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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/KinandeGSpdf) 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. 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. Copular clauses have a variety of functions and researchers have proposed taxonomies to capture this fact.

---
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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 1tal
     ‘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 yôlyáá
     1Mary 1COP there
     ‘There is Mary.’ (pointing)

     b. omúlumy’ óliá yó omúkoló 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
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
1Magulú COP 1tall
'Magulu is tall.'

b. Joháni ni mugalímu
1John COP 1teacher
'John is a teacher.'

c. Magulú ni w’ eBútembo
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) ahóngin’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 ngingo
aug.12hiding.place 12good 12-li(COP) 24inferior 17LOC 9bed
'The good hiding place is under the bed.'

(iii) Omũhũmbo 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 *eríbyá* is used in the past and future. It takes verbal inflections:

(6) a. iyóni yó wabyá mugalímu okó mwak’owálábâ?
    1who FOC 3s.past.be 1teacher 17on year last
    ‘Who was teacher last year?’

    b. ni Magulú yó wabyá mugalí:mu
       COP Magulu FOC 3s.past.be 1teacher
       ‘It is Magulu who was teacher.’

(7) Abrahamũ a bya ìse wa Ísaka,
    1Abraham 3s.pst.BE 1father 1of 1Isaac
    ‘Abraham was the father of Isaac.’  (Matthew 1:2)

(8) a. iyóni y’úka.syá.bya mugalímu
    1who FOC’3s.come.be 1teacher
    ‘Who will be teacher?’

    b. Magulú y’úkasyábya 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
    1 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.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 mugalimu
   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 augment if they are post copular as will be seen in the ensuing discussion. Indefinite noun phrases may or may not have augment depending on the syntactic context. They can even be non-specific while having augment, as the following example from Baker (2003) illustrates (= his (28a) with tones added)

(11) óbuli mundú mó-á-gúl-ire eritúnda.
   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 eritúnda 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 augment behave like Negative Polarity Items (NPIs) under many circumstances. She also notes that post copular noun phrases lack augment. 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 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
     Magulu COP 1architect 1for aug.9project 9that
     ‘Magulu is the architect for that project.’

(13) ītwe tūnasĩ 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, 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’ èríhuk’ obuhóti
   7What Mary did 5COP aug.5.cook aug.14.beans
   ‘What Mary did was to cook beans.’

   c. ekíbi ékyangáhík’ oko mundú ry’ èríbyá molómó:lo
   7bad.thing aug.7.might.happen 18on 1person 5COP aug.5.be weak.weak
   ‘The bad thing that might happen to someone is to be timid.’

(16) a. ómwira wage k’ ákákekulú k’ omo kisómó 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’okómút: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:
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(17) a. olúhi ló mbúga
    aug.11 war 11 COP 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. èmbugá ló lúhi
    aug.9 problem 11 COP aug.11 war8
    ‘The problem is the war.’

Note that it is not possible to get a predicational reading when the \textit{YO} copula is used. This is because whatever \textit{YO} agrees with is the focus. Therefore, if \textit{YO} agrees with the precopular focus, the post \textit{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 \textit{YO}, it would be a mistake to propose that \textit{YO} is the specificational copula and \textit{ni} is the predicational copula. There are examples of \textit{ni} in specificational sentences as well. Specifically, \textit{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: iyó ndi yó wib ‘ébitá bu?
    1 who 1 COP stole 8 book
    ‘Who stole the books?’

    b. A: ómwibí ni Magúlu
    aug.1 thief COP 1 Magulu
    ‘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 ni ndi?
    aug.1 thief COP who
    ‘Who is the thief?’

