

## 27 Applicative derivations in Kiranti

**Abstract:** Among the languages of the Trans-Himalayan family, the Kiranti subgroup stands out in terms of the richness of its applicative morphology. Most Kiranti languages have both an inherited valency-increasing \*-t suffix with applicative and causative functions (with cognates in the rest of the family) and innovated bipartite verb constructions with one or several applicative auxiliaries. This chapter illustrates the general properties of applicative constructions in Kiranti. It shows that both \*-t applicatives and bipartite verbs involve a specific set of redundant stem alternations in some languages, in particular Khaling, and that one language, Hayu, has developed a specific applicative conjugation class. The applied object is generally indexed as the direct object of a monotransitive verb, but it can receive the dative marker in some languages, like Thulung. All Kiranti languages have at least one benefactive applicative construction, but we also find applied objects with the semantic roles of patient, source, stimulus and instrument.

### 1 Introduction

AC's have been reported in at least eleven of the thirty-odd subgroups of the Trans-Himalayan (or Sino-Tibetan) family.<sup>1</sup> Given the size and typological diversity of the Trans-Himalayan family (Arcodia & Basciano 2020), it is counterproductive to attempt a comprehensive overview of all these subgroups in this chapter, and we restrict our discussion to Kiranti languages, with a focus on Khaling (khal1275), a language spoken by more than 10000 speakers in Solukhumbu, Eastern Nepal.<sup>2</sup>

The chapter first presents background information on Kiranti languages, and on morphosyntactic constructions relevant to the description of the applicatives, including case marking, person indexation, stem alternation and complex predicates. It then describes the two applicative constructions found in Kiranti languages, the -t suffix and the applicative auxiliaries, which are fused with the verb stem as a bipartite verb in most languages of the subgroup.

Then follows a description of the syntactic constructions where applicative constructions are used, including the effects of this valency-increasing derivation with

---

1 Branches of Trans-Himalayan where AC's have been described include Gyalrongic (Sun 2006, Jacques 2013, Zhang 2020), Old Chinese (Downer 1959, Jacques 2016), Dulong-Rawang (LaPolla 2000: 304–308), Jinghpo (Peng & Chappell 2011), Kuki-Chin (Peterson 2007), Karbi (Konnerth 2014: 260–261), Tani (Post 2007: 521), Dhimal (King 2009: 198–200), Kham (Watters 2002: 249), in addition to Kiranti.

2 Our Khaling teacher is Dhan Bahadur Rai, coauthor of several publications on the Khaling language, including Jacques et al. (2012, 2016, 2015).

verbs roots of various valencies, the use of applicative with complement clauses, and its combination with other voices and derivations.

The next section comprises an inventory of the semantic roles that the applied object (AppIO) can receive in the various applicative constructions in Khaling and other Kiranti languages.

Finally, the chapter concludes with a brief account of verbal lability, which has applicative-like semantics in some languages.

## 2 Background information

### 2.1 Kiranti languages

Kiranti is a subgroup of the Trans-Himalayan family, comprising about 30 languages, spoken in Eastern Nepal and neighbouring Sikkim.

Although the monophyly of the subgroup has been questioned (Gerber & Grollmann 2018), there are potential lexical, phonological and morphological innovations defining Kiranti (Michailovsky 2017, Jacques 2017) and this clade is also supported by Bayesian phylogenies (Sagart et al. 2019).

This section focuses on a number of morphosyntactic features that are needed to discuss applicative constructions in Kiranti languages: case marking, person indexation, stem alternation, and complex predicates (in particular bipartite verbs).

### 2.2 Case marking

All Kiranti languages mark transitive subjects with an ergative case and use an unmarked absolutive form for intransitive subjects. The ergative also serves to mark instruments. Direct objects are generally in absolutive form as in (1a), but some languages, including Bantawa (bant1281, Doornenbal 2009: 211), Puma (puma1239, Sharma 2014: 293–308) or Thulung (thul1246, Lahaussais 2002: 66–68), mark animate objects with the dative *-lai* borrowed from Nepali (1b).

(1) Bantawa (Doornenbal 2009: 229)

- a. *seluwa-ʔa*      *kʰaŋ*      *kʰik-mett-u*.  
bitter herb-ERG vegetables be.bitter-CAUS-3O  
'The herbs made the vegetables bitter.'
- b. *seluwa-ʔa*      *o*      *ŋa-lai*      *kʰikt-u*.  
bitter herb-ERG this fish-DAT numb-3O  
'The herbs numbed the fish.'

Beneficiaries can be encoded by a benefactive applicative (§5), but also simply by means of a postposition. In Khaling (khal1275) for instance, either *lagi* ‘for’ (borrowed from Nepali) or *dôl* ‘for’ (in higher register) combines with the genitive to mark beneficiaries, both animate and inanimate (2).

(2) Khaling

*kʰél brâ:-po dôl duk mɛ*  
 Khaling language-GEN for suffering do:2SG → 3:N.PST  
 ‘He is working hard for the Khaling language.’

The ablative *-laka* is also attested to mark the beneficiary in applicative constructions involving transitive or ditransitive bases (§4.1.3).

## 2.3 Person indexation

Kiranti languages distinguish singular, plural and dual numbers, and have a robust clusivity contrast. They encode transitivity in their verbal morphology, and transitive verbs can index the person and number of two arguments, with the possible exception of a few varieties which have undergone rapid morphological simplification in recent decades (Borchers 2008).

Ditransitive verbs generally index the recipient as direct object rather than the theme, as illustrated by (3) with the verb *|butt|* ‘give to drink’.

(3) Khaling (Jacques et al. 2015)

*?ām-ʔɛ ʔûŋ ku ʔi-bus-ta.*  
 3SGERG 1SG water 2/INV-give-1SG:PST  
 ‘He gave me water to drink.’

In order to describe specific slots in the polypersonal paradigm in a condensed fashion, transitive configurations are presented in the form  $X \rightarrow Y$ , where  $X$  corresponds to the transitive subject and  $Y$  to the object. For instance, the person configuration in (3) is 3SG → 1SG; the verb form *ʔi-bus-ta* ‘He gave it to me to drink’ indexes a third singular subject with first singular object.

Kiranti morphology is mainly suffixal, but Puma for instance allows up to three prefixes (Sharma 2014: 135), as shown in (4).

(4) Puma (Sharma 2014: 149)

*khokkuci-a ke-lai kha-ni-pa-sont-en*  
 3PL-ERG 1DU-DAT 1N.SG.O-3S/A-NEG-persuade-NEG:PST  
 ‘They did not persuade us.’

Some languages such as Khaling only have a single prefixal slot, which can be filled by a negative prefix, or by the prefix *ʔi-*, which occurs in all forms involving second person as subject or object (except the 1SG → 2) and in the inverse 3 → 1 forms, hence the gloss 2/INV in (3).

There is some interaction between person indexation and tense-aspect-modality (TAM), and in most languages, distinct paradigms have to be posited at least for past, non-past and imperative tenses. The segmentation of forms into affixes and bases is not always trivial, and requires decisions that are sometimes arbitrary (Ackerman et al. 2009). For instance, in the Khaling form *lâ:te* ‘he said it’ (3SG → 3SG.PST of *|lut|* ‘say’), it is unclear whether the *-t-* belongs to the verb stem (*lâ:t-*) or the past tense suffix (*-te*).<sup>3</sup>

Voice also affects person indexation in Kiranti. Reflexive-middle and applicative-causative forms have special conjugations involving non-predictable morphological alternations, and complete paradigms have to be listed in their entirety.

## 2.4 Stem alternations

The morphology of Kiranti verbs is not exclusively concatenative, and argument indexation, TAM and voice are not only encoded by affixes, but also by stem alternations, which present considerable variety across the subgroup (Herce 2021).

The partial paradigms from Khaling in Table 3 are representative of the type of stem alternations and affixation used to index person, number, tense and voice in Kiranti.

In the following discussion, verb forms are referred to using abstract root forms from which the paradigms can be derived by a set of regular expressions (see Jacques et al. 2012 and Jacques 2017 on the procedure to identify root forms in Khaling and other languages). These roots, which almost never occur as independent forms, and are not pronounceable as such, are written between vertical bars *|...|*.

