

# SMALL CLAUSES & SECONDARY PREDICATION IN KINANDE<sup>1</sup>

**Patricia Schneider-Zioga and Philip Ngessimo Mutaka**

California State University, Fullerton and University of Yaounde 1  
pzioga@fullerton.edu; pmutaka@gmail.com

This paper examines secondary predication in Kinande. Specifically, the investigation centers on argument small clauses, and depictive and resultative constructions. Overt functional morphemes that we identify as mediators of subject/predicate relationships ('relators' in the terminology of den Dikken 2006) head various types of secondary predication constructions in the language. The two relators we identify are invariant (non-agreeing) forms that are prepositional in nature. Thus, they correlate well with the type of relators that are found in secondary predication cross-linguistically. We observe that Kinande has a very limited class of adjectives and note how this affects the types of predicates one finds in secondary predication in Kinande. In depictive predication, an asymmetry between internal and external arguments is identified: depictive predication, contra the predictions of Pylkkänen 2008, is not possible with external arguments (subject of clauses or benefactive arguments) in Kinande using the same syntactic device that is available for depictive predication of objects in the language.

## Les propositions réduites et la prédication secondaire en kinande

Cet article traite de la prédication secondaire en kinande. De manière plus spécifique, l'étude met en exergue les propositions réduites sous la forme d'arguments, et les constructions déictives et résultatives. Les morphèmes fonctionnels ouverts que nous identifions comme médiateurs des relations sujet/prédicat ('relateurs' dans la terminologie de den Dikken 2006) sont à la tête de différents types de constructions de prédication secondaire dans la langue. Les deux relateurs que nous identifions sont des formes invariables (ils ne s'accordent pas) de nature prépositionnelle. C'est ainsi qu'ils correspondent bien au type de relateurs que l'on trouve dans les prédications secondaires à travers les langues. Nous notons que le kinande a une classe très limitée d'adjectifs et ceci affecte les types de prédicat que l'on trouve dans les prédications secondaires dans cette langue. Dans les prédications prédictives, on identifie une asymétrie entre les arguments internes et externes : la prédication déictive, nonobstant les prédictions de Pylkkänen 2008, n'est pas possible avec les arguments externes (sujet des propositions ou des arguments bénéfactifs) en kinande qui utilisent le même procédé syntaxique que l'on retrouve pour la prédication déictive des langues à objet.

## 0. INTRODUCTION

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

### (1) **ngáconsiderere Mariá mó mwira wage**

1s.consider      1Maria **MO** 1friend    1my

I consider Maria my friend.

---

<sup>1</sup> We would like to thank Mark Baker, Vicki Carstens, Chris Collins, Michael Diercks, Nancy Hedberg, Lorie Heggie, Brent Henderson, Larry Hyman, and Rodrigo Ranero for their comments on our work that is presented here. We would especially like to thank Marcel den Dikken for his 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 materials found at the Afranaph data base including the Kinande dictionary. We greatly appreciate the thought provoking and helpful comments of the reviewer. Finally, this paper could not have been written without the help and patience of Jacky Katsuva Syauswa. All errors are ours alone.

An additional 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:

(2) **ngáconsider Mariá ngá mwira wage**

1s.consider 1Maria **NGA** 1friend 1my

I consider Maria (as) my friend.

## 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:

(3) [<sub>V</sub> V [<sub>RP</sub> DP [R Pred]]]

There are no argument small clauses in Kinande that lack an overt relator. The structure in (3) 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 argument. That is, it must be a bare predicate (see Schneider-Zioga & Mutaka 2014 for discussion of copular constructions in Kinande). As den Dikken notes (p.c.), the particle *mo* is reminiscent of the English relator *as* in its obligatoriness and function as a relator. We note that despite this similarity, the distribution of *nga* (rather than *mo*) 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.<sup>2</sup> Here is an example of a noun that occurs in noun class 18:

(4) **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:

