

## Differential and non-differential object indexing in Mapudungun

### 1. Introduction

#### 1.1. The language

- Mapudungun (*mapu* ‘land’, *dungun* ‘speak, speech’) = the language of the Mapuche (Chile, Argentina): unclassified, with possible links to Arawakan (Díaz-Fernández 2011)
- ISO-code 693-3: *arn*; Glottolog: *mapu1245*
- [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mapuche\\_language](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mapuche_language)
- <https://mapudungunelhablamapuche.cl/>

#### 1.2. Typological micro-profile

- Simple phonology: 6 vowels, 22 consonants (including 6 approximants); obsolescent distinction between interdental and dento-alveolar consonants; no phonemic tone; stress largely predictable from syllable structure, which is moderately complex (Maddieson 2013): (C<sub>1</sub>)V(C<sub>2</sub>).
- Morphology: almost exclusively suffixing; relatively simple nominal structures (with compounding) but polysynthetic verbs (compound stems, nominal incorporation, NP verbalization); no flexivity, concatenative affixation, a handful of portmanteaus; no gender, no case, three numbers (SG, DU, PL).
- Syntax: dependent-marking at NP level, head-marking at clause level; constituent order VS and SVO (but S+O can each be agentive or patientive, Zúñiga 2019); agent-voice (direct verbs) vs. patient-voice clauses (inverse verbs); SBJ markers are neutrally aligned.

### 2. Differential object indexing: Formal aspects

- The rightmost affixal slots of the verbal complex:

(1) Finite:	...(-3.OBJ:P/INV-) MOOD-SBJ.PERSON-SBJ.NUMBER (-3.OBJ:A)
Nonfinite:	...(-OBJ:P/INV-) NFIN (-3.OBJ:A)


- Mapudungun verbs mark 0, 1, or 2 persons. Finite verbs show all three options:

- |     |                         |                     |   |
|-----|-------------------------|---------------------|---|
| (2) | a. <i>Mawün-i.</i>      | rain-IND[3]         | ‘It rained.’  |
|     | b. <i>Pe-i-m-i.</i>     | see-IND-2-SG        | ‘You (SG) saw (it/him/her/them).’                   |
|     | c. <i>Pe-fi-i-m-i.</i>  | see-3.OBJ-IND-2-SG  | ‘You (SG) saw it/him/her/them.’                     |
|     | d. <i>Elu-fi-i-m-i.</i> | give-3.OBJ-IND-2-SG | ‘You (SG) gave it/him/her/them to it/him/her/them.’ |

- Nonfinite verbs mark only 0 or 1 persons:

- (3) a. *mawün-n* rain-NFIN 'rain(ing)'  
 b. *pe-n* see-NFIN 'see(ing) (it/him/her/them)'  
 c. *pe-fi-n* see-3.OBJ-NFIN 'see(ing) it/him/her/them'  
 d. *elu-fi-n* give-3.OBJ-NFIN 'giving it/him/her/them to it/him/her/them'

Figure 1. Indexing alignment patterns (finite Vs, 3rd person)



### 3. Differential object indexing: Functional aspects

#### 3.1. Semantic and pragmatic factors (Zúñiga 2010; Zúñiga & Herdeg 2010)

- Variation with labile (4) and monotransitive (5)–(6) verbs:

- (4) a. *pe-pa-tu-i tañi pu che*  
 see-CIS-again-IND[3] 3.PSR PL person  
 'He saw his people again here.' (Salas 2006: 245)  
 b. *pe-pu-fi-i chi fūtra weda che*  
 see-TRANS-3.OBJ-IND[3] ART old evil person  
 'He saw the old, evil person there.' (Salas 2006: 211)
- (5) a. *langüm-i ñi ñuke*  
 kill-IND[3] 3.PSR mother  
 'He killed his mother.' (Salas 2006: 260)  
 b. *langüm-pu-fi-i tachi ngen-nge-lu fey mew*  
 kill-TRANS-3.OBJ-IND[3] ART master-be-PTCP DEM POSTP  
 'He killed [the demons] master (lit. the one being a master) there.' (Salas 2006: 211)
- (6) *feymew el-i tañi kure ka rüngal-me-fi-i eltun mew*  
 then have.funeral.for-IND[3] 3.PSR wife and bury-AND-3.OBJ-IND[3] tomb POSTP  
 'Then he had a funeral for his wife and went there to bury her in a tomb.' (Salas 2006: 239)

