Ditransitive constructions in Baule

Denis CREISSELS

Université Lumière (Lyon2)

denis.creissels@univ-lyon2.fr

Jérémie KOUADIO

Université d'Abidjan-Cocody

kouadinj@yahoo.fr

1. Introduction

The aim of this paper is to give a typologically-oriented presentation of the most salient features of the constructions in which Baule verbs encoding three-participant events can be involved.[1]

The paper is organized as follows. After giving basic information on Baule grammar (section 2), we present the three types of construction in which Baule trivalent verbs may occur: the transfer construction, and two varieties of double object constructions (section 3). Section 4 provides additional details on the double object construction. Section 5 describes the lexical distribution of the double object construction, and section 6 is devoted to grammaticalized uses of *kle* 'show' and *man* 'give' as valency operators in applicative periphrases.

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. Creissels & Kouadio 1977 provide a general presentation of Baule grammar. Our study is based on the variety of Baule spoken in the surroundings of the town of Toumodi. Our transcription is the standard orthography supplemented by the indication of lexical tones. [2]

In contrast with most of its closest relatives (Anyi, Nzema, Akan, etc.), Baule has a seven vowel system without ATR harmony. Baule lacks gender / class agreement, and shows only frozen vestiges of an ancient system of noun inflection involving prefixed class markers.

---

[1] We would like to thank Martha Larson for very helpful comments on previous versions of this paper.

[2] Baule has relatively little tonal morphology, and with the exception of the Kode dialect, the inherent tones of lexemes show very little dialectal variation, but tonal realizations are determined by a complex system of sandhi tone rules. Creissels & Koudio 1977: 57-131 provide a detailed description of this system in Toumodi Baule.

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 'flagged' (they do not bear case marks, and are not accompanied by adpositions either), 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 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, and their tone is determined by the tonal structure of the verb form to which they are attached.

	indep.pr.	subj.cl.
1SG	*mín*	*n*
2SG	*wɔ́*	*a*
3SG	*í*	*ɔ*
1PL	*é*	*e*
2PL	*ámùn*	–
3PL	*bé*	*be*

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

---

[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. It is found in a progressive periphrasis in which the auxiliated verb occurs in a nominalized form triggering the transposition of the P argument into a genitive.

b. *Ɔ   sú   bò   í   jànvuɛ̀'n.*
   3SG   PROG   hit   3SG   friend-DEF
   'S/he is hitting his/her friend.'

c. *Í   jànvuɛ̀'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 monoverbal independent assertive or interrogative clauses, either with an anaphoric or arbitrary interpretation, and the same applies to the subject of the first verb in serial verb constructions. '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 *nìn* in coordinative function (as in *Kòfí nìn Kuàkú* 'Kofi and Kouakou' → *ɔ̀ nìn 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. 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. (3). Genitives may be resumed by a pronoun inserted before their head. Depending on the nature of the genitive, the insertion of a resumptive pronoun between the genitive and its head may be optional, for example with proper names of persons, as in (3a), or obligatory, for example when the genitive is an NP ending with the definite or plural marker, as in (3b) (Creissels & Kouadio 1977:331-3).

(3) a. *Kòfí (í)   ákɔ́'n*
      Kofi   3SG   chicken-DEF
      'Kofi's chicken' (lit. 'Kofi (his) chicken')

   b. *ń   jànvuɛ̀   m'   bé   suǎ'n*
      1SG   friend   PL   3PL   house-DEF
      'my friends' house' (lit. 'my friends their house')

   c. *wɔ́   àwlô'n   nún   ákɔ́*
      2SG   yard-DEF   in   chicken
      'a chicken from your place'

   d. *bǎ   kánngán   ǹsán*
      child   small.small   three
      'three little children'

e. *bǎ kángán mɔ̀ bé sí'n wù-lí mùn*
child small.small REL 3PL father-DEF die-PFV PL
'the little children whose father died'

2.3. Adpositions

In addition to the preposition *nìn* 'with', Baule has several postposition-like items that are quite obviously grammaticalized nouns. Note that some functions typically assumed by adpositions in non-serializing languages may be assumed in Baule by serial verb constructions. For example, 'V with N' (N an instrument) may be rendered as *fa* N V (*fa* 'take') – ex. (4).

(4)   *ɔ fàà làliɛ̌'n kpɛ̀-lì kpáùn'n.*
3SG take.PFV knife-DEF cut-PFV bread-DEF
'S/he cut the bread with the knife.'

The expression of spatial relations involves genitival constructions in which locational nouns (such as *nún* 'inside', *sìn* 'back', etc.) fulfill the head role, but toponyms and some common nouns frequently involved in the expression of spatial relationships (such as *klɔ̌* 'village') may function as spatial complements or adjuncts without any overt indication of this role.

(5) a. *Kpànngɔ̂'n wò suǎ ì nyrún.*
bicycle-DEF be house 3SG face
'The bicycle is in front of the house.'

b. *Kuàkú wɔ̀-lì Àblòcí.*
Kouakou go-PFV Europe
'Kouakou went to Europe.'

NPs in spatial complement or adjunct role bear no mark of the distinction between static location, origin of movement and destination of movement. In Baule, the lexical meaning of the verb constitutes the only clue to this distinction.

