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Preface

Throughout the nineties, several important studies were carried out regarding the syntactic mapping and behavior of sentences that require and/or support three arguments. The seminal works of Comrie (1982) and Dryer (1986), along with those conducted within the Lexical Functional Grammar framework (Alsina and Mchombo 1990, Bresnan and Moshi 1990), have shed light on the diversity of the syntactic expressions of three-argument events across different languages. This phenomenon has stimulated a great deal of discussion and analysis, which continues to this day in more recent typological proposals, such as Dixon and Aikhenvald (2000b), Haspelmath (2005), Dryer (2007), Margetts and Austin (2007), and Malchukov et al. (2010).

It is widely recognized that languages can encode three-argument events either through verbs of transfer such as ‘give’, or by way of derived predicates with applicative or causative morphology. However, not all languages allow for constructions with three core arguments regardless of whether the predicate is derived or non-derived. This is the case with Yup’ik (Mithun 2000, Miyaoka 2010), Halkomelen (Gerdi 1993, 2010), and Kokama-Kokamilla (Vallejos Yopán 2010), languages that only allow monotransitive constructions.

At the same time, the fact that some languages support predicates with more than three participants has caught the attention of typologists, as no known language has non-derived verbs that project more than three arguments (Comrie 1975:11, Dixon 2000:39, Gerdi 2004, Kittilä 2007, Kulikov 1993). Despite the fact that triple object constructions have been identified in several languages, such as Swahili (Comrie 1976, 293), Kinyarwanda (Dryer 1983:137, Baker 1988:382-384), Popoluca de la Sierra (Marlett 1986:375), Otuteco (Zavala 2000:137), Shipibo-Konibo (Valenzuela 2002:440), Tswana (Creissels 2004), and Yaqui (Guerrero and Van Valin 2004), most languages seem to validate Song’s (1996:173–180) argument that derived predicates must maintain the number of core NPs permitted with non-derived verbs. There are very few studies dealing with the restrictions on multiple object constructions, a matter which requires further investigation from a typological point of view.

One of the goals of this study is to contribute to the understanding of the principles and constraints that illustrate the resources of a language to generate complex constructions, such as those mentioned above. In this sense, it is concerned with the study of syntactic transitivity in P’orhépecha, a Mesoamerican language isolate. The analysis presented in this work focuses primarily on the morphosyntactic properties of sentences with two or more non-agent arguments. Motivated by the scarcity of studies that deal with
ditransitive constructions in P’órhépecha, and by the remarkable morpho-
syntactic behavior of predicates undergoing valence increase, this study seeks
to offer a thorough description of P’órhépecha constructions composed of
non-derived three-argument verbs and of derived predicates resulting from
valence-increasing morphology. It is based on a functional-typological frame-
work rather than on a particular theoretical model. The descriptive apparatus
and formal criteria employed in analyzing the P’órhépecha data, as well as the
basic notions underlying this work, are common currency in various lexicalist
and functionalist approaches.

This book is based on my doctoral dissertation Expresión de argumentos,
funciones gramaticales y transitividad en p’órhépecha (2010a)—Argument
Expression, Grammatical Functions and Transitivity in Pórhépecha. I have
reviewed most of the chapters and reformulated some proposals following
more recent typological studies. I have also included additional information
about Pórhépecha so as to provide a more complete picture of this language,
especially regarding those aspects that distinguish it from other Mesoamerican
languages.
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CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Porhépecha or Tarascan is a language isolate spoken in the Mexican state of Michoacán. It is an exclusively suffixing, agglutinative language, with a nominative-accusative alignment type. It has a case system and a pragmatically determined constituent order. The present study deals with the topic of transitivity, focusing primarily on the analysis of ditransitive constructions and, more generally, on clauses with multiple objects.

I follow the typological proposal of Haspelmath (2005) and Malchukov et al. (2010) regarding the possible alignment types of constructions with prototypical three-participant verbs (verbs of transfer) involving an agent argument (A), a recipient-like argument (R), and a theme argument (T).1 According to these authors, these constructions are termed ditransitive regardless of the “formal manifestation of the arguments”. That is, their definition is based on semantic criteria in order to be “cross-linguistically applicable” (Malchukov et al. 2010:1). However, in the present study the term ditransitive is used to refer to syntactically ditransitive constructions, i.e., clauses with two non-agent-like arguments encoded in object function. Therefore, throughout this work, ditransitive constructions (and ditransitive verbs) in the sense of Malchukov et al. (2010) will be referred to as semantically ditransitive constructions (and semantically ditransitive verbs). Thus, a distinction is established here between the semantic valence of a predicate, i.e., the number of arguments involved in the event denoted by the verb (cf. Comrie 1993:907, Andrews 2007:133), and its syntactic valence, i.e., the number of arguments expressed in core (non-oblique) function (cf. Haspelmath 2002:211, Haspelmath and Müller-Bardey 2004). This distinction is applied to both non-derived predicates and predicates with argument-increasing morphology.


---

1 For Comrie (2012) and other typologists sharing his perspective, A (agent or agent-like) and P (patient-like) refer to the arguments of prototypical two-argument verbs, while A (agent), T (theme) and R (recipient-like) refer to the arguments of prototypical three-argument verbs. As pointed out by Haspelmath (2011), this is a typological characterization which allows for the comparison of the properties of arguments across constructions, establishing alignment types. This study will show that the alignment types of Porhépecha transfer verbs can be extended to other multiple argument predicates.
unmarked or marked by grammatical case—correspond to verb’s arguments, obliques (NPs flagged by adpositions or semantic case) are not restricted to adjuncts (entities or participants in an event that are not implied by the verb’s meaning); i.e., that it is possible for an argument to be encoded as oblique.

Based on the distinction made by Haspelmath (2005) and Malchukov, et al. (2010) between coding alignment and the alignment shown by behavioral properties, this study argues two points with regard to syntactically ditransitive constructions (double object constructions) in P’orhépecha: on the one hand, that most coding properties display neutral alignment and, on the other, that different behavioral properties concerning syntactic valence reduction (passive, reflexive, reciprocal and indefinite object) reveal asymmetries between objects that exhibit a secundative pattern or secondary object alignment. Therefore, in this study, the terms primary object (PO)/secondary object (SO) (Dryer 1986, 2007) and restricted object/unrestricted object (Bresnan and Moshi 1990, Alsina and Mchombo 1993, Bresnan 2001), commonly used in linguistic literature, are employed when referring to the asymmetrical properties of objects. It is also important to note that semantically ditransitive verbs in P’orhépecha display a construction split conditioned by the relative position of the verb’s arguments on the person scale, which forces the recipient-like argument (R) to be encoded as oblique, i.e., indirective alignment according to Haspelmath (2005) and Malchukov et al. (2010), discussed in Chapter 2.

The analysis of derived ditransitive predicates in P’orhépecha requires a detailed description of the semantic and morphosyntactic properties of the language’s valence-increasing mechanisms, which include: a) atypical applicative suffixes involving person features (-chi for 1st and 2nd person and -ku for 3rd person); b) causative/instrumental suffixes; and c) the unusual and complex verbal morphology involving part-whole suffixes that can generate external possession constructions. Not only does P’orhépecha allow for ditransitive constructions, but also for the addition of a new argument to syntactically ditransitive predicates, both derived and non-derived. Although such predicates may result in syntactically tritransitive constructions, these clauses are subject to certain restrictions. As I will demonstrate, predicates with more than three participants are more common and, in some cases, only result in grammatical constructions when one of the non-agent arguments is not encoded in core function.

The analysis presented here is based on a monostratal lexicalist approach which states that argument realization is largely predictable from the lexical semantic representation of predicates (conceptual structure) from which, in turn, the semantic or thematic role of the participants in the event can be derived (Levin and Rappaport 1998, 2005, Levin 2008, Alsina 1993, Bresnan...
Hence, the semantics-syntax interface (argument structure) plays a crucial role in the mapping of semantic arguments onto syntactic functions. In addition, the morphological processes are considered argument structure operations and the verbal stems that these generate are understood as resulting from the unification of morphemes in the lexicon. Therefore, complex predicates produced by valence-increasing mechanisms—event-changing operations, according to Haspelmath (2002:211)—display a new argument structure, subject to the same mapping principles that apply to non-derived predicates (cf. Alsina et al. 1997b, Haspelmath 2002, Bresnan 2001).2


Based on a careful examination of the behavior of multiple object clauses in P'orhépecha, I propose the thematic role hierarchy shown in Figure 1 as a descriptive device for capturing local generalizations in this language (cf. Levin and Rappaport 2005:155, 160, 177, Polinsky and Kozinsky 1992, Bornkessel et al. 2006, Payne 2008).3 Such generalizations relate to the mapping of core functions and, in particular, to which arguments have access to PO in multiple object constructions; i.e., which of the non-agent arguments has syntactic

---

2 In contrast with valence-increasing morphology, the passive, reflexive, reciprocal and anti-passive-like argument structure operations—function-changing mechanisms in terms of Haspelmath (2002:211)—produce stems which convey marked choices regarding the arguments’ mapping and so alter the syntactic realization of the arguments of the base predicate (cf. Culicover and Jackendoff 2005, Sandler and Spencer 1998, Bresnan 2001, Kulikov 2010).

3 The well-known controversy regarding the universality and validity of thematic role hierarchies is not discussed here. However, I should emphasize that the hierarchy in Figure 1 is not meant to be a universal construct governing argument realization.
primacy (to the exclusion of the other non-agent argument(s)) (cf. Comrie 2012:18, Payne 2008). Therefore, in this work it is assumed, as pointed out by Payne (2008:313), that “in expression of SRs [semantic roles] a relatively more privileged GR [grammatical relation] may reflect a ranking among SRs”.

agent > recipient/beneficiary/goal/source > instrument > patient/theme

**Figure 1** Thematic hierarchy

According to this hierarchy, of the non-agent arguments to be mapped onto object function, the one bearing the highest ranked role displays PO properties. Since the relevant generalizations in Porhépecha involve, on the one hand, derived predicates with arguments bearing possessor and causer-causee roles, and, on the other, predicates resulting from two argument-increasing mechanisms, it is necessary to consider the following: a) the possessor is ranked higher than its possessum (regardless of the thematic role of the latter); b) the causer outranks the causee; c) the agentive causee simultaneously bears the thematic roles of agent and patient, which seems to be a relevant feature in the ranking of this argument; and d) the recipient/beneficiary/goal/source and possessor of non-corporal entities are equally ranked with the agentive causee. I will offer evidence supporting the fact that complex predicates involving two valence-increasing mechanisms do not allow multiple object constructions when two non-agent arguments co-occur, which are equally ranked according to the access they have to PO.

The formal criteria for differentiating between core (subject and object) and oblique grammatical functions (flagged by adpositions or semantic case)

---

4 These thematic roles are meant to express the major semantic types of participants relevant to the phenomenon under discussion. Thematic roles are distinguished here from A, P, T and R, which stand for the arguments of prototypical two and three argument verbs (see footnote 1). The characterization of these roles is as follows: agent = instigator of the action denoted by the predicate, recipient = entity receiving another entity, beneficiary = entity that benefits from the action or event, source = entity from which something is moved, and instrument = the medium by which the action is carried out. Even though it is common for the recipient and source roles to convey possessor features, the possessor is considered here as an independent thematic role. Patient is used to refer to affected entities including those undergoing a change of state; theme refers to entities transferred physically or abstractly or to entities exhibiting change of location. Goal signals the entity to which the action is directed, such as the addressee of *verba dicendi*, the target of abstract transfers (teach, promise) or of verbs of physical transfer like throw.
in P’orhépecha, as well as the coding and behavioral properties of the arguments in monotransitive constructions, are covered in Chapter 2. Chapter 3 is dedicated to the analysis of non-derived three-argument verbs. I will demonstrate that while the encoding of T (theme) and R (recipient-like) in double object constructions does not allow for the establishment of a strong contrast between these two arguments, the behavioral properties of the T and R objects show asymmetries following a secundative pattern (PO/SO). In this chapter I will also provide data (previously unregistered in the case of P’orhépecha) related to certain restrictions on double object constructions, specifically to the fact that R must be encoded in oblique function—indirective alignment—under two circumstances: a) when T outranks R on the person hierarchy (1/2 > 3); or b) when a T denoting a human being is affected by passive, reflexive or reciprocal morphology.

Chapter 4 discusses the formal and semantic properties of applicative constructions in P’orhépecha, in which the verbal stems exhibit the applicative suffixes -chi for 1st/2nd person and -ku for 3rd person. The applicative allomorphs conditioned by the suffixation of valence-reducing affixes are discussed, as well as the impossibility for applicative morphology to co-occur with the middle/reflexive morpheme. Chapter 5 deals with the behavior of P’orhépecha causative suffixes. The syntactic expression of the causee argument, which behaves like the PO in double object constructions, and the conditions that allow its encoding as oblique, are analyzed. Furthermore, constructions in which these suffixes introduce an instrument are examined, along with the restrictions that exist in P’orhépecha when generating ditransitive constructions with an instrumental object.

Chapter 6 focuses on the argument realization of predicates with part-whole spatial suffixes. It is argued that P’orhépecha spatial suffixes are lexical affixes that establish a relationship between the area they denote and the verb’s arguments. Most part-whole spatial suffixes denote an area located within the entity referred to by the argument in subject function. The morphological mechanisms that allow this relationship to be changed are discussed, as well as the morphosyntactic properties of part-whole suffixes that allow for the generation of external possession ditransitive constructions.

In Chapter 7, the conformation of predicates containing more than three arguments is explored. The possibility for derived and non-derived ditransitive verbs to accept a new argument and become tritransitive constructions is examined. The data gathered supports the claim that P’orhépecha allows for triple object constructions. However, the evidence reveals that these are subject to certain restrictions. In order to shed light on the (un)grammaticality of syntactically tritransitive constructions resulting from predicates involving more than three arguments, the following should be taken into account: a) the
morphosyntactic structure of the predicates along with the type of relationship established among the participants of the derived verb; b) the thematic hierarchy derived from the arguments’ access to PO in ditransive constructions; and c) the asymmetrical character of tritransitive constructions in which only one of the objects can exhibit PO properties.

Finally, Chapter 8 offers a summary highlighting the major findings and conclusions of this research, providing an overview of the properties of P’orhépecha predicates which include three or more arguments. In the remainder of this chapter, some introductory information about P’orhépecha is presented. Section 1.1 offers general information on the P’orhépecha population and on the sources of the data on which this investigation is based. Section 1.2 includes an overview of previous works on P’orhépecha grammar, while section 1.3 offers a grammatical sketch of the language.

1.1 P’orhépecha Background and Sources

P’orhépecha or Tarascan is a language isolate that, according to the Population and Housing Census of 2010 carried out by the INEGI (National Institute for Statistics and Geography), is spoken by 117,221 people in the state of Michoacán, Mexico. The P’orhépecha region encompasses three areas: Lake Pátzcuaro, the western mountainous region called the Sierra or Meseta Tarasca, and a small valley to the north of the Sierra, known as the Cañada de los Once Pueblos. Even though the villages located in the same geographic region exhibit dialectal variations, there is a high degree of intelligibility among P’orhépecha speakers (see Friedrich, 1971b, 1971c, 1975).

The data that form the main body of this work come mainly from Puácuaro village, where I conducted fieldwork for over twelve years. Puácuaro is a community of around 1,700 inhabitants located on the western shore of Lake Pátzcuaro, in the municipality of Erongaricuaro, Michoacán. Although adults over the age of forty communicate in fluent P’orhépecha both within the community and with speakers from the surrounding villages, most children no longer learn P’orhépecha as their first language, though they are able to understand it. According to the National Indigenous Languages Institute (INALI 2006), 59.8% of the people of Puácuaro speak P’orhépecha, all of whom are bilingual.5

5 Internal paper based on the Population and Housing Census of 2005 carried out by INEGI.
To supplement the data gathered during my fieldwork, I include material from reliable sources such as published papers on various P’orhépecha communities—mainly from the Lake area—along with the translation of The New Testament, coordinated by Maxwell Lathrop (a project in which one of my informants from Puácuaro participated). Native speakers from Puácuaro corroborated all the examples obtained from these sources, as well as their Spanish translations.

Due to the fact that the phenomenon discussed in this paper has no referential information on a dialectal level, it is possible that the results of this investigation present linguistic variations in the different communities. In fact, I have detected such a variation in the case of passive constructions. The description provided in this study therefore serves as a starting point for research on the potential differences between the data from which the body of this work is comprised and the data from other linguistic variants of P’orhépecha.
1.2 Previous Works on P’orhépecha Grammar

The first studies of P’orhépecha date back to the sixteenth century. In addition to dictionaries and various texts in P’orhépecha, there are two important grammars written by Franciscan missionaries: Fray Maturino Gilberti’s *Arte de la lengua de Michuacan* (1987 [1558]) and Fray Juan Baptista de Lagunas’ *Arte y Dictionario con otras Obras en Lengua Michuacana* (1983 [1574]). Among the current sources on the P’orhépecha language, a vocabulary compiled by the native speaker Pablo Velásquez (1978) stands out. There is also a considerable body of P’orhépecha texts including short stories and narratives transcribed by native speakers or researchers, as well as textbooks, magazines, local newspaper articles and the aforementioned translation of the New Testament (first published in 1968 and then in 1977), which was done with the help of native speakers and coordinated by Lathrop.

Modern studies of P’orhépecha began in the twentieth century with the research carried out by Foster and Friedrich, still among the most important reference works on the language. Foster (1969) offered the first and most complete linguistic description of P’orhépecha grammar, based on the dialects spo-
ken in the lakeside communities of Ichupio and Tarerío. Friedrich (1984) made a valuable grammatical sketch based mainly on data from the villages of the Sierra, as well as a detailed description of Porhépecha phonology, including dialectal variations (Friedrich 1971b, 1971c, 1975). Furthermore, this author discussed Porhépecha morphological coding of form and space (Friedrich 1970, 1972), as well as the semantics of spatial suffixes (Friedrich 1969, 1971a), an issue also analyzed by Foster (1969). Also of note is the work of Warres (1974), who presented a brief but accurate description of Porhépecha verbal inflection, which differs in some aspects from the analyses by Foster and Friedrich.

Additionally, there are more recent studies that provide a general overview of Porhépecha grammar (mainly its morphological characteristics), which tend to coincide with Foster’s description. Wolf (1989) analyses several aspects of the phonology and morphology of spoken Porhépecha in Tarecuato. Monzón (1997), who works in the mountain communities of La Cantera and Angahuan, summarizes the most important aspects of the language’s morphology. Chamoreau (2000a), based on data from the island communities of Lake Pátzcuaro, discusses several phenomena of Porhépecha grammar from the perspective of Martinet’s theory.6 Finally, Nava (1997), who has worked mainly in the lakeside community of Puácuaro, has made important contributions regarding the knowledge of Porhépecha morphology.

Most recent research on the language has focused on the analysis of specific subjects relating to morphology and, in some cases, to morphosyntactic phenomena. The following works are the most relevant to this study: Monzón (2004) on the morphosyntax of spatial morphemes; Villavicencio’s (2006) analysis of the evolution of the case system, Nava’s (2004) proposal on the middle voice in Porhépecha; Maldonado and Nava’s (2002) discussion on causative constructions, both morphological and syntactic; Capistrán (2004) on ditransitive constructions, and Capistrán’s (2003, 2006a) descriptions of the applicative affixes in Porhépecha.

---

6 Chamoreau (2009)—in a revised and translated version of her book Parlons purepecha (2000b)—provides a synthesis of grammatical topics which covers aspects ranging from phonology to certain characteristics of Porhépecha syntax. Included in this work are several proposals from other contemporary researchers on language-specific phenomena of Porhépecha.
1.3 P’orhépecha Grammatical Sketch

P’orhépecha is an agglutinative language with a nominative-accusative alignment type. It is one of the few Mesoamerican languages with a morphological case system, and in contrast to other native languages of Mesoamerica, it has no noun incorporation. In fact, P’orhépecha does not strictly meet the five characteristics that, according to Campbell et al. (1986), define the Mesoamerican sprachbund: a vigesimal system, head-marking of nominal possession N-N, relational nouns, semantic calques and the absence of the SOV order.

While P’orhépecha does have a vigesimal system, the other four traits do not coincide completely with those usually recognized as Mesoamerican (see Capistrán and Nava 1998): a) nominal possession is mainly expressed through genitive markers on the possessor; b) the language lacks relational nouns; c) of the twelve semantic calques characteristic of Mesoamerican languages, in P’orhépecha there is only a relationship between the words meaning ‘alive’ and ‘awake’, forms that stem from the same verbal root (cf. Smith-Stark 1994); d) according to Friedrich (1984:61), P’orhépecha is an SOV language. I have also registered the SOV order in texts from the Lake Pátzcuaro area, but have found that it is pragmatically marked (Capistrán 2002a).

1.3.1 Phonological and Morphophonological Characteristics

The P’orhépecha language exhibits a phonemic contrast between aspirated and unaspirated obstruent consonants. Unaspirated obstruents have voiced allophones when they occur between a nasal and a vowel, while aspirated obstruents become unaspirated in the same context. Between vowels, aspirated obstruents exhibit preaspiration. In addition to obstruent consonants, the language has voiceless fricatives, glides, nasals, and two liquid-vibrant phonemes, differentiated by the feature of retroflexion. The nasal phonemes are /m/ and /n/, and the velar nasal is an allophone of /n/ in the majority of dialects, although it has a phonemic value in the Sierra region. The six-member vowel system of P’orhépecha includes a high-central retroflex vowel. All words must end with a vowel sound, which if unstressed is voiceless, and in some cases, omitted.

---

7 Kinship terms are the only ones that require the presence of a suffix (such as -ti for 1st/2nd person and -empa for 3rd person), to indicate the person features of the possessor (see 1.3.2.4). By contrast, and unlike other Mesoamerican languages, body-part nouns can occur without possessive markers.

8 All examples provided in this work have been transcribed phonologically. The following orthographic convention requires explanation: ī is a high-central retroflex vowel that, following Nava (2004), is represented as i when stressed.
Lexical roots end in an open syllable and are monosyllabic or disyllabic. The main stress, as a rule, falls on the last vowel of the root, thus indicating its morphological boundary. The only exception to this rule is found with the irregular verbs (Foster 1969, 60). This small group of monosyllabic roots combines with the formatives -ra or -rha in almost all their inflected forms. In these stems the stress falls on the formative suffixes, complying with the pattern: Root = CV'. The verbal roots niráni 'go' and xurháni 'come' are part of this group. In some cases, the morphophonemic processes impose vowel and consonant replacements and reductions, but in general, it is easy to recognize the morphemic boundaries. Finally, some roots may present reduplication, which as a rule, is preceded by a nasal sound.

9 Most suffixes are monosyllabic (generally V or CV), though some are bisyllabic.
10 For the sake of simplicity, in the glossed examples offered in this book the sound replacements and reductions resulting from the union of morphemes are omitted.
1.3.2 **Morphological and Syntactic Characteristics**

As mentioned above, P’orhépecha is a wholly suffixing language with a rich verbal morphology and a case system following a nominative-accusative alignment type. It lacks a paradigm of pronominal verbal affixes, but has pronominal enclitics for subject and object. These are not necessarily bound to the verb, and are usually attached to any type of preverbal constituent. P’orhépecha lacks definite articles and free-form 3rd person pronouns, though demonstrative terms can fulfill these functions. Besides pronominal clitics, the language has other sets of enclitics with adverbal and discourse functions.

1.3.2.1 **Verbal Stems and Inflection**

P’orhépecha verbal stems must combine with tense, aspect and/or mood inflections (TAM). There are two types of verbal roots in the language. The first consists of basic roots that can be verbal stems, as shown in (1), where the roots are followed by the non-finite marker -ni:

(1)  
a. piré-ni ‘to sing’  
b. atá-ni ‘to strike’  
c. ú-ni ‘to do/make’  
d. arhí-ni ‘to say’

The second type comprises roots that cannot form verbal stems by themselves. So as to be able to receive verbal inflection, these dependent roots must undergo suffixation. Generally, they take a thematic suffix or stem formative, e.g., -ka in washá-ka-ni ‘to sit down’ (INTR), -ra in shaná-ra-ni ‘to walk’, -rhi in wekó-rhi-ni ‘to fall’, -a in purhu-a-ni ‘to boil’ (INTR), -ta in xó-ta-ni ‘to tie’, kwerá-ta-ni ‘be missing’, and -ra in shaná-ra-ni ‘to walk’. However, it is common for one root to allow for different formatives, in which case the resulting stems may not only exhibit differences in valence, but also in meaning. The examples in (2) demonstrate this phenomenon:

---

11 Loanwords from Spanish, eg. gustárini ‘to like’, present the formative -ri which results from the reanalysis of the Spanish infinitive form (see Capistrán 2005b).
Dependent roots can also be combined with other suffixes that occur productively with basic roots, for example, the spatial suffixes and the middle/reflexive suffix -kurhi. Compare the examples in (2d, d’) with michani ‘to hoarsen’ (INTR) (-cha ‘throat’), (2b, b’) whith k’amat-cha-ni ‘to eat up’, and those in (2f, f’) with xorhenkurhini ‘to learn’ (-nkurh ‘intersection area’). Stems resulting from a dependent root combined with a formative or the middle/reflexive -kurhi can be appreciated in the following forms with the root kachú ‘cut’: kachúkuni ‘cut’, kachukurhini ‘to break apart’ (INTR), and in those with the root intsí ‘give’: instkuni ‘give’, intsimpini ‘give away’, intskurhini ‘give away’ (lit. ‘give something that belongs to oneself’).

The meanings of some dependent roots can be difficult to elucidate, as they can be very abstract and as there seem to be homophone roots. See for instance mítini ‘to know/realize’, mianí ‘to think/remember’ and mikuhrhini ‘to guess/predict/foresee’ in contrast with the forms in (2d, d’). There is no consensus among scholars on this subject. There is no agreement either regarding the recognition of a single formative when the same suffix occurs in stems
with different valence or voice values (see Nava 2004, Friedrich 1917a:9–10, and lexical appendices, Foster 1969:161–168). Given the fact that in several cases the meaning of the resulting predicate and its valence properties are not clearly deduced from their components, in this book these types of stems [root-formative] are presented as a whole; i.e., they will not be subject to morphological decomposition otherwise, in many cases, a cumbersome explanation would be required in order to spell out the meaning of both the root and the stem. Likewise, no morphological decomposition will be provided when the meaning of the resulting stem exhibiting either the middle/reflexive suffix or spatial suffixes cannot be analyzed compositionally, or when it is a clear lexicalized form. The same criteria will be applied with basic roots showing derived forms the meaning of which cannot be clearly deduced.

Within the group of dependent roots there is a particular set, usually called classificatory roots (see Foster 1969, Friedrich 1970, Capistrán 2000), which seem to correspond with the type of “dispositionals” discussed by Ameka and Levinson (2007). With certain exceptions, these dispositional roots take a spatial affix in order to become verbal stems, the function of which is to indicate the location of an entity (the figure whose shape/orientation is indicated by the verbal root) in a particular space (the ground, or part of it, encoded by means of the spatial affix). For example, icháruni means ‘a long thin object lying on the path’ (-ru ‘path/road’), and kirámukuni ‘a round object in canonical position is on/close to the edge of something’ (-mu ‘edge, mouth, lips’). Three of these dispositional roots are used nowadays in their nominalized forms as numeral classifiers (see Chapter 6), in what appears to be a reduction from an ancient system that included other dispositionals (Nava 1994).

As is characteristic of agglutinative languages, the verbal stems of P’orhépecha may take different types of affixes. The studies by Foster and Friedrich show that P’orhépecha predicates may have valence-changing suffixes such as the causative, passive, reflexive, and reciprocal, as well as morphemes with adverbial functions. Within the verbal morphology of this language, a set of over thirty spatial or locative suffixes stands out. The basic function of these suffixes is to locate the event expressed by the verb (see Foster 1969, Friedrich 1971a, Monzón 2004). The space or area referred to by these spatial affixes can

---

12 The verb wántiku ‘kill’, wá (‘strike’) -nti (‘angle’ from ear to shoulder when referring to the human body) -ku (locative expansion), is a good example of lexicalization since it can no longer be employed with its literal meaning ‘to strike someone on the neck’ and exhibits a distinct syntactic behavior as similar stems with other part-whole spatial affixes (see Chapter 6).
be environmental, such as a patio, a path, a body of water; or a part of a whole (usually called body-part morphemes) explored in Chapter 6.

The inflectional system of P’orhépecha includes affixes of time, aspect and mood. The non-finite verbal forms, marked with the suffix -ni, are commonly employed as main predicates in narrative contexts. In other circumstances, they carry out similar functions to the infinitive and gerund. The finite moods in P’orhépecha are the indicative, subjunctive and interrogative/clarificational. All these (except the imperative) display the same distinctions of time and aspect. In the indicative, the 3rd person subjects (-ti ‘3rd IND’) are formally distinguished from the 1st/2nd person subjects (-ka ‘1st/2nd IND’), while this distinction cannot be made in the interrogative/clarificational and subjunctive mood inflections. This contrast can be appreciated by comparing the predicates in (3), where the verb is inflected in the indicative and shows subject agreement, with the interrogative predicates in (4), where the mood inflection is not sensitive to the person features of the subject (-ki/-∅ are allomorphs that depend on tense/aspect markers).

(3) a. xi/t’ú/xuchá/chá t’iré-a-ka
   1SG/2SG/1PL/2PL eat-FUT-1/2IND
   ‘I /you/we/you (PL) will eat.’

   b. imá/ts’imá t’iré-a-tí
      that/those eat-FUT-31ND
      ‘S/he/they will eat.’

(4) a. t’iré-a-∅ t’ú/ ts’imá?
   eat-FUT-INTERR 2SG/those
   ‘Will you/they eat?’

   b. t’iré-sha-∅-ki xuchá/imá?
      eat-PROG-PRS-INTERR 1PL/that
      ‘Are we eating/is he eating?’

It is important to note that -ti/-ka inflections do not have the full array of person and number features exhibited by free pronoun forms. Therefore, the person distinction that these inflections convey corresponds to a type of agreement (restricted to the indicative mood), in which the suffixes -ti/-ka lack pronominal value (see Chapter 2).

The aspectual markers (perfect, habitual and progressive) take on different forms in two different contexts: in focalized sentences with the focal enclitic
=sï, and in some subordinate clauses that occur in the subjunctive. The examples in (5) illustrate this phenomenon in sentences with focalized subjects.

(5)  
a. Pédrú  piré-s-∅-ti  
Pedro  sing-PRF-PRS-3IND  
‘Pedro has sung.’

b. Pédrú  piré-s-p-ti  
Pedro  sing-PRF-PST-3IND  
‘Pedro had sung.’

c. Pédrú  piré-sha-∅-ti  
Pedro  sing-PROG-PRS-3IND  
‘Pedro is singing.’

d. Pédrú  piré-sha-p-ti  
Pedro  sing-PROG-PST-3IND  
‘Pedro was singing.’

As seen in the examples above, the perfect suffix -s in (5a, b) has no overt phonetic realization in (5a’, b’). In sentences (5c, d), -sha marks the progressive aspect, while in (5c’, d’) this aspect is expressed by way of a periphrastic construction with the auxiliary xarháni. Furthermore, in the subjunctive mood (marked with -ka in all persons), the realization of aspectual markers is conditioned by the type of subordinator. For example, while a predicate introduced by ximpóka ‘because’ (6a) presents the same aspectual affix as the clauses in (5a, c), the sentences introduced by éka ‘when’ (6b), take on the same forms as in focalized contexts.

(6)  
a. ximpóka  xuchá/María  t’iré-s-p-ka  
because  1Pl/Maria  eat-PRF-PST-SBJV  already  
‘…because we have already eaten/Maria has already eaten.’

b. éka  t’uí/tumpí-icha  xanó-∅-p-ka  
when  2sg/boy-pl  arrive-PRF-PST-SBJV  already  
‘…when you had already arrived/the boys had already arrived.’

13 The present perfect denotes the value of recent past, and the past perfect that of distant past, so it is common for both forms to be translated into Spanish using the indefinite (perfective) past. In this work, the English translations from P‘orhépecha are based on English language usage regarding the past simple and perfect forms.
1.3.2.2 Case and Adpositions

Both the morphological case system and the adpositions of P’orhépecha are properties relevant to this study. While core functions are flagged by grammatical case, oblique constituents are marked with adpositions or semantic case (cf. Blake 1994:39, 132, Bresnan 2001:96, Andrews 2007:152–154). As has been stated, the P’orhépecha case system follows a nominative-accusative alignment type. The two grammatical cases are -∅ for nominative, and the suffix -ni for object function. Since in P’orhépecha, as in various other languages (see Borg and Comrie 1984, Blake 1994), there is no distinction between accusative and dative, the term objective has been used in place of accusative regarding the case marker -ni (cf. Foster 1969, Friedrich 1984). The other case suffixes form a set of semantic cases, which includes a genitive marker. P’orhépecha case suffixes are presented in Table 3.

Table 3  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>-∅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>-ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative</td>
<td>-rhu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>-mpu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comitative</td>
<td>-nkuni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>-eri/-iri</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sentences in (7) exemplify the use of case affixes:

(7) a. tumpí eshé-s-∅-ti maríkwa-ni k’umáñchikwa-rhu  
boy   see-PRF-PRS-3IND   girl-OBJT   house-LOC  
‘The boy saw the girl in the house.’

b. acháati wántiku-s-∅-ti akwítsi-ni xácha-mpu  
man   kill-PRF-PRS-3IND   snake-OBJT   axe-INST  
‘The man killed the snake with (the) axe.’

14 See Villavicencio (2006:205–212) and Capistrán (2002b) regarding the distribution of -ni within the NP.
As can be observed in the examples above, the subjects of both transitive and intransitive sentences lack explicit marking, while the patient-like argument (P) of monotransitive constructions is marked with -ni. The same marking is used for arguments with a recipient-like role, as seen in (8).

(8) Pédru íntsku-s-∅-ti wíchu-ni Lúpi-ni
Pedro give-PRF-PRS-3IND dog-OBJT Lupe-OBJT
‘Pedro gave Lupe the dog.’

It is important to note that P’orhépecha is a language that has “differential object marking” (DOM), a phenomenon covered in Chapter 2. This explains why some singular patient/theme NPs in object function can occur without case marking (plural NPs are always marked). This DOM is subject to animacy-definiteness parameters. The following sentences illustrate this:

(9) a. xí xúska-s-∅-ka xáasí
1sg sow-PRF-PRS-1/2IND broad.bean
‘I sowed broad bean(s).’

b. Lúpi xwá-s-∅-ti chüti tsúntsu*{(-ni)}¹⁵
Lupe bring-PRF-PRS-3IND 2sg.poss pot-OBJT
‘Lupe brought your pot.’

There are two postpositions in the language which alternate with semantic cases:ximpó (related to -mpu) and xínkóni (free form of the comitative -nkuni).¹⁶

---

¹⁵ The symbol *( ) is used to signal that without the occurrence of the morpheme in parenthesis, the construction is ungrammatical. The opposite is signaled by (*), i.e., with the presence of the morpheme the resulting construction is ungrammatical.

¹⁶ There is another monomorphemic postposition, anápu. Its principal function is to indicate the place of origin of a person or object. For example: tumpí Morelia anápu ‘the boy from Morelia’ or tsakápu yorhékwaru anápu ‘river stone’ (tsakápu ‘stone’, yorhéwa ‘river’). As can be seen in the latter example, anápu governs the locative case -rhu when its complement is a common noun.
19

(10) a. warhüti wantá-s-∅-ti Pédrunki/Pédru-ni xinkóni
woman speak-PRF-PRS-3IND Pedro-COM /Pedro-OBJT POSP
'The woman has spoken with Pedro.'

b. xuchí wáts’i yetá-s-∅-ti
1SG.POS son/daughter1/2PSR mix-PRF-PRS-3IND
sebóya paré-nkuni/paré xinkóni
onion nopal-COM/nopal POSP
'My son/daughter mixed onion with nopal.'

c. Lúpi t’iré-sín-∅-ti xák’i-icha-nkuni/xák’i-icha-ni xinkóni
Lupe eat-HAB-PRS-3IND hand-PL-COM/hand-PL-OBJT POSP
'Lupe eats with (her) hands.'

As shown in (10a, c), both postpositions xinkóni and ximpó assign objective case to their complements when these are plural NPs or have human referents. This flagging exhibits a behavior similar to that of the DOM with patient/theme arguments, explaining the absence of case marking in both (10b) and (11b) below. Ximpó is, by far, the most versatile postposition, due to the fact that it covers a wide range of meanings. It may flag locative and instrumental NPs, alternating with the use of case affixes, as shown in the sentences in (11).

(11) a. Xosé xóta-s-∅-ti shenchéki-ni xuchí siñtári-icha-mpu
José tie-PRF-PRS-3IND donkey-OBJT 1SG.POSS rope-PL-INST
/siñtári-icha-ni ximpó
rope-PL-OBJT POSP
'José tied the donkey with my ropes.'

b. sapí eshé-s-∅-ti ma akwitsi-ni
child see-PRF-PRS-3IND one snake-OBJT
yorhékwa-rhu/yorhékwa ximpó
river-LOC/river POSP
'The child saw a snake in the river.'

The following examples show other values that can be expressed through the use of ximpó. In (12a), the NP introduced by this postposition means ‘because of’, while in (12b) its meaning is delegative (‘instead of’).
(12) a. Rósa  werá-sha-∅-ti  Pédru-ni  ximpó  
Rosa  cry-PROG-PRS-3IND  Pedro-OBJT  POSP  
‘Rosa is crying because of Pedro.’

b. María  warhá-a-ti  Lúpi-ni  ximpó  
Maria  dance-FUT-3IND  Lupe-OBJT  POSP  
‘Maria will dance instead of Lupe.’

Finally, it is important to mention that P’orhépecha has adopted the Spanish preposition *para*. Unlike the native postpositions, *para* never induces the use of case affixes in its complement, as shown in the following sentences:

(13) a. Pédru  piré-s-∅-ti  para  María(*-ni)  
Pedro  sing-PRF-PRS-3IND  for  Maria-OBJT  
‘Pedro sang for Maria.’

b. Lúpi  pyá-s-∅-ti  ma  wíchu-ni  para  tumpí-icha(*-ni)  
Lupe  buy-PRF-PRS-3IND  one  dog-OBJT  for  boy-PL-OBJT  
‘Lupe bought a dog for the boys.’

1.3.2.3 Pronominal Forms
The opposition between 1st/2nd and 3rd person that occurs with the indicative inflections -*ka* and -*ti*, mentioned in 1.3.2.1, is also present in the P’orhépecha system of pronominal forms. The language has no free pronouns for 3rd person, but, as is common in many languages (see Bhat 2004, Siewierska 2004), the demonstratives can be used pronomially. Among the most common demonstratives are the singular forms *í* ‘this’, *inté* ‘that (visible to the speaker)’, and *imá* ‘that (not visible to the speaker)’, as well as the corresponding plural forms *ts’il* ‘these’, *ts’imi* ‘those’, and *ts’imá* ‘those’. Whereas in (14a) the subject is expressed by a 1st or 2nd person pronoun, in (14b) both the subject and object are realized by demonstratives.

(14) a. xí/t’ú/xuchá/chá  t’iré-a-ka  
1SG/2SG/1PL/2PL  eat-FUT-1/2IND  
‘I/you/we/you (PL) will eat.’

17 See footnote 15.
b. í/ts’imá atá-s-∅-ti inté-ni
this/those strike-PRF-PRS-3IND that-OBJ
'This (one) struck that (one)/those struck that (one).'

The Porhépecha system of pronominal forms is made up of free morphemes and enclitics. The paradigms of these forms are explored in Chapter 2. The pronominal enclitics of subject and object can be attached to the verb or to any other type of preverbal element. Although there are no specific studies regarding the placement of the pronominal enclitics, it has generally been assumed that when they occur in preverbal position they behave as second position clitics, both in main and subordinate clauses (cf. Friedrich 1984:76, Nava 1997, Villavicencio 2006:105, Chamoreau 2009:62). However, as will be argued below, this is not always the case. In the sentences in (15) and (16), the pronominal enclitics surface in the expected positions. In (15) constructions with subject enclitics are exemplified.18

(15) a. wichu-ni=ksí pá-s-∅-ka
dog-OBJT=1/3PL.SBJ take/carry-PRF-PRS-1/2IND
'We took the dog somewhere.'

b. pawáni warhá-a-ka=ni
tomorrow dance-FUT-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ
'Tomorrow I will dance.'

c. máru tumpí-icha wantónskwarhe-síran-ti
some boy-PL talk-HAB.PST-3IND
éska=ksí wéka-am-ka karhá-ni
sbr=1/3PL.SBJ want/love-HAB.PST-SBJV fly-NF
'Some boys were talking about wanting to fly.' (uekanksí karhání.84)

Object enclitics have only 1st and 2nd person forms. These, in contrast with subject enclitics, have the marker -ni:

(16) a. Pédru=kini káni xarhóa-síndi-∅-ti
Pedro=2SG.OBJ a.lot help-HAB-PRS-3IND
'Pedro helps you a lot.'

18 The symbol "=" signals the attachment of enclitics.
b. witsintikwa Lúpi xikwá-ra-s-∅-ti=rini
   yesterday Lupe bathe.oneself-CAUS-PRF-PRS-3IND=1SG.OBJ
   ‘Yesterday Lupe bathed me.’

c. ximpóka=rini t’ú méntkisë wéka-s-∅-ka
   because=1SG.OBJ 2SG always want/love-PRF-PRS-SBJV
   ‘...because you have always loved me.’ (San Juanu 17(24))

In P’orhépecha, pronominal enclitics usually occur in second position when not hosted by the verb. However, the examples in (17) show instances that do not conform to this norm.

(17) a. xí yási=kini antá-nkwa-a-ka
   1SG now=2SG.OBJ reach-CNT-FUT-1/2IND
   ‘I will catch up with you now.’ (imaka akuitsintaka.17)

b. xuchíti táati nó-taru=rini xyó-nt’a-a-ti
   1SG.Poss father.1/2PSR neg-more=1SG.OBJ accept-ITR-FUT-3IND
   ‘My father will no longer accept me.’ (tumpi Chátaru anápu.121)

c. ximpóka tumína no=ksi ampé
   because money neg=1/3pl.SBJ (some)thing
   xatsí-kurhi-s-∅-ka
   have-MDL/REFL-PRF-PRS-SBJV
   ‘...because we have no money at all.’ (teroriti.111)

The free pronominal items for 1st and 2nd person objects are, as noted by Villavicencio (2006:102), morphologically complex lexical units that host object enclitics (see Chapter 2). This can be observed in (18).

(18) a. Pédru t’ú-n=kini atá-a-ti
    Pedro 2SG-OBJT=2SG.OBJ strike-FUT-3IND
    ‘Pedro will strike you.’

b. imá eshé-s-∅-ti xí-n=rini
   that see-PRF-PRS-3IND 1SG-OBJT=1SG.OBJ
   ‘S/he saw me.’
In P’orhépecha, as in other languages that have free and bound pronouns, the occurrence of free subject and object pronouns has an emphatic character, and therefore the use of pronominal enclitics is unmarked.

1.3.2.4 Morphological Marking of Syntactic Relations

P’orhépecha has morphological case marking—and therefore dependent marking according to Nichols (1986, 1992)—in the three major syntactic constituent types: NP, PP, and clause. The adpositions exclude any type of morphological marking prompted by their dependents, but they may govern the occurrence of case on their complements (see 1.3.2.2). This corresponds to a dependent marking pattern; however, the possessive NP and the clause allow for other types of marking.

The NPs with the genitive marker -eri/-iri in (19) contrast with those in (20) where the head is a kinship term.

(19) a. Xwánu-iri  \[ \text{Juan-gen} \] wíchu
    'Juan's dog'

    b. xuchá-eri  \[ \text{1pl-gen} \] tsúntsu
    'our pot'

(20) a. Xwánu-iri  \[ \text{Juan-gen} \] wáp’a
    'Juan's son/daughter'

    b. xuchá-eri  \[ \text{1pl-gen} \] wátsì
    'our son/daughter'

As seen in (20), P’orhépecha kinship terms have possessor markers—a head-marking pattern—and therefore have possessive NPs with double marking, according to Nichols (1986, 1992).19

---

19 The use of this marking on non-kinship terms is rare. It is generally accepted as being optional and exhibits dialectal variations. These variants, as well as the marking of P’orhépecha kinship terms can be consulted in Foster (1969), Nava (1997), and Chamoreau (2009).
In clauses, the core arguments expressed in NPs or by demonstratives with a pronominal function are case marked, either nominative -∅ or objective -ni. The indicative inflection, unlike the subjunctive and interrogative/clarificational (see (4) and (6)), agrees with the subject, -ka for 1st/2nd persons and -ti for 3rd person, and is therefore a head-marking pattern.

The pronominal expression of the verb’s arguments exhibits various possibilities regarding the marking patterns on the dependent and on the head. If the subject and/or object are encoded by free pronominal forms, as in the sentences in (21), the pattern is one of dependent marking (without considering subject agreement in the indicative mood).

(21) a. t’ú piré-sín-∅-ka
    2SG sing-HAB-PRS-1/2IND
    ‘You sing.’

b. xí t’ú-n=kini eshé-s-∅-ka
    1SG 2SG-OBJT=2SG.OBJ see-PRF-PRS-1/2IND
    ‘I saw you.’

If pronominal enclitics are employed it can be postulated, as proposed by Nichols (1992:55), that when the enclitic occurs in second position the marking is detached (neither the head nor the dependent are marked), whereas if attached to the verb, the marking is on the head.20 The sentences in (22) show these patterns in constructions with subject enclitics.

---

20 In fact, Nichols (1992:86) includes P’orhépecha among the languages that exhibit head-marking in clauses, since pronominal enclitics can attach to the verb. However, in this language the pronominal enclitics have an unmarked form corresponding to the nominative, and another marked with -ni that indicates the object. Therefore, the morphological marking indicating the grammatical function of the enclitic exhibits a formal parallelism with the dependent marking pattern shown by the case system: nominative -∅, objective -ni (see Chapter 2). A discussion of this issue is beyond the scope of this work, but Witzlack-Makarevich’s (2010:167–168) study is worth consulting, as it addresses similar problematic cases in the Klon and Araki languages. The author claims that, despite the fact that in these languages pronominal morphemes are prefixed to the verb, the locus of marking is on the dependent.
(22) a. pawáni=ri    t'iré-a-ka
   tomorrow=2SG.SBJ    eat-FUT-1/2IND
   ‘You will eat tomorrow.’

 b. witsítikwa  pyá-s-∅-ti=ksï    tsúntsu-ni
   yesterday    buy-PRF-PRS-3IND=1/3PL.SBJ    pot-OBJ
   ‘They bought the pot yesterday.’

In (23) examples of object enclitics are given.

(23) a. t'ú=rini    xwá-s-∅-ka
   1sg=1SG.OBJ    bring-PRF-PRS-1/2IND
   ‘You brought me.’

 b. Pédru    xwá-s-∅-ka=kini
   Pedro    bring-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=2SG.OBJ
   ‘Pedro brought you.’

Although free pronominal forms are emphatic, their use, as shown in (21), does not require the presence of enclitics. However, the language does allow for the co-occurrence of free forms and enclitics, in what could be described as a type of agreement (cf. Nichols 1992:52) exhibiting a double marking pattern. This phenomenon can also be observed when the enclitic of the 3rd person plural subject coexists with an NP or a demonstrative in subject function. The sentences in (24) exhibit the double marking of the subject.

(24) a. xí    piré-a-ka=ni
   1SG    sing-FUT-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ
   ‘I will sing.’

 b. t’ú=ri    no=ri
   2SG=2SG.SBJ    NEG=2SG.SBJ
   káma-sín-∅-∅    ichuskuta²¹
   have.on/with.oneself-HAB-PRS-INTERR    tortilla
   ‘Don’t you have any tortillas (on you)?’ (miríngua.91)

²¹ In some dialectal variants, though not in Puácuar, it is common for the subject enclitics to be joined to the free pronominal forms when the latter are placed before the verb, as in this example from the San Andrés community.
c. *tumpí-icha warhi-s-∅-ti=ksi*  
boy-PL die-PRF-PRS-3IND=1/3PL.SBJ  
‘The boys died.’

d. *ximá=ksi xáma-sūran-ti máru kwirís-icha*  
there=1/3PL.SBJ go.around-HAB.PST-3IND some duck-PL  
‘There were some ducks going around.’ (tumbi.106)

The sentences in (25) exemplify the different possibilities of double object marking. In (25a, c) the dependent marking pattern coexists with detached marking, and in (25b) with head-marking.

(25) a. *xí=kini t'ú-n=kini atá-s-∅-ka*  
1SG=2SG.OBJ 2SG-OBJT=2SG.OBJ strike-PRF-PRS-1/2IND  
‘I struck you.’

b. *xí *t'ú-n=kini atá-s-∅-ka=kini*  
1SG 2SG-OBJT=2SG.OBJ strike-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=2SG.OBJ  
‘I struck you.’

c. *éska táati=rini na wéka-∅-∅-ka*  
sbr father.1/2PSR=1SG.OBJ as want/love-PRF-PRS-SBJV  
*xi-n=rini*  
1SG-OBJT=1SG.OBJ  
‘As my Father has loved me.’ (San Juanu 15(9))

It is worth noting that in (24b) and (25c), the verbal inflection shows no subject agreement; therefore, the resulting clauses do not exhibit any kind of head-marking.

1.3.2.5 General Aspects of the Sentence

As mentioned earlier, the P’orhépecha language follows the nominative-accusative alignment pattern in all subsystems: case marking, enclitic marking, and verb subject agreement in the indicative mood. In (26), sentences with an inchoative verb are shown, in (27) with an active/agentive intransitive verb, and in (28) with a transitive verb.
(26) a. tumpí tepá-sha-∅-ti
    boy get.fat-PROG-PRS-3IND
    'The boy is getting fat.'

b. tepá-sha-∅-ka=ri
    get.fat-PROG-PRS-1/2IND=2SG.SBJ
    'You are getting fat.'

(27) a. acháati wiría-sha-∅-ti
    man run-PROG-PRS-3IND
    'The man is running.'

b. wiría-sha-∅-ka=ri
    run-PROG-PRS-3IND=2SG.SBJ
    'You are running.'

(28) a. acháati atá-sha-∅-ti tumpí-ni/tsúnstu-ni
    man strike-PROG-PRS-3IND boy-OBJT/pot-OBJT
    'The man is striking the boy/the pot.'

b. acháati=kini atá-sha-∅-ti
    man=2SG.OBJ strike-PROG-PRS-3IND
    'The man is striking you.'

Porhépecha allows for the omission of 3rd person singular pronouns (demonstratives) both in subject and object function, as shown in (29). This and other possibilities for the omission of pronominal forms are discussed in Chapter 2.

(29) a. wiría-sha-∅-ti
    run-PROG-PRS-3IND
    'S/he is running.'

b. atá-sha-∅-ti
    strike-PROG-PRS-3IND
    'S/he is striking him/her/it.'

Similarly, in ditransitive constructions, both pronominal objects may be omitted, as seen in (30b).
(30) a. \( \text{María} \ \text{ewá-ti} \ \text{kúchi-ni} \ \text{Páblu-ni} \)
Maria take.away-FUT-3IND pig-OBJT Pablo-OBJT
'María will take the pig away from Pablo.'

b. \( \text{ewá-ti} \)
take.away-FUT-3IND
'S/he will take it away from him/her.'

As is usual in languages with a case system, in P’orhépecha the constituent order is flexible (pragmatically determined) and provides no information on the grammatical functions of the NPs. The only existing work on the P’orhépecha constituent order is that of Capistrán (2002a), which is based on texts from the Lake Pátzcuaro area. According to this study, the SVO sequence (by far the most frequent in these texts) is the unmarked order, whereas SOV is common when emphasizing an O that refers to a prominent or unexpected discourse participant. The following examples show the VO (31) and the OV (32) orders.

(31)  
\( \text{S} \ \text{V} \ \text{O} \)

a. \( \text{imá} \ \text{kúmpa} \ \text{ká-a-sín-∅-ti} \)
that godfather have.on/with.onself-hab-prs-3IND
\( \text{kabá-echa-ni} \)
horse-PL-OBJT
'The godfather has some horses with him.' (Capistrán 2002a:376)

b. [The boy arrived at the place where the letter was,]  
\( \text{V} \ \text{O} \)
\( \text{katsí-k'u-s-∅-ti} \ \text{imá-ni} \ \text{síránta-ni} \ \text{ka} \)
hold-hand-PRF-PRS-3IND that-OBJT paper-OBJT and
\( \text{arhínt'a-s-∅-ti} \)
read-PRF-PRS-3IND
'...he held the letter in his hand and read it.' (Capistrán 2002a:377)

(32)  
[\( \text{I am afraid. What will your father say?}] \)
\( \text{S} \ \text{O} \ \text{V} \)
\( \text{xí} \ \text{wakásï-icha-ni} \ \text{wántiku-a-s-∅-ka} \)
ISG ox-PL-OBJT kill-distr-PRF-PRS-1/2IND
'I killed the oxen (the father’s oxen).' (Capistrán 2002a:372)
Coordinate constructions are marked with the nexus *ka*, while subordinate clauses are, as a rule, introduced through the use of diverse subordinate items, which determine the mood, indicative or subjunctive, of their complements. The non-finite verbal forms can occur in several contexts: in non-subordinate clauses within narrative contexts, in periphrastic constructions, in certain completive clauses, and in clauses introduced by the loanword *para*. 
CHAPTER 2

Subject and Object in Monotransitive Constructions

The cross-linguistic analysis of ditransitive constructions requires knowledge of the properties of monotransitive sentences. These constructions consist of predicates with two arguments, prototypically an agent-like (A) and a patient-like (P), expressed syntactically through the core grammatical functions of subject and object (cf. Comrie 2012, Haspelmath 2011). In order to identify grammatical relations in P’orhépecha and to define subject and object functions, I follow Keenan (1976) and Givón (1995, 2001a), who state that the definition of grammatical functions requires the identification of the different morphosyntactic properties associated with them (cf. Andrews 2007). From this perspective, the formal properties for determining grammatical relations can be reduced to coding properties (typically case, agreement, order) and behavioral properties (grammatical processes sensitive to different grammatical functions; for example, passivization, co-referentiality relationships and omission phenomena).

This chapter discusses the properties that allow core grammatical functions (subject and object) to be distinguished from obliques in P’orhépecha, as well as the coding and behavioral properties of arguments in monotransitive constructions. It is divided into two sections. In 2.1, the encoding strategies for the grammatical functions of subject and object are analyzed, and in 2.2, the morphosyntactic behavioral properties of these functions are discussed.

2.1 Coding Properties

The constituent order in P’orhépecha is not rigid, and therefore the syntactic position of the sentence constituents is not decisive for the identification of grammatical functions (see 1.3.2.5). As was stated in 1.3.2.2, the language has a morphological case system as well as a nominative-accusative alignment type. The nominative and the objective case markers flag core grammatical relations, while the locative, instrumental, and comitative case markers, as well as the adpositions, introduce obliques. In addition to case markers and adpositions, the encoding properties relevant in distinguishing core functions from obliques in P’orhépecha are the subject agreement suffixes in the indicative
mood (-ka 1st/2nd person and -ti 3rd person), the object marking -a on the verb, and the use of pronominal enclitics.

2.1.1 Nominative Case Marking and Objective Case Marking
As noted in 1.3.2.2, in P’orhépecha the nominative case (unmarked) is a coding property of subjects, while the suffix -ni is the case marker for objects, both in monotransitive and ditransitive constructions. Nevertheless, as is common in other languages that lack a distinction between accusative and dative marking (see Blansitt 1988, Bossong 1991, Malchukov 2008), in P’orhépecha certain NPs in object function (encoding a patient/theme) remain unmarked. This phenomenon, known as differential object marking (DOM), is commonly related to animacy and definiteness parameters (Comrie 1989:128, Aissen 2003, Croft 2003:132, 166–167). In P’orhépecha these parameters determine the occurrence of unmarked patient/theme objects.1 However, the possibility of being unmarked is limited to inanimate singular NPs without demonstratives or with the indefinite determinant -ma, and to singular NPs with a generic or collective meaning. On the other hand, all plural NPs, regardless of animacy or definiteness, must be marked (cf. Villavicencio 2006).2 In the sentences in (1), the contrast between the presence or absence of a case marker with collective, generic and mass nouns is illustrated.

(1) a. Chalío pyá-s-∅-ti ganádu/ganádu-ni
    Chalío buy-prf-prs-3ind cattle/cattle-objt
    ‘Chalío bought some cattle/the cattle.’

    b. xuchá arhá-s-∅-ka kurúcha/kurúcha-ni
    1pl ingest-prf-prs-1/2ind fish/fish-objt
    ‘We ate fish/the fish.’

    c. Páblu eshé-s-∅-ti yurhíri/yurhíri-ni
    Pablo see-prf-prs-3ind blood/blood-objt
    ‘Pablo saw blood/the blood.’

1 In P’orhépecha the DOM phenomenon is present in the P argument of monotransitive constructions, as well as in the theme argument (T) of ditransitive constructions (see Chapter 3).
2 The phenomenon is more complex than presented above. For a detailed discussion regarding DOM in P’orhépecha see Capistrán (2012).
In these sentences, the presence of -ni on the nominal objects yields a definite reading, while the marking of inanimate indefinite NPs yields a specific reading:

(2) \[\text{\text{\text{\textit{xí pyá-a-ka ma k'waníntikwa/k'waníntikwa-ni \}}}}\]
\[\text{\text{\text{\textit{1sg buy-FUT-1/2IND one shawl/shawl-OBJT}}}}\]
'I will buy a shawl (non-specific/a particular one).'

Unlike the sentences in (1) and (2), plural NPs must be case marked even when they have a generic reading or when they are inanimate indefinites. Compare (1b) with (3a), and (2) with (3b).

(3) a. \[\text{\text{\text{\textit{xwánu warhó-sïn-∅-ti k'werépuicha*(-ni)}}}}\]
\[\text{\text{\text{\textit{Juan fish-HAB-PRS-3IND charal-PL-OBJT}}}}\]
'Juan fishes charales (small fish).'

b. \[\text{\text{\text{\textit{xwá-a-∅ mårù k'waníntikwa-echa*(-ni)}}}}\]
\[\text{\text{\text{\textit{bring-DIST-IMP some shawl-PL-OBJT}}}}\]
'Bring some shawls.'

The ungrammaticality resulting from the omission of -ni in (3a, b) shows that the DOM in P’orhépecha cannot be determined unequivocally by animacy and definiteness. The constraints in this language regarding the omission of the objective marker -ni suggest that its occurrence is a coding property of the objects of monotransitive constructions.

2.1.2 Subject and Object Verb Markings

As shown in 1.3.2.1, in P’orhépecha the verbal inflection only distinguishes the person features of the subject in the indicative mood. In contrast with the interrogative/clarificational inflection, marked with -∅/-ki for all persons, and the subjunctive mood, marked with -ka regardless of the person of the subject, the indicative verbal forms must be inflected in agreement with the grammatical subject: if the subject is 1st/2nd person, the verb is marked with -ka; if it is 3rd person, then the marker is -ti.

(4) a. \[\text{\text{\text{\textit{xí/t’ú/xuchá/chá atá-s-∅-ka wíchu-ni}}}}\]
\[\text{\text{\text{\textit{1sg/2sg/1pl/2pl strike-PRF-PRS-1/2IND dog-OBJT}}}}\]
'I/we/you/we (PL) struck the dog.'
b. imá /ts’imá atá-s-∅-ti wíchu-ni
that /those strike-PRF-PRS-3IND dog-OBJT
‘S/he/they struck the dog.’

The -ka/-ti distinction of the P’orhépecha indicative inflection is an instance of the opposition “participants in the speech act/non-participants in the speech act”, postulated by Benveniste (1976 [1956]). As shown below, this opposition can be observed in several grammatical aspects of this language.

The only non-valence-changing verbal morpheme in P’orhépecha linked to the object grammatical function is the suffix -a, considered a plural object marker in studies of this language. A peculiarity of this morpheme is that it is only used with 3rd person objects. Accordingly, while the morpheme -a is present in (5), sentence (6) is ungrammatical if this affix is present in the verbal base.

(5) a. eshé-a-s-∅-ti
    see-DISTR-PRF-PRS-3IND
    ‘S/he saw the trees.’

b. xí wántiku-a-s-∅-ka wákasi-icha-ni
    1sg kill-DISTR-PRF-PRS-1/2IND ox-PL-OBJ
    ‘I killed the oxen.’

c. xí xwá-a-s-∅-ka=ni sapí-icha-ni
    1sg bring-DISTR-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1sg.SBJ child-PL-OBJ
    ‘I brought the children.’

(6) xuchá-n=ts’ini eshé(*-a)-s-∅-ti
    1PL-OBJT=1PL.OBJ see-DISTR-PRF-PRS-3IND
    ‘S/he saw us.’

As can be seen in the examples in (5) and (6), I differ from the prevailing analysis of -a as a plural object marker, a matter to which I shall return later. However, the occurrence of this affix on the verb signals a core grammatical relation, since it can only be present when it corresponds to a verbal argument functioning as an object;³ that is, it cannot be triggered by subjects, whether they are agents or patients, as seen in (7), nor by obliques, as in (8). Compare

³ As will be shown in Chapter 3, the occurrence of -a may be triggered by any of the objects in ditransitive constructions.
with the ungrammaticality of the forms shown in (7) and (8), resulting from the occurrence of -a on the verb:

(7) a. tumpí-icha  piré(-a)-s-∅-ti  xuchá-eri  pirékwa-ni  
boy-PL  sing-DIST-PRF-PRS-1PL  GEN  song-OBJ
‘The boys sang our song.’

b. yámintu-icha  xanó(-a)-s-∅-ti  
all-PL  arrive-DIST-PRF-PRS-1PL
‘Everybody arrived.’

(8) a. María  t’iré(-a)-s-∅-ti  sapí-icha-ni  
Maria  eat-DIST-PRF-PRS-3PL  child-PL-OBJ
xinkóni/sapí-icha-nkuní  
POSCHILD-PL-COM
‘Maria ate with the children.’

b. Pédru  tempúcha(-a)-s-∅-ti  tsimáni  warhúiti-icha-ni  
Pedro  marry-DIST-PRF-PRS-3IND  two  woman-PL-OBJ
xinkóni  
POS
‘Pedro got married to two women.’

c. xákurhi(-a)-sin-∅-ka=ni  sapí-icha-ni  ximpó  
worry-DIST-HAB-PRS-3/4IND=1SG  child-PL-OBJ  POS
‘I worry about the children.’

d. xuchá  washáka(-a)-wa-ka  washántsikwa-icha-rhu  
1PL  sit.down-DIST-FUT-3/4IND  chair-PL-LOC
‘We will sit down on the chairs.’

As mentioned previously, the object suffix -a is considered a 3rd person plural marker, which, according to some authors, has a pronominal or agreement value (see Chamoreau 2009:68, Monzón 2004:90–91, Nava 1997, Villavicencio 2006: 75, 115). The existence of this type of morpheme for 3rd person objects in P’orhépecha is striking given the absence of a similar affix, or affixes, for the 1st and 2nd persons. In an earlier study (Capistrán 2010b), I provided evidence that -a cannot be reduced to a number-agreement phenomenon, and that the
function of its presence/absence on the verb is to express the contrast between distributive (individuated entities) and collective (entities considered together as a unit). Distributive markers, according to Corbett (2000:111–120), are not a number category and are therefore not governed by agreement, nor do they align with the animacy hierarchy.4

The distributive value of -a can be observed when comparing the sentences in (9) with those in (10). In the former, -a is present because the object is considered as a collection of entities.

(9)  

a. énka ká-a-pirin-ka
   REL have.on/with.oneself-DISTR-COND-SBJV

   ma siéntu karíchi-icha-ni
   one hundred lamb-PL-OBJT

   'Whoever had a hundred lambs…' (San Lukasï 15(4))

b. eshé-a-nt'a-s-p-ti
   see-DISTRB-ITR-PRF-PST-3IND a.lot k'wirípu-echa-ni

   énka=ksi wákasï-icha-ni ka karíchi-icha-ni ka
   REL=1/3PL.SBJ ox-PL-OBJT and lamb-PL-OBJT and

   palómasï-icha-ni íntspikuarhi-a-ni xá-p-ka
   dove-PL-OBJT sell-DISTR-NF be-PST-SBJV

   'He found a lot of people who were selling oxen, lambs and doves.'
   (San Juanu 2(14))

Unlike the sentences in (9), those in (10) illustrate the fact that if the object is treated as a unit or non-individuated cluster, then the suffix -a is not used.

(10)  

a. ka tarhámpempa xatsí-s-p-ti wánikwa
   and father.in.law.3PSR have-PRF-PST-3IND a.lot

   chancháki-icha-ni
   horse-PL-OBJT

   '…and his father-in-law had a herd of horses.' (tumbi.105)

4 According to the proposal of Smith-Stark (1974), later developed by Corbett (2000), when there is a split in plural marking or number-agreement, it respects the animacy hierarchy. Therefore, if the 3rd person is marked, so are the 1st and 2nd persons.
b. xuchá p’urhéecha xatsí-kwarhi-s-∅-ka echéri-icha-ni
   1pl  p’orhépechas have-mdl/refl-prf-prs-1/2ind land-pl-objt

énka ximpó washástakata xa-∅-∅-ká iréta-echa
   rel  posp settled be-prf-prs-sbjv village-pl

‘We P’orhépechas have land where the villages are settled.’
(p’urhépecha jimpo II.124)

In contrast to (9), the sentences in (10) contain objects seen as units or clusters rather than individual entities. For example, in (10a) the translation of the NP ‘a herd of horses’ clearly has a collective sense, resulting from the absence of -a on the verb. This differs from (9a) where there are a hundred individual entities. The distributive/collective contrast that the presence/absence of -a conveys is shown clearly in (11).

(11) a. Xwánu xupí-a-sïn-∅-ti kurúcha-echa-ni answélo ximpó
   Juan grab-distr-hab-prs-3ind fish-pl-objt hook posp
   ‘Juan catches fish with a hook.’

b. Xwánu warhó-sïn-∅-ti k’werépu-icha-ni cherámakwa ximpó
   Juan fish-hab-prs-3ind charal-pl-objt net posp
   ‘Juan fishes charales (small fish) with a net.’

If a hook is used to fish, only one fish at a time can be caught and therefore, it is not possible to omit -a in (11a). In (11b) there is no -a, since the verb warhóni is used to indicate fishing with a net; i.e., many fish are caught at the same time.

The distributive value of -a can be identified in its use regarding singular NPs with a collective/mass sense, which have no case marking. The examples in (12) and (13) show that the presence of -a carries out the typical functions of distributive markers with collective/mass nouns to signal: a) entities spread over several locations, or b) entities spread over several sorts or types (Corbett 2000:112).

(12) a. tumpí chpíri ú-s-∅-ti
   boy fire do/make-prf-prs-3ind
   ‘The boy built a bonfire.’

b. tumpí chpíri ú-a-s-∅-ti
   boy fire do/make- distr-prf-prs-3ind
   ‘The boy built bonfires.’
(13) a. pyá-s-∅-ti semíya
   buy-PRF-PRS-3IND seed
   ‘S/he bought seed(s).’

   b. pyá-a-s-∅-ti semíya
   buy-DISTR-PRF-PRS-3IND seed
   ‘S/he bought (different kinds of) seeds.’

The distributive value of -a explains why this affix does not occur when objects are in the 1st or 2nd person (typically conceptualized as individuals) and makes it possible to postulate that in P’orhépecha the only inflectional marking exhibiting agreement is that established by the indicative suffixes -kal/-tí, which are neutral to number features.

2.1.3 Pronominal Forms

P’orhépecha, as mentioned in 1.3.2.3, has free pronominal forms only for the 1st and 2nd persons, while for the 3rd person demonstrative items are employed. Both types of morphemes can code the syntactic subject when there is no marking, i.e., when they exhibit the -∅ nominative marker. This can be seen in (14), in which demonstratives fulfill a pronominal function.

(14) inté atá-s-∅-ti inté-ní
    this strike-PRF-PRS-3IND this-OBJ
    ‘This one struck this one.’

The free pronominal forms for the 1st and 2nd person subjects are shown in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>xí</td>
<td>xuchá</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>t’ü</td>
<td>chá</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sentences in (15) exemplify the use of free pronouns in subject function.
(15) a. t’ú xupá-s-∅-ka
   2sg wash-prf-prs-1/2ind
   'You washed.'

b. xuchá pyá-s-∅-ka kuchi-ni
   1pl buy-prf-prs-1/2ind pig-objt
   'We bought the pig.'

In addition to free pronouns, P’orhépecha can code the subject via a system of pronominal enclitics (see Table 5).5

Table 5普onominal subject enclitics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>=ni</td>
<td>=ksí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>=rí</td>
<td>=tsí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>=∅</td>
<td>=ksí</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These enclitics occur attached either to the verb or to a preverbal element, as shown in 1.3.2.3. In the latter case, they generally behave as second-position clitics. The subject enclitics can coexist with free pronouns or, in the case of =ksí, with NPs or demonstratives in subject function, but this co-occurrence is not obligatory. The grammatical function of subject can therefore be coded either by way of free pronominal forms/demonstratives or by way of enclitics. Since the use of free pronominals or demonstratives is emphatic, indicating the subject by way of the enclitics is less marked. In (16), several examples of subject enclitic usage are given (cf. 1.3.2.3 and 1.3.2.4).


6 The same enclitic is used for 1st and 3rd person plurals, despite the fact that one would expect the same form to be used for the 1st and 2nd person plurals, given the norm of differentiation between the 1st/2nd and 3rd person. However, at least in the indicative mood, when =ksí appears the inflectional distinction -ka/-ti eliminates any ambiguity, which would not occur if the same enclitic form were employed for the 1st and 2nd persons.
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(16) a. xí  xupá-s-∅-ka=ni
   1sg  wash-prf-prs-1/2ind=1sg.sbj
   'I washed.'

b. xanó-s-∅-ka=ni
   arrive-prf-prs-1/2ind=1sg.sbj
   'I arrived.'

c. ishú=ri  eshé-s-∅-ka
   here=2sg.sbj  see-prf-prs-1/2ind
   'You saw it/him/her here.'

d. wíchu-nsi  pá-s-∅-ka
   dog-obj=1/3pl.sbj  take/carry-prf-prs-1/2ind
   'We took the dog somewhere.'

e. ishú  warhúti-icha  áñchikurhi-sín-∅-ti(ksí)
   here  woman-pl  work-hab-prs-3ind=1/3pl.sbj
   'Here women work.'

f. witsíntikwa=ksi  t’iré-s-∅-ti  kurhínta
   yesterday=1/3pl.sbj  eat-prf-prs-3ind  bread
   'Yesterday they ate bread.'

g. o=tsí  chá=t’u  wéka-sín-∅  nirá-ni?
   or=2pl.sbj  2pl=also  want/love-hab-prs-interr  go-nf
   'Or do you (PL) also want to go?'

While demonstratives and free pronouns can occur in oblique phrases and receive semantic case, the pronominal enclitics cannot. The enclitics in Table 5 only encode arguments mapped onto subject function. Therefore, unlike (17a, b), (17c) is ungrammatical.

(17) a. xí  iréka-sín-∅-ka  t’ú-nkuni
   1sg  inhabit-hab-prs-1/2ind  2sg-com
   'I live with you.'

b. t’ú  wantónskurhi-sín-∅-ka  ts’imá-nkuni
   2sg  talk-hab-prs-1/2ind  those-com
   'You talk to them.'
c. *witsintikwa=ri-nkuni wantónskurhi-s-∅-ti
   yesterday=2SG-COM talk-PRF-PRS-3IND
   Intended reading: 'Yesterday s/he talked to you.'

Porhépecha only has object pronominal forms for 1st and 2nd persons. For the 3rd person objects, as previously shown, demonstratives marked with the objective case are used.

(18) a. eshé-s-∅-ka=ni imá-ni
    see-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ that-OBJT
    'I saw him/her/that one.'

b. eshé-a-s-∅-ka=ni ts’imá-ni
    see-DISTR-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ those-OBJT
    'I saw them/those.'

The 1st and 2nd person objects can either be enclitics or complex free forms. Object enclitics have the peculiarity whereby if the subject is plural, they must also be plural; i.e., they present number agreement with plural subjects. Hence, plural subjects block number marking (singular/plural) for object enclitics. The ambiguous value (singular or plural) of =ts’inti and =ks’inti is maintained in clauses lacking explicit subjects. Moreover, when there is an explicit plural subject, singular objects can be marked by means of free pronominal forms (see Table 7).

---

7 In Porhépecha, the marking of plural subjects does not preclude the number marking of the object (singular or plural), despite the fact that the number marking of object enclitics is suspended when the subject is plural. As will be shown (2.1.4), the ambiguous value (singular or plural) of =ts’inti and =ks’inti is maintained in clauses lacking explicit subjects. Moreover, when there is an explicit plural subject, singular objects can be marked by means of free pronominal forms (see Table 7).

8 It may be postulated that object enclitic forms are bimorphemic. The ending -ni indicates object, as occurs when -ni is used as a case marker with nouns and demonstratives (cf. Foster 1969:43–47). However, the value of these forms is not what would be expected from the addition of the objective marker to the subject enclitics in Table 5.
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In (19), examples of singular subject sentences are provided.

(19) a. \textit{imá=rini atá-s-∅–ti}
    that=1sg.obj strike/prf/prs–3ind
    ‘S/he struck me.’

b. \textit{xí=kini atá-s-∅–ka}
    1sg=2sg.obj strike/prf/prs–1/2ind
    ‘I struck you (SG).’

c. \textit{Pédru=ts’ïni atá-s-∅–ti}
    Pedro=1pl.obj strike/hit/prf/prs–3ind
    ‘Pedro struck us.’

In contrast with the sentences in (19), if the subject is plural, the object enclitics for 1st and 2nd person must also be plural. Accordingly, sentences such as those in (20) are ungrammatical.

(20) a. \textit{*ts’ïmá=rini áta-s-∅–ti}
    those=1sg.obj strike/prf/prs–3ind
    Intended reading: ‘They struck me.’

b. \textit{*tumpí-icha=kini atá-s-∅–ti}
    boy-pl=2sg.obj strike/prf/prs–3ind
    Intended reading: ‘The boys struck you (SG).’

In order for this type of sentence to be grammatical, it requires a plural object form, as in (21). The resulting constructions are ambiguous: the enclitic can refer either to singular or to plural objects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st SG.OBJ</td>
<td>=rini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd SG.OBJ</td>
<td>=kini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st PL.OBJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd PL.OBJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(21) a. ts'imá=ts'ïni atá-s-∅-ti
   those=1SG/PL.OBJ strike-PRF-PRS-3IND
   'They struck me/us.'

   b. xuchá=ksïni atá-s-∅-ka
      1PL=2SG/PL.OBJ strike-PRF-PRS-1/2IND
      'We struck you (SG/PL).'  

The use of free pronominal objects causes the disambiguation of sentences such as those in (21). These forms are constructed with the free 1st and 2nd subject pronouns followed by -n (the reduced form of the case suffix -ni), to which the object enclitics must be attached (cf. Nava 1997).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Free pronominal object forms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SG Subject</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st SG.OBJ  xí-n=rini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd SG.OBJ  t'ú-n=kini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st PL.OBJ  xuchá-n=ts'ïni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd PL.OBJ  chá-n=ksïni</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pronominal forms in Table 7 have an emphatic character and can be employed alone or with object enclitics, as shown in (22).

