2010

Applicative Constructions In Shipibo-Konibo (Panoan)

Pilar Valenzuela
Chapman University, valenzuela@chapman.edu

Applicative Constructions In Shipibo-Konibo (Panoan)

Comments

This article was originally published in *International Journal of American Linguistics*, volume 76, issue 1, in 2010.

Copyright

APPLICATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS IN SHIPIBO-KONIBO (PANOAN)[1]

PILAR M. VALENZUELA

CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY

This article provides a detailed, typologically informed treatment of applicative constructions in Shipibo-Konibo, a Panoan language from Peruvian Amazonia. Shipibo-Konibo has three applicative suffixes: affective (i.e., benefactive or malefactive), dedicated malefactive, and associative. These applicative types are rather common cross-linguistically and hence the language cannot be said to be particularly rich either in terms of number or kinds of applicative constructions. Nevertheless, the Shipibo-Konibo system exhibits certain points of special interest such as the interplay between transitivity and the different applicative construction types, which include a restriction on the dedicated malefactive to combine with transitive verbs only, and the almost exclusively benefactive semantics of the affective when attached to transitives. Also noteworthy are the high degree of symmetry with regard to the morphosyntactic properties of base and applicative objects, obligatoriness/optionality of applicative constructions, and the semantic requirements of certain arguments.

[KEYWORDS: applicative, transitivity, object properties, Shipibo-Konibo, Panoan]

1. Introduction.

1.1. Definition of applicative construction. An applicative construction can be defined as a syntactic construction with overt verbal morphology which allows the coding of a thematically peripheral argument or adjunct as a core object argument (Peterson 2007:1); cross-linguistically, applicative constructions are typically transitivizing (but see Comrie 1985:312–19 and Payne 2000). Kinyarwanda (Bantu [Kimenyi 1980]), Nez Perce (Sahaptian [Rude 1986]), Nomatsiguenga (Maipuran Arawak [Wise 1971 and Payne

[1] This article is a condensed, revised version of chapter 17 in Valenzuela (2003). It is based on the analysis of a corpus consisting of approximately ten hours of recorded narrative text which I collected in the field, complemented with elicited data. The latter were used to further analyze phenomena first identified in spontaneous speech, explore less common possibilities offered by the Shipibo-Konibo applicativization system, and sometimes test its limits.

I am especially grateful to Shipibo-Konibo native speaker Yoi Sani/Luis Márquez Pinedo, who served as main language consultant, particularly for the examination of object properties. I would also like to thank David Peterson as well as an anonymous *IJAL* reviewer and an associate editor for valuable comments on previous versions of this work. Of course, any shortcomings are my responsibility.

[*IJAL*, vol. 76, no. 1, January 2010, pp. 101–44]

0020–7071/2010/7601–0004$10.00

1990]), Caquinte (Maipuran Arawak [Swift 1988]), and Hakha Lai (Tibeto-Burman [Peterson 2007]) have been described as being especially rich in terms of applicative constructions.

From a functional viewpoint, applicative constructions have been characterized as alternative construals that change the perspective on a scene (Croft 1994); they bring a peripheral participant onto center stage by assigning it to direct object role (Payne 1997:186). Through a derived applicative construction, a peripheral participant (rather than the "normal" object of the action denoted by the basic verb) is construed as the endpoint of the verbal segment, as the "chief locus of the effect of the action" (Croft 1994).

According to Peterson (2007:83), two main types of functional explanations for the use of applicative constructions have been offered in the literature. Discourse-grounded explanations argue that applicative constructions are used to indicate that the entity which corresponds to the applicative object has a greater discourse salience and a higher degree of topicality than would otherwise be expected of it (Rude 1986 and Donohue 2001). On the other hand, morphosyntactically based accounts focus on the fact that the coding of an otherwise oblique element as direct object makes the referent accessible to other processes such as relativization, passivization, or topicalization. Peterson points out that these explanations are not necessarily mutually exclusive, and that the dividing line between these two functions might be the status of the applicative objects as either animate or inanimate. Based on this distinction, there seems to be a tendency toward discourse grounded as opposed to morphosyntactically based explanations, respectively (Peterson 2007:120–21).

In some languages, the principal motivation for using certain applicative constructions may be to establish a semantic distinction (e.g., to differentiate static locative versus allative meanings in Haya, Narrow Bantu [Hyman and Duranti 1982:234 and Peterson 2007:49]) or to add semantico–pragmatic nuances (such as greater intensity, pity on the part of the speaker, and maybe intentionality), as has been attested in certain languages from Peru (Payne 2000, Wise 2002, Duff-Tripp 1997:100, and Rich 1999:54).

This paper provides the first detailed treatment of applicative constructions in Shipibo-Konibo (or any Panoan language). The remainder of **1** offers an overview of the parameters according to which applicative constructions may vary; this will serve as a framework for the subsequent discussion of Shipibo-Konibo. Section **1** closes with an introduction to the Shipibo-Konibo applicatives, including their resemblance to other morphemes in the language. Sections **2**, **3**, and **4** are devoted to the synchronic analysis of Shipibo-Konibo affective, dedicated malefactive, and associative applicative constructions, respectively; this includes their text frequency, distribution with the basic

transitivity types of verbs, semantic requirements of certain arguments, and presence/absence of nonapplicative paraphrases. Section **5** examines the coding and behavioral-control properties of applicative and base objects, while **6** deals with the combination of applicatives and other valency-changing operations in the same verb form. Finally, **7** highlights the main findings of the study.

1.2. Typological variation. Cross- and intralinguistically, applicative constructions vary along several morphosyntactic parameters; some of these are critical to Shipibo-Konibo, in particular obligatoriness versus optionality of applicative constructions, the relationship between applicatives and oblique nominal markers, the distribution of object properties in double object applicative constructions, and transitivity restrictions.

1.2.1. Obligatory vs. optional applicative constructions. Although not explicitly mentioned in the definition given in **1.1**, the prototypical applicative construction is commonly viewed as an alternative to a nonapplicative one. However, it may be the case that a language has one or more obligatory applicative construction(s), that is, one or more constructions lacking a semantically close nonapplicative paraphrase. This is the case in Tzotzil (Mayan [Aissen 1983]), where the only way to express a recipient semantic role is by attaching the suffix *-be* to the verb. After the addition of *-be*, the recipient argument functions as a direct object (i.e., triggers person and number agreement on the verb and may be passivized). Nominals are not marked for case in Tzotzil. As is shown in **2–4** below, only one of the three Shipibo-Konibo applicative constructions may have an alternative nonapplicative expression.

1.2.2. Applicative and oblique nominal markers: similar vs. alternative forms. In some languages having optional applicative constructions, a marker which is formally similar (and probably cognate) with the applicative is also attested on nominals. As pointed out by Wise (2002), this is the case in certain languages spoken in the Peruvian Amazon such as Yagua (Peba-Yaguan). A comparable situation has been reported for Warrwa (Eastern Nyulnyulan, Australia), where the suffix *-ngany* can attach to nominal and verbal roots; while nominal *-ngany* is principally an instrumental marker, verbal *-ngany* is the comitative/instrumental applicative (McGregor 1998:171). On the other hand, an applicative and its corresponding oblique nominal marker may exhibit different forms. For example, in Hakha Lai the instrumental applicative *-naak* does not resemble the instrumental oblique *=ʔin* (Peterson 2007:46). A comparable situation is described in **4**, when dealing with the associative applicative *-kin* ~ *-kiin* and the comitative *betan* in Shipibo-Konibo.

1.2.3. Monofunctional vs. polyfunctional applicative forms. Another way in which applicative constructions vary cross-linguistically is in the presence/absence of a single applicative form to signal different semantic roles of their objects. Thus, while Hakha Lai has seven applicative markers, each with a different semantic function, in Kichaga (Bantu) a single form yields a range of different meanings. A single language may combine monofunctional and polyfunctional applicative forms (e.g., Tukang Besi, Austronesian [Donohue 1999]).

In some Arawak languages of Peru, such as Pajonal Asheninka and Yanesha', the same verbal suffix may be used with a rather vague meaning, which may be translated as 'with reference to, including, or concerning X' (Wise 1986:592). A similar semantically vague "argument-adding" derivational suffix has been noted in the Northern Arawak language Tariana (Aikhenvald 2000:166–70). The applicative suffix of Arabela (Zaparoan) has been described as a generally object-adding mechanism, potentially having different functions such as passive comitative, containing something, abnormal condition, or even indicating pity on the part of the speaker (Rich 1999:54).

1.2.4. Encoding of applicative object. In a prototypical applicative construction, the applicative object is treated as the O argument of a basic transitive clause. However, in Warrwa there are instances where both the inflected verb and the applicative NP are simultaneously marked by *-ngany* or another oblique morpheme (McGregor 1998:171; see also example 85*a* below). Another example of how the coding of an applicative object may deviate from that of a base object is illustrated by Hakha Lai, where an instrumental applicative object may not be cross-referenced on the verb as base objects are, presumably due to animacy restrictions in the cross-referencing verbal pronouns (Peterson 2007:27–28; see also **1.2.5**).

1.2.5. Distribution of object properties. Applicative constructions vary both with respect to the distribution of object properties between the applicative object and the base object, and among constructions with different applicatives. As mentioned above, animacy restrictions are found in the cross-referencing verbal pronouns of Hakha Lai. While a beneficiary applicative object triggers person cross-referencing on the verb, an instrumental applicative object does not; the latter, however, can still trigger number agreement (Peterson 2007:24–28). Other object-associated properties with respect to which base and applicative objects may differ are constituent order, case marking, access to passivization, access to relativization, cross-clausal pivot control, reflexivization and reciprocalization control, and access to incorporation.

According to Donohue (1999), in Tukang Besi applicative constructions the valency of the base verb plays a role in determining the syntactic properties of an applicative object. In addition to this, the applicative object dis-

plays different syntactic properties depending on the semantic role assigned to it by the polyfunctional applicative *-ako* (which yields dative, instrument, theme, cause, and purpose meanings) (1999:231–32). For example, the base object of a dative applicative construction, but not that of a theme applicative construction, can be the head of a relative clause. Donohue (1999:268) concludes that "rather than classifying a language, or even a construction, as symmetrical or asymmetrical in terms of the distribution of object properties, each individual combination of grammatical construction, semantic role, and transitivity needs to be separately examined." In **5**, I show that base and applicative objects share most morphosyntactic properties in Shipibo-Konibo (a general discussion of object symmetry is provided in Valenzuela 2003:sec. 12.3). Another language described as exhibiting symmetrical objects is Bajau (Austronesian [Donohue 1996]).

1.2.6. Valency-increasing vs. semantic role rearrangement. In many languages, the addition of an applicative, particularly to a transitive base, does not always result in increased transitivity of the clause. Therefore, applicativization has been characterized as the rearrangement of the argument structure (Comrie 1985:312–19).

Payne (2000) points out that in Yagua the applicative *-ta* sometimes may not result in a transitivity increase or affect the semantic role of an object; rather it adds a sense of greater "intensity" to the meaning of the verb. This situation can also be observed in Yanesha', where the addition of the applicative *-am^{y}p^{y}* does not introduce object cross-referencing on the verb but instead adds the sense of greater "intensity" mentioned by Payne:

(1*a*) *Ø-kow-een-aan* *chesha-t^{y}oll*
3sg-look-CONT-OBJ.FOLLOWS child-DIM

'S/he is looking at the small child'.

(1*b*) *Ø-kow-am^{y}p^{y}-een-aan* *chesha-t^{y}oll*
3sg-look-APPL-CONT-OBJ.FOLLOWS child-DIM

'S/he is caring for the small child'. (Duff-Tripp 1997:100)

Also, I stated in **1.2.3** that the Arabela applicative may add somewhat idiosyncratic meanings to the clause, such as abnormal condition or even pity on the part of the speaker. Similar functions of applicatives have been reported in Bantu languages (Payne 2000).

1.2.7. Transitivity restrictions. Transitivity restrictions can be divided into two kinds: a minimum transitivity requirement and a maximum transitivity requirement. According to Aissen (1983:294–96), in Tzotzil the benefactive *-be* can only be combined with transitive stems. A similar situation is

attested in the Panoan language Matses (Kneeland 1979 and Fleck 2003). Shibatani (1996) interprets the minimum transitivity requirement for the benefactive in many languages in terms of the 'give' schema they are based on, which requires three core participants. This point will be crucial in **3** below, when I discuss the dedicated malefactive applicative construction in Shipibo-Konibo.

On the other hand, languages can be found which do not allow applicativization with a ditransitive basic verb. This group includes the Papuan languages Yimas and Alamblak, as well as Sesotho (Narrow Bantu) (Peterson 2007:63).

