus on an element known in the literature as the *linker* (Hyman 1985 (class lectures), & Mutaka 1986). This particle occurs between internal arguments of the verb and sometimes also between arguments of the verb and following adjuncts.[2] We conclude that all of these constructions involve predication and the functional morphemes mediate in this relation. Finally, we introduce some phonological properties of copular constructions and we present phonological evidence, mainly from tonology, that supports our conclusion that linker constructions have much in common with copular constructions.

2 Copulas

Copular constructions are clauses in which the predicate is not a verb, but some other category such as an AP, PP, or a noun phrase of some type. The predicate is then joined to the subject of the predication by a connecting element known as a copula.[3] Copular clauses have a variety of functions and researchers have proposed taxonomies to capture this fact.

---

[2] A linking morpheme with this distribution appears to be quite rare cross-linguistically. We address this later in the paper.

[3] In some languages there appears to be either a null connector, or no connector whatsoever. Most typically the copula has verbal properties, but in some languages, it is pronominal or prepositional or has mixed properties.

The taxonomies raise the question of how many distinct types of copular clauses there might be. The apparent multiplicity of types of copular clauses also raises the question of what is responsible for this multiplicity. One controversy related to this is the idea that the copula is responsible for the multiplicity of meanings because the copula is semantically ambiguous. In other words, there might be more than one copula. In many languages, this question seems especially difficult, as there is just a single copular lexeme. An additional question is whether certain copular constructions are related to others via movement, and thus share a common base. Kinande can shed some light on these issues, as there are a variety of copulas that are distributed according to the type of copular clause they occur in.

2.1   Types of copular constructions

We consider here the classical taxonomy of copular clauses proposed in Higgins (1973). The taxonomy identifies four categories: (a) predicational, (b) specificational, (c) identificational, and (d) equative copular clauses. We will see that Kinande uses different copulas roughly according to the type of copular sentence involved. We illustrate these types of copular constructions for Kinande and discuss each one in turn in the appropriate subsection.

PREDICATIONAL
(1) Magulú **ni**   mú:li
    1Magulu COP 1tall
    'Magulu is tall.'

SPECIFICATIONAL
(2) a. Ekyo   Maryá ákola, **ry'**   êríhuk'   obuhóti
       aug.7thing Mary   did   5COP   aug.5.cook aug.14beans
       'What Mary did was to cook beans.'

    b. ómwira   wage **k'**   ákákekulú   k'   omo   kisomó kyetu
       aug.1friend 1my 12COP   aug.12.old_woman 12of 18LOC 7church 7our
       'My (best) friend is a little old lady from our church.'

IDENTIFICATIONAL
(3) a. Maryá **yô**lyáá
       1Mary 1COP there
       'There is Mary.' (pointing)

    b. omúlumy' óliá   **yó**   omúkuló ów'edepartement.
       aug.1man aug.1that 1COP aug.1head of aug.9department
       'That man is the head of the department.' (said while pointing out man)

EQUATIVE

(4) a. Jórge Bergoglió ni Pápe Franswâ
'Jorge Bergoglio is Pope Francis.'

   b. Eririma   ky'   ekihugo;   n'embuto   yowene
      aug.5field 7COP aug.7world; &aug.9seed   9good

    b'   abana   b' Obwami   (Matthew 13:38)[4]
    2COP aug.2child 2of aug.14chieftancy
    'The field is the world, and the good seed stands for the people of the kingdom.'

2.2   Predicational copular clauses

     In predicational copular sentences, there is a property predicated of a referential subject. The copula in this case appears to be a semantically vacuous lexical item:

PREDICATIONAL
(5) a. Magulú   ni   mú:li   (Adjective Phrase)
     1Magulu COP 1tall
     'Magulu is tall.'

   b. Joháni ni   mugalímu   (Noun Phrase)
     1John   COP 1teacher
     'John is a teacher.'

   c. Magulú   ní   w' eBútembo   (Prepositional phrase)
     1Magulu   COP 1of 24Butembo
     'Magulu is from Butembo.'

In the first example, the predicate is an adjective phrase. In the second example, the predicate is a noun phrase and in the third example, it is a non-locative prepositional phrase. The copula used in the examples in ((5)), **ni**,[5] has no clear verbal properties in that

---

[4] All sentences from the Bible are from the *Kinandi New Testament*, translated by the United Bible Societies and The Bible Society of Uganda (1980). Sentences which are taken from the Bible do not have tones indicated in keeping with the fact that there are no tones in the source text.

[5] There are two additional copulas used in the present tense: -li, and –ne. As far as we can determine, -li is used under three conditions: (i) when a locative XP is subject; (ii, iii) when a location is predicate; (iv) when unfocused first or second person is subject.

    (i) ahóndin'   oko ngingó haly'   akábisamó   kuwéne
      16inferior 17LOC9bed 16-li(COP) aug.12hiding.place 12good
      'Under the bed is a good hiding place.'

    (ii) Akábisamó   kuwéne kalí   éndina   oko   ngíngo
       aug.12hiding.place 12good 12-li(COP) 24inferior 17LOC 9bed
       'The good hiding place is under the bed.'

    (iii) Omūhūmbo   wuwe ali   omo   byala   biwe

it does not allow verbal morphology indicating tense, aspect, modality, or agreement. **Ni** is essentially restricted to use in the present tense.

The verb eríbyâ is used in the past and future. It takes verbal inflections:

(6) a. iyóndi yó wa**byá**   mugalímu okó   mwak'owálábâ?
      1who FOC 3s.past.be 1teacher   17on year last
      'Who was teacher last year?'

   b. ni   Magulú yó   wa**byá**   mugalí:mu
      COP Magulu FOC 3s.past.be   1teacher
      'It is Magulu who was teacher.'

(7) Abrahamũ a**bya**   ĩse   wa Ĩsaka,
    1Abraham 3s.pst.BE 1father 1of 1Isaac
    'Abraham was the father of Isaac.'   (Matthew 1:2)

(8) a. iyóndi y'úka.syá.**bya**   mugalímu
      1who FOC'3s.come.be 1teacher
      'Who will be teacher?'

   b. Magulú y'úkasyá**bya**   mugalímu akalásí   káwá:nza
      1Magulu FOC'3s.come.be 1teacher   12school 12it.start
      'Magulu will be teacher (when school starts)'

In addition to **ni** not being able to take tense/aspect morphology, it can only have third person subjects:

(9) a.*ingyé **ni**   mugalímu
       I   COP 1teacher
    'I am a teacher.'

---

        aug.3threshing.stick 3his   3-li(COP) 18LOC 8hand 8his
        'His winnowing fork is in his hand.'   (Matthew 3:12)

   (iv) Tuli   bana   ba Abrahamũ
        1pl.li(COP) 2child 2of 1Abraham
        'We are children of Abraham.'   (John 8:33)

This is also a defective copula in that inflection for tense and aspect is not possible. It is used only in the present tense. It can be inflected for person. Moreover, it is not sensitive to person features. That is, the subject can be first, second, or third person. This sensitivity to a locative in the copular clause reminds of at least one aspect of the function of the copula –li in Early Modern Swahili and modern ChiBemba (McWhorter 1994). The copula -ne is used to assert existence. It is not defective.

    b. *iwé **ni**   mugalímu
      you COP 1teacher
      'You are a teacher.'

The subject of ***ni*** is, however, not restricted with respect to class. Any class may occur as subject. Since classes encompass both singular and plural, this means the ***ni*** copula restricts the person, but not the number or gender of the subject in the predication. The following examples illustrate that a class 2 subject and a class 10 subject are also possible with ***ni***:

(10) a. ibó   **ni**   bagalí:mu
        2they COP 2teacher
        'They are teachers.'

    b. esyosoro **ní**   nyírí   sya   bándu
      10lion   COP   10eater 10of   2person
      'Lions are man eaters.'

    An additional requirement of the copula ***ni*** is that any noun phrase following it must lack an augment. In Kinande, the presence of the augment is somewhat correlated with definiteness and specificity: definite noun phrases only lack augments if they are post copular as will be seen in the ensuing discussion. Indefinite noun phrases may or may not have augments depending on the syntactic context. They can even be non-specific while having augments, as the following example from Baker (2003) illustrates (= his (28a) with tones added)

(11) óbuli mundú mó-á-gúl-ire   eritúndâ.
     every man.1 AFF-1S/T-buy-EXT fruit.5
    'Every man bought a fruit.' (can be different fruits)

In this example, the noun phrase *eritunda* has an augment, yet it is neither definite nor specific.
    We do not at this time understand the function and distribution of the augment well. Progovac (1993) demonstrates that in Kinande, noun phrases lacking augments behave like Negative Polarity Items (NPIs) under many circumstances. She also notes that post copular noun phrases lack augments. However, post copular nominals do not seem to be licensed as NPIs by virtue of the position they occupy. Instead, we note that many languages, such as German or French, require or allow bare NPs in post copular position. This appears to be the case for Kinande as well. In Kinande, the distribution of bare NPs is slightly different from the aforementioned languages in that the post copular constituent **must** lack an

augment[6] across the board. The semantics of the post copular noun phrase does not seem to play a role in whether or not the augment occurs and the bare noun phrase is not restricted to only noun phrases referring to professions, titles, hobbies, or the like (see Matushansky and Spector (2005) for discussion of post copular bare nominals) as it is in French, but holds for noun phrases referring to inherent properties (e.g., *mukola-nabi* 'sinner'), etc.:

(12) Magulú ni   muarchitéct ów   eprojet   munyê
     1Magulu COP 1architect   1for aug.9project 9that
     'Magulu is the architect for that project.'

(13) ĩtwe tũnasĩ   omundu oyũ   ni   mukola-nabi
     we   1pl.know aug.1man 1this COP 1doer-bad
     'We know this man is a sinner.' (from John 9:24)

(14) Magulú ní   mwána
     Magulu COP 1child
     'Magulu is a child.'

In fact, we have discovered no examples of predication involving **ni** where the predicate is allowed to have an augment. Since the presence of the augment is approximately related to specificity/definiteness/givenness,[7] we conclude that the augment occupies D. Since nominal phrases cannot have augments when they are in post predicative copular position, it appears that DPs cannot be predicates in Kinande. This is expected if the proposal of Stowell (1989, 1991) is correct that arguments are DPs and predicates are NPs.

2.3   Specificational copular clauses

Specificational sentences are ones that specify who someone is, rather than describing a property of an individual. They are described in the literature as ones where one XP in the copular clause introduces a variable and the other XP involved in the copular clause supplies the value of the variable. The value is referential and receives the focus of the sentence. As noted in the literature, the variable and value in a specificational clause often can occur in either order.

The following examples illustrate inverse specificational clauses, where the variable is first and the value is second:

INVERSE SPECIFICATIONAL

---

[6] We will see that actually whether or not the augment is obligatorily lacking depends on the particular copula involved and the information structure related to the post copular constituent.

[7] See Progovac (1993) for a detailed discussion on definiteness and augments in Kinande.

(15) a. obo   Maryá áhuka   **b'**   óbuhóti
      14that   Mary   3s.cooked   14COP'   aug.14.beans
      'What Mary cooked is beans.'

   b. Ekyo Maryá ákola, **ry'**   êríhuk'   obuhóti
      7What Mary did   5COP   aug.5.cook aug.14beans
      'What Mary did was to cook beans.'

   c. ekíbí   ékyangáhík'   oko   mundú **ry'**   êríbyá molómó:lo
      7bad.thing   aug.7might.happen 18on 1person 5COP aug.5be weak.weak
      'The bad thing that might happen to someone is to be timid.'

(16) a. ómwira wage **k'**   ákákekulú   k' omo   kisomó kyetu
      1friend 1my   12COP   aug.12.old_woman 12of 18LOC 7church 7our
      'My (best) friend is a little old lady from our church.'

   b. enyamá éyiwíte magulw'á:ní, n'ekiyong'okómú:twé, n'   omúkí:ra **ky'**ékinyangú:su
      aug.9animal 9has legs,   and'mane   and tail   7COP aug.7.lion
      'An animal that has 4 legs, a mane, and a tail is the lion.'

Note that in these examples there is a different copula than the one that is used in predicational clauses. I will call this different copula **YO** after the form of the copula as it appears in class 1. This copula is defective in that it is never inflected with tense or aspectual morphology. Like **ni,** it can only have third person subjects. However, unlike **ni,** this copula exhibits agreement. Therefore, its form varies according to the noun class that the copula agrees with. It agrees with the word that introduces the value, which in the examples above is the post copular noun phrase. The word that introduces the value is the focus of the sentence. Therefore, we can say that the copula **YO** agrees with the focus of the specificational sentence. This agreement pattern is quite striking because in the literature, it has been claimed that Kinande, and perhaps Bantu languages in general, can only agree "upward," with a noun phrase that c-commands the lexical item that expresses agreement (see Baker 2008). Alternately, but with a similar effect, it has been proposed that agreement and movement of XPs to the left edge of a phrase whose head the XP agrees with are correlated. The agreement pattern that is manifested in these inverse specificational clauses demonstrates that the upward agreement claim is wrong.

     Consider now *reverse* specificational sentences. These are ones where the initial XP in the copular construction provides the value. The same copula, **YO**, occurs. In *reverse* specificational sentences, **YO** agrees with the pre-copular constituent ((17)a). In *inverse* sentences, **YO** agrees with the post-copular constituent ((17)b). We see that **YO** consistently agrees with the focus of a specificational sentence. This is especially clear in the following examples, because the pre-copular and post-copular XPs belong to different noun classes and agreement is in terms of noun class:

(17) a. olúhi   **ló**   mbúga
      aug.11war 11COP   9.problem
      'It is the war that is the problem.'/ 'The war is the thing that is the problem.'/
      'The war is the problem.'

   b. émbugá   **lô**   lúhi
      aug.9problem 11COP aug.11war[8]
      'The problem is the war.'

