

## “Subjective applicativization”: A rare phenomenon that deserves a closer look

Fernando Zúñiga  
University of Bern  
fernando.zuniga@isw.unibe.ch

A number of Western Austronesian constructions famously conflate functions that are usually kept separate in many other languages, viz. applicativization and promotion to subject. Some valency-changing operations in Mapudungun (unclassified, Chile/Argentina), Even (Tungusic, Russia), and Central Alaskan Yupik (Eskimoan, USA) show similar features but have received much less attention in the literature. The present talk explores these phenomena and discusses their implications for our understanding of grammatical voice (considering both functional-typological and Chomskyan perspectives; cf. Jeong 2007, Pytkäinen 2008, Georgala 2012 for the latter).

The Mapudungun verbal suffix *-(ñ)ma* applicativizes transitive predicates –i.e., it turns a nonagentive extra-thematic participant into a core syntactic argument–, commonly (but not obligatorily) with an adversative connotation (1).

- (1) a. *Ngilla-ñma-fi-n*                      *Antonio*    *ñi*            *kawello*.  
buy-ÑMA-3P-1SG.IND            A.            3.PSR    horse  
‘I bought Antonio’s horse from him.’ (Salas 2006: 120)  
b. *Leli-ñma-e-n*                      *ñi*            *ñawe*.  
look-ÑMA-INV-1SG.IND    1SG.PSR    daughter  
‘You looked at my daughter on me.’ (e.g. with bad intentions) (Salas 2006: 119)

With intransitive (2a) and atransitive predicates (2b), however, the same marker sometimes further grants the applied argument subject status. (Note that the language does have a passive marker, which would be used with cases like those in (1). It would be expected in (2a-b) but fails to appear.)

- (2) a. *Iñche*    *aku-ñma-n*                      *kiñe*    *küme*    *dungu*.  
1SG    arrive.here-ÑMA-1SG.IND    one    good    message  
‘I received a nice message.’ (lit. ‘I arrived-for/on a nice message’) (Smeets 2008: 303)  
b. *Mawün-ma-n*.  
rain-ÑMA-1SG.IND  
‘I got rained on.’ (lit. ‘I rained-for/on’) (Salas 2006: 125)

The Even verbal suffix *-w* can simply passivize a transitive predicate like *maa-* ‘kill’ with the expected syntactic outcome (3a). Interestingly enough, non-prototypical constructions like (3b-c), where the subject is portrayed as being negatively affected, are also possible, even though the latter is not a semantic argument of the base predicate (data from Malchukov 1993: 21-23):

- (3) a. *Etiken*                      *nugde-du*            *maa-w-ra-n*.  
old.man[NOM]    bear-DAT    kill-W-NFUT-3SG  
‘The old man was killed by a bear.’  
b. *Etiken*                      *nugde-du*            *gia-j*                      *maa-w-ra-n*.  
old.man[NOM]    bear-DAT    friend-REFL.POSS    kill-W-NFUT-3SG  
‘The bear killed the old man’s friend.’ (lit. ‘the old man was killed his friend by the bear’)  
c. *Etiken*                      *(imanra-du)*            *imana-w-ra-n*.  
old.man[NOM]    snow-DAT    snow-W-NFUT-3SG  
‘The old man is caught by the snowfall.’ (lit. ‘the old man was snowed’)

Finally, the CA Yupik verbal suffix *-(g)i* can simply introduce a nonagentive extra-thematic object with transitive predicates like *ner-* ‘eat’ (4a), thereby applicativizing it in the expected fashion. With some intransitive predicates like *tuqu-* ‘die’ (4b) and under specific semantic/pragmatic circumstances, however, the result of *(g)i*-suffixation is indeed a clause of higher transitivity, but with the extra-thematic participant marked like the agentive thematic participant of default clauses:

- (4) a. *Ner-i-anga*                      *neqe-m*                      *neqca-mnek*.  
       eat-I-IND.3SG→1SG      fish-ERG.SG      bait-ABL.SG:1SG.PSR  
       ‘The fish ate my bait (on me).’ (Miyaoaka 2012: 1100)
- b. *Tuqu-i-gaqa*                      *nulia-qa*.  
       die-I-IND.1SG→3SG      wife-ABS.SG:1SG.PSR  
       ‘My wife died on me.’ (lit. ‘I died-for/on my wife’) (Miyaoaka 2012: 836)

### Abbreviations

ABL ablative, DAT dative, ERG ergative, IND indicative, INV inverse, NFUT nonfuture, NOM nominative, POSS possessive, PSR possessor, REFL reflexive, SG singular

### References

- Georgala, Efthymia. 2012. Applicatives in their structural and thematic function: A minimalist account of multitransitivity. Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University.
- Jeong, Youngmi. 2007. *Applicatives: Structure and Interpretation from a Minimalist Perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Malchukov, Andrej. 1993. Adversative constructions in Even in relation to passive and permissive. In: B. Comrie & M. Polinsky (eds.), *Causatives and Transitivity*, 369–384. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Miyaoaka, Osahito. 2012. *A Grammar of Central Alaskan Yupik (CAY)*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Pylkkänen, Liina. 2008. *Introducing Arguments*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Salas, Adalberto. 2006. *El mapuche o araucano*. 2nd ed. Santiago: Centro de Estudios Públicos.
- Smeets, Ineke. 2008. *A Grammar of Mapuche*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.