## 2.5 Complex predicates

All Kiranti languages have complex predicates involving lexical verbs followed by closed class of auxiliaries, with various degrees of morphophonological and morpho-syntactic integration. In the following, lexical/main verbs are referred to as *V*<sub>1</sub>, and auxiliaries (also called ‘vector verbs’ or ‘aspectualizers’) as *V*<sub>2</sub>. The *V*<sub>2</sub>’s have various functions, including aspect, associated motion (Jacques et al. 2021), but also causative

<sup>3</sup> An anonymous reviewer objected that the past prefix was *-ε*, cognate to the *-a* past suffix found in other Kiranti languages. However, from the point of view of the synchronic analysis, this would amount to positing a suffix *-ε*, in complementary distribution with *-te*, only appearing after verb roots with a *-t* coda.

and applicative. A preliminary discussion of the general morphological properties of complex predicates is necessary before presenting the applicative  $V_2$ 's.

In some languages such as Limbu, the complex predicates are serial verb constructions, both verb forms remaining phonologically distinct, and identical to independent forms (5).

- (5) Limbu (van Driem 1987: 129)

*a-ndzum-ille yəllik sama:n-ha? khu:tt-aŋ*  
 1SG.POSS-friend-ERG much belongings-PL rob-1SG:S/O:PST  
*pi:r-aŋ*  
 give-1SG:S/O:PST  
 'My friend robbed me of many belongings.'

Bantawa  $V_1$ 's and  $V_2$ 's are represented as distinct words in Doornenbal's grammar, but they do not entirely behave like independent words, since prefixes (for instance second person *tɪ-* in 6) only appear on the  $V_1$ , and some of the indexation suffixes (as first person exclusive *-ka*) only occur on the  $V_2$ .

- (6) Bantawa (Doornenbal 2009:168)

*tɪ-man-nin kʰan-nin*  
 2-lose-1NS↔2 send.away-1NS↔2  
 'YousG have forgotten USPL.EXCL'

- (7) Bantawa (Doornenbal 2009: 254)

*kʰar-in lont-in-ka*  
 go-1/2PL come.out-1/2PL-EXCL  
 'We shall rise again.'

Rather than being serial verb constructions as in Limbu, these complex predicates are a subtype of bipartite verbs, as each of the verbal roots only has partial phonological and morphological autonomy (Jacques 2018, Lahaussais 2020).

In Western and Northern Kiranti languages, such as Khaling, the auxiliaries have become considerably more integrated and are phonologically fused with the lexical verb, as illustrated in the partial paradigms in Table 1.

In Khaling bipartite verbs, both  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  conjugate for person, number and tense, and indexation suffixes can surface as codas when the root of the lexical verb is an open syllable as in the case of |*dza*| 'eat'. For instance, the 1PL.INCL suffix *-ki* in its reduced form *-k-* is inserted between the  $V_1$  *dzo-* and the  $V_2$  *-kʰa-*, and person/number is thus redundantly marked two times, an example of multiple exponence. Similar phenomena are found in other Kiranti languages (see in particular Lahaussais 2020 on Thulung).

In the case of closed syllable verb stems, the indexation suffixes cannot surface as independent segments, but the stem alternations they cause are still visible in some

**Table 1:** Comparison of the paradigm of  $|dza|$  ‘eat’ with that of the compound verb  $|dza-k^h\lambda|$  ‘eat completely; eat and go’ in Khaling.

Form	$ dza $ ‘eat’	$ dza-k^h\lambda $
1SG→3SG	<i>dza-ŋʌ</i>	<i>dzʌ-ŋ-k^hʌt-u</i>
1DU.INCL→3	<i>dze-ji</i>	<i>dzê-j-k^hʌts-i</i>
1PL.INCL→3	<i>dze-ki</i>	<i>dzê-k-k^hʌ-ki</i>
2SG→3	<i>ʔi-dzɛ</i>	<i>ʔi-dzɛ-k^hʌt-u</i>

cases. For instance, in (8), the verb stem *-lām-* from  $|lipt|$  ‘light a fire’ shows nasalization of the coda *-p* to *-m* (with a falling tone), as a consequence of the merger of *-p* with the 1SG *-ŋ(ʌ)*, which does surface here as a distinct coda. This form also illustrates the fact that in Khaling, as in Bantawa, there is a single prefixal slot for the bipartite verb.<sup>4</sup>

(8) Khaling (Jacques et al. 2015)

*ʔām-ʔɛ mi-ʔɛ tsuroʔ ʔi-lām-sa-ŋʌ.*

3SG-ERG fire-ERG cigarette 2/INV-light.up:1SG-APPL:N.PST-1SG

‘He lights a cigarette for me.’

### 3 Morphology

There are two distinct applicative morphemes in Kiranti languages: an ancient *\*-t* transitive suffix, which is fused with the verb roots and displays extensive morphophonological alternation, and the more recent applicative auxiliaries, which in most Kiranti languages form bipartite verbs with the root of the verb to which they are attached.

#### 3.1 -t causative-applicative

The suffix *\*-t* serves to build applicative verbs in most, if not all, Kiranti languages. This section first presents the polyfunctionality of this suffix, then focuses on the stem alternations that occur in the paradigms of suffixed verb roots, and describes the distinct conjugation classes that came into being in some languages through a reflex of this suffix.

<sup>4</sup> Note the instrumental use of the ergative form *mi-ʔɛ* ‘by/using fire’ in (8).

### 3.1.1 Applicative and causative suffixes in Kiranti

A pair of valency-increasing dental suffixes *\*-t* and *\*-s* are reconstructible to proto-Kiranti (Michailovsky 1985, Bickel et al. 2010, Michailovsky 2017, Jacques 2017), with cognates in other branches of the Trans-Himalayan family (Wolfenden 1929), in particular Dulong-Rawang (LaPolla 2000: 308), Old Chinese (Jacques 2016), Gyalrongic (Zhangshuya 2020: 161) and Jinghpo (Dai & Xu 1992:78).

The suffix *\*-t* has reflexes in all Kiranti languages, but it is unclear whether it is productive in any of them. In Khaling (khal1275), Bantawa (bant1281) and Yakkha (yakk1236), although it is no longer productive with independent verbs, it appears in the applicative bipartite verb construction, which is fully productive (§3.2.2).

In most languages, it is only found in a limited number of verbs, with either causative or applicative function. A second suffix *\*-s*, which only has a causative function, has been lost in most Kiranti languages, but preserved in Southern (Bantawa bant1281, Doornenbal 2009: 230) and Eastern Kiranti (Limbu limb1266, van Driem 1987: 245-265, Chintang chhi1245, Bickel et al. 2010).

These two suffixes can be illustrated with the following examples from Limbu (Michailovsky 1985).

(9) Limbu

- a. |**ha:p**| ‘weep’ (intransitive, base form)  
**ha:b-ε**  
 weep-PST  
 ‘S/he was weeping/wept.’
- b. |**ha:pt**| ‘mourn, weep for’ (transitive, applicative)  
**ha:p-t-u**  
 weep-APPL-3:O  
 ‘S/he is/was mourning him/her.’
- c. |**ha:ps**| ‘cause to weep’ (transitive, causative)  
**ha:p-s-u**  
 weep-CAUS-3:O  
 ‘S/he makes/made him/her cry.’

In addition to the applicative function illustrated in (9b), the *-t* suffix also has a causative function with some verb bases, in particular motion verbs (Table 2). These forms are found in all Kiranti languages.

It is possible that motion verbs are the pivot through which the originally applicative prefix was reinterpreted as a causative, as meanings such as ‘bring’ or ‘take’ can be derived from ‘come’ and ‘go’ through both a comitative applicative (10) or a causative (11).

**Table 2:** The causative function of the *-t* suffix in motion verbs in Limbu.

<i>tʰaŋ</i>	‘come up’	<i>tʰak-t</i>	‘bring up’
<i>yu</i>	‘come down’	<i>yu:-t</i>	‘bring down’
<i>phɛn</i>	‘come (same level)’	<i>phɛt-t</i>	‘bring (same level)’
<i>ta</i>	‘come’	<i>ta:-t</i>	‘bring’

(10) ‘come with X’ → ‘bring’

(11) ‘cause X to come’ → ‘bring’

There is also an unrelated formative *-t* occurring on intransitive verbs, which Michailovsky (2017) refers to as ‘deponent’ verbs. Its only identifiable derivational function is denominal verbalizing (Jacques 2017).