Note that it is not possible to get a predicational reading when the **YO** copula is used. This is because whatever **YO** agrees with is the focus. Therefore, if **YO** agrees with the precopular focus, the post **YO** constituent must be topic. Under this circumstance, it does not seem possible to set up the appropriate discourse situation to get a predicational reading for the post copular constituent.

      Although all the examples of specificational sentences we have seen so far involve the copula **YO**, it would be a mistake to propose that **YO** is the specificational copula and **ni** is the predicational copula. There are examples of **ni** in specificational sentences as well. Specifically, **ni** occurs in *inverse* specificational sentences when the value is a name. Therefore, we find the following paradigm where the question/answer pair establishes an inverse specificational sentence involving names as the value:

(18) a. Q: iyóndi yó   wib 'ébitábu?
        1who 1COP stole 8book
        'Who stole the books?'

   b. A: ómwibí   **ni**   Magúlu
        aug.1thief COP 1Magulu
        'The thief is Magulu.'

Alternately, a question which elicits a specificational answer could be asked as follows, with the wh-word in situ, in inverse focus position:

(19) ómwibí   ní   ndi?
     aug.1thief COP who
     'Who is the thief?'

An appropriate answer where the thief is identified by name uses the **ni** copula:

---

[8] Here the augment *o-* of the noun *olúhi* 'the.war' has undergone an elision due to final –o in the **YO** copula that immediately precedes it. There is a phonological residue of the augment on the vowel of the **YO** copula in the form of a falling tone. There is a falling tone on the **YO** copula if the following word starts with an augment depending on the length of the post copular word.

(20) ómwibí **ni** Magúlu
     aug.1thief COP 1Magulu
     'The thief is Magulu.'

In contrast, an appropriate answer where the thief is identified by profession (noun class 1), rather than name, uses the familiar *YO* copula and the *ni* copula is ungrammatical:

(21) a. ómwibí y' ômúlámya
        aug.1thief 1COP aug.1doctor
        'The thief is the doctor.'

     b. *ómwibí **ni** omúlámya
        aug.1thief COP aug.1doctor

Indeed if *YO* is substituted for *ni* in ((20)) where the value is a proper name, the sentence is grammatical, but it is not an appropriate response to the question in ((19)):

(22) ómwibí yo Magúlu
     aug.1thief 1COP 1Magulu
     'The thief is (named) Magulu.'

This sentence can be translated 'The thief is named Magulu.' That is, it is interpreted as a reverse specificational sentence, with the initial XP *ómwibí* 'thief' being interpreted referentially and the post copular name being interpreted as a predicate.

Why then do names have this special status? Names are clearly special morphologically. They lack two elements that are typical of nouns in Kinande: an augment and a class marker.[9] Because of this difference, names are classified as belonging to a special subclass of noun class 1 (noun class 1 is the noun class that is used for singular humans). Specifically, names are identified as belonging to subclass 1a. We propose that names behave differently in specificational sentences because they lack augments and noun class prefixes. Augments express the feature of definiteness and noun class prefixes express the gender of a noun. Since both the augment and class marker are missing with names, it is not possible to disentangle which morphologically missing feature is responsible for the inability of names to participate in agreement with *YO* when in post-copular position. However, we suspect that the lack of the augment in particular is what renders names incapable of providing agreement features for the specificational copula. We will refine this statement shortly. Our suspicion is based on the fact that there is no agreement configuration in Kinande where the controller of agreement lacks an augment.

---

[9] Nouns in Kinande consist of the noun stem and in all classes except class 1a, a prefix to the stem that indicates the gender of the noun. The augment, sometimes referred to as a pre-prefix in the literature, precedes the prefixed stem: augment+class_marker+stem.

We can also demonstrate that there is nothing about names per se that prevents agreement with the **YO** copula. In Kinande it is possible for names to be placed in noun class 2a, a subclass of noun class 2, the plural class of humans. For example, the name Magulu could be placed in this class as aboMagulu. When a name is in subclass 2a, it means 'X and his/her associates.' The following question/answer pair illustrates a post copular plural name in class 2a for an inverse specificational sentence:

(23) a. Q: ábibí   ní   bahi?
         aug.2thief COP 2which
         Literally: 'The thieves are who?' (Direct question)

    b. A: ábibí   b'   áboMagúlu
         aug.2thief   2COP   aug.2aMagulu
         'The thieves are Magulu and his associates.'

Names in subclass 2a are prefixed with a class marker and here also have an augment. The copula that occurs in this case is the agreeing **YO** copula. This is the same copula that occurs in all other cases of inverse specificational sentences when a noun that has a class marker and augment serves as focus. This example clearly illustrates that the augment and class marker are decisive in making agreement possible.

Returning to singular names in subclass 1a, we propose that the copula **ni** is borrowed from the predicational paradigm and used in specificational sentences when proper names are post-copular foci because **ni** is the one copula that is non-agreeing. In this way, names bypass the requirement that the focus in specificational sentences must agree with the copula by using a non-agreeing copula.

In sum, we have seen that in specificational sentences, there is an agreeing copula which agrees in gender with the focused expression. Specificational sentences almost always allow the XPs involved in the copular construction to occur in either order. Therefore, the focused constituent can either precede or follow the copula. This means that in copular constructions, agreement, which in Kinande is otherwise always upward, with a c-commanding constituent, can be with a non-c-commanding constituent. We also saw that when names are the focus in post copular position, they take a different copula than usually occurs in specificational sentences. We proposed that this is a strategy used by names to bypass the requirement of focus agreement in specificational sentences.

We return now to a consideration of agreement in specificational sentences. We saw that a different copula occurs with names and we attributed this to the lack of morphology that indicates definiteness and gender when names occur. We note now an asymmetry with agreement and names when we consider *reverse* specificational sentences. In the examples we consider now, the name occurs in pre-copular position and is the focus. In this case, the **YO** specificational copula is used ((24)). The **ni** copula is ungrammatical on a specificational

reading. It could be used as a predicational copular sentence which could be an answer to the question of which occupation Magulu has ((25)):

(24) Magulú   yó   mwíbi
        1Magulu 1COP 1thief
        'Magulu is the one who is a thief.'/ 'It is Magulu who is a thief.'

(25) Magulú   ní   mwíbi
        1Magulu COP 1thief
        *'Magulu is the one who is a thief.'
        ok: 'Magulu is a thief.' (predicational reading)

These data indicate that names, despite their lack of augment and class marker, can fully agree with the specificational copula just in case they stand in a specifier/head relation to the copula. This is in opposition to their inability to agree with the copula when they are in an AGREE[10] relation with the head as they were when they are post copular focus. We note that this asymmetry is one identified by den Dikken (2014) with respect to person agreement where den Dikken provides a principled reason why AGREE is sensitive to the morphosyntactic make up of a noun phrase but specifier/head agreement is not. More specifically, he notes that AGREE is part of a structure building process which is sensitive to the precise syntactic structure visible as a syntactic object is merged. Den Dikken points out that specifier/head agreement in contrast is not structure-building. Instead it is defined representationally over the entire structure. Therefore, it is plausible that the noun class and definiteness features, which are predictable by virtue of the semantics of the word, are representationally available just in case there is a specifier/head agreement configuration.[11]

        The proposal that restrictions on agreement govern the distribution of the specificational copula can be further supported by the behavior of first and second person subjects in specificational contexts. Recall that neither copula allows first or second person (singular or plural) subjects, essentially regardless of discourse context:

(26) a.*ingye yo/ni mugeni
            I   COP   1guest

     b.*igwe yo/ni mwana
         you   COP 1child

Therefore, in (reverse) specificational sentences with first or second person subjects, no copula occurs. Instead, the first or second person pronoun is obligatorily interpreted as

---

[10] An AGREE relation is one where a lexical item searches via c-command for a potential goal/target of agreement. The AGREE relation involves c-command of a target of the agreement relation by an agreeing head. This stands in opposition to agreement via a specifier/head relation.

[11] The pre- versus post copular agreement asymmetry with names is also reminiscent of the pre- and post-verbal agreement asymmetry found in Standard Arabic.

focused, and the variable appears without an augment. This is expected since the variable is non-referential. Here are several examples from Valinande (1984) (= his volume 3, (21)):

(27) a. ingye mugéni[12]
   I   1guest
   'I am the one who is a guest.'/ 'It is me who is a guest.'/*'I am a guest.'

   b. igwé mwána
   you   1child
   'You are the one who is a child.'/ 'It is you who is a child.' /*'You are a child.'

It is not possible to contrastively focus the predicate (variable) when there is a first or second person pronoun as value, using a construction which lacks a copula. If the subject must be focus, then the predicate must be topic in this case. Hence, the impossibility of contrastive focus on the predicate:

(28) *igwe mulume kutse mwana?
   you 1man   or   1child
   'Are you a man or a child?'

Instead, the ***ni*** or ***–li[13]*** copula must be used:

(29) n'igwé múlú:mé kútse n'igwé mwá:na   ← NI COPULA
   be you 1man   or   be you 1child
   'Are you a man or are you a child?'

(30) u-lí   múlume kútsé mwá:na   ← -LI COPULA
   2sg-be 1man   or   1child
   'Are you a man or a child?'

(31) Answer: Nyi-rí   múlú:me
              1sg-be   1man
              'I am a man.'

The following sentences also illustrate the fact that non-focused first and second person subjects can co-occur with the agreeing copula –li:

(32) Uwe **u-li**   mwiga   wuwe, nĩkwa ĩtwe **tu-li**   biga   ba Musa.
   you 2sg-LI 1disciple 1his,   but   we   1pl-LI   2disciple 2.of Moses

---

[12] This can also be interpreted as an absolute small clause, equivalent to 'with me a guest,' as the following example illustrates:
(i) ingye mugeni, simwanganyihukira akakoko   kali ng'aka
   me   1guest, neg.2sg.can.cook   12chicken 12be as 12that
   'With me as guest, you cannot cook such a small chicken.'
[13] The –li copula is realized as –ri in certain phonological contexts.

'You are this fellow's disciple! We are disciples of Moses!' (John 9:28)

(33) a. Question: ulíndi?
     2s-be-who
     'What are you?'

   b. Answer: nyiri mugalímu ná kandi nyiri   kóyô
                 1sg-be 1teacher also and 1sg-be 1mother
                 'I am a teacher and a mother.'

Finally, if the subject of the predication is questioned in a wh-question, so that the answer must contain new information related to the subject, an inverse specificational sentence is necessary as an answer. Note that, with first and second person pronouns, as with names, the non-agreeing **ni** copula is necessary.[14] This is due to the fact that first and second person cannot agree with the **YO** copula. Therefore, the non-agreeing copula must be used.

(34) a. iyóndi yo   mugéni?/ omugení ní ndi
        1who 1COP 1guest
        'Who is the guest?

    Possible answers:
    b.*ingye mugeni
        I   1guest

    c. ni ingyê
       be I
       'It is me.'

    d. omugení   ni ingyê
       aug.1guest be I
       'The guest is me.'

We introduce here one additional piece of evidence that supports the inherent subject focus interpretation of utterances such as:

(35) ingye mugéni
     I   1guest
     'I am the one who is a guest.'

Consider again the following question:

---

[14] Since all pronouns in Kinande lack class markers and augments, it is correctly predicted that none of them should be able to be in an AGREE (without c-command) relation with the YO copula.

(36) Iyóndi yo   mugéni
     1who 1COP   1guest
     'Who (is it who) is guest?'

The following response would be possible if we interpret *Mugeni* both in the question and answer as a name rather than a predicate:

(37) ingye Mugéni
     I   Visitor/Guest
     'I am called Guest.'

Recall from earlier discussion that when the subject of the predication is focused, the remaining material must be interpreted non-referentially. Therefore, this is equivalent to the difference between "Omugalímu ni Kámbale (The teacher is Kambale.)" and "Omugalímu yo Kámbale (It is the teacher who is called Kambale.).

2.4 Identificational copular clauses

Identificational clauses are described in the literature as having a demonstrative pronoun or a phrase containing a demonstrative in subject position. The demonstrative in such a clause is understood as having a deictic function rather than being anaphoric. And, as pointed out in den Dikken (2005), an identificational clause is not understood as supplying a value for a variable or as having a contrastive or exhaustive reading. In the examples given by Higgins (1973) and discussed in Mikkelsen (2011), the demonstrative (phrase) occurs in the structural subject position. The following examples illustrate identificational clauses in Kinande. The question in ((38)a) establishes an identificational context. The identificational clause is given in ((38)b).

(38) a. Q: óliá   ní   ndi?
         aug.that   COP 1who
         'who is that?

   b. A: omúlumy óliá   **yó**   múkulú ów' edepartement.
        aug.1man aug.that   1COP 1giant   1of aug.9department
        'That man is the head of the department.'

We see that the **YO** copula is used in this identificational clause.
     The following example, where the pre-copular XP is in class 3 and the post copular XP is from class 9 and the **YO** copula indicates class 24 agreement, illustrates unequivocally that **YO** agrees with the post copular XP:

(39) omulong'   ólyá   y'   éKitsúku
     aug.3village aug3that   24COP aug.24Kitsuku
     'That village (pointing) is Kitsuku.'

