

THE LINKER IN KINANDE: A PREDICATION RELATION*

Patricia Schneider-Zioga and Philip Nguessimo Mutaka

California State University, Fullerton and University of Yaounde 1

pzioga@fullerton.edu; pmutaka@gmail.com

This paper examines the syntax of a functional morpheme, called the ‘linker,’ that occurs within the verb phrase in Kinande. It is argued that this morpheme marks predication relationships within the verb phrase. The linker sometimes functions as a marker of a subject/predicate relationship and sometimes as a marker of inverse predication. It is noted that Kinande is a symmetrical object language where the theme or goal/benefactive can occur in either order within the verb phrase all else being equal. Inverse predication corresponds to the inverted order of theme/benefactive possible in symmetrical object languages. Moreover, the linker is sometimes optional. It is argued that this is related to the argument structure and syntactic configuration involved. Additional evidence for the copular nature of the linker is given from the view of the tonology of Kinande where it is shown that certain tonal patterns connected to focus are found in copular and linker constructions alike.

Le connecteur en Kinande: une relation de prédication

Cet article traite de la syntaxe d’un morphème fonctionnel appelé « connecteur », qui apparaît dans le syntagme verbal en kinande. Selon les auteurs, ce morphème marque les relations de prédication au sein du syntagme verbal. Le connecteur fonctionne parfois comme un marqueur de la relation sujet/prédicat et parfois comme un marqueur de la prédication inverse. L’on note que le kinande est une langue à objet symétrique selon lequel le thème ou le but/le bénéfactif peut paraître suivant l’un ou l’autre ordre de mots au sein du syntagme verbal, tout autre élément de la phrase restant tel quel. La prédication inverse correspond à l’ordre inverse du thème/bénéfactif que l’on obtient généralement dans les langues à objet symétrique. Le connecteur est parfois facultatif. Selon les auteurs, ceci est dû à la structure de l’argument et de la configuration syntaxique impliquée. Une preuve complémentaire pour la nature de la copule du connecteur provient de la perspective de la tonologie du Kinande. L’on montre ici que certains schèmes tonals ayant trait au focus se retrouvent dans les constructions de la copule et du connecteur de manière similaire.

0. INTRODUCTION

The Bantu language Kinande (ISO 639-3, DR Congo) has an overt functional morpheme, called the linker (LK), which is internal to the verb phrase. The linker is always immediately preceded by a DP and agrees in noun class with this DP. In addition, the linker is obligatorily followed by a phrase, which need not necessarily be a noun phrase, although it is in these examples:

(1) a. **Kámbale ágúlira ekitábú kyo Nadíne**
1Kambale 3s.bought.appl 7book 7LK 1Nadine
Kambale bought a book for Nadine.

b. **Kámbale ágúlira Nadíné y’ ekitábu**
1Kambale 3s.bought.appl 1Nadine 1LK’ book
Kambale bought Nadine a book.

* 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 and insights. We would especially like to thank Marcel den Dikken for his helpful feedback. We are 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. In order to write this paper, we made extensive use of the Kinande dictionary supported by the Afranaph project. We especially thank our reviewer for his/her insightful and helpful comments. Finally, this paper could not have been written without the help and patience of Jacky Katsuva Syauswa. All errors are ours.

The linker is not present when only a single XP occurs in the verbal phrase:
(examples from Schneider-Zioga 2014a)

- (2) a. ***Kámbale ágúla ekitábú kyo**
1Kambale 3s.bought 7book 7LK
- b. ***Kámbale ágúla kyo ekitábu**
Kambale 3s.bought 7LK 7book
- c. **Kámbale ágúla ekitábu**
Kambale 3s.bought 7book
Kambale bought the book.

We will follow Schneider-Zioga (2014a, 2014b) in arguing that the linker mediates predication relations, and in this sense, is like a copula. Specifically, we will demonstrate that the Kinande linker sometimes functions like what den Dikken (2006) calls a *relator*. Den Dikken defines *relators* as functional heads that mediate a non-inverse subject/predicate relation. The Kinande linker also sometimes behaves like a *linker*² in the sense of den Dikken (2006), where a *linker* is any functional morpheme that marks inverse predications. Finally, we note that, although the linker as found in Kinande has been claimed to be a cross-linguistic rarity, it has something in common with more familiar semi-clefts, found in Romance languages.

1. A COPULAR VIEW OF THE LINKER

1.1 CASE?

Baker and Collins (2006) propose that the primary role of the linker is as a Case assigner. More specifically, they propose that the linker is a last resort mechanism to assign Case to the XP that follows it. In addition, they propose that the noun phrase immediately preceding the linker receives Case directly from the syntactically higher functional head *v*, which introduces the external argument of the verb. A linker, they argue, is not necessary with simple transitive verbs that have only a single internal argument since the noun phrase would receive its Case directly from *v*. However, Schneider-Zioga (2014a, 2014b) points out that the linker can, and often must, occur even if an expression follows it whose distribution is not regulated by Case theory. This, we note with Schneider-Zioga (2014a, 2014b), calls into question an analysis of the linker as a last resort Case assigner. We give a few examples that illustrate that the linker obligatorily occurs between a DP and an adverb. Since it is typical for expressions that function adverbially to be nominal in Kinande, as in many Bantu languages, we point out that our examples clearly involve adverbs:

- (3) a. **Kámbalé átuma ebarúhá *(yó) lubálúba** (manner adverb—not nominal)
Kambale 3s.sent 9letter 9LK quickly
Kambale sent the letter quickly.

² The term ‘linker’ is used in this paper in two distinct ways: a) as a pre-theoretical descriptive term for the verb phrase internal morpheme found in Kinande; and b) as a technical term from the work of den Dikken. To avoid confusion, we will italicize the word ‘linker’ when it refers to *linker* in the technical sense. See section 1.2 for further clarification of the terminology related to linkers as used in this paper.

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

If the distribution of the linker were driven by the Case licensing needs of expressions within the verb phrase, then the adverb examples should be just like the examples of a monotransitive verb in (2) –not requiring a linker-- since only one XP needs Case in these examples.

In addition to adverbs following linkers, defective verbs with an adverbial function can also follow linkers. The defective verbs in question are used to render the meanings *how* and *thus*. The verbs are defective in that they never take tense/aspect morphology. They do however use verbal morphology to express agreement with the subject of the clause that they take scope over. These forms do not seem to be participles, as they cannot be used to modify nouns. But whether they are verbs or participles, there is no Case theoretic reason for them to require Case. Therefore, these examples are incorrectly expected not to involve a linker if the Baker & Collins (2006) Case theoretic account is correct:

- (4) a. **Mó-bá-sóndiá éngyakyá yó b-áti** (agreeing defective verb)
 aff-2-look 9morning 9LK 2-how
 How did they look for (the word) “morning”? (A: They did an online dictionary search)

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

The previous data demonstrate that there are empirical reasons to reject the account of the linker in Baker and Collins (2006). Moreover, there are additional theory internal reasons to reject the account of Baker & Collins (2006). Some of these theory internal reasons are discussed in Schneider-Zioga (2014a, 2014b), so we do not reproduce them here.³ We will argue together with Schneider-Zioga (2014a, 2014b) that the linker is an element whose primary function is to mediate predication, rather than being a Case assigner.

