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The Halkomelem directional applicative suffix -nəs allows the endpoint of a motion verb to be expressed as an object argument. The applicative construction is an alternative to expressing the endpoint as an oblique phrase. Since there are two ways of expressing endpoints, this raises the question of when one construction is preferred over the other. Drawing on data from texts and elicitation, I show that several semantic effects accompany the use of applicatives. While oblique constructions are semantically neutral, applicative constructions have the implication that a controlled action is directed by an animate agent toward a topic-worthy endpoint for a particular purpose.
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1. Halkomelem applicatives.

Halkomelem is a Central Salish language spoken by around fifty elders in southwestern British Columbia. The data are from texts and original fieldwork on the Island Dialect (həlq̓omíləm). Like other Salish languages, Halkomelem is polysynthetic—many affixes referencing nominals appear in the verb complex, including agreement markers, transitive suffixes, and applicative suffixes. This paper addresses one of the directional applicable suffixes -nəs, which is attached to an intransitive base to allow the expression of an endpoint as a direct object.

(1)  ne:nh ‘go’ ᓄəʔəʔəs

-ˈəwə ‘come’ ᓄəʔəʔəs ‘come toward him/her/it/them’

xʷč̓əʔəm ‘run’ xʷč̓əʔəʔəs ‘run toward him/her/it/them’

xʷən̓iʔ ‘get there’ xʷən̓iʔəs ‘get there to him/her/it/them’

---

1 Thanks to the speakers who have provide data for this paper, especially Ruby Peter, who contributed all data not specifically attributed to another speaker. Thanks to Kaoru Kiyosawa, Charles Ulrich, and NWJL editor Tim Montler for their corrections, comments, and suggestions. Thanks to the audiences for comments on earlier versions of this paper (Gerdts 2004a, 2004b). Thanks to Zoey Peterson for editorial assistance. Funding for this research came from a Jacobs Fund Grant and SSHRC Standard Research Grants.

2 When suffixed with the directional applicable suffix, the verb ne:nh ‘go’ frequently shows vowel reduction. Also, some speakers lose the glottalization of the final m altogether, or they restructure it as an intervocalic glottal stop: nəʔəməs.
The syntactic effect of the directional applicative suffix can be seen by comparing the intransitive clause in (2) with the directional applicative construction in (3), where the endpoint of the motion is expressed as an applied object, i.e. the direct object in an applicative construction.3

(2) ni' ne̱m kʷθə swi̱wləs.
   AUX go DET boy
   ‘The boy went.’

(3) ni' nəm-nəs-əs kʷθə swi̱wləs kʷθə John.
   AUX go-DIR-3ERG DET boy DET John
   ‘The boy went up to John.’

Third person agreement in main clauses works on an ergative basis: ergative agreement is marked, while absolutive agreement is Ø. The clause in (2) is intransitive, as seen by the lack of an agreement suffix, and the clause in (3) is transitive, as seen by the presence of the ergative agreement suffix.

Endpoints of motion can also be expressed as an oblique NP in an intransitive construction.

(4) ni' ne̱m kʷθə swi̱wləs ḥə-ʔ John.
   AUX go DET boy OBL-DET John
   ‘The boy went up to John.’

Oblique NPs are marked by the catch-all preposition ḥə. In contrast, direct arguments appear with no case marking. Thus, both the subject and object NPs in (3) are preceded simply by a determiner, and no oblique preposition.

Gerdts (1988) discusses the syntactic properties of Halkomelem applicative constructions in detail. Suffice it to say that the applied object is clearly the direct object because it appears as an objective pronominal suffix (5) and furthermore can passivize (10).

(5) ni' ḥewə-nəsam sân.
    come come.here-DIR:1S.OBJ
    ‘Come here to me!’

---

In this paper, I address issues concerning the use of directional applicative constructions. Given that there are two different ways of expressing an endpoint—as the direct object in an applicative, as in (3), or as a prepositional phrase in an intransitive clause, as in (4)—what differences, if any, exist between these two paraphrases?

In section 2, I further explore the domain of motion verbs, showing that some verbs require serialization with a motion verb to express an endpoint. Nevertheless directional applicative suffixes attach to this class of verb. Furthermore, verbs that do not allow the expression of endpoints in an oblique phrase also do not take the directional applicative suffix. In section 3, I raise the fact that some verbs do not easily participate in the applicative constructions unless they are placed in a context that elaborates on the purpose of the event. Purpose implies agency, and in section 4, I show that directional applicatives are limited to controlled events and therefore only unergative verbs can serve as bases. In section 5, I turn to the properties of the applied object. I show that what seems at first to be a restriction on the animacy of the applied object is best viewed as a function of its topicality.

