THE SYNTACTIC BEHAVIOUR OF APPLICATIVE VERBS IN RURUULI-LUNYALA*

Amos Atuhairwe
Kyambogo University

ABSTRACT

In this paper, we examine the syntactic behaviour of applicative verbs in Ruruuli-Lunyala, which is among the least described Bantu languages. We describe different verb bases that can host an applicative verb: Specifically, we examine transitive, ditransitive, unaccusative and unergative verb bases. We also analyse object marking and examine *kakyarumwei* 'completely'/'very'/'a lot' with *bwereere* 'for nothing' with special attention to their behaviour in applicative constructions. This is explained under [+quantity] arguments, applicatives in degree adverbials and sentence adverbials in the applicative construction. We then argue that ideophones occur in mutually exclusive environment with the applicative adverbial.

Key words: verb bases, object marking, ideophones, applicative adverbial

1. INTRODUCTION

The objective of this paper is to examine the syntactic behaviour of applicative verbs in Ruruuli-Lunyala[1]. This study seeks to address the knowledge gap about Ruruuli-Lunyala applied verbs by focusing on the verb bases, object marking and other syntactic properties involving applicative constructions in Ruruuli-Lunyala. Empirical patterns of particular Bantu languages like Rutooro and Kinyarwanda have revealed theoretical generalizations on the behaviour of applicatives, but there exists considerable variation in the same languages (Isingoma 2012a). To show these variations, Jerro (2015) suggests that each applicative in a language encodes its own idiosyncratic restrictions on object symmetry. Some Bantu languages allow adding an object to unergative verbs (Bresnan & Moshi 1993). Furthermore, Pylkkänen (2002) shows that languages like Kichaga allow high applicatives, while Chichewa allows low applicatives only. She argues that there are two different types of applicative heads: high applicatives which denote a relation between the event encoded by the verb and the added argument, and low applicatives which denote a relation between the two post-verbal arguments. Low applicative heads modify the direct object. In other words, the applicative head relates the applied object to the thematic object, giving a recipient reading. They are interpreted as directional possessive relations: High applicatives relate the applied object to the verb phrase which is the event, giving a beneficiary reading. High applicative heads attach above the verb root and low applicative heads below it.

[1]Ethnologue (Eberhard et al., 2024) mentions different alternate names of Ruli (Baruli, Luduuli, Ruli, Ruluuli).

Dixon (2012) justifies such variations by explaining that different languages can exclusively permit applicative constructions with transitive and intransitive verbs, intransitive verbs, or transitive verbs. As a result, those variations call for verification on applicative constructions of the under-described Ruruuli-Lunyala language.

This paper is divided into 4 main sections: Section 1 is the introduction in the preceding paragraph, and it states the objectives and the rationale of this paper. Section 2 describes the methodological principles that we adhered to in undertaking this research. In Section 3, we deal with the result and discussion of the research findings starting with the syntactic behaviour of different verb bases in applicative constructions. We then deal with object marking, degree adverbials and then ideophones. Finally, Section 4 presents the conclusions of our findings.

2. METHODOLOGY

We employed both primary and secondary data sources. We used corpus and participant observation methods of data collection since grammatical analyses should be arrived at inductively, through observations from a corpus of recorded discourse, supplemented by direct observation of how the language is used in the community (Dixon 2012). One needs to gather a broad database which should contain numerous genres, and thereafter supplementary data should be gathered through participant observation (Bowern 2015). Ahuja (2005:245) explains that while using participant observation, "the researcher shares the activities of the community observing what is going on around him, supplementing this by conversations and interview. Ahuja identifies three major characteristics of participant observation, namely studying everyday life as experienced and understood by the participant, communicating with the participants through interaction and perceiving reality as it is and event to be studied in natural environment of the participants."

We used Ruruuli-Lunyala-English Dictionary (RLED) corpus data which was compiled by a Ruruuli-Lunyala language documentation project: *A comprehensive bilingual talking Ruruuli/Lunyala-English dictionary with a descriptive basic grammar for language revitalisation and enhancement of mother-tongue based education* (Witzlack-Makarevich, Namyalo, Kiriggwajjo, Molochieva & Atuhairwe 2019). RLED that formed the basis of the primary data in this article and was produced by speakers of Ruruuli-Lunyala from four districts of Uganda, namely Nakasogola, Kayunga, Kiryandongo and Buyende. The entire corpus has 74 text files, producing a total of 159,641 words with 1,172,763 tokens. This corpus had been compiled using a monitor-based approach (Sinclair 1991). However, we retrieved some text files from the larger corpus using a balanced or sample corpus approach to form a smaller corpus in line with Leech (2007). We had to structure the corpus in such a way that 4 to 6 text files came from each of the four districts in the sample corpus was compiled. The balanced sample corpus, which we drew from the larger one, had a total of 394,643 tokens from the selected 20 text files. Then we identified and retrieved all verb roots/stems and their applicative collocates from the balanced/sample corpus for analysis. We were able to obtain 740 applicative entries although 362 were analysed as per WordSmith sampling output (Scott 1996).