2.4. Serial verb constructions

Serial verb constructions (henceforth: SVCs) constitute a typical aspect of the syntax of Kwa languages.[4] The constructions of Baule commonly analyzed as SVCs can be schematized as follows: A/S V1 (P1) V2 (P2) (X). In comparison with other Kwa languages like Yoruba or Ewe, in which the categorial status of bare verb stems involved in SVCs may be questionable, the SVCs of Baule are uncontroversial with respect to the distinction between monoverbal

---

[4] Serial verb constructions are commonly defined as complex predicates (i.e., multiverbal constructions showing syntactic evidence of a monoclausal status) involving no morphological marking of the relationship between the verbs that constitute it.

and multiverbal constructions: as illustrated by ex. (6), even when clearly grammaticalized, verbs involved in a SVC construction can be inflected for TAM and polarity, and can combine with subject clitics.[5]

(6) a. *Bè   wànndì-lí   bà-lí.*
     3PL   run-PFV   come-PFV
     'They arrived running.'

   b. *Bè   à   fín   ló   à   bá.*
      3PL   PRF   leave   there   PRF   arrive
      'They have returned from there.'

   c. *Bé   fá'à   bé   sá   bê   bé   dí'à   lìkě.*
      3PL   take-NEG 3PL   hand   left   3PL   eat-NEG   thing
      'One does not eat with the left hand.'

   d. *Ǹ   kɔ̀   buàkê   ǹ   trà   ábìjân.*
      1SG   go   Bouaké   1SG   surpass   Abidjan
      'I go to Bouaké more often than to Abidjan.'

But on the other hand, the SVCs of Baule are particularly problematic with respect to the distinction between serialization proper and covert coordination. The only clear things in the analysis of the SVCs of Baule are that: (a) the verbs involved in SVCs show no evidence of undergoing decategorialization, and (b) the verb in V2 position cannot be analyzed as subordinated to the verb in V1 position, since in the absence of an NP between the two verbs, the verb in V1 position shows the demarcative high tone (see section 2.1). By contrast, as discussed in detail in Marta Larson's works, the monoclausal nature of the SVCs of Baule is questionable, and the possibility of an analysis in terms of covert coordination must be considered.

2.5. Object fronting

The transitive verbs of Baule may combine with *fa* 'take' into a particular type of SVC termed here 'object fronting construction' (henceforth OFC). The OFC can be schematized as A *fa* P V (p). A and P are NPs that receive their semantic roles from the transitive verb V, both verbs are inflected as in other varieties of SVCs, and 'p' symbolizes a pronoun resuming P. The occurrence of this resumptive pronoun depends on the transitivity properties of V: p must be present if P is definite and V does not accept null objects with an anaphoric interpretation, as in (7a); it does not appear if V accepts null objects, as in (7b).

(7) a. *B'à   kùn   ákɔ́'n.*   =   *B'à   fà   ákɔ́'n   b'à   kùn   í.*
      3PL-PRF   kill   chicken-DEF   3PL-PRF   take   chicken-DEF 3PL-PRF   kill   3SG
      'They have killed the 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. *B'à*   *kà*   *sìkǎ'n.*   =   *B'à*   *fà*   *sìkǎ'n*   *b'à*   *ká.*
    3PL-PRF   count   money-DEF   3PL-PRF   take   money-DEF   3PL-PRF   count
    'They have counted the money.'

This construction is however less grammaticalized in Baule than in some other Kwa languages in the sense that it implies some degree of similarity between the semantic role V assigns to P and the inherent argument structure of *fa* 'take'. For example, the contrast between the acceptability of the OFC in (7a) and its unacceptability in (8a) 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. (7b) and (8b).[6]

(8)   a. *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.'

    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.'

There are also restrictions on the use of the OFC that reveal its relation to information packaging in the clause. In particular, we have observed that interrogative or negative words cannot be fronted. Since interrogative and negative words are inherently non-topical, this impossibility provides evidence that the OFC marks the object as topical.

3. Types of constructions for trivalent verbs

3.1. Introductory remarks

We distinguish three types of monoverbal constructions in which trivalent verbs may occur: the transfer construction examined in section 3.2, and two types of double object constructions (henceforth DOC) examined in sections 3.3 and 3.4 respectively.[7]

As a rule, verbs occurring in one of these constructions also allow for an OFC in which one of the arguments (the object in the transfer construction, the second object in DOCs) is constructed as the complement of *fa* 'take' – ex. (9).

---

[6] According to Marta Larson (p.c.), this formulation may be too restrictive, and what really makes the OFC available is that A is highly volitional and P highly non-volitional in the discourse, which however can be viewed as an abstraction of P being held in A's hands.

[7] In our use of this term, 'double object construction' is nothing more than the traditional way to designate a construction in which two NPs have coding characteristics similar to those of the monotransitive patient. It leaves entirely open the question of the extent to which the two 'objects' possess or not the other properties characteristic of the monotransitive patient.

(9) a. *Kuàkú blɛ̀-lì   mín   biâ.*
        Kouakou bring-PFV 1SG   chair
        'Kouakou brought me a chair.'

    b. *Kuàkú fà-lì   biâ   blɛ̀-lì   mín.*
        Kouakou take-PFV chair bring-PFV 1SG
        'Kouakou brought me a chair.'

