

Discourse Function, Ergativity and Agreement in Cakchiquel Mayan

Nancy Hedberg
University of Minnesota
Nov. 1988

Cakchiquel, a language of the Quichean subfamily of Mayan languages¹, like all Mayan languages exhibits a system of verb-agreement that has an ergative-absolutive organization. Following standard usage in ergativity studies (e.g., Dixon 1979), I will use the label "S" to refer to the logical subject of an intransitive verb, "A" to refer to the logical subject of a transitive verb and "O" to refer to the logical object of a transitive verb.²

The verb agreement system is quite complex. Several factors combine to determine whether a given logical argument will be cross-referenced on the verb with an ergative prefix, with an absolutive prefix, or not morphologically cross-referenced at all. With intransitive verbs, the single argument, which is always S, always cross-referenced with the Absolutive prefix. With transitive verbs, the situation is more complicated. The two most transparent factors are whether the argument in question is A or O; and whether the verb is Active, Passive, Absolutive Antipassive or Focus Antipassive in voice. The combined constraints imposed on verb agreement by these two factors are summarized in the following chart.

¹ Cakchiquel, Tzutujil and Quich and Kekch are members of the Quichean branch of Mayan languages. Cf. Campbell (1979). Standard references on ergativity are Comrie (1978) and Dixon (1979).

² The phonemic symbols should be interpreted as follows:

x	unvoiced palatal fricative
ch	unvoiced alveopalatal affricate
j	unvoiced velar fricative
q	unvoiced uvular stop
ʼ	glottalized consonant (ejective or implosive)

The abbreviated morphological glosses should be interpreted as follows:

CPL	completive aspect	IRR	irrealis
INCPL	incompletive aspect		def definite
A	absolutive		MOD modal
E	ergative	neg	negative
3	third-person		cont continuative
s	singular	plur	plural
p	plural		fem feminine

fl indicates the third-person singular absolutive zero morpheme.

Voice	\ Role	A	O
Active		ERG	ABS
Passive		--	ABS
Focus Antipassive		ABS/---	ABS/---
Absolutive Antipassive		ABS	---

Indeterminacy remains only in the case of the A and O arguments with Focus Antipassive verbs. The choice of which of the logical argument to reference on the verb apparently depends on the person and number of both arguments, and possibly also on the lexical status of third-person arguments, i.e. whether they are expressed as pronouns or as full noun phrases.

The purpose of the present paper is to present the agreement facts about the Focus Antipassive and the other voices in Cakchiquel Mayan, and to begin identifying discourse factors which might explain the system. Before turning to the discussion of the voice constructions, however, it is necessary to lay out some preliminary information about Cakchiquel grammar.³

1. Cakchiquel verbal morphology

The following template schematically represents the morphological structure of a transitive verb in Cakchiquel. Except for the special 'perfect' verbs, a verb consists of at least a stem along with an aspect prefix and at least an absolutive prefix. Active voice transitive verbs contain an ergative prefix as well. Many verbs contain a voice suffix as well, as will be discussed in detail below. Finally, one or more suffixes may appear from the class loosely labeled *mode* below:

³The data for this paper come from Emilio Chagil, a native speaker of Cakchiquel from San Lucas, Guatemala. Emilio was the consultant in Field Methods courses at the University of Minnesota, Fall Quarter 1981 and Spring Quarter 1984, and has continued to work with me and with the instructor for the field methods course, Nancy Stenson. I am very grateful both to him for his patience through many hours of elicitation and text transcription, and to Nancy Stenson for her patient criticism and continuing interest in Cakchiquel.

ASPECT ⁴	ABSOLUTIVE ⁵	ERGATIVE	STEM	VOICE	MODE
Completive x-	1st sing	1st singRoot		Active	Directional -El, pe, -qa
Incompletive ni-/y-	2nd sing	2nd sing	Derived	Passive	Opt, Fut, Nec -na
Obligative ti-/k-	3rd sing	3rd sing		Absol Antipas	Locative Focus -we
Potential Xk-/Xt-	1st plural	1st plural		Focus AntiPas	Irrealis -ta
	2nd plural	2nd plural	Imperative		Reflexive -ERG-i
	3rd plural	3rd plural			

The exact phonetic form of the person number prefixes depends on how they are combined:

Abs\Erg	1sg	2sg	3sg	1pl	2pl	3pl
1sg	--	in-a	i-ir	--	in-i	in-ki
2sg	at-in	--	at-ur	at-qa	--	at-ki
3sg	in	a	u	qa	i	ki
1pl	--	oj-a	oj-or	--	oj-i	oj-ki
2pl	ix-in	--	ix-ir	ix-qa	--	ix-ki
3pl	e-en	a-a	e-r	e-qa	e-e	e-ki

There are two classes of active verb stems. Root Transitive stems are monosyllabic and can be inflected to form five distinct derived stems:

⁴ An aspect prefix is required except in the Perfect construction where no aspect prefix appears on the verb. y- and (x)k- occur before vowel-initial absolutive prefixes {-in, -at, -oj, -ix, -e} while ni- and (x)ti- before the other absolutive prefixes, i.e. before the null 3rd person singular absolutive prefix {-Ø} and before consonant-initial {-qu}. {x-} is realized as [s] before stems beginning with [ts] or [s] preceded only by the {-Ø} absolutive prefix. I follow the terminology of Dayley (1981) for Tzutujil.

⁵ An absolutive marker is required except in the Perfect construction in which only an Ergative prefix appears on the verb. The third person singular absolutive morpheme {-Ø} is phonologically null. The third person singular ergative morpheme has several allomorphs, depending for example on whether it occurs word-initially or word-medially and on whether it occurs before a vowel-initial stem or not. {-qu} is an alternative 1st person plural absolutive marker to {-oj}, which is possibly used to mark agentive participation in an intransitive action. There is another set of ergative prefixes, which occur before vowel-initial stems. The ergative prefixes are also used as possessive prefixes in genitive and relational noun phrase constructions. The absolutive prefixes are also used to mark the subjects of predicate adjectives and nouns and are morphologically incorporated into the independent pronouns.

Root Tr	Active	Passive	Imperative	<i>tax</i> -Passive	Antipassive	Focus
'do/make'	ban	ba:n	bana?	banataj	banon	bano?
'light'	bOx	bo:x	boxo?	boxotaj	boxon	boxo?
'catch'	chap	cha:p	chapa?	chapataj	chapon	chapo?
'cut'	chOy	cho:y	choyo?	choyotaj	choyon	choyo?
'beat'	ch ak	ch'a:k	ch aka?	ch'akataj	ch'akon	ch'ako?
'push'	nIm	ni:m	nima?	nimataj	nimon	nimo?
'hurt'	sOk	----	soko?	sokotaj	sokon	soko?
'eat'	tIj	ti:j	tija?	tijataj	tijon	tijo?
'help'	to?	to?	to?	----	to?on	to?o?
'pay'	tOj	to:j	tojo?	tojotaj	tojon	tojo?
'cook'	tsak	tsa:k	tsaka?	tsakataj	tsakon	tsako?

Derived Transitive verbs are formed by adding a voice suffix, {-Vj}, {-Vx} or {-Vn}, to a monosyllabic root. In a few cases only, the root functions as an intransitive verb as well a transitive verb.

Derived Tr	Active/ Imperative	Passive ⁶	Antipassive/ Focus	Root Intransitive	Gloss
'kill'	kOmsaj	kOmsEs	kOmsan	kOm	'die'
'look for'	kusaj	kusEs	kusan	----	
'break'	paxij	paxIx	paxan	pax	'break'
'learn'	tamaj	tamEx	taman	----	
'call'	wOyoj	wOyox	wOyon	----	

⁶{-s-} is a causative marker. Thus the verb meaning 'kill' in Cakchiquel is literally 'cause to die.' The passive suffix {-X} is realized as [s] when the closest preceding consonant is [s].