1.2 CLARIFICATION OF TERMINOLOGY

In this section we clarify the terminology that we will be using to analyze Kinande linkers. Clarification is necessary as a number of these terms have multiple meanings that

³ The *Distinctness* approach of Richards (2009, 2010) also appears to fall short empirically as an account of the linker. Richards proposes *Distinctness* as a constraint on linearization such that two XPs that are too similar in some way cannot be linearized within the same domain, specifically, within the same phase. The idea behind this is that the sensorimotor interface/phonology would not know how to linearize two syntactically non-distinct objects. With this in mind, Richards proposed that the linker occurs in Kinande because two syntactic phrases within the same domain are too similar to each other for the grammar to linearize them. Specifically, he proposes that they both bear the label DP and that similarity prevents them from being distinct in the relevant sense. Therefore, Richards conjectures that the phrase headed by the linker provides a boundary between two DPs so that the like labeled phrases are spelled out in different domains and therefore linearization problems are avoided. However, as pointed out in Schneider-Zioga (2014a, 2014b), this cannot work if *Distinctness* in Kinande cares about labels. If *Distinctness* cares about labels, then the same examples that show Baker and Collins’ (2006) Case theoretic proposal is empirically wrong also show that Richards’ (2009, 2010) *Distinctness* account cannot work to account for the linker in Kinande. This is because the examples in (3) involve XPs with distinct labels: DP and AdvP. Therefore, since the labels are distinct, there would be no motivation for distinct domains, and hence the linker phrase, to occur. Nonetheless, a linker is required even when labels are *distinct* in Richard’s sense.

will be relevant here. The first term of interest is “copula.” “Copula” is the name of a lexical item that is used to connect a primary non-verbal predicate and the subject of the sentence. However, we can also speak of *copula* from the point of view of the syntactic function of a lexical item. A *copula*, from a functional point of view, is a morpheme that links together or connects a predicate and its subject. Indeed, the word *copula* literally means ‘to connect’ or ‘to link.’ There is another closely related term: “linker.” This term is also multiply ambiguous. “Linker” is the name of a morpheme in the grammar of Kinande that is the focus of our interest here. (In fact, there are lexical items called “linkers” in many languages.) This morpheme is named for its observed function: that of connecting together two parts of a sentence. The term “linker” in this functional sense differs from *copula* in that it does not take a position as to what exactly is being connected: is predication or something else involved? Since we claim that the Kinande linker mediates a predication relation, we assert that we are taking a *copular* view of the linker, invoking the functional sense of the word *copula*. There is an additional meaning of the word “linker” from the syntax literature on predication, as indicated in section 1. *Linker* can be used in a technical theoretical sense following den Dikken (2006) to refer to the syntax of a functional category that is involved in predication. Specifically, the *linker* in this sense of the word is any functional category whose syntactic function is to facilitate the movement of one part of a predication past another part. As also stated in footnote 2, we will italicize the word “linker” when it is used in this technical sense. Finally, as mentioned in section 1, we note that the Kinande linker, like other *copular* morphemes, can also have the syntactic function of what den Dikken (2006) refers to as a *relator*. This means that it can mediate predication by heading a projection which contains a predicate and the subject of the predication within its domain. We turn now to an analysis of the structure of verb phrases with linkers.

1.3 THE BASIC STRUCTURE OF VERB PHRASES WITH LINKERS

In this section we will develop the idea that the function of the linker in Kinande is to mediate predication that occur within the verb phrase. To begin, we clarify what structures we assume for applied and double object constructions in Kinande, as the core case of linker constructions involves a verb with two objects, as illustrated in (1). First, following the discussions of Hoekstra (1988) and den Dikken (1995, 2006), we reject the idea that these verbs are three-place predicates. Schneider-Zioga (2014a), applying the diagnostics of Pylkkänen (2008), demonstrates that Kinande has high applicatives. That means that the applied object is an external argument of the VP. Here, following Pylkkänen, is the kind of structure we expect to find when high applicatives are involved:⁴

(5) [...T [_{VP} EA [_{v'} [_v V] [_{AppIP} Ben [_{AppI'} APPL [_{VP} V (IA)]]]]]]

Baker & Collins (2006) argue that the applied morpheme in Kinande and other languages is lexical rather than functional. Specifically, they propose it is a V, basing themselves on Marantz (1993) and the fact that applied morphemes are variants of the verb ‘give’ in many languages. If they are correct that the applied morpheme is a lexical category, then from the point of view of predication as developed in den Dikken (2006), there must be a still richer structure than that indicated in (5). Indeed, in that case, there must be a predication relation between the benefactive external argument and the lexical phrasal projection headed by the applied morpheme. According to den Dikken,

⁴ The abbreviation EA stands for ‘external argument,’ in other words, the subject of the sentence. IA stands for ‘internal argument.’

predication requires a functional head be projected as the head of the predication. This kind of functional head is what he analyzes as a *relator*:⁵

(6) [...T [VP EA [V' [V V] [Relator phrase Ben [Relator' Relator [AppIP APPL [VP V (IA)]]]]]]]

In addition to applied constructions, there are certain verbs in Kinande that inherently have what might appear to be two internal arguments of the verb. An example is the verb *erihâ* ‘to give.’ Given the semantics of the verb and a predication approach to argument structure as proposed by den Dikken (2006), double object verbs must consist of a verb that takes a small clause as an argument (see also Hoekstra 1988 and the previously cited references). In that small clause, the theme is the subject and the goal is the predicate, expressing a meaning similar to ‘X is at Y’. Schematically, considering first the double object verb alone, we have the following structure (we use the glosses for convenience) where the theme and goal are in a small clause predication relation. As we saw with applied verbs, a *relator* heads the predication construction:⁶

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

In this section we have argued that double object and applied verbs involve predication structures. We follow den Dikken (2006) in analyzing the head of predications as a functional element that is called a *relator*. The *relator* is not a specific category, but rather a cover term for the functional elements that head predication constructions. We identify the Kinande linker as the *relator* in the examples we have discussed so far.

The above discussion accounts for the following sentences, where what we pre-theoretically call the linker occurs in the position we hypothesized for the *relator* in the relevant sentences:

(8) a. **Kámbale ágúlira Nadíné y' ekitábu**
 1Kambale 3s.bought.appl 1Nadine 1LK' 7book
 Kambale bought Nadine a book.

b. [...[V' ágúlira] [Relator P Nadíné [Relator' y' [AppIP -if [VP agula ekitábu]]]]]

(9) a. **Nadíné ahá ekitábú kyo Kámbale**
 1Nadine 3s.give 7book 7LK 1Kambale
 Nadine gave the book to Kambale.

b. **ahá [relator phrase ekitábú [relator' kyo [predicate Kámbale]]]**

⁵ To be perfectly clear, den Dikken does not propose there is a functional category “relator” and that functional category must head all predications. Instead, he proposes that predication is always mediated by some functional category that heads the predication. In the particular case we are considering, the relator which mediates the predication is the functional item called “linker” in grammatical descriptions of Kinande.