The conditions in which the OFC can or must be used are not identical in all cases. We will see in the following sections that the use of the OFC is generally less restricted with verbs encoding three-participant events than with bivalent verbs, and is even obligatory in certain conditions, which never occurs with monotransitive verbs. There are however cases in which the impossibility to use the OFC with trivalent verbs can be explained by the same constraints as with bivalent verbs.

For example, *srɛ* 'ask' occurs in the transfer construction – ex. (10a) – or in a DOC with the source argument in the role of first object – ex. (10b), but is not accepted in the OFC.

(10) a. *Kuàkú srɛ̀-lì   sìkǎ   ń   sá   nún.*
        Kouakou ask-PFV   money   1SG   hand in
        'Kouakou asked me for money' (lit. 'Kouakou asked money in/from my hand')

    b. *Kuàkú srɛ̀-lì   mín   sìkǎ.*
        Kouakou ask-PFV   1SG   money
        'Kouakou asked me for money.'

    c. **Kuàkú fà-li   sìkǎ   srɛ̀-lì   mín.*
        Kouakou   ask-PFV   money   ask-PFV 1SG

A plausible explanation of this impossibility is that a person asking for money has no power upon the money s/he is asking for.

3.2. The transfer construction

Verbs with a meaning of the type 'put something in a place' or 'remove something from a place' have a construction in which the transferee occurs in immediate postverbal position and behaves in all respects like the patient of typical bivalent action verbs. The NP representing the transferee is followed by a locative phrase, i.e. a phrase of the type found in complement function with movement verbs such as *kɔ* 'go (to a place)' or *fin* 'leave (a place)'. The transferee can be converted into the complement of *fa* in the OFC in the same conditions as the patient-like argument of bivalent verbs.

(11) a. *Guà   ǹzân'n mín   véli'n   nún.*
        pour_out wine-DEF 1SG   glass-DEF in
        'Pour out the wine into my glass.'

b. *Fà ǹzân'n guὲ   í   mín vέlì'n   nún.*
take   wine-DEF pour_out 3SG   1SG   glass-DEF in
'Pour out the wine into my glass.'

An intriguing feature of the transfer construction is however that, when the transferee is not represented by a pronoun and the locative phrase does not include a genitive representing a possessor, a resumptive pronoun that adds nothing to the meaning of the construction may occur in the morphosyntactic slot of genitive dependent in the locative phrase.

(12) a. *Wlà nónnón'n   í   flìgô'n   nún.*
put   milk-DEF   3SG   fridge-DEF   in
'Put the milk into the fridge.' (lit. '... into its fridge.')

b. *Sìὲ   duô'n   í   sὲmlên'n   sú.*
put   yam-DEF 3SG   burning_charcoal-DEF   on
'Put the yam on the fire.' (lit. '... on its fire.')

c. *Sὲ   tánnìn mùn bé wiá nún mǎn   bὲ   wú.*
spread   cloth   PL   3PL sun in   so that   3PL   dry
'Spread the clothes in the sun so that they dry.' (lit. '... in their sun ...')

In the transfer construction, resumptive pronouns compete with pronouns representing possessors for the morphosyntactic slot of genitive of the locative phrase, which gives rise to ambiguous sentences. Sentences such as those of ex. (13) have two possible readings, depending on the interpretation of the third person pronoun as a genitive referring to a discourse salient entity, or as a mere agreement mark.

(13) a. *Gwà   ǹzân'n*$_i$ *í*$_{i/j}$ *vέlì'n   nún.*
pour   wine-DEF   3SG   glass-DEF in
'Pour the wine into the glass.', or 'Pour the wine into his/her glass.'

b. *Ǹ   yàcì-lì lòtô'n*$_i$ *í*$_{i/j}$ *klǒ   lò.*
3SG   leave-PFV car-DEF   3SG   village   there
'I left the car in the village' or 'I left the car in his/her village.'

In some cases, the resumptive pronoun can be semantically justified, at least to a certain extent, by a privileged relationship between the location and 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, so that literal interpretations of (12a) as 'Put the milk into its fridge', or of (12b) as 'Put the yam on its fire' cannot be entirely excluded. However, this construction also occurs in situations in which the relationship between the transferee and the goal/source is purely accidental, as in the first reading of (13b): the village was not created to leave cars in it. In (12c), no semantic motivation can be imagined for the presence of the resumptive pronoun either: there is no possible motivation for characterizing the sun as 'the sun of the clothes'.

We conclude that these pronouns do not contribute to the denotative meaning, and have grammaticalized as agreement marks. Two factors may have played a decisive role in the

grammaticalization process. First, the occurrence of a pronoun in genitive function is semantically justified at least in some cases. Second, the occurrence of a resumptive pronoun is fully justified in the synonymous OFC illustrated by ex. (11b) above, and in the absence of a genitive dependent within the locative phrase, there is no formal evidence that such a resumptive pronoun occupies the morphosyntactic slot of the first object rather than the genitive dependent slot within the locative phrase. Consequently, the development of the use of resumptive pronouns in the monoverbal construction of transfer verbs may be due at least partly to contamination by the synonymous OFC.

