THE APPLICATIVE CONSTRUCTION IN TUKANG BESI

Mark Donohue

Tukang Besi

Tukang Besi is spoken by a mobile population of traders based at the extreme southwestern corner of Sulawesi, Indonesia. It has a basically VOS word order, pronominal indexing, a Philippine-type case system, imploded stops, and fairly extensive verbal morphology.

There are three verbal affixes that serve to introduce applied objects; all three are suffixes, and they have the following forms and functions:

- ngkene Comitative
- ako Benefactive, Instrumental, Theme, Purpose, Cause
- VCI Locative, Allative

Examples of these different meanings are given in (1) – (8):

(1) Comitative (Agent)

No-kede-ngkene te omu-no
3.R:sit-COM CORE grandparent-3.POSS
'They sat with their grandparents.'

(2) Dative

No-helo'a-ako te ina-no
3.R:cook-APPL CORE mother-3.POSS
'They cooked for their mother.'

...
2 Properties of objects in Tukang Besi

Identifying a single argument of a predicate as the object of that predicate is not necessarily a straightforward task, as has been pointed out by Rugesamel (1993), even for a supposedly 'symmetrical' language (Bresman & Mosel 1990). Nevertheless, the (typical) object of a simple transitive verb can be identified in Tukang Besi based on the following criteria:

- It appears in the clause with one of the articles te or na, and is not marked by a preposition;
- It is usually indexed on the verb by the optional object indices;
- If head of a relative clause, the verb must take the object relative clause prefix i-;
- It can become the single argument of a verb employing a passive-like prefix, to- or te- or mo-
- It can be bound to the subject of the sentence by a reciprocal prefix, po-;
- It may be suppressed if it is a generic object;
- It may head a subject relative clause with a verb employing a passive prefix.

Examples of these properties in sentences with simple transitive verbs are given below:

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

(4) No-lu-ka-ako te towu 3.R-give-APPL CORE sugar-cane
'They gave some sugar cane (to someone).'.

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

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

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

(8) No-lembo-ako te karia'a 3.R-carry-APPL CORE festival
'They carried (something) for the festival.'

(9) Ku-'lta te 'obu 1SG-see CORE dog
'I can see a dog.'

(10) Ku-'lta-'e na 'obu 1SG-see-3.OBJ NOM dog
'I saw the dog.'

(11) Te 'obu i-'lta-su no-tode-mo CORE dog OP-see-1SG.POSS 3.R-flee-PF
'The dog that I saw is running away.'

These serve a function similar to the better-known Tagalog ng and en, respectively; na is glossed NOM for 'nominalive', following Kroeger (1990); te is glossed simply an CORE, indicating that it indicates a core, or direct, argument. A more complete gloss would be 'nominalive core'.

If a verb does not have object suffixes, then, rather than the object, the noun is the nominative argument, and controls floating quantifiers and is the preferred controller of zero anaphora with conjunction reduction.

With variants di- and ni-

All examples here are exemplified with re-, the most productive of these suffixes; te- also contains the specification that the action was accomplished without any violence whatsoever, preferably an animate effector; mo- is better termed an anti-cassative or resultative (see Lichtenbeck 1991).

Not applicable for an object with [instrumental] thematic role.

By 'simple transitive verb' I am indicating the range of verbs, such as lta 'see', and 'get', obtain', petu 'hit with back of fist', that allow for their object to be either a direct argument, a nominative one, or deleted. This is in contrast to the fact that in Tukang Besi some ambitransitive verbs require their patiensive argument to be nominative, and thus indexed on the verb by means of object suffixes if used transitively. These verbs do not allow unspecified object deletion, passivization, or questioning in place. Examples of such verbs are buti 'fall; drop', like 'wake up (intr.)'; pila 'break (intr.)'.

...
Properties of objects in applicative constructions

I will use the term applied object to refer to an argument that is only a core argument of the verb, displaying a range of the object properties listed in section 2, by virtue of the applicative morphology on the verb; if the verb was not suffixed with applicative morphology, the potential applied object would have to appear as the object of a non-contiguous serial verb construction, or in a prepositional phrase. If the underven verb was basically transitive, and so already had an object before the applicative morphology was added, that original object is called the base object.

