CHAPTER 3

Applicative Constructions Derived from Transitive Inanimate Verbs

3.1 Introduction

Marantz (1984) proposes that the following three properties characterize an applicative construction:

1. the appearance of extra morphology on a verb
2. the addition of an NP argument bearing an oblique thematic role, such as benefactive or goal
3. the extra argument (the applied object) will behave more like a surface direct object than the underlying object.

Although only Innu-aimun data is presented, it is likely that, within Algonquian languages, the applicative construction is not restricted to Innu-aimun, and that the structures referred to as 'double object' (Bloomfield 1979: Eastern Ojibwa, Todd 1971: Severn Ojibwa, Grafstein 1984: Western Ojibwa), 'double-goal' or 'benefactive' (Wolfart 1973: Plains Cree) are also applicative.[i]

None of these terms adequately describe the properties of the applicative construction. As only one NP in an Innu-aimun applicative construction displays the syntactic behaviour associated with objects, the term 'double object' would be misleading. 'Double-goal' suggests that both

object NPs bear the thematic role of goal, a situation which never arises and, as Piggott (1979, 16) points out 'benefactive' is also a potentially misleading label, 'since the semantics does not always indicate the presence of a beneficiary'. Piggott (1979, 60) redefines these constructions as a class of verbs whose members are subcategorized for two objects. Since the applied object isn't always semantically obligatory, however, this definition also fails to capture the characteristics of the applicative construction.

Algonquianists define applicative constructions structurally. Thus, constructions known as 'double object', 'double-goal' or 'benefactive' are defined by their extra verbal morphology. Specifically, in Innu-aimun, the morpheme -au has to be present.[ii] An underived verb such as miineu 'give something to someone' is not classed as a 'double object', 'double-goal' or 'benefactive' construction by Bloomfield (1962, 363 and 1979, 99), Wolfart (1973, 75) or Todd (1971, 186).

Structurally and semantically Innu-aimun applicative constructions are comparable to applicatives from a wide range of languages; for example, Bahasa Indonesian (Chung

1976), Swahili (Vitale 1981), Chimwiini (Kisseberth and Abasheikkh 1977), Chamorro (Gibson 1980), Tzotzil (Aissen 1983), Tuscararora (Williams 1976) and Huichol (Comrie 1976). Baker (1988, 267) claims that all of these are Partial-Double Object languages; their verbs can assign a maximum of one structural Case, but a second non-subject NP is nevertheless licensed by what will be referred to in this thesis as a 'special' means of Case assignment.

In section 3.2 of this chapter I describe the properties of the Innu-aimun applicative construction derived from a TI verb (TI-derived applicative). Since I have proposed that the presence of adjuncts is not random, but that the properties of the adjuncts reflect the properties of their associated arguments within the verb complex, for the sake of clarity the adjuncts themselves will be referred to as 'underlying object', 'applied object' and, where relevant, 'subject'.[iii] It should be remembered that the nominal adjuncts are not considered to be recipients of Case or theta roles and that they are optional.

In section 3.3 locative constructions are considered as a contrast to applicatives. The applied object of an

applicative construction must be logically, and therefore in Innu-aimun grammatically, animate. Where an inanimate NP is added to a transitive construction, the benefactive reading is lost and a locative construction results: locative case marking is required, there is no extra verbal morphology, and the underlying object retains its object status. In section 3.4 applicative constructions which do not contain the morpheme -au are discussed. These will be referred to as underived applicatives.

3.2 The Properties of the TI-derived Applicative Construction

All three of Marantz's applicative characteristics are displayed by the Innu-aimun applicative construction.

3.2.1 Extra Verbal Morphology

In Chapter One of this thesis the morpheme -au was introduced as the applicative morpheme. (23a) shows a TI verb and (23b) shows the derived applicative construction containing -au.

(23a) **Utīnamᵘ paassikaninu.**
ø-utin-am-ᵘ-ø paassikan-inu
3-take-TIth-SUB3-SUBsg:TI gun-OBV_INAN_SG
'S/he takes the gun'. (ie. someone else's gun)

Addition of -au allows the addition of the goal argument

natuukuuniish 'doctor'.

