Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area
Volume 21.1 — Spring 1998

THE MORPHOSYNTAX OF TRANSITIVIZATION IN LAI (HAKA CHIN)

David A. Peterson
University of California, Berkeley

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This paper will present a description of the morphosyntax of transitivization in Lai (Haka Chin). In addition to some relatively unproductive relationships between intransitive and transitive stems reflecting historical causative morphology, there are two types of productive postverbal particle which add an argument to the valence of the verb they occur in conjunction with. One of these particle types is a straightforward causative. The other particles, which are quite copious in Lai, are markers of what have variously been called 'applicative', 'indirective', or 'advancement to object' constructions.

In the first section of the paper, I present some discussion of basic clausal relations in Lai which will be of use in interpreting the examples. Thereafter, I present the indicators of transitivization constructions, demonstrating their semantics. Then I briefly discuss their categorial status. Finally, I systematically examine the syntactic characteristics of objects in such constructions. The conclusion considers the similarities and differences between the causative construction and the applicative constructions, and briefly discusses the Lai system of applicatives in relation to those of other languages.

2.0. BASIC CLAUSAL RELATIONS

There are two aspects of Lai clause structure which must be understood from the outset in order to appreciate the effects of the language's postverbal transitivizing particles. First, Lai clauses show a split-ergative alignment. Second, Lai is what Dryer 1986 calls a 'primary object' language.

2.1. Split ergativity

The split ergativity of Lai clauses is manifested in two different ways.

In an intransitive clause, the single argument is unmarked, or occurs in conjunction with the demonstrative/discourse deictic *khaa*[1]:

[1] *khaa* is basically a remote demonstrative, but it also functions as a discourse marker, indicating an entity which is known both to the speaker and his interlocutor (see Barnes, this issue). I refer to it and members of the same class of words as *discourse deictics*.

(1) tsewmaŋ (khaa) ʔa-thii
Tsewmang DEIC 3S SUBJ-die$_1$
'Tsewmang died.'

The ergative construction, exemplified in example (2),

(2) tsewmaŋ=niʔ thil (khaa) ʔa-baʔ
Tsewmang=ERG clothes DEIC 3S SUBJ-hang.up$_2$
'Tsewmang hung up the clothes.'

marks the agent with the clitic case particle *=niʔ*; the patient argument is either unmarked, or it occurs with the demonstrative/discourse deictic *khaa*.

On the other hand, if the action is not completed or its completion is in question, transitive clauses may also exhibit a *non*-ergative construction:

(3) tsewmaŋ (khaa) thil ʔa-bat-laay
Tsewmang DEIC clothes 3S SUBJ-hang.up$_1$-IRR
'Tsewmang will hang up the clothes.'

(4) tsewmaŋ (khaa) thil ʔa-bat-moo
Tsewmang DEIC clothes 3S SUBJ-hang.up$_1$-INTERR
'Did Tsewmang hang up the clothes?'

(5) tsewmaŋ (khaa) thil ʔa-bat-law
Tsewmang DEIC clothes 3S SUBJ-hang.up$_1$-NEG
'Tsewmang did not hang up the clothes.'

where the agent and patient are both unmarked and the verb contains a different stem form.[2] The *agent* may, however, occur with *khaa* in this construction, while the patient may not. If *khaa* were positioned following the patient in examples (3), (4), or (5), the relationship understood between the two NPs would be that of possessor and possessee and not of subject and object; the subject in such case would be some unnamed third person.[3]

---

2 Examples (3)-(5) may all occur with the ergative construction as well, with a difference, at least in some cases, in aspect.

3 It seems likely that the construction in examples 3-5 is historically primary, and that the ergative construction (and many of the corresponding verb stem alternations) arose from the reanalysis of some kind of nominalization as a finite verb form. Sentences like 3-5, however, are synchronically less frequent, and presumably do what we would expect of an antipassive: what would normally be expected to be an ergative subject is instead treated in the same way as the usual absolutive object. Discourse deictics like *khaa* gravitate towards the absolutive

When a clause is both affirmative and indicative, and its nominals display the ergative construction, what is here called 'Form II' of the verb occurs. Otherwise, 'Form I' is typically used. Thus, in example (2), which is affirmative, indicative, and displays the ergative construction, Form II is used, while in example (3), which does not have the ergative construction, Form I is used. In general, use of Form I corresponds to less transitive actions, while use of Form II corresponds to more transitive actions.[4]

A second way in which Lai's ergativity is split has to do with the morphology used to encode grammatical relations. As seen in the examples above, nominal marking shows an ergative pattern: the agents of transitives are marked in a special case, and patients of transitives and the single arguments of intransitives are treated in a different fashion (both unmarked).

Lai verbs, on the other hand, are preceded by a sequence of one or two agreement prefixes which exhibit a nominative-accusative pattern. Table 1 shows the elements in question. *A* refers to the agent argument associated with the prototypical transitive verb, *S* refers to the single argument associated with intransitive verbs, and *O* refers to the patient argument associated with prototypical transitive verbs.

			Reflexive object:
	A/S	*O*	A_i O_i
1s	ka-	-ka-	-a-
2s	na-	-ń- ~ -ʔin-	-a-
3s	ʔa-	-∅-	-a-
1p	ka-n-	-ka-n-	-ʔii-
2p	na-n-	-ń-...-hnaa ~ -ʔin-...-hnaa	-ʔii-
3p	ʔa-n-	-∅-...-hnaa	-ʔii-

Table 1. Verbal agreement markers.

The A/S markers for singulars are straightforward, as are the A/S markers for plurals, since the latter are simply a combination of the former and a plural element *-n-*. The marking of O is more complicated. The markers for O in the first person are the same as the markers for A and S. Third person O is zero-

subject instead of the object. The objects in examples (3)-(5), however, are not clearly marked as oblique, which is the other typical concomitant of antipassives.

[4] For a notionally intransitive verb, Form II occurs mostly in subordinate clauses. For example, Form II of the verb seen in example (1) would be used in a subordinate clause like *tsewmaŋ ʔa-thiʔ tsaa=ʔaʔ* . . . 'Because Tsewmang died . . .', or *tsewmaŋ ʔa-thiʔ tik=ʔaʔ* . . . 'When Tsewmang died . . .'. This is the other environment in which Form II consistently appears. Otherwise (see below), this form occurs with postverbal transitivizing particles.

marked, but in the third plural, a postverbal particle *-hnaa* indicates plurality of the object. Second person has the most complex O agreement morphology: there is allomorphy between *ʔin-* which occurs after a consonant-final (i.e., plural) A/S marker and *ń-*, which occurs following a vowel-final (i.e., singular) A/S marker. The latter allomorph involves a high tone realized on the nasal portion of the A-O combination. Again, as in the third plural, plurality of the object in the case of second person plural objects is indicated by the postverbal element *-hnaa*. If the O is coreferential with the A, there are special object markers, which can be given either a reflexive or a reciprocal interpretation (seen at right in the table). There is no distinction for person in these forms.[5]

Examples (6)-(8) demonstrate the use of some of these agreement markers:

(6) ʔa-ń-thoʔŋ-hnaa
3S SUBJ-2 OBJ-hit$_2$-PL OBJ
'He hit y'all.'

(7) ʔan-kan-thoʔŋ
3P SUBJ-1P SUBJ-hit$_2$
'They hit us.'

(8) ʔan-ʔii-thooŋ
3P SUBJ-P REFL-hit$_1$
'They hit each other / themselves.'

The first agreement marker indicates the person and number of the subject, and is unambiguous. The second marker indicates that the object is second person (6), first person plural (7), and reflexive or reciprocal with the subject (8). In (6), the plurality of the object is indicated by the postposed particle *-hnaa*.

2.2. Primary objects

A second syntactic characteristic which will be of interest is Lai's status as a 'primary object' language. Dryer 1986 distinguishes two language types based on their treatment of the objects of bivalent and trivalent verbs. First, there are languages in which the patient of a bivalent verb and the patient of a trivalent verb are treated in the same way, and the beneficiary/recipient of a trivalent verb is singled out for special treatment of some sort. This is the sort of pattern

[5] The reflexive or reciprocal use of these prefixes is just one aspect of their use. They also have a more general use as markers of a middle voice (see Tomoko Yamashita Smith, this issue).

familiar to speakers of most Indo-European languages, and is called a 'direct object' language. Secondly, there are languages like Ojibwe (see examples 9a-c), in which it is the patient of bivalent verbs and the *beneficiary/recipient* of trivalent verbs which pattern similarly. In the latter type of language the *patient* of trivalent verbs is given special treatment.

(9a) n-uwa:pem-A: u-tay-uwa:-n
1-see-3.ANIM 3-dog-3PL-OBV
'I see their dog.'

(9b) n-uwa:pent-a:n u-ci:ma:n-uwa:
1-see-3.INAM 3-canoe-3PL
'I see their canoe.'

(9c) n-gi:-mi:n-A: mzinhigan zha:bdi:s
1-PAST-give-3.ANIM book John
'I gave John a book.' (Dryer 1986:812, from Rhodes 1976)

In examples (9a) and (9b) there is a difference in the form of the object agreement marker in the verb which depends on the object's animacy. In example (9c), where there are two objects of differing animacy which the single object marker in the verb might refer to, it is clearly the recipient argument which the verb agrees with. Thus, in Ojibwe, the verb agrees with the patient of bivalent verbs, and the recipient of trivalent verbs, so those arguments pattern together in terms of verbal agreement. The patient argument of the trivalent verb, on the contrary, is given a special treatment in that no verbal agreement refers to it. Ojibwe has what Dryer characterizes as a 'primary object' system.

Lai ditransitives have agreement of the sort seen in Ojibwe. We have already seen that in the case of a monotransitive verb, agreement refers to the patient. For a ditransitive verb, however, agreement is not with the patient, but with the recipient:

(10) paŋpaar ʔan-rak-ka-peek
flowers 3P SUBJ-PAST-1S OBJ-give$_2$
'They gave me flowers.'

In example (10), there is no zero-marking which would agree with the third singular patient 'flowers'. Rather, there is agreement with the first singular recipient argument. What this pattern amounts to in most languages, including Lai, is that animate objects rather than inanimate objects are marked via

pronominal agreement. In fact, in Lai the system is somewhat more complex in that when there are multiple animate objects, there is (in some cases) a hierarchy among animates which dictates which object is marked. I will discuss this hierarchy, in particular as it relates to the transitivizing particles investigated in this paper, in section 5.1.1.2.

3.0. THE TRANSITIVIZING PARTICLES

The main purpose of this paper is to examine the morphosyntactic properties of objects in sentences containing a number of postverbal particles. The basic function of these particles is to specify the exact relation that the action described by the verb has towards one of the objects of that verb. Moreover, it is the addition of one of these particles which permits the presence of the object in question, so I characterize them as transitivizing. In Table 2, I present the particles of this sort which have been identified. In the following subsections I briefly exemplify their semantics.

-ter(-tshiʔ)	causative	**-hnoʔ**	malefactive
-piak	affected object (benefactive, malefactive, substitutive)	**-kaʔn**	prioritive
-tseʔm	additional benefactive	**-taak**	relinquitive
-pii	comitative	**-naak**	instrumental

Table 2. Postverbal transitivizing particles.

3.1. Causative constructions

There are several types of causative in Lai. Most of these are not synchronically productive, but reflect historical causatives whose reflexes are widely attested in Sino-Tibetan. Only causativization involving the postverbal particle *-ter* or the combination *-ter-tshiʔ* seems to be fully productive.

*3.1.1. *s- causatives*

There are a number of semantically related stem pairs in Lai which differ in the articulatory characteristics of their initial consonant. Consider the following stem sets.

Form I	*Form II*	*Verb*
kaaŋ	kaʔŋ	'to burn (intransitive)'
khaaŋ	khaʔŋ	'to burn (transitive)'

kek	ke?	'to break up (intransitive)'
khek	khe?	'to break up (transitive)'
kiak	kia?	'to snap / break (intransitive)'
khiak	khia?	'to snap / break (transitive)'
pe?l	pe?l	'to stumble / be dislocated (intransitive)'
phe?l	phe?l	'to cause to stumble / dislocate (transitive)'
pit	pi?	'to be blocked (intransitive)'
phit	phi?	'to block (transitive)'
tlaa	tlaak	'to fall (intransitive)'
thlaa	thlaak	'to drop (transitive)'
tsat	tsa?	'to be severed / be torn (intransitive)'
tshat	tsha?	'to sever / tear (transitive)'
ʈiaw	ʈiaw	'to be scattered (intransitive)'
ʈhiaw	ʈhiaw	'to scatter, plunder (transitive)'
ʈil	ʈi?l	'to fall from a hanging position (intransitive)'
ʈhil	ʈhi?l	'to make fall from a hanging position (transitive)'

The transitive stem pair has an aspirated initial consonant, while the intransitive pair does not. This pattern is familiar from elsewhere as the remnant of an **s-* causative prefix.[6] This process of causativization is not synchronically productive in Lai, however.

3.1.2. *-t *causatives*

There also are remnants of what is reconstructed as a **-t* causative suffix in Lai, as seen in other Chin languages (e.g., for Mizo by Chhangte 1993). These remnants usually occur in sets which may be abstracted as CVŋ ~ CVn/CV?n, where the first pair is a Form I ~ Form II alternation of an intransitive, and the last member is an invariant causative version of the intransitive, as in the following:

fiaŋ ~ fian	'to be clear'
fia?n	'to make clear'
keŋ ~ ken	'to bring along'
ke?n	'to make bring along'
kiaŋ ~ kian	'to wander'
kia?n	'to cause to wander'

6 See Benedict 1972:105-8.

luaŋ ~ luan	'to flow'
luaʔn	'to cause to flow'
nuŋ ~ nun	'to be alive'
nuʔn	'to make alive'
raŋ ~ ran	'to be fast'
raʔn	'to make fast'
thiaŋ ~ thian	'to be clean'
thiaʔn	'to cause to be clean'
thliaŋ ~ thlian	'to be clear'
thliaʔn	'to cause to be clear'
tliŋ ~ tlin	'to be fulfilled'
thiʔn	'to fulfill'
tluŋ ~ tlun	'to stay as a guest'
tluʔn	'to put up as a guest'
ɬaŋ ~ ɬan	'to try'
ɬaʔn	'to cause to try'

There are a couple of other verbs which show an identical semantic relationship and a similar morphophonological relationship, involving an invariant stem in both cases:

dam	'to heal'
daʔm	'to cause to heal'
thlum	'to be sweet'
thluʔm	'to make sweet'

3.1.3. **-sak** *causatives*

A third unproductive causative in Lai is the suffix *-sak*, so far found only with the verb *hmuʔ* 'to see', as in example (11),

(11) niihuu=niʔ boom khaa ʔa-ka-hmuʔ-sak
Ni Hu=ERG basket DEIC 3S SUBJ-1S OBJ-see$_2$-CAUS
'Ni Hu showed me the basket.'

and fossilized in the verbs *hniksak* 'to test, to try out', and *ʔiifaʔsak* 'to take (something) bitterly'. In the first word the role of *-sak* is obscured since there is no independent verb *hnik*. There is, however, a postverbal particle of the same form which means something like 'to be about to V', and which the consultant says contains an indication of preparedness, so if *hnik* meant something like 'to be prepared', it is plausible that something which meant

'cause to be prepared' could come to mean 'to test'. The second word must mean something like 'to cause oneself to hurt' given its composition. Reflexive *ʔii-* acts as a detransitivizing middle, and the base verb means 'to hurt'.

3.1.4. -ter causatives

The only synchronically productive causative in Lai is formed by addition of the postverbal particle *-ter* to a Form II verb stem. Compare the forms in examples (12) and (13).

(12) ʔuytsaw ʔa-thlii
dog 3S SUBJ-run$_1$
'The dog ran.'

(13) ʔuytsaw ka-thliik-ter
dog 1S SUBJ-run$_2$-CAUS
'I made the dog run.'