Table 1. Semantic/pragmatic factors: P argument in the  $\emptyset$ / $-fi$  opposition in 1/2/3→3 clauses<sup>1</sup>

	[±HUM]	[±DEF]	[±GIVEN]	[±ACCESS]	[±IMPORT]
$-\emptyset$ (50)	7– <b>43</b>	29–21	22–28	16– <b>34</b>	14– <b>36</b>
$-fi$ (39)	<b>25</b> –14	<b>35</b> –4	<b>26</b> –13	20–19	<b>23</b> –13

[±ACCESS] is Givón's (1994) referential distance measure (previous clauses)

[±IMPORT] is Givón's (1994) topic persistence measure (following clauses)

- Inaccessible and non-important non-human P's tend to be unmarked
- Definite, given (and important) human P's tend to trigger  $-fi$ 
  - ✚ Definite humans almost always trigger it (23::25)
  - ✚ Indefinite non-humans almost never trigger it (1::14)

∴ None of the factors is a sufficient or necessary condition (but they are with proper names and anaphora).<sup>2</sup>

### 3.2. Morphological factors

Table 2. Object indexing patterns<sup>3</sup>

	finite (IND)	nonfinite
1/2/3→3	direct: $\emptyset$ or $-fi_1-$	
3→1/2/3	inverse: $-mew$	
1SG→2SG	$-e-i-i-u$ -INV-IND-1-DU	$-fi_2-$ -OBJ-
1→2 (rest)	$-w-i-i-n$ -REFL-IND-1-PL	$(-w)-fi_2-$ -REFL*-OBJ-
2SG→1SG	$-e-n$ -INV-1SG.IND	$-fi_2-$ -OBJ-
2→1 (rest)	$-mu-Z$ -INV- $\{1_i\}$	$(-mu)-fi_2-$ -INV-OBJ-

∴  $fey$  'MED.DEM' has turned into two different verbal affixes when (further) grammaticalized:

- ✚  $-fi_1$  with mixed and non-local (1/2/3↔3) interactions (whether finite or nonfinite V<sub>s</sub>), and
- ✚  $-fi_2$  with local (1/2↔1/2) interactions (only nonfinite V<sub>s</sub>)

### 3.3. Syntactic factors

- I have not found any variation with (finite) underived ditransitives, either in elicitation or spontaneous interaction; in the speech of all my informants (from three different Chilean dialects), underived ditransitivity always triggers  $-fi$ .

<sup>1</sup> Based on seven narrative texts (five from Augusta 1910, one from Coña 1930, and one from my own field recordings made in June 2010).

<sup>2</sup> The interested reader is also referred to a non-stochastic account in Golluscio (2010) and an intriguing—but probably erroneous—analysis in Smeets (2008: 154).

<sup>3</sup> Z represents the different 1st-person-indicative markers:  $-n$  '1SG.IND',  $-i-i-u$  'IND-1-DU',  $-i-i-n$  'IND-1-PL'.

