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ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Relativization and Focusing

in Luganda and Bantu

by

Livingstone Walusimbi

Doctor of Philosophy in Linguistics

University of California, Los Angeles, 1976

Professor Talmy Givón, Chairman

This study seeks to analyze the formation of relative clauses and the phenomenon of focusing in Luganda and Bantu languages in general. It will be observed that relativization involves three major transformational rules: pronominalization, pronoun fronting, and co-referential NP-deletion. It will further be shown that Luganda, unlike other Bantu languages, violates the universal principle of pronoun attraction in relativization. This principle requires the relative pronoun to occur directly between the head noun and the relative clause. In Luganda, however, a different principle which I will call relative pronoun-verbal attraction is followed. This principle makes the relative pronoun occur immediately before a verbal word within the relative clause.

A universal relationship between relative clause and focus constructions will be demonstrated that both constructions share much of their underlying structures which indicates that they must be related in their deep structures. It will be shown that Bantu languages possess
various constructions which contain relative clauses without antecedent nouns. These constructions include, among others, embedded questions, WH-questions, and reduced cleft sentences. It will further be shown that the WH-questions are of three types, namely cleft, pseudo-cleft, and neutral. The first two show a relative-copular element on the surface.

Stacking of relative clauses and other postnominal noun modifiers will be investigated, and it will be demonstrated that the phenomenon is possible and it carries along with it a stacked interpretation. That is, the rightmost relative clause or postmodifier is of a higher rank than the preceding one. The hypothesis will be seen to apply to conjoined restrictive clauses as well. Ross' (1967) major constraints on relativization viz., the complex NP constraint and the coordinate structure constraint will also be examined in detail in the light of Luganda data, and it will be shown that these constraints are too strong in some cases.
INTRODUCTION

This study attempts to investigate relative clauses and related structures in Luganda, a Lake Bantu language, spoken in central and southern Uganda. But since these structures are similar in Bantu languages in many aspects, the study does not confine itself to Luganda alone. It examines a number of other Bantu languages as well.

The study is loosely based on the transformational-generative model, though whenever possible I have chosen to dispense with the formalisms, which in my mind add little to our understanding an utterance.

This study is organized in the following way: In chapter I I will discuss the relative clause formation, arguing after Givón [1974] that relative clauses involve three transformational rules, namely, pronominalization, pronoun fronting, and co-referential NP-deletion. The universal principle of pronoun attraction in relativization will also be discussed and it will be shown that this principle is violated in Luganda when object relativization is involved. Non-restrictive modifiers, and the notions of opacity, definiteness, and reference will also be examined in the light of relativization.

Chapter II deals with the relationship between relative clauses and focus constructions. I will argue that because of their similarities they must be related in their underlying structures.

Chapter III examines in detail headless relative clauses and predicate sentences. In this chapter I will show that there are three patterns of WH-word questions in Bantu languages viz, cleft, pseudo-cleft, and neutral.
In chapter IV I will discuss the notion of stacking of restrictive relative clauses including other noun modifiers. I will also examine two of Ross's major constraints on relativization, illustrating that these constraints may be violated in some Bantu constructions.
CHAPTER I

THE RELATIVE CLAUSE FRONTING RULE

1.0 The subject of relative clause formation from a deep structure is quite familiar among generative transformational linguists. Sentence (1) for instance, is said to have been formed from two sentences namely, (2) and (3):

(1) Ekitabo kye n-a- gula kirungi
   book that I-past-buy good
   'The book that I bought is good'

(2) N-a- gula ekitabo
   I-past-buy book
   'I bought a book'

(3) Ekitabo kirungi
   book good
   'The book is good'

The relative clause kye nagula 'that I bought' is transformationally derived from sentence (2) by a fronting rule that moves an object noun phrase (NP) ekitabo 'book' to be relativized in front of an embedded clause. I shall call this rule the Relative Clause Fronting Rule (RCF-Rule).

The RCF-rule applies when the sentential source of the relative clause is embedded as a noun modifier within the NP, and when the equi-noun is post-verbal within the embedded sentence as in (4):

(4) Ekitabo [nagula ekitabo] kirungi

Structure (4) can be diagrammatically represented as in (5)
Now when the relative clause fronting rule applies to (5), the NP in the embedded sentence, which is identical to the head NP, becomes relativized thus generating structure (6).

This relativization analysis, however, is very much oversimplified. There are several transformations involved in generating the surface structure of the relative clause from the deep structure. To understand relativization fully one needs to know about the pronominalization transformation discussed in the following section.

1.1 Pronominalization:

Givón [1972] proposes that pronominalization is a transformational phenomenon that involves copying and deletion rules. Relevant agreement features (gender, number, person, and case) are first copied from the noun that is going to be pronominalized and placed in the appropriate position for the pronoun. After the copying rule, the original noun may then be deleted. Under this analysis, string (7b)
(7) a. N-a- gula ekitabo  
   I-past-buy  book  
   'I bought a book'

b. N-a- ki-gula  
   I-past-it-buy  
   'I bought it'

is derived from (7a) by two rules viz., **feature copying** and **noun deletion** as the following derivation shows:

(8) a. N-a-gula ekitabo  'I bought a book'

b. **Pronominalization**  
   *N-a-ki-gula ekitabo  'I bought it a book'

c. **NP-deletion**  
   N-a-ki-gula  'I bought it'

The Noun Phrase deletion (NP-deletion) is obligatory in such a sentence construction in Luganda as well as in English. But it is an optional rule in Kiswahili, where the co-occurrence of a pronoun and a coreferential noun signals definiteness. Thus the Kiswahili sentences in (9) are both grammatical:

(9) a. Ni-li- numua kitabu  
   I- past-buy  book  
   'I bought a book'

b. Ni-li- ki-numua kitabu  
   I- past-it-buy  book  
   'I bought the book'

Returning to pronominalization as a copying-cum-deletion rule, the transformation is supported by the facts of topicalization in Luganda. If we topicalize the noun ekitabo 'book' in (8a) above we get a grammatical sentence (10) in which a noun co-occurs with a co-referential pronoun:
(10) Ekitabo n-a- ki-gula
    book I-past-it-buy

(a. 'I bought the book')
(b. 'As for the book I bought it')

In (10) topicalization obligatorily requires pronominalization, i.e.,
object agreement (see Givón [1975]).

1.2.0 Relativization

1.2.1 Object Relativization

Now returning to relativization, we find that the object relativi-
ization involves pronominalization (feature copying), pronoun fronting,
and co-referential NP-deletion rules. In this case, however, the two
rules, pronominalization and fronting apply simultaneously as shown in
the following derivation:

(11) a. Ekitabo [n-a- gula ekitabo] kirungi
    [I-past-buy book] good

b. Pronominalization and fronting:
Ekitabo [ki n-a-gula ekitabo] kirungi

c. Co-ref. NP-deletion
Ekitabo [ki n-a-gula] kirungi

The second lexicon changes the pronoun ki into a relative pronoun
kye [ki + e], and then we get:

(12) Ekitabo kye n-a- gula kirungi
    The book that I-past-buy good
    'The book that I bought is good'
1.2.2 Subject Relativization

So far I have been only concerned with the object relativization. Subject relativization also requires similar transformations. There are a number of differences between the two. First, no fronting is involved. And second, while the object relative pronoun is Pron + E, the subject relative pronoun is always an initial vowel (I.V.) which is a copy of the vowel of the Subject prefix. This I.V. when it is a high vowel it is lowered by a general rule in Luganda.

That is, ɨ → e; u → o.

This pre-prefix is always attached to the subject prefix. In case of genders 1/2 (3rd person singular) and 9/10 singular, the subject prefix is deleted following a general phonological rule in Luganda which deletes one of the two initial vowels. Therefore on surface representation (disregarding tone) both structures, the relativized and non-relativized containing 1/2 or 9/10 nominals look alike as (16a-b) and (17a-b) show:

(13) a. Ekitabo ki-yulise
    'The book is torn'

b. Ekitabo e-ki-yulise (gender 7/8)
    'The book that is torn'

(14) a. Akambe ka-menyese
    'The knife has broken'

b. Akambe a-ka-menyese (gender 12/14)
    'The knife that has broken'

(15) a. Abasajja ba-kola
    'The men are working'
b. Abasajja a-ba-kola (gender 1/2)
'The men who are working'

(16) a. Omwana a-tambula
'The child is walking'

b. Omwana a-tambula (gender 1/2)
'The child who is walking'

(17) a. Entebe e-menyesse
'The chair is broken'

b. Entebe e-menyesse (gender 9/10)
'The chair that is broken'

The pairs in (16) and (17) are differentiated only by means of tone patterns and context. The tone is syntactically motivated. There is no toneme for relative marker. In other words, tone is not morphemic in the relative clause construction. The tone pattern is predictable from a given syntactic construction and lexical tone of the words involved. To clarify this point let us consider briefly the tonal system in Luganda.

1.2.3 **Tonal Classes**

For the sake of brevity the phonological tone rules will be omitted. An underlying high tone is marked with an acute accent /'/, low tone with a grave accent /\/, and falling tone with a circumflex /^/.

There are three tonal classes in Luganda to which all the words belong. The division or classification is based on the behaviour of the words when they have an initial vowel (I.V.) or preprefix and when they do not, as well as their behaviour in syntactic contexts.

Tone class I contains words which in citation form, have a high-
tone pattern except the I.V. That is, the prefix and stem of the word have a high tone all through save the preprefix which always carries a low tone in citation. But if the I.V. is removed from the word, the high tone on the prefix is lowered thus keeping the same tone pattern of LH (H)* as exemplified in (18):

(18) \begin{tabular}{lll}
Forms with I.V. & Forms Without I.V. \\
è-kí-tábó & kì-tábó & 'book' \\
à-ká-mbé & kà-mbé & 'knife' \\
ò-mú-ntú & mú-ntú & 'person' \\
ò-kú-bálá & kù-bálá & 'to count' \\
ò-mú-tóñó & mú-tóñó & 'small' (1/2) \\
\end{tabular}

Tone class II contains words whose tone pattern is not affected by the presence or absence of I.V. Consider the following:

(19) \begin{tabular}{lll}
Forms with I.V. & Forms Without I.V. \\
ò-mw-àná & mw-àná & 'child' \\
à-bà-sàjjá & bà-sàjjá & 'men' \\
è-h-tèbè & h-tèbè & 'chair' \\
ò-kú-kólà & kù-kólà & 'to work' \\
è-ki-nènè & kì-nènè & 'big' \\
\end{tabular}

Tone class III comprises a comparatively small group of words mainly nouns and adjectives. When the I.V. is absent the tone pattern of the stem, but not that of the prefix, changes as shown in (20):

(20) \begin{tabular}{lll}
Forms with I.V. & Forms Without I.V. \\
ò-mù-láłù & mú-láłù' & 'mad man' \\
ò-mù-sótà & mú-sótà' & 'snake' \\
ò-mù-gáyáèvù & mú-gáyáèvù & 'lazy person' \\
\end{tabular}
1.2.4 Tone in Syntactic Structures

When these words in their tone classes occur in various syntactic positions, their tonal patterns undergo syntactic tonological (or intona-}

tional) changes. Consider for example these three words which belong to different tone classes as already seen above:

\[(21)\]
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } ìmùntú & \quad \text{'person'} \quad \text{(tone class I)} \\
\text{b. } ìmùsàjjà & \quad \text{'man'} \quad \text{(tone class II)} \\
\text{c. } ìmùlálù & \quad \text{'mad man'} \quad \text{(tone class III)}
\end{align*}

When each of these nouns functions as a surface subject of a sen-
tence we get the following tone patterns:

\[(22)\]
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } ìmùntú ìá-sékà & \quad \text{'the person is laughing'} \\
\text{b. } ìmùsàjjà ìá-sékà & \quad \text{'the man is laughing'} \\
\text{c. } ìmùlálù ìá-sékà & \quad \text{'the mad man is laughing'}
\end{align*}

Note that the subject agreement morpheme ì- bears a low tone in all the three cases. But now examine the following cases where the three nouns are heads of relative clauses:

\[(23)\]
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } ìmùntú ìá-sékà & \quad \text{'a person who is laughing'} \\
\text{b. } ìmùsàjjà ìá-sékà & \quad \text{'a man who is laughing'} \\
\text{c. } ìmùlálù ìá-sékà & \quad \text{'a mad man who is laughing'}
\end{align*}

The subject relative pronoun ì- in (23a) bears a high tone, whereas the same marker in (23b) and (23c) bears a low tone. The high tone on ì- in (23a) is accounted for by a tone assimilation rule. The low tone on the relative marker is assimilated to the preceding high tone of the final syllable of the word ìmùntú 'person', in this context.
Since the tone on the final syllable of omusajja 'man' and omulalu 'mad man' in (23) is low, the low tone on the relative pronoun a-remains unaffected.

The final falling (high low) tone on the relative clause aseka 'who is laughing' is also phonologically determined. The tone pattern of the relative clause depends on the tone class to which a given word belongs. Consider, for example, the verb okukola 'to work' which belongs to tone class II. The final tone on the verb in the relative clause remains low if the noun being modified is singular, but it is raised to high when the noun is plural:

(24) Òmúntú a-kolá
     Òmusâjjà a-kolá
     Òmúlálù a-kolá
     Òbántú a-bá-kolá
     Òbasâjjà a-bá-kolá
     Òbalálù a-bá-kolá

' a person who is working'
'a man who is working'
'a mad man who is working'
'the people who are working'
'the men who are working'
'the mad men who are working'

As can be seen in (24) it is unrealistic to argue that there is a single second-lexical tone for subject relativization in Luganda. The tone is only predictable from a combination of the syntactic and phonological components of the grammar.

1.2.5 The Fronting Rule in Prepositional Phrase Relativization

I have shown above that the co-referential NP-deletion rule applies obligatorily in non-topicalized sentences such as (8b) and (8c) repeated here as (25) for easy reference:

(25) a. #N-a-ki-gula ekitabo
     '#I bought it the book'
b. N-a-ki-gula
'I bought it'

Similarly the same rule applies obligatorily if the fronting-rule involves a prepositional phrase as in (26). (All other transformations are omitted.)