In the first example, the dog is the single argument of a simple intransitive verb. In the second example, the Form II stem of the verb is followed by the particle *-ter*, and the dog's function as subject is usurped by a first person singular participant, as indicated in the agreement prefixation. There is instead a zero third person singular object agreement marker corresponding to the dog.

The semantics of such causatives range from permissive or facilitative, as in example (14),

(14) tsewmaŋ=niʔ niihuu khaa ʈhutdan=ʔaʔ ʔa-ʈhut-ter
Tsewmang=ERG Ni Hu DEIC chair=LOC 3S SUBJ-sit$_2$-CAUS
'Tsewmang let / helped Ni Hu sit down in the chair.'

to somewhat more coercive, as in example (15):

(15) tsewmaŋ=niʔ niihuu door=ʔaʔ ʔa-kal-ter
Tsewmang=ERG Ni Hu market=LOC 3S SUBJ-go-CAUS
'Tsewmang sent Ni Huto the market.'

In general, however, the subject of such causatives does not have to be a direct or forceful instigator of the action expressed by the verb stem.

In order to express a more coercive causative, or one in which the causer necessarily plays a direct and essential role in the causing of the action, the suffix *-tshiʔ* is added to the verb-*ter* complex, as in example (16).

(16) ʔuytsaw ka-thliik-ter-tshiʔ
dog 1S SUBJ-run$_2$-CAUS-INTENS
'I made the dog run.' (i.e., I actively caused the dog's running.)

3.2. Applicative constructions

The remaining postverbal transitivizing particles are indicators of different types of 'applicative' constructions. By this, I mean a construction which indicates that what would normally be expected to appear as an oblique argument is treated as a direct object in morphosyntactic terms. As is often the case, the semantic role of the participant which is treated as a direct object of the verb determines the form of the particle in question.

In the remainder of this section, I simply give a brief introduction to the particles' semantics. Most of these particles are of fairly low frequency in texts, so most illustrations of their use are directly elicited examples. However, I include some text examples where they are available.

3.2.1. **-piak:** *affected object (benefactive/malefactive/substitutive)*

The use of *-piak* following the verb stem indicates the addition of an object which is semantically a beneficiary or a maleficiary of the action described by the verb. In addition, for many verbs, use of this particle may indicate that the subject performs the action *in place of* the object to which it refers. Example (17) gives a text example of this applicative construction in which the affected object is a beneficiary.

(17) maʔkhan vantsuŋmii=niʔ tsun tleem-pii ʔan-tii-mii
then angel=ERG DEIC wood slab-AUG 3P SUBJ-say-REL

tsuu ʔan-taat ʔan-taat-piak-ʔii
DEIC 3P SUBJ-hone$_2$ 3P SUBJ-hone$_2$-AFF-CONN
'Then the angels honed and honed the so-called big slab of wood for him and . . .'

Example (18), which occurred in the sentence just prior to (17), shows the same applicative construction in which the affected object is a maleficiary.

(18) ʔaa! tleem-pii khaa maʔ-tii tsun
INTERJ wood slab-AUG DEIC DEM-do$_i$ DEIC

taar-nuu=niʔ ʔa-ka-khaʔŋ-piak-ʔii . . .
old-woman=ERG 3S SUBJ-1S OBJ-burn$_2$-AFF-CONN
'Ah, the old woman burned the big slab of wood on me, and . . .'

It should be noted in passing that some Form II verbs which would be expected to fit into the class of verbs reflecting the **-t* causative instead take a beneficiary object with no additional morphology (namely, no *-piak*). For example, sentence (19)

(19) tsewmaŋ=ni? rool ?a-ka-tsua?n
Tsewmang=ERG meal 3S SUBJ-1S OBJ-prepare
'Tsewmang made a meal for me.'

is the equivalent of (20):

(20) tsewmaŋ=ni? rool ?a-ka-tsuan-piak
Tsewmang=ERG MEAL 3S SUBJ-1S OBJ-prepare$_2$-BEN
'Tsewmang made a meal for me.'

The verbs reflecting **-t* thus have either a causative or a benefactive semantics, with no apparent way of predicting which will occur. The benefactive type is fairly rare, however. For verbs of this sort, use of *-piak* preferentially involves the 'in place of' interpretation of the particle.

There is also an alternative construction for verbs marked by *-piak*; see (21):

(21) tsewmaŋ kay-ma? tsaa=?a? law ?a-thlaw
tsewmang 1S PRON sake=LOC field 3S SUBJ-hoe$_1$
'Tsewmang hoed the field for my sake.'

which the consultant claims is similar, but does not quite correspond to the *-piak* construction. In example (21) the beneficiary is structurally the possessor of a relational noun, *tsaa*, which is marked obliquely.

3.2.2. -tse?m*: additional benefactive*

-tse?m appears to be a special kind of benefactive, as in example (22):

(22) thiŋ ?a-ka-laak-tse?m
wood 3S SUBJ-1S OBJ-carry$_2$-ADD BEN
'He carried wood for me (in addition to carrying wood for himself).'

As the gloss indicates, the general idea behind verb-*tse?m* complexes is that the subject is already performing the action of the verb, and that in addition to performing that action for his own benefit, he also performs it for the benefit of the additional object.

3.2.3. -pii: *comitative*

-pii signals the addition of an object argument which is understood to be an equal participant with the subject in the performance of the action described by the verb. Thus, in the example in (23),

(23) ka-law ʔan-ka-thloʔ-pii
1S POSS-field 3P SUBJ-1S OBJ-hoe$_2$-COM
'They hoed my field (together) with me.'

-pii licenses an object which is given a comitative interpretation. A text example is given in (24).

(24) maʔtsun ʔin tʰaa tshuŋ=ʔaʔ tsun ʔa-ʔum-pii
then house good inside=LOC DEIC 3S SUBJ-live-COM
'and then he lived together with her in the good house.'

In some instances, verb-*pii* combinations have developed idiosyncratic semantics. For instance, one of the most frequent occurrences of *-pii* in texts involves adding it to the verb *kal* 'to go', resulting in a verb with essentially causative semantics: 'to take someone / something (somewhere)', as in (25).

(25) ʔii ʔa-thoʔ=ʔaʔ tsun khuay ʔa-zuat-mii-lee
CONN 3S SUBJ-begin$_2$=LOC DEIC bee 3S SUBJ-raise$_2$-REL-and

vaanzuaŋ ʔa-zuat-mii-hnaa ʔa-hoy-lee-hnaa
parrot 3S SUBJ-raise$_2$-REL-PL OBJ 3S POSS-friend-and-PL

zoŋ khaa ʔa-a-kal-pii-hnaa
also DEIC 3S SUBJ-REFL-go$_i$-COM-PL OBJ
And when he set off, he took along with himself bee(s) and a parrot which he had raised, and his friends.

The consultant considers constructions using *-pii* to be more or less the same as a construction without *-pii* in which the comitative object is coded obliquely using the comitative case clitic *=hee*. Thus sentence (26) is approximately the same as sentence (23).

(26) kay-maʔ=hee ka-law ʔan-thlaw
1S PRON=COM 1S POSS-field 3P SUBJ-hoe$_1$
'They hoed my field together with me.'

3.2.4. -hnoʔ*: malefactive*

The particle *-hnoʔ* produces similar results, usually signaling the addition of a maleficiary object. A verb-*hnoʔ* complex, however, is rarely given such a simple interpretation. The consultant describes *-hnoʔ* as indicating some kind of malice or harmful intent on the part of the subject towards the object it introduces, violent action, etc. Some examples are seen in (27)-(29), the last of which is a text example.

(27) kheeŋ ʔa-ka-hloʔn-hnoʔ
dish 3S SUBJ-1S OBJ-throw$_2$-MAL
'She threw the dish at me.'

(28) rul=niʔ ka-ʔin=ʔaʔ ʔa-ka-luʔ-hnoʔ
snake=ERG 1S POSS-house=LOC 3S SUBJ-1S OBJ-enter$_2$-MAL
'A snake came into my house on me.'

(29) tsuutsaʔaʔtsun ʔan-paa tsuu ʔa-hey-zuan-hnoʔ-ʔii
then 3P POSS-father DEIC 3S SUBJ-DIREC-fly$_2$-MAL-CONN
'Then it [a tiger] pounced on their father and . . .'

It should be further noted, though, that in other cases, *-hnoʔ* does not appear to have malefactive semantics at all, as in the next example.

(30) ʔii vaan-tsuŋ-mii=niʔ ʔan-thaʔy-ʔii vaantsuŋmii=niʔ
and angel=ERG 3P SUBJ-hear$_2$-CONN angel=ERG

ʔan-ruŋ-ʈum-hnoʔ-ʔii
3P SUBJ-DIREC-descend$_1$-FOR/TO-CONN
'And the angels heard about it and the angels came down to him, and . . .'

It is clear that *-hnoʔ* in this context indicates either simple motion towards the object, or possibly even the status of the object as a beneficiary. So, as in the case of *-piak*, there is variation in the exact semantics of the object associated with this particle.

The consultant thinks that the closest paraphrase of sentences including verb-*hnoʔ* complexes would be something like 'X verbed in the face of Y':

(31) ka-hmaay-ʔaʔ kheeŋ ʔa-hloʔn
1S POSS-face-LOC dish 3S SUBJ-throw$_2$
'He threw the dish in my face.'

However, the semantics of a sentence like (31) is not considered to be semantically equivalent to a sentence including a verb-*hno?* complex.

3.2.5. -ka?n*:* *prioritive*

-ka?n indicates that the action is accomplished by the subject *ahead of* or *before* the additional object. The consultant conceives of this primarily in spatial terms, but practically, it is hard to come up with a context in which this does not also entail temporal precedence:

(32) booy ?a-kan-ton-ka?n
chief 3S SUBJ-1P OBJ-meet$_2$-PRIOR
'He met the chief ahead of / before us.'

Unlike many of the other particles investigated, *-ka?n* has a non-applicative paraphrase. The consultant judges the degree of closeness between this paraphrase and a version using the verb-particle complex to be comparable to that between the *=hee* alternative to the verb-*pii* complex for expressing comitative objects described above. Sentence (33),

(33) kay-ma? hlaan=?a? ?a-kal
1S PRON before/front=LOC 3S SUBJ-go
'He went ahead of me.'

in which the semantically peripheral argument is expressed as the possessor of an obliquely marked locational noun, is judged to be virtually the same as (34),

(34) ?a-ka-kal-ka?n
3S SUBJ-1S OBJ-go-PRIOR
'He went ahead of me.'

where the semantically peripheral argument is not an oblique.

3.2.6. -taak*:* *relinquitive*

Sentences including *-taak* are interpreted as involving the subject of the verb leaving the added object and verbing as seen in examples (35) and (36).

(35) ?a-law ?a-kan-thlo?-taak
3S POSS-field 3S SUBJ-1P OBJ-hoe$_2$-RELINQ
'He left us and hoed his field.'

(36) . . . hee-ʔuʔ nan-ŋaa-lee nan-suur tiaʔ
here-PL 2P POSS-fish-and 2P POSS-net QUOT

ʔa-tii-ʔii ʔa-tshiaʔ-taak-hnaa
3S SUBJ-say-CONN 3S SUBJ-put$_2$-RELINQ-PL OBJ
'. . . "Here, you all, your fish and your net," she said, and she put them down and left them (the people spoken to).'

The temporal order of the event described by the verb and the event of leaving denoted by the suffix do not necessarily occur in consecutive order, as shown in the following example, where the flying and the leaving presumably occur simultaneously.

(37) vaanlooŋzuannaakhmun ʔa-rak-phaak tik=ʔaʔ khan
airport 3S SUBJ-PERF-reach$_2$ time=LOC DEIC

tsun ʔa-vaanzuanlooŋ=niʔ ʔa-rak-zuan-taak-diam-tsaŋ
DEIC 3S POSS-plane=ERG 3S SUBJ-PERF-fly$_2$-RELINQ-already-PERF
'By the time he$_j$ reached the airport, his$_i$ plane had already taken off (i.e., leaving him$_j$ behind).

The exact temporal ordering of the event expressed by the base verb and the event expressed by the particle probably depends largely on the semantics of the base verb. With the idea that the semantics involved in using this particle resembles what Himalayanists refer to as a relinquitive, I will use that term to describe this particle. I would like to make it clear, though, that this is a relinquitive *applicative*, which involves transitivization, something which is not clearly the case with Himalayan relinquitives.

While it is quite similar to the particles discussed so far, *-taak* differs from most in allowing the additional object that it licenses to be inanimate, as in example (38).

(38) ʔa-door ʔa-law ʔa-thloʔ-taak
3S POSS-store 3S POSS-field 3S SUBJ-hoe$_2$-RELINQ
'He left his store to hoe his field.'

3.2.7. -naak: *instrumental*

-naak is different from the preceding elements in that the object which it adds to the valence of the base verb is usually inanimate. What the particle indicates is that an instrument is the object of the verb, as in example (39).

(39) ʔii zooŋʈee=niʔ tsun ʔa-lutsin khaa ʔa-hmuʔ-ʔii
and monkey=ERG DEIC 3S POSS-hat DEIC 3S SUBJ-see2-and

lentee ʔa-tseʔl-naak
game 3S SUBJ-play-INST
'And the monkey saw his hat and played games with it.'

The consultant judges the following two sentences to be more or less the same semantically:

(40) tiiloon=ʔin tivaa (khaa) kan-tan
boat=INST river DEIC 1P SUBJ-cross
'We used the boat to cross the river.'

(41) tiiloon khaa tivaa kan-tan-naak
boat DEIC river 1P SUBJ-cross-INST
'We used the boat to cross the river.'

In example (40), the instrument object is coded with the oblique case particle *=ʔin*. The sentence in (41), on the other hand, has the postverbal transitivizer *-naak*, and the instrument object receives no oblique marking.

4.0. THE CATEGORIAL STATUS OF THE TRANSITIVIZERS

The categorial status of these elements may be of some significance: are they separate verbs, are they independent adverbial elements, or are they affixal? At this point there does not seem to be much reason to select one or the other of the latter two possibilities. Here I will briefly present a few arguments for excluding the first possibility, and will present one potential argument for the last.

First of all, main verbs always bear subject and object agreement. Examples of main verbs bearing agreement have already been given above. Some auxiliary elements may also bear agreement. One auxiliary element is the verb *duʔ* 'to want'. When *duʔ* is used as an auxiliary, it may bear agreement to the exclusion of the main verb, as in example (42).

(42) ka-ʔin=ʔaʔ kal ka-duʔ
1S POSS-house-LOC go 1S SUBJ-want
'I want to go to my house.'

Otherwise, it may itself follow the inflected main verb as a particle without agreement, as in example (43).

(43) ka-ʔin=ʔaʔ ka-kal-duʔ
1S POSS-house-LOC 1S SUBJ-go-want
'I want to go to my house.'

The postverbal particles under examination in this paper, unlike main verbs and auxiliary elements, never bear agreement: agreement always appears preceding the verb-particle complex.

Moreover, some elements which are clearly more grammaticalized than *-duʔ* (in being unable to take separate agreement) show a distinction between Form I and Form II in the appropriate morphosyntactic environments. For instance, the postverbal formative which indicates the subject's ability to perform the action of the verb shows this kind of alternation, as seen in examples (44) and (45).

(44) ʔa-tshim-khoʔ
3S SUBJ-say$_1$-able$_2$
'He is able to say it.'

(45) ʔa-tshim-khaw-law
3S SUBJ-say$_1$-able$_1$-NEG
'He is not able to say it.'

Of the sizable number of postverbal transitivizing particles which have been isolated here, however, none participate in any of the stem ablaut patterns which are found in the verbal system. For example, while we would expect Form II verb stems in most of the examples in this paper, the following examples (in which use of the negative should induce Form I if it can occur) show that there is no such alternation in the form of any of the particles considered here.