Whatever the historical scenario, in the present state of the language a possible functional motivation of this agreement mechanism is that, in the transfer construction, the locative argument can be considered as a secondary predicate expressing a predication about the transferee:

$$X_{agent}\ \textit{puts}\ Y_{transferee}\ Z_{location}\quad = X\ \textit{manipulates}\ Y\ \textit{so that}\ [Y\ \textit{is located at}\ Z]$$

This analysis is supported by the comparison with a three-place construction involving formally identical resumptive pronouns, but in which the third term is not an NP: in the construction illustrated by ex. (14), the resumptive pronoun precedes an adjective expressing a property predicated of the object (*I have repaired the bicycle = I have manipulated the bicycle so that it is good*).

(14) a. *B'à   yò   suǎ   mùn   bé   dǎn.*
    3PL-PRF make house PL   3PL   large
    'They have enlarged the houses.'

  b. *Màn   yò   kpànngô   í   kpâ.*
    1SG.PRF make bicycle   3SG   good
    'I have repaired the bicycle.'

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

We will see in section 3.4 that the recognition of resumptive pronouns in secondary predicate agreement function also gives a satisfactory account of the construction of *man* 'give'.

3.3. The double object construction of *kle* 'show'

The monoverbal construction of *kle* 'show' is an uncontroversial illustration of the type of construction commonly termed 'double object construction'. In this construction, the NP representing the person to whom something/someone is shown precedes the NP representing the person/thing shown. In contrast with the construction of *man* 'give' examined in the following section, it is important to note that in this construction, resumptive pronouns do not occur, and the second object may be a definite NP, a proper name, or an NP including a genitive dependent.

(15) a. *Kuàkú klè-lì Kòfí wɔ́ suǎ'n.*
       Kouakou show-PFV Kofi 2SG house-DEF
       'Kouakou showed your house to Kofi.'

    b. *Kuàkú klè-lì mín Ákísí.*
       Kouakou show-PFV 1SG Akissi
       'Kouakou showed me Akissi.'

However, the monoverbal construction of *kle* is acceptable only if the first object is higher than the second object according the following hierarchy: *personal pronouns > proper names > other NPs*. If this is not the case, the OFC must be used, and this constraint overrides the volitionality constraint according to which the OFC variant should be available only when the entity being shown is an inanimate object that can be manipulated by the person who shows it.

(16) a. **Kuàkú klè-lì Ákísí mín.*
       Kouakou show-PFV Akissi 1SG
       intended: 'Kouakou showed me to Akissi.'

     OK: *Kuàkú fà-lì mín klè-lì Ákísí.*
        Kouakou take-PFV 1SG show-PFV Akissi

    b. **Kuàkú klè-lì mín bé.*
       Kouakou show-PFV 1SG 3PL
       intended: 'Kouakou showed them to me.'

     OK: *Kuàkú fà-lì bé klè-lì mín.*
        Kouakou take-PFV 3PL show-PFV 1SG

    c. **Kuàkú klè-lì Kòfí Ákísí.*
       Kouakou show-PFV Kofi Akissi
       intended: 'Kouakou showed Akissi to Kofi.'

     OK: *Kuàkú fà-lì Ákísí klè-lì Kòfí.*
        Kouakou take-PFV Akissi show-PFV Kofi

Note that, when the DOC is available, the usual restrictions apply to the OFC. In the particular case of *kle*, this results in slightly different readings of the two constructions. For example, as illustrated by ex. (17), if the first object is a pronoun and the second object a proper name or an animate NP, the OFC must be selected if the intended meaning is 'introduce someone to someone' (which implies some degree of manipulation of the person being introduced), whereas the monoverbal construction must be selected if the intended meaning is 'show'.

(17) a. *Kuàkú klè-lì   mín í   yí'n.*
      Kouakou show-PFV 1SG   3SG   wife-DEF
      'Kouakou showed me his wife.'

    b. *Kuàkú fà-lì   í   yí'n   klè-lì   mín.*
      Kouakou take-PFV 3SG   wife-DEF show-PFV 1SG
      'Kouakou introduced his wife to me.'

For similar reasons, the OFC is rejected when *kle* is used to express 'teach a skill': a skill is not a thing that can be manipulated – ex. (18).

(18) a. *Kuàkú klè-lì   mín duô fiê   dí-lè̀.*
      Kouakou show-PFV 1SG   yam field do-NOMZ
      'Kouakou showed me how to cultivate yams.'

    b. **Kuàkú   fà-lì   duô   fiê   dí-lè̀   klè-lì   mín.*
      Kouakou   take-PFV yam   field do-NOMZ show-PFV 1SG

3.3. The double object construction of *man* 'give'

3.3.1. Introductory remarks

The construction of *man* 'give' constitutes a particularly original and intriguing aspect of Baule grammar. This verb occurs in a monoverbal construction in which the NP representing the recipient occurs in immediate postverbal position, followed by the NP representing the gift, as in (19a), and in an OFC in which the gift is encoded as the complement of *fa* 'take', as in (19b). In the monoverbal construction, it the first postverbal NP is not a pronoun itself, it may be followed by a resumptive pronoun, as in (19c).

