

Resumptive pronouns in ditransitive constructions: The case of Baule

Denis CREISSELS
Université Lumière (Lyon2)
denis.creissels@univ-lyon2.fr

Jérémie KOUADIO
Université d'Abidjan-Cocody
kouadinj@yahoo.fr

1. Introduction

This paper discusses the status of resumptive pronouns occurring in the construction of the Baule verb *man* ‘give’, and the possibility to analyze this construction as a monotransitive construction with the recipient in the syntactic role of genitive.¹

The recognition of constructions in which the recipient of a verb ‘give’ is syntactically a genitival modifier of the gift was proposed in Creissels 1979 for Baule and a few other languages spoken in various parts of the world. More recently, similar proposals have been discussed by other authors (see in particular Croft 1985, Lehmann & al 2004, Daniel 2006). This possibility is mentioned as *possessive strategy* in the typology of strategies for coding three-participant events put forward by Anna Margetts and Peter Austin, who rightly observe that “at times it is unclear whether a given example is an instance of the possessive strategy or the oblique strategy, reflecting difficulties in determining whether a genitive nominal or NP is embedded within another (possessive strategy), or is a clause-level adjunct or oblique” – Margetts & Austin 2007.

In the case of Baule, the analysis of the sequence *recipient – gift* in the construction of *man* ‘give’ as a genitival construction was suggested by the presence of resumptive pronouns which are not expected to occur between two objects in a ditransitive construction, whereas resumptive pronouns do occur in the genitival construction of Baule.²

The aim of this paper is to resume the analysis of the construction of the Baule verb *man* ‘give’, and more generally to discuss the status of resumptive pronouns in the ditransitive constructions of Baule, on the basis of additional data that do not figure in our 1977 Baule grammar (Creissels & Kouadio 1977).

The paper is organized as follows: after giving basic information on Baule grammar (section 2), we present the competition between monoverbal constructions and synonymous serial verb constructions characteristic of most trivalent verbs (section 3). In section 4, we compare the syntactic properties of *man* ‘give’ with those of *kle* ‘show’, whose monoverbal

¹ We would like to thank Felix Ameka and Martha Larson for very helpful comments on previous versions of this paper.

² In our use of this term, the characteristic property of resumptive pronouns is that their occurrence is conditioned by the existence of a particular syntactic configuration involving their antecedent and the head of the construction within which they fulfill a particular role.

construction ignores the restrictions that limit the use of the monoverbal construction of *man*. The evidence supporting the analysis of the monoverbal construction of *man* ‘give’ as a monotransitive construction is presented in section 5, whereas in section 6 we examine additional data leading to the conclusion that this analysis must be rejected. In section 7, we propose an analysis of the resumptive pronoun occurring in the construction of *man* ‘give’ compatible both with the data discussed in sections 5 & 6 and with the fact that resumptive pronouns also occur in the construction of other semantically trivalent verbs for which a monotransitive analysis is excluded. In section 8, we compare the resumptive pronouns occurring in the construction of Baule trivalent verbs with ‘linkers’ found in other African languages with a similar distribution.

2. Some basic information on Baule grammar

Baule is a language belonging to the Tano branch of Kwa, spoken in Ivory Coast by approximately 2 million speakers. In contrast with most of its closest relatives (Anyi, Nzema, Akan, etc.), Baule has a seven vowel system without ATR harmony. Baule ignores gender / class agreement, and shows only frozen vestiges of an ancient system of noun inflection involving prefixes.

2.1. Core syntactic roles

Baule intransitive and monotransitive clauses are characterized by a rigid S V (X) / A V P (X) constituent order.³ Core NPs are not case marked, and verbs do not agree with any of their arguments.

- (1) a. *Àliě'n à wùtú*
 canoe-DEF PRF capsize
 ‘The canoe has capsized’
- b. *Táluá'n sú tòn trō*
 girl-DEF PROG cook soup
 ‘The girl is cooking the soup’
- c. *Kòfí bò-lì táluá'n*
 Kofi hit-PFV girl-DEF
 ‘Kofi hit the girl’

Verb inflection encodes TAM and polarity distinctions. It involves prefixes, suffixes, and tonal variations. Baule verbs have no lexical tone: the tone of verb forms is entirely determined by their syllabic structure, TAM value, and position within the clause they head: whatever the tonal contour determined by the TAM value of a verb form, a demarcative high

³ The alternative APVX order, more or less grammaticalized in many other Kwa languages, depending on the TAM value of the verb, is marginal in Baule, and clearly involves a progressive periphrasis in which the verb occurs in a nominalized form triggering the transposition of the P argument into a genitive.

tone automatically attaches to its last vowel whenever it is not followed by a complement or adjunct.