(46) law ʔa-ka-thloʔ-ter-law
field 3S SUBJ-1S OBJ-hoe$_2$-CAUS-NEG
'He didn't make me hoe the field.'

(47) law ʔa-ka-thloʔ-piak-law
field 3S SUBJ-1S OBJ-hoe$_2$-BEN-NEG
'He didn't hoe the field for me.'

(48) law ʔa-ka-thloʔ-tseʔm-law
field 3S SUBJ-1S OBJ-hoe$_2$-ADD BEN-NEG
'He didn't hoe the field for me (in addition to hoeing it for himself).'

(49) law ʔa-ka-thloʔ-pii-law
field 3S SUBJ-1S OBJ-hoe$_2$-COM-NEG
'He didn't hoe the field with me.'

(50) law ʔa-ka-thloʔ-hnoʔ-law
field 3S SUBJ-1S OBJ-hoe$_2$-MAL-NEG
'He didn't hoe the field on me.'

(51) law ʔa-ka-thloʔ-kaʔn-law
field 3S SUBJ-1S OBJ-hoe$_2$-PRIOR-NEG
'He didn't hoe the field before me.'

(52) law ʔa-ka-thloʔ-taak-law
field 3S SUBJ-1S OBJ-hoe$_2$-RELINQ-NEG
'He didn't leave me and hoe the field.'

Thus, the status of the postverbal transitivizers with respect to verbal agreement and stem ablaut alternations indicate that they are not separate verbs.

Finally, while we have not exhaustively tested the possible orderings between different postverbal particles, the postverbal transitivizing particles all occur closer to the verb stem than any of the elements which we believe to be the innermost particles. For instance, the transitivizing particles all occur closer to the verb stem than the exhaustive particle *-diʔ*, and the experiential perfect particle *-bal*, as shown in examples (53)-(60).

(53a) ʔa-ka-thloʔ-ter-diʔ *diʔ-ter
3S SUBJ-1S OBJ-hoe$_2$-CAUS-EXHAUST EXHAUST-CAUS
'He made me hoe it all.'

(53b) ʔa-ka-thloʔ-ter-bal *bal-ter
3S SUBJ-1S OBJ-hoe$_2$-CAUS-EXPER EXPER-CAUS
'He has the experience of making me hoe it.'

(54a) ʔa-ka-thloʔ-piak-diʔ *diʔ-piak
3S SUBJ-1S OBJ-hoe$_2$-BEN-EXHAUST EXHAUST-BEN
'He hoed it all for me.'

(54b) ʔa-ka-thloʔ-piak-bal *bal-piak
3S SUBJ-1S OBJ-hoe$_2$-BEN-EXPER EXPER-BEN
'He has the experience of hoeing it for me.'

(55a) ʔa-ka-thloʔ-tseʔm-diʔ *diʔ-tseʔm
3S SUBJ-1S OBJ-hoe$_2$-ADD BEN-EXHAUST EXHAUST-ADD BEN
'He hoed it all for me (besides for himself).'

(55b) ʔa-ka-thloʔ-tseʔm-bal *bal-tseʔm
3S SUBJ-1S OBJ-hoe$_2$-ADD BEN-EXPER EXPER-ADD BEN
'He has the experience of hoeing it for me (besides for himself).'

(56a) ʔa-ka-thloʔ-pii-diʔ *diʔ-pii
3S SUBJ-1S OBJ-hoe$_2$-COM-EXHAUST EXHAUST-COM
'He hoed it all with me.'

(56b) ʔa-ka-thloʔ-pii-bal *bal-pii
3S SUBJ-1S OBJ-hoe$_2$-COM-EXPER EXPER-COM
'He has the experience of hoeing it with me.'

(57a) ʔa-ka-thloʔ-hnoʔ-diʔ *diʔ-hnoʔ
3S SUBJ-1S OBJ-hoe$_2$-MAL-EXHAUST EXHAUST-MAL
'He hoed it all to my detriment.'

(57b) ʔa-ka-thloʔ-hnoʔ-bal *bal-hnoʔ
3S SUBJ-1S OBJ-hoe$_2$-MAL-EXPER EXPER-MAL
'He has the experience of hoeing it to my detriment.'

(58a) ʔa-ka-thloʔ-kaʔn-diʔ *diʔ-kaʔn
3S SUBJ-1S OBJ-hoe$_2$-PRIOR-EXHAUST EXHAUST-PRIOR
'He hoed it all before me.'

(58b) ʔa-ka-thloʔ-kaʔn-bal *bal-kaʔn
3S SUBJ-1S OBJ-hoe$_2$-PRIOR-EXPER EXPER-PRIOR
'He has the experience of hoeing it before me.'

(59a) ʔa-ka-thloʔ-taak-diʔ *diʔ-taak
3S SUBJ-1S OBJ-hoe$_2$-RELINQ-EXHAUST EXHAUST-RELINQ
'He left me behind and hoed all of it.'

(59b) ʔa-ka-thloʔ-taak-bal *bal-taak
3S SUBJ-1S OBJ-hoe$_2$-RELINQ-EXPER EXPER-RELINQ
'He has the experience of leaving me behind and hoeing it.'

(60a) naam vialtee ʔa-ka-tshuʔn-naak-diʔ
knife all 3S SUBJ-1S OBJ-stab$_2$-INST-EXHAUST
'He stabbed me with all of the knives.'

(60b) naam ʔa-ka-tshuʔn-naak-bal
knife 3S SUBJ-1S OBJ-stab$_2$-INST-EXPER
'He has the experience of stabbing me with a knife.'

The same restrictions hold for these elements and the element *-seek*, which indicates the speaker's doubt that the action will be successfully performed. As shown to the right of these examples, in all but the case of *-naak* (for which, see section 5.7.2 below), the consultant also believes that the opposite ordering is simply unacceptable. The point is, if any postverbal elements in Lai have any claim to being affixal, then these transitivizing particles are the best candidates. There is no clear phonological evidence that would argue for analyzing them as affixes, however.

5.0. SYNTACTIC PROPERTIES OF OBJECTS

The verbal complex constituted by the Form II stem and one of the postverbal elements is (at least mono-)transitive.

It is also clear in most of the other cases discussed above that the verb-particle complex is transitive (or *more* transitive, in the sense of having multiple objects) by virtue of the particle. Take, for example, the verb *thii ~ thiʔ* 'to die'. This verb is intransitive in Form I, and it is intransitive in Form II. We know the latter is true since it cannot take an object marker in its simplex form.

(61) *ʔa-ka-thiʔ
3S SUBJ-1S OBJ-die$_2$
'He died ? me.'

Even if Form II *thi?* could take an object, it is unclear how the semantic role of the object would be determined. When *thi?* is augmented by the particles just discussed (except *-naak*, which is difficult to contextualize), the verb-particle complex takes an object, with semantics specified by the postverbal particles.

(62) ʔa-ka-thiʔ-ter-(tshiʔ)
3S SUBJ-1S OBJ-die$_2$-CAUS-(INTENS)
'He caused me to die.'

(63) ʔa-ka-thiʔ-piak
3S SUBJ-1S OBJ-die$_2$-BEN
'He died for me.'

(64) ʔa-ka-thiʔ-tseʔm
3S SUBJ-1S OBJ-die$_2$-ADD BEN
'He died for me (in addition to dying for himself).'

(65) ʔa-ka-thiʔ-pii
3S SUBJ-1S OBJ-die$_2$-COM
'He's obsessed with me.'[7]

(66) ʔa-ka-thiʔ-hnoʔ
3S SUBJ-1S OBJ-die$_2$-MAL
'He died on me.'

(67) ʔa-ka-thiʔ-kaʔn
3S SUBJ-1S OBJ-die$_2$-PRIOR
'He died before me.'

(68) ʔa-ka-thiʔ-taak
3S SUBJ-1S OBJ-die$_2$-RELINQ
'He died and left me.'

(69) ʔa-ka-kal-naak
3S SUBJ-1S OBJ-go-INST
'He went by means of me.'[8]

---

7 Clearly, this combination has developed a fairly idiosyncratic meaning.

8 Finding situations in which an instrument can be animate, and hence tell us explicitly about object marking, is difficult. This form might be used, for instance, if my body provided the route by which he traversed some obstacle, but it is still a rather farfetched example.

If the base verb is transitive, however, the resulting verb is ditransitive, and there is no readily apparent difference between the two objects. When there appear to be multiple objects, the question which arises is whether there is any difference in the syntactic behavior of the objects, and that will be the subject of the rest of the paper.

5.1. Object properties: preliminary remarks

The object properties which I consider below are ones discussed extensively for other languages and found often to help distinguish between the two objects in double-object constructions like the ones we see in Lai. The patterns which emerge for each property are discussed in turn for each postverbal particle, with the exception of *-naak*. The latter particle is sufficiently different from the others that it warrants a separate treatment, which I give it in section 5.7.

One property which appears to have a function, namely word order, turns out not to be diagnostic of object status. The consultant has on numerous occasions preferred an interpretation in which the first in a sequence of two objects is interpreted either as the causee or as the object associated with an applicative construction marker. However, when one directly tests this tendency, it turns out that either object in a two object sequence can be interpreted as the causee or applicative object, especially if context makes it clear which participant is more likely to play a particular role.

In what follows, I will distinguish between the two objects of applicative verbs as the *base object* (the one associated with the valence of the base verb, if there is one) and the *applicative object* (the one whose presence is due to the postverbal transitivizing particle).

5.1.1. Object agreement

First we will look in detail at object agreement. In the case of almost all transitivizing particles, the preverbal object agreement is with the object associated with the transitivizing particle. In some cases it is possible for postverbal plural marking to refer to the other object if the base of transitivization was already a transitive verb. There is also a crucial difference between object marking with causatives and object marking with applicatives.

5.1.1.1. Object agreement with -ter

Object agreement for causatives in *-ter* is invariably with the causee object.

(70) ka-ń-hmuʔ-ter
1S SUBJ-2S OBJ-see$_2$-CAUS
'I made you see him.'

(71) na-ka-hmuʔ-ter
2S SUBJ-1S OBJ-see$_2$-CAUS
'You made me see him.'

(72) naŋ-maʔ ka-hmuʔ-ter
2S PRON 1S SUBJ-see$_2$-CAUS
'I made him see you.'

(73) kay-maʔ na-hmuʔ-ter
1S PRON 2S SUBJ-see$_2$-CAUS
'You made him see me.'

(74) kay-maʔ ʔa-ń-hmuʔ-ter
1S PRON 3S SUBJ-2S OBJ-see$_2$-CAUS
'He made you see me.'

(75) naŋ-maʔ ʔa-ka-hmuʔ-ter
2S PRON 3S SUBJ-1S OBJ-see$_2$-CAUS
'He made me see you.'

In each of the cases in (70)-(75), the object which verbal agreement refers to is the participant who is made to perform the action of the verb base. The only case in which any agreement reflects the patient object (the non-causee) is when the causee is first person and the patient is plural.

(76) ʔa-ka-khoʔl-ter-hnaa
3S SUBJ-1S OBJ-wash-CAUS-PL OBJ
'He made me wash them.'

In this instance, if the causee were plural it would be reflected in the preverbal agreement (*-ka-n-* instead of *-ka-*), so the postverbal plural object marker is free to indicate the number of the other object. In the case of second and third person causees, *-hnaa* is instead interpreted as referring to the causee.

5.1.1.2. Object agreement with -piak

Object agreement for verb-*piak* complexes is with the affected object. Consider examples (77) and (78):

(77) tsewmaŋ door-ʔaʔ ʔa-kal
tsewmang market-LOC 3S SUBJ-go
'Tsewmang went to the market.'

(78) tsewmaŋ=niʔ door-ʔaʔ ʔa-ka-kal-piak
tsewmang=ERG market-LOC 3S SUBJ-1S SUBJ-go-AFF
'Tsewmang went to the market for me.'

In example (77), the verb *kal* 'to go' is intransitive: the verb takes only a subject agreement marker and the goal object is marked obliquely. In example (78), on the other hand, the particle *-piak* has been added, and the resulting verb-particle complex takes an object agreement marker.

It might be suggested that the oblique in example (77) *does* take agreement, but since the 'market' is third person, the marking is not visible. It is not easy to find examples of obliquely marked first or second person objects, since most oblique marking of those persons is actually mediated by a locational noun (e.g., *sin* 'possession'), but I have been able to elicit one example of a relative clause which should take second person agreement with an obliquely marked second person pronoun if it were to require agreement, but it does not:

(79) naŋ-ma=ʔaʔ ʔa-tsaaŋ-mii thil
2S PRON=LOC 3S SUBJ-happen (move)$_1$-REL thing
'what (the thing that) happened to you'

Thus, not surprisingly, oblique elements do not require agreement. Also, it should be noted that *kal* as a simplex verb cannot simply take an object marker which happens to refer to a beneficiary without the use of *-piak*.

(80) *tsewmaŋ(=niʔ) ʔa-ka-kal
tsewmang(=ERG) 3S SUBJ-1S OBJ-go
'Tsewmang went for me.'

When there is a patient object associated with the base verb, agreement is still with the affected object.

(81) ka-law ʔan-ka-thloʔ-piak
1S POSS-field 3P SUBJ-1S OBJ-hoe$_2$-AFF
'They hoed my field for me.'

The plurality of the *patient* object may be marked by postverbal plural object marking if the affected object is either first person singular or plural.

(82) ka-law ʔan-ka-thloʔ-piak-hnaa
1S POSS-field 3P SUBJ-1S OBJ-hoe$_2$-AFF-PL OBJ
'They hoed my fields for me.'

If the affected object is second or third person, however, there is ambiguity between a reading in which the affected object is plural and a reading in which the patient is plural. The preferred interpretation is that *-hnaa* refers to the affected object. This pattern is quite consistent with what holds for the other postverbal particles, as we will see below.

Now, it might be argued that since in Lai there is preferential marking of animate objects (see 2.2), in just about any imaginable situation, it is the affected object which is going to be marked on the verb. On this interpretation, affected objects would have agreement by virtue of their being animate, and not because of any independent requirement of the postverbal particle *-piak*. The only means of finding out whether the postverbal particles exert any independent influence on object marking is to look at what happens when both the base object and the applicative object are animate. Some representative examples of this type of situation are given in examples (83)-(88).

(83) ʔa-maʔ ʔa-ń-zuʔl-piak
3S PRON 3S SUBJ-2S OBJ-follow$_2$-AFF
'He followed him for you.'

(84) ʔa-maʔ ʔa-ka-zuʔl-piak
3S PRON 3S SUBJ-1S OBJ-follow$_2$-AFF
'He followed him for me.'

(85) naŋ-maʔ ʔa-ka-zuʔl-piak
2S PRON 3S SUBJ-1S OBJ-follow$_2$-AFF
'He followed you for me.'

(86) ʔkay-maʔ ʔa-ń-zuʔl-piak
1S PRON 3S SUBJ-2S OBJ-follow$_2$-AFF
'He followed me for you.'

(87) *naŋ-ma? ʔa-zuʔl-piak
2S PRON 3S SUBJ-follow$_2$-AFF
'He followed you for him.'

(88) *kay-ma? ʔa-zuʔl-piak
1S PRON 3S SUBJ-follow$_2$-AFF
'He followed me for him.'

As shown in these examples, when the affected object is either a first or a second person, and the patient is a third person (examples [83] and [84]), the *-piak* construction may be used as expected. The same holds when the affected object is first person and the patient is second person (85). However, if the affected object is second person and the patient is first person, the sentence is questionable at best (86). And if the affected object is third person, and the patient is either first or second person (87 and 88), the sentence is impossible. Thus, in addition to the hierarchy *animate* > *inanimate* which determines object agreement, for verb-*piak* combinations there exists a hierarchy among animates (1 > 2 > 3 or 1, 2 > 3; see below) which determines object agreement when there is more than one animate object.

