1. Introduction.

1.1 Basic characteristics of Ket

- Language ID: Ket (aka Yenisey Ostyak)
- Language family: Yeniseic (last surviving member)
- Geographical location: Central Siberia
- Main typological characteristics:
  - agglutinative noun system
  - polysynthetic verb system

1.2 Morphological structure of the Ket verb

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P8</th>
<th>P7</th>
<th>P6</th>
<th>P5</th>
<th>P4</th>
<th>P3</th>
<th>P1</th>
<th>P0</th>
<th>P-1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>subject or thematic valence reducing affix</td>
<td>incorporate infinitive as semantic peak or incorporated noun, adj, or adverb root</td>
<td>subject or object</td>
<td>thematic consonant (most are semantically opaque)</td>
<td>tense/mood /a/, /s/ or 3rd person animate subject or object</td>
<td>inanim. subject or object; or thematic valence change affix</td>
<td>tense/mood/aspect consonant /n/, /l/</td>
<td>subject or object</td>
<td>thematic valence reducing affix</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Not all of these positions (from Fig. 1) may be filled simultaneously in any verb form.
- In the surface (phonetic) representation of a verb form
  - some paradigmatically present elements may be truncated or elided (marked by {});
  - some non-morphological elements (vowels and consonants) can be inserted (not glossed).
- For a detailed observation of the rules governing deletion and insertion, see (Vajda 2004: 74-76).

1.2.1 Agreement marking

There are two productive transitive configurations and five productive intransitive configurations, some involving multi-site subject marking.

NB! The selection of agreement marker configuration is a lexical property of the stem, derived from a host of etymological idiosyncrasies, and is not dictated by any overall grammatical rule.
(1) Transitive configurations

- **Ket Transitive Configuration I**
  
  SBJ\(^8\)-laugh\(^7\)-CAUS\(^5\)-NPST\(^4\)-OBJ\(^3/1\)-ITER.TRAN\(^0\)-AN.PL.SBJ\(^1\) ‘S makes O laugh repeatedly’
  
  1SG \(d\{i\}\)\(^8\)-\(dáq\)\(^7\)-\(q\)\(^5\)-\(a\)\(^4\)-\(ku\)\(^1\)-\(da\)\(^0\) (I make you.S laugh)\(^1\)
  
  3M \(d\{u\}\)\(^8\)-\(dáq\)\(^7\)-\(q\)\(^5\)-\(a\)\(^4\)-\(ku\)\(^1\)-\(da\)\(^0\) (he makes him laugh)
  
  3F \(da\)\(^8\)-\(dáq\)\(^7\)-\(q\)\(^5\)-\(a\)\(^4\)-\(b\)\(^3\)-\(da\)\(^0\) (she makes it laugh)

- **Ket Transitive Configuration II**
  
  SBJ\(^8\)-find\(^7\)-OBJ\(^6\)-TH\(^5\)-NPST\(^4\)-ITER\(^0\)-AN.PL.SBJ\(^1\) ‘S finds O repeatedly’
  
  1SG \(d\{i\}\)\(^8\)-\(bá\)\(^7\)-\(kde\)\(^6\)-\(ku\)\(^1\)-\(ku\)\(^6\)-\(k\)\(^5\)-\(a\)\(^4\)-\(bed\)\(^0\) (I find you.S)
  
  3F \(da\)\(^8\)-\(bá\)\(^7\)-\(kde\)\(^6\)-\(ku\)\(^1\)-\(ku\)\(^6\)-\(k\)\(^5\)-\(a\)\(^4\)-\(bed\)\(^0\) (she finds it)

- **Ket Transitive Configuration III (unproductive)**
  
  SBJ\(^8\)-outside\(^7\)-\(sb\)\(^6\)-TH\(^5\)-OBJ\(^4\)-3/1-take\(^0\)-AN.PL.SBJ\(^1\) ‘S takes O outside’
  
  1SG \(d\{i\}\)\(^8\)-\(ɤ\)\(^7\)-\(la\)\(^7\)-\(b\)\(^6\)-\(k\)\(^5\)-\(a\)\(^4\)-\(qan\)\(^0\) (I take you.S)
  
