Triadic Constructions in Rutooro

Bebwa Isingoma
University of Agder

1. General observations on triadic constructions

In triadic constructions, we typically find three arguments, namely a subject and two postverbal arguments.[1] Two formal varieties obtain, as shown in (1) for English and in (2) for Rutooro, a Bantu language spoken in Uganda. In (1a) and (2a), the postverbal arguments are linearly realized as two contiguous NPs, i.e. NP_1 and NP_2, instantiating a double object construction (DOC), while in (1b) and (2b) they are realized as NP_2 and PP, instantiating a prepositional phrase construction (PPC):[2]

(1) a. Jane took Tom_1 a $book_2$. (DOC)
b. Jane took a $book_2$ to Tom_1. (PPC)

(2) a. Jeeni a-ka-twar-r-a $Toomu_1$ $ekitabu_2$.[3] (DOC)
Jane 3s-PAST-take-APPL-FV Tom book
'Jane took Tom a book.'
b. Jeeni a-ka-twar-a $ekitabu_2$ owa $Toomu_1$.[4] (PPC)
Jane 3s-PAST-take-FV book P Tom
'Jane took a book to Tom/Tom's place.'

Whereas Rutooro verbs such as *–twara* (take) in (2) admit the PPC, verbs such as *–ha* (give) do not allow it, as in (3):

(3) a. Jeeni a-ka-h-a $Toomu_1$ $ekitabu_2$.
Jane 3s-PAST-give-FV Tom book
'Jane gave Tom a book.'
b. *Jeeni a-ka-h-a $ekitabu_2$ owa $Toomu_1$.
Jane 3s-PAST-give-FV book P Tom
'Jane gave a book to Tom/Tom's place.

[1] In this study, I use the term *triadic* to mean what many linguists (e.g. Malchukov et al. 2010) refer to as *ditransitive.* In other words, the constructions referred to here as triadic exclude cases such as *They elected him president.*

[2] The study only considers PPCs whose PPs instantiate the semantic role 'goal.'

[3] Special abbreviations: **1**=1st Person, **3**=3rd Person, **APPL**=applicative, **FV**=final vowel, **Lit**.=literally, **P**=preposition, **PERF**=perfective, **POSS**=possessive, **s**=singular.

[4] Whereas Bantu locatives (e.g. Rutooro *owa*) have been treated in some studies (e.g. Baker 1988, 1992; Ndoleriire et al. 2009; Ndoleriire & Oriikiriza 1996) as prepositions, in other studies (e.g. Bresnan & Kanerva 1989, Bresnan & Mchombo 1995) they have been treated as nominals, because they exhibit nominal properties (e.g. concord in a string). However, there is also evidence that the locatives exhibit both nominal and prepositional properties (Asiimwe & Beermann 2010). On the semantic plane, Carstens (2008: 150 fn.23) states that Bantu locatives "have some prepositional semantic content (like 'in' or 'at')." In this study, I focus on the prepositional nature and function of Rutooro locatives and treat them as prepositions. Crucially, whether the locatives are treated as nominals or as prepositions does not affect the thrust of my analysis, namely the role of *owa* in triadic constructions compared to English *to* (see section 3). However, there are terminological implications.

 Selected Proceedings of the 42nd Annual Conference on African Linguistics, ed. Michael R. Marlo et al., 149-160. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

The verb *–twara* (take) is different from the verb *–ha* (give) in two main ways: First, *–ha* (give) is an inherently triadic verb, while *–twara* is basically a dyadic verb which can be used triadically in PPCs whose PPs are introduced by the Rutooro preposition *owa* (see section 3).[5] Second, *–twara* (take) is a spatial verb (i.e. it encodes a change in the physical location of an entity), while *–ha* (give) is not. The fact that (2b) is possible while (3b) is not suggests that PPCs in Rutooro are constrained by a semantic criterion which I will refer to as the LOCATIONAL CONSTRAINT; that is, only verbs with inherent spatial (locational) properties participate in Rutooro PPCs (see section 3 for details). *–Ha* (give) in (3) does not obey this constraint, whence (3b) is ill-formed. Given the LOCATIONAL CONSTRAINT, it follows that there are extremely fewer instances of PPCs than DOCs in Rutooro.

Rutooro, like many other Bantu languages (e.g. Luganda, Swahili), has two types of triadic verbs that occur in the DOC: monomorphemic verbs (simplex verbs, e.g. *–ha* (give)) and multimorphemic verbs (derived verbs, e.g. *–twar**r**a*: derived from *–twara* (take)). Monomorphemic verbs (e.g. *–ha* (give) and *–oleka* (show)) are typical triadic verbs. Multimorphemic verbs that participate in the DOC (e.g. *–twarra* (take)), on the other hand, are not typical triadic verbs. Rather, they are derived from inherently dyadic verbs (e.g. *–twarra* from *–twara* (take)), in order to be *triadicized*. This is achieved by augmenting their argument structure through verbal extension mechanisms such as applicativization and causativization. In this paper, I eschew the analysis of causativized verbs and consider applicativized verbs only. The verb *–twar**r**a* (take) in (2a) is the applicativized form of *–twara* (take) in (2b). Applicativization entails affixing the root of a verb, thereby increasing its valence by adding another participant to the verb's argument structure. The affix is usually *–ir,* with *–er* and *–r* as common allomorphs. Each of these is phonologically conditioned.[6]

The relevant literature on triadic constructions indicates that there are two event type semantics (cf. (4)) associated with the two formal varieties (cf. Pinker 1989, Harley 2002, Krifka 2003, Beavers 2010, among others):

(4) a. X CAUSES Y TO HAVE Z (DOC)
b. X CAUSES Z TO GO TO Y (PPC)

The DOC in (4a) encodes 'caused possession', whereas the PPC in (4b) encodes 'caused motion.' Hence, the DOC entails a possessional relation between the referents of the first object (OBJ_1) and the second object (OBJ_2). As pointed out above, there are extremely few PPCs in Rutooro, as they are governed by the LOCATIONAL CONSTRAINT. Thus, there is a need to identify the common verbs that obey this criterion and examine any other linguistic elements that come into play. It is important to point out that whereas there is abundant literature on applicative constructions (DOC) (e.g. Baker 1988, Marantz 1993, etc.), the available literature does not explicitly put a premium on the possessional properties of the constructions. This comports with Ngonyani's (1998: 67) observation that most scholarly work on applicatives has been devoted to benefactive and instrumental constructions, while areas involving thematic roles such as recipient (possession)[7], reason, etc. have not received enough attention. It is interesting to note that some of the studies that have attempted to analyze possession in applicative constructions (e.g. Pylkkänen 2002, 2008) state that while there is a possessional relation encoded in the DOCs of languages such as English (5), such a relation is absent in the DOCs of Bantu languages such as Luganda (6) – another Bantu language spoken in Uganda. In this paper, I

[5] Not every dyadic verb can be used triadically in the PPC, e.g. *–gamba* (tell). When *–gamba* (tell) occurs with a PP introduced by *owa*, the PP means ***at** X's place* and not ***to** X* or ***to** X's place*.

