Chapter 10
Applicative morphology

10.1 Applicatives: introduction

There are three different applicative suffixes, -ngkene, -ako and -(VC)i. These may all be grouped under the name APPlicative because they are all valency-increasing devices that add an extra object, rather than a subject (valency increase with the addition of a subject is the defining characteristic of causativisation). The first of these, -ngkene, here called the COMITATIVE or AGENTIVE applicative suffix, and glossed COM, has the most restricted range of meaning, always implying some degree of accompaniment in an action, and is most restricted in terms of which verbs it may occur on. The suffix -(VC)i (the values of the optional vowel (V) and optional consonant (C) that precede the invariable final -i vary) is labelled the DIRECTIONAL applicative suffix, and is glossed DIR. It appears to be developing into several distinct suffixes, which all have the shared component of a location or direction, but with additional differing semantic overtones. Finally -ako has the broadest range of meaning of the applicative suffixes, and is glossed simply as APPL for applicative. This affix can introduce arguments in dative, instrumental, theme, cause or purpose semantic roles.

Examples of the different semantic roles of applied objects that may be introduced by the different affixes are given in (1) - (8):

Comitative (Agent)
(1)  No-kede-ngkene te ompu-no.
    3R-sit-COM  CORE  grandparent-3POSS
    ‘They sat with their grandparents.’

Dative
(2)  No-helo'a-ako te ina-no.
    3R-cook-APPL  CORE  mother-3POSS
    ‘They cooked for their mother.’

Instrument
(3)  No-hugu-ako te poda-no.
    3R-chop-APPL  CORE  knife-3POSS
    ‘They chopped with their knives.’

Theme
(4)  No-hu'u-ako te towu.
    3R-give-APPL  CORE  sugar.cane
    ‘They gave some sugar cane (to someone).’
Location

(5) *No-kede-mi te kadera.*
3R-sit-DIR CORE chair
‘They sat on the chairs.’

Allative

(6) *No-wil(a)-isi te ama-su.*
3R-go-DIR CORE father-1SG.POSS
‘They visited my father.’

Cause

(7) *No-mate-ako te buti.*
3R-die-APPL CORE fall
‘They died in a fall.’

Purpose

(8) *No-lemba-ako te karia’a.*
3R-carry-APPL CORE festival
‘They carried (something) for the festival.’

An example of the different meanings attached to the directional suffix, depending on the choice of consonant, is seen in (9) and (10):

(9) *No-kede-api te ta’i u kadola.*
3R-sit-DIR CORE faeces GEN chicken
‘He sat in the chicken shit.’
(unintentionally, and has suffered as a result)

(10) *No-kede-mi te kadera.*
3R-sit-DIR CORE chair
‘He sat on the chair.’
(intended result of his actions)

The syntactic restrictions that apply to the different suffixes and the different semantic roles of the applied objects are dealt with individually in sections 10.2 - 10.4, and summarised in 10.7. The terminology used in the following discussion uses the standard terms found in the literature where such terms exist. The terms ‘base object’ and ‘applied object’ refer to the object of a predicate before applicative morphology was added to it, and the object that is dependent on the applicative morphology, respectively. Similarly, the applicative predicate is the predicate containing the applied object, and the base predicate is the one that contains the base object (if transitive), or the single intransitive argument. Since the [A] of the applicative predicate is always coindexed with the [A] or [S] of the base predicate, I shall refer to that argument as the subject of the construction.

Illustrating the use of these terms in English, with a dative applied object, in the sentence ‘Dawn cooked eggplants for Fred’, *Dawn* is serving as the subject of the base predicate, of the applicative predicate, and of the construction as a whole; *eggplants* is the base object, and *Fred* is the applied object; the basic sentence from which this applicative construction is derived is ‘Dawn cooked eggplants.’ This sentence is illustrated in the following models, which will be used in the rest of this chapter to illustrate the derivational
processes involved with the different affixes

Clausal constituents:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\emptyset \\
\downarrow \\
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[Dawn do-for Fred]} \\
\text{[Dawn cook eggplants]}
\end{array}
\end{array}
\]

Combined Predicate

Argument structure:

\[
\text{‘apply } \langle [\text{Ag: Dawn}], [\text{Dat: Fred}] \text{ cook } [\langle [\text{Ag: Dawn}], [\text{Pt: Eggplant}] \rangle] \rangle
\]

subject applied subject base
object object

One important restriction on the formation of applicative constructions is that the applied object may not bear the same semantic role as the base object. Thus, if the base object is [Dative], as in (11), a second [Dative] argument may not be added:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[Dative]} - [\text{Dative}]:
\end{array}
\]

(11)  * No-‘ema-ako te ina-no te polisi.
3R-answer-APPL CORE mother-3POSS CORE policeman
‘He answered the policeman for his mother.’

(Good with the reading ‘He answered the policeman by telling about his mother.’)

If the second dative argument is not indexed on the verb, it is acceptable:

(11)’ No-‘ema te polisi ako te ina-no.
3R-answer CORE policeman BEN CORE mother-3POSS
‘He answered the policeman for his mother.’

Similarly in (12), in which the verb hesala takes an instrument as its object, a second instrumental argument may not be added to the predicate:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[Instrument]} - [\text{Instrument}]:
\end{array}
\]

(12)  * No-he-sala-ako te hao te sala molengo.
3R-DO-trousers-APPL CORE rope CORE trousers old
‘He wore the old trousers by means of a piece of rope.’

An exception to this generalisation is presented in section 10.6, dealing with ditransitive verbs. The constraint illustrated in (12) is not one that prohibits the use of an applicative construction with verbs such as hesala; hesala may be part of an applicative construction, just not with an instrumental applied object:

(12)’ No-he-sala-ako te ama-no te sala leama.
3R-DO-trousers-APPL CORE father-3POSS CORE trousers good
‘He wore the good trousers as a favour to his father.’
One feature characterises all the applicative constructions, and is also shared with the causative constructions: unspecified object deletion may not apply to both the objects in the construction at the same time. In other words, when applicative morphology is present, at least one of the objects, the base or the applied object, must be present. Different constructions have different restrictions as to which of the objects may be deleted, but all require that at least one of them be present (either as object index or as full nominal).

10.2 Comitative applicative suffix -ngkene

This suffix is the most restricted of the three applicative suffixes, with respect to the semantic roles that it can introduce. Only [Agent] semantic roles are introduced, and this forms an exception to the otherwise firm requirement that the applied object of an applicative construction may not bear the same semantic role as an argument in the base predicate, showing that the prominence (as defined in chapter 3) assigned to an argument this far up the thematic hierarchy affects the grammaticality judgements of at least some constructions.

When an agentive object is added by the comitative applicative affix, the applied agent is an equal and voluntary participant in the action indicated by the verb, but is viewed by the speaker as of secondary importance after the [A]. When added to an intransitive verb, the applied object shows all the properties of a normal object, except for the inability to undergo unspecified object deletion, as mentioned below (18). Sentences illustrating the various properties associated with objects in Tukang Besi are given in (13) - (19):

(13) No-wila-ngkene te kene-su.
3R-go-COM CORE friend-1SG.POSS
‘They went with my friend.’

Object suffix:

(14) No-wila-ngkene-'e na kene-su.
3R-go-COM-3OBJ NOM friend-1SG.POSS
‘They went with my friend.’

Object relative clause:

(15) Te kene-su i-wila-ngkene-no no-waliako-mo.
CORE friend-1SG.POSS OP-go-COM-3POSS 3R-return-PF
‘My friend who they went with has come back.’

Passive prefix:

(16) No-to-wila-ngkene-mo na kene-su.
3R-PASS-go-COM-PF NOM friend-1SG.POSS
‘My friend was gone with.’

Reciprocal prefix:

(17) No-po-wila-wila-ngkene ke kene-su.
3R-REC-RED-go-COM and friend-1SG.POSS
‘They and my friend went with each other.’
Unspecified Object deletion:

(18) * No-wila-ngkene Ø.
    3R-go-COM
    ‘They went with [ ].’

Pragmatic focus:

(19) No-wila-ngkene te enai?
    3R-go-COM CORE who
    ‘Who did they go with?’

With a transitive verb, the same properties are encountered for an applied object, except that it may not be the subject of a passive sentence:

(20) No-homoru-ngkene te kene-no te wurai
    3R-weave-COM CORE friend-3POSS CORE sarong
    na ompu-su.
    NOM grandparent-1SG.POSS
    ‘My grandmother wove a sarong with her friend.’

Object suffix:

(21) No-homoru-ngkene-'e na kene-no te wurai
    3R-weave-COM-3OBJ NOM friend-3POSS CORE sarong
    te ompu-su.
    CORE grandparent-1SG.POSS
    ‘My grandmother wove a sarong with her friend.’

Object relative clause:

(22) Te kene-no i-homoru-ngkene-no (nu wurai)
    CORE friend-1SG.POSS OP-weave-COM-3POSS GEN sarong
    no-koni.
    3R-laugh
    ‘Her friend whom she wove a sarong with is laughing.’

Passive prefix:

(23) * No-to-homoru-ngkene-mo na kene-no (te wurai).
    3R-PASS-weave-COM-PF NOM friend-3POSS CORE sarong
    ‘Her friend was woven (a sarong) with.’

Reciprocal prefix:

(24) No-po-homo-homoru-ngkene ke kene-no (te wurai).
    3R-REC-RED-weave-COM and friend-3POSS CORE sarong
    ‘(My grandmother) and her friend wove a sarong with each other.’

Unspecified Object deletion:

(25) * No-homoru-ngkene Ø te wurai.
    3R-weave-COM CORE sarong
    ‘She wove a sarong with [ ].’
Pragmatic focus:

(26) \( \text{No-homoru-ngkene te emai?} \)
3R-weave-COM CORE who
‘Who did she weave (a sarong) with?’

The behaviour of the base object is illustrated in (27) - (32). It is immediately obvious that the base object is syntactically fairly inert. Indeed, the only one of the syntactic properties examined that an agentive base object has access to is the ability to be deleted.

Object suffix:

(27) * \( \text{No-homoru-ngkene-'e na wurai te kene-no.} \)
3R-weave-COM-3OBJ NOM sarong CORE friend-3POSS
‘She wove a sarong with her friend.’

Object relative clause:

(28) * \( \text{Te wurai i-homoru-ngkene-no (nu kene-no) no-leama.} \)
CORE sarong OP-weave-COM-3POSS GEN friend-3POSS 3R-good
‘The sarong that she wove with her friend is beautiful.’