(23b) **Nutinamuaau paassikaninu natuukuuniish.**
ni-utin-am-**au**-aa-u-ø
1-take-TIth-**APP**-TAth-SUBsg/OBJ3-OBJsg:TA

paassikan-inu natuukuuniish-ø
gun-OBV_INAN_SG doctor-PROX_SG(inan)
'I take the gun to the doctor.'

In (24) the applicative morpheme has been omitted, resulting in ungrammaticality.

(24) ***Nutinamaau paassikaninu natuukuuniish.**
ni-utin-am-aa-u-ø
1-take-TIth-TAth-SUBsg/OBJ3-OBJsg:TA

paassikan-inu natuukuuniish-ø
gun-OBV_INAN_SG doctor-PROX_SG(inan)

'I take the gun to the doctor.'

3.2.2 Applied Object Bears Oblique Theta Role

While in (23b) the applied object natuukuuniish 'doctor' is a goal, in (25b) the applied object ishkuess 'girl' is benefactive.

(25a) **Nitatuain mashinaikan.**
ni-t-atu-ah-e-n-ø
1-EP-point_at-TIfin(by hand)-TIth-SUBnon3-SUBsg:TI
mashinaikan-ø
book-PROX_SG(inan)

'I point at the book with my finger.'

(25b) **Nitatuaimuaau mashinaikaninu ishkuess.**
ni-t-atu-ah-am-**au**-aa-u-ø
1-EP-point_at-TIfin(by hand)-TIth-**APP**-TAth-SUBnon3/OBJ3-OBJsg:TA

mashinaikan-inu ishkuess-ø
book-OBV_INAN_SG girl-PROX_SG(an)

'I point at the book for the girl.'

An animate third person object is represented within the verb complex in both (23b) and (25b) by the TA theme sign -aa, an animate object.

3.2.3 Underlying Object Properties Transferred to Applied Objects

The applied objects in all of the applicative data presented in this thesis, consistent with Marantz's third characteristic, display object properties and the underlying objects lose these properties. However, before showing this, it is necessary to take a look at the means by which object properties can be identified.

Innu-aimun lacks two important means of determining the object-hood of an NP: restricted word order and Case marking. The following criteria will be used instead.

(i) animacy agreement
(ii) obviation
(iii) number agreement
(iv) inverse forms

(i) Innu-aimun verbs agree in animacy with their object. Further examples of this are shown in (26). The verbal root maatish 'to separate by cutting' appears as a TA verb in (26a) and as a TI verb (26b), according to the animacy of the object.

(26a) **Nimaatishuaau paakueshikan.**
ni-maatishu-aa-u-ø paakueshikan-ø
1-cut-TAth-SUBsg/OBJ3-OBJsg:TA bread-PROX_SG(an)
'I'm cutting bread.'

(26b) **Nimaatishen uiaash.**
ni-maatish-e-n-ø uiaash-ø
1-cut-TIth-SUB1-SUBsg:TI meat-PROX_SG(inan)
'I'm cutting meat.'

Example (27) is derived from the stem -maatish-. This stem is followed by the TI theme -am, the applicative morpheme -au and an extra NP auaass 'child'.

(27) **Nimaatishamuaau uiaashinu auaass.**
ni-maatish-am-**au**-aa-u-ø uiaash-inu
1-cut-TIth-**APP**-TAth-SUB1sg/OBJ3sg:TA meat-OBV_SG(inan)
auaass-ø
child-PROX_SG(an)

'I'm cutting off meat for the child.'

The TA inflectional suffix -u shows that the verb now has an

animate object: the TA direct theme sign -aa associated with auaass. Since the underlying object uiaashinu is inanimate, animacy agreement is now with the applied object auaass.

(ii) Another difference between example (26b) and (27) is in the form of uiaash: in the applicative construction the inanimate singular obviative nominal suffix -inu has been added (uiaashinu). Obviation has already been described in Chapter Two as a process which distinguishes non-coreferential third persons. Where two third persons appear as potential objects, the proximate NP will be the object because it is more dominant than the obviative NP. This is not to say that obviative NPs cannot be objects; where a transitive verb has a third person subject, the object, regardless of its animacy, will be obviative. It seems that in the case where there are two non-subject NPs, as in, for example, an applicative construction where only one is object, the obviative one will not have object features.[iv] As can be seen from example (27), the underlying object uiaashinu is obviative and the applied object auaass is proximate.