I conclude that the semantic effects seen in Halkomelem applicative constructions can be summarized as follows: while oblique constructions are semantically neutral, applicative constructions have the implication that a controlled action is directed by an animate agent toward a topic-worthy endpoint for a particular purpose.

2. Applicative versus oblique.

Directionals, like other obliques, such as locatives, instrumentals, and stimuli, can be expressed as oblique case PPs, as seen in the following examples:

(7)  neim  cen  k*θə  x̣aɬq'ələs. go 1s.sub OBL DET dabbing

‘I’m going to bingo.’

(8)  ði  yá-ewə  t³ə  John  ðə  t³ə  leləm. aux  dyn-come.here DET John  obl DET 1s.pos-house

‘John is coming to my house.’
However, unless the main verb is one of a small handful of motion verbs meaning ‘come’ and ‘go’, it is followed by a serialized motion verb, usually *neµ* ‘go’, followed by the oblique phrase.⁴

(9)  

\[
\text{ni} \, \text{cən} \, ?\text{əsəl} \, \text{neµ} \, ?\text{ə-} \, \text{snənəyməx}^\text{*}. \\
\text{AUX IS.SUB paddle go OBL-DET Nanaimo}
\]

‘I paddled to Nanaimo.’

(10)  

\[
\text{neµ} \, \text{čte}-\text{m neµ} \, ?\text{o} \, t^\text{ə-}\text{ɛn} \, \text{men, qeq!} \\
\text{go crawl go OBL DET:2POS father baby}
\]

‘Go crawl to your dad, baby!’

As seen by comparing (10) and (11), motion verbs generally require a serialized motion verb in order to express the endpoint as a directional phrase.

(11)  

\[
\text{*neµ} \, \text{čte}-\text{m ?o} \, t^\text{ə-}\text{ɛn} \, \text{men, qeq!} \\
\text{go crawl OBL DET:2POS father baby}
\]

‘Go crawl to your dad, baby!’

What is notable about the directional applicative suffix is that it allows the expression of a directional without the necessity of a serialized motion verb.

(12)  

\[
\text{neµ} \, \text{čte}-\text{m-ŋəs t^ə-} \, \text{men, qeq!} \\
\text{go crawl-DIR DET:2POS father baby}
\]

‘Go crawl to your dad, baby!’

Another example of this pattern is given in (13)–(15). The endpoint cannot appear simply as an oblique phrase of the verb *?əsəl* ‘paddle’ (13), but it can appear as an oblique phrase in a serialized verb construction (14) or as the object of the directional applicative (15).

(13)  

\[
\text{*neµ} \, \text{cən} \, ?\text{əsəl} \, ?\text{o} \, \overline{\text{ə} \, \text{sleni} \, \text{ni} \, \text{ni} \, \text{pələs}.} \\
\text{go IS.SUB paddle OBL DET woman AUX be.at Cowichan.Bay}
\]

‘I’m going to paddle toward the lady who is at Cowichan Bay.’

---

⁴ Montler (2008) makes the same point about verb serialization as a means for expressing endpoints in Klallam. However, he has pointed out to me that the serial construction is never required, but is used if the speaker wants to clarify the semantics. Also, he thinks that clauses with two identical verbs, as seen in the Halkomelem example in (10), which contains *neµ* as both an auxiliary verb and a serialized verb, are not used in Klallam. In contrast, they are very common in Halkomelem.
Thus the applicative morphology clearly adds directional semantics.

Many verbs, for examples the ones in (16a), take oblique directional phrases and also form directional applicatives. On the other hand, verbs such as those in (16b) do not allow the expression of an endpoint as a serialized motion verb with an oblique directional and also do not occur with -n̓əs.

(16) a. some verbs forming directional applicatives:


b. some verbs that do not form directional applicatives:


If the verbs in (16b) express an endpoint at all, they do so through other means, for example with transitive or causative morphology, rather than with applicative morphology (see Gerdts and Hukari 2000).