⁶ The structures we argue for have some relation to Larson’s 1988 VP shell analysis of double object constructions. Following Larson, double object and related verb phrases consist of two verbal projections: a VP shell headed by a null verb, and a lower phrase which is a complement of the null verb:

i. [...T [VP [V' [ec] [VP the book [V' give [to Kambale]]]]]]

The primary difference between Larson’s structure and the small clause structure argued for in this article is that Larson analyzes a verb like *give* as a three-place predicate. This is evident from the fact that the overt lexical verb *give* assigns a theta role to both the theme and the goal in his VP shell structures. In contrast, the small clause approach assumes a phrase headed by a functional category, which has a specifier and a predicate which is not assigned a theta role by a lexical verb anywhere in the larger proposed structure.

However, note that, as evident from comparing the examples in (1a&b), under typical conditions the benefactive or the theme of a transitive applied construction can appear in either order within the verb phrase. This is also true for the order of goal and theme in double object constructions. In addition to freedom of word order, either DP can cliticize to the verb or passivize. That is, goals/benefactives and themes all equally seem to behave as direct objects of the verb in Kinande. From the perspective of Bantu syntax, this means that Kinande is a “symmetrical double object language.” The question immediately arises as to what the relation is between these two opposite word orders: is one derived from the other or are two distinct constructions involved?

First, in response to questions related to economy raised by a reviewer, we consider the possibility that economy favors that each word order is independently generated and thus there is a structural sense in which a language like Kinande is symmetrical. That is, is it possible that there are two independent structures, one where the benefactive is the subject of the predication and one where the theme is the subject of the predication? In the case of applied constructions, semantic considerations will not allow us to generate syntactically symmetric structures to capture the symmetric behavior of theme and benefactive DPs. Recall that Kinande evinces high applicatives. This means that the benefactive argument is interpreted as an individual standing in a relation to the entire event syntactically expressed by the verb phrase. This interpretation does not change when the word order changes. Therefore, we cannot analyze the alternate word order as involving a distinct predication with the theme as subject of the predication because that would give us the wrong interpretation. Instead, we conclude that there is a derivational relation between the two word orders. Furthermore, when double object verbs are considered, from the semantic point of view there is not a significant change in interpretation regardless of the order of the goal and the theme in double object verbs. We tentatively take this to mean that only a single structure is involved from which the alternate word order is also derived. This conclusion would follow from Baker’s 1988 UTAH (Uniformity of Theta Assignment Hypothesis), which says, “Identical thematic relationships between items are represented by identical structural relationships between those items at the level of D-structure.” However, our conclusion remains tentative, as it is not clear to us how relevant UTAH might be to secondary predication constructions.

Finally, there are also considerations of cross-linguistic economy which militate against generating distinct word orders with distinct predication structures. Since there are languages that are not symmetric, we would need to find a reason why symmetric generation of small clauses would not be possible in some languages. This would seem to be an arbitrary stipulation. In contrast, if alternate word orders are derived by movement from a shared base, cross-linguistic variation in whether a language had symmetric or non-symmetric constructions of the type we are considering would seem to easily follow from, for example, variation in the properties of features of functional heads—a well documented source of cross-linguistic variation.⁷

Having rejected base generation of distinct word orders, we consider how the alternate word orders that we observe in the applied and double object constructions are derived. In so doing, we develop our proposal that the Kinande linker can also function as

⁷ For an example of a current account of cross-linguistic differences between languages with symmetric and non-symmetric (= only one DP behaves like a direct object) double object and applicative constructions see McGinnis (2000). She exploits the idea that in high applicatives, an applied morpheme defines a phase by virtue of introducing an external argument. The claim that applied morphemes are lexical rather than functional would cause a slight revision in her proposal such that a functional morpheme like the linker would define the phase. The proposed high applicative phase boundary allows either the theme or benefactive/goal to move to or occur at the edge of the phase. Therefore, symmetric behavior is evinced when high applicatives are involved. With low applicatives, in contrast, only the structurally highest DP will be able to move to the edge of the phase since according to her proposal a low applicative head does not define a phase boundary. Therefore, asymmetric behavior is found when low applicatives are involved. Crucially, there must be a fixed hierarchical structure at least roughly along the lines proposed here in order to account for the difference between symmetric and non-symmetric languages from the perspective of this approach.

a *linker* in the sense of den Dikken (2006). We have already noted that the proposed hierarchically complex structures involving *relators* capture semantic and cross-linguistically relevant syntactic facts in double object and applied constructions. That is, we hypothesized that the linker occurs internal to a *relator* phrase involving the VP. Furthermore, we conclude with Baker and Collins (2006) that the linker can head a functional projection that has a specifier position to which no thematic role is assigned. Hence, essentially any XP within the verb phrase can target that specifier position. This accounts for the fact noted in Baker and Collins (2006) that exactly one XP can precede the linker and essentially any XP within the verb phrase can target the immediate before the linker position even when there are more than two verb phrase internal XPs. Note that in our analysis, in contrast to Baker and Collins (2006), there are two instances of the linker within the verb phrase in Kinande. One instance is as a *relator*, mediating predication by heading the *relator* phrase that contains the subject of the predication and the predicate in the same domain. Another instance is as a *linker* in the technical sense—of the type proposed by den Dikken (2006, and related works), where the *relator* raises to the structurally higher *linker* head to facilitate movement of some more deeply embedded constituent past the subject of the predication. We locate the additional functional projection for the linker qua *linker* (LP for *linker phrase*) immediately above the relator phrase (RP) and immediately below vP:

- (10) [_{VP} EA [_{v'} [_v V]]_{LP} [_{L'} *linker* [[_{RP} BEN [_{R'} *relator* [_{AppIP} APPL [_{VP} V DP]]]]]]]]

The *linker* facilitates inversion of the predicate or part of the predicate past the subject of the predication. Facilitation is necessary because there is otherwise a minimality problem for the alternate word orders: how does one noun phrase A-move across another noun phrase? When we consider the small clause structures that we have hypothesized, it is clear that A-movement that crosses the subject of the predication is expected to be prevented by virtue of the fact that the small clause which contains both the theme and goal/benefactive constitutes a phase following Chomsky’s proposal that phases are propositional, as also discussed in den Dikken 2006. Therefore, anything more deeply embedded than the specifier of the phase and the head of the phase (here this is the subject of the predication and the relator head of the phase) should not be accessible to further movement. However, den Dikken proposes that the raising of a *relator*, which is a phase head, to a higher functional position—the *linker* head—extends the phase and hence the domain of movement for the more deeply embedded predicate (see den Dikken 2006 for details).

The following schematic example illustrates the derivation of the order theme benefactive which becomes possible if the *relator* raises to the *linker* head:⁸

- (11) [... [_{LP} [Theme]_k [_{L'} LK+*Relator*_r=YO [_{RP} Ben [_{R'} t_r [_{AppIP} APPL [_{VP} V t_k]]]]]]]]

An example sentence would be as follows:

- (12) **Kámbale ágúlira ekitábú kyo Nadíne**
 1Kambale 3s.bought.appl 7book 7LK 1Nadine
 Kambale bought a book for Nadine.