(5) **mu-li kapúsu (omojardin)**

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

<sup>2</sup> We note that the English connector *as* also has prepositional characteristics.

marker. For instance, a prenominal quantifier can intervene between the locative class marker and the noun (6a). Moreover, demonstratives, which are post nominal, agree with the noun in class, rather than agreeing with the locative class marker (60b). Finally, regarding subject/verb agreement with locative phrases in locative inversion contexts, the verb either agrees in noun class with the fronted locative phrase or the locative marker can “strand,” and remain post-verbal as an enclitic with only the “inner” noun fronting and hence agreeing with the verb (6c & d):

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

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

c. **o.mo-muyí mó-mu-á-híkiré múlwana ambu yo Kámbale**  
 aug.18-3village aff-18-TNS-arrive 1boy 3s.say 3s.COP Kambale  
 A boy whose name is Kambale arrived in the village.  
 Literally: In the village arrived a boy whose name is Kambale.

d. **o-muyí mwáhíkiré-mó múlwana ambu yo Kámbale**  
 aug-3village aff-3-TNS-arrive-18 1boy 3s.say 3s.COP Kambale  
 A boy whose name is Kambale arrived in the village.  
 Literally: The village arrived-in a boy whose name is Kambale.

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, which is consistent with it being a preposition. In copular clauses, the copula that is associated with prepositional phrases, *-li*, precedes *nga*. The copula used for predicational copular clauses, *ni*, cannot precede *nga*:

(7) a. **ali nga Kámbale**  
 3s.COP like 1Kambale  
 He is like Kambale.

b. **\*ni nga Kámbale**  
 COP like 1Kambale  
 He is like Kambale.

Furthermore, as pointed out to us by the reviewer, there is a clear preposition *nga* in some Bantu languages, such as Zulu. And although Kinande does not have the straightforward case of a preposition *nga* as found in some Bantu languages, it does share with languages such as Zulu certain similar functions of *nga*. For instance, whereas Zulu has a complementizer based on *nga* and an irrealis modal, Kinande has an irrealis complementizer *nga* and a modal/tense marker *nga*:

(8) a. **ngá tū-nalya-gendá lúbá, tū-nálwandī-hiká oko sáhâ**  
 if we-had-gone quickly, we-would-have-arrived 17on time

If we had gone earlier, we would have arrived on time.

- b. **Mukosa a-lí-ng' a-nga-yí-táp-a**  
 1Mukosa 3s-is-like 3s-TM-RFM-praise-FV  
 Mukosa is likely to praise himself

- c. **Akábisamó kuwéne ka-nga-by' éndina oko ngíngo**  
 aug.12hiding-place 12good 12-could-be underneath 17on 9bed  
 A good hiding place could be under the bed.

This cross-Bantu similarity supports the suggestion that the Kinande *nga* has prepositional properties.

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) prepositional 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:

- (9) **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”

We noted that the relator *nga* has an ambiguous status as a 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:

- (10) a. I regard you **as** intelligent ← *as* qua relator  
 b. **As** you are intelligent, you will understand that.... ← *as* qua complementizer

Finally, we note that *nga*, like *mo*, is morphologically invariant. Unlike *mo*, a phrase that follows *nga* can have an augment under certain circumstances.<sup>3</sup> However, we do not yet understand well what regulates the possibility of an augment following *nga*. We provide two examples (11a & b) where an augment is not only possible, but required, following *nga* and a third example where an augment is not allowed in the post *nga* position:

- (11) a. **níngirá ng' \*(o-)múkirirya**  
 1s.entered as aug-1agreeer  
 I entered (as) a believer.

