COPULAR CLAUSES IN KINANDE[1]

Patricia Schneider-Zioga & Philip Ngessimo Mutaka
California State University, Fullerton and University of Yaounde 1
pzioga@fullerton.edu; pmutaka@gmail.com

This paper presents a study of (a) predicational, (b) specificational, (c) identificational, and (d) equative copular clauses in Kinande. Initial inspection of the data would suggest that Kinande has copulas specialized for various semantic types of copular clauses: with one copula being used in predicational clauses and the other copula being used for specificational, identificational, and equatives clauses. Careful investigation reveals that there is not a perfect match between form and semantic function in copular clauses in Kinande. Instead, the choice of copula is governed by the ability of the noun phrase that is in semantic focus to undergo agreement. This study also sheds light on the distribution of augmented noun phrases in Kinande, which are observed to be not allowed anywhere that a predicate is required. Finally, copular clauses are approached here from the perspective of a well-known taxonomy that has been primarily used to study copular clauses in Indo-European languages. Therefore, this work lends itself as a resource to research that examines copulas from either an historical or cross-linguistic perspective.

Les propositions à copules en kinande

Cet article traite des propositions à copules du type de (a) prédication, (b) spécification, (c) identification, et (d) équatif en kinande. Une première analyse des données suggère que le kinande a des copules spécialisées pour différents types sémantiques des clauses à copules : il existe ainsi une copule que l'on utilise dans les propositions de prédication et l'autre copule qu'on utilise pour les propositions de spécification, d'identification et pour les propositions équatives. Une analyse plus approfondie laisse entrevoir qu'il n'y a pas une correspondance parfaite entre la forme et la fonction sémantique dans les propositions à copules en kinande. En revanche, le choix de la copule est gouverné par la capacité du syntagme nominal au sein du focus sémantique de subir l'accord. Cette étude jette plus de lumière sur la distribution des syntagmes nominaux avec augment en kinande qui justement ne sont permis nulle part ailleurs où un prédicat est requis. Somme toute, l'analyse des propositions à copules a été faite à partir d'une approche taxinomique bien connue et utilisée principalement pour l'étude des propositions à copules dans les langues indo-européennes. C'est pourquoi cette étude est susceptible d'être une ressource de recherche pour l'examen des copules suivant une perspective tant historique que comparative de l'étude des langues.

0. INTRODUCTION

Copular clauses appear to be syntactically simple clauses: two phrases linked by a semantically empty, or nearly empty lexical item. In reality, they are complex structures which have attracted the attention of linguists and scholars of language since the earliest recorded studies of language and linguistic knowledge. Despite this attraction, our literature search reveals that little work has been done on the synchronic syntax of copular clauses in Bantu languages. The purpose of this paper is to contribute toward building a basic understanding of copular clauses in Bantu languages by focusing on the Bantu language of Kinande (ISO 639-3). In particular, we investigate copular clauses in Kinande through the lens of the taxonomy of Higgins (1973), which has primarily been used to study a number of Indo-European languages.[2] We hope to then not only present

[1] We would like to thank Mark Baker, Vicki Carstens, Chris Collins, Michael Diercks, Lorie Heggie, Brent Henderson, and Rodrigo Ranero for their comments on our work that is presented here. We would especially like to thank Marcel den Dikken, Nancy Hedberg, and Larry Hyman for their helpful comments on previous versions of this paper. We are also grateful to the Afranaph Project, led by Ken Safir, and to participants of the second Afranaph Project Development Workshop for their comments and other intellectual support of this project. We made extensive use of the Kinande dictionary that is supported through the Afranaph website during our work on this project. Finally, we greatly appreciate the insightful comments and suggestions of our reviewer. We acknowledge that this paper could not have been written without the help and patience of Jacky Katsuva Syauswa. All errors are our own.

[2] Semitic (Rothstein 2001) and some East Asian languages such as Thai (Hedberg & Potter 2010) and Vietnamese have been studied from this viewpoint as well. We are also aware of work that investigates the North American indigenous language of Salish (Lyon 2013).

an overview of copular clauses in Kinande, but also to present them in a light that will facilitate cross-linguistic comparison in future research.

We will demonstrate that there are several morphologically distinct copulas in Kinande. Initially it would appear that they could be analyzed according to functions that at least roughly align with the functions identified in the taxonomy of Higgins (1973). That is, it might seem that each form aligns with a specific function. However, closer inspection shows this is not the case. Instead the syntax of copulas in Kinande is sensitive to the agreement and categorical features of the subject and predicate of the copular clause. Nonetheless, copulas can be roughly identified as follows: (a) a predicational copula *ni*; (b) a locative copula *–li*; (c) a copula ***YO*** that marks both specificational and equative copular sentences. The *ni* copula emerges as a default copula in situations where agreement is not possible.