[6] The allomorph *–er* occurs when the last vowel in the root (i.e. the vowel preceding the Final Vowel) is **o** or **e**, while *–ir* is used elsewhere. But if the root ends in *–r*, the 'vowel condition' does hold; instead, another –r is added to the –r of the root, resulting in a geminate. There are other minor allomorphs (see Rubongoya 1999: 189ff. for such details). Examples:

(a) *–er*: *–etw**e**ka* (carry) → *–etwek**er**a, –som**e**ka* (read) → *–som**er**a*

(b) *–ir* : *–handi**i**ka* (write) → *–handiik**ir**a*, *–v**u**ga* (drive) → *–vug**ir**a*, *–r**a**sa* (shoot) → *–ras**ir**a*

(c) *–r* : *–twa**r**a* (take) → *–twar**r**a*, *–hoto**r**a* (stir) → *–hotor**r**a*, *–gu**r**a* (buy) → *–gur**r**a*

[7] A recipient-relation between the postverbal arguments is what is termed as 'possession' in DOCs (cf. Pylkkänen 2002, 2008; Oh 2006; Pinker 1989, among others).

demonstrate that in (6) and its Rutooro equivalent in (7), as well as in many other related cases, there is a possessional relation between the referents of OBJ_1 and OBJ_2, as is the case in (5), although there are some differences (see section 2):

(5) a. He showed me$_1$ the paper$_2$. (Pylkkänen 2002: 48)
b. I bought John$_1$ a new VCR$_2$. (Pylkkänen 2002: 19)

(6) Mukasa y-a-som-edd-e Katonga$_1$ ekitabo$_2$.[8] [Luganda]
Mukasa 3s-PAST-read-APPL.PERF-FV Katonga book
'Mukasa read Katonga a book.' (Pylkkänen 2002: 24, 2008: 19)

(7) Mukasa a-ka-som-er-a Katonga$_1$ ekitabu$_2$.
Mukasa 3s-PAST-read-APPL-FV Katonga ekitabu
'Mukasa read Katonga a book.'

The paper is structured as follows. In section 2, I discuss the properties of DOCs. I demonstrate that Pylkkänen's (2002, 2008) 'non-possessionist' account does not apply to Rutooro, as possession is one of the core properties of the DOCs under consideration. I also show that her claim in relation to ((6)) is false. The section also pays attention to the fact that many DOCs in Rutooro are semantically multifaceted – which points to the crucial role of context. In section 3, I examine the properties of PPCs in Rutooro and I show that they are licensed by a LOCATIONAL CONSTRAINT. Concluding remarks are presented in section 4.

2. Properties of double object constructions

DOCs are characterized by the event type representation in (4a), realized by means of two contiguous objects (cf. (5), (6), (7)). The encoded meaning is 'caused possession'; that is, there is a possessional relation between the referents of the two objects (cf. Pinker 1989, Harley 2002, Beavers 2010, among others). However, Pylkkänen (2002, 2008) argues that no possessional relation is encoded in examples such as (6), but it is present in examples such as (5). Marantz (1993) proposes two types of applicatives: overt applicatives (i.e. realized with an affix, cf. (6), (7) and (8)) and non-overt applicatives (i.e. without an affix, cf. (5) and (9)):

(8) a. Jeeni a-ka-twek-er-a Toomu$_1$ ekitabu$_2$.
Jane 3s-PAST-send-APPL-FV Tom book
'Jane sent Tom the book.'
b. Jeeni a-ka-cumb-ir-a Toomu$_1$ ebyokulya$_2$.
Jane 3s-PAST-cook-APPL-FV Tom food
'Jane cooked Tom food.' = 'Jane cooked Tom a/the meal.'

(9) a. Jane sent Tom$_1$ a book$_2$.
b. Jane cooked Tom$_1$ a meal$_2$.

Following Marantz (1993), Pylkkänen (2002, 2008) treats triadic constructions as applicatives. She proposes two types of applicatives: high applicatives and low applicatives.[9] High applicatives are introduced above the lexical VP, because there is no possessional relation between the postverbal arguments. The role of the applicative marker is simply to add another participant to the event encoded by the verb. On the other hand, low applicatives are generated within the lexical VP, because there is a

[8] The interlinear gloss is mine.

[9] (a) HIGH APPLICATIVE: $[_{VoiceP}\ DP_{AGENT}\ [_{Voice'}\ Voice\ [_{ApplP}\ DP_{BEN/LOC/INST}\ [_{Appl'}\ Appl\ [_{VP}\ V\ DP_{THEME}\ ]]]]]$
(b) LOW APPLICATIVE: $[_{VoiceP}\ DP_{AGENT}\ [_{Voice'}\ Voice\ [_{VP}\ V\ [_{ApplP}\ DP_{REC}\ [_{Appl'}\ Appl\ DP_{THEME}]]]]]$
(Georgala & Whitman 2009: 2: adapted from Pylkkänen 2002: 19, 2008: 14)

possessional relation between the postverbal arguments. High applicatives are instantiated in languages such as Chaga, Luganda and Venda (i.e. Bantu languages), while low applicatives are found in languages such as English (Pylkkänen 2002: 15ff.).