(19) a. *Kuàkú màn-nìn   mín sìkǎ.*
      Kouakou give-PFV   1SG   money
      'Kouakou gave me money.'

    b. *Kuàkú fà-lì   sìkǎ   màn-nìn   mín.*
      Kouakou take-PFV money   give-PFV   1SG
      'Kouakou gave me money.'

    c. *Kuàkú màn-nìn   kòfí (í)   sìkǎ.*
      Kouakou give-PFV   Kofi (3SG) money
      'Kouakou gave Kofi money.'

Given the semantic nature of 'give', the fact that resumptive pronouns also occur between a genitival dependent and its head suggests analyzing the monoverbal construction of 'give' as a monotransitive construction in which the NP that immediately follows the verb is not a clause-level term, but rather fulfills the syntactic role of genitive.

The recognition of constructions in which the recipient of a verb 'give' is syntactically a genitival modifier of the gift was proposed by 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 the *possessive strategy* in the typology of strategies for coding three-participant events put forward by Margetts & Austin 2007, 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".

3.3.2. Restrictions on the monoverbal construction of man 'give'

The indexability hierarchy constraint observed in the monoverbal construction of *kle* 'show' also applies to *man*, and *man* shows no additional restriction involving animacy: provided the indexability hierarchy constraint is respected, human NPs can occur in second object function, as in (20).

(20) *B'à   mɛ̀n   í   blā.*[8]
      3PL-PRF give 3SG   woman
      'They gave him a woman.'

But in addition to the indexability hierarchy constraint, in the monoverbal construction of *man*, the second object (i.e., the NP representing the gift) cannot be definite, and cannot include a genitive interpreted as a possessor – ex. (21).[9] Here again, the use of the OFC is obligatory, whether the usual conditions on the use of the OFC are satisfied or not.

(21) a. **Kuàkú   màn-nìn   mín   wɔ́   kpànngɔ̂'n.*
        Kouakou   give-PFV   1SG   2SG   bicycle-DEF
        intended: 'Kouakou gave me your bicycle.'

     OK: *Kuàkú fà-lì   wɔ́   kpànngɔ̂'n   màn-nìn   mín.*
         Kouakou take-PFV 2SG   bicycle-DEF give-PFV   1SG

   b. **Kuàkú   màn-nìn   mín   sìkǎ'n.*
        Kouakou   give-PFV   1SG   money-DEF
        intended: 'Kouakou gave me the money.'

---

[8] When immediately followed by the 3rd person singular pronoun *í, man* is realized *mɛn.*

[9] 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 among others by 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.

OK: *Kuàkú fà-lì   sìkǎ'n   màn-nìn   mín.*
Kouakou take-PFV money-DEF give-PFV   1SG

Cross-linguistically, the restrictions we have observed in section 3.3 for the monoverbal construction of *kle* 'show' are not uncommon in ditransitive constructions, and the alternation between DOC and OFC with *kle* 'show' is reminiscent of the alternation between DOC and indirective construction in other languages. But this does not seem to be the case for the ban on definite gifts in the monoverbal construction of *man* 'give', which may suggest looking for an explanation according to which the monoverbal construction of *man* would not be a 'true' ditransitive construction.

3.3.3. 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, and the tonal realizations provide no evidence that might guide the choice between the two interpretations;

(b) in other cases, a resumptive pronoun appears between the recipient and the gift in the same conditions as in the genitival construction – ex. (22).

(22) a. *Màn kòfí (í)   bólí!*
     give   Kofi (3SG) goat
     'Give Kofi a goat!'

   (compare with *kòfí (í) bólí* 'goat belonging to Kofi')

   b. *Màn blā   mùn bé   bólí!*
      give   woman   PL   3PL   goat
      'Give the women a goat!'

   (compare with *blā mùn bé bólí* '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 modify the same head.

*3.3.4. Evidence against the analysis of the monoverbal construction
of* man *'give' as a monotransitive construction*

In Section 3.3.4, we have seen that the morphological make-up of the monoverbal construction of man 'give' suggests analyzing it as a monotransitive construction. However, if constituency tests are to be taken seriously, in particular those relying on extraction, this analysis, although semantically plausible, must be abandoned.

Baule has a focalizing construction that can be described as follows: [10]

– the focalized term occurs in sentence initial position, followed by the focalizing particle *yɛ̂*;
– 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 *ɔ̀* obligatorily occurs in sentence final position – ex. (23).[11]

(23) a. *Ákísí   tò-lì   juê.*
      Akissi   buy-PFV   fish
      'Akissi bought fish.'

     b. *Ákísí   yɛ̂   ɔ̀   tò-lì   juê   ɔ̀.*
        Akissi   FOC 3SG buy-PFV   fish   FOC
        'It is Akissi that bought fish.'

     c. *Juê   yɛ̂   Ákísí   tò-lì   ɔ̀.*
        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. (24).

(24) a. *Bè   bù-lì   Kòfí   suă'n.*
        3PL   demolish-PFV   Kofi   house-DEF
        'They demolished Kofi's house.'

     b. *Kòfí   suă'n   yɛ̂   bè   bù-lì   í   ɔ̀.*
        Kofi   house-DEF   FOC 3PL   demolish-PFV   3SG   FOC
        'It is Kofi's house that they demolished.'

