(A)SYMMETRY IN TIRIKI DOUBLE OBJECT CONSTRUCTIONS (DOCS)

Bresnan & Moshi (1990) showed that Bantu languages vary with regard to (a)symmetry in DOCs, i.e. whether one or both internal arguments show primary object properties. Past works (see van der Wal 2017 for a survey of relevant Bantu patterns) primarily focused on (a)symmetry in postverbal word order, passivization, and object marking. Tiriki (Bantu-Luyia, West Kenya), as illustrated below, behaves like a symmetrical language in that either object can be object-marked on the lexical ditransitive:

(1) a. Hudley a-manyiny-e va-somi vi-tapu [IO > DO]
Hudley 1SM-show-FV.PST 2-student 8-book
b. Hudley a-**va**-manyiny-e vi-tapu [OMing IO]
Hudley 1SM-**2OM**-show-FV.PST 8-book
c. Hudley a-**vi**-manyiny-e va-somi [OMing DO]
Hudley 1SM-**8OM**-show-FV.PST 2-student
'Hudley showed students books.'

Nevertheless, Tiriki DOCs also exhibit a flexibility in symmetry. First, no Tiriki DOC passes all symmetry tests. In the case of lexical ditransitives, Tiriki is symmetrical in object marking, but asymmetrical in word order, always defaulting to IO > DO in neutral discourse contexts:

(2) #Hudley a-manyiny-e vi-tapu va-somi [#DO > IO]
Hudley 1SM-show-FV.PST 8-book 2-student
'Hudley showed students books.' (*licit when 'book' bears aboutness topic*)

Second, Tiriki DOCs behave differently with respect to symmetry depending on the thematic roles of their objects (e.g. benefactive, instrumental, causative). For example, while passivization is symmetrical in most lexical ditransitives, it is only possible to promote DO in instrumental applicatives:

(3) Symmetrical passivization with lexical ditransitive
a. va-somi va-manyiny-**w**-e vi-tapu [passivizing IO]
2-student 2SM-show-PASS-FV.PST 8-book
'Students were shown books.'
b. vi-tapu vi-manyiny-**w**-e va-somi [passivizing DO]
8-book 8SM-show-PASS-FV.PST 2-student
'Books were shown to the students.'

(4) Asymmetrical passivization with instrumental applicative
a. *shi-chiko shi-lachil-il-**w**-e vu-shuma [*passivizing IO]
7-spoon 7SM-eat-APPL-PASS-FV.PST 14-ugali
'A spoon was used to eat ugali.'
b. vu-shuma vu-lachil-il-**w**-e shi-chiko [passivizing DO]
14-ugali 14SM-eat-APPL-PASS-FV.PST 7-spoon
'Ugali was eaten with a spoon.'

In fact, van der Wal (2017) has already reported this intra-language variation in symmetry across Bantu. However, its scope is restricted to objects as causee, benefactive, recipient, and theme. This talk, based on new empirical data, surveys seven types of DOCs in Tiriki (see (5)) and aims to contribute in the following ways: First, this thorough case study serves as a new testing ground for the implicational hierarchy (causative > applicative > lexical ditransitive) proposed in van der Wal (2017) and enriches existing descriptions of variable DOC (a)symmetry within a language (cf. Jeong 2007, Jerro 2016, Jerro 2019). Second, I present new findings on variable postverbal word orders across DOCs and flexible symmetry within a DOC (e.g. instrumental applicatives). Third, I extend the discussion beyond DOCs and into

predicates with DP-PP arguments, such as ‘give’ ditransitive (reminiscent of English dative constructions) and instrumentals.

(5) Summary of findings

DOCs	**Example**	**Symmetry**		
		Canonical word order	**Object marking**	**Passivization**
khuhela **‘to give’**	/	IO > DO	X *possible w/ IO*	X *possible w/ IO*
khuhana **‘to give’**	/	IO (PP) > DO	X *possible w/ DO*	X *possible w/ DO*
Other lexical ditransitives	*khumanyinya* ‘to show’	IO > DO	√	√
Benefactive applicatives	*khutekhela* ‘to cook for’	IO > DO	√	√
Instrumentals	*khulachila… na…* ‘to eat (ugali) with’	DO > IO (PP)	X *possible w/ DO*	N/A
Instrumental applicatives	*khulachilila* ‘to eat (ugali) with’	DO > IO	√	X *possible w/ DO*
Causatives	*khung’wekhitsa* ‘to feed (liquid)’	IO > DO	√	√