### 3.1.2 Applicative and stem alternations

Due to language-specific morphophonological alternations, the applicative *\*-t* suffix is not realized as a distinct segment in all the slots of the paradigms, and its presence is sometimes only indirectly detectable from stem alternations. In Khaling (khal1275) for instance, the Kiranti language with the highest number of verb stem alternations (Jacques et al. 2012), the contrast between applicative conjugations and the corresponding monotransitive conjugations is only visible in forms combining a first or second person singular subject with a third person object (1SG→3, 1SG→3) and in non-local configurations (when both arguments are third person). In all other configurations, including inverse (3→1, 3→2), local (1→2, 2→1), and direct forms with a dual or first/second plural transitive subject, applicative forms cannot be distinguished from monotransitive conjugations, as illustrated in Table 3, where ambiguous forms are shaded in grey.

The applicative suffix surfaces as *-d-* or *-t-* in non-past forms with a singular subject and third person object. In the past tense, which is marked by a suffix *-t-*, the applicative *-t* cannot be realized as a segment, but triggers the ‘strong’ stem in singular subject forms with a falling tone (in the case of |*kur*| ‘carry’, the strong stem is *kar-*, and the weak stem *kur-*).

**Table 3:** Comparison of monotransitive and applicative paradigms in Khaling (selected forms).

Form	<i>kur</i>   ‘carry’	<i>kurt</i>   ‘bring for’
1SG3→SG.N.PST	<i>kur-u</i>	<i>kārd-u</i>
1DU.INCL→3SG.N.PST	<i>kur-i</i>	<i>kur-i</i>
1PL.INCL→3SG.N.PST	<i>kār-ki</i>	<i>kār-ki</i>
2SG→3SG.N.PST	<i>ʔi-kū:r-u</i>	<i>ʔi-kārd-u</i>



Table 3 (continued)

Form	<i>kur</i>   ‘carry’	<i>kurt</i>   ‘bring for’
2PL→3SG.N.PST	<i>ʔi-kār-ni</i>	<i>ʔi-kâr-ni</i>
3SG→3SG.N.PST	<i>kə:r-ũ</i>	<i>kârd-ũ</i>
1SG→3SG.PST	<i>kur-u-ta</i>	<i>kâr-ta</i>
1DU.INCL→3SG.N.PST	<i>kər-iti</i>	<i>kər-iti</i>
1PL.INCL→3SG.N.PST	<i>kār-tiki</i>	<i>kâr-tiki</i>
2SG→3SG.PST	<i>ʔi-kûr-tɛ</i>	<i>ʔi-kâr-tɛ</i>
2PL→3SG.PST	<i>ʔi-kər-tɛ-nu</i>	<i>ʔi-kər-tɛ-nu</i>
3SG→3SG.PST	<i>kûr-tɛ</i>	<i>kâr-tɛ</i>

### 3.1.3 Coda alternations

In addition to the vocalic and tonal alternations illustrated above, the codas of some verb roots undergo alternation when combined with the applicative suffix. In Khaling, the only such alternation involves the assimilation of *-ŋ* to *-n-* (Jacques 2015).<sup>5</sup>

Bantawa has the greatest number of alternations of this type (Doornenbal 2009: 233), illustrated in Table 4: *-s* assimilates to *t*, *-r* and *-l* merge with *n* before *t* or assimilate to *t*, and some nasal codas are denasalized. These alternations are not regular, and have exceptions.

**Table 4:** Examples of alternations in the coda of verb roots triggered by the applicative *-t* in Bantawa.

Base verb	Applicative verb
<i>t<sup>h</sup>om</i>   ‘dance’ (tr)	<i>t<sup>h</sup>op-t</i>   ‘dance for someone’
<i>kus</i>   ‘heat’ (tr)	<i>kut-t</i>   ‘heat for someone’
<i>k<sup>h</sup>ur</i>   ‘carry’	<i>k<sup>h</sup>ut-t</i>   ‘carry for someone’

### 3.1.4 Applicative conjugation in Hayu

Hayu (wayu1241) is the only Kiranti language (and possibly the only Trans-Himalayan language) in which the *-t* applicative is compatible with the majority of verb roots (Michailovsky 1988: 89), in the form of a special conjugation in non-dual direct forms (5), which neutralizes the Past/Non Past contrast except in first person plural forms. As in Khaling, base forms and applicative ones are identical in local and inverse configurations.

<sup>5</sup> For instance, the motion verb |*k<sup>h</sup>onŋ*| ‘come (upwards)’ has the causative |*k<sup>h</sup>onŋt*| ‘bring (upwards)’, whose 1SG→3SG.N.PST is *k<sup>h</sup>ond-u* ‘I bring it upwards’.

**Table 5:** Selected forms of the applicative person-indexing paradigm in Hayu.

Form	base		applicative	
	N.PST	PST	N.PST	PST
1SG→3SG	-ŋ/-N/-səŋ	-kəŋ	-təŋ	-təŋ
1PL.INCL→3	-ke	-kikeŋ	-tike	-tikeŋ
1PL.EXCL→3	-kok	-kikoŋ	-tikok	-tikoŋ
2/3SG→3SG	∅	-ko	-to	-to
2/3SG→3PL	-me	-kome	-tome	-tome

Michailovsky (1988) analyzes this paradigm as a distinct conjugation class, and refrains from segmenting the applicative *-t-* from the rest of the ending.

## 3.2 Applicative complex predicates

### 3.2.1 Applicative auxiliaries

All Kiranti languages for which a detailed description is available (except Hayu) have at least one complex predicate construction (§2.5) with a applicative/benefactive  $V_2$  (Table 6).

Some Eastern Kiranti languages, Yakkha, Belhare and Yamphu, have two distinct  $V_2$ 's used in applicative constructions. In Yamphu for instance, the  $V_2$  *-pett* is the default applicative, while *-khitt* only occurs with manipulation verbs, and specifically means 'bring for'.

**Table 6:** Kiranti complex predicates with applicative function.

Language	Applicative	Source	Reference
Wambule	<i>-gwakt</i>	<i>gwakt</i>   'give'	Opgenort (2004: 424–426)
Jero	<i>-gəkt</i>	<i>gəkt</i>   'give'	Opgenort (2005: 213)
Khaling	<i>-sa(t)/-sət</i>	<i>sətt</i>   'greet, pass to'	
Dumi	<i>-khotnd-</i>	<i>khotnni</i> 'proffer'	van Driem (1993: 205)
Koyi	<i>-khond</i>	?	Lahaussais (2009: 19)
Thulung	<i>-sa(t)</i>		Lahaussais (2002: 212–214)
Kulung	<i>-pi</i>	<i>pi</i>   'give'	Tolsma (2006: 95–96)
Bantawa	<i>-pi</i>	<i>pi</i>   'give'	Doornenbal (2009: 284–285)
Puma	<i>-idt</i>	<i>it</i>   'give'	Sharma (2014: 299)
Camling	<i>-pid</i>	<i>it</i>   'give'	Ebert (2017: 731)
Chintang	<i>-bid</i> <i>-dhett</i>	<i>pit</i>	Paudyal (2015: 122)
Yakkha	<i>-piʔ</i> <i>-ni</i>	<i>piʔ</i>   'give'	Schackow (2015: 297–302) Schackow (2015: 299)
Belhare	<i>-pir</i>	<i>pir</i>	Bickel (2017: 710)

Table 6 (continued)

Language	Applicative	Source	Reference
Yamphu	<i>-pett</i>		
	<i>-pett</i>		Rutgers (1998: 178)
	<i>-khitt</i>		Rutgers (1998: 179)
Limbu	<i>-pi</i>	<i> pi </i> ‘give’	van Driem (1987: 128–129)

Most of these  $V_2$ ’s are transparently grammaticalized from verbs meaning ‘give’, and are not cognate across Kiranti. In Thulung, Allen (1975) reports the existence of a verb *samu* ‘give’ as the lexical source for the applicative  $V_2$ , but it appears to be restricted to complex predicates. In Dumi, both the applicative  $V_2$  and its source verb *khotnni* ‘proffer’ have highly irregular alternations, and no root form can be reconstructed (Michailovsky 2012). In Khaling, the  $V_2$  *-sa(t)/-sot* also presents complex alternations between the stems *-sa-*, *-sa-*, *-sat-*, *-sots-* and *-ses-*, which are not found in any independent verb form, and look like a patchwork from *|-a|*, *|-ut|* and *|-ot|* conjugation classes. There is no historical explanation for this pattern, but it is also shared by other  $V_2$ ’s such as the associated motion *k<sup>h</sup>Λ(t)* ‘do *X* and go’ (Jacques et al. 2021), which originates from the verb *|k<sup>h</sup>ot|* ‘go’.

