

Fernando Zúñiga

7 The applicative constructions of Mapudungun

Abstract: This chapter surveys the morphology, syntax, and semantics of the applicative constructions of Mapudungun (isolate; Chile/Argentina). The four markers addressed are the verbal suffixes *-l*, *-ñma*, *-tu*, and *-ye*. With respect to syntax, the Mapudungun constructions introduce to the clausal core an argument in P role (which, given the symmetrical-voice make-up of clausal syntax in the language, appears as either a subject or an object, depending on factors unrelated to applicativization). With respect to the semantic role of the applied phrase, the markers are relatively underspecified, albeit with some tendencies: *-l* and *-ñma*-applicatives center around the notions of approach/benefaction and separation/malefaction, respectively, but they can also express a broader Concernee-Concern relation; *-tu*-applicatives typically introduce Stimuli, Goals, or Patients; and *-ye*-applicatives introduce Comitatives or Speech/Thought Topics. The marker *-l* also causativizes (with some complicating aspects in the allomorphy found with both processes), *-ñma* appears on verbal/adverbial roots expressing spatial, temporal, and manner notions, and *-tu* and *-ye* also function as denominal verbalizers. The suffix *-tu* also has a number of other functions, including telicization and the derivation of reversionary/repetitive forms (both of which are frequent), as well as antipassivization (which is severely restricted and infrequent).

1 Introduction

The present chapter describes the applicative constructions of Mapudungun (a.k.a. Mapuche language or, in older studies, Araucanian; ISO 639-3 *arn*, Glottolog *mapu1245*). This indigenous language is an isolate spoken in south-central Chile and west-central Argentina by 150,000–250,000 speakers, to different degrees of fluency (Zúñiga and Olate 2017) and has been in contact with Spanish since the 16th century. There are a handful of very similar regional varieties (including obsolescent Huilliche, occasionally considered a separate language). Grammatical applicative-related facts seem to show negligible variation across the Chilean dialects; lexical and discourse-related aspects may show important inter-dialectal variation. This chapter focuses on the conservative registers of Central Mapudungun as spoken in the Araucanía Region in Chile.

Acknowledgments: I am grateful to Denis Creissels for his valuable comments on previous versions of this chapter. His contribution was especially important for improving the presentation of analytical issues in Section 2.

The phenomena discussed here center around the opposition illustrated in (1).¹ Suffixing *-ñma* to the verb allows the clause to accommodate as a primary object a participant not expressible with the underived verb:

- (1) a. *Düngu-nge juez mew!*
 speak-2SG.IMP judge POSTP
 ‘Speak to/with the judge!’ (base construction)
 b. *Düngu-ñma-fi-nge juez mew!*
 speak-APPL-3.OBJ-2SG.IMP judge POSTP
 ‘Speak with the judge in his/her favor!’ (applicative construction)

To judge from Polinsky’s (2013) classification of Mapudungun as not having applicatives, the topic of the present chapter may be considered controversial. Nevertheless, Peterson’s (2007: 1) description of applicatives as “means some languages have for structuring clauses which allow the coding of a thematically peripheral argument or adjunct as a core-object argument” covers (1) rather easily. In fact, Polinsky’s own definition straightforwardly applies to (1): “[i]n an applicative construction, the number of object arguments selected by the predicate is increased by one with respect to the basic construction”. (Her source, Moesbach 1962, addresses several of the phenomena treated here, but without using the label *applicative*.) Contemporary studies of Mapudungun morphosyntactic topics have employed the notion without discussing or reviewing it (e.g., Baker, Aranovich, and Golluscio 2005; Golluscio 2007; Zúñiga 2010a).

I employ here the comparative notion of applicative constructions advanced in Zúñiga and Creissels (this volume). An applicative construction (AC) contrasts in three important respects with a base construction (BC) headed by a predicate built upon the same root. First, the predicate in the AC shows additional overt marking that distinguishes it from the unmarked predicate in the BC. Second, the participant encoded as A or S in the BC appears as A or S in the AC. Third, the applied phrase (AppP) of the AC, in a role other than A or S, cannot be expressed in the BC at all, or it appears in the latter as a non-core constituent with a different coding. This comparative notion, however, is based on a Comrian model that uses the notions of A, P, and S understood as “syntactic terms whose prototypes are defined in semantic terms” (Comrie 1989: 111), which is insufficient to adequately capture Mapudungun verbal clause structure due to what I analyze as a symmetrical voice opposition in Section 2.

The chapter is structured as follows. Section 2 sketches the necessary basic information about Mapudungun morphosyntax and outlines what I think is the necessary

¹ Unless otherwise specified, numbered examples come from elicitation sessions I conducted with speakers in Chile in the early 2000s. The orthographic convention used here is the *Alfabeto Mapuche Unificado*, I have unified the spelling, and all interlinear glosses are my own. Examples provide phonologically underlying forms; to arrive at surface forms, some minor elision, assimilation, resyllabification, and epenthesis rules apply (Zúñiga 2006: Ch. VII.1.1).

adaptation to the basic Comrian A/P/S model in order to account for the structure of transitive clauses in the language. Sections 3, 4 and 5 survey the morphological, syntactic, and semantic characteristics of the applicatives of the language, respectively. Section 6 outlines other uses of the applicative markers, and Section 7 summarizes the main findings.

2 Basics of Mapudungun morphosyntax

2.1 Morphology

Mapudungun morphology is predominantly suffixing and agglutinative; it shows virtually no flexivity or fusion of formatives, and most grammaticalized elements show separative exponence and occur in concatenative strings. Nominal morphology is rather limited: the only process that leads to some structural complexity there is productive compounding. By contrast, verbs allow for verb-noun and verb-verb compounding and can take a high number of derivational and inflectional affixes, only very few of which need to be present for words to be well formed (Zúñiga 2017). Voice(-related) suffixes include reflexive *-w*, Agent-less passive *-nge*, some causatives, and several applicatives (see Golluscio 2010 and Zúñiga 2015 for more on transitivity, valency, and voice in Mapudungun).

Extant descriptions of Mapudungun morphology propose a templatic, rather than a layered or hybrid, structure of the verb complex. Nevertheless, accounts disagree regarding both the template's rigidity and the number of slots and fillers to be distinguished. Despite bearing some superficial similarities to Smeets's (2008) account, the model espoused here is closer to the partial proposals advanced in Augusta (1903), Harmelink (1996), Salas (2006), and Golluscio (2010).

2.2 Basic syntax

In this study, the terms *avalent*, *monovalent*, *bivalent*, and *trivalent* refer to the syntactic valency of predicates (and are abbreviated as “v0”, “v1”, etc.). *Zero-argument*, *one-argument*, *two-argument*, and *three-argument* describe clause types.

In Mapudungun, heads mark the relationships between themselves and some of their dependents at the clause level, and participants can be subjects, primary and secondary objects, oblique objects, or adjuncts.² Subjects and primary objects can bear a wide range of semantic roles, not only due to the specific predicates that assign them

² Instead of SUBJECT and OBJECT, other accounts have proposed FOCAL and SATELLITE PERSON (Salas 2006), and PRIMARY and SECONDARY ARGUMENT (Zúñiga 2015).

to their arguments but also because of the alternation between actor and undergoer voices, as will become apparent shortly. Secondary objects are usually Theme-like arguments of trivalent predicates. The distinction between oblique objects and adjuncts is semantic; the former express participants more involved in the predicate semantics while the latter bear peripheral semantic roles. See Zúñiga (2019) for more details on grammatical relations in Mapudungun.

The valency classes of Mapudungun underived predicates are summarized in Table 1 below (cf. Zúñiga 2015). Examples of the predicate and clause types follow.

Table 1: Valency classes of Mapudungun underived predicates and associated clause types.

Predicate class	Clause type	Arguments
I. Aivalent (e.g. <i>mawün-</i> ‘rain’)	Zero-argument	—
IIa. Monovalent (e.g. <i>la-</i> ‘die’)	One-argument	SBJ
IIb. Extended monovalent (e.g. <i>kon-</i> ‘enter’)	Two-argument	SBJ + OOBJ
IIIa. Bivalent (e.g. <i>mütrüm-</i> ‘call’)		SBJ + POBJ
IIIb. Extended bivalent (e.g. <i>tüku-</i> ‘put’)	Three-argument	SBJ + POBJ + OOBJ
IV. Trivalent (e.g. <i>elu-</i> ‘give’)		SBJ + POBJ + SOBJ

- (2) a. *Mawün-i.*
rain-IND[3]
‘It rained.’ (I)
- b. *La-i Rayen.*
die-IND[3] R.
‘Rayén died.’ (IIa)
- c. *Kon-i Nawel (Rayen mew).*
enter-IND[3] N. R. POSTP
‘Nahuel entered (Rayén’s house).’ (IIb)
- d. *Mütrüm(-fi)-n Rayen. — Mütrüm-e-n-mew Rayen.*
call-3.OBJ-1SG.IND R. call-INV-1SG.IND-3.OBJ R.
‘I called Rayén.’ (AV, direct; IIIa) ‘Rayén called me.’ (UV, inverse; IIIa)
- e. *Tüku(-fi)-n ilo challa mew.*
put-3.OBJ-1SG.IND meat pot POSTP
‘I put meat in the pot.’ (AV, direct; IIIb)
- f. *Elu-fi-n makuñ. —*
give-3.OBJ-1SG.IND blanket
‘I gave him/her a blanket.’ (AV, direct; IV)
Elu-e-n-mew makuñ.
give-INV-1SG.IND-3.OBJ blanket
‘S/he gave me a blanket.’ (UV, inverse; IV)