Passive prefix:

(29) * \( \text{No-to-homoru-ngkene-mo na wurai (te kene-no).} \)
3R-PASS-weave-COM-PF NOM sarong CORE friend-3POSS
‘The sarong was woven with.’

Reciprocal prefix:

(30) * \( \text{No-po-homo-homoru-ngkene ke wurai).} \)
3R-REC-RED-weave-COM and sarong

Unspecified Object deletion:

(31) \( \text{No-homoru-ngkene te kene-no \( \Phi \).} \)
3R-go-COM CORE friend-3POSS
‘She wove with her friend[ ].’

Pragmatic focus:

(32) * \( \text{No-homoru-ngkene te païra?} \)
3R-weave-COM CORE what
‘What did she weave with?’

One noteworthy property of the -ngkene suffix is the ability that it has to ‘force’ an agentive interpretation on some otherwise unaccusative verbs. For instance, the verb moturu ‘sleep’ can be interpreted as a state, ‘be asleep’, or as a process ‘fall asleep, go to sleep’. In neither case is the subject an agent. With the comitative applicative suffix added, however, an agentive interpretation is forced on the verb. This is a consequence of the fact that the applied agent is, as stated above, an equal and voluntary participant in the verb. Compare (33), with an unaccusative interpretation, and (34), in which the -ngkene suffix forces an unergative interpretation that was not otherwise available to the verb:
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[Theme]:

(33) No-moturu kene wowine ane ke hotu mopera.
    3R-sleep and woman exist and hair short
    ‘He slept with the woman with the short hair.’
    (ie., they were asleep near each other.)
    ( # they had sex together)

[Agent]:

(34) ke hotu mopera.
    3R-sleep-COM woman exist and hair short
    ‘He slept with the woman with the short hair.’
    ( ie., they had sex together)
    ( * they simply slept near each other without activity)

Sentence (33) uses the conjunction kene (on a bare NP; see chapter 18) to show an additional person who happened to be asleep as well. The [Theme/Patient] interpretation is the only one possible. In (34), however, the [A] of the now transitive verb must be an [Agent], because of the addition of the -ngkene applicative suffix that requires an [Agent] in the subcategorisation frame of the verb, and so the non-Active interpretation is not allowed. Most importantly, the meaning of the verb changes from the non-Active ‘be asleep; fall asleep’ to the Active ‘have sex with’, as indicated in the glosses. Some other verbs that have been observed with this alternation include mate ‘die, be dead / commit suicide’; nggolo ‘roll around on the ground (as if drunk) / roll around playfully’; molango ‘be drunk or seasick, become drunk or seasick / intentionally drink with the aim of becoming drunk’.

10.3 General applicative suffix -ako

The suffix -ako is the most common of the three applicative suffixes, and also displays the widest range of meaning of the three suffixes. Examples of the use of -ako to support dative, instrumental, theme, cause and purpose semantic roles as objects of the verbs have already been given in (2) - (8). Despite the fact that all these semantic roles may appear as objects of verbs affixed with this applicative suffix, they do not display identical syntactic behaviour, as can be determined when diagnostic tests are carried out. Additionally, the behaviour of the base object of the construction also varies, depending on the semantic role of the applied object. To illustrate this point, compare the following sentences, and their applicativised forms:

(35) a. No-ala te kau.
    3R-fetch CORE wood
    ‘She fetched the wood.’

   b. No-ala-ako te ina-su te kau.
    3R-fetch-APPL CORE mother-1SG.POSS CORE wood
    ‘She fetched the wood as a favour for my mother.’

(36) a. No-balo te ama-no.
    3R-answer CORE father-3POSS
    ‘She answered her uncle.’
b. No-balo-ako te kampo te ama-no.
   3R-answer-APPL CORE village CORE father-3POSS
   'She answered her uncle with the (name of the, information about the) village.'

When we add object suffixes to the verbs, we find that only the dative applied object allows this. The theme applied object in (38) cannot appear as a nominative argument, and be indexed on the verb by object suffixes:

(37) c. No-ala-ako-'e na ina-su.
   3R-fetch-APPL-3OBJ NOM mother-1SG.POSS
   'She fetched (it) as a favour for my mother.'

(38) c. * No-balo-ako-'e na kampo.
   3R-answer-APPL-3OBJ NOM village
   'She answered with the (name of the, information about the) village.'

Differences also emerge in the base objects, when we examine their behaviour in object relative clauses, in which the base object of a dative applicative construction may head a relative clause, whilst the base object of a theme applicative construction may not:

(39) d. Te kau i-ala-ako-no.
   CORE wood OP-fetch-APPL-3POSS
   'The wood that was fetched for her…'

(40) d. * Te ama-no i-balo-ako-no.
   CORE father-3POSS OP-answer-APPL-3POSS
   'Her father, who was answered with it…'

The properties of the applied and base objects of applicative constructions involving -ako are examined separately for the different semantic roles of the applied objects.

10.3.1 Dative applied objects

Dative applied objects built on intransitive or transitive base predicates display the same range of grammaticality as did the agentive objects found when the -ngkene suffix is used:

(41) No-wila-ako te ina-no i daoa.
   3R-go-APPL. CORE mother-3POSS OBL market
   'She went to the market for her mother.'

Object suffix:

(42) No-wila-ako-'e na ina-no i daoa.
   3R-go-APPL-3OBJ NOM mother-3POSS OBL market
   'She went to the market for her mother.'

Object relative clause:

(43) Te ina-no i-wila-ako-no no-mele.
   CORE mother-3POSS OP-go-APPL-3POSS 3R-happy
   'Her mother who she went to the market for is happy.'
Passive prefix:

(44) *No-to-wila-ako-mo na ina-no i daoa.
3R-PASS-go-APPL-PF NOM mother-3POSS OBL market
‘Her mother was gone to the market.’

(ie., her mother benefited by someone going to the market for her)

Reciprocal prefix:

(45) No-po-wila-wila-ako na amai.
3R-REC-RED-go-APPL NOM 3PL
‘They both went for each other.’

Unspecified Object deletion:

(46) *No-wila-ako Ø.
3R-go-APPL
‘She went for [ ].’

Pragmatic focus:

(47) No-wila-ako te emai i daoa?
3R-go-APPL CORE who OBL market
‘Who did she go to the market for?’

With a transitive verb, the same restrictions on grammaticality are encountered:

(48) No-helo’a-ako te ana-no te kaujawa.
3R-cook-APPL CORE child-3POSS CORE cassava
‘She cooked cassava for her children.’

Object suffix:

(49) No-helo’a-ako-’e na ana-no te kaujawa.
3R-cook-APPL-3OBJ NOM child-3POSS CORE cassava
‘She cooked cassava for her children.’

Object relative clause:

(50) Te ana-no i-helo’a-ako-no (nu kaujawa) no-mobila.
CORE child-3POSS OP-cook-APPL-3POSS GEN cassava 3R-full
‘Their children who she cooked (cassava) for are full.’

Passive prefix:

(51) No-to-helo’a-ako-mo na ana-no te kaujawa.
3R-PASS-cook-APPL-PF NOM child-3POSS CORE cassava
‘Her children were cooked cassava for.’

Reciprocal prefix:

(52) No-po-helo-helo’a-ako na amai.
3R-REC-RED-cook-APPL NOM 3PL
‘They both cooked for each other.’
Unspecified Object deletion:

(53) * No-helo'a-ako te kaujawa Ø.
3R-cook-APPL CORE cassava
‘She cooked cassava for [ ].’

Pragmatic focus:

(54) No-helo'a-ako te emai te kaujawa?
3R-cook-APPL CORE who CORE cassava
‘Who did she cook cassava for?’

The (limited) behaviour of the base object in a dative applicative construction is illustrated in (55) - (60):

Object suffix:

(55) * No-helo'a-ako-'e na kaujawa te ana-no.
3R-cook-APPL-3OBJ NOM cassava CORE child-3POSS
‘She cooked cassava for her children.’

Object relative clause:

(56) * Te kaujawa i-helo'a-ako-no (nu ana-no) no-mobai.
CORE cassava OP-cook-APPL-3POSS GEN child-3POSS 3R-hard
‘Their cassava she cooked (for her children) is hard.’

Passive prefix:

(57) * No-to-helo'a-ako-mo na kaujawa (te ana-no).
3R-PASS-cook-APPL-PF NOM cassava CORE child-3POSS
‘The cassava was cooked for the children.’

Reciprocal prefix:

(58) * No-po-helo-helo'a-ako kene kaujawa.
3R-REC-RED-cook-APPL and cassava

Unspecified Object deletion:

(59) No-helo'a-ako te ana-no Ø.
3R-cook-APPL CORE child-3POSS
‘She cooked [ ] for her children.’

Pragmatic focus:

(60) * No-helo'a-ako te pairo?
3R-cook-APPL CORE what
‘What did she cook for?’

(Good with an instrumental reading: ‘What did she cook with?’)

Notice that whilst the standard object relative clause (described in chapter 15) is not available to the base object, a relative clause with an argument other than the by-phrase, indexed as the first genitive argument, is grammatical. This construction is described in more detail in chapter 15.
10.3.2 Instrumental applied objects

The applied object of an instrumental applicative construction with intransitive or transitive base predicates shows the same behaviour as does a dative one, except that the verb may not be reciprocalised to make the instrumental applied object coindexed with the original subject. Sentences illustrating the behaviour of instrumental applied objects are given below:

(61) *No-wila-ako te kolikoli.*
  3R-go-APPL CORE canoe
  ‘He went by means of a canoe.’

Object suffix:

(62) *No-wila-ako-’e na kolikoli.*
  3R-go-APPL-3OBJ NOM canoe
  ‘He went by means of a canoe.’

Object relative clause:

(63) Te kolikoli i-wila-ako-no o-isala-melanga.
  CORE canoe OP-go-APPL-3POSS 3R-rather-long
  ‘The canoe that he used to go in is quite long.’

Passive prefix:

(64) *No-to-wila-ako-mo na honda-no.*
  3R-PASS-go-APPL-PF NOM motorbike-3POSS
  ‘His motorbike was gone with.’

Reciprocal prefix:

(65) *No-po-wila-wila-ako na kene-su ke honda.*
  3R-REC-RED-go-APPL NOM friend-1SG.POSS and motorbike

Unspecified Object deletion:

(66) *No-wila-ako Ø.*
  3R-go-APPL
  ‘He went by means of [ ].’

Pragmatic focus:

(67) *No-wila-ako te pāra?*
  3R-go-APPL CORE what
  ‘What did he use to go with?’