2. Active Constructions

Some elicited examples of active intransitive and transitive constructions showing the ergative-accusative patterning of the agreement prefixes on active voice verbs are shown in (1):

- (1) (a) **rie? x - e - kOm**
 3pPRO CMPL-3pABS-die
 'They died'
- (b) **rioj x - oj - war**
 1pPRO CMPL-1pABS-sleep
 'We slept'
- (2) (a) **rioj x-e-qa-nIm rie?**
 1pPro Cpl-3pA-1pE-push 3pPro
 'We pushed him'
- (b) **rie? x-oj-ki-wOyoj rioj**
 3pPro Cpl-1pA-3pE-call 1pPro
 'They called us'

Independent subject and object pronouns may be omitted. Du Bois (1987, for Sacapultec Mayan), Dayley (1981, for Tzutujil Mayan), Larsen (1987, for Quiche) claim in fact that sentences in ordinary discourse never reference both an A-argument and an O-argument of a clause with independent pronouns. This claim appears to hold true in Cakchiquel as well. In approximately 700 clauses from, none contains more than one independent A or O pronoun.⁷

The most typical word order in sentences elicited in isolation is AVO or SV as in the above examples. Proto-Mayan is commonly cited as having had VOA/VS order⁸. Basic word order in present-day Mayan languages has been claimed to be AVO/SV, VAO/VS or VOA/VS, depending on the language. The most frequently occurring word order in all of them, however, is

⁷These texts include one long, 400 clause narration of the feature film, "El Norte"; nine short spontaneous narratives totally 150 clauses; and two on-line narrations of short films without words, containing a total of 150 clauses. All the texts were produced by Emilio Chagill, and transcribed by Nancy Stenson and myself.

⁸The commonly used terminology SVO, VSO, VOS employs 'S' as a cover term for my 'S' and 'A'.

said to be AVO/SV. I will argue that word order in Cakchiquel is Topic+Focus+VX* as claimed also by Norman (1978) and Larsen (1987) for Quiche. See Gundel (e.g. 1985) and Hedberg (forthcoming) for a discussion of the discourse-functional construct 'topic' (roughly, what a sentence is about) and 'focus' (the primary stressed constituent of a sentence).

1.2 Verb + Subject: VS/VA

In constituent questions, only the question word appears in preverbal Focus position: the other arguments appear post-verbally, as does the A in (3a). When the question concerns the time or place of a transitive event, both A and O can appear post-verbally and in either order, as in the elicited example (3b) but if A is a pronoun it will appear immediately after the verb as in (3c). A and S Subjects also regularly appear post-verbally in subordinate clauses.

- (3) (a) **achike x-fl-u-IOq' ri-achin**
 what Cpl-3sA-3sE-buy def-man
 What did the man buy?
- (b) (i) **ajampe x-fl-u-tsak ri-rukil ri-isOq**
 when Cpl-3sA-3sE-cook def-food def-woman
 When did the woman cook the food?
- (ii) **ajampe x-fl-u-tsak ri-isOq ri-rukil**
 when Cpl-3sA-3sE-cook def-woman def-food
 When did the woman cook the food?
- (d) **ajampe x-fl-ki-ti:j rie? ri-Ek'**
 when Cpl-3sA-3pE-eat 3pPro def-chicken
 When did they eat the chicken?

Subordinate clauses frequently exhibit VA order, as in the examples in (4a-b), or VS as in (4c-d):

- (4) (a) **i kwan x-fl-ki-ts'at rie? ...**
 and when Cpl-3sA-3pE-see 3pEPro
 'and when they had seen it ...'
 [El Norte]
- (b) **akwi x-fl-u-bij ri-ru-te ru-tata ch-fl-e**
 how Cpl-3sA-3sE-say def-3sE-mother 3sE-father to-3sE-at
 like his parents told him
 [El Norte]
- (c) **entons k'o chi x-fl-ki-tamaj-na akwi y-e-tsjon ri-mejikans**
 then exist to Cpl-3sA-3pE-learn-Obl how Incpl-3pA-speak Def-Mexicans
 then they had to learn how the Mexicans speak
 [El Norte]
- (d) **chi y-e-ek'o-pe rie? k'a awe, k'a estads-unids**
 to Incpl-3pA-cross-come 3pPro until here, until states-United
 in order to get up to here, to the U.S.
 [El Norte]

VA order also appears in main clauses where the agent is expressed as an independent pronoun immediately following the initial verb as in (5a-c). As mentioned above, overt expression of an already activated and topical referent via an independent pronoun is rare when that referent is also cross-referenced on the verb. The function in these cases appears to be that of signalling the beginning of a new narrative section of the story (cf., for example, the discussion of Li and Thompson (1979) for the occurrence of non-zero pronouns in Chinese).

- (5) (a) **x-fl-ki-bij rie? chi y-e-kOm-s-Es cuqa**
 Cpl-3sA-3pE-say 3pPro that Incpl-3pE-die-cause-pass also
 They said that they would be killed also
 [El Norte]
- (b) **x-fl-ra-jo-ta ria? chi x-fl-tsjon-ta ru-k'In r-ana?**
 Cpl-3sA-3sE-want-Irr 3sPro to Cpl-3sA-speak-Irr 3sE-with 3sE-sister
 He wanted to speak with his sister
 [El Norte]
- (c) **i s-fl-samOj ria? ru-k'In ri-ka?i ru-q'a**
 and Cpl-3sA-work 3sPro 3sE-with def-two 3sE-hand
 and he worked with his two hands
 [El Norte]

VS order is sometimes used when participants new to the discourse are introduced, as in (6ii) below:

- (6) (i) **w- chbil i rIn najin ni-qu-ets'an**
 1sE-friend and 1sPro Prog Incpl-1pA-play
 a friend and I were playing
- (ii) **kwan ichajk'Imba s-fl-sk'in anaj Achik'o, jun chi-k-e ri-q- chbil**
 when suddenly Cpl-3sA-scream out Francisco, one to-3pE-at def-1pE-friend
 when all of a sudden Francisco, one of our friends, screamed
 [Snake bite story]

1.3 Object + Verb: OV

The object (O argument) may also appear in pre-verbal position. This order is typically one where A functions as a topic and O functions as a quantified phrase. In (4a) below, exhibiting AOV order, the initial A-argument functions as a new topic and O is the quantified expression meaning 'nothing'. In (4b) and (4c) which exhibit OV order, the A-argument functions as an already activated topic and hence is not expressed in the sentence, and again O is a quantified phrase meaning 'not much' or 'nothing':

- (4) (a) **ri-winaq ri x-in-ki-ts'at ma-jun-achike-ta x-fl-ki-ban**
 Def-people Rel Cpl-1sA-3pE-see neg-one-what-Irr Cpl-3sA-3pE-do
 the people who saw me didn't do anything.
 [Robbery Story]
- (b) **ma-k'I -ta mas pOq x-fl-k-Il**
 neg-much-Irr more money Cpl-3sA-3pE-find
 They didn't find much money
 [Robbery Story]
- (c) **ma-jun-achike-ta x-fl-ki-ban ch-w-e**
 neg-one-what-Irr Cpl-3sA-3pE-do to-1sE-at
 They didn't do anything to me
 [Robbery Story]

- (d) **ma-jun-mas-ta tsieq n-fl-a-kusaj ch-aw-ij**
 neg-one-more-Irr clothes Incpl-3sA-2sE-need to-2sE-at
 'So you don't have to wear too many clothes.'
 [Lake walk story]
- (e) (i) **taqaq'ij sabado, ma-jun-achike-ta x-fl-qa-ban**
 morning saturday neg-one-what-Irr Cpl-3sA-1pE-do
 'Saturday morning, we didn't do anything'
- (ii) **ma-jun-achike-ta x-fl-in-ban**
 neg-one-what-Irr Cpl-3sA-1pE-do
 'I didn't do anything.'
 [Emilio's weekend story]

Sentence (5) below also exhibits OV order and is used to open a story about the Guatemalan earthquake of 1976. Here the O is not a quantified phrase but it does function as a new topic.