There are two kinds of clauses headed by bivalent or trivalent predicates: actor-voice (AV) and undergoer-voice (UV) clauses, which feature direct and inverse verb forms, respectively. The choice between these clause types is based on person and animacy of the subject and the primary object, as well as on their relative topicality (Zúñiga 2006: Ch. VII). A simplified nominal hierarchy like [1/2 > 3 topical > 3 non-topical] will suffice for our present purposes. In interactions between two animate referents, when the agentive core argument outranks the non-agentive core argument on the nominal hierarchy, AV clauses are used; UV clauses are used when the converse situation holds. The referential status of secondary objects (e.g., Theme-like arguments of trivalent predicates) and oblique objects is irrelevant for the choice between clause types. In both clauses in (d), the 1st person is the subject and the woman is the primary object; Agent and Patient are the subject and the primary object in the AV clause on the left-hand side, and the primary object and the subject in the UV clause on the right-hand side, respectively. In (f), Agent, Recipient, and Theme are the subject, the primary object, and the secondary object in the AV clause on the left; they are the primary object, the subject, and the secondary object in the UV clause on the right. The agentive 3rd-person object in UV clauses is invariably head-marked as *-mew*. The conditions governing the appearance of the non-agentive 3rd-person object marker *-fi* in AV clauses are complex; *-fi* invariably occurs with trivalent predicates like *elu-* ‘give’ in (f) and variably occurs with bivalent predicates like *mütrüm-* ‘call’ in (d), depending on animacy, definiteness, and topicality of the object, as well as the proper-common distinction (Zúñiga 2010b).

Thus, derived and underived bivalent and trivalent predicates occur in the actor-voice direct form, the undergoer-voice inverse form, or in either, depending on the core arguments’ inherent semantic and relative pragmatic feature values.³ Instead of a one-to-one correspondence between the syntactic roles and the coding characteristics of core arguments, we find a correspondence mediated by a system of symmetrical voices, as depicted in Table 2. A (the argument of transitive verbs whose morphosyntactic behavior is that of the Agent of prototypical transitive verbs) is the subject in AV clauses and the object in UV clauses; P (the argument of transitive verbs whose morphosyntactic behavior is that of the Patient of prototypical transitive verbs) is the subject in UV clauses and the object in AV clauses.⁴

3 This holds not only for high-transitivity predicates like *langüm-* ‘kill’ and *i-* ‘eat’ (cf. the “prototypical transitive verbs” in Creissels, forthcoming) but also for low-transitivity ones like *pe-* ‘see’ and *ayü-* ‘love’. Some high-transitivity verbs (e.g., *trafo-* ‘break’) never occur in inverse forms because their Patient is inanimate, and two-argument constructions with inanimate Agents and animate Patients are banned in Mapudungun.

4 This symmetrical-voice account refers to syntax only. Both the morphology and the discourse frequency of direct and inverse forms are asymmetrical; the formal direct-inverse opposition is privative, rather than equipollent (see [2d] and [2f]), and inverse forms are seldom found in narrative texts (despite some being obligatory to encode those specific states of affairs, viz. those involving interactions between 1st/2nd and 3rd persons).

Table 2: Grammatical relations in transitive clauses.

	A	P
Actor voice (direct)	subject	primary object
Undergoer voice (inverse)	primary object	subject

Constituent-order regularities have not been explored systematically yet, but what we know so far about the flexible and (possibly) dominant VS+VO order of Mapudungun can be summarized as follows. Typical verbal clauses have no overt argument NP, or only one. Typical one-argument verbal clauses have their subject NP immediately after the predicate (2b). Lastly, typical two-/three-argument verbal clauses have their object NPs immediately after the predicate (2c–f) (if both objects are present, the secondary object usually precedes the primary object).

2.3 Valency/voice operations

Passivization with *-nge* applies only to bivalent and trivalent predicates; it suppresses the Agent, promotes the Patient/Recipient from primary object to subject, and leaves the Theme secondary object (if any) unaltered. The passive counterparts of (2d/f) are given in (3). Note the new two-argument clause type IIIC illustrated in (b), which has a non-agentive subject and a secondary object; this plays a role in the discussion of an applicative lookalike subtype in Section 6.2.1.

- (3) a. *Mütrüm-nge-n.*
 call-PASS-1SG.IND
 ‘I was called / someone called me.’ (IIa)
- b. *Elu-nge-n makuñ.*
 give-PASS-1SG.IND blanket
 ‘I was given a blanket.’ (IIIC)

Nominal incorporation (NI) is productive with bivalent verbs, possible but lexically constrained with trivalent verbs, and restricted with monovalent verbs. At first sight, bivalent verbs seem to become monovalent when they incorporate their Patient/Theme (4); we will see in Section 4.3, however, that they can actually become labile.

- (4) a. *Weñe-ke-n sañchu.*
 steal-HAB-1SG.IND pig
 b. *Weñe-sañchu-ke-n.*
 steal-pig-HAB-1SG.IND
 Both: ‘I usually steal pigs.’

Non-agentive monovalent verbs allow NI, but only if the new subject and the incorporate are in a possessive relation (5) (Baker, Aranovich, and Golluscio 2005). This is normally found in spontaneous discourse with body parts, but examples with owned items are not difficult to find:

- (5) a. *Lüf-i (ĩñche) ñi ruka.*
 burn-IND[3] 1SG.PRO 1SG.PSR house
 b. *(Iñche) lüf-ruka-n.*
 1SG.PRO burn-house-IND-1SG.IND
 Both: ‘My house burned down.’

The voice operators addressed in this chapter are NUCLEATIVIZERS: they allow participants not encoded as core terms in base constructions (BCs) to be encoded as such in derived monoclausal constructions (see Zúñiga and Creissels, this volume). Causatives introduce a causer-Agent in A role, and applicatives a non-Agent in P role, to the clause. Unlike in many other languages, rather than invariably introducing these arguments as subjects and objects, respectively, in Mapudungun the new arguments’ realization is contingent on the choice between actor and undergoer voices; when both highest-ranking participants are animate, these nucleativizers lead to constructions that systematically alternate. With AGENTIVE NUCLEATIVIZERS (ANS), the causer in A role is the subject with the actor-voice direct form (6b) and the primary object with the undergoer-voice inverse form (6c):

- (6) a. *Aye-n.*
 laugh-1SG.IND
 ‘I laughed.’
 b. *Aye-l-fi-n ñi wenüy.*
 laugh-CAUS-3.OBJ-1SG.IND 1SG.PSR friend
 ‘I made my friend laugh.’ (direct, AV)
 c. *Aye-l-e-n-mew ñi wenüy.*
 laugh-CAUS-INV-1SG.IND-3.OBJ 1SG.PSR friend
 ‘My friend made me laugh.’ (inverse, UV)

With NON-AGENTIVE NUCLEATIVIZERS (NANS), the new argument in P role is the primary object with the actor-voice direct form (7a) and the subject with the undergoer-voice inverse form (7b):

- (7) a. *Aye-tu-fi-n ñi wenüy.*
 laugh-APPL-3.OBJ-1SG.IND 1SG.PSR friend
 ‘I laughed at my friend.’ (direct, AV)

- b. *Aye-tu-e-n-mew* *ñi* *wenüy*.
 laugh-APPL-INV-1SG.IND-3.OBJ 1SG.PSR friend
 ‘My friend laughed at me.’ (inverse, uv)

Thus, with such Mapudungun nucleatives, there is a disconnect between the introduction or promotion of a core argument and the realization of that argument (see Figure 1 below). The direct-verb, actor-voice, Examples (6b) and (7a) instantiate causatives and applicatives, respectively, in the familiar sense; the inverse, undergoer-voice, Examples (6c) and (7b) are their syntactic mirror images:

Default			Mapudungun		
	AN	NAN		AN	NAN
SBJ	CAUS		SBJ	(6b)	(7b)
OBJ		APPL	OBJ	(6c)	(7a)
				CAUS	APPL

Figure 1: Two selected nucleative opposition types.

3 Morphology

The four applicative markers in the language are the verbal suffixes *-tu*, *-ye*, *-l*, and *-ñma*. No serial verb constructions or converbal constructions in the language qualify as ACs.⁵

The markers *-tu* and *-ye* are invariable; *-l* and *-ñma* show phonologically conditioned allomorphy. The allomorphs of *-l* are: *-l* after vowels, *-ül* after *w*, and *-el* elsewhere. Note that the suffix commonly appears as *-lel* with some vowel-final roots (viz. *i-* ‘eat’, *pe-* ‘see’, *pi-* ‘say’, *ina-* ‘follow’, *kullkü-* ‘reserve [domestic animals]’, and *kintu-* ‘look for’), and as *-yel* (with epenthetic *y*) with *la-* ‘die’ (see [36]). The allomorphs of *-ñma* are: *-ñma* after vowels and *-ma* elsewhere. Nevertheless, the suffix consistently appears as *-üñma* after the *m*-causative and some *m*-final roots—viz. *kim-* ‘know’ and *rungüm-* ‘grind’. Other exceptions include roots like *wew-üñma-* ‘win on (sbdy)’.⁶

5 I do not address here two markers that occur only with few verbs, namely *-mpe* ~ *-ñpe* (e.g., *illku-* ‘get angry’ > *illku-ñpe-* ‘call names’; cf. Smeets 2008: 310) and *-kütuye* (e.g., *rüpu-* ‘sever’ > *rüpu-kütuye-* ‘carve [with an axe]’, Augusta 1916: 199; cf. Smeets 2008: 288f). Verb compounding with *künü-* ‘leave’, *nie-* ‘have’, and *tüku-* ‘put’ also lies beyond the scope of the present chapter; see Augusta (1903: 261–268) and Smeets (2008: 293f, 316).

