

Fernando Zúñiga and Denis Creissels

1 Applicative constructions: An introductory overview

Abstract: This chapter presents and contextualizes the definition of applicative constructions used in the present book. (Although our definition is conservative in several respects, it is broader than some alternative definitions and narrower than others; in particular, we argue that a number of similar constructions are best regarded as look-alikes rather than as types of applicatives.) The chapter also surveys the main morphological, syntactic, and semantic parameters of variation of applicatives identified in the previous literature, and outlines the structural characteristics of the applicatives of Classical Nahuatl, the language for which the term was first used. Lastly, we provide a roadmap for the book and comment on its coverage and coherence.

1 Introduction

This chapter introduces the terminological and analytical prerequisites for the study of the phenomena at the center of attention in the present book. After this brief roadmap, Section 1 presents not only the definition of applicative constructions employed here but also the characteristics of several constructions that show both important similarities and crucial differences to them. Sections 2 through 4 survey the known variation of applicative constructions regarding morphology, syntax, and semantics, respectively. Section 5 outlines the applicatives of Classical Nahuatl, the language for whose description the term was first used. We have included this not only to show how multi-faceted applicativization can be, even in one single language, but also to prepare the reader for the kind of content and structure they will encounter in most of the chapters of the book. Section 6 presents the historical background of the term **APPLICATIVE** and discusses some relevant aspects of its present-day usage. Lastly, Section 7 comments on the structure, the scope, and the coherence of the book as a whole.

Acknowledgments: We are indebted to Peter Arkadiev, Donna Gerdts, and Monica Macaulay for their comments on the position paper that evolved into this chapter, as well as to the series editors for their comments on a previous version of the chapter. Many thanks also go to Drew Hancock-Teed, Jean Rohleder and especially Kevin Negele for their valuable help with the formatting of many chapters of the book.

1.1 Applicatives defined

An APPLICATIVE CONSTRUCTION (henceforth: AC) is defined here in opposition to a BASE CONSTRUCTION (henceforth: BC) with respect to several formal features, including those of one particular constituent of the former that bears a non-agentive semantic role, namely the APPLIED PHRASE (henceforth: AppP; see also Creissels, forthcoming). Example (1) from a Tlacolula Valley Zapotec variety illustrates such an opposition with a clause pair that most present-day linguists consider an instance of applicativization. In (1a), the co-Agent *Jwaany* ‘John’ is the AppP, an argument in P role of the clause headed by the applicativized verb ‘sing with’. The same participant is expressed as an optional adjunct (*cěhnn Jwaany* ‘with John’) in (1b), where the verb is in its base, non-derived, form and simply means ‘sing’:

- (1) San Lucas Quiaviní Zapotec (Zapotecan; Munro 2000: 285–286, glosses adapted)
- a. *B-i’lly-nèe Gye’eihlly [Jwaany]*.
 PERF-sing-APPL M. J.
 ‘Mike sang with John.’ (AC)
 - b. *B-i’lly Gye’eihlly [cěhnn Jwaany]*.
 PERF-sing M. with J.
 ‘Mike sang with John.’ (BC)

This conforms to the following definition, which we use in the present chapter and in the rest of the book:

The base construction (BC) and the applicative construction (AC) are related as follows:

- i) The predicates in both constructions are built upon the same root, but the one in the AC bears additional overt marking that distinguishes it from the one in the BC.
- ii) The participant encoded as S or A in the BC appears as S or A in the AC.
- iii) The AC includes a noun phrase in a role other than S or A, the applied phrase (AppP), which refers to a participant that either requires a non-core coding in the BC different from its coding in the AC or cannot be expressed at all in the BC.

We follow mainstream usage whenever there is no potential confusion and employ the term APPLICATIVE as shorthand for either an applicative construction (e.g., the whole clause in [1a]) or an applicative marker (e.g., the verbal suffix *-nèe* in [1a]).

One morphological feature of ACs, namely the marking asymmetry between the predicates, is treated disparately in the literature: it is an almost constant hallmark of ACs in functional-typological studies but not a criterial feature in some strands of formalist studies (see § 6.2). Other features of ACs, like their productivity, morphological regularity, and semantic predictability, are typically assumed to be present but rarely characterize the construction per se. Periphrastic constructions can be subsumed under our definition insofar as they show evidence of monoclausality. Nevertheless, as with

other periphrastic voices (see, for instance, the abundant literature on periphrastic causatives), it may be difficult to draw the line between a bona fide periphrastic applicative and a biclausal construction that is merely the translational equivalent of an AC.

One syntactic feature of ACs, namely the syntactic status of the constituents corresponding to the same referent in the different constructions, shows variation that is entwined with the defining traits of the construction and is addressed in Sections 1.2 and 3. Our definition uses the syntactic roles S and A; they correspond to the single essential argument of (a major subclass of) monovalent predicates and to the agentive argument of prototypical bivalent predicates, respectively. The other three roles used in our model of syntax are A's patientive counterpart P (i.e., a direct or primary object), a "dative role" D found with trivalent predicates and indirective alignment (i.e., an indirect object), and an ordinary oblique role X; these non-S/A roles are addressed in the context of applicativization in Section 3.1. All these comparative concepts used in alignment typology are understood here as in what Haspelmath (2011) calls the "Comrian approach" (Comrie 1989; Lazard 1994; Creissels 2006); specifically, A and P are "syntactic terms whose prototypes are defined in semantic terms" (Comrie 1989: 111). We use terms like SUBJECT and OBJECT, which refer to language-and-construction-particular alignment patterns, only language-specifically.

Applicativization is a subtype of verb-coded valency alternation: more specifically, several of its subtypes are special cases of NUCLEATIVIZATION, that is, an operation that allows participants not encoded as core terms in the base construction to be encoded as such in the derived construction. We elaborate on this contextualization in Section 6, after reviewing the variation of applicatives in Sections 2 through 4.

1.2 What applicatives are not: Lookalikes

Applicative lookalike constructions (henceforth: ALC) are either syntactically or morphologically similar to true ACs. We discuss them in turn in what follows.

1.2.1 Syntactic lookalikes

Pairs of constructions whose syntactic make-up conforms to the above definition of an AC-BC pair, but whose morphology does not, come in several types, depending on the formal relationship holding between the predicates of the two constructions involved (Comrie et al. 2015; Creissels, forthcoming). The alternation between the predicates of both clauses can be coded or uncoded, and asymmetrical or symmetrical. Table 1 summarizes the possibilities; the numbered examples provided further down are cross-referenced in the table. Applicativization appears in the upper left-hand cell; the alternations listed in the other cells correspond to different syntactic lookalike types.

Table 1: Morphological marking of ACs and syntactic lookalikes.

	CODED (“VOICE”)	UNCODED
ASYMMETRICAL	Privative marking: Applicativization (1)–(2)	—
SYMMETRICAL	– Suppletivism (3) – Equipollent marking (4)	Flexivalency (5)–(9)

The applicatives discussed in the functional-typological literature typically correspond to the PRIVATIVE-MARKING alternation type, in which the AC predicate shows higher morphological complexity than the BC predicate—more precisely, an element analyzable as an applicative marker, which in turn leads to a voice alternation.¹ Examples (1) above and (2) below illustrate such an opposition:²

- (2) Boumaa Fijian (Oceanic; Dixon 1988: 45)
- a. *E-la’o-va a suka a marama.*
 3SG.SBJ-go-APPL DEF sugar DEF woman
 ‘The woman is going for sugar.’ (AC)
- b. *E-la’o a marama.*
 3SG.SBJ-go DEF woman
 ‘The woman is going.’ (BC)

By contrast, the SUPPLETIVE alternation type consists in the predicates showing a formal difference that cannot be analyzed as a particular instance of some regular pattern. Instead of arbitrarily postulating a transitivizing (= applicativizing) or detransitivizing (= antipassivizing) “suppletive derivation”, it seems best to treat such pairs as simply alternating. (The abbreviation in inverted commas “BC” here and elsewhere signifies that that construction is the equivalent of the base construction if its counterpart were an applicative.) The following example illustrates this case:

- (3) Akhvakh (Northeast Caucasian; p.k.)
- a. *Riḷ’i q’am-a!*
 meat eat-IMP
 ‘Eat some/the meat!’ (ALC)

¹ Since it is not a syntactic lookalike of applicativization, we are glossing over the latter’s mirror image here, namely antipassivization (where the undirected predicate is morphologically more complex than its directed counterpart, as in Mandinka *dómó-rì* ‘eat [INTR]’ vs. *dómò* ‘eat [TR]’). See Creissels (forthcoming: Ch. 10) for more details.

² The marker *-va* can have other functions in Fijian, but we gloss polysemous markers in this chapter according to their function in the example under discussion. The same applies to Indonesian *-kan* in (40)/(43)/(44), for instance, which can also function as a causative.

- b. *Ūk-a!*
eat-IMP
'Eat!' ('BC')

In other cases, the predicates in both clauses also show the same number of morphemes, but neither predicate is zero-marked for voice; rather, they are EQUIPOLLENTLY MARKED; the predicates themselves are not unmarked, but the alternation is not morphologically oriented (i.e., the marking of the predicates provides no evidence that one of the constructions is basic and the other one derived). For instance, in (4), both predicates take a so-called final suffix: the “benefactive” transitive animate *-o* in (4a) and the animate intransitive *-aa* in (4b).³ (Note that the argument to analyze the verb stem ending in *-o* as somehow derived from any of the related verb stems is semantic, or possibly syntactic, rather than morphological.⁴ Compare this formal opposition to the Blackfoot applicative *-omo* in [31].)

- (4) Blackfoot (Algonquian; Frantz 2009: 102, glosses adapted)
- a. *Iihpómm-o-yii-wa-áyi* *ónnikis-i*
PST.buy-TA-DIR-3SG.PROX-3SG milk-NSPEC
'S/he bought (some) milk for him/her.' (ALC)
- b. *Iihpómm-aa-wa* *ónnikis-i*
PST.buy-AI-3SG.PROX milk-NSPEC
'S/he bought (some) milk.' ('BC')

With the last valency alternation type, both predicates show the same degree of morphological complexity (i.e., neither predicate is marked for voice), and instead of an applicative voice alternation there is a FLEXIVALENCY ALTERNATION (Martin Haspelmath, p.c.; Creissels, forthcoming: Ch. 15; Heidinger 2019 uses the related term “polyvalency” instead). PREDICATE LABILITY—more precisely: ambitransitivity—can be either weak or strong (Creissels 2014). With the former, the alternating clauses differ formally only with respect to the presence vs. absence of an argument NP (e.g., *Evan drinks tea* vs. *Evan drinks*). With the latter, the alternating clauses differ formally in other respects as well (most notably, in the coding of the shared argument NP in both clauses; e.g., *Gareth*

3 *Ónnikii* ‘(some) milk’ is a secondary object in both the AC and the BC—a grammatical relation that does not trigger indexing on the verb; the suffix *-wa* indexes the subject in both clauses. Primary objects appear indexed on the verb when non-3rd-person (but the 3rd-person AppP in [4a], an instance of such a primary object, is visible only via the direct marker *-(y)ii*, which implicitly signals syntactic transitivity). The 3sg index *-áyi* refers to the primary object, but the conditions governing its appearance are unconnected to applicativization (see Frantz 2009: Ch. 9).

4 There are four related verb stems meaning ‘buy’ in Blackfoot, namely animate intransitive (AIO) *ohpomm-aa* ‘buy (things)’, transitive inanimate (TI) *ohpomm-atoo* ‘buy (inanimate)’, and two transitive animate (TA) stems, namely *ohpomm-at* ‘buy (animate)’ and *ohpomm-o* ‘buy (things/inanimate/animate) for (animate)’.

broke the vase vs. *the vase broke*). In the case of weak lability, as in the English conative alternation (5) and benefactive alternation (6), the only formal difference between both clauses is the syntactic asymmetry regarding the phrase expressing the non-agentive participant (and its flagging).

- (5) English (Germanic; Levin 2015: 64)
- a. *Kelly kicked the intruder.* (ALC)
 - b. *Kelly kicked (at the intruder).* (“BC”)
- (6) English (p.k.)
- a. *Alun baked Gwen cookies.* (ALC)
 - b. *Alun baked cookies (for Gwen).* (“BC”)

Something analogous is found in the German dative alternation in (7), where the 2nd-person indirect object *dir* ‘(to) you’ (7a) contrasts with the oblique *an dich* ‘to you’ (7b), and in the English alternation in (8), where the non-agentive participant is an oblique in both clauses, albeit with different flagging (viz. *for* vs. *instead of*). In both instances, the verb remains unaltered:

- (7) German (Germanic; p.k.)
- a. *Ich schrieb dir den Brief.*
1SG.NOM wrote[1SG] 2SG.DAT ART.M.SG.ACC letter
‘I wrote you the letter.’ (ALC)
 - b. *Ich schrieb den Brief an dich.*
1SG.NOM wrote[1SG] ART.M.SG.ACC letter on/to 2SG.ACC
‘I wrote the letter to you.’ (“BC”)
- (8) English (p.k.)
- a. *Caitlín spoke up for the deputy.* (ALC)
 - b. *Caitlín spoke up instead of the deputy.* (“BC”)

In the case of strong lability, as in the Mandinka alternation in (9), there is also some marking difference between the clauses (here: the aspectual markers *yè* and *-tá*), but that difference does not relate the predicates derivationally to each other:

- (9) Mandinka (Mande; p.k.)
- a. *Díndíyò yè ń jélè.*
child.DEF COMPL.TR 1SG laugh
‘The child made fun of me.’ (ALC)
 - b. *Díndíyò jélè-tá.*
child.DEF laugh-COMPL.INTR
‘The child laughed.’ (“BC”)

1.2.2 Morphological lookalikes

Constructions whose morphological make-up corresponds to that of an AC, but some other features of which (e.g., systematicity or syntax) do not, also come in several types. Consider the overview in Table 2; the numbered examples provided further down are cross-referenced in the table.

Table 2: Main morphological lookalike subtypes.

CHARACTERISTIC		LABEL
Non-compositional meaning		Lexicalized applicatives (10)
No unmarked predicate		Applicative deponents (11)
No valency change	Semantic effect	Syntax-neutral intensification (12b)
	Pragmatic effect	Oblique registration (14b/d), (17), (18b)

First, verbal markers that applicativize some predicates can also irregularly and/or unproductively appear in so-called LEXICALIZED APPLICATIVES.⁵ Compare the semantic roles of the German direct object in the regular pair *steigen* ‘climb (INTR)’ vs. *besteigen* ‘climb (TR)’ with their counterparts in the irregular pairs in (10):

- (10) German (p.k.)
- | | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| <i>dürfen</i> ‘may, be allowed to’ | <i>bedürfen</i> ‘need, require’ (formal) |
| <i>kennen</i> ‘know (sb.)’ | <i>bekennen</i> ‘confess, admit’ |
| <i>kommen</i> ‘come’ | <i>bekommen</i> ‘receive’ |
| <i>schreiben</i> ‘write’ | <i>beschreiben</i> ‘describe’ |

Despite the suggestive morphology of the derived predicates, and perhaps even a syntax comparable to that of bona fide ACs, the semantics of such pairs is unpredictable. (See Zúñiga, Arkadiev, and Hegedűs, this volume, for more data and references regarding such German phenomena.)

Second, it is not uncommon to find APPLICATIVE DEPONENTS (also called *applicativa tantum*), that is, verbs that only occur with the marker that distinguishes base and applicativized versions of other verbs. For example, the following German *be*-prefixing verbs lack counterparts without that prefix:

- (11) German (p.k.)
- | | |
|---|------------------------|
| <i>beabsichtigen</i> ‘intend’ | * <i>absichtigen</i> |
| <i>beanspruchen</i> ‘claim, require, demand’ | * <i>anspruchen</i> |
| <i>bejahen</i> ‘affirm, approve’ | * <i>jahen</i> |
| <i>bewerkstelligen</i> ‘accomplish, put into execution’ | * <i>werkstelligen</i> |

⁵ See Pacchiarotti (2020: 104f) on the lexicalized “pseudo-applicatives” of Tswana in this context.