1. A TAXONOMY OF COPULAR CLAUSES

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

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 clause involved. We illustrate these types of copular clauses for Kinande and discuss each one in turn in the appropriate section:

PREDICATIONAL

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

SPECIFICATIONAL

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

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

IDENTIFICATIONAL

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

[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.

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

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

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

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

2. PREDICATIONAL COPULAR CLAUSES

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

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

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

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

In the first example, the predicate is an adjective phrase. In the second example, the predicate is a noun phrase and in the third example, it is a non-locative prepositional phrase. The copula used in the examples in (5), ***ni***, has no clear verbal properties in that it does not allow verbal morphology indicating tense, aspect, modality, or agreement. ***Ni*** is essentially restricted to use in the present tense affirmative.[5]

In the past (6) and future tenses (7), the non-defective verb eríbyâ is used. It takes verbal inflections:

[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] It is not possible to negate the *ni* copula with an independent morpheme. Instead a different form, a negative copula, occurs: *si*. We do not study negative copular clauses in this paper.

(6) **Magulú a*byá* mugalí:mu**
Magulu 3s.pst.be 1teacher
Magulu was a teacher.

(7) **Magulú asyá*bya* mugalímu (akalásí káwá:nza)**
1Magulu 3s.come.be 1teacher 12school 12starts
Magulu will be teacher (when school starts).

Returning to the defective copula ***ni***, we note that in addition to not being able to take tense/aspect morphology, it can only have third person subjects:[6]

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

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

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

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

b. **esyosoro *ní* nyírí sya bándu**
10lion COP 9eater 10of 2person
Lions are man eaters.

An additional property of the copula ***ni*** is that any noun phrase following it must lack an augment. The augment is a vowel pre-prefix. It precedes a stem that is prefixed with a morpheme that indicates the noun class the stem belongs to: augment+class_marker+stem. In current literature on the augment in Bantu languages, researchers have generally noted that semantic/pragmatic and syntactic factors are relevant to the distribution of the augment. For example, Hyman and Katamba (1993) argue that the distribution of the augment in the Bantu language Luganda is determined by the syntax of the constructions they occur in rather than purely from their semantic or pragmatics. They note that often the constructions impose certain semantic or pragmatic

[6] We have not been able to construct predicational sentences where the predicate is first or second person to see if ***ni*** is sensitive to the person of the predicate as well. However, in inverse specificational sentences, it is possible to have the post copular noun phrase be a first or second person pronoun. In these kind of cases, the copula is ni:

(i) **eprobleme *ni* iwe**
aug.9problem NI you
The problem is you.

requirements, related to focus, definiteness, and/or specificity, on the augmented or unaugmented nouns. They emphasize that the semantic/pragmatic properties of augmented and unaugmented nouns follow from the syntactic requirements on the augment rather than the other way around. More recently, Halpert (2012) argues that the augment in Zulu functions as a marker of intrinsic case. Halpert also notes that a number of researchers (Buell and de Dreu, 2011; de Dreu, 2008; Taraldsen, 2010; Visser, 2008) have argued that the augment is a D^0 head, a view with which we agree.

With respect to Kinande in particular, Progovac (1993) proposes that non-augmented forms need to be syntactically licensed. As a key property pointing in this direction, she notes that there is a subject/object asymmetry in the distribution of the augment, with non-augmented forms essentially always being restricted to verb phrase internal positions. More specifically, she suggests that nominals lacking augments have a syntax that is akin to that of Negative Polarity Items (NPIs) in that they need to be licensed by some c-commanding licensor. Moreover, she notes that augmented forms are tied to specificity. Note that this is distinct from whether or not augmented or non-augmented forms can be definite or indefinite. For example, indefinite noun phrases may or may not have augments depending on the semantic and syntactic context.[7] Nominal phrases can even be non-specific while having augments, as the following example from Baker (2003) illustrates (= his (28a) with tones added)

(10) **óbuli mundú mó-á-gúl-ire eritúndâ**.
every man.1 AFF-1S/T-buy-EXT fruit.5
Every man bought a fruit. (Can be different fruits)

In this example, the noun phrase *eritunda* has an augment, yet it is neither definite nor specific.

As mentioned, Progovac (1993) aruges that in Kinande, noun phrases lacking augments behave like Negative Polarity Items (NPIs) and need to be licensed via c-command by well-known NPI licensers such as negation and other irrealis operators. She also notes that post copular noun phrases lack augments. However, post copular nominals are not licensed as NPIs by virtue of the position they occupy—there seems to be no NPI licenser available. Instead, we note that many languages, such as German or French, require or allow bare NPs in post copular position when predicational meanings are expressed. This appears to be the case for Kinande as well. That is, we propose that the unaugmented nominal is a predicate. In Kinande, the distribution of bare NPs is slightly different from the aforementioned languages in that the post copular constituent **must** lack an augment[8] across the board. The bare noun phrase is not restricted to only noun phrases referring to professions, titles, hobbies, or the like as it is in French (see Matushansky and Spector (2005) for discussion of post copular bare nominals), but also holds for noun phrases referring to inherent properties (e.g., *mukola-nabi* 'sinner'), etc.:

(11) **Magulú ni muarchitéct ów eprojet munyê**[9]
1Magulu COP 1architect 1for 9project 9that
Magulu is (the) architect for that project.