The alternate word order that the *linker* facilitates for double object verbs is schematically illustrated here using English glosses:

⁸ Note that in this example, only a subpart of the predicate targets the specifier of *linker* phrase position.

(13) give_v [_{LP} [_{predicate} Kambale]_k [_L LK+ *Relator*_j [_{VP} t_v [_{RP} the book [_{relator} t_j t_k]]]]]

An example sentence would be as follows:

(14) **Nadíne áha Kámbalé yo ekitábu**
 1Nadine 3s.gave 1Kâmbale 1LK 7book
 Nadine gave Kambale a book.

In this section, we have considered the basic structure of phrases involving linkers in Kinande and have argued that the linker is used to establish or facilitate predication relations. We have proposed that there can be two functional projections related to linkers even if there is only one linker apparent. Specifically we suggested that all verb phrases with linkers at least involve a small clause headed by a linker that has the syntax of a *relator*, as discussed above. We then considered sentences where there was an order of benefactive/goal and theme that was opposite of the order determined by the small clauses. We proposed that this word order arose through a process of the linker that was located in the head of the *relator* phrase raising to the head of a higher functional projection: the *linker* phrase. We argued that the raising of the linker to the head of the *linker* phrase enlarged the domain of possible movement for XPs that were syntactically lower than the subject of the small clauses mediated by the *relator* head. Thus the *linker* facilitates movement of more deeply embedded XPs.

We finish this section by sketching out a very rough view of how we believe Case works in Kinande. First we point out that there is a literature (Diercks 2012) in Bantu languages that proposes as a parametric option that DPs in Bantu languages do not require Case. We acknowledge that most Bantu languages evince certain behaviors that suggest DPs in Bantu languages are not subject to Case requirements in the same way other well-studied languages are. Nonetheless, here we follow a standard minimalist approach in assuming that *v*, the functional head that introduces the external-most argument of causative verbs, assigns structural Case via AGREE to the DP with the relevant features that it *c*-commands. AGREE acts upon that the structurally closest DP. This ensures that the DP that occupies the specifier of the *relator* phrase will receive structural Case from *v* if there is no DP occupying the specifier of *linker* phrase intervening. This means that when the word order is benefactive theme, the benefactive phrase will receive structural Case from *v* and in double object constructions with word order theme goal, the theme will receive structural Case from *v*. The other head of a functional project projection that introduces external arguments, namely the *relator* head, also presumably can check Case via AGREE with the structurally closest DP that it *c*-commands. If there is a *linker* phrase, then the DP that occupies the specifier of *linker* phrase will receive Case from *v* and the following DP can have its Case features checked by the *c*-commanding *linker*. Therefore, we agree with Baker and Collins (2006) that the linker (can) assigns Case. However, as we argue throughout this paper, the linker is not a last resort licenser. That is, Baker and Collins are mistaken in their analysis of the linker's *raison d'être*.

1.4 OPTIONAL VERSUS OBLIGATORY LINKERS

Here we note that whereas linkers (that is, *linkers* or *relators*) are obligatory in the type of argument small clauses we have just discussed, there are also configurations where the linker is optional. Baker and Collins (2006) make optionality of linkers follow by stipulating that the XPs that follow optional linkers only optionally need Case. We will demonstrate that linker optionality is related to the semantics of the predications that have optional linkers. In this section, we limit our comments to our most general

observations. Since our primary goal is to provide a general description of constructions involving linkers in Kinande, it is outside the scope of this paper to provide a detailed account of the distribution of optional linkers. Therefore, we discuss some, but not all, of the semantic factors affecting optionality versus obligatoriness of linkers.

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

(15) **Kámbale ówa Marya (yo) omo.kisómo**

1Kambale 3s.heard 1Mary (1LK) 18Loc.7church

Kambale heard Mary in church.

(Judged true if Mary is in church and Kambale might or might not be.)

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

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

(16) **Kámbale ówira Marya *(yo) omo.kisómo**

1Kambale 3s.heard.appl 1Mary (1LK) 18Loc.7church

Kambale heard Mary in church. (Judged true only if Kambale is in the church.)

We analyze this example as a predication between the locative, which would function as the subject of the predication, and the applied phrase (the predicate). Note that this example illustrates inversion past the subject of the predication since the word order is theme followed by location, and therefore, the linker is a *linker* here.

We note with Baker and Collins (2006) that the linker is also obligatory when an instrument is involved: (=their 3b, with tones added)

(17) **Kámbale mo-á-sény-íry' olúkwí lw'- omó-mbása.**

Kambale aff-3s.tns-chop-Ext 11wood 11LK 18Loc-9axe

Kambale chopped wood with an axe.

The instrument has a relation to the entire event. Therefore, we can also analyze it as the subject of a predication mediated by the linker. Since the instrumental phrase does not co-occur with an applied morpheme,⁹ the predication holds between the VP as predicate and the instrumental phrase as subject of that predication, with the linker mediating that relation. This example also illustrates inversion past the instrument, the subject of the predication. The linker here has presumably moved to a higher position to facilitate this movement and is therefore a *linker*.

In contrast to the obligatoriness of the linker seen above, if a non-argument is predicated of a still larger constituent, the linker is optional. For instance, the linker can optionally occur as a *relator* in passive constructions, where it relates the event expressed by the passive TP to the agent:¹⁰

⁹ In some Bantu languages, sentences with instrumental phrases do involve an overt applied morpheme.

¹⁰ Our data does not agree here with that of Baker & Collins (2006). Our consultants do allow an optional linker in this context.

- (18) a. **amatúnda áhabáwá obulí mwaná (yo) ná mamá wíwe**
 6fruit 6.give.pass each 1child (1LK) with 1mother his/her
 Fruit was given to each child by his (own) mother.
- b. **omúkali mwáhérwe eritúndá (ryo) na Kámbale¹¹**
 1woman aff.1.give.tns.pass 5.fruit (5LK) with Kambale
 The woman was given the fruit by Kambale.
- c. **esyóngwí si-ká- seny- er-awa omó-músitú (mó) na bákali**
 10wood 10-tns-chop-appl-pass 18LOC-forest Lk.18 with 2woman
 Wood is chopped in the forest by women.

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

- (19) [RP [passive event] [R' YO [na Kambale]]] ← PASSIVE AGENT

Two final contexts for optional linkers are in comitative constructions¹² and in agreeing adverbial constructions:

- (20) a. **Kámbale batúmá ebarúha (yó) náye** ← COMITATIVES
 Kambale 2.send 9letter (9LK) with-1
 Kambale and he sent the letter.
- b. **Kámbale ágúla ekitábú (kyó) bá-náye**
 1Kambale 3s.tns.buy 7book (7LK) 2-with-1
 Kambale and he bought the book.

These examples illustrate that the comitative expression itself optionally agrees with the semantic subject of the sentence.