With the exception of the 2nd person plural pronoun, which has no clitic form, Baule has a paradigm of clitic pronouns used in S/A role. They are underlyingly toneless, their tone being determined by the tonal structure of the verb form to which they are attached.

	indep.pr.	subj.cl.
1SG	<i>mín</i>	<i>n</i>
2SG	<i>wó</i>	<i>a</i>
3SG	<i>í</i>	<i>o</i>
1PL	<i>é</i>	<i>e</i>
2PL	<i>ámùn</i>	–
3PL	<i>bé</i>	<i>be</i>

(2) a. *ò sú bò í*
 3SG PROG hit 3SG
 ‘(S)he is hitting him/her’

b. *ò sú bò í jànvuè`n*
 3SG PROG hit 3SG friend-DEF
 ‘(S)he is hitting his/her friend’

c. *Í jànvuè`n sú bò í*
 3SG friend-DEF PROG hit 3SG
 ‘His/her friend is hitting him/her’

A/S arguments are obligatorily expressed, either by NPs, or by clitic pronouns attached to the verb. Null subjects are not allowed in Baule, either with an anaphoric or arbitrary interpretation. ‘Clitic doubling’ in A/S role is frequent, but not obligatory. With respect to null objects, Baule shows an uncommon pattern of object drop that has been analyzed in detail by Martha Larson (Larson 2002a, Larson 2002b, Larson 2003, Larson 2005).

In addition to their use in S/A role, clitic pronouns can be proclitic to the comitative preposition *nì* in adnominal function (as in *Kòfí nì kuàkú* ‘Kofi and Kouakou’ → *ò nì kuàkú* ‘he and Kouakou’). In all other roles, independent pronouns are used, with however in some conditions optional phonological modifications that can be viewed as the manifestation of a tendency towards cliticization.

2.2. Serial verb constructions

Like the other Kwa languages, Baule has serial verb constructions (henceforth: SVCs)⁴ that can be schematized as follows: A/S V1 (P1) V2 (P2) (X). In comparison with other Kwa

⁴ In our use of this term, a serial verb construction is a complex predicate (i.e., a multiverbal construction showing syntactic evidence of a monoclausal status) involving no morphological marking of the relationship between the verbs that constitute it.

languages like Yoruba or Ewe, in which the categorial status of bare verb stems involved in constructions currently analyzed as SVCs may be questionable, the SVCs of Baule are relatively uncontroversial with respect to the distinction between monoverbal and multiverbal constructions: as illustrated by ex. (3), even when clearly grammaticalized, verbs involved in a multiverbal construction can be inflected for TAM and polarity, and can combine with subject clitics.⁵

- (3) a. *ɔ̀ wàndì-lí bà-lí*
 3SG run-PFV come-PFV
 ‘(S)he arrived running’
- b. *ɔ̀ à fìn ló à bá*
 3SG PRF leave that place PRF arrive
 ‘He has returned from there’
- c. *Bé fá’à bé sá bê bé dí’à likě*
 3PL take-NEG 3PL hand left 3PL eat-NEG thing
 ‘One does not eat with the left hand’
- d. *Ñ kò buàkê ñ trà ábijân*
 1SG go Bouaké 1SG surpass Abidjan
 ‘I go to Bouaké more often than to Abidjan’

But on the other hand, as discussed by Martha Larson, the multiverbal constructions of Baule are particularly problematic with respect to the distinction between serialization proper and covert coordination, and several types of Baule SVCs that correspond with uncontroversial SVCs in other Kwa languages bear a certain resemblance to covert coordination constructions. However, in this paper, we will be concerned only by multiverbal constructions that are clearly not coordination constructions.

2.3. Noun phrases

Nouns are preceded by genitives, and more generally by noun dependents that have the internal structure of NPs, and followed by all other types of noun dependents – ex. (4). Genitives may be resumed by a pronoun anteposed to their head. Depending on the nature of the genitive, the insertion of a resumptive pronoun between the genitive and its head may be optional, as in (4a), or obligatory, as in (4b) (Creissels & Kouadio 1977:331-3).

- (4) a. *Kòfí(i) ákó’n*
 Kofi 3SG chicken-DEF
 ‘Kofi’s chicken’ (lit. ‘Kofi (his) chicken’)

⁵ On SVCs in languages closely related to Baule, see in particular Hellan & al 2003 on Akan. For a general presentation of Baule SVCs, see Kouadio 2000, Larson 2002a, Larson 2003.

- b. *ní jànvuè'm' bé suǎ 'n*
 1SG friend PL 3PL house-DEF
 ‘my friends’ house’ (lit. ‘my friends their house’)
- c. *wó àwlô'n nún ákó*
 2SG yard-DEF in chicken
 ‘a chicken from your place’
- d. *bǎ kángán òsán*
 child small.small three
 ‘three little children’
- e. *bǎ kángán mò bé sí'n wù-lí mún*
 child small.small REL 3PL father-DEF die-PFV PL
 ‘the little children whose father died’

2.4. Adpositions

Baule has just one preposition, the comitative preposition *ní*, whose lexical origin cannot be traced back (although the fact that it can be preceded by clitic pronouns identical with subject clitics suggests that it results from the grammaticalization of a verb in V1 position in a SVC). All postposition-like items are quite obviously grammaticalized nouns. In addition to that, some functions typically assumed by adpositions in non-serializing languages are assumed in Baule by SVCs. For example, ‘V for N’ (N a beneficiary) is rendered as V *man* N (*man* ‘give’) – ex. (5a-b), and ‘V with N’ (N an instrument) is rendered as *fà* N V (*fà* ‘take’) – ex. (5).