[7] See Progovac 1993 for extensive discussion of the distribution of unaugmented nominals in Kinande. Hyman and Katamba 1993 for a careful study of the augment and its distribution in Luganda. Halpert 2012 investigates the syntax of the augment in Zulu and provides an account

[8] The correct generalization concerning whether or not the augment is obligatorily absent depends on the particular copula involved and the information structure related to the post copular constituent. We will address this in what follows.

[9] This sentence can answer the question: "What is Magulu?" and therefore can be interpreted as predicational.

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

(13) **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 correlated with specificity/givenness,[10] we conclude that the augment occupies D. Since nominal phrases cannot have augments when they are in post predicative copular position, given that the augment is a D^0 head, 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.

There is an additional copula: *-li*, that is relevant at this point.[11] We see that, like *ni*, it can be used in predicational copular clauses. However, it is used in predicational copular clauses under very restricted conditions, namely, whenever there is an unfocused first or second person subject. Recall there is a gap in the paradigm in that *ni* is restricted to third person subjects. If there is a first or second person subject in a predicational copular clause, *-li* is the copula that we observe:

(14) **Tu-*li* bana ba Abrahamũ**
1pl-li(COP) 2child 2of 1Abraham
We are children of Abraham. (John 8:33)

Here is an additional example that demonstrates the predicative use of the *–li* copula with the predicational reading verified through the context provided by a question/answer pair:

(15) a. Question: **u*lí* ndi**?
2s-be who
What are you?

b. Answer: **nyi*ri* mugalímu ná kandi nyi*ri* kóyô**
1s-be 1teacher also and 1s-be mother
I am a teacher and a mother.

As with ***ni,*** the augment is absent from the noun phrase that occurs after the *–li* copula. Thus, we find *bana* and not *abana* in (14). The lack of an augment is illustrated in the following example as well, where the predicational *mwiga/biga* 'disciple(s),' in class one and two respectively, do not have an augment:[12]

[10] Whereas Progovac (1993) convincingly ties the augment in Kinande to specificity, Valinande (1984), in his discussion of the augment, attempts to connect its presence exclusively to definiteness.

[11] For completeness, we mention also the copula *–ne*, which is used to assert existence. Unlike *ni*, it is not defective: it can be inflected for tense/aspect and agreement. Examples of its use can be found in Progovac (1993) and Mutaka (2007). We will not investigate this particular copula in this work.

[12] We note that the requirement of no augment holds also with past and future tense copula; that is, with the non-defective copula in predicational contexts:

(i) **Yoháni ábya mugalí:mu**
1John 3s.past.be 1teacher
John was (a) teacher.

(16) **Uwe uli mwiga wuwe, nĩkwa ĩtwe tu-*li* biga ba Musa**.
you 2s.li 1disciple 1his, but we 1pl-li 2disciple 2of Moses
You are this fellow's disciple! We are disciples of Moses! (John 9:28)

Unlike *ni*, the copula *-li* can be inflected for person (cf. the discussion related to examples (8) & (9)). However, despite the possibility of subject agreement, this copula is defective like *ni*, in that inflection for tense and aspect is not possible. *-li* is used only in the present tense.

In sum, there are two predicational copulas in the present tense: *ni* and *-li*. *Ni* is uninflected for subject agreement and is restricted to third person subjects, but *-li* inflects for subject agreement. *-Li* fills a gap in the paradigm of the defective predicational copula *ni* in that it occurs with first and second person subjects.[13] We summarize the facts in table form as well:

Table 1: PREDICATIONAL COPULA

Nature of SUBJECT	**Type of PREDICATE** ↓	**Choice of COPULA**
3rd person	**NP (not locative)**	*ni*
1st , 2nd person	**NP (not locative)**	*-li*

3. SPECIFICATIONAL COPULAR CLAUSES

Specificational sentences are ones that specify who someone is, rather than describing a property that holds of an individual. They are described in the literature as

---

(ii) **Magulú akándisyábya mugalí:mu**
1Magulu 3s.will.come.be 1teacher
Magulu will be a teacher.