An appropriate answer where the thief is identified by name uses the \textit{ni} copula:

\footnote{Here the augment \textit{o}- of the noun \textit{olúhi} ‘the war’ has undergone an elision due to final –\textit{o} in the \textit{YO} copula that immediately precedes it. There is a phonological residue of the augment on the vowel of the \textit{YO} copula in the form of a falling tone. There is a falling tone on the \textit{YO} copula if the following word starts with an augment depending on the length of the post copular word.}
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’ omúlámya
    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 specification 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. 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 specification 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 specification 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.
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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:

\[
\text{(23) a. Q: ábibí ní bahi?} \\
\text{ aug.2thief COP 2which} \\
\text{ Literally: ‘The thieves are who?’ (Direct question)}
\]

\[
\text{ b. A: ábibí b’ áboMagúlu} \\
\text{ aug.2thief 2COP aug.2aMagulu} \\
\text{ ‘The thieves are Magulu and his associates.’}
\]

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\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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
   1 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

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{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.
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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

   1guest

   ‘I am the one who is a guest.’ / ‘It is me who is a guest.’ / *‘I am a guest.’

b. igwé mwána

   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 múlumé kutse mwána?

   you 1man or 1child

   ‘Are you a man or a child?’

Instead, the ni or ~li copula must be used:

(29) n’igwé múlú:mé kútse n’igwé mwá:na

   1man or 1child

   ‘Are you a man or are you a child?’

(30) u-li múlumé kútse mwá:na

   2sg-1man or 1child

   ‘Are you a man or a child?’

(31) Answer: Nyi-rí múlú:me

   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 mwigá wuwe, níkwa ītwe 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:

(1) 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 specificalional sentence is necessary as an answer. Note that, with first and second person pronouns, as with names, the non-agreeing ni copula is necessary.\textsuperscript{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 mugeni?/ omugení 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:

\textsuperscript{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.
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(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 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 aug.3that 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 Arlètte  n’ omúlumy’ óliá ni Josh  
     aug.1 woman  that COP 1 Arlètte and  aug.1 man  that COP 1 Josh  
     That woman is Arlètte 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’ eyí ni  netbook  
     9 this COP smart phone; this COP flash drive; and’ 9 this 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  
     9 that  COP 9 dog 9 my  
     ‘That is my dog.’

(43) éryá  y’ émbwá  yage  
     9 that 9 COP aug.9 dog 9 my  
     ‘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’ ámagêtsi
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6COP  aug.6water
'It's the water.'

A: sy'  èsyómbe
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. 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) olútú  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) olúkímba  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.\(^\text{17}\) 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 Franșwâ
    ‘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:

(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) ingýe n’ ingýe 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 depductive 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) ngáconsider 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) ngáconsider 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.\(^\text{19}\) 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 (*omo*)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-Ɂi 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 Kámbole
   3s.COP like Kambale
   ‘He is like Kambale.’

   b.*ni nga Kámbole
   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

    b. As you are intelligent, you will understand that....

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. Kámbole aká-mu-langirá ngá/mó mukulukulu
    1Kambale 3s.TNS-3obj-see NGA/MO 1idiot
    ‘Kambale considers him (as) an idiot.’
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b.*Kambale akalangira nga/mo mukulukulu
1Kambale 3s.TNSsee NGA/MO 1idiot

(65) Kambale ati ni mukulukulu
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) Súsyelahĩraya n’ omũtwe wave, 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) Nikwa omugulu basonda-sonda erihamba Yesu, mobubaha esyondeko,
then 3time 3pl.want-want to.seize 1Jesus fear 10gathering
kusangwa mobaganza [Yesu mo mũmĩnyerĩ]
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 oyũwene okó rosí]
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 Mūnazaretĩ. 
   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 7wh at 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 likes books]
   b.*John seems [likes books]
   c. John seems [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 omulidére 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:
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(75) a. Ngáconsidere omulidé kó ni Magúlu
 1sg.consider aug.1leader KO be Magulu
‘I consider the leader to be Magulu.’

b. Ngáconsidere omulidé kw-álí íni Magúlu
 1sg.consider aug.1leader KO 1.be j-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 baongozi 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 baongozi 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.