Interestingly, all the Rutooro examples (including the Luganda one) provided above show that there is a possessional relation between the referents of OBJ_1 and OBJ_2 on a par with the English examples. In (8a), 'Jane sent Tom the book and Tom came into possession of the book (or there was that intention)', and in (8b) 'Jane cooked Tom the meal and Tom was (or was supposed to be) in possession of the meal by eating it.' In both cases, possession is clearly encoded, in that there is a 'HAVE – relation' between 'Tom' and 'the book' (8a) and 'Tom' and 'the meal' (8b). This is the kind of possessional relation that obtains in the English examples in (9). Furthermore, in both Pylkkänen's (2002: 24) Luganda example (6) and its Rutooro equivalent (7), the possessional relation is present as well. What (6) and (7) primarily mean is that by 'Mukasa reading Katonga the book, Katonga enters into possession with the content of what is being read (or at least this was the intention).' If (6) and (7) were uttered in English (i.e. Mukasa read Katonga a book), Pylkkänen would have no qualms in recognizing the English sentence as encoding a possessional relation on a par with (5a) which she recognizes as encoding a non-concrete transfer of possession relation. Pinker (1989: 48) refers to such a possessional relation as 'metaphorical possession.' In the following, I present more examples in which there is a concrete transfer of possession. In (10a) and (10b), Tom enters (or is supposed to enter) into a possessional relation with 'the bike' and' bread', respectively. Likewise, in (10c) and (10d), there is a concrete transfer relation (or an intention of having such a transfer relation) that allows 'Tom to have the house' (10c) and 'the letter' (10d). Also, by 'Jane throwing Tom the ball' in (10e), 'Tom is expected to come into possession of the ball by grabbing it.' As has already been shown in relation to (6), possession is not only encoded in Rutooro applicativized DOCs, but also in Luganda. McPherson (2008: 84), using the Luganda example in (11), expresses doubts about Pylkkänen's (2002) claim. She correctly conjectures that a possessional relation obtains between the referents of OBJ_1 and OBJ_2, namely, 'I bought her a dress and she was (or was supposed to be) in possession of the dress:'[10]

(10) a. Jeeni a-ka-twar-r-a Toomu$_1$ egaali$_2$.
Jane 3s-PAST-take-APPL-FV Tom bike
'Jane took Tom a bike.'

b. Jeeni a-ka-leet-er-a Toomu$_1$ omugaati$_2$.
Jane 3s-PAST-bring-APPL-FV Tom bread
'Jane brought Tom bread.'

c. Jeeni a-ko-ombek-er-a Toomu$_1$ enju$_2$.
Jane 3s-PAST-build-APPL-FV Tom house
'Jane built Tom a house.'

d. Jeeni a-ka-handiik-ir-a Toomu$_1$ ebaruha$_2$.
Jane 3s-PAST-write-APPL-FV Tom letter
'Jane wrote Tom a letter.'

e. Jeeni a-ka-hungur-r-a Toomu$_1$ omupiira$_2$.
Jane 3s-PAST-throw-APPL-FV Tom ball
'Jane threw Tom the ball.'

(11) N-a-mu$_1$-gul-idd-e olugoye$_2$.[11] [Luganda]
1s-PAST-3s-buy-APPL.PERF-FV dress
'I bought her a dress.' (McPherson 2008: 84)

Whereas we have seen that possession is encoded in the above Rutooro examples (and also the Luganda ones), it is not the only reading encoded in some of the sentences, as such sentences encode benefaction as well. But typically, (8a), (10a) and (10b) encode possession, while (8b), (10c), (10d) and

[10] Also, see McPherson & Paster (2008: 60 fn. 10).
[11] The interlinear gloss is mine.

(10e) encode both possession and benefaction.[12] For example, in addition to the possessive reading in (8b) (namely 'Jane cooked Tom the meal and the meal was (or was supposed to be) in his possession'), it also encodes 'deputative benefaction.'[13] Thus, (8b) also means that 'Jane cooked the meal for Tom so that he didn't have to.' In other words, it was Tom's duty to cook the meal, but Jane did it on his behalf. Similarly, apart from the possessive reading of (6) and (7) discussed above, they also have a 'deputative benefaction' reading, for example, in a situation where Katonga had been asked to read the book (e.g. by his father because the latter is not in position to read) and Mukasa volunteered to help Katonga in such a way that it is Mukasa who did the reading on behalf of Katonga. Similar interpretations are available for the examples (10c), (10d) and (10e) which encode both possession and 'deputative benefaction.' The fact that some DOCs typically encode possession (cf. (8a), (10a) and (10b)), while others encode both possession and benefaction ((8b), (10c), (10d) and (10e)) is mainly due to the verbs' semantics. The reason for this difference is that the events described by the applicativized verbs *–twekera* (send), *–twarra* (take) and *–leetera* (bring) (cf. (8a), (10a) and (10b)) are necessarily viewed as having 'recipients' and not 'beneficiaries.' Conversely, the events described by applicativized verbs such as *–cumbira* (cook), *–ombekera* (build) *–handiikira* (write) *–hungurra* (throw) (cf. (8b), (10c), (10d) and (10e)) are naturally viewed as having both 'recipients' and 'beneficiaries.' However, this does not mean that the applicativized verbs *–twekera* (send), *–twarra* (take) and *–leetera* (bring) cannot be used to encode 'deputative benefaction' at all. In order for them to encode 'deputative benefaction', there is a need to include constituents that will act as recipients/goals introduced by a preposition (12). This will, however, result in quadratic constructions, as opposed to the triadic ones in (8a), (10a), (10b). In this way, the OBJ_1 referents, which in cases such as (8a), (10a) and (10b) are recipients (possessors), will act as 'deputative beneficiaries.' If this is not done as is the case in (8a), (10a), (10b) above, then no 'deputative benefaction' is encoded. Thus, typically, (8a), (10a), (10b) encode possession.[14]

(12) a. Jeeni a-ka-twek-er-a Toomu$_1$ sente$_2$ owa Malia$_3$.
Jane 3s-PAST-send-APPL-FV Tom money P Mary
Lit. 'Jane sent Tom money to Mary/Mary's place'
'Jane sent money to Mary/Mary's place on behalf of Tom.'

b. Jeeni a-ka-twar-r-a Toomu$_1$ egaali$_2$ owa makanika$_3$.
Jane 3s-PAST-take-APPL-FV Tom bike P mechanic
Lit. 'Jane took Tom bike to mechanic/mechanic's place.'
'Jane took the bike to the mechanic/mechanic's place on behalf of Tom.'