[13] The function of *–li* as a first and second person predicational copula is somewhat obscured because *–li* also functions as a locative copula. –li is used if the subject or predicate is locative. In these examples, *-li* is inflected for third person subject/verb agreement in various noun classes. Here are several illustrative examples:

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

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

(iii) Omũhũmbo wuwe ali omo byala biwe
3threshing.stick 3his 3-li(COP) 18LOC 8hand 8his
His winnowing fork is in his hand. (Matthew 3:12)

We see that these locative uses do not syntactically look like the predicational examples we saw earlier. (i) is an example of locative inversion, and in all cases involving locatives, inverted or not, augmented XPs rather than bare noun phrases follow the locative *–li* copula. This relation between locatives and the occurrence of *-li* in copular clauses in Kinande is reminiscent of at least one aspect of the function of the copula *–li* in Early Modern Swahili and modern ChiBemba as discussed in McWhorter (1994), who notes a locative use of that copula.

copular clauses where one XP in the 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

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

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

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

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

b. **enyamá éyiwíte magulw'á:ní, n' ekiyong'okómú:twé,**
aug.9animal 9has 6legs and' 7mane

n' omúkí:ra *ky'* ékinyangú:su
and 3tail 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. We will call this different copula ***YO***[14] 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 phrase 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. Post copular agreement in inverse specificational sentences is not restricted to Kinande. For example, it is the pattern of agreement that Italian follows in inverse specificational sentences. The fact that Kinande displays this pattern is quite striking however 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).[15]

[14] We will have more to say on the form of this copula shortly.

[15] Alternately, but with a similar effect, it has been proposed for Bantu languages that agreement and movement of XPs to the left edge of a phrase whose head the XP agrees with are correlated. More technically, it has been proposed that agreement and the EPP (Extended Projection Principle) are linked in Bantu languages.

However, the agreement pattern that is manifested in these inverse specificational clauses demonstrates that the upward agreement claim is wrong.

We observe that with inverse copular clauses, there is always an augment in post copular position. This is not surprising if the lack of an augment is correlated with a post copular phrase functioning as a predicate. In the case of inverse copular sentences, the value is referential and therefore would need an augment since a referential noun phrase would have to be a DP and given our proposal that when the augment is lacking, the nominal is smaller than a DP.

Consider now *reverse* specificational sentences. These are specificational sentences 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 (19a). In *inverse* sentences, ***YO*** agrees with the post-copular constituent (19b). We see that ***YO*** consistently agrees with the focus of the specificational sentence. This is especially clearly illustrated 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:

(19) a. **olúhi** ***ló*** **mbúga** {REVERSE SPECIFICATIONAL reading}
aug.11war 11COP 9.problem
It is the war that is the problem./ The war is the thing that is the problem./
The war is the problem.

b. **émbugá** ***lô*** **lúhi** {INVERSE SPECIFICATIONAL reading}
aug.9problem 11COP aug.11war[16]
The problem is the war.

An augment occurs on the referential post-copular XP in the inverse specificational example (19b). In this example, the presence of the augment is partially obscured by a process of vowel elision, which happens as a means of resolving a hiatus situation. The hiatus occurs when the vowel final copula is followed by an augmented initial noun phrase. The copula ends in the vowel ***–o*** and in the example in question, the augment is also ***o-***. Its presence is still detectable due to the falling tone at the site of hiatus. Note that the falling tone in this context contrasts with the high tone on the final vowel of the copula when it is followed by an unaugment noun phrase, in (19a). A clearer way to represent the inverse specification situation might be as follows:

(20) a. **émbugá** **l*ó*** + ***o*lúhi** {before vowel elision}
aug.9problem 11COP aug.11war

b. **émbugá** ***l' ô*lúhi** {after vowel elision }
aug.9problem 11COP' aug.11war
The problem is the war.

Here is an additional example that illustrates the presence of an augment in inverse specificational sentences. The augment, which is the vowel ***a-*** in this example, is clearly indicated here after vowel elision since it has a different vowel quality from the final vowel of the copula. Note the falling tone at the hiatus site as in the previous example of inverse specification (19b).

[16] There is a falling tone at the hiatus site on the ***YO*** copula if the following word starts with an augment depending on the length of the post copular word. We leave a more precise phonological investigation of this process for future research.

(21) **Eprobléme *b'* *â*bágalimu**
aug. 9problem 2FOC aug.2teachers
The problem is the teachers.

We consider now in more detail the form of the copula in specificational sentences. We have asserted it is ***YO***, which looks like it can be analyzed into two distinct morphemes: one part that expresses agreement in noun class, and a second part that is pronominal: *-O*. First, we note that we can clearly see that the form of the copula is agreement+*-O* in reverse specificational sentences. This is easy to see because the augment does not occur on the post copular XP in reverse specificational clauses and therefore no phonological rule of vowel elision obscures the forms of the copula. We refer the reader to Valinande (1984) p. 441 for discussion of this fact and additional examples. However, in inverse cases, it is never possible to observe the whole copula to prove that it ends in *-O*. This is because in inverse cases, the post copular constituent always has an augment.[17] As already noted, a process of elision happens which causes a deletion of the vowel preceding the augment:

(22) …AGR-O + vowel-NP → AGR-∅ + vowel-NP

The simplest assumption is that inverse and reverse copular clauses involve the same copula. Therefore, we adopt this assumption.[18]

Although all the examples of specificational sentences we have seen so far involve the copula ***YO***, it would be a mistake to conclude that ***YO*** is the specificational copula and ***ni*** is the predicational copula. That is, we will see there are parts of the grammar of Kinande where the typology of copular sentences as proposed by Higgins (1973) and morphological forms of copulas in Kinande are not perfectly aligned. One misalignment we will observe is that there are examples of ***ni*** in specificational sentences as well as in predicational sentences. Specifically, ***ni*** occurs in *inverse* specificational sentences when the value is a name. Therefore, we find the following paradigm where the question/answer pair establishes the context for an inverse specificational sentence involving names as the value:

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

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

The context for an inverse specificational sentence with a name as value can also be set up as follows: a direct question with the wh-word in situ, in inverse focus position, elicits

[17] We will see shortly that proper names, which lack augments and so in principle should help us determine the form of the ***YO*** copula, cannot follow the ***YO*** copula in inverse situations. Therefore, they cannot help reveal the full form of the copula.

[18] Schneider-Zioga (2014) argues that ***YO*** is a pronominal copula as found in, for example, Egyptian Arabic:
(i) **il-bint *hiyya* l-mas'u:la**
the-girl ***she*** the-responsible(FemSg)
The girl is the one responsible.

a specificational answer:

(24) **ómwibí** ***ní*** **ndi**?
aug.1thief COP who
Who is the thief?

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

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

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

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

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

Indeed if ***YO*** is substituted for ***ni*** in (25) where the value is a proper name, the sentence is grammatical, but it is not an appropriate response to the question in (24). That is, it is not understood as a specificational sentence:

(27) **ómwibí** ***yo*** **Magúlu**
aug.1thief 1COP 1Magulu
The thief is (named) Magulu.

This sentence can be translated 'The thief is named Magulu.' That is, this appears to be an example of a name used as a predicate. We tentatively analyze this as and instance of subject focus of the initial XP *ómwibí* 'thief,' which is interpreted referentially, and the post copular name being interpreted as a predicate. It cannot be interpreted as an *inverse* specificational sentence.

Why then do names have this special status in Kinande? That is, why are they barred from occurring as the value (focus) in an inverse specificational sentence when the copula is ***YO***? 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 specificational sentences because they lack overt augments and noun class prefixes. Since the copula in question must agree with the focus, we conjecture that the lack of morphologically manifested features on a subclass 1a noun, prevents agreement.

Augments express the feature of specificity[19] 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

[19] And perhaps other features as well (Halpert 2012 and Progovac 1993).

inability of names to participate in agreement with ***YO*** when in post-copular position. However, we suspect that the lack of the augment in particular is what renders names incapable of providing agreement features for the specificational copula. We will refine this statement shortly. Our suspicion is based on the fact that, as far as we can determine, there is no agreement configuration in Kinande where the controller of agreement lacks an augment.

We can demonstrate that there is nothing about names per se that prevents agreement with the ***YO*** copula, but rather it is the lack of morphology related to noun class and information structure that is responsible. 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 direct question/answer pair illustrates an inverse specificational sentence with a post copular plural name in class 2a:

(28) a. Q: **ábibí ní bahi**?
aug.2thief COP 2which
Literally: The thieves are who?

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

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 value. Names in subclass 2a are prefixed with a class marker and here also have an augment. 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 (that is, ***ni*** has no agreement morphology). In this way, names bypass the requirement that the focus in specificational sentences must agree with the copula by using a non-agreeing copula just in case there is a focus that cannot agree.

We emphasize here that we are in no way claiming that all apparently augmentless nominals are predicates. However, we do note that names can be used either predicatively (27) or referentially (25). This does not depend on an augment visibly occurring on a name or not. We agree with Hyman and Katamba (1993) that there instances of non-overt augments. We analyze names as having non-overt augments when they are used referentially. We point out here that even non-overt augments can be missing, in which case, there is a predicative interpretation. Moreover, we made an observation (to be further addressed shortly) that non-overt augments cannot participate in post copular agreement.

We note 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 value. In this case, the ***YO*** specificational copula is used (29). The ***ni*** copula is ungrammatical on a specificational reading. Instead, it could be used as part of a predicational copular sentence which could be an answer to the question of which occupation Magulu has (30):

(29) **Magulú *yó* mwíbi** {SPECIFICATIONAL}
1Magulu 1COP 1thief
Magulu is the one who is a thief./ It is Magulu who is a thief.