18. Ku-helo’-ako te ana’-u te sede
   1SG-cook-APPL CORE child-2SG.POSS CORE taro
   ‘I cooked your children some taro.’

The 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 thematic role that it bears, or whether it is the applied or basic object. An example of this contrast is given in (19a), (19b), and (19c) (note that the objects in (19a) and (19b) bear the same thematic role, passive).

Verb without applicative morphology:

19a. Te kene-su tu’umjo-hu’u te kaball
    CORE friend-1SG.POSS PASS.SF-give CORE machete
    no-mele
    3.R-pleased
    ‘The friend of mine who was given a machete is pleased.’

Verb with applicative morphology: applied object as head:

19b. Te kene-su tu’umjo-a-ako
    CORE friend-1SG.POSS PASS.SF-fetch-APPL
    te kaball no-mele
    CORE machete 3.R-pleased
    ‘The friend of mine who a machete was fetched for is pleased.’

Except for an applicative construction with a [Theme] applied object, which was already a direct argument, but not the primary object (this construction only occurs about the verb hu’u, which specifies both [Dative] and [Theme] in its subcategorisation frame).
Verb with applicative morphology: base object as head:

(19c) *Te kabali te
CORE machete PASS.SF-fetch-APPL CORE

kene-su no-mohama
friend-1SG.POSS 3.R-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 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 thematic role of the applied object determines which of the two objects may be deleted, and which is obligatorily present. Example (20) 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 an Allative applied object (example 21), 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 thematic role, as seen in (22):

Dative applied object:

(20) No-ala-ako te kabali
3.R-fetch-APPL CORE friend-1SG.POSS CORE machete

'They fetched my friend a machete.'

Allative applied object:

(21) No-ala-ako te kabali
3.R-fetch-APPL CORE friend-1SG.POSS CORE machete

Another universal, 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 focused. This is illustrated in (23) and (24):

Applied object focused:

(23) No-ala-ako te emai te kabali?
3.R-fetch-APPL CORE who CORE machete

'My friend who fetched a machete for whom?'

Base object focused:

(24) No-ala-ako te kene-su te paira
3.R-fetch-APPL CORE friend-1SG.POSS CORE what

'My friend fetched a machete for what?'

Apart from the ability to be pragmatically focused, 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 thematic role of the applied object in the construction; the facts are summarised in the following tables. Tables 1 and 2 deal with the basic and applied objects of transitive verbs.

### Table 1: Transitive verbs. Properties of the applied object.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORC</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocal</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11 This stems from a general requirement in the language that if a verb has valency-increasing morphology, at least one object must be present.
12 Also grammatical with the applied object expressed by object suffixes:
   No-ala-ako-te (te kene-su)
   3R-fetch-APPL-3OBJ NOM friend-1SG.POSS CORE machete
   'They fetched my friend a machete.'

13 Expressible with a core-level serial verb construction: No-ala te paira ako te kene-su?
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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Transitive verbs. Properties of the basic object.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agent</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:

— 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 focused.

The variation in ability to be reciprocised is the simple result of semantic plausibility; instruments, themes and locations lack the sentence 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 & Kanerva 1989). The verb in *hu'a 'give' subcategories for *[Ag], [Dat], [Thm]∅. When the theme becomes the applied object, it is still ranked below the other object, the Dative, in the thematic hierarchy: *[Ag], [Dat], [Thm]APPL; in the other applicative constructions involving core thematic roles, the applied object is always higher than the base object in terms of this thematic hierarchy: *[Ag], [Ag]APPL, [ ]∅, *[Ag], [Dat]APPL, [ ]∅ or *[Ag], [Instr]APPL, [ ]∅.

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'a may be passivised (exemplified in 10).

Note that this symmetry does not extend to the objects of the applicativised *hu'u-ako; the base (dative) object may NOT be passivised if the verb is applicativised:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base object being subject with passive verb:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.R-PASS-give-PF NOM friend-1SG.POSS CORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaball ana machete this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'My friend was given this machete.'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is interesting that [Agent] applied objects cannot be subject with passive verbs, when all other applied objects may be. This is illustrated in (26):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agent (comitative) applied object:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.R-fetch-APPL CORE friend-1SG.POSS CORE machete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'They fetched my friend a machete.'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This probably results from a restriction on the passive operation that limits it to appearing only with arguments bearing a thematic role lower than [Agent], if there is one 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 thematic 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. It is worth noting that no simple transitive verbs have object with [Agent] thematic roles, whilst objects with [Dative], [Instrument] and [Theme/Patient] are all attested.