Moreover, ((40)) illustrates that a ***ni*** copula is used when a proper name is the post copular identificational phrase. This also demonstrates that agreement (or attempted agreement) is with the post copular identificational phrase:

(40) omúkali óli **ni** Arlétte n' omúlumy' óliá **ni** Josh
　　aug.1woman that COP 1Arlette and aug.1man that COP 1Josh
　　That woman is Arlette and that man is Josh.'

The context for ((40)) is that proposed by Mikkelsen (2011), where two people attend a party but they have unequal knowledge about the other partygoers. One attendee asks the other just who is who at the party. In this example, an identificational clause is used to discretely 'teach' someone the names of attendees of the party.

　　It is also possible for an indefinite noun phrase to be used in an identificational clause. In that case, the ***ni*** copula, the same copula used with names, is also used with indefinites. The context in these sentences is two acquaintances are in an electronics store and the one is not familiar with the products. The other one is, and explains what they are, while pointing:

(41) eyí ***ni*** smart phone; eyí ***ni*** flash drive; n' eyi ***ni*** netbook
　　9this COP smart phone; this COP flash drive; and' 9this is netbook
　　'This is a smart phone; this is a flash drive; and this is a netbook.'

Note that the identificational phrase lacks an augment since it is indefinite here and that the non-agreeing copula ***ni*** occurs. The pre-copular demonstratives indicate that the identificational phrases are in class 9; however, due to the loan word status of the identificational phrases, no class marker is indicated. Therefore, there is neither augment nor class marker, which means that the identificational clause cannot provide agreement features for the copula. However, when the identificational phrases involve possessed nouns, we can observe that ***ni,*** rather than the agreeing copula ***YO,*** occurs just in case the identificational phrase lacks an augment ((42)). If the possessed noun is prefixed with an augment, the agreeing copula ***YO*** occurs ((43)). The possessed noun is prefixed with a class marker in these examples. Therefore, it is specifically the augment that controls agreement.

(42) éryá ní mbwá yage
　　9that COP 9dog 9.my
　　'That is my dog.'

(43) éryá y' émbwá yage
　　9that 9COP aug.9dog 9my
　　'That is the dog that belongs to me.'

　　There is another type of clause that Mikkelsen (2011) considers identificational. Here, instead of a demonstrative, a pronoun is used. In the English translation, the pronoun is *it*. In Kinande, there is a null pronoun. The examples here are from Valinande (1984)

(44) Q: What did that?
　　A: gw' ámagétsi

      6COP   aug.6water
      'It's the water.'

  A: sy'   êsyómbene
      10COP aug.10goat
      'It's the goats.'

Hedberg (2000) calls this type of copular clause in English a truncated cleft because of its resemblance to a full cleft. Consider the English translation of the Kinande example: 'It's the goats.' The full cleft version would be: 'It's the goats that did this.' However, in Kinande, these do not look like a truncated cleft or at least it doesn't look like a truncated focus construction.[15] In focus constructions in Kinande, we find the **YO** morpheme follows the focused expression. In the sentences in ((44)) it precedes the focused expression. Moreover, the expression following **YO** when there is focus in a copular sentence cannot have an augment (from Valinande 1984: p.441):

(45) omúkali   yó   mwami/*omwami
    aug.1woman 1COP   3chief
    'It is the woman who is chief.'

The following sentence is translated as a cleft by Valinande (1984: p.752):

(46) Bo   bagení b'   ómwami
    2COP   2guest 2of aug.1chief
    'It is they indeed who are the guests of the chief.'

Note that the phrase that follows the **YO** marker of focus lacks an augment. This contrasts with the *it* identificational sentences in Kinande, as in ((44)), where there must be an augment.[16]

---

[15] It is not clear that this is actually a cleft construction in Kinande. It is possible that **YO** is a focus marker here. We briefly discuss this later in the article. A full understanding of whether or not this is a cleft lies outside the scope of the present article.

[16] An additional sentence type that arguably falls under the identificational rubric are presentational ones such as the following:

    (i) olutú   lwá   lunô
       aug.11nest 11of 11here
       'Here is the nest.'

Remarkably, the copula here is an agreeing linker of the type that usually occurs in noun phrases in Kinande and links together the head noun and, for example, a possessive noun: (modified from Valinande 1984: p. 762)

    (ii) olukímba   lwá   tatâ
       aug.11cloth   11of Father
       'Father's cloth'

2.5   Equative copular clauses

The fourth type of copular clause to consider is equatives. Equatives have an unclear status in the taxonomy with some linguists arguing that they do not exist or that they do not exist in all languages. We consider first equatives that are tautologies. We will see that they look like predicational sentences:

(47) óbwirá   ní bwírá,   n' ekási   ni kási
       aug.14friendship COP 14friendship   and aug.9duty COP 9duty
       'Friendship is friendship, but duty is duty.'

The post copular noun phrase obligatorily lacks an augment in this context but the precopular one has an augment.[17] Recall that having a post copular NP, as opposed to a DP is a hallmark of predication. This suggests that at least tautologies might not be truly equative in Kinande.
     We consider next noun phrases that are not names. That is, we consider nominals that can have class markers and augments so that we will be able to ascertain if the **YO** copula occurs in equatives that involve two different referential noun phrases.

(48) Eririma ky'   ekihugo; n'embuto yowene   b'   abana b'Obwami
       5field   7COP aug.7world; &9seed 9of good 2COP 2child 2of 14chieftancy
       'The field is the world, and the good seed stands for the people of the kingdom.'
       (from Matthew 13:38)

This example illustrates that the **YO** copula occurs in equatives along with post copular agreement, both characteristics that are familiar from inverse specificational clauses.
     Consider next the equation of names. We see that the **ni** copula is used which is expected given the fact that names lack augments and class markers. The following example has the context (in the spirit of Hedberg) where the hearer is reading an article which is authored by Keenan. Both the speaker and the hearer know who Keenan is and they know who Ochs is. The hearer did not know they were the same person. The speaker remarks:

(49) Kínan ni Óchs
       'Keenan is Ochs.'

An additional context which demonstrates an equative where both DPs in the equative are fully referential would be as follows. One person is from Argentina and knows who Jorge Bergoglio is (perhaps he was his teacher in high school). The person is also Catholic and knows the Pope's name is Pope Francis. This person, however, did not know that they are the same person. The person is informed of the relation between the two as follows:

(50) Jórge Bergoglió ni Pápe Franswâ
       'Jorge Bergoglio is Pope Francis.'

---

[17] Precopular noun phrases must always have augments in Kinande, a structural constraint.

The **ni** copula is also used in the context of equating an actor with his theater role as demonstrated by the following question and answer pair:

(51) Q: oyúkasata   Hamléte ni   níndî?
        aug.3sg.playing Hamlet COP who
        'Who is playing (the role of) Hamlet?'

    A: Hamléte ni   Magúlu
        Hamlet   COP Magulu
        'Hamlet is Magulu.'

If however the context requires information about the language rather than the world, the **YO** copula is used in an equative. For example, suppose someone does not know the name of Pope Francis when he was still a cardinal or does not know his worldly name but wants to find it out. In that case, one is informed as follows:

(52) Pápe Franswaá   yo   Jórge Bergogliô.
      1Pope Francis   1COP 1Jorge Bergoglio
      'Pope Francis is (named) Jorge Bergoglio.'

As we saw before with inverse specificational sentences, since names cannot agree due their lack of augment and class marker, **YO** can only be interpreted as a focus marker for the structural subject and the post copular name is then obligatorily interpreted as a predicate.

    Equatives are not completely productive in Kinande even though specificational copular sentences do seem to be. When human nouns other than names are equated, additional information is sometimes required for the equative to sound natural. For instance, in the following example, there was a theft and it was the doctor, a person whose profession, but not name, is shared knowledge. In response to who is the thief, the following answer was judged as slightly strange:[18]

(53) ?ómwibí   yó   omúlámya
      aug.1thief 1COP aug.1doctor
      'The thief is the doctor.'

Instead, the following was judged as natural:

---

[18] We note that although ni does not normally allow first or second person subjects, they are acceptable in the following equative example.
        (i) ingyé n'   ingyé na wu ni   iwê
              I   COP I   and you COP you
            'I am who I am and you are who you are.'

(54) ómwibí yó n'omúlámya
     'The thief is also the doctor.'
      This following translation was also provided by our consultant:
      'The thief is also the same person as the doctor.'

In sum, we see that equatives in Kinande look very much like inverse specificational sentences and thus are consistent with theories that view equatives and specificational clauses as arising from the same source.

3   Small clauses & secondary predication

In this section we examine secondary predication. Specifically, we look at argument small clauses and depictive and resultative constructions, with our focus being on the particles that connect the secondary predicate to its subject. As an illustration of the particles we are interested in, here is an example of an argument small clause that illustrates the connecting particle *mo*, a particle that occurs in secondary predication in Kinande, between the secondary predicate and its subject:

(55) ngáconsidere Mariá **mó** mwira   wage
      1s.consider   Maria **MO** 1friend 1.my
      'I consider Maria my friend.'

An additional tenseless particle that can occur in secondary predication contexts is **nga**, which can often be translated as 'as,' 'like,' or 'if,' depending on the syntactic configuration in which it occurs:

(56) ngáconsidere Mariá **ngá**   mwira wage
      1s.consider   Maria **NGA** 1friend 1.my
      'I consider Maria (as) my friend.'

3.1   Structure of small clauses & the connecting particles

We take it as essentially uncontroversial that there is a small clause constituent in argument small clauses. However, there are controversial issues related to the small clause constituent, such as the question of what the head of the small clause is. Is it the predicate itself or does a functional head of some type mediate this predication? We will adopt the view of den Dikken (2006), who proposes that predication is always mediated by a functional element. Den Dikken calls a functional element of this type a *relator*. The purpose of the relator is to connect the predicate to its subject. Here is the structure den Dikken proposes, where R = relator:

(57) [$_V$ V [$_{RP}$ DP [R Pred]]]

There are no argument small clauses in Kinande that lack an overt relator. The structure in ((57)) provides a natural account for the fact that secondary predication in Kinande obligatorily involves one of the overt relators *mo* or *nga*: they head the small clause.

The particle **mo** is morphologically invariant. That is, it does not express agreement with the subject of the predication. The phrase following the relator obligatorily lacks an augment. That is, it must be a bare predicate. As den Dikken notes (p.c.), the particle **mo** reminds of the English relator *as* in its obligatoriness and function as a relator although the distribution of **nga** is probably closer to the English relator *as*. **Mo** is identical to the prefix found on nouns that marks noun class 18, which is a locative class.[19] Here is an example of a noun that occurs in noun class 18:

(58) o.**mó**.mú.ti
      aug.18.3.tree
      'in the tree'

Noun class 18 is the class in Kinande of the expletive subject of existential sentences. That is, the subject of existentials is a class 18 null pronoun as shown by the class 18 subject/verb agreement:

(59) mu-li   kapúsu (o**mo**jardin)
      18-COP   12cat   (aug.18.9garden)
      'There is a cat (in the garden).'

Noun class marker 18, like other locative class markers, behaves in certain ways like an independent word, and thus, behaves more like a preposition rather than a class marker. For instance, a prenominal quantifier can intervene between the locative class marker and the noun ((60)a). Moreover, demonstratives, which are post nominal, agree with the noun in class, rather than agreeing with the locative class marker ((60)b). Finally, the verb can optionally either agree in noun class with the locative phrase as a whole or with the noun class of the "inner" noun ((60)c):

(60) a. o.**mó**   bulí   mú.ti
        aug.18 every 3.tree
        'in every tree'

    b. o.**mó**.mú.ti   oyụ
      aug.18.3.tree   3.this
      'in this tree'

    c. o.**mo**.ndata   **mu**-li   bándu   (from Valinande 1984, p. 532)
      aug.18.9above 9.COP 2person
      'In the house above there are persons'

The other relator, **nga**, is not related to the locative classes morphologically. However, it has prepositional properties. Mutaka (1986) has analyzed **nga** as a case assigning head,

---

[19] We note that the English connector *as* also has prepositional characteristics.

which is consistent with it being a preposition. In copular clauses, the copula that is associated with locative phrases precedes **nga**. **Ni** cannot precede **nga**:

(61) a. ali   nga Kámbale
       3s.COP   like Kambale
       'He is like Kambale.'

    b.*ni   nga Kámbale
      COP   like Kambale
      'He is like Kambale.'

     Additional cross-linguistic evidence supports the idea that **nga** is prepositional. Den Dikken (p.c.) points out to us a number of examples of locative relators in predication constructions in English and Dutch. Consider for example, the English "He takes **after** his father." In this example "after" is a (locative) prepositional relator of the predication relation. Den Dikken also points out similar examples of locative relators in Dutch:

(62) hij lijkt **op** zijn vader
     he seems on his father
     'He looks like his father; He resembles his father'

Interestingly, although the Kinande **nga** seems to have a prepositional meaning that is more general than simply locative, we can note that **nga** is found in similar contexts. For example, the word for "seem" in Kinande is *erí-bya nga*, that is "to be+nga"
     An additional property we note is that the relator **nga** has an ambiguous status as relator and as a complementizer, higher in the left edge. Kinande is not the only language to have the property of a relator also functioning as a complementizer. Marcel den-Dikken (p.c.) points us toward the English examples of:

(63) a. I regard you **as** intelligent   ← *as* qua relator

    b. **As** you are intelligent, you will understand that....   ← *as* qua complementizer

Finally, we note that **nga,** like **mo,** is morphologically invariant. Unlike **mo**, a phrase that follows **nga** can have an augment.
     One way that **nga** and **mo** differ from a verbal copula (let's consider the invariant **ni** copula as the closest parallel) is in that they do not have the ability to license a null subject on their own. **Nga** and **mo** can have a null subject only if it is licensed by a clitic pronoun affixed to the superordinate verb ((64)). **Ni**, although it lacks subject agreement, can license a null subject ((65)):

(64) a. Kámbale   aká-mu-langirá ngá/mó   mukulukúlu
       1Kambale 3s.TNS-3obj-see NGA/MO 1idiot
       'Kambale considers him (as) an idiot.'

   b.*Kambale   akalangira   nga/mo   mukulukulu
      1Kambale 3s.TNSsee   NGA/MO   1idiot

(65) Kámbale   ati   ni   mukulukúlu
      1Kambale 3sg.say COP 1idiot
      'Kambale said (that) he is an idiot.'