(22) a. imá xi=n=rini  eshé-s-∅-ti
      that 1SG-OBJT=1SG.OBJ see-PRF-PRS-3IND
      'S/he saw me.'

      b. xí=ksïni  eshé-s-∅-ka  chá-n=ksïni
         1SG=2PL.OBJ see-PRF-PRS-1/2IND  2PL-OBJT=2PL.OBJ
         'I saw you (PL).'

The object enclitics that occur attached to free pronouns must maintain number agreement with plural subjects:

(23) a. tumpí-icha xi-n=ts'ïni  eshé-s-∅-ti
      boy-PL 1SG-OBJT=1SG/PL.OBJ see-PRF-PRS-3IND
      'The boys saw me.'
b. *tumpí-icha=ksïni  eshé-s-∅-ti  t’ú-n=ksïni
   boy-PL=2SG/PL.OBJ  see-PRF-PRS-3IND  2SG-OBJT=2SG/PL.OBJ
   ‘The boys saw you (SG).’

c. ts’ú=ksïni  eshé-s-∅-ti  chá-n=ksïni
   that=2SG./PL.OBJ  see-PRF-PRS-3IND  2PL-OBJT=2SG/PL.OBJ
   ‘They saw you (PL).’

Unlike the sentences in (21), those in (23) are not ambiguous, since the free pronominal forms allow the number feature of the object to be determined.

Only free pronominal objects, and not enclitics, can be employed as adposition complements, i.e., in oblique constituents.

(24) a. ishú  t’ú-n=kini  xinkóni  warhá-a-ti
   here  2SG-OBJT=2SG.OBJ  POSP  dance-FUT-3IND
   ‘S/he will dance with you here.’

b. *ishú=kini  xinkóni  warhá-a-ti
   here=2SG.OBJ  POSP  dance-FUT-3IND
   Intended reading: ‘S/he will dance with you here.’

In oblique phrases, pronominal complements cannot present number agreement when the subject is plural.

(25) xuchá  wantónskurhi-sha-∅-ka
   1PL  talk-PROG-PRS-1/2IND

   t’ú-n=kini/t’ú-n=ksïni  xinkóni
   2SG-OBJT=2SG.OBJ/2SG-OBJT=2SG/PL.OBJ  POSP
   ‘We are talking to you.’

P’orhépecha subject and object enclitics cannot coexist in a clause. Consequently, when there is a 1st or 2nd person object enclitic in a clause (objects which, as will be explained below, must be expressed in the syntax), the subject cannot be coded by enclitics. Therefore, constructions such as those in (26) are ungrammatical.

(26) a. *ishú=ri  xwá-s-∅-ka=riní
   here=2SG.SBJ  bring-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.OBJ
   Intended reading: ‘You brought me here.’
b. *xwá-s-∅-ka=ni=ki/nikini
bring-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ=2SG.OBJ=1SG.SBJ
Intended reading: ‘I brought you.’

2.1.4 Omission of Subject and Object Pronominal Forms
P’orhépecha allows for the omission of subject and object pronominal forms. However, this omission is subject to certain constraints. The pronominal expression of 3rd person singular subjects by means of demonstratives can always be omitted, which could be explained by the existence of an enclitic =∅ for the 3rd person singular subject. The sentences in (27) present this type of clause, which is common when the identity of the subject is known given the discourse context.

(27) a. káma-sïram-p-ti
ampákiti ganádu
have.on/with.oneself-HAB.PST-PST-3IND good cattle
‘S/he used to have good cattle.’ (toru.60)

b. eshé-s-p-ti
wánikwa k’wirípu-ni
see-PRF-PST-3IND a.lot people-OBJT
‘S/he saw a lot of people.’ (San Markusí 5(38))

The absence of overt pronominal subject forms (free pronouns or enclitics), both in the indicative mood and in moods lacking subject agreement, allow a 3rd person singular value to be assigned to the argument in subject function. If the subject is not 3rd person singular, it must be expressed by an enclitic or a free pronoun. The examples (28a, b, c) illustrate the contrast between clauses with and without subject enclitics in the indicative (exhibiting the 3rd person subject agreement marker -ti), in the subjunctive, and in the interrogative moods, respectively.

(28) a. xanó-s-∅-ti
xanó-s-∅-ti=ksï
arrive-PRF-PRS-3IND arrive-PRF-PRS-3IND=1/3PL.SBJ
‘S/he arrived.’ ‘They arrived.’

b. éka xanó-∅-∅-ka
éka=ksï xanó-∅-∅-ka
when arrive-PRF-PRS-SBJV when=1/3PL.SBJ arrive-PRF-PRS-SBJV
‘When s/he arrived.’ ‘When we/they arrived.’

c. xanó-s-∅-ki?
arrive-PRF-PRS-INTERR xanó-s-∅-ki=ksï
arrive-PRF-PRS-INTERR=1/3PL.SBJ ‘Did s/he arrive?’ ‘Did we/they arrive?’
The absence of an overt pronominal subject in the indicative is also possible (although less frequent) when the verb is combined with the 1st/2nd person subject agreement marker -ka:

(29) a. \textit{xanó-s-∅-ka}  
\quad \text{arrive-PRF-PRS-1/2IND}  
\quad 'I arrived.'

b. \textit{méni-icha-ni nirá-siąm-p-ka}  
\quad \text{animáli p'í-wa-nt'a-ni}  
\quad \text{once-PL-OBJT go-HAB.PST-PST-1/2IND animal} \text{ fetch-DISTR-ITR-NF}  
\quad 'I often used to go fetch the animals.' (nanáka.2)

In (29), the only possible interpretation is that the subject is the speaker, the 1st person singular; this value cannot be attributed to a covert marker or enclitic =∅. In contrast to the sentences in (29), in the subjunctive mood—(30a)—and in the interrogative—(30b)—the 1st person singular subject must have an overt pronominal realization.

(30) a. \textit{éka=ni xanó-∅-∅-ka}  
\quad \text{when=1sg.sbj arrive-PRF-PRS-sbjv}  
\quad 'When I arrived.'

b. \textit{xí xanó-s-∅-ki?}  
\quad \text{1sg arrive-PRF-PRS-interr}  
\quad 'Did I arrive?'

In the sentences in (30), if the 1st person pronoun is omitted, then a reading can only be obtained with a 3rd person singular subject, as shown in (28b, c). Therefore, concerning sentences without an overt pronominal subject, such as those in (29), I suggest that the information provided by -ka (1st/2nd person), in addition to the speaker’s discourse-deictic function (necessarily the 1st person) leads to the conclusion that the grammatical subject corresponds to the utterer; that is, the grammatical function of subject is identified with the speaker’s discourse function.

In the case of the 3rd person singular, it seems that the subject is identified by way of a clitic =∅. However, this analysis does not account for the reading of the examples in (29). In constructions with object enclitics (which exclude the occurrence of subject enclitics), the absence of overt free pronominal subjects is common, whatever their person and number features are. This suggests that Porhépecha allows for the syntactic omission of free pronominal subject forms when there is morphological information from which the subject’s
identity can be deduced. In (31), the subject’s features are inferred from the information provided by the verbal inflection and the object enclitics.

(31) a. ishú=rini  atá-s-∅-ka
    here=1SG.OBJ  strike-PRF-PRS-1/2IND
    ‘You struck me here.’

b. ishú=kini  atá-s-∅-ti
    here=2SG.OBJ  strike-PRF-PRS-3IND
    ‘S/he struck you here.’

In (31a), the verbal inflection indicates that the subject is 1st or 2nd person. Since the object enclitic is that of the 1st person singular, the only possible subject is the 2nd person singular, ruling out the interpretation of the subject as 2nd person plural. For this interpretation to be possible, the object form would have to be plural. Consequently, the grammatical subject is determined by morphosyntactic inference. In (31b), the subject is identified in the same way as in (31a); the inflectional suffix -ti can only correspond to the 3rd person singular. However, ambiguity arises when the inflectional contrast -ka/-ti is not maintained, as shown in the interrogative sentences in (32).

(32) a. atá-s-∅-ki=kini?
    strike-PRF-PRS-INTERR=2SG.OBJ
    ‘Did s/he strike you?’/‘Did I strike you (SG)?’

b. atá-s-∅-ki=rini?
    strike-PRF-PRS-INTERR=1SG.OBJ
    ‘Did s/he strike me?’/‘Did you (SG) strike me?’

In (32), though the subject must be singular, there is no inflectional information that allows the person feature of the subject to be determined. Sentences with plural object enclitics and without a free pronominal subject are always ambiguous, as shown in (33).9

9 Note that these constructions cannot have a reflexive or reciprocal reading. As will be discussed, for transitive verbs to present these values, specific verbal suffixes need to be present.
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(33) a. ishú=ksïni
   atá-s-∅-ka
   here=2SG/PL.OBJ strike-PRS-1/2IND
   'We struck you (SG/PL) here.'/'I struck you (PL) here.'/'We struck you (SG/PL) here.'

b. ishú=ts'ïni
   atá-s-∅-ti
   here=1SG/PL.OBJ strike-PRS-3IND
   'They struck us/me here.'/'S/he struck us here.'

In (33a), the grammatical information provided by -ka, as well as the presence of the 2nd person plural object enclitic, leads to the identification of the subject as 1st person. However, given that the 2nd person singular object must take the plural form when the subject is plural, several interpretations are possible: [1st person plural subject: 2nd person singular/plural object] or [1st person singular subject: 2nd person plural object]. In (33b), the same type of ambiguity can be observed, but the subject must be 3rd person: [3rd person plural subject: 1st person singular/plural object] or [3rd person singular subject: 1st person plural object]. If there is no inflectional information relating to the subject, clauses in which it is not overt, but which have plural object enclitics, produce greater uncertainty as to the identification of the subject.

(34) atá-s-∅-ki=ksïni?
    strike-PRS-INTERR=2SG/PL.OBJ
    'Did s/he strike you (PL)?'/'Did they strike you (SG/PL)?'/'Did we strike you (SG/PL)?'/'Did I strike you (PL)?'

Clauses with object enclitics show that the subject can be omitted and that its grammatical features are inferred from the information provided by the object forms and by the verbal mood inflection. Depending on the number of the object and on the presence/absence of agreement marking relative to the subject, the identification of the latter can be either unequivocal or lead to several possible readings. The fact that P’orhépecha has sentences without a pronominal subject unrelated to a null morpheme—see examples (29) and (31–34)—leads to the question of whether it is necessary to postulate a clitic =∅ in the case of the 3rd person singular, or whether the subject can simply

---

10 This analysis differs from proposals such as that of Monzón (2004:102) and Villavicencio (2006:110), which suggest that P’orhépecha object enclitics are portmanteau forms that contain information relative to the subject.
be inferred by the absence of free or enclitic pronouns. This is a matter I leave open for discussion; however, it is important to consider the evidence outlined below, which shows that in constructions where 3rd person objects are omitted, there are no null morphemes.

In P’orhépecha, if the object is 1st or 2nd person it must be overtly expressed by pronominal forms. When there are no explicit objects, the only possible interpretation is that of a 3rd person object (prototypical object):

(35) \[ \text{eshé-s-∅-ka=ni} \]
\[ \text{see-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ} \]
'I saw it/him/her.'

Accordingly, (36b) is an adequate answer to the question in (36a), but (36c) is not, since it only allows for the reading ‘I struck him/her’.

(36) a. \[ \text{né=rini} \]
\[ \text{atá-s-∅-ki?} \]
\[ \text{who=1SG.OBJ strike-PRS-INTERR} \]
‘Who struck me?’

a'. \[ \text{xí=kini} \]
\[ \text{atá-s-∅-ka} \]
\[ \text{1SG=2SG.OBJ strike-PRS-1/2IND} \]
‘I struck you.’

a''. \[ \text{#xí} \]
\[ \text{atá-s-∅-ka} \]
\[ \text{1SG strike-PRS-1/2IND} \]
‘I struck him/her.’

Compare the sentences in (36) to those in (37):

(37) a. \[ \text{sapí} \]
\[ \text{werá-sha-∅-ti} \]
\[ \text{child cry-PROG-3IND} \]
‘The child is crying.’

a'. \[ \text{né} \]
\[ \text{atá-s-∅-ki?} \]
\[ \text{who strike-PRS-INTERR} \]
‘Who struck him/her?’

a''. \[ \text{xí} \]
\[ \text{atá-s-∅-ka} \]
\[ \text{1SG strike-PRS-1/2IND} \]
‘I struck him/her.’
The sentences in (36) show that the syntactic realization of the 1st and 2nd person objects is obligatory, while in (37) it is shown that 3rd person objects can be omitted. The possibility for 3rd person pronominal objects to remain without overt expression is a characteristic of P’orhépecha that might be due to the fact that the language lacks 3rd person object enclitics. Consequently, when there are no 1st or 2nd person objects, it is inferred that the object is 3rd person. The fact that sentences such as those in (35) and (38) below are grammatical, despite its being impossible for subject and object enclitics to co-occur in a clause, supports the argument of the non-existence of a null 3rd person object enclitic $\emptyset$ in P’orhépecha.

(38) a. ka mení nák’iru atá-a-ka=ni o and once although strike-FUT-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ or

\begin{align*}
\text{shuká-a-ka=ni} \\
\text{scold-FUT-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ}
\end{align*}

‘...and although I strike or scold him (talking about her son)…’

(warhíiti p’orhépecha.88)

b. pá-a-s-p-ti=ksï tsimáni k’wirípu-icha-ni take/carry-DISTR-PRF-PST-3IND=1/3PL.SBJ two person-PL-OBJT

\begin{align*}
xwáta-rhu para=ksï ximá wántiku-a-wa-ti \\
\text{hill-LOC for=1/3PL.SBJ there kill-DISTR-FUT-3IND}
\end{align*}

‘They led two people to the hill in order to kill them there.’

c. xuchá xatsí-kurhi-s-∅-ka echéri-icha-ni ka 1PL have-MDL/REFL-PRF-PRS-1/2IND land-PL-OBJT and

\begin{align*}
kwidári-sín-∅-ka=ksï \\
\text{take.care-HAB-PRS-1/2IND=1/3PL.SBJ}
\end{align*}

‘We have land and take care of it.’

d. xí ú-a-s-∅-ka=ni 1SG do/make-DISTR-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ

‘I made them.’

The occurrence of the distributive -a when there are no NPs or demonstratives in object function, as in (38d) and in the subordinate clause of (38b), leads to the interpretation of the patient/theme as a multiplicity of individuated entities,
allowing plurality to be inferred. On the other hand, the absence of -a in (38c) produces the reading of ‘the lands’ as a cluster or unit. The distributive value of -a excludes the possibility of its being considered an agreement or pronominal marker for 3rd person plural objects, which would contrast with a null form for 3rd person singular objects. It seems that in P’orhépecha, the absence of an overt pronominal object makes it possible to assign a 3rd person value to this argument. The occurrence of the suffix -a, given its distributive value, indicates individuated entities, but the suffix itself does not convey any number features.

The fact that the omission of 3rd person singular objects is not due to the existence of a null pronominal verbal affix can be corroborated when considering PPs that contain pronominal forms in objective case as their complements:

(39) a. xanó-s-∅-ka=ni
    arrive-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ
    ka
    and
t'iré-s-∅-ti
    eat-PRS-3IND
    xí-n=rini
    1SG-OBJT=1SG.OBJ
    xinkóni
    POSP
    ‘I arrived and s/he ate with me.’

b. xí=chka=ni
    1SG=ENF=1SG.SBJ
    i-ni
    this-OBJT
    xinkóni
    POSP
    kó
    AFFIR
    ni-wá-ka
    go-FUT-1/2IND
    tempúna-ni para xí=chka=ni xinkóni iréka-ni
    marry-NF for 1SG=ENF=1SG.SBJ POSP inhabit-NF
    ‘He is the one I will marry in order to live with him.’ (tembuna.73)

In (39a), the 1st person singular free pronoun is necessary in order to indicate ‘S/he ate with me’; if the pronominal form is omitted the only possible reading is ‘S/he ate with him/her’. The absence of a 3rd person free pronoun can be observed in (39b). In this sentence the postposition xinkóni in the purpose clause lacks an overt complement—as stated, enclitics cannot occur as complements of adpositions—so the reading of the PP is ‘with him/her’. Consequently, it can be concluded that in P’orhépecha, the elision of 3rd person pronouns or NPs is not an exclusive property of core arguments, nor does it depend on the existence of null pronominal markers on the verb. However, when an adposition lacks an overt complement, this complement can only be interpreted as 3rd person singular, as shown in (40).
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In (40), in order to obtain the reading ‘I ate with them’, the presence of a demonstrative with objective case is required; for example: tś’āni xinkóni ‘with them.’ The fact that it is not possible to interpret the absence of an explicit adposition complement as 3rd person plural, can be explained by noting that in the PP there is no marker that leads to this interpretation. Therefore, the 3rd person plural free pronoun cannot be omitted because it would be impossible to recover plurality information.

2.2 Behavioral Properties

The behavioral properties exhibited by the constituents of the clause are critical for determining grammatical relations. In P’orhépecha, as in many languages, there are certain morphosyntactic processes restricted to core functions. Such morphological mechanisms are function-changing operations (Haspelmath 2002:211)—morphological operations in the sense of Sandler and Spencer (1998) or diathesis changes sensu stricto and operational diathesis, in terms of Kulikov (2010)—i.e., although they do not alter the number of verbal arguments, they generate predicates with different morphosyntactic properties from those exhibited by the verbal base to which they are applied. These mechanisms involve alterations in argument realization, which usually result in a reduction of the predicate’s syntactic valence. The P’orhépecha reflexive, reciprocal, passive, and indefinite human object suffixes meet these conditions. They all apply to monotransitive verbs and prevent the patient-like argument (P) from being encoded in object function, allowing the establishment of behavioral properties related to this argument.

2.2.1 Indefinite Human Object Marker

In P’orhépecha, the morpheme -p’i (-p’e in dialectal variation) acts as a deobjectivization device. Therefore, its presence in the verbal base suppresses the syntactic expression of the object (cf. Kulikov 2010, Haspelmath 2002, Dixon
and Aikhenvald 2000b). Nevertheless, unlike similar mechanisms registered in other languages, the use of -p'i is constrained to human arguments; hence, its presence leads to the reading of the suppressed object as a generic or indefinite human (non-referential).

\[(41)\]

a. \[xwá\text{-}p'i\text{-}s\text{-}∅\text{-}ti\]
   \hspace{2cm} `S/he brought people/someone.'

b. \[pá\text{-}p'i\text{-}sín\text{-}∅\text{-}ti\]
   \hspace{2cm} `S/he leads people (for example, s/he smuggles illegal immigrants).'

c. \[Pédru\ wántiku\text{-}p'i\text{-}sín\text{-}∅\text{-}ti\]
   \hspace{2cm} `Pedro kills people (is a murderer).'

The sentences in (41) reject readings of the patient-like argument (P) as an indefinite thing or animal. For instance, example (41b) rejects the reading 'S/he carries something (things or animals).' These constructions are different from those in which a pronominal object has been omitted, since, in the latter case, the unexpressed object may denote a particular referent (any kind of animate or inanimate entity); for example \[pyásti\] `S/he bought it'; \[wántikusti\] `s/he killed it/him/her.' In contrast with predicates lacking a pronominal object, those exhibiting the morpheme -p'i do not admit an overt object NP. Moreover, such verbal bases disallow the demotion of the patient-like argument to an oblique phrase. For example:

\[(42)\]

a. \[*xwá\text{-}p'i\text{-}s\text{-}∅\text{-}ti\]
   \hspace{2cm} `S/he brought the child/children.'

\[\text{(ximpó/xinkóni)}\]
\[\text{(POSP)}\]

11 The term deobjectivization is taken from Kulikov, who uses it in relation to antipassives that do not allow for the expression of the suppressed core argument in oblique function. Although this is the norm in P’orhépecha, see footnote 9 of Chapter 3 on the suppression of the recipient/source.
b. *pá-\textit{p'i}-s\-\textit{ti} \quad k'\textit{wirípu(-ni)/k'wirípu-}\textit{ni} take/carry-\text{INDF.OBJ-HAB-PRS-3IND} \quad \text{people-OBJT/people-OBJT} \\
\textit{ximpó/xinkóni} \quad \text{POSP} \\
\text{Intended reading: ‘S/he leads people.’}

Since the suffix -\textit{p'i} is a syntactic valence-reducing mechanism, it cannot suppress an oblique constituent without resulting in ungrammatical sentences, as can be seen in (43).

\begin{tabular}{ll}
(43) & a. *t'iré-\textit{p'i}-s\-\textit{-ka}=ni \quad \textit{xinkóni} \\
& eat-\text{INDF.OBJ-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ} \quad \text{POSP} \\
& \text{Intended reading: ‘I ate with someone/some people.’} \\

& b. *ikía-\textit{p'i}-s\-\textit{-ti} \quad \textit{xinkóni} \\
& get.angry-\text{INDF.OBJ-PRF-PRS-3IND} \quad \text{POSP} \\
& \text{Intended reading: ‘S/he got angry at someone/some people.’}
\end{tabular}

### 2.2.2 Reflexivization and Reciprocalization

In P‘orhépecha, the reflexive and reciprocal forms of monotransitive verbs exclude the possibility for the patient-like argument (P) to be encoded as an object (the language lacks reflexive/reciprocal pronominal forms). Therefore, they reduce the syntactic valence of the predicate to which they are applied. Both constructions establish co-referentiality between the two arguments of a monotransitive verb (co-indexation of A and P). In the reflexive constructions, the agent acts on itself, while the reciprocal morpheme entails symmetrical actions in which agent and patient arguments exchange roles—the same participant is agent (acts on another) and patient (is affected by the other’s action)—thus requiring a plural subject (cf. Dixon and Aikhenvald 2000b, Levin and Rappaport 1998, Nedjalkov 2007).

The P‘orhépecha suffix -\textit{kurhi} (in other dialectal zones -\textit{kwarhi}) carries out the function of reflexivization, among others. The sentences in (44) are examples in which this morpheme performs a reflexive function.

---

12 This function of -\textit{kurhi} and its use as an anticausative (for example: \textit{María kakásti tsúnt suni ‘Maria broke the pot’, tsúntsu kakákurhisti ‘The pot broke’), are instances of syntactic valence reduction. However, there are non-valence-reducing constructions in which -\textit{kurhi} clearly marks the middle voice (see Nava 2004:85–89, 190–305, and Chapter 4 of this work).
In the sentences in (44), the syntactic expression of the patient, which in non-reflexive constructions is encoded in object function, is affected by the occurrence of \( \text{kurhi} \) on the verbal base, resulting in an intransitive construction. The same syntactic valence reduction is caused by the reciprocal morpheme \( \text{-péra}: \)

(45) a. \( \text{wántiku-péra-s-∅-ti}=\text{ksī} \)  
   \( \text{kill-recp-prf-prs-3ind}=1/3\text{pl.sbj} \)  
   ‘They killed each other.’

b. \( \text{xuchá eshé-péra-nt'a-a-ka} \quad \text{eskvéla-rhu} \)  
   \( \text{1pl see-recp-itr-fut-1/2ind school-loc} \)  
   ‘We will see each other again at school.’

2.2.3 Passivization

Verbs with agent and patient/theme arguments allow constructions with the suffix \( \text{-na} \), which are canonical passives; that is, clauses in which the agent cannot be encoded in core function and in which the patient-like argument (P) is expressed as the syntactic subject (cf. Bresnan 2001:25, Dixon and Aikenvald 2000b:7).\(^{14}\) While according to sixteenth century sources (Gilberti 1987:59 [1558:80], Lagunas 1983:62 [1574:33]) these constructions in Old P’orhépecha did not permit the demotion of the agent to an oblique, nowadays variations exist, both dialectal and within a specific community, that allow for this possibility. In Puácuaro this demotion seems to be related to the age of the speakers and to a greater level of contact with the Spanish language. In (46), there

\[ \text{Juan kill-mdl/refl-prf-prs-3ind} \]  
‘Juan killed himself.’

\[ \text{I strike myself.’} \]  
\( \text{xi atá-kurhi-sūn-∅-ka}=\text{ni} \)  
\( \text{1sg strike-mdl/refl-hab-prs=1sg.sbj} \)

---

\(^{13}\) The reciprocal suffix seems to be formed by the indefinite human object morpheme and the suffix \( \text{-ra} \), which indicates plurality (cf. Foster 1969:114).

\(^{14}\) The canonical passive does not occur in all P’orhépecha dialects. For example, in the lakeside community of Santa Fe, predicates with \( \text{-na} \) never lead to the promotion of object to subject. Such sentences, which exhibit properties related to impersonal constructions, are also possible in certain cases, in dialects employing canonical passives (see further on).
are sentences with the suffix -na in which the patient/theme is mapped onto subject function, resulting in intransitive constructions.

\[(46) \]

\[a. \text{María-eri kúchi wántiku-na-s-∅-ti} \quad (\text{Chálío-ni ximpó}) \]
\[
\text{Maria-gen pig kill-PASS-PRF-PRS-3IND} \quad (\text{Chálío-OBJT POSP})
\]
\['\text{Maria's pig was killed (by Chálío).}'\]

\[b. \text{ishú pyá-na-sín-∅-ti} \quad \text{anátapu-icha}\]
\[
\text{here buy-PASS-HAB-PRS-3IND} \quad \text{tree-PL}
\]

\['\text{Trees are bought here.'}\]

\[c. \text{xí atá-na-s-∅-ka=ni}\]
\[
\text{1SG strike-PASS-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ}
\]
\['\text{I was struck.'}\]

\[d. \text{ximá pá-na-s-p-ti} \quad \text{imá warhíri}\]
\[
\text{there take/carry-PASS-PRF-PST-3IND} \quad \text{that dead.person}
\]
\['\text{That dead person was carried there.' (no ambakiti.19)}\]

For speakers who do not accept an agentive oblique phrase, the meaning of \((46a)\) when adding the PP is 'Maria's pig was killed because of Chálío', while for those who accept agent demotion, the oblique phrase can be interpreted as referring either to the agent or the cause. The absence of an agentive phrase always produces an indefinite human agent reading.

Canonical passives in P’orhépecha cannot be generated if the event referred to by the predicate lacks an animate participant with agentive features, generally human. Therefore, constructions such as \((47b)\) are unacceptable.

\[(47) \]

\[a. \text{í tsúntsu kaká-na-s-∅-ti} \quad (\text{Pédru-ni ximpó}) \]
\[
\text{this pot break-PASS-PRF-PRS-3IND} \quad (\text{Pedro-OBJT POSP})
\]
\['\text{This pot was broken by Pedro.'}\]

\[b. *\text{í tsúntsu xatsí-na-s-∅-ti} \quad (\text{Pédru-ni ximpó}) \]
\[
\text{this pot have-PASS-PRF-PRS-3IND} \quad (\text{Pedro-OBJT POSP})
\]
\['\text{Intended reading: 'This pot is had by Pedro.'}\]

Similarly, sentences such as \((48)\) are interpreted as involving a human agent. Speakers who accept the syntactic expression of the demoted argument only allow oblique phrases with a human agent.
The suffix -na also occurs in impersonal constructions, which are a type of impersonal passive. They may be constructed from intransitive or monotransitive bases, without altering the syntactic valence of the base predicate; i.e., they allow for non-promotional passive constructions with two argument verbs. The examples in (49) and (50) show impersonal constructions with intransitive verbs (unaccusative and unergative), and with otherwise monotransitive verbs that have undergone intransitivization, respectively. In all of these sentences -na induces the interpretation of the understood actor or agent as indefinite or non-referential (cf. Foster 1969:129, Friedrich 1984:76, Monzón 2004:87).15

(48) witsákwə kurhí-ra-na-s-∅-ti
    weed get.burned-CAUS-PASS-PRF-PRS-31ND

(Pédru-ni ximpó)/(*xurhíata-ni ximpó)
(Pedro-OBJT POSP)/(sun-OBJT POSP)
‘The weed was burned (by Pedro)/(*by the sun).’

The suffix -na also occurs in impersonal constructions, which are a type of impersonal passive. They may be constructed from intransitive or monotransitive bases, without altering the syntactic valence of the base predicate; i.e., they allow for non-promotional passive constructions with two argument verbs. The examples in (49) and (50) show impersonal constructions with intransitive verbs (unaccusative and unergative), and with otherwise monotransitive verbs that have undergone intransitivization, respectively. In all of these sentences -na induces the interpretation of the understood actor or agent as indefinite or non-referential (cf. Foster 1969:129, Friedrich 1984:76, Monzón 2004:87).15

(49) a. ishú iré-na-sín-∅-ti
    here inhabit-PASS-HAB-PRS-31ND well
    ‘Here one lives well.’

b. ní-ná-s-∅-ti
    go-PASS-PRF-PRS-31ND
    ‘People have gone.’

c. yatíru kawí-na-sha-∅-ti
    a.lot get.drunk-PASS-PROG-PRS-31ND and neg well be-PASS-NF
    ‘Everybody is getting drunk and they are not fine.’

d. perénka k’wí-na-s-∅-ti
    but fall.asleep-PASS-PRF-PRS-31ND already
    ‘. . . but everybody has fallen asleep already (upon seeing that all the
    lights in the town are off ).’ (miringua.94)

(50) a. í iréta-rhu atá-p’i-na-sín-∅-ti
    this village-LOC strike-INDF.OBJ-PASS-HAB-PRS-31ND
    ‘In this village they strike people.’
15 This suffix has the same form as the evidential enclitic =na ‘hearsay’.
b. no, no atá-p'era-na-s-∅-ti
   No, NEG strike-RECP-PASS-PRF-PRS-3IND
   'No, the people did not strike each other (talking about a fight at a party).’ (p‘ichpiricha.100)

c. xwáta-rhu kú-p’era-na-sín-∅-ti
   hill-LOC meet-RECP-PASS-HAB-PRS-3IND
   'On the hill people meet each other.'

Impersonal constructions with -na allow for an overt NP or pronoun in subject function if it can be interpreted as indefinite or generic. The following sentences show that these constructions permit the presence of the 3rd person plural subject enclitic:

(51) a. piré-na-sha-∅-ti=ksi
   sing-PASS-PRG-PRS-3IND=1/3pl.sbj
   'People are singing.'

b. xanó-na-s-∅-ti=ksi
   arrive-PASS-PRF-PRS-3IND=1/3pl.sbj
   'People have arrived.'

c. *ts‘á xanó-na-s-∅-ti=ksi
   that arrive-PASS-PRF-PRS-3IND=1/3pl.sbj
   Intended reading: 'They have arrived.'

While (51a, b) are grammatical constructions (the occurrence of the 3rd person plural enclitic being optional), (51c) is not, since the occurrence of the demonstrative ts‘á in subject function disallows an indefinite or generic reading.17

---

16 In Porhépecha grammars from the sixteenth century it is documented that the sequence -p‘era-na (-hpera-nga) occurs in impersonal constructions. Gilberti (1987:58 [1558:79]) describes sentences like exehperangahati 'they all see each other,' as “active impersonal” and states that this type of sentence implies that they all do the action with each other or to each other. In the same way, Lagunas (1983:51–53 [1574:32–34]) considers predicates such as páhperangahati ‘all are taken’/‘they all are taken by each other,’ as impersonal constructions.

17 Impersonal sentences with -na may also exhibit, though it is less common, a 1st or 2nd person plural as the syntactic subject, but this can only be interpreted in the generic sense:
same restriction can be appreciated in the sentences in (52), in which plural NPs function as syntactic subjects (cf. Foster 1969:129, Monzón 2004:88–89).18

(52) a. sapí-icha warhí-na-sha-∅-ti
child-PL die-PASS-PROG-PRT-3IND
‘Children are dying.’

b. *xuchí sapí-icha warhí-na-sha-∅-ti
1SG.POSS child-PL die-PASS-PROG-PRT-3IND
Intended reading: ‘My children are dying.’

c. ka xiní iré-na-s-p-ti orhéta anápu-echa
and there inhabit-PASS-PRF-PST-3IND before RL-PL
‘…and our ancestors lived there.’ (murhukata.48)

d. tánkurhi-na-sián-ti yamíntu yóntki anápu p’orhéecha
gather-PASS-HAB.PST-3IND all before RL p’orhépechas
‘All our P’orhépecha ancestors used to assemble.’ (p’urhepecha jimpoll.172)

The sentences in (51) and (52) differ from impersonal passives in other languages, in which these constructions are characterized either by the presence of an expletive subject (as is the case with German) or by the absence of a subject. These constructions, according to Blevins (2003), involve impersonal verbal forms that suppress the subject (cf. Comrie 1977, Perlmutter 1978, Givón 1984, Shibatani 1985, Keenan and Dryer 2007, Rice 2000). Despite the fact that P’orhépecha constructions with the passive suffix -na, such as those in examples (49–52), do not fulfill the aforementioned characteristics, they lack a

---

(i) xuchá warhí-na-sha-∅-ka
1PL die-PASS-PROG-PRT-1/2IND
‘We are all dying (all the people of the town or all human beings).’

18 Even with agentive verbs (and even in the case of speakers who accept them in canonical passives), these constructions are incompatible with an agentive phrase. Compare (51a) with the ungrammaticality of the following sentence:

(i) *piré-na-s-∅-ti sapí-icha-ni ximpó
sing-PASS-PRF-PRT-3IND child-PL-OBJT POSP
Intended reading: ‘There was singing by the children.’
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referential subject and are therefore impersonal constructions in the sense of Siewierska (2010) and Malchukov and Ogawa (2011).

The same subject properties described above apply to -\textit{na} impersonal constructions with monotransitive verbs. In contrast to canonical passives, in the sentences in (53) the patient/theme is marked with objective case:19

(53) a. \textit{xiní=ksï} \textit{pá-na-sîn-∅-ti} \textit{pasapórtti-icha-ni}
there=1/3pl.sbj take/carry-PASS-HAB-PRS-3IND passport-PL-OBJT
’People carry passports there.’

b. \textit{í wêshurini=ksï ú-na-a-ti} \textit{táa-echa-ni}
this year=1/3pl.sbj do/make-PASS-FUT-3IND house-PL-OBJT
’This year people will build houses.’/ ’This year houses will be built.’

c. \textit{warhîiti-icha} \textit{Pâtskwaru anápu}
woman-PL Pátzcuaro RL
\textit{xuká-na-sîn-∅-ti koyári-icha-ni}
put.on/have.on-PASS-HAB-PRS-3IND necklace-PL-OBJT
’Women from Pátzcuaro wear necklaces.’

d. \textit{tyénda-echa-rhu xatsí-na-s-∅-ti} \textit{tsúntsu-icha-ni}
store-PL-LOC have-PASS-PRF-PRS-3IND pot-PL-OBJT
’In the stores they have pots.’

---

19 In Puácuaro, -\textit{na} impersonal clauses with agentive monotransitive verbs seem to be rare. According to my data, with this type of verb the impersonal construction is rejected if the patient is animate—a situation which naturally does not occur in the dialects which lack the canonical passive, such as that of Santa Fe (see footnote 14). These forms, found in texts from other villages, require further research.

(i) \textit{péru inté-ni késu-ni mák’u-xásï a-ná-sîn-∅-ti}
but this-OBJT cheese-OBJT same/as.well ingest-PASS-HAB-PRS-3IND

\textit{irêta sapírhati-icha-ni ximpó}
village small-PL-OBJT POSP
’… but this cheese is eaten in small villages as well.’ (itshúkua.331)

(ii) \textit{náni washásta-na-s-pi-∅ túa anápu yakáta-echa-ni?}
where set.down-PASS-PRF-PST-INTERR before RL pyramid-PL-OBJT
’Where were the ancient pyramids built?’ (p’urhepecha jimpo II.174)
As can be observed in (53d, e), impersonal constructions with -na, unlike canonical passives, may be generated with non-agentive transitive verbs.

The canonical passive and impersonal passive constructions with monotransitive verbs exhibit different behaviors. Canonical passive constructions are restricted to verbs involving an animate agent argument. This, for some speakers, can be expressed in an oblique phrase referring to a particular individual. The syntactic subject of canonical passives is the patient-like argument (P) and it has neither animacy nor referential restrictions. On the other hand, non-promotional impersonal passive constructions (common with intransitive verbs) are not constrained to verbs involving an agent; the understood actor (or overt syntactic NP subject, if there is one) must be human, with an indefinite or generic/non-referential value, and cannot be demoted to an oblique function (see footnote 18).

A characteristic of impersonal passives (and impersonal constructions in general) is that the syntactic valence of the base predicate is maintained (Blevins 2003, Malchukov and Ogawa 2011); i.e., in contrast to canonical passives, impersonal passives are not promotional constructions. Nevertheless, P’orhépecha (at least that of Puácuaro) has a peculiarity that could be explained by the properties of the impersonal construction with -na mentioned above. Monotransitive verbs that do not accept canonical passives, as is the case with the predicates in (53c–e), can only generate impersonal constructions when combined with -na. However, although the expected form is that shown in (53), many speakers employ sentences such as those in (54).21

---

20 Regarding the absence of a formal relationship between body part suffixes and nouns that refer to these parts, see the references to spatial suffixes in 1.3.2.1 and in Chapter 6.

21 The verb xatsíni with the meaning ‘have’ (xatsíni also means ‘put’) and the root p’amé ‘ache’ do not permit prototypical passives, since they lack an agentive subject. In the case of the verb xukáni: ‘to put on, have on’, it can accept the prototypical passive, but not in the construction in (54a). In that case, the habitual aspect, in addition to the reference to Pátzcuararo as the place where people wear necklaces, gives an impersonal value to the sentence.
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(54) a. Pátskwaru kóyari-icha xuká-na-sín-∅-ti  
Pátzcuaro necklace-pl put.on/have.on-PASS-HAB-PRS-3IND  
‘In Pátzcuaro people wear necklaces.’

b. tyénda-echa-rhu xatsí-na-s-∅-ti tsúntsu-icha  
store-pl-LOC have-PASS-PRF-PRS-3IND pot-pl  
‘In the stores they have pots.’

c. éka ts’irá-kurhi-sín-∅-ka,  
when get.cold-mdl/refl-HAB-PRS-SBJV,  
   xantsíri-icha p’amé-nturha-na-sín-∅-ti  
   leg/foot-pl ache-lower.extremity-PASS-HAB-PRS-3IND  
‘When it cools down, feet ache.’

In contrast to (53c–e), in (54a–c) the nouns koyáricha ‘necklaces’, tsúntsui-cha ‘pots’, and xantsíricha ‘feet’, are syntactic subjects. However, the sentences in (54) are not canonical passives. Firstly, they require the syntactic subject to be an NP with a generic interpretation. For example, (54a) becomes ungrammatical if the NP koyáricha ‘necklaces’ is substituted for í koyári ‘this necklace’. Similarly, (54c) cannot be interpreted as ‘the feet of a particular person hurting’. Secondly, they reject the encoding of the understood actor in an oblique phrase. The reason many speakers opt for the sentences in (54), rather than their semantically equivalent forms in (53), could be explained by the fact that P’orhépecha impersonal passives allow for a generic or indefinite subject. This property seems to induce speakers to promote the patient/theme to subject when it fulfills the referential conditions imposed on impersonal subjects.

Despite the differences between canonical passives and impersonal constructions, in both cases the presence of -na conveys the interpretation of the agent or actor as an indefinite human. Consequently, this morpheme can be recognized as a defocalization device of said argument, following the proposal of Shibatani (1985) on the primordial function of passive constructions.

2.3 Conclusions

In this chapter, I have examined the coding and behavioral properties that permit the distinction of core arguments (subject and object) from obliques in P’orhépecha. In terms of the argument structure of the monotransitive verbs analyzed here, in active constructions the arguments that correspond to A
(agent-like) and P (patient-like) are those realized in the syntax as subject and object, respectively.

Core grammatical functions have the following coding properties: Firstly, they are flagged by grammatical case. The subject is marked with -∅ ‘nominative’ and the object (P) with -ni (except in the case of certain singular NPs that are unmarked, i.e., that exhibit differential object marking DOM). Secondly, they trigger the occurrence of certain verbal morphemes. The person of the grammatical subject (1st/2nd vs. 3rd) determines the indicative mood inflection. The 3rd person objects induce the presence of the distributive suffix -a on the verb. Finally, only subjects and objects can be realized by pronominal enclitics, which can be cliticized either on the verb or on any other preverbal constituent. The 1st/2nd person objects must exhibit number agreement with plural subjects. The language rejects the co-occurrence of subject and object enclitics in a single clause; when there are object enclitics, the syntactic expression of an overt pronominal subject can be omitted, whatever its person and number features are.

Unlike core arguments, obliques are introduced by semantic case or adpositions. They do not trigger the occurrence of verbal affixes and cannot be coded through the use of pronominal enclitics. When the free pronominal forms of 1st and 2nd person object occur as PP complements, there is no number agreement with plural subjects.

Regarding the behavioral properties of core grammatical functions, it was established that the syntactic realization of objects, but not that of obliques, can be affected by valence-changing morphemes. Only objects can be suppressed by the indefinite human object suffix -p'i, and can be affected in their syntactic expression by the presence of the reflexive, reciprocal and passive suffixes.

It was also shown that in P’orhépecha there is a contrast between the coding of the 1st/2nd person and the 3rd person. In the indicative mood, the 1st and 2nd person subjects trigger the inflectional suffix -ka, while the 3rd person prompts the inflectional suffix -ti. There are neither free pronouns nor object enclitics for the 3rd person; only 3rd person pronominal objects (demonstratives marked with objective case) can remain without overt expression in the syntax.

I have offered data to support the argument that P’orhépecha lacks verbal affixes for each of the (grammatical) persons in subject and object function, but that the language does have pronominal enclitics that may or may not be attached to the verb. Regarding the suffix -a, I have proposed that it is not a plural object marker, but rather a distributive marker. Furthermore, I have demonstrated that the possibility of omitting 3rd person pronouns or NPs is not exclusive to core arguments and that therefore, the postulation of verbal pronominal markers (-∅, -a) for 3rd person objects is not justified and would stand out against the inexistence of similar verbal affixes for the 1st and 2nd person object.
CHAPTER 3

Three-argument Constructions with Non-derived Verbs

This chapter analyzes the behavior of P’orhépecha constructions resulting from non-derived three-argument verbs. The analysis of these data is based on the typological proposal of Haspelmath (2005) and Malchukov et al. (2010) regarding the alignment types exhibited by prototypical three-participant verbs, i.e., verbs of transfer that take an agent (A), a theme (T), and a recipient-like (R) as arguments. According to this proposal, all constructions with this type of verb are considered semantically ditransitive, regardless of the formal expression of the arguments (cf. Dixon and Aikhenvald 2000b, Dryer 2007, Margetts and Austin 2007). Consequently, Haspelmath and Malchukov claim that a language may have more than one type of ditransitive construction (e.g. languages with alternating patterns in the encoding of R). However, as has been stated, in this work the term “ditransitive construction” is restricted to syntactic transitivity, following Margetts and Austin (2007); i.e., it applies only to constructions that exhibit two non-agent arguments encoded in core function (not obliques). Therefore, in discussing P’orhépecha data, “ditransitive construction” and “double object construction” are used as interchangeable terms.

According to Haspelmath (2005) and Malchukov et al. (2010), ditransitive alignment types are established by comparing the properties of the object of monotransitive verbs P, with those of the two non-agent arguments of semantically ditransitive verbs, R and T (cf. Comrie 1982, Dryer 1986, 2007). The formal criteria for determining alignment patterns are based on a distinction between the coding alignment of R and T and the alignment of their behavioral properties. The three most common alignment patterns recognized by these authors are: a) indirective—T and P exhibit the same properties, which contrast with those of R; b) secundative—R and P share properties different from those of T; and c) neutral—T, R and P have the same properties.

The indirective pattern includes cases in which R presents dative properties (dative marking), as well as in which it exhibits oblique properties (flagged by adposition). Therefore, the term indirective alignment is not used to refer to a direct object (DO) versus indirect object (IO) pattern exclusively. What defines this alignment pattern is the contrast between P = T ≠ R (see Malchukov et al. 2010:11–12). The secundative pattern corresponds to the primary object (P = R)/secondary object (T) using Dryer’s (1986, 2007) terms, as well as to
asymmetrical double object constructions (unrestricted object/restricted object), according to the Lexical Functional Grammar (LFG) framework (Bresnan 2001:6). Neutral alignment, in LFG terminology, is present in symmetrical double object constructions.

Concerning the syntactic realization of semantically ditransitive verbs, the coexistence of different alignment types in the same language has been widely documented. This occurs with certain verbs displaying alternating constructions (e.g., dative shift), as well as with verbs exhibiting split constructions due to lexical, semantic, or grammatical factors (see Malchukov et al. 2010, Guerrero and Van Valin 2004, Bresnan et al. 2007, Haspelmath 2007). Furthermore, according to Malchukov et al., ditransitive alignment patterns shown by the coding properties of R and T do not necessarily coincide with those shown by their behavioral properties. In addition, the authors state that not all the coding or behavioral properties of ditransitive constructions in a language necessarily present the same alignment pattern.

In P’orhépecha, non-derived three-argument verbs present two coding patterns and their distribution depends on a variety of factors. In the first coding pattern, R receives oblique marking, resulting in a monotransitive construction in which T exhibits the same coding and behavioral properties as P (P = T ≠ R); i.e., indirective alignment according to Figure 2 in both coding and behavioral properties (P = T ≠ R). In the second, both R and T are encoded in object function, generating a double object ditransitive construction. In this chapter I will argue: a) that most of the coding properties of double object constructions follow a neutral pattern (see discussion in 3.1), but that object encoding by means of enclitics and number agreement of 1st/2nd person objects with plural subjects show a secundative pattern (3.2); and b) that all the behavioral properties of double object constructions are aligned in a secundative pattern (primary object PO versus secondary object SO).

![Figure 2](image-url)  
**Ditransitive alignment patterns (Malchukov et al. 2010:5)**
Porhépecha verbs that fit the semantic definition provided by Malchukov et al. (2010) of ditransitive verbs may consist of basic roots or dependent roots plus affixation. In (1) below, a list of such predicates is offered.

(1) Verbal stems with agent (A), theme (T), and recipient-like (R) arguments:
   a. intsku ‘give’
   b. intsîkurhi/intsîmpi ‘give away’
   c. meyámu ‘pay’
   d. k’waníra ‘throw’
   e. kónti ‘grant’
   f. kwáni(ta) ‘lend/borrow’
   g. xorphénta ‘teach’
   h. arhí ‘say’
   i. eyánku ‘tell’
   j. ewá ‘take away’
   k. entregári ‘hand over’
   l. enkargári ‘entrust’

All the verbs in (1) produce double object constructions. Most of them do not allow alternating patterns in the flagging of R (see 3.2 regarding the construction split imposed by the relative prominence of T and R on the person scale). Therefore, as shown in (2), sentences where the recipient-like argument (R) is encoded as oblique are rejected.

(2) a. ewá-s-∅-ti misítu-ni sapí-ni/*xinkóni/*sapí-nkuni
take.away-prf-prs-3ind cat-objt child-objt/posp/child-com
’S/he took the cat away from the child.’

   b. meyámu-s-∅-ti wánikwa tumína Xwánu-ni/*xinkóni/*para
pay-prf-prs-3ind a.lot money Juan-objt/posp/for

Xwánu
Juan
’S/he paid Juan a lot of money.’

   c. xi kwánita-s-∅-ka wátsï-ni
1sg borrow/lend-prf-prs-1/2ind son/daughter.1-2psr-objt
María-ni/*xinkóni/*María-nkuni
Maria-objt/posp/Maria-com
‘I lent Maria my son/daughter.’

---

1 The form kwáni ‘lend, borrow’ is less common than kwánita. According to the data from the sixteenth century Diccionario Grande de la Lengua de Michoacán, it is probable that the latter, recorded as ‘lend’, was formed by the addition of the causative suffix -ta to kwáni ‘borrow’. However, nowadays these forms mean both ‘lend’ and ‘borrow’, so I consider kwánita to be a lexicalized form.
d. íntsku-a-ti kurhûnta-ni sapí-ni/*xinkóni/*para sapí
give-FUT-3IND bread-OBJ child-OBJ/POSP/for child
‘S/he will give the child some bread.’

Of the verbs in (1), only entregári (a Spanish borrowing) exhibits an alternating pattern:

(3) a. Pédru entregári-a-ti tumpí-ni acháati-ni
Pedro hand.over-FUT-3IND boy-OBJT man-OBJT
‘Pedro will hand the boy over to the man.’

b. Pédru entregári-a-ti tumpí-ni
Pedro hand.over-FUT-3IND boy-OBJT
acháati-nkuni/acháati-ni xinkóni
man-com/man-OBJT POSP
‘Pedro will hand the boy over to the man.’

In (3a), the recipient is marked with objective case and the construction is ditransitive, while in (3b), the recipient is expressed in oblique function and the sentence is monotransitive. The only semantically ditransitive verbal stem identified so far, which disallows a double object construction, is kurháxkurhi ‘ask for’:

(4) xi kurháxkurhi-s-∅-ka=ni ma tsûntsstu
1SG ask.for-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ one pot
María-nkuni/*María-ni
Maria-com/Maria-OBJT
‘I asked Maria for a pot.’

In addition to the verbs already mentioned, P’orhépecha also has verbal roots that are part of three-argument predicates which generate double object constructions, such as p’etá ‘take out’, and p’ikú ‘take off/pull off’. In these cases, the source/location argument can be encoded either as an oblique or as an object. In the latter case, ditransitive constructions are created:

2 Verbal stems formed with the monotransitive verb xatsíni ‘put/have’, such as xatsírani ‘put/serve’, and xatsikuni ‘put’ (forms that, despite having undergone suffixation, do not allow
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(5) a. Xwánun p’ikú-s-∅-ti shénkwa
Juan take.off/pull.off-PRF-PRS-3IND berry
anátapu-rhu/anátapu-ni
tree-LOC/tree-OBJT
’Juan picked some berries from the tree.’

b. p’ikú-s-∅-ka=ni=xukánturhakwa
take.off/pull.off-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ shoe
xuchíiti acháati-ni
1SG.POS man-OBJT
’I took my husband’s shoes off.’

In the event referred to in (5a) someone picked some berries from the tree. If the source, anátapu ‘tree’, is flagged with locative case, it is presented only as the natural location of the berries; however, when it is marked with objective case, it is seen as being indirectly affected by the verbal action. When the source argument of the verb p’ikúni refers to a human being, as in (5b), it must be marked with objective case, since non-agentive human arguments are considered to be affected in this type of event (in P’orhépecha, NPs with human referents cannot be interpreted as locations and therefore cannot bear locative case).

The following sections are dedicated to the discussion of the morphosyntactic properties exhibited by three-argument constructions and particularly, by double object clauses. In section 3.1 the coding properties of double object constructions in P’orhépecha are discussed. It is argued that regarding coding alignment, the neutral pattern is predominant. Section 3.2 deals with the construction split conditioned by the relative prominence of T and R on the person scale, which imposes the encoding of R in oblique function, i.e., indirective

3 In (5a), the locative phrase anátapurhu cannot correspond to an adjunct. For this to be the case, a sentence such as Xwánun p’ikústi tskípu shénkwani anátapurhu ‘Juan pulled out the seed from the berry on the tree’ would be necessary, in which the source shénkwani ‘berry’ receives objective case and anátapurhu indicates where Juan is located (any kind of tree).

4 The possibility of object extraction is not considered here, since in P’orhépecha, relativization, cleft constructions, and focalization do not present relevant differences between the two objects of ditransitive sentences.

3  In (5a), the locative phrase anátapurhu cannot correspond to an adjunct. For this to be the case, a sentence such as Xwánun p’ikústi tskípu shénkwani anátapurhu ‘Juan pulled out the seed from the berry on the tree’ would be necessary, in which the source shénkwani ‘berry’ receives objective case and anátapurhu indicates where Juan is located (any kind of tree).

4 The possibility of object extraction is not considered here, since in P’orhépecha, relativization, cleft constructions, and focalization do not present relevant differences between the two objects of ditransitive sentences.
alignment when T outranks R on the person hierarchy. In 3.3, the behavioral properties of double object constructions are analyzed. It is maintained that these properties establish asymmetries between objects that are typical of a secundative pattern or primary object/secondary object (PO/SO) alignment. Furthermore, it is shown that in double object constructions in which T is a 3rd person human, R is demoted to oblique function in order to allow T to display PO behavioral properties. Finally, section 3.4 focuses on predicates in which valence-decreasing affixes co-occur.

3.1 Coding Properties of Double Object Ditransitive Constructions

3.1.1 Case Marking
As mentioned already, P’orhépecha lacks any distinction between accusative and dative marking. Therefore, as can be seen in the examples above and in (6), both objects of ditransitive constructions are flagged by the same case suffix:

(6) a. ewá-a-s-∅-ti máru tsúntsu-icha-ni Lúpi-ni
    take.away-distr-prf-prs-3ind some pot-pl-objt Lupe-objt
    ‘S/he took away some pots from Lupe.’

    b. xí íntsku-s-∅-ka itsî(-ni) maríkwa-ni
    1sg give-prf-prs-1/2ind water-objt girl-objt
    ‘I gave the girl some water/some of the water.’

In double object constructions, the recipient-like argument (R) must be case marked, whereas the theme (T) has the same restrictions as the single object (P) of monotransitive clauses regarding the presence/absence of case marking. As was shown in 2.1.1, in P’orhépecha the occurrence of an unmarked P depends on semantic features (animacy and definiteness) and is restricted to singular NPs. Therefore, the plural inflection of T in (6a) imposes the assignment of objective case to the NP, while in (6b) the case marking induces a definite reading of T. This difference in object marking—the differential object marking (DOM)—only affects patient/theme arguments. Non-theme argumental objects in double object constructions must be marked, even if they are inanimate and indefinite singular NPs (types of NPs that can be unmarked when corresponding to a patient/theme).
(7) a. inté acháati arhí-s-∅-ti ampé ma anátapu*(-ni)
   that man say-PRS-3IND (some)thing one tree-OBJ
   'That man said something to a tree.'

b. p’ikú-∅ míkwa ma tsúntsu*(-ni)
   take.off/pull.off-IMP lid one pot-OBJ
   'Take the lid off a pot.'

c. k’waníra-a-ka=ni ma tsakápu ma tsúntsu*(-ni)
   throw-FUT-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ one stone one pot-OBJ
   'I will throw a stone at a pot.'

In languages with DOM, such as P’orhépecha, case marking alignment in ditransitive constructions is not evident (i.e., it is unclear which coding pattern of P should be compared with T and R), especially in those in which T is also subject to differential marking (see Malchukov et al. 2010, Malchukov 2008, Bickel and Nichols 2009, Kittilä 2006). In DOM situations, Malchukov et al. (2010) propose adopting the most typical monotransitive construction with an inanimate and indefinite P as the main monotransitive construction of the language in question, the coding properties of which allow the establishment of alignment patterns.

In P’orhépecha, at first glance, the differential object marking of P and T might be interpreted as evidence of an indirective coding pattern, i.e., direct object (DO = P and T) versus indirect object (IO = R). However, unlike other languages with DOM (such as Spanish), in P’orhépecha the unmarked P and T are restricted to singular NPs. Therefore, in the prototypical monotransitive and ditransitive constructions (with an inanimate indefinite P/T), P and T are not necessarily unmarked (cf. Comrie 1989:128, Malchukov et al. 2010, Malchukov 2008). Since the omission of -ni in certain P/T singular NPs does not seem to provide strong enough evidence for determining the indirective alignment (DO/IO) of case marking, it seems appropriate to propose that the case marker -ni is an object coding property which conforms to a neutral alignment pattern.5

5 Data from the sixteenth century seems to indicate that in Old P’orhépecha, where the case marking of a patient/theme was highly restricted, indirective alignment could have existed (see Villavicencio 2006).

6 Given that P in monotransitive constructions and T in ditransitive ones can be unmarked, the fact that R must be marked by -ni in double object constructions cannot be considered a PO coding property (P = R) as opposed to the coding of SO without obligatory marking.
3.1.2  Constituent Order
As stated before, P’órhépecha is a language with flexible word order. Therefore, in double object constructions, there is no fixed constituent order establishing grammatical differences between NP objects. However, the occurrence of preverbal objects has the pragmatic function of indicating their discursive relevance, as is the case with monotransitive sentences (see Chapter 1).

In the examples below there are two postverbal objects. In (8) the theme is placed after the recipient, whereas in (9) it follows the verb directly.

(8) a. entregári-nt'a-s-p-ti José-ni Jesús-iri kwérpu-ni
    hand.over-itr-PRF-PST-3IND José-OBJT Jesus-GEN body-OBJT
    ‘They handed Jesus’ body over to José.’ (San Markusï 15(45))

    b. Xwánú ínts-a-s-∅-ti pipíchu-icha-ni tsírí
    Juan give-DISTR-PRF-PRS-3IND chicken-PL-OBJT corn
    ‘Juan gave the chickens corn.’

    c. Pédru arhí-s-∅-ti María-ni ma chkwánterhakwa
    Pedro say-PRF-PRS-3IND Maria-OBJT one lie
    ‘Pedro told Maria a lie.’

(9) a. íntsku-s-∅-ka=ni xuchíiti kúchi-ni Xwánu-ni
    give-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ 1SG.Poss pig-OBJT Juan-OBJT
    ‘I gave Juan my pig.’

    b. tumpí eyánku-a-s-∅-ti ma wantántskwa sapi-icha-ni
    boy tell-DISTR-PRF-PRS-3IND one story child-PL-OBJT
    ‘The boy told the children a story.’

    c. éska=ksi meyámu-a-ka kontribusióni Sésari-ni
    sbr=1/3PL.SBJ pay-FUT-SBJV tribute Caesar-OBJT
    ‘… that we give tribute to Caesar.’ (San Lukasï 23(2))

It is also common for one of the arguments in object function to be discursively prominent—generally the recipient-like (R)—and to be placed in preverbal position. In (10a, b) the recipient precedes the verb, while in (10c, d) the preverbal object is the theme.
(10) a. sési-i-s-∅-ki para Sésari-ni meyámu-ni
good-VRBL-PRF-PRS-INTERR for Caesar-OBJT pay-NF

kontribusióni?

‘Is it good to give Caesar a tribute?’ (San Lukasí 20(22))

b. éská imá imá-ni enkargári-a-ka
sbr that that-OBJT entrust-FUT-SBJV

yámintu imá-eri xatsíkuarhikwa-ni
all that-GEN possessions-OBJT

‘...that he will entrust him with all of his possessions.’
(San Lukasí 12(44))

c. yámintu í-ni ampé eyánku-s-p-ti Xwánu-ni
all this-OBJT (some)thing tell-PRF-PST-3IND Juan-OBJT

imá-eri xorhénkuarhiti-icha
that-GEN disciple-PL

‘His disciples told Juan all of this.’ (San Lukasí 7(18))

d. María tumína-ni k’waníra-s-∅-ti tumpí-ni
Maria money-OBJT throw-PRF-PRS-3IND boy-OBJT

‘Maria threw the money to the boy.’

Only in cases in which there is potential ambiguity; i.e., when both objects are NPs with animate referents (especially human), a specific order is imposed in order to distinguish the thematic roles of the NPs (cf. Kittilä 2006). The word orders I have found are: V OBJ (T) OBJ (R), as in (11a, b)—see also (3a and 6a)—and OBJ (R) V OBJ (T), as in (11c).7

7 The order of the constituents is only relevant in the case of ambiguity. Accordingly, while in (11c) the preverbal position of tumpíni allows its recognition as R, in the following example T occurs preverbally in spite of being human, due to the fact that common sense eliminates ambiguity.

(i) sapi-ni=ksi ewá-nt’a-s-∅-ti sipástsp’iri-ni
child-OBJT=1/3PL.SBJ take.away-ITR-PRF-PRS-3IND thief-OBJT

‘They rescued the child from the thief.’
(11) a. ínts-a-sīn-∅-ti=kṣī  
    k’wiripu-icha-ni  
    give-DISTR-HAB-PRS-3IND=1/3PL.SBJ  
    person/people-PL-OBJT  
    xurámutí-ni  
    chief-OBJT  
    ‘They give people to the chief.’  
    *‘They give the chief to the people.’

b. ewá-s-∅-ka=ni  
    acháati-ni  
    warhūtti-ni  
    take.away-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ  
    man-OBJT  
    woman-OBJT  
    ‘I stole (took away) the woman’s husband.’  
    *‘I stole (took away) the man’s wife.’

c. xi tumpí-ni íntsku-s-∅-ka  
    maríkwa-ni  
    1SG boy-OBJT  
    give-PRF-PRS-1/2IND  
    girl-OBJT  
    ‘I gave the girl to the boy.’  
    *‘I gave the boy to the girl.’

3.1.3 Object Marking on the Verb: The Suffix -a

The occurrence of the distributive morpheme -a in double object constructions can be triggered by either one of the objects; therefore, it is not a property which shows asymmetries between objects. Given that human referents are usually conceived of as individuated, in prototypical ditransitive constructions (with R [+Human]), plural NPs encoding R commonly require the presence of -a on the verb; the same happens with animate NPs.

(12) a. t’ú ínts-a-s-∅-ka  
    kurhínta-ni  
    sapí-icha-ni  
    2SG give-DISTR-PRF-PRS-1/2IND  
    bread-OBJT  
    child-PL-OBJT  
    ‘You gave the children the bread.’

b. meyámu-a-s-∅-ka=ni  
    témśni  
    pésu  
    pay-DISTR-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ  
    ten  
    peso  
    chūṭi  
    wātsi-icha-ni  
    2POSS son/daughter-1/2PSR-PL-OBJT  
    ‘I paid your children ten pesos.’

c. k’waníra-a-wa-ti  
    pipí-icha-ni  
    tsíri  
    throw-DISTR-FUT-3IND  
    chicken-PL-OBJT  
    corn  
    ‘S/he will throw the chickens some corn.’
In ditransitive constructions with an inanimate R, such as those in (13), the absence of the distributive marker is more likely, resulting in a collective reading of the plural NP.

(13) a. xatsíku-a-∅ ma irhínarhi mésa-icha-ni
    put-distr-imp one tablecloth table-pl-objt
    'Put a tablecloth on each table.'

    b. xatsíku-∅ ma irhínarhi mésa-icha-ni
    put-imp one tablecloth table-pl-objt
    'Put a tablecloth on the tables (one tablecloth for several tables).'

The marker -a may also correspond to the theme, as shown in (14).

(14) a. t’ú ínts-a-s-∅-ka wíchu-icha-ni imá-ni
    2sg give-distr-prf-prs-1/2ind dog-pl-objt that-objt
    'You gave him/her the dogs.'

    b. p’ikú-a-s-∅-ka=ni
    take.off/pull.off-distr-prf-prs-1/2ind=1sg.sbj
    xukánturhakwa-icha-ni xuchíiti acháati-ni
    shoe-pl-objt 1sg.poss man-objt
    'I took my husband’s shoes off.'

    c. k’waníra-a-s-∅-ti tsïtsïki-icha-ni maríkwa-ni
    throw-distr-prf-prs-3ind flower-pl-objt girl-objt
    'S/he threw the flowers to the girl.'

Although either of the objects in ditransitive constructions can induce the presence of the distributive morpheme, Porhépecha only permits one marker -a in the verbal stem. Therefore, in sentences with two plural NPs, the distributive suffix can be related to the individuated interpretation of both:

(15) ínts-a-s-∅-ti tekéchu-icha-ni tumpí-icha-ni
    give-distr-prf-prs-3ind horse-pl-objt boy-pl-objt
    'S/he gave the boys the horses (a horse to each boy).'
The symmetry between the two objects of ditransitive constructions with regard to -o, shows that the occurrence on the verb of the distributive marker is a property of the object function, regardless of whether the object is P, T, or R.

3.1.4 Pronominal Object Forms and Omission

The recipient-like argument (R) of ditransitive constructions can be realized through the use of the same pronominal object forms employed in monotransitive constructions. If this argument refers to 1st or 2nd person (as occurs when P = 1st/2nd person), the object enclitic must exhibit a plural form when the subject is plural:

(16) a. xí=kini íntsku-s-∅-ka kurhínta
    1sg=2sg.obj give-prf-prs-1/2ind bread
    ‘I gave you some bread.’

b. tsá=ts’íni ewá-s-∅-ti xuchúti
    those=1sg/pl.obj take.away-prf-prs-3ind 1sg.poss
    ichárhuta-ni
    canoe-objt
    ‘They took away the canoe from me.’

The sentences in (16) suggest that to be encoded by enclitics and to exhibit number agreement with the subject are properties that follow a secundative pattern (P = R ≠ T). In order to provide evidence of this type of alignment, constructions where R and T are not 3rd person and therefore could be encoded by pronominal enclitics, are required. This issue will be discussed in section 3.2, in which the split construction conditioned by T = 1st/2nd person is explored.

In the case of the 3rd person object, whether T or R, a demonstrative flagged by the case marker -ni is employed, a form also used for the single object in monotransitive constructions:

(17) a. t’ú intsikurhi-a-ka tsúntsu-ni imá-ni
    2sg give.away-fut-1/2ind pot-objt that-objt
    ‘You will give the pot away to him/her.’

b. xí íntsku-pirin-ka=ni í-ni imá-ni
    1sg give-cond-1/2ind=1sg.sbj this-objt that-objt
    ‘I would give him this (one).’
In ditransitive clauses, as in monotransitive ones, 1st and 2nd person objects must be expressed by pronominal forms. Accordingly, in (18), the answer to (18a) must include the 1st person plural object form, as shown by the unacceptability of the answer in (18c), in contrast to (18b).

(18) a. né=ksïni ewá-s-∅-ki ichárhuta-ni?
who=2PL.OBJ take.away-PRF-PRS-INTERR canoe-OBJT

‘Who took the canoe away from you (PL)?’

b. Pédru=ts’ïni ewá-s-∅-ti (ichárhuta-nï)
Pedro=1PL.OBJ take.away-PRF-PRS-3IND (canoe-OBJT)

‘Pedro took it away from us.’/‘Pedro took the canoe away from us.’

c. #Pedrú ewá-s-∅-ti (ichárhuta-nï)
Pedro take.away-PRF-PRS-3IND (canoe-OBJT)

Intended readings: ‘Pedro took it away from us.’/‘Pedro took the canoe away from us.’

Unlike 1st and 2nd person objects, 3rd person pronominal objects (demonstratives marked with -ni) can be omitted in the syntax. Not only is it possible to omit the syntactic expression of the theme, as shown in (18b), but in ditransitive sentences, the pronominal expression of both non-agent arguments T and R can be omitted if they refer to the 3rd person:

(19) a. né ewá-s-∅-ki ichárhuta-nï Pédru-nï?
who take.away-PRF-PRS-INTERR canoe-OBJT Pedro-OBJT

‘Who took the canoe away from Pedro?’

b. Páblu ewá-s-∅-ti
Pablo take.away-PRF-PRS-3IND

‘Pablo took it away from him.’

The omission of 3rd person pronominal objects is the norm when their referents can be identified from contextual information, as can be seen in the following examples:

(20) a. ka entregári-s-p-ti=ksï Pilátu-nï
and hand.over-PRF-PST-3IND=1/3PL.SBJ Pilate-OBJT
‘…and they handed him over to Pilate.’ (San Markusï 15 (1))
b. imá-na ñótsku-ní ya
that=EVID give-NF already
‘... that he gives it to it already (the guitar to the squirrel).’ (conejo.202)

c. imá-eri tatá Diósí ñótsku-a-tí
that-GEN lord God give-FUT-3IND

Dabidi-iri xurámukwa-ní
David-GEN authority-OBJT
‘His Lord God will give him David’s authority.’ (San Lukasí 1(32))

In (20a) the theme has been omitted, in (20c) the recipient, and in (20b) both arguments. Out of context, it is impossible to determine the semantic role (theme or recipient) of the NP ‘Pilate’ in (20a). The absence of overt 3rd person plural object NPs can also create ambiguity in cases such as those in (21b, c).

(21) a. naná kéri-rini ñóts-a-∅-ti
woman/mother big=1SG.OBJ give-DISTR-PRF-PRS-31ND
‘The grandmother gave them to me.’

b. ñóts-a-∅-ti tekéchu-icha-ní
give-DISTR-PRF-PRS-31ND horse-PL-OBJT
‘S/he gave him/her/them the horses.’
‘S/he gave the horses one/many thing(s).’

c. ñóts-a-∅-ti
give-DISTR-PRF-PRS-31ND
‘S/he gave them something.’
‘S/he gave him several things.’
‘S/he gave them several things.’

In (21a), the suffix -a in the verbal stem makes it possible to infer that the theme is 3rd person plural; however, given the possibility that -a may refer to the theme or to the recipient, the sentences in (21b, c) are ambiguous. The fact that sentences without overt objects, as in (21c), allow a reading in which both the theme and the recipient are thought of as sets of individuated entities, constitutes additional evidence that -a cannot be interpreted as a pronominal marker for 3rd person plural objects, as it would necessarily have to encode both arguments.
3.2 Construction Split: Double Object Constructions Versus R Encoded as Oblique

In P’orhépecha, as is common in certain other languages (see Alsina 1994, Evans 1997, Haspelmath 2004, 2007, Malchukov et al. 2010), semantically ditransitive verbs with agent (A), theme (T), and recipient-like (R) arguments exhibit a construction split determined by the relative position of T and R on the person hierarchy 1/2 > 3 or 1 > 2 > 3 (see Silverstein 1976, Whaley 1997:174, 178, Croft 2003:130, Siewierska 2004:149–151). In double object constructions R cannot be less prominent than T on the person hierarchy. Therefore, in a ditransitive construction with a 1st or 2nd person object, this object must refer to R. Accordingly, in double object constructions the ranking of R and T regarding access to PO—R (recipient-like) > T (theme)—aligns with the relative prominence of these arguments on the person hierarchy (cf. Alsina 1994:164–165, Evans 1997:420–421, Haspelmath 2004).

(22) a. kwánita-∅=rini chíiti wátsï-ni
   lend/borrow-imp=1sg.obj 2sg.poss son/daughter.1/2psr-objt
   ‘Lend me your son/daughter.’

b. imá=kini entregári-a-ti xurámuti-ni
   that=2sg.obj hand.over-fut-3ind chief-objt
   ‘He will hand the chief over to you.’
   *‘He will hand you over to the chief.’

c. Xwánu=kini ewá-a-∅-ti
   Juan=2sg.obj take.away-distr-prf-prs-3ind
   chíiti táati-icha-ni
   2sg.poss father.1/2prs-pl-objt
   ‘Juan took your parents away from you.’

d. intsîmpi-a-ka=kini
   give.away-fut-1/2ind=2sg.obj
   ‘I will give it to you.’
   *‘I will give you away to someone.’

---

8 This is a restriction on double object ditransitive sentences and therefore does not apply when, due to valence-reducing mechanisms, the coding of R in object function is blocked, as discussed in 3.3.3.
As shown in (22), the theme (T) cannot outrank the recipient-like argument (R) on the person hierarchy. This restriction applies even in the absence of an overt 3rd person object, as is the case in (22d). If T outranks R on the person hierarchy, the double object construction is blocked and R must be encoded in oblique function, resulting in a construction split.

The construction split exhibited by semantically ditransitive verbs in P'orhépecha fits the typological proposal of Haspelmath (2007). The author characterizes three types of situations with predicates including T and R, from the most to the least prototypical: a) canonical R = 1st/2nd person, T = 3rd person; b) cluster (i) R and T = 1st/2nd person; cluster (ii) R and T = 3rd person; and c) crossing R = 3rd person, T = 1st/2nd person. The author proposes that the least prototypical situations are those that can exhibit a more complex or marked construction. In P'orhépecha the canonical, shown in (22), and the cluster (ii), shown in several examples in the previous sections, result in double object constructions. If T = 1st person, R is coded as oblique in situations of crossing as well as of cluster (i), but if T = 2nd person, there is variation regarding R, as it can be encoded either as oblique or in object function. These patterns are examined in the rest of this section.

In P’orhépecha, when the theme (T) is 1st/2nd person and the recipient-like (R) is 3rd person, R is treated as an oblique; i.e., indirective alignment is imposed. Compare the sentence pairs in (23) and (24):

(23) a. **Pédru=kini intsku-a-ti ma maríkwa-ni**
    Pedro=2sg.obj give-fut-3ind one girl-objt
    ‘Pedro will give you a girl.’

    b. **Pédru=kini intsku-a-ti ma maríkwa-ni xinkóni**
    Pedro=2sg.obj give-fut-3ind one girl-objt posp
    ‘Pedro will give you to a girl.’

(24) a. **María=ts’ini enkargári-s-∅-ti naná kéri-ni**
    Maria=1pl.obj entrust-prf-prs-3ind woman big-objt
    ‘Maria entrusted grandmother to us.’

    b. **María=ts’ini enkargári-s-∅-ti naná kéri-ni xinkóni**
    Maria=1pl.obj entrust-prf-prs-3ind woman big-objt posp
    ‘Maria entrusted us to grandmother.’

As explained at the beginning of this chapter, the verbs in (23) and (24) prevent the alternation of the encoding patterns of R when T is 3rd person.
Constructions such as those in (23b) and (24b) are only permitted when T is 1st/2nd person, i.e., when T outranks R on the person hierarchy.

In atypical constructions where R and T are both 1st/2nd person, R tends to be coded as an oblique. This suggests that the prevalent hierarchy in Pórhépecha is: 1/2 > 3.

(25) a. xuchí táatti=rini enkargári-s-∅-ti
    ISG.POSS father.1/2PSR=ISG.OBJ entrust-PRF-PRS-3IND

    t’ú-n=kini xinkóni
    2SG-OBJT=2SG.OBJ POSP
    'My father entrusted me to you.'

b. chútti táatti-icha=ksïni intsikurhi-a-ti
    2SG.POSS father.1/2PSR-PL=2SG/PL.OBJ give.away-FUT-3IND

    xi-n=rini xinkóni
    ISG-OBJT=ISG.OBJ POSP
    'Your parents will give you away to me.'

However, some speakers accept double object constructions if R is 1st person, yet refuse them if R is 2nd person, which is congruent with the 1 > 2 > 3 hierarchy. The sentences in (26) are examples of the former case.

(26) a. chútti táatti-icha=ts'ïni entregári-s-∅-ti
    2SG.POSS father.1/2PSR-PL=1SG/PL.OBJ hand.over-PRF-PRS-3IND

    t’ú-n=kini
    2SG-OBJT=2SG.OBJ
    'Your parents handed you (SG) over to us/me.'

b. Diosí=rini kónti-s-∅-ti t’ú-n=kini
    God=1SG.OBJ grant-PRF-PRS-3IND 2SG-OBJT=2SG.OBJ
    'God granted me you.'

c. chútti táatti-icha enkargári-s-∅-ti=ts'ïni
    2SG.POSS father.1/2PRS-PL entrust-PRF-PRS-3IND=1SG/PL.OBJ

    t’ú-n=kini para=kini kwidári-ni
    2SG-OBJT=2SG.OBJ to=2SG.OBJ take.care-NF
    'Your parents entrusted you to me, to take care of you.'
The sentences in (26) contrast with the ungrammaticality (according to native speakers) of those in (27):

(27) a. *imá=kini entregári-s-∅-ti xí-n=rini
that=2SG.OBJ hand.over-PRF-PRS-3IND 1SG-OBJT=1SG.OBJ
Intended readings: ‘S/he handed me over to you.’
‘S/he handed you over to me.’

b. *intsímpi-s-∅-ti=kini xí-n=rini
give.away-PRF-PRS-3IND=2SG.OBJ 1SG-OBJT=1SG.OBJ
Intended readings: ‘S/he gave me to you.’
‘S/he gave you to me.’