The same grammatical restrictions are encountered with applied objects of transitive base verb:

(68) No-tu’o-ako te baliu te kau.
  3R-chop-APPL CORE axe CORE tree
  ‘He chopped the tree with an axe.’
Object suffix:

(69) *No-tu'o-ako-'e na baliu te kau.
3R-chop-APPL-3OBJ NOM axe CORE tree
‘He chopped the tree with an axe.’

Object relative clause:

(70) Te baliu i-tu'o-ako-no (nu kau) no-mohama.
CORE axe OP-chop-APPL-3POSS GEN tree 3R-sharp
‘The axe that he chopped (the tree) with is sharp.’

Passive prefix:

(71) No-to-tu'o-ako-mo na baliu (te kau).
3R-PASS-chop-APPL-PF NOM axe CORE tree
‘His axe was chopped (a tree) with.’

Reciprocal prefix:

(72) *No-po-tobo-tobo-ako na amai.
3R-REC-RED-stab-APPL NOM they

Unspecified Object deletion:

(73) *No-tu'o-ako te kau Ø.
3R-chop-APPL CORE tree
‘He chopped the tree with [ ].’

Pragmatic focus:

(74) No-tu'o-ako te paira (te kau)?
3R-chop-APPL CORE what CORE tree
‘What did he chop (the tree) with?’

The base object of an instrumental applicative construction behaves somewhat differently from that in dative or agentive constructions:

Object suffix:

(75) *No-tu'o-ako-'e na kau te baliu.
3R-chop-APPL-3OBJ NOM tree CORE axe
‘He chopped the tree with an axe.’

Object relative clause:

(76) *Te kau i-tu'o-ako-no (nu baliu) no-saori-melangka.
CORE tree OP-chop-APPL-3POSS GEN axe 3R-very-tall
‘The tree that he chopped with (the axe) is very tall.’

Passive prefix:

(77) *No-to-tu'o-ako-mo na kau (te baliu).
3R-PASS-chop-APPL-PF NOM tree CORE axe
‘The tree was chopped with (an axe).’

Reciprocal prefix:

(78) No-po-tobo-tobo-ako na amai (te poda).
3R-REC-RED-stab-APPL NOM 3PL CORE knife
‘They stabbed each other with (knives).’
Unspecified Object deletion:

(79)  
\[
\text{No-tu’o-ako } \text{te } \text{baliu } \emptyset . \\
3R-\text{chop-APPL } \text{CORE } \text{axe}
\]
‘He chopped [ ] with an axe.’

Pragmatic focus:

(80)  *
\[
\text{No-tu’o-ako } \text{te } \text{paira (te baliu)?} \\
3R-\text{chop-APPL } \text{CORE what } \text{CORE } \text{axe}
\]
‘What did he chop with (the axe)?’

(Good with the (bizarre) reading ‘What did he chop the axe with.’)

Unlike the dative and agentive base objects, the base object of an instrumental applicative construction can enter into a reciprocal relationship with the agent, given sufficient animacy. This is a good reason for supposing that the ability to enter into operations such as reciprocal ones is based on the argument’s inherent semantic content, rather than the role that it plays in a clause.

10.3.3 Theme applied objects

Applied objects bearing a theme role are not found for intransitive verbs, only for transitive verbs. Theme applied objects display little syntactic flexibility compared to the Agent, Dative and Instrument applied objects already examined. A theme applied object is not able to bear the nominative grammatical relation, but is capable of heading relative clauses, being subject in passive constructions, and being pragmatically focussed:

(81)  
\[
\text{No-hu’u-ako } \text{te } \text{boku } \text{te } \text{ana.} \\
3R-\text{give-APPL } \text{CORE } \text{book } \text{CORE } \text{child}
\]
‘He gave the child a book.’

Object suffix:

(82)  *
\[
\text{No-hu’u-ako-’e } \text{na } \text{boku } \text{te } \text{ana.} \\
3R-\text{give-APPL-3OBJ } \text{NOM } \text{book } \text{CORE } \text{child}
\]
‘He gave the child a book.’

Object relative clause:

(83)  
\[
\text{Te } \text{boku } \text{i-hu’u-ako-no (nu } \text{ana) no-mokobo.} \\
\text{CORE } \text{book } \text{OP-give-APPL-3POSS GEN } \text{child } \text{3R-thick}
\]
‘The book that he gave (to the child) is thick.’

Passive prefix:

(84)  
\[
\text{No-to-hu’u-ako-mo } \text{na } \text{boku (te } \text{ana).} \\
3R-\text{PASS-give-APPL-PF } \text{NOM } \text{book } \text{CORE } \text{child}
\]
‘The book was given (to a child).’

Reciprocal prefix:

(85)  *
\[
\text{No-po-hu’u-hu’u-ako } \text{na } \text{amai.} \\
3R-\text{REC-RED-give-APPL } \text{NOM } \text{they}
\]
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Unspecified Object deletion:

(86) * No-hu'u-ako te ana Ø.
3R-give-APPL CORE child
‘He gave the child with [ ].’

Pragmatic focus:

(87) No-hu'u-ako te paira (te ana)?
3R-give-APPL CORE what CORE child
‘What did he give (to the child)?’

The base object of a theme applicative construction is also very restricted:

Object suffix:

(88) * No-hu'u-ako-'e na ana te boku.
3R-give-APPL-3OBJ NOM child CORE book
‘He gave the child a book.’

Object relative clause:

(89) * Te ana i-hu'u-ako-no (nu boku) no-mele.
CORE child OP-give-APPL-3POSS GEN book 3R-happy
‘The child that he gave (the book) to is happy.’

Passive prefix:

(90) * No-to-hu'u-ako-mo na ana (te boku).
3R-PASS-give-APPL-PF NOM child CORE book
‘The child was given (a book).’

Reciprocal prefix:

(91) No-po-hu'u-ku'u-ako na amai (te boku).
3R-REC-RED-give-APPL NOM 3PL CORE book
‘They gave each other (a book).’

(The book must be the same real-world entity in each of the two transactions)

Unspecified Object deletion:

(92) No-hu'u-ako te boku Ø.
3R-give-APPL CORE book
‘He gave [ ] a book.’

Pragmatic focus:

(93) * No-hu'u-ako te emai (te boku)?
3R-give-APPL CORE who CORE book
‘Who did he give (a book) to?’

10.3.4 Cause applied objects

Only an intransitive verb can take -ako to introduce a cause phrase in an applicative construction. The syntactic behaviour of the applied object is very limited:
Applicative morphology

No-mate-ako te buti.
3R-die-APPL CORE fall
‘He died in a fall.’

Object suffix:
No-mate-ako-’e na buti.
3R-die-APPL-3OBJ NOM fall
‘He died in a fall.’

Object relative clause:
Te buti i-mate-ako-no…
CORE fall OP-die-APPL-3POSS
‘The fall that he died in….’

Passive prefix:
No-to-mate-ako-mo na buti.
3R-PASS-die-APPL-PF NOM fall
‘A fall was died in.’

Reciprocal prefix:
No-po-mate-mate-ako na kene-su ke buti.
3R-REC-RED-die-APPL NOM friend-1SG.POSS and fall

Unspecified Object deletion:
No-mate-ako Ø.
3R-die-APPL
‘He died in a [ ].’

Pragmatic focus:
No-mate-ako te païra?
3R-die-APPL CORE what
‘How did he die?’

Notice that some of the properties are different from those found with instrumental applied objects, distinguishing these two semantic roles.

10.3.5 Purpose applied objects

Purpose phrases can also be introduced by an applicative suffix, and are even more inert syntactically than causal applied objects. Unlike a causal applied object, however, a purpose applicative construction may appear on a transitive verb. With an intransitive base, the only ‘property’ displayed by a purpose applied object is the ability to be in pragmatic focus:

Ku-wila-ako te kawi-’a u kene-su.
1SG-go-APPL CORE marry-NL GEN friend-1SG.POSS
‘I went for the wedding of my friend.’
Purpose applicative constructions based on transitive verbs have even more restrictions, with pragmatic focus on the applied object only minimally interpreted as acceptable, and ungrammatical for some speakers. There is a tendency for pragmatic focus to be interpreted as referring to an instrumental applied object:

(108) * No-lea-ako- e te langke-‘a-no te kaitela.
3R-load-APPL CORE sail-NL-3POSS CORE corn
‘They loaded the corn for the voyage.’

Object suffix:

(109) * No-lea-ako- ‘e na langke-‘a-no te kaitela.
3R-load-APPL-3OBJ NOM sail-NL-3POSS CORE corn
‘They loaded the corn for the voyage.’

Object relative clause:

(110) * Te langke-‘a-no i-lea-ako-no (nu kaitela)
CORE sail-NL-3POSS OP-load-APPL-3POSS GEN corn
no-molengo.
3R-long
‘The voyage that they loaded (the corn on) was long.’
Passive prefix:

(111) * No-to-lea-ako-mo na langke-'a-no (te kaitela).

3R-PASS-load-APPL-PF NOM sail-NL-3POSS CORN corn

‘The voyage was loaded for (with corn).’

Reciprocal prefix:

(112) * No-po-lea-lea-ako na amai.

3R-REC-RED-load-APPL NOM 3PL

(this is good with a dative interpretation, ‘They loaded Ø for each other.’)

Unspecified Object deletion:

(113) * No-lea-ako Ø te kaitela.

3R-load-APPL CORE CORN corn

‘They loaded the corn for [ ].’

Pragmatic focus:

(114) No-lea-ako te paira (te kaitela)?

3R-load-APPL CORE what CORN corn

# ‘What did they load (to the corn)?’

(Preferred interpretation: ‘What did they use to load the corn with?’)

The base object of a purpose applicative construction is even more syntactically limited:

Object suffix:

(115) * No-lea-ako-'e na kaitela te langke-'a-no.

3R-load-APPL-3OBJ NOM CORN CORE sail-NL-3POSS

‘They loaded the corn for a voyage.’

Object relative clause:

(116) * Te kaitela i-lea-ako-no (nu langke-'a-no)

CORE CORN OP-load-APPL-3POSS GEN sail-NL-3POSS

o-koruo.

3R-many

‘The corn that they loaded (for the voyage) was much.’

Passive prefix:

(117) * No-to-lea-ako-mo na kaitela (te langke-'a-no).

3R-PASS-load-APPL-PF NOM CORN CORE sail-NL-3POSS

‘The corn was loaded for (a voyage).’

Reciprocal prefix:

(118) No-po-lea-lea-ako na amai (te langke-'a-no).

3R-REC-RED-load-APPL NOM 3PL CORE sail-NL-3POSS

‘They loaded each other for (a voyage).’

Unspecified Object deletion:

(119) No-lea-ako te langke-'a-no Ø.