- (5) **ri-sononEl x-fl-qa-na? nImaq'ayan ri-kwatro.**
 Def-earthquake Cpl-3sA-1pE-feel morning Def-four
 We felt the earthquake early in the morning of the fourth [of February]
 [Earthquake Story]

OAV order also is possible, but the verbs in such sentences are obligatorily in the focus antipassive voice, and will therefore be discussed in section 3 below. Preverbal position also frequently contains quantified phrases other than O arguments of active verbs. These again can be analyzed as filling the Focus slot. The examples in (6i-iii) illustrate, respectively, preverbal quantified noun phrases that are S arguments, O subjects of *tax*-passives, and possessor of O:

- (6) (i) **k'Ij winaq x-e-kOm**
 many people Cpl-3pA-die
 many people died
- (ii) **i sibilaj k'Ij winaq x-e-soko-taj**
 and very many people Cpl-3pA-hurt-taxPs
 and very many people got hurt
- (iii) **i sibilaj k'ij winaq chuqa s-fl-tsaq k-achoch**
 and very many people also Cpl-3pA-fall 3pE-home
 and very many people also their houses fell

2. Passive Constructions

2.1 The Simple Passive

Cakchiquel has a passive construction which contains a derived verb on which the O argument is cross-referenced with the absolutive prefix and the A argument can optionally appear in a prepositional phrase but is not cross-referenced on the verb. Root Transitive passives are formed by lengthening the vowel of the root while Derived Transitive passives are formed by adding a -Vx suffix to the root. Examples of agentless passives are shown in (7a-c). The examples in (7d-f) below show that the logical A-argument, though not cross-referenced on a passive verb, can appear inside a sentence-final prepositional phrase.

The discourse functions of simple passives in Cakchiquel appear to be the similar to those of passives in English. Thus, Foley and Van Valin (1984:167-168): "Passives may be divided into two general types according to their function. Passives which serve to remove the actor from the core of the clause are *backgrounding* passives, whereas those which function to permit a non-actor to occur as PrP are *foregrounding* passives." Similarly Dayley (1981) distinguishes between the absolutive and the rearranging functions of Tzutujil passives. The absolutive function of the passive is to allow the agent of a transitive activity to be unexpressed. The rearranging function allows the status of the arguments to the verb to be modified by promotional and demotional processes: "in Tzutujil (as in many other languages) there is a constraint such that the patient of an active transitive verb may never be the topic of the discourse. Therefore, if the topic of the discourse is a semantic patient in a transitive activity, then the status of the patient must be modified."

- (7) (a) **ri-ya-ros i ru-k'in ri-enrik ki-te? ki-tata x-e-kom-s-Es**
Df-hon-Rosa and 3sE-with Df-Enrique 3pE-mother 3pE-father Cpl-3pE-die-Cs-Pas
'Rosa and Enrique's mother and father were killed'
[El Norte]

- (b) **i kwan sabado x-qo-otsan x-oj-ch'a:k⁹**
 and when saturday Cpl-1pA-play Cpl-1pA-beat.Pas
 'and when on Saturday we played, we were beaten'
 [Emilio's Weekend story]
- (c) **chel komo akuchi ni-fl-k'ay-Ix-we komid**
 such like where Incpl-3sA-use-Pas-place food
 'like where food is served'
 [El Norte]
- (d) **i yamer x-e-kom-s-Es pa-be ru-ma jun k'ajol-achin aj-mejikan**
 and almost Cpl-3pA - kill- Cs- Pas 3sE-by one young-man hon-mexican
 'And they were almost killed on the road by a young mexican man'
 [El Norte]
- (e) **i x - fl - cha:p ru-ma ri-r-ahaf ri-hay**
 and Cpl-3sA-catch.Pas 3sE-by Df-3sE-owner Df-house
 'And she was caught by the owner of the house' [El Norte]
- (f) **ri kame najin n-fl-ele-s-Es chi-k-e ru-ma ri-beyoma?**
 that now are Incpl-3sA-take-Cs-Pas to-3pE-to 3sE-by Df-rich
 'which now has been taken away from them by the rich.' [El Norte]

In (7a), the possessive phrase occurs left dislocated in syntactic topic position and the possessed phrase O proper appears in syntactic focus position.¹⁰ This the first sentence of the narrative portion of a text in which the consultant retells the story of the movie "El Norte." In (7b) and (7d-f), O functions as an already an established pragmatic topic--hence is unexpressed. (7c) shows that arguments other than O may be passivized when functioning as activated topic--in this case a locative argument functions as the head of a relative clause. Another function of the rearranging passive might be to allow the introduction into the discourse of brand new A participants, which Dubois (1987) claims are blocked from occurring as ergatively-marked

⁹{qu-etsan} is phonetically realized as [qo:tsan] This is a nice illustration of the difference between the two 1st person absolutive prefixes {qu-} and {oj-}, apparently marking the difference between a more agentive intransitive subject {qu-} and a more patient-like one {oj-}. Notice the phonological resemblance between the agentive intransitive subject marker {qu-} and the ergative agent marker {qa-}.

¹⁰It actually isn't clear if the possessed phrase occurs in syntactic focus position or simply follows the possessor in syntactic topic position. It is, however, that the possessor is the primary topic in this sentence. If the possessor were not topicalized it would follow rather than precede the possessed phrase, as in (i) below:

- (i) **ntos ri-jun-r- œbil ri-ya-ros s-fl-tsijon ru-k'In ri-doktor-re**
 then def-one-3sE-friend def-hon-Rosa cpl-3sA-speak 3sE-with def-doctor-dem
 'Then Rosa's friend talked with the doctor.' [El Norte]

arguments. This is especially likely in (7d) above, where A is indefinite, but also possibly in (7e) where the possessor has not been mentioned although the referent of the possessed phrase has been mentioned.

The example in (8), which ends the story of El Norte, contains two coordinated passive predicates: one with an expressed, non-topical agent, and a second one in which the already established topic is the possessor of the O-proper. It is presumably the latter which is cross-referenced on the verb, as in example (6c) discussed earlier.

- (8) (i) **pork ru-tata no sol x-fl-kom-s-es ru-ma eskopet**
 because 3sE-father not only Cpl-esA-die-Cs-Pas 3sE-by shotgun
 'Because his father not only got killed by a shotgun
- (ii) **ru-ma q'atbel-taq-tsiq watemal, sino chuqa x-fl-ele-s-Es ru-jolon**
 3sE-by townhall-plural-word Guatemala ,but also Cpl-3sA-take-Cs-Pas 3sE-head
 by the Guatemalan army, but also got his head cut off'

2.2. *Taj* -Passives

There is a second Passive construction, occurring with a restricted set of Root Transitive verbs, which is formed by the addition of a *-taj* suffix to the imperative stem. Again the patient is cross-referenced with the absolutive prefix, while the agent may be optionally expressed in a prepositional phrase but may not be cross-referenced on the verb. Two examples from a story about the Guatemala earthquake of 1976 are shown in (9ii) and (9iii):

- (9) (i) **k'a saqar-na k'a k'a-ri x - fl- ki - tamaj**
 until dawn-NA until then Cpl-3sA-1pE-learn
 'By dawn, by then, we learned
- (ii) **chi nImi-laj-kam-1k x- fl-bana-taj**
 that big - Emph-die-Nom Cpl-3sA-do-TaxPas
 that a big disaster had occurred,

- (iii) **i sIbIIaj k'ij winaq x - e -soko-taj**
 and very many people Cpl-3pA-hurt-TaxPas
 and many people got hurt.'

[Earthquake story]

Cognate constructions in other Mayan languages are typically termed the "completive passives." About the *tax* -passive in Tzutujil, Dayley (1981: 473) says that it "differs in meaning from the Simple Passive in that it emphasizes the result of the transitive activity on the patient as well as the termination of the activity. Depending on the context the Completive Passive is best translated as (1) 'be finished being Xed', (2) 'be already Xed', or (3) 'get Xed' (where 'X' is the meaning of the verb stem). About the *taj* -Passive in Quiche, Treschel (1982: 57) states that, in the completive aspect "the completive passive voice emphasizes the state or condition of the patient NP once the action of the verb has been completed" (and translated with "get") and in the incompletive aspect it "implicates a degree of certainty on the part of the speaker that the action of the verb will be completed."

These characterizations appear to be appropriate for Cakchiquel as well. Thus, in (9) both *banataj* 'to occur, happen' and *sokotaj* 'to get hurt,' which are derivationally related to *ban* 'do/make' and *sok* 'hurt', respectively, do express completed events. A few examples of elicited *taj* -Passive are shown below in (10a)-(14a), with the corresponding Simple Passives shown in (10b)-(14b). The preferred word order in the *tax* -Passive is VO in the absence of an agent, rather than OV as in Simple Passives. Comments from the native Cakchiquel speaker suggest that this verb-initial word order may be a function of an added emphasis being placed on the verb in *tax* -Passive constructions.