  3F \(da\)\(^8\)-\(ɤ\)\(^7\)-\(la\)\(^7\)-\(b\)\(^6\)-\(k\)\(^5\)-\(a\)\(^4\)-\(qan\)\(^0\) (she takes it)

(2) Intransitive configuration (two basic)

- **Ket Intransitive Configuration I**
  
  SBJ\(^8\)-hanging\(^7\)-TH\(^5\)-NPST\(^4\)-N.SBJ\(^3\)-be.extended\(^0\)-AN.PL.SBJ\(^1\) ‘S is hanging’
  
  3F \(da\)\(^8\)-\(an\)\(^7\)-\(k\)\(^5\)-\(s\)\(^4\)-\(ta\)\(^0\)
  
  3N (SG, PL) \(an\)\(^7\)-\(k\)\(^5\)-\(b\)\(^3\)-\(ta\)\(^0\)

- **Ket Intransitive Configuration II**
  
  grow\(^7\)-SBJ\(^6\)-TH\(^5\)-NPST\(^4\)-start\(^0\) IC\(^8\)-red\(^7\)-SBJ\(^6\)-NPST\(^5\)-PRES\(^4\)-become\(^0\) being\(^7\)-SBJ\(^6\)-TH\(^5\)-NPST\(^4\)-become\(^0\) ‘S starts growing’ ‘S turns red’ ‘S comes into being’
  
  1S \(ti\)\(^7\)-\(ba\)\(^6\)-\(k\)\(^5\)-\(a\)\(^4\)-\(qan\)\(^0\) da\(^8\)-\(sule\)\(^7\)-\(bo\)\(^6\)-\(k\)\(^5\)-\(s\)\(^4\)-\(a\)\(^0\)
  
  3F \(ti\)\(^7\)-\(i\)\(^6\)-\(k\)\(^5\)-\(a\)\(^4\)-\(qan\)\(^0\) da\(^8\)-\(sule\)\(^7\)-\(u\)\(^6\)-\(k\)\(^5\)-\(s\)\(^4\)-\(a\)\(^0\)
  
  3N (SG, PL) \(ti\)\(^7\)-\(i\)\(^6\)-\(k\)\(^5\)-\(a\)\(^4\)-\(qan\)\(^0\) da\(^8\)-\(sule\)\(^7\)-\(u\)\(^6\)-\(k\)\(^5\)-\(s\)\(^4\)-\(a\)\(^0\)

2. Ditransitive constructions in Ket

2.1 Basic patterns

There are 2 basic types:

1) indirective construction
   a) dative
   b) benefactive
2) double object construction (DOC)

---

1 Here the Ket examples are given in phonological transcription with morpheme breaks. Further examples are represented in a 4-tier transcription: 1) phonetic transcription; 2) phonological transcription with morpheme breaks; 3) glossing; 4) English translation.
2.1.1 Indirective construction

a) Dative subtype

Here belongs the majority of transfer verbs including \( q\text{-}d\text{-}u\text{-}k\text{-}s\text{-}i/\text{bed} \) ‘give (3)’ (unlike \( b\text{-}aq\text{0} \) ‘give (1)’ and \( n\text{-}b\text{-}u\text{0} \) ‘give (2)’, it rather means ‘subject makes a gift/transfer with object’), \( i\text{k}\text{-}k\text{-}b\text{es} \) ‘bring’, \( q\text{u}\text{-}a\text{-}bed \) ‘sell’, \( e\text{d}\text{a}\text{-}q\text{-}t\text{-}a\text{0} \) ‘send’, as well as \( i\text{r}\text{-}a\text{-}k\text{i} \) ‘tell’.

(6) \( \text{āt haŋ-tip ketdāna t}\text{q}n\text{-}\text{u}ksibēt} \)

\[ \text{ād haŋ-tib ke’d-daŋa d{i}\text{8}-q\text{y}d\text{-}u\text{6-k5-s4-i/bed} \]
\[ \text{1SG female-dog person-M.DAT 1SG\text{-}gift\text{-}3SG.N\text{-}TH\text{-NPST\text{-}make} \]‘I give a dog to him.’