3R-load-APPL CORE sail-NL-3POSS

‘They loaded [ ] for the voyage.’
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Pragmatic focus:

(120) * No-lea-ako te paira (te langke-'a-no)?
  3R-load-APPL CORE what CORE sail-NL-3POSS
  ‘What did they load for (the voyage)?’

10.3.6 Summary of -ako

Unlike -ngkene, which has a small range of possible interpretations, all involving two equal participants involved in the same activity, the meaning of the -ako suffix is less constrained, possibly reflecting a longer period of grammaticalisation from its (supposed) original meaning ‘do for’, which function it still preserves as the sole interpretation of ako when used as the main verb of a clause. In non-contiguous level ‘serial verb constructions’ in which ako is functioning as a predicate (described in chapter 14), the only possible interpretations of the object of ako are dative or purposive, suggesting that the cause and instrumental interpretations are the most recent to be added to the wide range that this affix has when used in a nuclear level construction. Indeed, we can say that when ako introduces a cause phrase it is unambiguously an applicative affix, since in no other of its uses can it take a cause phrase. When it serves with a dative argument, the interpretation of ako as an affix rather than an independent verb is most arbitrary, since the independent verb ako can take dative objects as well, as seen in (121) which uses the set of dative object suffixes on the main verb ako:

(121) No-ako-naku te mia lum emba te wemba.
  3R-do.for-1SG.DAT.OBJ CORE person carry.SI CORE bamboo
  ‘The person carrying the bamboo did (it) for me.’

The difference in grammatical behaviour between instrumental and dative applied objects is minimal, the only difference being the ability to participate in a reciprocal construction, and that is most likely the result of constraints imposed by the semantics of the arguments themselves, rather than a syntactic constraint working on applicative constructions (this is intended in the same manner that not all transitive verbs can be reciprocalised. ‘We saw each other’, or ‘Anna and I laughed at each other’ are both acceptable, but real-world constraints stop sentences with highly affected, non-sentient patients, such as ‘The tree and I chopped each other down.’ from being grammatical when reciprocalised). This matter is discussed further in 10.7.

The fact that the base objects of these applicative constructions show some syntactic properties is also interesting. The ability to participate in a reciprocal construction is likely to be the result of the semantics of the arguments involved. The different restrictions involved in relative clauses are more fully discussed in chapter 15.

10.4 Locative applicative ‘suffix complex’ -(VC)i

The locative applicative suffix is of the general form -(VC)i; that is, the suffix necessarily contains the /i/ vowel, and may be preceded by a consonant. Some forms of the suffix additionally have a vowel preceding this consonant (there are no attested cases of -Vi). Unlike the preceding two affixes, which introduce primarily core semantic roles as core arguments of the verbal complex, the -(VC)i suffix serves only to make oblique arguments into core arguments of the verbal complex. The fact that these arguments bear lower-
ranked semantic roles than most of those introduced by -ngkene and -ako leads to different syntactic behaviour of either the applied object or the base object in some respects. This can be ascribed to the semantic roles of the participants, rather than being thought of as a property inherent in the affix itself, due to the fact that the non-core semantic roles introduced by -ako, the “cause” and “purpose” roles, also show substantially different behaviour from applied objects with higher semantic roles.

The different varieties of the suffix are set out below:

a. -i ‘removal’
   wulu ‘feather’ hewulu-i ‘pluck, remove feathers from’
   (the verb hewulu, without a directional applicative suffix, does not occur)

b. -pi ‘put’
   tau ‘put’ tau-pi ‘put in’

c. -api ‘discard’
   aso ‘sell’ aso-api ‘sell to (spitefully)’
   kabi ‘throw away’ kabi-api ‘throw away at’
   kahu ‘send’ kahu-api ‘send to’
   kede ‘sit’ kede-api ‘sit on (unintentionally)’
   tompa ‘throw at’ tompa-api ‘throw to (someone) (to catch)’
   tuhu ‘descend’ tuhu-api ‘descend down to’

d. -ti ‘plant’
   hembula ‘plant’ hembula-ti ‘plant (a place) with something’
   kombi ‘medicine’ komba-ti ‘treat (someone) with medicine’

e. -ki ‘forceful application’
   busu ‘punch’ busu-ki ‘punch with forward fist’
   pepe ‘slap’ pepe-ki ‘slap forcefully’
   sepa ‘kick’ sepa-ki ‘kick’
   tapa ‘inform’ tapa-ki ‘reprimand’

f. -'i ‘accompanying object’
   mai ‘come’ ma-'i ‘bring something’

g. -mi ‘endpoint activity’
   ‘ido ‘live’ ‘ido-mi ‘grow up in’
   da’o laro ‘be angry’ da’olaro-mi ‘be angry at’
   doito ‘cry’ doito-mi ‘cry about (someone)’
   kede ‘sit’ kede-mi ‘sit on’
   rato ‘arrive’ rato-mi ‘arrive to (someone)’
   tonto ‘view’ tonto-mi ‘stare at’
h. -\( V \)si ‘movement towards’
   uranga ‘be at’ urang(a)-isi ‘occupy’
   mai ‘come’ mai-si ‘come to (someone), approach’
   wila ‘go’ wila(a)-isi ‘visit’

In many cases the consonants found in this suffix represent the consonants that were final consonants in proto-Austronesian (eg., PMP * sepak ‘kick’ has the final *k preserved in the locative applicative suffix, even though it is dropped elsewhere in the language. This does not explain the consonant in, for instance, tau-pi, where tau is derived from proto-Austronesian * taRuq, since there is a (semi-) regular rule whereby *q > 2 in Tukang Besi. The expected form would thus be * tau-‘i, not the attested tau-pi. A recent loan word, tonto ‘view, spectate’ (The fact that this is a recent loan can be deduced from the fact that it has the variants tonto (< Malay tonton) and nonto (< Malay m gon ton (meN + tonton), shows an m in the affix, despite being a borrowing from Malay tonton with a final n; the expected * tonto-\( n \)i does not occur. Furthermore, there is the problem of verbs that were vowel-final in proto-Austronesian, but nonetheless show consonants in the locative applicative affix, such as mai (< PAN * maRi), which appears as mai(i)-‘i and mai(i)-isi, both forms displaying consonants. We must therefore conclude that a lot, perhaps even a majority, of the suffixal consonants are not derived from verb-final consonants in an earlier form of the language. Van den Berg (1989: 291–294) has also observed similar problems with respect to the \(-Ci\) and \(-CaO\) suffixes in Muna, observing that they often vary from dialect to dialect, and from affix to affix with the same root.

A cursory glance is sufficient to notice that some verbal roots (such as mai or kede) can appear with more than one possible allomorph of the \(-\(V\)Ci\) affix, leading to a tentative conclusion that the different consonants have developed into separate affixes, a solution that has been proposed for the similar affix (in terms of both form and function) that is found in Oceanic languages (Arms 1973, Geraghty 1983, Milner 1984 amongst others). This would however fail to capture the fact that most of the verb roots have only one possible affix. A further problem with the Tukang Besi data for this solution is that even having removed the consonant as a thematic consonant, and declared the locative applicative affix to be simply the \(-i\), we would still need to account for the variation between the presence and absence of vowels between the consonant and the verbal root (as in \(-api\) and \(-\(V\)si\)). It is worth noting that, apart from the object suffixes, all the other (limited) suffixal material on verbs is disyllabic, as are most roots in the language. The addition of a vowel to the \(-Ci\) affix cannot be accounted for by assuming it is an epenthetic vowel used to break up consonant clusters, as occurs in other languages, since all roots are vowel-final in Tukang Besi (diachronically, this becomes true only after the final *C has been reinterpreted as part of the applicative suffix). One possible solution is that the speakers are restructuring the morpheme based on analogy with the other, predominantly disyllabic, morphemes in the language. This solution is then not any more helpful in explaining the data here.

When combined with an intransitive root, the \(-\(V\)Ci\) affix produces syntactically productive applicative constructions:

\[
(122) \quad \text{No-kede-mi te kadera atu.} \\
3R-sit-DIR CORE chair that \\
\text{‘She sat on that chair.’}
\]
Applicative morphology

Object suffix:

(123)  
No-kede-mi-'e na kadera atu.  
3R-sit-DIR-3OBJ NOM chair that  
‘She sat on that chair.’

Object relative clause:

(124)  
Te kadera i-kede-mi-no no-to’oge.  
CORE chair OP-sit-DIR-3POSS 3R-big  
‘The chair that she used to sit on is big.’

Passive prefix:

(125)  
No-to-kede-mi-mo na kadera atu.  
3R-PASS-sit-DIR-PF NOM chair that  
‘His that chair was sat on.’

Reciprocal prefix:

(126)  
* No-po-kede-kede-mi na kene-su ke kadera.  
3R-REC-RED-sit-DIR GEN friend-1SG.POSS and chair  
‘My friend and the chair sat on each other.’

Unspecified Object deletion:

(127)  
* No-kede-mi Ø.  
3R-sit-DIR  
‘She sat on a [ ].’

Pragmatic focus:

(128)  
No-kede-mi te pai’a?  
3R-sit-DIR CORE what  
‘What did she sit on?’

The same grammatical patterns are encountered with applied objects of transitive base verbs, though the proscription against unspecified object deletion is absent, if the other (base) object is present:

(129)  
No-aso-api te bae te iai-no.  
3R-sell-APPL CORE rice CORE younger.sibling-3POSS  
‘He sold to his brother some rice.’

Object suffix:

(130)  
No-aso-api-'e na iai-no te bae.  
3R-sell-APPL-3OBJ NOM younger.sibling-3POSS CORE rice  
‘He sold to his brother some rice.’

Object relative clause, nominal agent precedes nominal theme:

(131)  
Te iai-no i-aso-api-no (nu bae)  
CORE younger.sibling-3POSS OP-sell-APPL-3POSS GEN rice  
no-da’o laro-no.  
3R-bad inside-3POSS  
‘His brother whom he sold (rice) to is angry.’
Object relative clause, nominal agent follows nominal theme:

(132)  
Te iai-no i-aso-api (nu bae)  
CORE younger.sibling-3POSS OP-sell-APPL GEN rice  
(nu ia) no-da'o laro-no.  
GEN 3SG 3R-bad inside-3POSS  
‘The rice that was sold to (his brother) (by him) is angry.’

Passive prefix:

(133)  
No-to-aso-api-mo na iai-no (te bae).  
3R-PASS-sell-APPL-PF NOM younger.sibling-3POSS CORE rice  
‘His brother was sold (rice) to.’