The fact that the verbs that were grammaticalized as applicative  $V_2$ ’s are not cognate across all of Kiranti languages suggests that this construction is not reconstructible to the proto-language, and developed independently in each of the subbranches of this subgroup. It is possible that they arose as a calque of the benefactive construction in Nepali, which involves the verb *dinu* ‘give’ (Pokharel 2005).

Most of the  $V_2$ ’s in Table 6 are dedicated applicative derivations, but some can also be used as causatives. In Thulung for instance, the  $V_2$ -*sa(t)* has a permissive function in (12).

(12) Thulung (Allen 1975)

*luŋ-ka ne pi khlos-ta ma t̪h̥əu qi-saŋ-qutsi*  
 stone-ERG TOP IDEO return-3SG.PST CONJ place leave-APPL-3SG→3DU.PST  
 ‘A stone suddenly turned round and allowed them to leave.’

### 3.2.2 Double marking of applicative derivation

In Khaling, the applicative *-sa(t)* differs from other  $V_2$ ’s in that the  $V_1$  with which it combines follows the conjugation of *-t* suffixed verb roots, even when the applicative *-t* suffixed form is not attested as an independent verb. The applicative derivation is thus doubly marked by the *-t* suffix and the  $V_2$ .

The *-t* suffix is directly visible in the paradigms of open syllable verbs, where it surfaces as *-s-*, *-j-* or *-ç-*, as illustrated in Table 7, due to a series of regular morphoph-

onological rules (described in Jacques et al. 2012). The verb **|p<sup>h</sup>lo|** ‘help’ lacks a corresponding **-t** applicative verb form †**|p<sup>h</sup>lo-t|**.

The applicative paradigms are complicated by the fact that some *V*<sub>1</sub>’s have preserved all expected stem alternations (for instance **|mu|** ‘do’ in Table 7), while other *V*<sub>1</sub>’s have generalized the same stem to most of the paradigm. For instance, **|p<sup>h</sup>lo-(t)-sa(t)|** ‘help on *X*’s behalf’ has the stem form **p<sup>h</sup>lo-** in nearly all forms. As it is unpredictable, the proportion of analogical forms has to be specified in the lexical entry of each verb.

In closed syllable verb roots, the **-t** suffix never surfaces directly, but the presence of the *strong stems* (Jacques et al. 2012) in singular subject forms (**kar-** in Table 8) indicates that the paradigm of the *V*<sub>1</sub> is based on that of the **-t** applicative (compare with the conjugation of **|kurt|** ‘bring for’ in Table 3).

**Table 7:** Selected forms of the paradigm of the **sa-** applicative from **|mu|** ‘do’ and **|p<sup>h</sup>lo|** ‘help’ in Khaling.

Form	<b> mu-(t)-sa(t) </b> ‘do on <i>X</i> ’s behalf’	<b> phlo-(t)-sa(t) </b> ‘help on <i>X</i> ’s behalf’
1SG→3SG.N.PST	<i>ma-s-sat-u</i>	<i>p<sup>h</sup>lo-s-sat-u</i>
1DU.INCL→3SG.N.PST	<i>mu-s-səts-i</i>	<i>p<sup>h</sup>lo-s-səts-u</i>
1PL.INCL→3SG.N.PST	<i>ma-ç-sa-ki</i>	<i>p<sup>h</sup>lo-s-sa-ki (p<sup>h</sup>loç-ç-sa-ki)</i>
2SG→3SG.N.PST	<i>ʔi-ma-s-sat-u</i>	<i>ʔi-p<sup>h</sup>lo-s-sat-u</i>
2PL→3SG.N.PST	<i>ʔi-mān-sa-ni</i>	<i>ʔi-p<sup>h</sup>lōn-sa-ni</i>
3SG→3SG.N.PST	<i>ma-s-sat-u</i>	<i>p<sup>h</sup>lo-s-sat-u</i>
2/3SG→1SG.N.PST	<i>ʔi-mā-j-sa-ŋa</i>	<i>ʔi-p<sup>h</sup>lōç-j-sa-ŋa</i>
3SG→2SG.N.PST	<i>ʔi-ma-ç-sa</i>	<i>ʔi-p<sup>h</sup>lo-sa</i>
1SG→3SG.PST	<i>ma-s-sat-ʌ</i>	<i>p<sup>h</sup>lo-s-sat-ʌ</i>
1DU.INCL→3SG.N.PST	<i>mu-s-səts-ti</i>	<i>p<sup>h</sup>lo-s-səts-ti</i>
1PL.INCL→3SG.N.PST	<i>ma-ç-sa-ktiki</i>	<i>p<sup>h</sup>lo-s-sa-ktiki</i>
2SG→3SG.PST	<i>ʔi-ma-s-sat-ε</i>	<i>ʔi-p<sup>h</sup>lo-s-sat-ε</i>
2PL→3SG.PST	<i>ʔi-mu-s-səts-tε-nu</i>	<i>ʔi-p<sup>h</sup>lo-s-səts-tε-nu</i>
3SG→3SG.PST	<i>ma-s-sat-ε</i>	<i>p<sup>h</sup>lo-s-sat-ε</i>

**Table 8:** Selected forms of the paradigm of the **sa-** applicative from **|kur|** ‘carry’ in Khaling.

Form	<b> kur-(t)-sa(t) </b> ‘carry for <i>X</i> ’
1SG→3SG.N.PST	<i>kār-sat-u</i>
1DU.INCL→3SG.N.PST	<i>kur-səts-i</i>
1PL.INCL→3SG.N.PST	<i>kār-sa-ki</i>
2SG→3SG.N.PST	<i>ʔi-kār-sat-u</i>
2PL→3SG.N.PST	<i>ʔi-kār-sa-ni</i>
3SG→3SG.N.PST	<i>kār-sat-u</i>

Table 8 (continued)

Form	<i>kur-(t)-sa(t)</i>   ‘carry for <i>X</i> ’
2/3SG→1SG.N.PST	<i>ʔi-kār-sa-ŋa</i>
3SG→2SG.N.PST	<i>ʔi-kār-sa</i>
1SG→3SG.PST	<i>kār-sat-a</i>
1DU.INCL→3SG.N.PST	<i>kur-səs-ti</i>
1PL.INCL→3SG.N.PST	<i>kār-sa-ktiki</i>
2SG→3SG.PST	<i>ʔi-kār-sat-ε</i>
2PL→3SG.PST	<i>ʔi-kur-səs-tε-nu</i>
3SG→3SG.PST	<i>kār-sat-ε</i>

Khaling is not the only language with double marking of applicative derivations. In Yakkha, the  $V_2$  *-piʔ* requires the applicative suffix *-t* on the  $V_1$  when used in applicative/benefactive function (Schackow 2015: 371). The  $V_2$  *-piʔ* lacks valency-increasing function when used without the *-t* suffix, and expresses either telicity or that ‘some participant is affected by the event in undesirable ways’, without introducing a new argument (Schackow 2015:299). In such cases, an applicative construction with the transitivizer *-ni* can be used as the applicative function of the intransitive *-piʔ* construction; compare (13a) with (13b). This type of equipollent derivation is restricted to a handful of verbs.

(13) Yakkha (Schackow 2015: 299)

- a. *ka mund-a-by-a-ŋ=na.*  
1SG forget-PST-V2.give-PST-1SG=NMLZ.SG  
‘I was forgetful.’
- b. *muʔ-ni-nen=na.*  
forget-transitivizer-1→2=NMLZ.SG  
‘I forgot you.’

### 3.2.3 Applicative derivations from intransitive bases

When the *-sa(t)/-sət* applicative is applied to intransitive verbs in Khaling, their stem also receives the additional *-t*. When these intransitive verbs already have a *-t* applicative or causative counterpart, the *-sa(t)/-sət* applicative of the intransitive verb is identical to that of its transitive form. For instance, the motion verb |*k<sup>h</sup>ot*| ‘go’ and its causative |*k<sup>h</sup>ott*| ‘take’ have the same applicative form (Table 9).<sup>6</sup>

<sup>6</sup> In addition, Table 7 illustrates the fact that  $V_1$  stems ending in dental obstruents originating from \**t* by morphological alternations (*-Vt/d/ts-*, but not *-ç-*) assimilate to *-Vs-* when followed by the  $V_2$  *-sa(t)/-səts*.