1.2.8. Applicativization and causativization. Applicativization and causativization are prototypically valency-increasing mechanisms that differ in the kind of argument that is added to the clause: a nonpatient object in the former case and a causer subject in the latter. It has been noted that a number of geographically and genetically unrelated languages may employ the same form with both causative and applicative (especially benefactive) functions (Song 1990:181–89 and Comrie 1989:176).[2]

For some languages it has been reported that the specific interpretation of a single such morpheme is closely associated to the kinds of verbs with which it combines. According to Austin (1997), some Australian languages have a single affix that works either as causative or applicative depending on the type of verb root to which it is attached. Other Australian languages have two or more suffixes: one used with unaccusative verbs to form causatives and the second one restricted to unergative verbs to form applicatives. In Hualapai (Yuman) the same verbal suffix derives causatives from stative predicates but benefactives from active ones (Ichihashi-Nakayama 1996:232). Comparable claims have been made for Asheninka (Maipuran Arawak [Payne 2002:490–91]) and Seko Padang (Austronesian [Payne 1997:191]).

Shipibo-Konibo employs different forms for causativization and applicativization, suggesting that the addition of an A argument is viewed differently from the addition of an O argument (Valenzuela 2002*a*). Nevertheless, there are constructions where the two categories meet. This is addressed in **4.1**, when I discuss sociative causation.

1.3. Shipibo-Konibo applicatives. Shipibo-Konibo[3] (henceforth SK) has three applicatives: the affective (i.e., benefactive or malefactive) *-xon*, the

[2] A discussion of the conceptual issues that drive the applicative–causative connection may be found in Shibatani and Pardeshi (2002).

[3] Spoken by over 30,000 individuals, Shipibo-Konibo is by far the first Panoan language in terms of numbers of speakers and the third one of the Peruvian Amazon. Ethnographic information on the Shipibo people can be found in Eakin, Lauriault, and Boonstra (1986), Morin (1998),

associative *-kin* ~ *-kiin*, and the dedicated malefactive *-(V)naan* ~ *-(V)n*.[4] These suffixes immediately follow the verb stem and thus precede modifying, tense, number, and aspect morphology (but see example 19 below). The addition of all three applicatives increases the transitivity of the clause by one. Another characteristic of SK (and apparently of Panoan in general) is the fact that applicatives lack cognate NP markers.

Table 1 shows that applicative markers differ a great deal in terms of text frequency.[5] Also, they combine differently with the basic transitivity types

---

Tournon (2002), and Valenzuela and Valera (2005), among others. As for their language, Valenzuela (2003) contains a grammar and Loriot, Lauriault, and Day (1993) is a Shipibo–Spanish dictionary.

The Shipibo-Konibo data throughout this article are given in the practical orthography employed in the bilingual schools: ⟨e⟩ stands for the high central unrounded vowel /ɨ/, ⟨b⟩ for the bilabial fricative /β/, ⟨x⟩ for the voiceless retroflex sibilant, ⟨r⟩ for the retroflex approximant /ɻ/, and ⟨Vn⟩ for a nasalized vowel. As in Spanish, ⟨ch⟩ is used for the palato-alveolar affricate /tʃ/ and ⟨j⟩ for the glottal fricative /h/. Primary stress falls on the first syllable of the word, unless the second syllable is heavy in which case this latter syllable attracts the stress. Deviations from this basic pattern are indicated through an acute accent. In order to distinguish elicited from spontaneous text examples, the latter are marked by (T) following their free English translation. Elicited examples include invented examples judged (un)acceptable by native speakers (e.g., 2 and 3), interpretations provided by native speakers (61–65), as well as slightly modified versions of text extracts offered by native speakers (e.g., example 7).

Abbreviations and symbols used in this paper are the following: 1 first-person singular; 2 second-person singular; 3 third-person singular; 1p first-person plural; 2p second-person plural; 3p third-person plural; A transitive subject function, A-orientation; ABL ablative; ABS absolutive; ALL allative; ASSOC associative; ATT attenuative; AUX auxiliary; BEN benefactive; CAUS causative; CMPL completive aspect; COM comitative; CONTRST contrast; COP copula; DEPREC deprecatory; DES desiderative; DIM diminutive; DIST distal; DS different subject; EM emphatic; ERG ergative; EV direct evidential; GEN genitive; HSY hearsay; HSY2 shorter form hearsay; I intransitive; IMP imperative; INC incompletive aspect; INF infinitive; INST instrumental; INTRSS interessive, complement of interest; LOC locative; MAL malefactive; MID middle; NEG negative; NMLZ nominalizer; NP_{REL} relativized noun phrase; n.SG nonsingular; O object function; OBL oblique; P previous event; PL plural; PO>S/A previous event, dependent object is coreferential with matrix subject; POS1 possessive first-person singular; POS3 possessive third-person singular; PP1 incompletive participle; PP2 completive participle; PROPR proprietive; PSSS previous event, same-subject, S-orientation; PSSA previous event, same-subject, A-orientation; PST4 several years ago past; REC reciprocal; S intransitive subject function, S orientation; simultaneous event (when preceding DS); SDS simultaneous event, different subjects; SIML similitive; SSSA simultaneous event, same-subject, A-orientation; TEMP temporal; T transitive; VBLZ transitive verbalizer.

[4] In SK, some morphemes exhibit alternate allomorphs depending on whether they attach to an element with an even or an odd number of moras. This phenomenon can be observed in the distribution of the dedicated malefactive and associative applicative variants, which are largely determined by the moraic structure of the base predicates to which they attach (Faust 1973:70–72). Thus *-kiin* and *-naan* or *-n* are added to verbs with an even number of syllables; in turn, *-kin* and *-Vnaan* or *-Vn* follow verbs with odd-numbered syllables. See also n. 12.

[5] Only the text corpus has been taken into account in the elaboration of tables 1–3 and 5. The total number of clauses is roughly above 6,000. As discussed in **6.1** and **6.2**, an applicative may either precede or follow valency-changing morphology.

TABLE 1
TEXT FREQUENCY OF SHIPIBO-KONIBO APPLICATIVE SUFFIXES

		Intransitive Stems	Transitive Stems	Others	Total
BEN/MAL	*-xon*	6	76	2	84
ASSOC	*-kin*	21	23	1	45
MAL	*-(V)naan*	0	17	0	17
Total		27	116	3	146

of verbs. The column in table 1 corresponding to intransitive stems includes reciprocalized forms, while that for transitive stems includes also ditransitives; under the category "Others," I have grouped classes involving nonprototypical transitive verbs.

Intriguingly, the forms *-xon* and *-kin* are also found as same-subject or participant agreement markers in the language. SK has a highly complex switch-reference system. In addition to conveying subject coreferentiality and the relative temporal or logical order of the events in the matrix and dependent clauses, same-subject markers correlate with the transitivity status of the matrix verb. That is, while both same-subject markers *-ax* and *-xon* are used when the event in the dependent clause is previous to the event in its matrix clause, *-ax* must be selected when the matrix verb is intransitive (see 69*b* below) and *-xon* when it is transitive (see 43 and 44 below). Analogously, while *-i* and *-kin* are the same-subject markers for simultaneous or overlapping events, the former is used when the matrix verb is intransitive (46) and the latter when the matrix verb is transitive (6).[6] The markers *-ax*, *-i* versus *-xon*, *-kin* are also found on adjunct expressions of monoclausal constructions, indicating semantic orientation of the adjunct toward the S or A participant, respectively. This characteristic of SK and Panoan in general has been referred to as "participant agreement" (Valenzuela 2005). A diachronic analysis of participant agreement markers is offered in Valenzuela (2003:chap. 20).

2. The benefactive/malefactive applicative *-xon*. The addition of *-xon* to a verb stem indicates the introduction of an object argument which is

[6] As stated in Valenzuela (1999), the different functions of *-xon* and *-kin* as same-subject markers and applicatives seem semantically compatible also. While a benefactive action can be viewed as transferring something from X to Y, this function could have been extended to encode movement from one event to another, thus having sequentiality implications. On the other hand, the associative function is compatible with a representation of two events taking place at the same time, or two aspects of a single event, that is, simultaneity.

semantically a beneficiary or maleficiary of the situation described by the verb. The benefactive applicative type has been claimed to be the most common cross-linguistically (Croft 1994:95 and Peterson 2007:40, 202). As shown in table 1, *-xon* is by far the SK applicative with the highest frequency of occurrence. Although it can be added to both intransitive and transitive verbs, its combination with the latter is overwhelmingly more frequent. Table 2 lists the specific verbs to which *-xon* attaches in the text data; the number of occurrences per verb is indicated within parentheses.[7] In addition, the semantic interpretation of *-xon* is indicated to the right of every verb.[8]

2.1. *-xon* with intransitive stems. SK has a fairly consistent ergative–absolutive case-marking system. When suffixed to an intransitive verb, *-xon* works as a transitivizer adding a second participant to the clause. Thus, the subject of the applicative construction (the base S) takes the ergative marker, and the applicative object is marked absolutive (clausal arguments are not encoded in the verb, with the partial exception of the plural *-kan* in 12 below):

(2) *Pexé* *Piko-ra* *tee-ke.* / * *Pexé* *Piko-n-ra*
Pexé Piko:ABS-EV work-CMPL Pexé Piko-ERG-EV

'Pexé Piko worked'.

(3) *Pexé* *Piko-**n**-ra* *e-a* *tee-**xon**-ke.* / * *Pexé*
Pexé Piko-ERG-EV 1-ABS work-*xon*-CMPL Pexé

Piko-ra
Piko:ABS-EV

'Pexé Piko worked for me (e.g., in my chacra)'.

[7] The lists of verbs and frequencies in tables 2, 3, and 5 are relative to my corpus; I do not wish to make any claims about what verbs applicatives might combine with if a different corpus were chosen. Nevertheless, I have decided to include this information to provide a picture of what verbs applicatives do occur with. Even though the applicative constructions analyzed here are very productive, this does not mean that in actual discourse applicatives occur with every potential base. As for the number of occurrences, this information provides an overall impression of how frequently applicative constructions occur.

[8] Note that the verb root *wina-* 'row' in table 2 is considered a non-prototypical transitive verb for the following reasons: *wina-* triggers transitivity harmony in serialized and multi-verb constructions; its subject must be marked ergative and imposes A (rather than S) agreement on adjuncts. Furthermore, in elicitation *wina-* allows for the presence of an absolutive marked object (either a means of transportation such as a canoe or a person; see **3.2**). However, all the text occurrences of *wina-* I have come across so far lack an expressed object (see also Valenzuela 1997:181–84).

TABLE 2
VERB STEMS OCCURRING WITH THE APPLICATIVE *-xon*

Verb Stems		Interpretation
Intransitive Stems: 6 instances		
ik-	'be, do (intr.)' (1)	(benefactive)
reken-	'lead the way' (1)	(benefactive)
korá-	'produce noise (by several people)' (1)	(malefactive)
nashi-	'bathe' (2)	(malefactive)
yoran ik-	'have sexual intercourse' (1)	(malefactive)
Non-prototypical Transitive Stem: 2 instances with same verb		
wina-	'row' (2)	(benefactive)
Transitive Stems: 76 instances		
ak-	'make, do (tr.)' (18)	(1 malefactive)
bi-	'get, extract' (7)	(benefactive)
na-raka-n-	'apply on the interior' (1)	(benefactive)
rao-n-	'treat with medicine' (2)	(benefactive)
ninkat-	'hear' (4)	(benefactive)
pe-kewé ak-	'embroider on the back' (1)	(benefactive)
wi-kené ak-	'design on the leg' (1)	(benefactive)
wexa-	'scratch, scrape' (1)	(benefactive)
bena-	'search, look for' (1)	(benefactive)
oro-	'sow' (1)	(benefactive)
keté ak-	'light up' (1)	(benefactive)
bo-	'carry, take' (3)	(benefactive)
ponte-	'correct, guide' (1)	(benefactive)
raan-	'send' (2)	(benefactive)
tseka-	'take out, extract' (1)	(benefactive)
repi-n-	'dock a canoe on the shore' (1)	(benefactive)
senen ak-	'abide by, keep' (1)	(benefactive)
be-	'bring' (4)	(benefactive)
pota-	'leave' (1)	(benefactive)
chia(k)-	'tighten (the mosquito net)' (4)	(benefactive)
nia(k)-	'introduce (a bone making a body part stand)'	(benefactive)
motsa-	'grind' (1)	(benefactive)
kobin-a(k)-	'boil' (1)	(benefactive)
nane-	'embark, put on board' (1)	(benefactive)
napó-	'put inside the canoe' (2)	(benefactive)
axe-a-	'teach' (2)	(benefactive)
taria-a(k)-	'do the homework' (1)	(benefactive)
onan-ma-	'show, teach' (1)	(benefactive)
toa-	'have in the lap' (1)	(benefactive)
xeati-a(k)-	'prepare drink' (3)	(benefactive)
yoi-	'tell' (2)	(benefactive)
tsaka-	'spear (e.g., a fish)' (1)	(benefactive)
benxoa-	'cure' (1)	(benefactive)
kopi-	'cast a spell on someone (in retribution)' (1)	(benefactive)
jopé-	'take off (the clothes)' (1)	(benefactive)

In combination with certain verbs, a *-xon*-marked applicative construction may function as a substitutive (Peterson 2007:17), i.e., it may indicate that the subject performs an action in place of the object to which *-xon* refers:

(4) *E-a* *isin-ai-tian-ra* *nokon* *wetsa-n* *e-a*
1ABS be.sick-S-DS-EV POS1 same.sex.sibling-ERG 1-ABS
tee-tan-xon-ke.
work-go.do.and.return-*xon*-CMPL
'Since I was sick, my brother went to work for me'.