3. The directional applicative as a purposive.

In addition to the directional meaning, the applicative often adds a sense of purpose. All of the following examples were judged incomplete without the

---

3 When I presented a version of this paper (Gerdts 2004a), Tim Montler pointed out to me that Saanich is very similar to Halkomelem in this respect. Montler (1986:167) calls the Saanich suffix –n̓əs ‘purposive’. He says that it “adds the implication that the subject has a specific purpose in its

inclusion of the explanation of why the action was directed toward the object; the explanation usually takes the form of a modifying or complement clause.

(17) ̄i ṅe c̆ wəl tecoł-nəs k*θə sqʷəme̱y
AUX Q 2S.SUB PERF arrive-DIR DET dog

?i:̀n s-ti:m?
AUX:POS NOM-ask

‘Are you here for the dog that you are asking for?’

(18) nẻm cən wəl cam-nəs k*θə sməyəθ
go 1S.SUB PERF go.uphill-DIR DET deer

AUX die-LCTR-1S.SUB

‘I’m going up the mountain for the deer that I killed.’

Note that the parallel clause with a stated purpose but without applicative morphology was judged ungrammatical:

(19) *nẻm cən wəl cam ṅe k*θə sməyəθ
go 1S.SUB PERF go.uphill OBL DET deer

AUX die-LCTR-1S.SUB

‘I’m going up some mountains for the deer that I killed.’

When asked to provide an example with a stated purpose but without applicative morphology, the speaker suggested the following sentence with the serialization of two verbs (the first providing the motion and the second providing the event):

(20) nẻm cən wəl cam ̃xaʔəs-t k*θə sməyəθ
go 1S.SUB PERF go.uphill pick.up-TR DET deer

AUX die-LCTR-1S.SUB

‘I’m going up some mountains to pick up the deer that I killed.’

action. It often, but not always, carries an implication of malevolent intent.” The Halkomelem suffix does not seem to imply malevolence, however. See Kiyosawa and Gerdts (2010a) for a discussion of malefactive uses of Salish applicative suffixes.

Here are some additional examples of the purposive use of the applicative.

(21) neµ cën šaq*əl-ənas əθə-ənə sılə.
    go 1S.SUB cross-DIR DET-1S.POS grandparent
    na?əθ ṣilaqəθ ə təə ʃəl.
    AUX:DET other.side OBL DET road

    ‘I’m going to cross the road because my grandmother is across there.’
    [literally: ‘I’m going to cross to my grandmother who is on the other side
    of the road.’]

(22) neµ cep ceʔ nəwiləm-ənas k*θən sx*əmnikw
    go 2PL.SUB FUT enter-DIR DET:2POS aunt/uncle
    ʔiʔ ʔaqiʔ.
    AUX sick

    ‘You will all go in and see your uncle who is sick.’
    [literally: ‘You people will go in toward your uncle who is sick.’]

(23) neµ cën x*əʔaləm-ənas k*θə-ənə əθəm niʔ?
    go 1SUB return-DIR DET-1S.POS drum AUX
    nə-s-melq.
    1S.POS-NOM-forget

    ‘I went back for the drum I forgot.’

(24) mi č ceʔ ʔax*-nasamš ɛcw-əθamš
    come 2S.SUB FUT go.downhill-DIR:1S.OBJ help-TR:1OBJ
    ə k*θə sce:ʔən əni ɛm-stəx*-ən.
    OBL DET salmon come go.downhill.CS-1S.SUB

    ‘You will come down to the beach and help me bring up the fish that I’m
    bringing up.’ [literally: ‘You will come down to me...”]

(25) neµ ʔə č ceʔ ʔicəm-ənas əqə q*eʔəq-eʔ?
    go Q 2S.SUB FUT swim-DIR DET log tie-TR

    ‘Are you going to swim to the log and tie it?’

In sum, we see that directional applicatives, especially with verbs with meanings other than ‘come’ and ‘go’, require purposive semantics: the agent must be directing the action toward the endpoint for a purpose.

4. **Agent control and the unaccusative ban on directional applicatives.**

Given the above observation, it is not surprising that unergative verbs but not unaccusative verbs can form directional applicatives. Unergative verbs are intransitive verbs in which the subject argument is semantically an agent in control of an event. Unaccusative verbs are intransitive verbs, usually processes, in which the subject argument is semantically a patient/undergoer that is not in control of the event.
control. Since directional applicatives require an agent to direct the action in a controlled, purposive manner, only unergative verbs are compatible with directional applicatives.