The straightforward explanation for this difference in null pronoun licensing is that ***nga***
and ***mo*** cannot assign Case to the subject position of the small clause, whereas ***ni*** can assign
Case to its subject position. That is, Case is assigned exceptionally to the subject of the small
clauses headed by ***nga*** and ***mo.***

3.2   Argument small clauses

   We first consider argument small clauses in Kinande. A few additional examples are
given here:

(66) Sũsyelahĩraya n'   omũtwe wawe, kusangwa
     not.swear   with 1head   1your   because
     siwangatoka   eriyira [oluywiri luguma [[mo lweru] kutse [mo lwĩragũlũ]]]
     not.you.succeed to.have 11hair   11one   MO 11white or   MO 11black
     'And do not swear by your head, for you cannot make even one hair white or black.'
     (from Matthew 5:36)

(67) Nĩkwa omugulu basonda-sonda erihamba Yesu,   mobubaha esyondeko,
     then   3time   3pl.want-want to.seize 1Jesus fear   10gathering
     kusangwa mobaganza [Yesu   mo mũmĩnyererĩ]
      because   3pl.counted Jesus   MO 1prophet
      'They wanted to arrest him, but they were afraid of the crowds, who considered Jesus
       a prophet.'   (Matthew 21:46)

(68) kutse muyire [[omuti   **mo** mubi] n'   [ebĩgũma byago mo bibi]]
      or   have aug.3tree   MO 3bad and   aug.8fruit 8its   MO 8bad
      '...or make the tree bad and its fruit bad.' (from Matthew 12:33)

(69) móbahúlíre [Magulú **mo** mugalímu oyúwene   okó   bosî]
      dj.3pl.called Magulu **MO** 1teacher   RELC1good aug17LOC all
      'They called Magulu the best teacher.'

(70) ngálangira Nadíné   mo mubúya
      1sg.see   1Nadine MO 1beautiful
      'I find Nadine beautiful.'

In these examples we see that adjectival predicates agree in class with the subject of the
predication and that ***mo*** remains invariant. In addition, the fact that the entire small clause
can be coordinated with another small clause, as illustrated in ((68)), provides evidence for

its constituency as a single unit. Finally, we see that the relator *mo* remains even if there is passivization or relativization of the subject of the predication:

(71) a. Asyahulwa   mo Mũnazaretĩ.
        3sg.fut.call.pass MO 1.Nazarene
        'He would be called a Nazarene.'   (from Matthew 2:23)

     b. ...Ngandikola kĩ   n'   omundu oyo   mukahula mo Mwami w'Abayũda kwehĩ?
        1sg.shall.do 7what with 1person 1that you.call   MO 1king   1.of 2.Jews Question
        'Then what shall I do with Him whom you call the King of the Jews?'
        (from Mark 15:12)

The fact that *mo* remains although the subject moves away indicates that the specifier of the projection headed by *mo* is not a criterial position of the relevant kind, in Rizzi's (1997) terms. That is, the specifier of the projection headed by *mo* does not "freeze" the specifier and prevent it from further syntactic activity. This is unlike how an agreeing head which heads a projection whose specifier is a criterial position might behave. Consider for example the following English sentences. Here the fact that agreeing T heads a projection whose specifier is a criterial position prevents further A-movement for the specifier of its projection:

(72) a. It seems [**John** like**s** books]
     b.***John** seem**s** [like**s** books]
     c. **John** seem**s** [to like books]

     Since *mo* obligatorily requires a bare predicate following it, it is not possible for a specificational small clause to occur when *mo* heads the small clause. The first of the following examples illustrates that *mo* heading a predicative small clause:

(73) ngáconsidere Magulú   mo mulidére
     1sg.consider 1Magulu MO 1leader
     'I consider Magulu the leader.'

An inverse specificational clause, where the predicate occurs in initial position and the subject of predication follows the predicate, is not possible with the *mo* relator:

(74) *Ngáconsidere omulidéré   mo Magúlu
      1sg.consider   aug.1leader   MO Magulu
      'I consider the leader to be Magulu.'

Instead, as in English, an inverse specificational predication is not possible without additional functional support as noted in the literature on small clauses and inverse copular constructions (den Dikken 2006, Moro 2000). In Kinande, a copula must occur between the subject of the predication and the predicate:

(75) a. Ngáconsidere omulidéré   kó ni Magúlu[20]
   1sg.consider   aug.1leader KO be Magulu
   'I consider the leader to be Magulu.'

  b. Ngáconsidere omulidéré kw-álí íni Magúlu
    1sg.consider   aug.1leader KO 1.be i-be Magulu
    'I consider the leader to be Magulu.'

Although this might seem like obvious evidence that inverse specificational sentences require more structure than predicational sentences, we note that when the XP following the relator is arguably larger than a predicate, as is the case with superlatives, the relator **mo** cannot occur. Instead one of the copulas occurs that we see in inverse specificational sentences with verbs that can take small clauses:

(76) a. ngálangira abagalímu betú **mo** baongózi buwéne
   1sg.see aug.2teacher 2our MO 2leaders 2good
   'I consider our teachers good leaders.'

  b.*ngalangira abagalimu betu **mo** (a)baongozi buwene okobosi
    1sg.see aug.2teacher 2our MO (aug.)2leaders 2good 17in.2all
    'I consider our teachers the best leaders.'

  c. ngálangira abagalímu betú **nga ni** baongózi buwéne okóbosî
    1sg.see aug.2teacher 2our as be 2leader 2good 17in.2all
    'I consider our teachers the best leaders.'

We saw earlier that there was a distinction between the augmentless and augmented nominal phrases whereby only augmentless ones could occur as predicate in a predicational copular sentence with the **ni** copula. Augmented nominal phrases were governed by a different copula. In the examples we have just considered, involving small clauses, it appears that there is a similar divide between NPs and larger structures: clear cases of predicates are governed by the relator **mo,** whereas larger phrases must occur in larger structures with copula.

3.3 Resultatives

 We consider now resultatives. These are secondary predication structures where the secondary predicate describes a new state holding of the subject of the secondary predication. The new state is brought about by the action of the verb. An example from English would be:

(77) They hammered the metal flat.

---

[20] We do not understand well the function of **ko**. We have observed that it sometimes occurs as a complementizer. It appears to have other functions, too.

This sentence could be paraphrased roughly as follows: they hammered the metal so much that, as a result, the metal was flat. In the literature, resultatives classically have adjectives as the secondary predicate. However, Kinande has few adjectives and we were unable to find examples of resultatives formed from APs. However, we did find examples of resultatives that involve predicates that can be rendered as PPs in the translation.[21]

(78) a. móbahésiry'ékyumá   eri-ki-yirá   mó kíbambale[22]
        3pl.forged   aug.7metal 5-7OM-have   MO 7flat
        'They forged the metal into a tray.'

      b. Kámbale   átwa   akaratásí mo bihánde
         1Kambale 3sg.cut 12paper   MO 8piece
         'Kambale cut the paper into pieces.'

      c. omuloyí   a-yi-henduká-yá   mo kanyúnyu
         aug.1sorcerer 3s-self-change-cause MO 12small bird
         'The sorcerer changed himself into a small bird.'

In these examples, the predicates are not in the locative class. They are NPs, with class markers and no augments. As with small clauses, predication is also mediated by the relator ***mo***.

      We did not find examples of resultatives involving subjects such as the Kinande equivalent of (the ungrammatical in English): Kambale forged the metal tired, where *tired* refers to the resultant state Kambale would be in after forging metal. While such examples are ungrammatical in English, subject resultatives have been reported to exist in some languages; therefore, it is of interest to investigate this. The scarcity of adjectives in Kinande limits our ability to construct plausible examples that would allow us to explore for Kinande the possibility of subject resultatives more fully. For example, Kinande lacks an adjective equivalent to *tired* or similar relevant adjectives. If we consider examples with NPs rather than APs, the following example might initially be analyzed as a subject resultative:

(79) ekópó   móyatul-**ík-**íré   **mo** bihánde.bihánde
     aug9cup 9.broke.**anti-causative** MO 8piece.8piece
     'The cup broke into many pieces.'

The sentence final NP expresses the result of the cup breaking. The relator MO immediately precedes the result predicate. Although it might appear that predication is with the subject,

---

[21] There is some controversy surrounding the status of PPs in resultative constructions (Giannakidou & Merchant 1999). Specifically, in their study of resultatives in Greek, Giannakidou & Merchant (1999) suggest that resultatives with PPs as secondary predicates might have a different structure from resultatives with APs since PPs can serve as a predicate in resultative constructions with many more verbs than APs can.
[22] This example is not so clearly resultative. It literally means 'They forged the metal to have/make it flat.'

we can note that the verb *eritul**ika*** has an anti-causative suffix *–ik* which detransitivizes the verb *eritula* 'to break.' The following example illustrates the transitive use of *eritula*:

(80) Kámbale atúlíre   ekópô
      Kambale 3sg.break.pst 9cup
      'Kambale has broken the cup.'

We analyze the subject of the anti-causative as an underlying internal argument to capture its relation to the related transitive verb. In this case then, we simply have another example of an object resultative, on a par with a passive as in the following example:

(81) akaratási   mókatwír**w**é   **mo** bihindibihíndi
      aug.12paper 12.cut.PASSIVE   MO 8piece.8piece
      'The paper was cut into many pieces.'

In sum, there are rather limited possibilities for resultative constructions in Kinande. This limitation appears minimally to be due to the fact that there are few adjectives in the language. Despite the limited possibilities for resultatives, we are able to establish that the same relators that mediate secondary predication for argument small clauses also occur in resultative constructions. Finally, the distribution of the relator we have seen is consistent with the hypothesis that the relator mediates a predication relation as shown in ((57)).

3.4 Depictives

Depictives involve secondary predication where the secondary predicate indicates a usually physical or psychological state that is contemporaneous with the activity expressed by the primary predicate. Here is an example of a depictive in English where the depictive adjective is predicated of the direct object:

(82) Kambale ate the meat raw.

We understand this roughly to mean: they ate the meat and the meat was raw at the time of eating it. The presence of the depictive predicate does not change the fundamental meaning of the verb. Therefore, it is adjunct like. The following sentence illustrates a depictive in Kinande which has essentially the same meaning as the previous English example:

(83) Kámbale mwálya enyamá   **mó** mbísi
      Kambale ate   aug.9meat **MO** 9raw
      'Kambale ate the meat raw.'

Note that the predication is again mediated by the relator **mo**. Moreover, the secondary AP predicate and its subject agree in noun class (gender & number).[23] Here is another example of a depictive in Kinande. As in the previous example, the depictive predicate is predicated

---

[23] The concept of noun class includes the idea of gender and number.

of the direct object and the subject and predicate adjective agree in noun class. Moreover, **mo** mediates the predication:

(84) nágúla   e<u>n</u>etbook   **mo** <u>ny</u>íhyáka
       1sg.bought   aug.9netbook MO 9new
       'I bought the netbook new.'

        Adjectives in Kinande follow the noun. Therefore, unlike a language such as English, where attributive adjectives precede the noun and depictive adjectives follow the noun, there is not a difference in word order to distinguish between attributive and depictive adjectival modification. Instead, the absence of the relator **mo** leads to an attributive interpretation:[24]

(85) nágúla   e<u>n</u>étbúk   <u>ny</u>íhyáka
       1sg.bought aug.9netbook 9new
       'I bought the new netbook.'

        Here are additional depictives where the subject of the depictive predication is still the direct object but the predicate is an NP rather than AP:

(86) a. sigubahe erĩherũkya Marĩa **mo** mũkalĩ wawe
           neg.2fear 5marry   Mary **MO** 1wife   1your
           'Do not be afraid to marry Mary as your wife.' (Matthew 1:20)

        b. bakowa emyatsi   yosĩ **mo** mĩsyo.
            3pl.hear aug.4news 4all MO 4parables
            'They hear all the stories as parables.' (from Mark 4:11)

        c. neryo mwatsũka erituma-bo   **mo** babiri-babiri.
           then   3s.began   5send-2them MO 2two-2two
           'He began to send them out two by two.' (from Mark 6:17)

In short, Kinande has object depictives. Both APs and NPs can function as secondary predicates in this case. Secondary predication involving object depictives is mediated by the relator **mo**.
        We consider next subject depictives. Although subject depictives are not rare cross-linguistically, subject depictives in Kinande are of interest as they have a somewhat different syntax from object depictives. In subject depictives, we do not find **mo** mediating the predication relation between the depictive secondary predicate and the subject of the

---

[24] If the post nominal adjective has an augment prefixed to it, it is understood as a relative clause:
(i) nágúla   e<u>n</u>étbúk' e<u>ny</u>íhyáka
      1sg.bought aug.9netbook aug.9which is new (the new one)
      'I bought the netbook which is new.'

predication (in this case the subject of the sentence). Instead, there are several possibilities. One possibility is for a depictive NP to be placed in locative class 18, so that the depictive is interpreted as a PP. Here is an example:

(87) Kámbale ágúla   ekitábú ky'   omo tamíro
      Kambale bought 7book   KYO 18.   9drunkenness
      'Kambale bought the book drunk.'
      (Literally: Kambale bought the book in drunkenness.)