As can be observed in table 2, when combined with an intransitive verb *-xon* may yield a benefactive or a malefactive reading. The choice between these two possibilities is often made by context. Also, the semantics of the verb involved plays an important role in making one of the interpretations most plausible. For example, when added to verbs such as *tee-* 'work' or *jo-* 'come', *-xon* is most likely interpreted as a benefactive (see examples 3 and 8*a*); when attached to verbs such as *isin-* 'get sick', *mawat-* 'die', *rabin-* 'feel embarrassed', or *jison-* 'urinate', a malefactive reading is most plausible (see also the discussion of examples 20 and 24 involving *be-* 'bring' and *kene-* 'miss, fail' in **3.1** below). Sentence (5) illustrates an instance where either a benefactive or a malefactive interpretation is possible, depending on the situational and cultural context:

(5) *Nokon* *bake-n-ra* *e-a* *kinan-**xon**-ke.*
POS1 child-ERG-EV 1-ABS vomit-*xon*-CMPL
'My child vomited (to my benefit/detriment)'.

Shipibo (grand)parents treat their male children with vegetal medicine so that they become good fishermen/hunters. This treatment induces vomiting, which is expected to free the child from negative characteristics such as laziness, poor shooting, etc. In such a circumstance, the sentence above would have a benefactive reading. If instead the child throws up for no apparent reason, the same expression would be given a malefactive interpretation since it could mean that the child is sick. Examples (6) and (7) illustrate the use of *-xon* as a malefactive applicative in the text data. In (6), a woman is advised to make use of a specific *piripiri*[9] in case she wants to separate from her partner but anticipates that he will not agree to this. Thus, the use of the *piripiri* is viewed as detrimental to the man's interests (in SK omission of required subject or object is normally understood as a zero third-person singular form, as is the case of the applicative object of *-xon*):

[9] The *pechi waste* is a type of *piripiri* (plant with special powers) used when one wishes to be abandoned by one's spouse or lover.

(6) *Ja* *joni-shoko* *mi-on* *keen-ai-bi* *mi-a* *ja-on*
that man-DIM:ABS 2-INTRSS want-SDS-EM 2-ABS 3-INTRSS

keen-yama-kin, *mi-n* *pe-chi* *waste-n*
want-NEG-SSSA 2-ERG BACK-BUTTOCK *piripiri*-INST

*nashi-**xon**-ti* *atipan-ke.*
bathe-*xon*-INF can-CMPL

'Even if that little man loves you, if you do not love him, you can bathe with the "to be abandoned" *piripiri* to his detriment'. (T)

According to Shipibo culture, the father of a newborn child must carefully abide by a set of specific rules, avoiding certain activities (e.g., eating certain kinds of meat, touching certain trees in the forest, lifting heavy objects, having sexual intercourse [especially with a woman other than the child's mother], playing soccer) in order not to affect the healthy development of the baby. In (7), the father did not comply with one of the prohibitions, and thus his child has been adversely affected:

(7) *Jawen* *papa-n* *yora-n* *i-**xon**-a,* *bicha-bo*
POS3 father-ERG body-OBL do.1-*xon*-PO>S/A phlegm-PL:ABS

kinan-ai *ja* *bake-shoko-n.*
vomit-INC that child-DIM-ERG

'Because his father had sexual intercourse (to the baby's detriment), the baby is vomiting phlegm'.

The deprecatory marker *-isi* may be used to force the malefactive interpretation of *-xon* in a construction where otherwise a benefactive reading would be most plausible:

(8*a*) *Oa-tonin-ra* *jo-xon-ke.*
DIST-ERG-EV come-*xon*-CMPL

'Those (people) came (to my benefit)'.

(8*b*) *Oa-**tonioinsi**-ra* *jo-xon-ke.*
DIST-ERG:DEPREC-EV come-*xon*-CMPL

'Those (people) came (to my detriment)'.

The following examples show the suffix *-xon* functioning as a benefactive (9) and as a malefactive (10), in combination with inactive intransitive stems. Note that the latter sentence involves an inanimate patient–subject (in SK it is not uncommon to find sequences of morphemes lacking clear-cut boundaries, such as certain nominal plus ergative or verb stem plus middle sequences):

(9) *Nokon* *choncho-baon-ra* *moa* *e-a* *ani-xon-ke.*
POS1 chicken-PL:ERG-EV already 1ABS (become)big-*xon*-CMPL
'My chickens grew already (to my benefit)'.

(10) *Nonti-n-ra* *e-a* *payó-xon-ke.*
canoe-ERG-EV 1ABS become.rotten-*xon*-CMPL
'(My) canoe became rotten to my detriment'.

The examples above are particularly interesting from a cross-linguistic perspective, given that languages sometimes restrict subjects of applicatives to volitional agentlike entities (Austin 1997, Ichihashi-Nakayama 1996, and Shibatani and Pardeshi 2002).

In SK, nouns and adjectives, as well as some adverbs and postpositions, can function as intransitive predicates by taking verbal affixes directly. These zero-derived intransitive verbs may also take the affective applicative. This is illustrated in (9) through the combination *ani-xon*. Other examples are: *shino* 'monkey', *shino-* 'turn into/behave like a monkey', *shino-xon-* 'turn into/behave like a monkey to someone's benefit/detriment'; *napon* 'in the middle of', *napon-* 'get to the middle of (e.g., a river or lake)', *napo-xon-* 'get to the middle to someone's benefit/detriment'.

2.2. *-xon* with transitive stems. So far, I have shown that it is possible for *-xon* to occur with different kinds of intransitive stems. Nevertheless, in spontaneous utterances, *-xon* is mostly attached to transitives. In these latter instances, *-xon* functions almost exclusively as a benefactive marker. Consider the following text example:

(11) *Ja-tian* *jawe-bi* *maxká-yam*[*a*]*-ai*: *wetsa-n-ki*
that-TEMP what:ABS-EM lack-NEG-INC other-ERG-HSY

piti *bena-**xon**-ai,* *wetsa-n* *wai*
fish:ABS search-*xon*-INC other-ERG chacra:ABS

*oro-**xon**-ai;* *ja-ska-ra.*
clear-*xon*-INC that-SIML-*ra*

'Then, (the shaman woman with two husbands) did not lack anything: while one (husband) searched for food/fish (for her), the other one cleared the chacra (for her); so it was'. (T)

A couple of sentences in the text data represent apparent counterexamples to the generalization that *-xon*, when combined with transitive base verbs, necessarily yields a benefactive reading. In both cases though the negative *-yama* is required to achieve this interpretation (these sequences of *V-xon-yama* are not counted as malefactive in table 2). A particular instance of

lexicalization results from the combination of the transitive *ninka*(*t*)- 'listen to, understand' and *-xon*, which appears to have developed into a fixed expression. Bilingual speakers translate *ninká-xon-* into the Spanish *hacer caso* 'pay attention to, listen to, follow somebody's advice' (see also 23):

(12) . . . *alcalde* *i-táanan;* *jakon* *a-kin* *no-a*
. . . mayor be-PSS good do.T-SSSA 1p-ABS

*ninká-**xon**-yama-kan-ai* *no-n* *jema* *maxkat-a*
hear-*xon*-NEG-PL-INC 1p-GEN town lack-PP2

jawéki-bo *no-n* *yoiy-ai-tian.*
thing-PL:ABS 1p-ERG say-S-DS

'Once elected mayor, they (i.e., the former candidates) don't listen to us when we expose to them the necessities of our town'. (T)

In SK, forces can be encoded as subjects of applicative constructions involving a transitive base verb:

(13) *Bai* *koshi-n-ra* *e-a* *nokon* *pisha*
way strong-ERG-EV 1-ABS POS1 bag:ABS

*be-**xon**-ke.*
bring-*xon*-CMPL

'The water current brought my bag (to the shore) to my benefit'.

Unlike subjects, which do not need to be human or even animate, it appears that beneficiaries must be animates (see also maleficiaries in **3.3**):

(14) *E-n-ra* *joshin* *pitso/shino* *be-xon-ke.*
1ERG-EV red:ABS parakeet:ABS/c.monkey:ABS bring-*xon*-CMPL

'I brought ripe (banana) for (my) parakeet/capuchin monkey'.

(15) **E-n-ra* *pei* *xobo* *be-xon-ke.*
1ERG-EV leaf:ABS house:ABS bring-*xon*-CMPL

'I brought leaves for my house (i.e., for the roof)'.

The category "transitive verbs" includes monotransitives and ditransitives. The text data, however, contains only one instance of *-xon* attached to a ditransitive base; it involves the verb *yoi* 'tell, say':[10]

[10] SK has two semantically generic verbs, the intransitive *ik-* 'be, do (intransitive)' and the transitive *ak-* 'do (transitive)'. These are found as pro-verbs, in combination with short exclamations and onomatopoeic roots to form verbs, and in periphrastic verbal constructions. In addition, the transitive *ak-* may be added to different kinds of roots to derive transitive verbs, and to a few intransitive verbs to obtain a derived transitive; the intransitive form *iki* functions as copula and as auxiliary verb.

(16) *Awakan* *yoiya* *iki,* *"mi-n* *ibo* *e-a*
tapir:ERG say:PP2 AUX 2-GEN owner:ABS 1-ABS

yoi-xon*-tan-we,"* *a-kin-ki* *ak-á* *iki,*
say-BEN-go.and.return-IMP do.T-SSSA-HSY do.T-PP2 AUX

kimisha-a-kin.
three-do.T-SSSA

'The Tapir said to him, "go tell your owner for me," he told him three times'. (T)

The addition of *-xon* to a ditransitive verb also has a valency-increasing effect. In (16), it is possible to add an object NP referring to the message to be communicated.

2.3. Obligatoriness of the *-xon* applicative construction. As stated in **1.2.1**, applicative constructions may vary as to whether their use is obligatory or optional. "Optional" means that there is a semantically very close paraphrase of the applicative construction involving a nonapplicative verb and a case-marked NP encoding the thematically peripheral participant. In SK, the *-xon* applicative construction (or in certain instances the dedicated malefactive; see **3.4**) is obligatory whenever the affective meaning (benefactive/malefactive) is to be communicated.[11]

3. The dedicated malefactive applicative construction. A second applicative suffix is the dedicated malefactive -(*V*)*naan* ~ -(*V*)*n*,[12] which indicates that the event or action in question is detrimental to someone else.

[11] Complements of interest, possessive pronouns, and reason-marked NPs were examined as possible components of alternative nonapplicative expressions. All these attempts yielded ungrammatical sentences or expressions bearing significantly different meanings (see Valenzuela 2003:17.2.5).

[12] As stated in n. 4 above, the allomorphs *-Vnaan* or *-Vn* attach to verbs with odd-numbered syllables, while *-naan* or *-n* are added to verbs with an even number of syllables. The long vowel may be lost in some instantiations of the malefactive. This distribution is illustrated in the list of verb forms below, where monomoraic stems take allomorphs starting with a vowel (also some kind of vowel harmony can be observed with *bo-* 'carry'), while bimoraic stems take those starting with the nasal consonant:

pi-	'eat'	*pi-ana*(*a*)*n-* ~ *pi-an*
bo-	'carry'	*bo-ona*(*a*)*n-* ~ *bo-on-*
rete-	'kill'	*rete-na*(*a*)*n-* ~ *rete-n-*
toe-	'break'	*toe-na*(*a*)*n-* ~ *toe-n-*
miin-	'bury'	*miin-na*(*a*)*n-* ~ *mii-n-*
rishki-	'hit w/pole'	*rishki-na*(*a*)*n-* ~ *rishki-n-*
waxa-	'tear (clothes/bag)'	*wasa-na*(*a*)*n-* ~ *waxa-n-*

TABLE 3
VERB STEMS OCCURRING WITH THE DEDICATED MALEFACTIVE APPLICATIVE

Verb Stems		Interpretation
Transitive Stems: 17 occurrences		
ke-ski-	'put, apply (e.g., paint, fat) on the edge of' (1)	(malefactive)
kató-	'select' (1)	(malefactive)
osan-	'laugh at' (2)	(malefactive)
keyo-	'finish' (3)	(malefactive)
yoi-	'say, tell' (1)	(malefactive)
rishki-	'hit (with a stick/pole)' (1)	(malefactive)
bo-	'carry, take' (1)	(malefactive)
wake-	'lift' (1)	(malefactive)
pi-	'eat' (4)	(malefactive)
tseka-	'take out' (1)	(malefactive)
seke-	'break' (1)	(malefactive)

Table 3 shows the stems that combine with the dedicated malefactive in the corpus.