Several tests for the unergative/unaccusative distinction have been developed for Halkomelem (Gerdts 1991, Gerdts and Hukari 1998, 2000). Unergative verbs are compatible with the desiderative suffix -əlmən and the limited control suffix -namət, while unaccusative verbs are not. As we see in Table 1, motion verbs that take the directional applicative suffix also take the desiderative and limited control suffixes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VERB</th>
<th>DIRECTIONAL</th>
<th>‘WANT TO’</th>
<th>‘MANAGE TO’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘GO’  ném</td>
<td>némənən</td>
<td>néməlmən</td>
<td>némənamət</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘COME’  ʔewə</td>
<td>ʔewənən</td>
<td>ʔewəəlmən</td>
<td>ʔewə namət</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘RUN’  ʔēn</td>
<td>ʔēnənən</td>
<td>ʔēnəlmən</td>
<td>ʔēnənəmət</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘CLIMB’ ʔīī</td>
<td>ʔīīnən</td>
<td>ʔīīəlmən</td>
<td>ʔīīnamət</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘GO HOME’ ʔak’u</td>
<td>ʔak’unən</td>
<td>ʔak’unəlmən</td>
<td>ʔak’unənamət</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘PADDLE’ ʔēq’ə</td>
<td>ʔēq’ənən</td>
<td>ʔēq’ələmən</td>
<td>ʔēq’ənamət</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘SWIM’  ʔīc’əm</td>
<td>ʔīc’əmən</td>
<td>ʔīc’əməlmən</td>
<td>ʔīc’əmənamət</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘WADE OUT’ ʔīs’əm</td>
<td>ʔīs’əmən</td>
<td>ʔīs’əməlmən</td>
<td>ʔīs’əmənamət</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Unergative verb paradigms.

In contrast, verbs that do not take the directional applicative suffix fail to take the desiderative and limited control suffixes as well, as illustrated in Table 2.
While the semantic forces at work are obscured by the English translations of these verbs, the results from a Halkomelem perspective are clear: some motion verbs are unergative while others are unaccusative.\(^6\)

### 5. Animacy effects and the topicality of the applied object.

In the previous section, it was shown that the directional applicative suffix is only used with verbs of the unergative class. Unergatives are intransitive verbs with a high degree of control whose subjects tend to be humans or other higher animates. This led me to inquire if there was a propensity for the applied objects of directional applicatives to be higher animates as well.

Elicitation reveals that when the endpoint is a place rather than a person, the directional applicative construction is not used.

(30) *ni öl cən nəm-əs kʷə tawən/ tələwtxʷ/ sənəməxʷ.
AUX 1S.SUB go-DIR DET town/bank/Nanaimo
‘I went to town/the bank/Nanaimo.’

Rather, speakers use a serial verb construction consisting of the verb for ‘go’ followed by the endpoint expressed as a denominal verb.\(^7\)

(31) ni öl cən nəm kʷə tawən/ kʷ-tələwtxʷ/ kʷ-sənəməxʷ.
AUX 1S.SUB go to-town/ go to-bank/ go to-Nanaimo
‘I went to town/the bank/Nanaimo.’

---

\(^6\) There is a third class of verbs of motion verbs, as Gerdts and Hukari (2000) note, which exhibit properties of both unergative and unaccusative verbs, and some of these appear with –nəs.

\(^7\) See Gerdts and Hukari (2008) for discussion and analysis of the denominal verb construction.
We thus see a contrast between a place (32), which cannot serve as the applied object in a directional applicative, and an animate entity located in a place (33), which can.\(^8\)

(32) *niʔ cə́n nəm-ns kʷθə mətuliyeʔ.
    AUX IS.SUB go-DIR DET Victoria
    ‘I went to Victoria.’

(33) niʔ cə́n nəm-ns kʷθə kəʔəmənt niʔ ?ə-ʔə mətuliyeʔ.
    AUX IS.SUB go-DIR DET government AUX OBL-DIR DET Victoria
    ‘I went to the government in Victoria.’

At first glance, then, applied objects in the Halkomelem directional applicative construction seem to be subject to an animacy condition.\(^9\)

I probed the issue further by examining a 5000-line corpus of Halkomelem texts.\(^{10}\) I counted both the directional applicatives formed with the suffix -nəs and any intransitive clauses that contained an oblique phrase with the semantics of a goal and a verb that is known to take the directional suffix. I categorized each endpoint according to its animacy, and the results are summarized in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ANIMATES</th>
<th>INANIMATES</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPLIED OBJECT</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBLIQUE</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Animate versus inanimate endpoints in Halkomelem.