It is important to note that the sentences in (27) are rejected not only when the intended reading of R is 2nd person, but also when it is 1st person. Given that the norm for constructions with T and R = 1st/2nd person is to present indirective alignment (R = oblique), for reasons of simplicity the prevalent 1/2 > 3 person hierarchy will be adopted from now on.

The examples in (26) show that, in P’orhépecha, the same pronominal object forms encoding P (1st and 2nd person) are used for R and T. However, when comparing the sentences in (26) and (27), it becomes clear that in double object contexts in which R is 1st person and T is 2nd person, only the former can be encoded by way of pronominal enclitics and exhibit number agreement with a plural subject, as seen in (26a, c). Consequently, the objects are asymmetrical with respect to these coding properties, which show a secundative alignment (PO/SO). In fact, 1st/2nd person enclitic marking and agreement with plural subjects are restricted to the core arguments P and R, and only can be exhibited by a T argument in monotransitive sentences, such as those in (24b) and (25b). Therefore, these properties do not follow the neutral pattern exhibited by the other coding properties (see Malchukov et al. 2010:10 on similar mixed alignment types of coding patterns).

3.3 Morphosyntactic Behavior: Double Object Constructions versus R Encoded as Oblique

This section deals with the behavior of T and R regarding their capability to access the morphological processes that affect the mapping of P onto an object function in monotransitive clauses. In double object ditransitive construc-
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...all the relevant behavioral properties—passive, reflexive, reciprocal, and indefinite human object markers—show asymmetries between objects, which yield a secundative alignment or PO/SO pattern. If R is coded as an oblique (indirective coding alignment), the core argument T can be affected by mechanisms of valence reduction, which is typical of the indirective alignment (P = T ≠ R) of behavioral properties. However, in P’orhépecha the encoding of R in oblique function is not limited to alternating verbs or to split constructions triggered by T’s outranking R on the person scale. This peculiarity will be addressed in the following sections.

3.3.1 Passivization

The canonical passive construction that stems from syntactically ditransitive verbs is very common in P’orhépecha, as shown in the following examples taken from texts (my translations):

(28) a. kónti-na-ni=ksi ma xosétu-ni
grant-PASS-NF=1/3PL.SBJ one boy-OBJT
‘They were granted a boy.’ (tata.55)

b. wantá-nt’a-s-p-ti=ksi yámintu ampé
speak-ITR-PRF-PST-3IND=1/3PL.SBJ all (some)thing
énka=ksi arhí-na-∅-p-ka imá sapíchu-eri
REL=1/3PL.SBJ say-PASS-PRF-PST-SBJV that child-GEN
ampé
(some)thing
‘They told everything that they had been told about the child.’
(San Lukasí 2(17))

c. xim póka=ní xi entregári-na-s-∅-ka
because=1SG.SBJ 1SG hand.OVER-PASS-PRF-PRS-SBJV
yámintu inté-ni ampé
all this-OBJT (some)thing
‘...because I have been handed over all of that.’ (San Lukasí 4(6))

In the sentences in (28), the subject of the passive construction corresponds to R. In fact, in P’orhépecha, when a double object construction undergoes
passivization, only R can be promoted to subject function; (29) and (30) illustrate this fact.

(29) a. intsîkurhi-s-∅-ti ch’ánumakwa-ni sapí-ni
give.away-prf-prs-3ind toy-objt child-objt
‘S/he gave the child the toy.’

b. sapí intsîkurhi-na-s-∅-ti ch’ánumakwa-ni
child give.away-pass-prf-prs-3ind toy-objt
‘The child was given the toy.’

c. *ch’ánumakwa intsîkurhi-na-s-∅-ti
(toy give.away-pass-prf-prs-3ind)
Intended reading: ‘The toy was given (to the child).’

(30) a. xurámuti entregári-na-s-∅-ti Pédru-ni
chief hand.over-pass-prf-prs-3ind Pedro-objt
‘The chief was given (lit. was handed over) Pedro.’

b. imá intsî-na-s-∅-ti warhúti-ni
that give-pass-prf-prs-3ind woman-objt
‘S/he was given the woman.’

‘S/he/it was given to the woman.’

c. ánchikurhiri kwánita-na-s-∅-ti
worker lend/borrow-pass-prf-prs-3ind
‘The worker was lent something.’

‘The worker was lent to someone.’

The ungrammatical sentences in (29) and (30) show that T, unlike the P argument of monotransitive verbs, cannot be the subject in passive constructions, even though R is not expressed in the syntax by an NP. Therefore, in the passivization of a double object construction, only R manifests the same behavior as the single object of monotransitive sentences; i.e., this behavioral property exhibits secundative alignment or a PO (P and R) versus SO (T) pattern.

Nonetheless, in P’orhépecha, T can become the subject in a passive clause if R is realized in oblique function. This occurs with semantically ditransitive verbs and other three-argument verbs that display alternating constructions,
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as well as in contexts in which T outranks R on the person hierarchy. The first case is exemplified in (31) with verbs that allow locative alternation, and in (32) with the verb *entregárin* ‘hand over’, which allows the encoding of R either in core or oblique function.

(31) a. no méni p’ikú-na-sín-∅-ti xígusi
    NEG once take.off/pull.off-PASS-HAB-PRS-3IND fig

    tsurhúmpini-rhu
    hawthorns-LOC
    ‘...for figs are not picked from hawthorns.’ (San Lukasí 6(44))

b. itsî xatsíra-na-s-∅ –ti tsúnts-rhu/*tsúntsu-ni
    water put/serve-PASS-PRF-PRS-3IND pot-LOC/pot-OBJT
    ‘The water was poured into the pot.’

c. naráncha-icha p’ikú-na-s-∅-ti=ksî
    orange-PL take.off/pull.off-PASS-PRF-PRS-3IND=1/3PL.SBJ

    anátapu-rhu/*-ni
    tree-LOC/-OBJT
    ‘The oranges were picked from the tree.’

(32) a. entregári-s-∅-ti xuchí wátsí-ni
    hand.over-PRF-PRS-3IND 1SG.POSS son/daughter1/2PSR-OBJT

    xorhénp’iti-ni/xorhénp’iti-ni xinkóni
    teacher-OBJT/teacher-OBJT POSP
    ‘S/he handed my son/daughter over to the teacher.’

b. xuchí wátsí entregári-na-s-∅-ti
    1SG.POSS son/daughter1/2PSR hand.over-PASS-PRF-PRS-3IND

    xorhénp’iti-ni xinkóni/*xorhénp’iti-ni
    teacher-OBJT POSP/teacher-OBJT
    ‘My son/daughter was handed over to the teacher.’

The second case corresponds to constructions in which R must be encoded as oblique (a construction split conditioned by T’s being 1st/2nd person), regardless of whether the verb allows alternating expressions of R.
In (31–33) the passive forms are derived from active ones in which the theme is the single argument encoded in object function, i.e., from monotransitive constructions. Nevertheless, in Porépecha it is possible for the theme to be the subject of the passive under certain conditions, even with predicates that do not allow alternating constructions nor involve the encoding split of R. This can be seen in (34) where, despite the ungrammaticality of the corresponding active form with R flagged as oblique (T and R are 3rd person), T occurs as subject and consequently, R is demoted to oblique:

(34) a. sapí intsí-na-nt’a-s-∅-ti tátempa-icha-ni xinkóni
    child give-PASS-ITR-PRS-3IND father.3PSR-PL-OBJT POSP
    ‘The child was given back to his parents.’

b. nanáka-echa enkargári-na-s-∅-ti María-nkuni
    girl-PL entrust-PASS-PRS-3IND Maria-COM
    ‘The girls were entrusted to Maria.’

Sentences such as those in (34) are only grammatical when T is human (and therefore R does not outrank T on the animacy hierarchy); compare (34) with (35):

(35) *tsúntsu intsí-na-s-∅-ti María-ni xinkóni
    pot give-PASS-PRS-3IND Maria-OBJT POSP
    Intended reading: ‘The pot was given to Maria.’

The sentences in (34) are restricted to human themes, that is, to non-prototypical ones. With verbs that reject alternating realizations of R in active constructions (unmarked forms), the occurrence of a [+Human] T allows the encoding
of R as oblique in morphologically marked contexts, e.g., in passive constructions (see 3.3.2). Therefore, T can have access to otherwise prohibited morphosyntactic operations and be promoted to the subject of a passive construction, as in (34). If in a predicate with three human participants (A, T, and R) the speaker wishes to give prominence to T for discursive reasons, the use of the passive form must block the encoding of R as a core argument; otherwise only R can be the passive subject.

The data examined so far lead to the conclusion that passivization in P’orhépecha shows asymmetries between the two objects of ditransitive sentences, which are characteristic of the PO/SO pattern \( (P = R \neq T) \). In this pattern, only the recipient-like argument (R) may undergo morphological operations that alter the expression of the verb’s arguments. Therefore, in P’orhépecha, to be the subject of a passive construction is a defining behavioral property of the PO, while the theme argument (T) in double object constructions behaves as an SO. For T to become a passive subject, R must be excluded from the core functions (not encoded in object function). Active constructions with indirect coding alignment \( (R = \text{oblique}) \) meet this condition and consequently, the passivization of these monotransitive constructions also follows an indirect alignment pattern \( (P = T \neq R) \). Therefore, to become the subject of a passive construction is a behavioral property of the single object of monotransitive clauses (P or T) and of the argument (R) in double object constructions. Nevertheless, P’orhépecha exhibits marked constructions in which the passivization of double object clauses allows a \([+\text{Human}]\) T to be promoted to subject function. This involves the exclusion of R from core functions, which is not permitted in the active form.

3.3.2 Reciprocalization and Reflexivization

With monotransitive verbs, the reciprocal suffix \(-p’era\) and the suffix \(-kurhi\), used reflexively, establish a co-referential relationship between the subject and the patient (P), yielding intransitive clauses. With three-argument verbs that generate ditransitive constructions, only the recipient-like argument (R) can undergo reflexivization or reciprocalization.

The presence of the morpheme \(-kurhi\) with reflexive value is uncommon with non-derived trivalent verbs. However, I have recorded it with the verb íntskuni ‘give’:

\[
\text{(36) a. Pédru íntsku-kurhi-s-∅-ti ma intsîp’erakwa-ni}
\]

Pedro give-mdl/refl-prf-prs-3ind one gift-objt

‘Pedro gave himself a gift.’
b. **Pedru íntsku-kurhi-s-∅-ti ma warhíti-ni**  
Pedro give-MDL/REFL-PRF-PRS-3IND one woman-OBJT  
‘Pedro gave himself a woman.’  
*‘Pedro gave himself to a woman.’

The sentences in (37) show verbal stems with the reciprocal morpheme.

(37) a. **tumpí-icha ewá-p’era-a-s-∅-ti**  
boy-PL take.away-RECP-DISTR-PRF-PRS-31ND  
maríkwa-echa-ni  
girl-PL-OBJT  
‘The boys stole (took away) each other’s girls.’

b. **xuchí wátsï-icha**  
1sg.POSS son/daughter.1/2psr-PL  
ínts-p’era-s-∅-ti=ksi tumína  
give-RECP-PRF-PRS-31ND=1/3PL.SBJ money  
‘My children gave each other some money.’

c. **acháati-icha kwánita-p’era-a-sín-∅-ti**  
man-PL lend/borrow-RECP-DISTR-HAB-PRS-31ND  
ánchikurhiti-icha-ni  
worker-PL-OBJT  
‘The men lend each other workers.’/‘The men borrow workers from each other.’  
*‘The men lend each other to the workers.’/‘The men borrow each other from the workers.’

d. **acháati-icha entregári-p’era-a-s-∅-ti**  
man-PL hand.over-RECP-DISTR-PRF-PRS-31ND  
warhíti-icha-ni  
woman-PL-OBJT  
‘The men handed over the women to each other.’  
*‘The men handed each other over to the women.’
As can be seen in (36b) and (37c, d), reflexive and reciprocal morphemes cannot indicate co-referentiality between the subject and the theme. The fact that R is the only argument that can undergo reciprocalization and reflexivization further supports the claim that R behaves as a PO, and T as an SO. Therefore, the monotransitive constructions in (36) and (37) cannot express statements equivalent to ‘The boys handed (themselves/each other) over to the judge.’ However, if R is expressed in oblique function, as happens with passive constructions, the theme is able to co-refer with the subject. The intransitive sentences in (38) exemplify this behavior with the verb *entregári*ni, which allows alternating encoding patterns of R.

(38) a. tumpí-icha entregári-p’era-s-∅-ti=ksi
   boy-PL hand.over-recp-prf-prs-3ind=1/3pl.sbj
   xurámuti-ni xinkóni
   chief-objt posp
   ‘The boys handed each other over to the chief.’

   b. María entregári-kurhi-s-∅ –ti imá-eri
      Maria hand.over-mdl/refl-prf-prs-3ind that-gen
      acháati-nkuni
      man-com
      ‘Maria handed herself over to her husband.’

Similarly, in constructions with a 1st/2nd person T which force R to be encoded as oblique, the theme can be co-referential with the subject:

(39) a. chá entregári-p’era-pirin-ka xurámuti-ni xinkóni
   2pl hand.over-recp-cond-1/2ind chief-objt posp
   ‘You (PL) would hand each other over to the chief.’

   b. xí íntsku-kurhi-a-∅-ka Diósí-ni xinkóni
      1sg give-mdl/refl-fut-1/2ind God-objt posp
      ‘I will give myself to God.’

With predicates that do not allow an indirective coding pattern (R = oblique) in the active voice, R must be encoded as oblique when A and T refer to the same entity. This is shown in (40) with the verb *íntskuni*, which, without the addition of verbal morphology, necessarily generates double object constructions when T is 3rd person.
(3.3.3) **Indefinite Object Marker**

In the previous chapter it was shown that the morpheme -p'i 'indefinite human object' blocks the syntactic realization of P when suffixed to monotransitive verbs. With ditransitive verbs that generate double object constructions, -p'i can only affect R. The sentences in (41), taken from texts, exemplify this.9

(41) a. ma érmanu entregári-p'i-a-ti imá-eri
    one brother hand.over-INDF.OBJ-FUT-3IND that-GEN
    érmanu-empa-ni
    brother-3PSR-OBJT
    'A brother will hand over his brother.' (San Markusï 13(12))

b. xáma-sha-p-ti eyánku-p'i-ni ampákiti
    go.around-PROG-PST-3IND tell-INDF.OBJ-NF good
    eyánkp'erakwa
    news
    'He was going around preaching the gospel.' (San Lukasï 8(1))

---

9 With monotransitive verbs, the argument affected by -p'i cannot be marked as oblique. Nevertheless, with trivalent verbs it seems possible (although it is not common) for R to be expressed in oblique function. This could be related to the semantic role of the argument in question and to the value of the oblique markers (see also 46b):

(i) xi entregári-p'i-s-∅-ka acháati-ni
    1SG hand.over-INDF.OBJ-PRF-PRS-1/2IND man-OBJT
    k’wiripu-iri xá’k’icha-rhu
    person/people-GEN hand-PL-LOC
    'I handed the man into the people’s hands.'

(ii) sapí-icha ewá-p’i-sín-∅-ti tumína amámpa-echa-ni
    child-PL take.away-INDF.OBJ-HAB-PRS-3IND money mother.3PSR-PL-OBJT
    xinkóni
    POSP
    'The children take money away from their mothers.'
c. ástaka=ri meyámu-p'i-a-ka ásta último sentábu
   until=2SG.SBJ pay-INDF.OBJ-FUT-1/2IND up.to last cent
   ‘...until you pay up to the last cent.’ (San Lukasí 12(59))

d. énka=ni ewá-p'i-n'a-x-∅-ka ampé
   REL=1SG.SBJ take.away-INDF.OBJ-ITR-HAB-PRS-SBJV (some)thing
   énka=ni no ínts-p'i-x-∅-ka
   REL=1SG.SBJ NEG give-INDF.OBJ-HAB-PRS-SBJV
   ‘(I am a severe man) who takes away things that I haven’t given
   (lit. I take away things from people that I haven’t given them).’
   (San Lukasí 19(22))

Even when T is human, -p'i cannot refer to it, as shown in (42).

(42) a. tsá ewá-p'i-a-s-∅-ti warhúti-icha-ni
    those take.away-INDF.OBJ-DISTR-PRF-PRS-3IND woman-pl-OBJT
    ‘They took away the women from them (from the people).’
    *‘They took away someone/people from the women.’

b. ínts-p'i-a-a-ti=ksí maríkwa-echa-ni
    give-INDF.OBJ-DISTR-FUT-3IND=1/3pl.SBJ girl-pl-OBJT
    ‘They will give the girls to someone/the people.’
    *‘They will give someone/people to the girls.’

c. kwánita-p'i-s-∅-ti Xosé-ni
    lend/borrow-INDF.OBJ-PRF-PRS-3IND José-OBJT
    ‘S/he lent/borrowed José.’
    *’S/he lent someone to José./’S/he borrowed someone from José.’

Since the syntactic suppression of an argument due to the presence of -p'i affects P in monotransitive constructions and R in double object constructions, the resulting alignment can be considered secundative: only POs (P and R) which are accessible to passivization, reciprocalization, and reflexivization can be affected by this deobjectivization mechanism.

Predicates where -p'i suppresses the syntactic expression of R in core function give rise to monotransitive constructions that allow a 1st/2nd person T.10

10 Similar constructions with the reciprocal morpheme do not seem to be common.
   However, I have found the following sentence to be acceptable:
In (43a, b)—compare with (26) and (27)—T is the only object. It is encoded by pronominal enclitics and it can also exhibit plural agreement with the subject,\(^\text{11}\) as happens when indirective coding alignment is imposed. Consequently, the suppression of R is a strategy similar to its encoding as oblique, as it allows the expression of a T that is more prominent than R on the person hierarchy. This clearly shows that in P’orohepecha, on the one hand, constructions in which T outranks R on the person scale are only barred from double object constructions. On the other hand, since enclitic coding (and its attendant agreement with a plural subject) is a PO coding property, it may be postulated that when R is suppressed by \(-p'i\) (PO behavioral property), the single object T may exhibit PO properties, as happens when R is encoded in oblique function. The data discussed in 3.4 provide further evidence to support this phenomenon.

### 3.3.4 Summary
In contrast to the coding properties of the two objects in ditransitive constructions, their behavioral properties uniformly follow a secundative alignment. In double object constructions, the possibility of being affected by the passive, reciprocal, reflexive, and indefinite human object morphemes shows an asymmetry: only R has access to these operations and therefore displays the same behavioral properties as P in monotransitive constructions. Therefore, in P’orohepecha, the behavioral properties discussed above play a defining role in the determination of the PO/SO pattern.

\(^{11}\) Regarding similar behavior in Ojibwa, see Dryer (1986:837–838) and Rhodes (2010).
The behavioral restrictions imposed on T by the PO/SO pattern account for the fact that, even when there is no alignment split due to the person hierarchy, the language permits the oblique expression of R in order to allow a T with a human referent (i.e., with equal animacy status as R) to display unrestricted behavior, having access to the morphological operations (passive, reciprocal, and reflexive) which characterize the POs.

3.4 Co-occurrence of Valence-decreasing Morphemes

The valence-reducing processes analyzed above show that ditransitive constructions in P’orhépecha follow the PO/SO pattern. Given this type of alignment, the ungrammaticality of predicates in which two valence-reducing mechanisms coexist is not surprising. In fact, the LFG framework predicts that in asymmetrical double object constructions only one of the non-agent arguments can be accessed by any word formation operation (“unrestricted” object or PO), while the other cannot (“restricted” object). Only in symmetrical double object constructions may both non-agent arguments simultaneously participate in word formation operations, resulting in grammatical predicates with two valence-decreasing processes (Bresnan and Moshi 1990, Alsina and Mchombo 1993, Alsina 1993:497–498, 555–598, 1996, MacKay and Trechsel 2008). In P’orhépecha the co-occurrence of reciprocal or reflexive suffixes with the indefinite human object morpheme yields ungrammatical predicates. Nevertheless, the language permits these morphemes to co-occur with the suffix -na, which generates either a canonical passive or an impersonal construction.

The examples in (44) show that constructions exhibiting reciprocalization or reflexivization combined with the indefinite human object morpheme are ungrammatical. This is the case regardless of the order in which the relevant morphemes appear.

(44) a. *ts’á kwánita/ints-p’era-p’i-s-∅-ti
those lend/borrow/give-RECP-INDF.OBJ-PRF-PRS-3IND

a’. *ts’á kwánita/ints-p’i-p’era-s-∅-ti
those lend/borrow/give-INDF.OBJ-RECP-PRF-PRS-3IND

Intended readings: ‘They lent/gave each other people.’
‘They lent/gave each other to someone.’

b. *entregári/intsku-kurhi-p’i-s-∅-ti
hand.over/give-MDL/REFL-INDF.OBJ-PRF-PRS-3IND
b' *entregári/ints-p'i-kurhi-s-∅-ti
hand.over/give-INDF.OBJ-MDL/REFL-PRF-PRS-3IND
Intended readings: ‘S/he handed her/himself over to the people/someone.’/‘S/he gave her/himself to the people/someone.’
‘S/he gave (handed over) people to her/himself.’/‘S/he gave people to her/himself.’

The fact that it is not possible for one of the arguments to undergo reciprocalization or reflexivization and for the other to be suppressed by -p’i can be predicted from the asymmetrical behavior of P’orhépecha double object constructions. However, as was mentioned above, the language admits certain coexisting valence-reducing mechanisms.

Contrary to what might be expected, -p’i, -p’era, or -kurhi can co-occur with the passive suffix; that is, the monotransitive base generated by any of these three affixes may be combined with the passive suffix -na (in P’orhépecha, passivization is a stem-closing process; its occurrence does not allow the subsequent application of non-inflectional morphology). In the following examples, predicates exhibiting the co-occurrence of the indefinite human object suffix with the passive one are shown. Since -p’i suppresses only R, rendering it inaccessible to subsequent morphological processes, the passivization of a predicate that has undergone this suppression forces T to become the subject of the construction, as in (45) and (46).12

(45) a. xurámuti entregári-p’i-na-s-∅-ti
chief hand.over-INDF.OBJ-PASS-PRF-PRS-3IND
‘The chief was handed over (to someone/the people).’
*'Someone/people was/were handed over to the chief.’

b. xí ewá-p’i-na-nt’a-s-∅-ka
1SG take.off-OBJ.INDF.OBJ-PASS-ITR-PRF-PRS-1/2IND
‘I was rescued.’

---

12 The fact that the theme (T) becomes the subject in (45) and (46) contrasts with the fact that it may not be co-indexed with A even though R has been suppressed. I suggest that P’orhépecha may impose a restriction on the co-occurrence in the same verbal base of two mechanisms which, without altering the mapping of the agent, have the syntactic effect of blocking the realization of non-agent arguments in object function.
Three-argument Constructions With Non-derived Verbs

(46) a. í ampákiti eyánkperakwa Diósï-iri xurámukwa-eri,
 this good news God-GEN authority-GEN

eyánku-p'ì-na-a-ti yápuru parhákpini-rhu
tell-INDF.OBJ-PASS-FUT-3IND all.places world-LOC
‘... and this gospel (good news) from the kingdom of God will be
preached all over the world.’ (San Mateu 24(14))

b. éka wáp’a acháati-iri
sBR son/daughter.3PSR man-GEN

entregári-p’ì-na-a-ka pekadóri-icha-eri
hand.over-INDF.OBJ-PASS-FUT-SUBJ people-PL-GEN

xák’i-icha-rhu
hand-PL-LOC
‘... that the Son of Man will be handed over into the hands of the
sinners.’ (San Mateu 26(45))

c. Diósï-iri ley ka wantáts’ìkpiti-icha-eri karákata-echa
God-GEN law and orator-PL-GEN writings-PL

xorhénta-p’ì-na-s-∅-ti
teach-INDF.OBJ-PASS-PRF-PRS-3IND
‘The law of God and the writings of the prophets were taught.’
(San Lukasï 16(16))

The sentences in (45) and (46) are canonical passives and, unlike those involving
the oblique encoding of R (see 3.3.1), they are not restricted to human
themes. With semantically ditransitive verbs that do not exhibit alternating
constructions, the only possibility whereby a prototypical [-Human] T can
occur as the subject of a canonical passive is if R has been suppressed.

The schematization below shows the realization of arguments in the canonical
passive construction in which the verbal base exhibits -p’ì suffixation.13

13 The type of representation in (47) is used throughout this book for expository conve-
nience in order to schematize the argument structure and the morphological configura-
tion of the analyzed predicates. These representations do not follow a specific theoretical
model, but provide a useful device for understanding the data discussed and can be easily
translated into specific frameworks. The semantic role of each of the arguments is indi-
(47) Argument structure of  
\[ \text{ints-p'i-na} \]
\[ \text{give-INDF.OBJ-PASS} \]

a. ints
\[ [ < \text{AG} > \quad < \text{RECP} > \quad < \text{TH} > ] \]

b. ints-p'i
\[ [ < \text{AG} > \quad \emptyset \quad < \text{TH} > ] \]

SBJ

In (47) two levels of word formation are distinguished. In the first, -p'i suppresses the recipient, which as a result, is no longer subject to the mapping rules and cannot participate in subsequent morphological operations. By applying the passive suffix -na, the theme becomes the only argument that can be mapped onto a core function and therefore becomes the subject of the construction.

A similar behavior can be observed in impersonal constructions with -na; in order to generate these constructions the recipient-like argument (R) cannot be encoded in object function. This condition is met when the verbal base has undergone reciprocalization or reflexivization, since A and R must be co-indexed. As explained in Chapter 2, in impersonal constructions -na induces the interpretation of the referent of the actor or agent as an indefinite or generic human, without necessarily modifying the syntactic expression of the arguments.

(48) a. \[ \text{entregári-p'era-na-s-∅-ti} \quad \text{karákata-icha-ni} \]
\[ \text{hand.over-RECP-PASS-PRF-PRS-3IND} \quad \text{writings-PL-OBJT} \]
\[ \text{‘Everybody handed over letters to each other.’} \]

\[ \text{cated by < > (cf. Bresnan and Moshi 1990, Haspelmath and Müller-Bardey 2004), sub-} \]
\[ \text{scripts signal co-indexed elements, and ∅ denotes the suppression of an argument. Each} \]
\[ \text{morphological process is introduced in a separate line following the order in which it} \]
\[ \text{occurs, which, as a norm, coincides with the lineal sequence of the suffixes. The bottom} \]
\[ \text{line illustrates the syntactic realization of arguments.} \]
b. *ishú-ksï*  
*ewá-p'era-na-a-sín-∅-ti*  
here=1/3PL.SBJ  
take.away.RECP-PASS-DISTR-HAB-PRS-3IND

*kabáyu-icha-ni*  
horse-PL-OBJT

'Here people take horses away from each other.'

c. *k'wínchikwa-rhu*  
*íntsku-kurhi-na-sín-∅-ti=ksï*  
party-LOC  
give-REFL-PASS-HAB-PRS-3IND=1/3PL.SBJ

*karóni-icha-ni*  
blanket-PL-OBJT

'During the party, people give themselves blankets.'

As is evident in (48), the reciprocal and reflexive suffixes establish co-indexation between A and R, yielding monotransitive predicates. A second word formation process takes place in which -na imposes the interpretation of the human actor as indefinite or generic, while T remains an object. However, as mentioned in Chapter 2, there is some variation: many speakers accept the promotion of the theme to subject function in these impersonal constructions.

\[(49)\]

a. *ínts-p'era-na-s-∅-ti*  
*íntsîmp'érakwa-icha*  
give.RECP-PASS-PRF-PRS-3IND  
gift-PL

'Gifts were given (to each other).'

b. *iréta-rhu*  
*áncikurhiti-icha*  
town-LOC  
worker-PL

*kwánita-p'era-na-sín-∅-ti*  
lend/borrow.RECP-PASS-HAB-PRS-3IND

'In the village, workers are lent (to each other).'

c. *eyánku-p'era-na-s-∅-ti*  
*wantántskwa-icha*  
tell.RECP-PASS-PRF-PRS-3IND  
story-PL

'Stories were told (to each other).'

d. *k’waníra-p'era-na-sín-∅-ti*  
*tsítsíki-icha*  
throw.RECP-PASS-HAB-PRS-3IND  
flower-PL

'Flowers are thrown (at each other).'
In the sentences in (49), the syntactic subject is a theme that must be interpreted as indefinite/generic (a requirement of the subject in impersonal constructions with -\textit{na}). The contrast between the syntactic realization of the impersonal constructions in (48) and those in (49) is shown in (50).

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{llll}
\hline
\textbf{(50) Argument structure of} & \textit{ints-p'era-na} & \textit{give-RECP-PASS} \\
\hline
\textbf{a. ints} & [\textit{< AG}> < \textit{RECIP} > < \textit{TH} >] & [\textit{< AG}> < \textit{RECIP} > < \textit{TH} >] \\
\textbf{b. ints-p'era} & [\textit{< AG}1> < \textit{RECIP}1 > < \textit{TH} >] & [\textit{< AG}1> < \textit{RECIP}1 > < \textit{TH} >] \\
& [\textit{< ∅i}> < \textit{RECIP}i > < \textit{TH} >] & [\textit{< ∅i}> < \textit{RECIP}i > < \textit{TH} >] \\
\textbf{c. ints-p'era-na} & [\textit{< AG}1> < \textit{RECIP}1 > < \textit{TH} >] & [\textit{< ∅i}> < \textit{RECIP}i > < \textit{TH} >] \\
\textit{GENERIC} & \textit{GENERIC} & \textit{GENERIC} \\
\hline
\textbf{Syntactic realization} & \textbf{SBJ} & \textbf{OBJ} & \textbf{SBJ} \\
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

3.5 Conclusions

In P’orhépecha, semantically ditransitive verbs, i.e., with A (agent), T (theme) and R (recipient-like) arguments (Haspelmath 2005, Malchukov et al. 2010), exhibit two coding patterns. In the first, R is expressed as an oblique: the coding and behavioral properties of R and T show indirective alignment. In the second, R and T are encoded as objects, yielding syntactically ditransitive constructions.

In double object constructions, the distributive suffix -\textit{a} and the free pronominal forms for 1st and 2nd person objects are consistent with a neutral pattern. The objective case marker -\textit{ni} may be absent from some P (object of monotransitive verbs) and T arguments, but this differential object marking (DOM)—which might be an instance of an indirective alignment of the DO/IO type—is limited to singular NPs. Given this constraint, I consider that case
marking in P'orhépecha also follows a neutral alignment. Object enclitic coding (1st/2nd person), conveying number agreement with plural subjects, shows secundative or PO/SO alignment \((P = R ≠ T)\), and therefore differs from the aforementioned coding properties of double object construction.

In the case of double object constructions, the behavioral properties of \(T\) and \(R\) (passivization, reflexivization, reciprocization, and indefinite human object marking) clearly follow a secundative or PO/SO alignment. Therefore, in P'orhépecha, these properties are fundamental in diagnosing or determining the PO/SO pattern in ditransitive constructions.

While in P'orhépecha most semantically ditransitive verbs do not display alternations in their coding patterns, the language shows a construction split conditioned by the relative prominence of \(T\) and \(R\) on the person scale. A double object construction is not allowed if \(T\) outranks \(R\) on this scale (in this particular circumstance, an indirective alignment \((R = \text{oblique})\) is imposed). However, if in a double object construction a valence-reducing mechanism blocks the mapping of \(R\) onto object function, then \(T\) has no person prominence restrictions: \(T\) may be encoded by 1st or 2nd person enclitics and agree in number with a plural subject. P'orhépecha allows for the encoding of \(R\) as oblique in other circumstances, regardless of the possibility of alternation, and of the prominence on the person hierarchy. Verbs which in the active form are restricted to double object constructions, exhibit the encoding of \(R\) as an oblique in passive clauses in order to permit a \([+\text{Human}]\) \(T\) to be promoted to the subject of the construction. The same phenomenon occurs when there is co-referentiality between \(A\) and \(T\). In both construction types \(R\) must be expressed as an oblique, since the secundative pattern defining the behavioral properties of syntactically ditransitive sentences prohibits \(T\) from displaying PO properties.

The likelihood of the co-occurrence of valence-reducing mechanisms shows a clear contrast between the passive and the affixes that merely block the expression of \(R\) in object function. In P'orhépecha, predicates in which the reciprocal or reflexive suffixes coexist with the indefinite human object marker are ungrammatical. Unlike the indirective constructions \((R = \text{oblique})\) in which \(A\) and \(T\) can co-refer, the suppression of \(R\) by \(-p'i\) does not allow the co-indexation of these two arguments. However, a predicate that has undergone reciprocization, reflexivization, or the suppression of the PO by \(-p'i\) can be the base of a construction with \(-na\). When \(R\) has been suppressed, the result is a canonical passive where \(T\) (without animacy restrictions) becomes the syntactic subject. If the predicate that combines with \(-na\) has undergone morphological processes that entail co-referentiality between \(A\) and \(R\), the resulting construction is impersonal.
The data examined show that in P’orhépecha, given a double object construction, the T argument may exhibit PO properties in two different circumstances. Firstly, when a valence-decreasing mechanism has blocked the encoding of R (PO) in object function, the following is allowed: 1) a 1st/2nd person T that is subject to enclitic coding, which agrees in number with plural subjects (PO coding property), and 2) a T argument as the subject of the construction with the passive suffix -\textit{na}.\footnote{In terms of Dryer (1986), these are instances in which the SO becomes the PO due to the original PO’s having lost its grammatical relation because of valence-decreasing mechanisms.} Secondly, given a double object construction where both T and R are 3rd person, the T argument may exhibit PO properties (i.e., be the subject of the passive or be co-referential with A) only if T is human and R is demoted to oblique, resulting in an intransitive construction. These constructions must be distinguished from the encoding of R in oblique function imposed when T outranks R on the person scale (where the single object T exhibits the coding and behavioral properties of P).

Although it is tempting to consider that P’orhépecha exhibits the sort of the “anti-dative” behavior described by Dryer (1986:821), it is important to note that the encoding of R as oblique is restricted in this language: there are no alternating constructions (dative shift) between double object sentences and the encoding of R as oblique in either of the two cases referred to above, as would be expected according to Dryer’s anti-dative rule.

P’orhépecha double object constructions stemming from semantically ditransitive verbs show that the thematic role ranking presented in Chapter 1, according to which a recipient/goal/source—recipient-like argument (R)—outranks a patient or theme (T), is a useful device for capturing generalizations about arguments’ access to PO (versus SO). At the same time, in these ditransitive constructions the ranking of R and T on this thematic hierarchy aligns with the relative prominence of R and T on the person hierarchy: T (SO) cannot outrank R (PO) on the person scale. Consequently, P’orhépecha double object constructions impose a harmonic alignment (term taken from the Optimality Theory, see Alsina 1999) between the prominence of non-agent arguments on the person scale and the syntactic primacy of PO over SO (PO > SO).

As I will show in the following chapters, this harmonic alignment is corroborated in P’orhépecha constructions with derived predicates. Supporting evidence comes from many ditransitive and tritransitive constructions which result from complex predicates having undergone argument-increasing opera-
tions. Furthermore, predicates involving two argument-increasing operations, explored in Chapter 7, demonstrate the relevance of the thematic ranking proposed here—derived from arguments that are encoded as PO in diverse ditransive constructions—in explaining the (un)grammaticality of multiple object constructions.
CHAPTER 4

Applicative Constructions

Applicative constructions involve predicates with morphological markers that allow the introduction of a participant in object function, which in the absence of such marking cannot be encoded as a core argument of the base verb (cf. Creissels 2004). Bresnan and Moshi (1990:148–149) argue that applicative constructions result from a derived verb (“applied verb”) that introduces a new object argument to the base verb. Similarly, Peterson (2007:3) and Dixon and Aikhenvald (2000b:13) define the applicative as a syntactic construction signaled by overt verbal morphology that permits the encoding as a grammatical object—i.e., core argument—of what would otherwise be an adjunct or a peripheral argument for the basic form of the verb.1

As I argued in a prior work (Capistrán 2006a), the P’orhépecha suffixes -ku for 3rd person and -chi for 1st and 2nd person are applicative morphemes:

\[(1)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
a. & \quad \text{pyá-s-∅-ti} & \quad \text{tsúntsu-ni} & \quad \text{para} & \quad \text{María} \\
& \quad \text{buy-PRF-PST-3IND} & \quad \text{pot-OBJT} & \quad \text{for} & \quad \text{María} \\
& \quad \text{‘S/he bought a pot for María.’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
b. & \quad \text{pyá*(-ku)-s-∅-ti} & \quad \text{tsúntsu-ni} & \quad \text{María-ni} \\
& \quad \text{buy-3APPL-PRF-PRS-3IND} & \quad \text{pot-OBJT} & \quad \text{María-OBJT} \\
& \quad \text{‘S/he bought María a pot.’}
\]

\[(2)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
a. & \quad \text{Xwánu wantónskurhi-sín-∅-ti} & \quad \text{xí-n=rini} & \quad \text{xinkóni} \\
& \quad \text{Juan} & \quad \text{talk-HAB-PRS-3IND} & \quad \text{1SG-OBJT=1SG.OBJ} & \quad \text{POSP} \\
& \quad \text{‘Juan talks with me.’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
b. & \quad \text{Xwánu=rini wantónskurhi*(-chi)-sín-∅-ti} \\
& \quad \text{Juan=1SG.OBJ} & \quad \text{talk-1/2APPL-HAB-PRS-3IND} \\
& \quad \text{‘Juan talks to me.’}
\]

1 This position differs from that of Baker (1988a, b) and of Marantz (1993) among others, who maintain that the applicative affix may lack overt realization, as well as from that of Pylkkänen (2002), who employs the term applicative for any construction type with an IO added to the argument structure of the verb.
In (1a), Maria is an adjunct (non-argumental beneficiary) introduced by the Spanish loanword para, while in (1b) Maria appears in core function bearing the objective case marker -ni. In (2b) there is also a syntactic valence increase in the derived verbal stem; the goal argument of the verb wantónskurhini ‘to talk, chat’ in (2a) is flagged by the comitative postposition, but in (2b) it is encoded in core function by way of the object enclitic =rini. In both (1) and (2) the occurrence of a new argument in object function is due to the presence of the suffixes -ku/-chi on the verbal stem, as shown by the ungrammaticality of (1b) and (2b) if these morphemes are omitted. Accordingly, as shown in (1b), the addition of -ku to a monotransitive verb generates a double object construction.

This chapter deals with the morphological and semantic characteristics of applicative marking in P’orhépecha, as well as with the properties of double object applicative constructions. In 4.1, the formal properties of -ku and -chi are discussed. The alternative between the introduction of a participant in object function by an applicative suffix and its encoding as oblique is analyzed. The semantic roles that can bear applied arguments are examined and explained based on the relationship between the subject/agent and the applied argument conveyed by P’orhépecha applicative morphemes. In 4.2, the morphosyntactic behavior of applied arguments that display PO properties is analyzed. The allo-morphy shown by -ku/-chi when combined with the reciprocal, passive, and indefinite object morphemes is accounted for, as well as the ungrammaticality that results from the addition of the middle/reflexive suffix -kurhi to verbal bases which have undergone applicativization. Finally, in 4.3, the unexpected occurrence of -ku in internal possession constructions is examined.

4.1 Formal and Semantic Properties of Applicative Marking

4.1.1 Applicative Marking with -ku/-chi
As stated above, the addition of -ku/-chi to monotransitive verbs results in double object constructions, which exhibit the characteristics of applicative constructions. However, since the suffixes -ku and -chi mark the person (3rd vs. 1st/2nd person) of the applied object, it might be argued that these morphemes are agreement or pronominal markers of semantically “dative-like” arguments (i.e., arguments such as the recipient, goal, source and beneficiary), which, as is the case in certain languages, also may be used to add participants in object function (see Peterson 2007:179–181). Nevertheless, there is evidence that -ku and -chi lack pronominal functions on the one hand, and that, on the other, these affixes are not agreement markers of semantically

The fact that -ku and -chi are not pronominal forms encoding arguments, or in the terms of Bresnan and Mchombo (1987:74), occurrences of anaphoric agreement (cf. Bhat 2004:15–17, Siewierska 2004:124–133, Corbett 2006:23, 99–109), is congruent with the fact that in Porhépecha 1st and 2nd person objects must be encoded by enclitics and/or by free pronominal forms outside the verbal complex, while 3rd person objects may be omitted without triggering the presence of pronominal markers on the verb. Compare the possibility of non-overt argument realization by pronominal forms shown in the sentences in (3) with the sentences in (4) and (5) in which the predicates exhibit -ku and -chi respectively:

(3) a. atá-s-∅-ti=rini
    strike-PRF-PRS-3IND=1SG.OBJ
    ‘S/he struck me.’  
    b. ewá-s-∅-ti=rini
    take.away-PRF-PRS-3IND=1SG.OBJ
    ‘S/he took it away from me.’

(4) a. pyá-ku-s-∅-ti
    buy-3APPL-PRF-PRS-3IND
    ma tsúntsu Maria-ni
    one pot Maria-OBJT
    ‘S/he bought Maria a pot.’
    b. pyá-ku-s-∅-ti
    buy-3APPL-PRF-PRS-3IND
    ‘S/he bought him/her something!’/‘S/he bought it from him/her.’

(5) a. t’ú=rini pyá-chi-s-∅-ka xuchüti tsúntsu-ni
    2SG=1SG.OBJ buy-1/2APPL-PRF-PRS-1/2IND 1SG.POSS pot-OBJT
    ‘You bought me my pot.’
    b. t’ú=rini pyá-chi-s-∅-ka
    2SG=1SG.OBJ buy-1/2APPL-PRF-PRS-1/2IND
    ‘You bought it for/from me.’
c. * t’ú  pyá-chi-s-∅-ka (xuchíiti  tsúnts-ni)
   2SG  buy-1/2APPL-PRF-PRS-1/2IND  (1SG.POSS  pot-OBJT)
   Intended readings: ‘You bought me my pot.’/‘You bought it for/from me.’

Since the sentences in (3a’, b’) do not require pronominal markers on the verb to license the omission of an overt 3rd person object, it seems questionable to suppose that this occurs when the predicate involves an argument introduced by -ku, as is the case in (4). In fact, the opposite is supported by the fact that when the object is a 1st or 2nd person introduced by -chi, it must coexist with a pronominal object form, as in (5a, b). The ungrammaticality of (5c) results from the absence of a pronominal form able to realize the argument introduced by -chi. Therefore, despite the person information conveyed by -chi, this suffix cannot function pronominally as anaphoric agreement.2

Moreover, it is clear that the morphemes -ku and -chi cannot be reduced to grammatical agreement markers, as these verbal affixes do not simply repeat the person information of an argument realized outside the verbal complex (cf. Bresnan and Mchombo 1987, Corbett 2006). It is important to note that despite the fact that this language does not display object agreement markers with non-derived monotransitive and ditransitive verbs, -ku/-chi must occur on the verb when introducing a new core argument in object function. These properties of -ku/-chi account for their absence in double object constructions with non-derived ditransitive verbs; the R arguments (with the recipient/goal/source role) never trigger the occurrence of -ku/-chi, as can be seen when comparing (3b) with the sentences in (6).

(6)  a. ewá-chi-s-∅-ti=rini ichárhuta-ni
   take.away-1/2APPL-PRF-PRS-3IND=1SG.OBJ  canoe-OBJT
   *‘S/he took the canoe away from me.’
   ‘S/he took the canoe away from my child.’

2 Examples such as those in (5) lead to the questioning of Friedrich’s (1984:69) argument that in the case of verbal bases with -chi, the presence of pronominal forms is simply a resource to disambiguate the value (1st/2nd person) that this suffix conveys. In both (5a) and (5b), the fact that the agent is 2nd person singular and that the theme NP is marked by the 1st person singular possessive form rules out any ambiguity regarding the person to which -chi refers. Sentences such as *t’ú=kini pyáchiska (xuchíiti tsúnts-ni) with the intended reading ‘You bought it (my pot) for yourself’ are ungrammatical, as can be seen in 4.2.2.
b. \textit{entregári-chi-s-∅-ti=rini sapí-ni}\hfill sapí-ni

\begin{tabular}{l}
\textit{hand.\textsubscript{over-1/2 appl-prf-prs-3ind=1sg.obj} child-objt} \\
\end{tabular}

\textit{"S/he handed over the child to me."} \\
\textit{"S/he handed over something to someone related to me."}

In (6a), the 1st person object \textit{=rini} cannot bear the source role. Similarly, in (6b), the 1st person singular cannot be the recipient. Sentences such as those in (6) can be produced, but they involve a new participant (see Chapter 7), which shows that \textit{-ku} and \textit{-chi} are argument-increasing morphemes and that therefore they are not merely object agreement phenomena.

The derivative function of \textit{-ku/-chi} is evident when these morphemes are realized by way of allomorphs without person features. For instance, the suffix \textit{-mi} is the allomorph of \textit{-ku/-chi} in passive constructions, as shown in (7). These morphs will be discussed further in section 4.2.

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(7)]
\begin{enumerate}
\item a. \textit{pyá-ku-s-∅-ti María-ni tsúntsu-ni} \\
\begin{tabular}{l}
\textit{buy-3appl-prf-prs-3ind} María-objt pot-objt \\
\end{tabular} \\
\textit{‘S/he bought Maria the pot.’} \\

\item a’. \textit{María pyá-mi-na-s-∅-ti tsúntsu-ni} \\
\begin{tabular}{l}
\textit{Maria buy-appl-pass-prf-prs-3ind pot-objt} \\
\end{tabular} \\
\textit{‘Maria was bought the pot.’} \\

\item b. \textit{pyá-chi-s-∅-ti=rini tsúntsu-ni} \\
\begin{tabular}{l}
\textit{buy-1/2appl-prf-prs-3ind=1sg.obj pot-objt} \\
\end{tabular} \\
\textit{‘S/he bought me the pot.’} \\

\item b’. \textit{xí pyá-mi-na-s-∅-ka tsúntsu-ni} \\
\begin{tabular}{l}
\textit{1sg buy-appl-pass-prf-prs-1/2ind pot-objt} \\
\end{tabular} \\
\textit{‘I was bought the pot.’} \\
\end{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}

The sentences (7a’, b’) are the passive forms of (7a, b). While the addition of a recipient/source participant is licensed by \textit{-ku/-chi} in (7a, b), in the passive constructions the presence of the new argument is indicated by the suffix \textit{-mi}. If valence-decreasing mechanisms occur, then the applied argument is not encoded in object function and the verbal stem must exhibit other applicative allomorphs (see 4.2.1).

The case of P’orhépecha applicatives is similar to that of some Muskogean languages, for which the existence of “dative” applicatives that conflate applicative and pronominal agreement functions has been proposed (see Munro...
Similarly, Baker and Kramer (2013) analyze the applicative marking in Amharic as a bi-morphemic agreement marker: applicative suffix (cognate of preposition) + agreement suffix (cf. Amberber 2000). Nevertheless, in these languages there are paradigms of pronominal/agreement object affixes in non-applicative constructions, which are formally related to those that occur with the applicative marking, whereas this is not the case in P’orhépecha. Therefore, the occurrence of person features in P’orhépecha applicative affixes cannot be explained as an instance of the same phenomena found in these languages.

The distinction between -chi (1st/2nd person) and -ku (3rd person) expresses the deictic-semantic opposition between participants in the speech act (1st and 2nd person) and non-participants in the speech act (3rd person), which can be observed in several grammatical aspects of P’orhépecha (see Chapter 2). The fact that this language only has verbal suffixes that place participants and non-participants in the speech act in opposition regarding the subject and the object argument introduced by -ku or -chi, may be related to the fact that the distinction between 1st/2nd person and 3rd person is relevant to arguments which are usually human. The participants introduced by -ku/-chi, as explained below, cannot correspond to instruments or to locations where the event is carried out, which are typically inanimate entities. P’orhépecha applicative suffixes prototypically introduce a human argument that enters into a particular relationship with the subject/agent from which the former must be differentiated.

4.1.2 Applicative versus Oblique Constructions: Alternation and Split
As mentioned above, the applicative suffixes -ku and -chi generate a syntactic object position; that is, the verbal bases that contain these suffixes allow the presence of a participant in object function that could not occur without the -ku/-chi suffixation. The applied argument is usually, but not necessarily, a new participant that is not specified in the argument structure of the non-derived verb. Since in P’orhépecha applied arguments can generally be characterized as human participants to whom the event denoted by the base verb is aimed—i.e., semantically dative-like participants (see 4.1.3)—I will use this generalized characterization to refer to applied arguments and their oblique equivalents throughout this section. The possibility of coding this type of participant in object function by way of -ku/-chi or of introducing it by way of oblique marking varies depending on the verb and, in some cases, on the animacy of the patient/theme. So, in the case of a few intransitive verbs, as

3 I thank an anonymous reviewer for calling my attention to the case of the Muskogean languages.
exemplified in (2), constructions can be found which alternate between the flagging of a participant by the comitative postposition xinkóni or the equivalent case suffix -nkuni, and monotransitive applicative constructions with -ku/-chi. In (8), these alternative constructions are illustrated with the verbal stem ikía ‘to get angry’.4

(8) a. Xwánu ikía-sín-∅-ti xí-n=rini xinkóni
Juan get.angry-HAB-PRS-3IND 1SG-OBJT=1SG.OBJ POSP
‘Juan gets angry at me.’

b. Xwánu=rini ikía-chi-sín-∅-ti
Juan=1SG.OBJ get.angry-1/2APPL-HAB-PRS-3IND
‘Juan hates me.’/‘Juan shows anger towards me.’

The intransitive verbs that support the presence of an adjunct flagged by the loanword para ‘for’, corresponding to the participant to whom the event is directed, also admit the possibility of the applicative construction:

(9) a. ma karákata xanó-s-∅-ti para María
one writings arrive-PRF-PRS-3IND for Maria
‘A letter arrived for Maria.’

b. María-ni xanó-ku-s-∅-ti ma karákata
Maria-OBJT arrive-3APPL-PRF-PRS-3IND one writings
‘A letter arrived for Maria.’

(10) a. xí piré-s-∅-ka=ni para María
1SG sing-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ for Maria
‘I sang for Maria.’

b. xí piré-ku-s-∅-ka=ni María-ni
1SG sing-3APPL-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ Maria-OBJT
‘I sang to Maria.’

Unlike the alternative constructions in (8–10), intransitive verbs such as those in (11) do not allow alternating constructions, as the applicative construction is the only available one.

4 As is evident in (8a, b), there may be semantic differences between sentences with a participant mapped onto object function and those with the same participant encoded in oblique function. This phenomenon does not fit into the scope of this study.
Applicative Constructions

(11) a. Lúpi xiwákurhi-ku-sín-∅-ti acháati-ni
   Lupe shout-3APPL-HAB-PRS-3IND man-OBJT
   ‘Lupe shouts at the man.’

   b. Lúpi orhé-ku-pa-sín-∅-ti acháati-ni
   Lupe be.first-dir-3APPL-DIR-HAB-PRS-3IND man-OBJT
   ‘Lupe goes in front of the man.’/‘Lupe gets ahead of the man.’

Alternative constructions with monotransitive verbs exhibit similar patterns to those with intransitive verbs. The examples in (12) and (13) illustrate the introduction of the new participant by para or through the use of -ku/-chi.

(12) a. tumpí ú-s-∅-ti tsúntsu-ni para xí
   boy do/make-PRS-3IND pot-OBJT for 1sg
   ‘The boy made the pot for me.’

   b. tumpí-rini ú-chi-s-∅-ti tsúntsu-ni
   boy=1sg.obj do/make-1/2APPL-PRS-3IND pot-OBJT
   ‘The boy made me the pot.’

(13) a. Pédru xwá-s-∅-ti ma wíchu-ni para xí
   Pedro bring-PRS-3IND one dog-OBJT for 1sg
   ‘Pedro brought a dog for me.’

   b. Pédru-rini xwá-chi-s-∅-ti ma wíchu-ni
   Pedro=1sg.obj bring-1/2APPL-PRS-3IND one dog-OBJT
   ‘Pedro brought me a dog.’

Monotransitive verbs that denote the displacement of an entity, such as ‘bring’ in (14) and ‘take/carry’ in (15), not only allow alternative constructions such as those in (13), but also the occurrence of equivalent versions with a postpositional phrase flagged by the comitative xinkóni or -nkuni. Nevertheless, this construction type is restricted to situations with a human theme:

(14) a. xwá-ku-s-∅-ka=ni sapí-ni/kúchi-ni
   bring-3APPL-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ child-OBJT/pig-OBJT
   María-ni
   Maria-OBJT
   ‘I brought Maria the child/pig.’
(15) a. pá-ku-s-∅-ka=ni sapí-ni/tsíri
take/carry-3APPL-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ child-OBJT/corn
doktóri-ni
doctor-OBJT
‘I took the child/corn to the doctor.’

b. pá-s-∅-ka=ni sapí-ni/*tsíri
take/carry-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ child-OBJT/corn
doktóri-nkuni
doctor-COM
‘I took the child/*corn to the doctor.’

Unlike (14a) and (15a)—which are examples of the most common applicative constructions with human themes—(14b) and (15b) are ambiguous. The participant in oblique function has the preferred reading of a co-participant agent; for example, in (15b) ‘I took/carried the child (somewhere) with the doctor (accompanied by the doctor).’

In P’orhépecha there are several verbs that could be expected to be non-derived ditransitives, given the type of event they denote. However, they are syntactically monotransitive verbs that require the suffixation of -ku or -chi in order to generate a ditransitive construction. The verbs atárant’ani ‘to sell’, pyáni ‘to buy’, and arhúkuni ‘to distribute’ belong to this set:

(16) a. atára*(-ku)-nt’a-s-∅-ti kúchi-ni Pédru-ni
sell-3APPL-ITR-PRF-PRS-3IND pig-OBJT Pedro-OBJT
‘S/he sold Pedro the pig.’

b. pyá*(-ku)-s-∅-ti tsúntsu-ni Pédru-ni
buy-3APPL-PRF-PRS-3IND pot-OBJT Pedro-OBJT
‘S/he bought Pedro (source) the pot.’
The verb atárant'ani ‘to sell’ in (16a) disallows the introduction of the recipient in oblique function, as does the verb pyáni ‘to buy’ in (16b), regarding the encoding of the source. The only condition under which these verbs can combine with a recipient/source headed by the comitative marking is when the theme is human, displaying the same restriction seen in sentences (14b) and (15b). Finally, the verb arhúkuni ‘to distribute’ in (16c) accepts the coding of the recipient by way of para.

Among the verbs that require applicativization in order to generate double object constructions the verb xurámuni ‘to order’ is worth noting, as it must be combined with -ku/-chi to introduce the participant to whom the order is directed. Compare the sentences in (17):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(17) a. } & \text{xurámuti-icha xurámu-s-p-ti=ksï kampánu-ni} \\
& \text{chief-pl order-prf-pst-3ind=1/3pl.sbj bell-objt} \\
& \text{xíska-ni} \\
& \text{hide-NF} \\
& \text{‘The chiefs ordered the bell to be hidden.’ (kampana.13)} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b. } & \text{xurámu-ku-s-p-ti Mintsita-ni éska=ksï } \\
& \text{order-3appl-prf-pst-3ind Mintsita-objt SBR=1/3pl.sbj} \\
& \text{ni-pirin-ka xíska-ni k'éri xatsíkwarhikwa-ni} \\
& \text{go-cond-sbjv hide-NF big wealth-objt} \\
& \text{‘He ordered Mintsita to go hide the treasure.’ (japunda.27)}
\end{align*}
\]

If -ku is eliminated in (17b), the sentence becomes ungrammatical. With the verb xurámuni it is not possible for the otherwise applied argument to be encoded as oblique.

It is important to mention the existence of a small number of dependant roots that allow applicative suffixation in order to form verbal stems that present differences in valence with those exhibited by the same root when combined with the middled/reflexive suffix -kurhi. Compare the monotransitive verbs kurhákurhini/kuráxkurhini ‘to answer, to ask for’ and the intransitive one eyákurhini ‘to commit oneself’ with the ditransitive predicates in (18).
In the sentences in (18), the use of -\textit{ku/-chi} is mandatory so as to encode the events of ‘answering something to someone’ and ‘promising something to someone’ without existing alternative constructions.\(^5\)

The data presented so far show that, regarding applicative marking, the most common (unrestricted) alternative constructions are those in which the participant to whom the event is aimed is introduced by the loanword \textit{para}, possibly an innovation due to the influence of the Spanish language. The alternative sentences with the postposition \textit{xinkóni} or the case marker -\textit{nkuni} present restrictions, generally related to the animacy status of the patient/theme and the verb type.

The person prominence relations that impose a construction split on semantically ditransive verbs, discussed in Chapter 3, also limit the possibility of applicative double object constructions. In contrast to the applicative constructions seen above, when there is a patient/theme that outranks the new participant on the person hierarchy it is impossible to introduce the latter by way of -\textit{ku/-chi}; i.e., the applicative construction is blocked:

\(^5\) In contrast with this situation, when the event referred to is ‘ask for’ alternative constructions are available as shown in the following examples (see also example (4) in Chapter 3):

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{kurhá-ku-s-∅-ka=ni} \hspace{1cm} ma \hspace{1cm} tsúntsu \hspace{1cm} María-\textit{ni}
\item \textit{xí kurháxkurhi-s-∅-ka=ni} ma \hspace{1cm} tsúntsu María-\textit{nkuni}
\end{enumerate}

\textit{ask.for-3appl-prf-prs-1/2ind=1sg.sbj one pot María-objt}

\textit{1sg ask.for-prf-prs-1/2ind=1sg.sbj one pot María-com}

‘I asked Maria for a pot.’

Although (i) and (ii) have different verbal stems, they can be considered as alternative forms with the source encoded in oblique or in object function.
(19) a. \( xí=kìni \quad \text{pá-}chi-s-∅-ka \quad \text{María-ni} \)
\[
\begin{array}{lll}
1\text{SG}=2\text{SG.OBJ} & \text{take/carry-1/2APPL-PRF-PRS-1/2IND} & \text{María-OBJT} \\
\text{1st/2nd person} & \text{Maria-object} & \text{took Maria to you.} \\
\end{array}
\]

b. \( *imá=kìni \quad \text{pá-}ku-s-∅-ti \quad \text{Xwánu-ni} \)
\[
\begin{array}{lll}
\text{that=2SG.OBJ} & \text{take/carry-3APPL-PRF-PRS-3IND} & \text{Juan-OBJT} \\
\text{Intended reading: ‘S/he took you to Juan.’} \\
\end{array}
\]

In (19a), the suffix -\( \text{chi} \) indicates 1st/2nd person, which is why the applied argument must be the 2nd person singular object -\( \text{kìni} \). Sentence (19b) is ungrammatical because -\( \text{ku} \) indicates a 3rd person applied object (Xuánuni), and there is a 2nd person object that should be the theme. Given that double object constructions in P’orhépecha are subject to person prominence constraints, the only way of expressing a new participant less prominent on the person hierarchy than the patient/theme is by encoding it as oblique, as can be observed in (20).

(20) a. \( imá=kìni \quad \text{xwá-s-∅-ti} \quad \text{para María} \)
\[
\begin{array}{lll}
\text{that=2SG.OBJ} & \text{bring-PRF-PRS-3IND} & \text{for María} \\
\text{‘S/he brought you for Maria.’} \\
\end{array}
\]

b. \( \text{pá-∅=}rìni \quad \text{María-nkuni} \)
\[
\begin{array}{lll}
\text{take/carry-IMP=}1\text{SG.OBJ} & \text{Maria-COM} \\
\text{‘Take me to Maria.’} \\
\end{array}
\]

c. \( \text{chítì} \quad \text{náanti=kìni} \quad \text{atárant’a-}s-∅-ti \quad \text{acháati-nkuni} \)
\[
\begin{array}{lll}
\text{2SG.Poss} \quad \text{mother1/2PSR=2SG.OBJ} & \text{sell-PRF-PRS-3IND} & \text{man-COM} \\
\text{‘Your mother sold you to the man.’} \\
\end{array}
\]

The addition of a new object by way of -\( \text{ku/-chi} \) also results in an ungrammatical construction if the patient-like argument (\( P \)) of a monotransitive verb is co-referential with the agent, or if it is meant as the subject of a passive construction (cf. 3.3.2). The first of these two cases is exemplified in (21).

(21) a. \( \text{pá-p’era-}sín-∅-ti=}kści \quad \text{doktórí-nkuni} \)
\[
\begin{array}{lll}
\text{take/carry-RECP-HAB-PRS-3IND=}1/3\text{PL.SBJ} & \text{doctor-COM} \\
\text{‘They take each other to the doctor.’} \\
\end{array}
\]
a. *pá-p'era-ku/-ku-p'era-sín-∅-ti=ksï
take/carry-RECP-3APPL/-3APPL-RECP-HAB-PRS-3IND=1/3PL.SBJ

doktórî-nî

doctor-OBJT

Intended reading: ‘They take each other to the doctor.’

b. xuchá atára-kurhi-nt’a-s-∅-ka=ksï
1PL sell-MDL/REFL-1TR-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1/3PL.SBJ

enemígu-icha-nkuni

enemy-PL-COM

‘We sold ourselves to the enemies.’

b’. * xuchá atára-kurhi-ku-nt’a-s-∅-ka=ksï
1PL sell-MDL/REFL-3APPL-1TR-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1/3PL.SBJ

enemígu-icha-ni

enemy-PL-OBJT

Intended reading: ‘We sold ourselves to the enemies.’

In (21a, b) there is co-referentiality between the patient/theme and the agent; therefore the new participant can only be introduced in oblique function. This same behavior can be observed in sentences where the patient/theme occurs as the subject of a passive construction, as shown in (22).

(22) a. k’wirípita arhúku-na-s-∅-ti para tumpí-icha
meat distribute-PASS-PRF-PRS-3IND for boy-PL

‘The meat was distributed to the boys.’

b. sapí pá-na-s-∅-ti xurámuti-ni xinkóni
child take/carry-PASS-PRF-PRS-3IND chief-OBJT POSP

‘The child was taken to the chief.’

6 In contrast to (21a’), the following sentence, in which the verbal stem exhibits the applicative allomorph -tsï (see 4.2.1), is grammatical, but the only available reading is that of co-referentiality between the subject and the applied object:

(i) pá-tsi-p’era-sín-∅-ti=ksï
take/carry-APPL-RECP-HAB-PRS-3IND=1/3PL.SBJ
doctor-OBJT

‘They take the doctor to each other.’
c. t'irékwa ú-na-s-∅-ti para t’ú
   food do/make-PASS-PRF-PRS-3IND for 2SG
   ‘The food was made for you.’

d. tsúntsu pyá-na-s-∅-ti Pédru-ni xinkóni
   pot buy-PASS-PRF-PRS-3IND Pedro-OBJT POSP
   ‘The pot was bought from Pedro.’

Predicates such as those in (22a–d) do not allow the coexistence of the passive and applicative morphemes, as can be seen when comparing (22a, d) with the ungrammaticality of the sentences in (23).7

(23) a. k’wirípita arhúku-ku-na/mi-na-a-s-∅-ti
tumpí-icha-ni
   meat distribute-3APPL-PASS/APPL-PASS-DISTR-PRF-PRS-3IND
   boy-PL-OBJT
   Intended reading: ‘The meat was distributed to the boys.’

b. tsúntsu pyá-ku-na/mi-na-s-∅-ti
   Pédru-ni
   pot buy-3APPL-PASS/APPL-PASS-PRF-PRS-3IND
   Pedro-OBJT
   Intended reading: ‘The pot was bought from/for Pedro.’

The sentences in (21–23) show—as might be expected in the case of a language in which ditransitive constructions exhibit secundative behavior (PO/SO)—that if the P argument of a monotransitive verb accesses the morphosyntactic processes restricted to the PO, it is impossible to introduce a semantically “dative-like” applied object. As is the case with T in ditransitive constructions, the P argument of a monotransitive verb that has undergone applicativization cannot display PO behavioral properties.

4.1.3 Thematic Role of the Applied Object

Studies across various languages with applicative morphemes show that applied arguments may bear diverse semantic roles. Languages also differ in

7 Compare the sentences in (23) with the passive form resulting from an applicative construction in (7) and in 4.2.1, where the applied argument becomes the syntactic subject.
the number of applicative constructions they have (see Dixon and Aikhenvald 2000a, Peterson 2007, Zavala 2000, Kiyosawa and Gerdts 2010). Among the most widespread semantic roles of applied arguments are: beneficiary/maleficiary, recipient, source, instrument, locative, comitative, purpose, and possessor. However, the typological study by Peterson (1999, 2007) shows that the most common scenario in languages with a single applicative construction is that in which the applied object bears the thematic role of recipient and/or of beneficiary/maleficiary. P’orhépecha belongs to the latter language group. The applicative morphemes -ku and -chi cannot denote participants with an instrumental or locative role. Therefore, sentences such as (24b) and (25b) are ruled out.

(24) a. kachúku-s-∅-ti k’wirípita kuchíyu-mpu
    cut-PRF-PRS-3IND meat knife-INST
    ‘S/he cut some meat with the knife.’

b. *kachúku-ku-s-∅-ti k’wirípita kuchíyu-ni
    cut-3APPL-PRF-PRS-3IND meat knife-OBJT
    Intended reading: ‘S/he cut some meat with the knife.’

(25) a. xanó-s-∅-ti táa-rhu
    arrive-PRF-PRS-3IND house-LOC
    ‘S/he arrived at the house.’

b. *xanó-ku-s-∅-ti táa-ni
    arrive-3APPL-PRF-PRS-3IND house-OBJT
    Intended reading ‘S/he arrived at the house.’

In P’orhépecha, applied arguments may bear the thematic roles of beneficiary/maleficiary, recipient, source, goal, and/or possessor. For example, with intransitive verbs, -ku and -chi allow the introduction of an object with a beneficiary (26) or goal (27) role.

(26) ánchikurhi-chí-sín-∅-ti=rini
    work-1/2APPL-HAB-PRS-3IND=1SG.OBJ
    ‘S/he works for me.’

8 The P’orhépecha verbal suffix that signals an instrument is the same marker that indicates a causative construction (see Chapter 5).
(27) a. xiwákurhi-ku-s-∅-ti sapí-ni
shout-3APPL-PRF-PRS-3IND child-OBJT
’S/he shouted at the child.’

b. chkwánterha-chi-∅-s-ka=kini
lie-1/2APPL-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=2SG.OBJ
‘I lied to you.’

c. no=ts’í méni xáma-a-ka chá
NEG=2PL.SBJ once go.around-FUT-1/2IND 2PL
wántónskwarhi-ku-a-ni xosétu-icha-ni
talk-3APPL-DISTR-NF boy-PL-OBJT
‘Don’t go around talking to the boys.’ (tembuna.77)

It is common for applied objects in ditransitive constructions to have a beneficiary and/or recipient role, as shown in (28), but they can also have a source or possessor role, as in (29). With verbs such as ‘steal’ and ‘kill’, the applied object is interpreted as malefactive, as shown in (30).9

(28) a. ú-ku-s-∅-ti ma k’waníntikwa María-ni
do/make-3APPL-PRF-PRS-3IND one shawl Maria-OBJT
‘S/he made Maria a shawl.’

b. segíri-s-p-ti nirá-ni tumína pá-ku-ni
keep.on-PRF-PST-3IND go-NF money take/carry-3APPL-NF
ya nanáka-ni
already woman-OBJT
‘He kept going back to take the woman some money.’ (tata.55)

9 The interpretation of the thematic role of the applied object depends to a great extent on the base verb and on the context. The possibility of ambiguity regarding the thematic role(s) of the applied object is a common phenomenon, which also occurs in P’orhépecha (see Peterson 2007:40, 120–121, Kiyosawa and Gerdts 2010:124–128). For example, recipients are generally also beneficiaries; possessors can also be sources and, as a rule, be positively or negatively affected (beneficiary/maleficiary).
c. *xurákw-che-∅=rini ishú xuchíítí ayxádu-ni*

leave-1/2APPL-1MP=1SG.OBJ here 1SG.POSS godson-OBJ

‘Leave my godson here with me (lit. leave me my godson here).’

(achaati.49)

(29) a. *pyá-ku-s-p-ti=ksi ma echéri ma acháati*

buy-3APPL-PRF-PST-3IND=1/3PL.SBJ one land one man

[tsúntu-úri]-ni
[potter]-OBJ

‘They bought a piece of land from the potter.’ (San Mateu 27(7))

b. *imá-ni énka=kini kurhá-chi-a-ka ma*

that-OBJ REL=2SG.OBJ ask.for-1/2APPL-FUT-SBJV one

ampé, intsku-∅

(some)thing, give-IMP

‘He who asks you for something, give it to him.’ (San Lukasí 6(30))

(30) a. *sipá-ku-s-∅-ka=ni ma kabáyu-ni Chalío-ni*

steal-3APPL-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ one horse-OBJ Chalío-OBJ

‘I stole a horse from Chalío.’

b. *wántiku-chi-s-∅-ti=rini wíchu-ni*

kill-1/2APPL-PRF-PRS-3IND=1SG.OBJ dog-OBJ

‘S/he killed my dog (on me).’

Sentences such as (30) can be considered instances of malefactive applicative constructions; however, the positive (benefactive) or negative (malefactive) effect on the applied argument depends on each specific situation. For example in (30b), a benefactive reading is available if, instead of a dog, it is a pig being taken to the slaughterhouse. In such cases, the involvement of a new core argument which is positively or negatively affected by the agent’s action always implies that the patient/theme belongs to the applied argument or, if this is not the case, that it is under its care or control (cf. Kiyosawa and Gerdts 2010:125–128).

The use of *-ku/-chi* to introduce the possessor of an entity is very common in P’orhépecha (see Capistrán 2006b):
The sentences in (31) are examples of what Payne and Barshi (1999b) call external possession (EP). According to these authors, EP exists when, given a possessor-possessum relationship, the possessor (who is not licensed by the argument frame of the verbal root itself) is expressed as a core constituent separate from that which encodes the possessum. The authors add that although the possessor (PRS) occurs as a core NP, it is also possible for the possession relationship to be expressed by way of a possessive pronoun or affix within the phrase containing the possessum (PSM). In P’orhépecha, unlike in other Mesoamerican languages with similar EP constructions (Zavala 1999, 2013), the possessum is not required to display possessive markers (on the same phenomenon in the Thompson language, see Kiyosawa and Gerdts 2010:126). Therefore, in many cases applicative constructions allow the interpretation of the applied argument as possessor or recipient. This is the case in the following sentences:

10 Payne and Barshi (1999b:6) treat applicative morphemes as one of the mechanisms employed in external possession (EP) constructions. The following are examples of internal possession, which can be compared with (32a, b):

(i) pá-s-∅-ti [Pédru-iri maríkwa-ni]
   take/carry-prf-prs-3ind [Pedro-gen girl-objt]
   ‘S/he took Pedro’s girl somewhere.’

(ii) xwá-a-ti [xuchíiti kúchi-ni]
    bring-fut-3ind [1sg.poss pig-objt]
    ‘S/he will bring my pig.’
(32) a. pá-ku-s-∅-ti maríkwa-ni Pédru-ni
take/carry-3APPL-PRF-PRS-3IND girl-OBJ Pedro-OBJ
’S/he took the girl to Pedro.’
’S/he took Pedro’s girl somewhere.’

b. xwá-chi-a-ti=rini kúchi-ni
bring-1/2APPL-FUT-3IND=1SG.OBJ pig-OBJ
’S/he will bring me my/the pig.’

c. eráku-chi-s-∅-ti=rini kabáyu-ni
choose/select-1/2APPL-PRF-PRS-3IND=1SG.OBJ horse-OBJ
’S/he chose my horse.’
’S/he chose the horse for me.’

On the other hand, with certain monotransitive base verbs such as those in (33), despite the lack of possessive markers, the only possible interpretation of the new argument is as the possessor of the single object argument of the base verb:

(33) a. gustári-ku-sïn-∅-ka=ni warhíiti-ni Pédru-ni
like-3APPL-HAB-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ woman-OBJ Pedro-OBJ
‘I like Pedro’s woman.’

b. María xuká-chi-s-∅-ti=rini
Maria put.on/have.on-1/2APPL-PRF-PRS-3IND=1SG.OBJ
k’waníntikwa-ni
shawl-OBJ
‘Maria put my shawl on.’/’Maria is wearing my shawl.’

c. eshé-chi-nt’a-s-∅-ka=kini tumína
see-1/2APPL-ITR-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=2SG.OBJ money
‘I found your money.’
*I found money for you.’

d. para eshé-ni abérisika eshé-ku-nt’a-pirin-ka ma frúta
for see-NF if see-3APPL-ITR-COND-SBJV one fruit
‘… to see if he could see a fruit (on the fig tree).’
*‘… to see if he could see a fruit for him.’ (San Markusī 11(13))
e. *shukúparhakwa=ts'ini a-chí-a-ni animáli-icha*
   clothes=1sg/pl.obj ingest-1/2appl-distr-nf animal-pl

‘The animals ate my clothes.’ (ma tumí.59)

The fact that with certain verbs the only available reading of the applied object is that of possessor seems to depend on the type of event in question. In (33a), for example, it is clear that to like someone or something is not an event where, for instance, a recipient can be added.¹¹

In addition to the examples examined above, P'orhépecha EP constructions also allow the applied object to be the possessor of an argument of the base predicate encoded in a locative phrase, as shown in (34) with the verbs *p'itáni* ‘take something out of some place’ and *inchárani* ‘get something into some place’.

(34) a. *p’itá-ku-s-∅-ti=p’atsímu Pédru-ni ichárhuta-rhu*
   take.out-3appl-prf-prs-3ind reed Pedro-objt canoe-loc
   ‘S/he took Pedro’s reed out of the/his canoe.’
   ‘S/he took the reed out of Pedro’s canoe.’

b. *inchá-ra-chi-s-∅-ti=rinī chkári táa-rhu*
   get.in/into-caus-1/2appl-prf-prs-3ind=1sg.obj firewood house-loc
   ‘S/he got my firewood into the/my house.’
   ‘S/he got the firewood into my house.’

In (34a, b) the applied object is interpreted as the possessor of a non-agent argument of the base verb, either the theme, or the location, or both (regarding the accessibility of oblique locatives to EP constructions see Payne and Barshi 1999b, and Deal 2013).¹² As a result, the possessor, as is usual, may also bear a recipient or beneficiary/maleficiary role. Nevertheless, the native speakers

¹¹ In P’orhépecha, the only possible translation for a sentence such as ‘I saw a fruit for him’ or ‘to find something for someone else’ is through the use of *para*; for example: *eshént’aska=ni tumína para t’ú* ‘I found money for you’. In order to indicate ‘S/he put something on me’, the ditransitive verbal stem *xatsíku* must be used: *Pédru=rinī xatsikusti karóñini* ‘Pedro put the blanket on me’.

¹² Other EP constructions that may present the possessum encoded in a locative oblique phrase are those with part-whole spatial suffixes discussed in Chapter 6.
consulted generally tend to reject the interpretation of the applied object in (34a, b) as merely a recipient or beneficiary/maleficiary. For example, if Pedro is not the possessor of any argument, they tend to opt for the sentence *p’itásti p’atsimu ichárhutarhu para Pédru* *‘He took the reed out of the canoe for Pedro’*. 