Reciprocal prefix:

(134)  
No-po-aso-aso-api na amai (te bara-bara).  
3R-REC-RED-sell-APPL NOM 3PL CORE things  
‘They sold things to each other.’

Unspecified Object deletion:

(135)  
No-aso-api Ø te bae.  
3R-sell-APPL CORE rice  
‘He sold rice to [ ].’

Pragmatic focus:

(136)  
No-aso-api te emai (te bae)?  
3R-sell-APPL CORE what CORE rice  
‘Who did he sell (rice) to?’

The base object of a locative applicative construction behaves very freely, compared to the base objects of the other types of applicative constructions:

Object suffix:

(137) *  
No-aso-api-'e na bae te iai-no.  
3R-sell-APPL-3OBJ NOM rice CORE younger.sibling-3POSS  
‘He sold some rice to his brother.’

Object relative clause:

(138)  
Te bae i-aso-api( * -no) (di iai-no)  
CORE rice OP-sell-APPL-3POSS OBL younger.sibling-3POSS  
no-mohali.  
3R-expensive  
‘The rice that was sold (to his brother) was expensive.’

Passive prefix:

(139) *  
No-to-aso-api-mo na bae (te iai-no).  
3R-PASS-sell-APPL-PF NOM rice CORE younger.sibling-3POSS  
‘The rice was sold to (his brother).’
Reciprocal prefix:

(140) *No-po-aso-aso-api na ia kene bae
3R-REC-RED-sell-APPL NOM 3SG and rice
(te iai-no).
CORE younger.sibling-3POSS
‘He and the rice sold each other to (his younger brother).’

Unspecified Object deletion:

(141) *No-aso-api te iai-no Ø.
3R-sell-APPL CORE younger.sibling-3POSS
‘He sold [   ] to his younger brother’

Pragmatic focus:

(142) No-aso-api te pāra (te iai-no)?
3R-sell-APPL CORE what CORE younger.sibling-3POSS
‘What did he sell to (his younger brother)?’

The most notable thing about the locative applicative constructions is the behaviour of the base object. Unlike the other applicative constructions that introduce higher semantic roles (agent, dative, instrument and theme/patient), the base object of a locative applicative construction may not be left out of a clause, and may be pragmatically focussed. This behaviour indicates that the lower semantic role of the applied object means that the object, although made into a core argument by the presence of applicative morphology, is not prominent enough pragmatically to be capable of satisfying the need for at least one object in the clause, or to be the sole locus of pragmatic focus.

10.5 Double applicatives

Double applicative constructions are available for a very limited subset of the possible combinations of applicative suffixes. The semantic roles and relative ordering of the applied objects determines the acceptability of a possible combination of applicative suffixes. The allowed interactions of two applicative suffixes may be summarised, arranged by affix forms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>-ngkene</th>
<th>-ako</th>
<th>-(VC)i</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-ngkene</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ako</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-(VC)i</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The allowed combinations of semantic roles of the applied objects are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>Ag</th>
<th>Dat</th>
<th>Instr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ag</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus (143) is a grammatical form, with the dative applicative affix further from the verb root than the agentive one, whilst (144), with the reverse order, is not:
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[Agent] + [Dative]

(143)  No-wila-ngkene-ako te ina-no te Wa Ki’i.
3R-go-COM-APPL  CORE  mother-3POSS  CORE  Wa Ki’i
‘She went with Wa Ki’i for her mother.’

[Dative] + [Agent]

(144) * No-wila-ako-ngkene te ina-no.
3R-go-APPL-COM  CORE  mother-3POSS
‘She went for someone with her mother.’

The allowed and ungrammatical structures are represented in (145)’ and (146)’:

(143)’  ‘APPL ([Ag], [Dat]  APPL ([Ag], [Ag]  PRED ([ ]) ) )’

(144)’ * ‘APPL ([Ag], [Ag]  APPL ([Ag], [Dat]  PRED ([ ]) ) )’

The grammatical properties of the two applied objects and the base object will be discussed in separate sections, based on the semantic role borne by the second applied object in the predicate. To describe the different objects, the terminology ‘second applied object’ and ‘first applied object’ will be used. The first applied object is the object that depends on the applicative morphology closest to the verb. The second applied object is the object dependent on the applicative morphology outside this. In the examples just examined, te Wa Ki’i is the first applied object of wila-ngkene-ako; the second applied object is te inano.

We may represent these groupings as follows:

[wila-[ngkene-[ako te ina-no]2nd_object-appl te Wa Ki’i]1st_object-appl ]
go-COM-APPL  CORE  mother-3POSS  CORE  Wa Ki’i

Double applicative constructions are also reported for Kinyarwanda (Kimenyi 1980, Gerdts 1992). Gerdts concludes that most of the ‘applicative’ structures in Kinyarwanda do involve advancement, and hence most of the apparent ‘double’ applicative structures do not really involve two applicatives. In Tukang Besi this argument will not work since many of the tests that Gerdts uses on Kinyarwanda to establish the presence of a position for the ‘applicative’ object even before the addition of applicative morphology do not apply to Tukang Besi, since it is a language without many of the symmetrical properties ascribed to Kinyarwanda.

10.5.1 Agent second applied objects

With an agent as the second applied object, the first applied object must be a locative applied object. Both intransitive and transitive constructions are found, and in both constructions the first applied object shows no syntactic activity at all. In the double applicative construction based on a transitive verb the base object is similarly inert syntactically. Intransitive and transitive sentences are exemplified separately, looking at the
same object properties that have been examined for basic applicative constructions.

Intransitive verbs:

(145) a. \textit{Ku-wil(a)-isi-ngkene te iai-su}  
1SG-go-DIR-COM CORE younger.sibling-1SG.POSS  
(di ompu-su).  
OBL grandparent-1SG.POSS  
‘I visited my grandmother with my younger sister.’

Object suffixes on second applied object:

b. \textit{Ku-wil(a)-isi-ngkene-’e na iai-su}  
1SG-go-DIR-COM-3OBJ NOM younger.sibling-1SG.POSS  
(di ompu-su).  
OBL grandparent-1SG.POSS  
‘I visited my grandmother with my younger sister.’

Object suffixes on first applied object:

c. * \textit{Ku-wil(a)-isi-ngkene-’e te iai-su}  
1SG-go-DIR-COM-3OBJ CORE younger.sibling-1SG.POSS  
na ompu-su.  
NOM grandparent-1SG.POSS  
‘I visited my grandmother with my younger sister.’

Object relative clause on second applied object:

d. \textit{Te iai-su i-wil(a)-isi-ngkene-su}  
CORE younger.sibling-1SG.POSS OP-go-DIR-COM-1SG.POSS  
(di ompu-su no-mele).  
OBL grandparent-3POSS 3R-happy  
‘My younger sister who I visited my grandmother with is happy.’

Object relative clause on first applied object:

e. * \textit{Te ompu-su i-wil(a)-isi-ngkene-su}  
CORE grandparent-3POSS OP-go-DIR-COM-1SG.POSS  
(u iai-su) no-mele.  
GEN younger.sibling-1SG.POSS 3R-happy  
‘My grandmother who I visited with (my younger sister) is happy.’

Passive:

f. * \textit{No-to-wil(a)-isi-ngkene-mo}  
3R-PASS-go-DIR-COM-PF  
(na kene-su / na ompu-su).  
NOM friend-1SG.POSS NOM grandparent-3POSS  
‘(My friend // My grandmother) was visited with.’

Pragmatic focus:

g. ‘\textit{U-wil(a)-isi-ngkene te ie’emai}?’  
2SG.R-go-DIR-COM CORE who  
‘Who are you visiting (with)?’

* ‘Who did you visit (with someone)?’
Transitive verbs:

(146) a. Ku-tau-pi-ngkene te iai-su
1SG-put-DIR-COM CORE younger.sibling-1SG.POSS
tea marica (di roukau i-helo'a-su / CORE pepper OBL vegetables OP-cook-1SG.POSS
teroukau i-helo'a-su). CORE vegetables OP-cook-1SG.POSS
‘I put pepper in the vegetables that I was cooking with my younger sister.’

Object suffixes on second applied object:
b. Ku-tau-pi-ngkene-’e na iai-su
1SG-put-DIR-COM-3OBJ NOM younger.sibling-1SG.POSS
tea marica (di roukau i-helo'a-su / CORE pepper OBL vegetables OP-cook-1SG.POSS
*te roukau i-helo’a-su).
CORE vegetables OP-cook-1SG.POSS
‘I put pepper in the vegetables that I was cooking with my younger sister.’

Object suffixes on first applied object:
c. *Ku-tau-pi-ngkene-’e te iai-su
1SG-put-DIR-COM-3OBJ CORE younger.sibling-1SG.POSS
na marica (di roukau i-helo’a-su / NOM pepper OBL vegetables OP-cook-1SG.POSS
teroukau i-helo’a-su). CORE vegetables OP-cook-1SG.POSS
‘I put pepper in the vegetables that I was cooking with my younger sister.’

Object suffixes on base object:
d. *Ku-tau-pi-ngkene-’e na roukau i-helo’a-su
1SG-put-DIR-COM-3OBJ NOM vegetables OP-cook-1SG.POSS
teiai-su. CORE younger.sibling-1SG.POSS
‘I put pepper in the vegetables that I was cooking with my younger sister.’

Object relative clause on second applied object:
e. Te iai-su i-tau-pi-ngkene-su
CORE younger.sibling-1SG.POSS OP-put-DIR-COM-1SG.POSS
* (u marica) (di roukau i-helo’a-su) no-mele.
GEN pepper OBL vegetables OP-cook-1SG.POSS 3R-happy
‘My younger sister who I put pepper in (the vegetables I was cooking) with is happy.’

Object relative clause on first applied object:
f. *Te marica i-tau-pi-ngkene-su
CORE pepper OP-put-DIR-COM-1SG.POSS
(di roukau i-helo’a-su) o-isala-mohana.
OBL vegetables OP-cook-1SG.POSS 3R-rather-hot
‘The pepper that I put in (the vegetables I was cooking) with (someone) is rather spicily hot.’
Object relative clause on base object:

g. * Te roukau i-tau-pi-ngkene-su
   CORE vegetables OP-put-DIR-COM-1SG.POSS
   (u marica) (u iai-su) no-mombaka.
   GEN pepper GEN younger.sibling-1SG.POSS 3R-delicious
   ‘The vegetables that I put (pepper) in with (my younger sister) are delicious’.

Passive:

h. * No-to-tau-pi-ngkene-mo
   3R-PASS-put-DIR-COM-PF
   (na kene-su / na marica / na roukau).
   NOM friend-1SG.POSS NOM pepper / NOM vegetables
   ‘(My friend / the pepper / the vegetables) was put in with.’