<sup>3</sup> See Schneider-Zioga & Mutaka 2014 for a discussion of the distribution of augments in the predication environment of copular clauses.

b. **abangi bakalendera ng' \*(e-)syonzĩgũ sy' omusalaba wa Kristo.**<sup>4</sup>  
 2many 2.walk as aug-10enemy 10LK'3cross 3of 1Christ  
 Many walk as enemies of the Cross of Christ. (from Philippians 3:18)

c. **Arléte akáyira Jósh ngá (\*o-)mwami**<sup>5</sup>  
 Arlette 3s.has 1Josh as (\*aug-)1chief  
 Arlette treats Josh like a king.

One way that *nga* and *mo* differ from a verbal copula is in that they do not have the ability to license a null subject on their own. As there are a rather larger variety of copulas in Kinande, let us consider *ni*, a copula that does not express subject/verb agreement as the closest parallel to *nga* and *mo*. *Nga* and *mo* can have a null subject only if it is licensed by a clitic pronoun affixed to the superordinate verb (12). *Ni*, although it also lacks subject agreement, can license a null subject (013) in its specifier position:

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

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

(13) **Kámbale ati ni mukulukúlu**  
 1Kambale 3s.say COP 1idiot  
 Kambale said (that) he is an idiot.

Since all of these relators appear to lack phi-features, we conjecture that it is the presence of tense in the copula rather than phi-features that allows for a null pronoun to be licensed as the subject of the predication when the copula *ni* occurs. The copula *ni* is inherently tensed (present tense). The small clause relators *nga* and *mo* lack tense and so are not capable of licensing a null pronoun subject on their own.

## 2. ARGUMENT SMALL CLAUSES

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

(14) **Sũsyelahĩraya n' omũtwe wawe, kusangwa siwangatoka**  
 not.swear with aug.3head 3your because not.2s.succeed

<sup>4</sup> From the *Kinandi New Testament*, translated by the United Bible Societies and The Bible Society of Uganda (1980). This sentence does not have tones indicated in keeping with the fact that there are no tones in the source text.

<sup>5</sup> Given the right context, it is possible to have an augment here, but in that case, it is interpreted as a different structure involving ellipsis. We show the elided part in parentheses:

(i) **Arléte akáyira Jósh ng'ó-mwamí (ng'okw'áká-mu-yirâ)**  
 1Arlette 3s.TNShave 1Josh as aug-3chief as on 3s.TNS-3sOM-have  
 Arlette treats Josh the way a king treats him.

**eriyira [oluywiri luguma [ [mo lweru ] kutse [mo lwĩragũlũ] ] ]**

5have aug.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, *Kinandi New Testament*)

- (15) **Nĩkwa omugulu basonda-sonda erihamba Yesu, mobubaha esyondeko,**  
 then aug.3time 3pl.want-want aug.5seize 1Jesus 2are.afraid aug.10crowd

**kusangwa mobaganza [Yesu mo mũmĩnyererĩ]**

because 3pl.counted 1Jesus MO 1prophet

They wanted to arrest him, but they were afraid of the crowds, who considered Jesus a prophet.’ (Matthew 21:46, *Kinandi New Testament*)

- (16) **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. (...Matthew 12:33, *Kinandi New Testament*)

- (17) **móbahúlíre [Magulú mo mugalĩmu oyúwene okó bosĩ]**  
 2called Magulu MO 1teacher RELC1good 17LOC 2all  
 They called Magulu the best teacher.

- (18) **ngálangira Nadíné mo mubúya**  
 1s.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 (16), 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:

- (19) a. **Asyahulwa mo Mũnazaretĩ.**  
 3s.TNScall.pass MO 1Nazarene  
 He would be called a Nazarene. (from Matthew 2:23, *Kinandi New Testament*)
- b. **Ngandikola kĩ n' omundu oyo mukahula mo Mwami w'Abayũda**  
 1s.TNS.do 7what with aug.1person 1that you.call MO 1king 1of ' 2Jews  
**kwehĩ?**  
 in.that.case  
 Then what shall I do with Him whom you call the King of the Jews?  
 (from Mark 15:12, *Kinandi New Testament*)