Object relative clauses:

As seen in (11), the passive participle relative clause involves the optional mention of the actor by means of possessive suffixes on the derived verb form; furthermore, ANY core arguments may be present in the form of a genitive phrase; an example with an applicative construction is seen in (27), in which the applied object is the head of the relative clause, the actor is a genitive phrase, if it is a proper noun.

14 I use agent to refer to the most agentive argument in a verb subcategorisation frame before it is suppressed by the passive operation. This is not necessarily an [Agent], since a verb with a subcategorisation frame with no [Agent], such as tarima 'receive' (whose subcategorisation frame is *[Dat], [Thm]∅) may also be passivised.
shown by possessive suffixes on the verb, and the base object is also present in the form of a genitive phrase:

Actor and base object indexed in an object relative clause:

(27) \(Te \ kene-su \ i-ala-ako-su\)

CORE friend-1SG.POSS OP-fetch-APPL-1SG.POSS GEN

kabali no-moela
machete 3.R-happy

‘My friend who(m) I fetched a machete for is happy.’

In addition to this standard relative clause with an applied object as head, the base object of a dative, instrumental, locative or allative applicative construction, or an applied object with theme, locative or allative thematic role, may head a special relative clause in which the possessive suffix indexes an argument other than the actor; for example:

Ambiguity of indexing in an object relative clause, [Dative] applicative:

(28) \(Te \ poda \ i-hu'u-ako-su \ no-molenga\)

CORE knife OP-give-APPL-1SG.POSS 3.R-old

The knife that was given to me is antique.’

Or: ‘The knife that I gave is antique.’

The rules for determining the reference of the possessive suffix and availability for being the head of such a relative clause are:

— the possessive suffixes must index a more agentive argument than the head;
— base objects, in an applied construction, may not index an [Agent]

This correctly predicts that, in addition to (27), (29a) is also grammatical, with the genitive phrase showing the [Dative] argument, and that (29b) is ungrammatical, because the base object kabali may not head an object relative clause which includes an [Agent] amongst its genitively indexed arguments.

(29a) \(Te \ kabali \ i-ala-ako \ u \ kene-su\)

CORE machete OP-fetch-APPL GEN friend-1SG.POSS

no-moela
3.R-sharp

‘The machete which was fetched for my friend is sharp.’

(29b) \(*Te \ kabali \ i-ala-ako-su \ u\)

CORE machete OP-fetch-APPL-1SG.POSS GEN

kene-su no-moela
friend-1SG.POSS 3.R-sharp

‘The machete which I fetched for my friend is sharp.’

The base object of an allative construction may head a relative clause, but then the applied object is treated as a non-core argument; that is, it is treated the same as it was before the applicative morphology was added to the verb:

(30) \(Te \ niro \ i-kabi-apu^-su \ i \ korang-mi\)

CORE rubbish OP-throw-DIR-1SG.POSS LD garden-2PL.POSS

o-koro
3.R-many

‘The rubbish that I throw in your garden is much.’

Having examined the properties displayed by the objects of inherently transitive verbs, we can turn to the properties found with the applied objects of inherently intransitive verbs. One of the semantic categories is not found with intransitive verbs (theme), another is available only for intransitives (cause). The properties found with applied objects bearing different semantic roles are summarised in table 3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agent</th>
<th>Dative</th>
<th>Instrumental</th>
<th>Locative</th>
<th>Allative</th>
<th>Cause</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Object suffix

DRC

Existential

Reciprocal

Iod

Focus

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 direct object of the verb.

A passive may not be formed about the purposive applied object of an intransitive verb.

4 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 Brasnan & Moshi 1990). One such language is Pancana (Austronesian, Mura-Buton group, Southeast Sulawesi). Examples (31a) and (31b) show that one object property, the ability to head an object relative clause, can be claimed by either of the objects of an applicative construction with a dative applied object:

**Passivised applied object:**

(31a) *Sabangka-ku no-iti-ala’a* *sabo*
friend-1SG.POSS 3.R-PASS-fetch-APPL soap

'My friend had soap fetched for him.'