(30) **Magulú *ní* mwíbi** {NOT SPECIFICATIONAL}
1Magulu COP 1thief
*Magulu is the one who is a thief.
ok: Magulu is a thief. (predicational reading)

Here is a brief interim summary of the facts:

Table 2: SPECIFICATIONAL COPULA

Type of nominal in FOCUS ↓	**inverse specificational (post copular focus)**	**reverse specificational (pre copular focus)**
not name	*YO*	*YO*
NAME	*ni*	*YO*

The 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, as they do in *reverse* specificational sentences. This is in opposition to their inability to agree with the copula when they are only in an AGREE[20] relation with the head, as they are when they are the post copular focus of *inverse* specificational sentences. 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 specificity 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.[21] We leave a detailed development of this idea for future research.

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. Neither the ***ni*** or ***YO*** copula allows first or second person (singular or plural) subjects, essentially regardless of discourse context:

[20] 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.

[21] The pre- versus post copular agreement asymmetry with names is also reminiscent of the pre- and post- verbal agreement asymmetry found in Standard Arabic and other languages. Therefore, it is worth investigating the points of similarity between those languages and Kinande.

(31) a.*__ingye yo/ni (o-)mugeni__
I COP 1guest

b.*__igwe yo/ni (o-)mwana__
you COP 1child

In *reverse* specificational sentences when first or second person subjects would stand in a specifier/head relation with a copula, no copula occurs.[22] Instead, the first or second person pronoun (the value) is obligatorily interpreted as focused, and the variable appears without an augment. The lack of an augment is expected since the variable is non-referential. Here are several examples from Valinande (1984) (= his volume 3, (21)):

(32) a. **ingye mugéni** [23]
I 1guest
I am the one who is a guest./It is me who is a guest./*I am a guest.

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

Evidence that there is obligatorily a reverse specificational reading or one where the initial nominal is focused when the copula is absent is as follows. It is not possible to contrastively focus the predicate (variable) when there is a first or second person pronoun in initial position, using a construction which lacks a copula. If the subject must be the focus, then the predicate must be the topic. Hence, the impossibility of contrastive focus on the predicate just in case there is no copula in the clause:

(33) *__igwe mulume kutse mwana__?
you 1man or 1child
Are you a man or a child?

Instead, the ***ni*** or ***–li***[24] copula must be used in order to focus a predicate when there is a first or second person subject. Of course, the subject cannot be understood as focused in this case:

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

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

[22] We cannot explain why the *–li* copula is not possible when a second or first person pronoun in initial position is focused. We note that focus in Kinande is always incompatible with canonical subject/verb agreement morphology (the so called 'anti-agreement' effect) (Schneider-Zioga 1995, 2007) and the *–li* copula is inflected with canonical subject/verb agreement morphology.

[23] This can also be interpreted as an absolute small clause, equivalent to 'with me a guest,' as the following example illustrates:

(i) **ingye mugeni, simwanganyihukira akakoko kali ng'aka**
me 1guest, neg.2sg.can.cook 12chicken 12be as 12that
With me as guest, you cannot cook such a small chicken.

[24] The –li copula is realized as –ri in certain phonological contexts.

(36) Answer: **Nyi-rí múlúme**
1sg-be 1man
I am a man.

Finally, consider a question/answer context where an inverse specificational sentence is necessary as an answer. Note that, with first and second person pronouns as post copular values, as with names, the non-agreeing ***ni*** copula is necessary. Since personal pronouns in Kinande lack noun class markers and augments, it is correctly predicted that none of them should be able to be in an AGREE relation with the ***YO*** copula without being in a specifier/head configuration, as noted in the previous discussion concerning names. Therefore, a non-agreeing copula must be used. Of course, for first and second person pronouns, even a specifier/head configuration is not enough for the ***YO*** copula to co-occur as the ***YO*** copula expresses agreement in gender rather than person. We observe the use of the non-agreeing ***ni*** copula:

(37) a. **iyóndi yo mugéni?/ omugení ní ndi?**
1who 1COP 1guest aug.1guest be who
Who is the guest? Who is the guest?

Possible answers:
b.***ingye (o-)mugeni**
I (aug-)1guest

c. **ni ingyê**
be I
It is me

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

Here is a brief summary of the facts concerning copula choice in specificational sentences including first and second person pronouns:

Table 3: SPECIFICATIONAL COPULA (Including 1st and 2nd person pronouns)

Type of nominal in FOCUS ↓	**inverse specificational (post copular focus)**	**reverse specificational (precopular focus)**
not name	*YO*	*YO*
NAME	*ni*	*YO*
1st & 2nd person pronouns	*ni*	∅

In short, we have seen that in specificational sentences, there is an agreeing copula which agrees in noun class with 3rd person focused expressions. Since specificational sentences allow the XPs involved in the copular construction to occur in either order, 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 downward with a non-c-commanding constituent.[25] We also saw that when names or pronouns are the focus in post copular position of inverse specificational clauses, they take a different non-agreeing copula than usually occurs in specificational sentences. We proposed that this is a strategy used by names and pronouns to bypass the requirement of focus agreement in specificational sentences, a workaround made necessary due to independent morphosyntactic limitations of names and pronouns in Kinande.