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, occupying the position of specifier of the projection headed by **mo** does not “freeze” the specifier and prevent it from further syntactic activity. This is unlike the behavior of a specifier that occurs in a criterial position. In not being a criterial position, the specifier of a relator phrase (RP) headed by **mo** contrasts with a different relator phrase construction within the verb phrase (20a) in Kinande headed by a

morpheme called the “linker.” The linker appears between constituents involved in double object and benefactive constructions. In (20b) we indicate the structure we have argued elsewhere (Schneider-Zioga & Mutaka 2015 ) that the linker is part of:

- (20) a. **Mo-n-a-h-ere eritunda ry- omukali** (their (14))  
 Aff-1sS-T-give-Ext fruit.5 Lk.5 woman.1  
 I gave a fruit to the woman.
- b. **Mo-n-a-h-ere** [<sub>RP</sub> **eritunda** [<sub>R</sub> [<sub>R</sub> **ry** ] **omukali** ]]  
 Aff-1sS-T-give-Ext fruit.5 Lk.5 woman.1  
 I gave a fruit to the woman.

Note that the specifier of the relator phrase normally headed by the linker has moved away via passivization (21a) and the linker cannot occur (21b):

- (21) a. **Eritunda mo-ry-a-h-er-w-e omukali.** (=their (13b))  
 Fruit.5 Aff-5S-T-give-Ext-Pass-Fv woman.1  
 A fruit was given to the woman.
- b. **\*Eritunda mo-ry-a-h-er-w-e** [<sub>RP</sub> **t** [<sub>R</sub> [<sub>R</sub> **ry** ] **omukali** ]]  
 Fruit.5 Aff-5S-T-give-Ext-Pass-Fv Lk.5 woman.1  
 A fruit was given to the woman.

When we compare (21b) to (20b) we see that when the linker, which agrees in phi-features with the specifier of the relator phrase it heads, is present, it prevents further A-movement for the specifier of its projection. Therefore, the linker is clearly associated with a criterial position, in contrast to the non-criterial **mo**.

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. This is because the post copular (post relator) XP of a specificational clause must be referential and therefore, cannot be a bare predicate. The first of the following examples illustrates **mo** heading a predicative small clause:

- (22) **ngáconsider Magulú mo mulidére**  
 1s.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:

- (23) **\*Ngáconsider omulidéré mo Magúlu**  
 1s.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:

(24) a. **Ngáconsiderere omulidéré kó ni Magúlu**<sup>6</sup>

1s.consider      aug.1leader      KO be 1Magulu

I consider the leader to be Magulu.

b. **Ngáconsiderere omulidéré kw-álí íni Magúlu**

1s.consider      aug.1leader      KO 3s.be      i-be 1Magulu

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:

(25) a. **ngálangira abagalímu betú mo baongózi buwéne**

1s.see      aug.2teacher      2our MO 2leaders      2good

I consider our teachers good leaders.

b. **\*ngalangira abagalimu betu mo (a)baongozi buwene okobosi**

1s.see      aug.2teacher      2our MO (aug.)2leaders      2good      17in.2all

I consider our teachers the best leaders.

c. **ngálangira abagalímu betú nga ni baongózi buwéne okóbosi**

1s.see      aug.2teacher      2our as      be 2leader      2good      17in.2all

I consider our teachers the best leaders.

We demonstrated in our work on copular clauses in Kinande (Schneider-Zioga & Mutaka 2014) that there is a distinction between 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 a copula.

## 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:

## (26) They hammered the metal flat.

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

<sup>6</sup> We do not understand well the syntax and function of **ko**. We have observed that it sometimes occurs as a complementizer and it appears to be related to the class 17 locative marker **oko** ('on, to'). It has other functions, as well.