- (5) a. *Wǎ kà mín sìkǎ màn mín*
 come count 1SG money give 1SG
 ‘Come and count my money for me’
- b. *Fà sìkǎ'n màn Kuàkú màn mín*
 take money-DEF give Kouakou give 1SG
 ‘Give the money to Kuaku on my behalf’
- c. *ǎ fà làliě'n kpè-lì kpàùn'n*
 3SG take knife-DEF cut-PFV bread-DEF
 ‘He cut the bread with the knife’

3. SVCs in competition with monoverbal constructions

Like other serializing languages, Baule has SVCs with clear semantic functions. But Baule also has SVCs synonymous with monoverbal constructions in which the predicate function is assumed by the verb in V2 position in the SVC, and no functional equivalent of the verb in V1 position (adposition or other) can be identified.

Bivalent verbs describing the manipulation of a patient by an agent can occur in monoverbal constructions with the agent and the patient in A and P role, but they sometimes have an alternative construction with the same denotative meaning, in which they occur in V2 position in a SVC with *fa* ‘take’ in V1 position, followed by the P argument of the verb in V2 position. This construction is however less grammaticalized in Baule than in some other Kwa languages in the sense that the SVC with *fa* is acceptable only if the semantic role of the P argument is compatible with the inherent meaning of *fa*. For example, the contrast between the acceptability of the SVC in (6a) and the unacceptability of the SVC in (6b) is due to the fact that one normally holds a chicken in one’s hands while killing it, which is not the case with a snake, and the same kind of explanation applies to ex. (7).

(6) a. *B'à kùn ákó'n* = *B'à fà ákó'n b'à kùn í*
 3PL-PRF kill chicken-DEF 3PL-PRF take chicken-DEF 3PL-PRF kill 3SG
 ‘They have killed the chicken’

b. *B'à kùn wǒ'n* / **B'à fà wǒ'n b'à kùn í*
 3PL-PRF kill snake-DEF 3PL-PRF take snake-DEF 3PL-PRF kill 3SG
 ‘They have killed the snake’

(7) a. *B'à kà sikká'n* = *B'à fà sikká'n b'à ká*
 3PL-PRF count money-DEF 3PL-PRF take money-DEF 3PL-PRF kill 3SG
 ‘They have counted the money’

b. *B'à kà srân mùn* = **B'à fà srân mùn b'à ká*
 3PL-PRF count person PL 3PL-PRF take person PL 3PL-PRF count
 ‘They have counted the people’

The use of SVCs synonymous with monoverbal constructions is more productive with verbs encoding three-participant events, as illustrated by ex. (8). Note in particular that ex. (8c) shows that the semantic restriction just mentioned for bivalent action verbs does not hold for trivalent verbs.⁶

(8) a. *Kuàkú màn-nìn mín sikká* = *Kuàkú fà-lì sikká màn-nìn mín*
 Kouakou give-PFV 1SG money Kouakou take-PFV money give-PFV 1SG
 ‘Kouakou gave me money’

⁶ Note however that not all trivalent verbs occurring in double object constructions can be paraphrased by SVCs. For example, *sre* ‘ask’ has an alternative construction in which the person asked for something is encoded like a locative adjunct, but no paraphrase by means of an SVC seems to be possible.

(i) *Kuàkú srè-lì mín sikká*
 Kouakou ask-PFV 1SG money
 ‘Kouakou asked me for money’

(ii) *Kuàkú srè-lì sikká n' sá nún*
 Kouakou ask-PFV money 1SG hand in
 ‘Kouakou asked me for money’ (lit. ‘Kouakou asked money from my hand’)

- b. *Kuàkú blè-lì mín biâ* = *Kuàkú fà-lì biâ blè-lì mín*
 Kouakou bring-PFV 1SG chair Kouakou take-PFV chair bring-PFV 1SG
 ‘Kouakou brought me a chair’
- c. *Kuàkú klè-lì mín Kòfí* = *Kuàkú fà-lì kòfí klè-lì mín*
 Kouakou show-PFV 1SG Kofi Kouakou take-PFV Kofi show-PFV 1SG
 ‘Kouakou showed me Kofi’, ‘Kouakou introduced Kofi to me’

But the existence of such relationships between SVCs and monoverbal constructions does not imply that they are freely interchangeable: both may be bound by particular restrictions. A detailed study of these restrictions still remains to be done, but on the whole, monoverbal constructions encoding three-participant events are generally less productive than the corresponding SVCs.

An intriguing aspect of the restrictions to the use of semantically trivalent verbs in monoverbal constructions is that they vary from verb to verb, and these variations seem to involve lexical conditioning.

4. Restrictions to the use of *man* ‘give’ and *kle* ‘show’ in monoverbal constructions

Before analyzing the syntactic properties of *man* ‘give’, it is important to observe that its use in a monoverbal construction is bound by stronger restrictions than the use of some other trivalent verbs, in particular *kle* ‘show’.

Ex. (8a) and (8c) above show that *man* ‘give’ and *kle* ‘show’ have two possible ways to express the participant to whom something is given/shown: either they are immediately followed by the NP representing this participant in a monoverbal construction, or this NP is introduced by *fà* ‘take’ in a SVC. There are however restrictions on the monoverbal construction of *man* ‘give’ that do not apply to *kle* ‘show’: in the monoverbal construction of *man*, the NP representing the thing given cannot be definite, and cannot include a genitive interpreted as a possessor – ex. (9b-c), whereas the NP representing the thing/person shown in the construction of *kle* ignores these restrictions – ex. (9a).⁷

- (9) a. *Kuàkú klè-lì mín wó suǎn*
 Kouakou show-PFV 1SG 2SG house-DEF
 ‘Kouakou showed me your house’