Using participant observation, we brought notebooks and wrote down observation notes, represented multiple speakers and controlled other variables such as gender, age, place of residence, as well as length of texts in the corpus. We were able to pose questions, hold conversations and listen to various comments about the generated transcriptions and translations that were relevant to this study. In the process, we were able to clarify and account for all forms of applica-

tive constructions, elicit meaning of associated lexical elements and expound any other lexical meaning so that we could get a more pragmatic and deeper understanding of applicative arguments.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this section, we present, interpret and discuss the research findings from examining the syntactic behaviour of applicative verbs in Ruruuli-Lunyala. We describe different verb bases that can undergo applicativization: Specifically, we analyse transitive, unaccusative and unergative verb bases. We also analyse object marking, [+quantity] arguments, [+intensity] modifiers, sentence adverbials, ideophones and applicative adverbials as found in Ruruuli-Lunyala applicative constructions.

3.1. Applicative Verb bases

There exist different restrictions in the selection of verb bases to which an applicative marker can attach. The applicative marker can exclusively attach to intransitive, or transitive verb bases in certain languages (Dixon 2012). Additionally, Dixon argues that a language can allow both transitive and intransitive verb bases to carry an applicative marker. In Ruruuli-Lunyala, all these categories of verb bases can attract an applicative marker with different syntactic formations and interpretations as examined below.

3.1.1 Transitive verb base

In the absence of an adverbial modifier or a telicity marker, transitive verb bases in Ruruuli-Lunyala conform to the canonical Bantu applicative construction of transitive verbs. (cf. Pacchiarotti 2018). Canonical applicative is a construction which "involves a derived verb form combined with a subject semantically identical to that of the non-derived form of the same verb, and with an applied object representing a participant that cannot be encoded as a core argument of the same verb in its non-derived form" (Creissels 2004:3). In Ruruuli-Lunyala, the applicative marker makes the applied object occupy the transitive object slot. The applied object immediately follows the derived verb unless its place is taken by an adverbial modifier or telicity marker like *kakyarumwei* 'completely/'very'/'a lot' and *bwereere* 'for nothing'. This implies that the formerly transitive object is no longer adjacent to the verb once an adverbial modifier or telicity marker is in place in an applicative construction of transitive bases in Ruruuli-Lunyala. Notably, transitive bases are often used with benefactives and locatives and depending on pragmatic interpretation, goal applicatives can also arise as illustrated below:

(1)   a.   *Bamuleetera ekyanzo.*[2]
           ba-mu-leet-er-a   e-kyanzo
           3plS-3sgO-bring-APPL-FV   AUG-7.hide
           'They bring a hide for him.'
      b.   *Bakileetera mpani.*

---

[2] All examples given in this paper are in Ruruuri-Lunyala (Bantu, Uganda; Researchers, 2024).

ba-ki-leet-er-a   mpani
3plS-7O-bring-APPL-FV   here
'They bring it from here.'

In example (1a) and (1b) above, *leeta* 'bring' is a transitive verb base. The derived form *leeter* means 'bring for' in (1a) and 'bring from' in (1b). The former has a prepositional phrase in the English rendition 'for him' that is benefactive, while the latter has a prepositional phrase 'from here' that is locative. In both cases, the applied argument occupies the transitive object slot after being licensed by the applicative marker in the applicative construction. *E-kyanzo* 'hide' is the transitive object in (1a) and is pronominalized in (1b).

However, the contextual interpretation determines the benefactive or goal status of the applicative object. The pragmatic interpretation can make sentence (1a) attain goal reading. In this case, *leeter* would mean 'bring to' in the English rendition. This is true for verbs like *twala* 'take', *tunda* 'sell', and others that put either the 'gift' or recipient in the object slot of verbs. Whereas some Bantu languages like Tswana show no valency change (Creissels 2004), transitive verb bases involving applicatives in Ruruuli-Lunyala indicate valency change.

3.1.2. Ditransitive verb base

There are some inherently ditransitive verbs in Ruruuli-Lunyala, and they include *weerya* 'give', *buurya* 'ask', and *sasula* 'pay' among others. Once such verbs are employed, they can take two post-verbal objects for meaning to be complete in non-applicative construction. They can only allow the incorporation of the peripheral argument in the verbal composition through verbal pronominal morphology. The applied object is prominalized for an applicative construction to be possible. The inclusion of a full NP as the applied object cannot allow an applicative construction in ditransitive Ruruuli-Lunyala verbs. In such a case, the applied object has to be expressed as a pronoun for an applicative construction to be acceptable as illustrated below:

(2)   a.   *Muweererye onkeremba ocaayi.*
              mu-weery-er-e   o-nkeremba   o-caayi
              3sgO-give-APPL-IMP   AUG-9.baby   AUG-1.tea
              'Give the baby tea for her.' (Give the baby tea on her behalf)
        b.   *#Weerya o-nkeremba ocaayi kulwa omwala.*
              weery-a   o-caayi   kulwa   o-mwala
              3sgO-give-FV   AUG-1.tea   for   AUG-3.girl
              'Give the baby tea for the girl.'