(7) \( \text{āt obduŋa jeēl’ diyuncbes’} \)

\[ \text{ād ob-daŋa ēel d{i}\text{8}-ik\text{7-u6-k5-n2-bes} \]
\[ \text{1SG father-M.DAT berries 1SG\text{-}here\text{-}3SG.N\text{-TH\text{-}move} \]‘I brought berries to my father.’

(8) \( \text{āt irĩŋ daŋa der’aqimme} \)

\[ \text{ād idĩŋ daŋa d{i}\text{8}-e\text{d}a\text{-}q\text{5-b3-n2-a} \]
\[ \text{1SG letter M.DAT 1SG\text{-}send\text{-}CAUS\text{-}3SG.N\text{-PST\text{-MOM}} \]‘I sent a letter to him.’

(9) \( qu’ ke’l baŋa quyąbet sujat \)

\[ qu’ ke’d baŋa \{du\text{8}\text{-}q\text{u}\text{7-u6-k5-a4-bed} \]
\[ \text{sell person 1SG.DAT \{3SG.M\text{-}sell\text{-}3SG.N\text{-TH\text{-NPST\text{-ITER\text{-dress}}} \]‘Salesman is selling me a dress.’

(10) \( \text{āt daŋa tovin’n’e āp bisepda qaan} \)

\[ \text{ād daŋa } \{d\text{i8}\text{-}o\text{-}b3-n2-k1} \]
\[ \text{āb biseb-da qaan 1SG 3SG.M.DAT 1SG\text{-}TH\text{-PST\text{-3SG.N\text{-PST\text{-tell}}} \]my brother-GEN words ‘I told my brother’s words to him.’

- Basic properties: agreement is indirective (object agreement prefixes index T), flagging is also indirective (R in dative, T unmarked).

b) Benefactive subtype

Other option for encoding of Beneficiary is marking of R by benefactive or adessive case (may be variants of the same case (cf. Vall, Kanakin 1985: 27)), consider the verb \( k\text{i}\text{t}\text{-k5-bed} \) ‘buy’:

(11) \( \text{āt se’n daŋa/ qimdiŋt tkitterjil’bēt} \)

\[ \text{ād se’n qim-diŋt d{i}\text{8}-k\text{i}\text{-aŋ6-k5-l2-bed} \]
\[ \text{1SG deers woman-F.ADES 1SG\text{-}price\text{-}3AN.PL\text{-TH\text{-NPST\text{-make}}} \]‘I bought (for) the woman reindeers.’

- Basic properties: agreement is indirective (object agreement prefixes index T), flagging is also indirective (R in benefactive, T unmarked).
2.1.2 Double object construction (DOC)

This type includes two GIVE verbs $b^2aq^0$ ‘give(1)’, $n^5b^3u^0$ ‘give(2)’ (which differ in aspectual properties), and few other verbs like $q^5a^4b^3dil^0$ ‘dress(1)’, $k^5a^4b^3to^0$ ‘dress(2)’, $r^5a^4b^3kit^0$ ‘rub’.

(12) $kɛˀî qîm tîb divijaq

ke’d qîm tîb d{u}$_i$-$i^6$-$b^3$-$ij^2$-$aq^0$

**person woman** dog **3SG.M**-$3SG.F$-$APPL^3$-$PST^2$-give$^0$

‘The man gave (his) wife a dog.’

(13) āt is’a dul’ den’ dan’bu

ād i-sa dul’ den d{i}$i$-$a^6$-$n^5$-$b^3$-$u^0$

1SG day-DIST child money 1SG-$3SG.M$-$TH^5$-$APPL^3$-give$^0$

‘I give the child money everyday.’

(14) ām dul’l besemda asamamɛl

ām dul’l besam da$^8$-$a^6$-$q^5$-$a^4$-$b^3$-$n^2$-$d{d}i$-$i^6$

mother child fur.coat **3SG.F**-$3SG.M$-$TH^5$-$PST^4$-$APPL^3$-$PST^2$-dress$^0$

‘Mother dressed the child in a fur coat.’