**Passivised basic object:**

(31b) *Sabo no-iti-ala’a* *sabangka-ku*
soap 3.R-PASS-fetch-APPL friend-1SG.POSS

'Soap was fetched for my friend.'

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

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:

(32) *No-wwa-kainta-e*
bas.3.R-give-1PL.INOBJ-2OBJ

'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 co-occur with another process affecting the instrumental object, such as indexing on the verb by means of the object suffixes (33a), being subject if the verb is passive (33b), or heading an object relative clause (33c):

(33a) *To-po-simbim-bimbi-ako’e na hansu*
1PL.R-REC-RED-slash-APPL NOM sword

'We slashed each other with swords.'

(33b) *No-to-simbim-bimbi-ako-mo na hansu*
3.R-PASS-REC-RED-slash-APPL-PF NOM sword

'The swords have been used for mutual slashing.'

(33c) *Ke hansu i-po-simbim-bimbi-ako nu sanggila*
CORE sword OP-REC-RED-slash-APPL GEN pirates

'The swords that were used by the pirates to slash each other with are sharp.'

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:

(34) *No-to-simbim-bimbi-ako’e*
3.R-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 thematic 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 others.

The reciprocal construction shows considerable variation depending on the thematic role played by the applied object. This probably has nothing to do with syntactic constraints, however, but is rather the result of simple semantic plausibility. In a clause involving, for instance, an agent, a thematic recipient, the theme lacks the animacy needed to participate in a reciprocal relationship, and so the (applied) recipient is the only non-subject eligible for this position. Similarly, in an instrumental applicative construction the instrumental role lacks the necessary animacy, and so cannot be interpreted as part of a reciprocal construction, despite being the applied object in the construction. It is equally not surprising that the locative and ablative constructions also allow the basic object to be reciprocalised.

5 Summary

The results presented here have shown that the patterns that have previously been claimed as universals for the behaviour of objects in applicative constructions, almost completely on the basis of data drawn from Bantu languages of central and eastern Africa, do not hold up in the light of evidence from this Austronesian data. For instance, it has been claimed that extraction of applied objects shows different grammaticality when done to the applied object of a beneficiary construction than to an instrumental construction. In Chichewa, the following sentences illustrate this fact (Abitino & Mchombo 1990; also Baker 1988a, 1988b).

\[
(35) \quad *A-wa nti aśtā̀kina améně chišãľu chî-nà gúl-ir-a
\]

\[
2-these be 2.girls 2.REL 7.food 7.S-PST-buy-AP-FV
\]

\[
mphātso
\]

9.gift

'These are the girls that the fool bought the gift for.'

This has been claimed as a universal property of applied objects, even in a language described as being symmetrical, Kichaga (Bresnan & Moshi 1990), the restriction on the extraction of beneficiary applied objects has been noted:

\[
(36) \quad Uwu nti maśalā aménè ányani á-kā phwān-ir-a
\]

3.this be 3.stone 3.REL 2.baboons 2.S-PR-break-AP-FV
dāngu
5.basket

'This is the stone that the baboons are breaking the basket with.'

There are some differences in grammaticality of sentences with applied objects bearing the same thematic role depending on the transitivity of the base predicate; as has been reported for Fula (Marantz 1984). In Fula, Marantz notes that instrumental applied objects of intransitive predicates, such as (38), may be subject if the verb is passive, whilst the applied object of a transitive construction may not, as in (39):

\[
(38) \quad Pâl-e hgam-r-aama
\]

*shoes dance-INST/PAST/PASS

*Shoes were danced with.'

\[
(39) \quad *Jàmmbere tay'-r-aama lekti
\]

*axe cut-INST/PAST/PASS tree

*An axe was used to cut a tree.'

In Tukang Besi the instrumental (and most other) applicative constructions show no differences between those based on transitive and those based on intransitive predicates, apart from unspecified object deletion. With an [Agent] predicate, an identical restriction on access to subject position in passive

16 Chong (1976) is an exception.

17 Though see Donohue (1991) for alternative data on Chichewa.
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constructions holds as does for Fula; the applied object of an intransitive predicate may be subject, that of a transitive predicate may not.

(40) No-to-wila-ngkene-mo na wowine mandawila
3.R-PASS-go-COM-PF NOM woman beautiful
'The beautiful woman was gone with.'