The fact that (8b), (10c), (10d) and (10e) encode more than one meaning requires us to put a premium on the role of context as a licensing mechanism. I dub this the CONTEXTUAL CONSTRAINT. The CONTEXTUAL CONSTRAINT highlights the fact that there is a caveat in the resolution of the meaning of the Rutooro DOCs under consideration. This arises out of the fact that the applicativized verbs in such DOCs are not lexically specified, resulting in strings with underdeterminate semantics (which is either possessive or benefactive). The phenomenon points to the fact that linguistic coding in such constructions contributes to meaning only partially (cf. Carston 2002: 15ff.). The hearer has to flesh out the linguistically (lexically) encoded meaning with extra-linguistic content in order to arrive at the intended meaning (see MacDonald et al. 1994 for details on ambiguity resolution). When this is done, the hearer will be in position to tell whether (8b), (10c), (10d) and (10e) encode possession or 'deputative benefaction.' Note that when contextual information is not readily available, given contextual assumptions become more readily accessible than others. This is due to the fact that the lexically encoded meanings (i.e. possession and benefaction) are graded in terms of prototypicality and

[12] The two Luganda examples encode both possession and benefaction.
[13] The terminology is from Van Valin & LaPolla (1997: 383).
[14] If the PP in (12) is interpreted as an adjunct, namely, '**at** Mary's place' (12a) and '**at** the mechanic's place' (12b), then the 'deputative benefaction' reading will be lost, as the OBJ_1 referents will assume their inherent role of 'recipients.' In this case, the English translation of (12) will be *Jane sent Tom money and Tom was at Mary's place* (12a) and *Jane sent Tom the bike and Tom was at the mechanic's place* (12b). Thus, under such circumstances, (12a) and (12b) become triadic constructions and only encode possession, as is the case in (8a), (10a) and (10b).

peripherality, apparently due to frequency of occurrence. Prototypically, (8b), (10c), (10d) and (10e) encode possession, while their benefactive reading is peripheral (but non-trivial). Hence, when such sentences are produced, the more accessible contextual assumption to a hearer is that they encode possession unless contextual information (extra-linguistic content) is available to warrant a benefactive reading (if it is the intended meaning).

We should note that there are cases in Rutooro where applicativized DOCs encode benefaction only (13). Evidently, these are the cases that have been the focus of most studies on applicatives, as Ngonyani (1998: 67) has rightly observed. (13a) encodes 'plain benefaction';[15] namely, when Jane opens the door for Tom, Tom derives the benefit of entering (or seeing what is in, say, the house). Tom does not enter into a possessional relation with the door. (13a) can also have a 'deputative benefaction' reading; that is, Tom was supposed to open the door, but Jane did it on his behalf. (13b) typically encodes a 'deputative benefaction' reading; that is, Jane helped Tom drive the car (Tom's). Thus, (13a) and (13b) are typical cases of benefaction, as they seem not to encode possession at all in the strictest sense of the term, unless we adopt Goldberg's (1995: 144ff.) "metaphorical transfer of effects," which I do not intend to pursue here. If we eschew the "metaphorical transfer of effects" point of view, then we can say that (13a) and (13b) are genuine cases in which no possessional relation obtains between the postverbal arguments.[16] But such cases cannot overshadow obvious cases where possession is encoded, namely (8a), (10a), (10b), as typical cases of possession, and (8b), (10c), (10d) and (10e) as cases where both possession and benefaction are encoded (with possession being prototypical):

(13) a. Jeeni a-ka-kingur-r-a Toomu_1 orwigi_2.
Jane 3s-PAST-open-APPL-FV Tom door
'Jane opened Tom the door.' = 'Jane opened the door for Tom.'

b. Jeeni a-ka-vug-ir-a Toomu_1 emotoka_2.
Jane 3s-PAST-drive-APPL-FV Tom car
Lit. 'Jane drove Tom the car.'
'Jane drove the car for Tom.'

What we need to discern from the foregoing is the fact that the Rutooro DOCs under consideration can be divided into three: those that typically encode possession (cf. (8a), (10a) and (10b)), those that encode possession and benefaction (cf. (8b), (10c), (10d) and (10e)) and those that do not encode possession (cf. (13a) and (13b)). In other words, both possession and benefaction are core semantic properties of the Rutooro DOCs under consideration. The situation in Rutooro reflects Ngonyani & Githinji's (2006: 51 fn. 9) observation that Bantu applicatives are diverse, with some encoding transfer of possession and others encoding benefaction. It is now clear that the Rutooro applicativized DOCs under consideration cannot be said to be 'high applicatives' or 'low applicatives' in keeping with Pylkkänen's (2002, 2008) "universal" typology of applicatives. They are not 'high applicatives', because they encode possession (in addition to encoding benefaction for some of them). In Pylkkänen's taxonomy 'high applicatives' do not encode possession at all. Also, the DOCs are not 'low applicatives', because some of them encode benefaction. According to Pylkkänen, applicatives that encode benefaction fall under 'high applicatives.' The only way out would be to place cases which typically encode possession (cf. (8a), (10a) and (10b)) within the class of 'low applicatives' and those that typically encode benefaction (cf. (13a) and (13b)) within the class of 'low applicatives.' But this poses two problems: First, Pylkkänen (2002: 19, 2008: 14) states that "low applied arguments bear no semantic relation to the verb *whatsoever*: they only bear a transfer of possession relation to the direct

[15] According to Van Valin & LaPolla (1997: 383f.), 'plain benefaction' denotes a situation where a referent derives a psychological or other benefit.

[16] This is not peculiar to Rutooro. The following English examples also present a more or less similar situation, because the OBJ_1 referent cannot possess the OBJ_2 referent, though such constructions are not very common in English.

(i) Open *me* t' door. (Yorkshire English: Beal 2004: 135)
(ii) Slay *me* the dragon (Fauconnier & Turner 1998: 29).
(iii) …an idealistic 18-year-old eager to go kill *him* some Redcoats (Fellbaum 2005: 219).

object [my emphasis].” But in (8a), (10a) and (10b), the applied arguments (OBJ_1) bear a semantic relation to the verb and to the direct objects (OBJ_2). They bear a semantic relation to the verb, because they are added participants to the event described by the verb via applicativization. This, according to Pylkkänen (2002: 19, 2008: 14), is a semantic property of ‘high applicatives.’ Likewise, they bear a semantic relation to the direct objects (OBJ_2), because there is a possessional relation between them (applied arguments or OBJ_1) and the direct objects (OBJ_2). Hence, the cases in (8a), (10a) and (10b) cannot be ‘low applicatives’, because they flout Pylkkänen’s axiom in relation to bearing a semantic relation with the verb. Second, where does one place cases where both possession and benefaction are encoded (cf. (8b), (10c), (10d) and (10e))? As it turns out, only cases which solely encode benefaction ((13a) and (13b)) fit within Pylkkänen’s typology. We have also seen the Luganda examples in (6) and (11) pattern with the Rutooro examples. The above facts not only point to the fact that Pylkkänen’s claim about the universality of her typology is false, but also they show the untenability of the very underpinnings of her typology.[17]