If object marking in verb-particle constructions were determined solely on the basis of this hierarchy, however, we would expect that it would still be possible to form constructions using *-piak* where the affected object was third person and the other object was either second or third person. We might expect, for instance, that

(89) ʔa-ma? ʔa-ka-zuʔl-piak
3S PRON 3S SUBJ-1S OBJ-follow$_2$-AFF
*'He followed me for him'; acceptable for 'He followed him for me.'

would have the intended reading as a possible meaning, in which the first person singular patient object, rather than the third person singular applicative object, is marked on the verb.

One explanation for these facts is that the postverbal particles independently stipulate that object agreement is to be with an argument of a particular semantic role, e.g., with the affected object in the case of *-piak*. If this stipulation conflicts with the other requirement of the system, i.e., that object marking be done on the basis of the hierarchy, then there is simply no way to use the *-piak* construction.

5.1.1.3. Object agreement with -tseʔm

The object marking for verb-*tseʔm* complexes is with the additional beneficiary, though the facts concerning postverbal plural marking are as seen with *-piak* in the preceding section. That is, sentences like (90)

(90) law ʔa-ka-thloʔ-tseʔm-hnaa
field 3S SUBJ-1S OBJ-hoe$_2$-ADD BEN-PL OBJ
'He hoed the fields for me.'

clearly indicate the plurality of the base object; for sentences in which the additional beneficiary was either second or third person, the interpretation of *-hnaa* would be ambiguous, but the preferred interpretation would be that *-hnaa* refers to the applicative object.

Also, as seen in the examples below, the consultant's judgments concerning verb-*tseʔm* complexes in which both objects are animate are quite similar to judgments for the comparable sentences using *-piak*. The only difference with this set is that both of the sentences involving first and second person objects (examples [93] and [94]), rather than just ones involving a second person beneficiary and a first person patient, are regarded as odd. It is this data which suggests that the hierarchy 1, 2 > 3 is more likely than 1 > 2 > 3.

(91) ʔa-maʔ ʔa-ń-zuʔl-tseʔm
3S PRON 3S SUBJ-2S OBJ-follow$_2$-ADD BEN
'He followed him for you.'

(92) ʔa-maʔ ʔa-ka-zuʔl-tseʔm
3S PRON 3S SUBJ-1S OBJ-follow$_2$-ADD BEN
'He followed him for me.'

(93) ʔkay-maʔ ʔa-ń-zuʔl-tseʔm
1S PRON 3S SUBJ-2S OBJ-follow$_2$-ADD BEN
'He followed me for you.'

(94) ʔnaŋ-maʔ ʔa-ka-zuʔl-tseʔm
2S PRON 3S SUBJ-1S OBJ-follow$_2$-ADD BEN
'He followed you for me.'

(95) *naŋ-maʔ ʔa-zuʔl-tseʔm
2S PRON 3S SUBJ-follow$_2$-ADD BEN
'He followed you for him.'

(96) *kay-maʔ ʔa-zuʔl-tseʔm
1S PRON 3S SUBJ-follow$_2$-ADD BEN
'He followed me for him.'

5.1.1.4. Object agreement with -pii

For verb-particle complexes containing *-pii*, agreement is with the comitative object. However, as in the case of verb-*piak* forms (and subject to the same potential ambiguities), plurality of a base object may be indicated by the postverbal plural marker.

(97) ka-law ʔan-ka-thloʔ-pii-hnaa
1S POSS-field 3P SUBJ-1S OBJ-hoe$_2$-COM-PL OBJ
'They hoed my fields with me.'

The consultant's judgments concerning the potential for *-pii* to occur with two animate objects are a close match with those already seen for *-piak* and *-tseʔm*.

(98) ʔa-maʔ ʔa-ń-zuʔl-pii
3S PRON 3S SUBJ-2S OBJ-follow$_2$-COM
'He followed him with you.'

(99) ʔa-maʔ ʔa-ka-zuʔl-pii
3S PRON 3S SUBJ-1S OBJ-follow$_2$-COM
'He followed him with me.'

(100) naŋ-maʔ ʔa-ka-zuʔl-pii
2S PRON 3S SUBJ-1S OBJ-follow$_2$-COM
'He followed you with me.'

(101) ʔkay-maʔ ʔa-ń-zuʔl-pii
1S PRON 3S SUBJ-2S OBJ-follow$_2$-COM
'He followed me with you.'

(102) *naŋ-maʔ ʔa-zuʔl-pii
2S PRON 3S SUBJ-follow$_2$-COM
'He followed you with him.'

(103) *kay-maʔ ʔa-zuʔl-pii
1S PRON 3S SUBJ-follow$_2$-COM
'He followed you with him.'

These facts are again consistent with the assumption that the postverbal particle makes demands on the type of semantic object that the object agreement will represent, which, however, is in conflict with the overall demands of object agreement related to animacy.

5.1.1.5. Object agreement with -hnoʔ

We have seen from previous examples that the object marked on a verb-*hnoʔ* complex reflects the person and number of the maleficiary. As in the previous cases, it is also possible to indicate the plurality of the base object, and the consultant's interpretations concerning marking of plurality with second and third person maleficiaries, where there are potential ambiguities, also hold for verb-*hnoʔ* combinations.

(104) kheeŋ ʔa-ka-hloʔn-hnoʔ-hnaa
dish 3S SUBJ-1S OBJ-throw$_2$-MAL-PL OBJ
'He threw dishes at me.'

The consultant's judgments about the acceptability of sentences containing multiple animate objects are likewise fairly consistent with those seen for the previous verb-particle combinations, again suggesting that the particle plays a role in determining the reference of object marking.

(105) ʔa-maʔ ʔa-ń-zuʔl-hnoʔ
3S PRON 3S SUBJ-2S OBJ-follow$_2$-MAL
'He followed him on you.'

(106) ʔa-maʔ ʔa-ka-zuʔl-hnoʔ
3S PRON 3S SUBJ-1S OBJ-follow$_2$-MAL
'He followed him on me.'

(107) naŋ-maʔ ʔa-ka-zuʔl-hnoʔ
2S PRON 3S SUBJ-1S OBJ-follow$_2$-MAL
'He followed you on me.'

(108) ʔkay-maʔ ʔa-ń-zuʔl-hnoʔ
1S PRON 3S SUBJ-2S OBJ-follow$_2$-MAL
'He followed me on you.'

(109) *naŋ-maʔ ʔa-zuʔl-hnoʔ
2S PRON 3S SUBJ-follow$_2$-MAL
'He followed you on him.'

(110) *kay-maʔ ʔa-zuʔl-hnoʔ
1S PRON 3S SUBJ-follow$_2$-MAL
'He followed me on him.'

5.1.1.6. Object agreement with -kaʔn

The object marking characteristics of verb-*kaʔn* complexes are the same as those seen for other verb-particle combinations. First, the main object agreement refers to the applicative object rather than the base object, but, as in example (111), the plurality of the base object may be indicated by the postverbal plural marker.

(111) law ʔa-kan-thloʔ-kaʔn-hnaa
field 3S SUBJ-1P OBJ-hoe$_2$-PRIOR-PL OBJ
'He hoed the fields ahead of us.'

The usual potential for ambiguity of *-hnaa* with second and third person prioritive objects is also present.

The restrictions on use of verb-*kaʔn* complexes with multiple animate objects are also similar to those already seen:

(112) ʔa-maʔ ʔa-ń-zuʔl-kaʔn
3S PRON 3S SUBJ-2S OBJ-follow$_2$-PRIOR
'He followed him ahead of you.'

(113) ʔa-maʔ ʔa-ka-zuʔl-kaʔn
3S PRON 3S SUBJ-1S OBJ-follow$_2$-PRIOR
'He followed him ahead of me.'

(114) ʔkay-maʔ ʔa-ń-zuʔl-kaʔn
1S PRON 1S SUBJ-2S OBJ-follow$_2$-PRIOR
'He followed me ahead of you.'

(115) ʔnaŋ-maʔ ʔa-ka-zuʔl-kaʔn
2S PRON 3S SUBJ-1S OBJ-follow$_2$-PRIOR
'He followed you ahead of me.'

(116) *naŋ-maʔ ʔa-zuʔl-kaʔn
2S PRON 3S SUBJ-follow$_2$-PRIOR
'He followed you ahead of him.'

(117) *kay-maʔ ʔa-zuʔl-kaʔn
1S PRON 3S SUBJ-follow$_2$-PRIOR
'He followed me ahead of him.'

5.1.1.7. Object agreement with -taak

Lastly, as seen before, object agreement in verb-*taak* complexes is with the relinquitive object rather than the base object. As usual, however, it is possible to indicate plurality of the base object, subject to the expected ambiguities with second and third person relinquitive objects.

(118) law ʔa-kan-thloʔ-taak-hnaa
field 3S SUBJ-1S OBJ-hoe$_2$-RELINQ-PL OBJ
'He left us and hoed the fields.'

The facts for potential use of verb-*taak* complexes with two animate objects are highly similar to those seen already:

(119) ʔa-maʔ ʔa-ń-zuʔl-taak
3S PRON 3S SUBJ-2S OBJ-follow$_2$-RELINQ
'He followed him, leaving you.'

(120) ʔa-maʔ ʔa-ka-zuʔl-taak
3S PRON 3S SUBJ-1S OBJ-follow$_2$-RELINQ
'He followed him, leaving me.'

(121) ʔkay-maʔ ʔa-ń-zuʔl-taak
1S PRON 3S SUBJ-2S OBJ-follow$_2$-RELINQ
'He followed me, leaving you.'

(122) ʔnaŋ-maʔ ʔa-ka-zuʔl-taak
2S PRON 3S SUBJ-1S OBJ-follow$_2$-RELINQ
'He followed you, leaving me.'

(123) *naŋ-maʔ ʔa-zuʔl-taak
2S PRON 3S SUBJ-follow$_2$-RELINQ
'He followed you, leaving him.'

(124) *kay-maʔ ʔa-zuʔl-taak
1S PRON 3S SUBJ-follow$_2$-RELINQ
'He followed me, leaving him.'

5.2. Relativization

The form of Lai relative clauses depends on the syntactic relation borne by the item relativized on internal to the relative clause. Compare the following:

(125) ʔa-tlaa-mii thil khaa ʔa-hnoom
3S SUBJ-fall$_1$-REL clothes DEIC 3S SUBJ-dirty
'The clothes which fell are dirty.'

(126) thil ʔa-bat-mii lawtlawpaa khaa
clothes 3S SUBJ-hang.up$_1$-REL farmer DEIC
ka-hoy ʔa-sii
1S POSS-friend 3S SUBJ-COP
'The farmer who hung up the clothes is my friend.'

(127) thil ʔa-bat-tuu lawtlawpaa khaa
clothes 3S SUBJ-hang.up$_1$-REL farmer DEIC
ka-hoy ʔa-sii
1S POSS-friend 3S SUBJ-COP
'*The farmer who hung up the clothes is my friend.*'

(128) tsewmaŋ=niʔ ʔa-baʔ-mii thil-pool
Tsewmang=ERG 3S SUBJ-hang.up$_2$-REL clothes-some
khaa ʔan-tlaa
DEIC 3S SUBJ-fall$_1$
'The clothes Tsewmang hung up fell down.'

In (125)-(127), the grammatical relation relativized on within the relative clause is the subject. Here there are two possibilities, both involving a Form I stem of the verb in the relative clause. Formation of such relative clauses may be based on a particle, *-mii*, or, in the case of a transitive subject, either on the particle *-mii* or on a particle *-tuu*. The latter involves either stronger emphasis on the argument being relativized on, or indicates that the head of the relative clause is the person who characteristically performs the action of the relative clause's verb. It is the latter use which apparently is responsible for the tendency of this marker to behave simply as an agentive nominalizer.

What is of interest here, however, is relativization with direct objects, as seen in (128). This, like the one of the subject relativization strategies, involves the particle *-mii*, but has the *Form II* stem of the verb in the relative clause.

Relativization on certain obliques (instruments and locatives) is accomplished by somewhat different means. In the case of both locatives and instruments, the particle *-naak* is used to indicate the oblique status of the nominal in the relative clause. In the following two sentences, for instance,

(129) paardoʔ=niʔ ʔaar ʔa-thaʔ-naak
Paardoʔ=ERG chicken 3S SUBJ-kill$_2$-REL

naam khaa ka-hmuʔ
knife DEIC 1S SUBJ-see$_2$
'I saw the knife Paardoʔ killed the chicken with.'

(130) paardoʔ=niʔ ʔaar ʔa-thaʔ-naak
Paardoʔ=ERG chicken 3S SUBJ-kill$_2$-REL

ʔin khaa ka-hmuʔ
house DEIC 1S SUBJ-see$_2$
'I saw the house Paardoʔ killed the chicken in.'

-naak is used to indicate that the role of the nominal in the relative clause is either an instrument or a location. Table 3 summarizes these primary relativization strategies.

Role of head	***Intrans. subj.***	***Agent***	***Patient***	***Instrum., Loc.***
Stem form	Form I	Form I	Form II	Form II
Relativizer	*-mii*	*-mii* / *-tuu*	*-mii*	*-naak*

Table 3. Primary relativization strategies.

In all cases of relativization, the verb of the relative clause bears markers agreeing with the subject and, where appropriate, the object of the relative clause verb. It is not uncommon for the head of the relative clause to appear internal to the relative clause.[9] I have not found the status of relative clauses as internally or externally-headed to be of relevance to the issues at hand, however, so I will not investigate these in any detail here.

5.2.1. *Relativization with* -ter

Either of the objects associated with a verb-*ter* complex may be relativized on by using the strategy for relativization on patient objects of monotransitive verbs. For instance, in example (131), the object relativized on is the patient:

(131) lawthlawpaa ka-ʔay-ter-mii rool khaa ʔa-thuu
farmer 1S SUBJ-eat-CAUS-REL food DEIC 3S SUBJ-stink$_1$
'The food I fed the farmer stinks.'

In example (132), on the other hand, the object relativized on is the causee:

(132) rool ka-ʔay-ter-mii lawthlawpaa ka-hooy ʔa-sii
food 1S SUBJ-eat-CAUS-REL farmer 1S POSS-friend 3S SUBJ-COP
'The farmer I fed is my friend.'

Thus, there is no syntactic distinction made between the two objects in terms of this property.

5.2.2. *Relativization with* -piak

Affected objects in relative clauses with applicative constructions may be relativized in the same way as direct objects (see 5.2 above):

(133) law ʔan-thloʔ-piak-mii lawtlawpaa khaa ka-hmuʔ
field 3P SUBJ-hoe$_2$-AFF-REL farmer DEIC 1S SUBJ-see$_2$
'I saw the farmer they hoed the field for.'

---

9 It is in many cases difficult to distinguish an internally-headed relative clause from a relative clause which is simply postposed rather than preposed to the head. Relative clauses like the one in (a) below, however, with an italicized head, make it clear that internally-headed relative clauses occur, since part of the relative clause, *Tsewmang=niʔ*, occurs before the head, while the remainder of the relative clause follows it:

(a) tsewmaŋ=niʔ *lawthlawpaa* law ʔa-thloʔ-pii-mii khaa ka-hmuʔ
Tsewmang=ERG farmer field 3S SUBJ-hoe$_2$-COM-REL DEM 1S SUBJ-see$_2$
'I saw the farmer that Tsewmang hoed the field with.'

Sentences like this typically have multiple readings, but I will not go into this here.

That the verb contains -piak does not preclude this relativization strategy for the base object, however, as example (134) shows.

(134) lawtlawpaa ʔan-thloʔ-piak-mii law khaa ka-hmuʔ
farmer 3P SUBJ-hoe$_2$-AFF-REL field DEIC 1S SUBJ-see$_2$
'I saw the field they hoed for the farmer.'