(78) a. móbahésiry'ékyumá  eri-ki-yirá  mó kíbambale22
   3pl.forged  Aug.7metal  5-7OM-have  MO 7flat
   ‘They forged the metal into a tray.’

   b. Kámbale  átwá  akaratásí mo bihánde
      1Kambale 3sg.cut 12paper  MO 8piece
      ‘Kambale cut the paper into pieces.’

   c. omuloyí  a-yi-henduká-yá  mo kanyúnu
      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-ɨk-ɨrê  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 *eritulika* 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 ekópó
   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 mókatwírwé mo b hindibihíndi
   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:

\[(84) \text{nágúla } \text{enetbook } \text{mo } \text{nyíhyáka} \]
\[
\text{1sg.bought } \text{aug.9netbook } \text{MO } 9\text{new} \\
\text{‘I bought the netbook new.’} \\
\]

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

\[(85) \text{nágúla } \text{enétbúk } \text{nyíhyáka} \]
\[
\text{1sg.bought } \text{aug.9netbook } 9\text{new} \\
\text{‘I bought the new netbook.’} \\
\]

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

\[(86) \text{a. sigubahe eríherũkya } \text{Marĩa mo } \text{mũkalĩ wawe} \]
\[
\text{neg.2fear } 5\text{marry Mary } \text{MO } 1\text{wife 1your} \\
\text{‘Do not be afraid to marry Mary as your wife.’ (Matthew 1:20)} \\
\]
\[
\text{b. bakowa emyatsi } \text{yosĩ mo } \text{mĩsyo.} \\
\text{3pl.hear } \text{aug.4news 4all } \text{MO 4parables} \\
\text{‘They hear all the stories as parables.’ (from Mark 4:11)} \\
\]
\[
\text{c. neryo mwatsũka erituma-bo } \text{mo } \text{babiri-babiri.} \\
\text{then 3s.began 5send-2them MO 2two-2two} \\
\text{‘He began to send them out two by two.’ (from Mark 6:17)} \\
\]

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:

\[(l) \text{nágúla } \text{enétbúk’ } \text{eníhyáka} \]
\[
\text{1sg.bought } \text{aug.9netbook aug.9which is new (the new one)} \\
\text{‘I bought the netbook which is new.’} \\
\]
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 ekitábu 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 omotamíro 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 ekitábu kyo Kámbé’ omotamíro.
    Kambale 3s.read.APPl 7book 7LK Kambere 18.9drunkenness
    ‘Kambale; read the book to Kambere (while) drunkj/*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. Johnj told Maryk the story in a state of total drunkennessj/*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 bá nwá
    1pl.began MO 2friend
    'We began as friends.'

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

(93) Twátsuka omo búnwá
    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) mó twabuga 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 reiterate 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
Kambale buy 3s. 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:

(98) a. Kámbalé átuma ebarúhá yó lubálúba
    Kambale sent 9letter 9LK quickly
    ‘Kambale sent the letter quickly.’

    b. móblánzir’ erinábá lyó ndeke
    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 adverbal 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 éngyáká yó b-áti
    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 okokalási kó ba-tyá
    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 predicational 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 predicational 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) Kambale águlira Nadîné y’ ekitábu
    Kambale bought 1Nadine 1LK’ aug.7book
    ‘Kambale bought Nadine a book.’

boundary between two DP’s 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 *ekitābu* 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.

