

Applicatives and the Antipassive

The phenomenon: Fortescue (1984) points out that in certain applicative constructions in West Greenlandic, the antipassive morpheme *-(s)i* is present.

- (1) Taania-p qajar-taa-ni asiru-i-vaa.
 Taania-ERG kayak-new-REFL.4SG break-AP-INDIC.3SG/3SG
 Taani had his new kayak destroyed (unintentionally).

Here, the applied argument *Taania-p* is negatively affected by the action and is the possessor of the patient argument *qajar-taa-ni* ‘his new canoe’. Note that the antipassive morpheme *-(s)i* appears on the verb. The presence of this morpheme is surprising, considering that the antipassive morpheme is a detransitivizing element.

- (2) a. Piita-up naalautiq surak-taa.
 Peter-ERG radio.ABS break-PART.3SG/3SG
 Peter broke the radio.
 b. Piita surak-si-juq (naalauti-mik).
 Peter.ABS break-AP-PART.3SG (radio-MIK)
 Peter is breaking the radio.

In (2a) we have the transitive construction; the subject has ergative case and the object absolutive, with the verb showing agreement with both the subject and object. In (2b) we have the antipassive (AP) construction; the AP morpheme *-si* is attached to the verb, with the subject showing absolutive case and the (optional) object showing an oblique case. The verb agrees with the subject only. The sentence is semantically transitive but syntactically intransitive.

This phenomenon of an AP morpheme occurring in an applicative extends beyond Eskimo-Aleut. In Chukchi, Dunn (1999) reports of an ‘applicative’ use of the AP morpheme.

- (3) a. ətlʔa-ta jəme-nenat ewirʔ-ə-t.
 mother-ERG hang-3SGA.3PLO clothing-E-3PL.ABS
 Mother hung up the clothes.
 b. ətlʔa-ta **ena**-jme-nen tətəl meniʔ-e.
 mother-ERG **AP**-hang-3SGA.3SCO door. 3SG.ABS cloth-INST
 Mother hung the door with cloth.

Dunn states “this applicative [*ena*-] relates to the original transitive stem so that the O of the original stem is an oblique and another oblique argument of the original stem is the O” (214). The example in (4b) shows the AP use of *ena*-, contrasting with the transitive (4a).

- (4) a. Qənwer ʔettʔ-e rələpʔen-nin gutil-ən.
 finally dog-ERG broke-AOR.3SG/3SG tether-ABS
 Finally the dog broke the tether.
 b. Qənwer ʔettʔ-ən **ine**-nləpʔet-gʔi (gutilg-e).
 finally dog-ABS **AP**-broke-AOR.3SG (tether-INTR)
 Finally the dog broke the tether.

In Salish, too, we see the presence of the antipassive morpheme *-m* with verbs such as ‘give’ and ‘sell’ in the presence of the benefactive morpheme *-as* (Gerds and Hukari 1998).

- (5) ʔa-**m**-əs-t ʔə tʰə sce:ʔən.
 give-**AP**-BEN-TR OBL DET salmon
 ‘give him/her the salmon’

Proposal: We can explain the presence of the AP morpheme in applicatives if we consider that (i) like the external argument, the internal argument is also ‘severed’ from the verb (ii) the AP

morpheme, rather than demoting or saturating an internal argument, adds an internal argument, and (iii) the applicative morpheme must combine with a verb that has an internal argument.

Syntax of the transitive and antipassive: I consider that the verb is a predicate of events only; the internal argument, just like the external argument (Kratzer 1996), is projected within a vP outside of the VP. The head of the vP contains a thematic role predicate (undergoer) which semantically combines with the verb through Kratzer's event identification. The syntax of the VP in the transitive is as follows.

- (6) a. $[_{VP} \text{ NP}_{OBJ} [_{V'} \text{ V}[_{UND}] [_{VP} \text{ V}]]]$
 b. $\lambda e [V(e) \ \& \ \text{UND}(e, \text{NP}_{OBJ})]$

The AP morpheme is an element which takes a verb that is a predicate of events and returns a verb that is a relation between an event and an entity. Unlike the above, the internal argument appears within the VP.

- (7) a. $[_{VP} [_{V'} [_{V} \text{ AP } \text{V}]] \text{ NP}_{OBJ}]]$
 b. $\lambda e [V(e, \text{NP}_{OBJ})]$

Syntax of the low applicative: Pyllkänen (2008) considers that the low applicative head first combines with the direct object and then the applied argument, and finally with the verb. I propose a different syntax. Here, the low applicative combines with a verb, but the verb itself must introduce an argument position. The low applicative introduces a possession related predicate (source, recipient, static possessor) (Cuervo 2014). The possessee argument of the applicative is identified with the undergoer argument of the verb through a process of argument identification, a counterpart of event identification. In this way, the single direct object can saturate both the possessee argument and the undergoer argument. Finally, the applied argument is merged as the possessor argument.

- (8) a. $[_{VP} \text{ NP}_{APPL} [_{V'} [_{V} \text{ V}[_{APPL}] [_{V} \text{ AP } \text{V}]] \text{ NP}_{OBJ}]]$
 b. $\lambda e [V(e, \text{NP}_{OBJ}) \ \& \ \text{POSS}(\text{NP}_{APPL}, \text{NP}_{OBJ})]$

The presence of the antipassive: We now have an explanation for the presence of the AP morpheme in these applicative constructions: the AP morpheme supplies an argument to the verb that gets identified with the possessee argument of the applicative possession predicate. Without the AP morpheme, there is no verbal argument to be identified with the possessee argument.

- (9)
- | | |
|---|--|
| $ \begin{array}{c} \text{VP} \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ \text{NP}_{APPL} \quad \text{V}' \\ \text{Taania} \quad \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ \text{V} \quad \text{NP}_{OBJ} \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \quad \text{qajar-taa-ni} \\ \text{v}[_{APPL}] \quad \text{V} \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ \text{AP} \quad \text{V} \\ \text{si} \quad \text{asiru} \end{array} $ | $ \begin{array}{l} \lambda e[\text{break}(e, \text{kayak}) \ \& \ \text{POSS}(\text{Taania}, \text{kayak})] \\ \lambda y \lambda e[\text{break}(e, \text{kayak}) \ \& \ \text{POSS}(y, \text{kayak})] \\ \lambda x \lambda y \lambda e[\text{break}(e, x) \ \& \ \text{POSS}(y, x)] \\ \lambda x \lambda e [\text{break}(e, x)] \\ \lambda e [\text{break}(e)] \end{array} $ |
|---|--|

The 'affected' element of the meaning is not part of the 'at-issue' meaning and is not represented (Wood and Marantz, to appear).

Conclusion: The presence of the AP morpheme in applicatives is puzzling under standard analyses of both constructions. The analysis here supports the notion that even the internal argument is not specified by the verb (Lohndahl 2012, Borer 2013). By treating the AP morpheme as an element which adds an argument rather than saturating one, we upend the traditional analysis of this construction and open up new ways of thinking about related intransitivization phenomenon, such as noun incorporation, and how these types of phenomena interact with applicative formation and possessor raising.