5.2.3. Relativization with -tseʔm

Relative clause formation shows the same pattern for verb-*tseʔm* complexes. If the relative clause contains *-tseʔm*, it is possible to relativize on the additional beneficiary object using the *-mii* strategy, as in example (135).

(135) law ʔan-thloʔ-tseʔm-mii lawtlawpaa khaa ka-hmuʔ
field 3P SUBJ-hoe$_2$-ADD BEN-REL farmer DEIC 1S SUBJ-see$_2$
'I saw the farmer they hoed the field for (besides themselves).'

It is also possible to relativize on the base object in such cases:

(136) lawtlawpaa ʔan-thloʔ-tseʔm-mii law khaa ka-hmuʔ
farmer 3P SUBJ-hoe$_2$-ADD BEN-REL field DEIC 1S SUBJ-see$_2$
'I saw the field they hoed for the farmer (besides for themselves).'

5.2.4. Relativization with -pii

Relativization on comitative arguments invariably involves *-pii*, as seen in example (137). In (137), note that the relativization strategy used is identical to that used for relativization on the single object of a transitive verb: the Form II + *-mii* strategy.

(137) tsewmaŋ=niʔ law ʔa-thloʔ-pii-mii
Tsewmang=ERG field 3S SUBJ-hoe$_2$-COM-REL

lawthlawpaa khaa ka-hmuʔ
farmer DEIC 1S SUBJ-see$_2$
'I saw the farmer Tsewmang hoed the field with.'

In examples (138) and (139), on the other hand, note that neither of the non-*pii* alternatives that the consultant is able to construct are actually cases of relativization on the comitative argument. In the first example, relativization is

on the subject, and the second example involves a different (non-transitivizing) postverbal particle in the embedded clause: *-ʈii*.

(138) tsewmaŋ=hee law ʔa-thlaw-mii
Tsewmang=COM field 3S SUBJ-hoe$_1$-REL

lawthlawpaa khaa ka-hmuʔ
farmer DEIC 1S SUBJ-see$_2$
'I saw the farmer Tsewmang hoed the field with.'

(139) tsewmaŋ=hee law ʔa-thlaw-ʈii-mii
Tsewmang=COM field 3S SUBJ-hoe$_1$-ASSOC-REL

lawthlawpaa khaa ka-hmuʔ
farmer DEIC 1S SUBJ-see$_2$
'I saw the farmer Tsewmang hoed the field with.'

-ʈii is not simply a special relativizer used for relativization on comitative objects, as seen by its use in final position in sentence (140).

(140) kan-kal-ʈii
1P SUBJ-go-ASSOC
'We go together.'

-ʈii is an associative or collective action marker, since its subject is either two conjoined noun phrases (141) or a single noun phrase subject with a comitative argument construed as a co-subject in the same clause (142).

(141) tsewmaŋ=lee niihuu ʔan-kal-ʈii
Tsewmang=and Ni Hu 3P SUBJ-go-ASSOC
'Tsewmang went with Ni Hu.'

(142) tsewmaŋ niihuu=hee ʔa-kal-ʈii / ʔan-kal-ʈii
Tsewmang Ni Hu=COM 3S SUBJ-go-ASSOC / 3P SUBJ-go-ASSOC
'Tsewmang went with Ni Hu.'

On the other hand, as usual, note that while it is possible to relativize on the comitative object of verb-*pii* complexes, it is still possible to relativize on the base object using the *-mii* strategy (example [143]).

(143) tsewmaŋ=ni? lawtlawpaa ?a-thlo?-pii-mii
Tsewmang=ERG farmer 3S SUBJ-hoe$_2$-COM-REL

law khaa ka-hmu?
field DEIC 1S SUBJ-see$_2$
'I saw the field Tsewmang hoed with the farmer.'

5.2.5. *Relativization with* -hno?

As in the previous cases, if the verb in the relative clause includes *-hno?*, relativization on the maleficiary object using the normal direct object relativization strategy is possible:

(144) tsewmaŋ=ni? naam ?a-hlo?n-hno?-mii
Tsewmang=ERG knife 3S SUBJ-throw$_2$-MAL-REL

lawthlawpaa khaa ka-hmu?
farmer DEIC 1S SUBJ-see$_2$
'I saw the farmer Tsewmang threw the knife at.'

It is also possible to relativize on the base object of such verbs using this construction:

(145) tsewmaŋ=ni? lawthlawpaa ?a-hlo?n-hno?-mii
Tsewmang=ERG farmer 3S SUBJ-throw$_2$-MAL-REL

naam khaa ka-hmu?
knife DEIC 1S SUBJ-see$_2$
'I saw the knife Tsewmang threw at the farmer.'

5.2.6. *Relativization with* -ka?n

Since there is a close paraphrase for verb-*ka?n* combinations that involves an oblique occurrence of the object which the particle would otherwise be associated with, relativization is a bit more interesting. As might be expected, if the relative clause contains a verb-*ka?n* complex, relativization on either the applicative object (146), or the base object (147) is possible using the *-mii* strategy:

(146) tsewmaŋ=ni? law ʔa-thlo?-kaʔn-mii
Tsewmang=ERG field 3S SUBJ-hoe$_2$-PRIOR-REL

lawtlawpaa khaa ka-hmu?
farmer DEIC 1S SUBJ-see$_2$
'I saw the farmer that Tsewmang hoed the field ahead of.'

(147) tsewmaŋ=ni? lawtlawpaa ʔa-thlo?-kaʔn-mii
Tsewmang=ERG farmer 3S SUBJ-hoe$_2$-PRIOR-REL

law khaa ka-hmu?
field DEIC 1S SUBJ-see$_2$
'I saw the field that Tsewmang hoed ahead of the farmer.'

It turns out in this case that relativization on the prioritive object in the case of the oblique variant is also possible. In this instance, relativization is not only judged to sound somewhat unnatural, but also, it involves a resumptive pronoun (italicized in [148]) that the *-mii* strategy normally does not require.

(148) tsewmaŋ=ni? *ʔa-maʔ* hlaan=ʔaʔ law ʔa-thlo?-mii
Tsewmang=ERG *3S PRON* before=LOC field 3S SUBJ-hoe$_2$-REL

lawtlawpaa khaa ka-hmu?
farmer DEIC 1S SUBJ-see$_2$
'I saw the farmer Tsewmang hoed the field ahead of.'[10]

5.2.7. Relativization with -taak

Finally, a relinquitive object may also be relativized using the strategy typically seen for direct objects.

(149) tsewmaŋ=ni? law ʔa-thlo?-taak-mii
Tsewmang=ERG field 3S SUBJ-hoe$_2$-RELINQ-REL

lawtlawpaa khaa ka-hmu?
farmer DEIC 1S SUBJ-see$_2$
'I saw the farmer Tsewmang left to hoe the field.'

---

[10] In fact, in relativizing on oblique forms which may *not* be relativized by using *-naak* (i.e., which are not instrumental or locative NPs internal to the relative clause), the consultant often uses a strategy which involves a resumptive occurrence of the head internal to the relative clause.

The base object may likewise be relativized using this strategy, exhibiting the pattern which by now is familiar:

(150) tsewmaŋ=ni? lawtlawpaa ?a-thlo?-taak-mii
Tsewmang=ERG farmer 3S SUBJ-hoe$_2$-RELINQ-REL

law khaa ka-hmu?
field DEIC 1S SUBJ-see$_2$
'I saw the field Tsewmang left the farmer to hoe.'

5.3. Association with discourse deictics

Insofar as demonstrative elements like *khaa* and *tsuu* are also markers of a higher degree of definiteness, givenness, or familiarity to the speaker and his interlocutor, there may be differences in the ability of these elements to be associated with particular noun phrases, depending on the level of topicality that the noun phrase has. Some studies (e.g., Rude 1986) have shown in particular that in applicative constructions, the object associated with the applicative morphology displays a higher degree of topicality than another object. We will see below that there is a tendency for *khaa* to occur with the applicative object instead of the base object. I have also tested this for *tsuu*, with almost identical results, but I will include only the data pertaining to *khaa* here. The cooccurrence of these elements with applicative objects will later also be seen to play a crucial role in disambiguation in a number of instances, making it possible for the base object to participate in constructions where it could not otherwise occur.

5.3.1. Discourse deictics with -ter

If *khaa* is used with one of the objects in a sentence containing a verb-*ter* complex, it will be interpreted as the causee argument. For instance, a version of sentence (151) in which Meenrihay is interpreted as being the causee is impossible:

(151) tsewmaŋ=ni? taaynaamkooŋ khaa meenrihay ?a-kho?l-ter
Tsewmang=ERG Taaynaamkoong DEIC Meenrihay 3S SUBJ-bathe-CAUS
'Tsewmang made Taaynaamkoong bathe Meenrihay.'

5.3.2. Discourse deictics with -piak

Concerning the occurrence of objects of verb-*piak* complexes with discourse deictics, while both example (152), in which *khaa* is associated with the base object,

(152) tsewmaŋ=ni? law khaa lawtlawpaa ?a-thlo?-piak
Tsewmang=ERG field DEIC farmer 3S SUBJ-hoe$_2$-AFF
'Tsewmang hoed the field for the farmer.'

and example (153), in which *khaa* is associated with the applicative object,

(153) tsewmaŋ=ni? lawtlawpaa khaa law ?a-thlo?-piak
Tsewmang=ERG farmer DEIC field 3S SUBJ-hoe$_2$-AFF
'Tsewmang hoed the field for the farmer.'

are possible, the consultant claims that the second sentence is far more natural than the first one.[11]

5.3.3. *Discourse deictics with* -tse?m

It is also the case with verb-*tse?m* complexes that the preferred placement of *khaa* is after the applicative object, rather than after the base object, as in example (154). However, it is also possible to have *khaa* after the base object (155).

(154) tsewmaŋ=ni? lawtlawpaa khaa law ?a-thlo?-tse?m
Tsewmang=ERG farmer DEIC field 3S SUBJ-hoe$_2$-ADD BEN
'Tsewmang hoed the field for the farmer (in addition to himself).'

(155) tsewmaŋ=ni? law khaa lawtlawpaa ?a-thlo?-tse?m
Tsewmang=ERG field DEIC farmer 3S SUBJ-hoe$_2$-ADD BEN
'Tsewmang hoed the field for the farmer (in addition to himself).'

5.3.4. *Discourse deictics with* -pii

When the use of *khaa* with objects of verb-*pii* complexes is examined, it is again clear that association of *khaa* with the applicative object (156) is preferred to association of it with the base object (157), although the latter is possible.

(156) tsewmaŋ=ni? lawtlawpaa khaa law ?a-thlo?-pii
Tsewmang=ERG farmer DEIC field 3S SUBJ-hoe$_2$-COM
'Tsewmang hoed the field with the farmer.'

---

[11] The ability of both of the objects in these and following cases to be associated with a discourse deictic might be expected to be attributable to the difference in animacy between them, and hence the ease in untangling their thematic roles. However, it turns out that this is not relevant: even in sentences where both objects are animate, either object may occur with a discourse deictic, although as usual its association with the applicative object is preferred.

(157) tsewmaŋ=ni? law khaa lawtlawpaa ?a-thlo?-pii
Tsewmang=ERG field DEIC farmer 3S SUBJ-hoe$_2$-COM
'Tsewmang hoed the field with the farmer.'

5.3.5. Discourse deictics with -hno?

For verbs combined with *-hno?*, investigation of the cooccurrence of objects with *khaa* yields the same results as for other postverbal transitivizing particles:

(158) tsewmaŋ=ni? kheeŋ khaa lawtlawpaa ?a-hlo?n-hno?
Tsewmang=ERG dish DEIC farmer 3S SUBJ-throw$_2$-MAL
'Tsewmang threw the dish at the farmer.'

(159) tsewmaŋ=ni? lawtlawpaa khaa kheeŋ ?a-hlo?n-hno?
Tsewmang=ERG farmer DEIC dish 3S SUBJ-throw$_2$-MAL
'Tsewmang threw the dish at the farmer.'

Both (158) and (159) are possible, but the consultant considers sentence (159), in which the maleficiary is followed by *khaa,* to be far more natural.

5.3.6. Discourse deictics with -ka?n

The possible placement of *khaa* with the objects of prioritive applicative verbs is consistent with what we have seen above for other verb-particle complexes:

(160) tsewmaŋ=ni? law khaa lawtlawpaa ?a-thlo?-ka?n
Tsewmang=ERG field DEIC farmer 3S SUBJ-hoe$_2$-PRIOR
'Tsewmang hoed the field ahead of the farmer.'

(161) tsewmaŋ=ni? lawtlawpaa khaa law ?a-thlo?-ka?n
Tsewmang=ERG farmer DEIC field 3S SUBJ-hoe$_2$-PRIOR
'Tsewmang hoed the field ahead of the farmer.'

While *khaa* may occur after either of the objects in question, the consultant prefers sentence (161), in which *khaa* follows the object associated with the postverbal particle.

5.3.7. Discourse deictics with -taak

Lastly, with relinquitive applicative verbs, *khaa* may as usual occur following either the base object (162) or the applicative object (163), but the

consultant again prefers the second alternative (in fact, on one occasion, he claimed that the first sentence was completely unacceptable).

(162) tsewmaŋ=ni? law khaa lawtlawpaa ?a-thlo?-taak
Tsewmang=ERG field DEIC farmer 3S SUBJ-hoe$_2$-RELINQ
'Tsewmang left the farmer and hoed the field.'

(163) tsewmaŋ=ni? lawtlawpaa khaa law ?a-thlo?-taak
Tsewmang=ERG farmer DEIC field 3S SUBJ-hoe$_2$-RELINQ
'Tsewmang left the farmer and hoed the field.'

5.4. Left-dislocation

In most texts and elicited examples, clauses have an SOV order. Only temporal and locative adjuncts consistently precede S (italicized in [164]-[165]).

(164) *?a-hnuu-?a?* *khan* ?a-faa-lee paŋaa=ni? tsun "kan-paa
3S POSS-back=LOC DEIC 3S POSS-son-PL five=ERG DEIC 1P POSS-father

phuu kan-hlam-laay" tia? ?an-tii-?ii ?an-kal
revenge 1P SUBJ-take-IRR QUOT 3P SUBJ-say-CONN 3P SUBJ-go
'After that, his five sons said "We'll take revenge for our father," and they set out.'

(165) . . . *?an-kal-naak=?a?* tsakay=ni? tsun
3P SUBJ-go-REL=LOC tiger=ERG DEIC

?an-rak-se?-ʈhaan-hnaa-?ii . . .
3P SUBJ-PAST-devour-ALSO-PL OBJ-CONN
'. . . at the place they went to the tiger also devoured them, and . . .'

However, occasionally an object may precede the subject, as in the following text examples:

(166) . . . *?a-tshew-hma?n* *khaa* fapaa paŋaa=ni? tsun
3S POSS-half-even DEIC son five=ERG DEIC

?an-?ay-khaw-tii-law
3P SUBJ-eat-able$_1$-do-NEG
'. . . and the five sons were not even able to eat half of him.'

(167) . . . *ʔan-thal-lee* *ʔan-lii-pool* *khaa*
3P POSS-bow-and 3P POSS-string-COLL DEIC

tsaaytsim-tee=niʔ khan ʔa-rak-ʔay-diʔ-ʔii . . .
mouse-DIM=ERG DEIC 3S SUBJ-PAST-eat-EXHAUST-CONN
'. . . the little mouse had eaten all of their bows and strings, and . . .'

(168) . . . *na-puu* *hii* tsakay=niʔ ʔa-rak-seʔ-ʔii
2S POSS-grandfather DEIC tiger=ERG 3S SUBJ-PAST-eat-CONN
'. . . a tiger ate your grandfather, and . . .'

(169) *ʔii* *tsakay* *kahriŋʔoʔy* *ʔa-hŋooŋ* *tsuu*
and tiger Kahring?o?y 3S POSS-neck DEIC

paalaw=niʔ tsun ʔa-tan-ʔii . . .
Paalaw=ERG DEIC 3S SUBJ-cut-CONN
'And Paalaw cut the tiger Kahring?o?y's neck, and . . .'