(26) a. Ennyumba [tu-sala mu-nyumba] nnungi
    house   [we-live in-house] good

b. Ennyumba gye tu-sula-mu nnungi
'The house which we-live-in (is) good'

Note that when a preposition is left stranded, following object-pronoun fronting, it is suffixed to the verb preceding it, as can be seen in (26b). But the prepositional gender, rather than the noun gender as in (26b), may be the basis for the relative pronoun. If this is done, then instead of (26b) we may get (27):

(27) Ennyumba mwe tu-sula nnungi
    'The house in which we-live is good'

The fronting of the preposition when the relative pronoun is based on the noun gender, however, is ungrammatical.

(28) *Ennyumba mu gye tusula nnungi
    'The house in which we live is good'

Notice further, that the preposition may not be fronted if the PP involves the associative preposition ne. Rather, a resumptive/anaphoric pronoun remains attached to ne at the original NP position, as shown in (29).

(29) a. Yayogera ne abayizi
    'He spoke with the students'
b. Abayizi be yayogera na- bo
'Students whom he spoke with-them
'The students he spoke with'

c. *Abayizi be yayogera -na
'The students whom he spoke with'

d. *Abayizi ne- be yayogera
'The students with-whom he spoke'

e. *Abayizi ne- be yayogera
'The students with-whom he spoke'

Like the preposition ne_(na) 'with', the preposition ku when it carries the meaning of 'about' also may not be fronted. In this case, only the noun agreement morpheme may form the base for the relative pronoun:

(30) a. Twayogera ku kitabo
'We talked about a book'

b. Ekitabo kye twayogera -ko
'The book which we talked -about'

c. *Ekitabo ku-e twayogera
'The book about-which we talked'

d. *Ekitabo ku kye twayogera
'The book about which we talked'

e. *Ekitabo kye twayogera ku- kyo
'The book which we talked about-it'

It should be noted here that other several prepositional object cases cannot be relativized via the three patterns discussed above.

Consider first the instrumental ne case:

(31) a. Nasala omugati ne akambe (instrumental)
'I sliced the bread with a knife'

b. *Akambe ke nasala omugati ne- ko
'The knife which I sliced the bread with-it'
c. *Akambe ke nasala omugati- ne  
'The knife which I sliced the bread-with'

d. *Akambe ne- ke nasala omugati  
'The knife with-which I sliced the bread'

Next consider the dative-benefactive formed with eri:

(32) a. Natwala ekitabo eri omusomesa (Dative)  
'I took a book to the teacher'

b. *Omusomesa gwe natwala ekitabo eri  
'The teacher whom I took the book to'

c. *Omusomesa eri-gwe natwala ekitabo  
'The teacher to- whom I took the book'

Relativization of these object cases (dative, instrumental, and benefactive) is possible only if an appropriate verbal extension (applied, causative, etc.) is used. To illustrate this, consider the examples below. In (33) an applied (APP) form is used and in (34) a causative (CAUS) verb suffix is employed:

(33) a. Natwal-ira omusomesa ekitabo (Dative-Benefactive)  
I took-APP teacher a book  
'I took a book to the teacher'

b. Ekitabo kye natwal-ira omusomesa  
The book which I took-APP teacher  
'The book I took to the teacher'

(34) a. Nasa- za akambe omugati (Instrumental)  
I-sliced-CAUS the knife bread  
'I sliced the bread with a knife'

b. Akambe ke nasa- za omugati  
The knife which I sliced-CAUS the bread  
'The knife which I used to slice the bread'
One may argue, after Keenan and Camrie [1974], that in these instances only when the prepositional object has been 'promoted' to direct object via the use of the verb suffixes, can it be relativized.

1.2.6 Prepositional Phrases as Antecedent of Embedded Modifiers

Givón [1972:29] observes that a prepositional nominal in Bantu imposes obligatorily its prepositional gender on a verb or a predicate in the same way as a subject nominal does. To illustrate this observation, consider (35c) and (35d).

(35) a. Entebe e- li-ko ebitabo  
    chair Ag-be-on books  
    'The chair has books on it'

b. Entebe n- yonjo  
   chair Ag-clean  
   'The chair is clean'

c. *Ku ntebe ku-li-ko ebitabo  
   On chair Ag-be-on books  
   'There are books on the chair'

d. *Ku ntebe ku-yonjo  
   on chair Ag-clean  
   'It's clean on the chair'

In (35c) and (35d) the verb -li 'be' and the adjective -yonjo 'clean' obligatorily take the prepositional agreement ku-. The noun entebe 'chair' in (35c) and (35d) does not control subject agreement as it does in (35a) and (35b). The ungrammaticality of (36) attests to this:

(36) a. *Ku ntebe e-li-ko ebitabo

b. *Ku ntebe n-yonjo
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Givón [1972] further notices that in Chibemba all the embedded modifiers following a prepositional head may either agree with the noun gender or the prepositional gender, and "the alternation makes a consistent semantic difference." This does not hold for Luganda. Take, for instance, the sentences in (37) in which both relativization patterns are illustrated:

(37) a. Tuula ku-nтебе ku-e n-daba ebitabo
    sit on-chair on-which I-see books
    'Sit on the chair on which I see books'

b. Tuula ku-nтебе gi-e n-daba-ko ebitabo
    sit on-chair which I-see- on books
    'Sit on the chair that I see books on'

In Luganda sentences (37b) are semantically identical. Notice that a similar but not identical dislocation process pertains in English where a PP may be fronted or just a noun as in (38).

(38) a. The chair that you are sitting on is dirty.

b. The chair on which you are sitting is dirty.

Otherwise modifiers in Luganda cannot agree with the prepositional gender of prepositional heads at all. Thus, for adjectives:

(39) a. Tuula ku-nтеɓe e- n- yonjo
    sit on-chair that-Ag-clean
    'Sit on the clean chair'

b. *Tuula ku nтеɓe -e ku-yonjo
    sit on chair which-Ag-clean
    'Sit on the chair on which it's clean'

And for Post-noun demonstrative:
(40) a. Tuula ku-n-tebe e- no
    sit on-chair Ag-this
    'Sit on this chair'

b. *Tuula ku-n-tebe ku-no
    sit on-chair Ag-this
    'Sit on this chair'

Similarly possessive modifiers:

(41) a. Tuula ku n-tebe e- y- ange
    sit on chair that-Ag-mine
    'Sit on my chair'

b. *Tuula ku n-tebe o- ku-ange
    sit on-chair which-Ag-mine
    'Sit on my chair'

And numerals:

Cardinals:

(42) a. Tuula ku n-tebe e- mu
    sit on-chair Ag-one
    'Sit on one chair'

b. *Tuula ku n-tebe ku-mu
    sit on-chair Ag-one
    'Sit on one chair'

Ordinals:

(43) a. Tuula ku n-tebe e- y- a- okubiri
    sit on-chair that-Ag-Assoc-two
    'Sit on the second chair'

b. *Tuula ku n-tebe o- ku-obiri
    sit on-chair that-Ag-two
    'Sit on the second chair'
1.3 Relative Clause Reduction

Relative Clauses of copular sentences may be transformationally reduced. In English, for instance, a relative pronoun or relative pronoun plus the verb be may optionally be deleted. The effect of this transformation is that it reduces the relative clause to either a post-nominal or pre-nominal modifier as exemplified in the following utterance:

(44) The girl (who is) in the house is my sister

Similarly in Luganda a relative pronoun plus the attributive copula li/ba may optionally be deleted from a relative clause in a copula sentence construction as in (45) through (47):

(45) a. Olaba olugoye o- luli ku mmeeza?
you see dress which-is on table
'Do you see a dress which is on the table?'
b. Olaba olugoye ku mmeeza?
you see dress on table
'Do you see a dress on the table?'

(46) a. Ndaba abawala a- bali mu ngatto emmyufu
I see girls who-are in shoes red
'I see some/the girls who are in red shoes'
b. Ndaba abawala mu ngatto emmyufu
I see girls in shoes red
'I see some/the girls in red shoes'

(47) a. Nalaba engatto e- zaali emmyufu
'I saw shoes which-were red'
b. Nalaba engatto emmyufu
I saw shoes red
'I saw the red shoes'
Sentences (45b), (46b), (47b) derive from (45a), (46a) and (47a) respectively by optionally deleting the underlined copular elements. That is, by deleting the relative pronoun plus the subject agreement and copula. This deletion rule applies obligatorily in case of copula sentences in the present tense, third person as exemplified below:

(48) a. Ndaba olugoye olumyufu
    I see dress red
    'I see a red dress'

    b. *Ndaba olugoye o- luli olumyufu
    'I see a dress which-is red'

In tenses other than the present, however, one may obtain the copula:

(49) a. Nalaba olugoye o- lwali olumyufu
    I saw a dress which-was red
    'I saw a dress that was red' (Remote past)

    b. Ndiraba olugoye o- luli-ba olumyufu
    I shall see dress which-will-be red
    'I'll see a dress that will be red' (Remote future)

The restriction in (48b) is a constraint found in most Bantu languages. Copula predicates in the present tense third person singular or plural get obligatorily reduced. The deletion rule discussed above, however, is applicable only in case of copula constructions. Otherwise, Object relative pronouns may not be deleted. Consider the following:

(50) a. Embwa gye wa- gula nnungi
    dog which you-bought good
    'The dog which you bought is good'

    b. *Embwa wa- gula nnungi
    'dog you-bought good'
Similarly, subject relative pronouns may not be deleted in non-copula clauses. Thus (51b) is ungrammatical:

(51) a. Abasiramu a- ba-a-genda e Maaka tebadda
    the Moslems who-they-went to Mecca never came
    'The Moslems who went to Mecca never came back'

   b. *Abasiramu baagenda e Maaka tebadda
      'the Moslems they-went to Mecca never came back'

The deletion rule also fails to apply if the surface NP of the matrix sentences is identical to the underlying subject NP of the relative clause, as illustrated in (52b).

(52) a. Ekikopo e- ki-ri ku-mmeeza kyange
    the cup which-Ag-is on-table mine
    'The cup that is on the table is mine'

   b. *Ekikopo ku-mmeeza kyange
      'cup on-table mine'

Furthermore, the deletion rule may also be blocked by potential ambiguities arising from the kind of main verb used in a matrix sentence. For example, when the rule applies to transfer verbs (see Givón [1972]) such as leeta 'bring', teeka 'put' and twala 'take', the resulting sentence has a different reading:

(53) a. Naleeta ekitabo e- kyalu ku-mmeeza
    I-brought book that-was on-table
    'I brought a book that was on the table'

   b. Naleeta ekitabo ku-mmeeza
      I-brought a book on-table
      'I brought a book to the table'
      *'I brought a book (which was) on the table'
In contrast, when the verb creates no ambiguity, the deletion rule is permissible:

(54) a. Na-laba ekitabo e- kyalı ku-mmeza
    I-saw book that-was on-table
    'I saw a book that was on the table'

b. Na-laba ekitabo ku-mmeza
    I-saw book on-table
    'I saw a book on the table'

1.4 Noun Modifiers

Most post nominal modifiers in Luganda and other Bantu languages may be considered as transformationally derived from relative clauses by some sort of reduction. Noun modifiers of this type include: prepositional phrases, adjectives, associatives, and numerals.

1.4.1 Prepositional Phrases

Prepositional phrases that are used to modify an NP are derived from full relative clauses by the deletion rule, as has been already discussed in the preceding section, see e.g. (47) above.

1.4.2 Adjectives

It is generally accepted in the Transformational Generative theory that adjectives modifying NP's are derived from relative clauses by reduction. For example, the English pre-nominal modifier in (55), is derived from (56) by two rules, the relative clause reduction, and adjective fronting rules.

(55) A pretty dress

(56) A dress which is pretty
Similarly in Luganda when the relative clause reduction rule applies, a post-nominal modifier may be generated as in (57):

(57) a. N-alaba abakazi a- ba-ali abalungi
     I-saw women η-o-were beautiful
     'I saw women who were beautiful'

b. Nalaba abakazi abalungi
     I saw women beautiful
     'I saw beautiful women'

Givón [1972a] observes that in Chibemba attributive adjectives may have either a VCV or CV prefix with a clear semantic contrast being involved, as exemplified, below:

(58) a. Ababemba bà- à- shipa beekala mu-Zambia
     'the Babemba who are brave live in Zambia' (Restrictive)

b. Ababemba âbà à- shipa beekala mu-Zambia
     'the Babemba, who are (all) brave, live in Zambia' (non-restrictive)

The VCV prefix, or the initial vowel of the agreement prefix, marks non-restrictive modifiers. The CV prefix marks restrictive modifier. Thus, where a non-restrictive modifier is marked with commas in English as we shall see later, in Chibemba the same modifier is indicated by VCV prefix. The VCV/CV contrast in Bemba occurs also in full relative clauses as well as in associative-possessives as we shall observe later.

In Luganda, however, a CV prefix is not permissible with attributive adjectives. Thus (59b) is ungrammatical:

(59) a. Ababemba a- bazira babeera mu Zambia
     'Babemba who-are brave live in Zambia'
     'The brave Babemba live in Zambia' (restrictive)

b. *Ababemba bazira babeera mu Zambia
1.4.3 **Associatives - Possessives**

Associative - possessive modifiers, like adjectives, may be viewed or derived from embedded structures. Examine the following:

(60) a. Ekitabo e- kyalı ekyange kyabula
    book which was mine lost
    'The book which was mine got lost'

b. Ekitabo ekyange kyabula
    book mine list
    'My book got lost'

1.4.4 **Numerals**

Cardinal numerals may also be transformationally derived from full relative clauses, as shown in (61):

(61) a. Abalenzi a- baali abasatu baagenda
    boys who were three left
    'The boys who were three left'

b. Abalenzi abasatu baagenda
    boys three left
    'The three boys left'

Similarly ordinals are derived from relative clauses which involve associative-possessive constructions. Consider (62)

(62) a. Ekitabo kya kusatu
    books of third
    'The book is third'

b. Ekitabo e- kyalı ekya okusatu
    book which was of third
    'The book which was third'

c. Ekitabo ekya okusatu
    book of third
    'The third book'
Notice that the relative reductions are always ambiguous as regards to tense. Thus:

(63) mu-ngatto emmyufu
    'in red shoes'

is neither past nor present.