6 Augusta (1916: 57) records the anomalous minimal pair *ngüf-ma-* ‘have (a body part) blocked’ vs. *ngüf-üñma-* ‘be surprised by dusk’. Upon closer inspection, the latter meaning appears to be regularly expressed by *ngüfke-ñma-* (or other verbs built on a non-cognate root); the unexpected form *ngüf-üñma-* seems to occur only sporadically and in unsystematic variation nowadays. (I am grateful to Aldo Olate for his help with this issue.)

All four markers are fully grammaticalized elements. The suffix *-tu*—actually, all *tu*-suffixes, see further down—probably originated from the verbal root *tu*- ‘get, take’. Strictly verbal *-ye* is likely a grammaticalized version of *ye*₁- ‘carry, bring’, and denominal *-ye* probably originated in *ye*₂- ‘regard as’. The etymon of *-l* may be *el*- ‘set, put’, *elu*- ‘give’, or *wül*- ‘give away, hand’. The suffix *-ñma* might be related to the verbal root *man*- ‘be lucky’, recorded in Augusta (1916: 131) for the Huapi dialect, but it might also have been originally polymorphemic (Zúñiga 2009b).⁷

The four markers show variation regarding their specificity. First consider applicative *-l* vis-à-vis causative *-l*. Mapudungun has four morphological causatives, two of which can co-occur with the applicatives and are particularly common. The *m*-causative is restricted to a closed but non-negligible class of monovalent verbs where the causee is low in animacy/control, for instance, *wadkü-m-i ko* (boil-CAUS-IND[3] water) ‘s/he boiled the water’. By contrast, the *l*-causative is productive and used frequently with monovalent verbs where the causee is high in animacy/control, for instance, *aye-l-e-n-mew* (laugh-CAUS-INV-1SG.IND-3.OBJ) ‘s/he made me laugh’. A number of verbs can take either suffix (e.g., *tran*- ‘fall’ > *tran-üm*- ‘fell’ vs. *tran-el*- ‘knock down’); see Golluscio (2007) for details. The allomorphy facts of causative *-l* mirror those of applicative *-l*, with the caveat that *-lel* is only an applicative morph. I therefore see this as an erstwhile instance of the much-cited causative-applicative polysemy that, in this case, has given rise to two different templatic slots—the causative appears closer to the root (see [8b]), and several other derivational markers can come in between both positions—and two functionally distinct fillers with very similar allomorphs.⁸ In addition, *-l* is a denominal verbalizer.

Second, applicative *-ye* has three homonyms: a denominal verbalizer, an unclear and obsolescent aspectual marker denoting completion or duration, and a marker denoting distributivity or multiplicity.

Third, some ambiguous elements that can be either verbal roots or adverbs and express spatial, temporal, and manner notions can appear extended by *-ñma*. Those elements can occur either on their own (e.g., *llekü*- ‘[get] close’, *fentre*- ‘[be] much’, and *welu*- ‘but; cross [v1]’), with *-ñma* in derived verbs (e.g., *llekü-ñma*- ‘approach [v2]’, *fentre-ñma*- ‘last a long time’, *welu-ñma*- ‘mistake [v2]’), or with *-ñma* in adverbs (e.g., *llekü-ñma* ‘near’, *fentre-ñma* ‘for a long time’, *welu-ñma* ‘upside down, backwards’). Except for these “relationalizers”, *-ñma* does not seem to have any homonyms.⁹

7 Evidence for this comes from the existence of autobenefactive *-ñmu* (e.g. in *küdaw-ñmu-n* ‘I worked for my own benefit’, Smeets 2008: 274). This element may be etymologically related to *-ñma*—e.g., via an erstwhile composition along the lines of **-ñ(-a)* ‘APPL’ + **-u* ‘REFL’—but it is not an applicative.

8 Smeets (2008) postulates three different morphemes *-(e)l*, *-(ü)l* and *-(l)el* in three separate templatic slots. In her account, the suffix *-(ü)l* denotes higher affectedness of the primary object (pp. 287–288).

9 Smeets (2008: 276f, 301f) postulates two different morphemes *-(ñ)ma* (“experience”) and *-(ü)ñma* (“indirect object”) in two separate templatic slots.

Lastly, it is still unclear how to best analyze the instances of grammaticalized *tu*'s in the verbal complex. At least three homophonous suffixes need to be distinguished synchronically: the denominal verbalizer (e.g., *kofke* 'bread' > *kofke-tu₁*- 'eat bread'), the telicizer (e.g., *nge*- 'be' > *nge-tu₂*- 'become'), and the reversionary/repetitive (e.g., *aku*- 'arrive' > *aku-tu₃*- 'arrive back'). (One of the ways to build iterative stems might be a special case of the reversionary/repetitive, e.g. *rüŋkü*- 'jump' > *rüŋkü~rüŋkü-tu*- 'bounce'; see Zúñiga and Díaz-Fernández 2014). The applicative and the reversionary/repetitive could be originally the same as the antipassive *-tu₄* (e.g., *imül*- 'roll' [v2] > *imül-tu₄*- 'roll for fun [v1]'). The valency-neutral suffixes (e.g., *kedif-tu*- 'shear [v2]' and *kewa*- 'fight [v1]' > *kewa-tu*- 'fight for fun [v1]') might also be instances of a bleached erstwhile applicative, and I regard them as such here. In sum, I tentatively distinguish deverbal *-tu₁*, aspectual *-tu₂* and *-tu₃*, and a broad polysemous *-tu₄* that has applicativization as one of its functions.

Applicatives can co-occur with causatives on the one hand and passives on the other; the former co-occurrence seems to be subject to semantic/pragmatic restrictions only; I have not found any restrictions for the latter. Regarding the combinability of the applicative suffixes among themselves, valency-altering *-tu* and *-ye* do not appear to occur twice on the same verb. They can occasionally combine with *-l* and *-ñma*, for instance: *tüku*- 'put' > *tüku-tu*- 'put at/on' > *tüku-tu-l*- 'put at/on for'. How freely *-l* and *-ñma* can combine with themselves or with each other is controversial; Smeets (2008: 280) says that the combinations *-l+ma* and *-ñma+ñma* are infrequent and unacceptable, respectively. Salas (2006:122) found that *ñma*-applicativization of an applicative form is admissible, at least with passivized verbs (8). My own work confirms Salas's findings for active clauses as well, albeit with some variation and uncertainty on the part of the speakers.

- (8) a. *Weñe-ñma-ñma-nge-i-m-i waka tami fotüm.*
steal-APPL-APPL-PASS-IND-2-SG cow 2SG.PSR son.of.man
'Someone/people stole your son's cow.'
- b. *Küpa-l-el-ma-nge-i-m-i kuram tami ñuke.*
come-CAUS-APPL-APPL-PASS-IND-2-SG egg 2SG.PSR mother
'Someone/people brought your mother eggs.'

Augusta (1903: 62) reports the following instance of *l*-stacking that does not involve causatives, and I have been able to find analogous forms rather easily in elicitation with other bivalent verbs. In such examples, each *-l* simply accommodates an AppP of its own into the clause (see § 4):

- (9) a. *Nentu-en!*
remove-2SG→1SG.IND
'Get me out (e.g., of jail)!'

- b. *Nentu-l-en* *wayun!*
 remove-APPL-2SG→1SG.IND thorn
 ‘Remove the thorn from me!’
- c. *Nentu-l-el-en* *ñi wayun tañi fotüm!*
 remove-APPL-APPL-2SG→1SG.IND 3.PSR thorn 1SG.PSR son.of.man
 ‘Remove the thorn from my son!’

Instances of *ñma*-stacking are rare in published sources but can be found, as illustrated in (10). In (10a), *anü-* ‘sit down’ first accommodates via *ñma*-suffixation the location on which the interlocutor sits as core argument, and then further accommodates the location’s possessor, that is, the speaker. In (10b), with *üfülü-* ‘sip, suck up’, the first *-ñma* is syntactically neutral—it merely changes the verb’s meaning from ‘sip’ to ‘swallow’—and the second accommodates the possessor of the ship, who appears as subject of an UV clause because it is animate (unlike the inanimate but potent waves):

- (10) a. *Anü-ñma-ñma-ki-eli* *ñi lifro!*
 sit-APPL-APPL-NEG-2SG→1SG.SUBJ 1SG.PSR book
 ‘Don’t you (SG) sit on my book!’ (Augusta 1916: 9)
- b. *Foche üfülü-ñma-ñma-e-i-mew* *ñi nafiu.*
 wave suck.up-ñMA-APPL-INV-IND[3]-3.OBJ 3.PSR ship
 ‘The waves swallowed his ship.’ (Augusta 1916: 271)

Mapudungun applicatives are not systematically restricted by either tense-aspect-mood values or the direct-inverse opposition, nor do they occur less often on main-clause finite verb forms than on subordinate nonfinite forms. Verbs with more than two applicatives, which would normally have more than three objects in the clause, are absent in extant texts and are virtually always rejected in elicitation. There seems to be a processing-related tendency not to applicativize verbs whose morphological make-up is already considerably complex, which might explain why applicativization is seldom found together with nominal incorporation, even though there is no hard constraint on their co-occurrence.

4 Syntax

4.1 General comments

Mapudungun applicatives are P-applicatives (Creissels, forthcoming; Zúñiga and Creissels, this volume). Most are TRANSITIVIZING, but some are REDIRECTING; the latter are valency-neutral but not syntax-neutral (i.e., they affect argument realization).