At this point, it is unclear what the pragmatics of this left-dislocation are, and it will take considerable textual analysis to discern its function.[12]

It is nonetheless of interest in the case of verbs with multiple objects to ask whether there are any restrictions on which object may be left-dislocated. We will thus examine this property for each of the particles in what follows.

5.4.1. Left-dislocation with -ter

If one of the objects associated with a verb-*ter* combination is left-dislocated, the consultant prefers to interpret it as referring to the causee. He admits, however, that it also might be interpreted as being the other object. Thus, example (170)

(170) taaynaamkooŋ tsewmaŋ=niʔ meenrihay ʔa-khoʔl-ter
Taaynaamkoong Tsewmang=ERG Meenrihay 3S SUBJ-bathe-CAUS

'Tsewmang made Taaynaamkoong bathe Meenrihay.'
or 'Tsewmang made Meenrihay bathe Taaynaamkoong.'

[12] As Matthew Dryer has pointed out to me, however, most of the dislocated noun phrases are heavy, so perhaps this characteristic may have some relevance.

may have either of the interpretations given, but for our consultant the first seems more appropriate.

If either the fronted nominal or the undislocated nominal is marked by a discourse deictic, on the other hand, it is unambiguously interpreted as the causee. In example (171), for instance,

(171) taaynaamkooŋ khaa tsewmaŋ=ni? meenrihay ?a-kho?l-ter
Taaynaamkoong DEIC Tsewmang=ERG Meenrihay 3S SUBJ- bathe-CAUS
'Tsewmang made Taaynaamkoong bathe Meenrihay.'

where the left-dislocated noun phrase cooccurs with *khaa*, the dislocated noun phrase must be the causee. In example (172),

(172) taaynaamkooŋ tsewmaŋ=ni? meenrihay khaa ?a-kho?l-ter
Taaynaamkoong Tsewmang=ERG Meenrihay DEIC 3S SUBJ- bathe-CAUS
'Tsewmang made Meenrihay bathe Taaynaamkoong.'

where the undislocated noun phrase cooccurs with *khaa*, it is instead the *un*dislocated noun phrase which represents the causee.

5.4.2. *Left-dislocation with* -piak

Left-dislocation facts for *-piak* and the other applicative markers at first seem a bit convoluted, but they are remarkably consistent from one to the next. For a sentence like (173),

(173) tsewmaŋ=ni? taaynaamkooŋ niihuu ?a-tshi?m-piak
Tsewmang=ERG Taaynaamkoong Ni Hu 3S SUBJ-say$_2$-AFF
'Tsewmang said it to Ni Hu for Taaynaamkoong.'

it is possible to left-dislocate the affected object, as in example (174).

(174) taaynaamkooŋ tsewmaŋ=ni? niihuu ?a-tshi?m-piak
Taaynaamkoong Tsewmang=ERG Ni Hu 3S SUBJ-say$_2$-AFF
'Tsewmang said it to Ni Hu for Taaynaamkoong.'

It is not allowable, though, to dislocate the non-affected object, as in (175).

(175) niihuu tsewmaŋ=ni? taaynaamkooŋ ?a-tshi?m-piak
Ni Hu Tsewmang=ERG Taaynaamkoong 3S SUBJ-say$_2$-AFF
*'Tsewmang said it to Ni Hu for Taaynaamkoong.'

The sentence in (175) would have to mean 'Tsewmang said it to Taaynaamkoong for Ni Hu', i.e., the left-dislocated noun phrase has to be the affected object. These sentences sometimes were confusing to the consultant, and he often clarified things for himself by associating the dislocated affected object with *khaa*.

A further complication is the following: if the affected object is marked by *khaa* or another discourse deictic, the other object *may* be left-dislocated.

(176) niihuu tsewmaŋ=niʔ taaynaamkooŋ khaa ʔa-tshiʔm-piak
Ni Hu Tsewmang=ERG Taaynaamkoong DEIC 3S SUBJ-say$_2$-AFF
'Tsewmang said it to Ni Hu for Taaynaamkoong.'

If both noun phrases are marked by discourse deictics, the interpretation of a left-dislocated noun phrase is that it must be the applicative object, as in example (177).

(177) taaynaamkooŋ khaa tsewmaŋ=niʔ niihuu khaa
Taaynaamkoong DEIC Tsewmang=ERG Ni Hu DEIC

ʔa-tshiʔm-piak
3S SUBJ-say$_2$-AFF
'Tsewmang said it to Ni Hu for Taaynaamkoong.'

All other possible combinations with different discourse deictics yield the same result.

To summarize, then, if one of the noun phrases cooccurs with a discourse deictic, it is interpreted as the affected object, and either object may be left-dislocated. If both or neither of the noun phrases is marked by a discourse deictic, only the applicative object may be left-dislocated.

There are almost no text examples of combined left-dislocation of an object and a double object construction like those seen in applicative constructions. The one example I am aware of, however, shows us another aspect of this construction's syntax, which presumably also holds in the case of other postverbal particles. In example (178),

(178) ʔa-biar khaa hliŋ=niʔ ʔa-thleʔ-piak ʔan-tii
3S POSS-loincloth DEIC thorn=ERG 3S SUBJ-tear$_2$-AFF 3P SUBJ-say
'. . . a thorn tore his loincloth, they say.'

the applicative object (the person whose loincloth is torn) is expressed by zero-marking on the verb and the patient object (the loincloth) is left-dislocated. Thus, if the affected object is expressed solely by verbal agreement, then the other object is free to be dislocated. Moreover, as (178) shows, it may itself under such conditions cooccur with a discourse deictic.

5.4.3. Left-dislocation with -tse?m

The left-dislocation facts for objects associated with verb-*tse?m* combinations are identical to those for objects of verb-*piak* combinations. For a sentence like (179),

(179) tsewmaŋ=ni? taaynaamkooŋ niihuu ?a-thsi?m-tse?m
Tsewmang=ERG Taaynaamkoong Ni Hu 3S SUBJ-say$_2$-ADD BEN
'Tsewmang said it to Ni Hu for Taaynaamkoong, in addition to for himself.'

only the beneficiary may be left-dislocated, as in (180),

(180) taaynaamkooŋ tsewmaŋ=ni? niihuu ?a-thsi?m-tse?m
Taaynaamkoong Tsewmang=ERG Ni Hu 3S SUBJ-say$_2$-ADD BEN
'Tsewmang said it to Ni Hu for Taaynaamkoong, in addition to for himself.'

and only if the beneficiary occurs with a discourse deictic may the other object be left-dislocated, as in (181):

(181) niihuu tsewmaŋ=ni? taaynaamkooŋ khaa ?a-thsi?m-tse?m
Ni Hu Tsewmang=ERG Taaynaamkoong DEIC 3S SUBJ-say$_2$-ADD BEN
'Tsewmang said it to Ni Hu for Taaynaamkoong, in addition to for himself.'

5.4.4. Left-dislocation with -pii

The left-dislocation facts with verb-*pii* combinations are consistent with those of other postverbal transitivizing particles. For a sentence like (182),

(182) tsewmaŋ=ni? taaynaamkooŋ niihuu ?a-tsooy-pii
Tsewmang=ERG Taaynaamkoong Ni Hu 3S SUBJ-carry-COM
'Tsewmang carried Ni Hu with Taaynaamkoong.'

a left-dislocated object must be interpreted as the comitative, as in (183).

(183) taaynaamkooŋ tsewmaŋ=niʔ niihuu ʔa-tsooy-pii
Taaynaamkoong Tsewmang=ERG Ni Hu 3S SUBJ-carry-COM
'Tsewmang carried Ni Hu with Taaynaamkoong.'

Only if the non-dislocated comitative argument occurs with a discourse deictic may a different dislocated argument be interpreted as a non-comitative:

(184) niihuu tsewmaŋ=niʔ taaynaamkooŋ khaa ʔa-tsooy-pii
Ni Hu Tsewmang=ERG Taaynaamkoong DEIC 3S SUBJ-carry-COM
'Tsewmang carried Ni Hu with Taaynaamkoong.'

5.4.5. Left-dislocation with -hnoʔ

As before, for a sentence containing a verb-*hnoʔ* complex like (185),

(185) meenrihay=niʔ taaynaamkooŋ tsewmaŋ ʔa-teʔŋ-hnoʔ
Meenrihay=ERG Taaynaamkoong Tsewmang 3S SUBJ-trick-MAL
'Meenrihay tricked Tsewmang to the detriment of Taaynaamkoong.'

only the maleficiary may be left-dislocated, as in example (186).

(186) taaynaamkooŋ meenrihay=niʔ tsewmaŋ ʔa-teʔŋ-hnoʔ
Taaynaamkoong Meenrihay=ERG Tsewmang 3S SUBJ-trick-MAL
'Meenrihay tricked Tsewmang to the detriment of Taaynaamkoong.'

Only if the maleficiary occurs with a discourse deictic may the other object be left-dislocated, as in example (187).

(187) tsewmaŋ meenrihay=niʔ taaynaamkooŋ khaa ʔa-teʔŋ-hnoʔ
Tsewmang Meenrihay=ERG Taaynaamkoong DEIC 3S SUBJ-trick-MAL
'Meenrihay tricked Tsewmang to the detriment of Taaynaamkoong.'

5.4.6. Left-dislocation with -kaʔn

The facts concerning left-dislocation of objects for prioritive applicative verbs are like those seen for other verb-particle complexes. For sentence (188),

(188) tsewmaŋ=niʔ taaynaamkooŋ meenrihay ʔa-ton-kaʔn
Tsewmang=ERG Taaynaamkoong Meenrihay 3S SUBJ-meet$_2$-PRIOR
'Tsewmang met Meenrihay ahead of Taaynaamkoong.'

only the object referred to by the postverbal transitivizing particle may be left-dislocated, as seen in example (189).

(189) taaynaamkooŋ tsewmaŋ=ni? meenrihay ?a-ton-ka?n
Taaynaamkoong Tsewmang=ERG Meenrihay 3S SUBJ-meet$_2$-PRIOR
'Tsewmang met Meenrihay ahead of Taaynaamkoong.'

Again, only if the prioritive object occurs with a discourse deictic may the other object be dislocated, as in example (190).

(190) meenrihay tsewmaŋ=ni? taaynaamkooŋ khaa ?a-ton-ka?n
Meenrihay Tsewmang=ERG Taaynaamkoong DEIC 3S SUBJ-meet$_2$-PRIOR
'Tsewmang met Meenrihay ahead of Taaynaamkoong.'

5.4.7. Left-dislocation with -taak

Finally, for a sentence like (191),

(191) tsewmaŋ=ni? meenrihay taaynaamkooŋ ?a-ton-taak
Tsewmang=ERG Meenrihay Taaynaamkoong 3S SUBJ-meet$_2$-RELINQ
'Tsewmang left Meenrihay and met Taaynaamkoong.'

only the relinquitive object may be left-dislocated,

(192) meenrihay tsewmaŋ=ni? taaynaamkooŋ ?a-ton-taak
Meenrihay Tsewmang=ERG Taaynaamkoong 3S SUBJ-meet$_2$-RELINQ
'Tsewmang left Meenrihay and met Taaynaamkoong.'

but if the relinquitive object is associated with a discourse deictic, the other object may be fronted:

(193) taaynaamkooŋ tsewmaŋ=ni? meenrihay khaa ?a-ton-taak
Taaynaamkoong Tsewmang=ERG Meenrihay DEIC 3S SUBJ-meet$_2$-RELINQ
'Tsewmang left Meenrihay and met Taaynaamkoong.'

5.5. Reflexivization / reciprocalization

In the discussion of verbal agreement in section 2.1 above, I noted that if the subject is coreferential with the object, special object agreement is used. In cases where the subject is animate and both objects are animate, there could in

theory be cases in which either of the objects is coreferential with the subject. For instance, consider the English sentences in (194) and (195):

(194) We met each other for the children.

(195) We met the children for each other.

In the first case, the expression 'each other' is the patient, and in the second case, the expression 'each other' is the beneficiary.

The question is, in Lai, whether either a beneficiary (or other more prototypically peripheral entity) or a patient may be coreferential with the subject in sentences involving transitivizing particles, or whether there are restrictions on which argument of a ditransitive verb may be represented by reflexive marking.

5.5.1. Reflexivization / reciprocalization with -ter

Reflexivization of a causative form has three possible interpretations. First, the cooccurrence of the reflexive object marking forms and *-ter* may result in the semantic nuance of 'subject pretends to V' (i.e., "causes self to V"), as in the example given in (196).

(196) ʔaar-pii farual tsuu ʔay ʔa-duʔ-hnaa
chicken-AUG chick DEIC eat 3S SUBJ-want-PL OBJ

tsaa=ʔaʔ ʔa-a-vaa-koʔm-ter-hnaa-ʔii . . .
sake=LOC 3S SUBJ-REFL-DIREC-be.friends$_2$-CAUS-PL OBJ-CONN
'Because he wanted to eat the hen and her chicks, he went and pretended to be friends with them, and . . .'

Secondly, a sentence like (197) has two possible interpretations, as shown:

(197) tsewmaŋ=niʔ meenrihay ʔa-a-khoʔl-ter
Tsewmang=ERG Meenrihay 3S SUBJ-REFL-bathe-CAUS
'Tsewmang$_i$ made Meenrihay bathe him$_i$.'
'Tsewmang made Meenrihay bathe herself.'

In the first interpretation, coreference is between the causer and the patient object of the base verb. In the second case, coreference is between the causee, i.e., the erstwhile agent of the base verb, and the patient object of the base verb.

It does not appear to be possible for a causer and a causee to be coreferential (e.g., 'Tsewmang made himself bathe Meenrihay'). This does not seem to be a

likely situation in pragmatic terms anyway, English examples like 'I made myself do it' notwithstanding.

5.5.2. Reflexivization / reciprocalization with -piak

Next, although it might be expected that either object of a verb-*piak* complex could be coreferential with the subject, it turns out that only the beneficiary argument may be. So, a sentence like (198),

(198) tsewmaŋ ʔan-ʔii-tshoʔn-piak
Tsewmang 3P SUBJ-REFL-talk.to$_2$-AFF
'They talked to Tsewmang for the benefit of each other.'

cannot instead have the meaning 'They talked to each other for the benefit of Tsewmang.' This meaning would have to be expressed as in (199),

(199) tsewmaŋ tsaa=ʔaʔ ʔan-ʔii-tshoon
Tsewmang sake=LOC 3P SUBJ-REFL-talk.to$_1$
'They talked to each other for the benefit of Tsewmang.'

where the beneficiary argument is given an oblique instantiation and the verb does not bear the applicative marker.

5.5.3. Reflexivization / reciprocalization with -tseʔm

The reflexivization facts for verb-*tseʔm* combinations are highly similar to those for verb-*piak* complexes. Thus, in a sentence like (200),

(200) tsewmaŋ ʔan-ʔii-tshoʔn-tseʔm
Tsewmang 3P SUBJ-REFL-talk.to$_2$-ADD BEN
'They talked to Tsewmang for each other, besides for themselves.'

the reflexive marker can only be interpreted as referring to the additional beneficiary object, and not to the other object. That is, (200) cannot mean 'They talked to each other for Tsewmang in addition to their own benefit'. The latter would, as before, involve oblique instantiation of the beneficiary object and omission of the postverbal transitivizing particle, as in (201):

(201) tsewmaŋ tsaa=ʔaʔ ʔan-ʔii-tshoon
Tsewmang sake=LOC 3P SUBJ-REFL-talk.to$_2$
'They talked to each other for Tsewmang.'

Clearly this is not a perfect rendering of the desired semantics since one of the

semantic components contributed by *-tseʔm* is absent, but it is the closest possible means of expression, according to the consultant.