Third, the applicative-like marker can distinguish two related clauses without there being an applied phrase, that is, predicate derivation may not bring about valency modulation. Consider that it is cross-linguistically common for a given morphological element to fulfill distinct functions in a particular language. On the one hand, the element in question may be an applicative marker in constructions that fully meet the definition of applicative construction given above. On the other hand, a homophonous element may be found in constructions where its presence marks a term of the clause as prominent in one way or another, without affecting its coding, or the coding of any other term. Such constructions are like applicative constructions as conceptualized here in that both operate on non-nuclear participants (i.e., participants other than those coded as A, S, or P in the base construction), or on circumstantials (i.e., participants bearing peripheral semantic roles). They are unlike applicative constructions, however, in that they do not involve a valency alternation.

This phenomenon appears to come in at least two distinct guises. In the first, the contrast between the marked and unmarked clauses is semantic and orbits notions like aspect (e.g., completion, repetition, iteration, or continuativity) and manner (e.g., intensity, persistence, or excess). Such constructions might be called instances of SYNTAX-NEUTRAL INTENSIFICATION. The pair in (12) illustrates such a case, where the applicative marker *-ir* appears in both (12a) and (12b) accommodating the AppP ‘the children’, but the second instance of *-ir* in (12b) does not introduce another AppP:

- (12) Nyole (Bantu JE.35; Wicks 2006: 107)
- a. *Ba-hayuh-ir-a* *aba-ana*.
3.SBJ.II-shout-APPL-FV II-child
‘They shout at the children.’ (AC)
 - b. *Ba-hayuh-ir-ir-a* *aba-ana*.
3.SBJ.II-shout-APPL-ASP-FV II-child
‘They are always shouting at the children.’ (ALC on AC)

Compare this with (13), where the applicative *-ñma* introduces an AppP every time it is suffixed to the verb; there is one AppP in (9b) (*Kuan* ‘Juan’) and two AppPs in (9c) (*Kuan* ‘Juan’ and *tañi fotüm* ‘his son’):

- (13) Mapudungun (isolate; based on Salas 2006: 122)
- a. *Weñe-i* *waka*.
steal-IND[3.SBJ] cow
‘S/he stole a/the cow.’ (BC)
 - b. *Weñe-ñma-fi-i* *waka Kuan*.
steal-APPL-3.OBJ-IND[3.SBJ] cow J.
‘S/he stole a/the cow from Juan.’ (AC)

- c. *Weñe-ñma-ñma-fi-i waka Kuan tañi foṭüm.*
 steal-APPL-APPL-3.OBJ-IND[3.SBJ] cow J. 3.PSR son.of.man
 ‘S/he stole a/the cow from Juan’s son.’ (AC on AC)

The second kind of valency-neutral applicative-like marking serves a chiefly pragmatic purpose. For instance, in the following examples, *mó sifápáánòṅ* ‘on a cross’ is an adjunct in both (14a) and (14b); in the latter, however, the adjunct is focused and actually obligatory. Note that the same verb can occur with the applicative marker in an AC (14c), and even with both the applicative and the applicative-like focus marker stacked (14d):

(14) Tswana (p.k.)

- a. *Dzísú ú-nè à-sw-á (mó sifápáánò-ṅ).*
 I.J. 3.SBJ.I-AUX 3.SBJ.I-die-FV LOC VII-cross-LOC
 ‘Jesus died (on a cross).’ (BC)
- b. *Dzísú ú-nè à-sw-él-à mó sifápáánò-ṅ.*
 I.J. 3.SBJ.I-AUX 3.SBJ.I-die-FOC-FV LOC VII-cross-LOC
 ‘Jesus died on a cross.’ (ALC)
- c. *Dzísú ú-nè à-rí-sw-él-à.*
 I.J. 3.SBJ.I-AUX 3.SBJ.I-1PL.OBJ-die-APPL-FV
 ‘Jesus died for us.’ (AC)
- d. *Dzísú ú-nè à-rí-sw-él-él-à mó sifápáánò-ṅ.*
 I.J. 3.SBJ.I-AUX 3.SBJ.I-1PL.OBJ-die-APPL-FOC-FV LOC VII-cross-LOC
 ‘Jesus died for us on a cross.’ (ALC on AC)

In order to avoid confusion in the discussion of markers that act as applicative markers in some of their uses only—as we did for the Nyole semantically-motivated clause alternation shown in (12)—we use the term **OBLIQUE-REGISTRATION CONSTRUCTION** for constructions involving verbal coding of the pragmatic prominence of an oblique without any change in the structure of the clause, like the one illustrated in (14). The term **REGISTERED OBLIQUE** can be used for the phrase whose pragmatic status is highlighted. (The alternative terms “oblique-highlighting construction” and “highlighted oblique”, respectively, could also be used.)⁶

⁶ An alternative terminology distinguishes “promotional applicativization proper” from “non-promotional registration applicativization” (see Hernández-Green 2016 for some references). Nevertheless, Nichols (1992) and many later studies use **REGISTRATION** in a different sense, according to which most default applicative markers are instances of registration (i.e., they do not express any features of the dependent—like person, gender, or number of the AppP—on the verbal head), as opposed to indexation (i.e., they do express some features of the dependent on the head). See also Pacchiarotti’s (2020) Type-D applicatives for Bantu in the context of valency neutrality.

Further consider Examples (15)–(17) below from three Mayan languages, where clauses with a fronted and focused constituent expressing a machete (bearing the semantic role of Instrument) and whose predicate takes the marker *-b'e* contrast with simple clauses with the machete as a postverbal adjunct (omitted here). In K'iche' (15), the result of the *b'e*-operation is an AC with the Instrument *ch'üich'* 'machete' promoted to primary object. In Tz'utujil (16), the resulting AC looks just like the one in (15), but the Instrument *machat* 'machete' is actually a secondary object (among other things, it is not cross-referenced on the verb). Lastly, in Kaqchikel (17), the result of *b'e*-suffixation is not applicativization, since the fronted participant is still an adjunct with instrumental marking (*rik'in*), despite the applicative-like verbal marking (see Mora-Marín 2003 for the individual analyses):

- (15) K'iche' (Mayan; Kaufman 1990: 78)

Ch'üich' k-Ø-in-rami-b'e-j lee chee'.
 machete INCOMPL-3SG.P-1SG.A-cut-APPL-TR DET wood
 'A machete is what I cut the wood with.' (AC)

- (16) Tz'utujil (Mayan; Dayley 1981: 27)

Machat x-in-re-ch'oy-b'e-ej.
 machete COMPL-1SG.P-3SG.A-cut-APPL-TR
 'It was a machete that he cut me with.' (AC)

- (17) Kaqchikel (Mayan; Dayley 1981: 27)

R-ik'in jun machät x-i-ru-sok-b'e-j.
 3SG-INS a machete COMPL-1SG.P-3SG.A-wound-OBLREG-TR
 'With a machete he wounded me.' (ALC)

Finally, note that Examples (15)–(17) above from Quichean Mayan show a situation where applicativization and oblique registration appear in different languages. Some Oaxaca Mixean languages are remarkable because applicativization and oblique registration coexist there in the same language; Zavala (2015) convincingly argues that this is the case in the Mixean varieties spoken in Totontepec and Tamazulápam. In (18) from the latter, for instance, a monotransitive base verb *ja:p* 'shovel' occurs in three alternating constructions. In the first two, we find the Instrument as a non-core participant and the element *më:t* 'with', occurring as a preposition in (18a) and as a so-called preverb in (18b). In (18c), however, the Instrument is a primary object, that is, it is in P role. Therefore, the verbal prefix *të-* has two related but distinct functions in the language: it is an oblique-registration marker in (18b) and an applicative marker in (18c):

- (18) Tamazulápam Mixe (Mixe-Zoquean; Zavala 2015: 214–215)

a. *N-ja:p-py më:t päl.*
 1.A-shovel-INCOMPL.INDEP with shovel

- b. *Päl mē:t n-tē-ja:p-y.*
shovel with 1.A-OBLREG:INS-shovel-INCOMPL.DEP
- c. *Päl n-tē-ja:p-py.*
shovel 1.A-APPL-shovel-INCOMPL.INDEP
- All three: ‘I shoveled it.’ (Sp. *lo levanté con la pala* in the original)

1.2.3 Summary

Table 3 below schematically summarizes an important part of the constructional space covered by applicatives and lookalikes. (Lexicalized applicatives are not included here; the numbered examples provided in §§ 1.2.1–1.2.2 are cross-referenced in the table.)

The vantage point / reference construction is represented by cell (a) in the table and consists of an [S/A V (X)] clause, which features an argument in S/A role, a predicate—represented as V for convenience here—and either an X argument in oblique role (in the case of an optional applicative) or nothing (in the case of an obligatory applicative).⁷ The prime symbol (') represents formal differences in the predicate (V vs. V'; these differences must be privative) and the oblique (X vs. X'; these differences can be of any kind). This constructional space is structured through four binary distinctions. The first two are morphological and consist of the formal opposition between unmarked and marked predicates (viz. the two columns) and the difference in formal marking between the two obliques X and X' (viz. the first and second rows). The other two distinctions are syntactic and concern the status of the non-S/A argument, that is, the distinction between oblique and non-oblique on the one hand and the one between non-core and core on the other (viz. the second, third, and fourth rows).

Table 3: Selected applicatives and applicative lookalikes.

Non-S/A argument		Predicate morphology	
		Unmarked	Marked
Oblique		(a) S/A V (X)	(e) S/A V' (X) (12b) and (14b)
		(b) S/A V X' (8a)	(f) S/A V' X'
Non-oblique	Non-core	(c) S/A V D (7a)	(g) S/A V' D
	Core	(d) S/A V P (5a), (6a), and (9a)	(h) S/A V' P

⁷ For reasons of readability, Table 3 ignores the following detail: the reference construction may also feature an argument in P role that undergoes no change, unless another argument is installed or promoted in P-role, in which case the initial P may be demoted depending on language-specific rules.

The non-shaded cells (f)–(h) represent different syntactic types of applicatives (viz. those promoting or installing either a core argument in P role, a non-core, non-oblique, argument in D role, or an oblique argument in X role). Cell (h) actually represents one of the narrowest definitions of the phenomenon: having both overt predicate marking and P status for the non-S/A argument.

The shaded cells (b)–(e) represent different kinds of lookalikes. Cells (b)–(d) represent syntactic lookalikes that participate in uncoded alternations with (a); the morphosyntactic status of the argument in non-S/A role in these clauses shows variation, but the predicate is invariably unmarked. One kind of morphological lookalike is only indirectly represented in the table: applicative deponents are found in constructions of the types (f)–(h) when there is no (a)-construction because the unmarked verb is not in use. Cell (e) represents a morphological lookalike of a different kind: the predicate bears applicative-like marking, but the syntactic status of the non-S/A argument in the clause in question and in the vantage clause in (a) are the same. That clause structure is the product of what we have labeled “syntax-neutral intensification” and “oblique registration” here (distinguishing the two subtypes we identified in § 1.2.2).

2 Morphological variation in applicative constructions

The main parameters of morphological variation in ACs are the wordhood status (§ 2.1), the grammaticalization status (§ 2.2), the allomorphy (§ 2.3), and the specificity (§ 2.4) of applicative markers.

2.1 Wordhood

The grammatical/morphosyntactic and phonological/prosodic autonomy of applicative markers shows variation. As a rough first approximation, markers can be either completely dependent (i.e., affixes) or completely autonomous (e.g., verbs or particles). They can also fall in between: they can be grammatically autonomous but phonologically dependent (i.e., clitics), or grammatically dependent but phonologically autonomous (i.e., “unclitics”, as per Woodbury 2011, or “anticlitics”, as per Zúñiga 2014). All examples of applicatives provided hitherto illustrate the affixal type; some exceptions are given in Section 2.2.

2.2 Grammaticalization status of applicative markers

Incipient applicative markers may be virtually indistinguishable from their lexical etymons, which, if they are verbs, may head their own clause. Markers that have evolved further along Hopper and Traugott's (2003) "cline of grammaticality", however, may retain part of their semantic content and morphosyntactic features but occur as functional, rather than as fully lexical, elements in monoclausal constructions. A special case of this consists in APPLICATIVE PERIPHRASES (Creissels 2010). These may be either serial verb constructions, as in Baule (19), or converbal constructions. In one subtype of the latter, the functional verb (e.g., a verb of giving) appears in a finite form while the lexical verb appears as a converb, as in Marathi (20), Japanese, and many other languages. In the other subtype, the lexical verb appears in a finite form while the functional element is a converb, as in Mankon (21); this seems to be a much rarer pattern.

- (19) Baule (Kwa; Creissels and Kouadio 2010: 34)

Ákísí à-tòn duô à-màn Kòfí.
A. PERF-cook yam PERF-give K.
'Akissi has cooked yam for Kofi.'

- (20) Marathi (Indo-Aryan; Pardeshi 1998: 147–148)

Rām-ne Sītā-lā bāg zāḍ-ūn di-l-ī.
R.-ERG S.-DAT garden(F) sweep-CVB give-PST-SG.F
'Ram swept the garden for Sita.'

- (21) Mankon (Grassfields Bantu; Leroy 2003: 459)

Mà m'í fà?á y'á mbó zúú.
1SG FUT work give.NFIN to 3SG.ENUNC
'I will work for him.'

Note that the coverage of the present book is skewed toward grammaticalized affixal applicatives. Only few chapters address applicativizing particles (in European languages), compound applicatives (in Papuan and Kiranti languages), or applicativizing particles and auxiliaries (in Cushitic languages).

2.3 Allomorphy

Some applicative markers are invariable, like English *out-* in *outgrow* and Mapudungun *-tu* in *illkutun* 'get angry with'. Others show phonologically conditioned allomorphy, like Mapudungun *-ñma* in (13) above: roughly, the marker appears as *-ñma* after vowels, as

-*ma* after glides and some other sonorant non-vocoids, and as -*ũñma* elsewhere.⁸ Like other grammatical markers, applicatives sometimes fuse with adjacent formatives in some languages.

Yet other markers show grammatically conditioned allomorphy. For instance, while the primary applicative -*omo* of Blackfoot in (31) below is invariable, several of the secondary applicatives are not. The locative applicative is *ist-* in the imperative and *it-* elsewhere. The associative applicative is *iihp-* word-initially, *omohp-* immediately after personal prefixes, and *ohp-* elsewhere (as in [29] below). Lastly, the allomorphs *iiht-*, *omoht-*, and *oht-* of a marker targeting several different semantic roles follow the same allomorphy rules as the associative applicative (Frantz 2009: 92–94); Example (31b) illustrates the second of these allomorphs, whereas the following examples illustrate the first (22a) and the third (22b):

- (22) Blackfoot (Frantz 2009: 92, glosses adapted)
- a. *Iiht-waawayáki-aa-wa* *miistsís-i*.
PST\SEC.APPL-hit.TA-DIR-3SG.PROX stick-NSPEC
‘S/he was hit with/by a stick.’
 - b. *Nit-yáak-oht-waahkayi* *áipottaa-wa*.
1-FUT-SEC.APPL-go.home.AI plane-PROX.SG
‘I’ll go home by plane.’