The fact that in P’orhépecha, EP constructions may include possessors of locative-marked NPs is corroborated by the applicativization of intransitive verbs with an oblique locative argument, such as those in (35), which generally convey a negative sense, e.g., of intruding (see Zavala 2000, Levy 2001, and Peterson 2007 on similar cases in other languages):

(35) a. *tumpí=rini inchá-a-ku-chi-s-∅-ti*
   boy=1SG.OBJ get.in/into-central-LOC.EXP-1/2APPL-PRF-PRS-3IND
   *táa-rhu*
   home-LOC
   ‘The boy got into my house.’

b. *washáka-ku-s-∅-ti Xwánu-ni kárru-rhu*
   sit.down-3APPL-PRF-PRS-3IND Juan-OBJT car-LOC
   ‘S/he sat on/in Juan’s car.’

c. *Fránsia anápu warhípiti-icha*
   France RL soldier-pl
   *inchá-a-ku-chi-s-p-ti=ts’ini*
   get.in/into-central-LOC.EXP-1/2APPL-PRF-PST-3IND=1PL.OBJ
   *xuchá-eri echéri Méxiku*
   1PL-GEN land Mexico
   ‘The French soldiers entered our land of Mexico.’ (p’urhepecha jimbo 1.150)

There are other uses of -*ku/-chi* in which it is possible to observe that the applied argument establishes a space or domain in which there is an entity, or in respect to which the action takes place. The first case is exemplified in the forms in (36).

(36) a. *két’a-ta-chi-∅=rini tsakápu-ni*
   move.away-CAUS-1/2APPL-1MP=1SG.OBJ stone-OBJT
   ‘Move the stone away from me.’
b. wantiku-ku-a-s-∅-ti tinky-icha-ni charhaku-ni
    kill-3APPL-DISTR-PRF-PRS-3IND fly-PL-OBJT baby-OBJT
    'S/he killed the flies (around) the baby.'

In (36a), someone is ordered to take a stone away from the space of the applied argument; for example, from the path of the 1st person singular or from where the 1st person singular is going to sit. In (36b), it is understood that someone killed the flies around the baby, that is, those that were in his/her space. Although there is no possessor reading of these sentences, there is a space or region that “belongs to” or is demarcated as the space of the applied argument.13

The second case, mentioned above, in which the applied argument establishes a domain in respect to which the action takes place, is found with intransitive verbs that undergo applicativization, as in the sentences in (37).

(37) a. María orhé-ku-pa-sín-∅-ti kabáyu-ni
    Maria be.first-3APPL-DIR-HAB-PRS-3IND horse-OBJT
    'Maria goes in front of the horse./'Maria got ahead of the horse.'

b. sapi-cha-ni két'aku-ku-a-ka xi
    child-PL-OBJT move.away-3APPL-DISTR-FUT-1/2IND 1SG
    'I will get away from the children.' (warhikuajku.21)

In (37a, b) the applicative morpheme introduces a participant—the horse in (37a) and the children in (37b)—whose role is to serve as a spatial reference with regard to the action of the subject. Similarly, in the sentences in (38), the event described by the base verb is performed in or with respect to the space or domain of the applied object:

---

13 Sentences such as the one below can be explained in the same way.

(i) mítachtis'ïni pwerta
    open-1/2APPL-IMP=1PL.OBJ door
    'Open the door for us.' (San Mateu 11(25))

According to Shibatani (1996), this type of utterance conveys the possessive-like control of the new argument over the effect of the opening of the door; to cross the generated space. It is therefore possible to say that the door is located within the area of displacement of the new argument; what is attempted by opening the door is the displacement of the new participant through this space.
(38) a. \( i=chka=na=reni \) \( w\text{é}ra-che-s-\emptyset-\text{ti} \)  
\( \text{this=EMPH=EVID=1SG.OBJ} \) \( \text{get.out-1/2APPL-PRF-PRS-3IND} \)  
\( \text{for strike-nf=1SG.OBJ} \)  
‘This (person) came out (where I was) to hit me.’ (warhuricha.8)

b. \( \text{no-ampákiti=reni} \) \( \text{sharhá-chi-s-\emptyset-\text{ti}} \)  
\( \text{devil=1SG.OBJ} \) \( \text{appear-1/2APPL-PRF-PRS-3IND} \)  
‘The devil appeared to me.’

c. \( \text{éka=reni} \) \( t\'u \) \( \text{tinkwíshurhi-chi-s-\emptyset-ka} \)  
\( \text{if=1SG.OBJ} \) \( 2SG \) \( \text{kneel.down-1/2APPL-PRF-PRS-SBJV} \)  
‘If you knelt down before me.’ (San Lukasí 4 (7))

d. \( \text{tsakápu wekórhí-ku-s-\emptyset-\text{ti}} \) \( \text{Xwánu-ni} \)  
\( \text{stone fall-3APPL-PRF-PRS-3IND} \) \( \text{Juan-OBJT} \)  
‘The stone fell on Juan’s property or near Juan.’

The fact that in the examples in (38) the applied object delimits the space or domain where the event takes place explains why in (38d), the applied argument is not a directly affected (patient-like) participant. Sentence (38d) cannot portray a situation in which the stone fell on Juan; the only possible reading is that the stone fell on the space or domain of the applied argument.  

With unaccusative verbs, the role of the applied object is to indicate the space/domain where the theme is or becomes located. This accounts for the occurrence of constructions such as (38d) and for the examples provided below.

(39) a. \( \text{imá-ki=tsũni} \) \( \text{xuchá-n=tsũni} \)  
\( \text{that-rel=1PL.OBJ} \) \( \text{1PL-OBJT=1PL.OBJ} \)  
\( \text{happen-1/2APPL-PRF-PST-SBJV} \)  
‘…what happened to us.’ (k’uichiticha.83)

14 To convey situations similar to ‘the stone fell on Juan’, different constructions are employed, which involve the use of spatial suffixes (see Chapter 6). With the verbal stem \( \text{wekórhí} \) the only possible way of signaling that the stone fell on someone is through the use of a construction such as the following:
b. tumína pakára-chi-s-∅-ti=rini  
money be.left-1/2APPL-PRF-PRS-3IND=1SG.OBJ  
'I had some money left over (lit. money is left over (to) me).'

c. k’amára-chi-s-∅-ti=rini tsíri  
finish-1/2APPL-PRF-PRS-3IND=1SG.OBJ corn  
'I ran out of corn (lit. corn finished itself (to) me).'

d. éska=rini bieni kweráta-chi-sín-∅-ka aliméntu  
SBR=1SG.OBJ well be.missing-1/2APPL-HAB-PRS-SBJV food  
‘. . . that I am short of food (lit. food is missing (to) me).’ (tata.55)

According to Alsina and Mchombo (1993), Alsina (1993), and Baker (1996, 1988b), in languages with asymmetrical object constructions or PO/SO, unaccusative verbs do not allow benefactive applicative constructions. The studies of Alsina and Mchombo (1993) and of Alsina (1993:539)—which adopt a thematic hierarchy where the instrument outranks the patient/theme while the locative role is the lowest ranked—claim that applicative morphemes cannot introduce a participant whose thematic role outranks the highest thematic role of the base predicate. Therefore, the only possible applicative construction with unaccusative verbs is the locative one. The data on P’orhépecha, however, bring these statements into question (see also Amberber 2000, and Peterson 2007:61–62 on the occurrence of non-locative applicative affixes with unaccusative verbs). Firstly, unlike the morphemes recognized as locative applicatives in linguistic literature, -ku and -chi do not introduce locative participants in object function—see example (25). For instance, in contrast to the ungrammaticality of a sentence such as *tsakápu wekórhi-kusti táani with the intended reading ‘The stone fell on the house,’ (38d) permits the addition of an NP with locative case to indicate the location where the stone fell: tsakápu wekórhi-kusti Xwánuni táarhu ‘The stone fell on Juan’s house.’ Secondly, as is evident in the examples shown above, with unaccusative verbs the applied argument can be considered as affected by the event—beneficiary or maleficiary—since the applicative construction locates the patient/theme in the domain of the applied argument.15 Furthermore, even in constructions with a

(i) tsakápu wekórhi-s-∅-ti Xwánuni iríep’u-rhu  
stone fall-PRF-PRS-3IND Juan-gen head-LOC  
The stone fell on Juan’s head.’

15 That verbs such as those in (39) can take an argument indicating the space where the theme is located is corroborated by the existence of constructions that are semantically
non-agentive verb and an inanimate applied object, the latter does not have a locative role *stricto sensu*, despite representing the space where the theme is located:

(40) a. anátapu-ni  kweráta-ku-sín-∅-ti  terénta
    tree-OBJ  be.missing-3APPL-HAB-PRS-3IND  manure
    ‘The tree lacks manure.’

b. mésa-ni  kweráta-ku-sín-∅-ti  ma  xantsíri
    table-OBJ  be.missing-3APPL-HAB-PRS-3IND  one  leg/foot
    ‘The table is missing a leg.’

c. i-ni  káxa-ni  kweráta-ku-sha-∅-ti  ma
    this-OBJ  box-OBJ  be.missing-3APPL-PROG-PRS-3IND  one
    botéya
    bottle
    ‘This box is missing a bottle.’

The readings of the sentences (40a, b) cannot be obtained if the applicative morpheme is eliminated and anátapu ‘tree’ in (40a) and mesa ‘table’ in (40b) equivalent to those in (39), which can be considered as spatial inversions. Compare (39) with the sentences below:

(i) énka=ksī  útasī  pakára-ncha-ni  xa-∅-ká
    REL=1/3PL.SBJ  still  be.left-SPA.INV-NF  be-PRS-1/2IND
    ‘...what is left over for us.’ (k’urhamarhpi:117)

(ii) énka  anátapu-icha  kweráta-ncha-∅-∅-ka  echéri
    when  tree-PL  be.missing-SPA.INV-PRF-PRS-SBJV  soil
    ‘...when the trees lack soil.’

(iii) xí  k’ámára-ncha-s-∅-ka  tsíri
    1SG  finish-SPA.INV-PRF-PRS-1/2IND  corn
    ‘I ran out of corn.’

The suffix -ncha comes from the spatial morpheme -ncha ‘the whole body’ (see Monzón 2004:173, 194). The space denoted by this type of morpheme is usually located on the entity referred to by the subject of the derived predicate (see Chapter 6). Therefore, the presence of -ncha in (i–iii) allows the possessor of the space, indicated by the spatial morpheme, to occur as the syntactic subject, and the theme to occur as the object. These constructions could be equated with the locative inversion phenomenon common with unaccusative verbs (see Bresnan and Kanerva 1989, Alsina 1993:77, 539–543). However, in Porhépecha, these inversions are not present with participants that refer to places; the syntactic subject is a new core argument in whose domain or space the event takes place.
bear locative case marking. For example, in the case of (40b), the reading in which mesa is flagged by locative case would roughly mean ‘One of the several legs placed on the table is missing’. The same contrast is found with transitive verbs; for example: két’atastí irhínarhini mésarhu ‘S/he removed the tablecloth (that was) on the table’ (the tablecloth was located on the table) as opposed to két’atakustí irhínarhni mésani ‘S/he removed the tablecloth from the table’ (the table was covered by the tablecloth).

The fact that in the cases presented above -ku and -chi do not function as locative applicative suffixes stricto sensu is evident in the fact that an entity with a clear locative role cannot become a core argument through the use of applicativization. Accordingly, while (41a) is a correct sentence, the applicative construction in (41b) is not.

(41) a. korráli-rhu kweráta-sha-∅-ti ma tsíkata
    pen-LOC be.missing-prog-prs-3ind one hen
    ‘A hen is missing from the pen.’

b. *ma tsíkata kweráta-ku-sha-∅-ti korráli-ni
    one hen be.missing-3appl-prog-prs-3ind pen-objt
    Intended reading: ‘A hen is missing from the pen.’

In P’orhépecha, the range of thematic roles that applied objects exhibit arises from the fact that applicative suffixes indicate that the event signaled by the base verb is aimed at or performed in relation to a realm, which I refer to as the space or domain of the new core participant or applied argument. With mono-transitive verbs, there are two possibilities regarding applicative constructions: a) a situation is created whereby the agent transfers the theme to the domain of the new core participant at whom the action is aimed—as in (28a) ‘S/he made Maria a shawl’ and (28c) ‘Leave my godson here with me’—so that the theme comes under the control or domain of the applied argument which, consequently, is affected either positively (beneficiary) or negatively (maleficiary); b) the agent acts on a patient/theme situated within the space or domain of the new participant, which as a result is indirectly affected (beneficiary/maleficiary), as in examples (36a) ‘Move the stone away from me’, (36b) ‘S/he killed the flies around the baby’, (3oa) ‘I stole a horse from Chalío’, and (33b) ‘Maria put my shawl on’. In both cases the agent directs its action to the domain of the applied argument, establishing a relationship between them: the action of the first involves an entity that is placed or becomes located within the domain of the second. So, just as when a theme passes to the domain of the applied argument it comes under its control/possession, when a patient or theme is
already located in such a domain it is possible to identify a possessive relationship between the two non-agent core arguments. The establishment of this relationship depends on the meaning of the verb, on the type of patient/theme in question, and on the community’s shared knowledge. For instance, given that it is uncommon for people to possess stones or flies, in sentences such as (36a) and (36b) a possessor reading of the applied argument is discouraged, while in (30b) such a reading is the expected one.

The distinction between being transferred to and being within the domain of the applied object accounts for the readings of sentences such as (32a) ‘S/he took the girl to Pedro’ or ‘S/he took Pedro’s girl’, as well as for those in which the only possible reading of the applied object is that of possessor, as in (33a) ‘I like Pedro’s woman’. The idea that an action is performed in place of, or for the benefit/detriment of someone else, is not an inherent value of P’orhépecha applicative predicates; rather, it arises from the kind of relationship established between the event denoted by the base verb and the new core participant.16

With agentive intransitive verbs, the action of the agent is directed toward the domain of the applied object, as in example (27a) ‘S/he shouted at the child’. In (26a) ‘S/he works for me’, it is understood that someone works in a place owned by or under the control of the 1st person singular; that is, the action is performed within the space or domain of the applied argument, which is therefore a beneficiary. Similarly, in (35a) ‘The boy got into my house’ and in (35b) ‘S/he sat on/in Juan’s car’, the action of the subject is carried out in a place (NP with locative case) that, due to the presence of the applicative suffix, is located in the domain of a participant other than the subject. With unaccusative verbs, as in (38d) ‘The stone fell on Juan’s property or near Juan’ and (39b) ‘I had some money left over (lit. money is left over (to) me)’, the theme remains or becomes located in the domain of the applied object and consequently, the latter may be affected by the event (beneficiary/maleficiary).

16 In sentences such as wántikuchisti=rini kúchini, both the possessive reading ‘S/he killed my pig’ and the benefactive or delegative readings ‘S/he killed the pig for me/instead of me’ arise from the fact that the patient is located in the domain of the 1st person singular and is therefore under its control (i.e., the pig is mine or I am the person in charge of taking care of or killing the animals). In contrast to this type of construction, in P’orhépecha, sentences such as piréchisti=rini (piréni ‘to sing’) can only mean ‘S/he sang to me’ but never ‘S/he sang instead of me’. In intransitive constructions the delegative meaning is expressed through the use of a phrase introduced by the postposition ximpó; for example, pirésti xuchíitti ximpó ‘S/he sang instead of me’ (xuchíitti is the possessive form of the 1st person singular and can be used pronominally).
The recipient, goal, source, and possessor roles exhibited by applied objects in P’orhépecha, and the resulting benefit or detriment to this participant, arise from the fact that in this language applicative suffixes restrict the location of the patient/theme argument of the base verb to the domain or space of the core argument they introduce; i.e., the patient/theme is always located within the space or domain of the applied argument. This behavior is congruent with the view that such thematic roles are semantically related (see Shibatani 1996, Primus 1999, 2006, and Van Valin 1993, among others). Shibatani (1996), for example, maintains that the beneficiary role results from a situation in which the patient/theme is transferred to, or becomes the possession of, someone other than the agent. Van Valin (1993:154 n-23) argues that in the logical structure (LS) of the recipient and source roles, there is an implied relationship of possession: become have (x, y) and become not have (x, y). Based on the statements of these authors, it follows that if a beneficiary, recipient, or source is higher ranked on a thematic hierarchy than a patient/theme, the same can be expected with respect to a possessor. In fact, as will be demonstrated in 4.2, in P’orhépecha double object applicative constructions the applied object is always the one exhibiting PO properties, which confirms the thematic ranking recipient/beneficiary/source/goal > patient/theme, as well as the claim that the possessor is higher ranked than its possessum regarding PO selection.

The analysis presented here regarding -ku/-chi morphemes shows that the applicative constructions stemming from agentive verbs exhibiting arguments that include a patient/theme and/or location role, situate these participants outside the scope or domain of the agent.

4.1.4 Summary
P’orhépecha is a language in which the applicative morphemes -ku and -chi display a peculiarity whereby they introduce an argument to be mapped onto object function at the same time as they indicate the person features of this object. These morphemes introduce a participant, typically human, with

---

17 VanValin (1993) and Jackendoff (2002:360), following earlier proposals, consider possession as a type of locative relationship, with the arguments (xloc, ytheme). However, both authors recognize the possessive relationship as being different from the localization of an entity in a region or place: ‘be (x, y).’ This distinction is evident in P’orhépecha, where the applicative suffixes may introduce a possessive relationship, but not locative applicative constructions.

18 The obviation of the thematic role of the possessum (patient/theme in the constructions analyzed so far) is a useful generalization that allows the examination of the possessor > possessum ranking in P’orhépecha external possession applicative constructions which arise from ditransitive predicates (see Chapter 7).
which the subject/agent establishes a relationship based on the distinction between their domains. Therefore, it is possible to recognize two characteristics of P’orhépecha applicative constructions. Firstly, -ku and -chi generate a syntactic object position. Secondly, the use of these applicative suffixes reveals that the agent carries out an action directed to, or in the space belonging to, another participant. The typically human character of the new core argument and the relationship established between the subject/agent and the applied object, seem to motivate the distinction between participants and non-participants in the speech act, expressed by the applicative morphemes -chi and -ku. Whenever these suffixes occur in a verbal base, not only is it possible to identify a new core argument, but also to recognize that this participant is mapped onto a syntactic object whose referent is different from that of the subject.

The next section will show that the characteristics attributed to applicative morphemes can explain the following morphological behavior of applicative constructions: a) the allomorphy exhibited by -ku/-chi when applicative predicates are affected by morphemes that alter the syntactic expression of the new participant, and b) the incompatibility of the applicative markers with the middle/reflexive suffix -kurhi.

### 4.2 Morphosyntactic Properties of Double Object Applicative Constructions

In 4.1.1, it was shown that the conditions that block the possibility of adding an applied object to monotransitive verbs, which in turn implies that the otherwise applied argument must be encoded in oblique function, are the same as those under which the R argument of semantically ditransitive verbs must be encoded as oblique. Double object constructions, both with non-derived ditransitive verbs and with verbs undergoing applicativization, are not allowed if: a) the patient/theme is the most prominent non-agent core argument on the person scale; and b) the patient/theme is co-referential with the agent or it occurs as the passive subject.

Ditransitive applicative constructions present the same object asymmetries as ditransitive constructions with non-derived verbs, which display a secundative alignment pattern. Accordingly, the single non-agent core argument of the monotransitive verb undergoing applicativization cannot be the syntactic subject of passive constructions. It cannot be syntactically suppressed by way of -p’i, nor can it be subjected to reciprocalization or reflexivization; only the applied argument can display PO properties. However, these constructions have certain peculiarities. Firstly, the suffixes -ku and -chi exhibit
allomorphs when the syntactic realization of the applied argument is affected by the passive, the reciprocal, or the indefinite object morphemes. Secondly, unlike in other languages, applicative suffixes cannot co-occur with the reflexive morpheme. In this section I will demonstrate that these peculiarities can be explained by appealing to the two characteristics described above: a) that -ku/-chi generate a syntactic object position and specify the person of this object; and b) that -ku/-chi indicate that the event is directed to, or takes place in, a domain outside the sphere of the subject/agent.

4.2.1 Allomorphs of the Suffixes -ku and -chi in Constructions with the Passive, Reciprocal, or Indefinite Object Morphemes

In P’orhépecha double object applicative constructions, only the applied argument can be promoted to subject in the passive construction. Examples (42) and (43) show the passivization of applicativized bases.

(42) a. Xwánu-ni xwá-ku-s-∅-ti tsúntsu-ni
   Juan-objt bring-3appl-prf-prs-3ind pot-objt
   ‘S/he brought Juan the pot.’

b. Xwánu xwá-mi-na-s-∅-ti tsúntsu-ni
   Juan bring-appl-pass-prf-prs-3ind pot-objt
   ‘Juan was brought the pot.’

(43) a. t’u pá-ku-s-∅-ka sapí-ni xurámuti-ní
   2sg take/carry-3appl-prf-prs-1/2ind child chief-objt
   ‘You took the child to the chief.’

b. sapí pá-mi-na-s-∅-ti xurámuti-ní
   child take/carry-appl-pass-prf-prs-3ind chief-objt
   ‘The child was taken the chief.’
   ‘The child was taken to the chief.’

The additional core argument introduced by -ku in the active form (42a) is marked by the suffix -mi in the passive construction (42b) and expressed as the syntactic subject. The suffix -mi must occur when an applicative construction is passivized, and in this type of construction the subject must be the applied argument. Consequently, in (43b) the only available reading is that the chief was taken to the child. These morphosyntactic properties of P’orhépecha applicative constructions account for the ungrammaticality of the sentences in (44):
(44) a. *Xwánu  xwá-ku-na-s-∅-ti  tsúntsu-ni  
Juan bring-3APPL-PASS-PRF-PRS-3IND  pot-OBJT  
Intended reading: ‘Juan was brought the pot.’

b. *Xwánu  xwá-na-s-∅-ti  tsúntsu-ni  
Juan bring-PASS-PRF-PRS-3IND  pot-OBJT  
Intended reading: ‘Juan was brought the pot.’

c. *tsúntsu  xwá-ku/-mi-na-s-∅-ti  Xwánu-ni  
pot bring-3APPL/-APPL-PASS-PRF-PRS-3IND  Juan-OBJT  
Intended reading: ‘The pot was brought to Juan.’

The suffix -mi is also used when passivizing constructions with a 1st or 2nd person applied argument:

(45) a. pyá-chi-s-∅-ti=rini  táa-ni  
buy-1/2APPL-PRF-PRS-3IND=1SG.OBJ  house-OBJT  
‘S/he bought me the house.’

b. *xí  pyá-chi-na-s-∅-ka  táa-ni  
1SG  buy-1/2APPL-PASS-PRF-PRS-1/2IND  house-OBJT  
‘I was bought the house.’

c. xí  pyá-mi-na-s-∅ ka  táa-ni  
1SG  buy-APPL-PASS-PRF-PRS-1/2IND  house-OBJT  
‘I was bought the house.’

The ungrammaticality of (44a) and (45b), as well as the morphological change of the suffixes -ku/-chi to -mi in the passive construction, is explained by the fact that -ku and -chi induce the addition of a syntactic object and specify its person features. When passivizing an applicative predicate, the applied argument must be promoted to subject function; therefore -ku and -chi cannot be used since their presence would trigger the addition of a 3rd or 1st/2nd person (applied) object, respectively. The invariant morpheme -mi is only used when passivizing predicates that have undergone applicativization; it signals that the new core argument is realized as the passive subject.19

19 In other dialects lacking the canonical passive, e.g., that of Santa Fe (see Chapter 2, footnote 14), the morpheme -mi is also missing. In constructions in which the suffix -na and
In (46), there are examples from texts showing the passivization of applicative verbs:

(46) a. ampákikwa eshé-mi-na-a-ka=ri
   good.deed see-APPL-PASS-FUT-1/2IND=2SG.SBJ
   'You will be justified (lit. you will be seen a good deed).’ (San Mateu 12(37))

b. éka=ni no ú-x-∅-ka
   if=1SG.SBJ NEG can-HAB-PRS-SBJV
   két’a-ta-mi-na-ni i-ni itsîma-ni
   move.away-CAUS-APPL-PASS-NF this-OBJ glass-OBJ
   'If no one is able to move this glass away from me… (lit. If I cannot be
   moved away this glass…).’ (San Mateu 26(42))

c. èska k’wirípu-icha pwá-mi-na-nt’a-a-ka
   SBR people-PL forgive-APPL-PASS-1TR-FUT-SBJV
   pekádu-icha-ni
   sin-PL-OBJT
   ‘… that people will be forgiven (for) their sins.’ (San Mateu 12(31))

d. xuchá isî xurámú-mi-na-s-∅-ka Diosí-ni
   1PL this.way order-APPL-PASS-PRF-PRS-1/2IND God-OBJT
   ximpó
   POSP
   'We were thus commanded by God.’ (San Juanu 5(12))

Another morphological change takes place when the indefinite human object suffix -p’i is added to an applicativized base. In this case, the verbal stem presents the applicative allomorph -tsî:\n
---
20 As is common in P’orhépecha morphophonology, the final vowel of -tsî tends to be omitted when it precedes an obstruent consonant.
(47)  a.  xwá-p‘i-s-∅-ti
    bring-INDF.OBJ-PRFPRS-3IND
    ‘S/he brought people/somebody.’

    b.  *xwá-ku-p‘i-s-∅-ti
girl-objt
    Intended readings: ‘S/he brought the girl to somebody.’
    ‘S/he brought somebody’s girl.’
    ‘S/he brought people to the girl.’

    c.  xwá-tsï-p‘i-s-∅-ti
girl-objt
    ‘S/he brought the girl to somebody.’/‘S/he brought somebody’s girl.’
    ‘S/he brought people/somebody to the girl.’

In (47a), the suffixation of the syntactic valence-decreasing morpheme -p‘i to
the monotransitive verbal root xwá ‘bring’ blocks the syntactic expression of
the theme as object, resulting in an intransitive construction. In applicative
constructions with two non-agent arguments, -p‘i can only affect the syntactic
realization of the applied argument. However, the sequence -ku-p‘i in (47b) is
ungrammatical. Such ungrammaticality is due to conflicting morphosyntac-
tic properties: on the one hand, -p‘i blocks the expression of an argument in
object function, and on the other, -ku and -chi require the presence of a 3rd or
1st/2nd person object, respectively. So, the applicative construction in (47c)
exhibits the applicative allomorph -tsï. This suffix prompts the recognition of
an applied argument, which is prevented by -p‘i from surfacing syntactically as
an object.

In fact, predicates with the sequence [-tsï-p‘i] may bear the same thematic
roles as the corresponding forms with -ku/-chi, except that the applied argu-
ment is marked as indefinite, as can be seen in (48).

(48)  a.  á-tsï-p‘i-s-∅-ti
    fruit
    ‘S/he ate somebody’s fruit.’

    b.  ú-tsï-p‘i-a-ti
    bread
    ‘S/he will make some bread for somebody/people.’
c. óna-tsï-p’i-s-∅-ti
   lock.up-APPL-INDF.OBJ-PRF-PRS-3IND pig-OBJT
   ‘S/he locked up somebody’s pig.’

d. orhé-tsï-p’i-pa-sìn-∅-ti
   be.first-APPL-INDF.OBJ-DIR-HAB-PRS-3IND
   ‘S/he got ahead of somebody/people.’

e. ánchikuri-tsï-p’i-sín-∅-ti
   work-APPL-INDF.OBJ-HAB-PRS-3IND
   ‘S/he works for somebody else.’

The applicative allomorph -tsï also appears in the reciprocal form of applicative constructions:

(49) a. atá-p’era-s-∅-ka=ksi
   strike-RECP-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1/3PL.SBJ
   ‘We struck each other.’

b. atá-tsï-p’era-a-s-∅-ka=ksi
   strike-APPL-RECP-DISTR-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1/3PL.SBJ
   sapí-icha-ni
   child-PL-OBJT
   ‘We struck each other’s children.’

c. pyá-tsï-p’era-a-s-∅-ka=ksi
   buy-APPL-RECP-DISTR-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1/3PL.SBJ
   kúchi-icha-ni
   pig-PL-OBJT
   ‘We bought pigs from each other.’

d. ú-tsï-p’era-s-∅-ti=ksi
   do/make-APPL-RECP-PRF-PRS-3IND=1/3PL.SBJ t’irékwa
   food
   ‘They made food for each other.’

While in (49a) a monotransitive verb is reciprocalized, in (49b, c and d) this morphological process affects applicative verbs. The co-occurrence of -ku or
-chi and the reciprocal morpheme is ungrammatical—compare (49c) and (49d) with *pyáchip’eraskaksí and *úkup’erastiksí. The co-referentiality between the subject and the applied argument, as well as the reduction of the syntactic valence caused by reciprocalization, is incompatible with the requirements of -ku or -chi. As stated above, the participant introduced by these morphemes must be encoded as an object whose referent cannot be the agent. Therefore, the suffix -tsí is used in P’orhépecha to allow the new argument to be co-referential with the subject. For example, (49b) describes an event in which X hit the child or the children of Y, and Y hit the child or children of X; therefore, the action of X involves a patient within the domain of Y, while the action of Y involves a patient within the domain of X. In (49c, d), X and Y are agent or recipient alternately, so one theme passes from X to Y and another passes from Y to X. In all of the sentences in (49), when X is the agent, s/he directs his/her action toward Y, in whose domain the patient/theme is or becomes located, while an inverse relationship is obtained when Y is the agent. Therefore, in each subevent of the reciprocal situation, the patient/theme is located in a domain that does not correspond to that of the agent.

The examples (44–49) evidence that -mi and -tsí are allomorphs of the applicative suffixes -ku and -chi in contexts where applicative predicates are affected by morphemes which block the realization of the applied argument in object function. This allomorphy could be related to the fact that in these contexts there is no applied object co-occurring with the subject, which is the case when applicative verbs undergo morphosyntactic processes that alter the expression of verbal arguments (passivization, reciprocalization, and indefinite object marking). Therefore, the condition that seems to motivate the differentiation between participants and non-participants in the speech act entailed by the opposition -chi/-ku is no longer present. The 3rd and 1st/2nd person features are neutralized in the morphemes -mi and -tsí, which mark the applied argument in passive and in reciprocal or indefinite constructions, respectively.

Finally, it is worth noting that the verbal bases that present the sequence [tsí-p’era] allow the suffixation of -na (in exactly the same way as non-derived ditransitive verbs exhibiting reciprocalization). This results in impersonal constructions where the theme may or may not be promoted to subject, as exemplified in (50).

(50) ishú pyá-tsí-p’era-na-s-∅-ti=ksí wíchu-icha(-ni)
here buy-APPL-RECP-PASS-PRF-PRS-3IND=1/3PL.SBJ dog-PL-OBJT
‘Here they bought dogs from/for each other.’/‘Here dogs were bought from/for each other.’
However, in contrast with non-derived ditransitive verbs, applicative constructions with an applied argument suppressed by -p’i do not allow sentences with a 1st/2nd person patient/theme, as shown in (51), nor canonical passive constructions with the theme encoded in subject function, as in (52).

(51) *pá-tsí-p’i-s-Ø-ti=kini
    take/carry-APPL-INDF.OBJ-PRF-PRS-3IND=2SG.OBJ
    Intended reading: ‘S/he took you to somebody else.’

(52) *ts’ımá tsúntsu-icha pyá-tsí-p’i-na-s-Ø-ti
    those pot-PL buy-APPL-INDF.OBJ-PASS-PRF-PRS-3IND
    Intended reading: ‘Those pots were bought for somebody else/people.’

The fact that sentences such as (51) and (52) are rejected shows that both a patient/theme ranked higher than the applied argument on the person hierarchy and a patient/theme encoded as the subject of a canonical passive block any possibility of producing an applicative construction. Consequently, the addition of a new participant is only allowed in oblique function—see examples (20) and (22).21 This shows that dissimilarities exist between constructions with non-derived ditransitive verbs and those with monotransitive verbs having undergone applicativization, where the applied argument is generally not an argument of the base verb.

4.2.2 For the Benefit of the Agent: Constructions with -kurhi

In the case of verbs that have undergone applicativization, adding the suffix -kurhi yields ungrammatical constructions if co-referentiality between the subject and the new participant is intended, that is, in situations where the action of the agent is directed at itself (indirect reflexive).22

21 The only case I have registered in which these restrictions are overthrown is with the verbal base eyá-ku/-chi ‘promise’, which behaves in the same way as non-derived ditransitive verbs; for example, eyá(tsi)p’iskakin ‘I promised you to someone’, and t’ú eyá(tsi)p’ínaska ‘you were promised to someone’ (for instance, in marriage). As shown in these examples, when -p’i suppresses the goal introduced by -ku/-chi it is possible to omit the applicative marker -tsí, a fact that could be attributed to the lexicalization that this verbal form seems to present.

22 Zavala (2000:713, 2013) considers as a common characteristic of Mesoamerican languages that applicative constructions are not permissible if the subject is co-referential with the possessor. Although the same behavior can be observed in P’orhépecha—see examples in (55)—the restriction on the use of applicative constructions is not limited to predicates where the agent is the possessor.
The ungrammaticality of (53a, b) can be explained in the same way as that of the sentences in (49) where the reciprocal morpheme -p’era co-occurs with -ku or -chi. However, unlike the sentences in (49), which do allow the co-appearance of -tśi + -p’era, the sequence -tśi-kurhi is not allowed, as can be seen in (53c). This is due to the difference between reciprocal and reflexive constructions. In reciprocal sentences with prior applicativization there are two events. In each of them the action of the agent is directed to another participant; yet in constructions of the type ‘S/he bought him/herself something’, the agent is also the recipient. The ungrammaticality of (53c) arises from the aforementioned fact that in P’orhépecha the applied argument and the agent must necessarily have different referents; in other words, they cannot co-refer. The only possible way in which the agent can also be the beneficiary or recipient is shown in the sentences in (54).

(54) a. xī pyá-ku-kurhi-a-ka ma wíchu-ni
1sg buy-3appl-mdl/refl-fut-3ind one dog-objt
‘I bought myself a dog.’

b. Lúpi ú-kurhi-sīn-∅-ti kurhínta
Lupe do/make-mdl/refl-hab-prs-3ind bread
‘Lupe makes herself bread.’

c. xatsíra-kurhi-a-ka=ni itsī
put/serve-mdl/refl-fut-1/2ind=1sg.sbj water
‘I will pour myself some water.’
d. énka k’wirípu-echa eráku-kwarhi-am-ka
   SBR people/person-PL choose/select-MDL/REFL-HAB.PST-SBJV

   sánteru ampárhati washántsïkwa-echa-ni
   more good chair-PL-OBJT

   ‘...how people used to choose the best seats for themselves.’ (San Lukasí 14(7))

  e. ampákiti ma pedásu p’ikú-kurhi-s-∅-ti
     good one piece take.off/pull.off-MDL/REFL-PRF-PRS-31ND

     ‘He pulled off a good piece for himself.’ (imaka akuintsintaka.17)

As can be observed in (54) the suffix -kurhi is directly attached to the verb; therefore, the stem has no valence-increasing morpheme. Examples (53) and (54) show that P’orhépecha differs from other languages in which reflexive constructions can indicate co-referentiality between the subject and the argument introduced by an applicative morpheme (Ngonyani 1996:115, Zavala 2000:691, Creissels 2004:6, Guerrero 2006:138). The morpheme -kurhi, as stated by Nava (1998, 2004), can be considered a middle/reflexive voice marker. This explains its use in indirect reflexive situations (the subject acts for its own benefit), as well as in contexts where the subject is the possessor of an entity. The latter situation can be seen in the following examples (see also Monzón 2004):

(55)  a. Pédru wántiku-kurhi-s-∅-ti kúchi-ni
       Pedro kill-MDL/REFL-PRF-PRS-31ND pig-OBJT

       ‘Pedro killed his pig.’

  b. xí xatsí-kurhi-s-∅-ka tumína
     1sg have-MDL/REFL-PRF-PRS-1/21ND money

     ‘I have my money.’

  c. ashá-kurhi-s-∅-ti ma karákata
      send-MDL/REFL-PRF-PRS-31ND one writings

     ‘S/he sent her/his letter.’/‘S/he sent a letter for her/himself.’

  d. p’ikú-kurhi-s-∅-ka=ni shénkwa
      take.off/pull.off-MDL/REFL-PRF-PRS-1/21ND=1sg.SBJ berry

      anátapu-rhu
      tree-LOC

     ‘I picked berries from my tree.’/‘I picked berries from the tree for me.’
In (54) and (55) the suffix -kurhi indicates that the event is focused on the subject or that the event is directed towards or performed in the domain of the subject/agent. It therefore follows that the patient/theme in (54) and (55) has to be or become situated within the domain of the agent; i.e., the patient/theme must be under the control of the agent. Accordingly, in these constructions the subject is recognized as the recipient or possessor of the theme, without any increase in the number of participants. In these cases, the function of -kurhi is the opposite of that of applicative morphemes; as previously stated the latter require non-identity (no co-referentiality) between the agent and the applied argument.

The behavior of the suffix -kurhi coincides with the functions that have been recognized in other languages regarding middle voice morphemes. For example, Mel'čuk (1994:146) states that in middle voice constructions the action is focused in some way on the referent of the grammatical subject or is, at least, directed towards it. Therefore, the middle voice can indicate that the subject acts on itself (reflexive interpretation), for its own interest, or on behalf of an entity that belongs to it (benefactive interpretation).

According to the analysis of LaPolla on similar constructions in Dulong/Rawang (2000:292–293, 306), those in (54) and (55) must be distinguished from applicative constructions. The occurrence of -kurhi on a verbal base generally reduces the syntactic valence, but never increases it; the beneficiary and/or possessor role that its use may entail is limited to cases where the beneficiary and the agent have the same referent. Accordingly, the middle/reflexive value of -kurhi contrasts with that of the applicative suffixes, and its usage indicates the typical roles of the applied arguments—recipient, beneficiary or possessor—in situations where the action, instead of being directed to a new participant, remains in the domain of the subject/agent.

4.3 Applicatives and Internal Possession

In P’orhépecha an atypical case of applicative constructions exists in which there is no valence increase (see Dixon and Aikhenvald 2000b, Zavala 2000, and Creissels 2004 regarding the same phenomenon in other languages). This occurs in events involving a possessive relationship where an external possession construction is expected. In (56), the contrast between an internal
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possession (IP) construction and an external possession (EP) applicative construction is shown.

(56) a. *eshé-s-∅-ka=ni [Xwánu-iri wichu-ni]
    see-prf-prs-1/2ind=1sg.sbj [Juan-gen dog-objt]
    'I saw Juan's dog.'

b. *eshé-ku-s-∅-ka=ni wíchu-ri Xwánu-ni
    see-3appl-prf-prs-1/2ind=1sg.sbj dog-objt Juan-objt
    'I saw Juan's dog (while he was carrying/walking it) (lit. I saw Juan (his) dog).'

In the monotransitive sentence (56a) the possessor Xwánu bears the genitive marker that signals its dependence on the nominal head wíchu. Sentence (56b) is a ditransitive EP construction in which the applicative suffix allows the expression of the possessor in object function. Although sentences such as (56b) are expected when the verbal stem has an applicative morpheme, I have found predicates with -ku in which the possessor remains internal to a genitive NP, yet the inclusion of a new participant is ruled out even though such constructions are monotransitive. This is exemplified in (57).

(57) a. *eshé-ku-s-∅-ka=ni [kabáyu Felípi-iri-ni]
    see-3appl-prf-prs-1/2ind=1sg.sbj [horse Felipe-gen-objt]
    (*Pédru-ni)
    (Pedro-objt)
    'I saw Felipe's horse (while he was with/riding it).'
    *'I saw Pedro with/riding Felipe's horse.'

b. *xatsí-ku-s-∅-ka=ni [Xwánu-iri tumína-ri]
    have-3appl-prf-prs-1/2ind=1sg.sbj [Juan-gen money-objt]
    (*Maria-ni)
    (Maria-objt)
    'I have Juan's money.'
    *'I have Juan's money for Maria.'
c. \textit{wini-ra-ku-s-∅-ka=ni}  
get.full-CAUS-3APPL-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ  

\[\text{[Maria-eri \ pósá-ni]} \ (\text{*acháati-ni})\]  
\[\text{[Maria-GEN \ well-OBJT]} \ (\text{man-OBJT})\]  
'I filled Maria's well.'  
*’I filled Maria's well for the man.’

In contrast to the sentences in (57), sentences such as (58) are ungrammatical given that the occurrence of \textit{-chi} requires the syntactic expression of a 1st/2nd person object corresponding to the applied argument.

\textit{(58)}  
\textit{xatsí-chi-s-∅-ti \ xuchíiti \ tumíná-ni}  
have-1/2APPL-PRF-PRS-3IND \ 1SG.Poss \ money-OBJT  
Intended reading: ‘S/he has my money.’

Further research is needed to clarify the contexts and/or the semantic or discourse factors that determine the appropriateness of constructions such as those in (57). They could then be compared with reported cases in other languages where the applied object is not realized in object function (see references above), and in particular with Central Zoque (Zavala 2013) where the possessor, marked on the verb by the applicative affix, is not promoted to PO. It is worth noting that in the constructions in (57) \textit{-ku} seems to retain certain properties of P’orhépecha applicative suffixes. Firstly, although the participant to which \textit{-ku} refers is not encoded in an independent NP, it is realized as the complement of an object NP encoding an argument. Secondly, these constructions cannot be passivized; the passivization of a predicate exhibiting applicative morphology requires the expression of the possessor in an independent NP, as shown in (59a) in contrast to (59b).

\textit{(59)}  
a. \textit{Felípi \ eshé-mi-na-s-∅-ti \ kabáyu-ni}  
Felipe \ see-APPL-PASS-PRF-PRS-3IND \ horse-OBJT  
‘Felipe was seen with/riding his horse (lit. Felipe was seen (his) horse).’

b. *\textit{kabáyu \ Felípi-iri \ eshé-ku/mi-na-s-∅-ti}  
horse \ Felipe-GEN \ see-3APPL/APPL-PASS-PRF-PRS-3IND  
Intended reading: ‘Felipe’s horse was seen.’
4.4 Conclusions

Porhépecha is a language in which the verbal suffixes -ku (for 3rd person) and -chi (for 1st and 2nd person) trigger a valence increase. These morphemes are not instances of grammatical or anaphoric agreement, but are applicative affixes. The suffixes -ku and -chi introduce a semantically dative-like participant in object function and, at the same time, specify the person features of this core argument. The opposition between non-participants in the speech act and participants in the speech act conveyed by these morphemes seems to be related to the typically human character of the referent associated with the applied argument and to the need to differentiate the applied object from the subject. With agentive verbs this difference is crucial, given that the relationship between the applied object and the subject/agent is established based on the differentiation between their domains.

The allomorphy that occurs when the applicativized verb undergoes morpholexical processes that alter the expression of the applied argument can be explained by the fact that -ku and -chi convey the presence of a syntactic object (3rd and 1st/2nd persons, respectively). When passivizing these predicates, the applied argument is promoted to subject, and as a result, the occurrence of -ku or -chi is banned. The same applies in the case of reciprocal constructions and of verbal stems with the indefinite human object morpheme, which blocks the syntactic realization of the applied argument in object function. In all three cases, the resulting constructions no longer exhibit the co-occurrence of a subject and an applied object; therefore the condition that seems to motivate the -ku/-chi differentiation between 3rd and 1st/2nd person disappears. This opposition is neutralized in the allomorphs -mi and -tsi, which mark the applied argument in the passive form, and in constructions with the reciprocal or indefinite object morphemes, respectively.

Porhépecha applicative suffixes signal that the event denoted by the base verb is directed towards (or is carried out in relation to) a domain other than that of the subject/agent and, as such, corresponds to the applied argument. If there is no such differentiation between the domain of the subject/agent and that of another participant, it is impossible to use the applicative construction. In contrast to applicative suffixes, the middle/reflexive morpheme -kurhi indicates that the event stays within the domain of the subject. Therefore, the addition of this morpheme to monotransitive verbs is used both to signal co-referentiality between the subject/agent and the patient/theme, and to indicate situations in which the subject, in addition to being the agent, is the recipient/beneficiary or possessor of the patient/theme.
Not all verbs allow the alternative expression of a participant as an applied object or as an oblique. The most common—and unrestricted—alternative constructions are those where the new participant can be introduced by the loanword *para*, while those in which the postposition *xinkóni* or the case marker -*nkuni* flag this participant are subject to constraints usually related to the animacy of the participant and the verb type.

A monotransitive verb cannot be applicativized under two circumstances. The first is when the patient/theme argument of the base verb is more prominent on the person hierarchy than the new participant. This fact is evidence that P’orhépecha imposes a harmonic alignment between the relative position of the non-agent core arguments on the person hierarchy and the syntactic primacy of PO over SO (PO>SO), which reflects a thematic ranking of core arguments. Accordingly, constructions with an SO that is more prominent on the person scale than the PO are ungrammatical. The second circumstance under which applicativization is blocked is when the patient/theme of the base verb displays PO behavioral properties due to the co-referentiality between it and the agent, or due to its promotion to the passive subject. Consequently, given a monotransitive verb with a patient/theme exhibiting any of the properties mentioned above, if the event referred to includes a recipient/beneficiary/goal/source, this participant can only be encoded in oblique function.

Ditransitive constructions resulting from the presence of applicative morphemes exhibit a secundative behavioral pattern, as do non-derived ditransitive verbs; only the applied object can display PO behavioral properties. The range of thematic roles that applied arguments in P’orhépecha may bear supports the thematic role rankings recipient/beneficiary/goal/source > patient/theme and possessor > possessum, derived from the argument’s access to PO. In contrast with non-derived ditransitive verbs, when the applied argument is suppressed by -*p’i*, sentences with a 1st or 2nd person patient/theme are not allowed, nor are canonical passive constructions in which the patient/theme is promoted to subject. This proves that there are behavioral differences between constructions with non-derived ditransitive verbs and monotransitive verbs having undergone applicativization.

Finally, atypical applicative constructions exist in P’orhépecha in which the possessor, referred to by the 3rd person applicative suffix -*ku*, is encoded in an object genitive phrase (IP). Although in these cases there is no syntactic valence increase, the possessum is located within the domain of a participant other than the subject. Unlike EP constructions, these sentences do not allow passivization.

A summary of the morphosyntactic properties of P’orhépecha applicative constructions is given in the following table.
**TABLE 8  Applicative constructions: alternative patterns and construction split**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicative markers that introduce an applied object</th>
<th>Applicative allomorphs when the applied argument is not encoded in object function</th>
<th>Syntactic function of applied objects</th>
<th>Constraints on applicative constructions stemming from monoto-transitive verbs</th>
<th>Oblique marking of semantically dative-like participants in non-applicative constructions</th>
<th>Constraints on alternative oblique constructions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*-chi 1st/2nd person</td>
<td>*-mi + passive</td>
<td>PO</td>
<td>*Patient/theme higher on the person hierarchy than the applied object</td>
<td>Comitative: *xinkóni/-nku</td>
<td>Lexical restrictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*-ku 3rd person</td>
<td>*-tsi + reciprocal or indefinite object</td>
<td>*Patient/theme co-referential with the agent</td>
<td></td>
<td>*New participant in comitative phrase if patient/theme has low animacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Patient/theme undergoing passivization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Action remaining in the agent's domain, which triggers -kurhi constructions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
P’orhépecha has three suffixes, -ra, -ta, and -tara, which introduce a participant with the role of causer or instrument. When functioning as causative markers, these suffixes generate a syntactic valence increase of both intransitive and monotransitive verbs. Inversely, when these morphemes introduce an instrument, they usually do not induce an increase in the syntactic valence. In fact, as will be shown below, there are certain conditions that limit the generation of constructions with an instrumental object.

This chapter is organized as follows: In 5.1, the way in which the argument structure of morphological causatives is understood in this work is described. This section also deals with the distribution of the causative morphemes -ra, -ta, and -tara, as well as with the use of double causative marking when introducing a single causative event. In 5.2, ditransitive constructions resulting from the causativization process are analyzed, while section 5.3 focuses on causative clauses in which the syntactic expression of the causee is affected by the presence of the middle/reflexive suffix -kurhi. Finally, section 5.4 covers constructions in which causative suffixes have an instrumental value.

5.1 Morphological Causatives

The use of verbal affixes in expressing causative situations is very common in P’orhépecha. Causation can be characterized, following Shibatani (1976b) and Comrie (1981:161, 1985:330, 1989:165–166), as a complex situation in which two events are involved: a CAUSE or causing event (E1), and the EFFECT/RESULT event or caused event (E2). Causative affixes can therefore be defined as derivative mechanisms involving the notion of CAUSE (E1), whereby a causer (agent) is introduced that triggers the event denoted by the base predicate (E2). What would otherwise be the subject of E2 in a non-causativized predicate (agent or patient/theme) becomes the causee of the causative construction.

In P’orhépecha, causative suffixes can combine with intransitive and monotransitive base verbs, resulting in the syntactic valence increase of the
derived stem. The causer is encoded as the syntactic subject, while the original subject of the base predicate (causee) is demoted to object function. In (1b) and (2b) sentences with intransitive verbs denoting a change of state are presented.

(1) a. purhú niní-s-∅-ti
    squash ripen-PRF-PRS-3IND
    'The squash ripened.'

    b. María niní-ra-∅-s-ti purhú-ni
    Maria ripen-CAUS-PRF-PRS-3IND squash-OBJT
    'Maria cooked the squash (lit. Maria caused the squash to ripen).'

(2) a. wichu kwaká-s-∅-ti
    dog get.wet-PRF-PRS-3IND
    'The dog got wet.'

    b. Pédru kwaká-ra-s-∅-ti wichu-ni
    Pedro get.wet-CAUS-PRF-PRS-3IND dog-OBJT
    'Pedro got the dog wet (lit. wet the dog).'

In (3b) the causativization of an agentive intransitive verb is shown, and in (4b) that of a monotransitive verb:

(3) a. sapí piré-s-∅-ti
    child sing-PRF-PRS-3IND
    'The child sang.'

    b. María piré-ra-s-∅-ti sapí-ni
    Maria sing-CAUS-PRF-PRS-3IND child-OBJT
    'Maria made the child sing.'

(4) a. Xwánu xwá-s-∅-ti tsíri
    Juan bring-PRF-PRS-3IND corn
    'Juan brought some corn.'

    b. María xwá-ra-s-∅-ti Xwánu-ni tsíri
    Maria bring-CAUS-PRF-PRS-3IND Juan-OBJT corn
    'Maria made Juan bring some corn.'
As in (1b) and (2b), in the causative constructions in (3b) and (4b) the arguments of the base predicate (E2) combine with the agent argument (causer) of the causing event (E1), resulting in a new and complex argument structure (cf. Comrie 1985, Haspelmath 2002, Alsina 1992, 1997, Sandler and Spencer 1998:228–231, Dixon 2000:31). When agentive predicates are causativized, as in (3b) and (4b), the agent of E2 bears attributes of a patient argument; i.e., it is affected somehow by the action of the causer. Therefore I maintain, as suggested by Rizzi (1986:534), Jackendoff (1990), and Alsina (1992), that the causee may have two thematic roles in the causative event: that which corresponds to its semantic function in the base predicate (E2) and that of patient, which stems from its relationship with the causer in the new complex event.

In (5–7), representations of the argument structure of the causative predicates (1b), (3b), and (4b) are presented. In (5), the single argument of the base predicate is a patient; therefore, in the causative construction the causee (the base predicate argument demoted from subject function by causative suffixation) is both the patient of ‘ripen’ and of the cause event. In (6) and (7), the agent of the base predicate becomes the causee in the causative construction, where it bears an agent role in addition to that of patient of the cause event (this merging of roles is represented as <PAT-AG>).

(5) Argument structure of \textit{niní-ra} \\
\textit{ripen-CAUS} \\
\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
\text{a. niní} & \text{[<PAT>]} \\
\text{b. niní-ra} & \text{[<PAT>]} \\
\hline
\text{Causer} & \text{Causee} \\
\text{Syntactic realization} & \text{SBJ OBJ} \\
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

(6) Argument structure of \textit{piré-ra} \\
\textit{sing-CAUS} \\
\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
\text{a. piré} & \text{[<AG’>]} \\
\text{b. piré-ra} & \text{[<PAT-AG’>]} \\
\hline
\text{Causer} & \text{Causee} \\
\text{Syntactic realization} & \text{SBJ OBJ} \\
\end{tabular}
\end{center}
(7) Argument structure of \textit{xwá-ra}
\textit{bring-CAUS}

\begin{tabular}{ll}
a. xwá & [\textit{CAUSE} \texttt{<AG'>} \texttt{<TH>}] \\
b. xwá-ra & [\textit{CAUSE} \texttt{<AG>} \texttt{<PAT-AG'>} \texttt{<TH>}] \\
\end{tabular}

Causer Causee

\begin{tabular}{llll}
Syntactic realization & SBJ & OBJ & OBJ \\
\end{tabular}

5.1.1 \textit{Causative Allomorphs}

The P’orhepecha causative allomorphs -\textit{ra} and -\textit{ta}, and their combination in -\textit{tara}, have a morphologically determined distribution (cf. Maldonado and Nava 2002, Bucio 2004).\footnote{The suffixes -\textit{ra}, -\textit{ta}, and -\textit{tara} are distinguished from transitive resolution formatives; the latter suffixes only occur with dependent roots, are lexically determined, and it is not possible to establish a derivative relationship between the transitive form (causative), and its intransitive counterpart (non-causative) (cf. Comrie 1981:161, Haspelmath 1993). Therefore, I disagree with the analysis of Maldonado and Nava (2002) who consider these formatives to be causative morphemes.}

In accounting for this distribution, it is important to recall that in P’orhepecha, with the exception of irregular verbs, the main stress falls on the last vowel of the root, thus indicating its morphological boundary. Irregular verbs are dependent monosyllabic roots; in the stems presenting these roots the stress falls on the formative suffixes.\footnote{As noted in Chapter 1, irregular verbal roots combine with the formative -\textit{ra} or -\textit{rha} (see Foster 1969:66).}

The causative -\textit{ra} occurs after basic roots, i.e., those that may function as stems. It also appears with the set of change of state verbal roots encoding property concepts, which generally take -\textit{pi}, -\textit{mi}, or -\textit{mpi} as formatives.

Examples of basic intransitive roots suffixed with -\textit{ra} are shown in (8).

(8) a. té-ra-s-∅-ti istî-ni
get.sweet-CAUS-PRF-PRS-3IND water-OBJ
’S/he sweetened the water.’

b. inchá-ra-nt’a-a-ti imá-eri trigu-ni
get.in/into-CAUS-ITR-FUT-3IND that-GEN wheat-OBJ
‘He will get his wheat in.’ (San Lukasî 3(17))
c. ásì=rini  t’ū  ché-ra-∅
    NEG=1SG.OBJ 2SG get.afraid-CAUS-IMP
    ‘Don’t frighten me.’ (no ambakiti.19)

In (9), examples with inchoative intransitive roots that combine with the
formatives -pi, -mi, and -ki are given.3

(9) a. Lúpi  urápe-ra-sín-∅-ti  shukúparhakwa
    Lupe  get.white-CAUS-HAB-PRS-3IND  clothes
    ‘Lupe whitens clothes.’

    b. itúme-ra-s-∅-ti  k’wíripita-ni
    get.salty-CAUS-PRF-PRS-3IND  meat-OBJT
    ‘S/he salted the meat.’

    c. Jesúsï  ampáke-ra-a-nt'a-s-p-ti
    Jesus  get.clean-CAUS-DISTR-ITR-PRF-PST-3IND
    wánikwa  p’aménchati-icha-ni
    a.lot  sick.person-pl-OBJT
    ‘Jesus cured a lot of sick people (lit. cleaned them).’ (San Lukasï 4 (40))

In (10), basic monotransitive roots causativized with -ra are illustrated.

(10) a. imá=ksini  eshé-ra-a-ti  ma  k’éri  kwártu-ni
    that=2PL.OBJ  see-CAUS-FUT-3IND  one  big  room-OBJT
    ‘He will show you a big room.’ (San Markusï 14(15))

    b. pyá-ra-s-∅-ka=ni  María-ni  t’atsíni
    buy-CAUS-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.OBJ  María-OBJT  bean
    ‘I made Maria buy beans.’

    c. Lúpi  urhú-ra-sín-∅-ti  Eli-ni  tsíri
    Lupe  grind-CAUS-HAB-PRS-3IND  Eli-OBJT  corn
    ‘Lupe makes Eli grind corn.’

3 These suffixes exhibit a vowel change from /i/ to /e/ when followed by the causative suffix.
d. imá-ni-ksí pá-ra-s-p-ti imá-eri
    that-OBJT=1/3PL.SBJ take/carry-CAUS-PRF-PST-3IND that-GEN

    krúsi-ni
cross-OBJT
    'They forced him to carry his cross.' (San Markusí 15(23))

The causative allomorph -ta appears with verbal bases exhibiting spatial suffixes (see Chapter 6) such as -ch'u in (11a) and -arha in (11b).

(11) a. niní-ch'u-ta-s-∅-ti purhú-ni
    ripen-bottom-CAUS-PRF-PRS-3IND squash-OBJT
    'S/he cooked the bottom of the squash.'

    b. kawásï p'amé-arha-ta-s-∅-ti Martíni-ni
    hot.pepper ache-central-CAUS-PRF-PRS-3IND Martin-OBJT
    'The hot pepper caused Martin's stomachache.'

The sentences in (11) are the causative forms of purhú niních'usti 'The bottom of the squash ripened' and Martíni p'améarhasti 'Martin has a stomachache'. The contrast between the causative predicate niníran 'caused something to ripen', seen in (1b), and that seen in (11a), shows that the causative allomorph is determined by the morphological conformation of the verbal base. The causative -ta also occurs after verbal bases with the formatives -a and -rhi (see Bucio 2004). Examples of this can be seen in (12) and (13), with roots that combine with the formatives -rhi and -a, respectively.

(12) a. akwárhi-ta-s-∅-ti María-ni
    get.hurt-CAUS-PRF-PRS-3IND María-OBJT
    'S/he hurt Maria.'

    b. apárhi-ta-s-∅-ti
    get.burned/sweat-CAUS-PRF-PRS-3IND
    'S/he burned it.'

    c. mórhi-ta-a-ka=ni sapí-ni yorhékwa-rhu
    cross-CAUS-FUT-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ child-OBJT river-LOC
    'I will make the child cross the river.'/I will take the child across the river.'
(13) a. María purú-a-ta-s-∅-ti itsí-ni  
    Maria  boil-CAUS-PRF-PRS-3IND water-OBJT  
    'Maria boiled the water.'

b. sharhía-ta-s-∅-ti sapí-ni  
    swim-CAUS-PRF-PRS-3IND child-OBJT  
    'S/he made the child swim.'

c. xí María-ni mía-ta-nt'a-s-∅-ka=ni  
    1SG Maria-OBJT remember-CAUS-ITR-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ  
    imá-ni wantántskwa-ni  
    that-OBJT story-OBJT  
    'I made Maria recall that story.'

The suffix -ta can also be found in verbal bases in which the distribution rule is unclear. This suggests that in these cases the choice of the causative allomorph is lexically determined (i.e., listed in the lexicon):

(14) a. shirími-ta-s-∅-ti=ksi
    tickle-CAUS-PRF-PRS-3IND=2PL.OBJ  
    'S/he tickled you (PL).'

b. washáka-ta-a-s-p-∅-ti=ksi yámintu
    sit.down-CAUS-DISTR-PRF-PST-3IND=1/3PL.SBJ everybody  
    k’wirípu-echa-ni  
    people-PL-OBJT  
    'They made all the people sit down.' (San Lukasí 9(15))

c. sikwáme tsínt’a-ta-a-ti wíchu-ni
    wizard  revive-CAUS-FUT-3IND dog-OBJT  
    'The wizard will revive the dog.'

d. Rósa k’wi-s-ta-a-ti charháku-ni
    Rosa  fall.asleep-S-CAUS-FUT-3IND baby-OBJT  
    'Rosa will make the baby sleep.'

---

4 In the case of certain verbs the causative allomorph -ta is preceded by the suffix -s, as in (14d). Its function is unclear and requires further research.
The causative -tara is added to verbal bases that present one or more suffixes after the root (excluding the spatial morphemes and the aforementioned formative affixes), and to irregular verbs (see Nava 2004:155). Examples with intransitive verbs are shown in (15), and with monotransitive verbs in (16).

(15) a. terékurhi-tara-s-∅-ti Pédru-ni
    laugh-CAUS-PRF-PRS-3IND Pedro-OBJT
    ‘S/he made Pedro laugh.’

    b. Pédru aogári-tara-s-∅-ti wíchu-ni
    Pedro drown-CAUS-PRF-PRS-3IND dog-OBJT
    ‘Pedro drowned the dog.’

    c. éskar=rini éska-tara-nt’a-a-ka
    SBR=1SG.OBJ open.the.eyes-CAUS-ITR-FUT-SBJV, -FUT-SBJV
    ‘. . . that he give me back my sight (lit. that he makes me open my eyes
    again).’ (San Lukasí 18(41))

    d. kawíkwa p’améncha-tara-∅-s-ti Xwánu-ni
    drink get.sick-CAUS-PRF-PRS-3IND Juan-OBJT
    ‘The drink made Juan sick.’

(16) a. xí wántiku-tara-s-∅-ka=ni kúchi-ni Pédru-ni
    1SG kill-CAUS-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ pig-OBJT Pedro-OBJT
    ‘I made Pedro kill the pig.’

    b. ka xuchá-eri-ni xurák’u-tara-ni-ts’ini
    and 1PL-GEN-OBJT leave-CAUS-NF=1PL.OBJ
    ‘. . . and they made us leave ours.’ (japunda.29)

    c. Pédru=rini mítata-s-∅-ti pwértan-ni
    Pedro=1SG.OBJ open-CAUS-PRF-PRS-3IND door-OBJT
    ‘Pedro made me open the door.’

    d. ka mámaru ampé=ksëni mítata-ni
    and several thing=2PL.OBJ know/realize-CAUS-NF
    ‘. . . and several other things that I will make you (PL) know.’ (San Lukasí 21(15))
In (17) the causative forms of the irregular verbs *nírá ‘go’* and *werá ‘cry’* are exemplified.

(17)  
\[\begin{align*}
a. \text{ni-tará-a-ka}=ni & \quad \text{tumpí-ni} \\
& \quad \text{go-CAUS-FUT-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ} \quad \text{boy-OBJT} \\
& \text{‘I will make the boy go.’} \\
b. \text{síráata} & \quad \text{we-tará-sín-∅-ti} \quad \text{Martíni-ni} \\
& \quad \text{smoke} \quad \text{cry-CAUS-HAB-PRS-3IND} \quad \text{Martin-OBJT} \\
& \text{‘The smoke makes Martin cry.’} \\
\end{align*}\]

The distribution of P’orhépecha causative allomorphs is generally conditioned by the morphological configuration of the predicate to which they are suffixed; i.e., the language lacks specialized causative allomorphs to indicate a particular type of causation. Nevertheless, as I will demonstrate in the next section, when a single causative event is introduced, P’orhépecha allows double causative marking, which forces an indirect causation reading of the predicate.

### 5.1.2 Double Causative Marking and Indirect Causation

P’orhépecha verbs that are causativized by *-ra* or *-ta* may present a second causative marker that, given the morphological conditioning of the causative allomorphs, must be *-tara*. These verbal stems may refer to a single causative event, in which case they have the same semantic and syntactic valence as those with a single causative morpheme. These causative constructions with double causative marking are employed to indicate or emphasize indirect causation (see Kulikov 1993, and Dixon 2000 regarding this phenomenon in other languages).

According to the studies of Shibatani (1976b, 2002b) and Shibatani and Pardeshi (2002) the causation phenomenon involves a cognitive/semantic continuum, the extremes of which correspond to manipulative/direct causation, and to directive/indirect causation. In prototypical direct causation there is a physical manipulation of the causee by the causer; the execution of E2 depends completely on the action of the causer, without any mediation between the cause and the caused event (E1 and E2 show spatio-temporal overlap). In prototypical indirect causation, the control of the causer over

---

5 Example (17b) and those in (15) clearly demonstrate, as proposed by Bucio (2004), that *-tara* is not a suffix used exclusively for indirect causation as claimed by Maldonado and Nava (2002).

6 Stems with double causative marking presented in this section are formally identical to those involving causativized predicates that undergo a new process of causativization, which are discussed in 5.2.3 and in 7.4.
the caused event is mediated by the action of the causee (the causer is not physically involved in the caused event). It is therefore possible to recognize two subevents, each one with an agent and, consequently, with potentially different spatio-temporal profiles (typically there is no integration of E1 and E2).

For example, the causer instructs the causee, who carries out the commanded event with a higher or lower degree of volition.

Between the prototypical poles there are intermediate causative stages in which the characteristics of the manipulative/direct and the directive/indirect causations are combined; for example, a setting where there is a joint action between the causer and the causee or where the causer assists the causee (sociative causatives). In this type of event, there is a spatio-temporal overlap between E1 and E2; therefore, this type of causation leans towards the direct end of the causative continuum. This implies a higher degree of coercion/control of the causer over E2 than in prototypically indirect causation (cf. Kulikov 1993:134, Comrie 1981:164–167, 1985:334, Dixon 2000:68, 73, Givón 1984, 2001b:45, 76–79, Song 1996).

In (18), examples of causativization of intransitive roots are shown, in which the double causative marking -ra-tara expresses a single causative event:

(18) a. ch’aná-ra-tara-s-∅-ka=ri María-ni
    play-CAUS-CAUS-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=2SG.SBJ Maria-OBJT
    ‘You made/told Maria (to) play.’

     b. xí warhá-ra-tara-s-∅-ka=ní wíchu-ní
    1sg dance-CAUS-CAUS-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ dog-OBJT
    ‘I made/told the dog (to) dance (a trained dog).’

The sentences in (18) must necessarily have an indirect reading; for example, if -tara is omitted in (18a), the preferred reading is ‘You played with Maria’ (sociative causative), while in (18b) the absence of -tara favors a reading where the causer physically manipulates the dog. Such meanings are rejected in (18a, b) since the stems exhibit double causative marking.7

7 The fact that double causative marking disallows direct causation readings can be clearly observed in the causativization of lexical middle/reflexive verbs such as akwárhini ‘get hurt’ (akwárhitani ‘hurt’ (12a)) apárhini ‘get burned’ (apárhitani ‘burn’ (12b)), kwákani ‘get wet’ (kwakárani ‘wet’ (2a)), xikwáni ‘bathe.oneself’ (xikwárani ‘bathe someone’), and shukúparhání ‘get dressed’ (-parha ‘convex exterior/back’, shukúparhatani ‘dress someone’). When these stems exhibit one causative marker the preferred reading is a direct one in which the causee lacks agentive features, while the occurrence of a second causative suffix implies an indirect reading with an agentive causee.
The phenomenon recognized by Kulikov (1993:126–127) whereby the sequence of two identical or similar causative affixes is reduced to a single marker can be found in P’orhépecha. The dependent verbal roots that combine with the causative allomorph -ta generally conflate the double marking -ta-tara into the form -tara. Likewise, the verbal bases that combine with -tara do not allow the double causative marking *-tara-tara. Where this sequence might be expected to occur only -tara is used. The first type of reduction can be observed by comparing the pairs of sentences in (19).

(19) a. wirhía-ta-s-∅-ka=ni Pédru-ni
run-CAUS-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ Pedro-OBJT
'I made Pedro run/I ran after Pedro.'

a'. wirhía(-ta)-tara-s-∅-ka=ni Pédru-ni
run-CAUS-CAUS-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ Pedro-OBJT
'I made/told Pedro (to) run.'
*I ran after Pedro.'

b. mórhí-ta-s-∅-ti sapí-ni
cross-CAUS-PRF-PRS-3IND child-OBJT
'S/he made/told the child (to) cross (a place).'/S/he took the child (across a place).'/S/he helped the child cross some place.'

b'. mórhí(-ta)-tara-s-∅-ti sapí-ni
cross-CAUS-CAUS-PRF-PRS-3IND child-OBJT
'S/he made/told the child (to) cross (a place).'
* S/he took the child (across a place).'/S/he helped the child cross some place.'

The sentences in (19a', b') convey double causative marking; therefore, whether the causative suffix -ta is expressed or not, these sentences have an indirect reading. They do not admit a direct or sociative causation reading, i.e., ‘S/he ran after the child’ and ‘S/he helped the child cross some place’, which are the preferred ones in (19a, b), respectively.

Given the ungrammaticality of the sequence *-tara-tara, the semantic differences between single and double causative marking cannot be formally expressed in the case of unergative verbs causativized with -tara.\(^8\)

---

\(^8\) The fact that -tara may correspond to a sequence of two causative morphemes (*-tara-tara) is clear in constructions where two causation processes are involved (see footnote 6).
(20) a. terékurhi-tara-s-∅-ka=ni sapí-ni
    laugh-CAUS-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ child-OBJT
    'I made/told the child (to) laugh.'

    b. tsankwára-tara-s-∅-ka=ni Pédru ni
    jump-CAUS-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ Pedro-OBJT
    'I made/told Pedro (to) jump.'

    c. xiwákurhi-tara-s-∅-ka=ni Pédru ni
    shout-CAUS-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ Pedro-OBJT
    'I made/told Pedro (to) shout.'

The sentences in (20) are used indistinctly to indicate direct causation without
any volition or control on the part of the causee, as well as prototypically indi-
rect causation.

When monotransitive verbs are causativized it is common to find double
causative marking. In fact, this is the most widespread way to causativize
monotransitive verbal roots that are suffixed with -ra:9

(21) a. xi tumpí-ni sipá-ra-tara-s-∅-ka=ni tumína
    1SG boy-OBJT steal-CAUS-CAUS-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ money
    'I made/told the boy (to) steal money.'

    b. María urhú-ra-tara-s-∅ sapí-ni tsíri-ni
    Maria grind-CAUS-CAUS-PRF-PRS-3IND child-OBJT corn-OBJT
    'Maria made/told the child (to) grind the corn.'

    c. xupá-ra-tara-s-∅-ka=ni María-ni
    wash-CAUS-CAUS-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ María-OBJT
    k’waníntikwa-ni
    shawl-OBJT
    'I made/told Maria (to) wash the shawl.'

Therefore, the stems in (20) also allow the readings 'I made/told him/her to make him/her
laugh/jump/shout'.

9 Regarding the possibility of causativizing ditransitive verbs, see Chapter 7.
d. xí Pédrnu- ni ú-ra-tara-a-ka=ní
1SG Pedro-OBJT make/do-CAUS-CAUS-FUT-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ one
tsúntsu
pot
‘I will make/tell Pedro (to) make a pot.’

In all of the sentences in (21) it is possible to omit -tara. According to the speakers consulted, the interpretation of such predicates is the same whether the stem has one or two causative suffixes, but double marking discourages sociative readings (e.g., assistive causation); therefore, double marking seems to emphasize indirect causation. Although further research on these constructions is needed, I have frequently found the use of only one causative marker in P’orhépecha texts. It generally occurs in contexts where the causer exerts a high degree of coercion and/or where the causee has little control or volition—situations that approach the pole of direct causation. This can be observed in the following examples, taken from texts:

(22) a. imá-ni=ksí pá-ra-s-p-tí imá-eri
that-OBJT=1/3PL.SBJ take/carry-CAUS-PRF-PST-3IND that-GEN
krúsi-ni
cross-OBJT
‘They forced him to carry his cross.’ (San Markusí 15(21))

10 Only in the case of the verb eshéni ‘see’ have I registered a significant contrast in meaning related to the presence of double marking: eshérani ‘to show (cause something to be seen)’; eshératarani ‘to tell someone to see something’.

11 Although in the case of sentences such as those in (22) the consulted speakers accept double causative marking, in spontaneous speech the use of a single marker is more common. Neither of the options is limited to a situation entailing a successful causation (regarding the contrast between successful and intended manipulation, see Givón 2001b:44). Therefore, constructions such as the one below are possible:

(i) pá-ra(-tara)-s-∅-ka=ní ka no
 take/carry-CAUS-CAUS-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ and NEG
ú-s-∅-ti
do/make-PRF-PRS-3IND
‘I told him/her to take it (somewhere) and s/he did not do it.’
b. fariseu-echa únta-s-p-ti=ksï winámarhi-ku-ní
    pharisee-pl begin-PRF-PST-3IND=1/3PL.SBJ speak.loud-3APPL-NF

    para=ksï afuersasi wantá-ra-ní mámaru
    to=1/3PL.SBJ forcibly speak-CAUS-NF several

    ampé-teru
    (some)thing-more

    ‘The Pharisees began to yell at him to force him to speak about many things.’ (San Lukasí 11(53))

5.2 Double Object Causative Constructions

In this section the properties of double object constructions derived from the causativization of monotransitive predicates are examined, as well as double object constructions resulting from causativization of previously causativized intransitive verbs. It will be shown that the morphosyntactic properties of the objects in both types of causative constructions exhibit asymmetries in line with the PO/SO pattern exhibited by the Porhépecha ditransitive constructions analyzed in previous chapters. In the two following subsections the encoding and behavioral properties of causativized monotransitive verbs are discussed. In these ditransitive constructions that have a patient/theme and an agentive causee, the latter is the argument displaying PO properties.

5.2.1 Coding Properties

In Porhépecha, the causativization of monotransitive bases always results in ditransitive constructions; therefore, causative morphemes can be considered syntactic valence-increasing mechanisms. In fact, with causativized monotransitive predicates, the coding of the causee in oblique function requires the addition of valence-reducing morphological marking (see 5.3).

Porhépecha double object causative constructions do not allow the patient/theme of the base predicate to outrank the causee on the person scale; therefore, if there is a 1st or 2nd person object enclitic, it must be the causee.

12 The encoding of the causee in oblique function is also allowed without the occurrence of valence-reducing morphology. However, this is restricted to complex predicates where the base resulting from a monotransitive verb that has undergone causativization is subject to applicativization or to a further causative process (see Chapter 7).
If in an event such as that of (23) the theme is 1st or 2nd person, an analytic causative construction must be used, provided there is no additional verbal morphology affecting the syntactic expression of the causee. The fact that in (23) the argument encoded by the 2nd person singular enclitic cannot be the theme, points to the PO status of the causee (PO behavioral properties are discussed in 5.2.2). The causee's ranking higher than a patient/theme regarding syntactic primacy is in line with its dual role (patient of the cause event E₁ and agent of E₂) in double object causative constructions resulting from monotransitive base verbs.

As is the norm with P’orhépecha ditransitive sentences, the order of the NP objects in double object causative constructions is variable; in cases of potential ambiguity, the causee is placed in a preverbal position.

(24) a. Pédru sapí-ni kwidári-tara-s-∅-ti María-ni
Pedro child-objt take.care-CAUS-PRF-PRS-3IND Maria-objt
‘Pedro made the child take care of Maria.’

b. xí Rósa-ni xwá-ra-a-ka maríkwa-ni
1sg Rosa-objt bring-CAUS-FUT-1/2IND girl-objt
‘I will make Rosa bring the girl.’

When there is no question as to the identity of the causee, both objects can appear postverbally in any order, as in (25a, b), or one of them (usually the causee) can be placed in a preverbal position, as in (25c, d):

(25) a. Páblu atá-ra-a-ti Ramóna-ni búrru-ni
Pablo strike-CAUS-FUT-3IND Ramona-objt donkey-objt
‘Pablo will make Ramona strike the donkey.’

b. kachúku-tara-s-∅-ka=ni k’wirípita-ni María-ni
cut-CAUS-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1sg.sbj meat-objt Maria-objt
‘I made Maria cut the meat.’

c. xí Lúpi-ni xwá-ra-s-∅-ka=ni ichárhuta-ni
1sg Lupe-objt bring-CAUS-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1sg.sbj canoe-objt
‘I made Lupe bring the canoe.’
d. xí ichárhuta-ni xwá-ra-s-∅-ka=ni Lúpi-ni
   1sg canoe-objt bring-caus-prf-prs-1/2ind=1sg.sbj Lupe-objt
   ‘I made Lupe bring the canoe.’