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.<sup>7</sup>

- (27) a. **móbahésiry'ékyumá**      **eri-ki-yirá**      **mó kíbambale**<sup>8</sup>  
 aff.2forged    aug.7metal    aug.5-7OM-have    MO 7tray  
 They forged the metal into a tray.
- b. **Kámbale átwá**      **akaratási**      **mo bihándé**  
 1Kambale    3s.cut    aug.12paper    MO 8piece  
 Kambale cut the paper into pieces.
- c. **omuloyí**      **a-yi-henduká-yá**      **mo kanyúnyu**  
 aug.1sorcerer    3s-self-change-cause    MO 12small bird  
 The sorcerer changed himself into a small bird.

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

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

- (28) **ekópó**      **móyatul-ík-iré**      **mo bihándé.bihándé**  
 aug.9cup    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, we can note that the verb *eritulika* has an anti-causative suffix *-ík* which detransitivizes the verb *eritula* 'to break.' The following example illustrates the transitive use of *eritula*:

- (29) **Kámbale atúlíre**      **ekópô**  
 Kambale    3s.break.pst    aug.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:

<sup>7</sup> 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.

<sup>8</sup> This example is not so clearly resultative. It literally means 'They forged the metal to have/make it a tray.'

- (30) **akarátási mókatwírwé mo bihindibihíndi**  
 aug.12paper 12.cut.PASSIVE MO 8piece.8piece  
 The paper was cut into many pieces.

In sum, there are rather limited possibilities for resultative constructions in Kinande. This limitation appears minimally to be due to the fact that there are few adjectives in the language. Moreover, it is well established in the literature that resultatives require stage level adjectives. It appears that few of the already limited number of adjectives in Kinande are stage level ones. This seems to be an even greater restriction on the possibility of resultative constructions in Kinande. 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 (3), repeated here, as (31), for convenience:

- (31) [<sub>V'</sub> V [<sub>RP</sub> DP [R Pred]]]

#### 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:

- (32) 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:

- (33) **Kám bale mwálya enyamá mó mbísi**  
 Kambale 3s.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.<sup>9</sup> Here is another example of a depictive in Kinande. As in the previous example, the depictive predicate is predicated of the direct object and the subject and predicate adjective agree in noun class. Moreover, **mo** mediates the predication:

- (34) **nágúla enetbook mo nyíhyáka**  
 1s.bought aug.9netbook MO 9new  
 I bought the netbook new.

Adjectives in Kinande follow the noun. Therefore, unlike a language such as English, where attributive adjectives precede the noun and depictive adjectives follow the noun, there is not a difference in word order to distinguish between attributive and

<sup>9</sup> The concept of noun class includes the idea of gender and number.

depictive adjectival modification. Instead, the absence of the relator **mo** leads to an attributive interpretation:<sup>10</sup>

- (35) **nágúla enétbúk nyíhyáka**  
 1s.bought aug.9netbook 9new  
 I bought the new netbook.

Here are additional depictives where the subject of the depictive predication is still the direct object but the predicate is an NP rather than AP:<sup>11</sup>

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

In short, Kinande has object depictives. Both APs and NPs can function as secondary predicates in this case. Secondary predication involving object depictives is mediated by the relator **mo**.

We consider next subject depictives. Although subject depictives are not rare cross-linguistically, subject depictives in Kinande are of interest as they have a somewhat different syntax from object depictives. In subject depictives, we do not find **mo** mediating the predication relation between the depictive secondary predicate and the subject of the 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 are several examples:

- (37) **Kám bale ágúla ekitábú ky’ omo tamíro**  
 Kambale 3s.bought aug.7book 7LK 18.9drunkenness  
 Kambale bought the book drunk.’  
 (Literally: Kambale bought the book in drunkenness.)

- (38) a. **Kám bale mwátúmíka omotamíro.**  
 Kambale 3s.worked 18.9drunkenness  
 Kambale worked drunk.

b. **Kám bale mwátumíkíre omotamiró yíwe**

<sup>10</sup> If the post nominal adjective has an augment prefixed to it, it is understood as a relative clause:

- (i) **nágúla enétbúk’ enyíhyáka**  
 1s.bought aug.9netbook aug.new (the new one)  
 ‘I bought the netbook which is new.’