Finally, some applicatives show lexically conditioned allomorphy. The benefactive/malefactive applicative of Aguaruna, for instance, is -*tu* for some verbs (23a) and -*hu* for others (23b):

- (23) Aguaruna (Chicham; Overall 2017: 303, 320)
- a. *Ami=na bala=na iŋki-tu-hama-ka-mĩ*.
2SG=ACC bullet=ACC put.in-APPL-2.OBJ-PFV-3.REC.PST.DECL
‘He’s loaded his gun (to shoot) you.’
 - b. *Wi numi=na tsupi-hu-ka-ta-himi-i*.
1SG wood=ACC cut-APPL-PFV-IMM.FUT-1→2PL-DECL
‘I will cut wood for you (PL).’

2.4 Specificity of applicative markers

Applicative markers can be dedicated or polysemous. Well-known cases in which the markers may also have other, arguably related, functions in the same language include those that applicativize some verbs but passivize, antipassivize, causativize, or decaus-

⁸ See Zúñiga (2009, this volume) for more details.

ativize others. See Zúñiga and Kittilä (2019: § 8.2.1) for a brief overview and some references. See also Malchukov (2015, 2016) for more on such “voice ambivalence” / “ambivalent voice”, and Bahrt (2021) for an in-depth study of co-expression patterns of voice markers / valency operators (for applicatives, see §§ 4.3.1, 4.4, 5.2.3, 5.3.3, and 7.6 therein, as well as Malchukov 2017).

For instance, *-aʔam* can either applicativize or antipassivize the same verb *qʔətx^w* ‘burn’ in Sliammon (24):

(24) Sliammon (Coast Salishan; Watanabe 2015: 1331, 1327)

- a. *Qʔətx^w-əx^w-Ø=č* *šə=θ=pipa-h-ut.*
burn-NTR-3.OBJ=1SG.SBJ.IND DET=2SG.PSR=paper-EP-PST
‘I burned your paper.’
- b. *Qʔətx^w-aʔam-θi=tʰəm* *ʔə=tə=pəp-pipa.*
burn-APPL-CTR:2SG.OBJ=1SG.SBJ.IND.FUT OBL=DET=PL-paper
‘I will burn the paper for you (sg).’
- c. *Qʔətx^w-aʔam=č* *ʔə=tə=pipa.*
burn-ANTIP=1SG.SBJ.IND OBL=DET=paper
‘I burn paper.’

Likewise, *-esh* can either applicativize or causativize the same verb *-men* ‘break’ in Kinyarwanda (25):

(25) Kinyarwanda (Bantu JD.61; Jerro 2017: 753)

- a. *Habimana y-a-men-a* *igi-kombe.*
H.(I) 3.SBJ.I-PST-break-IPFV VII-cup
‘Habimana broke the cup.’
- b. *Habimana y-a-men-esh-eje* *igi-kombe in-koni.*
H.(I) 3.SBJ.I-PST-break-APPL-PFV VII-cup IX-stick
‘Habimana broke the cup with a stick.’
- c. *Habimana y-a-men-esh-eje* *umw-ana igi-kombe.*
H.(I) 3.SBJ.I-PST-break-CAUS-PFV I-child VII-cup
‘Habimana made the child break the cup.’

The use of the same marker for applicative and causative constructions is particularly frequent cross-linguistically. Labels usually employed in the literature in order to refer to the phenomenon include “causative/applicative syncretism” (Shibatani and Pardeshi 2002: 116–122), “applicative/causative isomorphism” (Peterson 2007: 64–68, 133–140), “causative-applicative polysemy” (Malchukov 2017: 403; Creissels, forthcoming: Ch. 14.4.1), and “causative-applicative syncretism” (Bahrt 2021: 93–96); a slightly different term has been proposed by Croft (2022: 285): “causative-applicative co-expression”.

It is common to find lexical restrictions on such co-expression patterns. For instance, while many Kinyarwanda verbs from several semantic verb classes allow

both the instrumental-applicative and the causative interpretation of *-esh*, patientive intransitives (e.g., *rumbur-* ‘bloom’) usually exclude the former, and transitives that entail the use of an Instrument (e.g., *kat-* ‘cut’) typically exclude the latter (Jerro 2017: 757). Similarly, the Walapai verbal suffix *-(w)o* applicativizes agentive intransitives like ‘sing’ (26a–b) and transitives like ‘make’ (26c–d) but causativizes patientive intransitives like ‘cry’ (26e–f):

(26) Walapai (Yuman; Ichihashi-Nakayama 1996: 228–231)

- a. *Jean-ch swa:d-k-i.*
J.-SBJ sing-3-AUX
‘Jean is singing.’
- b. *Jean-ch ba ma-swa:d-o-y-k-i.*
J.-SBJ PL.OBJ 3→2-sing-APPL-FUT-3-AUX
‘Jean will sing for you all.’
- c. *Nya-ch he’ yo:v-wi-ny.*
1SG-SBJ dress make-AUX-PST
‘I made a dress.’
- d. *Nya-ch he’ nyi-yo:v-ò-wi-ny.*
1SG-SBJ dress 1→2-make-APPL-AUX-PST
‘I made you a dress.’
- e. *Nya-ch mi:-yi.*
1SG-SBJ cry-AUX
‘I am crying.’
- f. *Ma:-ch nya mi-mi:-wo-ng-wi-ny.*
2SG-SBJ 1SG 2→1-cry-CAUS-2-AUX-PST
‘You made me cry.’

See Section 3.4 for instances in which it is the intransitive-transitive divide that plays a central role in the distribution of such co-expression patterns.

3 Syntactic variation in applicative constructions

The main syntactic parameters along which applicative constructions vary are the status of the applied phrase (§ 3.1) and the status of the participant bearing the same semantic role as the applied phrase in the base construction (§ 3.2). Other important parameters are the status of different objects in the applicative construction (§ 3.3) and the sensitivity of applicatives to predicate valency (§ 3.4).

3.1 Status of the AppP in the AC

In most of the examples given hitherto, the AppP is encoded as P. ACs with AppPs that are syntactically less prominent include arguments in D role (i.e., indirect objects or “datives” with the Recipient of verbs of giving as semantic prototype, and whose coding differs from the one of the direct object while sharing with it some properties that make it more core-like than oblique-like; see Creissels, forthcoming), as well as those in an oblique X role. For comparative purposes, then, we can distinguish between P-, D-, and X-APPLICATIVES.⁹ For descriptive, language-specific purposes, we may use traditional terminology and distinguish between DIRECT, PRIMARY, INDIRECT, SECONDARY, and OBLIQUE APPLICATIVES.

Examples of D-applicatives are found in Kartvelian and Northwest Caucasian. In the following sentence pair, for instance, the Beneficiary is encoded differently from the argument in P role in (27a)—*st’at’ia* ‘(an) article’—and is outside the clausal core (i.e., it is an adjunct) in (27b):¹⁰

- (27) Georgian (Kartvelian; Manana Topadze, p.c.)
- a. *Da-v-u-ts’er-e* *bavšv-s* *st’at’ia*.
 PVB-1SG-APPL-write-1SG.AOR child-DAT article[NOM]
 ‘I wrote an article for the child.’ (AC)
 - b. *Da-v-ts’er-e* *st’at’ia* (*bavšv-isa-tvis*).
 PVB-1SG-write-1SG.AOR article[NOM] child-GEN-for
 ‘I wrote an article (for the child).’ (BC)

Examples of X-applicatives are found in Atlantic languages. In Seereer (28), for instance, the base verb *-ret* ‘go’ takes an argument expressing Destination (optionally marked by the semantically underspecified preposition *na* in [28a]) and cannot take a Source argument unless applicativized. Note, however, that the coding of the latter argument is even less P-like in (28b) than in (28a), *na* now being obligatory:

- (28) Seereer (Atlantic; Renaudier 2012: 183)
- a. *A-ret-a* (*na*) *marse*.
 3SG.SBJ-go-COMPL PREP market
 ‘S/he went to the market.’ (BC)
 - b. *A-ret-it-a* *na* *marse*.
 3SG.SBJ-go-APPL-COMPL PREP market
 ‘S/he left the market.’ (AC)

⁹ Creissels (forthcoming) also uses P-, D-, and X-applicatives, but the latter type specifically refers to constructions expressing a participant that cannot appear in the BC.

¹⁰ The markers *u-* (3rd person) and *i-* (1st/2nd person) are called “version” markers in Georgian studies; see Tuite (this volume).

A different brand of X-applicatives can be found in Algonquian languages. In Examples (22) above and (29) below from Blackfoot, as well as in Example (30) below from Ojibwe, for instance, the introduced participant can be expressed in a monoclausal construction only as an AppP; the latter is a Comitative ('with that book') in (29) and bears a less usual semantic role ('in the form of a man') in (30). This constituent is arguably a secondary object in Blackfoot, which seems to lack bona fide obliques; Rhodes (2010) shows that the Ojibwe AppP is less syntactically prominent than a secondary object but more like a core argument than an adjunct:¹¹

- (29) Blackfoot (Algonquian; Frantz 2009: 92; underlying form and glosses adapted)

Yáak-ohp-innisi'yi-yi-aaw om-yi sináákia'tsis-yi.

FUT-SEC.APPL-fall.AI-3PL-3PL DEM-INAN.SG book-INAN.SG

'They will fall with that book.'

- (30) Ojibwe (Algonquian; Rhodes 2010: 306)

Aniniw-ing=sh go naa o-gii#iN-aabam-aa-an

man-LOC=PTCL PTCL PTCL 3.A-PST#APPL-see.TA-3.P.ANIM-OBV

aniwi manidoo-an.

this.OBV spirit-OBV

'He saw the spirit in the form of a man.' (AC)

Some languages have distinct applicatives that allow different kinds of AppPs, as illustrated in (31) from Blackfoot. In (31a), the P-applicative / primary applicative marker *-omo* follows the verb stem and introduces a Beneficiary as primary object;¹² in (31b), the X-applicative / secondary applicative marker *omoht-* precedes the verb stem and introduces a Source as secondary object:

- (31) Blackfoot (Frantz 2009: 103, 93, glosses adapted)

a. *Nit-ii-yIssksipist-omo-aa-wa n-itáakkaa-wa w-óta's-iksi.*

1-PST-tie.TA-PRI.APPL-DIR-3SG.PROX 1-partner-PROX.SG 3-mount-PL.ANIM

'I tied up his horses for my partner.'

b. *N-omoht-o'too Lethbridge.*

1-SEC.APPL-arrive.AI L.

'I came from Lethbridge.'

¹¹ Rhodes (2010) calls this grammatical relation "relative root complement" and the oblique applicative marker "relative root". Frantz (2009) calls Blackfoot secondary applicative markers like *ohp-* in (29) and *omoht-* in (31b) "linkers" and does not address the syntax of the arguments they introduce.

¹² Blackfoot has both an equipollent benefactive marker *-o* (4a) and a benefactive applicative *-omo* (31a). The former is the only so-called final suffix on the stem while the latter is always added to another final; all the related stems meaning 'tie' (viz. transitive animate *yIssksip-ist-*, transitive inanimate *yIssksip-i-*, and animate intransitive *yIssksip-ist-aki-*) feature final suffixes of their own.

Finally, consider the following example from a variety of Southern Quechua:

- (32) Ayacucho Quechua (Quechuan; Parker 1969: 71)

Ñuqa-paq rima(-pu-wa)-nqa.

1SG-for speak-APPL-1.OBJ-3.SBJ.FUT

‘S/he will speak for me (in my stead or on my behalf).’

The sentence is also grammatical without the applicative *-pu* and the 1st-person-object marker *-wa* on the verb, in which case the constituent *ñuqapaq* ‘for me’ is simply an optional adjunct. With those two suffixes, however, the status of the non-agentive constituent in the clause cannot be unambiguously characterized; it is neither a run-of-the-mill object (since such arguments take either accusative *-ta*, allative *-man* or perhaps even sociative *-wan* instead of benefactive *-paq*) nor a simple oblique (since such constituents do not trigger object marking on the verb). The status and the distribution of such apparent morphology-syntax mismatches are under-researched topics.

More generally, little is known about the distribution and the evolution of different syntactic types of applicatives. Further research should also explore the extent to which ACs conform to or deviate from the rest of the morphosyntactic patterns of any given language, that is, the extent to which some ACs are best seen as subtypes of clause types already present, as novel clause types complementing the existent ones, or as something else entirely.

3.2 Status of the semantic equivalent of the AppP in the BC

In Example (1) from Zapotec, the co-Agent is an adjunct in the base construction. Nevertheless, the participant corresponding to the applied phrase may be obligatorily absent from the base construction, as in (33) from Tswana. In the latter language, the only way to express a participant with the role of Beneficiary in a monoclausal construction is via the AC:

- (33) Tswana (p.k.)

a. *Kì-tlàà-bérék-él-à Kìtsó màitsibù:á.*

1SG-FUT-work-APPL-FV K(I) evening(VI)

‘I’ll work for Kitso this evening.’ (AC)

b. *Kì-tlàà-bérék-á màitsibù:á.*

1SG-FUT-work-FV evening(VI)

‘I’ll work this evening.’ (BC)

Terminologically, we capture the difference between cases like those like Zapotec in (1) and those like Tswana in (33) by distinguishing OPTIONAL from OBLIGATORY APPLICATIVES.¹³

The participant bearing the same semantic role as the AppP in the BC may also occur as a low-prominence object, as in (34) below. Rather than being a double-object construction (henceforth: DOC),¹⁴ the BC in (34b) has a P argument (*Schokolade* ‘chocolate’, a direct object in the accusative) and a D argument (*den Kindern* ‘to the children’, an indirect object in the dative):

- (34) German (p.k.)
- a. *Wir be-schenk-en die Kind-er mit Schokolade.*
 1PL.NOM APPL-give.as.gift-1PL ART.ACC.PL child-PL[ACC] with chocolate
 ‘We present the children with chocolate as a gift.’ (AC)
 - b. *Wir schenk-en den Kind-er-n Schokolade.*
 1PL.NOM give.as.gift-1PL ART.DAT.PL child-PL-DAT chocolate
 ‘We give the children chocolate as a gift.’ (BC)

Table 4 below summarizes the different applicative types discussed based on the syntactic status of the participant corresponding to the applied phrase.

Table 4: Status of the AppP participant.

Status in BC		
Status in AC	X (optional)	— (obligatory)
	P	P-APPL
	D	D-APPL
	X (?)	X-APPL

The two cells at the bottom of the table merit special attention. The one on the right-hand side is what Creissels (forthcoming) calls “X-applicative” (see Footnote 9) and is illustrated in (35); the pot in which the porridge is to be cooked is expressed as an X in the AC but cannot be expressed in the BC:

¹³ Alternative terminologies distinguish “dynamic applicatives” from “non-dynamic applicatives” (Donohue 2003) and “applicatives” from “objectives” (Cysouw 2023). See also Pacchiarotti’s (2020) Type-B and Type-A applicatives.

¹⁴ The term usually refers to clauses with two morphologically indistinguishable objects. Further note that the comparative term “double-P construction” is narrower, because it refers to instances in which both non-S/A arguments show the coding properties that characterize P’s (not D’s) in monotransitive clauses.

(35) Tswana (p.k.)

- a. *Lòrátsó 'ú-tláá-àpè-èl-à mò-tòχó mó pìtsé-ḡ*
 L.(I) 3SBJ.I-FUT-cook-APPL-FV SG-porridge(III) LOC pot(IX)-LOC
é 'tô:nà.
 LK.IX big.IX
 'Lorato will cook the porridge in the big pot.' (AC)
- b. *Lòrátsó 'ú-tláá-àpàj-à mò-tò:χó.*
 L.(I) 3SBJ.I-FUT-cook-FV SG-porridge(III)
 'Lorato will cook the porridge.' (BC)

The cell on the left-hand side could logically exist, but we are not aware of any concrete instances in which the participant in question can appear as oblique in both BC and AC, specifically with a different coding.