(iii) A third person plural object of any a TA verb with a 1st or 2nd person subject is represented by the

addition of a final -(a)t to the singular object form of the verb.

(28) **Niuaauiinaaut naapessat.**
ni-uaauiin-aa-u-at naapess-at
1-talk_about-TAth-SUB1sg/OBJ3-OBJpl:TA boy-PROX_AN_PL
'I talk about the boys.'

TI verbs do not agree in number with their object.

(29) **Niuaauiiten mashinaikana.**
ni-uaauiit-e-n mashinaikan-a
1-talk_about-TIth-SUB1sg/OBJ3:TI book-PROX-INAN_PL
'I talk about the books.'

Number agreement is triggered on the derived TA verb by the plural applied object naapessat 'boys'. The underlying object is singular.

(30) **Niuaauiitamuaaut mashinaikaninu naapessat.**
ni-uaauiit-am-**au**-aa-u-at
1-talk_about-TIth-**APP**-TAth-SUB1sg/OBJ3-OBJpl:TA

mashinaikan-inu naapess-at
book-OBV_INAN_SG boy-PROX_AN_PL

'I talk about the book with the boys.'

In Chapter Two it was shown that the animate obviative morpheme has no number distinction. Thus, in (31) where the underlying object paakueshikana 'bread' is animate and marked for obviative, it could be singular or plural.

(31) **Nimaatishamuaaut paakueshikana naapessat.**
ni-maatish-am-**au**-aa-u-at paakueshikan-a
1-cut-TIth-**APP**-TAth-SUB1sg/OBJ3-OBJpl:TA bread-OBV_AN

naapess-at
boy-PROX_AN_PL

'I am cutting the bread/s for the boys.'

It is not possible to have two proximate plural 'objects'[v]: (32) is ungrammatical.

(32) ***Nimaatishamuaaut paakueshikanat naapessat.**
ni-maatish-am-**au**-aa-u-at
1-cut-TIth-**APP**-TAth-SUB1sg/OBJ3-OBJpl:TA

paakueshikan-at naapess-at
boy-PROX_AN_PL bread-PROX_AN_PL

'I am cutting the breads for the boys.'

In addition, it is clear from the ungrammaticality of (33) that the obviative underlying object paakueshikana, in spite of being either singular or plural, cannot trigger plural object agreement on the verb.

(33) ***Nimaatishamuaaut paakueshikana naapess.**
ni-maatish-am-**au**-aa-u-at paakueshikan-a
1-cut-TIth-**APP**-TAth-SUB1sg/OBJ3-OBJpl:TA bread-OBV_AN

naapess-ø
boy-PROX_SG

'I am cutting the bread/s for the boy.'

The source of the ungrammaticality in (33) is the mismatch in number between the verb and the applied object.

This data demonstrates that the applied object of an applicative construction triggers number agreement, further supporting the claim that the applied object, and not the underlying object, is the true object in these derived constructions: it triggers number and animacy agreement, and it is proximate.

(iv) As discussed earlier, TA verbs have two theme signs, direct (-aa) and inverse (-ikᵘ). In the case where the persons of the subject and object are any of the following combination: 2 > 1 > 3 > Obviative 3rd person > further Obviative person, the direct TA theme sign appears as in (34).

(34) **Niuiitshiaau.**
ni-uiitshi-aa-u-ø
1-help-TAth-SUBsg/OBJ3-OBJsg:TA
'I help him.'

The inverse theme sign is required where the subject and object appear in any relationship 3'>3'>3>1>2, as in example (35).

(35) **Niuiitshiikᵘ.**
ni-uiitshi-ikᵘ-u-ø
1-help-inv-SUB3/OBJ1sg-SUBsg:TA
'He helps me.'

In (34) ni- receives the role of agent, but in (35), although ni- remains first person singular, it is the theme.

TA theme signs seem to represent either subject or object. In an applicative construction it is predicted that the subject and applied object, and not the underlying object, will participate in the reversal triggered by the presence of the inverse TA theme sign. This is shown to be the case in the pair in (36); (36a) is a direct applicative construction and (36b) is the inverse form.

(36a) **Ninakuaatamuaaut uaapusha auaassat.**
ni-nakuaat-am-**au**-aa-u-at
1-snare-TIth-**APP**-TAth-SUB1sg/OBJ3-OBJpl:TA

uaapush-a auaass-at
rabbit-OBV_AN child-PROX_AN_PL

'I snare a rabbit for the children.'