Regarding the status of the applied phrase in the derived construction, Mapudungun applicatives are either PRIMARY-OBJECTIVE or SUBJECTIVE; the correspondences between predicate classes, clause argument inventories, and applicative types are summarized in Table 3 below.

Table 3: Mapudungun transitivity applicative types.

	base predicate/clause		derived predicate/clause	
A	IIa ₂ /IIb	SBJ (+OOBJ)	IIIa	SBJ + POBJ
B	IIIa/IIIb	SBJ + POBJ (+OOBJ)	IV	SBJ + POBJ + SOBJ
C	IV	SBJ + POBJ + SOBJ	V	SBJ + POBJ + 2X SOBJ

With trivalent, bivalent, and most monovalent base predicates, primary-objective and subjective applicatives regularly alternate, as mentioned in Section 2.3. Argument realization is determined by the rules that govern morphosyntactic inversion and the opposition between actor-voice and undergoer-voice clauses: the AppP is a primary object in an AV clause and a subject in an UV clause. Note that one clause type instantiated in derived clauses is not available with underived predicates, namely four-argument clauses (Clause Type V, with Applicative Type C).

Regarding the status of any companion objects to the AppP in the clause, base primary objects appear as secondary objects in the derived construction; there are no double- or triple-object constructions in Mapudungun in the sense of syntactically equivalent primary objects.

Regarding the status of the semantic equivalent of the AppP in the base construction, two cases must be distinguished. If the referent expressed by the AppP is a Concernee (or “External Possessor”; see Van de Velde 2020), it can be expressed as a non-argumental, NP-internal, constituent in the base clause, even though speakers consider such constructions stilted or unidiomatic, especially with kinship terms and part-whole relations (OPTIONAL APPLICATIVES). By contrast, non-Possessors could be expressed in an adpositional phrase in the base clause in some very few instances in principle (e.g., with the semantically void postposition *mew*), but such clauses are virtually never found outside of elicitation, and even there they are often semantically opaque and strongly dispreferred (OBLIGATORY APPLICATIVES).

4.2 Individual markers/constructions

The suffix *-tu* can have a syntactic effect, either transitivity (e.g., Type A, *ad-* ‘be beautiful’ > *ad-tu-* ‘find beautiful’, and Type B, *ütrüf-* ‘throw’ > *ütrüf-tu-* ‘throw at’) or, rather exceptionally, redirecting (e.g. *ingka-* ‘help’ > *ingka-tu-* ‘ask for help’, Augusta 1916: 65). The marker can also have a syntactically neutral and even a valency-decreasing effect (see § 6).

Ye-suffixation can also be syntax-neutral (see § 6), but it often has a syntactic effect, either transitivity (e.g., Type A, *ngüma*- ‘weep’ > *ngüma-ye*- ‘weep about, mourn’) or redirecting (with *n[gl]ütram*- ‘tell, narrate’, *pi*- ‘tell, say’, and *wifül*- ‘throw [liquid]’). See in (11) how bivalent/trivalent *n(g)ütram*- ‘tell (sthg.), tell (sthg.) to (sbdy.)’ becomes strictly trivalent with *-l* (11b) and bivalent while changing the semantic role of the object with *-ye* (11c):

- (11) a. *Nütram-n tüfachi epew.* / *Nütram-fi-n tüfachi epew.*
 tell-1SG.IND this story tell-3.OBJ-1SG.IND this story
 ‘I told this story.’ ‘I told this story to him/her/them.’
- b. *Fey fey nütram-el-e-n-mew.*
 DEM DEM tell-APPL-INV-1SG.IND-3.OBJ
 ‘S/he told me that.’ (Augusta 1916: 153)
- c. *Nütram-ye-i chi weychan.*
 tell-APPL-IND[3] ART war
 ‘S/he talked about the war.’ (Augusta 1916: 153)

The statement-question pair in (12) illustrates Type-B *l*-applicativization of the underived bivalent base predicate *dewma*- ‘make’ in a sentence pair (data from Augusta 1903: 75). *Kiñe makuñ* ‘a blanket’, the primary object in (12a), is a secondary object in (12b); the third person asked about is the primary object in (12b), which has access to *fi*-indexing on the verb and is the subject of a corresponding passive.

- (12) a. *Tañi ñuke dewma-ke-i kiñe makuñ.*
 1SG.PSR mother make-HAB-IND[3] one blanket
 ‘My mother is making a blanket.’ (BC)
- b. *Iney dewma-l-ke-fi-i kiñe makuñ tami ñuke?*
 who make-APPL-HAB-3.OBJ-IND[3] one blanket 1SG.PSR mother
 ‘For whom is your (SG) mother making a blanket?’ (AC)

In such AV clauses, the subject remains unaltered by applicativization; this holds for all markers except for those cases where *-ñma* behaves like an applicative and a passive combined (see § 6.2.1). If the AppP is a highly topical 3rd person or a speech-act participant, however, an UV clause must be used, in which the non-agentive new argument is the subject; both the Theme (*kiñe makuñ* ‘a blanket’) and the Agent (*tami ñuke* ‘your mother’, the base subject) are objects (13):

- (13) *Dewma-l-ke-e-n-mew kiñe makuñ tami ñuke.*
 make-APPL-HAB-INV-1SG.IND-3.OBJ one blanket 2SG.PSR mother
 ‘Your mother made a blanket for me.’

L-applicativization is not productive with underived monovalent predicates (i.e., Type A); cases like *wirar*- ‘shout (v1)’ > *wirar-el*- ‘shout at’ amount only to a handful of verbs and show significant variation in how speakers use them and in how confident the latter are about their usage.

The pair in (14) illustrates Type-B *ñma*-applicativization of bivalent *nütu*- ‘take’:

- (14) a. *Nütu-n kiñe kawello.*
 take-1SG.IND one horse
 ‘I took the horse.’ (BC)
- b. *Nütu-ñma-ñi-n ñi kawello.*
 take-APPL-3.OBJ-1SG.IND 3.PSR horse
 ‘I took his/her horse.’ (AC)

The following examples show how an underived monovalent verb in (15a) becomes bivalent in (15b) (Type A) and, after further applicativization, trivalent in (15c) (Type B). Unlike with *l*-applicativization, instances like (15b) are rather frequent; those like (15c) seem to be less common (see §§ 3 and 5).¹⁰

- (15) a. *Feyti küpa-lu anü-a-i.*
 DEM come-PTCP sit.down-FUT-IND[3]
 ‘Those who have come will have to sit down.’ (Smeets 2008: 89)
- b. *Anü-ñma-ki-lnge chumpiru!*
 sit.down-APPL-NEG-2SG.SUBJ hat
 ‘Do not sit on the hat!’ (Augusta 1916: 9)
- c. *Anü-ñma-nie-ñma-en ñi makuñ.*
 sit.down-APPL-ASP-APPL-2SG→1SG.IND 1SG.PSR blanket
 ‘You (SG) sat on my coat.’ (Smeets 2008: 303)

Underived trivalent predicates are not numerous, but they allow Type-C applicativization with *-l* and *-ñma*. Labile *pi*- ‘tell/say (to)’—the verb can take one, two, or three core arguments—behaves as expected when trivalent, both syntactically and semantically. In an AV applicative construction, the Theme appears as secondary object and the primary object is a Beneficiary or Maleficiary, often construed via kinship (in UV applicative constructions, subjects and primary objects swap places): *pi-lel*- means ‘tell (sbdy.) (sthg.) on behalf of’ and *pi-ñma*- ‘to tell (sbdy.) (sthg.) to the detriment of’. Trivalent *müntu*- ‘take away’ behaves alike. By contrast, trivalent *elu*- ‘give’ in (16) behaves as expected only with *-l* (16a); with *-ñma* (16b), there is no syntactic effect and the reading is one of permissive causation (and the suffix is actually optional or “emphatic” in that construction:

¹⁰ Golluscio (2010: 738) says that *ñma*-suffixation can be valency-neutral with bivalent base predicates, which I have found to be the case only exceptionally.

- (16) a. *Elu-l-en* *kofke tañi witran!*
 give-APPL-2SG→1SG.IND bread 1SG.PSR foreigner
 ‘Give bread to my foreigner!’ (Augusta 1916: 39)
- b. *Ñi chaw elu(-ñma)-e-n-mew ñi fem-a-el.*
 1SG.PSR father give-APPL-INV-1SG.IND-3.OBJ 1SG.PSR do-FUT-NFIN
 ‘My father has allowed me to do it.’ (Augusta 1916: 39)

Morphosyntactic inversion operates exactly as with bivalent base predicates (see the uv clause in [16b]); with nontopical 3rd-person AppPs, AV clauses are used, in which the (new) non-agentive participant is the primary object (17):

- (17) a. *Fey pi-lel-fi-n tañi chaw.*
 DEM tell-APPL-3.OBJ-1SG.IND 3.PSR father
 ‘I told that to her/his father for her/him.’
- b. *Ñi chaw elu(-ñma)-fi-i ñi fem-a-el.*
 3.PSR father give-APPL-3.OBJ-IND[3] 3.PSR do-FUT-NFIN
 ‘Her/his father has allowed her/him to do it.’

4.3 Summary and further points of interest

The syntactic effects of different applicatives are summarized in Table 4 below.

Table 4: Mapudungun transitivity applicative types.