Further research should explore whether present-day obligatory applicatives may have originated in erstwhile optional constructions (and the BC has ceased to be used with a counterpart of the applied phrase of the AC, for instance). Alternatively, ACs may begin as obligatory and become optional later, perhaps constrained by lexical or grammatical factors. Some data from the languages of Senegal suggest that language contact may play a role, with sporadic occurrences of prepositional coding of Beneficiaries modeled after another language in more or less pidginized varieties of languages that normally code beneficiaries via an obligatory P-applicative construction.

3.3 Status of different objects in the AC

Some P-applicative constructions are DOCs; in such cases, the literature has captured similarities and differences in the status of those two objects (i.e., two P's) via the terminological distinction between SYMMETRY and ASYMMETRY. Some authors distinguish between SYMMETRIC and ASYMMETRIC APPLICATIVES (e.g., Pytkänen 2008) while others distinguish more generally between SYMMETRICAL-OBJECT and ASYMMETRICAL-OBJECT LANGUAGES (e.g., Bresnan and Moshi 1993). The following examples from Kikuyu (36) and Chingoni (37) illustrate the difference between the two types. Despite the superficial similarity of the postverbal constituents in both sentences, diagnostics regarding constituent order rigidity, passivization, and indexing show that the two objects in (36) are equally prominent, whereas the object closest to the verb in (37) (*vandu* 'people') outranks the rightmost constituent (*ugimbi* 'beer'):

(36) Kikuyu (Bantu E51; Ngonyani and Githinji 2006: 35)

- Mũ-geni a-ra-gũr-ĩ-ire ci-ana mũ-bira.*
 I-guest 3.SBJ.I-PROG-buy-APPL-ASP VIII-child III-ball
 'The guest bought children a ball.'

- (37) Chingoni (Bantu N12; Ngonyani and Githinji 2006: 35)

M-geni i-gul-i va-ndu u-gimbi.
 I-guest PRS-buy-APPL II-person XIV-beer
 ‘The guest is buying beer for people.’

DOCs may be restricted or even absent in a given language. In such cases, ACs may be almost valency-neutral, as in (34) above, where the BC has P and D arguments (a direct and an indirect object), and the AC has a P and an X instead (a direct and an oblique object). Alternatively, they may be REDIRECTING, as in (38) below, where the P and the X argument (the direct and the oblique objects) merely become rearranged semantically and the operation is valency-neutral (see also § 3.4):

- (38) German (p.k.)

- a. *Wir be-sprüh-te-n die Pflanzen mit Pestizid.*
 1PL.NOM APPL-spray-PST-1PL ART.ACC.PL plant-PL with pesticide
 ‘We sprayed the plants with pesticide.’ (AC)
- b. *Wir sprüh-te-n Pestizid auf die Pflanz-en.*
 1PL.NOM spray-PST-1PL pesticide on ART.ACC.PL plant-PL
 ‘We sprayed pesticide on the plants.’ (BC)

3.4 Sensitivity to syntactic valency

This parameter refers to the number of core syntactic arguments in the base construction. In (39) below, for instance, the base predicate is syntactically monovalent and has no objects; since the psych verb *illku* ‘get angry’ has only two semantic arguments (viz. Experiencer and Stimulus), the BC has no other non-agentive participants that might be core syntactic arguments; *ñi chaw mew* ‘with my father’ in (39b) is an optional adjunct. (The clause can also include adjuncts expressing spatiotemporal Locations, but these are not relevant in the present context.)

- (39) Mapudungun (p.k.)

- a. *Illku-tu-fi-n ñi chaw*
 get.angry-APPL-3.OBJ-1SG.IND 1SG.PSR father
 ‘I got angry with my father.’ (AC)
- b. *Illku-n (ñi chaw mew).*
 get.angry-1SG.IND 1SG.PSR father POSTP
 ‘I got angry (with my father).’ (BC)

ACs with syntactically bivalent BC counterparts are by no means rare, as shown in Polinsky (2013) and Moroz and Polinsky (this volume). Example (40) illustrates an instance where the AC has two objects (*teman saya* ‘my friend’ and *nasi gorengnya* ‘the fried

transitivization device (i.e., applicable to both), etc., and later become either more freely applicable or more limited. Further research may unearth clear cases of ACs extending their applicability range due to contact.

Table 5 below summarizes the different applicative types discussed above based on the valency of both related clauses. REDIRECTING APPLICATIVES are valency-neutral and occupy the top-left-to-bottom-right, shaded, diagonal (the 1-1 cell is logically empty, since applicatives do not introduce arguments in S/A role). TRANSITIVIZING APPLICATIVES are valency-increasing and occupy the cells immediately below the previous diagonal. The cell corresponding to $v_3 \rightarrow v_2$ operations is a special case of detransitivization (e.g., with German *schchenken/beschenken* ‘give as a gift’ in [34]).

Table 5: Valency correspondences.

		BC valency		
		1	2	3
AC valency	1			
	2	MONOTR	REDIR	DETR
	3		DITR	REDIR
	4			TRITR

4 Semantic variation in applicative constructions

The parameter of semantic variation that has received most attention in the literature is whether the semantic role of the AppP has to be inferred from the context or is denoted by the particular construction (§ 4.1). A parameter that has received disparate treatment in the literature is the kind of semantic role borne by the AppP (§ 4.2).

4.1 Semantic role specificity

Broad applicatives are not difficult to find; Indonesian *-kan*, for instance, derives not only benefactive (as in [40] above) but also instrumental applicatives:

(43) Indonesian (Sneddon 1996: 79)

- a. *Dia meng-ikat-kan tali ke anjing.*
 3SG AV-tie-APPL rope to dog
 ‘He tied the rope to the dog.’ (AC)
- b. *Dia meng-ikat anjing dengan tali.*
 3SG AV-tie dog with rope
 ‘He tied up the dog with a rope.’ (BC)

Peterson (2007: 39) calls such constructions—“when a single applicative marker refers to multiple thematic participant types (regardless of whether or not these participants are treated identically in terms of morphosyntax)”—GENERALIZED APPLICATIVES. Note that the term covers not only instances where a particular marker can applicativize the same predicate with different semantics but also those where the marker behaves differently with predicates from different classes (e.g., valency classes).¹⁵

Further note that Indonesian *-kan* can function as a benefactive/instrumental applicative with monotransitives, as in (43) above, but as an (optional) “antibenefactive” marker with ditransitives, as in (44) below. The construction in (44b) promotes the Theme and demotes the Recipient vis-à-vis the DOC in (44a):

(44) Indonesian (Chung 1983: 234, cited in Malchukov 2017: 18)

- a. *Ali beri [wanita itu] [surat].*
A. give woman the letter
‘Ali gave the woman a letter.’
- b. *Ali beri(-kan) [surat] [kepada wanita itu].*
A. give-APPL letter to woman the
‘Ali gave a letter to the woman.’

Malchukov (2017: 17–21) calls this phenomenon “applicative reversal” (and considers it a special case of his “markedness reversal”).

Semantically specific applicatives are easy to find as well, especially those that introduce Beneficiaries, Instruments, accompanying Agents/Themes, and Locations (Peterson 2007). Hakha Lai is particularly interesting in that it has not only the cross-linguistically common benefactive, instrumental, and comitative applicatives but also a series of idiosyncratic and rare applicatives, namely additional-benefactive *-tseʔm* (45a), malefactive-allative *-hnoʔ* (45b), prioritive *-kaʔn* (45c), and relinquitive *-taak* (45d):

(45) Hakha Lai (Tibeto-Burman; Peterson 2007: 41, 19)

- a. *Thij ʔa-ka-laak-tseʔm.*
wood 3SG.SBJ-1SG.OBJ-carry-APPL₁
‘He carried wood for me (in addition to carrying wood for himself).’
- b. *Kheej ʔa-ka-hloʔn-hnoʔ.*
dish 3SG.SBJ-1SG.OBJ-throw-APPL₂
‘She threw the dish at me.’

¹⁵ Note Gil’s even broader notion: “A *generalized voice marker* is a marker M which, when applied to form X, marks the argument of X bearing the thematic role T as having a set of properties P” (2002: 276, emphasis in the original). This author sees such voice markers as ranging from “weak” to “strong”, depending on how many properties—for instance, morphosyntactic subject properties—the target argument shows. The term is also used differently by some theoretical studies, where additional aspects of the grammar-and-lexicon architecture are relevant (see, e.g., Svenonius 2014; but cf. Polinsky, this volume).

- c. *Booy ?a-ka-toon-kaʔn.*
 chief 3SG.SBJ-1SG.OBJ-meet-APPL₃
 ‘He met the chief ahead of / before me.’
- d. *?a-law ?a-ka-thloʔ-taak.*
 3SG.PSR-field 3SG.SBJ-1SG.OBJ-weed-APPL₄
 ‘He left me and weeded his field.’

Just as benefactive and malefactive applicatives are sometimes distinguished overtly (as in Amharic; see Amberber, this volume), the comitative type cannot be simply lumped together with what Messerschmidt (2022), following Melnar (1998), labels “portative”. With the (rather broad) comitative type, the AppP is “understood to be a co-participant with the subject in the performance of the action described by the verb” (Peterson 2007: 18); see Example (1) above and Example (46) below from Hakha Lai:

- (46) Hakha Lai (Peterson 2007: 18)
Ka-law ?an-ka-thloʔ-pii.
 1SG.PSR-field 3PL.SBJ-1SG.OBJ-weed-APPL
 ‘They weeded my field (together) with me.’

By contrast, the (narrower) portative type found in Caddoan languages and Osage occurs with motion verbs and allows the derived predicate to take an argument in P role that is portrayed as being carried by an Agent that is also a Theme (i.e., an Agent-cum-Theme argument) in S/A role, that is, as a Patient that is also a Theme (i.e., a Patient-cum-Theme).¹⁶ See the following illustration of the use of portative-applicative *ni-* in Caddo with the verb *wid(i)-* ‘arrive’:

- (47) Caddo (Caddoan; Melnar 1998: 170)
- a. *Kac’ikán=?awi-wid-ah.*
 PRIOR.QUOT=ABS.SG-arrive-PERF
 ‘They say he’s (already) here.’
- b. *Ni-wid-ah.*
 APPL-arrive-PERF
 ‘He brought it.’ (Lit. ‘He arrived carrying it.’)

¹⁶ The semantics of *ni-* and its allomorphs is probably broader in Caddoan, as seen from instances where the applicative marker co-occurs with a prefix denoting an animate Patient: ‘arrive’, ‘come’, and ‘go’ all become ‘follow’ then (see Rood 1976:72 for Wichita and Melnar 1998: 171 for Caddo). Messerschmidt herself cites a similar example from Sierra Popoluca, where the addressee is told to ‘take (= APPL+go) a dog’ and ‘bring (= APPL+come) a man’, and “it can be really difficult to tell [...] whether it is a sociative causative, a portative or a comitative construction” (2022: 176).

Among the many cross-linguistic generalizations discussed in Peterson (2007: 202–230), one that has become received wisdom in studies of valency and voice is the implicational relationship between different semantic roles. AppPs denoting Locations and those expressing Causes presuppose the existence of other applicatives, while instrumental, comitative, and benefactive/malefactive applicatives occur alone much more freely, “as anchors, as it were, for the development of distinct morphology (via extension of already existing applicative morphology or by grammaticalization of independent applicative constructions)” (p. 229). From this perspective, the exact synchronic distributions and diachronic connections between different applicatives in the same language and linguistic group are particularly interesting.

4.2 Semantic role kind

Semantic roles can be seen as central or peripheral, either in binary terms or along a continuum of involvement (Lehmann 2006). Central, maximally involved, roles are constitutive of the state of affairs and include Agents, Forces, Themes, and Patients. Peripheral, rather loosely involved, roles presuppose the presence of central ones and include Comitatives, Instruments, and Beneficiaries. Other roles, like Sources, Goals, Recipients, and Experiencers, occupy an intermediate zone.

Lehmann (2006) and many other studies have noted the cross-linguistic tendency for central roles to be granted core argument status in the syntax and for peripheral roles to be routinely expressed as oblique objects or adjuncts. Accordingly, there seems to be a cross-linguistic tendency for ACs to work on peripheral roles; Comitatives, Instruments, and Beneficiaries are indeed the most common roles with applicatives worldwide (Peterson 2007). ACs that are supposedly less common work on central roles like Themes and Patients, as illustrated by the following Tolai example:¹⁷

(48) Tolai (Oceanic; Mosel 1991: 248)

- a. *A vavina i mim=e ra tava.*
 ART woman 3.SBJ drink=APPL ART water
 ‘The woman drank the water.’ (AC)
- b. *A vavina i momo.*
 ART woman 3.SBJ drink
 ‘The woman drank (something).’ (BC)

¹⁷ Messerschmidt (2022) reanalyzes some causatives and other applicatives as portative applicatives, which leads her to regard the latter construction—which has a Patient-cum-Theme in P role—as frequent: she finds it in 22 out of 49 languages in her convenience sample (second only to benefactive applicatives, with 27 languages, and significantly outranking her third type, viz. locative-directional applicatives, with 10).

Finally, consider the question of the exact interpretation of the semantic role of the AppP. The literature has often noted that German *be*-ACs are systematically close, but not identical, semantic counterparts of their BCs. In the following pair, for instance, the old house is a Location in (49a) but rather a (non-prototypical) Patient in (49b). Some studies have claimed, however, that this HOLISM EFFECT may well be the result of direct object status and/or accusative coding, rather than of applicativization per se (Wechsler 2015: 308–309):

(49) German (p.k.)

- a. *Wir wohn-te-n damals in ein-em alt-en Haus.*
 1PL.NOM dwell-PST-1PL at.the.time in one-DAT old-DAT.SG house
 ‘We lived at the time in an old house.’ (BC)
- b. *Wir be-wohn-te-n damals ein alt-es Haus.*
 1PL.NOM APPL-dwell-PST-1PL at.the.time one[ACC] old-ACC.SG house
 ‘We occupied at the time an old house.’ (AC)

That the exact interpretation of the semantic role of the AppP can be related to the applicative marker, however, is seen in (50), where *ihr Auto* ‘their car’ is an accusative-marked direct object in both versions. In (50a), with *packen* ‘pack’, the Millers pack the inside of their car; in (50b), with *bepacken* ‘pack’, the object is interpreted as covering both the trunk and the top of their car:

(50) German (based on Brinkmann 1997: 58–59)

- a. *Müllers packen ihr Auto immer als blieben sie ein halbes Jahr lang weg.*
 b. *Müllers bepacken ihr Auto immer als blieben sie ein halbes Jahr lang weg.*
 Both: ‘The Millers pack their car as if they will be away for half a year.’

This effect seems to be a special case of a more general topological restriction placed on German *be*-verbs: the *be*-AC “resists interpretations in which the event denotes movement into the interior of an object”—an “exteriority constraint” (Wechsler 2015: 309). If the outlet in (51a) and the glass in (51b) are interpreted as (atypically) referring to the exterior of the corresponding entities, the clauses are grammatical; if they are intended to refer to their interior, they are not:

(51) German (Brinkmann 1997: 58)

- a. *Ted be-wirft [die Wand] / ^(*)[den Abfluss] (mit Dreck).*
 T. APPL-throws ART wall ART outlet with dirt
 Lit. ‘Ted throws the wall / the outlet with dirt.’
- b. *Sue be-gießt [den Braten] / ^(*)[das Glas] (mit Wasser).*
 S. APPL-pours ART roast ART glass with water
 Lit. ‘Sue pours the roast / the glass with water.’