(15) ām āt dul’ rabayopto

ām ād dul’ da$^8$-$ba^6$-$k^5$-$a^4$-$b^3$-$to^0$

mother 1SG hat **3SG.F**-$1SG^6$-$TH^5$-$NPST^4$-$APPL^3$-put$^0$

‘Mother puts a hat on me.’

(16) bû ku’tara batabgit

bû ku’d ād da$^8$-$ba^6$-$t^5$-$a^4$-$b^3$-$kit^0$

3SG fat 1SG **3SG.F**-$1SG^6$-$TH^5$-$NPST^4$-$APPL^3$-rub$^0$

‘She rubs me with fat.’

• **Basic properties**: flagging is neutral (both objects unmarked), indexing (usually) secundative (object AGR with R); but see below on animacy effects.

• Another property of this construction is that the verb includes an ‘applicative’ marker -$b$-, which is formally identical to the inanimate object (argument) marker in P3 (see below exx. 17-18).

(17) $datînqivit$

$da^8$-$ti^n^7$-$q^5$-$b^3$-$t^0$

**3SG.F**-$turn^7$-$CAUS^5$-$3SG.N$-$MOM^0$

‘She turns it.’

(18) $datîngajit$

$da^8$-$ti^n^7$-$q^5$-$a^4$-$t^0$

**3SG.F**-$turn^7$-$CAUS^5$-$3SG.M$-$MOM^0$

‘She turns him.’

*Why do canonical ditransitives verbs include an applicative marker, while less canonical ditransitives do not? This is typologically unusual.*
2.2 Animacy effects in DOC

In DOC with GIVE indexing is usually secundative, however, when the T is pronominal (only 1, 2 pronouns) the construction changes to indirective, both in indexing (agreement with T) and flagging (R is now in dative).

(19) anuks' ū ketduŋa āt dbiyoq
    anuks ū ked-daŋa ād d{i}^{3}-b^{3}-(i)-k{u}^{1}-aq^{0}
    tomorrow 2sg person-3sg.m.dat 1sg 1sg^{3}-appl^{3}-2sg^{1}-give^{0}
    ‘Tomorrow I will give you to the man.’

This is true even if R is also a pronoun:

(20) āb ōp ukuŋa āt dburaq
    āb ōb u-kuŋa ād d{u}^{3}-b^{3}-u^{2}-d{d}^{1}-aq^{0}
    my father 2sg-dat 1sg 3sg.m^{8}-appl^{3}-pst^{2}-1sg^{1}-give^{0}
    ‘My father gave me to you.’

Thus, hierarchy effects; ditransitive alignment is labile: usually (when R is higher than T on person/animacy scales), then alignment (agreement) is secundative, when T is higher (or when both R and T are equally pronominal), then alignment is indirective (agreement with T and R are dative).

2.3 Word order

Remarkably free in both types of ditransitive constructions, but there is a strong tendency for unmarked objects in DOC to be preverbal (exx. 12-16, etc.).

2.4 Notes on derived ditransitives

Derived ditransitives are marginal insofar as morphological causatives are not built productively from transitives.

Some (ex. 21) are formed analytically, some other (ex. 22) are rather formed with incorporated object.

(21) bū āt esla deri deraqadda
    bū ād esla ded d{u}^{8}-eda^{7}-q^{5}-a^{4}-d{i}^{1}-da^{0}
    3sg.m 1sg paper read 3sg.m^{8}-send^{7}-caus^{5}-npst^{4}-1sg^{1}-iter.trans^{0}
    ‘He makes me read the book.’

(22) ām āt dananbetqirit
    ām ād da^{8}-nan-bed^{7}-q5-di^{1}-t^{0}
    mother 1sg 3sg.f^{8}-bread-make^{7}-caus^{5}-1sg^{1}-mom.trans^{0}
    ‘Mother makes me bake bread.’

Still there are some causatives of transitives (ex. 23), and these have secundative alignment: have a double object construction with the causee unmarked and controlling verb agreement.