(36b) **Ninakuaatamuukut uaapusha auaassat.**
ni-nakuaat-am-**au**-ik^{u}-u-at
1-snare-TIth-**APP**-inv-SUB3/OBJ1sg-SUBpl:TA

uaapush-a auaass-at
rabbit-OBV_AN child-PROX_AN_PL

'The children snare a rabbit for me.'

As predicted, the underlying object, uaapusha 'rabbit', does not participate in the reversal of grammatical functions and theta roles caused by the inverse theme sign in (36b). Plural agreement in (36b) now looks like subject agreement. The translation also makes it clear that the underlying

object cannot be the object in (36b). If 'rabbit' were the object, the translation would have been 'The rabbit snares me for the children.'

Summary

The applied object triggers number and animacy agreement with the derived transitive verb, it is proximate and it is affected by the subject-object inversion caused by the TA theme signs. These characteristics are typical of NPs which are governed and assigned structural case by the verb (Baker 1988, 251). Underlying objects, on the other hand, don't show any kind of 'direct object' behaviour. The range of syntactic behaviour displayed by the applied and underlying objects is consistent with Baker's (1988, 266) predictions with respect to Partial Double Object languages.[vi]

In addition, the semantic properties of Innu-aimun applicative constructions are consistent with what Baker (1988, 236) considers to be semantic characteristics of applicative constructions cross-linguistically. According to Baker, they are possible when the applied object bears the following semantic roles: dative/goal, benefactive/ malefactive, instrumental, or locative.

The list is arranged in order of decreasing commonness and syntactic regularity across languages. Benefactive/ malefactive applicatives are nearly as common in languages of the world as dative/goal...Instrumental applicative constructions are less widespread linguistically, most of the examples coming from Africa. (Baker 1988, 236-7).

Benefactive applicatives appear to be the most common type of applicative construction in Innu-aimun. Another example of a benefactive applicative is shown in (37).

(37) **Nipaakunamuaau uaapusha naauii auaass.**
ni-paakun-am-**au**-aa-u-ø uaapush-a
1-skin-TIth-**APP**-TAth-SUBsg/OBJ3-OBJsg:TA rabbit-OBV_AN

naauii auaass-ø
that child-PROX_SG

'I skin the rabbit for that child.'

No examples of malefactive applicatives were found in the course of researching this thesis. Example (38) shows an example of a participant-goal applicative.[vii]

(38) **Nitinamuaau aapiuutaana naauii ishkueu**.
ni-t-itin-am-**au**-aa-u-ø
1-EP-hand-TIth-**APP**-TAth-SUBsg/OBJ3-OBJsg:TA

aapiuutaan-a naauii ishkueu-ø
key-OBV_INAN_PL that woman-PROX_SG(an)

'I hand that woman the keys.'[viii]

There are no locative applicatives in Innu-aimun, nor

are there instrumental applicatives.[ix] A locative applicative construction would contain the applicative morpheme, but the applied object, rather than having a benefactive theta role, for example, would bear the role of non-participant-goal as 'table' does in the example 'Peter placed the book on the table'. An instrumental applicative construction would contain the applicative morpheme and the applied object would be an instrument or 'indirect agent'. (For example, 'key' in 'Peter opened the door with a key.') Non-participant-goals and instruments are both logically inanimate. Appearance of the applicative morpheme therefore seems to be restricted, in Innu-aimun, by the animacy of the applied object. For this reason, discussion of Innu-aimun locative constructions, that is 'double object' constructions which do not contain the applicative morpheme, is relevant to the discussion of applicative constructions.

3.3 Locative Constructions

Applicative constructions require a logically animate applied object. For example, the recipient-goal applicative (39b) is derived from (39a) by the addition of the -au and the animate NP atim^{u} 'dog'.

(39a) **Niuepimiten uiaash.**

ni-uepimit-e-n-ø	uiaash-ø
1-throw-TIth-SUB1-SUBsg:TI	meat-PROX_SG(inan)

'I throw the meat.'