Pragmatic focus on second applied object:

i. ‘U-tau-pi-ngkene te ie’emai?
   2SG.R-put-DIR-COM CORE who
   ‘Who are you putting (it) (in it) with?’

Pragmatic focus on first applied object or base object:

j. * ‘U-tau-pi-ngkene te paira?
   2SG.R-put-DIR-COM CORE what
   ‘What are you putting (it) in (it) with (someone)?’
   ‘What are you putting in (it) with (someone)?’

The behaviour of a double applicative construction with an agentive second applied object is very similar to the behaviour of a basic applicative construction with an argument in the same semantic role as applied object. The only difference is the treatment of the non-(second) applied object, which in the case of a double applicative construction appears and behaves as an oblique argument, as if the locative applicative morphology had not been added to the verb. In the case of a double applicative construction based on a transitive verb, the first applied object may appear with either oblique (di) or core (te) case marking, but in each case behaves as an oblique argument syntactically, displaying no syntactic object properties.

10.5.2 Dative second applied objects

A dative applicative can follow either an agentive applicative -ngkene, or a locative -(VC)i applicative. The [Agent] + [Dative] combination is dealt with first. This is found only with transitive base verbs:

(147) a. No-homoru-ngkene-ako te iaku te kene-no
   3R-weave-COM-APPL CORE 1SG CORE friend-3POSS
   te wurai na ompu-su.
   CORE sarong NOM grandparent-1SG.POSS
   ‘My grandmother wove a sarong for me with her friend.’
Object suffixes on second applied object:
b. * No-homoru-ngkene-ako-aku te kene-no
   3R-weave-COM-APPL-1SG.OBJ CORE friend-3POSS
te wurai te ompu-su.
   CORE sarong CORE grandparent-1SG.POSS
   ‘My grandmother wove a sarong for me with her friend.’

Object suffixes on first applied object:
c. No-homoru-ngkene-ako-’e te iaku na kene-no
   3R-weave-COM-APPL-3OBJ CORE 1SG NOM friend-3POSS
   te wurai te ompu-su.
   CORE sarong CORE grandparent-1SG.POSS
   ‘My grandmother wove a sarong for me with her friend.’

Object suffixes on base object:
d. * No-homoru-ngkene-ako-’e te iaku te kene-no
   3R-weave-COM-APPL-3OBJ CORE 1SG CORE friend-3POSS
   na wurai te ompu-su.
   NOM sarong CORE grandparent-1SG.POSS
   ‘My grandmother wove a sarong for me with her friend.’

Object relative clause:
e. * Te (iaku / wurai / kene-no) i-homoru-ngkene-ako-no.
   1SG / sarong / friend-3POSS OP-weave-COM-APPL-3POSS
   ‘(I / the sarong / her friend) which was woven for with.’

Passive:
e. * No-to-homoru-ngkene-ako-mo na (iaku / kene-no / wurai).
   3R-PASS-weave-COM-APPL-PF NOM 1SG / friend-3POSS / sarong
   ‘(I / Her friend / A sarong) was woven with for.’

Pragmatic focus:
f. * Nu-homoru-ngkene-ako te (emai / paira)?
   2SG.R-weave-COM-APPL CORE who / what
   ‘Who are you weaving (something) for with (someone)?’
   ‘Who are you weaving (something) with for (someone)?’
   ‘What are you weaving for (someone) with (someone)?’

What is most interesting about the data on agent + dative combinations is that when there are two applied objects, only the first applied object, the agent, may be nominative and be indexed on the verb. The second applied object does not have these privileges. This suggests that the ability to be nominative is partly determined by the semantics of the argument itself; the agent is more prominent than the dative argument when it comes to determining which of the two may be nominative. This makes perfect sense if we assume that the applicative constructions ‘collapse’ the separate predicates and refer directly to prominence on the thematic hierarchy, as suggested in (147c)” (derived from (147c)’). Although (147b)’ appears to be a reasonable assignment of case features, when the ‘collapsed’ predicate is examined ((147b”)), the ungrammaticality of the structure which would assign nominative case to the third argument on the hierarchy is obvious (see chapter 20 for more discussion on the mechanism behind nominative case assignment).
Applicative morphology

With a locative applicative construction as the first suffix, the base predicate can be either intransitive or transitive.

Base verb is intransitive:

(148) a. No-wil(a)-isi-ako te ina-no te ompu-no
3R-go-DIR-APPL CORE mother-3POSS CORE grandparent-3POSS
na kene-su.
CORE friend-1SG.POSS
‘My friend visited her grandmother as a favour to her mother.’

Object suffixes on second applied object:

b. Ku-wil(a)-isi-ako-e na ina-su
1SG-go-DIR-APPL-3OBJ NOM mother-1SG.POSS
te ompu-su.
CORE grandparent-1SG.POSS
‘I visited my grandmother as a favour to my mother.’

Object suffixes on first applied object:

c. * Ku-wil(a)-isi-ako-e na ompu-su
1SG-go-DIR-APPL-3OBJ NOM grandparent-1SG.POSS
te ina-su.
CORE mother-1SG.POSS
‘I visited my grandmother as a favour to my mother.’

Object relative clause on second applied object:

d. Te ina-su i-wil(a)-isi-ako-su.
CORE mother-1SG.POSS OP-go-DIR-APPL-1SG.POSS
‘My mother who I visited (grandmother) for.’
Object relative clause on first applied object:
e. * Te ompu-su i-wil(a)-isi-ako-su.
   CORE grandparent-1SG.POSS OP-go-DIR-APPL-1SG.POSS
   ‘My grandmother who I visited for (my mother).’

Passive on second applied object:
f. * No-to-wil(a)-isi-ako-mo na ina-su.
   3R-PASS-go-DIR-APPL-PF NOM mother-1SG.POSS
   ‘My mother was visited (grandmother) for.’

Passive on first applied object:
g. * No-to-wil(a)-isi-ako-mo na ompu-su.
   3R-PASS-go-DIR-APPL-PF NOM grandparent-1SG.POSS
   ‘My grandmother was visited by me for (my mother).’

Pragmatic focus:
h. Nu-wil(a)-isi-ako te emai te ompu-'u.
   2SG.R-go-DIR-APPL CORE who CORE grandparent-2SG.POSS
   ‘Who are you visiting your grandmother as a favour for?’
   * ‘Who are you visiting as a favour for your grandmother?’

Transitive verbs as base:

(149) a. Ku-tau-pi-ako te ina-su te marica
   1SG-put-DIR-APPL CORE mother-1SG.POSS CORE pepper
   di roukau i-helo'a-su.
   OBL vegetables OP-cook-1SG.POSS
   ‘I put pepper in the vegetables that I was cooking for my mother.’

Object suffixes on second applied object:
b. Ku-tau-pi-ako-'e na ina-su te marica
   1SG-put-DIR-APPL-3OBJ NOM mother-1SG.POSS CORE pepper
   di roukau i-helo'a-su.
   OBL vegetables OP-cook-1SG.POSS
   ‘I put pepper in the vegetables that I was cooking for my mother.’

c. * Ku-tau-pi-ako-'e te ina-su te marica
   1SG-put-DIR-APPL-3OBJ CORE mother-1SG.POSS CORE pepper
   na roukau i-helo'a-su.
   NOM vegetables OP-cook-1SG.POSS
   ‘I put pepper in the vegetables that I was cooking for my mother.’

d. * Ku-tau-pi-ako-'e te ina-su na marica
   1SG-put-DIR-APPL-3OBJ CORE mother-1SG.POSS NOM pepper
   di roukau i-helo'a-su.
   OBL vegetables OP-cook-1SG.POSS
   ‘I put pepper in the vegetables that I was cooking for my mother.’
As was the case for the agentive second applied object, no passivisation is possible on this construction. Unlike the agentive case, however, passivisation is possible on dative applied objects of basic applicative constructions. Thus, the ungrammaticality of (148)g and (149)g is unexpected, and must be a feature of the doubly-embedded predicate with which the agent in the outermost applicative predicate is coindexed.
Passive of a dative double applicative construction:

\[(149g)^* \text{PASS } \langle [ ] \text{ APPL } \langle \text{[Ag], [Dat]} \rangle \text{ APPL } \langle \text{[Ag], [ ]} \rangle \text{ PRED } \langle [ ] \rangle \rangle\]

10.5.3 Instrumental second applied objects

Instrumental applicative morphology can occur as part of a double applicative construction only when it follows locative applicative morphology closer to the verb root. Versions based on both intransitive and transitive stems are found, and are exemplified in the following examples.

Intransitive:

(150) a. \textit{Ku-wil(a)-isi-ako } te kene-su
1SG-go-DIR-APPL CORE friend-1SG.POSS
te honda-su.
CORE motorbike-1SG.POSS
‘I visited my friend by means of my motorbike.’

Object suffixes on second applied object:

b. * \textit{Ku-wil(a)-isi-ako-’e na kene-su}
1SG-go-DIR-APPL-3OBJ NOM friend-1SG.POSS
te honda-su.
CORE motorbike-1SG.POSS
‘I visited my friend by means of my motorbike.’

Object suffixes on first applied object:

c. * \textit{Ku-wil(a)-isi-ako-’e te kene-su}
1SG-go-DIR-APPL-3OBJ CORE friend-1SG.POSS
na honda-su.
NOM motorbike-1SG.POSS
‘I visited my friend by means of my motorbike.’

Object relative clause on second applied object:

d. * \textit{Te honda-su i-wil(a)-isi-ako-su…}
CORE motorbike-1SG.POSS OP-go-DIR-APPL-1SG.POSS
‘My motorbike that was used by me to visit (my friend)…’

Object relative clause on first applied object:

e. * \textit{Te ina-su i-wil(a)-isi-ako-su…}
CORE mother-1SG.POSS OP-go-DIR-APPL-1SG.POSS
‘My mother that I visited by means of (my motorbike)…’

Passive on second applied object:

f. * \textit{No-to-wil(a)-isi-ako-mo na honda-su.}
3R-PASS-go-DIR-APPL-PF NOM motorbike-1SG.POSS
‘My motorbike was used by me to visit (my friend).’
Passive on first applied object:

**g.** *No-to-wil(a)-isi-ako-mo na ina-su.*

3R-PASS-go-DIR-APPL-PF NOM mother-1SG.POSS

‘My mother was visited by me by (motorbike).’

Pragmatic focus on second applied object:

**h.** 'U-wil(a)-isi-ako te paira te kene-'u?

2SG.R-go-DIR-APPL CORE what CORE friend-2SG.POSS

‘What are you visiting your friend by means of?’