5 Applicatives and applicative lookalikes in Classical Nahuatl

This section outlines applicativization in the language for whose description the term was first introduced (see § 6.1 for an outline of the term's subsequent history). We do not provide an introduction to Classical Nahuatl as a languoid here, but we otherwise follow the same blueprint as many chapters of the present book: we first provide the basics of Nahuatl clause and verb structure required for the discussion of applicatives (§ 5.1); then we list morphological (§ 5.2), syntactic (§ 5.3), and semantic hallmarks of applicatives in the language (§ 5.4); lastly, we make some remarks on the most prominent lookalikes found (§ 5.5). All examples given here are from Launey (1979: 192–209); translations are from the English version of that work by Christopher Mackay (Launey 2011: 202–221). For the description and analysis of applicatives, we consulted both that source and Launey (1994: 195–199). The reader is referred to Newman (1967), Sullivan (1988), and Andrews (2003) for other sources that present a very similar view of applicativization in the language.

5.1 Basics of Nahuatl morphosyntax

5.1.1 Core argument realization

In Classical Nahuatl, the existence of a grammatical relation “subject” conflating the single argument of monovalent verbs and the most Agent-like argument of bivalent verbs is uncontroversial. Neither subjects nor objects are flagged. 1st- and 2nd-person subjects are obligatorily indexed by means of prefixes (which are also used for non-verbal predicates), and there is no overt 3rd-person subject prefix; irrespective of person, subject plurality is marked by a suffix. Objects of monotransitive verbs and primary objects of ditransitive verbs are obligatorily indexed by means of markers from a paradigm that differs from the one used for subjects and includes a non-zero form for 3rd person. More generally, primary objects of ditransitive verbs behave identically to objects of monotransitive verbs. Secondary objects of ditransitive verbs share a number of properties with primary objects (including accessibility to antipassivization) but differ from them in other respects. The basic constituent order in verbal clauses is VSO, but discursively salient subjects or objects (either topicalized or focalized) can move to preverbal position.

5.1.2 Morphological structure of verbal predicates

The structure of Classical Nahuatl verb forms can be schematized as a sequence of morphological slots. Tables 6 and 7 below give an overview of the main fillers found in the slots that precede and follow the root, respectively.

Table 6: Pre-root slots of Nahuatl verb forms.

-8	-7	-6	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0
SBJ	OBJ	PL	DIREC	MID	ANTIP ₁	ANTIP ₂	IN	Root

The first three preradical slots correspond to argument indexes. Slot -8 can be filled by a subject index of first and second person; no overt marker occurs in this slot with a third-person subject. The imperative marker *x(i)-* (which implies a second-person subject) can also occupy this slot. Slot -7 can be filled by an object index. With transitive verbs, an overt object index obligatorily occurs in this slot with all persons. With ditransitive verbs, only the primary object is indexed. Slot -6 can be occupied by *im-*, which marks 3PL objects (either primary or secondary).¹⁸ Slot -5 can be occupied by a directional marker.

Slots -4 through -2 correspond to voice categories. Slot -4 can be filled by the middle voice marker (viz. *no-* with a 1SG subject, *to-* with a 1PL subject, *mo-* with a 2nd- or 3rd-person subject, and *ne-* in the “impersonal middle”, i.e., if the passive marker is also included in the verb form). Slots -3 and -2 can be filled by the human antipassive marker *tē-* and the non-human antipassive marker *tla-*, respectively.

Lastly, the slot immediately preceding the root can be filled by an incorporated nominal lexeme.

Table 7: Post-root slots of Nahuatl verb forms.

0	1	2	3	4	5
Root	CAUS	APPL	PASS	TAM	PL

The first three postradical slots also correspond to voice categories. Slot 1 can be filled by the causative marker *-(l)tia*.¹⁹ Slot 2 can be filled by the applicative marker, which has the allomorphs *-lia*, *-ia*, *-huia*, or *-lhuia*. Slot 3 can be filled by the impersonal marker *-hua* or the passive marker *-lo*, the uses of which overlap to some extent.

Slot 4 can be filled by a variety of TAM suffixes, including the so-called participial suffix (which by itself expresses a value that can be labeled “narrative past”),²⁰ the sequence [z- + participial suffix] (which expresses the value “future”), the incomplete past marker *-ya*, the potential marker *-ni*, and others (Launey 1994: 29).

¹⁸ The marking of object plurality by means of *im-* is not governed by the plurality of referents, but by plurality marking on the corresponding object NP. The general Nahuatl rule (which allows for some exceptions) is that only animate NPs can be marked for plural.

¹⁹ *-tia* is generally used for causatives of intransitives, and *-ltia* for causatives of transitives, but there are exceptions.

²⁰ The “participial suffix” selects a special form of the verb stem and has four distinct allomorphs (including a zero allomorph).

The final slot can be occupied by a formative marking subject plurality. Subject plurality is obligatorily marked in this slot, whereas subject singularity is not overtly marked.²¹

In addition to the morphological slots listed above, the verb form may be preceded by particles that are not attached to the verb morphologically, but have limited mobility and contribute to the expression of grammaticalized TAM values. These particles include *ō* (conventionally written as if it were a prefix), which, in combination with the “participial suffix” in the TAM slot, expresses a perfect meaning; the optative particle *mā* and its negative counterpart *mācamo*; *ye* ‘already’; and *oc* ‘still’.

5.1.3 Some remarks on ditransitive verbs and causativization

Two successive object indexes in the same verb form are not allowed, but a prefix *im*-marking 3PL objects may encode the plurality of two distinct participants. This justifies the recognition of ditransitive verbs—such as *maca* ‘give (sth.) to (sb.)’ or *ilhuia* ‘tell (sth.) to (sb.)’—which have a primary object (indexed) and a secondary object (not indexed).

The primary object represents an animate Goal. The secondary object (the Theme) shares with the primary object the lack of flagging, plurality marking on the verb, and accessibility to antipassivization. Unlike the primary object, the secondary object is not accessible to passivization.

Causatives of intransitive verbs behave like regular underived monotransitive verbs, with the causee in the role of object. Causatives of transitives behave like regular ditransitive verbs, with the causee in the role of primary object and the initial object in the role of secondary object.

5.2 The morphology of Nahuatl applicatives

The applicative suffixes are *-lia*, *-ia*, *-huia* and *-lhuia*; the former is the most common one. They do not differ semantically; their distribution is partly determined by the phonological nature of the ending of the stem to which they attach, but there is some free variation between them. These markers may not only trigger modifications of the stem but also undergo morphophonological modifications triggered by the formative that follows them.

Exceptionally, applicative constructions can be marked by a suffix identical to the causative suffix *-tia*, as in *cuīca-tia* ‘sing for (sb.)’ < *cuīca* ‘sing’ and *nāmac-tia* ‘sell (sth.) to (sb.)’ < *nāmaca* ‘sell (sth.)’.

²¹ As with object plurality marking, the marking of subject plurality by means of this suffix is not governed by the plurality of referents, but by plurality marking on the corresponding subject NP.

- b. *Cāmpa ni-c-no-cuī-lī-z* *in no-tlātlacōl?*
 where 1SG.SBJ-3.OBJ-MID-take-APPL-FUT DEF 1SG-food
 ‘Where shall I get food for myself?’ (Launey 1979: 196)

Example (56) illustrates the applicativization of a causative construction.

- (56) Classical Nahuatl (Launey 2011: 209)
Ti-nēch-in-cua-ltī-lia *nacatl in no-pil-huān-totōn.*
 2SG.SBJ-1SG.OBJ-PL-eat-CAUS-APPL meat DEF 1SG-child-CSTR.PL-DIM.PL
 ‘You are making my children eat meat.’

5.3 The syntax of Nahuatl applicatives

Classical Nahuatl applicatives are P-applicatives. In general (but not always, see Examples [63]–[64] below), they can be characterized as obligatory applicatives that increase the valency of the verb. Applicativization is possible for both intransitive and transitive verbs, but it is more productive with the latter. The possibility of applicativization of ditransitive verbs is not mentioned in the sources.

Applicativization converts intransitive BCs into monotransitive ACs with the applied phrase in the role of object (57); see also Example (67) in Section 6.1.

- (57) Classical Nahuatl (Launey 2011: 204)
- a. *Ni-tlaxtlāhua.*
 1SG.SBJ-pay
 ‘I pay.’
 - b. *Ni-mitz-tlaxtlāhu-ia.*
 1SG.SBJ-2SG.OBJ-pay-APPL
 ‘I pay you.’

Applicativization also turns transitive BCs into ditransitive ACs with the applied phrase in the role of primary object and the initial object encoded as the secondary object, as in (58)–(59).

- (58) Classical Nahuatl (Launey 2011: 205)
- a. *Ni-c-cui* *in tomin.*
 1SG.SBJ-3.OBJ-take DEF money
 ‘I take the money.’
 - b. *Ni-mitz-cuī-lia* *in tomin.*
 1SG.SBJ-2SG.OBJ-take-APPL DEF money
 ‘I take the money from you.’

(59) Classical Nahuatl (Launey 2011: 204)

- a. *Ni-qu-ixca* *tōtoltetl*.
 1SG.SBJ-3.OBJ-fry egg
 ‘I am frying eggs.’
- b. *Ni-mitz-ixqu-ia* *tōtoltetl*.
 1SG.SBJ-2SG.OBJ-fry-APPL egg
 ‘I am frying eggs for you.’

Applicatives from intransitives behave like underived monotransitive verbs, and applicatives from transitives behave like underived ditransitive verbs.

5.4 The semantics of Nahuatl applicatives

Applied objects mostly express the semantic roles of Beneficiary/Maleficiary, and more generally animate Goals. These roles include those implied by the lexical meaning of the verb, and consequently cannot be deemed “non-essential”, as in Example (57) above with ‘pay’. Launey (1994) provides additional examples with ‘declare (sth. to sb.)’, ‘send (sth. to sb.)’ and ‘throw (sth. to sb.)’.

A comitative meaning is possible with some verbs, for example ‘share’ > ‘share with’:

(60) Classical Nahuatl (Launey 2011: 206)

- Ō-ni-c-xelō* *in nacatl*. —
 PERF-1SG.SBJ-3.OBJ-share.PST DEF meat
Ākin ō-ti-c-xel-huī?
 who PERF-2SG.SBJ-3.OBJ-share-APPL.PST
 ‘I shared out the meat. — Who did you share it out with?’

Inanimate applied objects expressing ‘up to’ or ‘beyond’ are found with motion verbs:

(61) Classical Nahuatl (Launey 2011: 207)

- Ō-ni-c-chol-huī* *in ātoyatl*.
 PERF-2SG.SBJ-3.OBJ-flee-APPL.PST DEF river
 ‘I fled to the other side of the river.’

There are also isolated cases of inanimate applied objects that do not seem to lend themselves to semantic generalizations:

(62) Classical Nahuatl

- a. *Ni-c-chōqui-lia* *in no-tlātlacōl*.
 2SG.SBJ-3.OBJ-cry-APPL DEF 1SG-sin
 ‘I cry for (with reference to) my sins.’ (Launey 2011: 207)

- b. *Xi-c-tlāli-li* *iztatl in ātl.*
 IMP-3.OBJ-put-APPL.IMP salt DEF water
 ‘Put salt in the water.’ (Launey 1979: 200, 394)

A particularity of Classical Nahuatl applicativization is that objects modified by an adnominal possessor show a strong tendency to occur in an applicative construction in which the applied object is coreferential with the adnominal possessor of the secondary object. Rather than adding a participant, such ACs emphasize the fact that the referent of the adnominal possessor can be viewed as concerned by the participation of the referent of the possessee in the event. The non-applicative monotransitive constructions (63a) and (64a) are possible, but the same meanings are more commonly expressed as (63b) and (64b), respectively.²³

(63) Classical Nahuatl (Launey 2011: 206)

- a. *Ni-qu-in-tlazòtla* *in mo-pil-huān.*
 1SG.SBJ-3.OBJ-PL-like DEF 2SG-child-CSTR.PL
 ‘I love your children.’
 b. *Ni-mitz-in-tlazòti-lia* *in mo-pil-huān.*
 1SG.SBJ-2SG.OBJ-PL-like-APPL DEF 2SG-child-CSTR.PL
 ‘I love your children (for you).’

(64) Classical Nahuatl (Launey 2011: 206)

- a. *Ni-c-mati* *in mo-tlàtlacōl.*
 1SG.SBJ-3.OBJ-know DEF 2SG-sin
 ‘I know your sins.’
 b. *Ni-mitz-machi-lia* *in mo-tlàtlacōl.*
 1SG.SBJ-2SG.OBJ-know-APPL DEF 2SG-sin
 ‘I know your sins (regarding you).’

By contrast, if the object is incorporated, the possessor is treated as the object of a non-applicative monotransitive construction; compare (65a) and (65b). Applicative marking does occur in the more complex configuration illustrated by (65c):

(65) Classical Nahuatl (Launey 2011: 210)

- a. *Ni-mitz-pāqui-lia* *in mo-cuā.*
 1SG.SBJ-2SG.OBJ-wash-APPL DEF 2SG-head
 ‘I wash your head for you.’

²³ The nominal suffix encoding that the noun is modified by an adnominal possessor is labeled “construct form marker”.

- b. *Ni-mitz-cuā-pāca.*
 1SG.SBJ-2SG.OBJ-head-wash
 Lit. ‘I head-wash you.’ / ‘I wash you in terms of the head.’
- c. *Ni-mitz-cuā-pāqui-lia* in *mo-pil-tzin.*
 1SG.SBJ-2SG.OBJ-head-wash-APPL DEF 2SG-child-DIM
 Lit. ‘I head-wash your son (for you).’

5.5 Nahuatl applicative lookalikes

The language has lexicalized applicatives. For instance, *pōhua* ‘count, read’ is compatible with two applicative suffixes, *-lia* and *-ia*, but *pōhui-lia* has the regular meaning ‘count/read (sth.) to (sb.)’, whereas *pōhu-ia* unpredictably expresses ‘hex, cast a spell on’.²⁴

Interestingly enough, verb forms combining middle-voice marking and causative or applicative marking can be used with a conventionalized meaning distinct from their literal meaning ‘make oneself V’ or ‘V for oneself’. The combination [MID + CAUS] can be used as the honorific form of intransitive verbs (66a), whereas the combination [MID + APPL] can be used as the honorific form of transitive verbs (66b), without any change in valency:

- (66) Classical Nahuatl (Launey 2011: 213, 215)
- a. *Ti-mo-cochī-tia.*
 2SG.SBJ-MID-sleep-HON
 ‘You are sleeping.’ (honorific) (Lit. ‘You are making yourself sleep.’)
- b. *Qui-mo-chīhui-lia.*
 3.OBJ-MID-do-HON
 ‘He makes it.’ (honorific) (Lit. ‘He makes it for himself.’)

6 The notion of applicativization in context

6.1 Historical background

To the best of our knowledge, the term *verbo aplicativo* ‘applicative verb’ was first used in Rincón (1595), one of the earliest descriptions of Classical Nahuatl, and was later adopted by Carochi (1645) for his own description and by Uto-Aztecan studies ever since. As already presented in some detail in Section 5, Nahuatl intransitive and transi-

²⁴ Launey’s French original gives “*je lui jette un sort*” ‘I cast a spell on him’ (1979: 194), but Mackay’s English translation gives “I read his fortune (through divination with kernels of corn)” (2011: 204).

tive predicates can take the applicative suffix *-lia* or one of its allomorphs and thereby accommodate an (additional) object in the clause; (67) illustrates this with intransitive *tzàtzi* ‘shout’:

(67) Classical Nahuatl (Launey 2011: 42, 203, glosses added)

- a. *Ni-tzàtzi.*
1SG.SBJ-shout
‘I shout.’
- b. *Ni-mitz-tzàtzi-lia.*
1SG.SBJ-2SG.OBJ-shout-APPL
‘I shout after you.’ / ‘I call you by shouting.’