(39b) **Niuepimitamuaau(t) uiaashinu atim^{u}(at).**
ni-uepimit-am-**au**-aa-u-(at)
1-throw-TIth-**APP**-TAth-SUBsg/OBJ3-OBJsg-(OBJpl):TA

uiaash-inu atim^{u}-ø(at)
meat-OBV_SG(inan) dog-PROX_SG(an)(PROX_AN_PL)

'I throw the meat to the dog(s).'[x]

Substitution of the inanimate NP tshishtuukan 'door' for the animate atim^{u} 'dog' results in a locative rather than applicative construction.

(40) **Niuepimiten uiaash tshishtuukaniit.**
ni-uepimit-e-n-ø uiaash-ø
1-throw-TIth-SUB1sg/OBJ3:3TI meat-PROX_SG(inan)

tshishtuukan-iit
door-LOC(inan)

'I throw the meat at the door/s.'

The additional NP tshishtuukan 'door' takes locative case, and the object in (40), uiaash 'meat', remains proximate indicating that, unlike the theme 'object' of an applicative construction, the theme in (40) does not lose its object status when the extra NP is added.[xi] Number and animacy agreement support this. Even when the extra NP is grammatically animate and capable of triggering verbal

animacy agreement, it is the inanimate theme which agrees with the verb.

(41) **Niuepimiten muukumaan nete mishtikut.**
ni-uepimit-e-n-ø muukumaan-ø
1-throw-TIth-SUB1-SUBsg:TI knife-PROX-SG(inan)

nete mishtikᵘ-iit
there tree-LOC(an)

'I throw the knife at the tree/s.'

Further, it is clear that the theme, not the extra locative NP (which loses its number distinction) triggers number agreement with the verb. TA verbs agree in number with their object in a 1>3 example; in (42a) the animate plural theme tuuuaanat 'balls' triggers plural object agreement on the verb and in (42b) the verb agrees with the singular theme tuuuaan 'ball'.

(42a) **Niuepimitaaut tuuuaanat nete tshishtuukaniit.**
ni-uepimit-aa-u-at tuuuaan-at
1-throw-TAth-SUBsg/OBJ3-OBJpl:TA ball-PROX_AN_PL

nete tshishtuukan-iit
there door-LOC(inan)

'I throw balls at the door/s.'

(42b) **Niuepimitaau tuuuaan nete tshishtuukaniit.**
ni-uepimit-aa-u-ø tuuuaan-ø
1-throw-TAth-SUBsg/OBJ3-OBJsg:TA ball-PROX_SG(an)

nete tshishtuukan-iit
there door-LOC(inan)

'I throw a ball at the door/s.'

It seems that applicative constructions and locative constructions, both of which involve two non-subject NPs are fundamentally different from each other. The fact that the theme of an applicative construction loses its object status suggests that the difference is Configurational; the hierarchical relationship between Case-assigners and Case recipients may change when -au is added to the verb stem. How this might work remains to be explained. Notice that the applicative morpheme cannot appear in these locative constructions. Inserting -au into (42b) results in the ungrammatical construction in (43a) even when the extra NP, mishtikut 'tree' is grammatically animate though logically inanimate. The grammatical example in (43b) does not contain -au.

(43a) ***Niuepimitamuaau tuuuaan nete mishtikut.**
ni-uepimit-am-**au**-aa-u-ø
1-throw-TIth-**APP**-TAth-SUBsg/OBJ3-OBJsg:TA

tuuuaan-ø nete mishtik^{u}-iit
ball-PROX_SG(an) there tree-LOC(an)

'I throw a ball at the tree/s.'

(43b) **Niuepimitaau tuuuaan nete mishtikut.**
ni-uepimit-aa-u-ø
1-throw-TAth-SUBsg/OBJ3-OBJsg:TA

tuuuaan-ø nete mishtik^{u}-iit
ball-PROX_SG(an) there tree-LOC(an)

'I throw a ball at the tree/s.'

The examples in (43) show that applicative constructions require a logically animate applied object. The addition of a grammatically animate applied object such as mishtik^{u} 'tree' does not result in an applicative construction.

Interestingly, non-human logically animate NPs (ie. animals) can be marked locative.[xii]

(44) **Atimut taau iik^{u}.**
atim^{u}-iit t-aa-u iik^{u}-ø
dog-LOC(an) be-TAth-SUB1sg:AI louse-PROX_SG(an)
'The flea is on the dog.'

It seems to be impossible, however, to attach the locative suffix to any NP with human reference. (45a) and (45b) are not possible.