Pragmatic focus on first applied object:

**i.** *U-wil(a)-isi-ako te honda-su te ie'ei?*

2SG.R-go-DIR-APPL CORE motorbike-1SG.POSS CORE who

‘Who are you visiting by means of my motorbike?’

Base verb is transitive:

(151) **a.** Ku-tau-pi-ako te sidu te marica

1SG-put-DIR-APPL CORE spoon CORE pepper

( di /* te) roukau i-helo'a-su.

OBL CORE vegetables OP-cook-1SG.POSS

‘I put pepper in the vegetables that I was cooking with a spoon.’

Object suffixes:

**b.** *Ku-tau-pi-ako-'e na (sidu / marica / roukau).*

1SG-put-DIR-APPL-3OBJ CORE spoon pepper vegetables

‘I put pepper in the vegetables with a spoon.’

Object relative clause on second applied object:

**c.** Te sidu i-tau-pi-ako-su (u marica)

CORE spoon OP-put-DIR-APPL-1SG.POSS GEN pepper

( di roukau i-helo'a-su) no-to'oge.

OBL vegetables OP-cook-1SG.POSS 3R-big

‘The spoon which I used to put (something) in (the vegetables I was cooking) is large.’

Object relative clause on first applied object:

**d.** *Te roukau i-tau-pi-ako-su ( * u marica)*

CORE vegetables OP-put-DIR-APPL-1SG.POSS GEN pepper

( u sidu) no-mombaka.

GEN spoon 3R-delicious

‘The vegetables that I put (pepper) in with (the spoon) are delicious.’

Object relative clause on base object:

**e.** *Te marica i-tau-pi-ako-su ( u sidu)*

CORE pepper OP-put-DIR-APPL-1SG.POSS GEN spoon

( di roukau i-helo'a-su) no-mohana.

OBL vegetables OP-cook-1SG.POSS 3R-hot

‘The pepper that I put in (the vegetables I was cooking) with (the spoon) is hot.’
The most unusual feature of instrumental double applicative constructions is the fact that neither the instrumental applied object nor any other object can be selected as a nominative argument, and may head a relative clause only if the base predicate was transitive.

10.6 Applicatives and ditransitive verbs

Ditransitive verbs display some unusual behaviour when they are applicativised. There are two types of ditransitive verbs, those with a recipient and a theme arguments, and those with a theme and an (optional) instrument. These are exemplified by the subcategorisation frames presented in (152) and (153):

152) ‘hu’u 〈[Ag], ([Dat]), ([Thm])〉 ‘give’

153) ‘simbi 〈[Ag], ([Instr]), ([Pt])〉’ ‘slash’

When an applicative is added to a ditransitive verb, the resulting argument structure is often completely predictable. For instance, adding a beneficiary to simbi ‘slash’ can result in a sentence such as the following:

(154) Ku-simbi-ako te tuha-su te sede
1SG-slash-APPL CORE family-1SG.POSS CORE taro
(te kabali).
CORE machete
‘I slashed at the taro (with a machete) for my family.’

(154)’ ‘APPL 〈[Ag], [Dat] slashes [Ag], [Instr], [Pt]〉’

If we add a beneficiary argument to hu’u ‘give’, however, different behaviour is found. From a base construction such as:

155) Ku-hu’u-ke na iaisu te sede.
1SG-give-3OBJ NOM younger.sibling-1SG.POSS CORE taro
‘I gave my sister some taro.’

a beneficiary added by means of applicative morphology produces the following sentence, with the original goal object, iaisu, now an oblique argument:
(156) * Ku-hu'u-ako-'e na ina-su te sede
di iai-su.
1SG-give-APPL-3OBJ NOM mother-1SG.POSS CORE taro
OBL younger.sibling-1SG.POSS
taro
‘I gave my sister some taro for my mother.’

The argument structure that we propose for (156) is set out in (156)', with the subscripts indicating the semantic identity or non-identity of the arguments (same subscript = same argument). The argument structure associated with (155) is included for comparison, with the subscripts that indicate the identity of the arguments coordinated to match those used in (156)':

(155)' ‘give \langle [Ag]_1, [Dat]_3, [Thm]_4 \rangle’

(156)' ‘APPL \langle [Ag]_1, [Dat]_2 \rangle give \langle [Ag]_1, [Thm]_4 \rangle \langle [Loc]_3 \rangle’

The reason for the shift of the original dative argument to oblique status is that otherwise it would contravene the restriction that an applied object may not bear the same semantic role as a base object. Note that this shift to oblique status is only an option for the dative argument of a ditransitive verb. The dative argument of a transitive verb may not appear as an oblique argument, freeing up the dative core argument position for a dative applied object:

(157) * No-'ema-ako te ina-no di ama-no.
3R-answer-APPL CORE mother-3POSS OBL father-3POSS
taro
‘She answered her uncle as a favour to her mother.’

Verbs with an instrument as well as another non-agent in their subcategorisation frames display similar behaviour when an instrumental applied object is added. If the applicative suffix introduces an instrumental role (in order to emphasise it, and to make it available for heading a relative clause, for instance), the base object is marked as an oblique argument of the clause:

(158) * Ku-simbi-ako te kabali di sede.
1SG-slash-APPL CORE machete OBL taro
‘I slashed at the taro with a machete.’

In other words, the formula in (160)' is not fully descriptive of the process involved in applicativising *simbi*:

(158)' ‘APPL \langle [Ag]_1, [Instr]_2 \rangle slash \langle [Ag]_1, [Instr]_2, [Pt]_3 \rangle’

In (158), it appears that the presence of the instrument argument in both the applicative predicate and the base predicate causes the base object to be an oblique argument, just as
was found when an additional dative argument was added to a predicate with a dative argument in it. In (158), however, the instrumental arguments refer to the same real-world object - note that the use of the same numerical subscripts indicates their co-identity. The construction, however, behaves as if the restriction stating that there should be no more than three core arguments in a single or double predicate construction were still restricting the number of core arguments in (158). The result of combining the two predicates in (158) is the argument structure given in (158):'

(158)” ‘APPL 〈[Ag]_1, [Instr]_2  slash 〈[Ag]_1, [Instr]_2 〈[Pt]_3〉〉’

The agentive argument is not subject to demotion to oblique status. The instrument argument cannot be demoted, since the purpose of the applicative predicate is to make arguments core ones (even if they were already core). The patient of the base predicate is thus the argument that is demoted to oblique status.

10.7 Applicative summary

10.7.1 Basic applicative constructions

The data that has been exemplified in the preceding sections for each of the morphologically distinct affix types is presented here in tabular format for the sake of easy comparison. Table 16 deals with properties of the applied objects of intransitive base predicates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 16. Intransitive verbs. Properties of the applied object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>object suffix?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Noteworthy features:

° In contrast to the applied object of an inherently transitive verb, an agentive applied object of an inherently intransitive verb may be passivised;
° A locative or allative applied object may not be deleted if it is the sole object of the verb;
° A passive may not be formed about the purposive applied object of an intransitive verb.
With base predicates that are inherently transitive, the information summarised must include not only the data about the applied object, but also information concerning the behaviour of the base object in the applicative construction. This information is presented in tables 17 and 18:

Table 17. Transitive verbs. Properties of the applied object

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agent</th>
<th>Dative</th>
<th>Instrumental</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Locative</th>
<th>Allative</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>object suffix?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORC</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+, (+)</td>
<td>+, (+)</td>
<td>+, (+)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocal</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UOD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ (+)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Noteworthy features:

- An applied object bearing the role of agent, dative, instrument or theme/patient (defining the set of core relations) cannot be deleted;
- An applied object bearing the role of theme or purpose cannot be indexed on the verb by object suffixes (and thus cannot be nominative Case);
- An applied object bearing the role of agent cannot be passivised.

Table 18. Transitive verbs. Properties of the basic object

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agent</th>
<th>Dative</th>
<th>Instrumental</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Locative</th>
<th>Allative</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>object suffix?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>{+}</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UOD</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Noteworthy features:

- The base object in a locative or allative applicative construction cannot be deleted;
- The base object of a construction involving an agentive, instrumental, theme or purpose applied object cannot be pragmatically focussed.

One feature universally distinguishes an object of an applicative construction from an object of a simple transitive verb: an object in an applicative construction may not head a subject relative clause with a verb employing a passive prefix, regardless of the semantic role that it bears, or whether it is the applied or basic object. An example of this contrast is given in (159a), (159b) and (159c) (note that the objects in (159a) and (159b) bear the same
semantic role, [Dative]):

Verb without applicative morphology:

(159) a. *Te kene-su t[um]o-hu'u te kabali no-mele.
CORE friend-1SG.POSS PASS.SI-give CORE machete 3R-pleased
‘The friend of mine who was given a machete is pleased.’

Verb with applicative morphology: applied object as head:

b. * Te kene-su t[um]o-ala-ako te kabali no-mele.
CORE friend-1SG.POSS PASS.SI-fetch-APPL CORE machete 3R-pleased
‘The friend of mine who a machete was fetched for is pleased.’

Verb with applicative morphology: base object as head:
c. * Te kabali t[um]o-ala-ako te kene-su no-mohama.
CORE machete PASS.SI-fetch-APPL CORE friend-1SG.POSS 3R-sharp
‘The machete that was fetched for my friend is sharp.’

A further distinction concerns unspecified object deletion; although applicative constructions generally allow unspecified object deletion, there is a requirement that at least one object be present, either in an NP or as a pronominal object suffix (or both) (this stems from a general requirement in the language that if a verb has valency-increasing morphology, at least one object must be present; see chapter 4.5.1). This restriction means that if the applied object is the sole object in the clause, it cannot be deleted. When the applicative construction has more than one object, the semantic role of the applied object determines which of the two objects may be deleted, and which is obligatorily present. Example (160) demonstrates that a Dative applied object must be present, whilst the base object in the same applicative construction may be deleted. This is reversed for the objects in an applicative construction with a locative applied object (example (161)), in which the base object is obligatorily present, and the applied object is the optional one. If the verb without applicative morphology is intransitive, and so there is only one object in the applicative construction, the applied object must be present, regardless of its semantic role, as seen in (162):

Dative applied object:

(160) No-ala-ako * (te kene-su) (te kabali).
3R-fetch-APPL CORE friend-1SG.POSS CORE machete
‘They fetched my friend a machete.’

Locative applied object:

(161) No-aso-api (te kene-su) * (te kabali).
3R-sell-DIR CORE friend-1SG.POSS CORE machete
‘They sold my friend a machete.’
Locative applied object of an intransitive verb:

(162)  
\[ No-will(a)-isi (* (te kene-su)). \]
3R-go-APPL CORE friend-1SG.POSS
‘They visited my friend.’