- (21) **Kámbére mwátúmíre ebarúhá (y') á-tyâ** ← AGREEING ADVERBIAL
 Kambere aff.3s.send.tns 9letter (9LK) 3s-thus/just like that
 Kambere sent the letter just like that/thus. (e.g., without any money inside)

The agreeing adverbial, which is a defective verb, obligatorily agrees with the subject of the sentence. In both cases—comitative and agreeing adverbial, the optional linker agrees with the immediately preceding internal argument. In short, we can make a descriptive generalization about these optional environments: when an adjunct agrees with and/or is closely related to the external argument of the sentence, then the linker is optional.

Finally, we note that adjuncts that are related to the entire sentence through tense, such as temporal phrases, are integrated into the sentence only optionally with linkers. If

¹¹ This sentence is from Baker & Collins (2006), with the addition of an optional linker, which was accepted by native speakers.

¹² We note that these are additional examples that illustrate that the linker is not confined to contexts where the immediately following expression needs Case (even potentially optionally).

a linker occurs, then the post linker adjunct is necessarily interpreted as focused. Here are some examples:

(22) a. **Kámbale atúmá ebarúhá (y') omotututu** ← TEMPORAL

Kambale 3s.sent 9letter (9LK) 18morning

Kambale sent the letter in the morning.

b. **Kámbére mwímbíra Maryá (y') omotututu**

Kambere 3s.sang.appl 1Mary (1LK) 18morning

Kambere sang for Mary in the morning.

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

Although the linker is optional under the circumstances we described above, it is obligatory just in case the XP following the (potentially present) linker has a mandatory focus interpretation, as it must in an (in-situ) wh-question:¹³

(23) a. **uti wágúla erópo nyíhyanyíhya *(y') okó múgulu wáhi?**

2s.say 2s.bought 9dress 9new 9LK 17 time which?

When did you say you bought the new dress?

b. **Nadíne ásóma ekitábu ekyó (ky') omotututu.**

Nadine 3s.read 7book 7that (7LK) 18morning

Nadine read that book in the morning.

(24) a. **Omúkali ahúká éngokó *(y') áti**

1woman 3s.cooked 9chicken 9LK 3s.how

How did the woman cook the chicken?

b. **Kámbére mwátúmíre ebarúhá (y') átyâ**

Kambere 3s.sent 9letter (9LK)' 3s.thus

Kambere sent the letter like that (e.g., with no money in it).

To sum up our discussion here, we have introduced some of the major generalizations surrounding the linker. We have shown that its major characteristics follow naturally from a predication analysis of verb phrase internal arguments and from the proposal that the Kinande linker is either a *relator* or *linker* (in the sense of den Dikken), depending on the syntactic context. There are many aspects of the syntax of the linker that we have not yet addressed. Although some properties have been addressed in a more in depth way from a formal perspective in Schneider-Zioga (2014b), a comprehensive formal analysis is being developed in Schneider-Zioga (in progress).

2. MORE COPULAS

In Schneider-Zioga & Mutaka (2014), we investigated sentential copulas in Kinande. In that work, we looked specifically at the element that connects a predicate and its subject in primary predications. We established that there are a variety of copulas whose distribution is governed by the semantics of the predication involved, among other related

¹³ Wh-words in Kinande can remain in-situ, but need not, except for the wh-adjunct *áti* 'how.'

factors. For example, we established that one copula, *YO*,¹⁴ was involved in specificational clauses and a different one, *ni*, occurred in predicational clauses. Here, following Schneider-Zioga (2014a, 2014b), we note that the Kinande linker (recall example (1b)) looks morphologically identical to the *YO* copula that occurs in the inverse and reverse specificational copular clauses that we examined in other work. It also looks identical to the copula found in equatives (see Schneider-Zioga & Mutaka 2014). The following example illustrates the *YO* copula in specificational copular clauses:

- (25) **ómwibí y' ómúlámya**
 1thief 1COP 1doctor
 The thief is the doctor.

Here, therefore, is another point of similarity between Kinande linkers and copulas: morphological similarity. As noted in section 1.2, the word *copula* literally means “to fasten together,” “to link” or “to connect,” so, on some level at least, it is not necessary to restrict our expectations of the distribution of *copulas* to sentential predication alone.

2.1 A FEW ADDITIONAL COPULAR ELEMENTS

We observe here that the morpheme that marks focus in focus constructions also looks morphologically identical to the linker within the verb phrase and to the sentential copula that occurs in specificational and identificational sentences in Kinande, briefly discussed above, and discussed in more detail in Schneider-Zioga & Mutaka 2014:

- (26) a. **Ekitábu kyo Kám bale ágúla** {FOCUS marker, for class 7=*kyo*}
 7book 7FOC 1Kambale 3s.bought
 It is a book that Kambale bought.
- b. **Kám bale ágúlira ekitábú kyo Nadíne** {linker, for class 7=*kyo*}
 Kambale 3s.buy.appl 7book 7LK 1Nadine
 Kambale bought Nadine a book.’
- c. **Eririma ky’ ekihugo; n’embuto yowene** {copula, for class 7=*kyo*}
 aug.5field 7COP aug.7world; &9seed 9good
- b’ abana b’ Obwami** (Matthew 13:38)¹⁵
 2COP 2child 2of 14chieftancy
 The field is the world, and the good seed stands for the people of the kingdom.

Although we translate the focus constructions as clefts, we are not convinced that this is the correct syntactic analysis of the Kinande focus sentences. Instead, our preliminary proposal is that this is also a predication structure where the morpheme *YO* is a focus morpheme similar to *only*. Note that the focus morpheme agrees with the focused expression in initial position. One reason we are not convinced that this is a cleft structure, despite the fact that we have seen instances of *YO* as a copula in primary predication contexts, is because it is possible to have an overt copula co-occur with *YO*,

¹⁴ Here we call this copula *YO* as a shorthand way of referring to it. In actuality, it is found in a variety of different morphological forms. This is because it consists of two parts: an agreeing part, that varies according to the gender class of the XP it agrees with, and a pronominal *-O*, so called because it is found in pronominal enclitics and demonstratives.

¹⁵ 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.

which does make the focus construction look syntactically like a cleft. When the overt copula occurs, the focus marker *YO* co-occurs and therefore, it does not seem *YO* is a sentential copula in this context:

- (27) **ni kitábu kyo**
 be 7book 7FOC ...
 It is a book that ...

See also Schneider-Zioga (2007) for additional arguments that sentences like (26a) are not clefts. However, work remains before we conclude with certainty whether or not constructions like (26a) are clefts.

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

- (28) **Nadíne ágúlá-kyô** {enclitic pronoun, for class 7=*kyo*;
 1Nadine 3s.bought-7pro linker for class 7=*kyo* (see (26b))}
 Nadine bought it.

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

- (29) a. **Nadíne álángirá-yô** (NO CLASS 1 ENCLITIC—arbitrary gap)
 1Nadine 3s.saw -9/4/24pro/*1pro
 Nadine saw it (e.g., a cow). *Nadine saw him/her.
- b. **ágúlira Barack Obámá y' ekitábu** (linker, for class 1=*y(o)*)
 3s.buy.appl 1B. O. 1LK'7book
 He bought Barack Obama a book.