(45a) ***Pieniit taau iik^{u}.**
Pien-iit t-aa-u iik^{u}-ø
Pien-LOC be-TAth-SUB1sg:AI louse-PROX_SG(an)
'The louse is on Peter.'

(45b) ***Naapet taanua iik^{u}.**
naapeu-iit t-aa-nu-u iik^{u}-ø
man-LOC be-TAth-OBV_SUB1sg:AI louse-PROX_SG(an)
'The louse is on the man.'

The animate object in (46), maanitenish-, is permitted to take the locative suffix -iit.[xiii]

(46) **Maanitenishiit taakutapishtueu umiimiimeu**.
maanitenish-iit taakutapishtau-e-u
sheep_LOC(an) sit_on_top_of-TAth-SUB3sg/OBJ3':TA

umiimiimeu-ø
pigeon-PROX_SG(an)

'The pigeon sits on top of the sheep.'

On the other hand, the animate object in (47), ishkuess 'girl', because it has human reference, is obviative even for the more elderly speakers of Innu-aimun.

(47) **Ishkuessa taakutapishtueu umiimiimeu**.
ishkuess-a taakutapishtau-e-u
girl-OBV_AN sit_on_top_of-TAth-SUB3sg/OBJ3':TA

umiimiimeu-ø
pigeon-PROX_SG(an)

'The pigeon sits on top of the girl.'

The data in this section shows that, while it is true that the applicative morpheme is associated with a logically animate applied NP, it is not true of locative constructions that they only appear when the goal is logically inanimate, ie. when it is a non-participant-goal. It is possible that locative case marking may be required in cases where the applied morpheme is prohibited. For example, in the case where an applied object is logically inanimate but grammatically animate, as for example in (43b), the construction must be locative. More examples of this are

shown in (48a) and (48b) where the additional NPs, mishtikut 'tree' and kuunt 'snow', which are logically inanimate but grammatically animate, have the locative suffix.[xiv]

(48a) **Niuepimiten muukumaan nete mishtikut.**
ni-uepimit-e-n-ø muukumaan-ø
1-throw-TIth-SUB1-SUBsg:TI knife-PROX-SG(inan)
nete mishtik^{u}-iit
there tree-LOC(an)

'I throw the knife at the tree/s.'

(48b) **Niuepimiten muukumaan nete kuunt.**
ni-uepimit-e-n-ø muukumaan-ø
1-throw-TIth-SUB1-SUBsg:TI knife-PROX-SG(inan)
nete kuun-iit
there snow-LOC(an)

'I throw the knife into the snow.'

It seems that the applied object of an applicative has to be logically animate. This makes sense because both a beneficiary and a recipient-goal have to participate somehow in the action, either physically or emotionally, and therefore have to be animate. Inanimate things cannot be said to benefit from an action. The restrictions appear to be semantically rather than syntactically determined. One possible explanation for this is that selectional restrictions, specified in the lexical entry for the applicative morpheme, restrict the theta roles of the NPs it

selects. If this is the case, it is an argument in favour of analyzing the applicative morpheme as a selecting head, supporting the hypothesis of Baker (1988).

3.4 Underived Applicative Constructions

As mentioned earlier in this chapter, there are some constructions in Innu-aimun which have the same properties as applicative constructions, except that the applicative morpheme does not appear in the verb. In (49) there are two non-subject NPs.

(49) **Nimiinaaut naapessat miitshuaapinu.**

ni-miin-aa-u-at	naapess-at
1-give-TAth-SUBsg/OBJ3-OBJpl:TA	boy-PROX_AN_PL
miitshuaap-inu	
house-OBV_INAN_SG	

'I give the boys a house.'

The inanimate theme miitshuaapinu 'house', corresponding to an applicative underlying object, is obviative and does not trigger number or animacy agreement on the verb. The benefactor or recipient-goal naapessat 'boys', corresponding to the applied object of an applicative construction, is logically animate and triggers number and animacy agreement on the verb.

It would be incorrect to label naapessat in (49) the underlying object or miitshuapinu the applied object because there is no single object construction parallel to it. Both NPs are presumably part of the argument structure of miineu.