5.2.2 Behavioral Properties

In what follows, evidence is provided to show that only one of the objects of ditransitive causative constructions displays the syntactic behavioral properties of P (single object of monotransitive constructions). The argument exhibiting such properties corresponds to the A argument of the monotransitive base verb; i.e., the causee object behaves as PO, as does the applied argument in applicative constructions.

5.2.2.1 Passivization

When causativized monotransitive verbs are passivized, only the causee can be expressed as the syntactic subject:

(26) a. xí xupá-ra(-tara)-na-s-∅-ka k’waníntikwa-ni
   1sg wash-caus-caus-pass-prf-prs-1/2ind shawl-objt
   ‘I was made (caused) to wash the shawl.’

   b. sapí arhúku-tara-na-s-∅-ti kuhínta
   child distribute-caus-pass-prf-prs-3ind bread
   ‘The child was made (caused) to distribute bread.’

   c. Pédru pá-ra(-tara)-na-s-∅-ti Xwánu-ni
   Pedro take/carry-caus-caus-pass-prf-prs-3ind Juan-objt
   ‘Pedro was made (caused) to take Juan (somewhere).’
   *‘Pedro was taken (somewhere) by Juan (on someone’s orders).’

   d. xarhá-s-∅-ti xurhénkwa-echa
   there.is-prf-prs-3ind knowledge-pl

   énka no yámintu-echa múti-tara-na-x-∅-ka
   rel neg all-pl know/caus-caus-pass-hab-prs-sbjv
   ‘There is knowledge that cannot be made knowledgeable to all (lit. that not everybody can be made to know).’ (ji no xukuamiska.149)

As can be seen in (26c), the patient of the base verb ‘kill’ cannot be the subject of the passive construction; this syntactic function is restricted to the causee Pédru, to whom the order to kill is given. Therefore, the passivization of ditransitive causative clauses follows a PO/SO pattern.
5.2.2.2 Constructions with the Reciprocal Morpheme -p’era

In Porhépecha, situations in which the causee arguments act on each other (e.g., ‘I ordered them to hit each other’), or in which there is reciprocity between the causer and the causee (‘They ordered each other to hit him/her’), are usually expressed by way of syntactic causative constructions (cf. LaPolla 2000). However, I have registered predicates in which, in order to express these types of events, the causative and reciprocal morphemes coexist. In such predicates, different sequential orders can be observed: [RECP-CAUS] or [CAUS-RECP]. As expected, each sequence corresponds to a different semantic and morphosyntactic structure conveying specific co-referential relationships; that is, the linear order of the suffixes reflects that of the causativization and reciprocализation processes and, therefore, the scope of the reciprocal morpheme can be predicted (cf. Alsina 1999, Hyman 2003).

Verbal stems that present the sequence [RECP-CAUS] correspond to the causativization of predicates where reciprocity has been established between the agent and the patient of the caused event (E2); consequently, causativization applies to predicates that have undergone intransitivization. Since the causative marker becomes attached to a base with reciprocal affixation, the only causative allomorph that can be chosen is -tara, as exemplified in (27).

(27) a. tumpí-icha atá-p’era-tara-ta-s-∅-ti sapí-icha-ni
   boy-PL strike-RECP-CAUS-DISTR-PRF-PRS-3IND child-PL-OBJT
   ‘The boys made the children strike each other.’
   *‘The boys made each other strike the children.’

b. xuchí náanti=ts’ïni
   1SG.POSS mother.1/2PSR=1PL.OBJ
   xikwá-ra-p’era-tara-s-∅-ti
   bathe.oneself-CAUS-RECP-CAUS-PRF-PRS-3IND
   ‘My mother made us bathe each other.’

c. xarhóa-p’era-tara-a-s-∅-ti=ksï achtáati-icha-ni
   help-RECP-CAUS-DISTR-PRF-PRS-3IND=1/3PL.SBJ man-PL-OBJT
   ‘They made the men help each other.’
   *‘They made each other help the men.’

The sentences in (27a, c) only allow a reading in which the causees act upon each other. This shows that in predicates with the sequence [RECP-CAUS] the scope of the reciprocal suffix has to be internal to the caused event; i.e.,
co-referentiality is established between the arguments of the base verb—the agent and the patient (PO). This property is illustrated in the following representation of example (27a):

\[(28)\] Argument structure of \textit{atá-p’era-tara}  
\text{strike-RECP-CAUS}

\begin{enumerate}
\item a. atá  
\text{[<AG’> <PAT>]}  
\item b. atá-p’era  
\text{[<AG’i> <PATi>]}  
(pat=PO)
\item c. atá-p’era-tara  
\text{[\text{CAUSE}<AG> [<PAT-AG’i> <PATi>]]}
\end{enumerate}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>\text{Causer}</th>
<th>\text{Causee}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SBJ</td>
<td>OBJ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In contrast to the sentences in (27), predicates exhibiting the sequence [CAUS-RECP] correspond to a different operation: the reciprocalization of causativized verbs. In these cases, the scope of the reciprocal morpheme is external to the caused event; therefore, reciprocity must be established with the causer. In such constructions, the only arguments that can co-refer are the causer and the causee, as shown in (29c).\(^{13}\)

\[(29)\] a. \textit{sapí-icha \ eshé-ra-p’era-a-s-∅-ti=ksiβ}  
\text{child-pl see-CAUS-RECP-DISTR-PRF-PRS-3IND=1/3PL.SBJ}

\textit{karákata-echa-ni}  
\text{writings-PL-OBJT}

‘The children showed the books to each other (lit. made each other see the books).’

b. \textit{maríkwa-echa \ ú-ra(-tara)-p’era-s-∅-ti=ksiβ}  
\text{girl-pl do/make-CAUS-RECP-CAUS-RECP-PRF-PRS-3IND=1/3PL.SBJ}

\textit{kurhínta}  
\text{bread}

‘The girls made each other make some bread.’

\(^{13}\) The final vowel of causative suffixes tends to be omitted when it precedes obstruent consonants.
c. warhíiti-icha  xwá-ra(-tara)-p'era-a-s-∅-ti=ksi
   woman-PL   bring-CAUS-CAUS-RECP-DISTR-PRF-PRS-3IND=1/3PL.SBJ

  sapí-cha-ni
  child-PL-OBJ
  ‘The women made each other bring the children.’
  *‘The women made the children bring each other.’

d. xuchá  pá-ra(-tara)-p'era-s-∅-ka=ksi
   1PL   take/carry-CAUS-CAUS-RECP-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1/3PL.SBJ

  tsakápu
  stone
  ‘We made each other carry stones.’

Although speakers commonly utter sentences such as (29a), in situations of indirect causation where the causee has control over the caused event, as in (29b–d), analytical causative constructions are preferred. The representation of predicates with the [RECP-CAUS] sequence shown in (28) can be compared with the one in (30), which corresponds to sentence (29c).

(30) Argument structure of  xwá-ra(-tara)-p'era
     bring-CAUS-CAUS-RECP

   a. xwá  \[<AG'> <TH>\]
   b. xwá-ra(-tara)  \[CAUSE<AG>[<PAT-AG'> <TH>]\]
      \[|  |\]
      Causer  Causee
   c. xwá-ra(-tara)-p'era  \[CAUSE<AG1>[<PAT-AG1'> <TH>]\] (Causee=PO)
      \[|  |\]
      Syntactic realization  SBJ  OBJ

14 It is usual for P’orhépecha speakers to introduce the reciprocal morpheme after the first causative suffix when there is double causative marking. For example, the verbal stem in (29c) can also present the form xwárap'ératarastiksï without any change in meaning. The tendency to place the reciprocal morpheme after the first causative marker seems to stem from restrictions regarding the sequence -tara-p'era, a matter that requires further investigation. However, it is possible to speculate that these restrictions could account for the reduction or morphological change of -tara to -ta or -ra, observed in the causative forms
In (30), co-reference between the causee and the patient/theme of the embedded predicate is ruled out; reciprocalization necessarily co-indexes the causer and the causee.

5.2.2.3 Indefinite Object Marker

Causative suffixes can co-occur with the indefinite human object marker -p'i. Therefore, with causativized intransitive verbs, it is possible to find forms such as k'wístap'isïnti ‘S/he hypnotizes/makes people sleep’ or kwakárap'isti ‘S/he got someone/people wet (lit. S/he wet someone/people)’. When a causativized monotransitive base is combined with -p'i, the only argument that can be suppressed is the causee:

(31) a. atá-ra-p'i-s-∅-ti Pédru-ni
    strike-CAUS-INDF.OBJ-PRF-PRS-3IND Pedro-OBJT
    ‘S/he made someone strike Pedro.’
    *‘S/he made Pedro strike someone/people.’

    b. eshé-ra-p'i-a-ka-ni xuchí nanáka-ni
       see-CAUS-INDF.OBJ-FUT-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ 1SG.Poss little.girl-OBJT
       ‘I will show my little girl (to people).’
       ‘I will show someone/people to my little girl.’

If causativization includes double causative marking, the indefinite object suffix tends to occur before -tara, as can be seen in (32).

(32) xwá-ra-p'i-tara-s-∅-ka=ní tumpí-ni
    bring-CAUS-INDF.OBJ-CAUS-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ boy-OBJT
    ‘I made someone bring the boy.’
    *‘I made the boy bring someone/people.’

Regarding the verbal stem in (32), the option of generating the form xwáratarap’iskani with -p'i after -tara is rarely chosen and, in fact, is rejected by many speakers. This suggests the existence of morphological restrictions concerning certain suffix sequences involving -tara (see footnote 14 regarding a similar behavior related to the addition of the reciprocal marker to a causativized predicate).

of certain verbs when they undergo reciprocalization; for example, terékurhitaran ñé make someone laugh’, and terékurhi-ta/-ra-p'era-ni ‘to make each other laugh’.
In the case of predicates that are causativized with -tara, the sequence -tara-p’i and the reverse order p’i-tara are both acceptable, the latter being the preferred form in Puácuaro. The following examples, in which p’i suppresses the causee, illustrate this variation.

(33) a. ka múti-p’i-tara-ni imá-eri irékwarhikwa-ni
   and know/realize-INDF.OBJ-CAUS-NF that-GEN life-OBJT
   ‘...and make people know about his life (of the deceased).’ (ji no xukuamiska. 171)

b. múti-tara-p’i-s-p-ti
   know/realize-CAUS-INDF.OBJ-PRF-PST-3IND
   ‘He made people know it.’/‘He has made it known.’ (japunda.24)

c. amámpa t’atsíni eráku-p’i-tara-s-∅-ti
   mother-3PRS bean choose/select-INDF.OBJ-CAUS-PRF-PRS-3IND
   ‘The mother made someone sort the beans.’ (Monzón 2004:81)

d. arhúku-p’i-tara-s-∅-ka=ni/arhúku-tara-p’i-s-∅-ka=ni
   distribute-INDF.OBJ-CAUS-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ
   ‘I made someone distribute it.’/‘I have made (caused) it (to) be distributed.’

In the absence of double causative marking, the order p’i-tara (never -tara-p’i) often produces ambiguous forms, as the argument affected by the indefinite object suffix can refer either to the causee or to the patient/theme of the base verb. This ambiguity shows that, in these cases, the sequence of affixes does not match a single semantic and morphosyntactic structure. Examples of this are shown in (34), which can be compared to the unambiguous sentences in (31) and (32).

(34) a. atá-p’i-tara-s-∅-ka=ni Páblu-ni
   strike-INDF.OBJ-CAUS-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ Pablo-OBJT
   ‘I made someone strike Pablo.’/‘I have made (caused) Pablo (to) be struck.’
   ‘I made Pablo strike someone/people.’

b. ts’iná-p’i-tara-s-∅-ti Pédru-ni
   cure-INDF.OBJ-CAUS-PRF-PRS-3IND Pedro-OBJT
   ‘S/he made someone cure Pedro.’/‘S/he has made (caused) Pedro (to) be cured.’
   ‘S/he made Pedro cure someone/people.’
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c. José xarhóa-p’i-tara-a-ti Xwánu-ni
José help-INDF.OBJ-CAUS-FUT-3IND Juan-OBJT
‘José will make someone help Juan.’/‘José will make (cause) Juan (to) be helped.’
‘José will make Juan help someone/people.’

Given the morpheme sequence in the sentences in (34), the reading whereby -p‘i suppresses the patient/theme of the base verb is the expected one compositionally; i.e., the affix sequence and the semantic-morphosyntactic structure coincide. However, the reading in which the causee is suppressed shows that—unlike with the sequences [CAUS-INDF.OBJ] and [RECP-CAUS]—when the indefinite object marker occurs before -tara, the order of the suffixes does not necessarily reflect the morphological ordering of the processes exhibited by these predicates. It follows that the scope of -p‘i can be internal to the caused event (suppression of the patient of the base verb), or external to it (suppression of the causee). In the latter case, the semantic and morphosyntactic structure of predicates with -p’i-tara is the same as in examples (31) and (32) that present the sequence [CAUS-INDF.OBJ], which corresponds to the suffixation of -p‘i to a previously causativized base.

The fact that in (34) either the causee or the patient of the base verb can be targeted by -p‘i and, as a result, be suppressed, could be considered evidence that such causative constructions display a symmetrical pattern. However, it is important to recall that in the sequence [CAUS-INDF.OBJ] shown in (31) and (32), the causee is always the argument affected by -p‘i. Only with the sequence -p’i-tara can -p‘i suppress either the causee or the patient/theme. This can be explained by the fact that, while -tara is the obligatory causative allomorph for monotransitive predicates that have undergone the suppression of the patient/theme (PO), P’orhépecha also allows the sequence -p’i-tara to suppress the causee, i.e., the PO of the causative construction.

The asymmetrical behavior exhibited by the patient/theme and the causee can also be observed in the passivization of ambiguous forms with the sequence -p’i-tara; only the causee argument can be realized as the subject of the passive form. The sentences in (35) show the passivization of (34a, b).

(35) a. Chalío atá-p’i-tara-na-s-∅-ti
Chalío strike-INDF.OBJ-CAUS-PASS-PRF-PRS-3IND
‘Chalío was made (caused) to strike someone/people.’
*‘Chalío was struck on someone’s order.’/‘Chalío was caused to be struck.’
b. Pédru  ts’iná-p‘i-tara-na-s-∅-ti
Pedro    cure-INDF.OBJ-CAUS-PASS-PRF-PRS-3IND
‘Pedro was made (caused) to cure (someone/people)’
*‘Pedro was cured on someone’s order.’/‘Pedro was caused to be cured.’

The fact that there is only one possible reading of these passive forms demonstrates that in causative constructions the suppression of the causee (PO) triggered by -p‘i does not allow the patient/theme of the base verb to become the passive subject. It is worth noting that the same situation occurs when -p‘i suppresses an applied argument.

5.2.3 Causativization of Causativized Intransitive Predicates
In P’orhépecha, monotransitive predicates resulting from the causativization of intransitive base verbs (either unaccusatives or unergatives) allow an additional causativization process; this generates complex ditransitive predicates with two causees. The marking of the second causative process is subject to the same allomorph restrictions exhibited by stems with double causative marking encoding a single cause event (discussed in 5.1.2). In (36), common double causation predicates are shown. In these constructions, the argument of the intransitive base verb is clearly a patient that is directly manipulated by the causer introduced by the first causativization process.

(36) a. María  té-ra-tara-s-∅-ti  itsî-ni
   Maria get.sweet-CAUS-CAUS-PRF-PRS-3IND  water-OBJT
   Lúpi-ni
   Lupe-OBJT
   ‘Maria made Lupe sweeten the water.’

b. xi  xikwá-ra-tara-s-∅-ka=ni
   1SG  bathe.oneself-CAUS-CAUS-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ
   sapí-ni  wichu-ni
   child-OBJT  dog-OBJT
   ‘I made/told the child (to) bathe the dog.’
c. Pédru-ni inchá-ra-tara-a-ka=ni
   Pedro-OBJT get.in/into-CAUS-CAUS-FUT-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ

   sapí-ni/chkári-ni
   child-OBJT/firewood-OBJT
   ‘I will make/tell Pedro (to) get the child/firewood in (by carrying him/her/it).’

d. kwaká-ra-tara-s-∅-ka=ni maríkwa-ni
   get.wet-CAUS-CAUS-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ girl-OBJT

   shukúparhakwa-ni
   clothes-OBJT
   ‘I made the girl wet the clothes.’

e. k’wí-s-ta-tara-s-∅-ti Eli-ni charháku-ni
   fall.asleep-CAUS-CAUS-PRF-PRS-3IND Eli-OBJT baby-OBJT
   ‘S/he made Eli make the baby sleep.’

In cases in which the base verb has an agent argument, the most frequent scenario is for the corresponding causative predicate to indicate that the causer is physically involved in the caused event. Therefore, the causativization of such predicates produces constructions similar to those in (36), where the first causative event has a more direct causation reading (sociative), whereas the second necessarily entails indirect causation.

(37) a. María-ni wirhía(-ta)-tara-s-∅-ti Martíni-ni
   Maria-OBJT run-CAUS-CAUS-PRF-PRS-3IND Martin-OBJT
   ‘S/he made/told Maria (to) make Martin run (run after him).’

b. Lúpi=rini warhá-ra-tara-sin-∅-ti
   Lupe=1SG.OBJ dance-CAUS-CAUS-HAB-PRS-3IND

   sapí-ni/wíchu-ni
   child-OBJT/dog-OBJT
   ‘Lupe made/told me (to) make the child/dog dance.’

c. Pánfilu Ali-ni ch’áná-ra-tara-s-∅-ti Martíni-ni
   Pánfilo Ale-OBJT play-CAUS-CAUS-PRF-PRS-3IND Martin-OBJT
   ‘Pánfilo made/told Ale (to) make Martin play (to play with him).’
In (37a), it is generally understood that someone ordered Maria to physically affect Martin in order to make him run, or to run after him. In (37b), the preferred reading is that someone was commanded to move the child or the dog directly so as to make him/her/it dance, while in (37c) the preferred reading is the one in which Ale was sent to play with Martin.15

Predicates causativized with -tara are shown in (38). Given that the duplication of -tara is ungrammatical, the iteration of causation cannot be formally expressed:

(38) a. Páblu=kini xiwákurhi-tara(*-tara)-s-∅-ti sapí-ni
   Pablo=2sg.obj shout-CAUS-CAUS-PRF-PRS-3IND child-OBJT
   ‘Pablo made/told you (to) make the child shout.’

b. xí Pédru-ni tsankwára-tara(*-tara)-s-∅-ka sapí-ni
   1sg Pedro-OBJT jump-CAUS-CAUS-PRF-PRS-1/2IND child-OBJT
   ‘I made/told Pedro (to) make the child jump.’

c. María=rini terékurhi-tara(*-tara)-s-∅-ti nanáka-ni
   Maria=1sg.obj laugh-CAUS-CAUS-PRF-PRS-3IND little.girl-OBJT
   ‘Maria made/told me (to) make the little girl laugh.’

d. aogári-tara(*-tara)-s-∅-ka=ts’ï Pédru-ni
   drown-CAUS-CAUS-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=2pl.sbj Pedro-OBJT
   xeyáki-ni
   mouse-OBJT
   ‘You (PL) made/told Pedro (to) drown the mouse.’

All the verbal stems of the sentences in (38) also allow monotransitive constructions involving only one causation process; for example, compare (38a) with xiwákurhitaraskani Pédruni ‘I made/told Pedru (to) shout’ in (20c). In fact, all the stems conveying two causative events are phonologically indistinct from those presented in 5.1.2, where double causative marking is used to signal indirect causation. For instance, the verbal stem wirhía(ta)tarani can mean ‘order someone to run’ as in (19a’), or ‘order someone to make someone else run’, as in (37a). Finally, as might be expected, if there is a 1st/2nd person object, as in (37b) and (38a, c), it must be the causer introduced by the first causativization process. Consequently, neither the reading of (38a) as ‘Pablo made/told the

15 In the case of these constructions, most speakers consulted reject a reading such as ‘send X to tell, or order Y to do something’; for these types of events, analytic causative constructions are preferred.
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child (to) make you shout', nor that of (38c) as 'Maria made/told the girl (to) make me laugh' are allowed. This demonstrates that the person constraint is also maintained in these causative constructions, as well as the PO status of the arguments encoded by object enclitics.

In predicates with two causativization processes, the causer introduced by the first causativization process is always the one that displays PO properties. When the single argument of the intransitive base verb has a patient role, as in the sentences in (36), the thematic ranking of the two arguments in object function is the same as in the case of the causativization of monotransitive verbs; i.e., the causee bearing agentive characteristics outranks the one that only has a patient/theme role. If the base verb is unergative, it follows that both causee objects have two thematic roles (patient and agent). In these cases, the causer introduced by the first causativization process (Causee2) instigates the action of the agent of the base verb (Causee1), which is assigned the role of patient in this causative event and relegated to SO. The causer-causee relationship established among the participants involved in these double object constructions, along with the fact that a causer always outranks its causee in terms of syntactic primacy, are both consistent with the selection as PO of the causer introduced by the first causativization process (Causee2). The argument structure of this type of predicate is represented in (39).

(39) Causativization of a previously causativized agentive intransitive verb:

a. INTR.V

b. INTR.V-CAUS

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{Causer} \\
\text{Causee1}
\end{array}
\]

c. INTR.V-CAUS-CAUS

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{Causer} \\
\text{Causee2} \\
\text{Causee1}
\end{array}
\]

Syntactic realization

SBJ PO SO

The examples in (40) show the passivization of intransitive bases that have undergone double causativization:

(40) a. Adólfo inchá-ra-tara-na-∅-s-ti Martíni-ni
    Adolfo get.in/into-CAUS-CAUS-PASS-PRF-PRS-3IND Martin-OBJT

    'Adolfo was made to get Martin in.'
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b. xí kwaká-ra-tara-na-s-∅-ka sapí-ni
   ISG get.wet-CAUS-CAUS-PASS-PRF-PRS-1/2IND child-OBJT
   ‘I was made to get the child wet (lit. to wet the child).’

c. Lúpi apárhi(-ta)-tara-na-s-∅-ti
   Lupe get.burned/sweat-CAUS-CAUS-PASS-PRF-PRS-3IND
   sapí-ni
   child-OBJT
   ‘Lupe was made/told to make the child sweat.’

d. Pédru warhá-ra-tara-na-a-ti María-ni
   Pedro dance-CAUS-CAUS-PASS-FUT-3IND María-OBJT
   ‘Pedro will be made/told to make Maria dance.’

It is worth noting that even though some speakers accept the reading ‘orders someone to ask someone else to do something’ for the active sentence corresponding to the examples in (40), the same behavioral pattern is found regarding passivization. For example, (40d) can allow the reading ‘Pedro will be told to order Maria to dance’, but not one whereby someone will order Maria to tell Pedro to dance.

The addition of the indefinite human suffix -p’i to the causative constructions examined here results in the suppression of the causer introduced by the first causative marker (Causee2):

(41) xikwá-ra-tara-p’i-a-sïn-∅-ka=ni
    bathe.oneself-CAUS-CAUS-INDF.OBJ-DISTR-HAB-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ
    sapí-cha-ni
    child-PL-OBJT
    I made someone bathe the children.’
    ‘I made the children bathe someone/people.’

In constructions with intransitive verbs exhibiting double causativization, the sequence -p’i-tara creates ambiguity regarding the argument suppressed by -p’i (as in the sentences discussed in 5.2.2.3). Such ambiguity arises from the fact that either the second causative process marked by -tara applies to an intransitive base—resulting from the suppression of the first causee (PO)
by -p‘i—or, given a double object construction, -p‘i suppresses the causee introduced by -tara:16

(42) a. xikwá-ra-p‘i-tara-s-Ø-ka=ni
    bathe.oneself-CAUS-INDF.OBJ-CAUS-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ
    sapí-ni
    child-OBJT
    ‘I made someone bathe the child.’/’I caused the child to be bathed.’
    ‘I made the child bathe someone/people.’

b. kwaká-ra-p‘i-tara-s-Ø-ti=kini
    get.wet-CAUS-INDF.OBJ-CAUS-PRF-PRS-3IND=2SG.OBJ
    ‘S/he made someone get you wet (lit. made someone wet you).’
    ‘S/he made you get someone/people wet (lit. made you wet someone/people).’

Note that, as shown in the first reading of (42b), when -p‘i suppresses the causer introduced by the first causative process—the agent of the predicate kwakára ‘wet’ (Causee2)—sentences with a 1st or 2nd person patient are allowed, in exactly the same way as when -p‘i suppresses the R (recipient-like) in non-derived ditransitive predicates (see 3.3.3). The passivization of the ambiguous predicates in (42) shows that only the causer of the base predicates xikwára ‘bathe’ and kwakára ‘wet’ (Causee2) can be the subject of the passive clause.

(43) a. marikwa xikwá-ra-p‘i-tara-na-s-Ø-ti
    girl bathe-CAUS-INDF.OBJ-CAUS-PASS-PRF-PRS-3IND
    ‘The girl was made (caused) to bathe someone/people.’
    *The girl was bathed on someone’s order.’/’The girl was caused to be bathed.’

16 Since in the stems in (42) the double causative marker may be interpreted as a single causativization process (see 5.1.2), a predicate such as xikwárap‘itaraskani allows the reading ‘I ordered people to bathe themselves’.
5.3 Encoding the Causee in Oblique Function: Benefactive Causatives with the Suffix -kurhi

In P’orhépecha, causative suffixes can coexist with the middle/reflexive morpheme -kurhi. As will be seen in this section, the meaning of these verbal stems depends on the order in which the morphological processes take place, which, in turn, is related to the different functions of -kurhi. Specifically, this section will focus on the properties of constructions in which causativized monotransitive verbs are combined with the suffix -kurhi. This type of construction, of which there is no record in prior works on the P’orhépecha language, does not allow the encoding of the causee in object function.

A monotransitive verb that has undergone reflexivization can be causativized (compare with the reciprocal constructions in 5.2.2.2). The sequence [-kurhi-CAUS] denotes situations in which the causee and the patient of the base verb are co-referential:17

(44) a. María eráti-kurhi-tara-s-∅-ti Lúpi-ni
   Maria look-mdl/refl-caus-prf-prs-3ind Lupe-objt
   ‘Maria made Lupe look at herself (in the mirror).’

   b. no-ampákiti atá-kurhi-tara-s-∅-ti tumpí-ni
       devil strike-mdl/refl-caus-prf-prs-3ind boy-objt
       ‘The devil made the boy strike himself.’

The morpheme -kurhi in (44) clearly indicates co-referentiality between the causee and the patient, i.e., between the arguments of the base verb. In contrast, when causativization precedes the addition of -kurhi [CAUS-kurhi],

17 Reflexive predicates that undergo causativization are registered in the sixteenth century Diccionario Grande…—for example, esequarerahpentansi ‘make them look at themselves’ (D.G.:200). However, nowadays the use of analytic causative constructions is preferred in order to express events where the causee acts on him/herself (regarding this phenomenon in other languages, see LaPolla 2000).
the middle/reflexive suffix signals indirect reflexive situations; that is, the event remains within the domain of the causer who acts in his/her own interest, or affects an entity that belongs to him/her. This type of predicate is common with causativized intransitive verbs involving prototypical direct causation. Accordingly, the sentences in (45) are comparable to those discussed in 4.2.2; for example, *pyákurhist i ma kúchini* ‘S/he bought a pig for her/himself’, and *wántikukurhist i kúchini* ‘S/he killed her/his pig’.

(45) a. María té-ra-kurhi-a-ti kamáta-ni
Maria get.sweet-CAUS-MDL/REFL-FUT-3IND corn.drink-OBJT
‘Maria will sweeten the corn drink for herself.’

b. Pédr u ikía-ta-kurhi-sin-∅-ti kabáyu-ni
Pedro get.angry-CAUS-MDL/REFL-HAB-PRS-3IND horse-OBJT
‘Pedro makes his horse get angry.’

c. t’ú we-tá-ra-kurhi-a-ka nanák a-ni
2SG cry-CAUS-MDL/REFL-FUT-1/2IND little.girl-OBJT
‘You will make your little girl cry.’

d. xorhépe-ra-kurhi-nt’a-a-ka t’irékwa
get.hot-CAUS-MDL/REFL-ITR-FUT-1/2IND food
‘I will heat my food.’

In (45) the presence of -kurhi does not alter the transitivity of the causativized predicate. Instead, it indicates that the event remains within the domain of the subject/causer: the causee belongs to him/her or is under his/her control.

When the suffix -kurhi is added to causativized monotransitive verbs, this also results in middle-value sentences, which express the wish of the causer for someone to carry out an action that benefits him/her or that is in his/her best interest. The causee is a means to accomplish the goals of the causer. In (46), there are examples of monotransitive verbs causativized with -ra, and in (47), of verbal bases that require the causative -tara.

(46) a. Xwánu ú-ra-kurhi-s-∅-ti
Juan do/make-CAUS-MDL/REFL-PRF-PRS-3IND

ma pantalóni-ni (Rósa- ni xinkóni)
one trouser-OBJT (Rosa-OBJT POSP)
‘Juan had a pair of trousers made (by Rosa).’
b. *urhú-ra-kurhi-s-∅-ka=ni*  
*tsíri*  
grind-CAUS-MDL/REFL-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ  
corn  

*(Pédru-nkuni)*  
*(Pedro-COM)*  
‘I had my corn ground (by Pedro).’

c. *xwá-ra(-tara)-kurhi-s-∅-ka=ni*  
*chkári*  
bring-CAUS-CAUS-MDL/REFL-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ  
firewood  

*(sapí-ni  xinkóní)*  
*(child-OBJT  POSP)*  
‘I had some firewood brought to me (by the child).’

d. *María  eshé-ra-tara-kurhi-s-∅-ti*  
*María*  
see-CAUS-CAUS-MED/REFL-PRF-PRS-3IND  

*sapí-ni*  
*(Lúpi-ni  ximpó/xinkóní)*  
*(child-OBJT  (Lupe-OBJT  POSP/POSP))*  
‘Maria got someone (Lupe) to look after her child.’

(47)  

(47) a. *míta-tara-kurhi-s-∅-ka=ni*  
*pwérta-ni*  
open-CAUS-MDL/REFL-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ  
door-OBJT  

*Pédru-ni  ximpó*  
*Pedro-OBJT  POSP*  
‘I got the door opened for me (by Pedro).’

b. *t’ú=ri*  
*wántiku-tara-kurhi-s-∅-ka*  
*besérru*  
2SG=2SG.SBJ  
kill-CAUS-MDL/REFL-PRF-PRS-1/2IND  
calf  

*p’ukúrakata-ni  para  imá*  
*fat-OBJT  for  that*  
‘You had your fat calf killed for him.’  
*(San Lukaši 16(30))*

In the sentences in (46) and (47) the action of the causee benefits the causer, in whose domain the patient/theme is located. If the causee is realized by a full

18 The sentences in (46), unlike those exhibiting suppression of the causee by -p’i, do not necessarily yield the reading that the patient/theme is placed in or directed to the domain of the causer. Compare (46c) with the following sentence:
NP it must be encoded in oblique function and be flagged by either of the post-
positions ximpó ‘for/by’ or xinkóni ‘with’, or by the comitative marker -nkuni.
Therefore, the morpheme -kurhi indicates that the event remains within the
domain of the causer and, simultaneously, prohibits the expression of the cau-
see as a core argument, generating monotransitive constructions. Compare
(46a) with the sentences in (48):

(48) a. Xwánu ú-ra-s-∅-ti ma pantalóni-ni
    Juan do/make-CAUS-PRS-3IND one trouser-OBJT

    Rósa-ni
    Rosa-OBJT

    ‘Juan made/told Rosa (to) make a pair of trousers.’

b. *Xwánu ú-ra-kurhi-s-∅-ti
    Juan do/make-CAUS-MDL/REFL-PRS-3IND

    ma pantalóni-ni Rósa-ni
    one trouser-OBJT Rosa-OBJT

    Intended reading: ‘Juan, made/told Rosa (to) make himi a pair of trousers.’

In (48a) the causee cannot be demoted to oblique function without the pres-
ence of -kurhi. The sentence úraskani ma pantalón Rósankuni/Rósani ximpó
does not allow the reading ‘to have a pair of trousers made by Rosa’; the only
available interpretation is that someone, already identified but not mentioned,
was asked to make a pair of trousers in Rosa’s company or because of Rosa.

Moreover, the same type of middle construction occurs in sentences such as
those in (49), where the causer asks another person (or manages to get another
person) to carry out an action of value to the former:19

(i) xwá-ra-p'i-s-∅-ka=ni chkári
    bring-CAUS-INDF.OBJ-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ firewood

    ‘I sent for some firewood.’

19 The sequence [CAUS-kurhi] cannot be used to indicate co-referentiality between: a)
the causer and the agent of the base predicate (for example Pédru urhúrakurhisití tsíri
excludes the reading ‘Pedro made himself grind the corn’), or b) the causer and the
patient of the base verb (for example, the predicate wántikutarakurhini ‘to make/tell
someone (to) kill someone else’, cannot convey a reading such as ‘I caused someone to
kill me’). Parenthetically, in Old Porhépecha wandicuraquarena may mean ‘let oneself be
killed’ (D.G. 55) (regarding this type of causative, see LaPolla 2000, and Alsina 1993:371).
Causativized predicates to which -kurhi is added can be considered benefactive causatives, following Shibatani and Pardeshi (2002:94). According to these authors, this type of construction entails the encoding of the causee in oblique function and is characterized by the fact that the causer manages to get something done for his/her own benefit. These authors (also Alsina 1993:124–156, Alsina and Joshi 1991) also note that this type of construction is generally not possible with intransitive verbs. Accordingly, causativized intransitive verbs in P’orhépecha, despite allowing the suppression of the causee by -p’i, do not allow the use of -kurhi with the concomitant expression of the causee in oblique function.


c. *xiwákurhi-tara-kurhi-s-∅-ti\textsuperscript{20} (María-ni shout-CAUS-MDL/REFL-PRF-PRS-3IND}\textsuperscript{20} (Maria-OBJT xinkóni/ximpó) POSP/POSP) Intended reading: ‘S/he made Maria shout.’

Since in causative constructions with -kurhi the causee is not syntactically realized as an overt NP in core function, the patient of the base verb would be expected to be a 1st or 2nd person; which does occur.

(51) a. Xwán=rini wántiku-tara-kurhi-a-ti Juan=1SG.OBJ kill-CAUS-MDL/REFL-FUT-3IND ‘Juan will have me killed.’

b. xí=kini kwídári-tara-kurhi-s-∅-ka 1SG=2SG.OBJ take.care-CAUS-MDL/REFL-PRF-PRS-1/2IND (María-ni xinkóni) (Maria-OBJT POSP) ‘I had you looked after (by Maria)’/‘I had someone (Maria) look after you.’

c. xikwá-ra-tara-kurhi-s-∅-ti=rini bath-CAUS-CAUS-MDL/REFL-PRF-PRS-3IND=1SG.OBJ ‘S/he had me bathed.’

Moreover, and in contrast to constructions with -p‘i, the suppression of the causee as a core argument triggered by -kurhi generates monotransitive constructions in which the object of the base verb may display PO behavioral properties. Consequently, in the passive constructions exemplified in (52), the patient of the base verb becomes available for passivization.

(52) a. xí atá-ra-kurhi-na-s-∅-ka-ni 1SG strike-CAUS-MDL/REFL-PASS-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ ‘I was struck on someone’s order.’/‘I was caused to be struck.’

\textsuperscript{20} Sentences such as (50c) become grammatical if -tara is interpreted as a double causative, in which case the translation of (50c) would be ‘S/he ordered someone (Maria) to make someone else shout’.
b. sapí  kwidári-tara-kurhi-na-s-∅-ti
   child   take.care-CAUS-MDL/REFL-PASS-PRF-PRS-3IND

   (Maria-ni  ximpó)
   (Maria-OBJT  POSP)
   'The child was looked after (by Maria) on someone’s order.'/'The child
   was caused to be looked after (by Maria).'

c. karákata  kará-ra-kurhi-na-s-∅-ti
   writings   write-CAUS-MDL/REFL-PASS-PRF-PRS-3IND
   'The letter was written on someone’s order.'/'The letter was caused to
   be written.'

d. sapí-cha  sïpá-ra-kurhi-na-s-∅-ti=ksï
   child-PL   steal-CAUS-MDL/REFL-PASS-PRF-PRS-3IND=1/3PL.SBJ
   'The children were kidnapped on someone’s order.'/'The children were
   caused to be kidnapped.'

5.4 Instrumental Constructions

In P’orhépecha, there are two types of sentences exhibiting NPs with an
instrumental role: a) those in which the predicate has no verbal affix mark-
ing correlated with an instrumental NP; and b) those in which the suffixes
-ra, -ta, and/or -tara in the verbal stem have an instrumental value. The fact that
the same morpheme can have both a causative and an instrumental value
is not an isolated phenomenon; it has been registered in several languages.
In some, the causative/instrumental morphemes function as applicative
affixes when an instrumental object is introduced (see Kimenyi 1980:164–170,
Marantz 1993:143), whereas in other languages, the addition of an instrument
does not alter the syntactic valence (see Fleck 2002:387–389). In P’orhépecha,
the encoding of an instrument in core function requires it to be introduced
through verbal morphology. However, the presence of this morphology does
not require the instrument to be treated as a core argument. As will be shown,
in this language the occurrence of instrumental objects has restrictions that
limit the generation of double object constructions.

When predicates lack any causative/instrumental morphemes, instru-
mental NPs can only be introduced as obliques via the postposition ximpó or
through the instrumental case -mpu. In (53) and (54) examples of this type of
sentence with intransitive and monotransitive verbs are shown.
Constructions With Causative/Instrumental Suffixes

(53) a. t’arhépiti-icha warhá-sín-∅-ti bordóni-icha-ni ximpó
    old.man-pl dance-HAB-PRS-3IND cane-pl-OBJT POSP
    'The old men dance with canes.'

    b. sapí tsankwára-s-∅-ti lásu-mpu
    child jump-PRF-PRS-3IND rope-INST
    'The child jumped with a rope.'

(54) a. María=rini atá-sín-∅-ti chkári(-ni) ximpó
    Maria=1SG.OBJ strike-HAB-PRS-3IND stick-OBJT POSP
    'Maria strikes me with the/a stick.'

    b. xí ichárhuta(-ni) ximpó xwá-a-ka p’atsímu
    1SG canoe-OBJT POSP bring-FUT-1/2IND reed
    'I will bring reed in the canoe/by canoe.'

    c. Lúpi kuchíyu-mpu kachúku-sín-∅-ti k’wirípita
    Lupe knife-INST cut-HAB-PRS-3IND meat
    'Lupe cuts meat with a knife.'

When verbal bases are combined with -ra, -ta, or -tara having an instrumental value, a new predicate involving an instrumental argument is formed. However, the most common setting is for the new argument to still be expressed in an oblique phrase, flagged by either the postposition ximpó or the instrumental case marker -mpu. Consequently, in P’orhépecha, the occurrence of instrumental markers on the verb does not necessarily trigger, and in many instances does not allow, the addition of an instrumental NP in core function. This can be seen in the case of intransitive base verbs in (55) and with monotransitive base verbs in (56).

(55) a. t’arhépiti-icha warhá-ra-tara-sín-∅-ti bordóni-icha-ni ximpó
    old.man-pl dance-INST-INST-HAB-PRS-3IND cane-pl-OBJT POSP
    'The old men dance with canes.'

21 These constructions generally present double marking when the verb takes -ra or -ta (cf. Friedrich 1971a:107–109, Maldonado and Nava 2002).
b. sapi  tsankwára-tara-s-∅-ti  lásu-mpu
   child  jump-INST-PRF-PRS-3IND  rope-INST
   ‘The child jumped with a rope.’

(56) a. María=rini  atá-ra-tara-sín-∅-ti  chkári(-ni)
   María=1SG.OBJ  strike-INST-INST-HAB-PRS-3IND  stick-OBJT
   ximpó
   POSP
   ‘Maria strikes me with a stick.’

b. xí  ichárhuta(-ni)  ximpó  xwá-ra-a-ka  p’atsímu
   1SG  canoe-OBJT  POSP  bring-INST-FUT-1/2IND  reed
   ‘I will bring reed in the canoe/by canoe.’

c. Lúpi  kuchíyu-mpu  kachúku-tara-sín-∅-ti  k’wirípita
   Lupe  knife-INST  cut-INST-HAB-PRS-3IND  meat
   ‘Lupe cuts meat with a knife.’

As will be shown below, under certain circumstances P’orhépecha allows the encoding of the instrument marked in the verbal stem in object function with intransitive or monotransitive base predicates, while with ditransitive bases the only alternative is to encode the instrument in oblique function. These constructions are exemplified in (57) with the verb ‘give’, and in (58) with applicativized predicates, in which case any relative order of applicative and instrumental suffixes is acceptable.

(57) íntsku-tara-s-∅-ka=ni  Pédru-ni  tumína  sutúpu-mpu
   give-INST-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ  Pedro-OBJT  money  bag-INST
   ‘I gave Pedro the money in the bag.’

(58) a. Xwánu=rini  xupá-ra-Chi-s-∅-ti  shukúparhakwa
   Juan=1SG.OBJ  wash-INST-1/2APPL-PRF-PRS-3IND  clothes
   imá-eri  shapó-mpu
   that-GEN  soap-OBJT
   ‘Juan washed my clothes (for me) with his soap.’
b. tsúntsu-mpu pá-ku-tara-s-∅-ka=ni
   pot-INST take/carry-3APPL-INST-PRF-PRS-1/2ND=1SG.SBJ
   kamáta náanti-ni
   corn.drink mother1/2PRS-OBJT
   ’I took some corn drink in the pot to my mother.’

c. imá-eri tumínã-ni ximpó pyá-ra-ku-s-∅-ti
   that-GEN money-OBJT POSP buy-INST-3APPL-PRF-PRS-3IND
   tsíri María-ni
   corn María-OBJT
   ’With his/her money, s/he bought Maria some corn.’

Although further research is required on P’orhépecha instrumental constructions, in the data I have collected so far, it is possible to detect certain conditions that permit the addition of an object with an instrumental role to core arguments, i.e., constructions where the instrumental marking on the verb behaves as an applicative morpheme. Firstly, the encoding of an instrument in core function requires the presence of a causative/instrumental morpheme in the verbal stem. Secondly, the instrument must be essential or inherent to the action, and must correspond to a prototypical means of carrying out the event. Instrumental objects never refer to a specific entity; instead, they identify the type of (generic) instrument involved in the event. This analysis differs from that of Maldonado and Nava (2002:178).
c. María k’arháta-sín-∅-ti p’ánkwa-mpu
   María sweep-HAB-PRS-3IND broom-INST
   ‘Maria sweeps with a broom.’

In (59a), -tara co-occurs with the prototypical instrument for the action of sweeping, i.e., the broom, encoded in object function and therefore with no adposition or semantic case marker. Without the presence of the causative/instrumental verb suffix, the verb ‘sweep’ requires that the instrument NP be marked as oblique, as in (59c). Otherwise, as is shown in (59b), the only available reading is that of a strange event in which the broom is the patient of sweep. As in (59a), the sentences in (60) contain prototypical instruments for the action denoted by the verbs; the realization of these in object function is licensed by the instrumental suffixes:

(60) a. xí pirúakwa-ni sírikú-tara-sín-∅-ka=ni
    1SG thread-OBJT sew-INST-HAB-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ
    ‘I sew with thread.’

    b. xuchá shapó-ni xupá-ra-tara-sín-∅-ka=ksi
    1PL soap-OBJT wash-INST-INST-HAB-PRS-1/2IND=1/3PL.SBJ
    ‘We wash with soap.’

In addition to the presence of a prototypical instrument for the event denoted by the verb and to the presence of an instrumental suffix, the occurrence of an instrument in object function is subject to a third condition: it cannot co-occur with a patient/theme object that is highly ranked on the animacy scale. Therefore, while constructions such as those in (61) are possible, those in (62) are not.

(61) a. Xwánu kwiná-narhi-tara-sín-∅-ti óxi-icha-ní
    Juan shave-INST-HAB-PRS-3IND razor.blade-PL-OBJT
    ‘Juan shaves himself with razor blades.’

---

23 In certain communities, an animate patient is accepted in such constructions. For example, in Santa Fe I have registered xachániksï wíchuni atárasti ‘With the axe, they hit/killed the dog’. However, this is not the case in Puácuaro; the speakers consulted there do not accept an animate patient in this type of construction, with the sole exception of kurúcha ‘live fish, dead fish’.
b. maríkwa-echa eráti-kurhi-tara-sha-∅-ti
girl-PL look-MDL/REFL-INST-PROS-3IND

espéxu-icha-ni
mirror-PL-OBJT
‘The girls are looking at themselves in the mirrors.’

c. imá acháati wántiku-pʻi-tara-s-∅-ti
that man kill-INDF.OBJ-INST-PROF-PROS-3IND
pistóla-ni
gun-OBJT
‘That man killed (people) with a gun.’

Even though in the examples in (61) there is an understood human patient/theme, it is not expressed in object function; therefore, the instrument NP can be realized as an object. However, if the construction is not reflexive or if the human patient is not suppressed by -pʻi, the realization of the instrument in core function is ungrammatical:

(62) a. *Xósé óxi-icha-ni
José razor.blade-PL-OBJT
kwiná-narhi-ku-tara-sín-∅-ti
shave-flat.surface-LOC.EXP-INST-PROS-3IND
Pédru-ni
Pedro-OBJT
Intended reading: ‘José shaves Pedro with razor blades.’

b. *imá acháati pistóla-ni wántiku-tara-s-∅-ti
that man gun-OBJT kill-INDF-INST-PROF-PROS-3IND
Pédru-ni
Pedro-OBJT
Intended reading: ‘That man killed Pedro with a gun.’

The monotransitive sentence (59a), and those in examples (60) and (61) allow the addition of the suffix -na, which yields impersonal constructions: “X is used to do Y”. In this type of sentence the instrument may be promoted to subject function:

(63) a. óxi-icha kwiná-narhi-tara-sín-∅-ti
razor.blade-PL shave-flat.surface-INST-PASS-PROS-3IND
‘Razor blades are used to shave oneself.’

b. espéxu-icha eráti-kurhi-tara-sín-∅-ti
mirror-PL look-MDL/REFL-INST-PASS-PROS-3IND
‘The mirrors are used to look at oneself.’
c. *pistóla-icha*  *wántiku-p'i-tara-na-síñ-∅-ti*

   *gun-PL*  *kill-INDF.OBJ-INST-PASS-HAB-PRS-3IND*

   ‘Guns are used to kill.’

(64) a. *pánkwa  k'arháta-tara-na-síñ-∅-ti*

   *broom  sweep-INST-PASS-HAB-PRS-3IND*

   ‘Brooms are used to sweep.’

b. *pirúakwa  síríku-tara-na-síñ-∅-ti*

   *thread  sew-INST-PASS-HAB-PRS-3IND*

   ‘Thread is used to sew.’

The impersonal constructions in (63) and (64) are used to refer to the habitual/prototypical use of the instrument, which is why they are only accepted when the predicate has the habitual aspect marker.

When instrumental NPs are licensed to appear in object function, it is possible for double object constructions to be produced from monotransitive bases. Such constructions are grammatical, provided that the patient/theme is inanimate.

(65) a. *í-ni  kuchára-ni*

   *this-OBJ  trowel-OBJT*

   *ú-ra-tara-a-síñ-∅-ka=ni*

   *do/make-INST-INST-DISTR-HAB-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ*

   *tsíntsíkata-echa-ni*

   *fence-PL-OBJT*

   ‘I build fences with this (type of) trowel.’

b. *xí  tsúntsu-ni  xwá-ra-∅-ka=ni*

   *1SG  pot-OBJT  bring-INST-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ  water*

   ‘I brought some water in a pot.’

c. *xí  lápisí-icha-ni  kará-ra-tara(-a)-wa-ka  ma*

   *1SG  pencil-PL-OBJT  write-INST-INST-DISTR-FUT-1/2IND  one*

   *karákata*

   *writings*

   ‘I will write a letter with pencils.’
d. warhíti-icha xupáratarakwa-echa-ni
   woman-PL  washbasin-PL-OBJT

   xupá-ra-tara-síñ-∅-ti  shukúparhakwa
   wash-INST-INST-HAB-PRS-3IND  clothes
   'Women wash clothes in washbasins.'

e. xuchá urhú-ra-tara(-a)-wa-ka
   1PL  grind-INST-INST-DISTR-FUT-1/2IND

   yawári-icha-ni  xuchári  tsíri-ni
   metate(flat.stone)-PL-OBJT  1PL.Poss  corn-OBJT
   'We will grind our corn on metates (flat stones).'

In general, sentences such as those in (65) also allow the expression of the instrument in an oblique phrase; i.e., they exhibit alternation in the encoding of the instrument NP. As can be seen in (65a), when this argument is encoded in object function, the occurrence of a definite determiner does not imply reference to a particular object, but to a type of instrument (in this example, the type of trowel used in masonry). If reference is made to a particular instrument or to a specific set of instruments, the NP is necessarily marked as oblique, as shown in (66).

(66) a. xi tsúntsu-icha-ni ximpó xwá-ra-∅-ka=ni
   1SG  pot-PL-OBJT  POSP  bring-INST-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ

   ítsì
   water
   'I brought water in the pots.'

   b. Lúpi í-ni sarténi-ni ximpó
   Lupe this-OBJT  pan-OBJT  POSP

   ú-ra-tara-síñ-∅-ti  t'irékwa
   do/make-INST-INST-HAB-PRS-3IND  food
   'Lupe makes food in this pan.'

It is also common for the instrument to be marked as oblique when it is clearly not prototypical for the action referred to. This can be seen in examples (66) and (67).
(67) a. tumpí-icha bróchi-icha-ni atá-nt’a-tara-s-∅-ti
   boy-PL brush-PL-OBJT strike-ITR-INST-PRF-PRS-3IND

   táa-ni
   house-OBJT
   ‘The boys painted the house with brushes.’

b. tumpí-icha p’ánkwa-echa-ni ximpó
   boy-PL broom-PL-OBJT POSP

   atá-nt’a(-tara)-s-∅-ti táa-ni
   strike-ITR-INST-PRF-PRS-3IND house-OBJT
   ‘The boys painted the house with brooms.’

c. #tumpí-icha p’ánkwa-echa-ni atá-nt’a-tara-s-∅-ti
   boy-PL broom-PL-OBJT strike-ITR-INST-PRF-PRS-3IND

   táa-ni
   house-OBJT
   ‘The boys painted the house with brooms.’

(68) a. María takúsï-ni kutsú-narhi-ku-tara-sín-∅-ti
   Maria rag-OBJT clean-flat.surface-LOC.EXP-INST-HAB-PRS-3IND

   plátu-icha-ni
   plate-PL-OBJT
   ‘Maria cleans/dries the plates with the/a rag.’

b. María sïránta ximpó
   Maria paper POSP

   kutsú-narhi-ku(-tara)-sín-∅-ti plátu-icha-ni
   clean-flat.surface-LOC.EXP-INST-HAB-PRS-3IND plate-PL-OBJT
   ‘Maria cleans/dries the plates with paper.’

c. #María sïránta-ni
   Maria paper-OBJT

   kutsú-narhi-ku-tara-sín-∅-ti plátu-icha-ni
   clean-flat_surface-LOC.EXP-INST-HAB-PRS-3IND plate-PL-OBJT
   ‘Maria cleans/dries the plates with paper.’
In contrast with (67a) and (68a), in (67b) and (68b) the presence of a non-prototypical instrument flagged by the postposition ximpó makes the instrumental verb suffix optional. Constructions such as those in (67c) and (68c), with an instrumental object that is not prototypical for the action, are unusual and generally rejected.

Double object constructions with an instrumental argument also display asymmetrical behavioral properties, which are characteristic of Porhëpecha ditransitive constructions. The instrumental argument is the only one that can occur as the subject in impersonal constructions with -na:

(69) a. í kuchára ú-ra-tara-na-sín-∅-ti
    this trowel do/make-INST-INST-PASS-HAB-PRS-3IND
    tsĩntsikata-echa-ni
    fence-PL-OBJT
    ‘This (type of) trowel is used to build fences.’

b. xupáratarakanwa-echa xupá-ra-tara-na-sín-∅-ti
    washbasin-PL wash-INST-INST-PASS-HAB-PRS-3IND
    shukúparhakwa
    clothes
    ‘Washbasins are used to wash clothes.’

c. lápisí-icha kará-ra-tara-na-sín-∅-ti karákata-icha-ni
    pencil-PL write-INST-INST-PASS-HAB-PRS-3IND writings-PL-OBJT
    ‘Pencils are used to write letters.’

d. cherémakwa-icha warhó-ra-tara-na-sín-∅-ti kurúcha
    net-PL fish-INST-INST-PASS-HAB-PRS-3IND fish
    ‘Nets are used to fish/catch fish.’

e. yawári urhú-ra-tara-na-sín-∅-ti tsíri
    metate grind-INST-INST-PASS-HAB-PRS-3IND corn
    ‘The metate (flat stone) is used to grind corn.’

Unlike the sentences in (69), those in (70) are ungrammatical because the patient/theme is realized as the subject and the instrument remains encoded in object function.
Interestingly, if the instrumental argument is expressed in oblique function (either with an adposition or a semantic case marker), the patient/theme can be promoted to subject in constructions with -na, but the resulting constructions are canonical passives.
b. tsōntsīkata-icha ú-ra-tara-na-s-∅-ti
fence-PL make/do-instr-instr-pas-pass-fut-3ind

i kuchára-ni ximpó/kuchára-mpu
this trowel-objt posp/trowel-instr
‘The fences were built with this trowel/a trowel.’

c. xuchá-iri p’atsímu xwá-ra-tara-na-a-ti
1pl-gen reed bring-instr-instr-pas-fut-3ind

ichárhuta-icha-mpu/ichárhuta ximpó
canoe-PL-instr/canoe posp
‘Our reed will be brought in canoes/by canoe.’

The fact that, given an instrumental double object construction, only the instrumental object licensed by the verbal morphology can be realized as the subject of constructions with the passive suffix -na, makes it possible to state that, in P’orhépecha, the instrument outranks the patient/theme regarding PO selection. Nevertheless, it is important to recall that in order to generate a ditransitive construction involving an instrument, certain semantic restrictions apply that seem to be related to the instrumental object’s ranking: the generic character of the instrumental NP and the requirement of a low animacy status of the patient/theme.

5.5 Conclusions

The P’orhépecha morphemes -ra, -ta, and -tara increase the semantic valence of a predicate since they introduce an argument bearing a causer or instrument role. When their function is to causativize, they bring about an increase in syntactic valence; however, when they introduce an instrument, the derivation of a ditransitive construction is restricted.

It has been shown that causative/instrumental markings display morphologically and lexically determined allomorphy. Furthermore, P’orhépecha allows for predicates with two causative markers (subject to morphological restrictions), which indicate either indirect causation or iteration of the causation process. In the latter case, with unergative base verbs, the prevalent reading of the first causation is direct, whereas that of the second is indirect.

Regarding the encoding of the causee in oblique function, P’orhépecha requires the suffixation of the middle/reflexive morpheme -kurhi; the ensuing
construction corresponds to benefactive causatives. The encoding of an instrument in oblique function has no restrictions and is common even when the instrumental markers occur attached to the predicate. Although the introduction of an instrument object is only possible if instrumental marking occurs on the verb, the encoding of the instrument as a core argument is an operation that must comply with semantic restrictions: instruments must be generic and prototypical devices for the event at hand. The derivation of ditransitive constructions with an instrumental argument also demands the low animacy status of the patient/theme.

Double object constructions involving a causee or an instrument display evidence of behavioral asymmetries following the PO/SO pattern; the new object (causee or instrument) exhibits PO behavioral properties. Accordingly, in causative sentences, only the causee can occur as the passive subject, undergo reciprocalization, and/or be suppressed by -p'i. In constructions with an instrumental object, only the instrument can occur as the subject of predicates exhibiting the passive morpheme -na. This evidences the higher ranking of the causee/instrument over a patient/theme regarding access to PO versus SO.

With regard to double object causative sentences resulting from causativized monotransitive verbs, it is clear that the argument acted upon by the causee (patient/theme of the base verb = SO) must be less prominent on the person scale than the causee itself (PO). If the patient/theme is 1st/2nd person, the language presents two options: an analytic causative construction or the suppression of the causee. Considering the person constraint exhibited by Porhepecha ditransitive constructions, it follows that constructions with an SO that is more prominent on the person scale than the PO are not allowed. Therefore, a harmonic alignment between the syntactic primacy PO > SO and the prominence on the person hierarchy is imposed.

It is important to note that in causative and instrumental double object constructions—as with those derived from applicativization—the PO is always the object resulting from morphological marking on the verb, while when two causative events occur, the object resulting from the last causativization process displays PO properties. This behavior might suggest that access to PO in Porhépecha derived predicates is determined by the embedding of the morphological processes; i.e., given a base predicate, the newly introduced object would be the PO. This would make the appeal to object ranking on a thematic hierarchy less relevant in accounting for accessibility to syntactic primacy. Nevertheless, as will be shown in Chapter 7, this situation is not maintained in the case of Porhépecha multiple object constructions involving two valence-increasing mechanisms. These constructions are ungrammatical if they include two objects equally ranked on the thematic hierarchy derived from access to
PO versus SO in ditransitive sentences. Such consistency strongly supports the claim that in P’orhépecha there is a clear tendency for the syntactic primacy of the verbal arguments mapped onto core functions to be determined according to a thematic ranking.

Finally, there is an aspect of P’orhépecha causative constructions that must be considered: in two different circumstances discussed in this chapter, predicates presenting causative suffixes become ambiguous. In the first, the ambiguity, resulting from the iteration of causative markers and the *-tara-tara constraint, concerns the available readings either of a single causative event or of two causative events. In the second, the ambiguity is related to argument suppression due to the alternating combination of -tara with -p’i, which allows the sequence -p’i-tara to correspond either to the suppression of the PO of the base predicate, or to the suppression of the causee (PO of the causativized predicate). In both cases identical affix sequences do not correspond to a unique semantic and morphosyntactic structure.

The following tables are a summary of the main properties of morphological causative/instrumental constructions in P’orhépecha.

**Table 9**  
Ditransitive causative constructions involving a single causative event

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Causative allomorphs</th>
<th>Double marking</th>
<th>Causee encoding and syntactic function</th>
<th>Constraints on causative construction stemming from monotransitive base verbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Root -ra</td>
<td>-ra-tara</td>
<td>Causee = PO</td>
<td>*Patient/theme higher on the person hierarchy than the causee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root[-pi/-mi/-mpi]-ra</td>
<td>-ra-tara</td>
<td>Causee promoted to subject</td>
<td>[CAUSATIVE BASE] -PASS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root[-SPA.SUF/-rhi/-a]-ta</td>
<td>(-ta)-tara</td>
<td>Causee suppression</td>
<td>[CAUSATIVE BASE] -INDEF.OBJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root[-X(-Y)]-tara</td>
<td>-tara (*-tara-tara)</td>
<td>Causee co-referential with causer</td>
<td>[CAUSATIVE BASE] -RECP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Causee co-referential with the patient/theme of the base verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[V-RECP] -CAUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causative allomorphs</td>
<td>Double marking and causation type</td>
<td>Causees encoding and syntactic function</td>
<td>Constraints on double causative construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root-(ra)-tara</td>
<td>-ra</td>
<td>Ditransitive constructions</td>
<td>*Causee1 higher on the person hierarchy than the Causee2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causee1-Causee2</td>
<td>preferred reading=direct causation</td>
<td>Causee1 = SO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-tara</td>
<td>Causee2 = PO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>indirect causation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root[-(pi/-mi/-mpi)]-ra-tara</td>
<td>-ra</td>
<td>Causee2 promoted to subject</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causee1-Causee2</td>
<td>preferred reading=direct causation</td>
<td>[CAUSATIVE BASE]-CAUS-PASS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-tara</td>
<td>Causee2 co-referential with causer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>indirect causation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root<a href="-ta">-(SPA,SUF/-rhi/-a)</a>-tara</td>
<td>(-ta)</td>
<td>Causee2 suppression</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causee1-Causee2</td>
<td>preferred reading=direct causation</td>
<td>[CAUSATIVE BASE]-CAUS-INDF.OBJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-tara</td>
<td>Causee2 suppression</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>indirect causation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Root-X(-Y)]-tara</td>
<td>-tara</td>
<td>Monotransitive constructions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(*-tara-tara)</td>
<td>preferred reading=direct causation + indirect causation</td>
<td>Causee1 suppression</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causee1-Causee2</td>
<td></td>
<td>[CAUSATIVE BASE-INDF.OBJ]-CAUS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Causee2 co-referential with Causee1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[CAUSATIVE BASE-RECP]-CAUS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 11  Benefactive causative constructions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbal stem</th>
<th>Causee encoding</th>
<th>Constraints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[CAUSATIVE BASE]-mdl/refl</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>*Intransitive base verbs -kurhi constructions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 12  Instrumental constructions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrumental allomorphs</th>
<th>Instrument encoding</th>
<th>Instrumental object behavioral properties</th>
<th>Constraints on constructions with an instrumental object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Root-(ra)(-tara)</td>
<td>OBL/OBJ</td>
<td>PO</td>
<td>*Absence of instrumental marking on the verb stem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root-([-pi/-mi/-mpi]-ra)(-tara)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Instrument promoted to subject in impersonal -na constructions</td>
<td>*Non-prototypical instrument for the event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root-([-spa.suf/-rhi/-a]-ta)(-tara)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Ditransitive base verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Root-X(Y)]-tara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Monotransitive base verb with a patient/theme object high on the animacy scale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 6

Predicates with Spatial Suffixes: Part-whole Relations and External Possession Constructions

P’orhépecha has a set of over thirty verbal affixes that indicate spatial notions, called spatial suffixes, which can be grouped into two main subsets: geographic location suffixes (e.g. -mi ‘water/liquid’, -ru ‘path/road’), and part-whole suffixes that indicate inalienable possession (e.g. -k’u ‘upper extremity/hand’, -parha ‘back/convex exterior’). This chapter examines the morphosyntactic properties of predicates with spatial suffixes that allow the generation of ditransitive constructions. These double object constructions can only result when the predicate presents part-whole affix morphology. Although part-whole affixes cannot be defined as syntactic valence-increasing mechanisms, the predicates that contain them often allow ditransitive external possession (EP) constructions, in which the whole/possessor of the area or body part indicated by the spatial morpheme is realized in object function without processes of causativization or applicativization. In fact, as will be shown in this chapter, this type of EP construction exhibits different morphosyntactic properties from those found with the EP constructions resulting from applicativization discussed in Chapter 4. Double object constructions stemming from predicates with part-whole spatial suffixes are exemplified in (1).

(1)  a. wíchu katsá-k’u-s-Ø-ti sápi-ni
    dog     bite-upper.extremity-PRFPRS-3IND   child-OBJT
    xákti-ni
    forearm/hand-OBJT
    ‘The dog bit the child’s hand.’

    b. Lúpi xupá-na-sha-Ø-ti  itsúkwa-ni  María-ni
    Lupe    wash-cavity-PROGPRS-3IND      breast-OBJT      Maria-OBJT
    ‘Lupe is washing Maria’s breast.’

It is important to note that the encoding of part-whole possessive relationships in P’orhépecha has three main characteristics. Firstly, predicates with part-whole spatial affixes, such as those in (1), do not allow the encoding of the
possession and the possessum in a single genitive NP; therefore internal possession (IP) constructions are ungrammatical, as shown in (2).

(2) *wichu katsá-\textit{k'u-s-}\textit{∅-ti} sapí-iri
\textit{dog bite-upper.extremity-PRF-PRS-3IND child-GEN}
\textit{xák'i-ni}
\textit{forearm/hand-OBJT}

Intended reading: ‘The dog bit the child’s hand.’

Secondly, if there is no part-whole spatial suffix, ditransitive constructions are not allowed (see (3a)), and the inalienable possession of a body part cannot be syntactically expressed (see (3b)).

(3) a. *Lúpi \textit{xupá-sha-∅-ti} itsúkwa-ni María-ni
\textit{Lupe wash-PROG-PRS-3IND breast-OBJT Maria-OBJT}
Intended reading: ‘Lupe is washing Maria’s breast.’

b. Lúpi \textit{xupá-sha-∅-ti} itsúkwa-ni María-eri-ni
\textit{Lupe wash-PROG-PRS-3IND breast-OBJT Maria-GEN-OBJT}
‘Lupe is washing Maria’s breast (e.g. an animal’s breast that belongs to Maria, which is separated from the rest of its body).’
* ‘Lupe is washing Maria’s breast (Maria’s body part).’

Lastly, the various part-whole spatial affixes have different morphosyntactic properties. Similar to the predicates in (1–3), the one in (4), with the suffix -\textit{ntu} that indicates the area extending from below the knee to the foot in the human body, cannot generate a ditransitive construction. In this case, as is the norm with most part-whole suffixes, the body part they refer to is necessarily related to the argument in subject function:

(4) a. wichu \textit{katsá-ntu-s-∅-ti} xantsíri-ni
\textit{dog bite-lower.extremity-PRF-PRS-3IND leg/foot-OBJT}
‘The dog bit its foot.’

1 If the verbal root in (3) undergoes applicativization, the resulting EP double object construction would have the same meaning as the IP construction in (3b); i.e., the sentence with the applicative suffix -\textit{ku}, Lúpi \textit{xupákushati itsúkwani Maríani}, only allows the reading whereby the breast is not an inalienable part of Maria.
b. *wíchu katsá-ntu-s-∅-ti sápi-ni
   dog bite-lower.extremity-prf-prs-3ind child-objt

xantsíri -ni
   leg/foot-objt

Intended reading: ‘The dog bit the child’s foot.’

The organization of this chapter is as follows: In 6.1, a general overview of P’orhépecha spatial suffixes is provided, along with a discussion of their grammatical status. In 6.2, the types of relationship between the space denoted by the two subsets of spatial morphemes and the arguments of the derived predicate are shown, as well as the encoding patterns of these arguments. This section goes on to explore the morphological mechanisms that allow the area signaled by part-whole suffixes to change from one locus to another. Based on the analysis of various kinds of predicates with part-whole morphemes, a unified explanation regarding the effects on verb valence exhibited by these predicates is offered. Section 6.3 focuses on the morphosyntactic properties of predicates with part-whole spatial suffixes that refer to an area located on an entity denoted by an argument other than the subject. It is shown that these stems allow the generation of ditransitive EP constructions, in which the possessor of the body part referred to by the spatial morpheme displays PO behavioral properties.

6.1 Grammatical Status of Spatial Suffixes

According to Friedrich (1970, 1971a:13), P’orhépecha spatial suffixes function as locative adverbials that represent the location of an event in terms of spatial features by specifying certain properties of the space where the action or state is located. In other words, spatial morphemes signal the space where the event indicated by the verb takes place or is directed to, or where one of the participants in the event is, or becomes, located.

According to the characteristics of the different spaces signaled by the spatial morphemes, it is possible to recognize two main subsets: a) geographic location suffixes, and b) part-whole suffixes (cf. Friedrich 1969:130). Geographic location spatial suffixes refer to places or areas of the environment such as -pi/-pa ‘ground/land’, -ru ‘path/road’, -nu ‘patio’, -mi/-ma ‘water/liquid’, and -p’i/-p’a ‘fire’. Part-whole suffixes, on the other hand, signal a geometrical area located within a larger entity. This group is comprised of morphemes used to refer to body parts and/or to parts of an object; for example, -ts’t ‘top’ or ‘head’, -ntu ‘lower extremity/base’ or ‘foot’, and -ni/-na ‘cavity’ or ‘chest’.
In the majority of cases, the semantics of spatial suffixes encompasses features relative to the shape and other geometric properties of the space referred to (see Friedrich 1969, 1970, 1971a, and Monzón 2004). For example, certain part-whole spatial suffixes convey meanings for which there are no free lexemes in the language, such as -a ‘central or bounded’ (in the human body the gastrointestinal area), and -nti ‘surface of an angle on a vertical axis’ (in the human body the area from the ear to the shoulder). Furthermore, there is no formal relationship between the spatial suffixes and the nouns with similar meanings; for example: -mi ‘liquid/water’, itsì ‘water’, -mu ‘edge/mouth’, penchùmikwa ‘mouth’; -ntu ‘lower extremity/foot’, xantsíri ‘leg/foot’; -tsì ‘top/head’, ép’u ‘head’. Although it can be supposed that some spatial morphemes may come from now lost body-part terms, there is no available evidence supporting this. P’orhépecha grammars of the sixteenth century (Gilberti 1987 [1558], Lagunas 1983 [1574]) show that spatial suffixes and body-part terms in Old P’orhépecha have the grammatical characteristics as in the modern language.2

P’orhépecha spatial morphemes resemble the lexical affixes of the Salishan languages, discussed principally by Saunders and Davis (1975), Anderson (1985), Bach (1993), Mithun (1997), Gerdts (1998, 2003), and Gerdts and Hinkson (2004). For the most part, these authors recognize that the lexical affixes in these languages present the following properties, which are also exhibited by P’orhépecha spatial suffixes:3

1. They have a lexical meaning related mainly to spatial notions, among which are forms used for body parts.
2. They make the meaning of the verb to which they are bound more precise by indicating the participation of certain entities in the event, without replacing or incorporating arguments.

---

2 In modern and Old P’orhépecha, most of the nouns used to denote body parts are derived from verbal stems that commonly present spatial affixes. Generally, P’orhépecha body-part terms refer to the function of the part or to the shape/location of the area on the body (see the sixteenth century Diccionario Grande de la Lengua de Michoacán, and Capistrán 2013).

3 The lexical affixes of these languages may be bound to verbal and non-verbal bases. Given that the spatial suffixes in P’orhépecha only function as verbal affixes, I only consider the properties that are exhibited by the lexical affixes as constituents of the predicate. In this regard, it is worth noting that Gerdts (1998, 2004) states that in Halkomelem, lexical affixes function as incorporations and can occupy argumental positions (cf. Fleck 2006). However, there is no consensus on this matter encompassing the entire group of languages that present lexical affixes. The arguments provided by Gerdts regarding Halkomelem do not seem to apply to the P’orhépecha language, which is why I adopt the stance of Anderson, Bach, and Mithun with regard to the second and third properties listed here.
3. They can co-occur with morphologically unrelated nouns conveying similar meanings to those of the lexical affixes or specifying a part located in the area indicated by these affixes.

4. They may relate to different semantic and grammatical functions, mainly to patient objects and locative obliques.

In (5) and (6) examples are shown of P’orhépecha spatial suffixes that denote a part-whole relationship. In these constructions, the suffixes indicate a body part of the entity denoted by the subject of the derived verb, which can be specified by a noun either in object or oblique function:

(5) a. María p’á-narhi-s-∅-ti éskwa-ni/-rhu

   Maria touch-flat.surface-PRF-PRS-3IND eye-OBJT/-LOC

   ‘Maríai touched heri eye.’

   b. Xwánu xuká-nti-a-s-∅-ti
tínti-icha-ni kutsîkwa-rhu

   Juan have.on/put.on-angle-distr-PRF-PRS-3IND
fly-PL-OBJT ear-LOC

   ‘Juan has flies on his ear.’

As can be seen in (5a), -narhi ‘flat surface’ (used to refer to the face when applied to the human body) indicates an area of María’s body, and the word éskwa ‘eye’ a subregion of that area or a body part located therein. If a lack of context makes it necessary to specify the affected subregion of the face, the nominal that names the part (éskwa) must be syntactically expressed by an NP. For example, the predicate p’ánarhini is also used if reference is made to the cheek. However, if the face is touched, the most common way of saying this is simply María p’ánarhisti, and the presence of the noun kánarhikwa ‘face’ is considered redundant. Similarly, in (5b), without the presence of kutsîkwa ‘ear’, it is not possible to ascertain whether Juan has flies on his neck, on his shoulder, or on his ear, since -nti covers the area from the ear to the shoulder when referring to the human being.

The examples in (6) illustrate the use of geographic location spatial morphemes referring to entities that are typically regarded as places.

(6) a. pisu kwaká-pi-sha-∅-ti

   ground get.wet-ground-PROG-PRS-3IND

   ‘The ground is getting wet.’
b. María inchá-mi-s-∅-ti xapónta-rhu
   Maria get.in/into-liquid-PRF-PRS-3IND lake-LOC
   'Maria went into the lake.'

In (6a), the spatial suffix -pi indicates that písu 'ground' is a space that undergoes a change of state, while in (6b), -mi signals that the subject/agent enters into a liquid space, specified by the argument xapóntarhu, which is marked with locative case.

The examples in (5) and (6) show that the four properties recognized as characteristic of Salishan lexical affixes can also be found in Porhépecha constructions with spatial suffixes. These suffixes do not replace arguments. They can co-occur with morphologically unrelated nouns that specify the part located in the area signaled by part-whole morphemes, as seen in (5), or that specify the environmental entity that includes the space referred to by the geographic location affixes, as seen in (6). The space or region they denote may be related to argument NPs that correspond to objects or locative obliques.4

Porhépecha spatial affixes form a closed set that is distinguished formally and functionally from the classificatory mechanisms—numeral classifiers and dispositional-classificatory verbs—that exist in the language (see 1.3.2.1).5 Consider the constructions in (7–9):

(7) a. xwá-∅ tsimáni erá-kwa tsúntsu-icha-ni
    bring-IMP two round.object-NMLZ pot-PL-OBJT
    'Bring two pots.'

b. xwá-∅ tsimáni ichá-kwa pirímu-icha-ni
    bring-IMP two long.object-NMLZ stick-PL-OBJT
    'Bring two sticks.'

(8) a. tsúntsu kirá-mi-s-∅-ti (istî-rhu)
    pot round.object-liquid-PRF-PRS-3IND (water-LOC)
    'The pot is in the water.'

4 As mentioned by Friedrich (1971a), spatial suffixes can also indicate directionality and, in some cases, instrumental value; for example, eróparhani 'to look back' (eró 'look' -parha 'back'), and urhúk‘uni 'to grind manually' (urhú 'grind' -k‘u 'hand').

5 This difference between classificatory and locative morphemes is also discussed in DeLancey’s (1999) work on Klamath.
b. pirímu ichá-mi-s-∅-ti
    stick long.horiz.object-liquid-PRF-PRES-IND (water-LOC)
    ‘The stick is (horizontally) in the water.’

(9) a. Lúpi kirá-mu-s-∅-ti ma bolíta
    Lupe round.object-edge-PRF-PRES-3IND one little.ball
    (penchúmikwa-rhu)
    (mouth-LOC)
    ‘Lupe has a little ball in her mouth.’

b. Lúpi ichá-mu-s-∅-ti
    Lupe long.horiz.object-edge-PRF-PRES-3IND

    ma pirímu (penchúmikwa-rhu)
    one stick (mouth-LOC)
    ‘Lupe has a stick (horizontally) in her mouth.’

In (7), erákwa and ichákwa are employed in the quantification of round and long objects, respectively. In (8) and (9), the dispositional roots—dependent roots that must be combined with spatial suffixes—indicate the orientation or position of an entity that is located in a particular space: kirá in (8) refers to round (or three-dimensional) objects (in cases of entities such as pots, these are placed in their canonical position with the opening upward), while ichá in (9) is employed for long (thin) objects in horizontal position.