(41) *No-to-homorata-ngkene-mo na ompu-su
3.R-PASS-weave-COM-PF NOM grandparent-1SG.POSS present
'My grandmother was woven with.'

Note that in (41), even though there is no theme object mentioned (the thing woven), the sentence is still grammatical, giving evidence that the process of unspecified object deletion is not a detransitivisation process.

Finally, the range of things that may be treated as the applied objects in applicative constructions appears to be much greater in Tukang Besi than has been described for other languages; in contrast to the three (benefactive, instrument, locative) that have been described for Chichewa, and the four (sociative, beneficiary, instrument, locative, comitative) that Kinyarwanda has been described as showing, Tukang Besi has eight morphosyntactically differentiated classes of applied objects, ranging from the very object-like allative objects to the almost non-functional purpose objects. These purposes and cause applicative constructions introduce arguments that acquire almost no properties of objects, other than the ability to be expressed as arguments of the verb.

It appears that some of the ‘universals’ that have been proposed to explain the African language data are remnants of either a historical predilection for certain constructions, or areal spread of restraints on grammar through typologically similar Bantu languages. A broadening of the database to include genetically unrelated languages is needed for further work on applicative constructions.

Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>APPL</th>
<th>COM</th>
<th>CORE</th>
<th>DIR</th>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>LD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st person</td>
<td>2nd person</td>
<td>3rd person</td>
<td>applicative</td>
<td>comitative</td>
<td>core argument</td>
<td>directional</td>
<td>genitive</td>
<td>locational</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>APPL</th>
<th>COM</th>
<th>CORE</th>
<th>DIR</th>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>LD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st person</td>
<td>2nd person</td>
<td>3rd person</td>
<td>applicative</td>
<td>comitative</td>
<td>core argument</td>
<td>directional</td>
<td>genitive</td>
<td>locational</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RED reduplication  S. subject focus  SG singular
ST subject focus  UOD unspecified object deletion

REFERENCES

Alinea, A.

Alinea, A. & Sam A. Mchombo

Bakker, Mark C.

Bakker, Mark C.

Berman, Joan & Jonna Kannerva

Berman, Joan & Lisoba Mwini

Boochoha, Cathy M.

Boochoha, Cathy M.
1991 'Chichewa dialects “A” and “B”: how symmetrically asymmetrical are they?,' Canberra: Department of Linguistics, Faculty of Arts, ms.

Boochoha, Mark

Bosbergh, Charles W. & Mohammad Imam Abubeks

Breuker, Paul R.

Brickenberck, Frank

Marquez, Alex P.
Nominal clauses (i.e. clauses consisting normally of only one or two noun phrases) are a rather marginal or non-existent phenomenon in many languages and have received little attention in syntactic analysis and theory. They represent a somewhat embarrassing phenomenon for most syntactic theories. A clause by definition has a verbal component and is characterised by verbal features like tense, mood and/or aspect. Accordingly, nominal clauses have frequently been analysed as reduced verbal clauses, mainly as copula clauses having their copula verb deleted, e.g. in Latin and Russian.

In many Polynesian languages nominal clauses are rather frequent. The analysis of them in most grammars is based on the terminology and descriptive framework used for verbal clauses, cf. terms like subject and predicate (Hopper 1993:102) or argument and predicate (Mosel 1993:500-502). The purpose of this paper is to look at nominal clauses not as deviant or reduced verbal clauses, but as independent syntactic constructions in their own right. I shall give a brief descriptive survey of nominal clauses in the closely related Polynesian languages Samoan (S) and Tokelauan (T). Although there are some morphological and syntactic differences between the two languages the basic morphological and syntactical structure of nominal clauses in them as well as in other Polynesian languages (cf., e.g., Bauer 1993:78-82) is so similar that it most probably is inherited from Proto-Polynesian (cf. Clark 1976:36-37).

2. Nominal clauses in Samoan and Tokelauan

There are two types of nominal clauses in these languages: nominal clauses consisting of just one noun phrase and nominal clauses consisting of two noun phrases or a noun phrase and a verbal clause.
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An important exception is Henkerveld (1993).

In Polynesian languages there is no copula verb and hardly any argument for analysing nominal clauses as being derived from underlying copula clauses.