	<i>-tu</i>	<i>-ye</i>	<i>-l</i>	<i>-ñma</i>
Valency-increasing/ Transitivity				
Type A: IIa/IIb>IIIa	✓	✓	(✓)	✓
Type B: IIIa/IIIb>IV	✓	✗	✓	✓
Type C: IV>V	✗	✗	✓	(✓)
Valency-neutral/ Redirecting				
IIa>IIa	(✗)	✓	✗	✗

Note how applicativization interacts with nominal incorporation. Example (4) above illustrated the latter process with the bivalent verb *weñe-* ‘steal’, which is also used in (18) below (from Augusta 1903: 293). Applicativization works as expected with the default clause (18a), turning the bivalent verb trivalent, but the verb-noun compound in (18b) does not take *-ñma* (or any other applicative marker) in order to license the third argument; as mentioned in Section 2 above, *weñe-sañchu-* is labile (bivalent/trivalent) and means ‘steal a pig / pigs (from)’:

- (18) a. *Weñe-ñma-e-n-mew* *ñi* *sañchu*
 steal-APPL-INV-1SG.IND-3.OBJ 1SG.PSR pig
 b. *Weñe-sañchu-e-n-mew*.
 steal-pig-INV-1SG.IND.3.OBJ
 Both: 'S/he stole my pig from me.'

Something analogous happens with incorporating monovalent verbs (19) (cf. Example [5]). The simple stem can be applicativized and become bivalent (19a), but the strictly monovalent compound verb *lűf-ruka-* cannot (19b):

- (19) a. *Lűf-ma-n* *ñi* *ruka*.
 burn-APPL-1SG.IND 1SG.PSR house
 b. *Lűf-ruka(*-ma)-n*.
 burn-house-APPL-1SG.IND
 Both: 'My house burned down on me.'

In fact, this alternation between applicativized and incorporating versions of non-agentive monovalent base predicates with possessors appears to be systematic with body parts, as in (20):

- (20) a. *Ngűf-ma-n* *ñi* *yűw*.
 get.blocked-APPL-1SG.IND 1SG.PSR nose
 b. *Ngűf-yűw-n*.
 get.blocked-nose-1SG.IND
 Both: 'I got my nose blocked.'

Now note that transitivity applicativization with *-l* and *-ñma* seems to make the marking of the new argument on the predicate obligatory, not unlike the situation found in three-argument clauses.¹¹ 1st and 2nd person core arguments are always overtly marked in some way in two- and three-argument BCs,¹² but 3rd-person primary object show variation in direct verb forms (they are invariably marked on inverse forms). For instance, the primary object of bivalent *leli-* 'look at' can, but need not, be marked, while the primary object of trivalent *elu-* 'give' must be marked (21):¹³

¹¹ I have found this to be the case with most older speakers, but the speech of some younger speakers shows the pattern reported by Golluscio (2010: 721–722): *fi*-marking of the primary objects of derived verbs is as fluid as the one found with underived bivalent verbs, rather than as rigid as found with trivalent verbs. More research is needed here.

¹² Finite verbs expressing 2SG→1SG interactions constitute an exception: they take the endings *-e-n* (-INV-1SG.IND) and *-e-li* (INV-1SG.SUBJ); see Zúñiga (2006: Ch. VII) for details. This, however, is unrelated to applicativization.

¹³ This is related to the conditions governing differential object marking mentioned in Section 2.2.

- (21) a. *Feyti ngürü leli-nie(-fi)-i tañi malle.*
 ART fox look.at-ASP-3.OBJ-IND[3] 3.PSR paternal.uncle
 ‘The fox was watching his paternal uncle.’ (based on Salas 2006: 274)
- b. *Fey elu-*(fi)-i chi pu trewa.*
 then give-3.OBJ-IND[3] ART PL dog
 ‘Then he gave [them] to the dogs.’ (Salas 2006: 262)

Both applicativized trivalent verbs (21a) and applicativized bivalent verbs (21b) require the 3rd-person primary object marker *-fi* to appear on the verb. This is illustrated with *-ñma* here, but is independent of the exact applicative used (22):

- (22) a. *Leli-ñma-*(fi)-n ñi ñawe.*
 look.at-APPL-3.OBJ-1SG.IND 3.PSR daughter.of.man
 ‘I looked at his daughter (with bad intentions).’ (Salas 2006: 120)
- b. *Tofkü-ñma-*(fi)-n.*
 spit-APPL-3.OBJ-1SG.IND
 ‘I spit at him/her.’ (cf. *tofkü-n* spit-1SG.IND ‘I spat’)

Applicativization is naturally connected to access to relativization, because attributive constructions are headed by core arguments only. In the following example, the head noun is the subject in (23a) and the secondary object in (23b); the latter is the most frequent kind of occurrence in narratives:

- (23) a. *Chi wentru küme-künü-tu-fi-lu chi domo*
 ART man be.good-leave-APPL-3.OBJ-PTCP ART woman
ka amutu-i.
 also go.away-IND[3]
 ‘The man who had cured the woman also went away.’ (Salas 2006: 265)
- b. *Xosé ñi ngilla-ñma-fiel-chi libru Xuan ñam-küle-i.*
 J. 3.PSR buy-APPL-NFIN-ATTR book J. get.lost-RES-IND[3]
 ‘The book which José bought from Juan is lost.’ (Smeets 2008: 354)

Applicativization does not seem connected to specific restrictions on the access to discourse-related operations like focalization, but more research is needed here.

5 Semantics

With *-tu* and *-ye*, the interpretation of the AppP normally relies on the marker and the semantics of the base predicate. With *-l* and *-ñma*, the exact reading depends on an interplay between the applicative marker, the specific semantics and syntactic valency

of the base predicate, and contextual features. (Zúñiga 2010a provides additional details of the *l-ñma* opposition from a semantic perspective.)

The semantic role of the AppP with valency-increasing *tu*-verbs is often predictable; such arguments are usually Stimuli of experiencer verbs (e.g., *nümu*- ‘smell [v1]’ > *nümu-tu*- ‘smell [v2]’), Goals of motion verbs (e.g., *nag*- ‘descend’ > *nag-tu*- ‘descend towards’), or Patients of change-of-state verbs (e.g., *pütre* ‘burn [v1]’ > *pütre-tu*- ‘burn [v2]’). When syntactically neutral but semantically relevant, some alternations involving *-tu* are otherwise transitivity-increasing, with *tu*-marked verbs denoting more intensity (e.g., *ngeyku*- ‘rock’ > *ngeyku-tu*- ‘rock strongly’) or more affectedness (e.g., *ñidüf*- ‘sew’ > *ñidüf-tu*- ‘mend’). Many verbs show semantic idiosyncrasies not clearly related to such effects.

Verbal *ye*-suffixation as illustrated in (24) introduces AppPs as motion Comitatives (a) or Topics of Speech/Thought (b). With denominal *ye*-verbs, the AppP expresses a social relationship (‘regard as N’, [24c]):

- (24) a. *Amu-ye-fi-n* *ñi* *wenüy*.
 go-APPL-3.OBJ-1SG.SBJ.IND 1SG.PSR friend
 ‘I went with my friend.’
 b. *Ngüma-ye-fi-n* *ñi* *ñawe*.
 weep-APPL-3.OBJ-1SG.SBJ.IND 1SG.PSR daughter.of.man
 ‘I wept for my daughter.’
 c. *Patron-ye-nge-n*.
 boss-VBLZ-PASS-1SG.SBJ.IND
 ‘I am considered the boss.’

Syntactically neutral *ye*- is rather unpredictable semantically, as are some instances of redirecting *ye*- (25) (data from Augusta 1916: 260):

- (25) a. *Wifül-nge-i* *mollfüñ*.
 spatter-PASS-IND[3] blood
 ‘They were spattered with blood.’
 b. *Wifül-ye-i* *ñi* *külen* *chi* *trewa*.
 spatter-APPL-IND[3] 3.PSR tail ART dog
 ‘The dog spatters (around with) its (wet) tail.’

All instances of *-l* or *-ñma* with trivalent base predicates seem to introduce a Concernee (or “External Possessor”), usually via a kinship or part-whole relation, as in (26). This holds not only with underived bases (26a) (except for *elu-ñma*- ‘allow’ in [16b]), but also with derived ones (26b). Although near-equivalent states of affairs can be conveyed via other constructions (viz. with NP-Internal Possessors as non-arguments), External-Possession applicatives are the preferred, idiomatic, mode of expression (also with those derived from bivalent derived bases, like [26c]):

- (26) a. *Elu-l-fi-n* *sañchu* *tañi* *wenüy* *tañi* *foṭüm*.
 give-APPL-3.OBJ-1SG.IND pig 3.PSR friend 1SG.PSR son.of.man
 ‘I gave my son’s friend a pig.’ (Golluscio 2010: 737)
- b. *Dewma-l-el-e-n-mew* *kiñe* *makuñ* *ñi* *ñuke*.
 make-APPL-APPL-INV-1SG.IND-3.OBJ one blanket 1SG.PSR mother
 ‘S/he made a blanket for my mother.’
- c. *Illku-tu-l-fi-n* *Xwan* *tañi* *foṭüm*.
 get.angry-APPL-APPL-3.OBJ-1SG.IND J. 3.PSR son.of.man
 ‘I scolded Juan’s son.’ (Golluscio 2010: 733)

By contrast, *-l* or *-ñma* that applicativize bivalent base predicates introduce a participant that can bear some of the other roles borne associated with the Ancient Greek and Latin extra-thematic dative. Verbs allowing both markers often show an opposition between motion towards or away from a referent when applicativized (27) (data from Salas 2006: 120):

- (27) a. *Ngilla-lel-fi-n* *Antonio* *ñi* *kawello*.
 buy-APPL-3.OBJ-1SG.IND A. 3.PSR horse
 ‘I bought Antonio’s horse for him.’ (i.e., from someone else)
- b. *Ngilla-ñma-fi-n* *Antonio* *ñi* *kawello*.
 buy-APPL-3.OBJ-1SG.IND A. 3.PSR horse
 ‘I bought Antonio’s horse from him.’