5.5.4. Reflexivization/reciprocalization with -pii

As seen with the previous applicative constructions, use of the reflexive marker with verb-*pii* combinations indicates coreference between the subject and the comitative argument, as seen in example (202).

(202) tsewmaŋ ʔan-ʔii-puak-pii
Tsewmang 3P SUBJ-REFL-carry$_2$-COM
'They carried Tsewmang with each other (i.e., they both worked to carry him).'

The sentence in (202) may not be interpreted as 'They carried each other with Tsewmang (i.e., Tsewmang worked with each of them in order for them to carry each other in turn)'. The latter would probably have to be expressed by multiple sentences.

5.5.5. Reflexivization / reciprocalization with -hnoʔ

Similarly, in conjunction with a verb-*hnoʔ* complex, the reflexive marker must be interpreted as referring to the object licensed by *-hnoʔ*. Thus in (203),

(203) ʔan-vaa-lee khaa ʔan-ʔii-thaʔ-hnoʔ-hnaa
3P POSS-husband-PL DEIC 3P SUBJ-REFL-kill$_2$-MAL-PL OBJ
'They killed their husbands to the detriment of each other.'
* 'They killed each other to the detriment of their husbands.'

ʔii- refers to the maleficiary object encoded by *-hnoʔ* and not to the patient argument of the verb *thaʔ*.

5.5.6. Reflexivization / reciprocalization with -kaʔn

I have not managed to find a context in which it is possible for a prioritive applicative object to be understood as reflexive or reciprocal with the subject. Since the semantics of this particle make it clear that the subject performs the action in advance of the applicative object, this type of situation appears to be logically impossible.

Interestingly, though, the other situation, in which coreference would exist between the subject and the base object, does not seem to be possible either. Thus, in order to express something like 'They met each other before Taaynaamkoong and Tsewmang met each other', where we might expect

something like *taaynaamkooŋ=lee tsewmaŋ ʔan-ʔii-ton-kaʔn*, the consultant cannot use a verb-*kaʔn* complex. Instead, he claims (204) would be used to express this.

(204) taaynaamkooŋ=lee tsewmaŋ ʔan-ʔii-ton
Taaynaamkoong=and Tsewmang 3P SUBJ-REFL-meet$_2$

hlaan=ʔaʔ ʔan-ʔii-toŋ
front=LOC 3P SUBJ-REFL-meet$_1$

Example (204) consists of two clauses with separate reciprocal events. Thus, even though it seems logically impossible for coreference to exist between the subject and applicative object, for prioritive applicative constructions coreference between the subject and base object also appears to be disallowed.

5.5.7. Reflexivization / reciprocalization with -taak

Lastly, in example (205),

(205) tsewmaŋ ʔan-ʔii-tsoʔn-taak-vee-vee
Tsewmang 3P SUBJ-REFL-talk.to$_2$-RELINQ-also-also
'They left each other and talked to Tsewmang.'

the reflexive marker in the verb represents the relinquitive object, and not the base object.[13] This sentence cannot mean something like 'They left Tsewmang and talked to each other', which would have to be something like (206).

(206) tsewmaŋ ʔan-kal-taak-ʔii ʔan-ʔii-tsoon
Tsewmang 3P SUBJ-go-RELINQ-CONN 3P SUBJ-REFL-talk.to$_1$

Thus, it does not appear possible for the reflexive to refer to the base object of verb-*taak* combinations, either.

5.6. Control of subject coreference in purposive clauses

Finally, there is a purposive clause type in Lai in which the subject is preferably expressed only by pronominal agreement. The subject of the subordinate clause may be coreferential with the object of the main clause (207).

(207) haaw kaleeŋ ʔa-zaʔw-khoʔ-naak tsaa diŋ=ʔaʔ
fence outside 3S SUBJ-look-able$_2$-PURP sake PURP=LOC

13 Why *-vee-vee* is needed in this example is not entirely clear.

hŋaaktshiapaa	ka-tsooy
boy	1S SUBJ-lift

'I lifted the boy so that he could see over the fence.'

It is of interest to see if there are any restrictions on which objects of ditransitive main clauses with causative and applicative verbs may be interpreted as coreferential with the subject of such purposive clauses.

5.6.1. Purposive clauses subordinated to -ter

All other things being equal, the main clause object which is coreferential with the subject of purposive clauses is the patient, and not the causee of a main clause verb-*ter* combination. Thus, (208) may have either of two readings.

(208)

ʔa-ʈaʔ-naak	tsaa	diŋ=ʔaʔ	tsewmaŋ=niʔ
3S SUBJ-cry-NOMLZR	sake	PURP=LOC	Tsewmang=ERG

lawthlawpaa	taaynaamkooŋ	ʔa-nam-ter
farmer	Taaynaamkoong	3S SUBJ-push-CAUS

'Tsewmang made the farmer push Taaynaamkoong$_i$ so that he$_i$ would cry.'

or 'Tsewmang made Taaynaamkoong push the farmer$_i$ so that he$_i$ would cry.'

Note, however, that a reading in which the purposive clause subject is coreferential with the causee of the main clause is not possible. That is, this sentence may not mean 'Tsewmang made the farmer$_i$ push Taaynaamkoong so that he$_i$ would cry' or 'Tsewmang made Taaynaamkoong$_i$ push the farmer so that he$_i$ would cry'.

5.6.2. Purposive clauses subordinated to -piak

With purposive clauses of the sort seen in (207), only the applicative object of the main clause may be coreferential with the subject of the subordinate clause, so that only the first reading of the sentence in (209) is possible.

(209)

door=ʔii	ʔa-kal-khoʔ-naak	tsaa	diŋ=ʔaʔ
market=LOC	3S SUBJ-go-able$_2$-NOMLZR	sake	PURP=LOC

lawthlawpaa	khaa	tsewmaŋ	ka-ton-piak
farmer	DEIC	Tsewmang	1S SUBJ-meet$_2$-AFF

*I met Tsewmang$_i$ for the farmer so that he$_i$ could go to the market.'

In example (209), which object in the main clause is the applicative object is clear only by virtue of the cooccurrence of that object with *khaa*. In fact, if neither of the objects occurs with *khaa*, as in example (210),

(210) door=ʔii ʔa-kal-khoʔ-naak tsaa diŋ=ʔaʔ
market=LOC 3S SUBJ-go-able$_2$-NOMLZR sake PURP=LOC

lawthlawpaa tsewmaŋ ka-ton-piak
farmer Tsewmang 1S SUBJ-meet$_2$-AFF
'I met Tsewmang for the farmer$_i$ so that he$_i$ could go to the market.'
or 'I met the farmer for Tsewmang$_i$ so that he$_i$ could go to the market.'

either object may be interpreted as coreferential with the subject of the purposive clause. Note, however, that the object which is the controller of the subject in the purposive clause is always interpreted as the applicative object. Thus, sentence (210) may not mean 'I met the farmer$_i$ for Tsewmang so that he$_i$ could go to the market' or 'I met Tsewmang$_i$ for the farmer so that he$_i$ could go to the market.'

5.6.3. Purposive clauses subordinated to -tseʔm

Similarly, if a purposive clause is associated with a main clause in which an additional benefactive applicative object is clearly identified by use of a discourse deictic, it is clear which object controls coreference with the subject of the purposive clause:

(211) door=ʔii ʔa-kal-khoʔ-naak tsaa diŋ=ʔaʔ
market=LOC 3S SUBJ-go-able$_2$-NOMLZR sake PURP=LOC

lawthlawpaa khaa tsewmaŋ ka-ton-tseʔm
farmer DEIC Tsewmang 1S SUBJ-meet$_2$-ADD BEN
'I met Tsewmang for the farmer$_i$ (besides my own benefit) so that he$_i$ could go to the market.'
*'I met Tsewmang$_i$ for the farmer (besides my own benefit) so that he$_i$ could go the the market.'

Thus, an interpretation of example (211) in which the controller of the third singular subject marking of the subordinate clause verb is the base object (Tsewmang) is disallowed.

Sentences like (212), in which no discourse deictic is used in the main clause,

(212) door=ʔii ʔa-kal-khoʔ-naak tsaa diŋ=ʔaʔ
market=LOC 3S SUBJ-go-able$_2$-NOMLZR sake PURP=LOC

lawthlawpaa tsewmaŋ ka-ton-tseʔm
farmer Tsewmang 1S SUBJ-meet$_2$-ADD BEN
'I met Tsewmang for the farmer$_i$ (besides my own benefit) so that he$_i$ could go to the market.'
'I met the farmer for Tsewmang$_i$ (besides my own benefit) so that he$_i$ could go the the market.'

are ambiguous. In any case, the controller of coreference in the subordinate clause is always the applicative (i.e., additional beneficiary) object, as can be seen from the possible glosses.

5.6.4. Purposive clauses subordinated to -pii

As before, if an object in a main clause containing a verb-*pii* complex cooccurs with a discourse deictic, that object is interpreted as being the applicative object, as well as the controller for the pronominal morphology in an associated purposive clause, as in example (213).

(213) ʔa-ʈaʔ-law-naak tsaa diŋ=ʔaʔ tsewmaŋ=niʔ
3S SUBJ-cry$_2$-NEG-NOMLZR sake PURP=LOC Tsewmang=ERG

hŋaaktshiapaa khaa lawthlawpaa ʔa-ton-pii
boy DEIC farmer 3S SUBJ-meet$_2$-COM
'Tsewmang met the farmer with the boy$_i$ so that he$_i$ wouldn't cry.'
*'Tsewmang met the farmer$_i$ with the boy so that he$_i$ wouldn't cry.'

If the discourse deictic is absent, as in example (214),

(214) ʔa-ʈaʔ-law-naak tsaa diŋ=ʔaʔ
3S SUBJ-cry$_2$-NEG-NOMLZR sake PURP=LOC

tsewmaŋ=niʔ hŋaaktshiapaa lawthlawpaa ʔa-ton-pii
Tsewmang=ERG boy farmer 3S SUBJ-meet$_2$-COM
'Tsewmang met the farmer with the boy$_i$ so that he$_i$ wouldn't cry.'
or 'Tsewmang met the boy with the farmer$_i$ so that he$_i$ wouldn't cry.'

either object may control the subject marking in the purposive clause, as long as that object is interpreted as the comitative object of the main clause. Thus, sentence (214) cannot mean 'Tsewmang met the farmer$_i$ with the boy so that he$_i$ wouldn't cry' or 'Tsewmang met the boy$_i$ with the farmer so that he$_i$ wouldn't cry'.

5.6.5. *Purposive clauses subordinated to* -hno?

Purposive clauses paired with main clauses containing malefactive applicative verbs behave like the purposive clauses associated with clauses containing other types of applicative constructions. While the meaning of (215) is clear due to the presence of a discourse deictic,

(215) ʔa-ʈaʔ-naak tsaa diŋ=ʔaʔ tsewmaŋ=niʔ
3S SUBJ-cry$_2$-NOMLZR sake PURP=LOC Tsewmang=ERG

taaynaamkooŋ khaa lawthlawpaa ʔa-nam-hnoʔ
Taaynaamkoong DEIC farmer 3S SUBJ-push-MAL
'Tsewmang pushed the farmer to the detriment of Taaynaamkoong$_i$ so that he$_i$ would cry.'
*'Tsewmang pushed the farmer$_i$ to the detriment of Taaynaamkoong so that he$_i$ would cry.'

example (216) is ambiguous:

(216) ʔa-ʈaʔ-naak tsaa diŋ=ʔaʔ tsewmaŋ=niʔ
3S SUBJ-cry$_2$-NOMLZR sake PURP=LOC Tsewmang=ERG

taaynaamkooŋ lawthlawpaa ʔa-nam-hnoʔ
Taaynaamkoong farmer 3S SUBJ-push-MAL

'Tsewmang pushed the farmer to the detriment of Taaynaamkoong$_i$ so that he$_i$ would cry.'
or 'Tsewmang pushed Taaynaamkoong to the detriment of the farmer$_i$ so that he$_i$ would cry.'

What is certain about (216) is that the controller of subject agreement in the purposive clause is the maleficiary object of the main clause. So, (216) may not mean 'Tsewmang pushed Taaynaamkoong$_i$ to the detriment of the farmer so that he$_i$ would cry' or 'Tsewmang pushed the farmer$_i$ to the detriment of

Taaynaamkoong so that he$_i$ would cry', in which subject agreement in the purposive clause is controlled by the patient object of the main clause.

5.6.6. Purposive clauses subordinated to -ka?n

Once more, control of purposive clause subject marking is by the applicative object of verb-*ka?n* complexes in the main clause, and if that object cooccurs with a discourse deictic, the meaning of the sentence is unambiguous.

(217) ʔa-ʈaʔ-naak tsaa diŋ=ʔaʔ tsewmaŋ=niʔ
3S SUBJ-cry$_2$-NOMLZR sake PURP=LOC Tsewmang=ERG

hŋaaktshiapaa khaa lawthlawpaa ʔa-ton-kaʔn
boy DEIC farmer 3S SUBJ-meet$_2$-PRIOR
'Tsewmang met the farmer ahead of the boy$_i$ so that he$_i$ would cry.'
*Tsewmang met the farmer$_i$ ahead of the boy so that he$_i$ would cry.'

If such an indicator is absent, the sentence is ambiguous.

(218) ʔa-ʈaʔ-naak tsaa diŋ=ʔaʔ tsewmaŋ=niʔ
3S SUBJ-cry$_2$-NOMLZR sake PURP=LOC Tsewmang=ERG

hŋaaktshiapaa lawthlawpaa ʔa-ton-kaʔn
boy farmer 3S SUBJ-meet$_2$-PRIOR
'Tsewmang met the farmer ahead of the boy$_i$ so that he$_i$ would cry.'
or 'Tsewmang met the boy ahead of the farmer$_i$ so that he$_i$ would cry.'

But, in both cases, the controller of subject agreement in the purposive clause is the main clause applicative object. It is not possible for the base object to control the subject agreement of the purposive clause.

5.6.7. Purposive clauses subordinated to -taak

Lastly, example (219) shows that if one of the objects of a main clause relinquitive applicative verb is marked with a discourse deictic, it will be interpreted as the applicative object, and it will control subject marking in an accompanying purposive clause.

(219) door=ʔii ʔa-kal-khoʔ-naak tsaa diŋ=ʔaʔ
market=LOC 3S SUBJ-go-able$_2$-NOMLZR sake PURP=LOC

lawthlawpaa khaa tsewmaŋ ka-ton-taak
farmer DEIC Tsewmang 1S SUBJ-meet$_2$-RELINQ
'I left Tsewmang$_i$ and met the farmer so that he$_i$ could go to the market.'
*'I left Tsewmang and met the farmer$_i$ so that he$_i$ could go to the market.'

On the other hand, example (220) shows that it is not just the presence of *khaa* which leads to coreference between the purposive clause subject and the applicative object of the main clause.

(220) door=ʔii ʔa-kal-khoʔ-naak tsaa diŋ=ʔaʔ
market=LOC 3S SUBJ-go-able$_2$-NOMLZR sake PURP=LOC

lawthlawpaa tsewmaŋ ka-ton-taak
farmer Tsewmang 1S SUBJ-meet$_2$-RELINQ
'I left Tsewmang$_i$ and met the farmer so that he$_i$ could go to the market.'
or 'I left the farmer$_i$ and met Tsewmang so that he$_i$ could go the the market.'

If neither of the objects of the main clause occurs with *khaa*, either may control subject marking in the purposive clause, but the object which is the controller must always be interpreted as the relinquitive object.

5.7. *Objects with* -naak

As mentioned earlier, the transitivization construction which is most divergent in terms of the morphosyntactic properties discussed here is the instrumental applicative construction marked by *-naak*. Although it is missing some of the characteristics of applicative constructions which have animates as their prototypical applicative objects, as will be shown below, it nonetheless displays some such characteristics.