⁷ The same ban on definite NPs in gift role in the monoverbal construction of ‘give’, and more generally on definite NPs in the role of second object of several other ditransitive verbs, has been observed in Akan, as noted a.o. in Osam 2003: “Various studies (Stewart 1963, Lord 1982, Osam 1994a, 1996) have shown that most ditransitive verbs in the language cannot take a Theme NP that is definite in the structure”. The motivation for this restriction on the use of definite NPs in second object role remains unclear. Osam 2003 puts forward an explanation in terms of hierarchical constraints, but this explanation is not sufficient, since definite NPs in second object role are prohibited with some ditransitive verbs only, and are acceptable with some others, in Akan as well as in Baule.

b. **Kuàkú màn-nìn mín wó kpàngô'n*

Kouakou give-PFV 1SG 2SG bicycle-DEF

intended: 'Kouakou gave me your bicycle'

OK: *Kuàkú fà-lì wó kpàngô'n màn-nìn mín*

Kouakou take-PFV 2SG bicycle-DEF give-PFV 1SG

c. **Kuàkú màn-nìn mín sikká'n*

Kouakou give-PFV 1SG money-DEF

intended: 'Kouakou gave me the money'

OK: *Kuàkú fà-lì sikká'n màn-nìn mín*

Kouakou take-PFV money-DEF give-PFV 1SG

This does not mean that the use of *kle* 'show' is devoid of restrictions. As shown by ex. (10), the monoverbal construction of *kle* is impossible when the participant to whom something/someone is shown is not higher than the participant that is shown to him/her in animacy hierarchy.

(10) a. *Kuàkú klè-lì mín Ákísí*

Kouakou show-PFV 1SG Akissi

'Kouakou introduced Akissi to me'

b. **Kuàkú klè-lì Ákísí mín*

Kouakou show-PFV Akissi 1SG

intended: 'Kouakou introduced me to Akissi'

OK: *Kuàkú fà-lì mín klè-lì Ákísí*

Kouakou take-PFV 1SG show-PFV Akissi

c. **Kuàkú klè-lì mín bé*

Kouakou show-PFV 1SG 3PL

intended: 'Kouakou introduced them to me'

OK: *Kuàkú fà-lì bé klè-lì mín*

Kouakou take-PFV 3PL show-PFV 1SG

d. **Kuàkú klè-lì Kòfí Ákísí*

Kouakou show-PFV Kofi Akissi

intended: 'Kouakou introduced Akissi to Kofi'

OK: *Kuàkú fà-lì Ákísí klè-lì Kòfí*

Kouakou take-PFV Akissi show-PFV Kofi

However, cross-linguistically, such restrictions are not uncommon in ditransitive constructions, which is not the case for those observed in the monoverbal construction of *man*

‘give’. This suggests looking for an explanation according to which the monoverbal construction of *man* would not be a ‘true’ ditransitive construction.

5. Evidence supporting the analysis of the monoverbal construction of *man* ‘give’ as a monotransitive construction

In the monoverbal construction of *man* ‘give’, the evidence for recognizing the recipient as a genitive modifier of the gift comes from the fact that the sequence formed by the NPs representing the recipient and the gift in the monoverbal construction of *man* has the appearance of a genitival construction:

(a) when the recipient is represented by a personal pronoun, there is no morphological evidence that this pronoun is syntactically the object of the verb it follows rather than the genitive modifier of the noun it precedes, since Baule uses the same set of pronouns in both roles;

(b) in other cases, a resumptive pronoun appears between the recipient and the gift in the same conditions as in the genitival construction – ex. (11).

- (11) a. *Màn kòǎ́ (í) bóǎ́*
give Kofi (3SG) goat
‘Give Kofi a goat’

(compare with *kòǎ́ (í) bóǎ́* ‘goat belonging to Kofi’)

- b. *Màn blā m̀̀n bé bóǎ́*
give woman PL 3PL goat
‘Give the women a goat’

(compare with *blā m̀̀n bé bóǎ́* ‘goat belonging to the women’)

This strongly suggests a monotransitive analysis according to which *man* is followed by a single NP including a genitival modifier interpreted as a future possessor: ‘Give [a goat intended for Kofi]’. In addition to being consistent with the meaning of possession transfer carried by *man*, this analysis has the advantage of predicting the impossibility to express within the frame of this construction ‘Give me your goat!’, since two pronouns in genitive role cannot immediately follow each other.

6. Evidence against the analysis of the monoverbal construction of *man* ‘give’ as a monotransitive construction

However, if constituency tests are to be taken seriously, in particular those relying on extraction, the analysis suggested by the morphological make-up of the monoverbal construction of *man* ‘give’, although semantically plausible, must be abandoned.

Another reason for rejecting the monotransitive analysis is that *recipient – gift* sequences in the monoverbal construction of give cannot always be interpreted as the realization of a genitival construction.

6.1. Evidence from extraction

Baule has a focalizing construction that can be described as follows:

- the focalized term occurs in sentence initial position, followed by the focalizing particle *yê*;
- resumption of the focused element by an overt pronoun in situ is obligatory if the focalized term is the subject; in other roles, the presence of a resumptive pronoun depends on conditions that have not been fully established yet;
- in all cases, a particle *ò* obligatorily occurs in sentence final position – ex. (12).