**Table 9:** Partial paradigm of |*k<sup>h</sup>ott*| ‘take’ and the applicative of |*k<sup>h</sup>ot*| ‘take’ and |*k<sup>h</sup>ot*| ‘go’.

Form	<i>k<sup>h</sup>ot</i>   ‘go’	<i>k<sup>h</sup>ott</i>   ‘take’	Applicative
1SG(→3SG.N.PST)	<i>k<sup>h</sup>oʒj-ŋa</i>	<i>k<sup>h</sup>ottt-u</i>	<i>k<sup>h</sup>oʒs-sat-u</i>
1DU.INCL(→3SG.N.PST)	<i>k<sup>h</sup>ets-i</i>	<i>k<sup>h</sup>ets-i</i>	<i>k<sup>h</sup>es-səts-i</i>
1PL.INCL(→3SG.N.PST)	<i>k<sup>h</sup>oʒç-ki</i>	<i>k<sup>h</sup>oʒç-ki</i>	<i>k<sup>h</sup>oʒç-sa-ki</i>
2SG(→3SG.N.PST)	<i>ʔi-k<sup>h</sup>oʒj</i>	<i>ʔi-k<sup>h</sup>ottt-ʉ</i>	<i>ʔi-k<sup>h</sup>oʒs-sat-ʉ</i>
3SG(→3SG.N.PST)	<i>k<sup>h</sup>oʒj</i>	<i>k<sup>h</sup>ottt-ʉ</i>	<i>k<sup>h</sup>oʒs-sat-ʉ</i>

For instance, the form *k<sup>h</sup>oʒs-sat-u* can either be interpreted as the applicative form of *k<sup>h</sup>ottt-u* ‘I will take it’ (14a) or that of the intransitive *k<sup>h</sup>oʒj-ŋa* ‘I will go’ (14b).<sup>7</sup>

(14) Khaling

- a. *kitab k<sup>h</sup>oʒs-sat-u*  
 book take-APPL-1SG→3  
 ‘I will take the book for him/her.’
- b. *kitab ʔaŋ-bi k<sup>h</sup>oʒs-sat-u*  
 book buy:INF-LOC go:APPL-APPL-1SG→3  
 ‘I will go to buy the book for him/her.’

## 4 Syntax

While grammars of Kiranti provide extensive data on the morphology of applicative constructions, their syntax remains imperfectly described, and this section mainly focuses on Khaling.

Since beneficiaries can be marked by means of a postposition (§2.2), applicative derivation selecting a beneficiary as ApplO (on which see §5) cannot be considered to be obligatory. This is not the case with other types of semantic roles (including goal or stimulus), for which no alternative construction is possible to express the same meaning (see Creissels on Tswana, §3.1, this volume).

### 4.1 Transitivity of the base verb

#### 4.1.1 Intransitive verbs

In all Kiranti languages, the *-t* suffix (§3.1) can derive applicative verbs from intransitive verb roots. The intransitive subject of the BC (in the absolutive, see 15a) corre-

<sup>7</sup> For an account of the intransitive conjugation, see Jacques et al. (2012).

sponds to the transitive subject in the AC, marked in the ergative (15b),<sup>8</sup> and the added argument is the direct object of the AC.

(15) Khaling

- a. *ām ηāi*  
 3SG be.afraid:N.PST:3SG  
 'He is afraid.'
- b. *ām-ʔε nêr ηān-d-u*  
 3SG-ERG tiger be.afraid-APPL-3SG→3:N.PST  
 'He is afraid of the tiger.'

V<sub>2</sub> applicatives (§3.2, §3.2.3) occur with intransitive bases in most Kiranti languages, with the same reorganization of argument structure, as illustrated in (16).

(16) Khaling

- a. *tsəttə tsêr-tə*  
 child piss-2/3SG:PST  
 'The child pissed.'
- b. *tsəttə-ʔε ʔi-tsêr-səs-ta*  
 child-ERG 2/INV-piss-APPL-1SG:PST  
 'The child pissed on me.'

In Limbu (van Driem 1987: 128) and Bantawa (Doornenbal 2009: 284), however, V<sub>2</sub> applicatives are only found with transitive bases.

#### 4.1.2 Transitive verbs

While in Eastern and Southern Kiranti languages, the *-t* applicative often occurs with transitive bases, in Khaling, only one such example is attested: |*kurt*| 'bring for' from |*kur*| 'carry' (Table 3).

The V<sub>2</sub> *-sa(t)* is used instead to build the applicative of all other transitive verbs. For instance, the transitive verb |*jok*| 'distribute, share' selects as its object the entity being distributed, and the only possibility to promote the people who receive the shares from the distribution to argument status is by using the applicative V<sub>2</sub> *-sa(t)*, as in (17b). Both the ApplO and the object of the BC (henceforth BO) are in absolutive form, but the verb indexes the number of the ApplO.

<sup>8</sup> Examples (15a) and (15b) illustrate the verb root *s* |*jin*| 'be afraid' and |*jint*| 'be afraid of', respectively, with regular morphophonological alternations.

## (17) Khaling (Jacques et al. 2015)

a. *ʔuŋa lēmpɛ jog-u.*

1SG:ERG sweet distribute-1SG→3:N.PST

'I distribute sweets.'

b. *ʔuŋa tsətsə-hem lēmpɛ jok-sat-u-nu.*

1SG:ERG child-PL sweet distribute-APPL-1SG→3:N.PST-PL

'I distribute sweets to the children.'

In languages such as Bantawa and Thulung, which mark direct objects with the dative suffix *-lai* (§2.2), both the ApplO (18) and the BO(19) can receive dative case.

## (18) Thulung

*go oram nem a-lwak-lai*

1SG PROX.DEM house 1SG.POSS-younger.sibling-DAT

*qi-sat-pu*

leave-APPL-1SG→3SG

'I leave this house to my brother.'

## (19) Thulung

*go i:nima tsəttə-lai qulumtsa-ka jal-sa-nini*

1SG 2PL.POSS child-DAT stick-INSTR strike-APPL-1SG→2PL

'I will strike your child for you with a stick.'

In Khaling, applicative verbs derived from a transitive base generally become ditransitive, with both the BO and the ApplO in absolutive form, though the latter can optionally be marked with the benefactive case when the applicative has a benefactive interpretation (§2.2). The applied phrase is thus not completely assimilated to the grammatical function of object.

For instance, in (20), the ApplO *ʔa-tsə-su* 'my two sons' can either be in absolutive form or receive the complex marker *-po lagi* 'for'.<sup>9</sup>

## (20) Khaling

*ʔa-tsə-su(-po lagi) kitap*

1SG.POSS-son-DU(-GEN for) book

*ʔan-sat-a-su*

buy:APPL-APPL-1SG→3SG.PST-DU

'I bought book(s) for my two sons.'

<sup>9</sup> The ablative *-laka*, which occurs in ditransitive constructions to mark the beneficiary (§4.1.3) is not possible with this verb.



Although the ApplO is most often indexed as direct object as in (17b), (20) and (21a), when the BO is first or second person and the ApplO is third person, the former can be indexed instead (as in 21b) due to its being higher in the person hierarchy.

(21) Khaling

- a. *ʔuŋa ʔi-tso tʰɿ-sa-nɛ*  
 1SG:ERG 2SG.POSS-son wake-APPL-1SG→2SG:N.PST  
 'I will wake your son for you.'
- b. *ʔuŋa ʔi-mɛm-po lagi ʔin*  
 1SG:ERG 2SG.POSS-mother-GEN for 2SG  
*tʰɿ-sa-nɛ*  
 wake-APPL-1SG→2SG:N.PST  
 'I wake you on your mother's behalf.'

In Hayu (§3.1.4), the *-t* applicative can be applied to most transitive verbs, in the form of a specific applicative conjugation (see Table 5). Since both the applied object and the original object are marked in the absolutive, examples as (22) are ambiguous as to whether the overt noun is the applied phrase or not (Michailovsky 1988: 142).

(22) Hayu (Michailovsky 1988: 142)

- ga aŋ uxpʊ pʊk-t-uŋ-mi*  
 1SG:ERG 1SG.POSS father lift-APPL-1SG → 3-ASSERT  
 (a) 'I wake/woke my father.'  
 (b) 'I wake/woke my father for him/her (someone else).'  
 (c) 'I wake/woke him/her/it for my father.'

In addition, interpretation (a) in (22) is very close to the meaning of the BC (23), but has the additional nuance of forced causation ('I forced my father to get up'). Intensive or coercive meaning without increase in the number of participants is attested in causative derivations (especially double causatives, see Kulikov 1993), but appears to be rare in applicative derivations.