Overall, the data show three things. First, motion verbs with endpoints are more commonly expressed as intransitive constructions with oblique phrases than as directional applicatives: oblique phrases appear in 93 of 112 examples (83%).

---

\(^8\) Tim Montler suggested to me, based on his analysis of Klallam directionals, that an example like (32) might be possible with a malefactive reading, for example if terrorists were go to target Victoria. But even with an agent with evil intent, examples like these were rejected.

\(^9\) This restriction would parallel the one proposed for Halkomelem psych applicatives (Gerdts and Kiyosawa 2005b).

\(^{10}\) These texts were recorded by Wayne Suttles in 1962 from five speakers of the Island dialect of Halkomelem. They were transcribed and translated with the assistance of Arnold Guerin and Ruby Peter and will appear as an edited volume (Gerdts ed., in prep.).
and thus greatly outnumber applied objects, which appear in 19 of 112 examples (17%). Second, oblique phrases are used to express the 82 if 81 examples (90%) of inanimate NPs, including items, locations, and clauses giving purposes, places, etc. Nevertheless, almost half (9 of 19 examples) of the applicative constructions had inanimate applied objects. Finally, animate endpoints appear as applied objects around half the time (in 10 of 21 examples).

Thus, we see that a restriction against inanimate applied objects is not supported by the data from texts. However, there is a much higher tendency for an animate endpoint to appear as an applied object than for an inanimate endpoint to do so. These results are consistent with a study of the discourse properties of applicatives in Salish languages by Gerdts and Kiyosawa (2005a). They conclude that applied objects are high in topicality, while oblique NPs are low in topicality. Animate NPs are often more central to the discourse, while inanimate NPs are often part of the setting, typically appearing once as they become relevant and then being dropped from the story. In contrast, the animate characters often have continuing roles.

When the main character is the endpoint of a motion verb, then an applicative construction is used. For example, when the referent is the central character Snot Boy in (34)–(36) or the singing woman in (37)–(38), an applicative rather than an oblique construction is used.

**Snot Boy** (Sophie Micheal)

(34) ‘And when the food was ready, she told them,’

(35) “nẹ́n nə́n-əs təə̣ṇ sqaq̣?əq̣ ʔiʔ xʷay-ʔ.”

(36) ‘And the next one went to look, and he said, “There is nothing there. There is just snot on the bed.”’

**Crane Steals the Rivers** (Sophie Micheal)

(37) ‘And this was the song that Ts’umts’iyi was singing, and this was what the children heard. And one of them said, “The one that is singing is singing about our father.”’

---

1See also Kiyosawa and Gerdts 2010b: Chapter 8.
In contrast, if the endpoint is non-topical, it will appear as an oblique, even if it refers to a human. For example, a non-individualized person such as the Indian agent (40) or a generic NP such as *xʷəl̓məxʷ* ‘First Nations people’ (42) are non-topical in the following passages.

**Hunting with Flares** (Samuel Tom)

(39) ‘Now it’s different. The native people have changed. They don’t go looking for their food. They just go for the white man’s food now. And they just want money, and when they don’t have money they just go hungry.’

(40) səw ne̓m-s təqə ičənt iʔ qʷal “ən s-ƛʔiʔ kʷən̓s təm-əs-ə-xʷ sʔəltən.”

‘They go to the Indian agent and say, “I want you to give me food.”’

**The Cowichan Weir** (Samuel Tom)

(41) ‘Now that’s the way it was. A young man always kept going there, I guess it was crazy or whatever.’

(42) yaʔ ne̓m təm əxʷəl̓məxʷ.

‘He always goes there to the Indians.’

(43) ‘And then he saw a girl. So he spoke up when he got home to his parents, “I saw a very nice girl. It would be good if I go ask to marry her.”’

We see the same effect with inanimate NPs. Usually, inanimates are non-topical and overwhelmingly they appear as obliques. But when they are in
fact topical, they appear in applicative constructions. For example, ‘fire’ is central to a text about pitlampining (the hunting technique of luring animals with fire) (45), and the place where the Elhwa live is central to a story about the northern tribes making war on the Elhwa (47).