(12) a. *Ákísí tò-lì jué*
 Akissi buy-PFV fish
 ‘Akissi bought fish’

b. *Ákísí yê ò tò-lì jué ò*
 Akissi FOC 3SG buy-PFV fish FOC
 ‘It is Akissi that bought fish’

c. *Jué yê Ákísí tò-lì ò*
 fish FOC Akissi buy-PFV FOC
 ‘It is fish that Akissi bought’

When the object of a transitive verb includes a genitival modifier, the entire object NP can be extracted, but it is impossible to extract the head of the genitival construction only, leaving the genitival modifier in situ – ex. (13).

(13) a. *Bè bù-lì Kòfí suǎ'n*
 3PL demolish-PFV Kofi house-DEF
 ‘They demolished Kofi’s house’

b. *Kòfí suǎ'n yê bè bù-lì ò*
 Kofi house-DEF FOC 3PL demolish-PFV FOC
 ‘It is Kofi’s house that they demolished’

c. **Suǎ'n yê bè bù-lì Kòfí ò*
 house-DEF FOC 3PL demolish-PFV Kofi FOC
 intended: ‘They demolished Kofi’s HOUSE’

If the monoverbal construction of *man* ‘give’ were a monotransitive construction with the NP representing the recipient in genitive role, it would be expected to follow the same pattern, but this is not what can be observed: in the monoverbal construction of *man* ‘give’, it

is perfectly possible to extract the NP representing the gift, leaving the NP representing the recipient in situ – ex. (14).

(14) a. *Kuàkú màn-nìn Kòfí (í) bólí*
 Kouakou give-PFV Kofi 3SG goat
 ‘Kouakou gave Kofi a goat’

b. *Bólí yê Kuàkú màn-nìn Kòfí ò*
 goat FOC Kouakou give-PFV Kofi FOC
 ‘It is a goat that Kouakou gave Kofi’

6.2. Sequences *recipient – gift* that cannot constitute genitival constructions

Another piece of evidence against the monotransitive analysis is that the sequence formed by the NPs representing the recipient and the gift cannot always be interpreted as a sequence *genitive – head noun*. The point is that the NP representing the gift in the monoverbal construction of man ‘give’ cannot include a genitive interpreted as a possessor, but can include a genitive expressing a part-whole relationship, giving raise to sequences, such as *mín í sîn* in ex. (15), which in Baule cannot constitute viable genitival constructions.

(15) *Màn mín í sîn*
 give 1SG 3SG half
 ‘Give me half of it’

The acceptability of (15) contrasts with the unacceptability of pronouns sequences in constructions in which both pronouns should be interpreted as genitives, for example in nominalizations, as illustrated by ex. (16).

(16) a. *Wó Kòfí (í) flè-lé'n fù-lì mín nún*
 2SG Kofi 3SG call-NMLZ-DEF climb-PFV 1SG in
 ‘The fact that you called Kofi (lit. ‘your Kofi’s calling’) surprised me’

b. **Wó mín flè-lé'n fù-lì mín nún*
 2SG 1SG call-NMLZ-DEF climb-PFV 1SG in
 intended: ‘The fact that you called me ...’

OK: *Mín flè-lé'n mò à flè-lì mín'n ...*
 1SG call-NMLZ-DEF REL 2SG call-PFV 1SG-DEF
 lit. ‘My calling that you called me ...’

7. Resumptive pronouns in the monoverbal construction of trivalent verbs

7.1. The resumptive pronoun in the construction of *man* ‘give’

The only analysis compatible with the data presented in the preceding sections is that, in spite of the homonymy with the genitival construction:

(a) the NPs representing the recipient and the gift constitute distinct terms in the monoverbal construction of *man* ‘give’;

(b) the resumptive pronoun does not mark agreement of a nominal head with a genitive, but of the second object (representing the gift) with the first object (representing the recipient).

In other words, *Màn blā m̀n bé bóli* ‘Give the women a goat!’ (ex. (11b) above) is not lit. something like ‘Give [a goat intended for the women]’, but rather ‘Give [the women]_i [a goat intended for them]_i’.

Our conclusion is therefore that the monoverbal construction of *man* ‘give’ is a ditransitive construction. It however differs from ordinary ditransitive constructions by involving an uncommon type of agreement mechanism, formally identical with the agreement of nominal heads with genitive modifiers, but in which the controller and the target are the 1st and 2nd object of a ditransitive construction respectively.

Diachronically, the origin of this agreement mechanism is probably the grammaticalization of constructions such as English *Give John his money* interpreted as ‘Give John the money due to him’, which in Baule resulted in sequences *object 1 – object 2* homonymous with sequences *genitive – head noun*.

7.2. Resumptive pronouns in the monoverbal construction of other trivalent verbs

Additional evidence supporting our analysis comes from the occurrence of resumptive pronouns marking agreement between the two non-subject terms following the verb in the construction of trivalent verbs other than *man*. In some cases, for example with *sɛ* ‘ask’ (see footnote 5), the lexical meaning of the verb would be compatible with a monotransitive analysis similar to that discussed for *man* ‘give’ in the preceding sections. But in most cases, in contrast to *man* ‘give’, the semantic roles involved are incompatible with the hypothesis according to which the first of the two terms would be the genitive modifier of the second one. Moreover, in at least some cases, any ‘possessive’ interpretation of the resumptive pronouns is excluded, and the only possible function that can be recognized for it is a purely syntactic one.