3. Properties of prepositional phrase constructions

PPCs are characterized by the event type semantics X CAUSES Z TO GO TO Y (cf. (4b)), linearly realized by means of a PP following the postverbal NP ((14) and (15)). It follows that the encoded meaning is ‘caused motion to a location’, whereby sentient NPs inside the PPs are viewed as a type of location in an extended semantic field (Jackendoff 1983: 192). Pinker (1989: 83) points out that in (14), John is viewed as “merely a spatial target (possibly asleep or dead).” In other words, reception is not emphasized, though John may eventually catch the ball:

(14) I threw the ball$_2$ to John$_1$. (Pinker 1989: 83)

(15) a. Jeeni a-ka-twar-a enkaito$_2$ owa Toomu$_1$.
Jane 3s-PAST-take-FV shoes P Tom
‘Jane took the shoes to Tom/Tom’s place.’

b. Jeeni a-ka-twek-a egaali$_2$ ye owa makanika$_1$.
Jane 3s-PAST-send-FV bike her P mechanic
‘Jane sent her bike to the mechanic/mechanic’s place.’

c. Jeeni a-ka-leet-a abaana$_2$ owa nyina$_1$ bo.
Jane 3s-PAST-bring-FV children P mother their
‘Jane brought the children to their mother/mother’s place.’

d. Jeeni a-ka-samb-a omupiira$_2$ owa Toomu$_1$.[18]
Jane 3s-PAST-kick-FV ball P Tom
‘Jane kicked the ball to Tom/Tom’s place.’

e. Jeeni a-ka-hungur-a ekalaamu$_2$ owa Toomu$_1$
Jane 3s-PAST-throw-FV pen P Tom
‘Jane threw the pen to Tom/Tom’s place.

[17] Note that the discussion in this section does not include Rutooro monomorphemic verbs such as *–ha* (give) and *–oleka* (show). These verbs pattern with their English counterparts (‘give’ and ‘show’) and encode possession.

[18] The PP in this sentence can be an adjunct, interpreted as ‘at Tom’s place’, when *–samba omupiira* means ‘play soccer’ (and not ‘kick the/a ball’). Children normally play soccer at home. But the preferred construction is usually one where a locative applicative is used (as shown in the example below). Note that locative applicatives are not analysed in this study, as they constitute a different phenomenon.

(i) Jeeni a-ka-samb-ir-a omupiira owa Toomu.
Jane 3s-PAST-play-APPL-FV ball P Tom
Lit. ‘Jane played ball at Tom’s place.’
‘Jane played soccer at Tom’s place.’

I mentioned earlier that there are very few triadic PPCs in Rutooro. This points to a semantic constraint on triadic verbs, referred to here as the LOCATIONAL CONSTRAINT. The LOCATIONAL CONSTRAINT is a semantic criterion that verbs participating in the Rutooro PPC must obey. It requires verbs that participate in the PPC to have an inherent locational property. That is, a verb that obeys the LOCATIONAL CONSTRAINT denotes a change in the physical location of an entity and lexically encodes a directional meaning. Such a verb expresses the motion of the theme to a landmark. This constraint highlights the strategy that Rutooro uses to lexicalize the conceptual structure of motion events involving its triadic verbs (cf. Talmy 1991). As pointed out in section 1, *–twara* 'take' (15a) obeys the LOCATIONAL CONSTRAINT in that it involves setting an entity in motion so that this entity goes to a location. Other such verbs inherently specified as locational are *–tweka*: 'send' (15b), *–samba* 'kick' (15d), *–leeta* 'bring' (15c), *–hungura* 'throw' (15e), etc. However, the manner of setting entities in motion when these verbs are used is not the same. While *–twara* (take) and *–leeta* (bring) involve 'accompanied motion', *–tweka* (send) does not involve any accompaniment. *–Samba* (kick) and *–hungura* (throw), on the other hand, involve 'ballistic motion' (cf. Pinker 1989: 82ff.). We should remind ourselves that these verbs are not inherently triadic verbs; rather, they are inherently dyadic verbs which can optionally select additional arguments introduced by the preposition *owa* in the PPC. Such additional arguments are non-core arguments.[19]

It is instructive to note that apparently, Rappaport & Levin (2008: 138) have in mind some version of the LOCATIONAL CONSTRAINT when they state that only verbs which lexically denote a change in physical location can license PPCs with a directional meaning.[20] It is the lack of inherent locational properties in other Rutooro triadic verbs that makes them incapable of accommodating the PPC. For example, the Rutooro verbs *–ha* (give), *–oleka* (show) and *–gamba* (tell), as well as their English counterparts *give*, *show* and *tell*, lack inherent locational properties. Pinker (1989: 83) observes that "*give* cannot be used to mean the physical motion of an object." However, unlike Rutooro which does not allow *–ha* (give), *–oleka* (show) and *–gamba* (tell) in the PPC (e.g. (3b)), English allows *give*, *show* and *tell* to be used in the PPC.[21] Granted that Pinker's (1989) claim is valid and *give* lacks inherent locational properties, the fact that a sentence like *Jane gave a book to Tom* is grammatical, while an equivalent formal variety in Rutooro (cf. 3b) is not well formed, seems to be attributed to the preposition *to*, which has allative semantics.[22] Conversely, Rutooro *owa* fails to encode a direction

[19] There has been a recurrent debate on whether such additional constituents should be treated as arguments or adjuncts. I am not going to engage in this debate in this paper. The only comment I would like to make here, following Kroeger (2004: 10), is that the distinction between adjuncts and arguments is not always evident. For a discussion on arguments vs. adjuncts, see Huddleston & Pullum (2002: 219ff.), Biber et al. (1999: 129f.) and Van der Leek (1996: 327ff.), among others.

[20] Rappaport & Levin (2008) argue that both the DOC and PPC involving verbs such as *give* only encode 'caused possession'; that the PPC does not encode 'caused motion' because it does not have a possessional path. Rappaport & Levin's proposal could be used to explain why the Rutooro verb *–ha* (give) does not accept the PPC (see (3b)). But this study maintains the general event type semantics of the PPC, i.e. **X** CAUSES **Z** TO GO TO **Y.**

[21] Note that a verb like *–oleka* (show) or *–gamba* (tell) can be used in a clause with a postverbal NP and PP, but the PP must be an adjunct (not an argument), interpreted as *at X's place*. Also, note that *–gamba* only becomes triadic as an applicativized verb (i.e. *–gambira*) and occurs in the DOC.