The additional facts noted in Schneider-Zioga (2014a) are that a phonological process of vowel harmony applies to linkers, but not enclitics, thus suggesting they are distinct lexical items. We refer the reader to that work for details.

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

2.2 THE LINKER AND SEMI-CLEFTS

In this section, we have two goals: (i) to develop an additional reason to view the linker as a *copular* element; and (ii) to demonstrate that something like the Kinande linker might not be as cross-linguistically rare as it has been claimed to be in the relevant literature.

As pointed out to us by den Dikken (p.c.) on the view that the linker is a *copula* in the broader sense focused on in this paper, these constructions are reminiscent of the semi-cleft construction found in Romance languages. Here is an example of the semi-cleft construction from Portuguese (30b), discussed by Resenes & den Dikken (2012). Note that a copula intervenes between the verb and its direct object:

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

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

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

Linker constructions in Kinande resemble semi-clefts in that they look like they involve a copula of the type found in primary predications and the apparent copula occurs in verb phrase internal position. We also note that they share with semi-clefts the property of their post *copular/post linker* constituent bearing focus. Consider the following example:

(31) **Kám bale ágúlira Nadíné y’ ekitábu**
 Kambale 3s.bought 1Nadine 1LK’ 7book
 Kambale bought Nadine a book.

With *ekitábu* bearing focus, the following translation is equally plausible: ‘What Kambale bought Nadine was a book.’ Could the Kinande structure be a reduced pseudocleft? Agreement facts immediately rule out a reduced pseudocleft analysis for Kinande. Schneider-Zioga & Mutaka (2014) demonstrate that inverse specificational sentences in Kinande involve agreement of the copula with the post copular expression. This includes inverse specificational sentences that are clear cases of pseudo clefts. In linker constructions, agreement is always with the pre-linker XP rather than with the focused expression. Therefore, there is indisputable evidence that these are not reduced pseudoclefts, all else being equal.

We assume that, as proposed as a possibility by Resenes & den Dikken (2012) for Romance semi-clefts, the *linker/relator* in Kinande bears a focus feature that must be realized on the following constituent. This focus feature cannot be realized on tensed verbal constituents. This is consistent with the syntax of focus in other constructions in Kinande, such as additive focus constructions, where focus on tensed verbs is realized in a different way than focus on other lexical items.¹⁶ This focus requirement forces there always to be two XP’s within the verb phrase. This is then another parallel between Kinande linker constructions and *copulas*.¹⁷

¹⁶ In Schneider-Zioga (in progress), it is suggested that the difference between semi-clefts and linker constructions in Kinande is due to an EPP requirement on most agreeing lexical items in Kinande and many Bantu languages: when there is agreement, there must also be a lexical item occupying the specifier position of the agreeing item. Therefore, in Kinande there must be an agreeing phrase preceding the linker qua *linker* and the linker qua *relator* and a phrase that can bear focus following it.

¹⁷ We also call to mind the linkers of Khoisan languages studied by Collins (2003) as well as Baker & Collins (2006). We note from their work that linkers in Hoan can link a prepositional phrase to the verb:

(i) **Tsi a-kyxai ki !oa na.** (Hoan)
 3pl Prog-dance Lk house in
 They are dancing in the house.

3. A BRIEF DISCUSSION OF THE TONOLOGY OF FOCUS IN KINANDE: THE SYNTAX/PHONOLOGY INTERFACE

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

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

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

Although this is not possible with linkers in Kinande because of their EPP-agreement requirement, such “linking” is possible in Romance semi-clefts:

- (ii) a. **o Joao dancou na Portela**
 the Joao danced in.the Portela
- b. **o Joao dancou foi na Portela**
 the Joao danced was in.the Portela
 Joao danced at the PORTELA (and not somewhere else).

If linkers in Khoisan languages are also implicated in focus, the relation between this type of linker and Romance semi-clefts will certainly be worth pursuing in this light.

the intonational phrase tone is H as illustrated in (e) by the names that are not at the end of an utterance.

a. iyó Magulu mulí:to it.is 1Magulu 1heavy It is Magulu who is heavy.	iyó Kátsuba mulí:to it.is 1Katsuba 1heavy	iyó Káhúka mulí:to it.is 1Kahuka 1heavy
b. iyó Magú:lu it.is Magulu It is Magulu.	iyó Kátsu:ba	iyó Káhú:ka
c. Magulú ni mulí:to 1Magulu is 1heavy Magulu is heavy.	Kátsuba ni mulí:to	Káhú:ka ni mulí:to
d. amagulú máku:hi 6leg 6short Legs which are short	Kátsubá múku:hi 1Katsuba 1short Katsuba who is short	Káhúká múku:hi 1Kahuka 1short Kahuka who is short.
e. Ni Magú:lú, ná Kátsu:bá, na Káhú:ka is Magulu, and Katsuba, and Kahuka. It is Magulu, and Katsuba, and Kahuka.	Ní Kátsu:bá, na Káhú:ka, na Magú:lu It is Katsuba, and Kahuka and Magulu.	Ni Káhú:ká, na Magú:lú, ná Kátsu:ba It is Kahuka, and Magulu, and Katsuba.

With this background in mind, let us examine the following forms. In (32) & (33), we compare clauses with infinitive and imperative forms respectively, paying special attention to the tones in the last word of each example. In the infinitives (32)a,b, the last word of the intonational phrase bears both a phrasal H on the penultimate vowel and an intonational L on the final vowel. Recall that penultimate length is a cue that tells us that the word in which it occurs is at the end of the intonational phrase.

(32) a. **erítwalira obundú bo Magú:lu**
5bring 14food 14LK 1Magulu
to bring food to Magulu

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

Consider now the imperative examples in (33). Notice that the last word of the intonational phrase ends with a low tone, L, that is not preceded by a phrasal H:

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

b. **twalira Magulú y' obu:ndu**
imperative.bring 1Magulu 1LK 14food

Bring the food to Magulu!

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

Of interest now are the forms in (34) where the sentences with pronominal/deictic *olú* “this” in (34a-c) behave tonally like the imperative, in that they lack a phrasal H:

(34) a. **Olú ló lukímba lwa Magu:lu**

11this 11COP 11dress 11of 1Magulu

This is the dress of Magulu.

b. **Olukímb’ olú ló lwa Magu:lu**

11dress 11this 11COP 11of 1Magulu

This dress is the one for Magulu.

c. **Olú ló lwa Magu:lu**

11this 11COP 11of 1Magulu

This one is Magulu’s (meaning the dress)

Literally: This one is (the one) of Magulu.

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

(35) **Olukímbá lulyá ló lwa Magú:lu**

11dress 11that 11COP 11of 1Magulu

That dress is the one for Magulu.