(23) Hayu

- ga aŋ uxpʊ pʊk-k-uŋ-mi*  
 1SG:ERG 1SG.POSS father lift-PST-1SG3-ASSERT  
 'I woke my father.'

Person hierarchy effects are also observed: either the beneficiary (24a) or the object of the BC (24b) can be indexed on the verb. When the original object is a first or second person and the beneficiary a third person, the beneficiary is marked with the suffix *-le:si* (24b). In such forms, the morphological contrast between applicative and non-ap-

plicative conjugations is neutralized (§3.1.4), so that (24b) does not count as a genuine case of applicative construction.

(24) Hayu (Michailovsky 1988: 142)

- a. *ga gon co puk-no-m*  
 1SG 2SG child raise- 1→2-ASSERT  
 ‘I will wake the child up for you.’
- b. *minoŋ-le:si ga gon puk-no-m*  
 3SG-for 1SG 2SG raise-1→2-ASSERT  
 ‘I will wake you up for him.’

Michailovsky (1988: 140) also reports a conflicting example, where the verb is marked in the 3SG→3 applicative suffix *-to* (Table 5), but the beneficiary (1SG) is not indexed, and receives instead the suffix *-le:si*. This isolated example, which runs counter to the person hierarchy observed in the rest of Kiranti, is difficult to interpret in the absence of additional data from this language.

(25) Hayu

- komi-ha aŋ-le:si kolu xo:co six-to-m*  
 3SG-ERG 1SG-for one chicken kill-APPL:2/3→3-ASSERT  
 ‘He killed a chicken for me.’

#### 4.1.3 Ditransitive verbs

Applicative derivations with ditransitive verbs are poorly documented in existing grammars of Kiranti languages. In Khaling, the applicative of *|bi|* ‘give’ expresses a double transfer of property, with a direct recipient in the absolutive, and an indirect recipient which may be optionally marked with the benefactive postpositions. In (26), the 2SG indirect recipient is indexed as object in the verb morphology, though it receives optional marking of the ablative suffix *-laka*, marking here the beneficiary.

(26) Khaling

- ʔuŋa ʔin-laka Boyd kitap bīn-san-tēni*  
 1SG-ERG 2SG-ABL Boyd book give:APPL-APPL-1SG→2SG:PST  
 ‘I gave Boyd a book for you.’

When the direct recipient is higher in the person hierarchy than the indirect one, speakers have hesitations about whether the direct recipient is to be encoded as object in verbal indexation rather than the indirect one. Example (27), where the 2sg direct recipient is encoded as an object, is the consensus obtained after a thorough discussion between speakers.

(27) Khaling

*ʔuŋʌ Boyd-laka kitap ʔin bin-san-teni*  
 1SG:ERG Boyd-ABL book 2SG give-1SG→2SG:PST  
 ‘I gave you a book for Boyd.’

## 4.2 Combination with other voices and complex constructions

The Khaling  $V_2$  applicative **-sa(t)** is not compatible with reflexive derivations. For instance, the applicative **|mo-(t)-sa(t)|** ‘vomit on’ (see 38 below), from the intransitive verb **|mo|** ‘vomit’, cannot be combined with reflexive-middle **-(N)si** derivation (Jacques et al. 2016) to express the meaning ‘vomit on oneself’.

The form expressing this meaning (28) appears at first glance to only contain a verb stem from the root **|mo|** ‘vomit’ followed by the reflexive **-nsi** suffix.

(28) Khaling

*moŋ-nsi-ŋa-ta*  
 vomit:APPL-REFL-1SG-PST:1SG  
 ‘I vomited on myself.’

However, there is a morphological complication here: the stem **mo-** rather than **moŋ-** would have been expected from the root **|mo|** in the 1SG. The stem form **moŋ-** corresponds to the conjugation class **|-ot|** (Jacques et al. 2016). This piece of indirect evidence indicates that **moŋnsiŋata** ‘I vomited on myself’ is not directly derived from the intransitive **|mo|** ‘vomit’, but rather from the non-attested **-t** applicative †**|mo-t|**, which occurs as first element of the applicative **|mo-(t)-sa(t)|** ‘vomit on’. We thus have a partial preservation of applicative derivation in this reflexive form.

The  $V_2$  applicative **-sa(t)** can occur in the reciprocal periphrastic construction, which combines the auxiliary **|lu|** ‘feel’ with the bare infinitive of the verb root of the BC. This infinitive selects the *reduced strong stem* (Jacques et al. 2012: 1119) of the  $V_1$ , for instance **ʔaŋ-** from the root **|ʔiŋ|** ‘buy’ in (29).

(29) Khaling

*ʔām-su kitap ʔaŋ-sa lū-iti*  
 3-DU book buy-APPL feel-DU:PST  
 ‘They two bought books for each other.’

Yakkha presents a similar situation: applicative verbs can undergo reciprocal derivation, as can be seen in example 30 (Schackow 2015: p 274), but it is not possible to combine applicative  $V_2$ 's and reflexive derivations.<sup>10</sup>

(30) Yakkha

*Kancin moja pham-bi-khusa ca-me-ci=ha*  
 1DU sock knit-APPL-RECIP eat.AUX-N.PST-[1]DU=NMLZ.N.SG  
 'We knit socks for each other.'

In Khaling, the applicative can also be employed in the periphrastic desiderative construction with the impersonal verb |*dhak*| 'want', involving optional reduplication of the last syllable of the bare infinitive (in this case, the  $V_2$  -*sa*)

(31) Khaling

*ʔām kitap ʔa-ʔāŋ-sa~sa dā:*  
 3SG book 1SG-buy-APPL~DESID want:3SG:N.PST  
 'I want to buy a book for him.'

## 5 Semantics

The -*t* applicative conveys various semantic roles to the ApplO, including goal, stimulus, instrument or beneficiary/maleficiary. These general properties are illustrated below with data from Khaling and Hayu.

In Khaling, the applied object of applicative verbs derived by the -*t* suffix can be a *goal* (or an addressee), a *stimulus* or a *beneficiary* depending on the base verb, but each applicative verb only has one fixed interpretation (Table 10) and these verbs are highly lexicalized (Jacques 2015).

For instance, the applicative |*ɲint*| of the intransitive verb |*ɲin*| 'be afraid' can only be interpreted as 'be afraid of' (see 15b above, §4.1.1): its ApplO is necessarily a stimulus, and cannot be beneficiary (entailing an interpretation 'be afraid for X').

The only -*t* applicative with a beneficiary interpretation in Khaling, |*kurt*| 'bring for' (Table 3), has a counterpart with a  $V_2$  (Table 8) with the more compositional meaning of 'carry for'.

Instrumental applicatives are not found in Khaling, but in Hayu (§3.1.4), the applicative conjugation (32b) can either convey beneficiary (i) or instrumental (ii) roles to the ApplO for most verbs (32a).

<sup>10</sup> Belhare has a specific  $V_2$  marking autobenefactive (Bickel 2017: 710), and this meaning is not expressed by combining the applicative  $V_2$  with the regular reflexive.

**Table 10:** -*t* applicatives in Khaling.

base	meaning	applicative	meaning	semantic role
<i>ɲur</i>	roar	<i>ɲurt</i>	roar at	goal
<i>bhur</i>	be angry	<i>bhurt</i>	scold	goal
<i>bhrot</i>	shout	<i>bhrott</i>	call	goal
<i>ret</i>	laugh	<i>rett</i>	laugh at	goal
<i>lem</i>	be sweet	<i>lemt</i>	coax	goal
<i>ɲin</i>	be afraid	<i>ɲint</i>	be afraid of	stimulus
<i>tshil</i>	be frustrated	<i>tshilt</i>	be dissatisfied with	stimulus
<i>kur</i>	carry	<i>kurt</i>	bring for	beneficiary

(32) Hayu (Michailovsky 1988: 141)

- a. *ga ruk-k-ɯŋ-mi*  
 1SG:ERG plough-PST-1SG→3-ASSERT  
 ‘I ploughed it (of a field).’
- b. *ga ruk-t-ɯŋ-mi*  
 1SG:ERG plough-PST:APPL-1SG→3-ASSERT  
 (i) ‘I ploughed for him/her.’  
 (ii) ‘I ploughed using it (of an ox).’

In addition, the applicative can also have a forced causation interpretation in Hayu, as illustrated by (22) above.