3.1. The dedicated malefactive applicative construction. If we look back at table 1, the first observation to be drawn is that the text frequency of the dedicated malefactive is relatively low (17 instances as opposed to 84 for the *-xon* construction and 45 for the associative). In addition to this, all the verb stems in table 3 are transitive; i.e., unlike *-xon*, the dedicated malefactive suffix attaches to transitive verbs only. This finding confirms the minimal transitivity requirement imposed by the dedicated malefactive in SK which has been pointed out in previous work (Faust 1973:72 and Valenzuela 1997:126). For exclusively illustrative purposes, I include in (17) a list of intransitive verbs followed by the dedicated malefactive. These combinations were judged ungrammatical by native speakers; alternatively, the related *-xon*-marked form was offered to add the malefactive meaning:

(17)	'go'	**ka-*(*a*)*naan-*	*ka-xon-*
	'arrive'	**nokó-*(*o*)*naan-*	*nokó-xon-*
	'dance'	**ransa-*(*a*)*naan-*	*ransa-xon-*
	'bathe'	**nashi-*(*i*)*naan-*	*nashi-xon-*
	'work'	**tee-*(*a*)*naan-*	*tee-xon-*
	'behave like a monkey'	**shino*(*o*)*naan-*	*shino-xon-*
	'die'	**mawa-*(*a*)*naan-*	*mawá-xon-*
	'become rotten, used up'	**payó-*(*o*)*naan-*	*payó-xon-*

Crucially, the list above includes both active (e.g., 'dance') and inactive (e.g., 'become rotten') intransitives, thus showing that the restriction in question correlates with verb valency rather than with an unaccusative vs. unergative distinction (see Peterson 2007:61–62). One dominantly intransitive stem, however, was accepted by consultants when given in combination with the dedicated malefactive. The context for the next sentence is that of a competition where participants take turns singing different songs:

(18) *Mi-n-ra* *e-a* *i-kas-ai* *bewá-ribi* *mi-n-pari*
2-ERG-EV 1-ABS do.I-DES-PP1 song:ABS-also 2-ERG-first

e-a *bewa-**naan**-ke.*
1-ABS sing-MAL-CMPL

'You sang first the same song I wanted to sing (to my detriment)'.

Bewa- 'sing' is a cognate object verb in that it can take an absolutive-marked object (referring to the different kinds of Shipibo songs), but still its subject is marked absolutive and triggers S (rather than A) participant agreement, etc. This and other subtypes of two-argument verbs of intermediate transitivity are discussed in **3.2** below.

A further observation that can be drawn from table 3 is that the combination of *a*(*k*)- 'do (tr.)' with the dedicated malefactive suffix was not attested in the text data. This fact is particularly surprising given that *a*(*k*)- is also the transitive pro-verb and pro-verbs are expected to have high text frequency. In elicitation, however, the combination of *a*(*k*)- with the dedicated malefactive can easily be obtained. But unlike other stems that require the dedicated malefactive to be next to the stem and thus precede other verbal morphology, like the negative *-yama* and the plural *-kan* (in this order), *a*(*k*)- requires the plural to precede the dedicated malefactive; the negative, however, keeps its expected position:

(19) *Ja-baon-ra* *e-a* *a-kan-an-yama-ke*
3-PL:ERG-EV 1-ABS do.T-PL-MAL-NEG-CMPL

'They did not do (it) on me'.

There are nevertheless instances of transitive verbs that when combined with the dedicated malefactive yield unacceptable expressions. SK has a couple of suppletive verb pairs that exhibit a number–transitivity distinction: *jo-* 'come (singular)' vs. *be-* 'come (non.singular)/bring' and *ka-* 'go (singular)' vs. *bo-* 'go (non.singular)/take'. Interestingly, *be-* 'bring' can only combine with *-xon* in order to achieve either a benefactive or a malefactive meaning:

(20) *Joxo* *nawa-baon-ra* *no-a*
white outsider-PL:ERG-EV 1p-ABS

rao/jakon joi/jakon-ma *isin*
medicine:ABS/good word:ABS/good-NEG illness:ABS

*be-xon-ke. / *be*(*e*)*naanke*
bring-*xon*-CMPL

'The white outsiders brought us medicine/good news/bad illnesses'.

In **2.1**, I referred to the role of verb semantics in assigning *-xon* either a benefactive or a malefactive reading when combining with intransitives. It was also mentioned that when *-xon* follows *jo-* 'come (sing.)', the singular/intransitive suppletive form of *be-*, it is most plausibly given a benefactive interpretation. In accordance with the latter observation, it may be posited that it is the inherent meaning of 'bring' and its probably frequent use with a benefactive sense that led to the fixation of *be-xon-* and thus to the unacceptability of the *be-*MAL sequence (cf. *kene-* in 24). In addition to the suppletive forms *jo-* 'come (sing.)'/*be-* 'come (non-sing.), bring', there is in SK another pair of stems that work in an analogous way: *ka-* 'go (sing.)/*bo-* 'go (non-singular), carry'. But unlike *be-*, *bo-* can take both applicatives, *-xon* and the dedicated malefactive -(*V*)*naan*:

(21) *Jato-n* *xobo* *patax* *ik-á* *bakeranoman-kaya*
3p-GEN house next.to be-PP2 young.man:ERG-CONTRST

*bo-**onaan**-a* *ik-á* *iki* *jawen* *bake* *xontako.*
carry-MAL-PP2 be-PP2 AUX POS3 child young.girl:ABS

'Instead, a young man who lived next to their house had taken his young daughter with him'. (T)

Further examples extracted from the text corpus are given below. In (22) and (23), the roots are prototypical transitives and the malefactive meaning is clear:

(22) *Jatian* *mi-ki* *ainbo* *sinat-ai-tian,* *mi-n* *jawen*
then 2-OBL woman:ABS be.angry-S-DS 2-ERG POS3

chitonti *xeni-n* ***ke-ski-nan**-a,* *ja*
chitonti:ABS fat-INST MOUTH-paint-MAL-PO>S/A that

ainbo *tsini-ti* *k-ai.*
woman:ABS play-INF go-INC

'If a woman is angry at you, you can apply (dolphin's) fat on the edge of her *chitonti* (k. skirt) to her detriment, and she will become an easy woman'. (T)

(23) *Jaskáketian-ki,* *wetsa-o-ri-kea* *kishi-ki,*
in.this.way-HSY2 other-DIST-about-LOC:ABL leg:ABS-HSY2

kapetan ***tseka-nan-a*** *iki,* *jawen* *ibo-n*
alligator:ERG take.out-MAL-PP2 AUX POS3 owner-GEN

joi *ninká-xon-yama-ke-tian.*
voice:ABS hear-BEN-NEG-P-DS

'And so it is said that the alligator on the other side (of the lake) bit off his leg to his detriment, for not having followed its owner's warning'. (T)

The only counterexample in the corpus, in the sense that the dedicated malefactive suffix adds a benefactive rather than a detrimental meaning, is given in (24):

(24) *Maxokan-ra* *e-a* *atapa* *kene-nan-ke*
opossum:ERG-EV 1-ABS chicken:ABS fail-*nan*-CMPL

'The opossum failed (to catch) my chicken (to my benefit)'.

When the sequence **kene-xon-* was offered to a language consultant, it was rejected. The verb *kene-* is most commonly used to express that one missed one's prey when shooting or driving a hunting weapon (see also Loriot, Lauriault, and Day 1993:339). Therefore, one might argue that since *kene-* is generally employed with a detrimental meaning, the combination *kene-nan-* has become fixed and the dedicated malefactive suffix was assigned a broader affective function. This situation could be interpreted as the converse of the one described for the verb *be-* 'come (non.singular), bring'.

3.2. The dedicated malefactive and verbs of intermediate transitivity. While most SK verbs can be classified as inherently intransitive or transitive (requiring special derivational morphology to change their valency), there are different degrees of transitivity and a fuzzy area between "non-prototypical intransitive" and "non-prototypical transitive" verbs. In **3.1**, I argued that the dedicated malefactive applicative imposes a minimal transitivity requirement on the base verb to which it attaches, given that its combination with different kinds of clearly intransitive stems yields ungrammatical forms. In this section, I examine the ability of non-prototypical transitive and intransitive verbs to combine with the dedicated malefactive suffix.

SK has a set of verbs that, although requiring their subjects to be marked ergative and although being associated with A-agreement, fail to exhibit other relevant properties of transitive verbs. A question that arises is whether these verbs may combine with the dedicated malefactive. One example of this category of non-prototypical transitives is *wina-* 'row'. As mentioned in

n. 8, the subject of *wina-* is necessarily coded in the ergative case and this root is associated with A-agreement; furthermore, at least in elicitation, *wina-* even allows for an object argument such as a canoe or a person (i.e., row the canoe or take somebody somewhere by rowing). However, so far I have not been able to find text occurrences of *wina-* that include an overt object. Interestingly, *wina-* resembles intransitives in that it cannot be combined with the dedicated malefactive (**wina-naan-*), but it resembles transitives in that *wina-xon-* is given a benefactive reading exclusively. Consider the following examples:

(25) *Neeri* *e-a* *wina-xon-we,* *baba-shoko!*
over.here 1-ABS row-*xon*-IMP grand.child-DIM

'Row for me over here, grandchild!'

(26) *E-a* *jain* *ka-ti-n* *raket-ain-bi* *Koriman* *e-a*
1-ABS there go-INF-OBL fear-SDS-EM Korin:ERG 1-ABS
wina-xon-ke.
row-*xon*-CMPL

*'Although I was afraid of getting there, Korin rowed (me) to my detriment'.

The verb *join-* 'breathe' is somewhat similar to *wina-* in that it requires its subject to be marked ergative and is associated with A-agreement. Again, it is possible to obtain a restricted set of absolutive-marked objects in elicitation situations:

(27) *Ainbo-nin-ra* (*niwe/jakonma* *koin*) *join-ai.*
woman-ERG-EV wind:ABS/good-NEG smoke:ABS breathe-INC

'The woman breathes (air/the harming smoke)'.

Even though breathing for someone's benefit or to someone's detriment may seem pragmatically unfeasible, elicitation data suggest that it is somewhat preferred (or rather less dispreferred) to combine *join-* with *-xon* than with the dedicated malefactive:

(28*a*) *Jene-n* *rete-kean-a-bi-ra* *ainbo-nin*
flowing.water-ERG kill-almost-PO>S/A-EM-EV woman-ERG
join-ai.
breathe-INC

'After almost drowning, the woman is (now) breathing'.

(28*b*) *?Jene-n* *rete-kean-a-bi-ra* *ainbo-nin*
flowing.water-ERG kill-almost-PO>S/A-EM-EV woman-ERG

e-a *join-xon-ai.*
1-ABS breathe-*xon*-INC

'After almost drowning, the woman is (now) breathing to my benefit'.

(28*c*) **Jene-n* *rete-kean-a-bi-ra* *nokon*
flowing.water-ERG kill-almost-PO>S/A-EM-EV POS1

rawikan *e-a* *join-naan-ai.*
enemy:ERG 1-ABS breathe-MAL-INC

'After almost drowning, my enemy is (now) breathing to my detriment'.

The verb *kinan-* 'vomit' also behaves like a transitive in terms of case marking and participant agreement (among other properties). However, it does not allow for objects unless they are somehow modified, for example by *-bires* 'purely, just' (i.e., the equivalent of 'I vomited the rice' might not be acceptable to native speakers but 'I vomited just the rice' might be). In **2.1**, it was shown that the sequence *kinan-xon-* (vomit-*xon*-) could be assigned a benefactive or a malefactive reading depending on the situational/cultural context. However, unlike the verbs previously discussed in this section, *kinan-* may also occur in combination with the dedicated malefactive:

(29) *Rao* *e-n* *xea-ma-a-ra,* *bake-n* *ea*
medicine:ABS 1-ERG drink-CAUS-PO>S/A/-EV child-ERG 1-ABS

*kinan-**naan**-ke.*
vomit-MAL-CMPL

'My son threw up the medicine I gave him to my detriment'.

The verbs *keen-* 'want, love, like, need' and *shinanbenot-* 'slip the mind, forget' have the special characteristics of allowing two alternative case-frames: ⟨ABS ABS⟩ or ⟨ABS complement of interest⟩ (Valenzuela 2003:sec. 8.2.2.5). Interestingly, *keen-* can only be combined with *-xon* to achieve a benefactive or malefactive effect:

(30) *Roniman-ra* *wetsa* *ainbo* *e-a*
Ronin:ERG-EV other woman:ABS 1-ABS

*keen-xon-ke/*keen-naan-ke.*
want-*xon*-COMPL

'Ronin wants/likes another woman (to my benefit/detriment)'.

In this respect, *keen-* differs from the semantically close but syntactically distinct verb *noi-* 'love'. Being a prototypical transitive, *noi-* takes both applicatives *-xon* and *-naan* to achieve a benefactive or a malefactive meaning, respectively:

(31*a*) *Roniman-ra* *e-a* *wetsa* *ainbo* *noi-xon-ke.*
Ronin:ERG-EV 1-ABS other woman:ABS love-*xon*-CMPL
'Ronin loves another woman to my benefit/*to my detriment'.

(31*b*) *Roniman-ra* *e-a* *wetsa* *ainbo* *noi-naan-ke.*
Ronin:ERG-EV 1-ABS other woman:ABS love-MAL-CMPL
'Ronin loves another woman to my detriment/*to my benefit'.

Unlike *keen-*, *shinanbenot-* 'slip the mind, forget' does combine with the two applicative suffixes in question:

(32) *Piko-n-ra* *e-a* *nokon* *bake* *xontako* *moa*
Piko-ERG-EV 1-ABS POS1 child unmarried.girl:ABS already
shinan-beno-xon-ke/shinan-beno-naan-ke.
mind-slip-*xon*-CMPL/mind-slip-MAL-CMPL
'Piko already forgot my unmarried daughter to my benefit/to my detriment'.