This is shown in more detail in the examples in (36) (37) & (38), which also illustrate other identically behaving deictic forms that do not include the meaning of “near speaker:”

(36) a. **Olukímbá lulyá ló lwa Magú:lu**

aug.11dress 11that 11COP 11of 1Magulu

That dress is the one for Magulu.

b. **Lu:lyá ló lwa Magú:lu**

11that 11COP 11of 1Magulu

That one is for Magulu.

c. **Lu:lyá ló lukímba lwa Magú:lu**

11that 11COP 11dress 11of 1Magulu

That one is the dress of Magulu.

(37) a. **Olukímbá o:ló ló lwa Magú:lu**

11dress 11that-near listener 11COP 11of 1Magulu

That dress near you is for Magulu.

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

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

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

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

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

In sum, the use of *olú* “this” in these focus contexts triggers the equivalent of the imperative L on the last vowel of the intonational domain in focus contexts involving copulas and other linkers and relators. In contrast, the words that correspond to the English “that” (such as *lulyá*, “that” and *oló* “that, near listener”) do not trigger the Intonational L on the last word that blocks the assignment of the phrasal H to the penultimate vowel.¹⁸

However, the last word of a sentence with *olú* “this” need not necessarily have the special intonational pattern that also occurs with imperative sentences. Instead, it may surface with the phrasal H followed by the intonational L just in case the speaker merely reports the contents of the utterance as opposed to focusing it. In other words, the speaker here does not focus *olú* “this” in such an utterance as shown in (39a). Similarly, if the intention of the speaker is merely to contradict a subpart of a sentential constituent of a copular clause spoken by his interlocutor, he will also produce a regular form with no intonational L that blocks the phrasal H on the penultimate vowel as shown in (39b).¹⁹ Note that the *ni* copula is used in these examples.

¹⁸ To distinguish the focus use of “this” from its non-focus use, the second author (Mutaka) proposes that the focus use bears the feature of *evidentiality* that is associated with the left periphery or the feature of *evidentiality* is activated in a more salient way in focus contexts. The use of the focus “this” is a strong deictic that the speaker uses to demonstrate something, that is, as a piece of direct evidence to which he wants to draw his listeners’ attention.

¹⁹ The following pair provides an example of the entire context for the tonal pattern described in (39) where a statement is subsequently contradicted with the normal intonational pattern:

(i) **o:lú ni lukímba lwa Mutaka**
 11this be 11dress 11of Mutaka
 This is Mutaka’s dress. (The name *Mutaka* is underlyingly toneless)

A response where a subconstituent is contradicted would be as follows:

(ii) **háahá o:lú ni lukímba lwa Magú:lu**
 haha. 11this be 11dress 11of Magulu
 Haha. This is MAGULU’S dress.

(39) a. **Olú ni lukimba lwa Magú:lu**
 11this is 11dress 11of 1Magulu
 This is the dress of Magulu.

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

In sum, we have seen a special behavior for the evidential demonstrative *olú* in focus environments that involve the *YO* focus copula (also discussed in Schneider-Zioga & Mutaka 2014).

We turn now to other examples involving focus. In the following forms, all of which involve focus and copulas or the linker (in other words, *linkers* and/or *relators*), what comes after the last H vowel is realized as an intonational phrase final lowered H tone (or a mid tone). We find this particularly interesting because we see that examining the discourse context in which an utterance is spoken helps unearth a phonological feature that has not been earlier observed and that the probing of sentences from a syntactic point of view helped us detect. In the following examples, we observe instances of focus and the mid tone on all TBUs (Tone Bearing Units) following the final H in sentences involving copulas or the linker (i.e., *linkers*, and/or other *relators*). In (0a & b) we see examples involving contrastive focus. Note the final mid tones:

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

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

In (41a-d) we have additional examples of focus contexts and again we observe the mid tone:

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

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

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

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

Since Kinande is a language that contrasts H versus \emptyset underlyingly in most cases and that uses the lexical L tone sparingly in some lexical items (e.g. omúkali ‘woman’) and grammatically as a tone marker in some tenses (e.g. huma hit (imperative), notably to prevent the assignment of the phrasal H on the penultimate vowel), what can then be the status of a mid tone or a lowered H tone in Kinande? As we show here, this lowered H tone appears on the various TBUs that appear after the last H tone in a copular sentence, or one with a linker, or with other *linkers* or *relators*, in focus contexts. It could be analyzed as a Focus H register that turns the L tone at the end of an intonational phrase into a mid tone, i.e., a Low tone pronounced on a high register, which corresponds to a mid tone.

We briefly reconsider the contrast between *olú* ‘this’ and the various forms that can be translated as ‘that’ discussed in the beginning of this section. This contrast is manifested via the non-assignment of the phrasal H on the penultimate vowel in the case of *olú* ‘this.’ We might surmise that this is the result of the assignment of an ‘Evidential L tone’ at the end of the intonational phrase if we accept the idea that this contrast is captured in terms of an evidentiality feature in copular and other *linker* and *relator* focus contexts.²⁰ We leave the question of the exact account for this ‘evidential L tone’ feature for further research.

We would like to end this section with additional data that might help future researchers sort out and account for the non-assignment of the phrasal H just with the use of *olú* ‘this’ in a declarative utterance. Note that the examples in (42a-c) all involve a copula or other *relator/linker* element. Whereas the example in (43) lacks such an element:

(42) a. **Olú ló lukímba lwa Magu:lu**

11this 11COP 11dress 11of 1Magulu

This is Magulu’s dress.

b. **Olukímb’ o:lú ló lwa Magu:lu**

11dress 11this 11COP 11of 1Magulu

This dress is the one for Magulu.

c. **Ngábigulir’ olukímb’ o:lú lo Magu:lu**

1s.bought.appl 11dress 11this 11LK 1Magulu

I bought this dress for Magulu.

(43) **Olukímb’ o:lú, ngábilugulira Magú:lu**

11dress 11this, 1s.11it.bought.appl 1Magulu

This dress, I bought it for Magulu.

Although one author is a native speaker of Kinande with a background in phonology, we do not see how it is possible to give a strictly phonological account for the contrast of the non-assignment of the phrasal H on the penultimate vowel in (42) and its assignment in (43). What is certain is that, with the use of *olú* ‘this,’ the forms in (42) sound normal. Although the one in (43), which lacks the intonational phrase final L, sounds normal as well, one can produce it when one is not really focusing on literally showing the dress to Magulu, but is instead merely upholding the topic of conversation. The idea of evidentiality related to focus is perhaps even better rendered by the use of the other form of ‘this’ *lunó*, which refers to something one is holding in one’s hand. Here,

²⁰In the case of the imperative, it is clear that the Imperative L is the one that is assigned at the end of the intonational phrase to prevent the assignment of the phrasal H onto the penultimate vowel (Mutaka forthcoming).

one may or may not use the non phrasal H on the penultimate vowel, depending whether one is again emphasizing that one is literally showing the dress or merely reporting the event that the dress belongs to Magulu. In the latter case, the speaker will use the phrasal H on the penultimate vowel. Note that these are syntactic contexts that involve copulas or related *linkers* and/or *relators*:

- (44) a. **Lunó ló lukímba lwa Magú:lu / Magu:lu**
 11that/this 11COP 11dress 11of 1Magulu
 That/This is Magulu's dress.
- b. **Olukímbá lunó ló lwa Magú:lu/ Magu:lu**
 11dress 11that/this 11COP 11of 1Magulu
 That/This dress is for Magulu.
- c. **Ngábigulir' olukímbá lunó lo Magú:lu/Magu:lu**
 1s.bought.appl 11dress 11that/this 11LK 1Magulu
 I bought that/this dress for Magulu.