**Hunting with Flares** (Samuel Tom)

(44) ‘But when you get to where the murres are, you have to extinguish your fire,’

(45) neµ hənəm-ənəs-əs təə həyqʷ
go go(IMPF)-DIR-3ERG DET fire
‘because they go to the fire’

(46) ‘...right up to the bow of the boat. The murres jump for the fire and try to put it out.’

**Story of the Elhwa** (Manson George)

(47) sis miw ʔəwə-ənəm təə stə̓ləw-s
NOM.AUX.3POS come.LNK come.here-DIR-PAS DET river-3POS
tə̓əwneʔəl ʔiʔIkʷəʔ, ʔiʔ tə̓m-ʔełəs.
those.ones Elhwa CONJ time.of-hot
‘And they came to the river of those Elhwa people, and it was summer.’

Another example illustrating the centrality of an inanimate object to a story is the role that the box plays in Ellen White’s “Seagull Steals the Sun”. Seagull tricks Sun into a box, darkening the world. So whenever Seagull approaches the box, he is also in fact also approaching the Sun. Thus, ʔəəm ‘box’ is expressed as an applied object in (48).

**Seagull Steals the Sun** (*Halkomelem—Hukari et al. 1977*)

(48) ʔəə mə wəl nəm-ənəm ʔə-ʔ qʷəni
again hearsay PERF go-DIR-PAS OBL-DIR DET seagull
tə̓ə ʔəəm.
DET box
‘And Seagull went to the box again.’
[literally: ‘And the box was gone up to again by Seagull.’]
In sum, I surmise that it is not the animacy of the NP per se that determines whether it appears as an applied object or not, but rather its topicality. Higher animates are inherently more topical, but things and places of interest to the storyline or to the main character are also topical and thus may appear as applied objects. In contrast, both animate and inanimate referents that are not central to the story tend to be expressed as obliques.

6. Conclusion.

The directional applicative suffix \(-nas\) allows the expression of an endpoint as a direct object rather than as an oblique phrase. This paper has investigated the semantic effects present in directional applicative constructions that are lacking in their intransitive counterparts. As discussed in section 2 and section 4, that a verb expresses motion is not a sufficient condition for it to take the directional applicative suffix. As shown in section 3, a directional applicative has the implication that the action is directed by the agent toward the endpoint for a purpose. Section 4 discusses directional applicatives in terms of the verb class of the base intransitive verb. Unaccusative verbs, because they do not have agents, do not form directional applicatives. Unergative verbs, however, are good candidates for directional applicatives, so long as the action is a motion for which an endpoint can be expressed. Given these two conditions, only a portion (approximately one half) of motion verbs form directional applicatives, and most of these only occur when purposive semantics is present.

Applicative constructions are rare compared to their intransitive counterparts. Of the 112 examples of motion verbs known to take applicative suffixes and expressing endpoints in a 5000-line corpus of texts, only 19 (17%) appear in applicative constructions. Examining the endpoints in this corpus from the point of view of their centrality to the text, we find another difference between directional applicative constructions and their intransitive counterparts: endpoints only serve as applied objects if they are high in topicality. Animates, since they tend to be high in topicality, often appear as applied objects rather than obliques (in 50% of examples in this corpus). In contrast, inanimates usually appear as obliques in intransitive constructions (in 90% of examples in this corpus).

In conclusion, while oblique constructions are semantically neutral, applicative constructions have the implication that a controlled action was directed by an animate agent toward a topic-worthy endpoint for a particular

---

12 Directional applicatives thus contrast with psych applicatives. The relational applicative suffix \(-me?\) attaches to a wide variety of psychological and cognitive verbs, including unaccusative bases. We have found twenty-seven verbs taking this suffix (Gerdts and Kiyosawa 2005b) and, as far as we know, all psychological verbs that allow oblique stimuli have applicative counterparts.
purpose. Thus, we see that directional applicatives are not simply an alternative means of packaging the endpoint, as many syntactic treatments of applicatives would lead us to believe. Rather Halkomelem directional applicatives are used by speakers to achieve certain semantic effects. Cross-linguistically, there have been few attempts to explain the reasons for choosing applicative constructions over intransitive constructions with oblique phrases, hindered in part by the relative rarity of applicatives formed on intransitive bases (Polinsky 2005). However, two recent studies on Tukang Besi (Donohue 2001) and Hakha Lai (Peterson 2007), show results along the lines of what I report here for Halkomelem directional applicatives. The Halkomelem results are therefore not surprising but nevertheless make a contribution to our understanding of applicative constructions in Salish and in languages of the world.
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