- (7) a. *kūla-ke elu-fi-n mansana*  
 three-NSG give-3.OBJ-1SG.IND apple  
 ‘I gave them three apples each / an apple to each of them three.’ (Smeets 2008: 112)
- b. *elu-düingu-a-fi-n*  
 give-matter-FUT-3.OBJ-1SG.IND  
 ‘I will communicate the matter to him/her/them.’ (Augusta 1916: 39)
- (8) a. *ka-ke-lu pi-la-i tañi elu-a-fi-el*  
 other-NSG-PTCP say-NEG-IND[3] 3.PSR give-FUT-3.OBJ-NFIN  
 ‘They did not want (lit. did not say) to give to others.’ (Smeets 2008: 410)
- b. *feychi elu-el ofisha kom tüfeychi ilo nü-ke-i*  
 ART give-NFIN sheep all DEM meat take-HAB-IND[3]  
 ‘The one to whom the lamb has been given takes the rest of the meat.’ (Augusta 1910 1.11)
- Derived mono- and di-transitives show variation. Monotransitive causatives pattern with underived monotransitives — they show DOI (cf. CAUS in (5)):
- (9) a. *apüm-i pülku*  
 finish.CAUS-IND[3] wine  
 ‘S/he finished the wine.’ (Salas 2006: 171; intransitive *af-* ‘finish’)
- b. *are-m-i ko*  
 heat-CAUS-IND[3] water  
 ‘S/he heated water.’ (Golluscio 2007: 217)
- c. *küdaw-el-fi-n Pedro*  
 work-CAUS-3.OBJ-1SG.IND P.  
 ‘I made Pedro work.’ (Golluscio 2007: 225)
- I have found only very little variation with applicatives; we typically find *-fi* there.
- (10) a. *aku-lu engün ngüma-l-fi-i ka feypi-fi-i engün:...*  
 arrive-PTCP 3PL cry-APPL-3.OBJ-IND[3] and tell-3.OBJ-IND[3] 3PL  
 ‘When they (PL) arrived, he cried for them and told them: ...’ (Salas 2006: 260)
- b. *entu-ñma-fi-i tañi ekulluw-küle-mum pontro*  
 remove-APPL-3.OBJ-IND[3] 3.PSR cover.oneself-PROG-NMLZ poncho  
 ‘He took away from her the poncho she was covering herself with.’ (Salas 2006: 262)

Table 3. Count in 16 narrative texts  
 in Salas (2006) (3rd person, active)

	DIR.FIN	DIR.NFIN	Semantic Role	
<i>-ñma</i>	6::7	1::7 ( <i>-lu</i> )	Maleficiary, animate Source	Possessor, “Affectee”
<i>-l</i>	14::16	2::16 ( <i>-el, -lu</i> )	Beneficiary, animate Goal	
<i>-tu</i>	10::12	1+1::12 ( <i>-am</i> )	animate Goal, Stimulus, CoS-Patient	
<i>-ye</i>	2::2	—	Motion Comitative, Topic of Speech/Thought	

(11) a. *feymew tífachi weche wentru tripa-rke-i* [...]
   
then this young man exit-REP-IND[3]
   
*witranma-me-a-lu tañi kiñe kúme weníy*
  
visit-AND-FUT-PTCP 3.PSR one good friend
   
'Then, they say, this young man went out [...], in order to visit a good friend of his.'
   
(Salas 2006: 307)

b. *fey tichi kura lawen-tu-am tachi kutran*
  
DEM ART stone medicine-VBLZ-NFIN ART sick
   
'That one was the stone [used] for treating the sick [man].' (Salas 2006: 214)

(12) *anü-ñma-nie-i-m-i kiñe makuñ*
  
sit.down-APPL-ASP-IND-2-SG one blanket
   
'You are sitting on a blanket.' (Augusta 1916: 10)

Golluscio (2010: 722) reports variation in the Argentinean variety of her informant(s) (possibly related to "the speaker's perception of the topicality of the recipient"):

(13) a. *kicha-l-n ropa tañi püñeñ*
  
wash-APPL-1SG.IND clothes 1SG.PSR child.of.woman
   
'I (F) washed my child's clothes.'

b. *kicha-l-fi-n ropa tañi püñeñ*
  
wash-APPL-3.OBJ-1SG.IND clothes 1SG.PSR child.of.woman
   
'I (F) washed clothes for my child.'