Finally, let us examine extended intransitive verbs of emotion. These verbs behave like prototypical intransitives in terms of case marking on the subject and participant agreement. However, unlike other intransitives, verbs of emotion take a second argument (the stimulus) which is generally marked by the oblique *-ki*. Out of seven verbs of emotion that were examined, only *raket-* ~ *raké-* 'fear, be afraid of' may combine with the dedicated malefactive:

(33*a*) *Ronin-ra* *ino-ki* *raké-ke.*
Ronin:ABS-EV jaguar-OBL be.afraid.of-CMPL
'Ronin was afraid of the jaguar'.

(33*b*) *Roniman-ra* *e-a* *ino-ki*
Ronin:ERG-EV 1-ABS jaguar-OBL
raké-xon-ai/raké-enaan-ke.[13]
be.afraid.of-*xon*-INC/be.afraid.of-MAL-CMPL
'Ronin was afraid of the jaguar to my benefit/to my detriment'.

[13] In a different elicitation session, the same speaker, Mr. Yoi Sani, rejected the form **rakéenaanke* but confirmed that *rakéxonke* cannot be interpreted as a malefactive.

TABLE 4
VERBS OF INTERMEDIATE TRANSITIVITY WITH THE AFFECTIVE AND DEDICATED MALEFACTIVE APPLICATIVES

	-xon	*-(V)na(a)n ~ -(V)n*
bewa- 'sing'	benefactive	malefactive
wina- 'row'	benefactive	N.A.
join- 'breathe'	?benefactive	N.A.
kinan- 'vomit'	benef. / malef.	malefactive
keen- 'want'	benef. / malef.	N.A.
shinanbenot- 'slip the mind'	benefactive	malefactive
raket- 'be afraid of'	benefactive	?malefactive
Other emotion verbs	benefactive	N.A.

Two other extended intransitive verbs of emotion, *rabin-* 'feel embarrassed' and *sinat- ~ siná-* 'be angry', allow for the suffixation of *-xon* (the English equivalent of the relevant portion being 'feel embarrassed of something / be angry at something in relation to, to someone's benefit), while their combination with the dedicated malefactive is judged ungrammatical. As expected, *rabin-* and *sina(t)-* may take the dedicated malefactive when transitivized by the addition of *a(k)-* 'do (tr.), make', i.e., 'make someone feel embarrassed' and 'make someone angry', respectively. Table 4 summarizes the possible combinations of verbs of intermediate transitivity status with the two applicatives examined so far.

In sum, the different degrees of transitivity that verbs exhibit are reflected in their ability to combine with the applicatives *-xon* and *-(V)na(a)n ~ -(V)n*, as well as in the meaning(s) achieved when a combination is possible. Furthermore, non-prototypical (in)transitive verbs may differ in this respect even from other members of their own subcategory (e.g., *raket-* 'be afraid of' vs. other verbs of emotion, or *keen-* 'want' from *shinanbenot-* 'slip the mind'). Differences in judgment among speakers and even different judgments by the same speaker at different opportunities are expected.

3.3. Dedicated malefactive applicative constructions and semantic restrictions. Certain constructions involving the dedicated malefactive allow for nonhuman subjects. Interestingly, the benefactive counterparts in the (*b*) sentences were judged unacceptable.[14]

(34*a*) *Kinaman-ra* *e-a* *bake* *rete-naan-ke.*
vomit:ERG-EV 1-ABS child:ABS kill-MAL-CMPL
'My child died from vomit to my detriment (lit., vomit killed my child)'.

[14] According to two different language consultants, the (*b*) instances are not acceptable, given that *kinan* and *akonten* would be interpreted as having human features (Yoi Sani, personal communication, 2000 and Ranin Nita, personal communication, 2001).

(34*b*) **Kinaman-ra nokon rawí e-a rete-xon-ke.*
vomit:ERG-EV POS1 enemy:ABS 1-ABS kill-BEN-CMPL

'My enemy died from vomit to my benefit (lit., vomit killed my enemy)'.

(35*a*) *Akonteman-ra e-a bake kopi-naan-ke.*
akonten:ERG-EV 1-ABS child:ABS affect.negatively-MAL-CMPL

'The *akonten* tree affected my child negatively to my detriment'.

(35*b*) **Akonteman-ra e-a nokon rawí*
akonten:ERG-EV 1-ABS POS1 enemy:ABS

kopi-xon-ke.
affect.negatively-BEN-CMPL

'The *akonten* tree affected my enemy negatively to my benefit'.

Sentences (36) and (37) show that the unacceptability of (34*b*) and (35*b*) is not due to the ungrammaticality of attaching *-xon* to the verbs involved; instead, they suggest that it is the nature of the subject referent that accounts for it:

(36) *Epa-n-ra nokon rawí e-a rete-xon-ke.*
paternal.uncle-ERG-EV POS1 enemy:ABS 1-ABS kill-*xon*-CMPL

'My paternal uncle killed my enemy to my benefit'.

(37) *Ja-n-ra nokon rawí e-a*
3ERG-EV POS1 enemy:ABS 1-ABS

kopi-xon-ke.
return.something.to-*xon*-CMPL

'S/he returned it (a negative behavior) to my enemy to my benefit'.

Recall, however, that inanimate subjects were allowed in certain *-xon* applicative constructions with intransitive and transitive base verbs (examples 10 and 13). In these latter instances, however, the events depicted by the predicate can be seen as beneficial in a more obvious, expected way. This suggests that certain verbs are more strongly associated with a given event schema, so that an unexpected benefactive/malefactive reading is not possible even when the appropriate applicative is added.

Like *-xon* objects, dedicated malefactive objects may be nonhuman animates:

(38) *Bake-n-ra paranta joshin pitso pi-anaan-ke.*
child-ERG-EV banana red:ABS parakeet:ABS eat-MAL-CMPL

'The child ate the ripe banana to the parakeet's detriment'.

But differently from benefactive objects, which are necessarily animate (examples 14 and 15), dedicated malefactive objects may be inanimate:

(39) *Iskoira-n* *kirika-ra* *oi-n* ***biblioteca***
school-GEN book:ABS-EV rain-ERG library:ABS
mechá a-nan-ke.
wet do.T-MAL-CMPL
Lit., 'The rain made the school books wet to the library's detriment'.

(40) *?Iskoira-n* *kirika-ra* *profesor-nin* ***biblioteca***
school-GEN book:ABS-EV teacher-ERG library:ABS
bi-xon-ke.
get-*xon*-CMPL
'The teacher got the school books to the library's benefit'.

Sentence (41) shows that the relatively low acceptability of (40) is most probably triggered by the semantic nature of the benefactive object:

(41) *Iskoira-n* *kirika-ra* *profesor-nin* ***bake-bo***
school-GEN book:ABS-EV teacher-ERG child-PL:ABS
bi-xon-ke.
get-*xon*-CMPL
'The teacher got the school books to the children's benefit'.

In sum, the data provided in (38)–(41) suggest that the dedicated malefactive applicative places weaker animacy restrictions on its object than the benefactive.

3.4. Obligatoriness of the dedicated malefactive applicative construction. As was the case with *-xon*, there is no straightforward nonapplicative expression that could be considered as a semantically close paraphrase of the dedicated malefactive applicative construction. A possible candidate for marking an NP with a malefactive meaning is the oblique *-ki*, which may translate into English by means of the preposition 'against', as in *mesa-ki* [table-OBL] '(break something) against the table' (see also examples 22 and 33). However, all attempts to obtain nonapplicative malefactive constructions with an NP-*ki* sequence have been unsuccessful. There is no other potential close paraphrase for the dedicated malefactive applicative construction.

4. The associative *-kin ~ -kiin*. A third applicative is the associative *-kin ~ -kiin*. Its text distribution is shown in table 5.[15] The first important observation is that, unlike the affective and dedicated malefactive, the associative applicative distributes equally with intransitive and transitive stems.

[15] *Chiton-* is an intermediate transitivity verb. It requires an ergative marked subject and triggers A participant agreement. However, it is very restricted in terms of the objects it takes; generally, it lacks an overt object.

TABLE 5
VERB STEMS OCCURRING WITH THE ASSOCIATIVE APPLICATIVE

Intransitive Stems: 21 instances

nokó-	'arrive' (1)
bewa-	'sing' (1)
tee-	'work' (2)
raro-	'be(come) happy' (e.g., to see someone) (1)
bene-	'be(come) happy' (e.g., to receive something) (1)
ja-	'exist, live' (2)
ik-	'be, do (intr.)' (12)
kopi-anan-	(return.sth.to sb.-REC) 'compete with/respond to one another' (1)

Intermediate Transitivity Stem: 1 instance

chiton-	'put on, wear a/the *chitonti*' (1)

Transitive Stems: 23 instances

ak-	'make, do (tr.)' (11)
xepo-	'lock somebody/something' (1)
pi-	'eat' (1)
shinan-	'think, plan' (2)
xea-	'drink' (1)
bo-	'carry, take' (1)
yatan-	'hold, grab' (1)
bana-	'sow' (1)
rene-	'grind' (1)
xeati ak-	'prepare drink' (1)
iráke ak-	'thank' (1)
kampo ak-	'build a soccer field' (1)

Non-prototypical Transitive Stem: 2 instances with same verb

wina-	'row' (2)

Transitive Stems: 76 instances

ak-	'make, do (tr.)' (18)
bi-	'get, extract' (7)
na-raka-n-	'apply on the interior' (1)
rao-n-	'treat with medicine' (2)
ninkat-	'hear' (4)
pe-kewé ak-	'embroider on the back' (1)
wi-kené ak-	'design on the leg' (1)
wexa-	'scratch, scrape' (1)
bena-	'search, look for' (1)
oro-	'sow' (1)
keté ak-	'light up' (1)
bo-	'carry, take' (3)
ponte-	'correct, guide' (1)

TABLE 5—*continued*

raan-	'send' (2)
tseka-	'take out, extract' (1)
repi-n-	'dock a canoe on the shore' (1)
senen ak-	'abide by, keep' (1)
be-	'bring' (4)
pota-	'leave' (1)
chia(k)-	'tighten (the mosquito net)' (4)
nia(k)-	'introduce (a bone making a body part stand)' (1)
motsa-	'grind' (1)
kobin-a(k)-	'boil' (1)
nane-	'embark, put on board' (1)
napó-	'put inside the canoe' (2)
axe-a-	'teach' (2)
taria-a(k)-	'do the homework' (1)
onan-ma-	'show, teach' (1)
toa-	'have in the lap' (1)
xeati-a(k)-	'prepare drink' (3)
yoi-	'tell' (2)
tsaka-	'spear (e.g., a fish)' (1)
benxoa-	'cure' (1)
kopi-	'cast a spell on someone (in return)' (1)
jopé-	'take off (the clothes)' (1)

4.1. The associative applicative construction. As in the previously examined applicative constructions, the addition of the associative *-ki(i)n* to a base verb has a valency-increasing effect. Hence, when attached to an intransitive stem, this suffix adds a second argument to the clause, generally interpreted as an "accompanied" or "helped" participant;[16] when added to a transitive base, its host becomes ditransitive. In (42), it can be seen that the verb *yakat- ~ yaká-* takes a single absolutive-marked argument; but when the applicative *-kin* is added, the result is a transitive clause:

(42*a*) *Jawen* *baba-ra* *yaká-ke/*jawen* *baba-n-ra.*
POS3 granddaughter:ABS-EV sit-CMPL/POS3 gd.-ERG-EV

'Her granddaughter is sitting'.

(42*b*) *Jawen* *baba-n-ra* [*jawen* *yoxan*
POS3 granddaughter-ERG-EV POS3 old.woman:ABS

pashkin-ke-tian] *yaká-**kin**-ke.*
be.tired-P-DS sit-ASSOC-CMPL

'Since her grandmother was tired, the granddaughter sits with her'. (Valenzuela 1997:121)

[16] Note that the associative applicative might have some benefactive nuances.