In (50), a non-participant-goal NP, that is to a say logically inanimate NP, requires the locative suffix.[xv]

(50) **Nimiinuen shuuniaau kaatshishkutamaatsheutshuaapiit.**
ni-miinu-e-n shuuniaau-ø
1-give-AIfin-SUB1sg:AI money-PROX-SG(inan)

kaatshishkutamaatsheutshuaap-iit
school-LOC(inan)

'I give money to the school.'

Notice, however, that the verb in (50) is, at least morphologically, intransitive (AI). It seems that 'give' has some exceptional means of accommodating an object so that in (49) the applicative morpheme is not required, and in (50) TI morphology does not appear.

Another verb similar to (49) uaapaatinieu 's/he shows something to him/her' is shown in (51). Like miineu, there is no TI equivalent.

(51) **Niuaapaatiniaaut miitshuaapinu ishkueut.**
ni-uaapaatini-aa-u-at miitshuaap-inu
1-show_to-TAth-SUB1sg/OBJ3-OBJpl:TA house-OBV_INAN_SG

ishkueu-at
woman-PROX_AN_PL

'I show the house to the women.'[xvi]

Given the similarities between these underived 'double object' constructions and applicatives, it would be desirable to say they are in fact the same type of structure. Baker (1988, 282) discusses a class of underived verbs 'give' type verbs which participate in applicative constructions in the Austronesian language Chamorro.[xvii] He proposes that, since these verbs are 'canonical applicative type verbs in that they naturally focus on a goal or benefactive argument', they have what he calls 'a null applicative'. For the purposes of this paper these constructions will be called underived applicatives, and discussion of Baker's 'null applicative' theory will be considered in Chapter Four. In addition to 'give' verbs, 'to show' and 'to send' are very common members of this class; 'to hit' and 'to like' are probably never in this class. (Baker 1988, 285). Consistent with this, in Innu-aimun 'to hit' is not a member of the underived class.

(52) **Nitutaamaimuaau atimua naapeu.**
ni-t-utam-ah-am-***(au)**-aa-u-ø
1-EP-hit-TIfin-TIth-APP-TAth-SUBsg/OBJ3-OBJsg:TA

atimu-a naapeu-ø
dog- OBV_AN man-PROX_AN(SG)

'I hit the dog for the man.'

And it is not possible to form an applicative construction from 'to like'.

(53) ***Niminaatamuaau miinuusha nishiim.**
ni-minaat-am-**au**-aa-u-ø miinuush-a
1-like-TIth-**APP**-TAth-SUBsg/OBJ3-OBJsg:TA cat-OBV_AN

ni-shiim-ø
1-brother-PROX_SG(an)

'I like the cat for my brother.'

In (53) the subject is an experiencer, so the construction lacks a volitional agent. Assuming volition and control are linked, if there is no control, there can be no beneficiary. The presence of a volitional agent seems to be a crucial factor in determining when an applicative construction (derived or underived) is possible. At least two of Baker's three 'canonical applicatives' are underived in Innu-aimun. These constructions will be discussed further in the following chapter.

FOOTNOTES

i.. In all these cases the appearance of the morpheme -au in the verb is accompanied by a new extra NP.

ii.. The applicative morpheme is the same in Eastern Ojibwa (Bloomfield 1979, 99), Plains Cree (Wolfart 1973, 75), Severn Ojibwa (Todd 1971, 186) and Menomini (Bloomfield 1962, 363).

iii.. The term 'object' is used to refer to the object of a single object construction such as 'John cut some cake'. In a 'double object' construction such as 'John cut Sue some cake', 'some cake' will be referred to as the 'underlying object'. The extra NP, 'Sue', which is generally benefactive, is to be referred to as the 'applied object'. The data presented in this thesis contains a higher percentage of nominal adjuncts than would normally occur in Innu-aimun. These examples were purposely elicited in order to facilitate linguistic analysis.

iv.. Piggott (1979, 184), in his discussion of Ojibwa 'benefactive' verbs, draws the same conclusion: 'In this sentence, the occurrence of the suffix -an [obviative] also indicates that mishiiminan is not the object with which the verb agrees.'

v.. This statement applies only to applicative constructions. For Ojibwa, for example, Grafstein (1984, 118) states that obviation is optional across clause boundaries. In a biclausal construction two proximate (plural or singular) NPs may be able to appear in Innu-aimun, so long as they are not in the same clause.