[22] Ontologically, *to* encodes the concept of direction and its complement is therefore a location (Baker 1992: 41). Colleman & De Clerk (2009: 10) underscore the role of *to* when they state that, "it is the morpheme *to* which brings in the path semantics which distinguishes the prepositional dative from the DOC." However, it has been argued that *to* in triadic PPCs is different from allative *to*; namely, *to* in triadic PPCs has been reanalyzed and no longer has allative semantics. Rather, it has dative semantics, encoding the theta role 'recipient' (Rappaport & Levin 2008: 142ff). But apparently, there is general agreement that dative *to* evolved from allative *to* (McFadden 2002: 108, Cuyckens & Verspoor 1998: 63). This, therefore, suggests that dative *to* contains an aspect of allative semantics that encodes the path followed by the theme (Colleman et al. 2010: 138). In other words, despite the grammaticalization process, the traces of the allative semantics of *to* remain present in dative *to* in line with Hopper's (1991: 22) PRINCIPLE OF PERSISTENCE, whereby a grammaticalized form semantically retains traces of the original lexical item. As a corollary, grammaticalized *to* can be seen as encoding a conceptual path. Thus, whether we treat *to* as an allative preposition or a grammaticalized dative preposition, the central claim that it has allative semantics seems to be invulnerable to the debate. This, therefore, allows us to view English *to* as encoding direction.

reading, because unlike English *to* which has allative semantics, Rutooro *owa* is a locative (stative) preposition, as shown in the brief discussion below.

As pointed out above, I would like to briefly discuss the locativity of *owa. Owa* is a variant of *omwa* (which is derived from *omu* – a class 17 locative in Rutooro). Typically, *owa*, together with *ha* (class 16 in Rutooro), is used in relation to 'open areas,' e.g. *owa Toomu* = 'at Tom's home,' *ha kanisa* = 'at the church,' while *omwa* (together with its stem *omu*) is used in relation to 'containment,' e.g. *omwa Toomu* = 'in Tom's home,' *omu kanisa* = 'in the church.' *Owa* and *omwa* strictly take NP complements whose referents are human. Therefore, it is adequate to treat their terminal *–a* as a relational (genitive or associative) morpheme (as this is the morpheme used in Rutooro as the equivalent of *of*), on a par with Swahili *kwa*, i.e. locative *ku–* + relational *–a* (cf. Bentley 1998: 181, Ashton 1944: 171ff.). Thus, we have *omu* +*-a* = *omua* → *omwa. Owa* could be said to have been derived directly from *omwa*. The two locatives contain the same segments apart from /m/. This suggests that it is this segment that brings in the difference in meaning between the two. The removal of /m/ may be seen as a way of 'desemanticizing' *omwa* so as to derive a form that is not associated with 'containment' – the underlying semantic constituent in *omwa*. Hence, the general meaning of *owa* and *omwa* is *at/in the location of*. They do not necessarily mean *at/in the home/house of* (although this is the prototypical meaning), since there are instances where they are used without pointing to this meaning, e.g. in *Omurwairi ali owa dakitaali* = 'The patient is at the doctor's,' the PP means *at the doctor's* (i.e. where the doctor works/is working). Note that while there is a difference between *owa* and *omwa*, once the LOCATIONAL CONSTRAINT is met in a string, apparently this distinction is lost. Both *owa* and *omwa* can now assign the semantic role 'goal' to their complement NPs with sentient human referents, and they can be used interchangeably. In fact some native speakers prefer *omwa*, while others use both. But it is not in the scope of this paper to discuss microparametric variations. We should note that when the NP inside the PP is plural, the form used is *omu* (16). This form is also used in constructions where the NP within the PP is an inherently spatial non-sentient referent (e.g. *omu katale* 'in the market' or 'to the market' when *allativized*) to encode 'containment.' (When no 'containment' is encoded, *–ha* is used with such NPs.) It is interesting to note that the form used with plural NPs has no associative *–a*. It seems that with plural NPs, there is no genitive relation established between the 'location' and the NP referents, apparently because here the 'location' is not associated with a single referent:[23]

(16) Toomu a-ka-twar-a omukazi$_2$ we *omu* bazaire$_1$ be.
Tom 3s-PAST-take-FV wife his P parents his
'Tom took his wife to his parents/parents' place.'

In this study, I maintain that NPs within the PP of the type of PPCs under consideration should be viewed as goals (cf. Jackendoff 1983: 192, Pinker 1989: 83, Colleman et al. 2010: 137). In the Rutooro examples (15) the locative preposition *owa* assigns the semantic role 'goal' owing to the context or specifically the co-text (i.e. the verbs are locational). The context (i.e. extra-linguistic content) also determines whether the NP inside the PP, for example, in (15a) should be interpreted as a 'non-sentient goal' (17a) or a 'sentient goal' (17b). The same holds for the rest of the strings in (15). Abdulaziz (1996: 121) states that the second postverbal argument in the Swahili example (18) has two interpretations, namely *to me* (i.e. a 'sentient goal') and *to my place* (i.e. a 'non-sentient goal').

(17) a. Jane took the shoes$_2$ to Tom's place$_1$.
b. Jane took the shoes$_2$ to Tom$_1$.

(18) A-li-let-a kitabu$_2$ kwa-ngu$_1$. [Swahili] (Abdulaziz 1996: 121)
3s-PAST-bring-FV book P-POSS.1
'He brought the book to me/to my place.'

[23] There are several subtleties involved in the use of *owa* and its variants that I have not covered here lest I digress considerably, for example, the dropping of the augment in (16) (that is, instead of *abazaire*, we have *bazaire*), cases where the NP inside the PP is a non-human but animate entity (e.g. dog), etc.