#### 4. (Interim) conclusions

- a) There are two suffixes *-fi* that mark objects high on the Silversteinian nominal hierarchy. The marker occurring with 3rd-person objects shows functionally motivated variation: definite humans tend to trigger it while indefinite inanimates tend not to do so. The marker occurring with 1st/2nd-person objects in nonfinite forms is obligatory.
- b) The variation observed with 3rd-person objects is sensitive to both predicate valency and morphological status:
  - underived ditransitives show no variation;
  - (monotransitive) causatives seem to pattern (roughly?) like underived monotransitives; and
  - applicatives show only little variation: at least in Central Mapudungun, they tend to obligatorily take the object marker (except with inanimate objects).

## Abbreviations

A agent-like argument of transitive predicate, AND andative, APPL applicative, ART article, CAUS causative, CIS cislocative, DEF definite, DEM demonstrative, DU dual, FUT future, HAB habitual, HUM human, IND indicative, INV inverse, MED medial, NEG negation, NFIN non-finite, NSG non-singular, OBJ object, P patient-like argument of transitive predicate, PL plural, POSTP postposition, PROG progressive, PSR possessor, PTCP participle, REFL reflexive, REP reportative, SG singular, SBJ subject, TRANS translocative, VBLZ verbalizer  
 1, 2, 3 grammatical persons  
 x→y x acts on y

## References

- Augusta, Félix José de. 1910. *Lecturas araucanas*. Valdivia: Imprenta de la Prefectura Apostólica.
- Augusta, Félix José de. 1916 [2007]. *Diccionario araucano. Mapuche-español, español-mapuche*. Santiago: Ediciones Cerro Manquehue.
- Coña, Pascual. 1930 [2006]. *Lonco Pascual Coña ñi tuculpazugun. Testimonio de un cacique mapuche*. Santiago: Pehuén.
- Díaz-Fernández, Antonio. 2011. Relaciones genéticas del mapuzungun. Aportes para su ubicación dentro del stock Equatorial. In Fernández Garay, Ana & Díaz-Fernández, Antonio (eds.), *Investigaciones sobre lenguas indígenas sudamericanas*, 41–85. Santa Rosa: Ediciones de la Universidad Nacional de La Pampa.
- Givón, Talmy (ed.). 1994. *Voice and inversion*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Golluscio, Lucía. 2007. Morphological causatives and split intransitivity in Mapudungun. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 73.2: 209–238.
- Golluscio, Lucía. 2010. Ditransitive constructions in Mapudungun. In: Malchukov, Andrej; Haspelmath, Martin & Comrie, Bernard (eds.), *Studies in ditransitive constructions: A comparative handbook*, 710–756. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Maddieson, Ian. 2013. Syllable structure. In: Dryer, Matthew S. & Haspelmath, Martin (eds.), *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*, Ch. 12. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. (<http://wals.info/chapter/12>, accessed on 2022-05-11.)
- Salas, Adalberto. 2006. *El mapuche o araucano*. 2nd, rev. ed. Santiago de Chile: Centro de Estudios Públicos.
- Smeets, Ineke. 2008. *A grammar of Mapuche*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Zúñiga, F. 2010. La marca diferencial del objeto en mapudungún. *Lingüística* 24: 141–164.
- Zúñiga, Fernando. 2019. Grammatical relations in Mapudungun. In A. Witzlack-Makarevich & B. Bickel (eds.), *Argument selectors: A new perspective on grammatical relations*, 39–67. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Zúñiga, Fernando. & Herdeg, Alexandra. 2010. A closer look at Mapudungun inversion and differential object marking. Paper read at the EuroBABEL Cross-CRP meeting ‘Development of tag sets and tagging standards for the analysis of hierarchy effects in language corpora’, Villa Tillmanns, Leipzig, Germany, March 14–16.