The opposition is conventionalized with some verbs, but it often leads to an interpretation in terms of benefaction and malefaction, even with motion verbs (28) (data from Augusta 1903: 75):

- (28) a. *Ye-l-fi-n* *ñi* *kuchillo*.
 carry-APPL-3.OBJ-1SG.IND 3.PSR knife
 ‘I brought him his knife (in order to help him).’
- b. *Ye-ñma-fi-n* *ñi* *kuchillo*.
 carry-APPL-3.OBJ-1SG.IND 3.PSR knife
 ‘I brought his knife away from/to him (in order to harm him).’

Other predicates show no such semantic opposition, for instance: *ruka*- ‘build a house’ > *ruka-lel-* ~ *ruka-ñma-* ‘build a house as protection for’; see also denominal *chadi-l-* ~ *chadi-ñma-* ‘salt (v2)’.

Interestingly enough, the AppP of *ñma*-marked predicates is sometimes interpreted as broadly affected irrespective of the base verb’s syntactic valency (albeit without granting the AppP subject status; see § 6.2.1). Many instances of monovalent base predicates introduce such an argument when applicativized with *-ñma*; quite often, the

actions performed are customary, as with labile *pütu-* ‘drink’ in (29), or even ritual, as with monovalent *ngilla-tu-* ‘perform rogations’ in (30):

- (29) a. *Pichi pütu-rke-i.*
 a.little drink-REP-IND[3]
 ‘S/he drank a little, I am told.’ (Smeets 2008: 465)
- b. *Ka pichi pütu-ñma-pu-fi-i-n.*
 and a.little drink-APPL-TRANS-3.OBJ-IND-1-PL
 ‘And there we (PL) drank to him (the deceased).’ (Smeets 2008: 277)
- (30) a. *Feychi che itro rumel ngillatu-ke-i*
 ART person upright always perform.rogation-HAB-IND[3]
kiñe fūta kura mew.
 one big stone POSTP
 ‘This Mapuche always performs a rogation on a large boulder.’ (Guevara 1911: 110)
- b. *Ngillatu-ñma-nge-ke-la-n.*
 perform.rogation-APPL-PASS-HAB-NEG-1SG.IND
 ‘No rogations are performed in my honor.’ (Augusta 1916: 62)

Some applicativized verbs have AppPs of unpredictable semantics, especially with *-ñma*. Cases in point include monovalent *lladkü-* ‘grow sad, upset’; *lladkü-tu-* means, as expected, ‘get upset with, scold’ but *lladkü-ñma-* means ‘offer one’s condolences’. A similar example is bivalent *dapill-* ‘clean (potato/legume plant before earthing it up)’; *dapill-ma-* means ‘earth up (potato/legume plant)’. Monovalent *anü-* ‘sit down’ can take *-ñma* to introduce a locative argument (see Example [10a]), but this derivation also has a different, probably metaphorically related, reading:

- (31) *Anü-ñma-e-i-mew* *wekufü.*
 sit.down-APPL-INV-IND[3]-3.OBJ demon
 ‘S/he was possessed by a demon.’

It is hard to find Mapudungun verbs that occur with all four applicatives; moreover, even in those cases where a verb takes three of them, the potential marker-specific semantic differences often appear neutralized. Examples showing some semantic opposition include monovalent *tofkü-* ‘spit’ and bivalent *ütrüf-* ‘throw’. The former invariably adds the person spat at/on when applicativized; *-l* and *-ñma* denote the familiar benefactive and malefactive meanings, and *-tu* encodes an additional, unpredictable, nuance (‘with contempt’). Similarly, the latter introduces a Goal/Source with *-l* and *-ñma* and a Goal with added meaning with *-tu* (‘in order to scare/hurt him/her’).

The semantic roles borne by the AppP of different ACs are summarized in Table 5 below.

Table 5: Semantics roles of AppPs in Mapudungun.

<i>-tu</i>	Stimulus, Motion Goal, Change-of-state Patient
<i>-ye</i>	Motion Comitative, Topic of Speech/Thought
<i>-l</i>	affected participant; implied Motion Goal, Beneficiary, Concernee
<i>-ñma</i>	affected participant; implied Motion Source, Maleficiary, Concernee

There are no systematic explorations of applicativization in the context of reflexives and reciprocals. Reflexive *-w* appears to usually work compositionally with *-tu*, does not normally co-occur with *-ñma* (see Footnote 7), and often shows subtle meaning idiosyncrasies when co-occurring with *-l*. Consider the pairs in (32); the reflexive has the expected yield with *-tu* in (a–b), is a detransivizer or has the expected yield with *-ñma* (c–d), and shows unpredictable yields with *-l* (e–f):¹⁴

- (32) a. *ayfiñ*- ‘become decorated’ > *ayfiñ-tu*- ‘decorate’ > *ayfiñ-tu-w*- ‘decorate oneself’
 b. *tün*- ‘look for lice’ > *tün-tu*- ‘look for lice on (sbdy.)’ > *tün-tu-w*- ‘look for lice on oneself’
 c. *ngilla-tu*- ‘conduct rogations (v1); ask (v2)’ > *ngilla-tu-ñma*- ‘conduct rogations for (v2)’
 > *ngilla-tu-ñma-w*- ‘conduct rogations (v1)’
 d. *wütrü*- ‘water, irrigate’ > *wütrü-ñma*- ‘have (liquid) spilled on one; spill (liquid) on’
 > *wütrü-ñma-w*- ‘spill (liquids) on each other’
 e. *düngu*- ‘speak’ > *düngu-l*- ‘make speak, read, play (CAUS)’ > *düngu-l-w*- ‘speak to oneself’
 f. *üwe*- ‘become solitary/empty’ > *üwe-l*- ‘take to a deserted area’ (APPL)
 > *üwe-l-w*- ‘get lost, lose one’s way’

The reflexive freely occurs with denominal *-ye*, but I have not found robust examples with deverbal *-ye*. An interesting example of deadjectival *-ye* is found with *afma* ‘faithful, loyal’: labile *afma-tu*- means ‘be amazed; admire’, bivalent *afma-ye*- means ‘be careful of/with’, and monovalent *afma-ye-w*- means ‘incur expenses’ (Augusta 1916: 3).

¹⁴ The latter is probably related to a more general pattern involving *-l* (whether causative or applicative), namely its tendency to combine with some other morphemes. A particularly frequent instance of this is found with the bimorphemic deadjectival verbalizer *-l-ka* (e.g., *pichi*- ‘be little’ > *pichi-l*- ‘give a little piece’ > *pichi-l-ka*- ‘make smaller, abbreviate’, Augusta 1916: 178; see also Golluscio 2007: 223).

6 Lookalikes

6.1 Syntactic lookalikes

Mapudungun constructions whose syntactic make-up conforms to the definition of ACs but whose morphology does not are either coded and symmetrical (suppletivism) or uncoded and symmetrical (flexivalency). Suppletivism is easy to find with causatives; with applicatives, it seems to be found only with bivalent-trivalent pairs (e.g., *wül-* ‘give [v2]’ vs. *elu-* ‘give [v3]’), not with monovalent-bivalent pairs. Flexivalency is not difficult to find with v1-v2 pairs (e.g., *küdaw-* ‘work [on]’) and also occurs with v2-v3 pairs (e.g., *pi-* ‘say, tell’).

6.2 Morphological lookalikes

6.2.1 Non-alternating non-agentive nucleatives

With alevant predicates and a subclass of non-agentive monovalent predicates, *ñma*-derivation causes non-agentive nucleativization, but invariably of the SUBJECTIVE kind; this phenomenon seems to be unrelated to the existence of symmetrical voices, and quite rare (Zúñiga 2020). As with applicatives (see § 4.1), such derived predicates head not only clauses of a type available to underived ones (IIa₁, NAN Type D) but also another clause type (IIIC, NAN Type E); the latter is like the passive of a three-argument clause mentioned in Section 2.3 (see Example [3b]). The distinction between Operations D-E on the one hand and Applicatives A-C surveyed in Section 4 on the other has a semantic correlate: predicate classes I and IIa₁ have no agentive argument. This is schematically summarized in Table 6 below.

Table 6: Selected transitivizing Mapudungun *ñma*-nucleatives.

base predicate/clause			derived predicate/clause	
D	I	—	IIa ₁	SBJ
E	IIa ₁	SBJ	IIIC	SBJ + SOBJ

The examples in (33) illustrate this phenomenon. In (a), the marker increases the valency of alevant *maw(ün)*- ‘rain’ so as to make it monovalent (Type D); the same happens with other meteorological predicates, as well as with astronomical predicates (see [35a] below). In (b), the marker increases the valency of non-agentive monovalent *nag-* ‘descend’ in the presence of an inanimate companion argument, making the predicate bivalent (Type E); the same happens with other comparable verbs and nouns:

- (33) a. *Mawün-i.* — *Mawün-ma-n.*
 rain-IND[3] rain-NAN-1SG.IND
 ‘It rained.’ ‘It rained on me / I got rained on.’
- b. *Nag-i mawün.* — *Nag-ma-n mawün.*
 descend-IND[3] rain descend-NAN-1SG.IND rain
 ‘Rain fell.’ ‘Rain fell on me.’