5.7.1. *Object agreement with* -naak

A major difference between *-naak* and the other particles discussed here is that agreement is not necessarily with the instrument object, but rather is often with the base object in the case of a transitive base verb. The only time when it

is possible to determine this is when there is a first or second person patient object, as in the following example:

(221) ka-naam khaa tsewmaŋ=ni? ʔa-ń-tshuʔn-naak
1S POSS-knife DEIC Tsewmang=ERG 3S SUBJ-2S OBJ-stab$_2$-INST
'Tsewmang stabbed you with my knife.'

In example (221), even though the instrument is not marked obliquely, it is not reflected in the object agreement of the verb, that property being restricted to the second singular object, presumably by virtue of its higher animacy.

The plurality of the applicative object may nonetheless be indicated by the postverbal plural object marker, though the usual caveats concerning ambiguity apply if the argument which is marked in the main object marking slot is second or third person.

(222) tsewmaŋ=ni? ka-naam khaa ʔa-ń-tshuʔn-naak-hnaa
Tsewmang=ERG 1S POSS-knife DEIC 3S SUBJ-2S OBJ-stab$_2$-INST-PL OBJ
'Tsewmang stabbed you with my knives.'

5.7.2. Relativization with -naak

Another way in which verb-*naak* complexes differ from the other verb-particle complexes discussed here is in the inability of their objects to relativize using the strategy typically used for patient objects. Example (223) shows that such a strategy is not available: the *-mii* relativizer is not used.

(223) tsewmaŋ=ni? lawthlawpaa ʔa-tshuʔn-naak
Tsewmang=ERG farmer 3S SUBJ-stab$_2$-INST

naam khaa ka-hmuʔ
knife DEIC 1S SUBJ-see$_2$
'I saw the knife Tsewmang stabbed the farmer with.'

Although there is a paraphrase for sentences without *-naak* in which the instrument is expressed obliquely, when asked for a sentence in which the relative clause does not contain *-naak* but in which relativization is on the instrument, the consultant claims this is not possible. Thus, it appears the only means for relativization on an instrument is to follow the relative clause verb with *-naak*.

Also different is the fact that if one wants to relativize on the patient object, it cannot be done with a verb-*naak* complex: the simple verb with an oblique instrument object must instead be used, as in example (224).

(224) tsewmaŋ=ni? naam=?in ?a-tshu?n-mii
Tsewmang=ERG knife=INST 3S SUBJ-stab$_2$-REL

lawthlawpaa khaa ka-hmu?
farmer DEIC 1S SUBJ-see$_2$
'I saw the farmer Tsewmang stabbed with the knife.'

Thus, unlike all the other postverbal particles we have seen above, when the relative clause verb is followed by *-naak*, the base object is apparently inaccessible to relativization.

However, before leaving the subject of relativization with verb-*naak* complexes, note that while the applicative *-naak* and the relativizer *-naak* obviously come from the same material historically, there is evidence that one construction is not directly related to the other. This evidence comes from ordering of other postverbal elements with respect to the two particles. We saw in section 4 above that the applicative marker *-naak*, like other applicative markers, occupies a position which is closer to the verb stem than most other postverbal particles. *-naak* in relative clauses exhibits a different distribution, as far as I know, always occurring at the very end of the string of postverbal elements. Thus, other particles, including those which were seen to usually *follow* postverbal transitivizing particles like instrumental *-naak*, may occur *between* the verb stem and relativizing *-naak*, as in the following examples:

(225) naam ?a-ka-tshu?n-bal-naak=?a? ka-kal-laay
knife 3S SUBJ-1S OBJ-stab-EXPER-REL=LOC 1S SUBJ-go-IRR
'I'm going to go where he once stabbed me with a knife.'

(226) lawthlawpaa=ni? ŋaa ?a-tan-di?-naak naam
farmer=ERG fish 3S SUBJ-cut-EXHAUST-REL knife

khaa ka-hmu?
DEIC 1S SUBJ-see
'I saw the knife that the farmer cut all the fish with.'

The fact that there is such a difference in the relative ordering of the particle in these different situations suggests that although they are obviously related, they are not the same thing, so that relativization on locations and instruments is not directly related to the use of *-naak* as an applicative marker in main clauses.

Further evidence supporting this conclusion is the fact that both particles may be present simultaneously, as in example (227).

(227) naam=ʔin ŋaa ʔa-tan-naak-diʔ-naak=ʔaʔ ka-kal
knife=INST fish 3S SUBJ-cut-INST-EXHAUST-REL=LOC 1S SUBJ-go
'I went to where he cut all the fish up with a knife.'

In example (227), the first *-naak* is the instrumental applicative, and the second is a relativizer, in this case indicating relativization on a location. In such sentences it is necessary that the instrument object still be marked with the instrumental case clitic (see below), presumably to keep the NP roles clear.

5.7.3. Discourse deictics with -naak

Investigation of objects' potential for cooccurrence with *khaa* also produces somewhat different results in the case of *-naak*. *khaa* may *only* be used with the instrument (i.e., applicative) object. That is, while example (228) is a fine sentence,

(228) tsewmaŋ=niʔ tiloon khaa tivaa ʔa-tan-naak
Tsewmang=ERG boat DEIC river 3S SUBJ-cross-INST
'Tsewmang crossed the river with the boat.'

example (229) is not:

(229) *tsewmaŋ=niʔ tivaa khaa tiloon ʔa-tan-naak
Tsewmang=ERG river DEIC boat 3S SUBJ-cross-INST

A further complication with *-naak* is that the instrument object of a verb-*naak* complex may still bear its oblique marker, *=ʔin*. In these cases, it is not the instrument but the base object with which *khaa* occurs. Compare:

(230) tsewmaŋ=niʔ tsaluŋ khaa kheeŋ ʔa-khuay-naak
Tsewmang=ERG board DEIC dish 3S SUBJ-break-INST
'Tsewmang broke the dish with the board.'

(231) tsewmaŋ=niʔ kheeŋ khaa tsaluŋ=ʔin ʔa-khuay-naak
Tsewmang=ERG dish DEIC board=INST 3S SUBJ-break-INST
'Tsewmang broke the dish with the board.'

Sentence (230) has the characteristics we expect to be associated with a verb-*naak* complex. In sentence (231), on the other hand, although the verb contains *-naak*, the instrument object is still marked obliquely, and under these circumstances, the patient object occurs with *khaa*. The ability of the patient to

be marked in this manner would be expected if the ability to be marked by *khaa* were tied to being a central object and the instrument in this example is not a central object by virtue of its still being marked by the oblique case clitic.

5.7.4. Left-dislocation with -naak

Since in most cases it is clear from context which of two objects is the instrument object, one would expect that either may be left-dislocated. The consultant claims, though, that dislocations of the instrument, as in (232),

(232) naam (khaa) tsewmaŋ=ni? taaynaamkooŋ ?a-tshu?n-naak
knife DEIC Tsewmang=ERG Taaynaamkoong 3S SUBJ-stab$_2$-INST
'Tsewmang stabbed Taaynaamkoong with the knife.'

are preferable to dislocations of the non-instrument, as in example (233):

(233) taaynaamkooŋ tsewmaŋ=ni? naam ?a-tshu?n-naak
Taaynaamkoong Tsewmang=ERG knife 3S SUBJ-stab$_2$-INST
'Tsewmang stabbed Taaynaamkoong with the knife.'

The usual means of allowing the non-applicative object to be dislocated seen in section 5.4 was association of the applicative object with a discourse deictic; this does not have the usual effect in a sentence like (234), however, which the consultant judges to be odd.

(234) ?taaynaamkooŋ tsewmaŋ=ni? naam khaa ?a-tshu?n-naak
Taaynaamkoong tsewmang=ERG knife DEIC 3S SUBJ-stab$_2$-INST
'Tsewmang stabbed Taaynaamkoong with the knife.'

In a situation where either object could potentially be understood as the instrument, a dislocated noun will always be interpreted as the instrument, as in (235) and (236), and even as in (237) and (238), where the undislocated object occurs with a discourse deictic.

(235) tsauk tsewmaŋ=ni? kheeŋ ?a-ne?n-naak
book Tsewmang=ERG dish 3S SUBJ-pile.on.top.of-INST
'Tsewmang used the books to pile on top of the dishes.'

(236) kheeŋ tsewmaŋ=ni? tsauk ?a-ne?n-naak
dish Tsewmang=ERG book 3S SUBJ-pile.on.top.of-INST
'Tsewmang used the dishes to pile on top of the books.'

(237) tsauk tsewmaŋ=ni? kheeŋ khaa ?a-ne?n-naak
book Tsewmang=ERG dish DEIC 3S SUBJ-pile.on.top.of-INST
'Tsewmang used the books to pile on top of the dishes.'

(238) kheeŋ tsewmaŋ=ni? tsauk khaa ?a-ne?n-naak
dish Tsewmang=ERG book DEIC 3S SUBJ-pile.on.top.of-INST
'Tsewmang used the dishes to pile on top of the books.'

Thus, there appears to be a strong preference for dislocation of the instrument object over dislocation of the base object.

5.7.5. Reflexivization / reciprocalization with -naak

Verb-*naak* combinations also part ways with the other applicative constructions when it comes to the possible interpretations of reflexive markers associated with them. Thus in (239),

(239) tsewmaŋ ?an-?ii-tle?r-naak
Tsewmang 3P SUBJ-REFL-threaten-INST
'They used Tsewmang to threaten each other.'

the reflexive refers to the base object of the verb rather than the applicative object (Tsewmang). This sentence cannot be interpreted to mean 'They used each other to threaten Tsewmang', which is what we would expect if the applicative object could be coreferential with the subject.

5.7.6. Purposive clauses subordinated to -naak

Finally, the facts for purposive clauses linked to main clauses with verb-*naak* complexes are also different.

(240) ?a-ʈa?-naak tsaa diŋ=?a? tsewmaŋ=ni?
3S SUBJ-cry-NOMLZR sake PURP=LOC Tsewmang=ERG

lawthlawpaa khaa taaynaamkooŋ ?a-tle?r-naak
farmer DEIC Taaynaamkoong 3S SUBJ-threaten-INST

'Tsewmang used the farmer to threaten Taaynaamkoong$_i$ so that he$_i$ would cry.'
*'Tsewmang used the farmer$_i$ to threaten Taaynaamkoong so that he$_i$ would cry.'

As seen from the possible interpretation of sentence (240), it is the *patient* of threatening which controls the reference of the subject agreement marker in the

purposive clause, and not the instrument. The same is true if the discourse deictic is absent, as in (241):

(241) ʔa-ɬaʔ-naak tsaa diŋ=ʔaʔ tsewmaŋ=niʔ
3S SUBJ-cry-NOMLZR sake PURP=LOC Tsewmang=ERG

lawthlawpaa taaynaamkooŋ ʔa-tleʔr-naak
farmer Taaynaamkoong 3S SUBJ-threaten-INST

'Tsewmang used the farmer to threaten Taaynaamkoong$_i$ so that he$_i$ would cry.'

or 'Tsewmang used Taaynaamkoong to threaten the farmer$_i$ so that he$_i$ would cry.'

This sentence can*not* mean either 'Tsewmang used the farmer$_i$ to threaten Taaynaamkoong so that he$_i$ would cry' or 'Tsewmang used Taaynaamkoong$_i$ to threaten the farmer so that he$_i$ would cry', which would be expected if the instrument object could control reference of the subject marking in the purposive clause.

Thus, there are a number of differences between the instrumental applicative construction and the other applicative constructions.

6.0. SUMMARY

Table 4 summarizes the results of the preceding investigation of the morphosyntactic characteristics of the two objects associated with particular verb-particle complexes.

6.1. Causatives vs. applicatives

In general, it can be seen that in applicative constructions, with the exception of relative clauses, it is the applicative object which displays the properties generally associated with monotransitive objects, to the exclusion of the base object. The only exception is in the case of the instrumental, for which reflexivization/reciprocalization, object marking, and purposive clause subject marking are controlled by the base object. In the case of causatives, similarly, reflexivization/reciprocalization and purposive subject control are not associated with causee objects, but are instead the domain of the base object.

Note also that object marking is somewhat different in the case of causatives as opposed to most applicatives. With the former, as we saw in examples (70)-(75), unlike in the case of almost all applicative constructions, there are no hierarchical restrictions on what object can be marked on the verb. Object marking of verb-*ter* complexes is determined solely by the person and number

Particle:	*Property:*	*object agreement*	mii- *relative*	*occurrence with* khaa	*left-dislocation*	*reflexive/ reciprocal*	*purposive control*
-ter	base obj:	marginal	yes	no	(yes)	yes	yes
	CAUSEE:	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	no
-piak	base obj:	marginal	yes	marginal	marginal	no	no
	AFF:	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
-tse/m	base obj:	marginal	yes	marginal	marginal	no	no
	ADD BEN:	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
-pii	base obj:	marginal	yes	marginal	marginal	no	no
	COM:	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
-hno/	base obj:	marginal	yes	marginal	marginal	no	no
	MAL:	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
-ka/n	base obj:	marginal	yes	marginal	marginal	no	no
	PRIOR:	yes	yes	yes	yes	?	yes
-taak	base obj:	marginal	yes	marginal	marginal	no	no
	RELINQ:	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
-naak	base obj:	yes	no	no	(marginal)	yes	yes
	INST:	marginal	no	yes	yes	no	no

Table 4. Object properties for objects with verb-particle complexes.

of the causee. I would suggest that the difference between the two types of particle has to do with their functional role. In the case of the causative, the function is simply a semantic one: to create a transitive verb with causative semantics. In the case of the remaining postverbal particles, as has been demonstrated for some other languages' applicative systems, the function is not just semantic, but also indicates a higher topicality status for the object that the particle allows to be treated as a morphosyntactically direct object. Thus, it is only natural that objects with higher inherent topicality (first and second persons) be preferentially allowed in these roles over those of lower inherent topicality (third persons).

6.2. The status of Lai applicatives

The morphosyntax of Lai applicatives does not present much in the way of surprises. In the prototypical case, applicative objects behave more like direct objects in morphosyntactic terms than do base objects. The only exception is instrumental applicative objects, which presumably have a less morphosyntactically central position due to their low animacy.

One particularly interesting aspect of the system, however, is the extent to which it interacts with topicalization. As seen above, in many cases a construction may involve use of a discourse deictic with an object in order to unambiguously mark it as the applicative object. More importantly, object marking is itself a topicalization strategy. Not seen from the examples given in this paper is the true text-function of Lai applicatives, which seems to be to allow pronominalization of a previously mentioned referent.

The semantic nature of the objects which the applicative constructions involve is also of interest since many of these are not categories that I am familiar with as likely applicative objects. In particular, the additional beneficiary, prioritive, and relinquitive applicatives are applicative types which, as far as I know, have never been described for any language.

Future work should be directed towards identifying other constructions which make a distinction between the applicative and base objects, and towards establishing these distinctions on the basis of a wider range of data. Equally important is comparative work to determine the provenance of the applicatives. Some of the morphology discussed here is attested in related languages and/or has transparent grammaticalization sources within Lai. Figuring out the relation of this morphology to what can be found in other languages will give us an abundant source of information on the grammaticalization of applicative morphology, and may provide a new source for determining language relations within Kuki-Chin and beyond.

REFERENCES

BENEDICT, Paul K. 1972. *Sino-Tibetan: A Conspectus.* James A. Matisoff, contributing ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

CHHANGTE, Lalnunthangi. 1993. *Mizo Syntax.* Eugene, Oregon: University of Oregon Ph.D. dissertation.

DRYER, Matthew. 1986. "Primary objects, secondary objects, and antidative." *Language* 62:808-845.

RHODES, Richard. 1976. *The Morphosyntax of the Central Ojibwa Verb.* University of Michigan Ph.D. dissertation.

RUDE, Noel. 1986. "Topicality, transitivity, and the direct object in Nez Perce." *International Journal of American Linguistics* 52:124-153.