A comparable phenomenon is found in Bantu languages, and the term is regularly used in that descriptive tradition as well. In Kinyarwanda, for instance, many verbs can take the applicative suffix *-iish* and thereby accommodate another object in the clause they head; (68) illustrates this with transitive *-andik-* ‘write’:

(68) Kinyarwanda (Kimenyi 1980: 32)

- a. *Umukoôbwa a-ra-andik-a ibáruwa n’-íikáramu.*
girl 3SG.SBJ-PRS-write-FV letter with-pen
 - b. *Umukoôbwa a-ra-andik-iish-a ibáruwa ikáramu.*
girl 3SG.SBJ-PRS-write-APPL-FV letter pen
- Both: ‘The girl is writing a letter with a pen.’

Examples (67) and (68) look quite similar, but they differ in a number of important ways—which partly explains the fact that different descriptive traditions have gravitated towards different ideas about what “canonical” applicatives look like (see § 6.2 for more on this issue). Regarding syntax, the base verbs applicativized by the markers *-lia* and *-iish* in the two languages belong to different valency classes, at least in the examples chosen here: the new object is alone in the Nahuatl example but co-occurs with another object in the Kinyarwanda clause. Regarding semantics, the new object can have various semantic roles in Nahuatl, namely Beneficiary, Maleficiary, Goal, etc.; it can only be an Instrument with Kinyarwanda *iish*-applicatives. Regarding morphology, the applicative markers occupy quite different niches in their respective semiotic ecologies. In Nahuatl, a homophonous suffix *-lia* also occurs on honorific verbs, but the causative *-tia* has a different shape. Kinyarwanda does not have honorific verbs, but its causative is also marked by *-iish*, and applicative constructions with an applied phrase expressing roles other than Instrument require a different marker. Lastly, the broad applicative illustrated in (67) is typically the only way to accommodate that particular non-agentive participant in the clause in Nahuatl, whereas the instrumental applicative normally allows Kinyarwanda speakers to choose from the two roughly synonymous expressions given in (68).

Unlike Uto-Aztecan studies, early descriptions of Bantu languages show significant terminological disparity regarding the treatment of applicatives. In his descriptive sketch of Kongo, Brugioti (1659: 40) used the term *verbum respectivum* ‘respective verb’ (opposed to the unmarked *verbum absolutum* ‘absolute verb’); Bleek (1873: 8) used “relative form of the verb” for southern languages, and Endemann (1876: 64) used the term *direktiv* ‘directive’ for Sotho. Bantuist terminology seems to have unified in the late 19th century: Bentley (1887: 627) and Steere (1884: 158) used the term “applied form” in their studies of Kongo and Swahili, respectively, and “applicative” is found—occasionally alongside other terms—in Torrend (1891), Stapleton (1903), Meinhof and Van Warmelo (1932), Watkins (1937), Guthrie (1967–1971), Meeussen (1967), as well as in later studies. (See Dammann 1961: 160–161 for a review of the labeling of applicatives in Bantu studies in particular and Pacchiarotti 2020: 28–31 for a more detailed terminological survey in general.)

Authors working in other descriptive traditions have sometimes used alternative terms, e.g. “rule of Dative” (e.g., Chung 1976 for Indonesian) and “object advancement” (e.g., Norman 1978 for Eastern Mayan, as well as Aissen 1983, 1987 for Tzotzil). Modern Mayanists not working in the Relational-Grammar framework have customarily used the term *applicative* (e.g., Grinevald and Peake 2012: 38), and some scholars working on Philippine languages have employed it as well (e.g., Bell 1983 for Cebuano). Other terms have not spread beyond descriptive, often language-specific, studies. For instance, work on Kartvelian uses “version”, a coinage derived from Georgian *kceva* ‘turning, change, behavior’; Salas (2006: 119) labels the Mapudungun applicative markers *sufijos indirectizantes* ‘indirecting suffixes’; Ainu descriptions have used the terms “appropriative” and “demonstrative” (Bugueva 2010: 752); and several dictionaries of linguistics from the 1950s and 1960s use the term “accommodative”, possibly under the influence of the traditional term *dativus commodi* (Pacchiarotti 2020: 30).

Despite this variation, the applicative has led until recently a comparatively quiet life as a technical label, even by the somewhat inauspicious standards of late-20th-century theoretical linguistics, where crucially related notions like *transitivity*, *valency*, and *voice* have aroused some analytical controversy and spawned a non-negligible variety of interpretations and sub-classifications. Unlike notorious terms like *subject*, *ergative*, and even *passive*, which have not only attracted considerable interest but also proven to be lasting sources of disagreement, *applicative* and the phenomena it covers seem to have drawn just the right amount of attention for the label not to become contentious.

6.2 Present-day usage

Even though applicatives are less problematic than several other linguistic terms, modern studies do show some variation regarding both the place the applicative occupies in a theory of grammar and its exact definition. This is hardly surprising: even though classical languages have similar constructions—consider Latin pairs like *ridere*

‘laugh (at)’, which can be intransitive or transitive, vs. *deridere* ‘laugh at’, which is transitive—the traditional language descriptions of antiquity provided neither the terminology nor the analytical apparatus to study such occurrences as the conspicuous grammatical phenomenon they are in many languages. Moreover, as prominent and pervasive as applicatives are in Uto-Aztecan, the descriptions of those languages have never been at center stage in Western linguistics; it is the description of familiar European languages and the theorizing they have spawned that have informed the accounts of non-European linguistic structures.

6.2.1 Applicatives and their counterparts

With respect to the company applicatives keep in linguistic theory, the general consensus among present-day scholars is that such constructions are best regarded as a kind of voice.²⁵ Functional-typological studies of transitivity, valency, and voice customarily distinguish between operations that increase the valency of the predicate and those that decrease it; applicatives are routinely placed in the first group. Another customary distinction made is whether the operation preserves the base inventory of semantic arguments or alters it. Interestingly enough, applicatives are placed either in the former or in the latter group, depending on how they are interpreted. Kroeger (2005), for instance, sees applicatives as “increase[ing] the syntactic valence of a verb by introducing a new primary object, [. . .] [t]ypically [. . .] ‘promot[ing]’ an oblique argument [. . .], and so [the applicative] *does not affect* the argument structure of the verb” (p. 273, our emphasis). By contrast, Kulikov (2011) sees applicatives as “introduc[ing] a Direct Object (lacking in the initial structure), [. . .] [which] may denote an entirely new participant in the situation, or it can be promoted from the periphery of the syntactic structure, where it surfaced as an Oblique Object in the non-derived diathesis” (p. 389), and as an example of the operations that “*do not preserve* the inventory of semantic roles” (p. 385, our emphasis).

Applicatives in which the applied phrase is a core argument (i.e., P-applicatives) constitute a special case of a morphosyntactic operation some recent studies call NUCLEATIVIZATION. Nucleatives allow a participant not encoded as a core argument in the initial construction to be encoded as a core argument in the derived construction. (Their mirror images, denucleatives, need not concern us here.) We employ Creissels’s

²⁵ Mel’čuk (2006) is a notable recent example in the functional-typological tradition that proposes a rather narrow notion of voice. Not only does that study distinguish between diathesis and voice based on the predicate-marking parameter (as others do, e.g., Kulikov 2011 and Zúñiga and Kittilä 2019), but it also distinguishes categories like “active”, “passive”, and “reflexive” (i.e., Mel’čuk’s “voices”) from those like “causative”, “decausative”, and “applicative” (i.e., his “[de-]transitivizers”, which “are similar to voices in that they also entail a modification of the basis diathesis” but “express some [essentially additional] propositional meaning”, p. 194).

(forthcoming) use of the term, according to which nucleatives distinguish an S/A and a P version, and P-applicatives are a special case of the latter. Note from Table 8 that, by definition, applicatives targeting lower-prominence (i.e., non-core) grammatical relations are not nucleatives.²⁶

Table 8: Applicatives and syntactic types of nucleatives.

Status of new argument			
S/A	P	D	X
S/A-nucleatives	P-nucleatives = P-applicatives	D-applicatives	X-applicatives

Incidentally note that portative constructions mentioned in Section 4.1 are problematic neither for the definition of applicative employed in the present book nor for how we propose to capture different types of applicatives. In our view, the Caddo portative as described by Melnar (1998) is simply a P-applicative.

Zooming in on different types of nucleatives, and also following Creissels (forthcoming), we distinguish between agentive and non-agentive S/A-nucleatives here; we can additionally distinguish the same semantic types of P-nucleatives (see Table 9).²⁷ Some examples follow.

Table 9: Semantic and syntactic types of nucleatives.

S/A-nucleatives		P-nucleatives	
Agent	non-Agent	Agent	non-Agent
causative	non-causative	non-applicative	applicative
S/A-nucleatives (25c) and (26f)	S/A-nucleatives (69) and (70a)	P-nucleatives (70b)	P-nucleatives

This chapter has already provided numerous examples of applicative (P-)nucleatives, which we neither repeat nor cross-reference here; for examples of causative S/A-nucleatives, see Examples (25c) and (26f). Example (69) below from Ilocano shows a

²⁶ Zúñiga and Kittilä (2019) use the term *nucleativization* for the installment of arguments in semantic structure irrespective of their realization, whereas Creissels (forthcoming) frames the concept—as we do here—in terms of the (semantic-)syntactic roles S, A, P, etc. In addition, Zúñiga and Kittilä’s (2019) employ labels for language-specific grammatical relations and consequently distinguish between subjective and objective nucleatives.

²⁷ Zúñiga and Kittilä (2019) distinguish between subjective and objective nucleatives. Note that these authors’ taxonomy regards causatives as prototypically subjective and applicatives as prototypically objective.

non-causative S/A-nucleative; the clause corresponds to a construction combining the effects of applicativization and passivization. Beneficiaries can simply appear in an oblique role in Ilocano clauses, but, thanks to the circumfix *i-...-an* (i.e., the so-called benefactive voice marker), the predicate ‘buy’ can also accommodate such participants in S/A role:

- (69) Ilocano (Philippine Austronesian; Rubino 2005: 337)
I-gatáng-an=n=ak man iti bagás.
 BV-buy-BV=2/3SG=1SG.ABS please OBL rice
 ‘Please buy some rice for me.’

Example (70b) illustrates a non-applicative P-nucleative; the clause corresponds to a construction combining the effects of causativization and the reversal of grammatical relations without detransitivization. Mapudungun *l*-causatives often behave in a familiar way: they install a causer-Agent in the clause, the erstwhile argument in S/A role appears in P role, and the verb is in the (unmarked) Agent Voice (70a). Nevertheless, when an obviative/non-topical 3rd person acts on a proximate/topical 3rd person, as in (70b), the syntax of the language requires that the former be in P role and the latter in S/A role; the verb is in the inverse-marked Patient Voice instead:

- (70) Mapudungun (p.k. and Golluscio 2007: 211; orthography and glosses adapted)
- a. *Ti wentru aye-l-fi-i ta malen.*
 DET man laugh-CAUS-3.P-IND[3] DET girl
 ‘The man (PROX) made the girl (OBV) laugh.’
 - b. *Tañi chaw aye-l-e-i-mew ta malen.*
 3.PSR father laugh-CAUS-INV-IND-3.A[3] DET girl
 ‘The girl’s father (OBV) made her (PROX) laugh.’
 (Lit. ‘Her father made the girl laugh.’)

6.2.2 Applicatives and their types

With respect to how broadly applicatives are defined in the recent literature, there is more variation than regarding their place in theories of grammar. Our term is broader than Kulikov’s (2011), for instance, whose applicative is limited to our P-applicatives; this author suggests using the label “benefactive” for D-applicatives and does not address X-applicatives. Further note that our terminology is not explicitly framed in terms of prototype vs. periphery—unlike Zúñiga and Kittilä’s (2019), which distinguishes prototypical applicatives, which target direct/primary objects, from non-prototypical applicatives, which target grammatical relations of lower prominence, e.g., indirect/secondary objects and obliques. (We will return to the prototype vs. periphery issue further down.)

Our applicatives have the syntactic status of the applied phrase in the applicative construction as an explicit parameter of variation, and are therefore subclassified into P-, D-, and X-applicatives; the status of the companion non-agentive argument in the applicative clause (if any) is an additional parameter of variation, captured by the distinction between symmetrical and asymmetrical. By contrast, Beck’s (2009: 539–540) taxonomy conflates these two parameters. He first distinguishes direct applicatives, which “realize the applied object as a direct object”, from non-direct applicatives, which “add an additional indirect or oblique object”. Then he says that a third type might be worth distinguishing, but instead of subclassifying his non-direct applicatives (as we do), he splits up his first type: while one subtype of direct applicatives of transitive stems “add a direct applied object, displacing the original direct object”, this additional type “creates ditransitives with equally ranked (Upper Necaxa Totonac [. . .]) or symmetrical objects (Kichaga [. . .])” (p. 540).

Table 10 below compares these three different terminologies with the one we use it in this book (which is the same as in Creissels, forthcoming).

Table 10: Some syntactic types of applicatives.

	P		D	X
Kulikov (2011)	applicatives		benefactives	—
Zúñiga and Kittilä (2019)	prototypical applicatives		non-prototypical applicatives	
Beck (2009)	direct applicatives 1	direct applicatives 2	non-direct applicatives	
This book	P-applicatives asymmetrical	D-applicatives symmetrical	X-applicatives	

At their most exclusive, definitions of applicative constructions use the term only for a clause type that grants direct object status to a non-agentive adjunct of a related, base, construction. Until relatively recently and on both sides of the functionalist-formalist divide—at least before Baker’s proposed extension, see further down—overt morphological marking on the predicate was normally seen as a requisite as well. Such an arguably rather narrow understanding of applicatives owes an important debt to studies conducted in formalist traditions (viz. Relational Grammar in the 1980s, Government and Binding in the 1980s and 1990s, Lexical Functional Grammar in the 1990s, and Minimalism in the 2000s and 2010s). As a consequence, even less restrictive notions found in the current mainstream tend to see applicativization as essentially syntactic (more specifically: valency-increasing and promotional).

Functionally oriented studies of voice and related phenomena have not fundamentally departed from this tenet (see, e.g., Peterson 2007; Kulikov 2010; Givón 2001). A case in point is Shibatani’s (1996) proposed terminology, which is superficially similar

to Kulikov's (2011). Shibatani explicitly excludes X-applicatives from his definitions but argues in favor of distinguishing his "applicatives" (= locative/instrumental P/D-applicatives) from his "benefactives" (= benefactive P/D-applicatives) rather strictly, based both on their respective semantics and on the following cross-linguistic observation: the former type "generally allow[s] intransitive bases, while [the latter] seldom admit[s] intransitive bases" (p. 160). Notice that we are not aware of many authors that follow this proposal; not even this author himself distinguished these notions as sharply in later studies (e.g., Shibatani 2006).

At their most inclusive, characterizations of applicative constructions delineate a family of clause types employed to give a selected non-agency-related element of the clause some kind of syntactic, semantic, and/or pragmatic prominence vis-à-vis the (lower) status that constituent has in the base construction. A subset of such characterizations concentrates on syntactic prominence and regards some syntactic applicative lookalikes as applicatives—but it is worth noting that such approaches have not usually made it into the functional-typological mainstream. For example, Shibatani (2006) restricts the focus of attention to constructions installing or promoting to P or D status (thereby excluding X-applicatives), but it abstracts from morphological parameters, thus conflating diathesis and voice: his "benefactive/maefactive/applicative" category subsumes Germanic and Romance external-possession constructions with unmarked verbs, the Japanese benefactive verbal applicative periphrasis with *yaru* 'give (to non-human or inferior)', and the Guarijío benefactive affixal applicative with *-ke*. Similarly, Croft (2022) distinguishes between "overtly verb-coded voice strategies" and "zero verb-coded voice strategies"; he consequently labels oppositions like the English dative and locative alternations "zero coded simple predicate [i.e., non-periphrastic, F.Z. & D.C.] strategy for applicative constructions" (pp. 280–287).