Resumptive pronouns similar to that found in the monoverbal construction of *man* ‘give’ occur in particular in the construction of transfer verbs, between the NP representing the thing transferred and the PostpP representing the goal, as illustrated by ex. (17). In some cases, the resumptive pronoun can be semantically justified by the nature of the goal and its relation to the thing transferred (the fridge has been made to put things like milk in it, the fire has been lit to cook food on it), but ex. (17c) is a particularly clear case in which no semantic motivation can be imagined for the presence of the resumptive pronoun: there is no possible motivation for characterizing the sun as ‘the sun of the clothes’.

- (17) a. *Wl̀à nónnón'n í flìgò'n nún*
 put milk-DEF 3SG fridge-DEF in
 'Put the milk into the fridge'
- b. *Siè duò'n í sèmlên'n sú*
 put yam-DEF 3SG burning_charcoal-DEF on
 'Put the yam on the fire'
- c. *Sè tánnìn mùn bé wiá nún mǎn bè wú*
 spread cloth PL 3PL sun in so that 3PL dry
 'Spread the clothes in the sun so that they dry'

Note in particular the two possible readings of sentences such as those of ex. (18), depending on the interpretation of the third person pronoun as a genitive referring to a discursively salient entity, or as an agreement mark.

- (18) a. *Gwà òzân'n í véli'n nún*
 pour wine-DEF 3SG glass-DEF in
 'Pour the wine into the glass', or 'Pour the wine into his/her glass'
- b. *N̄ yàci-lì lòtò'n í klǒ lò*
 3SG leave-PFV car-DEF 3SG village there
 'I left the car in the village' or 'I left the car at his/her place'

In the case of transfer verbs, it is particularly tempting to analyze the resumptive pronoun, whatever its origin, as having grammaticalized as a mark of agreement of a secondary predicate, since semantically, the locative expression in the construction of transfer verbs can be viewed as a predication about the transferee. Moreover, it is conceivable to extend this analysis to the verb 'give':

$X_{\text{agent}} \textit{puts} Y_{\text{transferee}} Z_{\text{location}} \Rightarrow X \textit{ makes } [Y \textit{ be located at } Z]$

$X_{\text{agent}} \textit{ gives} Y_{\text{recipient}} Z_{\text{gift}} \Rightarrow X \textit{ makes } [Y \textit{ have } Z]$

But the possibility to analyze a resumptive pronoun introducing the third term of a three-place construction, and agreeing with the second term, as a marker of secondary predication is particularly obvious when the third term of the construction is an adjective in predicate function, as in ex. (19).

- (19) a. *B'̀à yò suǎ mùn bé dǎn*
 3PL-PRF make house PL 3PL large
 'They have enlarged the houses'
- b. *Màn yò kpàngô í kpá*
 1SG.PRF make bicycle 3SG good
 'I have repaired the bicycle'

c. *B'à yò bé àwló í klànmǎn*
 3PL-PRF make 3PL compound 3SG beautiful
 'They have embellished their compound'

8. Comparison with other languages

In some African languages having S V X / A V P X as their basic constituent order, verb complements or adjuncts that follow the verb but are separated from it by another complement or adjunct must be preceded by a word that has properties somewhat unexpected for a preposition:

- it never contributes to the recognition of the semantic role of the term it licenses, which means that this term is always, either an argument of the verb, or an oblique whose semantic role must be retrievable from its lexical meaning, or marked independently in some other way;

- it never occurs with terms in immediate postverbal position;
- it disappears if the term it licenses moves to a preverbal position.

In addition to that:

- in some of the languages that have this atypical kind of preposition, there is no fixed order of the nominal terms following the verb, which means that, even in the construction of a given verb, the preposition in question may mark any non-subject term (argument or satellite), depending on the linear order of the terms in postverbal position;

- in one of the languages in which a preposition of this kind has been recognized, it agrees with the term in immediate postverbal position.

These prepositions have been variously designated as 'transitive particles' (Dickens), 'default prepositions', 'multipurpose oblique markers' (Güldemann), or 'linkers' (Collins).

In the Khoisan language Ju|'hoan (Dickens 2005), verbs divide into three classes according to the number of the non-subject terms that can be present without triggering the use of the verbal suffix *-a* encoding the presence of a valency-external participant in postverbal position: intransitive, transitive, and ditransitive. Independently of the use of this verbal suffix (glossed VE for 'valency-external participant'), postverbal terms are introduced by the preposition *kò* if and only if they are separated from the verb by another term. Ex. (20) & (21) illustrate this mechanism with the intransitive verb *!áí* 'die' and with the transitive verb */!ohm* 'chop'. Note that, in these examples, there are at most two terms in postverbal position, but the presence of additional terms in postverbal position would require the repetition of *kò* before all postverbal terms not immediately adjacent to the verb.