As shown in (2a) above, both the indirect and the applicative objects can be marked[3] on the verb, and then the direct object appears as a postverbal constituent of a sentence. The applicative object *mu-* 'her' and the indirect object *onkeremba* 'baby' are marked on the verb *weery* 'give'. The direct object *ocaayi* 'tea' is outside the verbal complex. It is the applicative affix /-*er*-/ that licenses the inclusion of the peripheral argument 'for her' in the verbal composition.

Based on the example in (2b), the applied object is a full NP. In such a case, it is the non-applicative form of the sentence that is the only possible construction. The use of *kulwa* 'on behalf/for' links the applied object to the verbal predicate. Any attempt to use an applicative with

---

[3] Marking the object on the verb means the morphological indexing of the object on the verbal complex.

the full NP, for example, *omwala* 'the girl' will necessitate adopting a pronominal case of the applied object, which in this case, is 3sgO *mu* 'her' as shown in (2a). This particular way of using object pronouns in applicative constructions is consistent in all inherently ditransitive verbs.

In addition to the morpho-syntactic processes involving di-transitive verbs, the syntactic structure shown in (2a) implies that di-transitive verb bases in Ruruuli-Lunyala are capable of taking four arguments including only one applicative object. The four arguments in (2a) include the subject in the external structure[4], while the indirect object, the direct object and the applicative object form the internal structure. The subject 2sg *mu* 'you' is null since imperatives in Ruruuli-Lunyala take an empty subject. The indirect object is the dative NP *onkeremba* 'the baby'. The direct object is the theme NP *ocaayi* 'tea'. The applicative object is the benefactive NP pronoun 3sg *mu* 'her'. This is different from other Bantu languages like Kinyarwanda where more than one applicative object would be possible even with one applicative morpheme (Kimenyi 1980; Ngoboka 2005).

3.1.3. Unaccusative verb base

An unaccusative verb takes an indirect internal argument as its sole argument, and its grammatical subject cannot be assigned the semantic role of agent. In Ruruuli-Lunyala, unaccusative verbs can permit applicative derivation and form a consistent pattern that has uniformity in form and meaning. These unaccusative verbs are either monosyllabic intransitive verbs like *fa* 'die' and *gwa* 'fall' or originally intransitive verbs whose transitivization is signaled by /k/ in their last syllable. There is a /k/:/l/ transitivity pair relationship, whereby the presence of /k/ in the last syllable denotes unaccusativity, while /l/ in the same position would make the verb transitive. Unaccusative verbs whose transitivity status is signaled by /k/ exclusively form locative applicatives. Below are examples of unaccusative verbs in the /k/:/l/ transitivity pair relationship:

(3)	**Unaccusative form**		**Transitive Form**	
(i)	*bbogoka*	'break soundly'	*bbogola*	'break soundly'
(ii)	*cabbuka*	'break' (of pottery)	*cabbula*	'break' (of pottery)
(iii)	*domoka*	'form hole'	*domola*	'form hole'
(iv)	*nyontoka*	'squash'	*nyontola*	'squash'

Based on examples (3 i-iv) above, the substitution of /k/ with /l/ in, for instance, *nyontoka* 'squash' to form *nyontola* 'squash' makes the unaccusative verb transitive. The subject of the unaccusative verb does not initiate anything, while in the transitive case, the subject initiates and causes the event in question to take place (Isingoma 2012b; Dixon 2009). This pattern is consistent and very frequent with the verbs that advance the thematic notion of 'push or opening'. More examples include *iguka* 'open': *igula* 'open', *kapuka* 'break suddenly': *kapula* 'break suddenly', *taaguka* 'tear': *taagula* 'tear'

From the unaccusative verb *nyontoka* 'squash', one gets the derived form *nyontokera*

---

[4] Chomsky (1981) mentions three arguments of verb structure: external, direct and oblique arguments (internal indirect arguments). Arguments generated outside the verb phrase and not governed by the verb at D-structure (Derived structure) are called external, while those generated within the verb phrase are called internal (direct arguments). Oblique arguments are also called internal indirect arguments.

'squash at/in'. This is a locative applicative case. The thematic element of locatives is the only possible applicative classification for unaccusative verbs in the /k/:/l/ transitivity pair relationship.

It is the derived form of the transitive counterpart of the unaccusative verb that is used for beneficiary applicatives. For instance, the transitive counterpart of *nyotoka* 'squash' is *nyontola* 'squash', which changes to *nyontoora*[5] 'squash for' in the applicative construction. It is *nyontoora* 'squash for' that is used in the construction of a benefactive applicative. The interpretation of locative and benefactive applicatives derived from the /*k:*/l/ transitivity pair relationship can be further illustrated below:

(4)   a.   *Ofene yanyontokeire mpani.*
             o-fene   e-a-nyontok-e-ire   mpani
             AUG-1.jack-fruit   1S-PST-squash-APPL-PFV   ADV
             'The jack-fruit squashed from here.'
       b.   *Emotoka yamunyontoleire ofene.*
             e-motoka   a-a-mu-nyontol-er-ire   o-fene
             AUG-9.vehicle 9S-PST-3sgO-squash-APPL-PFV   AUG-1.jack-fruit
             'The vehicle squashed a jack-fruit for him.'

With respect to the sentences (4a) and (4b) above, *nyontokera* means 'squash from' but *nyotoora* can mean both 'squash for' and 'squash from'. The former is derived from the unaccusative verb *nyontoka* 'squash' while the latter is derived from its transitive counterpart *nyontola* 'squash'. The interpretation from this example indicates that unaccusative verbs from /*k:*/l/ transitivity pair relationship form locative applicatives, while their transitive counterparts are valency increasing and can form both locative and benefactive applicatives (Bostoen & Mundeke 2011).

3.1.4. Unergative verb base

Unergative verbs are those which are intransitive and can semantically be distinctive by their licensing of an agent argument. They describe actions initiated by the subject. In Ruruuli-Lunyala, unergative verbs allow applicative derivation in both locative and benefactive applicatives and in other lexico-pragmatic contexts. Examples of unergative verbs and their applicative derivations are shown below:

(5)   **Unergative Basic Form**   **Unergative Derived Form**
(i)   *iruka* 'run'   *irukira* 'run for/at'
(ii)   *naaba* 'take a bath'   *naabira* 'take a bath for/at'
(iii)   *kula* 'grow'   *kuura* 'grow for/at'
(iv)   *landa* 'creep'   *landira* 'creep for/at'
(v)   *sooka* 'start'   *sookera* 'start from' or 'start with'

---

[5] The applicative suffix *–r-* is an applicative marker allomorph from *–er-/–ir-* and found in applicative constructions involving verb-bases that end with the liquid /l/. There is suffixation, segment deletion, after which, compensatory lengthening of the root vowel takes place in the present tense. The final derived verb depicts an applicative marker which has lost its vowel such that *–er-* or *–ir-* in the basic form becomes /r/ in the derived form (Atuhairwe 2021).

Unergative verbs in examples (5 i-v) allow the addition of an object despite being intransitive in their basic form, courtesy of an applicative formation process. They add applicative arguments with the semantic role of beneficiary or location. For instance, the applicative verb *irukira* means either 'run for' or 'run at/in'. In example (v), one may need a pragmatic interpretation to analyse *sookera* as either 'start from' or 'start with'.

3.2. Object marking

The object marker **(OM)** in Bantu languages appears between the tense marker and the verb stem (Ngonyani & Githinji 2006). The question we consider is which object is marked on the verb. To answer this question, we first explain how object marking works in the language we are investigating. In Ruruuli-Lunyala, the object is realized either in the form of full post-verbal Noun Phrase **(NP)** without object marking, or the post-verbal **NP** does not appear at all as shown below:

(6) a. *Yaboine esente.*
         a-a-boine   e-sente
         3sgS-PST-see.PFV   AUG-10.money
         'He saw the money.'
     b. *Yaziboine.*
         a-a-zi-boine
         3sgS-PST-10O-see.PFV
         'He saw it.'

According to the Bantu noun class system, the noun-object *e-sente* 'money' is in class ten. There is a full post-verbal **NP** *esente* 'the money' in (6a) above, but no object marking. In (6b), there is the object pronoun *zi* 'it' marked on the verb and appears between the tense marker and the verb stem. It also agrees in noun class with its noun antencedent *esente* 'money'.

The object marker can co-occur with a full object **NP** as illustrated below;

(7) a. *Muweererye onkeremba ocaayi.*
         mu-weery-er-e   o-nkeremba   o-caayi
         3sgO-give-APPL-IMP   AUG-9.baby   AUG-1.tea
         'Give the baby tea for her.'
     b. *#Weerya o-nkeremba ocaayi kulwa omwala.*
         weery-a   o-caayi   kulwa   o-mwala
         3sgO-give-FV   AUG-1.tea   for   AUG-3.girl
         'Give the baby tea for the girl.'

As shown in (7a) above, the applicative object can be marked on the verb, and then both the direct and indirect objects appear as a postverbal constituent of a sentence. The applicative object *mu-* 'her' is marked on the verb *weery* 'give'. The direct object *ocaayi* 'tea' and the indirect object *onkeremba* 'baby' are outside the verbal complex. The inclusion of the peripheral argument 'for her' in the verbal composition is solely possible because of the use of the applicative suffix /–er-/, which, with regard to the verb root *weery* 'give', is seemingly realised as an infix, since it is inserted within the root of the verb. Additionally, there seem to occur the

insertion of *presumed*[6] 'infixes' *–ri-* or *–re-* within bases that end with /-z/ and have three or more syllables. The two *presumed* 'infixes' are used in respect of vowel harmony. If the vowel in the second last syllable of the base is /a/, /i/ or /u/, *–ri-* is used, and if the vowel is /e/ or /o/, *–re-* is used. Therefore, the word like *bonereza* 'punish' becomes *bonerereza* 'punish for/at' while *cwanganiza* 'organise' becomes *cwanganiriza* 'organise for/at'.

In a situation where a full NP forms the applied object, the non-applicative form of the sentence is the only possible construction as shown in (7b). The use of *kulwa* 'for' links the applied object to the verbal predicate. The observed pattern of object marking in applicative constructions is consistent in all inherently ditransitive verbs.

Furthermore, we illustrate applicative object marking using the ditransitive verbs *leka* 'leave' and *koba* 'tell' vis-à-vis *tambula* 'travel' as shown below:

Goal

(8) a. *Yandekeire abaana musanju.*
      a-a-n-lek-**e**-ire   a-baana musanju
      3sgS-PST- 1sgO- leave -**APPL**-FV AUG.2.child   seven
      'He left seven children to me.'

Benefactive

    b. *Oisenga yabimunkobera byona-byona.*
        o-isenga   a-a-bi-mu-n-kob-**er**-a   bi-ona-bi-ona
        1.aunt   1sgS-PST-8O-3sgO-1sgO-tell-**APPL**-FV   8-all
        'Aunt told her everything for me.'

Locative

    c. *OSabanyala atambuura mu motoka.*
        o-Sabanyala   a-tambul-**ir**-a   mu   motoka
        AUG-1.Banyala king   3sgS-travel-**APPL**-FV   by   car
        'Banyala king travels by car.'

As shown in (8a) above, the goal applicative object *-n-* 'me' is marked on the derived verb. The applicative object licensed by the applicative suffix is at the same time adjacent to the verb. The verb *leka* 'leave' has shown valency increase, and in the process it attracts the pronominal case of the applicative verb.

Relatedly, the indirect object *oisenga* 'aunt' appears is pronominalised and marked on the verb as shown in (8b). The applied/applicative object *-n-* 'for me' is also marked on the verb. In the immediate post-verbal position is the base object *byona byona* 'everything' because *koba* 'tell' is a ditransitive verb. All three objects agree with their respective noun classes and are marked using pronominal morphology.

The applicative objects in both (8a) and (8b) have a common characteristic of being animate. Ruruuli-Lunyala allows object marking for animate objects which mostly represent bene-

---

[6] A *presumed* 'infix' is an actual applicative suffix that is inserted into the root of the derived verb after base modification by metathesis.

factive and goal applicative arguments as shown in (8a) and (8b) above, respectively. Additionally, like in Kinyarwanda (Dryer 1983), both benefactive and goal objects may be simultaneously indexed on the verb.

As illustrated in sentence (8c), locatives behave differently from benefactive and goal applicatives. Locative applicatives take inanimate objects which cannot undergo object marking in Ruruuli-Lunyala. The locative applicative object *mu motoka* 'by car' is not marked on the applicative verb *tambuura* 'travel by'. Instead, it appears as a post-verbal prepositional phrase that can only follow such derived verb form licensed by an applicative marker.

3.3. [+Quantity] arguments, applicative adverbials and sentence adverbials

Caudal and Nicolas (2005:6) refer to [+quantity] arguments as "any theme or patient argument whose reference can be measured by verb phrase adverbials". This definition is backed up by 'quantity' interpretation as in *Yannig ate his entire pancake*: Quantity scales are used with verbs that license an incremental theme. In contrast, *Yannig dried his shirt perfectly* is given a [+intensity] interpretation, which is characterized by degree modifiers. We contextualize these concepts in Ruruuli-Lunyala. There emerges an applicative adverbial preceding a [+quantity] argument. Any theme or patient argument whose reference can be measured by an applicative adverbial is a [+quantity] argument as elaborated below:

(9)   a.   *Yakalabiire kakyarumwei omusiri.*
             a-a-kalab-i-ire   kakyarumwei   o-musiri
             3sgS-PST-cultivate-APPL-PFV   completely   AUG-3.field
             'He completely cultivated the field.' (He cultivated the entire field)
       b.   *Yatamiiriire kakyarumwei.*
             a-a-tamiir-i-ire   kakyarumwei
             1sgS-PST-be_drunk-APPL-PFV   completely
             'He was completely drunk.'

In (9a) above, there is a [+quantity] theme *o-musiri* 'field' in a transitive construction. There is also [+intensity] interpretation in (9b) in addition to its being an intransitive construction. However, both (9a) and (9b) have applicative adverbial arguments, that is, the equivalents of *kalabiire kakyarumwei* 'completely cultivated' and *tamiir-i-ire kakyarumwei* 'completely drunk', respectively. The applicative adverbial arguments are in a strict collocation relationship because of applicativisation. *Kakyarumwei* 'completely' in *kalabiire kakyarumwei* 'completely cultivated' measures out [+quantity] patient *o-musiri* 'field'. The applicative adverbial *kakyarumwei* 'completely' in 'completely drunk' does not measure out anything since its intransitive nature involves [+intensity] interpretation with maximal degree. This makes the construction in (9b) acquire [+intensity] reading with closed degree scale.

However, not all applicative adverbials associated with *kakyarumwei* 'completely' have degree scale interpretations. There are other cases where *kakyarumwei* plays a unique role of a text-restructuring conjunct as shown in sentence (10). In such instances, it neither implies 'completely' nor 'very/extremely' and their semantically associated adverbs. Instead, it serves as a sentence adverbial in an applicative construction. It always appears at the sentence initial position as 'phrase of first' equivalent to *first of all/to begin with/firstly*. In this way, it can be interpreted as a sentence adverb as elaborated below:

(10) *Okusokera kakyarumwei, wabbawo abakibandwa.*
      oku-sok-er-a   kakyarumwei   wa-a-bba-a-wo   a-bakibandwa
      INF-begin-APPL-FV   ADV   16-PST-live-FV-ECL   AUG-2.traditional priest
      'First of all, there lived traditional priests.'

The 'phrase of first' as expressed in o*kusokera kakyarumwei* 'first of all' is only possible after being licensed by the applicative marker. The derived verb *soker* 'start from' cannot on its own convey 'phrase of first' meaning without the applicative adverbial *kakyarumwei.* In this case, the entire phrase o*kusokera kakyarumwei* 'first of all' is realised as a sentence adverbial: Its meaning is not restricted to the verb only but to the entire sentence as a whole. It can be interpreted that in instances where *kakyarumwei* is used as a focusing device, inferences to degree scales are not relevant.

3.4. Idiomatic use of *bwereere* 'for nothing'

In Ruruuli-Lunyala, *bwereere* 'for nothing' is an idiomatic expression with two equivalents in English, namely 'without payment', 'with no reward or result' (cf. Turnbull et al. 2010). The English sentence 'He ate the pineapple for nothing' means he did not pay for the pineapple he ate or his eating of the pineapple was either not rewarded or had no result. Translating such a sentence into Ruruuli-Lunyala can be best expressed with the help of the telicity applicative device *bwereere* 'for nothing'. It is always in collocation relationship with the derived form of the applicative verb. It is also positioned in a syntactic environment similar to that of *kakyarumwei* 'completely'/'very/'a lot' in the morphology of applicatives as indicated below:

(11) a.   *Yaliiriire kakyarumwei ennanansi.*
           a-a-ly-**ir-i**-ire   kakyarumwei   e-nnanansi
           3sgS-PST-eat-**APPL-APPL**-PFV ADV   AUG-9.pineapple
           'He completely ate the pineapple.'
      b.   *Yaliiriire bwereere ennanansi.*
           a-a-ly-**ir-i**-ire   bwereere   e-nnanansi
           3sgS-PST-eat-**APPL-APPL**-PFV   'for nothing'   AUG-9.pineapple
           'He ate the pineapple for nothing.'

It is the applicative marker is compatible with the use of *kakyarumwei* 'completely'/'very'/'a lot' and *bwereere* 'for nothing' as shown in (11a) and (11b) above, respectively. Coming immediately after the applicative verb and before the applicative object, the applicative adverbial occupies the applicative object slot in an applicative construction. One should also note that both *kakyarumwei* 'completely/very' and *bwereere* 'for nothing' can mark telicity in applicative construction in different ways. The former forms an applicative adverbial that can determine the end point or boundedness of the event in question. It serves the role of 'affected'/delimiting argument (cf. Tenny, 1992). The latter assesses the goal and outcome of the sentence as a whole. We found *bwereere* 'for nothing' a telicity marker for it to conveys an aspectual notion of 'goal and boundedness' as embedded in the definition of telicity (cf. Comrie 1976; Walková 2012).

3.5 Ideophones and Applicative Adverbials

In Ruruuli-Lunyala, *kakyarumwei* can be interpreted as 'completely'/'loudly'/'rapidly' with special attention to ideophone constructions. It serves as a degree adverbial and ideophones can serve as applicative adverbial markers. There is a systematic use of ideophones to mark the applicative adverbial *kakyarumwei* 'completely'/'loudly'/'rapidly'. Ideophones serve different functions in their description of a predicate with regard to manner, colour, sound, smell, action, state or intensity (Voeltz & Kilian-Hatz 2001). Beyond being realised as "a mental image a spoken sound evokes in a listener", ideophones are referred to as "intensifiers that reinforce the impact of morpho-lexical structures" (Mphande 1992: 3). The different functions of ideophones in Ruruuli-Lunyala, bring about different semantic realisations of the applicative adverbial *kakyarumwei*. Thus, *kakyarumwei* can be construed to mean 'rapidly' when its corresponding ideophone denotes manner or intensity. If the ideophone denotes smell, colour, action or state, *kakyarumwei* means 'completely'. When sound is involved, *kakyarumwei* can be interpreted as 'loudly'. Below is a presentation of different ideophones showing how they are construed to encode meaning with the applicative adverbial *kakyarumwei*.