As pointed out by Friedrich (1970), although spatial suffixes on the one hand, and numeral classifiers and classificatory verbs on the other share geometric notions of shape/dimension/position, they correspond to different phenomena. The latter imply a classification of nominal referents (subject or object) based on the shape and disposition of the entities, whereas the spatial suffixes indicate properties of the space where the event is located. This, as a rule, implies the breakdown of an area or entity into geometric components. In contrast to the classification conveyed by the use of the verbal roots in (9), the occurrence of spatial affixes is independent of the shape and disposition properties of the entities involved, as is evident in the following sentence: María/tsúntsù/kuchíyu kwákámusti ‘Maria/the pot/the knife got wet in her/its mouth/edge.’ P’orhépecha spatial affixes have no classificatory functions.

According to Levy (1999) (see also Mithun 1997, and Gerdts and Hinkson 2004) when part terms occur in a verbal complex, they are typically related to the EP
phenomenon, and they only acquire classificatory value if employed to indicate the shape of the whole (for example, ‘leg’ for long objects). In Porhèpecha, part-whole affixes cannot be used to refer to a whole, e.g., -t’arha ‘long area limited or flanked by something on both ends’ (used for the upper leg) may refer to the trunk of a tree, but cannot be used to refer to a trunk as an entity separate from the tree. Geographic location spatial suffixes such as -mi ‘water/liquid’ or -pi ‘fire’, unlike classificatory mechanisms, are not obligatory when something is stated about this kind of entity; for example, the suffix -mi does not occur in the predicate referring to water in (10).

(10) itsî xapönta-rhu anápu ampó-narhi-s-∅-ti
    water lake-LOC RL get.clean-flat.surface-PRF-PRS-3IND
    ‘The water in the lake is clean (on its surface).’

6.2 Relationships between the Space Signaled by Spatial Morphemes and the Arguments of the Derived Verb

Porhèpecha part-whole spatial suffixes can be classified into three groups, depending on whether, in the absence of additional morphological mechanisms, the space they refer to is or is not located within the entity denoted by the argument in subject function. From now on, for simplicity’s sake, when referring to the whole within/on which an area is located (the possessor of the part), the expression ‘the entity denoted by’ will be assumed as implicit and thus frequently omitted. Table 13 presents an overview of these three groups using the part-whole suffixes exemplified in this chapter. The second column shows the basic or general meaning of each suffix, followed by the area or part it indicates when used to refer to the human body.

---

6 For a complete list of Porhèpecha spatial morphemes with their referential possibilities and their semantic specifications, see Friedrich (1971a) and Monzón (2004). Table 13 is only a rough characterization of the basic meaning conveyed by part-whole suffixes based on my data and on the studies of these two authors.
### Table 13  Part-whole spatial suffixes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part-whole morpheme</th>
<th>Area/part referred to</th>
<th>Whole/possessor Subject</th>
<th>Whole/possessor Non-subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-a(rha)</td>
<td>center, central bounded central area of the trunk/gastrointestinal area</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>+LOC.EXP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-cha</td>
<td>inside of a narrowing throat</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>+LOC.EXP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-(n)cha</td>
<td>exterior of a narrowing neck</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>+LOC.EXP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ch'u</td>
<td>bottom/underside buttocks and genital area</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>+LOC.EXP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-k'u</td>
<td>final section of upper extremity from elbow to hand</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-mu</td>
<td>edge/orifice mouth/lips</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>+LOC.EXP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-narhi</td>
<td>flat surface face</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>+LOC.EXP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-nchi</td>
<td>upper surface seen from below not applicable to the human body</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>+LOC.EXP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ni</td>
<td>cavity chest</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Vowel ablaut -na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-nti</td>
<td>angle from ear to shoulder</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>+LOC.EXP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ntu(rha)</td>
<td>lower extremity/base from knee to foot</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>+LOC.EXP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As can be observed in Table 13, the spatial suffix -\textit{rhi} ‘external surface of a body or entity’, identified by Monzón (2004), shows atypical behavior in P’orhépecha, as the surface referred to cannot be located on the argument encoded as the subject of the derived verb, as can be seen in (11).

\(\text{(11) a. xupá-rhi-nt'a-s-∅-ti tsúntsu-ni}\)
\textit{wash-external.surface-itr-prf-prs-3ind pot-objt}
‘S/he washed the pot (on the outside).’

\(\text{b. María kurhú-rhi-s-∅-ti pipíchu-ni}\)
María \textit{get.burned-external.surface-prf-prs-3ind chicken-objt}
‘Maria burned the chicken (on the outside).’

\(\text{c. *María kurhú-rhi-s-∅-ti}\)
Intended reading: ‘Maria burned herself.’
In order for -rhi to refer to the external surface of the subject argument, the middle/reflexive suffix -kurhi must be employed.

(12) María kurhú-rhi-kurhi-s-∅-ti
    ‘Maria burned herself.’

Several part-whole affixes denote an area that can be located either on the subject or on another participant. This is the case with -t’a ‘side’, with -k’u ‘forearm/hand’ (when referring to the human body) in (13), and with -nchi ‘upper surface seen from below’ in (14).

(13) a. sapí kwená-k’u-s-∅-ti
    ‘The childi licked hisi forearm/hand.’

    b. misítu kwená-k’u-s-∅-ti sapí-ni
    ‘The cat licked the child’s forearm/hand.’

(14) a. téchu teré-nchi-sha-∅-ti
    ‘The ceiling is rotting.’

    b. atá-nchi-nt’a-s-∅-ti atákwa
    ‘S/he spread paint on the ceiling.’

In the case of the majority of part-whole suffixes, the area they denote must be located on the argument in subject function, as shown by the ungrammaticality of (15b).

(15) a. María teyá-narhi-s-∅-ti
    ‘Maria hit herself on the face.’/‘Mariai hit heri face.’
b. *María teyá-narhi-s-∅-ti sapí-ni
   Maria    hit-flat.surface-PRF-PRS-3IND    child-OBJT
   Intended readings: ‘Maria hit the boy’s face.’/‘Maria hit the boy on the face.’

The part-whole suffixes that signal an area of the subject can undergo morphological processes that allow this area to be located on an argument other than the subject. These processes are introduced in 6.2.1 and discussed in 6.2.2.1.

As mentioned above, the absence of a part-whole spatial morpheme excludes the possibility of implementing an inalienable possession relationship, as can be seen when comparing the sentences in (16).

(16) a. María xupá-ntu-s-∅-ti (xantsíri-ni/-rhu)
   Maria    wash-lower.extremity-PRF-PRS-3IND (leg/foot-OBJT/-LOC)
   ‘Maria washed her foot.’

b. María xupá-s-∅-ti xantsíri-ni/*-rhu
   Maria    wash-PRF-PRS-3IND    leg/foot-OBJT/-LOC
   ‘Maria washed the leg/foot.’
   *‘Maria washed her leg/foot.’

In contrast to (16a), (16b) can only mean ‘Maria washed the leg/foot’ (e.g. the leg/foot of an animal separated from the rest of its body). Likewise, if the middle/reflexive morpheme -kurhi is added to the verbal stem in (16b)—María xupákurhisti xantsírini—the only available reading is that the leg/foot is the property (and not a body part) of Maria. Consequently, neither this middle sentence nor (16a) allow the encoding of the patient xantsírini as an oblique marked by locative case or the encoding of the whole/possessor of the part denoted by the body-part noun.

Similarly, part-whole morphemes are required by roots such as the dependent root kwí ‘carry something on the body’ and xuká when meaning ‘to have something on or put something on one’s body’. In the predicates in (17), the spatial suffixes -parha ‘convex exterior’ and -ntsí ‘top’ indicate the region where the theme argument is located.

(17) b. xi=kiní kwí-parha-pa-a-ka
   1sg=2sg.OBJ carry-convex.exterior-DIR-FUT-1/2IND
   ‘I will carry you (on my back).’ (temba.97)
Predicates with part-whole suffixes that signal a part or region of an argument other than the subject entail constructions that Friedrich (1971a:8) defines as instances of “allofactive voice”; i.e., an action is carried out by an agent towards an object that is external or distinct from it. In contrast, predicates with part-whole suffixes that refer to a part or region located on the subject argument generate reflexive or middle constructions. According to Friedrich, middle and reflexive stems are instances of the “non-allofactive voice”, which is comprised of “actions and states that are somehow immanent in or referring to the subject” (1971a:8–9); i.e., the event remains in the domain of the subject.

Middle constructions are also found with predicates that present geographic location spatial suffixes such as -pi ‘ground’ and -mi ‘liquid’. These suffixes, unlike part-whole morphemes, can only be combined with intransitive roots, resulting in stems where the event denoted by the verbal root remains within the domain of the subject.

Example (18) shows sentences with change of state verbs in which the geographic location suffixes correspond to or are related to the entity that undergoes the change.7

(18) a. pisu kwaka-pi-sha-∅-ti
    ground get.wet-ground-prog-prs-3ind
    ‘The ground is getting wet.’

    b. yorhekwa xawá-mi-s-∅-ti
    river deepen-liquid-prf-prs-3ind
    ‘The river is deep.’

In the sentences in (19), the spatial suffixes indicate the place where the single argument of the base verb is, or becomes, located. In these locative constructions, the location of the event can only be syntactically expressed by an NP if flagged by locative case:

---

7 Predicates similar to those in (18) allow the expression of their only argument in locative case. See Monzón (2004:228–233, 363, 384–629) on this alternation.
(19) a. *wichu* apó-pi-s-∅-ti 
    dog long.horiz.object-ground-prf-prs-3ind (ground-LOC) 
    ‘The dog lay down on the ground.’/‘The dog is lying on the ground.’

b. *ka* yameru=ksī warhi-mi-sīram-ti
    and almost=1/3pl.SBJ die-liquid-hab.pst-3ind
    ‘... and they almost perished in the water.’ (San Lukasī 8(23))

c. *wé-mi-nt’a-s-p-ti*
    get.out-liquid-itr-prf-pst-3ind
    ‘S/he got out of the well.’ (Maria.41)

Despite the fact that most of the part-whole suffixes that necessarily refer to an area located on the subject argument do not allow locative constructions such as those in (19), these are allowed with the part-whole spatial -ni/-ne. This suffix may denote a part of the argument encoded in subject function, as in (20a, b), or an area of the place where this argument is or becomes located, as in (20c).⁸

(20) a. María p’á-ni-s-∅-ti
    Maria touch-cavity-prf-prs-3ind
    ‘Maria touched heri/*j breast.’

b. p’orhóta xawá-ni-s-∅-ti
    hole deepen-cavity-prf-prs-3ind
    ‘The hole is deep.’

c. xí wekó-ne-s-∅-ka kawáru
    1sg fall-cavity-prf-prs-1/2ind ditch
    ‘I fell into the ditch.’ (miringua.91)

6.2.1 Change of Domain or Relocalization of the Space Referred to by Spatial Morphemes

As shown above, geographic location spatial suffixes indicating entities such as -pi ‘fire’ or -mi ‘liquid’ can only be combined with intransitive roots. In the

⁸ In (20c), the noun *kawáru* is an oblique argument. The absence of the locative case marker is explained by the fact that, in Porhépecha, nouns that denote places (most of them ending in -ru/-ro, which comes from the locative -rhu) do not permit this type of marking when their syntactic function is locative.
resulting predicates, which are also intransitive, these spatial suffixes are related to the subject, i.e., either to the entity undergoing a change of state or to the location of the subject argument. Conversely, part-whole spatial suffixes can combine with intransitive or transitive verbs. The syntactic valence of the derived predicates depends on whether the part or region denoted by these suffixes is located on the entity denoted by the subject or on another entity involved in the event. As mentioned earlier (see Table 13), the majority of part-whole suffixes can only signal an area of the argument in subject function, but there are certain morphological mechanisms that allow the relocalization of this area to another entity. These are, depending on the spatial affix in question, the vowel ablaut and the addition of certain suffixes that can only occur after a spatial morpheme.

The only part-whole suffix with which the change of domain from the subject argument to another participant is marked by way of vowel ablaut is -ni ‘cavity’. Compare the forms in (21) and (22):

(21) a. p’á-ni-s-∅-ti
    touch-cavity-PRF-PRS-3IND
    ‘S/he touched hisi/heri chest.’

    b. p’á-na-s-∅-ti
    touch-cavity-PRF-PRS-3IND
    ‘S/he touched hisj/herj chest.’

(22) a. t’wá-ni-s-∅-ti
    spit-cavity-PRF-PRS-3IND
    ‘S/he spit on hisi/heri chest.’

    b. t’wá-na-s-∅-ti
    spit-cavity-PRF-PRS-3IND
    ‘S/he spit on hisj/herj chest.’

Vowel ablaut is also found with the geographic spatial morphemes -pi/-p’i ‘fire, ground’ and -mi ‘liquid’. These related forms indicate the location of the patient/theme argument of a monotransitive base verb, or a location towards which the effect of the action of the subject/agent is directed (compare the examples in (23) with the intransitive sentences in (19), in which -pi and -mi signal the location of the subject argument).
(23) a. erá-p’a-sha-∅-ka=ni
tiríapu chpíri-rhu
look-fire-PROG-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ corncob fire-LOC
'I am looking at the corncobs on the fire.'

b. kachú-ma-∅-tì
p’atsímu xapónta-rhu
cut-liquid-PRF-PRS-3IND reed lake-LOC
'S/he cut the reed in the lake.'

c. t’wá-pa-∅-ka=ni
pisu-∅/-rhu
spit-ground-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ ground-OBJT/-LOC
'I spat (on) the ground.'

d. tsitá-ma-∅-ka=ni
limónisì itsí-rhu
squeeze-liquid-FUT-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ lemon water-LOC
'I will squeeze lemon into the water.'

Similarly, the part-whole spatial -ni ‘cavity’, on taking the form -na, can be employed to locate the patient/theme of the base root. Compare the sentences in (24) with (20c), xí wekóneska kawáru ‘I fell into the ditch’:

(24) a. p’etá-na-∅-ka=ni
sapí-ni p’orhóta-rhu
take.out-cavity-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ child-OBJT hole-LOC
'I took the child out of the hole.'

b. ó-na-a-tì
kúchi-ni xatákwa-rhu
cover-cavity-FUT-3IND pig-OBJT corral-LOC
lock.up
‘S/he will lock up the pig in the corral.’

c. erá-na-nì
kawáru
look-cavity-NF cave
‘…to look inside the cave.’ (Maria.43)

In the case of the remaining part-whole morphemes that signal a part of the argument in subject function, the presence of the suffixes -ku or -ta is necessary in order for the whole/possessor to switch to a participant other than the subject. This is exemplified with an intransitive verbal root in (25) and with a monotransitive one in (26).
(25) a. Lúpi/táa kwaká-mu-s-∅-ti  
Lupe/door get.wet-edge-PRF-PRS-3IND  
‘Lupe wet her mouth/lips.’/‘Lupe’s mouth/lips got wet.’/‘The door (of the house) got wet.’

b. kwaká-mu-ta-s-∅-ti  
get.wet-edge-LOC.EXP-PRF-PRS-3IND=1SG.OBJ  
‘S/he wet the door.’

c. kwaká-mu-ku-s-∅-ti=rini  
get.wet-edge-LOC.EXP-PRF-PRS-3IND=1SG.OBJ  
‘S/he wet my mouth/lips.’

(26) a. xupá-narhi-s-∅-ti  
wash-flat.surface-PRF-PRS-3IND  
‘S/he washed heri/hisi face (eye, cheek).’

b. xupá-narhi-ta-s-∅-ti  
wash-flat.surface-LOC.EXP-PRF-PRS-3IND  
‘S/he washed the inner wall.’

c. xupá-narhi-ku-s-∅-ti  
wash-flat.surface-LOC.EXP-PRF-PRS-3IND  
‘S/he washed herj/hisj face (eye, cheek).’

It is important to note that in (25c) and (26c), the morpheme -ku that follows a spatial affix is not the applicative morpheme. This suffix is in a paradigmatic relation with the vowel ablaut, as seen in (21) and (22), and with -ta, as shown in (25b) and (26b); furthermore, it does not alternate with -chi when the object is 1st/2nd person, which is evident in (25c).

According to Friedrich (1971a:21, 55, 61–67), although with certain predicates exhibiting spatial morphemes the locative expansion (-ku or -ta) is determined by the verbal root, while with others alternating suffixation is allowed, the prevailing norm is the use of -ta when the space signaled by the part-whole suffix is located within an entity of the domestic—principal parts of the dwelling—or natural environment, particularly that affected by man. In contrast, -ku occurs with referents related to any taxonomic body, especially to clothing, plants, containers, and zoological body parts. This distribution of -ku and -ta can be observed in (25) and (26). In (25a) -mu may refer either to the mouth/lips of a person or to the door of a house; in (25b) -ta is required since what is
wet by someone is the door of the house, while in (25c), where -mu refers to a human body part, it is followed by -ku. Similarly, in (26b) the occurrence of -ta is related to the fact that it is the inner wall of a house that is washed.

In studies discussing P’orhépecha spatial morphemes, certain claims are made about the grammatical function and transitivizing effects of the vowel ablaut and of the suffixes -ku and -ta, which will be discussed in 6.2.2.1. Foster (1969:117, 127) considers the suffixes -ku and -ta attached to spatial morphemes to be “locative expansions” (a term adopted in this work), and claims that they change the locus of the action or the condition expressed by the verbal base to a similar locus on the body of another, or, in some cases, to another part of the body of the subject of the verb (cf. Monzón 2004:248, 251, 325). This author adds that if the base verb is transitive, -ta is not transitivizing, but if it is intransitive, -ta is transitivizing.

Friedrich (1971a:67–81) considers that the vowel ablaut /a/, as well as the suffixes -ku and -ta, are voice markers that express allofactive forms, i.e., actions carried out by the subject towards another entity or non-inherent object. However, Friedrich recognizes non-allofactive constructions stemming from predicates with -ku and -ta, which leads him to propose the existence of homophone morphemes in the case of these suffixes. Nava (1998, 2004), on the other hand, argues that the vowel ablaut /a/, along with the suffixes -ku and -ta, should be considered causative or active morphemes, and that there is a different -ku with a middle value.

In discussing the function and valence-changing effects of the locative expansions -ku and -ta, it is important to emphasize that similar constructions are generated from predicates presenting locative expansions attached to part-whole suffixes, and from predicates with part-whole suffixes that do not require or admit locative expansions. Therefore, the next section, in which the effects of part-whole morphemes on syntactic valence are explored, will deal with predicates with part-whole affixes that can designate an area or body part of an argument other than the subject of the derived predicate without additional morphological processes. I will give evidence to propose that the morphosyntactic properties and valence-changing possibilities of part-whole morphemes can be accounted for by their relational character, as well as by the specification they convey regarding the argument that corresponds to

---

9 Friedrich (1971a) proposes a zero morpheme in opposition to -ku and -ta, which indicates the non-allofactive voice. According to this author, the allofactive/non-allofactive value of spatial affixes such as -ku ‘upper extremity/hand’, which neither present the vowel ablaut nor take -ku or -ta, is determined by the transitivity of the base.
the whole/possessor, without the need to resort to valence or voice-changing morphology.

6.2.2 Valence Change and Coding Patterns of Predicates with Part-whole Morphemes

The presence of part-whole spatial suffixes may or may not alter the syntactic valence of the verb they are bound to, depending on the transitivity of the base verb, the location of the part on the argument encoded in subject function or on another argument, and on the encoding patterns of the arguments of the derived predicate. This is supported by the behavior of predicates with spatial suffixes that signal an area or body part of the subject argument or of another argument. These part-whole suffixes, when added to monotransitive verbs, result in either middle-reflexive constructions or active constructions with an agent acting upon an area located in another’s domain. In both constructions the part directly affected, if syntactically expressed by an NP, can be encoded as an object or in oblique function with locative case. These alternating constructions can be seen in (27).

(27) a. María xupá-k’u-s-∅-ti
    María wash-upper.extremity-PRF-PRS-3IND
    (xák’i-ní/-rhu)
    (forearm/hand-OBJT/-LOC)
    ‘Maria washed her hand.’

b. Pédrú xupá-k’u-s-∅-ti María-ní
    Pedro wash-upper.extremity-PRF-PRS-3IND María-OBJT
    (xák’i-ní/-rhu)
    (forearm/hand-OBJT/-LOC)
    ‘Pedro washed Maria’s hand.’

In these constructions, the spatial morphemes add the lexical information to the base verb that a part of a whole is involved in the event (for example, ‘wash’ versus ‘wash-hand’). Since the affected zone, when expressed through the use of an NP, presents alternating coding patterns, the syntactic valence of the base verb may or may not change. Nevertheless, while the reflexive construction in (27a) may result in an intransitive sentence or present an object NP, if the hand does not belong to the subject/agent, as in (27b), its possessor must
be encoded in object function, which makes a monotransitive sentence or a double object construction possible.

Part-whole suffixes, when added to monotransitive verbs, also permit constructions such as those in (28). In these predicates, the spatial suffix indicates a part of a whole affected by the action carried out on the patient argument of the base verb. In these instances, if the part is expressed by an NP, it must bear locative case:

(28) a. xí  tsitá-k’u-s-∅-ka=ni limónisí-ni
     1sg squeeze-upper.extremity-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ lemon-OBJT
     (xak’íri-rhu)
     (forearm/hand-LOC)
     ‘I squeezed the lemon onto my hand.’

b. xí  tsitá-k’u-s-∅-ka=ni limónisí-ni
     1sg squeeze-upper.extremity-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ lemon-OBJT
     sapí-ni  (xak’íri-rhu)
     child- OBJT  (forearm/hand-LOC)
     ‘I squeezed the lemon onto the child’s hand.’

In (28) the spatial morpheme -k’u adds a locative argument to the base verb, which is semantically unrelated to the argument structure of the verbal root ‘squeeze’. Consequently, the middle/reflexive construction in (28a) is monotransitive, while (28b) is ditransitive.

A valence-increasing effect may also occur with change of state intransitive verbs—middle/reflexive verbs such as kwakáni ‘get wet’ and k’árhíni ‘get dry’—that require the addition of a part-whole suffix in order to signal the

10 The semantic and/or syntactic valence increase that may result from the occurrence of part-whole affixes is evident with unergative base verbs:

(i) Páblu wirhía-parha-a-sha-∅-ti sîrūki-icha-ni (péshu-rhu)
    Pablo run-convex.exterior-distr-PROG-PRS-3IND ant-PL-OBJT (back-LOC)
    ‘Pablo has ants running on his back.’

The addition of -parha to the verb ‘run’ leads to an increase of arguments; the possessor of the part affected by the action is realized in subject function. Constructions of this type can be considered as spatial or locative inversions, since the syntactic subject (possessor of the part) is not an effector but a location.
area undergoing a change of state. Compare the sentences in (29) with those in (30).

(29) a. takusí karhí-na’s-∅-ti
    rag get.dry-itr-prf-prs-3ind
    ‘The rag dried.’

b. Lúpi k’arhí-ra-na’s-∅-ti takúsí-ni
    Lupe get.dry-caus-itr-prf-prs-3ind rag-objt
    ‘Lupe dried the rag.’

(30) a. María k’arhí-k’u-na’s-∅-ti
    Maria get.dry-upper.extremity-itr-prf-prs-3ind
    xák’i-ni/-rhu
    forearm/hand-objt/-loc
    ‘Maria’s hand dried.’

b. Lúpi k’arhí-k’u-na’s-∅-ti María-ni
    Lupe get.dry-upper.extremity-itr-prf-prs-3ind María-objt
    xák’i-ni/-rhu
    forearm/hand-objt/-loc
    ‘Lupe dried Maria’s hand.’

When comparing (29a) with (30a), it becomes evident that the part-whole spatial morpheme licenses the expression of a noun in object or oblique function that specifies the part. Consequently, despite the fact that the base root is intransitive, the derived middle/reflexive verbal stem in (30a) allows a montransitive construction. In (30b), since the hand belongs to someone different from the argument in subject function, the possessor of the hand must be encoded in object function. In this case a new predicate is derived from an intransitive root, which involves an agent acting upon another participant without requiring the occurrence of a causative suffix, as is the case in (29b).11

11 The same transitivizing effect is found with the non-corporeal affix -nchi, used to refer to the ceiling in the following examples:

(i) téchu kwáka-nchi-s-∅-ti
    roof/ceiling get.wet-upper.surface-prf-prs-3ind
    ‘The ceiling got wet.’
In contrast to (29b), where no part-whole relation is involved, in (30b) the occurrence of \(-k’u\) allows the generation of a double object construction.

The examples in (31) display the suffix \(-rhi\) ‘external surface’, which denotes an area that must be located on an argument other than the subject. When this part-whole suffix is attached to either a monotransitive verb, as in (31a), or to a middle/reflexive verb, as in (31b), the result is an active monotransitive construction.

\[
\begin{align*}
(31) \quad & \text{a. } Lupí \ p’á-rhi-s-∅-ti \quad \text{Martíni-ni} \\
& \quad \text{Lupe touch-external.surface-prf-prs-3ind} \quad \text{Martin-OBJ} \\
& \quad ‘\text{Lupe touched Martin (on his external surface/his skin).}’ \\
& \quad \text{b. } María \ kwaká-rhi-s-∅-ti \quad \text{wíchu-ni} \\
& \quad \text{Maria get.wet-external.surface-prf-prs-3ind} \quad \text{dog-OBJ} \\
& \quad ‘\text{Maria wet the dog (on its external surface).}’
\end{align*}
\]

The examples offered in this section show that the meaning and morphosyntactic properties of predicates with part-whole spatial suffixes stem from the integration of the following: the argument structure of the base verb, the lexical information of the spatial morphemes, and the different possibilities of these suffixes regarding the argument of the derived stem that correspond to the whole or possessor of the area referred to. The spatial suffixes that denote a region of a whole are relational: they license the occurrence of an NP that specifies the part or subarea, and require the presence of another NP that corresponds to the whole/possessor. If the part is located on the argument encoded as the subject of the derived verb, the resulting construction is middle/reflexive (the event remains within the domain of the subject), and the syntactic valence of the base verb may or may not change given the alternating coding of the NP that specifies the part. When the part does not belong to the subject of the derived predicate, it follows that there is an agent that directs its action to the domain of another participant, thus licensing not only the presence of an NP that indicates the part, but also the addition of another argument NP: the whole/possessor. Consequently, these predicates may generate ditransitive constructions in the absence of valence-increasing mechanisms such as causativization or applicativization. This analysis also accounts for predicates with part-whole suffixes presenting locative expansions.

\[
\begin{align*}
(ii) \quad & \text{xí kwáka-nchi-s-∅-ka=ni} \quad \text{téchu-ni} \\
& \quad 1sg \quad \text{get.wet-upper.surface-prf-prs-1/2ind=1sg.sbj} \quad \text{roof/ceiling-OBJ} \\
& \quad ‘\text{I wet the ceiling.’}
\end{align*}
\]
6.2.2. Functions of the Locative Expansions -ku and -ta

As stated above, the function of the locative expansions -ku and -ta is to displace or relocalize the area signaled by the part-whole spatial affixes—mainly from the argument in subject function to another argument of the derived verb—without presenting inherent voice or transitivizing/causativizing values. This function, depending on the type of base verb and on the encoding possibilities of the arguments, yields different transitivity outcomes (similar to what occurs with the predicates examined in 6.2.2).

In general, the collected data support Friedrich’s statement about the correlation between the referent type of the whole/possessor and the choice of -ku (taxonomic body, clothing, plants, containers, and zoological body parts) or -ta (the domestic environment, principally parts of the dwelling). In this regard it is worth noting that, at least in the case of the Puácuarro community, -ta never occurs when the area signaled by a spatial suffix is located on an animate entity.\(^\text{12}\)

In the remainder of this section, predicates presenting locative expansions—with the sequence [SPA.SUF-ku] and with the sequence [SPA.SUF-ta]—are explored. The next examples show monotransitive base verbs combined with part-whole morphemes undergoing -ku suffixation. In (32), the whole/possessor is a human being, in (33a, b) it is a container, and in (33c) it is a plant.

\(32\) a. *kwachá-mu-ku-ni*  
strike-edge-LOC.EXP-NF

‘He struck her on the mouth.’ (Maria.41)

b. *wéna-s-∅-ti xeyá-a-ku-ni sïtúrhi-ni ka*  
begin-PRF-PRS-3IND rub-central-LOC.EXP-NF stomach-OBJT and

*kutsíkwa-echa-ni antsí-nti-ku-a-ni*  
ear-PL-OBJT pull-angle-LOC.EXP-DISTR-NF

‘Hei started to rub hisj stomach and to pull hisj ears.’ (miringua.92)

---

\(^{12}\) The only exception I have registered occurs with the spatial -k’u ‘upper extremity/hand’; when it does not refer to a part of the subject argument, the suffix -ta may be used. The spatial morpheme -ta ‘side’ may also signal an area of the subject argument or of another participant. In the latter case, the addition of the suffix -ku is common: *washát’ani Jesúsïni* ‘S/he sat next to Jesus’ (Saint Luke 8(35)), *kwántoki ma píchpiri kirát’akuni ma esquínarhu* ‘When a friend sat crouching next to a corner’ (p’ichiricha.99). When the morphemes that denote ‘upper extremity/hand’ and ‘side’ are combined with -ta and -ku, respectively, the whole/possessor cannot be the argument in subject function. These facts show a tendency to treat these affixes in the same way as the majority of part-whole spatial suffixes.
(33) a. p’ikú-nti-ku-s-∅-ka=ni
take.off/pull.off-angle-LOC.EXP-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ

kanít’akwa-ni  tsúntsu-ni
handle-OBJT  pot-OBJT
‘I pulled off the pot’s handle.’

b. ts’î  sési  xupá-parha-ku-a-ni
those  well  wash-convex.exterior-LOC.EXP-DISTR-NF

tsúntsu-icha-ni  ka  plátu-icha-ni
pot-PL-OBJT  and  plate-PL-OBJT
‘They wash the pots and plates well (on the outside).’ (San Lukasí 11(39))

c. ka  imá-eri  xorhénkwarhiti-icha  únta-s-p-ti
and  that-GEN  disciple-PL  begin-PRF-PST-3IND

kachú-ts’î-ku-pa-ni  espíga
cut-top-LOC.EXP-DIR-NF  ear.of.wheat
‘. . . and his disciples started to pluck the ears of wheat.’ (San Lukasí 6(1))

In the sentences in (34), the sequence [SPA.SUF-ku] indicates the area where the patient/theme of the base verb is located.

(34) a. t’ú=rini  no  atá-ntu-ku-s-∅-ka
2SG=1SG.OBJ  NEG  strike-lower.extremity-LOC.EXP-PRS-1/2IND

p’untsúmikwa  ampé
perfume  (some)thing
‘You did not smear perfume on my feet.’ (San Lukasí 7(45))

b. kwí-parha-ku-a-s-∅-ti
carry-convex.exterior-LOC.EXP-DISTR-PRF-PRS-3IND

chancháki-icha-ni  chkári-xapú
donkey-PL-OBJT  ash
‘S/he loaded the donkeys with ash.’ (tata Pedru.25)
c. éskà=ksi xó-ch’a-ku-pirin-ka
   SBR=1/3PL.SBJ tie-exterior.narrowing-LOC.EXP-COND-SBJV
   ma tsakápu molínu-rhu anápu
   one stone mill-LOC RL
   ‘. . . that they tied a millstone around his neck.’ (San Lukasì 17(2))

d. xatsí-ts’i-ku-sín-∅-ti sunúnta Lúpi-ni
   put-top-LOC.EXP-HAB-PRS-31ND blanket Lupe-OBJT
   ‘S/he put a blanket on Lupe’s head.’

As can be seen in the examples above, the types of constructions and the effects on syntactic valence shown by the sequence [TR.V-SPA.SUF-ku] are the same as those presented in the previous section with the part-whole suffixes -k’u (when not referring to the forearm/hand of the subject argument) and -rhi. The same situation occurs with change of state intransitive roots that allow an agentive subject; for example, the reflexive readings of ‘to wet oneself’, ‘to dry oneself’, ‘to burn oneself’, and ‘to clean oneself’. Therefore, the argument-adding effect of the sequence [SPA.SUF-ku] with this type of verb is the same as in (30b) and (31b); compare (30b) Lúpi k’arhík’unt’asti Mariáni xák’ini ‘Lupe dried Maria’s hand’ and (31b) kwakárhisti wíchuni ‘Maria wet the dog’, with the sentences in (35):

(35) a. ampá-ts’i-ku-s-∅-ka=ni sapí-ni
   get.clean-top-LOC.EXP-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ child-OBJT
   ‘I combed the child.’

b. kwaká-parha-ku-s-∅-ti=rini
   get.wet-convex.exterior-LOC.EXP-PRF-PRS-31ND=1SG.OBJ
   ‘S/he wet my back.’

c. kurhú-narhi-ku-s-∅-ti Lúpi-ni
   get.burned-flat.surface-LOC.EXP-PRF-PRS-31ND Lupe-OBJT
   ‘S/he burned Lupe’s face.’

d. k’arhí-ts’i-ku-nt’a-a-ti xawíri Lúpi-ni
   get.dry-top-LOC.EXP-ITR-FUT-31IND hair Lupe-OBJT
   ‘S/he will dry Lupe’s hair.’

The valence increase in predicates with locative expansions, in contrast to their middle/reflexive counterparts, arises from the displacement triggered by
-ku of the part or area signaled by the part-whole suffix from the entity denoted by the subject to another entity. Given this displacement, the possessor of the part must be introduced, and the locus of the agent’s action necessarily becomes located within the domain of the possessor/whole.

The fact that the function of locative expansions is merely to signal an area of an argument other than the subject without conveying valence increase or voice value, is supported by the occurrence of the sequence [SPA.SUF-ku] with intransitive roots, where it signals the location of the argument in subject function. The following examples show this type of locative construction:

(36) a. *sapí inchá-ch'u-ku-s-∅-ti káma-rhu*
    child get.in/into-bottom-LOC.EXP-PRF-PRS-3IND bed-LOC
    ‘The child went under the bed.’

b. *ximá=na apó-kwa-ntu-ku-ni*
    there=EVID long.horiz.object-ADV-lower.extremity-LOC.EXP-NF
    ma urhíkwa-rhu
    one oak-LOC
    ‘Over there he lay down at the foot of an oak.’ (enkantu.71)

c. *ké-mu-ku-nt'a-s-∅-ti=ksï*
    descend-edge-LOC.EXP-ITR-PRF-PRS-3IND=1/3PL.SBJ
    ‘They descended to the (river) bank.’

d. *kirá-ntu-ku-síram-ka*
    round.object-lower.extremity-LOC.EXP-HAB.PST-SBJV
    ma shénkwa-rhu
    one berry.tree-LOC
    ‘…that s/he sat at the foot of a berry tree.’ (imanga nombe mitipka uni.49)

e. *petá-kurhi-∅ ma bánku*
    take.out-MED/REFL-IMP one stool
    *para=ri washá-ts'ï-ku-ni*
    to=2SG.SBJ sit.down-top-LOC.EXP-NF
    ‘Take out a stool to sit down.’ (achaati.49)
In the sentences in (36), the part-whole suffix signals the area of the place, encoded in a locative phrase, where the subject is or becomes located. It is this type of construction that leads Friedrich (1971a:61–64) to suggest that there are in fact two -ku suffixes, one allofactive or active, as in (32–35), and another with locative value, as in (36). Likewise, Nava (2004) postulates the existence of two -ku suffixes, one causative/active and another with a middle value. Unlike these analyses, the one offered here accounts for the constructions with part-whole suffixes followed by -ku in a unified way, without resorting to the existence of two homophone affixes. The possibility of syntactic valence increase that can be observed in (32–35) stems from the type of predicate to which the sequence [SPA.SUF-ku] is added, rather than from an inherent transitive or causative value of -ku.

Summarizing, constructions with part-whole spatial morphemes followed by -ku can be explained by considering the argument structure of the base predicates, the relational character of part-whole morphemes that require the encoding of the whole/possessor in an independent NP, and the displacement or relocatization triggered by -ku of the part or region from the entity denoted by the subject to that indicated by another argument of the derived verb. In (37), the representation of the argument structure of the predicate in (36a), inchách‘ukusti, is presented.

(37) Argument structure of inchá-ch‘u-ku

get.in/into-bottom-LOC.EXP  ‘get under something’

inchá-ch‘u_{part}ku

Syntactic realization

[<AG> <LOCWHOLE>] SBJ OBL

In (37), -ku indicates that the spatial -ch‘u ‘bottom/underside’ does not refer to the subject/agent but to the entity (argument marked with locative case) where the agent is situated. The construction does not give rise to an increment in syntactic valence; -ku merely locates the subject/agent in a specific place.

The understanding of the function of -ku proposed here also accounts for the contrast between reflexive constructions (e.g., xupánarthisti éskwani/rhu ‘S/hei washed hisi/heri eye’), and those in which the agent directs its action
towards another participant (e.g., xupánarhikusti éskwani/rhu sapíni ‘S/he washed the boy’s eye’). In (38) and (39), the argument structures of both types of predicates are represented, respectively.\footnote{The same analysis can be applied to the spatial suffix denoting a cavity. In this case, the vowel ablaut has the same function as the locative expansions: xupánini ‘to wash one’s chest’, xupánani ‘to wash somebody else’s chest’.}

(38) Argument structure of \textit{xupá-narhi}  
\textit{wash-flat.surface}  
‘wash one’s face/eye/cheek’  

\textit{xupá-narhi}_{\text{part}}  
\text{Syntactic realization}  
\begin{array}{ccc}  
\text{SBJ} & \text{OBJ} & \text{OBL}  
\end{array}  

(39) Argument structure of \textit{xupá-narhi-ku}  
\textit{wash-flat.surface-LOC.EXP}  
‘wash someone’s face/eye/cheek’  

\textit{xupá-narhi}_{\text{part-ku}}  
\text{Syntactic realization}  
\begin{array}{ccc}  
\text{SBJ} & \text{OBJ} & \text{OBL}  
\end{array}  

While the addition of the spatial -narhi to the verbal root \textit{xupá} ‘wash’ in (38) establishes identity between the possessor of the part and the subject/agent, the presence of -ku in (39) induces the displacement of the inalienable possession relation inherent to part-whole affixes to a non-subject participant. Therefore, the occurrence of -\textit{ku} demands the addition of the whole/possessor, which is affected by the action denoted by the base verb and encoded in object function. Accordingly, the resulting constructions are monotransitive or ditransitive. It is possible to account for sentences such as \textit{tsitántunt’asti limónisï (xantsírirhu)} ‘S/he squeezed some lemon onto her/his foot’, and \textit{tsitántukunt’asti limónisï Xwánuni (xantsírirhu)} ‘S/he squeezed some lemon onto Juan’s foot’ in the same way:

(40) Argument structure of \textit{tsitá-ntu}  
\textit{squeeze-lower.extremity}  
‘squeeze something onto one’s foot’  

\textit{tsitá-ntu}_{\text{part}}  
\text{Syntactic realization}  
\begin{array}{ccc}  
\text{SBJ} & \text{OBJ} & \text{OBL}  
\end{array}  

(41) Argument structure of *tsítá-ntu-ku*

squeeze-lower.extremity-LOC.EXP

‘squeeze something onto someone else’s foot’

*tsítá-ntu*\textsubscript{part}-\textsubscript{ku}

\[ [[\text{<ag> } \text{<pat>}] <\text{pat}\textsubscript{whole}> <\text{loc}\textsubscript{part}>] \]

Syntactic realization

SBJ OBJ OBJ OBL

Unlike in the structure in (40), in (41) the sequence [SPA.SUF-\textsubscript{ku}] signals that the possessor of the part indirectly affected by the action (part that can be expressed in an NP with locative marking) is someone other than the agent; therefore, the resulting construction is ditransitive. In addition, the proposed analysis explains the valence increase conveyed by middle/reflexive base verbs followed by [SPA.SUF-\textsubscript{ku}]:

(42) Argument structure of *kwáká-narhi*

get.wet-flat.surface

‘wet one’s face/eye/cheek’

*kwáká-narhi*\textsubscript{part}

\[ [\text{<ag}\textsubscript{whole}> \text{<pat}\textsubscript{part}/\text{loc}\textsubscript{part}>] \]

Syntactic realization

SBJ (OBJ/OBL)

(43) Argument structure of *kwáká-narhi-ku*

gewet-flat.surface-LOC.EXP

‘wet someone’s face/eye/cheek’

*kwáká-narhi*\textsubscript{part}

\[ [\text{<ag}> \text{<pat}\textsubscript{whole}> \text{<pat}\textsubscript{part}/\text{loc}\textsubscript{part}>] \]

Syntactic realization

SBJ OBJ (OBJ/OBL)

Predicates that present part-whole morphemes followed by the locative expansion -\textsubscript{ta} can be explained in the same way as those presenting the locative expansion -\textsubscript{ku}. For example, the sentences in (44) require the use of -\textsubscript{ta} since the area referred to by the spatial morpheme is a part of a house.

(44) a. *wíchu kwená-mu-ta-sha-∅-ti pwérta-ni táa-rhu*

dog lick-edge-LOC.EXP-PROG-PRS-3IND door-OBJT house-LOC

‘The dog is licking the door of the house.’
b. María xupá-narhi-ta-a-ti parédi-ni  
Maria wash-flat.surface-LOC.EXP-FUT-3IND wall-OBJT  
táa-ni/-rhu  
house-OBJT/-LOC  
'Maria will wash the (inner) wall of the house.'

c. wíchu yará-narhi-ta-s-∅-ti parédi-ni/-rhu  
dog urinate-flat.surface-LOC.EXP-PRF-PRS-3IND wall-OBJT/-LOC  
'The dog peed on the wall.'

In sentences (44a, b), the whole where the part is located is a place—the house—and can therefore be encoded as an object or in oblique function with locative case. This alternating pattern depends on whether or not the whole is considered affected by the action. The nominal term that specifies the part, 'door' and 'wall', is flagged by objective case. If it were marked by locative case, the resulting reading would be one in which something located on the door or wall of the house was licked or washed, as is the case in (45) below. In (44c), the sequence [narhi-ta] is attached to an intransitive root and refers to the flat surface of a wall, which can either be the place towards which the dog directed its urine, in which case it is marked with locative case, or the entity/place somehow affected by the dog’s action, in which case it is encoded in object function. Note that while charháku yarhánarhisti means ‘the baby peed his face’, in the sentence (44c), wíchu yarhánarhitasti parédiñi/rhu ‘the dog peed (on) the wall’, the presence of -narhi-ta introduces ‘the wall’ as the locus of the action of the subject.

In all the above cases, the valence-changing effects of the occurrence of the sequence [SPA.SUF-ta] can be explained, as in the case of -ku, by the fact that the locative expansion indicates an area located on an entity other than that denoted by the subject/agent, as well as by the coding patterns allowed for these constructions. Therefore, there is no need to resort to the postulation of an active or causative value of -ta, whether with monotransitive or intransitive base roots (cf. Foster 1969, Nava 2004).

As in predicates with the locative expansion -ku, those in which the part-whole suffix is followed by -ta allow constructions where the patient/theme of the base verb is located in the area signaled by the part-whole suffix. In this case, as the whole in which the patient/theme is located is an inanimate location, the most common scenario is that in which the whole is not considered affected by the action of the agent, and is therefore flagged by locative case.
(45) a. *p’ikú-parha-ta-sha-∅-ka=ni*
take.off/pull.off-convex.exterior.LOC.EXP-PROG-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ

*witsákwa téchu-rhu*
weed ceiling/roof-LOC
‘I am pulling the weed off the roof.’

b. *erá-narhi-ta-∅-ka=ni*
look-flat.surface-LOC.EXP-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ

*ma siránda parédi-rhu*
one paper wall-LOC
‘I looked at a piece of paper on the (inner) wall.’

c. *tsíkata akú-mu-ta-sha-∅-ti tsíri pwérta-rhu*
hen eat-edge-LOC.EXP-PROG-PRS-3IND corn door-LOC
‘The hen is eating the corn by the door.’

d. *xatsí-ts’i-ta-sìn-∅-ti sunúnta káma-rhu*
put-top-LOC.EXP-HAB-PRS-3IND blanket bed-LOC
‘S/he puts the blanket on the bed.’

The data presented so far challenge Nava’s (2004:180–184) analysis of -*ku* and -*ta* as morphemes with a causative function in constructions without middle-voice value. In fact, none of the sentences seen here include constructions with meanings such as ‘to make someone squeeze something on a body part of him/herself’, which would be expected in the case of [V-SPA.SUF] bases which have been causativized. This fact proves that the locative expansion suffix -*ta* must be differentiated from its causative homophone. Given the importance of this issue for understanding the morphological mechanisms conveyed by predicates with part-whole suffixes, I will show that this type of predicate may undergo causativization, but that these causative constructions present properties that differ from those exhibited by the stems [V-SPA.SUF-LOC.EXP].

As already noted, locative expansions do not add an agentive participant nor do they necessarily alter the syntactic valence of the base predicate. Conversely, the causativization of predicates with part-whole spatial suffixes always results in a syntactic valence increase; the introduction of a causer does not alter the relationship between the spatial affixes and the arguments of the base predicate. This can be seen in the examples in (46), where the
spatial morpheme refers to a part of the causee argument of the causativized predicate.

\[(46)\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a.</th>
<th>xupá-ni-ta-s-∅-ti</th>
<th>María-ni</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wash-cavity-CAUS-PRF-PRS-3IND</td>
<td>Maria-OBJT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘S/he made Maria wash her own chest.’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. sïpí-rhu-ta-s-∅-ti | sapí-ni |
| smell-tip-CAUS-PRF-PRS-3IND | child-OBJT |
| ‘S/he made the child smell something.’ |

c. k’amá-cha-ta-s-∅-ti | Rósa-ni | kurhínta |
| finish-inner.narrowing-CAUS-PRF-PRS-3IND | Rosa-OBJT | bread |
| eat up |
| ‘S/he made Rosa eat up the bread.’ |

The causative allomorph -\(ta\) can also be seen in sentences such as those in \[(47)\], where it occurs after spatial suffixes that do not permit or do not require locative expansions. In these cases, there is also no modification regarding the relationship between the spatial suffix and the arguments of the base verb.

\[(47)\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a.</th>
<th>sapí</th>
<th>aná-t’a-s-∅-ti</th>
<th>parédi-rhu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>child</td>
<td>long.vert.object-side-PRF-PRS-3IND</td>
<td>wall-LOC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘The child is standing next to the wall.’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a’.</th>
<th>Lúpi</th>
<th>aná-t’a-ta-s-∅-ti</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lupe</td>
<td>long.vert.object-side-CAUS-PRF-PRS-3IND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sapí-ni</td>
<td>parédi-rhu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>child-OBJT</td>
<td>wall-LOC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Lupe made the child stand next to the wall.’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Pédru | erá-nchi-s-∅-ti | kwaráki-ni |
| Pedro | look-upper.surface-PRF-PRS-3IND | squirrel-OBJT |
| téchu-rhu |
| ceiling/roof-LOC |
| ‘Pedro looked at the squirrel on the ceiling.’ |
b’. erá-nchi-ta-s-∅-ti  Pédru-ni  kwaráki-ni
look-upper.surface-CAUS-PRF-PRS-3IND Pedro-OBJT squirrel-OBJT
téchu-rhu
ceiling/roof-LOC
‘S/he made Pedro look at the squirrel on the ceiling.’

With verbs that express a change of state undergone by a patient/experiencer, the suffix \(-ta\) following a spatial suffix can only be the causative: it introduces the causer of the change of state undergone by the whole (possessor of the part), which has been previously determined in the base predicate presenting a part-whole morpheme.

(48) a. Martín  p’amé-arha-s-∅-ti
Martin  ache-central-PRF-PRS-3IND
‘Martin had a stomachache.’

a’. k’awásí  p’amé-arha-ta-s-∅-ti  Martíni-ni
hot.pepper  ache-central-CAUS-PRF-PRS-3IND  Martin-OBJT
‘The hot pepper gave Martin a stomachache.’

b. purhú  niní-ch’u-s-∅-ti
squash  ripen-bottom-PRF-PRS-3IND
‘The squash ripened at the bottom.’

b’. xí  niní-ch’u-ta-s-∅-ka=ni  purhú-ni
1SG  ripen-bottom-CAUS-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ  squash-OBJT
‘I cooked the bottom of the squash.’

Unlike with middle/reflexive verbs (see (43) above), with verbal roots such as those in (49), the sequence [SPA.SUF-\(-ku\)], expected in the case of human referents, is not permitted when the intended reading is that someone or something causes the change of state.14

14 Middle/reflexive verbal roots like ‘get dry’ and ‘get wet’ allow bases with either [SPA.SUF-\(-ku\)] (see (34)), or [SPA.SUF-CAUS]. Although k’arhíntukunt’ani and k’arhíntutunt’ani can both express ‘to dry someone else’s foot’, only the latter permits the reading ‘to order someone to dry his/her foot’. The contrast between locative expansions and causative markers is evident when the causative morpheme -\(tara\) is added to these forms; whereas k’arhíntukutarant’ani only allows the reading ‘to make/order someone to dry someone
Predicates with Spatial Suffixes

(49)  

a. *p'amé-ntu-ku-ni  
ache-lower.extremity-LOC.EXP-NF  
Intended reading: ‘To make someone’s foot ache.’

b. *niní-ch’ú-ku-ni  
ripen-bottom-LOC.EXP-NF  
Intended reading: ‘To cook the bottom/underside of something.’

The ungrammaticality of the forms in (49) is explained by the fact that for a predicate to be able to present [SPA.SUF-LOC.EXP] and to signal that the action of the subject is directed to another participant, it is necessary for the intransitive verbal root to allow an agent argument capable of causing or controlling the event. This does not occur, for example, with ‘ache’ or ‘ripen’. Therefore, this kind of event cannot be transferred to another’s body: the only way to add an agent argument is by means of causativization.15

It is worth noting that sentences such as washáts’îkuni ‘to sit down on top of something’, cannot be derived from *washáts’îni. Likewise, predicates that

else’s foot’, k’arhíntu(ta)tarant’ani may mean the same or ‘to make/order someonei to dry his/her foot’.

As stated by Friedrich (1971a:60, 106), in the case of intransitive verbs, -ta and the vowel ablaut can function as portmanteau morphemes with a causative value. This can be confirmed by dialectal variations that present the causativization of intransitive predicates exhibiting [SPA.SUF-ku]:

(i) sapí washá-mu-ku-s-∅-ti yorhékwa-rhu  
child sit.down-edge-LOC.EXP-PRF-PRS-3IND river-LOC  
‘The child sat on the river bank.’

(ii) washá-mu-ku-tara-s-∅-ka=ni  
sit.down-edge-LOC.EXP-CAUS-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ  
sapí-ni yorhékwa-rhu  
child-OBJT river-LOC  
‘I sat the child down on the river bank.’/‘I made/told the child (to) sit on the river bank.’ (Uricho)

(iii) xi sapí-ni washá-mu-ta-s-∅-ka  
1SG child-OBJT sit.down-edge-LOC.EXP/CAUS-PRF-PRS-1/2IND bank/edge-LOC  
oríya-rhu  
‘I sat the child on the river bank.’

While in the Uricho lakeside community the causative suffix is added to the [SPA.SUF-ku] sequence, in the majority of P’orhélépecha communities only constructions such as (iii) are employed. In these constructions, the suffix -ta has a double function: to displace the spatial reference (function of -ku in (ii)) and, at the same time, to transitivize the construction by adding a causer (function of -tara in (ii)).
present -ta—for example (44c) wíchu yaránarhisti parédini/rhu ‘The dog peed on the wall’ and (45c) tsíkata akúmutashi tsíri pwértarhu ‘The hen is eating the corn by the door’—cannot be explained by the causativization of the corresponding forms without -ta; sentences such as *parédi yarhánarhisti and *tsíri/pwerta akúmuni are ungrammatical.

When the type of part-whole spatial morpheme considered here is suffixed to a verbal root, there seem to be two possible outcomes: a) [V-SPA.SUF] (space located on the argument encoded in subject function), or b) [V-SPA.SUF-LOC. EXP] (space located on an argument other than the subject). This supports the claim that -ku and -ta are not independent suffixes, but rather morphological expansions of the spatial morphemes. As such, they cannot be used freely as unconstrained mechanisms to derive new predicates from bases previously formed by the suffixation of spatial morphemes.

Analyzing -ku and -ta as markers that cause the relocalization of an area or body part explains the fact that with certain part-whole spatial suffixes locative expansions may displace the locus to another body part, without the need for discussing the existence of homophone suffixes with distinct values or functions (cf. Friedrich 1971a:30, 59, 95, Foster 1969:35, 128, Monzón 2004:325–327, 381). This is shown in the following examples (in (50b) the author’s glosses are respected):

(50) a. apárhe-ts’ï-ta-ni
   get.burned-top-LOC.EXP-NF
   ‘To burn one’s knee.’ (Foster 1969:117)

b. táki yurhíri wé-ncha-ta-sha-ti
   child blood get.out-exterior.narrowing-RL-d.pres-3
   ‘The child is bleeding from his calf.’ (Monzón 2004:326)

The use of -ku or -ta in cases such as those in (50) seems to present dialectal variations. In Puácuaro, the norm is to employ -ku when the possessor of the part is human:

(51) a. María xupá-rhu-ku-s-∅-ti t’ék’í-ni
   Maria wash-tip-LOC.EXP-PRF-PRS-3IND nail-OBJT
   ‘Maria washed her nail.’
b. \textit{teyá-narhi-ku-s-∅-ka=ni} \\
\textit{hit-flat.surface-LOC.EXP-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ}

\textit{anánasta-rhu/-ni} \\
\textit{shin-LOC/-OBJT}
‘I hit my shin.’/‘I hit myself on the shin.’

c. \textit{kurhú-ts’i-ku-a-ka=ri xurhíntskwa-ni} \\
\textit{get.burned-top-LOC.EXP-FUT-1/2IND=2SG.SBJ knee-OBJT}
‘You will burn your knee.’

In (50) and (51), as noted by Foster and Monzón, the presence of -\textit{ku} or -\textit{ta} alters the area denoted by the spatial suffix. For example, (51a) without -\textit{ku} would mean ‘S/he\textit{r} washed her\textit{h}is\textit{s} nose’ whereas the addition of -\textit{ku} enables the spatial suffix to refer to the finger or nail. In (51b) the suffix -\textit{narhi}, used for the face, refers to the shin, and in (50c) the spatial affix employed for ‘head’ signals the knee. Note that in (50) and (51), the area signaled by the spatial morphemes followed by -\textit{ku} or -\textit{ta} may be located on the subject argument. However, these verbal stems may also refer to the part of an argument other than the subject (see Monzón 2004:325, 381).

(52) a. \textit{María xupá-rhu-ku-s-∅-ti [sapí-iri t’ék’i-ni]} \\
\textit{Maria wash-tip-LOC.EXP-PRF-PRS-3IND [child-GEN nail-OBJT]}
‘Maria washed the boy’s nail.’

b. \textit{Pédro erá-ch’a-ku-s-∅-ti} \\
\textit{Pedro look-exterior.narrowing-LOC.EXP-PRF-PRS-3IND}
\[p’untánta \textit{María-eri-ní}] \\
\[calf \textit{María-GEN-OBJT}]
‘Pedro looked at Maria’s calf.’

If the function of -\textit{ku} and -\textit{ta} is to displace the location of the area/part designated by a spatial morpheme—or in terms of Foster (1969:116), to change the locus of the action—it can be postulated that when these suffixes convey a displacement from one body part to another, this function overrides that of locating the part on a participant other than the subject. Under these conditions, the sequence [\textit{SPA.SUF-ku/-ta}] lacks restrictions regarding the argument that must be identified as the possessor/whole, as occurs with the spatial -\textit{k’u} used to signal ‘forearm/hand’. However, in the constructions in (52), unlike
with the forms seen above, part and whole must be encoded in a genitive NP, i.e., in an internal possession (IP) construction. The contrast between the morphosyntactic behaviour of these constructions and of those in which the occurrence of -ku does not involve any modification of the body part denoted by the spatial morpheme will be discussed in the next section.

6.3 Ditransitive External Possession Constructions

This section focuses on the coding and behavioral properties of double object constructions expressing situations in which an agent directs its action to the (body) part of another participant, either affecting it directly or affecting an object located within it. The encoding of such situations results in two possibilities with respect to the generation of ditransitive constructions. In the first, the part-whole suffixes that refer to a region or part of a participant other than the subject/agent, inherently or by way of morphological marking, license the addition of a new core argument: the possessor of the part encoded in object function. This results in external possession (EP) ditransitive constructions. In these cases, instances can be found where the morphology exhibited by the spatial morphemes brings about situations in which the agent of the base verb directs its action to the domain of another participant: the whole or possessor. The second possibility of generating ditransitive EP constructions from predicates with part-whole morphemes involves the addition of valence-increasing operations. It occurs when the locative expansions transfer the location of the area denoted by a part-whole spatial morpheme to another body part, whose possessor may or may not be the argument encoded as the subject of the derived verb. If the possesor is not the subject argument, the part-whole relationship must be encoded as IP, as the addition of applicative morphemes is necessary in order to generate ditransitive EP constructions.

Regarding the first option, the presence of part-whole relational suffixes makes it necessary for the whole/possessor to be encoded in an independent NP. In these constructions, as demonstrated earlier, the locating of a body part on a participant other than the subject argument arises from: a) a property inherent to the spatial suffix (e.g., -k’u ‘upper extremity/hand’ and -rhi ‘external surface’), b) the vowel ablaut, and c) the presence of locative expansions. In (53), examples of predicates with the spatial suffix -k’u are given.
(53) a. wichu katsá-k’u-sha-∅-ti sapí-ni
dog bite-upper.extremity-prog-prs-3ind child-objt

xák’i-ni/-ru
forearm/hand-objt/-loc
‘The dog is biting the boy’s forearm/hand.’

b. Lúpi eshé-k’u-s-∅-ti sapí-ni
Lupe see-upper.extremity-prf-prs-3ind child-objt

xák’i-ni/*-ru
forearm/hand-objt/-loc
‘Lupe saw the boy’s forearm/hand.’

In (53a) -k’u indicates the body part directly affected by the action of the subject/agent. The presence of this morpheme enables the nominal expression of the part—xák’i ‘forearm/hand’—either as a core or as an oblique argument, while the possessor is encoded in object function. The alternating coding of the body-part NP is conditioned by the way in which the event is presented and by the extent to which the whole is affected. If the whole and the body part are considered equally affected (to bite a child on the hand implies biting the child), the latter can be marked with locative case, which may be considered a kind of object demotion. Conversely, when the whole is not (thought to be) affected, as in (53b)—to see a child’s forearm/hand does not imply or is not the same as seeing the child—if the body part is expressed by an NP, it must be as an object. In (53a, b), EP constructions can be recognized whereby the possessor is encoded as a core argument without resorting to the use of applicative morphology. Consequently, if the body part is expressed in object function, ditransitive constructions are generated.

Ditransitive constructions also result from stems exhibiting spatial morphemes such as -ru, as in (54), and -na, as in (55).

(54) a. María kwaká-rhi-s-∅-ti p’unkwári tsíkata-ni
Maria get.wet-external.surface-prf-prs-3ind feather hen-objt
‘Maria wet the hen’s feathers.’

b. t’ú xupá-rhi-s-∅-ka atsîmu tsúntsu-ni
2SG wash-external.surface-prf-prs-1/2ind mud pot-objt
‘You washed away the pot’s mud.’
In (54a, b) the spatial \(-rhi\) refers to the external surface of the hen and the pot, respectively. Consequently, in (54a), \(-rhi\) has the effect of transitivizing the base verb and licensing the addition of a second object—\(p’unkwári\) ‘feathers’—since the feathers cover the whole surface of the hen. In (54b), the NP \(atsímu\) ‘mud’ can be omitted, resulting in the meaning ‘You washed the pot’; however, since the mud is located on the area indicated by \(-rhi\), the addition of the NP \(atsímu\) is licensed. As in the constructions previously discussed, without the spatial morpheme such double object constructions are ungrammatical; for example, \(*xupásti atsimu tsúntsuni\) and \(*kwákárásti p’unkwári tsikatani\) (kwáka ‘get wet’ plus the causative \(-ra\) can only result in monotransitive sentences: kwákárásti [tsíkata-eri p’unkwárini] ‘S/he wet the hen’s feathers (already pulled out of the hen’s body)’).

In (55) there are examples of ditransitive constructions with the suffix \(-na\) ‘cavity’, which exhibit vowel ablaut.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(55) a.} & \quad \text{teyá-na-s-∅-ti} & \quad \text{María-ni} & \quad \text{itsúkwa-ni/-rhu} \\
& \quad \text{hit-cavity-PRF-PRS-3IND} & \quad \text{Maria-OBJT} & \quad \text{breast-OBJT/-LOC} \\
& \quad \text{‘S/he hit Maria’s breast.’ / ‘S/he hit Maria on her breast.’} \\
\text{b.} & \quad p’á-na-s-∅-ka=ni & \quad \text{ma} & \quad \text{tumpásí} \\
& \quad \text{touch-cavity-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ} & \quad \text{one} & \quad \text{pimple} \\
& \quad \text{charháku-ni} & \quad \text{(péchu-rhu)} \\
& \quad \text{baby-OBJT} & \quad \text{(chest-LOC)} \\
& \quad \text{‘I touched a pimple on the baby’s chest.’}
\end{align*}
\]

In (55a), the noun \(itsúkwa\) ‘breast’ can occur either as a locative oblique or as an object; in the latter case the result is a double object construction. In (55b), the baby’s chest is where the patient (a pimple) is located; therefore if the noun \(péchu\) is expressed syntactically, it must be obliquely marked.

Double object constructions are also generated from predicates exhibiting part-whole suffixes followed by the locative expansions \(-ku\) and \(-ta\), which require the body part to be located on a participant other than the subject/agent. In the examples in (56), the action of the subject/agent directly affects the part indicated by the spatial suffix.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(56) a.} & \quad k’wikí-ch’u-ku-s-∅-ti & \quad \text{búrru-ni} & \quad \text{ch’éti-ni/-rhu} \\
& \quad \text{whip-bottom-LOC.EXP-PRF-PRS-3IND} & \quad \text{donkey-OBJT} & \quad \text{tail-OBJT/-LOC} \\
& \quad \text{‘S/he whipped the donkey’s tail.’}
\end{align*}
\]
b. **antsí-cha-ku-s-∅-ti**  
**katámpa-ni**  
pull-inner.narrowing-LOC.EXP-PRF-PRS-3IND tongue-OBJT

**wichu-ni**  
dog-OBJT  
'S/he pulled the dog's tongue.'

c. **kwaká-ntí-ku-a-s-∅-ka-ni**  
get.wet-angle-LOC.EXP-DISTR-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ

máru réma-icha-ní anátapu-ní/-rhu  
some branches-PL-OBJT tree-OBJT/-LOC  
'I wet some branches on the tree.'

d. **kaká-rhu-ku-s-∅-ti=rini**  
úrhi-ní  
break-tip-LOC.EXP-PRF-PRS-3IND=1SG.OBJ nose-OBJT

'S/he broke my nose.'

e. **kurhú-mu-ta-s-∅-ti**  
pwérta-ní  
get.burned-edge-LOC.EXP-PRF-PRS-3IND door-OBJT

táa-ní/-rhu  
house-OBJT/LOC  
'S/he burned the door of the house.'

In (57), the spatial suffix followed by the locative expansion signals either the location of the patient/theme or the affected body part.

(57) a. **erá-ts’í-ku-a-∅**  
**listóni-icha-ni**  
look-top-LOC.EXP-DISTR-IMP ribbon-PL-OBJT

ép’u-rhu  
sápí-ní  
head-LOC child-OBJT  
'Look at the ribbons on the child's head.'
Unlike with the EP ditransitive constructions shown above, in the double object constructions in (57) (see also (55b)), the inalienable possession relation is established between the possessor NP in object function and the NP flagged by locative case (the body part). Therefore, even if the body part is not specified by a nominal term, the occurrence of part-whole spatial morphology in the verbal stem results in the generation of double object constructions.

Although part-whole spatial morphemes, either with or without locative expansions, can increase the syntactic valence of the base verb, this is not always the case. For example, three-argument verbs, such as ewá ‘take away’, remain ditransitive even if part-whole spatial suffixes are added. In this type of construction the source argument is the possessor; if an NP denoting the body part is present, it must bear locative marking.

(58) a. ewá-k’u-∅  
kuchiyu-ni

take.away-upper.extremity-IMP  
knife-OBJT

sapí-ni  (xák’i-rhu)
child-OBJT  (forearm/hand-LOC)
‘Take the knife away from the child’s hand.’

b. ewá-mu-ku-s-∅-ka=ni  

tsíkata-ni

take.away-edge-LOC.EXP-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ  
hen-OBJT

xiwátsí-ni  (penchúmikwa-rhu)
coyote-OBJT  (mouth-LOC)
‘I took the hen away from the coyote’s mouth.’
In ditransitive constructions resulting from the presence of spatial suffixes (or of spatial suffixes plus locative expansions), the possessor/whole exhibits PO properties. It is the only object argument that may undergo passivization, as in (59), or reciprocalization, as in (60), and that may be suppressed by the indefinite object marker -p'i, as in (61).

(59) a. María teyá-na-na-s-∅-ti itsúkwa-ni
    María hit-cavity-PASS-PRF-PRS-3IND breast-OBJT
    'Maria's breast was hit (lit. Maria was hit her breast).'

b. tsúnstu xupá-nti-ku-na-s-∅-ti kanít'akwa-ni
    pot wash-angle-LOC.EXP-PASS-PRF-PRS-3IND handle-OBJT
    'The pot’s handle was washed (lit. the pot was washed its handle).'

c. sapí kwená-mu-ku-na-s-∅-ti penchúmikwa-ni
    child lick-edge-LOC.EXP-PASS-PRF-PRS-3IND mouth-OBJT
    'The child’s mouth was licked (lit. the child was licked his mouth).'

d. xí kaká-ts’ï-ku-na-s-∅-ka ma kwashánta
    1SG break-top-LOC.EXP-PASS-PRF-PRS-1/2IND one egg
    'An egg was broken on my head (lit. I was broken an egg on my head).'

(60) a. tumpí-icha teyá-parha-ku-p'era-s-∅-ti=ksï
    boy-PL hit-convex.exterior-LOC.EXP-RECP-PRF-PRS-3IND=1/3PL.SBJ
    'The boys hit each other’s backs.'

b. ishú kaká-ts’ï-ku-p’era-sín-∅-ti=ksï
    here break-top-LOC.EXP-RECP-HAB-PRS-3IND=1/3PL.SBJ

kaskaróni-icha-ni
    eggshell-PL-OBJT
    'Here they break eggshells on each other’s heads.'

(61) a. xorhénp’iti teyá-ts’ï-ku-p’i-sín-∅-ti
    teacher hit-top-LOC.EXP-INDF.OBJ-HAB-PRS-3IND
    ép’u-rhu
    head-LOC
    'The teacher hits (people) on the head.'
b. *María kutsú-ntu-ku-p'i-s-∅-ti
   María clean-lower.extremity-LOC.EXP-INDF.OBJ-PRF-PRS-3IND

   xantsíri-icha-ni
   leg/foot-PL-OBJT
   ‘Maria cleaned (people’s) feet.’

c. *Lúpi xeyá-parha-ku-p'i-sín-∅-ti
   Lupe rub-convex.exterior-LOC.EXP-INDF.OBJ-HAB-PRS-3IND
   ‘Lupe rubs (people’s) backs.’

d. *t'ú xatsí-ch'u-ku-p'i-a-ka
   2SG put-bottom-LOC.EXP-INDF.OBJ-FUT-1/2IND injection-PL-OBJT
   ‘You will give injections.’

The fact that the possessor exhibits PO properties confirms its higher ranking on the thematic hierarchy: it outranks its possessum (part) or any another patient/theme argument regarding access to PO. In fact, in constructions in which both part and possessor/whole are in object function, as well as in sentences with a patient/theme located within a part of a whole, as in (59d), (69b), and (61d), the possessor of the area towards which the agent’s action is directed is always the PO.

As pointed out before, EP constructions with predicates presenting part-whole suffixes arise from the fact that the part and the whole cannot be encoded in a single NP; i.e., these predicates do not allow internal possession (IP) constructions. Therefore, the sentences in (62) are ungrammatical.

(62) a. *xupá-narhi-ku-s-∅-ti [María-eri éskwa-ni]
   wash-flat.surface-LOC.EXP-PRF-PRS-3IND [Maria-GEN eye-OBJT]
   Intended reading: ‘S/he washed Maria’s eye.’

b. *kaká-nti-ku-s-∅-ka=ni
   break-angle-LOC.EXP-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ

   [tsúntsu-iri kanít’akwa-ni]
   [pot-GEN handle-OBJT]
   Intended reading: ‘I broke the pot’s handle.’

In contrast to the sentences in (62), when the function of the locative expansion is to modify or relocate the area denoted by the spatial morpheme to another region of the body, the generation of IP constructions is the norm. In
these cases, the sequence of morphemes [SPA.SUF-ku/-ta] signals a part that can be located either on the subject argument or on another argument of the derived predicate. When referring to a part of an argument other than the subject, the part and the possessor must be expressed by a single NP (see Monzón 2004), as shown in (63) and (64).

(63) a. erá-cha-ku-s-∅-ti
    look-exterior.narrowing-LOC.EXP-PRS-3IND
    p’untánta-ní
    calf-OBJT
    'S/he looked at Maria’s calf.'

b. *erá-cha-ku-s-∅-ti
    look-exterior.narrowing-LOC.EXP-PRS-3IND
    p’untánta-ní
    'S/he looked at her/his calf.'

(64) a. xupá-rhu-ku-s-∅-ti
    wash-tip-LOC.EXP-PRS-3IND
    xuchüti dédu-ní
    [1SG.POSS finger-OBJT]
    'S/he washed my finger.'

b. *xupá-rhu-ku-s-∅-ti=rini
    wash-tip-LOC.EXP-PRS-3IND=1SG.OBJ
    dédu-ní
    finger-OBJT
    Intended reading: 'S/he washed my finger.'

c. xupá-rhu-ku-s-∅-ti
    wash-tip-LOC.EXP-PRS-3IND
    dédu-ní
    finger-OBJT
    'S/he washed her/his finger.'

The contrast between the sentences (63a)/(64a) and the ungrammatical sentences (63b)/(64b), shows that if the sequence [SPA.SUF-LOC.EXP] refers to
an area located on a participant other than that realized as the subject, the part and the whole cannot be expressed by two independent NPs; i.e., IP constructions are imposed. Both (63c) and (64c) cannot denote events in which the argument in the subject function is not the part possessor; the only possible reading of these forms is that the subject ‘... saw his/her own calf’ and ‘... washed his/her own finger’, respectively.

It is possible to explain the behavior of the sentences in (63) and (64) by considering that, as mentioned previously, when -ku displaces the reference of the spatial morpheme to another area of the body, its property of situating the body part on a participant other than that refered to by the subject is over-ridden. In these cases, the locative expansions only license the occurrence of an NP that denotes the part. Therefore, when the body part does not belong to the argument in subject function, the sequence [SPA.SUF-LOC.EXP] only allows the introduction of an NP that must encode the part-whole relation. This accounts for the ungrammaticality of the EP constructions in (63b) and (64b).

In sentences (63a) and (64a), the action is exerted directly on the part-whole unit, generating monotransitive constructions. Conversely, when the action involves an entity located on the area denoted by the spatial suffix, this entity is encoded as an object, whereas the part-whole unit may be expressed in a locative phrase or in an object NP if it is considered affected by the action. This can be observed in (65).

(65) a. xupá-narhi-ku-s-∅-ka=ni yurhíri
    wash-flat.surface-LOC.EXP-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ blood

    [sapi-iri anánasta-ni/-rhu]
    [child-GEN shin-OBJ/-LOC]
    ‘I washed the blood off the child’s shin.’/‘I washed off the blood (that was) on the child’s shin.’

b. kurhí-rhu-ku-s-∅-ka=ni
    get.burned-tip-LOC.EXP-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ

    tumpásí  [sapi-iri ték’i-rhu]
    growth  [child-GEN nail-LOC]
    ‘I burned a growth on the child’s nail.’
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c. atá-ch’a-ku-nt’a-s-∅-ti
strike-exterior.narrowing-LOC.EXP-ITR-PRF-PRS-3IND medicine

[Lúpi-iri p’untánta-ni]
[Lupe-GEN calf-OBJT]
’S/he spread medicine on Lupe’s calf.’

d. p’ikú-ts’ï-ku-s-∅-ka=ni echéri
take.off/pull.off-top-LOC.EXP-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ dirt

[sapí-iri xurhíntskwa-ni/-rhu]
[child-GEN knee-OBJT-OBJT/-LOC]
‘I took the dirt off the child’s knee.’/’I took off the dirt (that was) on the child’s knee.’

In the sentences in (65), where the part-whole unit is obliquely expressed in a genitive NP (IP), the patient/theme behaves as PO. If the IP phrase occurs as an object, it exhibits PO behavior, as evidenced in the passive forms in (66).

(66) a. atsîmu xupá-rhu-ku-na-s-∅-ti [sapí-iri ték’i-rhu]
mud wash-tip-LOC.EXP-PASS-PRF-PRS-3IND [child-GEN nail-LOC] ‘The mud was washed off the child’s nail.’

b. [sapí-iri xurhíntskwa]
[child-GEN knee]

p’ikú-ts’ï-ku-na-s-∅-ti echéri
take.off/pull.off-top-LOC.EXP-PASS-PRF-PRS-3IND dirt ‘The child’s knee was cleaned (lit. ‘the child’s knee was taken off dirt).’

In order to generate EP constructions from predicates such as those in (62a), (62b), and (64), applicative morphemes must be added. Examples of this are shown in (67) and (68).17

17 As in other cases involving third-person applicative constructions, I have registered clauses such as the one in (67b) in which there is no EP. However, the part-whole genitive phrase, if expressed, must be marked with objective case (see 4.3). Compare the forms in (65) with the following sentences: xupárhukukukan [sapíiri ték’i’i] yurhiri ‘I washed the blood from the child’s nail’, and atách’akukunt’askani sïpíata [Lupíri p’untántani] ‘I spread medicine on Lupe’s calf’.
(67) a. wíchu katsá-ch’a-ku-χi-s-∅-ti=rini
dog bite-exterior.narrowing-LOC.EXP-1/2APPL-PRF-PRS-3IND=1SG.OBJ

p’untánta-ni/-rhu
calf-OBJT/-LOC
‘The dog bit my calf.’

b. erá-narhi-ku-ku-a-s-∅-ka=ri
look-flat.surface-LOC.EXP-3APPL-DISTR-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=2SG.SBJ

anánasta-ni maríkwa-echa-ni
shin-OBJT girl-PL-OBJT
‘You looked at the girl’s shins.’

c. xupá-rhu-ta-ku-a-s-∅-ka=ni
wash-tip-LOC.EXP-3APPL-DISTR-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ

Martíni-ni ték’i-icha-ni
Martin-OBJT nail-PL-OBJT
‘I washed Martin’s nails.’

(68) a. xupá-narhi-ku-χi-s-∅-ka=ki
wash-flat.surface-LOC.EXP-1/2APPL-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=2SG.OBJ

máncha anánasta-rhu
stain shin-LOC
‘I washed the stain from your shin.’

b. t’ú kurhí-rhu-ku-ka-ka puntsáni
2SG get.burned-tip-LOC.EXP-3APPL-FUT-1/2IND mole

sapí-ni dédu-rhu
child-OBJT finger-LOC
‘You will burn the mole on the child’s finger.’

The addition of the applicative -ku/-chi in (67) and (68) licenses the introduction of the whole/possessor in an independent NP, bearing objective case. Unlike the forms in (63) and (65), these predicates can generate ditransitive
EP constructions. In (67) and (68), the applicative suffix performs the same function as the locative expansions when they do not displace the reference of the spatial morpheme to another part of the body: it indicates a space located within the domain of an argument other than the subject/agent.