(20) *Ju|'hoan* (Dickens 2005)

a. *Mí !ú-n!a 'àn !áí*
 1SG grand-father die
 'My grandfather died'

b. *Mí !ú-n!a 'àn !ái-á /Aotcha*
 1SG grand-father die-VE |Aotcha
 ‘My grandfather died at |Aotcha’

c. *Mí !ú-n!a 'àn !ái-á goàq='àn* OR *Mí !ú-n!a 'àn goàq='àn !ái'⁸*
 1SG grand-father die-VE yesterday 1SG grand-father yesterday die
 ‘My grandfather died yesterday’

d. *Ha !ái-á /Aotcha kò /ámà hè*
 3SG die-VE |Aotcha LK today
 ‘He died in |Aotcha today’

e. *Ha !ái-á /ámà hè kò /Aotcha*
 3SG die-VE today LK |Aotcha
 ‘He died in |Aotcha today’

(21) *Ju/'hoan* (Dickens 2005)

a. *Ha kú //ohm !àihn*
 1SG IPFV chop tree
 ‘He was chopping the tree’

b. *Ha kú //ohm-a !àihn kò g/úí*
 1SG IPFV chop-VE tree LK forest
 ‘He was chopping the tree in the forest’

c. *Ha kú //ohm-a g/úí kò !àihn*
 1SG IPF chop-VE forest LK tree
 ‘He was chopping the tree in the forest’

In *Ju|'hoan*, the verb */a 'àn* ‘give’ can be followed by two postverbal terms representing the recipient and the gift. According to the general rule, the second one must be introduced by *kò*. The order */a 'àn – recipient – kò – gift* seems to be usual, but */a 'àn – gift – kò – recipient* is also possible, and valency-external terms may even be inserted between the NPs representing arguments, or precede them – ex. (22).

(22) *Ju/'hoan* (Baker & Collins 2006)

Mi /'an Maria ko ambere ko tzi
 1SG give Maria LK bucket LK outside
 ‘I give Maria the bucket outside’

= *Mi /'an tzi ko Maria ko ambere*
 1SG give outside LK Maria LK bucket

⁸ NPs having a temporal meaning can be placed in preverbal position, in which case the suffix *-a* is not required.

= *Mi /'an Maria ko tzi ko ambere*
 1SG give Maria LK outside LK bucket

= *Mi /'an ambere ko Maria ko tzi*
 1SG give bucket LK Maria LK outside

= *Mi /'an tzi ko ambere ko Maria*
 1S give outside LK bucket LK Maria

= *Mi /'an ambere ko tzi ko Maria*
 1SG give bucket LK outside LK Maria

Atypical prepositions functioning as purely syntactic elements that never contribute to the identification of semantic roles constitute a common feature of non-Khoe South African Khoisan languages.

=Hoan has a preposition *ki* used in much the same way as Ju|'hoan *kò*, with however the important difference that =Hoan has a fixed ordering of postverbal terms (Collins 2003, Collins 2004, Baker & Collins 2006). With monotransitive verbs, the object is obligatorily in immediate postverbal position, whereas with *cu* 'give' – ex. (23), the order is obligatorily *cu* – *recipient* – *ki* – *gift*.

(23) =Hoan (Collins 2003)

Ma 'a cu Jefo ki setinkane
 1SG PROG give Jeff LK hand-harp
 'I am giving Jeff the hand-harp'

The Bantu language Nande has a prepositional clitic very similar in some respects with Ju|'hoan *kò*. Baker & Collins 2006 provides both a detailed description of this aspect of Nande grammar, and a formal analysis aiming at a unified account of this 'linker' and the atypical Khoisan prepositions. Nande has possibilities of variations in the linear order of postverbal terms similar to those of Ju|'hoan. There are however two important differences between Nande and Ju|'hoan:

- in a construction involving more than two successive terms in postverbal position, the Nande 'linker' can occur only once, before the second postverbal term;
- the Nande 'linker' agrees in class with the term in immediate postverbal position.

This mechanism is illustrated in ex. (24) with a monotransitive construction to which an instrumental satellite (encoded as a locative) is added, and in ex. (25) with a ditransitive construction involving applicative derivation of a monotransitive verb.

(24) Nande (Baker & Collins 2006)

a. *Kambale moasenyire olukwi I' omo-mbasa*
 CL1.Kambale AFF.A3CL1.TAM.chop CL11.wood 11.LK LOCCL18- CL9.axe
 'Kambale chopped wood with an axe'

- b. *Kambale moasenyire omo-mbasa m' olukwi*
 CL1.Kambale AFF.A3CL1.TAM.chop LOCCL18- CL9.axe CL18.LK CL11.wood
 'Kambale chopped wood with an axe'

(25) *Nande (Baker & Collins 2006)*

- a. *Kambale asengera omwami y' ehilanga*
 CL1.Kambale AFF.A3CL1.TAM.pack.APPL CL1.chief CL1.LK CL19.peanuts
 'Kambale packed peanuts for the chief'

- b. *Kambale asengera ehilanga hy' omwami*
 CL1.Kambale AFF.A3CL1.TAM.pack.APPL CL19.peanuts CL19.LK CL1.chief
 'Kambale packed peanuts for the chief'

To the best of our knowledge, Nande is the only Bantu language in which similar phenomena have been observed, and it is spoken in an area very far from the South African Khoisan area, which excludes any explanation involving contact phenomena.

The area where Baule is spoken is very far both from the South African Khoisan area, and from the region of East Africa where Nande is spoken. However, a comparison between the 'linkers' found in Nande and in several Khoisan languages and the resumptive pronouns occurring in the monoverbal construction of Baule trivalent verbs reveals striking similarities. This suggests that perhaps the resumptive pronouns in the construction of Baule trivalent verbs represent an early stage in a grammaticalization process whose result could be the conversion of these resumptive pronouns into 'linkers' devoid of semantic content but necessary to license postverbal verb dependents that are not contiguous to their head.