Thus (10a) implies that the wood-cutting "must have been a lot of work--it took all day," or was performed by a lot of people; however, no such implication is associated with (10b):

- (10) (a) **x - fl -choyo-taj ri-che?**
 CPL-3sA-cut-TaxPas Def-wood
 'the wood was cut'

- (b) **ri-che x - fl - cho:y**
 Def-woodCPL-3sA-cut.Pas
 'the wood was cut'

The example in (11a) implies that all ALL the clothes were washed, but (11b) does not:

- (11) (a) **x - fl -ch'aja-taj ri-ts'ieq**
 CPL-3sA-wash-TaxPas Def-clothes
 'the clothes were washed'
- (b) **ri-ts'ieq x - fl - ch'a:j**
 Def-clothes CPL-3sA-wash.Pas
 'the clothes were washed'

Example (12a) could be used to refer to an entire tournament having been lost, with (12b) then referring to the loss of a single game within the tournament:

- (12) (a) **x - fl -ch'aya-taj**
 CPL-3sA-beat-TaxPas
 's/he was beaten'
- (b) **x - fl - ch'a:y**
 CPL-3sA-beat.Pas
 's/he was beaten'

Example (13) shows that oblique agents can occur with *taj* -Passives just as with regular passive, though it appears that the agent is implicated as having a more central role in the accomplishment of the action in the *taj* -Passive as compared to the Simple Passive. Thus, from (13a) but not from (13b), the man can be inferred to have had the conscious aim of catching the person and to have succeeded in doing so:

- (13) (a) **ria? x - fl -chapa-taj ru-ma ri-achin**
 3sPro CPL-3sA-catch-TaxPas 3sE-by Def-man
 's/he was caught by the man'
- (b) **ria? x - fl - ch'a:p ru-ma ri-achin**
 3sPro CPL-3sA-catch.Pas 3sE-by Def-man
 's/he was caught by the man'

In (14a) but not in (14b), however, inclusion of 'the woman' as the agent is judged to be ungrammatical. The consultant offered the explanation that water and heat perhaps, but not the woman, produced the food's resultant cooked state. The relevant notion of agency is thus a very direct one:

- (14) (a) **x - fl -tsaka-taj (*ru-ma ri-ixoq)**
 CPL-3sA-catch-TaxPas (* 3sE-by Def-woman)
 'it was cooked (*by the woman)'
- (b) **x - fl - tsa:k ru-ma ri-ixoq**
 CPL-3sA-catch.Pas 3sE-by Def-woman
 'it was cooked by the woman'

Taj -passives can also occur with incomplete aspect, in which case the future completion of the action is emphasized, as in (15):

- (15) **ni-fl-soko-taj ria?**
 Incp1-3sA-hurt-TaxPas 3sPro
 'He'll get hurt'

As mentioned above, only a subclass of verbs have a *taj* -passive variant; all those that do exist are Root Transitives but not all Root Transitive verbs have them. It may be significant that many of the *taj* -passives can be most felicitously translated into English with *get*-passives.

It is noteworthy that the word order in the elicited *taj*-passive constructions with full NP subjects in (10) and (11) is Verb + Subject; whereas the word order of the elicited simple passive counterparts is Subject + Verb. Thus, the Subjects of elicited simple Passives but not *tax*-Passives are placed in syntactic topic position. If we assume that elicited sentences are a type of discourse-initial sentence, the word order facts suggest that *taj* -Passive sentences unlike Simple Passives are not necessarily topic-comment constructions. Instead they can be used to express only a comment--i.e., the fact that a certain event occurred, thus answering the topical question 'What happened?' The examples occurring in the texts, which were shown in (9), arguably exhibit Focus + New Topic order, or New-Topic + Comment. This analysis is supported by the

example in (16) below, which occurs near the end of the El Norte narration, in which the O subject of the two occurrences of *banataj*, is clefted¹¹ and thus explicitly signaled as the Focus being identified with the overtly expressed topic 'what happened':

- (16) (i) **i rIn n-fl-in-bij chi Uts, Uts-laj-sin,**
and 1sPro Incpl-3sA-1sE-say that good, good-emph-movie,
and I say that it's good, a good movie,
- (ii) **Uts-laj-beyal, Uts-laj-tsi,**
good-emph-way, good-emph-word
well done, a good story,
- (iii) **i ya-ri mer ni-fl-bana-taj chi-la watemal,**
and cop-def really Incpl-3sA-do-TaxPas to-there Guatemala
and that's really what happens down there in Guatemala,
- (iv) **ya-ri qas ni-fl-bana-taj chi-la watemal ru-k'In ri-por-taq-winaq.**
cop-def exactly Incpl-3sA-do-TaxPas to-there Guatemala 3sE-with def-poor-plur-people
This is exactly what happens in Guatemala with the poor people.
[El Norte]

3. The Focus Antipassive

Mayan languages are especially interesting typologically because they contain both Passive constructions and two constructions that invite the label "antipassive." The construction that I will call a "Focus Antipassive" is sometimes referred to in Mayan linguistics as simply an "Antipassive" because it contains a derived intransitive verb cross-indexed with only a single argument, generally the A-argument. The Focus Antipassive seems to be generally recognized in current Mayan Linguistics as having characteristics that are not at all typical of Antipassives universally.¹² It seems rather to be a construction unique to Mayan languages, which I will argue

¹¹the cop-def constituent here, **ya-ri**, also occurs when full arguments are clefted as in (ii):

- (ii) **ya-rIt-ri X-at-ur-ts'at ri-eloq'on**
cop-2sPro-def cpl-2sA-3sE-see def-thief
you were the one the thief saw

¹²E.g., according to Larsen (1987: 42), it is not really an antipassive because neither A nor O is oblique nor is either optional. Note, however, that O sometimes surfaces as an oblique phrase and also that when it is an already-activated topic, it frequently does not surface at all.

bears resemblance at the universal level as much to focus constructions as to antipassives. Cakchiquel also contains a second Antipassive-type construction, which also contains a derived intransitive verb indexing only a single argument. In these constructions it is always the A-argument that is cross-referenced, and the construction does seem to exhibit universally typical Antipassive characteristics.

Because I am interested in explaining the apparently idiosyncratic facts of Cakchiquel by interpreting them as instantiations of universal properties of language, I have chosen a terminology which most closely reflects the universal properties of the Cakchiquel constructions. Thus I adopt the terms "Focus Antipassive" and "Absolutive Antipassive" used by Dayley (1981). The term "Focus" is closely associated with discourse grammar, while "Antipassive" is more closely associated with sentence grammar. Mayan languages are thus typologically very interesting in that their study can potentially contribute to the study of the interaction between sentence grammar and discourse grammar. The Mayan Focus Antipassive is especially interesting because it involves a class of constructions consisting of questions, relative clauses, and clefts, as well as various types of quantified constructions, various subsets of which have been identified as similar both semantically and syntactically at various times in terms of various grammatical theories. Furthermore, these constructions exhibit an intriguing subject-object asymmetry in which the split patterns along ergative-absolutive lines.

3.1 Extracted Agent

Focus Antipassive stems are formed by adding the suffix *-o* to the Active stem of Root Transitive verbs, and by adding the suffix *-n* to Derived Transitive stems. The most salient use of Focus Antipassives is in a class of constructions that might be referred to as "extracted agent" in transformational terms. It is used whenever the A-argument is relativized, questioned, or clefted. Examples of these types of Focus Antipassive constructions are shown in (17):

- (17) (a) **achike x - fl - ban-o**
 who Cpl-3sA-do-Foc
 'Who did it?'
- (b) **ri-achin ri x - fl - ban-o**
 Def-man that Cpl-3sA-do-Foc
 'the man who did it'
- (b) **ya-rIa-ri ri x-fl-ban-o**
 Cop-3sPro-def Rel Cpl-3sA-do-Foc
 'It is he who did it'

Object constituent questions and relative clauses take the regular transitive active form of the verb. Because of the question word + verb + subject, word order in such cases, and the lack of case marking on noun phrases, the use of different verb stems for subject and object relatives and questions serves to disambiguate them. An example illustrating this point is shown in (18):

- (18) (i) **achike x - fl - u - to? ria?** Active
 who Cpl-3sA-3sE-help 3sPro
 'Who did he help?'
- (ii) **achike x - fl - to?-o ria?** Focus
 who Cpl-3sA--help-Foc 3sPro
 'Who helped him?'

