

Fernando Zúñiga

## 2 Questionnaire on applicative constructions

Please note that the structure of the contributions need not reflect the order of the questions in the questionnaire, but all the points listed in the questionnaire are expected to be addressed in one way or another and should be briefly recapitulated in the concluding section of the article.

### The language(s)

Please give (i) a general characterization of the language(s) in terms of geography, genealogy, contact, sociolinguistic status, dialectal variation, etc. In case you are dealing with an individual language, please also provide the ISO and Glottolog codes that identify it. Either as an additional subsection or as a separate article section, please give (ii) a short survey of the basic elements of clause structure necessary to understand your contribution. In language-family contributions, the general characterization part will probably need to be somewhat longer than a mere couple of sentences and might even come close to 300 or 400 words. With languages whose morphology and/or syntax is particularly complex, the morphosyntactic essentials part will probably take up most of the space. Whatever kind of balance you end up striking between both introductory subsections, please make sure these two parts do not exceed 1,500 words in total length.

#### 1 Morphology

- 1.1 How are the main ACs of the language(s) marked on the predicate (e.g., affixally, prosodically, with an auxiliary, a functional verb, a [clitic?] particle. . .)?
- 1.2 If there are applicative serial verb constructions or converbal constructions, which verbs are involved, how can they be described structurally and functionally? How grammaticalized are the functional verbs?
- 1.3 If there is allomorphy for the individual markers, what conditions it (phonology, morphology, lexical predicate class [e.g., valency-based])?
- 1.4 Do applicativized verbs show comparable inflectional paradigms to those of their base counterparts, or are they defective/restricted/regularized. . . ?

---

**Acknowledgments:** I am indebted to Denis Creissels and Sara Pacchiarotti for their comments on earlier versions of this questionnaire.

## 2 Syntax

- 2.1 What is the syntactic status of the applied phrase in the different ACs in the language(s)?
- 2.2 Does the syntactic status of the applied phrase's companion arguments/adjuncts change between the BC and the AC?
- 2.3 Are there restrictions on the stacking/combination of voice operations? Is applicativization required, allowed, dispreferred, blocked, etc., in the context of nominal incorporation, (anti-)passivization, (anti-)causativization, reflexives, reciprocals. . . ?
- 2.4 Are some ACs a special subset of ditransitive/double-object constructions in terms of argument-realization specifics, or are they only morphologically different from underived predicates belonging to the same valency class?
- 2.5 How rigid/flexible is the assignment of case/agreement frames to ACs when compared to BCs? See Exx. (19–20) in the position paper, where AppPs in Mapudungun are arguably not simply default primary objects.
- 2.6 Does applicativization condition the access of non-core syntactic arguments to operations such as relativization or focalization?

## 3 Semantics

- 3.1 Are different markers specialized for different semantics (e.g., valency and semantic role)?
- 3.2 Which semantic roles can be expressed by the applied phrase? Are there semantic roles that can be expressed only by means of an applicative construction (in either monoclausal or biclausal constructions)? For instance, the only way to express the location 'at my place' in Blackfoot (1) is as the secondary object of an applicativized verb (i.e., there is no adjunct equivalent to its English translation with an adposition):

(1) Blackfoot (Frantz 2009: 94)

<i>It-á-ooyi-wa</i>	<i>n-ookóówa-yi.</i>
APPL-DUR-eat.AI-PROX.SG	1-home-INAN.SG
'S/he eats at my place.'	

- 3.3 If a given semantic role can be expressed both in a BC and an AC, is there a semantic difference between the Applied phrase and its counterpart in the BC (e.g., affectedness, individuation, specificity, . . .)? Are there other semantic differences between the AC and the BC (e.g., aspect and manner)?
- 3.4 Is there a pragmatic difference between the applied phrase and its counterpart in the BC (e.g., topicalization, [contrastive] focalization)? Are there other pragmatic differences between the AC and the BC (e.g., theticity)?
- 3.5 If both a BC and an AC are available with a given verb (irrespective of whether there is a semantic opposition or not), is there a discourse-sensitive specificity to their distribution?

#### 4 Lookalikes

- 4.1 If there is no *bona fide* applicative marking on the predicate, are there (quasi-) productive uncoded alternations (e.g., *English I bought flowers for you* vs. *I bought you flowers*)? How can they be described structurally and functionally? How are they conditioned/licensed?
- 4.2 Are there markers that may have turned from erstwhile applicatives into strictly valency-neutral markers (e.g., spatial/directional markers, politeness markers. . .)?

## Abbreviations

AI	animate intransitive
APPL	applicative
DUR	durative
INAN	inanimate
PROX	proximate
SG	singular

## References

Frantz, Donald. 2009. *Blackfoot grammar*. 2nd end. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.