1.5 The Position of the Relative Pronoun

The universal principle of pronoun attraction in relativization is of interest at this point, since according to Givón [1972b] relative subordinators or relative pronouns tend to be 'attracted' to a position directly between the head noun and the relative clause. For an SVO language like Luganda, with the relative clause following the head noun, this is indeed true, trivially for subject relative pronoun, as seen earlier above. For object relative clauses, however, Luganda constitutes a clear counter-example to Givon's claims since when the subject or an object relative clause is a full NP, it intervenes between the relative pronoun and the head noun, as exemplified in (64b):

(64) a. Omusajja gwe o- labye musomesa
    man who you-seen teacher
    'The man that you've seen is a teacher'

b. Omusajja Petero gwe a- labye musomesa
    man Petero who Ag-seen teacher
    'The man that Peter has seen is a teacher'

c. *Omusajja gwe Petero a-labye musomesa

The occurrence of the object relative pronoun gwe between NP Petero and the VP alabye 'has seen' follows a specific principle in Luganda which we may call relative pronoun-verbal attraction. This
principle specifies that relative pronouns must occur immediately before the verbal word of the embedded sentence. This principle accounts for the ungrammaticalness of (64c) above.

The relative pronoun-verbal attraction holds also when the unbound personal pronouns occur as subjects:

(65) a. Omusajja nze gwe n-dabye musomesa
    man     I    who(m) I-seen teacher
    'As for me, the man I've seen is a teacher'

    b. Omusajja mmwe gwe mu-labye musomesa
    man   you who(m) you-seen teacher
    'As for you, the man you've seen is a teacher'

    c. *Omusajja gwe nze n-dabye musomesa
    d. *Omusajja gwe mmwe mu-labye musomesa

While the relative pronoun-verbal attraction principle is obligatory in Luganda, it is either optional or does not exist in other Bantu languages.

Generally the relative pronoun in many Bantu languages follows the universal attractive principle (where the pronoun occurs adjacent to the head NP). In Chibemba, for example, the attraction principle is obligatory. Consider the following data taken from Givón [1972b]:

(66) a. Icitabo icyo umwana à- à- mweene
    book which child he-past-see
    'The book that the child saw'

    b. *Icitabo umwana icyo à-à-mweene

In Kiswahili, the situation is complex. When the relative pronoun is attached to a relative supporter amba- it must obligatorily occur adjacent to the head NP. And in this case subject-postposing (see Givón [1972b]) is optional:
(67) a. Mariamu a- me- ki-pika chakula
   Mary Ag-perf-it-cook food
   'Mary has cooked food'

b. Chakula amba-cho Mariamu a- me- ki-pika
   food which Mary Ag-perf-it-cook
   'The food which Mariamu has cooked'

c. Chakula amba-cho a-me-ki-pika Mariamu (subject postposed)

d. *Chakula Mariamu amba-cho a-me-pika

When the relative pronoun is not attached to the relative pronoun supporter amba-, it may either be prefixed or suffixed to the verbal word, pending on the tense. It is prefixed to the verb immediately after the past -li-, present continuous -na-, and future -ta-; and it is suffixed to the verbal word in the habitual. In the case of the immediate past (or 'present perfect'), the relative pronoun is obligatorily attached to the relative pronoun supporter, as in (70), above. Unlike in Luganda, the embedded subject noun cannot intervene between the relative pronoun and the head noun in Swahili. Consider the following data:

(68) Chakula a- li- cho- ki-pika Mariamu
    food Ag-past-which-obj-cook Mary
    'The food which Mary cooked'

(69) Chakula a- na- cho- ki-pika Mariamu
    food Ag-pres-which-obj-cook Mary
    'The food which Mary is cooking'

(70) Chakula a- ta- cho- ki-pika Mariamu
    food Ag-fut-which-obj-cook Mary
    'The food which Mary shall cook'

(71) Chakula a- a- ki-pika-cho Mariamu
    food Ag-pres-obj-cook-which Mary
    'The food which Mary cooks'
(72) *Chakula Mariamu a-li cho-ki-pika

(73) *Chakula Mariamu a-ki-pika-cho

The above data conform to the subject postposing rule discussed by Bokamba [1971] and Givón [1972]. Givón observes that if the object relative pronoun is bound to a verbal word in an SVO language, the subject noun of the embedded sentence is obligatorily postposed. That is, if the subject of the embedded sentence is a noun, it cannot occur between the relative pronoun and the head noun. Rather, it must be moved to the right of the verbal word containing the relative pronoun morpheme as in (68) through (71). Luganda is a clear counter-example to the subject-postposing principle.

In Luyole, a Bantu language spoken in the Eastern Region of Uganda, the object relative pronoun is only optionally attached to the verb:

(74) a. Ekitabo ehi Petero ga- gula
    book which Peter past-buy
    'The book which Peter bought'

b. Ekitabo Petero ehi ga- gula
    book Peter which past-buy
    'The book which Peter bought'

c. *Ekitabo ehi ga-gula Petero

The data in (74) shows that Luyole lost the constraint which requires the object relative pronoun to occur adjacent to the verb as in Luganda, although it could optionally occur there. Because of this, it is not necessary in this language to postpose the embedded subject noun as the ungrammaticalness of (74c) indicates. The language thus has a way of fronting the relative pronoun to the beginning of the relative clause without postposing the embedded subject NP.
1.6 Ambiguity Resulting From the Position of the Object Relative Pronoun

The position of the object relative pronoun as verb-attached may cause ambiguity in object relativization in Luganda. If the subject of the embedded clause agrees with the antecedent of the relative pronoun in gender and number it creates an ambiguity with a topic interpretation. Consider the following:

(75) Omusajja owama gwe a- labye a- genze
    man child whom Ag-seen Ag-left

{"The man whom the child has seen left'
 {'As for the man, the child that he has seen left'}

This ambiguity also involves the reversal of subject-object roles. The two interpretations of (75) may be illustrated when one considers construction with nouns of different genders:

(76) a. Embwa Omusajja gye a- labye e- genze
dog man which he-seen it-left
'The dog which the man saw left'

b. Omusajja embwa gye a- labye e- genze
man dog that he-saw it-left
'The man, the dog that he saw left'

The class 9/10 singular relative pronoun gye in (76b) shows clearly that although the NP omusajja 'man' occurs in the initial position, it is not the head noun, but the topicalized subject of the embedded clause. This interpretation is unambiguous due to the gender of the object relative pronoun gye, which could only be coreferential with 'dog'.

In the second analysis, the syntactic functions of the said NP's change. The first reading gives the normal interpretation given in (75) above in which the NP omusajja 'man' is the antecedent of the
relative clause *omwana gwe alabye* 'whom the child has seen', and the NP *omwana* 'child' is the subject of the clause *gwe alabye* 'whom (he) has seen'. The second reading gives us the following interpretation.

(77) The child whom the man saw left.

In this interpretation the NP *omwana* 'child' becomes the antecedent of the relative clause, and *omusajja* 'man' becomes the subject of the embedded sentence. This interpretation is quite common. As a matter of fact, this interpretation is more common than the interpretation in (75) above. With regards to sentence (75), all my informants recognized it as ambiguous when asked:

(78) Who left, the man or child?

In contrast, neither (79) nor (80) below were judged ambiguous when speakers were asked 'who got lost?':

(79) *Ekibe Omusajja kye ya-laba kya-bula*  
    *jackal man which he-saw it- lost*  
    'The jackal which the man saw got lost'

(80) *Ekibe Omusajja gwe kya-laba ya-bula*  
    *jackal man whom it- saw he- lost*  
    *{The man whom the jackal saw got lost*  
    *{The jackal, the man that it saw got lost*}

In both sentences (79) and (80) the NP *ekibe* 'jackal' occurs initially. In (79) it is the antecedent of the relative clause *omusajja kye yalaba* 'which the man saw'. But in (80) the same NP is realized as the underlying subject of the embedded sentence *ekibe kyalabe omusajja* 'the jackal saw a man'.
1.7.0 Non-Restrictive Relative Clauses

It is generally believed that most languages have restrictive relative clauses. Many languages, however, lack the non-restrictive clauses (henceforth NR relatives). The relative clauses discussed so far are all restrictive. They are restrictive in the sense that they further restrict the NP's they modify. Further, they contain presupposed information when modifying definite nouns. In short they limit the domain of their antecedents. Both the restrictive clauses and their antecedents are "under the roof of a single intonation phrase" [Wilson 1967]. For example in Luganda:

(81) Omusajja gwe olabye mubbi
    'The man who you saw is a thief'

The clause gwe olabye 'whom you saw' is a restrictive relative clause. It presupposes 'you saw a/the man'.

Unlike restrictive relatives, NR relatives do not define or restrict the domain of the noun they modify. Intonationally, they stand in loose relation to their antecedent. Further, they contain parenthetical-ly, asserted rather than presupposed information. For example:

(82) That man, who is my neighbour, was arrested by the police last night.

The NR relative who is my neighbour adds parenthetical information to its antecedent that man.

In Luganda NR-relatives are formed by postponing the relative clause. Thus in object relative clause we find:

(83) a. Ekikopo kye negula jjo kyatise
    'The cup which I bought yesterday has broken' (R)
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b. Ekikopo kytise kye nagula jjo
   'The cup, the one that I bought yesterday, broke'  (NR)

(84) a. Omusajja omwana gwe yalabye agenze
       'The man whom the child saw has left'  (R)
       (not the one whom the child didn't see...)

b. Omusajja agenze omwana gwe yalabye
       'The man, whom the child saw, left'  (NR)

And for subject relative clauses, similarly:

(85) a. Omulenze e- yagenta mu Amerika akomyewo
       'The boy who-went to America has come back'  (R)
       (not the one who didn't go)

b. Omulenze akomyewo e-ya-genta mu America
       'The boy who went to America, has come back'  (NR)

The postposing device which marks NR-relative in Luganda, is not
accepted in some dialects. For some, sentences (83b), (84b), and (85b)
sound odd. But when the same constructions occur in 'yes-no' questions
or exclamations, they become acceptable in spite of the fact that the
word order does not change except the intonation which is applied to all
'yes-no' questions in the language. Thus (86) is acceptable to all
dialects:

(86) Ekikopo kytise kye nagula jjo?
    'Has the cup, which I bought yesterday, broken?'

The fact that (86) is grammatical suggests that for the dialects which
do not accept postposed NR relatives, the construction is spreading into
the language at least via some environments.

In at least one Bantu language, Bemba (central Bantu) the difference
between restrictive and NR-relatives is marked by the VCV/CV prefix
contrast (for a more detailed discussion consult Givón [1972a]). Restrictive modifiers are marked by a CV-prefix when adjectives or subject relative clauses are involved:¹

(87) Ababemma bà-à-ìshile beekala mu Lusaka
   'The Bemba who came (not those who didn't) live in Lusaka'

(88) Ababemma bà-suma bà-à-ìshile
   'The good Babemba came' (not the bad ones)

And the NR-modifiers are marked by a VCV prefix:

(89) Ababemma ábã-à-ìshile beekala mu Lusaka
   'The Bemba, who (all) came, live in Lusaka'

(90) Ababemma ábã-suma bá-à-ìshile
   'The Bemba, who are (all) good, come'

1.7.1 Other Non-Restrictive Modifiers

Although in present day Luganda the VCV/CV prefix contrast does not function to mark the difference between restrictive and NR-relatives, it does occur in some embedded modifiers. These include quantifiers, numerals and possessives/associatives, as illustrated below.

Quantifiers:

(91) a. Abaana bangi bazze
    'Many (of the) children came' (R)

     b. Abaana abangi bazze
    'The children, who're many, came' (NR)

(92) a. Leeta ebitabo bingi
    'Bring (any) many books' (R)

¹These data are derived (with some modifications) from Givón [1972a] and [1974].
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b. Leeta ebitabo ebangi
'Bring the books, which are many'  (NR)

Numerals:

(93) a. Abasajja bataano bazze
'Five men came'  (R)

b. Abasajja abataano bazze
'The men, who're five, came'  (NR)

(94) a. Mpa ebitabo bitaano
'Give me five books'  (R)

b. Mpa ebitabo ebitaano
'Give me the books, which are five'  (NR)

Possessive-Associative:

(95) a. Essaati yange ebuze
'My shirt is lost'  (R)

b. Essaati eyange ebuze
'The shirt, which is mine, is lost'  (NR)

(96) a. Twala ekiteeteeyi kya Maliamu
'Take Mary's dress'  (R)

b. Twala ekiteeteeyi ekya Maliamu
'Take the dress, which is Mary's'  (NR)

1.7.2 Non-Restrictive Modifiers, Opacity, Definitiveness, and Reference

It is interesting to note that some of the above modifiers show
the semantic distinction of definiteness versus indefiniteness by the
same device of the VCV/CV prefix contrast. Thus in (91) through (94)
the CV-modifier imposes an indefinite interpretation.

The problem of definiteness is related to opacity and reference,
and to understand the former, one must understand the latter first.
These three semantic phenomena, which are extensively discussed by Givón [1972, 1974], can be briefly explained as follows:

An opaque context is an environment where a nominal (noun) can be interpreted either as referential (assumed to exist) or non-referential (not assumed to exist) as in (97):

(97) Omusajja ayagala okugula essaati

{The man wants to buy a shirt' (a specific one) (REF.)
 {The man wants to buy a shirt' (any shirt) (NON-REF.)

In this sentence the noun ssaati 'shirt' is ambiguous with respect to referentiality. It may be that the man wants to buy a specific shirt or any shirt. That is, the speaker may or may not have a specific shirt in mind.

On the other hand, a non-opaque environment is one in which a nominal is obligatorily referential, that is, it is assumed to exist, as is the case in (98):

(98) Omusajja alina essaati

'The man has a shirt'

In (98) the noun ssaati 'shirt' is specific. The speaker assumes that the hearer can identify it. Thus consider:

(99) a. I met a man
   b. I met the man

In both (99a) and (99b) the object NP is assumed to exist, i.e. it is referential. But it is only in (99b) that the referential 'man' is also definite.

As Givón [1974] observes, restrictive modifiers may modify both the referential and non-referential nouns. But non-referential nouns cannot be modified by NR-modifiers.
1.7.3 Non-Restrictive Modifiers and Negation

Mould [1973] has shown that in Luganda, object nominals following a negative verb cannot have a VCV prefix. Thus (100c) and (101c) are ungrammatical.

(100) a. Nnina ekitabo
'I've a/the book' (REF)

b. Sirina kitabo
'I don't have a/any book' (NON-REF)

c. *Sirina ekitabo

(101) a. Njagala ekitabo
'I want the/a book' (NON-REF) (REF)

b. Saagala kitabo
'I don't want a/any book' (NON-REF)

c. *Saagala ekitabo

As can be seen the object NP in (100a) is obligatorily referential while that in (101a) is either referential or non-referential. Yet when their verbs are negated, both lose the initial vowel, and are obligatorily non-referential.