Unsurprisingly, the 1st-person new argument is the subject, rather than the primary object, in the derived construction. Two features of such constructions are unexpected, however. First, the new argument being the subject is not due to the person-related rules governing morphosyntactic inversion. In (a), those rules cannot apply at all, since there is only one argument on the right-hand side; 3rd-person arguments are also installed as subjects in those instances, for example: *mawünmai* ‘s/he got rained on’, *mawünmayengu* ‘they (DU) got rained on’, and *nagmayengün mawün* ‘rain fell on them (PL)’. (Such examples are extremely rare in published texts but unproblematic in elicitation.) Second, while in (a) it may seem natural that the only semantic argument appears as subjective syntactic argument in the derived construction, in (b) one could have expected the derived bivalent predicate *nag-ma-* to be morphologically bipersonal, that is, to have inverse morphology (e.g., **nag-ma-e-n-mew*), or at least passive morphology (e.g., *nag-ma-nge-n*).

In fact, to judge from the relevant dictionary entries in Valdivia (1606), passive morphology was found with such forms in earlier stages of the history of Mapudungun. Consider (34), an instance of *-ñma* deriving a bivalent verb from a noun, where passive marking is apparently still optional:

- (34) *Witran-ma(-nge)-n.*
 visitor-VBLZ-PASS-1SG.IND
 ‘I’ve got a visitor.’ (Smeets 2008: 303)

In the original form of this kind of *ñma*-nucleativization, in order to accommodate the additional (usually human) argument in the absence of an animate Agent, the clause had to be overtly passivized. This constraint was later relaxed, and nowadays such verbs no longer require the passivizing morpheme *-nge*, but the AppP is the subject nonetheless. In (33), *-ñma* resembles a Philippine-like OBLIGATORY APPLICATIVE-CUM-PASSIVE that simultaneously introduces a new argument to the clause and grants it subject status.

Regarding the semantics of such *ñma*-operators applied to low-transitivity Agentless base predicates like those in (35), the new argument appears to be a participant broadly construed as affected. It is not systematically interpreted in terms of perception, motion, possession, or even benefaction/malefaction:

- (35) a. *Kĩnekemew pun-ma-i-i-n.*
 sometimes night-NAN-IND-1-PL
 ‘Sometimes night fell on us.’ (Smeets 2008: 302)
- b. *Iñche aku-ñma-n kiñe kũme dungu.*
 1SG arrive-NAN-1SG.IND one good message
 ‘I received a nice message.’ (Smeets 2008: 379)

Some few verbs seem to optionally or even obligatorily take *-l* instead of *-ñma* in Type-E operations, but more research is needed here. The most robust example of this I have found is *la-* ‘die’ (36), which expectedly takes *-ũñma* when the base verb is an (irregular) *m*-causative (36a) but appears as *la-yel-* when there is no causativization (36b), without any difference regarding the new argument’s semantic role:

- (36) a. *Langũm-ũñma-nge-n ñi fotũm.*
 kill-APPL-PASS-1SG.IND 1SG.PSR son.of.man
 ‘They killed my son on me.’ (Salas 2006: 123)
- b. *La-yel-n tañi kũme chaw.*
 die-NAN-1SG.IND 1SG.PSR good father
 ‘My good father has died on me.’ (Augusta 2016: 111)

6.2.2 Syntax-neutral markers

Constructions whose syntax is identical with derived and underived verbs can be found in the language, especially with the markers *-tu* and *-ye*. More research is needed here, but the available facts suggest that the syntactically neutral markers are not focalization devices; instead, they seem to be either semantic explicators or simply semantic differentiators. Lists of verbs that make syntactically neutral use of the applicative markers can be found in Zúñiga (2009a).

As mentioned in Section 3, *tu*-suffixation is syntactically neutral with a considerable number of verbs, either with an unpredictable semantic effect (e.g., *allkü-* ‘hear [v1/v2]’ > *allkü-tu-* ‘listen [to]’) or, somewhat less frequently, without any recognizable semantic effect (e.g., *illam-* ~ *illam-tu-* ‘despise’). With other verbs, however, it is valency-decreasing, that is, *-tu* can also reflexivize a verb by suppressing the expression of its non-agentive argument (*ñikũm-* ‘protect from the wind’ > *ñikũm-tu-* ‘protect oneself from the wind’). Antipassivization is found only with few verbs that do not seem to belong to any particular formal or semantic class, some of which are actually labile (e.g., *ira-* ‘split [v2]’ > *ira-tu-* ‘split [wood] [v2/v1]’). Labile *nũtram-* ‘tell, narrate’ is a case in point; compare the examples given in (11) above with the ones in (37) below. Note that even the *tu*-marked verb is labile:

- (37) *Nütram-tu-n.* / *Nütram-tu-fi-n.*
 tell-ANTIP-1SG.IND tell-ANTIP-3.OBJ-1SG.IND
 ‘I talked.’ ‘I talked with him/her/them.’

The exact semantic role of the non-Agent is rather varied with these verbs, usually showing some idiosyncrasy, for instance: *lawen-* ‘use as medicine (v2)’ > *lawen-tu-* ‘take medicine (v1); treat/heal (v2)’ vis-à-vis *kafkü-* ‘whisper to’ > *kafkü-tu-* ‘whisper (v1)’.

Ye-suffixation can also be syntax-neutral, either with (e.g., *traf-* ‘meet [v2]’ > *traf-ye-* ‘bump into on the road’) or without a semantic effect (e.g., *duam-* ~ *duam-ye-* ‘need’).

Syntax-neutral *ñma*-suffixation is rather rare (see [10b] for an example), but syntax-neutral *-l* seems to occur less seldom. The following examples with *wül-* ‘give away, hand’ from Augusta (1916: 256) show valency-increasing *-l* and *-ñma* (38) alongside syntax-neutral *-l* (39); the particular reading ‘give blows, hit’ seems to require *-l* for most speakers:

- (38) a. *Fey wül-el-a-e-n-mew* *ñi makuñ.*
 DEM give.away-APPL-FUT-INV-1SG.IND-3.OBJ 1SR.PSR blanket
 ‘S/he will sell my blanket for me, instead of me.’
 b. *Wül-ma-e-n-mew* *ñi ofisha.*
 give.away-APPL-INV-1SG.IND-3.OBJ 1SG.PSR sheep
 ‘S/he sold my sheep (against my will).’
- (39) *Wül-el-fi-i kura mew.*
 give.away-L-3.OBJ-IND[3] stone POSTP
 ‘S/he hit him/her with a stone.’

6.2.3 Applicative deponents

Applicative deponents or *applicativa tantum*—i.e., verbs that appear with one of the applicative markers but do not stand in opposition to an unmarked verb of the same root—are common in Mapudungun only as denominals. Some verbs with fossilized markers seem to have shown productive oppositions until relatively recently; for instance, present-day *añel-tu-* ‘threaten’ used to occur alongside *añel-* a century ago, apparently without any difference in meaning (Augusta 1916: 10).¹⁵ Denominal verbs with *-tu* and *-ye* are numerous (e.g., *wekufü* ‘devil’ > *wekufü-tu-* ‘bedevil, bewitch’ and *patron* ‘boss’ > *patron-ye-* ‘consider [sbdy.] one’s boss’); those with *-l* and *-ñma* are less frequent but not rare (e.g., *piwke* ‘heart’ > *piwke-l-* ‘put in the middle of’ and [34]).

¹⁵ The original root seems to have been *ane-* ~ *añe-*, and Erize (1960: 54) lists *ane-l-*, *ane-tu-* and *ane-l-tu-* as synonyms.

The effects of applicative-like marking are summarized in Table 7 below.

Table 7: Syntactic and semantic effects of selected Mapudungun markers.

	<i>-tu</i>	<i>-ye</i>	<i>-l</i>	<i>-ñma</i>
Valency-increasing:				
– denominal verbalization	✓	✓	✓	✓
– non-agentive nucleativization	✗	✗	(✗)	✓
Valency-decreasing:				
v2>v1(/v2)	✓	✗	✗	✗
Valency-neutral:				
– strictly neutral, semantic effect	✓	✓	some	some
– strictly neutral, no semantic effect	(✓)	✓	some	some

7 Conclusions

This chapter surveyed the applicative constructions attested in Mapudungun and other uses of applicative morphology. These can be characterized as follows:

Morphology

- Mapudungun does not have constructions that could be analyzed as applicative periphrases or analytical applicative constructions.
- The different subtypes of applicative constructions use one of four verbal suffixes occupying slots in the verbal template near the root, in close vicinity to other valency-changing markers. Combining two applicative markers in one verb complex is possible but subject to some restrictions.
- The applicative suffixes *-tu* and *-ye* do not show allomorphy. The allomorphy of *-l* and *-ñma* is conditioned phonologically and, albeit less importantly, lexically.
- All markers have homonyms and some (viz. *-tu* and *-l*) are arguably polysemous.

Syntax

- Mapudungun applicatives are P-applicatives. The new participant could appear in the base construction in some cases in principle, either as an optional adjunct or as a non-argumental Possessor.
- Depending on argument-realization rules unrelated to applicativization, the applied phrase may occur either as a primary object in actor-voice clauses, with direct verbs, or as a subject in undergoer-voice clauses, with inverse verbs. With

verbs belonging to two clearly delimited valency classes, *ñima*-derivation installs a new participant in a non-P role as the subject, and is therefore a lookalike.