(23) qīm āt se'n' dautaqqindit
    qīm ād se'n da^{8}-utaq^{7}-q^{5}-m^{2}-di^{1}-t^{0}
    woman 1sg deer.pl 3sg.f^{8}-graze^{7}-caus^{5}-pst^{2}-1sg^{1}-mom.trans^{0}
    ‘The woman made me graze reindeer.’
NB! This verb has no applicative marker -b- unlike other DOC verbs. Moreover, the underlined object se ň ‘reindeer’ doesn’t trigger any agreement verb-internally.

Other causatives can behave differently. For example, iliŋ7-q5-da0 ‘feed’ takes the causee as the main object, while the base object (what is eaten) is in instrumental.

(24) āt bũ nanjaši diliŋqajda
ād bũ nan-as d{u}8-liŋ7-ŋ5-a4-da0
1SG 3SG bread-INST 1SG 8-eat7-CAUS5-3SG.M4-ITER.TRANS0
‘I feed him with bread.’

Thus it basically follows the Russian pattern.

2.5 Notes on syntactic properties

2.5.1 Reflexives (and reciprocals)

Reflexives (and sometimes reciprocals) if related to the (main) object can be expressed by coreferent subject agreement (in 3rd person; in 1,2 person by object pronouns – we comb us, etc, cf. ex. 25). This seems to be possible for both monotransitives and ditransitives of the indirective type, which predictably encode coreference of A and T arguments:

(25) bũ datuyun/butoqit
bũ da8-tukun7-bu6-t5-o4-l2-kit0
3SG 3SG.F8-comb7-3COREF-TH4-PST4-PST2-rub0
‘She combs herself.’

(26) bũ ʷūŋere ʷtikolēj
bũ ʷd-ʷŋe da8-ŋ.d7-k5-o4-l2-a1-dij0
3SG 2PL-DAT 3SG.F8-visible7-TH5-PST5-PST2-3SG.COREF1-INTR0
‘She showed herself to us.’

However, the same subject marker can also be used for coreference between Subject and Recipient:

(27) deŋ uska qapka tƣranbūyabetin
deŋ uska qapka d{u}8-qvdaŋ7-bu6-k5-a4-bed0-in-1
people back forth 3AN.PL8-gift.ITER7-3COREF7-TH5-NPST4-ITER0-AN.PL-1
‘People give it (among themselves) back and forth.’

NB! With oblique objects reflexives/reciprocals are formed by anaphoric pronouns.

2.5.2 Resultative (passive)

Ket has no regular morphological passive. However, certain stem types do have productive resultative derivations.

Possible ways to form stative resultatives:

1) insertion of the affix /a~aja/ in P1 (exx. 28, 30);
2) change of the base morpheme (such as base -to0 ‘put’ changed to stative resultative -ta0, cf. exx. 15 and 31);
An example of a resultative from a monotransitive:

(28) *avaro*
\[ a^4-b^3-a^1-do^0 \]
\[ NPST^4-3SG.N^3-RES^1-cut^0 \]
‘It is cut.’

Resultative is possible with some indirective ditransitives, as well. Indirective ditransitives built with the base *-bed^0* regularly form stative resultative stems by adding the affix /aja/ in P1:

(29) *áp hun/ qo’t qaruksajabet*
\[ āb hun qo’t qyd7-u^6-k^5-s^4-aja^1-bed^0 \]
1SG daughter already gift^7-3SG.F^6-TH^5-NPST^4-RES^1-make^0
‘My daughter is already given.’

However, resultative forms are impossible for GIVE (1,2).

Yet at least in one case of a verb with a double object construction, promotion of R/Goal argument to the resultative subject is possible. This can be seen with DRESS verbs. While *q5-dil0* ‘dress(3)’ which takes an indirective pattern has a resultative with T as subject (ex. 30), the secundative DRESS2 has a resultative with G as the subject (ex. 31).

(30) *du’i qiberali*
\[ du’i q5-(i)-b^3-a^1-dil^0 \]
hat TH^5-APPL^3-RES^1-dress^0
‘The hat is put on.’

