

We explore complementizer meaning in adverbial clauses in Kinyamulenge, a dialect of Kinyarwanda spoken in South Kivu province, Democratic Republic of Congo. We focus on the distribution of the complementizers *kó* and *ngo* in reason clauses (*because/since...*) and result clauses (*so that/in order that...*). We have two goals. First, we wish to provide a descriptive account of the various factors affecting complementizer choice in adverbial clauses. Both complementizers have been given various (sometimes conflicting) meanings in previous works on selected embedded clauses (Givón & Kimenyi, 1974; Ngoboka & Zeller, 2016). In contrast to the fuzzy data in selected embedded clauses, we find a clear pattern in adverbial clauses, which we hope may shed light on their distinction elsewhere. Second, we propose an account of these facts building on Charnavel (2019). We suggest that Kinyamulenge lexicalizes a meaning distinction involving logophoricity proposed in Charnavel’s account of *because*-clauses in English.

Reason-clauses. Reason adverbial clauses involve a perceived causal relationship between the main clause and adverbial clause such that the adverbial clause is seen as the “reason” (broadly construed) that the main clause is true. In Kinyamulenge, reason-clauses are translated with *kuvera kó*. *Kuvera* is always optional.

- (1) *Yohana ya-gi-ye kwaa mu-ganga (kuvera) kó Maria*
 John 1SM-go-ASP to 3NC-hospital because COMP Maria
ya-ra-rwa-iy-a
 1SM-PRES-be.sick-ASP-FV
 ‘John went to the hospital because Mary is sick.’

We also find that the complementizer *ngo* is possible in response to *because*-prompts; it licenses a non-factive reading. (2) can be followed with ... *ariko ntiyarwaye*, ‘... but she’s not sick.’

- (2) Context: John heard that Maria is sick, so he decided to visit her in the hospital. But everyone knows Mary was never sick; she was just faking.
Yohana ya-gi-ye kwaa mu-ganga ngo Maria ya-ra-rwa-iy-e
 John 1SM-go-ASP to 3NC-hospital COMP Maria 1SM-PRES-be.sick-ASP-SBJV
 ‘John went to the hospital because Mary is sick.’

Ngo in (2) signals that the subject *Yohana* believes that Mary is sick, but the speaker does not. Consistent with this is the observation that in reason-clauses which strictly reflect the speaker’s epistemic/evidential reasoning (*since*-clauses in English; Charnavel 2017), only *kó* is possible.

- (3) *Maria a-shobor-a kuva a-ri o-mu-nyamulenge kó a-vug-a*
 Mary 1SM-MOD-FV COP.INF 1SM-COP 1AUG-1NC-munamulenge COMP 1SM-speak-FV
i-ki-nyamulenge
 7AUG-7NC-kinyamulenge
 ‘Mary must be a Munyamulenge since she speaks Kinyamulenge.’

Result clauses. Result clauses (also called finite purpose clauses) involve a causal dependency in the other direction: the adverbial clause is perceived as the result or outcome of the eventuality in the main clause (Meier, 2003; Schmidtke-Bode, 2009). In English, result clauses are generally introduced by *so that* or *in order that*. In Kinyamulenge, simple result clauses are translated with *kugira ngo*. Again, *kugira* is always optional.

- (4) *Yohana ya-shir-ye kompyuta mu=i-somero (kugira) ngo muri wese*
 John 1SM-put-ASP computer in=9NC-library so.that COMP 1person every
a-shobor-a ku-yi-koresh-a
 1SM-MOD-FV 15NC-9OM-use-FV

‘John put the computer in the library so that everyone can use it.’

In (4), John’s intention is that everyone use the computer; this is why he places it in the library. We also find that *kó* is able to introduce a result clause in specific contexts, in particular, if only the speaker has an opinion about the adverbial clause.

- (5) *kompyuta i-ri mu=i-somero kó muri wese a-shobor-a*
 computer 9SM-COP in=9NC-library COMP 1person every 1SM-MOD-FV
ku-yi-koresh-a
 15NC-9OM-use-FV

‘The computer is in the library so that everyone can use it.’

Across reason- and result-clauses, we find a broad correlation: *ngo* is used when the adverbial clause is evaluated from the perspective of (local) main-clause subject. *Kó* indicates that the speaker is the evaluator of the adverbial clause.