---

[10] This focalizing construction is usual, but not obligatory, in wh-questions; for example, 'Who bought fish?' can be expressed as *Wán tò-lì juê?* |who|buy-PFV|fish| or *Wán yɛ̂ ɔ̀ tò-lì juê ɔ̀?* |who|FOC|3SG|buy-PFV|fish|FOC|.
[11] In the examples, both *yɛ̂* and *ɔ̀* are glossed FOC, because both are obligatory in the focus construction. However, the identification of the focalized constituent relies entirely on *yɛ̂*; *ɔ̀* just marks the end of a sentence in which focalization occurs.

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 is observed: in the monoverbal construction of *man* 'give', it is perfectly possible to extract not only the NP representing the recipient, but also the NP representing the gift, leaving the NP representing the recipient in situ – ex. (25).

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

   b. *Kòfí yê   Kuàkú   mèn-nìn   í   bólí   ò.*[12]
      Kofi FOC   Kouakou give-PFV   3SG   goat   FOC
      'It is to Kofi that Kouakou gave a goat.'

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

Another reason for rejecting the monotransitive analysis is that *recipient – gift* sequences in the monoverbal construction of *man* 'give' cannot always be interpreted as the realization of a genitival construction. 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 rise to sequences, such as *mín í sîn* in ex. (26), which in Baule cannot constitute viable genitival constructions.

(26)   *Màn mín   í   sîn!*
        give 1SG   3SG   half
        'Give me half of it!'

The acceptability of (26) contrasts with the unacceptability of pronoun sequences in constructions in which both pronouns would be genitives modifying the same head.

3.3.5. Conclusion of section 3.3

The only analysis compatible with the data presented in this section 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';

---

[12] The perfective suffix is 'transparent' to the rule according to which *man* followed by the 3rd person singular pronoun *í* is realized *mɛn*.

(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 mùn bé bólí!* 'Give the women a goat!' (ex. (22b) above) is not lit. '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 similar to the agreement of nominal heads with genitive modifiers, but in which the controller and the target are the first and the second 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*, since the genitive construction of Baule is characterized by the *dependent-head* order and the use of the head-marking strategy.

Functionally, the analysis of this agreement mechanism as secondary predicate agreement, already proposed for other constructions in section 3.2, can be extended to the DOC of *man* 'give', since the meaning of *man* includes a possessive predication involving the gift and the recipient:

$$X_{agent} \text{ } gives \text{ } Y_{recipient} \text{ } Z_{gift} = X \text{ } makes \text{ } [Y \text{ } has \text{ } Z]$$

4. More about DOCs

Concerning the behavioral properties of DOCs in Baule, the general principle is that, apart from the fact that it cannot be fronted in the OFC, the first object behaves in all respects like the monotransitive patient, whereas several operations are not possible with the second object, and can be carried out only via the conversion of the second object into the object of *fa* in the OFC. Some of these impossibilities may be the mere consequence of the constraints on the DOCs already stated in section 3.

The passivization test, which in many languages reveals the existence of an asymmetry in DOCs, is not available in Baule, since Baule has no passive forms or constructions. Mechanisms that make apparent an asymmetry include topicalization, reflexivization, and relativization.

In DOCs, the second object can be focalized – ex. (23) above, but it cannot be topicalized, whereas the topicalization of the first object is possible – ex. (27).

(27) a. *Kòfí klè-lì   Kuàkú wó   suǎ'n.*
         Kofi   show-PFV Kouakou 2SG   house-DEF
         'Kofi showed your house to Kouakou.'

Kuàkú, Kòfí klè-lì   í   wɔ́   suǎ'n.
Kouakou Kofi show-PFV 3SG 2SG   house-DEF
'Kofi showed your house to Kouakou.'

c. **Wɔ́ suǎ'n,   Kòfí klè-lì   Kuàkú (í).*
    2SG house-DEF   Kofi show-PFV Kouakou 3SG
    intended: 'Your house, Kofi showed it to Koukou.'

OK: *Wɔ́ suǎ'n,   Kòfí fà-lì   klè-lì   Kuàkú.*
    2SG house-DEF   Kofi take-PFV show-PFV Kouakou

Intensive pronouns in reflexive or reciprocal function cannot figure in second object role, but this is a mere consequence of the indexability constraint stated in section 3.3. They cannot occur in first object role with the second object as their antecedent either. In other words, the second object in a DOC cannot be involved in reflexivization. Ex. (28) illustrates the expression of reflexive relationships involving (either in antecedent or target role) an argument that would be represented by the second object in a DOC.

(28) a. *Kòfí$_i$ fà-lì   í   wûn$_i$ klè-lì   Kuàkú.*
        Kofi   take-PFV 3SG   self   show-PFV   Kouakou
        'Kofi$_i$ showed himself$_i$ to Kouakou.'

     b. *Kòfí   fà-lì   Kuàkú$_i$ klè-lì   í   wûn$_i$.*
        Kofi   take-PFV Kouakou   show-PFV 3SG   self
        'Kofi showed Kouakou$_i$ to himself$_i$ (e.g., on a picture).'

The function of first object in the DOC is accessible to relativization, but the function of second object is not. Here again, the use of the OFC is obligatory – ex. (29).

