

## Predication and Specification in Kinande

Higgins 1973 distinguished predicational from specificational copular sentences in English, with the two connected nominals classified as shown in (1):

(1)	<b>Sentence type</b>	<b>Pre-copular phrase</b>	<b>Post-copular phrase</b>	<b>Example</b>
	Predicational	Referential	Predicational	John is a teacher.
	Specificational	Superscriptional	Referential	The teacher is John.

Two approaches to copular sentences are current in the literature: the ‘inverse analysis’ and the ‘equative analysis’. The inverse analysis (e.g. Moro 1997, den Dikken 2006) posits that superscriptional phrases are generated as small clause predicates that then undergo predicate inversion to initial position. Mikkelsen 2005, following this approach, thus assigns the semantic types in (2a) to the three types of phrase. The equative analysis, on the other hand, posits that both phrases in specificational sentences are referential (e.g. Heycock & Kroch 1999), yielding the semantic types in (2b). Romero 2005, on an equative approach, argues that the superscriptional phrase denotes an individual concept, as in (2c).

(2)		<b>Referential</b>	<b>Predicational</b>	<b>Superscriptional</b>
(a)	Mikkelsen 2005	e	<e,t>	<e,t>
(b)	Heycock & Kroch 1999	e	<e,t>	e
(c)	Romero 2005	e	<e,t>	<s,e>

Following Kuno & Wongkhamthong 1981, Hedberg & Potter 2010 point out that specificational and predicational sentences surface with different copulas in Thai. They show that specificational clauses can occur in two orders, one the reverse of the other, so that the superscriptional phrase can occur after the presumed ‘equative’ copula. Such ‘reverse specificational’ sentences are crucial to the debate between the inverse analysis and the equative analysis at the level of universal grammar. Hedberg & Potter argue that reverse specificational sentences, even in English, occur in the same contexts as specificational sentences, as shown in (3c), and hence should have the same semantics. Mikkelsen 2005, on the other hand, claims that reverse-specificational sentences are simply predicational sentences with subject focus.

(3)		<b>Specificational</b>	<b>Predicational</b>	<b>Reverse specificational</b>
(a)	<b>Inverse analysis</b>	<e,t> + e	e + <e,t>	e + <e,t>
(b)	<b>Equative analysis</b>	e /<s,e> + e	e + <s,e>	e + e /<s,e>
(c)	<b>Example in context</b>	[Which one is the teacher?] The teacher is JOHN.	[Tell me about John.] John is the TEACHER.	[Which one is the teacher?] JOHN is the teacher.

In this paper, we argue that facts from the Bantu language Kinande support the inverse analysis of copular sentences in that language. Like Thai, Kinande exhibits two different morphemes for connecting two nominals in copular sentences; and reverse-specificational as well as specificational sentences exhibit one morpheme while predicational sentences exhibit the other morpheme. However, just as in predicational sentences, the second nominal in reverse-specificational sentences is marked as a syntactic predicate. The difference is only that the subject is focused. We show that den Dikken’s 2006 inverse-analysis theory of relators and linkers successfully explains all of the Kinande data.

The sentence in (4) answers the question, ‘What about the war?’ and is an ordinary subject-predicate sentence with a copula connecting the two nominals. We claim that NI is a (non-agreeing) copulative RELATOR in the sense of den Dikken 2006, which serves to mediate the predication of ‘being a problem’ to ‘the war’, as shown in the analysis in (5). Kinande doesn’t have definite or indefinite articles. Although

in-situ referential objects can take prefixed augments, complements of NI can't take augments. Such nominals are predicates semantically; lack of an augment indicates that they are also syntactic predicates.

- (4) olúhi      **ni**      mbúga  
 aug.11war COP 9.problem  
 'The war is a problem.'

- (5) [RP oluhi [R' [RELATOR=Cop **NI**] [mbuga]]]

The specificational sentence in (6) and its reverse-specificational counterpart in (7) both constitute ways of answering the question, 'What is the problem?'. Note that specificational sentences involve a different copular element: LO.

- (6) émbugá      **lô**      lúhi  
 aug.9problem 11FOC aug.11war  
 'The problem is the WAR.'

- (7) olúhi      **lô**      mbúga  
 aug.11war 11FOC 9.problem  
 'The WAR is the problem.'

In both cases, 'war' is focused, and the mediating element, LO, agrees with the focus in noun class. The final nominal in (6) has an augment (realized tonally on the previous syllable), which indicates that it is referential. However, the final nominal in (7) lacks an augment, indicating that it is syntactically predicative despite its definite translation into English and its pragmatic status as topical by virtue of repeating material from the eliciting question. This nominal functions as a superscriptional phrase, but it is clearly marked as a syntactic predicate, consistent with the inverse analysis.

We propose that (7) receives the analysis in (8), following den Dikken's claim that predication can be mediated by RELATORS instantiated by a variety of functional heads, here FOCUS (FOC). FOC agrees with the nominal occurring in its specifier.

- (8) [RP oluhi [R' [RELATOR=Foc **LO**] [mbuga]]]

Finally, we analyze (6) as an instance of predicate inversion, where the RELATOR (here again FOC) agrees with the nominal in its specifier and then raises to an external functional head, here TOPIC (TOP), and merges with it, thereby licensing the non-minimal movement of the predicate across the subject. The initial predicative nominal obligatorily contains an augment, indicating that it is a reduced relative clause of the type found also in headed relative clauses, as shown in (9).

- (9) a. e-netbook      e-nyihyaka                      b. a-ba-lume a-ba-genda  
 aug-9.netbook aug-9.new                      aug-2-man aug-2-left  
 'a netbook which is new'                      'the men who left'

A more accurate translation of (6) then is 'That which is a problem is the war.' We note that inversion, as proposed by den Dikken, is motivated as a means of licensing the reduced relative in its headless state. Our analysis of (6), shown in (10), thus instantiates den Dikken's LINKER schema shown in (11).

- (10) [TopP embuga<sub>j</sub> [Top' [LINKER=Top+RELATOR=Foc **LO**]<sub>i</sub> [RP luhi [R' t<sub>i</sub> t<sub>j</sub>]]]]

- (11) [FP PREDICATE<sub>j</sub> [F+R<sub>i</sub> [RP SUBJECT [R' t<sub>i</sub> t<sub>j</sub>]]]]

DEN DIKKEN, M. 2006, *Relators and Linkers*, MIT Press. HEDBERG, N. & D. POTTER, 2010, Equative and predicational copulas in Thai, BLS. HEYCOCK, C. AND A. KROCH, 1999, Pseudocleft connectedness, *Linguistic Inquiry* 30. HIGGINS, R. 1973, *The Pseudo-Cleft Construction in English*, MIT dissertation. MIKKELSEN, L. 2005, Copular Clauses, J. Benjamins. MORO, A. 1997, *The Raising of Predicates*, CUP. ROMERO, M. 2005, Concealed questions and specificational subjects, *Linguistics and Philosophy* 28.