The final sentences we discuss here have identical syntactic contexts to the just discussed sentences in (44). The difference is that a non-evidential demonstrative is used in these final examples. These examples demonstrate that it is ungrammatical if one does not use the phrasal H on the penultimate vowel as has been indicated earlier. Thereby, they underscore the fact that a special intonational tone pattern is tied to evidential deictics in focus contexts involving copulas and related *linkers* and *relators*:

- (45) a. **Lulyá ló lukímba lwa Magú:lu (*Magu:lu)**
 11that 11COP 11dress 11of 1Magulu
 That is Magulu's dress.
- b. **Olukímbá lulyá ló lwa Magú:lu (*Magu:lu)**
 11dress 11that 11COP 11of 1Magulu
 That dress is for Magulu.
- c. **Ngábigulir' olukímbá lulyá lo Magú:lu (*Magu:lu)**
 1s.bought.appl 11dress 11that 11LK 1Magulu
 I bought that dress for Magulu.

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

4. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have presented a preliminary investigation of the syntax of the linker in Kinande. We have considered in some depth the proposal of Schneider-Zioga (2014 a,b) that what has been called the linker in the Kinande literature is actually a copular-like category that mediates “regular” and inverse predication within the verb phrase. Our conclusion is that predication is widespread throughout the grammar of Kinande and

reaches far beyond the traditional expectation that predication involves the subject of a sentence and the primary predicate. We argued that predication is also present between the vP or even TP and a phrase other than the subject of the sentence.

We demonstrated that a predication analysis is empirically superior to the most widely accepted analysis of the linker in the current literature, namely that the linker is a last resort Case assigner. The last resort Case view incorrectly predicts that post-linker XPs must require Case. We demonstrated that this is an inaccurate generalization because adverbs and defective verbs and other expressions that do not require Case can follow the linker. The last resort Case view accounts for instances of optional linkers as being Case related: XPs that follow optional linkers only optionally require Case. This seems stipulative unless convincing independent evidence can be found. We demonstrated that if we consider the linker to mark instances of predication, semantic generalizations governing the distribution of optional linkers become evident. Moreover, we established that post linker XPs are sensitive to focus. A Case theoretic account of the syntax of linkers has nothing to say about this, but a *copular* view of linkers does. Copular constructions are well known to impose information structure related interpretations, specifically related to topic and focus, on the constituents that make up the copular construction. We showed that the linker construction had information-structure and morphological related similarities to semi-clefts, a copula-based construction found in Romance languages. Furthermore, the parallel between the two constructions—linkers and semi-clefts—suggests that linkers of the type found in Kinande are not as rare as has been argued in the literature. In addition, we established that the Kinande linker is morphologically identical or nearly identical to a sentential copula and related morphemes in the language. A Case theoretic account of the linker would have to interpret those facts simply as coincidence. Finally, we presented novel findings concerning the phonology of tone and its interactions with focus in *copular* and related structures. In doing so we were able to provide tonal evidence for the linker-as-*copular*-element view advocated in this paper.

The findings of this paper are not just significant for the empirical insights they provide into the syntax and phonology of Kinande. They point the way to a virtually unexplored area of grammar in languages of the world. Moreover, they indicate that one of the most basic properties of grammar: recursion, where a phrase of one type (here a predication) is embedded in a phrase of the same type, can be found in sentences that appear to lack embedding, unless their structure is reinterpreted from a predicational point of view.

ABBREVIATIONS

1,5,7,11, etc.	noun class number	FOC	focus
1s,2s,3s	first person singular agreement, second person singular, third person singular	IA	internal argument
aff	affirmative marker	LK	linker
appl	applicative	LOC	locative
COMP	complementizer	neg	negation
COP	copula	pass	passive
EA	external argument	pro	pronoun
EXCL	exclamation	tns	tense marker
ext	extension		

REFERENCES

- Baker, Mark C. 2003. Agreement, dislocation, and partial configurationality. In Andrew Carnie, 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.
- Baker, Mark C. & Christopher Collins. 2006. Linkers and the internal structure of vP. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 24. 307-354.
- Collins, Christopher. 2003. The internal structure of vP in Ju|hoansi and ≠Hoan. *Studia Linguistica* 57(1), 1-25.
- den Dikken, Marcel. 2006. *Relators and linkers: The syntax of predication, predicate inversion, and copulas*. Linguistic Inquiry Monographs 47. Cambridge, MA & London: MIT Press.
- Diercks, Michael. 2012. Parameterizing case: Evidence from Bantu. *Syntax*, 15(3), 253-286.
- Edwards, Malcolm. 2006. Pronouns, agreement and focus in Egyptian Arabic. *SOAS Working Papers in Linguistics*, vol. 14, 51-62.
- Hoekstra, Teun. 1988. Small clause results. *Lingua*, 74(2), 101-139.
- Hyman, Larry M. 1990. Boundary tonology and the prosodic hierarchy. In Sharon Inkelas & Drag Zec (eds.), *The phonology-syntax connection*, 109-125. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- McGinnis, Martha. 2000. Phases and the syntax of applicatives. In Min-Joo Kim and Uri Strauss (eds.), *NELS 31*, 333–349. University of Massachusetts, Amherst: GLSA Publications.

- Mutaka, Ngessimo. Forthcoming. The phonology of tone in the imperative in Kinande. To appear in Gene Buckley, Thera Crane, and Jeff Good. *Revealing structure: Finding patterns in grammars and using grammatical patterns to elucidate languages*. A festschrift to honor Larry M. Hyman. (anticipated to be published through Stanford: CSLI)
- Mutaka, Ngessimo. 1986. *Issues in Kinande syntax*. Presentation at USC.
- Pykkänen, Liina. 2008. *Introducing arguments*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Resenes, Mariana & den Dikken, Marcel. 2012. Semi-clefts as a window on the syntax of predication and the ‘object of’ relation. In *Proceedings of CLS 48*. Chicago Linguistics Society.
- Richards, Norvin. 2009. Locality and Linearization: The Case of Kinande. *Gengo Kenkyu* 136, 75–92.
- Richards, Norvin. 2010. *Uttering Trees*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- 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. 2014b. Linking, Predication, & Symmetry: On the Syntax of the Linker in Kinande. *Proceeding of the 32nd Annual West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*. Cascadilla Press.
- Schneider-Zioga, Patricia. 2014a. The linker in Kinande reconsidered. In One Boyer, Ruth Kramer, & Elizabeth Zsiga (Eds.), *Selected proceedings of the 44th Annual Conference of African Linguistics*, this volume. Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- Schneider-Zioga, Patricia & Mutaka, Ngessimo. 2014. Copular clauses in Kinande. (submitted to: *The Journal of West African Linguistics*.)