(31) *du’i át bayapta*
\[ du’i ád ba^6-k^5-a^4-b^3-ta^0 \]
hat 1SG 1SG^6-TH^5-NPST^4-APPL^3-be.put^0
‘I am wearing a hat.’

Thus resultative formation is indirective in the case of Indirective ditransitives and secundative with DOC ditransitives.

**2.5.3 Questions**

No restrictions on questioning of nominal constituents, including T and R from a double object construction.

**2.5.4 Relativization**

Relativization by prenominal finite strategy (involving a fully finite verb is placed before the relativized constituent) is possible for subjects, (non-oblique) objects, and also for some obliques usually marked by “bare” cases.

---

2 Here belongs *-as* (Instrumental), *-bes* (Prosecutive), *-an* (Caritive), *-ka* (Locative). They attach to the noun stem without the genitive element *-d-*. 
With a double object GIVE, both objects can be relativized:

(32) ət denʼ dovijaq ke  t
[ād den  d{i}8-o4-b3-ij2aq] ke’d
[1SG money 1SG8-3SG.M4-APPL3-PST2-give] person
‘The man I gave money to.’

(33) ət biseb dovijaq denʼ
[ād biseb d{i}8-o4-b3-ij2aq] den
[1SG brother 1SG8-3SG.M4-APPL3-PST2-give] money
‘The money which I gave to my brother.’

With Indirective ditransitives only T can be relativized by gapping. The dative R if relativized is resumed
by a resumptive pronoun:

(34) ət dɛŋnaŋa tq ʌtnibet ɛsɬu
[ād denjanja d{i}8-qx̱d7-n2-i/bed] ɛsɬu
[1SG people-3AN.PL.DAT 1SG8-gift7-PST2-make] book
‘The book which I gave to the people.’

(35) ət ɛsɬa naŋa tq ʌtnibet d ɛˀŋ
[ād esla naŋa d{i}8-qx̱d7-o6-{k5}-n2-i/bed 0 ] de’ŋ
[1SG book 3AN.PL.DAT 1SG8-gift7-3SG.N6-TH5-PST2-make] people
‘The people to which I gave the book.’

Relativization by non-finite prenominal strategy (involving the so-called Infinitive) is possible for T in
Indirective constructions (ex. 36) and both for T and R in DOC constructions (exx. 37-38), the subject of
the relative clause is in GEN:

(36) əp ɛrʁat ke t
[āb edqat] ke’d
[my send] person
‘The person I sent.’

(37) ketda qɨl dɯ̄l’
[ked-da qɨl] dɯ̄l’
[person-GEN dress] child
‘The child the man dressed.’

(38) ketda qɨl dɯ̄’
[ked-da qɨl] dɯ̄’
[person-GEN dress] child
‘The hat the man (regularly) puts on.’

Thus relativization in both strategies is indirective (T behaves like P) with the indirective pattern, but
neutral in RCs formed from DOC (both T & R can be relativized).
2.5.5 Nominalization

Bare infinitives/nominalizations of the type:

(39) *dɯl'da târ binusut*

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{dɯl-da} \quad \text{tâd} \quad b \{ \text{in}^7 \cdot \text{b}^3 \} \cdot \text{n}^2 \cdot \text{qut}^0 \\
\text{child-GEN} \quad \text{beat} \quad R^7 \cdot \text{3SG.N}^3 \cdot \text{PST}^2 \cdot \text{finish}^0
\end{array}
\]

‘The beating of the child finished.’ or ‘The child finished beating.’

With nominalization built from monotransitives GEN argument may be either A or P. Alternatively P can be unmarked:

(40) *dûl târ binusut*

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{dûl} \quad \text{tâd} \quad b \{ \text{in}^7 \cdot \text{b}^3 \} \cdot \text{n}^2 \cdot \text{qut}^0 \\
\text{child} \quad \text{beat} \quad R^7 \cdot \text{3SG.N}^3 \cdot \text{PST}^2 \cdot \text{finish}^0
\end{array}
\]

‘The beating of the child finished.’