The above restriction applies also to both restrictive and NR-modifiers as illustrated below:

(102) a. Njagala ekitabo ekinene
'I want the big book' (R)

b. Saagala kitabo kine
'I don't want a/any big book' (R) (NON-REF)

c. *Saagala kitabo ekinene

d. *Saagala ekitabo ekinene
(103) a. Njagala ebitabo ebibiri
   'I want the books, which are two'  (NR)

b. Saagala bitabo bibiri
   'I don't want (any) two books'  (R) (NON-REF)

c. *Saagala bitabo ebibiri

The ungrammaticality of (103c) illustrates that the object NP following a negative verb must be non-referential, since non-referential nouns cannot be modified by NR-modifiers, and the VCV-prefix on a numeral marks it as a NR-modifier.

Mould [1973] further observes that the only way to express a definite object of a negative verb in Luganda is by topicalizing the object. For example, when the object in (102b) is topicalized we get the following:

(104) Ekitabo ekinene si-ki-agala
   { 'I don't want the big book'
   { 'As for the big book, I don't want it'

Similarly when nominals modified by NR-modifiers are topicalized, the modifiers retain their non-restrictiveness as shown by the examples of (105):

(105) Ebitabo ebibiri si-bi-agala
   { 'I don't want the books, which are two (the two books)'
   { 'As for the books, which are two, I don't want them'

Other Bantu languages do not show these restrictions under negation. In Chibemba, for example, a language that, as already noted, shows a VCV/VCV prefix contrast to distinguish non-restrictive from restrictive modifiers, a VCV prefix may occur after a negativized verb.

Furthermore the restrictive and NR-modifiers never lose their
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semantic interpretations. This is so because the definite noun need not be fronted following a negative verb. Rather, if it has a VCV-prefix (i.e. if it is referential), then it is obligatorily definite, and may be modified by either restrictive or NR-modifiers. Thus consider the following data from Givón [1974:133]

(106) Nshia-mweene aba-ana ba-a-ishile
     'I didn't see the children who came' (R)

(107) Nshia-mweene aba-ana aba-a-ishile
     'I didn't see the children, who (all) came' (NR)

We may conclude from the data in (99) through (107) that Luganda, including some other Eastern Bantu languages which have almost completely lost the VCV/CV contrast in both nouns and modifiers, have come to depend on the topicalization device for marking referentiality and definiteness of objects under negation. And as a result the VCV/CV shifted function gradually (see Givón [1974]). The limited cases in Luganda discussed above where this device is still operative may be regarded as relic forms.
CHAPTER II

RELATIVE CLAUSE AND FOCUS

2.1.0 Recent studies, such as Schachter [1971], Robinson [1972] and Takizala [1972] show that there is a universal relationship between the relative clause and focus constructions. In English, for instance, we find the following:

(109) It was the child who destroyed the ball.
(110) The one who destroyed the ball was the child.
(111) The child who destroyed the ball was punished.

The sentences (109) through (111) are semantically related. They all have common presuppositions viz:

(112) The child destroyed something.
(113) Someone destroyed the ball.

Moreover the three sentences have a syntactic structure in common. This structure is the relative clause:

(114) who destroyed the ball

The cleft sentence (109) and the pseudo-cleft sentence (110) have a common NP constituent child in focus.

In this chapter I shall discuss the semantic-syntactic relation among these constructions in Luganda. I shall argue that the restrictive relative clause and the focus constructions discussed above are related in their underlying structure.

2.1.1 Emphatic-Copula Construction

In SVO (i.e. Subject-verb-object) languages the clefting marker or
copula precedes the clefted or focused NP as can be seen in (109) above. The NP 'child' in (109) is preceded by the copula be in its past form.

In Kihung' an a Bantu language spoken in South-Western Congo (Kinshasa) one finds the same pattern as exemplified by the following data.\(^1\)

(115) a. Kipes a - swim - in zoono
Kipese Ag - buy - past chair yesterday
'Kipese bought a chair yesterday'

b. (Kwe) kit Kipes ka-swim-in zoono
('It's) chair Kipese Ag - buy - past yesterday
'It's a/the chair that Kipese bought yesterday'

c. (Kwe) Kipes a - swim-in zoono
('It's) Kipese Ag - buy - past yesterday
'It's Kipese who bought a/the chair yesterday'

Like in English the Kihung'an clefting particle kwe, which may optionally be deleted, occurs before the focused NP.

In Runyankore,\(^2\) a Lake-Bantu language spoken in Western Uganda, the copula may precede or follow the clefted nominal as exemplified below:

**Object**

(116) a. Ni\(^3\) nyenda ekikopo
I- want cup
'I want a/the cup'

b. Ekikopo ni kyo ndi-kwenda
cup cop it I- want
'It's the cup that I want'

---

\(^1\)Taken from Takizala [1972].

\(^2\)For the Runyankore data I am indebted to Beth Butumbwire.

\(^3\)There are two types of ni in Bantu namely, ni which stands for 1st person singular, and ni the copula.
c. **Ni kyo ekikopo eki- ndi-kwenda**
   cop it cup which-I- want
   'It's the cup that I want'

d. *Ni ekikopo eki-ndi-kwenda

(117) a. **Ni-nyenda omwojo**
   I- want boy
   'I want a/the boy'

b. Omwojo **ni we ndi-kwenda**
   boy cop him I- want
   'It's the boy I want'

c. **Ni we omwojo ou- ndi-kwenda**
   cop him boy whom-I- want
   'It's the boy whom I want'

Subject

(118) a. **Abaana bagyenda**
   children go (*are going)
   'The children go'

b. **Abaana ni bo bagyenda**
   children cop them go
   'It's the children who go'

c. **Ni bo abaana a- bagyenda**
   cop them children who-go
   'It's the children who go'

Luganda, unlike the above described and many other Bantu languages
has a different cleft construction which may be described as emphatic-
copula (henceforth EMP-COP) construction. This construction brings the
required nominal into focus by means of an EMP-COP. Unlike the usual
cleft construction described above where the clefting particle precedes
the clefted nominal, the EMP-COP obligatorily follows the focussed
nominal. Consider structures in (119b) and (120b) in which the object nominal is in focus.

(119) a. N-jagala ekikopo
     I-want a cup

     b. Ekikopo kye n-jagala
        cup EMP-COP I-want
        'The cup is (indeed) the one I want'

(120) a. Tu-alaba omusajja
        we-saw a man

     b. Omusajja gwe tu-alaba
        man EMP-COP we-saw
        'The man is (indeed) the one we saw'

     c. *gwe omusajja tu-laba

Similarly when the subject is in focus we get (121b) and (122b):

(121) a. Abaana bagenda
        'The children are going'

     b. Abaana be bagenda
        children EMP-COP are going
        \{ 'The children are (indeed) the ones who are going' \}
        \{ 'It's the children who are going' \}

(122) a. Ekikopo ki-buze
        'The cup is-lost'

     b. Ekikopo kye ki-buze
        cup EMP-COP lost
        \{ 'The cup is (indeed) the one which got lost' \}
        \{ 'It's the cup that is lost' \}

     c. *Kye ekikopo ki-buze

Observe that the cleft constructions and the Luganda EMP-COP constructions "share, roughly", much of their presuppositional structure
viz the simplex sentence. For example, take the Runyankore clefted structure (123) below and the Luganda EMP-COP structure (119b) repeated here as (123) for easy reference.

(123) Ni kyo ekikopo eki-ndi-kwenda
      'It's the cup that-I-want'

(124) Ekikopo kye n-jagala
      'The cup is (indeed) the one I want'

The structure in (123) has the following simplex sentence:

(125) Ni-nyenda ekikopo
      'I- want a cup'

and (124) has the following:

(126) N-jagala ekikopo
      'I-want a cup'

In addition to the shared presuppositional structure, constructions (123) and (124) both have the same semantic presupposition. They presuppose that I want something and that there are other things around which I do not want.

The fact of Luganda's having an EMP-COP construction where many other Bantu languages have a cleft construction has a diachronic explanation. The attributive copula ni was historically lost in Luganda while it was retained in other languages (for a detailed discussion of this subject see Givón [1974]). Thus when ni was lost in the language, Luganda resorted to using the EMP-COP construction to cover the semantic area of both the EMP-COP and cleft constructions.

In Chibemba both constructions, the EMP-COP and cleft, were retained. Consider the following:
(127) Joni éé àà-ishile
    John EMP-COP came
    'John is (indeed) the one who came'

(128) Ni Joni àà-ishile
    it's John came
    'It is John who came'

Returning to the main theme of this section, when we compare the
EMP-COP constructions with relative clause constructions in Luganda we
find that they share much of their structures. Take the following as an
illustration:

Object

(129) Òèìóòò ñè ñàvílá kibuve
    'The cup which I bought is lost'

(130) Òèìóòò ñè ñàvílá
    {'The cup is (indeed) the one I bought'}
    {'It's the cup that I bought'}

Subject

(131) Àbàànà à-bàángà balungi
    'The children who are going are good'

(132) Àbàànà bè bàángà
    {'The children are (indeed) the ones who are going'}
    {'It's the children who're going'}

The data in (129) and (131) show that the relative clause construc-
tion is formed by placing an appropriate relative pronoun/marker (de-
tails apart) in front of the relativized sentence as discussed in Chap-
ter I. Similarly the EMP-COP construction is also formed by inserting
an appropriate EMP-COP at the beginning of the clause. Furthermore the
relative marker and the EMP-COP both must agree with their antecedent noun in gender and number. Another most striking thing about the similarity of the two constructions in Luganda, is the virtual identity of the EMP-COP with the object relative pronoun as the examples in (129) and (130) show.

2.1.2 Tone

Another striking similarity between the EMP-COP and relative clause constructions involves a change of the final underlying high tone of the verbal word of the clause to low.\(^\text{4}\) The following will illustrate this resemblance. The acute and grave accents represent high and low tone respectively.

(133) a. Abàànà bágèndá
'The children are going'

b. Abàànà bè bágènda
'The children are indeed the ones who are going'

c. Abàànà à-bágèndá
'The children who're going'

(134) a. ìjàgàlà èkìkópò
'I want a cup'

b. èkìkópò kye ìjàgàlà
'The cup is (indeed) the one I want'

\[^{4}\text{Some verbal words especially those whose finite forms are disyllabic, change their final tone from high to falling tone (which is a combination of high and low) as in the following:}\]

`Abàànà báddùkà
'The children are running'

`Abàànà bè báddùkà
'The children are indeed the ones who are running'

`Abàànà à-báddùkà
'The children who are running'
c. `èkikòpò kyé njégàlè
'The cup that I want'

If the verbal word ends in a low tone or falling tone (which is a combination of high and low tone) no change takes place in both constructions.

(135) a. òmùsàjjà àlyà
'A/the man is eating'

b. òmùsàjjà yè àlyà
'The man is (indeed) the one who is eating'

c. òmùsàjjà à-àlyà
'The man who's eating'

2.1.3 Prepositional Phrase Involving ne⁵ and ku

We observed in 1.1.5 that a prepositional phrase which contains the preposition ne (na) cannot be fronted in a relative clause construction nor can the co-referential NP-deletion rule apply. To remind ourselves consider the following:

(136) a. Nakulaba ne omukeeka
'I saw you with a mat'

b. Omukeeka gwe nakulaba na-gwo
'The mat which I saw you with (it)'

⁵The lexical item ne (na) has a double function. It is used as a conjunction as in

Musa ne Yozefu
'Moses and Joseph'

and as a preposition as in

Musa yagenda ne Yozefu
'Moses went with Joseph'

Musa yasala ennyama ne akambe akaddugala
'Musa cut the meat with a dirty knife'
c. *Omukeeka gwe nakulaba na
   'The mat which I saw you with'

d. *Omukeeka na gwe nakulaba
   'The mat with which I saw you'

e. *Omukeeka na-gwo gwe nakulaba
   'The mat with (it) which I saw you'

In the same way, the preposition ne (na) can never be moved into
focus as the ungrammaticalness of (173b)-(137d) indicates.

(137) a. Omukeeka gwe nakulaba na-gwo
   'The mat was (indeed) the one I saw you with (it)'

b. *Omukeeka gwe nakulaba na

c. *Omukeeka na gwe nakulaba

d. *Omukeeka na-gwo gwe nakulaba

The ungrammaticalness of the sentences of (136) and (137) is ac-
counted for by a general rule in Bantu, which states that the prepo-
sition ne (na) must obligatorily be preceded by a verb and followed by an
NP (noun or pronoun).

The preposition ku (ko)\(^6\) 'about' discussed in 1.1.5 like ne (na),
cannot be preposed if it occurs in a relative clause. Likewise this
preposition cannot be fronted in an EMP-COP sentence. As an example,
consider the following:

(138) a. Twayogera ku kitabo
   'We talked about a book'

b. Ekitabo kye twayogera-ko
   'The book was (indeed) the one we talked about'

---
\(^6\)The preposition ku changes to ko when suffixed to a verb.
c. *Ekitabo ku kye twayogera

d. *Ekitabo ko kye twayogera

Like the preposition ne(na) 'with', ku(ko) 'about' must always follow a verb, and not vice versa. This accounts for the ungrammaticalness of (138c) and (138d).

2.1.4 Subject Noun Intervention

The intervention of the subject noun of the embedded sentence between the head noun and relative pronoun discussed in (1.4) above applies also to EMP-COP sentences. Thus another similarity between relative clauses and EMP-COP sentences. Consider the following:

(139) a. Yozefu yalaba Yokana
    'Joseph saw John'

b. Yozefu Yokana gwe yalaba
   {'Joseph was (indeed) the one whom John saw'}
   {'It's Joseph who John saw'}

c. *Yozefu gwe Yokana yalaba

The subject noun Yokana of the embedded sentence in (139b) intervenes between the focussed nominal and the EMP-COP.

2.2 Psuedo-Cleft Construction

The EMP-COP and pseudo-cleft sentences share much of their semantic, presuppositional structure. As an illustration of this assertion, compare the following structures.