- Mapudungun applicatives differ regarding how they interact with valency classes. *Ye*-verbs are bivalent (whether via valency increase from a monovalent verb or via valency redirecting from a bivalent verb). *Tu*-verbs add a core argument, either making a monovalent verb bivalent or making a bivalent verb trivalent. The markers *-l* and *-ñima* have the same effect as *-tu*, but also apply to base predicates belonging to otherwise excluded valency classes, namely trivalent verbs (*-l*) or aivalent verbs (*-ñima*).
- The use of Mapudungun applicatives is not conditioned by the limited access of adjuncts to some structural operations. Rather, it is related either to the impossibility to clearly express some semantic roles not related to possession otherwise than with this operation (in the obligatory cases), or to an idiomaticity stipulation that requires kinship- or part-whole-based Possessors of patientive arguments to be expressed as indirectly affected and therefore as applied core arguments (in the optional cases).
- In applicative constructions, the applied phrase is an overt/covert NP showing all the syntactic properties that characterize primary objects or subjects in non-applicative constructions. When 3rd-person primary objects, they seem to always, or almost always, co-occur with the verbal suffix *-fi* on direct verbs (unlike comparable objects in non-applicative constructions, which trigger the marking much less often, taking into account considerations of animacy, person, and relative topicality). There is no other difference between applicative constructions and constructions of underived verbs involving the same number of objects, but one clause type occurs only as applicative construction (viz. four-argument clauses).
- There are no particular restrictions on the combination of applicatives with causatives and passives, and verb-noun compounds can take applicative marking as well, apparently as long as the resulting word is not too difficult to parse. Reflexives and reciprocals of applicatives need to be explored in more detail; some markers behave as expected and others show syntactic and semantic idiosyncrasies. Verb forms including more than two occurrences of the applicative marker, applicativized verb-noun compounds, and applicative constructions including more than two new argument phrases seem to be ruled out.

Semantics

- All applicative suffixes are semantically underspecified markers that license several semantic roles.
- In the case of *-tu* and *-ye*, the interpretation of the new argument usually depends on the marker itself and the semantics of the base predicate. With *-tu*, the new participant is typically either the Stimulus of experiencer verbs, the Goal of motion

verbs, or the Patient of change-of-state verbs. With *-ye*, it is a motion Comitative or the Topic of Speech/Thought.

- With *-l* and *-ñma*, the exact interpretation of the new argument depends on the marker itself, the syntax and semantics of the base predicate, and contextual features. When applicativized, trivalent predicates accommodate a Concernee (“External Possessor”). Monovalent predicates accommodate a participant broadly construed as affected, with lexical semantics of the elements in the clause and context in charge of the specifics. Bivalent predicates show lexically conditioned variation: some verbs use the markers to encode approach and separation, respectively; others encode benefaction and malefaction; yet others neutralize the distinction in favor of broadly construed affectedness or Concernee-Concern relationship and either take any marker interchangeably or lexically requires one of them irrespective of meaning. Several *ñma*-applicatives license semantically unpredictable applied phrases.
- Mapudungun applicative constructions seem to have no pragmatic or discursive implications.

Lookalikes

- Valency-neutral instances of *tu*- and *ye*-marking—either with or without a difference in semantics—are numerous; strict syntactic neutrality is exceptional with *-l* and *-ñma*.
- Non-applicative *tu*-marking is frequent and can, on a lexical basis, antipassivize, telicize, or form a reversionary/repetitive; the latter is possibly related to one of the iterative stem formations. With some verbs, *tu*-marking denotes higher intensity or higher Patient affectedness. Non-applicative *ye*-marking is relatively infrequent and appears to be obsolescent; it can encode distributivity/multiplicity of participants and, possibly, completion or duration.
- With *-l* and *-ñma*, three non-applicative functions are prominent. First, *-l* is also a (high-control) causative that increases the valency of (mostly) monovalent predicates. Second, a small closed class of ambiguous verbal/adverbial roots expressing spatial, temporal, and manner notions can form “relational” adverbs with *-ñma*. Third, *ñma*-derivation of aivalent and some non-agentive monovalent verbs is transitivizing/valency-increasing: it installs the new participant (which is interpreted as broadly affected) as the subject and is therefore reminiscent of a combined applicative-cum-passive operation.
- Lexicalized applicatives with verbal roots do not seem to be particularly numerous. By contrast, the use of *-tu* and *-ye* to verbalize nouns is an important lexicon-expanding device in the language.

Abbreviations

AC	applicative construction
AN	agentive nucleativizer
ANTIP	antipassive
APPL	applicative
ART	article
ASP	aspect
ATTR	attributive
AV	actor voice
BC	base construction
CAUS	causative
DEM	demonstrative
FUT	future
HAB	habitual
IMP	imperative
IND	indicative
INV	inverse
NAN	non-agentive nucleativizer
NEG	negative
NFIN	nonfinite
NI	nominal incorporation
OBJ	object
OOBJ	oblique object
PASS	passive
PL	plural
POBJ	primary object
POSTP	postposition
PRO	pronoun
PSR	possessor
PTCP	participle
REFL	reflexive
REP	reportative
RES	resultative
SBJ	subject
SG	singular
SOBJ	secondary object
SUBJ	subjunctive
TRANS	translocative
UV	undergoer voice
VBLZ	verbalizer
v0, v1, v2 . . .	syntactic valency of predicates
x→y	x acts on y

References

- Augusta, Félix José de. 1903. *Gramática araucana*. Valdivia: Imprenta Central J. Lampert.
- Augusta, Félix José de. 1916. *Diccionario araucano*. Santiago: Imprenta Universitaria.
- Baker, Mark, Roberto Aranovich & Lucía Golluscio. 2005. Two types of syntactic noun incorporation: Noun incorporation in Mapudungun and its typological implications. *Language* 81(1). 138–176.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1989. *Language universals and linguistic typology: Syntax and morphology*. 2nd edn. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Creissels, Denis. Forthcoming. *Transitivity, valency, and voice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Erize, Esteban. 1960. *Diccionario comentado mapuche-español. Araucano, pehuenche, pampa, picunche, ranculche, huilliche*. Buenos Aires: Universidad Nacional del Sur.
- Golluscio, Lucía. 2007. Morphological causatives and split intransitivity in Mapudungun. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 73(2). 209–238.
- Golluscio, Lucía. 2010. Ditransitive constructions in Mapudungun. In Andrej Malchukov, Martin Haspelmath & Bernard Comrie (eds.), *Studies in ditransitive constructions: A comparative handbook*, 710–756. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Guevara, Tomás. 1911. *Folklore araucano*. Santiago: Imprenta Cervantes.
- Harmelink, Bryan. 1996. *Manual de aprendizaje del idioma mapuche*. Temuco: Ediciones Universidad de la Frontera.
- Moesbach, Ernesto Wilhelm de. 1962. *Idioma mapuche*. Padre Las Casas: Editorial San Francisco.
- 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. Available online at <http://wals.info/chapter/109>, accessed on 2021–06–01.
- Salas, Adalberto. 2006. *El mapuche o araucano*. 2nd, revised edn. Santiago: Centro de Estudios Públicos.
- Smeets, Ineke. 2008. *A grammar of Mapuche*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Valdivia, Luis de. 1606. *Arte y gramatica general de la lengua que corre en todo el Reyno de Chile*. Lima: Francisco del Canto.
- Van de Velde, Mark. 2020. Concernee-Concern constructions: A comparative study of external possession in the Bantu languages. *Studies in Language* 44(1). 70–94.
- Zúñiga, Fernando. 2006. *Deixis and alignment: Inverse systems in indigenous languages of the Americas*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Zúñiga, Fernando. 2009a. The applicatives of Mapudungun. Paper presented at the SSILA Annual Meeting, San Francisco, 8–11 January.
- Zúñiga, Fernando. 2009b. An exploration of the diachrony of Mapudungun valency-changing operations. Unpublished manuscript, University of Zurich.
- Zúñiga, Fernando. 2010a. Benefactive and malefactive applicativization in Mapudungun. In Fernando Zúñiga & Seppo Kittilä (eds.), *Benefactives and malefactives: Typological perspectives and case studies*, 203–218. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Zúñiga, Fernando. 2010b. La marca diferencial del objeto en mapudungún. *Lingüística* 24. 141–164.
- Zúñiga, Fernando. 2015. Valency classes in Mapudungun. In Andrej Malchukov & Bernard Comrie (eds.), *Valency classes in the world's languages, Vol. 2*, 1515–1544. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Zúñiga, Fernando. 2017. Mapudungun. In Michael Fortescue, Marianne Mithun & Nicholas Evans (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of polysynthesis*, 696–712. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Zúñiga, Fernando. 2019. Grammatical relations in Mapudungun. In Alena Witzlack-Makarevich & Balthasar Bickel (eds.), *Argument selectors: A new perspective on grammatical relations*, 39–67. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Zúñiga, Fernando. 2020. Subjective applicatives in Even, Yupik, and Mapudungun. Paper read at the 53rd Annual Meeting of the Societas Linguistica Europaea, 28 August.

- Zúñiga, Fernando & Antonio Díaz-Fernández. 2014. Reduplication in Mapuzungun: Form and function. In Gale Gómez & Hein van der Voort (eds.), *Reduplication in indigenous languages of South America*, 17–37. Leiden: Brill.
- Zúñiga, Fernando & Aldo Olate. 2017. El estado de la lengua mapuche, diez años después. In Isabel Aninat, Verónica Figueroa & Ricardo González (eds.), *El pueblo mapuche en el siglo XXI: propuestas para un nuevo entendimiento entre culturas en Chile*, 343–374. Santiago: Centro de Estudios Públicos.