The next text examples illustrate associative applicative constructions involving other inactive intransitives (43 and 44) and an intransitive verb of emotion (45):

(43) *. . . jakiribi* *xobo* *a-xon* ***ja-kin****-a-bi-ronki*
. . . again house do.T-PSSA exist-ASSOC-PP2-EM-HSY

i-káti-ai *kikin* *jakon-ma.*
be-PST4-INC very good-NEG

'Building a house again, they lived together very badly.' (T)

(44) *. . . ja* *bo-xon-ronki* *westíora* *shanka* *kini* *meran*
3:ABS carry-PSSA-HSY one rock hole inside

*i-**kin**-ai*
do.I-ASSOC-INC

'(The *Yonkexta* woman) took him and they stayed together in the rock cave'. (T)

(45) *Rama-ra* *e-n* *raro-**kin**-kas-ai* *mato*
now-EV 1-ERG be.happy.about-ASSOC-DES-INC 2p:ABS

Piró-ma *ik-á-bo.*
Peru-NEG be-PP2-PL:ABS

'Now I want to greet you. (Native people) who are not from Peru'. (T)

We now turn to data involving active intransitives. In (46) and (47) an asymmetrical relationship between the subject and applicative object participants can be observed. In (46) a recently married man goes back to his village taking his new wife with him; in (47) it is the shaman woman who is responsible for the relationship with the ayahuasca spirits while her two husbands help her in different ways:

(46) *Jawen* *jema-n* *nokó-**kin**-ke-tian* *jawen*
POW3 village-ALL meet:MID-ASSOC-P-DS POS3

reken *merati-baon* *ja* *ainbo*
first lover-PL:ERG that woman:ABS

bachin-i *bo-kan-ai.*
pull.by.the.hair-SSSS go.n.SG-PL-INC

'And when (the newly married woman) arrives to his (i.e., the husband's) village with him, his former lovers will pull that woman by the hair'. (T)

(47) *Jatian nishi xea-nko, wetsa-n bewa-**kin**-ai, wetsa-n*
then rope drink-LOC other-ERG sing-ASSOC-INC other-ERG

shinitapon keté-a-xon-ai.
pipe:ABS light-do.T-*xon*-INC

'During the ayahuasca drinking sessions, one (husband) helped her sing while the other one lighted up the pipe for her'. (T)

With the active inherently directed movement verbs 'go' and 'come', *-kin* requires the nonsingular/transitive suppletive forms *bo-* and *be-*, rather than the singular and intransitive counterparts *ka-* and *jo-* (see **3.1**): *bo-kin-/*ka-kin-* 'go with someone'; *be-kin-/*jo-kin-* 'come with someone'. The selection of *bo-* and *be-* is compatible with the transitivization of the clause triggered by *-kin* and the fact that the subject participant does not act alone.

It is with the associative that the only applicative construction involving a reciprocalized stem is found in the text data:

(48) *Ja iki koshi shinan-ya-bo ja ainbo-bo*
that COP strong think-PROPR-PL:ABS that woman-PL:AB

*kopi-**anan-kin**-ai-bo.*
give.something.in.return-REC-ASSOC-PP1-PL:ABS

'They were brave, the woman who fought against each other in competition (during the *Ani Xeati* ceremony or female puberty rites)'. (T)

The next text examples illustrate associative applicative constructions involving transitive base verbs. Sentence (49) is part of the negotiations between two sets of parents who are arranging a marriage between their respective daughter and son. As culturally expected, the prospective groom's father portrays his son as lacking the relevant abilities and knowledge that a Shipibo man should have:

(49) *Bo-tan-we! Jawe a-ti onan-tani-ma*
carry-go.and.return-IMP what do.T-INF know-ATT-NEG

*i-ken-bi mato-n atapa xepo-**kin**-ti-bires.*
be-PDS-EM 2p-GEN chicken:ABS lock-ASSOC-INF-purely

'Take him with you! Although he hardly knows how to do anything, at least he can help you lock up your chickens'. (T)

(50) *. . . bake-baon-ki ishton rene-**kin**-a iki*
. . . child-PL:ERG-HSY quickly grind-ASSOC-PP2 AUX

'. . . the children helped (her) grind (the corn) quickly'. (T)

As mentioned above, (most) associative applicative constructions seem to imply an inherent dependency relationship where, generally, the participant coded as the associate object can be seen as more involved in the execution of the event expressed by the base predicate, while that coded as transitive subject acts as a helper or accompanier. For example, in (50) above, the Canary Woman presents herself to a group of Shipibo children and prepares corn beer for their parents. So that she can finish on time, the children help her grind the corn (also see 47). Nevertheless, with *tee-* 'work', the expected interpretation 'A helps Associative O to work' is rejected; instead, subjects are viewed as having the main responsibility for the work and the associated participants are helpers under pressure:

(51) *E-a-ra* *Rawa-n* *tee-kin-ai* *jawen* *wai-n.*
1-ABS-EV Rawa-ERG work-ASSOC-INC POS3 chacra-LOC

*'Rawa helps me work . . .'
'I help Rawa work on his chacra' (Rawa indirectly obliges me to do it).

(52) *Juan* *Melendres-nin-ra* *e-a* *tee-kin-ai.*
Juan Melendres-ERG-EV 1-ABS work-ASSOC-INC

*'Juan Melendres helps me work'.
'I work for Juan Melendres'.

A plausible interpretation is that, at least with the verb *tee-*, *-kin* functions primarily as a sociative causativizer (see **1.2.8**), so that the ergatively marked argument functions as causer and the applicative object as causee, both participants taking part in the base event (i.e., it is assumed that A works too). In fact, this hypothesis is supported by the information given in parentheses in (51), which was offered by a native speaker. This particular meaning of the sequence *tee-kin-* was also noted in Valenzuela (1997) whose examples come from a different collaborator. Although the English translation in (53) is somewhat misleading, the information in parentheses makes the sociative causation meaning clear:

(53) *Wesna-n-ra* *ishton* *ka-kas-**kin*** *Rama* *tee-**kin**-ai.*
Wesna-ERG-EV soon go-DES-SSSA Rama work-ASSOC-INC

'Wesna$_i$ is working with Rama$_j$ (probably asked Rama for help) because she$_i$ wants to leave soon'. (Valenzuela 1997:123)

A second verb forcing the sociative causation reading is *pake-t-* 'fall', which results from the combination of the transitive *pake-* 'drop' and the middle marker:

(54) *Ja* *pae-n-a-nin-ra* *e-a* *paké-kin-ke.*
that sour-VBLZ-PP2-ERG-EV 1-ABS drop:MID-ASSOC-CMPL

'That drunk (person) made me fall (falling with me)'.

More research is needed to see which other verbs behave in a similar fashion, i.e., whether a sociative causation interpretation is required rather than just possible (Valenzuela 2002*a*).[17]

4.2. Nonapplicative associative constructions. The associative is the only applicative construction that may have a closer nonapplicative paraphrase. The alternate expression involves an NP marked by the noncognate comitative postposition *betan* ~ *-bé*,[18] which links entities with similar animacy status.

(55*a*) *Tita-n-ra* *papa* *wai* *oro-kiin-ai.*
mother-ERG-EV father:ABS chacra:ABS clear-ASSOC-INC

'Mother helps father clear the chacra/clears the chacra with father'.

(55*b*) *Tita-n-ra* *wai* *oro-ai* *papa* ***betan***.
mother-ERG-EV chacra:ABS clear-INC father COM

'Mother clears the chacra with father'.

As in the applicative construction, the nonapplicative counterpart implies that both participants, the subject and the *betan*-marked NP, take part in the event depicted by the verb. The next text example is particularly revealing. Here, the speaker utters an expression containing an associative applicative construction, and then further elaborates on the same idea, this time offering a nonapplicative paraphrase involving the comitative *-bé*:

(56) *Jatian* *Ne-ino-nin* *shinan-a* *iki,* ***ja***
then flow.water-jaguar-ERG think-PP2 AUX 3:ABS

i-kin-ti, *no?;* *o sea,* ***ja-bé*** ***i-ti***.
be-ASSOC-INF right?; that.is 3-COM be-INF

'Then, the Nutria$_i$ thought that (the woman) was going to be with him$_i$ (join him$_i$), right?; that is, that she was going to be with him'. (T)

Sentence (56) seems to support the claim that the *betan* construction is viewed by native speakers as a semantically close paraphrase to the associative applicative one. Further research is needed to account for the distribution of the two forms. One possibility though is that there exists a subtle

[17] According to the available literature, causative morphemes in Panoan languages are all cognate, similar in form to *-mV*, *-n*, and *ak-* or *wa-*. These morphemes show no resemblance to the applicative *-kin* and therefore provide no comparative diachronic evidence to claim that the associative applicative actually derived from a former causative (see Shibatani and Pardeshi 2002 and Payne 2002).

[18] Unlike other Panoan languages where the allomorphic distribution of the comitative is associated with transitivity distinctions, in SK *betan* is used with NPs involving nouns while *-bé* attaches to pronouns.

semantic distinction such that the *betan* construction does not (necessarily) imply more involvement of one participant in the execution of the event, as is the case with *-kin* constructions.

5. Object properties. In SK, there is no systematic morphosyntactic means for distinguishing direct from indirect objects, or primary from secondary objects. When applicatives are added to a transitive stem, the resulting augmented verb is ditransitive. This section examines the distribution of object properties between the base object and the applicative object, and shows that these exhibit an overall symmetrical behavior. It is also shown that SK applicative constructions may differ among themselves in this respect.

5.1. Coding properties: case marking and constituent order. Like other ditransitive constructions in SK, applicative objects and base objects are marked absolutive (but see 59 and 85*a*) and may also occur in either order preceding the verb. That is, neither word order nor case marking can distinguish between them. Example (57), containing two objects of equal animacy status, shows that either absolutive-marked argument may be interpreted as patient or applicative:

(57) *Wesna-ra* *e-n* *Tsoma* *rao-n-kin-ke.*
Wesna:ABS-EV 1-ERG Tsoma:ABS medicine-VBLZ-ASSOC-CMPL
'I helped Wesna to cure Tsoma/I helped Tsoma to cure Wesna'.

However, the general situation found in text is that one or more participants of a multi-valence clause are omitted, since they are recoverable from the context. Text data where all three participants are overtly mentioned are rare. (58) illustrates one of these exceptional cases. The speaker comments on the need for Shipibo women to preserve their culture by manufacturing and wearing their traditional *chitontis* (woman's skirt or wrap) instead of buying Western clothes in the stores. In this way, mother and daughters can dress similarly, in a Shipibo way.

PATIENT ASSOCIATIVE
(58) . . . *yoman* *maban-xon* *mi-n* *chopa* *mi-n* *bake-bo*
. . . thread spin-PSSA 2-GEN cloth:ABS 2-GEN child-PL:ABS
SUBJECT
mi-n *chiton-**kin**-ti* . . .
2-ERG wear.*chitonti*-ASSOC-INF
'. . . spinning the thread (and manufacturing cloth) you and your daughters can dress your own (resulting) *chitontis* . . .' (T)

Associative applicative constructions differ from their *-xon* and dedicated malefactive counterparts in that the patient of the basic clause may be encoded as an oblique (from Valenzuela 1997:124–25):

(59) *E-n* *mi-a* *jatíbi* *jawéki-**nin*** *a-**kin**-ti* *iki.*
1-ERG 2-ABS all thing-OBL do.T-ASSOC-INF AUX
'I will help you with everything'.

A coding alternative to absolutive marking may also be available to the associative object, which may be simultaneously marked by the comitative postposition *betan* in a multiple applicative construction, probably to avoid ambiguity (see 85*a*).

Both applicative and patient objects can be left- or right-dislocated. Examples (60*a*) and (60*b*) illustrate right-dislocation:

(60*a*) *Ainbo-nin-ra* *pisha* *a-xon-ke,* ***meráya***.
woman-ERG-EV bag:ABS make-BEN-CMPL shaman:ABS

(60*b*) *Ainbo-nin-ra* *meráya* *a-xon-ke,* ***pisha***.
woman-ERG-EV shaman:ABS make-BEN-CMPL bag:ABS
'The woman made a bag for the shaman'.

5.2. Relativization. Both the applicative and the base object may be extracted. In these instances, the resulting structure may function as a relative clause. It is possible in some cases to obtain ambiguous readings where the relativized element is given a patient object and an applicative object interpretation, respectively. This is shown in the expressions below, which at the same time illustrate the existence of postnominal and prenominal relative clauses in SK (Valenzuela 2002*b*):

(61*a*) *Joni* [*yobekan* *kopi-xon-a*]. . . .
person sorcerer:ERG do.sorcery.in.retribution-BEN-PP2:ABS-EV

(61*b*) [*yobekan* *kopi-xon-a*] *joni*. . . .
sorcerer:ERG do.sorcery.in.retribution-BEN-PP2 person
'The man on whom the sorcerer performed an act of sorcery in retribution (to somebody else's benefit)/The man for whom the sorcerer performed an act of sorcery in retribution (on somebody else). . . .'

Besides following and preceding their head nominals, relative clauses in SK may be internally headed. However, this latter construction is only possible for object (and intransitive subject) relativization (Valenzuela 2002*b*). Interestingly, the elicited data suggest that in internally headed relatives involving dedicated malefactive and especially *-xon* affective constructions,

patient base objects rather than applicative objects are preferably interpreted as NP_{REL}:[19]

(62*a*) *E-n-ra* *oin-ke* [*ainbo-nin* *meráya* *pisha*
1-ERG-EV see-CMPL woman-ERG shaman:ABS bag:ABS
a-xon-a].
do.T-BEN-PP2

(62*b*) *E-n-ra* *oin-ke* [*ainbo-nin* *pisha* *meráya*
1-ERG see-CMPL woman-ERG bag:ABS shaman:ABS
a-xon-a].
do.T-BEN-PP2

'I saw the bag that the woman made for the shaman'.
*I saw the shaman for whom the woman made a/the bag'.

(63*a*) *E-n-ra* *oin-ke* [*ja-n* ***ochíti*** *joni* *boonaan-a*].
1-ERG-EV see-CMPL 3-ERG dog:ABS man:ABS take:MAL-PP2

(63*b*) *E-n-ra* *oin-ke* [*ja-n* *joni* ***ochíti*** *boonaan-a*].
1-ERG-EV see-CMPL 3-ERG man:ABS dog:ABS take:MAL-PP2

'I saw the dog that he took to the man's detriment'.
?'I saw the man to whose detriment he took the dog'.