Analysis. We suggest that the complementizers *kó* and *ngo* reflect the presence of a logophoric attitudinal center (*l*) in the adverbial clause. Our analysis follows Charnavel (2019), who proposes two distinct perspectival projections in *because*-clauses in English. There is a “causal judge” (*j*), who evaluates the causal dependency between the main and adverbial clause. Below this is projected a logophoric attitude center (*l*), who evaluates the truth of the adverbial clause.

- (6) [Main clause . . . [Adverbial clause *j kuvera/kugira* [CP *l kó/ngo*]]]

The impetus for distinguishing *j* from *l* in Kinyamulenge comes from cases like (2) and (4). Taking (2) as an example, *l* in this case is just the subject *Yohana*: according to him—and not the speaker—Mary is sick. The causal judge though includes John *and* the speaker: according to both individuals, the reason that John went to the hospital is that (John believes that) Mary is sick. We suggest that *kó* and *ngo* grammaticalize the distinction between when the speaker is and is not included in *l*. (For space, we put aside the mechanism for establishing *l*’s referent.)

- (7) For some logophoric center *l*, $[[\text{COMP}]] = \lambda P \lambda w. \forall w' \in \text{ACC}_{l,w}, P(w') = 1$
 a. realize COMP as *kó* when *l* = speaker (+local subject)
 b. realize COMP as *ngo* when *l* = local subject

We define two clausal connectives BECAUSE and RESULT below. They may be overt as *kuvera* and *kugira* respectively, and may also sometimes be silent (see e.g. Whelpton 1995; Stephenson 2007).

- (8) a. $[[\text{BECAUSE}]]^j = \lambda P \lambda Q \lambda w.$ According to *j*’s relevant knowledge, the reason that $Q(w) = 1$ is that $P(w) = 1$.
 b. $[[\text{RESULT}]]^j = \lambda P \lambda Q \lambda w.$ According to *j*’s relevant knowledge, the result of $Q(w) = 1$ is that $P(w) = 1$

- (9) For some logophoric center *l*, $[[\text{BECAUSE COMP P}]]^j = \lambda Q \lambda w.$ According to *j*’s relevant knowledge, the reason that $Q(w) = 1$ is that, $\forall w' \in \text{ACC}_{l,w} P(w') = 1$

Thus, Kinyamulenge’s complementizers reflect a common trend among Bantu languages to encode “perspective” in the C-system (Diercks, 2013; Gluckman, 2021), distinct from the causal judge. Ultimately, our analysis may shed light on the full distribution *kó* and *ngo* in embedding contexts. The complementizers have variously been described as providing factual, evidential, epistemic, and quotative meanings (Givón & Kimenyi, 1974; Ngoboka & Zeller, 2016), depending on a variety of factors. We comment briefly on how these various meanings may arise compositionally under our analysis.

References

- Charnavel, Isabelle (2017). Non-at-issueness of *since*-clauses. *Proceedings of SALT 27*, 43–58.
- Charnavel, Isabelle (2019). Perspectives in causal clauses. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 37, 389–424.
- Diercks, Michael (2013). Indirect agree in Lubukusu complementizer agreement. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 31:2, 357–407.
- Givón, Talmy & Alexandre Kimenyi (1974). Truth, belief and doubt in Kinyarwanda. *Studies in African Linguistics*, vol. 5.
- Gluckman, John (2021). Null Expletives and Embedded Clauses in Logoori. *Syntax* .
- Meier, Cécile (2003). The meaning of *Too*, *Enough* and *So...that*. *Natural Language Semantics* 11, 69–107.
- Ngoboka, Paul & Jochen Zeller (2016). The conjoint/disjoint alternation in Kinyarwanda. van der Wal, Jenneke & Larry Hyman (eds.), *The conjoint/disjoint alternation in Bantu*, Walter de Gruyter.
- Schmidtke-Bode, Karsten (2009). *A typology of purpose clauses*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- Stephenson, Tamina (2007). Judge dependence, epistemic modals, and predicates of personal taste. *Linguist and Philos* 30, 487–525.
- Whelpton, Matthew (1995). *The Syntax and Semantics of Infinitives of Result*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Oxford.