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:

(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:

(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 *erihà* ‘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 loa 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 is 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:

\[(103) \quad \text{give \relator \phrase the book} \quad \textrm{\relator Relator \predicate \text{Kambale}} \]

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:

\[(104) \quad \text{Kambale ágúlira Nadíné y’ ekitábu} \quad \text{Kambale bought.appl 1Nadine \text{1LK} aug.7book} \quad \text{‘Kambale bought Nadine a book.’} \]

\[(105) \quad \text{Nadíné ahá ekitábú \text{kyo} Kambale} \quad \text{1Nadine give aug.7book \text{7LK} Kambale} \quad \text{‘Nadine gave the book to Kambale.’} \]

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:
    \[
    \ldots[\text{functional phrase}\,[\text{AppP}\,\text{APPL}\,\text{VP}\,\text{Theme}]]_k\,[\text{functional}\,\text{F+Relator}=\text{YO}_j\,[\text{relator phrase}\,\text{Ben}\,[\text{Relator‘}\,t_j\,t_k]]]
    \]

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

(108) For double object verbs:
    give [\text{functional phrase}\,[\text{predicate}\,\text{Kambale}]_k\,[\text{functional}\,\text{F+Relator}_j\,[\text{relator phrase}\,\text{the book}\,\text{[relator‘}\,t_j\,t_k]]]

(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 as predication involving the theme Marya (‘Mary’) as subject and omokisómo (in the church) as the predicate.
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If the applied morpheme occurs on the verb, the locative locates the entire event. In that case, the linker is obligatory:

(111) Kâmbale 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) Kâmbale mo-á-sény-íry' olúkwí lw'- omó-mbásá.
     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:

(113) a. amatúnda áhábáwá 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 erítúndá (ryo) na Kâmbale33
     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-tyá  ← 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’)  omotutu  ← TEMPORAL  
    Kambale 3sg.sent 9letter (9LK) 18morning  
    ‘Kambale sent the letter in the morning.’
  b. Kámbére mwímbíra  Maryá (y’)  omotutu  
    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).
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'When did you say you bought the new dress?'

b. Nadíne ásóma ekitábu ekyó (ky’*) omotututu.
  Nadíne 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 mwátúmí ebarúhá (y)’ átyā
  Kambere 3sg.sent 9letter (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 specificalional 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 7LK 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 ágúlä-kyó      {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:

\[ \text{LINKER} = \text{vowel harmony} \]

(124)  a. Kámbale mwáhéré ábana abó bé n’ebíkene (bwé)
       Kambale gave 2children 2those 2LK and 8yam
       'Kambale gave those children also YAMS.'

    b. Kámbale mwáhéré ábana abó bá n’ amagétse (bwa)
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Kambale gave 2children 2those 2LK and 6water
‘Kambale gave those children also WATER.’

c. Kámbale mwáhéré ábana abó bó n’obuhóti (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:

\[ \text{ENCLITIC} = \text{NO VOWEL HARMONY} \]

(125) a. Kámbale mwáhéré bó n’ebikene
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.’ |
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.’
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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.’
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 ni 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) olú  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 olú  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 tāmī. Ka sì lukímbā lwā Māgūlū. Ka ní lwä 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. olukimb’ olú ka ní lwā Māgūlū. Ka sì lwä 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’ ekitabū (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
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captured in terms of an evidentiality feature in copular and other linker and relator focus contexts.\textsuperscript{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 \textit{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:

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(136)] a. Olú ló lukímba lwa Magu:lu
l1this l1COP l1dress l1of 1Magulu
‘This is Magulu’s dress.’

\item b. Olukímb’ o:ú ló lwa Magu:lu
aug.l1dress l1this l1COP l1of 1Magulu
‘This dress is the one for Magulu’

\item c. Ngábigulir’ olukímb’ o:lú lo Magu:lu
1sg.bought.app l1aug.l1dress l1this l1LK 1Magulu
‘I bought this dress for Magulu.’
\end{enumerate}

\begin{enumerate}
\item [(137)] Olukímb’ o:lú, ngábilugulira Magú:lu
aug.l1dress l1this, 1sg.l1it.bought.app l1Magulu
‘This dress, I bought it for Magulu.’
\end{enumerate}

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 \textit{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” \textit{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:

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(138)] a. Lunó ló lukímba lwa Magú:lu / Magu:lu
that/this is Magulu’s dress
\end{enumerate}

\textsuperscript{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 ló 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.
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