(29) a. *biān mɔ̀ ǹ   mɛ̀n-nìn   í   sìkǎ'n*
        man REL 1SG give-PFV   3SG   money-DEF
        'the man to whom I gave money'

     b. ** sìkǎ mɔ̀ ǹ   màn-nìn   Kuàkú'n*
          money REL 1SG give-PFV   Kouakou-DEF
        intended: 'the money I gave to Kouakou'[13]

     OK: *sìkǎ   mɔ̀ ǹ   fàà   màn-nìn   Kuàkú'n*
         money   REL 1SG take.PFV give-PFV   Kouakou-DEF

There are also asymmetries in the possibility to leave the objects unexpressed. In the DOC of *man* 'give', the first object (representing the recipient) can be left unexpressed if unspecific – ex. (30a). By contrast, the expression of the second object (representing the gift) is

---

[13] Note that this construction is not accepted with a relativization reading, but is acceptable with a nominalization reading: 'the fact that I gave money to Kouakou'.

obligatory, and the use of *lìkě* 'thing' in object role is the standard way to leave it unspecified – ex. (30b). When *man* is followed by a single NP, the only possible interpretation is that this NP represents the gift, even if its meaning suggests rather interpreting it as a recipient; both an anaphoric recipient reading and an unspecified recipient reading are excluded – ex. (30c).

(30) a. *Kòfí màn-nìn   sìkǎ.*
          Kofi   give-PFV   money
          'Kofi gave money (to someone).'

    b. *Kòfí màn-nìn   Kuàkú   *(lìkě).*
          Kofi   give-PFV   Kouaku   thing
          'Kofi gave something to Kouaku.'

    c. *Kòfí màn-nìn   Kuàkú.*
          Kofi   give-PFV   Kouaku
          lit. 'Kofi gave Kouaku.', in the sense that, e.g., Kofi was asked to send someone for help, and he sent Kouakou.

5. DOCs and the lexicon

5.1. Verbs occurring in DOCs

We have found no other verb occurring in a DOC with the same properties as *kle* 'show, introduce, teach'.

A DOC with the same properties as that of *man* 'give' is possible with the following verbs: *blɛ* 'bring', *cɛ ~ cɛcɛ* 'share out', *su* 'serve (food, drink)', *wua* 'steal'.

Some trivalent verbs that do not imply change of location, and consequently could be expected to occur in a DOC, have the transfer construction as their only possible construction. This is in particular the case of *to* 'buy', whose construction is identical to that of 'take something from someone('s hand)' – ex. (31).

(31) a. *Kòfí tò-lì   kpànngô   ̀ngá Kuàkú sá   nún.*
          Kofi   buy-PFV bicycle   DEM Kouakou hand   in
          'Kofi bought this bicycle from Kouakou.'

    b. *Kòfí fà-lì   flúwá'n   Kuàkú   sá   nún.*
          Kofi   take-PFV book-DEF   Kouakou   hand   in
          'Kofi took the book from Kouakou('s hand).'

We have already seen in section 3.1 that *srɛ* 'ask (something from somebody)' can occur in the transfer construction or in the DOC.

Concerning verbs that a priori could be expected to be found in the transfer construction or in a DOC, Baule has no verb 'send', and expresses this meaning via the SVC *fa ... kɔ* 'take ... go'. This SVC cannot not be interpreted as 'take and go': in spite of the fact that it is

resumed by a subject pronoun before 'go', the subject expressed before 'take' represents a person who does not him/herself bring the thing s/he sends – ex. (32).[14]

(32)   *Bè   fà-lì   sìkǎ   bè   wɔ̀-lì   klɔ̌   lɔ̀.*
        3PL   take-PFV money   3PL   go-PFV   hand   in
        'They sent money to the village.'

In fact, this construction has the appearance of the OFC variant of a transfer construction, but the corresponding transfer construction **Bè wɔ̀-lì sìkǎ klɔ̌ lɔ̀.* is not possible.

5.2. Light verb constructions

Baule has relatively few verbs occurring in DOCs in which two postverbal NPs represent protagonists in an event encoded by the verb, but makes a very wide use of light verb constructions superficially similar to DOCs, in which the noun forming a lexicalized combination with the light verb occurs in second object position. Resumptive pronouns are present in the same conditions as in the transfer construction or in the DOC of *man* 'give'. In other words, in addition to a very limited number of verbs encoding three-participant events productively used in DOCs, Baule has a much higher number of verbs whose occurrence in DOCs is conditioned by the existence of a lexicalized relationship with the noun in second object role.

For example, *yo* 'make' normally cannot figure in a DOC, but the light verb construction *yo ... fé* 'do pleasure' is (at least superficially) a double object construction with *fé* 'pleasure' in second object role and the person being pleased encoded as the first object.

A formal criterion for distinguishing light verb constructions from ordinary DOCs in which the second object represents an argument of a trivalent verb is that second objects forming a lexicalized combination with a light verb cannot be fronted.

Among the meanings commonly expressed by ditransitive verbs, 'sell' is expressed in Baule by the light verb construction *yo ... àtɛ̌* 'do sale', with the NP representing the thing sold in first object role, and the person to whom something is sold encoded like a locative adjunct – ex. (33).

(33)   *Kòfí yò-lì   í   kpànngɔ̂'n í   àtɛ̌   kuàkú sá   nún.*
        Kofi do-PFV 3SG bicycle-DEF 3SG sale   Kouakou hand in
        'Kofi sold his bicycle to Kouakou.'