In some extracted agent constructions, it is the O-argument that is cross-referenced on the verb:

- (19) (a) **achike x - e - pax-in ri-laq**¹³
 who Cpl-3pA-break-Foc Def-dish
 'Who broke the dishes?'
- (b) **achike x - qu - chap-o rioj**
 who Cpl-p1A-catch-Foc 1pPro
 'Who caught us?'
- (c) **ri-eleq'on-ri ri x-i-ts'it-o**

¹³Another possibility here is that the verb is agreeing with a plural question word, **achike**, 'who'.

def-thief-def rel Cpl-1sA-saw-Foc
'It was the thief that saw me'

- (d) **ri-eleq'on-ri ri x-a-ts'it-o**
def-thief-def rel Cpl-2sA-saw-Foc
'It was the thief that saw you'

However there are other contexts in which the verbs are formally identical to the verbs in the focus questions above, but in which the A-argument rather than the O-argument is cross-referenced on the verb:

- (20) (a) **ya-rie-ri ri x - e - pax-in jun laq**
cop-3pPro-def rel Cpl-3pA-break-Foc one dish
'It was they who broke a dish'

- (b) **ya-rioj-ri ri x - qu - chap-o ria?**
cop-1pPro-def rel Cpl-1pA-catch-Foc 3sPro
'We were the ones who caught him'

- (21) **rioj ri achike nu-qu-k'ats-in chi-k-e ri-aj-beyoma-taq-winaq**
1pPro rel what Incpl-1pA-useful-Foc to-3pE-at def-hum-rich-plural-people
We who are useful to the rich people [El Norte]

The cognate system of agreement in Focus Antipassive constructions in Quiche was described by Norman and Campbell (1978) as depending on the following agreement hierarchy:

1st person, 2nd person > 3rd person plural > 3rd person singular

The Focus Antipassive verb is predicted to agree with whichever argument, A or O, is higher (leftmost) on the hierarchy. The above examples indicate that this person-number hierarchy appears to work quite well for Cakchiquel as well. Thus, as would be predicted by the hierarchy, the examples showing O-agreement in (19) above had 1st or 2nd person singular or 3rd person

plural O-arguments with 3rd person singular A-arguments. Also as would be predicted by the hierarchy, the examples showing A-agreement in (20) and (21) had 1st or 3rd person plural A-arguments with 3rd person singular O-arguments. However, sometimes the form predicted by the person-hierarchy is rejected, as in the example in (22), where the verb agrees with a 3rd person plural O-argument instead of with the 1st person plural A-argument which is higher on the hierarchy:

- (22) (i) **ya-rioj-ri ri x-e-ts'it-o ri-achin**
 cop-1pPro-def rel Cpl-3pA-see-Foc Def-man
 'we were the ones who saw the men'
- (ii) **??ya-rioj-ri ri x-oj-ts'it-o ri-achin**
 cop-1pPro-def rel Cpl-1pA-see-Foc Def-man
 'we were the ones who saw the men'

A possible reason for this exception is that the plurality of the O-object, *achin* 'man' is not marked in the noun itself (although there is a plural form, *achi?a*, 'men!'). It may also be the case that the rejection is due to the artificial nature of the elicitation situation, and the consultant did admit uncertainty about some of his intuitions concerning this set of examples.

A second restriction claimed for the use of the Focus Antipassive in Quiche, is that one argument must be third person (cf. Treschel, 1981, Larsen, 1987). However, Cakchiquel Focus Antipassives without a third-person argument are optionally possible if A is cross-referenced on the verb and if O appears in an oblique phrase as in (23ii):

- (23) (i) **ya-rIt-ri ri x-in-at-ts'at**
 cop-2sPro-def rel Cpl-1sA-2sE-see
 'you were the one who saw me'
- (ii) **ya-rIt-ri ri x-a-ts'it-o ruk'In rIn**
 cop-2sPro-def rel Cpl-2sA-see-Foc with 1sPro
 'you were the one who saw me'

- (iii) ***ya-rIt-ri ri x-i-ts'ito (ruk'in rIn)**
 cop-2sPro-def rel Cpl-1sA-see-Foc with 1sPro
 'you were the one who saw me'

And when only O is third person, the Focus Antipassive is again optional, but either A or O may be cross-referenced on the verb, as shown in (24) for a 1st person A-argument and in (25) for a 2nd person A-argument:

- (24) (i) **ya-rIn-ri ri x-fl-i-ts'at ri-eleq'on**
 cop 1sPro-def rel Cpl-3sA-1sE-see def-thief
 'It is I who saw the thief'
- (ii) **ya-rIn-ri ri s-i-ts'ito ri-eleq'on**
 cop 1sPro-def rel Cpl-1sA-see-Foc def-thief
 'It is I who saw the thief'
- (iii) **ya-rIn-ri ri s-fl-ts'it-o ri-eleq'on**
 cop 1sPro-def rel Cpl-3sA-see-Foc def-thief
 'It is I who saw the thief'
- (25) (i) **ya-rIt-ri ri x-fl-at-ts'at ri-eleq'on**
 cop 2sPro-def rel Cpl-3sA-2sE-see def-thief
 'It was you who saw the thief'
- (ii) **ya-rIt-ri ri x-a-ts'ito ri-eleq'on**
 cop 2sPro-def rel Cpl-2sA-see-Foc def-thief
 'It was you who saw the thief'
- (iii) **ya-rIt-ri ri s-fl-ts'ito ri-eleq'on**
 cop 2sPro-def rel Cpl-3sA-see-Foc def-thief
 'It was you who saw the thief'

Finally, sometimes the Focus Antipassive is rejected altogether even though one argument is third person:

- (26) (i) **ri-eleq'on-ri ri x-uj-ur-ts'at**
 def-thief-def rel Cpl-1pA-3sE-saw
 'It was the thief that saw us'

- (ii) **??ri-eleq'on-ri ri s-fl-ts'ito'**
 def-thief-def rel Cpl-3sA-saw-Foc
 'It was the thief that saw us
- (iii) ***ri-eleq'on-ri ri x-oj-ts'it-o**
 def-thief-def rel Cpl-1pA-saw-Foc
 'It was the thief that saw us
- (27) (i) **ya rie-ri ri x-in-ki-ts'at**
 cop 3pPro-def rel Cpl-1sA-3pE-see
 'They were the ones who saw me'
- (ii) **??ya rie-ri ri x-e-ts'it-o (ru-k'In rIn)**
 cop 3pPro-def rel Cpl-3pA-see-Foc (3sE-with 1sPro)
 'They were the ones who saw me'
- (iii) **??ya rie-ri ri x-i-ts'it-o (ru-k'In rIn)**
 cop 3pPro-def rel Cpl-1sA-see-Foc (3sE-with 1sPro)
 'They were the ones who saw me'

The complexity and singularity of this system has led researchers to search for an explanation in grammatical theory. For example, Treschel (1982), relying on a more detailed description by Mondlach (1981), criticizes two analyses prevalent in the Mayan literature-- the "disambiguation analysis" and the "antipassive analysis", and presents a Montague Grammar analysis which he claims combines the best aspects of both. Within Relational Grammar, Berinstein (1984) analyzes their K'ekchi cognates as examples of "2-3 retreat,"¹⁴ whereby the initial 2 spontaneously demotes to a 3. Because the initial 2 is not overrun it cannot pass its number features laterally to the 1. Davies and Sam-Colop (1988) have recently presented a three stage analysis for the Quiche construction, which they call an "antipassive," according to which an initial 1 does overrun the 2-arc, putting the initial 2 en ch mage, and then advances back to 1. Because the 2-arc is an overrun arc, "lateral feature passing" can occur, enabling the person-

¹⁴Aissen (1987), p. 52-53.

number features of the demoted (O) argument to be cross-referenced on the derived intransitive verb¹⁵.

3.2 Focussed Agent

The Focus Antipassive can also with certain types of quantified A-arguments. As shown in (28) and (29), when **majun**, 'no one' and **jun**, 'someone' are A-arguments, the use of the Focus Antipassive is obligatory; and (29) shows that agreement is with the O-argument in such cases.