Studies in the Chomskyan tradition take a similar tack (although they usually exclude both D- and X-applicatives). Baker's (1988: 280–288) influential study of incorporation first distinguishes alternations involving Recipient-Beneficiaries and verbs marked with some (non-null) reflex of **-id* in Bantu from the English so-called dative shift by calling only the former applicatives. Then, he argues that the syntax of those two kinds of alternations is comparable, later claiming that the valency-increasing mechanism is the same in both kinds, namely preposition incorporation. Crucially, Baker ends up analyzing English verbs occurring in double-object constructions as follows: "for the relevant small and semi-idiosyncratic set of verbs, the applied affix is syntactically present but is simply not seen morphologically" (p. 284). The same reasoning and conclusions are found in Marantz (1993: 114–115), and are later applied to wider samples of languages and phenomena, for example in Jeong (2007: 3) and Pylkkänen (2008: 11–12).

It is not uncommon to find descriptive studies that work with notions that are not overly restrictive, presenting applicatives as coming in "prototypical" and "peripheral" versions—occasionally framed in terms of "canonical" and "non-canonical" versions. First, applicative constructions are seen as clauses typically headed by predicates that are overtly derived from those heading base constructions; "unmarked applicatives" are regarded as non-canonical. Second, the syntactic status of the applied phrase in the

AC is seen as prototypically being the P role, that is, that of a direct or primary object; applicatives featuring less prominent syntactic roles are regarded as non-canonical. Third, the canonical applicative construction is an optional variant, equivalent in terms of its truth value to the base construction; ACs that do not have a monoclausal BC counterpart (i.e., “non-promotional applicatives”) are seen as non-canonical. Lastly, the semantic role borne by the applied phrase is required to be not only non-agentive but also peripheral; applicatives targeting central non-agentive roles like Theme and Patient, but also arguably intermediate roles like Stimulus and some Location-related notions are considered non-canonical.²⁸

Our definition treats “unmarked applicatives” as an oxymoron—more accurately: applicativized predicates are morphologically marked by definition; constructions that are analogous but lack morphological marking are called “syntactic lookalikes” here. Regarding the other three domains, however, our definition simply includes the non-canonical cases: the exact grammatical relation borne by the applied phrase, the optionality or obligatoriness of the AC to express a given state of affairs, and the exact (kind of) semantic role and are left open; rather than definitional stipulations, they are parameters of variation. Therefore, our terminology is simultaneously narrower and broader than many, if not most, canon-based terminologies. It is narrower because we do not treat the boundary between applicatives and their syntactic and morphological lookalikes as fuzzy: it may be that different languages show different frequencies of tokens or types of particular applicatives and lookalikes, but such quantitative assessment does not inform the notional distinction between the phenomena. Our terminology is also broader, because we explicitly take different syntactic, morphological, and semantic subtypes into account, but especially because we abstain from stipulating that one particular bundle of features is the prototype and others are deviations thereof.

Irrespective of the terminological treatment given to “non-canonical applicatives”, there are good reasons to have a closer look at such phenomena, and the reader is referred to Pacchiarotti and Zúñiga (2022) for recent contributions to our knowledge of some of them. The phenomena specifically showcased in that book include co-expression patterns / instances of polysemy that are not restricted to other voice categories (e.g., denominal and deadjectival verbalization, nominalization, and relativization), functions of applicative-like morphology that are not semantically neutral (e.g., covering aspectuality, pluractionality, and intensity), and functions that are related to information-structure categories (e.g., focalization and topic continuity). It was not the editors’ intention to use the results of such explorations to justify broadening or narrowing some received definition, however; rather, they thought it was important to use

²⁸ See in this context Lehmann and Verhoeven (2006) for a terminological proposal that has not been widely accepted. These authors argue in favor of recognizing a whole range of transitivity processes targeting non-agentive participants in Yucatec Maya. This range can be seen as having two poles: one for lexical derivation that targets central semantic roles with syntactic consequences (“extraversion”) and another for syntactically regular promotion that targets peripheral semantic roles (“applicativization”).

them to deepen our understanding of applicatives and lookalikes in particular, as well as of phenomena related to transitivity, valency, and voice in general.

Since the turn of the century, mainstream functional-typological linguistics has tended to favor grammatical-category labels that are not excessively narrow on the one hand and, at least partly, to move away from prototype-vs.-periphery characterizations on the other (especially those that do not address the radial structure of the notions explicitly, as well as those with fuzzy boundaries).²⁹ It is in this spirit that we propose the definition of applicative constructions used for the present book. Taking into account predicate morphology and syntactic status of the applied phrase here only, our applicative covers the uncontroversial case: the structure represented in cell (h) vis-à-vis cell (a) in Table 11 (adapted from Table 3 in § 1.2.3). Following several other studies, we have broadened the applicative to include the structure depicted in cell (g). Following Creissels (forthcoming), we have added the structure of cell (f) to the category, and we have made explicit that the oblique X in cell (a) need not be expressible.

Table 11: Selected applicatives and applicative lookalikes.

Status of non-S/A argument		Predicate morphology			
		Unmarked		Marked	
Oblique		(a)	S/A V (X)	(e)	S/A V' (X)
		(b)	S/A V X'	(f)	S/A V' X'
Non-oblique	Non-core	(c)	S/A V D	(g)	S/A V' D
	Core	(d)	S/A V P	(h)	S/A V' P

We have stopped short of including in our definition the two most prominent related structures of the table, that is, those represented in cells (d) and (e). The former is a syntactic lookalike; including it would equate applicativization with a syntactic operation, namely X-to-P promotion, and blur the distinction between diathesis and voice, thereby additionally contradicting the spirit of the term as originally employed in the description of Classical Nahuatl (there, it refers to a derived verb form). The structure represented in cell (e) is a morphological lookalike; including it would equate the applicative with the overt predicate marker, which would in turn presumably correlate with some broad notion of “functional” (i.e., semantic and/or pragmatic) prominence of the argument in non-S/A role. Our notion is, we think, reasonably conservative (since we do not abstract from either the morphology or the syntax) while also reasonably non-

²⁹ An example of an explicit (if uninfluential) canon-based approach is Dixon and Aikhenvald (1997, 2000) and especially Dixon (2012: Ch. 25), with its rather restrictive definition of the applicative prototype and several “extensions” (e.g., he regards our obligatory applicative as peripheral and labels it “quasi-applicative”).

restrictive (since we do not require the applied phrase to be in P role). Our goal has not been to define the “correct” applicative but, rather, to make the analysis of the variation found with applicatives and applicative-like constructions across and within languages as consistent and principled as possible.

7 Structure, coverage, and coherence of the present book

The first part of this book contains this introductory overview; a questionnaire designed to be used as a brief checklist for exploring applicative constructions in individual languages or language groups (Ch. 2); and a very short chapter that includes maps depicting the approximate geographical locations of the languages addressed in the book, as well as those languages’ genealogical affiliations (Ch. 3). The second part includes twenty-five case studies, grouped in three sections according to whether they deal with individual languages or with areal or genealogical overviews. The third part includes a chapter that comments on several terminological and theoretical issues raised by this introductory chapter (POLINSKY); a chapter that provides an update of Polinsky’s (2013) typological survey of applicatives (MOROZ AND POLINSKY); and a chapter summarizing what we believe to be the main results of the case studies (CREISSELS AND ZÚÑIGA).

The chapters in the second part of the book deal with a sample of individual languages or language groups that we thought were necessary, important, or especially interesting in a comparative survey of applicative constructions. Chapters covering phenomena found in the Americas include four that address three groups identified by MOROZ AND POLINSKY. GERDTS—who has already co-authored a comprehensive survey of applicatives in Salishan in general (Kiyosawa and Gerdts 2010)—describes in detail the applicatives found in the variety of Halkomelem spoken in Vancouver Island. MONTGOMERY-ANDERSON describes the applicatives of the Mayan family, with a special focus on the Chontal language of southern Mexico. Reflecting both the historical importance and the comparative significance of Uto-Aztecan applicatives, two chapters cover considerable part of the phenomena found in those languages: THORNES covers languages from the Northern branch, and ÁLVAREZ GONZÁLEZ AND ESTRADA FERNÁNDEZ cover languages spoken in Northwestern Mexico. Several chapters cover families and languages beyond those mentioned by MOROZ AND POLINSKY’s survey: MITHUN gives an overview of the applicatives found in Eskimo-Aleutian, LOCKWOOD AND MACAULAY survey those found in Algonquian, and HERNÁNDEZ-GREEN AND LÓPEZ NICOLÁS present applicatives and lookalikes in Otomi and Zapotec. BECK outlines applicativization in a Totonacan language spoken in south-central Mexico; CENSABELLA covers Toba/Qom, a Guaicurian language spoken in northern Argentina; and ZÚÑIGA covers Mapudungun, an isolate of southern Chile and south-central Argentina.

Regarding Africa, MOROZ AND POLINSKY say that applicatives are found “mostly in Bantu”, and two chapters address them here: PACCHIAROTTI gives an overview for the

family, and CREISSELS covers in detail the applicatives of Tswana, a language spoken in Botswana and South Africa. Also belonging to the Niger-Congo group, Atlantic languages have been comparatively neglected in the literature dealing with voice(-related) phenomena; VOISIN AND CREISSELS's chapter contributes to rectifying this neglect. PAYNE surveys the applicatives of Nilotic (Nilo-Saharan), VANHOVE those of Cushitic (Afro-Asiatic), and AMBERBER zooms in on the applicatives of Amharic (Ethio-Semitic).

MOROZ AND POLINSKY also mention Austronesian in the western Pacific region. Two chapters deal with those languages, namely McDONNELL AND TRUONG, who cover applicatives in languages of western Indonesia, and MUSGRAVE, WAYAN ARKA, AND RAJEG, who cover them in Standard Indonesian. Two further chapters complete the picture for that part of the world: FOLEY and AUSTIN survey applicatives in Papuan and Australian languages, respectively.

Lastly, Polinsky (2013) briefly commented on “the dearth of applicatives in Eurasia” and mentioned some Northwest Caucasian languages as an exception to the rule. ARKADIEV, LANDER, AND BAGIROKOVA cover precisely that family; TUTE surveys the applicatives of Kartvelian in the southern Caucasus. The two final chapters address groups not singled out by Polinsky's 2013 piece: JACQUES AND LAHAUSOIS cover Kiranti (Sino-Tibetan), and ZÚÑIGA, ARKADIEV, AND HEGEDŰS cover applicativizing preverbs in a number of European languages (Germanic, Balto-Slavic, and Hungarian).

The titles in the *Comparative Handbooks of Linguistics* series face the challenge of striking a balance between comparability across chapters and state-of-the-art analytic coverage. In order to ensure comparability, we asked our authors to work with both a significantly shorter version of this introductory chapter (in the form of an 8,500-word position paper) and the two-page questionnaire mentioned above, as well as to follow a thematic blueprint “morphology-syntax-semantics-lookalikes” rather closely in the conclusions section of their own chapters. The purpose of the position paper and the questionnaire was to provide the individual contributors with a suitable descriptive meta-language—which is, ideally, both theoretically neutral and descriptively effective—and a frame of reference. In order to ensure adequate analytic coverage, we explicitly gave our authors relatively free rein not only as to how they may want to structure their chapters—the thematic blueprint worked better in some instances than in others—but also as to which phenomena they may want to include in their discussion in addition to those explicitly mentioned in the questionnaire.

Consequently, chapters dealing with individual languages or groups first give an introduction to the language(s) covered and their basic morphosyntactic structures, and then survey morphological, syntactic, and semantic features of the applicatives and lookalikes found in them, but they do not necessarily follow this structural template. For example, ZÚÑIGA's chapter on Mapudungun follows it rather closely, but CREISSELS's chapter on Tswana does not, favoring instead a structure largely based on syntactic aspects of the phenomena it surveys. (We sent early versions of these two chapters to our authors alongside the position paper and the questionnaire.)

Even though our contributors had considerable leeway when it came to structuring their chapters, many did follow the thematic template, thereby giving a distinct formal coherence to the book. We probably erred on the side of restrictiveness by imposing some terminological coherence as well—hopefully in a reasonable way. For instance, some Mesoamerican studies have employed the term *registration applicative* to refer to some constructions we prefer to treat as lookalikes, and we asked Néstor Hernández-Green and Oscar López Nicolás to exert special care when using potentially conflicting terms and to make the correspondences between the labels used by Mesoamericanists and ours explicit. By the same token, Kartvelian studies traditionally employ the term *version* to refer to the relevant part of those languages' applicative morphology, and we asked Kevin Tuite to make sure that both Kartvelologists and typologists could follow his presentation and analysis comfortably. We proceeded in the same manner regarding the traditional Algonquianist terms *relative preverbs* and *relative roots* in Hunter Lockwood and Monica Macaulay's contribution.

Abbreviations

A	Agent-like argument of bivalent/trivalent predicate
AC	applicative construction
ACC	accusative
AI	animate intransitive
AIO	animate intransitive with an object
ALC	applicative lookalike construction
ANIM	animate
ANTIP	antipassive
AOR	aorist
APPL	applicative
AppP	applied phrase
ART	article
ASP	aspect
AV	Agent voice
BC	base construction
CAUS	causative
COMPL	completive
CTR	control transitivity marker
CSTR	construct form marker
CVB	converb
D	Recipient-like argument of trivalent predicate
DAT	dative
DECL	declarative
DEF	definite
DEM	demonstrative
DET	determiner
DETR	detransitive

DIM	diminutive
DIR	direct
DIREC	directional
DITR	ditransitive
ENUNC	enunciative
EP	epenthesis
ERG	ergative
F	feminine
FOC	focus
FUT	future
FV	final vowel
GEN	genitive
HON	honorific
IMM	immediate
IMP	imperative
IN	incorporated nominal
INAN	inanimate
INCOMPL	incompletive
IND	indicative
INDIR	indirect
INS	instrumental
INTR	intransitive
IPFV	imperfective
LK	linker
LOC	locative
MID	middle
MONOTR	monotransitive
NFIN	nonfinite
NOM	nominative
NSPEC	nonspecific
NTR	noncontrol transitivizer
OBJ	object
OBL	oblique
OBLREG	oblique registration
OBV	obviative
P	Patient-like argument of bivalent predicate
PASS	passive
PERF	perfect
PFV	perfective
PL	plural
POSTP	postposition
PRI	primary
PRIOR	prioritive
PROG	progressive
PROX	proximate
PSR	possessor
PST	past
PTCL	particle
PVB	preverb

QUOT	quotative
REC	recent
S	single argument of monovalent predicate
SBJ	subject
SEC	secondary
SG	singular
SR	semantic role
TA	transitive animate
TAM	tense-aspect-mood
TI	transitive inanimate
TR	transitive
TRITR	tritransitive
Vs	verbs
1, 2, 3	grammatical persons
I, II, . . .	noun classes
-	default morpheme boundary
=	clitic morpheme boundary
#	phonological word boundary

References

- Aissen, Judith. 1983. Indirect object advancement in Tzotzil. In David Perlmutter (ed.), *Studies in relational grammar*, Vol. 1, 272–302. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Aissen, Judith. 1987. *Clause structure in Tzotzil*. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Andrews, J. Richard. 2003. *Introduction to Classical Nahuatl*. Rev. edn. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Bahrt, Nicklas N. 2021. *Voice syncretism*. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Baker, Mark C. 1998. *Incorporation: A theory of grammatical function changing*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Beck, David. 2009. A taxonomy and typology of Lushootseed valency-increasing suffixes. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 75(4). 533–569.
- Bell, Sarah. 1983. Advancements and ascensions in Cebuano. In David Perlmutter (ed.), *Studies in relational grammar*, Vol. 1, 143–218. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bentley, William Holman. 1887. *Dictionary and grammar of the Kongo language*. London: Trübner.
- Bleek, Wilhelm Heinrich Immanuel. 1873. *Report of Dr. Bleek concerning his researches into the Bushman language, presented to the Honorable House of Assembly by command of His Excellency the Governor (Cape of Good Hope)*. Cambridge, UK: Published as a micro-fiche by Chadwyck-Healey in association with the British Library and Avero Publications.
- Bresnan, Joan & Lioba Moshi. 1993. Object asymmetries in comparative Bantu syntax. In Sam Mchombo (ed.), *Theoretical aspects of Bantu grammar*, 47–91. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Brinkmann, Ursula. 1997. *The locative alternation in German: Its structure and acquisition*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Brugiotti da Vetralla, Giacinto. 1659. *Regulae quaedam pro difficillimi Congensium idiomatis faciliiori captu, ad grammaticae normam redactae, a F. Hyacintho Brusciotto, a Vetralla* [Some rules for the more easy understanding of the most difficult idiom of the people of the Congo, brought into the form of grammar by Fr. Hyacinth Brusciotto from Vetralla]. Rome: Tipografia della Congregazione di Propaganda Fide.
- Bugaeva, Anna. 2010. Ainu applicatives in typological perspective. *Studies in Language* 34(4). 749–801.