Given the role of context in the assignment of the semantic role 'goal' and the interpretation between 'non-sentient goal' and 'sentient goal', there is a need to posit that the Rutooro PPC requires the CONTEXTUAL CONSTRAINT as an ancillary constraint to the LOCATIONAL CONSTRAINT. The CONTEXTUAL CONSTRAINT on the PPC should be divided into two subtypes, namely the CO-TEXTUAL SUB-CONSTRAINT and the INTERPRETIVE SUB-CONSTRAINT. The CO-TEXTUAL SUB-CONSTRAINT is closely related to the LOCATIONAL CONSTRAINT, but differs from it with respect to focus. While the LOCATIONAL CONSTRAINT focuses on the verb, the CO-TEXTUAL SUB-CONSTRAINT focuses on the preposition. The CO-TEXTUAL SUB-CONSTRAINT permits the locative *owa* to assign the theta role 'goal' to the NP inside the PP, since unlike English *to* which is lexically specified, Rutooro *owa* is contextually (or actually co-textually) specified; that is, for it to assign the theta role 'goal', it must be used with a verb that obeys the LOCATIONAL CONSTRAINT. This means that given that *owa* is a locative, it would naturally assign the specific 'stative location' theta role to the NP. But the co-text (the fact that the governing verb meets the LOCATIONAL CONSTRAINT) allows it to assign the specific theta role 'goal' to the NP. The INTERPRETIVE SUB-CONSTRAINT, on the other hand, is crucial in determining whether the NP inside the PP should be construed as a 'non-sentient goal' (cf.17a) or as a 'sentient goal' (cf.17b). This is another aspect of the lexical underspecification of *owa*, although prototypically the NP inside the PP is interpreted as a 'non-sentient goal.'[24] The INTERPRETIVE SUB-CONSTRAINT is dependent on extra-linguistic content.

The 'non-sentient goal' interpretation of these PPCs is the prototypical interpretation. For example, in (15a), the more accessible interpretation is that of 'Jane took the shoes to Tom's place' ('non-sentient goal' interpretation). But a 'sentient goal' interpretation is possible, for example, in a situation where Tom is a cobbler. In this context, when a speaker produces (15a), he/she means that 'Jane took the shoes to Tom' ('sentient goal' interpretation). The NPs inside the PPs in (15d) and (15e) are also, in the main, interpreted prototypically (that is 'non-sentient goal'), but their peripheral interpretation ('sentient goal') also obtains. However, in some cases the 'sentient goal' interpretation is more salient. For example, in (15b), the 'sentient goal' interpretation 'Jane sent her bike to the mechanic' is more salient than the 'non-sentient goal' interpretation. This could be due to other co-textual factors such as the presence of the common noun 'makanika' (mechanic) which denotes a profession and is not conceptually associated with someone's home. In fact, even if Jane actually sent her bike to the mechanic's home, if she sent it there for repair, then the 'sentient goal' interpretation' is the intended meaning. The reason for this is that it is the mechanic who is the target and not his/her home. However, despite the salience of the 'sentient goal' interpretation in (15b), the 'non-sentient' goal interpretation is also possible. For example, if there is only one mechanic in an area (which is very common in the region where Rutooro is spoken) such that the word 'makanika' in that area refers to a uniquely identifiable person, then in such a situation (15b) can mean 'Jane sent her bike to the mechanic's place' (e.g. for storage). The use of other common nouns denoting someone's profession such as 'tailor', 'carpenter', 'doctor', etc. as NP referents within the PP would trigger a similar situation as in (15b), namely, the salience of the 'sentient goal' interpretation. In (15c), the 'non-sentient goal' interpretation is dominant, but also the 'sentient goal' interpretation is salient. It all depends on what the speaker intends to communicate. Crucially, both the 'non-sentient goal' and 'sentient goal' interpretations are compatible with the 'localist' approach to triadic PPCs adopted in this study, that is, the event type semantics in (4b). Note that the prototypicality of the 'non-sentient goal' interpretation can be viewed in terms of Luraghi's (2011: 216) observation that "a human being's habitual location provides a better landmark for spatial reference than the human being himself."

4. Conclusion

In this paper, I have addressed and remedied gaps in the study of applicativized DOCs. Whereas applicativized DOCs have been widely studied, one of their core properties, i.e. possession has not been given due attention. On the basis of Rutooro data, I have shown that possession is not only one of the

[24] A syntactic representation of the prototypical interpretation ('non-sentient goal') requires us to assume that there is a non-overt (empty) noun that refers to 'home' and heads the NP inside the PP (also see Carstens 2008: 150 for a related proposal).

meanings expressed by such DOCs, but it is also a core component in the semantics of the constructions under consideration. I have also shown that semantic properties alone cannot form the basis for positing a good taxonomy of the type of applicativized DOCs discussed in the paper. Rather, a premium must be put on the proviso that the context imposes on the meaning resolution of the constructions. The paper has also examined the properties of Rutooro triadic PPCs whose NPs inside the PPs instantiate the semantic role 'goal.' I have shown that these PPCs are not only constrained by a LOCATIONAL CONSTRAINT (i.e. the governing verb must be spatial), but also they are constrained by contextual (i.e. co-textual and extra-linguistic) factors.

References

Abdulaziz, Mohamed H. 1996. *Transitivity in Swahili*. Köln: Rüdiger Koppe Verlag.

Ashton, E.O. 1944. *Swahili Grammar*. London: Longmans.

Asiimwe, Allen & Dorothee Beermann. 2010. The Morpho-syntax of locative expressions in Runyankore-Rukiga. (ms). Makerere University Kampala and NTNU-Trondheim.

Baker, Mark C. 1988. *Incorporation: A Theory of Grammatical Function Changing*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Baker, Mark C. 1992. Thematic conditions on syntactic structure: evidence from locative applicatives. In Roca, I.M. (ed.). *Thematic Structure: Its role in Grammar*. Berlin: Foris.

Beal, Joan C. 2004. The Morphology and Syntax of English Dialects in the North of England. In Kortmann, Bernd, Kate Burridge, Rajend Mesthrie, Edgar W. Schneider & Clive Upton. (eds.). *A Handbook of Varieties of English, Volume II.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Beavers, John. 2010. An Aspectual Analysis of Ditransitive Verbs of Caused Possession in English. *Journal of Semantics 28: 1-54.*

Bentley, Mayrene. 1998. The Marking of Grammatical Relations in Swahili. *Studies in African Linguistics 27.2: 178-197.*

Biber, Douglas, Stig Johansson, Geoffrey Leech, Susan Conrad & Edward Finegan. 1999. *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English.* London: Longman.

Bresnan, Joan & Jonni M. Kanerva. 1989. Locative Inversion in Chichewa: A Case Study of Factorization in Grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry 20.1: 1-50.*

Bresnan, Joan & Sam A. Mchombo. 1995. The Lexical Integrity Principle: Evidence from Bantu. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 13: 181-254.*

Carstens, Vicki. 2008. DP in Bantu and Romance. In Demuth, Katherine & Cécile De Cat. (eds.). *The Bantu-Romance Connection: a comparative investigation of verbal agreement, DPs, and information structure*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Carston, Robin. 2002. *Thoughts and Utterances: The Pragmatics of Explicit Communication.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Colleman, Timothy & Bernard De Clerk. 2009. 'Caused motion'? The semantics of English to-dative and Dutch *aan*-dative. *Cognitive Linguistics 20.1: 5-42.*

Colleman, Timothy, Bernard De Clerk & Magda Devos. 2010. Prepositional Dative Constructions in English and Dutch. A Contrastive Semantic Analysis. *Neuphilologiche Mitteilungen 111.2: 132-152*.