- (28) (i) **ma-jun s-fl-ts'it-o-ta ri-acin**
 not-one Cpl-3sA-saw-Foc-Irr Def-man
 'Nobody saw the man'
- (ii) ***ma-jun x-fl-u-ts'at-ta ri-acin**
 not-one Cpl-3sA-3sE-saw-Irr Def-man
 'Nobody saw the man'
- (29) (i) **jun s-fl-ts'it-o ri-achin**
 one Cpl-3sA-saw-Foc Def-man
 somebody saw the man
- (ii) **jun x-fl-u-ts'at ri-achin**
 one Cpl-3sA-saw-Foc Def-man
 somebody saw the man
- (30) (a) **ma-jun x-i-ts'it-o-ta**
 not-one Cpl-1sA-saw-Foc
 nobody saw me
- (b) **jun x-a-ts'it-o**
 one Cpl-2sA-saw-Foc
 somebody saw you

¹⁵Presumably, Sam-Colop (in preparation) will discuss the differences between the K'ekchi and the Quiche structures that motivate these different analyses.

Example (31) shows that not all quantified A-arguments trigger use of the Focus Antipassive, and (32) shows an example of a 1st person plural universal quantified A-argument which occurred in a text:

- (31) (i) **ki-nojEl x-at-ki-ts'at**
 3pE-every cpl-2sA-3pE-see
 'Everyone saw you.'
- (ii) ***ki-nojEl x-a-ts'it-o ...**
 3pE-every cpl-2sA-3pE-see-Foc
 'Everyone saw you'.'
- (iii) ***ki-nojel x-e-ts'it-o ...**
 3pE-every cpl-3pa-see-Foc
 'Everyone saw you.'
- (32) (i) **ka?i oxi q'ij despues**
 two three day after
 two or three days later
- (ii) **ri-q- chbil Achiko x-fl-ka:choj anaj**
 def-1pE-friend Francisco Cpl-3sA-be.well again
 our friend Francisco was well again
- (iii) **per q-onojEl x-fl-qa-xbij-q-i.**
 but 1pE-all Cpl-3sA-1pE-scare-1pE-Refl
 but all of us were scared

[Snake Bite story]

One explanation for the restriction on quantified-agent Focus Antipassives might be the fact that the ergative marker occurs as a prefix on the quantifier, and thus is required to occur on the verb to mark the agent as a sort of 'ergative-harmony' process. This seems unlikely, however, given the lack of such harmony in examples such as (33), where the ergative-marker on the quantified agent is not prohibited from 'co-referring' with the absolutive marker on the predicate, and (34), where a quantified O-argument is cross-referenced with an absolutive marker on the verb:

- (33) **q-onojel k'a oj-war-naq-na**
 1pE-all still 1pA-sleep-nom--opt
 'We all were still sleeping'
 [Earthquake story]
- (34) **ri-eleq'on x-oj-ur-ts'at q-onojel rioj**
 Def-thief Cpl-1pA-3sE-see 1pE-all 1pPro
 'The thief saw all of us'

A second possible explanation is suggested by the consultant's hesitation when he was asked to provide the translation of 'everyone saw you' in a paradigm with 'no one', and his explanation that Cakchiquel is different from English and you can't say "every-one" but have to talk about "a entire group."

A possibly related use of the Focus Antipassive is in sentences which contain an unclefted emphasized agent. In the Focus Antipassive (i) examples shown in (35)-(39), agency is contrastively attributed to a particular subgroup of possible agents in the antipassive, but this attribution does not take place in the Active (ii) sentences. Thus, (35i) but not (35ii) implies that only some of us washed the dishes, and (36i) but not (36ii) implies that we paid with our own money. The Focus Antipassive thus seems to be associated with a semantically partitive agent

- | | | | |
|------|------|---|--------------------------|
| (35) | (i) | rioj x - qu - ch'aj-o laq
1sPro Cpl-1pA-wash-Foc Def-dish
'WE washed dishes' | <u>Focus Antipassive</u> |
| | (ii) | rioj x - fl -qa - ch'aj laq
1sPro Cpl-3sA-1pE-wash Def-dish
'We washed dishes' | <u>Active</u> |
| (36) | (i) | rioj x - qu - toj-o ria?
1sPro Cpl-1pA-wash-Foc 3sPro
'WE paid him' | <u>Focus Antipassive</u> |
| | (ii) | rioj x - fl -qa - toj ria?
1sPro Cpl-3sA-1pE-wash 3sPro
'We paid him' | <u>Active</u> |

Two interpretations are associated with (37i): the contrastive subgroup (partitive) interpretation again, and also one implying that each person individually participated in lighting the fire. That is, a distributive plural reading is associated with the focus antipassive construction.

- (37) (i) **rie? x - e - box-o ri-q'aq'** Focus Antipassive
 3pPro Cpl-3pA-light-Foc Def-fire
 'THEY lit the fire'
- (ii) **rie? x - fl -ki - box ri-q'aq'** Active
 3pPro Cpl-3sA-3pE-light Def-fire
 'They lit the fire'

Finally, (38i) but not (39ii) implies that only I and not you or anyone cooked, a contrastive agent reading:

- (38) (i) **rIn x - i - tsak-o ri-rukil** Focus Antipassive
 1sPro Cpl-1sA-cook-Foc Def-food
 'I cooked the dishes'
- (ii) **rIn x - fl -in - tsak ri-rukil** Active
 1sPro Cpl-3sA-1sE-cook Def-food
 'I cooked the dishes'

Example (39) is an example from a text, showing that A can act as the focus of new information and not just contrastively:

- (39) (i) **i kwando x-qu-be x-fl-qa-ts'ita,**
 and when Cpl-1pA-go Cpl-3sA-1pE-see
 and when we went to see him
- (ii) **jun kumats x-fl-ch'op-o ru-chin.**
 one snake 3sA-bite-Foc 3sE-for
 a SNAKE had bit him.
 [Snake Bite Story]

Finally, the Focus-Antipassive is sometimes used in reflexive and reciprocal constructions, as in text-example (40) below:

- (40) (i) **i aqal x-fl-k-kuqur-s-aj k-anima,**
 and then Cpl-3sA-3pE-happy-cause-Act 3pE-spirit
 'and then they made each other happy,
- (ii) **ma-x-e-chap-o-ta-k-i**
 neg-Cpl-3pE-shout-Foc-Irr-3pE-Refl
 'They didn't shout at each other
- (iii) **mejor x-fl-ki-chop xajoj**
 better Cpl-3sA-3pE-start dancing
 'It's better to start dancing'
 [dance film story]

The range of semantic interpretations just outlined which are associated with focus antipassive constructions are theoretically intriguing. That is, the class consisting of positive and negative existential, distributive, partitive, contrastive, and reciprocal noun phrases have all been analyzed at some time in the past as noun phrases with a certain amount of quantificational force (see, for example, Lakoff 1970 and Roberts 1987 for distributive plurals; and Link 1984, for reciprocals). Furthermore, this entire class of quantificational agent-phrases occurs in the same, immediately pre-verbal position that relativized, questioned, and clefted phrases occur in, and require the same form of following verb, i.e. the Focus Antipassive. (Also see Schachter 1971 for parallels between questions, clefts and relative clauses; and May 1985 for parallels between quantifier-raising and wh-movement constructions.)

3.3 O Topic + A Focus + Verb

A third use of the antipassive involves sentences in which there is no overt object noun phrase following the verb. Examples (41) and (42) show that the Focus Antipassive is obligatory when the O-argument is in topicalized position before a pre-verbal A-argument:

- (41) (i) **rIn x-fl-in-tsak ri-rukil-way ri x - fl -qa-tij**
 1sPro Cpl-3sE-1sA-cook Def-food-tortilla that Cpl-3sA-1pE-eat
 'I cooked the food that we ate'.
- (ii) **ri-rukil-way ri x - fl -qa-tij, rIn x-i-tsako**
 Def-food-tortilla that Cpl-3sA-1pE-eat, 1sPro Cpl-1sA-cook-Foc
 'The food that we ate, I cooked'.
- (iii) ***ri-rukil-way ri x - fl -qa-tij, rIn x-fl-in-tsak**
 Def-food-tortilla that Cpl-3sA-1pE-eat, 1sPro Cpl-3sE-1sA-cook
- (42) (i) **ria? x - fl - u-ban ri-kasno-way**
 3sPro Cpl-3sA-3sE-do Def-bread-tortilla
 'He made the bread'
- (ii) **ri-kasno-way ria? x - fl - ban-o**
 Def-bread-tortilla 3sPro Cpl-3sA-do-Foc
 'The bread, HE made.'
- (iii) ***ri-kasno-way ria? x - fl - u-ban**
 Def-bread-tortilla 3sPro Cpl-3sA-3sE-do

In the topicalized OAV sentences in (41ii) and (41ii), the antipassive is required. As shown in (40iii) and (41iii), the Active is ungrammatical here although it is grammatical in the nontopicalized AVO sentences in (40i) and (41i).