Pseudo-cleft

(140) (Ekintu) kye njagala kye kitabo
    (thing) which I want COP book
    'What I want is a/the book'
(141) (omutu) Pulezidenti gwe yatta yali Muzungu
(person) President whom killed was White-man
'The one whom the President killed was a White-man'

EMP-COP

(142) Ekitabo kye njagala
book EMP-COP I-want
'The book is (indeed) the one I want'

(143) Omuzungu Pulezidenti gwe yatta
White-man President EMP-COP killed
'The White-man was (indeed) the one President killed'

The sentences in (140) and (142) both presuppose that

(i) There exists something that I want

and assert that

(ii) That thing is a book.

Similarly, sentences (141) and (143) presuppose that

(i) There existed someone whom President killed

and assert that

(ii) That someone was a white-man.

Furthermore, notice that the underlined constituents ekitabo 'book'
and omuzungu 'White-man' are the ones being focussed upon in (149),
(151) and (150), (152) respectively. Unlike in English, however, where
the nominal in focus position occurs in immediate post-copula position
in both cleft and pseudo-cleft constructions, in Luganda it occurs in
post-copula position in case of the pseudo-cleft constructions, but
pre-EMP-COP in the EMP-COP construction. But note that whether the
focussed nominal occurs before or after the copula/EMP-COP, that copula/
EMP-COP like the relative pronoun must agree with it both in gender and
number as shown below:
Pseudo-cleft

(144) Kye n-jagala ye musajja akola ennyo
    'what I-want is the man who works hard' (1/2 sing.)

(145) Kye n-jagala be baana abalungi
    'what I-want are the children who're good' (1/2 pl.)

(146) Kye n-a- laba gu-a- li musota
    what I-past-see Ag-past-be snake
    'What I saw was a snake' (3/4 sing.)

(147) Kye n-a- laba gi-a- li misota
    what I-past-see Ag-past-be snakes
    'What I saw were snakes' (3/4 pl.)

EMP-COP

(148) Omusajja akola ennyo gwe n-jagala
    man who works hard EMP-COP I-want
    'The man who works hard is (indeed) the one I want' (1/2 sing.)

(149) Abaana abalungi be n-jagala
    children who are good EMP-COP I-want
    'The children who're good are (indeed) the ones I want' (1/2 pl.)

(150) Omusota gwe n-a- laba
    snake EMP-COP I-past-see
    'The snake is (indeed) the one I saw' (3/4 sing.)

(151) Emisota gye n-a- laba
    snakes EMP-COP I-past-see
    'The snakes are (indeed) the ones I saw' (3/4 pl.)

As can be seen in (144) through (151), the copula/EMP-COP agrees with
the noun in focus regardless of word-order.

The relations discussed above all confirm the argument that the
focus constructions involve relative clauses and that both constructions
are related in their underlying structure.

The similarities between relative clause and focus constructions that I have presented in this chapter cannot be regarded as accidental. They clearly indicate that the two constructions are related in their underlying structure.
CHAPTER III

HEADLESS RELATIVE CLAUSES AND PREDICATE SENTENCES

3.1.0 Headless Relative Clauses

The transformational analysis of relative clauses followed in Chapter I presupposes the existence of an antecedent (head noun) to the relative clauses since the analysis requires nominal identity. That is, in order for relativization to take place under the said analysis, there must be two identical NP's one of which becomes the antecedent of the relative pronoun of the relative clause as discussed in Chapter I. However, a close look reveals that there are certain relative clauses whose pronouns lack antecedent nouns. As an example, consider the following English structures:

(152) I know what he wants
(153) What I saw on the table was the duster
(154) She is sitting where you told her to sit
(155) We know who he was
(156) I wrote what was in the book
(157) Why she did it was to irritate me
(158) How Mary did it was by kneeling on the table

The pronouns what, where, why and how in (152) through (158) are generally referred to as independent relative pronouns and the underlined relative clauses are labelled headless relative clauses since their relative pronouns are apparently lacking antecedents.

In Luganda these headless relatives or what Kuroda [1969] refers to as independent relatives are of four types: relatives in reduced pseudo
cleft sentences, relatives with optionally deleted head noun, relatives in indirect (embedded) questions, and WH-word questions.

3.1.1 Relative Clauses with Deleted Head Nouns

One of the most characteristic processes in Bantu languages is the anaphoric deletion rule of nouns after grammatical agreement has applied.¹ For example, the subject noun in the following sentences may be anaphorically deleted.

(159) a. Abaana ba-tta empologoma
  children Ag-killed lion
  'The children killed a lion'

  b. ba- tta empologoma
     they-kill lion
     'They killed a lion'

The concordial agreement ba- in (159a) becomes an anaphoric pronoun when the head noun is deleted in (159b).

Similarly an object noun is deleted after the application of the pronominalization rule discussed in I.

(106) a. Abaana ba-a-laba empologoma
  'The children saw a lion'

  b. Abaana ba- a- gi-laba
     the children conc.-past-it-see
     'The children saw it'

In the same way, the use of relative clauses (and other modifiers) as anaphoric pronouns is extended to virtually all relative clauses in

¹It has been observed by Givón [1975] that subject agreement morphemes have the same function as the subject anaphoric pronouns. In other words they are fundamentally one and the same phenomenon. Similarly object pronouns are basically anaphoric pronouns.
Luganda, thereby leaving relative pronouns on the surface without antecedents within the same clause. When this transformation rule applies the pronouns left behind are used anaphorically. As an illustration consider the following:

**Subject head noun deletion**

(161) a. Omulensi a-yambadde engatto emmyufo ye Musa
     'The boy who's wearing the red shoes is Moses'

     b. A-yambadde engatto emmyufo ye Musa
        '#Who's wearing the red shoes is Moses
        'The one who's wearing the red shoes is Moses'

(162) a. Ongigali o-gu-onoonese gu-ange
     'The bread which has gone bad is mine'

     b. O-gu-onoonese gu-ange
        '#Which-has gone bad is mine
        'The one which has gone bad is mine'

**Object head noun deletion**

(163) a. Mmanyi omuntu gwe n-jagala
     'I know the person who I-want'

     b. Mmanyi gwe n-jagala
        'I know who I-want'

(164) a. Ekitabo Malyamu kye y-a-gula ki-lungi
     'The book which Mary bought is good'

     b. Malyamu kye y-a-gula ki-lungi
        Mary which (she) bought is-good
        'The one which Mary bought is good'

The same thing is true of adjectives in Luganda. In English attributive adjectives cannot occur without head noun or a pronoun.
(165) a. Give me the **big** book
    b. Give me the **big** one
    c. *Give me the **big**

In Luganda, no replacement is required, and the adjective is used anaphorically, much like the relative clause:

(166) a. m- pa  ekitabo  ekinene
    me-give  book  **big**
    ’Give me the big book’

b. Npa  ekinene
    *Give me the **big**
    ’Give me the big one’

A similar transformation of the relative clause antecedent deletion occurs in Lunyole, another Lake Bantu Language spoken in the Eastern Region of Uganda. As in Luganda the head of a subject relative clause may be deleted as in (167).

(167) a. Omusele  o-u-ambaye  engaito  enando  nje  John
    ’The man who is wearing red shoes is John’

b. O-u-ambaye  engaito  enando  nje  John
    *who is wearing red shoes is John
    ’The one wearing red shoes is John’

Likewise the head of an object relative clause may also be deleted:

(168) a. Manyire  omgati  o-gu-nenda
    ’I know the bread **which I want**’

b. Manyire  o-gu-nenda
    I know **which I want**
    ’I know the one I want’

---

2For the Lunyole data I am indebted to Wesana-Chomi.
3.1.2 Relatives in Reduced Pseudo-cleft Constructions

We observed in 2.2 that pseudo-cleft constructions involve relative clauses. Some pseudo-clefts are full pseudo-cleft sentences and others are reduced pseudo-cleft constructions. As already stated, reduced pseudo-cleft constructions contain relative clauses without head nouns. Examine the following:

(169) **Kye njagala enyo gwe mwenge**
'What I want very much is beer'

(170) **We twatuukira zaali essaawa 7**
'When we arrived it was 1 o'clock'

(171) **E-ki-akugobya wano bwali bujama**
'Why you're sent away from here was your being dirty'

(172) **We twatuula we wano**
'Where we sat is here'

It may be argued that the underlined clauses in (169) through (172) derive from relative clauses of the sentences with head nouns by the application of a rule that optionally deletes a head noun of any relative clause as discussed in 3.1.1 above. If this argument holds then we would expect (169) through (172) to be generated from (173) through (176) respectively:

(173) **Ekintu kye njagala enyo gwe mwenge**
'The thing that I want very much is beer'

(174) **Ekiseera we twatuukira zaali essaawa 7**
'The time when we arrived was 1 o'clock'

(175) ***Ensonga e-ki-akugobya wano bwali bujuma**
'*The reason that you were sent away from here was your being dirty'

(176) **Ekifo we twatuula we wano**
'The place where we sat is here'
But, while sentence (173), (174) and (176) are grammatical, (175) is un-
grammatical because of the conflict between the noun *ensi*ŋa 'reason'
and the concord ki of the verb -gobyə 'be sent away'. *Ensi*ŋa belongs
to noun class 9/10 singular with a concordial agreement e (underlying i).
The concord ki is of a different noun class, 7/8 singular. Thus the ac-
tual lexical head noun *ensi*ŋa 'reason' cannot be the antecedent of the
relative clause e-ki-akugobyə wano 'why you're sent away'. The relative
clause whose head noun is *ensi*ŋa 'reason' would be e-ia-kugobyə wano
'that you're sent away' with a concord i of the verb -gobyə.

Further, although sentence (176) is acceptable, the noun ekifo
'place' of class 7/8 is not the proper antecedent of the relative pro-
noun we (historically wə·pa locative gender 16). If ekifo were the
antecedent of the relative clause we twatuəa 'where we sat', the rela-
tive pronoun would have been kye (ki + e) agreeing with the head noun
(noun class 7/8 singular). The same holds true for sentence (174).

Similar arguments that the head noun of a pseudo-cleft sentence is
not the proper antecedent of a relative clause in a reduced pseudo-cleft
construction, may be raised for English as well. Take, for example,
sentences (177) through (180):

(177) The **thing** that I saw was a snake.
(178) The **way** (that) John did that was by standing on a ladder.\(^3\)
(179) What I saw was a snake.
(180) How John did that was by standing on a ladder.

While the nouns **thing** and **way** are the antecedents of the relative
clauses in (177) and (178) respectively, they are not the antecedents of

\(^3\)Taken from Akamajian [1970:160].
the relatives in (179) and (180) respectively. If this were the case then we would expect (181) and (182) with the relative pronouns what and how respectively to be grammatical.

(181) *The thing what I saw was a snake
(182) *The way how John did it was by standing on a ladder

Following the above data one may conclude, as Akamajian [1970] did, that independent relative clauses such as those in (169) through (172) and (179)-(180) are not generated from the pseudo-cleft sentences in (173) through (176) and (177)-(180), respectively.

3.1.3 Indirect (embedded) Questions

As Kuroda [1969] observes, relative and interrogative pronouns in English share a lot of semantic and syntactic characteristics. Take the following example:

(183) a. The man who I saw is here
   b. He asked me who I saw
   c. Who did I see?

(184) a. The town where he went was destroyed
   b. She wanted to know where he went
   c. Where did he go?

(185) a. The time when they came back was 6 p.m.
   b. We do not know when they came back
   c. When did they come back?

\[4\] I understand this sentence is acceptable in some dialects of English.
The relative pronouns in (183a), (184a) and (185a) are morphologically and semantically identical to the interrogative pronouns in (183b), (184b) and (185b) respectively, and besides the morphological identity, both pronouns have a common syntactic characteristic of being preposed, and their clauses are embedded in the matrix sentence.

As the above structures may suggest, indirect (embedded) questions in (183b), (184b) and (185b) could involve relativization, in their underlying structures, and the relative clauses involved are headless. In Luganda the same pattern is illustrated below:

(186) Namubuuza gye yalaga
     'I asked him where he went'

(187) Tetutegeera kye boogera
     'We don't understand what they are saying'

(188) Simanyi gwe yayogera naye
     'I don't know who he spoke with'

(189) Simanyi bwe yakikola
     'I don't know how he did it'

(190) Omanyi lwe yajja?
     'Do you know when he came?'

The underlined structures in (186) through (190) are semantically related to the following unembedded WH-questions.

(191) Yalaga wa?
     'Where did he go?'

(192) Boogera ki?
     'What are they saying?'

(193) Yayogera na ani?
     'With whom did he speak?'
(194) Yakikola etya?
    'How did he do it?'
(195) Yajja ddi?
    'When did he come?'

I shall demonstrate in the following section that WH-questions in
Luganda and Bantu fall into three categories.

3.1.4 WH-Word Questions

There are three WH-question patterns in most Bantu languages,
namely, cleft (EMP-COP in case of Luganda), pseudo-cleft, and neutral
order. For example, in Luganda one finds the following.

(196) Boogera ki?
    'What are they saying?' (neutral)

(197) Ki-ki kye boogera?
    'What (is it that) they are saying?' (EMP-COP/cleft)

(198) Kye boogera kye ki?
    'What they are saying is what?' (pseudo-cleft)

Likewise in Chinyanja, another Eastern Bantu language, one finds the
following. 5

(199) n-di-ani mzungu yo?
    'Who is that European?' (cleft)

(200) n-na-li-po n-di-ani?
    'Who was here?' (pseudo-cleft)

(201) ci-lombo cy-a-n-ji cy-a-pha nkuku?
    'What animal killed the chicken?' (neutral)

5This data is taken from Givón [1974:123]. Kihung' an also has a
similar data (see Takizala [1972]).
The underlined morphemes in (196) through (201) are the WH-question pronouns and they occur in various positions depending on whether the construction is a cleft (or EMP-COP), pseudo-cleft, or neutral pattern. In Luganda they occur at the end in a neutral pattern as in (196) except in case of dative (see Dative below). They occur in initial position, in a EMP-COP/cleft pattern and medially or finally in a pseudo-cleft pattern. In both patterns a relative-form of the morpheme is obligatory\(^6\) as exemplified in (197) and (198) above.

The morpheme kye which occurs after and before the interrogative pronoun ki in (197) and (198) is the copula-relative marker in question. Its absence in the cleft (EMP-COP) and pseudo-cleft WH-questions results in ungrammatical utterances in Luganda as the ungrammaticality of (202c) below shows.