As for the  $V_2$  applicatives (Table 6), their default interpretation in all Kiranti languages is that of benefactive (‘for *X*’, ‘on *X*’s behalf’) illustrated below with data from Khaling. Example (33) shows a typical example of benefactive  $V_2$  construction, with a 1SG beneficiary indexed on the verb.

(33) Khaling

*tikîm poɔpoɔp ni sâ:-ʔɛ go*  
 DEM:AUDITORY owl TOP who-ERG FOC  
*ʔi-sêj-sa-ŋa-nu*  
 INV/2-kill-APPL:N.PST-1SG-PL  
 ‘Who is going to kill that (noisy) owl for me?’ (<https://doi.org/10.24397/pangloss-0000608#S54>)

When the applicative  $V_2$  has a benefactive interpretation, the ApplO can be optionally marked with benefactive case marking, even while being indexed on the verb (20).

This construction is used to specify the recipient of an action (for instance, with the verb |*jok*| ‘distribute’, see 17b). The benefactive function for the applicative  $V_2$  has in some cases meanings that are not entirely compositional. In particular, it can turn verbs of

manipulation into verbs of transfer of property. For instance, the  $V_2$  applicative of the transitive verb |*pum*| ‘hold in one’s fist’ specifically means ‘give something by putting it into someone’s fist’ (34), an action in which the giver, holding the object to be given in his fist, places it in the palm of the recipient (so that the latter does not see what is being given).

- (34) Khaling (Jacques et al. 2015)  
*ʔām-ʔε kheptsi pām-sa-tε.*  
 3SG-ERG money hold.in.fist:APPL-APPL-3SG:PST  
 ‘He put money into his hand.’

Similarly, |*lott*| ‘reach into’, a verb which selects bags or containers as object, has an applicative form meaning ‘go somewhere to fetch something for someone’ (35).

- (35) Khaling (Jacques et al. 2015)  
*ʔuŋa pasal-bi-m saman ʔin*  
 1SG:ERG shop-LOC-NMLZ thing 2SG  
*loŋn-sa-nε.*  
 reach.into:APPL-APPL-1SG→2:N:PST  
 ‘I will fetch your things in the shop.’

Apart from the benefactive/recipient function, the  $V_2$  applicative in Khaling has three other possible interpretations.

First, when the applied object is the possessor of the original object, as in (36a), the  $V_2$  often has a malefactive meaning. When the BO is not possessed, a beneficiary interpretation is favoured (36b).

- (36) Khaling  
 a. *ʔām-ʔε ʔa-kitap ʔi-kʰe-s-səs-ta*  
 3SG-ERG 1SG.POSS-book 2/INV-steal-APPL-APPL-1SG:PST  
 ‘He stole my book’.  
 b. *ʔām-ʔε kitap ʔi-kʰe-s-səs-ta*  
 3SG-ERG book 2/INV-steal-APPL-APPL-1SG:PST  
 ‘He stole a book for me.’ (possible interpretation)

Second, with a limited number of verbs (such as |*iŋ*| ‘buy’), the applied object can also refer to the source from which the BO is obtained, as in (37).

- (37) Khaling  
*kitap ʔân-sa-nε*  
 book buy:APPL-APPL-1SG→2SG  
 ‘I will buy the book for you.’ (as a present, benefactive)  
 ‘I will buy the book from you.’ (you are a bookseller, source applicative)

Third, it can express the goal of the action with intransitive verbs of physical excretion such as |**mo**| ‘vomit’ (38), |**?e**| ‘shit’ or |**tser**| ‘piss’ (16b).

(38) Khaling

**tsottso-ʔe ʔiŋ ʔi-mə-s-səs-ta**

child-ERG 1SG 2/INV-vomit-APPL-APPL-1SG:PST

‘The child vomited on me.’

The semantic role of stimulus is almost never attributed to a ApplO by V<sub>2</sub> applicative derivations in Kiranti. The only exception is the transitivizer **-ni** in Yakkha, which does have this function with a handful of examples (see 13b, §3.2).

## 6 Lookalikes

All Kiranti languages have examples of object-preserving lability, illustrated by the root |**khutt**| ‘steal’ in Limbu, which means ‘steal, rob of’ when conjugated transitively (39c, 39d), and can be interpreted as ‘be stolen’ when occurring with intransitive morphology (39a).

A few Kiranti languages, including Puma and Limbu (but not Khaling), also have subject-preserving lability (Bickel et al. 2007), as in (39b), where |**khutt**| also shows the meaning ‘commit a theft’, with an intransitive subject corresponding to the transitive subject of (39c) and (39d).

(39) Limbu (van Driem 1991: 527)

a. **Sapla khutt-ε**

book steal-PST:INTR

‘The book was stolen.’

b. **A-ndzum-in khutt-ε**

1SG.POSS-friend-DEF steal-PST:INTR

‘My friend committed a theft.’

c. **mε-n-ni-baŋ-ba mənə-lle**

NEG-NEG-see-1SG→3:PST-NMLZ man-ERG

**a-yaŋ-in khutt-u**

1SG.POSS-money-DEF steal-3:O

‘A man I didn’t see stole my money.’

d. **A-ndzum-ille sapla khutt-aŋ**

1SG.POSS-friend-ERG book steal-1SG.O:PST

‘My friend robbed me of my book.’

The transitive construction in (39c) selects as transitive subject the same semantic role as the intransitive subject of (39b). The additional argument in (39c) has the semantic role of patient, and the relationship between (39b) and (39c) resembles that of an intransitive BC with an AC selecting a patient as ApplO, though without overt derivation.

The verb in example (39d) takes two arguments in addition to its subject: an absolutive argument (patient) not encoded in the verb morphology, and a second one indexed as direct object with a semantic role of maleficiary, possessor of the patient. Its semantics resembles that of a malefactive applicative construction (compare in particular 5 and 36a above), though again without any overt derivation.

## 7 Conclusion

The applicative constructions in Khaling and other Kiranti languages present features that are fairly widespread crosslinguistically, but a few observations are of wider interest.

First, a striking feature of one of the applicative markers (the suffix *-t*) is the fact that it appears in a specific set of applicative conjugation classes. Applicative forms are distinct from non-applicative ones *only in a subsection of the direct configurations*, involving a third person object and a non-dual subject, as observed in Khaling (§3.1.2) or Hayu (§3.1.4). This results in ambiguous forms in inverse configurations (3→1/2) and in local scenarios (1→2 and 2→1), as illustrated by (24) in §4.1.2.

Second, the parallel grammaticalization of  $V_2$  applicatives across Kiranti (§3.2.1), which are not reconstructible to the proto-language renewed the applicative constructions throughout the whole subgroup (except Hayu). The morphological paradigms of these auxiliaries are highly irregular, but the irregularities do not appear to be shared across languages.

Third, the bipartite applicative constructions in Khaling, Bantawa and Yakkha (§3.2.2) exhibit double marking, expressing applicative derivation by a combination of the *-t* suffix (or its secondary effects on stem alternations) and of the applicative  $V_2$ .

Fourth, the  $V_2$  applicatives are not only compatible with intransitive and monotransitive verbs, but also occur on ditransitives, resulting in four-argument predicates (§4.1.3).

Fifth, the applicatives in Kiranti can convey a broad range of semantic roles to the ApplO on a verb-to-verb basis (§5).



## Abbreviations

ApplO	applied object
BO	object of the base construction
ABL	ablative
APPL	applicative
ASSERT	assertive
CAUS	causative
CONJ	conjunction
DAT	dative
DEF	definite
DEM	demonstrative
DESID	desiderative
du	dual
ERG	ergative
EXCL	exclusive
FOC	focus
INCL	inclusive
INF	infinitive
INV	inverse
INSTR	instrumental
LOC	locative
N.	non-
NEG	negation
NMLZ	nominalization
NS	non-singular
PL	plural
PST	past
RECIP	reciprocal
SG	singular
TOP	topic

## References

- Ackerman, Farrell, Jim Blevins & Rob Malouf. 2009. Parts and wholes: implicative patterns in inflectional paradigms. In Jim Blevins & Juliette Blevins (eds.), *Analogy in grammar*, 54–82. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Allen, Nicholas J. 1975. *Sketch of Thulung grammar, with three texts and a glossary*. Ithaca: China-Japan Program.
- Arcodia, Giorgio Francesco & Bianca Basciano. 2020. Morphology in Sino-Tibetan Languages. In Mark Aronoff (ed.), *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Linguistics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press. doi:10.1093/acrefore/9780199384655.013.530.
- Bickel, Balthasar. 2017. Belhare. In Graham Thurgood & Randy LaPolla (eds.), *The Sino-Tibetan languages*, 696–721. London: Routledge.