The examples in (43) show that OAV order is a sufficient condition for use of a focus verb, but not a necessary one. Although the focused A-argument must occur in pre-verbal position if the verb is in Focus Antipassive voice (cf. 43v), the O-argument can occur sentence-finally (cf. 43iv) as well as sentence-initially (cf. 43iii). Only if O occurs in sentence-initial position is the Focus Antipassive voice obligatory.

- (43) (i) Q: **achike s-fl-tsak-o ri-kinaq i ri-aros**
 who Cpl-3sA-cook-Foc Def-beans and Def-rice
 Who cooked the beans and the rice?

- (ii) A: **ri-kinaq ya-rIn x-i-tsak-o i ri-aros nu-te s-fl-tsak-o**
 def-bean cop-1sPro Cpl-1sA-cook-Foc and def-rice 1sE-mother Cpl-3sA-cook-Foc
 'The beans, I made MYSELF, but the rice my MOTHER made.'
- (iii) A: **ya-rIn x-i-tsak-o ri-kinaq i nu-te s-fl-tsak-o ri-aros**
 cop-1sPro Cpl-1sA-cook-Foc def-bean and 1sE-mother Cpl-3sA-cook-Foc def-rice
 'I made the beans myself, but my mother cooked the rice.'
- (iv) A: **ri-kinaq ya-rIn x-i-tsak-o i nu-te s-fl-tsak-o ri-aros**
 def-bean cop-1sPro Cpl-1sA-cook-Foc and 1sE-mother Cpl-3sA-cook-Foc def-rice
 'The beans I made myself, but my mother cooked the rice.'
- (iv) A: ***ya-rIn ri-kinaq x-i-tsako ...**
***x-i-tsako ri-kinaq ya-rIn ...**
***x-i-tsako ya-rIn ri-kinaq ...**

The topic need not appear in the same sentence as the antipassive verb for which it functions as the direct object. It may instead be a discourse topic, as demonstrated by the second sentence in (44), which occurred in the text about earthquake, and in which the Focus Antipassive is again obligatory:

- (44) (i) **por ri x-fl-bana-taj ma-jun x-fl-ban-o-ta.**
 for Rel¹⁶ Cpl-3sA-do-tax not-one Cpl-3sA-do-Foc-Irr.
 because what happened NOBODY did it.
- (ii) **ri-ruchulef x - fl - ban-o / *x - fl - u -ban.**
 the-earth Cpl-3sA-do-Foc / *Cpl-3sA-3sE-do.
 THE EARTH did it.
- [Earthquake story]

Dayley (1981) says about OAV sentences in Tzutijil that their function is to contrast both the A and the O. This characterization is apt for (43) and possibly for (41) and (42), but my Topic + Focus analysis better fits (44), where 'what happened' is functioning as a new topic and thus receives Topic stress in the English gloss, but it is only contrastive in the weak sense that it rather than something else is being selected as topic.

¹⁶It isn't clear whether 'ri' is a definite marker or a relative marker here. Interesting that they have the same form--free relatives are a type of definite expression.

3.4 Generic Action

A fourth and final use of the Focus Antipassive involves sentences in which the O-argument following the verb is indefinite and in fact nonspecific: it consists of a bare noun, preceded by neither a definite nor an indefinite article. A sentence containing an Active verb with a nonspecific object in either the completive or incomplete aspect, is interpreted as expressing an action occurring on only a single occasion, whereas the Focus Antipassive expresses a generic action which is interpreted as occurring on possibly more than one occasion. This contrast is exemplified in (45):

- (45) (i) **ria? x - fl - yak-o poq** Focus Antipassive
3sPro Cpl-3sA-save-Foc money
'He saved money (on possibly more than one occasion)
- (ii) **ria? x - fl - u - yak poq** Active
3sPro Cpl-3sA-3sE-save money
'He saved money (on a single occasion)
- (46) (i) **ria? ni - fl - paxi-n laq** Antipassive
3sPro Incpl-3sA-break-Foc dish
'He breaks dishes/is a dish breaker
- (ii) **ria? ni - fl - u - paxij laq** Active
3sPro Incpl-3sA-3sE-break dish
'He is breaking/will break dishes

About the Antipassive sentence in (46i), the consultant noted that "this guy has the special skill of breaking dishes," but no such implication is derivable from (46ii). There is a preference for Active sentences to contain definite rather than indefinite objects. Thus though (46ii) is grammatical, it is not a prototypical Active sentences. Example (47) illustrates the use of the Focus Antipassive with a nonspecific O-argument in a text:

- (47) (i) **i x-e-be pa jun-nIma-ja ru-k'In ri-beyoma?-taq-winaq**
and Cpl-3pA-go in one-big-house 3sE-with def-rich-plural-people
'and they went into a big house with rich people
- (ii) **chin ni-fl-ki-tamaj akwi ni-fl-ki-ban y-e-ch'aj-o laq,**
to Incpl-3sA-3pE-learn how Incpl-3sA-3pE-do Incpl-3pA-wash-Foc dishes
'in order to learn how to wash dishes
- (iii) **akwi ni-fl-ki-ban y-e-ch'aj-o tsi?eq**
how Incpl-3sA-3pE-do Incpl-3pA-wash-Foc clothes
how to wash clothes [El Norte]

4. The Absolutive Antipassive

The Absolutive Antipassive stem for Root Transitive verbs can be formed from the Focus Antipassive stem by adding -n , as shown in the table on page 3. No morphological distinction is made between Focus and Absolutive Antipassive with Derived Transitive stems.

4.1 Derived Intransitives

Absolutive Antipassive verbs sometimes function as pure intransitive verbs, such that an intransitive translation into English would be appropriate. Thus, the difference between the Focus Antipassive verb in (48i) and the Absolutive Antipassive verb in (48ii) is best captured in English by the lexical items, 'catch' and 'shout':

- | | | | |
|------|------|--|-------------------------------|
| (48) | (i) | ria? x - fl - chap-o
3sPro Cpl-3sA-catch-Foc
'He caught it' | <u>Focus Antipassive</u> |
| | (ii) | ria? x - fl - chap-on
3sPro Cpl-3sA-catch-Aps
'He shouted.' | <u>Absolutive Antipassive</u> |

The Focus Antipassive verb in (49i) is best translated as 'beat' while the Absolutive Antipassive verb in (49ii) is translated 'win'. The semantic similarity in the 'beat'/'win' case is

more transparent than in the 'catch'/shout' case. English speaker even occasionally say either 'I beat' or 'I won him', instead of the respectively more proper 'I won' and 'I beat him.'

- (49) (i) **ria? x - fl - ch'ak-o** Focus Antipassive
 3sPro Cpl-3sA-beat-Foc
 'He beat him'
- (ii) **ria? x - fl - ch'ak-on** Absolutive Antipassive
 3sPro Cpl-3sA-beat-APs
 'He won.'

The examples in (50) show that Cakchiquel unlike English possesses separate lexical items for the transitive and intransitive senses of 'eat':

- (50) (i) **ria? x - fl - tij-o** Focus Antipassive
 3sPro Cpl-3sA-eat-Foc
 'He ate it'
- (ii) **ria? x - fl - wa?** Intransitive
 3sPro Cpl-3sA-eat
 'He ate'

When no object appears overtly, an unspecified patient is usually understood, as in example (51ii):

- (51) (i) **ria? x - fl - u - qUm** Active
 3sPro Cpl-3sA-3sE-drink
 'He drank it/something'
- (ii) **ria? x - fl - qum-un** Absolutive Antipassive
 3sPro Cpl-3sA-drink-APs
 'He drank (something)'

The native speaker consultant reports that the verbs in (48i) and (48ii) are instances of different verbs "which just sound similar. However the pairs of verbs shown in the (i) and (ii) examples of (49) and (51) are instances of "the same verb."