<sup>11</sup> Examples from the *Kinandi New Testament*.

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:

- (39) **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 cannot modify an applied phrase:

- (40) **Kámbale ásómera ekitábú kyo Kámbér' omotamíro.**  
 Kambale 3s.read.APPL aug.7book 7LK 1Kambere 18.9drunkenness  
 Kambale<sub>j</sub> read the book to Kambere<sub>k</sub> (while) drunk<sub>j/\*k</sub>.

The interpretation that the depictive modifies the applied phrase does not become easier if the subject of the sentence and the applied (benefactive) phrase are put in different noun classes in an effort to more completely distinguish the possible controllers of the depictive PP:<sup>12</sup>

- (41) **Abagalimu básómera ekitábú kyo Kámbér' omotamíro.**  
 aug.2teacher 2read.APPL aug.7book 7LK 1Kambere 18.9drunkenness  
 The teachers<sub>j</sub> read the book to Kambere<sub>k</sub> (while) drunk<sub>j/\*k</sub>

Since Kinande has high applicatives, a depictive predicate modifying a benefactive 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. And although it is not possible for the depictive to modify the benefactive as illustrated above in (40) & (41), we note, following a suggestion of the reviewer, that a depictive predicate can modify a benefactive just in case the locative depictive predicate is accompanied by a possessive pronoun. In that case, the intended controller of the depictive modification is unambiguous and under this condition, the depictive predicate can indeed modify the benefactive:

- (42) a. **Abagalimu básómera ekitábú kyo Kámbér' omotamíro yiwe.**  
 aug.2teacher 2read.APPL aug.7book 7LK 1Kambere 18.9drunkenness 8.his/her  
 \*The teachers read the book to Kambere<sub>k</sub> (while) drunk<sub>k</sub>  
 literally: The teachers read the book to Kambere<sub>k</sub> in his<sub>k</sub> drunkenness.

<sup>12</sup> In addition, the word order within the verb phrase, which is relatively free in Kinande, does not affect the (im-)possibility of construing the depictive as modifying the benefactive phrase. The sentence below has the order Benefactive Theme (the reverse of the examples in (40) and (41)), but this does not affect the judgment that the depictive cannot be construed with the benefactive phrase:

- (i) **Abagalimu básómera Kámbére y' ekitabu omotamiro**  
 2teacher 2read.APPL 1Kambere 1LK' aug.7book 18.9drunkenness  
 The teachers<sub>j</sub> read Kambere<sub>k</sub> the book (while) drunk<sub>j/\*k</sub>

- b. **Abagalimu básómera Kámberé y' ekitabu omotamiro yiwe.**  
 2teacher 2read.APPL 1Kambere 1LK aug.7book 18.9drunkenness 8.his/her  
 \*The teachers read Kambere<sub>k</sub> the book (while) drunk<sub>k</sub>  
 literally: The teachers read the book to Kambere<sub>k</sub> in his<sub>k</sub> drunkenness

Note that our examples illustrate that depictive modification of the benefactive is possible when a possessive pronoun plays a role regardless of the ordering of the benefactive and any internal arguments of the verb.

Therefore, Pylkkänen's theory makes the correct prediction: depictive predicates in Kinande can modify external arguments, which, since Kinande has high applicatives, include the benefactive. Furthermore, we note that subjects and applied arguments in Kinande behave alike in that neither can be modified by a **mo** depictive, but instead require that the depictive predicate occur as a prepositional phrase.<sup>13</sup> Depictive prepositional phrases seem to have a different distribution even in English. We observe for English that implicit agents of passives seem comparatively plausible as subjects of depictive predications, whereas applied arguments, which are low applicatives in English, are not possible subjects of depictive predications:

- (43) a. This book was bought drunk vs. this book was bought in a state of drunkenness.