(202) a. A-yagala ba-ani  
"Whom does he want?" (neutral)

b. Ba-ani be a-yagala  
"Who (are they that) they want?" (EMP-COP/cleft)

c. *Ba-ani a-yagala

Subject WH-Questions

If the object NP is being questioned as in (196), the cleft/EMP-COP

\(^6\)Givón [personal communication] suggests that basically Bantu languages have the three WH-question patterns given above, and that in either pattern a copular and relative structure (which historically and semantically still underly clefting and the WH-pronoun) may or may not occur on surface structure. Thus in Luganda it is always deleted in the neutral pattern as in (196). Thus hoogera kye ki with the occurrence of the relative-copula kye underlies (196).
and pseudo-cleft patterns may be used. But when the subject is being questioned the WH-question construction is generally EMP-COP/cleft pattern. A neutral pattern is unacceptable. Notice that a relative pronoun and a cleft/EMP-COP particle do not co-occur in this construction.

(203) a. Ki-ki e-ki-kuluma?
    'What (is it that) is biting you?' (EMP-COP/cleft)

b. *Eki-kuluma ki-ki? (neutral)

c. *Ki-ki kye e-ki-kuluma

(204) a. Ba-ani a-ba-genda?
    'Who (are they that) are going?' (cleft/EMP-COP)

b. *Aba-genda ba-ani?
    'Who are going?' (neutral)

c. *Ba-ani be a-ba-genda

A pseudo-cleft pattern, however, is acceptable though the EMP-COP/cleft pattern is preferred.

(205) E-ki-kuluma kye ki?
    *What is biting you is what
    'What is biting you?' (pseudo-cleft)

(206) A-ba-genda be ba-ani?
    *The ones who are going are who!
    'Who are going?' (pseudo-cleft)

**Dative Object WH-Questions**

If the dative NP is questioned, the WH-question pattern may be either neutral, EMP-COP/cleft or pseudo-cleft, and in case of the neutral pattern the WH-question pronoun occurs immediately before the
direct object NP. Consider the following:

(207) a. N-a-wa ani ekītabo
    'To whom did I give the book?' (neutral)

b. Ani gwe n-a-wa ekītabo
    'Whom (was it that) I gave the book to?' (EMP-COP/cleft)

c. Gwe n-a-wa ekītabo y-a-li ani
    'The one whom I gave the book to who'
    'Whom did I give the book to?' (pseudo-cleft)

**Associative-Object WH-Questions**

Like the dative case, associative object construction also accepts the three WH-question patterns as exemplified in (208).

(208) a. N-naa-genda ne ani
    'With whom shall I go?' (neutral)

---

7 In English, direct and indirect objects may appear in two orders as in (a) and (b):

(a) Mary gave the book to John.
(b) Mary gave John the book.

In Luganda the indirect object always precedes the direct object in the basic structure, no matter whether the former is preceded by a preposition or not.

Mariamu yawa Yokana ekītabo
Mary gave John (the) book

Mariamu yaggya ku Yokana ekītabo
Mary took from John a book

Thus when the dative case is questioned, the WH-pronoun occupies the same position as in (207a) i.e. before the direct object. It may, however, occur at the end if the direct object is topicalized:

Ekītabo Mariamu y-a-ki-wa ani
'As for the book, Mary gave it to whom'
    'Whom did Mary give the book to?'
b. Ani gwe n-naa-genda na-ye
   who that I shall go with him
   'Who (is it) that I'll go with?' (EMP-COP/cleft)

c. Gwe n-naa-genda na-ye ani
   whom I'll go with is who
   'Who shall I go with?' (pseudo-cleft)

**Benefactive WH-Questions**

Here again, the three WH-question patterns, neutral, EMP-COP/cleft and pseudo-cleft, apply. The verb extension suffix -era/-ira (prepositional or applied) is added to the stem of the verb, to indicate the benefactive:

(209) a. A-kol-era ani?
   'Whom does he work for?' (neutral)

   b. Ani gwe a-kol-era
   'Whom (is it) that he works for?' (EMP-COP/cleft)

   c. Gwe a-kol-era ye ani
   'Whom does he work for?' (pseudo-cleft)

**Instrumental WH-Questions**

The instrumental case in Luganda is expressed in three different ways, viz. (a) by the use of a preposition na 'with', as in English.

(210) A-mu-kuba na muggo
   'He beats him with a stick'

(b) by the deletion of the preposition na 'with' as in (211) below.

(211) A-mu-kuba muggo
   'He beats him (with) a stick'

(c) by the application of the causative extension of the verb:
(212) A-mu-kub-isa muggo
'He beats him with a stick'

In case of (210) where a preposition is used, only the neutral WH-question pattern is permitted. Thus (213b) and (212c) are ungrammatical.

(213) a. A-mu-kuba na ki
'With what does he beat him?' (neutral)

b. *Kiki kye a-mu-kuba na-kyo (EMP-COP/cleft)

c. *Kye a-mu-kuba na-kyo kye ki (pseudo-cleft)

The structure with a deleted preposition accepts only the neutral and EMP-COP/cleft WH-question patterns:

(214) a. A-mu-kuba ki
'What does he beat him with?' (neutral)

b. Kiki kye a-mu-kuba
'What (is it) that he beats him with?' (EMP-COP/cleft)

c. *Kye a-mu-kuba kye ki (pseudo-cleft)

The WH-question pattern using the causative verb suffix also accepts only the neutral and EMP-COP/cleft patterns:

(215) a. A-mu-kub-isa ki
'What does he beat him with?' (neutral)

b. Kiki kye a-mu-kub-isa
'What (is it) that he beats him with?' (EMP-COP/cleft)

c. *Kye a-mu-kub-isa kye ki

Other Oblique Case WH-questions

'Oblique' cases that will be considered here are those that require the following WH-pronouns:

wa 'where', ddi 'when', and -tya 'how'.
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In all the three instances, only the neutral WH-question pattern may be used:

(216) a. A-yimba a-tya
   'How does she sing?' (neutral)

   b. *A-tya bwe a-yimba
   (EMP-COP/cleft)

   c. *Bwe a-yimba bwe a-tya
   (pseudo-cleft)

(217) a. Mu-li-dda ddi?
   'When will you come back?' (neutral)

   b. *ddi lwe mu-li-dda
   (EMP-COP/cleft)

   c. *Lwe mu-li-dda lwe ddi
   (pseudo-cleft)

(218) a. Ba-a-genda wa
   'Where did they go?' (neutral)

   b. *Wa gye ba-a-genda
   (EMP-COP/cleft)

   c. *Gye ba-a-genda y-a-li wa
   (pseudo-cleft)

On the other hand the oblique case lwaki 'why' takes an obligatory EMP-COP/cleft WH-question pattern. Thus (219b) and (219c) are ungrammatical:

(219) a. Lwaki ba-a-vuma omukazi
   'Why (was it that) they insulted the woman?' (EMP-COP/cleft)

   b. *Ba-a-vuma omukazi lwaki
   (neutral)

   c. *Kye ba-a-vuma omukazi ki-a-li lwaki?
   (pseudo-cleft)

Notice that when a relative-copula is preceded by the interrogative marker lwaki 'why' it may optionally be deleted together with an auxiliary verb as in (219a) above. Sentence (220) is thus possible.

---

8. Notice that the proper EMP-COP particle used with the oblique case WH lwaki 'why' is kye and not lwe as it would be expected. lwe is used with ddi 'when' (see (217)).
(220) Lwaki (kwe ba-a-va) ba-vuma omukazi

3.2 Predicate Sentences

3.2.0 In Chapter II, I discussed the emphatic copula as one of the syntactic devices for focusing in Luganda. In this section I will demonstrate that an emphatic copula (EMP-COP) in Luganda always requires an obligatory referential predicate nominal in structures of the type: NP be NP and that these structures normally require relative clauses. On the other hand, the other normal type of copula, (attributive copula), has no such restriction. Let us now consider the two types of copula one by one. Both of these copulas are mutually exclusive. -li is used with remote past and present tenses, while -ba occurs with near past, immediate, and future (remote and near) tenses. The attributive copula in Luganda normally occurs with indefinite predicate nominals. ⁹

Remote Past

(221) a. Musoke y- a- li musawo
    Musoke Ag-past-cop doctor
    'Musoke was a/*the doctor'

b. Musoke y-a-li musawo abantu gwe ba-ayagala ennyo
    'Musoke was a/*the doctor who they loved so much people'

(222) Tu-a-li basawo
    we-past-cop doctors
    'We were (*the) doctors'

⁹Predicate nominals like all accusative nominals are basically indefinite, "...accusative objects tend to show a large percentage of indefinites," [Givón (1975)].
Present

(223) Musoke musawo
     'Musoke (is) a/the doctor'

(224) Tu-li basawo
     we-cop doctors
     'We are (*the) doctors'

(225) *Musoke a-li musawo
     Musoke Ag-cop doctor
     'Musoke is a doctor'

(226) *Abasajja ba-li basawo
     men Ag-cop doctors

Notice that the copula li is obligatorily deleted in the third person present tense (both singular and plural) as the ungrammaticalness of (225) and (226) shows. This is a general rule in Bantu (See Givón (1974)).

Near and Immediate Past

(227) Musoke y-a ba-dde musawo
     Musoke Ag-past-COP-MB doctor
     'Musoke was a/the doctor'

(228) Tu-ba-dde basawo
     we-COP-MB doctors
     'We've been doctors'

Future

(229) Musoke a-maa-ba musawo
     Musoke Ag-Fut-COP doctor
     'Musoke shall be a/the doctor'
(230) Tu-li- ba basawo  
we-fut-COP doctors  
'We'll be (*the) doctors'

The predicate nominal musawo 'doctor' in (221) through (230) is either referential or non-referential, and the sentences are complete. Furthermore, although these sentences with attributive predicates may accept restrictive relative clauses, they do not accept non-restrictive modifiers. Thus (234) and (235) are ungrammatical:

(231) Musoke musawo mulungi  
'Musoke is a good doctor'  (R)

(232) Tu-li basawo a- ba- tendeke  
we-are doctors who-are-trained  
'We're trained doctors'  (R)

(233) Tu-li basawo babiri  
we-are doctors two  
'We're two doctors'  (R)

(234) *Musoke musawo owange  
'Musoke is a doctor, who is mine'  (NR)

(235) *Tu-li basawo ababiri  
'*We-are (any) doctors, who are two'  (NR)

The ungrammaticalness of (234) and (235), as stated in 1.6.2, is accounted for by the fact that NR-modifiers modify only referential nouns (see Givón (1973)).

3.2.1 Emphatic-Copula Predicates

In Luganda the emphatic-copula predicate sentences of the type NP copula NP differ from their counterpart, the attributive copula
predicate sentences, in three major syntactic aspects. Firstly, the
former require a referential predicate as exemplified below.

(236) Musoke ye musawo
Musoke EMP-COP doctor
'Musoke is (indeed) the doctor' (ref/*non-ref)

(237) Omusajja ye mwami
man EMP-COP chief
'The man is (indeed) the chief' (ref/*non-ref)

(238) Omuserikale ye musomesa
policeman EMP-COP teacher
'The policeman is (indeed) the teacher' (ref/*non-ref)

Note that the EMP-COP obligatorily co-occurs with the attributive
copula in all tenses except present tense. And when the two co-occur
the predicate nominal obligatorily takes a VCV prefix, thus making a
referential/non-referential contrast by means of the VCV/CV prefix
distinction. Take the following, for example:

(239) a. Musoke ye y-a-li omu-sawo
Musoke EMP-COP conc-past-COP doctor
'Musoke was (indeed) the doctor' (Ref)

b. *Musoke ye omu-sawo
'Musoke was (indeed) the doctor' (Ref)

c. *Musoke ye y-a-li mu-sawo
'Musoke was (indeed) a doctor' (Non-ref)

(240) a. Omu-ana ye mu-bbi
'The child is (indeed) the thief' (Ref)

b. *Omu-ana ye a-li omu-bbi
'The child is (indeed) the thief'
(241) a. Musoke ye a-li-ba omu-somesa
   "Musoke will (indeed) be the teacher"

b. *Musoke ye omu-somesa

c. *Musoke ye a-li-ba mu-somesa

The second distinction between the emphatic and attributive copula predicates is that the former accepts both the restrictive and NR-modifiers, while the latter accepts only restrictive modifiers as stated earlier.

(242) a. Musoke musawo wange
   "Musoke is my doctor" (R)

b. *Musoke musawo owange
   "Musoke is a doctor, who is mine" (NR)

(243) Musoke ye musawo wange

(244) Musoke ye musawo owange
   "Musoke is (indeed) the doctor, who is mine" (NR)

(245) Abasajja abo be bayizzi abasatu
   "Those men are (indeed) the three hunters" (NR)
   "Those men are three hunters"

Carlota Smith [1969] observes that English predicate sentences that have specified determiner the in the predicate nominal sound odd or incomplete unless restrictive relative clauses modify them. In other words, referential predicate NP's are said to be odd or incomplete without relative clauses. Consider the following:

(246) a. Musoke is a teacher (non-ref)

b. Musoke is the teacher (ref)
(247)  a. That man is a doctor (non-ref)
       b. That man is the doctor (ref)

(248)  a. His brother is a linguist (non-ref)
       b. His brother is the linguist (ref)

The sentences in (246a), (247a), and (248a), with non-referential predicate are quite okay. On the other hand, the sentences in (246b), (247b), and (248b) sound odd or incomplete. However when a restrictive relative clause is embedded in the object NP they sound fine. Thus (249) through (251) are no longer said to be odd or incomplete:

(249)  Musoke is the teacher who taught me Russian

(250)  That man is the doctor who cured my disease

(251)  His brother is the linguist whom I was talking with

    Likewise in Luganda, an emphatic-copula predicate sentence sounds
    odd or incomplete as a statement without a restrictive relative clause.
    Thus (236) through (238) repeated here as (252b), (253b) and (254b) are
    not readily accepted by native speakers:

(252)  a. Musoke musawo
       'Musoke is a teacher' (non-ref)
       b. Musoke ye musawo
       'Musoke is (indeed) the teacher' (ref)

(253)  a. Omusajja oyo mwami
       'That man is a chief' (non-ref)
       b. Omusajja oyo ye mwami
       'That man is (indeed) the chief' (ref)
(254) a. Omuserikale musomesa
   'The policeman is a teacher' (non-ref)

   b. Omuserikale ye musomesa
   'The policeman is (indeed) the teacher' (ref)

Like in English these emphatic-copula predicate structures become ac-
ceptable when relative clauses modify them as shown below:

(255) Musoke ye musawo gwe njagala
   'Musoke is (indeed) the doctor I want'

(256) Omusajja oyo ye mwami gwe nayogere naye
   'That man is (indeed) the chief I spoke with'

(257) Omuserikale ye musomesa e-yansomesa amateeka g'oku ngundo
   'The policeman is the teacher who taught me the rules of road
   safety'

To sum up, predicate nominals following emphatic-copula, unlike
those which follow the attributive-copula, are obligatorily referential,
and take a VCV prefix, to contrast with the non-referential (attribu-
tive) copula predicates which take a CV prefix. The said nominal takes
the VCV prefix when they do so in all tenses save the present tense
where the attributive copula (if the emphatic copula is present) is
obligatorily deleted. Since predicate nouns following the emphatic
copula are obligatorily referential, it is not an accident that they
"sound much better", when modified with a relative clause. Although
in the appropriate discourse context, such as:

(258) You know who is the doctor who operated on Smith?