- Carochi, Horacio. 1645. *Arte de la lengua mexicana con la declaracion de los adverbios della*. Mexico City: Juan Ruyz.
- Chung, Sandra. 1976. An object-creating rule in Bahasa Indonesia. *Linguistic Inquiry* 7(1). 41–87.
- Chung, Sandra. 1983. An object-creating rule in Bahasa Indonesia. In David Perlmutter (ed.), *Studies in Relational Grammar I*, 219–271. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1989. *Language universals and linguistic typology: Syntax and morphology*. 2nd edn. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Comrie, Bernard, Iren Hartmann, Martin Haspelmath, Andrej Malchukov & Søren Wichmann. 2015. Introduction. In Andrej Malchukov & Bernard Comrie (eds.), *Valency classes in the world's languages, Vol. 1*, 3–26. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Creissels, Denis. 2006. *Syntaxe générale, une introduction typologique*. 2 vols. Paris: Lavoisier-Hermès Science.
- Creissels, Denis. 2010. Benefactive applicative periphrases. In Fernando Zúñiga & Seppo Kittilä (eds.), *Benefactives and malefactives: Typological perspectives and case studies*, 29–69. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Creissels, Denis. 2014. P-lability and radical P-alignment. *Linguistics* 52(4). 911–944.
- Creissels, Denis. Forthcoming. *Transitivity, valency, and voice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Creissels, Denis & Jérémie Kouadio. 2010. Ditransitive constructions in Baule. In Andrej Malchukov, Martin Haspelmath & Bernard Comrie (eds.) *Studies in ditransitive constructions: A comparative handbook*, 166–189. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Croft, William. 2022. *Morphosyntax: Constructions of the world's languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cysouw, Michael. 2023. *Encyclopaedia of German diatheses*. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Dammann, Ernst. 1961. Das Applikativum in den Bantusprachen. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 111(1). 160–169.
- Dayley, Jon P. 1981. Voice and ergativity in Mayan languages. *Journal of Mayan Linguistics* 2. 3–82.
- Dixon, R. M. W. 1988. *A grammar of Boumaa Fijian*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Dixon, R. M. W. 2012. *Basic Linguistic Theory, Volume 3: Further grammatical topics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dixon, R. M. W. & Alexandra Aikhenvald. 1997. A typology of argument-determined constructions. In Joan Bybee, John Haiman & Sandra Thompson (eds.), *Essays on language function and language type*, 71–113. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Dixon, R. M. W. & Alexandra Aikhenvald. 2000. Introduction. In R. M. W. Dixon & Alexandra Aikhenvald (eds.), *Changing valency: Case studies in transitivity*, 1–29. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Donohue, Mark. 2003. Morphological templates, headedness, and applicatives in Barupu. *Oceanic Linguistics* 42(1). 111–143.
- Endemann, Karl. 1876. *Versuch einer Grammatik des Sotho*. Berlin: Wilhelm Hertz.
- Frantz, Donald. 2009. *Blackfoot grammar*. 2nd edn. Toronto: Toronto University Press.
- Gil, David. 2002. The prefixes *di-* and *N-* in Malay/Indonesian dialects. In Fay Wouk & Malcolm Ross (eds.), *The history and typology of western Austronesian voice systems*, 241–283. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Givón, Talmy. 2001. *Syntax*. 2 vols. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Golluscio, Lucía. 2007. Morphological causatives and split intransitivity in Mapudungun. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 43(2). 209–238.
- Grinevald, Colette & Mark Peake. 2012. Ergativity and voice in Mayan languages: A functional-typological approach. In Gilles Authier & Katharina Haude (eds.), *Ergativity, valency and voice*, 51–110. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Guthrie, Malcolm. 1967–1971. *Comparative Bantu: An introduction to the comparative linguistics and prehistory of the Bantu languages, Vols. I–IV*. Farnborough: Gregg.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2011. On S, A, P, T, and R as comparative concepts for alignment typology. *Linguistic Typology* 15(3). 535–567.

- Heidinger, Steffen. 2019. Reflexive and unmarked anticausatives in French and Spanish: Frequency of transitive use and undergoer overlap. *Languages* 216(4). 53–69.
- Hernández-Green, Néstor. 2016. Registration versus applicative constructions in Acazulco Otomi. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 82(3). 353–383.
- Hopper, Paul & Elisabeth Closs Traugott. 2003. *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ichihashi-Nakayama, Kumiko. 1996. The “applicative” in Hualapai: Its functions and meanings. *Cognitive Linguistics* 7(2). 227–239.
- Jeong, Youngmi. 2007. *Applicatives: Structure and interpretation from a minimalist perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Jerro, Kyle. 2017. The causative-instrumental syncretism. *Journal of Linguistics* 53(4). 751–788.
- Kaufman, Terrence. 1990. Algunos rasgos estructurales de los idiomas Mayances con referencia especial al K'iche'. In Nora England & Stephen Elliott (eds.), *Lecturas sobre la lingüística maya*, 59–114. Antigua Guatemala: Centro de Investigaciones Regionales de Mesoamérica.
- Kimenyi, Alexandre. 1980. *A relational grammar of Kinyarwanda*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Kiyosawa, Kaoru & Donna Gerdts. 2010. *Salish applicatives*. Leiden: Brill.
- Kroeger, Paul. 2005. *Analyzing grammar: An introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kulikov, Leonid. 2010. Voice typology. In Jae Jung Song (ed.), *The Oxford handbook of linguistic typology*, 368–398. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Launey, Michel. 1979. *Introduction à la langue et à la littérature aztèques, tome 1: grammaire*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Launey, Michel. 1994. *Une grammaire omniprédicative, essai sur la morphosyntaxe du nahuatl classique*. Paris: CNRS éditions.
- Launey, Michel. 2011. *An introduction to Classical Nahuatl*. Translated & adapted by Christopher Mackay. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lazard, Gilbert. 1994. *L'actance*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France.
- Lehmann, Christian. 2006. Participant roles, thematic roles and syntactic functions. In Tasaku Tsunoda & Taro Kageyama (eds.), *Grammatical relations: Festschrift for Masayoshi Shibatani*, 153–174. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Lehmann, Christian & Elisabeth Verhoeven. 2006. Extraversive transitivization in Yucatec Maya and the nature of the applicative. In Leonid Kulikov, Andrej Malchukov & Peter de Swart (eds.), *Case, valency and transitivity*, 465–493. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Leroy, Jacqueline. 2003. *Grammaire du mankon: Langue du Bantou des Grassfields parlée dans la province Nord-Ouest du Cameroun*. Paris: University of Paris 3 dissertation.
- Levin, Beth. 2015. Semantics and pragmatics of argument alternations. *Annual Review of Linguistics* 1. 63–83.
- Malchukov, Andrej. 2015. Valency classes and alternations: Parameters of variation. In Andrej Malchukov & Bernard Comrie (eds.), *Valency classes in the world's languages, Vol. 1: Introducing the framework, and case studies from Africa and Eurasia*, 73–130. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Malchukov, Andrej. 2016. “Ambivalent voice”: Markedness effects in valency change. In Taro Kageyama & Wesley M. Jacobsen (eds.), *Transitivity and valency alternations*, 389–422. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Malchukov, Andrej. 2017. Markedness effects in applicative formation. In Albert Álvarez González & Ía Navarro (2017), *Verb valency changes: Theoretical and typological perspectives*, 3–29. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Marantz, Alec. 1993. Implications of asymmetries in double object constructions. In Sam A. Mchombo (ed.), *Theoretical aspects of Bantu grammar*, 113–150. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Meeussen, Achille Emile. 1967. Bantu grammatical reconstructions. *Africana Linguistica* 3(1). 79–121.
- Meinhof, Carl & Nicolaas J. van Warmelo. 1932. *Introduction to the phonology of the Bantu languages. Being the English version of “Grundriss einer Lautlehre der Bantusprachen” by Carl Meinhof, translated, revised*

- and enlarged in collaboration with the author and Dr. Alice Werner by N. J. van Warmelo. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- Melnar, Lynette Renee. 1998. *Caddo verb morphology*. Chicago: University of Chicago dissertation.
- Mel'čuk, Igor. 2006. *Aspects of the theory of morphology*. Edited by David Beck. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Messerschmidt, Maria. 2022. Increasing the valency of motion verbs: The case of the portative construction. *STUF – Language Typology and Universals* 75(1). 161–197.
- Mora-Marín, David. 2003. Historical reconstruction of Mayan applicative and antidative constructions. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 69(2). 186–228.
- Mosel, Ulrike. 1991. Towards a typology of valence. In Hansjakob Seiler & Waldfried Premper (eds.), *Partizipation. Das sprachliche Erfassen von Sachverhalten*, 240–251. Tübingen: Narr.
- Munro, Pamela. 2000. The leaky grammar of the Chickasaw applicatives. In Arika Okrent & John Boyle (eds.), *The proceedings from the main session of the Chicago Linguistic Society's thirty-sixth meeting*, 285–310. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Newman, Stanley. 1967 [2021]. Classical Nahuatl. In Norman McQuown (eds.), *Handbook of Middle American Indians, Vol. 5: Linguistics*, 179–199. New York: University of Texas Press.
- Ngonyani, Deo & Peter Githinji. 2006. The asymmetrical nature of Bantu applicative constructions. *Lingua* 116(1). 31–63.
- Nichols, Johanna. 1992. *Linguistic diversity in space and time*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Norman, William. 1978. Advancement rules and syntactic change: The loss of instrumental voice in Mayan. In Jeri Jaeger, Anthony Woodbury, Farrell Ackerman, Christine Chiarello, Orin Gensler, John Kingston, Eve Sweetser, Henry Thompson & Kenneth Whistler (eds.), *Proceedings of the 4th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society (General Session)*, 458–476. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society.
- Overall, Simon. 2017. *A grammar of Aguaruna (Iñia Chicham)*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Pacchiarotti, Sara. 2020. *Bantu applicative constructions*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Pacchiarotti, Sara & Fernando Zúñiga (eds.). 2022. *Applicative morphology: Neglected syntactic and non-syntactic functions*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Pardeshi, Prashant. 1998. A contrastive study of benefactive constructions in Japanese and Marathi. *Sekai no nihongo kyōiku* 8. 141–165.
- Parker, Gary. 1969. *Ayacucho Quechua grammar and dictionary*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Peterson, David. 2007. *Applicative constructions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Polinsky, Maria. 2013. Applicative constructions. In Matthew Dryer & Martin Haspelmath (eds.), *The world atlas of language structures online*, Ch. 109. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. <http://wals.info/chapter/109> (accessed 24 April 2020).
- Pylkkänen, Liina. 2008. *Introducing arguments*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Renaudier, Marie. 2012. *Dérivation et valence en Seereer*. Lyon: Lumière University Lyon 2 dissertation.
- Rhodes, Richard. 2010. Relative root complement: a unique grammatical relation in Algonquian syntax. In Jan Wohlgemuth & Michael Cysouw (eds.), *Rara and rarissima: Documenting the fringes of linguistic diversity*, 305–324. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Rincón, Antonio del. 1595 [1895]. *Arte mexicana / Gramática y vocabulario mexicanos por el padre Antonio del Rincon*. México: Oficina Tipográfica de la Secretaría de Fomento.
- Rood, David. 1976. *Wichita grammar*. New York: Garland.
- Rubino, Carl. 2005. Iloko. In Alexander Adelaar & Nikolaus Himmelmann (eds.), *The Austronesian languages of Asia and Madagascar*, 326–349. London: Routledge.
- Salas, Adalberto. 2006. *El mapuche o araucano: Fonología, gramática y antología de cuentos*. 2nd, revised edn. Santiago de Chile: Centro de Estudios Públicos.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1996. Applicatives and benefactives: A cognitive account. In Masayoshi Shibatani & Sandra Thompson (eds.), *Grammatical constructions*, 157–194. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi. 2006. On the conceptual framework for voice phenomena. *Linguistics* 44(2). 217–269.

- Shibatani, Masayoshi & Prashant Pardeshi. 2002. The causative continuum. In Masayoshi Shibatani (ed.), *The grammar of causation and interpersonal manipulation*, 85–126. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Sneddon, James Neil. 1996. *Indonesian: A comprehensive grammar*. London: Routledge.
- Stapleton, Walter Henry. 1903. *Comparative handbook of Congo languages*. Bolobo, Congo Independent State: Hannah Wade Printing Press of the Baptist Missionary Society.
- Steere, Edward. 1884. *A handbook of the Swahili language as spoken at Zanzibar*. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.
- Sullivan, Thelma D. 1988. *Compendium of Nahuatl grammar*. Translated from the Spanish by Thelma D. Sullivan & Neville Stiles. Edited by Wick R. Miller & Karen Dakin. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.
- Svenonius, Peter. 2014. Generalized applicatives: Reassessing the lexical-functional divide. *Theoretical Linguistics* 40(3/4). 439–446.
- Torrend, Julius. 1891. *A comparative grammar of the South-African Bantu languages comprising those of Zanzibar, Mozambique, the Zambezi, Kafirland, Benguela, Angola, the Congo, the Ogowe, the Cameroons, the Lake Region, etc.* London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co.
- Vamarasi, Marit Kana. 1999. *Grammatical relations in Bahasa Indonesia*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Watanabe, Honoré. 2015. Valency classes in Sliammon Salish. In Andrej Malchukov & Bernard Comrie (eds.), *Valency classes in the world's languages, Vol. 2: Case studies from Austronesia, the Pacific, the Americas, and theoretical outlook*, 1313–1358. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Watkins, Mark Hanna. 1937. *A grammar of Chichewa: A Bantu language of British Central Africa*. Philadelphia: Linguistic Society of America.
- Wechsler, Stephen. 2015. *Word meaning and syntax: Approaches to the interface*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wicks, Douglas Allen. 2006. A partial grammar sketch of Lunyole with emphasis on the applicative construction(s). La Mirada, CA: Biola University MA thesis.
- Woodbury, Anthony. 2011. Atkan Aleut “unclitic” pronouns and definiteness: A multimodular analysis. In Etsuyo Yuasa, Tista Bagchi & Katharine Beals (eds.), *Pragmatics and Autolexical Grammar: In honor of Jerry Sadock*, 125–142. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Zavala, Roberto. 2015. Instrumentos y comitativos en las lenguas de la familia mixezeoque. Una exploración desde la gramaticalización y la tipología. *Amerindia* 37(2). 189–228.
- Zúñiga, Fernando. 2009. An exploration of the diachrony of Mapudungun valency-changing operations. Ms., University of Zurich.
- Zúñiga, Fernando. 2014. (Anti-)cliticization in Mapudungun. *Morphology* 24. 161–175.
- Zúñiga, Fernando & Seppo Kittilä. 2019. *Grammatical voice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.