Sentence (160) is also grammatical with the applied object expressed by object suffixes:

(160)  
\[ No-alu-ako ‘e (na kene-su) (te kabali). \]
3R-fetch-APPL-3OBJ NOM friend-1SG.POSS CORE machete
‘They fetched my friend a machete.’

Another generalisation, this time linking applied objects with objects of simple transitive verbs, is that they may always be in pragmatic focus, such as is found in questions. In most cases, the base object is no longer able to be pragmatically focussed. This is illustrated in (163) and (164):

Applied object focussed:

(163)  
\[ No-ala-ako te emai te kabali? \]
3R-fetch-APPL CORE who CORE machete
‘Who did they fetch a machete for?’

Base object focussed:

(164)  
\[ * No-ala-ako te kene-su te paira? \]
3R-fetch-APPL CORE friend-1SG.POSS CORE what
‘What did they fetch for my friend?’

(this is expressible with a core-level serial verb construction: No-ala te paira ako te kene-su?)

Apart from the ability to be pragmatically focussed, and the inability to be the passive head of a subject relative clause, applied and base objects of applicative constructions display considerable variation with regard to their access to different object-defining grammatical processes, depending on the semantic role of the applied object in the construction. The facts are summarised in the preceding tables 17 and 18, dealing with the basic and applied objects of transitive verbs.

The variation in ability to be reciprocalised is the simple result of semantic plausibility; instruments, themes and locations lack the sentience necessary to participate in a transitive verb action. The inability of an applied object that is a theme to be indexed on the verb with object suffixes comes as a result of its position on the thematic hierarchy (Bresnan and Kanerva 1989, see chapter 3.2.5). The verb in hu’u ‘give’ subcategorises for \( \langle [Ag], [Dat], [Thm] \rangle \). When the theme becomes the applied object, it is still ranked below the other object, the Dative, in the thematic hierarchy: \( \langle [Ag], [Dat], [Thm]_{APPL} \rangle \); in the other applicative constructions involving core semantic roles, the applied object is always higher than the base object in terms of this thematic hierarchy: \( \langle [Ag], [Ag]_{APPL}, [ ] \rangle , \langle [Ag], [Dat]_{APPL}, [ ] \rangle \) or \( \langle [Ag], [Instr]_{APPL}, [ ] \rangle \). The fact that the theme applied object may be subject if the verb is passive stems from the fact that even without applicative morphology both arguments of hu’u may be passivised (exemplified in (11.2.1)).

Note that this symmetry does not extend to the objects of the applicativised hu’u-ako.
The base (dative) object may NOT be subject if the verb is applicativised:

Base object being subject with passive verb:

(165) * No-to-hu'u-ako-mo na kene-su te kabali ana.
3R-PASS-give-APPL-PF NOM friend-1SG.POSS CORE machete this

‘My friend was given this machete.’

It is interesting that [Agent] applied objects cannot be subject with passive verbs, when all other applied objects may be. This is illustrated in (166):

Agent (comitative) applied object:

(166) * No-to-homoru-ngkene-mo na kene nu ompu-su.
3R-PASS-weave-COM-PF NOM friend GEN grandparent-1SG.POSS

‘The friend of my grandmother was woven a sarong with.’

This probably results from a restriction on the passive operation that limits it to appearing only with arguments bearing a semantic role lower than [Agent], if there is such an argument present in the argument structure of the verb. In an applicative construction based on an intransitive verb, the only roles in the argument structure are both [Agent], but in a construction based on a transitive verb, there is (even if suppressed by unspecified object deletion) an argument with a semantic role lower than [Agent]; this argument may not be subject in a passive verb construction, however, because of the restraints on the selection of arguments by the passive process that limit it to the second semantic role in the hierarchy. It is worth noting that no simple transitive verbs have objects with [Agent] semantic roles, whilst objects with [Dative], [Instrument] and [Theme/Patient] are all attested.

10.7.2 Double applicative constructions

The summary of basic applicative constructions had to deal with the properties of the applied object and the base object for both transitive and intransitive verbs. In double applicative constructions there are at least two objects present, the first applied object and the second applied object (gauged by the relative distance of the relevant applicative morphology from the stem of the verb). If the verb was transitive before any applicative morphology was added, then the base object is also a factor to be considered.

Note that the first applied object in a double applicative construction is not the same as the base object of a basic applicative construction, nor is there a direct correspondence between the second applied object based on an intransitive verb and the applied object of a basic applicative construction based on a transitive verb. Illustrating the first of these two points, consider the marking and behaviour in nominalisations of the base object of a basic applicative construction, and the first applied object of a double applicative construction, shown here in (167) - (172). In both cases, the semantic role of the second applied object is [Agent], but only the dative applied object of the basic applicative construction is marked as a core argument, and treated as such in nominalisations:

(167) Ku-ala-ngkene te kene-su te kabali ana.
3R-fetch-COM CORE friend-1SG.POSS CORE machete this

‘I fetched this machete with my friend.’
The different behaviour displayed by the second applied object of a double applicative construction, compared to that displayed by the applied object of a basic applicative construction, is illustrated in (173) - (174), where the objects in question are both in a [Dative] semantic role:

(173) \textit{Te kene-su i-wil(a)-isi-ako-su…}\newline \textit{CORE friend-1SG.POSS OP-go-DIR-APPL-1SG.POSS} \newline ‘My friend who\textit{(se grandmother)} I visited for \textit{(them)}…’

(174) * \textit{Te kene-su i-ma(i)-isi-ako-su…}\newline \textit{CORE friend-1SG.POSS OP-come-DIR-APPL-1SG.POSS} \newline ‘My friend who I came to \textit{(somewhere)} for…’

The behaviour of the object arguments in double applicative constructions, exemplified in section 10.5, is summarised in tables 19 - 21:
Table 19. Intransitive verbs. properties of the second applied object

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intransitive</th>
<th>Locative +</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>object suffix?</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORC</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UOD</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other object</td>
<td>di</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20. Transitive verbs. properties of the second applied object: I
(Other objects: base object // first applied object)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transitive</th>
<th>Locative +</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>object suffix?</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORC</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UOD</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other objects</td>
<td>di // te/di</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21. Transitive verbs. properties of the second applied object: II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transitive</th>
<th>Agent +</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>object suffix?</td>
<td>-†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORC</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UOD</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other objects</td>
<td>te</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

†(note: object suffixes may index the comitative applied object)

10.8 Combining properties and the question of symmetry or asymmetry

A symmetrical language is one in which both objects of a construction with more than one object are accorded equal status grammatically. Either may be passivised, for example (see Bresnan and Moshi 1990). One language with both this property, and a strong typological similarity to Tukang Besi, and thus a convenient point from which to conduct a comparison, is Pancana (Austronesian, Muna-Buton group, Southeast Sulawesi; data from my own fieldnotes). Examples (175a) and (175b) show that at least one object property, the ability to be subject in a passive construction, can be claimed by either of the objects of an applicative construction with a dative applied object:
Pancana:
Passivised applied object:
(175)  a.  *Sabangka-ku no-ti-ala-a'u sabo.*
    friend-1SG.POSS 3R-PASS-fetch-APPL soap
    ‘My friend had soap fetched for him.’

Passivised basic object:
  b.  *Sabo no-ti-ala-a'u sabangka-ku.*
    soap 3R-PASS-fetch-APPL friend-1SG.POSS
    ‘Soap was fetched for my friend.’

Discussing the differences between symmetrical and asymmetrical languages, Alsina (1993: 565) notes that

The diagnostics which prove to be reliable cross-linguistically are the ability of an argument to be expressed as the subject, to be represented by means of an object marker, and to be reciprocalized.

Furthermore, it is not just the ability of either object to display such properties that is important (1993:560):

Chichewa is a language in which only one internal argument at a time can exhibit properties of nonrestricted arguments. This we shall take to be the defining characteristic of an “asymmetrical” language. On the other hand, a symmetrical language is one in which two internal arguments may simultaneously display properties of nonrestricted arguments.

Even in this stricter definition Pancana qualifies as symmetrical; for example, sentence (176) shows both the objects indexed on the verb with object suffixes:

Pancana:
Pronominalised applied and basic objects (on a ditransitive verb):
(176)  *No-waa-kainta-e.*
    3R-give-1PL.IN.OBJ2-3OBJ
    ‘They gave it to us.’

Examining these criteria for Tukang Besi, we find that none of the applicative constructions allow both objects equal access to be subject in a passive construction, to be represented by means of an object marker, or to be bound with the subject in a reciprocal construction. In all cases, if one object may display that property, the other may not. It would seem that Tukang Besi is an asymmetric language. However, whilst no applicative construction presents two objects that are accessible to the same grammatical process, the instrumental applicative does allow a reciprocal construction (combining the subject and the base (theme) object) to cooccur with another process affecting the instrumental object, such as indexing on the verb by means of the object suffixes (177a), being subject if the verb is passive (177b), or heading an object relative clause (177c):
a. *To-po-simbi-simbi-ako-‘e na hansu.*
   1PL.R-REC-RED-slash-APPL-3OBJ NOM sword
   ‘We slashed each other with swords.’

b. *No-to-po-simbi-simbi-ako-mo na hansu.*
   3R-PASS-REC-RED-slash-APPL-PF NOM sword
   ‘The swords have been used for mutual slashing.’

c. *Te hansu i-po-simbi-simbi-ako nu sanggila iso no-mohama.*
   CORE sword OP-REC-RED-slash-APPL GEN pirate yon 3R-sharp
   ‘The swords that were used by the pirates to slash each other with are sharp.’

(Notice that *simbi* is not treated the same as *tomp*a (section 10.6). It belongs in the subclass of transitive verbs that allow for nominative instruments (see chapter 4))

It is not possible to combine multiple object-affecting processes on a verb base which does not include a reciprocal, for example, passive and object suffixes are not compatible on the same verb form:

(178) *No-to-simbi-ako-‘e.*
   3R-PASS-slash-APPL
   ‘They were chopped with them.’

Although Tukang Besi generally shows the properties of an asymmetrical language, certain constructions with objects bearing instrumental semantic roles display some features that would be consistent with a symmetrical interpretation. The data from Tukang Besi indicates that rather than classifying a language, or even a construction, as symmetrical or asymmetrical, each individual combination of grammatical construction, semantic role, and transitivity needs to be separately examined. The behaviour of objects in applicative constructions does not follow strict rules such that examination of one part of the system can lead to sure predictions about the behaviour of other areas.