5.3. Verbs of saying

Three verbs of saying can be identified in Baule: *se*, *kan* and *ijɔ*. None of them occurs in a DOC. The construction of *se* 'tell' includes an object NP representing the addressee, but the second complement of this verb is always a complement clause introduced by the complementizer *ké*, never a second object NP. With *kán* and *ijɔ* 'speak, say', the only way to encode the addressee is via a SVC – see section 6.

---

[14] Note that *kɔ* 'go' occurs as *wɔ* in combination with some affixes.

In addition to the three verbs of saying mentioned above, Baule has light verb constructions referring to speech events but involving verbs other than verbs of saying in light verb function, and with some of them, the addressee can be represented by an NP preceding the nominal element of the light verb compound, i.e., in the same position as the first object in a DOC – ex. (34).

(34) a. *Bè   dì-lì   mín   nànwlê.*
        3PL   eat-PFV   1SG   truth
        'They told me the truth.'

    b. *Bè   buà-lì   mín   àtô.*
        3PL   spread-PFV   1SG   lie
        'They told me a lie.'[15]

6. *Kle* 'show' and *man* 'give' in applicative periphrases

Kle 'show' and *man* 'give' are used as valency operators in SVCs in which their function is to license an additional participant in the argument structure of another verb. In Baule, applicative periphrases involving *man* constitute the standard way to encode beneficiaries – ex. (35),[16] and *kle* is used to encode addressees, with *kán* 'speak' as well as with light verb constructions referring to speech events – ex. (36).

(35) *Ákísí   à   tɔ̀n   duô   à   màn   Kòfí.*
      Akissi   PRF   cook yam   PRF   give   Kofi
      'Akissi cooked yam for Kofi.'

(36) a. *Kàn   ǹdě̌   klè   bé.*
        say   word   show 3PL
        'Speak to them!'

    b. *Tù   í   bó   klè   mín.*
        pull_out   3SG   meaning   show   1SG
        'Explain it to me!'

---

[15] The gloss of *bua* takes into account constructions in which a verb *bua* is found with an independent meaning, but the homonymy may well be purely accidental. Note in particular that *bua* 'spread' is strictly intransitive.

[16] Note however that the acceptability of SVCs including two occurences of *man* is questionable. The beneficiary of an event lexicalized as *man* 'give' is rather expressed by means of a complex construction:

Kòfí   à   fà   sìkǎ'n   à   màn   mín   ké   ǹǹ   fá   mán   Kuàkú.
Kofi   PRF   take   money-DEF   PRF   give   1SG   COMP   1SG.HORT take   give   Kouakou
'Kofi gave me the money for Kouakou.' (lit. '... so that I give it to Koukou.')

Ex. (37) illustrates a possible variant of the sentences in ex. (34) above. The meaning is slightly different: encoding the addressee as the complement of *kle* results in a more emphatic formulation. This is however difficult to reflect in the translation.

(37) a. *Bè   dì-lì   nànwlɛ̂ klè-lì   mín.*
         3PL   do-PFV   truth   show-PFV 1SG
         'They told me the truth.'

      b. *Bè   buà-lì   àtô   klè-lì   mín.*
         3PL   spread-PFV lie   show-PFV 1SG
         'They told me a lie.'

7. Conclusion

In this paper, we have shown that:

(a) In Baule, *kle* 'show' is the only verb occurring in a double object construction of the type commonly found in the languages of the world; *man* 'give' occurs in an atypical variety of double object construction characterized by the impossibility to have definite NPs in second object function, and by the occurrence of resumptive pronouns that are also found in other constructions involving two successive complements following the verb (in particular, the transfer construction).

(b) The double object constructions of Baule are in competition with a serial verb construction in which the second object of the double object construction is encoded as the complement of *fa* 'take'; the use of this construction is in particular obligatory in order to subject the second object to operations that, in the double object construction, are possible only with the first object.

(c) In Baule, few verbs encoding three-participant events can be found in double object constructions (and in particular, verbs of saying do not occur in double object constructions), but many other Baule verbs can be used as light verbs in a construction superficially similar to the double object construction of *man* 'give', with the noun forming a compound with the light verb in second object position, and a complement NP in first object position.

(d) In Baule, *man* 'give' and *kle* 'show' have grammaticalized uses in applicative periphrases in which they license the introduction of a beneficiary (in the case of *man*) or of an addressee (in the case of *kle*).

Abbreviations

COMP: complementizer
DEF: definite
DEM: demonstrative
FOC: focalization
HORT: hortative

NEG: negation
NOMZ: nominalization
PFV: perfective
PL: plural
PRF: perfect
PROG: progressive
REL: relativizer
SG: singular

References

Ameka F. 2005. 'Forms of secondary predication in serializing languages'. In Himmelmann, 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.

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.

Croft, W. 1985. 'Indirect object 'lowering'. In M. Niepokuj & al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the Eleventh Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society. 39-51.

Daniel, M. 2006. 'Monotransitivity in 'give'-constructions (exploring the periphery of ditransitives)'. Conference 'Rara and Rarissima'. Leipzig, MPI.

Haspelmath, M. 2005a. 'Ditransitive constructions: the verb *give*'. In Haspelmath, M., M. S. 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 ESSLLI 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.