(88) a. Kámbale mwátúmíka omotamíro.
        Kambale 3s.worked   18.9drunkenness
        'Kambale worked drunk.'

     b. Kámbale mwátumíkíre omotamiró   yíwe
        Kambale 3s.worked   18.9drunkenness 9his
        'Kambale worked drunk.' (Literally: Kambale worked in his drunkenness.)

This depictive-like phrase can also modify an implicit external argument:

(89) ekitábu   kyágúláwa   omotamíro
      aug.7book 7bought.PASSIVE   18.9drunkenness
      'The book was bought while (he was) drunk.'

The locative subject depictive in Kinande does not behave like depictives that have been reported in languages such as English, where it is well established that depictives are not able to modify implicit external arguments. The locative depictive also cannot modify an applied phrase:

(90) Kámbale ásómera   ekitábú kyo Kámbér'   omotamíro.
      Kambale 3s.read.APPl   7book   7LK Kambere   18.9drunkenness
      'Kambale$_j$ read the book to Kambere$_k$ (while) drunk$_{j/*k}$.'

Since Kinande has high applicatives, a depictive predicate modifying an applied phrase should be possible according to Pylkkänen's (2008) theory of applicatives and depictives: nothing should prevent a depictive from modifying a high applicative if it can modify a subject since they are both external arguments according to her theory of applicatives. On one measure, her theory makes the correct prediction: subjects and applied arguments in Kinande behave alike in that neither can be modified by a **mo** depictive. Depictive prepositional phrases seem to have a different distribution even in English. We observe that implicit agents of passives seem comparatively plausible as subjects of depictive predications, whereas applied arguments are not possible subjects of depictive predications:

(91) a. This book was bought drunk vs. this book was bought in a state of drunkenness.
      b. John$_j$ told Mary$_k$ the story in a state of total drunkenness$_{j/*k}$

We cannot explain why now the implicit external argument of the passive is relatively more available for depictive predication than when an AP is the secondary predicate. However, if the PP attaches at the level of the voice phrase, this captures the readings that are available in both English and Kinande.

Unaccusative verbs in Kinande do allow *mo* depictives. This is consistent with our observations about unaccusative verbs and resultative predications in Kinande. The following example illustrates that *mo* occurs in this case:

(92) Twátsuká mo bánwáni
     1pl.began MO 2friend
     'We began as friends.'

Locative class depictive predicates are also possible here, as is the relator **nga**:

(93) Twátsuka omo búnwáni
     1pl.began 18. 14friendship
     'We began in friendship.'

The relator **nga** is also possible in depictives, although we do not yet have a systematic overview of its distribution. Here are some illustrative examples where we note that **nga** can be used for subject depictives:

(94) mótwabuga eprojet   ngá   bíra
     1pl.finished 9project NGA 2friend
     'We finished the project as friends.'

(95) níngirá   ng'   omúkirirya
     1s.entered   NGA aug.1believer
     'I entered as a believer.'

In sum, we see that there is an object/non-object asymmetry in secondary predication in Kinande. The asymmetry is seen in the distribution of the relator for secondary predication where the relator *mo* is reserved for secondary predications involving objects. We note that Pylkkänen (2008) observes an object/non-object asymmetry for the Bantu language of Venda. She points out that depictives in Venda have one form that modifies only direct objects, which she says are non-agreeing forms (although to us the data appears consistent with an analysis of agreement in terms of noun class). She notes another form that she calls an agreeing form. This form can serve as a depictive for any argument. To us, these "agreeing forms" look possibly clausal, which would explain their freer distribution. It seems then that the object/non-object asymmetry in secondary predication observed in Kinande can be found in other Bantu languages and merits a closer look. Finally, we re-iterate our observation that the data from secondary predication in Kinande provides good support for a theory of predication that postulates a head of the predication other than the predicate.

4   The linker within the verb phrase: a predication relation

Kinande has a functional morpheme called the linker (LK) that is internal to the verb phrase. We will argue that the linker marks predication relations. Specifically, we will demonstrate how it has properties of linkers in the sense of den Dikken (2006), where a linker is a functional morpheme that marks inverse predications. We will also demonstrate that the linker in Kinande sometimes functions like a relator. That is, some linkers are the functional head that mediates a non-inverse predication relation. We also note that although linkers have been claimed in the literature to be a cross-linguistic rarity, we will see they have something in common with familiar semi-clefts, found in Romance languages.

The Kinande linker is always immediately preceded by a DP and agrees in noun class with this preceding DP:

(96) a. Kámbale ágúlira   ekitábú **kyo** Nadíne
      Kambale bought.appl 7book   **7LK** 1Nadine
      'Kambale bought a book for Nadine.'

   b. Kámbale ágúlira   Nadíné **y'**   ekitábu
      Kambale bought.appl 1Nadine **1LK**' book
      'Kambale bought Nadine a book.'

In addition, the linker is obligatorily followed by a syntactic object, which need not necessarily be a noun phrase, although it is in these examples. The linker does not occur when the verbal phrase is such that only a single post-verbal XP occurs:

(97) a.*Kámbale ágúla   ekitábú *kyo*
       K.   3s.buy 7book 7LK

    b.*Kámbale ágúla   *kyo* ekitábu
       Kambale 3s.buy 7LK 7book

    c. Kámbale ágúla   ekitábu
       Kambale 3s.buy 7book
       'Kambale bought the book.'

The core case of linker constructions involves some type of verb with two objects. An example is a verb with an applied argument and a direct object as illustrated in ((96)), so that exactly two internal arguments are involved.

4.1   Case?

Baker and Collins (2006) propose that the primary role of the linker is as a Case assigner. Specifically, they propose that the linker assigns Case to the XP that follows it and thus licenses that XP. In addition, they propose that the noun phrase immediately preceding the linker receives Case directly from the verb. A linker, they argue, is not

necessary with transitive verbs that have only a single internal argument since the noun phrase would receive its Case directly from the verb. However, Schneider-Zioga (2013, 2014) points out that the linker can, and often must, occur, even if an expression follows it whose distribution is not regulated by Case theory. This, we note with Schneider-Zioga (2013, 2014), calls into question an analysis of the linker as a Case assigner. We give a few examples that illustrate that the linker obligatorily occurs between a DP and an adverb. Since it is typical for expressions that function adverbially to be nominal in Kinande, as in many Bantu languages, we point out that our examples clearly involve adverbs: [25]

(98) a. Kámbalé átuma ebarúhá **yó** lubálúba   (manner adverb—not nominal)
  Kambale sent 9letter 9LK quickly
  'Kambale sent the letter quickly.'

 b. móbánzir' erinabá   **lyó** ndeke   (manner adverb-not nominal)
  aff.2.like.tns 5(nonfinite).wash 5.LK well
  'They well-liked to wash' (i.e. they enjoyed washing)

If the distribution of the linker were driven by the Case licensing needs of expressions within the verb phrase, then the adverb examples should be just like the examples of a monotransitive verb in ((97)) –not requiring a linker-- since only one XP needs Case. Therefore, there are empirical reasons to reject the account of the linker in Baker and Collins (2006). There are also theory internal reasons to reject their account. Some of these theory internal reasons are discussed in Schneider-Zioga (2013, 2014), so we do not reproduce them here.[26] We will argue with Schneider-Zioga (2013, 2014) that the linker is

---

[25] There are also adverbial participials which are used to render the meaning *how* and *thus.* They are defective verbs in that they never take tense/aspect morphology. There are languages where participles are case marked. However, there seems to be no Case theoretic reason for them to require Case for licensing. In any event, we include examples of participles that are preceded by linkers for completeness, since such examples were not documented in Baker and Collins (2006):
i) a. Mó-bá-sóndiá éngyakyá   **yó**   b-áti   (agreeing defective verb)
  aff-2-look   9morning   9LK 2-how
  'How did they look for (the word) "morning"?' (A: They did an online dictionary search)

 b. ábaná   móbakáya okokalásí **kó**   ba-tyâ   (agreeing defective verb)
  2children 2went   17school 17LK 2-thus
  'The children went to school thus (e.g. without eating)'

[26] The *Distinctness* approach of Richards (2009, 2010) also appears to fall short empirically as an account of the linker. Richards proposes *Distinctness* as a constraint on linearization such that two XPs that are too similar in some way cannot be linearized within the same domain, specifically, within the same phase. The idea behind this is that the sensorimotor interface/phonology would not know how to linearize two syntactically non-distinct objects. With this in mind, Richards proposed that the linker occurs in Kinande because two syntactic phrases within the same domain are too similar to each other for the grammar to linearize them. Specifically, he proposes that they both bear the label DP and that prevents them from being distinct in the relevant sense. Therefore, Richards conjectures that the phrase headed by the linker provides a

an element whose primary function is to mediate predication, rather than being a Case assigner.

4.2   Linkers & copulas

In section 2, we investigated copulas in Kinande. We established that there are a variety of copulas whose distribution is governed by the type of predication involved, among other related factors. For example, we saw that one copula, ***YO***, was involved in specificational clauses and a different one, ***ni***, occurred in predicational clauses. Here, following Schneider-Zioga (2013, 2014), we note that the linker (recall examples ((96)a&b)) looks morphologically identical to the ***YO*** copula that occurs in the inverse and reverse specificational copular clauses that we examined previously. Therefore, there is already one point of similarity between linkers and copulas.

As pointed out to us by den Dikken (p.c.) on the view that the linker is a copula, then these constructions are reminiscent of the semi-cleft construction found in Romance languages. Here is an example of the semi-cleft construction from Portuguese ((99)b), discussed by Resenes & den Dikken (2012):

(99) a. O João comprou um livro
   the João bought a book

  b. O João comprou ***foi*** um livro
    the João bought ***was*** a book

This construction might look like a (reduced) pseudocleft (the equivalent of: "What João bought was a book.'). However, Resenes & den Dikken (2012) demonstrate that most semi-cleft sentences in their study were monoclausal and did not involve a reduced pseudo cleft. Instead, they involve a predication structure.

The linker constructions in Kinande resemble semi-clefts in that they look like they involve a copula and verb phrase internal arguments. We also note that they share with semi-clefts the property of their post copular constituent bearing focus. Consider the following example:

(100) Kámbale ágúlira Nadíné **y'** ekitábu
    Kambale bought 1Nadine **1LK**' aug.7book
    'Kambale bought Nadine a book.'

---

boundary between two DPs so that the like labeled phrases are spelled out in different domains and therefore linearization problems are avoided. However, as pointed out in Schneider-Zioga (2013, 2014), this cannot work if *Distinctness* in Kinande cares about labels. If *Distinctness* cares about labels, then the same examples that show Baker and Collins' (2006) Case theoretic proposal is empirically wrong also show that Richards' (2009, 2010) *Distinctness* account cannot work to account for the linker in Kinande. This is because the examples in ((98)) involve XPs with distinct labels: DP and AdvP. Therefore, since the labels are distinct, there would be no motivation for distinct domains, and hence the linker phrase, to occur. Nonetheless, a linker is required even when labels are *distinct* in Richard's sense.

With *ekitábu* bearing focus*,* the following translation is equally plausible: 'What Kambale bought Nadine was a book.' Could the Kinande structure be a reduced pseudocleft? Agreement facts immediately rule out a reduced pseudocleft analysis for Kinande. Recall that inverse specificational sentences in Kinande involve agreement of the copula with the post copular expression. In linker constructions, agreement is always with the pre-linker XP rather than with the focused expression. Therefore, there is clear evidence that these are not reduced pseudoclefts, all else being equal. This is then another parallel between Kinande linker constructions and semi-clefts.[27]

Here we clarify what structures we assume for applied and double object constructions in Kinande, as they are central to studying the syntax of the linker. Schneider-Zioga (2014), following the diagnostics of Pylkkänen (2008), demonstrates that Kinande has high applicatives. That means that the applied object is an external argument of the VP. Here, following Pylkkänen, is the kind of structure we expect to find when high applicatives are involved:[28]

(101)   [....T [$_{vP}$ EA [$_{v'}$ [$_v$ v] [$_{ApplP}$ Ben [$_{Appl'}$ APPL [$_{VP}$ V (IA)]]]]]]

However, from the point of view of predication, as developed in den Dikken (2006), there must be a still richer structure. Indeed, in that case, there must be a predication relation between the benefactive applied external argument and the applied phrase. According to den Dikken, predication requires a functional head be projected as the head of the predication. This functional head is what he calls a relator and it heads a relator phrase[29]:

(102)   [....T [$_{vP}$ EA [$_{v'}$ [$_v$ v] [$_{Relator phrase}$ Ben [$_{Relator'}$ Relator [$_{ApplP}$ APPL [$_{VP}$ V (IA)]]]]]]]

In addition to applied constructions, there are certain verbs that inherently have two arguments in Kinande. An example is the verb *eríhâ* 'to give.' Given the semantics of the verb and a predication approach to argument structure, as argued by den Dikken (2006) double object verbs must consist of a verb that takes a small clause as an argument. In that

---

[27] We also call to mind the linkers of Khoisan languages studied by Collins (2003) as well as Baker & Collins (2006). We note from their work that linkers in Hoan can link a prepositional phrase to the verb:
(i) Tsi a-kyxai   **ki** !oa na.   (Hoan)
    3pl Prog-dance **Lk** house in
    'They are dancing in the house.'
Although this is not possible with linkers in Kinande, such "linking" is possible in Romance semi-clefts:
(ii) a. o Joao dancou na Portela
       the Joao danced in.the Portela
     b. o Joao dancou *foi* na Portela
        the Joao danced was in.the Portela
        'Joao danced at the PORTELA (and not somewhere else).'
If linkers in Khoisan languages are also implicated in focus, the relation between these type of linkers and Romance semi-clefts will certainly be worth pursuing in this light.
[28] The abbreviation EA stands for 'external argument' and IA stands for 'internal argument.'
[29] To be perfectly clear, den Dikken does not propose there is a lexical item "relator" and that lexical item must head all predications. Instead, he proposes that predication is always mediated by some functional category that heads the predication. In the particular case we are considering, predication is mediated by the functional item "linker" (in the sense of linker as used in Kinande grammatical description).

small clause, the theme is the subject and the goal is the predicate (expressing a meaning similar to 'X is at Y'). Schematically, considering first the double object verb alone, we have the following where the theme and goal are in a predication relation. As we saw with applied verbs, a relator heads the predication construction:

(103)   give [relator phrase the book [relator' Relator [predicate Kambale]]]

In both applied and double object constructions, the relator is the appropriate form of **YO**. We assume that, as proposed as a possibility by Resenes & den Dikken (2012) for Romance semi-clefts, the linker/relator bears a focus feature that must be realized on the following constituent. This focus feature cannot be realized on verbal constituents. This is consistent with the syntax of focus in other constructions in Kinande, such as additive focus constructions, where focus on verbs is realized in a different way than focus on non-verbs. Therefore, a non-verbal constituent must follow the linker to receive focus.[30] The above assumptions account for the following sentences, where the linker occurs in the position we hypothesized for the relator in the relevant sentences:

(104)   Kámbale ágúlira   Nadíné **y'**   ekitábu
          Kambale bought.appl 1Nadine **1LK**' aug.7book
          'Kambale bought Nadine a book.'