- Bickel, Balthasar, Martin Gaenszle, Arjun Rai, Prem Shoj Rai, Shree Kumar Rai, Vishnu Rai & Narayan P. Sharma. 2007. Two ways of suspending object agreement in Puma: Between incorporation, antipassivization, and optional agreement. *Himalayan Linguistics* 7. 1–19.
- Bickel, Balthasar, Manoj Rai, Netra Paudyal, Goma Banjade, Toya Nath Bhatta, Martin Gaenszle, Elena Lieven, Iccha Purna Rai, Novel K Rai & Sabine Stoll. 2010. The syntax of three-argument verbs in Chintang and Belhare (Southeastern Kiranti). In Andrej Malchukov, Martin Haspelmath & Bernard Comrie (eds.), *Studies in ditransitive constructions: A comparative handbook*, 382–408. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Borchers, Dörte. 2008. *A grammar of Sunwar: Descriptive grammar, paradigms, texts and glossary*. Leiden: Brill.
- Dai, Qingxia & Xijian Xu. 1992. *Jīngpōyǔ yǔfǎ* 景頗語語法 [A grammar of Jingpo]. Beijing: Zhōngyāng mínzú xuéyuàn chūbǎnshè.
- Doornenbal, Marius. 2009. *A grammar of Bantawa*. Leiden: Leiden University PhD dissertation.
- Downer, Gordon B. 1959. Derivation by tone-change in Classical Chinese. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 22(1/3). 258–290.
- van Driem, George. 1987. *A grammar of Limbu*. Berlin and New York: Mouton De Gruyter.
- van Driem, George. 1991. Tangut verbal agreement and the patient category in Tibeto-Burman. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 54.3. 520–534.
- van Driem, George. 1993. *A Grammar of Dumi*. Berlin and New York: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Ebert, Karen. 2017. Camling. In Graham Thurgood & Randy LaPolla (eds.), *The Sino-Tibetan languages*, 722–735. London: Routledge.
- Gerber, Pascal & Selin Grollmann. 2018. What is Kiranti? *Bulletin of Chinese Linguistics* 11(2). 99–152.
- Herce, Borja. 2021. Stem alternations in Kiranti and their implications for the morphology-phonology interface. *Journal of Linguistics* 57(2). 321–363.
- Jacques, Guillaume. 2013. Applicative and tropative derivations in Japhug Rgyalrong. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 36(2). 1–13.
- Jacques, Guillaume. 2015. Derivational morphology in Khaling. *Bulletin of Chinese Linguistics* 8(1). 78–85.
- Jacques, Guillaume. 2016. How many \*-s suffixes in Old Chinese? *Bulletin of Chinese Linguistics* 9(2). 205–217.
- Jacques, Guillaume. 2017. A reconstruction of Proto-Kiranti verb roots. *Folia Linguistica Historica* 38. 177–215.
- Jacques, Guillaume. 2018. Bipartite verbs in Japhug and other Trans-Himalayan languages. *Linguistics of the Tibeto Burman Area* 41(2). 175–191.
- Jacques, Guillaume, Aimée Lahaussais, Boyd Michailovsky & Dhan Bahadur Rai. 2012. An overview of Khaling verbal morphology. *Language and Linguistics* 13(6). 1095–1170.
- Jacques, Guillaume, Aimée Lahaussais & Dhan Bahadur Rai. 2016. Reflexive paradigms in Khaling. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 39(1). 33–48.
- Jacques, Guillaume, Aimée Lahaussais, Dhan Bahadur Rai & Yadav Kumar. 2015. *Khaling-Nepali-English dictionary, version 1.0*. Paris: Projet HimalCo. <http://himalco.huma-num.fr/>.
- Jacques, Guillaume, Aimée Lahaussais & Shuya Zhang. 2021. Associated motion in Sino-Tibetan/Trans-Himalayan. In Antoine Guillaume & Harold Koch (eds.), *Associated motion*, 819–853. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- King, John T. 2009. *Grammar of Dhimal*. Leiden: Brill.
- Konnerth, Linda. 2014. *A grammar of Karbi*. Eugene: University of Oregon PhD dissertation.
- Kulikov, Leonid. 1993. The ‘second causative’: A typological sketch. In *Causatives and transitivity*, 121–154. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Lahaussais, Aimée. 2002. *Aspects of the grammar of Thulung Rai: An endangered Himalayan language*. Berkeley: University of California PhD dissertation.
- Lahaussais, Aimée. 2009. Koyi Rai: An initial grammatical sketch. *Himalayan Linguistics Archive* 4. 1–33.
- Lahaussais, Aimée. 2020. Predicate derivations in Thulung. *Journal of South Asian Languages and Linguistics* 7(1). 57–84.

- LaPolla, Randy. 2000. Valency-changing derivations in Dulong/Rawang. In R.M.W. Dixon & A.Y. Aikhenvald (eds.), *Changing valency: Case studies in transitivity*, 282–311. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Michailovsky, Boyd. 1985. Tibeto-Burman dental suffixes: Evidence from Limbu (Nepal). In Graham Thurgood, James A. Matisoff & David Bradley (eds.), *Linguistics of the Sino-Tibetan area: The state of the art*, 363–375. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Michailovsky, Boyd. 1988. *La langue hayu*. Paris: Editions du CNRS.
- Michailovsky, Boyd. 2012. Internal reconstruction of the Dumi verb : Lexical bases and stem formation. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 35(2). 49–87.
- Michailovsky, Boyd. 2017. Kiranti languages. In Graham Thurgood & Randy LaPolla (eds.), *The Sino-Tibetan languages*, 646–679. London: Routledge.
- Opgenort, Jean-Robert. 2004. *A grammar of Wambule*. Leiden: Brill.
- Opgenort, Jean-Robert. 2005. *A grammar of Jero, with a historical comparative study of the Kiranti languages*. Leiden: Brill.
- Paudyal, Netra. 2015. *Aspects of Chintang syntax*. Zürich: University of Zürich PhD dissertation.
- Peng, Guozhen & Hilary Chappell. 2011. Ya33 ‘give’ as a valency increaser in jinghpö nuclear serialization. *Studies in Language* 35(1). 128–167.
- Peterson, David A. 2007. *Applicative constructions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pokharel, Madhav P. 2005. Benefactive constructions in Nepali. *Kobe papers in linguistics* 2(149–179).
- Post, Mark W. 2007. *A grammar of Galo*. Melbourne: LaTrobe University PhD dissertation.
- Rutgers, Roland. 1998. *Yamphu, grammar, texts and lexicon*. Leiden: Research School CNWS.
- Sagart, Laurent, Guillaume Jacques, Yunfan Lai, Robin J. Ryder, Valentin Thouzeau, Simon J. Greenhill & Johann-Mattis List. 2019. Dated language phylogenies shed light on the ancestry of Sino-Tibetan. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 116(21). 10317–10322. doi:10.1073/pnas.1817972116. <https://www.pnas.org/content/116/21/10317>.
- Schackow, Diana. 2015. *A grammar of Yakkha*. Berlin: Language Science Press. <http://langsci-press.org/catalog/book/66>.
- Sharma, Narayan Prasad. 2014. *Morphosyntax of Puma, a Tibeto-Burman language of Nepal*. London: School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London PhD dissertation.
- Sun, Jackson T.-S. 2006. Jiāróngyǔ dòngcí de pàishēng xíngtài 嘉戎语动 词的派生形态 [Derivational morphology in the Rgyalrong verb]. *Mínzú yǔwén* 民族语文 4(3). 3–14.
- Tolsma, Gerard Jacobus. 2006. *A grammar of Kulung*. Leiden: Brill.
- Watters, David E. 2002. *A grammar of Kham*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wolfenden, Stuart. 1929. *Outlines of Tibeto-Burman linguistic morphology, with special reference to the prefixes, infixes and suffixes of classical Tibetan and the languages of the Kachin, Bodo, Nāgā, Kuki-Chin and Burma groups*. London: Royal Asiatic Society.
- Zhang, Shuya. 2020. *Le dialecte de Brag-bar du rgyalrong situ et sa contribution à la typologie de l'expression des relations spatiales: le mouvement associé et l'orientation*. Paris: Inalco PhD dissertation.