- b. John<sub>j</sub> told Mary<sub>k</sub> the story in a state of total drunkenness<sub>j/\*k</sub>

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:

- (44) **Twátsuká mo bánwáni**

1pl.began MO 2friend  
 We began as friends.

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

- (45) **Twátsuka omo.búnwáni**

1pl.began 18. 14friendship  
 We began in friendship.

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

- (46) **mótwabuga eprojet ngá bíra**

1pl.finished aug.9project NGA 2friend  
 We finished the project as friends.

<sup>13</sup> A possibility currently being investigated in Schneider-Zioga (in progress) is that the **mo** relators are actually augmentless forms of a class 18 prepositional phrase. Our understanding of the syntax of the augment in Kinande is still in its early stages.

- (47) **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.

## 5. SECONDARY PREDICATION WITH VERBS

In this final section, we briefly consider secondary predication involving verbs. We first consider argument small clauses. Verbs of perception can select small clauses with verbal predicates, as noted in Mutaka (2011). When a verb constitutes the predicate in this type of secondary predication construction, there is no obvious mediator of predication such as the relator *mo* or *nga*.

- (48) a. **mó-n-á-láng-ir-e Magulú á-ka-wâ** (unaccusative predicate)  
 aff.1s.saw 1Magulu 3s.ASPECTfall  
 I saw Magulu fall
- b. **Mó-n-ow-ír-e Magulú ákîmba** (unergative predicate)  
 aff.1s.hear Magulu 3s.ASPECTsing (a-ka-imb-a)  
 I heard Magulu sing.
- c. **mó-n-á-lángire Magulú ákagul' ekitábu** (transitive predicate)  
 aff.1s.saw Magulu 3s.ASPECTbuy aug.7book  
 I saw Magulu buy a notebook.

The verb form used as a predicate in argument small clause constructions is a participle. This can be seen from the fact that it cannot occur as an independent verb form. We demonstrate that using the small clause from (48a) as an illustration:

- (49) **\*Magulú á-ka-wâ**  
 Magulu 3s-ASPECT-fall  
 \*Magulu falling.

An additional instance where a verb selects a small clause whose predicate is a verb is in causatives. The following example demonstrates the causativization of a transitive verb. We see that in this case, the verbal predicate is incorporated into the causative verb, which means that the VP that constitutes the predicate of the small clause is a bare form:

- (50) **Mó-n-á-hándik-is-ír-i-e omúkalí y' ebarúha**

aff-1s-TNS-write-CAUS-TNS-CAUS-TNS    aug.1woman    1LK    aug.9letter  
I made the woman write a letter.

In all examples of verbal predicates of argument small clauses, we see that indeed an untensed form is used.

When a verbal predicate is used to express a depictive meaning, a tensed, non-participial form is used, but a relator *i-* occurs. This same construction is used for subject (51a & b) and object (52) depictives. That is, unlike with non-verbal depictive predicates, there is no subject/object asymmetry observable in the form of verbal secondary predicates:

(51) a. **abafirime    mobagenda eka    i-babiriluha kutsibu**  
aug.2nurse    aff.2went    24home    i-2be.tired    strongly  
The nurses went home exhausted.

b. **Tékela mwábúyire    eprojet    í-nabíribhondóha**  
Thecla    aff.3s.finished    aug.9project    i-3s.TNS.to.become.thin  
Thecla finished the project a complete wreck completely emaciated.

(52) **omúlumé mwâlétír' ekitú    í-kyabíritota    kutsibutsibu omo magétse**  
aug.1man aff.delivered    aug.7package    i-7TNS.to.be.wet completely    18.LOC water  
The man delivered the package completely wet (=the package was wet).

The relator *i-* occurs in a number of other constructions as well. For instance, it immediately precedes subjunctive clauses. Therefore, it does not function only as a mediator of predication as far as we can currently determine. We plan to gain a better understanding of the syntax of this morpheme in future research.

