INTRODUCTION

The languages of the Americas are rich and diverse with regard to the two main mechanisms for valence increase, i.e. causative and applicative (see Shibatani 2002, and Craig & Halle 1988, respectively). The Amazon is no exception in this respect, and in fact, in this area, a variety of such constructions are found with particular frequency.

At first sight, causative and applicative have not much in common besides the introduction of a new central participant in the manner of existence\(^1\) described by the predicate. Assuming that at least some languages show a clear hierarchization of grammatical relations (subj > object(s)), we expect that in such languages the incremental participant enters the clause scene either through the top — subject —, or through the bottom — object. This lends respectively causatives and applicatives. A further look, however, may show that both have a similar effect on the object position, since that position shall host the participant that is thereby being demoted (in the case of the causative) or promoted (for the applicative). On verbs with a single argument the object position is created, whereas in verbs that require a direct object a competition for the object's position is brought about between the participant originally treated as direct object and the demoted / promoted participant. The landing ground for a participant barred from the direct object slot is that of the indirect object. Or, alternatively in a given language, that of an adjunct since no valence change mechanism seems to increase the number of core arguments beyond that allowed by the lexical, non derived, argument structure of verbs (Haspelmath & Muller-Bradey 2004).

Moreover, the two processes of valence increase converge in those causatives that show both the causer and the causee as participating in the same way with regard to the manner of existence described by the predicate, namely, the causative comitative, rendered more often than not by way of an applicative construction (Sikuani, Arawak languages). A final point of intersection between causative and applicative is the way they impinge on the passive. On the one hand, a causative verb like ‘make’ or ‘get’ is used, through reflexivization, as a passive auxiliary (Arawak-Lokono; Munduruku; cf. French il s'est fait renverser par un bus; and English he got himself arrested). On the other hand, the promotion of a participant that is affected indirectly, a typical effect of the applicative function, may be achieved with the increment entering the core not through the bottom but through the top, by giving it access to the subject’s position of a light verb like ‘have’, the complement of which is the original clause now in the shape of a participial form of the passive (I had my temperature taken by the doctor).

The most interesting aspect of the morphosyntax of causatives is the fate of the causee. Usually, languages choose between two basic strategies, which we can refer to as leap-frog and push-chain. Leap-frog causatives, whose mechanics, if not the label, was identified long ago by Comrie (1974) in French, Turkish and other languages, in some way instantiated in the Amazonian area by Émérillon (Tupi-Guarani), leads the causee, deprived of its subject position, to take the first free position in a descending hierarchy of grammatical relations (direct object > indirect object > adjunct). Push-chain causatives, attested in Sikuani, lead the causee to preempt the direct object position, while the participant that happened to be there moves to the indirect object position. A three-place causativised verb should thus relegate an original indirect object to an adjunct role. This game of musical chairs in which the causative and the applicative engage has an effect on case as well as on grammatical relations, and if a

---

\(^1\) This phrase is put forward as a cover term for all types of propositional meanings that predicates convey, such as states, events, actions, properties and so on.
zone of objects is created as a consequence of it, the result in terms of ranking has to be identified for both domains, cases and grammatical relations: The Korean causative (Kozinsky & Polinsky 1993) generates a double accusative but not a double object, since only one of them has the syntactic properties of the object of a divalent verb; the Bantu applicative (Kisseberth & Abasheikh 1977) results in two objects whose syntactic hierarchy varies following the operation taken as a test (passivation, etc.). The promotion achieved by the applicative can also be obtained by the simple assignment of dative case to the new participant, as in the traditional "dative of interest" of some Romance languages (e.g. Spanish me lo dañaron). Finally, languages commonly select verbal predicates as targets for increasing valence processes, but this is no necessity. On the one hand the existence of causation on nominal predicates (existential: A makes B exist; possessive: A makes B have C; tranformative: A makes B be C) is proposed for some Tupi-Guarani languages. On the other hand, a category of nominal applicatives (Ribeiro 2002) can be posited, for languages that feature the distinction between "alienable / inalienable" nouns, in order to account for the morphosyntax of so-called genitive classifiers required by possessed "alienable" nouns.

Several semantic subtypes of causatives may co-occur in one and the same grammatical system. The most common are the direct type (make X VERB), the inductive (have X VERB), the permissive (let X VERB), the assistive (help X VERB), and, as we have seen, the comitative (have X VERB while VERBing oneself). Often, these types make use of different formal material and rely on subtle distinctions involving the differential controlling capacity of the causer and the causee. Recent Tupi-Guarani studies (Praça 2007) have shown that the well-known existence of two different constructions depending on the valence of the causativised verb does not rest, at least in certain languages, on the formal category of valence per se (monovalents take a causative prefix, divalents take a causative suffix, phonologically different from the former). Instead, the choice ultimately relies on the semantic clue of degree of agentivity retained by the causee. This could shed some light on the affinity, often observed cross-linguistically, between the direct type of causative and single-argument verbs. The applicative is commonly used to bring closer to the center of the scene a participant whose semantic role, given a particular verb, forces it to surface as an adjunct or some periphrastic expression. A human entity, especially a speech act participant, indirectly affected by, or interested in, the manner of existence described by the predicate, is the most eligible candidate for promotion via the applicative, but other roles show also some propensity to it, the more common of them being instrument and location.

On the diachronic side, the causative generally displays, on the axis of grammaticalization, a stage that goes from a bi-clausal construction where the main lexical verb is the non-finite complement of a causal verb of the type make — periphrastic causatives — up to a single clausal construction marking causation merely by an affix. The semantics described above can take advantage of this difference between the two formal devices when both exist in one single language. The morphology of the applicative, as we know, results from a kind of incorporation (Baker 1988) often involving adpositions and, less commonly, verbs and even nouns. Depending on the developmental diachronic stage of grammaticalization, the etymology of the applicative morpheme is more or less transparent. When it is, we would expect that the applicative does not retain the entire semantics of the etymon. Because grammaticalization is a continuum, some languages like Panara (je, Dourado 2001) show a situation where, under some conditions regarding the order of constituents, the distinction between object of the applicative verb — core argument status —
and adpositional object — adjunct status — is a real challenge to the linguist. Also, and because grammaticalization only represents the initial part on the axis of semantic demotivation that a given element undergoes, the process can extend up to lexicalization.

The whole collection of papers proposed hereafter relies on first-hand field data. Each paper is authored by a long term specialist in the language. The analyses of valence increasing patterns supplied in these original works are clear evidence of how the languages of Amazonia can lead general typological/theoretical issues to tighten their links to the empirical manifestations of the universality/diversity dialectics. [...]