(259) Jones is the doctor
they all sound okay even without a relative clause. What they really
require, then, is a discourse mention (presupposition).
CHAPTER IV
STACKED AND CONJOINED RESTRICTIVE CLAUSES,
AND CONSTRAINT ON RELATIVIZATION

4.1 Stacked Restrictive Relative Clauses

Noun phrases may have more than one restrictive relative clause or
modifier following them in a kind of chain as in the following English
sentences:

(260) The man who has a long hair who is wearing a blue shirt is
a hippie.

The underlined relatives in (260) are said to be stacked restrictive
clauses or modifiers and carry the stacked interpretation. That is, the
relative on the extreme left modifies the NP, while the relative on the
right modifies the NP plus the preceding relative clause. Thus in
(260) the relative who has a long hair modifies the NP the man and then
the relative who is wearing a blue shirt modifies or restricts both the
NP and the relative immediately following it.

Sandra Annear Thompson (1969) rejects this analysis of the stacked
interpretation that they should be explained in terms of stacked struc-
tures. Her argument against the analysis is based on three points, two
of which are given here. First, she points out that "the stacked in-
terpretation is closely correlated with stress." In other words, any
relative clause or modifier in a chain may become of higher rank depend-
ing on where the speaker puts the stress. For example, the relative
clause who has a long hair in (260) above which is the inner clause,
may become of higher rank if it receives the first stress, and if the
speaker switches the stress and puts it on the outer relative clause.
who is wearing a blue shirt, it becomes of higher rank. Thus the interpretation does not depend on word-order or structural explanation.

"The fact that a clause is 'higher' in a structure does not seem to correlate with whether it is interpreted as being of higher rank."

Her second objection is that if the stacked relative clause analysis is true, then the pre-nominal adjectives which are preposed by transformation, would be expected to indicate the relative clause from which they come. In other words, an adjective transformed from a relative clause or modifier which is higher in rank would retain its rank. For example, the modifier bare-footed in the following noun phrase [Thompson, 1969:38]:

(261) The man who has a beard who is bare-footed

would be expected to be of higher rank when preposed as in (262) and (263) irrespective of its position.

(262) the bare-footed bearded man

(263) the bearded bare-footed man

But she observes that this is not the case. "The adjective that is stressed is interpreted as modifying the rest of the NP, independent of its position..."

Stockwell, Schachter, and Partee [1969] also observe that some native speakers of English do not accept the stacked interpretation of the relative clauses or noun modifiers in a chain. Rather, they interpret those clauses as conjoined. They further note that "...it appears that stacking of relative clauses may be a fairly deep kind of basis for
dialect differentiation, such that some speakers have the ART-S\(^1\) deep structure (which is easily constrained against stacking), where others have some sort of N-S structure (here the distinction between the NP-S and NOM-S is of no consequence...". In short, the difference between these dialects is a deep structure constraint.

In this chapter I shall show the existence of both the stacked relative clauses and/or noun modifiers in Luganda rejected by Thompson cited above, and the conjoined relative clauses. I shall also illustrate that constraints such as those discussed by Stockwell, Schachter, and Partee [1969] may not be deep structure, but rather surface structure constraint.

Now let us examine the following sentence:

(264) Embwa **gye olabye e-badde mu nju yange**.

'The dog that you saw that was in the house (not the one which was somewhere else) is mine'

The relative clause **gye olabye** 'that you saw' modifies the head noun **embwa** 'dog'. But the relative clause **e-badde mu nju** 'that was in the house' modifies the whole NP **embwa gye olabye** 'the dog that you saw'. That is, it restricts the domain of the head noun plus the restrictive relative clause **gye olabye** 'that you saw'. In other words, the extreme right restrictive relative clause (or modifier) is of higher rank than the inner one.

Sentence (264) has the following interpretation:

\(^{1}\)For a detailed discussion of the ART-S, NP-S, NOM-S, etc. formulations proposed to account for recursion of restrictive relative clauses, see Stockwell, Schachter, and Partee [1969:447-466] and Walusimbi and Givón [1970:161].
(265) Out of all the dogs that you saw, the one in the house belongs to me.

The relative clause e-badde mu nju 'that was in the house' is realized as the "higher ranking clause" in Thompson's terms.

When the order of the relative clauses in (264) is changed the stacked interpretation changes also. Consider (266):

(266) Emmba e-badde mu nju gye olabye yange

'The dog that was in the house that you saw (not the one that you didn't see) is mine.'

The extreme right clause comes into focus. That is, it modifies the entire modified NP preceding it. Similarly sentence (266) has the following interpretation:

(267) Out of all the dogs that were in the house, the one that you saw belongs to me.

As shown elsewhere (see Walusimbi and Givón [1970:165]) the P-markers for (264) and (266) can be represented as (268) and (269) respectively.

(268)
As can be seen in both cases (268) and (269), the relative $S_3$ modifies
the head noun *embwa* 'dog', whereas the relative $S_2$ modifies $NP$ plus $S_3$.
In other words, $S_2$ in (268) is higher in rank than $S_3$. Likewise in
(269), $S_2$ has a higher rank than $S_3$. This stacking interpretation is
very important in Luganda, since Luganda has no stress of the English
type. Thus, the relative order of the modifiers plays an important role
in indicating the scope of restrictive modifiers when they are
'stacked'.

The second Thompson's argument against the stacking relative clause
structure interpretation that "if the stacking interpretation is justi-
fied, we would expect to find that preposed adjectives would carry with
them the information as to which clause they come from", is invalid in
Luganda as well as in other Bantu languages. In Luganda the relative
clause reduction rule that generates modifying (attributive) adjectives
is different from a similar rule which operates in English. For example, the relative clause reduction rule deletes the copula but retains a preprefix that may be perhaps interpreted as a relative or subordination marker. Examine the following.

(270) a. Embwa e- li n-nene e-dduse
dog which-COP big run away
'The dog which is big has run away'

b. Embwa e- n-nene e-dduse
dog which-big has run away
'The big dog has run away'

In (270b) the copula li (together with the tense marker) is deleted but the relative pronoun e is retained. Secondly, the embedded modifying adjectives, unlike in English, are never preposed. Thus, there is no ordering distinction between embedded adjectives and relative clauses. Both follow the head noun, and the "stacked" structure interpretation applies equally to the adjectives as it does to the relative clauses.

Consider the following:

(271) Omusajja omulema omuzira agenze
man big tall left
'The brave lame man has left' (not the cowardly lame one)

When the order of the two adjectives is changed we get the following:

(272) Omusajja omuzira omulema agenze
'The tall lame man has left' (not the tall unlame one)

The difference in meaning between (271) and (272) is distinct. In (271) the adjective omuwanvu 'tall' is of higher rank, and in (272) it is omulema 'lame'. Thus, like the relative clauses, the interpretation of the stacked modifying adjectives depends on the structure or linear
ordering. The extreme right adjective or modifier restricts the domain
of the NP including its modifier(s).

4.2.0 **Conjoined Restrictive Relative Clauses**

It was observed in Walusimbi and Givón [1970] that there are two
types of conjoined restrictive clauses (henceforth CR relatives) in
Luganda. CR relatives type I include relative clauses where simultaneous
events or actions occur, and CR relatives type II are those
relatives in which two or more consecutive events or actions are
conjoined.

4.2.1 **CR-Relatives Type I**

In this type of CR relatives the conjunctions *ate nga* 'and also'
are used as exemplified by the following:

(273) Omuyizi a-soma *ate nga* a-kola tayiga bulungi
    student who-studies and also works does not study well
    'A/any student who studies and also works doesn't do well
    at school'

(274) Omusejja omunene *ate nga* wa maanyi mulungi
    man big and also of strength (is) good
    'A/any big strong man is good'

As can be noted in (273) and (274) the conjunctions *ate nga* 'and also'
are used only when generic\(^2\) or non-specific head nouns are involved.

---

\(^2\)Subject head nouns may be ambiguous with respect to genericity
and specificity. For example, this sentence:

Omukazi omuddugavu omunene muzira
woman black big brave

may be assigned any of the following interpretations:

a. The tall black woman is brave (specific)
b. A/any tall black woman is brave (generic)
In (273) the head noun *omuyizi* 'student' (any student) is generic. Similarly, the head noun *omusajja* 'man' (any man) in (274) is generic. Thus (275) where the head nouns *omuyizi* 'student' and *omusajja* 'man' are obligatorily referential (specific) due to the presence of the possessive pronoun *waffe* 'our' or the demonstrative modifier *ono* 'this', respectively, are ill-formed.

(275) a. *Omuyizi waffe a-soma ate nga akola tayiga bulungi* 
    student our who-study and also who work neg-study well

b. *Omusajja ono omulungi ate nga munene muzira* 
   man this good and also big brave

4.2.2 CR-Relatives Type II

The conjunction used in this type of CR relatives is *ne* 'and' (and then) as exemplified below:

(276) *Omusajja e- yagenda ne adda abuze* 
    man who-went and returned is lost
   'The man who went and then came back is lost'

(277) *Poliisi omubbi gwe yakutte ne e-mu-ta ba-mu-sse* 
    Police thief whom (they) arrested and released they-him-kill
   'The thief whom the police arrested and then released was killed'

Notice that the tense used in the verb phrase of the second conjunct must be a narrative (unmarked) tense. Other tenses are not acceptable as indicated by the ungrammaticalness of (278) through (281):

(278) *Omusajja e- yagenda ne y- a-dda abuze* 
    'man who-left and he-past-return lost'

(279) *Omusajja a- genze ne a-zze abuze* 
    'man who-left and he-came lost'
(280) *Omusajja a-li-genda ne a-li-dda a-li-ba mu-lungi 'man who-will-go and he-will return he-will-be good'  

(281) *Omusajja a-naa-genda ne a-naa-dda a-naa-ba mu-lungi 'man who-will-go and he-will-return he-will-be good (within 18 hours)'  

The non-co-occurrence of the conjunction ne 'and' with other tenses save the narrative one seems to be a surface constraint rather than a deep one. This claim is confirmed by the fact that the second verbal word, when it occurs by itself, the appropriate tense is retained as in (282) through (285):

(282) y-a-dda 'he came back'  
(283) a-zze 'he has come back'  
(284) a-li-dda 'he'll come back (later than 24 hours)'  
(285) a-naa-dda 'he'll come back (within 18 hours)'  

The grammaticality of (282) through (285) clearly indicates that there is an obligatory rule that deletes the tense "under some conditions of tense identity or perhaps conditions of tense sequence, i.e. that the tense in the second verbal indicates the same or a latter time category than in the first verbal."\(^3\)  

In Walusimbi and Givón [1970] we claimed that a generic interpretation is wrong with the ne conjunction because a specific head noun is always required in that construction. For example the head noun omusajja 'man' in (286) cannot be interpreted as any man.

---

\(^3\)See Walusimbi and Givón [1970].
(286) Omusajja e- ya-genze ne a-komawo mulungi man who-left and returned (is) good

\{ 'The man who went and then came back is good' \}
\{ '*'Any man who went and then came back is good' \}

When we originally made this claim we based our observation on the past tense of the verb which, as stated earlier, asserts "that the event described has already taken place"\(^4\) and therefore the NP involved must be referential and thus specific. Consideration of other tenses such as the habitual and future (near and remote) however, reveals that non-referential interpretation is possible with the conjunction ne 'and'.

Consider the following:

(287) a. Omusajja a- genda ne a- komawo mu-lungi man who-go and conc-return (is) good

'A/any man who goes and then comes back is good' (habitual)

b. Omusajja a- li- genda ne a- komawo ndimwebaza man who-fut-go and conc-return I'll thank him

'I'll thank a/any man who'll go and who'll come back' (remote future)

c. Omusajja a- naa-genda ne a- komawo n-naa-mu-ebaza man who-fut-go and conc-return I'll thank him

'I'll thank a/any man who'll go and who'll come back' (near future)

As a matter of fact, a non-generic interpretation is not possible in (287). This is evident from the fact that the head noun in (287) cannot be modified by either a demonstrative or associative (possessive) pronoun as exemplified by the ungrammaticalness of the following:

---

\(^4\) Taken from Bokama [1971:220].
(288) a. *Omusajja ono a-genda ne a-komawo mulungi
    man this \textit{wun}-go and return (is) good
    'This man who goes and then comes back is good'

b. *Omusajja \textit{wange} a-genda ne a-komawo mulungi
    'My man who goes and then comes back is good'

 c. *Omusajja ono a-li-genda ne a-komawo ndimwebaza
    'I'll thank this man who'll go and then come back'

From the data given above we may conclude that the conjunction of the
consecutive events or properties, unlike its counterpart of the simul-
taneous events which may be used to conjoin restrictive relative clauses
which modify only generic head nouns, is employed to conjoin restrictive
relatives which modify both generic and non-generic NPs.\(^5\)

The sequential ordering of the CR-relatives type II is a semantic,
pragmatic constraint. This can be demonstrated when we examine two
events which must occur in a particular order, an order which is un-
reversible. For example, sentence (289) is acceptable but not (290).

(289) Osubbi Police gwe yakwata ne e-mu-tta yali Mukiga
    'The thief whom the Police arrested \textit{and} then killed him was a
    Mukiga by tribe'

(290) *Osubbi Police gwe yatta ne e-mu-kwata yali Mukiga
    'Thief Police who killed \textit{and} him-arrest was Mukiga'

Where stress may be used in English, in Luganda a repeated conjunc-
tion \textit{ne} and verbal word are optionally used in the CR relatives Type II.
The repeated verbal occurs in its infinitival form.