Finally, as with non-verbal secondary predication, it is very difficult to find resultative constructions involving verbal predicates. Therefore, it is not just the lack of verbs that determines this gap in the syntax of Kinande. Our discussion of secondary predication in Kinande involving verbs remains preliminary.

## 6. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have investigated secondary predication in Kinande. As Kinande is a language that is especially rich in linkers and relators, we observed overt functional categories that head various types of secondary predication constructions in the language: argument small clauses, resultatives, and depictives. The two relators we identified when non-verbal predicates are involved are invariant forms that are prepositional in nature. Thus, they fit in well with the type of relators that are found cross-linguistically. However, in certain ways secondary predication is more limited in Kinande than it is in other languages. This is due in part to the fact that Kinande has few adjectives and even fewer stage-level adjectives, which are the semantic type of adjectives claimed in the literature to be necessary for secondary predication. We saw that Kinande makes use of prepositional phrases for secondary predication to bypass the fact that so few adjectives are available for secondary predication. Additionally, we noted that depictive predication is not possible with external arguments in Kinande using the same syntactic device that is available for depictive predication of objects. Finally, we briefly considered secondary predication with verbal predicates. We saw that they have a somewhat different syntax than non-verbal secondary predication in that they lack a subject/object asymmetry with

respect to predication structures. That is, verbal secondary predication appears to use the same syntactic device regardless of whether a subject or non-subject is modified.



## ABBREVIATIONS

|               |                                                                                 |      |                |
|---------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|----------------|
| 1s, 2s, 3s    | 1 <sup>st</sup> , 2 <sup>nd</sup> , 3 <sup>rd</sup> person<br>singular, etc.    | LK   | linker         |
|               |                                                                                 | LOC  | locative       |
| 1, 7, 9, etc. | number that<br>identifies noun<br>class (relevant to<br>agreement<br>processes) |      |                |
| aff           | affirmative marker                                                              | neg  | negation       |
| APPL          | applied morpheme                                                                | OM   | object marker  |
| aug           | augment                                                                         | PASS | passive        |
| CAUS          | causative                                                                       | PRED | predicate      |
| COP           | copula                                                                          | RP   | relator phrase |
|               |                                                                                 | TNS  | tense          |

## REFERENCES

- den Dikken, Marcel. 2006. Relators and Linkers. The Syntax of Predication, Predicate Inversion, and Copulas. Linguistic Inquiry Monographs 47. Cambridge, MA & London: MIT Press.
- Giannakidou, Anastasia, & Merchant, Jason. 1999. Why Giannis can't scrub his plate clean: On the absence of resultative secondary predication in Greek. In Greek Linguistics' 97: Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Greek Linguistics, Ekdosis Ellinika Grammata, Athens, 93-103.
- Moro, Andrea. 2000. Dynamic Antisymmetry. Linguistic Inquiry Monograph 38. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Mutaka, Ngessimo. 1986. Issues in Kinande syntax. Presentation at USC.
- Mutaka, Ngessimo. 2011. Kinande: A grammar sketch (Version 1.0).  
<http://www.africananaphora.rutgers.edu/images/stories/downloads/casefiles/KinandeGS.pdf>
- Pylkkänen, Liina. 2008. Introducing Arguments. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Resenes, Mariana & den Dikken, Marcel. 2012. Semi-clefts as a window on the syntax of predication and the 'object of' relation. In Proceedings of CLS 48. Chicago Linguistics Society.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In Liliane Haegeman (ed.) Elements of Grammar, Dordrecht: Kluwer, 281-337.
- Schneider-Zioga, Patricia & Mutaka, Ngessimo. 2014. Copular clauses in Kinande. (submitted to: The Journal of West African Linguistics.)
- Schneider-Zioga, Patricia & Mutaka, Ngessimo. 2015. The linker in Kinande: A predication relation. The Journal of West African Linguistics.
- Valinande, Nzama. 1984. The Structure of Kinande (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Georgetown University.