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. Moreover, 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 (38a) establishes an identificational context. The identificational clause is given in (38b).

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

A: **omúlumy óliá yómúkulú ów' edepartement**.
aug.1man aug.1that 1COP1giant 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 24 and the ***YO*** copula indicates class 24 agreement, illustrates unequivocally that ***YO*** agrees with the post copular XP:

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

The data we have examined here indicate that the ***YO*** copula is used for identificational copular clauses and the agreement is with the post copular expression. This is the same pattern we find with specificational copular clauses. (40) illustrates that the similiarity extends to proper names: a ***ni*** copula is used when a proper name is the post copular identificational phrase.

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

[25] The reviewer makes the important and interesting point that although we claim there is a c-command relation between the precopular and the post copular XPs in specificational sentences, we have not actually established this. It has proven difficult to construct plausible specificational sentences that will establish c-command through binding or other diagnostics. Therefore, we acknowledge this as a weakness of our analysis and will develop plausible evidence for our claim of c-command in future work.

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:

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

The fact that the ***ni*** copula is required in this context can be accounted for in the same way as with specificational clauses.

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

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

Note that the identificational phrase lacks an augment and that the non-agreeing copula ***ni*** occurs. In predicational copular clauses, the occurrence of an augment was sensitive to the syntactic context: only non-augmented NPs could occur in the position of the predicate—and definiteness did not play a role in determining whether or not a nominal lacked an augment—anything that was semantically a predicate occurred there and was unaugmented. When we consider identificational copular clauses we find the familiar situation with augments in Kinande in NPI licensing environments: lack of augment correlates with indefiniteness and presence of the augment correlates with definiteness. In the sentence under consideration (41), the pre-copular demonstratives indicate that the identificational phrases are in class 9; however, due to the loan word status of the identificational phrases, in addition to there being no augment, no class marker occurs on them either. Therefore, there is neither augment nor class marker, which means that the identificational phrase cannot provide agreement features for the copula, but still does not tell us which morpheme's absence is responsible for directing agreement in the usual case. However, when the identificational phrases involve possessed nouns, we can observe that ***ni,*** rather than the agreeing copula ***YO,*** occurs just in case the identificational phrase lacks an augment (42). If the possessed noun is prefixed with an augment, the agreeing copula ***YO*** occurs (43). The possessed noun is prefixed with a class marker in these examples. Therefore, it is specifically the augment that controls agreement.

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

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

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

(44) Q: **What did that**?
A: gw' ámagétsi
6COP aug.6water
It's the water.

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

Hedberg (2000) calls this type of copular clause in English a truncated cleft because of its resemblance to a full cleft. Consider the English translation of the Kinande example: 'It's the goats.' The full cleft version would be: 'It's the goats that did this.' However, in Kinande, these do not look like a truncated cleft or at least they do not look like a truncated focus construction.[26] 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*** copula of precopular focus lacks an augment. This contrasts with the *it* identificational sentences in Kinande, as in (44), where there must be an augment.[27]

In sum, identificational copular clauses can take either a ***YO*** or ***ni*** copula. A ***YO*** copula is chosen if the identificational phrase, which is post copular, is overtly augmented. The ***YO*** copula agrees with the post copular constituent. If the post copular

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

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

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

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

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

identificational phrase is not augmented, so either a name or an indefinite,[28] agreement is not possible and the non-agreeing ***ni*** copula must occur as a last resort.

5. EQUATIVE COPULAR CLAUSES

The fourth type of copular clause we consider is equatives. Equatives have an unclear status in Higgins' 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 in Kinande:

(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.[29] Recall that having a post copular NP, as opposed to a DP is a hallmark of predication. This suggests that tautologies might equate predicates in Kinande. We note that although *ni* does not normally allow first or second person subjects, they are acceptable in the following equative example:

(48) **ingyé n' ingyé na wu ni iwê**
I COP I and you COP you
I am who I am and you are who you are.

This suggests to us that the ***ni*** copula here is a last resort copula which arises due to a failure of post copular agreement rather than the ***ni*** copula that is used for predicative sentences, as the predicative ***ni*** copula cannot agree with a first or second person subject.

We consider next non-tautologies with referential 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.

(49) **Eririma *ky'* ekihugo; n'embuto yowene b' abana b' Obwami**
5field 7COP aug.7world; &9seed 9good 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 of referential noun phrases 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, p.c.) 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:

[28] We have not yet determined to what extent specificity as opposed to simple definiteness plays a role in determining the distribution of augments in these constructions.
[29] Precopular/preverbal noun phrases must always have augments in Kinande, a structural constraint.

(50) **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:

(51) **Jórge Bergoglió ni Pápe Franswâ**
Jorge Bergoglio is Pope Francis.