Cuyckens, Hubert & Marjolijn Verspoor. 1998. On the road to *to*. In Van der Auwera, Johan, Frank Durieux & Ludo Lejeune. (eds.). *English as a Human Language*. Munich: Lincon.

Fauconnier, Gilles & Mark Turner. 1998. Blending as a central process of grammar: Expanded version (ms). www.markturner.org.

Fellbaum, Christiane. 2005. Examining the constraints on the benefactive alternation by using the World Wide Web as a corpus. In Reis, Marga & Stephan Kesper. (eds.). *Linguistic Evidence: empirical, theoretical, and computational perspectives*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Georgala, Effi & John Whitman. 2009. Ditransitives and applicative structure in Greek. *Proceedings of the 43rd Annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society (CLS43)*. Chicago.

Goldberg, Adele E. 1995. *Constructions: A Construction Approach to Argument Structure*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Harley, Heidi. 2002. Possession and the double object construction. In Pica, Pierre. (ed.). *Linguistic Variation Yearbook 2: 26-68*.

Hopper, Paul. 1991. On some principles of grammaticalization. In Traugott, Elizabeth Closs & Bernd Heine. (eds.). *Approaches to Grammaticalization, Vol.1.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Huddleston, Rodney & Geoffrey K. Pullum. 2002. *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jackendoff, Ray. 1983. *Semantics and Cognition*. London: MIT Press.

Krifka, Manfred. 2003. Semantic and Pragmatic Conditions for the Dative Alternation. *Proceedings of the KASELL International Conference on English Language and Linguistics, Seoul, June 25-26*.

Kroeger, Paul R. 2004. *Analyzing Syntax: A Lexical Functional Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Luraghi, Silvia. 2011. The coding of spatial relations with human landmarks. In Kittilä, Seppo, Katja Västi & Jussi Ylikoski. (eds.). *Case, Animacy and Semantic Roles.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

MacDonald, Maryellen C., Neal J. Pearlmutter & Mark S. Seidenberg. 1994. Lexical Nature of Syntactic Ambiguity Resolution. *Psychological Review 101.4: 676-703*.

Malchukov, Andrej, Martin Haspelmath & Bernard Comrie. (eds.). 2010. *Studies in Ditransitive Constructions: A Comparative Handbook*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Marantz, Alec. 1993. Implications of Asymmetries in Double Object Constructions. In Mchombo, Sam. (ed.). *Theoretical Aspects of Bantu Grammar.* California: CSLI Publications.

McFadden, Thomas. 2002. The Rise of to-Dative in Middle English. In Lightfoot, David W. (ed.). *Syntactic Effects on Morphological Change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McPherson, Laura. 2008. A Descriptive and Theoretical Account of Luganda Verbal Morphology. Unpublished BA thesis, Scripps College.

McPherson, Laura and Mary Paster. 2009. Evidence for the Mirror Principle and Morphological Templates in Luganda Affix Ordering. In Ojo, Akinloye & Lioba Moshi. (eds.). *Selected Proceedings of the 39th Annual Conference on African Linguistics*. Sommerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project, 56-66.

Ndoleriire, Oswald & Celestino Oriikiriza. (eds.). 1996. Runyakitara Language. Course Manual. (ms). Makerere University Kampala

Ndoleriire, Oswald, John Kintu, Jacinta Kabagenyi & Harriet Kasande. 2009. *Runyoro/Rutooro-English Dictionary.* Kampala: Fountain Publishers.

Ngonyani, Deo. 1998. Properties of Applied Objects in Kiswahili and Kindendeule. *Studies in African Linguistics 27.1: 67-95.*

Ngonyani, Deo & Peter Githinji. 2006. The Asymmetric Nature of Bantu Applicative Constructions. *Lingua 116: 31-63*.

Oh, Eunjeong. 2006. Second Language Acquisition of the English Double Object Constructions by Korean Speakers. PhD Dissertation: University of South California.

Pinker, Steven. 1989. *Learnability and Cognition*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Pylkkänen, Lina. 2002. Introducing Arguments. PhD Dissertation. MIT.

Pylkkänen, Lina. 2008. *Introducing Arguments.* Cambridge: MIT Press.

Rappaport-Hovav, Malka & Beth Levin. 2008. The English dative alternation: The case of verb sensitivity. *Journal of Linguistics 44: 129-167.*

Rubongoya, L.T. 1999. *A Modern Runyoro-Rutooro Grammar*. Köln: Rüdiger Koppe Verlag.

Talmy, Leonard. 1981. Path to Realization: A Typology of Event Conflation. *Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society 17: 480-519.*

Van der Leek, Frederike. 1996. Rigid Syntax and Flexible Meaning: The Case of English Ditransitive. In Goldberg, Adele E. (ed.). *Conceptual Structure, Discourse and Language.* Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Van Valin, Robert D. & Randy LaPolla J. 1997. *Syntax: Structure, Meaning, and Function*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Selected Proceedings of the 42nd Annual Conference on African Linguistics: African Languages in Context

edited by Michael R. Marlo, Nikki B. Adams, Christopher R. Green, Michelle Morrison, and Tristan M. Purvis

Cascadilla Proceedings Project Somerville, MA 2012

Copyright information

ISBN 978-1-57473-453-9 library binding

Ordering information

Orders for the library binding edition are handled by Cascadilla Press.
To place an order, go to www.lingref.com or contact:

Cascadilla Press, P.O. Box 440355, Somerville, MA 02144, USA
phone: 1-617-776-2370, fax: 1-617-776-2271, sales@cascadilla.com

Web access and citation information

This entire proceedings can also be viewed on the web at www.lingref.com. Each paper has a unique document # which can be added to citations to facilitate access. The document # should not replace the full citation.

This paper can be cited as:

Isingoma, Bebwa. 2012. Triadic Constructions in Rutooro. In *Selected Proceedings of the 42nd Annual Conference on African Linguistics*, ed. Michael R. Marlo et al., 149-160. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project. www.lingref.com, document #2766.