4.2 Generic Object

Example (42ii) above showed that the Focus Antipassive form *chapo* can be used in a reciprocal construction meaning 'shout at each other'. The form *chapo* can also be used to mean 'catch' in a focus antipassive construction with either a definite or an indefinite O-argument as in (52i) and (52ii):

- (52) (i) **ria? x-fl-chapo ri-imul** Focus Antipassive
3sPro Cpl-3sA-3sE-catch Def-rabbit
'HE caught the rabbit'
- (ii) **ria? x-fl-chapo imul**
3sPro Cpl-3sA-3sE-catch rabbit
'He caught rabbits'

The form *chapon* can also occur as an Absolutive Antipassive form meaning 'catch' if (and only if) the O-argument is indefinite and in fact, non-specific, as in (53ii):

- (53) (i) ***ria? x-fl-chapon ri-imul** Abs Antipassive
3sPro Cpl-3sA-3sE-catch Def-rabbit
'He caught the rabbit'
- (ii) **ria? x-fl-chapon imul**
3sPro Cpl-3sA-3sE-catch rabbit
'He caught rabbits'

Absolutive Antipassive constructions with expressed objects emphasize the repeated nature of the action even more than do their Focus Antipassive counterparts. Thus, the sentence in (53ii) indicates that the agent caught rabbits as a job or as a hobby, and that the catching took place over an extended, longer than normal, period of time, instead of on one or a few specific occasions. The example in (54) shows that the combination of the Absolutive Antipassive stem with the completive aspect results in a remote past, "used to" meaning:

- (54) **rIn x -i -ch'aj-on laq kame w-achjil ni-fl-ban-o**
 1sPro Cpl-1sA-wash-AAp dish now 1sE-husband Incpl-3sA-do-Foc
 'I used to wash the dishes, but now my husband does it.'

4.3 Perfect Verbs

A third use of the Absolutive Antipassive stem is in the "Perfect" construction, which is notable for lacking both an ABSOLUTIVE marker and a tense/aspect prefix. (55a) shows an example of a perfect construction containing a Root Transitive verb, and (55b) shows an example containing a Derived Transitive verb. Notice that the A-argument is cross-referenced by the ergative rather than the absolutive prefix:

- (55) (a) **rIn nu-ban-on**
 1sPro 1sE-do-Aps
 'I have done it'
- (b) **rie? ki-woy-on ria?**
 3pPro 3pErg-call-Aps 3sA
 'They have called him'

The difference between the perfect and the active voice is nicely illustrated in the following example:

- (46) (a) **ria? x-fl - u- yow-aj-r-i**
 3sPro Cpl-3sA-3sE-hide-Act-3sE-Refl
 'He hid himself' (he did it but may not still be there)
- (b) **ria? ru- yow-an-ri**
 3sPro 3sE-hide-Aps-3sE-Refl
 'He is hidden' (he's done it and is there now)
- (c) **ria? ni-fl-yow-aj-ri**
 3sPro Incpl-3sA-hide-Act-3sE-Refl
 'He is hiding' (he's doing it and isn't there yet)

Many examples occur in texts that are elicited as narrations of short films in progress, such as the examples in (56) and (57):

- (56) (i) **i kame ki-k'am-on-pe jun nImI-laj-ch'akat,**
and now 3pE-bring-App-come one big-emph-chair
'and now they're bringing in a big chair
- (ii) **i aqal najin ni-fl ki-ya-qa pan-ilef**
and now prog Incp-3sA-3pE-put-down in-earth
'and now they're putting it down.'
- (57) (i) **ru-yowal juba ri-achin porke ma-x-fl-to:j-ta ch-e,**
3sE-angry some def-man because neg-Cpl-3sA-pay.Pas-Irr to-back
'the man was a little mad because he hadn't been paid,
- (ii) **ri-por-isoq ru-xub-in-r-i chi-r-ij ri-achin**
def-poor-woman 3sE-scare-AAp-3sE-Refl to-3sE-back def-man
'so the poor woman was a little scared behind the man'

Perfect verbs also occur frequently in constructions describing the weather, as in (58):

- (58) **i ri-q'ij qas Uts ru-ban-on**
and def-day quite good 3sE-do-AAp
'and the day was quite nice'

Finally, the verb meaning 'know' always occurs in the perfect form in incompletive aspect, as in (59a). When it occurs in the active voice it means 'learn,' as in (59b):

- (59) (a) **i sol ri-qa-tata chi-kaj ru-taman achike ru-ma**
and only def-1pE-father to-sky 3sE-learn-AAp what 3sE-by
'and only our father up there knows why'
- (b) **x-fl-qa-tamaj chi nImI-laj-kamIk x-fl-bana-taj**
Cpl-3sA-1pE-learn.Act that big-emph-death Cpl-3sA-do-Tax.Pass
'We learned that a big disaster had occurred.'
[Earthquake story]

References

- Aissen, Judith L. 1987. Towards a theory of agreement controllers. Manuscript from course materials, Aissen/Ladusaw, "Locality and Agreement Systems," 1987 Linguistic Institute, Stanford University. To appear in Brian E. Joseph & Paul M. Postal, eds. *Studies in Relational Grammar 3*.
- Berinstein, Ava. 1984. Evidence for multiattachment in K'ekchi Mayan. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles. New York: Garland Press.
- Campbell, Lyle. 1979. Middle American languages. *The languages of Native America*, ed. by L. Campbell & M. Mithun. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1978. Ergativity. *Syntactic typology*, ed. by Winfred P. Lehmann, 329-94. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Davies, William D. and L. Enrique Sam-Colop. 1988. Regularizing K'iche' verb agreement. Paper presented at the Minnesota Conference on Language and Linguistics, September 30-October 1, 1988, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
- Dayley, Jon Philip. 1981. Tzutijil grammar. Ph.D. dissertation. Berkeley.
- DeLancey, Scott. 1981. An interpretation of split ergativity and related patterns. *Lg.* 57.626-657.
- Dixon, Robert M. W. 1979. Ergativity. *Lg.* 55.59-138.
- Du Bois, John W. 1987. The discourse basis of ergativity. *Lg.* 63.805-855.
- Foley, William A. and Robert D. Van Valin Jr. 1984. *Functional syntax and universal grammar*. Cambridge University Press.
- Lakoff, George. 1970. Linguistics and natural logic, *Synthese* 22, 151-271.
- Larsen, Thomas W. 1987. The syntactic status of ergativity in Quiche. *Lingua* 71. 33-59.
- Li, Charles N. and Sandra A. Thompson. 1979. Third-person pronouns and zero-anaphora in Chinese discourse. In *Discourse and Syntax*, ed. by Talmy Givón, *Syntax and Semantics* 12, 311-335. New York: Academic Press.

- Link, Godehard. 1984. Plural. To appear in Dieter Wunderlich and Arnim von Stechow (eds.),
Handbook of Semantics.
- May, Robert. 1985. Logical Form: It's Structure and Derivation. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Norman, William M. 1978. Advancement rules and syntactic change: The loss of instrumental
voice in Mayan. Proceedings of the Fourth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics
Society, 458-476.
- Norman, William M. and Lyle Campbell. 1978.
- Roberts, Craige. 1987. Distributivity. Paper presented at the Sixth Amsterdam Colloquium.
- Sam-Colop, Luis Enrique (in preparation). Antipassive and 2-3 Retreat in K'iche' University of
Iowa Master's thesis.
- Schachter, Paul. 1973. Focus and relativization. *Language* 49, 14-46.
- Smith-Stark, T. 1978. The Mayan antipassive: some facts and fictions. In N. England (ed.),
Papers in Mayan Linguistics, 169-187. *Studies in Mayan Linguistics*. No. 2 (Univ. of
Missouri miscellaneous publications in anthropology no. 6).
- Trechsel, Frank R. 1982. A categorial fragment of Quiche. *Texas Linguistic Forum*. 20.

porke ri-jun-se ora-re ru-yak'-on juba ru-rajel
because def-one-woman-dem 3sE-save-Ap some 3sE-money
'because this woman had saved some money'[El Norte]