vi..Wolfart (1973, 75) describes Plains Cree 'double-goal verbs' as follows: '...the inanimate goal of the underlying stem, although not cross-referenced in the derived verb, is still the primary object, and the animate goal of the derived stem is the secondary object'. It isn't clear which NP Wolfart considers most object-like, but it would seem to be the underlying object (the 'inanimate goal') rather than the applied object. If this were the case Wolfart's Plains Cree 'double-goal' constructions would not be applicatives and in fact would be difficult to explain in the framework of Baker (1988).

vii.. A finer definition of goal is required in this discussion. In each of the following two sentences the goal, Peter, is quite different: (i) 'Sue threw the book at Peter.' (ii) 'Sue threw the book to Peter.' In (i), 'Peter' could be substituted for any inanimate object, for example 'tree' or 'wall'. The preposition 'at' conveys no sense of Peter as an animate participant. In (ii), Peter has to be animate and, at least in the mind of the thrower, participating. Peter as goal in (1) will be called a Non-participant-goal and in (2) a Participant-goal.

viii.. In nitinamuaau 'to hand someone thing' (ni-t-itin-am-u-aa-u), the sequence -titi- reduces to -ti-.

ix.. Instrumental constructions are formed by addition of TA and TI concrete finals -in 'by hand' - e.g., paast-in-eu 'to break to bits by hand' (Clarke 1986, 61).

x.. Note that the derived form of this verb can only have a benefactive reading. To throw, for example, a stone at the dog, another verb has to be used:

Nipimuushinaataau ashiniinu naauii atimᵘ.

ni-pimuushinaat-aa-u ashinii-inu
1p-throw_a_projectile-TAth-SUB1sg/OBJ3sg:TA stone-OBV_INAN_SG
naauii atimᵘ-ø
that dog-PROX_SG(an)

'I throw a stone at that dog.'

As this is neither a locative construction nor an applicative, some component of the verb may be performing the same function as the applicative morpheme; atimᵘ agrees with the verb.

xi.. The following points should be noted: (i) The locative marker is considered inflectional and it is always the final suffix to be added to an NP (Sandra Clarke, personal communication). (ii) An NP marked locative cannot also be marked plural; the number distinction is therefore lost.

xii.. This is an area of Innu-aimun grammar which appears to be changing; older speakers of Innu-aimun feel more comfortable adding locatives to animals than younger speakers. (Marguerite MacKenzie, personal communication). The following forms were provided by speakers over the age of about 60: nishk+iit 'goose+LOC'; minush+iit 'cat+LOC'; namesh+iit 'fish+LOC', although adding the locative to a body part was preferred:

Ashiniissinu nete takunenua uaapush ushkataat.

ashinii-ss-inu nete takun-e-nua
stone-dim-OBV_INAN_SG there have-TAth-SUB3sg/OBJ3':TA

uaapush-ø u-shkatai-iit
rabbit-PROX_SG(an) 3-stomach-LOC(an)

'A bullet is there in the rabbit's stomach.'

Younger speakers were not comfortable using locatives either with animate objects or with body parts.

xiii.. A younger speaker provided the following example as an alternative to example (46) in the text.

Maanitenisha taakutapishtueu umiimiimeu.

maanitenish-a taakutapishtau-e-u umiimiimeu-ø
sheep_OBV_AN sit_on_top-TAth-SUB3sg/OBJ3':TA pigeon-

PROX_SG(an)
'The pigeon sits on top of the sheep.'

maanitenisha 'sheep' has an obviative suffix rather than the more standard locative.

xiv.. The locative suffix reduces to -t in the same environments as the plural suffix -at reduces to -t. Thus, following the 'u' of mishtuk^{u} 'tree' the 'n' of kuun 'snow', the locative suffix reduces to -t: (mishtikut and kuunt).

xv.. It hasn't been possible to elicit an example with the verb 'give' where the theme is logically animate and the goal is logically inanimate. Possibly there are semantic restrictions prohibiting this type of construction.

xvi.. Semantically, an equivalent to (50) is ruled out - *I show the house to the school - so it isn't possible to check and see whether there is AI morphology where TI would be expected.

xvii.. Baker (1988, 474) has a footnote to this discussion, however, to the effect that all the Chamorro verbs of this class end in -i, the same form as the applicative morpheme. He admits that this -i could be the applicative morpheme, without which these underived double construction verbs may be unable to surface.