A clear contrast emerges between the function of the applicative morpheme, as in examples (67) and (68), and its function in constructions where the locative expansions locate the part on a participant other than the subject. Compare (67c) with (69):

(69) \[ \begin{array}{l}
\text{xí } \text{Pédru-ni } \text{sípá-rhu-}ta-ku-s-∅-ka=ni \\
1\text{sg Pedro-objt steal-tip-Loc.EXP-3APPL-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ}
\end{array} \]

\[ \begin{array}{l}
durási \text{ anátapu-rhu} \\
\text{peach tree-LOC}
\end{array} \]

‘I stole peaches from Pedro’s tree.’

Note that in (67) and (68), the applicative suffix introduces the possessor of the body part in object function. However, in (69), the applied argument (Pédruni) can only correspond to the possessor of the whole, the tree.

In constructions where the applied argument corresponds to the whole or possessor of the part, as in (67) and (68), it behaves as the PO, as can be seen in the passive forms in (70).

(70) \[ \begin{array}{l}
a. \text{xupá-narhi-}ku-\text{mi-na-s-∅-ka=ni} \\
\text{wash-flat.surface-Loc.EXP-APPL-PASS-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ}
\end{array} \]

\[ \begin{array}{l}
anánasta-ni \\
\text{shin-objt}
\end{array} \]

‘My shin was washed’ (lit. I was washed my shin).’

b. \[ \begin{array}{l}
\text{sapi } \text{p’ikú-ts’i-ku-}mi-na-s-∅-ti \\
\text{child take.off/pull.off-top-Loc.EXP-APPL-PASS-PRF-PRS-3IND}
\end{array} \]

\[ \begin{array}{l}
\text{echéri } \text{xurhúntskwa-rhu} \\
\text{dirt knee-LOC}
\end{array} \]

‘The child’s knee was cleaned (lit. ‘the child was taken off dirt on his knee).’
6.4 Conclusions

Porhópecha spatial morphemes are lexical affixes that specify, in spatial terms, the event denoted by the predicate to which they are adjoined. Their presence in a verbal base results in the establishment of certain types of relationships between the area or space they refer to and the arguments of the derived predicate. The subset of spatial morphemes that refer to a part of a whole is relational: these morphemes license the occurrence of an NP that identifies the part or subarea, and also require the presence of another nominal term corresponding to the whole/possessor; i.e., the possessor/whole and the part must be encoded as independent NPs. It has been argued that the relational character of part-whole morphemes, and the specification they convey regarding the argument that corresponds to the whole/possessor, explain both their valence-changing effects and their possibility of generating ditransitive EP constructions without requiring valence-increasing morphology ( applicative or causative).

The analysis offered supports the proposal that in order to understand the meaning and morphosyntactic properties of predicates with part-whole spatial affixes, it is necessary to take the following into account: the argument structure of the base verb, the lexical information of the spatial morphemes, and the different possibilities exhibited by these suffixes to refer to an area of the entity denoted by the subject or of that denoted by another argument of the derived predicate. It has been shown that part-whole spatial suffixes may or may not alter the syntactic valence of the verb they are bound to, depending on the transitivity of the base verb, on which argument (subject or non-subject) is the possessor-whole, and on the encoding patterns of the arguments of the derived predicate.

If the part signaled by the part-whole suffix is located on the argument of the derived verb in subject function, the resulting construction is middle/reflexive (the event remains within the domain of the subject), and the syntactic valence of the base verb may or may not change given the alternating coding of the NP that specifies the part. When the part is not located on the entity referred to by subject of the derived predicate, it follows that there is an agent that directs its action to the domain of another participant. In this case, not only is the presence of an NP indicating the part licensed, but also the addition of an NP encoding the whole/possessor. Consequently, these predicates may generate ditransitive constructions without valence-increasing mechanisms such as causativization or applicativization. This proposal offers a unified explanation of predicates with morphemes such as -k’u ‘upper extremity’ and -rhi ‘external surface’, which can signal a part or area of a non-subject argu-
ment without the need for morphological marking, as well as of predicates presenting part-whole suffixes that require morphological processes (vowel ablaut or the use of locative expansions -\textit{kau} and -\textit{ta}) in order to locate the part referred to on an argument other than the subject.

The analysis of different constructions with part-whole morphemes shows that the function of both the vowel ablaut and the locative expansions is to change the location of the part or area signaled by part-whole suffixes, mainly from the entity denoted by the subject to one denoted by another argument of the derived predicate. Therefore, these mechanisms allow a distinction to be made between the space/domain of the subject argument and that of another argument, without conveying inherent voice or transitivity values, as has been argued in other studies of P’orhépecha. Moreover, it has been stated that the argument structure of predicates with part-whole spatial affixes indicating a region or body part of the argument to be mapped onto subject function, must be differentiated from constructions with part-whole suffixes that have undergone causativization by way of the causative allomorph -\textit{ta}. This causative suffix introduces an agent argument and triggers a syntactic valence increase without altering the relationship between the arguments and the part-whole morphemes exhibited by the base predicate that has undergone causativization.

The predicates with part-whole spatial morphemes that, due to an inherent property or to additional morphological marking, refer to a part of an entity denoted by an argument other than the subject, may result in EP double object constructions in two circumstances: a) when the possessor/whole and the nominal term specifying the part are encoded in object function (although in most cases it is possible to encode the part as an oblique locative, resulting in monotransitive constructions); and b) when the possessor/whole and the patient/theme of the base verb are encoded in object function while the part (where the patient/theme is located) can only bear locative marking, which always results in double object constructions. In both types of ditransitive constructions, the possessor of the area towards which the agent’s action is directed exhibits PO properties. This behavior confirms that the possessor/whole outranks its possessum or another patient/theme argument on the thematic hierarchy regarding accessibility to PO versus SO.

Finally, it has been demonstrated that when the sequence [SPA.SUF-LOC.EXP] has the effect of transferring the reference of the spatial morpheme to a different area of the whole, the locative expansion no longer necessarily locates the part on an entity other than that denoted by the subject of the derived predicate, nor licences the encoding of the whole/possessor in an independent NP. Consequently, if the action of the agent is directed to another
participant, the part and the whole can only be encoded in a genitive NP (IP). If a patient/theme is located on the part referred to, a double object construction may be generated; in these circumstances the genitive NP in object function exhibits PO behavior. In order to generate EP constructions, the whole/possessor must be introduced as a core argument by way of applicativization, the applied argument becoming the PO. These constructions are distinguished from those referred to above, in which the occurrence of locative expansions necessarily indicates that the whole/possessor is not the argument encoded in subject function. If the latter type of construction undergoes applicativization, the applied argument must be the possessor of the whole, and not the possessor of the area indicated by the spatial morpheme.

The following tables summarize the properties of the main construction types exhibiting part-whole spatial suffixes.

**Table 14  Middle/reflexive constructions with part-whole suffixes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base verb</th>
<th>Part-whole morphological marking</th>
<th>Argument encoding and syntactic function</th>
<th>Transitivity of the derived predicate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intransitive (middle/reflexive)</td>
<td>SPA.SUF, SPA.SUF-\textit{kurhi}</td>
<td>Possessor/whole = SBJ</td>
<td>Intransitive/monotransitive constructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Body-part NP = OBLLOC/OBJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monotransitive</td>
<td>SPA.SUF-\textit{loc.exp}</td>
<td>If there is a patient/theme located on the body part:</td>
<td>Monotransitive constructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>displacement of the area denoted to another body part</td>
<td>patient/theme = OBJ, body-part NP = OBL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base verb</td>
<td>Part-whole morphological marking</td>
<td>Argument encoding and syntactic function</td>
<td>Transitivity of the derived predicate and construction type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intransitive (middle/reflexive)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Possessor/whole + body-part term encoded as GEN NP = PO</td>
<td>Monotransitive IP constructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monotransitive</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>If there is a patient/theme located on the body part: a) patient/theme = PO GEN NP = OBL b) patient/theme = SO GEN NP = PO</td>
<td>Monotransitive IP constructions Ditransitive IP constructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Possessor/whole (applied object) = PO Body-part NP = OBL/SO</td>
<td>Monotransitive/ ditransitive EP applicative constructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPA.SUF</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>If there is a patient/theme located on the body part: possessor/whole (applied object) = PO patient/theme = SO body-part NP = OBL</td>
<td>Ditransitive EP applicative constructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPA.SUF vowel ablaut</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPA.SUF-LOC.EXP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>If there is a patient/theme located on the body part: possessor/whole = PO patient/theme = SO body-part NP = OBL</td>
<td>Ditransitive EP constructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPA.SUF-LOC.EXP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>If there is a patient/theme located on the body part: possessor/whole = PO patient/theme = SO body-part NP = OBL</td>
<td>Ditransitive EP constructions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15: Active constructions with part-whole suffixes
CHAPTER 7

Constructions with Predicates Involving More than Three Arguments

The possibility of predicates having more than three arguments is a little-studied issue; only a few authors discuss this type of construction. Margetts and Austin (2007), for example, state that the number of participants of ditransitive predicates can be surpassed if such predicates allow causativization or applicativization, in which case verbs with four arguments can be derived. In line with this, Kittilä (2007), in his typological study on tritransitive constructions, contends that in some languages the addition of a causer or beneficiary to ditransitive events yields sentences with four explicit arguments—what he calls semantically tritransitive constructions. The existence of languages that allow this type of sentence has recently attracted the attention of typologists, since no language has verbs that inherently entail more than three arguments.

According to Song’s (1996:173–180) study of causative constructions, the maximum number of core NPs allowed by a language in ordinary sentences (without valence-increasing affixes) must be preserved when non-derived ditransitive verbs undergo causativization; a fact the author terms “NP density control”. Thus, in languages such as Songhai (Song 1996:174) the result of causativizing three-argument predicates is an ambiguous construction with a direct object and an indirect object, in which either the causee argument or the original indirect object is not encoded in the syntax; this suggests that the language maintains NP density control. Along the same lines, Dixon (2000), Comrie (1985), Kulikov (1993), Alsina (1993:628), and Kittilä (2007) have pointed out that in languages with argument augmentation mechanisms operating on ditransitive verbs, it is common for an otherwise core argument to be suppressed or to be encoded by other means, for example, as an oblique. Gerdts (2004) argues that the number of argumental positions a language permits does not block the derivation of predicates entailing an argument increase, provided that the total output of the valence process involved adjusts to the mapping principles of the language. This can be achieved via detransitivizing processes (for example, the antipassive), so that a new argument may be mapped following the rules of the language. According to Song (1996:179) detransitivizing operations are a way of maintaining NP density control.

1 According to Gerdts’ analysis, intermediate valence values are not monitored. Therefore, derived predicates must not be ruled out when the output of a morphological chain
Comrie (1976:293) and Creissels (2004) differ from Song in stating that the maximum number of core arguments permitted across languages is four. Indeed, syntactically tritransitive sentences have been registered in several languages, although in most cases there is little information regarding their properties and morphosyntactic restrictions. Creissels (2004) asserts that the possibility of adding participants to syntactically ditransitive verbs seems to be subject to arbitrary restrictions, which vary from language to language. While the author notes that in Tswana non-derived ditransitive verbs can undergo applicativization but not causativization, in Yaqui the opposite is true (Guerrero and Van Valin 2004). Other languages in which syntactically tri-transitive sentences resulting from applicativization have been registered are Kinyarwanda (Dryer 1983:137, Baker 1988a:382, 384, Kimenyi 1980:31), Oluteco (Zavala 2000:715), and Popoluca de la Sierra (Marlett 1986:375). Tritransitive sentences derived from the causativization of ditransitive verbs have also been recorded in Swahili (Comrie 1976:293) and Tagalog (Comrie 1975:13). Similarly, triple object constructions involving the applicativization of causativized monotransitive verbs have been identified in Swahili (Baker 1988a:394, Alsina 1993:623), Tswana (Creissels 2004), Yaqui (Guerrero and Van Valin 2004), and Shipibo-Konibo (Valenzuela 2002:440). Finally, in Tswana (Creissels 2004) and Totonac (Beck 2006), this type of construction is found with monotransitive verbs having undergone double applicativization. The scarcity of information on such construction types can be attributed to the small number of languages exhibiting tritransitive sentences and, more importantly perhaps, to the fact that in the languages in which they are permitted, they are not common in spontaneous speech nor in texts and in many cases can only be obtained through elicitation (cf. Margetts and Austin 2007, Kittilä 2007).

Porhépecha, as will be examined here, offers various options regarding constructions with more than three arguments resulting from valence-increasing morphology. Due to the fact that the language possesses valence-reducing mechanisms, predicates involving more than three arguments but which do not generate tritransitive sentences can be expected. Indeed, as can be seen in the following examples, the addition of an argument in object function when the base predicate has undergone argument suppression is common in Porhépecha.

(whatever the number of morphological operations involved) exhibits a syntactic total valence no greater than that allowed by the language.
In these examples, the manifestation as an object NP of the recipient-like argument (R) of the ditransitive base verb has been blocked by -$p'i$, in a causative construction in (1a) and in an applicative construction in (1b) (see also Nava 1996:63). However, in contrast to the ditransitive sentences in (1), those in (2) show the existence of triple object constructions in P’orhépecha.

Constructions similar to those in (1) were registered in the sixteenth century with both non-derived ditransitive verbs, (i), and with applicativized predicates undergoing causativization, (ii). Likewise, in Old P’orhépecha there are causativized constructions resulting from ditransitive base verbs that have not undergone argument suppression, (iii).

(i)  
$eua\textsuperscript{\text{-}}p\textsuperscript{\text{-}}pe\textsuperscript{-}ta\textsuperscript{-}ra\textsuperscript{-}pe\textsuperscript{-}ni$  
$e\textsuperscript{\text{-}}w\textsuperscript{\text{-}}a\textsuperscript{-}pe\textsuperscript{-}ta\textsuperscript{-}ra\textsuperscript{-}pe\textsuperscript{-}ni$  
take.away-INF.OBJ-CAUS-INF.OBJ-NF  
‘Make someone buy something or take something away.’ (D.G.399)

(ii)  
$hupa\textsuperscript{\text{-}}p\textsuperscript{\text{-}}te\textsuperscript{-}ra\textsuperscript{-}pe\textsuperscript{-}ni$  
$xu\textsuperscript{\text{-}}p\textsuperscript{\text{-}}a\textsuperscript{-}ts\textsuperscript{\text{-}}p\textsuperscript{\text{-}}e\textsuperscript{-}ta\textsuperscript{-}ra\textsuperscript{-}pe\textsuperscript{-}ni$  
wash-APPL-INF.OBJ-CAUS-INF.OBJ-NF  
‘Make someone wash something for/of someone else.’ (D.G.251)

(iii)  
$eua\textsuperscript{\text{-}}h\textsuperscript{\text{-}}c\textsuperscript{\text{-}}u\textsuperscript{-}ta\textsuperscript{-}ra\textsuperscript{-}pe\textsuperscript{-}ni$  
$e\textsuperscript{\text{-}}w\textsuperscript{\text{-}}a\textsuperscript{-}k\textsuperscript{\text{-}}u\textsuperscript{-}ta\textsuperscript{-}ra\textsuperscript{-}pe\textsuperscript{-}ni$  
take.away-hand-CAUS-INF.OBJ-NF  
‘Make someone take something from someone’s hand.’ (D.G.198)
Constructions involving more than three arguments

(2) a. Ricardo ewá-ra-s-∅-ti Adriánu-ni
   Ricardo take.away-CAUS-PRS-3IND Adrian-OBJT

   ma kwashánta tsíkata-ni
   an egg chicken-OBJT

   ‘Ricardo made Adrian take an egg from the chicken.’
   (Maldonado and Nava 2002:169)

b. ú-mu-ta-chi-sha-∅-ka=kini
   do/make-edge-LOC.EXP-1/2APPL-PROG-PRS-1/2IND=2SG.OBJ

   kut’á-ni tsítsíki ma
   house-OBJT flower one

   ‘I am drawing a flower on the entrance to your house (for you).’
   (Monzón 2004:107)

According to Kittilä (2007), who reproduces an example from Maldonado and Nava (2002) similar to (2a), P’orhépecha data stand out because it is uncommon for languages with a neutral coding pattern to support syntactically tritransitive constructions.

Throughout this chapter, I will show that P’orhépecha imposes both morphosyntactic and semantic restrictions on syntactically tritransitive sentences. For example, as will be explained below, triple object constructions are favored when the new object added by valence-increasing morphology is 1st/2nd person. The aim of this chapter is to contribute to the elucidation of the factors that determine the (un)grammaticality of predicates with more than three arguments, and of those leading to tritransitive constructions. To this end, I will consider the following contexts: a) the causativization and applicativization of non-derived ditransitive verbs, b) the causativization and applicativization of predicates with part-whole spatial morphemes, c) the co-occurrence of causativization and applicativization processes, and d) the possibility of applying double applicativization or causativization to monotransitive verbs (see Kulikov 1993:127, 142–144 on languages with double causativization).

This chapter seeks to demonstrate that in P’orhépecha: i) both the grammaticality of sentences with more than three arguments and the type of event to which they refer depend on the morphosyntactic structure of the derived predicates, on the thematic relations established among the participants, and on the permissible argument-encoding patterns; and ii) the linear sequence of the (argument-increasing) suffixes coincides with the order in which the
morphosyntactic processes apply, and consequently, the morpheme order is related to the semantics and syntax of the derived predicate (cf. Baker 1985, Alsina 1999, Hyman 2003).

Any discussion of P’orhépecha tritransitive predicates must take into account the asymmetrical character exhibited by double object constructions, as well as the thematic hierarchy derived from PO selection in ditransitive clauses. In fact, since P’orhépecha tritransitive sentences exhibit the same pattern as ditransitive ones—only one argument can display PO properties—the following question emerges: how is PO selection established among three potential objects? Given that in derived double object constructions the new object introduced by valence-increasing morphology is the one that qualifies as the PO, a similar situation might be supposed in the case of tritransitive clauses, i.e., that the last introduced object is the PO. If so, a thematic ranking of arguments would not be relevant in accounting for the possibility of tritransitive constructions and PO selection. Therefore, it is necessary to examine whether the (un)grammaticality of triple object constructions is related to the co-occurrence of two arguments that qualify as PO in different ditransitive constructions and/or to the co-occurrence of valence-increasing mechanisms, and ultimately, what role these factors play in determining the PO.

The analysis of the complex predicates discussed here corroborates the claim that in P’orhépecha, as a norm, a thematic ranking is relevant in determining which argument has access to PO and the consequent (un)grammaticality of triple object constructions. In this respect, evidence will be offered to show that in P’orhépecha: a) the applied object with a possessor role outranks its possessum without exception, regardless of the thematic role of the latter in the applicative event; and b) an agentive causee and a prototypical applied argument (beneficiary/recipient, source, goal, or possessor of a non-corporal entity), which both display PO properties in ditransitive constructions resulting from monotransitive base verbs, are equally ranked in access to PO.

The remainder of this chapter is organized as follows: In 7.1, predicates with part-whole spatial affixes having undergone applicativization or causativization are analyzed. In 7.2, sentences resulting from the addition of causative or applicative morphology to non-derived ditransitive verbs are examined. In 7.3, constructions that exhibit the co-occurrence of applicative and causative affixes are discussed. Finally, section 7.4 focuses on predicates with double applicativization, whereas section 7.5 is dedicated to the analysis of constructions involving two causative events.
7.1 Causativization and Applicativization of Predicates with Part-whole Spatial Morphemes

As discussed in Chapter 6, verbal bases with part-whole spatial suffixes (generally followed by locative expansions) that do not refer to a part of the entity denoted by the subject of the derived predicate permit external possession (EP) constructions. In these constructions an agent acts upon a space, or an object located in that space, belonging to another participant; i.e., an agent affects a region or body part of another participant. These predicates allow the addition of an applied argument, as shown in (2b) and in (3).

(3) (Speaking about a donkey):

\[ \text{segíri-s-p-ti=ksï} \quad \text{pá-ku-ni} \quad \text{Jesúsï-ni} \]
\[ \text{keep.on-PRF-PST-3IND=1/3PL.SBJ} \quad \text{take/carry-3APPL-NF} \quad \text{Jesus-OBJT} \]

\[ \text{ka} \quad \text{xatsí-parha-ku-ku-a-s-p-ti=ksï} \]
\[ \text{and} \quad \text{put-convex.exterior-LOC.EXP-3APPL-DISTR-PRF-PST-3IND=} \]
\[ \text{1/3PL.SBJ} \]

\[ \text{ts'ïmá-eri} \quad \text{karóni-icha-ni} \quad \text{ka} \quad \text{luék'u=ksï} \]
\[ \text{those-GEN} \quad \text{blanket-PL-OBJT} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{then=} \quad \text{1/3PL.SBJ} \]

\[ \text{xatsíra-s-p-ti} \quad \text{Jesúsï-ni} \]
\[ \text{put/serve-PRF-PST-3IND} \quad \text{Jesus-OBJT} \]

‘Following this, they took it to Jesus and they put their blankets on its back and put Jesus on it.’ (San Lukasï 19(35))

In the first conjoined clause, there are no overt NPs encoding the donkey (on whose back the blanket is located) or its possessor (Jesus). Interestingly, when taking this utterance out of context, the consulted speakers offered the following sentence where all the participants are overtly realized by NPs:

(4) \[ \text{Jesúsï-ni} \quad \text{tatsú-parha-ta-ku-s-p-ti=ksï} \]
\[ \text{Jesus-OBJT} \quad \text{draped-convex.exterior-CAUS-3APPL-PRF-PST-3IND=} \]
\[ \text{1/3PL.SBJ} \]

\[ \text{sunúnta} \quad \text{imá-eri} \quad \text{búrru-ni} \]
\[ \text{blanket} \quad \text{that-GEN} \quad \text{donkey-OBJT} \]

‘They draped Jesus’ donkey with a blanket.’
Sentence (4), resulting from a previously causativized predicate that undergoes applicativization, exhibits three objects. The applied object Jesúsíni occurs preverbally—the position for discourse-relevant elements—and bears the role of possessor of the donkey. The same occurs with predicates with the 1st/2nd person applicative suffix. In the sentences in (5), the whole and the part are encoded in object function and, once again, the applied argument bears the role of possessor of the entity (whole) where the part is located (see also (2b)).

(5)  
a. María=riní  kwarhá-ntu-ku-chí-s-∅-ti  
    María=1SG.OBJ get.broken-lower.extremity-LOC.EXP-1/2APPL-PRF-PRS-3IND  
    ma xantsíri washánts’ïkwa-ni  
    one leg/foot chair-OBJT  
    ‘Maria broke one leg of my chair.’

b. kwaká-ts’ï-ku-chí-s-∅-ti=riní  
    get.wet-top-LOC.EXP-1/2APPL-PRF-PRS-3IND=1SG.OBJ  
    xawíri (xuchííti) sapí-ni  
    hair (1SG.POSS) child-OBJT  
    ‘Maria wet my child’s hair.’

In EP constructions such as those in (4) and (5), the applied argument is the only one which can display PO behavioral properties, as demonstrated in (6) and (7).

(6)  

a. xí  kwarhá-ntu-ku-mí-na-s-∅-ka  
    1SG get.broken-lower.extremity-LOC.EXP-APPL-PASS-PRF-PRS-1/2IND  
    ma xantsíri washánts’ïkwa-ni  
    one leg/foot chair-OBJT  
    ‘A leg of my chair was broken (lit. I was broken a leg (of) the chair).’
b. Xwánu tsitá-ntu-ku-mi-na-s-∅-ti
Juan squeeze-lower.extremity-LOC.EXP-APPL-PASS-PRF-PRS-3IND

limónisí imá-eri sapí-ni
lemon that-GEN child-OBJT
'Some lemon was squeezed onto the foot of Juan’s child (lit. ‘Juan was squeezed lemon his child on the foot’).'

c. Xwánu kachú-na-mi-na-s-∅-ti
Juan cut-cavity-APPL-PASS-PRF-PRS-3IND
mintisíta awáni-ni
heart rabbit-OBJT
'The heart of Juan’s rabbit was cut out (lit. Juan was cut the heart (of) his rabbit).'

(7) Argument suppression by -p’i

xupá-narhi-ku-tsí-p’i-s-∅-ka=ni
wash-flat.surface-LOC.EXP-APPL-INDF.OBJ-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ

éskwa-ni sapí-ni
eye-OBJT child-OBJT
‘I washed the eye of someone else’s child.’/‘I washed the child’s eye at the request of his/her parents.’

Triple object constructions involving part-whole morphemes can also be generated through causativization (see footnote 2). The sentences in (8) show causative constructions in which both the body-part NP, corresponding to the area or part indicated by the spatial suffix, and its possessor are encoded as core arguments.

(8) a. María=rini kwarhá-ntu-ku-tara-s-∅-ti
Maria=1SG.OBJ get.broken-lower.extremity-LOC.EXP-CAUS-PRF-PRS-3IND

xantsíri-ni pipíchu-ni
leg/foot-OBJT chicken-OBJT
‘Maria made me break the chicken’s leg.’
b. xí Lúpi-ni  antsi-cha-ku-tara-s-∅-ka=ní
   1SG Lupe-OBJT pull-inner.narrowing-LOC.EXP-CAUS-PRF-PRS-1/21ND=1SG.SBJ

katámpa-ni  wíchu-ni
tongue-OBJT dog-OBJT
‘I made Lupe pull the dog’s tongue.’

The constructions in (8) do not allow the body part to be encoded as a locative NP. Thus, if all third-person arguments are expressed by NPs, the result is a triple object construction. The same outcome may occur when the spatial suffix indicates the body part where the patient/theme of the base root is located. In this type of event, if the part is expressed by a nominal term, it must be flagged by locative case, as can be seen in (9).

(9) a. xí Pédru-ni  kaká-ts’i-ku-tara-s-∅-ka=ní
   1SG Pedro-OBJT break-top-LOC.EXP-CAUS-PRF-PRS-1/21ND=1SG.SBJ

   ma kwashánta sapí-ni (ép’u-rhu)
one egg child-OBJT (head-LOC)
‘I made Pedro break an egg on the child’s head.’

b. ts’ínáp’iri=kíni tsitá-ntu-ku-tara-s-∅-ti
   doctor=2SG.OBJ squeeze-lower.extremity-LOC.EXP-CAUS-PRF-PRS-31ND

   limónisí sapí-ni (xantsíri-rhu)
   lemon child-OBJT (foot-LOC)
‘The doctor made you squeeze some lemon onto the child’s foot.’

In sentences (8) and (9), the body-part possessor has patient-like features since it is affected by the action of the causee. This patietive role supports the PO status of the causee and its ranking higher than the possessor of the part. Accordingly, these sentences become ungrammatical if the body-part

---

3 In the causative constructions I have registered, when the body part exhibits alternating marking (see Chapter 6), the rule is to opt for oblique marking, giving rise to double object constructions.
possession outranks the causee on the person hierarchy. Thus, (9b) does not permit, under any circumstances, the reading ‘The doctor ordered the child to squeeze lemon onto your foot’. The PO properties of the causee can be corroborated in the passive forms in (10) and in the verbal bases with the addition of the suffix -p’i in (11).

(10) Passivization

\[
Pédru \text{ tsitá-ntu-ku-tara-na-s-Ø-ti}
\]

Pedro squeeze-lower.extremity-LOC.EXP-CAUS-PASS-PRF-PRS-3IND

\[
límóniś sapí-ni (xantsíri-rhu)
\]

lemon child-OBJ (foot/leg-LOC)

‘Pedro was made (caused) to squeeze some lemon onto the child’s foot.’

*‘Some lemon was squeezed onto Pedro’s foot by the child (on someone’s orders).’

(11) Argument suppression by -p’i

\[
xupa-narhi-ku-tara-p’i-s-Ø-ti \text{ éskwa-ni}
\]

wash-flat.surface-LOC.EXP-CAUS-INDF.OBJ-PRF-PRS-3IND eye-OBJT

\[
sapí-ni
\]

child-OBJ

‘S/he made someone wash the child’s eye.’ ‘S/he caused the child’s eye to be washed.’

*‘S/he made the child wash someone’s eye.’

Although it is possible to generate the triple object sentences in (8) and (9), the causativization of this type of verbal base is more natural when the realization of the causee as a core argument is blocked by the addition of the middle/reflexive suffix -kurhi, which evidently produces ditransitive constructions:

(12) a. pero Xwánu-ni xi

\[
\text{but Juan-OBJT 1SG}
\]

\[
kachú-ch’a-ku-tara-kurhi-s-Ø-ka
\]

cut-exterior.narrowing-LOC.EXP-CAUS-MDL/REFL-PRF-PRS-1/2IND

‘…but I had Juan decapitated.’ (San Lukasí 9(9))
b. *xupá-narhi-ku-tara-kurhi-s-∅-ti*
   *wash-flat.surface-LOC.EXP-CAUS-MDL/REFL-PRF-PRS-3IND*

   *sapi-ni  éskwa-ni*
   *child-OBJT  eye-OBJT*
   ‘S/he had the child’s eye washed.’

The verbal stems analyzed in this section contain two valence-increasing processes. The ensuing predicates, which have more than three arguments, are able to generate triple object constructions in which the object introduced by the last derivative process has PO status. The relationships established among the co-arguments of these derived predicates support the proposal that the thematic ranking derived from the arguments’ access to PO in ditransitive constructions is maintained in the constructions discussed in this section. In fact, PO selection can be captured by the rankings: possessor > possessum (whole/entity within which the part is located) in applicative constructions, and causee (patient-agent) > patient (whole or possessor of the part) in causative constructions.

### 7.2 Causativization and Applicativization of Non-derived Ditransitive Verbs

#### 7.2.1 Applicative Constructions

While Chapter 4 dealt with ditransitive constructions resulting from the applicativization of monotransitive predicates, this section will focus on instances in which predicates are generated by the applicativization of non-derived ditransitive verbs. As will be shown, in the events denoted by these predicates, a participant must be or become located within the domain of the applied object. There are two options regarding the thematic role of the applied argument: a) it can be the possessor of either of the non-agent arguments of the base verb; and b) it can simultaneously be the recipient of the theme and its possessor, or merely the recipient (in this case, the base verb must involve an argument with a source role). Consequently, the applicativization of three-argument verbs may yield tritransitive EP constructions, in which the possessum generally exhibits possessive markers in agreement with its possessor. The most common sentences of this type are those in which the new argument is either 1st or 2nd person, so that the utterance has two 3rd person NP objects, as illustrated in (13).
Constructions involving more than three arguments

(13) a. íntsku-chi-∅=rini tumína xuchíiti sapí-ni
   give-1/2APPL-1MP=1SG.OBJ money 1SG.POSS child-OBJT

   ka xi=kini íntsku-n’t’a-a-ka
   and 1SG=2SG.OBJ give-ITR-FUT-1/2IND

   ‘Give my child some money and I will pay you back.’

b. xatsíku-chi-s-∅-ti=kini sïpíata chíiti kúchi-ni
   put-1/2APPL-PRF-PRS-3IND=2SG.OBJ medicine 2SG.POSS pig-OBJT

   ‘S/he put some medicine on your pig.’

c. p’ikú-chi-n’t’a-∅=rini wíchu-ni
   take.off/pull.off-1/2APPL-ITR-1MP=1SG.OBJ dog-OBJT

   xukách’akwa-ni
   collar-OBJT

   ‘Take off the collar from my dog.’

The sentences in (13) must comply with certain semantic constraints. Firstly, unlike in the case of applicative constructions stemming from non-derived ditransitive verbs in other languages (Marantz 1993:134, Kittilä 2007), the reading whereby the applied argument is a beneficiary/recipient is rejected. For example, in (13a), the intended reading ‘Give my child/the child some money for me’ is not possible. Secondly, the applied object must correspond to the possessor of the recipient-like argument (R) of the base verb (the PO in double object constructions). This is the only available reading even in the absence of possessive marking, as in (13c). Accordingly, if in (13a) the possessive form xuchíiti is eliminated, the reading continues to be ‘Give my child some money’, whereas the interpretation ‘Give my money to the child’ is not allowed.

When the applied object is 3rd person and the participants in the event are clearly identified, there is a tendency to avoid three object NPs. Thus, the adversative clause in (14), where the NP encoding the applied argument has been omitted, is more natural than an equivalent clause in which all the arguments are expressed by overt NPs.

---

4 Recall that the possessive relationship arises from the location of a participant within the domain of the applied argument, and that only in these cases is it possible to obtain the reading ‘do something instead of somebody else’s doing it, or in somebody else’s benefit’. Accordingly, example (13c) can also be translated as ‘Take the dog’s collar off for me’ (the dog is under the control or care of the 1st person), and (13b) as ‘S/he put some medicine on your pig’.
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(14) Xwánů no múti-s-∅-ti piré-ni, peru María
Juan NEG know/realize-PRF-PRS-3IND sing-NF, but Maria
xorhénta-ku-a-ti ma pirékwa imá-eri sapí-ni
‘Juan cannot sing, but Maria will teach a song to his/*her child.’

The sentence in (14) disallows a reading whereby Maria teaches her own child a song instead of, or for the benefit of, someone else. In fact, the presence of -ku impedes the establishment of a possessive relationship between María and iméri sapíni, as this suffix necessarily indicates that the child belongs to someone other than the agent.5

In constructions with three object NPs (registered during my field work), as a rule, the applied object occurs in preverbal position, especially when the possessum is animate, as in (15b, c).

(15) a. xatsíku-ku-s-∅-ka=ni xótatarakwa
put-3APPL-PRF-PRS-1/2IND-1SG.SBJ shoelace

sapí-ni xukánturhakwa-ni
child-OBJ shoe-OBJ

‘I put a shoelace on the child’s shoe (lit. I put the child shoelace his shoe).’

5 If the possessor is 3rd person it is common to find IP constructions even when the verbal stem presents -ku:

(i) íntsku-ku-s-∅-ka=ni
give-3APPL-PRF-PRS-1/2IND-1SG.SBJ

istí [kúchi Xwánů-iri-ni]
water [pig Juan-gen-objt]

‘I gave Juan’s pig some water.’

As in constructions with monotransitive verbs (see 4.3), if sentences such as (i) are passivized, only the possessor, not the genitive phrase, occurs as the subject.

(ii) a. Xwánů k’waníra-mi-na-s-∅-ti ma tsakápu imá-eri kúchi-ni
Juan throw-APPL-PASS-PRF-PRS-3IND one stone that-GEN pig-OBJ

‘A stone was thrown at Juan’s pig (lit. Juan was thrown a stone (at) his pig).’

b. *Xwánů-iri kúchi k’waníra-mi/ku-na-s-∅-ti ma tsakápu
Juan-gen pig throw-APPL/3APPL-PASS-PRF-PRS-3IND one stone

Intended reading: ‘A stone was thrown at Juan’s pig (lit. Juan’s pig was thrown a stone).’
b. Xwánu-ni=ksí k’waníra-ku-s-∅-ti ma tsakápu
   Juan-OBJT=1/3PL.SBJ throw-3APPL-PRF-PRS-3IND one stone

   imá-eri kúchí-ni
   that-GEN pig-OBJT
   ‘They threw a stone at Juan’s pig.’

c. xi María-ni xorhénta-ku-a-ka=ni
   ISG Maria-OBJT teach-3APPL-FUT-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ

   imá-eri sapí-ni ma pirékwa
   that-GEN child-OBJT one song
   ‘I will teach Maria’s son a song.’

The applicativization of three-argument verbs is more common when the R
(recipient-like) argument of the base verb has already been suppressed by way
of -p’i. In the resulting ditransitive constructions the applied argument, unlike
in the constructions in (12–15), necessarily corresponds to the possessor of the
T (theme) argument (see also (1b)).

(16) a. ka ú-ni meyámu-p’i-ku-a-ni
    and can-NF pay-INDF.OBJ-3APPL-DISTR-NF

    imá-eri k’wíripu-echa-ni ts’imá-eri pekádu-echa-ni
    that-GEN people-PL-OBJ those-GEN sin-PL-OBJT
    ‘. . . and be able to pay for his people’s sins.’ (karakata para Ebreo 3(17))

b. ínts-p’i-ku-s-∅-ka=ni tumína Pédru-ni
    give-INDF.OBJ-3APPL-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ money Pedro-OBJT
    ‘I gave someone Pedro’s money.’
    *‘I gave (some) money to someone related to Pedro.’
    *‘I gave (some) money to someone for Pedro.’

c. Pédru=rini entregári-p’i-chi-s-∅-ti
    Pedro=1SG.OBJ hand.over-INDF.OBJ-1/2APPL-PRF-PRS-3IND

    xuchútti sapí-ni
    ISG.POSS child-OBJT
    ‘Pedro handed my son over to someone.’
d. xí Páblu-ni intsíkurhi-p’ī-ku-a-ka=ni
   1SG Pablo-OBJ give.away-INDF.OBJ-3APPL-FUT-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ
   imá-eri wichu-ni
   that-GEN dog-OBJT
   ‘I will give Pablo’s dog away.’

Sentence (16b) shows that when the base verb has undergone PO suppression, the applied argument cannot bear the role of beneficiary/recipient, or that of possessor of the suppressed argument (R).

The contrast between the sentences in (13–15), where there has been no argument suppression, and those in (16), can be seen in the argument structures of both these constructions, described in (17) and (18).

(17) Argument structure of íntsku-chí
    give-1/2APPL
    a. íntsku [< AG > < RECIP > < TH >]
    b. íntsku-chí [APPL [< AG > < RECIP > < TH >] <PSR OF RECIP >]
   Syntactic realization SBJ SO SO PO

(18) Argument structure of ínts-p’ī-chí
    give-INDF.OBJ-1/2APPL
    a. ínts [< AG > < RECIP > < TH >]
    b. ínts-p’ī ∅
    c. ínts-p’ī-chí [APPL [< AG > < ∅ > < TH >] <PSR OF THEME >]
   Syntactic realization SBJ SO PO

The argument structures represented in (17) and (18) help explain the constraint in P’ohrehpecha on the applied argument that prevents it from being interpreted as a beneficiary/recipient. In the case of the applicativization of monotransitive verbs, the patient/theme must be located within the domain of the applied argument. Since with transfer verbs the theme becomes located within the sphere of the recipient, the only possible relationship between the agent and the applied argument is one in which a participant located within the domain of the applied argument is involved in the agent’s action. Thus, in the structure of (17), the agent transfers a theme to a recipient that belongs to the applied argument. This situation differs with respect to that of predi-
cates such as (18) where the agent transfers a theme belonging to another participant (the applied argument) to an indefinite recipient. In the latter case, the outcome is an event in which the agent is an intermediary, as it allows the displacement of the theme from the possessor/source to the recipient. This is also the case with the verbs involving a source argument. In this case, since the theme comes under the control of the agent, the latter can transfer it to another participant.

Predicates with the root *ewá* ‘take away’ plus an applicative morpheme are commonly used in two types of situations in which the agent is an intermediary that allows the displacement of the theme from the source to the recipient: when receiving something meant for another participant (the applied argument is the recipient of the theme), or when rescuing or recovering something for another participant (the applied argument is simultaneously the recipient and the possessor of the theme). The latter case, which presents the iterative morpheme -nt'a (*ewánt'ani* ‘take away again’), is illustrated in (19).

(19) \[ \text{péri imá=chka=riní gitárrí-ni} \]
\[ \text{but that=EMPH=1SG.OBJ guitar-OBJ} \]
\[ \text{ewá-kurhi-s-∅-ki} \]
\[ \text{take.away-MDL/REFL-PRS-INTErr/CLAR} \]
\[ \ldots \text{because he (the squirrel) took the guitar away from me (the rabbit).} \]
\[ \text{(conejo.202)} \]
\[ \text{ni-pá-∅=ksïni ewá-chi-nt’a-ni} \]
\[ \text{go-DIR-EXORT=2SG/PL.OBJ take.away-1/2APPL-ITR-NF} \]
\[ \text{‘We will recover it (from the squirrel) for you (said the mole to the rabbit).} \]
\[ \text{(conejo.202)} \]
\[ \text{ka imá=na nirá-ni ewá-ku-nt’a-ni} \]
\[ \text{and that=EVID go-NF take.away-3APPL-ITR-NF} \]
\[ \text{‘

\[ \ldots \text{and that he (the mole) went to recover it (from the squirrel).} \]
\[ \text{(conejo.204)} \]

As expected, *ewá* may also be combined with the applicative morpheme to introduce the possessor of the source.
In the second and third sentences of (19) there are no overt 3rd person object NPs; however, given the discourse context the participants are easily identified. These sentences can be compared with the triple object constructions in (20).

(20) a. Pédru=rini ewá-chi-nt’a-s-∅-ti (xuchüti)
   Pedro=1SG.OBJ take.away-1/2APPL-ITR-PRF-PRS-3IND (1SG.POSS)
   kabáyu-ni Xwánu-ni
   horse-OBJ Juan-OBJ
   ‘Pedro rescued my horse from Juan (for me).’/‘He took back my horse from Juan (for me).’

b. xí=kini ewá-chi-nt’a-a-ka (chüüti)
   1SG=2SG.OBJ take.away-1/2APPL-ITR-FUT-1/2IND (2SG.POSS)
   wátsí-ni Xwánu-ni
   son/daughter.3PSR-OBJT Juan-OBJT
   ‘I will rescue your son/daughter from Juan (for you).’

In the sentences in (20), given that the applied object is 1st/2nd person, there is no ambiguity regarding who the possessor/recipient of the theme is (the possessive marker is optional). However, this is not the case when the applied object is 3rd person. The ambiguity created in this case tends to trigger the following behavior: a) the applied object occurs in a preverbal position; b) the theme presents possessive marker; and c) the possessor is placed before the genitive phrase:

(21) a. ? xí Xwánu-ni ewá-ku-nt’a-s-∅-ka=ni
   1SG Juan-OBJT take.away-3APPL-ITR-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ
   kabáyu-ni María-ni
   horse-OBJ Maria-OBJT
   Intended readings: ‘I rescued Juan's horse from Maria.’
   ‘I rescued Maria's horse from Juan.’

b. xí María-ni ewá-ku-nt’a-s-∅-ka=ni
   1SG Maria-OBJT take.away-3APPL-ITR-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ
   [imá-eri wáp’a-ni] José-ni
   [that-GEN son/daughter.3PSR-OBJT] José-OBJT
   ‘I rescued Maria’s son/daughter from José.’
As can be observed, all of the intended readings of (21a) tend to be rejected. Conversely, in (21b), the preverbal object NP preceding the genitive phrase is unmistakably identified as the possessor/recipient of the theme.\(^7\) It must be emphasized, however, that these constructions are more common when at least one of the 3rd person object NPs is omitted, as in (19) and (22).

\[(22)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{xí} & \quad \text{ewá-ku-nt'a-s-∅-ka=ni} \\
1SG & \quad \text{take.away-3APPL-ITR-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ} \\
& \quad \begin{bmatrix}
\text{imá-eri} & \text{kabáyu-ni} \\
\text{that-GEN} & \text{horse-OBJT}
\end{bmatrix} \text{José-ni} \\
& \quad \begin{bmatrix}
\text{José-OBJT}
\end{bmatrix}
\end{align*}
\]
\[\text{‘I rescued his/her (identifiable by context) horse from José.’}\]

The other frequent use of \textit{ewá} plus an applicative suffix is to indicate that something is obtained or bought for someone else (to take from one to give to another); thus, it depicts an event where the applied object is the (potential) recipient. In (23) examples exhibiting the 1st/2nd person applicative suffix are given.

\[(23)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
a. \text{xí=ki}= & \quad \text{ewá-chi-s-∅-ka itsúkwa} \\
1SG = 2SG.OBJ & \quad \text{take.away-1/2APPL-PRF-PRS-1/2IND milk} \\
& \quad \begin{bmatrix}
\text{[itsúkwa-xwári]-ni} \\
\text{[milkman]-OBJT}
\end{bmatrix}
\end{align*}
\]
\[\text{‘I got/took away the milk (from the milkman) for you.’}\]

\[
b. \text{chá=ts'i}= & \quad \text{ewá-chi-nt'a-a-ka sáni} \\
2PL=1SG/PL.OBJ & \quad \text{take.away-1/2APPL-ITR-FUT-1/2IND few} \\
& \quad \text{kartóni}
\end{align*}
\]
\[\text{‘You (PL) will get/buy some cardboard for me again.’}\]

The sentences in (23) illustrate, once again, the tendency to avoid triple object constructions. Although in (23a) the occurrence of the NP \textit{itsúkwa-xwári} ‘the milkman’ is admitted, it is considered redundant. In (23b), registered in conversation, the speakers have a shared knowledge regarding the person from whom they are going to buy the cardboard. In potentially ambiguous construc-

\(^7\) In these constructions, the applied argument is the possessor of the theme even when the base verb has not undergone PO suppression by \textit{-p'i} (cf. examples in (26)).
tions with the 3rd person applicative suffix, if all the arguments are realized by overt NPs, as in (24), the applied argument is placed before the verb:

(24) $xí$ María-ni $ewá-ku-s-∅-ka=ni$
    1sg Maria-objt take.away-3APPL-PRF-PRS-1/2IND-1SG=1SG.SBJ

$k’wirípita \ [k’wirípita-xatsíri]\-ni$
meat \ [butcher]-OBJT
‘I got/took away the meat from the butcher for Maria.’

Given a discourse context, the norm is that the source and/or the recipient NPs be omitted, without the risk of producing ambiguity.

(25) a. María málu $xarhá-s-p-ti$ ka $xí$
    Maria sick be-PRF-PST-3IND and 1SG

$ewá-ku-s-∅-ka=ni$ $itsúkwa$ Lúpi-ni
take.away-3APPL-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ milk Lupe-OBJT
‘Maria was sick and I got the milk from Lupe for her.’

b. $[k’wirípita-xatsíri]$ xanó-s-∅-ti $ya$ ka $xí$
   [butcher] arrive-PRF-PRS-3IND already and 1SG

$ewá-ku-a-ka=ni$ $k’wirípita$ Lúpi-ni
take.away-3APPL-FUT-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ meat Lupe-OBJT
‘The butcher has already arrived and I will get the meat (from him) for Lupe.’

c. éki $xwári$ xanó-nkwa-∅-p-ka, Lúpi no
when courier arrive-CNT-PRF-PST-SBJV, Lupe NEG

$xarhá-s-p-ti$ peru $xí$ $ewá-ku-na-t’s-∅-ka$
be-PRF-PST-3IND but 1SG take.away-3APPL-ITR-PRF-PRS-1/2IND

$itsúkwa$ ka wantónskurhi-s-∅-ka=ni imá-ni xinkóni
milk and talk-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ that-OBJT POSP
‘When the courier arrived Lupe wasn’t home, but I got the milk (from him) for her and talked to him.’
Applicative constructions with the predicate *ewáni* ‘to take away’ are highly productive when the source argument has been suppressed by *-p‘i*, the identity of which is therefore irrelevant. These constructions are syntactically ditransitive:

(26) a. *ewá-p‘i-ku-a-ka=ni*  
| take.away-INDF.OBJ-3APPL-FUT-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ |
| tsúntsú-ni |
| pot-OBJT |

*Rósa-ni*

Rosa-OBJT

‘I will buy/get the pot for Rosa.’

b. *ewá-p‘i-chi-nt‘a-s-∅-ti=rini*  
| take.away-INDF.OBJ-1/2APPL-ITR-PRF-PRS-3IND=1SG.OBJ |

*kabódyu-ni*

horse-OBJT

‘S/he rescued my horse (for me).’

### 7.2.2 Causative Constructions

Although it has been claimed that syntactically ditransitive verbs can undergo causativization in P’orhépecha (Maldonado and Nava 2002), I have found that, without the occurrence of a valence-reducing operation, this is uncommon. Furthermore, this type of construction tends to be avoided when two [+Animate] 3rd person NP objects co-occur. In fact, causative constructions with three explicit object arguments are favored when the causee is 1st/2nd person—exactly the same situation as with applicativized ditransitive verbs.

(27) a. *táati=rini*  
| intsku-tara-s-∅-ti |
| tumína |

Pedro-OBJT

‘My father made me give Pedro some money.’

---

8 When trying to obtain a causative construction in which all the arguments are overtly expressed, P’orhépecha speakers commonly resort to an analytic construction. However, the speakers’ reactions have led me to note that morphological causative constructions convey a reading involving greater coercion of the causer over the causee, which coincides with Maldonado and Nava’s observations.
‘My father made Pedro give me some money.’

b. *María-ts‘ini ewá-ra-s-∅-ti kárru-ni José-ni
   María=1PL.OBJ take.away-caus-prf-prs-3IND car-OBJT José-OBJT
   ‘Maria made us take the car away from José.’
   *‘Maria made José take the car away from us.’

As happens in all cases of potential ambiguity, if two [+Animate] 3rd person objects compete for the causee role, the norm is for the new object (causee) to occur in preverbal position (cf. Maldonado and Nava 2002:177):

(28) a. k’waníra-tara-s-∅-ka=ni Pédru-ni ma chkári
   throw-caus-prf-prs-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ Pedro-OBJT one stick
   wíchu-ni
dog-OBJT
   ‘I made Pedro throw the dog a stick.’

b. Xwánu María-ni íntska-tara-s-∅-ti Pédru-ni
   Juan María-OBJT give-caus-prf-prs-3IND Pedro-OBJT
   karákata-ni
   writings-OBJT
   ‘Juan made Maria give Pedro the letter.’
   ?’Juan made Pedro give Maria the letter.’

c. xí sapí-ni ewá-ra-s-∅-ka=ni
   1SG child-OBJT take.away-caus-prf-prs-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ
   líbru-ni Xwánu-ni
   book-OBJT Juan-OBJT
   ‘I made the child take the book away from Juan.’
   ?’I made Juan take the book away from the child.’

In (28a), three postverbal objects may appear because no ambiguity will arise, but it is more common for the causee to precede the verb as shown in (28b, c). These last two sentences would be rejected if they presented three postverbal objects, as two of them are potential causees.

Causativized ditransitive verbs follow the same pattern previously described regarding 3rd person arguments: when these are identifiable by the discourse
context, they are left implicit. Therefore, the sentences in (29) and (30) are more natural than those in (27) and (28).

(29) a. \textit{tú=riní íntsku-tara-s-∅-ti tumína-ni}  
\begin{tabular}{ll}
2SG=1SG.OBJ & give-CAUS-PRF-PRS-3IND money-OBJT \\
\end{tabular}  
'You made me give him/her the money.'

b. \textit{María-ts’iní ewá-ra-s-∅-ti}  
\begin{tabular}{ll}
Maria=1PL.OBJ & take.away-CAUS-PRF-PRS-3IND \\
\end{tabular}  
'Maria made us take it away from him/her.'

(30) a. \textit{María ká-a-sín-∅-ti wánikwa}  
\begin{tabular}{ll}
Maria & have.on/with.oneself-distr-HAB-PRS-3IND a.lot \\
\end{tabular}  
\begin{tabular}{ll}
kabáyu-icha-ni & ka xí íntsku-tara-s-∅-ka=ní \\
horse-PL-OBJT & and 1SG give-CAUS-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ \\
ma & kabayú-ní Páblu-ní \\
one & horse-OBJT Pablo-OBJT \\
\end{tabular}  
'Maria has a lot of horses and I made her give Pablo one horse.'

b. \textit{María wéka-síam-p-ti ma animáli-ní ka}  
\begin{tabular}{ll}
Maria & want/love-HAB.PST-PST-3IND one animal-OBJT and \\
\end{tabular}  
\begin{tabular}{ll}
xí íntsku-tara-s-∅-ka=ní & ma kabáyu-ní \\
1SG & give-CAUS-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ one horse-OBJT \\
\end{tabular}  
Páblu-ní  
Pablo-OBJT  
'Maria wanted an animal and I made Pablo give her a horse.'

In (30a) \textit{Páblu-ní} is interpreted as the recipient and in (30b) as the causee. However, if the discourse context is eliminated in (30a, b), the sentence \textit{xí íntsku-taraskani ma kabáyuni Páblu-ní} becomes ambiguous, contrasting with the sentences in (29) which only permit the reading whereby the causee is 1st person.

As expected, the causativization of ditransitive verbs is much more productive when the predicate exhibits morphology blocking the encoding in core function of either the causee or the PO of the base verb. The suppression of the causee is found in constructions where the middle/reflexive morpheme \textit{-kurhi}
is suffixed to the causativized predicate, which entails the oblique realization of the causee (see Chapter 5).9

(31)  a. Pédru íntsku-tara-kurhi-s-∅-ti María-ni tumína
Pedro give-CAUS-MDL/REFL-PRF-PRS-3IND María-OBJT money

( Xwánu-ni ximpó)
(Juan-OBJT POSP)
‘Pedro had some money given to Maria (by Juan).’

b. ewá-ra-kurhi-s-∅-ka=ni María-ni
take.away-CAUS-MDL/REFL-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ María-OBJT

itsí (warhíti-nkuni)
water (woman-COM)
‘I had some water bought (taken away) from Maria (by the woman).’

c. eyánku-tara-kurhi-s-∅-ka=kini ma kwéntu
tell-CAUS-MDL/REFL-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=2SG.OBJ one tale

‘I ordered (someone) to tell you a story.’/‘I had a story told to you.’

The suppression of the PO of the base verb occurs when causativization is applied to a predicate in which -p’i has already blocked the syntactic realization of the PO.

(32)  a. sapí-ni k’waníra-p’i-tara-s-∅-ka=ni
child-OBJT throw-INDF.OBJ-CAUS-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ

tsakápu
stone
‘I made the child throw stones (at the people).’

9 In (31c), the suppression of the causee allows a 1st/2nd person recipient-like argument (R). Accordingly, in this type of predicate R behaves as PO, evidence of which is given in the following example:

(i)  xí íntsku-tara-kurhi-na-s-∅-ka sipíata (Lúpi-ni
1SG give-CAUS-MDL/REFL-PASS-PRF-PRS-1/2IND medicine (Lupe-OBJT

xinkóni/ximpó)
POSP/POSP)
‘I was given medicine (by Lupe) on someone’s orders.’
b. **táati**  
*intsikurhi-p’i-tara-s-∅-ti-ts’i*ni*

father.1/2PSR give.away-INDF.OBJ-CAUS-PRS-PRF-3IND=1PL.OBJ

*wíchu-ni*

dog-OBJ

‘My father made us give our dog away.’

c. **ka**  
*antísï ximpó wéka-am-pi-∅*

and why POSP want/love-hab.pst-pst-INTERR/CLAR

*meyámu-p’i-tara-ni imá-eri no xakák’ukwa-ni*

pay-INDF.OBJ-CAUS-NF that-GEN NEG belief-OBJ

tatá  
* k’urhámarhp’i-tí-ni*  
MR. ask.a.lot-OBJ

‘... and why he wanted to make Mr. Ask-a-Lot pay for his disbelief.’

(k’urhamarhpiti.95)

d. **ewá-p’i-tara-s-∅-ka=ni**  
*sapí-ni*

take.away-INDF.OBJ-CAUS-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ child-OBJ

*tumína*

money

‘I made the child take some money away from the people.’

Whereas the identity of the causee is irrelevant in (31), in (32) it is the identity of the recipient/goal/addressee or source that is not significant. This type of sentence seems to fit the discourse requirements, improving the information flow. This aspect of such constructions, coupled with their ditransitive nature, could account for their being preferred and thus more widespread than their equivalent tritransitive constructions.

The data presented in this section and in 7.2.1 show that the causativization and applicativization of ditransitive verbs is favored when: a) at least one 3rd person object is not overtly expressed by an NP, and b) there is argument suppression. In fact, the preference for constructions with a maximum of two object NPs is clearly manifested when the base verb exhibits locative alternation or object/oblique alternation of the R (recipient-like) argument. Compare the sentences in (33) with those undergoing causativization in (34):
(33) a. \( p'íkú-a-ti \) \( shénkwa \) \( xuchí \) \( anátapu-ni/-rhu \)
\text{take.off/pull.off-fut-3ind} \text{ berry} \text{ 1sg.poss tree-objt/-loc}
‘He will pick berries from my tree.’

b. \( entregári-a-ti \) \( tumpí-ni \) \( xurámuti-ni/xurámuti-ni \) \( xinkóni \)
\text{hand.over-fut-3ind} \text{ boy-objt chief-objt/chief-objt posp}
‘S/he will hand the boy over to the chief.’

(34) a. \( p'íkú-ra-s-∅-ka=ni \)
\text{take.off/pull.off-caus-prf-prs-1/2ind=1sg.sbj}
\( shénkwa \) \( María-ni \) \( Pédru-iri \) \( anátapu-rhu/*-ni \)
\text{berry} \text{ Maria-objt Pedro-gen tree-loc/-objt}
‘I made Maria pick berries from Pedro’s tree.’

b. \( María=rini \) \( entregári-tara-s-∅-ti \) \( tumpí-ni \)
\text{Maria=1sg.obj} \text{ hand.over-caus-prf-prs-3ind} \text{ boy-objt}
\( xurámuti-ni \) \( xinkóni/*xurámuti-ni \)
\text{chief-objt posp/chief-objt}
‘Maria made me hand the boy over to the chief.’

While the sentences in (33) show the alternating encoding of \text{anátapu} ‘tree’ and \text{xurámuti} ‘chief’, respectively, those in (34) only accept the realization of these arguments as obliques.

7.2.3 Morphosyntactic Properties of Objects in Tritransitive Constructions

In constructions resulting from the causativization or applicativization of ditransitive verbs, the causee or the applied argument exhibit PO properties. Only these arguments can be 1st/2nd person objects expressed by enclitics, and consequently, cannot be outranked on the person scale by any other argument in object function. Therefore, as has been shown previously, the arguments’ prominence on the person hierarchy aligns with the syntactic primacy \text{PO} > \text{SO}. Furthermore, the causee and the applied argument exhibit the constituent order characteristic of POs: they are placed in preverbal position when potential ambiguity arises. In fact, in the prevailing order of triple object constructions the new object appears preverbally regardless of whether or not there is ambiguity.

The behavioral properties of the causee and applied object confirm their PO status. Consider, first, the morphosyntactic behavior of the causative constructions when undergoing passivization or argument suppression by way of \(-p'i\). Although speakers generally reject the addition of passive morphology to
tritransitive predicates (as they are considered highly complex constructions), in cases in which the passivization of causativized verbs is accepted, only the causee can be promoted to subject:

(35) a. \(xí \) íntsku-tara-na-s-∅-ka tumína María-ni
   1sg give-caus-pass-prf-prs-1/2ind money María-objt
   'I was made (caused) to give Maria some money.'
   *'I was given some money by Maria (on someone's orders).'

b. Chalío p‘ikú-ra-na-s-∅-ti xukánturhakwa
   Chalío take.off/pull.off-caus-pass-prf-prs-3ind shoe
   sapí-ni
   child-objt
   'Chalío was made (caused) to take the child's shoes off.'
   *'Chalío's shoes were taken off by the child (on someone's orders).'

c. sapí k‘waníra-tara-na-s-∅-ti ma chkári kúchi-ni
   child throw-caus-pass-prf-prs-3ind one stick pig-objt
   'The child was made (caused) to throw a stick at the pig.'

The PO character of the causee is also manifested when the indefinite human object morpheme -p‘i is suffixed to causativized predicates:

(36) a. k‘waníra-tara-p‘i-s-∅-ka=ni tsúntsu-ni
   throw-caus-indf.obj-prf-prs-1/2ind=1sg.sbj pot-objt
   José-ni
   José-objt
   'I made someone throw the pot to/at José.'/'I caused the pot to be thrown to/at José.'
   *'I made José throw the pot to/at someone.'

b. íntsku-tara-p‘i-s-∅-ka=ni kurhínta
   give-caus-indf.obj-prf-prs-1/2ind=1sg.sbj bread
   María-ni
   María-objt
   'I made someone give Maria some bread.'/'I caused some bread to be given to Maria.'
   *'I made Maria give bread.'
The same object asymmetries occur regarding applicative constructions: the applied argument is the only one that can be promoted to the subject in the passive form.

(37) a. Xwánú  k’waníra-mi-na-s-∅-ti  ma  tsakápu
     Juan      throw-APPL-PASS-PRF-PRS-3IND one stone

     imá-eri     kúchi-ni
     that-GEN   pig-OBJT

     ‘A stone was thrown at Juan’s pig (on him) (lit. Juan was thrown a stone his pig).’

b. sapí  xatsíku-mi-na-s-∅-ti  xótatarakwa
     child   put-APPL-PASS-PRF-PRS-3IND shoelace

     xukánturhakwa-ni
     shoe-OBJT

     ‘A shoelace was put on the child’s shoe (on his/her behalf) (lit. the child was put (a) shoelace (his/her) shoe).’

c. xí  xorhénta-mi-na-s-∅-ka  ma  pirékwa
     1SG   teach-APPL-PASS-PRF-PRS-1/2IND one song

     (xuchíiti  sapín-ni)
     (1SG.POSS child-OBJT)

     ‘My child was taught a song (on my behalf) (lit. I was taught a song (to) my child).’

The sentences in (38) show the passive forms of bases with the root ewá plus the applicative morpheme.¹¹

¹⁰ According to the speakers consulted, in this sentence the NP that encodes the possessum is usually omitted since it is understood that the person who was taught was the daughter/son of the 1st person. The same occurs in the sentences in (38) with respect to the omission of the source.

¹¹ The grammaticality of the sentences in (38) contrast with the ungrammaticality of forms such as *sipáspíri ewákunasti Pédruni iméri kabáyuni and *itsúkwa xwári ewákunasti itsúkwa Mariani, where the source argument is promoted to subject.
(38) a. Pédru  ewá-mi-na-nt’a-s-∅-ti
    Pedro   take.away-APPL-PASS-ITR-PRF-PRS-3IND

    imá-eri   kabáyu-ni (sípátsp’úri-ní)
    that-GEN  horse-OBJT  (thief-OBJT)

    ‘Pedro’s horse was rescued (from the thief) (on his behalf) (lit. Pedro
    was rescued his horse from the thief).’

b. María  ewá-mi-na-s-∅-ti  itsúkwa
    Maria  take.away-APPL-PASS-PRF-PRS-3IND  milk

    ([itsúkwa-xwári]-ni)
    ([milkman]-OBJT)

    ‘The milk for Maria was gotten (from the milkman) (lit. ‘Maria was
    taken away milk from the milkman by someone).’

Likewise, in constructions resulting from the applicativization of ditransitive
verbs, only the applied argument can undergo reciprocalization:12

(39) a. tumpí-icha  ewá-tsí-p’era-a-nt’a-s-∅-ti=ksí
    boy-PL   take.away-APPL-RECP-DISTR-ITR-PRF-PRS-3IND=
               1/3PL.SBJ

    kabáyu-icha-ni
    horse-PL-OBJT
    ‘The boys rescued each other’s horses.’
    *The boys rescued somebody’s horses from each other.’

b. xatsíku-tsí-p’era-a-s-∅-ka=ksí  síplatá
    put-APPL-RECP-DISTR-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1/3PL.SBJ  medicine

    sapí-cha-ni
    child-PL-OBJT
    ‘We gave (lit. put) medicine to each other’s children.’

12 In contrast to the sentences in (39), if the applicative suffix is added to a predicate that
has undergone reciprocalization (and consequently, where the source argument displays
PO properties), the resulting sentences are ungrammatical:

(i) *sapí-cha  ònts-p’era-chi-s-∅-ti=ts’íni
    child-PL  give-RECP-1/2APPL-PRF-PRS-3IND=1SG/PL.OBJ 1SG.POSS money-OBJT

    xuchíti  tumína-ni
    1sg.poss  1sg.poss money-OBJT

    Intended reading: ‘The children gave each other my money.’
c. *k'waníra-tsï-p'era-a-s-∅-ti=ksï*  
*tsakápu*

throw-APPL-RECP-DISTR-PRS-3IND=1/3PL.SBJ  stone

*wichu-icha-ni*

dog-PL-OBJT

‘They threw stones at each other’s dogs.’

d. *íntsku-tsï-p'era-a-sín-∅-ka=ksï*  
*kurhínta*

give-APPL-RECP-DISTR-HAB-PRS-1/2IND-1/3PL.SBJ  bread

*sápí-icha-ni*

child-PL-OBJT

‘We give bread to each other’s children.’

Lastly, the addition of -p’í to applicativized ditransitive verbs suppresses the applied argument, as shown in (40).

(40) a. *xorhénta-tsï-p'i-sín-∅-ti*  
*pírekwa-icha-ni*  
*sápí-ni*

*teach-APPL-INDF.OBJ-HAB-PRS-3IND*  *song-PL-OBJT*  *child-OBJT*

‘S/he teaches songs to someone else’s child.’/‘S/he teaches songs to the child (at the request of his/her parents).’

b. *éwá-tsï-p'i-nt'a-s-∅-ka=ní*  
*kabáyu-ni*

*take.away-APPL-INDF.OBJ-ITR-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ*  *horse-OBJT*

*(sípátsp'íri-ní)*

(thief-OBJT)

‘I rescued somebody else’s horse (from the thief).’

c. *éwá-tsï-p'i-s-∅-ka=ní*  
*kurúcha*

*take.away-APPL-INDF.OBJ-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ*  *fish*

‘I bought (took away) fish for someone else at his/her request.’

Sentences such as those in (40) are commonly translated as ‘do something as a favor for somebody else, or at his/her request’. This is expected since in applicative constructions the agent’s action is directed towards the domain of the applied argument, where the patient/theme is located.¹³

¹³ In constructions such as (40c) the norm is to omit the source NP. The verb *ewátsíp'íni* is frequently used to indicate ‘buy for someone else’ (the identity of the source is irrelevant) and seems to be, to a certain degree, a lexicalized form.
In tritransitive constructions resulting from causativized or applicativized non-derived ditransitive verbs, the PO is always the new object introduced by these valence-increasing mechanisms. In these constructions, PO selection cannot always be predicted based on the relative thematic ranking of arguments proposed here as prevalent in P’orhépecha. According to this ranking an agentive causee (with a dual role of agent and patient) is equally ranked with a recipient/beneficiary/source/goal or a possessor of a non-corporeal entity, while a possessor outranks its possessum regardless of the thematic role of the latter. In all the applicative constructions previously examined, the applied argument with a possessor role is the PO whereas its possessum is an SO. Therefore, when the applied argument is the possessor of the R (recipient-like) argument (the PO in non-derived ditransitive constructions), its selection as PO is expected in accordance with the proposed thematic ranking. Likewise, the fact that the applied argument can be neither the possessor of the theme nor a beneficiary/recipient might be explained considering that in these constructions two arguments would coexist—the recipient/source and the applied argument (a beneficiary or the possessor of the theme)—each of which qualifies as PO in ditransitive clauses; thus, these arguments are equally ranked regarding syntactic primacy.

However, a different situation arises in triple object constructions with base verbs such as ewáni. With this verb, the applied argument (PO) becomes the recipient/possessor of the theme, while the source argument becomes an SO. Consequently, these constructions are not consistent with the thematic ranking positing a recipient, a possessor of a theme, and a source as equally ranked regarding PO selection. Another context in which this thematic ranking is not maintained is in the case of causative clauses in which the causee displays PO properties while the recipient-like argument (R) exhibits SO behavior.

14 Croft’s (1990, 1998) analysis could be used to account for the syntactic prominence of the causee (PO) in tritransitive constructions, whereas the PO behavior of the applied argument in tritransitive constructions could be explained adopting Marantz’s (1993) proposal regarding the embedding of Event1 (base verb) into Event2 (applicative predicate). However, these approaches are inadequate to explain the behavior of P’orhépecha predicates that involve the interaction of causative and applicative morphemes discussed in 7.3.

15 It might be argued that the syntactic primacy of the causee is due to its agentive features, as Guerrero and Van Valin (2004) propose in order to explain the same phenomenon in Yaqui. However, this is a problematic solution for P’orhépecha constructions, as will be discussed in section 7.3.2.
Considering these cases, the determining factor regarding PO status in the tritransitive constructions discussed in this section seems to be whether an argument is or is not the new object introduced by valence-increasing morphology, a proposal which could be extended to the applicativization and causativization of monotransitive verbs. However, if the embedding of valence-increasing processes were the determining factor with regard to PO selection, all constructions involving two valence-increasing mechanisms would be expected to be grammatical. As will be shown below, this is not the case, which corroborates the relevance of the relative thematic ranking of the co-arguments in accounting for the generation of grammatical constructions.

In the sections below evidence will be provided to support the following proposal: that the grammaticality of triple object constructions exhibiting more than one valence-increasing operation depends on the last introduced object outranking the other arguments to be mapped onto object function on the thematic hierarchy prevalent in P’orhēpecha. In fact, this is the case with constructions containing spatial suffixes seen in 7.1. Consequently, tritransitive constructions are ungrammatical when they have two arguments with potential access to PO according to their thematic ranking; i.e., arguments which in ditransitive constructions qualify as PO and are therefore equally ranked on the thematic hierarchy.16

Therefore, considering all the possibilities regarding multiple object constructions, it is possible to argue that the morphosyntactic configuration of predicates with more than three arguments is a determining factor in the generation of grammatical tritransitive sentences, which explains the differences between the causativization/applicativization of non-derived ditransitive verbs and that of derived ditransitive predicates.

---

16 This proposal also applies to ditransitive constructions such as:

(i) niní-ru-a-s-∅-ti máru kwashánta-echa-ni
    ripen-CAUS-3APPL-DISTR-PRF-PRS-3IND some egg-PL-OBJT
    sapí-icha-ní
    child-PL-OBJT
    'He cooked the children some eggs.'

(ii) té-ra-tara-a-ka=ní itsí-ní María-ní
    get.sweet-CAUS-CAUS-FUT-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ water-OBJT María-OBJT
    'I will make Maria sweeten the water.'
7.3 Predicates Exhibiting Interaction of Causative and Applicative Morphemes

In this section, the restrictions imposed on P’orhépecha predicates that have undergone both causativization and applicativization will be examined. It will be shown that the occurrence of such predicates (which would produce tri-transitive constructions), is restricted to situations where either the causee or the applied argument take precedence over the other according to the thematic ranking prevalent in P’orhépecha.

Since constructions that present the morpheme sequence [CAUS-APPL] and [APPL-CAUS] will be discussed, it is important first to specify the type of events described by predicates presenting these processes. Throughout this section the following will be argued: Firstly, that the type of event denoted by predicates undergoing causativization and applicativization is determined by the order in which the morphological processes take place, which in turn establishes the argument structure of these predicates and the relationships between the participants. Secondly, that in P’orhépecha the linear sequence of valence-increasing suffixes coincides with the order in which these morphosyntactic operations occur. Finally, that the events denoted by the predicates in question support the analysis offered in Chapter 4 where it was argued that P’orhépecha applicative morphemes establish a relationship between the agent/subject of the base predicate and the applied argument, the former directing its action to the domain of the latter.

7.3.1 Causativization of Applicativized Predicates

The causativization of a verb that has undergone applicativization, exhibiting the sequence [APPL-CAUS], produces ungrammatical sentences, as can be seen in (41).17

17 The only case in which some speakers accept the causativization of a predicate with an applied argument is with the dependent root eyá, which must undergo applicative suffixation in order to form the verbal stem ‘promise something to someone’ (see Chapter 4). The fact that in this case the applied argument is compulsory may explain why this predicate is treated in the same way as non-derived ditransitive verbs.

(i) eyá-ku-tara-s-∅-ti=rini ma wícu-ni sapí-ni
promise-3APPL-CAUS-PRF-PRS-3IND=1SG.OBJ one dog-OBJT child-OBJT
‘S/he made me promise the child a dog.’

(ii) xí eyá-ku-tara-na-s-∅-ka ma wíchu-ni sapí-ni
1SG promise-3APPL-CAUS-PASS-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.OBJT one dog-OBJT child-OBJT
‘I was made (caused) to promise the child a dog.’
In contrast with causative clauses stemming from non-derived ditransitive verbs (see 7.2) or from verbal bases with spatial suffixes (see 7.1), those in (41) are ungrammatical due to the presence of an applied argument with a (potential) recipient/source role, as in (41a, c), or with the role of possessor of a non-corporeal entity, as in (41b). This is supported by the fact that the same occurs in the case of the causativization of intransitive verbs having undergone applicativization, such as those in (42), and that therefore, the ungrammaticality of the predicates in (41) cannot merely be due to the number of NPs involved in such constructions.

(41) a. *pyá-ku-tara-s-∅-ti=rini tsïntsu-ni
  buy-3APPL-CAUS-PRF-PRS-3IND=1SG.OBJ pot-OBJT

  Maria-ni
  Maria-OBJT
  Intended reading: ‘He made me buy Maria a pot.’

b. *xupá-ku-tara-s-∅-ti=kini Lúpi-ni
  wash-3APPL-CAUS-PRF-PRS-3IND=2SG.OBJ Lupe-OBJT

  shukáparhakwa
  clothes
  Intended reading: ‘S/he made you wash Lupe’s clothes.’

c. *xwá-ku-tara-s-∅-ka=ni chkári
  bring-3APPL-CAUS-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ firewood

  Intended reading: ‘I made him/her bring firewood for him/her.’

(42) a. *xiwákurhi-ku-tara-s-∅-ka=kini Lúpi-ni
  shout-3APPL-CAUS-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=2SG.OBJ Lupe-OBJT

  Intended reading: ‘I made you shout at Lupe.’

b. *sapí-ni inchá-ku-tara-s-∅-ti Pédru-ni
  child-OBJT get.in/into-3APPL-CAUS-PRF-PRS-3IND Pedro-OBJT

  táa-rhu
  house-LOC
  Intended reading: ‘S/he made the child enter Pedro’s house.’
The sentences in (41) and (42) are consistent with the statements of Baker (1988a:395) and Alsina (1993:621–625, 493) that PO languages (or, more accurately, those that present a PO/SO pattern in these construction types) do not allow the causativization of predicates that have undergone applicativization. In the case of P’orhépecha, this can be explained by considering the morphosyntactic conformation of such predicates and their resulting argument structures. In (43), a schematized representation of sentence (42a) is shown and in (44), that of the sentences in (41).

(43) Argument structure of *xiwákurhi-ku-tara
    shout-APPL-CAUS
    a. xiwákurhi  [AG']
    b. xiwákurhi-ku  [APPL [AG'] < GO >]
    c. *xiwákurhi-ku-tara  [CAUSE < AG > [APPL [PAT-AG'] < GO >]
                        Causer     Causee

(44) Argument structure of *pyá/xupá-ku-tara
    buy/wash-APPL-CAUS
    a. pyá/xupá  [AG' < PAT/TH >]
    b. pyá/xupá-ku  [APPL [AG' < PAT/TH >] < RECI/PSPR OF PAT/TH >]
    c. *pyá/xupá-ku-tara  [CAUSE < AG > [APPL [PAT-AG' < PAT/TH >]
                         < RECI/PSPR >]
                        Causer     Causee

According to the structures in (43) and (44), the type of event that these predicates can encode is one whereby the causer (AG) prompts an event in which the agent of the base predicate (AG') directs its action to the domain of the applied argument. That is, in (43), AG causes AG' to shout at someone, and in (44), AG causes AG' to wash or buy something for someone else. However, the semantic arguments involved cannot be mapped onto core functions.