As indicated at the end of section 7, the Baule data suggests that, starting from cases in which possessive marking of the second object in a double object construction is semantically motivated, the reanalysis of this possessive marking as secondary predicate agreement may constitute a crucial move in such an evolution.

9. Conclusion

In this paper, we have shown that, although there is some evidence suggesting that the monoverbal construction of the Baule verb *man* 'give' is a monotransitive construction with the recipient NP in genitive role, this analysis must be rejected. We have shown that the resumptive pronouns involved in this construction more generally occur in monoverbal constructions of trivalent verbs, including cases in which there is no possibility to analyze them as encoding a possessive relation, and the only semantic justification one can imagine for their presence between two arguments of the same verb is the possibility to interpret the relationship between these two arguments in terms of secondary predication. We have concluded that the resumptive pronouns occurring in the construction of Baule trivalent verbs might represent an early stage in a grammaticalization process leading to the emergence of 'linkers' devoid of any semantic content, but required to license verb dependents that are not contiguous to their head.

Abbreviations

Numbers preceded by ‘CL’ indicate noun classes; otherwise, they indicate persons

AFF: affirmative
APPL: applicative
CL: noun class
DEF: definite
FOC: focalization
IPFV: imperfective
LK: linker
LOCCL: locative class
NEG: negation
NMLZ: nominalizer
PL: plural
PRF: perfect
PROG: progressive
PFV: perfective
SG: singular
TAM: tense-aspect-modality
VE: valency external participant

References

- Ameka F. 2005. ‘Forms of secondary predication in serializing languages’. In Himmekmann, N. & E. Schultze-Berndt, *Secondary predication and adverbial modification. The typology of depictives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 355-78.
- Ameka F. 2006. ‘Ewe serial verb constructions in their grammatical context’. In Aikhenvald, A & R. Dixon, *Serial verb constructions. A cross-linguistic typology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 124-143.
- Baker, M. C. & C. Collins. 2006. ‘Linkers and vP structure’. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 24. 307-354.
- Collins, C. 2003. ‘The internal structure of vP in Ju|’hoan and =Hoan’. *Studia Linguistica* 57. 1-25.
- Collins, C. 2004. ‘The absence of the linker in double object constructions in N|uu’. *Studies in African Linguistics* 33/2. 163-198.
- Comrie B. 2005. ‘Towards a typology of ditransitive constructions’. 6th Congress of the Association for Linguistic Typology. Padang (Indonesia).
- Creissels, D. 1979. *Les constructions dites “possessives”, étude de linguistique générale et de typologie linguistique*. Thèse de doctorat d'état. University of Paris 4.
- Creissels, D. & N. Kouadio. 1977. *Description phonologique et grammaticale d'un parler baoulé*. Abidjan: Institut de Linguistique Appliquée.

- Daniel, M. 2006. 'Monotransitivity in 'give'-constructions (exploring the periphery of ditransitives)'. Conference 'Rara and Rarissima'. Leipzig, MPI.
- Dickens, P. D. 2005. *A concise grammar of Ju/'hoan*. Cologne: Rüdiger Köppe.
- Haspelmath, M. 2005a. 'Ditransitive constructions: the verb *give*'. In Haspelmath, M., M. Dryer, D. Gil, & B. Comrie (eds.), *The World Atlas of Language Structures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 426-429.
- Haspelmath, M. 2005b. 'Argument marking in ditransitive alignment types'. *Linguistic Discovery* 3. [free online journal, linguistic-discovery.dartmouth.edu]
- Hellan, L., D. Beermann, & E. Saetherø Andenes. 2003. 'Towards a typology of serial verb constructions in Akan'. In Dakubu M.E. & E. Osam (eds.) *Proceedings of the Legon/Trondheim Linguistics Project Annual Colloquium*. 61-86.
- Kouadio, J. 2000. 'Les séries verbales en baoulé: Questions de morphosyntaxe et de sémantique'. *Studies in African Linguistics* 29/1. 75-90.
- Larson, M. 2002a. 'Baule SVCs: Two distinct varieties of missing objects'. In Dakubu M.E. & E. Osam (eds.) *Proceedings of the Legon/Trondheim Linguistics Project Annual Colloquium*. 87-109.
- Larson, M. 2002b. 'The semantics of object drop in Baule'. In Nissim, M. (ed.). *Proceedings of the Seventh ESSLI Student Session*.
- Larson, M. 2005. *The Empty Object Construction and related phenomena*. PhD thesis. Cornell University.
- Lehmann, C., Y-M. Shin & E. Verhoeven. 2004. *Direkte und indirekte Partizipation. Zur typologie der sprachlichen Repräsentation konzeptueller Relationen*. (ASSiDUE 13). Second revised edition. Erfurt: Universität.
- Margetts, A. & P. Austin. 2007. 'Three-participant events in the languages of the world: towards a crosslinguistic typology'. *Linguistics* 45/3. 393-451.
- Osam, E. 2003. 'An introduction to the verbal and multi-verbal system of Akan'. In Beermann D. & L. Hellan (eds.), *Proceedings of the workshop on Multi-Verb Constructions*. Trondheim: Norwegian University of Science and Technology.
- Tymian, J., N. Kouadio & J.-N. Loucou. 2003. *Dictionnaire baoulé-français*. Abidjan: Nouvelles Editions Ivoiriennes.