\(^5\)This difference between \textit{past} and \textit{habitual} and future in terms of
a non-referential interpretation of nouns within the scope of these
tenses, is discussed in Givón [1973a].
(291) a. Omwana e- yalya ne yeebaka ne okwebaka mulungi
     child who-ate and slept and to sleep (is) good
     'The child who ate and then slept is good'

b. Ekitabo kye nagula ne noki-soma ne oku-ki-soma kirungi
     book which I bought and I-it-read and to-it read (is) good
     'The book which I bought and then read is good'

The device of repeating a verbal word applies to CR relatives
Type I and sentence conjunction as well, as may be seen in the following
examples:

(292) Abasajja a- baakola ate nga baayimba ne oku-yimba balungi
     men who-worked and also sang and to-sing (are) good
     'The men who worked and also sang are good'

(293) Omusajja yagenda ne akola ne okukola
     man went and work and to work
     'The man went and worked'

Notice that while the repetition of a second verbal is optional in
(291) through (293), it is obligatory when more than two CR-relatives
of Type II are not related in such a way that one is the result of the
other. Thus while (294b) is grammatical, (295b) is not.

(294) a. Omusajja gwe nayita ne ajja ne ayimba ne okuyimba yagenda
     'The man I sent for who came and later sang left'

b. Omusajja gwe nayita ne ajja ne ayimba yagenda
     'The man I send for and who came and sang left'

(295) a. Omusajja gwe nalaba e-yakola ne ayimba ne okuyimba yagenda
     man who I saw who-worked and sing and to sing left
     'The man I saw who worked and later sang left'

b. *Omusajja gwe nalaba e-yakola ne ayimba yagenda
     'man who I saw who-worked and sing left'
In (295) the three actions or events see, work and sing are not pragmatically related in any obvious way. That is, the man did not work because he was seen nor did he sing because he worked or was seen. The three CR relatives are independent of each other pragmatically. But in (294) the CR relatives are pragmatically connected. The man's coming and singing were caused by his being sent for.

Notice also that in case of (295) the conjunction ne 'and' is obligatorily deleted immediately after the first conjunct (i.e. where there are more than two conjuncts), as the ungrammaticality of (296) shows:

(296) *Omusajja gwe nalaba ne akola ne ayimba ne akuyimba yagenda man who I-saw and work and sing and to-sing left

but it is optionally deleted in the case of (294) repeated here as (297):

(297) Omusajja gwe nayita ne ajja ne ayimba (ne okuyimba) yagenda
    'The man I send for and who came and sang left'

4.2.3 Conjunction of Adjectives

Unlike the conjunctions ate nga of the CR relatives Type 1, ne does not conjoin adjectives if they are modifying the same head noun. Thus while (298) is grammatical, (299) is not.

(298) Omwana omugezi ate nga muwombefu mulungi
    child clever and also humble (is) good
    'A clever humble and child is good'

(299) *Omwana omugezi ne muwombefu mulungi

The constraint blocking the conjunction of two adjectives by the conjunction ne is semantic. The two qualities, cleverness and humbleness in (299), for example, are inherent, and timeless and do not occur in a
sequence. This constraint applies also to unreduced relative clauses semantically related to the adjectives. This further supports the claim that this constraint is semantic. Consider the following:

(300) *Abaana a-baali bagezi ne baali bawombeefu baagenda
'children who-were clever and were humble left'

Full relative clauses from which adjectives are derived may, however, be conjoined by ne if the second conjunct carries a consecutive event interpretation as in (301).

(301) a. Omwana e- yali omulungi ne ayonooneka yabula
child who-was good and became bad got lost
'The child who was good and later became bad got lost'

b. *Omwana omulungi ne ayonooneka yabula
child good and became bad lost

c. *Omwana e-ayonooneka ne omulungi yabula
child who-became bad and good lost

4.3.0 Stacking of CR-Relative Clauses

So far I have shown the stacking of restrictive relative clauses and the CR-relative clauses separately. In this section I shall show that in Luganda CR-relatives can be stacked.

4.3.1 Stacking of CR-Relatives Type I

Stacking of CR-Relatives Type I is only possible if they are the last in a string. They may not be followed by another stacked, non-conjoined clause. Thus (302c) and (303b) are ungrammatical.

(302) a. Omukazi omutono omuwanvu a-genze.
woman slender tall has left
'The tall slender woman has left' (no conjunction)
b. Omukazi omutono omwanvu ate nga muddugavu mulungi
   woman slender tall and also black good
   'A/any tall slender and black woman is beautiful'

c. Omukazi omutono ate nga mwanvu omuddugavu mulungi

(303) a. Omukazi omutono a-labika abulungi ate nga akola nnyo
    woman slender who is good-looking and works hard
    muka Musa
    wife of Moses
    'The slender good-looking and hard-working woman is Moses'
    wife'

b. Omukazi omutono ate nga a-labika bulungi a-kola ennyo muka
    Musa

4.3.2 Stacking of CR-Relatives Type II

Like the CR-relatives Type I, stacking of these relatives is only
permissible if they occur at the end of the conjoined clause. Thus
(304b) is ill-formed.

(304) a. Omusajja omunene gwe tu-a-sanga ne tu-mu-buuzza yagenda
    man big whom we met and greet left
    'The big man we met whom we greeted left'

b. Omusajja gwe tu-a-sanga ne tu-mu-buuzza omunene a-genze
    whom we met and greet big left
    'The big man we met and greeted left'

Notice that of the two possible configurations (305) and (306)
given below, only (306) is permissible for both CR-relatives Type I and
Type II.
The intervening conjunction in (302b), (303a), and (304a), does not affect the stacked interpretation. The extreme right restrictive modifier remains of higher rank.

4.3.3.0 **Constraint on Stacking Subject and Object Relative Clauses**

4.3.3.1 **Stacking of Subject Relative Clauses**

Subject relative clauses may not be stacked in a chain. Thus the following is ungrammatical:

(307) *Omulenzi e-yagenda e-yayimba mulungi
boy who went who sang (is) good
'The boy who went who sang is good'

Yet conjunction of relatives in (308) and (309) is permissible.

(308) Omulenzi e-yagenda ate nga yayimba mulungi
boy who-went and also sang (is) good
'The boy who went and also sang is good'

(309) Omulenzi e-yagenda ne ayimba mulungi
'The boy who went and later sang is good'

4.3.3.2 **Stacking of Object Relative Clauses**

Like the subject relative clauses, object relatives may also not be stacked.
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(310) *Ekitabo kye nagula kye nasoma kirungi
book which I bought which I read (is) good
'The book I bought which I read is good'

Again conjunction is allowed here.

(311) Ekitabo kye nagula ne nkisoma kirungi
'The book which I bought and read is good'

As observed in Walusimbi and Givón [1970] a subject relative clause
and an object relative clause may be stacked together as exemplified
below.

(312) Omulenzi e-yagonia gwe walaba akomyewo
boy who-went whom you saw has returned
'The boy who went whom you saw has come back'

(313) Omulenzi gwe walaba e-yagenda akomyewo
boy whom you saw who-went has returned
'The boy whom you saw who went has come back'

Notice, however, that this constraint which blocks the stacking of
two or more subject or object restrictive relative clauses does not ap-
ply to modifying adjectives. Thus (314) as already noted is permissible:

(314) Omusajja omunene omuwanvu agenze
man big tall has left
'The tall big man has left'

Yet the constraint applies to unreduced relative clauses thought to be
related to adjectives as the ungrammaticalness of (315) indicates.

(315) *Omusajja e- yali omunene e- yali omuwanvu yagenda
man who-was big who-was tall left
'The man who was big who was tall left'
If one of the restrictive relative clauses is unreduced and the other is reduced, stacking of two or more subjects is allowed. Thus (316) and (317) are grammatical:

(316) Omusajja e— yali omunene omuwanvu yagenda
     man     who—was    big    tall    left
     'The tall man who was big left'

(317) Omusajja omumpi e— yali mu nju yagenda
     man     short who—was in house left
     'The short man who was in the house left'

(318) Omusajja e— yali omumpi e— yali mu nju yagenda
     man     who—was    short who—was in house left
     'The man who was short who was in the house left'

The fact that (314), (316), and (317) are grammatical, clearly indicates that the constraint discussed above is not a semantic (deep) constraint, but of performance or perceptual nature. Stacked unreduced restrictive relative clauses of the same syntactic structure are hard to perceive. In short, the constraint in question is perceptually motivated.

4.4.0 Constraints on Relativization

Ross [1967] observes that a number of transformations including relativization are subject to certain constraints. In this chapter I shall concern myself with syntactic contexts which violate his two major constraints viz, the Complex NP Constraint and Coordinate Structure Constraint in Luganda.

4.4.1 The Complex NP Constraint

Ross [1967] notices that no element of a relative clause may be
moved out of its own clause. In other words, no element of a relative clause can be relativized or questioned. The Complex NP Constraint (hereinafter CNPC) in full reads:

No element contained in a sentence dominated by a noun phrase with a lexical head noun may be moved out of that noun phrase by transformation. (p. 70)

According to this constraint the underlined NP's in (319a) and (320a) cannot be relativized or questioned. Thus sentences (319b) and (320b) (320c) are ungrammatical.

(319)  a. Nalaba omusajja e-yali mu mmotoka
       'I saw a man who was in a car'

       b. *mmotoka gye nalaba omusajja e-yali mu baagibba
          *'The car which I saw the man who was in was stolen'

(320)  a. Nasanga omusajja e- yagula eryato
        I met man who bought a boat
        'I met a man who bought a boat'

       b. *eryato lye nasanga omusajja e- yagula ddungi
          boat which I met man who bought good
          *'The boat which I met a man who bought is good'

       c. *kiki lye nasanga omusajja e-yagula
          *'What that I met a man who bought?'

The CNPC makes it impossible to move mmotoka 'car' from the relative clause e-yali mu mmotoka 'who was in a car' in (319) presumably because this clause is dominated by an NP with a lexical head noun omusajja 'man'. Likewise the ungrammatical sentences (320b) and (320c) are presumably blocked by the same constraint.

4.4.1.1 CNPC in Reduced Relative Clauses

Examples can be produced from Luganda, however, where the CNPC is
violated. Such examples involve reduced relative clauses which contain
a verb plus a prepositional phrase. Similarly in English a reduced
relative clause with V-ing+PP (i.e. a verb ending in -ing followed by
a prepositional phrase) also violates the constraint under consideration.
Consider the following:

(321) a. Nalaba omusajja e-yali atudde ku ntebe
    'I saw a man who was sitting on a chair'

   b. Nalaba omusajja atudde ku ntebe
    'I saw a man sitting on a chair'

As the CNPC states the NP entebe 'chair' in (321a) cannot be relativized
as the ungrammaticalness of (322) shows.

(322) *Entebe gye nalaba omusajja e-yali atudde-ko yamenyeka
    *'The chair which I saw a man who was sitting-on broke'

But the same NP in (321b) with a reduced relative clause may be moved
out of its own clause by a transformation as (323) shows.

(323) Entebe gye nalaba omusajja atudde-ko yamenyeka
    'The chair I saw a man sitting on broke'

You will recall that when an object NP of a preposition is moved out of
a PP, the preposition is adjoined to the adjacent verb preceding it.
Thus ku 'on' in (323) changes to -ko and is suffixed to the verb before
it.

The grammaticality of (323) suggests that CNPC is too strong. It
would certainly block such sentences since, according to Ross, reduced
relative clauses also comply with his CNPC.
4.4.2 Coordinate Structure Constraint

The coordinate structure constraint (hereinafter CSC) aims at accounting for what the Chomsky's principle of A over A cannot do. It states:

In a coordinate structure, no conjunct may be moved, nor may any element contained in a conjunct be moved out of that conjunct. (Ross [1967:89])

This constraint will block ill-formed sentences such as (324c) and (325b) and (325c):

(324) a. Yokaana yayozza essowaani ne Maliyamu ne afumba emmere
   'John washed the dishes and Mary cooked the food'

   b. *Essowaani Yokaana ze yayozza ne Maliyamu ne afuma emmere
      zitukula
      *'The dishes which John washed and Mary cooked the food
      are clean'

   c. *Emmere Maliyamu gye yafumba ne Yokaana ne ayoza essowaani
      yali nnungi
      *'The food which Mary cooked and John washed the dishes
      was good'

(325) a. Omulerzi ne omuwala baagenda ku ssomero bombiriri
   'The boy and the girl went to school together'

   b. *Oyo ye mulenzi e-ne omuwala bagenda ku ssomero bombiriri
      *'That is the boy who and the girl went to school together'

   c. *Muwala ki e-ne omulenzi baagenda ku ssomero bombiriri
      *'Which is the girl who and they boy went to school together?'

The CSC may be violated, however, if two conjuncts in a consecutive event conjunction share a subject as in (326) and (327):

(326) a. Yagenda mu dduuka ne agula eggaali
   'He went to the store and bought a bike'
b. Mu dduuka mwe yagenda ne agula egaali mujama
   'The store in which he went and bought a bike is dirty'

(327) a. Yokaana yaleeta ekitabo ne a-ki-wa Mukasa
   'John brought a book and gave it to Mukasa'

b. Ekitabo Yokaana kye yaleeta ne a-ki-wa Mukasa ki-a-bula
   'The book which John brought and gave it to Mukasa got lost'

The CSC is further violated if two conjuncts share a subject in
the simultaneous event conjunction structure as in (328):

(328) a. Mukasa akuba entongooli ate nga afuuwa ne endere
   Mukasa plays harp     and also blows the flute
   'Mukasa plays a harp and plays the flute as well'

b. Entongooli Mukasa gye akuba ate nga afuuwa ne endere ekutuse
   *'The harp which Mukasa plays and blows the flute as well has
   broken'

4.4.3 Conclusion

Ross [1967] notices some instances which seem to violate his con-
straints in English but admits that he has no plausible analysis for
them. I have shown in this chapter that the violation of both CNPC and
CSC in Luganda can be accounted for. Reduced relative clauses that con-
tain a verb and a prepositional phrase account for the violation of the
CNPC. And in case of the CSC, it is violated if two conjuncts share a
subject in both consecutive and simultaneous event conjunction
structures.
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