The ungrammaticality of (43) and (44) can be attributed to the fact that two arguments coexist (the causee and the applied argument resulting from

18 See Alsina (1993:493, 625) and Fleck (2002:385) on the existence of this type of predicate in symmetrical languages.
two subsequent valence-increasing operations), which are equally ranked in access to PO, and that therefore neither can be selected as the most prominent syntactic object. This explanation is supported by two facts. Firstly, constructions exhibiting the sequence [APPL-CAUS] are grammatical if the applied argument is not prototypical, i.e., if it corresponds to a patient/theme that is always outranked by a causee on the thematic hierarchy established by PO selection. In these cases, the applied argument exhibits SO behavior:

(45) a. $\begin{array}{ll} x_1 \quad Xwånu-ni & \text{wéra-ku-tara-s-Ø-ka=ni} \\ 1SG \quad Juan-OBJ & \text{get.out-3APPL-CAUS-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ} \\ \end{array}$

$\begin{array}{ll} \quad \text{kabåyu-ni} \\ \quad \text{horse-OBJ} \\ \end{array}$

‘I made Juan halt the horse (lit. I made Juan get out to the horse).’

b. $\begin{array}{ll} Maria=rini & \text{xupá-narhi-ku-tara-s-Ø-ti} \\ \text{Maria=1SG.OBJ} & \text{wash-flat.surface-loc.exp-3APPL-CAUS-PRF-PRS-3IND} \\ \end{array}$

$\begin{array}{ll} \quad Xosé-ni & \text{anánasta-ni} \\ \quad José-OBJ & \text{shin-OBJ} \\ \end{array}$

‘Maria made me wash José’s shin.’

In (45a), the participant introduced by -ku, kabåyu ‘horse’, has patient/theme features. The same can be observed in (45b), where the applicative suffix introduces the body-part possessor, which bears a patient role. Although the predicates in (45) exhibit the sequence [APPL-CAUS], the role of the applied argument, unlike in the predicates in (43) and (45), can be equated with that of a patient/theme that is directly affected by the action of the causee. The meaning of these constructions is the expected one: someone causes someone else to direct his/her action to the applied argument. These sentences are grammatical since the applied argument does not compete with the causee for PO status, and therefore the latter can be encoded in object function and display PO properties. The PO behavior of the causee is evident in passive constructions.

(46) a. $\begin{array}{ll} Xwånu & \text{wéra-ku-tara-na-s-Ø-ti} \\ \quad \text{kabåyu-ni} \\ Juan & \text{get.out-3APPL-CAUS-PASS-PRF-PRS-3IND} \quad \text{horse-OBJ} \\ \end{array}$

‘Juan was made to halt the horse.’
b. María xupá-narhi-ku-ku-tara-na-s-∅-ti
   Maria wash-flat.surface-LOC.EXP-3APPL-CAUS-PASS-PRF-PRS-3IND

   Xosé-ni anánasta-ni
   José-OBJT shin-OBJT
   'Maria was made to wash José's shin.'
   *'Maria's shin was washed by José on someone's orders.'

The second fact that supports the explanation of the ungrammaticality of
the forms in (43) and (44) presented above, is that verbs that have undergone
applicativization can be causativized when the overt expression of the applied
argument in object function has been blocked by -p'i. The contrast between
the representations in (43)/(44) and the constructions in which the applied
object has been suppressed can be observed in (47) (see (ii) in footnote 2).

(47) a. *xiwákurhi-ku-tara-s-∅-ka=kini Lúpi-ni
    shout-3APPL-CAUS-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=2SG.OBJ Lupe-OBJT
    Intended reading: 'I made you shout at Lupe.'

   a'. xí xiwákurhi-tsë-p'i-tara-s-∅-ka=ni
    1SG shout-APPL-INDF.OBJ-CAUS-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ

    Pédru-ni
    Pedro-OBJT
    'I made Pedro shout at the people.'

b. *xupá-ku-tara-s-∅-ti=kini Lúpi-ni
   wash-3APPL-CAUS-PRF-PRS-3IND=2SG.OBJ Lupe-OBJT

   shukúparhakwa
   clothes
   Intended reading: 'S/he made you wash Lupe's clothes.'

b'. t'ú Pédru-ni xupá-tsë-p'i-tara-s-∅-ka
   2SG Pedro-OBJT wash-APPL-INDF.OBJ-CAUS-PRF-PRS-1/2IND

   shukúparhakwa
   clothes
   'You made Pedro wash someone else's clothes.'
Although the relationships among the participants of the event are the same in the pairs of sentences above, only (47 a’, b’, c’), where the applied argument has been suppressed, are grammatical. However, -p’i cannot be used to block the overt realization of the causee in object function. This can be seen in the following examples with monotransitive roots:

\[(48)\]

\[a.\] *xupá-ku-tara-p’i-s-∅-ti=shukuparbha\]
wash-3APPL-CAUS-PRF-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ clothes
Maria-objt
Intended reading: ‘S/he made someone wash Maria’s clothes.’/‘S/he caused Maria’s clothes to be washed.’

\[b.\] *pyá-ku-tara-p’i-s-∅-ka=n\]
by-3APPL-CAUS-PRF-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ
Lúpi-objt bread
Intended reading: ‘I made someone buy bread for Lupe.’/‘I caused some bread to be bought for Lupe.’

The ungrammaticality of the sentences in (48) suggests that the application of morphological processes that affect the arguments’ mapping onto object function requires that one of the arguments qualify as PO (i.e., that the base undergoing the suppression be grammatical). Therefore, -p’i could only block the encoding of the causee in object function in (48) if it were the PO of the causativized applicative construction.
7.3.2 **Applicativization of Causativized Predicates**

As in other languages with PO constructions (Baker 1988a:394, Alsina 1993:623–631, Guerrero and Van Valin 2004), P’orhépecha allows the applicativization of previously causativized agentive predicates. However, there are restrictions regarding the type of event that such predicates can denote, as can be observed in (49).

(49) a. *xiwákurhi-tara-chi-s-∅-ti=rini sapí-ni*
   
   `shout-CAUS-1/2APPL-PRF-PRS-3IND=1SG.OBJ  child-OBJ`

   `’S/he made my child shout.’`

   `*’S/he made the child shout at me.’`

b. *xí Pédru-ni we-tára-ku-s-∅-ka=ni sapí-ni*
   
   `1SG Pedro-OBJT cry-CAUS-3APPL-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ`

   `child-OBJ`

   `’I made Pedro’s child cry.’`

   `*’I made the child cry at Pedro.’/’I made Pedro cry at the child.’`

The predicates in (49) disallow a reading in which the applied argument has a goal role; the only available interpretation is one in which the applied argument is the possessor of the causee. The same restriction is found in sentences with monotransitive base verbs exhibiting the sequence [CAUS-APPL], as can be seen in the sentences in (50).

(50) a. *eshé-ra-chi-s-∅-ti=rini*
   
   `see-CAUS-1/2APPL-PRF-PRS-3IND=1SG.OBJ`

   `wichu-ni xuchí sapí-ni/?xuchí wichu-ni sapí-ni`

   `dog-OBJT 1SG.POSS child-OBJ/ 1SG.POSS dog-OBJT child-OBJ`

   `’S/he showed my child the dog.’`

   `?’S/he showed the child my dog.’`

b. *Lúpi-ni sïpí-rhu-ta-ku-s-∅-ti tsïtsîki-ni*
   
   `Lupe-OBJT smell-tip-CAUS-3APPL-PRF-PRS-3IND flower-OBJT`

   `imá-eri sapí-ni/?imá-eri tsïtsïki-ni sapí-ni`

   `that-GEN child-OBJ/ that-GEN flower-OBJT child-OBJ`

   `’S/he made Lupe’s child smell the flower.’`

   `?’S/he made the child smell Lupe’s flower.’`
The applied argument in the sentences in (51) and (52) exhibits PO behavioral properties: in (51) it is the subject of the passive construction and in (52) it undergoes reciprocalization.

(51) a. \( \text{xí eshé-ra-mi-na-s-∅-ka} \)
    1SG see-CAUS-APPL-PASS-PRF-PRS-1/2IND

    \( \text{xuchí sapí-ni ma wíchu-ni} \)
    1SG.POSS child-OBJT one dog-OBJT

    ‘My child was shown a dog (on my behalf) (lit. I was shown a dog my child).’

b. \( \text{xí xiwákurhi-tara-mi-na-s-∅-ka sapí-ni} \)
    1SG shout-CAUS-APPL-PASS-PRF-PRS-1/2IND child-OBJT

    ‘My child was made (caused) to shout (on me) (lit. ‘I was made to shout (my) child).’

(52) \( \text{warhúti-icha xiwákurhi-tara-tsí-p’era-a-sín-∅-ti=ksí} \)
    woman-PL shout-CAUS-APPL-RECP-DISTR-HAB-PRS-3IND= 1/3PL.SBJ

    sapí-icha-ni
    child-PL-OBJT

    ‘The women make each other’s children shout.’
    *‘The women make the children shout at each other.’

The semantic role and the PO behavior of the applied argument in (49) and (50) can be predicted by taking into account the order of the morphological processes, as well as the relationships established among the participants of the event. In (53), the argument structure of (49a) ‘S/he made my child shout’ is represented, and in (54), that of (50a) ‘S/he showed my child the dog’.

(53) Argument structure of \( xiwákurhi-tara-chi \)
    shout -CAUS- APPL

    a. xiwákurhi \( [<AG']> \)
    b. xiwákurhi-tara \( [\text{CAUSE} <AG> [ <PAT-AG'> ]] \)
    c. xiwákurhi-tara-chi \( [\text{APPL} [\text{CAUSE} <AG> [ <PAT-AG'> ]] <\text{PSR}_{OF\text{CAUSEE}}> ] \)

    Causer Causee

    Syntactic realization SBJ SO PO
Constructions involving more than three arguments

Argument structure of eshé-ra-chi

(54) Argument structure of eshé-ra-chi
see -CAUS-APPL

a. eshé [ < EX > < TH > ]
b. eshé-ra [cause < AG > [ < PAT-EX > < TH > ] ]

Causer Causee

Syntactic realization SBJ SO SO PO

Both (53) and (54) describe an event where the agent of the predicate that undergoes applicativization—the causer—is the one directing its action towards the applied argument. Consequently, the only possible reading is that the causer acts on a participant located within the domain of the applied argument; that is, the applied argument is the possessor of the causee. The fact that the applied object displays PO properties confirms that, in P’orhépecha, an argument with the possessor role is always ranked higher than its posses-sum regarding access to PO.19

Unlike the sentences analyzed so far, the predicates that exhibit the sequence [CAUS-APPL] are ungrammatical if the role of the applied argument is that of recipient or possessor of the patient/theme:

(55) a. *xí=kini pyá-ra-chi-s-∅-ka
1SG=2SG.OBJ buy-CAUS-1/2APPL-PRF-PRS-1/2IND

María-ni ma tsúntsu
Maria-OBJT one pot

Intended reading: ‘I made Maria buy you a pot.’

19 The addition of the possessor of the causee by way of applicativization tends to be rejected when the causee is an agent acting on a patient. According to the speakers consulted, such predicates are unusual and are only allowed when the applied argument is 1st or 2nd person.

(i) ? xupá-ra -chi-s-∅-ti=rini xuchi nanáka-ni
wash-CAUS-1/2APPL-PRF-PRS-3IND=1SG.OBJ 1SG.POSS little.girl-OBJT

wánikwa shukúparhakwa
a.lot clothes

‘S/he made my little girl wash a lot of clothes.’

‘S/he made my little girl wash a lot of clothes for me.’
The fact that the sentences in (55) are not possible can be predicted based on the thematic ranking of the arguments regarding access to PO: these constructions have two arguments—the causee and the applied object—that compete for PO status, and therefore the applicativization of the causativized predicate is not allowed.

The ungrammaticality of the sentences in (55) contrasts with the grammaticality of equivalent sentences in other languages with PO constructions, such as Swahili (Baker 1988a:394, Alsina 1993:623), where the applied argument is the PO, or Yaqui (Guerrero and Van Valin 2004), where the PO is the causee argument. According to Alsina’s (1993) proposal, the patientive nature of the causee explains why this participant behaves as an SO in Swahili. In contrast, Guerrero and Van Valin argue that in Yaqui the logical structure of the predicate determines that the causee is the most prominent argument after the actor, and consequently is the PO.

The data on Swahili and Yaqui suggest that there are languages in which the agentive role of the causee is related to or determines its syntactic primacy over the recipient (the causee is the PO), while in other languages it is the causee’s patientive role that is relevant in determining its ranking lower than a beneficiary/recipient (PO). Following this line of reasoning, it is possible to claim that in P’orhépecha the two semantic roles of the causee are taken into account in determining its thematic ranking; hence, an agentive causee and a recipient/beneficiary/source/goal share a middle ranking between agent and patient/theme arguments. Therefore, as opposed to Swahili and Yaqui, the ungrammaticality of P’orhépecha tritransitive sentences involving an agentive causee and a recipient/beneficiary/source/goal applied argument can be expected.

The explanation offered here of the ungrammaticality of the constructions in (55), resulting from the applicativization of causativized bases, is further supported by the grammaticality of similar constructions in which the causee
cannot be mapped onto object function. This situation occurs when the applicativization operates on a causativized predicate in which the causee has already been suppressed by -p'i, as in (56), or which exhibits the middle/reflexive suffix -kurhi, as in (57), with the consequent exclusion of the causee from the core functions. Compare the ungrammaticality of the tritransitive sentences in (55) with the ditransitive constructions in (56) and (57):

(56) a. pyá-ra-p'i-ku-s-∅-ka-ni
    Pédrù-ni
    buy-CAUS-INDF.OBJ-3APPL-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ Pedro-OBJT

    karákata-ni
    writings-OBJT
    'I made someone buy Pedro a book.'/'I caused the book to be bought for Pedro.'

    b. Pédrù  atá-ra-p'i-ku-s-∅-ti
    Pedro strike-CAUS-INDF.OBJ-3APPL-PRF-PRS-3IND

    Páblù-ni  kabáyu-ni
    Pablo-OBJT horse-OBJT
    'Pedro made someone kill Pablo's horse.'/'Pedro caused Pablo’s horse to be killed.'

(57) a. ú-ra-kurhi-ku-a-ka=ni
    kurhínta
    do/make-CAUS-MDL/REFL-3APPL-FUT-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ bread

    xuchí  náanti-ni (Rósa-ni xinkóni)
    1SG.POSS mother.1/2PSR-OBJT (Rosa-OBJT POSP)
    'I will have bread made for my mother (by Rosa).'</n
    b. xuchí  táati=rini
    1SG.POSS father.1/2PSR=1SG.OBJ

    pyá-ra-kurhi-chi-s-∅-ti
    buy-CAUS-MDL/REFL-1/2APPL-PRF-PRS-3IND one shawl

    ma  k’waníntikwa
    'My father had a shawl bought for me.'

In contrast to the causative constructions discussed in Chapter 5, the encoding of the causee in oblique function is permitted without the need for any morphological marking when causativized monotransitive verbs undergo a new
valence increase. This can be seen by comparing (57a) with (58), where the causee can only be encoded as an oblique NP.20

(58) urhu-ra-ku-s-∅-ti  Pédr-ü-ni  tsir-i
    grind-CAUS-3APPL-PRF-PRS-3IND  Pedro-OBJT  corn

José-ni  xinkōni /*José-ni
José-OBJT  POSP /José-OBJT
’S/he caused Pedro’s corn to be ground (by José).’
*S/he made Pedro grind somebody else’s corn in José’s company.’

The type of event denoted by these predicates is schematized in (59), where the argument structure of constructions such as those in (56–58) is shown.

(59) Argument structure of TR.V-CAUS-p’i/(-kurhi)-APPL

a. TR.V  [<AG>  <PAT/TH>]

b. TR.V-CAUS  [CAUSE <AG>  [<PAT-AG>  <PAT/TH>]]

| c. TR.V-CAUS-p’i/(-kurhi)  ∅
| d. TR.V-CAUS-p’i/(-kurhi)-APPL  [CAUSE <AG>  [<∅>  <PAT/TH>]]  <RECIP/PSR>]

Causer  Causee

Syntactic realization
TR.V-CAUS-p’i-APPL  SBJ  SO  PO
TR.V-CAUS(-kurhi)-APPL  SBJ  OBL  SO  PO

Given that in P’orhépecha applicative constructions a relationship between the agent of the base predicate and the applied argument is established, predicates such as (59d) refer to situations in which the causer directs the event to the domain of the applied argument (the recipient or the possessor of the theme). Such predicates are only grammatical when the causee is not encoded in core function, as in (59). The exclusion of the causee from the core arguments suggests that in this type of event it is not the identity of the causee

20 Of the different constructions in which the causee is not expressed in object function, the most common are those with -kurhi.
that is relevant, but rather its role as an intermediary or as an instrument that serves the purpose of the causer. This explains why the sentences in (56) are customarily translated as ‘I used someone to buy the book for Pedro’ and ‘Pedro used someone to kill Pablo’s horse’. In the predicates in (57), the presence of the middle/reflexive morpheme -kurhi—which occurs in benefactive causative constructions (see Chapter 5)—clearly indicates that the event remains under the control of the subject/causer; i.e., this participant uses someone (the causee) to carry out an action directed to the domain of the applied argument.

As a result of the exclusion of the causee from the core functions, the applied argument becomes the highest ranked object and may therefore exhibit PO behavior; for example, it is the subject in the passive construction:

(60) xí ú-ra-kurhi-mi-na-s-∅-ka
    1SG do/make-CAUS-MDL/REFL-APPL-PASS-PRF-PRS-1/2IND

kurhínta
bread
‘Some bread was made for me on someone’s orders.’

To conclude this section it is worth mentioning that, according to the speakers consulted, predicates such as those schematized in (59) can be generated from ditransitive base verbs and can produce tritransitive constructions involving five arguments:

(61) a. xí=kini ewá-ra-p’i-chi-nt’a-s-∅-ka
    1SG=2SG.OBJ take.away-CAUS-INDF.OBJ-1/2APPL-ITR-PRF-PRS-1/2IND

chüti wíchu-ni sipátsp’iri-ni
2SG.POSS dog-OBJ thief-OBJ
‘I made someone take your dog away from the thief.’/’I had your dog rescued from the thief.’

b. María ínstku-tara-kurhi-chi-s-∅-ti=rini
    Maria give-CAUS-MDL/REFL-1/2APPL-PRF-PRS-3IND=1SG.OBJ

kurhínta xuchí sapi-ni
bread 1SG.POSS child-OBJ
‘Maria had some bread given to my child.’
7.3.3 **Summary**
The configuration of the argument structure of predicates with causativization and applicativization and the viability of mapping their arguments onto core functions are key aspects in the generation of grammatical constructions involving these morphological processes.

In 7.3.1 and 7.3.2, evidence was provided to show the following: Firstly, that the relationships among the arguments of the derived predicates arise from both the order of the morphological processes and the characteristics of Porhèpecha applicative constructions that distinguish between the domain of the subject of the predicate undergoing applicativization and that of the applied argument. Secondly, that the thematic roles of the arguments involved in predicates with causativization and applicativization are a determining factor in the assignment of PO/SO grammatical functions, and in the consequent grammaticality of the resulting sentences. Thirdly, that constructions with both an agentive causee and an applied argument to be mapped onto object function are ungrammatical when it is impossible, given their equal thematic ranking, for one to be selected over the other as the PO. Table 16 summarizes the properties of predicates exhibiting the co-occurrence of causative and applicative suffixes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 16</th>
<th><strong>Constructions with co-occurring causative and applicative suffixes</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suffix sequence</td>
<td>APPL-CAUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event type</td>
<td>The causer instigates an event where an agent directs its action to the domain of the applied argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-existence of applied and causee objects</td>
<td>*INTR/TR.V-APPL-CAUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INTR/TR.V-APPL-CAUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APPL = patient/theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TR.V-CAUS-APPL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Constructions involving more than three arguments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suffix sequence</th>
<th>APPL-CAUS</th>
<th>CAUS-APPL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argument suppression</td>
<td>Applied argument suppression</td>
<td>Causee suppression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*INTR.V-CAUS-(p')-APPL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INTR/TR.V-APPL-(p')-CAUS</td>
<td>APPL = *causee's possessor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TR.V-CAUS-(p')-APPL</td>
<td>APPL = recipient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>patient/theme's possessor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*causee's possessor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pattern [INTR/TR.V-APPL-CAUS] shown in Table 16 may produce grammatical sentences only if the applied argument has been suppressed or if it bears a non-prototypical thematic role (patient/theme). On the other hand, the patterns involving the applicativization of causativized predicates [INTR/TR.V-CAUS-APPL] may generate grammatical sentences if the applied object is the only one that qualifies as PO. This occurs when the applied argument is the possessor of the causee or when the causee has been excluded from the core functions. In the latter case, the applied argument must bear the role of recipient or possessor of the patient/theme. Thus, it may be concluded that the derivation of tritransitive constructions resulting from the co-occurrence of causativization and applicativization is limited to predicates in which the object introduced last outranks the other object arguments on the thematic hierarchy underlying access to PO.

### 7.4 Constructions with Double Applicativization

P’orhépecha constructions with two applied objects are restricted to situations in which the second applied argument bears the role of the possessor of the first. These are common when the applied argument introduced first has a patient-like role, as in (62).

(62)  
Pédru wéra-ku-chi-s-∅-ti=rini kabáyu-ni
Pedro get.out-3appl-1/2appl-prf-prs-3ind=1sg.obj horse-objt
‘Pedro halted my horse for me.’
The most common predicates with non-prototypical applied arguments are those containing part-whole spatial suffixes that require applicativization in order to encode the whole/possessor in object function. These predicates may undergo a new applicativization process to introduce the possessor of the participant affected by the action (the whole or possessor of the part), as observed in (63).\(^{21}\)

\[(63)\]

a. ts’ínápi’iri xupá-rhu-ku(-ku)-chi-a-ti=kini
   doctor   wash-tip-LOC.EXP-3APPL-1/2APPL-FUT-3IND=2SG.OBJ
   chúti sapí-ni yurhíri ték’i-rhu
   2SG.POSS child-OBJT blood nail-LOC
   ‘The doctor will wash away the blood from your son’s nail.’

b. xí Luápi-ni
   1SG Lupe-OBJT
   xupá-narhi-ku(-ku)-ku-s∅-ka=ni
   wash-flat.surface-LOC.EXP-3APPL-3APPL-PRF-PRS-1/21ND=1SG.SBJ
   imá-eri sapí-ni anánasta-ni
   that-GEN child-OBJT shin-OBJT
   ‘I washed the shin of Lupe’s child.’

In the sentences in (62) and (63), the first applied argument has a (non-prototypical) patient/theme role, while the second, its possessor, is the one exhibiting PO properties; for example, it is the only one that can be promoted to subject function in the passive construction:

\[(64)\]

a. Pédru wé-ku-mi-na-s∅-ti kabáyu-ni
   Pedro get.out-3APPL-APPL-PASS-PRF-PRS-3IND horse-OBJT
   ‘Pedro’s horse was halted (for him) (lit. Pedro was halted (his) horse).’

\(^{21}\) The first applicative morpheme -\(\text{ku}\) has been placed in parentheses since the sequence -\(\text{ku-ku}\) is generally reduced to -\(\text{ku}\). This reduction is obligatory when there are three successive homophone morphemes (see Friedrich 1971a:108), as is the case in (63b).
b. Lúpi  xupá-narhi-ku(-ku)-mi-na-s-∅-ti
    Lupe  wash-flat.surface-LOC.EXP-3APPL-APPL-PASS-PRF-PRS-3IND

imá-eri    sapí-ni    anánasta-ni
    that-GEN  child-OBJ  shin-OBJ

'The shin of Lupe’s child was washed (on her behalf) (lit. Lupe was
washed the shin her child).'

According to Foster (1969:127), in P’orhépecha there are constructions with
double applicativization in which both a recipient and a beneficiary are at play.
The only example offered by this author is xwákuche=reni, translated as ‘bring
it to me, for her/him’. Although it is necessary to research other dialects, all the
speakers I have consulted accept, albeit as somewhat rare, utterances similar
to that offered by Foster, if and when the second applied argument represents
the possessor of the recipient introduced by the first applicative process; that
is, the only allowed translation of Foster’s example is ‘Bring it to my son’. This
is illustrated in (65).

(65) a. ? pyá-ku-chi-∅=rini tékwa sapí-ni
    buy-3APPL-1/2APPL-IMP=1SG.OBJ honey child-OBJ

‘Buy my child some honey (on my behalf).’

*‘Buy some honey from/for the child for me.’

b. ? xwá-ku-chi-∅=rini ma tsúntsu
    bring-3APPL-1/2APPL-IMP=1SG.OBJ one pot

xuchíiti    nanáka-ni
    1SG.POSS  little.girl-OBJ

‘Bring my little girl a pot.’

*‘Bring my little girl a pot for me.’

Interestingly, I have only been able to register this type of sentence when,
as in (65), the possessor is in the first person and the verb is in the imperative
mood. According to the observations of native speakers, these
sentences are generally translations into P’orhépecha of the Spanish pro-
nominal clitic constructions (dativus ethicus), but they are not in use in the
language.\(^{22}\) The marginal character of these sentences suggests that the use

\(^{22}\) In contrast with the sentences in (65), P’orhépecha speakers easily accept constructions
exhibiting the addition of the applicative morpheme to the predicate eyákuni ‘promise
something to someone’ (see footnote 17):
of applicativization to introduce the possessor of an applied argument with a role other than that of patient/theme is not productive in P’orhépecha.23

Sentences with double applicativization also produce ungrammatical sentences when one applied argument corresponds to the source/possessor of the theme and the other one to the recipient. This is shown in (66).

(66) a. *pyá-ku-chi-s-∅-ti=rini tékwa María-ni
   buy-3APPL-1/2APPL-PRF-PRS-3IND=1SG.OBJ honey María-OBJ
   Intended readings: ‘She bought honey from Maria for me.’
   ‘She bought some honey from me for Maria.’

b. *Pédru=rini xwá-ku-chi-s-∅-ti tumína
   Pedro=1SG.OBJ bring-3APPL-1/2APPL-PRF-PRS-3IND money
   María-ni
   María-OBJ
   Intended readings: ‘Pedro brought me some money for Maria.’
   ‘Pedro brought Maria my money.’
   ‘Pedro brought me Maria’s money.’

The constructions with double applicativization in (66) can only refer to events involving both a recipient and a possessor of the theme, that is, predicates in which the theme is displaced from its possessor to a recipient via the agent. Hence, it could be argued that the ungrammaticality of such sentences arises from the co-occurrence of two prototypical applied arguments, i.e., two arguments with equal thematic ranking that would have to be mapped onto object function. This claim is supported by sentences in which the predicates have undergone the suppression of the first applied argument by -p‘i, as seen in the following sentences.

(i) Pédru=rini eyá-ku-chi-s-∅-ti ma kabáyu-ni
   Pedro=1SG.OBJ promise-3APPL-1/2APPL-PRF-PRS-3IND one horse-OBJ
   (xuchí) sapí-ni
   (1SG.Poss) child-OBJT
   ‘Pedro promised my child a horse.’

23 The acceptance of sentences such as those in (65) is similar to the case of sentences in which the applied argument is the possessor of an agentive causee (see footnote 19).
(67) a. \textit{*p’ikú-ku-chi-s-∅-ti=rini}
\hspace*{1cm} take.off/pull.off-3APPL-1/2APPL-PRF-PRS-31ND=1SG.OBJ

\textit{shénkwa Xwánu-ni (anátapu-rhu)}
\hspace*{1cm} berry Juan-OBJ \hspace*{0.5cm} (tree-LOC)

Intended readings: ‘S/he picked berries from Juan’s tree for me.’
‘S/he picked berries from my tree for Juan.’

b. \textit{p’ikú-śō-p’-ku-s-∅-ka=ni}
\hspace*{1cm} take.off/pull.off-APPL-1/2APPL-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ

\textit{shénkwa Xwánu-ni (anátapu-rhu)}
\hspace*{1cm} berry Juan-OBJ \hspace*{0.5cm} (tree-LOC)

‘I picked berries from Juan’s tree for someone else.’
‘I picked berries from someone else’s tree for Juan.’

Sentence (67b) is ambiguous. Either the applied argument \textit{Xwánuni} is the possessor of the tree and the first applied argument, affected by -\textit{p’i}, is the recipient, or the relationship is reversed: \textit{Xwánuni} is the recipient, and the applied argument affected by -\textit{p’i} is the possessor of the tree. The same relationships among the participants of the event can be seen in the sentences in (68), where the agent also displaces an object from a source/possessor to a recipient; i.e., the agent performs an action requested by someone else.

(68) a. \textit{eshé-a-∅=ri Lúpi-ni? xó}
\hspace*{1cm} see-fut-interr=2SG.SUJ Lupe-OBJ \hspace*{0.5cm} yes

\textit{eshé-a-ka=ni}
\hspace*{1cm} see-fut-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ

‘Will you see Lupe?’ ‘Yes I will.’

\textit{xí ishú xwá-śō-p’-ku-sha-∅-ka}
\hspace*{1cm} 1SG here bring-APPL-1/2APPL-PROG-PRS-1/2IND

\textit{ma irhínarhi-ni}
\hspace*{1cm} one tablecloth-OBJ

‘I am bringing her a tablecloth that someone sent her (I am bringing her a tablecloth at the request of someone else).’
b. xi nirá-s-p-ka=ni Pátkwaru para
1sg go-prf-pst-1/2ind=1sg.sbj Pátzcuaro for

Maria-ni eshé-ni ka
Maria-objt see-nf and

pá-tsi-p’i-ku-s-∅-ka=ni
take/carry-appl-1ndf.obj-3appl-prf-prs-1/2ind=1sg.sbj

ma karákata-ni
one writings-objt
‘I went to Pátzcuaro to see Maria and I brought her a letter (that someone gave me for her).’

c. Eli ni-wá-ti korréo-rhu ka
Eli go-fut-3ind post.office-loc and

ashá-tsì-p’i-chi-a-ti=rini xuchí
send-appl-1ndf.obj-1/2appl-fut-3ind=1sg.obj 1sg.poss

pakéti-ni
parcel-objt
‘Eli will go to the post office and will send (someone) my parcel (instead of me/on my behalf).’

In (68a, b) the first applied argument, which has been suppressed by -p’i, corresponds to the source/possessor of the theme, while the second one has a recipient role. In (68c), the roles of the applied arguments are reversed, and the theme usually appears with possessive marking agreeing with its possessor. None of these sentences may convey the reading ‘S/he/I brought/took/sent something to somebody for someone else’.

The intermediary role of the agent arises from the argument structure represented in (69).
Constructions involving more than three arguments

(69) Argument structure of *pá-tsï-p’i-ku*

\[
\text{take/carry-APPL-INDF.OBJ-3APPL}
\]

a. pá  
\[\langle \text{AG} \rangle \langle \text{TH} \rangle\]

b. pá-ku/-tsï  
\[\text{APPL} [\langle \text{AG} \rangle \langle \text{TH} \rangle ] \langle \text{RECIPE/PSR} \rangle\]

|  

c. pá-tsï-p’i  
\[\text{APPL} [\langle \text{AG} \rangle \langle \text{TH} \rangle ] \langle \emptyset \rangle \langle \text{RECIPE/PSR} \rangle \]

Syntactic realization  

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c}
\text{SBJ} & \text{SO} & \text{PO} \\
\end{array}
\]

In (69b), the first applicativization process introduces either the possessor of the theme or its recipient. In the first case, the agent’s action is aimed at the theme located within the domain of the applied argument. If the realization of the applied argument in core function is blocked, as in (69c), it is possible to add a new argument with a recipient role, as in (69d). If the first applicativization operation introduces a recipient that is suppressed by -p’i, as in (69c), the theme becomes located within the domain of another participant (the possessor of the theme) as a result of the second applicativization process, as in (69d). In both cases, the agent directs his/her action to a theme located within the domain of X (source/possessor of the theme), and shifts the theme to another participant (recipient). What is impossible in these contexts is for constructions to be generated in which the agent transfers the theme to X (so that the theme becomes located within the domain of X) and a new participant Y becomes the beneficiary (the theme is directed to him/her).

The data described in this section show that the generation of ditransitive or tritransitive constructions with two applied objects is limited to situations where the second applied argument, bearing a possessor role, outranks the first on the thematic hierarchy, which enables it to display PO behavior. These predicates tend to occur only in cases in which the first applicative suffix introduces a participant with a patient-like role, while the second denotes its possessor. The applicativization of a previously applicativized verbal base that has undergone argument suppression yields grammatical ditransitive constructions if the predicate denotes an event in which the subject/agent plays an intermediary role in the displacement of a theme from its possessor to a recipient.
7.5 Constructions with Double Causativization

Maldonado and Nava (2002) claim that P’orhépecha allows for the morpho-logical causativization of previously causativized intransitive, monotransitive, and ditransitive verbs, which yields constructions with two causee arguments encoded in object function. These authors argue that, theoretically speaking, there are no structural restrictions in P’orhépecha to inhibit the derivation of even more complex causative events (e.g., more than two causativization processes), and that the difficulty lies with keeping track of so many intermediate inductors.

In this section, new data is provided for the analysis of double causativiza-tion, which argues against the unrestricted derivation of multi-causativization processes. The data gathered show that doubly causativized predicates involving two agentive causees are accepted with certain reservations and that, moreover, the language disallows predicates with more than two coexisting agentive causees.

As described in Chapter 5, the double causativization of unergative verbs is preferred when the first causativization process denotes a situation where the causer is physically involved in the caused event (direct causation).

(70) a. María-ni wirhía(-ta)-tara-s-∅-ti Martíni-ni
Maria-objt run-caus-caus-prf-prs-3ind Martin-objt
‘S/he made/told Maria (to) make Martin run (to run after Martin).’
‘S/he made/told Maria (to) tell Martin to run.’

b. xí Pédrun-i piré-ra-tara-s-∅-ka=ni
1sg Pedro-objt sing-caus-caus-prf-prs-1/2ind=1sg.sbj
Lúpi-ni (ma pirékwa)
Lupe-objt (one song)
‘I made/told Pedro (to) make/order Lupe (to) sing (a song).’

There are two potential readings of (70a), but the one in which Martin is ordered to run tends to be rejected. If the predicate has only one possible reading, as in (70b), double causativization is accepted even if an NP such as ma pirékwa ‘a song’ is added. However, the use of an analytic construction is preferred, such as xí arhískañi Pédruní éskiréra Lúpini ‘I told/commanded Pedro to make/order Lupe (to) sing’. Analytic causative constructions are also used to express events such as ‘I commanded Maria to order Martin to run’. 
With monotransitive verbs exhibiting double causativization, a parallel situation occurs. The double causativization of these verbs is facilitated when the actor of the base predicate corresponds to an experiencer, as in (71a, b), or to an entity on which an object is located, as in (71c).

(71) a. xí tumpí-ni eshé-ra-tara-s-∅-ka
   1sg boy-objt see-caus-caus-prf-prs-1/2ind

táa-ni acháati-ni
   house-objt man-objt
   'I made/told the boy (to) show the man the house.'
   '?I made/told the boy (to) tell the man to see the house.'

b. María-ni sïpí-rhu(-ta)-tara-s-∅-ka=ni
   Maria-objt smell-tip-caus-caus-prf-prs-1/2ind=1sg.sbj

   sapí-ni tsïtsïki-ni
   child-objt flower-objt
   'I made/told Maria (to) make the child smell the flower.'
   '?I made/told Maria (to) tell the child to smell the flower.'

c. Pédru=kini cherhé-nti(-ta)-tara-s-∅-ti
   Pedro=2sg.obj shapeless.object-angle-caus-caus-prf-prs-3ind

   sunúnta-ni acháati-ni
   blanket-objt man-objt
   'Pedro made/told you (to) put the blanket on the man.'
   '?Pedro made/told you (to) tell the man to put the blanket on.'

Sentence (70a) and the examples in (71) allow readings whereby the first causation is direct (the causer is physically involved in the caused event), and the second is indirect. However, readings involving two indirect causations tend to be rejected. Such restrictions on double causativization operations seem to account for the oddness of these constructions; they are, in fact, rejected in many cases. In (72), examples are given of sentences with predicates analogous to those offered by Maldonado and Nava (2002), and Nava (2004:155), which these authors consider to be grammatical constructions. However, I have found a great deal of variability in the acceptability judgments, which is indicated with the symbol %.
(72) a. % xí María-ni urhú-ra-tara-s-∅-ka=ni
    1SG Maria-OBJT grind-CAUS-CAUS-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ

    Pédru-ni tsíri
    Pedro-OBJT corn

    ‘I made/told Maria (to) make Pedro grind the corn.’

    b. % Lúpi Xwánu-ni xwá-ra-tara-s-∅-ti
    Lupe Juan-OBJT bring-CAUS-CAUS-PRF-PRS-3IND

    sapí-ni child-ni
    chkári-ni firewood-OBJT

    ‘Lupe made/told Juan (to) make the child bring the firewood.’

The sentences in (72) refer to habitual actions and, maybe for that reason, the
speakers vacillate in accepting them as natural sounding. However, predicates
that do not refer to daily situations, such as those in (73), are consistently
rejected.

(73) a. ? xí Xwánu-ni xwá-ra-tara-s-∅-ka=ni
    1SG Juan-OBJT bring-CAUS-CAUS-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=1SG.SBJ

    tumpí-ni pelóta-ni
    boy-OBJT ball-OBJT

    ‘I made/told Juan (to) make the boy bring the ball.’

b. ? pyá-ra-tara-s-∅-ti=rini María-ni ma
    buy-CAUS-CAUS-PRF-PRS-3IND=1SG.OBJ Maria-OBJT one

    tsúntsu
    pot

    ‘S/he made/told me (to) make Maria buy a pot.’

c. ? t’ú Xwánu-ni sípá-ra-tara-s-∅-ka
    2SG Juan-OBJT steal-CAUS-CAUS-PRF-PRS-1/2IND child-OBJT

    wíchu-ni
    dog-OBJT

    ‘You made/told Juan (to) make the child steal the dog.’
The examples shown in (72) suggest that the acceptability judgments of the sentences in (73) do not depend on issues of grammaticality, a question open to further investigation. Given the relationship established between the causer and the causee in a causative event, there should be no impediment for the mapping onto core function of the arguments of predicates exhibiting double causativization, as evidenced by the acceptance of (70b). In (74), the argument structure corresponding to sentence (70b) is shown.

(74) Argument structure of *piré-ra-tara*

sing-CAUS-CAUS

| a. piré | [CAUSE <AG’> (<TH>)] |
| b. piré-ra [CAUSE <AG’’> [PAT-AG’> (<TH>)]]) |
| Causer | Causee1 |
| c. piré-ra-tara [CAUSE<AG> [CAUSE [PAT-AG’’>[PAT-AG’> (<TH>)]])]] |
| Causer | Causee2 |

Syntactic realization: SBJ PO SO (SO)

In (74c), the causee resulting from the addition of the causative marker -tara to the causativized predicate *piré-ra* (AG’ Causee1) outranks the causee involved in this predicate (AG’ Causee1) regarding access to PO. Even though both are agentive, the first acts on, or exerts control over, the second. The possibility of generating tritransitive constructions is consistent with the fact that in a causer-causee relationship, the causer always outranks the causee regarding syntactic primacy. In fact, in all constructions with double causativization, the actor or agent of the most embedded predicate always behaves as an SO. This is confirmed in the passive forms in (75) and (76).

(75) a. *tumpí eshé-ra-tara-na-s-∅-ti táa-ni*  
    boy see-CAUS-CAUS-PASS-PRF-PRS-3IND house-OBJT  
    acháati-ni  
    man-OBJT  
    ‘The boy was made (caused) to show the man the house.’  
    *‘The boy was shown the house by the man (on someone’s orders).’
b. \textit{t’ú \cheré-nti-ta-tara-na-s-∅-ka}
\textit{sunúnta \acháati-ni}
\hfill \small{2sg shapeless.object-angle-CAUS-CAUS-PASS-PRF-PRS-1/2IND man-OBJT}

‘You were made (caused) to put the blanket on the man.’

*‘The blanket was put on you by the man (on someone’s orders).’

\textbf{(76) a.} \textit{Pédru piré-ra-tara-na-s-∅-ti sapí-ni}
\hfill \textit{Pedro sing-CAUS-CAUS-PASS-PRF-PRS-3IND child-OBJT}

\hfill \textit{(ma \ pirékwa)}
\hfill \textit{(one \ song)}

‘Pedro was made (caused) to make the child sing (a song).’

*‘Pedro was made (caused) to sing (a song) by the child (on someone’s orders).’

b. \textit{María urhú-ra-tara-na-s-∅-ti Lúpi-ni tsíri}
\hfill \textit{Maria grind-CAUS-CAUS-PASS-PRF-PRS-3IND Lupe-OBJT corn}
\hfill \textit{Valéria-ni \ Yuyáni-ni \ Adriánu-ni}
\hfill \textit{Valeria-OBJT \ Yuyani-OBJT \ Adrian-OBJT}

‘Maria was made (caused) to make Lupe grind the corn.’

*‘Maria was made (caused) to grind the corn by Lupe (on someone’s orders).’

The constraints regarding the derivation of clauses with two agentive causees question the assertion of Maldonado and Nava (2002:181) that P’orhépecha exhibits double causativization of ditransitive verbs resulting in constructions with four objects. In (77), the example given by these authors is reproduced.

\textbf{(77)} \textit{Erátzini arhí-ra-tara-s-∅-ti ma wantántskwa}
\hfill \textit{Eratzin speak/tell-CAUS-CAUS-PRF-PRS-3IND one \ story}

\hfill \textit{Valéria-ni \ Yuyáni-ni \ Adriánu-ni}
\hfill \textit{Valeria-OBJT \ Yuyani-OBJT \ Adrian-OBJT}

‘Eratzin made Valeria make Yuyani tell a story to Adrian.’

Contrary to Maldonado and Nava’s claim, all the speakers I consulted strongly rejected sentence (77), whatever the order of the NPs. I take this to indicate that there are syntactic restrictions concerning the number of arguments that can be encoded in core function. In my own research, there are no cases in which the language allows sentences with more than three objects. Thus,
P’orhépecha seems to corroborate the contention of Comrie (1976:293) and Creissels (2004) that cross-linguistically, the maximum number of object NPs is three.

In contrast to predicates such as those in (72) and (73), the double causativization of monotransitive verbs is more likely to occur when the agent of the base verb (Causee1) is excluded from the core arguments. This exclusion implies that the identity of such an argument is irrelevant; it is only a means for the realization of the caused event. Normally, predicates with double causativization are built in order to command a specific person to ask someone else to perform an action. Analogous to [TR.V-CAUS-APPL] constructions (see (60)), the demotion of the causee may be achieved without any valence-reducing morphology, as shown in (78).

(78) a. María-ni urhú-ra-tara-s-∅-ti tsíri
   Maria-objt grind-caus-caus-prf-prs-3ind corn
   (sapí-ni ximpó)
   (child-objt posp)
   ‘S/he made/told Maria (to) have the corn ground (by the child).’
   *‘S/he ordered someone (the child) to make Maria grind the corn.’

b. xí Lúpi-ni ú-ra-tara-a-ka=ni
   1sg Lupe-objt do/caus-caus-fut-1/2ind=1sg.sbj
   kurhínta (Rósa-nkuni)
   bread (Rosa-com)
   ‘I will make/tell Lupe (to) have some bread made (by Rosa).’
   *‘I will order someone (Rosa) to make Lupe make some bread.’

c. Páblu María-ni pyá-ra-tara-s-∅-ti ma tsúntsu
   Pablo Maria-objt buy-caus-caus-prf-prs-3ind one pot
   ‘Pablo made Maria have a pot bought.’
   *‘Pablo ordered (someone) to make Maria buy a pot.’

In (78), the agent of the predicate undergoing causativization by -ra—e.g., the child in (78a)—is encoded in oblique function. Nevertheless, this argument generally remains syntactically unexpressed by an overt NP, since its identity (who grinds, buys, etc.) is irrelevant. Under these circumstances, sentences such as those in (78) have no constraints and may, in fact, be passivized.
Parallel constructions to (79) may be derived when the second causativization process is applied to a causativized predicate presenting middle/reflexive -kurhi suffixation, in which case the agent of the base verb can only be realized in oblique function. These predicates are usually uttered to indicate that the person who triggers the event seeks some personal benefit, or to convey that someone else undertakes the action instead of him/her (delegative).

In the sentences in (80), the causative -tara is suffixed to a predicate in which the PO (Causee1) has been demoted by the addition of -kurhi.24 Analogously, there are double causative sentences where the causee introduced by the first causative suffix has already been suppressed by -p'i, as shown in (81).

24 The same semantic and morphosyntactic structure is shown in the following examples, which demonstrate the speakers’ preference for placing the suffix -kurhi after -tara (see Chapter 5):

(i) tü Pédru-ni atá-ra-tara-kurhi-s-∅-ka wíchu-ni
The same semantic and morphosyntactic structure is shown in the following examples, which demonstrate the speakers’ preference for placing the suffix -kurhi after -tara (see Chapter 5):

(i) tü Pédru-ni atá-ra-tara-kurhi-s-∅-ka wíchu-ni
2SG Pedro-objt strike-CAUS-CAUS-MDL/REFL-CAUS-CAUS-PRF-PRS-1/2IND=2IND= dog-objt
‘You made Pedro have the dog beaten (on your behalf).’
‘You ordered (someone) to make Pedro strike the dog.’
Constructions involving more than three arguments

(81) a. t’ú Chalío-ni atá-ra-p’i-tara-n’ta-s-∅-ka
   2sg Chalío -objt strike-caus-1nd.obj-caus-itr-prf-prs-1/2ind

táa-ni
house-objt
’You made Chalío have/get the house painted.’
*’You ordered (someone) to make Chalío paint the house.’

b. ú-ra-p’i-tara-a-ka=ni Rósa-ni
   do/make-caus-1nd.obj-caus-fut-1/2ind=1sg.sbj Rosa-objt

ichúskuta
tortilla
’I will make Rosa have some tortillas made.’

c. sipá-ra-p’i-tara-s-∅-ti José-ni ma
   steal-caus-1nd.obj-caus-prf-prs-3ind José-objt one

kárru-ni
car-objt
’S/he made José have a car stolen.’

All the ditransitive sentences presented above have been fully accepted by a non-negligible number of speakers. Predicates with ditransitive base verbs, such as those in (82), do materialize as tritransitive structures, and they actually involve five participants. Note, however, that the Causeee has been suppressed.

(ii) Páblu=rini pyá-ra-tara-kurhi-s-∅-ti
   Pablo=1sg.obj buy-caus-caus-mdl/refl-prf-prs-3ind

ichúskuta (tumpí-ni xinkóni)
tortilla (boy-objt posp)
’Pablo made me have some tortillas bought (by the boy) on his behalf.’
*’Pablo ordered (the boy) to make me buy some tortillas on his behalf.’
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(82) a. t’ú=rini ewá-ra-p’i-tara-s-∅-ka
   2SG=1SG.OBJ take.away-CAUS-INDF.OBJ-CAUS-PRF-PRS-1/2IND

   Pédru-ni búrru-ni
   Pedro-OBJT donkey-OBJT
   ‘You made me have the donkey taken away from Pedro.’

b. xí Lúpi-ni k’waníra-tara-kurhi-s-∅-ka tsakápu
   1SG Lupe-OBJT throw-CAUS-MDL/REFL-PRF-PRS-1/2IND stone

   wíchu-ni
   dog-OBJT
   ‘I made Lupe have stones thrown at the dog (on my behalf).’

Note that in (82b), where -tara conveys double causativization (as the iteration of this suffix is ungrammatical), the causee introduced by the second causativization process (Causee2) is the one encoded in object function, as in (82a).

Finally, constructions with more than two agentive causees tend to be rejected even when there has been argument suppression, which offers significant evidence to prove that P’orhépecha disallows this type of predicate. For example, the following utterances were judged as incomprehensible by the speakers consulted and may therefore be considered ungrammatical: ewárp’itarakurhistirini kabáyuni Xwánuni, with the intended reading ‘S/he ordered me to order someone to make someone else steal/take the horse from Juan’, and urhúrp’itarakurhistirini tsíri, meant to be interpreted as ‘S/he ordered me to order someone else to make someone grind the corn’. I was able to register a single case of a predicate exhibiting three causee arguments, shown in (83). Note, however, that the actor of the base verb eshéni ‘to see’ is not an agent, and that the third causativizing process operates on a predicate that has undergone PO suppression.

(83) eshé-ra-tara-kurhi-s-∅-ti=rini acháati-ni
   see-CAUS-CAUS-MDL/REFL-PRF-PRS-3IND=1SG.OBJ man-OBJT

   táa -ni
   house-OBJT
   ‘S/he₁ made me have the house shown to the man (on hisi/heri behalf).’
7.6 Conclusions

In this chapter, the discussion has focused on predicates with more than three arguments. Even though P’orhépecha allows the derivation of triple object constructions, these have been shown to be heavily constrained.

In each section of this chapter I have provided evidence that, in P’orhépecha, the grammaticality of sentences with more than three arguments depends on the argument structure of the derived predicates, and on the possibilities regarding the syntactic realization of the arguments. I have proposed that the type of event encoded by such predicates is determined by the morphological conformation of the derived verb, as well as by the consequent relationships established among the participants of the event. This can be clearly observed, for example, in applicative constructions where the relationship established between the syntactic subject and the applied argument determines the type of event that can be referred to by such predicates. Based on this specific relationship, it is possible to account for the rejection of sentences in which both a recipient and a beneficiary are involved, as well as to understand the type of situation conveyed by predicates exhibiting an interaction between causative and applicative morphemes, and by those resulting from the applicativization of non-derived ditransitive verbs. Regarding the morphological configuration of the derived predicate, the coexistence of two valence-increasing processes makes evident that the linear sequence of the suffixes coincides with the order in which the morphosyntactic processes take place. Thus, the order of morphemes affects the semantics and the syntax of the new predicate.

From the data gathered in this investigation, it can be stated that in P’orhépecha it is possible to derive complex predicates with an argument structure involving a maximum of five participants, giving rise to triple object constructions. I have argued that, in such sentences, the relevant factors for the determination of the PO are the morphosyntactic structure of the derived predicates (number of valence-increasing processes) and the semantic relationships established among the co-arguments. Indeed, evidence has been offered supporting the claim that in P’orhépecha PO selection and the (un)grammaticality of multiple object constructions can be predicted to a large extent from a thematic ranking of the arguments to be mapped onto object function. Furthermore, in all multiple object constructions no other object argument may outrank the PO on the person hierarchy; i.e., P’orhépecha exhibits harmonic alignment between the prominence of the objects on the person scale 1 → 2 > 3 and the syntactic primacy PO > SO.

One of the aims of this chapter has been to demonstrate the contrasts between the causativization or applicativization of non-derived ditransitive
verbs, and that of derived predicates resulting from a valence increase. In this respect, various proposals have been made.

Firstly, predicates that exhibit two valence-increasing mechanisms do not allow the generation of tritransitive constructions when two arguments that must be mapped onto object function co-occur, which qualify as PO in ditransitive constructions and therefore have equal access to PO status. Based on the (un)grammaticality of triple object constructions stemming from predicates undergoing two valence-increasing processes, the following generalizations can be made regarding the arguments’ access to PO: that the possessor outranks its possessum, and that the agentive causee and the applied arguments with the role of possessor of the patient/theme or of beneficiary/recipient/source/goal are equally ranked. To support this analysis, I have demonstrated that: a) triple object constructions are grammatical when the object introduced by the last valence-increasing mechanism is the highest ranked on the thematic hierarchy and is therefore able to exhibit PO behavior; and b) when the second valence-increasing process operates on a predicate where the PO has been suppressed, the resulting sentence is always grammatical.

Secondly, when non-derived ditransitive verbs undergo causativization or applicativization, predicates are generated in which the co-occurrence of two object arguments, each of which corresponds to the PO when occurring in ditransitive constructions, is allowed. Under these circumstances, the new object (the causee or the applied argument) is always the one displaying PO properties.

I have also provided evidence to show that sentences with three NPs in object function are usually avoided, which suggests a tendency in P’orhépecha to maintain NP density control. For example, constructions with four core arguments are favored when a 1st/2nd person object enclitic is added or when the overt realization of a 3rd person object NP is omitted. Even when triple object constructions are grammatical, ditransitive constructions resulting from the suppression of an argument are far more common.

It can be concluded that, regardless of the number of NPs allowed in object function in a sentence, the generation of tritransitive sentences in P’orhépecha has certain constraints that arise from: a) the morphosyntactic and argumental structures of the predicate, and b) the fact that only one object argument qualifies as the PO. The data examined here and in the preceding chapters make it possible to conclude that in P’orhépecha PO selection can generally be accounted for, and therefore predicted, based on a thematic hierarchy of arguments that must be mapped onto object function, which establishes equivalent ranking for certain thematic roles. Consequently, multiple object constructions with two equally ranked arguments regarding access to PO are ungrammatical.
CHAPTER 8

Conclusions

The cross-linguistic variation regarding the generation of predicates referring to events that involve three or more participants is currently receiving a great deal of attention in typological studies. Although there are several typological proposals, as well as various studies on the diverse patterns exhibited by languages which have derived and non-derived three-argument predicates, research on the possibility of generating monoclausal constructions involving more than three participants is in its nascent stage. The present study aims to contribute to the knowledge of the principles and restrictions governing the resources of a language to generate complex predicates with three or more arguments, which may result in syntactically ditransitive and tritransitive sentences.

This work offers the first description and analysis of the feasibility of producing ditransitive and tritransitive constructions in P’orhépecha, or Tarascan, a Mesoamerican language isolate which is exclusively suffixing and agglutinative. In contrast to almost all other Mesoamerican languages, P’orhépecha has a morphological case system that exhibits a nominative-accusative alignment type, a property which is of special relevance for the present investigation. This system lacks a distinction between accusative and dative: the nominative is not marked and -ni marks arguments in object function (although the language has differential object marking). Throughout this work, I have provided evidence to show that the constituent order in P’orhépecha is flexible, but that this flexibility is constrained in certain contexts, especially in cases in which there is potential ambiguity regarding the identification of the thematic roles of arguments (typically human participants) encoded in object function.

P’orhépecha has verbal suffixes the occurrence of which is related to the core grammatical functions of subject (indicative mood suffixes -ka for 1st/2nd person and -ti for 3rd person) and of object (-a marking for 3rd person objects). Moreover, this language possesses pronominal subject enclitics and object enclitics for 1st and 2nd person, which cannot co-occur in a clause. Pronominal enclitics can be adjoined to the verb or to any other preverbal element. These characteristics, as well as the existence of the case system mentioned above, have led to the claim that P’orhépecha can exhibit three types of marking on a clausal level: dependent marking, head-marking, and detached marking.

I have also shown that, in addition to case marking and adpositions, the encoding properties relevant in distinguishing core functions from obliques
are: the inflectional subject suffixes, the verbal suffix -\( a \) (analyzed here as a distributive marker), and the use of pronominal enclitics. The properties of these morphological markings reveal that the language distinguishes between the codification of 1st/2nd person and that of 3rd person, which is manifested in several aspects of P’orhépecha grammar. Concerning the indicative mood marking, the language exhibits an opposition between -\( ka \) for 1st/2nd person and -\( ti \) for 3rd person. In the case of objects, only the 1st and 2nd person can be expressed by pronominal enclitics. These exhibit number agreement with plural subjects, as opposed to the 3rd person pronominal forms (demonstratives), which never show such agreement. Whereas 3rd person pronominal objects may be omitted in the syntax, this is not allowed in the case of 1st/2nd person objects. The distinction between the 1st/2nd and the 3rd person is also manifested in the use of the suffix -\( chi \) for 1st/2nd person and -\( ku \) for 3rd person, which, I argue, are instances of applicative morphemes.

The analysis of P’orhépecha three-argument verbs and of valence-increasing mechanisms has lead to the identification of the types of predicates that can denote events involving three or more participants, as well as of the possibilities of generating sentences with two or three objects. The data examined provide evidence that syntactically ditransitive constructions in P’orhépecha (with both derived and non-derived verbs) are double object constructions exhibiting a neutral coding pattern regarding case marking and the distributive marker, while enclitic encoding, restricted to 1st/2nd person, as well as enclitic object agreement with plural subjects, is consistent with a secundative pattern.

In contrast to the coding properties, all behavioral properties (passivization, reflexivization, reciprocals, and object suppression by way of the suffix -\( p'i \) ‘indefinite human object’) reveal asymmetries between the objects that correspond to a secundative or PO/SO alignment. This accounts for the behavioral properties displayed by triple object constructions, in which two of the objects must behave as SOs. Regarding the suppression process carried out by -\( p'i \), I have shown that when it blocks the realization of the PO in core function, the corresponding argument is no longer accessible to new morphological processes (even when it remains semantically active). It follows that, if a predicate with a suppressed PO undergoes a new morphological process, the suppressed argument is not subject to the mapping rules.

This study on whether P’orhépecha can generate predicates with more than three participants, either from non-derived ditransitive verbs or from verbs that have undergone a valence increase, has yielded certain unexpected results. On the one hand, it has been shown that these predicates exclude certain relationships among the participants of an event, which would otherwise
be expected. On the other hand, although it has been demonstrated that the language allows predicates with more than three arguments, the data have made it clear that it also imposes restrictions on tritransitive constructions. In this regard, I have proposed that the grammaticality of triple object sentences depends on: a) the type of event referred to by the predicate, b) the morphological configuration of the predicate, and c) the fact that only one of the object arguments may qualify as the PO. Furthermore, the data analyzed indicate that constructions with more than two objects are favored when one of the objects is a 1st or 2nd person pronominal form. Similarly, the derivation of predicates with more than three arguments is facilitated when at least one of the non-subject arguments is either suppressed from the core arguments or not realized as an overt NP, yielding ditransitive sentences. This behavior can be considered evidence that the language has a tendency to maintain the number of NPs allowed in non-derived predicates (NP density control).

In what follows, a summary of the major findings and conclusions of this research is given. In 8.1, the characteristics of P'orhépecha valence-increasing mechanisms are summed up. In 8.2, the various encoding patterns exhibited by non-derived and derived three-argument predicates are briefly reviewed and commented on. Finally, section 8.3 returns to the discussion on the importance of considering certain semantic aspects regarding the study, description, and understanding of human languages. In this respect, the example of the P'orhépecha language sheds light on the relevance of employing a relative ranking of arguments on a thematic hierarchy in order to make generalizations that account for both the asymmetrical behavior of objects and the operational restrictions regarding the generation of ditransitive and tritransitive sentences.

8.1 Valence-increasing Mechanisms

This work provides evidence that P’orhépecha has three morphological mechanisms that allow an increase in the number of arguments and in the syntactic valence of a predicate, the morphosyntactic properties of which display certain peculiarities.

A) Applicative suffixes. It has been shown that P’orhépecha possesses an applicative affix -ku for 3rd person and another -chi for 1st and 2nd person, which introduce a “semantically dative-like” participant (typically a recipient, beneficiary, goal, source, or possessor) in object function. This conflation of derivative function and inflectional features is of special interest in typological terms, since it has not been registered in any other language lacking
pronominal or anaphoric object agreement marking on the verb. It has also been shown that the applicative morphemes have allomorphs lacking person features (-tsī and -mi) in contexts in which the applied argument is affected by valence-decreasing mechanisms. It has been argued that P’orhépecha applicative suffixes establish a distinction between the area or domain of the subject/agent and that of the applied argument. With verbs involving an agent and a patient/theme, the former directs its action to the domain of the applied argument, where the patient/theme is or becomes located. This explains why the applicative suffixes are incompatible with the middle/reflexive morpheme -kurhi: the event would remain within the domain of the subject.

B) Causative/instrumental morphemes. The P’orhépecha suffixes -ra, -ta, and -tara add an argument with a causer or instrumental role to the base verb. When their function is causative, these suffixes result in a syntactic valence increase, but when their function is instrumental, there are constraints regarding the encoding of the instrument argument in object function. As has been shown, P’orhépecha allows verbal stems with two causative markers, which may indicate indirect causation or the iteration of the causativization process. In the latter case, the predominant reading is one in which the first causation is direct and the second indirect. Furthermore, the analysis of P’orhépecha causative clauses has revealed the existence of benefactive causative constructions, i.e., in which the causee is merely a channel through which the causer’s purpose is achieved. These constructions require the use of the middle/reflexive suffix -kurhi, which triggers the coding of the causee as oblique.

C) Spatial affixes that indicate a part-whole relation. P’orhépecha verbal morphology stands out among the Mesoamerican languages due to its large set of spatial morphemes that can only be affixed to verbal bases. The presence of spatial morphemes (indicating either a geographic location or part-whole inalienable possession) in verbal bases is not the result of noun incorporation. Instead, these must be considered as lexical affixes. The data show that a suffix denoting a part or area licenses an NP specifying this part or subarea, but simultaneously requires the presence of another NP corresponding to the whole/possessor. It has been argued that this property of part-whole affixes accounts for the possibility of generating external possession (EP) ditransitive constructions when the possessor of the part is an entity denoted by an argument of the derived predicate other than that encoded in subject function. Although this is the case with some part-whole affixes, the majority of part-whole spatial suffixes denote an area located on the entity referred to by the subject of the derived predicate. Consequently, in order to displace the location of the part to another participant, morphological marking is required.
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(vowel ablaut or the locative expansions -ku and -ta, which lack inherent voice or transitivity value). Cases in which the locative expansions modify the reference of the spatial morpheme by transferring the space it denotes to a different area of the same whole have also been discussed. In these instances either the argument encoded in subject function or another argument of the derived verb may be the possessor of the body part. In the latter case, applicative morphology is required in order to produce EP ditransitive constructions. It has also been argued that the increase in the semantic and/or syntactic valence of the predicates with part-whole spatial suffixes depends on the following: the characteristics of the base verb, the combination of its arguments with the lexical information of the suffixes, the specifications conveyed by part-whole morphemes (with or without morphological marking) regarding the argument that corresponds to the whole/possessor, and the coding patterns allowed by the derived predicate.

8.2 Coding Patterns: Alternating Constructions and Construction Splits

The analysis of P’orhépecha predicates with three arguments has shown that these exhibit different coding patterns. In some cases the language allows alternating constructions while in others there are coding pattern splits (only one construction is possible) determined by the prominence relations of non-agent arguments on the person hierarchy 1/2 > 3. Likewise, the animacy component (regardless of the person features) has proven to be a relevant factor in certain cases in explaining the different encoding possibilities.

A) Non-derived verbs. P’orhépecha has a large group of semantically ditransitive verbs, which exhibit two types of encoding patterns: indirective alignment, in which the R (recipient-like) argument is realized as an oblique with comitative marking, and double object constructions. Of these verbs, I have only registered one that does not allow double object constructions—the verb kuráhkurhini ‘ask for’—and one that allows alternating patterns—the loanword entregárini ‘hand over’. However, as is the case with several other languages, P’orhépecha presents a split in the coding patterns determined by the relative prominence of T (theme) and R on the person hierarchy: if T outranks R, an indirective pattern is imposed. A salient property of P’orhépecha is that the language requires the codification of R as oblique in circumstances other than those mentioned above, but which are related to the animacy scale: 1) when a human T and the agent are co-referential, and 2) in constructions
where a human T undergoes passivization. That is, the language imposes the coding of R as oblique so that T may display behavioral properties parallel to the object of monotransitive verbs.

Porhépecha also has non-derived three-argument verbs such as pëtëni ‘take out’ and p’ikûni ‘take off/pull off’. The locative/source argument of these verbs can be encoded either as oblique or in object function; the resulting sentence pattern alternates between indirective alignment and double object constructions. However, if the third argument is human—or generally any animate—only the double object pattern emerges.

B) Applicative suffixes. In Porhépecha the applicativization of monotransitive verbs generates double object constructions. However, there is an atypical case that is restricted to situations in which both the applied argument and the possessor of the patient/theme are 3rd person. In these circumstances, the language allows both the double object construction—external possession (EP) construction—and the encoding of the possessor in a genitive NP—internal possession (IP) construction. The possibility that a non-possessor participant has of exhibiting alternative coding (in object function by way of applicativization, or in oblique function) depends on the verb type, on the role of the participant in question, and on the animacy of the patient/theme. The most common alternative constructions are those that introduce a beneficiary via the Spanish loanword para. In events that denote the displacement of a theme (e.g., ‘take’ and ‘buy’), the alternative between constructions with an applied object and those involving the same participant with comitative marking is only possible if the theme is human; in other cases, only the applicative construction is permitted.

C) Causative/instrumental suffixes. The causativization of a monotransitive base verb always results in a double object construction. Unlike in other languages, in Porhépecha the encoding of a causee as oblique (with comitative marking or introduced by the postposition ximpó) requires the addition of the middle/reflexive suffix -kurhi, as well as the presence of a patient/theme, which leads to the generation of verbal bases with benefactive causative features. In addition, a causee may surface in oblique function without any sanctioning verbal morphology only when a causativized monotransitive verb undergoes a new valence-increasing process.

In contrast with causative constructions, when causative/instrumental suffixes introduce an instrument, the norm is for it to be encoded as an oblique with instrumental marking, as occurs with instrumentals that are added without the predicate’s exhibiting instrumental suffixes. Unlike the applicative affixes, the morphemes with instrumental value do not usually generate double object constructions. The alternation between the encoding of an instru-
ment marked on the verb in either oblique or object function is only possible under certain circumstances. When a monotransitive verb presents instrumental morphology, double object constructions can be generated only if the instrument is non-specific and prototypical for the type of event in question, and if the patient/theme has a low position on the animacy scale.

D) Part-whole spatial suffixes. Predicates with spatial suffixes that signal a body part or area located on an entity denoted by an argument of the derived verb other than the subject, allow the generation of EP constructions. In such contexts, the whole/possessor is encoded in object function; if a body-part noun is present it can be encoded in object function or as an oblique flagged by locative case. When the base verb involves a patient/theme argument that is not a body part, this and the whole/possessor are realized in object function, while the nominal term signaling the body part can only be encoded as an oblique. However, in cases in which locative expansions transfer the region referred to by the spatial morpheme to another area of the whole, the whole/possessor and the part must be encoded in a single NP (IP), which can bear either objective or locative case.

Finally, it is important to note that the person prominence constraint that imposes an indirective coding pattern on non-derived verbs can also be observed in constructions with derived predicates. Consequently, in the case of causative and applicative double object constructions, neither the causee nor the applied argument can be less prominent than the patient/theme on the person hierarchy. In the case of causative constructions, if the patient/theme is 1st or 2nd person and the causee must be expressed in core function, an analytic construction is used. If in applicative constructions there is a 1st/2nd person patient/theme and a beneficiary-like participant, the latter can only be introduced as an adjunct in oblique function; i.e., a monotransitive verb cannot undergo applicativization if the patient-like argument (P) is 1st/2nd person.

8.3 Semantic-syntact Interface

Porhépecha is a language in which the explicative reach of semantic factors can be clearly observed when determining the coding and morphosyntactic properties of predicates with three or more arguments. Throughout this work, it has been argued that in order to account for the type of event that complex predicates may denote, and for the grammaticality of multiple object constructions in Porhépecha, it is crucial to consider the semantic relations established among the co-arguments of a given predicate. Specifically, the establishment
of a ranking of thematic roles related to the syntactic primacy of the arguments (PO > SO) has proven to be a relevant and valuable resource in making generalizations regarding the asymmetries manifested by the objects of ditransitive constructions, as well as regarding the (un)grammaticality that can result from combining two valence-increasing mechanisms. Likewise, the constraints on coding imposed by the occurrence of a 1st/2nd person non-agent argument shed light on the interaction between the person hierarchy (1/2 > 3) and the arguments’ access to PO.

8.3.1 PO Selection and the Thematic Roles of Arguments

Based on a careful examination of P’orhépecha data, it has been proposed that the syntactic prominence of the arguments to be encoded in core function (S > PO > SO) can be predicted to a large extent from the relative ranking of their thematic roles. The evidence of predicates with three or more arguments presented here supports the thematic hierarchy presented below, as well as the additional ranking regarding possession, which states that a possessor is always ranked higher than its possessum regardless of the thematic role of the latter.

agent/causer > recipient/beneficiary/goal/source/possessor.of.a.non-corporeal.entity/agentive.causee > instrument > patient/theme
possessor > possessum

Figure 3 Prevalent thematic ranking in p’orhépecha

It is clear that P’orhépecha exhibits a strong tendency to determine the syntactic prominence of the arguments to be mapped onto core function according to a thematic ranking. With non-derived ditransitive verbs the recipient/goal/source argument becomes the PO. In the case of derived ditransitive predicates, the object resulting from an increase in valence is the one ranked highest regarding access to PO. This object is the beneficiary/recipient/goal/source/possessor in applicative constructions, the agentive causee in causative constructions, the instrument in instrumental constructions, and the possessor/whole in constructions with part-whole spatial affixes.

Thus, if PO selection is related to a thematic ranking, it might be predicted that clauses with two equally ranked object arguments (that qualify as PO in ditransitive constructions) cannot be generated. This prediction is confirmed by the (un)grammaticality of triple object constructions with derived ditransitive predicates that undergo a new argument-increasing process. In these
circumstances, the generation of tritransitive constructions is restricted to cases in which no two arguments are equally ranked regarding PO status. The evidence provided supports this analysis, as it demonstrates that predicates involving two arguments with equally ranked thematic roles only allow the generation of grammatical constructions if the PO of the predicate that undergoes the second valence-increasing process has been suppressed or demoted from a core function. This ensures that there are no longer two arguments competing for access to PO that must be mapped onto object function.

The proposed argument ranking accounts for the PO selection in ditransitive constructions, as well as in those involving two valence-increasing mechanisms. However, it has been shown that predicting PO selection based on a thematic ranking becomes problematic in certain contexts. In fact, it has been demonstrated that both the causativization and applicativization of non-derived ditransitive verbs generate grammatical sentences in which the PO corresponds to the new object—the causee or the applied argument—despite the fact that in both these contexts two arguments that qualify as PO in ditransitive constructions may co-occur.

A careful analysis of the data leads to the conclusion that the morphosyntactic configuration of non-derived ditransitive verbs that have undergone an argument-increasing process takes precedence over the thematic ranking principle. In contrast, the grammaticality of all ditransitive and tritransitive constructions exhibiting two valence-increasing processes depends entirely on the thematic ranking of co-arguments regarding their access to PO.

8.3.2 The Person Hierarchy: Syntactic Primacy and Transitivity

In chapters 3, 4, and 5 evidence was given to show that, in P’orhépecha, the relative prominence on the person hierarchy affects the way in which arguments are encoded, particularly with regard to the possibility of generating ditransitive constructions. This phenomenon can be generalized as follows: In derived and non-derived double object constructions, the patient/theme cannot be more prominent on the person hierarchy (1/2 > 3) than the other argument in object function.

In the chapters mentioned above, it was also shown that the constraints on ditransitive constructions imposed by the person hierarchy seem to go hand in hand with the thematic ranking of arguments derived from their access to PO. The object with the highest thematic ranking (PO) also has to be ranked highest on the person hierarchy. In order to allow a 1st/2nd person object bearing a lower thematic role than that of a non-agent co-argument, the encoding of the latter in object function must be blocked; i.e., either it is encoded as oblique or suppressed by morphological means. In tritransitive constructions
involving two valence-increasing processes, the object resulting from the last valence increase (bearing the highest ranked role regarding access to PO) must also be highest on the person prominence scale. However, as has been noted, P’orhépecha allows the causativization or applicativization of non-derived ditransitive verbs from which tritransitive sentences can be generated. In these constructions, even if there are two objects with equal ranking according to the thematic hierarchy prevalent in P’orhépecha, the new object (PO) cannot be ranked lower on the person hierarchy than the other arguments in object function. When considering all double and triple object constructions, it becomes clear that they conform to the following principle: P’orhépecha imposes a harmonic alignment between the prominence on the person hierarchy \((1/2 > 3)\) and the syntactic primacy \((PO > SO)\). Thus, P’orhépecha provides interesting data regarding the linguistic discussion of the factors that trigger morphosyntactic restrictions conditioned by the person scale.
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**Tarascan Texts**


**Words**

achaati = *Achaati imanga nomine mitipka uni*, in Santamaría Galván et al., 49–50. (Ihuatzio)


enga jatsikurhipka = *Achaati enga jatsikurhipka janatpiriri Jimbo*, in Santamaría Galván et al., 63–64. (Tarerío)

imaka akuitsintaka = *Achaati imaka akuitsintaka*, in Santamaría Galván et al., 16–18. (San Jerónimo)

ishukua = *Ishukua*, in Wolf, 331. (Tarecuato)

japunda = *Japundarini erangusthi*, in Torres Sanchéz, 13–38. (San Jerónimo)


ji no xukuamiska = *Ji no xukuamiska, ji xurhijkirhiska!*, in Torres Sanchéz, 147–171. (San Jerónimo)

juata = *Juata Akumarhane ka Chupikuarhu anapu*, in Santamaría Galván et al., 43–44. (San Jerónimo)

kampana = *Kampana tirípitiri*, in Santamaría Galván et al., 13. (San Jerónimo)
karakata para Ebreo = Karakata para Ebreo uandiricha. La epístola a los hebreos, in Lathrop, 766–802.
k’uichitiicha = Cherasnaspti k’uichitiicha, in Santamaría Galván et al., 83. (Tarerío)
k’urhamarhpiti = Acha k’urhamarhpiti in Torres Sánchez, 93–121. (San Jerónimo)
ma tumbi = Ma tumbi eratsipka tembuchakuarhini, in Santamaría Galván et al., 57–59. (Ihuatzio)
Maria = Maria juata, in Santamaría Galván et al., 40–42. (San Jerónimo).
Miringua = Miringua, in Santamaría Galván et al., 89–95. (San Andrés Tziróndaro)
murhukata = Murhukata angonakua, in Santamaría Galván et al., 48. (Ihuatzio)
nanaka = Nanáka P’wákwaru anápu, in Alejandra Capistrán Garza (ms.), 2001. (Puácuaro)
no ambakiti = No ambakiti, in Santamaría Galván et al., 19–20. (San Jerónimo)
p’ichpiricha = Tsimani p’ichpiricha, in Santamaría Galván et al., 99–100. (San Andrés Tziróndaro)
San Juanu = Ambakiti eiankperakua eska na karaka San Juanu, in Lathrop, 322–412.
San Markusí = Ambakiti eiankperakua eska na karaka San Markusí, in Lathrop, 120–194.
San Mateu = Ambakiti eiankperakua eska na karaka San Mateu, in Lathrop, 5–119.
tata = Tata imangi noteru eskampka, in Santamaría Galván et al., 55–56. (Ihuatzio)
tata Pedro = Tata Pedro no ambakiti, in Santamaría Galván et al., 25–28. (San Jerónimo)
tembu = Temba no sesi umbarhisti uámbani, in Santamaría Galván et al., 96–98. (San Andrés Tziróndaro)
tembuchati = Jimbani tembuchati, in Santamaría Galván et al., 31–32. (San Jerónimo)
tembuna = Tembuna ka no ambakiti, in Santamaría Galván et al., 72–77. (Tarerío)
teroriti = Teroriti, in Santamaría Galván et al., 111. (Ichupio)
toru = Toru miringata jiuatsio anapu, in Santamaría Galván et al., 60–62. (Ihuatzio)
tumbi = Tumbi enga nirajka tembuchani, in Santamaría Galván et al., 103–108. (Ichupio)
tumbi tembuchati = Tumbi tembuchati, in Santamaría Galván et al., 78–82. (Tarerío)
uarhikuajku = Uarhikuajku no erakpisíndi, in Santamaría Galván et al., 21–22. (San Jerónimo)
uarhuricha = Uekanaspti uarhuricha cheranani, in Santamaría Galván et al., 86–88. (San Andrés Tziróndaro)
uchépu = Uchépu, in Wolf, 361. (Tarecuato)
uekankši karhani = Uekankši karhani, in Santamaría Galván et al., 84–85. (San Andrés Tziróndaro)
de Michoacán, Instituto Michoacano de Cultura, Universidad Michoacana de San Nicolás de Hidalgo. (Cuanajo)