Thus, GEN can refer to A or P, a caseless NP refers only to P.

With ditransitives:

(41) *āb tāp deŋ-naŋa qɯren binusut*

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{āb} \quad \text{ta'b} \quad \text{den-naŋa} \quad \text{qud-en} \quad b \{ \text{in}^7 \cdot \text{b}^3 \} \cdot \text{n}^2 \cdot \text{qut}^0 \\
\text{my} \quad \text{dogs} \quad \text{people-3AN.PL.DAT} \quad \text{gift-ITER} \quad R^7 \cdot \text{3SG.N}^3 \cdot \text{PST}^2 \cdot \text{finish}^0
\end{array}
\]

‘My giving of dogs to people finished.’

Here like with monotransitives, T can be caseless or genitive (T=P), R will be dative (NB! this is GIVE3 which is indirective; GIVE1,2 do not have infinitives).

DRESS1 is the only DOC ditransitive which can have an infinitive:

(42) *āb dɯlda qar ʲa ŋ q īlʲ binusut*

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{āb} \quad \text{dɯl-da} \quad \text{qa} \quad \text{daŋ} \quad \text{qîlʲ} \quad \text{b} \{ \text{in}^7 \cdot \text{b}^3 \} \cdot \text{n}^2 \cdot \text{qut}^0 \\
\text{my} \quad \text{child-GEN} \quad \text{clothes} \quad \text{dress} \quad R^7 \cdot \text{3SG.N}^3 \cdot \text{PST}^2 \cdot \text{finish}^0
\end{array}
\]

‘My child’s dressing finished.’ or ‘I finished dressing my child.’

In this construction, both R and T (like P) can appear in the GEN; importantly however only T (like P) can appear caseless. This is then an indirective feature (P=T).

3. Diachronic issues

3.1 The origin of the applicative marker

- An open question: What is the role of the applicative marker in a ditransitive construction and how to explain its identity to the marker of inanimate patients of transitives?
(43) *ke’i da’n dubbet*

ke’d do’n du^8-b^3-bed^0

person knife 3SG.M^8-3SG.N^3-make^0

‘The man makes a knife.’

See also (ex. 17).

While some approaches (cf. Belimov 1991) do not consistently differentiate between different -b-markers, as shown by Vajda (2004), the use of -b- in GIVE1 cannot be regarded as an agreement marker:

- b^3-aq^0 ‘give(1)’ is also compatible with an animate theme, even if such constructions tend to be avoided.
- Note also that the applicative marker is retained in constructions with a pronominal object (when the construction switches to indirective if T is 1,2 person, see exx. 19-20).

Yet, it can be shown that diachronically the applicative marker is identical to the inanimate object marker (cf. Georg’s 2007 discussion of ‘petrified uses’ of -b-).

- The original identity of all the aforementioned varieties of -b- prefix is also still evident from morphological behavior: the -b- marker in all of its uses regularly disappears in imperatives (Georg 2007).

Note that cross-linguistically T in a ditransitive construction is usually inanimate; for some languages it has been noted that animate Ts are prohibited (cf. Baker 1996 on Mohawk), in other languages animate/pronominal Ts trigger an alignment switch (as is also case in Ket; see Malchukov, Haspelmath & Comrie 2007 for other languages).

3.2. Evolution of ditransitive constructions

The proposed diachronic scenario:
- DOC constructions

Verbs like GIVE(1,2) represent the first stage:

(44) *āt ōp ōks/ davaq*

ād ōb ōks d{i}^8-a^6-b^3-aq^0

1SG father stick 1SG^8-3SG.M^6-APPL^3-give^0

‘I give (my) father a stick.’

- Variable DOCs

Verbs like as t^5-a^4-b^3-kit^0 ‘rub’ represent an intermediate case:

a) it still allows for a double object construction:

(45) *bū is tv’ daāntabyit*

bū is tv’ da^8-an^6-t^5-a^4-b^3-kit^0

3SG fish salt 3SG.F^8-3AN.PL^6-TH^5-NPST^4-APPL^3-rub^0

‘She rubs fish with salt.’