However, differently from the results obtained for the two applicative constructions previously examined (especially from the one involving the affective *-xon*), there is some evidence that the applicative object is preferably interpreted as NP_{REL} in internally headed relatives containing the associative *-kin*:

(64) *E-n-ra* *bena-ke* [*Wesna-n* ***ochíti*** ***joni***
1-ERG-EV look.for-CMPL Wesna- ERG dog:ABS man:ABS
raon-kin-a].
cure-ASSOC-PP2

'I looked for the man whom Wesna helped to cure the dog'.
'I looked for the dog that Wesna helped the man to cure'.

[19] It must be stressed that the grammaticality claims regarding relative constructions derive from the judgments of a single native speaker. However, his judgments with these and other analogous examples were fairly consistent. The sentences were examined in different orders each time and were intertwined with other construction types; each instance was tested on at least two separate occasions. Moreover, the same pattern was found with the patient and the recipient objects of the verbs *meni-* 'give' and *bichin-* 'take away'; that is, in these instances, when an internally headed relative was offered to the consultant, his interpretation corresponded to that of a patient relative. I acknowledge, however, that the nature of the task makes this kind of test admittedly controversial.

(65) *E-n-ra* *bena-ke* [*Wesna-n* ***joni*** *ochíti*
1-ERG-EV look.for-CMPL Wesna-ERG man:ABS dog:ABS
raon-kin-a].
cure-ASSOC-PP2

'I looked for the man whom Wesna helped to cure the dog'.
*I looked for the dog that Wesna helped the man to cure'.

In conclusion, this piece of evidence suggests that in dedicated malefactive and particularly in *-xon* applicative constructions, it is patient objects that are generally relativized through an internally headed strategy. However, all of this does not differentiate whether it is base object syntactic status vs. patient semantic role that is the relevant factor in these examples.

5.3. Interclausal control. In one type of complex sentence, the marker *-a* is used to encode anterior events, where the object of a dependent clause is coreferential with the subject (i.e., S/A argument) of its matrix clause. When the dependent clause is ditransitive, either object (i.e., the recipient or the patient) may be selected for this process (examples 66 and 67 are from Valenzuela 2002*a*:422):

(66) *Pena-n* (*bake-shoko*) *meni-**a**-ra* *ainbo*
Pena-ERG child-DIM give-PO>S/A-EV woman:ABS
xobo-n *ka-ke*.
house-ALL go-CMPL

'After Pena$_i$ gave (her$_j$) the baby, the woman$_j$ went home'.

(67) *Pena-n* (*ainbo*) *meni-**a**-ra* *bake* *wini-ke*.
Pena-ERG woman:ABS give-PO>S/A-EV child:ABS cry-CMPL

'After Pena$_i$ gave (it$_j$) to the woman, the child$_j$ cried'.

Analogously, in applicative constructions either the applicative or the base object may be interpreted as coreferential with the matrix clause subject. Let us imagine a situation where the speaker's mother lives in another village and the speaker sends Rono to take care of her. In this case, Rono is the base object and mother the applicative object:

(68*a*) *E-n* *raan-xon-**a**-bi-ra* *nokon* *tita*
1-ERG send-*xon*-PO>S/A-EMP-EV POS1 mother:ABS
isin-ke.
get.sick-CMPL

'Even though I sent him$_i$ (for her$_j$), my mother$_j$ got sick'.

(68*b*) *E-n* *raan-xon-**a**-bi-ra* *Rono* *ka-yama-ke*.
1-ERG send-*xon*-PO>S/A-EMP-EV Rono:ABS go-NEG-CMPL
'Even though I sent him$_i$ (for her$_j$), Rono$_i$ did not go'.

A sentence involving the associative applicative follows. Its context is that of a traditional story narrating how a man, feeling embarrassed after his sister-in-law painted part of his face black with genipa, went up to the sky and became the moon. During the nights when the moon cannot be seen completely, the Shipibo say that the man is showing the painted portion of his face:

(69*a*) *Ja-n* *be-ski-naan-a-ra* *ainbo* *siná-ke*.
3-ERG FACE-paint-MAL-PP2-EV woman:ABS get.angry-CMPL
'After she$_i$ painted (her$_j$ husband) on the face (to her$_j$ detriment), the woman$_j$ got angry'.

(69*b*) *Ja-n* *be-ski-naan-a-ra* *bene*
3-ERG FACE-paint-MAL-PP2-EV husband:ABS
rabin-ax *naikan* *ka-ke*.
feel.embarrassed-PSSS sky:ALL go-CMPL
'After she$_i$ painted (him$_j$) on the face (to his$_j$ wife's detriment), the man$_j$ felt embarrassed and went up to the sky'.

5.4. Reciprocalization. Since an object generally has the property of being able to be reflexive or reciprocal with the subject, one may ask which of the objects of a ditransitive applicative construction controls reciprocality. The following English examples illustrate the potential ambiguity when all participants are animate (from Peterson 2007:33):

(70*a*) *We met each other for the children.*
(70*b*) *We met the children for each other.*

In both sentences above, the expression 'each other' is coreferential with the subject. However, while in (70*a*) 'each other' encodes the patient participant, in (70*b*) it refers to the beneficiary.[20] Utterances where the applicative *-xon* and the reciprocal have been added to a verb root (in this order) are found in the text data. In all instances, 'each other' is interpreted as the applicative object (see also 77):

[20] In Hakha Lai, when similar expressions are encoded through applicative constructions (with the exception of instrumentals), only the applicative object may be understood as reciprocal with the subject (Peterson 2007:33–34).

(71) *Ja-bo-ra* *kokoti-bo* ***be-xon-anan****-ai*.
3-PL:ABS-EV fruit-PL:ABS bring-BEN-REC-INC
'They bring fruit for each other'.

However, the text data does not contain any instance in which *-xon* and the reciprocal combine on the same verb and all the arguments are human. Constructed examples including the V-REC-BEN sequence and three human participants were offered to native speakers, who provided free translations. In all instances, speakers readily interpreted the patient as reciprocal with the subject. When asked whether the beneficiary could also be understood as reciprocal with the subject, the speakers either rejected this reading or in some instances accepted it only after additional material was included:

(72*a*) *E-a-ra* *nokon* *bake-baon* *noko-**ananan-xon**-ke,*
1-ABS-EV POS1 child-PL:ERG meet-REC-*xon*-CMPL
'My children met each other for me'.

(72*b*) *E-a-ra* *nokon* *bake-baon* *noko-ananan-xon-ke,*
1-ABS-EV POS1 child-PL:ERG meet-REC-*xon*-CMPL
jato-n-a *jakon* *jawéki.*
3p-GEN-NMLZ good thing
'My children met me for each other, for their own benefit'.

In sum, the preliminary results offered here suggest that in the constructions at hand, either the applicative or the base object may be reciprocal with the subject: the (preferred) reading depends on the relative order in which the reciprocal suffix and the applicative *-xon* occur.

The addition of the dedicated malefactive suffix to a reciprocalized stem yields an ungrammatical sentence due to the minimal transitivity requirement; utterances exhibiting the reverse order (i.e., V-MAL-REC) have not been attested either. Therefore, it was not possible to test whether the subject in this construction type would be interpreted as reciprocal with the base and/or the malefactive object.

I do not have systematic elicited data on reciprocalization control in associative applicative constructions. However, verb roots followed by the reciprocal and the applicative *-kin* (in this order) occurred in the text data (examples 48 and 81) and show that the applicative object can be the reciprocal of the subject. Figure 1 summarizes the properties held by the different sorts of objects in the three applicative construction types.

Base and *-xon* applicative objects do not differ in coding properties, prenominal and postnominal relativization, or interclausal coreferentiality control. However, the data suggest that *-xon*-marked applicative objects have fewer object properties than base objects, since only the latter may be interpreted

	BASE OBJECT	APPLICATIVE OBJECT
Case marking		
—benefactive/malefactive	ABS	ABS
—dedicated malefactive	ABS	ABS
—associative	ABS/OBL	ABS/*betan*
Preverbal orders	+	+
Preposing/Right-dislocation	+	+
Prenominal Relative Clause	+	+
Postnominal Relative Clause	+	+
Internally Headed Relative Clause		
—benefactive/malefactive	preferred	
—dedicated malefactive	preferred	dispreferred
—associative	dispreferred	preferred
Cross-clausal control	+	+
Reciprocalization control		
—benefactive/malefactive	+ (V-REC-*xon*)	+ (V-*xon*-REC)
—dedicated malefactive	N.A./no data available	N.A./no data available
—associative	No data available	+ (V-REC-ASSOC)

FIG. 1.—Morphosyntactic properties of base and applicative objects.

as NP_{REL} in internally headed relatives. In reciprocalized constructions, both objects may be read as reciprocal with the subject, possibly depending on the relative order of the applicative and reciprocal suffixes. Object properties in dedicated malefactive applicative constructions are very similar to those mentioned for *-xon* constructions. In sum, despite minor differences, it can be said that in these two construction types patient and applicative objects are highly symmetrical. Associative applicative constructions differ from their *-xon* and dedicated malefactive counterparts in that their base or applicative object may exhibit alternative marking. Also, in internally headed relatives the associative object rather than the base object may be preferably interpreted as NP_{REL}.

6. Combination of valency-changing operations. This section deals with the combination of applicatives and other valency-changing operations such as reflexive, reciprocal, and causative (other well-known mechanisms such as agentive passive and antipassive are not available in SK).

6.1. Applicative and valency-increasing operations. The affective and dedicated malefactive applicatives follow causativized stems both in the text and elicited data; sentences with the opposite order were rejected.[21]

[21] Note, however, that the roots in (74) are not transitive, which precludes them from taking the malefactive directly. It is possible that combinations of V(tr.)-MAL-CAUS are possible given the right context.

(73) *onan-ma-xon-* [know-CAUS-BEN] 'teach someone for somebody else'
ani a-xon- [big do.T-BEN] 'grow/raise something/somebody for somebody else'
pani-n-xon- [hang-VBLZ-BEN] 'hang something for somebody else'

(74) *jiki-ma-naan-* [enter-CAUS-MAL] 'let somebody enter to somebody else's detriment'
mape-n-naan- [go.up-VBLZ-MAL] 'lift something to somebody else's detriment'
ani a-naan- [big do.T-MAL] 'grow/raise something/somebody to somebody else's detriment'

A different situation is found in associative applicative and causative combinations. The causativizer *-ma* may either precede or follow the associative to signal scope distinctions:

(75) *Rona-n-ra* *Wesna* *bake* *rao*
Rona-ERG-EV Wesna:ABS child:ABS medicine:ABS
*xea-**ma-kin**-ke.*
drink-CAUS-ASSOC-CMPL
'Rona helped Wesna give medicine to the child'.

(76) *E-n-ra* *nokon* *bene* *xea-**kin-ma**-ke.*
1-ERG-EV POS1 husband:ABS drink-ASSOC-CAUS-CMPL
'I made (him) drink with my husband'.

In contrast, the causativizers *a*(*k*) and *-n* necessarily precede the associative applicative; the reverse order yields ungrammatical utterances.

6.2. Applicative and valency-decreasing operations. Adding the reciprocal or middle suffixes to a verb has a detransitivizing effect. The applicative *-xon* can either precede or follow the reciprocal:

(77) *Oa* *rabé-ra* *ia* ***bi-xon-anan**-i* *iki.*
DIST two:ABS-EV lice:ABS get-BEN-REC-SSSS COP
'Those two are searching each other for lice'.

(78) *Ja-baon-ra* *e-a* *bi-**ananan-xon**-ke.*
3-PL:ERG-EV 1-ABS get-REC-*xon*-CMPL
'They got married for me'.

However, the occurrence of *-xon* with a middle-marked or detransitivized stem in general seems to be rare. In fact, the reciprocalized form *bi-ananan* in (78) may be considered as an instance of lexicalization: 'get married'. For expressions comparable to the English *He washed for me*, the preferred

construction is one marking the NP coding the benefactive participant with *kopi* 'because of'. However, one instance where *-xon* can combine with a middle-marked stem is the following (*-kaa* is the middle morpheme):

(79) *Kaisi-nin-ra* *mi-a* *ishton* *benxo**kaa-xon**-ke.*
Kaisi-ERG-EV 2-ABS quickly get.ready-*xon*-CMPL
'Kaisi got ready quickly for you'.

That the applicative *-xon* rarely co-occurs with the middle suffix might have to do with the fact that this latter morpheme already signals subject affectedness, and hence introduction of an additional affected participant would be incompatible.

Combinations of reciprocal or middle-marked stems with the dedicated malefactive were judged ungrammatical, most probably due to the minimal transitivity requirement imposed by this applicative on the base verb. This restriction would account for the impossibility of expressing, through a dedicated malefactive applicative construction, situations that seem pragmatically feasible, corresponding to the English *They left each other to the children's detriment* or *The child burned her/himself to my detriment*.