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:

(52) 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, so there is not an equation, then the ***YO*** copula is used when the post copular phrase is a name. 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:

(53) **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 overt 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:

(54)**?ómwibí yó omúlámya**
aug.1thief 1COP aug.1doctor
The thief is the doctor.

Instead, the following was judged as natural:

(55) **ómwibí yó n' omúlámya**
aug.1thief 1COP and aug.1doctor
The thief is also the doctor.
The 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.

6. CONCLUSION

In this paper we have presented an overview of copular clauses in Kinande by considering them from the point of view of the taxonomy of Higgins (1973). We observed that Kinande has a rich possibility of copulas which are more or less distributed according to the semantic function of the copular clause. However, we could not conclude that there are distinct copulas in Kinande aligned with each semantic function of a copular clause. Instead, we attempted to show that a process of default agreement (or lack or agreement) accounted for most of the variation in the distribution of copulas in Kinande.

ABBREVIATIONS

AFF	affirmative mood	pst	past tense
appl	applied	1s, 2s, 3s	first, second, third person singular, etc.
aug	augment	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, etc.	numerals stand for the appropriate noun class
COP	copula		
FOC	focus		
LOC	locative		

REFERENCES

Baker, Mark C. 2003. Agreement, dislocation, and partial configurationality. In Carnie, Andrew, Heidi Harley & Mary Willie (eds.), Formal Approaches to Function in Grammar. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 107–32.

Baker, Mark C. 2008. The Syntax of Agreement and Concord. Cambridge University Press.

Buell, Leston and de Dreu. 2011. Subject raising in Zulu and the nature of PredP. Ms. Universiteit van Amsterdam and Universiteit Leiden.

Dikken, Marcel den. 2005. Specificational copular sentences and pseudoclefts. The Blackwell Companion to Syntax, 292-409.

Dikken, Marcel den. 2006. Relators and Linkers. The Syntax of Predication, Predicate Inversion, and Copulas. Linguistic Inquiry Monographs 47. Cambridge, MA & London: MIT Press.

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

de Dreu, Merijn. 2008. The internal structure of the Zulu DP. Master's thesis, Universiteit Leiden.

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

Halpert, Claire. 2012. Argument licensing and agreement in Zulu. Ph.D. Dissertation, MIT.

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

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

Hedberg, Nancy. 2007. Yes-No questions, information structure, and prosody. Paper presented at the LIPP Symposium on Clause Syntax, Information Structures, and Discourse Pragmatics, Munich, Germany, June 21-22.

Hedberg, Nancy, & Potter, David. 2010. Equative and predicational copulas in Thai. Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society 36

Higgins, Francis Roger. 1973. The pseudo-cleft construction in English. Ph.D. Dissertation, MIT.

Hyman, LarryM., and Francis X. Katamba. 1993. The augment in Luganda: Syntax or pragmatics? In Sam Mchombo (ed.), Theoretical Aspects of Bantu Grammar 1. Stanford, CA: CLSI, 209-256

Lyon, J. 2013. Predication and equation in Okanagan Salish: The syntax and semantics of determiner phrases. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of British Columbia.

Matushansky, Ora, & Spector, Benjamin. 2005. Tinker, tailor, soldier, spy*. In Emar Maier, Corien Bary & Janneke Huitink (eds.), Proceedings of SuB9. www.ru.nl/ncs/sub9

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

Mikkelsen, Line. 2011. Copular clauses. Semantics: An International Handbook of Natural Language Meaning *2*:1805-1829.

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

Progovac, Ljiljana. 1993. Non-augmented NPs in Kinande as Negative Polarity Items. In Sam Mchombo (ed.), Theoretical Aspects of Bantu Grammar 1. Stanford, CA: CLSI, 257-270.

Rothstein, Susan. 2001. Predicates and Their Subjects. Kluwer.

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

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

Schneider-Zioga, Patricia. 2014. The linker in Kinande reconsidered. In One Boyer, Ruth Kramer, & Elizabeth Zsiga (eds.), Selected Proceedings of the 44th Annual Conference of African Linguistics. Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
Stowell, Timothy. 1989. Subjects, specifiers, and X-bar theory. In Mark R. Baltin, & Anthony S. Kroch (eds.), Alternative Conceptions of Phrase Structure. UCP, 232-262.
Stowell, Timothy. 1991. Determiners in NP and DP. In Katherine Leffel & Denis Bouchard (eds.), Views On Phrase Structure. Springer Netherlands, 37-56.
Taraldsen, Tarald. 2010. The nanosyntax of Nguni noun class prefixes and concords. Lingua 120:1522–1548.
Valinande, Nzama. 1984. The structure of Kinande. Ph.D. Dissertation, Georgetown University.
Visser, Marianne. 2008. Definiteness and specificity in the isiXhosa determiner phrase. South African Journal of African Languages 11–29.