(12)	**Verb and ideophone**		**Function**	**Verb and applicative adverbial**		
(i)	*kopolya*	**kopwei**	manner	*kopoorya*	**kakyarumwei**	'blinks rapidly'
(ii)	*myankulya*	***mya***	manner	*myankuurya*	***kakyarumwei***	'shine brightly'
(iii)	*yatika*	**pwa**	sound	*yatikira*	**kakyarumwei**	'break loudly'
(iv)	*kunga*	**cwi**	sound	*kungira*	***kakyarumwei***	'cry loudly'
(v)	*yeya*	***swii!***	action	*yeera*	***kakyarumwei***	'sweep completely'
(vi)	*tiica*	***kutu***	action	*tiicirya*	***kakyarumwei***	'break completely'
(vii)	*jitukuliki*	**tukutukutuku**	colour	*jitukulikira*	**kakyarumwei**	'red completely'
(viii)	*sirika*	**ce/ceiceicei!**	state	*sirikira*	**kakyarumwei**	'be silent totally'
(ix)	*twala*	***pai pai pai***	intensity	*twara*	***kakyarumwei***	'take hurriedly'
(x)	*fu*	***fufufu***	intensity	*feera*	***kakyarumwei***	'die completely'

As shown in examples (12 i-x) above, ideophones are in collocation relationship with certain verbs. The pair of verb and ideophone corresponds to the applicative verb with the intensifier adverbial *kakyarumwei*. The construal of the ideophones yields exactly the same meaning as their corresponding applicative adverbial *kakyarumwei*. As such, the action *tiica **kutu*** and *tiicirya **kakyarumwei*** have the same meaning, that is, 'break completely', the same way *yatika **pwa*** and *yatikira **kakyarumwei*** have the same meaning too, that is, 'break loudly'. This can call for a morphosyntactic interpretation which emphasises the semantic and positional features of ideophones (Awoyale, 1981). In this case, ideophones occur in mutually exclusive environment with the applicative adverbial. The fact that the applicative adverbial must be licensed by an applicative morpheme means that ideophones cannot be used with derived verbs in Ruruuli-Lunyala.

According to the categories stipulated in Voeltz & Kilian-Hatz (2001), ideophones that encode actions can either be punctual or durative. For instance, *yeya swii w*hich is semantically equivalent to *yeyera kakyarumwei* 'sweep completely' is a durative action. In contrast, *tiica kutu* which is semantically equivalent to *tiicirya kakyarumwei* 'break completely' is a punctual occurrence. We, therefore, claim that ideophones have a typical syntactic and semantic relationship with the applicative adverbial *kakyarumwei*.

4. CONCLUSION

We have shown that all types of verb bases can attract an applicative marker: Transitive, ditransitive, unergative and unaccusative verb bases all allow an applicative construction. We highlighted the syntactic inter-variations and relationships between these verb bases. For instance, we have shown the /k/:/l/ transitivity pair relationship, whereby the presence of /k/ in the last syllable denotes unaccusativity, while /l/ in the same position would make the verb transitive. In this case, unaccusative verbs whose transitivity status is signaled by /k/ exclusively form locative applicatives.

We have also indicated the two ways by which object marking is observed in Ruruuli-Lunyala as in most Bantu languages: either the object appears as a post-verbal Noun Phrase or the post-verbal NP does not appear at all. Further analysis indicates that Ruruuli-Lunyala uses verbal pronominal morphology to mark the applicative object. The applied object is realized as a pronoun for an applicative construction to be possible. We also noted how the inclusion of a full NP as the applied object cannot allow an applicative construction in ditransitive Ruruuli-Lunyala verbs. In such a case, the applied object has to be expressed as a pronoun in the applicative construction.

We explained how the applicative construction in Ruruuli-Lunyala can license an applicative adverbial *kakyarumwei* 'completely'/'very'/'a lot' and the telicity marker *bwereere* in addition to the applied object.

Lastly, we also pointed out that ideophones can occur in mutually exclusive environment with the applicative adverbial *kakyarumwei* 'completely'/'rapidly'/'loudly'. We, thus, claim that ideophones have a typical syntactic and semantic relationship with the applicative adverbial. Interface between ideophones and applicative adverbial usage needs further investigation to establish if these findings are unique to Ruruuli-Lunyala or cut across all Bantu Languages.

REFERENCES

Ahuja, Ram. 2005. *Research Methods*. Second edition. New Delhi, India: Prem Rawat.