Unlike dedicated malefactive applicative constructions which disallow reciprocalized and middle-marked stems, and *-xon* applicative constructions where detransitivized stems are uncommon, the associative easily combines with reciprocalized and middle stems. In the examples below, the middle or the reciprocal precedes the associative:

(80) *Rona-n-ra* *nokon* *bake* *boexee-kin-ke.*
Rona-ERG-EV POS1 child:ABS comb:MID-ASSOC-CMPL
'Rona helped/told my child to comb (combing herself too)'.

(81) *Joni-n-ra* *jawen* *rawí* *i-**ananan-kin**-ke*
man-ERG-EV POS3 enemy:ABS do.I-REC-ASSOC-CMPL
*kopi-**anan-kin**-ke.*
return-REC-ASSOC-CMPL
'The man confronted his enemy as an equal'.

In the following text example, the associative *-kin* precedes the reciprocal:

(82) . . . *tee-ain-bo* *a-**kin-anan**-i* *no-n* *bake-bo*
. . . work-LOC-PL do.T-ASSOC-REC-SSSS 1p-GEN child-PL:ABS
ja-ská-a-xon *ani a-ti* *kopí.*
that-SIML-do.T-PSSA big do.T-INF reason
'. . . we (my husband and I) help each other in our work in order to be able to raise our children'.

6.3. Multiple applicative constructions. It is possible to attach more than one applicative to the same verb stem. Examples (83) and (84) are from Valenzuela (1997) and were confirmed by a different speaker. In (83), the associative refers to the son and the dedicated malefactive to the canoe owners:

(83) *Beso-n* *jawen* *bake* *jato-n* *nonti* *yoká-ti*
Beso-ERG POS3 child:ABS 3p-GEN canoe ask-INF

raan-a-ra *e-n* *yoká-**kin-naan**-tan-ke.*
send-PP2-EV 1-ERG ask.for-ASSOC-MAL-go.and.return-CMPL

'Beso$_i$ sent his son$_j$ to ask for their canoe, and I accompanied him$_j$ to do it to their detriment (probably they did not want to lend their canoe)'.

(84) *E-n-ra* *Rono* *shinan-**kin-xon**-ke* [*mia*
1-ERG-EV Rono:ABS think-ASSOC-BEN-CMPL 2:ABS

jaská-a-kin *a-xon-ti*].
so-do.T-SSSA do.T-BEN-INF

'I gave Rono the idea so that he made it that way for you'.

Examples (85*a*) and (85*b*) show two possible ways of coding the associated participant; marking *Wexá* with *betan*, as in (85*a*), eliminates the ambiguity found in (85*b*):

(85*a*) *E-n-ra* *Tsoma* *nonti* *rabi-kin-xon-ai*
1-ERG-EV Tsoma:ABS canoe:ABS praise-ASSOC-BEN-INC

Wexá ***betan***
Wexá COM

'I praise the canoe for Tsoma with Wexá'.

(85*b*) *E-n-ra* ***Wexá*** *Tsoma* *nonti*
1-ERG-EV Wexá:ABS Tsoma:ABS canoe:ABS

rabi-kin-xon-ai.
praise-ASSOC-BEN-INC

'I praised the canoe for Tsoma with Wexá'.
'I praised the canoe with Tsoma for Wexá'.

7. Conclusions. In this study I have shown that SK applicative constructions can be regarded as prototypical except for the fact that (with the possible exception of the associative) they are obligatory, which precludes us from assigning them a pragmatically marked function. SK applicatives combine differently with the basic transitivity types of verbs. The affective (i.e., benefactive/malefactive) *-xon* is overwhelmingly attested with transitives, a finding which is compatible with Shibatani's (1996) hypothesis that benefactives are based on the 'give' schema. When combined with transitives,

-xon has an almost exclusive benefactive interpretation, a situation that appears to be uncommon cross-linguistically.

One noteworthy property of the dedicated malefactive applicative is that it attaches to transitive stems only. I have shown that this restriction is in fact based on transitivity and not on an active vs. inactive distinction. Verbs of intermediate transitivity status exhibit a mixed and unpredictable behavior in terms of their ability to combine with the applicatives. I have also noted that certain verbs appear to be more strongly associated with an event schema that includes either a benefactive or a malefactive participant, so that a different reading is not acceptable even when the appropriate applicative is added. This can be interpreted as instances where preferred event conceptualization and language use affect the shape of grammar, overriding morphosyntactic principles. Also, there is some evidence suggesting that the dedicated malefactive applicative may place weaker semantic restrictions on its arguments than *-xon*. This hypothesis requires further research.

The associative applicative is equally attested with intransitive and transitive bases, and implies the involvement of both subject and applicative object. This joint participation may be reflected in the fact that with verbs having suppletive singular/intransitive vs. nonsingular/transitive stems, the latter rather than the former are required. It is also possible that this selection is related to the valency increase caused by the addition of the associative. Even though SK employs different constructions for applicativization and causativization, there is evidence showing that the associative applicative may be used for the coding of sociative causation.

Applicative suffixes typically follow other valency-changing elements; however, certain alternate morpheme orders are possible to signal scope distinctions. Given the minimal transitivity requirement imposed by the dedicated malefactive, it cannot combine with middle-marked and reciprocalized stems (which are detransitivized). Therefore, a morphosyntactic restriction seems to account for the impossibility of expressing, through a dedicated malefactive applicative construction, situations which are pragmatically feasible, such as 'They left each other to the children's detriment'. It was also noted that *-xon* rarely follows middle-marked stems despite the ease with which it combines with the different transitivity types of verbs.

A characteristic of SK is the absence of systematic morphosyntactic means for distinguishing direct from indirect objects, or primary from secondary objects. In consonance with this, the examination of the properties of base and applicative objects provided here shows that these also exhibit an overall symmetrical behavior.

Finally, an area where future research is imperative involves the grammaticalization sources of applicatives. As pointed out in **1.3**, the SK affective and associative suffixes are formally identical and semantically compatible with two same-subject or participant agreement markers associated with tran-

sitivity. Comparative work addressing this question will undoubtedly contribute to a better understanding of the different possible diachronic paths of applicative constructions.

REFERENCES

AIKHENVALD, ALEXANDRA Y. 2000. Transitivity in Tariana. Changing Valency: Case Studies in Transitivity, ed. R. M. W. Dixon and A. Y. Aikhenvald, pp. 145–72. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

AISSEN, JUDITH. 1983. Indirect object advancement in Tzotzil. Studies in Relational Grammar 1, ed. D. Perlmutter, pp. 272–302. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

AUSTIN, PETER. 1997. Causatives and applicatives in Australian aboriginal languages. The Dative and Related Phenomena, ed. K. Matsumura and T. Hayashi, pp. 165–225. Tokyo: Hitsuji Shobo.

COMRIE, BERNARD. 1985. Causative verb formation and other verb-deriving morphology. Language Typology and Syntactic Description, vol. 3, Grammatical Categories and the Lexicon, ed. Timothy Shopen, pp. 309–48. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____. 1989. Language Universals and Linguistic Typology. 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

CROFT, WILLIAM A. 1994. Voice: Beyond control and affectedness. Voice Form and Function, ed. B. Fox and P. J. Hopper, pp. 89–117. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

DONOHUE, MARK. 1996. Bajau: A symmetrical Austronesian language. Language 72:782–93.

_____. 1999. A Grammar of Tukang Besi. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

_____. 2001. Coding choices in argument structure: Austronesian applicatives in texts. Studies in Language 25:217–54.

DUFF-TRIPP, MARTHA. 1997. Gramática del Idioma Yanesha' (Amuesha). Lima: Ministerio de Educación del Perú and Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.

EAKIN, LUCILLE; ERWIN LAURIAULT; AND HARRY BOONSTRA. 1986. People of the Ucayali: The Shipibo and Conibo of Peru. International Museum of Cultures Publication 12. Dallas: International Museum of Cultures.

FAUST, NORMA. 1973. Lecciones para el Aprendizaje del Idioma Shipibo-Conibo. Yarinacocha, Pucallpa: Ministerio de Educación del Perú and Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.

FLECK, DAVID W. 2003. A grammar of Matses. Ph.D. dissertation, Rice University.

HYMAN, LARRY, AND ALESSANDRO DURANTI. 1982. On the object relation in Bantu. Studies in Transitivity, ed. P. Hopper and S. Thompson, pp. 217–39. New York: Academic Press.

ICHIHASHI-NAKAYAMA, KUMIKO. 1996. The "applicative" in Hualapai: Its functions and meanings. Cognitive Linguistics 7:227–39.

KIMENYI, ALEXANDRE. 1980. A Relational Grammar of Kinyarwanda. UCPL 91. Berkeley: University of California Press.

KNEELAND, HARRIET. 1979. Lecciones para el Aprendizaje del Idioma Mayoruna. Yarinacocha, Pucallpa: Ministerio de Educación del Perú and Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.

LORIOT, JAMES; ERWIN LAURIAULT; AND DWIGHT DAY. 1993. Diccionario Shipibo–Castellano. Yarinacocha, Pucallpa: Ministerio de Educación del Perú and Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.

MCGREGOR, WILLIAM. 1998. Applicative constructions in Warrwa. Case, Typology and Grammar, ed. A. Siewierska and J. J. Song, pp. 171–99. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

MORIN, FRANÇOISE. 1998. Los Shipibo-Conibo. Guía Etnográfica de la Alta Amazonía, vol. 3, ed. Fernando Santos and Frederica Barclay, pp. 275–435. Quito: FLACSO-Ecuador/IFEA.

PAYNE, DAVID L. 1990. Some widespread grammatical forms in South American languages. Amazonian Linguistics: Studies in Lowland South American Languages, ed. D. L. Payne, pp. 75–87. Austin: University of Texas Press.

_____. 2002. Causatives in Asheninka: The case for a sociative source. The Grammar of Causation and Interpersonal Manipulation, ed. M. Shibatani, pp. 485–505. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

PAYNE, DORIS L. 2000. The Yagua applicative and universals of role hierarchies. Paper presented at the annual meeting of SSILA, San Francisco, November 2000.

PAYNE, THOMAS E. 1997. Describing Morphosyntax: A Guide for Field Linguists. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

PETERSON, DAVID A. 2007. Applicative Constructions. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

RICH, ROLLAND G. 1999. Diccionario Arabela–Castellano. Lima: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.

RUDE, NOEL. 1986. Topicality, transitivity, and the direct object in Nez Perce. IJAL 52:24–153.

SHIBATANI, MASAYOSHI. 1996. Applicatives and benefactives: A cognitive account. Grammatical Constructions, ed. M. Shibatani and S. Thompson, pp. 157–94. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

SHIBATANI, MASAYOSHI, AND PRASHANT PARDESHI. 2002. The causative continuum. The Grammar of Causation and Interpersonal Manipulation, ed. M. Shibatani, pp. 85–126. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

SONG, JAE JUNG. 1990. On the rise of causative affixes: A universal typological perspective. Lingua 82:151–200.

SWIFT, KENNETH E. 1988. Morfología del Caquinte: Arawak Preandino. Yarinococha, Pucallpa: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.

TOURNON, JACQUES. 2002. La Merma Mágica: Vida e Historia de los Shipibo-Conibo del Ucayali. Lima: Centro Amazónico de Antropología y Aplicación Práctica.

VALENZUELA, PILAR M. 1997. Basic verb types and argument structures in Shipibo-Conibo. M.A. thesis, University of Oregon.

_____. 1999. Adverbials, transitivity and switch-reference in Shipibo-Konibo (Panoan). Chicago Linguistic Society 35: Panel on Linguistic Diversity and Linguistic Theory, ed. Sabrina J. Billings, John P. Boyle, and Aaron M. Griffith, pp. 355–71. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

_____. 2002*a*. Causativization and transitivity in Shipibo-Konibo. The Grammar of Causation and Interpersonal Manipulation, ed. M. Shibatani, pp. 417–83. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

_____. 2002*b*. Relativization in Shipibo-Konibo: A Typologically-Oriented Study. Lincom Studies in Native American Linguistics 42. Munich: Lincom Europa.

_____. 2003. Transitivity in Shipibo-Konibo grammar. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Oregon.

_____. 2005. Participant agreement in Panoan. Secondary Predication and Adverbial Modification: The Typology of Depictives, ed. Nikolaus P. Himmelmann and Eva F. Schultze-Berndt, pp. 259–98. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

VALENZUELA BISMARCK, PILAR, AND AGUSTINA VALERA ROJAS. 2005. Koshi Shinanya Ainbo: El Testimonio de una Mujer Shipiba. Lima: Fondo Editorial Facultad de Ciencias Sociales, Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos.

WISE, MARY RUTH. 2002. Applicative affixes in Peruvian Amazonian languages. Current Studies on South American Indian Languages, Indigenous Languages of Latin America 3, ed. Mily Crevels et al., pp. 329–44. Leiden: Research School of Asian, African, and Amerindian Studies.

_____. 1986. Grammatical characteristics of preandine Arawakan languages of Peru. Handbook of Amazonian Languages, ed. D. C. Derbyshire and G. K. Pullum, vol. 1, pp. 567–642. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

_____. 1971. Identification of Participants in Discourse: A Study of Aspects of Form and Meaning in Nomatsiguenga. Summer Institute of Linguistics Publications in Linguistics and Related Fields 28. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics.