

Complementation in Luruuli/Lunyara

Marie-Louise Lind Sørensen (rzj911@hum.ku.dk, University of Copenhagen)

Alena Witzlack-Makarevich (awitzlack@isfas.uni-kiel.de, University of Kiel)

Luruuli/Lunyara (ISO 639-3: *ruc*) is a previously undescribed Great Lakes Bantu language mainly spoken in the Nakasongola and Kayunga districts of central Uganda. Luruuli/Lunyara employs a number of complementation strategies. The most common strategies are complement clauses with the verb in the infinitive form marked by the prefix *(o)ku-*, as in (1a), and several types of clausal complements with finite verb forms. The complement clause can be either unmarked, as in (1b) or be marked with a complementizer, the most common of which is *nti*, as in (1c). These two options are also available for complement clauses with direct speech. Another less common complementizer is *nga*. Another source of variation among the complementation strategies comes from the form of the finite verb: Some constructions are preferentially used with the subjunctive, as in (1d).

In this paper we will first provide an overview of the complementation strategies in Luruuli/Lunyara and draw parallels to constructions described for related languages. As individual matrix predicates do not allow for every complementation strategy and have preferences for specific complementation strategies, we will then proceed with the exploration of conditions which determine the choice of the complementation strategies. To this end, we consider several predictors.

First we investigate the restrictions imposed by the semantic characteristics of various matrix predicate types, e.g. knowledge predicates, phasal predicates, utterance predicates (following Noonan 2007). Then we also consider whether the complement clause refers to a proposition or a state of affairs (cf. Svenonius 1994, Cristofaro 2003, Boye 2012), also known as “actions” and “facts” (Vendler 1967), and “events” and “propositions” (Palmer 1979), a contrast that can essentially be understood as a contrast between truth-valued and non-truth valued meaning units. Finally we also consider the identity of the subject arguments in the two clauses and the polarity of the two clauses.

Examples

(1) Luruuli/Lunyara (own fieldwork)

- a. *Nsobola okusosoitoora omuntu ekiibulo.*
 1sgS-can-FV INF-serve-FV AUG-1.person AUG-7.meal
 ‘I can serve a person a meal.’
- b. *N-lowooz-a ba-ku-fun-a-mu kidooli.*
 1sgS-think-FV 3plS-PROG-get-FV-LOC little
 ‘I think they benefit little.’
- c. *Naye nje n-ku-lowooz-a nti o-Kanca a-li-ba-bon-a.*
 but I 1sgS-PROG-think-FV COMPL AUG-1.God 3sgS-FUT-3plO-see-FV
 ‘But I think that God will judge them.’
- d. *O-mwana tu-ku-tak-a a-kul-e.*
 AUG-1.child 1plS-PROG-want-FV 3sgS-grow.up-SUBJ
 ‘We want the child to grow up.’

References

- Boye, Kasper. 2012. *Epistemic meaning: A crosslinguistic and functional-cognitive study*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Cristofaro, Sonia. 2003. *Subordination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Noonan, Michael. 2007. Complementation. In Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description: Volume 2, Complex constructions*, 52–150. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2nd edn.
- Palmer, Frank Robert. 1979. *Modality and the English modals*. London: Longman.
- Svenonius, Peter. 1994. *Dependent nexus: Subordinate predication structures in English and the Scandinavian languages*: University of California, Santa Cruz PhD dissertation.
- Vendler, Zeno. 1967. *Linguistics in philosophy*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University.