(105)   Nadíné ahá ekitábú   **kyo** Kámbale
          1Nadine give aug.7book   **7LK** Kambale
          'Nadine gave the book to Kambale.'

However, note that, as evident from the examples in ((96) a&b), Kinande is a so-called symmetrical double object language, which means that under typical conditions either goal/benefactive or the theme of a double object or transitive applied construction can appear in either order within the verb phrase. In addition, either DP can cliticize to the verb or passivize. Of interest here is the fact that the arguments can appear in either order and hence that either one can appear immediately before the linker and hence can control agreement on the linker. As noted in Baker and Collins (2006), exactly one XP can precede the linker and most XP's within the verb phrase can target the immediate before the linker position, even when there are more than two verb phrase internal XPs. Therefore, we conclude with Baker and Collins (2006) that the linker heads a functional projection that has a specifier position to which no thematic role is assigned and hence essentially any XP within the verb phrase can target its specifier position.[31] This means there are two instances of the linker within the verb phrase in Kinande: one that is a relator, as outlined above, and another that facilitates inversion of the predicate in the structures

---

[30] In Schneider-Zioga (in progress), it is pointed out that the difference between semi-clefts and linker constructions in Kinande is due to an EPP requirement on most agreeing lexical items in Kinande and many Bantu languages: when there is agreement, there must also be a lexical item occupying the specifier position of the agreeing item. Therefore, in Kinande there must be a phrase both preceding and following the linker qua linker and the linker qua relator.

[31] We assume that this functional phrase dominates a level of the verb phrase immediately below vP (the phrase that hosts the external argument of the verbal phrase).

we hypothesized, past the subject of the predication. This is an instance of a *linker* in a technical sense—of the type proposed by den Dikken (2006, and various related works). For this type of *linker* to occur, by hypothesis a relator raises to a structurally higher functional category. The raising of the relator makes it possible for the predicate to invert past the subject of the predication (see den Dikken 2006 for details). First we will illustrate schematically what we have in mind and then we will give an example of a sentence that reflects that structure:

(106)   For applied verbs:
   [...[functional phrase [ApplP APPL[VP V Theme]]k [functional' F+Relator=YOj [relator phrase Ben [Relator' tj tk]]]]

(107)   Illustrative example:
   Kámbale águlira   ekitábú **kyo** Nadíne
   Kambale bought.appl 7book **7LK** 1Nadine
   'Kambale bought a book for Nadine.'

(108)   For double object verbs:
   give [functional phrase [predicate Kambale]k [functional' F+ Relatorj [relator phrase the book [relator' tj tk]]]

(109)   Illustrative example:
   Nadíne   áha Kámbalé **yo** ekitábu
   1Nadine gave 1Kambale 1LK aug.7book
   'Nadine gave Kambale a book.'

4.3   Optional versus obligatory linkers

Here we note that whereas linkers (that is, *linkers* or relators) are obligatory in the type of argument small clauses we have just discussed, there are also configurations where the linker is optional. Here we limit our comments to our most general observations. Since our primary goal is to provide a general description of copular and linking constructions in Kinande, it is outside the scope of this paper to provide a detailed account of the distribution of optional linkers. Therefore, we discuss some, but not all, of the various factors affecting optionality versus obligatoriness of linkers.

First we note that there is a difference in meaning between optional and obligatory linkers when we consider locatives. For instance, if the locative is the location of the entire VP, then the linker is obligatory. However, if the locative locates the internal argument, then the linker is optional. Here are the sentences that illustrate this difference:

(110)   Kámbale   ówa   Marya (**yo**)   omokisómo
   1Kambale heard 1Mary (1LK) 18Loc.7church
   'Kambale heard Mary in church'
   (Judged true if Mary is in church and Kambale might
    or might not be.)

Based on the interpretation of this sentence, we analyze this is as predication involving the theme *Marya* ('Mary') as subject and *omokisomo* (in the church) as the predicate.

If the applied morpheme occurs on the verb, the locative locates the entire event. In that case, the linker is obligatory:

(111)   Kámbale ówira   Marya *(**yo**)   omokisómo
         1Kambale heard.appl 1Mary (1LK)   18Loc.7church
         'Kambale heard Mary in church' (Judged true only if Kambale is in the church.)

We analyze this example as a predication between the applied phrase and the applied phrase. We note with Baker and Collins (2006) that the linker is also obligatory when an instrument is involved: (=their 3b, with tones added)

(112)   Kámbale mo-á-sény-íry'   olúkwí   lw'-   omó-mbása.
         Kambale Aff-1S/T-chop-Ext 11.wood Lk.11 loc.18-axe.9
         'Kambale chopped wood with an axe.'

In contrast, if a non-argument is predicated of a larger constituent, the linker is optional. For instance, the linker can optionally occur as a relator in passive constructions, where it relates the event expressed by the passive TP to the agent:[32]

(113)   a. amatúnda áhabáwá   obulí mwaná (yo)   ná mamá   wíwe
            6fruit   6.give.pass.fv each 1child (1LK) by 1mother his/her
            'Fruit was given to each child by his (own) mother.'

         b. omúkali mwáhérwe   eritúndá (ryo)   na Kámbale[33]
            1woman aff.1.give.tns.pass aug.5.fruit   (5LK) by Kambale
            'The woman was given the fruit by Kambale.'

         c. esyóngwí si-ká- seny- er-awa   omó-músitú (mó)   na   bákali
            10wood   10-TNS-chop-APPL-PASS   LOC.18-forest Lk.18 with 2woman
            'Wood is chopped in the forest by women.'

One way of analyzing the predication is as follows. However, we admit that if this is the correct structure, then it is rather delicate to ensure the proper agreement of the optional relator with the preceding DP rather than with the TP, for example. We leave this as a problem to be solved in later work:

(114)   [[$_{TP}$ passive event   ] [$_{R'}$ YO [na Kambale]]]   ← PASSIVE AGENT

---

[32] Our data does not agree here with that of Baker & Collins (2006). Our consultants do allow an optional linker in this context.

[33] This sentence is from Baker & Collins (2006), with the addition of an optional linker, which was accepted by native speakers.

Two final contexts for optional agreement in linker constructions are in comitative constructions and in agreeing adverb constructions:

(115)   a. Kámbale batúmá   ebarúha (yó)   náye   ← COMITATIVES
            Kambale 2.send.fv 9letter   (9LK) with-1
            'Kambale and he sent the letter.'

        b. Kámbale   ágúla   ekitábú (kyó) bá-náye
            1Kambale 1.tns.buy.fv   7book   (7LK) 2.with-1
            'Kambale bought the book with him.'

These examples also illustrate that the comitative expression itself optionally agrees with the subject of the sentence. The optional linker agrees with the immediately preceding internal argument.[34]

(116)   Kámbére mwátúmíre   ebarúhá   (**y'**)   á-tyâ   ← AGREEING ADVERB
        Kambere aff.1.send.tns aug.9letter(9LK) 1-thus/just like that
        'Kambere sent the letter just like that/thus.' (e.g., without any money inside)

In short, we can make a descriptive generalization about these optional environments: when an adjunct agrees with and/or is closely related to the external argument of the event, then the linker is optional.

Finally, we note that adjuncts that are related to the entire sentence, such as temporal phrases, are integrated into the sentence only optionally with linkers. If a linker occurs, then the post linker adjunct is interpreted as focused. Here are some examples:

(117)   a. Kámbale a-túm-á   ebarúhá (**y'**)   omotututu ←TEMPORAL
            Kambale 3sg.sent   9letter   (9LK)   18morning
            'Kambale sent the letter in the morning.'

        b. Kámbére mwímbíra   Maryá (**y'**)   omotututu
            Kambere 3sg.sang.appl 1Mary (1LK) 18morning
            'Kambere sang for Mary in the morning.'

There is then a descriptive generalization that adjuncts that modify constituents that are larger than the applied phrase (or VP as relevant) only optionally need linkers.

Although the linker is optional under the circumstances we described above, it is obligatory just in case the XP following the (potentially present) linker has a mandatory focus interpretation, as it must in an (in-situ) wh-question:

(118)   a. uti   wágúla   erópo   nyíhyanyíhya *(**y'**)   okó múgulu wáhi?
            2sg.say 2bought aug.9dress 9new   9LK   17 time   which?

---

[34] We note that these are additional examples that illustrate that the linker is not confined to contexts where the immediately following expression needs Case (even potentially optionally).

'When did you say you bought the new dress?'

      b. Nadíne ásóma   ekitábu   ekyó (ky') omotututu.
        Nadine 3sg.read aug.7book 7that   (7LK) 18morning
        'Nadine read that book in the morning.'

(119)   a. Omúkali ahúká   éngokó *?(y)'   áti
         1woman 3sg.cooked   9chicken 9LK   3sg.how
         'How did the woman cook the chicken?'

      b. Kámbére mwátúmíre ebarúhá (y)'   átyâ
        Kambere 3sg.sent   9.letter (9LK)' 3sg.thus
        'Kambere sent the letter like that (e.g., with no money in it).'

In section 4 we have introduced some of the major generalizations surrounding the linker. We have shown that its major characteristics follow naturally from a predication analysis of verb phrase internal arguments and from the proposal that the Kinande linker is either a relator or linker (in the sense of den Dikken), depending on the syntactic context. There are still many aspects of the syntax of the linker that we have not yet addressed. Although some properties have been addressed in a more in depth way from a formal perspective in Schneider-Zioga (2013), a comprehensive formal analysis is developed in Schneider-Zioga (in progress).

5   A few final linkers/relators

Finally, we observe that the morpheme that marks focus in focus constructions, looks morphologically identical to the linker within the verb phrase and the copula that occurs in specificational and identificational sentences:

(120)   a. Ekitábu   ***kyo*** Kámbale   ágúla   {FOCUS marker, for class 7=***kyo***}
         aug.7book FOC 1Kambale 3p.bought
         'It is a book that Kambale bought.'

      b. Kámbale ágúlira   ekitábú   ***kyo*** Nadíne   {linker, for class 7= ***kyo***}
        Kambale 3s.buy.appl.fv aug.7book 7*LK* 1Nadine
        'Kambale bought Nadine a book.'

Although we translate the focus constructions as clefts, we are not convinced that this is the correct syntactic analysis of the Kinande focus sentences. Instead, our preliminary proposal is that this is also a predication structure where the morpheme ***YO*** is a focus morpheme similar to *only*. Note that the focus morpheme agrees with the focused expression in initial position. One reason we are not convinced that this is a cleft structure, despite the fact that we have seen instances of ***YO*** as a copula, is because it is possible to have an overt copula co-occur with ***YO***, which makes the focus construction look syntactically like a cleft. When the overt copula occurs, the focus marker ***YO*** co-occurs and therefore, it does not seem ***YO*** is a copula in this context:

(121)   ni kitábu kyo ….
          be 7book 7FOC …
          'It is a book that …'

See also Schneider-Zioga (2007) for additional arguments that sentences like ((120)a) are not clefts. However, much work remains before we conclude with certainty whether or not constructions like ((120)a) are clefts.

 As a final observation about the distribution of linking elements, we note that enclitic pronouns are also very similar to the Kinande linker found in the verb phrase:

(122)   Nadíne   ágúlá-***kyô***   {clitic pronoun, for class 7=***kyo***;
          1Nadine bought-7pro   linker for class 7= ***kyo*** (see ((96)a))}
          'Nadine bought it.'

In fact, the similarity is so great that it led Baker & Collins (2006) to propose that the enclitic pronoun is in fact an instance of the linker. We believe that their analysis is incorrect. Here we present the arguments found in Schneider-Zioga (2014), who demonstrates that the linker is similar, but ***not identical*** to an enclitic pronoun. Consider facts regarding class 1 enclitic pronouns. There is an arbitrary morphological gap such that there is no class 1 enclitic. However, there is a class 1 linker, as we have already seen:

(123)   a. Nadíne   álángirá-***yô***   (NO CLASS 1 ENCLITIC—arbitrary gap)
          1Nadine saw   -9/4/24pro/*1pro
          'Nadine saw it (e.g., a cow).' '*Nadine saw him/her.'

          b. ágúlira   Barack Obámá ***y'***ekitábu   (linker, for class 1= ***y(o)***)
          3sg.buy.appl 1B. O.   1LK'aug.7book
          'He bought Barack Obama a book.'

The additional facts noted in Schneider-Zioga (2014) are that a phonological process of vowel harmony applies to linkers, but not enclitics, thus suggesting they are distinct lexical items. The process centers on the additive focus marker *na* 'also/and.' Consider data where the additive focus marker focuses the theme in a double object construction with the order Goal Theme. We follow Schneider-Zioga (2014) in observing that this is a *vowel harmony* domain, such that the vowel quality of the augment of the focused expression spreads regressively into the linker. In the following examples, we see that the linker exceptionally does not end in –o. Instead, its final vowel harmonizes in vowel quality with the augment of the following DP:

          LINKER = vowel harmony
(124)   a. Kámbale mwáhéré ábana   abó   ***bé***   n'**e**bíkene (bwé)
             Kambale gave   2children 2those   2LK and 8yam
             'Kambale gave those children also YAMS.'

          b. Kámbale mwáhéré ábana   abó   ***bá***   n' **a**magétse (bwa)

Kambale gave   2children 2those   2LK and 6water
'Kambale gave those children also WATER.'

c. Kámbale mwáhéré ábana abó   **bó**   n'**o**buhóti (bwo)
Kambale gave 2children 2those   2LK   and 14bean
'Kambale gave those children also BEANS.'

In contrast, such a vowel harmony process is not evident when a focused expression follows an enclitic pronoun:

ENCLITIC = NO VOWEL HARMONY

(125)   a. Kámbale mwáhéré **bó**   n'ebíkene
Kambale gave   2them and aug.8yams
'Kambale gave them also YAMS.'

b.*Kambale mwahere **be**   n'ebikene
Kambale gave   2them   and aug.8yams

Therefore, despite their lexical similarity, this vowel harmony process distinguishes the two types of lexical items.

Although they are clearly not identical, still we cannot overlook the strong relation that appears to exist between copulas, linkers, and pronouns. We follow Schneider-Zioga (2013, 2014) in noting that the copula in Kinande has a "pronominal flavor." It is rather common in languages of the world for copulas to develop out of pronouns, although investigating this relation lies outside the scope of this paper.

6 A brief discussion of the tonology of focus in Kinande: the syntax/phonology interface

In this section we observe that the copula and the related linkers and relators in Kinande have a phonological reflex with respect to tone. Specifically, we will analyze two tone patterns. One is a pattern that is identical to the pattern of imperative verbs with respect to the intonational phrase. In this first pattern, we will see that one particular deictic lexical item that we analyze as having an evidential feature induces a low tone at the end of the intonational phrase in the copular focus contexts we study. The second pattern that we will analyze involves a midtone (or lowered high tone) at the end of the intonational phrase. This pattern is evident whenever we have a copula or a related linker or relator within the intonational phrase and focus is involved. We find supportive of our syntactic analysis the fact that what we have analyzed as copulas, and other linkers and relators all pattern together phonologically with respect to tone.

We begin our discussion with some preliminaries concerning tone in order to clarify the changes brought about by various tones at the intonational phrase level. We first provide examples that illustrate what happens in various phonological domains relevant for the phrasal phonology of Kinande. Our examples involve lexical tones on the phonological word at the output of the lexical component. That is, we first consider the properties of

tones before they enter the postlexical component where they will be submitted to two other domains, namely, the phonological phrase, and the intonational phrase.

Our examples, which are given in the table below, make use of three names, each of which is three syllables long and each of which has different tonal properties. The tonal properties of the names are illustrated in row (a). The first name is *Magulu* (which means 'legs,' but is used here as the name of a person). *Magulu* is toneless. The second name, *Kátsuba*, has a high tone on the initial syllable. The third name is *Káhúka* (which means 'insect,' but is used here as the name of a person). *Káhúka* has a high tone on the initial and peninitial syllable. Row (b) illustrates that there is a phrasal H that is assigned to the penultimate syllable of the phrase. This phrasal H is evident on the toneless name *Magulu*. The phrasal H is not evident on the other two words in this row due to the interaction of that H with the lexical H tones of those names. Row (c) illustrates that this same phrasal H appears in precopular subject position. Again, it is evident on the toneless name *Magulu*. The H in (d) comes from the prefix of the following word which, among other things, knocks out any lexical L tone that might be on the last vowel of the preceding word as illustrated in the form of names in columns 2 and 3 of row (d). Consider now tones in intonational phrases. One way these may be detected in our examples is by the presence of penultimate vowel length. The tone of an intonational phrase may be L at the end of a word as evident in all of our examples. The L knocks down a phrasal H that is at the end of a word. That is why the phrasal H appears on the penultimate vowel and the intonational L on the last vowel. However, in list intonation, the intonational phrase tone is H as illustrated in (e) by the names that are not at the end of an utterance.

a. iyó Magulu mulí:to
   it.is 1Magulu 1heavy
   'It is Magulu who is
   heavy.'
	iyó Kátsuba mulí:to
	it.is 1Katsuba 1heavy
		iyó Káhúka mulí:to
		it.is 1Kahuka 1heavy

b. iyó Magú:lu
   it.is Magulu
   'It is Magulu.'
	iyó Kátsu:ba	iyó Káhú:ka

c. Magulú ni mulí:to
   1Magulu is 1heavy
   'Magulu is heavy.'
	Kátsuba ni mulí:to	Káhú:ka ni mulí:to

d. amagulú máku:hi
   aug.6leg 6short
   'Legs which are short'
	Kátsubá múku:hi
	1Katsuba 1short
	'Katsuba who is short'
		Káhúká múku:hi
		1Kahuka 1short
		'Kahuka who is short.'

e. Ni Magú:lú, ná Kátsu:bá,
   na Káhú:ka
   is Magulu, and
   Katsuba, and Kahuka.
  'It is Magulu, and
   Katsuba, and Kahuka.'
	Ní Kátsu:bá, na Káhú:ka,
	na Magú:lu
	'It is Katsuba, and Kahuka
	and Magulu.'
		Ni Káhú:ká, na Magú:lú, ná
		Kátsu:ba
		'It is Kahuka, and Magulu,
		and Katsuba.'

With this background in mind, let us examine the following forms. In ((126) and (127)), we compare clauses with infinitive and imperative forms respectively, paying special attention to the tones in the last word of each example. In the infinitives (((126))a & b), the last word of the intonational phrase bears both a phrasal H on the penultimate vowel and an intonational L on the final vowel. Recall that penultimate length is a cue that tells us that the word in which it occurs is at the end of the intonational phrase.

(126)   a. erítwalira obundú   bo   Magú:lu
            5bring   aug.14food 14LK 1Magulu
            'to bring food to Magulu'

        b. erítwalira Magulú y'   obú:ndu
            5bring   1Magulu 1LK aug.14food
            'to bring Magulu food'

Consider now the imperative examples in ((127)). Notice that the last word of the intonational phrase ends with a low tone, L, that is not preceded by a phrasal H:

(127)   a. twalir'   obundú   bo   Magu:lu
            imperative.bring aug.14food 14LK 1Magulu
            'Bring the food to Magulu!'

        b. twalira   Magulú y'   obu:ndu
            imperative.bring   1Magulu 1LK aug.14food
            'Bring the food to Magulu!'

As proposed in earlier work (Mutaka ms, Hyman 1990), the lack of phrasal H in imperatives is the consequence of the assignment of an Imperative L at the end of the relevant intonational phrase.

    Of interest now are the forms in ((128)) where the sentences with pronominal/deictic *olú* "this" in ((128)a-c) behave tonally like the imperative, in that they lack a phrasal H:

(128)   a. Olú   ló   lukímba lwa Magu:lu
            11this 11COP 11dress 11of 1Magulu
            'This is the dress of Magulu.'

        b. Olukímb'   olú   ló   lwa Magu:lu
            aug.11dress 11this 11COP 11of 1Magulu
            'This dress is the one for Magulu'

        c. Olú   ló   lwa Magu:lu
            11this 11COP 11of 1Magulu
            'This one is Magulu's' (meaning the dress)
            Literally: 'This one is (the one) of Magulu.'

In contrast, sentences which are otherwise syntactically identical, but with *lulyá* "that," instead of *olú* "this," behave like regular forms where a phrasal H surfaces on the penultimate vowel and an intonational L on the final vowel:

(129)   Olukímbá   lulyá   ló   lwa   Magú:lu
          aug.11dress 11that 11COP 11of 1Magulu
          'That dress is the one for Magulu.'

This is shown in more detail in the examples in ((130), (131) & (132)), which also illustrate other identically behaving deictic forms that do not include the meaning of "near speaker:"

(130)   a. Olukímbá   lulyá   ló   lwa   Magú:lu
             aug.11dress 11that 11COP 11of   1Magulu
                 'That dress is the one for Magulu.'

          b. Lu:lyá ló   lwa Magú:lu
             11that 11COP 11of 1Magulu
             'That one is for Magulu'

          c. Lu:lyá ló   lukímba lwa Magú:lu
             11that 11COP 11dress 11of 1Magulu
             'That one is the dress of Magulu"

(131)   a. Olukímbá o:ló   ló   lwa Magú:lu
             11dress   11that-near listener 11COP 11of 1Magulu
             'That dress near you is for Magulu'

          b. O:ló   ló   lwa Magú:lu
             11that-near listener 11COP 11of 1Magulu
             'That one near you is for Magulu.'

          c. O:ló   ló   lukímba lwa Magú:lu
             11that-near listener 11COP 11dress 11of 1Magulu
             'That dress near you is for Magulu.'

(132)   a. Olukímbá lu:nó   ló   lwa Magú:lu
             11dress   11that-near speaker 11COP 11of 1Magulu
             'That dress near me is for Magulu.'

          b. Lu:nó   ló   lwa Magú:lu
             11that-near speaker 11COP 11of 1Magulu
             'That one near me is for Magulu.'

          c. Lu:nó   ló   lukímba lwa Magú:lu
             11that-near speaker 11COP 11dress 11of 1Magulu
             'That one near me is the dress of Magulu."

43

In sum, the use of olú "this" in these focus contexts triggers the equivalent of the imperative L on the last vowel of the intonational domain in focus contexts involving copulas and other linkers and relators. In contrast, the words that correspond to the English "that" (such as *lulyá*, "that" and *oló* "that, near listener") do not trigger the Intonational L on the last word that blocks the assignment of the phrasal H to the penultimate vowel.[35]

However, the last word of a sentence with *olú* "this" need not necessarily have the special intonational pattern that also occurs with imperative sentences. Instead, it may surface with the phrasal H followed by the intonational L just in case the speaker merely reports the contents of the utterance as opposed to focusing it. In other words, the speaker here does not focus *olú* "this" in such an utterance as shown in ((133)a). Similarly, if the intention of the speaker is merely to contradict a subpart of a sentential constituent of a copular statement by his interlocutor, he will also produce a regular form with no intonational L that blocks the phrasal H on the penultimate vowel as shown in ((133)b).[36] Note that the **ni** copula is used in these examples.

(133)   a. Olú   ni lukímba lwa   Magú:lu
             11this is 11dress   11of 1Magulu
             'This is the dress of Magulu.'

          b. Olukímb'o:lú   ní lwa   Magú:lu
             11dress   11this is 11of 1Magulu
             'This dress is for Magulu.'

In sum, we have seen a special behavior for the evidential demonstrative *olú* in focus environments that involve the **YO** focus copula (discussed in earlier sections of this paper as a copula and as a focus marker).

    We turn now to other examples involving focus. In the following forms, all of which involve focus and copular or copular like linkers and/or relators, what comes after the last H vowel is realized as an intonational phrase final lowered H tone (or a mid tone). We find this particularly interesting because we see that examining the discourse context in which an utterance is spoken helps unearth a phonological feature that has not been earlier

---

[35] To distinguish the focus use of "this" from its non-focus use, the second author (Mutaka) proposes that the focus use bears the feature of *evidentiality* that is associated with the left periphery or the feature of *evidentiality* is activated in a more salient way in focus contexts. The use of the focus "this" is a strong deictic that the speaker uses to demonstrate something, that is, as a piece of direct evidence to which he wants to draw his listeners' attention.

[36] The following pair provides an example of the entire context for the tonal pattern described in (133) where a statement is subsequently contradicted with the normal intonational pattern:
(i) o:lú   ni lukímba lwa   Mutaka
     11this   be 11dress 11of   Mutaka
   'This is Mutaka's dress.' (The name *Mutaka* is underlyingly toneless)
A response where a subconstituent is contradicted would be as follows:
(ii) háahá o:lú   ni lukímba lwa Magú:lu
     haha. 11this be 11dress 11of Magulu
     'Haha. This is MAGULU'S dress.'

observed and that the probing of sentences from a syntactic point of view helped us detect. In the following examples, we observe instances of focus and the mid tone on all TBUs following the final H in sentences involving copulas, linkers, and/or other relators. In ((134)a & b) we see examples involving contrastive focus. Note the final mid tones:

(134)   a. kwê támī. Ka   si   lukímbā lwā Māgūlū. Ka   ní lwá Kátsūbā
             EXCL.neg COMP neg.be 11dress 11.of Magulu COMP be 11of Katsuba
             Wait a minute! It is not Magulu's dress. It is Katsuva's.

         b. olukímb'   olú   ka   ní lwā Māgūlū. Ka   sí   lwá Kátsūbā
             aug.11dress 11this COMP be 11of Magulu. COMP neg.be 11of Kasuva
             'This dress is for Magulu instead. It is not for Katsuva.'

In ((135) a-d) we have additional examples of focus contexts and again we observe the mid tone:

(135)   a. Kámbale yo   mugalí :mū. (focused subject)
              1Kambale 1COP 1teacher
              'It is Kambale who is the teacher.'

         b. eZaíre   yê   Kó :ngō   (Uttered to correct a mistaken belief)
              24Zaire 24COP 24Congo
              'Zaire is the CONGO.'

         c. Munábwi:ré ni   Pásī :kā.   (Uttered to correct a mistaken belief)
              today   COP Easter
              'Today is EASTER.'

         d. ah'   ábaná   b'   ekiTábū (contrastive focus on *ekitabu* "book")
              3sg.gave aug.2child 2LK aug.7book
              'He gave the BOOK to the children.'

        Since Kinande is a language that contrasts H vs Ø underlyingly in most cases and that uses the lexical L tone sparingly in some lexical items (e.g. omúkalì 'woman') and grammatically as a tone marker in some tenses (e.g. huma hit (imperative), notably to prevent the assignment of the phrasal H on the penultimate vowel), what can then be the status of a mid tone or a lowered H tone in Kinande? As we show here, this lowered H tone appears on the various TBUs that appear after the last H tone in a copular sentence, or one with a linker or other relator, in focus contexts. It could be analyzed as a Focus H register that turns the L tone at the end of an intonational phrase into a mid tone, i.e., a Low tone pronounced on a high register, which corresponds to a mid tone.
        We briefly reconsider the contrast between *olú* "this" and the various forms that can be translated as "that" discussed in the beginning of this section. This contrast is manifested via the non-assignment of the phrasal H on the penultimate vowel in the case of *olú* "this." We might surmise that this is the result of the assignment of an "Evidential L tone" at the end of the intonational phrase if we accept the idea that this contrast is

captured in terms of an evidentiality feature in copular and other linker and relator focus contexts.[37] We leave the question of the exact account for this "evidential L tone" feature for further research.

We would like to end this section with additional data that might help future researchers sort out and account for the non-assignment of the phrasal H just with the use of *olú* "this" in a declarative utterance. Note that the examples in ((136)a-c) all involve a copula or relator/linker element. Whereas the example in ((137)) lacks such an element:

(136)   a. Olú   ló   lukímba lwa Magu:lu
           11this 11COP 11dress 11of 1Magulu
           'This is Magulu's dress.'

        b. Olukímb'   o:lú   ló   lwa   Magu:lu
           aug.11dress 11this 11COP 11of 1Magulu
           'This dress is the one for Magulu'

        c. Ngábigulir'   olukímb'   o:lú lo   Magu:lu
           1sg.bought.appl   aug.11dress   11this 11LK 1Magulu
           'I bought this dress for Magulu.'

(137)   Olukímb'   o:lú,   ngábilugulira   Magú:lu
           aug.11dress 11this, 1sg.11it.bought.appl 1Magulu
           'This dress, I bought it for Magulu.'

Although one author is a native speaker of Kinande with a background in phonology, we do not see how it is possible to give a strictly phonological account for the contrast of the non-assignment of the phrasal H on the penultimate vowel in ((136)) and its assignment in ((137)). What is certain is that, with the use of *olú* "this," the forms in ((136)) sound normal. Although the one in ((137)), which lacks the intonational phrase final L, sounds normal as well, one can produce it when one is not really focusing on literally showing the dress to Magulu, but is instead merely upholding the topic of conversation. The idea of evidentiality related to focus is perhaps even better rendered by the use of the other form of "this" *lunó,* that refers to something one is holding in one's hand. Here, one may or may not use the non phrasal H on the penultimate vowel, depending whether one is again emphasizing that one is literally showing the dress or merely reporting the event that the dress belongs to Magulu. In the latter case, the speaker will use the phrasal H on the penultimate vowel. Note that these are syntactic contexts that involve copulas or related linkers:

(138)   a. Lunó ló lukímba lwa Magú:lu / Magu:lu
          that/this is Magulu's dress

---

[37]In the case of the imperative, it is clear that the Imperative L is the one that is assigned at the end of the intonational phrase to prevent the assignment of the phrasal H onto the penultimate vowel (Mutaka forthcoming).

    b. Olukímbá lunó ló lwa Magú:lu/ Magu:lu
       that/this dress is for Magulu

    c. Ngábigulir'olukímbá lunó lo Magú:lu/Magu:lu
       I bought that/this dress for Magulu

The final sentences we discuss here have identical syntactic contexts to the just discussed sentences in ((138)). The difference is that a non-evidential demonstrative is used in these final examples. These examples demonstrate that it is ungrammatical if one does not use the phrasal H on the penultimate vowel as has been indicated earlier. Thereby, they underscore the fact that a special intonational tone pattern is tied to evidential deictics in focus contexts involving copulas and related linkers and relators:

(139)   a. Lulyá ló lukímba lwa Magú:lu (*Magu:lu)
            'That is Magulu's dress.'

         b. Olukímbá lulyá ló lwa Magú:lu (*Magu:lu)
            'That dress is for Magulu.'

         c. Ngábigulir'olukímbá lulyá lo Magú:lu (*Magu:lu)
             'I bought that dress for Magulu.'

In this section, we have demonstrated that there are at least two distinct phonological tone patterns that occur in focus domains that involve copulas, and related linkers and relators. This finding is consistent with our syntactic analysis that classifies the linker in the verb phrase as being closely related to the clausal copula. Furthermore, it reveals an area of phonological investigation in Kinande that will be worth exploring.

7   Conclusion

In this paper we have presented an encyclopedic overview of predication constructions in Kinande involving copulas and related linkers and relators. We documented in detail copular constructions and considered how they fit into the proposed universal typology of Higgins. We considered secondary predication as well. As Kinande is a language that is especially rich in linkers and relators, we have been able to establish that predication constructions are headed by functional elements rather than the lexical predicate of the construction. We have also investigated in some depth the proposal of Schneider-Zioga that what has been called the linker in the Kinande literature is actual a copular-like category. We noted that the linker in double object and applied constructions in Kinande has similarities to semi-clefts in Romance languages and thus is probably not as rare a phenomenon as it might appear to be when considered in isolation. We also presented novel findings concerning the phonology of tone and its interactions with focus in copular and related structures.

References

Baker, Mark C. (2003). Agreement, dislocation, and partial configurationality. In Carnie, Andrew, Heidi Harley & Mary Willie (eds.), *Formal approaches to function in grammar*. John Benjamins Amsterdam. 107–32.

Baker, Mark C. (2008). *The syntax of agreement and concord*. Cambridge University Press.

Baker, Mark, and Collins, Chris. (2006). Linkers and the internal structure of vP. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 24. 307-354.

Chomsky, Noam. (1995). *The minimalist program.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Collins, Christopher. (2003). 'The internal structure of vP in Ju|hoansi and ≠Hoan.' *Studia Linguistica* 57(1), 1-25.

den Dikken, Marcel. (2002). 'Direct and parasitic polarity item licensing,' *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 5, 35–66.

Dikken, Marcel. (2005). Specificational copular sentences and pseudoclefts. *The Blackwell companion to syntax* (pp. 292-409).

den Dikken, Marcel. (2006). *Relators and linkers. The syntax of predication, predicate inversion, and copulas* Linguistic Inquiry Monographs 47. Cambridge, MA & London: MIT Press.

den Dikken, Marcel. (2014). The attractions of agreement. Ms. CUNY Graduate Center.

Edwards, Malcolm. (2006). Pronouns, agreement and focus in Egyptian Arabic. *SOAS Working Papers in Linguistics,* vol. 14, 51-62.

Giannakidou, Anastasia, & Merchant, Jason. (1999). Why Giannis can't scrub his plate clean: On the absence of resultative secondary predication in Greek. In *Greek Linguistics' 97: Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Greek Linguistics, Ekdosis Ellinika Grammata, Athens* (pp. 93-103).

Hedberg, Nancy. (1988). The discourse function of cleft sentences in spoken English. Paper delivered at the annual meeting of the LSA (Linguistic Society of America)

Hedberg, Nancy. (2000). The referential status of clefts. *Language*, 891-920.

Hedberg, Nancy. 2007. Yes-No Questions, Information Structure, and Prosody. Paper presented at the LIPP Symposium on Clause Syntax, Information Structures, and Discourse Pragmatics, Munich, Germany, June 21-22.

Higgins, F(rancis) Roger. (1973). *The pseudo-cleft construction in English* (Doctoral dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology).

Hyman, Larry M. (1990). Boundary tonology and the prosodic hierarchy. In Sharon Inkelas and Drag Zec (Eds.). *The phonology-syntax connection*, 109-125. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Markman, Vita 2006, Pronominal copula constructions are what? Reduced specificational pseudo-clefts. In Chang & H. Haynie (eds), *Proceedings of the 26th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*. 366-374. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Matushansky, Ora, & Spector, Benjamin. (2005). TINKER, TAILOR, SOLDIER, SPY*. In Emar Maier, Corien Bary & Janneke Huitink (Eds.), *Proceedings of SuB9*. www.ru.nl/ncs/sub9

McWhorter, John. (1994). From focus marker to copula in Swahili. *Proceedings of the Twentieth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society: Special Session on Historical Issues in African Linguistics*, *20(2),* (pp. 57-66).

Mikkelsen, Line. (2011). Copular clauses. *Semantics: An international handbook of natural language meaning*, *2*, (pp. 1805-1829).

Miyagawa 2010. *Why Agree? Why Move? Unifying Agreement-based and Discourse Configurational Languages.* Linguistic Inquiry Monograph 54. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Moro, Andrea. 2000. *Dynamic antisymmetry.* Linguistic Inquiry Monograph. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Mutaka, Ngessimo. Forthcoming. The phonology of tone in the imperative in Kinande. To appear in Gene Buckley, Thera Crane, and Jeff Good. *Revealing structure: Finding patterns in grammars and using grammatical patterns to elucidate languages. A festschrift to honor Larry M. Hyman*. (anticipated to be published through Stanford: CSLI)

Mutaka, Ngessimo M. (2007). Kinande: A Grammar Sketch (Version 1.0). Retrieved from: http://www.africananaphora.rutgers.edu/images/stories/downloads/casefiles/KinandeGS.pdf

Mutaka, Ngessimo. (1986). Issues in Kinande syntax. Presentation at USC.

Mutaka, N., & Kavutirwaki, K. (2008). Kinande/Konzo-English Dictionary with an English-Kinande/Konzo Index. Retrieved from: http://www.africananaphora.rutgers.edu/images/stories/downloads/dictionary/kinande-en_dictionary.pdf

Pereltsvaig, Asya. (2001). On the Nature of Intra-clausal Relations: A Study of Copular Sentences in Russian and Italian. (Doctoral dissertation), McGill University, Montreal.

Progovac, Ljiljana. (1993). Non-augmented NPs in Kinande as Negative Polarity Items. In Sam Mchombo (Ed.), *Theoretical aspects of Bantu grammar 1* (pp. 257-270). Stanford, CA: CLSI.

Pylkkänen, Liina. (2008). *Introducing arguments*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Resenes, Mariana & den Dikken, Marcel. (2012). Semi-clefts as a window on the syntax of predication and the 'object of' relation. In *Proceedings of CLS 48*. Chicago Linguistics Society.

Richards, Norvin. (2009). Locality and Linearization: The Case of Kinande. *Gengo Kenkyu 136*, 75–92.

Richards, Norvin. (2010). *Uttering Trees.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Rizzi, Luigi. (1997). The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery. In Liliane Haegeman (Ed.) *Elements of Grammar*, Kluwer, Dordrecht, 281-337.

Schneider-Zioga, Patricia. (1995). Specifier/Head Agreement in Kinande, *Cahiers Linguistique D'Ottawa.* Vol. 23, University of Ottawa, pgs. 67-96.

Schneider-Zioga, Patricia. (2000). Anti-agreement and the fine structure of the left edge. In Ruixi Ai, Francesca del Gobbo, Makie Irie, & Hajime Ono (Eds.), *Working Papers in Linguistics 6*, 94–114. Irvine: Department of Linguistics, University of California.

Schneider-Zioga, Patricia. (2007). Anti-agreement, anti-locality, and minimality: the syntax of dislocated subjects. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory, 25(2),* 403-446.

Schneider-Zioga, Patricia (2013). The syntax of the linker in Kinande: Breaking symmetry. ms. CSU, Fullerton.

Schneider-Zioga, Patricia. (2014). The linker in Kinande reconsidered. In One Boyer, Ruth Kramer, & Elizabeth Zsiga (Eds.), *Selected proceedings of the 44th Annual Conference of African Linguistics*, this volume. Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Stowell, Timothy. (1989). Subjects, specifiers, and X-bar theory. In Mark R. Baltin, & Anthony S. Kroch (Eds.), *Alternative conceptions of phrase structure* (pp. 232-262). UCP.

Stowell, Timothy. (1991). Determiners in NP and DP. In Katherine Leffel & Denis Bouchard (Eds.), *Views on phrase structure* (pp. 37-56). Springer Netherlands.

Valinande, Nzama. (1984). *The Structure of Kinande* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Georgetown University.