NB! At the same time, t^5-a^4-b^3-kit^0 ‘rub’ can appear in an instrumental applicative construction:
(46) bū īs tyaː s1 daaŋtaːbyiːt

\[
bū īs \ tyaːs \ da^8-\text{-a}^5-a^4-b^3-\text{-kit}^0 \\
3SG \ fish \ \text{salt-INST} \ 3SG.F^8-3AN.PL^6-\text{-NPST}^4-\text{-APPL}^3-rub^0 \\
\]

‘She rubs fish with salt.’

b) if instrument is incorporated it can obviate the use of the applicative marker (cf. Vajda 2003: 81):

(47) bu is/ daaŋtaːyit

\[
bū īs \ da^8-\text{-ty}^7-a^5-a^4-\text{-kit}^0 \\
3SG \ fish \ 3SG.F^8-salt^7-3AN.PL^6-\text{-NPST}^4-rub^0 \\
\]

‘She salts fish.’

NB! Incorporation obviating the use of object agreement is regularly observed for monotransitives in Ket and is also common cross-linguistically.

- Instrumental applicative constructions

Other verbs (e.g. ɤla7-k5-b3-ta0 ‘drag’) can appear in instrumental constructions only:

(48) būŋ ət súǔlas dɤkabogdoviltaŋin

\[
būŋ \ að \ súǔl-as \ d{u}^8-ɤla^7-bo^6-k^5-d/o^4-b^3-l^2-ta^0-in^1 \\
3AN.PL \ 1SG \ \text{sledge-INST} \ 3AN.PL^8-out^7-1SG^6-\text{-NPST}^4-\text{-APPL}^3-\text{-PST}^2-\text{-drag}^0-\text{-AN.PL}^1 \\
\]

‘They dragged me outside by sled (once).’

NB! Change to instrumental construction may be due to language contact: imitation of the Russian pattern?

- Other verbs?

It remains unclear whether other verbs containing an “applicative” or “intensive” marker -b- can be traced back to the ditransitive double object construction.

Note that in some cases, restructuring should have affected agreement as well.

(49) ət tuw’s1 buɾe tan d eskomdaq

\[
əd \ tuw’s \ bude \ tan \ d{u}^8-es^7-k^5-o^4-b^3-n^2-\text{-daq}^0 \\
1SG \ stone \ his \ \text{in.direction} \ 1SG^8-up^7-\text{-PST}^4-\text{-INTENSE}^3-\text{-PST}^2-\text{-throw}^0 \\
\]

‘I threw a stone at him.’

Here restructuring affected agreement as well, insofar as the verb agrees with the theme/instrument, while originally it should have indexed the goal argument, as the presence of the applicative/intensive marker suggests. A concomitant change was a change in the status of the secondary (inanimate) object marker, which was dissociated from the case-marked nominal and acquires a a semi-formal status of the “applicative” or “intensive” markers.
4. Conclusions:

In general, these data suggest that originally the basic type of the ditransitive (and broader three argument) construction in Ket was a double object construction with both objects unmarked, and which used two different agreements slots for primary object (goal) and for the invariantly marked secondary object (theme/instrument). Subsequently the secundative pattern was partially reanalyzed with some ditransitives, with the secondary object marker retained in a semi-fossilized form of the “applicative” or “intensive” markers.

Qualification: a major diachronic question (which will be left open here) is whether for the period when the present day applicative markers were a full-fledged agreement a single verb form accommodated several object slots or there were several verbal components subsequently contracted.
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Glossing:
- ABL Ablative
- ADES Adessive
- AN animate
- APPL applicative
- CAUS causative
- COREF coreferential subject marker
- DAT Dative
- F feminine
- N inanimate
- IC involuntary causative
- INST Instrumental (Comitative)
- INTENSE intensifier
- INTR intransitive
- ITER ITERative
- M masculine
- MOM momentaneous
- NPST non-past
- PL plural
- PST past
- R semantics is not clear
- RES resultative
- SG singular
- TH thematic consonant
- TRANS transitive