Amos, Atuhairwe. 2021. *Applicative Verbs in Ruruuli-Lunyala: Structure and Meaning*. Ph.D. dissertation, Makerere University.

Awoyale, Yiwola. 1981. Nominal compound formation in Yoruba ideophones. *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics*, *3*(2): 139-157.

Bostoen, Koen and Léon Mundeke. 2011. The causative/applicative syncretism in Mbuun (Bantu B87, DRC): Semantic split or phonemic merger? *Journal of African languages and linguistics*, *32*(2): 179-218.

Bowern, Claire. 2015. *Linguistic fieldwork: A practical guide*. Springer.

Bresnan, Joan and Lioba Moshi. 1993. Object asymmetries in comparative Bantu syntax. In *Theoretical Aspects of Bantu Grammar*, ed. by Sam A. Mchombo, 47-91. Stanford, CA: CSLI.

Caudal, Patrick and David Nicolas. 2005. Types of degrees and types of event structures. In *Event arguments: Foundations and applications*, ed. by Claudia Maienborn and Angelika Wöllstein, 277-300. Tubingen: Niemeyer.

Comrie, Bernard. 1976. *Aspect*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Reprinted 2001.

Creissels, Denis. 2004. Non-canonical applicatives and focalization in Tswana. Paper presented at the SWL1 conference (Leipzig, 5-8 August).

Dixon, Robert. M. 2012. *Basic Linguistic Theory*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Dryer, Matthew S. 1983. Indirect objects in Kiyarwanda revisited. In *Studies in Relational Grammar I*, ed. by David M. Pelmutter, 129-140. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Eberhard, David M., Gary F. Simons, and Charles D. Fennig. 2024. *Ethnologue: Languages of the world*. Twenty-second edition. Dallas, Texas: SIL International. Online version: http://www.ethnologue.com

Isingoma, Bebwa. 2012a. *Argument Structure: A Comparative Study of Triadic Constructions in Rutooro and English.* Ph.D. dissertation, University of Agder.

Isingoma, Bebwa. 2012b. Triadic Constructions in Rutooro. In *Selected Proceedings of the 42nd Annual Conference on African Linguistics*, ed. by Michael R. Marlo, Nikki B. Adams, Christopher R. Green, Michelle Morrison, and Tristan M. Purvis, 149-160. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Kimenyi, Alexandre. 1980. *A Relational Grammar of Kinyarwanda*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Leech, Geoffrey. 2007. New resources, or just better old ones? The Holy Grail of representativeness. In *Corpus linguistics and the web*, ed. by Marianne Hundt, Nadja Nesselhauf and Carolin Biewer, 133-149. Amsterdam: Brill Rodopi.

Mphande, Lupenga. 1992. Ideophones and African Verse. *Research in African Literatures*, *23*(1): 117-129.

Ngoboka, Jean P. 2005. *A syntactic analysis of Kinyarwanda applicatives.* Citeseer.

Ngonyani, Deo, and Peter Githinji. 2006. The asymmetric nature of Bantu applicative constructions. *Lingua*, *116*(1), 31-63.

Pacchiarotti, Sara. 2018. *Bantu applicative construction types involving*-id: form, functions and diachrony*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Oregon.

Pylkkänen, Liina. 2002. *Introducing arguments.* Ph.D. dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Scott, Mike. 1996. *WordSmith tools*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sinclair, John. 1993. Representativeness in corpus design. *Literary and Linguistic Computing 8* (4): 243-257.

Tenny, Carol Lee. 1992. The aspectual interface hypothesis. In *Lexical matters*, ed. by Ivan A. Sag and Anna Szabolcsi, 1-27. Stanford, CA: CSLI.

Turnbull, Joanna, Diana Lea, Dilys Parkinson, Patrick Phillips, Ben Francis, Suzanne Webb, Victoria Bull and Michael Ashby. 2010. *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Voeltz, F. K. Erhard and Christa Kilian-Hatz. 2001. *Ideophones.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Walková, Milada. 2012. Dowty's aspectual tests: Standing the test of time but failing the test of aspect. *Poznań Studies in Contemporary Linguistics PSiCL*, *48*: 495-518.

Witzlack-Makarevich, Alena, Saudah Namyalo, Anatol Kiriggwajjo, Zarina Molochieva, and Amos Atuhairwe. 2019. *A corpus of spoken Ruuli*. Makerere University & Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

Zeller, Jochen. 2004. *Left Dislocation in Zulu*. Manuscript, University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban, South Africa.

APPENDIX

Abbreviations

1	First person; class 1
2	Second person; class 2
3	Third person; class 3
ADV	Adverb
APPL	Applicative
AUG	Augment
ECL	Enclitic
FV	Final vowel
IMP	Imperative
INF	Infinitive
NP	Noun phrase
O	Object
PL	Plural
PFV	Perfective
PST	Past tense
RLED	Ruruuli-Lunyala-English Dictionary
S	Subject
sg	Singular